

# Exercises for Cryptology 1

## Discrete Logarithms

Christian Majenz & Carsten Baum, DTU

April 17, 2023

### ❓ Exercise 1. (Computing Discrete Logarithms with smooth group order)

Let  $p$  be a prime and  $g, h \in Z_p^*$  where  $g$  has order  $p - 1$ . Then given  $p, g, h$  the discrete logarithm problem is to find the unique  $a \in Z_{p-1}$  such that  $g^a = h \bmod p$ .

For this exercise, let  $p = 31$ ,  $g = 11$ ,  $h = 5$ .

1. Try out all possible choices of  $a$  to find the discrete logarithm. For an arbitrary  $p$ , how many multiplications modulo  $p$  would you have to do (in the worst case) to find  $a$  this way?
2. We observe that  $p - 1 = 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$  and want to use this to simplify the computation of the discrete logarithm. Let  $x = (p - 1)/2$ ,  $y = (p - 1)/3$ ,  $z = (p - 1)/5$  and consider the elements  $g^x, g^y, g^z$ . What do you know about the order of these elements modulo  $p$ ?
3. We can find the value  $a \bmod 2$  by computing the discrete logarithm of  $h^x$  for the base  $g^x$ . Similarly, we can obtain  $a \bmod 3$  from  $g^y, h^y$  and  $a \bmod 5$  from  $g^z, h^z$ . Can you use this to find  $a \in Z_{30}$  more efficiently?
4. More generally, assume that  $p - 1$  has  $\ell$  prime factors that are all smaller than  $B$ . Can you (roughly) say how many multiplications modulo  $p$  you have to do, in comparison to the trivial method that tries out all choices of  $a$ , to recover the discrete logarithm?

### ❓ Exercise 2. (When the Decisional Diffie Hellman Problem is easy)

Let  $p$  be a prime. In the lecture, we considered the DDH problem in the case when  $g \in Z_p^*$  was of large prime order  $q$  such that  $q|p - 1$ . Now instead, assume that  $g \in Z_p^*$  is a generator of the whole group  $Z_p^*$ .

Show that, in this case, one can distinguish tuples of the form  $(g, g^a, g^b, g^{a \cdot b})$  for  $a, b \in Z_{p-1}$  from tuples of the form  $(g, g^a, g^b, g^c)$  for  $a, b, c \in Z_{p-1}$  with a very good chance. For this, use the observations from the previous exercise and consider what happens if you raise each element in the tuple to  $(p - 1)/2$ .

### ❓ Exercise 3. (From Diffie Hellman to Public-Key Encryption)

Let  $p$  be a prime and  $g \in Z_p^*$  be of large prime order  $q|p - 1$ . In the Diffie Hellman Key Exchange Protocol, Alice and Bob exchange messages  $A = g^a \bmod p$ ,  $B = g^b \bmod p$  where  $a, b \in Z_q$ .

1. Assume that Bob publishes the message  $B$  as a public key, while he keeps  $b$  as his secret key. Alice now encrypts a message  $m \in \{0, 1\}$  as follows:

- (a) She chooses  $a \in Z_q, r \in Z_q^*$ , and computes  $c_1 = g^a \bmod p$ .
- (b) If  $m = 0$  then she sets  $c_2 = B^a \bmod p$ , otherwise she sets  $c_2 = B^a \cdot g^r \bmod p$ .
- (c) She lets  $c_1, c_2$  be the ciphertext for Bob.

Show how Bob can recover the message.

2. Show that this encryption scheme is IND-CPA secure assuming DDH is hard in the group  $Z_p^*$  with generator  $g$ . Namely, show that if there exists an attacker that wins the IND-CPA security game with probability  $P > 1/2$ , then we can use it to construct an algorithm that breaks *DDH* with the same probability.

#### ❓ Exercise 4. (The Pedersen Commitment)

Commitments are an advanced cryptographic primitive. They allow a sender to “commit” to a message  $m$  towards the receiver by sending a value  $c$ . Having only  $c$  (i.e. before  $m$  is “opened” to the receiver), the receiver cannot say what message  $m$  is contained inside  $c$ . At the same time, once  $c$  is sent to the receiver then the sender cannot change his mind and open  $c$  to another message  $m'$  anymore towards the sender. More formally, a commitment scheme consists of two algorithms:

**Commit** A *Com* algorithm which, on input  $m$  outputs values  $c, d$ .

**Open** An *Open* algorithm which, on input  $m, c, d$  outputs a bit.

It is required that the commitment scheme is binding and hiding:

**Binding** It should be computationally difficult for a sender to generate values  $m, m', d, d', c$  such that  $\text{Open}(m, c, d) = \text{Open}(m', c, d') = 1$  while  $m \neq m'$ . Note that sender has a free choice of all these values, as long as both messages  $m, m'$  are different but open the same commitment  $c$  which the sender can also choose.

**Hiding** Given  $m_0, m_1$  by an adversary, this adversary should not be able to decide if it is a commitment to  $m_0$  or  $m_1$  for an honestly generated commitment  $c$  (similar to the IND-CPA property for encryption schemes, where the adversary can pick two “potential” messages but cannot say which one is ultimately encrypted in the ciphertext).

Towards constructing a commitment scheme, let us, as before, assume that  $p$  is a prime and  $g \in Z_p^*$  is of large prime order  $q | p - 1$ . We assume that  $p, q, g$  are public knowledge for everyone. A first attempt for a commitment scheme is the following:

**Commit** On input  $m \in Z_q$ , output  $c = g^m \bmod p$  and  $d = \perp$ .

**Open** On input  $m \in Z_q, c \in Z_p^*$  output 1 if  $c = g^m \bmod p$  and 0 otherwise.

Show that this construction is insecure because it is not hiding!

A version of this, which bears resemblance to the previous exercises, is actually secure! It is called the *Pedersen Commitment* and it works as follows, assuming an additional  $h \in \langle g \rangle$  (i.e.  $h = g^a$  for some value  $a$ ).  $h$  is also of prime order  $q$  and also publicly known (and fixed for sender and receiver):

**Commit** On input  $m \in Z_q$ , sample a random  $r \in Z_q$  and output  $c = g^m h^r \bmod p$  and  $d = r$ . The receiver will obtain  $c$  while the sender keeps  $d$  to itself.

**Open** On input  $m \in Z_q, c \in Z_p^*, d \in Z_q$  output 1 if  $c = g^m h^r \bmod p$ , otherwise output 0.

1. Assume that neither sender nor receiver know the discrete logarithm of  $h$  to the base  $g$  modulo  $p$ . Then the aforementioned commitment scheme is binding. To prove this, assume for contradiction that there exists a sender algorithm that can, on input  $p, q, g, h$ , generate values  $m, m', c, r, r'$  such that  $g^m h^r \bmod p = g^{m'} h^{r'} \bmod p$  where  $m \neq m'$ . Then show that you can use this sender algorithm to compute the discrete logarithm of  $h$  to base  $g$  modulo  $p$ !
2. Show that the commitment scheme is also hiding! To do this, you can use that there must exist an  $a \in Z_q$  such that  $h = g^a \bmod p$ . Then you can show that an honestly generated commitment  $c = g^m h^r \bmod p$  could have been generated by any other message  $m'$  using a certain randomness  $r'$ .