

A Compression Function Exploiting Discrete Geometry : Generalization to Higher Dimensions

Benjamin Wesolowski

Supervised by Dimitar Jetchev

Laboratory for Cryptologic Algorithms, EPFL, Fall 2012

Abstract

Abstract...

Introduction

Introduction...

1 Construction of the Compression Function

1.1 Incidence-Based Preprocessing

(here will come explanations about why we are doing this...) Let K be a field, and n a positive integer.

Definition 1.1 (Hyperplane). For any integer $0 \le d < n$, a subset H of K^n is a hyperplane of dimension d if there exist parameters $c_{i,j} \in K$ such that

$$H = \{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in K^n \mid x_j = c_{1,j}x_1 + ... + c_{d,j}x_d + c_{0,j}, \forall j = d+1, ..., n\}.$$

Definition 1.2 (Flag). A flag in K^n is a sequence $K^n \supset H_{n-1} \supset ... \supset H_1 \supset H_0$ where H_i is a hyperplane of dimension i for i = 0, ..., n-1.

Remark 1.3. This definition excludes "degenerated" hyperplanes. For instance, with $K = \mathbb{R}$ and n = 2, a hyperplane of dimension 1 is a nonvertical line.

Proposition 1.4. Let d be a positive integer smaller than n, H a hyperplane of dimention d-1 parameterised by the collection $\{c_{i,j}\}$, and G a hyperplane of dimension d parameterised by $\{b_{i,j}\}$. Then, $H \subset G$ if and only if $c_{k,j} = b_{k,j} + b_{i,j}c_{k,i}$ for j = d+1, ..., n and k = 0, ..., d-1.

Proof. We proceed by successive equivalences. One has $H \subset G$ if and only if for any $x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in H$, $x \in G$. But any point in H (resp. in G) is uniquely determined by its first d-1 (resp. d) coordinates, and all the following ones are given by the formula $x_j = c_{1,j}x_1 + ...c_{d-1,j}x_{d-1} + c_{0,j}$ (resp. $x_j = b_{1,j}x_1 + ...b_{d,j}x_{d-1} + b_{0,j}$). Therefore, $H \subset G$ if and only if $\forall x_1, ..., x_{d-1} \in K, \forall j = d+1, ..., n$, we have

corresponding to
$$x_d$$

$$b_{1,j}x_1 + \dots + b_{d-1,j}x_{d-1} + b_{d,j}(c_{1,d}x_1 + \dots + c_{d-1,d}x_{d-1} + c_{0,d}) + b_{0,j}$$

$$= c_{1,j}x_1 + \dots + c_{d-1,j}x_{d-1} + c_{0,j}.$$

This equality is equivalent to

$$(b_{0,j} + b_{d,j}c_{0,d} - c_{0,j}) + \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} (b_{k,j} + b_{d,j}c_{k,d} - c_{k,j})x_k = 0.$$
 (1)

But for a given j, equality 1 stands for all $x_1, ..., x_{d-1} \in K$ if and only if $b_{k,j} + b_{d,j}c_{k,d} - c_{k,j} = 0$ for all k = 0, ..., d-1. Indeed, choosing $x_1 = ... = x_{d-1} = 0$ gives $b_{0,j} + b_{d,j}c_{0,d} - c_{0,j} = 0$, and choosing $x_k = 1$ while all the other x's are set to 0 gives $b_{k,j} + b_{d,j}c_{k,d} - c_{k,j} = 0$.

Finally, we have that $H \subset G$ if and only if equality 1 is satisfied for all $x_1, ..., x_{d-1} \in K$ and j = d+1, ..., n, which is true if and only if $c_{k,j} = b_{k,j} + b_{i,j}c_{k,i}$ for all j = d+1, ..., n and k = 0, ..., d-1.

Flags in the 3-dimensional space Let Q be a point, L a line and P a plane in K^3 , parameterized by

$$P = \{(x_1, x_2, c_{1,3}x_1 + c_{2,3}x_2 + c_{0,3}) \mid x_1, x_2 \in K\},\$$

$$D = \{(x_1, b_{1,2}x_1 + b_{0,2}, b_{1,3}x_1 + b_{0,3}) \mid x_1 \in K\},\$$

$$Q = (a_{0,1}, a_{0,2}, a_{0,3}).$$

Applying proposition 1.4, we obtain that (Q, L, P) is a flag (i.e. $Q \in L \subset P$) if and only if

$$b_{1,3} = c_{1,3} + c_{2,3}b_{1,2},$$

$$b_{0,3} = c_{0,3} + c_{2,3}b_{0,2},$$

$$a_{0,2} = b_{0,2} + b_{1,2}a_{0,1},$$

$$a_{0,3} = b_{0,3} + b_{1,3}a_{0,1}.$$

Therefore we define, for a block-length of n,

$$C_3^{\text{PRE}}: K^6 \longrightarrow K^3$$

$$(a_1, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, c_3) \longmapsto (c_1, c_2, c_3),$$

$$C_2^{\text{PRE}}: K^6 \longrightarrow K^4$$

$$(a_1, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, c_3) \longmapsto (b_1, b_2, c_1 + c_2b_1, c_3 + c_2b_2),$$

$$C_1^{\text{PRE}}: K^6 \longrightarrow K^3$$

$$(a_1, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, c_3) \longmapsto (a_1, b_2 + b_1a_1, (c_3 + c_2b_2) + (c_1 + c_2b_1)a_1),$$

and $C^{\text{PRE}} = C_1^{\text{PRE}} \times C_2^{\text{PRE}} \times C_3^{\text{PRE}}$. A triple in $K^3 \times K^4 \times K^3$ belongs to $C^{\text{PRE}}(K^6)$ if and only if it parameterizes a flag in K^3 .

Proposition 1.5 (Completion property). Let $A = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ define a point, $B = (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$ a line and $C = (c_1, c_2, c_3)$ a plane in K^3 . We have

- 1. if $A \in B$, then A, B and c_2 uniquely determine a flag $A \in B \subset C$;
- 2. if $B \subset C$, then B, C and a_1 uniquely determine a flag $A \in B \subset C$;
- 3. if $A \in C$, then A, C, b_1 and b_2 uniquely determine a flag $A \in B \subset C$.

We say that C^{PRE} has the completion property.

Proof. The points 2 and 2 are clear from the formulas for C^{PRE} . So consider that $A \in B$, and c_2 are given. We need to find c_1 and c_3 such that $A \in B \subset C$. But we have $b_3 = c_1 + c_2b_1$ and $b_4 = c_3 + c_2b_2$, so we can derive $c_1 = b_3 - c_2b_1$ and $c_3 = b_4 - c_2b_2$.

1.2 Construction of a New Compression Function

Construction 1.6 (Non-Linear Matrix-Style Postprocessing). We consider the postprocessing function $C^{POST}: K^7 \to K^3$ defined by

$$C^{\text{POST}}(a, b_1, b_2, c, x, y, z) = \mathfrak{M} \cdot (a \ b_1 \ b_2 \ c \ x \ y \ z \ yz \ xz \ xy)^t,$$

where \mathfrak{M} is a matrix over K with coefficients $(\omega_{ij})_{i,j}$, and columns $(W_j)_j$ satisfying the following conditions:

C1.
$$\det(W_5 \ W_9 \ W_{10}) \neq 0$$
, $\det(W_6 \ W_8 \ W_{10}) \neq 0$, $\det(W_7 \ W_8 \ W_9) \neq 0$,

C2.
$$W_1 = W_9 + W_{10}, W_2 = W_8, W_3 = W_{10}, W_4 = W_8 + W_9.$$

C3.
$$W_5 = W_8$$
, $W_6 = W_9$, $W_7 = W_{10}$.

We now set $K = \mathbb{F}_{2^n}$.

Construction 1.7 (3-dimentional Szemerédi-Trotter Compression Function). Let $f_{\mathcal{X}}, f_{\mathcal{Z}} : \mathbb{F}_{2^n}^3 \to \mathbb{F}_{2^n}$ and $f_{\mathcal{Y}} : \mathbb{F}_{2^n}^4 \to \mathbb{F}_{2^n}$ be three distinct and independently sampled PuRFs. We define $H^{f_{\mathcal{X}}, f_{\mathcal{Y}}, f_{\mathcal{Z}}} : \mathbb{F}_{2^n}^6 \to \mathbb{F}_{2^n}^3$ as

$$H^{f_{\mathcal{X}},f_{\mathcal{Y}},f_{\mathcal{Z}}}(a,b_1,b_2,c_1,c,c_3) = C^{POST}(a,b_1,b_2,c,x,y,z),$$

where

$$(x, y, z) = (f_{\mathcal{X}} \times f_{\mathcal{Y}} \times f_{\mathcal{Z}}) \left(C^{\text{PRE}}(a, b_1, b_2, c_1, c, c_3) \right).$$

2 Proof of Collision Resistance

2.1 Strategy

Blabla,

$$\operatorname{coll}(\mathcal{Q}) \to \underbrace{\left(\operatorname{coll}_{I}(\mathcal{Q}) \wedge \neg \operatorname{bad}_{\operatorname{cl}[\kappa]}(\mathcal{Q})\right)}_{\mathbf{E_{1}}} \vee \underbrace{\left(\neg \operatorname{coll}_{II}(\mathcal{Q}) \wedge \operatorname{bad}_{\operatorname{cl}[\kappa]}\right)}_{\mathbf{E_{2}}} \vee \underbrace{\operatorname{coll}_{II}(\mathcal{Q})}_{\mathbf{E_{3}}}.$$

Figure 1: The game $\operatorname{Exp}^{B_{\Sigma}}$.

```
Let i \leftarrow 0, \operatorname{ctr} \leftarrow 0;

while i < q do

i \leftarrow i + 1;

p_i \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(\operatorname{ctr});

if 0 \le \sum_{j=1}^i p_j \le B_\Sigma then

With propability p_i, return true;

end if

end while

return false.
```

Output lines If A is an \mathcal{X} -query, and B and C are two preceding queries such that $A \in B \subset C$ with $y = f_{\mathcal{Y}}(B)$ and $z = f_{\mathcal{Z}}(C)$, then the evaluation of the compression function at $(a, b_1, b_2, c, c_2, c_3)$, i.e. $C^{\text{POST}}(a, b_1, b_2, c, x, y, z)$, lies on the line

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}:b_1,b_2,c,y,z,a} = \{ P_{\mathcal{X}}(b_1,b_2,c,y,z,a) + xQ_{\mathcal{X}}(y,z) \mid x \in K \}.$$

where

$$P_{\mathcal{X}}(b_1, b_2, c, y, z, a) = aW_1 + b_1W_2 + b_2W_3 + cW_4 + yW_6 + zW_7 + yzW_8,$$
$$Q_{\mathcal{X}}(y, z) = W_5 + zW_9 + yW_{10}.$$

Setting $x = f_{\mathcal{X}}(A)$ leads to the output point, which can therefore be interpreted as a random point on the line $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}:b_1,b_2,c,y,z,a}$. In order to truly get a random point, the line must not be degenerated; this is guaranteed by the condition $\det(W_5, W_9, W_{10}) \neq 0$ which implies

$$Q_{\mathcal{X}}(y,z) = (W_5 \ W_9 \ W_{10}) \cdot (1 \ z \ y)^t \neq 0.$$

We define similarly the output lines for \mathcal{Y} -queries and \mathcal{Z} -queries, with the non-degeneracy conditions $\det(W_6\ W_8\ W_{10}) \neq 0$ and $\det(W_7\ W_8\ W_9) \neq 0$.

2.2 Bounding $Pr[E_1]$

We need the following proposition, proven in [1].

Proposition 2.1. In the game $\operatorname{Exp}^{B_{\Sigma}}$ given in figure 1, the advantage of any adversary \mathcal{A} is at most B_{Σ} .

Lemma 2.2. Let Q be any query list and κ any positive integer. Then,

$$\Pr[\mathbf{E_1}] = \Pr[\operatorname{coll}_I(\mathcal{Q}) \land \neg \operatorname{bad}_{\operatorname{cl}[\kappa]}(\mathcal{Q})] \le \frac{\kappa Y}{2^n}.$$

Proof. First notice that

$$\Pr[\operatorname{coll}_I(\mathcal{Q}) \land \neg \operatorname{bad}_{\operatorname{cl}[\kappa]}(\mathcal{Q})] \leq \Pr[\operatorname{coll}_I(\mathcal{Q}) \mid \neg \operatorname{bad}_{\operatorname{cl}[\kappa]}(\mathcal{Q})].$$

For any positive integer $i \leq$, let n_i denote the number of pairs of preceding queries compatible with the *i*-th query. Every such pair defines a line from which the answer of the *i*-th query determines a point to be added to the yield set. If we assume $\operatorname{bad}_{\operatorname{cl}[\kappa]}(\mathcal{Q})$, any of those lines cannot contain more than κ previous yield point, so the probability to hit a previous yield point on a given line is at most $\kappa/2^n$. Thus an union bound on the n_i lines bounds by $n_i \kappa/2^n$ the probability for the *i*-th query to give rise to a collision. We can now apply proposition 2.1 with $B_{\Sigma} = \kappa Y/2^n$, since $\sum_{i=1}^{3q} n_i \leq Y$.

2.3 Bounding $Pr[E_3]$

Lemma 2.3. Let Q be any query list and γ any positive integer. Then,

$$\Pr[\mathbf{E_3}] = \Pr[\text{coll}_{II}(\mathcal{Q})] \le 3\frac{q\gamma}{2^n} + 3\left(\frac{q^4}{2^{2n-3}}\right)^{\gamma}.$$

Proof. We bound the probability of an \mathcal{X} -query A causing a collision. Suppose $B \subset C$ and $B' \subset C'$ are two distinct couples of preceding queries such that $A \in B \subset C$ and $A \in B' \subset C'$. Let

$$x = f_{\mathcal{X}}(A),$$

$$y = f_{\mathcal{Y}}(B),$$

$$z = f_{\mathcal{Y}}(C),$$

$$y' = f_{\mathcal{Z}}(B'),$$

$$z' = f_{\mathcal{Z}}(C').$$

The \mathcal{X} -query A causes a collision if and only if

$$(b_1 - b'_1)W_2 + (b_2 - b'_2)W_3 + (c - c')W_4 + (y - y')W_6 + (z - z')W_7 + (yz - y'z')W_8 = x((z - z')W_9 + (y - y')W_{10})$$

By the conditions on the W_i s, this is equivalent to

$$((b_1 - b'_1) + (c - c') + (yz - y'z'))W_8$$

$$+((c - c') + (y - y'))W_9$$

$$+((b_2 - b'_2) + (z - z'))W_{10}$$

$$= x((z - z')W_9 + (y - y')W_{10})$$

Observe that $det(W_5 \ W_9 \ W_{10})$ together with the condition that $W_5 = W_8$ holds that W_8, W_9 and W_{10} are linearly independent. Hence, A causes a collision if and only if

$$(b_1 - b'_1) + (c - c') + (yz - y'z') = 0,$$

$$(c - c') + (y - y') = x(z - z'),$$

$$(b_2 - b'_2) + (z - z') = x(y - y').$$

Thus, there is at most one solution for x that would cause a collision, and a prerequisite is that $(B \subset C)$ and $(B' \subset C')$ satisfy

$$(b_1 - b_1') + (c - c') + (yz - y'z') = 0, (2)$$

and

$$(y - y') ((c - c') + (y - y')) = (z - z') ((b_2 - b'_2) + (z - z')).$$
 (3)

Moreover, we cannot have simultaneously y = y' and z = z'. Indeed, this would imply c = c', $b_1 = b'_1$ and $b_2 = b'_2$. But by the completion property, A, b_1, b_2 and c uniquely determine a flag, so B = B' and C = C'.

If $(B \subset C)$ and $(B' \subset C')$, satisfy all those conditions, we say they are quadratically compatible. In order to bound properly the probability of $\mathbf{E_3}$, we need to introduce an auxiliary event dealing with such pairs. For any positive integer γ , let $\mathrm{bad}_{\mathcal{X}:\mathrm{quad}[\gamma]}(\mathcal{Q})$ be the event that more than γ pairs $(B \subset C)$ and $(B' \subset C')$ in \mathcal{Q} satisfying $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ and either $y \neq y'$ or $z \neq z'$ are quadratically compatible.

Lemma 2.4. Let $(B \subset C)$ and $(B' \subset C')$ be two distinct pairs such that $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ and either $y \neq y'$ or $z \neq z'$. Then, the probability that $(B \subset C)$ and $(B' \subset C')$ are quadratically compatible is lower than $1/2^{2n-3}$.

Proof. We denote by $\mathbf{F_1}$ the event that equation 2 is satisfied, and by $\mathbf{F_2}$ the event that equation 3 is satisfied.

1. First assume that B = B' and $C \neq C'$. Then, y = y', $z \neq z'$ and one of z ou z' is non-zero. Assume it is z'. The event \mathbf{F}_1 becomes

$$yz' = yz + (c - c'),$$

But $c \neq c'$. Indeed, by the completion property, $B \cap B' \neq \emptyset$, B = B' and c = c' would imply C = C'. Therefore $\mathbf{F_1}$ is satisfied if and only if $y \neq 0$ and z' = z + (c - c')/y. But z and z' are two random variables uniformlyy distributed over \mathbb{F}_{2^n} , and independent since $C \neq C'$, so we have

$$\Pr[\mathbf{F_1}] \le \Pr[\mathbf{F_1} \mid z' \ne 0] + \Pr[z' = 0] \le \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

Now assume $\mathbf{F_1}$ is true. Then, we have z - z' = (c' - c)/y, and $\mathbf{F_2}$ is satisfied if and only if $y(b_2 - b_2') = (c' - c)$. But y is a random variables

uniformely distributed over \mathbb{F}_{2^n} . Assuming $\mathbf{F_1}$ adds the condition $y \neq 0$. Therefore, $\Pr[\mathbf{F_2} \mid \mathbf{F_1}] \leq 1/(2^n - 1) \leq 1/(2^{n-1})$. Finally, in the case B = B' and $C \neq C'$, we have

$$\Pr[\mathbf{F_1} \wedge \mathbf{F_2}] = \Pr[\mathbf{F_1}] \Pr[\mathbf{F_2} \mid \mathbf{F_1}] \le \frac{1}{2^{2(n-1)}}.$$

2. The same argument in the case $B \neq B'$ and C = C' holds

$$\Pr[\mathbf{F_1} \wedge \mathbf{F_2}] \le \frac{1}{2^{2(n-1)}}.$$

3. Assume now that $B \neq B'$ and $C \neq C'$. This implies that y, y', z and z' are mutually independent random variables. Suppose $y' \neq 0$. Then, $\mathbf{F_1}$ becomes

$$z' = \frac{y}{y'}z + \frac{(b_1 - b'_1) + (c - c')}{y'},$$

and is satisfied with probability $1/2^n$. Then,

$$\Pr[\mathbf{F_1}] \le \Pr[\mathbf{F_1} \mid y' \ne 0] + \Pr[y' = 0] \le \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

Assume that $\mathbf{F_1}$ is true. Suppose $y' \neq 0$. We have

$$z - z' = (1 - \frac{y}{y'})z - \frac{(b_1 - b'_1) + (c - c')}{y'}$$

Suppose furthermore that $y \neq y'$. Then, given y and y', z-z' is a random variable uniformly distributed over \mathbb{F}_{2^n} , and

$$(z-z')^2 + (z-z')(b_2 - b_2') = (y-y')((c-c') + (y-y'))$$

admits at most 2 solutions for z - z'. Therefore,

$$\Pr[\mathbf{F_2} \mid \mathbf{F_1} \land y \neq y' \land y' \neq 0] \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

Thus,

$$\Pr[\mathbf{F_2} \mid \mathbf{F_1}] \le \Pr[\mathbf{F_2} \mid \mathbf{F_1} \land y \ne y' \land y' \ne 0] + \Pr[y = y' \lor y' = 0 \mid \mathbf{F_1}]$$

$$\le \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2^{n-2}}$$

Finally, we have

$$\Pr[\mathbf{F_1} \wedge \mathbf{F_2}] = \Pr[\mathbf{F_1}] \Pr[\mathbf{F_2} \mid \mathbf{F_1}] \le \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{n-2}} = \frac{1}{2^{2n-3}}.$$

References 9

Lemma 2.5. Let Q be generated adaptatively. For any positive integer γ ,

$$\Pr[\operatorname{bad}_{\mathcal{X}:\operatorname{quad}[\gamma]}(\mathcal{Q})] \le \left(\frac{q^4}{2^{2n-3}}\right)^{\gamma}.$$

Proof. There are less than q^4 possible pairs $(B \subset C)$, $(B' \subset C')$, and each of them are quadratically compatible with probability smaller than $1/2^{2n-3}$, so

$$\Pr[\mathrm{bad}_{\mathcal{X}:\mathrm{quad}[\gamma]}(\mathcal{Q})] \leq \binom{q^4}{\gamma} \frac{1}{2^{(2n-3)\gamma}} \leq \frac{q^{4\gamma}}{2^{(2n-3)\gamma}}.$$

We can now continue our bounding of $\Pr[\mathbf{E_3}]$. Given $\neg \operatorname{bad}_{\mathcal{X}:\operatorname{quad}[\gamma]}(\mathcal{Q})$, there are at most γ possible pairs $(B \subset C)$ and $(B' \subset C')$ that could give rise to a collision. Given such a pair, there is at most one x satisfying

$$(c-c') + (y-y') = x(z-z'),$$

 $(b_2-b'_2) + (z-z') = x(y-y').$

The probability of x hitting the solution is $1/2^n$, so the probability for an \mathcal{X} -query to cause a collision of type II is lower than $3q\gamma/2^n$. The same argument stands for \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Z} -queries, and we obtain the result

$$\Pr[\mathbf{E_3}] \le 3\frac{q\gamma}{2^n} + 3\left(\frac{q^4}{2^{2n-3}}\right)^{\gamma}.$$

Conclusion

Conclusion...

References

[1] Dimitar Jetchev, Onur Özen, Martijn Stam, Collisions are not incidental: a compression function exploiting discrete geometry. In Proceedings of the 9th international conference on Theory of Cryptography (TCC'12), Ronald Cramer (Ed.). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 303-320, 2012.