
ON THE SECURITY OF SUBSPACE SUBCODES OF REED–SOLOMON CODES FOR PUBLIC KEY ENCRYPTION

by

Alain Couvreur & Matthieu Lequesne

Abstract. — This article discusses the security of McEliece-like encryption schemes using subspace subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes, *i.e.* subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} whose entries lie in a fixed collection of \mathbb{F}_q -subspaces of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . These codes appear to be a natural generalisation of Goppa and alternant codes and provide a broader flexibility in designing code based encryption schemes. For the security analysis, we introduce a new operation on codes called the *twisted product* which yields a polynomial time distinguisher on such subspace subcodes as soon as the chosen \mathbb{F}_q -subspaces have dimension larger than $m/2$. From this distinguisher, we build an efficient attack which in particular breaks some parameters of a recent proposal due to Khathuria, Rosenthal and Weger.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Notation and prerequisites.....	4
3. Subspace Subcodes.....	6
4. Further properties of the expansion operator.....	11
5. The XGRS cryptosystem.....	13
6. Twisted-square code and distinguisher.....	15
7. Attacking the SSRS scheme.....	22
8. Conclusion.....	27
References.....	27

1. Introduction

In the late 70’s, at the very beginning of public key cryptography, McEliece proposed a public key encryption scheme whose security relies on the hardness of the bounded decoding problem [BMvT78]. However, the system should be instantiated with a public code equipped with an efficient decoding algorithm and one usually expect from the public code to be indistinguishable from an arbitrary one since this last property guarantees the security of the system. In his seminal article [McE78], McEliece proposed to instantiate his system with a binary Goppa code [Gop70, Gop71] (see [Ber73] for a description in English).

One of the major drawbacks of such a proposal is the significant size of the public key. McEliece’s historical proposal with binary Goppa codes required a 32.7 kB key for a claimed classical security of 65 bits. In the recent NIST submission *Classic McEliece* [BCL⁺19], a public key size of 261 kB is proposed for a claimed security level of 128 bits. For this reason, there has been many attempts

Key words and phrases. — Code-based cryptography, McEliece encryption scheme, subspace subcodes, GRS codes, expansion of codes, square product of codes, key recovery attack.

in the last forty years to replace the Goppa codes used in McEliece’s scheme by other families of codes, in order to reduce the key size. Many of these proposals focus on Generalised Reed–Solomon (GRS) codes, since they benefit from excellent decoding properties. On the other hand, their structure is difficult to hide. Consequently, to our knowledge, all code-based cryptographic schemes using GRS codes or low-codimensional subcodes of GRS codes as trapdoor have been attacked.

The use of GRS codes to replace Goppa codes in McEliece’s scheme was initially suggested in Niederreiter’s paper [Nie86], but this proposal was attacked by Sidelnikov and Shestakov [SS92] (although an earlier article from Roth and Seroussi [RS85] already explained how to recover the structure of a GRS code). To overcome the attack of Sidelnikov and Shestakov while trying to keep the benefits of GRS codes, several proposals appeared in the literature. Berger and Loidreau proposed to replace the GRS code by a subcode of low codimension [BL05]; Wieschebrink [Wie06] included some random columns in a generator matrix of a GRS code; his approach was enhanced in NIST submission RLCE [Wan16, Wan17], where random columns are included and then “mixed” with the original columns using specific linear transformations; finally Baldi, Bianchi, Chiaraluce, Rosenthal and Schipani (BBCRS) [BBC⁺16] proposed to mask the structure of a GRS code by right multiplying it by a “partially weight preserving” matrix. All these proposals have been partially or fully broken using attacks derived from a square code distinguisher. The first contribution, due to Wieschebrink [Wie10] broke the Berger–Loidreau proposal. Later on, Wieschebrink’s and BBCRS schemes were attacked in [CGG⁺14, COTG15] and RLCE in [CLT19].

In summary, forty years of research on the use of algebraic codes for public key encryption boil down to the following observations.

- (1) On one hand, the raw use of GRS codes as well as most of the variants using these codes lead to insecure schemes.
- (2) On the other hand, Goppa codes or more generally alternant codes remain robust decades after they were initially proposed by McEliece.

Alternant codes are nothing but subfield subcodes of GRS codes. Hence, considering the spectrum with (full) GRS codes on one end and their subfield subcodes (*i.e.* alternant codes) on the other, the intermediary case is that of *subspace subcodes* of Reed–Solomon codes. This notion of *subspace subcodes* of Reed–Solomon (SSRS) was originally introduced without any cryptographic motivation by Solomon, McEliece and Hattori [Ste93, MS94, Hat95, HMS98]. An SSRS code is a subset of a parent Reed–Solomon code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} consisting of the codewords whose components all lie in a fixed λ -dimensional \mathbb{F}_q -vector subspace of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , for some $\lambda \leq m$. These codes are no longer linear over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} but only over \mathbb{F}_q . The SSRS construction provides long codes with good parameters over alphabets of moderate size, in the spirit of alternant codes [MS86, Chapter 12]. Therefore these codes are interesting from an information-theoretic point of view.

For public key cryptography, some recent works exploring different approaches appeared in the recent years. The first use of the notion of subspace subcodes for cryptography comes from Gabidulin and Loidreau who propose to use subspace subcodes of Gabidulin codes for a rank-metric based cryptosystem in [GL05, GL08]. The first work discussing the use of SSRS codes for public key encryption is due to Berger, Gueye and Klamti [BGK19]. Shortly after, Berger, Gueye, Klamti and Ruatta [BGKR19] proposed a cryptosystem based on quasi-cyclic subcodes of SSRS codes. In another line of work, Khathuria, Rosenthal and Weger [KRW21] proposed a McEliece-like encryption scheme using expanded subspace subcodes of GRS codes instead of Goppa codes. Throughout the document, we will refer to this scheme as the *XGRS* scheme (where the *X* stands for *expanded*).

The use of subspace subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes is of particular interest in code based cryptography since it includes McEliece’s original proposal based on Goppa codes on the one hand and encryption based on generalised Reed–Solomon codes on the other hand as the two extremities of a same spectrum. Indeed, starting from Reed–Solomon codes over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and considering subspace subcodes over subspaces of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} of dimension $1 \leq \lambda \leq m$, the case $\lambda = m$ corresponds to GRS codes, while the case $\lambda = 1$ corresponds to alternant codes (which include Goppa codes). The

notion of subspace subcodes allows a modulation of the parameter λ . Consequently, they are of particular interest for two reasons.

- (1) Subspace subcodes may provide interesting codes for encryption with $\lambda > 1$, providing shorter keys than the original McEliece scheme.
- (2) Their security analysis encompasses that of Goppa and alternant codes and may help to better understand the security of McEliece encryption scheme. We emphasise that such a security analysis is of crucial interest since *Classic McEliece* lies among the very few candidates selected by the NIST for the last round of the post-quantum standardisation process.




FIGURE 1. The case $\lambda = m$ (i.e. using the whole GRS code as secret key) is known to be insecure. On the other hand, the case $\lambda = 1$ corresponding to alternant codes (among which Goppa codes) is a well-studied hard problem. Our attack covers all cases where $m/2 < \lambda \leq m$.

Our contribution. — In the present article, we first introduce a general public key cryptosystem relying on subspace subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes, which we refer to as the *SSRS cryptosystem*. We prove that the XGRS cryptosystem of [KRW21] is in fact a sub-instance of the SSRS scheme. Then, we analyse the security of the SSRS cryptosystem, using alternatively a high-level approach (considering abstract subspaces of \mathbb{F}_{q^m}) or a more constructive one (focusing on explicit descriptions of such codes as \mathbb{F}_q -linear codes using the *expansion operator*). We present a distinguisher on the SSRS scheme, by introducing a new and original notion, which we called *twisted product of codes*. Our distinguisher succeeds for any subspace subcode of a GRS code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} when the subspaces have dimension $\lambda > m/2$ (see Figure 1). Using this distinguisher we derive a polynomial time attack on SSRS when $\lambda > m/2$, which in particular breaks some parameters of the XGRS scheme proposed by its authors, namely the case of subspace subcodes on 2-dimensional subspaces of GRS codes over \mathbb{F}_{q^3} .

Related work. — This work should be related to [BGK19, § VI.B] where it is shown that an encryption scheme based on an expanded GRS code (the full code, not a subspace subcode) is not secure. Next, in the same reference [BGK19, § VI.C], the case of subspace subcodes is discussed and the proposed attack involves a brute force search on all the bases used for the expansion of each position. This attack has an exponential complexity, while ours runs in polynomial time.

On the other hand, the “ $\lambda > m/2$ condition” for the public code to be distinguished from a random one should be compared to the results of [COT14b, COT17], where some classical Goppa codes are attacked using, among others, the square code operation. The considered classical Goppa codes correspond to the parameters $m = 2$ and $\lambda = 1$ and hence lie at the very limit of the distinguisher. These Goppa codes got however broken due to peculiar features that give them a larger dimension compared to generic alternant codes of the same parameters (see [SKHN76, COT14a]).

Outline of the article. — We start in Section 2 by fixing the notation and bringing well-known notions of algebraic coding theory that are necessary to follow the article. The notion of subspace subcodes is recalled in Section 3 as well as some of their known properties. We also discuss the way to practically represent subspace subcodes, and introduce the SSRS cryptosystem, which is an instantiation of the McEliece scheme using subspace subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes. Some

operators play an important role in this article, Section 4 is devoted to them and the way they interact with each other. In Section 5, we present the XGRS cryptosystem from [KRW21] and prove that it is a sub-instance of the SSRS cryptosystem. The notion of *twisted square code* and the corresponding distinguisher are introduced in Section 6. Finally, Section 7 is devoted to the presentation of the attack on SSRS scheme.

Note. A long version of the present article including further detailed proofs and remarks is available online. See [CL20].

Acknowledgements. — The authors express their deep gratitude to the anonymous referees whose relevant comments and suggestions permitted a significant improvement of the present article. This research was conducted while Matthieu Lequesne was employed by Sorbonne Université and Inria. Matthieu Lequesne is now employed at the CWI in Amsterdam (Netherlands) and is funded by the ERC-ADG-ALGSTRONGCRYPTO project (no. 740972).

2. Notation and prerequisites

In this section, we fix the notation and recall some usual tools of code-based cryptography that are used in the definition of subspace subcodes and in the construction the XGRS cryptosystem.

2.1. Notation. — In this article, q denotes a power of a prime and m a positive integer. The vector space of polynomials of degree less than k over a field \mathbb{F} is denoted by $\mathbb{F}[X]_{<k}$. The space of matrices with entries in a field \mathbb{F} with m rows and n columns is denoted by $\mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$. Given an \mathbb{F} -vector space \mathcal{V} and vectors $\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{s-1} \in \mathcal{V}$, the subspace spanned over \mathbb{F} by the \mathbf{v}_i 's is denoted by

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{s-1} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i \mid \lambda_i \in \mathbb{F} \right\}.$$

Moreover, given a matrix $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times n}$, we denote by $\langle \mathbf{G} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}}$ the space spanned by the **rows** of \mathbf{G} , that is to say the code with generator matrix \mathbf{G} , is denoted by

$$\langle \mathbf{G} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \text{ row of } \mathbf{G} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}} = \{ \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{G} \mid \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}^k \}.$$

The *support* of a vector is the set of its indices with non-zero entries. An $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F} is a linear code over \mathbb{F} of length n and dimension k .

Given two integers a, b with $a < b$, we denote by $\llbracket a, b \rrbracket$ the interval of integers $\{a, a+1, \dots, b\}$. The cardinality of a finite set U is denoted by $|U|$. Given a probabilistic event A , its probability is denoted by $\mathbb{P}[A]$ and the mean of a random variable X is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[X]$.

Convention. In this article, any word or finite sequence of length ℓ is indexed from 0 to $\ell - 1$. In particular, codewords of length n are indexed as follows: (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) .

2.2. Reed–Solomon codes. —

Definition 1 (Generalised Reed–Solomon codes). — Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a vector whose entries are pairwise distinct and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a vector whose entries are all nonzero. The *generalised Reed–Solomon (GRS) code with support \mathbf{x} and multiplier \mathbf{y} of dimension k* is defined as

$$\mathbf{GRS}_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ (y_0 f(x_0), \dots, y_{n-1} f(x_{n-1})) \mid f \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]_{<k} \}.$$

If $\mathbf{y} = (1, \dots, 1)$ then the code is said to be a *Reed–Solomon* code and denoted as $\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})$.

2.3. Component wise product of codes. — The component-wise product of two vectors \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} in \mathbb{F}^n is denoted by

$$\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a_0 b_0, \dots, a_{n-1} b_{n-1}).$$

This definition extends to the product of codes, where the *component-wise product* or \star -*product* of two \mathbb{K} -linear codes \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$ spanned over a field $\mathbb{K} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{A} \star_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B} \rangle_{\mathbb{K}}.$$

When $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$, we denote by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{K}}^{\star 2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A} \star_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{A}$ the *square code* of \mathcal{A} spanned over \mathbb{K} .

Remark 2. — The field \mathbb{K} in the above notation is almost always equal to \mathbb{F} the base field on which the codes are defined. However, it may sometimes be a subfield. For the sake of clarity, we make the value of \mathbb{K} explicit only in the ambiguous cases.

2.4. Punctured and shortened codes. — The notions of *puncturing* and *shortening* are classical ways to build new codes from existing ones. These constructions will be useful for the attack. We recall here their definition. For a codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, we denote by (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) its entries.

Definition 3 (Puncturing, shortening). — Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$. The *puncturing* and the *shortening of \mathcal{C} at \mathcal{L}* are defined as

$$\mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(c_i)_{i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket \setminus \mathcal{L}} \mid \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \mid \forall i \in \mathcal{L}, c_i = 0\}).$$

Similarly, given a matrix \mathbf{M} with n columns, one defines $\mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{M})$ as the matrix whose columns with index in \mathcal{L} are removed, so that puncturing a generator matrix of a code yields a generator matrix of the punctured code.

Shortening a code is equivalent to puncturing the dual code, as explained by the following proposition.

Proposition 4 ([HP03, Theorem 1.5.7]). — Let \mathcal{C} be a linear code over \mathbb{F}_q^n and $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$. Then,

$$\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{Dual}(\mathcal{C})) = \mathbf{Dual}(\mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{C})) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Dual}(\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{C})) = \mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{Dual}(\mathcal{C})),$$

where $\mathbf{Dual}(\mathcal{A})$ denotes the dual of the code \mathcal{A} .

Remark 5. — The notation $\mathbf{Dual}(\mathcal{C})$ to denote the dual code of \mathcal{C} is rather unusual. This code is commonly denoted \mathcal{C}^{\perp} .

2.5. Bases and trace map. — In this paper, we consider codes over a finite field \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and codes over its subfield \mathbb{F}_q . A useful and natural tool is the trace map.

Definition 6 (Trace map). — Let q be a prime power and m an integer. The trace map is defined as

$$\mathbf{Tr} : \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q^m} & \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}_q \\ x & \longmapsto \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x^{q^i}. \end{cases}$$

Definition 7 ([LN97, Definition 2.30]). — Let $\mathcal{B} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . There exists a unique basis $\mathcal{B}^* = (b_0^*, \dots, b_{m-1}^*)$, such that :

$$\forall 0 \leq i, j \leq m-1, \quad \mathbf{Tr}(b_i b_j^*) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This basis will be referred to as the *dual basis* of \mathcal{B} and denoted \mathcal{B}^* .

Given an \mathbb{F}_q -basis $\mathcal{B} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and x an element of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Then the expression of x as an \mathbb{F}_q -linear combination of the elements of \mathcal{B} writes as

$$x = \mathbf{Tr}(b_0^* x) b_0 + \dots + \mathbf{Tr}(b_{m-1}^* x) b_{m-1},$$

where $\mathcal{B}^* = (b_0^*, \dots, b_{m-1}^*)$ denotes the dual basis of \mathcal{B} .

3. Subspace Subcodes

3.1. Definition and first properties. —

Definition 8 ([HMS98]). — Given a linear code \mathcal{C} defined over a field \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , and a λ -dimensional subspace \mathcal{S} of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} ($0 \leq \lambda \leq m$), the subspace subcode $\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}$ is defined to be the set of codewords of \mathcal{C} whose components all lie in \mathcal{S} .

$$\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \mid \forall i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket, c_i \in \mathcal{S}\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n.$$

It is important to note that the code $\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}$ is an \mathbb{F}_q -linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ which is generally neither \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear nor linear over some intermediary extension. Since each entry of a codeword can be represented as λ elements of \mathbb{F}_q , the code could be converted into a code over the alphabet \mathbb{F}_q^λ . Such a code would form an additive subgroup over $(\mathbb{F}_q^\lambda)^n$, therefore this construction is called a *subgroup subcode* by Jensen in [Jen95]. In a context of message transmission, this natural way to represent such a subspace subcode is detailed further in § 3.2.

We can generalise this definition with different subspaces for each entry.

Definition 9. — Given a linear code \mathcal{C} of length n over a field \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , and the λ -dimensional subspaces $(\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1})$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} ($0 \leq \lambda \leq m$), the subspace subcode $\mathcal{C}_{|(\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1})}$ is defined to be the set of codewords of \mathcal{C} such that the i -th components lies in \mathcal{S}_i .

$$\mathcal{C}_{|(\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1})} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \mid \forall i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket, c_i \in \mathcal{S}_i\}.$$

Remark 10. — When $\mathcal{S}_0 = \dots = \mathcal{S}_{n-1} = \mathbb{F}_q$, then we find the usual definition of *subfield subcode*.

Remark 11. — It is possible to give a more general definition where the \mathcal{S}_i 's do not have the same dimension λ . However, such a broader definition would be useless in the present article.

Proposition 12. — Let \mathcal{C} be a linear code of length n and dimension k over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ be a subspace of dimension $\lambda \leq m$. Then

$$(1) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}} \geq km - n(m - \lambda).$$

Proof. — See for instance [Jen95, Theorem 2 (1)]. □

Example 13. — The following example comes from [HMS98].

Consider \mathcal{C} the Reed–Solomon code over \mathbb{F}_{2^4} of length 15 and dimension 9. This code has minimum distance 7. Any element of \mathbb{F}_{2^4} can be decomposed over the \mathbb{F}_2 -basis $(1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \alpha^3)$, where α is a root of the irreducible polynomial $X^4 + X + 1$. Let \mathcal{S} be the subspace spanned by $(1, \alpha, \alpha^2)$. The code $\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}$ is the subset of codewords of \mathcal{C} that have no component in α^3 . Hence, if one uses this code for communication, there is no need to send the α^3 component, since it is always zero.

So this subspace subcode can be seen as an \mathbb{F}_2 -linear code of length 15 over the set of binary 3-tuples. But the code is not a linear code over \mathbb{F}_{2^3} . The minimum distance of $\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}$ is at least 7, because it cannot be less than the minimum distance of the parent code. The number of codewords in $\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}$ is 2^{22} . As a comparison, one other way to create a code of length 15 over binary 3-tuples is by shortening the generalised BCH code $[63, 52, 7]$ over \mathbb{F}_{2^3} . This gives a $[15, 4, \geq 7]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{2^3} which has 2^{12} codewords.

Similarly to the case of subfield subcodes, inequality (1) is typically an equality as explained in the following statement that we prove because of a lack of references.

Proposition 14. — Let \mathcal{R} be a uniformly random code among the codes of length n and dimension k over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let $\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1}$ be \mathbb{F}_q -subspaces of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} of dimension λ . Suppose that $km > n(m - \lambda)$. Then, for any integer ℓ , we have

$$\mathbb{P} [\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{R}_{|(\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1})} \geq km - n(m - \lambda) + \ell] \leq q^{-\ell} \left(\frac{1}{1 - q^{-mn}} + \frac{1}{q^{km - n(m - \lambda)}} \right).$$

In particular, for fixed values of q, m and λ , this probability is in $O(q^{-\ell})$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. — Let \mathbf{G}_{rand} be a uniformly random variable among the full rank matrices in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k \times n}$ and

$$\mathcal{R} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{m}\mathbf{G}_{\text{rand}} \mid \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k\}.$$

The code \mathcal{R} is uniformly random among the set of $[n, k]$ codes over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} ([Cou20, Lemma 3.12]). Let Φ be the \mathbb{F}_q -linear canonical projection

$$\Phi : \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n \longrightarrow \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{F}_{q^m} / \mathcal{S}_i.$$

Then, $\mathcal{R}_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})}$ is the kernel of the restriction of Φ to \mathcal{R} and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{R}_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})}|] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k} \mathbf{1}_{\Phi(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{G}_{\text{rand}})=0} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k} \mathbb{P} [\Phi(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{G}_{\text{rand}}) = 0] \\ (2) \quad &= 1 + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k \setminus \{0\}} \mathbb{P} [\Phi(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{G}_{\text{rand}}) = 0]. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbf{G}_{rand} is uniformly random among the full-rank matrices, then for any $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k \setminus \{0\}$, the vector $\mathbf{m}\mathbf{G}_{\text{rand}}$ is uniformly random in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n \setminus \{0\}$ ([Cou20, Lemma 3.13]) and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k \setminus \{0\}, \quad \mathbb{P} [\Phi(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{G}_{\text{rand}}) = 0] &= \frac{|\ker \Phi \setminus \{0\}|}{|\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n \setminus \{0\}|} \\ &= \frac{|\prod_i \mathcal{S}_i| - 1}{q^{mn} - 1} \\ &= \frac{q^{\lambda n} - 1}{q^{mn} - 1} \leq q^{-n(m-\lambda)} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - q^{-mn}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, applied to (2),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{R}_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})}|] &\leq 1 + |\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k \setminus \{0\}| \cdot q^{-n(m-\lambda)} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - q^{-mn}} \\ &\leq 1 + q^{km-n(m-\lambda)} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - q^{-mn}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using Markov inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} [\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{R}_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})}) \geq km - n(m-\lambda) + \ell] &= \mathbb{P} [|\mathcal{R}_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})}| \geq q^{km-n(m-\lambda)+\ell}] \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} [|\mathcal{R}_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})}|]}{q^{km-n(m-\lambda)+\ell}} \\ &\leq q^{-\ell} \left(\frac{1}{1 - q^{-mn}} + \frac{1}{q^{km-n(m-\lambda)}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

3.2. How to represent subspace subcodes? — For a practical implementation, subspace subcodes may be represented as codes over the subfield \mathbb{F}_q with a higher length. For this sake we introduce the *expansion operator* and give some of its properties.

3.2.1. The Expansion Operator. —

Definition 15 (Expansion of a vector or a code). — For an \mathbb{F}_q -basis \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , let $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}$ denote the expansion of a vector over the basis \mathcal{B} defined by

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}} : \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\ell & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{F}_q^{m\ell} \\ (x_0, \dots, x_{\ell-1}) & \longmapsto & (x_{0,0}, \dots, x_{0,m-1}, \dots, x_{\ell-1,0}, \dots, x_{\ell-1,m-1}), \end{cases}$$

where for any $i \in \llbracket 0, \ell - 1 \rrbracket$, $x_i = x_{i,0}b_0 + \dots + x_{i,m-1}b_{m-1}$. Given a linear code \mathcal{C} of length n over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , denote $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})$ the linear code over \mathbb{F}_q defined by

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{c}) \mid \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

We will apply this operator to vectors or codes of different lengths ℓ .

Note that if $\mathcal{B}^* = (b_0^*, \dots, b_{m-1}^*)$ denotes the dual basis of \mathcal{B} then

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{Tr}(b_0^*x_0), \dots, \mathbf{Tr}(b_{m-1}^*x_0), \dots, \mathbf{Tr}(b_0^*x_{\ell-1}), \dots, \mathbf{Tr}(b_{m-1}^*x_{\ell-1})).$$

We also wish to define the expansion of a matrix so that the expansion of a generator matrix of a code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ over a basis \mathcal{B} is a generator matrix of $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})$. It turns out that expanding the rows of a generator matrix is not sufficient. Indeed, for a given codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ and any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, the vector $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha\mathbf{c})$ is in $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})$. This leads to the following definition.

Definition 16 (Expansion of a matrix). — Given $\mathcal{B} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let $\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}}$ denote the following operation.

$$\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}} : \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k \times n} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{F}_q^{mk \times mn} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{m}_0 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{m}_{k-1} \end{pmatrix} & \longmapsto & \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(b_0\mathbf{m}_0) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(b_{m-1}\mathbf{m}_0) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(b_0\mathbf{m}_{k-1}) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(b_{m-1}\mathbf{m}_{k-1}) \end{pmatrix} \end{cases}.$$

Remark 17. — Caution, applying $\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}}$ to an $1 \times n$ matrix returns an $m \times mn$ matrix. It is **not** equivalent to applying $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}$ to the vector corresponding to this row.

Remark 18. — $\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}^*}(\mathbf{M}) = (\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{M}^\top))^\top$.

Proposition 19 ([KRW21, Proposition 1]). — Let \mathcal{C} be a linear code of dimension k and length n over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let \mathbf{G} denote a generator matrix of \mathcal{C} and \mathbf{H} denote a parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} . Then, for any fixed \mathbb{F}_q -basis \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , the following hold.

- (i) For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^k$, we have $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{G})$.
- (ii) For all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, we have $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}((\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{y}^\top)^\top)^\top = \mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}^*}(\mathbf{H}) \cdot \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{y})^\top$.

Corollary 20. — Let \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{H} be a generator and a parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} respectively. Let \mathcal{B} denote an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Then $\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{G})$ and $\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}^*}(\mathbf{H})$ are respectively a generator matrix and a parity-check matrix of $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})$.

Definition 21 (Block). — Given a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, an \mathbb{F}_q -basis \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and a non negative integer $i < n$, the i -th block of the expanded vector $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{v}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{mn}$ is the length m vector composed by the entries of index $mi, mi + 1, \dots, mi + m - 1$ of $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{v})$. It corresponds to the decomposition over \mathcal{B} of the i -th entry of \mathbf{v} . We extend this definition to matrices, where the i -th block of an expanded matrix means the $mk \times m$ matrix whose rows correspond to the i -th block of each row of the expanded matrix. In particular, the expansion in a basis \mathcal{B} of some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ is the concatenation of n blocks of length m .

3.2.2. Expansion over various bases. — We have seen in Definition 9 that we could define a subspace subcode with different subspaces for each entry. Similarly, we can define an expansion with regard to a different basis for each entry.

Definition 22. — Given ℓ bases $(\mathcal{B}_0, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\ell-1})$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , we define $\mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\mathbf{x})$ as the expansion of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\ell$, whose i^{th} block is the expansion of x_i over the basis \mathcal{B}_i . For a linear code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, we define $\mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\mathcal{C})$ in a similar fashion. Finally, given a matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k \times n}$ and an additional \mathbb{F}_q -basis $\bar{\mathcal{B}} = (\bar{b}_0, \dots, \bar{b}_{m-1})$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , we define

$$\mathbf{ExpMat}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}^{\bar{\mathcal{B}}}(\mathbf{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\bar{b}_0 \mathbf{m}_0) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\bar{b}_{m-1} \mathbf{m}_0) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\bar{b}_0 \mathbf{m}_{k-1}) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\bar{b}_{m-1} \mathbf{m}_{k-1}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using dual bases we get an explicit description:

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{Tr}(b_{0,0}^* x_0), \dots, \mathbf{Tr}(b_{0,m-1}^* x_0), \dots, \mathbf{Tr}(b_{\ell-1,0}^* x_{\ell-1}), \dots, \mathbf{Tr}(b_{\ell-1,m-1}^* x_{\ell-1})),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_i = (b_{i,0}, \dots, b_{i,m-1})$.

The properties of Proposition 19 still hold for various bases.

Remark 23. — Note that contrary to the expansion of codes, the expansion of a matrix depends on the choice of a basis $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ for the vertical expansion. When considering the code spanned by an expansion matrix, different choices of $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ yield the same code, so we will omit the vertical expansion basis in the expansion matrix operator.

3.2.3. Squeezing: the inverse of expansion. — We can define the “inverse” of the expansion operator.

Definition 24 (Squeezing). — Let $\mathcal{B} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ be a basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_{0,0}, \dots, x_{0,m-1}, \dots, x_{n-1,0}, \dots, x_{n-1,m-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{mn}$. We define the *squeezed vector* of \mathbf{x} with respect to the basis \mathcal{B} as

$$\mathbf{Squeeze}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} x_{0,j} b_j, \dots, \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} x_{n-1,j} b_j \right) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n.$$

Let \mathcal{C} be an $[m \times n, k]$ -code over \mathbb{F}_q . We define the *squeezed code* of \mathcal{C} with respect to \mathcal{B} as

$$\mathbf{Squeeze}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{Squeeze}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{c}) \mid \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Finally, given a matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{mk \times mn}$, then $\mathbf{SqueezeMat}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{M}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{mk \times n}$ denotes the matrix whose rows are obtained by squeezing each row of the matrix \mathbf{M} over \mathcal{B} .

Remark 25. — Beware that if \mathbf{M} is obtained by expanding a matrix of rank r over the basis \mathcal{B} , then $\mathbf{SqueezeMat}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{M}))$ is a $km \times n$ matrix and hence is **not** equal to \mathbf{M} but it generates the same code.

Proposition 26. — Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and \mathcal{B} be a basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Then,

$$\mathbf{Squeeze}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})) = \mathcal{C}.$$

Similarly to the expansion operators, we can define the squeezing operators with a different basis for each block.

3.2.4. Representation of subspace subcodes. — Let \mathcal{C} be a code of length n and dimension k over the field \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and \mathcal{S} denote an \mathbb{F}_q -subspace of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} of dimension $\lambda \leq m$. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} = (b_0, \dots, b_{\lambda-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\lambda}$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathcal{S} . Then any vector $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{S}^n$, *i.e.* whose entries are all in \mathcal{S} can be expanded as

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathbf{c}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_{0,0}, \dots, c_{0,\lambda-1}, \dots, c_{n-1,0}, \dots, c_{n-1,\lambda-1}),$$

where the $c_{i,j}$'s are the coefficients of the decomposition of c_i in the $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Remark 27. — Note that the previous definition makes sense only for vectors in \mathcal{S}^n .

Next, the subspace subcode $\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}$ can be represented as

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathbf{c}) \mid \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}\}.$$

Here again, as noticed in Remark 27, the notion is well-defined only for codes with entries in \mathcal{S} .

Similarly to Definition 21, a *block* refers to a set of the form $\llbracket i\lambda, (i+1)\lambda - 1 \rrbracket$. That is to say, a set of $\lambda = \dim \mathcal{S}$ consecutive indexes of the expanded code, corresponding to the decomposition of a single entry in \mathcal{S} in the basis $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$.

3.3. Subspace-subcodes of Reed-Solomon codes. — Expanding codes, in particular Reed-Solomon codes, over the base field has been studied since the 1980's. For instance, in [KL85, KL88], Kasami and Lin investigate the weight distribution of expanded binary Reed-Solomon codes. Sakakibara, Tokiwa and Kasahara extend their work to q -ary Reed-Solomon codes [STK89].

But the idea behind subspace subcodes, which consists in keeping only the subset of codewords that are defined over a subspace of the field, first appears in a paper by Solomon [Sol93]. In a joint work with McEliece [MS94], they define the notion of *trace-shortened* codes, which is a special case of subspace subcodes where $\lambda = m - 1$ and where the considered subspace \mathcal{S} is the kernel of the trace map. These articles focus uniquely on Reed-Solomon codes. Still, this point of view turns out to be the most general one since a subspace subcode of a GRS code can always be regarded as a subspace subcode of an RS code by changing the subspaces as explained by the following statements.

Proposition 28. — Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, $\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1}$ be \mathbb{F}_q -subspaces of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\times})^n$. Then,

$$(\mathcal{C} \star \mathbf{a})_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})} = \mathcal{C}_{|(a_0^{-1}S_0, \dots, a_{n-1}^{-1}S_{n-1})} \star \mathbf{a}.$$

Moreover, let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ be a support and a multiplier, then

$$\mathbf{GRS}_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})} = \mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})_{|(y_0^{-1}S_0, \dots, y_{n-1}^{-1}S_{n-1})} \star \mathbf{y}.$$

The notion is then generalised to any kind of subspace and any code by Jensen in [Jen95] under the name *subgroup subcodes*. In his thesis [Hat95] and in [HMS98], Hattori studies the dimension of subspace subcodes of Reed-Solomon codes. Some conjectures of Hattori are later proved by Spence in [Spe04]. Cui and Pei extend the results to generalised Reed-Solomon codes in [JJ01]. Then, Wu proposes a more constructive approach of these codes using the equivalent of the expansion operator in [Wu11]. The idea of using distinct bases for each position is introduced in [vDT99].

3.4. An instantiation of McEliece with SSRS codes. — Let us first present a generic encryption scheme based on subspace subcodes of GRS codes. This cryptosystem will be referred to as the *Subspace Subcode of Reed-Solomon* (SSRS) scheme. We will later prove that the cryptosystem of [KRW21] is a sub-instance of the SSRS scheme.

3.4.1. Parameters. — The cryptosystem is publicly parametrised by:

- q a prime power;
- m an integer;
- λ such that $0 < \lambda < m$;
- n, k such that $0 \leq k < n \leq q^m$ and $km > (m - \lambda)n$.

3.4.2. Key generation. —

- Generate a uniformly random vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ with distinct entries.
- Choose n uniformly random λ -dimensional vector subspaces $\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^m$ with respective bases $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_0}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_{n-1}}$.
- Let $\mathbf{G}_{\text{pub}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{(km-n(m-\lambda)) \times \lambda n}$ denote a generator matrix of the code

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_0}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_{n-1}})}(\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})|_{(\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1})}).$$

If \mathbf{G}_{pub} is not full-rank, abort and restart the process. See Section 5.2 for the practical computation on \mathbf{G}_{pub} .

- The public key is \mathbf{G}_{pub} and the secret key is $(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_0}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_{n-1}})$.

Lemma 29 (Public Key Size). — *The public key is a matrix of size $m(n-k) \times \lambda n$ over \mathbb{F}_q . Only the non-systematic part is transmitted. Hence the public key size in bits is*

$$m(n-k)(\lambda n - m(n-k)) \log_2(q).$$

3.4.3. Encryption. — Let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{mk-(m-\lambda)n}$ be the plaintext. Denote

$$t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor.$$

Choose $\mathbf{e} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{(m-\lambda)n}$ uniformly at random among vectors of $\mathbb{F}_q^{(m-\lambda)n}$ with exactly t non-zero blocks (see Definition 21).

3.4.4. Decryption. — From $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\lambda n}$, construct a vector $\mathbf{y}' \in \mathbb{F}_q^{mn}$ by completing each block of size λ with $m-\lambda$ entries set to zero.

Denote $\mathbf{y}'' = \mathbf{Squeeze}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\mathbf{y}')$. According to the definition of \mathbf{e} , the vector $\mathbf{y}'' \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is at distance t of the code $\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})$. Hence, by decoding, one computes the unique $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})$ at distance $\leq t$ from \mathbf{y}'' and the expansion of \mathbf{c} yields \mathbf{mG}_{pub} .

4. Further properties of the expansion operator

We now introduce some properties of the expansion operators. More specifically, in order to analyse the XGRS cryptosystem, we study how this operator behaves with respect to other operations (especially those used in the key generation): puncturing/shortening, computing the dual, changing the expansion basis. We also consider the relation with the square product operation, as this is a natural distinguisher for GRS-based codes.

In this section, for the sake of clarity, all properties will be defined considering the same basis for each entry, but everything works exactly the same way if one considered expansion with a different basis for each entry, as different columns of \mathbb{F}_q^m (or blocks of columns of \mathbb{F}_q corresponding to the expansion of same column of \mathbb{F}_q^m) do not interact.

4.1. Subspace subcodes as shortening of expanded codes. — This lemma explains how to construct the parity-check matrix of a subspace subcode from the parity-check matrix of the parent code. This result is important to perform computations over the subspace subcodes.

Lemma 30. — *For integers n and $\lambda < m$, denote $\mathcal{J}(\lambda, m)$ the subset of $\llbracket 0, mn-1 \rrbracket$ consisting of the last $m-\lambda$ entries of each block of length m*

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{J}(\lambda, m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{im + j, i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket \lambda, m-1 \rrbracket\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{B} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathbb{F}_q^m such that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} = (b_0, \dots, b_{\lambda-1})$ is a basis of \mathcal{S} . Then,

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{S}}) = \mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{J}(\lambda, m)}(\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})).$$

Equivalently, the following diagram is commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{(\cdot)_{|S}} & \mathcal{C}_{|S} \\
\downarrow \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}} & & \downarrow \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S} \\
\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{J}(\lambda, m)}(\cdot)} & \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{C}_{|S})
\end{array}$$

Let $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k \times n}$ denote a parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} . Complete the basis $\mathcal{B}_S = (b_0, \dots, b_{\lambda-1})$ with $m - \lambda$ additional elements $(b_{\lambda}, \dots, b_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{m-\lambda}$ such that $\mathcal{B} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ forms an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . According to Corollary 20, the matrix $\mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}^*}(\mathbf{H})$ is a parity-check matrix of $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})$ and, from Proposition 4, removing (puncturing) the last $m - \lambda$ columns of each block of this matrix provides a parity-check matrix of $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{C}_{|S})$.

4.2. Puncturing and shortening. —

Lemma 31. — *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let \mathcal{L} denote a subset of $\llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$. Then the following equalities hold.*

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{C})) = \mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}'}(\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})),$$

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{C})) = \mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}'}(\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})),$$

where \mathcal{L}' denotes the set of all columns generated from expanding columns in \mathcal{L} , that is

$$\mathcal{L}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \{i + j, 0 \leq j < m\}.$$

Proof. — The result is straightforward for puncturing. The expansion operation is independent for each column, hence puncturing a column before expanding is equivalent to puncturing the corresponding block of m columns. As for shortening, the shortening operation is the dual of puncturing operation, hence the result is a consequence of the next lemma. \square

4.3. Dual code. —

Lemma 32 ([Wu11], Lemma 1). — *Let \mathcal{B} be a basis and \mathcal{B}^* denote the dual basis. For all $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, if \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} are orthogonal, i.e. $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}^\top = 0$, then $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{a})$ and $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}^*}(\mathbf{b})$ are orthogonal*

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{a}) \cdot (\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}^*}(\mathbf{b}))^\top = 0.$$

Corollary 33. — *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let $\mathcal{B} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ be a basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Then the following equality holds.*

$$\mathbf{Dual}(\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C})) = \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}^*}(\mathbf{Dual}(\mathcal{C})),$$

where \mathcal{B}^* denotes the dual basis of \mathcal{B} .

4.4. Changing the expansion basis. —

Lemma 34. — *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let $(\mathcal{B}_i)_i$ be n bases of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let $(\mathbf{Q}_i) \in (\mathbb{F}_q^{m \times m})^n$ denote n invertible $m \times m$ matrices. The following equality holds.*

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i \cdot (\mathbf{Q}_i^{-1})^\top)_i}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_i}(\mathcal{C}) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Q}_0 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathbf{Q}_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. — Let \mathbf{c} be a codeword of \mathcal{C} . We only focus on the first entry of \mathbf{c} which we denote by c . We also denote the elements of \mathcal{B}_0 by (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1}) and the entries of \mathbf{Q}_0 by $(q_{i,j})_{i,j}$. The decomposition of c in \mathcal{B}_0 is $c = c_0b_0 + \dots + c_{m-1}b_{m-1}$. Let $\mathcal{D} = (d_0, \dots, d_{m-1})$ be the basis $\mathcal{B}_0 \cdot (\mathbf{Q}_0^{-1})^\top$. For any $i \in \llbracket 0, m-1 \rrbracket$, we have $b_i = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} d_j q_{i,j}$. Expressing c in this new basis gives

$$c = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} c_i b_i = \sum_i \left(\sum_j d_j q_{i,j} \right) = \sum_j \left(\sum_i x_i q_{i,j} \right) d_j.$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{c}) \cdot \mathbf{Q}_0 = \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{c})$. This holds for any entry of any codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$. \square

4.5. Scalar multiplication in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . —

Lemma 35. — Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let $(\mathcal{B}_i)_i$ be a basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ denote a vector of length n over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . The following equality holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\mathcal{C}) &= \mathbf{Exp}_{(a_i \mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\{(\mathbf{c} \star \mathbf{a}) \mid \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}\}) \\ &= \mathbf{Exp}_{(a_i \mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\mathcal{C} \star \mathbf{a}). \end{aligned}$$

5. The XGRS cryptosystem

5.1. The cryptosystem. — We describe here the cryptosystem which we call *XGRS*, presented in [KRW21] by Khathuria, Rosenthal and Weger. Next, we explain why XGRS is a sub-instance of the SSRS scheme.

5.1.1. Parameters. — The cryptosystem is publicly parametrised by:

- q a prime power;
- m an integer;
- λ such that $2 \leq \lambda < m$;
- n, k such that $0 \leq k < n \leq q^m$ and $km > (m - \lambda)n$.

q	m	λ	n	k	Public Key Size (kB)
13	3	2	1258	1031	579
7	4	2	1872	1666	844

TABLE 1. Parameters proposed for the XGRS scheme [KRW21]

Remark 36. — As suggested by the parameters in Table 1, m is a small integer. The preprint version of the paper [KRW19] proposed to use $m = 2$ with a slightly modified key generation. The proposed parameters are now $m = 3$ and $m = 4$.

5.1.2. Key Generation. —

- Generate uniformly random vectors $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n \times (\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\times)^n$ such that \mathbf{x} has distinct entries. Denote $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{GRS}_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and let \mathbf{H}_{sec} be a parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} .
- Choose γ , a primitive element of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}/\mathbb{F}_q$, i.e. a generator of the field extension. We consider the basis $\mathcal{B}_\gamma = (1, \gamma, \dots, \gamma^{m-1})$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} .
- Set $\mathbf{H} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma^*}(\mathbf{H}_{\text{sec}}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m(n-k) \times mn}$ a parity-check matrix of $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma}(\mathcal{C})$.
- For any $i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$, choose \mathcal{L}_i a random subset of $\llbracket (i-1)m, im-1 \rrbracket$ of size $|\mathcal{L}_i| = m - \lambda$. Set $\mathcal{L} = \cup_i \mathcal{L}_i$.
- Set $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{L}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{H}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m(n-k) \times \lambda n}$.
- For any $i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$, choose \mathbf{Q}_i a random $\lambda \times \lambda$ invertible matrix. Denote by \mathbf{Q} the block-diagonal matrix having $\mathbf{Q}_0, \dots, \mathbf{Q}_{n-1}$ as diagonal blocks.
- Denote by \mathbf{S} the invertible matrix of \mathbb{F}_q such that $\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{L}} \cdot \mathbf{Q}$ is in systematic form.
- Set $\mathbf{H}_{\text{pub}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{L}} \cdot \mathbf{Q}$.
- The public key is \mathbf{H}_{pub} , the private key is $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathcal{L}, \gamma)$.

Remark 37. — Compared to the cryptosystem presented in [KRW21], we omitted the block permutation. Indeed, applying a block permutation after expanding is equivalent to applying the permutation before the expansion and then expanding. As we start with a GRS code chosen uniformly at random, applying a permutation on the columns does not change the probability distribution of the public keys.

5.1.3. Encryption. — Recall that $t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor$ the error-correcting capacity of a GRS code of length n and dimension k . The message is encoded as a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\lambda n}$ whose support is included in t blocks of length λ , *i.e.* there exist positions $i_0, \dots, i_{t-1} \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$, such that

$$\text{Support}(\mathbf{y}) \subseteq \bigcup_{0 \leq \ell \leq t-1} \llbracket \lambda(i_\ell - 1), \lambda i_\ell - 1 \rrbracket.$$

The ciphertext is then defined as $\mathbf{c}^\top = \mathbf{H}_{\text{pub}} \cdot \mathbf{y}^\top$.

5.1.4. Decryption. — In order to decrypt the ciphertext, a user knowing the private key should:

- generate \mathbf{H}_{sec} from \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} .
- compute $\mathbf{c}' = \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{S}^{-1\top}$;
- compute $\mathbf{c}'' = \text{Squeeze}_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma}(\mathbf{c}')$;
- find $\mathbf{y}'' \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ of weight $|\mathbf{y}''| \leq t$ such that $\mathbf{c}''^\top = \mathbf{H}_{\text{sec}} \mathbf{y}''^\top$ (*i.e.* decode in \mathcal{C});
- compute $\mathbf{y}' = \text{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma}(\mathbf{y}''))$;
- finally recover $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}' \cdot (\mathbf{Q}^{-1})^\top$.

5.2. Relation with the SSRS scheme. — To conclude this section, we show that the XGRS scheme is a sub-instance of the SSRS scheme presented in Section 3.4.

Proposition 38. — *The XGRS scheme with secret key $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathcal{L}, \gamma)$ is equivalent to the SSRS scheme with secret key $(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1})$ where the subspaces \mathcal{S}_i are defined as follows.*

- Let $\mathcal{B}_i^{(0)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}_i}(\mathcal{B}_\gamma) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\lambda}$ where $\mathcal{L}_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{j - mi, \forall j \in \mathcal{L} \cap \llbracket im, (i+1)m - 1 \rrbracket\}$.
- Set $\mathcal{B}_i^{(1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y_i^{-1} \mathcal{B}_i^{(0)} \cdot (\mathbf{Q}_i^{-1})^\top$.
- \mathcal{S}_i is the subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ spanned by the elements of $\mathcal{B}_i^{(1)}$.

Proof. — Let \mathcal{C}_{pub} denote the public code of an instance of the XGRS scheme with private key $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathcal{L}, \gamma)$, *i.e.* \mathcal{C}_{pub} is the code over \mathbb{F}_q that admits the public key \mathbf{H}_{pub} as parity-check matrix. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} &= \text{Dual} \left(\langle \mathbf{H}_{\text{pub}} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right) \\ &= \text{Dual} \left(\langle \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{L}} \cdot \mathbf{Q} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us define $\mathbf{Q}^{(1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{Q}^{-1})^\top$. This is still a block-diagonal matrix composed of n blocks of size $\lambda \times \lambda$. We can rewrite this

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \text{Dual} \left(\langle \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{L}} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right) \cdot \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}.$$

We can replace $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{L}}$ by its definition: $\text{Pct}_{\mathcal{L}}(\text{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma^*}(\mathbf{H}_{\text{sec}}))$. Next, we can swap the **Dual** and **Punct** operators according to Proposition 4:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \text{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\text{Dual} \left(\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma^*} \left(\langle \mathbf{H}_{\text{sec}} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right) \right) \right) \cdot \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}.$$

We can then swap the **Dual** and **Exp** operators according to Corollary 33.

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \text{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_\gamma} \left(\text{Dual} \left(\langle \mathbf{H}_{\text{sec}} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right) \right) \right) \cdot \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}.$$

Let \mathbf{G}_{sec} be a generator matrix of the secret code $\text{Dual}(\langle \mathbf{H}_{\text{sec}} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q})$, *i.e.* a generator matrix of the code $\mathbf{GRS}_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. We have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \text{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}} \left(\langle \mathbf{G}_{\text{sec}} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right) \right) \cdot \mathbf{Q}^{(1)}.$$

Let us denote $\mathbf{Q}^{(2)}$ the block-diagonal matrix obtained by replacing each $\lambda \times \lambda$ matrix of $\mathbf{Q}^{(1)}$ by the $m \times m$ matrix obtained by inserting “an identity row/column” at the positions corresponding to \mathcal{L} . For instance, if $m = 3, \lambda = 2$ and the first element of \mathcal{L} equals 1, which means that the column 1 is shortened, we add a column and a row in the middle of $\mathbf{Q}_0^{(1)}$, *i.e.*

$$\text{if } \mathbf{Q}_0^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} q_{00} & q_{01} \\ q_{10} & q_{11} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{then } \mathbf{Q}_0^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} q_{00} & 0 & q_{01} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ q_{10} & 0 & q_{11} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, we can write

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \text{Sh}_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\left\langle \text{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}}(\mathbf{G}_{\text{sec}}) \cdot \mathbf{Q}^{(2)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right).$$

We define $\mathbf{Q}_i^{(3)}$ as the matrix obtained from $\mathbf{Q}_i^{(2)}$ by permuting the columns so that the inserted columns are the $m - \lambda$ rightmost ones. For instance in the previous example, we would have

$$\mathbf{Q}_0^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} q_{00} & q_{01} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ q_{10} & q_{11} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{Q}^{(3)} = \mathbf{Q}^{(2)} \mathbf{P}$ where \mathbf{P} is a block-diagonal matrix whose diagonal blocks are $m \times m$ permutations matrices. Then, we replace \mathcal{L} by the set $\mathcal{J}(\lambda, m) = \{mi + j \mid 0 \leq i < n, \lambda \leq j < m\}$. Hence, we get

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \text{Sh}_{\mathcal{J}(\lambda, m)} \left(\left\langle \text{ExpMat}_{\mathcal{B}_{\gamma}}(\mathbf{G}_{\text{sec}}) \cdot \mathbf{Q}^{(3)} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right).$$

We can apply the basis change explained in Lemma 34.

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \text{Sh}_{\mathcal{J}(\lambda, m)} \left(\left\langle \text{ExpMat}_{(\mathcal{B}'_i)_i}(\mathbf{G}_{\text{sec}}) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{B}'_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{B}_{\gamma} \cdot ((\mathbf{Q}_i^{(3)})^{-1})^{\top}$ for all $i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$. Finally, we apply Proposition 28 and Lemma 35 to replace the code $\mathbf{GRS}_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ by $\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \text{Sh}_{\mathcal{J}(\lambda, m)} \left(\left\langle \text{ExpMat}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\mathbf{G}'_{\text{sec}}) \right\rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right),$$

where \mathbf{G}'_{sec} is a generator matrix of $\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathcal{B}_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} y_i^{-1} \mathcal{B}'_i$ for all $i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$. In other words, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})_{|(\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1})}$, where \mathcal{S}_i is the subspace spanned by the λ first elements of \mathcal{B}_i . This is indeed an instance of the SSRS cryptosystem. \square

6. Twisted-square code and distinguisher

In this section, we first recall how the star product of codes may distinguish some codes such as Reed–Solomon codes from random ones. It turns out that the raw use of the star product is not sufficient to distinguish SSRS codes from random codes. Therefore, in the second part of this section, we introduce a new notion called *twisted star product*. We first explore the case $m = 3, \lambda = 2$ to give some insight on the interest of defining this twisted star product of two subspace subcodes. Then, we define this notion for other parameters. Note that a similar notion appears in Randriambololona’s work on the existence of asymptotically good binary codes with asymptotically good squares [Ran13]. In the third part of the section, we focus on the dimension of the twisted square codes and how it can be used as a distinguisher.

We refer to Figure 2 for a diagram summarising the relations between the various statements to follow.

6.1. Square code distinguisher. — The notion of star product has been recalled in Section 2.3. We recall the following result on the generic behaviour of random codes with respect to this operation.

Theorem 39. — ([CCMZ15, Theorem 2.3], *informal*) *For a linear code \mathcal{R} chosen at random over \mathbb{F}_q of dimension k and length n , the dimension of $\mathcal{R}^{\star 2}$ is typically $\min(n, \binom{k+1}{2})$.*

Theorem 39 provides a distinguisher between random codes and algebraically structured codes such as generalised Reed–Solomon codes and their low-codimensional subcodes [Wie10, CGG⁺14], Reed–Muller codes [CB14], polar codes [BCD⁺16] some Goppa codes [COT14b, COT17], high-rate alternant codes [FGO⁺11] or algebraic geometry codes [CMCP14, CMCP17]. For instance, in the case of GRS codes, we have the following result.

Proposition 40. — *Let $n, k, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ be as in Definition 1. Then,*

$$(\mathbf{GRS}_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))^{\star 2} = \mathbf{GRS}_{2k-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \star \mathbf{y}).$$

In particular, if $k \leq n/2$, then

$$\dim(\mathbf{GRS}_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))^{\star 2} = 2k - 1.$$

Thus, compared to random codes whose square have dimension quadratic in the dimension of the code, the square of a GRS code has a dimension which is linear in that of the original code. This criterion allows to distinguish GRS codes of appropriate dimension from random codes. A rich literature of cryptanalysis of code-based encryption primitives involves this operation.

In an initial version of the XGRS cryptosystem, submitted on ArXiv [KRW19], such a distinguisher could be applied to the cryptosystem and lead to an attack. The authors changed the cryptosystem in order to avoid such attacks. The new parameters are out of reach of a distinguisher based on the square code operation. This motivates the introduction of an alternative product.

6.2. The twisted square product. — In the remainder of this section, for the sake of simplicity, are stated using the same subspace and expansion basis for all blocks but they can be straightforwardly generalised to the case of various subspaces and expansion bases.

6.2.1. Motivation: the case $\lambda = 2, m = 3$. — In this section, we consider the case $\lambda = 2, m = 3$. Let us introduce a definition that is needed in the sequel.

Definition 41. — Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -vector space, we define the square subspace

$$\mathcal{S}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle ab \mid a, b \in \mathcal{S} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}.$$

Lemma 42. — *Let \mathcal{S} be a subspace of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} of dimension 2. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} = (\gamma_0, \gamma_1)$ be a basis of \mathcal{S} . Let $a, b \in \mathcal{S}$ such that*

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}((a)) = (a_0, a_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}((b)) = (b_0, b_1).$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}}((ab)) = (a_0b_0, a_0b_1 + a_1b_0, a_1b_1),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2} = (\gamma_0^2, \gamma_0\gamma_1, \gamma_1^2)$.

Remark 43. — Note that when $m = 3$ and $\dim \mathcal{S} = 2$, we have $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^3}$. Indeed, let (γ_0, γ_1) be a basis of \mathcal{S} , if $\gamma_0^2, \gamma_0\gamma_1$ and γ_1^2 were not \mathbb{F}_q -independent, denoting $\zeta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \gamma_1/\gamma_0$, then 1, ζ and ζ^2 would not be \mathbb{F}_q -independent either. Hence ζ would have degree ≤ 2 over \mathbb{F}_q . But by definition $\zeta \notin \mathbb{F}_q$.

Consider the SSRS scheme with $m = 3, \lambda = 2$. The public key is a generator matrix \mathbf{G} of $\mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_{S_0}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{S_{n-1}})}(\mathcal{C}_{|(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1})})$. From an attacker's point of view, the spaces S_0, \dots, S_{n-1} and their bases $\mathcal{B}_{S_0}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{S_{n-1}}$ are unknown. But, we have access to the entries of \mathbf{G} , in particular we have access to the coefficients a_0, a_1 (resp. b_0, b_1) of the decomposition in the basis \mathcal{B}_i of the i -th entry of some codewords of \mathcal{C} . Hence, the coefficients of the product ab in the basis $(\gamma_0^2, \gamma_0\gamma_1, \gamma_1^2)$ of S_i^2 can be computed **without knowing neither \mathcal{C} nor the basis \mathcal{B}_i** . This motivates the following definition.

Definition 44 (Twisted product). — Let \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} in \mathbb{F}_q^{2n} whose components are denoted

$$\mathbf{a} = (a_0^{(0)}, a_0^{(1)}, a_1^{(0)}, a_1^{(1)}, \dots, a_{n-1}^{(0)}, a_{n-1}^{(1)});$$

$$\mathbf{b} = (b_0^{(0)}, b_0^{(1)}, b_1^{(0)}, b_1^{(1)}, \dots, b_{n-1}^{(0)}, b_{n-1}^{(1)}).$$

We define the *twisted product* of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} as

$$\mathbf{a} \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a_i^{(0)}b_i^{(0)}, a_i^{(0)}b_i^{(1)} + a_i^{(1)}b_i^{(0)}, a_i^{(1)}b_i^{(1)})_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{3n}.$$

This definition extends to the product of codes, where the *twisted product* of two codes \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{2n}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{A} \tilde{\star} \mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \mathbf{a} \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{A}^{\tilde{\star}2}$ denotes the *twisted square code* of a code \mathcal{A} : $\mathcal{A}^{\tilde{\star}2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A} \tilde{\star} \mathcal{A}$.

With this definition, we can rewrite Lemma 42 for vectors in the following way.

Lemma 45. — Let \mathcal{S} be a subspace of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} of dimension 2. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} = (\gamma_0, \gamma_1)$ be a basis of \mathcal{S} . Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ such that all their entries lie in \mathcal{S} . Then,

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathbf{a}) \tilde{\star} \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}}(\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b}),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2} = (\gamma_0^2, \gamma_0\gamma_1, \gamma_1^2)$.

Extending this result to codes, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 46. — Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ -code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and \mathcal{S} a subspace of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} of dimension λ . Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} = (\gamma_0, \gamma_1)$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathcal{S} . Then,

$$(4) \quad (\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}))^{\tilde{\star}2} = \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}}\left((\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}})^{\star 2}_{\mathbb{F}_q}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2} = (\gamma_0^2, \gamma_0\gamma_1, \gamma_1^2)$. This results generalises straightforwardly to an expansion over various subspaces.

Proof. — This is a direct consequence of Lemma 45 by definition of the **Exp** operator and by \mathbb{F}_q -linearity of **Exp**. \square

Note that in our case, because $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, the basis $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}$ in (4) is a full basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Theorem 46 is summarised by the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{(\cdot)_{|\mathcal{S}}} & \mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}} & \xrightarrow{(\cdot)^{\star 2}_{\mathbb{F}_q}} & (\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}})^{\star 2}_{\mathbb{F}_q} \\ \downarrow \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}} & & \downarrow \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}} & & \downarrow \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}} \\ \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Sh}_{\mathcal{J}(\lambda, m)}(\cdot)} & \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}}) & \xrightarrow{(\cdot)^{\tilde{\star}2}} & \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}}\left((\mathcal{C}_{|\mathcal{S}})^{\star 2}_{\mathbb{F}_q}\right) \end{array}$$

6.2.2. General definition of the twisted square code. —

Remark 47. — This section is a generalisation of the previous definitions and results. A reader only interested in the practical aspects of the attack can skip directly to Section 6.3.

For arbitrary $\lambda \geq 2$, we have the following definition.

Definition 48 (Twisted square product, general case). — Let \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} in $\mathbb{F}_q^{\lambda n}$ whose components are denoted

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{a} &= (a_{0,0}, \dots, a_{0,\lambda-1}, a_{1,0}, \dots, a_{1,\lambda-1}, \dots, a_{n-1,0}, \dots, a_{n-1,\lambda-1}), \\ \mathbf{b} &= (b_{0,0}, \dots, b_{0,\lambda-1}, b_{1,0}, \dots, b_{1,\lambda-1}, \dots, b_{n-1,0}, \dots, b_{n-1,\lambda-1}).\end{aligned}$$

We define the *twisted product* $\mathbf{a} \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\binom{\lambda+1}{2}n}$ of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} such that for any $i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$ and for r, s such that $0 \leq r \leq s \leq \lambda-1$,

$$(\mathbf{a} \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b})_{i\binom{\lambda+1}{2} + \binom{s+1}{2} + r} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} a_{i,r}b_{i,s} + a_{i,s}b_{i,r} & \text{if } r < s \\ a_{i,r}b_{i,r} & \text{if } r = s. \end{cases}$$

This definition extends to the product of codes, where the *twisted product* of two codes \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{\lambda n}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{A} \tilde{\star} \mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \mathbf{a} \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}.$$

In particular, $\mathcal{A}^{\tilde{\star}2}$ denotes the *twisted square code* of a code \mathcal{A} : $\mathcal{A}^{\tilde{\star}2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A} \tilde{\star} \mathcal{A}$.

We are interested in the case where $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, because the goal is to reconstruct a fully expanded code. For a random subspace $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ of dimension λ , its dimension is typically $\min \left\{ \binom{\lambda+1}{2}, m \right\}$. The case $m = 3, \lambda = 2$ is a special case where $\binom{\lambda+1}{2} = m$. Hence, for other parameters m, λ such that $\binom{\lambda+1}{2} = m$, Theorem 46 generalises straightforwardly. But when $\binom{\lambda+1}{2} > m$, the twisted square code does not correspond to an expanded code. It is as if the code were expanded over a generating family of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} which is not a basis: the vectors are too long. A way to circumvent this and to obtain a result similar to Theorem 46 is to shorten the twisted square code to cancel the useless columns and obtain an expansion over a basis. This yields the following results.

Lemma 49. — Let \mathcal{S} be a subspace of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} of dimension λ such that $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}} = (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{\lambda-1})$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathcal{S} . Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}$ denote the first m elements of $(\gamma_0^2, \gamma_0\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_0\gamma_i, \gamma_1\gamma_i, \dots, \gamma_i^2, \dots, \gamma_{\lambda-1}^2)$. Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ whose entries all lie in \mathcal{S} . Denote \mathbf{c} the vector of length $\binom{\lambda+1}{2}n$ over \mathbb{F}_q defined as

$$\mathbf{c} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathbf{a}) \tilde{\star} \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathbf{b}).$$

Let $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ denote the set

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{K}(\lambda, m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \binom{\lambda+1}{2}i + j, i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket, j \in \llbracket m, \binom{\lambda+1}{2} - 1 \rrbracket \right\}.$$

If $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}$ is a basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and for any $i \in \mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$, the i -th entry of \mathbf{c} is zero, then,

$$(6) \quad \mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}(\mathbf{c}) = \mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}}(\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b}).$$

Proof. — Let \mathbf{c} be defined as in the statement. We want to prove that

$$\mathbf{Squeeze}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}}(\mathbf{Pct}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}(\mathbf{c})) = \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b}.$$

This is equivalent to Equation (6) because $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}$ is a basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Without loss of generality, we only need to focus on the block corresponding to the first entry in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} .

Let $(a_0, \dots, a_{\lambda-1})$ and $(b_0, \dots, b_{\lambda-1})$ denote the decomposition of the first entries of \mathbf{a} (resp. \mathbf{b}) over $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$. The first entry of $\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b}$ is

$$\left(\sum_i a_i \gamma_i \right) \left(\sum_j a_j \gamma_j \right) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j < \lambda} c_{i,j} \gamma_i \gamma_j,$$

where the coefficients $c_{i,j}$ match exactly the definition of the twisted square product, hence correspond to the entries of \mathbf{c} .

Let $\mathcal{B}_{\text{full}}$ denote the family $(\gamma_0^2, \gamma_0\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_0\gamma_i, \gamma_1\gamma_i, \dots, \gamma_i^2, \dots, \gamma_{\lambda-1}^2)$. The last entries of each block of \mathbf{c} are equal to zero. This corresponds exactly to the elements of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{full}}$ that are not in \mathcal{B}_{S^2} . We therefore have

$$\text{Squeeze}_{\mathcal{B}_{S^2}}(\text{Pct}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda,m)}(\mathbf{c})) = \text{Squeeze}_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{full}}}(\mathbf{c}) = \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b}.$$

□

This leads to the following main statement, which is the generalisation of Theorem 46.

Theorem 50. — *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and \mathcal{S} a subspace of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} of dimension λ such that $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_S = (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{\lambda-1})$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of \mathcal{S} . Then,*

$$(7) \quad \text{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda,m)}\left(\left(\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}})\right)^{\star 2}\right) \subseteq \text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{S^2}}\left(\left(\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}}\right)_{\mathbb{F}_q}^{\star 2}\right),$$

where \mathcal{B}_{S^2} and $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ are defined as in Lemma 49, provided \mathcal{B}_{S^2} is a basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . This result generalises straightforwardly to an expansion over various subspaces and bases.

Proof. — We intend to apply Lemma 49. This lemma has two conditions. The first condition is met by shortening the left-hand term. Indeed, the effect of shortening is that we keep only the words whose entries indexed by $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ are all equal to zero. The second condition (\mathcal{B}_{S^2} being a basis) is a hypothesis.

Compared to Lemma 49 and its proof, one should be careful that in general $\text{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda,m)}(\mathcal{A}^{\star 2})$ (where \mathcal{A} denotes $\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}})$) is not spanned by words of the form $\text{Pct}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda,m)}(\mathbf{a} \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b})$ with $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{A})$ but by linear combinations, *i.e.* words of the form

$$\text{Pct}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda,m)}(\mathbf{a}_0 \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b}_0 + \dots + \mathbf{a}_s \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b}_s), \quad \text{for } \mathbf{a}_0, \dots, \mathbf{a}_s, \mathbf{b}_0, \dots, \mathbf{b}_s \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Therefore, one needs to apply the very same reasoning as that of the proof of Lemma 49 replacing $\mathbf{a} \tilde{\star} \mathbf{b}$ by a sum of such vectors. This is not a problem and the proof generalises straightforwardly, since all the involved operators are linear.

Finally, because of the shortening operation, we only obtain an inclusion and not an equality. □

Remark 51. — In the special case $\binom{\lambda+1}{2} = m$, $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m) = \emptyset$, therefore the shortening is useless and the inclusion in (7) is an equality.

Remark 52. — In the sequel, we see that under a reasonable conjecture and some condition, the inclusion in (7) is an equality.

6.3. Dimension of the twisted square of subspace subcodes. —

6.3.1. Typical dimension of the twisted square of a random subspace subcode. — Similarly to Theorem 39 on squares of random codes, we expect that twisted squares of random codes typically have the largest possible dimension. For this reason, we state the following conjecture which is confirmed by our experimental observations using the computer algebra software *Sage*.

Conjecture 53. — *For any positive integer k such that $2k \leq n$, any \mathbb{F}_q -subspace $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ of dimension $\lambda \geq 2$ such that $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ and any \mathbb{F}_q -basis \mathcal{B}_S of \mathcal{S} , let \mathcal{R} denote an $[n, k]$ code chosen uniformly at random, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{R}|_{\mathcal{S}}))^{\star 2} = \min\left\{\binom{\lambda+1}{2}n, \binom{km - n(m-\lambda) + 1}{2}\right\}\right] \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

It is worth noting that in general $\binom{\lambda+1}{2} > m$. In such a case, as already mentioned before stating Lemma 49, the code $(\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{R}|_{\mathcal{S}}))^{\star 2}$ represents something **which is not an expansion of a code with respect to a basis of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$** but rather a kind of expansion with respect to a family of generators of the set \mathcal{S}^2 . This family is denoted $\mathcal{B}_{\text{full}}$ in the proof of Lemma 49. This set spans \mathcal{S}^2 but is not linearly independent in general. Hence, given a vector with entries in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$,

the decomposition with respect to this family of generators is not unique. For this reason, it is difficult to identify the twisted square code with the expansion of another code.

To ensure the unique decomposition, the key idea is to proceed as in the statement of Theorem 50 and to **shorten** the twisted square code on the positions of the set $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ introduced in (5), *i.e.* shortening the last $\binom{\lambda+1}{2} - m$ positions of each block of length $\binom{\lambda+1}{2}$. According to Theorem 50, a codeword in $\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}(\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{R}_{|S})^{\bar{*}2})$ is the expansion of a codeword of $\mathcal{R}^{\bar{*}2}$ in a given basis of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . The latter property is in general not satisfied by codewords of $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{R}_{|S})^{\bar{*}2}$. Therefore, this shortened code turns out to be a more relevant object of study and its dimension is of particular interest in the sequel. This dimension is the purpose of the following statement.

Corollary 54. — *Let \mathcal{R} be a uniformly random $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ be a subspace such that $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Denote by $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ the set introduced in (5). Then, under Conjecture 53, we typically have*

$$(8) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}(\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{R}_{|S})^{\bar{*}2}) \geq \min \left\{ mn, \binom{km - n(m - \lambda) + 1}{2} - n \left(\binom{\lambda + 1}{2} - m \right) \right\}.$$

6.3.2. Typical dimension of the twisted square of a subspace subcode of a RS code. — On the other hand, subspace subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes have a different behaviour. Indeed, Theorem 50 yields the following result.

Corollary 55. — *Given a GRS code $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{GRS}_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and an \mathbb{F}_q -subspace $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ of dimension $\lambda < m$ such that $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Denote by $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ the set introduced in (5). Then,*

$$(9) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \left(\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}(\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{C}_{|S})^{\bar{*}2}) \right) \leq \min\{mn, m(2k - 1)\}.$$

6.3.3. The distinguisher. — Putting the previous statements together, the twisted product provides a distinguisher between expanded subspace subcodes of GRS codes and expanded subspace subcodes of random codes.

Theorem 56. — *Let k be a positive integer, $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ of dimension $\lambda \geq 2$ an \mathbb{F}_q -subspace such that $\mathcal{S}^2 = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, \mathcal{B}_S an \mathbb{F}_q -basis. Let \mathcal{D} be defined as $\mathbf{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_S}(\mathcal{C}_{|S})$, where \mathcal{C} is either a random $[n, k]$ code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} or an $[n, k]$ GRS code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Suppose also that*

$$(10) \quad m(2k - 1) < \min \left\{ mn, \binom{km - n(m - \lambda) + 1}{2} - n \left(\binom{\lambda + 1}{2} - m \right) \right\}.$$

Then, assuming Conjecture 53, the computation of $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}(\mathcal{D}^{\bar{}2})$ provides a polynomial-time algorithm which decides whether \mathcal{C} is an RS code or a random code and succeeds with high probability. This extends straightforwardly to the case of multiple spaces and bases.*

Remark 57. — Condition (10) entails in particular $2k \leq n$, which is a necessary condition for the distinguisher to succeed. Indeed, if $2k > n$, the square code of the GRS code spans the whole space $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$. Hence it cannot be distinguished from a random code. When this condition is not met, it is sometimes possible to shorten the code so that the shortened code meets this condition. This is addressed in Section 6.3.5.

6.3.4. Experimental results. — Using the computer algebra software *Sage*, we tested the behaviour of the dimension of the twisted square (shortened at $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$) of subspace subcodes either of random codes or of RS codes. For each parameter set (see Table 2), we ran more than 100 tests and none of them yielded dimensions of the twisted square that was different from the bounds given either by Conjecture 53 or by Corollary 55.

In particular, these experiments show that bounds (8) and (9) are typically equalities. Note that this observation is not necessary to distinguish the codes but it will be useful for the attack presented in Section 7.

Parent code	q	m	λ	n	k	Bounds on the dimension of $\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}(\mathcal{C}^{\tilde{x}2})$	Actual Dimension of $\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}(\mathcal{C}^{\tilde{x}2})$
Random	7	3	2	120	55	≥ 360	360
RS	7	3	2	120	55	≤ 327	327
Random	7	5	3	160	75	≥ 800	800
RS	7	5	3	160	75	≤ 745	745

TABLE 2. Parameter sets for the tests. The code \mathcal{C} is the shortening at $m - \lambda$ positions per block of the expansion of a parent code. The parent code is either random or a Reed–Solomon code, as indicated in the first column of the table. The penultimate column gives the bounds on the dimension of the twisted square code shortened at $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$: a lower bound for random codes (Corollary 54) and an upper bound for SSRS codes (Corollary 55). The last column gives the actual dimension of the twisted square code computed using *Sage*. For each set of parameters, at least 100 tests were run and the actual dimension never differed from the bounds. We observe in particular that the bounds stated in Corollaries 54 and 55 are typically equalities.

6.3.5. Broadening the range of the distinguisher by shortening. — Similarly to the works [CGG⁺14, COT17], the range of the distinguisher can be broadened by shortening the public code. This can make the distinguisher work in some cases when $2k \geq n$. The idea is to shorten some blocks of length λ (corresponding to a given position of the original code in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$). For each shortened block the degree k is decreased by 1. Indeed, from Lemma 31 shortening a whole block corresponds to shortening the corresponding position of the parent code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} .

Let us investigate the condition for this to work. Let s_0 be the least positive integer such that $2(k - s_0) - 1 < n - s_0$, i.e.

$$s_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2k - n.$$

If one shortens the public code at $s \geq s_0$ blocks, which corresponds to $s(m - \lambda)$ positions, we can apply Theorem 56 on the shortened code. The condition of the theorem becomes

$$m(2(k - s) - 1) < \min \left\{ m(n - s), \binom{m(k - s) - (n - s)(m - \lambda) + 1}{2} - (n - s) \left(\binom{\lambda + 1}{2} - m \right) \right\}.$$

Example 58. — Consider the parameters of XGRS in the first row of Table 1. Suppose we shorten $s = 820$ blocks of the public key (i.e. 1260 positions of the parent GRS code). It corresponds to reduce to $n' = n - s = 438$ and $k' = k - s = 211$. The shortened public key will have dimension 195. Thus, the twisted square of the shortened public key will typically have dimension 1263 while the twisted square of an expanded subspace subcode of a random code would have full length, i.e. $3(n - s) = 1314$.

6.3.6. Limits of the distinguisher: the “ $m/2$ barrier”. — Suppose that $\lambda \leq \frac{m}{2}$ and let \mathcal{C} be a GRS code of dimension k and \mathcal{S} a subspace of dimension λ such that the SSRS code reaches the typical dimension (see Propositions 12 and 14), i.e. $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}} = km - n(m - \lambda)$.

For this dimension to be positive, we must have

$$k > n \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{m} \right) > \frac{n}{2}.$$

This is incompatible with the necessary condition $2k \leq n$ (see Remark 57) and cannot be overcome by shortening blocks as described in Section 6.3.5. Hence, **whenever $\lambda \leq m/2$, the distinguisher is ineffective.**

Remark 59. — In [COT14b, COT17] a distinguisher on so-called wild Goppa codes over quadratic extensions is established using the square code operation after a suitable shortening. This corresponds precisely to the case $\lambda = 1$ and $m = 2$ which, according to the previous discussion, should be out of reach of the distinguisher. The reason why this distinguisher is efficient for these

parameters is precisely because the dimension of such codes significantly exceeds the lower bound of Proposition 12 (see [SKHN76, COT14a]).




FIGURE 2. Informal summary of the statements. Any statement is the consequence of the statements pointing to it.

7. Attacking the SSRS scheme

In this section, we describe how to use these tools to attack the SSRS scheme. For the sake of convenience, we first focus on the parameters with $m = 3$, $\lambda = 2$ and then discuss the general case.

7.1. Further conjectures for the attack. — As explained in Section 6.3.4 our experiments show that Inequalities (8) and (9) are typically equalities. This encourages us to state the following two conjectures.

Conjecture 60. — *Let $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}, \mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ be as in Theorem 50 and suppose that Equation (10) is satisfied. If \mathcal{C} is an $[n, k]$ GRS code, then, with high probability, the inclusion of Equation (7) is an equality, i.e.*

$$\text{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)} \left((\text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}}(\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}}))^{\star 2} \right) = \text{Exp}_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}} \left((\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}})_{\mathbb{F}_q}^{\star 2} \right).$$

In addition, the right-hand term of the last equality satisfies the following inclusion.

Lemma 61. — *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -vector space. Then*

$$(11) \quad (\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}})_{\mathbb{F}_q}^{\star 2} \subseteq (\mathcal{C}^{\star 2})|_{\mathcal{S}^2}.$$

Proof. — It suffices to observe that the result holds on \mathbb{F}_q -generators. Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then, $\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}^{\star 2}$. In addition, for any $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, we have $(\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b})_i \in \mathcal{S}^2$. Thus, $\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b} \in (\mathcal{C}^{\star 2})|_{\mathcal{S}^2}$. \square

Moreover, Inclusion (11) turns out to be typically an equality in the case of GRS codes as suggested by the following conjecture.

Conjecture 62. — *Let $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}^2}, \mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ be as in Theorem 50 and suppose that Equation (10) is satisfied. If \mathcal{C} is an $[n, k]$ GRS code, then, with high probability, the inclusion of Equation (11) is an equality, i.e.*

$$(\mathcal{C}|_{\mathcal{S}})_{\mathbb{F}_q}^{\star 2} = (\mathcal{C}^{\star 2})|_{\mathcal{S}^2}.$$

7.2. The case $m = 3$ and $\lambda = 2$. —

7.2.1. Constructing the square code. — Let \mathcal{C}_{pub} be the public code of an instance of the SSRS scheme. This code is described by a generator matrix \mathbf{G}_{pub} which is the only data we have access to. We know that there exist unknown spaces $\mathcal{S}_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n-1}$ with bases $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_i} = (b_{i,0}, b_{i,1})$ and an RS code over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} such that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_i})_i} \left(\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})|_{(\mathcal{S}_i)_i} \right).$$

We can compute the generator matrix of the twisted square code $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}^{\star 2}$, which according to Theorem 46 is equal to

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_i^2})_i} \left(\left(\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})|_{(\mathcal{S}_i)_i} \right)^{\star 2}_{\mathbb{F}_q} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_i^2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (b_{i,0}^2, b_{i,0}b_{i,1}, b_{i,1}^2)$. Moreover, assuming Conjecture 62, this code is likely to be equal to

$$\mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_i^2})_i} (\mathbf{RS}_{2k-1}(\mathbf{x})).$$

It is important to stress that, at this stage, we do not know the value of \mathbf{x} nor the $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_i}$ or the $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_i^2}$.

7.2.2. Finding the value of \mathbf{x} . — We now have access to a fully expanded RS code (and not a subspace subcode) and want to use this to find the value of \mathbf{x} . In fact, the authors of [BGK19] propose an algorithm to solve this problem, by using a generalisation of the algorithm of Sidelnikov and Shestakov [SS92] to recover the structure of GRS codes.

Theorem 63. — [BGK19, § IV.B] *Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ be a vector with distinct entries and $\mathcal{B}_0, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$ be an n -tuple of \mathbb{F}_q -bases of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Let*

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i} (\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})).$$

There exists a polynomial time algorithm which

takes as inputs \mathcal{C} , *three distinct elements $x'_0, x'_1, x'_2 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and an \mathbb{F}_q -basis \mathcal{B}'_0 of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} ;*
and returns $x'_3, \dots, x'_{n-1} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ *and \mathbb{F}_q -bases $(\mathcal{B}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}'_{n-1})$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} such that*

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}'_0, \dots, \mathcal{B}'_{n-1})} (\mathbf{RS}_k((x'_0, \dots, x'_{n-1}))).$$

The principle of the algorithm is very similar to that of Sidelnikov Shestakov. Starting from a systematic generator matrix of an expanded Reed–Solomon code, the hidden structure of the RS code is deduced from relations satisfied by the $m \times m$ blocks of the right hand side of this systematic generator matrix.

Remark 64. — Theorem 63 asserts in particular that the choice of three values of the support together with one basis uniquely determines a pair $(\mathbf{x}, (\mathcal{B}_i)_i)$ describing a code $\mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)_i}(\mathbf{x})$.

Using this Theorem 63, we obtain a vector \mathbf{x}' and \mathbb{F}_q -bases \mathcal{B}'_i of \mathbb{F}_{q^3} such that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}^{\star 2} = \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}'_i)_i} (\mathbf{RS}_{2k-1}(\mathbf{x}')).$$

Remark 65. — Note that the value of \mathbf{x}' is not necessarily the same as the one contained in the secret key but we are looking for an equivalent secret key, *i.e.* we only need a code description which allows us to decode.

7.2.3. Recovering a secret key. — Once \mathbf{x}' is found, there remains to find bases $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}'_0}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}'_{n-1}}$ of 2-dimensional subspaces $\mathcal{S}'_0, \dots, \mathcal{S}'_{n-1} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^3}$ such that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} = \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}'_i})_i} (\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x}')).$$

These bases can be obtained by solving a linear system. They are the pairs

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}'_0} = (b_0^{(0)}, b_0^{(1)}), \dots, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}'_{n-1}} = (b_{n-1}^{(0)}, b_{n-1}^{(1)})$$

such that

$$\mathbf{Squeeze}_{(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}'_i})_i} (\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}) \subseteq \mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x}'),$$

which can be equated as follows. Let \mathbf{H} be a parity-check matrix of $\mathbf{RS}_k(\mathbf{x})$ and \mathbf{G}_{pub} a generator matrix of \mathcal{C}_{pub} . Let

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} b_0^{(0)} & & & & (0) \\ b_0^{(1)} & & & & \\ & b_1^{(0)} & & & \\ & b_1^{(1)} & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & b_{n-1}^{(0)} & \\ (0) & & & b_{n-1}^{(1)} & \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^3}^{2n \times n}.$$

The unknown entries of \mathbf{B} are the solutions of the linear system

$$(12) \quad \mathbf{G}_{\text{pub}} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{H}^\top = 0.$$

There are

- $2n$ unknowns in \mathbb{F}_{q^3} which yields $6n$ unknowns in \mathbb{F}_q ;
- for $(3k - n)(n - k) = O(n^2)$ equations.

Thus, the matrix \mathbf{B} is very likely to be the unique solution up to a scalar multiple. From this, we obtain a complete equivalent secret key, which allows to decrypt any ciphertext.

Remark 66. — After presenting a polynomial time recovery of the structure of expanded GRS codes in [BGK19, § IV.B], the extension to expanded SSRS codes is discussed [BGK19, § VI.C]. The suggested approach consists in performing a brute-force search on the expansion bases $\mathcal{B}_0, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$. But the cost of such an approach is exponential in n and λ . Our use of the twisted square code allows to address the same problem in polynomial time.

7.2.4. Extending the reach of the attack by shortening blocks. — As explained in Section 6.3.5, it may happen that $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}^{\star 2} = \mathbb{F}_q^{3n}$, i.e. the twisted square of the public code equals the whole ambient space. In such a situation, the distinguisher fails and so does the attack. To overcome this issue, it is sometimes possible to shorten a fixed number s of blocks of \mathcal{C}_{pub} and apply the previous attack to this block-shortened code.

More precisely, let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \llbracket 0, 2n - 1 \rrbracket$ be a set of indices corresponding to a union of blocks, i.e. of the form $\mathcal{I} = \{2i_0, 2i_0 + 1, \dots, 2i_s, 2i_s + 1\}$. We apply the previous algorithm to the code $\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}})$ which returns $((x'_i)_{i \notin \mathcal{I}}, (\mathcal{B}'_i)_{i \notin \mathcal{I}})$ such that

$$\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}})^{\star 2} = \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}'_i)_{i \notin \mathcal{I}}}((x'_i)_{i \notin \mathcal{I}}).$$

Recall that the choice of three of the x'_i 's and one of the \mathcal{B}'_i 's entirely determines the other ones. Then, one can re-apply the same process with another set of blocks \mathcal{I}_1 such that there are at least 3 that are neither in \mathcal{I}_0 nor in \mathcal{I}_1 . This allows to deduce new values for x_i 's for $i \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}_1$. And we repeat this operation until \mathbf{x}' is entirely computed. Then, we proceed as in Section 7.2.3 to recover the rest of the secret key.

7.2.5. Application: attacking some parameters of the XGRS system. — The proposed attack efficiently breaks all parameters of Type I proposed in [KRW21] (i.e. with $\lambda = 2$ and $m = 3$). Using a *Sage* implementation, the calculation of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}^{\star 2}$ takes a few minutes. Next, we obtained a full key recovery using the “guess and squeeze” approach described further in Section 7.6 followed by a usual Sidelnikov Shestakov attack. The overall attack runs in less than one hour for keys corresponding to a claimed security level of 256 bits. The previously described approach consisting in applying directly the algorithm of [BGK19, § VI.B] on $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}^{\star 2}$ has not been implemented but is probably even more efficient.

7.3. The general case. — The attack presented in Section 7.2 generalises straightforwardly (up to the following details) when the conditions of Conjecture 60 are met.

- According to Theorem 50, we should no longer work with $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}^{\tilde{x}2}$ but with $\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}^{\tilde{x}2}\right)$, where $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ is defined in Lemma 49 (5). Assuming Conjectures 60 and 62, we deduce that this code is the expansion of a GRS code. Hence, the algorithm of [BGK19, § VI.B] can be applied to it.
- The recovery of the subspaces and bases described in Section 7.2.3 involves a matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\lambda n \times n}$ with λn nonzero entries, which will be the unknowns of the system (12). Hence, this system has λn unknowns in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , i.e. λmn unknowns in \mathbb{F}_q for $(mk - n(m - \lambda))(n - k) = O(n^2)$ equations. As the value of m (and hence λ) remain very small compared to n , there is still in general a unique solution up to a scalar multiple.

7.4. Summary of the attack. — The attack can be summarised by the following algorithms, depending on the values of k and n .

Algorithm 1 The attack when $2k \leq n$

- 1: Compute $\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)}\left(\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}}^{\tilde{x}2}\right)$, where $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)$ is the union of the last $\binom{\lambda+1}{2} - m$ positions of each block (see Lemma 30 (3));
 - 2: Apply the algorithm of [BGK19, § VI.B] to recover a support \mathbf{x} of the parent Reed–Solomon code;
 - 3: Apply the calculations of Section 7.2.3 to recover the bases \mathcal{B}_i .
-

Algorithm 2 Attack when $2k > n$

- 1: Choose a number s of blocks to shorten satisfying condition (10) so that the distinguisher succeeds.
 - 2: Pick a union of s blocks \mathcal{I} and
 - (a) Compute $\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)'}\left(\mathbf{Sh}_{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}})^{\tilde{x}2}\right)$, where $\mathcal{K}(\lambda, m)'$ is the union of the last $\binom{\lambda+1}{2} - m$ positions of each block;
 - (b) Apply the algorithm of [BGK19, § VI.B] to recover a partial support $(x_i)_{i \notin \mathcal{I}}$;
 - (c) Repeat this process with another \mathcal{I} until you got the whole support \mathbf{x} .
 - 3: Apply the calculations of Section 7.2.3 to recover the bases \mathcal{B}_i .
-

Note that the support of a GRS code is defined up to three degrees of freedom. Hence, in Algorithm 2, in order to consistently reconstruct the whole support of \mathbf{x} , one should make sure that the set \mathcal{I} always includes the first three positions and assign them some fixed arbitrary values.

7.5. Complexity. — For the complexity analysis and according to the parameters proposed in [KRW21], we suppose that $m = O(1)$, $\lambda = O(1)$ and $k = \Theta(n)$.

7.5.1. Step 1, the twisted square computation. — First let us evaluate the cost of the computation of the twisted square of the code $\mathcal{C}_{\text{pub}} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{\lambda n}$ of dimension $k_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (mk - n(m - \lambda))$.

1. Starting from a $k_0 \times \lambda n$ generator matrix of \mathcal{C}_{pub} , any non ordered pair of rows provides a generator of the twisted square. Hence there are $\binom{k_0+1}{2} = O(n^2)$ generators to compute, each computation costing $n\binom{\lambda+1}{2}$ operations. This is an overall cost of $O(n^3)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_q .
2. Then, deducing a row echelon generator matrix of this twisted square from these $O(n^2)$ generators has the cost of the computation of the row echelon form of a $O(n^2) \times O(n)$ matrix, which requires $O(n^{\omega+1})$ operations in \mathbb{F}_q (see [BCG⁺17, Théorème 8.6]), where $\omega \leq 3$ is the complexity exponent of operations of linear algebra.

Thus, the overall cost of the computation of this twisted square code is $O(n^{\omega+1})$. In addition, in the situation where $2k - 1 > n$, we need to iterate the calculation on a constant number of shortenings of the public code, which has no influence on the complexity exponent.

Remark 67. — Similarly to the discussions [COT17, § VI.D] and [CMCP17, § VI.B.4], it is possible to randomly generate $O(n)$ generators of the twisted square code and perform the echelon form on this subset of generators. This provides the whole twisted square code with a high probability, reducing the cost of the calculation to $O(n^\omega)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_q .

7.5.2. Step 2, recovering \mathbf{x} . — The second step of the attack, *i.e.* performing the algorithm of [BGK19, § VI.B] to recover \mathbf{x} is not that expensive. A quick analysis of this algorithm allows to observe that the most time consuming step is the calculation of the systematic form of the generator matrix, which has actually been performed in the previous step. Therefore, this second step can be neglected in the complexity analysis.

7.5.3. Step 3, recovering the bases. — Finally, the last step of the attack, consisting in recovering the bases \mathcal{B}_i , boils down to the resolution of a linear system of $O(n^2)$ equations and $O(n)$ unknowns, which costs $O(n^{\omega+1})$ operations.

Summary. The overall cost of the attack is of $O(n^{\omega+1})$ operations in \mathbb{F}_q .

7.6. Recovering the bases for arbitrary expanded codes: *guess and squeeze*. — To conclude this section, we present an alternative approach to detect the hidden structure of expanded codes and recover the expansion bases. As explained in Section 7.2.5, this is the approach we implemented. The advantage of this approach is that it can be applied to expansions of codes which are not RS codes. Therefore it could be an interesting tool for other cryptanalyses.

Given a code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ and bases $\mathcal{B}_0, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , suppose you only know a generator matrix of

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{exp}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{Exp}_{(\mathcal{B}_i)}(\mathcal{C}).$$

The objective is to guess the \mathcal{B}_i 's iteratively instead of brute forcing any n -tuple of bases, which would be prohibitive.

Step 1. Shorten \mathcal{C}_{exp} at $k-1$ blocks (which corresponds to $m(k-1)$ positions). This yields a code whose dimension most of the times equals m . According to Lemma 31, this is the expansion of a code of dimension 1 obtained by shortening \mathcal{C} at $k-1$ positions.

Step 2. Puncture this shortened code in order to keep only two blocks. We get a $[2m, m]$ code which we call $\mathcal{C}_{\text{exp, tiny}} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{2m}$. This code is the expansion of a $[2, 1]$ code called $\mathcal{C}_{\text{tiny}} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^2$ obtained from \mathcal{C} by shortening $k-1$ positions and puncturing the remaining code in order to keep only 2 positions.

Step 3. Now, for any pair of bases $(\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1)$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , compute

$$\mathbf{Squeeze}_{(\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1)}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{exp, tiny}}).$$

The point is that, for a wrong choice of bases, we get a generator matrix with m rows and 2 columns which is very likely to be full rank. Hence a wrong choice provides the trivial code $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^2$. On the other hand, a good choice of bases provides the code $\mathcal{C}_{\text{tiny}}$ which has dimension 1. This property allows to guess the bases.

Actually, according to Lemma 35, if one guesses the bases $a_0\mathcal{B}_0, a_1\mathcal{B}_1$ for some $a_0, a_1 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\times$, the squeezing will provide $\mathcal{C}_{\text{tiny}} \star (a_0, a_1)$ which also has dimension 1. Therefore, it is possible to first guess the bases up to a scalar multiple in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\times$. Therefore, the cost of computing these two bases is in $O(q^{2m(m-1)})$ operations.

Once the first two bases are known, one can restart the process by with another pair of blocks involving one of the two blocks for which the basis is already known, which requires $O(q^{m(m-1)})$ operations. This yields an overall complexity of $O(q^{2m(m-1)} + nq^{m(m-1)})$ operations in \mathbb{F}_q for this *guess and squeeze* algorithm.

Remark 68. — Note that in the attack of XGRS scheme, the bases to guess are known to be of the form $(1, \gamma, \gamma^2, \dots, \gamma^{m-1})$ for some generator $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. This additional information significantly improves this search and reduce the cost of the calculation of the n bases to $O(q^{2m} + nq^m)$ operations.

Remark 69. — Proceeding this way only allows to get back the code $\mathcal{C} \star \mathbf{a} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ for an unknown vector $\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\times)^n$. However, this is an important first step. For instance, if \mathcal{C} was a Reed–Solomon, we obtain a generalised Reed–Solomon code whose structure is computable using Sidelnikov and Shestakov attack. It is then possible to decode.

8. Conclusion

We presented a polynomial time distinguisher on subspace subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes relying on a new operation called the *twisted square product*. We are hence able to distinguish SSRS codes from random ones as soon as the dimension λ of the subspaces exceeds $\frac{m}{2}$. From this distinguisher, we derived an attack breaking in particular the parameter set $\lambda = 2$ and $m = 3$ of the XGRS system [KRW21].

These results contribute to better understand the security of the McEliece encryption scheme instantiated with algebraic codes. On the one hand, we have generalised Reed–Solomon codes, which are known to be insecure since the early 90’s. On the other hand, alternant codes seem to resist to any attack except some Goppa codes with a very low extension degree [COT17, FPdP14]. The present work provides an analysis of a family of codes including these two cases as the two extremities of a spectrum. Concerning the subspace subcodes lying in between, we show an inherent weakness of SSRS codes when $\lambda > m/2$ (See Figure 1, page 3). The case $\lambda = m/2$ is in general out of reach of our distinguisher, but remains border line as testified by some attacks on the cases $\lambda = 1, m = 2$ in the literature [COT17, FPdP14].

A question which remains open is the actual security of the cases $1 < \lambda < m/2$ which are out of reach of the twisted square code distinguisher. These codes, which include alternant codes, deserve to have a careful security analysis in the near future. Indeed, if they turn out to be resistant to any attack, they could provide an alternative to *Classic McEliece* [BCL⁺19] with shorter key sizes. On the other hand, if some of these codes turned out to be insecure, this may impact the security of *Classic McEliece* which is a crucial question in the near future.

References

- [BBC⁺16] Marco Baldi, Marco Bianchi, Franco Chiaraluce, Joachim Rosenthal, and Davide Schipani. Enhanced public key security for the McEliece cryptosystem. *J. Cryptology*, 29(1):1–27, 2016.
- [BCD⁺16] Magali Bardet, Julia Chautet, Vlad Dragoi, Ayoub Otmani, and Jean-Pierre Tillich. Cryptanalysis of the McEliece public key cryptosystem based on polar codes. In *Post-Quantum Cryptography 2016*, LNCS, pages 118–143, Fukuoka, Japan, February 2016.
- [BCG⁺17] Alin Bostan, Frédéric Chyzak, Marc Giusti, Romain Lebreton, Grégoire Lecerf, Bruno Salvy, and Éric Schost. *Algorithmes Efficaces en Calcul Formel*. Frédéric Chyzak (auto-édit.), Palaiseau, September 2017.
- [BCL⁺19] Daniel J. Bernstein, Tung Chou, Tanja Lange, Ingo von Maurich, Rafael Mizoczki, Ruben Niederhagen, Edoardo Persichetti, Christiane Peters, Peter Schwabe, Nicolas Sendrier, Jakub Szefer, and Wang Wen. Classic McEliece: conservative code-based cryptography. <https://classic.mceliece.org>, March 2019. Second round submission to the NIST post-quantum cryptography call.
- [Ber73] Elwyn Berlekamp. Goppa codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 19(5):590–592, 1973.
- [BGK19] Thierry P. Berger, Cheikh Thiécoumba Gueye, and Jean Belo Klamti. Generalized subspace subcodes with application in cryptology. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 65(8):4641–4657, 2019.
- [BGKR19] Thierry P. Berger, Cheikh Thiécoumba Gueye, Jean Belo Klamti, and Olivier Ruatta. Designing a public key cryptosystem based on quasi-cyclic subspace subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes. In *International Conference on Algebra, Codes and Cryptology*, pages 97–113. Springer, 2019.
- [BL05] Thierry P. Berger and Pierre Loidreau. How to mask the structure of codes for a cryptographic use. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 35(1):63–79, 2005.
- [BMvT78] Elwyn Berlekamp, Robert McEliece, and Henk van Tilborg. On the inherent intractability of certain coding problems. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 24(3):384–386, May 1978.

- [CB14] Ivan V. Chizhov and Mikhail A. Borodin. Effective attack on the McEliece cryptosystem based on Reed-Muller codes. *Discrete Math. Appl.*, 24(5):273–280, 2014.
- [CCMZ15] Ignacio Cascudo, Ronald Cramer, Diego Mirandola, and Gilles Zémor. Squares of random linear codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 61(3):1159–1173, 3 2015.
- [CGG⁺14] Alain Couvreur, Philippe Gaborit, Valérie Gauthier-Umaña, Ayoub Otmani, and Jean-Pierre Tillich. Distinguisher-based attacks on public-key cryptosystems using Reed-Solomon codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 73(2):641–666, 2014.
- [CL20] Alain Couvreur and Matthieu Lequesne. On the security of subspace subcodes of Reed-Solomon codes for public key encryption, 2020. ArXiv:2009.05826.
- [CLT19] Alain Couvreur, Matthieu Lequesne, and Jean-Pierre Tillich. Recovering short secret keys of RLCE in polynomial time. In Jintai Ding and Rainer Steinwandt, editors, *Post-Quantum Cryptography 2019*, volume 11505 of *LNCS*, pages 133–152, Chongqing, China, May 2019. Springer.
- [CMCP14] Alain Couvreur, Irene Márquez-Corbella, and Ruud Pellikaan. A polynomial time attack against algebraic geometry code based public key cryptosystems. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium Inf. Theory - ISIT 2014*, pages 1446–1450, June 2014.
- [CMCP17] Alain Couvreur, Irene Márquez-Corbella, and Ruud Pellikaan. Cryptanalysis of McEliece cryptosystem based on algebraic geometry codes and their subcodes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 63(8):5404–5418, 8 2017.
- [COT14a] Alain Couvreur, Ayoub Otmani, and Jean-Pierre Tillich. New identities relating wild Goppa codes. *Finite Fields Appl.*, 29:178–197, 2014.
- [COT14b] Alain Couvreur, Ayoub Otmani, and Jean-Pierre Tillich. Polynomial time attack on wild McEliece over quadratic extensions. In Phong Q. Nguyen and Elisabeth Oswald, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2014*, volume 8441 of *LNCS*, pages 17–39. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014.
- [COT17] Alain Couvreur, Ayoub Otmani, and Jean-Pierre Tillich. Polynomial time attack on wild McEliece over quadratic extensions. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 63(1):404–427, 1 2017.
- [COTG15] Alain Couvreur, Ayoub Otmani, Jean-Pierre Tillich, and Valérie Gauthier-Umaña. A polynomial-time attack on the BBKRS scheme. In J. Katz, editor, *Public-Key Cryptography - PKC 2015*, volume 9020 of *LNCS*, pages 175–193. Springer, 2015.
- [Cou20] Alain Couvreur. Introduction to coding theory, 2020. Lecture notes available on http://www.lix.polytechnique.fr/~alain.couvreur/doc_ens/lecture_notes.pdf.
- [FGO⁺11] Jean-Charles Faugère, Valérie Gauthier, Ayoub Otmani, Ludovic Perret, and Jean-Pierre Tillich. A distinguisher for high rate McEliece cryptosystems. In *Proc. IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop- ITW 2011*, pages 282–286, Paraty, Brasil, October 2011.
- [FPdP14] Jean-Charles Faugère, Ludovic Perret, and Frédéric de Portzamparc. Algebraic attack against variants of McEliece with Goppa polynomial of a special form. In *Advances in Cryptology - ASIACRYPT 2014*, volume 8873 of *LNCS*, pages 21–41, Kaoshiung, Taiwan, R.O.C., December 2014. Springer.
- [GL05] Ernst M Gabidulin and Pierre Loidreau. On subcodes of codes in rank metric. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium Inf. Theory - ISIT*, pages 121–123. IEEE, 2005.
- [GL08] Ernst M. Gabidulin and Pierre Loidreau. Properties of subspace subcodes of Gabidulin codes. *Adv. Math. Commun.*, 2(2):147–157, 2008.
- [Gop70] Valerii D. Goppa. A new class of linear error-correcting codes. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 6(3):24–30, 1970. In Russian.
- [Gop71] Valerii D. Goppa. Rational representation of codes and (L, g) codes. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 7(3):41–49, 1971. In Russian.
- [Hat95] Masayuki Hattori. *Subspace Subcodes of Reed-Solomon Codes*. PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, 1995.
- [HMS98] Masayuki Hattori, Robert J. McEliece, and Gustave Solomon. Subspace subcodes of Reed-Solomon codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 44(5):1861–1880, 1998.
- [HP03] W. Cary Huffman and Vera Pless. *Fundamentals of error-correcting codes*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [Jen95] Jørn M. Jensen. Subgroup subcodes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 41(3):781–785, 1995.
- [JJ01] Cui Jie and Pei Junying. Subspace subcodes of generalized Reed-Solomon codes. *Acta Mathematicae Applicatae Sinica*, 17(4):503–508, 2001.

- [KL85] Tadao Kasami and Shu Lin. On the binary weight distribution of some Reed–Solomon codes. Technical report, NASA, 1985.
- [KL88] Tadao Kasami and Shu Lin. The binary weight distribution of the extended $(2m, 2m - 4)$ code of the Reed–Solomon code over $GF(2^m)$ with generator polynomial $(x - \alpha)(x - \alpha^2)(x - \alpha^3)$. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 98:291–307, 1988.
- [KRW19] Karan Khathuria, Joachim Rosenthal, and Violetta Weger. Encryption scheme based on expanded Reed–Solomon codes, 2019. ArXiv:1906.00745v2 (Version 2).
- [KRW21] Karan Khathuria, Joachim Rosenthal, and Violetta Weger. Encryption scheme based on expanded Reed–Solomon codes. *Advances in Mathematics of Communications*, 15(2):207–218, 2021.
- [LN97] Rudolf Lidl and Harald Niederreiter. *Finite fields*, volume 20 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1997. With a foreword by P. M. Cohn.
- [McE78] Robert J. McEliece. *A Public-Key System Based on Algebraic Coding Theory*, pages 114–116. Jet Propulsion Lab, 1978. DSN Progress Report 44.
- [MS86] Florence J. MacWilliams and Neil J. A. Sloane. *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, fifth edition, 1986.
- [MS94] Robert J. McEliece and Gustave Solomon. Trace-shortened Reed–Solomon codes. *The Telecommunications and Data Acquisition Progress Report 42-117*, page 119, 1994.
- [Nie86] Harald Niederreiter. Knapsack-type cryptosystems and algebraic coding theory. *Problems of Control and Information Theory*, 15(2):159–166, 1986.
- [Ran13] Hugues Randriambololona. Asymptotically good binary linear codes with asymptotically good self-intersection spans. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 59(5):3038–3045, 2013.
- [RS85] Ron M. Roth and Gadiel Seroussi. On generator matrices of MDS codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 31(6):826–830, 1985.
- [SKHN76] Yasuo Sugiyama, Masao Kasahara, Shigeichi Hirasawa, and Toshihiko Namekawa. Further results on Goppa codes and their applications to constructing efficient binary codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 22:518–526, 1976.
- [Sol93] Gustave Solomon. Non-linear, non-binary cyclic group codes. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium Inf. Theory - ISIT*, pages 192–192. IEEE, 1993.
- [Spe04] Sarah A. Spence. Identifying high-dimension subspace subcodes of Reed–Solomon codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50(6):1280–1282, 2004.
- [SS92] Vladimir Michilovich Sidelnikov and S.O. Shestakov. On the insecurity of cryptosystems based on generalized Reed–Solomon codes. *Discrete Math. Appl.*, 1(4):439–444, 1992.
- [Ste93] Jacques Stern. A new identification scheme based on syndrome decoding. In D.R. Stinson, editor, *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO'93*, volume 773 of *LNCS*, pages 13–21. Springer, 1993.
- [STK89] Katsumi Sakakibara, Kin-Ichiroh Tokiwa, and Masao Kasahara. Notes on q -ary expanded Reed–Solomon codes over $GF(q^m)$. *Electronics and Communications in Japan (Part III: Fundamental Electronic Science)*, 72(2):14–23, 1989.
- [vDT99] Marten van Dijk and Ludo Tolhuizen. Efficient encoding for a class of subspace subcodes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 45(6):2142–2146, 1999.
- [Wan16] Yongge Wang. Quantum resistant random linear code based public key encryption scheme RLCE. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium Inf. Theory - ISIT 2016*, pages 2519–2523, Barcelona, Spain, July 2016. IEEE.
- [Wan17] Yongge Wang. RLCE–KEM. <http://quantumca.org>, 2017. First round submission to the NIST post-quantum cryptography call.
- [Wie06] Christian Wieschebrink. Two NP-complete problems in coding theory with an application in code based cryptography. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium Inf. Theory - ISIT*, pages 1733–1737, 2006.
- [Wie10] Christian Wieschebrink. Cryptanalysis of the Niederreiter public key scheme based on GRS subcodes. In *Post-Quantum Cryptography 2010*, volume 6061 of *LNCS*, pages 61–72. Springer, 2010.
- [Wu11] Yingquan Wu. On expanded cyclic and Reed–Solomon codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 57(2):601–620, 2011.

ALAIN COUVREUR, Inria • LIX, École polytechnique, Palaiseau, France • *E-mail* : alain.couvreur@inria.fr
MATTHIEU LEQUESNE, Sorbonne Université • Inria, Paris, France • *E-mail* : matthieu.lequesne@inria.fr