

Modern Cryptology - Homework 2

Yosef Goren

June 16, 2022

In this homework I will be denoting \mathbb{P} to mean the set of primes. and denoting $a \equiv_N b$ to mean $a \equiv b \pmod{N}$.

1 Public-key Encryption from QR

1.1 QR given factorization

For any $X \in \mathbb{N}$ denote: $QR(X)$ as the set of quadratic residues modulus X .

Lemma I;

$$\forall P, Q \in \mathbb{P} : QR(N) = QR(P) \cap QR(Q)$$

Proof Lemma I:

Let $a \in QR(N)$.

$$\exists x, K : x^2 \equiv_N a \Rightarrow x^2 = a + (K)PQ$$

$$\Rightarrow x^2 = a + (KP)Q \wedge x^2 = a + (KQ)P$$

$$\Rightarrow x^2 \equiv_Q a \wedge x^2 \equiv_P a$$

$$\Rightarrow a \in QR(Q) \wedge a \in QR(P) \Rightarrow a \in QR(Q) \cap QR(P)$$

Let $a \in QR(P) \cap QR(Q)$. Thus:

$$\exists x_1, x_2 : a \equiv_P x_1 \wedge a \equiv_Q x_2$$

Thanks to the Chinese remainder theorem we know there exists a solution x which satisfies:

$$x \equiv_P x_1, x \equiv_Q x_2$$

Thus:

$$\Rightarrow a \equiv_P x^2, a \equiv_Q x^2 \Rightarrow a \equiv_{PQ} x^2 \Rightarrow a \in QR(N)$$

Now we use the correctness of the Lemma I to define a polynomial algorithm:

```
1 def qr(a: int, P: int, Q: int) -> bool:
2     """the algorithm determines if 'x' is
3     quadratic residue of under modulus PQ"""
4     a_is_P_qr = a**((P-1)/2)%P == 1
5     a_is_Q_qr = a**((Q-1)/2)%Q == 1
6     return a_is_P_qr and a_is_Q_qr
```

Indeed the names of the variables at lines 4 and 5 are informative (and correct) due to the properties of Euler's criterion as seen in class, meaning that a is qr modulus P iff $a^{(P-1)/2} \equiv_P 1$, and same with Q . This together with Lemma I proves the correctness of this algorithm.

We have seen in the last homework how modulus exponentiation can be done efficiently; which makes this algorithm polynomial.

1.2 Generating QR

In the following, all expressions and operations are in the \mathbb{Z}_N^* group unless said otherwise.

Let $x \in QNR(N)$.

Lemma I; $x, z \in QNR(N) \Rightarrow zx^{-1} \in QR(N)$:
Since $QNR(N) = QNR(P) \cap QNR(Q)$ we get:

$$(zx^{-1})^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv_P (z)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} (x^{-1})^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv_P (z)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} (x^{\frac{p-1}{2}})^{-1} \equiv_P (-1)(-1)^{-1} = 1$$

and in the same way under modulus Q we get $(zx^{-1})^{\frac{q-1}{2}} \equiv_Q 1$. From Euile's criterion we get that $(zx^{-1})^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \in QR(N)$.

Lemma II; $\{y^2x : y \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*\} \supseteq QNR(N)$:
Let $z \in QNR(N)$, from Lemma I we get $x^{-1}z \in QR(N)$ Thus:

$$\exists y : y^2 = zx^{-1} \Rightarrow y^2x = z \Rightarrow z \in \{y^2x : y \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*\}$$

Lemma III; $\{y^2x : y \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*\} \subseteq QNR(N)$:
Let $y \in \mathbb{Z}_N^*$. Assume $\exists z : z^2 = y^2x$. Thus:

$$z^2y^{-2} = x \Rightarrow (zy^{-1})^2 = x \Rightarrow x \notin QNR(N)$$

Hence the assumption is incorrect, and $y^2x \in QR(N)$.

Proof:
Define $g(z) = z \cdot x, g : QR(N) \rightarrow QNR(N)$.
From Lemma II and III, we get that g 's image is exactly $QNR(N)$.
 g is invertible and thus is a bijection.
Let:

$$a^2 \in QR(N), y \stackrel{\$}{\sim} \mathbb{Z}_N^*$$

Since y^2 has four different roots:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{y \leftarrow \mathbb{Z}_N^*} [y^2 = a^2] &= \frac{4}{|\mathbb{Z}_N^*|} = \frac{1}{\frac{|\mathbb{Z}_N^*|}{4}} = \frac{1}{|QR(N)|} \\ &\Rightarrow y^2 \stackrel{\$}{\sim} QR(N) \end{aligned}$$

And since g is bijection $QR(N) \rightarrow QNR(N)$:

$$g(y^2) = y^2 x \overset{\$}{\sim} QNR(N)$$

□

2 Statistically Hiding Commitments

2.1 Inner Product with Random String

Let:

$$\langle a, b \rangle = (\sum_i a_i b_i) \% 2$$

$$L = \{0, 1\}^n$$

Proof: Let $b \in L \setminus \{0^n\}$. Let j be the first non-zero index of b . Define:

$$f(a) = a_1 a_2 \dots \bar{a}_j \dots a_n$$

Lemma I; $\langle a, b \rangle =_2 \langle f(a), b \rangle + 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a, b \rangle &= \sum_i a_i b_i = \sum_{i \neq j} a_i b_i + a_j b_j = \sum_{i \neq j} a_i b_i + a_j \\ &= \sum_{i \neq j} a_i b_i + \bar{a}_j + 1 = \sum_i f(a)_i b_i + 1 = \langle f(a), b \rangle + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma II; f is bijection $\{a : \langle a, b \rangle =_2 1\} \longleftrightarrow \{a : \langle a, b \rangle =_2 0\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \{a : \langle a, b \rangle =_2 0\} &\Leftrightarrow \langle x, b \rangle =_2 0 \Leftrightarrow \langle f(x), b \rangle =_2 1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \langle f(x), b \rangle =_2 1 \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in \{a : \langle a, b \rangle =_2 1\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus f is bijection.

Proof using the Lemma II: Let:

$$a = |\{a : \langle a, b \rangle =_2 1\}|, b = |\{a : \langle a, b \rangle =_2 0\}|$$

From Lemma II: $a = b$.

In addition one of the two cases must always be correct, hence: $a + b = 1$.

Solving these two equations gives $a = b = \frac{1}{2}$.

By definition:

$$a = \Pr_{a \leftarrow L} [\langle a, b \rangle =_2 0], b = \Pr_{a \leftarrow L} [\langle a, b \rangle =_2 1]$$

meaning they are both $\frac{1}{2}$.

2.2 Inner Product is Universal

Denote: $H = \{h_a : a \in L\}$.

Let $a \in L$. We want to show that:

$$\forall x, y \in L : x \neq y \quad \Pr_{h \leftarrow H} [h(x) = h(y)] \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

Proof:

Let $x, y \in L : x \neq y$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{h \leftarrow H} [h(x) = h(y)] &= \Pr_{a \leftarrow L} [h_a(x) = h_a(y)] \\ &= \Pr_{a \leftarrow L} [h_a(x) = h_a(y)] = \Pr_{a \leftarrow L} [< a, x > = < a, y >] \\ &= \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}} \Pr_{a \leftarrow L} [< a, x > = < a, y > : < a, x > = b] \cdot \Pr [< a, x > = b] \\ &= \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}} \Pr_{a \leftarrow L} [< a, x > = < a, y >] \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}} \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{1}{2}$ is the size of the output space, this indeed shows that H is universal hash function family.

2.3 Purifying Randomness

Denote $L_n = \{0, 1\}^n$.

Denote a uniform distribution over G with $\mathbb{U}(G)$.

Denote $A \circ B$ operator here denotes a distribution obtained by sampling from $a \leftarrow A, b \leftarrow B$ and resulting with the sample $a(b)$.

Denote (A, B) to mean a distribution that is sampled by sampling $a \leftarrow A, b \leftarrow B$ and returning the sample (a, b) .

The distribution $< r, < r, s >>$ from the question can be described with: $(\mathbb{U}(L_n), \mathbb{U}(H) \circ \mathbb{U}(L_1))$

Let $H = \{h_a\}_{a \in L}$ where each h_a is the function defined in the last section. Now consider the leftover hash lemma; indeed we have seen in the prior section, H is a universal hash function family.

Thus we conclude from leftover hash lemma that:

$$SD((\mathbb{U}(H), \mathbb{U}(H) \circ S), (\mathbb{U}(H)), \mathbb{U}(L_1)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{|S|}}}{2}$$

No

3 Is Factoring NP complete?

3.1 Equivalence to Factoring

We show that there exists a polynomial turing machine for deciding L iff there exists a polynomial factoring TM by showing:

1. Polynomial TM for factoring which uses a polynomial TM for deciding L .
2. Polynomial TM for deciding L which uses a polynomial TM for factoring.

Armed with the church turing thesis; we describe these two turing machines as code of a contemporary programming language.

1. Factoring given decision:

```
1 def factor(N: int, decide_oracle)->tuple:
2     """given a number 'N',
3     and given a 'decide_oracle' function which decides 'L',
4     return the list of prime factors of 'N'.
5     The implementation is a loop of binary searches."""
6     prime_factors = []
7     while N > 1:
8         #find the largest prime factor of current 'N':
9         left, right = 1, N
10        while left < right-1:
11            M = (left+right)//2
12            if decide_oracle(N, M):
13                left = M
14            else:
15                right = M
16        largest_prime_factor = right
17        #add it to list and update 'N':
18        prime_factors.append(largest_prime_factor)
19        N = N//largest_prime_factor
20    return prime_factors
```

Indeed this implementation does a polynomial (w.r to #bits) number of calls to the oracle, and executes only a polynomial number of operations itself:

note how each iteration of the binary search algorithm is polynomial with the number of bits of N since it is logarithmic with the size of the search space. In addition, there can only be a polynomial (w.r to #bits) number of factors since each one is at-least 2; this means there are only a polynomial number of iterations in the main loop.

2. Decision given factoring:

```
1 def decide(N: int, M: int, factoring_oracle)->bool:
2     """returns 'True' if (N,M) is in L, and False otherwise."""
3     prime_factors = factoring_oracle(N)
4     return max(prime_factors) > M
```

3.2 coNP

Here we show $L \in NP \cap coNP$ in two parts:

- $L = L_a \in NP$.
- $\bar{L} = L_b \in NP$.

To show each of these we will define a relation R which will satisfy all conditions:

1. $\forall (x, y) \in R, |y| = Poly(|x|)$
 2. $(x, y) \in R \Leftrightarrow x \in L$
 3. $\exists M_R$, NTM which decides R and is polynomial.
- Define R_a for L_a :

$$R_a = \{((N, M), p) : p \in \mathbb{P} \wedge p > M \wedge N \% p = 0\}$$

It is easy to see that if $(N, M), p \in R_a$ then since p is a prime factor of N which is larger than M - it means that $(N, M) \in \mathbb{P}$. In addition, $\#bits(p) \leq \#bits(N)$ thus the length is linear (and polynomial).

As for the last condition, we define a NTM M_a which will decide R_a : Given some input M_a will simply check for the three conditions for the pair of inputs to be contained within R_a . Checking for the first condition in polynomial time is far from trivial, nevertheless it is widely known that $PRIME \in \mathbb{P}$, and thus it is possible to check if $p \in \mathbb{P}$ in polynomial time; ofcourse it is possible for the other two conditions also.

- Define R_b for L_b :

$$\{((N, M), S) : \prod_{p \in S} p = N \wedge S \subseteq \mathbb{P} \wedge \max(S) \leq M\}$$

Note how S is the set of prime factors of N .

We define a NTM to decide R_b :

Given an input $((N, M), S)$ - the machine will check each condition for being contained in R_b and accept iff all three are statisfied; taking the product of a set of numbers can comparing it can be done in polynomial time, same as taking the maximal value in a list. As before, we know that checking if a number is prime can be done in polynomial time, and there can only be a polynomial number of elements in the input to begin with (w.r to the size of the input...).

Additionally, it is worth noting how in this case too the length of S will be polynomially bound to the length of N (hence to the length of (N, M) too): This is because the number of prime factors of N is $O(\log(N))$, and each of them has length of $O(\log(N))$.

To sum up, we have shown that $L \in NP$, and that $L_b = \bar{L} \in NP$ hence $L \in coNP$, meaning $L \in NP \cap coNP$.