Rigorous Foundations for Dual Attacks in Coding Theory

Charles Meyer-Hilfiger, Jean-Pierre Tillich

Journée C2 - 17/10/2023



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで

Dual attacks in codes and lattices

Dual attacks solve

Decoding Problem (Codes)

Shortest Vector Problem (Lattices)

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

 \rightarrow Heart of security of cryptographic primitives

Lattices : Dual attacks impact Kyber (NIST standard)

Dual attacks in codes and lattices

Dual attacks solve	
Decoding Problem (Codes)	Shortest Vector Problem (Lattices)
ightarrow Heart of security of cryptographic primitives	
Lattices : Dual attacks impact Kyber (NIST standard)	
Independence assumptions to analyse dual attacks	
↓ (Valid?)	
Not so much	
Codes	Lattices
[CDMT22]	[DP23]
$\stackrel{\downarrow}{Notice experimental differences}$	↓ Show the model cannot hold in some

• 1) Why independence assumptions does not hold.

• 2) Give rigorous foundations for analyzing dual attacks.

э

イロン イ団 とく ヨン イヨン

Table of Contents

Dual attacks and their analysis

2 Theorical explanation

3 A new model to analyze dual attacks

Setting for **Dual** attacks in Coding Theory

Linear code

 \mathscr{C} a binary [n,k] linear code: linear subspace of \mathbb{F}_2^n of dimension k.

Decoding problem at distance t (sparse)

- Input: $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ where $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e}$ with $\mathbf{c} \in \mathscr{C}$ and $|\mathbf{e}| = t$
- **Output:** $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ such that $|\mathbf{e}| = t$ and $\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{e} \in \mathscr{C}$.

 $|\mathbf{x}|$ is Hamming weight of \mathbf{x} : number of non-zero coordinates.

Dual code

 $\mathscr{C}^{\perp} = \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \ : \ \langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{c} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathscr{C}\} \to \mathscr{C}^{\perp} \text{ is } [n, n-k] \text{ linear code}$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Dual attacks 1.0 (Statistical decoding [Al-Jabri, 2001])

• Compute all
$$\mathbf{h} \in \mathscr{C}_w^{\perp} \subset \mathscr{C}^{\perp} =$$

• Compute $\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{h}_i \rightarrow$ Biased toward 0

$$\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}}\left(\langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h} \rangle\right) \stackrel{\scriptscriptstyle \triangle}{=} \frac{\left|\left\{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp} : \langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h} \rangle = 0\right\}\right|}{|\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}|} \ 2 \ - 1$$

$$\mathsf{lf} \ \left| \mathscr{C}_w^{\perp} \right| > \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}} \left(\langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h} \rangle \right)} \right)^2 \Rightarrow \ \mathsf{Distinguish} \ \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e} \ \mathsf{from random} \ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$$

Estimate of $\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}}(\langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h} \rangle)$ (\mathscr{C} is random) Theorem [CDMT22]

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_{w}^{\perp}}\left(\langle\mathbf{e},\mathbf{h}\rangle\right) &\approx \mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}'\in\mathcal{S}_{w}^{n}}\left(\langle\mathbf{e},\mathbf{h}'\rangle\right) \ = \ \frac{K_{w}^{(n)}\left(|\mathbf{e}|\right)}{\binom{n}{w}} \quad (K_{w}^{(n)} \text{ Krawtchouk poly.})\\ & \text{Where } \mathscr{C}_{w}^{\perp} \subset \mathcal{S}_{w}^{n} \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \{\mathbf{h}' \in \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n} \ : \ |\mathbf{h}'| = w\} \end{split}$$

 $K_w^n(|\mathbf{e}|) / {n \choose w}$ 2^{-1} 2^{-4} n = 100, w = 10 2^{-7} 2^{-10} 2^{-13} 2^{-16} 2^{-19} 2^{-22} $|\mathbf{e}|$ Ó 10 20 30 40 50 $\mathsf{Hold if: } \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}\right|\right] > \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}' \in \mathcal{S}_w^n}\left(\langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h}' \rangle\right)}\right)$

Dual attacks 2.0 [CDMT, 2022]

• Split support in complementary part \mathscr{P} and $\mathscr{N} \to \text{Recover } e_{\mathscr{P}}$?



$$\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle$$

$\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle \rightarrow \text{biased toward } 0$

∜

• Find $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{|\mathscr{P}|}$ s.t $\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle$ is the most biased toward 0

 \rightarrow Hope maximum for $\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}$

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト

э

Recovering e₉

• 1) How big is $\operatorname{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}}(\langle \mathbf{y},\mathbf{h}\rangle+\langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}}\rangle)?$

• 2) How big is $\operatorname{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_{u}^{\perp}}(\langle \mathbf{y},\mathbf{h}\rangle+\langle \mathbf{x},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}}\rangle)$ for all other $\mathbf{x}\neq\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}$'s?

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{1)} \text{ Estimate of } \mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}} \left(\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle \right) \\ \text{Theorem [CDMT22]} \end{array}$

$$\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}}\left(\langle \mathbf{y},\mathbf{h}\rangle+\langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}}\rangle\right) \quad \approx \quad \frac{K_w^{(|\mathscr{N}|)}\left(|\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}|\right)}{\binom{|\mathscr{N}|}{w}}$$

 $\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}}\left(\langle\mathbf{y},\mathbf{h}\rangle+\langle\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}}\rangle\right)=\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}}\left(\langle\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}}\rangle\right)$

 $\approx \operatorname{bias}_{\mathbf{h}'_{\mathscr{N}} \in \mathscr{C}_{w}^{\perp}}\left(\langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}'_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle\right)$

$$= \frac{K_w^{(|\mathcal{N}|)}(|\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{N}}|)}{\binom{|\mathcal{N}|}{w}}$$

$$\rightarrow \mathsf{Hold if: } \mathbb{E}\left[|\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}|\right] > \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}}\left(\langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathcal{N}} \rangle\right)}\right)^2$$

2) Estimate of $\operatorname{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}}\left(\langle \mathbf{y},\mathbf{h}\rangle+\langle \mathbf{x},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}}\rangle\right), \qquad \mathbf{x}\neq\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle &= \langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}} + \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Independence Assumption

Assume $\langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}} + \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle$ independent when \mathbf{h} uniform in \mathscr{C}_w^{\perp}

∜

$\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle \sim \operatorname{Bern}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right), \qquad \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}$

Sum up in a plot!

Under Independence assumption:



Sum up in a plot!

Under Independence assumption:



Table of Contents

Dual attacks and their analysis

2 Theorical explanation

3 A new model to analyze dual attacks

Why independence assumption is false

Indepence assumption

$$\Rightarrow \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle \sim \text{Bern}(1/2)$$



 $\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle = \langle (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}) \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle$

 \rightarrow Assumption cannot hold!

э

・ロト ・四ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

About $\langle \mathbf{y},\mathbf{h}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{x},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}}\rangle$



$$\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle = \langle (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}) \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle$$

Definition

$$\mathscr{C}^{\mathscr{N}}$$
 is $[n-s,k-s]$ code of gen. mat. \mathbf{G}'

$$\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \in (\mathscr{C}^{\mathscr{N}})^{\perp}$$

 $\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle = \langle (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}) \, \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}} + \mathbf{c}^{\mathscr{N}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{N}} \rangle$

 $\forall \mathbf{c}^{\mathscr{N}} \in \mathscr{C}^{\mathscr{N}}$

An expression for $bias(\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle)$

Theorem of bias of error terms in RLPN

$$\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_{w}^{\perp}}\left(\langle\mathbf{y},\mathbf{h}\rangle+\langle\mathbf{x},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}}\rangle\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-s} N_{i} \frac{K_{w}^{(n-s)}\left(i\right)}{\binom{n-s}{w}}$$

where $N_i \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \left| (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}) \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}} + \mathscr{C}^{\mathscr{N}} \bigcap \mathcal{S}_i^{n-s} \right|$ is weight enumerator

Proof: Poisson formula

 \rightarrow Dominated by lowest *i* s.t $N_i \neq 0$

$$\rightarrow \mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathscr{C}_{w}^{\perp}}\left(\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}} \rangle\right) \approx \frac{1}{\binom{n-s}{w}} K_{w}^{(n-s)}\left(|\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}|\right)$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Table of Contents

Dual attacks and their analysis

Theorical explanation

3 A new model to analyze dual attacks

Model for the bias

 $\rightarrow \mathscr{C}$ is random [n,k] linear code,

$$\mathbf{bias}_{\mathbf{h}\in\mathscr{C}_{w}^{\perp}}\left(\langle \mathbf{y},\mathbf{h}\rangle+\langle \mathbf{x},\mathbf{h}_{\mathscr{P}}\rangle\right)=\sum_{i=0}^{n-s}N_{i} \ \frac{K_{w}^{(n-s)}\left(i\right)}{\binom{n-s}{w}}$$

where $N_{i}\stackrel{\Delta}{=}\left|\left(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{P}}\right)\mathbf{R}+\mathbf{e}_{\mathscr{N}}+\mathscr{C}^{\mathscr{N}}\bigcap\mathcal{S}_{i}^{n-s}\right|$ is weight enumerator

Model

$$N_i \sim \text{Poisson}\left(\frac{\binom{n-s}{i}}{2^{n-k}}\right)$$

2

イロン イロン イヨン イヨン

Experimental Results

Under Poisson model:



э

イロン イ団 とく ヨン イヨン

Conclusion

- This model can be used to analyze dual attacks
- [CDMT22] with a tweak \rightarrow originally claimed complexities!
- Can be adapted to Lattices

Thank you!