

# PhenoAuth: A Novel PUF-Phenotype-based Authentication Protocol for IoT Devices

Fei Hongming<sup>1</sup>, Owen Millwood<sup>2</sup>, Prosanta Gope<sup>2</sup>, Jack Miskelly<sup>3</sup>, Biplab Sikdar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The National University of Singapore, Singapore  
fei.hongming@u.nus.edu, bsikdar@nus.edu.sg

<sup>2</sup>Department of Computer Science, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK  
{ojwmillwood1, p.gope}@sheffield.ac.uk

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Secure Information Technologies, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom  
j.miskelly@qub.ac.uk

**Abstract**—Physical Unclonable Functions (PUFs) have been shown to be a highly promising solution for enabling high security systems tailored for low-power devices. Commonly, PUFs are utilised to generate cryptographic keys on-the-fly, replacing the need to store keys in vulnerable, non-volatile memories. Due to the physical nature of PUFs, environmental variations cause noise, manifesting themselves as errors which are apparent in the initial PUF measurements. This necessitates expensive active error correction techniques which can run counter to the goal of lightweight security. ML-based techniques for authenticating noisy PUF measurements were explored as an alternative to error correction techniques, bringing about the concept of a *PUF Phenotype*, where PUF identity is considered as a structure agnostic representation of the PUF, with relevant noise encoding. This work proposes a full noise-tolerant authentication protocol based on the PUF Phenotype concept and methodology for an Internet-of-Things (IoT) network, demonstrating mutual authentication and forward secrecy in a setting suitable for device-to-device communication. Upon conducting security and performance analyses, it is evident that our proposed scheme demonstrates resilience against various attacks compared to the currently existing PUF protocols.

**Index Terms**—Physical Unclonable Functions (PUFs), PUF-Phenotype, Authentication Protocol, IoT.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Internet of Things (IoT) describes a network where heterogeneous physical devices interconnect with each other so that all devices in it can communicate and exchange data smartly, quickly and safely. In recent years, IoT applications and devices have developed rapidly, e.g., smart homes [1], Industry 4.0 [2], smart grids, and healthcare. It brings significant changes to industrial and societal production and management that allow the monitoring and control of multiple sensors in detail and then precisely manage the operations ranging from data collection and processing to analysis and interventions. However, IoT devices manage, process or store confidential and sensitive data, e.g., users' private data and passwords, and in most cases, are lightweight and have limited computing resources, which raises security concerns. While numerous authentication protocols have been proposed [3]–[7], several practical challenges remain inadequately addressed. These include the reliance on a trustworthy third-party verifier or

server, the lack of secure and reliable non-volatile memory (NVM), and the resource constraints inherent in group authentication scenarios.

Physical Unclonable Function (PUF) is a secure primitive that provides a streamlined solution for lightweight device authentication. It is rooted in the physical characteristics of devices that are produced during the manufacturing process, which are considered to be “uncontrolled” even by the manufacturers. PUFs are widely used in lightweight scenarios since they can provide unclonable and “invasive-resistant” entropy for security applications with a low cost of resources. In general, PUFs use challenges as input and provide responses as the output. The challenges can be viewed as a different stimulus to the hardware, which may control how the device is activated or initialized. The readout of responses takes several clock cycles but do not consume too many resources. Although PUFs can provide lightweight, secure primitives for authentication, it has two significant drawbacks. The first is that PUFs are found to be vulnerable to Machine-Learning Modelling-Attacks (MLMAs); if one adversary with machine-learning capability can collect enough challenge-response pairs (CRPs), then he/she can model the PUF with high accuracy. Thus, the CRPs used for authentication should be hidden from adversaries. Secondly, PUFs' responses contain noise when they are evaluated, which results in unreliability in practical applications. One countermeasure is using error correction algorithms to correct errors between evaluations. However, such methods either need pre-shared or real-time generated helper data, which undergrade the security of PUFs and, thus, the authentication protocols. For example, [8] has shown that the adversary can get a non-negligible advantage from learning and manipulating the helper data. Secure and efficient authentication protocols for IoT devices are still under research.

### A. Related Work

In response to such challenges with protocol-level integration of PUFs, various research has investigated extraneous techniques for measuring PUF response authenticity without explicit de-noising steps. Intuitively, machine learning (ML)

techniques appeared as a clear candidate for solving the problem. Karimian et al. introduced the first ML-based authentication of PUFs [9]. Their work exploited a deep Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) to classify the origin of noisy DRAM-PUF-derived responses formed as image data. Najafi et al. performed a similar study utilising CNNs to authenticate Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) PUF responses by characterising responses which represent the physical sub-structure of the DRAM cells used to derive the response, enabling this information to be encoded into the model [10]. Suragani et al. investigated using CNNs to classify noisy Static Random Access Memory (SRAM) PUF responses, even when corrupted with large artefacts in the images [11]. Millwood et al. introduced the concept of a *PUF Phenotype* as a means to define PUF data as a structure-agnostic representation of the PUF, including all noise sources, as opposed to the previous methods by which structural PUF data is encoded in response to be authenticated [12]. In this work, the authors also utilise a modified CNN to perform classification and authentication across multiple devices.

### B. Motivation and Contributions

Recently published works have demonstrated that noisy hardware identifying information can be used directly to distinguish between nominally identical devices by treating recognition of the noisy IDs as a computer vision problem. The dominant approach to these identities has been to require a de-noising (i.e., error correction) step, with many protocols requiring bit-perfect correction. In some cases, helper data is also required to filter or how the identifying information is used (e.g., filtering high noise sections). Poorly designed helper data can itself be a source of vulnerability.

In contrast, the computer vision approach (utilising CNNs) requires no error correction and no helper data because the recognition models are inherently noise-tolerant. In fact, they can use the noise distribution as a recognition feature, considering that only a minority subset of the noise produced by a physical system is truly random in position, magnitude, and distribution. That means the resource cost of authentication is shifted almost entirely to the verifying device. Additionally, while the initial methods for classifying noisy PUF responses with CNNs replaced the helper data problem, they did not explicitly tackle the resource overhead issue, with fully connected deep CNNs also requiring a large amount of device storage to operate. Millwood et al. demonstrated that CNN-based PUF authentication need not require the resource-heavy fully connected layer, significantly reducing the required storage to achieve highly accurate authentication. However, this approach is not an unqualified improvement in all aspects. So far, it has only been tested on fairly large IDs, larger than typical in comparable systems. More importantly, it has sufficiently different properties from the dominant on-device error correction method such that it cannot be substituted into existing protocols. That, in turn, makes it difficult to compare the practicality of deploying it in a real system or to perform a proper vulnerability analysis. Thus, we lack a set of full

protocols for this type of authentication, and as a result, we cannot accurately evaluate the system-level pros and cons or determine which scenarios it may be suitable or unsuitable for. Finally, existing machine learning-based PUF authentication systems [7] exclusively account for a solitary device within a trained model. Consequently, when contemplating a set of  $n$  provers, a designated verifier must retain the  $n - 1$  model to manage authentication requests from every other member of the group. Given the resource constraints of an IoT device, this is an unrealistic requirement for on-device authentication.

This paper addresses all the aforementioned issues by proposing PhenoAuth, a complete PUF-Phenotype-based authentication protocol for IoT devices. As it is common in IoT networks to have both device-to-server and device-to-device communication, this protocol allows for both modes. This also allows for comparison with as wide a range of existing protocols as possible. We provide algorithms for ID generation, model training, enrollment and deployment, and device authentication. Other than the additional model training step, these are directly comparable to the stages of a conventional PUF protocol.

We use the proposed protocol to provide a system-level vulnerability analysis and a comparison with previously proposed protocols. It should be noted this is not intended to be a definitive protocol, rather initial steps aimed at providing a solution for a reasonably generic authentication scenario. The hope is this can be used as a starting point for further analysis, refinement, and application to more specific scenarios where this approach can prove advantageous.

Overall, this work provides the following key contributions:

- 1) A novel PUF-based authentication scheme using the concept of *PUF-Phenotype*, where a group of IoT devices (that may act as both prover and verifier) can authenticate each other. Unlike the existing group-based authentication scheme, devices in our proposed scheme are not required to store any *group key* and can detect any alterations or erasures on the stored data, which means that they achieve the same important property of PUFs, tamper resistance.
- 2) A single ML-based PUF authentication model that is appropriate for multiple group devices that can run on lightweight IoT devices without a third-party trusted verifier.
- 3) A concrete analysis and evaluation are performed on the proposed protocol. Formal analysis based on the sequence of games shows that the protocol can guarantee mutual authentication, privacy, and backward and forward security against multiple attacks based on the Dolev-Yao (DY) adversary model.

### C. Paper organisation

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we first provide a brief introduction to DRAM PUF and PUF-Phenotype. This section also presents a description of the reliability analysis of DRAM memory PUFs. Section III presents our proposed privacy-preserving PUF-Phenotype-based authentication protocol for IoT devices. A comprehen-

sive formal security proof of the proposed scheme is given in Section IV. Performance analysis of the proposed protocol is then provided in Section V. Finally, we conclude our paper with concluding remarks in Section VI.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

### A. DRAM PUF

DRAM PUFs (DPUFs) are a type of PUF that utilize the inherent physical imperfections in DRAMs for security purposes, which was first proposed by [13]. Almost all computers, ranging from high-performance ones to low-resource constraint IoT devices, are equipped with DRAM, which shows the portability and wide adaptability of DRAM PUFs. The memory-PUF referenced in this work is the DRAM PUF used in [12], which used data collected from DDR3 memory on a commodity system. As noted in that paper, this is only exemplary of memory PUFs in general, and the same techniques should transfer to other PUFs based on memory structures (in particular SRAM PUFs), which have been demonstrated to possess the same properties as regards PUF identity and noise characteristics. However, it should be noted that this has not yet been proven experimentally on PUFs other than the DRAM PUF.

The proposed protocol uses a fairly large block of noisy PUF data as the primary ID. However, it also requires a smaller de-noised (bit-perfect) key to be used in the transmission of this data. Previous works on memory PUFs have shown that within the cells of memory being used as a PUF, there is a reliability distribution, with a minority of cells exhibiting much higher reliability (i.e., less noise). For example, a large-scale test of DRAM PUFs on chips from multiple manufacturers found that at least 2.67% of cells had reliability greater than 99% before error correction. This behaviour is ideal for this protocol, as these low-noise cells can be targeted for key generation with minimal error correction. The remaining noisy cells can be used without error correction as the main ID. This, is in contrast to how this PUF would be used in a conventional protocol, where either the system is limited to using only this subset of low-noise cells or a significant degree of error correction scaled to the noise level in the worst-case cells is needed.

### B. PUF-Phenotype

As previously mentioned, the concept of PUF-Phenotype was first proposed by Millwood et al. [12], which describes a detectable expression of PUF measurements (experimentally, a DRAM-PUF) including noise from all sources and their relevant encoding, without explicit features describing the underlying PUF structure. This method was proposed to be analogous to biometric authentication methods such as facial recognition, whereby authentication is achieved through classification of the image of a face, including noisy features such as angle, light, facial defects etc. This method provides some key benefits, as PUF measurements can be taken with minimal post-processing (only conversion to an image format is required) and no error correction is required.

It was determined in [12] that PUF Phenotypes of the DRAM-PUF could be authenticated very effectively. Generating a PUF Phenotype image consists of the process described in Algorithm 1, whereby raw PUF measurements are taken across varying operating conditions to capture the noise profile of the particular PUF. The measurements are then converted into a two-dimensional matrix, where each individual matrix cell contains an integer in the range [0-255], the output being a grayscale image with each pixel denoting pixel intensity. This image forms the input to train DPAN (DRAM-PUF Authentication Network), the classification CNN based on VGG-16 as demonstrated in [12]. The training process of DPAN is described in Algorithm 2.

---

#### Algorithm 1 PUF-Phenotype Generation Algorithm

---

```

1: Dataset Generation
2: Input:  $C \in \{c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ : Challenge Data
3: Output:  $X$ : Phenotype dataset
4: Data:  $P$ : Environmental parameters (Temp., Voltage)
5:  $m$ : Number of devices
6:  $n$ : Number of challenges
7: for  $i \leftarrow 0$  to  $P$  do
8:   for  $j \leftarrow 0$  to  $m$  do
9:     for  $k \leftarrow 0$  to  $n$  do
10:      Write challenge pattern from the start location
11:      Set  $t_{RCD}$  to 0
12:       $R_{ijk} \leftarrow$  Perform read operation on DRAM
13:    block
14:       $x \leftarrow \text{IMGEN}(R_{ijk})$ 
15:      /*  $x$ : PUF Phenotype */
16:      Assign device label to  $T$ 
17:      Store  $x$  in  $X$ 
18:   return  $X$ 

```

---



---

#### Algorithm 2 Model Training

---

```

1: Input:  $X$ : PUF Phenotype dataset
2: Output:  $DPAN$ : Trained model;
3:  $RDPUF, UDPUF$ : Reliable and unreliable parts of the DPUF
4:  $t$ : Confidence threshold
5: Split  $X$  into train/test sets:  $o$  &  $p$ 
6:  $F_a \leftarrow$  Fine-tune VGG16 using  $o$ 
7: /*  $F_a$ : Training features */
8:  $F_b \leftarrow$  Fine tune VGG16 using  $p$ 
9: /*  $F_b$ : Testing features */
10: Train Classifier using  $F_a$ 
11: Test Classifier using  $F_b$ 
12:  $DPAN \leftarrow$  Combined trained VGG16 & Classifier
13:  $t \leftarrow$  Tune confidence threshold to zero false positives
14:  $RDPUF, UDPUF \leftarrow$  Characterization & Analysis
15: return  $DPAN, t, RDPUF, UDPUF$ 

```

---

---

**Algorithm 3** Reliability Analysis

---

```
1: Input:  $C \in \{c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ : Challenge Data
2: Output:  $SC$ : Stable challenge
3: Data:  $P$ : Environmental parameters (Temp., Voltage)
4:  $n$ : Number of challenges
5:  $r$ : Number of repeat measurements
6:  $t_e$ : Error threshold
7:  $l$ : Size of responses in bits
8: while  $\text{length}(SC) < l$  do
9:   for  $i \leftarrow 0$  to  $n$  do
10:    for  $j \leftarrow 0$  to  $P$  do
11:     for  $k \leftarrow 0$  to  $r$  do
12:       $R_{ijk} \leftarrow$  PUF measurement for  $C_i$ 
13:       $HW_{ij} \leftarrow$  Add  $R_{ijk}$  to Hamming Weight
14:     for Cell  $b$  in  $HW_{ij}$  do
15:      if  $b$  in  $SC$  then
16:        if  $HW_b/r < t_e$  or  $> 1 - t_e$  then
17:           $SC \leftarrow$  Remove  $b$  from  $SC$ 
18:        else if  $HW_b/r > t_e$  or  $< 1 - t_e$  then
19:           $SC \leftarrow$  Append  $b$  to  $SC$ 
20: return  $SC$ 
```

---

### C. Reliability Analysis

For the proposed protocol, the data generated for DPAN training must also be analysed to locate a map of highly stable bits, which can be used to form noise-free responses using minimal error correction. The process for doing so is a modified version of that used in [14] and can be performed on the prover device as the DPAN training data is generated. The process for generating one stable response for a single device is described in 3. The plain language description is as follows: Each response must be generated a large number of times and the Hamming weight for each cell's response recorded. This can then be used to locate bits above a certain threshold of stability. The process is repeated for each temperature and voltage point, retaining only bits which exceed the threshold in every case. In [14] a threshold of 0.99 (99%) found at least 2% of the total memory to be suitable. The final map of these high-stability cells produces a challenge which will result in a response of reliability no less than the threshold value across all operating conditions. The choice of threshold is a design consideration based on acceptable error rate and available resources. A higher threshold means the stable response will be spread out over a larger memory region and take longer to regenerate, but will have a lower bit error rate and therefore, require less correction.

## III. PROPOSED SCHEME

In this section, we describe our proposed PUF-Phenotype-based authentication protocol.

### A. System Model

Our system model encompasses a typical IoT communications scenario where a group of IoT devices can engage in




Fig. 1: Usage of DRAM PUF in the proposed protocol.

direct interactions among themselves and establish communication with their gateway or vice versa. In this regard, any device/gateway can act as either a Prover or a Verifier. In such a group, each device stores information derived from other devices in the network during the enrollment phase. It should be noted that the stored information performs as the identity list ( $Dev_{id}$ ) and enrollment information ( $DPAN, \Delta$ ), which does not take much space. More performance discussion is presented in Section V. During the authentication, devices will authenticate each other's identity and agree on an identical key for further communication using a combination of the stored data and noisy PUF responses generated as needed. At the end of each session, devices will update the interior states. Because of tamper resistance, DRAM PUFs cannot be modified or read out when the protocol is not executing, i.e., when the device is not powered on. We want the whole system to have the same security property of PUFs, tamper resistance, which means the ability to resist physical and logical attacks to alter, duplicate, or extract the sensitive information they contain. Besides, we consider a group authentication case, where a branch of devices communicate with each other. We want to ensure that even when a single device is corrupted after the enrollment phase, the security of the other devices will not be affected.

### B. Adversary Model and Assumptions

For the implemented IoT communication scenario, we consider two adversary models. First, we allow the adversary to have the capability described in the typical Dolev-Yao intruder model [15], who has complete control over radio links in the network. The adversary can eavesdrop, alter, or block any messages he/she wants. The adversary has all the knowledge needed to understand the content in transferred messages. For example, the adversary knows what  $M_1, M_2$  are composed of. We allow the adversary to have physical access to the device when the protocol is not executed, which means that the adversary can read, write or modify any information inside the non-volatile memory (NVM). After the enrollment and before




Fig. 2: System model.

the execution of the authentication protocol, the adversary can eavesdrop and alter any data he/she wants. However, we do not allow the adversary to physically access the DRAM PUF. Considering the property of tamper resistance, it is reasonable to assume that the adversary cannot perform such attacks directly on PUFs. Third, we also consider the case that, at some moments of authentication protocol execution, the adversary gets full control of one device, including accessing the DPUF arbitrarily, which means that he/she can obtain the key source.

We analyse the proposed protocol under the following assumptions.

- 1) First, the DPUF is assumed to be secure due to its tamper resistance property, which means any attempt to readout or modify the DPUF will be detected and will cause the whole authentication to fail.
- 2) Second, the intermediate variables or states generated during the execution of the authentication protocol cannot be obtained, altered or erased.
- 3) Third, we consider the adversary to have the ability to corrupt one device in the execution of the authentication protocol. We assume that all the challenges used in our protocol  $C_i$  is only used once, which ensures that all the other devices can preserve all security properties apart from communicating with the corrupted one.

### C. Proposed Authentication Protocol

The proposed protocol consists of two phases: the enrollment phase and the authentication phase. The protocol has two participants, i.e., the prover and the verifier. In the enrollment phase, the prover and the verifier exchange responses on the same challenge, and then they store the device ID, XORed responses from both sides, and corresponding challenges in the NVM.

1) *Enrollment Phase:* As shown in Fig. 3, all the devices (may act as a prover or verifier) in the proposed IoT ecosystem need to exchange all the security parameters and other relevant




Fig. 3: The enrollment phase of the proposed protocol

information, such as model parameters (that will be used during the authentication phase) using the following three steps and through a secure communication channel. The adversary is not supposed to get any advantage in this phase.

- **Step 1:** In this step, the prover initializes the enrollment. We refer to the session id as  $i$ . First, the prover generates the challenge  $C_i$  using a true random number generator (TRNG), forwards it to the DRAM PUF, and gets the noisy response  $R_{p_i}$  and stable response  $SR_{p_i}$ . Then, it invokes the PUF-Phenotype Generation algorithm to generate the Phenotype dataset. The prover sends the combined information  $M_0$ , including the device id  $Dev_p$ , challenge  $C_i$ , the stable response  $SR_{p_i}$  and Phenotype dataset  $X_p$ , to the verifier.
- **Step 2:** In this step, the verifier generates a session key source and PUF Phenotype dataset for further pairwise authentication. After receiving the request from the prover, the verifier invokes the DPAN Enrollment Phase and generates the Phenotype dataset  $X_v$ . Secondly, it invokes the Phenotype model training algorithm to get the trained model  $DPAN_v$  from  $X_p$ . Then, the verifier inputs the challenges  $C_i$  to the  $DPUF_v$  and gets the noisy response  $R_{v_i}$  and stable response  $SR_{v_i}$ . By XORing stable responses from both side, the session  $\Delta_i$  can be generated from  $SR_{v_i}$  and  $SR_{p_i}$ , which can be stored directly without leaking any credential information. The verifier also stores the prover's ID  $Dev_p$  for later checking. In the end, the prover sends its id  $Dev_v$ , static response  $SR_{v_i}$ , and Phenotype  $X_v$  back to the prover. It should be noted that, for enrollment of a group of devices, the model training process needs all the PUF-Phenotype from all the engaging devices' DPUFs. Also, it does no harm on the security of the protocol even if the adversary can get the contents stored in the NVM.
- **Step 3:** After receiving  $M_1$  from the verifier, the prover performs similar operations. First, it trains the model by

invoking the Phenotype model training algorithm and gets  $DPAN_p$ . Then it computes XORed stable responses from both sides and stores it. It also stores the verifier's id together with the challenge  $C_i$ .

2) *Authentication Phase*:: As shown in Fig. 4, the prover and verifier communicate with each other in 3 steps and then authenticate each other.

- **Step 1:** In this step, a device that wants to authenticate with a target device  $Dev_v$  initiates the protocol. In this session, the initializer device will play the role of a prover, and the other be the verifier. The prover first loads stored information from the enrollment phase,  $C_i, SR_{v_i}, \Delta_i$ . Then it inputs the challenge  $C_i$  to the DPUF and gets two parts of responses, the noisy response  $R_{p_i}$  and stable response  $SR_{p_i}$ .  $SR_{p_i}$  is viewed as the entropy source and used to derive the session key  $mk_{p_i}$ . Then, it computes the new challenge for the next session as  $C_{i+1} \leftarrow H(C_i || mk_{p_i})$ . The adversary cannot trace the value of the challenge if the session key is secure. Then, the prover inputs  $C_{i+1}$  to the DPUF and gets new noisy response  $R_{p_{i+1}}$  and stable response  $SR_{p_{i+1}}$ , and calculates  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^1$  and  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^2$  by XORing the current stable response with the new noisy response, and current stable responses with the new stable response, respectively. The prover packs the device id  $Dev_{p_i}$ ,  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^1$  and  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^2$  as the associated data, and encrypts them with session key  $mk_{p_i}$ . It can get the ciphertext  $\alpha_{p_i}$  and authentication Tag  $Tag_{p_i}$ . In the end, the prover sends  $M_1$  to the verifier, including a request for authentication,  $\alpha_{p_i}$ ,  $Tag_{p_i}$  and  $AD_{p_i}$ , and waits for the response.
- **Step 2:** In this step, the verifier decides whether or not to accept the authentication; if so, it will generate the PUF Phenotype and send its identity information to the device for authentication. After receiving  $M_1$ , the verifier loads  $C_i, \Delta_i$  according to the ID  $Dev_{p_i}$ . If it exists, it will unpack the received associated data and get  $\alpha_{p_i}$ ,  $Tag_{p_i}$  and  $AD_{p_i}$ . The first thing the verifier does is to verify whether  $M_1$  is honestly transferred. It inputs  $C_i$  to its DPUF  $DPUF_v$  and gets noisy response  $R_{v_i}$  and stable response  $SR_{v_i}$ . Then, it can get  $SR_{v_{p_i}}$  by XORing  $\Delta_i$  and  $SR_{v_i}$ . The session key can be derived from  $SR_{v_i}$  using *Key Derivation Function* (KDF). The tag can be verified using the session key. The verifier aborts the protocol if  $\widehat{Tag}_{p_i} \neq Tag_{p_i}$ , which means  $M_1$  has been modified or is unsynchronized. If verification passes, the verifier will test whether this  $M_1$  is generated by an honest prover. It first unpacks the noisy response  $R_{p_{i+1}}$  by XORing  $SR_{v_i}$  and  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^1$ . Secondly, it invokes  $IMGen(\cdot)$  to generate an image from the noisy response, which will be the input of the  $DPAN$  model. The  $DPAN$  model outputs the classification result  $Y_{p_{i+1}}$  and the confidence value  $S$ . The protocol will be aborted if the classification result is wrong or  $S$  is lower than the threshold  $\hat{t}$ . If the verification passes, the verifier will believe that the message  $M_1$  is honestly




Fig. 4: Authentication phase of proposed protocol.

transferred and sent by a legal prover. Here, the verifier can obtain the updated stable response of the prover




Fig. 5: Security Framework for Mutual Authentication.

by  $SR_{p_{i+1}} \leftarrow \Delta_{p_{i+1}}^2 \oplus SR_{v_i}$ . Then it first generates the new challenge  $C_{i+1} \leftarrow H(C_i || mk_{p_i})$ , where  $H(\cdot)$  is a hash function. Then the prover generates the new noisy response  $R_{p_{i+1}}$  and stable response  $SR_{p_{i+1}}$ . It can update  $\Delta_{i+1} \leftarrow SR_{p_{i+1}} \oplus SR_{v_{i+1}}$ .  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^1$  and  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^2$  can be generated from  $SR_{p_i} \oplus SR_{v_{i+1}}$  and  $SR_{v_i} \oplus R_{v_{i+1}}$ . Then, the verifier packs  $Dev_v$ ,  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^1$  and  $\Delta_{p_{i+1}}^2$  as the associated data  $AD_{v_i}$ , encrypts them with the session key  $mk_{p_i}$ , and gets the ciphertext  $\alpha_{v_i}$  and authentication tag  $Tag_{v_i}$ . In the end, the verifier stores  $C_{i+1}$ ,  $\Delta_{i+1}$ , and updates the id  $Dev_v \leftarrow H(Dev_v || mk_{p_i})$ .  $M_2$  is then sent, composed of the response of the authentication request  $Auth_{ok}$ ,  $\alpha_{v_i}$ ,  $Tag_{v_i}$  and  $AD_{v_i}$ . It should be noted that, as long as the session key is not compromised, the leakage of  $\Delta$ ,  $\Delta^1$ ,  $\Delta^2$  does no harm to the security of the protocol. A formal security proof is presented in Section IV.

- **Step 3:** In this step, the prover will validate two things, the first is whether  $M_2$  is honestly transferred, and the second is whether  $M_2$  is generated in this session by a legal verifier. After receiving  $M_2$ , the prover first unpacks the associated data into  $Dev_v$ ,  $\Delta_{v_{i+1}}^1$ ,  $\Delta_{v_{i+1}}^2$ .  $AD_{v_i}$  can be verified by encrypting it with the session key  $mk_{p_i}$ , and then checking if the generated tag  $\widehat{Tag}_{v_i}$  equals  $Tag_{v_i}$ . Secondly, the verifier obtains the noisy response of the verifier by  $R_{v_{i+1}} \leftarrow \Delta_{v_{i+1}} \oplus SR_{v_i}$ . Similar with the verifier, the prover invokes  $IMGen(\cdot)$  and  $DPAN$  model to verify the identity of the verifier. The session will be aborted if either the classification result is wrong or the confidence value is below the threshold. If they all pass, the prover updates its stored data. The new  $\Delta_{i+1}$  for the next session can be generated by XORing  $SR_{v_{i+1}}$  and  $SR_{p_{i+1}}$ . The device ID can be generated by  $Dev_p \leftarrow H(Dev_p || mk_{p_i})$ . The updating of the device id can ensure forward and backward privacy as long as the assumption of this protocol stands. At this point, all the steps on the device side have been completed.

## IV. SECURITY MODEL AND ANALYSIS

### A. Adversarial Model

Based on the discussion in Section III-B, we formally define the invasive adversary to analyse the security of the proposed protocol. We allow the adversary to eavesdrop, modify, and delay communication between the prover and the verified to gain the advantage of breaking the security. The adversary can also perform invasive operations on the on-chip NVM, which means it can readout the stored information in the NVM. It is also allowed to modify the data. Also, if the adversary blocks the entire communication channel (which can be detected easily), the authentication will fail, and the best result for the adversary is the same as the denial of service (DoS) attack. Since we assume that the enrollment phase is performed in a secure channel, we consider  $\mathcal{A}$  can issue the following Oracle queries:

- **Launch**( $1^\lambda$ ): A new session is started by the prover.
- **SendP**( $Dev_{id}, m$ ): Send arbitrary message  $m$  to device  $Dev_{id}$ .
- **Issue**( $DPUF$ ): Allows  $\mathcal{A}$  to have physical access to the PUF instance  $DPUF$ , and perform queries **Challenge**( $\cdot$ ) and **Reveal**( $\cdot$ ).
- **Reveal**( $C_i, \Delta_i$ ):  $\mathcal{A}$  reveals sensitive data  $C_i$  and  $\Delta$  in NVM.
- **Corrupt**( $\cdot$ ): Allows  $\mathcal{A}$  to modify the content in NVM.
- **Block**( $\cdot$ ) Allows  $\mathcal{A}$  to block authentication message  $M_1, M_2$  for any side it wants in running of the protocol.

We allow  $\mathcal{A}$  to have access to the NVM only when the session is not running on the device, and forbid it from accessing the DPUF. Thus, we give the definition for a **cleanness predicate**.

**Definition 1 (Cleanness predicate):** If the  $\mathcal{A}$  does not invoke **Issue**( $puf$ ) during the whole game, and only invokes **Reveal**( $\cdot$ ) and **Corrupt**( $\cdot$ ) when the protocol is not running on the device, we call this session a **cleanness predicate**.

Apart from the cleanness predicate defined above, we also state which kind of interactions between adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  and challenger  $\mathcal{C}$  are **clean**, in order to capture the nontrivial advantage  $\mathcal{A}$  can obtain without breaking the security of our protocol. Next, we give the definition of a matching session.

**Definition 2 (Matching Session):** In the device-to-device (D2D) communication protocol between a prover  $Dev_p$  and a verifier  $Dev_v$ , we say a session  $\pi_{pv_i}$  is a matching session if device id  $Dev_p$  and  $Dev_v$  are valid and the messages are honestly transferred between these two valid devices.

### B. Security Model

Here we describe the security analysis model for the protocol. In the model, the challenger  $\mathcal{C}$  maintains a group of IoT devices  $D_1, \dots, D_n$ , with each device operating a number of instances of the proposed mutual authentication protocol  $\Pi$ . We denote the protocol performed between device  $p$  and device  $v$  as  $\Pi_{pv}$ , and the  $i$ -th session as  $\pi_{pv_i}$ . We define a matching session where the messages communicated between devices are honestly transferred. We capture the protocol's security  $\Pi_{pv}$  through a game performed between a challenger  $\mathcal{C}$




Fig. 6: Privacy game.

and an adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ , noted as  $\text{Exp}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{MA}(\lambda)$ . The goal of  $\mathcal{A}$  is to model the communicated message  $M_1 : \{\alpha_{p_i}, Tag_{p_i}, AD_{p_i}\}$  and  $M_2 : \{\alpha_{v_i}, Tag_{v_i}, AD_{v_i}\}$  or derive the session key  $mk$  used in  $\Pi_{pv}$ . At the end of the authentication process,  $\text{Exp}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{MA}(\lambda)$  will output 1 (accept) or 0 (reject). We say  $\mathcal{A}$  wins the game if it causes a **clean** session and  $\text{Exp}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{MA}(\lambda)$  output 1, where  $\mathcal{C}$  accepts the authentication without a matching session. The basic game is considered as follows:

$\text{Exp}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{MU}(\lambda)$ :

- 1)  $(Dev_{id}, C_i, \Delta_i, pp) \xleftarrow{\text{Random}} \text{Setup}(\cdot)$ ;
- 2)  $(\widehat{Dev}_{id}, \widehat{M}_1, \widehat{M}_2, \widehat{mk}_i) \xleftarrow{\text{Random}} \mathcal{A}^{\text{Issue, Challenge, Reveal, Corrupt, SendP, Block}}((C_i, \Delta_i, pp))$ ;
- 3)  $\Phi := \text{Outcome}(\widehat{mk}_i, \widehat{M}_1, \widehat{M}_2)$ ;

The challenger  $\mathcal{C}$  executes a setup algorithm for enrolling into a trusted environment and all the public parameters  $pp$  for initialization. Here,  $pp$  denotes all the available public parameters used to initialize the authentication, e.g., the length of security parameters and the setting up of KDF. The basic game of mutual authentication comprises of two parts: prover authentication and verifier authentication. For both parts, we consider the same adversary model as discussed in Section IV-A. We denote the advantage of the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  in this game as  $\text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{mu}(\lambda)$ , which is defined as the probability  $\mathcal{A}$  causes a winning event.

### C. Privacy Model

Now, we consider indistinguishability-based privacy. In this case, the challenger  $\mathcal{C}$  maintains 2 devices that communicate with each other using the proposed protocol. The adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  eavesdrops somewhere in the network but tries to trace the communication parties. The privacy goal is that, in a clean session, the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot distinguish the true message from a randomly generated value. The basic game is shown in Figure 6 and considered as follows:

$\text{Exp}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{IND}}(\lambda)$ :

- 1)  $\mathcal{A}$  issues  $\text{Launch}(1^\lambda)$ .

- 2)  $\mathcal{C}$  sets up the system, starts running the protocol  $\Pi_{pv}$  on devices  $p$  and  $v$ , and obtains  $M_1, M_2$  from the communication of the protocol.
- 3)  $\mathcal{C}$  combines  $M_1, M_2$  as  $m_0$ , and then generates a random value with the same length  $|M_1| + |M_2|$ , noted as  $m_1$ . Then,  $\mathcal{C}$  generates a random choice  $b$  from  $\{0, 1\}$ , and then sends  $m_b$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- 4)  $\mathcal{A}$  sends his choice  $b^*$  to  $\mathcal{C}$ .

At the end of the game,  $\text{Exp}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{IND}}(\lambda)$  outputs the result whether  $b = b^*$ , 1 if the same and 0 if not. We say  $\mathcal{A}$  wins the game if  $\text{Exp}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{IND}}(\lambda)$  outputs 1, and note that the advantage that  $\mathcal{A}$  wins the game is  $\text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{ind}}(\lambda) = |\Pr[(\text{Exp}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{IND}}(\lambda) = 1)] - \frac{1}{2}|$ .

### D. Mutual Authentications

We divide the analysis into two cases: prover impersonation and verifier impersonation. In prover impersonation, the protocol  $\Pi$  accepts  $M_1$  without an honest matching partner. We capture the security between a challenger  $\mathcal{C}$  and adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ . Figure 5 shows the whole game  $\text{Exp}_{\text{puf}, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{MU}}(\lambda)$ . Here, we show the analysis step by step, taking prover impersonation as an example.

**Prover Impersonation:** Now, we consider the above model for analyzing the security of the proposed authentication protocol.

*Proof:* As discussed in Section IV-B and shown in Figure 5, the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  tries to mimic an honest prover by generating  $mk$  and  $M_1$ , without a corresponding matching session and also in a cleanness predicate. We start from the original game.

**MUGame 0:** This is the original game played between  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ . We denote the advantage of this game as  $\text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mugame0}}(\lambda)$ .

**MUGame 1:** In this game,  $\mathcal{A}$  replaces  $mk_p \leftarrow \{0, 1\}^{|mk_p|}$ . First,  $\mathcal{A}$  physically assesses a device before the session starts and reads  $Dev_p, C_i, \Delta_i$  from the NVM. Then it issues  $\text{Launch}(1^\lambda)$  and tries to generate  $M_1$ . It should be noted that  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot access the NVM when the device is running. During the communication,  $\mathcal{A}$  eavesdrops on all the communicated information and stores it. After it collects a polynomial amount of data, it blocks the device's communication and tries to mimic it. For that, the adversary collects associated data  $\{AD\}$ , the tags  $\{Tag\}$  and the ciphertext  $\alpha$ , and invokes  $\mathcal{B}_1$ , which is built to break the security of AEAD algorithm. In the proposed protocol, the session key is updated after every session, and  $\mathcal{A}$  can obtain no advantage from knowing the old key for a new session; even  $\mathcal{B}_1$  breaks the CPA-security of AEAD. The only chance is that  $\mathcal{B}_1$  can produce ciphertext and tag without knowing the correct key, which is bounded by the integrity game. Here, we introduce an abort event when  $AD_{p_i}$  is inconsistent with the tag  $Tag$ . Thus, the advantage after this game is:

$$\text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mugame1}}(\lambda) < \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mugame0}}(\lambda) + \epsilon_1 + \text{Adv}_{\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}_1}^{\text{aeadauth}}(\lambda). \quad (1)$$

**MUGame 2:** In this game,  $\mathcal{A}$  treats  $\Delta_i$  as the XORed responses from two DPUFs. The adversary has already collected enough CRPs from the associated data in **Game 1** and



it issues the adversary  $\mathcal{B}_2$  and forwards the CRPs to it. Then,  $\mathcal{A}$  gets the output  $\widehat{R}, \widehat{SR}$  from  $\mathcal{B}_2$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  invokes  $KDF$  to derive the session key  $\widehat{mk}$  from  $\widehat{SR}$ . Finally, as  $\mathcal{A}$  has the ‘session key’ and associated data  $AD_p$ , it can generate  $\widehat{\alpha}_p, \widehat{Tag}_p$  using  $AEAD.Enc(\cdot)$ . The advantage of this game is:

$$\text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mugame}^2}(\lambda) \leq \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{mugame}^1}(\lambda) + \text{Adv}_{\Pi, \mathcal{A}}^{\text{modpuf}}(\lambda). \quad (2)$$

We can find that if the session key is secure, then  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot break the authentication security in the verifier impersonation game if the  $AEAD$  algorithm is secure, and  $DPUF$  is secure against the modelling attack.

**Verifier Impersonation** Now, we analyse the security of the proposed authentication protocol from the view of a prover. The goal is that the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot start a **clean** session and win the MU without a matching session.

*Proof:* Similar to the discussion in the prover impersonation case, the adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  tries to mimic an honest verifier by generating the session key  $mk$  and  $M_2$ . In the proposed protocol, the prover and verifier store the same information on the device, and the adversary is allowed to have physical access to the NVM when the protocol is not running. The transferred information  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are highly similar, with the exception of the authentication state ( $Auth_{req}, Auth_{ok}$ ) and associated information  $AD$ . Thus, the analysis is similar, and the challenger  $\mathcal{C}$  will abort the game when the tag cannot be verified or the protocol aborts itself as discussed in the protocol. We present the full formal analysis in the Appendix\* for privacy security. An informal discussion is given in Section V-A.

## V. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON

### A. Security Evaluations

This section compares the proposed protocol with five state-of-the-art PUF-based authentication protocols. It can be observed that most of these protocols are based on assumptions that may not stand in practice, e.g., some protocols demand a trusted third-party verifier, a secure NVM, etc. Here, we have listed several vital properties ( $P_1$ - $P_{10}$ ) expected to build a secure IoT ecosystem. Next, we use these properties ( $P_1$ - $P_{10}$ ) to benchmark the performance of our proposed scheme with others, as shown in Table I. Next, we briefly explain how the proposed protocol achieves all the properties  $P_1$ - $P_{10}$ .

$P_1$  (*Privacy and Confidentiality*): In the IoT ecosystem, IoT devices often collect sensitive data (e.g., health, environmental etc.), and privacy is essential to maintain user trust and comply with data protection regulations. On the other hand, in some cases, the privacy of the devices is also vital, especially when we consider passive attackers. In our proposed protocol, the prover and verifier update their ID after every session  $Dev_{id_{i+1}} \leftarrow H(Dev_{id_i} || mk_i)$ . Hence, it will be difficult for a passive adversary to target a specific device. Besides, our proposed protocol ensures a secure session key establishment that helps to achieve the confidentiality of the messages transferred between the prover and verifier and vice versa. On

TABLE I: Comparison of PUF Protocols

| Schemes                | $P_1$ | $P_2$ | $P_3$ | $P_4$ | $P_5$ | $P_6$ | $P_7$ | $P_8$ | $P_9$ | $P_{10}$ |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|
| Yildiz et al. [16]     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | x     | ✓     | x     | x     | ✓     | x        |
| Aysu et al. [5]        | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | x     | ✓     | x     | x     | x        |
| Gope et al. [4]        | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | x     | ✓     | x     | -     | x     | x        |
| Zheng et al. [6]       | x     | ✓     | x     | ✓     | x     | x     | x     | x     | ✓     | x        |
| Ren et al. [3]         | ✓     | ✓     | x     | ✓     | x     | x     | x     | -     | x     | x        |
| Yu et al. [7]          | x     | ✓     | x     | ✓     | x     | x     | x     | ✓     | x     | x        |
| <b>Proposed Scheme</b> | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓     | ✓        |

✓: Yes; X: No;

$P_1$ : **Privacy**  $P_2$ : **Mutual Authentication**  $P_3$ : **Backward Security**  $P_4$ : **Forward Security**  $P_5$ : **No CRP Database Required**  $P_6$ : **No Third Party Required**  $P_7$ : **No Secure NVM Required**  $P_8$ : **Error Correction without Using HD**  $P_9$ : **Supporting Group-based Authentication**  $P_{10}$ : **Group-based Authentication without Group Key**

the contrary, in several state-of-the-art schemes, such as Zheng et al. [6], the IDs for devices  $A$  and  $B$  are sent in plaintext in the air; therefore, the adversary can easily trace the identity of communication parties.

$P_2$  (*Mutual Authentication*): This property is essential to establish trust between the prover and the verifier. In our proposed scheme, the verifier authenticates the prover by verifying the authentication tag  $Tag_{p_i}$ . Similarly, the prover authenticates the verifier using the  $Tag_{v_i}$  authentication tag.

$P_3$  and  $P_4$  (*Backward Security and Forward Security*): Both these properties ensure the security of the whole protocol, even if the secrets ( $mk$  for our proposed protocol) maintained by the entities are compromised by the adversary. In our protocol,  $mk_p$  is derived from the prover’s stable PUF response  $SR_p$ . As we limit the adversary’s access to the DPUF, even if the adversary can learn the value of challenge, which can be obtained from the NVM or computed with  $C_{i+1} \leftarrow H(C_i || mk_{p_i})$ , it still cannot generate the legitimate response of an unaccessible DPUF. Thus, the compromise of the secret  $mk$  will not help the adversary to decipher any previously or subsequent intercepted message. In this way, we achieve forward and backward security.

$P_5$  (*No CRP Database Required*): This property assesses the necessity of a CRP database. Studies by Yildiz et al. [16], Gope et al. [4], Zheng et al. [6], and Ren et al. [3] all require IoT devices to store CRPs, pre-generated during the enrollment phase, in secure NVM. Consequently, the number of supportable sessions depends on the quantity of pre-shared and stored CRPs. In Yildiz et al. [16], strong PUFs generate key entropy sources, claiming a vast key space. However, generating and storing CRPs can burden IoT devices (the server maintains the database in [16]). Our protocol, in contrast, stores the trained model  $DPAN$  instead of CRPs, which can hardly be used to derive any CRP information. In this way, we mitigate risks associated with resource depletion and CRP leakage.

$P_6$  (*No Third Party Required*): This property relates to operating the protocol without a trustworthy third party, enhancing the autonomy of IoT systems and lessening their dependency on external networks or services, which is crucial for reliability and performance. D2D communication scenarios are more

\*Link for the Supplementary Material (Complete Security Proof)

applicable in IoT applications. Our protocol can be highly symmetrical; any enrolled device can perform as the prover or verifier, realizing D2D communication.

Property  $P_7$  (*No Secure NVM Required*): Since many IoT devices are deployed in the open and public places, it makes them vulnerable to invasive attacks. Therefore, any assumption on secure NVM is impractical. A sophisticated adversary could potentially read or modify NVM content, as highlighted in the CK-adversary model [17]. Our protocol ensures security and privacy, even with insecure NVM, as discussed in Section IV. Unlike existing PUF-based protocols, in the proposed protocol, we allow the adversary to read the NVM when the protocol is not in execution. All it can obtain is the  $Dev_{id}, C_i, \Delta_i$ , which can neither be traced nor analysed since the ID changes after every session and the  $C_i, \Delta_i$  are useful only when DPUF can be assessed.

Property  $P_8$  (*Error Correction without Using HD*): Error correction is a common concern regarding authentication and key generation protocols which use PUFs as the entropy source. PUFs are sensitive to environmental effects, e.g., temperature and voltage, which means different responses can be observed at different system operating times. To deal with errors, the existing protocols rely on conventional error correction schemes (such as fuzzy extractor, majority voting, etc.). In contrast, our proposed scheme uses the DPAN model to deal with errors.

$P_9$  and  $P_{10}$  (*Supporting Group Authentication without Group Key*): In many IoT environments, such as home IoT or industrial IoT, sometimes a group of devices must communicate with each other securely. In this regard, considering the resource limitation of IoT devices, we need an efficient group authentication scheme. Unfortunately, existing PUF-based group authentication protocols rely on a group key or store multiple models on each device’s memory. The protocols that rely on the group key are always vulnerable when the group key is compromised [6], [16]. On the other hand, if we want to transform an existing PUF-model-based approach [7] to support a group-based authentication system. In this regard, contemplating a set of  $n$  provers in a group, a designated verifier must retain the  $n - 1$  model (or CRP database) to manage authentication requests from every other member of the group. This is inefficient as most of the IoT devices have limited storage and computational resources. In contrast, the proposed scheme efficiently supports group authentication, requiring minimal additional resources per device. Beyond the DPAN model, it necessitates only a single query of  $Dev_{id}, C, \Delta$  for each device. This demonstrates the proposed protocol’s efficiency in terms of operational time and storage costs, particularly in the context of group authentication.

### B. Computational Cost

In this section, we show the computation cost of the proposed scheme. In this regard, we enumerate all the cryptographic primitives utilized in our proposed protocol, along with their practical construction methodologies. Our protocol incorporates several components, namely: DRAM PUF,

TABLE II: Computation Cost for PhenoAuth

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>Prover</b>   | $2N_{DPUF} + 2N_H + 2N_{AEAD.Enc} + N_{DPAN} + N_{KDF}$ |
| <b>Verifier</b> | $2N_{DPUF} + 2N_H + 2N_{AEAD.Enc} + N_{DPAN} + N_{KDF}$ |

TABLE III: Execution time of the Various Operations Used in the Proposed Scheme

| Operations                  | Prover          | Verifier        |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| H( $\cdot$ )(SHA-256)       | 0.026ms         | 0.026ms         |
| AEAD.Enc( $\cdot$ )         | 0.37ms          | 0.37ms          |
| DPUF                        | 0.12ms          | 0.12ms          |
| DPAN                        | 5.72s           | 5.72s           |
| HKDF( $\cdot$ )(HMAC-based) | 2.9ms           | 2.9ms           |
| <b>Total</b>                | $\approx 5.7$ s | $\approx 5.7$ s |

a Hash function, an AEAD algorithm, an Image generation algorithm, a DPAN model, and a Key Derivation Function. These elements are specifically chosen for their minimal resource consumption, making them suitable for IoT devices. The computational cost of the protocol has been computed by aggregating the operational time of each function multiplied by its respective time cost. We denote the runtime of a function  $f(\cdot)$  as  $N_{f(\cdot)}$ . Hence, the total estimated operational time can be expressed as shown in Table II. Given that our protocol is designed for D2D communication scenarios, the time expenditure for both parties involved is approximately equal to the calculation above. To rigorously analyse the proposed protocol’s performance, particularly the device overhead associated with running the DPAN model needs to be evaluated. For this, we use similar implementation settings as in [12]. The VGG16 feature extractor was modified for classification tasks. We implemented it on a Raspberry Pi 3 Model-B, and it was observed that storing a model for three devices requires approximately 56 MB of memory, similar to the results in [12]. Additionally, the time taken to perform the classification is around 5.72 seconds. We also simulate other functions on a single core 798 MHz CPU with 256MB of RAM, using the JCE library [18] to evaluate the execution time of the cryptographic primitives used in the proposed protocol. We show the results in Table III. Finally, it is essential to highlight that within our proposed scheme, any IoT device has the capability to function as both the prover and verifier, with their computational costs being similar, as illustrated in Table III.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work of Prosanta Gope was supported by The Royal Society Research Grant under grant RGS\R1\221183. Biplab Sikdar is supported by the National Research Foundation, Singapore and Infocomm Media Development Authority under its Future Communications Research Development Programme, under grant FCP-NUS-RG-2022- 019. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the views of the National Research Foundation, Singapore and Infocomm Media Development Authority.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have introduced a novel PUF-based authentication protocol called PhenoAuth for resource-constrained IoT devices using the concept of PUF-Phenotype. PhenoAuth has been designed to facilitate authenticated anonymous communication and ensure the integrity and privacy of IoT devices. One of the notable features of the proposed scheme is to detect any unauthorized attempted modification of the security credentials stored in the device memory. Moreover, the proposed PhenoAuth can also ensure backwards and forward security as long as the DRAM PUF remains uncompromised. One caveat, however, warrants discussion: PhenoAuth's reliance on the DRAM PUF, which is categorized as a weak PUF due to its finite responses (linearly growing with PUF size). Future work into the effectiveness of reducing Phenotype size while maintaining high authentication performance would increase the number of available unique CRPs for use in this protocol. The protocol's sustainability, namely the number of supported sessions, is intrinsically linked to the key space, specifically, the stable portion of the DRAM PUF's response. In summary, PhenoAuth contributes a robust level of security for IoT device authentication. The adoption of PUF-Phenotype instead of traditional error correction algorithms affords the system greater adaptability in managing secret storage and addressing the intrinsic noise present in PUF responses.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. S. Poh, P. Gope, and J. Ning, "Privhome: Privacy-preserving authenticated communication in smart home environment," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1095–1107, 2019.
- [2] H. Lasi, P. Fettke, H.-G. Kemper, T. Feld, and M. Hoffmann, "Industry 4.0," *Business & information systems engineering*, vol. 6, pp. 239–242, 2014.
- [3] X. Ren, J. Cao, M. Ma, H. Li, and Y. Zhang, "A novel puf-based group authentication and data transmission scheme for nb-iot in 3gpp 5g networks," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 3642–3656, 2021.
- [4] P. Gope, J. Lee, and T. Q. Quek, "Lightweight and practical anonymous authentication protocol for rfid systems using physically unclonable functions," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 2831–2843, 2018.
- [5] A. Aysu, E. Gulcan, D. Moriyama, P. Schaumont, and M. Yung, "End-to-end design of a puf-based privacy preserving authentication protocol," in *International Workshop on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*. Springer, Conference Proceedings, pp. 556–576.
- [6] Y. Zheng, W. Liu, C. Gu, and C.-H. Chang, "Puf-based mutual authentication and key exchange protocol for peer-to-peer iot applications," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2022.
- [7] M.-D. Yu, M. Hiller, J. Delvaux, R. Sowell, S. Devadas, and I. Verbauwhede, "A lockdown technique to prevent machine learning on pufs for lightweight authentication," *IEEE Transactions on Multi-Scale Computing Systems*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 146–159, 2016.
- [8] J. Delvaux and I. Verbauwhede, "Attacking puf-based pattern matching key generators via helper data manipulation," in *Topics in Cryptology—CT-RSA 2014: The Cryptographer's Track at the RSA Conference 2014, San Francisco, CA, USA, February 25–28, 2014. Proceedings*. Springer, 2014, pp. 106–131.
- [9] N. Karimian, F. Tehranipoor, N. A. Anagnostopoulos, and W. Yan, "Dramnet: Authentication based on physical unique features of DRAM using deep convolutional neural networks," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1902.09094, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1902.09094>
- [10] F. Najafi, M. Kaveh, D. Martín, and M. Reza Mosavi, "Deep PUF: A Highly Reliable DRAM PUF-Based Authentication for IoT Networks Using Deep Convolutional Neural Networks," *MDPI Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 6, 2021.
- [11] R. Suragani, E. Nazarenko, N. A. Anagnostopoulos, N. Mexis, and E. B. Kavun, "Identification and classification of corrupted puf responses via machine learning," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Hardware Oriented Security and Trust (HOST)*, 2022, pp. 137–140.
- [12] O. Millwood, J. Miskelly, B. Yang, P. Gope, E. B. Kavun, and C. Lin, "Puf-phenotype: A robust and noise-resilient approach to aid group-based authentication with dram-pufs using machine learning," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, 2023.
- [13] F. Tehranipoor, N. Karimian, W. Yan, and J. A. Chandy, "Dram-based intrinsic physically unclonable functions for system-level security and authentication," *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 1085–1097, 2016.
- [14] J. Miskelly and M. O'Neill, "Fast dram pufs on commodity devices," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 3566–3576, 2020.
- [15] D. Dolev and A. Yao, "On the security of public key protocols," *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 198–208, 1983.
- [16] H. Yıldız, M. Cenk, and E. Onur, "Plgakd: A puf-based lightweight group authentication and key distribution protocol," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 5682–5696, 2020.
- [17] R. Canetti and H. Krawczyk, "Analysis of key-exchange protocols and their use for building secure channels," in *International conference on the theory and applications of cryptographic techniques*. Springer, 2001, pp. 453–474.
- [18] Oracle Technology Network, "Java cryptography architecture (jca)," <http://docs.oracle.com/javase/6/docs/technotes/guides/crypto/CryptoSpec.html>, accessed: 2017-04-20.