

---

**TD 5: PRFs**


---

**Exercise 1.***CTR Security*

Let  $F : \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^n$  be a PRF. To encrypt a message  $M \in \{0,1\}^{d \cdot n}$ , CTR proceeds as follows:

- Write  $M = M_0 \| M_1 \| \dots \| M_{d-1}$  with each  $M_i \in \{0,1\}^n$ .
- Sample  $IV$  uniformly in  $\{0,1\}^n$ .
- Return  $IV \| C_0 \| C_1 \| \dots \| C_{d-1}$  with  $C_i = M_i \oplus F(k, IV + i \bmod 2^n)$  for all  $i$ .

The goal of this exercise is to prove the security of the CTR encryption mode against chosen plaintext attacks, when the PRF  $F$  is secure.

1. Recall the definition of security of an encryption scheme against chosen plaintext attacks.
2. Assume an attacker makes  $Q$  encryption queries. Let  $IV_1, \dots, IV_Q$  be the corresponding  $IV$ 's. Let  $\text{Twice}$  denote the event “there exist  $i, j \leq Q$  and  $k_i, k_j < d$  such that  $IV_i + k_i = IV_j + k_j \bmod 2^n$  and  $i \neq j$ .” Show that the probability of  $\text{Twice}$  is bounded from above by  $Q^2 d / 2^{n-1}$ .
3. Assume the PRF  $F$  is replaced by a uniformly chosen function  $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ . Give an upper bound on the distinguishing advantage of an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  against this idealized version of CTR, as a function of  $d, n$  and the number of encryption queries  $Q$ .
4. Show that if there exists a probabilistic polynomial-time adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  against CTR based on PRF  $F$ , then there exists a probabilistic polynomial-time adversary  $\mathcal{B}$  against the PRF  $F$ . Give a lower bound on the advantage degradation of the reduction.

**Exercise 2.***PRF from DDH*

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be a security parameter. Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be a cyclic group of prime order  $q > 2^n$  which is generated by a public  $g \in \mathbb{G}$  and for which DDH is presumably hard.

We want to build a secure Pseudo-Random Function (PRF) under the DDH assumption in  $\mathbb{G}$ . The following construction was proposed by Naor and Reingold in 1997.

We define the function  $F : \mathbb{Z}_q^{n+1} \times \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$  as:

$$F(K, x) = g^{a_0 \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n a_j^{x_j}},$$

where we parsed  $K = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n)^\top$  and  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^\top$ .

For an index  $i \in [1, n]$ , we consider an experiment where the adversary is given oracle access to a hybrid function  $F^{(i)}(K, \cdot)$  such that

$$\forall x \in \{0,1\}^n, F^{(i)}(K, x) = g^{R^{(i)}(x[1 \dots i]) \cdot \prod_{j=i+1}^n a_j^{x_j}},$$

where  $R^{(i)} : \{0,1\}^i \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_q$  is a uniformly sampled function and  $x[1 \dots i]$  denotes the  $i$  first bits of  $x$ .

1. Prove that in the adversary's view,  $F^{(0)}$  behaves exactly as the function  $F$  if we define  $x[1 \dots 0] = \varepsilon$ , the empty string. How does  $F^{(n)}$  behave in the adversary's view?
2. Let  $(g^a, g^b, g^c)$  be a DDH instance, where  $a, b \leftarrow U(\mathbb{Z}_q)$  and we have to decide whether  $c = ab$  or if  $c \leftarrow U(\mathbb{Z}_q)$ . Describe a probabilistic polynomial-time algorithm that creates  $Q$  randomized instances of DDH  $\{g^a, g^{b_\ell}, g^{c_\ell}\}_{\ell=1}^Q$ , where  $\{b_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^Q$  are uniformly random and independent over  $\mathbb{Z}_q$ , with the properties that:

- If  $c = ab \bmod q$ , then  $c_\ell = ab_\ell$  for any  $\ell \in [1, q]$ .
  - If  $c \neq ab \bmod q$ , then  $(b_1, c_1, \dots, b_Q, c_Q)$  follows the uniform distribution over  $(\mathbb{Z}_q)^{2Q}$ .
3. For each  $i \in [0, n]$ , define the experiment  $\text{Exp}_i$  where  $\mathcal{A}$  is given oracle access to  $F^{(i)}(K, \cdot)$  for  $K \leftarrow U(\mathbb{Z}_q^{n+1})$ . After at most  $Q$  evaluation queries,  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs a bit  $b'$ . Prove that for each  $i \in [0, n-1]$  it holds that  $\text{Exp}_i$  is computationally indistinguishable from  $\text{Exp}_{i+1}$  under the DDH assumption.
  4. Conclude by giving an upper bound on the advantage of a PRF distinguisher as a function of the maximal advantage of a DDH distinguisher.

*Remark:* Contrary to the GGM construction, the advantage loss does not depend on  $Q$ . This is a consequence of the random self-reducibility.