

A Deterministic Algorithm for the Discrete Logarithm Problem in a Semigroup

Simran Tinani* ¹ and Joachim Rosenthal¹

¹University of Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse, 8057 Zurich. ,

WWW home page: <https://www.math.uzh.ch/aa/>

June 10, 2021

Abstract

The discrete logarithm problem in a finite group is the basis for many protocols in cryptography. The best general algorithms which solve this problem have time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$, where N is the order of the group. These algorithms require the inversion of some group elements or rely on finding collisions, and thus do not adapt to work in the general semigroup setting. For semigroups, probabilistic algorithms with similar time complexity have been proposed. The main result of this paper is a deterministic algorithm for solving the discrete logarithm problem in a semigroup. Specifically, let x be an element in a semigroup having finite order N_x . If $y \in \langle x \rangle$ is given the paper provides an algorithm having time complexity $O(\sqrt{N_x} \log N_x)$ to find all natural numbers m with $x^m = y$. The paper also give an analysis of the success rates of the existing probabilistic algorithms, which were so far only conjectured or stated loosely.

1 Introduction

Let G be a group and assume $x, y \in G$ are two elements of the group. We refer to x as the base element. The discrete logarithm problem (referred to henceforth as DLP) asks for the computation of all integers $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ (assuming such integers exist) such that $x^m = y$. The DLP plays an important role in a multitude of algebraic and number theoretic cryptographic systems. Its use was introduced in the Diffie-Hellman protocol for public key exchange

*Corresponding author. email: simran.tinani@math.uzh.ch

[6] and has since seen a tremendous amount of development, generalisations and extensions [11]. Many modern-day systems for public key exchange use the discrete logarithm problem in a suitable group. The most commonly used groups have been the multiplicative group of finite fields and the group of points on an elliptic curve. The DLP in Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves and more general abelian varieties has also been studied extensively [5].

For a general finite group of order N , there exist algorithms that solve the DLP in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ steps. Such algorithms are said to produce a square root attack. The most well-known examples are Shank's Baby Step-Giant Step algorithm [18] and the Pollard-Rho algorithm [16]. Note that Shank's algorithm is a deterministic algorithm having time complexity $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ group multiplications and space complexity $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ as well. In contrast Pollard's algorithm is a probabilistic algorithm having time complexity $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ group multiplications and space complexity $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Elliptic curve groups have been widely implemented in practice since for a carefully selected elliptic curve group the best known classical algorithm for solving DLP has running time $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$, where N is the group order. This is in contrast to many other finite groups such as the multiplicative group of a finite field and the group of invertible matrices over a finite field where algorithms with subexponential running time are known [1].

In cryptography the Diffie-Hellman protocol using a finite group has been generalized to situations where the underlying problem is a discrete logarithm problem in a semigroup or even to situations where a semigroup acts on a set [9, 10]. The interested reader will find more material in a recent survey by Goel et al. [7].

It is naturally interesting to ask whether the DLP also has a square root attack in more generalized structures such as semigroups. Here, we define a semigroup as any set of elements with an associative binary operation. Since the best algorithms for the DLP all make use of the existence of inverses, it is unclear whether they can be generalized to a semigroup. However, when a special type of semigroup element, called a torsion element, is used as the base, it turns out that the DLP is reducible in polynomial time to the DLP in a finite group. A torsion element is one whose powers eventually repeat to form a cycle, and will be defined more precisely in Section 2. This section also elaborates more on why the standard collision-based algorithms are not directly adaptable to the semigroup case. A semigroup in which every element is torsion is called a torsion semigroup.

The DLP in semigroups with a torsion base element, in a classical setting, was first discussed by Chris Monico [13] in 2002, and later in a paper by Banin and Tsaban [3] in 2016. While the discussion in the present paper is entirely on classical algorithms, it is also worth mentioning the paper [4], where the authors independently provide a quantum algorithm that solves the DLP in a torsion semigroup.

Both the algorithm of Monico and the one of Banin and Tsaban are probabilistic and might fail with low probability. It is therefore of interest to come up with an algorithm which deterministically computes the discrete logarithm in a semigroup. In this regard we like to make some analogy to the problem of determining if an integer is a prime number, a problem of great importance in cryptography. Nowadays in practice the algorithm of Miller and Rabin [12, 17] has been implemented for many years. Still it was a great result when Agrawal, Kayal and Saxena [2] came up with a deterministic polynomial time algorithm to achieve this goal.

The main contribution of this paper will be a deterministic algorithm for computing the discrete logarithm of an element y in some semigroup S with respect to some torsion base element $x \in S$.

A key step in finding the discrete logarithm in a semigroup is computing the cycle length of an element. Both the above-mentioned papers [13] and [3] provide probabilistic algorithms to address this problem. Once the cycle length value is obtained, the discrete logarithm may easily be computed with a few more simple steps. While Monico does not provide further elaboration on how this is done, the paper by Banin and Tsaban bridges this knowledge gap by showing how the problem is reduced to a DLP in a group once the cycle length and start values are known.

The paper is structured as follows: After providing preliminaries and basic definitions in Section 2, we will analyse in Section 3 the success rates and expected number of steps involved in the probabilistic algorithms for cycle length by Banin and Tsaban (Algorithm 1) and Monico (Algorithm 3). Neither of the original papers explicitly computes these respective quantities, or bounds for them. In fact, the arguments given in both the papers for the algorithms' success rates and time complexities are loose and/or conjectural in nature. With regard to Algorithm 1, our analysis suggests that the claim by the authors about the complexity may, in fact, be untrue. For Algorithm 3, we are able to show that the probability of success is very high for practical values of the bound used, as conjectured by the author.

In Section 4, which is the main section of this paper, we provide a deterministic algorithm to calculate the cycle length L_x of a torsion element x of a semigroup and thus to also solve the DLP, without the use of an oracle. This algorithm has complexity $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N_x} \cdot \log N_x)$, where N_x denotes the order of x (which will be defined in Section 2). For completeness, we will also demonstrate the use of Pohlig-Hellman algorithm [15] for a semigroup.

2 Preliminaries

A semigroup S is a set together with an associative binary operation. Like in group theory where a torsion group consists of elements of finite order only we define:

Definition 1 (Torsion Element). Let S be a semigroup. An element $x \in S$ is called a torsion element if the sub-semigroup $\langle x \rangle := \{x^k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ generated by x , is finite. S is called a torsion semigroup if every $x \in S$ is a torsion element.

Throughout the paper the following definitions will be assumed:

Definition 2 (Cycle Start). Let $x \in S$. The cycle start s_x of x is defined as the smallest positive integer such that $x^{s_x} = x^b$ for some $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $b > s_x$.

Definition 3 (Cycle Length). Let $x \in S$. The cycle length L_x of x is defined as the smallest positive integer such that $x^{s_x+L_x} = x^{s_x}$.

Definition 4 (Element order). Let $x \in S$. With notation as above, we define the order N_x of x as the cardinality of the sub-semigroup $\langle x \rangle$. Note that $N_x = s_x + L_x - 1$.

Definition 5 (Semigroup DLP). Let S be a semigroup and $x \in S$. The semigroup DLP is defined as follows. Given $y \in \langle x \rangle := \{x^k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, find all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^m = y$.

We state below a key result first proved in [3].

Lemma 1 ([3]). *Let S be a semigroup and $x \in S$ be an element with cycle start s_x . The set of powers $G_x = \{x^{s_x+k}, k \geq 0\}$ of x forms a finite cyclic group. The identity element of G_x is given by x^{tL_x} , where t is the minimum positive integer such that $x^{tL_x} \in G_x$.*

The following result is stated in [13] in a slightly different formulation. We provide an equivalent proof based on the group structure of G_x .

Lemma 2 ([13]). *Let $x \in S$ have cycle start s_x and cycle length L_x . For all integers $n, m \geq s_x$, we have $x^m = x^n \iff n \equiv m \pmod{L_x}$.*

Proof. We can assume without loss of generality that $n \geq m$, and so we can write $n = m + kL_x + u$, with $k \geq 0$ and $0 \leq u < L_x$. First suppose that $n \equiv m \pmod{L_x}$, i.e. $u = 0$. Since $m, n \geq s_x$, we have $x^n = x^{m+kL_x} = x^m$.

Conversely, if $x^n = x^m$, write $n_1 = n - s_x \geq 0$, and $m_1 = m - s_x \geq 0$. We have

$$x^{s_x+m_1} = x^{s_x+n_1} = x^{s_x+m_1+kL_x+u} = x^{s_x+m_1+u}.$$

Now, without loss of generality, $m_1 \geq s_x$, because if not, one can always increment m_1 and n_1 by multiples of L_x until this happens. So, we can assume that x^{m_1} lies in G_x and is thus invertible. We multiply by the inverse on both sides to finally get

$$x^{s_x} = x^{s_x+u}.$$

Thus, we must have $u = 0$ or $n \equiv m \pmod{L_x}$, as required. □

Remark 1. It becomes clear from the above discussion that the standard collision-based algorithms for order and discrete log computations in a group do not adapt directly to a general semigroup. Collision-based algorithms for the computation of the order N of a group element x (for instance, see [19]) are based on the principle that whenever N can be expressed in the form $N = A - B$ for non-negative integers A and B , the collision $x^A = x^B$ always occurs. However, this principle does not work in a semigroup, where there are two independent components of the order. More specifically, for a semigroup element x with cycle length L_x and cycle start s_x , whenever L_x may be expressed in the form $A - B$ for non-negative integers A and B , the equality $x^A = x^B$ holds if and only if $A, B \geq s_x$. As an example, consider a semigroup element x with cycle length $L_x = 12$ and cycle start $s_x = 5$. Then, $L_x = 15 - 3$, but $x^{15} \neq x^3$. Thus without prior knowledge of the cycle start, the semigroup order N_x or cycle length L_x cannot directly be found using the same collision-based algorithms for groups.

Similarly, collision-based algorithms fail for discrete log computations in a semigroup. As an example, consider a semigroup element x with cycle length $L_x = 15$ and cycle start $s_x = 10$, and suppose that the discrete log of $y = x^5$ is to be found. Then $y \cdot x^6 = x^{11} = x^{26}$ is obtained as a collision. However,

unlike in the group case, the conclusion $y = x^{26-6} = x^{20}$ is wrong since $x^5 \neq x^{20}$. This happens because even though x is torsion and forms a cycle of powers, it is not invertible.

This concludes the prerequisite knowledge on torsion elements in semigroups. In the next section, we study the existing probabilistic algorithms for cycle lengths, and analyse their assumptions, working and complexities.

3 Existing Probabilistic Algorithms

3.1 Banin and Tsaban's Algorithm

In this section, we study the probabilistic algorithm described in [3] for computing the cycle length of a torsion element in a semigroup. While the authors of the original paper describe their theory only for torsion semigroups, it will become clear that the same discussion holds true for any semigroup when the base element chosen is torsion.

Let S be a semigroup and x be a torsion element of S . Let s_x denote the cycle start of x and L_x its cycle length. Then, recall from Lemma 1 that $G_x := \{x^{s_x}, x^{s_x+1}, \dots, x^{s_x+L_x-1}\}$ is a cyclic group, and that it has order L_x . The authors of [3] assume the availability of a ‘Discrete Logarithm Oracle’ for the group G_x , which returns values $\log_x h$ for $h \in G_x$. They state that these values need not be smaller than the group order but are polynomial in the size of G_x and the element x . The representation of the identity in G_x is unknown, and a method to compute inverses is not available.

The authors claim that the well-known algorithms for discrete logarithm computations in groups do not explicitly require inverses, or can easily be modified to work without the use of inverses. While it is true that these algorithms make use of mainly the existence of inverses rather than their explicit computation, we believe that the fact that easy modification is possible is not immediate without some justification. In fact, it will become clear in the later sections that the modified Baby-Step-Giant-Step algorithm devised by Monico [13] (and also the deterministic algorithm presented in Section 4) is a crucial and non-trivial part of any such modification.

We make the following observation from the proof of Lemma 1 found in [3]. For any $k \geq 0$, denote by v_k the smallest positive integer such that

$$v_k L_x \geq 2s_x + k.$$

We then have $x^{v_k L_x - s_x - k} \in G_x$ and

$$x^{s_x + k} x^{v_k L_x - s_x - k} = x^{v_k L_x} = x^{t L_x}, \quad (1)$$

so the inverse of the element $x^{s_x + k}$ of G_x is given by $x^{v_k(L_x) - s_x - k}$. In particular, the computation of inverses requires prior knowledge of the cycle start. As will be explained below, the cycle start may be computed only once the value of the cycle length is known, using a binary search. This explains why the authors insist that their Discrete Logarithm Oracle does not need to use the computation of inverses.

Below, we describe Algorithm 1, which is the algorithm suggested in [3] to compute the order of the group G_x , i.e. the cycle length L_x of x .

Algorithm 1: Banin-Tsaban Algorithm for Cycle Length

Input A finite semigroup S with $|S| = N$ and an element $x \in S$
Output The cycle length L_x of x

- 1: Initialize $i \leftarrow 1$, $g \leftarrow 1$. Fix a bound $r > 1$.
 - 2: **while** $i < r$
 1. Choose a random number $k_i > 0$.
 2. Use the DLP oracle to compute $k'_i = \log_x(x^{k_i})$.
 3. Set $g \leftarrow \gcd(k_j - k'_j) = \gcd\left(\gcd_{j < i}(k_j - k'_j), k_i - k'_i\right)$.
 4. Set $i \leftarrow i + 1$.
 - 3: **end while**
 - 4: Return $L_x := g$.
-

Note that in step 2.2, the gcd is being taken over all the computed values of $k_i - k'_i$ so far. Now let N denote a common bound for the values of k and k' . By the assumption on the available oracle, we may take N to be polynomial in L_x , so $\mathcal{O}(k) = \mathcal{O}(k') = \mathcal{O}(N) = \mathcal{O}(L_x^u)$ for some natural number u . The oracle may be assumed to have the standard $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_x})$ complexity for discrete logarithm calculations in a group, so the key part of calculating the total complexity is finding the number of calls to the oracle. The authors state that the expected number of steps needed (i.e. calls to the oracle) is $\mathcal{O}(1)$, i.e. that the bound B can be fixed independently to N . We give a more detailed analysis of this claim below.

The algorithm operates under the natural assumption that once a number k is selected, the oracle returns a random element $k' \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ lying

in the congruency class of $k \pmod{L_x}$. In other words, we can assume that the differences $k - k'$ are uniformly distributed in the set of all multiples of L_x bounded above by N .

We first examine the probability that L_x is obtained in a fixed number r of steps. We set $N' = N/L_x$. The problem can clearly be formulated as follows. Choosing uniformly distributed multiples $(M_1 \cdot L_x, \dots, M_r \cdot L_x)$ of L_x in $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, what is the probability that $\gcd(M_1 \cdot L_x, \dots, M_r \cdot L_x) = L_x$, or equivalently, choosing uniformly distributed numbers (M_1, \dots, M_r) in $\{1, 2, \dots, N'\}$ what is the probability that $\gcd(M_1, \dots, M_r) = 1$?

By Theorem 1 in [14], the following expression is known for this quantity.

$$\text{Prob}(\gcd(M_1, M_2, \dots, M_r) = 1) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\zeta(r)} + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{N'}), & \text{if } r \geq 3, \\ \frac{1}{\zeta(r)} + \mathcal{O}(\frac{\log N'}{N'}), & \text{if } r = 2, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where ζ denotes the Riemann-Zeta function.

The above expressions give the probability of the algorithm returning the correct cycle length L_x in a fixed number of trials r . We now derive a bound for the expected number of steps until L_x is obtained, i.e. until $\gcd(M_1, \dots, M_r) = 1$. This is exactly the expected number of calls to the oracle until the algorithm succeeds.

Writing $\overline{M}_{r-1} = \gcd(M_1, \dots, M_{r-1})$ and $\overline{M}_r = \gcd(M_1, \dots, M_r)$, it is clear that the expected number of calls to the oracle is given by

$$\sum_{r=1}^{N'} r \cdot \text{Prob}(\overline{M}_{r-1} \neq 1, \text{ and } \overline{M}_r = 1).$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Prob}(\overline{M}_{r-1} \neq 1, \text{ and } \overline{M}_r = 1) \\ &= \text{Prob}(\overline{M}_r = 1) - \text{Prob}(\overline{M}_{r-1} = 1) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\zeta(r)} - \frac{1}{\zeta(r-1)} + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{N'}) & \text{if } r \geq 3 \\ \frac{1}{\zeta(r)} - \frac{1}{N'} + \mathcal{O}(\frac{\log N'}{N'}) & \text{if } r = 2 \end{cases} \quad (\text{by (2)}), \end{aligned}$$

where the conclusion in the third line follows from the fact that the event $(\overline{M}_{r-1} = 1)$ is a subset of the event $(\overline{M}_r = 1)$, and the exact complement of the event $(\overline{M}_r = 1, \& \overline{M}_{r-1} \neq 1)$.

Thus, the expected number of steps is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{r=3}^{N'} r \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\zeta(r)} - \frac{1}{\zeta(r-1)} \right) + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{\zeta(2)} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log N'}{N'} \right) + N' \cdot \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N'} \right) \\
&= N' \cdot \frac{1}{\zeta(N')} - \sum_{r=2}^{N'-1} \frac{1}{\zeta(r)} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log N'}{N'} \right) + N' \cdot \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N'} \right) \\
&\geq N' \cdot \frac{1}{\zeta(N')} - (N' - 2) \cdot \frac{1}{\zeta(N')} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log N'}{N'} \right) + N' \cdot \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N'} \right) \\
&= 2 \cdot \frac{1}{\zeta(N')} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log N'}{N'} \right) + N' \cdot \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{N'} \right), \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in the second last line follows from $\zeta(N') < \zeta(r)$, for every $2 \leq r < N'$. The above discussion makes it clear that the expected number of calls to the oracle depends purely on the value of $N' = N/L_x$, though the exact dependence may not have a neat closed form. By assumption we have $N = \mathcal{O}(L_x^u)$, and $u \geq 1$. So, $N' = N/L_x = \mathcal{O}(L_x^{u-1})$. Thus, the quantity N' cannot be treated as a constant in the cycle length L_x unless u is known to be 1.

From the lower bound (3), it is also apparent that for $u > 1$, the expected number of calls to the oracle is, in fact, not constant in L_x , contrary to the claim of the authors. Note that since N depends on the oracle being used, it is fixed and cannot be modified to instead be systematically increased. Thus, the authors' claim that any DLP oracle that returns exponents polynomial in the cycle length (group size) yields a constant-time cycle length calculator, is not true.

Finally, in Algorithm 2, we present the binary search algorithm to find the cycle start once L_x is known. This algorithm has been given in [3], though the idea to use a binary search is also originally mentioned in [13].

Lemma 3. *Let N_x be the order of the element x . Then Algorithm 2 requires*

$$\mathcal{O}((\log N_x)^2).$$

semigroup multiplications.

Proof. Computing $x^{s_x+L_x}$ requires $\mathcal{O}(\log N_x)$ semigroup multiplications and the number of loops in the algorithm is of the order $\mathcal{O}(\log N_x)$. \square

Algorithm 2: Calculating Cycle Start (Binary Search)

Input A semigroup element x with cycle length L_x

Output Cycle start s_x of x

- 1: Initialize $s_x \leftarrow 1$
 - 2: **while** $x^{s_x+L_x} \neq x^{s_x}$ **do**
 - $s_x \leftarrow 2s_x$
 - $a \leftarrow s_x/2$
 - 3: **end while**
 - 4: **while** $|a - s_x| \geq 2$
 - $c \leftarrow (a + s_x)/2$
 - if** $x^{c+L_x} \neq x^c$ **then**
 - $a \leftarrow c$
 - else**
 - $s_x \leftarrow c$
 - 5: **end while**
-

3.2 Monico's Algorithm

In his PhD thesis [13], Chris Monico provides a probabilistic algorithm (described below as Algorithm 3) that calculates the cycle length of an element in a finite ring of order N . This algorithm makes use of the multiplicative semigroup structure of the finite ring, and of the availability of the explicit bound N for every cycle length, and is in fact applicable to any semigroup where such a bound N is available. In this subsection, we analyse this algorithm, provide a more concrete bound on its success rate, and compute its complexity in terms of N . We will discuss this algorithm in terms of torsion semigroups, as opposed to finite rings.

In the original work, Monico states that the bound B of Algorithm 3 can always be chosen so that $B < \sqrt{a_1 m - b_1}$. We remark that this claim is, in fact, wrong. For example, with a cycle length value of 4, and $a_1 m - b_1 = 104$, $a_2 m - b_2 = 52$, we get $g = 52$. If $B < \sqrt{a_1 m - b_1} = \sqrt{104} < 11$, then we would only test divisors d below 11, and would never factor out 13 to obtain the true cycle length.

Further, Monico suggests a modification to the above algorithm, viz. to find several such a_i and b_i and compute all the gcd's. It is clear that this suggestion is exactly the method used in Banin and Tsaban's algorithm as discussed in Section 3.1.

Algorithm 3: Monico's Baby-Step Giant-Step for Cycle Length

Input A finite semigroup S with $|S| = N$ and an element $x \in S$

Output The cycle length L_x of x

- 1: Set $m = \lceil \sqrt{N} \rceil$. Choose a prime $q > N$.
 - 2: For $0 \leq i \leq m$, compute and store in a table the pairs $(i; x^{q+im})$.
Sort the table by the second component.
 - 3: Find the least positive integer b_1 such that x^{q+b_1} is in the table:
 $x^{q+b_1} = x^{q+a_1m}$. (Note: $0 < b_1 < m$).
 - 4: Find the least positive integer b_2 such that x^{2q+b_2} is in the table:
 $x^{2q+b_2} = x^{q+a_2m}$. (Again, $0 < b_2 < m$).
 - 5: Compute $g = \gcd(a_1m - b_1, a_2m - b_2 - q)$.
 - 6: For each divisor d of g below some bound B , do the following:
 - 7: **if** $x^{N+g/d} = x^N$ **then**
 - 8: set $g \leftarrow g/d$;
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: Output $L_x = g$ and stop.
-

We now analyze the probability of success. The algorithm first looks for a collisions of the form $x^{N+a_1m} = x^{N+b_1}$. The working principle is that in this case, the cycle length L_x divides $a_1m - b_1$. Similarly, if also $x^{N+a_2m} = x^{N+b_2}$ then $g = \gcd(a_1m - b_1, a_2m - b_2)$ is a multiple of L_x .

So far, the process is essentially the same in both Algorithms 1 and 3: while the former uses a discrete logarithm oracle to obtain multiples of the cycle length, the latter directly finds these multiples by finding collisions. However, in Algorithm 3, we do not proceed with computing multiple factors of L_x , but work with the fixed multiple g of L_x , whereas in Algorithm 1 this multiple shrinks several times.

Algorithm 3 then proceeds by fixing a bound B and iterating over every number d below B to check if $d \mid g$. If yes, it executes the next part, i.e. checks if $x^{N+D/d} = x^N$, and if this holds, it sets $D \leftarrow D/d$. Note that if the number g can be factored easily, then we do not need this fixed bound B , and can instead iterate over every prime factor d of g . It is well-known that the number of prime factors of g counted with multiplicity is $\mathcal{O}(\log g)$, so step 5 of the algorithm can find L_x in $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ steps. However, in general, factoring g may be difficult, so we assume from here on that the algorithm proceeds by fixing a bound B for the divisors of g . Below we analyse the

probability of the algorithm succeeding in terms of B and g .

Lemma 4. *The probability that Algorithm 3 succeeds is bounded below by $(1 - \frac{1}{B})^{\log g}$.*

Proof. We write $g = L_x \cdot F$ for some number F and suppose that the algorithm fails. This means that there is a divisor, and hence also a prime power divisor of F , which the algorithm fails to factor out. Let p be a prime dividing F , α_p denote its largest power dividing F , and β_p be its largest power below the fixed bound B . So, we have $p^{\alpha_p} \mid F$, $p^{\alpha_p+1} \nmid F$, $p^{\beta_p} < B$, $p^{\beta_p+1} > B$.

Since the number of times the algorithm divides g by p is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\beta_p} i = \beta_p \cdot (\beta_p + 1)/2,$$

we must have $\beta_p \cdot (\beta_p + 1)/2 < \alpha_p$ if the algorithm fails. So, the algorithm succeeds as long as $\beta_p \cdot (\beta_p + 1)/2 \geq \alpha_p$ for every prime divisor p of F . Thus, the probability of success for the algorithm can be bounded below by

$$\prod_{p \mid g} \text{Prob} \left(\frac{\beta_p \cdot (\beta_p + 1)}{2} \geq \alpha_p \right).$$

Note that if B is fixed, so is β . Write $v_p = \frac{\beta_p(\beta_p+1)}{2}$ for simplicity. We may assume that g is a random multiple of L_x below the bound B , so F is a random number in $\{1, \dots, \frac{B}{L_x}\}$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\alpha_p \leq v_p) &= 1 - \text{Prob}(p^{v_p+1} \mid F) \\ &= 1 - \left(\frac{B/L_x}{p^{v_p+1}(B/L_x)} \right) \\ &= 1 - 1/p^{v_p+1} = 1 - \frac{1}{p^{\frac{\beta_p(\beta_p+1)}{2}+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, a lower bound for the probability of the algorithm's success is

$$\prod_{p \mid F} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{\frac{\beta_p(\beta_p+1)}{2}+1}} \right).$$

Now, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
p^{\beta_p+1} > B &\iff \frac{1}{p^{\beta_p+1}} < \frac{1}{B} \\
\implies 1 - \frac{1}{p^{\frac{\beta_p(\beta_p+1)}{2}+1}} &> 1 - \frac{1}{B^{\frac{\beta_p}{2}+1}} > 1 - \frac{1}{B}.
\end{aligned}$$

We further make the following observation. Let $\omega(n)$ denote the number of distinct prime divisors of integer n (note, however, that the same statement also holds if counted with multiplicity). Then clearly, $2^{\omega(n)} \leq n$, and so, taking logarithms, $\omega(n) \leq \log_2 n$.

Collecting all the above results, we conclude that the probability of success Prob (success) of Algorithm 3 is bounded below as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Prob (success)} &\geq \prod_{p|F} \left(1 - \frac{1}{B}\right) \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{1}{B}\right)^{\omega(F)} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{B}\right)^{\log F} \\
&\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{B}\right)^{\log g}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Note that this bound shows that Algorithm 3 is indeed successful with overwhelming probability, as conjectured by the author. For example, with $B = 10^6$, even when g is extremely large, say $g = 2^{4000}$, the probability of success is greater than 99.6 percent, by the bound derived in Lemma 4.

Finally, note that the complexity is dependent entirely on step (2), as step (5) has constant complexity, and the time for steps (3) and (4) are negligible. Therefore, the algorithm requires $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ exponentiation operations, where N is the size of the semigroup (or the available bound on the cycle length). The algorithm can also be modified to update the value of N step-by-step until a large enough value is found. This is precisely the technique we use in our deterministic algorithm Algorithm 4, and would make the complexity of Algorithm 3 identical to that of ours.

4 Deterministic Solution of the DLP

The solution of the DLP in a semigroup involves two parts: the calculation of the cycle length and start of the base element x , and the use of this value to find the discrete log.

4.1 Deterministic Algorithm for Cycle Length Computation

We now present our deterministic algorithm for the computation of the cycle length. It works by finding a suitable collision, and also guarantees finding the actual cycle length rather than just a multiple of it, in a fixed number of steps.

Algorithm 4: Deterministic Algorithm for Cycle Length

Input A semigroup S and a torsion element $x \in S$. Assume N_x is the order of x .

Output Cycle length L_x of x

- 1: Initialize $N \leftarrow 1$.
 - 2: Set $q \leftarrow \lceil \sqrt{N} \rceil$.
 - 3: Compute, one by one, $x^N, x^{N+1}, \dots, x^{N+q}$ and check for the equality $x^N = x^{N+j}$ at each step $j \geq 1$. Store these values in a table as pairs $(N + j, x^{N+j})$, $0 \leq j < q$. If $x^N = x^{N+j}$ for any $j < q$, then set $L_x \leftarrow j$ and end the process.
 - 4: If no match is found, sort the table by the second components and go to the next step.
 - 5: For $0 \leq i \leq q$, compute, one by one, the values $x^{N+iq}, x^{N+2q}, \dots, x^{N+iq}$ and at each step i , look for a match in the table of values calculated in step 3.
 - 6: Suppose that a match $x^{N+iq} = x^{N+j}$ is found, and i is the smallest integer such that this happens. Set $L_x \leftarrow iq - j$ and end the process.
 - 7: If no match is found in steps 3 or 5, set $N \leftarrow 2 \cdot N$ and go back to step 2.
-

Theorem 1. *Let S be a semigroup and $x \in S$ a torsion element. Algorithm 4 returns the correct value of the cycle length L_x with*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{N_x} \cdot \log N_x\right)$$

semigroup multiplications. The total space complexity is $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N_x})$ semigroup elements.

Proof. We first assume $N \geq \max(L_x, s_x)$ and show that steps 1 to 5 succeed in finding L_x . We have $q = \lceil \sqrt{N} \rceil$. If $L_x < q$, then the equality $x^N = x^{N+L_x}$ is found in the first step and the statement of the theorem follows. Else if $L_x \geq q$, we can write uniquely

$$L_x = iq - j,$$

for some positive integers $i > 0$, $0 \leq j < q$. Now, we must have $i \leq q$, because otherwise if $i \geq q + 1$, we would have

$$L_x \geq (q + 1)q - j > q^2 + q - q = q^2 \geq N,$$

a contradiction.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} L_x &= iq - j, \quad 0 < i \leq q, \quad 0 \leq j < q \\ \implies N + j + L_x &= N + iq \\ \implies x^{N+j} &= x^{N+j+L_x} = x^{N+iq}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows because $N > s_x$ by assumption. So, such a collision always occurs between elements of the two lists in the algorithm.

We now claim that for the smallest such integer i computed in step (5) of Algorithm 4, $L_x = iq - j$.

To see this, let i be the smallest positive integer such that

$$x^{N+j} = x^{N+iq}.$$

Also let $L_x = i'q - j'$, $0 < i' \leq q$, $0 \leq j' < q$. We have already shown above that such integers i' and j' exist for our choice of N . By the definition of L_x , we must have $L_x \mid iq - j$. Now suppose that $i' > i$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} i'q - j' &\geq (i + 1)q - j' \\ &= iq + (q - j') > iq \\ &\geq iq - j. \end{aligned}$$

But, $L_x = i'q - j' \mid iq - j$, so we must have $iq - j = i'q - j'$. Since $i' > i$, this means that

$$q \leq (i' - i)q = (j' - j) < j',$$

which is a contradiction because $0 \leq j' < q$. So, we must have $i' = i$, $j' = j$. This proves the claim.

We have shown above that the algorithm finds the correct cycle length when $N > \max(s_x, L_x)$. Since the algorithm doubles the value of N until a match is found, it always terminates and outputs the correct cycle length. We now look at the time complexity. Since efficient algorithms exist for finding matches (for instance, with hashing), we may safely ignore their contribution to the complexity. Now note that both steps 3 and 6 involve at most $q = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ multiplications. Thus, clearly, for a fixed value of N , steps 1 to 5 in algorithm 4 require $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ multiplications in the semigroup S .

Moreover, the algorithm starts at $N = 1$ and doubles N until the cycle length is found, i.e. until $N > \max(s_x, L_x)$. Thus, the number of times steps 1 to 7 are performed is

$$\lceil \log(\max(L_x, s_x)) \rceil = \mathcal{O}(\max(\log(L_x), \log(s_x))) = \mathcal{O}(\log N_x)$$

Thus, the total number of steps is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\sqrt{N_x}\right) \cdot \log N_x\right).$$

Clearly, step (3) involves the storage of $q = \lceil \sqrt{N} \rceil = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\max(s_x, L_x)}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{N_x}\right)$ elements, so this value gives the total space complexity. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 2. For the case of a group, there exist better algorithms for the computation of the order of an element even when the total group order is unbounded. For instance, Algorithm 3.3 in [19] uses a growth function $d(t)$, which generalizes the square root function used above, to compute the order N of a group element x , and achieves time and space complexities of $\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{N}\right)$, thus eliminating the additional $\log N$ multiplier introduced by the method in Algorithm 4.

However, this method fails when used for a general semigroup due to the presence of two independent unknown components of the order. To see this, note that the algorithm would need to be modified for a semigroup as follows. At stage t , one has $g(t-1) \leq N_x < g(t)$. On the completion of the baby steps, one has a table with the powers $x^{g(t)}, x^{g(t)+1}, \dots, x^{g(t)+b(t)}$ (the addition of $g(t)$ is necessary in the semigroup case to ensure that the loop is entered). The giant steps compute $x^{g(t)+g(t-1)+b(t)}, x^{g(t)+g(t-1)+2 \cdot b(t)}, \dots, x^{g(t)+g(t-1)+d(t) \cdot b(t)} = x^{2g(t)}$. Now, while N_x is guaranteed to have a unique expression as $g(t-1) + ib(t) - j$ with $0 < i \leq d(t)$ and $0 \leq j \leq b(t)$, this does not necessarily lead to a collision. In fact, if $b(t) < L_x < g(t-1)$ and $2L_x > g(t) = g(t-1) + d(t) \cdot b(t)$,

then neither the baby steps nor the giant steps leads to a collision, and the cycle length is never found (note that this can happen only if $L_x > s_x$). Moreover, if a collision $x^{g(t)+g(t-1)+ib(t)} = x^{g(t)+j}$ is obtained in the giant step phase, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that $L_x \mid g(t-1) + ib(t) - j$. If instead we forced the condition $g(t-1) \leq N_x < g(t)$, a collision again may never occur because there is no control on the cycle start (For instance, in matrix semigroups over finite simple semirings, the cycle start is often found to be much larger than the cycle length. In such cases, adapting group-based algorithms would fail). See Remark 1 for further details.

4.1.1 Experimental Results for Cycle Length Computations

We used Algorithm 4 to compute cycle length values in several common semigroups, such as matrix semigroups over finite fields, matrix semigroups over the finite simple semiring S_{20} (see [20] for a construction and [10] for the addition and multiplication tables), and the symmetric and alternating groups (where the cycle length is precisely the order of the element). We further used the obtained cycle lengths to compute the cycle start values using Algorithm 2. The working code may be found at <https://github.com/simran-tinani/semigroup-cycle-length>.

4.2 Solving the DLP once the Cycle Length is known

In this section, we demonstrate the solution of the DLP for a torsion element x in the semigroup S once the cycle length is known. As before let N_x be the order of the sub-semigroup $\langle x \rangle$, let L_x be the cycle length of the torsion element x (which we assume is already computed) and let $y \in \langle x \rangle$ be an element.

In [3], the authors demonstrate the next steps in solving for $\log_x(y)$, via a reduction to a DLP in the group G_x , once L_x and s_x are known. The procedure is described in Algorithm 5 below, which has been adapted from the original formulation in [3].

The authors of [3] do not provide a justification of why the key step in their algorithm, which appears as step (5) in Algorithm 5, works. In Theorem 2 we will prove the correctness of this step, or in other words, that the value returned is indeed the desired discrete logarithm value. Before this, we will need the following technical result.

Lemma 5. *Let L_x be the cycle length of $x \in S$, and n , a , and a' be fixed positive integers. Suppose that $x^{bL_x+n} = x^a \in G_x$, where b is the minimum*

Algorithm 5: Algorithm for Discrete Logarithm

Input A semigroup S , a torsion element $x \in S$, with cycle length L_x and cycle start s_x , and $y \in S$ with $y = x^m$

Output The discrete logarithm m of y with base x

- 1: Compute $t = \left\lceil \frac{s_x}{L_x} \right\rceil$ and define $x' = x^{tL_x+1} \in G_x$.
 - 2: Find the minimum number $0 \leq b \leq t$ such that $y' = y \cdot x^{bL_x} \in G_x$ using binary search.
 - 3: Use Shank's Baby-Step Giant-Step algorithm for the group $\langle x' \rangle \subseteq G_x$ to compute $m' \in \{0, 1, \dots, L_x - 1\}$ such that $(x')^{m'} = y'$.
 - 4: Find the maximum number $c \geq 0$ such that $x^{(tL_x+1)m'-cL_x} \in G_x$ using binary search.
 - 5: Return $m = m'(tL_x + 1) - (b + c)L_x$.
-

such number such that $x^{bL_x+n} \in G_x$, and $x^{n-cL_x} = x^{a'} \in G_x$, where c the maximum number such that $x^{n-cL_x} \in G_x$. Then

$$bL_x + n \leq a, \text{ and } n - cL_x \leq a'.$$

Proof. First let $x^{bL_x+n} = x^a$ with b minimal such that $x^{bL_x+n} \in G_x$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $bL_x + n > a$. We must have, by the minimality of b , $x^{(b-1)L_x+n} \notin G_x$, so $(b-1)L_x + n < a$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{But, } x^{bL_x+n} &= x^a \in G_x \\ \implies bL_x + n - a &= kL_x, \quad k \geq 1 \\ \implies (b-k)L_x + n &= a \\ \implies x^{(b-k)L_x+n} &= x^a \in G_x, \quad k \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction to the minimality of b . So, $bL_x + n \leq a$. Now suppose that $x^{n-cL_x} = x^{a'} \in G_x$, with c maximal, and suppose that $n - cL_x > a'$. We argue as above:

$$\begin{aligned} L_x \mid n - cL_x - a' \\ \implies n - (k+c)L_x &= a', \text{ for some } k \geq 1 \\ \implies x^{n-(k+c)L_x} &= x^{a'} \in G_x, \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to the maximality of c . Thus $n - cL_x \leq a'$. \square

Theorem 2. *Let S be a semigroup, $x \in S$ a torsion element and $y \in \langle x \rangle$ any element. Assume the cycle length L_x and cycle start s_x of x are known. Then Algorithm 5 returns the correct values of the discrete logarithm $m = \log_x(y)$ in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_x} + (\log N_x)^2)$ semigroup multiplications, with a required storage of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_x})$ semigroup elements.*

Proof. We use the notations of Algorithm 5, and also write $n = \log_x y$. We will show that the output m is equal to the correct discrete logarithm value n . Recall that we have a group G_x , generated by $x' := x^{tL_x+1}$, and with identity x^{tL_x} . The parameter t is given by the formula $t = \left\lceil \frac{s_x}{L_x} \right\rceil$. Inverses in G_x can be computed in polynomial time using the formula (1). There are now two cases:

1. When $y \in G_x$, we have $b = 0$. Here, it is possible to use Shank's Baby Step-Giant Step algorithm [18] which is a deterministic algorithm and which requires $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_x})$ semigroup multiplications and storage space $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_x})$, in order to compute $\log_{x'}(y)$. This is done in step (3). From this value, $n = \log_x(y)$ is readily computed, as shown below. Note that in this case, $\log_x(y)$ is determined modulo L_x .
2. When $y \notin G_x$, Algorithm 5 first computes, using binary search, the smallest power b of x^{L_x} such that the product $y \cdot x^{bL_x}$ lies in the group G_x , and then proceeds as in case 1 via the Baby Step-Giant Step algorithm to find the discrete logarithm m' of $y \cdot x^{bL_x}$ with base x' (i.e. $(x')^{m'} = y \cdot x^{bL_x}$). Note that in this case, the value of $\log_x(y)$ is less than s_x , and is thus determined uniquely in \mathbb{N} . Again, the time and space complexity are both $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_x})$.

In both cases above, we have the maximal value c such that $x^{m'(tL_x+1)-cL_x} \in G_x$, and so $c \leq L_x + s_x + 1 = N_x + 1$, since $m' \leq L_x$ and $tL_x \leq L_x + s_x$. We also clearly have $b \leq t \leq N_x$. Since the computations of both b and c are done via binary searches, they contribute $\mathcal{O}((\log N_x)^2)$ steps to the overall time complexity. Now,

$$x^{m'(tL_x+1)-cL_x} = x^{m'(tL_x+1)} = (x')^{m'} = x^{bL_x+n}.$$

Applying Lemma 5 to the above equation, we must have

$$m'(tL_x + 1) - cL_x \leq bL_x + n, \text{ and } bL_x + n \leq m'(tL_x + 1) - cL_x.$$

Therefore, $bL_x + n = m'(tL_x + 1) - cL_x$, or $n = m'(tL_x + 1) - (b + c)L_x$, which is precisely equal to m , the value returned by the Algorithm 5. Thus, $m = n$. This completes the proof. \square

Combining Theorem 1, Lemma 3 and Theorem 2 we arrive at the main proposition of the paper:

Proposition 1. *Let S be a semigroup, $x \in S$ a torsion element and $y \in \langle x \rangle$ any element. The discrete logarithm $m = \log_x(y)$ can be computed deterministically in*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{N_x} \cdot \log N_x\right)$$

semigroup multiplications, with a required storage of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N_x})$ semigroup elements.

Proof. For the solution, one begins by finding L_x . This can be done using Algorithm 4 and according to Theorem 1 this requires $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N_x} \cdot \log N_x)$ semigroup multiplications.

By Lemma 3 the computation of the cycle start s_x is achieved in $\mathcal{O}((\log N_x)^2)$ semigroup operations, which does not contribute to the overall cost of the algorithm.

By Theorem 2, the discrete logarithm m can then be retrieved using Algorithm 5, in $\mathcal{O}(\log N_x + \sqrt{L_x})$ semigroup multiplications, with a required storage of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{L_x})$ semigroup elements.

As $L_x \leq N_x$, the overall complexity is dominated by the computation of the cycle length, and the proof of the result is now clear. \square

4.3 Solving the DLP once the Factorization of the Cycle Length is known

We mentioned in the introduction that for a general group of order N the best general known algorithms for solving the discrete logarithm problem have complexity $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$.

In case the order N has a prime factorization into small primes there is the famous Pohlig-Hellman algorithm [15] for solving the DLP whose complexity is dominated by the largest prime factor in the integer factorization of N .

In case that we have available the integer factorization of the cycle length L_x we can adapt the Pohlig-Hellman algorithm for groups to a Pohlig-Hellman algorithm for solving the DLP in a semigroup. Algorithm 6 represents this

adapted Pohlig-Hellman algorithm.

Algorithm 6: Pohlig-Hellman Algorithm for solving the Discrete Logarithm Problem in a Semigroup

Input A semigroup S , a torsion element $x \in S$, with cycle length $L_x = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{e_i}$ and cycle start s_x , and $y \in S$ with $y = x^m$

Output The discrete logarithm m of y with base x

- 1: Compute $t = \left\lceil \frac{s_x}{L_x} \right\rceil$ and define $x' = x^{tL_x+1} \in G_x$.
- 2: Find the minimum number $0 \leq b \leq t$ such that $y' = y \cdot x^{bL_x} \in G_x$ using binary search.
- 3: **for** $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$
 1. Compute the values $x'_i = (x')^{L_x/p_i^{e_i}}$, $y'_i = (y')^{L_x/p_i^{e_i}}$, and $\gamma_i := (x'_i)^{p_i^{e_i-1}}$.
 2. Calculate the inverse z_i of x'_i in G_x using (1).
 3. Set $k \leftarrow 0$ and $n_0 \leftarrow 0$.
 4. **while** $k < e_i$ **do**
 - (a) Compute $y'_k = (y'_i z_i^{n_k})^{p_i^{e_i-1-k}} \in \langle \gamma_i \rangle$.
 - (b) Use Shank's Baby-Step Giant-Step algorithm for the group $\langle \gamma_i \rangle \subseteq G_x$ to compute $d_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p_i - 1\}$ such that $\gamma_i^{d_k} = y'_k$.
 - (c) Set $n_{k+1} \leftarrow n_k + p_i^k d_k$, and $k \leftarrow k + 1$.
 5. **end while**
 6. Set $m_i := n_{e_i}$.
- 4: **end for**
- 5: Use the Chinese Remainder Theorem to solve the congruence equations

$$m' \equiv m_i \pmod{p_i^{e_i}}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$$

uniquely for $m' \pmod{L_x}$. This gives the discrete logarithm of y' with respect to the base x' in the group G_x .

- 6: Find the maximum number $c \geq 0$ such that $x^{(tL_x+1)m' - cL_x} \in G_x$ using binary search.
 - 7: Return $m = m'(tL_x + 1) - (b + c)L_x$.
-

Theorem 3. *Let S be a semigroup, $x \in S$ a torsion element and $y \in \langle x \rangle$ any element. Assume the cycle start s_x of x is known and assume the integer factorization of the cycle length L_x is known to be $L_x = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{e_i}$. Then Algorithm 6 computes the discrete logarithm $\log_x y$ requiring $\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{i=1}^r e_i (\log L_x + \sqrt{p_i}) + (\log N_x)^2\right)$*

semigroup multiplications. The space complexity of the algorithm consists in $\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{i=1}^r e_i \sqrt{p_i}\right)$ semigroup elements.

Proof. Step 1. and 2. are in analogy to the corresponding steps of Algorithm 5. Steps 3. to 5. represent the Pohlig-Hellman algorithm for groups with the implied complexity dominated by the largest prime factor p_i of the integer factorization of L_x (for a reference on Pohlig-Hellman in groups, see in [8, Theorem 2.32]). It follows that the running time of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{i=1}^r e_i (\log L_x + \sqrt{p_i})\right)$ semigroup multiplications. The computation of b and c require in addition $(\log N_x)^2$ semigroup multiplications. The total space complexity is $\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{i=1}^r e_i \sqrt{p_i}\right)$ semigroup elements and that completes the proof. \square

5 Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the support of Swiss National Science Foundation grant n. 188430.

References

- [1] L. M. Adleman and J. DeMarrais. A subexponential algorithm for discrete logarithms over all finite fields. *Math. Comp.*, 61(203):1–15, 1993.
- [2] M. Agrawal, N. Kayal, and N. Saxena. PRIMES is in P. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 160(2):781–793, 2004.
- [3] M. Banin and B. Tsaban. A reduction of semigroup DLP to classic DLP. *Des. Codes Cryptography*, 81(1):75–82, October 2016.
- [4] A.M. Childs and G. Ivanyos. Quantum computation of discrete logarithms in semigroups. *Journal of Mathematical Cryptology*, 8(4):405 – 416, 01 Dec. 2014.
- [5] H. Cohen, G. Frey, R. Avanzi, C. Doche, T. Lange, K. Nguyen, and F. Vercauteren, editors. *Handbook of Elliptic and Hyperelliptic Curve Cryptography*. Discrete Mathematics and its Applications (Boca Raton). Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2006.
- [6] W. Diffie and M. E. Hellman. New directions in cryptography. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, IT-22(6):644–654, 1976.
- [7] N. Goel, I. Gupta, and B. K. Dass. Survey on SAP and its application in public-key cryptography. *J. Math. Cryptol.*, 14(1):144–152, 2020.
- [8] Jeffrey Hoffstein, Jill Pipher, Joseph H Silverman, and Joseph H Silverman. *An introduction to mathematical cryptography*, volume 1. Springer, 2008.
- [9] D. Kahrobaei, C. Koupparis, and V. Shpilrain. Public key exchange using matrices over group rings. *Groups Complex. Cryptol.*, 5(1):97–115, 2013.
- [10] G. Maze, C. Monico, and J. Rosenthal. Public key cryptography based on semigroup actions. *Adv. in Math. of Communications*, 1(4):489–507, 2007.
- [11] A. J. Menezes, P. C. van Oorschot, and S. A. Vanstone. *Handbook of applied cryptography*. CRC Press Series on Discrete Mathematics and its Applications. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1997.
- [12] G. L. Miller. Riemann’s hypothesis and tests for primality. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 13(3):300–317, 1976.

- [13] C. Monico. *Semirings and semigroup actions in public-key cryptography*. PhD thesis, University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, 2002.
- [14] J.E. Nymann. On the probability that k positive integers are relatively prime. *Journal of Number Theory*, 4(5):469 – 473, 1972.
- [15] S. Pohlig and M. Hellman. An improved algorithm for computing logarithms over $\text{GF}(p)$ and its cryptographic significance (corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on information Theory*, 24(1):106–110, 1978.
- [16] J. M. Pollard. Monte Carlo methods for index computation. *Mathematics of computation*, 32(143):918–924, 1978.
- [17] M. O. Rabin. Probabilistic algorithm for testing primality. *J. Number Theory*, 12(1):128–138, 1980.
- [18] D. Shanks. Class number, a theory of factorization, and genera. In *Proc. of Symp. Math. Soc., 1971*, volume 20, pages 41–440, 1971.
- [19] Andrew V. Sutherland. Order computations in generic groups. 2007.
- [20] J. Zumbrägel. Classification of finite congruence-simple semirings with zero. *Journal of Algebra and Its Applications*, 07(03):363–377, 2008.