

## 1 Construction of PEG from OWF

First, we recall the definition of a pairwise independent hash family and the Leftover Hash Lemma:

### Definition 1. Pairwise Independent Hash Family

$\mathbb{H} = \{h : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m\}$  such that over random  $h \leftarrow \mathbb{H}$ :

- $\forall x \in \{0, 1\}^n, h(x)$  is uniform in  $\{0, 1\}^m$
- $\forall x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^n, h(x), h(x')$  are independent

### Theorem 2. Leftover Hash Lemma

Let  $\mathbb{H} := \{h : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m\}$  be a family of pairwise independent hash functions, and let  $X \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^n$  be a random variable with min-entropy  $H_\infty(X) \geq k$ . Then for  $h \sim \mathbb{H}$  chosen uniformly at random, we have the following bound on the statistical distance:

$$SD[(h, h(X)), (h, U_m)] \leq \epsilon$$

if  $m = k - 2 \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , that is to say,  $(h, h(X))$  is  $\epsilon$ -close to the uniform distribution of  $|h| + m$  bits,  $|h|$  denotes the description length of the function  $h$ .

Recall the definition of an  $s$ -regular one-way function:

### Definition 3. $s$ -Regular One Way Function

An  $s$ -regular OWF is a OWF such that for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n, |f^{-1}(f(x))| = 2^{s(n)}$ . (think of this as a  $s$ -to-1 mapping).

Also, recall the definition of a pseudo-entropy generator:

### Definition 4. Pseudo-Entropy Generator

$F$  is a pseudo-entropy generator if there exists  $k = k(n)$  such that:

1.  $H(F(U_n)) \leq k$ .
2. There exists ensemble of distributions  $Y_n$  such that  $H(Y_n) \geq k + \frac{1}{100n}$  and  $\{F(U_n)\} \approx_c \{Y_n\}$ .

### Claim 5. OWF $\Rightarrow$ PEG

We will construct a PEG from an  $s$ -regular OWF,  $f$ , as follows:

$$F(x, M, r) := f(x), M, r, M \odot x, r \odot x$$

where  $f(x) \in \{0, 1\}^n, M \in \{0, 1\}^{(s+1) \times n}, r \in \{0, 1\}^n, M \odot x \in \{0, 1\}^{s+1}, r \odot x \in \{0, 1\}$

so  $H(f(x)) = n - s, H(M) = (s + 1)n, H(r) = n, H(M \odot x) = ?, H(r \odot x) = ?$

For  $F$  to be a PEG, we want the entropy of  $M \odot x$  and  $r \odot x$  to be lower than if they were uniformly random, while still being computationally indistinguishable from uniform random strings.

First we will show that  $r \odot x$  is at least somewhat determined given the remainder of the  $F(x, M, r)$

**Lemma 6. Low Real Entropy**

Given the following random variables:

$$X(x, M, r) := (f(x), M, r, M \odot x), \quad Z(x, M, r) := r \odot x, \quad Z' := U_1$$

$F(U_n) = XZ$  here  $n = |(x, M, r)|$  instead of  $|f(x)|$

For some  $k$ ,  $H(F(U_n)) = H(XZ) = k$  where  $XZ$  is the concatenation of  $X$  and  $Z$

Construct ensemble  $Y_n = XZ'$

$$H(Y_n) = H(XZ')$$

we want to show that  $H(Y_n) \geq k + \frac{1}{100n}$

Idea: given  $X$ ,  $x$  is unique, so  $r \odot x$  must have less entropy than  $U_1$

Since  $f$  is  $s$ -regular:

$$T = f^{-1}(f(x)), |T| = 2^s$$

Since  $M \odot x$  is a pairwise independent hash:

$$\forall x' \in T, x' \neq x, \Pr_M [M \odot x' = M \odot x] = \frac{1}{2^{s+1}}$$

because  $\forall x. M \odot x$  is uniform in  $\{0, 1\}^{s+1}$

We can get a bound on the uniqueness of  $x$  given  $X$

$$\Pr_M [\exists x \in T \text{ s.t. } M \odot x' = M \odot x] \leq \frac{1}{2^{s+1}} 2^s = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{by union bound}$$

the complement is

$$\Pr [x \text{ is unique } |X] > \frac{1}{2}$$

if  $x$  is unique, it determines  $x \odot r$  decreasing entropy of  $Z|X$

$H(Z|X) \leq \frac{1}{2}$  because there is at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  probability that  $x$  is unique given  $X$ , in which case  $Z|X$  can only take on one value and has entropy 0

$H(Z'|X) = 1$  by definition

$$H(Z|X) + \frac{1}{2} \leq H(Z'|X)$$

$$\Rightarrow H(XZ) + \frac{1}{2} \leq H(XZ') \text{ by conditional entropy } \forall \text{ r.v.s } X, Z. H(XZ) = H(X) + H(Z|X)$$

$$\therefore H(Y_n) \geq k + \frac{1}{100n}$$

**Lemma 7. High Pseudo Entropy**

$$\{F(U_n)\} \approx_c \{Y_n\}, \quad Y_n \text{ defined same as before}$$

$$(f(x), M, r, M \odot x, r \odot x) \approx_c (f(x), M, r, M \odot x, U_1)$$

*Proof.* Assume for the sake of contradiction,  $\exists$  NUPPT  $A$ , poly  $p$ , s.t. for infinitely many  $n$ :

$$\Pr [A(f(x), M, r, M \odot x) = r \odot x] \geq \frac{1}{2} + p(n)$$

This assertion is the negation of the lemma. We want to show that this implies  $f$  is not OWF, therefore the lemma must be true.

Our reduction won't have access to  $x$ , only  $f(x)$ , so how will we simulate  $M \odot x$ ?

Idea:  $|M \odot x| = s + 1$ ,  $M \odot x$  is necessarily not uniform, but  $(M \odot x)[1 \dots s - 2 \log(n)]$  is uniform

$H_\infty(x|f(x)) = s$  because  $f$  is  $s$ -regular, so by the leftover hash lemma:

$$SD((M \odot x)[1 \dots s - 2 \log(n)], U_{s-2 \log(n)}) \leq \frac{1}{n} = \epsilon$$

We can simulate  $(f(x), M, r, (M \odot x)[1 \dots s - 2 \log(n)])$  by guessing uniformly randomly  $(M \odot x)[1 \dots s - 2 \log(n)] \sim U_{s-2 \log(n)}$

We have the following bound on the probability that  $(M \odot x)[1 \dots s - 2 \log(n)]$  is supported, in other words,  $(f(x), M, r, (M \odot x)[1 \dots s - 2 \log(n)])$  is valid, i.e. there exists an  $x$  and  $M$  that can produce that string:

$$SD(D, U) \leq \epsilon \implies Pr[x \in \text{sup}(D)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

Since we have only  $2 \log(n) + 1$  bits of  $M \odot x$  unknown, we can try all possible suffixes until a valid input is found in polynomial time.

We can construct the following reduction that inverts  $f$ :

$B(y = f(x)) :=$

$M \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^{(s+1) \times n}$

$t_1 \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^{s-2 \log(n)}$

for  $t_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{s-2 \log(n)}$  :

$x' \leftarrow B_0(y, M, t = t_1 || t_2)$   $B_0$  finds the preimage of  $f(x)$  given  $M$  and  $M \odot x$ , it is defined below  
if  $f(x') = y$ , output  $x'$

One of the values of  $t_1 || t_2$  should be a valid  $M \odot x$ , as proved before, so this reduction should return an element in the preimage with non-negligible probability, assuming  $B_0$  inverts  $f(x)$  given  $M, M \odot x$  with non-negligible probability.

We will construct  $B_0$  the same as was by Goldreich-Levin [GL89]. We will leave out some details and analysis, but they can be found in prior lectures or the original reduction.

$B(y, M, t) :=$

$r_1, \dots, r_m$  pairwise independent  $n$ -bit strings

$g_1, \dots, g_m$  pairwise independent bits

for  $i = 1 \dots n$  :

for  $j = 1 \dots m$  :

$z_{ij} \leftarrow A(y, M, r_j \oplus e_i, t) \oplus g_j$  where  $e_i$  is the one-hot vector with  $e_i[i] = 1$

\*the aim is that  $A(y, M, r_j \oplus e_i, t) = x \odot (g \oplus e_i)$  and  $g_j = x \odot r_j$

$z_i \leftarrow \text{maj}(\{z_{ij}\}_{j=1 \dots m})$

□

## Acknowledgement

## References

- [GL89] Oded Goldreich and Leonid A. Levint. A hard-core predicate for all one-way functions. *Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 1989.