

## TD 4 - Design of a provably secure hash function

### I. Design of a hash function $\{0, 1\}^{2m} \longrightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$

1.  $p - 1 = 2q$  and  $q$  is prime; so, the divisors of  $p - 1$  are  $\{1, 2, q, 2q = p - 1\}$ .

Since  $d$  is a divisor of  $p - 1$ , we have  $d \in \{1, 2, q, p - 1\}$ .

2. Since  $0 \leq x_2, x_4 \leq q - 1$ :  $-(q - 1) \leq x_4 - x_2 \leq q - 1$ .

But  $q$  is prime; then  $(x_4 - x_2)$  is prime to  $q$  and lesser than  $q$ , so  $d \neq q$ ; and, since  $p - 1 = 2q$ ,  $d \neq p - 1$ .

3. Obvious:  $\alpha^{x_1} \beta^{x_2} \equiv \alpha^{x_3} \beta^{x_4} \pmod{p} \iff \alpha^{(x_1 - x_3)} \equiv \beta^{(x_4 - x_2)} \pmod{p}$

4. If  $d = 1$ , let  $u = (x_4 - x_2)^{-1} \pmod{p - 1}$ :  $u \cdot (x_4 - x_2) = 1 + k \cdot (p - 1)$  Then  $\beta^{(x_4 - x_2) \cdot u} \pmod{p} \equiv \beta^{1 + k(p - 1)} \pmod{p} \equiv \beta \pmod{p}$  (from Fermat's little theorem).

Replacing in 3., we obtain:  $\beta = \alpha^{(x_1 - x_3) \cdot u} \pmod{p}$ , i.e.  $\lambda = (x_1 - x_3) \cdot u \pmod{p - 1}$ , qed.

5. **5.a.** Since  $d = 2$  and  $p - 1 = 2 \cdot q$ , we have  $x_4 - x_2$  prime to  $q$ ; so  $u \cdot (x_4 - x_2) = 1 + k \cdot q$ .

Then  $\beta^{(x_4 - x_2) \cdot u} \pmod{p} \equiv \beta^{1 + kq} \pmod{p} \equiv \beta \cdot (\beta^q)^k \pmod{p}$ .

But  $q = \frac{p-1}{2}$  and  $\beta$  is a primitive elements mod  $p$ . Thus,  $\beta^{p-1} = 1 \pmod{p}$  and  $\beta^q = \beta^{\frac{p-1}{2}} = -1 \pmod{p}$ . Finally,  $\beta^{(x_4 - x_2) \cdot u} = (-1)^k \cdot \beta \pmod{p}$ , qed.

**5.b.** Replacing in 3., we have:  $\beta = \pm \alpha^{(x_1 - x_3) \cdot u} \pmod{p}$  ie  $\beta = \alpha^{(x_1 - x_3) \cdot u + \delta \cdot q} \pmod{p}$  with  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ . Thus, either  $\delta = 0$ , i.e.  $\lambda = u \cdot (x_1 - x_3) \pmod{p - 1}$  or  $\delta = 1$ , i.e.  $\lambda = u \cdot (x_1 - x_3) + q \pmod{p - 1}$ , qed.

6. From previous questions, we have the following algorithm:

```

AlgoCalculLogBeta( p, alpha, beta, ;x1, x2, x3, x4 ) {
  q = (p - 1)/2;
  d = pgcd(x4 - x2, p - 1) ;
  if (d == 1) {
    u = (x4 - x2)^{-1} mod (p - 1);
    lambda = (x1 - x3) * u mod p - 1;
  }
  else { // here d == 2
    u = (x4 - x2)^{-1} mod q;
    lambda = (x1 - x3) * u mod p - 1;
    if (ExpoMod( alpha, lambda, p ) == -beta) lambda = lambda + q ;
  }
  return lambda ;
}

```

The cost is  $O(1)$  arithmetic operations mod  $p - 1$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ ; thus  $O(\log^{1+\epsilon} p)$ , which is small even for large values of  $p$  (eg 1024 bits). So, if a collision is known for  $h_1$ , Then we may easily compute the discrete logarithm  $\beta$ , which is in contradiction with the hypothesis that  $\lambda$  is very expensive to compute. Thus  $h_1$  is collision resistant.

## II. Extension to a hash function: $\{0, 1\}^* \longrightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$

7.

$$\begin{aligned} h_2 : (\{0, 1\}^m)^4 &\rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m \\ (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) &\mapsto h_1(h_1(x_1, x_2), h_1(x_3, x_4)) \end{aligned}$$

8. Let  $x \neq y$  be a collision for  $h_2 : h_2(x) = h_2(y)$ . We distinguish two cases:

- either  $h_1(x_1, x_2) \neq h_1(y_1, y_2)$  or  $h_1(x_3, x_4) \neq h_1(y_3, y_4)$  : thus, since  $h_1(x_1, x_2), h_1(x_3, x_4) = h_1(y_1, y_2), h_1(y_3, y_4)$  we found a collision on  $h_1$ .
- or, since  $x \neq y$ , we may by symmetry restrict to the case  $(x_1, x_2) \neq (y_1, y_2)$ . Then, since  $h_1(x_1, x_2) = h_1(y_1, y_2)$ , we have a collision on  $h_1$ .

All computations are performed in  $O(m)$  time –comparisons here–, which is polynomial (linear here) in the input  $(x, y)$  size.

Since  $h_1$  is assumed collision resistant, we deduce by contradiction that  $h_2$  is collision resistant too.

9. By induction, we state that if  $h_i$  is collision resistant, then  $h_{i+1}$  is collision resistant too.

- Base case: for  $i = 1$ ,  $h_1$  is assumed collision resistant.
- Induction: similarly to previous question, we prove that if  $h_{i+1}$  is not collision resistant, then  $h_i$  is not collision resistant; the proof is exactly the same, just replacing  $h_1$  by  $h_i$  and  $h_2$  by  $h_{i+1}$ .

Since  $h_1$  is collision resistant by hypothesis, then  $h_i$  is collision resistant for any  $i \geq 2$ .

10. Let  $C(i)$  be the number of calls to  $h_1$  performed during computation of  $h_i$ . We have  $C(i) = 2.C(i-1) + 1 = 2^i.C(0) + \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 2^k = 2^i - 1$ .

For a  $n$  bits sequence, we thus call  $n/m$  times  $h_1$ . The cost of  $h_1$  is  $\tilde{O}(m)^{1+\epsilon}$ . Then the cost is then  $O(n.m^\epsilon) = O(n^{1+\epsilon}) = \tilde{O}(n)$ .

11. Let  $A$  be the message and  $n$  its number of bits. To compute  $H(A)$ , let  $i$  such that  $2^i.m = n$  i.e.  $i = \lceil \log_2 \frac{n}{m} \rceil$ . Then we compute  $H(A) = h_i(A)$ .

Using recursion, this algorithm may also be used on-line to hash an input bit stream (i.e. the size  $n$  of the message is discovered when EOF is met).

Another alternative is to use the Merkle-Damgard protocol (cf lecture).

## III. HAIFA Extension scheme

12

13

14★ M2R assignment