# 18733: Applied Cryptography Recitation

Number Theoretic Symmetric Key Constructions

Gihyuk Ko February 24, 2017

Carnegie Mellon University

# **Number Theory**

Number theory has provided very elegant solutions to many questions in cryptography

- Pseudorandom Generators
- One-way functions
- Public Key Cryptography

Today: a few examples of number theoretic constructions in symmetric cryptography

- Pseudorandom Generators
- Carter-Wegman MAC
- Provable Compression Functions

**Pseudorandom Generators**:  $G: K \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ 

Security of Pseudorandom Generators: Unpredictability of Next Bit

$$A \xrightarrow{\{x_0 \dots x_n\}} O \leftarrow k \leftarrow \$, \{x_0 \dots x_n\} \leftarrow G(k)$$

Secure PRG: for all PPT algorithms A

$$Adv_{PRG}(A,G) = \Pr[A(\{x_0 \dots x_n\}) = x_{n+1}] < \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$$

### Practical Pseudorandom Generators



- Practical pseudorandom generators are deterministic algorithms
- Seed is picked from state of the machine (e.g., temperature, time, etc) which is considered random
- Previous output( $X_n$ ) is used to generate next output( $X_{n+1}$ )

How can we make next bit unpredictable from a deterministic algorithm?

# Linear Congruential Generators

#### Number streams calculated from linear equations of the form:

#### Linear Congruential Generators

 $X_{n+1} = aX_n + c \pmod{m}$ 

- *m*: modulus (m > 0)
- a: multiplier (0 < a < m)
- c: the increment (0  $\leq$  c < m)
- $X_0$ : starting value, or seed ( $0 \le X_0 \le m$ )

Is this PRG always secure? No! a = c = 1: predictable sequence! Selection of a, c, m is critical!

One example value:  $m = 2^{31} - 1$  and a = 1103515245, c = 12345 (glibc)

## Blum-Blum-Shub Generator

Proposed by Lenore **Blum**, Manuel **Blum**, and Michael **Shub** Has the strongest public proof for its strength (CSPRNG)

```
Blum-Blum-Shub Generator
```

 $X_{n+1} = X_n^2 \pmod{m}$ 

- m = pq: modulus where p, q are large primes (m > 0)
- $X_0 = s^2 \pmod{m}$ : starting value, or seed ( $0 \le s \le m$ )

Is this PRG secure? Yes!

Security of this reduces to hardness of quadratic residue problem

In proof: Chinese Remainder Theorem, Quadratic residues, Legendre/Jacobi symbols, and more (Security proof of BBS).

#### Carter-Wegman MAC: Secure One-time MAC

**MAC**: I = (S, V) where S: MAC signing, V: MAC verification. Security of One-time MAC: analogous to security of one-time pad

$$A \xrightarrow{m} \underbrace{t}_{(m',t')} \xrightarrow{m} O \xleftarrow{k \leftarrow \$, t \leftarrow S(k,m)} \bigcup_{\substack{\downarrow \\ b = 1 \text{ if } V(k,m',t') = yes \\ b = 0 \text{ otherwise}}$$

Secure One-time MAC: for all PPT algorithms A

$$Adv_{PRG}(A, I) = \Pr[O(A, I) = 1] < \epsilon$$

## Carter-Wegman MAC: Example of One-time MAC

Can be secure against *all* adversaries and faster than PRF-based MACs (HMAC, NMAC CBC-MAC, etc)

One-time MAC

 $S(k,m) = P_m(a) + b \pmod{q}$ 

- *q*: a large prime (e.g.,  $q = 2^{128} + 51$ )
- k = (a, b): two random ints less or equal to  $q (0 < a, b \le q)$
- $m = (m[1] \dots m[l])$ : an *l*-block message with a block size 128.
- $P_m(x) = x^{l+1} + m[l]x^l + \cdots + m[1]x$ : a polynomial of degree l + 1

It can be shown that given S(k, m), adversary has no information about S(k, m') (proof in Blackboard's lecture note 05-integrity)

#### Construction from One-time MAC

Carter-Wegman MAC

 $CW((k_1, k_2), m) = (r, F(k_1, r) \oplus S(k_2, m))$ 

- (S, V): a secure one-time MAC scheme
- $F: K_F \times \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ : a secure PRF
- *r*: a random number in  $\{0,1\}^n$

**Theorem**: If (S, V) is a secure one-time MAC and *F* a secure PRF then *CW* is a secure MAC outputing tags in  $\{0, 1\}^{2n}$ 

# **Provable Compression Functions**

## **Compression functions**: $h(H, m) : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{H}$ Used in Merkle-Damgard iterated construction

Provable Compression Function  $h(H, m) = u^H \cdot v^m \pmod{p}$ 

- p: random 2000-bit prime (p > 0)
- u, v: random numbers less than p (1  $\leq u, v < p$ )
- $\cdot$  *m*, *H*: inputs to the compresion function

Fact: finding collision for  $h(\cdot, \cdot)$  is as hard as solving `discrete-log' modulo p**Discrete Log Problem**: Given  $y = g^x$  and g, output x.

# Questions?