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#### Abstract

The $\pi$-cipher is one of the candidates of the CAESAR competition. One of the advertised features of the $\pi$-cipher is tag second-preimage resistance: it should be hard to generate a message with a given tag, even for the legitimate key holder (insider attack). In this note, we show that the generalized birthday attack of Wagner gives a practical tag second-preimage attack against the $\pi$-cipher.


## 1 Introduction

The $\pi$-cipher [2] is an authenticated encryption algorithm submitted to the CAESAR competition. One of the extra features advertised by the designers is tag second-preimage resistance: it should be hard to produce second-preimages of a given tag, even for an adversary who knows the secret key (most authenticated encryption algorithm do not have this feature, and an insider can easily generate tag second-preimages).

As written in [2, 4.1], the tag generation of an $m$-block message with the $\pi$-cipher can be written as:

$$
T=T^{\prime \prime} \boxplus_{8} e\left(1, M_{1}\right) \boxplus_{8} e\left(2, M_{2}\right) \boxplus_{8} \cdots \boxplus_{8} e\left(m, M_{m}\right)
$$

where $e$ denotes a keyed function known to the key holder (the e-triplex), $\boxplus_{8}$ is a component-wise addition of vectors of 8 elements in $\mathbb{Z}_{2^{\omega}}$, and $T^{\prime \prime}$ is the associated data tag (known to the insider). The word-size $\omega$ is 16,32 , or 64 , depending on the security level. In a tag second-preimage attack, an insider wants to build a message $M$ reaching a fixed $\operatorname{tag} \bar{T}$. Witout loss of generality, we assume $T^{\prime \prime}=0$ and $\bar{T}=0$.

## 2 Generalized birthday attack

In the submission document of $\pi$-cipher, the tag second-preimage problem is seen as a knapsack problem, and the main attack considered is a variant of an attack by Camion and Patarin [1]. However, the generalization of this attack due to Wagner [3] can break the problem more efficiently.

The generalized birthday attack of Wagner is an attack against the $m$-sum problem: given $m$ lists $L_{1}, L_{2}, \ldots, L_{m}$, one find values $l_{1} \in L_{1}, \ldots, l_{m} \in L_{m}$ such that $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} l_{m}=0$. If each list contains at least $2^{r / m}$ elements there is a good probability that a solution exists, but the best known algorithm is a simple birthday attack in time and memory $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(2^{r / 2}\right)$. The idea is to build two lists $L_{A}$

[^0]and $L_{B}$ with all the sums of elements in $L_{1}, \ldots L_{m / 2}$ and $L_{m / 2+1}, \ldots L_{m}$ respectively, sort $L_{A}$ and $L_{B}$, and look for a match between the two lists ( $L_{A}$ and $L_{B}$ contains $2^{r / 2}$ elements).

Wagner's algorithm will have a lower complexity, but it requires more elements in the lists. For instance, with $m=4$, it uses lists of size $2^{r / 3}$ and in order to find one solution using $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(2^{r / 3}\right)$ time and memory. The basic operation of the algorithm is the general join $\bowtie \triangleleft_{j}: L \triangleright \triangleleft_{j} L^{\prime}$ consists of all elements of $L \times L^{\prime}$ that agree on their $j$ least significant bits. More precisely, the operation can be defined over list of values with associated data:

$$
L \bowtie \triangleleft_{j} L^{\prime}=\left\{\left(l \oplus l^{\prime},\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)\right) \mid(l, a) \in L,\left(l^{\prime}, a^{\prime}\right) \in L^{\prime},\left(l \oplus l^{\prime}\right)^{[0 . . j-1]}=0^{j}\right\} .
$$

The join operation is computed efficiently by sorting the lists $L$ and $L^{\prime}$ according to the lower $j$ bits, and stepping through the lists simultaneously in order to find values that agree on their low bits. Moreover, the sorting can be done in linear time using a hash table, or a radix sort.


Fig. 1. Wagner's algorithm for $m=4$

The generalized birthday algorithm for $m=4$ is described by Figure 1 . We first build the lists $L_{12}=L_{1} \unlhd_{r / 3} L_{2}$ and $L_{34}=L_{3} \triangleright_{r / 3} L_{4}$, containing about $2^{r / 3}$ elements. Next, we build $L_{1234}=L_{12} \bowtie \triangleleft_{2 r / 3} L_{34}$. Since the elements of $L_{12}$ and $L_{34}$ already agree on their $r / 3$ lower bits, we are only matching bits $r / 3$ to $2 r / 3$, so we still expect to find $2^{r / 3}$ elements. Finally, we expect one of the elements of $L_{1234}$ to be zero. This can be generalized to any $m$ that is a power of two, using a binary tree: if $m=2^{a}$, we need $m$ lists of $2^{r /(a+1)}$ elements and the time and memory used by the algorithm is $2^{a} \cdot r 2^{r /(a+1)}$. The algorithm for $m=8$ is shown by Figure 2 .

## 3 Application to the $\pi$-cipher

In order to apply this attack to the $\pi$-cipher, we need to solve the $m$-sum problem for the word-wise modular addition $\boxplus_{8}$. Wagner showed to solve the generalized birthday problem with a modular addition, and his trick also works for the word-wise modular addition. More precisely, we have to modify the join operator:

$$
L \boldsymbol{⿶}_{j} L^{\prime}=\left\{\left(l \boxplus_{8} l^{\prime},\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)\right) \mid(l, a) \in L,\left(l^{\prime}, a^{\prime}\right) \in L^{\prime},\left(l \boxplus_{8} l^{\prime}\right)^{[0 . j-1]}=0^{j}\right\} .
$$

Since the word-wise modular addition $\boxplus_{8}$ only has carries from the low order bits to the high order bits, when $x$ and $y$ have their $j$ low-order bits set to zero, $x \boxplus_{8} y$ also has $j$ low-order bits set to zero. Moreover, the join -4 can still be computed efficiently. We first negate the list $L$ and define $-L=\{(-l, a) \mid(l, a) \in L\}$, where $-l$ is the additive inverse with regard to the word-wise addition $\boxplus_{8}$, i.e. $l \boxplus_{8}(-l)=$ 0 . Then we sort $-L$ and $L^{\prime}$ according to the lower $j$ bits, and step through the lists in parallel. When an element of $-L$ and an element of $L^{\prime}$ agree on their low bit, the corresponding sum will have its low bits equal to zero. Therefore, this variant of Wagner's algorithm is suitable for a tag second-preimage attack on the $\pi$-cipher.

We give a full description of an attack on the $\pi$-cipher with $\omega=16$ in Algorithm 1 this attack uses 8 lists of size $2^{32}$ (illustrated by Figure 2), i.e. we consider an 8 -block message, with $2^{32}$ possibilities for each block. This gives a complexity of $2^{35}$. More generally, we can apply Wagner's attack to different versions of $\pi$-cipher (i.e. with different values of $\omega$ ), and several trade-offs between the message length and the attack complexity are possible. We give some parameters in Table 1

Table 1. Attack parameters

|  | Short messages |  |  |  | Optimal parameters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\omega$ | $m$ | $\|L\|$ | Complexity |  | $m$ | $\|L\|$ | Complexity |
| 16 | $2^{3}$ | $2^{32}$ | $2^{35}$ |  | $2^{11}$ | $2^{11}$ | $2^{22}$ |
| 32 | $2^{7}$ | $2^{32}$ | $2^{39}$ |  | $2^{16}$ | $2^{15}$ | $2^{31}$ |
| 64 | $2^{15}$ | $2^{32}$ | $2^{47}$ |  | $2^{22}$ | $2^{23}$ | $2^{45}$ |



Fig. 2. Wagner's algorithm for $m=8$

```
Algorithm 1 Short message attack with \(\omega=16\) and \(m=8\).
    for \(0 \leq i<8\) do
        for \(0 \leq j<2^{32}\) do
            \(L[i][j] \leftarrow(e(i,[j]), j)\)
        end for
    end for
    \(L[8] \leftarrow \operatorname{Merge}(L[0], L[1], 32)\)
    \(L[9] \leftarrow \operatorname{Merge}(L[2], L[3], 32)\)
    \(L[10] \leftarrow \operatorname{Merge}(L[4], L[5], 32)\)
    \(L[11] \leftarrow \operatorname{Merge}(L[6], L[7], 32)\)
    \(L[12] \leftarrow \operatorname{Merge}(L[8], L[9], 64)\)
    \(L[13] \leftarrow \operatorname{Merge}(L[10], L[11], 64)\)
    \(L[14] \leftarrow \operatorname{Merge}(L[12], L[13], 96)\)
    for all \(\left(l,\left(\left(\left(a_{1}, a_{2}\right),\left(a_{3}, a_{4}\right)\right),\left(\left(a_{5}, a_{6}\right),\left(a_{7}, a_{8}\right)\right)\right)\right) \in L[14]\) do
        if \(l=0\) then
            return \(\left[a_{1}\right]\left|\left|\left[a_{2}\right]\right|\right|\left[a_{3}\right]\left|\left|\left[a_{4}\right]\right|\right|\left[a_{5}\right]\left|\left|\left[a_{6}\right]\right|\right|\left[a_{7}\right]\left|\mid\left[a_{8}\right]\right.\)
        end if
    end for
    function \(\operatorname{Merge}\left(L, L^{\prime}, \tau\right)\)
        \(\operatorname{Sort}\left(L,-\right.\) low \(\left._{\tau}\right)\)
        \(\operatorname{Sort}\left(L^{\prime}, \operatorname{low}_{\tau}\right)\)
        \(i \leftarrow 0\)
        \(j \leftarrow 0\)
        while \(i<|L|\) and \(j<\left|L^{\prime}\right|\) do
            \((l, a) \leftarrow L[i]\)
            \(\left(l^{\prime}, a^{\prime}\right) \leftarrow L^{\prime}[j]\)
            if \(\operatorname{low}_{\tau}(-l)<\operatorname{low}_{\tau}\left(l^{\prime}\right)\) then
                    \(i \leftarrow i+1\)
            else if \(\operatorname{low}_{\tau}(-l)>\operatorname{low}_{\tau}\left(l^{\prime}\right)\) then
                    \(j \leftarrow j+1\)
            else
                    \(M \leftarrow M \cup\left\{\left(l \boxplus_{8} l^{\prime},\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)\right)\right\}\)
                end if
        end while
        return \(M\)
    end function
```
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