

TIME AND QUERY COMPLEXITY TRADEOFF FOR THE DIHEDRAL COSET PROBLEM

MAXIME REMAUD AND JEAN-PIERRE TILLICH

ABSTRACT. The Dihedral Coset Problem (DCP) in Z_N is an important quantumly defined problem to which for instance the learning with errors problem reduces. There are several algorithms for solving it. On one hand, we have algorithms *à la* Ettinger-Høyer running in $O(2^{c \log N})$ time but using $O(\log N)$ queries, for some constant c . On the other hand, algorithms *à la* Kuperberg need $\tilde{O}\left(2^{\sqrt{c_{\text{DCP}} \log N}}\right)$ time and queries, for some constant c_{DCP} . Despite being the subject of a lot of studies, no algorithm using an intermediate number of queries was known up till now. It means that an attacker who has, for cost or time reasons, limited queries, will be forced to use a linear query algorithm running in exponential time. We propose an algorithm taking as a parameter the number Q of queries we are allowed to do, therefore interpolating between existing algorithms. We thus explicitly show that it takes $\tilde{O}\left(2^{c\left(\log N - \frac{1}{c_{\text{DCP}}} \log^2 Q\right)}\right)$ time. Our algorithm improves over algorithms *à la* Ettinger-Høyer when Q is minimal and matches algorithms *à la* Kuperberg when Q is maximal, while offering new possibilities in between. The key point of our algorithm is to give a degree of freedom in the way coset states are preprocessed, that we then link to the parameter Q to obtain an optimal algorithm with respect to Q . We also introduce a new sieving procedure to assemble the constructed coset states, allowing us to retrieve the secret s .

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **From DHSP to DCP.** Many cryptographic primitives are built relying on the hardness of finding a hidden subgroup in a group (see for instance CSIDH [CLM⁺18] and more generally any cryptosystem based on the isogeny problem [CJS14], some cryptosystems based on lattice problems to which we will refer below and even symmetric primitives such as Poly1305-AES [Ber05, BNP18]). This problem can be expressed as follows

Definition 1 (HSP). *The hidden subgroup problem is defined as:*

- *Given: a function $f : G \rightarrow R$ that is constant and distinct on the left cosets of an unknown subgroup H of a group G , R being a finite set,*
- *Find: (a generating set of) H*

When G is Abelian, there is a well-known polynomial-time quantum algorithm solving HSP, consisting in building a superposition over the elements of G , computing $f(G)$ in an ancillary register, applying a Quantum Fourier Transform (QFT) on the first register and finally sampling it. Shor's algorithm is a specific case of this algorithm. When G is not Abelian, there is no general algorithm for solving this problem but some algorithms exist for particular non-Abelian groups like dihedral groups.

A standard method to solve Dihedral HSP (DHSP) is by coset sampling. The beginning is the same as before: we build a superposition over the elements of G and compute $f(G)$ in an ancillary register. But at this point, we measure the ancillary, which leaves us with a superposition over a coset of the unknown subgroup. This is the crucial argument used in [EH99] to show that solving HSP for the dihedral group of order $2N$ reduces to Dihedral Coset Problem, which can be expressed as follows

Definition 2 (DCP). *The Dihedral Coset Problem is defined as:*

- *Given: a collection of coset states of the form $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle|x\rangle + |1\rangle|x+s\rangle)$ for random $x \in \llbracket 0, N \rrbracket$,*
- *Find: $s \in \llbracket 0, N \rrbracket$*

Arithmetic is done mod N .

We will consider in what follows that we have access to an oracle outputting states that we will denote $|\psi_k\rangle$ and defined by

$$(1) \quad |\psi_k\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle + \omega_N^{sk} |1\rangle)$$

where k is a known uniformly distributed random element of \mathbb{Z}_N . They are obtained from coset states (the states used as an input to DCP) by applying the QFT on \mathbb{Z}_N on the first register and then measuring it with a measurement operator \mathcal{M}_1 :

$$|\psi_k\rangle = (\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathbf{I})(\mathbf{F}_N \otimes \mathbf{I}) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|x\rangle|0\rangle + |x+s\rangle|1\rangle) \right).$$

Thus, finding $s \in \llbracket 0, N \rrbracket$ from a collection of states $|\psi_k\rangle$ for known uniformly distributed random $k \in \llbracket 0, N \rrbracket$ solves DCP and DHSP in turn.

Links with lattice problems.

Lattice cryptography currently stands among the most promising branches of post-quantum cryptography. It turns out that DHSP is at the root of a chain of reductions between various lattice problems, among which we can find the well-known Learning With Errors (LWE) problem. This chain starts with a work of Regev [Reg02], which notes that solving the Unique Shortest Vector Problem (uSVP) reduces to DHSP. Cryptosystems based on this problem have been proposed, see for example [AD97, Reg04a]. In turn, Lyubashevsky and Micciancio [LM09] proved the equivalence between uSVP, Bounded Distance Decoding (BDD) and the decision version of the shortest vector problem (GapSVP). Since LWE is a BDD instance and Stehlé et al. [SSTX09] reduced the Short Integer Solution problem (SIS) to LWE, both these problems are concerned by the hardness of solving DHSP. In the end, it means that the security of the main lattice-based cryptosystems (based on any of the previously cited problems) would be impacted by an efficient algorithm solving DHSP.

Algorithms à la Ettinger-Høyer.

The first attempt to solve DCP was made by Ettinger and Høyer in [EH99]. Their main result is that it can be solved with a linear ($O(\log N)$) number of queries. However, the proposed algorithm runs in exponential time ($O(N)$), since it basically enumerates all possible values for the secret s . They find it using $O(\log N)$ measurements of coset states and a statistical argument involving Hoeffding's lemma.

As described by [BS18, Bon19], it is possible to improve the running time of Ettinger-Høyer’s algorithm by reducing the resolution of DCP to a subset sum problem, which can be solved in $O(2^{0.291 \log N})$ classical time and memory [BCJ11] or $O(2^{0.226 \log N})$ quantum time and memory [HM18]. In turn, solving DCP inherits from these complexities. A quantum algorithm using $O(2^{0.236 \log N})$ time and $O(\log N)$ quantum memory was later proposed in [BBSS20], which could be used instead of the previous one.

Algorithms à la Kuperberg.

In its seminal work [Kup05], Kuperberg introduced a subexponential (in time, queries and quantum space) algorithm for solving DCP. We present here the main idea behind the algorithm, since it was used in the following works of Regev [Reg04b] (which used a slightly increased number of queries and time but a polynomial quantum space) and Kuperberg [Kup13] himself (his second algorithm improving over Regev’s own).

Let $N = 2^n$. The idea is the following. We have an oracle producing coset states $|\psi_k\rangle$ where k is random in \mathbb{Z}_N and we are looking for $|\psi_{2^{n-1}}\rangle$, since

$$\mathbf{H} |\psi_{2^{n-1}}\rangle = \mathbf{H} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle + (-1)^s |1\rangle) \right) = |s_0\rangle,$$

s_0 being the least significant bit of the secret s .

We also have a combination routine taking a certain number of coset states in input and outputting a single coset state with better properties. More precisely, this combination routine will have a parameter u such that if the labels of the input states are divisible by 2^{iu} , then the label of the output state will be divisible by $2^{(i+1)u}$. It will be repeated r times, meaning that after the i -th routine, the iu least significant bits of the labels of the output states will be equal to 0, for $i \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket$ (i.e. the i -th routine puts at least u bits to 0). According to our purpose, $ru = n - 1$. The optimal choice for r and u is to take both of order $O(\sqrt{n})$, leading to an algorithm running in $2^{O(\sqrt{n})}$ time and requiring $2^{O(\sqrt{n})}$ queries. This process can be represented as in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Representation of the process used to build subexponential algorithms for solving dihedral HSP.

Once we have $|\psi_{2^{n-1}}\rangle$, we can retrieve the least significant bit of s and reiterate the process in different possible manners to retrieve the other bits of s (see for example [BNP18]).

Our contribution.

We introduce an algorithm taking as a parameter the number of quantum queries we are allowed to do, placing ourselves in a query-limited setting for practical reasons. Indeed, the attacker might have a time-limited access to the oracle or might have to pay a certain price for a quantum query, inducing a limit on the number of queries

the attacker could do [IEAL18]. Our algorithm interpolates between Ettinger-Høyer algorithm (and its subsequent improvements) and Kuperberg's second algorithm and is really able to use any number of queries, from linear to $\tilde{O}\left(2^{\sqrt{2n}}\right)$, feeling the gap in between.

Previous algorithms mainly aim at building n coset states with indices which are powers of 2 (from 0 to $n-1$) and applying an inverse QFT on their tensor product. In other words, we can arrange their labels as n rows of a matrix with n columns which would be diagonal. Our algorithm is more scalable and needs $m < n$ coset states whose labels, if seen as a matrix of m rows and n columns, is a partial triangular matrix. This induces an easy to solve subset sum problem that we will face when assembling these states, while not requiring too much work to build coset states whose labels have $n-1$ zeroes.

We give in the following table an overview of the complexities of the main results for subexponential algorithms. Any quantum algorithm solving the subset sum problem with a polynomial quantum space can be used. We define c as the constant such that its complexity in time is $O(2^{cn})$. In the same way, c_{DCP} is the constant of the algorithm used to combine coset states. At the current time and to the best of our knowledge, $c = 0.236$ [BBSS20] and $c_{\text{DCP}} = 2$ [Kup13] are the best constants existing.

Algorithm	Queries	Time	Quantum Space
[EH99]	$O(n)$	$O(2^n)$	$O(n)$
[Bon19]	$O(n^2)$	$\tilde{O}(2^{0.226n})$	$\tilde{O}(2^{0.226n})$
This work	$O(n)$	$O(2^{0.236n})$	$O(n)$
[Kup05]	$O(2^{3\sqrt{n}})$	$O(2^{3\sqrt{n}})$	$O(2^{3\sqrt{n}})$
[Reg04b]	$2^{O(\sqrt{n \log n})}$	$2^{O(\sqrt{n \log n})}$	$O(\text{poly}(n))$
[CJS14]	$2^{(\sqrt{2}+o(1))\sqrt{n \log n}}$	$2^{(\sqrt{2}+o(1))\sqrt{n \log n}}$	$O(\text{poly}(n))$
[Kup13] & This work	$\tilde{O}(2^{\sqrt{2n}})$	$\tilde{O}(2^{\sqrt{2n}})$	$O(\text{poly}(n))$
This work	Q	$\tilde{O}\left(2^{c\left(n - \frac{\log^2 Q}{c_{\text{DCP}}}\right)}\right)$	$O(\text{poly}(n))$

TABLE 1. Table summarizing the complexity exponents of the algorithms for DCP.

2. PREVIOUS ALGORITHMS

We will focus in this subsection on Regev's algorithm. While its time-complexity is slightly worse than the one of Kuperberg's first algorithm, it only requires polynomial quantum space (subexponential one is required for Kuperberg's first algorithm). Kuperberg's second algorithm has better time-complexity and uses also polynomial quantum space, but it uses a similar structure to the one of Regev's algorithm (i.e. tensorization of state vectors, computation in an ancillary of a particular function, measurement of the ancilla, classical processing, and finally a quantum projection). For the sake of simplicity, we will only describe Regev's algorithm here.

Goal.

The goal of Regev's algorithm is to produce states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_4\rangle, \dots, |\psi_{2^{n-1}}\rangle$, since we have

Lemma 1 (Lemma 5.1 [CJS14]). *Given $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_4\rangle, \dots, |\psi_{2^{n-1}}\rangle$ (with $2^n = \Omega(N)$), we find s in polynomial time with probability $\Omega(1)$.*

Combination algorithm.

The following lemma gives us the complexities of the combination routine of Regev's algorithm.

Lemma 2 (Lemma 5.5 [CJS14]). *There exists an algorithm taking $O(2^k \text{poly}(\log N))$ time and succeeding with probability $\Omega(1)$ provided that $k \geq l' - l + 1$.*

The algorithm in question is Algorithm 1. From several coset states whose labels are divisible by 2^l , it creates a coset state whose label is divisible by $2^{l'}$, with $l < l'$, thus allowing one to build coset states with more and more zeroes.

Algorithm 1 Combination algorithm cancelling low-order bits

Require: Parameters l and l' , states $|\psi_{x_1}\rangle, \dots, |\psi_{x_k}\rangle$ with $x_1 \dots x_k \in 2^l \llbracket 0, N/2^l - 1 \rrbracket$.

Ensure: $|\psi_{x'}\rangle$ with $x' \in 2^{l'} \llbracket 0, N/2^{l'} - 1 \rrbracket$.

- 1: Tensor the states

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^k |\psi_{x_i}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^k}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^k} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{b}\rangle$$

- 2: Compute $\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \bmod 2^{l'}$ in an ancillary register

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^k}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^k} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{b}\rangle \left| \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \bmod 2^{l'} \right\rangle$$

- 3: Measure the ancillary register

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{Z}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^k: \\ \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \bmod 2^{l'} = z}} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{b}\rangle |z\rangle$$

- 4: Classically compute the vectors \mathbf{b} which are solutions and project the superposition onto a pair of solutions $(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{b}_1\rangle + \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{b}_2\rangle \right)$$

- 5: Relabel the basis states to $(|0\rangle, |1\rangle)$, resulting in

$$\frac{\omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{x})}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle + \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}_2 - \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{x})} |1\rangle \right)$$

While \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 had (at least) l trailing zeroes, their difference will have l' trailing zeroes, since they are equal modulo $2^{l'}$. The combination algorithm described above can be used in a different configuration, cancelling high-order bits of the state vector instead of the low-order bits. It has the same time-complexity and success probability. For more details, we refer to the work of Childs, Jao and Soukharev [CJS14], since they studied in depth Regev's algorithm and refined it.

Sieving algorithm. The process described in Figure 1 corresponds to the sieving algorithm below. The sets contain state vectors having the same number of (low-order or high-order) cancelled bits.

Algorithm 2 Sieving algorithm

Require: A combination algorithm taking k states from a set S_{i-1} to build one from S_i with probability $\geq p$, $\forall i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$.

Ensure: A state from S_m .

- 1: **repeat**
 - 2: **while** $\forall i, |S_i| < k$ **do**
 - 3: Generate a state from S_0
 - 4: Combine k states from S_i to make one from S_{i+1}
 - 5: **until** there is a state in S_m
-

Lemma 3 (Lemma 5.3 [CJS14]). *Algorithm 2 needs $k^{(1+o(1))m}$ state preparations and combinations, $O(mk)$ space and succeeds with probability $1 - o(1)$ provided $me^{-2k} = o(1)$.*

In the end, assuming that $mk = (1 + o(1)) \log N$, we have thanks to Lemmas 2 and 3, by letting $k = c\sqrt{\log N \log \log N}$, a runtime of

$$2^{k+(1+o(1))m \log k} \text{poly}(\log N).$$

This is optimized by $c = 1/\sqrt{2}$, giving a total runtime for Regev's algorithm of

$$2^{(\sqrt{2}+o(1))\sqrt{\log N \log \log N}}.$$

3. PROPOSED ALGORITHM

In this section, we do not have any prior requirement on N , so let $n = \lceil \log N \rceil$. We will denote by m the quantity of coset states we use and we define $M = 2^m$. Let $|\psi_k\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + \omega_N^{sk} |1\rangle)$ where $k \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ is known and $s \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ is the secret value we are looking for.

Goal. We would like to build the following superposition, which gives the secret s when the inverse QFT is applied on it:

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_N} \omega_N^{sj} |j\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{QFT}_N^{-1}} |s\rangle$$

In order to construct a similar superposition, we follow the same construction as in Algorithm 1 but the difference is that we avoid collisions by computing the inner product modulo $N > M$, while in Regev's algorithm and subsequent works, collisions are needed and thus the modulus is $2^{l'} < M$. We then lift the entanglement between the registers $|\mathbf{b}\rangle$ and $|\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \bmod N \rangle\rangle$ by using a quantum algorithm for solving the subset sum problem. It will take the classically known vector \mathbf{k} as a parameter and the register $|\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \bmod N \rangle\rangle$ as an input, in order to subtract its output from the register $|\mathbf{b}\rangle$. At this step we will obtain a superposition quite similar to the one we would like to have (Equation 2), therefore we apply the inverse QFT and we conclude by a measurement which will give s with good probability. This procedure corresponds to Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Ideal algorithm

Require: A parameter $m < n$.

Ensure: An element $j \in \mathbb{Z}_N$.

- 1: Generate/create states $|\psi_{k_i}\rangle$ for $i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$
- 2: Tensor the states and append a register on \mathbb{Z}_N

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^m |\psi_{k_i}\rangle |\mathbf{0}_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k})} |\mathbf{b}\rangle |0\rangle$$

- 3: Compute the inner product of \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{k} in the ancillary register

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k})} |\mathbf{b}\rangle |\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle \pmod N\rangle$$

- 4: Uncompute \mathbf{b} thanks to \mathbf{k} and $|\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle \pmod N\rangle$ $\triangleright Z$ being a normalizing constant

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{Z}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k})} |\mathbf{0}_m\rangle |\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle \pmod N\rangle$$

- 5: Apply the inverse QFT on Z_N on the second register

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_N} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{Z}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{(s-j)\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle} \right) |\mathbf{0}_m\rangle |j\rangle$$

- 6: Measure the state and output the resulting j .
-

However, we cannot expect the subset sum solver to succeed for each instance, since collisions might occur. This is why we differentiate between Algorithm 3 in which we consider the algorithm solving the subset sum problem to be ideal and the following algorithm which is the one we can expect to build in practice. The ideal algorithm will all the same be useful since it will provide us a useful bound for the analysis of the real algorithm.

Hypothesis 1. *We assume that we have an algorithm \mathcal{S} correctly solving the subset sum problem for a given instance with some probability depending on the number of collisions of the considered instance, i.e. such that for a given dot product $\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle$, $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_N^m$ being known, it outputs:*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{b} & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{col}(\mathbf{b})} \\ \mathbf{b}' \neq \mathbf{b} & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{col}(\mathbf{b})} \end{cases} \quad \forall \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m.$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{col}(\mathbf{b})$ is the number of vectors colliding with $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$:

$$\mathcal{N}_{col}(\mathbf{b}) \stackrel{def}{=} \#\{\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{F}_2^m : \langle \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{k} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle \pmod N\}.$$

We introduce a new notation for the set of \mathbf{b} 's such that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle) = \mathbf{b}$.

Notation 1. *Let us denote by \mathcal{G} the set of \mathbf{b} 's that are correctly recovered by $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}$ for a given \mathbf{k} :*

$$\mathcal{G} \stackrel{def}{=} \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m : \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle) = \mathbf{b}\}$$

and let G be the size of the set \mathcal{G} .

Assuming this hypothesis, we can build Algorithm 4, which will be shown to output s with good probability.

Algorithm 4 Real algorithm

Require: A parameter $m < n$ and coset states $|\psi_{k_i}\rangle$ for $i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$.**Ensure:** An element $j \in \mathbb{Z}_N$.

- 1: Tensor the states and append a register on
- \mathbb{Z}_N

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^m |\psi_{k_i}\rangle |\mathbf{0}_n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k})} |\mathbf{b}\rangle |0\rangle$$

- 2: Compute the inner product of
- \mathbf{b}
- and
- \mathbf{k}
- in the ancillary register

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k})} |\mathbf{b}\rangle |\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle \pmod N\rangle$$

- 3: Apply
- $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}$
- to uncompute
- \mathbf{b}

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k})} |\mathbf{b} \oplus \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle)\rangle |\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle \pmod N\rangle$$

- 4: Measure the first register. If the result is not
- $\mathbf{0}_m$
- , abort and restart with new coset states. Otherwise, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{G}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{G}} \omega_N^{s(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k})} |\mathbf{0}_m\rangle |\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle \pmod N\rangle$$

- 5: Apply the inverse QFT on
- \mathbb{Z}_N
- on the second register

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_N} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{G}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{G}} \omega_N^{(s-j)(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k})} \right) |\mathbf{0}_m\rangle |j\rangle$$

- 6: Measure the state and output the resulting
- j
- .
-

We apply in Step 4 a measurement in order to disentangle the superposition we have, so we can apply the inverse QFT in the same natural way as in the ideal algorithm. The probability of success of the measurement (i.e. of measuring 0) will be shown to be good enough for our purpose.

3.1. Analysis. In order to analyze our algorithm, we will proceed in two steps. First, we will give a lower bound on the expected value of G , which will be derived thanks to a lower bound on G involving Z and the expected value of Z , which is easier to compute. Namely, we will prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *We have for G the lower bound*

$$\mathbb{E}[G] \geq M \left(1 - \frac{M-1}{N} \right).$$

Second, we will prove the following lemma, on the probability of success of our algorithm.

Lemma 5. *Algorithm 4 outputs the secret s with probability $\frac{M(N-M+1)}{N^2}$.*

3.1.1. Proof of Lemma 4. We start by giving the probability of measuring a value $j \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ at the end of Algorithm 3. It will be helpful to compute $\mathbb{E}[Z]$.

Lemma 6. *The measurement gives the value $j \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ with probability*

$$\mathbb{P}_{ideal}[j] = \frac{M^2}{NZ} \prod_{i=1}^m \cos^2 \left(\pi k_i \frac{s-j}{N} \right)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{ideal}[j] &= \frac{1}{NZ} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{(s-j)\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle} \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{NZ} \left| \prod_{i=1}^m \left(1 + \omega_N^{(s-j)k_i} \right) \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{NZ} \prod_{i=1}^m \left| 1 + \omega_N^{(s-j)k_i} \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{NZ} \prod_{i=1}^m 4 \cos^2 \left(\pi k_i \frac{s-j}{N} \right) \\
&= \frac{M^2}{NZ} \prod_{i=1}^m \cos^2 \left(\pi k_i \frac{s-j}{N} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

□

We now give the expected value of Z .

Lemma 7. *We have*

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] = M \left(1 + \frac{M-1}{N} \right).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6 and using the fact that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_N} \mathbb{P}_{ideal}[j] = 1$, we can write

$$Z = \frac{M^2}{N} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_N} \prod_{i=1}^m \cos^2 \left(\pi k_i \frac{s-j}{N} \right)$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] = \frac{M^2}{N} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_N} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^m \cos^2 \left(\pi k_i \frac{s-j}{N} \right) \right]$$

and since the k_i are i.i.d., we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Z] &= \frac{M^2}{N} \left(1 + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_N \setminus \{s\}} \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[\cos^2 \left(\pi k_i \frac{s-j}{N} \right) \right] \right) \\
&= \frac{M^2}{N} \left(1 + (N-1) \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{2} \right) \\
&= \frac{M}{N} (N + M - 1)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, we give a lower bound on G involving Z .

Lemma 8. *We have for G the lower bound*

$$G \geq 2M - Z.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{G}_1 be the set of \mathbf{b} 's that do not collide with any $\mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{F}_2^m \setminus \{\mathbf{b}\}$:

$$\mathcal{G}_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m : \mathcal{N}_{col}(\mathbf{b}) = 1 \},$$

If we denote by G_1 the size of the set \mathcal{G}_1 , we trivially have $G \geq G_1$. Now, let $\overline{G}_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \#\{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m : \mathcal{N}_{\text{col}}(\mathbf{b}) > 1\} = \#(\mathbb{F}_2^m \setminus \mathcal{G}_1)$. We have by definition

$$Z \geq G_1 + 2\overline{G}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{G}_1 = M - G_1.$$

Therefore $Z \geq 2M - G_1$, meaning that $G_1 \geq 2M - Z$. Combining this inequality with $G \geq G_1$ yields the result. \square

The proof of Lemma 4 follows from Lemma 7 and Lemma 8.

3.1.2. *Proof of Lemma 5.* In the same way as for Lemma 6, we can compute the probability of measuring $j \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ at the end of Algorithm 4. In particular, we have for s

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{real}}[s] = \frac{1}{NG} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{G}} \omega_N^0 \right|^2 = \frac{G}{N}$$

We have by Lemma 4 that $\mathbb{E}[G] \leq M \left(1 - \frac{M-1}{N}\right)$. Thus we can expect the probability $\mathbb{P}_{\text{real}}[s]$ to be greater than $\frac{M(N-M+1)}{N^2}$.

3.2. **Complexity.** If we take a look at the ideal algorithm and consider that there is no collision, we can see that we would like 2^m to be as close to N as possible in order for the sum

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{(s-j)\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle}$$

to have as many as possible elements of the sum

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} \omega_N^{(s-j)\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k} \rangle}.$$

In the mean time, the closest 2^m gets to N , the more the probability of having collisions $\langle \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{k} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{k} \rangle$ for $\mathbf{b}_1 \neq \mathbf{b}_2$ increases. We thus have to find a compromise on the value m or play on the values k_i used in the algorithm, since it can allow us to avoid collisions and simplify the resolution of the subset sum problem.

Without any pre-processing of the values k_i used, we will need

- $O\left(\frac{N}{N-M}m\right)$ queries, since on average Algorithm 4 will be repeated $\frac{M}{\mathbb{E}[G]} = \frac{N}{N-M+1}$ times (by Lemma 4) because of Step 4, and
- $O\left(\frac{N}{N-M}2^{cm}\right)$ time, corresponding to the resolution of the subset sum problem (repeated the same number of times, for the same reason), for which we assume we have a quantum algorithm solving this problem with a complexity in $O(2^{cm})$ where c is the constant of the quantum subset sum solver.

If we now want to reduce the size of the subset sum problem we have to solve, we can pre-process the coset states to build specific values of k_i . We will have to pay the price of their construction, which can be achieved by Kuperberg's second algorithm (or any improvement). Given a threshold parameter t , we can considerate the following configuration for the k_i to use in Algorithm 4 (the k_i are written in \mathbb{F}_2^n with their least significant bit on the left, dots represent unknown bits):

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{c} k_1 \\ k_2 \\ \vdots \\ k_{m-t} \\ k_{m-t+1} \\ \vdots \\ k_m \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots & m-t-1 & m-t & \cdots & n-1 \\ 1 & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ 0 & 1 & \ddots & \bullet & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \cdots & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \bullet \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet \end{pmatrix}$$

Building states satisfying this configuration would therefore take $\tilde{O}\left(2^{\sqrt{c_{\text{DCP}}(m-t)}}\right)$ queries and time, where c_{DCP} is the constant of the algorithm used to construct the states ($c_{\text{DCP}} = 2$ for Kuperberg's second algorithm). Now for the subset sum problem, solving it on the first $m-t$ bits is easy, the difficulty comes from the last $n-m+t$ bits, leading to a complexity in $O(2^{ct})$ time. In the end, the total complexity of the algorithm is:

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{N}{N-M}2^{\sqrt{c_{\text{DCP}}(m-t)}}\right) \text{ queries, and } \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N}{N-M}2^{\max\{\sqrt{c_{\text{DCP}}(m-t)}, c_{\text{SS}}t\}}\right) \text{ time.}$$

Remark 1. We notice that taking m slightly less than n ,

- when $t = 1$, we have to build a state with $k = 2^{n-1}$, which corresponds to running a "full" version of Kuperberg's second algorithm. Our algorithm then requires $\tilde{O}\left(2^{\sqrt{c_{\text{DCP}}n}}\right)$ queries and time.
- when $t = m$, the k_i are kept random and we have to solve the "full rank" subset sum, giving an algorithm à la Ettinger-Høyer, requiring $O(n)$ queries and $O(2^{c_{\text{SS}}n})$ time.
- when $1 < t < m$, we have a new algorithm working for a number of queries between $O(n)$ and $\tilde{O}\left(2^{\sqrt{c_{\text{DCP}}n}}\right)$.

We can now present our final algorithm, using Kuperberg's second algorithm as a combination routine and Algorithm 4 to retrieve the secret s .

Algorithm 5 Final algorithm

Require: q such that 2^q is the number of queries we are allowed to do.

Ensure: The secret s .

- 1: Use Kuperberg's second algorithm (or any improvement) to create states $|\psi_{k_i}\rangle$ for $i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$ satisfying the configuration represented by the matrix 3, where $m < n$ ($m = n - 2$ for example) and $t = n - \frac{q^2}{c_{\text{DCP}}}$.
 - 2: Apply Algorithm 4 on these m states to obtain a value $j \in \mathbb{Z}_N$.
 - 3: Check if j is the secret. If not, return to Step 1. Otherwise, output j .
-

We can now give the complexity of Algorithm 5.

Theorem 1. Algorithm 5 finds s with $\tilde{O}(2^q)$ queries in $\tilde{O}\left(2^{c_{\text{SS}}\left(n - \frac{q^2}{c_{\text{DCP}}}\right)}\right)$ time.

Proof. We can express the parameter t in function of the number of queries. Let $q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{c_{\text{DCP}}(m-t)}$, we can write that

$$t = m - \frac{q^2}{c_{\text{DCP}}}.$$

and thus that it takes

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{N}{N-M}2^q\right) \text{ queries, and } \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N}{N-M}2^{\max\{q, c_{SS}\left(m-\frac{q^2}{c_{\text{DCP}}}\right)\}}\right) \text{ time.}$$

Looking at the value q_{opt} for which we have equality between the two terms in the maximum function, we get

$$q_{\text{opt}} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{c_{\text{DCP}}}{2c}\right)^2 + c_{\text{DCP}}m - \frac{c_{\text{DCP}}}{2c}} \\ \approx \sqrt{c_{\text{DCP}}m}.$$

Finally, the algorithm has on average a probability of success (i.e. outputting s) of $\frac{\mathbb{E}[G]}{N} = \frac{M(N-M+1)}{N^2}$, meaning that we can expect to find s with

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^3}{M(N-M)^2}2^q\right) \text{ queries, and } \tilde{O}\left(\frac{N^3}{M(N-M)^2}2^{c_{SS}\left(m-\frac{q^2}{c_{\text{DCP}}}\right)}\right) \text{ time.}$$

Taking m slightly less than n , we conclude the proof. \square

We plot $c_{SS}\left(n - \frac{q^2}{c_{\text{DCP}}}\right)$ as a function of q for different values of n and $m = n - 2$ in figure 2.




FIGURE 2. Time (log of) as a function of the number of queries (we used $c_{\text{DCP}} = 2$ ([Kup13]), $c = 0.236$ ([BSS20]) and 0.291 for the classical subset sum solver ([BCJ11] used in algorithms *à la* Ettinger-Høyer).

REFERENCES

- [AD97] Miklós Ajtai and Cynthia Dwork. A public-key cryptosystem with worst-case/average-case equivalence. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, El Paso, Texas, USA, May 4-6, 1997*, pages 284–293, 1997.
- [BBS20] Xavier Bonnetain, Rémi Briceout, André Schrottenloher, and Yixin Shen. Improved classical and quantum algorithms for subset-sum. In Shiho Moriai and Huaxiong Wang, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2020*, pages 633–666, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- [BCJ11] Anja Becker, Jean-Sébastien Coron, and Antoine Joux. Improved generic algorithms for hard knapsacks. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2011 - 30th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Tallinn, Estonia, May 15-19, 2011. Proceedings*, pages 364–385, 2011.
- [Ber05] Daniel J. Bernstein. The poly1305-aes message-authentication code. In Henri Gilbert and Helena Handschuh, editors, *Fast Software Encryption*, pages 32–49, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [BNP18] Xavier Bonnetain and María Naya-Plasencia. Hidden shift quantum cryptanalysis and implications. In Thomas Peyrin and Steven Galbraith, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2018*, pages 560–592, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
- [Bon19] Xavier Bonnetain. Improved low-qubit hidden shift algorithms, 2019. arXiv:1901.11428.
- [BS18] Xavier Bonnetain and André Schrottenloher. Quantum security analysis of csidh. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2018/537, 2018. ia.cr/2018/537.
- [CJS14] Andrew Childs, David Jao, and Vladimir Soukharev. Constructing elliptic curve isogenies in quantum subexponential time, 2014.
- [CLM⁺18] Wouter Castryck, Tanja Lange, Chloe Martindale, Lorenz Panny, and Joost Renes. Csidh: An efficient post-quantum commutative group action. In Thomas Peyrin and Steven Galbraith, editors, *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2018*, pages 395–427, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
- [EH99] Mark Ettinger and Peter Høyer. On quantum algorithms for noncommutative hidden subgroups. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, page 478–487, 1999.
- [HM18] Alexander Helm and Alexander May. Subset sum quantumly in 1.17^n . In Stacey Jeffery, editor, *13th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2018)*, volume 111 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 5:1–5:15, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2018. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [IEAL18] Andrew Ilyas, Logan Engstrom, Anish Athalye, and Jessy Lin. Black-box adversarial attacks with limited queries and information, 2018.
- [Kup05] Greg Kuperberg. A subexponential-time quantum algorithm for the dihedral hidden subgroup problem, 2005. arXiv:quant-ph/0302112.
- [Kup13] Greg Kuperberg. Another subexponential-time quantum algorithm for the dihedral hidden subgroup problem, 2013. arXiv:1112.3333.
- [LM09] Vadim Lyubashevsky and Daniele Micciancio. On bounded distance decoding, unique shortest vectors, and the minimum distance problem. In *Proceedings of CRYPTO 2009*, volume 5677 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 577–594. IACR, Springer, 2009.
- [Reg02] Oded Regev. Quantum computation and lattice problems, 2002. arXiv:cs/0304005.
- [Reg04a] Oded Regev. New lattice-based cryptographic constructions. *J. ACM*, 51(6):899–942, 2004.
- [Reg04b] Oded Regev. A subexponential time algorithm for the dihedral hidden subgroup problem with polynomial space, 2004. arXiv:quant-ph/0406151.
- [SSTX09] Damien Stehlé, Ron Steinfeld, Keisuke Tanaka, and Keita Xagawa. Efficient public key encryption based on ideal lattices. In Mitsuru Matsui, editor, *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2009, 15th International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security, Tokyo, Japan, December 6-10, 2009. Proceedings*, volume 5912 of *LNCS*, pages 617–635. Springer, 2009.

ATOS QUANTUM LAB, LES CLAYES-SOUS-BOIS AND INRIA DE PARIS, PARIS 75012

Email address: `maxime.remaud@atos.net`

INRIA DE PARIS, PARIS 75012

Email address: `jean-pierre.tillich@inria.fr`