

# Proofs by Reduction

coinstudent2048

August 23, 2021

## 1 The Thing

Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be a cyclic group of prime order  $l > 3$  and  $\mathbb{F}$  be its scalar field. Let  $Z \in \mathbb{G}$  be the identity element.

**Definition 1.1** (Discrete Logarithm (DL) Assumption). *Let  $G, H \in \mathbb{G}$ . Then finding (the unique)  $x \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $xG = H$  is “hard”.*

**Definition 1.2.** *A function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is **negligible** if for every polynomial  $p(\cdot)$  there exists an  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all integers  $n > N$  it holds that  $f(n) < \frac{1}{p(n)}$ .*

Definition 1.2 is copied from Katz & Lindell. We first prove the following lemma:

**Lemma 1.1.** *If  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-negligible, then  $g(n) = f(n)^m$  for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m > 1$  is non-negligible.*

*Proof.* The non-negligibility of  $f$  means that there exists a polynomial  $p(\cdot)$  such that for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists an  $n > N$  such that  $f(n) \geq \frac{1}{p(n)}$ . Let  $p_f(\cdot)$  be such polynomial and  $n_f$  be such  $n > N$ . Then setting  $p_g(\cdot) = p_f(\cdot)^m$  and  $n_g = n_f$  suffices for non-negligibility of  $g$  because  $f(n_f) \geq \frac{1}{p_f(n)} \Rightarrow f(n_f)^m \geq \left(\frac{1}{p_f(n)}\right)^m$ .  $\square$

Lemma 1.1 justifies the usage of finite number of breaks in proof by reduction.

**Definition 1.3** (“One-time Address” (OTA) Assumption). *Let  $U, G \in \mathbb{G}$  whose DL relationship to each other is unknown. Let  $f : \mathbb{F} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G}$  be the following:*

$$(k_a, k_b) \mapsto (k_a U + k_b G, (1/k_a)G)$$

*Then given  $(K, L) \in \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{G}$ , finding (the unique)  $f^{-1}(K, L)$  is “hard”.*

**Theorem 1.2.** *OTA assumption holds if and only if DL assumption holds.*

*Proof.* The proof consists of 2 parts:

- *DL is easy  $\Rightarrow$  OTA is easy:* Applying the first DL break on  $L$  base  $G$  will give  $1/k_a$ , which will trivially give  $k_a$ . Then applying the second DL break on  $K - k_a U$  base  $G$  will give  $k_b$ .
- *OTA is easy  $\Rightarrow$  DL is easy:* Let  $A, B \in \mathbb{G}$  (both not equal to  $Z$ ) be the group elements to find DL for (without loss of generality,  $x \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $xA = B$ ). Then perform the following procedure on  $A$ :
  1. Applying an OTA break on  $(U, A)$  will give  $k_a, k_b \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $U = k_a U + k_b G$  and  $A = (1/k_a)G$ . Hence,  $k_a A = G \Rightarrow U = k_a U + k_b(k_a A)$ .
  2. Let  $y_1 \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $U = y_1 A$ . Now  $U = k_a U + k_b k_a A$  becomes  $y_1 A = k_a(y_1 A) + k_b k_a A \Rightarrow y_1 = k_a y_1 + k_b k_a \Rightarrow y_1 - k_a y_1 = k_b k_a$ . Therefore,

$$y_1 = k_b k_a (1/(1 - k_a)).$$

Then perform the same procedure to  $B$  (hence another OTA break). Now we have  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $U = y_1 A$  and  $U = y_2 B$ . Hence,  $y_1 A = y_2 B \Rightarrow y_1(1/y_2)A = B$ .

□

**Definition 1.4** (DL “Vector” Assumption). *Let  $G_1, \dots, G_n \in \mathbb{G}$  (with  $n > 1$ ) whose DL relationship to each other is unknown. Also let  $H \in \mathbb{G}$ . Then finding  $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $\exists z_i (z_i \neq 0)$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n z_i G_i = H$  is “hard”.*

**Theorem 1.3.** *OTA assumption holds if and only if DL Vector assumption holds.*

*Proof.* The proof consists of 2 parts:

- *DL is easy  $\Rightarrow$  DL Vector is easy:* Set random scalars on  $z_2, \dots, z_n$  so that at least one of them is not zero. Then applying DL break on  $H - \sum_{i=2}^n z_i G_i$  base  $G_1$  will give  $z_1$ .
- *DL Vector is easy  $\Rightarrow$  DL is easy:* Set  $n = 2$ . Let  $A, B \in \mathbb{G}$  (both not equal to  $Z$ ) be the group elements to find DL for (without loss of generality,  $x \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $xA = B$ ). Then applying DL Vector break on  $G_1 = A, G_2 = B, H = Z$  will give  $z_1, z_2$  such that  $z_1 A + z_2 B = Z$ . Now we have  $z_1 A + z_2 (xA) = Z \Rightarrow z_1 + z_2 x = 0 \Rightarrow x = (-z_1)(1/z_2)$ .

Both  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  will never be zero, because if one of them is, then the other should also be zero, contradicting the requirement  $\exists z_i (z_i \neq 0)$ . □