

## 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  $(\text{sk}, \text{pk})$ .
- $\text{Sign}'(m, \text{sk})$ : 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  $(\text{Gen}, \text{Tag})$  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  $\text{pk}$  is the public key generated by the  $\text{Gen}$  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.