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- We denote, by $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, the finite field with $q=p^{n}$ elements, where $p$ is a prime number and $n$ is a positive integer.
- By $\mathbb{F}_{q}^{*}=\langle g\rangle$, we denote the multiplicative cyclic group of nonzero elements of $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, where $g$ is a primitive element of $\mathbb{F}_{q}$.
- Let $f$ be a function form the finite field $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ to itself then $f$ can be uniquely represented as a univariate polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ of the form $f(X)=\sum_{i=0}^{q-1} a_{i} X^{i}, a_{i} \in \mathbb{F}_{q}$.
- We call a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{F}_{q}[X]$, a permutation polynomial (PP) over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ if the associated mapping $x \mapsto f(x)$ is a bijection from $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ to $\mathbb{F}_{q}$.
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- One of the most important developments in block cipher cryptanalysis was the invention of differential cryptanalysis by Biham and Shamir.
- A function $f$ is called differentially $\delta$-uniform if for every $a \in \mathbb{F}_{q}^{*}$ and every $b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}$, the equation $f(X+a)-f(X)=b$ admits at most $\delta$ solutions.
- When $\delta=1$, we say that the function $f$ is perfect nonlinear (PN) function.
- When $\delta=2$, we say that the function $f$ is almost perfect nonlinear (APN) function.
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Figure: Basic Boomerang Attack
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## Boomerang Attacks

- A good differential $\alpha \xrightarrow{E_{0}} \beta$ over $E_{0}$ that holds with probability $p$.
- A good differential $\gamma \xrightarrow{E_{1}} \beta$ over $E_{1}$ that holds with probability $q$.
- These two differentials can now be used to construct a distinguisher over the whole cipher.
- We start with a pair of plaintexts $x_{0}$ and $x_{1}$ with a difference $\alpha$.
- When encrypting these two plaintexts, we expect the corresponding intermediate texts $y_{0}:=E_{0}\left(x_{0}\right)$ and $y_{1}:=E_{0}\left(x_{1}\right)$ to have a difference $\beta$ with probability $p$.

- With $z_{0}:=E_{1}\left(y_{0}\right)$ and $z_{1}:=E_{1}\left(y_{1}\right)$ being the respective ciphertexts, we now construct two more ciphertexts $z_{2}:=z_{0}+\delta$ and $z_{3}:=z_{1}+\delta$ by adding the difference $\delta$ to each of $z_{0}$ and $z_{1}$.
- Then the pairs $\left(z_{0}, z_{2}\right)$ and $\left(z_{1}, z_{3}\right)$ both have a difference of $\delta$, the ciphertext difference in the second differential.
- Decrypting these two ciphertexts, provides us with two more intermediate texts, $y_{2}:=E_{1}^{-1}\left(z_{2}\right)$ and $y_{3}:=E_{1}^{-1}\left(z_{3}\right)$ and two more plaintexts, $x_{2}:=E_{0}^{-1}\left(y_{2}\right)$ and $x_{3}:=E_{0}^{-1}\left(y_{3}\right)$.
- Assuming independence of the two ciphertext pairs $\left(z_{0}, z_{2}\right)$ and $\left(z_{1}, z_{3}\right)$, both of their respective intermediate pairs $\left(y_{0}, y_{2}\right)$ and $\left(y_{1}, y_{3}\right)$ will have a differences of $\gamma$ with probability $q^{2}$.

- Combining this with the probability that $\left(x_{0}, x_{1}\right)$ follows the first differential, we have with probability $p q^{2}$ that $y_{0}+y_{1}=\beta$, $y_{0}+y_{2}=\gamma$ and $y_{1}+y_{3}=\gamma$.
- This forces the difference between $y_{2}$ and $y_{3}$ to be $\beta$.
- Again assuming independence from the other pairs, the pair $\left(y_{2}, y_{3}\right)$ will follow the first differential with probability $p$, resulting in a plaintext difference of $\alpha$ between $x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$.
- Taking all of these steps together, we estimate that the probability to see a difference $\alpha$ between $x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$ is equal to $p^{2} q^{2}$.



## Boomerang Uniformity

- To simplify this analysis, in 2018, Cid et al. introduced the notion of boomerang connectivity table (BCT)


## Boomerang Uniformity

- To simplify this analysis, in 2018, Cid et al. introduced the notion of boomerang connectivity table (BCT)
- In this paper the BCT entries were defined for permutation functions in even characteristic and the knowledge of the inverse of the permutation was required to compute the BCT entries


## Boomerang Uniformity

- To simplify this analysis, in 2018, Cid et al. introduced the notion of boomerang connectivity table (BCT)
- In this paper the BCT entries were defined for permutation functions in even characteristic and the knowledge of the inverse of the permutation was required to compute the BCT entries
- In 2019, Li et al. gave an equivalent technique to compute BCT, which does not require the compositional inverse of the permutation polynomial $f(X)$ at all
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- The boomerang uniformity of the function $f$, denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{f}$, is then defined as the maximum of $\mathcal{B}_{f}(a, b)$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}^{*}$.
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- Cid et al. showed that for permutation functions $f$, the boomerang uniformity is greater than or equal to the differential uniformity
- However, perhaps, due to lack of any explicit example in the case of non-permutations, in several follow up papers the term "permutation" was not emphasized and it has been stated that for any function $f$, the differential uniformity is less than the boomerang uniformity
- In 2021, Hasan et al. showed that for non-permutations, the differential uniformity is not necessarily smaller than the boomerang uniformity


## Monomials with known boomerang uniformity in odd

 characteristic|  | $p$ | $d$ | Condition | $\mathcal{B}_{f}$ | Is PP? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $C_{1}$ | 3 | $\frac{p^{n}+3}{2}$ | $n$ odd | 3 | Yes |
| $C_{2}$ | $p>2$ | $p^{m}-1$ | $n=2 m, p \not \equiv 2(\bmod 3)$ | 2 | No |
| $C_{3}$ | $p>2$ | $\frac{\left(p^{m}+3\right)\left(p^{m}-1\right)}{2}$ | $n=2 m$ | 2 | No |
| $C_{4}$ | $p>2$ | $\frac{p^{n}-3}{2}$ | $p^{n} \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$ | $\leq 6$ | No |
| $C_{5}$ | $p>2$ | $p^{n}-2$ | any $n$ | $\leq 5$ | Yes |
| $C_{6}$ | $p>2$ | $k\left(p^{m}-1\right)$ | $n=2 m, \operatorname{gcd}\left(k, p^{m}+1\right)=1$ | 2 | No |

Table: Monomials $X^{d}$ over $\mathbb{F}_{p^{n}}$ with known boomerang uniformity.
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- Helleseth and Sandberg considered the differential uniformity of this class of power maps and showed that its differential uniformity $\Delta_{f}$ is given by

$$
\Delta_{f} \leq \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } p=3 \text { and } n \text { is even } \\ 3 & \text { if } p \neq 3 \text { and } p^{n} \equiv 1 \quad(\bmod 4) \\ 4 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

- It is easy to see that when $p^{n} \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$ then $f$ is a permutation.
- We considered the boomerang uniformity of the power permutation $X^{\frac{p^{n}+3}{2}}$, where $p^{n} \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$ for all $p>3$ and showed that the boomerang uniformity is $\leq 23$


## Our Contribution

- Moreover, we also obtained the compositional inverse of this power permutation


## Theorem

Let $q \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$ then the compositional inverse of the power permutation $f(X)=X^{\frac{q+3}{2}}$ is given by

$$
f^{-1}(X)= \begin{cases}X^{\frac{q+1}{4}} & \text { if } p \equiv 3 \\ X^{\frac{3 q-1}{4}} & \text { if } p \equiv 7 \\ (\bmod 8) \\ (\bmod 8)\end{cases}
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## Our Contribution

- We also determined the algebraic degree of the compositional inverse


## Theorem

Let $p \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$ and $n=2 m+1$ for some non-negative integer $m$ then the algebraic degree of the inverse of the power permutation $f(X)=X^{\frac{p^{n}+3}{2}}$ is

$$
\begin{cases}\frac{(4 m+1) p-4 m+1}{4} & \text { if } p \equiv 3 \\ \frac{(4 m+3) p-4 m-1}{4} & \text { if } p \equiv 7 \\ (\bmod 8) \\ (\bmod 8)\end{cases}
$$

## Future Directions
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