

SCIENCE PASSION TECHNOLOGY

Improved Search for Integral, Impossible Differential and Zero-Correlation Attacks

Hosein Hadipour Simon Gerhalter Sadegh Sadeghi Maria Eichlseder FSE 2024 - Leuven, Belgium

> hsn.hadipour@gmail.com

Motivation and Our Contributions

🐴 Motivation

Contributions

Improving the CP-based methods to find ID/ZC, and integral distinguishers.
 Introducing a CP model for the partial-sum technique for the first time.
 Improving distinguishers of Ascon, QARMAv2, and ForkSKINNY (25 Dists.).
 Improving key recovery attacks of SKINNY, and ForkSKINNY (24 Attacks).

Motivation and Our Contributions

🐴 Motivation

😯 Contributions

- S Improving the CP-based methods to find ID/ZC, and integral distinguishers.
- Introducing a CP model for the partial-sum technique for the first time.
- S Improving distinguishers of Ascon, QARMAv2, and ForkSKINNY (25 Dists.).
- S Improving key recovery attacks of SKINNY, and ForkSKINNY (24 Attacks).

Part of Our Results Regarding Distinguishing Attacks

Cipher	#Rounds	Dist.	Data complexity	Ref.
QARMAv2-64	5	Integral	$egin{array}{c} -&& -& 2^8 & / & 2^{16} & / & 2^{44} \\ 2^8 & / & 2^{16} & / & 2^{44} \\ 2^{16} & / & 2^{44} & / & 2^{96} \end{array}$	[Ava+23]
QARMAv2-64 ($\mathscr{T} = 1$)	7 / 8 / 9	Integral		This work
QARMAv2-64 ($\mathscr{T} = 2$)	8 / 9 / 10	Integral		This work
QARMAv2-128($\mathscr{T} = 2$)	10 / 11 / 12	Integral		This work
ForkSKINNY-64-192 ForkSKINNY-64-192 ForkSKINNY-64-192 ForkSKINNY-64-192	16 17 16 21	Integral Integral ID ID	2 ⁷² 260 -	[Niu+21] This work [HSE23] This work
ForkSKINNY-128-256	14	Integral	2 ⁵⁶	[HSE23]
ForkSKINNY-128-256	15	Integral	2 ⁵⁶	This work

Part of Our Results Regarding Key Recovery Attacks

Cipher	#R	Time	Data	Mem.	Attack	Setting / Model	Ref.
SKINNY-64-64	17	2 ⁵⁹	2 ^{58.79}	2 ⁴⁰	ID	STK / CP	[HSE23]
	18	2 ^{53.58}	2 ^{53.58}	2 ⁴⁸	Int	60,SK / CP,CT	This work
SKINNY-128-128	17	2 ^{116.51}	2 ^{116.37}	2 ⁸⁰	ID	STK / CP	[HSE23]
	18	2 ^{105.58}	2 ^{105.58}	2 ⁹⁶	Int	120,SK / CP,CT	This work
SKINNY-128-384	26	2 ³⁴⁴	2 ¹²¹	2 ³⁴⁰	lnt	360,SK / CP,CT	[HSE23]
	26	2 ³³¹	2 ¹²²	2 ³²⁸	Int	360,SK / CP,CT	This work
ForkSKINNY-128-256	26	2 ^{250.30}	2 ¹²⁷	2 ¹⁶⁰	ID	256,RTK / CP	[BDL20]
	26	2 ^{238.50}	2 ^{128.60}	2 ^{175.60}	ID	256,RTK / CP	This paper

Outline

1 Background and the Research Gap

- 2 Search For Distinguishers
- **3** Our New Word-Wise Method for Finding Distinguishers
- 4 Our New Bit-Wise Method for Finding Distinguishers
- 5 Our Unified CP Model for Key-Recovery
- 6 Contributions and Future Works

Background and the Research Gap



- Integral attack [Lai94; DKR97]
- Impossible-differential attack [BBS99; Knu98]
- Zero-correlation attack [BR14]



- Integral attack [Lai94; DKR97]
- Impossible-differential attack [BBS99; Knu98]
- Zero-correlation attack [BR14]



- Integral attack [Lai94; DKR97]
- Impossible-differential attack [BBS99; Knu98]
- Zero-correlation attack [BR14]



- Integral attack [Lai94; DKR97]
- Impossible-differential attack [BBS99; Knu98]
- Zero-correlation attack [BR14]



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 STK_0

ZΩ

 Y_0

 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle

 X_1

 W_0

 STK_1



ZΩ

 Y_0

Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle STK_0

 X_1

 W_0

 STK_1



ZΩ

 Y_0

Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle STK_0

 W_0

 STK_1



 X_1

ZΩ

Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 X_1

 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



 Find two differences (linear masks) that propagate forward and backward with probability one and contradict each other in the middle



Relation Between ZC and Integral Distinguishers

Any ZC distinguisher can be converted to an integral distinguisher [Sun+15].

Link Between ZC and Integral Distinguishers [Sun+15]

Let $F : \mathbb{F}_2^n \to \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a vectorial Boolean function. Assume A is a subspace of \mathbb{F}_2^n and $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that (α, β) is a ZC approximation for any $\alpha \in A$. Then, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, $\langle \beta, F(x + \lambda) \rangle$ is balanced over the set

$$A^{\perp} = \{ x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \mid \forall \ \alpha \in A : \langle \alpha, x \rangle = 0 \}.$$

Example: Conversion of ZC Distinguisher to Integral Distinguisher



- $X_0[7, 10, 13]$ takes all possible values and the remaining cells take a fixed value
- $X_6[7] \oplus X_6[11] \oplus X_6[15]$ is balanced

- Common technique for ID key recovery:
 - Early abort technique [Lu+08]
- Common technique for ZC/Integral key recovery:
 - Partial-sum technique [Fer+00]

 $\Delta_{
m \scriptscriptstyle U}
earrow \Delta_{
m \scriptscriptstyle L}$ $\Delta_{
m \scriptscriptstyle L}$ $r_{\rm D}$

- Common technique for ID key recovery:
 - Early abort technique [Lu+08]
- Common technique for ZC/Integral key recovery:
 - Partial-sum technique [Fer+00]



- Common technique for ID key recovery:
 - Early abort technique [Lu+08]
- Common technique for ZC/Integral key recovery:
 - Partial-sum technique [Fer+00]



- Common technique for ID key recovery:
 - Early abort technique [Lu+08]
- Common technique for ZC/Integral key recovery:
 - Partial-sum technique [Fer+00]



- Common technique for ID key recovery:
 - Early abort technique [Lu+08]
- Common technique for ZC/Integral key recovery:
 - Partial-sum technique [Fer+00]



Previous Tools for ID/ZC, and Integral Attacks

- Tools based on dedicated algorithms:
 - CRYPTO 2016 (*DC*-MITM, ID) [DF16]
- Tools based on general purpose solvers:
 - Eprint 2016 (ID) [Cui+16]
 - ASIACRYPT 2016 (Integral) [Xia+16]
 - EUROCRYPT 2017 (ID, ZC) [ST17]
 - ToSC 2017 (ID, ZC) [Sun+17]
 - ToSC 2020 (ID, ZC) [Sun+20]





Search for Distinguishers

Our Previous Method to Search Distinguishers [HSE23]




 $\bigcirc \textit{CSP}_{ ext{L}}(\Delta_{ ext{L}},\Delta_{ ext{L}}')$

 $\bigcirc \mathit{CSP}_{\mathrm{M}}(\Delta'_{\mathrm{U}},\Delta'_{\mathrm{L}})$







Hosein Hadipour, Simon Gerhalter, Sadegh Sadeghi, Maria Eichlseder FSE 2024 - Leuven, Belgium

14



Our New Word-Wise Method for Finding Distinguishers

Relax the Limit of Fixing the Contradiction's Location

H Find ID distinguisher for $r_{\rm D}(=r_{\rm U}+r_{\rm L})$ rounds



Modeling the distinguishers in [HSE23].

Our modeling of the distinguishers.

Our New Bit-Wise Method for Finding Distinguishers



Hosein Hadipour, Simon Gerhalter, Sadegh Sadeghi, Maria Eichlseder



Hosein Hadipour, Simon Gerhalter, Sadegh Sadeghi, Maria Eichlseder



 $\begin{aligned} \Delta_i &= (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_o = (0, 0, 0, 0) \\ \Delta_i &\neq (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_o \neq (0, 0, 0, 0) \\ \Delta_i &= (0, 0, 0, 1) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_o = (?, 1, ?, ?) \\ \Delta_i &= (0, 1, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_o = (1, ?, ?, ?) \end{aligned}$

 $2 \, c \, 3$

Hosein Hadipour, Simon Gerhalter, Sadegh Sadeghi, Maria Eichlseder



Hosein Hadipour, Simon Gerhalter, Sadegh Sadeghi, Maria Eichlseder



 $\Delta_{i} = (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_{o} = (0,0,0,0)$ $\Delta_{i} \neq (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_{o} \neq (0,0,0,0)$ $\Delta_{i} = (0,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_{o} = (?,1,?,?)$ $\Delta_{i} = (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_{o} = (1,?,?,?)$ $\Delta_{i} = (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_{o} = (1,1,?,?)$ $\Delta_{i} = (1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{S} \Delta_{o} = (?,0,?,?)$

Hosein Hadipour, Simon Gerhalter, Sadegh Sadeghi, Maria Eichlseder



Hosein Hadipour, Simon Gerhalter, Sadegh Sadeghi, Maria Eichlseder

0 8 2 9 h c d х S(x)0 9 6 8 5 $2 \, c \, 3$ $\lambda_i \setminus \lambda_o$ 0 d C 0 16 1 0 λ_i 0 0 0 0 2 0 3 0 x $x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4$ 4 0 5 6 7 0 S 8 0 -8 Q 0 а 0 0 b 0 $\mathcal{S}(x)$ $y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4$ с 0 d λo 0000 ۵ f

 $\lambda_i = (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ $\lambda_i \neq (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o \neq (0,0,0,0)$

e

8 9 h c d х $\mathcal{S}(x)$ 9 6 8 5 2 с 3 $\lambda_i \setminus \lambda_o$ 0 C d 0 $\lambda_i = (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ 1 0 λ_i 0010 2 $\lambda_i \neq (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o \neq (0,0,0,0)$ 3 0 .1 x $x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4$ 4 0 5 $\lambda_i = (0, 0, 1, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o = (1, ?, ?, ?)$ 6 7 S 8 0 Q 0 а 0 b 0 $\mathcal{S}(x)$ $y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4$ c 0 d 1??? λo ۵ f

8 h c d x $\mathcal{S}(x)$ 9 6 8 5 2 с 3 $\lambda_i \setminus \lambda_o$ 0 0 1 λ_i 000 2 3 Ω .1 x $x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4$ 4 + + + 5 6 7 S 8 -8 Q а 0 b 0 $\mathcal{S}(x)$ $y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4$ c Ω d λo 1?1? 0 f

 $\lambda_i = (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ $\lambda_i \neq (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o \neq (0, 0, 0, 0)$ $\lambda_i = (0, 0, 1, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o = (1, ?, ?, ?)$ $\lambda_i = (1, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_o = (1, ?, 1, ?)$

8 c x $\mathcal{S}(x)$ 6 8 5 2 с 3 $\lambda_i \setminus \lambda_o$ 0 1 λ_i 1010 2 3 Ω .1 x $x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4$ 4 + + + 5 6 7 S 8 Q a 0 b 0 $\mathcal{S}(x)$ $y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4$ с d λo 0 ? ? 1 ۵ f

 $\lambda_{i} = (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_{o} = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ $\lambda_{i} \neq (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_{o} \neq (0, 0, 0, 0)$ $\lambda_{i} = (0, 0, 1, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_{o} = (1, ?, ?, ?)$ $\lambda_{i} = (1, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_{o} = (1, ?, 1, ?)$ $\lambda_{i} = (1, 0, 1, 0) \xrightarrow{S} \lambda_{o} = (0, ?, ?, 1)$

CP Model for Deterministic Bit-Wise Trails - I

- For each bit position, we define an integer variable with domain $\{0, 1, -1\}$.
- Define CP constraints to model the propagation of deterministic bit-wise trails.

S-box

Assume that x[i], y[i] are integer variables with domain $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ to encode the input and output differences at the *i*-th bit position, respectively. The valid deterministic differential transitions satisfy the following:

$$\begin{array}{l} if(x[0] = 0 \land x[1] = 0 \land x[2] = 0 \land x[3] = 0) \ then \ (y[0] = 0 \land y[1] = 0 \land y[2] = 0 \land y[3] = 0) \\ elseif(x[0] = 0 \land x[1] = 0 \land x[2] = 0 \land x[3] = 1) \ then \ (y[0] = -1 \land y[1] = 1 \land y[2] = -1 \land y[3] = -1) \\ elseif(x[0] = 0 \land x[1] = 1 \land x[2] = 0 \land x[3] = 0) \ then \ (y[0] = 1 \land y[1] = -1 \land y[2] = -1 \land y[3] = -1) \\ elseif(x[0] = 1 \land x[1] = 0 \land x[2] = 0 \land x[3] = 0) \ then \ (y[0] = 1 \land y[1] = 1 \land y[2] = -1 \land y[3] = -1) \\ elseif(x[0] = 1 \land x[1] = 0 \land x[2] = 0 \land x[3] = 1) \ then \ (y[0] = -1 \land y[1] = 1 \land y[2] = -1 \land y[3] = -1) \\ elseif(x[0] = 1 \land x[1] = 0 \land x[2] = 0 \land x[3] = 1) \ then \ (y[0] = -1 \land y[1] = 0 \land y[2] = -1 \land y[3] = -1) \\ elseif(x[0] = 1 \land x[1] = 1 \land x[2] = 0 \land x[3] = 0) \ then \ (y[0] = 0 \land y[1] = -1 \land y[2] = -1 \land y[3] = -1) \\ else(y[0] = -1 \land y[1] = -1 \land y[2] = -1 \land y[3] = -1) \ endif; \end{array}$$

Example: ID/ZC Distinguishers for 5 Rounds of Ascon



 2^{155} ZC Distinguishers (upper/lower nonzero: \mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z})

Hosein Hadipour, Simon Gerhalter, Sadegh Sadeghi, Maria Eichlseder FSE 2024 - Leuven, Belgium



 2^{155} ID Distinguishers (upper/lower unknown: \mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z})

The Advantages of Our Method to Search for Distinguishers

- Sased on satisfiability of the CP model
- Any feasible solutions of our CP model is a distinguisher
- We do not fix the input/output of distinguisher
- ✤ Extendable to a unified model for key-recovery
 - Senables us to find a distinguisher optimized for key-recovery
 - Senables us to consider key-recovery techniques:
 - 🛇 MitM
 - 📀 Key bridging
 - ⊘ Partial-sum technique

Our Unified CP Model for Partial-Sum Key-Recovery



Naive Approach v.s. Partial-Sum Technique

🚔 Naive approach:

24

 $\Theta \ \mathbf{x} = F(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{c})$ $\Theta \ T = N \cdot 2^{|\mathbf{k}|}$

✤ Partial-sum technique:

Solution ×₁ = f₁(k₁, x₀), x₂ = f₂(k₂, x₁), ..., x = f_n(k_n, x_{n-1})
Solution ×₀ = c, N₀ = N, N_i < N
T = ∑_{i=1}ⁿ N_{i-1}/n · 2^{|k_1|+...+|k_i|} < ∑_{i=1}ⁿ N/n · 2^{|k|}
T < N · 2^{|k|}





Naive Approach v.s. Partial-Sum Technique

- 🚔 Naive approach:
- ✤ Partial-sum technique:





Example: Partial-Sum Integral Key Recovery for AES [Fer+00]



$$\begin{split} \mathcal{C}_4[0] &= \mathcal{S}^{-1} \left(\bar{\mathcal{K}}_5[0] \oplus \mathtt{OE} \cdot \mathcal{S}^{-1} \left(\mathcal{C}_6[0] \oplus \mathcal{K}_6[0] \right) \oplus \mathtt{O9} \cdot \mathcal{S}^{-1} \left(\mathcal{C}_6[7] \oplus \mathcal{K}_6[7] \right) \\ &\oplus \mathtt{OD} \cdot \mathcal{S}^{-1} \left(\mathcal{C}_6[10] \oplus \mathcal{K}_6[10] \right) \oplus \mathtt{OB} \cdot \mathcal{S}^{-1} \left(\mathcal{C}_6[13] \oplus \mathcal{K}_6[13] \right) \end{split}$$

• Time complexity of naive key recovery: $6 \times 2^{32} \times 2^{40} \approx 2^{74.58}$

Partial-sum Technique for Integral Key Recovery [Fer+00]



- Guess $K_6[0,7]$ and derive $S_0(C_6[0] \oplus K_6[0]) \oplus S_1(C_6[7] \oplus K_6[7])$
- Guess $K_6[10]$ and derive $\mathcal{S}_2(C_6[10] \oplus K_6[10])$
- Guess $K_6[13]$ and derive $\mathcal{S}_3(C_6[13] \oplus K_6[13])$
- Guess $\overline{K}_5[0]$ and derive $C_4[0]$
- Time complexity: $6 \times 4 \times 2^{48} \approx 2^{52}$ S-box lookups



Our CP Model for Partial-Sum Technique - I



Step	Guessed	$K \times D = Mem$	Time	Stored Texts
0	-	$2^0 \times 2^{40} = 2^{40}$	240-5.2	$Z_{17}[1, 3, 4, 7]; X_{17}[8, 11, 12, 13, 15]; X_{16}[15]$
1	$STK_{17}[1]$	$2^4 \times 2^{36} = 2^{40}$	$2^{44-7.2}$	$Z_{17}[3, 4, 7]; X_{17}[8, 11, 12, 15]; X_{16}[14, 15]$
2	STK ₁₇ [7]	$2^8 \times 2^{32} = 2^{40}$	$2^{44-8.2}$	$Z_{17}[3,4]; X_{17}[8,12,15]; Z_{16}[6]; X_{16}[14,15]$
3	STK ₁₇ [3]	$2^{12} \times 2^{28} = 2^{40}$	$2^{44-7.2}$	$Z_{17}[4]; X_{17}[8, 12]; Z_{16}[6]; X_{16}[12, 14, 15]$
4	$STK_{17}[4]$	$2^{16} \times 2^{28} = 2^{44}$	$2^{44-7.2}$	$Z_{16}[0, 6, 7]; X_{16}[10, 12, 14, 15]$
5	$STK_{16}[6]$	$2^{20} \times 2^{20} = 2^{40}$	248-7.2	$Z_{16}[0,7]; X_{16}[12,15]; X_{15}[5]$
6	$STK_{16}[7]$	$2^{24} \times 2^{16} = 2^{40}$	244-7.2	$Z_{16}[0]; X_{16}[12]; X_{15}[5,9]$
7	$STK_{16}[0]$	$2^{28} \times 2^4 = 2^{32}$	$2^{44-6.2}$	X ₁₃ [0]
Σ		2 ⁴⁴	2 ^{41.32}	

 $\underline{\textbf{Hosein Hadipour}}, \ Simon \ Gerhalter, \ Sadegh \ Sadeghi, \ Maria \ Eichlseder$

Our CP Model for Partial-Sum Technique - II

- Assume that in each step we guess at least one cell of the involved keys.
- We define the number of steps *s* which is less than the number of involved key cells.
- For each cell we define an integer variable with domain $\{0, \cdots, s\}$.
- We define some constraints to compute the step number of deriving each cell.



Our Unified Model for Finding Integral Attack

- Our CP model for finding complete integral attack includes the following modules:
 - Model the distinguisher part
 - Model the meet-in-the-middle technique
 - Model the involved cells in key recovery
 - Model the step assignment
 - Model the tweakey schedule (key-bridging)
 - Model the time/memory complexity evaluation
- Objective function: minimize the total time complexity

Usage of Our Tool

python3 attack.py -RB 1 -RD 12 -RF 5



✓ We use MiniZinc [Net+07] to create our CP models

- Ve use Gurobi [Gur22] and OrTools [PF] as the CP solvers
- Our tool can find the results in a few seconds running on a regular laptop

Example: 18-round Integral Attack on SKINNY-n-n



Contributions and Future Works



Contributions and Future Works

- Contributions
 - ${\ensuremath{ \bullet } }$ Improving unified models for finding complete ID/ZC/integral attacks
 - Introducing a CP model for the partial-sum technique for the first time
 - Sound improved attacks for SKINNY, and ForskSKINNY, and QARMAv2
- Future works
 - A Extending our distinguisher models for ID/ZC to find indirect contradictions
 - A Extending our tools to AndRX and ARX ciphers, e.g., Simeck, and SPECK.
 - A Extending our approach to division property or monomial prediction techniques
 - A Improving the key-recovery part of our CP models for ZC attacks

O: https://github.com/hadipourh/zeroplus

: https://ia.cr/2023/1701

Bibliography I

- [Ava+23] Roberto Avanzi et al. The QARMAv2 Family of Tweakable Block Ciphers. IACR Trans. Symmetric Cryptol. 2023.3 (2023), pp. 25–73. DOI: 10.46586/T0SC.V2023.I3.25–73.
- [BBS99] Eli Biham, Alex Biryukov, and Adi Shamir. Cryptanalysis of Skipjack Reduced to 31 Rounds Using Impossible Differentials. EUROCRYPT 1999. Vol. 1592. LNCS. Springer, 1999, pp. 12–23. DOI: 10.1007/3-540-48910-X_2.
- [BDL20] Augustin Bariant, Nicolas David, and Gaëtan Leurent. Cryptanalysis of Forkciphers. IACR Trans. Symmetric Cryptol. 2020.1 (2020), pp. 233–265. DOI: 10.13154/tosc.v2020.i1.233-265.
- [BR14] Andrey Bogdanov and Vincent Rijmen. Linear hulls with correlation zero and linear cryptanalysis of block ciphers. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* 70.3 (2014), pp. 369–383. DOI: 10.1007/s10623-012-9697-z.

Bibliography II

[Cui+16] Tingting Cui et al. New Automatic Search Tool for Impossible Differentials and Zero-Correlation Linear Approximations. IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2016/689. 2016. URL: https://eprint.iacr.org/2016/689.

[DF16] Patrick Derbez and Pierre-Alain Fouque. Automatic Search of Meet-in-the-Middle and Impossible Differential Attacks. CRYPTO 2016. Vol. 9815. LNCS. Springer, 2016, pp. 157–184.

[DKR97] Joan Daemen, Lars R. Knudsen, and Vincent Rijmen. The Block Cipher Square. FSE 1997. Vol. 1267. LNCS. Springer, 1997, pp. 149–165. DOI: 10.1007/BFb0052343.

[Fer+00] Niels Ferguson et al. Improved Cryptanalysis of Rijndael. FSE 2000. Vol. 1978. LNCS. Springer, 2000, pp. 213–230. DOI: 10.1007/3-540-44706-7_15.

Bibliography III

36

- [Gur22] Gurobi Optimization, LLC. Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual. 2022. URL: https://www.gurobi.com.
- [HSE23] Hosein Hadipour, Sadegh Sadeghi, and Maria Eichlseder. Finding the Impossible: Automated Search for Full Impossible Differential, Zero-Correlation, and Integral Attacks. EUROCRYPT 2023. Vol. 14007. LNCS. Springer, 2023, pp. 128–157. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-30634-1_5.
- [Knu98] Lars Knudsen. DEAL-a 128-bit block cipher. complexity 258.2 (1998), p. 216.
- [Lai94] Xuejia Lai. Higher order derivatives and differential cryptanalysis. Communications and cryptography. Springer, 1994, pp. 227–233.
Bibliography IV

- [Lu+08] Jiqiang Lu et al. Improving the Efficiency of Impossible Differential Cryptanalysis of Reduced Camellia and MISTY1. CT-RSA 2008. Vol. 4964. LNCS. Springer, 2008, pp. 370–386. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-79263-5_24.
- [Net+07] Nicholas Nethercote et al. MiniZinc: Towards a Standard CP Modelling Language. CP 2007. Vol. 4741. LNCS. Springer, 2007, pp. 529–543.
- [Niu+21] Chao Niu et al. Zero-Correlation Linear Cryptanalysis with Equal Treatment for Plaintexts and Tweakeys. CT-RSA 2021. Vol. 12704. LNCS. Springer, 2021, pp. 126–147. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-75539-3_6.
- [PF] Laurent Perron and Vincent Furnon. **OR-Tools**. Version 9.3. Google. URL: https://developers.google.com/optimization/.

Bibliography V

- [ST17] Yu Sasaki and Yosuke Todo. New Impossible Differential Search Tool from Design and Cryptanalysis Aspects. EUROCRYPT 2017. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 185–215. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-56617-7_7.
- [Sun+15] Bing Sun et al. Links Among Impossible Differential, Integral and Zero Correlation Linear Cryptanalysis. CRYPTO 2015. Vol. 9215. LNCS. Springer, 2015, pp. 95–115. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-47989-6_5.
- [Sun+17] Siwei Sun et al. Analysis of AES, SKINNY, and Others with Constraint Programming. IACR Transactions on Symmetric Cryptology 2017.1 (Mar. 2017), pp. 281–306. DOI: 10.13154/tosc.v2017.i1.281-306.

Bibliography VI

39

[Sun+20] Ling Sun et al. On the Usage of Deterministic (Related-Key) Truncated Differentials and Multidimensional Linear Approximations for SPN Ciphers. IACR Transactions on Symmetric Cryptology 2020.3 (Sept. 2020), pp. 262–287. DOI: 10.13154/tosc.v2020.i3.262-287.

- [Tez14] Cihangir Tezcan. Improbable differential attacks on Present using undisturbed bits. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 259 (2014), pp. 503–511. DOI: 10.1016/j.cam.2013.06.023.
- [Xia+16] Zejun Xiang et al. Applying MILP Method to Searching Integral Distinguishers Based on Division Property for 6 Lightweight Block Ciphers. ASIACRYPT 2016. Vol. 10031. LNCS. 2016, pp. 648–678. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-53887-6_24.