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## Motivation

## BIKE Key Generation

Require: BIKE parameters $n, w, \ell$.
Ensure: Private key ( $h_{0}, h_{1}, \sigma$ ) and public key $h$.
1: Generate $\left(h_{0}, h_{1}\right) \stackrel{5}{\leftarrow} \mathcal{R}^{2}$ both of odd weight $\left|h_{0}\right|=\left|h_{1}\right|=w / 2$.
 at random.
3: Compute $h \leftarrow h_{1} h_{0}^{-1}$.
4: Return ( $h_{0}, h_{1}, \sigma$ ) and $h$.

## NTRU Key Generation

Require: NTRU parameters $n, p, q$.
Ensure: Priv. key ( $f, f_{p}, f_{q}$ ), pub. key $h$.
1: Generate $f \stackrel{5}{\leftarrow} \mathcal{L}_{f}$
2: Generate $g \stackrel{s}{\leftarrow} \mathcal{L}_{g}$
3: Compute $f_{p} \leftarrow 1 / f$ in $S_{3}$
4: Compute $f_{q} \leftarrow 1 / f$ in $S_{q}$
5: Compute $g \leftarrow 3 \cdot g \cdot f_{g}$ in $R_{q}$
6: Compute $h_{q} \leftarrow 1 / h$ in $S_{q}$
7: Return $\left(f, f_{p}, f_{q}\right)$ and $h$.

## sNTRUp Key Generation

Require: sNTRUp parameter $q$.
Ensure: Priv. key ( $f, g_{\text {inv }}$ ), pub. key $h$.
repeat
Generate $g \stackrel{\mathfrak{s}}{\leftarrow} R, g$ small
until $g$ is invertible in $R_{3}$
Generate $f \stackrel{s}{\leftarrow}$ Short
Compute $g_{\text {inv }} \leftarrow 1 / g$ in $R_{3}$
Compute $h \leftarrow g /(3 \cdot f)$ in $R_{q}$
7: Return $\left(f, g_{\text {inv }}\right)$ and $h$.

Observation: secret polynomials are inverted.
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## Motivation

## Processing secrets requires protection against side-channel adversaries.

Constant time implementations counter timing attacks. Embedded devices: Attacker can measure power consumption.

## Our Work

1. First procedure for masking polynomial inversion.
2. It is efficient.
3. Possible at arbitrary masking order.

## Conceptual Considerations

## Attacker Model

- All inversions happen in key generation, which is executed once.
- The only valid attack is a (profiled) Simple Power Analysis with one attack measurement.


## Shuffling and Masking

- Standard countermeasure: shuffling (randomizing the execution order of steps within the inversion procedure)
- Shuffling: highly non-trivial, probably infeasible for optimized inversion implementations.
- Masking: very efficient against SPA, possible on arithmetic shares using Fermat inversion (expensive)
- Usually, first-order masking is sufficient against realistic attackers.


## Masking?

- Based on Shamir's secret sharing
- Hiding secret values from the CPU that processes it by splitting them up in multiple random shares
- Usual in PQC: boolean and additive masking
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$$
a+b=a_{1}+b_{1}+a_{2}+b_{2}
$$
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In which masking domain is polynomial inversion linear?
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## Polynomial-Multiplicative Masking

## Old Idea: Multiplicative Masking

New: Shares are polynomials, whose polynomial product yields the secret polynomial.

## Old problem: Masking zero.

No new problem: The zero polynomial is not invertible and will never be masked.

## Additive to Polynomial Multiplicative Conversion



$a=\quad \times \quad$|  |
| :--- |
|  |
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## Invertibility: Two Cases

## BIKE and NTRU

- There is an easy way of sampling invertible polynomials.
- BIKE: The polynomial must have an odd weight (sample uniform, check \& correct).
- NTRU: All non-zero polynomials are invertible (sample uniform).


## Invertibility: Two Cases

## Streamlined NTRU Prime

## BIKE and NTRU

- There is an easy way of sampling invertible polynomials.
- BIKE: The polynomial must have an odd weight (sample uniform, check \& correct).
- NTRU: All non-zero polynomials are invertible (sample uniform).
- No easy way to sample invertible polynomials
- Even the (shared) input polynomial might not be invertible
- Invertibility check is done by inverting
- Uniform random polynomials are invertible with high probability
- Solution:

1. Sample uniform random $r$
2. If inversion of $r a_{0}+r a_{1}$ fails, $a$ or $r$ were not invertible, start over
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## Multiplicative to Additive Conversion

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p= a \\
& p= \times \\
&+\square a_{1}+ \\
& a_{1}+ \\
& a_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial
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- Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial
- Cost: 2 polynomial multiplications


## Multiplicative to Additive Conversion

| $p=$ | $a$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $p$ | $=\left(\begin{array}{\|c}a_{1} \\ p\end{array}+\begin{array}{\|c}a_{2} \\ m\end{array}\right.$ |
| $p=$$m_{1}$ <br> $m_{1} m_{1} m_{2}$ <br> $a_{2} m_{1} m_{2}$ |  |
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## Multiplicative to Additive Conversion

| $p=$ | $a$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $p$ | $=\left(\begin{array}{\|c}a_{1} \\ p\end{array}+\begin{array}{\|c}a_{2} \\ m\end{array}\right.$ |
| $p=$$m_{1} m_{1} m_{2}$ <br> $m_{2} m_{1} m_{2}$ |  |

- Idea: usually the inverted polynomial is multiplied by another polynomial
- Cost: 4 polynomial multiplications
- Higher orders: re-sharing needed as intermediate steps
- Multiplication of two secret polynomials in additive domain would require re-sharing already for first order!


## Side-Channel Evaluation

## Additive to Polynomial-Multiplicative Conversion with implicit Inversion


t-test (2000 traces) without randomness: leakage

t-test (100 000 traces) with randomness: no leakage

More evaluation: see the paper.

## Performance Evaluation

| NTRU-HPS-2048677 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ord. $d$ | A2M Inversion |  |  | M2A Mul. |  |  | M2A Conversion |  |  |
|  | Cydes | muL |  | Cycles | MUL | ADD | Cycles | MUL | ADD |
| 1 | 1723778 | 2 | 1 | 885773 | 4 | 4 | 486165 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 2372502 | 5 | 1 | 2090841 | 9 | 12 | 1230767 | 5 |  |
| 3 | 3211410 |  | 1 | 3802004 | 16 | 24 | 2238833 | 9 | 15 |
| 4 | 4260732 | 14 | 1 | 6057128 | 25 | 40 | 3503189 | 14 | 24 |
| 5 | 5524861 | 20 | 1 | 8848501 | 36 | 60 | 5049140 | 20 | 35 |
| 6 | 6991050 | 27 | 1 | 12097869 | 49 | 84 | 6859272 | 27 | 48 |
| Unprotected operations: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Addition: |  |  |  |  | 18340 clock cycles |  |  |  |  |
| - Multiplication: |  |  |  |  | 201383 clock cycles |  |  |  |  |
| - Inversion: |  |  |  |  | 1273864 clock cycles |  |  |  |  |

## Performance Evaluation

| Ord. $d$ | A2M Inversion |  |  | M2A Mul. |  |  | M2A Conversion |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cycles | MUL | INV | Cycles | MUL | ADD | Cycles | MUL | ADD |
| 1 | 1723778 | 2 | 1 | 885773 | 4 | 4 | 486165 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 2372502 | 5 | 1 | 2090841 | 9 | 12 | 1230767 | 5 | 8 |
| 3 | 3211410 | 9 | 1 | 3802004 | 16 | 24 | 2238833 | 9 | 15 |
| 4 | 4260732 | 14 | 1 | 6057128 | 25 | 40 | 3503189 | 14 | 24 |
| 5 | 5524861 | 20 | 1 | 8848501 | 36 | 60 | 5049140 | 20 | 35 |
| 6 | 6991050 | 27 | 1 | 12097869 | 49 | 84 | 6859272 | 27 | 48 |

Unprotected operations:

- Addition: 18340 clock cycles
- Multiplication:

201383 clock cycles

- Inversion: 1273864 clock cycles
$1^{\text {st }}$ order A 2 M with inversion vs unprotected inversion: $35 \%$ overhead


## Performance Evaluation

|  | A2M Inversion |  |  | M2A Mul. |  |  | M2A Conversion |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ord. $d$ | Cycles | MUL | INV | Cycles | MUL | ADD | Cycles | MUL | ADD |
| 1 | 1723778 | 2 | 1 | 885773 | 4 | 4 | 486165 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 2372502 | 5 | 1 | 2090841 | 9 | 12 | 1230767 | 5 | 8 |
| 3 | 3211410 | 9 | 1 | 3802004 | 16 | 24 | 2238833 | 9 | 15 |
| 4 | 4260732 | 14 | 1 | 6057128 | 25 | 40 | 3503189 | 14 | 24 |
| 5 | 5524861 | 20 | 1 | 8848501 | 36 | 60 | 5049140 | 20 | 35 |
| 6 | 6991050 | 27 | 1 | 12097869 | 49 | 84 | 6859272 | 27 | 48 |

Unprotected operations:

- Addition:
- Multiplication:
- Inversion: 18340 clock cycles 201383 clock cycles 1273864 clock cycles


## BIKE Level 1

| Ord. $d$ | A2M Inversion |  |  | M2A Mul. |  |  | M2A Conversion |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cycles | MUL | INV | Cycles | MUL | ADD | Cycles | MUL | ADD |
| 1 | 21317392 | 2 | 1 | 4240017 | 4 | 4 | 2131405 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 24487146 | 5 | 1 | 9584999 | 9 | 12 | 5342630 | 5 | 8 |
| 3 | 28736397 | 9 | 1 | 17068753 | 16 | 24 | 9622491 | 9 | 15 |
| 4 | 34007250 | 14 | 1 | 26740596 | 25 | 40 | 14994627 | 14 | 24 |
| 5 | 40275530 | 20 | 1 | 38507790 | 36 | 60 | 21419851 | 20 | 35 |
| 6 | 47744390 | 27 | 1 | 52493255 | 49 | 84 | 28945019 | 27 | 48 |

Unprotected operations:

- Addition:
- Multiplication:
- Inversion:
$1^{\text {st }}$ order A 2 M with inversion vs unprotected inversion: $35 \%$ overhead
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| :---: |
| Ord. $d$ |

Unprotected operations:
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## BIKE Level 1

| Ord. $d$ | A2M Inversion |  |  | M2A Mul. |  |  | M2A Conversion |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cycles | MUL | INV | Cycles | MUL | ADD | Cycles | MUL | ADD |
| 1 | 21317392 | 2 | 1 | 4240017 | 4 | 4 | 2131405 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 24487146 | 5 | 1 | 9584999 | 9 | 12 | 5342630 | 5 | 8 |
| 3 | 28736397 | 9 | 1 | 17068753 | 16 | 24 | 9622491 | 9 | 15 |
| 4 | 34007250 | 14 | 1 | 26740596 | 25 | 40 | 14994627 | 14 | 24 |
| 5 | 40275530 | 20 | 1 | 38507790 | 36 | 60 | 21419851 | 20 | 35 |
| 6 | 47744390 | 27 | 1 | 52493255 | 49 | 84 | 28945019 | 27 | 48 |

Unprotected operations:

- Addition:
- Multiplication:
- Inversion:
$1^{\text {st }}$ order A 2 M with inversion vs unprotected inversion: $11 \%$ overhead
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## Conclusion

- Efficient method for masking polynomial inversion to counter Simple Power Analysis
- In the paper:
- M2A conversion without implicit multiplication
- Generalization to higher masking orders
- Recent work by Coron et al. ${ }^{1}$ shows theoretical vulnerability of A2M algorithm starting from third order
- Can be mitigated with low cost (more random sampling)
- Higher-order single-trace SPA attackers are rather theoretical
- Future work: formal proofs of our algorithms
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