

### Question 1

Compare and contrast the following MAC protocols:

1. MAC-and-encrypt:  $(Enc(k, m), MAC(k, m))$
2. Encrypt-then-MAC:  $(Enc(k, m), MAC(k, Enc(k, m)))$

Which is better to use in real-world situations?

### Question 2

In this question we will explore the idea of a *cryptographic commitment scheme* and how to build them using secure hash functions.

Say Alice wants to play a game with Bob about coin flipping. If Bob can guess the outcome of the coin, he wins \$5. Otherwise, he pays Alice \$5.

Alice wants to convince Bob her coin flip is fair, but doesn't want to tell him what the result was before he guesses. In order to solve this, they use a commitment scheme – she finds a random bit  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  and publishes  $H(b)$ .

After Bob publishes his guess  $b'$ , she reveals  $b$ , and Bob can verify for himself whether his guess was correct, and be sure that Alice did not change the real value upon seeing his guess.

1. **Explain why Bob is convinced of the fact that Alice did not cheat, assuming  $H$  is a cryptographically-secure hash function.**
2. **Is this scheme still secure if  $H$  is no longer preimage-resistant? If not, who has the 'advantage' in this scenario, and how would they exploit the change?**
3. **Is this scheme still secure if  $H$  is no longer collision-resistant? If not, who has the 'advantage' in this scenario, and how would they exploit the change?**

### Question 3

Recall the MAC security game:

1. An adversary sends  $m$  and receives  $MAC(k, m)$  for a polynomial amount of times (with different messages as desired).

2. If the adversary can output some **valid**  $(m', MAC(k, m'))$  such that  $m'$  was not sent in the previous round, they win the MAC security game.

Consider the following MAC scheme, using SHA-2 as the hash function:

$$MAC(k, m) = H(k || m)$$

1. **Argue why this scheme is insecure using the MAC security game, and provide the steps an adversary would take to win the game.**

*HINT: What attack is SHA-2 vulnerable to in particular?*

2. **Does your attack from part 1 work for the scheme  $MAC(k, m) = H(m || k)$ ? Explain why or why not.**

**Contributors:**

- Ryan Cottone
- Will Giorza