Collision-resistant hash-shuffles on the reals^{*}

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]: 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].

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

A total computable oneway surjection f was constructed in [1] via a partial permutation of the bits of the input based on an effective enumeration of the

^{*}Supported by Beijing Natural Science Foundation (IS24013).

 $^{^\}dagger \mathrm{Authors}$ are in alphabetical order. We thank L. Levin for several suggestions.

halting problem \emptyset' . Independently Gács [9] 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] asked whether collision-resistant computable oneway real functions exist. Although the oneway function in [1] is strongly nowhere injective (all inverse images are uncountable) but not collisionresistant: 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] 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, 10] 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, 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 $\S2$, where we also show that the *shuffles* of [1] are not collision-resistant.

Hash-maps and their corresponding *hash-shuffles* are defined in §3 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 by specifying an appropriate hash function based on a universal Turing machine.

We conclude in §5 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 \mathbb{N} be the set of natural numbers, represented by n, m, i, j, t, s. Let 2^{ω} be the set of reals, represented by variables x, y, z, v, w, and $2^{<\omega}$ the set of strings which we represent by σ, τ, ρ . 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, \succ 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^{ω} 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 μ be the uniform measure on 2^{ω} , determined by $\mu(\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket) = 2^{-|\sigma|}$. Probability in $2^{\omega} \times 2^{\omega}$ is reduced to 2^{ω} via $(x, y) \mapsto x \oplus y$. A subset of 2^{ω} is positive if it has positive μ -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^{ω} to 2^{ω}
- 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 *z*computable). Effectively open sets or Σ_1^0 classes are of the form $\bigcup_i \llbracket \sigma_i \rrbracket$ where (σ_i) is computable. A family (V_n) is called uniformly Σ_1^0 if

$$V_n = \bigcup_i \llbracket \sigma_{n,i} \rrbracket$$
 where $(\sigma_{n,i})$ is computable.

A Martin-Löf test is a uniformly Σ_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.

2 Oneway functions and collisions

Oneway functions where introduced in [6, 23]. Levin [15] 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 $\mu(\mathsf{dom}(f)) > 0$ and

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

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

Definition 2.1 (Levin). We say that $f \subseteq : 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$ 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, Lemma 3.5].

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

By [1, Theorem 4.4] the total computable function

$$f: 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$$
 given by $f(x)(i) := x(a_i)$ (1)

is a oneway surjection. By [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] of *negligibility* (also see [4]) 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] 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) 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 $\mathbb{N} - A$ form a null class. The existence of such A is well-known (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^{ω} while keeping it partial computable does not make f collision-resistant. These attempts show that obtaining collision-resistant oneway functions requires a new ingredient.

3 Hash shuffles

Toward achieving collision resistance we first extend the shuffle format (1) 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] 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 $w \geq_T A$ can invert f on any random $y \geq_T A$.

3.1 Properties of hash-shuffles

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

$$f(x)(i) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i}) = (x(a_i) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i})) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i}) = x(a_i).$$
(2)

For each y let x be given by

$$x(m) := \begin{cases} y(i) \otimes h(x \upharpoonright_{a_i}) & \text{if } a_i = m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(3)

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

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

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

so $\llbracket V_{\tau} \rrbracket = f^{-1}(\llbracket \tau \rrbracket)$. 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) $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \rho \rrbracket = \emptyset \implies \llbracket V_{\tau} \rrbracket \cap \llbracket V_{\rho} \rrbracket = \emptyset$
- (iii) V_i is finite and $i \mapsto V_i$ is computable.

Let (U_i) 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.

3.2 Inversions of hash-shuffles

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

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

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

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

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

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 $\hat{V}_0, V_0 \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ 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 $\mu(V_{i+1}) \le \mu(\hat{V}_{i+1})/2 \le \mu(V_i)/2$.

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

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 $\hat{g}(\lambda) = \lambda$
- $g(x) \downarrow \iff \lim_{\tau \prec x} \hat{g}(\tau) = g(x) \iff \lim_{\tau \prec x} |\hat{g}(\tau)| = \infty.$

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 $y \geq_T A$
- (iii) f is oneway relative to each $w \geq_T A$.

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 $\mathsf{d} : 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$ by

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

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

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

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

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

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

Assuming that g is partial computable, $y \not\geq_T A$ 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-random and $A \not\leq_T y \oplus r$. Let

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

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

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

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 σ .

Since y is r-random, by Lemma 3.5, 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

$$|\hat{g}_r(y \mid i)| \le a_{i+1} \quad \text{for all } i > j_0.$$
(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 $i \ge t_n$ then

$$|\hat{g}_r(y \restriction_i)| \ge |\hat{g}_r(y \restriction_t)| > n = a_{i+1}$$

which contradicts (5). 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 $w \geq_T A$ and $g \leq_T w$. If

$$y \oplus w \geq_T A \land y \text{ is } w\text{-random}$$
(6)

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

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 $w \geq_T A$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.3 we get (i), (ii) and by Lemma 3.6 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 we define a hash h based on the universal enumeration and show that the h-shuffle has the required properties.

In §4.2 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 $2^{<\omega} \times \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}$.

4.1 Hashing with the universal predicate

Fix a universal effective enumeration (φ_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 ψ with $\forall i \in \emptyset', \ \psi(i) = \varphi_i(i)$.

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 (σ_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:

$$h(\tau) := \begin{cases} \varphi_{n_i}(n_i) & \text{if } \sigma_i \prec \tau \ \land \ \tau \in 2^{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle} \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma_i \not\prec \tau \ \land \ \tau \in 2^{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle} \end{cases}$$

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

Suppose that x, z are f-siblings and let σ 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 $\varphi_i(i)$.

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

$$\mathsf{DNC}_2 := \{ \psi : \forall n, \ \psi(n) \in \{0,1\} \land \forall i \in \emptyset', \psi(i) \neq \varphi_i(i) \}$$

be the set of diagonally non-computable 2-valued functions. By [12] almost all oracles fail to compute a member of DNC_2 .

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 $w \geq_T \emptyset'$:

- 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 and f be the h-shuffle.

By Corollary 3.7 f is a random-preserving nowhere injective surjection and no $w \geq_T \emptyset'$ computes any probabilistic inversion of f. By [24, 18]:

if w is random and computes a member of DNC_2 then $w \ge_T \emptyset'$ (7)

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

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

$$(M \supseteq B \land M \cap C = \emptyset) \lor (M \supseteq C \land M \cap B = \emptyset)$$

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 (σ_i, n_i) be an effective enumeration of $2^{<\omega} \times (B \cup C)$ without repetitions and set

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

Consider the A-hash given by

$$h(\tau) := \begin{cases} B(n_i) & \text{if } \sigma_i \preceq \tau \ \land \ \tau \in 2^{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle} \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma_i \not\preceq \tau \ \land \ \tau \in 2^{\langle \sigma_i, n_i \rangle} \end{cases}$$

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

Suppose that x, z are f-siblings and let σ 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

$$\begin{pmatrix} n \in B \cup C \land x(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) \neq z(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) \end{pmatrix} \implies n \in B \\ \left(n \in B \cup C \land x(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) = z(\langle \sigma, n \rangle) \right) \implies n \in C.$$

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

We say that c.e. sets B, C are *computably inseparable* if there is no computable (B, C)-separating set. By [22, 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_2 , Lemma 4.3 gives an alternative proof of Theorem 4.2. 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 Π_1^0 class. By [22, Proposition 111.6.2] every c.e. Turing degree contains such B, C.

By [12, 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 $w \geq_T A$.

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, 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

$$\mathsf{S}(B,C)$$
 is a null $\Sigma_3^0(A)$ class. (8)

Let h be the $(B \cup C)$ -hash of Lemma 4.3 and f be the h-shuffle.

Let $w \geq_T A$ be weakly 2-random relative to A so $w \geq_T A$.

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

By (8), the choice of h, w and Lemma 4.3 w does not compute any pair of f-siblings. In particular f is oneway and collision resistant.

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.

5 Injective oneway functions

Injective oneway maps (in particular permutations) are well-studied in computational complexity and cryptography [11, 10]. 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 \leq -downward closed subset of $2^{\leq \omega}$. 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.

Lemma 5.1. Suppose $f :\subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$ is partial computable and

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

There is $g \leq_T w$ with g(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 $[P] \subseteq \mathsf{dom}(f), P \leq_T w$ 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^{τ} .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Since each $\llbracket B^{\tau} \rrbracket$ 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 $[P] \subseteq \mathsf{dom}(f)$ for each i < 2 we get $f(x_i) \downarrow$ and

$$\forall \tau \prec y \;\; \forall \theta \prec x_i : \; \llbracket \hat{f}(\theta) \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \neq \emptyset$$

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

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] 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.

Let $x \leq_{LR} y$ denote that every y-random is x-random.

Lemma 5.2 ([13, 14]). The following are equivalent for each x:

- (i) x is a.e. dominating
- (*ii*) $\emptyset' \leq_{LR} x$
- (iii) every positive Π_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 Π_2^0 class (e.g. [2, Proposition 2.1])

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

By [21, 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.

Partial computable injections are not oneway relative to any $w \ge_{LR} \emptyset'$.

Theorem 5.3. Let $f :\subseteq 2^{\omega} \to 2^{\omega}$ 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 Π_2^0 class by (a)
- there is a positive $\Pi_1^0(w)$ class $P \subseteq \mathsf{dom}(f)$ by Lemma 5.2.
- $f(P) \in \Pi_1^0(w)$ by (b).

By Lemma 5.1 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 $\forall y \in f(P), f(g(y)) = y$

so f is not oneway relative to w.

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

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

References

- G. Barmpalias and X. Zhang. Computable one-way functions on the reals. Arxiv 2406.15817, 2024.
- [2] G. Barmpalias, M. Wang, and X. Zhang. Complexity of inversion of functions on the reals. Arxiv 2412.07592, 2024.
- 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.
- [4] L. Bienvenu and C. P. Porter. Deep Π_1^0 classes. Bull. Symb. Log., 22 (2):249–286, 2016.
- [5] P. Cholak, N. Greenberg, and J. S. Miller. Uniform almost everywhere domination. J. Symb. Log., 71(3):1057–1072, 2006.

- [6] W. Diffie and M. Hellman. New directions in cryptography. IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, 22(6):644–654, 1976.
- [7] N. Dobrinen and S. Simpson. Almost everywhere domination. J. Symbolic Logic, 69(3):914–922, 2004.
- [8] R. G. Downey and D. Hirschfeldt. Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity. Springer, 2010.
- [9] P. Gács. A (partially) computable map over infinite sequences can be 'one-way'. Circulated draft, May 8, 2024.
- [10] L. A. Hemaspaandra and J. Rothe. Characterizing the existence of one-way permutations. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 244(1):257–261, 2000.
- [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.
- [12] C. G. Jockusch and R. I. Soare. Π⁰₁ classes and degrees of theories. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 173:33–56, 1972.
- [13] B. Kjos-Hanssen. Low for random reals and positive-measure domination. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 135(11):3703–3709, 2007.
- [14] B. Kjos-Hanssen, J. S. Miller, and R. Solomon. Lowness notions, measure and domination. J. Lond. Math. Soc., 85(3):869–888, 2012.
- [15] L. Levin. Email correspondence, December 2023. with G. Barmpalias, and P. Gács, A. Lewis-Pye, A. Shen.
- [16] L. Levin. Email correspondence, July 2024. with G. Barmpalias, and P. Gács, A. Lewis-Pye, A. Shen.
- [17] L. A. Levin. The tale of one-way functions. Probl. Inf. Transm., 39(1): 92–103, 2003.
- [18] L. A. Levin. Forbidden information. J. ACM, 60(2):9:1–9:9, 2013.
- [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.

- [20] P. Martin-Löf. The definition of random sequences. *Inf. Comput.*, 9: 602–619, 1966.
- [21] J. S. Miller and L. Yu. On initial segment complexity and degrees of randomness. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360(6):3193–3210, 2008.
- [22] P. G. Odifreddi. Classical recursion theory. Vol. I. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989.
- [23] G. B. Purdy. A high security log-in procedure. Commun. ACM, 17(8): 442–445, 1974.
- [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.
- [25] V. V. V'yugin. Algebra of invariant properties of binary sequences. Probl. Peredachi Inf., 18(2):83–100, 1982.