Lecture 5: Hard Core Predicates

Instructor: Omkant Pandey

Spring 2017 (CSE 594)

Instructor: Omkant Pandey

Lecture 5: Hard Core Predicates S

Spring 2017 (CSE 594)

A B +
 A B +
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A
 A

(신문) (문)

1 / 17

- 2

- Proof via Reduction: f_{\times} is a weak OWF
- Amplification: From weak to strong OWFs

Instructor: Omkant Pandey Lecture 5: Hard

Lecture 5: Hard Core Predicates Spring 2017

 ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ■

 s
 Spring 2017 (CSE 594)

- What do OWFs Hide?
- Hard Core Predicate
- Concluding Remarks on OWFs
- Scribe notes volunteers?

3

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・

- The concept of OWFs is simple and concise
- But OWFs often not very useful by themselves
- It only guarantees that f(x) hides x but nothing more!
 - E.g., it may not hide first bit of x,
 - Or even first half bits of x
 - Or ANY subset of bits
- In fact: if $\mathbf{a}(x)$ is some information about x, we don't know if f(x) will hide $\mathbf{a}(x)$ for any non-trivial $\mathbf{a}(\cdot)$

Is there any non-trivial function of x, even 1 bit, that OWFs hide?

ヘロト 人間ト 人団ト 人団ト 三日

Hard Core Predicate

- A hard core predicate for a OWF f
 - is a function over its inputs $\{x\}$
 - its output is a single bit (called the "hard core bit")
 - it can be easily computed given x
 - but "hard to compute" given only f(x)
- Intuition: f may leak many bits of x but it does not leak the hard-core bit.
- In other words, learning the hardcore bit of x, even given f(x), is "as hard as" inverting f itself.
- <u>Think</u>: What does "hard to compute" mean for a single bit?
 - you can always guess the bit with probability 1/2.

5/17

(日) (四) (三) (三) (三)

• Hard-core bit cannot be efficiently "learned" or "predicted" or "computed" with probability $> \frac{1}{2} + \mu(|x|)$ even given f(x)

Definition (Hard Core Predicate)

A predicate $h : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}$ is a hard-core predicate for $f(\cdot)$ if h is efficiently computable given x and there exists a negligible function ν s.t. for every non-uniform PPT adversary \mathcal{A} and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\Pr\left[x \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n : \mathcal{A}(1^n, f(x)) = h(x)\right] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \nu(n).$$

Instructor: Omkant Pandey

コン スポン イラン イラン 一支

Hard Core Predicate: Construction

- Can we construct hard-core predicates for general OWFs f?
- Define $\langle x, r \rangle$ to be the **inner product** function mod 2. I.e.,

$$\langle x,r \rangle = \left(\sum_i x_i r_i\right) \mod 2$$

• Same as taking \oplus of a random subset of bits of x.

Theorem (Goldreich-Levin)

Let f be a OWF (OWP). Define function

$$g(\boldsymbol{x},r)=(f(\boldsymbol{x}),r)$$

where |x| = |r|. Then g is a OWF (OWP) and

$$h(x,r) = \langle x,r \rangle$$

is a hard-core predicate for g.

Some remarks

- The theorem is not for f, but for a different function, g.
- Is this useful at all?
 - Indeed, consider the function g':

$$g'(1x) = g'(0x) = f(x).$$

- Clearly, the first bit of g's input is hard core for g.
- It works even if f is not one-way!
- The problem with the above is that it "looses" information about its input. This is not good for applications.
- It "explains" nothing about the inherent hardness of f
- Function g in the GL theorem *statistically* does not loose any information that f does not about its input.
- ...and the hard core bit for g is easy to guess if f is not one-way.

- Proof via reduction?
- Main challenge: Adversary \mathcal{A} for h only outputs 1 bit. Need to build an inverter \mathcal{B} for f that outputs n bits.

Instructor: Omkant Pandey

Lecture 5: Hard Core Predicates SI

Spring 2017 (CSE 594)

A D F A A F F

(신문) (신문)

3

Warmup Proof (1)

- <u>Assumption</u>: Given g(x, r) = (f(x), r), adversary \mathcal{A} always (i.e., with probability 1) outputs h(x, r) correctly
- Inverter \mathcal{B} :
 - Compute $x_i^* \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(f(x), e_i)$ for every $i \in [n]$ where:

$$e_i = (\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(i-1)\text{-times}}, 1, \dots, 0)$$

• Output
$$x^* = x_1^* \dots x_n^*$$

Instructor: Omkant Pandey

・ロト ・日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ うへの

Warmup Proof (2)

• Assumption: Given g(x,r) = (f(x),r), for every x, adversary \mathcal{A} outputs h(x,r) with probability $3/4 + \varepsilon(n)$ over the choices of r.

$$\forall x : \Pr_r[A(f(x), r) = h(x, r)] \ge \frac{3}{4} + \varepsilon(n).$$

- Main Problem: Adversary may not work on "improper" inputs (e.g., $r = e_i$ as in previous case)
- Main Idea: Split each query into two queries s.t. each query individually looks random

・ロト ・同ト ・ヨト ・ヨト ・ヨー つへの

Warmup Proof (2)

• Inverter \mathcal{B} :

- Let $a := \mathcal{A}(f(x), e_i \oplus r)$ and $b := \mathcal{A}(f(x), r)$, for $r \stackrel{\$}{\leftarrow} \{0, 1\}^n$
- Compute $c := a \oplus b$ as a guess for x_i^*
- Repeat many times to get many such c and take majority to get x_i^*
- Output $x^* = x_1^* \dots x_n^*$
- **Proof** that \mathcal{B} inverts f(x):
 - If both a and b are correct, then $c = x_i$ because:

$$c = a \oplus b = \langle x, e_i \oplus r_i \rangle \oplus \langle x, r \rangle = x \cdot (r + e_i) + x \cdot r \mod 2 = x \cdot e_i = x_i.$$

- Claim: $c = x_i$ with probability $1/2 + 2\varepsilon$
- Proof: by union bound A is wrong about either a or b with at most:

$$(1/4 - \varepsilon(n)) + (1/4 - \varepsilon(n)) = 1/2 - 2\varepsilon$$

probability. So a, b are correct w/ prob. $\geq 1/2 + 2\varepsilon$, so is c.

• If you repeat $\frac{2n}{\varepsilon(n)}$ times, by **Chernoff Bound**, majority of *c* will be correct $x_i^* \le 1 - e^{-n}$ prob.

12 / 17

・ロト ・日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ うへの

In the next class!

- Goldreich-Levin theorem has been extremely influential even outside cryptography
- Has applications to learning, list-decoding codes, extractors,...
- Great tool to add to your toolkit

(ロ) (四) (ヨ) (ヨ) (ヨ)

- One-way functions are necessary for most of cryptography
- But often not sufficient for things like key-exchange or public-key encryption.
- Black-box separations known [Impagliazzo-Rudich'89]; Open problem: full separations not known
- More examples of one-way functions?
- More than 1 hard core bit?
- Other ways to get hard core bit?

On more examples of OWFs

- We saw a OWF based on factoring. Are there more candidates?
- Many examples based on:

Discrete Log: compute $x \in G$ from (g, y, p) where g generates a group G, and p = |G| is prime, and $y = g^x$ in G.

RSA Problem: compute *d* from (e, N) s.t. $e \cdot d \equiv 1 \mod \phi(N)$ where $\phi(N) = |\mathbb{Z}_N^*|$ and *N* is product of two large primes.

Quadratic Residuosity: compute square roots of perfect squares modulo N (Rabin's function).

More: more examples from lattices and LWE problem; such "hardness assumptions" are few and rare.

- You actually get a collection of OWFs from the above, not a single OWF. However, collections imply a single OWF as well. (discussed later)
- Special hard-core predicates and more than 1 bit based on specific structures of these functions. (For general OWFs, GL can be extended to yield $\log n$ hard core bits).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ □ のへで

On more examples of OWFs

- Universal One-way Functions (Levin)
 - Suppose somebody tells you that OWFs exist! but they don't know what that function is.
 - Can you use this fact to build an explicit OWF? Explicit = one which you could implement (in principle, on Turing machines).
 - Yes! Levin constructs an explicit function which is one-way if there exists **any** OWF (even if not known explicitly).
- OWFs from the famous "**P** vs **NP**" problem?
 - OWFs whose hardness can be reduced to the validity of $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$.
 - Unlikely to exist based on current evidence [Goldreich-Goldwasser-Moshkovitz,...]

16 / 17

・ロト ・日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ うへの

Markov and Chernoff Bounds

• Proof on the board?

Instructor: Omkant Pandey

Lecture 5: Hard Core Predicates Spring 2017 (CSE 594)

17 / 17

- 12