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## Introduction

Alice wants to communicate with Bob secretely.


## Assumption

- The encryption method is publicly known.
- The transmission is intercepted by John.
- John is malevolent; he may send fake messages to deceive Bob.


## Requirements

1. $D(d, E(e, x))=x$
2. $D$ and $E$ are polynomial-time algorithms
3. John cannot compute $x$ from $y$ without knowing $d$.

## One-time pad (information secure)

Let $e=d$, a random string of length the same as $x$.
Let $E(e, x)=e \oplus x$ and $D(d, y)=d \oplus y$.
Then $D(d, E(e, x))=d \oplus(e \oplus x)=x$.
And if John knows $x$ and $y$, he knows $d$.

## Problems with one-time pad

- How to agree upon the key (i.e. $d$ and $e$ )?
- The keys are too long, and this makes frequent routine communication impossible.


## Remarks

- One-time pad is information secure.
- Computer scientists focus on computational secure protocols.


## Public-Key Cryptography

## Scheme

1. Bob: generates $(e, d)$ and announces $e$.
( $d$ is kept secretly by Bob himself.)
2. Alice: sends a message $x$ to Bob by computing and transmitting $y$ where $y=E(e, x)$.

3 . Bob: gets $x$ by computing $D(d, y)$.

## Requirements

- It is computationally infeasible to deduce $d$ from $e$ and $x$ from $y$ without knowing $d$.
- $E(e, x)$ and $D(d, y)$ can be computed in polynomial time.
- $x=D(d, E(e, x))$.


## One-Way Function

$f$ : a function from strings to string with

1. $f$ is one-to-one;
2. for all $x,|x|^{\frac{1}{k}} \leq|f(x)| \leq|x|^{k}$ for some $k>0$;
3. $f$ can be computed in polynomial time;
4. there is no polynomial-time algorithm that computes $x$ from $y=f(x)$ or returns "no" of no such an $x$ exists. (or a stronger version requires no polynomial fraction of )

## Remark

We still not yet know the existence of true one-way functions.

## Integer multiplication

$f_{\text {MULT }}(p, C(p), q, C(q))= \begin{cases}p q & \text { if Condition (1) holds } \\ (q, C(q), q, C(q)) & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}$
Condition (1): $C(p)$ and $C(q)$ are valid primality certifcates

Factoring the products of two primes is believed to be difficult.

## Exponentiation modulo a prime

$$
f_{\operatorname{EXP}}(p, C(p), r, x)=\left(p, C(p), r^{x} \quad \bmod p\right)
$$

where $r$ is a primitive root modulo $p$, and it is included in the certificate $C(p)$.

The inverse of $f_{\text {EXP }}$ is the famous problem to evaluate the discrete logarithm, which is also believed to be very hard.

## RSA

A (believed) realization of a public-key cryptosystem provided by Ron Rivest, Adi Shamir, and Len Adleman

## Idea

1. Let $p, q$ be two primes. Then

$$
x^{\phi(p q)+1} \equiv x \quad(\bmod p q)
$$

That is, $x^{e} \bmod p q$ is invertible whenever $e \perp \phi(p q)$.
2 . Let $e d \equiv 1(\bmod \phi(p q))$. That is, $e d=1+k \phi(p q)$. Then

$$
\left(x^{e}\right)^{d}=x^{e d}=x^{1+k \phi(p q)} \equiv x \quad(\bmod p q)
$$

## Scheme

1. Find primes $p$ and $q$.
2. Let $N=p q$. Then $\phi(N)=p q-p-q+1$.
3. Find $e \perp \phi(N)$. Then there is $d$ such that $e d \equiv 1(\bmod \phi(N))$.
4. Make ( $N, e$ ) public.
5. Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E(e, N, x)=x^{e} \quad \bmod N \\
& D(d, N, y)=y^{d} \quad \bmod N
\end{aligned}
$$

Each one keeps a private key $d$ and announces the public key $e$ and the modulus $N$.
Then

$$
\left(x^{e}\right)^{d} \equiv x \quad(\bmod N)
$$

## The RSA function

$$
f_{\mathrm{RSA}}(x, e, p, C(p), q, C(q))=\left(x^{e} \bmod p q, p q, e\right)
$$

whenever $e \perp p q$ and $C(p)$ and $C(q)$ are primality certificates for $p$ and $q$.

## Remarks

- Once we can factor $p q$, we can recover $d$ from $\phi(p q)$. $\Longrightarrow$ Inverting $f_{\text {RSA }}$ can be reduced to inverting $f_{\text {MULT }}$.
- There are variants of the cryptosystem that are as hard as factoring the product of two primes.


## Cryptography and Complexity

UP : Unambiguous non-deterministic Polynomial time
A language is in UP iff it can be decided by a non-deterministic Turing machine such that for any input $x$ there is at most one accepting computation.
Clearly, $P \subseteq U P \subseteq N P$.

Theorem $\mathrm{UP}=\mathrm{P}$ if and only if there are no one-way functions.

Remark The notion of worst-case performance of algorithms is inadequate for approaching the issue of secure cryptography.

## Trapdoor Function

## Randomized Cryptography

How to transmit a frequent message? Such as one bit $b \in\{0,1\}$ ?

1. Generate an random number $x \leq \frac{p q}{2}$.
2. Transmit $y=(2 x+b)^{e} \bmod p q$.

## Remark

The last bit of an integer is exactly as secure as the RSA public-key cryptosystem.

## Protocols

- Signatures
- Mental Poker
- Zero Knowledge


## Signature

It should

- contain the information of the original message;
- be modified in a way that unmistakably identifies the sender.


## Protocol

$$
S(x)=\left(x, x^{d} \quad \bmod p q\right)=(x, y)
$$

And one who wants to verify the signature can test if

$$
y^{e} \quad \bmod p q=x .
$$

The point is that, one cannot generate $y$ without knowing $d$.

## Mental Poker

How to distribute a deck of cards fairly?

- One card can be distributed to only one player.
- The probability that all players get the same card are the same.
- There is no dealer.
- Some cards are more desired than others.
- Each player does not know other players' cards.

Let's consider three numbers $a<b<c$ as the cards, Alice and Bob as the players.
Each player gets one card, and the one who gets the larger number wins.

## The protocol:

1. Alice and Bob agree on a large prime $p$.
2. Each has two secret keys: $\left(e_{A}, d_{A}\right)$ and $\left(e_{B}, d_{B}\right)$ such that

$$
e_{A} d_{A} \equiv e_{B} d_{B} \equiv 1 \quad(\bmod p-1)
$$

(This implies $x^{e_{A} d_{A}} \equiv x^{e_{B} d_{B}} \equiv x(\bmod p)$.)
Alice: $E\left(e_{A}, x\right)=x^{e_{A}} \bmod p ; D\left(d_{A}, y\right)=y^{e_{A}} \bmod p$
Bob: $E\left(e_{B}, x\right)=x^{e_{B}} \bmod p ; D\left(d_{B}, y\right)=y^{e_{B}} \bmod p$
3. Alice encodes $a, b, c$ and sends them to Bob in a random order.
4. Bob chooses one number, say $x$, for Alice. Alice decodes $x$ and she knows her card.
5. Bob encodes the remaining two numbers, sends then to Alice in random order.
6. Alice chooses one from the two, decodes it by her $d_{A}$, and
sends it to Bob (say $y$ ).
7. Bob decodes $y$, and he knows his card.

## Interactive Proofs

An interactive proof system $(A, B)$ between Alice and Bob is

1. Alice runs an exponential-time algorithm;
2. Bob runs a poly.-time randomized algorithms;
3. Alice sends $m_{2 i-1}=A\left(x ; m_{1} ; \ldots ; m_{2 i-2}\right)$;

Bob sends $m_{2 i}=B\left(x ; m_{1} ; \ldots ; m_{2 i-1 ; r_{i}}\right)$ where $r_{i}$ is a random string;
$i,\left|r_{i}\right|,\left|m_{i}\right| \leq|x|^{k}$ for some $k>0$.
4. The last message, which is sent by Bob, $\in\{$ "yes", "no" $\}$.
$(A, B)$ decides a language $L$ iff

- $x \in L \Rightarrow x$ accepted by $(A, B)$ with Prob. $\geq 1-\frac{1}{2^{|x|}} ;$
- $x \notin L \Rightarrow x$ accepted by $\left(A^{\prime}, B\right)$ with Prob. $\leq \frac{1}{2^{|x|}}$ for any exponential-time algorithm $A^{\prime}$.

Theorem $\mathrm{NP} \subseteq \mathrm{IP}, \mathrm{BPP} \subseteq \mathrm{IP}$.

Theorem Graph Non-isomorphism $\in$ IP
Given $x=\left(G, G^{\prime}\right)$, determine whether they are non-isomorphic.

Definition $G=(V, E)$ and $G^{\prime}=\left(V^{\prime}, E^{\prime}\right)$ are isomorphic iff there is a bijection $\pi$ from $V$ to $V^{\prime}$ such that $(u, v) \in E$ iff $(\pi(u), \pi(v)) \in E^{\prime}$. (WLOG, we may assume $V=V^{\prime}$.)

Protocol: $i$ th round

1. Bob:
(a) generates a random bit $b_{i}$;
(b) generates a graph $G_{i}$ such that $G_{i}=G^{\prime}$ if $b_{i}=1$, and $G_{i}=G$ if $b_{i}=0 ;$
(c) sends $m_{2 i-1}=\left(G, \pi_{i}\left(G_{i}\right)\right)$ where $\pi_{i}$ is a random permutation on the labels of the vertices.
2. Alice checks whether $\left(G, \pi_{i}\left(G_{i}\right)\right)$ are non-isomorphic. If they are, $m_{2 i}=1$, otherwise $m_{2 i}=0$.

Finally, Bob checks if $\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{|x|}\right)$ is identical to $\left(m_{2}, \ldots, m_{2|x|}\right)$. Answer "yes" if it is the case; otherwise answer "no".

## Zero Knowledge

Alice wants to convince Bob that she knows something, but she does not like to leak any other information about this except just convincing Bob.
Definition (3-Coloring) : Given a graph. decide whether the nodes can be colored by just three colors such that two adjacent nodes have different colors.

Suppose that Alice's coloring is $\chi: V \mapsto\{00,01,11\}$.

## Protocol:

1. Alice:
(a) Generate a random permutation $\pi$ of the three colors.
(b) Generate $|V|$ RSA public-private key pairs $\left(p_{i}, q_{i}, d_{i}, e_{i}\right)$ for each node $i \in V$.
(c) Compute the probabilistic encoding $\left(y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ according to $b_{i} b_{i}^{\prime}=\pi(\chi(i))$ for $i \in V$. That is, $y_{i}=\left(2 x_{i}+b_{i}\right)^{e_{i}} \bmod p_{i} q_{i}$ and $y_{i}^{\prime}=\left(2 x_{i}^{\prime}+b_{i}^{\prime}\right)^{e_{i}} \bmod p_{i} q_{i}$ where $0 \leq x_{i}, x_{i}^{\prime} \leq \frac{p_{i} q_{i}}{2}$.
(d) Reveal $\left(e_{i}, p_{i} q_{i}, y_{i}, y_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ for each node $i \in V$ to Bob.
2. Bob picks at random an edge $(i, j) \in E$.
3. Alice reveals to Bob the private keys $d_{i}$ and $d_{j}$.
4. Bob:
(a) Compute $b_{i}=\left(y_{i}^{d_{i}} \bmod p_{i} q_{i}\right) \bmod 2$, and similarly for

$$
b_{i}^{\prime}, b_{j}, \text { and } b_{j}^{\prime}
$$

(b) Check if $b_{i} b_{i}^{\prime} \neq b_{j} b_{j}^{\prime}$.

If Alice intends to cheat Bob, Bob has at least $|E|^{-1}$ prob. to identify this.
Repeat this protocol $k|E|$ times can reduce the prob. of false positive $\leq e^{-k}$.

Remark All problems in NP have zero-knowledge proofs. (by reduction)

