

Problem 1

1. This is False since Bob will know that Eve is not the person that he supposes to talk with since he will verify what Eve sent to him using the k that Bob and Alice established before. The security of the MAC still depends on the secrecy of the key. In addition, Alice and Bob use an increment counter. Therefore, any attempt to intervene or replaying the message will be detected.
2. This new protocol is **not secured**. Since Eve can use two previous messages (The second and the third message) to XOR them together. The part $y = PRG(k)$ will be cancelled out. That leaves Eve with the result:

$$2 \parallel A -> B \parallel N_A \parallel N_B \oplus 3 \parallel B < -A \parallel N_A \parallel N_B$$

- This is insecure since now Eve can basically have every information and can establish his own communication with Bob.
3. Yes. This protocol will remain secure. We basically establish **session counter** for each handshake we make. The security is still guaranteed as what we did in question 1.1.

Problem 2

1. Like what we discussed in class, we need a variable called δ which is tolerance delay. We need to do the following check on each side when they receive the information:
 - (a) Alice send Bob her T_A , and Bob also need to have Alice's previous T_A on his file. Let's call it T'_A . The first check is to compare if this is a new message by comparing $T_A > T'_A$.
 - (b) The second check is when Bob records his own current time, called it T_B . He uses his T_B to subtract the tolerance delay δ to see if the message arrived on time or not. Then he compares the following $T_A > T_B - \delta$
 - (c) Repeat the two above checks for new handshakes.
2. This will not impact the security. Since every PRP is a PRF, and every PRF is a MAC. Therefore, when we encrypt the full input, the output will still satisfy the condition of a MAC. Hence, it will provide the same security as we were using a Mac.
3. **Yes** if the GSM protocol is compromised, then the attacker has the ability to initiate handshake with **different sessions** using the information that he spoofed on the **previous sessions**

Problem 3

1. $185 \cdot 11^{150} + 1230 \cdot 1024^{33} \pmod{41}$
- Using property 1.2:

$$(185 \cdot 11^{150} \pmod{41} + 1230 \cdot 1024^{33} \pmod{41}) \pmod{41}$$

- Using property 1.4:

$$((185 \pmod{41})(11^{150} \pmod{41}) + (1230 \pmod{41})(1024^{33} \pmod{41})) \pmod{41}$$

- Using property 1.5:

$$(21(11 \bmod 41)^{150} + 0 \cdot (1024^{33} \bmod 41)) \bmod 41 = (21 \cdot (11)^{150}) \bmod 41$$

- Since 41 is a prime number, we using 1.5 and 1.9 together:

$$\begin{aligned} ((21 \bmod 41) \cdot 11^{150 \bmod \phi(41)} \bmod 41) \bmod 41 &= (21 \cdot 11^{150 \bmod 40} \bmod 41) \bmod 41 \\ &= 21 \cdot 11^{30} \bmod 41 \\ &= 672 \bmod 41 = 16 \end{aligned}$$

2. $645(19850^{874000} + 653 \cdot 123456^{9856}) \bmod 29$

- Using property 1.4:

$$((645 \bmod 29) \cdot (19850^{874000} + 653 \cdot 123456^{9856}) \bmod 29) \bmod 29$$

- Using property 1.2:

$$7 \cdot (((19850)^{874000} \bmod 29) + (653 \cdot 123456^{9856} \bmod 29)) \bmod 29 \bmod 29$$

- Using property 1.9, since 29 is a prime number:

$$(7 \cdot (19856^{874000 \bmod 28} \bmod 29) + ((653 \bmod 29) \cdot (123456)^{9856 \bmod 28} \bmod 29) \bmod 29) \bmod 29$$

- Simplify:

$$\begin{aligned} (7 \cdot (14^8 + (15 \cdot (123456)^0 \bmod 29)) \bmod 29) \bmod 29 &= (7 \cdot (14^8 + 15 \bmod 29) \bmod 29) \bmod 29 \\ &= (7 \cdot (1475789071) \bmod 29) \bmod 29 \\ &= (7 * 9) \bmod 29 \\ &= 63 \bmod 29 \\ &= 5 \end{aligned}$$

3. $\frac{513}{12} + \frac{704}{11} + 20450 \bmod 103$

- change to the inverse form:

$$513 \cdot 12^{-1} + 704 \cdot 11^{-1} + 20450 \bmod 103$$

- Using property 1.2:

$$(513 \cdot 12^{-1} \bmod 103 + 704 \cdot 11^{-1} \bmod 103 + (20450 \bmod 103)) \bmod 103$$

- Using multiplicative inverse, we have $(12 * 43) \bmod 103 = 1$. Therefore, $12^{-1} = 43$. Similarly, $(11 * 75) \bmod 103 = 1$. Therefore, $11^{-1} = 75$:

$$\begin{aligned} (513 \cdot 43 \bmod 103 + (704 \cdot 75) \bmod 103 + 56) \bmod 103 &= (17 + 64 + 56) \bmod 103 \\ &= 137 \bmod 103 \\ &= 34 \end{aligned}$$

4. $248 - \frac{45}{123456} + \frac{1785}{32 \cdot 2} \pmod{86}$

- This is **not valid** since we can't find the multiplicative inverse of 123456 and $32 \cdot 2$ such that $123456 \cdot X \pmod{86} = 1$ and $32 \cdot 2 \cdot Y \pmod{86} = 1$ where X, Y are the multiplicative inverse.

5. $245 \cdot (17 + (421 \cdot 8^{109}(32^{590} + 7996))) \pmod{59}$

- Using property 1.4:

$$(245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 + (421 \cdot 8^{109}(32^{590} + 7996))) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}$$

- Using property 1.2:

$$(245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 \pmod{59} + (421 \cdot 8^{109} \cdot (32^{590} + 7996) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}$$

- Using property 1.4:

$$(245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 \pmod{59} + (421 \pmod{59} \cdot 8^{109} \pmod{59} \cdot (32^{590} + 7996) \pmod{59})) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}$$

- Using property 1.4:

$$(245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 \pmod{59} + (421 \pmod{59} \cdot (8^{109} \pmod{59} \cdot (32^{590} \pmod{59} + 7996 \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}$$

- Using property 1.2:

$$(245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 \pmod{59} + (421 \pmod{59} \cdot (8^{109} \pmod{59} \cdot (32^{590} \pmod{59} + 7996 \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}$$

- Using Lemma 1.4:

$$(245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 \pmod{59} + (421 \pmod{59} \cdot (8^{109 \pmod{\phi(59)}} \pmod{59} \cdot (32^{590 \pmod{\phi(59)}} \pmod{59} + 7996 \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}$$

$$(245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 \pmod{59} + (421 \pmod{59} \cdot (8^{109 \pmod{58}} \pmod{59} \cdot (32^{590 \pmod{58}} \pmod{59} + 7996 \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}$$

$$(245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 \pmod{59} + (421 \pmod{59} \cdot (8^{51} \pmod{59} \cdot (32^{10} \pmod{59} + 7996 \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}$$

- Using property 1.5:

$$\begin{aligned} & (245 \pmod{59} \cdot (17 \pmod{59} + (421 \pmod{59} \cdot ((8 \pmod{59})^{51} ((32 \pmod{59})^{10} + 7996 \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59} \\ &= (9 \cdot 17 + (8 \cdot (8^{51}(32^{10} + 31) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59} \\ &= (9 \cdot (17 + (8 \cdot (8^{51} \cdot 34) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59} \\ &= (9 \cdot (17 + (8 \cdot 28) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59} \\ &= (9 \cdot (17 + 47) \pmod{59}) \pmod{59} \\ &= 45 \pmod{59} \\ &= 45. \end{aligned}$$

6. $\phi(43) + \phi(1680)$ (First represent each of 43 and 1680 as a product of powers of distinct primes and then compute the Euler's function.)

$$43 = 43^1$$

$$1680 = 2^4 \cdot 3^1 \cdot 5^1 \cdot 7^1$$

$$\phi(43) = (43^1 - 43^0) = 42$$

$$\phi(1680) = (2^4 - 2^3)(3^1 - 3^0)(5^1 - 5^0)(7^1 - 7^0) = 384$$

- Hence:

$$\phi(43) + \phi(1680) = 42 + 384 = 426$$

7. Is the following congruence true? why?

$$13 \cdot 4 \equiv 93 \cdot 6 \pmod{19}$$

- They are not congruence since:

$$\text{Left Side} = 13 \cdot 4 \pmod{19}$$

$$\text{Using 1.4} = ((13 \pmod{19}) \cdot (4 \pmod{19})) \pmod{19}$$

$$= (13 \cdot 4) \pmod{19}$$

$$= 52 \pmod{19} = 14$$

$$\text{Right Side} = 93 \cdot 6 \pmod{19}$$

$$\text{Using 1.4} = ((93 \pmod{19}) \cdot (6 \pmod{19})) \pmod{19}$$

$$= (17 \cdot 6) \pmod{19}$$

$$= 102 \pmod{19} = 7$$

- Since Right Side \neq Left Side. Therefore, it is **not congruent**.