

# MODERN CRYPTOGRAPHY

## STRONGER SECURITY NOTIONS

SEP 4, 2025

Dr Shashank Singh

# TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Stronger Seucrity Notions
2. CPA Seucrity
3. Pseudo random function

# **STRONGER SECURITY NOTIONS**

# SECURITY FOR MULTIPLE ENCRYPTION

- Consider a scenario where the same key is used for multiple message exchanges by two communicating parties. An adversary, denoted as  $\mathcal{A}$ , eavesdrops on all the messages.

# SECURITY FOR MULTIPLE ENCRYPTION

- Consider a scenario where the same key is used for multiple message exchanges by two communicating parties. An adversary, denoted as  $\mathcal{A}$ , eavesdrops on all the messages.

$\text{PrivK}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{mult}}(n) :$

1.  $\mathcal{A}$  is given  $\Pi(n)$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs  $\mathbf{m}_0 := (m_{00}, m_{01}, \dots, m_{0t})$  and  $\mathbf{m}_1 := (m_{10}, m_{11}, \dots, m_{1t})$ , where  $m_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}^*$  with  $|m_{0i}| = |m_{1i}| \forall i$ .
2.  $k \leftarrow \text{GEN}(n)$ ,  $b \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}$  and  $\mathbf{c} := (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_t)$  is given to the  $\mathcal{A}$ , where  $c_i \leftarrow \text{ENC}(k, m_{bi})$
3.  $\mathcal{A}$  return a bit  $b'$ .
4. The output of the experiment is  $b' \stackrel{?}{=} b$ .



## Definition 1

A private key encryption scheme  $\Pi(n)$  has an **indistinguishable multiple encryption in the presence of an eavesdropper**, or is EAV-secure, if for all PPT adversaries  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a negligible function  $\varepsilon()$  such that, for all  $n$ ,

$$\Pr[\text{PrivK}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{mult}}(n) = 1] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon(n). \quad (1)$$



## Remark

- The one-time pad encryption scheme does not have indistinguishable multiple encryptions in the presence of an eavesdropper.

**CPA SECURITY**

# SECURITY AGAINST CHOSEN-PLAINTEXT ATTACK

Let  $\Pi(n)$  be an encryption scheme and  $\mathcal{A}$  be a CPA adversary.

$\text{PrivK}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{cpa}}(n) :$

1.  $k \xleftarrow{\$} \text{GEN}(n)$  and the encryption oracle  $\text{ENC}_k(\cdot)$  is given to  $\mathcal{A}$ .
2.  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs  $m_0, m_1 \in \{0, 1\}^*$  with  $|m_0| = |m_1|$ .
3.  $b \xleftarrow{\$} \{0, 1\}$  and  $c \leftarrow \text{ENC}(k, m_b)$  is given to  $\mathcal{A}$ .
4.  $\mathcal{A}$  return  $b'$ .
5. The output of the experiment is  $b' \stackrel{?}{=} b$ .





## Definition 1

A private key encryption scheme  $\Pi(n)$  has an **indistinguishable encryption under the chosen plain text attack**, or is CPA-secure, if for all PPT adversaries  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a negligible function  $\varepsilon()$  such that, for all  $n$ ,

$$\Pr[\text{PrivK}_{\mathcal{A}, \Pi}^{\text{cpa}}(n) = 1] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon(n). \quad (2)$$



## Note

- We can also define CPA-security for multiple encryptions in a similar manner.

## Theorem 1

Any private-key encryption scheme that is CPA-secure is also CPA-secure for multiple encryptions.



## Remark

- The theorem has positive consequences.
- We only need a CPA-secure fixed-length encryption scheme.
- Since multiple encryption is also CPA secure, we can use the same key to encrypt longer messages as needed.

# CONSTRUCTION OF CPA SECURE SCHEMES

- We have observed that CPA security (IND-CPA) remains intact even when the same key is used to encrypt multiple messages.
- The key takeaway from this observation is that we should concentrate on designing a CPA-secure scheme for encrypting fixed-length messages only, i.e., for  $\mathcal{M} = \{0, 1\}^n$  for some  $n$ .
- The encryption schemes for encrypting fixed-length messages will be referred to as block ciphers. A block cipher is represented by an abstract concept known as a Pseudorandom Function, more precisely by Pseudorandom Permutations.
- When we talk about the pseudorandomness of functions, we are essentially referring to the pseudorandomness of a distribution over functions.

# PSEUDO RANDOM FUNCTION

# PSEUDORANDOM FUNCTION

- We have observed that large discrete distributions are frequently defined by algorithms that efficiently sample elements according to the distribution.
- We are interested in the random functions of the set  $\mathcal{F}_n$ .

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \{f : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n\}$$

- $|\mathcal{F}_n| = 2^{n \cdot 2^n}$  is very large even for very small  $n$ .

# KEYED FUNCTION

We define a keyed function as a function

$$F : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^{\ell_{\text{in}}(n)} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{\ell_{\text{out}}(n)},$$

which takes as input a key,  $k \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ , completely specifies function

$$F_k : \{0, 1\}^{\ell_{\text{in}}(n)} \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{\ell_{\text{out}}(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_n.$$

## Remark

- ▶  $\left| \{F_k : F_k \text{ is a keyed function and } k \in \{0, 1\}^n\} \right| = 2^n \ll |\mathcal{F}_n|.$
- ▶ If  $\ell_{\text{in}}(n) = \ell_{\text{out}}(n) = n$ ,  $F_k$  is called length preserving.
- ▶ The size of the keyed function, though very, very small in comparison to  $|\mathcal{F}|$  but is still too large ( $2^n$ ) for us.

## Definition 1

An efficient, length-preserving keyed function  $F_k$ , where  $k \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is said to be a pseudorandom function if for all probabilistic polynomial-time distinguishers (algorithms)  $\mathcal{D}$ , there is a negligible function  $\varepsilon()$  such that,

$$\left| \Pr_{k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} [\mathcal{D}(F_k(\cdot)) = 1] - \Pr_{f \leftarrow \mathcal{F}} [\mathcal{D}(f(\cdot)) = 1] \right| \leq \varepsilon(n).$$



Informally, if it's nearly impossible to determine whether a given function (oracle access) is a keyed function or a random function from the set  $\mathcal{F}$  with a probability better than  $\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon(n)$ , then we can consider the distribution of keyed functions to be pseudorandom.