

# CS171 HW5

Q1. For Scheme 1: (i) A queries  $m = m_0 || m_2$  and receives  $t = F_k(m_0) || F_k(m_0 \oplus m_2)$   
 (ii) A queries  $m' = m_1 || m_2$  and receives  $t' = F_k(m_1) || F_k(m_1 \oplus m_2)$   
 (iii) A sends  $m^* = m_1 || m_0$  and  $t^* = F_k(m_1) || F_k(m_0 \oplus m_1)$   
 where  $F_k(m_1)$  is the 1<sup>st</sup>  $n$  bits of  $t'$  and  $F_k(m_0 \oplus m_1)$  is the last  $n$  bits of  $t$

For Scheme 2: (i) A queries  $m_{01} = m_0 || m_1$  and retrieves  $t_{01} = F_k(r) \oplus F_k(0 || m_0) \oplus F_k(1 || m_1)$   
 (ii) A queries  $m_{00} = m_0 || m_0$  and retrieves  $t_{00} = F_k(r) \oplus F_k(0 || m_0) \oplus F_k(1 || m_0)$   
 (iii) A queries  $m_{11} = m_1 || m_1$  and retrieves  $t_{11} = F_k(r) \oplus F_k(0 || m_1) \oplus F_k(1 || m_1)$   
 (iv) A sends  $m^* = m_1 || m_0$  and  $t^* = r || t_{01} \oplus t_{00} \oplus t_{11}$  where  $r$  is retrieved from any of  $t_{01}$  &  $t_{00}$  &  $t_{11}$ , and  $t_{01} \oplus t_{00} \oplus t_{11} = F_k(r) \oplus F_k(0 || m_1) \oplus F_k(1 || m_0)$

Q2. (1) We construct  $Mac'$ :

①  $Gen'(1^n) := Gen(1^n)$

②  $Mac'(k, m) := t' = Mac(k, m) || LSB(Mac(k, m))$  where  $LSB(x)$  is the least significant bit of the output of  $x$

③  $Verif'(k, m, t)$ : Let  $t' = t_0 || b$  where  $t_0 \in \{0, 1\}^n$  &  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ . Output 1 if  $t_0 = Mac(k, m)$  and output 0 otherwise.

(2) If there exists adversary A that breaks  $Mac'$  then adversary B can use A to break  $Mac$ :

(i) When A outputs a query  $m_i$  for the  $Mac'(k, \cdot)$  oracle, B forwards  $m_i$  to its oracle for  $Mac(k, \cdot)$  and sends  $Mac(k, \cdot) || LSB(Mac(k, \cdot))$  to A

(ii) In the end when A outputs  $(m^*, t^*)$ , B removes the last bit of  $t^*$  and denote it  $t_{truncated}^*$ . B outputs  $(m^*, t_{truncated}^*)$

(3) Since  $Mac'$  is only unforgeable, adversary A can possibly obtain  $t'$  for the same  $c$ , which  $(c, t')$  would pass the oracle for CCA which would output  $m_b$ , giving A the probability of 1 of breaking CCA security.



Q3. (1b) 
$$\begin{cases} r = F(K_2, m) \\ t = \text{Mac}_R(r; K_2, m) \end{cases}$$

(2b) Assume toward contradiction that adversary  $A$  can distinguish between Hyb0 and Hyb1 with non-negligible advantage, We can then construct  $B$  from  $A$  to distinguish between PRF  $F$  and the random function  $R$  with non-negligible advantage.

$B$  is constructed:

(i)  $B$  receives a function  $G$  which is either  $F_K$  or  $R$ , but it doesn't know.

(ii)  $B$  runs  $A$ , simulating the MAC oracle using  $G$  in place of  $F$  in Hyb0 and  $R$  in Hyb1: When  $A$  makes a query on  $m$ ,  $B$  provides the tag computed using  $G(m)$ .

(iii) Whenever  $A$  determines that it is interacting with Hyb0,  $B$  determines that it is interacting with  $F_K$ , vice-versa.

(2c)  $\Pr[\text{Hyb}_1 \rightarrow 1] = 2^{-l}$  since  $R$  is truly random  
 $\therefore$  Prove by reduction to  $R$

(2d)  $\Pr[\text{Hyb}_0 \rightarrow 1] \leq \text{negl}$

$\therefore$  MAC security game  $\text{MAC-forge}_{A, \Pi_D}(n)$  is not breakable

$\therefore \Pi_0$  is a secure MAC