

# 3 – Private Key Encryption

Eklavya Sharma

## Contents

<b>1 Computational Security</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Definition of relaxations . . . . .	1
1.2 [Draft] Necessity of the relaxations . . . . .	2
<b>2 Defining Computationally Secure Encryption</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3 Pseudorandom Generators</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4 Stronger notions of security</b>	<b>3</b>
4.1 Multiple messages . . . . .	3
<b>5 Chosen-Plaintext Attack</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6 Pseudorandom Functions</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>7 CTR mode of operation</b>	<b>6</b>

## 1 Computational Security

### 1.1 Definition of relaxations

Unlike perfect security, we make 2 additional assumptions to make secure encryption practical:

- Adversaries are **efficient** and only run for a feasible amount of time.
- Adversaries have a **negligible** probability of success.

All encryption schemes are parametrized by a security parameter  $n$ .  $n$  is usually the key length. The terms ‘efficient’ and ‘negligible’ are defined in terms of  $n$ .

**Definition 1.** *An efficient adversary is a probabilistic polynomial-time (PPT) algorithm, where the input is at least as large as the security parameter.*

**Definition 2.** Denote the set of all negligible functions of  $n$  as  $\text{negl}(n)$ , where

$$\text{negl}(n) = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} o(n^{-k})$$

**Theorem 1.**

$$f \in \text{negl}(n) \iff \forall p(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x], \exists N \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \geq N, f(n) < \frac{1}{p(n)}$$

**Theorem 2.**

$$f \in \text{negl}(n) \implies (\forall p(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x], p(n)f(n) \in \text{negl}(n))$$

## 1.2 [Draft] Necessity of the relaxations

(TODO: Needs rigor)

- Powerful adversary can brute force the set of keys to break scheme with very high probability.
- Normal adversary can guess key and break scheme with slightly higher probability than pure guess.

## 2 Defining Computationally Secure Encryption

- The key-generation algorithm **Gen** takes input  $1^n$  and returns key  $k$ . We assume (why?) that  $|k| \geq n$ .
- The encryption algorithm **Enc** takes the key and message as input and outputs a ciphertext.
- The decryption algorithm **Dec** takes the key and ciphertext as input and outputs a message.

**Definition 3.** The adversarial indistinguishability experiment  $\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{eav}(n)$ :

1.  $A$  is given input  $1^n$ . It outputs 2 messages  $m_0$  and  $m_1$  with  $|m_0| = |m_1|$ .
2.  $k \in \mathcal{K}$  is generated by running **Gen**( $1^n$ ).  $b$  is chosen uniformly randomly from  $\{0, 1\}$ .  $c = e_k(m)$ , called the challenge ciphertext, is computed and given to  $A$ .
3.  $A$  outputs a bit  $b'$ .

$$4. \text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{eav}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b' = b \\ 0 & \text{if } b' \neq b \end{cases}$$

Messages output by adversary are required to be of the same length otherwise adversary can use ciphertext length to determine which message was encrypted.

**Definition 4.** Scheme  $\Pi$  is EAV-secure iff for every PPT adversary  $A$ ,

$$\Pr [\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n) = 1] - \frac{1}{2} \in \text{negl}(n)$$

**Definition 5.** Let  $\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n, b)$  be the experiment where the message chosen by the challenger is fixed to be  $m_b$  (instead of choosing uniformly randomly from  $\{m_0, m_1\}$ ), but the adversary doesn't know this. Let  $\text{PrivKOut}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n, b)$  be the output  $b'$  of the adversary.

**Theorem 3.**  $\Pi$  is secure iff for all PPT adversaries  $A$ ,

$$|\Pr [\text{PrivKOut}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n, 1) = 1] - \Pr [\text{PrivKOut}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{eav}}(n, 0) = 1]| \in \text{negl}(n)$$

### 3 Pseudorandom Generators

**Definition 6.** Let  $l(n)$  be a polynomially-bounded function. Let  $G : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{l(n)}$  be a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm.  $G$  is a pseudorandom generator (aka PRG) iff both these conditions hold:

- *Expansion:*  $\forall n > 1, l(n) > n$ .
- *Pseudorandomness:* For any PPT algorithm  $D$ ,

$$\left| \Pr_{s \in_R \{0,1\}^n} [D(G(s)) = 1] - \Pr_{r \in_R \{0,1\}^{l(n)}} [D(r) = 1] \right| \in \text{negl}(n)$$

A pseudorandom generator  $G$  can be used to construct an encryption scheme  $\Pi_G$ :

- **Gen:**  $k \in_R \mathcal{K}$ .
- $e_k(m) = m \oplus G(k)$ .
- $d_k(c) = c \oplus G(k)$ .

**Theorem 4.**  $G$  is a PRG  $\implies \Pi_G$  is EAV-secure.

## 4 Stronger notions of security

### 4.1 Multiple messages

The multiple-message eavesdropping experiment  $\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{mult}}(n)$ :

1. The adversary  $A$  is given input  $1^n$  and outputs  $M_0 = [m_{0,i}]_{i=1}^t$  and  $M_1 = [m_{1,i}]_{i=1}^t$  where  $\forall i, |m_{0,i}| = |m_{1,i}|$ .
2.  $k = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ ,  $b \in_R \{0, 1\}$ .
3.  $\forall i, c_i = e_k(m_{b,i})$ .  $C = [c_i]_{i=1}^t$ .

4.  $A$  is given  $C$  and it outputs a bit  $b'$ .

$$5. \text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{mult}}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b' = b \\ 0 & \text{if } b' \neq b \end{cases}$$

**Definition 7.**  $\Pi$  has indistinguishable multiple encryptions iff

$$\Pr [\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{mult}}(n) = 1] - \frac{1}{2} \in \text{negl}(n)$$

**Theorem 5.** Any stateless and deterministic encryption scheme has distinguishable multiple encryptions.

*Proof.* The adversary chooses message lists  $M_0 = (m, m)$  and  $M_1 = (m, m')$ . Then given  $C = (c_1, c_2)$ , it outputs  $b' = (c_1 \neq c_2)$ . The adversary succeeds with probability 1.  $\square$

## 5 Chosen-Plaintext Attack

The chosen-plaintext attack experiment  $\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{cpa}}(n)$ :

1.  $k = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ .

2.  $A$  is given input  $1^n$  and oracle access to  $e_k$  and outputs  $(m_0, m_1)$  where  $|m_0| = |m_1|$ .

3.  $b \in_R \{0, 1\}$ .  $c = e_k(m_b)$  is given to  $A$ .

4.  $A$ , which continues to have oracle access to  $e_k$ , outputs a bit  $b'$ .

$$5. \text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{cpa}}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b' = b \\ 0 & \text{if } b' \neq b \end{cases}$$

**Definition 8.**  $\Pi$  is indistinguishable under chosen-plaintext attack iff

$$\Pr [\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{cpa}}(n)] - \frac{1}{2} \in \text{negl}(n)$$

**Definition 9.** The LR-oracle  $\text{LR}_{k,b}$  is a function where  $\text{LR}_{k,b}(m_0, m_1) = e_k(m_b)$ .

The LR-oracle experiment  $\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{lr-cpa}}(n)$ :

1.  $k = \text{Gen}(1^n)$ .  $b \in_R \{0, 1\}$ .

2.  $A$  is given input  $1^n$  and oracle access to  $\text{LR}_{k,b}$ .

3.  $A$  outputs a bit  $b'$ .

$$4. \text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{lr-cpa}}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b' = b \\ 0 & \text{if } b' \neq b \end{cases}$$

**Definition 10.**  $\Pi$  has indistinguishable multiple encryptions under chosen-plaintext attack if

$$\Pr [\text{PrivK}_{A,\Pi}^{\text{lr-cpa}}(n)] - \frac{1}{2} \in \text{negl}(n)$$

**Theorem 6.**  $\Pi$  is CPA-secure iff it is multi-CPA-secure.

*Proof.* (Proof will appear in a later chapter)  $\square$

## 6 Pseudorandom Functions

**Definition 11.** Let  $|\mathcal{M}|, |\mathcal{K}|, |\mathcal{C}| \in \text{poly}(n)$ . Let  $\text{Func}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}}$  be the family of all functions from  $\mathcal{M}$  to  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $F = \{F_k : k \in \mathcal{K}\} \subseteq \text{Func}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}}$  be a function family.  $F$  is pseudorandom iff for every PPT distinguisher  $D$ ,

$$\left| \Pr_{k \in_R \mathcal{K}} [D^{F_k}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr_{f \in_R \text{Func}_{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C}}} [D^f(1^n) = 1] \right| \in \text{negl}(n)$$

**Example 1.**  $F_k(x) = x \oplus k$  is not pseudorandom.

**Definition 12.** A function family  $F$  is efficient iff  $\forall f \in F$ ,  $f$  can be computed in polynomial time.

**Definition 13.** Let  $|\mathcal{M}|, |\mathcal{K}| \in \text{poly}(n)$ . Let  $\text{Perm}_{\mathcal{M}}$  be the family of all permutations of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $F = \{F_k : k \in \mathcal{K}\} \subseteq \text{Perm}_{\mathcal{M}}$  be a permutation family.  $F$  is pseudorandom iff for every PPT distinguisher  $D$ ,

$$\left| \Pr_{k \in_R \mathcal{K}} [D^{F_k}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr_{f \in_R \text{Perm}_{\mathcal{M}}} [D^f(1^n) = 1] \right| \in \text{negl}(n)$$

$F$  is strongly pseudorandom iff for every PPT distinguisher  $D$ ,

$$\left| \Pr_{k \in_R \mathcal{K}} [D^{F_k, F_k^{-1}}(1^n) = 1] - \Pr_{f \in_R \text{Perm}_{\mathcal{M}}} [D^{f, f^{-1}}(1^n) = 1] \right| \in \text{negl}(n)$$

A pseudorandom permutation is also called a block cipher.

**Definition 14.** A permutation family  $F$  is efficient iff  $\forall f \in F$ ,  $f$  and  $f^{-1}$  can be computed in polynomial time.

**Theorem 7.** If  $F = \{F_k : k \in \mathcal{K}\} \subseteq \text{Perm}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is a pseudorandom permutation and  $|\mathcal{M}| \geq |\mathcal{K}|$ , then  $F$  is also a pseudorandom function.

*Proof.* (TODO: Add proof) □

**Theorem 8.** Let  $F$  be a pseudorandom function. Let  $G(s) = \text{concat}_{i=1}^l F_s(i)$ . Then  $G$  is a pseudorandom generator.

**Theorem 9.** A pseudorandom generator with expansion  $l(n)$  can be used to construct a pseudorandom function with input and output size  $O(\log n)$ .

**Theorem 10.** Let  $F$  be a pseudorandom function family. Let  $\Pi(n)$  be this scheme:

- $\text{Gen} : k \in_R \{0, 1\}^n$ .
- $e_k(m) = (r, F_k(r) \oplus m)$ , where  $r \in_R \{0, 1\}^n$ .
- $d_k((r, c)) = F_k(r) \oplus c$ .

Then  $\Pi(n)$  is LR-CPA-secure.

## 7 CTR mode of operation

‘Mode of operation’ is a way of encrypting messages of variable lengths using a fixed-length block cipher.

Specification of CTR mode of operation, which uses a pseudorandom function family  $F$ :

- Gen:  $k \in_R \{0, 1\}^n$ .
- $e_k([m_i]_{i=1}^l) = [\text{IV}] + [F_k(c+i) \oplus m_i]_{i=1}^l$ , where  $\text{IV} \in_R \{0, 1\}^n$  is called the initialization vector.
- $d_k([\text{IV}] + [m_i]_{i=1}^l) = [F_k(c+i) \oplus c_i]_{i=1}^l$

**Theorem 11.** *The CTR mode of operation is LR-CPA-secure.*