

Directed Threshold Multi – Signature Scheme without SDC

Sunder Lal * and Manoj Kumar **

* Dept of Mathematics, IBS Khandari, Dr. B.R.A. University Agra.
Sunder_lal2@rediffmail.com.in.

** Dept of Mathematics, HCST, Farah – Mathura, [U. P.] – 281122.
yamu_balyan@yahoo.co.in

Abstract. In this paper, we propose a **Directed threshold multisignature scheme without SDC**. This signature scheme is applicable when the message is sensitive to the signature receiver; and the signatures are generated by the cooperation of a number of people from a given group of senders. In this scheme, any malicious set of signers cannot impersonate any other set of signers to forge the signatures. In case of forgery, it is possible to trace the signing set.

Key words. Digital signature, Directed signatures, Multi-signatures, Threshold-signatures, Lagrange interpolation, discrete logarithm problems.

1. Introduction

Digital signature is a cryptographic tool to authenticate electronic communications. Digital signature scheme allows a user with a public key and a corresponding private key to sign a document in such a way that anyone can verify the signature on the document (using her/his public key), but no one can forge the signature on any other document. This self-authentication is required for some applications of digital signatures such as certification by some authority.

In most situations, the signer is generally a single person. However, in some cases the message is sent by one organization and requires the approval or consent of several people. In these cases, the signature generation is done by more than one consenting person. A common example of this policy is a large bank transaction, by one organization, which requires the signature of more than one partner. Such a policy could be implemented by having a separate digital signature for every required signer, but this solution increases the effort to verify the message linearly with the number of signer. To solve this problems, Multisignature schemes [10,11,13,17,18] and threshold signature schemes [5,6,7,9,12,20] are used where more than one signers share the responsibility of signing messages

Threshold signatures are closely related to the concept of threshold cryptography, first introduced by Desmedt [5, 6, 7]. In 1991, Desmedt and Frankel [6] proposed the first (t, n) threshold digital signature scheme based on the RSA system. In (t, n) threshold signature scheme, any subgroup of t or more shareholders of the designated group can generate a valid group signature in such a way that the verifier can check the validity of the signature without identifying the identities of the signers. In threshold schemes, when any t or more shareholders act in collusion, they can impersonate any other set of shareholders to forge the signatures. In this case, the malicious set of signers does not have any

responsibility for the signatures and it is impossible to trace the signers. Unfortunately, with threshold schemes proposed so far, this problem cannot be solved.

In multisignature schemes, the signers of a multisignature are identified in the beginning and the validity of the multisignature has to be verified with the help of identities of the signers. For multisignature, it is indeed unnecessary to put a threshold value to restrict the number of signers. Consider the situation, where a group of anonymous members would have to generate a multisignature. The members of this group use pseudonyms as their identities in the public directory. What concerns the verifier most is that at least t members sign a message and they indeed come from that group. Nevertheless, the verifier has no way to verify whether a user is in fact a member of that group because of the anonymity of the membership. In this case, the multisignature schemes cannot solve this problems, however, the threshold signature schemes do.

On the other hands, there are so many situations, when the signed message is sensitive to the signature receiver. Signatures on medical records, tax information and most personal/business transactions are such situations. Signatures used in such situations are called directed signatures [1, 2, 3, 14, 15, 19, 23, 24]. In directed signature scheme, the signature receiver has full control over the signature verification process and can prove the validity of the signature to any third party, whenever necessary. Nobody can check the validity of signature without his cooperation.

Many threshold signature schemes require a **trusted SDC** to generate the group secret keys and secret shares of group members, which have a single point of vulnerability. The existence of such a center is not a reasonable assumption; there are two potential problems.

- First, for many applications, there is no one person or devices which cab be completely trusted by all members of the group.
- Second, the use of a key center creates a single point failure. Any security lapse at the key center can reveal the private key.

To avoid these problems, in 1992, Harn introduced a scheme based on a modified ElGamal signature scheme, which does not require a trusted SDC [10]. Each member works as a SDC, generates and distributes the secret shares for each user. In this paper, we proposed a ***Directed - Threshold Multi - Signature Scheme without SDC.***

2. Directed - Threshold Multi - Signature Scheme without SDC

In this scheme, each shareholder works as a SDC to generate his secret key and distribute the corresponding secret shares to other shareholders. In advance, all the shareholders are agree for the public parameters. We assume that there is a **designated combiner DC** who takes the responsibility to collect and verify each partial signature and then produce a group signature. **Nevertheless, there is no partial secret information of the other users associated with the DC.**

2.1. Group Public Key and Secret Shares Generation Phase

- (a). All the members of the organization S agree to select the group public parameters p, q, g, h and a common random secret K .
- (b). Each member i in G_S computes $W = g^{-K} \bmod p$.
- (c). Each member i in G_S randomly selects a $(t-1)$ th degree polynomial $f_i(x)$ secretly and an integer $u_{S_i} \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ publicly.
- (d). Each member i in G_S computes partial group public key $y_i = g^{f_i(0)} \bmod p$.
- (e). The group public key y_S is given by $y_S = \prod_{i \in G_S} y_i \bmod p$.
- (f). Each member i in G_S works as SDC. He selects a random secret $h_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ and computes the secret value l_{ij} and public value m_{ij}, n_{ij} for $j \neq i$, as,

$$l_{ij} = [h_{ij} + f_i(u_{S_i})] \bmod q,$$

$$m_{ij} = g^{l_{ij}} \bmod p \text{ and } n_{ij} = g^{h_{ij}} \bmod p.$$

- (g). Each member i in G_S computes a public value v_{S_j} for each member $j \neq i$, of the group G_S , as, $v_{S_j} = l_{ij} \cdot y_{S_j}^K \bmod p$.

Here, y_{S_j} is the public key associated with each user j in the group G_S .

- (h). Each member i in G_S sends $v_{S_{ij}}$ to each member $j \neq i$, through a public channel.

2.2. Partial Signature Generation by any t Members and Verification

If any t members of the organization out of n members agree to sign a message m for a person R . R possesses a pair (x_R, y_R) . Then the signature generation has the following steps.

- (a). Each member $i, i \in H_S$, randomly selects K_{i_1} and $K_{i_2} \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ and computes

$$u_i = g^{-K_{i_2}} \bmod p, v_i = g^{K_{i_1}} \bmod p \text{ and } w_i = g^{K_{i_1}} y_R^{K_{i_2}} \bmod p.$$

- (b). Each member makes u_i, w_i publicly and v_i secretly available to each member of H_S . Once all u_i, v_i and w_i are available, each member $i, i \in H_S$ computes the product U_S, V_S, W_S and a hash value R_S , as,

$$U_S = \prod_{i \in H_S} u_i \text{ mod } q, \quad V_S = \prod_{i \in H_S} v_i \text{ mod } q,$$

$$W_S = \prod_{i \in H_S} w_i \text{ mod } q, \text{ and } R_S = h(V_S, m) \text{ mod } q.$$

(c). Each member $i, i \in H_S$ recovers his/her secret share l_{ji} , as,

$$l_{ji} = v_{S_{ji}} W^{x_{S_i}} \text{ mod } p. \quad (j \neq i.)$$

(d). Each member $i, i \in H_S$ computes a value $C_i = \prod_{k \in H_S, k \neq i} \frac{(0 - u_{S_k})}{(u_{S_i} - u_{S_k})} \text{ mod } q.$

(e). Each member of H_S computes his/her modified shadow $MS_{S_i} = \sum_{j \in G_S, j \neq H_S} l_{ji} \cdot C_i \text{ mod } q.$

(f). Each member $i, i \in H_S$ uses his/her modified shadow, MS_{S_i} and a value s_i , as

$$s_i = [K_i + (f_i(0) + MS_{S_i}) \cdot R_S] \text{ mod } q.$$

(g). Each member $i, i \in H_S$ sends his partial signature to the designated combiner DC . DC verify the partial signature (s_i, v_i, C_i, R_S) by the relation,

$$g^{s_i} \stackrel{?}{\equiv} v_i \cdot \left(y_i \prod_{j \in G_S, j \neq H_S} m_{ji}^{C_i} \right)^{R_S} \text{ mod } p.$$

If the above equation holds, then the partial signature (s_i, v_i, C_i, R) for shareholder i is valid.

2.3. Group Signature Generation.

(a). DC can compute the group signature $S_S = \sum_{i=1}^l s_i \text{ mod } q$ by combining all the partial signature.

(b). DC sends $\{S_S, U_S, W_S, m\}$ as signature of the group S for the message m to R .

2.4. Signature Verification by R

To verify the validity of the group signature $\{S_S, U_S, W_S, m\}$ the verifier R needs is/her secret key x_R . This sub-section consists of the following steps.

(a). The verifier R computes a verification value $E = \prod_{i \in H_S} \left(\left(\prod_{j \in G_S, j \neq H_S} n_{ji} \right)^{C_i} \right) \text{ mod } p.$

(b). Only the verifier R can recover the values R_R and R_S , as

$$R_R = W_S \cdot U_S^{x_R} \text{ mod } p \text{ and } R_S = h(V_S, m).$$

- (c). The verifier R uses the congruence $g^{S_S} \stackrel{?}{\equiv} R_R \cdot (E \cdot y_S)^{R_S} \text{ mod } p$ to check the validity the signature. If this congruence holds, then the group signature $\{S_S, U_S, W_S, m\}$ is valid signature of the organization S on the message m .

2.5. Proof of Validity by R to any third Party C

(a). R computes $\mu = U_S^{x_R} \text{ mod } p$ and $R_R = \mu \cdot W_S \text{ mod } p$.

(b). R sends $\{R_R, E, S_S, U_S, m, \mu\}$ to C .

- (c). C recovers $R_S = h(R_R, m)$ and uses the following congruence to check the validity of the signature

$$g^{S_S} \stackrel{?}{\equiv} R_R \cdot (E \cdot y_S)^{R_S} \text{ mod } p.$$

If this does not hold C stops the process; otherwise goes to the next step.

- (d) In a zero knowledge fashion R proves to C that $\log_{U_S} \mu = \log_g y_R$ as follows:-

- C chooses random $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ computes $w = (U_S)^u \cdot g^v \text{ mod } p$ and sends w to R .
- R chooses random $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ computes $\beta = w \cdot g^\alpha \text{ mod } p$, $\gamma = \beta^{x_R} \text{ mod } p$ and sends β, γ to C .
- C sends u, v to R , by which R can verify that $w = (U_S)^u \cdot g^v \text{ mod } p$.
- R sends α to C , by which she can verify that

$$\beta = (U_S)^u \cdot g^{v+\alpha} \text{ mod } p, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = (\mu)^u \cdot y_R^{v+\alpha} \text{ mod } p.$$

3. Security Discussions

In this sub-section, we shall discuss the security aspects of proposed scheme. Here we shall discuss several possible attacks and show that, none of these can successfully break the system.

- (a). Is it possible to retrieve the partial secret keys $f_i(0)$, $i \in G_S$?

This is as difficult as solving discrete logarithm problem. No one can get the partial group public key y_i , since f_i is the randomly and secretly selected polynomial by the member i . On the other hand, by using the public keys y_S no one also get the partial secret keys $f_i(0)$ because

$$y_i = g^{f_i(0)} \text{ mod } p \text{ and } y_S = \prod_{i \in G_S} y_i \text{ mod } p.$$

- (b). Is it possible to retrieve the secret share l_{ij} from the equation

$$l_{ij} = [h_{ij} + f_i(u_{S_i})] \text{ mod } q ?$$

No, because f_i is the randomly and secretly selected polynomial and h_{ij} is also a randomly and secretly selected integer by the member i .

(c). Is it possible to retrieve the secret share l_{ij} from the equation

$$m_{ij} = g^{l_{ij}} \pmod p ?$$

No, because this is as difficult as solving discrete logarithm problem.

(d). Is it possible to retrieve the secret share l_{ij} from the equation

$$v_{S_{ij}} = l_{ij} \cdot y_{S_j}^K \pmod p?$$

No because K is a randomly and secretly selected common integer.

(e). Is it possible to retrieve the secret shares l_{ij} from the equation

$$l_{ji} = v_{S_{ji}} W^{x_{S_i}} \pmod p?$$

Only the user i can recover his secret shares l_{ij} because x_{S_i} is secret key of the user i .

(f). Can one retrieve the modified shadow MS_{S_i} from the equation

$$MS_{S_i} = \sum_{j \in G_S, j \notin H_S} l_{ji} \cdot C_i \pmod q ?$$

It is impossible to collect the modified shadow MS_{S_i} from the equation because all l_{ij} are secret information shared by the users.

(g). Is it possible that the designated combiner DC retrieve the any partial information from the equation

$$S_S = \sum_{i \in H_S} s_i \pmod q ?$$

Obviously, this is computationally infeasible for DC .

(h). Is it possible to that any one can impersonate a user $i \in H$?

A forger may try to impersonate a user $i \in H_S$, by randomly selecting two integers K_{i_1} and $K_{i_2} \in \mathbb{Z}q$ and broadcasting u_i , v_i and w_i . But without knowing the secret shares l_{ij} and R_S , it is difficult to generate a valid partial signature s_i to satisfy the verification equations,

$$g^{s_i} \stackrel{?}{\equiv} v_i \cdot \left(y_i \prod_{j \in G_S, j \notin H_S} m_{ji}^{C_i} \right)^{R_S} \pmod p.$$

(g). Is it possible to that any one can forge a signature $\{S_S, U_S, W_S, m\}$ by the following equation

$$g^{S_S} \stackrel{?}{\equiv} R_R \cdot (E \cdot y_S)^{R_S} \pmod p ?$$

A forger may randomly selects an integer R_R and then computes the hash value R_S such that $R_S = h(R_R, m) \bmod q$, obviously to compute the integer S_S is equivalent to solving the discrete logarithm problem. On the other hand, the forger can randomly select R_S and S_S first, then try to determine a value R_R that satisfies the signature verification equation. However, according to the property of the hash function h , it is quite impossible. Thus, this attack will not be successful.

4. Illustration

For illustration, Suppose $|G_S| = 7$, $|H_S| = 4$, $p = 47$, $q = 23$, $g = 3$, $K = 11$ and $W = 12$.

Group public Key and Secret Shares Generation Phase

(a). All the users compute their secret and public values, which are given by the following table.

VALUE USER	Secret $f_i(x)$	Secret $f_i(0)$	Public u	Public y_i	Secret x_{S_i}	Public y_{S_i}
User-S ₁	$7 + 12x^3$	7	9	25	9	37
User-S ₂	$9 + 11x^3$	9	13	37	11	4
User-S ₃	$14 + 8x^3$	14	15	14	13	36
User-S ₄	$17 + 3x^3$	17	11	2	19	18
User-S ₅	$13 + 7x^3$	13	18	36	5	8
User-S ₆	$18 + 15x^3$	18	19	6	10	17
User-S ₇	$21 + 15x^3$	21	21	21	14	14

(b). The group public key y_S is given by $y_S = 25$.

(c). User- S₁ makes the following table.

VALUE USER	secret h_{ij}	secret l_{ij}	public m_{ij}	public n_{ij}	public v_{ij}
User - S ₂	14	4	34	14	2
User - S ₃	9	13	36	37	10
User - S ₄	11	5	8	4	45
User - S ₅	15	17	2	42	18
User - S ₆	17	15	42	2	43
User - S ₇	13	16	32	36	42

(d). User- S_2 makes the following table.

VALUE \ USER	Secret	Secret	Public	Public	Public
	h_{2j}	l_{2j}	m_{2j}	n_{2j}	v_{2j}
User - S_1	13	14	14	36	21
User - S_3	14	3	27	14	24
User - S_4	9	8	28	17	25
User - S_5	7	21	21	25	25
User - S_6	16	11	4	8	19
User - S_7	3	16	32	27	42

(e). User- S_3 and makes the following table.

VALUE \ USER	Secret	Secret	Public	Public	Public
	h_{3j}	l_{3j}	m_{3j}	n_{3j}	v_{3j}
User - S_1	7	11	4	25	40
User - S_2	10	5	8	17	26
User - S_4	11	1	3	4	9
User - S_5	13	16	32	36	28
User - S_6	19	4	34	18	24
User - S_7	21	17	2	21	27

(f). User- S_4 makes the following table.

VALUE \ USER	Secret	Secret	Public	Public	Public
	h_{4j}	l_{4j}	m_{4j}	n_{4j}	v_{4j}
User - S_1	19	15	14	18	46
User - S_2	13	20	7	36	10
User - S_3	11	10	17	4	33
User - S_5	6	16	32	24	28
User - S_6	8	17	2	28	8
User - S_7	18	11	4	6	23

(g).User- S_5 makes the following table.

VALUE \ USER	Secret	Secret	Public	Public	Public
	h_{5j}	l_{5j}	m_{5j}	n_{5j}	v_{5j}
User – S_1	6	16	32	24	24
User – S_2	17	22	16	2	11
User – S_3	18	15	42	6	26
User – S_4	13	5	8	36	45
User – S_6	19	21	21	18	32
User – S_7	8	11	4	28	23

(h).User- S_6 makes the following table

VALUE \ USER	Secret	Secret	Public	Public	Public
	h_{6j}	l_{6j}	m_{6j}	n_{6j}	v_{6j}
User – S_1	2	7	25	9	34
User – S_2	5	19	18	8	33
User – S_3	7	4	34	25	32
User – S_4	11	7	25	4	16
User – S_5	13	19	18	36	45
User – S_7	12	2	9	12	17

(i).User- S_7 makes the following table.

VALUE \ USER	Secret	Secret	Public	Public	Public
	h_{7j}	l_{7j}	m_{7j}	n_{7j}	v_{7j}
User – S_1	11	19	18	4	5
User – S_2	13	7	25	36	27
User – S_3	15	15	42	42	26
User – S_4	17	16	32	2	3
User – S_5	14	8	28	16	14
User – S_6	12	16	32	12	2

Partial Signature Generation by any t Users

If any four members $S_2, S_4, S_6,$ and S_7 are agree to sign a message m for a person R , possessing $x_R = 7, y_R = 25$, then the signature generation has the following steps.

- (a). S_2 randomly selects $K_{2_1} = 11, K_{2_2} = 13$ and computes $u_2 = 1, v_2 = 4$ and $w_2 = 17$.
- (b). S_4 randomly selects $K_{4_1} = 10, K_{4_2} = 12$ and computes $u_4 = 4, v_4 = 17$ and $w_4 = 9$.
- (c). S_6 randomly selects $K_{6_1} = 14, K_{6_2} = 17$ and computes $u_6 = 24, v_6 = 14$ and $w_6 = 6$.
- (d). S_7 randomly selects $K_{7_1} = 18, K_{7_2} = 5$ and computes $u_7 = 6, v_7 = 6$ and $w_7 = 25$.
- (e). Each user computes $U_S = 16, R_R = 25, W_S = 14$ and $R_S = h(25, m) = 7$. (let).
- (f). S_2 recovers his shares $l_{12} = 4, l_{32} = 5, l_{52} = 22$ and $C_2 = 1, MS_2 = 8, s_2 = 15$.
- (g). S_4 recovers his shares $l_{14} = 5, l_{34} = 1, l_{54} = 5$ and $C_4 = 11, MS_4 = 6, s_4 = 10$.
- (h). S_6 recovers his shares $l_{16} = 15, l_{36} = 4, l_{56} = 21$ and $C_6 = 9, MS_6 = 15, s_6 = 15$.
- (i). S_7 recovers his shares $l_{17} = 16, l_{37} = 17, l_{57} = 11$ and $C_7 = 3, MS_7 = 17, s_7 = 8$.

Partial Signature Verification and Signature Generation by DC

- (a) **DC** verifies each partial signature. For example for user $S_2, s_2 = 15, v_2 = 4, m_{12} = 34, m_{32} = 8, m_{52} = 16, y_{S_2} = 37, R_S = 7, C_2 = 12$, and check $3^{16} \equiv 4 \cdot 37^7 (34 \cdot 8 \cdot 16)^7 \pmod{47}$. This holds. Similarly, he checks other partial signatures.
- (b). **DC** computes a group value $S_S = 2$ and sends $\{2, 16, 14, m\}$ as signature of the group S for the message m .

Signature Verification by the Person R

- (a). The verifier R computes a verification value $E = 12$.
- (b). The verifier R can recovers the values $R_R = 25$ and $R_S = 7$.
- (c). The verifier R uses the congruence $3^2 \equiv 25 \pmod{47}$ to check the validity of the signature.

This congruence holds, so the group signature $\{2, 16, 14, m\}$ is valid signature of the group S on the message m for the person R .

Proof of Validity by R to any third Party C

- (a). R computes $\mu = 32, R_R = 25$ and sends $\{25, 12, 2, 16, m, 32\}$ to C .
- (b). C recovers $R_S = 7$ and check the concurrence $3^2 \equiv 25 \pmod{47}$ for the validity of the signature. This holds; so, C goes to the next steps.
- (c). R in a zero knowledge fashion proves to C that $\log_{16} 32 = \log_3 25$ as follows:-

- C chooses random $u = 13, v = 15$ and computes $w = 9$ and sends w to R .

- R chooses random $\alpha = 11$ computes $\beta = 36$, $\gamma = 16$ and sends β , γ to C .
- C sends u, v to R , by which R can verify that $w = 9$.
- R sends α to C , by which she can verify that $\beta = 36$ and $\gamma = 16$.

5. Remarks

In this paper, we have proposed a **Directed –Threshold Multi - signature Scheme without SDC**. In this scheme,

- **Each shareholder works as a SDC** to generate his secret key and distribute the corresponding secret shares to other shareholders.
- There is a **designated combiner DC** who takes the responsibility to collect and verify each partial signature and then produce a group signature, **but no secret information is associated with the DC** .
- Any malicious set of signers cannot impersonate any other set of signers to forge the signatures. In case of forgery, it is possible to trace the signing set.
- Any t or more shareholders acting in collusion cannot conspire to reconstruct the group secret key by providing their own secret shares.

References

1. Boyar, J., Chaum D., Damgard I. and Pederson T., (1991), Convertible undeniable signatures. *Advances in Cryptology – Crypto*, 90, LNCS # 537,p.p.189-205.
2. Chaum D. (1991). Zero- knowledge undeniable signatures. *Advances in Cryptology – Eurocrypt*, 90, LNCS # 473,p.p.458-464.
3. Chaum D. (1995). Designated confirmer signatures, *Advances in Cryptology Euro crypt*, 94 LNCS # 950,p.p.86-91.
4. Diffie W. and Hellman M. (1976), New directions in Cryptography, *IEEE Trans. Info.Theory*.31.pp. 644 - 654.
5. Desmedt, Y. (1988). Society and group oriented cryptography. In *Advances in Cryptology – Crypto -87, Proceedings*. p.p. 457-469. New York: Springer Verlag.
6. Desmedt, Y. and Frankel Y. (1991). Shared Generation of Authenticators and Signatures. In *Advances in Cryptology –Crypto -91, Proceedings*. p.p. 457-469. New York: Springer Verlag.
7. Desmedt, Y. (1994). Threshold cryptography. *European Transactions on Telecommunications and Related Technologies*.Vol. 5,No. 4, p.p.35 – 43.
8. Guillou, L.C. and Quisquater J.J. (1988), A practical zero-knowledge protocol fitted to security microprocessors minimizing both transmission and memory. “*Advances in Cryptology –Eurocrypt*, 88, LNCS # 330,p.p.123 - 128.
9. Gennaro R., Jarecki Hkrawczyk S., and Rabin T. (1996). Robust threshold DSS signature. *Advances in Cryptology – Euro Crypto - 96, Proceedings*. p.p.354 - 371. Berlin-Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
10. Harn L. and Kiesler T. (1989). New Scheme for Digital Multisignatures.*Electronic Letters*. 25(15): p.p. 1002-1003.
11. Hardjono T. and Zheng Y. (1992). A practical Digital Multisignature Scheme Based on DLP. *Advance in cryptology –Auscrypt-92*, p.p. 16 – 21.
12. Harn L. (1993). (t, n) Threshold signature scheme and digital multisignature. *Workshop on cryptography and Data security, Proceedings*. June 7-9: p.p.61-73. Chung Cheng Institute of Technology, ROC.
13. Itakura K. and Nakamura K. (1983). A Public Key C cryptosystem Suitable for Digital Multisignatures.*NEC Research and Develop*.p.p.1-8.
14. Lim C.H. and Lee P.J. (1993). Modified Maurer-Yacobi, scheme and its applications. *Advance in cryptology –Auscrypt*, LNCS # 718, p.p. 308 – 323.
15. Lim C.H. and P.J.Lee. (1996). Security Protocol, In *Proceedings of International Workshop*, (Cambridge, United Kingdom), Springer-Verlag, LNCS # 1189.
16. Mullin R.C., Blake I.F., Fuji – Hara R. and Vanstone S.A. (1985). Computing Logarithms in a finite field of characteristic two. *SIAM J. Alg.Disc.Meth*. p.p.276 – 285.
17. Okamoto T. (1988). A digital Multi-signature scheme using bijective PKC. *ACM transactions on computer systems*, Vol 6, No - 8, p.p. 432-441.
18. Ohta K. and Okamoto T. (1991). A digital multisignature scheme based on Fiat- Shamir scheme. *Advance in Cryptology Asiacypt-91* p.p. 75 – 79.
19. Okamoto T. (1994), Designated confirmer signatures and public key encryption are equivalent. *Advances in Cryptology – Crypto*, 94 LNCS # 839, p.p.61-74.
20. Rabin, T. (1998). A simplified approach to threshold and proactive RSA. In *Advances in Cryptology –Crypto -98, Proceedings*. p.p. 89-104. New York: Springer Verlag.

21. Shamir A. (1979). How to share a secret, *communications of the ACM*, 22: p.p. 612 - 613.
22. Schnorr C.P. (1994). Efficient signature generation by smart cards, *Journal of Cryptology*, 4(3), p.p.161-174.
23. Sunder Lal and Manoj Kumar. (2003). A directed signature scheme and its applications. Proceedings, National Conference on Information Security, New Delhi, 8-9 Jan 2003, p.p. 124 – 132.
24. Yen S.M. and Laih C.S. (1993). New digital signature scheme based on Discrete Logarithm, *Electronic Letters*, Vol. 29 No. 12 pp. 1120-1121.
25. Zheng, Y., Matsumoto T. and Imai H. (1990). Structural properties of one – way hash functions. *Advances in Cryptology – Crypto, 90*, Proceedings, p.p. 285 – 302, Springer Verlag.



Manoj Kumar received the B.Sc. degree in mathematics from Meerut University Meerut, in 1993; the M. Sc. in Mathematics (Goldmedalist) from C.C.S.University Meerut, in 1995; the M.Phil. (Goldmedalist) in *Cryptography*, from Dr. B.R.A. University Agra, in 1996, completed the Ph.D. in applied Mathematics, in 2003. He also taught applied Mathematics at DAV College, Muzaffarnagar, India from Sep 1999 to March 2001; at S.D. College of Engineering & Technology, Muzaffarnagar, and U.P., India from March 2001 to Nov 2001; at

Hindustan College of Science & Technology, Farah, Mathura, continue since Nov 2001. He also qualified the *National Eligibility Test* (NET), conducted by *Council of Scientific and Industrial Research* (CSIR), New Delhi- India, in 2000. He is a member of Indian Mathematical Society, Indian Society of Mathematics and Mathematical Science, Ramanujan Mathematical society, and Cryptography Research Society of India. His current research interests include Cryptography, Numerical analysis, Pure and Applied Mathematics.