Analyzing Cryptographic Functions in Java for JIT-Based Sidechannels

William Eiers

June 20, 2018

Abstract

In the context of runtime systems, security is of utmost importance, especially for cryptographic functions. One particular class of vulnerabilities, side-channel vulnerabilities, have seen increasing popularity hackers due to both its subtlety and complexity. Most side-channel attacks take advantage of the fact that to compute anything, it takes both time and space to do so. Programs containing side-channel vulnerabilities leak information through which a potential attacker can learn secret information simply by observing the programs execution. Many side-channels are simply present because of bad-code practices, but others are much more subtle. In this project, we aim to investigate side-channel vulnerabilities arising from Just-In-Time (JIT) compilation of Java cryptographic functions (such as ModPow), where potential vulnerabilities not originally present in the source code may arise from JIT optimizations.

1 Introduction and Motivation

Side-channel attacks against software have become more popular in recent years. Optimizations within core algorithms used in software are implemented by developers, causing different execution paths to be taken during program execution. Such optimizations can cause the program to spend longer amounts of time or use different amounts of memory, depending on the inputs to the program. This creates a side-channel, a way for an outside agent to possibly learn secret information using observable differences in resource usage [2, 5, 6]. Developerintroduced optimizations are just one way a side-channel can be realized. However, optimizations can be implemented automatically, possibly by a compiler during code generation. Runtime systems, such as the Java Virtual Machine (JVM), operate on architecture-independent bytecode by interpreting it into architecture-dependent code on execution. This causes a huge performance hit, however, as interpretation is orders-of-magnitute slower than compiled code. The JVM gets some of this performance back by introducing runtime optimizations, such as method compilation or compiling paths which are taken multiple times. These optimizations create a case much similar to the one above, where developers inadverdently induce a side-channel. In cryptographic functions, such as the Java BigInteger method modPow, a single invocation causes specific paths to be "heated up" allowing the JVM to optimize these paths due to properties of secret values, such as the private exponent. By gaining some performance back, it is possible that the JVM introduces a side-channel, possibly leaking information about secret values.

1.1 Outline

In this report, we aim to investigate how the Java HotSpot Virtual Machine affects the presence of side-channels, mainly in the context of cryptographic functions. Specifically, we explore the effect of Just-In-Time compiler optimizations with the following questions in mind:

- What is Just-In-Time compilation?
- In what ways can Just-In-Time compilation impact the presence or strength of side-channels?
- Can cryptographic functions leak information due to JIT optimizations?

All experiments were run on an Intel i5-6600K CPU at 3.5 GHz and 32GB of RAM, running the KDE Neon Linux 16.04 distribution. We used Java 8 SE, version 1.8.0_171, Java HotSpot(TM) 64-bit server Virtual Machine.

2 Just-In-Time (JIT) Compilation

The JIT compiler is a runtime component of the Java Virutal Machine which aims to recover some of the performance lost due to interpretation of architectureindependent bytecode. Normally, at runtime Java class files are loaded into the JVM and interpreted line-by-line, causing a huge overhead for each instruction. When JIT is enabled, the JIT compiler interacts with the JVM and attempts to compile code it sees as being importance to performance. For example, the first time a method is invoked, the JIT compiler will compile the method, introducing a small overhead during the initial invocation. Subsequent calls to the method will use the compiled bytecode, rather than intepreting the code lineby-line, boosting performance tremendously. If the method is taken multiple times, the JIT compiler will attempt to optimize the method even further. The possible levels of compilation include five tiers, from purely interpreted (L0) to purely optimized (L4). In this report, we specifically look at the effects of L4 compilation in the context of the modular exponentiation function within the Java library. Other kinds of optimizations include (but are not limited to):

• *Method compilation.* Depending on how often a method is called, the method can be continually recompiled to the next optimization tier.

- *Branch prediction.* Similar to branch-prediction at the micro-architectural level, the HotSpot virtual machine keeps track of how often different conditional branches are taken, and uses this information to generate more efficient native code where the more frequent branch appears first.
- Optimistic compilation. As a method gets more rigorously compiled (towards the L4 level), if a particular branch is taken nearly all the time, HotSpot will optimize away the rarely taken branch, leaving an exceptionlike *trap* in its place.

3 Side-channel Attacks

Side-channels are indirect information channels in which an attacker can learn secret information just by observing differences in resource consumption through said channel. Essentially, side-channel attacks take advantage of the fact that for a program to compute anything useful, it must use some kind of resource to do so. This can be time, memory, or even power usage. This resource usage is secondary to the program's goal: that is, the resource usage is not the end goal of the program. Additionally, such usage tends to be observable: programs generally take varying amounts of time to perform a task based on the inputs received. For example, factoring a small number is computationally less expensive than factoring large numbers. A side-channel attack occurs when an attacker can use the observable differences leaked through the side-channel to learn secret information within the program. We consider one such case in the next section.

3.1 Insecure Password Checker

Consider the password checking method in Figure 1. This function checks whether a user-input string *guess* matches the stored password *password*, which we refer to as the secret value. This particular implementation walks character by character and returns as soon as it finds a mismatch. This optimization, however, introduces a side-channel in the code, causing the function to be insecure. Particularly, with no prior knowledge of the secret value, a potential attacker can leverage a side-channel attack by trying different passwords and measuring the time taken for the function to return.

To illustrate this timing difference, we assume the secret value (stored word) is *LEET* and measure the time it takes for the **passwordCheckerInsecure** to return on five different inputs to the JVM. The length of each input is 4, the same as the secret value. For zero matched characters, time taken was 200ns. Each matching character increased this value by 200ns, taking 800ns when all characters matched. While the timing difference is small, it is nonetheless observable, allowing an attacker to learn the secret password. When JIT was enabled, no characters matched took 45ns, one character 51ns, two characters 50ns, three characters 60ns, four characters 13617ns. The extreme timing of the last case is an example of a complex JIT compilation sequence, where either

```
public static boolean passwordCheckerInsecure(final String
  guess) {
    if (guess.length() != password.length())
        return false;
    for (int i = 0; i < guess.length(); ++i) {
        if (guess.charAt(i) != password.charAt(i)) {
            return false;
        }
    }
    return true;
}
```

Figure 1: Insecure Password checker Code.

the last invocation caused an uncommon trap to be triggered, or a new level of optimization to be induced.

3.2 Secure Password Checker

Ideally, if the passwordCheckerInsecure function took the same amount of time regardless of the input, then there would be no observable timing differences. To locate such imbalances, developers can use static analysis tenchniques [4, 7, 1, 3] to analyze program code and fix possible side-channels. This is the case for the passwordCheckerSecure function in Figure 2. The function is made secure by making sure all inputs take an equal amount of time to check the password. However, Just-In-Time compilers introduce various optimization techniques in the runtime dynamically which may introduce a timing imbalance, depending on the inputs.

```
public static boolean passwordCheckerSecure(final String
    password, final String guess) {
    boolean matched = true;
    for (int i = 0; i < password.length(); ++i) {
        if (guess.charAt(i) != password.charAt(i)) {
            matched = matched & false;
        } else {
            matched = matched & true;
        }
    }
    return matched;
}</pre>
```

Figure 2: Secure Password checker Code.

Our goal is to show that passwordCheckerSecure function may contain



Figure 3: Timing difference for two different heated paths. Time is in nanoseconds.

a JIT-induced side-channel. Our experiment setup considered two executions paths, one where no characters match, and one where only the first characters match. We consider the following approach:

- Prime the JVM environment a large number of times with a single input string which matches none of the characters of password
- Time a single invocation of secure password checker on a different value for both cases and compare the results

We assume both inputs are of length 4, and the secret password is again *LEET*. We performed 1000 trials of this process and averaged the result. The number of priming iterations was 40000. The results are shown in Figure 3. Clearly, when JIT is disabled (Figure 3a) we see no side-channel. When JIT is enabled (Figure 3b) we see a slight difference in the timing values. Again, the observable difference is small, but noticeable.

4 Case Study: Java ModPow

Side-channels, whether induced by the JIT compiler or by developers themselves, are much easier to detect when encompassed code is relatively small. Modern cryptographic functions contain much more code than the password checker example mentioned in Section 3.2. We consider the Java function BigInteger.modPow, for which the source code can be found in the Appendix A. The core of BigInteger.modPow function does only a small amount of work, relegating much of the computation to the functions BigInteger.oddModPow and BigInteger.montgomeryMultiply. The algorithm used is a variant of the sliding window algorithm equipped with montgomery multiplication. Given a base, exponent, and modulus the algorithm works as follows. Initially, if modulus is even, the algorithm separates it into an odd part (m_1) and a power of two (m_2) , exponentiates mod m_1 through BigInteger.oddModPow, manually exponentiates mod m_2 , and uses the Chinese Remainder Theorem to combine the results. If modulus is odd, the algorithm simply calls BigInteger.oddModPow to perform the modular exponentiation. Regardless of whether or not *modulus* is even, the majority of the work is done in the BigInteger.montgomeryMultiply function and its derivatives (implMontgomeryMultiply and montReduce).

Due to the large amount of code involved in even a single BigInteger.modPow invocation, and the limited time available for experimentation, we were unable to successfully induce a JIT-based side-channel in the code. Instead, we investigated the different levels of optimization induced by JIT compilation, exploring the possibility that a side-channel might be induced by carefully crafting input values which trigger the diffent levels of optimization. In particular, we focused on the number of times BigInteger.montgomeryMultiply was compiled to the L4 level, and the effect on timing the compilation induced. We considered ten randomly generated exponents, each with 20 digits and roughly equal in magnitude, and used a similar priming scheme as the one mentioned in Section 3.2. We used the following values for the base and modulus, as well as the exponent value we used for the single timing of BigInteger.modPow:

- base b = 5973054346545950711
- even modulus m = 1642726067283675822
- odd modulus m = 1642726067283675821
- text exponent e = 16768880304745619701

We experimented with priming values $p = \{21, 22\}$ and considered cases where the modulus was even and where the modulus was odd. For space reasons, the results for BigInteger.montgomeryMultiply are shown in Table 1, while the full results are shown in Appendix B. The second column shows how many times montgomeryMultiplication was invoked in a single modPow invocation. The interesting case is highlighted in Table 1, for the fifth exponent value e =21581371295657932221. In both cases, montgomeryMultiply was not compiled to the L4 level in any of the 100 trials when primed 21 times. When we primed for 22 times, montgomeryMultiply was compiled to L4 in most of the cases, resulting in a performance overhead in the timing of the last invocation. This occurred for both even and odd modulus, though the timing is more prevalent when the modulus was odd. Interestingly, in the timings for the even case for all the exponents are higher when the modulus was even. We believe this is due to the increased amount of work done when the modulus is even. While this clearly isn't a side-channel in and of itself, it gives credence to the idea that JIT compilation may be able to induce side-channels in rather complex blocks of code.

5 Conclusion

In this report we explored the possibility that Just-In-Time compilation optimizations within the context of runtime systems can inadverdently induce side-channels in previously secure code. Specifically, we investigated the JIT

Exponent	# Calls	n	P = 21	nP = 22		
Exponent	# Calls	# L4	Time	# L4	Time	
25730899574802462604	436	4	80941 (98%)	1	69815~(88%)	
24660523187409145475	436	9	81926 (99%)	2	69605~(87%)	
33649042240140657826	458	0	71057~(86%)	0	67897~(85%)	
28324482328545617634	436	2	81665~(98%)	4	65914 (83%)	
21581371295657932221	392	0	69231~(83%)	81	77826 (98%)	
25652608396773858801	436	5	80565~(97%)	3	68651 (86%)	
24341655831718219991	414	33	69864 (84%)	10	79685 (100%)	
23536477189379635045	436	0	78880 (95%)	3	69932~(88%)	
24020887706891028596	436	4	82994 (100%)	6	69765~(88%)	
25608332753867915599	436	1	80707~(97%)	3	69593~(87%)	

(a) Odd modulus

(b) Even modulus

Exponent	# Calls]	nP = 21	nP = 22			
Exponent	# Calls	# L4	Time	# L4	Time		
25730899574802462604	436	99	96145~(90%)	99	85493 (87%)		
24660523187409145475	436	100	95067~(89%)	100	87333 (89%)		
33649042240140657826	458	98	98635~(93%)	96	87591 (89%)		
28324482328545617634	436	99	98545~(92%)	98	89117 (90%)		
21581371295657932221	392	0	106599~(100%)	94	98678 (100%)		
25652608396773858801	436	98	96233~(90%)	99	85908 (87%)		
24341655831718219991	414	97	101209 (95%)	97	88342 (90%)		
23536477189379635045	436	99	95723~(90%)	99	86699 (88%)		
24020887706891028596	436	98	99169~(93%)	100	90106 (91%)		
25608332753867915599	436	100	95377~(89%)	98	84983 (86%)		

Table 1: The results for montgomery Multiplication during 100 modPow computations. Time is in nanoseconds, with the percentage this exponent took with respect to the mean timing of all exponents in parenthesis. component of the Java Hotspot Virtual Machine on a toy password checker example, and the real world implementation of the cryptographic function mod-Pow within the Java library. We were able to induce a side-channel in the password checker example, and showed promising results for the case of mod-Pow. Possible future work includes a deeper investigation of the effects of the JIT compiler on complex code blocks such as those found in modPow, and other cryptographic functions within the Java library. Our work shows that JIT-like optimizations in runtime systems can potentially induce a side-channel, or at least affect the strength of existing side-channels.

References

- Timos Antopoulos, Paul Gazzillo, Michael Hicks, Eric Koskinen, Tachio Terauchi, and Shiyi Wei. Decomposition instead of self-composition for ksafety. 2017.
- [2] David Brumley and Dan Boneh. Remote timing attacks are practical. Computer Networks, 48(5):701-716, 2005.
- [3] Jia Chen, Yu Feng, and Isil Dillig. Precise detection of side-channel vulnerabilities using quantitative cartesian hoare logic. In *Proceedings of the* 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, pages 875–890. ACM, 2017.
- [4] Boris Köpf and David Basin. An information-theoretic model for adaptive side-channel attacks. In Proceedings of the 14th ACM conference on Computer and communications security, pages 286–296. ACM, 2007.
- [5] Pedro Malagón, Juan-Mariano de Goyeneche, Marina Zapater, Zorana Bankovic, José M Moya, and David Fraga. Effects of compiler optimizations on side-channel attacks.
- [6] Dan Page. A note on side-channels resulting from dynamic compilation. IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive, 2006:349, 2006.
- [7] Quoc-Sang Phan, Lucas Bang, Corina S Pasareanu, Pasquale Malacaria, and Tevfik Bultan. Synthesis of adaptive side-channel attacks. In *Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF), 2017 IEEE 30th*, pages 328–342. IEEE, 2017.

Appendices

ſ

Appendix A Java BigInteger modPow Source code

Listing 1: Java listing

1	/**
2	* Returns a BigInteger whose value is
3	<pre>* <tt>(this^{exponent} mod m)</tt>. (Unlike {@code pow</pre>
	}, this
4	<pre>* method permits negative exponents.)</pre>
5	*
6	* @param exponent the exponent.
7	* Cparam m the modulus.
8	<pre>* @return <tt>this^{exponent} mod m</tt></pre>
9	* @throws ArithmeticException {@code m} ≤ 0 or the exponent
	is
10	* negative and this BigInteger is not <i>relatively</i>
11	<pre>* prime to {@code m}.</pre>
12	* @see #modInverse
13	*/
14	<pre>public BigInteger modPow(BigInteger exponent, BigInteger m) { if (m_nimum ())</pre>
15	if (m.signum <= 0)
16	<pre>throw new ArithmeticException("BigInteger: modulus not</pre>
	positive");
17	// Trivial cases
18	if (exponent.signum == 0)
19	return (m.equals(ONE) ? ZERO : ONE);
20 21	return (m.equars(one) : ZERO . ONE);
22	if (this.equals(ONE))
23	return (m.equals(ONE) ? ZERO : ONE);
24	(,,,,,, ,
25	if (this.equals(ZERO) && exponent.signum >= 0)
26	return ZERO;
27	
28	<pre>if (this.equals(negConst[1]) && (!exponent.testBit(0)))</pre>
29	<pre>return (m.equals(ONE) ? ZERO : ONE);</pre>
30	
31	<pre>boolean invertResult;</pre>
32	<pre>if ((invertResult = (exponent.signum < 0)))</pre>
33	<pre>exponent = exponent.negate();</pre>
34	
35	BigInteger base = (this.signum < 0 this.compareTo(m) >= 0
36	? this.mod(m) : this);

```
BigInteger result;
37
          if (m.testBit(0)) { // odd modulus
38
              result = base.oddModPow(exponent, m);
39
          } else {
40
              /*
41
               * Even modulus. Tear it into an "odd part" (m1) and
42
                   power of two
               * (m2), exponentiate mod m1, manually exponentiate mod
43
                   m2, and
               * use Chinese Remainder Theorem to combine results.
44
               */
45
46
              // Tear m apart into odd part (m1) and power of 2 (m2)
47
              int p = m.getLowestSetBit(); // Max pow of 2 that
48
                  divides m
49
              BigInteger m1 = m.shiftRight(p); // m/2**p
50
              BigInteger m2 = ONE.shiftLeft(p); // 2**p
              // Calculate new base from m1
53
              BigInteger base2 = (this.signum < 0 || this.compareTo(</pre>
54
                  m1) >= 0
                                 ? this.mod(m1) : this);
              // Caculate (base ** exponent) mod m1.
              BigInteger a1 = (m1.equals(ONE) ? ZERO :
58
                              base2.oddModPow(exponent, m1));
59
60
              // Calculate (this ** exponent) mod m2
61
              BigInteger a2 = base.modPow2(exponent, p);
62
63
              // Combine results using Chinese Remainder Theorem
64
              BigInteger y1 = m2.modInverse(m1);
65
              BigInteger y2 = m1.modInverse(m2);
66
67
              if (m.mag.length < MAX_MAG_LENGTH / 2) {</pre>
68
                 result = a1.multiply(m2).multiply(y1).add(a2.
69
                      multiply(m1).multiply(y2)).mod(m);
              } else {
70
                 MutableBigInteger t1 = new MutableBigInteger();
                 new MutableBigInteger(a1.multiply(m2)).multiply(new
72
                      MutableBigInteger(y1), t1);
                 MutableBigInteger t2 = new MutableBigInteger();
73
                 new MutableBigInteger(a2.multiply(m1)).multiply(new
74
                      MutableBigInteger(y2), t2);
                 t1.add(t2);
                 MutableBigInteger q = new MutableBigInteger();
76
```

```
result = t1.divide(new MutableBigInteger(m), q).
77
                       toBigInteger();
               }
78
           }
79
80
          return (invertResult ? result.modInverse(m) : result);
81
       }
82
83
       /**
84
        * Returns a BigInteger whose value is x to the power of y mod
85
            z.
        * Assumes: z is odd && x < z.
86
        */
87
       private BigInteger oddModPow(BigInteger y, BigInteger z) {
88
       /*
89
        * The algorithm is adapted from Colin Plumb's C library.
90
91
        * The window algorithm:
        * The idea is to keep a running product of b1 = n^(high-order
93
            bits of exp)
        * and then keep appending exponent bits to it. The following
94
            patterns
        * apply to a 3-bit window (k = 3):
95
        * To append 0: square
96
        * To append 1: square, multiply by n<sup>1</sup>
91
        * To append 10: square, multiply by n^1, square
98
        * To append 11: square, square, multiply by n<sup>3</sup>
90
        * To append 100: square, multiply by n^1, square, square
100
        * To append 101: square, square, square, multiply by n<sup>5</sup>
        * To append 110: square, square, multiply by n<sup>3</sup>, square
        * To append 111: square, square, square, multiply by n<sup>7</sup>
        * Since each pattern involves only one multiply, the longer
            the pattern
        * the better, except that a 0 (no multiplies) can be appended
106
            directly.
        * We precompute a table of odd powers of n, up to 2<sup>k</sup>, and can
             then
        * multiply k bits of exponent at a time. Actually, assuming
108
            random
        * exponents, there is on average one zero bit between needs to
        * multiply (1/2 of the time there's none, 1/4 of the time
110
            there's 1,
        * 1/8 of the time, there's 2, 1/32 of the time, there's 3, etc
            .), so
        * you have to do one multiply per k+1 bits of exponent.
112
113
```

 * it goes. There is a whits+1 bit lookahead buffer, buf, that is * filled with the upcoming exponent bits. (What is read after the * end of the exponent is unimportant, but it is filled with zero here.) * When the most-significant bit of this buffer becomes set, i. e. * (buf & thlmask) != 0, we have to decide what pattern to multiply * by, and when to do it. We decide, remember to do it in future * after a suitable number of squarings have passed (e.g. a pattern of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n¹1 immediately; * a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n³ after one more * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * When we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be * optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n²2 * the buffer and save a squaring. * After a size a squaring. * After a size a squaring. * After a size a squaring. * and the remaining 1/2^ (k-1) of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2^ (k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a 's if followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2^ (k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a 's i followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 squarings are to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't 'k hurt in the case k = 1, either.) 	114	* The loop walks down the exponent, squaring the result buffer
<pre>* filled with the upcoming exponent bits. (What is read after the * end of the exponent is unimportant, but it is filled with zero here.) * When the most-significant bit of this buffer becomes set, i. e. * (buf & thlmask) != 0, we have to decide what pattern to multiply * by, and when to do it. We decide, remember to do it in future * after a suitable number of squarings have passed (e.g. a pattern * of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n'1 immediately; * a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n'3 after one more * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * * when we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be * optimized awy. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n'2 * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n'2, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring 1/2^c(k-1) of the time, it requires 1 * squaring. * * And the remaining 1/2^c(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * * And the remaining 1/2^c(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)</pre>	115	* it goes. There is a wbits+1 bit lookahead buffer, buf, that
<pre>* end of the exponent is unimportant, but it is filled with zero here.) * When the most-significant bit of this buffer becomes set, i. e. * (buf & tblmask) != 0, we have to decide what pattern to multiply * by, and when to do it. We decide, remember to do it in future * after a suitable number of squarings have passed (e.g. a pattern * of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n¹1 immediately; * a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n³ after one more * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * * * When we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n² * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n², * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2⁻(k-1) of the time, it requires 1 * squarings. * And the remaining 1/2⁻(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute thatle, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) * the tot in the case k = 1, either.) * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *</pre>	116	* filled with the upcoming exponent bits. (What is read after
<pre>* When the most-significant bit of this buffer becomes set, i. e. * (buf & tblmask) != 0, we have to decide what pattern to multiply * by, and when to do it. We decide, remember to do it in future * after a suitable number of squarings have passed (e.g. a pattern * of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n^1 immediately; * a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n^3 after one more * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * * When we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be * optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n^2 * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n^z, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2"(k-1) of the time, it requires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2"(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)</pre>	117	* end of the exponent is unimportant, but it is filled with
<pre>* (buf & tblmask) != 0, we have to decide what pattern to multiply * by, and when to do it. We decide, remember to do it in future after a suitable number of squarings have passed (e.g. a pattern * of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n^1 immediately; a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n^3 after one more * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * * When we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be * optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n^2 * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n^z, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring. * And the remaining 1/2°(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)</pre>	118	* When the most-significant bit of this buffer becomes set, i.
* by, and when to do it. We decide, remember to do it in future * after a suitable number of squarings have passed (e.g. a pattern * of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n ¹ immediately; * a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n ³ after one more * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * when we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be * optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n ² * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n ² z, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squarings. * And the remaining 1/2 ^c (k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)	119	* (buf & tblmask) != 0, we have to decide what pattern to
<pre>* after a suitable number of squarings have passed (e.g. a pattern * of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n¹ immediately; * a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n³ after one more * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * * When we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n² * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * * * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n², * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2^c(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)</pre>	120	* by, and when to do it. We decide, remember to do it in
* of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n ¹ immediately; * a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n ³ after one more squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * * When we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be * optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n ² 2 * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n ² z, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squarings. * And the remaining 1/2 ² (k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)	121	* after a suitable number of squarings have passed (e.g. a
 * a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n³ after one more * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. * * When we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be * optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n²2 * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n²z, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2^(k-1) of the time, it requires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) 	122	* of "100" in the buffer requires that we multiply by n ¹
<pre>124 125 126 * squaring), clear the buffer, and continue. 127 128 * When we start, there is one more optimization: the result 129 129 * is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be 128 * optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like 120 129 * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the 121 130 * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n² 131 * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into 132 * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into 133 * 134 * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n²z, 135 * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time 136 * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 137 * squaring, 1/2^c(k-1) of the time, it requires k-2 138 * And the remaining 1/2^c(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are 139 * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squaring * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *</pre>	123	$*$ a pattern of "110" calls for multiplying by n^3 after one
* When we start, there is one more optimization: the result buffer is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer and then starting to square it, we have already computed n ² to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into the buffer and save a squaring. the buffer and save a squaring. the buffer and save a squaring. the start where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 squarings. And the remaining 1/2 ^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a 130 * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)		
* is implcitly one, so squaring it or multiplying by it can be * optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer and then starting to square it, we have already computed n ² * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n ² , * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squarings. * And the remaining 1/2 ^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)		· · · · ·
<pre>* optimized away. Further, if we start with a pattern like "100" * in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer * and then starting to square it, we have already computed n² * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n², * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2^(k-1) of the time, it requires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) * one squaring it is the save it is the save it is in the case it is in the case it is it is</pre>		
"100" in the lookahead window, rather than placing n into the buffer and then starting to square it, we have already computed n ² 2 to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into the buffer and save a squaring. * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n ² , where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time ti requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 squaring. * And the remaining 1/2 ^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)	127	
<pre>buffer subfer and subfer and</pre>	128	
 * to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into * the buffer and save a squaring. * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n²z, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2^(k-1) of the time, it requires 1 * squarings. * And the remaining 1/2^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) 	129	
* the buffer and save a squaring. * the buffer and save a squaring. * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n ² , * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2 ^(k-1) of the time, it requires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2 ^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)	130	\ast and then starting to square it, we have already computed n^2
* This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n ² x, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2 ^(k-1) of the time, it requires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2 ^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)	131	* to compute the odd-powers table, so we can place that into
 * This means that if you have a k-bit window, to compute n²z, * where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2^(k-1) of the time, it requires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) 	132	* the buffer and save a squaring.
<pre>* where z is the high k bits of the exponent, 1/2 of the time * it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 * squaring, 1/2^(k-1) of the time, it requires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * a well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)</pre>	133	*
 it requires no squarings. 1/4 of the time, it requires 1 squaring, 1/2^(k-1) of the time, it reqires k-2 squarings. * And the remaining 1/2^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) 	134	
 137 * squaring, 1/2^(k-1) of the time, it reqires k-2 squarings. 138 * And the remaining 1/2^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a 139 * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 140 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that 141 * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, 142 * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings 143 * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't 144 * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) 	135	
<pre>squarings. squarings. * And the remaining 1/2^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.) *</pre>	136	· · · · ·
a * 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't hurt in the case k = 1, either.)	137	
140 * squarings, not k-1. The average of these is 1. Add that 141 * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, 142 * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings 143 * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't 144 * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)	138	* And the remaining 1/2 ^(k-1) of the time, the top k bits are a
<pre>141 * to the one squaring we have to do to compute the table, 142 * and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings 143 * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't 144 * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)</pre>	139	* 1 followed by k-1 0 bits, so it again only requires k-2
<pre>* and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings * as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't * hurt in the case k = 1, either.)</pre>	140	
<pre>* as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't</pre>	141	
* hurt in the case k = 1, either.)	142	* and you'll see that a k-bit window saves k-2 squarings
	143	* as well as reducing the multiplies. (It actually doesn't
145 */	144	* hurt in the case k = 1, either.)
	145	*/

```
// Special case for exponent of one
146
           if (y.equals(ONE))
147
               return this;
148
149
           // Special case for base of zero
           if (signum == 0)
               return ZERO;
153
           int[] base = mag.clone();
           int[] exp = y.mag;
           int[] mod = z.mag;
           int modLen = mod.length;
158
           // Make modLen even. It is conventional to use a
159
               cryptographic
           // modulus that is 512, 768, 1024, or 2048 bits, so this
160
               code
           // will not normally be executed. However, it is necessary
161
               for
           // the correct functioning of the HotSpot intrinsics.
162
           if ((modLen & 1) != 0) {
163
               int[] x = new int[modLen + 1];
16
               System.arraycopy(mod, 0, x, 1, modLen);
163
               mod = x;
               modLen++;
167
           }
168
169
           // Select an appropriate window size
170
           int wbits = 0;
171
           int ebits = bitLength(exp, exp.length);
172
           // if exponent is 65537 (0x10001), use minimum window size
173
           if ((ebits != 17) || (exp[0] != 65537)) {
               while (ebits > bnExpModThreshTable[wbits]) {
                   wbits++;
               }
17
           }
179
           // Calculate appropriate table size
180
           int tblmask = 1 << wbits;</pre>
181
182
           // Allocate table for precomputed odd powers of base in
183
               Montgomery form
           int[][] table = new int[tblmask][];
184
           for (int i=0; i < tblmask; i++)</pre>
185
               table[i] = new int[modLen];
186
187
           // Compute the modular inverse of the least significant 64-
188
```

```
bit
           // digit of the modulus
189
           long n0 = (mod[modLen-1] & LONG_MASK) + ((mod[modLen-2] &
190
                LONG_MASK) << 32);
           long inv = -MutableBigInteger.inverseMod64(n0);
191
195
           // Convert base to Montgomery form
193
           int[] a = leftShift(base, base.length, modLen << 5);</pre>
194
193
           MutableBigInteger q = new MutableBigInteger(),
196
                             a2 = new MutableBigInteger(a),
197
                             b2 = new MutableBigInteger(mod);
198
           b2.normalize(); // MutableBigInteger.divide() assumes that
199
               its
                           // divisor is in normal form.
200
201
           MutableBigInteger r= a2.divide(b2, q);
202
           table[0] = r.toIntArray();
203
204
           // Pad table[0] with leading zeros so its length is at
205
                least modLen
           if (table[0].length < modLen) {</pre>
206
              int offset = modLen - table[0].length;
207
              int[] t2 = new int[modLen];
208
              System.arraycopy(table[0], 0, t2, offset, table[0].
209
                  length);
              table[0] = t2;
210
           }
211
212
           // Set b to the square of the base
213
           int[] b = montgomerySquare(table[0], mod, modLen, inv, null
214
               );
           // Set t to high half of b
216
           int[] t = Arrays.copyOf(b, modLen);
217
           // Fill in the table with odd powers of the base
219
           for (int i=1; i < tblmask; i++) {</pre>
220
               table[i] = montgomeryMultiply(t, table[i-1], mod,
221
                   modLen, inv, null);
           }
222
           // Pre load the window that slides over the exponent
224
           int bitpos = 1 << ((ebits-1) & (32-1));</pre>
225
226
           int buf = 0;
227
           int elen = exp.length;
228
```

```
int eIndex = 0;
229
           for (int i = 0; i <= wbits; i++) {</pre>
230
               buf = (buf << 1) | (((exp[eIndex] & bitpos) != 0)?1:0);</pre>
231
               bitpos >>>= 1;
232
               if (bitpos == 0) {
233
                    eIndex++;
234
                    bitpos = 1 << (32-1);
235
236
                    elen--;
               }
237
           }
238
239
           int multpos = ebits;
240
241
            // The first iteration, which is hoisted out of the main
242
                loop
            ebits--;
243
           boolean isone = true;
244
245
           multpos = ebits - wbits;
246
           while ((buf & 1) == 0) {
247
               buf >>>= 1;
248
               multpos++;
249
           }
250
251
           int[] mult = table[buf >>> 1];
252
253
           buf = 0;
254
           if (multpos == ebits)
255
                isone = false;
256
257
           // The main loop
258
           while (true) {
               ebits--;
260
                // Advance the window
261
               buf <<= 1;
262
263
                if (elen != 0) {
264
                    buf |= ((exp[eIndex] & bitpos) != 0) ? 1 : 0;
265
                    bitpos >>>= 1;
266
                    if (bitpos == 0) {
267
                        eIndex++;
268
                        bitpos = 1 << (32-1);
269
                        elen--;
270
271
                    }
               }
272
273
               // Examine the window for pending multiplies
274
```

```
if ((buf & tblmask) != 0) {
275
                   multpos = ebits - wbits;
276
                   while ((buf & 1) == 0) {
277
                       buf >>>= 1;
278
                       multpos++;
279
                   }
280
                   mult = table[buf >>> 1];
281
                   buf = 0;
282
               }
283
284
               // Perform multiply
285
               if (ebits == multpos) {
286
                   if (isone) {
287
                       b = mult.clone();
288
                       isone = false;
289
                   } else {
290
                       t = b;
291
                       a = montgomeryMultiply(t, mult, mod, modLen, inv
292
                            , a);
                       t = a; a = b; b = t;
293
                   }
294
               }
295
296
               // Check if done
297
               if (ebits == 0)
298
                   break;
299
300
               // Square the input
301
               if (!isone) {
302
                   t = b;
303
                   a = montgomerySquare(t, mod, modLen, inv, a);
304
                   t = a; a = b; b = t;
305
               }
306
           }
307
308
           // Convert result out of Montgomery form and return
309
           int[] t2 = new int[2*modLen];
310
           System.arraycopy(b, 0, t2, modLen, modLen);
311
312
           b = montReduce(t2, mod, modLen, (int)inv);
313
314
           t2 = Arrays.copyOf(b, modLen);
315
316
317
           return new BigInteger(1, t2);
       }
318
319
       /**
320
```

```
* Returns a BigInteger whose value is (this ** exponent) mod
321
             (2**p)
        */
322
       private BigInteger modPow2(BigInteger exponent, int p) {
323
           /*
324
            * Perform exponentiation using repeated squaring trick,
                 chopping off
            * high order bits as indicated by modulus.
326
            */
           BigInteger result = ONE;
           BigInteger baseToPow2 = this.mod2(p);
           int expOffset = 0;
330
331
           int limit = exponent.bitLength();
332
           if (this.testBit(0))
334
              limit = (p-1) < limit ? (p-1) : limit;</pre>
335
           while (expOffset < limit) {</pre>
331
               if (exponent.testBit(expOffset))
                   result = result.multiply(baseToPow2).mod2(p);
339
               expOffset++;
340
               if (expOffset < limit)</pre>
341
                   baseToPow2 = baseToPow2.square().mod2(p);
342
           }
343
344
           return result;
345
       }
346
```

```
return montReduce(product, n, len, (int)inv);
   } else {
       return implMontgomeryMultiply(a, b, n, len, inv,
           materialize(product, len));
   }
}
private static int[] montgomerySquare(int[] a, int[] n, int len
    , long inv,
                                  int[] product) {
   implMontgomeryMultiplyChecks(a, a, n, len, product);
   if (len > MONTGOMERY_INTRINSIC_THRESHOLD) {
       // Very long argument: do not use an intrinsic
       product = squareToLen(a, len, product);
       return montReduce(product, n, len, (int)inv);
   } else {
       return implMontgomerySquare(a, n, len, inv, materialize
           (product, len));
   }
}
// Range-check everything.
private static void implMontgomeryMultiplyChecks
    (int[] a, int[] b, int[] n, int len, int[] product) throws
        RuntimeException {
   if (len % 2 != 0) {
       throw new IllegalArgumentException("input array length
           must be even: " + len);
   }
   if (len < 1) {
       throw new IllegalArgumentException("invalid input
           length: " + len);
   }
   if (len > a.length ||
       len > b.length ||
       len > n.length ||
       (product != null && len > product.length)) {
       throw new IllegalArgumentException("input array length
           out of bound: " + len);
   }
}
// Make sure that the int array z (which is expected to contain
// the result of a Montgomery multiplication) is present and
// sufficiently large.
private static int[] materialize(int[] z, int len) {
```

```
if (z == null || z.length < len)</pre>
         z = new int[len];
     return z;
}
// These methods are intended to be be replaced by virtual
     machine
// intrinsics.
private static int[] implMontgomeryMultiply(int[] a, int[] b,
     int[] n, int len,
                                   long inv, int[] product) {
    product = multiplyToLen(a, len, b, len, product);
    return montReduce(product, n, len, (int)inv);
}
private static int[] implMontgomerySquare(int[] a, int[] n, int
      len,
                                 long inv, int[] product) {
    product = squareToLen(a, len, product);
    return montReduce(product, n, len, (int)inv);
}
/**
 * Montgomery reduce n, modulo mod. This reduces modulo mod and
       divides
 * by 2<sup>(32*mlen)</sup>. Adapted from Colin Plumb's C library.
 */
private static int[] montReduce(int[] n, int[] mod, int mlen,
     int inv) {
    int c=0;
    int len = mlen;
    int offset=0;
    do {
        int nEnd = n[n.length-1-offset];
        int carry = mulAdd(n, mod, offset, mlen, inv * nEnd);
        c += addOne(n, offset, mlen, carry);
        offset++;
    } while (--len > 0);
    while (c > 0)
        c += subN(n, mod, mlen);
    while (intArrayCmpToLen(n, mod, mlen) >= 0)
        subN(n, mod, mlen);
```

```
return n;
}
```

Appendix B BigInteger modPow Results

The following exponent values correspond to the respective columns from left to right:

- \bullet 25730899574802462604
- 24660523187409145475
- $\bullet \ \ 33649042240140657826$
- $\bullet \ 28324482328545617634$
- 21581371295657932221
- 25652608396773858801
- 24341655831718219991
- $\bullet \ 23536477189379635045$
- $\bullet \ 24020887706891028596$
- 25608332753867915599

java.lang.AbstractStringBuilder::append	99	100	100	100	99	98	99	100	99	100
java.lang.AbstractStringBuilder::ensureCapacityInternal	99	100	100	100	99	98	99	100	99	100
java.lang.Integer::numberOfLeadingZeros					100		99		36	
java.lang.Math::min	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.Number:: <init></init>	99	100	99	100	100	99	100	100	98	100
java.lang.Object:: <init></init>	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String:: <init></init>	99	100	100	100	99	98	99	100	99	100
java.lang.String::charAt	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String::equals	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String::getChars	99	100	100	100	99	98	99	100	99	100
java.lang.String::hashCode	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String::indexOf	99	100	100	100	100	99	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String::length	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.System::getSecurityManager	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger:: <init></init>										
java.math.BigInteger::addOne	99	100	99	100	100	99	99	99	98	100
java.math.BigInteger::implMontgomeryMultiply	91	88	46	80		85	81		90	91
java.math.BigInteger::implMontgomeryMultiplyChecks	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::implMontgomerySquare	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::implMulAdd	99	100	99	100	100	99	100	100	99	100
java.math.BigInteger::implMulAddCheck	99	100	99	100	100	99	100	99	98	100
java.math.BigInteger::implSquareToLen	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::implSquareToLenChecks	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::intArrayCmpToLen	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::materialize	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::montReduce	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::montgomeryMultiply	99	100	98	99		98		99	98	100
java.math.BigInteger::montgomerySquare	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::mulAdd	99	100	99	100	100	99	100	99	98	100
java.math.BigInteger::multiplyToLen	99	100	99	100	100	98	99	99	98	100
java.math.BigInteger::primitiveLeftShift	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::squareToLen	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.util.Arrays::copyOfRange	99	100	100	100	99	98	99	100	99	100
Mean timing (ns)	96145	95067	98635	98545	106599	96233	101209	95723	99169	95377
Pct of max mean (%)	90	89	93	92	100	90	95	90	93	89

Figure 4: Even modulus, priming value = 21



Figure 5: Even modulus, priming value = 22

Figure 6: Method compilation results for BigInteger.modPow in the case of an even modulus over 100 runs. The running time on the bottom is in nanoseconds.



Figure 7: Even odd, priming value = 21

java.lang.AbstractStringBuilder::append	100	100	100	100	98	100	100	100	100	98
java.lang.AbstractStringBuilder::ensureCapacityInternal	99	100	100	100	99	99	100	100	100	98
java.lang.Math::min	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.Number:: <init></init>										
java.lang.Object:: <init></init>	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String:: <init></init>	99	98	100	100	99	100	100	100	100	99
java.lang.String::charAt	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String::equals	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String::getChars	100	98	100	100	98	100	100	100	100	98
java.lang.String::hashCode	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String::indexOf	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.String::length	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.lang.System::getSecurityManager	100		100	100		100		100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::addOne	100	98	98	99	99	98	100	100	100	99
java.math.BigInteger::implMontgomeryMultiply										
java.math.BigInteger::implMontgomeryMultiplyChecks	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::implMontgomerySquare	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::implMulAdd	100	99	100	99	100	99	100	100	100	99
java.math.BigInteger::implMulAddCheck	100				100		100	100	100	
java.math.BigInteger::implSquareToLen	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::implSquareToLenChecks	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::intArrayCmpToLen	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::materialize	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::montReduce	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::montgomeryMultiply										
java.math.BigInteger::montgomerySquare	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::mulAdd	100	99	100	99	100	99	100	100	100	99
java.math.BigInteger::multiplyToLen			90	96		98	100		99	
java.math.BigInteger::primitiveLeftShift	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.math.BigInteger::squareToLen	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
java.util.Arrays::copyOfRange		98	100	100		100	100	100	100	
	00045	cocor	67007		77026		70505	60033	00705	
Mean timing (ns)	69815 88	69605 87	67897 85	65914 83	77826 98	68651 86	79685 100	69932 88	69765 88	69593 87
Pct of max mean (%)	88	87	85	83	98	86	100	88	88	87

Figure 8: Even odd, priming value = 22

Figure 9: Method compilation results for BigInteger.modPow in the case of an odd modulus over 100 runs. The running time on the bottom is in nanoseconds.