

Homework 5

Deadline: November 1; 2020, 11:59 PM EST

1. **(10 points)** Let $(\text{Gen}, \text{Sign}, \text{Verify})$ be a multi-message UF-CMA secure digital signature scheme that can be used to sign messages of length n . Consider the following new scheme for signing messages of length $2n$:
 - $\text{Gen}'(1^n)$: Compute $(\text{sk}_1, \text{pk}_1) \leftarrow \text{Gen}(1^n)$ and $(\text{sk}_2, \text{pk}_2) \leftarrow \text{Gen}(1^n)$. Set $\text{sk} := (\text{sk}_1, \text{sk}_2)$ and $\text{pk} := (\text{pk}_1, \text{pk}_2)$. Output (sk, pk) .
 - $\text{Sign}'(m, \text{sk})$: Parse $\text{sk} := (\text{sk}_1, \text{sk}_2)$. Compute $\sigma_1 \leftarrow \text{Sign}(m[0 : n], \text{sk}_1)$ and $\sigma_2 \leftarrow \text{Sign}(m[n : 2n], \text{sk}_2)$. Output $\sigma := \sigma_1 || \sigma_2$.
 - $\text{Verify}'(\sigma, \text{pk})$: Parse $\text{pk} := (\text{pk}_1, \text{pk}_2)$ and $\sigma := \sigma_1 || \sigma_2$. Compute $b_1 \leftarrow \text{Verify}(\sigma_1, \text{pk}_1)$ and $b_2 \leftarrow \text{Verify}(\sigma_2, \text{pk}_2)$. Output $b := b_1 \wedge b_2$.

Show that $(\text{Gen}', \text{Sign}', \text{Verify}')$ is **not** a UF-CMA secure digital signature scheme.

2. (a) **(10 points)** Let $(\text{Gen}, \text{Sign}, \text{Verify})$ be a multi-message UF-CMA secure digital signature scheme. Consider the following new scheme:
 - $\text{Gen}'(1^n)$: Compute and output $(\text{sk}, \text{pk}) \leftarrow \text{Gen}(1^n)$.
 - $\text{Sign}'(m, \text{sk})$: Compute $\sigma \leftarrow \text{Sign}(m, \text{sk})$ and output $\sigma' := \sigma || \sigma$.
 - $\text{Verify}'(\sigma, \text{pk})$: Parse $\sigma := \sigma_1 || \sigma_2$. Compute $b \leftarrow \text{Verify}(\sigma_1, \text{pk})$. If $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ and $b = 1$, output 1, else output 0.

Show that $(\text{Gen}', \text{Sign}', \text{Verify}')$ is also a multi-message UF-CMA secure digital signature scheme.

- (b) **(10 points)** In the class we saw that PRFs imply MACs. You have to show that the converse is not true, i.e., a MAC scheme may not be a PRF. More specifically, given a UF-CMA secure MAC scheme $(\text{Gen}, \text{Tag}, \text{Verify})$, show that (Gen, Tag) is not necessarily a PRF.
3. **(15 points)** Let $\{h_i : \{0, 1\}^{2n} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}_{i \in \{0, 1\}^n}$ be a collision resistant hash function family that compresses $2n$ bits to n bits. Show that for a randomly sampled i , h_i is a **one-way function**.
4. *Order-preserving* hash functions (or encryption schemes resp.) are functions/schemes, where the hashed output (or ciphertexts resp.) follow the same lexicographic order as the messages. Such a property would be extremely useful for computing on encrypted database. In this question, we will see why this property is hard to achieve.
 - (a) **(5 points)** Let $\mathcal{E} := (\text{Gen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ be a public key encryption scheme such that for each $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, if $m_1 \leq m_2$, then $\text{Enc}(\text{pk}, m_1) \leq \text{Enc}(\text{pk}, m_2)$, where \mathcal{M} is the message space and pk is the public key generated by the Gen algorithm. Show that \mathcal{E} is not semantic secure.

- (b) **(10 points)** Suppose a function $H : \{0, 1\}^{2n} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$ has the following property. For each $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{2n}$, if $x \leq y$, then $H(x) \leq H(y)$. Show that H is not collision resistant (describe how to efficiently find a collision in such a function).

Hint: Binary search, always recursing on a range that is guaranteed to contain a collision.