## Question 1:

We'll show that F isn't a secure PRF by showing that there exists a PPT D s.t.

 $\left|\Pr[D^{F_k(\cdot)}=1]-\Pr[D^{f(\cdot)}=1]\right|$  isn't negligible, where f is a completely random function from  $\{0,1\}^m$  to  $\{0,1\}^m$ 

We'll define the distinguisher D as follows:

Let a be an m-bit long string  $a_1,\ldots,a_m$  s.t.  $a_1=\cdots=a_m=0$ 

Let b be an m-bit long string  $b_1, \dots, b_m$  s.t.  $b_1 = 1$  and  $b_2 = \dots = b_m = 0$ 

Let c be an m-bit long string  $c_1,\ldots,c_m$  s.t.  $c_1=0$  and  $c_2=\cdots=c_m=1$ 

Let d be an m-bit long string  $d_1,\ldots,d_m$  s.t.  $d_1=\cdots=d_m=1$ 

D asks its oracle O 4 queries: O(a), O(b), O(c), O(d)

D outputs 1 if and only if  $O(a) \oplus O(b) = O(c) \oplus O(d)$ 

• If  $O = F_k$ , then  $\Pr[D^{F_k(\cdot)} = 1] = 1$ , because in this case it holds that:

$$O(a) = F_k(a) = k[1, a_1] \oplus k[2, a_2] \oplus ... \oplus k[m, a_m] = k[1, 0] \oplus k[2, 0] \oplus ... \oplus k[m, 0]$$

$$O(b) = F_k(b) = k[1, b_1] \oplus k[2, b_2] \oplus \dots \oplus k[m, b_m] = k[1, 1] \oplus k[2, 0] \oplus \dots \oplus k[m, 0]$$

$$O(c) = F_k(c) = k[1, c_1] \oplus k[2, c_2] \oplus ... \oplus k[m, c_m] = k[1, 0] \oplus k[2, 1] \oplus ... \oplus k[m, 1]$$

$$O(d) = F_k(d) = k[1, d_1] \oplus k[2, d_2] \oplus \dots \oplus k[m, d_m] = k[1, 1] \oplus k[2, 1] \oplus \dots \oplus k[m, 1]$$

Therefore,  $O(a) \oplus O(b) = k[1,0] \oplus k[2,0] \oplus ... \oplus k[m,0] \oplus k[1,1] \oplus k[2,0] \oplus ... \oplus k[m,0] = k[1,0] \oplus k[1,1]$  (due to associativity and commutativity of  $\oplus$  and the fact that  $x \oplus x = 0$  and  $0 \oplus x = x$ )

Similarly, 
$$O(c) \oplus O(d) = k[1,0] \oplus k[2,1] \oplus ... \oplus k[m,1] \oplus k[1,1] \oplus k[2,1] \oplus ... \oplus k[m,1] = k[1,0] \oplus k[1,1]$$

Thus 
$$O(a) \oplus O(b) = k[1,0] \oplus k[1,1] = O(c) \oplus O(d)$$
, from which we get that:  $\Pr[D^{F_k(\cdot)} = 1] = \Pr[O(a) \oplus O(b) = O(c) \oplus O(d)] = \mathbf{1}$ 

• If O = f (a completely random function),  $\Pr[D^{f(\cdot)} = 1] = \frac{1}{2^n}$  because in this case it holds that:

$$\Pr[D^{f(\cdot)} = 1] = \Pr[O(a) \oplus O(b) = O(c) \oplus O(d)] =_{*}$$

$$= \Pr[O(a) \oplus O(a) \oplus O(b) = O(a) \oplus O(c) \oplus O(d)] =$$

$$= \Pr[O(b) = O(a) \oplus O(c) \oplus O(d)] =_{**}$$

$$= \Pr[f(b) = O(a) \oplus O(c) \oplus O(d)] = \frac{1}{2^{m}}$$

(\*) – performing  $\oplus$  on both sides

(\*\*) – since f is a completely random function, the probability that applying f on some input (b in this case) will yield a specific output  $(O(a) \oplus O(c) \oplus O(d)$  in this case) among all the  $|\{0,1\}^m| = 2^m$  possible outputs is  $\frac{1}{2^m}$ 

From the above, we get that

$$\left|\Pr[D^{F_k(\cdot)}=1] - \Pr[D^{f(\cdot)}=1]\right| = \left|1 - \frac{1}{2^n}\right|$$
 which isn't negligible (because for  $n \ge 1$  it holds that  $1 - \frac{1}{2^n} \ge 1 - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} > negl(n)$ )

Therefore, the proposed F isn't a secure PRF.

## Question 2:

The given MAC scheme is **not** secure. We'll recall the definition of a secure MAC scheme:

## Definition:

A MAC scheme  $\Pi$  is secure if for every PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  there exists a negligible function  $v(\cdot)$  such that

$$\Pr[\mathsf{MacForge}_{\Pi,\mathcal{A}}(n) = 1] \le \nu(n)$$

$$\operatorname{MacForge}_{\Pi,\mathcal{A}}(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \operatorname{Vrfy}_k(m^*,t^*) = 1 \\ 1, & \text{and } m^* \notin \mathcal{Q} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \mathcal{Q}$$

Q =Set of all queries asked by A

An attacker can break the security of this MAC scheme in the following way:

The attacker asks the query mmm (the concatenation of m with itself 3 times), where m is a 32-byte block that contains only zeroes, for example. The attacker receives Mac(k, mmm), and forges the tag of the query m by outputing Mac(k, mmm). Notice that the attacker didn't ask the query m before.

The probability of a successfull forging of the attacker is exactly 1, since:

$$Mac(k, mmm) = F(k, m) \oplus F(k, m) \oplus F(k, m) = F(k, m) = Mac(k, m)$$

Where the  $2^{nd}$  equality is due to  $\bigoplus$  properties (mentioned in the previous question) and the fact that F is a PRF, thus it's deterministic.

Therefore, Pr[Mac(k,m) = Mac(k,mmm)] = 1 > negl(n) and so the MAC scheme isn't secure.

```
; The beal you risker (sen more 8 100001 mg) 1255 sen (3)
                                                     1255 1255 - 251
 ל ראמני, 251 האמני (ידוץ, ניתן זאן לודמ שלו מתריק בגוצ עם אד כו -רתטוכם שלו).
ניתן צשבר ולכבוק כן ראשונים מדודים שלון).
Z_{1255}^{*} \approx Z_{5}^{*} \times Z_{251}^{*} 1/25/27/W15/2/p)
8 100000 1 mod 1255 (8 mod 5,8 mod 251) 100001 ; for 251
= (3^{100000^{11}} \text{ mod } 5, 8^{100001} \text{ mod } 351) \qquad \text{Modular}
= (3^{100000^{11}} \text{ mod } 5, 8^{100000} \text{ mod } 351) \qquad \text{Exponentiation}
= 3 \cdot 3^{100000} \text{ mod } 5 = 3 \cdot 3^{100000} \text{ mod } 5 = 3 \cdot (3^{4} \text{ mod } 5) \xrightarrow{4} \text{ mod } 5
= 3 \cdot 1^{\frac{1000000}{4}} \text{ mod } 5 = 3 \cdot (3^{4} \text{ mod } 5) \xrightarrow{4} \text{ mod } 5
1371× (Jen Br = 8.1 = 8.1 mod 251=8
         קיבלט שניתן לכתוב את 25% (am 100001 g C: (8,8) בתצור האיט ערהית.
 P 9 : Z1255 S (3,8) NX 5750 7W a.5+b.251=qcd (5,251)=1 :Z1255 S (3,8) NX 5750 7W
g(3)(5,251) = g(3)(5,1) [1 = 251 - 50.5] = 1
1 = 1.251 + (-50).5 \implies a = -50, b = 1
1 = 1.251 + (-50).5 \implies a = -50, b = 1
1 = 1.251 + (-50).5 \implies a = -50, b = 1
  1p=b·q mo) 1255=1·251 ma) 1255=251 ;CRT-N (NOB)
 19= a.p. mad 1255 = -50.5 mod 1255=1005
 8^{100001} mo) 1255 = 3 \cdot 1p^{-1}8 \cdot 1q mo) 1255 = 3 \cdot 251 + 8 \cdot 1005 mo) 1255 = 87.93 mo) 1255 = (8)
```