

## Homework 5

Due date: Friday, April 21<sup>th</sup> 11:30 AM

### Question 1 (25 points)

Consider the following protocol for two parties  $A$  and  $B$  to flip a fair coin.

1. A trusted party  $T$  publishes her public key  $pk$ ;
  2. Then  $A$  chooses a uniform bit  $b_A$ , encrypts it using  $pk$ , and announces the ciphertext  $c_A$  to  $B$  and  $T$ ;
  3. Next,  $B$  acts symmetrically and announces a ciphertext  $c_B \neq c_A$ ;
  4.  $T$  decrypts both  $c_A$  and  $c_B$ , and the parties XOR the results to obtain the value of the coin.
- Argue that even if  $A$  is dishonest (but  $B$  is honest), the final value of the coin is uniformly distributed.
  - Assume the parties use El Gamal encryption (where the bit  $b$  is encoded as the group element  $g^b$  before being encrypted — note that efficient decryption is still possible). Show how a dishonest  $B$  can bias the coin to any values he likes.
  - Suggest what type of encryption scheme would be appropriate to use here. Can you define an appropriate notion of security for a fair coin flipping and prove that the above coin flipping protocol achieves this definition when using an appropriate encryption scheme?

### Question 2 (30 points)

Suppose three users have RSA public keys  $(N_1, 3)$ ,  $(N_2, 3)$ , and  $(N_3, 3)$  (i.e., they all use  $e=3$ ), with  $N_1 < N_2 < N_3$ . Consider the following method for sending the same message  $m \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$  to each of these parties: choose a uniform  $r \leftarrow Z_{N_1}^*$ , and send to everyone the same ciphertext

$$\langle [r^3 \bmod N_1], [r^3 \bmod N_2], [r^3 \bmod N_3], H(r) \oplus m \rangle \quad (1)$$

where  $H : Z_{N_1}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$ . Assume  $\ell \gg n$

- Show that this is not CPA-secure, and an adversary can recover  $m$  from the ciphertext even when  $H$  is modeled as a random oracle.
- Show a simple way to fix this and get a CPA-secure method that transmits a ciphertext of length  $3\ell + O(n)$ .

### Question 3 (15 points)

Secret sharing is a problem in cryptography where  $n$  shares  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  (called shadows) are given to  $n$  parties where some of the shadows or all of them are needed in order to reconstruct the secret ( $M$ ) which is a number (i.e. there is a specified threshold  $t$ , such that any  $t$  shadows make it possible to compute  $M$  which is a bit string). Consider the following secret sharing algorithm:

1. Choose at random  $t - 1$  positive integers  $a_1, \dots, a_{t-1}$  with  $a_i < P$  ( $P$  is a prime number) and let  $a_0 = M$ .
2. Build the polynomial  $f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + a_3x^3 + \dots + a_{t-1}x^{t-1}$ .
3. Create  $n$  shadows that are:  $(1, f(1) \pmod{p}), \dots, (n, f(n) \pmod{p})$  (i.e. every participant is given a point (an integer input to the polynomial, and the corresponding integer output)).

**Note:** Suppose  $t < P - 1$

Based on the above protocol, answer the following questions:

Part 1 (6 points) In above protocol, arithmetic is all modulo  $p$  to build the polynomial. Suppose that we mistakenly calculate the shadows as  $(x, f(x))$  instead of  $(x, f(x) \pmod{p})$ , can an eavesdropper gain information from  $M$  or not if the eavesdropper sees some of the points (e.g. Suppose the eavesdropper finds  $(1, f(1))$  or  $(2, f(2))$ )? If your answer is no, please prove it otherwise provide an example that shows the eavesdropper can gain information about  $M$ .

Part 2 (9 points) Suppose we modify the scheme such that  $M = a_0 + a_1 + \dots + a_{t-1} \pmod{p}$ . Does having  $t$  or more shadows make it possible to compute  $M$ ? Does having fewer than  $t$  shadows reveal nothing about  $M$ ? Please justify your answers.

### Question 4 (30 points)

A strong one-time secure signature scheme satisfies the following: given a signature  $\sigma'$  on a message  $m'$ , it is infeasible to output  $(m, \sigma) \neq (m', \sigma')$  for which  $\sigma$  is a valid signature on  $m$  (note that  $m = m'$  is allowed)

- Give a formal definition of strong one-time secure signatures.
- Assuming the existence of one-way functions, show a one-way function for which Lamport's scheme is not a strong one-time secure signature scheme.
- Construct a strong one-time secure signature scheme based on any assumption use in the book.

**Hint:** Use a particular one-way function in Lamport's signature.