

Comment on “An arbitrated quantum signature scheme with fast signing and verifying”

Yi-Ping Luo¹ and Tzonelih Hwang^{*}

*Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Cheng Kung
University, No. 1, University Rd., Tainan City, 70101, Taiwan, R.O.C.*

¹ yiping@ismail.csie.ncku.edu.tw

^{*} hwangtl@ismail.csie.ncku.edu.tw

Abstract

Recently, Liu et al. (Quantum Inf Process (2014) 13:491–502) proposed an arbitrated quantum signature (AQS) scheme, where a signature receiver (Bob) can verify the signer’s signature through the help of a trusted arbitrator. However, this paper shows that a malicious Bob can perform the existential forgery of the signature under the chosen message attack without being detected.

Keywords: Arbitrated quantum signature; Existential Forgery; Quantum cryptography; Quantum signature.

1 Introduction

Arbitrated quantum signature (AQS) is one of the imperative research topics in quantum cryptography which guarantees the authentication of identities and the integrity of the classical messages or quantum states over insecure quantum channels

[1-3]. Usually, in an AQS scheme, a trusted arbitrator helps a receiver to validate the legitimacy of the signature. Similar to the classical digital signature, an AQS should satisfy the following security requirements [3]:

1. **Unforgeability:** Neither the signature receiver nor an attacker can forge a signature or change the content of a signature.
2. **Non-repudiation:** After signing a valid signature, a signer should not be able to deny that.

In 2001, Gottesman and Chuang [4] firstly brought out the idea of designing an AQS scheme based on fundamental principles of quantum physics. After that, various AQS schemes have been proposed [1-3, 5-19]. Recently, Liu et al. proposed an AQS scheme with fast signing and verifying technique [20], where a new quantum one-time pad (QOTP) called D-QOTP (QOTP using decoy states) is designed to avoid being forged and disavowed [18, 19]. However, in this paper, we show that a malicious receiver, Bob, can perform the existential forgery of the signature under the chosen message attack by using several valid quantum message and signature pairs without being detected. Therefore, the requirements of unforgeability and non-repudiation are not satisfied in Liu et al.'s AQS scheme.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews Liu et al.'s AQS scheme. Section 3 describes the existential forgery in Liu et al.'s scheme. Section 4 summarizes the result.

2 Review of Liu et al.'s AQS Scheme

In this section, at first we describe the technique of the D-QOTP (i.e., quantum one-time pad using decoy states) algorithm which used in Liu et al.'s AQS scheme. Subsequently, we briefly review of Liu et al.'s AQS scheme.

2.1 The D-QOTP Algorithm

Suppose K denotes the secret key shared between the sender and the receiver. The quantum message $|P\rangle$ can be encrypted to $|C\rangle$ as follows, where $|P\rangle = \otimes_{i=1}^n |p_i\rangle$, $|p_i\rangle = \alpha_i|0\rangle + \beta_i|1\rangle$, $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbf{C}$, $|\alpha_i|^2 + |\beta_i|^2 = 1$, and $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Encryption Algorithm of D-QOTP

E1. Split K into $2^{t+1} - 2$ substrings $Q = K_{2(L1)}; K_{2^2(L1)}, K_{2^2(L2)}; \dots;$

$$K_{2^t(L1)}, \dots, K_{2^t(L2^{t-1})}; K_{2(R1)}; K_{2^2(R1)}, K_{2^2(R2)}; \dots; K_{2^t(R1)}, \dots, K_{2^t(R2^{t-1})} \quad (\text{more details}$$

please see [20]), where $2^{t+1} \geq n + 3$.

E2. Every substrings $K_{2^i(L2^j)}$ and $K_{2^i(R2^j)}$ can be interpreted as decimal integers

i_{Lj} and i_{Rj} , respectively, where $1 \leq i \leq t$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2^{i-1}$. That is,

$$(Q)_{10} = 1_{L1}; 2_{L1}, 2_{L2}; \dots; t_{L1}, \dots, t_{L2^{t-1}} \cdot 1_{R1}; 2_{R1}, 2_{R2}; \dots; t_{R1}, \dots, t_{R2^{t-1}}.$$

E3. R is the quantum sequence in the states of the loop of $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$, i.e.,

$$R = (|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle; |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle; \dots).$$

E4. $|C\rangle = E_K(|P\rangle)$, where the decoy state of $|R\rangle$ is inserted into $|P\rangle$ to form $|C\rangle$

based on $(Q)_{10}$.

Finally, we can get the output $|C\rangle = E_K(|P\rangle)$ from E1 to E4.

Based on the cipher-text $|C\rangle$ and the secret key K , the decryption algorithm is described as follows.

Decryption Algorithm of D-QOTP

D1. The same as Step E1, split K into the string Q .

D2. The same as Step E2 to obtain the decimal integer string $(Q)_{10}$.

D3. The same as Step E2 to construct $|R\rangle$.

D4. Extract the decoy states from $|C\rangle$ based on $(Q)_{10}$, which is denoted as $|R'\rangle$.

Subsequently, measure $|R'\rangle$ with the bases which are indicated in $|R\rangle$. Verify the measurement result to check the eavesdropping and the integrity of $|P\rangle$. If there exists an eavesdropping, this session will be aborted and restarts the protocol again.

Finally, we can decrypt $|C\rangle$ to obtain $|P\rangle = D_K(|C\rangle)$.

2.2 A Brief Review of Liu et al.'s AQS scheme

Here, a signer Alice wants to sign on the quantum message $|P\rangle$ and transmits it to the signature receiver, Bob. Subsequently, Bob can verify Alice's signature with the help of a trusted arbitrator, Trent. Liu et al.'s AQS scheme is composed of three phases: the initializing phase, the signing phase, and the verifying phase.

Initializing phase

Step I1. Trent shares the secret keys K_A and K_B with Alice and Bob, respectively, through the unconditionally secure quantum key distribution protocols,

$$\text{where } K_A \in \{0,1\}^{L_A}, K_B \in \{0,1\}^{L_B}, L_A \geq \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil + 2, \text{ and } L_B \geq \left\lceil \frac{n+L_A}{2} \right\rceil + 2.$$

Step I2. Alice, Bob, and Trent choose a loop sequence $|R\rangle$ from $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ as a set of the decoy states.

Signing phase

Step S1. Alice prepares the quantum message $|P\rangle$, in which if $|P\rangle$ is composed of

known quantum states, then arbitrary copies of $|P\rangle$ can be produced. If $|P\rangle$ is composed of unknown quantum states, then there need at least three copies of $|P\rangle$, i.e. $|P\rangle_1$, $|P\rangle_2$, and $|P\rangle_3$, where $|P\rangle_1 = |P\rangle_2 = |P\rangle_3$.

Step S2. Follow Step E1, Alice obtains Q_A .

Step S3. From Step E2, Alice obtains $(Q_A)_{10}$.

Step S4. Alice generates her quantum signature $|S\rangle = E_{K_A}(|P\rangle_3)$ based on $|R\rangle$ and $(Q_A)_{10}$.

Step S5. Alice sends $|S\rangle \otimes |P\rangle_1 \otimes |P\rangle_2$ to Bob.

Verifying phase

Step V1. Upon receiving the quantum sequence, Bob compares whether $|P\rangle_1 = |P\rangle_2$ by using quantum fingerprinting [21]. If the comparison result is negative, then Bob aborts this transmission and informs Alice to restart the scheme. Otherwise, Bob splits K_B into Q_B and then obtains $(Q_B)_{10}$ by using the same way in Step E1 and E2.

Step V2. Bob transforms $|P\rangle_2$ into $|T\rangle = E_{K_B}(|P\rangle_2)$ by using $|R\rangle$ and $(Q_B)_{10}$.

Step V3. Bob keeps $|P\rangle_1$ and $(Q_B)_{10}$, and then sends $|S\rangle \otimes |T\rangle$ to Trent.

Step V4. Trent splits K_A and K_B into Q_A and Q_B to obtain $(Q_A)_{10}$ and $(Q_B)_{10}$, respectively, which is identical with Step D1~D3. Subsequently, Trent extracts the decoy states from $|S\rangle$ and $|T\rangle$ based on $(Q_A)_{10}$ and $(Q_B)_{10}$ to obtain $|P'\rangle_3$ and $|P'\rangle_2$, respectively.

Step V5. Following Step D4, Trent measures the extracted decoy states $|S\rangle\backslash|P'\rangle_3$ and $|T\rangle\backslash|P'\rangle_2$ with the bases which are indicated in $((Q_A)_{10}, |R\rangle)$ and $((Q_B)_{10}, |R\rangle)$, respectively. In this case, Trent can check whether there exists an eavesdropper or not. Besides, Trent can also check existence of any forgery attack from the measurement results. Subsequently, Trent compares $|P'\rangle_3$ and $|P'\rangle_2$. If $|P'\rangle_3 \neq |P'\rangle_2$, Trent aborts this communication and the scheme needs to be restarted. Otherwise, Trent continues to the next step.

Step V6. Trent transforms $|P'\rangle_2$ to $|T\rangle = E_{K_B}(|P'\rangle_2)$ based on $|R\rangle$ and $(Q_B)_{10}$. After that, Trent transforms $|P'\rangle_3$ to $|S\rangle_T = E_{K_B}(E_{K_A}(|P'\rangle_3))$ based on $((Q_A)_{10}, |R\rangle)$ and $((Q_B)_{10}, |R\rangle)$. Trent sends $|T\rangle \otimes |S\rangle_T$ to Bob.

Step V7. Bob extracts and measures the decoy states from $|T\rangle$ and $|S\rangle_T$ based on $((Q_B)_{10}, |R\rangle)$, respectively, and denotes the rest particles of $|T\rangle$ and $|S\rangle_T$ as $|P''\rangle_2$ and $|S''\rangle$. Bob verifies the measurement results, if there exists an eavesdropping, then Bob rejects the signature. Otherwise, Bob goes to the next step.

Step V8. Bob compares $|P''\rangle_2$ with his retained $|P\rangle_1$. If $|P''\rangle_2 = |P\rangle_1$, then Bob accepts $|S''\rangle$. Otherwise, Bob rejects $|S''\rangle$.

3 The Existential Forgery of Signature

In this section, we demonstrate that a malicious receiver, Bob, is able to perform the existential forgery of signer's signature without being detected as follows.

In their AQS scheme, Alice's quantum signature $|S\rangle$ is generated based on the loop sequence $|R\rangle$ and the secret key K_A . For signing the different quantum messages (i.e., $|P\rangle_A$ and $|P\rangle_B$, where $\|P\rangle_A\| = \|P\rangle_B\| = n$, and $|P\rangle_A \neq |P\rangle_B$), Alice generates different quantum signatures ($|S\rangle_A$ and $|S\rangle_B$) based on the loop sequence $|R\rangle$ and the secret key K_A . However, because of the usage of the same secret key, the positions of the decoy states would always be the same in two different quantum signatures. A malicious receiver, Bob, may collect several quantum signatures in order to comprehend the positions of the quantum messages and the decoy states. Once the positions of the quantum message are revealed to n -bit length, Bob can modify the pair of the quantum message and the quantum signature together by using unitary operations without being detected. Therefore, their scheme cannot satisfy the requirements of unforgeability.

For example, suppose there are two quantum messages $|P\rangle_A = |0\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle|0\rangle$, $|P\rangle_B = |1\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle$, $\|P\rangle_A\| = \|P\rangle_B\| = 4$, $K = 1011$, and $|R\rangle = (|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle)$. We can divide K and obtain $Q = (K_{2(L1)}; K_{2^2(L1)}, K_{2^2(L2)} \cdot K_{2(R1)}; K_{2^2(R1)}, K_{2^2(R2)}) = (10; 1, 0.11; 1, 1) = (10; 1.11; 1)$, where the zero position is ignored and the exclusion principle is used in the last equation. Subsequently, $(Q)_{10} = (2; 1.3; 1)$. For the quantum messages $|P\rangle_A$ and $|P\rangle_B$, the resulting signatures are $|S\rangle_A = (|1\rangle, |p_1\rangle_A, |0\rangle, |p_2\rangle_A, |+\rangle, |p_3\rangle_A, |p_4\rangle_A, |0\rangle) = (|1\rangle, |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |+\rangle, |0\rangle, |0\rangle, |0\rangle)$ and $|S\rangle_B = (|1\rangle, |p_1\rangle_B, |0\rangle, |p_2\rangle_B, |+\rangle, |p_3\rangle_B, |p_4\rangle_B, |0\rangle) = (|1\rangle, |1\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |1\rangle, |1\rangle, |0\rangle)$, respectively. Now, Bob compares $|S\rangle_A^i$ and $|S\rangle_B^i$ by using quantum

fingerprinting, where $1 \leq i \leq 8$. Bob can obtain the comparison results of $|S\rangle_A^2 \neq |S\rangle_B^2$, $|S\rangle_A^4 \neq |S\rangle_B^4$, $|S\rangle_A^6 \neq |S\rangle_B^6$, $|S\rangle_A^7 \neq |S\rangle_B^7$. Since the number of $|S\rangle_A^i \neq |S\rangle_B^i$ is equal to the length of the quantum message (i.e., 4), therefore, Bob can perform any unitary operation on the new quantum message and the corresponding quantum signature in the positions (2,4,6,7) without being detected. Due to this attack, the signer, Alice, can later deny that she has signed a new quantum message. Therefore, Liu et al.'s AQS scheme cannot satisfy the requirements of the unforgeability as well as non-repudiation.

4 Conclusions

In this article, we have pointed out that Liu et al.'s AQS scheme suffers from the existential forgery of the signature under the chosen message attack performed by a signature receiver, Bob. The possible way to resolve this issue is that, the signer (Alice) has to share a new secret key with the arbitrator (Trent), which requires a QKD protocol to perform between them. However, this approach is not feasible for a signature scheme and that also impair the efficiency of the protocol. Therefore, how to design an AQS scheme with the feature of key re-usability would be an interesting research topic.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank the Ministry of Science and Technology of Republic of China for financial support of this research under Contract No. MOST 104-2221-E-006-102 -.

References

- [1] G. H. Zeng, "Reply to 'Comment on 'Arbitrated quantum-signature scheme''," *Physical Review A*, vol. 78, Jul 2008.
- [2] M. Curty and N. Lutkenhaus, "Comment on "arbitrated quantum-signature scheme"," *Physical Review A*, vol. 77, Apr 2008.
- [3] G. H. Zeng and C. H. Keitel, "Arbitrated quantum-signature scheme," *Physical Review A*, vol. 65, Apr 2002.
- [4] D. Gottesman and I. L. Chuang, "Quantum Digital Signatures," pp. arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0105032v2, 2001.
- [5] D. Gottesman and I. Chuang, "Quantum digital signatures," *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0105032*, 2001.
- [6] J. Wang, Q. Zhang, L. M. Liang, and C. J. Tang, "Comment on: "Arbitrated quantum signature scheme with message recovery" [Phys. Lett. A 321 (2004) 295]," *Physics Letters A*, vol. 347, pp. 262-263, Dec 5 2005.
- [7] H. Lee, C. H. Hong, H. Kim, J. Lim, and H. J. Yang, "Arbitrated quantum signature scheme with message recovery," *Physics Letters A*, vol. 321, pp. 295-300, Feb 16 2004.
- [8] Y. G. Yang and Q. Y. Wen, "Arbitrated quantum signature of classical messages against collective amplitude damping noise (vol 283, pg 3198, 2010)," *Optics Communications*, vol. 283, pp. 3830-3830, Oct 1 2010.
- [9] Y. G. Yang and Q. Y. Wen, "Arbitrated quantum signature of classical messages against collective amplitude damping noise," *Optics Communications*, vol. 283, pp. 3198-3201, Aug 15 2010.
- [10] S. K. Chong, Y. P. Luo, and T. Hwang, "On "Arbitrated quantum signature of classical messages against collective amplitude damping noise"," *Optics Communications*, vol. 284, pp. 893-895, Feb 1 2011.
- [11] Y. P. Luo and T. Hwang, "New arbitrated quantum signature of classical messages against collective amplitude damping noise (vol 284, pg 3144, 2011)," *Optics Communications*, vol. 303, pp. 73-73, Aug 15 2013.
- [12] T. Hwang, S. K. Chong, Y. P. Luo, and T. X. Wei, "New arbitrated quantum signature of classical messages against collective amplitude damping noise," *Optics Communications*, vol. 284, pp. 3144-3148, Jun 1 2011.
- [13] Y. P. Luo and T. Hwang, "Arbitrated quantum signature of classical messages without using authenticated classical channels," *Quantum Information Processing*, vol. 13, pp. 113-120, Jan 2014.
- [14] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, "Going beyond Bell's theorem," in *Bell's theorem, quantum theory and conceptions of the universe*,

ed: Springer, 1989, pp. 69-72.

- [15] Q. Li, W. H. Chan, and D. Y. Long, "Arbitrated quantum signature scheme using Bell states," *Physical Review A*, vol. 79, May 2009.
- [16] X. F. Zou and D. W. Qiu, "Security analysis and improvements of arbitrated quantum signature schemes," *Physical Review A*, vol. 82, Oct 21 2010.
- [17] T. Hwang, Y. P. Luo, and S. K. Chong, "Comment on "Security analysis and improvements of arbitrated quantum signature schemes"," *Physical Review A*, vol. 85, May 24 2012.
- [18] F. Gao, S. J. Qin, F. Z. Guo, and Q. Y. Wen, "Cryptanalysis of the arbitrated quantum signature protocols," *Physical Review A*, vol. 84, Aug 29 2011.
- [19] J. W. Choi, K. Y. Chang, and D. Hong, "Security problem on arbitrated quantum signature schemes," *Physical Review A*, vol. 84, Dec 29 2011.
- [20] F. Liu, S. J. Qin, and Q. Su, "An arbitrated quantum signature scheme with fast signing and verifying," *Quantum Information Processing*, vol. 13, pp. 491-502, Feb 2014.
- [21] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, J. Watrous, and R. de Wolf, "Quantum fingerprinting," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 87, Oct 15 2001.