TO PASS 80% or higher



GRADE 100%

## Week 6 - Problem Set

LATEST SUBMISSION GRADE 100%

 Recall that with symmetric ciphers it is possible to encrypt a 32-bit message and obtain a 32-bit ciphertext (e.g. with the one time pad or with a nonce-based system). Can the same be done with a public-key

system?

- No, public-key systems with short ciphertexts
  - can never be secure.
- Yes, the RSA-OAEP system can produce 32-bit ciphertexts.
- Yes, when encrypting a short plaintext the output
  of the public-key encryption algorithm can be truncated to the length
  of the plaintext.
- It is possible and depends on the specifics of the system.

✓ Correct

An attacker can use the public key to build a

dictionary of all  $2^{32}$  ciphertexts of length 32 bits along with

their decryption and use the dictionary to decrypt any captured ciphertext.

2. Let  $(\mathrm{Gen}, E, D)$  be a semantically secure public-key encryption

system. Can algorithm  ${\cal E}$  be deterministic?

- No, but chosen-ciphertext secure encryption can be deterministic.
- No, semantically secure public-key encryption must
- Yes, some public-key encryption schemes are deterministic.
- Yes, RSA encryption is deterministic.

✓ Correct

be randomized.

That's correct since otherwise an attacker can easily

break semantic security.

3. Let  $(\mathrm{Gen}, E, D)$  be a chosen ciphertext secure public-key encryption

system with message space  $\{0,1\}^{128}$  . Which of the following is also chosen ciphertext secure?

 $\square$  (Gen, E', D') where

$$E'(\mathrm{pk},m) = \left(E(\mathrm{pk},\;m),\; E(\mathrm{pk},\;0^{128})\right)$$

$$\text{ and } D'\big(\mathrm{sk},\ (c_1,c_2)\big) = \begin{cases} D(\mathrm{sk},c_1) & \text{if } D(\mathrm{sk},c_2) = 0^{128} \\ \bot & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

 $\ensuremath{ \ensuremath{ \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \ensuremath{ \ensuremath{ \ensuremath{ \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|} \hline \ensuremath{ \ensuremath{$ 

$$E'(pk, m) = (E(pk, m), 0^{128})$$

and 
$$D'ig(\mathrm{sk},\ (c_1,c_2)ig) = egin{cases} D(\mathrm{sk},c_1) & ext{if } c_2 = 0^{128} \ ot & ext{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

✓ Correct

1/1 point

1 / 1 point

1/1 point

This construction is chosen-ciphertext secure. An attack on  $(\operatorname{Gen}, E', D)$  gives an attack on (Gen, E, D).  $\square$  (Gen, E', D') where E'(pk, m) = (E(pk, m), E(pk, m))and  $D'(sk, (c_1, c_2)) = D(sk, c_1).$ lacksquare (Gen, E', D') where  $E'(\mathrm{pk},m)=E(\mathrm{pk},\ m\oplus 1^{128})$  and  $D'(\mathbf{sk},c) = D(\mathbf{sk},c) \oplus 1^{128}$ ✓ Correct This construction is chosen-ciphertext secure. An attack on  $(\operatorname{Gen}, E', D)$  gives an attack on (Gen, E, D). 4. Recall that an RSA public key consists of an RSA modulus  ${\cal N}$ 1 / 1 point and an exponent  $\emph{e}.$  One might be tempted to use the same RSA modulus in different public keys. For example, Alice might use  $\left(N,3\right)$  as her public key while Bob may use  $\left(N,5\right)$  as his public key. Alice's secret key is  $d_a=3^{-1} \ \mathrm{mod} \ \varphi(N)$ and Bob's secret key is  $d_b = 5^{-1} \operatorname{mod} \varphi(N)$ . In this question and the next we will show that it is insecure for Alice and Bob to use the same modulus  $N.\ \mbox{In particular},$ we show that either user can use their secret key to factor  $N. \ \ \,$ Alice can use the factorization to compute  $\varphi(N)$  and then compute Bob's secret key. As a first step, show that Alice can use her public key  $\left(N,3\right)$ and private key  $d_a$  to construct an integer multiple of  $\varphi(N)$ . Which of the following is an integer multiple of  $\varphi(N)$ ?  $\bigcirc$   $5d_a - 1$  $\bigcirc$   $3d_a + 1$ (a)  $3d_a - 1$  $\bigcirc d_a + 1$ ✓ Correct Since  $d_a=3^{-1} \ \mathrm{mod} \ arphi(N)$  we know that  $3d_a=1\, \mathrm{mod}\, arphi(N)$  and therefore  $3d_a-1$  is divisibly by  $\varphi(N)$ . 5. Now that Alice has a multiple of  $\varphi(N)$  let's see how she can 1 / 1 point factor N=pq. Let x be the given muliple of  $\varphi(N)$ . Then for any g in  $\mathbb{Z}_N^*$  we have  $g^x=1$ in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ . Alice chooses a random gin  $\mathbb{Z}_N^*$  and computes the sequence  $g^x,g^{x/2},g^{x/4},g^{x/8}\dots$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ and stops as soon as she reaches the first element  $y=g^{x/2^i}$  such that  $y \neq 1$  (if she gets stuck because the exponent becomes odd, she picks a new random g and tries again). It can be shown that with probability 1/2 this y satisfies

 $\int y = -1 \mod p$ , and

 $\int y = 1 \mod p$ , and

```
\bigcirc s = s_2^a \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}_N.
```

```
\checkmark Correct s=s_1^a\cdot s_2^b=s^{r_1a}\cdot s^{r_2b}=s^{r_1a+r_2b}=s\ {\rm in}\ \mathbb{Z}_N.
```

8. Let G be a finite cyclic group of order n and consider

the following variant of ElGamal encryption in  ${\cal G}$ :

- Gen: choose a random generator g in G and a random x in  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . Output  $\mathrm{pk}=(g,h=g^x)$  and  $\mathrm{sk}=(g,x)$ .
- $E(\operatorname{pk}, m \in G)$ : choose a random r in  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  and output  $(g^r, \ m \cdot h^r)$ .
- $D(\operatorname{sk},(c_0,c_1))$ : output  $c_1/c_0^x$ .

This variant, called plain ElGamal, can be shown to be semantically secure

under an appropriate

assumption about  ${\it G}.$  It is however not chosen-ciphertext secure

because it is easy to compute on ciphertexts. That is,

let  $(c_0,c_1)$  be the output of  $E(\operatorname{pk},m_0)$  and let

 $(c_2,c_3)$  be the output of  $E(\operatorname{pk},m_1).$  Then just given

these two ciphertexts it is easy to construct the

encryption of  $m_0 \cdot m_1$  as follows:

- $\bigcirc$   $(c_0/c_2,\ c_1/c_3)$  is an encryption of of  $m_0\cdot m_1$ .
- $\bigcirc \ (c_0/c_3,\ c_1/c_2)$  is an encryption of of  $m_0\cdot m_1$  .
- $\bigcirc$   $(c_0c_2, c_1c_3)$  is an encryption of of  $m_0 \cdot m_1$ .
- $\bigcirc$   $(c_0c_3, c_1c_2)$  is an encryption of of  $m_0 \cdot m_1$ .

# ✓ Correct

Indeed,  $(c_0c_2,\ c_1c_3)=(g^{r_0+r_1},\ m_0m_1h^{r_0+r_1})$ ,

which is a valid encryption of  $m_0 m_1$  .

9. Let G be a finite cyclic group of order n and let  $\mathrm{pk}=(g,h=g^a)$  and  $\mathrm{sk}=(g,a)$  be an ElGamal public/secret

key pair in  ${\cal G}$  as described in Segment 12.1. Suppose we want to

distribute the secret key to two parties so that both parties are

needed to decrypt. Moreover, during decryption the secret key is

never re-constructed in a single location. A simple way to do so it

to choose random numbers  $a_1,a_2$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  such

that  $a_1+a_2=a.$  One party is given  $a_1$  and the other party

is given  $a_2$ . Now, to decrypt an ElGamal ciphertext

 $\left(u,c\right)$  we send u to both parties. What do the two parties return

and how do we use these values to decrypt?

- $\bigcirc$  party 1 returns  $u_1\leftarrow u^{a_1}$ , party 2 returns  $u_2\leftarrow u^{a_2}$  and the results are combined by computing  $v\leftarrow u_1+u_2$ .
- $\bigcirc$  party 1 returns  $u_1 \leftarrow u^{-a_1}$  , party 2 returns  $u_2 \leftarrow u^{-a_2}$ 
  - and the results are combined by computing  $v \leftarrow u_1 \cdot u_2.$
- igcup party 1 returns  $u_1\leftarrow u^{(a_1^2)}$  , party 2 returns  $u_2\leftarrow u^{(a_2^2)}$  and the results are combined by computing  $v\leftarrow u_1\cdot u_2$ .
- lack order party 1 returns  $u_1 \leftarrow u^{a_1}$ , party 2 returns  $u_2 \leftarrow u^{a_2}$  and the results are combined by computing  $v \leftarrow u_1 \cdot u_2$ .

### ✓ Correct

Indeed,  $v=u_1\cdot u_2=g^{a_1+a_2}=g^a$  as needed

for decryption. Note that the secret key was never re-constructed  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

for this distributed decryption to work.

1/1 point

1/1 point

10. Suppose Alice and Bob live in a country with 50 states. Alice is

currently in state  $a \in \{1, \dots, 50\}$  and Bob is currently in

state  $b \in \{1,\ldots,50\}$ . They can communicate with one

another and Alice wants to test if she is currently in the same state

as Bob. If they are in the same state, Alice should learn that fact

and otherwise she should learn nothing else about Bob's location. Bob

should learn nothing about Alice's location.

They agree on the following scheme:

- They fix a group  ${\cal G}$  of prime order p and generator g of  ${\cal G}$
- Alice chooses random x and y in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  and sends to Bob  $(A_0,A_1,A_2)=\left(g^x,\ g^y,\ g^{xy+a}\right)$
- Bob choose random r and s in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  and sends back to Alice  $(B_1,B_2)=(A_1^rg^s,\ (A_2/g^b)^rA_0^s)$

What should Alice do now to test if they are in the same state (i.e. to test if a=b)?

Note that Bob learns nothing from this protocol because he simply

recieved a plain ElGamal encryption of  $g^a$  under the public key  $g^x$  . One can show that

if  $a \neq b$  then Alice learns nothing else from this protocol because

she recieves the encryption of a random value.

- Alice tests if a = b by checking if  $B_2B_1^x = 1$ .
- On Alice tests if a=b by checking if  $B_2/B_1^x=1$ .
- Alice tests if a = b by checking if  $B_1^x B_2 = 1$ .
- Alice tests if a = b by checking if  $B_2^x B_1 = 1$ .



The pair  $(B_1,B_2)$  from Bob satisfies  $B_1=g^{yr+s}$  and  $B_2=(g^x)^{yr+s}g^{r(a-b)}$ . Therefore, it is a

plain ElGamal encryption of the plaintext  $g^{r\left(a-b
ight)}$  under the

public key  $\left(g,g^{x}\right)$ . This plaintext happens to be 1 when a=b.

The term  $B_2/B_1^x$  computes the ElGamal plaintext and compares it to 1.

Note that when  $a \neq b$  the r(a-b) term ensures that Alice learns

nothing about b other than the fact that  $a \neq b$ .

Indeed, when  $a \neq b$  then r(a-b) is a uniform non-zero element of

 $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

11. What is the bound on d for Wiener's attack when N is a product of three equal size distinct primes?

1/1 point

1/1 poi

- $\bigcirc d < N^{1/6}/c$  for some constant c.
- $\bigcirc \ d < N^{1/3}/c$  for some constant c.
- $\bigcirc \ d < N^{1/4}/c$  for some constant c.
- $\bigcirc \ d < N^{1/5}/c$  for some constant c.

The only change to the analysis is that N-arphi(N) is now

on the order of  $N^{2/3}$  . Everything else stays the same. Plugging

in this bound gives the answer. Note that the bound is weaker in this case compared to when N is a product of two primes making the attack less effective.