
From: Leo Ducas <leo.ducas1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 26, 2017 6:12 AM
To: pqc-comments
Cc: pqc-forum@list.nist.gov
Subject: OFFICIAL COMMENT: DRS

Dear Authors,

I am trying to understand and reproduce your reduction algorithm for signatures. I've had trouble with the document, where I think there are a few typos (marked by comments in the following python code).

My implementation ends up getting stuck in an infinite loop. While most signatures are produced within less than 10000 iterations of the reduction loop, one sample in (say) 30 does not stop before a million iteration.

I suspect that my implementation is still not conform to yours. In particular I would be grateful if you could specify more precisely the desired behavior for the rounded division $w[i]/D$ (toward 0 ? toward $-\infty$?). Please also let me know if the typo I suspect are indeed typos and if I addressed them properly.

Best regards
-- Leo Ducas

==== tentative re-implementation in python

```
import random
from numpy import zeros, int64
import sys

# params
n = 912
D = n
b = 28 // typos ? Sometime referred as B in the document
Nb = 16
N1 = 432
delta = 28

Samples = 100000

def RandomSign():
    return random.randint(0, 1)*2 -1

def KeyGen():
    L = Nb*[b] + N1 *[1] + (n - 1 - Nb - N1) * [0]
    random.shuffle(L)
    t = [D] + L
    S = zeros((n, n), dtype=int64)

    for i in xrange(n):      # Typo ? i should start at 0 ?
        S[i, i] = t[0]
```

```

    for j in xrange(1, n):
        S[i, (i+j) % n] = t[j] * RandomSign() # typo ? t is one-dimensional
return S

# For efficiency, I'm using directly vector operation rather than loops.
# I rewrote this assuming that the lign  $w_l \leftarrow w_l + q M_{\{i,j\}}$  is typoed,
# and that the correct instruction is  $w_l \leftarrow w_l + q M_{\{i,l\}}$ 

# Unlike C, Python does not round toward 0 but toward -oo, adding an option
# to force this behavior

ROUND_TOWARD_ZERO = True

def Sign(S, v):
    w = v
    i = 0
    it = 0
    while True:
        it += 1
        if it % 1000 == 0:
            print it,
            sys.stdout.flush()

        if ROUND_TOWARD_ZERO and w[i] < 0:
            q = -((-w[i])/D)
        else:
            q = w[i]/D

        w -= q * S[i]

        if (max([abs(x) for x in w]) < D):
            return w

        i = (i + 1) % n

def SignRandom(S):
    v = zeros(n, dtype=int64)
    f = 2**delta - 1
    for i in xrange(n):
        # Simulate random hash of fresh message
        # Always chosen positive, as the version with sign is commented out
        # in the reference implementation
        v[i] = random.randint(0, f)
    return Sign(S, v)

S = KeyGen()

for a in range(100):
    print
    print "Sample ", a
    SignRandom(S)

```

From: Leo Ducas <leo.ducas1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 10:42 PM
To: pqc-comments
Cc: pqc-forum@list.nist.gov; Han Zhao; Yang Yu; thomaspl@uow.edu.au
Subject: OFFICIAL COMMENT: DRS

Dear authors,

I think I have managed to reproduce your algorithm (it is now always terminating), I would nevertheless appreciate if you could confirm that I have properly interpreted potential typos in your report.

In addition, my colleagues and I have a further question regarding the specifications of your scheme:

In your PKC2008 paper, the message was hashed to a symmetric space $[-W, W]^n$, but this is less clear in the NIST document. It seems that the reference implementation samples in $[0, W]^n$ for $W=2^{28}$. More precisely, there is a line to also randomize the sign (line 312 of `char_key_conv.h`) but it has been commented out.

Could you please clarify the intended hashing space ?

Thanks in advance

-- Leo Ducas, Yang Yu and Han Zhao

From: Thomas Plantard <thomaspl@uow.edu.au>
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 3:34 AM
To: Leo Ducas; pqc-comments
Cc: pqc-forum@list.nist.gov; Han Zhao; Yang Yu
Subject: Re: OFFICIAL COMMENT: DRS

Dear Leo, Yang and Han,
regarding the typos, I think Arnaud answered it or should answer it really soon.
Sorry if there was too many for understanding clearly our scheme.
As I told you, I can confirm that our "intentions" was a signed message.
However, if you think that a positive only message could be an issue, please do not hesitate to communicate it (specially to us) as at this stage we want to minimize the number of corrections we need to do to our scheme. I am not sure of the process to modify submission: we may have to keep it to the necessary change only.
Please do not hesitate if you have further questions.
Best regards.
Thomas Plantard.
