
Sarthak Singhal
(20171091)

PQR-1

4th April 2020

Questions

- A. Design a zero-knowledge proof for the Discrete-Logarithm Problem (DLP), that is, given prime p , generator g and the element $y = g^x \bmod p$, how does a prover claiming to know x , convince the verifier, without revealing x ?
- B. Moreover, using hash-functions (and assuming them to be random oracles) show how to build a digital signature scheme based on your above zero-knowledge proof and the hardness of DLP?
- C. Also, show how you would design collision-resistant hash functions based on the hardness of DLP.

Answers

ANS-1

Definition of ZKP

In cryptography, a zero-knowledge proof or zero-knowledge protocol is a method by which one party (the prover) can prove to another party (the verifier) that they know a value x , without conveying any information apart from the fact that they know the value x . The essence of zero-knowledge proofs is that it is trivial to prove that one possesses knowledge of certain

information by simply revealing it; the challenge is to prove such possession without revealing the information itself or any additional information.(WIKI)

Construction

Let P be prover and V be verifier.

Let $y = g^x \bmod p$ be the DLP.

Let P wants to show to V that it knows x, without revealing x or any other information about x.

Given information:

- g,p and y are public
- x is the private key of P (not known to anyone else)

Step1 (P's computation)

- Chose any random number r from the group \mathbb{Z}_p^*
- Construct $t = g^r \bmod p$
- Send this t to V

Step2 (V's computation)

- Chose any random number c from the group \mathbb{Z}_p^*
- Send this to P

Step3 (P's computation)

- Construct $z = c * x + r$
- Send this z to V

Step4 (V's computation)

- Check if $g^z \bmod p = (y^c * t) \bmod p$
- If true, then V verifies that P knows x else not

Verification Proof

Given

- $z = c * x + r$
- $y = g^x \bmod p$
- $t = g^r \bmod p$

$$RHS = (y^c * t) \bmod p$$

$$= ((g^{c*x} \bmod p) * t) \bmod p$$

$$= ((g^{c*x} \bmod p) * (g^r \bmod p)) \bmod p$$

$$= g^{c*x+r} \bmod p$$

$$= g^z \bmod p$$

$$= LHS$$

Thus V will verify if $g^z \bmod p = (y^c * t) \bmod p$.

Completeness Proof

From above calculations, it is clear that $RHS = LHS$ only when

$c * x^o + r = c * x^p + r$, where x^o is original x and x^p is x with prover.

If P knows x then $x^o = x^p$ and thus V will verify and hence the proof is complete.

Soundness Proof

If P doesn't know x then probability of $x^o = x^p$ is negligible ($1/P$) and thus probability of acceptance by V is also negligible. Thus the proof is sound.

Zero Knowledge

P sends z and t to V. Since t is DLP, no information about x can be revealed by revealing t . $z = c * x + r$ where c and r are random numbers so z is also random and no information about x is revealed. Thus P doesn't reveal any information about x by sharing z and t and thus the proof is ZKP.

ANS-2

- The above method cannot be used as digital signature as it is interactive, meaning information flows from both P and V to each other.
- If we can construct a non-interactive ZKP, we can use it as a digital signature.
- Only information that flows from V to P is of c which is a random number.
- Thus if P can send c to V the proof would become non-interactive and can be used as a digital signature.
- P would also need to prove to V that c is truly a random number.
- To ensure this, we can take $c = H(p, g, y)$ and send it to V.
- As $H(x, y, z)$ is a random oracle, c is truly a random number and thus our problem of proving c random is solved.

Using this, above algorithm can be modified as:

Step1 (P's computation) [Signing]

- Chose any random number r from the group \mathbb{Z}_p^*
- Construct $t = g^r \bmod p$
- Take $c = H(p, g, y)$ [Step 2 removed]
- Construct $z = c * x + r$ [Step 3 removed]
- Send t & z to V

Step2 (V's computation) [**Verifying**]

- Take $c = H(p, g, y)$
- Check if $g^z \bmod p = (y^c * t) \bmod p$
- If true, then V verifies that P knows x else not

Note that steps 2 & 3 are omitted.

Thus based on the above ZKP and hardness of DLP, we have constructed a digital signature using H as a random oracle.

ANS-3

- Now to construct a random oracle H() we can use H as a CRH as it satisfies properties of a random oracle.
- To design a CRH, we can use the Merkle-Damgard Transform which is a way of extending a fixed-length CRH function into a general one that receives inputs of any length.

Construction

Let $\langle \text{Gen}_h, h \rangle$ be a fixed-length CRH with input length $2L$ and output length L . Construct a variable-length CRH $\langle \text{Gen}, H \rangle$ as follows:

$\text{Gen}(1^n)$:

Upon input 1^n , run the key-generation algorithm Gen_h of the fixed-length CRH and output the key. Let it be s .

$H^s(M)$:

- Let the message be M of length x ($x < 2^L$) and key be s .
- Pad M with zeroes so that its length is exactly a multiple of L .
- Now divide M into B blocks each of size L .

-
- Now $M = (m_1 || m_2 || \dots || m_B)$.
 - Define $Z_0 = 0^L$ (initialization vector)
 - For every i in $(1, \dots, B)$, compute $Z_i = h^s(Z_{i-1} || m_i)$
 - Output $Z = h^s(Z_B || x)$

Note: $x < 2^L$ is just to ensure that x fits in one block. This is not a hard requirement.

Claim is that if h is CRH, constructed H is also a CRH.

Proof

- We will prove that if there is a collision in H , there will also be a collision in h .
- This would imply that h is not a CRH.
- This would be a contradiction as h is a CRH.
- Hence our assumption of getting a collision in H would be wrong which would prove H to be a CRH.

Let $M = (m_1 || m_2 || m_B)$ with length x and $M' = (m'_1 || m'_2 || m'_B)$ with length x' .

Let there be a collision in H .

Case-1 ($x \neq x'$):

- Since $H(x) = H(x') \Rightarrow h^s(Z_B || x) = h^s(Z'_B || x')$.
- Since $x \neq x' \Rightarrow$ collision in h^s .
- Hence contradiction.

Case-2 ($x = x'$):

- Let Z and Z' be intermediate hash values of M and M' during the computation of H .
- Since $M \neq M'$ and they are of same length, \exists at least one index i ($1 \leq i \leq B$) such that $m_i \neq m'_i$.

-
- Let i^* be the highest index for which it holds that $Z_{i^*-1} \parallel m_{i^*} \neq Z'_{i^*-1} \parallel m'_{i^*}$
 - If $i^* = B$, then $(Z_{i^*-1} \parallel m_{i^*})$ and $(Z'_{i^*-1} \parallel m'_{i^*})$ constitute a collision because we know that H of both the messages is same along with length implying $Z_B = Z'_B$ (if $Z_B \neq Z'_B$ there is already a collision).
 - If $i^* < B$, then maximality of i^* implies $Z_{i^*} = Z'_{i^*}$
 - Because $\forall i > i^*, Z_{i-1} \parallel m_i = Z'_{i-1} \parallel m'_i$
 - Let $i = i^* + 1$
 - $\Rightarrow Z_{i^*} \parallel m_{i^*} = Z'_{i^*} \parallel m'_{i^*}$
 - $\Rightarrow Z_{i^*} = Z'_{i^*}$ and $m_{i^*} = m'_{i^*}$
 - This again implies collision in $(Z_{i^*-1} \parallel m_{i^*})$ and $(Z'_{i^*-1} \parallel m'_{i^*})$
 - Thus in all cases we get a collision in h^s which is a contradiction.

Hence constructed H^s is truly a CRH if we have h^s .

Constructing h^s

We can construct h^s based on the hardness DLP as follows:

$$h(x, y) = (g^x * z^y) \bmod p \text{ where } z = g^k \bmod p$$

Claim: If someone finds collision in h , then he can solve DLP (i.e. He can find k given z, g, p)

Proof

Let there be a collision in h .

$$h(x_1, y_1) = h(x_2, y_2)$$

Since $x_1 y_1 \neq x_2 y_2$, WLOG lets take $y_1 \neq y_2$

$$h(x_1, y_1) = (g^{x_1} * z^{y_1}) \bmod p$$

$$h(x_2, y_2) = (g^{x_2} * z^{y_2}) \bmod p$$

$$\Rightarrow g^{x_1} z^{y_1} \equiv g^{x_2} z^{y_2}$$

$$\Rightarrow g^{x_1 - x_2} \equiv z^{y_2 - y_1}$$

$$\Rightarrow g^{x_1 - x_2} \equiv g^{k(y_2 - y_1)}$$

$$\Rightarrow (g^{x_1 - x_2})^{(y_2 - y_1)^{-1}} \equiv (g^{k(y_2 - y_1)})^{(y_2 - y_1)^{-1}} \equiv g^k$$

$$\Rightarrow k = (x_1 - x_2)/(y_2 - y_1)$$

Thus if we find collision in our hash function, we can compute k efficiently and thus can solve DLP, which is not possible.

Hence h is a CRH.
