

## UIUCTF 2018: Xoracle (250)

ecx86

In this problem, we deal with multiple encryptions of the same plaintext, namely many random-length, random-valued one-time-pads. The problem could also be framed as a many-time pad attack where the attacker wants to deduce the pad. One key observation is that

$$c_i \oplus c_{i+k} = (p_i \oplus o_i) \oplus (p_{i+k} \oplus o_{i+k}) = (p_i \oplus o_i) \oplus (p_{i+k} \oplus o_i) = p_i \oplus p_{i+k},$$

where  $p$  is the plaintext,  $o_i$  the corresponding one-time-pad, and  $k$  is the pad's length  $|o|$ .

Instead, we will take a statistical approach: WLOG, fix a keylength  $k$ . Then, collect many ciphertexts  $c_0 \dots c_i$ . Next, for a given  $i$ , we could, for each ciphertext, calculate:  $c_i \oplus c_{i+k}$ . Naturally, for most ciphertexts, our fixed  $k$  is incorrect, so  $(o_i \oplus o_i + k)$  is some random byte. It is crucial to note, however, that  $(o_i \oplus o_i + k)$  is randomly distributed from 0 to 256, and likewise,  $c_i \oplus c_{i+k} = (p_i \oplus p_{i+k}) \oplus (o_i \oplus o_i + k)$  would be random too. However, if our fixed keylength was by chance correct, then  $c_i \oplus c_{i+k} = (p_i \oplus p_{i+k}) \oplus 0$ . In other words, for a large corpus of ciphertexts  $c_i$  and a keylength  $k$ , we could measure the frequencies of  $c_i \oplus c_{i+k}$  from 0 to 256, and the correct value  $p_i \oplus p_{i+k}$  would show up as a spike. This allows us to calculate  $p_i \oplus p_{i+k}$  for any  $i$ , which we denote as  $(i, i+k)$ , where  $(i, j) = p_i \oplus p_j$ . However, a major limitation is that  $128 \geq k \geq 255$  because of the way the one-time-pads are generated.

Now, it's useful to note that since  $(i, j)(j, k) = (i, k)$ . For brevity, the  $\oplus$  operator has been elided. Using this property, we can extend our oracle from  $(i, i+k)$  to  $(i, j)$  for any  $i, j \in [0, l]$ . To see this, consider any two  $i, j$ . WLOG, say  $i < j$ . There are three cases: First, if  $k = j - i$  is acceptable; in which case, we are done. Next, if  $j - i > 255$ , i.e.  $k$  is too high; we can rewrite  $(i, j)$  as  $(i, i+255)(i+255, j)$ . Note that the left symbol has an acceptable gap  $k' = 255$ , whereas the right symbol has a gap  $k' = j - i - 255 = k - 255$ . In other words, the gap has strictly decreased from  $k$  to  $k'$ . Then, we can continue recursively rewriting the right symbol until it is acceptable, at which point we are done. Finally, if  $j - i < 128$ , i.e.  $k$  is too low; we can rewrite  $(i, j)$  as  $(i, i+255)(j, i+255)$ . Like earlier, the left symbol's gap is acceptable, while the right symbol's gap  $k' = i + 255 - j = 255 - k$ ; however, since we know  $k < 128$ , that means  $128 \geq k' \geq 255$ , and we are done.

Now, by chaining multiple of these xor pairs  $(i, j)$ , we can achieve  $(i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots i_n)$  for any even  $n$ . For example,  $(1, 2)(1, 3) = (2, 3)$  and  $(1, 2)(3, 4) = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ . In other words, we could calculate the combined xor sum of any even number of

bytes from the plaintext:

$$(i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots, i_{2n}) = \bigoplus_{m=1}^{2n} p_{i_m}$$

Another way we can think about these combined xor sums is a bitstring representation. For a bitstring of length  $l$ , we say the  $i$ th digit is 1 if  $p_i$  is included in the xor sum. So really, we are working in the group  $G = (l\text{-bit numbers of even Hamming weight with the operator } \oplus)$ . It is easy to verify this:  $G$  is closed and associative under  $\oplus$ , the identity is 0, and each element is its own inverse. Likewise, the group is Abelian (e.g. commutative).

Unfortunately, because our group  $G$  only includes even Hamming weight xor-sum inclusion bitstrings, it's impossible to calculate the value of any plaintext byte by itself. So instead, we calculate  $(0, i)$  for each  $i$  from 0 to  $l$ . In effect, we have effectively reduced the random keylength one-time-pad to a single-byte pad  $p \oplus p_0$ . Now, we simply have to try all 256 possibilities of the key  $p_0$ , calculating  $p_0 \oplus (p \oplus p_0)$ . For the correct  $p_0$ , this would result in the original plaintext  $p$ . Another way to think about this is that by brute-forcing any one of the bytes  $p_0$ , then we could say:

$$G \cup p_0 = (\{0, 1\}^l, \oplus, 0),$$

meaning we could access the xor-sum of any combination of plaintext bytes, including the singleton sums  $p_i$  which together form the plaintext  $p$ .

Finally, we use the linux utility 'file' to find which of the decryptions has a known format.