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## Impossible Differential Cryptanalysis

- Defined at the end of the 90's as a generalization of differential cryptanalysis
- Given a cipher $E=E_{0} \circ E^{\prime} \circ E_{1}$
- A differential $\left(\delta_{\mathrm{x}}, \delta_{\mathrm{y}}\right)$ over $E^{\prime}$ is impossible if

$$
\forall k \in \mathcal{K} \quad P_{x}\left[E^{\prime}\left(x \oplus \delta_{x}\right) \oplus E^{\prime}(x)=\delta_{y}\right]=0
$$

- Usually a set of differentials $\left(\delta_{x}, \delta_{y}\right) \in \Delta_{x} \times \Delta_{y}$ fulfill this property
- From this distinguisher on $E^{\prime}$, we can mount a key-recovery attack on $E$


## Complexity

The 3 phases of the key-recovery attack:

- Data generation: Generating pairs from a set of plaintexts
- Key sieving: Partial inversion with a selected number of potential candidate
- Exhaustive key search
- Recent publications: [BN-PS14], [Der16] Analyzing and minimizing the time complexity of the attack, with maximal focus on:
- the data generation phase
- and the key sieving phase
- This work: Providing a statistical analysis of the relation between the data complexity and the time complexity of:
- the exhaustive key-search phase


## Distinguishing Attack



- $\Delta_{X}$ and $\Delta_{Y}$ are linear (or affine) spaces
- $\left|\Delta_{Y}\right|=2^{n-\ell}$
- A structure: subset of $2^{t}$ elements in $\Delta_{X}$
- From a data complexity $N=2^{s+t}$, we can generate $N_{s}=2^{s+t}\left(2^{t}-1\right)$ pairs


## Classical Model: Binomial Distribution

- Statistical modeling similar to classical differential attacks
- Statistically a pair is a sample
- [ $T=i$ ]: the event that the differential(s) appears $i$ times
- Given $p=\left|\Delta_{Y}\right| 2^{-n}=2^{-\ell}$

Assuming a binomial distribution:

- For a random permutation,

$$
\begin{aligned}
P\left[T_{\mathcal{B}}=0\right] & =\binom{N_{S}}{0} p^{0}(1-p)^{N_{S}} \\
& =(1-p)^{N_{S}} \approx \exp \left[-N_{S} p\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

## Advantage of an ID Distinguisher

- Advantage of a key recovery attack: number of won key-bits
- False alarm error probability: ratio of random permutations for which the differential(s) is impossible

Wrong key randomization hypothesis:

- Advantage of a distinguishing attack: $a=\log _{2}(P[T=0])$

Binomial distribution and its approximation

- Advantage estimate

$$
\tilde{a}_{\mathcal{B}}=\frac{N_{S}}{\ln (2)}\left(2^{-\ell}\right)
$$

## Motivation and Contribution

- Experiments on 12-bit random permutations
- The data complexity is $2^{s+t}$
- â: the experimental advantage
- $a_{\mathcal{B}}$ : classical advantage
- $a_{\mathcal{M H}}$ : Advantage obtained with the theory developed in this paper

| $\ell$ | $s$ | $t$ | $s+t$ | $\hat{a}$ | $a_{\mathcal{B}}$ | $a_{\mathcal{M H}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1.25 | 1.27 | 1.25 |
| 7 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 4.99 | 5.07 | 4.99 |
| 9 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 1.11 | 1.26 | 1.11 |
| 9 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 4.44 | 5.05 | 4.44 |
| 9 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 17.73 | 20.22 | 17.77 |
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## Counting the Number of Pairs

To derive the new model: we do not manipulate pairs

$$
E^{\prime}\left(x \oplus \delta_{x}\right) \oplus E^{\prime}(x) \in \Delta_{y} \Leftrightarrow\left\lfloor\left(E^{\prime}\left(x \oplus \delta_{x}\right) \oplus E^{\prime}(x)\right\rfloor_{\ell}=0\right.
$$

- "Algorithm", inside a structure:
- Create a vector L of $\ell$ bits
- For all $x$, increment $L\left[\left\lfloor E^{\prime}(x)\right\rfloor_{\ell}\right]$
- Number of pairs is $S_{j}=\sum_{i=0}^{2^{e}-1}(L[i](L[i]-1)) / 2$
- Total number of pairs: Sum of $S_{j}$ for each structure


## Remarks:

- Inside a structure, the counting is similar to the counting in the multidimensional linear context
- Already used to show the relation between truncated differential and multidimensional linear attacks


## Focussing on ONE Structure

- Focusing on one structure:

$$
S_{j}=\sum_{i=0}^{2^{\ell}-1}(L[i](L[i]-1)) / 2
$$

- Impossible differential attacks: No pairs $\Leftrightarrow$ each $L[i]$ should be equal to 0 or 1
- L follows a multivariate hypergeometric distribution
- If the structure has $2^{t}$ plaintexts, $L$ should have:
- $2^{\ell}-2^{t}$ items equal to " 0 "
- and $2^{t}$ items equal to " 1 "

$$
P[\text { No pairs }]=\frac{\binom{2^{\ell}}{2^{t}}}{\binom{2^{2 n}}{2^{t}}}\left(2^{n-\ell}\right)^{2^{t}}
$$

## Multiple Structures

- Classical attacks: More than one structure
- If we assume independence between the structures we can derive the following estimate:

$$
\tilde{a}_{M H}=\frac{N_{S}}{\ln (2)}\left(2^{-\ell}-2^{-n}\right)
$$

- To compare with the classical estimate

$$
\tilde{a}_{B}=\frac{N_{S}}{\ln (2)}\left(2^{-\ell}\right)
$$

- In general, the independence assumption is accurate as long as

$$
N=2^{s+t} \ll 2^{\ell}
$$

- If we do not make this assumption, the model is more complicated and is based on the bi-multivariate hypergeometric distribution


## Bi-Multivariate Hypergeometric Distribution: Maximal Advantage



- The maximal advantage of an impossible differential distinguisher $\left(\delta_{X}, \delta_{Y}\right)$ is

$$
a_{\max }=\frac{\left(2^{n-\ell}-1\right)\left(2^{t}-1\right)}{2 \ln (2)}\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(2^{-\min (n, \ell+t)}\right)\right)
$$
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## Key-Recovery Attacks



- Attack on $r_{\text {in }}+r+r_{\text {out }}$ rounds
- $\Delta_{\text {in }}$ and $\Delta_{\text {out }}$ as the sets of all possible input respectively output differences
- $N^{A}=2^{s^{\prime}+t^{\prime}}$ : Data complexity of the key-recovery attack
$\ell^{\prime}$ bits
- When more than one structure is involved, the data complexity of a distinguishing and a key recovery attack is the same


## Experiments on a 16-bit Feistel

- Key-recovery attack on a 16-bit Feistel with 4 branches
- Taking an impossible differential distinguisher with

$$
\left|\Delta_{X}\right|=\left|\Delta_{Y}\right|=2^{4}
$$

- â: experimental advantage
- $\bar{a}$ : obtained in the paper
- $\tilde{a}_{\mathcal{B}}$ : classical advantage

| $\log (N)$ | $s^{\prime}$ | $t^{\prime}$ | $\hat{a}$ | $\bar{a}$ | $\tilde{a}_{\mathcal{B}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 0 | 10 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.68 |
| 11 | 0 | 11 | 2.53 | 2.54 | 2.70 |
| 12 | 0 | 12 | 10.14 | 10.14 | 10.82 |


| $\log (N)$ | $s^{\prime}$ | $t^{\prime}$ | $\hat{a}$ | $\bar{a}$ | $\tilde{a}_{\mathcal{B}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 2 | 8 | 2.53 | 2.54 | 2.71 |
| 11 | 3 | 8 | 5.01 | 5.07 | 5.41 |
| 12 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 8 | 9.81 | $10.14^{*}$ | 10.82 |

- Left: 2 rounds before the distinguisher, 2 rounds after
- Right: 1 round before the distinguisher, 2 rounds after
*:non-accuracy: due to the non-independence of the structures


## Only ONE Differential

- In the case of a single input differential $(t=1)$
- $N_{S}=2^{s+t-1}\left(2^{t}-1\right)$ can not be estimated as $N_{S} \approx 2^{s+2 t-1}$
- Maximal advantage: advantage using the full codebook
- Without the approximation, the maximal advantage is 0.72
- This advantage was previously estimated as 1.42
- The time complexity of the recent impossible differential attacks on SIMON is larger than estimated.


## LBlock and CRYPTON

- Key-recovery attack on 23 rounds of LBlock of Boura et al
- Data complexity of $2^{55.5}$
- The time complexity has been computed for an advantage of 30.6 bits
- Corrected advantage: 28.69 bits
- Key-recovery on 7 rounds of CRYPTON of Boura et al
- Data complexity: $2^{114.9}$ known plaintexts
- The time complexity has been computed for an advantage of 148.44 bits
- Corrected advantage: 145.45 bits
- This result does not influence the overall time complexity since it is not dominated by the exhaustive key-search


## Conclusion

- We analyze the advantage of impossible differential attacks
- We corrected it from

$$
\frac{N_{S}}{\ln (2)}\left(2^{-\ell}\right)
$$

to

$$
\frac{N_{S}}{\ln (2)}\left(2^{-\ell}-2^{-n}\right)
$$

- This result has an impact on the complexity of the exhaustive key search when $\ell$ is close to $n$
- We partially solve the problem of asymmetry between chosen plaintext and chosen ciphertext impossible differential attacks

