

# W-OTS# - Shorter and Faster Winternitz Signatures

---

Author: Herman Schoenfeld <[herman@sphere10.com](mailto:herman@sphere10.com)>

Version: 1.1

Date: 2020-07-20

Copyright: (c) [Sphere 10 Software Pty Ltd](https://www.sphere10.com). All Rights Reserved.

## Abstract

A very simple modification to the standard W-OTS scheme is presented called W-OTS# that achieves a security enhancement similar to W-OTS+<sup>1</sup> but without the overhead of generating and transforming a randomization vector in every round of the chaining function. The idea proffered by W-OTS# is to simply thwart Birthday-attacks<sup>2</sup> altogether by signing an HMAC of the message-digest (keyed with cryptographically random salt) rather than the message-digest itself. The signer thwarts a birthday attack by virtue of requiring that the attacker guess the salt bits in addition to the message-digest bits during the collision scanning process. By choosing a salt length matching the message-digest length, the security of W-OTS# reduces to that of the cryptographic hash function. This essentially doubles the security level of W-OTS and facilitates the use of shorter hash functions which provide shorter and faster signatures for same security. For example, W-OTS# 128-bit signatures have commensurate security to standard W-OTS 256-bit signatures yet are roughly half the size and twice as fast. It is proposed that Blake2b-128 and Winternitz parameter  $w=4$  (i.e. base-16 digits) be adopted as the default parameter set for the W-OTS# scheme.

## 1. Birthday Attack

---

A birthday attack involves an attacker forging a signature for a "malicious" message  $M$  by re-using a signature for an "agreed" message  $m$ . In this class of attack, the attacker has knowledge of a message  $m$  that the victim is willing and intending to sign in the future. The attacker creates variations of  $m$  as  $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$  any of which will also be deemed "valid" and signed by the victim. Whilst the victim considers each message  $m_i$  "identical", their hash digests are unique. This can be achieved by simply varying one or more nonce values or whitespace within  $m$  to create this set.

The attacker simultaneously generates variations of a "malicious" message  $M$  as the set  $\{M_1, \dots, M_l\}$  and stops until a collision  $H(m_i) = H(M_j)$  is found (where  $H$  is the cryptographic hash function used in the scheme).

**NOTE:** the probability of finding such collisions is far more likely than a standard brute-force attack by virtue of the Birthday problem<sup>2, 3</sup>.

When a collision-pair  $(m_i, M_j)$  is found, the attacker asks the victim to sign valid  $m_i$  giving  $s = \text{Sign}(m_i, \text{key}) = \text{SignDigest}(H(m_i), \text{key})$ . The attacker then proceeds to forge a signature for invalid  $M_j$  by simply re-using  $s$ , as follows:

```
1: s = Sign(M_j, key)
2:   = SignDigest(H(M_j), key)
3:   = SignDigest(H(m_i), key)
4:   = s
```

Unbeknownst to the victim, by signing `m_i`, they have also signed `M_j`.

## 2. W-OTS & W-OTS+

The Winternitz scheme is a well-documented <sup>4 5</sup> scheme whose description is beyond the scope of this document. However, of relevance is the relationship between the W-OTS "security parameter" `n` (the bit-length of `H`) and its "security level" which is generally `n/2`. This follows from the fact that if a brute-force attack on `H` requires `2^n` hash rounds then a birthday attack requires `2^(n/2)`<sup>2</sup> hash rounds. By eliminating the birthday attack, and assuming no such other class of attacks exist for `H`, the security level of the scheme is restored back to that of a brute-force attack on `H` which is `n`.

W-OTS+ achieves a similar security enhancement through obfuscation of pre-images in the hashing chains, however they are performed during the chaining function which adds an overhead (significant in some implementations). W-OTS# is similar to W-OTS+ in this regard except it only obfuscates the message-digest once via an HMAC (keyed with the salt) and uses the standard W-OTS chaining function, which is faster than W-OTS+. Despite the concatenation of the salt to the signature, the overall signature size decreases by virtue of selecting a shorter hash function `H`.

## 3. W-OTS#

The W-OTS# construction is almost identical to a standard W-OTS construction for Winternitz parameter `w` and cryptographic hash function `H`. The security parameter `n` is inferred from the the bit-length of `H`.

In W-OTS, a message-digest `md` is computed as `md=H(message)`. During signing, digits of base `2^w` are read from `md` and signed in a Winternitz chain. In W-OTS#, the message-digest `md` is replaced with the "sig-mac" `smac` defined as:

### 3.1 Signature Message Authentication Code (SMAC)

```
1: smac = SMAC(m, salt)
2:       = HMAC(H(m), salt)
3:       = H(salt || H(salt || H(m)))
```

The `salt` is concatenated to the signature and used to compute `smac` during verification.

**NOTE** the checksum digits are calculated and signed identically as per W-OTS but derived from `smac` not `md`.

## 3.2 Salt

The `salt` is generated by the signer using cryptographic random number generator. The length of the `salt` is `n` bits which is the minimum value required to nullify a birthday attack (proven below). The salt is defined as:

```
1: salt = {0,1}^n (i.e. n cryptographically random bits)
```

### 3.1.2 Proof

1. A birthday-collision is expected after  $1.25 * \text{SQRT}(U)$ <sup>2</sup> hashing rounds where `U` is maximum hashing rounds ever required (non-repeating).
2. In W-OTS,  $U=2^n$  where `n` is the security parameter (bits-length of `H`) and thus (1) becomes  $1.25 * 2^{(n/2)}$ .
3. In W-OTS#, adding a `d`-bit salt hardens a birthday-collision to  $A = 1.25 * 2^{((n+d)/2)}$  rounds. This follows from the fact that an attacker must scan for collision  $(\text{HMAC}(H(m_i), \text{salt}), \text{HMAC}(H(m_j), \text{salt}))$  which involves `d` more bits (whereas in W-OTS they just scan for  $(H(m_i), H(m_j))$ ).
4. A brute-force attack on `H` requires  $B = 2^n$  hashing rounds<sup>2</sup>.
5. We need to choose `d` such that  $A = B$ , since we only need to harden a birthday attack to match that of a brute-force attack. Hardening beyond is redundant since the security level of the scheme is only as strong as the weakest attack vector.
6. Evaluating (5) gives  $d = 2 \cdot \ln(0.8) / \ln(0.2) + n = 0.2773 + n$  which is approximately `n`.
7. Thus choosing  $d=n$  is sufficient to thwart birthday-attack. QED.

## 4. Reference Implementation

This section contains snippets for the full [reference implementation](#)<sup>6</sup>. The reference implementation is part of the PQC library within the [Hydrogen Framework](#)<sup>7</sup>.

```
public class WOTSSharp : WOTS {  
  
    public WOTSSharp()  
        : this(WOTSSharp.Configuration.Default) {  
    }  
  
    public WOTSSharp(int w, bool usePublicKeyHashOptimization = false)  
        : this(w, Configuration.Default.HashFunction, usePublicKeyHashOptimization)  
    {  
    }  
  
    public WOTSSharp(int w, CHF hashFunction, bool usePublicKeyHashOptimization =  
false)  
        : this(new Configuration(w, hashFunction, usePublicKeyHashOptimization)) {  
    }  
}
```

```

public WOTSSharp(Configuration config)
    : base(config) {
}

public override byte[,] SignDigest(byte[,] privateKey, ReadOnlySpan<byte>
digest)
    => SignDigest(privateKey, digest,
Tools.Crypto.GenerateCryptographicallyRandomBytes(digest.Length));

public byte[,] SignDigest(byte[,] privateKey, ReadOnlySpan<byte> digest,
ReadOnlySpan<byte> seed) {
    Guard.Argument(seed.Length == digest.Length, nameof(seed), "Must be same
size as digest");
    var wotsSig = base.SignDigest(privateKey, HMAC(digest, seed));
    Debug.Assert(wotsSig.Length == Config.SignatureSize.Length *
Config.SignatureSize.Width);
    seed.CopyTo(wotsSig.GetRow(Config.SignatureSize.Length - 1)); // concat seed
to sig
    return wotsSig;
}

public override bool VerifyDigest(byte[,] signature, byte[,] publicKey,
ReadOnlySpan<byte> digest) {
    Debug.Assert(signature.Length == Config.SignatureSize.Length *
Config.SignatureSize.Width);
    var seed = signature.GetRow(Config.SignatureSize.Length - 1);
    return base.VerifyDigest(signature, publicKey, HMAC(digest, seed));
}

[MethodImpl(MethodImplOptions.AggressiveInlining)]
private byte[] SMAC(ReadOnlySpan<byte> message, ReadOnlySpan<byte> seed)
    => HMAC(ComputeMessageDigest(message), seed);

private byte[] HMAC(ReadOnlySpan<byte> digest, ReadOnlySpan<byte> seed) {
    using (Hashers.BorrowHasher(Config.HashFunction, out var hasher)) {
        hasher.Transform(seed);
        hasher.Transform(digest);
        var innerHash = hasher.GetResult();
        hasher.Transform(seed);
        hasher.Transform(innerHash);
        return hasher.GetResult();
    }
}

public new class Configuration : WOTS.Configuration {
    public new static readonly Configuration Default;

    static Configuration() {
        Default = new Configuration(4, CHF.Blake2b_128, true);
    }

    public Configuration()

```

```

        : this(Default.w, Default.HashFunction,
Default.UsePublicKeyHashOptimization) {
    }

    public Configuration(int w, CHF hasher, bool usePubKeyHashOptimization)
        : base(
            w,
            hasher,
            usePubKeyHashOptimization,
            AMSOTS.WOTS_Sharp,
            Hashers.GetDigestSizeBytes(hasher),
            new OTSKeySize(
                Hashers.GetDigestSizeBytes(hasher),
                (int)Math.Ceiling(256.0 / w) + (int)Math.Floor(Math.Log(((1 <<
w) - 1) * (256 / w), 1 << w)) + 1
            ),
            new OTSKeySize(
                Hashers.GetDigestSizeBytes(hasher),
                usePubKeyHashOptimization ? 1 : (int)Math.Ceiling(256.0 / w) +
(int)Math.Floor(Math.Log(((1 << w) - 1) * (256 / w), 1 << w)) + 1
            ),
            new OTSKeySize(
                Hashers.GetDigestSizeBytes(hasher),
                (int)Math.Ceiling(256.0 / w) + (int)Math.Floor(Math.Log(((1 <<
w) - 1) * (256 / w), 1 << w)) + 1 + 1 // Adds extra row for seed here
            )
        ) {
    }
}
}
}
}

```

## 5. References

1. Hülsing, A. "W-OTS+ -Shorter Signatures for Hash-Based Signature Schemes". 2013. Url: <https://eprint.iacr.org/2017/965.pdf>. Accessed: 2020-07-22. [↵](#)
2. Wikipedia. "Birthday Attack". Url: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birthday\\_attack](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birthday_attack). Accessed: 2020-07-22 [↵↵↵↵↵](#)
3. Wikipedia. "Birthday Problem". Url: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birthday\\_problem](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birthday_problem). Accessed: 2020-07-22 [↵](#)
4. Ralph Merkle. "Secrecy, authentication and public key systems / A certified digital signature". Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Electrical Engineering, Stanford University, 1979. Url: <http://www.merkle.com/papers/Certified1979.pdf> [↵](#)
5. Sphere 10. "Winternitz One-Time Signature Scheme (W-OTS)". URL: <https://sphere10.com/articles/cryptography/pqc/wots>. [↵](#)
6. Sphere 10 Software. PQC Library. Url: <https://github.com/Sphere10/Hydrogen/tree/master/src/Hydrogen/Crypto/PQC>. Accessed 2023-05-09. [↵](#)
7. Sphere 10 Software. Hydrogen Framework. Url: <https://github.com/Sphere10/Hydrogen>. Accessed 2023-05-09. [↵](#)