

How Easy is Code Equivalence over \mathbb{F}_q ?

Nicolas Sendrier¹ and Dimitris E. Simos^{1,2}

¹ INRIA Paris-Rocquencourt

² SBA Research

8th International Workshop on Coding Theory and Cryptography

WCC 2013, Bergen, Norway

April 15, 2013

Outline of the Talk

Introduction

Outline of the Talk

Introduction

Code Equivalence Problem

Motivation

Previous Work

Outline of the Talk

Introduction

Code Equivalence Problem

Motivation

Previous Work

Support Splitting Algorithm

Mechanics

Generalization

Outline of the Talk

Introduction

Code Equivalence Problem

Motivation

Previous Work

Support Splitting Algorithm

Mechanics

Generalization

Research Problems

Linear Codes

Linear Code

A **linear** $[n, k]$ code C of length n is a k -dimensional subspace of the finite vector space \mathbb{F}_q^n and its n -bit elements are called **codewords**

Generator Matrix

- A $k \times n$ matrix G over \mathbb{F}_q , is called a **generator matrix** for C if the **rows** of G **form** a basis for C , so that $C = \{xG \mid x \in \mathbb{F}_q^k\}$

Hamming Space

- The Hamming **distance** (metric) on \mathbb{F}_q^n is the following mapping,

$$d : \mathbb{F}_q^n \times \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N} : (x, y) \mapsto d(x, y) := |\{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \mid x_i \neq y_i\}|$$

- The pair (\mathbb{F}_q^n, d) is a metric space, called the **Hamming space** of dimension n over \mathbb{F}_q , denoted by $H(n, q)$

Equivalence of Linear Codes

Notion of Equivalence

What it means for codes to be essentially “different” but being of the same quality?

The Celebrated MacWilliams Theorem (1961)

1. Any (linear) mapping between linear codes preserving the weight of the codewords induces an equivalence for codes
2. Two codes C, C' are of the same quality if there exists a mapping $\iota : \mathbb{F}_q^n \mapsto \mathbb{F}_q^n$ with $\iota(C) = C'$ which preserves the Hamming distance, i.e. $d(v, v') = d(\iota(v), \iota(v'))$, for all $v, v' \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$
3. These distance-preserving mappings are called isometries and the codes C and C' will be called isometric

Which are the Isometries of $H(n, q)$?

Permutation Equivalence: When $\mathbb{F}_q, q = 2$

- **Permutation** of codeword **coordinates**
- $C \stackrel{\text{PE}}{\sim} C'$, if $\exists \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n: C' = \sigma(C) = \{\sigma(x) \mid x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in C\}$ where $\sigma(x) = \sigma(x_1, \dots, x_n) := (x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma^{-1}(n)})$

Monomial or Linear Equivalence: When \mathbb{F}_q, q is a prime

- **Permutation** of codeword **coordinates** and **scaling** of coordinate **values**
- $C \stackrel{\text{LE}}{\sim} C'$, if $\exists \iota = (v; \sigma) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{*n} \times \mathcal{S}_n:$
 $C' = (v; \sigma)(C) = \{(v; \sigma)(x) \mid (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in C\}$ where
 $(v; \sigma)(x_1, \dots, x_n) := (v_1 x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, v_n x_{\sigma^{-1}(n)})$

Which are the Isometries of $H(n, q)$?

Semi-Linear Equivalence: When \mathbb{F}_q , $q = p^r$ is a prime power

- **Permutation** of codeword **coordinates** and **scaling** of coordinate **values**
- Application of field **automorphisms** in each coordinate position
- $C \stackrel{\text{SLE}}{\sim} C'$, if $(v; (\alpha, \sigma)) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{*n} \rtimes (\text{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q) \times \mathcal{S}_n)$:
 $C' = (v; (\alpha, \sigma))(C) = \{(v; (\alpha, \sigma))(x) \mid (x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} \in C\}$ where
 $(v; (\alpha, \sigma))(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (v_1 \alpha(x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}), \dots, v_n \alpha(x_{\sigma^{-1}(n)}))$

The **LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE** problem

- **Parameters:** n, k, q .
- **Instance:** two matrices $G, G' \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k \times n}$ such that $C = \langle G \rangle$, $C' = \langle G' \rangle$
- **Decisional:** are $\langle G \rangle \stackrel{\text{LE}}{\sim} \langle G' \rangle$?
- **Computational:** Find $(v; \sigma) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{*n} \rtimes \mathcal{S}_n$ such that $\langle G' \rangle = (v; \sigma)(\langle G \rangle)$

Importance of Code Equivalence

Relation to Error-Correcting Capability

Equivalent codes have the **same** error-correction properties (i.e. decoding)

Relation of the Hardness of Code Equivalence in Cryptography

- The **public key** of the McEliece cryptosystem is a **randomly permuted** matrix G' of the generator matrix G of a binary Goppa code [McEliece, 1978]
- Identification schemes from error-correcting codes
 - ▶ **Zero-knowledge** protocols [Girault, 1990, Sendrier and Simos, 2013]

What is known about Code Equivalence?

Complexity

PCE over \mathbb{F}_2 is **difficult** to decide in the **worst case**:

1. **not** NP-complete
2. at least **as hard as** GRAPH ISOMORPHISM [Petrank and Roth, 1997]
3. **Recent** result for \mathbb{F}_q : $GI \preceq PCE$ [Grochow, 2012]
4. PCE over \mathbb{F}_q **resists** quantum Fourier sampling; **Reduction** of PCE to the HIDDEN SUBGROUP PROBLEM [Dinh, Moore and Russell, 2011]

Plan of this Talk

Exploit the **average** and **worst-case** hardness of the LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE problem over \mathbb{F}_q

What is known about Code Equivalence?

Recent Algorithms

- **Mapping** codes to **graphs** for PCE, LCE, SLCE over $\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_3, \mathbb{F}_4$, respectively [Östergård, 2002]
- **Classification** of ELC orbits of **bipartite graphs** for PCE over \mathbb{F}_2 [Danielsen and Parker, 2008]
- Adaptation of **Hypergraph Isomorphism** algorithms for PCE over \mathbb{F}_q [Babai, Codenotti and Grochow, 2011]
- Computation of **canonical forms** of linear codes for LCE over \mathbb{F}_q [Feulner, 2009, 2011]
- **Support splitting** algorithm for PCE over \mathbb{F}_q [Sendrier, 2000]
- **No** efficient algorithm for LCE or SLCE is **known**

Important

Can we develop a **polynomial-time** algorithm for settling the LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE problem on the **average** case?

The Support Splitting Algorithm (I)

SSA

- Solves the PCE problem (decisional and computational versions)
- Partition the support \mathcal{I}_n of a code $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ into small sets that are fixed under operations of $\text{PAut}(C)$

Signatures and Invariants

- A mapping S is a **signature** if $S(\sigma(C), \sigma(i)) = S(C, i)$
- Property of the code and one of its positions (**local** property)
- S is called discriminant for C if there exist $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$ such that $S(C, i) \neq S(C, j)$ and fully discriminant if this holds $\forall i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$
- A mapping \mathcal{V} is an **invariant** if $C \sim C' \Rightarrow \mathcal{V}(C) = \mathcal{V}(C')$ (**global** property, “ \sim ” is w.r.t. to PCE but can be defined for LCE or SLCE)

The Support Splitting Algorithm (II)

The Procedure [Sendrier, 2000]

- From **given** signature S and code C , we wish to **build** a sequence $S_0 = S, S_1, \dots, S_r$ of **signatures** of increasing “discriminancy” such that S_r is **fully discriminant** for C (by **successive** refinements of S)
- The idea is to **label** positions with **different** signature values; what remains in the end reveals a **matching** between codeword coordinates

Fundamental Properties of SSA

1. $SSA(C)$ returns a **labeled** partition $\mathcal{P}(S, C)$ of $\mathcal{I}_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$
2. Assuming the **existence** of a fully discriminant signature, $SSA(C)$ recovers the desired permutation σ of $C' = \sigma(C)$ ($\forall i \in \mathcal{I}_n \exists$ unique $j \in \mathcal{I}_n$ such that $S(C, i) = S(C', j)$ and $\sigma(i) = j$)
3. **If** $C' = \sigma(C)$ **then** $\mathcal{P}'(S, C') = \sigma(\mathcal{P}(S, C))$
4. The **output** of $SSA(C)$ where $C = \langle G \rangle$ is **independent** of G

The Support Splitting Algorithm (III)

Dual Code

$C^\perp = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \mid \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } y \in C\}$ where:

1. $\langle x, y \rangle_E = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i, y_i \rangle_E = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i = x_1 y_1 + \dots + x_n y_n \in \mathbb{F}_q$
2. $\langle x, y \rangle_H = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i, y_i \rangle_H = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \bar{y}_i = x_1 y_1^2 + \dots + x_n y_n^2 \in \mathbb{F}_4$

A Good Signature

The mapping $(C, i) \mapsto \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}(C_i)}(X)$, where $\mathcal{H}(C) = C \cap C^\perp$ is the hull of a code, is a signature which for **random** codes,

- **commutes** with permutations $\sigma(\mathcal{H}(C)) = \mathcal{H}(\sigma(C))$; Hence, **any** invariant applied to $\mathcal{H}(C)$ still remains an **invariant**
- **easy** to compute because of the small dimension [Sendrier, 1997]
- **discriminant**, i.e. $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}(C_i)}(X)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}(C_j)}(X)$ are “often” different

Heuristic Complexity of SSA

Complexity of Auxiliary Functions

- Gaussian Elimination for computing $k \times n$ generator matrices: $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$
- Cost for computing $\mathcal{W}_C(X)$ for $[n, h]$ code C : $\mathcal{O}(n2^h)$

Algorithmic Cost of SSA

Let C be a **binary** code of length n , and let $h = \dim(\mathcal{H}(C))$:

- First step: $\mathcal{O}(n^3) + \mathcal{O}(n2^h)$
- Each refinement: $\mathcal{O}(hn^2) + \mathcal{O}(n2^h)$
- Number of refinements: $\approx \log n$

Total (heuristic) complexity: $\mathcal{O}(n^3 + 2^h n^2 \log n)$

- When $h = \mathcal{O}(1) \implies$ SSA runs in **polynomial** time

41.94% of codes over \mathbb{F}_2 have $h = 0$, 41.94% have $h = 1$, 13.98% have $h = 2$, 0.02% have $h = 3$ and so on..

Computational vs. Decisional Code Equivalence

How are Computational and Decisional Problems Related?

- If one can explicitly solve the computational problems of code equivalence then one can also solve its corresponding decisional versions
- The other direction is also possible (Sendrier and Simos, 2012)
- Provided that for the PCE problem we have access to an oracle; An abstract version of SSA denoted by $\text{Or}_{\text{PCE}}(G, G') \in \{\text{TRUE}, \text{FALSE}\}$

Computational and Decisional PCE are equally hard

- Let G and G' span two $[n, k]$ linear codes C and C' over \mathbb{F}_q
- If $\text{Or}_{\text{PCE}}(G, G')$ is TRUE and $\text{Or}_{\text{PCE}}(G_i, G'_j)$ is TRUE for some $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_n$ then there exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$ such that $C' = \sigma(C)$ and $j = \sigma(i)$
- Building block of an algorithm that retrieves the permutational part of a (semi)-linear isometry for the computational (S)LCE problems

The Closure of a Linear Code (I)

Approach for the Generalization of SSA

- **Reduce** LCE or SLCE to PCE (similar approach by [Skersys, 1999])
- Recall that SSA **solves** PCE in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ (for “several” instances)

Closure of a Code

Let $\mathbb{F}_q = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{q-1}\}$, with $a_0 = 0$, and a linear code $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$. Define $\mathcal{I}_{q-1}^{(n)}$ as the cartesian product of $\mathcal{I}_{q-1} \times \mathcal{I}_n$ where $\mathcal{I}_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$. The **closure** \tilde{C} of the code C is a code of length $(q-1)n$ over \mathbb{F}_q where,

$$\tilde{C} = \{(a_k x_i)_{(k,i) \in \mathcal{I}_{q-1}^{(n)}} \mid (x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} \in C\}$$

- \tilde{C} contains **every possible multiplication** of the coordinate x_i of a codeword $x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} \in C$ with **all nonzero elements** of \mathbb{F}_q

The Closure of a Linear Code (II)

Dependance from a Lexicographical Ordering on $\mathbb{F}_q^* = \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$

For example, the **ordering** $(a_1, 1) < \dots < (a_1, n) < (a_2, 1) < \dots < (a_2, n) < \dots < (a_{q-1}, 1) < \dots < (a_{q-1}, n)$ gives a **total order** for $\mathcal{I}_{q-1} \times \mathcal{I}_n$, and gives rise to the following closure,

$$\tilde{C} = \{(a_1 x_1, \dots, a_1 x_n, \dots, a_{q-1} x_1, \dots, a_{q-1} x_n) \mid (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in C\}$$

Systematic Form of the Closure (Sendrier and Simos, 2012)

- Let p a **primitive** element of $\mathbb{F}_q = \{0, p, p^2, \dots, p^{q-2}, p^{q-1} = 1\}$
- Define an ordering according to a **cyclic shift** of a **power** of p
- $\tilde{C}_{\text{sys}} = \{(x_1, p x_1, \dots, p^{q-2} x_1, \dots, x_n, p x_n, \dots, p^{q-2} x_n) \mid (x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} \in C\}$
- **Systematic form is unique**
- Let $C, C' \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$. Then $C \stackrel{\text{LE}}{\sim} C'$, if and only if $\tilde{C} \stackrel{\text{PE}}{\sim} \tilde{C}'$

The Closure of a Linear Code (III)

The Closure is a Weakly Self-Dual Code ($C \subset C^\perp$)

$\forall \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \tilde{C}$ the Euclidean inner product is

$$\tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{y} = \underbrace{\left(\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} p^{2j} \right)}_{=0 \text{ over } \mathbb{F}_q, q \geq 5} (\sum_i x_i y_i) = 0$$

- Clearly $\dim(\mathcal{H}(\tilde{C})) = \dim(\tilde{C})$ and SSA runs in $\mathcal{O}(2^{\dim(\mathcal{H}(\tilde{C}))})$
- The closure **reduces** LCE to the **hard** instances of SSA for PCE
- **Exceptions** are for $q = 3$ and $q = 4$ with the **Hermitian** inner product

Building Efficient Invariants from the Closure

- For **any** invariant \mathcal{V} the **mapping** $C \mapsto \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{H}(\tilde{C}))$ is an invariant
- The **dimension** of the hull over \mathbb{F}_q is on average a **small** constant

The Reduction of LCE to PCE

Illustration of the Reduction

- Ψ a **linear isometry** of the Hamming space $H(n, q)$
- τ a **block-wise** permutation of the generalized symmetric group $\mathcal{S}(q-1, n) := \mathcal{C}_{q-1} \wr_n \mathcal{S}_n$ (The **semidirect product** of n copies of \mathcal{C}_{q-1} and \mathcal{S}_n)

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & \mathcal{C}' \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}} & \xrightarrow{\tau} & \tilde{\mathcal{C}}' \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}) & \xrightarrow{\tau} & \mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}') \end{array}$$

- The **LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE** problem can be **solved** if we can **retrieve** Ψ from τ

An Extension of SSA

A Good Signature for \mathbb{F}_3 and \mathbb{F}_4

- $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\widetilde{C}) = \mathcal{H}(\widetilde{C})$ (valid **only** for these fields)
- $S(\widetilde{C}, i) = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{H}(\widetilde{C}_i)}(X)$

An Efficient Algorithm for Solving LCE

- **Input:** C, C', S
 1. **Compute** \widetilde{C} and \widetilde{C}'
 2. $\mathcal{P}(S, \widetilde{C}) \leftarrow \text{SSA}(\widetilde{C})$ and $\mathcal{P}'(S, \widetilde{C}') \leftarrow \text{SSA}(\widetilde{C}')$
 3. **If** $\mathcal{P}'(S, \widetilde{C}') = \tau(\mathcal{P}(S, \widetilde{C}))$ **return** τ ; **else** $C \approx C'$ w.r.t. LCE
 4. $\widetilde{C}' = \tau(\widetilde{C})$ and a Gaussian elimination (GE) on the **permuted** generator matrices of the closures will **reveal** the scaling coefficients
- **Note:** For SLCE we **only** have to consider an additional GE

Heuristic Complexity for SSA and its Extension

Polynomial extension of SSA

- For \mathbb{F}_3 and \mathbb{F}_4 but **still** exponential for all other cases..

| Algorithm | Field (alphabet) | Random codes (average-case) | Weakly self-dual codes (worst-case) |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| SSA | \mathbb{F}_2 | $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ | $\mathcal{O}(2^k n^2 \log n)$ |
| SSA extension | \mathbb{F}_3 | $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ | $\mathcal{O}(3^k n^2 \log n)$ |
| SSA extension | \mathbb{F}_4 | $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ | $\mathcal{O}(2^{2k} n^2 \log n)$ |
| SSA extension | $\mathbb{F}_q, q \geq 5$ | $\mathcal{O}(q^k n^2 \log n)$ | $\mathcal{O}(q^k n^2 \log n)$ |

Remark

The **hardness** of LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE arises from the absence of an **easy computable** invariant **not** the inexistence of an algorithm!

Can we Do Better?

What about $\mathbb{F}_q, q \geq 5$?

- If $C \sim C'$ w.r.t. LCE or SLCE $\implies \mathcal{H}(C) \sim \mathcal{H}(C')$ w.r.t. LCE or SLCE is **not** true
- The hull is **not** an invariant for LCE or SLCE over $\mathbb{F}_q, q \geq 5$
- (The weight enumerator) of the hull of the closure is **not** an **easy computable** invariant over $\mathbb{F}_q, q \geq 5$ (closure is weakly self-dual)

Conjecture (Sendrier and Simos, 2012)

The LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE problem seems to be **hard** for **all** instances over $\mathbb{F}_q, q \geq 5$

- **Supported** by some **impossibility** results on the **Tutte polynomial** of a graph which **corresponds** to the **weight enumerator** of a code
- **Evaluation** of weight enumerator is **always hard** except for a handful of points which correspond to \mathbb{F}_q for $q \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ (Vertigan, 1998)

Research Problems

Related to Invariants

- Are all invariants **related** to the **weight enumerator** of a code?
- Do we already **know** all **easy computable** invariants?

Related to the Closure

- Other **reductions** of LCE or SLCE to PCE?

Related to Code-based Cryptography

- LCE or SLCE **seems** to be hard over \mathbb{F}_q , $q \geq 5$
- Can we build **zero-knowledge** protocols or other **cryptographic schemes** based on the **hardness** of LCE or SLCE?

Summary

Highlights

1. We defined the closure of a linear code
2. We presented a generalization of the support splitting algorithm for solving the LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE problem for \mathbb{F}_3 and \mathbb{F}_4
3. We conjectured that the LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE problem over \mathbb{F}_q , $q \geq 5$ is hard for almost all instances

Summary







Highlights

1. We defined the closure of a linear code
2. We presented a generalization of the support splitting algorithm for solving the LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE problem for \mathbb{F}_3 and \mathbb{F}_4
3. We conjectured that the LINEAR CODE EQUIVALENCE problem over \mathbb{F}_q , $q \geq 5$ is hard for almost all instances

Future Work

Solve (some) of the research problems..!

References

-  László Babai, Paolo Codenotti, Joshua Grochow and Youming Qiao, “Code equivalence and group isomorphism,” In Proc. 22nd Ann. Symp. on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2011), pages 1395-1408. ACM-SIAM, 2011.
-  E. Petrank and R. M. Roth, “Is code equivalence easy to decide?,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 1602–1604, 1997.
-  N. Sendrier, “On the dimension of the hull,” *SIAM J. Discete Math.*, vol. 10, pp. 282–293, 1997.
-  N. Sendrier, “Finding the permutation between equivalent codes: the support splitting algorithm,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, pp. 1193–1203, 2000.
-  N. Sendrier and D. E. Simos, “The Hardness of Code Equivalence over \mathbb{F}_q and its Application to Code-based Cryptography,” to appear in Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Post-Quantum Cryptography (PQCrypto 2013), Preprint, 2013.
-  D. Vertigan, “Bicycle dimension and special points of the Tutte polynomial,” *Journal of Comb. Theory, Series B*, vol. 74, pp. 378–396, 1998

Questions - Comments

Thanks for your Attention!



{nicolas.sendrier,dimitrios.simos}@inria.fr
dsimos@sba-research.org