

# Assignment 1

October 12, 2020

## Q.1

Due to the shift-cipher's key is from 0 to 25, so we try all 26 keys. When the  $key = 13$ , we decrypt the ciphertext:

"SUSTech is a public university founded in the lush hills of Nanshan District Shenzhen It is working towards becoming a world class university excelling in interdisciplinary research nurturing innovative talents and delivering new knowledge to the world."

## Q.2

We prove that for every pair of plaintexts  $x, x'$ , the probability that Eve guesses  $x_b$  after seeing the ciphertext  $c = Enc_k(x_b)$  is at most  $1/2$ , if and only if we have  $E_{U_n}(x) \equiv E_{U_n}(x')$ .

### "if" part

if  $E_{U_n}(x) \equiv E_{U_n}(x')$ , the Eve can not get any information and the probability is at most.

### "only if" part

We prove by contrapositive. Suppose  $\exists x_1, x_2$  such that  $E_{U_n}(x_1) \neq E_{U_n}(x_2)$  which means that there has a  $y_0$  satisfied that  $Pr[Y_{x_1} = y_0] > Pr[Y_{x_2} = y_0]$ . So that Eve guesses  $x_1$  if the ciphertext  $y = y_0$ , otherwise Eve guesses randomly. Then the probability is larger than  $1/2$ .

## Q.3

### "if" part

Suppose that  $Pr[Enc_k(m) = c] = Pr[Enc_k(m') = c]$ , we should prove that (Gen,Enc,Dec) with message space  $M$  is perfectly secure, which means:

$$Pr[M = m | C = c] = \frac{Pr[C = c | M = m] * Pr[M = m]}{\sum_{m' \in M} Pr[C = c | M = m'] * Pr[M = m']} = Pr[M = m]$$

$$Pr[C = c | M = m] * Pr[M = m] = \sum_{m' \in M} Pr[C = c | M = m'] * Pr[M = m']$$

Since  $\forall m, m' \in M$ , we have  $Pr[C = c | M = m] = Pr[C = c | M = m']$ , so that

$$\sum_{m' \in M} Pr[C = c | M = m'] * Pr[M = m'] = Pr[C = c | M = m'] * \sum_{m' \in M} Pr[M = m'] = Pr[C = c | M = m]$$

Above all, we complete the proof.

### "only if" part

Suppose that (Gen,Enc,Dec) with message space  $M$  is perfectly secure. Fix arbitrary messages  $m, m'$  and ciphertext  $c$ , since it is perfectly secure,

$$\forall m \in M, Pr[M = m | C = c] = Pr[M = m]$$

So we have

$$Pr[E_{nc_k}(m) = c] = \frac{Pr[M = m|C = c] * Pr[C = c]}{Pr[M = m]} = Pr[C = c]$$

$$Pr[E_{nc_k}(m') = c] = \frac{Pr[M = m'|C = c] * Pr[C = c]}{Pr[M = m']} = Pr[C = c]$$

The result is nothing to do with  $m$ ,  $Pr[E_{nc_k}(m) = c] = Pr[E_{nc_k}(m') = c]$

## Q.4

(1)

Yes. For every  $m \in Z_M$ , we have  $Pr[E_k(m) = c] = \frac{|k \in Z_M : k + m \bmod M = c|}{|Z_M|} = \frac{1}{6}$ . Due to an encryption scheme (Gen, Enc, Dec) with message space  $M$  is perfectly secure if and only if  $Pr[E_{nc_k}(m) = c] = Pr[E_{nc_k}(m') = c]$ , this encryption scheme is *perfectly secure*.

(2)

No. Let  $m_1 = 1$ ,  $m_2 = 0$ ,  $c = 4$ ,  $Pr[E_{nc_k}(m_1) = c] = 0$ ,  $Pr[E_{nc_k}(m_2) = c] = \frac{1}{3}$ , they go against an encryption scheme (Gen, Enc, Dec) with message space  $M$  is perfectly secure if and only if  $Pr[E_{nc_k}(m) = c] = Pr[E_{nc_k}(m') = c]$ , so this encryption scheme is not perfectly secure.

## Q.5

for any two messages  $m_0, m_1$ ,  $m_0$  and  $m_1$  agree on at least  $l/2$  bits.. Suppose there is a new message  $m_2$ ,  $m_2$  and  $m_1$  also agree on at least  $l/2$  bits.

$m_2$  could be composed of the first half of  $m_0$  and the second half of  $m_1$ . So that we have  $E_{U_n}(m_0) \equiv E_{U_n}(m_1) \equiv E_{U_n}(m_2)$  which prove that any encryption scheme that is half-message perfectly secure must in fact also be perfectly secure.

## Q.6

To prove that the statistical distance  $\Delta(X, Y)$  defined in Definition 2.1 of Lecture 3 is a metric. We should prove:

$$(1) \Delta(X, Y) = 0 \Leftrightarrow (X, Y)$$

since

$$\Delta(X, Y) = \max_{T \subseteq 0, 1^n}$$

$$|Pr[X \in T] - Pr[Y \in T]| = 0$$

which means  $t \in 0, 1^n$  and  $Pr[X \in T] = Pr[Y \in T]$ . Suppose  $\forall t \in 0, 1^n$

$$Pr[X = t] = Pr[X \in t] = Pr[X \in t] = Pr[Y \in t] = Pr[Y = t]$$

So that  $X = Y$

$$(2) \Delta(X, Y) = \Delta(Y, X)$$

since

$$\Delta(X, Y) = \max_{T \subseteq 0, 1^n}$$

so that

$$|Pr[X \in T] - Pr[Y \in T]| = \max_{T \subseteq 0, 1^n}$$

$$|Pr[Y \in T] - Pr[X \in T]| = \Delta(Y, X)$$

$$(3) \Delta(X, Y) \leq \Delta(X, Z) + \Delta(Z, Y)$$

$\Delta(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in \text{Supp}(X) \cup \text{Supp}(Y)} |Pr[X = w] - Pr[Y = w]|$  So that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta(X, Z) + \Delta(Z, Y) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in \text{Supp}(X) \cup \text{Supp}(Y)} |Pr[X = w] - Pr[Z = w]| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in \text{Supp}(X) \cup \text{Supp}(Y)} |Pr[Z = w] - Pr[Y = w]| \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in \text{Supp}(X) \cup \text{Supp}(Y)} (|Pr[X = w] - Pr[Z = w]| + |Pr[Z = w] - Pr[Y = w]|) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in \text{Supp}(X) \cup \text{Supp}(Y)} (|Pr[X = w] - Pr[Z = w] + Pr[Z = w] - Pr[Y = w]|) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{w \in \text{Supp}(X) \cup \text{Supp}(Y)} (|Pr[X = w] - Pr[Y = w]|) \\
 &= \Delta(X, Y)
 \end{aligned}$$

So the statistical distance  $\Delta(X, Y)$  defined in Definition 2.1 of Lecture 3 is a metric.

## Q.7

To prove that the computational indistinguishability  $\approx$  defined above is an equivalence relation, we need to prove that  $\approx$  is reflexive, symmetric and transitive.

### reflexive

$X_n \approx Y_n$  for any  $\epsilon$ ,  $Pr[A(X_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Y_n) = 1] \leq \epsilon(n)$ , which means  $X_n \approx X_n$

### symmetric

If  $X_n \approx Y_n$ ,  $|Pr[A(X_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Y_n) = 1]| = |Pr[A(Y_n) = 1] - Pr[A(X_n) = 1]|$ , which means  $X_n \approx X_n$

### transitive

If  $X_n \approx Y_n$  and  $Y_n \approx Z_n$ , for any  $\epsilon$ ,  $Pr[A(X_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Y_n) = 1] \leq \epsilon(n)$ ,  $Pr[A(Y_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Z_n) = 1] \leq \epsilon(n)$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &Pr[A(X_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Y_n) = 1] \\
 &= Pr[A(X_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Y_n) = 1] + Pr[A(Y_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Z_n) = 1] \\
 &\leq |Pr[A(X_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Y_n) = 1]| + |Pr[A(Y_n) = 1] - Pr[A(Z_n) = 1]| \\
 &\leq 2\epsilon(n)
 \end{aligned}$$