

Quantum Cyber-Attack on Blockchain-based VANET

Kazi Hassan Shakib, Mizanur Rahman, *Member, IEEE*, Mhafuzul Islam

Abstract—Blockchain-based Vehicular Ad-hoc Network (VANET) is widely considered as secure communication architecture for a connected transportation system. With the advent of quantum computing, there are concerns regarding the vulnerability of this architecture against cyber-attacks. In this study, a potential threat is investigated in a blockchain-based VANET, and a corresponding quantum cyber-attack is developed. Specifically, a quantum impersonation attack using Shor’s algorithm is developed to break the Rivest-Shamir-Adleman (RSA) encrypted digital signatures of VANET and thus create a threat for the trust-based blockchain scheme of VANET. A blockchain-based VANET, vehicle-to-everything (V2X) communication, and vehicular mobility are simulated using OMNET++, the extended INET library, and vehicles-in-network simulation (VEINS) along with simulation of urban mobility (SUMO), respectively. A small key RSA based message encryption is implemented using IBM Qiskit, which is an open-source quantum software development kit. The findings reveal that the quantum cyber-attack—i.e., impersonation attack—is able to successfully break the trust chain of a blockchain-based VANET. This highlights the need for a quantum secured blockchain.

Index Terms— Quantum Computing, Blockchain, VANET, Cybersecurity, Cyber-attack.

I. INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY, blockchain-based Vehicular Ad-hoc Network (VANET) architecture has been gaining popularity due to its distributed and decentralized architecture [1], efficient data transmission capability, and secure data generation and broadcasting ability over VANET networks [2]. Rating-based or trust-value-based blockchain networks can efficiently play a trusted role by setting up the proof-of-work (PoW) or proof-of-stake (PoS) consensus mechanisms [2]. Such a trust management system could ensure privacy-protected [1] and secured vehicle-to-everything (V2X) communication because of its ability to ensure the veracity of the exchanged messages via a digital signature of a message sender (e.g., vehicle). For example, RSA (Rivest-Shamir-Adleman) is a public-private asymmetric key encryption, which is widely used as an encryption technique in blockchain-based VANET architecture to encrypt messages.

Due to the high mobility of vehicles, small key based encryption is popular in VANET [3]. Moreover, a small key based encryption needs less complex computational operations and storage and hence is highly recommended for blockchain security [4][5]. Existing studies prove that a non-quantum computing-based or classical attack [6] cannot generate such a blockchain-based VANET attack because blockchain can identify the attacker through consensus-based or rating-based mechanisms, hashing, encryption, and its distributed nature

with transparency in the public ledger-based approach [2]. However, recently, several survey studies pointed out that quantum computing-based cyber-attacks could open the vulnerabilities of a blockchain-based VANET [7] [8] [4][9].


A classical attack model, such as a false message by any attacker, will cause a lack of trust in vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) communication, and a blockchain-based VANET can identify such malicious vehicles (or vehicle) using a trust-based blockchain framework. However, there are cases where the trust-based framework of blockchain could become vulnerable. For example, a blockchain-based VANET cannot identify a malicious vehicle and corresponding false messages in an impersonation attack, as shown in Figure 1. In this scenario, a group of vehicles, with each vehicle acting as a block, creates a blockchain under a Roadside Unit (RSU), and the RSU runs a trust management unit. All RSUs between each other form (as shown between the $\#(N+1)$ to $\#(N+2)$ RSU) a trust evaluation chain, which is a chained framework to store and transmit trust information. As presented in Figure 1, a malicious vehicle (orange in color) could impersonate a non-malicious vehicle (green in color) by forging its digital signature using a quantum attack. The attacker could generate an impersonation message of a false traffic crash and broadcast the false message to surrounding vehicles, as shown in Figure 1. All vehicles within its communication range, upon receiving the message, send the false message to RSU $\#(N+1)$ as an acknowledgement (Ack) of the transaction. RSU $\#(N+1)$ then disseminates the transaction message to other vehicles for their consensus regarding the transaction. After that, if it is an authenticated and trusted message, RSU sends the false message to all other vehicles and RSUs about the crash within its communication range. In this scenario, RSU $\#(N+1)$ cannot find the original sender (orange in color) of the false traffic crash message, as the digital signature of the green vehicle has been compromised by the malicious vehicle (orange in color). So, the trust mechanism fails to detect the original attacker. Furthermore, if the attacker vehicle receives the “Miner” (block creation responsibility) capability as a trusted vehicle, it also adds another malicious vehicle to support the false message in the blockchain. This scenario shows a vulnerability of a blockchain based VANET using a quantum computing based attack model.

The blockchain-based architecture relies on two cryptographic mechanisms to provide security and trust [6]: (i) check the integrity of the data itself using hash functions, and (ii) check the ownership of the data with asymmetric cryptography. If a quantum algorithm can break the

Manuscript received April 7, 2023.

K. H. Shakib and M. Rahman is with the Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, USA (e-mail: khshakib@crimson.ua.edu; mizan.rahman@ua.edu).

M. Islam is with the General Motors, Michigan, USA (e-mail: mdmhafi@g.clemson.edu).



Note: In this figure, we only focus on an attack scenario for a blockchain-based VANET. Thus, we are not showing two-way V2V communication.




Fig 1. An example attack scenario for a Blockchain-based VANET.

cryptographic algorithm, it can create security concerns for any secure communication architectures, such as blockchain, as it uses an encryption technique, i.e., RSA [7], elliptic curve digital signature algorithm (ECDSA)[3][8].

In this paper, we developed a quantum cyber-attack framework exploiting the vulnerability of the cryptographic ownership mechanism. The objectives of this study are to:

- (i) identify the existing vulnerabilities of secured blockchain-based VANET,
- (ii) develop a quantum impersonation attack model to break the trust-based architecture of a blockchain-based VANET, and
- (iii) develop a proof-of-concept for quantum advantage (using quantum Shor's algorithm) against RSA.

This proof-of-concept will demonstrate a potential threat of quantum attacks on the public-private key based cryptography in VANET architecture. The quantum attack model in this study is developed based on Shor's algorithm [8], which has an exponential speedup in solving prime number factorization. Findings from this study will help to identify existing vulnerabilities of blockchain based VANET architecture and provide insights into potential threats that could arise due to quantum computing advancement.

II. RELATED WORK

For non-quantum-based attacks, prime factorization, which is a major part of cryptography used in ownership mechanism, cannot be broken in polynomial time [9]. As modular exponentiation (one of the necessary steps in prime factorization) cannot be executed in polynomial time by

classical computing algorithms, it takes exponential time. However, such an approach is possible in a quantum-based attack scenario. In quantum computing, using the superposition property of qubits, complex calculations can be solved. For example, it is possible to do factorization in polynomial time with quantum computing, where classical computer needs exponential time to perform prime factorization [9]. Due to the nature of finding non-trivial factors in every iteration, Shor's algorithm guesses and is more likely to find factors in polynomial time [9].

Quantum attacks can be formulated using two different algorithms: (i) Shor's algorithm [9] because of its ability of factorization; and (ii) Grover's algorithm due to its searching capability [10]. Shor's algorithm provides threat on asymmetric cryptography through prime factorization and discrete logarithm problem solving capability, which covers the basis for a wide range of cryptographic techniques. On the other hand, Grover's algorithm is applicable for symmetric cryptography through inverting the hash functions [11].

Grover's algorithm is more appropriate for PoW-based scheme. Authors in [6] presented two primary applications of Grover's algorithm. Firstly, the algorithm can enable quadratic speedup for solving hash functions and creating attacks [12]. The attacker, who controls more than half of computing power of the network as miner, can monopolize the data and even rewrite the blocks by creating forks as well. Secondly, the attacker can search for hash collisions [12][13] to replace certain parts of blocks without breaking the chain. Moreover, the attacker can create a more reliable chain by keeping the hash of the block the same, as the pointer of the previous block will point to the same block.

In the study [14], authors describe a transaction hijacking scenario in cryptocurrency platforms using the public key, which is published to the network or revealed from transactions sitting in the memory pools. They present an attack model that uses the Shor's algorithm on a known public key to decrypt the private key. Then, using that decrypted private key creates a conflicting transaction spending the same value. They create a commit-delay-reveal architecture to safeguard the reveal of public key encryption. Though such a scheme can fail in a broadcasting scenario, such a delay will cause lack of trust. Another limitation of the study was the failure to provide a proof-of-concept.

A few studies have been conducted on improving the ownership mechanism of blockchain and making it quantum-safe through post-quantum cryptography [15] and quantum key distribution (QKD) [16]. However, post-quantum solutions lack standardization, suffer from periodicity and symmetry [17], and use large-size keys, which increase the complexity of the decryption of the key, such as a lattice-based architecture [6]. In addition, the QKD-based technique requires dedicated quantum communication channels [18], and physically setting up such channel is not feasible in a dynamic network, such as VANET. In addition, such long-distance QKD transfer in quantum secure direct communication channels, which is known as quantum relay, could have increased quantum error and complexity. Moreover, quantum relays [19] are prone to quantum noise and errors as well as concurrent eavesdropping (compromised RSU in our case), which will be almost impossible to make a fault-tolerant and randomized (random qubit measurement) QKD [4] to address security issues. Therefore, the quantum-based blockchain solution, which could ensure security against quantum-based attacks, is in its early days. To the best of our knowledge, there is no quantum attack model on blockchain-based VANET in the literature that demonstrates its vulnerability. This indicates the importance of this research and the gap in the existing literature.

III. BLOCKCHAIN-BASED VANET AND THREAT MODEL

This section presents an architecture of blockchain-based VANET and identifies its vulnerabilities against a quantum-attack.

A. Blockchain-based VANET Architecture

Blockchain-based VANET architecture has not been standardized yet. However, two different mechanisms, i.e., Proof-of-Work (PoW) and Proof-of-Stake (PoS) based consensus [1][2], are available in literature for implementing VANET architecture. Unlike PoW, which requires the computational power for solving cryptographic puzzles (i.e., solving SHA-X) [17], PoS considers all the vehicles as stakeholders of the system, and trustworthy vehicles/randomly selected vehicles to be considered as the 'Miner' criteria. Here, we briefly explain the concept of PoW based VANET and PoS based VANET as follows:

- (a) *PoW based VANET*: In PoW, the consensus mechanism works as when a vehicle sends a traffic crash warning message, and it goes to the "Mempool" of the

RSU/miner. The mempool is where the unauthenticated messages or transactions stay as long as there are no similar reports from other vehicles regarding the message [20].

- (b) *PoS based VANET*: The consensus mechanism of PoS works as it checks the traffic crash message with other vehicles' (stakeholders') consensus about the message. It has the ability to find out the malicious transaction through horizontal trust (HT) in V2V communication and vertical trust (VT) in V2I communication [21].

Algorithm-1 (see below) presents the pseudo code of a blockchain based VANET architecture. In this paper, we identified the vulnerabilities of a trust based PoS mechanism as well as indicated corresponding vulnerabilities of PoW mechanism. Note that this study focused on proving the vulnerability of PoS mechanism instead of PoW; the corresponding reasonings are presented in subsection III.B. The RSU is defined as a static node that keeps a copy of the ledger and works as an administrator of the system. RSU validates the integrity of a transaction and the corresponding messages by a consensus mechanism.

Trust-chain is a trust-based blockchain architecture with asymmetric encryption to identify ownership using the digital signatures of the vehicles and their trust values, which increase with every authenticated transaction. A trust chain-based blockchain architecture verifies authenticity in two steps. Firstly, it verifies the ownership of the digital signature that is encrypted with RSA/ECDSA. Secondly, it checks the authenticity of the message.

Algorithm 1: Blockchain based VANET architecture.

Result: Blockchain secured system

Initialization.

Step 1: Building vertical trust mechanism between vehicles (VT)

Step 2: Building horizontal trust mechanism between vehicle to infrastructure (HT)

Step 3: Storing transactions on public ledger on RSU

Step 4: Executing consensus-based voting system for every transaction

Step 5: Generate a voting result to identify malicious nodes

Follow Step 2

Step 6: If malicious node found

Increase trust value

Track two more transactions and block

Else

Continue checking

Step 7: Assign miner responsibility, add new block and increase trust value

Step 8: Pass the blacklist to other RSU

To generate a block, multiple entities called miners with high trust value (validates transactions and introduces new vehicles) verify the block transaction with a defined rule. As a final step, verified transactions are stored in the blockchain and dissipated to every block to maintain transparency. For example, a vehicle with false trajectories (speed-difference and distance), false digital signature, or false information about a traffic crash can be identified using a consensus mechanism. The voting is done by horizontal trust result (trusted=1 and not trusted=0) created by every transaction, which is sent to RSU (as VT step) for voting. RSU calculates majority voting (greater than the threshold trust value) for every transaction

and classifies malicious transactions. This threshold changes with increasing trust of the vehicles.

There is a forward dissemination of packets from RSU to all vehicles within its wireless communication coverage to let every other vehicle know about any transactions and corresponding trust values to maintain the ledger. A vehicle with the highest trust value (the highest stake value) or a randomly selected vehicle (if many vehicles has the same trust value) serves as a validator/miner. It will create a new block with a new vehicle and an increase in overall trust values. This trust value offset has been calculated as described in the reference [2]. Trust value can be increased with every vehicle authenticity check and message validation (adds 5 per transaction in this paper), with identifying false transactions (adds 10 per transaction), and with adding new validators/miners (20 for mining) upon writing onto the block. If a malicious vehicle tries to do double spending with the same gas value (i.e., compensation value for a transaction to store in a block), it can be identified too. The system blocks the malicious vehicle after two transactions. Trust values can be carried to other RSUs, and if a vehicle is blocked by any RSU, it cannot enter a new block of other RSUs.

B. Threats and Vulnerabilities of a Blockchain-based VANET

The threats to a blockchain-based VANET system can be considered low if the trustworthiness of the system is maintained. Tempering of data and sniffing in ongoing VANET conversations (V2V and/or V2I) are considered less possible because of trustworthy encryption, such as RSA, hashing of the data, and distributed transparent ledger. However, as quantum computing can find out the digital signature of a vehicle, which is part of each disseminated message, it can be used to create an attack and make a trust-based system vulnerable and can have a catastrophic impact on VANET, even creating the possibility of multi-vehicle collisions and changing the routes of vehicles. Here, we explain the vulnerabilities of PoS and PoW of a blockchain based VANET because of an impersonation attack.

- (a) *Vulnerabilities of PoS-VANET due to an impersonation attack:* As shown in Figure 1, a general attack scenario on the PoS mechanism is created in which a malicious vehicle creates a false message, and with the consensus mechanism of blockchain, gets detected, tracked, and eventually gets blocked. Then, a digital signature from disseminated packets of RSU is used and tries to forge the digital signature of a trusted vehicle. A malicious vehicle creates an impersonation attack by broadcasting a false message of a traffic crash with forged digital signature. The system tries to block malicious vehicle identification through the digital signature with majority votes of the stakeholders. In this way, a blockchain-based VANET blocks a vehicle as a malicious vehicle. So, with quantum computers [20], if we can figure out and break the encryption, such an attack would be possible [22]. An attacker gains the trust of the system, gets miner responsibilities, and introduces new malicious vehicles. Thus, the consensus

of majority voting fails to remove the malicious vehicle as it has more stakes in the system by adding more malicious vehicles and using their votes to influence the system. The attacker starts double spending the initial gas amount at the beginning and spams the VANET with more false messages.

- (b) *Vulnerabilities of PoW-VANET due to an impersonation attack:* The PoW mechanism also acts on the consensus mechanism using the consensus mechanism in an unauthenticated mempool [20]. A malicious vehicle can report the same traffic crash with other vehicles' digital signatures and authenticate the message. An attacker could have 10 minutes [17] to either figure out how to crack the puzzle to act as a miner (which can be done using Quantum Grover's algorithm) [22] or the digital signature (using Quantum Shor's algorithm) of other vehicles to spread the traffic crash notification from the mempool.

IV. QUANTUM-BASED IMPERSONATION ATTACK MODEL

This section presents an architecture of Quantum Shor's algorithm that will be used to launch a quantum cyber-attack on a blockchain-based VANET.

A. Quantum Shor's Algorithm

Quantum Shor's algorithm uses period finding (phase) in superposition states to perform modular exponentiation in polynomial time. In Algorithm-2, we have explained the quantum Shor's algorithm to break RSA. The key insight behind Shor's algorithm is to use quantum Fourier transform to efficiently find the period of a modular multiplication function. The modular multiplication function takes two integers, say m and x , and computes the remainder of the product of m and x divided by some modulus, N . In other words, it computes $m^x \bmod N$.

To factor a composite number N using Shor's algorithm, we first choose a random prime number m between 1 and $N-1$. Then we apply the modular multiplication function repeatedly to compute $m^x \bmod N$ for a series of values of x until we find two values of x , say x_1 and x_2 , such that $m^{x_1} \bmod N = m^{x_2} \bmod N$. The period of the modular multiplication function is then given by the difference between x_1 and x_2 , i.e., $p = x_1 - x_2$. Finding the period p is the key step in Shor's algorithm, and it can be done efficiently using Quantum Fourier Transform (QFT). The QFT is a quantum version of the classical Fourier transform, which is a mathematical tool for analyzing periodic functions. By applying the QFT on the superposition states corresponding to the outputs of the modular multiplication function, the algorithm can find the period [23]. If the phase is odd or check $m^{\frac{r}{2}}$ (m is a prime number) and it is congruent to $1 \pmod{N}$, where N is a public key, it is in the order of $r/2$ (r is a fraction denominator). Then, the $GCD(m^{\frac{r}{2}-1}, N)$ and $GCD(m^{\frac{r}{2}+1}, N)$ are applied to obtain prime factors of N .

Algorithm 2: Shor's algorithm for breaking RSA

Result: Private key decryption

Initialization.

Step 1: Take the public key from key pair = (N, A)

Step 2: Choose a prime number m

Step 3: Run Shor's algorithm with periodic phase (p)

Calculate phase (p) using modular exponentiation on m and Quantum Fourier Transform

Step 4: Find fraction denominator r with fraction of phase (p) and N

Step 5: If p is odd or $GCD\left(m^{\frac{r-1}{2}}, N\right) = -1$

Follow Step 2

Else

Apply $GCD\left(m^{\frac{r-1}{2}}, N\right)$ & $GCD\left(m^{\frac{r+1}{2}}, N\right)$

Step 6: Check guessed factor of N

Step 7: Use guessed factor to decode the RSA encrypted message

Figure 2 depicts the quantum circuit implementation with 8 qubits (q) and 4 classical bits (c) for the prime factorization of 15, where $m=7$ and $N=15$. Four of the counting qubits ($q_0, q_1, q_2,$ and q_3) are into superposition states of $(|0\rangle, |1\rangle)$ with equal probability using the Hadamard gate (see "H" in Figure 2). Then, we use X -gate or Pauli- X gate (see "X" in Figure 2) to convert from State-1 (an auxiliary qubit) to State-0. After that, m is raised to the power of 2^q modulo N using a controlled operation to find the modular exponentiation. Later, all gates are appended to aggregate every qubit, q , in each iteration of modulo operation to form the circuit. After that, an inverse QFT is performed on the counting qubits to determine the finite time (period finding) value (state $|s\rangle$) from the frequency domain (superposition state $|t\rangle$) and appended (with every qubit q) to get the circuit. Then, the counting qubits are measured and stored the results in the classical bits.

B. Quantum Impersonation Attack

In this scheme, the trust chain's dependency on the corresponding trust value is exploited to detect any discrepancy by verifying the digital signatures and messages. As shown below, the attack scheme in Algorithm-3 presents trust-based blockchain vulnerabilities using quantum Shor's

algorithm. Algorithm-2 runs as a sub-process of Algorithm-3 to forge the digital signature and use it to broadcast a false message (e.g., traffic crash) with a forged digital signature. It also checks if the system is PoW-architecture based or not, as it must decide if there is a time constraint for the attack to be successful. An attacker also tries to double spending when it sends multiple transactions with the same gas value to save up its transaction limits. It also gains trust by pinning its blame on other vehicles using their forged digital signatures. As a malicious vehicle takes on the miners' responsibilities, it can introduce new malicious vehicles and help to get a majority in voting.

Our attack model depends on breaking asymmetric cryptography or public-key cryptography. With the forged private key or digital signature, a sender (i.e., a malicious vehicle) broadcasts false messages or transactions to other trusted vehicles and corresponding RSU within its communication range in the blockchain. These private-public key pairs are formed using the prime factorization in RSA. By using quantum Shor's algorithm, a malicious vehicle can guess the prime factor and figure out the private key, thus forming the attack scheme. Our proposed attack scheme does well in finding small private keys with the existing capabilities of quantum computing.

Algorithm 3: Attack Scheme based on Quantum Computing (QC)

Result: Compromised digital signatures and adding new malicious nodes

Initialization.

Step 1: Take the public key from broadcasted messages

Step 2: Use Quantum Shor's algorithm [run Algorithm. 3] to get the private key

Step 3: Forge digital signatures

Step 4: Broadcast false message

Step 5: If time duration-based Proof of Work

Follow step 1

Else

Continue

Step 6: Do double spending

Step 7: Gain trust and block another node with consensus voting

Step 8: Gain miner responsibility

Step 9: Add false nodes/vehicles to the system




Fig 2. Quantum circuit implementation of modular exponentiation using IBM Qiskit.

V. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND IMPLEMENTATION

In order to validate the effectiveness of the quantum attack model, the performance evaluations of a blockchain-based VANET are conducted utilizing a simulation platform, i.e., Objective Modular Network Testbed in C++ (OMNET++) [21][25]. For implementing this simulation platform, the attack model is divided into three environments: mobility, VANET, and quantum computing, as shown in Figure 3. To set up the mobility environment, we used Simulation for Urban Mobility (SUMO) [26], which interacts with VEINS [27] and contains the road network and vehicle trajectory information. Overall, we simulated blockchain-based VANET using OMNET++, extended INET [28] library for communication, VEINS, and SUMO for vehicular mobility. In our simulation, we use a small key RSA-based message encryption, implemented in Qiskit (IBM quantum environment) [24]. Prime factorization has been done using Shor’s algorithm to forge the digital signature of neighboring vehicles. Finally, we generate a false message using the forged digital signature to create an impersonation attack within the VANET.




Fig 3. Block diagram of system interaction architecture.

A. Mobility and VANET Environment Setup

The blockchain-based VANET has been tested and implemented using OMNET++ 5.6.2 version with the help of SUMO. The VEINS (5.21 version)-SUMO integration has been done to set up the simulation of a traffic crash scenario. INET (version 4) is used to implement V2RSU (V2I) and V2V communication. We implement the blockchain using C++ in OMNET++ with five nodes, where four moving nodes act as vehicles and one static node, i.e., RSU. In the omnetpp.ini file, we declare the simulation conditions, initial money, data rate, connectivity protocols, delays, number of malicious vehicles, and number of malicious transactions (acts as fault-tolerance limit, considered two in our simulation). On the network (.ned) file, we declare all the V2V and V2I communication protocols. In the vehicular (vehicles and RSU) files, we define the message relay, packet generation (packet length, packet type, digital signatures, timestamp, hashed messages), receive, acknowledgment, block creation request, verification, and routing information. The success of the trust chain depends on successfully decrypting, validating, and verifying authenticated messages and finding malicious transactions and suspected vehicles at any point in time. We generate log

messages (timestamp and trust value) for every transaction within the blockchain-based VANET. The RSU aggregates the voting of every vehicle to make malicious vehicle identification decisions as per the consensus mechanism.

As illustrated in Figure 4, every vehicle’s onboard unit (OBU) has three modules: mobility, VANET, and blockchain ledger. The mobility module consists of the roadway network and the vehicle’s trajectory information. The VANET module enables V2V and V2I communication. The blockchain ledger module consists of records of transactions that contain a digital signature, a message, a timestamp, and transaction value details. Each vehicle uses a blockchain ledger module for each transaction to vote for authenticity. The RSU has the VANET module as it receives messages and disseminates transaction messages. It also contains a ledger module, which checks authenticity using majority voting, and maintains a list of suspected vehicles and their corresponding block lists.

We use VEINS and SUMO to generate vehicle trajectory information. A dedicated ledger module is coded in OMNET++, and INET is used for VANET communication. For each message, a sender (a vehicle or an RSU) generates a packet, encrypts it with RSA using an asymmetric key, and broadcasts it to a receiver (a vehicle or an RSU). This communication between a sender and a receiver will be stored in their respective ledgers. This ledger information consists of their transaction value, which is a gas value as defined above, their digital signature, message, and timestamp. If both sender and receiver are vehicles, these transaction details are also sent to the RSU by the receiver, and the RSU disseminates this transaction to other vehicles to maintain consistency in the ledgers of other vehicles. Each vehicle generates the credibility of this transaction and uploads its trust value using either “1” or “0.” Here, “1” represents a trusted transaction, and “0” represents a non-trusted transaction.

The RSU then checks the transaction’s digital signature and corresponding gas value for double spending scenarios. In addition, the RSU checks the overall authenticity of the transaction and the corresponding message based on majority voting. The trustworthiness of each transaction is decided based on a trust threshold value. If trusted, it increases the trust value of the overall system; otherwise, it puts the vehicle on a suspected list.

At least two transactions are needed to identify a malicious vehicle as fault tolerance, block it, and pass it to other RSUs. The transaction value (or gas spent in every transaction) and trust value are calculated as presented in the reference [2]. The key parameters related to the quantum attack model are provided in Table I.

TABLE I: KEY PARAMETERS

Parameters	Values
Number of Vehicles	4
Number of RSU	1
Packet Size	100 bytes
Encryption Type	RSA
Hash Algorithm	SHA-256
Gas	100




Fig 4. Component diagram for the implementation of quantum-based attack model.

B. Quantum Computing Environment Setup

An attacker receives the disseminated packet of other transactions from RSU and uses Quantum Shor's algorithm to decipher the digital signature of the sender. In this simulation experiment, an attack is created using IBM Quantum Lab [24]. As we can identify the message and public key from RSU disseminated packets, we guess the private key of the sender and verify the private key pair formulation for a pair of vehicles using Shor's algorithm.

Using Qiskit programming language, we are able to determine the co-prime of a small prime number (15) that can encrypt any number between 0 and 9 as a digital signature and even up to any of 14 sequential letters (out of the 26 alphabets in English) that can be used as messages in V2V communications. Thus, we break the small key RSA algorithm using Shor's algorithm. Then, we generate messages with forged digital signatures from a vehicle, which is selected as the malicious vehicle in our simulation. With such an attack the whole trust mechanism of the blockchain became vulnerable as it identified another vehicle as a malicious vehicle but could not identify the original malicious vehicle. The trust value of the malicious vehicle increases as the blockchain-based VANET could not identify the malicious vehicle. After this attack, the malicious vehicle gains more trust, gets selected as the miner, and introduces more malicious vehicles into the new block.

VI. EVALUATION OUTCOMES

This section is structured into three subsections. The first subsection focuses on the evaluation of the failure of a trust based PoS-VANET system caused by a quantum impersonation attack. The accumulated trust value was calculated by adding offsets in every triggered event and by generating event logs. In the second subsection, we evaluate the failure of the trust mechanism due to an impersonation attack by examining each

vehicle profile. Finally, the third subsection assesses the computational time required for a quantum-powered attack to meet the time-limited consensus-based VANET's blockchain architecture.




Fig 5. Variation of accumulated trust value in RSU.

A. Evaluation of Trust-based System Failure

We present a trust-based VANET architecture using simulation parameters (as shown in Table I) that fails to detect and increases the trust value of a malicious vehicle (i.e., Vehicle #2). Note that Vehicle #2 impersonates another vehicle, i.e., Vehicle #3, to complete a malicious transaction. As shown in Figure 5, we observe that the accumulated trust value in the RSU increases even if a malicious transaction or impersonation attack by creating false messages that occur within the VANET. Trust value increases as long as the blockchain can find a malicious vehicle responsible for the false message transaction. However, this creates controversy on the trust-based VANET system, as it cannot decrease the trust until it finds a malicious transaction that has been impersonated and compromised by a malicious vehicle itself. This proves the vulnerability of the trust-based system. We also observe that a new block has been introduced, even if there is a malicious vehicle present, that

conducts malicious transactions in the VANET. We observed (see Figure 5) that the accumulated trust value increases for an event with an increment of 10 even if a malicious transaction occurs (indicated as red circles). On the other hand, the accumulated trust value increases for an event with an increment of 20 due to mining a new block (see the green circle), whereas the trust value increases with an increment of 5 for an authenticated transaction. This shows how a trust-based architecture fails to resist an impersonation attack and assigns mining responsibilities even if a malicious transaction occurs.

B. Evaluation of Vehicular Profile of Trust Value

In this subsection, we evaluate trust-chain value of each vehicle at the vehicular level without considering trust offsets. Figure 6 illustrates the trust value profiles for Vehicle #2 and Vehicle #3. As Vehicle #2 executes a quantum impersonation attack on Vehicle #3, it forges the digital signature of Vehicle #3, causing the trust value of Vehicle #3 to decline for each malicious transaction. However, the trust value of Vehicle #2 increases, making it appear like a trusted node in VANET. We observe that Vehicle #3 gets blocked and its trust value reaches zero when it appears to perform malicious transactions more than the threshold. Figure 6 shows that Vehicle #3 gets suspected of a malicious transaction by blockchain consensus mechanism at event 17, and the trust value reduces to -1. Vehicle #2 does this impersonation attack, but it does not get suspected due to its forging of digital signature, and its trust value increases to +1. Again, the same happens at events #88 and #137, where Vehicle #2 pins the blame on Vehicle #3, and the trust value of Vehicle #3 declines and eventually gets to 0 as it gets blocked. Vehicle #2, despite being the malicious node, becomes the miner at event #93 by being randomly selected as the miner. This depicts the evaluation of individual vehicular level trust mechanism and failure of PoS-based trust-chain architecture (as stakeholders' consensus fails to identify the malicious vehicle).




Fig 6. Vehicular trust value profiles.

C. Computational Time Requirement

We assess the time required for generating a quantum-based private key to satisfy the computational time requirement for smaller key RSA [15]. To model a quantum attack, it is first necessary to break RSA, decrypt the received message, and forge digital signatures. Note that the private keys change with

a predefined frequency of 10 mins for a new block as per PoW mechanism-based blockchain [6]. Our approach only takes polynomial time complexity and can identify the factors for a small key efficiently (which acts as a proof-of-concept). In our case, factoring a 4-bit number like 15 takes between 5 to 17 seconds (experiment repeated 30 times). We developed this quantum-based attack model with a small key RSA (4 bits in our experiment) as a proof-of-concept due to existing limited computational capacity to break 2048-bit RSA. Figure 7 shows that the mean factorization time is 10.4 using a Poisson probability distribution of 30 trials. In addition to this factorization time, additional computational time is required to decrypt a message and create a false message packet with forged digital signature. OMNET++ stores the total computational time (factorization time, message decryption and forged message creation) in a log file as shown below.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Computational Time} \\ = \text{Factorization Time} + \text{Message Decryption} + \text{Forged} \\ \text{Message Creation} \end{aligned}$$

Overall, it takes a mean of 115 seconds, which is significantly lower than the 10 minutes required to hack into the current block. This ensures that the false message in “mempool” gets sufficient votes within the time constraint. Thus, our quantum cyber-attack generation technique takes advantage of the current limitation of blockchain-based VANET.




Fig 7. Probability distribution of required time (in seconds) for factorization.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The presented attack model with a quantum advantage over classical computers has given the necessary proof-of-concept to expose the vulnerabilities of a blockchain-based VANET. Even though existing quantum computers do not have the necessary computational efficiency to break 2048-bit RSA, we conclude that the presented quantum attack on a small key RSA (4 bits in our experiment) could act as a proof-of-concept for such an attack. In this study, a quantum impersonation attack model is developed against a state-of-the-art PoS and a time-constraint based PoW mechanism and evaluated its effectiveness. Specifically, the vulnerability of vertical trust (vehicle-to-infrastructure trust-chain) using the aggregated trust profile at RSU and the horizontal trust (vehicle-to-vehicle trust-chain) is

evaluated using each vehicle's trust profile. It reveals that the quantum cyber-attack—i.e., impersonation attack—is able to successfully break the trust chain of a blockchain-based VANET. Thus, blockchain based VANET requires post-quantum cryptography solutions that do not have periodicity, symmetry, or large key problems. In future studies, quantum-based short key solutions like quantum digital signatures (QDS), quantum key distribution (QKD) over quantum satellites, or 1000 km long quantum communication channels could be explored. Therefore, a quantum secured blockchain based VANET can be a solution and a future direction for attaining a secured blockchain based VANET system.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This material is based on a study supported by the Alabama Transportation Institute (ATI). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Alabama Transportation Institute (ATI).

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Li, L. Pei, D. Liao, G. Sun, and D. Xu, "Blockchain Meets VANET: An Architecture for Identity and Location Privacy Protection in VANET," *Peer Peer Netw Appl*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 1178–1193, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s12083-019-00786-4.
- [2] Z. Yang, K. Yang, L. Lei, K. Zheng, and V. C. M. Leung, "Blockchain-based decentralized trust management in vehicular networks," *IEEE Internet Things J*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1495–1505, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1109/JIOT.2018.2836144.
- [3] R. Shaikh and D. Deotale, "A Survey on VANET Security using ECC, RSA & MD5," *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer and Communication Engineering*, vol. 4, 2015, doi: 10.17148/IJARCC.2015.4637.
- [4] M. Younan, M. Elhoseny, A. A. Ali, and E. H. Houssein, "Quantum Chain of Things (QCoT): A New Paradigm for Integrating Quantum Computing, Blockchain, and Internet of Things," *17th International Computer Engineering Conference, ICENCO 2021*, pp. 101–106, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ICENCO49852.2021.9698947.
- [5] T. M. Fernandez-Carames and P. Fraga-Lamas, "Towards Post-Quantum Blockchain: A Review on Blockchain Cryptography Resistant to Quantum Computing Attacks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 21091–21116, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2968985.
- [6] "Quantum Computing - The Impending End for the Blockchain?" <https://www.sitm.wiwi.uni-due.de/research/publications/publication-list/quantum-computing-the-impending-end-for-the-blockchain-15595/> (accessed Jan. 28, 2023).
- [7] "The Convergence of IoT and Quantum Computing - IEEE Internet of Things." <https://iot.ieee.org/newsletter/january-2021/the-convergence-of-iot-and-quantum-computing.html?highlight=WyJxdWFudHVtIl0=> (accessed Apr. 02, 2023).
- [8] L. Tessler and T. Byrnes, "Bitcoin and quantum computing," *ArXiv*, 2017.
- [9] P. W. Shor, "Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring," in *Proceedings 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 1994, pp. 124–134. doi: 10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700.
- [10] L. K. Grover, "A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search," *Proceedings of the Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, vol. Part F129452, pp. 212–219, Jul. 1996, doi: 10.1145/237814.237866.
- [11] V. Fernandez, A. B. Orue, and D. Arroyo, "Securing blockchain with quantum safe cryptography: When and how?," *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, vol. 1267 AISC, pp. 371–379, 2021, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-57805-3_35/COVER.
- [12] B. Rodenburg and S. P. Pappas, "Blockchain and Quantum Computing," 2017.
- [13] W. Cui, T. Dou, and S. Yan, "Threats and Opportunities: Blockchain Meets Quantum Computation," Nov. 2020, doi: 10.23919/CCC50068.2020.9189608.
- [14] I. Stewart, D. Ilie, A. Zamyatin, S. Werner, M. F. Torshizi, and W. J. Knottenbelt, "Committing to quantum resistance: a slow defence for Bitcoin against a fast quantum computing attack," *R Soc Open Sci*, vol. 5, no. 6, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1098/RPOS.180410.
- [15] T. Srivastava, B. Bhushan, S. Bhatt, and A. K. M. B. Haque, "Integration of Quantum Computing and Blockchain Technology: A Cryptographic Perspective," *Studies in Big Data*, vol. 108, pp. 197–228, 2022, doi: 10.1007/978-981-19-0924-5_12/TABLES/3.
- [16] V. Fernandez, A. B. Orue, and D. Arroyo, "Securing blockchain with quantum safe cryptography: When and how?," *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, vol. 1267 AISC, pp. 371–379, 2021, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-57805-3_35/COVER.
- [17] L. Tessler and T. Byrnes, "Bitcoin and quantum computing," *ArXiv*, 2017.
- [18] "The Convergence of IoT and Quantum Computing - IEEE Internet of Things." <https://iot.ieee.org/newsletter/january-2021/the-convergence-of-iot-and-quantum-computing.html?highlight=WyJxdWFudHVtIl0=> (accessed Apr. 02, 2023).
- [19] H. Chen, "Quantum Relay Blockchain and Its Applications in Key Service," in *Proceedings of the 2020 4th International Conference on Cryptography, Security and Privacy*, in ICCSP 2020. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 95–99. doi: 10.1145/3377644.3377657.
- [20] E. H. Diallo, O. Dib, N. R. Zema, and K. Al Agha, "When Proof-of-Work (PoW) based blockchain meets VANET environments," *2021 12th International Conference on Information and Communication Systems, ICICS 2021*, pp. 336–343, May 2021, doi: 10.1109/ICICSS2457.2021.9464609.
- [21] A. Haddaji, S. Ayed, and L. C. Fourati, "Blockchain-based Multi-Levels Trust Mechanism against Sybil Attacks for Vehicular Networks," *Proceedings - 2020 IEEE 14th International Conference on Big Data Science and Engineering, BigDataSE 2020*, pp. 155–163, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1109/BIGDATASE50710.2020.00028.
- [22] D. A. Bard, J. J. Kearney, and C. A. Perez-Delgado, "Quantum advantage on proof of work," *Array*, vol. 15, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1016/J.ARRAY.2022.100225.
- [23] J. F. Rivera-Miranda, Á. J. Caicedo-Beltrán, J. D. Valencia-Payán, J. M. Espinosa-Duran, and J. Velasco-Medina, "Hardware emulation of quantum Fourier transform," in *2011 IEEE 2nd Latin American Symposium on Circuits and Systems, LASCAS 2011 - Conference Proceedings*, 2011. doi: 10.1109/LASCAS.2011.5750269.
- [24] "Quantum Lab - IBM Quantum." <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com/lab> (accessed Mar. 19, 2023).
- [25] "OMNeT++ Discrete Event Simulator." <https://omnetpp.org/> (accessed Mar. 19, 2023).
- [26] "Eclipse SUMO - Simulation of Urban MObility." <https://www.eclipse.org/sumo/> (accessed Mar. 19, 2023).
- [27] "Veins - Vehicles in Network Simulation." <https://omnetpp.org/download-items/Veins.html> (accessed Mar. 19, 2023).
- [28] "INET Framework - INET Framework." <https://inet.omnetpp.org/> (accessed Mar. 19, 2023).



Kazi Hassan Shakib is a Ph.D. student at The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. He received his B.Sc. in Engineering in Computer Science and Engineering from Chittagong University of Engineering and Technology, Bangladesh, in 2018. His research interest includes Quantum Computing, Machine Learning, Internet of Things, and Encryption.



Mizanur Rahman (Member, IEEE) is an assistant professor in the Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa. After his graduation in August 2018, he joined as a postdoctoral research fellow for the Center for Connected Multimodal Mobility (C²M²), a U.S. Department of Transportation Tier 1 University Transportation Center (cecas.clemson.edu/c2m2). He also served as an Assistant Director of C2M2. His research focuses on traffic flow theory and transportation cyber-physical systems for connected and automated vehicles and smart cities.



Mhafuzul Islam is currently working as a Senior Researcher at General Motors. He received his Ph.D. in Civil Engineering in 2021 from Clemson University. He also received a B.S. degree in Computer Science and Engineering from Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET) in 2013 and an M.S. degree in Civil Engineering from Clemson University in 2018. His research interest includes transportation cyber-physical systems with an emphasis on data-driven connected autonomous vehicles utilizing machine learning.