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Abstract. The LLL algorithm, despite its ubiquity and celebrity over the past 37 years, has never been properly understood so far. In this paper, we argue that LLL behaves essentially identically to a certain stochastic variant of the sandpile model that we introduce here, and that this observation explains many of its major folklore mysteries at once, in particular the well-known discrepancy between its worst- and average-case output quality. This result represents one of the first steps toward a scientific understanding of the practical behavior of lattice reduction algorithms. Its impact is most deeply felt in the area of post-quantum cryptography, in particular lattice-based cryptography, where it is of critical importance to correctly evaluate the strength of lattice reduction algorithms.

1. Introduction

1.1. The problem and its history. Ever since its advent in 1982, the numerous practitioners of LLL have been puzzled by the curious phenomenon that there exists such a conspicuous gap between the actual performance of LLL and what could be said of it theoretically. It has been a well-known theorem from the original LLL paper [14] that the worst-case length of the shortest vector of an LLL-reduced basis is proportional to $(4/3)^{n-1} \approx 1.075^n$, where $n$ is the rank of the basis, and that this bound is sharp. It has been just as well-known that LLL in practice yields $\approx 1.02^n$ almost all the time, except in some special cases in which, actually, it does even better. (The numbers 1.075 and 1.02 here are called root Hermite factors (RHF), which is the standard measure of the output quality of lattice reduction algorithms such as LLL: the closer it is to 1, the stronger the algorithm.)

It is surprising and puzzling that there exist hardly any papers that attempt to understand this intriguing phenomenon of such an important algorithm. Even a numerical assessment of the performance of LLL came relatively recently [19], which is, to the best of our knowledge, the only published work on the topic, besides a few works (co-)authored by the second-named author [21], [23]. Perhaps it was thought by the community to be beyond reach. Stehlé [32] recounts

One may wonder if the geometry of “average” LLL-reduced bases is due to the fact that most LLL-reduced bases are indeed of this shape, or if the LLL algorithm biases the distribution. It is hard to decide between both possibilities . . .

Stehlé is asking here whether most LLL bases have RHF $\approx 1.02$ or not. This question has been more or less settled by Venkatesh and the second-named author [23], using the theory of automorphic forms.

Theorem 1 (Kim and Venkatesh [23]). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $N = N(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, in all dimensions $n > N$, $100 - \varepsilon$ percent of Siegel-reduced bases of $100 - \varepsilon$ percent

\footnote{The proof in [23] assumes the Riemann hypothesis, but in a removable way.}
of n-dimensional lattices, with respect to the invariant measure under the action of the
unimodular group $SL_n \mathbb{Z}$, have $\text{RHF} > 1.075 - \varepsilon$.

In other words, most LLL bases (of most lattices) have $\text{RHF} \approx 1.075$, implying that
LLL biases the distribution, and very severely at that. The thesis of the second-named
author [21] proves partial results toward Theorem 1 for the actual LLL, and supports it
eperimentally by revealing the presence of dark LLL bases. The unpublished [22] exhibits
even more exotic manifestations of the bias.

This series of works exploring the bias of LLL represent the first serious attempt towards
understanding the practical behavior of LLL. It helps us frame the problem as follows. If
the LLL algorithm had any respect for the statistics of the LLL bases, we would always
have $\text{RHF} \approx 1.075$. Yet in practice, this never happens. Therefore the algorithm, despite
its simplicity (see Algorithm 1 below for pseudocode), must be doing something extremely
weird.

1.2. The importance of the problem, especially to cryptography. The main pur-
pose of the present paper is to shed light on this “weirdness” of LLL, in particular the
discrepancy between its worst-case and average-case performances. The foundational place
that LLL occupies in a number of areas in computer science and mathematics (see e.g.
[20]) is already more than enough to justify the effort. However, it is via cryptography
that this problem carries serious and imminent real-world impact.

Recently, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) announced a call for
proposals for the cryptography standards of the post-quantum era ([16]). The winning
proposal will be implemented all across the United States within the next few decades.
The largest portion of accepted submissions, 26 out of 64 total, comes from the family of
lattice-based cryptosystems. Lattice-based systems are recognized for their efficiency and
versatility; for example, fully homomorphic encryption ([11]) represents another major
appeal of lattice-based cryptosystems.

The often pointed out weakness of lattice-based systems is the insufficient confidence
of the community in its security ([4]). Part of what this means is that we have a very poor
understanding of the phenomena surrounding the cryptosystem. The behavior of the LLL
algorithm, in particular its worst- and average-case RHF gap, is a prime example of such.
Our close-to-nonexistent knowledge on LLL leaves us defenseless against questions such as:
what if LLL, or an LLL-like algorithm (e.g. BKZ [30]), can be improved vastly, to the
extent that it is capable of breaking every practical lattice-based cryptoscheme? Since we
made it from 1.075 to 1.02 by merely implementing LLL, it is reasonable to suspect that
further improvements may be attainable by some clever trick.

The practitioners of lattice-based cryptography are well-aware of the risk caused by the
knowledge gap such as above, and are hedging accordingly — though seemingly based on
intuition, rather than science. According to Tables 5-10 in [2], most proposed lattice-based
schemes to the recent NIST submissions make rather modest security claims compared
to the estimates from current state-of-art techniques. Many submissions claim about half
or less as many bits of security as estimated by [2], except that no rationale is provided
for halving rather than, say, quartering. If they were confident about their understanding
of lattice reduction algorithms, it would be self-defeating to do so; one does not observe
such reservation in submissions from multivariate cryptography, for example, a major
competitor of lattices in post-quantum cryptography.

One may suggest that we simply forgo lattices, to be on the safe side. However, this
entails massive opportunity cost, since so much resource has been invested in it already.
Moreover, there are certain appeals of lattice-based cryptography that we would be sad to give up. In summary, it is important for the purpose of establishing confidence in lattice-based cryptography as a whole that we develop a theory of LLL — and lattice reduction algorithms in general — that matches observations in practice. The folklore problem is the natural starting point for such an undertaking.

1.3. **Summary of this paper.** Our main contention is that the LLL algorithm may be understood as a kind of a sandpile model ([3], [6]), and that this idea opens up a path to a systematic understanding of the various phenomena involving LLL that have long been considered impenetrable. In particular, the rich and diverse tools from mathematics and physics employed to study sandpile models are now available for LLL as well.

The goal of this paper is to provide a concise presentation of this paradigm, with a focus on the average-case output quality of LLL. More detailed and technical studies, along with generalization to other families of reduction algorithms, will follow in the forthcoming works.

There already exist a few other works that point out the similarity between lattice reduction algorithms and sandpile-style cellular automata. This is, to the best of our knowledge, first discussed in [23], and [13] is perhaps the closest in spirit to the present paper in the literature. Our work takes a step further, in that we introduce new sandpile models that capture the practical behavior of LLL with stunning accuracy, and point out that most of the mysterious behavior of LLL is in fact natural, if not obvious, from the sandpiles perspective.

Specifically, we introduce two sandpile models that we named LLL-SP (Algorithm 2) and SSP (Algorithm 3) respectively. LLL-SP exhibits nearly identical quantitative behavior to that of LLL, suggesting that the two algorithms operate under the same principles. SSP is a simple stochastic variant of the abelian sandpile model (ASM), which is mathematically far more tractable than LLL-SP. Quite surprisingly, SSP also closely imitates the typical output statistics of LLL. These qualities make SSP a useful toy model for LLL. Indeed, we can prove the desideratum for SSP, that its average “RHF” is bounded strictly away from its worst bound. Extending this argument to LLL-SP and then to LLL seems challenging yet nonetheless within the domain of mathematics.

In the last section, we further demonstrate the explanatory power of sandpile models, by giving brief discussions on other aspects of LLL — time complexity, etc. — that they are capable of accounting for. We also discuss the implications of our work to lattice-based cryptography.

1.4. **Assumptions and notations.** Throughout this paper, instead of the original LLL reduction from [14], we work with its Siegel variant, a slight simplification of LLL. The Siegel reduction shares with LLL all its idiosyncrasies, and a bit easier to handle technically; hence a reasonable starting point for our research.

$n$ always means the dimension of the relevant Euclidean space. Our lattices in $\mathbb{R}^n$ always have full rank.

A basis $\mathcal{B}$, besides its usual definition, is an ordered set, and we refer to its $i$-th element as $b_i$. Denote by $b^*_i$ the component of $b_i$ orthogonal to all vectors preceding it, i.e. $b_1, \ldots, b_{i-1}$. Also, for $i > j$, define $\mu_{i,j} = \langle b_i, b^*_j \rangle / \langle b^*_j, b^*_j \rangle$. Thus the following equality holds in general:

$$b_i = b^*_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mu_{i,j} b^*_j.$$
We will write for shorthand \( \alpha_i := \|b_i^*\|/\|b_{i+1}^*\| \), and \( Q_i = (\alpha_i^{-2} + \mu_i^2)^{-1/2} \). When discussing lattices, \( r_i := \log \alpha_i \), and when discussing sandpiles, \( r_i \) refers to the “amount of sand” at vertex \( i \).
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2. Modeling LLL by a sandpile

2.1. The LLL algorithm. We briefly review the LLL algorithm; for details, we recommend \([14]\), in which it is first introduced. A pseudocode for the LLL algorithm is provided in Algorithm \([1]\). Be reminded that, whenever we mention LLL, we are really referring to its Siegel variant.

Algorithm 1 The LLL algorithm (Siegel variant)

0. Input: a basis \( B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\} \) of \( \mathbb{R}^n \), a parameter \( \delta < 0.75 \)
1. while true, do:
2. Size-reduce \( B \).
3. (Lovász test) choose the lowest \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n - 1\} \) such that \( \delta \|b_k^*\|^2 > \|b_{k+1}^*\|^2 \)
4. if there is no such \( k \), break
5. swap \( b_k \) and \( b_{k+1} \) in \( B \)
6. Output \( B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\} \), a \( \delta \)-reduced LLL basis.

Proposition 2. After carrying out Step 5 in Algorithm \([7]\), the following changes occur:

(i) \( \alpha_{k-1}^{\text{new}} = Q_k \alpha_k \)
(ii) \( \alpha_k^{\text{new}} = Q_k^{-2} \alpha_k \)
(iii) \( \alpha_{k+1}^{\text{new}} = Q_k \alpha_{k+1} \)
(iv) \( \mu_{k+1}^{\text{new}} = \mu_{k+1,k-1} \)
(v) \( \mu_{k+1,k}^{\text{new}} = Q_k^2 \mu_{k+1,k} \)
(vi) \( \mu_{k+2,k+1}^{\text{new}} = \mu_{k+2,k} - \mu_{k+2,k+1} \mu_{k+1,k} \)
(vii) \( \mu_{k+1,l}^{\text{new}} = \mu_{k+1,l} + \mu_{k+1,k+1,l}^{\text{new}} \) for \( 1 \leq l \leq k - 1 \)
(viii) \( \mu_{l,k}^{\text{new}} = \mu_{l,k+1} + \mu_{l,k+1} \mu_{k+1,k}^{\text{new}} + \mu_{l,k} \mu_{k+1,k}^{\text{new}} \) for \( l \geq k + 2 \)
(ix) \( \mu_{l,k+1}^{\text{new}} = \mu_{l,k} - \mu_{l,k+1} \mu_{k+1,k} \) for \( l \geq k + 2 \)

and there are no other changes. The superscript “new” refers to the corresponding variable after the swap.

Proof. Straightforward calculations (see e.g., \([13]\)). \( \square \)

2.2. Sandpile basics. We also briefly review the basics of the sandpile models. For references, see Dhar \([7, 8]\) or Perkinson \([26]\).

A sandpile model is defined on a finite graph \( G \), with one distinguished vertex called the sink. In the present paper, we only concern ourselves with the cycle graph, say \( A_n \), consisting of vertices \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\} \) and one unoriented edge for each adjacent pair \( v_i \) and \( v_{i+1} \). We also consider \( v_1 \) and \( v_n \) as adjacent. We designate \( v_n \) as the sink.

A configuration is a function \( f : \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\} \to \mathbb{R} \). Just as reduction algorithms work with bases, sandpile models work with configurations. We write for short \( r_i = f(v_i) \). One may think of \( r_i \) as the amount or height of the pile of sand placed on \( v_i \).

Just as LLL computes a reduced basis by repeatedly swapping neighboring basis vectors, sandpiles compute a stable configuration by repeated toppling. Let \( T, I \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \). A
configuration is stable if \( r_i \leq T \) for all \( i \neq n \). A toppling operator \( T_i \) replaces \( r_i \) by \( r_i - 2I \), and \( r_{i-1} \) by \( r_{i-1} + I \) and \( r_{i+1} \) by \( r_{i+1} + I \). An illustration is provided in Figure 1. Applying \( T_i \) when \( r_i > T \) is called a legal toppling. By repeatedly applying legal topplings, all excess “sand” will eventually be thrown away to the sink, and the process will terminate.

In our paper, \( T — \) threshold — will always be a fixed constant, but \( I — \) increment — could be a function of the current configuration, or a random variable, or both. In the former case, we say that the model is nonabelian — otherwise abelian. In the second case, we say that the model is stochastic. The (non-stochastic) abelian sandpile theory is quite well-developed, with rich connections to other fields of mathematics — see e.g. [15]. Other sandpile models are far less understood, especially the nonabelian ones.

### 2.3. The LLL sandpile model

Motivated by Proposition 2, especially the formulas (i) – (iii), we propose the following Algorithm 2, which we call the LLL sandpile model, or LLL-SP for short.

#### Algorithm 2

**The LLL sandpile model (LLL-SP)**

0. Input: \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_{n,n-1} \in [-0.5,0.5] \), a parameter \( \delta < 0.75 \)
1. Rewrite \( r_i := \log \alpha_i, \mu_i := \mu_{i+1,i} \) \( T := -0.5 \log \delta \)
2. while true, do:
3. choose the lowest \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} \) such that \( r_k > T \)
4. if there is no such \( k \), break
5. subtract \( 2 \log Q_k \) from \( r_k \)
6. add \( \log Q_k \) to \( r_{k-1} \) (if \( k - 1 \geq 1 \)) and \( r_{k+1} \) (if \( k + 1 \leq n - 1 \))
7. (re-)sample \( \mu_{k-1}, \mu_k, \mu_{k+1} \) uniformly from \([-0.5,0.5]\)
8. Output: real numbers \( r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1} \leq T \)

The only difference between LLL (Algorithm 1) and LLL-SP (Algorithm 2) lies in the way in which the \( \mu \)'s are replaced after each swap or topple. Our experimental results below demonstrate that this change hardly causes any difference in their behavior. A theoretical perspective is discussed at the end of this section.

The decision to sample \( \mu_i \)'s uniformly is largely provisional, though it is justified post hoc by Figure 4. One could refine the model by updating \( \mu_i \)'s with the formulas in Proposition 2 and then re-sampling \( \mu_{i+2,i} \)'s uniformly.
2.4. **Numerical comparisons.** Figure 2 shows the average shape of the output bases and configurations by LLL and LLL-SP. We also ran the same experiments where the method of choosing \(k\) are tweaked. We omitted them here due to limited space, but the same lessons are obtained anyway.

For each dimension \(n = 80, 100, 120\), we ran each algorithm 5,000 times with the same set of input bases of determinant \(\approx 2^{10n}\), generated using the standard method suggested in [19]. A point \((i, y)\) in each plot indicates that the average of \(r_i := \log \alpha_i\)'s over those 5,000 outputs equal \(y\).

One easily observes that the algorithms yield nearly indistinguishable outputs. In particular, since RHF can be computed directly from the \(r_i\)'s by the formula

\[
RHF = \exp \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (n - i) r_i \right),
\]

we expect both algorithms to yield about the same RHF. Indeed, Figure 3 shows that the RHF distribution of LLL and LLL-SP are in excellent agreement.

The resemblance of the two algorithms runs deeper than on the level of output statistics. See Figure 4 which depicts the plot of points \((i, Q_{k(i)}^{k(i)}\) and \(\mu_{k(i)+1,k(i)} = \mu_{k(i)}\) as we ran LLL and LLL-SP on dimension 80, where \(k(i)\) is \(k\) chosen at \(i\)-th iteration.\(^2\) The two plots

\(^2\)We have the same results in higher dimensions, but they are too cumbersome to present.
2.5. Discussion. The only difference between LLL and LLL-SP has to do with the way they update the $\mu_k(=\mu_{k+1,k})$'s. For LLL-SP, the $\mu_k$-variables are i.i.d. and independent of the $r_k$-variables. For LLL, $\mu_k$ is determined by a formula involving its previous value and $r_k$. However, it seems plausible that the $\mu_k$'s in LLL, as a stochastic process, is mixing, which roughly means that they are close to being i.i.d, in the sense that a small perturbation in $\mu_k$ causes the next value $\mu_k^{\text{new}}$ to become near unpredictable. Numerically, this is robustly supported by the graphs at the bottom of Figure 4. Theoretically, our intuition comes from the fact that the formula $\mu_k^{\text{new}} = \mu_k/(\mu_k^2 + \alpha_k^{-2}) \pmod{1}$ is an approximation of the Gauss map $x \mapsto \{1/x\}$, which is proven to have excellent mixing properties (see [27]). This idea can be formulated in the form of a mathematical conjecture, which can then be considered a rigorous version of the statement “LLL is essentially a sandpile model.”

3. Lessons from SSP

The drawback of LLL-SP is that it is difficult to study, since it is nonabelian. The literature on nonabelian sandpile models is very thin, and to the best of our knowledge, there is no theoretical treatment on this subject. We hope that our work here provides some motivation to pursue nonabelian models in more depth.
In this section, we introduce a certain abelian stochastic sandpile model that we named SSP, which is in a sense an abelianized version of LLL-SP. A priori, SSP appears completely unrelated to LLL. Surprisingly, though, its average output shape turns out to be extremely close to that of LLL. Moreover, SSP has a mathematical theory that is analogous to that of ASM developed by Dhar ([6], see also [8]), which is developed in a separate paper by the second-named author [24]. Therefore, SSP is a useful toy model that could yield insights into some of the most prominent features of the output statistics of LLL. It may yield some hints as to how to start analyzing the non-abelian LLL-SP as well.

3.1. Introduction to SSP. A pseudocode for SSP is provided in Algorithm 3. This is exactly the same as ASM, except for Step 4, which determines the amount of sand to be toppled at random. The decision to sample from the uniform distribution is an arbitrary one; we could have chosen something else, and much of the discussion below still apply.

Algorithm 3 Stochastic sandpile (SSP)

0. Input: $r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$, parameters $T, I \in \mathbb{Z}, I > 0$
1. while true, do:
2. choose a $k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $r_k > T$
3. if there is no such k, break
4. sample $\gamma$ uniformly from $\{1, \ldots, 2I - 1\}$
5. subtract $2\gamma$ from $r_k$
6. augment $\gamma$ to $r_k-1$ and $r_k+1$
7. Output: integers $r_1, \ldots, r_{n-1} \leq T$

3.2. Output shape of SSP. The average output shape of this stochastic sandpile model (SSP) is shown in Figure 5. Figure 5 not only shares all the major characteristics of Figure 2 but they are also quantitatively alike. The values $r_i$’s are nearly identical in the middle, which gradually decreases as $i$ approaches the boundary, starting at around $i = 15$ and $n - 15$. Furthermore, in both figures, the differences between the threshold and the middle values, and the differences between the middle and the boundary value, are equal; in the case of SSP, it is $\approx I/2$, and for LLL, it equals about 0.08. Outside the paradigm we are developing here, this should come as quite surprising: Algorithms 1 and 3 are simply so different that there is no reason to expect that anything similar would come out of them.

This finding may shed light on an important idea in lattice-based cryptography called the geometric series assumption (GSA), first proposed by Schnorr ([29]). GSA says that the output shape of a reduction algorithm is flat, with possible exceptions near the boundaries. Though an indispensable part in cryptanalysis of lattice systems, there has been a complete lack of explanation as to why GSA is valid, as with the 1.02. Our introduction of SSP may open up a path to understanding the mechanism behind this phenomenon.

3.3. Mathematical properties of SSP. A mathematical theory of SSP closely analogous to that of ASM has been recently developed ([24]), largely motivated by the experimental result above. Below we discuss some of its most important implications.

As in the case of ASM, the stable configurations of SSP form a monoid, and there exist recurrent configurations. However, the most important result is that SSP possesses the unique steady state, the probability distribution on the set of outputs that one approaches as one repeatedly runs the algorithm with sufficiently randomized inputs. Figure 5 is a
reflection of the steady state of SSP, from which one can compute its average “RHF” via (1).

The notion of the steady state alone clarifies numerous aspects of the practical behavior of LLL. The number “1.02” immediately obtains a neat mathematical meaning: an invariant of the steady state. Moreover, by definition, a steady state is independent of the input distribution, which explains why the number 1.02 seems independent of how the input bases are sampled for LLL, an observation in [18] that is also declared as a conjecture there.

Therefore, the whole question regarding the average output of LLL — why 1.02, why GSA, why independent of input sampling — comes down to studying the quantitative properties of the steady state. Even for SSP, this is highly nontrivial, where it reduces to a tricky problem in combinatorics. Still, it is possible to prove some useful statements. For example, it would be interesting to compare Theorem 1 above to the following:

**Proposition 3.** The worst-case log (RHF) of SSP is \( T/2 + o_n(1) \). The average \( \log (\text{RHF}) \) of SSP is bounded from above by \( T/2 - I/e^2 + o_n(1) \).

(Empirically \( \log (\text{RHF}) \approx T/2 - I/4 \) on average.)

**Proof.** This is an immediate corollary of Proposition 8 of [24]. The idea is to estimate the number of stable configurations with \( \log (\text{RHF}) > T/2 - \alpha \), and multiply it by the maximum point mass \( m \approx I^{-(n-1)} \) of the steady state to bound the proportion of such configurations in the steady state. For any \( \alpha < 1/m e^2 \) one can easily show that it approaches zero as \( n \to \infty \). \( \square \)

4. **Why LLL does better**

With the sandpile perspective, there are several ways to see why LLL should do better than 1.075. A short explanation is illustrated in Figure [6]: the set of LLL bases with high RHF is small, and the increment \( Q_i \) of LLL tends to be too large to step on it. Formally, we can interpret it as the following two-step argument, nicely summing up our discussions so far:

(i) The \( \mu_k \)'s of LLL are mixing, i.e. it suffices to consider LLL-SP.
(ii) The LLL-SP steady state (or something to that effect) measure of the set of high-RHF bases is small.
For (ii), proceeding as in Proposition 3 — i.e. estimate the maximum point mass $m$ of the steady state — seems to be a promising approach. To elaborate, consider SSP again. There it is helpful to think of toppling as “pushing” a given input distribution into the associated direction, as shown in Figure 6 (except that the figure shows only one input). After many topples, the distribution is shaped into a parallelepiped, and from then on toppling in SSP amounts to simply shifting the parallelepiped. This is the idea used in [24] to prove the existence of the steady state for SSP and some of its quantitative properties; see the paper [24] for details.

This exact same picture applies to LLL-SP, and even to LLL itself. The difficulty merely comes from the fact the numbers involved are a bit uglier, but we believe this can be harnessed with a clever use of mathematics.

5. Conclusion and further discussions

In this paper, we developed the sandpile interpretation of the LLL algorithm, and demonstrated its usage for understanding why LLL virtually never gives $\text{RHF} \approx 1.075$ despite Theorem 1. There are, however, many more ways in which our paradigm can shed light on the practical behavior of LLL. We briefly mention some of them below, which are the topics of the sequels to this work.

5.1. Regarding time complexity. It is possible to prove some nice statements regarding the time complexity of LLL-SP, by bounding its performance by that of a suitably modified SSP. We can prove that, with probability $1 - \varepsilon$, it takes no less than $c(\varepsilon)n^2b$ swaps for LLL-SP to finish, where $c(\varepsilon)$ is a constant depending on $\varepsilon$, and $b$ is the height of the tallest pile. This agrees up to order with the well-known upper bound. Furthermore, regarding the optimal (i.e. $\delta = 0.75$) LLL problem (see e.g. [1]), the optimal LLL-SP can be easily shown to terminate in polynomial time with probability arbitrarily close to one, and perhaps even on average. The exception happens only if $\mu_i \approx 0.5$ most of the time, but this is clearly improbable.

5.2. Finite-size scaling theory. The characteristics of the average output shapes of LLL, LLL-SP, and SSP are in fact a quite general phenomenon of stochastic sandpile
models on one-dimensional graphs (see [28] and [12]), and they can be explained by finite-size scaling theory (FSS; see [5]). According to the theory, to each model there exists a single constant $\nu$ that simultaneously governs the average $r_i$ of the steady state in the $n$ limit (hence RHF as well), the variance of $r_i$, and the degree of “curviness” at the boundaries — see Section III. A of [12]. FSS in the context of lattice reduction is interesting because it accounts for numerous unexplained phenomena in this realm, such as GSA, its failure at the boundaries, and the apparent convergence of RHF as $n \to \infty$.

5.3. **Generalizations to other reduction algorithms.** Stronger lattice reduction algorithms, such as deep-LLL and BKZ, all fall under the category of stochastic self-organized criticality (SOC) models on one-dimensional graphs as well. Hence all the discussions in this paper so far are expected to apply to them directly. BKZ is especially of interest, since it is the most widely used practical algorithm for cryptography and hard lattice problems. Its “steady state” has the shape akin to that of traffic models — see [9].

5.4. **Implications to cryptography.** That LLL can be understood on a scientific basis is already a good news for lattice-based cryptography as a whole, since a significant portion of confidence in security comes from the understanding of all the associated phenomena. Below we consider specific issues that may be of interest to cryptologists.

It seems still hard to answer why it has to be that particular number $\approx 1.02$. This is analogous to asking why water freezes at $0^\circ$C rather than $4^\circ$C, say. Even in the case of SSP, this problem demands a very tight estimate of the steady state, which we have not been able to manage.

Perhaps a more important problem for cryptography is whether the LLL algorithm can be improved, while retaining its “toppling method” and its relatively low complexity. Here sandpiles may help in a substantial way. The idea is that, whatever one does with LLL, one can do the same with SSP. And the only way to improve SSP in the above sense is to consistently distort the distribution of $\gamma$ (see Algorithm 3), which is likely time-costly.

Our work also clarifies the notion of a random lattice, central to the cryptanalysis of lattice systems but without a precise definition. It has been typically understood in terms of the so-called “Haar measure” on $\text{SL}_n \mathbb{Z} \backslash \text{SL}_n \mathbb{R}$ (see [31]), but as Theorem 1 suggests this measure does not reflect the practical behavior. From the physical point of view, a random lattice is simply any generic distribution on the set of input bases that stabilizes to an approximate “steady state,” or critical point, of the reduction algorithm in question. This should liberate cryptanalysts from the Haar measure, which is cumbersome to work with both theoretically and experimentally.
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