Myby

• $D(sk, (c_0, c_1))$: output c_1/c_0^x . This variant, called plain ElGamal can be shown to be semantically secure under an appropriate assumption about 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 $E(\mathrm{pk},m_0)$ and let (c_2,c_3) be the output of $E(\mathrm{pk},m_1)$. Then just given these two ciphertexts it is easy to construct the encryption of $m_0 \cdot m_1$ as follows: \bigcirc $(c_0/c_3, c_1/c_2)$ is an encryption of of $m_0 \cdot m_1$. (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 $m_0 \cdot m_1$. \bigcirc $(c_0-c_2,\ c_1-c_3)$ is an encryption of of $m_0\cdot m_1$. 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_0m_1 . 9. Let G be a finite cyclic group of order n and let $pk = (a, h = a^a)$ and sk = (a, a) be an ElGamal public/secret

```
which is a valid encryption of m_0m_1.
9. Let G be a finite cyclic group of order n and let pk = (g, h = g^a) and sk = (g, a) be an ElGamal public/secret
                                                                                                                                            1/1分
    key pair in 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
    (u,c) we send u to both parties. What do the two parties return
    and how do we use these values to decrypt?
    O 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.
        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.
    \bigcap party 1 returns u_1 \leftarrow u^{a1}, party 2 returns u_2 \leftarrow u^{a2}
         and the results are combined by computing v \leftarrow u_1 + u_2.
    \bullet 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.
             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
             for this distributed decryption to work.
10. Suppose Alice and Bob live in a country with 50 states. Alice is
                                                                                                                                            1/1分
    currently in state a \in \{1, \dots, 50\} and Bob is currently in
    state b \in \{1, \dots, 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 G of prime order p and generator g of 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)=\left(A_1^rg^s,\ (A_2/g^b)^rA_0^s\right)
    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 
eq b then Alice learns nothing else from this protocol because
    she recieves the encryption of a random value.
    \bigcirc Alice tests if a=b by checking if B_2^x B_1=1.
        Alice tests if a = b by checking if B_1^x B_2 = 1.
    (a) Alice tests if a = b by checking if B_2/B_1^x = 1.
        Alice tests if a = b by checking if B_2 B_1^x = 1.
        ✓ 正确
             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(a-b)} under the
             public key (g, g^x). 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 
eq 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分
   \bigcirc d < N^{1/6}/c for some constant c.
    \label{eq:def} \bigcirc \ d < N^{1/5}/c \ \text{for some constant} \ c.
    \  \  \, \bigcirc \  \, d < N^{1/2}/c \ {\rm for \ some \ constant} \ c.
    \bigcirc \ d < N^{2/3}/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

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