Skanda Koppula

Collaborators: Jonathan Frankle, Sam DeLaughter April 22, 2017

**Problem 1.1** The function  $H': \{0,1\}^m \to \{0,1\}^n$  that applies the one-bit compression UOWHF H repeatedly is also a UOWHF. Specifically, for a size-m input x and key  $K = k_m |k_{m-1}| \dots |k_n|$ :

$$H'_K(x) = H_{k_m}(H_{k_{m-1}}(\dots H_{k_n}(x)))$$

We show that this construction is a UOWHF by contradiction. Suppose there existed a PPT A that could produce such a colliding x' for H' (as per the UOWHF definition). We construct a PPT B that breaks the UOWHF-ness of  $H_{k_t}$  with probability  $\frac{1}{\text{poly}}$ :

- 1. B begins by querying A for its commitment pre-image x.
- 2. B then guesses a specific location t in the chain/UOWHF to break. The choice of t is  $m \le t < n$ , a poly-sized number of choices to guess among.
- 3. B picks  $k_t, k_{t-1}, \dots k_n$ , and evaluates  $\gamma = H_{k_t}(H_{k_{t-1}}(\dots H_{k_n}(x)))$ .
- 4. Declare  $\gamma$  as the commitment pre-image for the UOWHF t that we chose to break.
- 5. Following UOWHF protocol, key  $k_t$  is selected, and we select keys  $k_m, k_{m-1}, \ldots, k_{t+1}$  as well.
- 6. B queries A for its collision, x'.
- 7. B outputs its collision guess  $\gamma' = H_{k_t}(H_{k_{t-1}}(\dots H_{k_n}(x')))$ .

B outputs the correct guess  $\gamma'$  with at least  $\frac{1}{m-n} = \mathsf{non-negl}(x)$  probability. By definition,  $H'_K(x) = H'_K(x')$ . This means that at some point in the chain, evaluation of the hash chain must switch from differing to being the same (evaluating on input x vs. x'). The probability we select the correct such switching point t is  $\frac{1}{\mathsf{poly}}$ , implying that B breaks the UOWHF-ness of H a non-negligible amount, contradiction. No B can exist, H' is a UOWHF.

## Problem 1.2.a.

That  $\bar{H}$  is a function that compresses its input by one bit is clear from the dimensionality of  $M: n \times n + 1$ . What remains is showing that  $\bar{H}$  is universal: that given two randomly chosen  $(x_1, y_1)$  and  $(x_2, y_2)$ , the probability of choosing M such that  $Mx_1 = y_1$  and  $Mx_2 = y_2$  is  $\frac{1}{22n}$ 

The total size of the space of all binary  $n \times n + 1$  matrices is  $2^{n(n+1)}$ . Denote M[i] as the i-th row of M, and y[i] as the i-th entry in y. Mechanics of matrix multiplication tell us that  $M[i] \cdot x_1 = y_1[i]$  and  $M[i] \cdot x_2 = y_2[i]$ . This means that every row corresponds to an underconstrained 2-equation, n+1 variable linear equation with binary coefficients and variables. From counting principles, we see that there are  $2^{n-1}$  satisfying assignments to each row M[i], and thus  $2^{n(n-1)}$  M's that satisfy the universal hash function condition. The probability of picking such an M is thus  $\frac{2^{n(n-1)}}{2^{n(n+1)}} = \frac{1}{2^{n(n+1)-n(n-1)}} = \frac{1}{2^{2n}}$  as desired for universality.

## Problem 1.2.b.

This reduces to sampling a row-rank-n M such that  $My = M(x_2 - x_1) = 0$ . If we are able to sample a full-rank  $n \times n$  matrix M', we can always compute the necessary values for the last column in M to satisfy the linear equality. This reduces the problem to sampling a full rank  $n \times n$  matrix in poly-time w.h.p.

If we randomly sample the binary column vectors of the matrix in order: the first column vector is trivially linearly independent. The second column is linearly dependent with the first column vector with probability  $\frac{1}{2^n}$ , so the probability that it is linearly independent is  $1 - \frac{1}{2^n}$ . Similarly, the probability that the third column is linearly dependent with the first two is  $\frac{2}{2^n}$ , so the probability that it's linearly independent is  $1 - \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$ . Because each draw is independent, the probability that all n vectors are linearly independent is:

$$p(n) = \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} 1 - 2^{-(n-i)}$$

We want to show that p(n) is greater than some constant non-negl c. Using the lower bound  $e^{-2x} \le 1 - x$  for every term in the product above, we obtain:

$$p(n) \ge \prod_{i=0}^{n-2} e^{-\frac{2}{2^{n-i}}} = e^{-2\sum_{j=2}^{n} \frac{1}{2^{j}}} = e^{-2(\frac{1}{2} - 2^{-n})} = e^{2^{-n+1} - 1} \ge \lim_{n \to \infty} e^{2^{-n+1} - 1} = \frac{1}{e}$$

This shows that we obtain a full rank matrix with non-negligible probability.

## Problem 1.2.c.

 $H_{M,i}(x)$  compresses its input by a single bit by virtue of the size-preserving permutation, and the single-bit compression function  $\bar{H}$ . We show H is a UOWHF by contradiction. Assume there were a PPT A that could break the UOWHF-ness. Using A, we construct PPT B to break the one-wayness of permutation  $f_i(x)$ . On challenge input  $f_i(\alpha)$ :

- 1. Begin by querying A for its commitment pre-image x
- 2. Use the Part 1.2.b. to sample M such that  $Mf_i(\alpha) = Mf_i(x)$ .
- 3. Extract from A the colliding pre-image x' such that  $Mf_i(x) = Mf_i(x') = \gamma$ .
- 4. Output x'.

By Lemma 1.2.c, with high probability (non-negligible), there are only two non-zero values of  $f_i(\zeta)$  that map to  $\gamma$ . This fact, combined with the fact that  $Mf_i(x) = Mf_i(x') = Mf_i(\alpha)$ , and the fact that  $f_i$  is a permutation, means  $\alpha$  must be either x or x' with non-negligible probability. This increases the probability of a one-wayness break of  $f_i$  to non-negligible, contradiction. No such A can exist, and H is a UOWHF.

Proof of Lemma 1.2.c (with non-negligible probability, there is no other unique x'' such that  $Mx' = Mx'' = Mx'' = \gamma$ . The probability that  $M\beta = \gamma$  is  $\frac{1}{2^n}$ . The probability that this is not the case is  $1 - \frac{1}{2^n}$ . Now, we want this to be true for all  $x'' \neq x, x', 0$  in the input space of  $f_i(x) = \beta$ . There are  $2^{n+1} - 3$  such possible inputs. Thus, the total probability that there is no other input that maps to  $\gamma$  is thus:

$$p = (1 - \frac{1}{2^n})^{2^{n+1} - 3} \ge e^{-2(\frac{1}{2^n})(2^{n+1} - 3)} = e^{\frac{3}{2^{n-1}} - 4} \ge \lim_{n \to \infty} e^{\frac{3}{2^{n-1}} - 4} = \frac{1}{e^4}$$

Here, we've applied the bound  $1-x \ge e^{-2x}$ . This shows the probability of no third valid x'' existing is bounded above a non-negligible amount.