



*Research Article*

# Identity-Based Encryption with (Almost) Tight Security in the Multi-instance, Multi-ciphertext Setting\*

Dennis Hofheinz

ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland  
hofheinz@inf.ethz.ch

Jessica Koch

Karlsruhe, Germany

Christoph Striecks

AIT Austrian Institute of Technology, Vienna, Austria  
christoph.striecks@ait.ac.at

Communicated by Manoj Prabhakaran

Received 10 November 2022 / Revised 7 December 2023 / Accepted 15 January 2024  
Online publication 29 February 2024

**Abstract.** We construct an identity-based encryption (IBE) scheme that is tightly secure in a very strong sense. Specifically, we consider a setting with many instances of the scheme and many encryptions per instance. In this setting, we reduce the security of our scheme to a variant of a simple assumption used for a similar purpose by Chen and Wee (CRYPTO 2013, Springer, 2013). The security loss of our reduction is  $\mathbf{O}(k)$  (where  $k$  is the security parameter). Our scheme is the first IBE scheme to achieve this strong flavor of tightness under a simple assumption. Technically, our scheme is a variation of the IBE scheme by Chen and Wee. However, in order to “lift” their results to the multi-instance, multi-ciphertext case, we need to develop new ideas. In particular, while we build on (and extend) their high-level proof strategy, we deviate significantly in the low-level proof steps.

**Keywords.** Public-key cryptography, Identity-based encryption, Dual-system groups, Multi-challenge security, Tightness.

## 1. Introduction

**Tight Security.** For many cryptographic primitives, we currently cannot prove security directly. Hence, we typically *reduce* the security of a given scheme to the hardness of a computational problem, in the sense that every successful attack on the scheme yields a successful problem solver. Now it is both a theoretically and practically interesting question to look at the *loss* of such a reduction. Informally, the loss of a reduction quan-

---

\*This paper was reviewed by Akshima and an anonymous reviewer  
This is an extension of a paper which appeared at PKC 2015. Compared to the conference version, we have added full proofs, and in particular a treatment of the “full adversaries” case.

tifies the difference between the success of a hypothetical attacker on the cryptographic scheme, and the success of the derived problem solver. From a theoretical perspective, for instance, the loss of a reduction can also be viewed as a quantitative measure of (an upper bound for) the “distance” between primitive and assumption. But “tight” (or, “loss-free”) reductions are also desirable from a practical perspective: the tighter a reduction, the better are the security guarantees we can give for a specific instance of the scheme. Hence, we can recommend smaller keylengths (which lead to more efficiency) for schemes with tighter security reduction.

However, in most practical usage scenarios, a cryptographic primitive is used multiple times. (For instance, in a typical multi-user encryption scenario, many instances of the encryption scheme are used to produce even more ciphertexts.) Hence, tight security reductions become particularly meaningful when they reduce an attacker on the whole system (with many instances of the cryptographic scheme) to a problem solver. In fact, while for many primitives (such as secret-key [3] or public-key [4] encryption), one-instance security is known to imply multi-instance security, the corresponding security guarantees for concrete schemes may indeed vanish in the number of instances [3].

**Existing Tightly Secure Schemes.** The loss of security reductions has been considered explicitly by Bellare et al. [3] for the case of encryption schemes. The first “somewhat tight” reductions (whose loss is independent of the number of instances of the scheme, but not of the number of ciphertexts) for public-key encryption (PKE) schemes could be given in [5]. In the following years, more tight (or somewhat tight) reductions for encryption schemes were constructed in the random oracle model [8, 12, 18], or from “ $q$ -type” assumptions [22, 23].<sup>1</sup>

However, only recently, the first PKE schemes emerged [1, 29, 37] whose tight security (in the multi-instance, multi-ciphertext setting) can be proved under simple assumptions in the standard model.<sup>2</sup> Even more recently, *identity-based* encryption (IBE) schemes with “somewhat tight” security (under simple assumptions) have been constructed [7, 13]. (This required new techniques, since it is not clear how to extend the techniques of [1, 29, 37] to the IBE setting.) In this case, “somewhat tight” means that their security reduction loses only a small multiplicative factor, but still considers the standard IBE security experiment [10] with one encryption and one instance of the scheme. Nonetheless, while the IBE schemes from [7, 13] are not proved tightly secure in a multi-user, multi-ciphertext setting, these schemes imply tightly secure PKE schemes (even in the multi-user, multi-ciphertext setting) when plugged into the transformations of [10, 29, 37].<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>A “ $q$ -type” assumption may depend on the size of the investigated cryptographic system. (That is, larger cryptographic systems may only be secure under a stronger instance of the assumption.) Hence, a tight reduction (even in a multi-instance scenario) to a  $q$ -type assumption may not yield security guarantees that are independent of the number of users.

<sup>2</sup>A “simple” assumption is defined through a security game in which an adversary first gets a challenge whose size only depends on the security parameter and must then output a unique solution without further interaction. Examples of simple assumptions are DLOG, DDH, or RSA, but not Strong Diffie–Hellman [9] or  $q$ -ABDHE [22].

<sup>3</sup>More specifically, Boneh and Franklin [10] mention (and attribute this observation to Naor) that every IBE scheme can be viewed as a signature scheme. The signature schemes thus derived from [7, 13] are then suitable for the conversions of [29, 37], yielding PKE schemes tightly secure in the multi-user, multi-ciphertext setting.

**Our Contribution.** In this work, we construct the first IBE scheme with an almost tight security reduction in the multi-instance, multi-ciphertext scenario. Our reduction is only almost tight, since it loses a factor of  $\mathbf{O}(k)$ , where  $k$  is the security parameter. However, we stress that this loss is independent of the number of ciphertexts, revealed user secret keys, or instances of the scheme. In our security reduction, we rely on a computational assumption in composite-order pairing-friendly groups; this assumption is a variant of an assumption used by Chen and Wee [13] for their IBE scheme, and in particular simple in the above sense. We note that a conversion to the prime-order setting using the techniques from [17,27,36,38] (see also [6]) seems plausible—specifically since Chen and Wee [13] already describe such a conversion for their assumption—but we leave such a conversion as an open problem.

**Our Approach.** Our scheme is a variant of the IBE scheme by Chen and Wee [13] (which is almost tightly secure in the one-instance, one-ciphertext setting), and our proof strategy draws heavily from theirs. Hence, to describe our techniques, let us first briefly sketch their strategy.

In a nutshell, Chen and Wee start with a real security game, in which an adversary  $A$  receives a master public key  $mpk$  of the scheme, as well as access to arbitrarily many user secret keys  $usk_{id}$  for adversarially chosen identities  $id$ . At some point,  $A$  selects a fresh challenge identity  $id^*$  and two messages  $M_0^*, M_1^*$ , and then receives the encryption  $C_{id^*}^* \leftarrow \text{Enc}(mpk, id^*, M_b)$  (under identity  $id^*$ ) of one of these messages. After potentially querying more user secret keys (for identities  $id \neq id^*$ ),  $A$  eventually outputs a guess  $b^*$  for  $b$ . If  $b^* = b$ , we say that  $A$  wins. Chen and Wee then show security by gradually changing this game (being careful not to significantly decrease  $A$ 's success), until  $A$  trivially cannot win (except by guessing).

As a first preparatory change, Chen and Wee use the user secret key  $usk_{id^*}$  to construct the challenge ciphertext  $C_{id^*}^*$ . (This way, the encryption random coins for  $C_{id^*}^*$  do not have to be known to the security game.) Additionally  $C_{id^*}^*$  is now of a special, “pseudo-normal” form that will later enable a gradual randomization of the encrypted message. The core of the proof then consists of a number of hybrid steps, in which the distribution of all generated user secret keys (including the user secret key  $usk_{id^*}$  used to generate  $C_{id^*}^*$ ) is modified. Concretely, in the  $i$ -th hybrid game, each used  $usk_{id}$  contains an additional “blinding term” of the form  $R(id|_i)$ , where  $id|_i$  is the  $i$ -bit prefix of  $id$ , and  $R$  is a truly random function. Eventually, each user secret key  $usk_{id}$  will be fully randomized by a truly random value  $R(id)$ . In particular, at this point, the key  $usk_{id^*}$  used to prepare  $C_{id^*}^*$  is blinded by a fresh random value  $R(id^*)$ . By the special “pseudo-normal” form of  $C_{id^*}^*$ , this means that the corresponding encrypted message is also blinded, and  $A$ 's view is finally independent of the challenge bit  $b$ .

We keep this high-level proof structure, extending it of course to multiple ciphertexts and multiple instances of the scheme. However, as we will explain below, the way Chen and Wee gradually introduce the blinding terms  $R(id|_i)$  does not immediately extend to many ciphertexts or instances; hence, we need to deviate from their proof strategy here. **The Problem.** Specifically, Chen and Wee move from the  $(i - 1)$ -th to the  $i$ -th hybrid through a single reduction as follows: first, they guess the  $i$ -th bit  $id_i^*$  of the challenge identity  $id^*$ . Then, they set up things such that

- (a) all user secret keys for identities  $id$  with  $id_i = id_i^*$  (i.e., that coincide in the  $i$ -th bit with  $id^*$ ) behave as in the previous hybrid (i.e., carry a blinding term  $R(id|_{i-1})$ ),
- (b) all user secret keys for identities  $id$  with  $id_i = 1 - id_i^*$  carry a blinding term of  $R(id|_{i-1}) \cdot R'(id|_{i-1})$ . Depending on the input of the reduction, we have either that  $R' = 1$  (such that the overall blinding term is  $R(id|_{i-1})$ ), or that  $R'$  is an independently random function. (In particular, all  $usk_{id}$  with  $id_i = 1 - id_i^*$  contain an embedded computational challenge  $R'$ .)

Depending on whether or not  $R' = 1$ , this setup simulates the  $(i - 1)$ -th or the  $i$ -th hybrid. However, we remark that the setup of Chen and Wee only allows to generate “pseudo-normal” challenge ciphertexts  $C_{id^*}^*$  for identities  $id^*$  with the initially guessed  $i$ -th bit  $id_i^*$ . (Intuitively, any pseudo-normal ciphertext for an identity  $id$  with  $id_i = 1 - id_i^*$  would “react with” an additional blinding term  $R'(id|_{i-1})$  in  $usk_{id}$ , allowing to trivially solve the computational challenge.)

Hence, in their  $i$ -th game hop, only challenge ciphertexts for identities with the same  $i$ -th bit can be generated. Thus, their approach cannot in any obvious way be extended to multiple challenge ciphertexts for different identities. (For similar reasons, a generalization to multiple instances of the scheme fails.)

**Our Solution.** In order to move from the  $(i - 1)$ -th to the  $i$ -th hybrid, we thus follow a different strategy that involves three reductions. The main technical ingredient in our case is the ability to distribute the blinding terms  $R(id|_i)$  in user secret keys into two different “compartments” (i.e., subgroups) of the composite-order group we are working in. (In particular, a term  $R(id|_i)$  in one compartment can be changed independently of terms in the other compartment.)

More specifically, recall that in the  $(i - 1)$ -th hybrid, all user secret keys carry an additional  $R(id|_{i-1})$  blinding term, and all challenge ciphertexts are pseudo-normal (in the sense that they “react with” the blinding terms in user secret keys). In our first step, we move all blinding terms  $R(id|_{i-1})$  in the  $usk_{id}$  into the two compartments, depending on the  $i$ -th bit of  $id$ . (That is, if  $id_i = 0$ , then the corresponding blinding term  $R(id|_{i-1})$  goes into the first compartment, and if  $id_i = 1$ , then it goes into the second.)

In our second step, we can now treat the embedded blinding terms for  $id_i = 0$  and  $id_i = 1$  separately. In particular, since these cases are now “decoupled” by being in different compartments, we can completely re-randomize the underlying random function  $R$  in exactly one of those compartments. (This does not lead to trivial distinctions of the computational challenge since we do not introduce *new* blinding terms that would “react with” pseudo-normal ciphertexts and thus become easily detectable. Instead, we simply *decouple* existing blinding terms in different subgroups.) Note, however, that since now different random functions, say,  $\widehat{R}$  and  $\widetilde{R}$ , determine the blinding terms used for identities with  $id_i = 0$  and  $id_i = 1$ , we essentially obtain blinding terms that depend on the first  $i$  (and not only  $i - 1$ ) bits of  $id$ .

Finally, we revert the first change and move all blinding terms in the  $usk_{id}$  into one compartment. In summary, this series of three moves has thus created blinding terms that depend on the first  $i$  bits of  $id$ . Thus, we have moved to the  $i$ -th hybrid. If we follow the high-level strategy of Chen and Wee again, this yields a sequence of  $\mathbf{O}(k)$  reductions that show the security of our IBE scheme. (From a conceptual perspective, it might also be interesting to note that none of our reductions needs to *guess*, e.g., an identity bit.)

**Subsequent Works.** Since publication of the PKC'15 version [30], a series of subsequent works using (some of) our techniques have appeared. Attrapadung et al. [2] and Gong et al. [24] resolved an open problem left by our work: they provide a *prime-order* instantiation of an (almost) tightly secure IBE in the multi-instance multi-ciphertext setting. Technically, [24] directly build upon our dual-system-group definition.

Shortly thereafter, Gay et al. [20] presented the first tightly and CCA-secure public-key encryption (PKE) scheme based (solely) on the DDH assumption and without pairings. Their work combines a number of ideas: their first ingredient is a translation of the Chen-Wee IBE scheme from [13] to the PKE setting. In the PKE setting, there are no (explicit) user secret keys, and during this translation they only appear as intermediate values during decryption (that are not revealed to an adversary). Hence, this translation can use exponents instead of group elements for user secret keys and thus only requires a mild hardness assumption (DDH) and no pairings. Second, Gay et al. [20] apply our randomization strategy to this translated scheme to obtain security for many challenge ciphertexts. This application is analogous to how we refine the randomization strategy of [13], only that [20] operate in the PKE setting.

Back in the IBE setting, Gong et al. [26] improved the performance of (almost) tightly IBE schemes by analyzing the (almost) tightly secure IBE due to Blazy et al. [7] in the dual-system-group framework via [24]. Moreover, Gong et al. [25] presented an (almost) tightly and selective-opening-attack secure IBE in the composite-order setting. Besides, Chen et al. [16] gave an IBE with a tighter security reduction and constant-size public parameters in the composite-order setting. All of these works benefit (directly or indirectly) from our techniques to obtain tight multi-ciphertext security.

Some further works used ideas for achieving multi-challenge security in the PKE setting using the strategy from [20] mentioned above. Concretely, Gay et al. [21] combined the approach from [20] with an even more refined randomization strategy from [28] to obtain the first (almost) tightly secure PKE based on DDH with small public keys and ciphertexts. Moreover, Hofheinz et al. [31] used ideas from [20] to achieve (almost) tightly chosen-ciphertext secure IBE. Several later works dealt with (almost) tightly secure hierarchical IBE [32,34] also in the multi-challenge setting [33,35]. Moreover, Garg et al. [19] made an interesting connection to key-dependent-message secure IBE by adapting our introduced paradigm in combination with [11].

**Outline of the Paper.** After introducing some preliminary definitions in Sect. 2, we explain the necessary algebraic structure (mentioned in the “compartment discussion” above) of “extended nested dual system groups” (ENDSGs) in Sect. 3. (This structure extends a similar structure of Chen and Wee [13].) In Sect. 4, we present our IBE scheme from ENSDGs, and in Sect. 5, we show how to instantiate ENSDGs in composite-order pairing-friendly groups.

## 2. Preliminaries

**Notation.** For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be the security parameter. For a finite set  $\mathcal{S}$ , we denote by  $s \leftarrow \mathcal{S}$  the process of sampling  $s$  uniformly from  $\mathcal{S}$ . For an algorithm  $A$ , let  $y \leftarrow A(k, x)$  be the process of running  $A$  on input  $k, x$  with access to uniformly random coins and assigning the result to  $y$ . (We may omit to mention the  $k$ -

input explicitly and assume that all algorithms take  $k$  as input.) To make the random coins  $r$  explicit, we write  $A(k, x; r)$ . We say an algorithm  $A$  is probabilistic polynomial time (PPT) if the running time of  $A$  is polynomial in  $k$ . A function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is negligible if it vanishes faster than the inverse of any polynomial (i.e., if  $\forall c \in \mathbb{N} \exists k_0 \forall k \geq k_0 : |f(k)| < 1/k^c$ ). Further, we write vectors in bold font, e.g.,  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$  for a vectors of length  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and with components  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ . (We may also write  $\mathbf{v} = (v_i)_{i \in [n]}$  or even  $\mathbf{v} = (v_i)_i$  in this case.) In the following, we use a *component-wise* multiplication of vectors, i.e.,  $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v}' = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \cdot (v'_1, \dots, v'_n) = (v_1 \cdot v'_1, \dots, v_n \cdot v'_n)$ . Further, we write  $\mathbf{v}^j := (v_1^j, \dots, v_n^j)$ , for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\mathbf{v}_{-i} := (v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n)$ , for  $i \in [n]$ , and  $s^{\mathbf{v}} := (s^{v_1}, \dots, s^{v_n})$ . For two random variables  $X, Y$ , we denote with  $\text{SD}(X; Y)$  is the statistical distance of  $X$  and  $Y$ . We might also say that  $X$  and  $Y$  are  $\varepsilon$ -close if  $\text{SD}(X; Y) \leq \varepsilon$ .

**Identity-Based Encryption.** An identity-based encryption (IBE) scheme  $\text{IBE}$  with identity space  $\mathcal{ID}$  and message space  $\mathcal{M}$  consists of the five PPT algorithms  $\text{Par}$ ,  $\text{Gen}$ ,  $\text{Ext}$ ,  $\text{Enc}$ ,  $\text{Dec}$ . Parameter sampling  $\text{Par}(k, n)$ , on input a security parameter  $k$  and an identity length parameter  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , outputs public parameters  $pp$  and secret parameters  $sp$ . (We assume that  $\text{Ext}$ ,  $\text{Enc}$ , and  $\text{Dec}$  have implicitly access to  $pp$ .) Key generation  $\text{Gen}(pp, sp)$ , on input  $pp$  and  $sp$ , outputs a master public key  $mpk$  and a master secret key  $msk$ . User secret key extraction  $\text{Ext}(msk, id)$ , given  $msk$  and an identity  $id \in \mathcal{ID}$ , outputs a user secret key  $usk_{id}$  associated with  $id$ . Encryption  $\text{Enc}(mpk, id, M)$ , given  $mpk$ , an identity  $id \in \mathcal{ID}$ , and a message  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ , outputs an  $id$ -associated ciphertext  $C_{id}$ . Decryption  $\text{Dec}(usk_{id}, C_{id})$ , given  $usk_{id}$  for an identity  $id$ , and ciphertext  $C_{id}$ , outputs  $M \in \mathcal{M} \cup \{\perp\}$ . For correctness, we require that for any  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , for all  $(pp, sp) \leftarrow \text{Par}(k, n)$ , for all  $(mpk, msk) \leftarrow \text{Gen}(pp, sp)$ , for all  $id \in \mathcal{ID}$ , for all  $usk_{id} \leftarrow \text{Ext}(msk, id)$ , for all  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ , and for all  $C_{id} \leftarrow \text{Enc}(mpk, id, M)$ ,  $\text{Dec}$  satisfies  $\text{Dec}(usk_{id}, C_{id}) = M$ . For security, we define multi-instance, multi-ciphertext IBE security, dubbed  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security, for  $(\mu, q) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ , as follows.

**(Weak)  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security.** An IBE scheme  $\text{IBE}$  defined as above is  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA-secure if and only if any PPT adversary  $A$  succeeds in the following experiment only with probability at most negligibly larger than  $1/2$ . Let  $\text{Enc}'(mpk, id, b, M_0, M_1)$  be a PPT auxiliary encryption oracle that, given a master public key  $mpk$ , a challenge identity  $id \in \mathcal{ID}$ , a bit  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , and two messages  $M_0, M_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ , outputs a challenge ciphertext  $C_{id} \leftarrow \text{Enc}(mpk, id, M_b)$ . First,  $A$  gets honestly generated public parameter  $pp$  and master public keys  $(mpk_1, \dots, mpk_\mu)$ . During the experiment,  $A$  may adaptively query  $\text{Ext}(msk_j, \cdot)$ -oracles and  $\text{Enc}'(mpk_j, \cdot, b, \cdot, \cdot)$ -oracles, for corresponding  $mpk_j, msk_j$  and a (uniform) bit  $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$ , for all  $j \in [\mu]$ . Eventually,  $A$  outputs a guess  $b^*$ . We say that  $A$  is valid if and only if  $A$  never queries an  $\text{Ext}(msk_j, \cdot)$  oracle on an identity  $id$  for which it has already queried the corresponding  $\text{Enc}'(mpk_j, \cdot, b, \cdot, \cdot)$  oracle (and vice versa); each message pair  $A$  selected as input to  $\text{Enc}'$  contained only equal-length messages; and  $A$  has only queried its  $\text{Enc}'$ -oracles at most  $q$  times per  $j$ -instance. We say that  $A$  succeeds if and only if  $A$  is valid and  $b = b^*$ . Concretely, the previous described experiment is given in Fig. 1 and denoted  $\text{Exp}_{\text{IBE}, A}^{(\mu, q)\text{-ibe-ind-cpa}}$ . Further, we define the advantage function for any PPT  $A$  as

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{IBE}, A}^{(\mu, q)\text{-ibe-ind-cpa}}(k, n) := \left| \Pr \left[ \text{Exp}_{\text{IBE}, A}^{(\mu, q)\text{-ibe-ind-cpa}}(k, n) = 1 \right] - 1/2 \right|.$$

**Experiment**  $\text{Exp}_{\text{IBE},A}^{(\mu,q)\text{-ibe-ind-cpa}}(k,n)$   
 $(pp, sp) \leftarrow \text{Par}(k,n)$   
 $(mpk_j, msk_j)_{j \in [\mu]} \leftarrow (\text{Gen}(pp, sp))^\mu$   
 $b \leftarrow \{0,1\}$   
 $b^* \leftarrow A^{\text{Ext}(msk_j, \cdot), \text{Enc}'(mpk_j, \cdot, b, \cdot, \cdot)}_{j \in [\mu]}(pp, (mpk_j)_{j \in [\mu]})$   
 if  $A$  is valid and  $b = b^*$  then return 1 else return 0

**Fig. 1.** The  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment.

Furthermore, we call IBE *weakly*  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA secure iff  $\text{Adv}_{\text{IBE},A}^{(\mu,q)\text{-ibe-ind-cpa}}$  is negligible for all *weak* PPT adversaries  $A$ . Here,  $A$  is weak if it never requests challenge ciphertexts for the same scheme instance and identity twice (i.e., if it never queries any  $\text{Enc}'(mpk_j, \cdot, b, \cdot, \cdot)$  oracle twice with the same identity  $id$ ).

Finally, we remark that the one-instance, one-ciphertext notion  $(1, 1)$ -IBE-IND-CPA is the standard notion of IBE security considered in, e.g., [7, 10, 13].

**Pairings.** Let  $G, H, G_T$  be cyclic groups of order  $N$ . A *pairing*  $e : G \times H \rightarrow G_T$  is a map that is *bilinear* (i.e., for all  $g, g' \in G$  and  $h, h' \in H$ , we have  $e(g \cdot g', h) = e(g, h) \cdot e(g', h)$  and  $e(g, h \cdot h') = e(g, h) \cdot e(g, h')$ ), *non-degenerate* (i.e., for generators  $g \in G, h \in H$ , we have that  $e(g, h) \in G_T$  is a generator), and *efficiently computable*.

### 3. Extended Nested Dual System Groups

**(Nested) Dual System Groups.** Nested dual system groups (NDSG) [13] can be seen as a variant of dual system groups (DSG) [15], which itself are based on the dual system framework introduced by Waters [38]. NDSGs were recently defined by Chen and Wee and enabled to prove the first IBE (almost) tightly and fully secure under simple assumptions. In the following, based on NDSGs, we construct a new notion we call extended nested dual system groups.

**A Variant of Nested Dual System Groups.** We introduce a variant of Chen and Wee's nested dual system groups (NDSG) [13], dubbed extended NDSG (ENDSG). (Mainly, we re-use and extend the notions from [13].) Further, let  $\mathbf{G}(k, n')$  be a group generator that, given integers  $k$  and  $n'$ , generates the tuple  $(G, H, G_T, N, (g_{p_1}, \dots, g_{p_{n'}}), (h_{p_1}, \dots, h_{p_{n'}}), g, h, e)$ , for a pairing  $e : G \times H \rightarrow G_T$ , for composite-order groups  $G, H, G_T$ , all of known group order  $N = p_1 \cdots p_{n'}$ , for  $k$ -bit primes  $(p_i)_i$  and integer  $n' \in \mathbf{O}(1)$ . Further,  $g$  and  $h$  are generators of  $G$  and  $H$ , and  $(g_{p_i})_i$  and  $(h_{p_i})_i$  are generators of the (proper) subgroups  $G_{p_i} \subset G$  and  $H_{p_i} \subset H$  of order  $|G_{p_i}| = |H_{p_i}| = p_i$ , respectively. In this setting, an ENSDG ENDSG consists of algorithms  $\text{SampP}, \text{SampG}, \text{SampH}, \widehat{\text{SampG}}, \widehat{\text{SampG}}$ :

**Parameter sampling.**  $\text{SampP}(k, n)$ , given security parameter  $k$  and parameter  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , samples  $(G, H, G_T, N, (g_{p_1}, \dots, g_{p_{n'}}), (h_{p_1}, \dots, h_{p_{n'}}), g, h, e) \leftarrow \mathbf{G}(k, n')$ , for a constant integer  $n'$  determined by  $\text{SampP}$ , and outputs public parameters  $pp = (G, H, G_T, N, g, h, e, m, n, \text{pars})$  and secret parameters  $sp = (\widehat{h}, \widetilde{h}, \widehat{\text{pars}}, \widetilde{\text{pars}})$ , where  $m : H \rightarrow G_T$  is a linear map,  $\widehat{h}, \widetilde{h}$  are nontrivial  $H$ -elements, and

$\widehat{pars}$ ,  $\widetilde{pars}$ ,  $\widehat{pars}$  may contain arbitrary additional information used by  $\text{SampG}$ ,  $\text{SampH}$ , and  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$  and  $\widetilde{\text{SampG}}$ .

**$G$ -group sampling.**  $\text{SampG}(pp)$ , given parameter  $pp$ , outputs  $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_n) \in G^{n+1}$ .

**$H$ -group sampling.**  $\text{SampH}(pp)$ , given parameter  $pp$ , outputs  $\mathbf{h} = (h_0, \dots, h_n) \in H^{n+1}$ .

**Semi-functional  $G$ -group sampling 1.**  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , given  $pp$  and  $sp$ , outputs  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} = (\widehat{g}_0, \dots, \widehat{g}_n) \in G^{n+1}$ .

**Semi-functional  $G$ -group sampling 2.**  $\widetilde{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , given  $pp$  and  $sp$ , outputs  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}} = (\widetilde{g}_0, \dots, \widetilde{g}_n) \in G^{n+1}$ .

The algorithms  $\text{SampG}$  and  $\text{SampH}$  (used for correctness in our IBE scheme) sample from a “normal” distribution, while  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$  and  $\widetilde{\text{SampG}}$  (used to prove security of our IBE scheme) sample from a “semi-functional” distribution. During the security proof of our IBE scheme (as shown later), in a bit-by-bit fashion (depending on the identity bits of the challenge ciphertexts), normal ciphertext and secret-key elements are made semi-functional and security follows.

**Correctness of ENDSG.** For correctness, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , for all integers  $n = n(k) > 1$ , for all  $pp$ , where  $pp$  is the first output of  $\text{SampP}(k, n)$ , we require:

**Associativity.** For all  $(g_0, \dots, g_n) \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$  and for all  $(h_0, \dots, h_n) \leftarrow \text{SampH}(pp)$ , we have  $e(g_0, h_i) = e(g_i, h_0)$ , for all  $i \in [n]$ .

**Projective.** For all  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , for all  $g_0$  which is the first output of  $\text{SampG}(pp; s)$ , for all  $h \in H$ , we have  $m(h)^s = e(g_0, h)$ .

**Security of ENDSG.** For security, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , for all integers  $n = n(k) > 1$ , for all  $(pp, sp) \leftarrow \text{SampP}(k, n)$ , we require:

**Orthogonality.** For  $m$  specified in  $pp$ , for  $\widehat{h}, \widetilde{h}$  specified in  $sp$ , we have  $m(\widehat{h}) = m(\widetilde{h}) = 1$ . For  $g_0, \widehat{g}_0$ , and  $\widetilde{g}_0$  that are the first outputs of  $\text{SampG}(pp)$ ,  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , and  $\widetilde{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , respectively, we have that  $e(g_0, \widehat{h}) = 1$ ,  $e(g_0, \widetilde{h}) = 1$ ,  $e(\widehat{g}_0, \widetilde{h}) = 1$ , and  $e(\widetilde{g}_0, \widehat{h}) = 1$ .

**$G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups.** The outputs of  $\text{SampG}$ ,  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$ , and  $\widetilde{\text{SampG}}$  are distributed uniformly over the generators of different nontrivial subgroups of  $G^{n+1}$  (that only depend on  $pp$ ) of coprime order, respectively, while the output of  $\text{SampH}$  is uniformly distributed over the generators of a nontrivial subgroup of  $H^{n+1}$  (that only depends on  $pp$ ).

**Non-degeneracy.** For  $\widehat{h}$  specified in  $sp$  and for the first output  $\widehat{g}_0$  of  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , it holds that  $e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})$  is uniformly distributed over the generators of a nontrivial subgroup of  $G_T$  (that only depends on  $pp$ ). Similarly,  $e(\widetilde{g}_0, \widetilde{h})$  is uniformly



distributed over the generators of a nontrivial subgroup of  $G_T$  (that only depends on  $pp$ ), where  $\tilde{h}$  is specified in  $sp$  and  $\tilde{g}_0$  is the first output of  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ .

**Left-subgroup indistinguishability 1 (LS1).** For any PPT adversary  $D$ , we have that the function

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, G, D}^{\text{ls1}}(k, n) := |\Pr [D(pp, \mathbf{g}) = 1] - \Pr [D(pp, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}) = 1]|$$

is negligible in  $k$ , where  $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ .

**Left-subgroup indistinguishability 2 (LS2).** For any PPT adversary  $D$ , we have that the function

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, G, D}^{\text{ls2}}(k, n) := & |\Pr [D(pp, \tilde{h}\tilde{h}, \mathbf{g}'\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}) = 1] \\ & - \Pr [D(pp, \tilde{h}\tilde{h}, \mathbf{g}'\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}) = 1]| \end{aligned}$$

is negligible in  $k$ , where  $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}' \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , and  $\tilde{h} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for  $\tilde{h}$  and  $\tilde{h}$  specified in  $sp$ .

**Nested-hiding indistinguishability (NH).** For any PPT adversary  $D$ , for all integers  $q' = q'(k)$ , the function

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, G, D}^{\text{nh}}(k, n, q') := & \max_{i \in [\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor]} (|\Pr [D(pp, \widehat{h}, \tilde{h}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{-(2i-1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-2i}, (\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{q'})) = 1] \\ & - \Pr [D(pp, \widehat{h}, \tilde{h}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{-(2i-1)}, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-2i}, (\mathbf{h}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}'_{q'})) = 1]|), \end{aligned}$$

is negligible in  $k$ , where  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_{i'} & := (h_{i',0}, \dots, h_{i',n}) \leftarrow \text{SampH}(pp), \\ \mathbf{h}'_{i'} & := (h_{i',0}, \dots, h_{i',2i-1} \cdot (\widehat{h})^{\tilde{\gamma}_{i'}}, h_{i',2i} \cdot (\tilde{h})^{\tilde{\gamma}'_{i'}}, \dots, h_{i',n}), \end{aligned}$$

for  $\widehat{h}, \tilde{h}$  specified in  $sp$ , for  $\tilde{\gamma}_{i'}, \tilde{\gamma}'_{i'} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\text{ord}(H)}^*$ , and for all  $i' \in [q']$ .

The LS1 property is used in the security proof of our IBE scheme to introduce semi-functional components into the challenge ciphertexts. During the proof, via the LS2 property, such challenge ciphertexts either contain semi-functional elements from  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$  or  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$  depending on the bits of the challenge-ciphertext. Thereby, the orthogonality property ensures that user secret keys with elements depending on  $\widehat{h}$  are orthogonal to challenge-ciphertext elements sampled from  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$ ; analogously, user secret keys with elements depending on  $\tilde{h}$  are orthogonal to challenge-ciphertext elements sampled from  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$ . The NH property can then be used to introduce fresh randomness into user secret keys bit-by-bit (which stays unnoticed by any PPT adversary). Lastly, the non-degeneracy property ensures the uniform distribution of the message component in the challenge ciphertexts and (weak) security follows. Moreover, the

$G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property allows for uniform re-randomization of the output from  $\text{SampG}$ ,  $\widetilde{\text{SampG}}$ ,  $\text{SampG}$ , and  $\text{SampH}$ .

**(Informal) Comparison of NDSGs and ENDSGs.** Loosely speaking, in contrast to the NDSGs from [14], ENDSGs have a second semi-functional  $G$ -group sampling algorithm  $\widetilde{\text{SampG}}$  as well as a second nontrivial  $H$ -element in  $sp$  (i.e.,  $\widetilde{h}$ ). Further, we omit the  $\text{SampGT}$ -algorithm. Concerning the ENDSG properties, we extend the NDSG properties and assumptions appropriately and introduce one additional assumption (i.e., LS2). The proof strategy of the single-instance, single-challenge IBE from NDSGs in [14] is adapted to the multi-instance, multi-challenge case. Namely, semi-functional components are carefully integrated into challenge ciphertexts and user secret keys (i.e., depending on the bits of the challenge ciphertexts, orthogonal semi-functional components are introduced in a bit-by-bit fashion to the user secret keys). That is particularly achieved with the help of the introduced and extended LS2 and the  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups properties, respectively.

#### 4. An (Almost) Tightly $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA-Secure IBE

**A Variant of the IBE of Chen and Wee** [13]. We are now ready to present our variant of Chen and Wee's IBE scheme [13]. As a basic building block we use an ENDSG  $\text{ENDSG} = (\text{SampP}, \text{SampG}, \text{SampH}, \widetilde{\text{SampG}}, \text{SampG})$  from Sect. 3. Besides, for groups  $G_T$  (defined below), let  $\mathcal{UH}$  be a family of universal hash functions  $H : G_T \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^k$  such that for any nontrivial subgroup  $G'_T \subset G_T$ , and for  $H \leftarrow \mathcal{UH}$ ,  $X \leftarrow G'_T$ , and  $U \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k$ , we have  $\text{SD}((H, H(X)); (H, U)) = \mathbf{O}(2^{-k})$ . Let  $\text{IBE} = (\text{Par}, \text{Gen}, \text{Ext}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$  with identity space  $\mathcal{ID} = \{0, 1\}^n$ , for  $n = n(k)$ , and message space  $\mathcal{M} = \{0, 1\}^k$  be defined as follows:

**Parameter generation.**  $\text{Par}(k, n)$  samples  $(pp', sp') \leftarrow \text{SampP}(k, 2n)$ , with  $pp' = (G, H, G_T, N, g, h, e, m, 2n, \text{pars})$  and  $sp' = (\widehat{h}, \widetilde{h}, \widetilde{\text{pars}}, \widetilde{\text{pars}})$ , and  $H \leftarrow \mathcal{UH}$ , and then outputs the public and secret parameters  $(pp, sp)$ , where  $pp = (pp', H)$  and  $sp = sp'$ .

**Key generation.**  $\text{Gen}(pp, sp)$ , given parameters  $pp$  and  $sp$ , samples  $msk \leftarrow H$ , and outputs a master public key  $mpk := (pp, m(msk))$  and a master secret key  $msk$ .

**Secret-key extraction.**  $\text{Ext}(msk, id)$ , given  $msk \in H$  and  $id = (id_1 \dots id_n) \in \mathcal{ID}$ , samples  $(h_0, \dots, h_{2n}) \leftarrow \text{SampH}(pp)$  and outputs a user secret key

$$usk_{id} := (h_0, msk \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n h_{2i-id_i}).$$

**Encryption.**  $\text{Enc}(mpk, id, M)$ , given  $mpk = (pp, m(msk))$ ,  $id = (id_1 \dots id_n) \in \mathcal{ID}$ , and a message  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ , computes  $(g_0, \dots, g_{2n}) := \text{SampG}(pp; s)$ , for  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , and  $g_T := m(msk)^s (= e(g_0, msk))$ , and outputs a ciphertext

$$C_{id} := (g_0, \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_i}, H(g_T) \oplus M).$$

**Decryption.**  $\text{Dec}(usk_{id}, C_{id'})$ , given a user secret key  $usk_{id} =: (K_0, K_1)$  and a ciphertext  $C_{id'} =: (C_0, C_1, C_2)$ , outputs

$$M := H\left(\frac{e(C_0, K_1)}{e(C_1, K_0)}\right) \oplus C_2.$$

**Correctness of IBE.** We have

$$\begin{aligned} H\left(\frac{e(C_0, K_1)}{e(C_1, K_0)}\right) \oplus C_2 &= H\left(\frac{e(g_0, msk \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n h_{2i-id_i})}{e(\prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id'_i}, h_0)}\right) \oplus H(g_T) \oplus M \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} H(g_T) \oplus H(g_T) \oplus M, \end{aligned}$$

for  $id = id'$ . (\*) holds due to **ENDSG's** associativity and projective properties.

**$(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security of IBE.** We base our high-level proof strategy on the IBE-IND-CPA proof strategy of Chen and Wee [13], but deviate on the low level. First, we define auxiliary secret-key extraction  $\overline{\text{Ext}}$  and auxiliary encryption  $\overline{\text{Enc}}$ , random functions  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}$ , pseudo-normal ciphertexts, semi-functional type- $(\cdot, i)$  ciphertexts, and semi-functional type- $i$  user secret keys similarly to [13]:

**Auxiliary secret-key extraction.**  $\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk, id; \mathbf{h})$ , given parameter  $pp$ , master secret key  $msk$ , an identity  $id = id_1 \dots id_n \in \mathcal{ID}$ , and  $\mathbf{h} = (h_0, \dots, h_{2n}) \in (H)^{2n+1}$ , outputs a user secret key

$$usk_{id} := (h_0, msk \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n h_{2i-id_i}).$$

**Auxiliary encryption function.**  $\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id, M; msk, \mathbf{g})$ , given parameter  $pp$ , identity  $id = id_1 \dots id_n \in \mathcal{ID}$ , message  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ , master secret key  $msk$ , and  $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_{2n}) \in (G)^{2n+1}$ , outputs a ciphertext

$$C_{id} := (g_0, \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_i}, H(e(g_0, msk)) \oplus M).$$

**Random function families.** Let  $id|_i := id_1 \dots id_i$  be the  $i$ -bit prefix of an identity  $id$ , and let  $\mathcal{ID}|_i := \{0, 1\}^i$ . For an instance  $j$  and  $i \in [n] \cup \{0\}$ , consider functions  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i} : \mathcal{ID}|_i \rightarrow H$ ,  $id|_i \mapsto (\widehat{h})^{\widehat{\gamma}_{j,i}(id|_i)}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i} : \mathcal{ID}|_i \rightarrow H$ ,  $id|_i \mapsto (\widetilde{h})^{\widetilde{\gamma}_{j,i}(id|_i)}$ , where  $\widehat{\gamma}_{j,i} : \mathcal{ID}|_i \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\text{ord}(H)}^*$ ,  $id|_i \mapsto \widehat{\gamma}_{j,id|_i}$  and  $\widetilde{\gamma}_{j,i} : \mathcal{ID}|_i \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\text{ord}(H)}^*$ ,  $id|_i \mapsto \widetilde{\gamma}_{j,id|_i}$  are independently and truly random.

**Pseudo-normal ciphertexts.** Pseudo-normal ciphertexts are generated as

$$\begin{aligned} C_{id} &:= \overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id, M; msk, \mathbf{g}\widehat{\mathbf{g}}) \\ &= (g_0\widehat{g}_0, \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_i}\widehat{g}_{2i-id_i}, \mathbf{H}(e(g_0\widehat{g}_0, msk)) \oplus M), \end{aligned}$$

for uniform  $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_{2n}) \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} = (\widehat{g}_0, \dots, \widehat{g}_{2n}) \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ . (Hence, pseudo-normal ciphertexts have  $G$ -components sampled from  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$ .)

**Semi-functional type- $(\wedge, i)$  and type- $(\sim, i)$  ciphertexts.** Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}$  be random functions as defined above. Semi-functional ciphertexts of type  $(\wedge, i)$  are generated as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{C}_{id} &:= \overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id, M; msk \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i), \mathbf{g}\widehat{\mathbf{g}}) \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{=} (g_0\widehat{g}_0, \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_i}\widehat{g}_{2i-id_i}, \mathbf{H}(e(g_0\widehat{g}_0, msk \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i))) \oplus M) \end{aligned}$$

while semi-functional ciphertexts of type  $(\sim, i)$  are generated as

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{C}_{id} &:= \overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id, M; msk \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i), \mathbf{g}\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}) \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{=} (g_0\widetilde{g}_0, \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_i}\widetilde{g}_{2i-id_i}, \mathbf{H}(e(g_0\widetilde{g}_0, msk \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i))) \oplus M), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_{2n}) \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} = (\widehat{g}_0, \dots, \widehat{g}_{2n}) \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp)$ , and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}} = (\widetilde{g}_0, \dots, \widetilde{g}_{2n}) \leftarrow \widetilde{\text{SampG}}(pp)$ , while (1) and (2) hold due to ENDSG's properties.

**Semi-functional type- $i$  user secret keys.** Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}$  be defined as above. For  $\mathbf{h} = (h_0, \dots, h_{2n}) \leftarrow \text{SampH}(pp)$ , semi-functional type- $i$  user secret keys are generated as

$$\begin{aligned} usk_{id} &:= \overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i), id; \mathbf{h}) \\ &= (h_0, msk \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n h_{2i-id_i}). \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 1.** *If ENDSG is an ENDSG system as defined in Sect. 3 and  $\mathbf{H}$  is a universal hash function, then IBE defined as above is weakly  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA-secure. Concretely, for any weak PPT adversary  $A$  with at most  $q' = q'(k)$  key extraction queries per instance and running time  $t$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, there are distinguishers  $D_1$  on LS1,  $D_2$  on LS2, and  $D_3$  on NH with running times*

$t'_1 \approx t'_2 \approx t'_3 \approx t + \mathbf{O}(\mu nk^c(q + q'))$ , respectively, for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ , with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\text{IBE},A}^{(\mu,q)\text{-ibe-ind-cpa}}(k, n) &\leq \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG},\mathbf{G},D_1}^{\text{ls1}}(k, 2n) + 2n \cdot \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG},\mathbf{G},D_2}^{\text{ls2}}(k, 2n) \\ &\quad + n \cdot \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG},\mathbf{G},D_3}^{\text{nh}}(k, 2n, \mu q') + \mu q \cdot \mathbf{O}(2^{-k}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

for group generator  $\mathbf{G}$  defined as above.

*Proof.* We show the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security of IBE for any weak PPT adversary  $A$  in a sequence of games where we successively change the games until we arrive at a game where  $A$  has only negligible advantage (i.e., success probability of  $1/2$ ) in the sense of  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA. Let  $S_{A,j}$  be the event that  $A$  succeeds in Game  $j$ . We give an overview how the challenge ciphertexts and user secret keys are generated in Table 1.

**Game 0.** Game 0 is the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA experiment as defined above.

**Game 1.** Game 1 is defined as Game 0 apart from the fact that all challenge ciphertexts are pseudo-normal.

**Game 2.i.0.** Game 2.i.0 is defined as Game 1 except that all user secret keys are semi-functional of type  $(i - 1)$  and all challenge ciphertexts are semi-functional of type  $(\wedge, i - 1)$ , for all  $i \in [n]$ .

**Game 2.i.1.** Game 2.i.1 is defined as Game 2.i.0 except that if and only if the  $i$ -th bit of a challenge identity is 1, then the corresponding challenge ciphertext is semi-functional of type  $(\sim, i - 1)$ . (Otherwise, if and only if the  $i$ -th bit of a challenge identity is 0, then the corresponding challenge ciphertext is semi-functional of type  $(\wedge, i - 1)$ .)

**Game 2.i.2.** Game 2.i.2 is defined as Game 2.i.1 except that the challenge ciphertexts are semi-functional of type  $(\cdot, i)$  (where  $\cdot$  can be  $\wedge$  or  $\sim$  as defined in Game 2.i.1, i.e., depending on the  $i$ -th challenge identity bit) and the user secret keys are semi-functional of type  $i$ .

**Game 3.** Game 3 is defined as Game 2.n.0 except that the challenge ciphertexts are semi-functional of type  $(\wedge, n)$  and the user secret keys are semi-functional of type  $n$ .

**Game 4.** Game 4 is defined as Game 3 except that the challenge ciphertext messages are uniform  $k$ -length bitstrings.

**Lemma 1.** (Game 0 to Game 1) *If the  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property and LS1 of ENDSG hold, Game 0 and Game 1 are computationally indistinguishable. Concretely, for any PPT adversary  $A$  with at most  $q' = q'(k)$  extraction queries per instance and running time  $t$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE there is a distinguisher  $D$  on LS1 with running time  $t' \approx t + \mathbf{O}(\mu nk^c(q + q'))$ , for some constant*

**Table 1.** Instance- $j$  challenge ciphertexts for challenge identity  $id_{j,i'}^*$ , for  $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ , for  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widetilde{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for  $R_{j,i'} \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k$ , and for instance- $j$  user secret keys for identity  $id$ , for  $\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \text{SampH}(pp)$ , for all  $(j, i', i) \in [\mu] \times [q] \times [n]$ .

Challenge ciphertexts for $id_{j,i'}^*$	
Game 0	$\text{Enc}(mpk_j, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*)$
Game 1	$\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j, \widehat{\mathbf{g}})$
Game 2.i.0	$\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id_{j,i'}^* _{i-1}), \widehat{\mathbf{g}})$
Game 2.i.1	if $id_{j,i',i}^* = 0$ : $\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id_{j,i'}^* _{i-1}), \widehat{\mathbf{g}})$ if $id_{j,i',i}^* = 1$ : $\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id_{j,i'}^* _{i-1}), \widetilde{\mathbf{g}})$
Game 2.i.2	if $id_{j,i',i}^* = 0$ : $\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id_{j,i'}^* _i), \widehat{\mathbf{g}})$ if $id_{j,i',i}^* = 1$ : $\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id_{j,i'}^* _i), \widetilde{\mathbf{g}})$
Game 3	$\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,n}(id_{j,i'}^*), \widehat{\mathbf{g}})$
Game 4	$\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, R_{j,i'}; msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,n}(id_{j,i'}^*), \widehat{\mathbf{g}})$
User secret keys for $id$	
Game 0	$\text{Ext}(msk_j, id)$
Game 1	$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j, id; \mathbf{h})$
Game 2.i.0	$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id _{i-1}) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id _{i-1}), id; \mathbf{h})$
Game 2.i.1	$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id _{i-1}) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id _{i-1}), id; \mathbf{h})$
Game 2.i.2	$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id _i) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id _i), id; \mathbf{h})$
Game 3	$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,n}(id) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,n}(id), id; \mathbf{h})$
Game 4	$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,n}(id) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,n}(id), id; \mathbf{h})$

The differences between games are given by underlining

$c \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$|\Pr[S_{A,0}] - \Pr[S_{A,1}]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG.G},D}^{\text{LS1}}(k, 2n). \quad (2)$$

*Proof.* In Game 0, all challenge ciphertexts are normal in the sense of IBE while in Game 1, all challenge ciphertexts are pseudo-normal. In the following, we give a description and its analysis of a LS1 distinguisher that uses any efficient IBE-attacker in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA sense.

**Description.** The challenge input is provided as  $(pp, \mathbf{T})$ , where  $\mathbf{T}$  is either  $\mathbf{g}$  or  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}$ , for  $pp = (G, H, G_T, N, g, h, e, m, 2n, \text{pars})$ ,  $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ , and  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ . First,  $D$  samples  $(msk_j)_j \leftarrow (H)^\mu$ , sets  $mpk_j := (pp, H, m(msk_j))$ , for all  $j$ , for  $\mathbf{H} \leftarrow \mathcal{UH}$ , and sends  $(mpk_j)_j$  to  $A$ . During the experiment,  $D$  answers instance- $j$  secret key extraction queries to oracle  $\text{Ext}(msk_j, \cdot)$ , for  $id \in \mathcal{ID}$ , as

$$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j, id; \text{SampH}(pp)),$$

for all  $j$ . (We assume that  $A$  queries at most  $q'$  user secret keys per instance.) Then,  $D$  fixes a bit  $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$ .  $A$  may adaptively query its  $\text{Enc}'$ -oracle; for  $A$ -chosen instance- $j$  challenge identity  $id_{j,i}^* \in \mathcal{ID}$  and equal-length messages  $(M_{j,i,0}^*, M_{j,i,1}^*)$ .  $D$  returns

$$\overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i}^*, M_{j,i,b}^*; msk_j, \mathbf{T}^{s_{j,i}})$$

to  $A$ , for  $s_{j,i} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , for all  $(j, i) \in [\mu] \times [q]$ . (We assume that  $A$  queries at most  $q$  challenge ciphertexts per instance.) Eventually,  $A$  outputs a guess  $b'$ .  $D$  outputs 1 if  $b' = b$  and  $A$  is valid in the sense of  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA, else outputs 0.

**Analysis.** The provided master public keys and the  $A$ -requested user secret keys yield the correct distribution and are consistent in the sense of Game 0 and Game 1. Due to ENDSG's  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property, we have that  $\mathbf{T}$  is uniformly distributed over the generators of a nontrivial subgroup of  $G^{2n+1}$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{T}^s$ , for  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , is distributed uniformly over the generators of a nontrivial subgroup of  $G^{2n+1}$  and, thus, all challenge ciphertexts yield the correct distribution in the sense of Game 0 and Game 1. If  $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{g}$ , then the challenge ciphertexts are distributed identically as in Game 0. Otherwise, i.e., if  $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{g}\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ , then the challenge ciphertexts are distributed identically as in Game 1. Hence, (2) follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** (Game 1 to Game 2.1.0) *If the orthogonality property of ENDSG holds, the output distributions of Game 1 and Game 2.1.0 are the same. Concretely, for any PPT adversary  $A$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, it holds that*

$$\Pr [S_{A,1}] = \Pr [S_{A,2.1.0}]. \quad (3)$$

*Proof.* In this bridging step, we argue that each instance- $j$  master secret key  $msk_j$ , with  $msk_j \leftarrow H$ , generated as in Game 1 and the (implicit) instance- $j$  master secret keys  $msk'_j$ , with  $msk'_j := msk''_j \cdot \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,0}(\varepsilon) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,0}(\varepsilon)$ , for  $msk''_j \leftarrow H$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,0}, \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,0}$  defined as above, generated as in Game 2.1.0, are identically distributed, for all  $j$ . Note that the master public keys for  $A$  contain  $(m(msk_j))_j$ ; but since  $((m(msk'_j))_j = (m(msk''_j))_j)$ , which is due to the orthogonality property of ENDSG, no  $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,0}$ -information and no  $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,0}$ -information is given out in the master public keys. Further, since  $(msk_j)_j$  and  $(msk''_j)_j$  are identically distributed, it follows that (3) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** (Game 2.i.0 to Game 2.i.1) *If the  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property and LS2 of ENDSG hold, Game 2.i.0 and Game 2.i.1 are computationally indistinguishable. Concretely, for any PPT adversary  $A$  with at most  $q' = q'(k)$  extraction queries per instance and running time  $t$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, there is a distinguisher  $D$  on LS2 with running time  $t' \approx t + \mathbf{O}(\mu nk^c (q + q'))$ , for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that*

$$|\Pr [S_{A,2.i.0}] - \Pr [S_{A,2.i.1}]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, G, D}^{\text{ls2}}(k, 2n), \quad (4)$$

for all  $i \in [n]$ .

*Proof.* In Game 2.i.0, we have semi-functional type- $(\wedge, i - 1)$  challenge ciphertexts while in Game 2.i.1, challenge ciphertexts are semi-functional of type  $(\sim, i - 1)$  if and only if the  $i$ -th challenge identity bit is 1.

**Description.** The challenge input is provided as  $(pp, \widehat{h\tilde{h}}, \mathbf{g}'\widehat{\mathbf{g}}', \mathbf{T})$ , where  $\mathbf{T}$  is either  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}}$  or  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}$ , for  $pp$  as before, for  $\widehat{h}, \tilde{h}$  specified in  $sp$ , for  $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}' \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}' \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp, sp)$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp, sp)$ . First,  $D$  samples  $(msk_j)_j \leftarrow (H)^\mu$ , sets  $mpk_j := (pp, H, m(msk_j))$ , for all  $j$ , for  $H \leftarrow \mathcal{UH}$ , for  $m$  specified in  $pp$ , and sends  $(mpk_j)_j$  to  $A$ . Further,  $D$  defines a truly random function  $R : [\mu] \times \{0, 1\}^{i-1} \rightarrow \langle \widehat{h\tilde{h}} \rangle$ . During the experiment,  $D$  answers instance- $j$  secret key extraction queries to oracle  $\text{Ext}(msk_j, \cdot)$  as

$$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot R(j, id|_{i-1}), id; \text{SampH}(pp)),$$

for  $id \in \mathcal{ID}$  and all  $j$ . (Again, we assume that  $A$  queries at most  $q'$  user secret keys per instance and we set  $id|_0 = \{0, 1\}^0 =: \varepsilon$ .)  $A$  may adaptively query its  $\text{Enc}'$ -oracle; for instance- $j$  challenge identity  $id_{j,i'}^* = id_{j,i',1}^* \dots, id_{j,i',n}^* \in \mathcal{ID}$  and equal-length messages  $(M_{j,i',0}^*, M_{j,i',1}^*)$ ,  $D$  returns

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot R(j, id_{j,i'}^*|_{i-1}), (\mathbf{g}'\widehat{\mathbf{g}}')^{s_{j,i'}}) & \text{ if } id_{j,i',i}^* = 0, \\ \overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot R(j, id_{j,i'}^*|_{i-1}), \mathbf{T}^{s_{j,i'}}) & \text{ if } id_{j,i',i}^* = 1, \end{aligned}$$

to  $A$ , for  $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$ , for  $s_{j,i'} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , for all  $(j, i') \in [\mu] \times [q]$ . Eventually,  $A$  outputs a guess  $b'$ .  $D$  outputs 1 if  $b' = b$  and  $A$  is valid in the sense of  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA, else outputs 0.

**Analysis.** The master public keys yield the correct distribution as well as the requested user secret keys (which is due to ENDSG's  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property, i.e., the output of  $\text{SampH}$  is uniformly distributed over the generators of a nontrivial subgroup of  $H^{2n+1}$ ). For the challenge ciphertexts, note that  $\mathbf{g}'\widehat{\mathbf{g}}'$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  are uniformly distributed over the generators of their respective nontrivial subgroup of  $G^{2n+1}$  and, hence,  $(\mathbf{g}'\widehat{\mathbf{g}}')^s$  and  $\mathbf{T}^s$ , for  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , are distributed uniformly over the generators of their respective nontrivial  $G^{2n+1}$ -subgroup as well. If  $\mathbf{T} = \widehat{\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}}$ , then the challenge ciphertexts are distributed identically as in Game 2.i.0. Otherwise, if  $\mathbf{T} = \widehat{\mathbf{g}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}}$ , then the challenge ciphertexts are distributed identically as in Game 2.i.1 (where, in both cases, ENDSG's orthogonality and non-degeneracy properties hold; thus,  $\widehat{h}$  and  $\tilde{h}$  must contain coprime nontrivial elements and the challenge ciphertexts yield the correct distribution). Hence, (4) follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** (Game 2.i.1 to Game 2.i.2) *If the  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property and  $NH$  of ENDSG hold, Game 2.i.1 and Game 2.i.2 are computationally indistinguishable. Concretely, for any PPT adversary  $A$  with at most  $q' = q'(k)$  extraction queries per instance and running time  $t$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, there is a distinguisher  $D$  on  $NH$  with running time  $t' \approx t + \mathbf{O}(\mu nk^c (q + q'))$ , for some*



constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$|\Pr[S_{A,2.i.1}] - \Pr[S_{A,2.i.2}]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG},G,D}^{\text{nh}}(k, 2n, \mu q'), \quad (5)$$

for all  $i \in [n]$ .

*Proof.* In Game 2.i.1, the challenge ciphertexts are semi-functional of type  $(\wedge, i-1)$  if the  $i$ -th bit of the challenge identity is 0 and semi-functional of type  $(\sim, i-1)$  if the  $i$ -th bit of the challenge identity is 1, while in Game 2.i.2, all challenge ciphertexts are of type  $(\cdot, i)$ .

**Description.** The challenge input is  $(pp, \widehat{h}, \widetilde{h}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{-(2i-1)}, \widetilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-2i}, (\mathbf{T}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{T}_{\mu,q'}))$ , where  $\mathbf{T}_{j,i'}$  equals either

$$(h_{j,i',0}, \dots, h_{j,i',2n}) \quad \text{or} \quad (h_{j,i',0}, \dots, h_{j,i',2i-1} \cdot (\widehat{h})^{\widetilde{Y}_{j,i'}}, h_{j,i',2i} \cdot (\widetilde{h})^{\widetilde{Y}_{j,i'}}, \dots, h_{j,i',2n}),$$

for  $pp$  as before,  $\widehat{h}, \widetilde{h}$  specified as in  $sp$ , for  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widetilde{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for  $(h_{j,i',0}, \dots, h_{j,i',2n}) \leftarrow \text{SampH}(pp)$ , and for uniform  $\widehat{Y}_{j,i'}, \widetilde{Y}_{j,i'} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\text{ord}(H)}^*$ , for all  $(j, i') \in [\mu] \times [q']$ .  $D$  samples  $(msk_j)_j \leftarrow (H)^\mu$ , sets  $mpk_j := (pp, H, m(msk_j))$ , for all  $j$ , for  $H \leftarrow \mathcal{UH}$ , for  $m$  specified in  $pp$ , and sends  $(mpk_j)_j$  to  $A$ . Further,  $D$  defines random functions  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}, \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}$  as above. In addition, for identity  $id = id_1 \dots id_n \in \mathcal{ID}$ , we will define

$$\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) := \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id|_{i-1}) \quad \text{and (implicitly)} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) := \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id|_{i-1}) \cdot (\widetilde{h})^{\widetilde{Y}_{j,i'}}$$

if  $id_i = 0$  and

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) := \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id|_{i-1}) \quad \text{and (implicitly)} \quad \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) := \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id|_{i-1}) \cdot (\widehat{h})^{\widehat{Y}_{j,i'}}$$

if  $id_i = 1$ , for suitable  $(j, i') \in [\mu] \times [q']$  as shown below. Further, during the experiment,  $D$  returns the  $i'$ -th secret key extraction query in instance  $j$  for an identity  $id$ , with prefix  $id|_i$  not a prefix of an already queried identity in instance  $j$ , as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id|_{i-1}), id; \mathbf{T}_{j,i'}) & \quad \text{if } id_i = 0, \\ \overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id|_{i-1}) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i), id; \mathbf{T}_{j,i'}) & \quad \text{if } id_i = 1, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $(j, i')$ . (Note that  $id|_i$  could be a valid prefix in any other instance different to  $j$ . Further, we assume that  $A$  queries at most  $q'$  user secret keys per instance.) For an identity prefixes  $id|_i$  that is a prefix of an already queried identity in instance  $j$ , let  $(j, i'')$  be the index of that query. In that case,  $D$  returns

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id|_{i-1}), id; \mathbf{T}_{j,i''} \cdot \text{SampH}(pp)) & \quad \text{if } id_i = 0, \\ \overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id|_{i-1}) \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id|_i), id; \mathbf{T}_{j,i''} \cdot \text{SampH}(pp)) & \quad \text{if } id_i = 1, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $j$ . (Note that we use  $\text{SampH}$  to rerandomize the  $H^{2n+1}$ -subgroup element of  $\mathbf{T}_{j,i''}$ .) Further,  $A$  may adaptively query its  $\text{Enc}'$ -oracle; for  $A$ -chosen instance- $j$  challenge identity  $id_{j,i''}^* = id_{j,i''}^*, 1 \dots, id_{j,i''}^*, n \in \mathcal{ID}$  and equal-length messages  $(M_{j,i''}^*, 0, M_{j,i''}^*, 1)$  and returns

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i''}^*, M_{j,i''}^*, b; msk_j \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id_{j,i''}^* | i), (\mathbf{g}_{-(2i-1)} \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{-(2i-1)})^{S_{j,i''}}) \text{ if } id_{j,i''}^*, i = 0, \\ & \overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i''}^*, M_{j,i''}^*, b; msk_j \cdot \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id_{j,i''}^* | i), (\mathbf{g}_{-2i} \widetilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-2i})^{S_{j,i''}}) \text{ if } id_{j,i''}^*, i = 1, \end{aligned}$$

to  $A$ , for  $s_{j,i''} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , for  $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ , for fixed  $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$ , for all  $(j, i'')$ . (Note that a modified  $\overline{\text{Enc}}$ -input is provided with only  $4n$  instead of  $4n + 2$  elements. Nevertheless, the omitted elements are not needed to generate a valid ciphertext (since it is consistent with the challenge identities  $(id_{j,i''}^*)_{j,i''}$ ). Hence, we assume that  $\overline{\text{Enc}}$  works as desired.) Eventually,  $A$  outputs a guess  $b'$ .  $D$  outputs 1 if  $b' = b$  and  $A$  is valid in the sense of  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA, else outputs 0.

**Analysis.** Note that the provided master public keys yield the correct distribution. For the  $A$ -requested user secret keys, we have that since  $\widehat{h}$  and  $\widetilde{h}$  have nontrivial  $H$ -elements of coprime order (again, this is due to  $\text{ENDSG}$ 's orthogonality and non-degeneracy properties), the random functions  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}$  yield the correct distributions in the sense of Game 2.i.1 and Game 2.i.2, respectively. Due to the  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property of  $\text{ENDSG}$ ,  $\mathbf{g}_{-(2i-1)}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{-(2i-1)}$  as well as  $\mathbf{g}_{-2i}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-2i}$  are uniformly distributed over the generators of their respective nontrivial subgroups of  $G^{2n}$  and, thus,  $(\mathbf{g}_{-(2i-1)} \widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{-(2i-1)})^s$  and  $(\mathbf{g}_{-2i} \widetilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-2i})^s$ , for  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , are distributed uniformly over the generators of their respective nontrivial subgroup of  $G^{2n}$ . Further, if  $id_{j,i''}^*, i = 0$ , then it holds that  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id_{j,i''}^* | i) = \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id_{j,i''}^* | i-1)$  and all required components  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{-(2i-1)}$  to create the challenge ciphertexts are given. Analogously, if  $id_{j,i''}^*, i = 1$ , then we have  $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i}(id_{j,i''}^* | i) = \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{j,i-1}(id_{j,i''}^* | i-1)$  and all necessary components  $\widetilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-2i}$  are provided as needed. Hence, the challenge ciphertexts and user secret keys yield the correct distribution. If  $(\mathbf{T}_{j,i'})_{j,i'} = (h_{j,i'}, 0, \dots, h_{j,i'}, 2n)_{i'}$ , then the user secret keys are distributed identically as in Game 2.i.1. If  $(\mathbf{T}_{j,i'})_{j,i'} = (h_{j,i'}, 0, \dots, h_{j,i'}, 2i-1 \cdot (\widehat{h})^{\widehat{y}_{j,i'}}, h_{j,i'}, 2i \cdot (\widetilde{h})^{\widetilde{y}_{j,i'}}, \dots, h_{j,i'}, 2n)_{j,i'}$ , then the user secret keys are distributed identically as in Game 2.i.2. Thus, (5) follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** (Game 2.i-1.2 to Game 2.i.0) *If the  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property and LS2 of  $\text{ENDSG}$  hold, Game 2.i-1.1 and Game 2.i.0 are computationally indistinguishable. Concretely, for any PPT adversary  $A$  with at most  $q' = q'(k)$  extraction queries per instance and running time  $t$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, there is a distinguisher  $D$  with running time  $t' \approx t + \mathbf{O}(\mu nk^c (q + q'))$ , for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that*

$$|\Pr[S_{A,2,i-1.2}] - \Pr[S_{A,2,i.0}]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, G, D}^{\text{ls2}}(k, 2n), \quad (6)$$

for all  $i \in [n] \setminus \{1\}$ .

*Proof.* In Game  $2.i - 1.2$ , challenge ciphertexts are of type  $(\cdot, i - 1)$  and depend on the  $(i - 1)$ -th challenge identity bit while in Game  $2.i.0$ , challenge ciphertexts are of type  $(\wedge, i - 1)$ . This proof is very similar to the proof of Lemma 3 except that the challenge ciphertexts depend on the  $(i - 1)$ -th instead of the  $i$ -th challenge identity bit.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** (Game 2.n.2 to Game 3) *If the  $G$ - and  $H$ -subgroups property and LS2 of ENDSG hold, Game 2.n.2 and Game 3 are computationally indistinguishable. Concretely, for any PPT adversary  $A$  with at most  $q' = q'(k)$  extraction queries per instance and running time  $t$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, there is a distinguisher  $D$  with running time  $t' \approx t + \mathbf{O}(\mu k^c (q + q'))$ , for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that*

$$|\Pr[S_{A,2.n.2}] - \Pr[S_{A,3}]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG},G,D}^{\text{ls2}}(k, 2n). \quad (7)$$

*Proof.* It is easy to see that Game 3 and a potential Game 2.n+1.0 would be identical. Hence, we can reassemble the proof of Lemma 5 with  $i := n + 1$  and (7) directly follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** (Game 3 to Game 4, weak adversaries) *Game 3 and Game 4 are statistically indistinguishable. Concretely, for any PPT weak adversary  $A$  on the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security of IBE, it holds that*

$$|\Pr[S_{A,3}] - \Pr[S_{A,4}]| \leq \mu q \cdot \mathbf{O}(2^{-k}). \quad (8)$$

*Proof.* In Game 4, we replace each challenge message  $M_{j,i',b}$ , for challenge bit  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , with a (fresh) uniformly random  $k$ -length bitstring  $R_{j,i'} \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k$ . We argue with ENDSG's non-degeneracy property and the universality of  $H$  for this change. Concretely, for instance- $j$  Game-3 challenge ciphertexts

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text{Enc}}(pp, id_{j,i'}^*, M_{j,i',b}^*; msk_j \cdot \widehat{R}_{j,n}(id_{j,i'}^*), (\widehat{\mathbf{g}}\widehat{\mathbf{g}})^{s_{j,i'}}) \\ &= ((g_0\widehat{g}_0)^{s_{j,i'}}, \left( \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_{j,i',i}^*} \widehat{g}_{2i-id_{j,i',i}^*} \right)^{s_{j,i'}}), H(e((g_0\widehat{g}_0)^{s_{j,i'}}, msk_j \cdot \widehat{R}_{j,n}(id_{j,i'}^*))) \\ & \oplus M_{j,i',b}^*), \end{aligned}$$

for  $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ , for  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for  $s_{j,i'} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , for all  $i' \in [q]$ , note that

$$e((\widehat{g}_0)^{s_{j,i'}}, \widehat{R}_{j,n}(id_{j,i'}^*)) = e((\widehat{g}_0)^{s_{j,i'}}, \widehat{h})^{\widehat{y}_{j,i'}},$$

for uniform  $\widehat{y}_{j,i'} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{ord}(H)}^*$ , is uniformly distributed in a nontrivial subgroup  $G'_T \subset G_T$  due to the non-degeneracy property of ENDSG. Furthermore, since  $A$  is a weak adversary, all the  $\widehat{R}_{j,n}$  are for different preimages and thus independently random. Hence, since  $H$  is a (randomly chosen) universal hash function, we can conclude that

$\text{SD}((H, H(X)); (H, U)) = \mathbf{O}(2^{-k})$ , for  $X \leftarrow G'_T$  and  $U \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k$ . A union bound yields (8).  $\square$

**Lemma 8.** (Game 4) *For any PPT adversary  $A$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, it holds that*

$$\Pr[S_{A,4}] = 1/2. \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* In Game 4, for (uniform) challenge bit  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , we provide  $A$  with challenge ciphertexts that include a uniform  $k$ -length bitstring instead of a  $A$ -chosen  $b$ -dependent message, for each instance and challenge. Hence,  $b$  is completely hidden from  $A$  and (9) follows.  $\square$

Taking (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9) together, shows (1).

**From Weak to Full  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA Security.** The analysis above shows only weak security: we must assume that the adversary  $A$  never asks for encryptions under the same challenge identity and for the same scheme instance twice. We do not know how to remove this restriction assuming only the abstract properties of ENDSGs. However, at the cost of one tight additional reduction to (a slight variant of) the Bilinear Decisional Diffie–Hellman (BDDH) assumption, we can show full  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security.

Concretely, in Game 3, challenge ciphertexts for  $A$  are prepared using (the hash value of)  $e(\widehat{g}_0^s, \widehat{h}^\gamma)$  as a mask to hide the plaintext behind. Here,  $\widehat{g}_0^s$  and  $\widehat{h}$  are public (as part of the ciphertext, resp. public parameters),  $s$  is a fresh exponent chosen randomly for each encryption, and  $\gamma$  is a random exponent that however only depends on the scheme instance and identity. (Thus,  $\gamma$  will be reused for different encryptions under the same identity). Hence, if we show that many tuples  $(\widehat{g}^{s_i}, e(\widehat{g}_0^{s_i}, \widehat{h}^\gamma))$  (for different  $s_i$  but the same  $\gamma$ ) are computationally indistinguishable from random tuples, we obtain that even multiple encryptions under the same identity hide the plaintexts, and we obtain full security.

Of course, the corresponding reduction should be tight, in the sense that it should not degrade in the number of tuples, or in the number of considered  $\gamma$ .

**A (Subgroup) Variant of the BDDH Assumption (s-BDDH).** For any PPT adversary  $D$ , we have that the function

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, G, D}^{\text{s-bddh}}(k, n) := & \left| \Pr \left[ D(pp, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{abc}) = 1 \right] \right. \\ & \left. - \Pr \left[ D(pp, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^z) = 1 \right] \right| \end{aligned}$$

is negligible in  $k$ , for  $(pp, sp) \leftarrow \text{SampP}(k, n)$ , for  $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ , for  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} = (\widehat{g}_0, \dots, \widehat{g}_n) \leftarrow \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for  $\widehat{h}$  specified in  $sp$ , for  $e$  specified in  $pp$ , and for (uniform)  $a, b, c, z \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ .

**Rerandomization.** Fix  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{g}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a \in G^{n+1}$ ,  $\widehat{g}_0^b \in G$ ,  $\widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c \in H$ , and  $\mathbf{T} = e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^z \in G_T$ , for  $a, b, c, z \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ .

**Rerand<sub>a</sub>-algorithm.**  $\text{Rerand}_a(N, \mathbf{g}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T})$  samples  $r_1, t_1 \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and outputs

$$(\mathbf{g}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}_a),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}^{\bar{a}} &= (g_0^{\bar{a}}, \dots, g_n^{\bar{a}}), \text{ for} \\ g_0^{\bar{a}} &= (g_0^a)^{r_1} \cdot g_0^{t_1} = g_0^{a \cdot r_1 + t_1} \text{ and } g_i^{\bar{a}} = (g_i^a)^{r_1} \cdot g_i^{t_1} = g_i^{a \cdot r_1 + t_1}, \text{ for all } i \in [n], \\ \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}} &= (\widehat{g}_0^{\bar{a}}, \dots, \widehat{g}_n^{\bar{a}}), \text{ for} \\ \widehat{g}_0^{\bar{a}} &= (\widehat{g}_0^a)^{r_1} \cdot \widehat{g}_0^{t_1} = \widehat{g}_0^{a \cdot r_1 + t_1} \text{ and } \widehat{g}_i^{\bar{a}} = (\widehat{g}_i^a)^{r_1} \cdot \widehat{g}_i^{t_1} = \widehat{g}_i^{a \cdot r_1 + t_1}, \text{ for all } i \in [n], \\ \mathbf{T}_a &= \mathbf{T}^{r_1} \cdot e(\widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}^c)^{t_1} = \mathbf{T}^{r_1} \cdot e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{b \cdot c \cdot t_1} \end{aligned}$$

If  $z = abc$ , then  $\bar{a}$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and  $\mathbf{T}_a = \mathbf{T}^{\bar{a}bc}$ . If  $z \neq abc$ , then  $\bar{a}$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and  $\mathbf{T}_a = e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{zr_1 + bct_1}$ , where  $zr_1 + bct_1$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ .

**Rerand<sub>b</sub>-algorithm.**  $\text{Rerand}_b(N, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T})$  samples  $r_2, t_2 \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and outputs

$$(\mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}_b),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{g}_0^b &= (\widehat{g}_0^b)^{r_2} \cdot \widehat{g}_0^{t_2} = \widehat{g}_0^{b \cdot r_2 + t_2}, \\ \widehat{h}^b &= (\widehat{h}^b)^{r_2} \cdot \widehat{h}^{t_2} = \widehat{h}^{b \cdot r_2 + t_2}, \\ \mathbf{T}_b &= \mathbf{T}^{r_2} \cdot e(\widehat{g}_0^a, \widehat{h}^c)^{t_2} = \mathbf{T}^{r_2} \cdot e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{a \cdot c \cdot t_2}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $z = abc$ , then  $\bar{b}$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and  $\mathbf{T}_b = \mathbf{T}^{a\bar{b}c}$ . If  $z \neq abc$ , then  $\bar{b}$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and  $\mathbf{T}_b = e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{zr_2 + act_2}$ , where  $zr_2 + act_2$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ .

**Rerand<sub>c</sub>-algorithm.**  $\text{Rerand}_c(N, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T})$  samples  $r_3, t_3 \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and outputs

$$(\mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}_c),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{h}^c &= (\widehat{h}^c)^{r_3} \cdot \widehat{h}^{t_3} = \widehat{h}^{c \cdot r_3 + t_3}, \\ \mathbf{T}_c &= \mathbf{T}^{r_3} \cdot e(\widehat{g}_0^a, \widehat{h}^b)^{t_3} = \mathbf{T}^{r_3} \cdot e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{a \cdot b \cdot t_3}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $z = abc$ , then  $\bar{c}$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and  $\mathbf{T}_c = \mathbf{T}^{a\bar{b}\bar{c}}$ . If  $z \neq abc$ , then  $\bar{c}$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and  $\mathbf{T}_c = e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{zr_3 + abt_3}$ , where  $zr_3 + abt_3$  is uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ .

**Rerand<sub>abc</sub>-algorithm.** Rerand<sub>abc</sub>( $N, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}$ ) outputs

$$(\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{g}_0^{\bar{b}}, \widehat{h}^{\bar{b}}, \widehat{h}^{\bar{c}}, \mathbf{T}_{abc})$$

by running Rerand<sub>a</sub>( $N, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}$ )  $\rightarrow$  ( $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}_a$ ) and take this output as new input ( $N, \mathbf{g}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}_a$ ) for Rerand<sub>b</sub>. Then take this output ( $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}_{ab}$ ) as appropriate input for Rerand<sub>c</sub> to get ( $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{\bar{a}}, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T}_{abc}$ ).

The input exponents  $a, b, c$  and  $z$  for all algorithms are required to be uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , but if we reuse the outputs of Rerand<sub>a</sub> and Rerand<sub>b</sub>, then  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$  are uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ . However, the uniform distribution in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  is statistically indistinguishable from the uniform distribution in  $\mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , since for  $a \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*, \bar{a} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N$  the statistical distance  $\text{SD}(a; \bar{a}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N} |\Pr[a = x] - \Pr[\bar{a} = x]| = \frac{N - \varphi(N)}{N}$  is negligible in  $k$ , because for  $N = p_1 \cdot \dots \cdot p_{n'}$ , where  $n' \in \mathbf{O}(1)$  and  $p_s$  denotes the smallest  $k$ -bit prime factor of  $N$ , we have  $\frac{N - \varphi(N)}{N} \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \frac{N}{N} - \frac{N}{N} + \sum_{l=1}^{n'} \binom{n'}{l} \frac{1}{p_s^l} \leq c(n') \cdot \frac{1}{p_s} \in \mathbf{O}(2^{-k})$ , for a constant  $c(n')$  depending on  $n'$ . (Note that  $(*)$  holds due to  $\frac{\varphi(N)}{N} \geq \frac{N}{N} + \sum_{l=1}^{n'} \binom{n'}{l} \frac{1}{p_s^l}$ .) So, if  $z = abc$ , then  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}$  are uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and  $\mathbf{T}_{abc} = \mathbf{T}^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}}$ . If  $z \neq abc$ , then  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}$  are uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  and, for  $z_a := zr_1 + bct_1, z_{ab} := z ar_2 + \bar{a}ct_2$  and  $z_{abc} := z ab r_3 + \bar{a}\bar{b}t_3$ , we have  $\mathbf{T}_{abc} = e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{z_{abc}}$ , where  $z_a, z_{ab}$  and  $z_{abc}$  are all uniformly distributed in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ .

**Lemma 9.** (Game 3 to Game 4, full security) *Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a group generator and Rerand<sub>abc</sub>, Rerand<sub>a</sub> rerandomization algorithms, all as defined above. If ENDSG is an ENDSG system,  $s$ -BDDH holds, and  $\mathbf{H}$  is a universal hash function, Game 3 and Game 4 are computationally indistinguishable. Concretely, for any PPT adversary  $A$  with at most  $q' = q(k)$  extraction queries per instance and running time  $t$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, there is a distinguisher  $D$  with running time  $t' \approx t + \mathbf{O}(\mu nk^c(q + q'))$ , for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that*

$$|\Pr[S_{A,3}] - \Pr[S_{A,4}]| \leq \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, \mathbf{G}, D}^{\text{s-bddh}}(k, 2n) + \mu q \cdot \mathbf{O}(2^{-k}). \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* In Game 3, each challenge ciphertext carries a  $b$ -dependent  $A$ -chosen message, for  $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$ , while in Game 4, each challenge ciphertext message is replaced by uniform  $k$ -length  $b$ -independent bitstring.

**Description.**  $D$  is provided with challenge input  $(pp, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T})$ , where  $\mathbf{T}$  is either  $e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{abc}$  or  $e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^z$ , for  $(pp, sp) \leftarrow \text{SampP}(k, 2n)$ , for  $\mathbf{g} \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp)$ , for  $\widehat{\mathbf{g}} = (\widehat{g}_0, \dots, \widehat{g}_n) \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp, sp)$ , for  $\widehat{h}$  specified in  $sp$ , for  $e$  specified in  $pp$ , and for  $a, b, c, z \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ . First,  $D$  samples  $(msk_j)_j \leftarrow (H)^\mu$ , sets  $mpk_j := (pp, \mathbf{H}, m(msk_j))$ , for all  $j$ , for  $\mathbf{H} \leftarrow \mathcal{UH}$ , for  $m$  specified in  $pp$ , and sends

$(mpk_j)_j$  to  $A$ . Further,  $D$  defines a truly random function  $\widehat{R} : [\mu] \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \langle \widehat{h} \rangle$ . During the experiment,  $D$  answers instance- $j$  extraction queries for  $id \in \mathcal{ID}$  as

$$\overline{\text{Ext}}(pp, msk_j \cdot \widehat{R}(j, id), id; \text{SampH}(pp)),$$

for all  $j$ . Further,  $A$  may adaptively query its  $\text{Enc}'$ -oracle; for  $A$ -chosen instance- $j$  challenge identity  $id_{j,i'}^* = id_{j,i',1}^* \dots, id_{j,i',n}^* \in \mathcal{ID}$  and messages  $(M_{j,i',0}^*, M_{j,i',1}^*) \in (\mathcal{M})^2$  of equal length, for all  $(j, i') \in [\mu] \times [q]$ . For each fresh instance- $j$  challenge identity  $id_{j,i'}^*$  (i.e.,  $id_{j,i'}^*$  was not queried before by  $A$  in instance  $j$ ),  $D$  computes  $(\mathbf{g}^{a_{j,i'}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{a_{j,i'}}, \widehat{g}_0^{b_{j,i'}}, \widehat{h}^{b_{j,i'}}, \widehat{h}^{c_{j,i'}}, \mathbf{T}_{j,i'}) \leftarrow \text{Rerand}_{\text{abc}}(N, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, \widehat{g}_0^b, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^b, \widehat{h}^c, \mathbf{T})$  and returns

$$((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}}, \left( \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_{j,i',i}^*} \widehat{g}_{2i-id_{j,i',i}^*} \right)^{a_{j,i'}}, \text{H}(e((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}}, msk_j) \cdot \mathbf{T}_{j,i'}) \oplus M_{j,i',b}^*)$$

to  $A$ , for  $b \leftarrow \{0, 1\}$ , for  $s_{j,i'} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , for all  $(j, i')$ . For a requiered challenge identity  $id_{j,i''}^*$  in instance  $j$  (where  $(j, i'') \in [\mu] \times [q]$  is the index of that previous query in instance  $j$ ),  $D$  computes  $(\mathbf{g}^{a'_{j,i''}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{a'_{j,i''}}, \widehat{g}_0^{b_{j,i''}}, \widehat{h}^{b_{j,i''}}, \widehat{h}^{c_{j,i''}}, \mathbf{T}'_{j,i''}) \leftarrow \text{Rerand}_a(N, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^{a_{j,i''}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^{a_{j,i''}}, \widehat{g}_0^{b_{j,i''}}, \widehat{h}, \widehat{h}^{b_{j,i''}}, \widehat{h}^{c_{j,i''}}, \mathbf{T}_{j,i''})$  and returns

$$((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a'_{j,i''}}, \left( \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_{j,i'',i}^*} \widehat{g}_{2i-id_{j,i'',i}^*} \right)^{a'_{j,i''}}, \text{H}(e((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a'_{j,i''}}, msk_j) \cdot \mathbf{T}'_{j,i''}) \oplus M_{j,i'',b}^*)$$

to  $A$ , for all  $(j, i'')$ . Eventually,  $A$  outputs a guess  $b'$ .  $D$  outputs 1 if  $b' = b$  and  $A$  is valid in the sense of  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA, else outputs 0.

**Analysis.** The master public keys yield the correct distribution as well as the requested user secret keys. If  $\mathbf{T} = e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^{abc}$ , then the challenge ciphertext exponents (as rerandomized in  $\text{Rerand}_{\text{abc}}$  and  $\text{Rerand}_a$ , respectively) are distributed  $\mathbf{O}(2^{-k})$ -close to the challenge ciphertext exponents in Game 3. (See rerandomization paragraph above.) For a fresh challenge identity  $id_{j,i'}^*$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & ((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}}, \left( \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_{j,i',i}^*} \widehat{g}_{2i-id_{j,i',i}^*} \right)^{a_{j,i'}}, \text{H}(e((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}}, msk_j) \cdot \mathbf{T}_{j,i'}) \oplus M_{j,i',b}^*) \\ & \stackrel{(*)}{=} ((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}}, \left( \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_{j,i',i}^*} \widehat{g}_{2i-id_{j,i',i}^*} \right)^{a_{j,i'}}, \text{H}(e((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}}, msk_j \cdot \widehat{h}^{b_{j,i'} c_{j,i'}})) \\ & \oplus M_{j,i',b}^*), \end{aligned}$$

where  $(*)$  holds due the orthogonality property of ENDSG. Note that we (implicitly) set  $s_{j,i'} := a_{j,i'}$  and  $\widehat{\gamma}_{j,i'} := b_{j,i'} \cdot c_{j,i'}$ . For a requiered challenge identity  $id_{j,i'}^*$ , we rerandomize the previously used query value  $a_{j,i'}$ , for index  $(j, i')$ , and leave  $\widehat{\gamma}_{j,i'}$  fixed.

Otherwise, if  $\mathbf{T} = e(\widehat{g}_0, \widehat{h})^z$ , then the challenge ciphertext exponents are distributed  $\mathbf{O}(2^{-k})$ -close to the challenge ciphertext exponents in Game 4, i.e., we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & ((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}})^{a_{j,i'}}, \left( \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_{j,i'}^*} \widehat{g}_{2i-id_{j,i'}^*} \right)^{a_{j,i'}}, \mathbf{H}(e((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}}, msk_j) \cdot \mathbf{T}_{j,i'}) \oplus M_{j,i',b}^* \\ &= ((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}})^{a_{j,i'}}, \left( \prod_{i=1}^n g_{2i-id_{j,i'}^*} \widehat{g}_{2i-id_{j,i'}^*} \right)^{a_{j,i'}}, \mathbf{H}(e((g_0 \widehat{g}_0)^{a_{j,i'}}, msk_j \cdot \widehat{h}^{z'_{j,i'}})) \\ &\oplus M_{j,i',b}^*, \end{aligned}$$

for some uniform  $a_{j,i'} \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and  $z'_{j,i'} := z_{j,i'} a_{j,i'}^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  with overwhelming probability. Further, since  $\mathbf{H}$  is a (randomly chosen) universal hash function, we have that  $\mathbf{SD}((\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{H}(X)); (\mathbf{H}, U)) = \mathbf{O}(2^{-k})$ , for  $X \leftarrow G'_T$  and  $U \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^k$ . Finally, via a union bound, (10) follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** (Full  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security of IBE) *Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a group generator as defined above. If ENDSG is an ENDSG system, s-BDDH holds, and  $\mathbf{H}$  is a universal hash function, then IBE is  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA-secure. Concretely, for any PPT adversary  $A$  with at most  $q' = q'(k)$  extraction queries per instance and running time  $t$  in the  $(\mu, q)$ -IBE-IND-CPA security experiment with IBE, there are distinguishers  $D_1$  on LS1,  $D_2$  on LS2,  $D_3$  on NH, and  $D_4$  on s-BDDH with running times  $t'_1 \approx t'_2 \approx t'_3 \approx t'_4 \approx t + \mathbf{O}(\mu nk^c(q + q'))$ , respectively, some constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ , with*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Adv}_{\text{IBE}, A}^{(\mu, q)\text{-ibe-ind-cpa}}(k, n) &\leq \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, \mathbf{G}, D_1}^{\text{ls1}}(k, 2n) + 2n \cdot \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, \mathbf{G}, D_2}^{\text{ls2}}(k, 2n) \\ &\quad + n \cdot \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, \mathbf{G}, D_3}^{\text{nh}}(k, 2n, \mu q') + \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}, \mathbf{G}, D_4}^{\text{s-bddh}}(k, 2n) \\ &\quad + \mu q \cdot \mathbf{O}(2^{-k}), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for group generator  $\mathbf{G}$  defined as above.

*Proof.* Taking (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (10), and (9) together, yields (11).  $\square$

## 5. Instantiations of ENDSGs in Composite-Order Groups

**Assumptions in Groups with Composite Order.** We slightly modify two (known) dual system assumptions (i.e., see DS1, DS3 below, and [14]) and define one (new) dual system assumption (see DS2 below). Further, we give a dual system variant of the Bilinear Decisional Diffie–Hellman assumption, dubbed DS-BDDH, and argue that DS-BDDH implies s-BDDH from Sect. 4. Let  $\mathbf{G}(k, 4)$  be a composite-order group generator that outputs the following group parameters  $(G, H = G, G_T, N, e, g, g_{p_1}, g_{p_2}, g_{p_3}, g_{p_4})$  with the composite-order groups  $G, G_T$ , each of order  $N = p_1 \cdots p_4$ , for pairwise-distinct  $k$ -bit primes  $(p_i)_i$ . Further,  $g_{p_i}$  is a generator of the subgroup  $G_{p_i} \subset G$  of order



$p_i$ , and  $g$  is a generator of  $G$ . More generally, we write  $G_q \subseteq G$  for the unique subgroups of order  $q$ . The assumptions in groups with composite order are as follows:

**Dual system assumption 1 (DS1).** For any PPT adversary  $D$ , the function

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathbb{G}, D}^{\text{ds1}}(k) := \left| \Pr \left[ D(\text{pars}, g'_{p_1}) = 1 \right] - \Pr \left[ D(\text{pars}, g'_{p_1 p_2}) = 1 \right] \right|$$

is negligible in  $k$ , for  $(G, G_T, N, e, g, (g_{p_i})_i) \leftarrow \mathbb{G}(k, 4)$ ,

$$\text{pars} := (G, G_T, N, e, g, g_{p_1}, g_{p_3}, g_{p_4}), \text{ and } g'_{p_1} \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} G_{p_1}, g'_{p_1 p_2} \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} G_{p_1 p_2}.$$

Compared to [14, Sec. 5.1, Assumption 1], in our definition, besides the implications that  $N$  consists of four pairwise-distinct  $k$ -bit primes instead of three, the element  $g_{p_4}$  is given as additional input to  $D$ .

**Dual system assumption 2 (DS2).** For any PPT adversary  $D$ , the function

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathbb{G}, D}^{\text{ds2}}(k) := \left| \Pr \left[ D(\text{pars}, g'_{p_1 p_2}) = 1 \right] - \Pr \left[ D(\text{pars}, g'_{p_1 p_3}) = 1 \right] \right|$$

is negligible in  $k$ , for  $(G, G_T, N, e, g, (g_{p_i})_i) \leftarrow \mathbb{G}(k, 4)$ ,

$$\text{pars} := (G, G_T, N, e, g, g_{p_1}, g_{p_4}, g_{p_1 p_2}, g_{p_2 p_3}),$$

$$g_{p_1 p_2} \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} G_{p_1 p_2}, g_{p_2 p_3} \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} G_{p_2 p_3}, \text{ and } g'_{p_1 p_2} \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} G_{p_1 p_2}, g'_{p_1 p_3} \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} G_{p_1 p_3}.$$

**Dual system assumption 3 (DS3).** For any PPT adversary  $D$ , the function

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathbb{G}, D}^{\text{ds3}}(k) := \left| \Pr \left[ D(\text{pars}, g_{p_2}^{xy}, g_{p_3}^{xy}) = 1 \right] - \Pr \left[ D(\text{pars}, g_{p_2}^{xy+\gamma'}, g_{p_3}^{xy+\gamma'}) = 1 \right] \right|$$

is negligible in  $k$ , for  $(G, G_T, N, e, g, (g_{p_i})_i) \leftarrow \mathbb{G}(k, 4)$ ,

$$\text{pars} := (G, G_T, N, e, g, (g_{p_i})_i, g_{p_2}^x \widehat{X}_4, g_{p_2}^y \widehat{Y}_4, g_{p_3}^x \widetilde{X}_4, g_{p_3}^y \widetilde{Y}_4),$$

$$\widehat{X}_4, \widetilde{X}_4, \widehat{Y}_4, \widetilde{Y}_4 \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} G_{p_4}, x, y, \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*, \text{ and } \gamma' \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*.$$

Compared to [14, Sec. 5.1, Assumption 2], in our definition, we have to reflect the additional subgroup we use. Namely, besides the implications that  $N$  consists of four pairwise-distinct  $k$ -bit primes instead of three, the elements  $(g_{p_2}^x \widehat{X}_4, g_{p_2}^y \widehat{Y}_4, g_{p_3}^x \widetilde{X}_4, g_{p_3}^y \widetilde{Y}_4)$  are given as input to  $D$  instead of  $(g_{p_2}^x \widehat{X}_3, g_{p_2}^y \widehat{Y}_3)$ , for  $\widehat{X}_3, \widehat{Y}_3 \leftarrow G_{p_3}$ ; moreover, the additional elements  $g_{p_3}^{xy}$  and  $g_{p_3}^{xy+\gamma'}$  are given as input to  $D$ .

**Dual system bilinear DDH assumption (DS-BDDH).** For any PPT adversary  $D$ , the function

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathbb{G}, D}^{\text{ds-bddh}}(k) := \left| \Pr \left[ D(\text{pars}, e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^{abc}) = 1 \right] - \Pr \left[ D(\text{pars}, e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^z) = 1 \right] \right|$$

is negligible in  $k$ , for  $(G, G_T, N, e, g, (g_{p_i})_i) \leftarrow \mathbb{G}(k, 4)$ , for

$$\text{pars} := (G, G_T, N, e, g, (g_{p_i})_i, g_{p_1}^a, g_{p_2}^a, g_{p_2}^b, g_{p_2 p_4}, g_{p_2 p_4}^b, g_{p_2 p_4}^c),$$

for  $g_{p_2 p_4} \xleftarrow{\$} G_{p_2 p_4}$ ,  $a, b, c, z \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ .

**Lemma 10.** (DS-BDDH implies s-BDDH) *For any PPT adversary  $D$  with running time  $t$  on s-BDDH there is a distinguisher  $D'$  on DS-BDDH with running time  $t' \approx t$  such that*

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathbb{G}, D'}^{\text{ds-bddh}}(k) = \text{Adv}_{\mathbb{G}, D}^{\text{s-bddh}}(k, n), \quad (12)$$

for  $\mathbb{G}$  as defined above. Hence, s-BDDH holds under DS-BDDH.

*Proof.* **Description.** The challenge input to  $D'$  is provided as  $(\text{pars}, \mathbf{T})$ , where  $\mathbf{T}$  is either  $e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^{abc} \leftarrow G_{p_1}$  or  $e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^z$ , for

$$\text{pars} = (G, G_T, N, e, g, (g_{p_i})_i, g_{p_1}^a, g_{p_2}^a, g_{p_2}^b, g_{p_2 p_4}, g_{p_2 p_4}^b, g_{p_2 p_4}^c),$$

for  $g_{p_2 p_4} \xleftarrow{\$} G_{p_2 p_4}$ , and for  $a, b, c, z \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ . First,  $D'$  sets the public parameter as  $pp := (G, H := G, G_T, N, g, e, m, n, \text{pars}')$ , for  $m : h' \mapsto e(g_1, h')$ ,  $\text{pars}' := (g_{p_1}, g_{p_4}, g_{p_1}^w, h := g, h^w)$ , for  $w \leftarrow (\mathbb{Z}_N^*)^n$ , and for some integer  $n$  determined by  $D'$ . Then,  $D'$  sends

$$(pp, \mathbf{g} := (g_{p_1}^s, g_{p_1}^{s \cdot w}), \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}} := (g_{p_2}^{\hat{s}}, g_{p_2}^{\hat{s} \cdot w}), \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, g_{p_2}^{b \cdot \hat{s}}, g_{p_2 p_4}, g_{p_2 p_4}^b, g_{p_2 p_4}^c, \mathbf{T}),$$

for  $s, \hat{s} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , to  $D$ . Finally,  $D$  outputs a value which  $D'$  forwards to its own challenger.

**Analysis.** Note that  $pp$  is distributed as defined in s-BDDH. If  $\mathbf{T} = e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^{abc}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[ D'(\text{pars}, e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^{abc}) = 1 \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[ D(pp, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, g_{p_2}^{b \hat{s}}, g_{p_2 p_4}, g_{p_2 p_4}^b, g_{p_2 p_4}^c, e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^{abc}) = 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

follows. Otherwise, if  $\mathbf{T} = e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^z$  holds, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[ D'(\text{pars}, e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^z) = 1 \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[ D(pp, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}^a, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}, \widehat{\mathbf{g}}^a, g_{p_2}^{b \hat{s}}, g_{p_2 p_4}, g_{p_2 p_4}^b, g_{p_2 p_4}^c, e(g_{p_2}, g_{p_2})^z) = 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (12) follows.  $\square$

**ENDSGs in Groups with Composite Order.** Let  $\mathbf{G}(k, 4)$  be as defined above. For simplicity, we write  $g_i := g_{p_i}$  and  $g_{ij} := g_{p_i p_j}$ , for all  $(i, j) \in [4] \times [4]$ . We instantiate ENDSGs  $\text{ENDSG}_{\text{CO}} = (\text{SampP}, \text{SampG}, \text{SampH}, \widehat{\text{SampG}}, \widetilde{\text{SampG}})$  in composite-order groups as follows:

**Parameter sampling.**  $\text{SampP}(k, n)$ , given  $k$  and  $n$ , samples  $(G, H, G_T, (p_i)_i, e, g, h, (g_i)_i) \leftarrow \mathbf{G}(k, 4)$  and outputs  $pp := (G, H, G_T, N, g, e, m, n, \text{pars})$  and  $sp := (\widehat{h}, \widehat{h}, \widetilde{\text{pars}}, \widetilde{\text{pars}})$ , for

- $m : H \rightarrow G_T, h' \mapsto e(g_1, h')$ ,
- $\text{pars} := (g_1, g_4, g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, h, h^{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbf{R}_4)$ , for  $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow (\mathbb{Z}_N^*)^n, \mathbf{R}_4 \xleftarrow{\$} (G_{p_4})^n$ ,
- $\widehat{h} \xleftarrow{\$} G_{p_2 p_4}, \widetilde{h} \xleftarrow{\$} G_{p_3 p_4}$ ,
- $\widetilde{\text{pars}} := (g_2, g_2^{\mathbf{w}}), \widehat{\text{pars}} := (g_3, g_3^{\mathbf{w}})$ .

**G-Group sampling.**  $\text{SampG}(pp)$ , on input  $pp$ , samples  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and outputs  $(g_1^s, g_1^{s \cdot \mathbf{w}})$ .

**H-Group sampling.**  $\text{SampH}(pp)$ , on input  $pp$ , samples  $r \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and outputs  $(h^r, h^{r \cdot \mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbf{R}'_4)$ , for  $\mathbf{R}'_4 \xleftarrow{\$} (G_{p_4})^n$ .

**Semi-functional G-group sampling 1.**  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , on input  $pp$  and  $sp$ , samples  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and outputs  $(g_2^s, g_2^{s \cdot \mathbf{w}})$ .

**Semi-functional G-group sampling 2.**  $\widetilde{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , on input  $pp$  and  $sp$ , samples  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and outputs  $(g_3^s, g_3^{s \cdot \mathbf{w}})$ .

**Correctness of  $\text{ENDSG}_{\text{CO}}$ .** For all  $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and group parameters  $(G, H, G_T, N, e, g, h, (g_i)_i) \leftarrow \mathbf{G}(k, 4)$ , we have:

**Associativity.** For all  $s, r \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , for all  $(g_1^s, g_1^{s \cdot \mathbf{w}}) \leftarrow \text{SampG}(pp; s)$ , for all  $(h^r, h^{r \cdot \mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbf{R}'_4) \leftarrow \text{SampH}(pp; r)$ , for  $\mathbf{R}'_4 = (R'_i)_i \in (G_{p_4})^n$ , it holds that

$$e(g_1^s, h^{r \cdot w_i} \cdot R'_i) = e(g_1^s, h^{r \cdot w_i}) = e(g_1^{s \cdot w_i}, h^r)$$

for all  $i \in [n]$ , and for  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}_N^*)^n$ .

**Projective.** For all  $s \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , for all  $h' \in H$ , it holds that  $m(h')^s = e(g_1, h')^s = e(g_1^s, h')$ . (Note that  $g_1^s$  is the first output of  $\text{SampG}(pp; s)$ .)

**Security of  $\text{ENDSG}_{\text{CO}}$ .** Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a composite-order group generator as defined above, for all  $k, n, \in \mathbb{N}$ , for all  $(pp, sp) \leftarrow \text{SampP}(k, n)$ , we have:

**Orthogonality.** For  $\widehat{h}, \widetilde{h}$  specified in  $sp$ , we have

$$m(\widehat{h}) = e(g_1, \widehat{h}) = e((g^{p_2 p_3 p_4})^{\gamma_{g_1}}, (g^{p_1 p_3})^{\gamma_{\widehat{h}}}) = 1$$

and

$$m(\tilde{h}) = e(g_1, \tilde{h}) = e((g^{p_2 p_3 p_4})^{\gamma_{g_1}}, (g^{p_1 p_2})^{\gamma_{\tilde{h}}}) = 1$$

for suitable exponents  $\gamma_{g_1}, \gamma_{\tilde{h}}, \gamma_{\tilde{h}} \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ . Further, for  $g_1^s, g_2^{s'},$  and  $g_3^{s''}$  that are the first outputs of  $\text{SampG}(pp; s), \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp; s'),$  and  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp; s''),$  for  $s, s', s'' \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , we have  $e(g_1^s, \tilde{h}) = e(g_1^s, \tilde{h}) = e(g_2^{s'}, \tilde{h}) = e(g_3^{s''}, \tilde{h}) = 1.$

**G- and H-subgroups.** Since  $g_1, g_2,$  and  $g_3$  are generators of subgroups  $G_{p_1}, G_{p_2},$  and  $G_{p_3}$  of coprime order, the outputs of  $\text{SampG}, \widehat{\text{SampG}},$  and  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}$  are uniform over the generators, which generates nontrivial subgroups of  $G$  of coprime order. Since  $h$  is a generator of  $H$  and  $\mathbf{R}_4$  is uniform over the generators of  $(G_{p_4})^n,$  the output of  $\text{SampH}$  is uniformly distributed over the generators of  $H.$

**Non-degeneracy.** For the first output  $g_2^s$  of  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp; s)$  (with uniform  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ ), and for  $\tilde{h} \in G_{p_2 p_3}$  as specified in  $sp,$  it holds that  $e(g_2^s, \tilde{h}) = e(g_2, \tilde{h})^s$  is uniformly distributed over the generators of the subgroup generated by  $e(g_2, \tilde{h}).$  Similarly, for the first output  $g_3^s$  of  $\widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp; s),$  it holds that  $e(g_3^s, \tilde{h}) = e(g_3, \tilde{h})^s$  is distributed uniformly over the generators of the subgroup generated by  $e(g_3, \tilde{h}).$

**Left-subgroup indistinguishability 1.** We prove the following lemma

**Lemma 11.** (DS1 implies LS1) *For any PPT adversary  $D$  with running time  $t$  on LS1 of  $\text{ENDSG}_{\text{co}}$  as defined above, there is a distinguisher  $D'$  on DS1 with running time  $t' \approx t$  such that*

$$\text{Adv}_{\mathbb{G}, D'}^{\text{ds1}}(k) = \text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}_{\text{co}}, \mathbb{G}, D}^{\text{ls1}}(k, n), \quad (13)$$

for  $\mathbb{G}$  as defined above. Hence, LS1 holds under DS1.

*Proof. Description.* The challenge input to  $D'$  is provided as  $(pars, \mathbf{T}),$  where  $\mathbf{T}$  is either  $g'_1 \leftarrow G_{p_1}$  or  $g'_{12} \leftarrow G_{p_1 p_2},$  for  $pars = (G, G_T, N, e, g, g_1, g_3, g_4).$  First,  $D'$  sets the public parameter as  $pp := (G, H := G, G_T, N, g, e, m, n, pars'),$  for  $m : h' \mapsto e(g_1, h'), pars' := (g_1, g_4, g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, h := g, h^{\mathbf{w}}),$  for  $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow (\mathbb{Z}_N^*)^n,$  and for some integer  $n$  determined by  $D'.$  Then,  $D'$  sends  $(pp, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{w}})$  to  $D.$  Finally,  $D$  outputs a value which  $D'$  forwards to its own challenger.

*Analysis.* Note that  $pp$  is distributed as defined in LS1. If  $\mathbf{T} = g'_1,$  then  $(g'_1, (g'_1)^{\mathbf{w}})$  is distributed as the output of  $\text{SampG}(pp)$  as needed and  $\Pr [D'(pars, g'_1) = 1] = \Pr [D(pp, (g'_1, (g'_1)^{\mathbf{w}})) = 1]$  follows. Otherwise, if  $\mathbf{T} = g'_{12},$  then  $(g'_{12}, (g'_{12})^{\mathbf{w}})$  is distributed as  $\text{SampG}(pp) \cdot \widehat{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp),$  for suitable  $sp,$  as desired and, hence, we have that  $\Pr [D'(pars, g'_{12}) = 1] = \Pr [D(pp, (g'_{12}, (g'_{12})^{\mathbf{w}})) = 1].$  As a consequence, (13) follows.  $\square$

**Left-subgroup indistinguishability 2.** We prove the following lemma

**Lemma 12.** (DS2 implies LS2) *For any PPT adversary  $D$  with running time  $t$  on LS2 of  $\text{ENDSG}_{\text{co}}$  defined as above there is a distinguisher  $D'$  on DS2 with running time  $t' \approx t$  such that*

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}_{\text{co}}, \mathbf{G}, D}^{\text{ls2}}(k, n) = \text{Adv}_{\mathbf{G}, D'}^{\text{ds2}}(k), \quad (14)$$

for  $\mathbf{G}$  as defined above. Hence, LS2 holds under DS2.

*Proof.* **Description.** The challenge input to  $D'$  is provided as  $(\text{pars}, \mathbf{T})$ , where  $\mathbf{T}$  is either  $g'_{12} \leftarrow G_{p_1 p_2}$  or  $g'_{13} \leftarrow G_{p_1 p_3}$ , for  $\text{pars} = (G, G_T, N, e, g, g_1, g_4, g_{12}, g_{23})$ . First,  $D'$  defines the public parameter as  $pp := (G, H := G, G_T, N, g, e, m, n, \text{pars}')$ , for  $m : h' \mapsto e(g_1, h')$ ,  $\text{pars}' := (g_1, g_4, g_1^{\mathbf{w}}, h := g, h^{\mathbf{w}})$ , for  $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow (\mathbb{Z}_N^*)^n$ , and for some integer  $n$  determined by  $D'$ . Then,  $D'$  sends  $(pp, g_{23} g_4^\gamma, g_{12}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{T}^{\mathbf{w}})$ , for  $\gamma \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , to  $D$ . Eventually,  $D$  outputs a value which is forwarded by  $D'$  to its own challenger.

**Analysis.** Note that  $pp$  is distributed as defined in LS2. If  $\mathbf{T} = g'_{12}$ , then  $(g'_{12}, (g'_{12})^{\mathbf{w}})$  is distributed as  $\text{SampG}(pp) \cdot \widetilde{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for suitable  $sp$ , as needed and, hence, we have that

$$\Pr [D'(\text{pars}, g'_{12}) = 1] = \Pr [D(pp, g_{23} g_4^\gamma, g_{12}, (g'_{12}, (g'_{12})^{\mathbf{w}})) = 1]$$

follows. Otherwise, if  $\mathbf{T} = g'_{13}$ , then  $(g'_{13}, (g'_{13})^{\mathbf{w}})$  is distributed as  $\text{SampG}(pp) \cdot \widetilde{\text{SampG}}(pp, sp)$ , for suitable  $sp$ , as desired and, hence,  $\Pr [D'(\text{pars}, g'_{13}) = 1] = \Pr [D(pp, g_{23} g_4^\gamma, g_{12}, (g'_{13}, (g'_{13})^{\mathbf{w}})) = 1]$  holds. As a consequence, (14) follows.  $\square$

**Nested-hiding indistinguishability.** We prove the following lemma

**Lemma 13.** (DS3 implies NH) *For any PPT adversary  $D$  with running time  $t$  on NH of  $\text{ENDSG}_{\text{co}}$  there is a distinguisher  $D'$  on DS3 with running time  $t' \approx t$  such that*

$$\text{Adv}_{\text{ENDSG}_{\text{co}}, \mathbf{G}, D}^{\text{hh}}(k, n, q') \leq \text{Adv}_{\mathbf{G}, D'}^{\text{ds3}}(k), \quad (15)$$

for  $q' \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{G}$  as defined above. Hence, NH holds under DS3.

*Proof.* The proof follows the same strategy as shown in Chen and Wee's work [13] except that we have to integrate two coprime-order semi-functional generators  $\widehat{h}$  and  $\widetilde{h}$  instead of just one as in [13].

**Description.** The challenge input to  $D'$  is provided as  $(\text{pars}, \mathbf{T})$ , where  $\mathbf{T} := (\widehat{\mathbf{T}}, \widetilde{\mathbf{T}})$  is either  $(g_2^{xy}, g_3^{xy})$  or  $(g_2^{xy+\gamma'}, g_3^{xy+\gamma'})$ , for

$$\text{pars} := (G, G_T, N, e, g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_2^x \widehat{X}_4, g_2^y \widehat{Y}_4, g_3^x \widetilde{X}_4, g_3^y \widetilde{Y}_4),$$

for  $\widehat{X}_4, \widehat{Y}_4, \widetilde{X}_4, \widetilde{Y}_4 \xleftarrow{g} G_{p_4}$ ,  $x, y \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ , and for  $\gamma' \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ . Furthermore,  $D'$  receives an auxiliary input  $i \in [\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor]$ , for some integer  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  determined by  $D'$ . First,  $D'$  samples

$r, \hat{r}, \tilde{r}, \hat{s}, \tilde{s} \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ ,  $\mathbf{R}'_4 \xleftarrow{\$} (G_{p_4})^n$ ,  $\mathbf{w}' \leftarrow (\mathbb{Z}_N^*)^n$ , and sets

$$\begin{aligned} h &:= (g_1 g_2 g_3 g_4)^r, & \hat{h} &:= (g_2 g_4)^{\hat{r}}, & \tilde{h} &:= (g_3 g_4)^{\tilde{r}}, \\ \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{-(2i-1)} &:= (g_2^{\hat{s}}, g_2^{\hat{s}\mathbf{w}'})_{-(2i-1)}, & \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{-2i} &:= (g_3^{\tilde{s}}, g_3^{\tilde{s}\mathbf{w}'})_{-(2i)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $h$ ,  $\hat{h}$ , and  $\tilde{h}$  are generators of  $G$ ,  $G_{p_2 p_4}$ , and  $G_{p_3 p_4}$ . Then,  $D'$  defines public parameter as

$$pp := (G, H := G, G_T, N, g, e, n, m, pars'),$$

for  $m : h' \mapsto e(g_1, h')$  and

$$\begin{aligned} pars' &:= (g_1, g_4, g_1^{\mathbf{w}'}, h, h^{\mathbf{w}'}(g_2^y \hat{Y}_4)^{r\mathbf{e}_{2i-1}}(g_3^y \tilde{Y}_4)^{r\mathbf{e}_{2i}} \mathbf{R}'_4) \\ &= (g_1, g_4, g_1^{\mathbf{w}'}, h, h^{\mathbf{w}'} \mathbf{R}_4), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_j$  is the  $j$ -th unit vector of length  $n$  and, implicitly, we have

$$\mathbf{w} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}' \pmod{p_1 p_4} \\ \mathbf{w}' + y \cdot \mathbf{e}_{2i-1} \pmod{p_2} & \text{and } \mathbf{R}_4 = \mathbf{R}'_4 + \hat{Y}_4^r \cdot \mathbf{e}_{2i-1} + \tilde{Y}_4^r \cdot \mathbf{e}_{2i}. \\ \mathbf{w}' + y \cdot \mathbf{e}_{2i} \pmod{p_3} \end{cases}$$

Now, by running the algorithm from [15, Lemma 6] on input  $(1^{q'}, (g_2, g_4, g_2^x \hat{X}_4, g_2^y \hat{Y}_4, \hat{\mathbf{T}}))$  and on input  $(1^{q'}, (g_3, g_4, g_3^x \tilde{X}_4, g_3^y \tilde{Y}_4, \tilde{\mathbf{T}}))$ ,  $D'$  generates tuples

$$(g_2^{\hat{r}_j} \hat{X}_{4,j}, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_j)_{j=1}^{q'} \quad \text{and} \quad (g_3^{\tilde{r}_j} \tilde{X}_{4,j}, \tilde{\mathbf{T}}_j)_{j=1}^{q'},$$

respectively, where

$$\hat{\mathbf{T}}_j = \begin{cases} g_2^{\hat{r}_j y} \cdot \hat{Y}_{4,j}, & \text{if } \hat{\mathbf{T}} = g_2^{xy} \\ g_2^{\hat{r}_j y} \cdot \hat{Y}_{4,j} \cdot g_2^{\hat{\gamma}'_j}, & \text{if } \hat{\mathbf{T}} = g_2^{xy+\gamma'} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_j = \begin{cases} g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y} \cdot \tilde{Y}_{4,j}, & \text{if } \tilde{\mathbf{T}} = g_3^{xy} \\ g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y} \cdot \tilde{Y}_{4,j} \cdot g_3^{\tilde{\gamma}'_j}, & \text{if } \tilde{\mathbf{T}} = g_3^{xy+\gamma'}. \end{cases}$$

Further,  $D'$  samples  $r'_j \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*$ ,  $\mathbf{X}'_{4,j} \xleftarrow{\$} (G_{p_4})^n$ , for all  $j \in [q']$ , and sends

$$(pp, \hat{h}, \tilde{h}, \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{2i-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{2i}, (\mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_{q'}))$$

to  $D$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}_j &= (h^{r'_j} \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_j} \widehat{X}_{4,j} \cdot g_3^{\tilde{r}_j} \widetilde{X}_{4,j}, (h^{r'_j} \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_j} \widehat{X}_{4,j} \cdot g_3^{\tilde{r}_j} \widetilde{X}_{4,j})^{\mathbf{w}'}) \\ &\quad ((g_2^y \widehat{Y}_4)^{r'_j r} \widehat{\mathbf{T}}_j)^{\mathbf{e}_{2i-1}} \cdot ((g_3^y \widetilde{Y}_4)^{r'_j r} \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_j)^{\mathbf{e}_{2i}} \mathbf{X}'_{4,j}) \\ &= \begin{cases} (h^{r_j}, h^{r_j \cdot \mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{4,j}) & \text{if } \widehat{\mathbf{T}}_j = g_2^{\hat{r}_j y} \cdot \widehat{Y}_{4,j} \\ & \text{and } \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_j = g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y} \cdot \widetilde{Y}_{4,j} \\ (h^{r_j}, h^{r_j \cdot \mathbf{w}} \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_j y \mathbf{e}_{2i-1}} \cdot g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y \mathbf{e}_{2i}} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{4,j}) & \text{if } \widehat{\mathbf{T}}_j = g_2^{\hat{r}_j y} \cdot \widehat{Y}_{4,j} \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_j y} \\ & \text{and } \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_j = g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y} \cdot \widetilde{Y}_{4,j} \cdot g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for  $h^{r_j} := h^{r'_j} \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_j} \widehat{X}_{4,j} \cdot g_3^{\tilde{r}_j} \widetilde{X}_{4,j}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{4,j} := \mathbf{X}'_{4,j} + \widehat{Y}_4^{r'_j r} \mathbf{e}_{2i-1} + \widetilde{Y}_4^{r'_j r} \mathbf{e}_{2i}$  implicitly and  $\mathbf{w}$  as above.

**Analysis.** Note that  $pp$  is distributed as defined in NH. If  $\mathbf{T} = (g_2^{xy}, g_3^{xy})$ , then  $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}_j = g_2^{\hat{r}_j y} \cdot \widehat{Y}_{4,j}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_j = g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y} \cdot \widetilde{Y}_{4,j}$ , for all  $j \in [q']$ , and, thus,  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_{q'})$  is distributed as  $(\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_{q'})$ , for suitable  $sp$ , as needed. Else, if  $\mathbf{T} = (g_2^{xy+y'}, g_3^{xy+y'})$ , then  $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}_j = g_2^{\hat{r}_j y} \cdot \widehat{Y}_{4,j} \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_j y}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_j = g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y} \cdot \widetilde{Y}_{4,j} \cdot g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y}$  for all  $j \in [q']$ , and, thus,  $(\mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_{q'})$  is distributed as  $(\mathbf{h}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}'_{q'})$ , for suitable  $sp$ , since  $(\widehat{h}, g_2^{\hat{r}_j y} \cdot \widehat{Y}_{4,j})$  and  $(\widetilde{h}, g_3^{\tilde{r}_j y} \cdot \widetilde{Y}_{4,j})$  are identically distributed as  $(\widehat{h}, (\widehat{h})^{\hat{r}_j y} \cdot \widehat{Y}_{4,j})$  and  $(\widetilde{h}, (\widetilde{h})^{\tilde{r}_j y} \cdot \widetilde{Y}_{4,j})$ , respectively, for  $\hat{r}_j, \tilde{r}_j \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*, \widehat{Y}_{4,j}, \widetilde{Y}_{4,j} \xleftarrow{g} G_{p_4}$ , for all  $j \in [q']$ .  $\square$

### Acknowledgements

We thank the anonymous reviewers for helpful remarks. Jessica Koch was supported by BMBF project “KASTEL”. Christoph Striecks was supported by a DFG grant (GZ HO 4534/2-1) and by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) and netidee SCIENCE grant P31621-N38 (PROFET). Work was done while all authors were with Karlsruhe Institute of Technology.

**Funding** Open access funding provided by Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article’s Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

## References

- [1] Masayuki Abe, Bernardo David, Markulf Kohlweiss, Ryo Nishimaki, and Miyako Ohkubo. Tagged one-time signatures: Tight security and optimal tag size. In Kaoru Kurosawa and Goichiro Hanaoka, editors, *PKC 2013*, volume 7778 of *LNCS*, pages 312–331. Springer, February / March 2013. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36362-7\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36362-7_20).
- [2] Nuttapon Attrapadung, Goichiro Hanaoka, and Shota Yamada. A framework for identity-based encryption with almost tight security. *LNCS*, pages 521–549. Springer, December 2015. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48797-6\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48797-6_22).
- [3] Mihir Bellare, Anand Desai, Eric Jorjani, and Phillip Rogaway. A concrete security treatment of symmetric encryption. In *38th FOCS*, pages 394–403. IEEE Computer Society Press, October 1997.
- [4] Mihir Bellare, Anand Desai, David Pointcheval, and Phillip Rogaway. Relations among notions of security for public-key encryption schemes. In Hugo Krawczyk, editor, *CRYPTO '98*, volume 1462 of *LNCS*, pages 26–45. Springer, August 1998.
- [5] Mihir Bellare, Alexandra Boldyreva, and Silvio Micali. Public-key encryption in a multi-user setting: Security proofs and improvements. In Bart Preneel, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2000*, volume 1807 of *LNCS*, pages 259–274. Springer, May 2000.
- [6] Mihir Bellare, Brent Waters, and Scott Yilek. Identity-based encryption secure against selective opening attack. In Yuval Ishai, editor, *TCC 2011*, volume 6597 of *LNCS*, pages 235–252. Springer, March 2011.
- [7] Olivier Blazy, Eike Kiltz, and Jiaxin Pan. (hierarchical) identity-based encryption from affine message authentication. In *Proceedings of CRYPTO (1) 2014, number 8616 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 408–425. Springer, 2014.
- [8] Alexandra Boldyreva. Strengthening security of RSA-OAEP. In Marc Fischlin, editor, *CT-RSA 2009*, volume 5473 of *LNCS*, pages 399–413. Springer, April 2009.
- [9] Dan Boneh and Xavier Boyen. Short signatures without random oracles. In Christian Cachin and Jan Camenisch, editors, *EUROCRYPT 2004*, volume 3027 of *LNCS*, pages 56–73. Springer, May 2004.
- [10] Dan Boneh and Matthew K. Franklin. Identity-based encryption from the Weil pairing. In Joe Kilian, editor, *CRYPTO 2001*, volume 2139 of *LNCS*, pages 213–229. Springer, August 2001.
- [11] Dan Boneh, Shai Halevi, Michael Hamburg, and Rafail Ostrovsky. Circular-secure encryption from decision Diffie–Hellman. In David Wagner, editor, *CRYPTO 2008*, volume 5157 of *LNCS*, pages 108–125. Springer, August 2008.
- [12] David Cash, Eike Kiltz, and Victor Shoup. The twin Diffie–Hellman problem and applications. In Nigel P. Smart, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2008*, volume 4965 of *LNCS*, pages 127–145. Springer, April 2008.
- [13] Jie Chen and Hoeteck Wee. Fully, (almost) tightly secure IBE and dual system groups. In Ran Canetti and Juan A. Garay, editors, *CRYPTO 2013, Part II*, volume 8043 of *LNCS*, pages 435–460. Springer, August 2013a. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40084-1\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40084-1_25).
- [14] Jie Chen and Hoeteck Wee. Fully, (almost) tightly secure IBE from standard assumptions. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Report 2013/803, 2013b. <http://eprint.iacr.org/2013/803>.
- [15] Jie Chen and Hoeteck Wee. Dual system groups and its applications — compact hibe and more. *Cryptology ePrint Archive*, Report 2014/265, 2014. <http://eprint.iacr.org/>.
- [16] Jie Chen, Junqing Gong, and Jian Weng. Tightly secure IBE under constant-size master public key. *LNCS*, pages 207–231. Springer, 2017. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54365-8\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54365-8_9).
- [17] David Mandell Freeman. Converting pairing-based cryptosystems from composite-order groups to prime-order groups. In Henri Gilbert, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2010*, volume 6110 of *LNCS*, pages 44–61. Springer, May 2010.
- [18] David Galindo, Sebastià Martín Molleví, Paz Morillo, and Jorge Luis Villar. Easy verifiable primitives and practical public key cryptosystems. In Colin Boyd and Wenbo Mao, editors, *ISC 2003*, volume 2851 of *LNCS*, pages 69–83. Springer, October 2003.
- [19] Sanjam Garg, Romain Gay, and Mohammad Hajiabadi. Master-key KDM-secure IBE from pairings. In *LNCS*, pages 123–152. Springer, 2020. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45374-9\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45374-9_5).
- [20] Romain Gay, Dennis Hofheinz, Eike Kiltz, and Hoeteck Wee. Tightly CCA-secure encryption without pairings. *LNCS*, pages 1–27. Springer, 2016. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49890-3\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49890-3_1).
- [21] Romain Gay, Dennis Hofheinz, and Lisa Kohl. Kurosawa-desmedt meets tight security. *LNCS*, pages 133–160. Springer, 2017. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63697-9\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63697-9_5).



- [22] Craig Gentry. Practical identity-based encryption without random oracles. In Serge Vaudenay, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2006*, volume 4004 of *LNCS*, pages 445–464. Springer, May / June 2006.
- [23] Craig Gentry and Shai Halevi. Hierarchical identity based encryption with polynomially many levels. In Omer Reingold, editor, *TCC 2009*, volume 5444 of *LNCS*, pages 437–456. Springer, March 2009.
- [24] Junqing Gong, Jie Chen, Xiaolei Dong, Zhenfu Cao, and Shaohua Tang. Extended nested dual system groups, revisited. *LNCS*, pages 133–163. Springer, 2016a. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49384-7\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49384-7_6).
- [25] Junqing Gong, Xiaolei Dong, Zhenfu Cao, and Jie Chen. Almost-tight identity based encryption against selective opening attack. *The Computer Journal*, 59 (11): 1669–1688, 2016b. <https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/bxw030>.
- [26] Junqing Gong, Xiaolei Dong, Jie Chen, and Zhenfu Cao. Efficient IBE with tight reduction to standard assumption in the multi-challenge setting. *LNCS*, pages 624–654. Springer, December 2016c. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53890-6\\_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53890-6_21).
- [27] Jens Groth and Amit Sahai. Efficient non-interactive proof systems for bilinear groups. In Nigel P. Smart, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2008*, volume 4965 of *LNCS*, pages 415–432. Springer, April 2008.
- [28] Dennis Hofheinz. Adaptive partitioning. *LNCS*, pages 489–518. Springer, 2017. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56617-7\\_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56617-7_17).
- [29] Dennis Hofheinz and Tibor Jager. Tightly secure signatures and public-key encryption. In Reihaneh Safavi-Naini and Ran Canetti, editors, *CRYPTO 2012*, volume 7417 of *LNCS*, pages 590–607. Springer, August 2012.
- [30] Dennis Hofheinz, Jessica Koch, and Christoph Striecks. Identity-based encryption with (almost) tight security in the multi-instance, multi-ciphertext setting. In *PKC 2015*, *LNCS*, pages 799–822. Springer, 2015. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46447-2\\_36](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46447-2_36).
- [31] Dennis Hofheinz, Dingding Jia, and Jiaxin Pan. Identity-based encryption tightly secure under chosen-ciphertext attacks. *LNCS*, pages 190–220. Springer, December 2018. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03329-3\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03329-3_7).
- [32] Roman Langrehr and Jiaxin Pan. Tightly secure hierarchical identity-based encryption. *LNCS*, pages 436–465. Springer, 2019. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17253-4\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17253-4_15).
- [33] Roman Langrehr and Jiaxin Pan. Unbounded HIBE with tight security. *LNCS*, pages 129–159. Springer, December 2020a. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64834-3\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64834-3_5).
- [34] Roman Langrehr and Jiaxin Pan. Tightly secure hierarchical identity-based encryption. *Journal of Cryptology*, 33 (4): 1787–1821, 2020b. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00145-020-09356-x>.
- [35] Roman Langrehr and Jiaxin Pan. Hierarchical identity-based encryption with tight multi-challenge security. *LNCS*, pages 153–183. Springer, 2020c. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45374-9\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45374-9_6).
- [36] Allison B. Lewko. Tools for simulating features of composite order bilinear groups in the prime order setting. In David Pointcheval and Thomas Johansson, editors, *EUROCRYPT 2012*, volume 7237 of *LNCS*, pages 318–335. Springer, April 2012.
- [37] Benoît Libert, Marc Joye, Moti Yung, and Thomas Peters. Concise multi-challenge CCA-secure encryption and signatures with almost tight security. In *Proceedings of ASIACRYPT 2014*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2014.
- [38] Brent Waters. Dual system encryption: Realizing fully secure IBE and HIBE under simple assumptions. In Shai Halevi, editor, *CRYPTO 2009*, volume 5677 of *LNCS*, pages 619–636. Springer, August 2009.