

## ElGamal Encryption

## Zether: Towards Privacy in a Smart Contract World

Financial Cryptography and Data ..., 2020 - Springer

From < https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as\_sdt=0%2C5 &q=Zether%3A+Towards+Privacy+in+a+Smart+Contract+World&btnG=>

Benedikt Bunz1, Shashank Agrawal2, Mahdi Zamani3, and Dan Boneh4

1Stanford University, benedikt@cs.stanford.edu 2Visa Research, shaagraw@visa.com 3Visa Research, mzamani@visa.com 4**Stanford University**, dabo@cs.stanford.edu

-stamord oniversity, daboe cs.stamord.c

Hello
Alice!

Alice's
public key

6EB69570
08E03CE4

Alice's
public key

Alice

PrK<sub>A</sub> = x

Alice's
private key

Ctrl/F --> ElGamal --> Exact mathes **21** 

B: intends to encrypt message M to R.  $F_{encod}(M) = M$ 

$$m \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*}$$
;  $r \notin \mathbb{Z}_{p-1}^{*}$ ;

 $E = m* \mathbf{a}^{r} \mod p$ ;  $D = \mathbf{g}^{r} \mod p \implies C = (E, D)$ 
 $B: \qquad C = (E, D)$   $A: \Pr_{X} = (X)$ 
 $D \notin \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*} \mod p = (g^{t}) \mod$ 

Additively inverse element -x to element x modulo p-1.

D<sup>-x</sup> mod p computation using Fermat theorem:
If p is prime, then for any integer p holds p.

$$D^{-x} = D^{p-1-x} \bmod p$$

>> 
$$mx = p-1-x$$
  
>>  $mod(x+mx, p-1) \Rightarrow 0$   
>>  $D_mx = mod = exp(D_mx, p)$ 

Homomorphic encryption: cloud computation with encrypted data

$$PP = (P, g)$$
  
 $B: PuK_A = a;$   $A: PiK_A = x; a = g^x mod p.$ 

Multiplicatively Homomorphic Encryption

B:  

$$m_1$$
,  $m_2$  - two mossages to be encrypted:  $1 < m_1 * m_2 < p-1$ .  
 $m_1$ :  $r_1 \leftarrow randi(\mathcal{I}_{p-1})$ 

```
m<sub>2</sub>: r<sub>1</sub> ← randi (Zp-1)
               E_1 = m_1 * \alpha^{r_1} \mod P
C_1 = (E_1, D_1)
D_1 = g^{r_1} \mod P
D_2 = (E_1, D_2)
D_3 = g^{r_2} \mod P
m_2: r_2 \leftarrow randi(\mathcal{I}_p^*)
                E_2 = m_2 * \alpha^{r_2} \mod P 
D_2 = g^{r_2} \mod P
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \log P
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \log P
 \mathcal{R}: m = m_1 * m_2 \mod p
                \Gamma = (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2) \mod(p-1)
m: E = m * a^{n} mod p \ c = (E,D)
           D=g"modp
                                                                       c_1 * c_2 mod p = (E_1, D_1) * (E_2, D_2) = (E_1 * E_2, D_1 * D_2) =
                                                                 =(m_4 * m_2 * a^{r_2} * a^{r_2} mod p, g^{r_2} * g^{r_2} mod p) =
                                                                 = (m * o(r_1 + r_2) mod p - 1 mod p, g(r_1 + r_2) mod (p-1) = 0
                                                                 =(M*Q^r mod p, g^r mod p) = c = (E, D)
 Multiplicative homomorphie encryption means that
 encryption of multiplication m_1 \times m_2 of two messages m_1, m_2
is equal to ciphertext c that is equal to the multiplication
of two ciphertexts C1 * C2.
 Fintex - Blockchain: incomes = expenses
                                                                                                                                       Balance equation
i_1
i_2
i_3
i_4
i_2
i_4
i_2
i_4
i_4
i_5
i_5
i_6
i_7
i_8
                                                                                                                     To prove that different
  Enc (Puk, ist) = c: = ci & Ciz mod P?
  Enc(Puk, my m) = cm = cm cmz mod p \ ci and cm uzsifruoja
```

ta pacia suma

Additively-multiplicative homemorphie encryption

Property: evoryone in the net could verify belance m: e.g.  $C_1 \cdot C_2 = C = Enc^{\dagger}(\alpha, m_1 + m_2) = Enc^{\dagger}(\alpha, m)$ 

Addively-multiplicative homomorphic encryption.

Let  $n_1 = g^{m_1} \mod p$   $n = n_1 * n_2 \mod p = g^{m_1} * g^{m_2} \mod p = q^{m_1} \mod p$ 

 $m = m_1 + m_2 \mod (p-1)$ . But  $p \sim 2^{2048} \longrightarrow 10^{700}$   $i_1, i_2, m_1, m_2, etc. << 10^{700}$ 

Therefore  $M_1 + M_2 \mod (p-1) = \text{always} = M_1 + M_2 = M_0 = 27 \mod 1175 = 27$ 

Since DEF(m1) = gm1 modp is 1-to-1 mapping:

for one My corresponds one DEF(M1), then

DEF  $(m_1 + m_2) = DEF(m) = n_1 * n_2 \mod p = n \mod p = g^m \mod p$ .

B: n = n1 \* n2 modp.

 $n_1$ :  $E_1 = n_1 * Q^{r_1} m od p$   $C_1 = (E_1, D_1)$  A:  $D_1 = Q^{r_1} m od p$   $Dec^{\dagger}(x, C_1) = n_1$ 

 $N_2: E_2 = N_2 * Q^{r_2} mod P$   $C_2 = (E_2, D_2)$   $Dec^+(x, c_2) = N_2$ 

 $n = n_1 * n_2 \mod P$ ;  $r = (r_1 + r_2) \mod (P-1)$ .

n: E = n \* o mod p D = g mod p C = (E, D) D = g mod p C = (E, D) D = g mod p

A: must find  $m_1$  from equation  $g^{m_1} \mod p = n_1$   $m_2$   $g^{m_2} \mod p = n_2$ 

Net: must vorify balance

If p is secure  $p \sim 2^{2048} \approx 10^{700}$ , the find  $m_1$ ,  $m_2$ , in general,

is infeasible.

But! If  $m_1$ ,  $m_2 \sim 10^3$ , then  $m_1$ ,  $m_2$  could be found total scan procedure: search numbers from 1 to  $10^9$ . Sine A knows what sums should be received she simply vorifies if  $g^{m_1}$  mod  $p = n_1$ .

&  $g^{m_2}$  mod  $p = n_2$ .

Till this place

$$m \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*}$$
;  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{p-1}$ ;  $\Longrightarrow$   $E \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*}$ ;  $D = \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*}$ 
 $\Im P = M \Longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*} = \mathcal{L}_{1}, \mathcal{Z}_{1}, \mathcal{Z}_{1}, \dots, 10 \mathcal{Y}$ 
 $\mathbb{Z}_{p-1} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 9\}$   $|\mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*}| = |\mathbb{Z}_{p-1}|$ 
 $Enc(m, r) = (E, D)$ 
 $Enc: \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*} \times \mathbb{Z}_{p-1} \Longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*} \times \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*}$ 
 $ext{one-to-one}$ 
 $ext{isomorphism}$ 
 $ext{m1}, m2: must be encrypted using  $r_{1} \Longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{p-1} \& r_{2}^{*} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*}$ 
 $ext{m} = m_{1} * m_{2}$ 
 $ext{m} = m_{1} * m_{2}$ 
 $ext{m} = m_{1} * m_{2}$ 
 $ext{m} = m_{1} * m_{2} * g^{r_{2} + r_{2}} = mod p$ 
 $ext{D} = g^{r_{2} + r_{2}}$ 
 $ext{E} = m \cdot g^{r_{1}}; E = g^{r_{2}}.$$ 

Additively Homomorphic Encryption

ElGamal encryption. ElGamal encryption is a public key encryption scheme secure under the DDH assumption. A random number from  $\mathbb{Z}_p^*$ , say x, acts as a private key, and  $y = g^x$  is the public key corresponding to that. To encrypt an integer b, it is first mapped to one or more group elements. If  $b \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ , then a simple mapping would be to just raise g to b. Now, a ciphertext for b is given by  $(g^b y^r, g^r)$  where  $r \xleftarrow{\$} \mathbb{Z}_p^*$ . With knowledge of x, one can divide  $g^b y^r$  by  $(g^r)^x$  to recover  $g^b$ . However,  $g^b$  needs to be brute-forced to compute b.

$$m \in \mathbb{Z}_{p-1}: 1 < m < p-1$$
 $E^{+}=g^{m}*a^{r} \mod p; \quad D^{+}=g^{r} \mod p$ 
 $E=m*a^{r} \mod p; \quad D=g^{r} \mod p$ 
 $C^{+}=(E^{+},D^{+})$ 
 $g: C^{+}=(E^{+},D^{+})$ 
 $g: C^{+}=(E^{+$ 

We argue that this is not an issue. First, as we will see, the Zether smart contract does not need to do this, only the users would do it. Second, users will have a good estimate of ZTH in their accounts because, typically, the transfer amount is known to the receiver. Thus, brute-force computation would occur only rarely. Third, one could represent a large range of values in terms of smaller ranges. For instance, if we want to allow amounts up to 64 bits, we could instead have 2 amounts of 32 bits each, and encrypt each one of them separately. In this paper, for simplicity, we will work with a single range, 1 to MAX, and set MAX to be  $2^{32}$  in the implementation.

$$2^{10} = 1024 = 1 \text{ K}$$
;  $2^{20} = 1 \text{ M}$ ;  $2^{30} = 1 \text{ G}$ ;  $2^{40} = 1 \text{ T}$ ;  $2^{50} = 1 \text{ P}$ 

## ElGamal encryption.

ElGamal encryption is a public key encryption scheme secure under the DDH assumption. A random number from  $Z_p$ , say x, acts as a private key, and  $a = g^x \mod p$  the public key corresponding to that.

To encrypt an integer m in  $Z_{p-1}$ , it is first mapped to one or more elements of  $Z_p^*$ . If m is in  $Z_p^*$ , then a simple mapping would be to just raise g to m. Now, a ciphertext for m is given by  $(g^m a^r)$ , where r is chosen at random from  $Z_{p-1}$ . With knowledge of x, one can divide  $g^m a^r$  by  $(g^r)^x$  to recover  $g^m$ .

However, gb needs to be brute-forced to compute b.

We argue that this is not an issue. First, as we will see, the Zether smart contract does not need to do this, only the users would do it. Second, users will have a good estimate of ZTH in their accounts because, typically, the transfer amount is known to the receiver. Thus, brute-force computation would occur only rarely. Third, one could represent a large range of values in terms of smaller ranges. For instance, if we want to allow amounts up to 64 bits, we could instead have 2 amounts of 32 bits each, and encrypt each one of them separately. In this paper, for simplicity, we will work with a single range, 1 to MAX, and set MAX to be 232 in the implementation.

$$2^{64} = 2^{8} \cdot 2^{8}$$

$$d \log_{q}(\widetilde{m}) - \cdots - d \log_{q}(\widetilde{m}) = m$$

$$PP = (p, q); |p| \sim 2^{8}, |q| \sim 2^{8} \quad \text{search area}$$

$$256 \quad 256 \leftarrow \text{choices}$$

$$|p| = 8 \text{ bits} \quad |q| = 8 \text{ bits}$$

$$Ethereum: gas - frice for computation of smooth contract.$$

Education and Inica love in the diagraph
14 here am, gas - frice ger conjugation of
Ethereum: gas-price for computation of smoot contract.  Search area is 1-16
$C_{\alpha\alpha}$ is a real $C_{\alpha}$ in $C_{\alpha}$
sear on war 13 1 - (10)