

Ramp Up NTT in Record Time using GPU-Accelerated Algorithms and LLM-based Code Generation

Yu Cui^{1,2*}, Hang Fu^{1*}, Licheng Wang^{1†}, Haibin Zhang^{2†}

¹Beijing Institute of Technology

²Yangtze Delta Region Institute of Tsinghua University, Zhejiang

{cuiyu, fuhang, lcwang}@bit.edu.cn, bchainzhang@aliyun.com

Abstract

Homomorphic encryption (HE) is a core building block in privacy-preserving machine learning (PPML), but HE is also widely known as its efficiency bottleneck. Therefore, many GPU-accelerated cryptographic schemes have been proposed to improve the performance of HE. However, these methods often require complex modifications tailored to specific algorithms and are tightly coupled with specific GPU and operating systems. It is interesting to ask how to generally offer more practical GPU-accelerated cryptographic algorithm implementations. Given the powerful code generation capabilities of large language models (LLMs), we aim to explore their potential to automatically generate practical GPU-friendly algorithm code using CPU-friendly code. In this paper, we focus on number theoretic transform (NTT)—the core mechanism of HE. We first develop and optimize a GPU-friendly NTT (GNTT) family that exploits PyTorch’s fast matrix computation and precomputation, achieving an approximately $62\times$ speedup—a significant boost over existing ones. Then we explore GPU-friendly code generation using various LLMs, including DeepSeek-R1, OpenAI o1 and o3-mini. We discover many interesting findings throughout the process. For instance, somewhat surprisingly, our experiments demonstrate that DeepSeek-R1 significantly outperforms OpenAI o3-mini and o1, but still cannot beat our optimized protocol. The findings provide valuable insights for turbocharging PPML and enhancing code generation capabilities of LLMs. Codes are available at: <https://github.com/LMPC-Lab/GenGPUCrypto>.

1 Introduction

In recent years, aimed at ensuring the privacy of machine learning, significant research efforts have

focused on achieving privacy-preserving machine learning (PPML) (Ng and Chow, 2023). The core of these PPML solutions lies the utilization of homomorphic encryption (HE) and secure multiparty computation (MPC) (Pang et al., 2024; Choi et al., 2024; Rho et al., 2024). While ensuring data confidentiality, the use of these cryptographic algorithms introduces substantial computational overhead. To address this efficiency challenge, researchers have proposed numerous optimization approaches to accelerate model training and inference over ciphertexts (Frimpong et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024). Similar to PPML, realizing privacy protection for large language models (LLMs) has become increasingly significant (Das et al., 2025). Moreover, Zhao and Song (2024) highlights the necessity of constructing privacy-preserving LLMs, which can maintain performance.

For the efficiency optimization of both PPML and privacy-preserving LLMs, achieving GPU acceleration for HE and MPC is the critical task. However, existing GPU-accelerated cryptographic schemes (Shen et al., 2024; Moon et al., 2024) require complex modifications and are tightly coupled with the internal structure of GPUs, operating system and even hardware, lacking generality and portability. For fully HE with hardware architecture, **limited generality is an obstacle for further accelerating polynomial computation**, since it is difficult for specific-designed hardware accelerators to maintain optimal acceleration as the degree of the polynomials changes (Zhang et al., 2024).

Therefore, a better strategy is to bypass the underlying architecture and construct GPU-accelerated cryptographic algorithms from the perspective of high-level language frameworks, thereby breaking through the limitations of generality. Tan et al. (2021) exploits PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019) to construct a MPC framework for PPML, which implements the entire cryptographic operations on GPU. They argue that directly trans-

*Co-first authors contributed equally.

†Corresponding authors.

Algorithm	Implementation	Precomputation
GNTT1	Matrix parallel computation using PyTorch	Serial computing
GNTT2	LUT-based acceleration	Parallel and serial computing
GNTT3	Using CuPy to reduce memory consumption	Parallel and serial computing
GNTT4	Utilizing CuPy to support large parameters for HE	Parallel and serial computing

Table 1: GNTT family algorithms. The four algorithms are similar in their core NTT operations, with differences lying in the precomputation and optimizations in implementation details. GNTT2 has the optimal execution efficiency, while GNTT3 and GNTT4 are enhanced based on GNTT2.

lating CPU-based code to the GPU is difficult to improve performance immediately due to the distinct designs in architecture between the CPU and GPU. Their research also emphasizes the importance to build GPU-friendly cryptography. Many researches aimed at realizing GPU-friendly algorithms for PPML has concentrated on MPC, and there remains a notable gap in studies exploring the parallelization for HE. Therefore, it is interesting to ask how to generally offer more practical GPU-accelerated HE implementations.

Motivated by the powerful ability of LLMs in code generation recently (Yan et al., 2024), we introduce an innovative research problem: **Do LLMs have excellent GPU-friendly cryptographic code generation capability?** In this paper, we take number theoretic transform (NTT) (Agarwal and Burrus, 1975) as the core research object, since underlying polynomial computation with high computational complexity is one of the two root factors of fully HE’s inefficiency, and NTT is crucial for optimizing these polynomial operations (Zhang et al., 2024). Therefore, NTT’s efficiency directly influences the performance of PPML. We require LLMs to generate GPU-friendly NTT code built on PyTorch, according to the given CPU-friendly code of Fast-NTT (Satriawan et al., 2024), and benchmark the generation capability of LLMs.

We optimize and implement a practical GPU-friendly NTT (GNTT) family that leverages PyTorch’s efficient matrix computation and precomputation to significantly boost the computational speed. The GNTT family consists of four distinct algorithm instances (GNTT1–GNTT4). Additionally, we exploit CuPy (Nishino and Loomis, 2017) to alleviate issues related to floating-point type conversions and high memory consumption. A comparative analysis of the implementation details for each GNTT instance is provided in Table 1.

For models to study, we choose DeepSeek-R1

(DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025), OpenAI o3-mini¹ and o1 (Jaech et al., 2024), which demonstrate outstanding performance in mathematics and programming. We conduct a thorough analysis of the generated codes from an algorithmic theory perspective. Furthermore, the experimental results have shown that GNTT realizes nearly a around $62\times$ speedup under ideal conditions, compared to the CPU-friendly Fast-NTT. Overall, **DeepSeek-R1 significantly outperforms OpenAI o3-mini and o1, but it still far from reaching the level of GNTT**. To sum up, the contributions of this paper are as follows:

- **Innovative research problem:** To our knowledge, this paper is the first work to introduce the research problem of GPU-friendly cryptographic code generation capabilities in LLMs, which is essential to generally realize more practical GPU-accelerated HE.
- **GNTT family:** We first develop and optimize GNTT family leveraging PyTorch’s fast matrix computation and precomputation. To improve the performance of GNTT, lookup table (LUT) and CuPy serve as innovative solutions to accelerate the precomputation and reduce memory consumption, respectively. By utilizing GPU-friendly calculating operation, GNTT is far superior to Fast-NTT.
- **Comprehensive theory analysis:** We conduct a comprehensive analysis of the algorithms generated by LLMs from the theoretical perspective of cryptography, providing a detailed comparison of the differences between each algorithm.
- **Experimental findings:** The experimental results indicate that existing LLMs show significant variations and exhibit defects in their GPU acceleration solutions. The findings offer significant insights that can drive future advancements in PPML and contribute to the enhancement of code generation capabilities in LLMs.

¹<https://openai.com/index/openai-o3-mini>




Figure 1: The framework of GPU-Accelerated cryptographic algorithm code generation based on LLMs and its benchmarking. We provide an example of algorithmic code generation on how to convert the core CPU-friendly code for GNTT precomputation into a code that takes into account the computational advantages of both CPU and GPU. This example actually illustrates the core difference between GNTT1 and GNTT2.

2 Approach

2.1 Framework Overview

The core framework for GPU-accelerated cryptographic algorithm code generation leveraging LLMs is illustrated in Figure 1. We refer to (Wu et al., 2024) to formalize this framework as

$$(g, t) = F(c, d, p(x)|\theta), \quad (1)$$

where d represents various types of CPU and GPU, and F is the LLM parameterized by θ . The code generation prompt p includes the parameters required for executing cryptographic algorithms (e.g., q for the NTT algorithm in Section 3). Given a CPU-friendly code c written in any programming language, the LLM generates the corresponding GPU-friendly code via code translation. The LLM then utilizes external tools (Schick et al., 2023) to execute code g in an environment equipped with d , benchmarking the algorithm’s execution time t . g primarily utilizes frameworks like PyTorch and CuPy, which enable high-speed matrix parallel computation. This formalized expression intuitively demonstrates that the performance of cryptographic algorithms is closely related to d , and it exhibits a high degree of generality for d with various configurations.

2.2 Code Generation Benchmark

To evaluate the quality of GPU-accelerated code generated by LLMs, we propose a benchmark as follows:

- **Effective GPU acceleration:** The GPU-accelerated code should exhibit a substantial increase in execution speed compared to the original CPU-friendly code. Moreover, the conversion process should go beyond basic transformations, such as directly converting scalars to tensors, and should also encompass the conversion of cryptographic algorithms themselves. This will ensure the potential of matrix parallel computing is fully leveraged.
- **Reasonable parallel computation:** Admittedly, not all computations are suited for GPU acceleration. Some CPU-friendly computations that are difficult to parallelize, should maintain their original computational logic. If all computational operations are forcibly converted using PyTorch, it may actually slow down the execution speed. Therefore, the code generated by LLMs should embody both CPU-friendly and GPU-friendly code, balancing the advantages of both to achieve maximum speed optimization.
- **Accurate cryptographic calculations:** The correctness of the execution result of the converted GPU-accelerated cryptographic algorithm code should not be affected.

3 Comprehensive Analysis

This section presents a comprehensive analysis of the GNTT family and the code generation capabilities of LLMs. The notation and terminology for NTT-based negative-wrapped convolution are

detailed in [Appendix A](#).

3.1 GNTT Family

The GNTT family comprises four distinct GPU-friendly NTT algorithm instances, optimizing computational speed by leveraging PyTorch for efficient matrix computations. In the algorithm tables later, for ease of distinction, operations executed on the GPU will be highlighted in [green](#).

3.1.1 GNTT1

Following the formulations provided in ([Satriawan et al., 2024](#)), equations (13)~(18), the NTT can be rewritten in matrix form as:

$$\mathbf{a}' = \mathbf{W}_{\text{NTT}} \cdot \mathbf{a} \pmod{q}, \quad (2)$$

where the transformation matrix \mathbf{W}_{NTT} is defined as:

$$\mathbf{W}_{\text{NTT}} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi^0 & \psi^1 & \dots & \psi^{n-1} \\ \psi^0 & \psi^3 & \dots & \psi^{3 \cdot (n-1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi^0 & \psi^{(2n-1)} & \dots & \psi^{(2n-1) \cdot (n-1)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Similarly, the inverse transformation can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{c} = n^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{W}_{\text{INTT}} \cdot \mathbf{c}' \pmod{q}, \quad (4)$$

where the inverse transformation matrix \mathbf{W}_{INTT} is given by:

$$\mathbf{W}_{\text{INTT}} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi^{-0} & \psi^{-0} & \dots & \psi^{-0} \\ \psi^{-1} & \psi^{-3} & \dots & \psi^{-(2n-1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi^{-(n-1)} & \psi^{-3 \cdot (n-1)} & \dots & \psi^{-(2n-1) \cdot (n-1)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

This matrix formulation provides a structured representation of NTT and its inverse, making it well-suited for implementation in PyTorch. To demonstrate this approach, [Algorithm 1](#) provides a full implementation of the method. While the algorithm is computationally inefficient in terms of raw performance, it effectively illustrates the NTT algorithmic flow and serves as a valuable reference for understanding the key steps in NTT computations.

GNTT1 leverages the efficiency of tensor computations on GPU to accelerate NTT. Key operations, such as matrix multiplication and element-wise multiplication, are efficiently executed on the GPU. However, the calculation of matrix entries ψ^{2ij+j} , which requires $O(n^2)$ exponentiations, is not suitable for GPU parallelization and is instead

performed on the CPU. This step introduces significant computational overhead and reduces the algorithm's overall efficiency. Further optimization will be addressed in subsequent algorithms.

Algorithm 1 GNTT1

Input: Polynomials \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{b} of length n , prime modulus q , a primitive $2n$ -th root of unity ψ , d .

Output: $\mathbf{c} = \text{INTT}(\text{NTT}(\mathbf{a}) \odot \text{NTT}(\mathbf{b}))$.

1: Initialize \mathbf{W}_{NTT} and \mathbf{W}_{INTT} , size $n \times n$.

2: **for** i, j **do**

3: $\mathbf{W}_{\text{NTT}}[i, j] \leftarrow \psi^{2ij+j} \pmod{q}$

4: **end for**

5: Move matrix to device:

$\mathbf{W}_{\text{NTT}} \leftarrow \mathbf{W}_{\text{NTT}}.\text{to}(\text{cuda})$

6: **Compute NTT:** $\mathbf{a}' \leftarrow \mathbf{W}_{\text{NTT}} \cdot \mathbf{a} \pmod{q}$

7: **Compute NTT:** $\mathbf{b}' \leftarrow \mathbf{W}_{\text{NTT}} \cdot \mathbf{b} \pmod{q}$

8: $\mathbf{c}' \leftarrow (\mathbf{a}' \odot \mathbf{b}') \pmod{q}$

9: Compute inverse: ψ^{-1} and n^{-1}

10: **for** i, j **do**

11: $\mathbf{W}_{\text{INTT}}[i, j] \leftarrow (\psi^{-1})^{2ij+i} \pmod{q}$

12: **end for**

13: Move matrix to device:

$\mathbf{W}_{\text{INTT}} \leftarrow \mathbf{W}_{\text{INTT}}.\text{to}(\text{cuda})$

14: **Compute INTT:**

$\mathbf{c} \leftarrow n^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{W}_{\text{INTT}} \cdot \mathbf{c}' \pmod{q}$

15: **Return:** \mathbf{c}

3.1.2 GNTT2

To address the computational complexity of calculating powers of the primitive $2n$ -th root of unity, we note that the computation depends solely on n and q , making it suitable for precomputation. This allows us to transfer the computation to the offline phase. Specifically, we enhance the matrix construction process from GNTT1 by precomputing and storing the power values in LUTs. This optimization enables the online phase to concentrate on low-overhead tensor operations, such as matrix multiplication, which are computationally efficient.

In addition to LUT precomputation, GNTT2 further optimizes matrix construction by utilizing PyTorch's broadcasting mechanism. Instead of computing each matrix entry individually, the transformation matrices \mathbf{W}_{NTT} and \mathbf{W}_{INTT} are directly constructed by indexing the LUTs, as illustrated in the green-highlighted sections of [Algorithm 2](#). This design capitalizes on the efficiency of PyTorch's tensor operations, where broadcasting maps pre-computed values across the matrix in a single operation, thereby reducing memory access overhead.

Algorithm	FNTT-o1	FNTT-o3	FNTT-DS	GNTT (Baseline)
High GPU friendliness	✗	✗	✗	✓
Thoughts on precomputation	✗	✓	✓	✓
Correct precomputation	✗	✓	✗	✓
Reasonable parallel computation	✗	✗	✓	✓
Application of mathematical skills	✗	✗	✓	✗

Table 2: The comprehensive comparative analysis of GPU-friendly NTT algorithm codes from the theoretical perspective of cryptographic algorithms.

Algorithm 2 GNTT2

Input: $a, b, n, q, \psi, \psi^{-1}, d$.

Output: c .

- 1: **Offline Computation: Matrix Construction**
 - 2: $i, j \leftarrow \text{range}(0, n)$
 - 3: $\text{exponents}[i, j] \leftarrow 2ij + j$
 - 4: Precompute the LUT for powers of $\psi \bmod q$:
 - 5: **for** $k = 0$ to $\max(\text{exponents})$ **do**
 - 6: $\text{LUT}_{\psi}[k] \leftarrow \psi^k \bmod q$
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Precompute the LUT for powers of $\psi^{-1} \bmod q$:
 - 9: **for** $k = 0$ to $\max(\text{exponents})$ **do**
 - 10: $\text{LUT}_{\psi^{-1}}[k] \leftarrow (\psi^{-1})^k \bmod q$
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: $\mathbf{W}_{\text{NTT}} \leftarrow \text{LUT}_{\psi}[\text{exponents}]$
 - 13: $\mathbf{W}_{\text{INTT}} \leftarrow \text{LUT}_{\psi^{-1}}[\text{exponents}]$
 - 14: **Online Computation: NTT & INTT**
 - 14: ▷ The online phase follows the methodology presented in GNTT1.
 - 15: **Return:** c
-

3.1.3 GNTT3 and GNTT4

The core optimization of GNTT3 and GNTT4 lies in the use of CuPy to address the issues encountered with PyTorch during computation. Building upon GNTT2, GNTT3 utilizes CuPy to reduce memory consumption and avoids the cumbersome conversion between floating-point and integer types during matrix-vector multiplication. Additionally, when the parameters n and q are very large, GNTT2 may experience overflow in the modular operation of INTT. To effectively alleviate this problem, we transfer the result tensor back to the CPU and perform the modular operation using CuPy’s modular function.

3.2 GPU-friendly NTT generated by LLMs

This section evaluates the ability of LLMs to convert CPU-friendly Fast-NTT into efficient, PyTorch-based GPU-friendly versions. We pro-

vide each model with the same source code and prompt them to generate GPU-accelerated implementations. We analyze the responses (FNTT-o1, FNTT-o3, FNTT-DS) from three models: OpenAI o1, o3-mini and DeepSeek-R1, all of which successfully produce corresponding PyTorch implementations accompanied by theoretical explanations. The comparison of these algorithm codes is shown in Table 2. A detailed analysis of their outputs allows us to evaluate whether they meet the properties outlined in our proposed benchmark, focusing on GPU acceleration, parallelism, and correctness.

3.2.1 FNTT-o1

FNTT-CPU is implemented using pure Python loops and sequential computations, making it well-suited for small-scale operations characterized by strong data dependencies, such as modular exponentiation and modular inversion. Because these operations involve limited data and exhibit inherent sequential dependencies, executing them on the CPU circumvents the overhead associated with data transfers and kernel launches, thereby preserving high efficiency.

In contrast, FNTT-o1 converts all operations into tensor computations and offloads them to the GPU. However, it retains the sequential algorithmic structure inherited from FNTT-CPU, which was originally designed for CPU execution. Consequently, although operations such as modular exponentiation and butterfly computations are performed using tensors, they are still processed in a step-by-step manner. This inherent sequential execution prevents the algorithm from fully leveraging GPU parallelism. While FNTT-o1 benefits from GPU acceleration for massively parallel tasks, indiscriminately offloading all operations, including those more efficiently executed on the CPU, introduces unnecessary computational overhead and ultimately degrades overall performance.

3.2.2 FNTT-DS

Unlike FNTT-o1, FNTT-DS restructures the algorithm to fully exploit GPU parallelism by representing computations as batched tensor operations rather than relying on the sequential control flow inherited from CPU-friendly designs. In FNTT-DS, modular exponentiation is reformulated to update entire tensors in parallel. Specifically, a boolean mask identifies positions in the exponent tensor where the exponent is odd, enabling simultaneous updates to the corresponding elements of the result tensor with the current base value. Although the implementation still uses a while loop to iterate until all exponent values are reduced to zero, each iteration processes the entire tensor at once through a single kernel launch. This vectorized approach eliminates the need for launching separate kernels for individual element updates, reducing kernel launch overhead. Additionally, FNTT-DS subtly applies Fermat’s Little Theorem to compute modular inversion efficiently. Rather than using an iterative procedure, it employs the identity $x^{-1} \equiv x^{q-2} \pmod q$ to perform modular inversion by invoking the modular exponentiation routine once.

The NTT algorithm in FNTT-DS uses a for loop to manage the transformation stages, but the actual computation within each stage, including rotation factor calculation and butterfly operations, is performed in parallel through batched tensor operations. This approach fully utilizes the GPU’s parallelism, processing the entire dataset concurrently in each stage, leading to significant performance improvements. The design reflects the principles of reasonable parallel computing, combining sequential control with extensive parallel execution to accelerate computationally demanding tasks.

It is worth noting that DeepSeek-R1 intended to precompute the indices for order-reversal sorting and the rotation factors in the NTT process to optimize efficiency. The model attempted to eliminate redundant calculations and improve performance by precomputing these values. Unfortunately, order-reversal is tightly coupled with the specific polynomial being processed, making it ineffective as a true precomputation step. Furthermore, by calculating the rotation factors during each iteration, this precomputation strategy ultimately fails. Instead of computing the factors once and reusing them, they are recalculated in each loop iteration, which limits the ability to fully exploit parallelization and optimization.

3.2.3 FNTT-o3

The key improvement in FNTT-o3 is the precomputation of rotation factors. Unlike other models, which recalculate rotation factors in each iteration, FNTT-o3 computes them once before the main loop begins and stores them in the precomputation tensor. This approach eliminates redundant calculations at each stage of the NTT, thereby reducing computational overhead. Additionally, as in FNTT-DS, a vectorized approach is employed for the butterfly operations, processing the even and odd components in parallel through batched tensor operations.

4 Experiment

4.1 Implementation and Setup

We conduct our experiments on a machine equipped with an NVIDIA A10 GPU, an 8-core CPU, and 30 GiB of RAM, running Ubuntu 22.04. The CPU-friendly Fast-NTT (FNTT-CPU) code is implemented using open-source code². We evaluate FNTT-CPU, GNTT4, FNTT-o1, FNTT-o3, and FNTT-DS from two perspectives: algorithm execution time and memory consumption. The baseline is composed of GNTT and FNTT-CPU. Additionally, it is important to note that due to potential issues in GPU-friendly code generated directly by LLMs, which may lead to computational or compilation errors, the code used for experimental benchmarking has been manually adjusted or prompted for correction by the LLMs. These adjustments do not involve the core algorithm principles.

4.2 Metrics

The algorithm execution time consists of two stages: NTT and INTT. Memory consumption is measured based on the entire function call process, excluding the precomputation of matrix generation. The comprehensive speedup S is computed as follows:

$$S_l = \frac{time_{NTT}^c + time_{INTT}^c}{time_{NTT}^l + time_{INTT}^l}, \quad (6)$$

where c represents FNTT-CPU, and l denotes the GPU-friendly algorithm. The final score s is calculated as follows:

$$s = \frac{S_l}{S_{baseline}} + \frac{M_{baseline}}{M_l}, \quad (7)$$

where M is the memory consumption.

²<https://github.com/Jyun-Neng/NTT>




Figure 2: Evaluation results based on parameters q and n that satisfy PQC for all algorithms.

Moreover, the parameters used in the experiments, especially n and q , are selected based on the recommendations from both NIST Post-Quantum Cryptography (PQC) standards³ and HE literature, although the parameter choices vary between these fields. For PQC, the parameter selection follows the standards outlined in (Liang and Zhao, 2022). On the other hand, for HE, the parameters are chosen based on research (Yang et al., 2022; Özerk et al., 2022) focused on optimizing NTT for efficient implementation. The experimental data are drawn from multiple sets of results, emphasizing the data points that converge towards the median value.

4.3 Main Results

We discuss the experimental results separately based on the variations in experimental parameters. For experiments with PQC parameters, the algorithm execution time and memory consumption benchmarking results are shown in Figure 2. Due to space limitations, additional experimental results can be found in Appendix B. Overall, FNTT-o1 exhibits the poorest performance due to its unoptimized execution speed (even worse than the original FNTT-CPU) and the highest memory consumption. Although FNTT-DS significantly outperforms FNTT-o3 in execution time, it still falls far short of the baseline. FNTT-o3 shows better memory cost than FNTT-DS, yet fails to surpass the baseline either. The comprehensive analysis reveals that GNTT2 maintains a substantial advantage over algorithms generated by LLMs, achiev-

ing a speedup of $s = 62.22$ when $n = 2048$ and $q = 12289$. Furthermore, GNTT3 offers additional memory reduction. The precomputation test results, presented in Figure 3 in Appendix B, indicate that GNTT2 significantly reduces precomputation time compared to GNTT1.

For experiments with HE parameters, the test results are summarized in Table 3. Under large parameter configurations, GNTT4 shows noticeable degradation in speedup while demonstrating increased memory consumption. Notably, we observe the encouraging phenomenon that algorithms generated by LLMs can outperform the baseline. Among the comparative algorithms, FNTT-DS achieves a speedup approaching the baseline level, while FNTT-o3 maintains commendable performance in memory consumption.

Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that the current LLMs each demonstrate distinct characteristics in their thinking, and can surpass our GNTT family in certain evaluation criteria. Specifically, DeepSeek-R1 clearly outperforms OpenAI o3-mini and o1. However, overall, they still exhibit considerable shortcomings.

5 Related Work

In recent years, GPU-friendly protocols proposed have been able to bring optimizations at different levels for PPML. GForce (Ng and Chow, 2021) is an innovative framework to oblivious inference, integrating tailored cryptographic protocols with advancements in machine learning. It features a set of GPU-friendly protocols optimized for non-linear computations, leveraging GPU parallelism. However, GForce lacks generality for GPU acceleration.

³<https://csrc.nist.gov/projects/post-quantum-cryptography>

Algorithm	Parameter q	Parameter n	NTT time (s)	INTT time (s)	Speedup	Memory (MiB)	Score
FNTT-CPU	$2^{23} - 2^{13} + 1$	2048	2.365035	1.433533	1.00	1.3	-
GNTT4	$2^{23} - 2^{13} + 1$	2048	0.045315	0.026255	53.07	222.7	-
FNTT-o1	$2^{23} - 2^{13} + 1$	2048	1.516539	0.757572	1.67	278.0	0.83
FNTT-o3	$2^{23} - 2^{13} + 1$	2048	0.287637	0.336224	6.09	217.5	1.14
FNTT-DS	$2^{23} - 2^{13} + 1$	2048	0.071202	0.014727	44.21	236.6	1.77
FNTT-CPU	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	1024	0.924408	0.585499	1.00	0.5	-
GNTT4	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	1024	0.040413	0.028420	21.94	217.1	-
FNTT-o1	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	1024	0.762433	0.379534	1.32	277.5	0.84
FNTT-o3	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	1024	0.154871	0.166861	4.69	217.2	1.21
FNTT-DS	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	1024	0.067743	0.013848	18.51	236.5	1.76
FNTT-CPU	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	2048	2.370426	1.432466	1.00	1.3	-
GNTT4	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	2048	0.045228	0.026296	53.17	226.0	-
FNTT-o1	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	2048	1.521742	0.761007	1.67	278.0	0.84
FNTT-o3	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	2048	0.285375	0.33635	6.12	217.6	1.15
FNTT-DS	$2^{30} - 2^{18} + 1$	2048	0.070627	0.015392	44.21	236.6	1.79

Table 3: Evaluation results based on large parameters q and n that satisfy HE for all algorithms. The values where the algorithm achieves optimal performance relative to others generated by LLMs are highlighted in **green**, while values that outperform the baseline are highlighted in **red**.

Considering the obstacles of realizing protocol-independent acceleration, Piranha (Watson et al., 2022) provides a general-purpose scheme for MPC to utilize GPU acceleration. Force (Dai et al., 2023) is an efficient Four-Party PPML scheme on GPU, achieving significant performance improvements compared to other schemes such as Piranha by introducing novel protocols. However, these schemes generally have defects in practicability.

6 Conclusion

To improve the efficiency of practical HE, we develop and optimize a GNTT family by exploiting PyTorch’s fast matrix computation and precomputation. Our optimization ramps up the HE speed in record time. In addition, we explore the capability of LLMs to automatically generate GPU-friendly NTT code utilizing CPU-friendly Fast-NTT code. We carefully conduct a thorough algorithmic analysis of each model from multiple aspects, including GPU friendliness, precomputation, and the application of mathematical skills. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate a number of interesting results, including one exhibiting DeepSeek-R1’s superior GPU-friendly code generation capability over its competitors.

Limitations

Due to the limitations of LLMs in GPU-friendly code generation tasks, our investigation is limited to NTT, the core mechanism of HE. Moreover, during the experiments, since the matrix computation function of PyTorch executed on GPU requires the input matrices or vectors to be in floating-point format. However, this requirement can introduce small computational errors, especially when the parameters n and q are quite large. Therefore, addressing the error introduced by floating-point computations is an important direction for future work.

References

- R.C. Agarwal and C.S. Burrus. 1975. [Number theoretic transforms to implement fast digital convolution](#). *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 63(4):550–560.
- Hyunmin Choi, Simon S. Woo, and Hyoungshick Kim. 2024. [Blind-touch: Homomorphic encryption-based distributed neural network inference for privacy-preserving fingerprint authentication](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(20):21976–21985.
- Tianxiang Dai, Li Duan, Yufan Jiang, Yong Li, Fei Mei, and Yulian Sun. 2023. [Force: Highly efficient four-party privacy-preserving machine learning on GPU](#). Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2023/493.

- Badhan Chandra Das, M. Hadi Amini, and Yanzhao Wu. 2025. [Security and privacy challenges of large language models: A survey](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.* Just Accepted.
- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, T. Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wanxia Zhao, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.
- Eugene Frimpong, Khoa Nguyen, Mindaugas Budzys, Tanveer Khan, and Antonis Michalakis. 2024. [Guardml: Efficient privacy-preserving machine learning services through hybrid homomorphic encryption](#). In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing*, SAC '24, page 953–962, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Xinyang Huang, Junxue Zhang, Xiaodian Cheng, Hong Zhang, Yilun Jin, Shuihai Hu, Han Tian, and Kai Chen. 2024. [Accelerating privacy-preserving machine learning with genibatch](#). In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, EuroSys '24, page 489–504, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helvar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, Alex Iftimie, Alex Karpenko, Alex Tachard Passos, Alexander Neitz, Alexander Prokofiev, Alexander Wei, Allison Tam, Ally Bennett, Ananya Kumar, Andre Saraiva, Andrea Vallone, Andrew Duberstein, Andrew Kondrich, Andrey Mishchenko, Andy Applebaum, Angela Jiang, Ashvin Nair, Barret Zoph, Behrooz Ghorbani, Ben Rossen, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Boaz Barak, Bob McGrew, Borys Minaiev, Botao Hao, Bowen Baker, Brandon Houghton, Brandon McKinzie, Brydon Eastman, Camillo Lugaresi, Cary Bassin, Cary Hudson, Chak Ming Li, Charles de Bourcy, Chelsea Voss, Chen Shen, Chong Zhang, Chris Koch, Chris Orsinger, Christopher Hesse, Claudia Fischer, Clive Chan, Dan Roberts, Daniel Kappler, Daniel Levy, Daniel Selsam, David Dohan, David Farhi, David Mely, David Robinson, Dimitris Tsipras, Doug Li, Dragos Oprica, Eben Freeman, Eddie Zhang, Edmund Wong, Elizabeth Proehl, Enoch Cheung, Eric Mitchell, Eric Wallace, Erik Ritter, Evan Mays, Fan Wang, Felipe Petroski Such, Filippo Raso, Florencia Leoni, Foivos Tsimpourlas, Francis Song, Fred von Lohmann, Freddie Sulit, Geoff Salmon, Giambattista Parascandolo, Gildas Chabot, Grace Zhao, Greg Brockman, Guillaume Leclerc, Hadi Salman, Haiming Bao, Hao Sheng, Hart Andrin, Hessam Bagherinezhad, Hongyu Ren, Hunter Lightman, Hyung Won Chung, Ian Kivlichen, Ian O'Connell, Ian Osband, Ignasi Clavera Gilaberte, Ilge Akkaya, Ilya Kostrikov, Ilya Sutskever, Irina Kofman, Jakub Pachocki, James Lennon, Jason Wei, Jean Harb, Jerry Twore, Jiacheng Feng, Jiahui Yu, Jiayi Weng, Jie Tang, Jieqi Yu, Joaquin Quiñero Candela, Joe Palermo, Joel Parish, Johannes Heidecke, John Hallman, John Rizzo, Jonathan Gordon, Jonathan Uesato, Jonathan Ward, Joost Huizinga, Julie Wang, Kai Chen, Kai Xiao, Karan Singhal, Karina Nguyen, Karl Cobbe, Katy Shi, Kayla Wood, Kendra Rimbach, Keren Gu-Lemberg, Kevin Liu, Kevin Lu, Kevin Stone, Kevin Yu, Lama Ahmad, Lauren Yang, Leo Liu, Leon Maksin, Leyton Ho, Liam Fedus, Lilian Weng, Linden Li, Lindsay McCallum, Lindsey Held, Lorenz Kuhn, Lukas Kondrasiuk, Lukasz Kaiser, Luke Metz, Madelaine Boyd, Maja Trebacz, Manas Joglekar, Mark Chen, Marko Tintor, Mason Meyer, Matt Jones, Matt Kaufer, Max Schwarzer, Meghan Shah, Mehmet Yatbaz, Melody Y. Guan, Mengyuan Xu, Mengyuan Yan, Mia Glaese, Mianna Chen, Michael Lampe, Michael Malek, Michele Wang, Michelle Fradin,

- Mike McClay, Mikhail Pavlov, Miles Wang, Mingxuan Wang, Mira Murati, Mo Bavarian, Mostafa Rohaninejad, Nat McAleese, Neil Chowdhury, Neil Chowdhury, Nick Ryder, Nikolas Tezak, Noam Brown, Ofir Nachum, Oleg Boiko, Oleg Murk, Olivia Watkins, Patrick Chao, Paul Ashbourne, Pavel Izmailov, Peter Zhokhov, Rachel Dias, Rahul Arora, Randall Lin, Rapha Gontijo Lopes, Raz Gaon, Reah Miyara, Reimar Leike, Renny Hwang, Rhythm Garg, Robin Brown, Roshan James, Rui Shu, Ryan Cheu, Ryan Greene, Saachi Jain, Sam Altman, Sam Toizer, Sam Toyer, Samuel Miserendino, Sandhini Agarwal, Santiago Hernandez, Sasha Baker, Scott McKinney, Scottie Yan, Shengjia Zhao, Shengli Hu, Shibani Santurkar, Shraman Ray Chaudhuri, Shuyuan Zhang, Siyuan Fu, Spencer Papay, Steph Lin, Suchir Balaji, Suvansh Sanjeev, Szymon Sidor, Tal Broda, Aidan Clark, Tao Wang, Taylor Gordon, Ted Sanders, Tejal Patwardhan, Thibault Sottiaux, Thomas Degry, Thomas Dimson, Tianhao Zheng, Timur Garipov, Tom Stasi, Trapit Bansal, Trevor Creech, Troy Peterson, Tyna Eloundou, Valerie Qi, Vineet Kosaraju, Vinnie Monaco, Vitthay Pong, Vlad Fomenko, Weiyi Zheng, Wenda Zhou, Wes McCabe, Wojciech Zaremba, Yann Dubois, Yinghai Lu, Ying Chen, Young Cha, Yu Bai, Yuchen He, Yuchen Zhang, Yunyun Wang, Zheng Shao, and Zhuohan Li. 2024. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*.
- Zhichuang Liang and Yunlei Zhao. 2022. Number theoretic transform and its applications in lattice-based cryptosystems: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.13546*.
- Jungho Moon, Dongwoo Yoo, Xiaoqian Jiang, and Miran Kim. 2024. Thor: Secure transformer inference with homomorphic encryption. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*.
- Lucien K. L. Ng and Sherman S. M. Chow. 2021. **GForce: GPU-Friendly oblivious and rapid neural network inference**. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2147–2164. USENIX Association.
- Lucien K. L. Ng and Sherman S. M. Chow. 2023. **Sok: Cryptographic neural-network computation**. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 497–514.
- ROYUD Nishino and Shohei Hido Crissman Loomis. 2017. Cupy: A numpy-compatible library for nvidia gpu calculations. *31st conference on neural information processing systems*, 151(7).
- Özgün Özerk, Can Elgezen, Ahmet Can Mert, Erdiç Öztürk, and Erkan Savaş. 2022. Efficient number theoretic transform implementation on gpu for homomorphic encryption. *The Journal of Supercomputing*, 78(2):2840–2872.
- Qi Pang, Jinhao Zhu, Helen Möllering, Wenting Zheng, and Thomas Schneider. 2024. **Bolt: Privacy-preserving, accurate and efficient inference for transformers**. In *2024 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 4753–4771.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. **Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library**. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Donghwan Rho, Taeseong Kim, Minje Park, Jung Woo Kim, Hyunsik Chae, Jung Hee Cheon, and Ernest K Ryu. 2024. Encryption-friendly llm architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02486*.
- Ardianto Satriawan, Rella Mareta, and Hanho Lee. 2024. **A complete beginner guide to the number theoretic transform (NTT)**. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2024/585.
- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessi, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. **Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools**. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 68539–68551. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Shiyu Shen, Hao Yang, Wangchen Dai, Lu Zhou, Zhe Liu, and Yunlei Zhao. 2024. **Leveraging gpu in homomorphic encryption: Framework design and analysis of bfv variants**. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 73(12):2817–2829.
- Sijun Tan, Brian Knott, Yuan Tian, and David J. Wu. 2021. **Cryptgpu: Fast privacy-preserving machine learning on the gpu**. In *2021 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 1021–1038.
- Jean-Luc Watson, Sameer Wagh, and Raluca Ada Popa. 2022. **Piranha: A GPU platform for secure computation**. In *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, pages 827–844, Boston, MA. USENIX Association.
- Cheng-Kuang Wu, Zhi Rui Tam, Chao-Chung Wu, Chieh-Yen Lin, Hung-yi Lee, and Yun-Nung Chen. 2024. **I need help! evaluating LLM’s ability to ask for users’ support: A case study on text-to-SQL generation**. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2191–2199, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weixiang Yan, Haitian Liu, Yunkun Wang, Yunzhe Li, Qian Chen, Wen Wang, Tingyu Lin, Weishan Zhao, Li Zhu, Hari Sundaram, and Shuiguang Deng. 2024. **CodeScope: An execution-based multilingual multitask multidimensional benchmark for evaluating LLMs on code understanding and generation**. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1021–1038. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Long Papers), pages 5511–5558, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yang Yang, Sanmukh R Kuppannagari, Rajgopal Kannan, and Viktor K Prasanna. 2022. Nttgen: a framework for generating low latency ntt implementations on fpga. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM International Conference on Computing Frontiers*, pages 30–39.

Boshi Yuan, Shixuan Yang, Yongxiang Zhang, Ning Ding, Dawu Gu, and Shi-Feng Sun. 2024. MD-ML: Super fast Privacy-Preserving machine learning for malicious security with a dishonest majority. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*, pages 2227–2244, Philadelphia, PA. USENIX Association.

Junxue Zhang, Xiaodian Cheng, Liu Yang, Jinbin Hu, Ximeng Liu, and Kai Chen. 2024. Sok: Fully homomorphic encryption accelerators. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(12):1–32.

Guoshenghui Zhao and Eric Song. 2024. Privacy-preserving large language models: Mechanisms, applications, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.06113*.

A Preliminaries

A.1 Terminology

Many researchers do not distinguish the number theoretic transform itself from the FFT-based algorithms used to compute it. Following (Satriawan et al., 2024), we refer to the transform as the NTT (exhibiting quadratic complexity $O(n^2)$ when computed directly) and to any FFT-like procedure that performs this transform as the Fast-NTT (achieving quasi-linear complexity $O(n \log n)$).

A.2 Notation

The integer ring \mathbb{Z}_q consists of the set of integers $\{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$, equipped with addition and multiplication operations modulo q . Let the polynomial quotient ring $\mathbb{Z}_q[x]/\phi(x)$ denote the set of equivalence classes of polynomials over \mathbb{Z}_q , where each polynomial is reduced modulo the irreducible polynomial $\phi(x)$. In the context of PQC and HE, the chosen rings are predominantly of the form $\mathbb{Z}_q[x]/(x^n + 1)$. Polynomial multiplication within the ring $\mathbb{Z}_q[x]/(x^n + 1)$ must be computed using negative wrapped convolution. Let $a(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i$ and $b(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i x^i$ be polynomials of degree at most $n-1$ in the quotient ring $\mathbb{Z}_q[x]/(x^n + 1)$. The negative wrapped convolution $NWC(\cdot)$ is defined as:

$$NWC(a(x), b(x)) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_k x^k, \quad (8)$$

where the coefficients c_k are given by:


$$c_k = \left(\sum_{i=0}^k a_i \cdot b_{(k-i)} - \sum_{i=k+1}^{n-1} a_i \cdot b_{(k+n-i)} \right) \bmod q. \quad (9)$$

This operation ensures that polynomial multiplication respects the structure of the quotient ring by incorporating reduction modulo $x^n + 1$.

Considering that optimization techniques will be employed in matrix computations, a polynomial $\mathbf{a}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i$ in $\mathbb{Z}_q[x]/(x^n + 1)$ can be equivalently represented as a vector over \mathbb{Z}_q , denoted as $\mathbf{a} = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}]$. Scalars are denoted by regular lowercase letters (e.g., a), polynomials by bold lowercase letters (e.g., \mathbf{a}), and vectors representing polynomials transformed via the Number Theoretic Transform are denoted with a prime symbol (e.g., \mathbf{a}' is the NTT representation of \mathbf{a}).


We define \times , \odot , and \cdot to represent polynomial, element-wise vector, and integer multiplications, respectively. Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, n denotes the degree of the polynomial ring, and q denotes the prime modulus of its coefficients.

B Experiment Results




(a) Precomputation time for $q = 7681$. (b) Precomputation time for $q = 12289$. (c) Precomputation time for $q = 8380417$.

Figure 3: Evaluation results of the precomputation time for GNTT algorithms.




(a) NTT running time for $q = 7681$.




(b) NTT running time for $q = 8380417$.

Figure 4: Comparison of the evaluation results for NTT running time.




(a) INTT running time for $q = 7681$.




(b) INTT running time for $q = 8380417$.

Figure 5: Comparison of the evaluation results for INTT running time.



(a) Memory cost for $q = 7681$.



(b) Memory cost for $q = 8380417$.

Figure 6: Comparison of the evaluation results for memory consumption.