# Collision-resistant hash-shuffles on the reals<sup>∗</sup>

George Barmpalias and Xiaoyan Zhang†

State Key Lab of Computer Science, Institute of Software Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

January 7, 2025

Abstract. Oneway real functions are effective maps on positive-measure sets of reals that preserve randomness and have no effective probabilistic inversions. We construct a oneway real function which is collision-resistant: the probability of effectively producing distinct reals with the same image is zero, and each real has uncountable inverse image.

## 1 Introduction

Oneway functions underly much of the theory of computational complexity [\[17\]](#page-15-0): they are finite maps that are computationally easy to compute but hard to invert, even probabilistically. Modern cryptographic primitives rely on their existence, an unproven hypothesis which remains a long-standing open problem. Non-injective oneway functions play a special role in public-key cryptography, especially when they are collision-resistant: no algorithm can generate siblings (inputs with the same output) with positive probability in a resource-bounded setting [\[3](#page-14-0)].

Levin [\[15\]](#page-15-1) extended this concept to computable functions on the reals (infinite binary sequences) in the framework of computability theory and algorithmic randomness [\[8](#page-15-2), [19](#page-15-3)]. They are partial computable real functions that preserve randomness in the sense of Martin-L¨of [\[20\]](#page-16-0) and no probabilistic algorithm inverts them with positive probability.

A total computable oneway surjection f was constructed in [\[1](#page-14-1)] via a partial permutation of the bits of the input based on an effective enumeration of the

<sup>∗</sup>Supported by Beijing Natural Science Foundation (IS24013).

<sup>†</sup>Authors are in alphabetical order. We thank L. Levin for several suggestions.

halting problem  $\emptyset'$ . Independently Gács [\[9\]](#page-15-4) constructed a partial computable function which is probabilistically hard to invert in a different setting, where probability is over the domain rather than the range.

Given the importance of collision-resistant oneway functions in computational complexity Levin [\[16](#page-15-5)] asked whether collision-resistant computable oneway real functions exist. Although the oneway function in [\[1](#page-14-1)] is strongly nowhere injective (all inverse images are uncountable) but not *collision*resistant: a Turing machine can produce f-siblings (reals  $x \neq z$  with  $f(x) =$  $f(z)$ ) given any sufficiently algorithmically random oracle. So f-siblings can be effectively produced by a probabilistic machine with positive probability.

Our goal is to establish the existence of a total computable nowhere injective collision-resistant oneway function. The key idea is apply a hash to the partial permutation (shuffle) used in the original oneway function [\[1](#page-14-1)] with a boolean function h and show that (under mild assumptions on h) these hash-shuffles are also oneway and (strongly) nowhere injective. We then define a specific h based on the universal partial computable predicate and show that corresponding hash-shuffle is collision-resistant.

Given that oneway permutations [\[11](#page-15-6), [10](#page-15-7)] are also significant in computational complexity, it is interesting to know whether injective oneway maps on the reals exist. This is not known but by [\[1](#page-14-1), Corollary 3.2] they cannot be total computable. Assuming random-preservation we show that inverting partial computable injections is in general easier than inverting total computable many-to-one maps on the reals.

**Outline.** Oneway functions and collision-resistance are defined in  $\S$ [2,](#page-2-0) where we also show that the *shuffles* of [\[1\]](#page-14-1) are not collision-resistant.

Hash-maps and their corresponding hash-shuffles are defined in §[3](#page-4-0) and shown to be oneway under mild assumptions on their hash-map. This analysis also shows how to obtain oneway functions of different strengths, in terms of the Turing degrees of the oracles that can probabilistically invert them.

A collision-resistant oneway function is obtained in §[4](#page-8-0) by specifying an appropriate hash function based on a universal Turing machine.

We conclude in §[5](#page-12-0) by establishing an upper bound on the hardness of partial computable oneway injections which is lower than the worse-case for total computable oneway many-to-one maps on the reals.

**Notation.** Let N be the set of natural numbers, represented by  $n, m, i, j, t, s$ . Let  $2^{\omega}$  be the set of reals, represented by variables  $x, y, z, v, w$ , and  $2^{<\omega}$  the set of strings which we represent by  $\sigma, \tau, \rho$ . We index the bits  $x(i)$  of x starting from  $i = 0$ . The prefix of x of length n is  $x(0)x(1)\cdots x(n-1)$  and is denoted by x  $\upharpoonright_n$ . Let  $\preceq$ ,  $\prec$  denote the prefix and strict prefix relation between two strings or a string and a real. Similarly  $\succeq$ ,  $\succeq$  denote the suffix relations. Let  $x \oplus y$  denote the real z with  $z(2n) = x(n)$  and  $z(2n+1) = y(n)$ .

The *Cantor space* is  $2^{\omega}$  with the topology generated by the basic open sets

$$
\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket := \{ z \in 2^{\omega} : \sigma \prec z \} \text{ for } \sigma \in 2^{<\omega}.
$$

Let  $\mu$  be the *uniform measure* on  $2^{\omega}$ , determined by  $\mu([\sigma]) = 2^{-|\sigma|}$ . Probability in  $2^{\omega} \times 2^{\omega}$  is reduced to  $2^{\omega}$  via  $(x, y) \mapsto x \oplus y$ . A subset of  $2^{\omega}$  is positive if it has positive  $\mu$ -measure and *null* otherwise. Let

- $\downarrow$ ,  $\uparrow$  denote that the preceding expression is defined or undefined
- $f: \subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  denote that f is a function from a subset of  $2^{\omega}$  to  $2^{\omega}$
- dom(f) be the *domain* of f: the set of  $x \in 2^{\omega}$  where  $f(x)$  is defined.

Turing reducibility  $x \leq_T z$  means that x is computable from z (is zcomputable). Effectively open sets or  $\Sigma_1^0$  classes are of the form  $\bigcup_i [\![ \sigma_i ]\!]$ where  $(\sigma_i)$  is computable. A family  $(V_n)$  is called uniformly  $\Sigma_1^0$  if

$$
V_n = \bigcup_i [\![\sigma_{n,i}]\!]
$$
 where  $(\sigma_{n,i})$  is computable.

A *Martin-Löf test* is a uniformly  $\Sigma_1^0$  sequence  $(V_n)$  such that  $\mu(V_n) \leq 2^{-n}$ . A real x is random if  $x \notin \bigcap_n V_n$  for any Martin-Löf test  $(V_n)$ . Relativization to oracle r defines  $\Sigma_1^0(r)$  classes and r-random reals.

## <span id="page-2-0"></span>2 Oneway functions and collisions

Oneway functions where introduced in [\[6,](#page-15-8) [23](#page-16-1)]. Levin [\[15](#page-15-1)] adapted this notion to effective maps on the reals. Let  $f, g: \subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$ .

We say that  $g$  is a probabilistic inversion of  $f$  if

$$
\mu({y \oplus r : f(g(y \oplus r)) = y}) > 0
$$

and say that f is random-preserving if  $\mu(\text{dom}(f)) > 0$  and

 $f(x)$  is random for each random  $x \in \text{dom}(f)$ .

These are the ingredients of Levin's definition of oneway real functions.

**Definition 2.1** (Levin). We say that  $f \subseteq 2^{\omega} \rightarrow 2^{\omega}$  is oneway if it

- is partial computable and random-preserving
- has no partial computable probabilistic inversion.
- If f has no probabilistic inversion  $g \leq_T w$  it is oneway relative to w.

Remark. Oneway functions can be defined with 'randomness-preserving' replaced with the weaker condition that with positive probability f maps to random reals. It is not hard to show that the two formulations are essentially equivalent, up to effective restrictions  $[2, \text{Lemma } 3.5].$ 

Let  $(a_i)$  be an effective enumeration of  $\emptyset'$  without repetitions.

By [\[1](#page-14-1), Theorem 4.4] the total computable function

<span id="page-3-0"></span>
$$
f: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega} \text{ given by } f(x)(i) := x(a_i)
$$
 (1)

is a oneway surjection. By [\[1](#page-14-1), Theorem 4.9]

 $f^{-1}(y)$  is uncountable for each  $y \in f(2^{\omega})$ .

Unfortunately f lacks the desired property of collision-resistance.

The notion of V'yugin [\[25\]](#page-16-2) of *negligibility* (also see [\[4](#page-14-3)]) is handy.

**Definition 2.2** (V'yugin). A class  $C \subseteq 2^{\omega}$  is negligible if the set of oracles that compute a member of C is null. If the set of oracles z such that  $w \oplus z$ computes a member of C is null we say that C is w-negligible.

Levin [\[16\]](#page-15-5) defined collision-resistance for real functions.

**Definition 2.3** (Levin). Given  $f: \subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  the members of

$$
S_f := \{(x, z) : x \neq z \ \land \ f(x) = f(z)\}
$$

are called f-siblings. We say that f is collision-resistant if  $S_f$  is negligible and *collision-resistant relative to w* if  $S_f$  is w-negligible.

To see that f of [\(1\)](#page-3-0) is not collision-resistant note that it is a *shuffle*: it outputs a permutation of selected bits of the input. The selected positions are the members of  $\emptyset'$  so if we fix  $k \notin \emptyset'$  and let

 $x_k$  be the real z with  $\forall i \ (z(i) = x(i) \iff i \neq k)$ 

then  $x \mapsto (x, x_k)$  is computable and each output is an f-sibling.

Toward collision-resistance we could use another c.e. set  $A$  in place of  $\emptyset'$  in its definition which has thin infinite complement: the oracles that compute an infinite subset of  $N-A$  form a null class. The existence of such A is wellknown (any hypersimple set has this property).

With this modification  $f$  would still fail collision-resistance but would satisfy the weaker property that the oracles computing members of

$$
\{(x, z) : \forall i_0 \ \exists i > i_0, \ x(i) \neq z(i) \ \land \ f(x) = f(z)\}
$$

is null. Restricting f to a positive subset of  $2^{\omega}$  while keeping it partial computable does not make  $f$  collision-resistant. These attempts show that obtaining collision-resistant oneway functions requires a new ingredient.

#### <span id="page-4-0"></span>3 Hash shuffles

Toward achieving collision resistance we first extend the shuffle format [\(1\)](#page-3-0) for oneway functions  $f$  by effectively adding some "noise" to the output of  $f$ by combining it with the output of another function  $h$  which we call a hash.

**Definition 3.1.** If  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  is an infinite c.e. set a computable

$$
h: \{\sigma : |\sigma| \in A\} \to \{0, 1\}
$$

is called an A-hash or simply a hash.

Let  $\otimes$  denote the XOR operator between bits.

**Definition 3.2.** If h is an A-hash the h-shuffle is the

 $f: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  given by  $f(x)(i) := x(a_i) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i})$ 

where  $(a_i)$  is a computable enumeration of A without repetitions.

Under mild assumptions on  $h$  these generalized shuffles preserve the properties of  $(1)$ . An A-hash h is *trivial* if A is computable and

hash-shuffles refer to h-shuffles for non-trivial h.

We show that hash-shuffles  $f$  are oneway and nowhere injective. Our analysis differs from [\[1\]](#page-14-1) and establishes additional properties: (a) there are oneway functions of different strengths according to the choice of the domain A of the hash; (b) no oracle  $w \not\geq_T A$  can invert f on any random  $y \not\geq_T A$ .

#### 3.1 Properties of hash-shuffles

<span id="page-5-2"></span>We establish the basic properties of hash-shuffles.

**Lemma 3.3.** For each c.e. set A and A-hash h the h-shuffle  $f$  is

- total computable, surjective and random-preserving
- strongly nowhere injective:  $f^{-1}(y)$  is uncountable for each y.

**Proof.** Let  $(a_i)$  be a computable enumeration of A without repetitions and f be the h-shuffle. Clearly f is total computable and

<span id="page-5-0"></span>
$$
f(x)(i) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i}) = (x(a_i) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i})) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i}) = x(a_i). \tag{2}
$$

For each  $y$  let  $x$  be given by

<span id="page-5-1"></span>
$$
x(m) := \begin{cases} y(i) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i}) & \text{if } a_i = m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
$$
 (3)

By [\(2\)](#page-5-0) we have  $f(x) = y$  so f is a surjection. By replacing 0 in [\(3\)](#page-5-1) with arbitrary bits we get that  $f^{-1}(y)$  is a perfect set, hence uncountable.

The oracle-use of  $f(x)(n)$  is  $\ell_n := \max\{a_i : i \leq n\} + 1$ . Let

$$
V_{\tau} := \{ \sigma \in 2^{\ell_{|\tau|}} : f(\sigma) \preceq \tau \}
$$

- so  $[[V_\tau]] = f^{-1}([\tau]]$ ). Since  $f(x)(n)$  depends exclusively on  $x(a_n)$ ,  $x \upharpoonright_{a_n}$ :
	- (i)  $\mu(V_{\tau i}) = \mu(V_{\tau})/2$  for  $\tau \in 2^{<\omega}$ ,  $i < 2$ , so  $\mu(V_{\tau}) = 2^{-|\tau|}$
- (ii)  $\lVert \tau \rVert \cap \lVert \rho \rVert = \emptyset \implies \lVert V_{\tau} \rVert \cap \lVert V_{\rho} \rVert = \emptyset$
- (iii)  $V_i$  is finite and  $i \mapsto V_i$  is computable.

Let  $(U_j)$  be a universal Martin-Löf test with prefix-free  $U_i \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$  and

$$
E_j := \bigcup_{\tau \in U_j} V_{\tau}.
$$

By (iii) the sets  $E_j$  are c.e. uniformly in j. By (i), (ii) we get

$$
\mu(E_j) = \sum_{\tau \in U_j} \mu(V_\tau) = \sum_{\tau \in U_j} 2^{-|\tau|} = \mu(U_j) \le 2^{-j}
$$

so  $(E_j)$  is a Martin-Löf test. Since  $f^{-1}(\llbracket U_j \rrbracket) = \llbracket E_j \rrbracket$  if y is not random and  $f(x) = y$  then x is not random. So f is random-preserving.  $\Box$ 

#### <span id="page-6-2"></span>3.2 Inversions of hash-shuffles

We show that hash-shuffles have no computable probabilistic inversions.

**Definition 3.4.** A *prediction* is a partial  $p: \subseteq 2^{\langle \omega \rangle} \to \{0,1\}$  and

• y is p-predictable if  $p(y \restriction_n) \downarrow$  for infinitely many n and

$$
p(y \upharpoonright_n) \downarrow \implies y(n) = p(y \upharpoonright_n)
$$

• y is r-predictable if it is p-predictable for a prediction  $p \leq_T r$ .

<span id="page-6-0"></span>We need a property of random reals regarding predictions.

**Lemma 3.5.** If  $y$  is  $r$ -predictable then  $y$  is not  $r$ -random.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality assume that  $r$  is computable. Assuming that y is p-predictable for a partial computable prediction  $p$  it suffices to construct a Martin-Löf test  $(V_i)$  with  $y \in \bigcap_i [V_i]$ .

Let  $\hat{V}_0, V_0 \subseteq 2^{\langle \omega \rangle}$  be c.e. and prefix-free sets such that

- $\hat{V}_0$  contains a prefix of every *p*-predictable real
- $V_0 := \{ \sigma \; p(\sigma) : \sigma \in \hat{V}_0 \}.$

Then  $\mu(V_0) \leq 1/2$ . Assuming that  $V_i$  has been defined let  $\hat{V}_{i+1}, V_{i+1} \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ be c.e. and prefix-free containing proper extensions of strings in  $V_i$  and

- $\hat{V}_{i+1}$  contains a prefix of every *p*-predictable real
- $V_{i+1} := \{ \sigma \; p(\sigma) : \sigma \in \hat{V}_{i+1} \}.$

Then  $(V_i)$  are uniformly c.e. and  $\mu(V_{i+1}) \leq \mu(\hat{V}_{i+1})/2 \leq \mu(V_i)/2$ .

So  $(V_i)$  is a Martin-Löf test and by definition  $y \in \bigcap_i [V_i]$ .

口

We say that  $\hat{g}$  is a representation of  $g: \subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  if

- $\hat{g}: 2^{<\omega} \to 2^{<\omega}$  is  $\preceq$ -preserving and  $\hat{g}(\lambda) = \lambda$
- $g(x) \downarrow \iff \lim_{\tau \to x} \hat{g}(\tau) = g(x) \iff \lim_{\tau \to x} |\hat{g}(\tau)| = \infty.$

<span id="page-6-1"></span>Every partial computable g has a computable representation  $\hat{g}$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** If h is an A-hash and f is the h-shuffle

(i) f has an A-computable inversion

- (ii) f is not probabilistically invertible on any random  $y \nleq_T A$
- (iii) f is oneway relative to each  $w \not\geq_T A$ .

**Proof.** Let  $(a_i)$  be a computable enumeration of A without repetitions so

$$
f(x)(i) = x(a_i) \otimes h(x \restriction_{a_i})
$$

defines the  $(A, h)$ -shuffle. Define  $d: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  by

$$
\mathsf{d}(y)(n) = \begin{cases} y(i) \otimes h(\mathsf{d}(y) \restriction_n) & \text{if } a_i = n \\ 0 & \text{if } n \notin A \end{cases}
$$

so  $d \leq_T A$ . For each i, n with  $a_i = n$  we have

$$
\mathsf{d}(y)(a_i) = \mathsf{d}(y)(a_i) = y(i) \otimes h(\mathsf{d}(y) \restriction_n)
$$

so for  $x := \mathsf{d}(y)$  and each i we have

$$
f(\mathsf{d}(y))(i) = \mathsf{d}(y)(a_i) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i}) = y(i).
$$
 (4)

This implies  $f(d(y)) = y$  for each y which concludes the proof of (i).

Assuming that g is partial computable,  $y \nleq_T A$  is random and

$$
E := \{ r : f(g(y, r)) = y \}
$$

it remains to show that  $\mu(E) = 0$ . For a contradiction assume otherwise and let  $r \in E$  be such that  $y$  is  $r\text{-random}$  and  $A \not \le_T y \oplus r.$  Let

$$
g_r(z) := g(z,r)
$$
 so  $g_r \leq_T r$  and  $f(g_r(y)) = y$ .

We define a prediction  $p \leq_T r$ . For each i and  $\sigma \in 2^i$  let

$$
p(\sigma) := \begin{cases} \hat{g}_r(\sigma)(a_{i+1}) \otimes h(\hat{g}_r(\sigma) \upharpoonright_{a_{i+1}}) & \text{if } |\hat{g}_r(\sigma)| > a_{i+1} \\ \uparrow & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
$$

where  $\hat{g}_r \leq_T r$  is a representation of  $g_r$ . Since  $f(g_r(y)) = y$ , for all i

$$
y(i + 1) = f(g_r(y))(i + 1) = g_r(y)(a_{i+1}) \otimes h(g_r(y) \upharpoonright_{a_{i+1}})
$$

so if  $p(\sigma)$  halts for  $\sigma \prec y$  then p predicts y correctly on  $\sigma$ .

Since  $y$  is r-random, by Lemma [3.5,](#page-6-0)  $p$  cannot predict  $y$  infinitely often so  $\exists j_0 \ \forall i > j_0, \ p(y \upharpoonright_i) \uparrow$ . Since  $\forall i, \ \hat{g}_r(y \upharpoonright_i) \downarrow$  we get

<span id="page-8-1"></span>
$$
|\hat{g}_r(y \restriction_i)| \le a_{i+1} \quad \text{for all } i > j_0. \tag{5}
$$

Let  $t_n := \min\{t : t > j_0 \land |\hat{g}_r(y|\,|_t)| > n\}.$  We claim that

$$
n \in A \iff n \in \{a_0, \dots, a_{t_n}\}.
$$

Indeed if  $n = a_{i+1}$  for some  $i \geq t_n$  then

$$
|\hat{g}_r(y\restriction_i)| \geq |\hat{g}_r(y\restriction_{t_n})| > n = a_{i+1}
$$

which contradicts [\(5\)](#page-8-1). Since  $(t_n) \leq_T y \oplus r$  we get  $A \leq_T y \oplus r$  which contradicts the choice of r. We conclude that  $\mu(E) = 0$  so (ii) holds.

For (iii) consider the above argument for  $w \not\geq_T A$  and  $g \leq_T w$ . If

<span id="page-8-2"></span>
$$
y \oplus w \not\geq_T A \land y \text{ is } w\text{-random} \tag{6}
$$

the above argument gives  $\mu(E) = 0$ . Since [\(6\)](#page-8-2) holds for almost all y there is no probabilistic inversion  $g \leq_T w$  of f so (iii) holds.  $\Box$ 

<span id="page-8-3"></span>**Corollary 3.7.** If h is an A-hash then the h-shuffle is

- (i) total computable and random-preserving
- (ii) surjective and nowhere injective
- (iii) oneway relative to each  $w \nleq_T A$ .

<span id="page-8-0"></span>**Proof.** By Lemma [3.3](#page-5-2) we get (i), (ii) and by Lemma [3.6](#page-6-1) we get (iii).  $\Box$ 

### 4 Collision-resistance

We exhibit a total computable oneway and nowhere injective collision-resistant  $f: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$ . In §[4.1](#page-9-0) we define a hash h based on the universal enumeration and show that the h-shuffle has the required properties.

In §[4.2](#page-10-0) we obtain hashes from pairs of disjoint c.e. sets and use them to obtain collision-resistant oneway functions of various strengths. Let

$$
(\sigma, n) \mapsto \langle \sigma, n \rangle
$$
 with  $|\sigma| < \langle \sigma, n \rangle$ 

be a computable bijection between  $2<sup>{\omega}</sup> \times \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}$ .

#### <span id="page-9-0"></span>4.1 Hashing with the universal predicate

Fix a universal effective enumeration  $(\varphi_i)$  of all partial computable boolean functions on  $\mathbb N$  so  $\emptyset' = \{i : \varphi_i(i) \downarrow \}$  is the halting set.

The universal-predicate is  $\varphi_i(i)$  and a boolean total extension of it is a boolean function  $\psi$  with  $\forall i \in \emptyset', \psi(i) = \varphi_i(i)$ .

<span id="page-9-1"></span>**Lemma 4.1.** There is a hash-shuffle  $f$  such that every pair of  $f$ -siblings computes a boolean total extension of the universal predicate.

**Proof.** Let  $(\sigma_i, n_i)$  be an effective enumeration of  $2^{<\omega} \times \emptyset'$ .

Let  $A := \{ \langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle : i \in \mathbb{N} \}$  and define the A-hash:

$$
h(\tau) := \begin{cases} \varphi_{n_i}(n_i) & \text{if } \sigma_i \prec \tau \ \land \ \tau \in 2^{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle} \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma_i \nprec \tau \ \land \ \tau \in 2^{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle} \end{cases}
$$

so the *h*-shuffle is given by  $f(x)(i) =: h(x |_{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle}) \otimes x(\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle)$ .

Suppose that x, z are f-siblings and let  $\sigma$  be the least prefix of x which is not a prefix of z. By the definition of f and  $f(x) = f(z)$ 

$$
\forall n \in \emptyset' \ \big( x(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) = z(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) \iff \varphi_n(n) = 0 \big).
$$

Therefore  $\psi(n) := x(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) \otimes z(\langle \sigma, n \rangle)$  is an  $(x \oplus z)$ -computable boolean total extension of  $\varphi_i(i)$ . 口

We say  $\psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  is diagonally non-computable if  $\forall i \in \emptyset', \psi(i) \neq \varphi_i(i)$ . Let

$$
DNC_2 := \{ \psi : \forall n, \ \psi(n) \in \{0,1\} \ \land \ \forall i \in \emptyset', \psi(i) \neq \varphi_i(i) \}
$$

be the set of diagonally non-computable 2-valued functions. By [\[12](#page-15-9)] almost all oracles fail to compute a member of  $DNC_2$ .

<span id="page-9-2"></span>**Theorem 4.2.** There exists a total computable  $f: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  which is

- (i) a random-preserving oneway surjection
- (ii) collision-resistant and nowhere injective

and each random  $w \not\geq_T \emptyset'$ :

- does not compute any probabilistic inversion of f
- does not compute any pair of f-siblings.

**Proof.** Let h be the hash of Lemma [4.1](#page-9-1) and f be the h-shuffle.

By Corollary [3.7](#page-8-3)  $f$  is a random-preserving nowhere injective surjection and no  $w \not\geq_T \emptyset'$  computes any probabilistic inversion of f. By [\[24](#page-16-3), [18](#page-15-10)]:

<span id="page-10-1"></span>if w is random and computes a member of  $\text{DNC}_2$  then  $w \geq_T \emptyset'$ (7)

By the choice of h and [\(7\)](#page-10-1), if  $w \not\geq_T \emptyset'$  is random then it does not compute any pair of f-siblings. In particular f is oneway and collision-resistant.  $\Box$ 

#### <span id="page-10-0"></span>4.2 Hashing by inseparable sets

Given c.e.  $B, C \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  with  $B \cap C = \emptyset$  if  $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and

$$
(M \supseteq B \ \wedge \ M \cap C = \emptyset) \ \vee \ (M \supseteq C \ \wedge \ M \cap B = \emptyset)
$$

<span id="page-10-2"></span>we say that M is  $(B, C)$ -separating.

**Lemma 4.3.** If  $B, C \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  are disjoint c.e. sets there is a hash h such that every pair of siblings for the h-shuffle computes a  $(B, C)$ -separating set.

**Proof.** Let  $(\sigma_i, n_i)$  be an effective enumeration of  $2^{\lt \omega} \times (B \cup C)$  without repetitions and set

$$
A := \{ \langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle : i \in \mathbb{N} \}.
$$

Consider the A-hash given by

$$
h(\tau) := \begin{cases} B(n_i) & \text{if } \sigma_i \preceq \tau \ \land \ \tau \in 2^{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle} \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma_i \nleq \tau \ \land \ \tau \in 2^{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle} \end{cases}
$$

so the *h*-shuffle is given by  $f(x)(i) =: h(x |_{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle}) \otimes x(\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle)$ .

Suppose that x, z are f-siblings and let  $\sigma$  be the least prefix of x which is not a prefix of z. By the definition of f and  $f(x) = f(z)$  for all n

$$
(n \in B \cup C \ \land \ x(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) \neq z(\langle \sigma, n \rangle)) \implies n \in B
$$

$$
(n \in B \cup C \ \land \ x(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) = z(\langle \sigma, n \rangle)) \implies n \in C.
$$

So  $M := \{n : x(n) \neq z(n)\}\$ is  $(B, C)$ -separating and  $M \leq_T x \oplus z$ .

 $\Box$ 

We say that c.e. sets  $B, C$  are *computably inseparable* if there is no computable  $(B, C)$ -separating set. By [\[22,](#page-16-4) Theorem 11.2.5] the sets

$$
H_i := \{ n : \varphi_n(n) = i \}, i < 2
$$

are computably inseparable. Since every  $(H_0, H_1)$ -separating set is in DNC<sub>2</sub>, Lemma [4.3](#page-10-2) gives an alternative proof of Theorem [4.2.](#page-9-2) Let

 $S(B, C)$  denote the class of  $(B, C)$ -separating sets.

Let B, C be c.e. computably inseparable sets so  $S(B, C)$  is a  $\Pi_1^0$  class. By [\[22,](#page-16-4) Proposition 111.6.2] every c.e. Turing degree contains such  $B, C$ .

By [\[12,](#page-15-9) Theorem 5.3]  $S(B, C)$  is a negligible  $\Sigma_3^0(B\cup C)$  class.

We say that w is weakly 2-random relative to A if it is not a member of any  $\Sigma_3^0(A)$  null class. For such reals w we have  $w \not\geq_T A$ .

Theorem 4.4. For each noncomputable c.e. set A there exists a total computable random-preserving nowhere injective  $f: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  such that

- (i) f is a oneway collision-resistant surjection
- (ii) A computes an inversion of  $f$  and a pair of  $f$ -siblings

and if w is weakly 2-random relative to A then

- w does not compute any probabilistic inversion of f
- w does not compute any pair of f-siblings.

**Proof.** By [\[22,](#page-16-4) Proposition 111.6.2] there exist computably inseparable c.e. B, C with  $A \equiv_T B \equiv_T C$ . Since B, C are disjoint  $A \equiv_T B \cup C$  so

<span id="page-11-0"></span>
$$
\mathsf{S}(B,C) \text{ is a null } \Sigma_3^0(A) \text{ class.} \tag{8}
$$

Let h be the  $(B\cup C)$ -hash of Lemma [4.3](#page-10-2) and f be the h-shuffle.

Let  $w \not\geq_T A$  be weakly 2-random relative to A so  $w \not\geq_T A$ .

By Corollary [3.7](#page-8-3)  $f$  is a random-preserving nowhere injective surjection and there is no probabilistic inversion  $g \leq_T w$  of f. By Lemma [3.6](#page-6-1) (i) there is an  $A$ -computable inversion of  $f$ .

By  $(8)$ , the choice of h, w and Lemma [4.3](#page-10-2) w does not compute any pair of  $f$ -siblings. In particular  $f$  is oneway and collision resistant.  $\Box$ 

Corollary 4.5. For each noncomputable c.e. A there exists a total computable nowhere injective surjection  $f: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  such that

- f is oneway and collision-resistant relative to almost all oracles
- f is not oneway and not collision-resistant relative to A.

## <span id="page-12-0"></span>5 Injective oneway functions

Injective oneway maps (in particular permutations) are well-studied in computational complexity and cryptography [\[11](#page-15-6), [10](#page-15-7)]. It is therefore interesting to know if there are injective oneway real functions  $f$ . It is not hard to show that such f cannot be total computable  $[1, Corollary 3.2]$ . We do not know if partial computable oneway injections exist. However we obtain an upper bound on their strength: the oracles that can probabilistically invert them.

An interesting corollary is that, in general, it is easier to invert (even without random oracles) partial computable random-preserving injections than probabilistically invert total oneway real functions.

A tree T is a  $\preceq$ -downward closed subset of  $2^{<\omega}$ . A real x is a path of T if  $x \upharpoonright_n \in T$  for all n. Let  $[T]$  be the class of all paths of T. Recall the notion of representations of functions from §[3.2.](#page-6-2)

<span id="page-12-1"></span>**Lemma 5.1.** Suppose  $f : \subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  is partial computable and

- $P \leq_T w$  is a tree with  $[P] \subseteq \text{dom}(f)$
- the restriction of f to  $[P] \neq \emptyset$  is injective.

There is  $q \leq_T w$  with  $q(f(x)) = x$  for all  $x \in [P]$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\hat{f}$  be a computable representation of f with  $|\hat{f}(\sigma)| \leq |\sigma|$  and

$$
P_s := P \cap 2^{\ell_s} \quad \text{where} \quad \ell_s := \min\{t : \forall \sigma \in P \cap 2^t, \ |\hat{f}(\sigma)| > s\}.
$$

Since  $[P] \subseteq \text{dom}(f), P \leq_T w$  the family  $(P_s)$  is w-computable. Let

$$
B^{\tau} = \{ \sigma \in P_{|\tau|} : \tau \preceq \hat{f}(\sigma) \} \subseteq P
$$

and  $\hat{g}(\tau)$  be the longest common prefix of the strings in  $B^{\tau}$ .

Since  $(P_{|\tau|})$  is a *w*-computable family of finite sets:

- $\hat{g} \leq_T w$  is a representation of some  $g: \subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$
- $q(y) \downarrow \iff \lim_{\tau \prec y} |\hat{q}(\tau)| = \infty.$

Assuming  $x \in [P]$ ,  $f(x) = y$  we show  $g(y) = x$ . If  $g(y) \downarrow$  then

$$
x \in \bigcap_{\tau \prec y} [B^\tau] \subseteq \bigcap_{\tau \prec y} [\hat{g}(\tau)] = \{g(y)\}
$$

so  $g(y) = x$ . It remains to show that  $g(y) \downarrow$ .

For a contradiction suppose that  $\forall s, \hat{g}(y | s) \preceq \sigma$  for some  $\sigma$  so

$$
\forall i < 2 \ \forall \tau \prec y: \ \|B^{\tau}\| \cap \|\sigma i\| \neq \emptyset.
$$

Since each  $[[B^{\tau}]]$  is closed, by compactness there exist  $x_0, x_1$  with

$$
x_i \in \bigcap_{\tau \prec y} \left( \llbracket B^\tau \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \sigma i \rrbracket \right) \subseteq [P].
$$

Since  $[P] \subseteq \text{dom}(f)$  for each  $i < 2$  we get  $f(x_i) \downarrow$  and

$$
\forall \tau \prec y \ \ \forall \theta \prec x_i: \ \lbrack\!\lbrack\widehat{f}(\theta)\rbrack\!\rbrack \cap \lbrack\!\lbrack\tau\rbrack\!\rbrack \neq \emptyset
$$

which implies  $f(x_i) = y$ . Since  $x_i \in \llbracket \sigma_i \rrbracket$  we have  $x_0 \neq x_1$  which contradicts the hypothesis that  $f$  is injective on  $[P]$ .  $\Box$ 

A function  $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  is almost everywhere dominating (a.e.d.) if it dominates all  $q : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ ,  $q \leq z$  for almost all oracles z. By [\[7](#page-15-11)] there exists such  $p \leq_T \emptyset'$ . Oracles that compute an a.e.d. function are called a.e.d.

This notion can be characterized in terms of relative randomness.

<span id="page-13-0"></span>Let  $x \leq_{LR} y$  denote that every y-random is x-random.

**Lemma 5.2** ([\[13](#page-15-12), [14](#page-15-13)]). The following are equivalent for each  $x$ :

- $(i)$  x is a.e. dominating
- (*ii*)  $\emptyset' \leq_{LR} x$
- (iii) every positive  $\Pi_2^0$  class has a positive  $\Pi_1^0(x)$  subclass.

Note that if  $f: \subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  is partial computable:

(a) the domain of  $f$  is a  $\Pi_2^0$  class (e.g. [\[2,](#page-14-2) Proposition 2.1])

(b) if  $P \subseteq \text{dom}(f)$  is  $\Pi_1^0(w)$  then  $f(P) \in \Pi_1^0(w)$  (e.g. [\[2](#page-14-2), Proposition 2.2]).

By [\[21](#page-16-5), Theorem 4.3] if x is z-random and  $y \leq_T x$  is random then y is z-random. So if  $f$  is random-preserving it preserves z-randomness for all z.

<span id="page-13-1"></span>Partial computable injections are not oneway relative to any  $w \geq_{LR} \emptyset'$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** Let  $f: \subseteq 2^{\omega} \rightarrow 2^{\omega}$  be a partial computable injection and  $w \geq_{LR} \emptyset'$  then f is not oneway relative to w.

**Proof.** Assuming that  $f$  is random-preserving by the hypothesis:

- dom(f) is a positive  $\Pi_2^0$  class by (a)
- there is a positive  $\Pi_1^0(w)$  class  $P \subseteq \text{dom}(f)$  by Lemma [5.2.](#page-13-0)
- $f(P) \in \Pi_1^0(w)$  by (b).

By Lemma [5.1](#page-12-1) let  $g \leq_T w$  be such that  $\forall x \in P$ ,  $g(f(x)) = x$ . Then

- $P$  has a  $w'$ -random member  $x$  because it is positive
- $f(x)$  is w'-random because f is random-preserving.

Since  $f(P)$  is  $\Pi_1^0(w)$  class with a w'-random member:

$$
\mu(f(P)) > 0
$$
 and  $\forall y \in f(P), f(g(y)) = y$ 

 $\Box$ 

so  $f$  is not oneway relative to  $w$ .

By §[3.2](#page-6-2) there is a total computable  $f: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$  which is oneway relative to any  $w \not\geq_T \emptyset'$ . Conversely it is not hard to show that no total computable f is oneway relative to  $\emptyset'$ , see [\[2](#page-14-2), Theorem 2.9].

On the other hand by [\[5](#page-14-4)] there are  $w \not\geq_T \emptyset'$  with  $w \geq_{LR} \emptyset'$ . So assuming randomness-preservation, by Theorem [5.3](#page-13-1) partial computable injections are in general easier to invert than total computable many-to-one functions.

### References

- <span id="page-14-1"></span>[1] G. Barmpalias and X. Zhang. Computable one-way functions on the reals. Arxiv 2406.15817, 2024.
- <span id="page-14-2"></span>[2] G. Barmpalias, M. Wang, and X. Zhang. Complexity of inversion of functions on the reals. Arxiv 2412.07592, 2024.
- <span id="page-14-0"></span>[3] M. Bellare, S. Halevi, A. Sahai, and S. Vadhan. Many-to-one trapdoor functions and their relation to public-key cryptosystems. In H. Krawczyk, editor, Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO '98, pages 283–298, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1998. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- <span id="page-14-3"></span>[4] L. Bienvenu and C. P. Porter. Deep  $\Pi_1^0$  classes. *Bull. Symb. Log.*, 22 (2):249–286, 2016.
- <span id="page-14-4"></span>[5] P. Cholak, N. Greenberg, and J. S. Miller. Uniform almost everywhere domination. J. Symb. Log., 71(3):1057–1072, 2006.
- <span id="page-15-8"></span>[6] W. Diffie and M. Hellman. New directions in cryptography. IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, 22(6):644–654, 1976.
- <span id="page-15-11"></span>[7] N. Dobrinen and S. Simpson. Almost everywhere domination. J. Symbolic Logic, 69(3):914–922, 2004.
- <span id="page-15-2"></span>[8] R. G. Downey and D. Hirschfeldt. Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity. Springer, 2010.
- <span id="page-15-4"></span>[9] P. Gács. A (partially) computable map over infinite sequences can be 'one-way'. Circulated draft, May 8, 2024.
- <span id="page-15-7"></span>[10] L. A. Hemaspaandra and J. Rothe. Characterizing the existence of one-way permutations. Theor. Comput. Sci., 244(1):257–261, 2000.
- <span id="page-15-6"></span>[11] R. Impagliazzo and S. Rudich. Limits on the provable consequences of one-way permutations. In Proc. 21st Annu. ACM Symp. Theory Comput., STOC'89, page 44–61, New York, NY, USA, 1989. Assoc. Comput. Mach.
- <span id="page-15-9"></span>[12] C. G. Jockusch and R. I. Soare.  $\Pi_1^0$  classes and degrees of theories. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 173:33–56, 1972.
- <span id="page-15-12"></span>[13] B. Kjos-Hanssen. Low for random reals and positive-measure domination. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 135(11):3703–3709, 2007.
- <span id="page-15-13"></span>[14] B. Kjos-Hanssen, J. S. Miller, and R. Solomon. Lowness notions, measure and domination. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 85(3):869–888, 2012.
- <span id="page-15-1"></span>[15] L. Levin. Email correspondence, December 2023. with G. Barmpalias, and P. Gács, A. Lewis-Pye, A. Shen.
- <span id="page-15-5"></span>[16] L. Levin. Email correspondence, July 2024. with G. Barmpalias, and P. Gács, A. Lewis-Pye, A. Shen.
- <span id="page-15-0"></span>[17] L. A. Levin. The tale of one-way functions. Probl. Inf. Transm., 39(1): 92–103, 2003.
- <span id="page-15-10"></span>[18] L. A. Levin. Forbidden information. J. ACM, 60(2):9:1–9:9, 2013.
- <span id="page-15-3"></span>[19] M. Li and P. M. Vitányi. An introduction to Kolmogorov complexity and its applications. Graduate Texts in Computer Science. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 2008.
- <span id="page-16-0"></span>[20] P. Martin-Löf. The definition of random sequences. Inf. Comput., 9: 602–619, 1966.
- <span id="page-16-5"></span>[21] J. S. Miller and L. Yu. On initial segment complexity and degrees of randomness. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 360(6):3193–3210, 2008.
- <span id="page-16-4"></span>[22] P. G. Odifreddi. Classical recursion theory. Vol. I. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989.
- <span id="page-16-1"></span>[23] G. B. Purdy. A high security log-in procedure. Commun. ACM, 17(8): 442–445, 1974.
- <span id="page-16-3"></span>[24] F. Stephan. Martin-Löf random and PA-complete sets. In Logic Colloquium '02, volume 27 of Lect. Notes Log., pages 342–348. Assoc. Symbol. Logic, La Jolla, CA, 2006.
- <span id="page-16-2"></span>[25] V. V. V'yugin. Algebra of invariant properties of binary sequences. Probl. Peredachi Inf., 18(2):83–100, 1982.