# Lecture 24: Digital Signatures using RSA Assumption

- Bob wants to receive encrypted messages. So, Bob fixes n, the number of bits in the primes he wants to choose. Bob picks two random n-bit primes p and q. Bob computes  $N = p \cdot q$ . Bob samples a random  $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(N)}^*$ . Bob computes  $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(N)}^*$  such that  $e \cdot d = 1 \mod \varphi(N)$  using the extended GCD algorithm. Bob set  $\mathsf{pk} = (n, N, e)$  and  $\mathsf{trap} = d$ .
- The public-key for Bob pk is broadcast to everyone
- To encrypt a message  $m \in \{0,1\}^{n/2}$ , Alice runs the  $\operatorname{Enc}_p k(m)$  algorithm defined as follows. Alice samples  $r \in \{0,1\}^{n/2}$  and computes  $c = (r || m)^e \mod N$ . The cipher-text is c.
- After receiving a cipher-text  $\widetilde{c}$ , Bob runs the decryption algorithm  $\operatorname{Dec}_{pk,\operatorname{trap}}(\widetilde{c})$ . Bob computes  $(\widetilde{r},\widetilde{m})=\widetilde{c}^d \mod N$ .

- Correctness. We have seen that this public-key encryption is always correct (relies on the fact that  $gcd(e, \varphi(N)) = 1$ )
- **Security.** We have seen that this public-key encryption scheme is secure as long as the randomness *r* used in every encryption algorithm is distinct against computationally bounded eavesdroppers (relies on the birthday bound and the RSA assumption)

### Abstraction

- Recall that we have seen that the function  $f_e \colon \mathbb{Z}_N^* \to \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  defined by  $f_e(x) = x^e \mod N$  is a bijection that is efficient to evaluate. We shall abstract this concept as "Evaluation is efficient"
- Recall that the inverse function  $f_e^{-1} \colon \mathbb{Z}_N^* \to \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  is efficient to evaluate given d, where  $e \cdot d = 1 \mod \varphi(N)$ ; otherwise, not. We shall abstract this concept as "Inversion is inefficient"
- In a public-key encryption we want that the "encryption algorithm is efficient" and "decryption algorithm is inefficient."
  So, we used the evaluation of f<sub>e</sub> for encryption and the inversion of f<sub>e</sub> for decryption.

## Digital Signature

- In a digital signature scheme, the signer publishes a public-key pk and keeps a trapdoor trap with herself
- Later, if the signer wants to endorse a message m then she uses an algorithm  $\operatorname{Sign}_{\mathsf{pk},\mathsf{trap}}(m)$  to generate a signature  $\sigma$
- Everyone should be able to verify that "the publisher of the public-key pk endorses the message  $\widetilde{m}$  using the signature  $\widetilde{\sigma}$ " by running the verification algorithm  $\operatorname{Ver}_{\operatorname{pk}}(\widetilde{m},\widetilde{\sigma})$ "
- An adversary who sees the public-key pk and a few message-signature pairs  $(m_1, \sigma_1), (m_2, \sigma_2), \ldots, (m_k, \sigma_k)$  cannot forge a valid signature  $\sigma'$  on a new message m'

- First observe that we want "verification to be efficient" and "signing to be inefficient"
- So, using the ideas in the "abstraction slide," the idea is to use "evaluation of  $f_e$ " for verification and "inversion of  $f_e$ " for signing

- Alice decides to endorse messages using n-bit primes. Alice picks two random n-bit prime numbers p,q. Alice computes  $N=p\cdot q$  and samples a random  $e\in\mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(N)}^*$ . Alice computes d such that  $e\cdot d=1\mod\varphi(N)$ . Alice sets  $\mathrm{pk}=(n,N,e)$  and  $\mathrm{trap}=d$
- To sign a message  $m \in \{0,1\}^n$ , Alice runs  $\operatorname{Sign}_{\mathsf{pk},\mathsf{trap}}(m)$  defined as follows. Compute  $\sigma = m^d \mod N$ .
- To verify a message-signature pair  $(\widetilde{m}, \widetilde{\sigma})$ , Bob runs the verification algorithm  $\operatorname{Ver}_{\operatorname{pub}}(\widetilde{m}, \widetilde{\sigma})$  defined as follows. Output  $\widetilde{m} == \widetilde{\sigma}^e \mod N$ .

THIS SCHEME IS INSECURE!

## Attack on the Previous Scheme

- ullet Pick any  $\sigma' \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$
- Compute  $m' = (\sigma')^e \mod N$
- Note that this is an efficient attack
- Note that we did not even need to see any other message-signature pairs
- Although, we do not have any "control" over the message. It is a valid forgery nonetheless

- We want to use the fact that in the previous forgery attack, the adversary did not have any control over the message that was being signed
- So, here is the idea underlying the fix. We shall pick a random  $r \in \{0,1\}^{n/2}$  and include r in the public-key pk. To sign a message  $m \in \{0,1\}^{n/2}$ , we compute (r||m) and compute the signature  $\sigma = (r||m)^d \mod N$ . To verify a message-signature pair  $(\widetilde{m},\widetilde{\sigma})$ , Bob (the verifier) checks  $(r,\widetilde{m}) == (\widetilde{\sigma})^e \mod N$
- The formal scheme is presented next

#### $Gen(1^n)$ :

- Pick random n-bit primes p and q.
- Compute N and  $\varphi(N)$
- Sample  $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{\varphi(N)}^*$
- Compute d such that  $e \cdot d = 1 \mod \varphi(N)$
- Sample random  $r \in \{0,1\}^{n/2}$
- Return pk = (n, N, e, r) and trap = d

 $Sign_{pk,trap}(m)$ :

• Return  $(r||m)^d \mod N$ 

 $\operatorname{Ver}_{\operatorname{pk}}(\widetilde{m},\widetilde{\sigma})$ :

• Return  $(r || \widetilde{m}) == \widetilde{\sigma}^e \mod N$ 

In the next lecture we shall learn how to sign arbitrary-length messages  $m \in \{0,1\}^*$