
Tutorial 1: Perfect Secrecy

Submission Guidelines All problems must be solved in class today. Searching on the internet for solutions is strictly discouraged.

- The shift cipher (also called Caesar cipher) works as follows. The English alphabet is represented by numbers from 0 to 25 i.e., $\{A, B, \dots, Z\}$ are mapped to $\{0, 1, \dots, 25\}$ in the same order.

Define $\mathcal{K} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 25\}$, $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 25\}^*$

$\text{Gen}()$: $k \xleftarrow{\text{U}} \mathcal{K}$

$\text{Enc}(k, \mathbf{m} = m_1 m_2 \dots m_n)$: Set $c_i \leftarrow m_i + k \pmod{26}$. Ciphertext is given by $\mathbf{c} = c_1 c_2 \dots c_n$.

$\text{Dec}(k, \mathbf{c} = c_1 c_2 \dots c_n)$: Recover message components as $m_i \leftarrow c_i - k \pmod{26}$.

- Is it perfectly secret?

A: It is not perfectly secret. In fact, it is not secure at all. Trying all 26 possibilities for the key will help in deciphering the message.

- Can you modify the description to make it perfectly secret?

A: The scheme becomes perfectly secure when only one character is encrypted i.e., $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C} = \{0, 1, \dots, 25\}$ (in other words, a different key is chosen for each letter). We have, for arbitrary $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\Pr[C = c | M = m] = \Pr[K = (c - m) \pmod{26}] = \frac{1}{26}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[C = c] &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \Pr[K = k] \cdot \Pr[M = \text{Dec}(k, c)] \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{26} \cdot \Pr[M = c - k \pmod{26}] \\ &= \frac{1}{26} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \Pr[M = m \pmod{26}] \\ &= \frac{1}{26} \end{aligned}$$

In other words, we have $\Pr[C = c | M = m] = \Pr[C = c]$ for any $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$. Therefore the modified scheme is perfectly secret.

- Prove or refute: Every encryption scheme for which the size of the key space \mathcal{K} equals the size of the message space \mathcal{M} and for which the key is chosen uniformly from \mathcal{K} , is perfectly secret.

A: The statement is false. We show this by providing a counter example. Define $\mathcal{M} = \{a, b\}$, $\mathcal{K} = \{k_1, k_2\}$, $\mathcal{C} = \{0, 1\}$. Let $\text{Enc}(k, a) = 0$ and $\text{Enc}(k, b) = 1$ for $k = k_1, k_2$. Dec algorithm will return a on input ciphertext 0 and b on input ciphertext 1. Clearly, the scheme is correct.

$$\Pr[C = 1 | M = a] = 1 \neq 0 = \Pr[C = 1 | M = b],$$

thus showing that the scheme is not perfectly secret.

- Let $\varepsilon < 1$ be a constant. An encryption scheme $\mathcal{E} = (\text{Gen}, \text{Enc}, \text{Dec})$ over $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{C})$ is called ε -almost perfectly secret if for any distribution over \mathcal{M} , any $m \in \mathcal{M}$ and any $c \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$|\Pr[M = m | C = c] - \Pr[M = m]| < \varepsilon.$$

Show that if \mathcal{E} is an ε -almost perfectly secret encryption scheme, then $|\mathcal{K}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|\mathcal{M}|$.

A: Suppose that $|\mathcal{K}| < (1 - \varepsilon)|\mathcal{M}|$. Consider the uniform distribution on \mathcal{M} and let $c \in \mathcal{C}$ be a ciphertext that occurs with non-zero probability. Let $\mathcal{M}(c)$ denote the set of all possible decryptions of c . That is,

$$\mathcal{M}(c) = \{m : m = \text{Dec}(k, c) \text{ for some } k \in \mathcal{K}\}.$$

Clearly, $|\mathcal{M}(c)| \leq |\mathcal{K}|$ and from our assumption, $|\mathcal{M}(c)| < (1 - \varepsilon)|\mathcal{M}(c)|$. So there exists $m' \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{M}(c)$. We have

$$\Pr[M = m' | C = c] = 0.$$

Also,

$$\Pr[M = m'] \geq \frac{\varepsilon|\mathcal{M}|}{|\mathcal{M}|},$$

since the messages are uniformly distributed and m' could be any message out of a fraction of at least ε of the messages. Combining the above we have

$$|\Pr[M = m' | C = c] - \Pr[M = m']| \geq \varepsilon,$$

contradicting the fact that \mathcal{E} is ε -almost perfectly secret.

4. Modify the one-time pad as follows. Let $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^\ell$ and the key generation be such that first a key \tilde{k} is uniformly chosen from $\{0, 1\}^{\ell/2}$ and then the key is defined by $k = \tilde{k} \parallel \tilde{k}$ where \parallel denotes concatenation. (In addition, define $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{C} = \{0, 1\}^\ell$.) Is this scheme perfectly secure? Justify your answer.

A: No, this scheme is not perfectly secure. Let $m_0 = 0^{\ell/2} \parallel 0^{\ell/2}$, $m_1 = 1^{\ell/2} \parallel 0^{\ell/2}$ and $c = 0^{\ell/2} \parallel 1^{\ell/2}$. We have

$$\Pr[C = c | M = m_0] = \Pr[K = c \oplus m_0] = \Pr[K = 0^{\ell/2} \parallel 1^{\ell/2}] = 0,$$

given the way keys are generated. On the other hand,

$$\Pr[C = c | M = m_1] = \Pr[K = c \oplus m_1] = \Pr[K = 1^{\ell/2} \parallel 1^{\ell/2}] = \frac{1}{2^{\ell/2}}.$$

Hence, there exist $m_0, m_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\Pr[C = c | M = m_0] \neq \Pr[C = c | M = m_1],$$

implying that the scheme is not perfectly secret.