

# A Negative Result for Fuzzy Extractors

Luke Demarest  
University of Connecticut  
luke.h.demarest@gmail.com

Benjamin Fuller  
University of Connecticut  
benjamin.fuller@uconn.edu

Alexander Russell  
University of Connecticut  
acr@uconn.edu

April 11, 2022

## Abstract

We show a negative result for efficient fuzzy extractors for all distributions with fuzzy min entropy even when given a (quasi) polynomial advice string from an unbounded collaborator.

## 1 Introduction

We show a negative result for efficient fuzzy extractors for all distributions with fuzzy min entropy even when given a (quasi) polynomial advice string from an unbounded collaborator.

We will compare to other works like [1].

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section we will introduce existing results to help clarify our place in the literature, provide necessary existing definitions to show what we are borrowing and what we build on, and we will provide new definitions in support of our novel results.

### 2.1 Existing Definitions

**Definition** (Entropy). *Entropy*, denoted  $H(X)$ , for some random variable  $X$  is a measure of how stable the outcomes of the random variable are. It is calculated as

$$H(X) := \sum_{i=1}^n p(x_i) \log(p(x_i))$$

where there are  $n$  values that  $X$  takes and we denote them as  $x_i$ .

**Definition** (Min Entropy). *Min Entropy*, denoted  $H_\infty(X)$ , is a best case measure of the stability of the random variable  $X$ . It is calculated as

$$H_\infty(X) := -\log\left(\max_{x_i} p(x_i)\right)$$

**Definition** (Average Conditional Min Entropy). *Average Conditional Min Entropy*, denoted  $\tilde{H}_\infty(X|Y)$  for two random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  is an average measure of the remaining entropy of the former given the outcome of the latter. It is calculated as

$$\tilde{H}_\infty(X|Y) := -\log\left(\mathbb{E}_{y \leftarrow Y}\left[\max_x \Pr[X = x | Y = y]\right]\right).$$

**Definition** (Hartley Entropy). *Hartley Entropy* also called *Hartley's Function* measures the uncertainty of a random variable in a basic way, measuring the number of outcomes the random variable has with non-zero probability. It can be computed as

$$H_0(X) = |\{x \in X \mid \Pr[X = x] > 0\}|.$$

**Definition** (Markov's Inequality). Markov's inequality is a tail bound for random variables that gives an upper bound on the probability of a random variable deviating from its mean. Let  $X$  be a non-negative valued random variable. Then the following inequality holds for any  $\alpha > 0$ :

$$\Pr[X \geq \alpha \cdot \mathbb{E}[X]] \leq 1/\alpha.$$

## 2.2 Previous Results

It has been shown that universal fuzzy extractors are impossible in the information theoretic setting.

### 2.2.1 Markov Bound for Predictability

Markov bounds are tail bounds that use Markov's Inequality to bound the probability that a random variable deviates significantly from its expected value. In Markov's inequality, we necessarily lose a multiplicative factor (here called *alpha*) in order to control the probability of the event occurring. When discussing entropy, we are dealing with a log scaled value which makes losing multiplicative factors costly. Instead, we can perform a Markov bound on the predictability scale. In this case, rather than lose a multiplicative factor in entropy, we lose a multiplicative factor in predictability which translates to a small number of bits of entropy lost for the controlled outcomes.

We present the proof here: Let  $\vec{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k)$  be independent random variables. Let  $Y$  be a random variable arbitrarily correlated with  $\vec{X}$ .

Then we can bound the entropy loss of  $\tilde{H}_\infty(\vec{X} | Y)$  using a Markov bound on predictability.

$$\tilde{H}_\infty(\vec{X} | Y) = \Delta \quad (1)$$

$$-\log\left(\mathbb{E}_Y\left[\max_{\vec{x}} \Pr[\vec{X} = \vec{x} | Y = y]\right]\right) = \Delta \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_Y\left[\max_{\vec{x}} \Pr[\vec{X} = \vec{x} | Y = y]\right] = 2^{-\Delta} \quad (3)$$

$$\Pr_Y\left[\max_{\vec{x}} \Pr[\vec{X} = \vec{x} | Y = y] \geq \alpha \cdot 2^{-\Delta}\right] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \quad (4)$$

$$\Pr_Y\left[\log\left(\max_{\vec{x}} \Pr[\vec{X} = \vec{x} | Y = y]\right) \geq \log(\alpha) - \Delta\right] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \quad (5)$$

$$\Pr_Y\left[-\log\left(\max_{\vec{x}} \Pr[\vec{X} = \vec{x} | Y = y]\right) < \Delta - \log(\alpha)\right] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \quad (6)$$

$$\Pr_Y[H_\infty(X | Y) < \Delta - \log(\alpha)] \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \quad (7)$$

### 2.3 New Definitions

Fuzzy extractors with quasipolynomial advice.

## 3 Sampling Procedure

The sampling procedure that we will use and discuss in this work is two fold. There is first, a family of distributions that we will call  $\mathcal{W}$ . There is some finite number of distributions in this family, we call  $|\mathcal{W}| = \mathcal{R}$ . We let  $Z$  be an index for the distributions in the family and we denote the  $Z$ th family  $W_Z$ . The distribution  $W_Z$  can then be sampled, and we denote a sample of  $W_Z$  as  $w_Z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . When  $Z$  is clear, we will omit the subscript.

To sample a uniform point in  $\mathcal{W}$ , we can uniformly select  $Z$  and then pick from  $W_Z$  uniformly. This two stage process gives us more tools to reason about the ability of an efficient adversary.

In general, we will assume that  $\mathcal{W}$  is public to any adversary, algorithm, or party we may discuss. We will generally assume that the specific selection of  $Z$  is only shared with specific parties. We will also assume that the specific  $w$  sampled from  $W_Z$  is private and only known to parties who are given it explicitly.

An interesting part of this work is how we share information about  $W_Z$ . We will allow an inefficient adversary access to the entire description of  $W_Z$  and ask them to produce an advice string for an efficient adversary, that is that the advice string length is bound from above by a arbitrary polynomial function of our security parameter.

## References

- [1] Benjamin Fuller, Leonid Reyzin, and Adam Smith. When are fuzzy extractors possible? *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(8):5282–5298, 2020.