## 1 Problem 1

- 1. Yes. The polynomial is irreducible over GF(2), and it generates a maximal length LFSR sequence of length 255.
- 2. The maximum cycle length generated by  $x^8 + x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + 1$  is  $2^8 1 = 255$ . We can use the following program to verify the answer:

```
1 | \text{key} = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]
2 for i in range(1, 1000):
       if key == [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]:
3
4
           print(f'{i}: {key}')
5
      tmp = key[0]
6
      for j in range(7):
7
           key[j] = key[j + 1]
8
      key[7] = 0
9
       if tmp:
10
           key[3] = 1 ^ key[3]
11
           key[4] = 1 ^ key[4]
12
           key[5] = 1 ^ key[5]
13
           key[7] = 1 ^ key[7]
```

#### Output:

```
1 1: [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]

2 256: [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]

3 511: [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]

4 766: [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]
```

3. Not all irreducible polynomials are primitive polynomials. For example,  $x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1$  is irreducible over GF(2), but it is not primitive because it does not generate a maximal length LFSR sequence of length 15.

```
1 | \text{key} = [0, 0, 0, 1]
2 for i in range (1,20):
3
       if key == [0, 0, 0, 1]:
4
           print(f'{i}: {key}')
5
      tmp = key[0]
6
       for j in range(3):
7
           key[j] = key[j + 1]
8
      key[3] = 0
9
       if tmp:
10
           key[0] = 1 ^ key[0]
11
           key[1] = 1 ^ key[1]
12
           key[2] = 1 ^ key[2]
           key[3] = 1 ^ key[3]
13
```

#### Output:

```
1 1: [0, 0, 0, 1]

2 6: [0, 0, 0, 1]

3 11: [0, 0, 0, 1]

4 16: [0, 0, 0, 1]
```

## 2 Problem 2

#### 1. output:

20 0110101010111011000101111 32 33 34 Decrypted text: ATNYCUWEARESTRIVINGTOBEAGREATUNIVERSITYTHATTRANSCENDSDISCIPL 35 INARYDIVIDESTOSOLVETHEINCREASINGLYCOMPLEXPROBLEMSTHATTHEWORLDFACESWEWILLCONT 36 INUETOBEGUIDEDBYTHEIDEATHATWECANACHIEVESOMETHINGMUCHGREATERTOGETHERTHANWECAN INDIVIDUALLYAFTERALLTHATWASTHEIDEATHATLEDTOTHECREATIONOFOURUNIVERSITYINTHEFI 38 RSTPLACE

2. Yes. Given a 8-stage LFSR, we know:

```
\begin{cases} a_n = (a_{n+1}C_7 + a_{n+2}C_6 + a_{n+3}C_5 + \dots + a_{n+6}C_2 + a_{n+7}C_1 + a_{n+8}C_0) \mod 2 \\ a_{n+1} = (a_{n+2}C_7 + a_{n+3}C_6 + a_{n+4}C_5 + \dots + a_{n+7}C_2 + a_{n+8}C_1 + a_{n+9}C_0) \mod 2 \\ a_{n+2} = (a_{n+3}C_7 + a_{n+4}C_6 + a_{n+5}C_5 + \dots + a_{n+8}C_2 + a_{n+9}C_1 + a_{n+10}C_0) \mod 2 \\ a_{n+3} = (a_{n+4}C_7 + a_{n+5}C_6 + a_{n+6}C_5 + \dots + a_{n+9}C_2 + a_{n+10}C_1 + a_{n+11}C_0) \mod 2 \\ a_{n+4} = (a_{n+5}C_7 + a_{n+6}C_6 + a_{n+7}C_5 + \dots + a_{n+10}C_2 + a_{n+11}C_1 + a_{n+12}C_0) \mod 2 \\ a_{n+5} = (a_{n+6}C_7 + a_{n+7}C_6 + a_{n+8}C_5 + \dots + a_{n+11}C_2 + a_{n+12}C_1 + a_{n+13}C_0) \mod 2 \\ a_{n+6} = (a_{n+7}C_7 + a_{n+8}C_6 + a_{n+9}C_5 + \dots + a_{n+12}C_2 + a_{n+13}C_1 + a_{n+14}C_0) \mod 2 \\ a_{n+7} = (a_{n+8}C_7 + a_{n+9}C_6 + a_{n+10}C_5 + \dots + a_{n+13}C_2 + a_{n+14}C_1 + a_{n+15}C_0) \mod 2 \end{cases}
```

Knowing  $a_0, a_1, ..., a_{15}$ , can compute  $C_0, C_1, ..., C_7$ , thus can solve a 8-stage LFSR.

3.  $C_0 = 1$ ,  $C_1 = 0$ ,  $C_2 = 0$ ,  $C_3 = 0$ ,  $C_4 = 1$ ,  $C_5 = 1$ ,  $C_6 = 1$ ,  $C_7 = 0$ 

```
1 f16keyoutput = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0]
2 \mid \text{solution} = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]
3
4 for i in range (255):
5
       flg = 1
6
       for j in range(8):
7
           c = 0
8
           for k in range(8):
9
                c += solution[k] * f16keyoutput[j+1+k]
10
           if(f16keyoutput[j] != c%2):
11
                flg = 0
12
                break
13
       if flg:
14
           print(solution)
15
           break
16
17
       cnt = 0
18
       while(solution[cnt]):
19
           solution[cnt] = 0
20
           cnt += 1
21
       solution[cnt] = 1
```

Output:

```
1 [0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1]
```

## 3 Problem 3

1. output:

```
1 Naive algorithm:
2 (1, 2, 3, 4): 38688 (2, 3, 1, 4): 54314 (3, 4, 1, 2): 42889
3 (1, 2, 4, 3): 39161 (2, 3, 4, 1): 54895 (3, 4, 2, 1): 38954
4 (1, 3, 2, 4): 39184 (2, 4, 1, 3): 43461 (4, 1, 2, 3): 31338
5 (1, 3, 4, 2): 54739 (2, 4, 3, 1): 42571 (4, 1, 3, 2): 35229
6 (1, 4, 2, 3): 43078 (3, 1, 2, 4): 43135 (4, 2, 1, 3): 35416
7 (1, 4, 3, 2): 35168 (3, 1, 4, 2): 42929 (4, 2, 3, 1): 31271
8 (2, 1, 3, 4): 39189 (3, 2, 1, 4): 35047 (4, 3, 1, 2): 39013
  (2, 1, 4, 3): 58516 (3, 2, 4, 1): 42893 (4, 3, 2, 1): 38922
10 Average: 41666.6666666666664, Standard Deviation: 7168.251295740747
11
12 Fisher - Yates shuffle:
13 (1, 2, 3, 4): 41951 (2, 3, 1, 4): 41694 (3, 4, 1, 2): 41600
14 (1, 2, 4, 3): 41832 (2, 3, 4, 1): 41521 (3, 4, 2, 1): 41528
15 (1, 3, 2, 4): 41968 (2, 4, 1, 3): 41997 (4, 1, 2, 3): 41651
16 (1, 3, 4, 2): 42073 (2, 4, 3, 1): 41199 (4, 1, 3, 2): 41263
17 (1, 4, 2, 3): 41594 (3, 1, 2, 4): 41737 (4, 2, 1, 3): 41348
18 (1, 4, 3, 2): 41466 (3, 1, 4, 2): 41953 (4, 2, 3, 1): 41777
19 (2, 1, 3, 4): 41668 (3, 2, 1, 4): 41553 (4, 3, 1, 2): 41643
20 (2, 1, 4, 3): 41730 (3, 2, 4, 1): 41299 (4, 3, 2, 1): 41955
21 Average: 41666.66666666664, Standard Deviation: 240.0315372797685
```

- 2. Fisher-Yates shuffle is better because it demonstrates a more uniform distribution, as indicated by a lower standard deviation compared to the Naïve algorithm.
- 3. The Naïve algorithm is known to be biased because the probability of each element in each position is not equal, primarily due to the fact that it always selects from the entire range of indices for swapping. In contrast, the Fisher-Yates shuffle ensures each position can only swap with positions before it (or itself), leading to a more uniform and unbiased distribution.

# 4 Appendix

Package used in the program: numpy

```
1 pip install numpy
```