

# Applied Cryptography: Homework 6

(Deadline: 10:00am, 2020/10/28)

*Justify your answers with calculations, proofs, and programs.*

1. (20 points, question 5.10, page 181 of the textbook)

Suppose that messages are designated as “safe” or “dangerous” and an adversary is trying to find a collision of one safe and one dangerous message under a hash function  $h$ . That is, the adversary is trying to find a safe message  $x$  and a dangerous message  $x'$  such that  $h(x) = h(x')$ . An obvious attack would be to choose a set  $\mathcal{X}_0$  of  $Q$  safe messages and a set  $\mathcal{X}'_0$  of  $Q'$  dangerous messages, and test the  $QQ'$  resulting ordered pairs  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{X}_0 \times \mathcal{X}'_0$  to see if a collision occurs. We analyze the success of this approach in the random oracle model, assuming that there are  $M$  possible message digests.

- (a) For a fixed value  $x \in \mathcal{X}_0$ , determine an upper bound on the probability that  $h(x) \neq h(x')$  for all  $x' \in \mathcal{X}'_0$ .
- (b) Using the result from (a), determine an upper bound on the probability that  $h(x) \neq h(x')$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}_0$  and all  $x' \in \mathcal{X}'_0$ .
- (c) Show that there is a 50% probability of finding at least one collision using this method if  $QQ' \approx cM$ , for a suitable positive constant  $c$ .

2. (10 points, question 5.11, page 181 of the textbook)

Suppose  $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is a hash function where  $|\mathcal{X}|$  and  $|\mathcal{Y}|$  are finite and  $|\mathcal{X}| \geq 2|\mathcal{Y}|$ . Suppose that  $h$  is a **balanced hash function** (i.e.,

$$|h^{-1}(y)| = \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{|\mathcal{Y}|}$$

for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ). Finally, suppose ORACLE-PREIMAGE is an  $(\epsilon, Q)$ -algorithm for **Preimage**, for the fixed hash function  $h$ . Prove that COLLISION-TO-PREIMAGE is an  $(\epsilon/2, Q+1)$ -algorithm for **Collision**, for the fixed hash function  $h$ .

3. (10 points, question 5.12(a), page 181 of the textbook)

Suppose  $h_1 : \{0, 1\}^{2m} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$  is a collision resistant hash function. Define  $h_2 : \{0, 1\}^{4m} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$  as follows:

- 1. Write  $x \in \{0, 1\}^{4m}$  as  $x = x_1 \| x_2$ , where  $x_1, x_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{2m}$ .
- 2. Define  $h_2(x) = h_1(h_1(x_1) \| h_1(x_2))$ .

Prove that  $h_2$  is collision resistant (i.e., given a collision for  $h_2$ , show how to find a collision for  $h_1$ ).

4. (20 points, question 5.13, page 182 of the textbook)

In this exercise, we consider a simplified version of the Merkle-Damgard construction. Suppose **compress**:  $\{0, 1\}^{m+t} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ ,

where  $t \geq 1$ , and suppose that

$$x = x_1 \| x_2 \| \cdots \| x_k,$$

where

$$|x_1| = |x_2| = \dots = |x_k| = t.$$

We study the following iterated hash function:

**Algorithm 5.8:** SIMPLIFIED MERKLE-DAMGARD  $(x, k, t)$

**external compress**

$z_1 \leftarrow 0^m \| x_1$

$g_1 \leftarrow \mathbf{compress}(z_1)$

**for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  **to**  $k - 1$

**do**  $= \begin{cases} z_{i+1} \leftarrow g_i \| x_{i+1} \\ g_{i+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{compress}(z_{i+1}) \end{cases}$

$h(x) \leftarrow g_k$

**return**  $(h(x))$

Suppose that **compress** is collision resistant, and suppose further that **compress** is *zero preimage resistant*, which means that it is hard to find  $z \in \{0, 1\}^{m+t}$  such that  $\mathbf{compress}(z) = 0^m$ . Under these assumptions, prove that  $h$  is collision resistant.