

# The complexity of solving a random polynomial system\*

Giulia Gaggero and Elisa Gorla

## 1 Introduction

Randomness plays a fundamental role within cryptography. For example, it plays a pivotal role within key generation and cryptographic algorithms are subject to randomness tests. In multivariate cryptography, one typically wishes for the public key be as close as possible to, or at least appear as, a random system. A random system is expected to be hard to solve, since the Multivariate Quadratic Problem is not only NP-complete, but also known to be hard to solve on average for a wide range of parameters. From this point of view, e.g., a digital signature scheme whose public keys are sufficiently random is expected to be secure.

In this paper, we discuss what it means for a polynomial system to be random and how hard is it to solve a random polynomial system. In Definition 7 we propose a mathematical formulation for the concept of random system. The definition of randomness that we propose is broad enough to include a vast majority of the systems which are of interest in cryptography. For example, every polynomial system which has a finite number of solutions over the algebraic closure of the field over which it is defined is random according to Definition 7, for a suitably chosen open set. We then specify our definition further in Definition 13. One advantage of this definition is that the property of being random according to Definition 13 can be computationally tested, at least in principle.

In Theorem 21, Corollary 24, Corollary 25, Theorem 31, and Proposition 29, we prove upper bounds for the degree of regularity and the solving degree of a random polynomial system, depending on parameters of the system such as the number of equations, the number of variables, and the degree of the equations. The usefulness of our bounds is threefold: On the one side, our bounds can be used to directly produce bounds on the complexity of computing a Gröbner basis, hence of solving, many systems which are of interest in cryptography. Bounds on the complexity produced in this way have the advantage of being widely applicable and the disadvantage of not always being close to the actual complexity for each system to which they apply. On the other side, our bounds give us an idea of what security one can hope to achieve for a system with given parameters. In fact, our bounds on the degree of regularity are sharp, i.e., for any choice of the parameters there are systems that meet the bounds. Last but not least, our bounds can be used as a point of comparison for the security of a given public key, in the following sense. Say that, in order to forge a signature produced with a given multivariate digital signature scheme, one has to find a solution of a system of  $m$  equations of degree  $D$  in  $n$  variables. Suppose that such a system is random according to our definition. Then our results provide an upper bound  $B$  for the degree of regularity or the solving degree of such a system. Say that one can compute or estimate by a different method the degree of regularity or the solving degree of the same system and suppose that this turns out to be  $C$ . Clearly, it must always be that  $C \leq B$ . However, how far  $C$  is from  $B$  gives us a measure of how close to optimal the digital signature scheme is for its choice of parameters. In other words, if  $B$  and  $C$  are close, then there is not much space for improvement, since any system with those parameters can have degree of regularity or solving degree at most  $B$ . If on the contrary  $B$  and  $C$  are far apart, then potentially there is a lot of space for finding a more robust system with the same parameters, since a system with those parameters can have degree of regularity or solving degree up to  $B$ .

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 contains some preliminaries which are useful throughout the paper. In Section 3 we discuss the concept of randomness and propose two def-

---

\*This research was funded by armasuisse through grant no. CYD-C-2020010.

initions of random system, in Definition 7 and Definition 13. We briefly review cryptographic semiregular sequences and semiregular sequences and show that the latter are random according to our definitions. In Section 4, after recalling some results from commutative algebra, we prove some bounds on the degree of regularity and the solving degree of a random system consisting of polynomials the same degree. The bounds appear in Theorem 21, Corollary 24, Corollary 25, Theorem 31, and Proposition 29. Finally, in Section 5 we apply our results to the study of GeMSS and Rainbow.

## 2 Preliminaries

The first algorithm for computing Gröbner bases appeared in the doctoral thesis of Buchberger [7]. Modern algorithms for computing Gröbner bases are based on linear algebra and are more efficient than Buchberger's. Examples of linear-algebra-based algorithms are  $F_4$  [16],  $F_5$  [17], the *XL Algorithm* [14], *MutantXL* [8], and their variants. In all of these systems, one computes the reduced row echelon form of the Macaulay matrix associated to the polynomial equations in a given degree, for one or more degrees.

We now describe the basic structure of linear-algebra-based algorithms. We start from the homogeneous situation, following [4, p. 54]. Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be a field and let  $R = \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be the polynomial ring in  $n$  variables with coefficients in  $\mathbb{F}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$  be a system of homogeneous polynomials and fix a term order. The **homogeneous Macaulay matrix**  $M_d$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  has columns indexed by the terms of  $R_d$  sorted, from left to right, according to the chosen order. The rows of  $M_d$  are indexed by the polynomials  $m_{i,j}f_j$ , where  $m_{i,j} \in R$  is a monomial such that  $\deg(m_{i,j}f_j) = d$ . The entry  $(i, j)$  of  $M_d$  is the coefficient of the monomial of column  $j$  in the polynomial corresponding to the  $i$ -th row.

Now let  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  be any polynomials (not necessarily homogeneous). For any degree  $d \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  the **Macaulay matrix**  $M_{\leq d}$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  has columns indexed by the terms of  $R$  of degree  $\leq d$ , sorted in decreasing order from left to right. The rows of  $M_{\leq d}$  are indexed by the polynomials  $m_{i,j}f_j$ , where  $m_{i,j} \in R$  is a monomial such that  $\deg(m_{i,j}f_j) \leq d$ . The entries of  $M_{\leq d}$  are defined as in the homogeneous case. Notice that, if  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  are homogeneous, the Macaulay matrix  $M_{\leq d}$  is just a block matrix, whose blocks are the homogeneous Macaulay matrices  $M_d, \dots, M_0$  associated to the same equations. This is the reason for using homogeneous Macaulay matrices in the case when  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  are homogeneous. Some algorithms, as *MutantXL* [8], use a variation called **mutant strategy** of this algorithm in the non-homogeneous case: If the reduction of the Macaulay matrix in degree  $d$  has produced new polynomials  $g_1, \dots, g_\ell$  of degree strictly smaller than  $d$ , one appends to the reduction of  $M_{\leq d}$  the polynomials  $m_{i,j}g_j$ , where  $m_{i,j} \in R$  is a monomial such that  $\deg(m_{i,j}g_j) \leq d$ , then computes the reduced row echelon form again. Throughout the paper, we refer to the algorithms that employ the mutant strategy as **mutant algorithms** and to the others as **standard algorithms**.

The size of the Macaulay matrices  $M_{\leq d}$  and  $M_d$ , hence the computational complexity of computing their reduced row echelon forms, depends on the degree  $d$ . This motivates the next definition.

**Definition 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$  and let  $\tau$  be a term order on  $R$ . The **solving degree** of  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to  $\tau$  is the least degree  $d$  such that Gaussian elimination on the Macaulay matrix  $M_{\leq d}$  produces a  $\tau$ -Gröbner basis of  $\mathcal{F}$ . We denote it by  $\text{solv. deg}_\tau(\mathcal{F})$ . Finally, when  $\tau$  is the degree reverse lexicographic order, we omit the subscript  $\tau$ .*

Notice that the solving degree may depend on the algorithm used to perform the Gröbner basis computation. In particular, for mutant algorithms it may be smaller than for standard ones.

The complexity of linear-algebra-based algorithms is dominated by the cost of computing a degree reverse lexicographic Gröbner basis of the system, see [9, Sections 2 and 3] for more detail. Therefore, an upper bound on the solving degree with respect to the reverse lexicographic order yields an upper bound on the complexity of computing the desired Gröbner basis, hence on the complexity of solving the polynomial system.

Let  $I$  be a homogeneous ideal of  $R$ . For an integer  $d \geq 0$  we denote by  $I_d = I \cap R_d$  the  $\mathbb{F}$ -vector space of homogeneous polynomials of degree  $d$  in  $I$ . For  $g \in R$  a polynomial, we denote by  $g^{\text{top}}$  the homogeneous part of  $g$  of largest degree. E.g., if  $g = x^3 + 2xy^2 - y + 1 \in \mathbb{F}[x, y]$ , then

$g^{\text{top}} = x^3 + 2xy^2$ . For a polynomial system  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}} \subseteq R$  the homogeneous system  $\{f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}\}$ . Up to doing Gaussian elimination in a matrix whose rows correspond to  $f_1, \dots, f_m$ , we may suppose that  $f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}$  are linearly independent. We will assume this throughout the paper.

The **degree of regularity** was introduced in [1, 3].

**Definition 2.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq R$  be a polynomial system. The **degree of regularity** of  $\mathcal{F}$  is

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) = \begin{cases} \min\{d \geq 0 \mid (\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}})_d = R_d\} & \text{if } (\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}})_d = R_d \text{ for } d \gg 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the cryptographic literature, the degree of regularity is often used as a proxy for the solving degree. This is the case, e.g., in the specification documents of GeMSS [11]. However, this does not always produce reliable estimates. In fact, there are examples in which the gap between the degree of regularity and the solving degree is large, see e.g. [6, Examples 3.2 and 3.3]. A recent result by Semaev and Tenti [23, 24] however shows that, under suitable assumptions, the solving degree of a standard algorithm is at most twice the degree of regularity. Thanks to this result, an upper bound for the degree of regularity yields a proven upper bound for the solving degree.

**Theorem 3** ([24, Corollary 3.67] and [23, Theorem 2.1]). Let  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m, x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\} \subseteq R$  be a polynomial system. If  $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) \geq \max\{q, \deg(f_1), \dots, \deg(f_m)\}$ , then

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F}) \leq 2d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) - 2.$$

Notice that, in almost all systems of cryptographic interest, the field size and the degrees of the polynomials are relatively small. Therefore, one expects that Theorem 3 applies to such systems.

Another recent result by Salizzoni [22] shows that the solving degree of a mutant algorithm is at most the degree of regularity plus one, unless the system contains polynomials of large degree.

**Theorem 4** ([22, Proposition 3.10]). Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$  be a polynomial system, then

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \max\{d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) + 1, \deg(f_1), \dots, \deg(f_m)\}.$$

Another algebraic invariant connected to the solving degree of a polynomial system is the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity. We refer the reader to [9, Section 3.4] and [10] for its definition and a discussion on its relation with the other invariants.

**Remark 5.** If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$  and the system  $\mathcal{F}$  contains the field equations  $x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n$ , then  $(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}})_d = R_d$  for  $d \gg 0$ , therefore the degree of regularity is finite.

**Remark 6.** If  $(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}})_d = R_d$  for  $d \gg 0$ , then

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{reg}(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}}).$$

Therefore:

- By Theorem 4

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \max\{\text{reg}(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}}) + 1, \deg(f_1), \dots, \deg(f_m)\}$$

for mutant algorithms.

- If  $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) \geq \max\{q, \deg(f_1), \dots, \deg(f_m)\}$ , then by Theorem 3

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F}) \leq 2d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) - 2$$

for standard algorithms.

To conclude the section, we recall how a typical multivariate one-way function is constructed. Let  $\mathbb{F}_q$  be the finite field of cardinality  $q$  and  $R = \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be the polynomial ring over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  in  $n$  variables. Let  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in R$ , and consider the evaluation map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} : \quad \mathbb{F}_q^n &\rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m \\ \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) &\mapsto (f_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), \dots, f_m(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)) \end{aligned}$$

To hide the structure of  $\mathcal{F}$ , we compose it with two random invertible linear maps  $S : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$  and  $T : \mathbb{F}_q^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$ . We obtain  $\mathcal{P} = T \circ \mathcal{F} \circ S$  a set of  $m$  polynomials  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  in  $n$  variables over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . The public key of the multivariate scheme is  $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$  and the private key is  $\{\mathcal{F}, S, T\}$ . The trapdoor consists of constructing  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$  is efficiently computable. Notice that  $\mathcal{P}$  should be hard to invert without the knowledge of  $S, T$ , in particular it should be hard to recover the structure of  $\mathcal{F}$  from  $\mathcal{P}$ .

### 3 Random polynomial systems

Consider a system of  $m$  equations of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_m$  in  $n$  variables. Over a finite field, one often defines a random system as a polynomial system whose coefficients are chosen uniformly at random in the given field. In this paper, we propose a different definition of randomness for a polynomial system. Our definition still captures the intuitive idea of randomness, while allowing us to estimate the degree of regularity of a random system.

Over an infinite field, one may use the concept of genericity from algebraic geometry to define randomness. More precisely, fix a nonempty Zarisky-open subset of  $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{n+d_1}{n}-1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{n+d_m}{n}-1}$ , where  $\mathbb{P}^t$  denotes  $t$ -dimensional projective space. Define a random system as an element of that open set. This makes sense, since every nonempty Zarisky-open set is dense, hence a system of  $m$  equations of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_m$  in  $n$  variables whose coefficients are chosen uniformly at random is generic with high probability according to this definition. The problem of extending this definition to a finite field is that, over a finite field, a nonempty Zarisky-open set is no longer dense, so the connection with our intuitive idea of randomness is lost. Nevertheless, for a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , we may define randomness using a Zariski-dense open set defined over the algebraic closure  $\overline{\mathbb{F}_q}$ . While it is not necessarily the case that almost every polynomial system of given degrees with coefficients in  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is random, this is the case whenever  $q$  is large enough, or if we consider a finite extension of  $\mathbb{F}_q$  of large enough cardinality.

**Definition 7.** Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be a field and  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$  be its algebraic closure. Denote by  $\mathbb{P}^t$  the  $t$ -dimensional projective space over  $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$ . Let  $d_1, \dots, d_m$  be positive integers and let  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{\binom{n+d_1-1}{n-1}-1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{n+d_m-1}{n-1}-1}$  be a nonempty Zariski-open set. For a polynomial  $f$ , denote by  $[f] \in \mathbb{P}^{\binom{n+\deg(f)-1}{n-1}-1}$  the projective point, whose coordinates are the coefficients of  $f$ . A system  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$  with  $\deg(f_i) = d_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  is **random with respect to  $\mathcal{U}$**  if  $([f_1], \dots, [f_m]) \in \mathcal{U}$ .

In the cryptographic literature, random sequences of polynomials are often assumed to be cryptographic semiregular sequences, see e.g. [1, 2]. This is the case in the cryptanalysis of several systems, as e.g. [11]. The next definition appears in [1, Definition 3.2.1 and Definition 3.2.4], [3, Definition 5], and [5, Definition 5 and Definition 9].

**Definition 8.** Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$  be a homogeneous system. If  $\mathbb{F} \neq \mathbb{F}_2$ , we say that  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  are a **cryptographic semiregular sequence** if for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and all  $g_i \in R$  such that  $g_i f_i \in (f_1, \dots, f_{i-1})$  and  $\deg(g_i f_i) < d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F})$ , one has that  $g_i \in (f_1, \dots, f_{i-1})$ .

If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_2$ , we say that  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in R/(x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2)$  are a **cryptographic semiregular sequence** if for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and all  $g_i \in R/(x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2)$  such that  $g_i f_i \in (f_1, \dots, f_{i-1})$  and  $\deg(g_i f_i) < d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^2 + x_1, \dots, x_n^2 + x_n\})$ , one has that  $g_i \in (f_1, \dots, f_{i-1})$ .

If  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  are not homogeneous, then they are a **cryptographic semiregular sequence** if  $f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}$  are a cryptographic semiregular sequence.

In this paper, we use the word cryptographic semiregular sequence in order to distinguish the concept of semiregularity used in the cryptographic literature from the concept of semiregularity originally introduced by Pardue [20, 21], which inspired it. The original definition by Pardue is given over an infinite field  $\mathbb{F}$ . As we are interested also in dealing with finite fields, we extend it in the natural way.

**Definition 9.** Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an infinite field and let  $R = \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Let  $I$  be a homogeneous ideal and let  $A = R/I$ . A polynomial  $f \in R_d$  is **semiregular** on  $A$  if for every  $e \geq d$ , the vector space map  $A_{e-d} \rightarrow A_e$  given by multiplication by  $f$  has maximal rank (that is, it is either injective or

surjective). If  $\mathbb{F}$  is a finite field, let  $\overline{R} = \overline{\mathbb{F}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Then  $f$  is **semiregular** on  $A$  if it is semiregular on  $\overline{R}/I\overline{R}$ .

A sequence of homogeneous polynomials  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  is a **semiregular sequence** if  $f_i$  is semiregular on  $A/(f_1, \dots, f_{i-1})$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

It follows from [21, Proposition 1] that, if  $\mathbb{F} \neq \mathbb{F}_2$ , then a semiregular sequence is also a cryptographic semiregular sequence. The converse does not hold, as shown in [21], see the example just below [21, Proposition 1].

The next proposition presents a simple situation in which cryptographic semiregular sequences and semiregular sequences coincide.

**Proposition 10.** *Let  $q > 2$  and let  $f_1 = x_1^q - x_1, \dots, f_n = x_n^q - x_n, f_{n+1} = f \in R = \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . The sequence  $f_1, \dots, f_{n+1}$  is cryptographic semiregular if and only if the sequence  $f_1^{\text{top}} = x_1^q, \dots, f_n^{\text{top}} = x_n^q, f_{n+1}^{\text{top}} = f^{\text{top}}$  is semiregular.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that, if the sequence  $f_1, \dots, f_{n+1}$  is cryptographic semiregular, then the sequence  $x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q, f^{\text{top}}$  is semiregular. We start by observing that the sequence  $x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q$  is regular. Therefore, in order to show that  $x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q, f^{\text{top}}$  is semiregular, it suffices to show that  $f^{\text{top}}$  is semiregular on  $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$ . If  $f_1, \dots, f_{n+1}$  is cryptographic semiregular and  $d = \deg(f)$ , then the Hilbert series of  $R/(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}})$  is  $[(1 - z^d)(1 + z + \dots + z^{q-1})^n]$  by [5, Proposition 6]. Here for  $p(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} p_i z^i \in \mathbb{Z}[[z]]$ , we denote by  $\delta(p) = \min\{i \geq 0 \mid p_i \leq 0\} - 1$  and define  $[p(z)] = \sum_{i=0}^{\delta(p)} p_i z^i$ . Then  $f^{\text{top}}$  is semiregular on  $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$  and  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}}$  is a semiregular sequence by [21, Proposition 1].  $\square$

Pardue in [20, 21] shows that Fröberg's Conjecture [18], a conjecture which has attracted a lot of attention within the commutative algebra community and that is widely believed to hold, is equivalent to the following

**Conjecture 11.** *Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be an infinite field. A generic sequence of polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_m$  in  $R = \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  is semiregular.*

If the conjecture is true, then a sequence of polynomials of given degrees is semiregular with high probability, provided that the ground field has large enough cardinality. It follows that, if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$  with  $q \gg 0$  and Fröberg's Conjecture holds, then a sequence of polynomials of given degrees is a cryptographic semiregular sequence with high probability. In addition, most cryptographic semiregular sequences are semiregular sequences, as semiregular sequences conjecturally contain a dense open set.

In [1, Section 3.2], Bardet conjectures that a sequence of polynomials with coefficients in  $\mathbb{F}_2$  is cryptographic semiregular with high probability. This conjecture is motivated by experimental evidence, see also [2, Conjecture 2]. The conjecture is later disproved by Hodges, Molina, and Schlather, who in [19] prove that there are choices of the parameters for which no cryptographic semiregular sequence exists over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ . This is the case, e.g., for  $m = 1$  and  $n > 3d_1$ .

In the next proposition we show that, when  $n$  is large compared to  $q$ , there exists no semiregular sequence that contains the field equations, hence by Proposition 10 no cryptographic semiregular sequence of  $n + 1$  polynomials which contains the field equations.

**Proposition 12.** *Let  $q > 2$  and  $n \geq d(q + 1)$ . Then there exists no semiregular sequence over  $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$  that starts with a polynomial  $f$  of  $\deg(f) = d$ . In particular, there exists no cryptographic semiregular sequence that consists of the  $n$  field equations and one polynomial of degree  $d$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A = \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$ . If a semiregular sequence as in the statement exists, let  $e = \max\{a \mid f^a \neq 0\}$ . Then  $e \leq q - 1$  and  $f^{e+1} = f^e \cdot f = 0 \in A_{d(e+1)}$ , so the map

$$\phi : A_{de} \xrightarrow{\cdot f^e} A_{d(e+1)}$$

is not injective. Since  $\phi$  is not injective, it can be surjective only if the dimension of the codomain is smaller than the dimension of the domain. This is equivalent to

$$\binom{n}{d(e+1)} < \binom{n}{de} \iff n < d(2e + 1).$$

It follows that, if  $n \geq d(2e + 1)$ , then there exists no homogeneous semiregular sequence according to Pardue of the form  $x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q, f$ , with  $\deg(f) = d$ . The part of the statement concerning semiregular sequences follows, since  $2q - 1 \geq 2e + 1$ . Moreover, there exists no cryptographic semiregular sequence consisting of the  $n$  field equations and one polynomial of degree  $d$ , since such a sequence would be semiregular by Proposition 10.  $\square$

For relatively small values of  $q$ , one may want to add the field equations to the system that one wants to solve. Therefore, we are interested in a notion of randomness that also applies to systems that contain the field equations.

In this paper, we propose two dense Zariski-open sets, which can be used to formalize the intuitive idea of a random system. The set  $\mathcal{V}$  corresponds to systems of  $m$  polynomials in  $n$  variables which contain a regular sequence of length  $n$ , while the set  $\mathcal{U}$  parametrizes systems of  $m$  polynomials which contain a regular sequence of  $n$  polynomials of the smallest possible degrees. Notice that  $\mathcal{V}$  contains  $\mathcal{U}$  and, if  $m \geq n$ , it also contains the set of cryptographic semiregular sequences and that of semiregular sequences.

**Definition 13.** Fix  $m \geq n \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_m$ . For any multiset  $\Delta$  of cardinality  $n$  contained in the multiset  $\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ , let  $\mathcal{U}_\Delta$  be the subset of  $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{n+d_1-1}{n-1}-1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{n+d_m-1}{n-1}-1}$  whose points correspond to polynomials  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in R$  such that  $\{f_i^{\text{top}} \mid d_i \in \Delta\}$  is a regular sequence. Let

$$\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\{d_1, \dots, d_n\}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{\Delta \subseteq \{d_1, \dots, d_m\}, |\Delta|=n} \mathcal{U}_\Delta.$$

A **random system** of  $m$  polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_m$  in  $n$  variables is a system  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$  such that  $\deg(f_i) = d_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $([f_1], \dots, [f_m]) \in \mathcal{U}$ .

It is well-known that  $\mathcal{U}_{\{d_1, \dots, d_n\}}$  is a dense open set for any choice of  $1 \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$ , if  $m = n$ . This implies that any  $\mathcal{U}_\Delta$  as in Definition 13 is a dense open set, hence also  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  are. Notice that the elements of  $\mathcal{V}$  are exactly the systems of polynomials of degrees  $d_1, \dots, d_m$  for which the degree of regularity is well-defined. Notice moreover that, if  $m = n$ , a random system is a system for which  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}}$  is a regular sequence. Since this case is well-studied in the cryptographic literature, in the sequel we often assume  $m > n$ .

**Remark 14.** For any system  $\mathcal{F}$ , one has

$$\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\} \in \mathcal{U}_{\{q, \dots, q\}}.$$

## 4 The degree of regularity of a random system

In this section, we establish an upper bound for the degree of regularity of a random system  $\mathcal{F}$  consisting of  $m$  polynomials of equal degree  $D$ . In combination with Theorem 3 and Theorem 4, this provides us with an upper bound for the solving degree of a system of random polynomials of the same degree.

**Remark 15.** Notice that  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{U}_{\{d, \dots, d\}}$  for a given  $d > 0$  if and only if  $T \circ \mathcal{F} \circ S \in \mathcal{U}_{\{d, \dots, d\}}$ . In other words, when deciding whether a system of polynomials of equal degree is random, one can safely ignore the random linear transformations  $S$  and  $T$  used to disguise the internal system  $\mathcal{F}$ . This also shows that, for system whose equations are all of the same degree, being a random system according to our definition is an intrinsic property of the system and it is not affected by the invertible linear transformations used to disguise the system.

In [6, Section 4], the authors provide an upper bound for the degree of regularity of a system of quadratic polynomials which contains a regular sequence. In this section, we follow the same basic approach and extend it to systems of polynomials of the same degree and systems of polynomials of the same degree to which one adds the field equations. The cases that we treat in this paper are technically more challenging and require the use of more sophisticated results from commutative algebra. We start by introducing the family of lex-segment ideals. A conjecture by Eisenbud, Green, and Harris will allow us to reduce to these ideals, when estimating the regularity of ideals generating by random systems.

**Definition 16.** Let  $C$  be a positive integer. A monomial ideal  $L \subseteq R$  is a **lex-segment ideal** if it has the property that if  $u, v \in R$  are monomials of the same degree such that  $u \geq_{\text{lex}} v$  and  $v \in L$ , then  $u \in L$ .

Let  $c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$  be non negative integers. An ideal  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq R$  is a  $(c_1, \dots, c_n; C)$ -**LexPlusPowers (LPP) ideal** if  $\mathcal{L} = (x_1^{c_1}, \dots, x_n^{c_n}) + L_C$ , where  $L_C$  is a lex-segment ideal generated in degree  $C$ .

**Notation 17.** Let  $I \subseteq R$  be a homogeneous ideal containing a regular sequence of polynomials of degrees  $c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$ . For each  $C \geq 0$ , we denote by  $\text{LPP}(I; c_1, \dots, c_n; C)$  the  $(c_1, \dots, c_n; C)$ -LPP ideal  $\mathcal{L} = (x_1^{c_1}, \dots, x_n^{c_n}) + L_C$  such that  $\dim(I_C) = \dim(\mathcal{L}_C)$ . We make  $L_C$  unique by choosing the largest lex-segment ideal generated in degree  $C$  for which the equality  $\mathcal{L} = (x_1^{c_1}, \dots, x_n^{c_n}) + L_C$  holds.

The next conjecture [15, Conjecture ( $V_m$ )] has been settled in several cases and it is widely believed to hold within the commutative algebra community. For an introduction to the Eisenbud-Green-Harris Conjecture and an excellent survey of known cases see [13]. Here we state the conjecture in a weak form, which is what we need in the sequel.

**Conjecture 18** (Eisenbud-Green-Harris Conjecture). Let  $I \subseteq R$  be a homogeneous ideal containing a regular sequence of polynomials of degrees  $c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$ . Then

$$\text{reg}(I) \leq \text{reg}(\text{LPP}(I; c_1, \dots, c_n; C))$$

for all  $C \geq c_n$ .

In order to estimate the degree of regularity of our systems, we use the following result by Caviglia and De Stefani.

**Proposition 19** ([12, Lemma 2.3]). Let  $c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$  and  $2 \leq C \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (c_i - 1)$ . Let  $\mathcal{L} = (x_1^{c_1}, \dots, x_n^{c_n}) + L_C$  be a  $(c_1, \dots, c_n; C)$ -LPP ideal, and assume that  $\mathcal{L} \neq (x_1^{c_1}, \dots, x_n^{c_n})$ . Set  $u = x_a^{t_a} v$ , with  $t_a \neq 0$  and  $v \in \mathbb{F}[x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]$ , be the smallest monomial with respect to the lexicographic order which belongs to  $L_C$  and has degree  $C$ . Then

$$\text{reg}(\mathcal{L}) = t_a + \sum_{i=a+1}^n (c_i - 1).$$

Our first result is an explicit bound for the degree of regularity of a random systems of polynomials of the same degree. In order to make the proof more readable, we introduce the following notation.

**Notation 20.** If  $u \in R_D$  is a monomial that only involves the variables  $x_k, \dots, x_n$  and it is divisible by  $x_k^a$  and not by  $x_k^{a+1}$ , we say that  $u$  is a  $(D, k, a)$ -type monomial.

**Theorem 21.** Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$  be a polynomial system and assume without loss of generality that  $f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}$  are linearly independent of degree  $D$ . Assume that Conjecture 18 holds. For  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$  and  $1 \leq t \leq D - 1$ , let

$$\sigma_{k,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{D-1} \binom{n-i-1+j}{j} + \sum_{j=1}^t \binom{n-k-1+j}{j}.$$

If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a random polynomial system, then

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) = n(D - 1) + 1$$

if  $m = n$  and

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \begin{cases} n(D - 1) & \text{if } 1 \leq m - n \leq \sigma_{1,1}, \\ (D - t) + (n - k)(D - 1) & \text{if } \sigma_{k,t-1} < m - n \leq \sigma_{k,t} \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq n - 1 \text{ and } t \neq 1, \\ (n - k + 1)(D - 1) & \text{if } \sigma_{k-1,D-1} < m - n \leq \sigma_{k,1} \text{ for some } 2 \leq k \leq n - 1 \end{cases}$$

if  $m > n$ .

*Proof.* If  $m = n$ , then  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}}$  is a regular sequence of  $n$  polynomials of degree  $D$ , hence  $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) = n(D - 1) + 1$ . Suppose therefore that  $m > n$  and let  $J$  be the ideal generated by  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}}$ . Consider the lexicographic order on  $R$  and let

$$\mathcal{L} = \text{LPP}(J; D, \dots, D; D) = (x_1^D, \dots, x_n^D) + L_D,$$

be the LPP ideal with  $L_D$  the largest lex-segment ideal generated in degree  $D$  such that  $\dim(\mathcal{L}_D) = \dim(J_D)$ . Let  $\ell = \dim(\mathcal{L}_D / \langle x_1^D, \dots, x_n^D \rangle)$ . Since both  $f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}$  and  $x_1^D, \dots, x_n^D$  are linearly independent, we have

$$m = \dim(J_D) = \dim(\mathcal{L}_D) = \ell + n,$$

hence  $\ell = m - n$ .

The number of  $(D, k, D - t)$ -type monomials is

$$\dim(\mathbb{F}_q[x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]_t) = \binom{n - k - 1 + t}{t},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{k,t} &= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{D-1} \binom{n - i - 1 + j}{j} + \sum_{j=1}^t \binom{n - k - 1 + j}{j} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{D-1} \dim(\mathbb{F}_q[x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n]_j) + \sum_{j=1}^t \dim(\mathbb{F}_q[x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]_j) \end{aligned}$$

is the number of degree  $D$  monomials in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n] / (x_1^D, \dots, x_n^D)$  which are bigger than or equal to  $x_k^{D-t} x_n^t$ , the smallest  $(D, k, D - t)$ -type monomial. In other words, the monomial  $x_k^{D-t} x_n^t$  in position  $\sigma_{k,t}$  is the ordered list of degree  $D$  monomials in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n] / (x_1^D, \dots, x_n^D)$ .

Let  $u$  be the smallest monomial in  $\mathcal{L}_D / \langle x_1^D, \dots, x_n^D \rangle$ . In other words,  $u$  is the monomial in position  $\ell$  in the ordered list of degree  $D$  monomials in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n] / (x_1^D, \dots, x_n^D)$ . If  $1 \leq \ell \leq \sigma_{1,1}$ , then  $u$  is a  $(D, 1, D - 1)$ -type monomial. If  $\sigma_{k,t-1} \leq \ell \leq \sigma_{k,t}$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$  and  $2 \leq t \leq D - 1$ , then  $u$  is a  $(D, k, D - t)$ -type monomial. Finally, if  $\sigma_{k-1, D-1} \leq \ell \leq \sigma_{k,1}$  for some  $2 \leq k \leq n - 1$ , then  $u$  is a  $(D, k, D - 1)$ -type monomial. Since  $1 \leq \ell \leq \dim(\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]_D) / (x_1^D, \dots, x_n^D)_D = \sigma_{n-1, D-1}$ , then  $\ell$  always belong to one of the intervals above.

If  $u = x_k x_n^{D-1}$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ , then the smallest degree  $D$  monomial in  $L_D$  is  $x_{k+1}^D$ , which is a  $(D, k + 1, D)$ -type monomial. For any other  $u$ , the smallest degree  $D$  monomial in  $L_D$  is  $u$ . It follows that, if  $u$  is a  $(D, k, D - t)$ -type monomial, then

$$\text{reg}(\mathcal{L}) = (D - t) + (n - k)(D - 1)$$

by Proposition 19. The thesis now follows from observing that

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{reg}(J) \leq \text{reg}(\mathcal{L}), \tag{1}$$

where the inequality follows from Conjecture 18.  $\square$

**Example 22.** In this example we show how to compute the bounds from Theorem 21 for concrete choices of the parameters. Let  $n = 6$  and  $D = 3$ , so  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_6]_3$ . Then  $1 \leq k \leq 5$  and  $1 \leq t \leq 2$ . The values of  $\sigma_{k,t}$  are

$\sigma_{k,t}$	$t = 1$	$t = 2$
$k = 1$	5	20
$k = 2$	24	34
$k = 3$	37	43
$k = 4$	45	48
$k = 5$	49	50

If  $m = 12$ , then  $m - n = 6$  and  $\sigma_{1,1} < 6 \leq \sigma_{1,2}$ . Hence  $k = 1$ ,  $t = 2$ , and

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) \leq (D - 2) + (n - 1)(D - 1) = 11.$$

If  $m = 42$ , then  $m - n = 36$  and  $\sigma_{2,2} < 36 \leq \sigma_{3,1}$ . Hence  $k = 3$  and

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) \leq (n - 3 + 1)(D - 1) = 8.$$

**Remark 23.** The upper bounds produced in Theorem 21 are sharp for all values of  $m, n, D$ . In fact, they are met by any system  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $(f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}})$  is a  $(D, \dots, D; D)$ -LPP ideal.

Combining Theorem 21 and Theorem 4, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 24.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq R$  be a random system of degree  $D$  polynomials. If Conjecture 18 holds, then for a mutant algorithm

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F}) \leq n(D - 1) + 2$$

if  $m = n$  and

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \begin{cases} n(D - 1) + 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq m - n \leq \sigma_{1,1}, \\ (D - t) + (n - k)(D - 1) + 1 & \text{if } \sigma_{k,t-1} < m - n \leq \sigma_{k,t} \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq n - 1 \text{ and } t \neq 1, \\ (n - k + 1)(D - 1) + 1 & \text{if } \sigma_{k-1,D-1} < m - n \leq \sigma_{k,1} \text{ for some } 2 \leq k \leq n - 1 \end{cases}$$

if  $m > n$ .

*Proof.* The upper bound found in Theorem 21 for the degree of regularity of  $\mathcal{F}$  is bigger than or equal to  $D$  for all  $k$  and  $t$ . The thesis then follows from Theorem 4.  $\square$

Combining Theorem 21 and Theorem 3, one obtains the following.

**Corollary 25.** Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq R$  be a random system of degree  $D$  polynomials and assume without loss of generality that  $D \leq n(q - 1)$ . Assume that Conjecture 18 holds. If  $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) \geq q$ , then for a standard algorithm

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq 2n(\min\{D, q\} - 1)$$

if  $m = n$  and

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq 2 \min\{n(q - 1), d\}$$

where

$$d = \begin{cases} n(D - 1) - 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq m - n \leq \sigma_{1,1}, \\ D - t + (n - k)(D - 1) - 1 & \text{if } \sigma_{k,t-1} < m - n \leq \sigma_{k,t} \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq n - 1 \text{ and } t \neq 1, \\ (n - k)(D - 1) & \text{if } \sigma_{k-1,D-1} < m - n \leq \sigma_{k,1} \text{ for some } 2 \leq k \leq n - 1 \end{cases}$$

if  $m > n$ .

*Proof.* First, since  $(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)_{n(q-1)+1} = R_{n(q-1)+1}$ , one has

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}} \cup \{x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q\}) \leq n(q - 1) + 1.$$

If  $D < q$ , then

$$(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}} \cup \{x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q\})_{q-1} = (\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}})_{q-1} \neq R_{q-1},$$

since  $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) \geq q$  by assumption. Therefore,  $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \geq q = \max\{D, q\}$ . If  $q \leq D \leq n(q - 1)$ , then

$$(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}} \cup \{x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q\})_{D-1} = (x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)_{D-1} \neq R_{D-1},$$

hence  $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \geq D = \max\{D, q\}$ . This shows that the assumptions of Theorem 3 are satisfied. The thesis now follows by combining Theorem 21, Theorem 3, and the observation that

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}).$$

$\square$

**Remark 26.** While the estimates of Corollary 24 and of Corollary 25 hold for every  $D$ , they are most relevant for  $D \leq q$ . In fact, for  $D > q$  we obtain tighter upper bounds on the degree of regularity - hence on the solving degree - of  $\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}$  in Theorem 31 by inspecting the degree  $D$  part of the system  $\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\} \in \mathcal{U}_{\{q, \dots, q\}}$ . This corresponds to the fact that, whenever the degree of the equations of the system is larger than or comparable to the field size, it is convenient to add the field equations to the system before computing a Gröbner basis.

Next we estimate the degree of regularity and the solving degree of  $\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}$  in the case when  $D \geq q$ . We start by observing that one can make a few simplifications and assumptions without loss of generality.

**Remark 27.** After reducing the equations of  $\mathcal{F}$  modulo the field equations, they have degree at most  $q - 1$  in each variable, hence total degree at most  $n(q - 1)$ . Therefore, when adding the field equations to a polynomial system of degree  $D$ , we may always assume that

$$D \leq n(q - 1).$$

**Remark 28.** A simple Hilbert function computation allows one to show that the assumption that  $f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}$  are linearly independent modulo  $(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$  holds on a dense open set, whenever

$$m \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\min\{n, \lfloor \frac{D}{q} \rfloor\}} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} \binom{n + D - 1 - iq}{n - 1}. \quad (2)$$

If inequality (2) is not satisfied, then  $f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}$  cannot be linearly independent.

The simplest case to treat is that of very overdetermined systems, more specifically the case when  $f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}$  are too many to be linearly independent modulo  $(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$ , that is, when  $m$  is larger than the bound from Remark 28. The next proposition shows that, in such a situation, the degree of regularity is equal to the degree of the equations of the system.

**Proposition 29.** Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$  be a polynomial system of degree  $D$  where  $q \leq D \leq n(q - 1)$ . If  $m > \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{D}{q} \rfloor} (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} \binom{n + D - 1 - kq}{n - 1}$ , then there is a dense open set  $\mathcal{W}$  such that, if  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{W}$ , then

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) = D.$$

Moreover,

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq 2D - 2,$$

with respect to a standard Gröbner basis algorithm, and

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq D + 1,$$

with respect to a mutant Gröbner basis algorithm.

*Proof.* Notice that  $D \leq n(q - 1)$  implies that  $\min\{n, \lfloor \frac{D}{q} \rfloor\} = \lfloor \frac{D}{q} \rfloor$ . Since by assumption

$$m > \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{D}{q} \rfloor} (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} \binom{n + D - 1 - kq}{n - 1} = \dim(R/(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q))_D,$$

then there is an open set  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $m$ -tuples of polynomials of degree  $D$  such that

$$\langle f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}} \rangle + (x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)_D = R_D.$$

Since  $(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}} \cup \{x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q\})_{D-1} = (x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)_{D-1} \neq R_{D-1}$ , then

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) = D.$$

The rest of the statement now follows from Theorem 3 and Theorem 4.  $\square$

One can also easily derive a lower bound on the degree of regularity.

**Remark 30.** Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$  be a polynomial system of degree  $q \leq D \leq n(q-1)$ . Since  $(\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}} \cup \{x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q\})_{D-1} = (x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)_{D-1} \neq R_{D-1}$ , then

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \geq D.$$

The next theorem yields an upper bound on the degree of regularity of a random system of equations of degree larger than the field size to which we add the field equations. The bound is tighter than the one from Corollary 25.

**Theorem 31.** Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$  be a polynomial system of degree  $D$ , where  $q \leq D \leq n(q-1)$ . Assume that  $m \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{D}{q} \rfloor} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} \binom{n+D-1-iq}{n-1}$  and that  $f_1^{\text{top}}, \dots, f_m^{\text{top}}$  are linearly independent modulo  $(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$ . Assume that Conjecture 18 holds. For  $1 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor$  and  $1 \leq t \leq q-1$ , let

$$\eta_{k,t} = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{D+t}{q} \rfloor - 1} (-1)^i \binom{n-k}{i} \binom{n-k-1+D-(i+1)q+t}{n-k-1}$$

and

$$\sigma_{k,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \eta_{i,j} + \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{k,j}.$$

Finally, let

$$\delta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m = \sigma_{k,t} \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor \text{ and } 1 \leq t < q-1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq \begin{cases} n(q-1) - \delta & \text{if } 1 \leq m \leq \sigma_{1,1}, \\ q-t + (n-k)(q-1) - \delta & \text{if } \sigma_{k,t-1} < m \leq \sigma_{k,t} \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor \text{ and } 1 < t \leq q-1, \\ (n-k+1)(q-1) - \delta & \text{if } \sigma_{k-1,q-1} < m \leq \sigma_{k,1} \text{ for some } 2 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, making use of a standard Gröbner basis algorithm,

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq \begin{cases} 2n(q-1) - 2(\delta+1) & \text{if } 1 \leq m \leq \sigma_{1,1}, \\ 2(q-t) + 2(n-k)(q-1) - 2(\delta+1) & \text{if } \sigma_{k,t-1} < m \leq \sigma_{k,t} \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor \text{ and } 1 < t \leq q-1, \\ 2(n-k+1)(q-1) - 2(\delta+1) & \text{if } \sigma_{k-1,q-1} < m \leq \sigma_{k,1} \text{ for some } 2 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor. \end{cases}$$

Instead, using a mutant Gröbner basis algorithm,

$$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq \begin{cases} n(q-1) - \delta + 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq m \leq \sigma_{1,1}, \\ q-t + (n-k)(q-1) - \delta + 1 & \text{if } \sigma_{k,t-1} < m \leq \sigma_{k,t} \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor \text{ and } 1 < t \leq q-1, \\ (n-k+1)(q-1) - \delta + 1 & \text{if } \sigma_{k-1,q-1} < m \leq \sigma_{k,1} \text{ for some } 2 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Fix the lexicographic order on  $R$ . We start by proving that  $\eta_{k,t}$  is the number of  $(D, k, q-t)$ -type monomials in  $R$  which are linearly independent modulo  $(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$ , that is

$$\eta_{k,t} = \dim \left[ \frac{\mathbb{F}_q[x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]}{(x_{k+1}^q, \dots, x_n^q)} \right]_{D-(q-t)}. \quad (3)$$

Since  $x_{k+1}^q, \dots, x_n^q$  is a regular sequence in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]$ , a standard Hilbert Series computation yields the explicit formula

$$\dim \left[ \frac{\mathbb{F}_q[x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]}{(x_{k+1}^q, \dots, x_n^q)} \right]_{D-(q-t)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{D+t}{q} \rfloor - 1} (-1)^i \binom{n-k}{i} \binom{n-k-1+D-(i+1)q+t}{n-k-1},$$

where we notice that  $D+t-q \leq (n-k)(q-1)$  implies that  $\lfloor \frac{D+t}{q} \rfloor - 1 < n-k$ . This establishes the equality in (3). Similarly to the proof of Theorem 21, we notice that

$$\sigma_{k,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} \eta_{i,j} + \sum_{j=1}^t \eta_{k,j}$$

is the number of monomials of degree  $D$  which do not belong to  $(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$  and are greater than or equal to  $x_k^{q-t} x_n^{D-q+t}$ , the smallest  $(D, k, q-t)$ -type monomial.

Let  $I \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be the ideal generated by  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}} \cup \{x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{L} = (x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q) + L_D$  be the  $(q, \dots, q; D)$ -LPP ideal such that

$$\dim(I_D) = \dim(\mathcal{L}_D).$$

Hence  $\mathcal{L}_D$  has exactly  $m$  minimal monomial generators of degree  $D$  that do not belong to  $(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$ . Recall that, by assumption,  $L_D$  is the largest lex-segment ideal generated in degree  $D$  such that  $\mathcal{L} = (x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q) + L_D$ . Let  $u$  be the smallest degree  $D$  monomial in  $\mathcal{L}/(x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$ . Then  $u$  is a  $(D, k, q-t)$ -type monomial for suitably chosen  $1 \leq k \leq n - \lfloor \frac{D-1}{q-1} \rfloor$  and  $1 \leq t \leq q-1$ . More precisely:

- $1 \leq m \leq \sigma_{1,1}$  corresponds to  $t = k = 1$ ,
- $\sigma_{k-1, q-1} < m \leq \sigma_{k,1}$  corresponds to  $t = 1$  and  $k \neq 1$ ,
- $\sigma_{k, t-1} < m \leq \sigma_{k,t}$  corresponds to  $t \neq 1$ .

If  $u$  is a  $(D, k, q-t)$ -type monomial, then the smallest monomial in  $L_D$  is also a  $(D, k, q-t)$ -type monomial, unless  $u = x_k^{q-t} x_n^{q-1}$ . Notice that this corresponds to  $m = \sigma_{k,t}$ . In this case,  $D = 2q - t - 1$  and the smallest degree  $D$  monomial in  $L_D$  is  $x_k^{q-t-1} x_{k+1}^q$ . This is a  $(D, k, q-t-1)$ -type monomial if  $t \neq q-1$  and a  $(D, k+1, q)$ -type monomial if  $t = q-1$ .

If Conjecture 18 holds, then

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^q - x_1, \dots, x_n^q - x_n\}) \leq \text{reg}(\mathcal{L}). \quad (4)$$

Moreover, by Proposition 19

$$\text{reg}(\mathcal{L}) = \begin{cases} q-t-1 + (n-k)(q-1) & \text{if } m = \sigma_{k,t} \text{ and } t \neq q-1, \\ q-t + (n-k)(q-1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The bound on the degree or regularity now follows from (4) and (5). The bounds on the solving degree follow from the bound on the degree of regularity, Theorem 3, and Theorem 4.  $\square$

## 5 Applications to the study of GeMSS and Rainbow

GeMSS and Rainbow were the only multivariate schemes in Round 3 of NIST Post-Quantum Cryptography Standardization process. They are based on modifications of HFE (Hidden Field Equation) and UOV (Unbalanced Oil and Vinegar), respectively.

In order to get a heuristic idea of how secure each of the proposed system is, we computed the degree of regularity and the solving degree for some instances of both schemes and we compared them to the results of Theorem 21 and Theorem 31. We used Magma to compute the solving degree and Singular to compute the degree of regularity. The values that we obtain (and that we indicate in the tables below) are almost always the same for systems with the same parameters.

For each choice of the parameters in the table, we produce ten instances of the public key  $\mathcal{PK} = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  of the chosen scheme. For each one of them, we choose a random vector  $s = (s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{F}_q^m$  as a signature (in case the chosen vector is not a valid signature, we replace it with another randomly chosen vector). In order to forge the signature, an attacker may want to solve the system  $\mathcal{PK}s = \{p_1 - s_1, \dots, p_m - s_m\}$ . We make the system  $\mathcal{PK}s$  square by assigning random values to the last  $n - m$  variables. This yields a system  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ .

Since in GeMSS we work over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ , we add to the system  $\mathcal{F}$  the field equations  $\mathcal{E} = \{x_1^2 + x_1, \dots, x_m^2 + x_m\}$ . In the next table we compare the experimental results we obtained for GeMSS with the bounds from Theorem 31. The experiments show that both the solving degree and the degree of regularity of  $\mathcal{F}$  can be more than twice the solving degree of  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . This confirms the intuition that adding the field equations is a good strategy in order to solve the system  $\mathcal{F}$  over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ .

Unfortunately we were able to compute the degree of regularity of  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}$  only for small values of the parameters. In the next table the first three columns contain the parameters of the cryptosystem, and the fourth the number of polynomials and variables that appear in  $\mathcal{F}$ . The columns labelled ' $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$ ' and ' $\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$ ' contain the values computed with Magma and Singular. The columns labelled ' $\text{max solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$ ' and ' $\text{max } d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$ ' are the bounds given by the Theorem 31 for the chosen parameters and a standard Gröbner basis algorithm.

n, D	a	v	m	$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$	$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$	$\text{max } d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$	$\text{max solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$
12, 4	1	1	11	5	3	18	10
8, 9	1	1	7	3	3	10	6
8, 9	1	2	7	3	3	10	6
8, 9	2	1	6	3	3	8	5
8, 9	2	2	6	3	3	8	5
24, 4	1	1	23		4	42	22
24, 4	1	2	23		4	42	22
24, 4	1	3	23		4	42	22
24, 4	2	1	22		4	40	21
24, 4	2	2	22		4	40	21
24, 4	3	1	21		4	38	20

While GeMSS is random according to Definition 13, the experimental results make it clear that both the degree or regularity and the solving degree of GeMSS are far from the largest values that one can find for a system of those parameters according to Theorem 31. This indicates that, for the same parameters, one should be able to find systems for which the complexity of computing a Gröbner basis is much larger. This does not necessarily mean that GeMSS is insecure, just that it may not be optimal for its parameters, i.e., a different choice of system with the same parameters may offer more security.

For Rainbow, we choose to work over  $\mathbb{F}_4$  and  $\mathbb{F}_9$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a square system,  $\mathcal{F}$  is random according to our definition if and only if  $\mathcal{F}^{\text{top}}$  is a regular sequence. This turns out to be the case in most of the examples that we computed and in that case

$$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) = m + 1 \quad (6)$$

by Theorem 21. This is confirmed by our computations.

Since the systems coming from this scheme are quadratic, adding the field equations may increase the solving degree of the system. However, for the small values of  $q$  that we tried in our experiments, we find that in all cases but one the solving degree decreases when adding the field equations. This makes sense, as the degree  $q$  of the equations that we add is never larger than the solving degree of the system to which we add them. In the next table we summarize the results that we obtained in our computational experiments. Since in our experiments the solving degree of  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}$  is almost always smaller than that of  $\mathcal{F}$ , in our examples  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}$  is the relevant system to consider, that is, the system that one wants to try to solve. Therefore, we consider the degree of regularity and solving degree of  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}$ . In our table, we compare the degree of regularity and the solving degree of  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}$  with the upper bounds from Theorem 21 and Corollary 25. We use

Corollary 25 as the algorithm implemented in Magma is a standard one. The first three columns contain the chosen values for the parameters and the number of polynomials and variables that appear in  $\mathcal{F}$ . The columns labelled ' $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F})$ ' and ' $\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$ ' contain the values computed with Magma and Singular. The column labelled ' $\text{max solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$ ' contains the bounds from Corollary 25. We do not include the values of the degree of regularity and solving degree of  $\mathcal{F}$  in the table, as we find that the system  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}$  can always be solved more efficiently than the system  $\mathcal{F}$ .

$q$	$[v_1, o_1, o_2]$	$m$	$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F})$	$d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$	$\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$	$\text{max solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E})$
4	[3, 2, 2]	4	4/5	4	4	8
4	[3, 3, 3]	6	6/7	5	5	12
4	[7, 5, 5]	10	10/11	6	6	20
9	[3, 2, 2]	4	5	5	9	–
9	[7, 5, 5]	10	11	9/10	10	20

Notice that Corollary 25 does not apply to the case  $q = 9$  and  $[v_1, o_1, o_2] = [3, 2, 2]$ , since  $d_{\text{reg}}(\mathcal{F}) = 5$ . For these parameters, the bound from Corollary 25 would yield  $\text{solv. deg}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}) \leq 8$ . However, the bound does not hold in this case, as our experiments show.

As for GeMSS, we observe that the values that we computed for the solving degree of  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{E}$  are far from the upper bounds predicted by Corollary 25. We conclude that, also in this case, one expects to find systems with the same parameters as these instances of Rainbow and for which the complexity of computing a Gröbner basis is larger.

## References

- [1] Magali Bardet, *Étude des systèmes algébriques surdéterminés. Applications aux codes correcteurs et à la cryptographie*, PhD thesis, Université Pierre et Marie Curie - Paris VI, 2004.
- [2] Magali Bardet, Jean-Charles Faugère, and Bruno Salvy, *Complexity of Gröbner basis computation for Semi-regular Overdetermined sequences over  $\mathbb{F}_2$  with solutions in  $\mathbb{F}_2$* , PhD thesis, INRIA, 2003.
- [3] Magali Bardet, Jean-Charles Faugère, and Bruno Salvy, *On the complexity of Gröbner basis computation of semi-regular overdetermined algebraic equations*, Proceedings of the International Conference on Polynomial System Solving 2004, 71-74.
- [4] Magali Bardet, Jean-Charles Faugère, and Bruno Salvy, *On the complexity of the F5 Gröbner basis algorithm*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **70** (2015), 49-70.
- [5] Magali Bardet, Jean-Charles Faugère, Bruno Salvy, and Bo-Yin Yang, *Asymptotic behaviour of the degree of regularity of semi-regular polynomial systems*, Proceedings of MEGA **5**, 2005.
- [6] Mina Bigdeli, Emanuela De Negri, Manuela Muzika Dizdarevic, Elisa Gorla, Romy Minko, and Sulamithe Tsakou, *Semi-regular sequences and other random systems of equations*, Women in Numbers Europe III, Springer (2021), 75-114.
- [7] Bruno Buchberger, *Bruno Buchberger's PhD thesis 1965: An algorithm for finding the basis elements of the residue class ring of a zero dimensional polynomial ideal*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **41** (2006), 475–511.
- [8] Johannes A. Buchmann, Jintai Ding, Mohamed Saied Emam Mohamed, and Wael Said Abd Elmageed Mohamed, *MutantXL: Solving multivariate polynomial equations for cryptanalysis*, Dagstuhl seminar proceedings (2009).
- [9] Alessio Caminata and Elisa Gorla, *Solving multivariate polynomial systems and an invariant from commutative algebra*, 8th International Workshop, WAIFI 2020, Springer (2021), 3-36.
- [10] Alessio Caminata and Elisa Gorla, *Solving degree, last fall degree, and related invariants*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **114** (2023), 322-335.

- [11] Antoine Casanova, Jean-Charles Faugère, Gilles Macario-Rat, Jacques Patarin, Ludovic Perret, and Jocelyn Ryckeghem, *GeMSS: a great multivariate short signature*, UPMC-Paris 6 Sorbonne Universités; INRIA Paris Research Centre, 2017.
- [12] Giulio Caviglia and Alessandro De Stefani, *Linearly presented modules and bounds on the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of ideals*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **150** (2022), no.4, 1397-1404.
- [13] Giulio Caviglia, Alessandro De Stefani, and Enrico Sbarra, *The Eisenbud-Green-Harris Conjecture*, Commutative algebra - Expository Papers Dedicated to David Eisenbud on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday, Springer (2021), 159-187.
- [14] Nicolas Courtois, Alexander Klimov, Jacques Patarin, and Adi Shamir, *Efficient Algorithms for Solving Overdefined Systems of Multivariate Polynomial Equations*, Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2000, Springer (2000), 392-407.
- [15] David Eisenbud, Mark Green, and Joe Harris, *Higher Castelnuovo Theory*, Astérisque **218** (1993), 187-202.
- [16] Jean-Charles Faugère, *A new efficient algorithm for computing Gröbner bases (F4)*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **139** (1999), 61-88.
- [17] Jean-Charles Faugère, *A new efficient algorithm for computing Gröbner bases without reduction to zero (F5)*, Proceedings of the 2002 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC '02), 75-83.
- [18] Ralf Fröberg, *An inequality for Hilbert series of graded algebras*, Mathematica Scandinavica **56** (1985), 117–144.
- [19] Timothy Hodges, Sergio Molina, and Jacob Schlather, *On the existence of semi-regular sequences*, Journal of Algebra **476** (2017), 519-547.
- [20] Keith Pardue, *Generic polynomials*, preprint (1999).
- [21] Keith Pardue, *Generic sequences of polynomials*, Journal of Algebra **324** (2010), no. 4, 579-590.
- [22] Flavio Salizzoni, *An upper bound for the solving degree in terms of the degree of regularity*, preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.13485>.
- [23] Igor Semaev and Andrea Tenti, *Probabilistic analysis on Macaulay matrices over finite fields and complexity of constructing Gröbner bases*, Journal of Algebra **565** (2021), 651-674.
- [24] Andrea Tenti, *Sufficiently overdetermined random polynomial systems behave like semiregular ones*, PhD Thesis, University of Bergen (2019), available at <https://hdl.handle.net/1956/21158>.