

this is not the case: it turns out that a slightly stronger assumption than the CDH assumption is both necessary and sufficient to prove the security of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{EG}}$ .

Recall the basic ElGamal encryption scheme,  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{EG}} = (G, E, D)$ , introduced in Section 11.5. It is defined in terms of a cyclic group  $\mathbb{G}$  of prime order  $q$  generated by  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ , a symmetric cipher  $\mathcal{E}_s = (E_s, D_s)$ , defined over  $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C})$ , and a hash function  $H : \mathbb{G}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ . The message space of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{EG}}$  is  $\mathcal{M}$  and the ciphertext space is  $\mathbb{G} \times \mathcal{C}$ . Public keys are of the form  $u \in \mathbb{G}$  and secret keys are of the form  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_q$ . The algorithms  $G$ ,  $E$ , and  $D$  are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G() &:= \alpha \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Z}_q, \ u \leftarrow g^\alpha, \ pk \leftarrow u, \ sk \leftarrow \alpha \\ &\quad \text{output } (pk, sk); \\ E(u, m) &:= \beta \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Z}_q, \ v \leftarrow g^\beta, \ w \leftarrow u^\beta, \ k \leftarrow H(v, w), \ c \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}} E_s(k, m) \\ &\quad \text{output } (v, c); \\ D(\alpha, (v, c)) &:= w \leftarrow v^\alpha, \ k \leftarrow H(v, w), \ m \leftarrow D_s(k, c) \\ &\quad \text{output } m. \end{aligned}$$

To see why the CDH assumption by itself is not sufficient to establish the security of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{EG}}$  against chosen ciphertext attack, suppose the public key is  $u = g^\alpha$ . Now, suppose an adversary selects group elements  $\hat{v}$  and  $\hat{w}$  in some arbitrary way, and computes  $\hat{k} \leftarrow H(\hat{v}, \hat{w})$  and  $\hat{c} \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}} E_s(\hat{k}, \hat{m})$  for some arbitrary message  $\hat{m}$ . Further, suppose the adversary can obtain the decryption  $m^*$  of the ciphertext  $(\hat{v}, \hat{c})$ . Now, it is very likely that  $\hat{m} = m^*$  if and only if  $\hat{w} = \hat{v}^\alpha$ , or in other words, if and only if  $(u, \hat{v}, \hat{w})$  is a DH-triple. Thus, in the chosen ciphertext attack game, decryption queries can be effectively used by the adversary to answer questions of the form “is  $(u, \hat{v}, \hat{w})$  a DH-triple?” for group elements  $\hat{v}$  and  $\hat{w}$  of the adversary’s choosing. In general, the adversary would not be able to efficiently answer such questions on his own (this is the DDH assumption), and so these **decryption queries may potentially leak some information about the secret key  $\alpha$ . Based on the current state of our knowledge, this leakage does not seem to compromise the security of the scheme; however, we do need to state this as an explicit assumption.**

Intuitively, the **interactive CDH assumption** states that given a random instance  $(g^\alpha, g^\beta)$  of the DH problem, it is hard to compute  $g^{\alpha\beta}$ , even when given access to a “DH-decision oracle” that recognizes DH-triples of the form  $(g^\alpha, \cdot, \cdot)$ . More formally, this assumption is defined in terms of the following attack game.

**Attack Game 12.3 (Interactive Computational Diffie-Hellman).** Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be a cyclic group of prime order  $q$  generated by  $g \in \mathbb{G}$ . For a given adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , the attack game runs as follows.

- The challenger computes

$$\alpha, \beta \xleftarrow{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{Z}_q, \ u \leftarrow g^\alpha, \ v \leftarrow g^\beta, \ w \leftarrow g^{\alpha\beta}$$

and gives  $(u, v)$  to the adversary.

- The adversary makes a sequence of *DH-decision oracle queries* to the challenger. Each query is of the form  $(\tilde{v}, \tilde{w}) \in \mathbb{G}^2$ . Upon receiving such a query, the challenger tests if  $\tilde{v}^\alpha = \tilde{w}$ ; if so, he sends “yes” to the adversary, and otherwise, sends “no” to the adversary.
- Finally, the adversary outputs some  $\hat{w} \in \mathbb{G}$ .

We define  $\mathcal{A}$ ’s **advantage in solving the interactive computational Diffie-Hellman problem**, denoted  $\text{ICDHadv}[\mathcal{A}, \mathbb{G}]$ , as the probability that  $\hat{w} = w$ .  $\square$