

Homework 12

Problem 1. Let G be a pseudorandom generator of stretch ℓ such that $\ell(n) \geq 2n$.

- (a) Define G' as $G'(s) = G(s0^{|s|})$. Is G' necessarily a pseudorandom generator?
- (b) Define G'' as $G''(s) = G(s_1 \cdots s_{n/2})$ for $s = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n$. Is G'' necessarily a pseudorandom generator?

Solution. (a) No. We will give a counterexample below. Consider another PRG H with stretch ℓ , and define G as: on input x with length $|x| = 2n$:

$$G(x) = \begin{cases} 0^{\ell(2n)} & \text{if } x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} = 0 \\ H(x) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

We will now prove that this G is a PRG. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(G(x)) = 1) \\ &= \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(G(x)) = 1 \mid x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} = 0) \Pr(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} = 0) \\ & \quad + \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(G(x)) = 1 \mid x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} \text{ not all } 0) \Pr(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} \text{ not all } 0) \\ &= \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(0) = 1 \mid x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} = 0) \Pr(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} = 0) \\ & \quad + \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(H(x)) = 1 \mid x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} \text{ not all } 0) \Pr(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{2n} \text{ not all } 0) \\ &= \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(0) = 1) \times 2^{-n} + \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(H(x)) = 1) \times (1 - 2^{-n}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \Pr_{s \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(G(x)) = 1) - \Pr_{r \in \{0,1\}^{\ell(2n)}} (\mathcal{A}(r) = 1) \right| \\
&= \left| \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(0) = 1) \times 2^{-n} + \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(H(x)) = 1) \times (1 - 2^{-n}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \Pr_{r \in \{0,1\}^{\ell(2n)}} (\mathcal{A}(r) = 1) \right| \\
&\leq (1 - 2^{-n}) \left| \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(H(x)) = 1) - \Pr_{r \in \{0,1\}^{\ell(2n)}} (\mathcal{A}(r) = 1) \right| \\
&\quad + 2^{-n} \left| \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^{2n}} (\mathcal{A}(0) = 1) - \Pr_{r \in \{0,1\}^{\ell(2n)}} (\mathcal{A}(r) = 1) \right| \\
&\leq (1 - 2^{-n}) \text{negl}(2n) + 2^{-n} \times 1 \\
&= \text{negl}(2n)
\end{aligned}$$

Then consider G' with this G . We have $G'(s) = G(s0^{|s|}) = 0^{\ell(2n)}$ by definition, so for any input s the encoding of G' is always constant, which means G' is not a PRG (we can set \mathcal{A} to output 1 if and only if the input is all 0).

(b) Yes. Since $G''(s) = G(s_1 \cdots s_{\frac{n}{2}})$ only depends on the first half of input s , and is independent with $s_{\frac{n}{2}+1}, \dots, s_n$, so we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr_{s \in \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(G''(s)) = 1) = \Pr_{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n \in \{0,1\}} (\mathcal{A}(G(s_1 \cdots s_{\frac{n}{2}})) = 1) \\
&= \sum_{s_{\frac{n}{2}+1}, \dots, s_n \in \{0,1\}} \Pr_{s_1, \dots, s_{\frac{n}{2}} \in \{0,1\}} (\mathcal{A}(G(s_1 \cdots s_{\frac{n}{2}})) = 1 \mid s_{\frac{n}{2}+1} \cdots s_n) \Pr(s_{\frac{n}{2}+1}, \dots, s_n) \\
&= \Pr_{s_1, \dots, s_{\frac{n}{2}} \in \{0,1\}} (\mathcal{A}(G(s_1 \cdots s_{\frac{n}{2}})) = 1) \sum_{s_{\frac{n}{2}+1}, \dots, s_n \in \{0,1\}} \Pr(s_{\frac{n}{2}+1}, \dots, s_n) \\
&= \Pr_{s_1, \dots, s_{\frac{n}{2}} \in \{0,1\}} (\mathcal{A}(G(s_1 \cdots s_{\frac{n}{2}})) = 1)
\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, as $|G''(s)| = |G(s_1 \cdots s_{\frac{n}{2}})| = \ell(\frac{n}{2}) = \ell''(n)$, so we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \Pr_{s \in \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(G''(s)) = 1) - \Pr_{r \in \{0,1\}^{\ell''(n)}} (\mathcal{A}(r) = 1) \right| \\
&= \left| \Pr_{s_1, \dots, s_{\frac{n}{2}} \in \{0,1\}} (\mathcal{A}(G(s_1 \cdots s_{\frac{n}{2}})) = 1) - \Pr_{r \in \{0,1\}^{\ell(\frac{n}{2})}} (\mathcal{A}(r) = 1) \right| \\
&= \text{negl}\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \\
&= \text{negl}(n)
\end{aligned}$$

The second last line is due to the fact that G is a PRG. Thus G'' is also a PRG.

Problem 2. A keyed family of functions F_k is a pseudorandom random permutation (PRP) if (a) $F_k(\cdot)$ and $F_k^{-1}(\cdot)$ are efficiently computable given the key k and (b) for any polynomial-time algorithm \mathcal{A} ,

$$\left| \Pr\left(\mathcal{A}^{F_k(\cdot), F_k^{-1}(\cdot)}(1^n) = 1\right) - \Pr\left(\mathcal{A}^{f_n(\cdot), f_n^{-1}(\cdot)}(1^n) = 1\right) \right| \leq \text{negl}(n).$$

Consider the following encryption scheme

1. Sample key k uniformly at random.
2. On input plaintext $x \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$, algorithm Enc_k samples randomness $r \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$ and outputs ciphertext $F_k(r \| x)$.

Solve the following problems assuming that F_k is a PRP.

- (a) Show how the decryption Dec_k works.
- (b) Prove that the encryption scheme is CPA-secure.

Solution. (a) Consider $\text{Dec}_k : y \mapsto (F_k^{-1}(y))_{[\frac{n}{2} + 1 : n]}$ where " $[i : j]$ " means taking the i -th to j -th bit. Then for any plaintext $x \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$, we have $\text{Dec}_k(\text{Enc}_k(x)) = (F_k^{-1}(F_k(r \| x)))_{[\frac{n}{2} + 1 : n]} = (r \| x)_{[\frac{n}{2} + 1 : n]} = x$.

(b) Consider $\tilde{\Pi} = (\tilde{\text{Enc}}, \tilde{\text{Dec}})$ where real random function f_n is used, and Π where F_k is used. If Π is not CPA, then there is some adversary \mathcal{A} with the encryption oracle that can attack Π , which means $\Pr(\mathcal{A}_{\Pi} \text{ succ}) \geq 1/2 + 1/\text{poly}(n)$.

Consider $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Pi}}$. It's success rate is strictly $1/2$ if it has not queried Enc using the same random r with the one used in the actual encryption. Meanwhile, the probability of the occurrence of using the same random r is $q(n)/2^n$ where $q(n)$ is the number of queries \mathcal{A} makes to Enc , which should be polynomial. Thus: $\Pr(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Pi}} \text{ succ}) \leq 1/2 + q(n)/2^n = 1/2 + \text{negl}(n)$.

Using the above adversaries, We can construct a poly-time distinguisher D between (F_k, F_k^{-1}) and (f_n, f_n^{-1}) with oracles O_1, O_2 and input 1^n :

1. Run $\mathcal{A}(1^n)$, whenever encryption is called with input x , answer with $O_1(r \| x)$ where r is randomly sampled from $\{0, 1\}^n$.
2. When \mathcal{A} outputs x_0, x_1 , choose random bit b , feed $O_1(r \| x_b)$ to \mathcal{A} and get output b' .
3. Output $1_{b=b'}$.

Then, we know that $\Pr(D^{F_k, F_k^{-1}}(1^n) = 1) = \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\Pi \text{ succ})$, and $\Pr(D^{f_n, f_n^{-1}}(1^n) = 1) = \Pr(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Pi}} \text{ succ})$.

So:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \Pr(D^{f_n, f_n^{-1}}(1^n) = 1) - \Pr(D^{F_k, F_k^{-1}}(1^n) = 1) \right| \\ &= \left| \Pr(\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{\Pi}} \text{ succ}) - \Pr(\mathcal{A}_\Pi \text{ succ}) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

which raises contradiction to the fact that F_k is PRP. Thus, the encryption scheme is CPA-secure.