

## Practice problem set 4

You do not have to hand in these exercises, they are for practicing only.

### Problem 1: A pretty good measurement

You are given one of three states  $\rho_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ ,  $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}$ , and  $\rho_2 = |1\rangle\langle 1|$ , each with equal probability.

- (a) What is the probability of correctly identifying which state you were given (1, 2 or 3) if you use the pretty-good-measurement?
- (b) Can you find a measurement that will give you a better success probability?

### Problem 2: Negligible functions

A function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called negligible if for any  $c \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , there exists an integer  $n_c$  such that for all  $n > n_c$  we have

$$|f(n)| < \frac{1}{n^c}.$$

- (a) Show that  $f(n) = 2^{-(\log(n))^2}$  is negligible.
- (b) Show that if  $f(n)$  and  $g(n)$  are negligible, then so is  $h(n) = f(n) + g(n)$ .
- (c) Similarly, show that if  $f(n)$  is negligible, and  $g(n) = O(n^d)$  for some  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , then so is  $h(n) = f(n) \cdot g(n)$ . Can you see why negligible functions are useful to bound the success probability of an adversary?

### Problem 3: 2-universality

Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_y : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m\}$  be a 2-universal family of hash functions. For some  $m' < m$ , define  $\mathcal{F}' = \{f'_y : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'}\}$  by  $f'_y(x) = f_y(x)_{|m'}$ , that is, the first  $m'$  bits of  $f_y(x)$ . Show that  $\mathcal{F}'$  is also 2-universal.

### Problem 4: A weak seeded extractor

For any  $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , define  $f_y : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$  by  $f_y(x) = x \oplus y$ . Here,  $\oplus$  represents the bitwise parity (e.g.,  $11 \oplus 01 = 10$ ).

- (a) Show that the family  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_y\}$  is 1-universal.
- (b) How could you use  $\mathcal{F}$  to build a  $(k, 0)$ -weak seeded randomness extractor  $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$  for any  $k$ . Is this extractor useful?
- (c) Alice and Bob are impressed by the parameter  $\epsilon = 0$  in the previous exercise. They decide that if  $\mathcal{F}$  can be used for a  $(k, 0)$ -weak seeded randomness extractor, then certainly it can reasonably be used as a **strong** seeded randomness extractor as well. They define  $\text{Ext}(x, y) = f_y(x)$ . Do you think this is a good idea? How does Eve's guessing probability change after extraction?

### Problem 5: Deterministic extractors on bit-fixing sources

In the lectures, you learned that no deterministic function can serve as an extractor for *all* random sources of a given length. This doesn't rule out the possibility that a deterministic extractor can work on some restricted class of sources. Consider Alice holding an  $n$ -bit source  $X$  that fixes  $t < n$  bits. These  $t$  bits represent the bits that Eve learns about  $X$ , and that are therefore not usable by Alice anymore for her cryptographic tasks.

- (a) If Alice knows which  $t$  positions are fixed by  $X$ , how much randomness can she extract from  $X$ ?
- (b) Now suppose Alice does not know which bits are compromised (but she does know  $t$ ). She decides to extract randomness from  $X$  by taking the XOR of all of her bits, producing just one output bit. For which values of  $t$  is this secure?
- (c) Alice now wants to extract more than one bit of randomness from  $X$  (still without knowing which positions are fixed). Her idea is to take subsets of the bits of  $X$ , and to treat each subset as its own bit-fixing source. What is the largest number of independent subsources she can take (in terms of  $n$  and  $t$ ), such that it is possible to securely extract a bit of randomness from each subsourse?