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Abstract—The US National Institute of Standards and Technology initiated a standardization process for post-quantum cryptography in 2017, with the aim of selecting key encapsulation mechanisms and signature schemes that can withstand the threat from emerging quantum computers. In 2022, Falcon was selected as one of the standard signature schemes, eventually attracting effort to optimize the implementation of Falcon on various hardware architectures for practical applications. Recently, Mitaka was proposed as an alternative to Falcon, allowing parallel execution of most of its operations. These recent advancements motivate us to develop high throughput implementations of Falcon and Mitaka signature schemes on Graphics Processing Units (GPUs), a massively parallel architecture widely available on cloud service platforms. In this paper, we propose the first parallel implementation of Falcon on various GPUs. An iterative version of the sampling process in Falcon, which is also the most time-consuming Falcon operation, was developed. This allows us to implement Falcon signature generation without relying on expensive recursive function calls on GPUs. In addition, we propose a parallel random samples generation approach to accelerate the performance of Mitaka on GPUs. We evaluate our implementation techniques on state-of-the-art GPU architectures (RTX 3080, A100, T4 and V100). Experimental results show that our Falcon-512 implementation achieves 58,595 signatures/second and 2,721,562 verifications/second on an A100 GPU, which is 20.03× and 29.51× faster than the highly optimized AVX2 implementation on GPU. Our Mitaka implementation achieves 161,985 signatures/second and 1,421,046 verifications/second on the same GPU. Due to the adoption of a parallelizable sampling process, Mitaka signature generation enjoys ≈ 2–20× higher throughput than Falcon on various GPUs. The high throughput signature generation and verification achieved by this work can be very useful in various emerging applications, including the Internet of Things.

Index Terms—Post-quantum cryptography, lattice-based cryptography, and graphics processing units (GPU).

1 INTRODUCTION

Post-quantum cryptography (PQC) is an emerging research field with the aim of developing new cryptographic schemes that are capable to withstand the threat of scalable quantum computers. In the year 2017, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) of the United States initiated a standardization process involving worldwide participation [1]. Besides security concerns, the candidates are also evaluated on their implementation efficiency to ensure the possibility of widespread deployment. After almost five years of evaluation and public discussions, NIST has selected for standardization one key-encapsulation mechanism (KEM): Kyber [2], and three signature schemes: Crystal-Dilithium [3], Falcon [4] and SPHINCS+ [5]. The standardization process is still ongoing, currently in Round 4, with the aim of standardizing more post-quantum digital signatures. Besides the NIST standardization, there is also another ongoing effort to improve post-quantum signature and KEM. For instance, Mitaka [6] is a recent work that proposed a parallelizable variant of Falcon, which is simpler and allows masked implementation. Another interesting work is Scabbard [7], a suite of more efficient variants of the NIST finalist KEM, Saber [8].

During this evaluation period, many optimized implementations of NIST PQC candidates were presented. Most of them focused on Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGA) [9], x86 (including AVX2) [10] and ARM Cortex-M4 hardware architectures [11], [12], which are the official platforms suggested by NIST for evaluation. On top of that, some interesting works explored other advanced hardware architectures like ARM Cortex-A for high-performance embedded systems [13], and graphics processing units (GPU) that allow massively parallel computation [14].

GPU was originally designed to accelerate graphics and video applications, but later on, opened up for general-purpose computing. For instance, GPUs were used to accelerate deep learning [15], medical imaging [16], cryptography [17], [18] and power grid simulation [19]. It is now considered a de-facto accelerator in many cloud services [20], [21]. Due to this reason, there are also some efforts in developing high throughput implementation of NIST PQC candidates on GPUs [14], [22], [23], [24], [25]. However, among the three signature schemes selected by NIST for standardization, only Crystal-Dilithium [26] and SPHINCS+ [14] were previously implemented on GPU platforms. The possibility of parallelizing the other scheme, Falcon, on GPU platforms, remains an open research problem.

High throughput signature generation and verification is beneficial to applications that have high volume and require fast response time. For instance, IoT applications require the cloud server to handle massive data collected from sensor
nodes, which involves verifying thousands of signatures generated from the sensor nodes. A GPU-accelerated solution that can provide high throughput signature generation and verification would be very useful to such applications. Another typical use case can be found in e-commerce. Consider the case of Alibaba Single’s Day [27], we see around 583,000 orders per second during its peak time, and online payment adopts digital signature to secure the payments. Assumes that it conducts two signature verifications for each transaction to verify the buyer’s certificate (identity) and his/her signature on the payment, followed by one signature generation (to confirm the transaction). In merely one second, the system needs to handle up to 583,000 signature generations and 1,166,000 verifications. This can be a very challenging task if all the signature generation and verification tasks are to be computed using only CPU, even for a very powerful server.

In this paper, we focus on optimizing the implementation of the Falcon [4] and Mitaka [6] signature schemes on GPU platforms. The signature generation in Falcon utilizes the Fast Fourier sampling (ffSampling) algorithm, which turns out to be the most time-consuming operation in Falcon. This is because the ffSampling algorithm recursively traverses the Falcon tree until it reaches the leaves. A closer look into this reveals that it is non-trivial to parallelize ffSampling due to the data dependency between each sample. It is also challenging to implement such a recursive function call in GPU since the overhead introduced by dynamic parallelism [28] is not negligible and the maximum recursion depth supported is only 24. In contrast, Mitaka signature generation is more parallelizable on GPU platforms. In particular, the Gaussian sampling process does not have data dependency as in the case of ffSampling. Besides, Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) and Number Theoretic Transform (NTT) are frequently used in both signature schemes; they are considered embarrassingly parallel algorithms, which can be parallelized on the GPU platforms easily. These analyses show that both Falcon and Mitaka are potential candidates for parallel implementation. In order to achieve high throughput signature generation/verification on GPU platforms, we proposed several implementation techniques to address the issue in ffSampling and optimize other operations. We also analyze and compare Falcon and Mitaka from the parallel implementation aspects. The contributions of this paper are summarized below:

1) An iterative version of ffSampling is presented. We develop an iterative ffSampling algorithm by emulating the stack management during the recursive function call. This allows us to implement the ffSampling on a GPU without using the costly recursive function call (through dynamic parallelism). In addition, we optimize this iterative version of ffSampling by carefully managing the complicated memory operations during the tree traversal. This includes the placement of the emulated stack, pseudo-random number generation (PRG), and optimized memory copy within a thread. Finally, we apply the proposed ffSampling implementation technique on Falcon and evaluate its performance on four state-of-the-art GPUs: RTX 3080, A100, T4, and V100.

2) The first parallel implementation of Falcon signature on GPUs is presented. Other than ffSampling, we also parallelize most of the operations in Falcon, including FFT, NTT, HashToPoint and polynomial addition/subtraction. A kernel-fusion technique is also proposed to combine several operations in Falcon to reduce the overhead of kernel invocations. The proposed optimized implementation of Falcon-512 signature generation achieves a throughput of 27,908 sign/s (1,913,380 verify/s) and 58,595 sign/s (2,721,562 verify/s) on RTX 3080 and A100 respectively. The results from A100 are 16.34× and 74.58× faster than the AVX2 implementation [4], for signature generation and verification, respectively.

3) The first parallel implementation of Mitaka signature on GPUs is presented. Mitaka is a parallelizable variant of Falcon, but there is no implementation of this scheme on a parallel architecture to date. To close this gap, the first parallel implementation of Mitaka signature on GPUs is presented. Mitaka signature generation and verification are highly parallelizable as most of the operations are either polynomial arithmetic (e.g., multiplication, addition, subtraction) or coefficient-wise computation, which do not have data dependencies. However, the Gaussian sampling process illustrated in the reference implementation [6] consumes the random samples in a serial manner. To allow full parallel implementation, we propose to break the Gaussian sampling into two phases. The random samples are first generated in bulk through the ChaCha20 stream cipher, followed by the rejection sampling process. The proposed optimized implementation of Mitaka signature generation on GPUs achieved 74,010 sign/s (695,931 verify/s) and 161,985 sign/s (1,421,046 verify/s) on RTX 3080 and A100, respectively. The results from A100 are 20.03× and 29.51× faster than the reference implementation [6], for signature generation and verification respectively. We open-sourced our implementation to https://github.com/benlwk/Falcon-Mitaka to encourage more future research on this topic.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Falcon: NIST Standardized Signature

Falcon [4] is a hash-and-sign post-quantum signature scheme based on the NTRU lattice problem [29]. For the same security level, Falcon achieves the most compact signature size among the three post-quantum signatures selected by NIST for standardization, while still having competitive signature generation and verification speed on a CPU. As opposed to Crystal-Dilithium [3], the other signature based on lattice problems selected for NIST standardization which only samples small integers with a uniform distribution on an interval, the signature generation process of Falcon requires sampling short vectors from discrete Gaussian distributions over lattices [30]. To accelerate this process, Falcon

1. Our implementation allow high parallelism, and it is different from the original Mitaka implementation. Note that this proposed modification but do not affect the security of Mitaka.
utilizes the Fast Fourier sampling (FFSampling) algorithm [4], [31]. However, FFSampling is particularly “delicate to implement”, listed by the authors of Falcon as one of the main shortcomings in the specification [4]. To the best of our knowledge, no reported attempt of implementing FFSampling on a platform with a high degree of parallelism has been made previously.

2.2 Mitaka: a Parallelizable Variant of Falcon

Recently, Mitaka [6], a variant of the Falcon signature scheme, overcame the aforementioned pitfalls by replacing FFSampling with a “hybrid” sampling procedure [32] based on a parallelizable discrete Gaussian sampler over lattices [33]. However, the vectors generated by the hybrid sampler are longer than the ones from FFSampling, which affects the security of the signature scheme. To compensate for the security loss, Mitaka modifies the key generation algorithm and revises the parameters of the scheme. Although the Mitaka signature scheme is designed to be parallelizable and maskable, very little study on the implementation aspects of Mitaka has been made previously, except the reference implementation on an Intel CPU from the authors [6].

2.3 Overview of NVIDIA GPU Architecture and CUDA

Volta and Ampere are the two representatives of advanced GPU architectures released by NVIDIA in 2017 and 2020, respectively. These GPUs consist of thousands of cores, which are ideal for computing on massively parallel data. For instance, the RTX3080 (Ampere architecture) consists of 128 cores. CUDA is the Software Development Kit released by NVIDIA to ease the programming of GPU for general-purpose computing. Under the CUDA programming model, multiple threads are grouped into a block, where multiple blocks form a GPU grid. This relationship is illustrated in Fig. 1, where each thread and block can be indexed individually for parallel computing. NVIDIA GPUs grouped 32 threads into one warp in order to allow efficient instruction scheduling and memory access. Warp divergence occurs if threads within a warp do not execute the same path, which may have a serious performance penalty. In the subsequent presentation, we refer to tid as a unique ID for parallel threads within a block.

2.4 Related Works

The use of GPU in accelerating cryptography algorithms has been common in the past decade. For instance, it was used in accelerating fully homomorphic encryption [17], [34], wherein heavy computations like NTT and residue number system (RNS) are offloaded to the GPU. Lee et al. [23] exploited the tensor cores in contemporary GPU architectures to compute the polynomial convolution of NTRU, variants of FrodoKEM and LAC, but it only supports non-ephemeral keypair. A follow-up work uses dot-product instructions on GPU [24] to speed up the polynomial convolution in Saber and FrodoKEM, with support to ephemeral keypair. GPU was also used as an accelerator to create a signature server [35] based on elliptic curve cryptography (ECC).

There is limited prior work in the literature that implement Falcon [4]. Thomas Pornin presented an optimized version of Falcon on CPU utilizing AVX2 instructions [10]. In the same work, they also presented the implementation of Falcon on Cortex-M4 microcontroller. In another work, Oder et al. [36] managed to reduce the dynamic memory consumption of Falcon by 43% through revision of the memory layout in Falcon implementation targeting Cortex-M4 microcontroller. Besides that, there are two prior works that optimized the implementation of Falcon on more advanced processor architectures. Nguyen and Gaj [37] proposed techniques to compress the size of the twiddle-factor table and optimize the memory access pattern in FFT to achieve a fast and memory-efficient implementation on Cortex-A72. Kim et al. [38] demonstrated techniques for parallelizing the FFT and NTT operations utilizing the NEON instructions found in the NVIDIA Carmel with ARMv8 architecture. Recently, a hardware architecture for Falcon signature verification was proposed in [39], but the implementation does not include the signature generation. There is no prior work reported on the implementation of the Mitaka signature, except the reference implementation presented by the authors [6].

In summary, most of these prior implementations focus on optimizing the memory and computational aspects of FFT and NTT. However, the most time-consuming part of Falcon signature generation is the FFSampling algorithm that involves expensive memory operations during the tree-traversal process. In addition, there is no parallel implementation of Falcon and Mitaka on the massively parallel architecture like GPU. The previous parallel implementation techniques reported only target a small degree of parallelism supported by NEON [37], [38] and AVX [4], which are not directly applicable to the GPU architecture. Hence, we are motivated to close this gap and explore techniques to optimize the implementation of Falcon and Mitaka on GPUs with high throughput performance.

3 Proposed GPU Implementation Techniques

This section first presents the overview of GPU-based signature servers and their potential applications. Followed by this are the descriptions of the proposed techniques to optimize the performance of Falcon and Mitaka on GPUs. The design choices and trade-offs made in our implementation are also presented in this section.

3.1 Overview of the Parallel Signature Generation and Verification on GPUs

There are two commonly used strategies to parallelize an algorithm on a GPU targeting server environment: coarse-grain and fine-grain [22]. Coarse-grain implementation completes the entire algorithm within one thread, which is essentially a serial implementation. The parallelism is achieved by processing many threads concurrently, wherein sufficient workload is required to fully exploit the computing power in GPU. On the other hand, the fine-grain approach assigns several threads to compute one algorithm in parallel. This allows us to fully harness the GPU even though the workload is relatively low. The coarse-grain approach relies on large amount of workload to achieve a high throughput performance, but this may not be always attainable. Moreover, it has high latency, which is not desirable
for applications that require fast response time. Fine-grain approach has low latency but the throughput performance is rather low. This relationship was also observed in prior work that implemented the post-quantum KEMs [22].

Taking these into consideration, we took an intermediate approach. Referring to Fig. 1, we compute one signature (generation or verification) on a block in a fine-grain approach and instantiate \( K \) blocks to process \( K \) signatures concurrently. This can be viewed as a combination of coarse-grain (processing multiple signatures) and fine-grain (computing one signature with multiple threads) parallelism to achieve a balance between throughput and latency. Within each block, several GPU kernels were developed to compute all the signing or verification processes using different numbers of parallel threads. For instance, polynomial arithmetic can be parallelized with a high number of threads, but the hash function that has a smaller degree of parallelism uses a smaller number of threads. This approach was also observed in other GPU implementations of post-quantum cryptography [23], [24], [25].

### 3.2 Parallelizing Falcon Signature

Falcon [4] allows the pre-expanded LDL tree as part of the private key to be used in the signature generation. However, in this paper, we have implemented a more generic version that rebuilds the LDL tree dynamically for every signature generation, following closely the reference implementation. Table 1 shows the breakdown of major computational steps in Falcon signature generation and verification, which was evaluated on an Intel i9-10900K CPU, based on the reference implementation submitted to NIST. According to the Table, \( \text{ffSampling} \) and FFT/IFFT are the most time-consuming operations in Falcon, accounted more than 70% of the entire signature generation process. This shows that parallelizing and optimizing these two operations can greatly improve the performance of Falcon. We also focus on optimizing NTT/INTT which accounted for almost half of the execution time in signature verification. HashToPoint algorithm is used in both signature generation and verification; it is inherently a serial process, and the parallelism is limited to the hash function (i.e., SHAKE) only.

#### 3.2.1 Original Recursive ffSampling Algorithm

The original \( \text{ffSampling} \) algorithm was implemented in a recursive manner [4]; it is reproduced in Algorithm 1. For the input vector \( t \), parameter \( \sigma \), and Gram matrix \( G \) associated with matrix \( B \), the algorithm will generate a vector \( z \) such that \((t - z)B\) is a discrete Gaussian vector with standard deviation \( \sigma \). To realize the sampling procedure, the algorithm generates a Falcon tree (see Fig. 2) with the LDL decomposition \((\text{poly}_G, \text{ffSampling})\), line 9 in Algorithm 1) and samples discrete Gaussian values on each leaf \((\text{SamplerZ}, \text{lines 4, 5 in Algorithm 1})\). The function \( \text{poly_split_fft} \) computes the Gentleman-Sande inverse FFT butterflies [40], and the function \( \text{poly_merge_fft} \) computes the Cooley-Tukey FFT butterflies [41]. Functions \( \text{poly_add}, \text{poly_sub}, \text{and poly_mul_fft} \) compute the polynomial addition, subtraction, and pointwise multiplication, respectively.

It is challenging to implement this algorithm on a GPU, due to the following reasons:

1) Referring to Fig. 2 and Algorithm 1 lines 15 and 23, the samples in Falcon are generated by each leaf in Falcon tree in a sequential manner. There is a data dependency between each sample in the \( \text{ffSampling} \) algorithm, which makes it impossible to compute multiple samples in parallel. For instance, we need to first obtain the sample on the right-most leaf (labeled as 3), traverse backward and proceed to the next leaf (labeled as 5). In other words, one cannot execute the \( \text{ffSampling} \) to generate multiple samples at a time. This prevents parallelizing \( \text{ffSampling} \), and the only way to implement this is through a coarse-grain method, wherein one thread computes one \( \text{ffSampling} \) algorithm.

2) NVIDIA GPU allows recursive function call to be implemented through the dynamic parallelism [28] feature, but it is relatively expensive. Each recursive function call needs to configure the kernel launch...
parameters (e.g., number of blocks and threads), introducing significant overhead. Take Falcon-512 as an example, the $N = 512$ leaves in the LDL tree, so it takes one function call from the host (CPU) and $N \times 2 - 2 = 1022$ calls from the kernel to fully traverse the entire tree. Hence, it is very expensive to implement ffSampling algorithm on a GPU in a recursive manner.

3) Some operations in Algorithm 1 exhibits high level of parallelism. For instance, poly_split_fft (line 10) and poly_mul_fft (line 19) can be executed in parallel. One way to exploit this is to run the Algorithm 1 with a single thread, and then launch another child kernel on the GPU with multiple threads to execute poly_split_fft and poly_mul_fft. This approach also requires the use of dynamic parallelism [28] which has high overheads. Moreover, after each parallel computation in poly_split_fft and poly_mul_fft, we need to synchronize all the child threads before returning to the parent thread and moving on to the next recursion. This kind of synchronization is also very expensive.

Note that dynamic parallelism is widely used to facilitate workload management within the GPU kernels without relying on the CPU, wherein the size of the workload is unknown a priory. However, such an approach should have sufficient parallelism and low recursive depth in order to enjoy the performance benefit. Unfortunately, ffSampling is a serial algorithm, which means that each recursive call can only launch one thread at a time. Due to these reasons, we found that implementing ffSampling in recursive form could be inefficient for GPU architectures. Hence, in this paper, we have converted Algorithm 1 into its iterative version, which is detailed in Algorithm 2. With the proposed iterative ffSampling algorithm, we do not have to rely on the dynamic parallelism, avoiding all the expensive overhead in launching kernel within a kernel.

### 3.2.2 Proposed Iterative ffSampling Algorithm

We now present the proposed iterative ffSampling algorithm. It uses an array $S$ to record the stack frames $(t_0, t_1, G_{00}, G_{01}, G_{11}, tmp, N, z_0, z_1)$. The size of $S$ is $\log_2 N + 1$ since ffSampling is essentially a reverse depth-first tree traversal (accessing the right sub-tree first, then the left sub-tree, see Fig. 2) of a perfect binary tree with depth $\log_2 N$ [4]. During each iteration, the algorithm will access the top stack frame $S[top]$ and make updates based on its local state. The values $z_0$ and $z_1$ in a stack frame can indicate the local state of ffSampling. This is because $z_1$ is initialized before the first recursive call and $z_0$ is initialized before the second recursive call (after the first recursion). Recursive calls in Algorithm 1 (lines 15 and 23) become pushing new stack frames into $S$ in Algorithm 2 (lines 20 and 29). Statements after recursions in Algorithm 1 (lines 16 and 24) are converted to the updateSt function in Algorithm 3, which calls poly_merge_fft to update $S[top]$ based on its local state.

Both Algorithm 1 and 2 produce the same outputs and have the same time complexity, since their only difference is the stack management. Moving stack frames to an array does not change the computational steps or the data flow of the algorithm.

### 3.2.3 FFT and NTT

FFT involves complex numbers, which are stored in the same array separately. A polynomial with length $N$ is stored in an array of $2 \times N$; the first $N$ elements are real numbers, while the next $N$ elements are imaginary numbers. The FFT in-place implementation in Falcon is detailed in Algorithm 4; it takes the polynomial $a$ in natural format and produces the results in FFT format, replacing the original data in polynomial $a$. The FFT first level is skipped because the twiddle factor used is $i$, resulting in free operation [4]. There are two for loops involved in FFT algorithm. The size of $i$ loop doubles in every level (controlled by $m$ in lines 8 and 21), while the size of $j$ loop halves in every level (controlled by $ht$ in lines 7 and 20). The twiddle factors are pre-computed into a lookup table, where they are accessed differently at each level (lines 8 and 9). The main computation in FFT is the butterfly operations, wherein two coefficients from polynomial $a$ are multiplied with the twiddle factors (line 17), and one of them is added up (line 18). Note that the multiplication in the complex domain is the most
Algorithm 2 The iterative fffSampling_dytree algorithm.

Input: $t = (t_0,t_1)$, standard deviation $\sigma$, Gram matrix $G = \begin{pmatrix} G_{00} & G_{01} \\ G_{01} & G_{11} \end{pmatrix}$, buffer $tmp[0:4N]$, array $S[0:\log_2 N + 1]$ with tuples $(t_0,t_1,G_{00},G_{01},G_{11},tmp,N,z_0,z_1)$.

Output: Samples $z = S[0] \cdot (t_0,t_1)$.

1: function It_ffSampling$(t_0,t_1,G_{00},G_{01},G_{11},tmp,N)$
2: \hspace{1cm} $top \leftarrow 0$.
3: \hspace{1cm} $S[0] \leftarrow (t_0,t_1,G_{00},G_{01},G_{11},tmp,N,null,null)$.
4: \hspace{1cm} loop
5: \hspace{1.5cm} Let $St$ be alias to $S[top]$.
6: \hspace{1.5cm} $n \leftarrow St.N, hn \leftarrow n/2$.
7: \hspace{1.5cm} if $n = 1$ then
8: \hspace{2cm} $R \leftarrow \sigma/\sqrt{St.G_{00}[0]}$.
9: \hspace{2cm} $St.t0[0] \leftarrow $SamplerZ$(St.t0[0], R)$.
10: \hspace{2cm} $St.t1[0] \leftarrow $SamplerZ$(St.t1[0], R)$.
11: \hspace{2cm} $top \leftarrow top - 1$, updateSt$(S[top])$.
12: \hspace{1cm} else
13: \hspace{2cm} if $St.z1 = null$ then
14: \hspace{3cm} poly_LDL_fft$(St.G_{00}[0], G_{11})$;
15: \hspace{3cm} poly_split_fft$(St.G_{00}[0], hn)$;
16: \hspace{3cm} poly_split_fft$(St.G_{11}[0], hn)$;
17: \hspace{3cm} $St.G_{00}[0], G_{11}[0]$.
18: \hspace{2cm} else if $St.z0 = null$ then
19: \hspace{3cm} $St.t1 \leftarrow poly_sub(St.t1, tmp[2n:3n])$.
20: \hspace{3cm} $St.t0 \leftarrow poly_lld_fft(St.t0, tmp[0:n], z1)$.
21: \hspace{3cm} $St.t0 \leftarrow poly_add(St.t0, tmp[0:n])$.
22: \hspace{2cm} end if
23: \hspace{1cm} $top \leftarrow top + 1$.
24: \hspace{1cm} if $n = N$ then
25: \hspace{1.5cm} return.
26: \hspace{1.5cm} else
27: \hspace{2cm} $top \leftarrow top - 1$, updateSt$(S[top])$.
28: \hspace{1.5cm} end if
29: \hspace{1cm} end if
30: \hspace{1cm} end loop
31: \hspace{1cm} end function

FFT algorithm is inherently parallel because there are always $N/2$ pairs of work items (butterfly operations) to be computed in each FFT level, and these work items are not dependent on each other. In particular, one can execute the $i$ and $j$ loops in parallel by assigning the correct indices.

time-consuming one as it involves four multiplications, one subtraction and one addition.

Due to limited parallelism offered by NEON and AVX2 instructions, previous implementation of Falcon FFT [4], [37], [38] can only parallelize part of the FFT operations. Algorithm 5 shows the fully parallel version of FFT implementation that utilizes a large degree of parallelism.
NTT is frequently used in Falcon for both signature generation and verification; it is detailed in Algorithm 6. The computational patterns of NTT are very similar to the FFT described in Algorithm 4, except that it is operating in the integer domain (INT32) instead of FP64. Unlike FFT, the NTT algorithm has to be executed for $\log_2 N$ levels (line 3), since the first level in NTT cannot be skipped. It reads the pre-computed twiddle factors (line 7) and performs the butterfly operations (lines 10 – 13) similar to the FFT. The modular multiplication ($MQ\_MUL$ in line 11) is implemented using the Montgomery algorithm [4].

NTT can be parallelized similarly to FFT. Unlike FFT which deals with complex numbers, NTT can achieve more parallelism (bound by $N/2$) because it does not contain the imaginary part. Referring to Algorithm 7, the polynomial $a$ is first loaded onto the shared memory (lines 6 – 8). The $i$ and $j$ loops in Algorithm 6 are parallelized in the same way as described in Fig. 3. The twiddle factors are loaded (line 9) and the index ($j$) for accessing the polynomial (line 10) is calculated. It is followed by the butterfly operations (lines 13 – 16) and synchronization across all parallel threads. After completing all NTT levels, the results are copied from shared memory to the global memory (lines 19 – 21).

Algorithm 5 Our proposed parallel FFT in-place implementation in Falcon.

**Input:** Polynomial $a$ in natural format.

**Output:** Polynomial $a$ in FFT format.

1: function FFT($a$)
2:   $hn \leftarrow N/2$.
3:   $t \leftarrow hn$.
4:   $m \leftarrow 2$.
5:   _shared_ $sa[N]$; \textcolor{red}{\triangleright} Initialize shared memory
6: \textcolor{red}{\triangleright} Copy from global to shared memory
7:   for $u = 0; u < N/BDim; u++$
8:     $sa[u \times BDim + tid] \leftarrow [a[bid 	imes N + u 	imes BDim + tid]]$.
9:   end for
10: \textcolor{red}{\triangleright} Load twiddle factors
11:   $sre \leftarrow tf[[(m + i)/2]]$.
12:   $sim \leftarrow tf[[(m + i)/2] + 1]$.
13: \textcolor{red}{\triangleright} Load real parts
14:   $xre \leftarrow sa[j]$.
15: \textcolor{red}{\triangleright} Load imag. parts
16:   $xim \leftarrow sa[j + hn]$.
17:   $yre \leftarrow sa[j + ht]$.
18:   $yim \leftarrow sa[j + hn + ht]$.
19: \textcolor{red}{\triangleright} Butterfly operations
20:   $j1 \leftarrow j_1 + t_1$.
21:   $m \leftarrow m \times 2$.
22:   $t \leftarrow ht$.
23:   \textcolor{red}{\triangleright} Write back to global memory
24:   for $u = 0; u < N/BDim; u++$
26:   end for
27: end function

### 3.3 HashToPoint

Algorithm 8 shows the HashToPoint algorithm in Falcon, which utilizes the SHAKE-256 as an extendable-output hash function (XOF). It is found that the while loop (lines 6 - 12) is a serial process because the coefficients in output polynomial $c_i$ are extracted from SHAKE-256 serially. In other words, it is not possible to parallelize this while loop to have any performance gain. However, a closer look into SHAKE-256 reveals that the inner states can be parallelized by using 25 parallel threads. This is an approach exploited to implement SHA3 in a fine-grain parallel manner, which was first proposed by Lee et al. [43]. In this paper, we adopted the same idea to parallelize SHAKE-256 operations (lines 3, 4 and 7) on the GPU; the while loop remains in serial execution.

#### 3.3.1 Other Operations
Polynomial arithmetic (e.g., addition, subtraction, negation, etc.) can be parallelized easily as they are coefficient-wise...
operations. We launched \( N \) threads to compute these operations in a fine-grain parallel manner. The remaining operations like encode/decode are serial processes, so we implemented them in a coarse-grain parallel manner.

### 3.4 Parallelizing Mitaka Signature

Table 2 shows the breakdown of major computational steps in Mitaka signature generation and verification, which was evaluated on an Intel i9-10900K CPU, based on the reference implementation from the authors [6]. The sampler in Mitaka is the most time-consuming operation; it consumes around 57% of time in signature generation. It consists of two parts: Normaldist and the discrete Gaussian sampler (sample_discrete_gauss). Normaldist is a function used in the sampler to generate a centered normal polynomial using the Box-Muller algorithm. It can be parallelized directly on a GPU as it involves only coefficient-wise operations with no data dependency between the coefficients. The discrete Gaussian sampler accounts for 22% of the entire execution time in Mitaka signature generation. Followed by this are the FFT/IFFT and FP64 arithmetic, which are coefficient-wise operations that can be parallelized. For signature verification, most of the time was spent in the FP64 arithmetic (74%). Since Mitaka was designed to be easily parallelizable, most of the operations can be directly implemented on a GPU. In this section, we focus on describing the optimization techniques to improve the performance of Mitaka implemented on a GPU.

#### 3.4.1 Generating polynomial with normal distribution

Algorithm 9 shows the Box-Muller algorithm used to generate a random polynomial before passing it to the discrete Gaussian sampler. Three random vectors with \( N \) bytes long

---

**Algorithm 6** NTT implementation in Falcon [4].

**Input:** Polynomial \( x \) in natural format.

**Output:** Polynomial \( x \) in NTT format.

1. function NTT(t, T)
2. \( t \leftarrow N \);
3. for \( m = 1; m < N; m = m \times 2 \) do
4. \( ht \leftarrow t/2 \);
5. \( j_1 \leftarrow 0 \);
6. for \( i = 0; i < m; i++ \) do
   ▶ Load twiddle factors
7. \( s \leftarrow tf[m + i] \);
8. \( j_2 \leftarrow j_1 + ht \);
9. for \( j = j_2; j < j_2; j++ \) do
   ▶ Butterfly operations
10. \( u \leftarrow a[j] \);
11. \( v \leftarrow MQ\_MUL(a[j + ht], s) \);
12. \( a[j] = MQ\_ADD(u, v) \);
13. \( a[j + ht] = MQ\_SUB(u, v) \);
14. end for
15. \( j_1 \leftarrow j_1 + t \);
16. end for
17. \( t \leftarrow ht \);
18. end for
19. end function

**Algorithm 7** Parallel implementation of NTT on a GPU.

**Input:** Polynomial \( x \) in natural format.

**Output:** Polynomial \( x \) in NTT format.

1. function NTT(t, T)
2. _shared_ sa[N]; ▶ Initialize shared memory
3. Copy from global to shared memory
4. for \( u = 0; u < N/BDim; u++ \) do
5. \( sa[u \times BDim + tid] = a[bid \times N + u \times BDim + tid] \);
6. end for
7. \( t \leftarrow N \);
8. for \( m = 1; u < N; m = m \times 2 \) do
9. \( ht \leftarrow t/2 \);
10. \( s \leftarrow tf[m + tid/ht] \);
11. \( j \leftarrow tid \% ht + (tid/ht) \times t \);
12. end for
13. \( u \leftarrow sa[j] \);
14. \( v \leftarrow MQ\_MUL(sa[j + ht], s) \);
15. \( sa[j] = MQ\_ADD(u, v) \);
16. \( sa[j + ht] = MQ\_SUB(u, v) \);
17. Synchronize threads.
18. end for
19. ▶ Write back to global memory
20. for \( u = 0; u < N/BDim; u++ \) do
21. \( a[bid \times N + u \times BDim + tid] = sa[u \times BDim + tid] \);
22. end for
23. end function

**Algorithm 8** HashToPoint in Falcon [4].

**Input:** A string \( s \), a modulus \( q \leq 2^{16} \), polynomial length \( N \).

**Output:** A polynomial \( e = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i x^i \) in \( \mathbb{Z}_q[x] \).

1. function HashToPoint(str, q, N)
2. \( k \leftarrow [2^{16}/q] \);
3. ctx ← SHAKE-256-Init()
4. SHAKE-256-Inject(ctx, str)
5. \( i \leftarrow 0 \);
6. while \( i < N \) do
7. \( t \leftarrow SHAKE-256-Extract(ctx, 16) \);
8. if \( t < kq \) then
9. \( c_i \leftarrow t \% q \);
10. \( i \leftarrow i + 1 \);
11. end if
12. end while
13. end function
Algorithm 9 Generate Normal Distribution Random Polynomial: Box-Muller.

**Input:** Three random vectors $u, v$ and $e$ of $N$ bytes.  
**Output:** A centered normal polynomial $vec$.

1: function NormList($u, v, e$)  
2:   for $i = 0; i < N/2; i++$ do  
3:     $uf[i] \leftarrow 2 \times PI \times (u[i] \& 0x1FFFFFFFFFFFFF) \times 2^{-53}$  
4:     $vf[i] \leftarrow 0.5 + (v[i] \& 0x1FFFFFFFFFFFFF) \times 2^{-54}$  
5:     $b0 \leftarrow \text{ffsll}(e[2 \times i + 1])$ \hspace{1em} ▷ Find first bit set  
6:     $b1 \leftarrow \text{ffsll}(e[2 \times i])$  
7:     $\text{geom}[i] \leftarrow \text{CMUX}(63 + b0, b1 - 1, CZ(e[2 \times i]))$  
8:     $vf[i] \leftarrow \sqrt{(N \times (\ln(2) \times \text{geom}[i] - \log(vf[i])))}$  
9:   end for  
10: \hspace{1em} ▷ Write the results onto $vec$  
11: for $i = 0; i < N/2; i++$ do  
12:   $vec[2 \times i] \leftarrow vf[i] \times \cos(uf[i])$  
13:   $vec[2 \times i + 1] \leftarrow vf[i] \times \sin(uf[i])$  
14: end for  
15: end function 

are generated and passed to Algorithm 9. The algorithm then generates $N/2$ random samples ($vf[i]$) from these three random vectors (i.e., $u, v$ and $j$). Lines 2 – 9 describe the detailed steps to perform the Box-Muller transform to obtain these random samples. Finally, the random polynomial $vec$ is obtained by taking the cosine and sine values (lines 11 and 12) from the random samples. Note that Algorithm 9 only involves coefficient-wise operations, so it can be easily parallelized. We launched $N/2$ threads in our implementation, each thread computes one item in the $i$ loop (line 2 and line 10), thus achieving a fine-grain parallel implementation of Algorithm 9.

### 3.4.2 Batch Random Samples Generation

The discrete Gaussian sampler requires a lot of random samples, which are generated from ChaCha20 stream cipher in the reference implementation of Mitaka. In a serial implementation presented by the authors of [6], the random samples are generated on an on-demand basis, which is not friendly to the parallel implementation. Algorithm 10 shows the serial discrete Gaussian sampler implemented by the authors of [6]. Line 3 can be parallelized as there is no data dependency between each coefficient. SamplerZ and base_sampler invokes several instances (lines 9, 16 and 25) to obtain random bytes on an on-demand basis. Note that the random samples are generated through ChaCha20 stream cipher and stored in a buffer. Every time get8() or get64 are called, it reads the remaining random samples in this buffer; if random samples in the buffer are completely consumed, ChaCha20 will be invoked to refill it. To compute this in parallel, we can instantiate $N$ structures to hold the random samples, so that $N$ threads can compute line 3 in parallel. However, we need to perform housekeeping on these structures to keep track of the number of random samples consumed, which is a non-trivial overhead.

In this paper, we proposed to divide the discrete Gaussian sampler into two parts. Firstly, a large number of random samples are generated on the GPU with batch processing and stored in a large buffer on the global memory. Then, we invoke the sample_discrete_gauss in Algorithm 10. Note that this only changes the sequence of how the random samples are generated and consumed; we believe this does not create any security issues. With the proposed technique, we no longer need to generate the random samples through ChaCha20 on an on-demand basis, which greatly reduces the housekeeping overhead. In particular, lines 9, 16 and 25 can obtain the pre-computed random samples directly.

From Algorithm 10, we know that each iteration of while loop (lines 8 – 21) consumes 129 bytes. From our experiments, we found that most of the time, this while loop only execute once or twice, because the chance to reject $r$ (line 16) is low. In other words, the consumed random bytes are between $129 – 258$ bytes. In our implementation, we instantiate $K$ blocks and $N$ threads, each thread generates $N_{samp} = 512$ bytes of random samples. Algorithm 11 shows the proposed batch random samples generation implemented on a GPU. Note that each ChaCha20 encryption in counter mode produces 64 bytes of random samples. We repeat this for $N_{samp}/64$ (line 2) in each thread to generate sufficient random samples. The unique counter value is generated through the thread ID (line 3, tid), which is a unique identifier for each thread. Since there are $K$ signatures (blocks) generated, we use the block ID (bid) to create the unique counter for each block. Next, the initialization
vector (IV), which is constant, is loaded onto the state buffer (line 5), followed by the encryption key (line 8). The counter value is XORed with the last 8 bytes of the state buffer (lines 10–11). The ChaCha20 stream cipher is executed to encrypt the counter value and generate 64 bytes of random samples. Note that the details of ChaCha20 encryption are not shown in Algorithm 11 for brevity reasons; it can be found in our source code shared on the public domain. Finally, the results in state buffer are copied to the dst, which will be consumed by the discrete Gaussian sampler (Algorithm 10, lines 9, 16 and 25).

3.4.3 Other Operations

We implemented the FFT/IFFT and FP64 arithmetic in a fine-grain parallel manner, following the same techniques described in Falcon (Section 3.2.3 and 3.3.1). Similarly, the hash function (SHAKE) used in Mitaka can be parallelized through the technique described in [43]. The process similar to the HashToPoint algorithm in Falcon is also used to hash the input message; we only parallelize SHAKE and leave the hash process executed in serial. The remaining operations like encode/decode are implemented in a coarse-grain parallel manner.

3.5 Kernel Fusion

Implementation of Falcon and Mitaka requires many GPU kernels to handle different function calls. Each of the function is implemented as a GPU kernel and called from the CPU, which may have a different configuration (number of threads) due to the exploitable parallelism of each function. For instance, all FP64 polynomial arithmetic can use N threads, NTT/INTT can use N/2 threads, but FFT/IFFT may only use N/4 threads. However, each instantiation of GPU kernel requires additional steps to configure the number of blocks/threads, prepare the stack memory and perform context switch; all these introduce some overheads. To reduce these overheads, we proposed to fuse multiple kernels that have the same parallelism (i.e., the same number of threads) into one kernel. By performing kernel fusion, we can effectively reduce the number of kernel calls and potentially reuse some of the intermediate results.

Algorithm 11 Batch random samples generation in Mitaka for signature generation.

Input: Buffer dst with $N \times 512$ bytes, encryption key $prng_k$, samples per thread $N_{samp}$

Output: $N \times 512$ bytes of random samples generated through ChaCha20 stream cipher.

1. function PRNG_batch($u$, $v$, $e$)
   ▶ Each ChaCha20 encryption produces 64B.
   ▶ This is repeated for $N_{samp}/64$ times to fill up dst.
2. for $j = 0; j < N_{samp}/64; j++$
   ▶ Generate the counter for encryption.
3. $cc \leftarrow bid \times N \times N_{samp} + tid \times N_{samp} + j \times 8$
   ▶ Load 16B of Initialization Vector (IV).
4. for $i = 0; i < 4; i++$
5. $state[i] = CW[i]$
6. end for
   ▶ Removed for brevity.
7. for $i = 0; i < 8; i++$
8. $state[4 + i] = prng_k[bid \times 56 + 4 + i]$
9. end for
10. $state[14] = state[14] \oplus cc$ ▶ XOR with counter
12. Compute ChaCha20 encryption.
13. ... ▶ Removed for brevity.
14. for $i = 0; i < 8; i++$
15. $dst[bid \times N \times N_{samp}/4 + j \times N \times 8 + i \times N + tid] = state[i]$
16. end for
17. end for
18. end function

4 Experimental Results and Discussions

The evaluation platforms used in our experiments are detailed in Table 4. Platform-1 is a desktop workstation consisting of Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-10900K CPU operating at 3.70 GHz clock, an RTX 3080 GPU and 32 GB RAM. Platform-2 is the ARDC Nectar Research Cloud system [44] that allows flexible configurations on computing resources. The GPU devices that we used in Platform-2 are A100, T4 and V100. Note that RTX 3080 is a consumer-grade GPU commonly found in desktop workstations, while the A100, T4 and V100 GPUs are server-grade GPUs with higher performance. These GPUs represent the four state-of-the-art NVIDIA GPU architectures: Volta (V100, from the year 2017), Turing (T4, from the year 2018) and Ampere (A100, from the year 2020; RTX 3080, from the year 2021). Following the parallelization strategy described in Section 3.1, K GPU blocks are launched to generate/verify K signatures in parallel. Within each block, multiple threads are used to compute one signature.

4.1 Performance of Falcon and Mitaka Signature Schemes on GPUs

Fig. 4 shows the performance of Falcon and Mitaka signature generation on four selected GPU platforms. The throughput of signature generation increases when the size
TABLE 3: Micro-benchmark of the proposed kernel fusion technique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Falcon: Sign</th>
<th>Invocation</th>
<th>Total Time (µs)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mq_NTT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.07</td>
<td>NTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mq_poly_tomonty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>Convert to Montgomery representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mq_poly_montymul_ntt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>Point-wise multiplication for two polynomials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mq_conv_small</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>Reduce a small signed integer modulo q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mq_div_12289</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>q = 12289 Divide x by y modulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mq_iNTT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>INTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recompute_G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>Recompute the private key G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Falcon: Verify</th>
<th>Invocation</th>
<th>Total Time (µs)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mq_NTT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>NTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce_s²</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>Reduce s² elements modulo q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mq_poly_montymul_ntt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>Point-wise multiplication for two polynomials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mq_iNTT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>INTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mq_poly_sub</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>Point-wise subtraction for two polynomials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>norm_s²</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>Normalize -s¹ elements into the [-q/2..q/2] range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitaka: Sign</th>
<th>Invocation</th>
<th>Total Time (µs)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>normaldist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196.42</td>
<td>NTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poly_mul_fft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>Point-wise multiplication for two polynomials (complex domain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitaka: Verify</th>
<th>Invocation</th>
<th>Total Time (µs)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poly_mul_fft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>Point-wise multiplication for two polynomials (complex domain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poly_add</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>Point-wise addition for two polynomials (complex domain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitaka: Verify</th>
<th>Invocation</th>
<th>Total Time (µs)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poly_mul_fft_add</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>Kernel fusion: combined these two kernels into one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4: Experimental Platforms Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform-1</th>
<th>Platform-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPU</td>
<td>CPU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTX 3080</td>
<td>Intel i9-10900K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V100</td>
<td>Intel Xeon Gold 6150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A100</td>
<td>Nvidia RTX 3080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volta</td>
<td>AMD Ryzen 7 5800X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turing</td>
<td>Intel Xeon Gold 6150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampere</td>
<td>Intel Xeon Gold 6150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compute capability</td>
<td>1.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock (GHz)</td>
<td>Memory bandwidth (GB/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>No. Streaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Multiprocessor (SM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Compiler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70 GHz</td>
<td>Clock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the workload increases (i.e., larger K). In general, the throughput saturates when the batch size K is between 1024 to 16,384; but for T4 with a smaller number of cores, the throughput saturates earlier when K ≥ 64. Note that throughput saturation indicates that the GPU is already fully loaded, giving additional workload (i.e., increasing K) will not produce higher throughput anymore. Experimental results also show that Mitaka-512 and Mitaka-1024 are always faster than Falcon-512 and Falcon-1024, the speed-up can range from 1.99 to 19.72 times depending on the batch size and GPU platforms. This is mainly because Mitaka uses a parallelizable sampler, which benefits from the parallel architecture in a GPU; whereas the Falcon ffSampling is not parallelizable, only a coarse-grained implementation on GPUs is possible. This shows that the design choice of a signature scheme can greatly affect its performance on parallel hardware architectures.

Fig. 5 shows the performance of Falcon and Mitaka signature verification on various GPU platforms. Similar to signature generation, the throughput of verification increases when the size of workload increases (i.e., larger K), but it takes more workload to reach the saturated state. The throughput saturation happens in all selected GPUs when the batch size K ≥ 4096. In contrast to signature generation, Falcon has a remarkably high verification throughput across all the selected GPUs, which is higher than Mitaka for most of the test cases. We note that this performance difference is due to the efficient verification process in Falcon which only involves simple polynomial arithmetic in the integer domain using number theoretic transform (NTT). Hence, all the computations can be carried out using integer units in GPUs. On the other hand, Mitaka signature verification was computed over double precision involving the fast Fourier transform (FFT), which is executed on floating point units in GPUs. For A100 and V100, the throughput of 32-bit integer units is 2 × higher than 64-bit floating point units [28], but the gap is higher for T4 and RTX 3080 (32 × higher [28]). This explains that Mitaka signature verification can be significantly slower if it is implemented on double precision.

Table 5 shows the throughput and latency of Falcon/Mitaka-512 and Falcon/Mitaka-1024, respectively. The experiments are carried out for 30 times and the average results were reported. Experimental results show that the
signature generations have low latency and high throughput performance. For instance, the slowest GPU in our experiment, T4, can produce 16,384 Falcon-1024 signatures in 2144.22 ms; the fastest GPU, A100 can complete the same task in only 279.61 ms. The performance of signature verification is equally impressive, wherein all verifications can be completed within 100 ms regardless of the batch size and the GPU used.

4.2 Comparison with Existing Works

Table 6 shows the comparison of our work against the state-of-the-art Falcon and Mitaka implementation on CPU. We also compared our implementation results with three recently published works on the GPU implementation of postquantum signature schemes. FP64 refers to the reference implementation provided by the Falcon and Mitaka authors, which is implemented using double precision floating point; while AVX2 is the optimized implementation utilizing AVX2 instructions available on the CPU. Our Falcon-512 implementation on RTX 3080 is $7.78 \times$ and $52.43 \times$ faster than the AVX2 implementation for sign and verify, respectively. For the case of Falcon-1024, the speed-up is higher ($20.56 \times$ and $148.56 \times$), due to the high parallelism available in GPU. Since there is no AVX2 implementation of Mitaka available, we compare our work with the reference implementation (FP64) on CPU. Our GPU implementation is $9.15 \times$ (sign)/$14.45 \times$ (verify) and $39.07 \times$ (sign)/$69.1 \times$ (verify) faster than FP64 for Mitaka-512 and Mitaka-1024 respectively.

Wang et al. [45] had reported the first implementation of XMSS signature on GPU devices. For the parameter set XMSS$_{10}$, they reported a throughput of 225396 sign/s and 730450 verify/s on RTX 3090. Note that this GPU has more cores compared to the one we use, so we scale the results.
Fig. 5: Throughput of Falcon-512 and Mitaka-512 signature verification on various GPU devices.

across accordingly. XMSS\_10 [45] has a faster signature generation compared to Falcon-512 and Mitaka-512. On the other hand, Falcon and Mitaka verification throughputs are 3.16× and 1.14× faster than XMSS\_10 (scaled). Similar results are also observed in the recent GPU implementation of Dilithium [26]. Dilithium achieved throughput of 717, 306 sign/s and 1, 960, 182 verify/s on RTX 3090 Ti, which is 20.8× and 7.84× (scaled) faster than Falcon-512 and Mitaka-512, respectively. In contrast, the verification throughput of Falcon-512 and Mitaka-512 is 3.2× and 1.18× (scaled) faster than Dilithium. Sun et al. [14] showed that throughput of 5, 152 sign/s and 106, 390 verify/s can be achieved by SPHINCS on an older GPU, GTX 1, 080. Our implementation of Falcon-512 and Mitaka-512 are 1.59× and 4.22× faster in a signature generation; it is also 5.28× and 1.92× faster in signature verification, compared to SPHINCS [14].

4.3 Discussions

From the experimental results, we note that Mitaka signature verification is slower than Falcon, due to the use of double-precision arithmetic. The original Mitaka scheme [6] does not restrict that the verification process must reside on the double precision domain. By porting it over to the integer domain, we believe that the Mitaka verification throughput on GPUs can be greatly improved. Since the Mitaka verification process is very similar to the Falcon verification [4] with the same polynomial degree and modulus in the arithmetic, the FFT used by the Mitaka verification can be easily replaced with the NTT in the integer domain. However, in this paper, we follow strictly the reference implementation provided by the authors [6] so that the test vectors can be verified.

Besides that, referring to the use case in e-commerce that we discussed in Section 1, we observed that an A100 GPU
can process the required signature generations (583,000) and verifications (1,166,000) in \(\approx 10 s\) and \(\approx 0.42 s\) respectively, using Falcon-512. This shows that offloading these computations to a GPU accelerator [35], the response time can be greatly reduced.

### 5 Conclusions

A high throughputs implementation of Falcon and Mitaka was presented in this article. Experimental results show that Mitaka has a much higher signature generation throughput compared to Falcon, due to the parallelizable sampling process. On the other hand, Falcon enjoys a higher verification throughput as all the computations can be performed in the integer domain. This shows that the choices made in designing a signature scheme can greatly affect its performance on various hardware architectures, including parallel architecture like GPU. Close analysis on the Mitaka verification process shows that its performance on GPUs can be improved if we port the existing implementation from FP64 to integer domain, which is an interesting future work to pursue. Given that the NIST standardization for the signature scheme is still ongoing, parallelizing the selected candidates on GPUs would also be a good research direction.
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TABLE 6: Comparing with CPU and state-of-the-art implementations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fal-512 Mit-512 Fal-1024 Mit-1024</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPU, Op/s</td>
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<td></td>
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<td>3167</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>71306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XMSS [14] (SHA-256)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>225398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>771306</td>
</tr>
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<td>Dilithium [26]</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Sign</td>
<td>717306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>1960182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPHINCS [14] (ChaCha)</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>31552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>108390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
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<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPU, Op/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVX2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>27908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>74100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work (RTX 3080)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>1913380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>699591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XMSS [10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>225398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>771306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilithium [26]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>717306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>1960182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPHINCS [14]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>31552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify</td>
<td>108390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest throughput with $K = 16384$.

2 Performance scaled by the number of cores, 10496/8704. RTX 3090 was used in [45].

3 Performance scaled by 10752/8704 RTX 3090 Ti was used in [26].

4 Performance scaled by 2560/8704. GTX 1080 was used in [14].
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