

# A variant of Wiener's attack on RSA

Andrej Dujella

Department of Mathematics  
University of Zagreb, Croatia  
e-mail: [duje@math.hr](mailto:duje@math.hr)  
URL: <http://web.math.hr/~duje/>

## **RSA cryptosystem - Rivest, Shamir, Adleman (1978)**

$n = p \cdot q$ ,  $p$  and  $q$  are large primes

$$\varphi(n) = (p - 1)(q - 1) = n - p - q + 1$$

public exponent  $e$ ,  $\gcd(e, \varphi(n)) = 1$

secret exponent  $d$ ,  $ed \equiv 1 \pmod{\varphi(n)}$

In a typical RSA:  $p$  and  $q$  have approximately the same number of bits, and  $e < n$ .

encryption:  $C = M^e \bmod n$

decryption:  $M = C^d \bmod n$

To speed up the RSA decryption one may try to use small secret decryption exponent  $d$ . The choice of a small  $d$  is especially interesting when there is a large difference in computing power between two communicating devices, e.g. in communication between a smart card and a larger computer.

In this situation, it would be desirable:

- smart card - small secret exponent

- larger computer - small public exponent

to reduce the processing required in the smart card.

## Wiener (1990) - attack on RSA with small $d$ :

$$ed - k\varphi(n) = 1$$

$$\varphi(n) \approx n \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{k}{d} \approx \frac{e}{n}$$

Assume that  $p < q < 2p$ . If  $d < \frac{1}{3}n^{0.25}$ , then

$$\left| \frac{k}{d} - \frac{e}{n} \right| < \frac{1}{2d^2}.$$

By classical Legendre's theorem,  $d$  is the denominator of some convergent  $p_m/q_m$  of the continued fraction expansion of  $e/n$ , and therefore  $d$  can be computed efficiently from the public key  $(n, e)$ .

Total number of convergents is of order  $O(\log n)$ ; a convergent can be tested in polynomial time.

**Verheul and van Tilborg (1997):** An extension of Wiener's attack that allows the RSA cryptosystem to be broken when  $d$  is a few bits longer than  $n^{0.25}$ . For  $d > n^{0.25}$  their attack needs to do an exhaustive search for about  $2t + 8$  bits (under reasonable assumptions on involved partial convergents), where  $t = \log_2(d/n^{0.25})$ .

**Boneh and Durfee (1999),**

**Blömer and May (2001):**

Attacks based on Coppersmith's lattice-based technique for finding small roots of modular polynomials equations using LLL-algorithm. The attacks works (heuristically, but practically) if  $d < n^{0.292}$ .

The conjecture is that the right bound below which a typical version of RSA is insecure is  $d < n^{0.5}$ .

**D. (2004):** A slight modification of the Verheul and van Tilborg attack, based on Worley's result from 1981 on Diophantine approximations, which implies that all rationals  $p/q$  satisfying the inequality

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{p}{q} \right| < \frac{c}{q^2},$$

for a positive real number  $c$ , are given by

$$\frac{p}{q} = \frac{rp_{m+1} \pm sp_m}{rq_{m+1} \pm sq_m}$$

for some  $m \geq -1$  and nonnegative integers  $r$  and  $s$  such that  $rs < 2c$ .

**D. and Ibrahimpašić (2008):** Worley's result is sharp, in the sense that the condition  $rs < 2c$  cannot be replaced by  $rs < (2 - \varepsilon)c$  for any  $\varepsilon$ .

In both mentioned extensions of Wiener's attack, the candidates for the secret exponent are of the form  $d = rq_{m+1} + sq_m$ . We test all possibilities for  $d$ , and number of possibilities is roughly (number of possibilities for  $r$ )  $\times$  (number of possibilities for  $s$ ), which is  $O(D^2)$ , where  $d = Dn^{0.25}$ .

More precisely, number of possible pairs  $(r, s)$  in Verheul and van Tilborg attack is  $O(D^2 A^2)$ , where  $A = \max\{a_i : i = m+1, m+2, m+3\}$ , while in our variant number of pairs is  $O(D^2 \log A)$  (and also  $O(D^2 \log D)$ ).

Another modification of the Verheul and van Tilborg attack has been recently proposed Sun, Wu and Chen. It requires (heuristically) an exhaustive search for about  $2t - 10$  bits, so its complexity is also  $O(D^2)$ . We cannot expect drastic improvements here, since, by a result of Steinfeld, Contini, Wang and Pieprzyk from 2005, there does not exist an attack in this class with subexponential run-time.

## Testing

There are two principal methods for testing:

1) compute  $p$  and  $q$  assuming  $d$  is correct guess:

$$\varphi(n) = (de - 1)/k, \quad p + q = n + 1 - \varphi(n),$$

$$(p - q)^2 = (p + q)^2 - 4n;$$

2) test the congruence  $(M^e)^d \equiv M \pmod{n}$ ,  
say for  $M = 2$ .



Here we present a new idea, which is to apply “meet-in-the-middle” to this second test.

We want to test whether  $2^{e(rq_m+1+sq_m)} \equiv 2 \pmod{n}$ .

Note that  $m$  is (almost) fixed. Let  $m'$  be the largest odd integer such that

$$\frac{p_{m'}}{q_{m'}} > \frac{e}{n} + \frac{2.122e}{n\sqrt{n}}.$$

Then  $m \in \{m', m' + 1, m' + 2\}$ .

Let  $2^{eq_m+1} \bmod n = a$ ,  $(2^{eq_m})^{-1} \bmod n = b$ . Then we test the congruence  $a^r \equiv 2b^s \pmod{n}$ .

We can do it by computing  $a^r \bmod n$  for all  $r$ , sorting the list of results, and then computing  $2b^s \bmod n$  for each  $s$  one at a time, and checking if the result appears in the sorted list.

This decrease the time complexity of testings phase to  $O(D \log D)$  (with the space complexity  $O(D)$ ).

We have implemented the proposed attack in PARI and C++ (with V. Petričević), and it works efficiently for values of  $D$  up to  $2^{30}$ , i.e. for  $d < 2^{30}n^{0.25}$ .

For larger values of  $D$  the memory requirements become too demanded.

| $\log_2 n$ | $\log_2(2^{30}n^{0.25})$ | $\log_2(n^{0.292})$ |
|------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 512        | 158                      | 150                 |
| 768        | 222                      | 224                 |
| 1024       | 286                      | 299                 |
| 2048       | 542                      | 598                 |

A space-time tradeoff might be possible, by using unsymmetrical variants of Worley's result (with different bounds on  $r$  and  $s$ ).

| bound for $r$ | bound for $s$ | chance of success |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| $4D$          | $4D$          | 98%               |
| $2D$          | $2D$          | 89%               |
| $D$           | $D$           | 65%               |
| $D$           | $4D$          | 86%               |
| $4D$          | $D$           | 74%               |
| $D/2$         | $2D$          | 70%               |
| $2D$          | $D/2$         | 47%               |
| $D/4$         | $4D$          | 54%               |
| $4D$          | $D/4$         | 28%               |

The attack can be slightly improved by using better approximations to  $\frac{k}{d}$ , e.g.  $\frac{e}{n+1-2\sqrt{n}}$  instead of  $\frac{e}{n}$ .

Implementation issues: hash functions instead of sorting.

With these improvements we hope that for 1024-bits RSA modulus  $n$ , the range in which our attack can be applied might be comparable with known attacks based on LLL-algorithm.