

a verier ve s aver - and s and seriouring you my the - c for our further communications. Trully yours B."

PKI - Public Key Infrastructure is created as a Trusted Third Party - TTP to confirm that Puk belongs to the concrete person and to anybody else. 010 002 PKI TimeStamp Schnorr Signature Scheme (S-Sig). In general, to create a signature on the message of any finite length M parties are using cryptographic secure H-function (message digest). In Octave we use H-function >> hd28('...')% the input '...' of this function represents a string of symbols between the commas. % the output of this function is decimal number having at most 28 bits. Let *M* be a message in string format to be signed by Alice and sent to Bob: >> M='Hello Bob' For signature creation Alice uses public parameters PP=(p, g) and Alice's key pair is  $PrK_A = x$ ,  $PuK_A = a = g^x \mod p$ . Alice chooses at random u, 1 < u < p-1 and computes first component r of his signature:  $r=g^u \mod p$ . (2.19)Alice computes H-function value h and second component s of her signature:  $h=\mathbf{H}(M||r)$ . (2.20) $s=u+xh \mod (p-1)$ . (2.21)Alice's signature on h is  $\sigma = (r, s)$ . Then Alice sends M and  $\sigma$  to Bob. After receiving M' and  $\sigma$ , **Bob** according to (2.20) computes h' $h'=\mathbf{H}(M'||r),$ and verifies if  $g^s \mod p = ra^{h'} \mod p$ . (2.22)V1 V2 Symbolically this verification function we denote by  $\operatorname{Ver}(a,\sigma,h') = \operatorname{V} \in \{ \operatorname{True}, \operatorname{False} \} \equiv \{ 1, 0 \}. \quad (2.23)$ This function yields *True* if (2.22) is valid if: h=h' and  $PuK_A = a = F(PrK_A) = a^x \mod p$ . and: *M*=*M*′ Non-Interactive Zero Knowledge Proof - NIZKP PP = (p, g). In blockchain applications **#:** NIZKP of knowledge **x**:  $\mathfrak{B}$ : PuK<sub>A</sub> = a  $PrK_A = x = randi(p-1)$ Ver(Cert<sub>A</sub>, PuK<sub>CA</sub>)=True  $PuK_A = a$  $PuK_A = a = g^x \mod p$ CRL, OCSP **h**, (**r**, **s**), Cert<sub>A</sub> **1.** Computes *r* for random number *i*: Verifies: *i*=randi(*p*-1)  $g^s = ra^h \mod p$  $r=g^i \mod p$ V1 V2 2. Generates h: h=randi(p-1) **3.** Computes:

*s=i+xh* mod (*p*-1)

>> p= int64(268435019)	>> g_ <mark>s=mod_exp</mark> (g,s,p)
p=268435019	g_s = <mark>222564698</mark>
>> g=2:	V1=g_s;
8 -,	>> a_h=mod_exp(a,h,p)
>> x=int64(randi(p-1))	a_h = 143512214
x = 89089011	>> V2=mod(r*a_h,p)
$> a = mod exp(g \times p)$	V2 = 222564698
2 - 221828624	
a - 221020024	βabβab
$\sum_{i=i}^{i} f(A_{i}(x_{i}) + f(A_{i}(x_{i})))$	
>> 1=11104(ranu(p-1))	
1 = 228451192	
>> r=mod_exp(g,i,p)	
r = 33418907	
h=int64(randi(p-1))	
h = 49498768	
> s=mod((i+x*h),p-1)	
s = 263459276	

				c1ß		AA		]	
				c2β		PrK <sub>E</sub> =	Z		
<b>B1</b> :	m1=2000 n1=g <sup>m1</sup> mod p		UTxO	m3=1000	c4β		c3β	} }=g <sup>m3</sup> mod n	ି: PrK <sub>E</sub> = y
	c1a=Enc( <mark>a</mark> ,i1,n1) c1β=Enc( <mark>β</mark> ,j1,n1)		n1=Dec( <b>x</b> ,c1a) Comp(n1)=m1	c3β=Enc(β,i3,n3)			c3	Bb=Enc( <b>b</b> ,i5,n3)	PuK <sub>E</sub> = <i>b</i>
<b>B2</b> :	m2=3000 n2= <b>g</b> <sup>m2</sup> mod <b>p</b>		$PrK_A = x$ PuK <sub>A</sub> = a	m4=4000					
	c2a=Enc( <b>a</b> ,i2,n2) c2β=Enc( <mark>β</mark> ,j2,n2)		c2a n2=Dec( <b>x</b> ,c2a) Comp(n2)=m2	$n4=g^{m4} \mod p$ $c4\beta=Enc(\beta,i4,n4)$	.)				
		C1a	C20			•			
			c12a	Net		c34beta			

 $A: M_1 + M_2 = 2000 + 3000 = 5000 = 1000 + 4000 = M_3 + M_4$ 

To prove that Tx is honest Alice is using additively-homomorphic encryption:

1. Enc(a,m1+m2)=c1a\*c2a=c12a

Enc(beta,m3+m4)=c3beta\*c4beta=c34beta

1. Alice must prove that ciphertexts c12a and c34beta are equivalence.

It means that ciphertexts c12a and c34beta encrypts the same plaintext, namely 5000.

Till this place

Behaviour of the Rivest, Shamir, Tauman ring signature scheme

In the original paper, Rivest, Shamir, and Tauman described ring signatures as a way to leak a secret. For instance, a ring signature could be used to provide an anonymous signature from "a high-ranking <u>White House</u> official", without revealing which official signed the message. Ring signatures are right for this application because the anonymity of a ring signature cannot be revoked, and because the group for a ring signature can be improvised.

Another application, also described in the original paper, is for <u>deniable signatures</u>. Here the sender and the recipient of a message form a group for the ring signature, then the signature is valid to the recipient, but anyone else will be unsure whether the recipient or the sender was the actual signer. Thus, such a signature is convincing, but cannot be transferred beyond its intended recipient.

There were various works, introducing new features and based on different assumptions:

## **Threshold ring signatures**

Unlike standard "t-out-of-n" threshold signature, where t of n users should collaborate to sign a message, this variant of a ring signature requires t users to cooperate in the ring signing protocol. Namely, t parties  $S_1, ..., S_t \in \{P_1, ..., P_n\}$  can compute a (t, n)-ring signature,  $\sigma$ , on a message, m, on input  $(m, S_1, ..., S_t, P_1, ..., P_n)$ .

## Linkable ring signatures

The property of linkability allows one to determine whether any two signatures have been produced by the same member (under the same private key). The identity of the signer is nevertheless preserved. One of the possible applications can be an offline <u>e-cash system</u>.

## Traceable ring signature

In addition to the previous scheme the public key of the signer is revealed (if they issue more than one signatures under the same private key). An <u>e-voting system</u> can be implemented using this protocol.

# Efficiency

Most of the proposed algorithms have <u>asymptotic</u> output size ; i.e., the size of the resulting signature increases linearly with the size of input (number of public keys). That means that such schemes are impracticable for real use cases with sufficiently large (for example, an e-voting with millions of participants). But for some application with relatively small <u>median</u> input size such estimate may be acceptable.

<u>CryptoNote</u> implements ring signature scheme by Fujisaki and Suzuki in p2p payments to achieve sender's untraceability. More efficient algorithms have appeared recently. There are schemes with the sublinear size of the signature, as well as with constant size.

The original paper describes an <u>RSA</u> based ring signature scheme, as well as one based on <u>Rabin signatures</u>. They define a <u>keyed</u> "combining function" which takes a key, an initialization value, and a list of arbitrary values. is defined as, where

is a trap-door function (i.e. an RSA public key in the case of RSA based ring signatures).

The function

is called the ring equation, and is defined below. The equation is based on a symmetric encryption function:

It outputs a single value which is forced to be equal to. The equation can be solved as long as at least one , and by extension, can be freely chosen. Under the assumptions of RSA, this implies knowledge of at least one of the inverses of the trap door functions (i.e. a private key), since.

# Signature generation

Generating a ring signature involves six steps. The plaintext is signified by, the ring's public keys by.

1. Calculate the key

, using a <u>cryptographic hash function</u>. This step assumes a <u>random oracle</u> for, since will be used as key for.

- 2. Pick a random glue value.
- 3. Pick random for all ring members but yourself (will be calculated using the signer's private key), and calculate corresponding.
- 4. Solve the ring equation for
- 5. Calculate
- using the signer's private key:
- 6. The ring signature now is the -tuple

# Signature verification

Signature verification involves three steps.

1. Apply the public key trap door on all:

2.	Calculate the symmetric key
3.	Verify that the ring equation holds