

---

# Assignment 2: Elliptic curve signatures (Ed25519)

Muhammad Ayain Fida Rana  
Department of Computer Science and Technology  
University of Cambridge  
15 JJ Thomson Avenue, Cambridge CB3 0FD, United Kingdom  
mafr2@cam.ac.uk

## 1 Introduction

In this assignment, I have implemented an elliptic curve signature scheme called Ed25519 from scratch. My implementation supports both standard point addition and a relatively faster (less costly) version using extended projective coordinates. My implementation closely follows RFC 8032 (Josefsson & Liusvaara, 2017) for the API design and the Hisil et al. (2008) work on twisted Edwards curves for a faster algorithm point addition. The code is publicly available at <https://github.com/ayainfida/p79-assignment2-ed25519>.

## 2 Implementation Architecture

The core implementation is split across modular components, briefly introduced here, with key design choices discussed in Section 3.

**Field Elements (field.py).** Defines an integer modulo prime  $p$  field, `ModInt`, supporting arithmetic operations.

**Point (point.py).** Implements point addition for the Edwards curve, as well as computing the  $x$ -coordinate.

**Primitives (primitives.py).** Defines type safe wrapper classes around raw byte strings for API type safety.

**Encoding/Decoding (encoding.py).** Handles little-endian byte conversion, point compression/decompression, and scalar clamping.

**Double-and-Add (methods.py).** Provides a scalar multiplication algorithm supporting both standard and extended coordinate systems, implemented recursively.

**Ed25519 (ed25519.py).** Exposes a public Ed25519 interface for signing and verification.

**Defaults (defaults.py).** Defines shared constants used throughout the implementation.

## 3 Implementation Design Choices

### 3.1 Field Representations

Based on the last assignment's feedback and discussion with Martin, this time I designed a two-tier class hierarchy for field arithmetic: an immutable `ModInt` base class, with both `FieldElement` (modulo  $p = 2^{255} - 19$ ) and `FieldQ` (modulo  $q \approx 2^{252}$ ) inheriting from it. The `ModInt` class ensures that every value is reduced modulo its prime during initialization.

As both classes represent  $\mathbb{F}_p$  and  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , I fixed the corresponding prime during initialization, allowing for a single-argument construction. Using separate classes distinguishes both

fields at the type level and avoids using the incorrect modulus during scalar multiplication, signing, and verification.

The `ModInt` class supports operator overloading, making the code much more interpretable and less prone to arithmetic errors compared to my last assignment, where I had separate functions for field arithmetic (e.g., `fadd`). This is evident from the following example:

$$\frac{x_1y_2 + x_2y_1}{1 + dx_1x_2y_1y_2}$$

```
(A1): fdiv(fadd(fmul(x_1, y_2), fmul(x_2, y_1)),
          fsub(1, fmul(d, fmul(x_1, fmul(x_2, fmul(y_1, y_2))
(A2): ((x_1 * y_2) * (x_2 * y_1)) / (1 + d * x_1 * x_2 * y_1 * y_2))
```

I also implemented explicit field compatibility checks before every arithmetic operation, raising an error if two elements belong to different fields.

```
def __is_field_element(self, other: object):
    if not isinstance(other, ModInt):
        raise TypeError("Elements must be ModInts.")
    if self.p != other.p:
        raise ValueError("Elements must belong to the same field.")
```

### 3.2 Point Representations

To represent a point on the Edwards curve  $-x^2 + y^2 = 1 + dx^2y^2 \pmod{p}$ , I introduced two representations: `Point`<sup>1</sup> and `ExtendedPoint`<sup>2</sup>. The `Point` representation is used primarily at the API boundary (e.g., compression and decompression). Its constructor takes the  $y$ -coordinate and the sign bit of  $x$ , and reconstructs the corresponding  $x$ -coordinate accordingly:

$$x = \pm \sqrt{\frac{y^2 - 1}{dy^2 + 1}}$$

To compute the square root, I implemented a `sqrt` operation for `ModInt` using the exponentiation-based method applicable to primes  $p \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$ , as described in RFC 8032 (Josefsson & Liusvaara, 2017). Additionally, point addition is implemented as:

$$(x_1, y_1) + (x_2, y_2) = \left( \frac{x_1y_2 + x_2y_1}{1 + dx_1x_2y_1y_2}, \frac{x_1x_2 + y_1y_2}{1 - dx_1x_2y_1y_2} \right)$$

As this formula is complete, no separate doubling formula is required, and is implemented simply as `self + self`. Both  $x$  and  $y$  are instances of `FieldElement`, so this algebraic expression can be evaluated directly due to operator overloading.

The division operator in `FieldElement` translates into a field inversion followed by multiplication, and since double-and-add repeatedly applies point additions and doublings, this results in many costly inversions. This motivated the introduction of `ExtendedPoint`, where point additions and doublings avoid repeated inversions, deferring a single inversion until conversion back to `Point` form. For `ExtendedPoint`, I followed the addition formulas from Hisil et al. (2008)<sup>3</sup> for the case  $a = -1$ , which matches the Ed25519 curve equation.

My Ed25519 API supports both standard and fast scalar multiplication through the enum `ED25519ScalarMultAlgorithm`, passed to the `ED25519` constructor. For the latter, the `BASE_POINT`<sup>4</sup> is first converted to `ExtendedPoint`, and the result is converted back to `Point`.

<sup>1</sup>of the form  $(x, y)$

<sup>2</sup>extended projective coordinates  $(X : Y : Z : T)$

<sup>3</sup>Twisted Edwards curve is defined as  $ax^2 + y^2 = 1 + dx^2y^2$

<sup>4</sup>of the type `Point`

---

```

if self.algorithm == ED25519ScalarMultAlgorithm.SCALAR_MULT:
    result = double_and_add(k, Pt)
elif self.algorithm == ED25519ScalarMultAlgorithm.FAST_SCALAR_MULT:
    result = double_and_add(k, Pt.to_extended_coordinates())
else:
    raise ValueError(f"Unsupported algorithm: {self.algorithm}")

```

This means that the `double_and_add` function supports both point types:

```
def double_and_add(k: int, Pt: Point | ExtendedPoint) -> Point | ExtendedPoint
```

Since it is implemented recursively, the final result preserves the type of input point.

### 3.3 Cryptographic Primitives

I really liked the idea of using Type States in Daniel's lecture on *Software Engineering Principles*. These type states enforce correct API usage and preserve logical guarantees throughout the program's lifetime. As a result, for this assignment, rather than passing raw bytes, I introduced dataclasses: `Key`, `Message`, and `Signature`. For further distinction between public and private keys, I introduced explicit wrapper types: `PrivateKey` and `PublicKey`. All of these primitive classes are immutable, which prevents accidental mutation during processing.

By introducing distinct types, misuse of raw bytes<sup>5</sup> is avoided: a function expecting a `PublicKey` will not accept a `PrivateKey`. This in turn makes function signatures self-documenting: e.g., the signing function requires a `PrivateKey`, while verification requires a `PublicKey`:

```

def sign(self, msg: Message, sk: PrivateKey) -> Signature
def verify(self, msg: Message, sig: Signature, pk: PublicKey) -> bool

```

Furthermore, I also introduced a `LengthError` exception to handle invalid length inputs at the API boundaries, making error messages more user-friendly and self-expressive.

## 4 Testing and Validation

Individual tests are documented in `tests/*.py`; here, I provide a high-level overview of the testing strategy.

**Ed25519 API Testing.** Validated my implementation against the test vectors published in RFC 8032 (Josefsson & Liusvaara, 2017) and Project Wycheproof (McCarney et al., 2016). Tested type validation, length validation, as well as unforgeability, authenticity, integrity, and determinism.

**Point Addition Agreement.** Verified that both standard and fast point addition produce identical results for the same inputs.

**Encoding.** Tested point compression/decompression round-trip property, MSB masking for  $y$ -coordinates and scalar clamping (Josefsson & Liusvaara, 2017).

**Finite Field Operations** Tested for correctness of the defined operations and verified algebraic properties (commutativity, associativity, identity, inverse) for addition and multiplication.

**Group Law Operations** Validated the results of point addition and doubling are valid points on curve, along with edge cases like the point at infinity.

---

<sup>5</sup>At the very core, key, signature, and message are of type bytes

---

## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 Limitations and Production Considerations

I used Python’s built-in `int` type for field arithmetic over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , which is not constant-time. This means that operations on values close to  $p$  may take longer than on smaller values, potentially leaking information through timing-based side-channel attacks. Moreover, I have implemented the double-and-add algorithm in a recursive fashion that has data-dependent branches, which could potentially leak scalar bits. For a production-quality implementation, constant-time field arithmetic, uniform memory accesses, and avoidance of data-dependent branches<sup>6</sup>.

In addition to these timing attacks, there are a few validation gaps in my implementation. I did not explicitly check that a decoded public key is in the prime-order subgroup. Similarly, point decompression stores the encoded  $y$ -coordinate as a `FieldElement`, reducing it modulo  $p$ , thereby not rejecting non-canonical encodings. These were fine to not be considered for assignment purposes, but production-quality requires stricter validation.

### 5.2 Observations and Uncertainties

During testing, I intentionally passed invalid types to the `verify` and `sign` methods to ensure that a `TypeError` is raised. However, this failed the static type checker<sup>7</sup>, since the test itself deliberately violates the function’s type signature. To proceed, I added `# type: ignore` to the corresponding lines in the test files. I faced a similar issue with the `double_and_add` function. Given that it supports both `Point` and `ExtendedPoint` types and preserves the return type accordingly at runtime, the static type checker did not recognize this, and I had to explicitly add the `ignore` comment; otherwise, the code would have been full of instance checks.

According to Hisil et al. (2008), `ExtendedPoint` was supposed to be faster, but I did not see any differences in test case timings; maybe it is noticeable at a finer granularity. I chose to add an enum option for selecting the point addition method, which was useful for testing but is not standard practice.

Moreover, I first added length checks in the primitive types, which did not allow invalid byte lengths, but this raised exceptions even before executing the function. Therefore, I removed these checks and explicitly took them into account in my API-exposed functions—I wonder what the best way to do this is!

## References

- Huseyin Hisil, Kenneth Koon-Ho Wong, Gary Carter, and Ed Dawson. Twisted edwards curves revisited. In *International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security*, pp. 326–343. Springer, 2008.
- Simon Josefsson and Ilari Liusvaara. Edwards-Curve Digital Signature Algorithm (EdDSA). RFC 8032, January 2017. URL <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8032>.
- Daniel McCarney, Filippo Valsorda, Samuel Lucas, and Andrew Ayer. Project wycheproof: Test vectors for cryptographic implementations. <https://github.com/C2SP/wycheproof>, 2016.

---

<sup>6</sup>similar to the Montgomery ladder, which has a fixed sequence of operations

<sup>7</sup>uv run ty check