

Exercises decomp

Construction :

$$K \in \{0,1\}^n$$

and a message $m \in \{0,1\}^{\ell(n)}$ [uniformly distributed]

and G : PRG,

$$G: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{\ell(n)}.$$

$$\text{Enc}_K(m) : c = G(K) \oplus m$$

$$\text{Dec}_K(c) : m = G(K) \oplus c$$

Proof of security :

for a PRG G , we know that,

(by definition).

$$P[D(G(K))=1] - P[D(w)=1] \leq n^{-c(n)}$$

$$G: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{\ell(n)} \quad \& \quad w \in \{0,1\}^{\ell(n)}$$

generated from pseudo random generator.

[uniform distribution]

distinguisher

can't distinguish b/w a truly random generated output and a output generated by PRG.

To prove:

$$P[\text{PrivK}_{A,\pi}^{\text{adv}}(n)=1] \leq \frac{1}{2} + n^{-c(n)}$$

consider a PPTMA,

$$P[D(w)=1] = P[\text{PrivK}_{A,\pi}^{\text{adv}}(n)=1] = \frac{1}{2} \quad (2)$$

\Rightarrow since, in a truly random setting there's a $\frac{1}{2}$ chance, uniform distribution for the adversary A to output either if bit $b \in \{0,1\}$

$$P[D(G(K))=1] = P[\text{PrivK}_{A,\pi}^{\text{adv}}(n)=1] \quad (3)$$

\Rightarrow if G is a PRG, then we can say that the probability by which the distinguisher recognizes $G(K)$ as a pseudorandom string than random string, should be same as the probability of adversary A guessing the message bit b , using the scheme π .

using (2) & (3) in (1), we get

$$P[\text{PrivK}_{A,\pi}^{\text{adv}}(n)=1] \leq \frac{1}{2} + n^{-c(n)}$$

\therefore given scheme is provably secure.