

## Cryptography III

### Question 1 *Public-key encryption and digital signatures* ()

Alice and Bob want to communicate over an insecure network using public-key cryptography. They know each other's public key.

- (a) Alice receives a message: Hey Alice, it's Bob. You owe me money. Plz send ASAP.  
The message is encrypted with Alice's public key.

◇ *Question:* Can Alice be sure that this message is from Bob?

**Solution:** No. Alice's public key is public. Anyone can encrypt a message under Alice's public key, not necessarily Bob.

- (b) Bob receives a message: Hey Bob, it's Alice. How many dollars do I owe you?  
The message is digitally signed using Alice's private key.

◇ *Question:* Can Bob be sure that this message is from Alice?

◇ *Question:* How does Bob verify this message?

**Solution:** Yes. Only Alice can create a signature under her key.  
Bob can verify it using Alice's public key.

- (c) Alice receives a response: 10000

The message is encrypted with Alice's public key using El-Gamal encryption. Alice decrypted this successfully, but suddenly remembered that she only owed Bob \$100.

◇ *Question:* Assume Bob would not lie. How did an attacker tamper with the message?

◇ *Question:* What could Bob have additionally sent that would've stopped this attack?

**Solution:** The attacker multiplied  $c_2$  by 100, or multiplied  $c_1 \cdot c'_1, c_2 \cdot c'_2$  where  $c'$  is a valid encryption of 100, or they encrypted an entirely new message.  
Bob could attach a signature to his original message.

**Question 2** *Why do RSA signatures need a hash?* ( min)

To generate RSA signatures, Alice first creates a standard RSA key pair:  $(n, e)$  is the RSA public key and  $d$  is the RSA private key, where  $n$  is the RSA modulus. For standard RSA signatures, we typically set  $e$  to a small prime value such as 3; for this problem, let  $e = 3$ .

To generate a **standard** RSA signature  $S$  on a message  $M$ , Alice computes  $S = H(M)^d \bmod n$ . If Bob wants to verify whether  $S$  is a valid signature on message  $M$ , he simply checks whether  $S^3 = H(M) \bmod n$  holds.  $d$  is a private key known only to Alice and  $(n, 3)$  is a publicly known verification key that anyone can use to check if a message was signed using Alice's private signing key.

Suppose we instead used a **simplified** scheme for RSA signatures which skips using a hash function and instead uses  $M$  directly, so the signature  $S$  on a message  $M$  is  $S = M^d \bmod n$ . In other words, if Alice wants to send a signed message to Bob, she will send  $(M, S)$  to Bob where  $S = M^d \bmod n$  is computed using her private signing key  $d$ .

- (a) With this **simplified** RSA scheme, how can Bob verify whether  $S$  is a valid signature on message  $M$ ? In other words, what equation should he check, to confirm whether  $M$  was validly signed by Alice?

**Solution:**  $S^3 = M \bmod n$ .

- (b) Mallory learns that Alice and Bob are using the **simplified** signature scheme described above and decides to trick Bob into believing that one of Mallory's messages is from Alice. Explain how Mallory can find an  $(M, S)$  pair such that  $S$  will be a valid signature on  $M$ .

You should assume that Mallory knows Alice's public key  $n$ , but not Alice's private key  $d$ . The message  $M$  does not have to be chosen in advance and can be gibberish.

**Solution:** Mallory should choose some random value to be  $S$  and then compute  $S^3 \bmod n$  to find the corresponding  $M$  value. This  $(M, S)$  pair will satisfy the equation in part (a).

**Alternative solution:** Choose  $M = 1$  and  $S = 1$ . This will satisfy the equation.

- (c) Is the attack in part (b) possible against the **standard** RSA signature scheme (the one that includes the cryptographic hash function)? Why or why not?

**Solution:** This attack is not possible. A hash function is one way, so the attack in part (b) won't work: we can pick a random  $S$  and cube it, but then we'd need to find some message  $M$  such that  $H(M)$  is equal to this value, and that's not possible since  $H$  is one-way.

Comment: This is why the real RSA signature scheme includes a hash function: exactly to prevent the attack you've seen in this question.

**Question 3 Hashing passwords with salts****(15 min)**

When storing a password  $pw$ , a website generates a random string  $salt$ , and saves:

$$(salt, Hash(pw \parallel salt))$$

in the database, where  $Hash$  is a cryptographic hash function.

- (a) If a user tries to log in with password  $pw'$  (which may or may not be the same as  $pw$ ), how does the site check if the user has the correct password?
- (b) Why use a hash function  $Hash$  rather than just store  $pw$  directly?
- (c) Suppose the site doesn't use a salt and just stores  $Hash(pw)$ . What attack becomes easier?
- (d) Suppose the site has two candidate hash functions  $Hash_1$  and  $Hash_2$ . Their properties are shown in the table below.

| Function | One-Way | Collision Resistant |
|----------|---------|---------------------|
| $Hash_1$ | Yes     | No                  |
| $Hash_2$ | Yes     | Yes                 |

Which of them suffice for password hashing?

**Solution:**

- (a) The site computes  $Hash(pw' \parallel salt)$  using the  $salt$  in the database. If this hash output equals the stored hash value, the password is correct.
- (b) If the hash function is secure and the password has good entropy, even if an attacker hacks into the site, the attacker cannot figure out the passwords.
- (c) It makes inverting the hash much easier. Many hackers use a precomputed inverse hash table for some common passwords to reverse the hashes of common passwords.  
  
Salts disable such tables and force the attacker to perform at least a dictionary attack for each user.
- (d) Both suffice since we only need one-wayness.