

**THINKING INSIDE THE BOX: PRIVACY AGAINST STRONGER
ADVERSARIES**

by

ELDON CHUNG

(B.Comp. (Hons.), National University of Singapore)

**A THESIS SUBMITTED
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY CENTRE FOR
QUANTUM TECHNOLOGIES
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE**

2024

Thesis Advisors:

Associate Professor Divesh Aggarwal, Thesis Advisor
Dr. Maciej Obremski, Co-Advisor

Examiners:

Professor Marco Tomamichel
Assistant Professor Prashant Nalini Vasudevan
Associate Professor Stefano Tessaro, University of Washington

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is my original work and it has been written by me in its entirety. I have duly acknowledged all the sources of information which have been used in the thesis.

This thesis has also not been submitted for any degree in any university previously.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eldon Chung', written over a horizontal line.

Eldon Chung

02-Feb-2024

Acknowledgments

I am very fortunate to have been advised by Prof. Divesh Aggarwal. He has been one of the most supportive professors I have ever met and has always had the best interest of his students in mind. He has always let me explore any questions I express an interest in and encouraged me to work on it to the best of my ability. I am also very grateful to have been co-advised by Prof. Maciej Obremski, for the amount of care, time, and effort, he has put into mentoring me, and for the endless list of interesting questions he has given me to work on. Both of them have been amazing guiding figures and I would not have chosen anyone else to be in their place if given a choice. I hope to carry their lessons with me and eventually make changes in the world that they can be proud of.

I would also like to thank the many amazing people I have had an opportunity to collaborate and discuss ideas with. I would like to thank Zeyong Li and Grace Tan for all the times we have collaborated and worked together. The two of them have always spared time to work on my ideas with me, no matter how silly they turn out to be. While some of the ideas may not have panned out, it was always a fun learning experience. I would also like to thank Prof. Siyao Guo and Prof. Kasper Green Larsen for hosting me at NYU Shanghai and Aarhus University respectively. I would like to thank Prof. Noah Stephens-Davidowitz, and Prof. Alexander Golovnev, for opportunity they gave me to collaborate with them, and for all the fun and unforgettable moments while doing so. I would like to thank the people I've shared an office with in the last few years. Teodora Baluta, Kareem Shehata, Bo Wang, and Rui Shi Chew, for all the random chats and discussions we have had.

Finally and very importantly, I want to thank Duong Pham, and Grace Tan for being my emotional support all these years. I'm not sure I would have been able to make it this far without the two of you.

Contents

Acknowledgments	i
1 Summary	v
1.1 Papers	v
2 Introduction	1
2.1 Side-Channel Attacks	2
2.2 Cryptographic Primitives	4
2.2.1 Randomness in Cryptography, and Extractors	4
2.2.2 Secret Sharing, and its extensions	6
2.2.3 Privacy Amplification	7
2.2.4 One-Way Functions, the Random Oracle Model	7
2.3 The General Questions and Our Results	8
2.3.1 Randomness for Leakage-Resilient and Non-Malleable Cryptography	9
2.3.2 Explicit (Collision-Resistant/Non-malleable) Extractors	11
2.3.3 Stronger Bounds for Immunizing Random Backdoored Oracles	14
2.4 Preliminaries	17
2.4.1 Notation	17
2.4.2 Probability Theory	17
2.4.3 Min-entropy	18
2.4.4 Extractors	19
3 Randomness Requirements for Leakage-Resilient and Non-malleable Secret Sharing	21
3.1 Our Results	25

3.1.1	Leakage-Resilient 2-out-of-2 Secret Sharing Requires Extractable Randomness.	26
3.1.2	Random-less Reductions for Secret Sharing.	29
3.2	Related Work	30
3.3	Preliminaries	30
3.3.1	Secret Sharing	32
3.3.2	Amplifying Leakage-Resilience	33
3.4	Technical Overview	34
3.4.1	Leakage-Resilient Secret Sharing Requires Extractable Randomness.	34
3.4.2	Open Questions	37
3.4.3	Amplifying Leakage-Resilience	37
3.5	Randomness Extraction from Leakage-Resilient Secret Sharing Schemes	38
3.5.1	The Main Result	45
3.5.2	Efficient Leakage-Resilient Secret Sharing Requires Efficiently Extractable Randomness	45
3.5.3	An Extension to the Setting of Computational Security	48
3.6	Random-less Reductions for Secret Sharing	49
3.6.1	Distribution Designs from Partial Steiner Systems	52
4	Non-malleable Extraction, and Privacy Amplification	54
4.1	Chapter Organisation and Our Results	60
4.2	Preliminaries	62
4.2.1	Rejection Sampling for Extractors	62
4.2.2	Extractors	65
4.2.3	Privacy Amplification	67
4.3	Technical overview	69
4.3.1	Collision Resistant Extractors	69
4.4	General Compiler for Seeded Extractors	70
4.4.1	Our Non-Malleable Extractor Compiler	71
4.5	A Generic Construction of a Two-Source Non-Malleable Extractor	75
4.6	Collision resistance of Extractors	82
4.6.1	Generic Collision Resistance for Seeded Extractors	82

4.6.2	Collision Resistance of the Raz Extractor	84
4.7	A Fully Non-malleable Seeded Extractor	88
4.8	A Two-Source Non-malleable Extractor	90
4.9	A Two-Source Non-malleable Extractor With Rate $\frac{1}{2}$	92
4.10	Privacy Amplification against Memory Tampering Active Adversaries.	94
5	Stronger 3SUM-Indexing Lower Bounds	100
5.0.1	Our Results	104
5.1	Preliminaries	107
5.1.1	Data Structures	107
5.1.2	3SUM-Indexing	107
5.2	Reduction from Reachability Oracles in the Butterfly Graph	108
5.3	Reduction from Lopsided Set Disjointness	113
5.4	Lower Bound for Non-Adaptive Data Structures	116
5.5	Bit Probe Lower Bound for 3SUM-Indexing	118
6	Conclusion and Future Work	122
6.1	Conclusion	122
6.2	Future Work	122
6.2.1	Randomness Requirements	122
6.2.2	Non-malleable Extractors	122
6.2.3	Collision Resistant Extractors	123
6.2.4	Pre-processing Adversaries	124
	Bibliography	125

Chapter 1

Summary

In this thesis, we study extensions of statistical cryptographic primitives. In particular we study leakage-resilient secret sharing, non-malleable extractors, and immunized ideal one-way functions. The thesis is divided into three main chapters.

In the first chapter, we show that 2-out-of-2 leakage resilient (and also non-malleable) secret sharing requires randomness sources that are also extractable. This rules out the possibility of using min-entropic sources.

In the second, we introduce collision-resistant seeded extractors and show that any seeded extractor can be made collision resistant at a small overhead in seed length. We then use it to give a two-source non-malleable extractor with entropy rate 0.81 in one source and polylogarithmic in the other. The non-malleable extractor lead to the first statistical privacy amplification protocol against memory tampering adversaries.

In the final chapter, we study the hardness of the data structure variant of the 3SUM problem which is motivated by a recent construction to immunise random oracles against pre-processing adversaries. We give worst-case data structure hardness for the 3SUM problem matching known barriers in data structures for adaptive adversaries. We also give a slightly stronger lower bound in the case of non-adaptivity. Lastly, we give a novel result in the bit-probe setting.

1.1 Papers

Chapter 3 is based on **On Secret Sharing, Randomness, and Random-less Reductions for Secret Sharing** which was accepted at TCC 2022 [3].

Chapter 4 is based on **Extractors: Low Entropy Requirements Colliding With Non-Malleability**, which was accepted at CRYPTO 2023 [2].

CHAPTER 1. SUMMARY

Chapter 5 is based on **Stronger 3SUM-Indexing Lower Bounds**, which was accepted at SODA 2023 [60].

Chapter 2

Introduction

Cryptography is the study of protocols between multiple parties that provide some notion of privacy against adversaries. Notable examples include:

1. (**Multi Party Computation, MPC**) Multiple parties coming together to compute a function f on their joint inputs without revealing their inputs to each other.
2. (**Privacy Amplification, PA**) Communicating over an eavesdropped channel, to “strengthen” a weakly random secret key into a fully uniform one.
3. (**Signature Schemes**) Appending “signatures” to messages that can later be verified using some previously distributed information.

Typically, such protocols are built using vital components. From our examples listed above:

1. MPC can be built using a primitive called *secret sharing* [63, 94].
2. PA can be built using a primitive called a *randomness extractor* [73].
3. Signature Schemes can be built using a primitive called *one-way functions* [153].

However, the privacy guarantee of the above protocols are against adversaries whose access is only limited to the public communication between the parties or information disclosed by the protocols themselves. Such adversaries are sometimes referred to as “black-box” or “out-of-the-box” adversaries¹. Real life attacks on a

¹Here, the box refers to the device that is performing the computation.

cryptographic protocol or primitive need not be restricted in such ways. Adversaries might have: (1) Access to the “box” to gain additional information about the inputs or computations (which we refer to as *leakage*), or (2) the ability to tamper with the cryptographic primitives, or similarly, (3) the ability to inject “back-doors”. We can think of all three of such adversaries as having some additional access to or influence on certain parts *inside the box*, which potentially circumvent the security guarantees of the protocols that are run. As they say, a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, similarly, a cryptographic protocol is only as strong as its weakest primitive. We will study strengthening these primitives.

We first give background on some of these types of attacks (referred to as side-channel attacks), and then on certain cryptographic primitives that we will be studying.

2.1 Side-Channel Attacks

A *side-channel attack* refers to any attack that is based on either obtaining additional information or influencing the execution of a protocol rather than being based on the design of the protocol itself [167]. In the real world, these attacks range from monitoring CPU cache accesses to leak information about the secret key [20, 19, 170], flipping targeted bits by running other programs on the same device [119], or even introducing backdoors into specific implementations (see the infamous Dual_EC_DRBG PRG algorithm standardised in NIST that was suspected to have a backdoor for the NSA [142]). We will study three types of cryptography that address these types of attacks.

Leakage Resilience Cryptography. Leakage Resilience Cryptography is the study of cryptography against adversaries that obtain additional information, such as computational states or secret keys or inputs. Such attacks have been implemented in real life [109, 138, 121] to obtain portions of secret keys or other information about other running processes on the same machine.

Generally speaking, adversaries are modelled as having additional information via some arbitrary *leakage function* f (we will focus on the case that f is computationally unbounded), and we refer to the output of f as the *leakage*. Relevant works in

this area include designing symmetric key protocols in the face of bounded-length leakage of secret keys [88, 69] and public key protocols in the face of arbitrary length leakage of secret keys for [14].

For a general survey on leakage-resilient cryptography, one can refer to [91].

Non-malleable Cryptography. Non-malleable Cryptography on the other hand, is the study of cryptography where the adversary takes on a more active role by tampering with the execution of the protocol. For example, by tweaking inputs, or changing states of computation, or overwriting certain information. There are several works introducing non-malleability for various cryptographic primitives [83, 92, 95].

One particular application of interest is again the task of having two parties Alice and Bob who have to transform an agreed-upon weak secret (entropic but not necessarily uniform) into a fully uniform one – except this time the adversary is not only allowed to eavesdrop, but to actively tamper with the communications between the two parties, or corrupt some of the internal state of one of the two parties. Prior works on this include [79, 131, 53].

Backdoors, and Immunisation. The last model of adversaries that we will study is the type of adversary that can covertly influence protocols. For example, they could influence protocols into using backdoored one-way functions for which they have an advantage in. This is part of a larger study called *Kleptography*. One way of creating primitives or protocols that resist such attacks is via *immunization* which take established constructions and strengthening them against this type of adversary.

Along these lines, the works in [71, 26, 154, 98, 102] study immunizing one-way functions and pseudorandom generators in various settings. The setting introduced by [102] (which is the one we will focus on) is where the adversary who introduces the backdoor also has unbounded computational power create an advice string (of bounded length) which they subsequently have bounded query access to.

2.2 Cryptographic Primitives

2.2.1 Randomness in Cryptography, and Extractors

Algorithms for cryptography (and otherwise) are commonly designed while assuming access to uniformly random and independent bits as a random source. However, it is not clear that random sources used by computers in real life (such as voltage measurements or timings between hardware events) can provide such a guarantee. This is an issue because without this assumption, we might lose the security guarantees that the algorithms provide.

One way to mitigate this is to use a *randomness extractor* (denoted by Ext), which is an algorithm that is applied on random sources X to output (statistically close to) m uniformly random bits which can then be used by any algorithm. In the context of cryptography, the statistical distance ε (or total variation distance) needs to be negligible² in the security parameter of the protocol. We also note that extractors have interesting relationships to other constructs, such as Ramsey graphs [61], expander graphs [107], hash functions [164], and more.

Ideally, we should consider constructing extractors for one of the most general class of random sources — the class of random sources with *min-entropy*. A random source X has min-entropy k (denoted by $H_\infty(X) \geq k$) if $\min_x \{-\log(\Pr[X = x])\} \geq k$. We refer to the quantity $\frac{k}{n}$ as the *min-entropy rate*. Unfortunately, this class of randomness sources is not extractable, even if we only consider n -bit sources X with min-entropy $n - 1$ — consider any proposed extractor Ext' that outputs even a nearly uniform single bit for this class, we can give a source X' with $H_\infty(X') \geq n - 1$ such that $Ext'(X')$ is the nearly constant distribution.

To mitigate this, one natural relaxation is to instead provide the extractor with additional random sources. We first consider the case where extractors additionally have access to an independent and uniform source. For ease of exposition, when a random variable X is supported on the set of n bits $\{0, 1\}^n$ and has min-entropy k is called an (n, k) -source.

²A function is called *negligible* if it is smaller than any inverse polynomial.

(Seeded Extractors) Seeded extractors $Ext : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ are algorithms that take in a (n, k) -sources X , and additionally a uniform d -bit source called the *seed* S .

Via the probabilistic argument, we know that seeded extractors exist for arbitrary values of min-entropy k , with output length $m = k + d - 2 \log(1/\varepsilon) - O(1)$, and seed length $d = \log(n - k) + 2 \log(1/\varepsilon) + O(1)$, with total variation distance ε . Thus, the goal is to find explicit (or equivalently, efficient in n) constructions that meet such parameters. The best known explicit constructions are due to [151] and [107], which work for all values of k , and are either: (1) optimal in entropy loss, but have a slightly larger seed requirement or (2) optimal in seed requirement.

(Two-source Extractors) A generalisation of seeded extractors are *two-source* extractors $Ext : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$, where the second source need not be uniform, but also has min-entropy. Again, the probabilistic argument shows that two-source extractors exist for where the min-entropy requirement in both sources are $\log(n) + 2 \log(1/\varepsilon) + O(1)$. However, the best known constructions fall short of meeting this requirement *in general*.

For example, Raz's extractor in [150] requires one of the sources to have min-entropy at least $\frac{n}{2}$, and $\Omega(\log(n))$ min-entropy in the other source. The extractors by Chattopadhyay and Zuckerman [55], and by Li in [132] match the entropy requirement but only achieve inverse polynomial distance to uniform, which is insufficient for applications in cryptography.

(Non-malleable Extractors) An extension of extractors that will be of particular interest are extractors that are *non-malleable*, (denoted by $nmext$). These are extractors that take in two sources X , and Y , and provide the extraction guarantee $nmext(X, Y) \approx_\varepsilon U_m$, even when $nmext(f(X), g(Y))$ is revealed, where f and g can be thought of as functions that tamper with the random sources X and Y respectively. *Seeded non-malleable extractors* fulfil this guarantee when X has min-entropy, Y is fully uniform, f is the identity function, and g is any fixed-point-free function. *Seedless non-malleable extractors* (which are two-source extractors) are when at least one of f or g are fixed-point-free, and it suffices that X and Y have min-entropy.

Seeded non-malleable extractors were first introduced and shown to exist (via the probabilistic argument) in [79] for (n, k) sources, with seed length $\log(n - k + 1) + 2 \log(1/\varepsilon) + O(1)$, and output length $\frac{k}{2} - \frac{3}{2} \log(1/\varepsilon) - \log(d) - O(1)$. Since then a line of works [133, 134, 52] resulted in seeded non-malleable extractors min-entropy $k = \Omega(\log^2(n/\varepsilon))$, output length $\Omega(k)$, and seed length $O(\log^2(n/\varepsilon))$.

As for seedless non-malleable extractors, Li in [134] gives one such that the entropy requirement is $c \cdot n$ in both n -bit sources with exponentially small statistical distance to uniform. The exact value for c for the entropy requirement is not known, though it is very close to 1.

2.2.2 Secret Sharing, and its extensions

Informally, secret sharing [37, 156] is a cryptographic primitive that enables parties (using some sharing algorithm **Share**) to “split” a secret m into a few “shares” $\text{Sh}_1, \text{Sh}_2, \dots, \text{Sh}_n$, where the recovery of the secret is possible only when specific subsets of shares are used (as inputs for the recovery algorithm **Rec**). A special case of this is *threshold* secret sharing, where recovery is possible when the amount of shares provided is above some threshold t , and impossible otherwise. We also refer to this as t -out-of- n secret sharing.

Secret sharing has also been used as a primitive for secure multi-party computation [63, 56, 31], generalised oblivious transfer [157], threshold cryptography [68], and zero knowledge PCPs [110].

The “standard” construction for secret sharing is given by Shamir in [156], and provides the guarantee that any adversary that holds less than t shares is unable to distinguish between the original secret m_0 and some other secret $m_1 \neq m_0$.

(Leakage Resilient Secret Sharing) Introduced in [33], *local leakage-resilient secret sharing* (LRSS) studies secret sharing for *local leakage*. In addition to the usual guarantees, LRSS is furthermore secure against an adversary that is able to use leakage functions f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n to obtain leakage information $f_1(\text{Sh}_1), \dots, f_n(\text{Sh}_n)$ from each share, where the total output length of each function f_i is bounded.

2.2.3 Privacy Amplification

Introduced by Bennett, Brassard, and Robert in [35], Privacy Amplification is the cryptographic protocol that allows Alice and Bob to create a fully uniform bit string, using a common shared weakly random string. The challenge here is that Alice and Bob have to communicate via a compromised channel on which the adversary is allowed to eavesdrop on or tamper with messages (that are sent on the channel). This protocol itself has been used as a building block for other applications in cryptography, such as quantum bit commitment [44], and quantum oblivious transfer [34].

The parameters of interest are: (1) The number of rounds of communication needed, (2) the entropy-rate required of the initially shared string, (3) the length of the resulting output string, (4) the total variation distance of the output string from the truly uniform distribution. Letting k be the initial amount of min-entropy in the shared string, and letting m be the length of the output, we can define the loss to be $k - m$. The goal is to minimize loss, minimize the entropy rate required, whilst maximising output length, and keeping the total variation distance of the output string exponentially close to uniform.

Recently, Li in [133] gave a two-round protocol for arbitrary min-entropy, where the loss is linear in the amount of initial min-entropy, and the total variation distance is exponentially small in the amount of min-entropy. However, their protocol still relies on access to additional uniform randomness.

2.2.4 One-Way Functions, the Random Oracle Model

One-way functions are efficient functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that for any efficient adversary Adv , where Adv has access to f , the probability that $Adv^f(f(x))$ (where x is chosen uniformly at random) finds an x' such that $f(x') = f(x)$ is negligible in n .

They have been used as primitives to create other objects, such as pseudo-random generators [113], or bit-commitment schemes [108].

Impagliazzo and Rudich in [114] studied using a black-box fully random permutation R to model the ideal one-way function. Indeed, a line of works [114, 171] show the hardness of inverting random oracles for efficient adversaries.

(One-Way Functions against Preprocessing Adversaries) However, one-way functions in practice (such as the SHA family of algorithms are not keyed), and instead are fixed in advance. This allows adversaries to pre-process information about the functions which can subsequently be used during the inversion process. For example, consider an adversary that builds a massive inversion table for SHA256 which can then be used to arbitrarily invert it on any point.

In light of this, [66] consider a model of adversary Adv where it additionally has access to an advice string of length S which may depend on the random oracle R , and is allowed to make T oracle accesses into the advice string, and random oracle, and they show an upper bound on the probability (as a function of S and T) that an adversary is able to invert a random query. In particular they show the probability Adv inverts $f(x)$ for a uniformly random x is at most $O(\frac{T(S+n)}{N})$, with $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, and $N = 2^n$.

Guo et al. in [102] refer to the aforementioned type of adversary as a *preprocessing adversary* and observe that any privacy guarantees are lost when the length of the advice S exceeds N (basically having a large inversion table). In light of this, they introduce *one-way functions in the random oracle model against S preprocessing*. Which are functions $f = A^R$ (A is an efficient algorithm with oracle access to R) which are efficiently computable given oracle access to some random oracle R .

Interestingly, they further link the existence of such one-way functions (against adversaries that use S space, and T oracle accesses) to the average case hardness of data structure problems, and show that both notions are *equivalent*.

Remark 1 (Informal, [102]). *There exists a data structure problem that is hard on average where the query distribution can be efficiently generated if and only if there exists a one-way function against adversaries that use S space, and T oracle accesses in the random oracle model.*

2.3 The General Questions and Our Results

In this thesis, the overarching focus is on studying cryptographic primitives against adversaries that, in way or another, are “in-the-box”. We view these results as steps in bridging the gap between theoretical cryptography, and modelling real-

world attacks. Some of our results are tight, in the sense that any improvement upon them will necessitate longstanding breakthroughs in either circuit complexity or two-source extractors, or data structure lower bounds.

2.3.1 Randomness for Leakage-Resilient and Non-Malleable Cryptography

As mentioned, it is impossible to construct good extractors from min-entropic sources. However, this does not mean that it is impossible to use such sources for specific applications. Indeed, in the case of algorithms, Zuckerman in [172] showed that min-entropic sources suffice for BPP algorithms. On the other hand, for information-theoretic secret key encryption, Bosley and Dodis in [41] showed that encrypting an m -bit long message using an n -bit random source (with $m > \log(n)$) implies a deterministic extractor for that source that outputs nearly m bits, thus concluding that encryption requires randomness sources which are extractable (i.e. min-entropic sources do not suffice).

The question remains open on other cryptographic primitives in terms of their randomness requirements. Given how one can build 2-out-of-2 secret sharing from secret key encryption, a natural extension to the Bosley and Dodis result is to also ask whether the same can be said out of 2-out-of-2 secret sharing. Indeed, this is an open question posed by Bosley and Dodis in [41].

(Our Contribution) We consider two extensions of secret sharing.

We show that 2-out-of-2 *leakage resilient secret sharing* (LRSS) requires access to a randomness sources that are extractable. Moreover, if the 2-out-of-2 LRSS is efficient, then efficient extractors exist. Let (Sh, Rec) be a secret sharing scheme, and let \mathcal{Y} be a class of random sources used by Sh . And informally, let it be that:

1. Any adversary that has only 1 share has at distinguishing advantage at most ε_1 .
2. Any adversary that obtains leakages $f(\text{Sh}_1)$, and $g(\text{Sh}_2)$ has distinguishing advantage at most ε_2 .

Then we have the following:

Theorem 2 (Formally stated in 34). *Let $(\mathit{Sh}, \mathit{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ be an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages (with 1 bit of leakage). Then, either:*

1. *The scheme uses exponentially (in b) random bits;*
2. *There exists an extractor that extracts m bits with statistical distance δ from uniform. Here, δ on the order of $2^{-\Omega(b)}$, and $\text{poly}(\varepsilon_2)$. And m is on the order of b , and $\log(1/\varepsilon_2)$.*

Furthermore, if Sh is an efficient algorithm, the extractor can be given as a family of $\text{poly}(b)$ -sized circuits.

The above result can also be extended to 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing with essentially the same parameters.

Informally, this shows that either one must use either: (1) use superpolynomially long random sources, or (2) use extractable sources to share secrets that are leakage-resilient or non-malleable.

Furthermore, we note that we can combine our results here with a certain combinatorial object called *distribution designs*. Distribution designs are combinatorial objects that “distribute” a set of n items $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into a collection of m sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_m$. Then, consider any set of indices of sets $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [m]$, the union of the sets indexed by \mathcal{I} yields $[n]$ if and only if $|\mathcal{I}|$ is at least some threshold t .

To see how this would be useful, consider for example an n -out-of- n secret sharing scheme (i.e. all n shares need to be present for the secret to be recovered). Then we could use a distribution design to distribute the n shares that were created (without randomness) into m sets. Note here that each set will be our new share, and the secret can only be recovered if and only if at least t of these new shares are present (since they recover all n of the original shares).

Hence, we obtain the following corollaries:

Corollary 3 (Informal). *If every $(t = 2, n, \varepsilon)$ -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness requires a (δ, m) -extractable class of randomness sources, then so does every (t', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness whenever $n \leq \binom{n'}{t'-1}$. Moreover, this is the best reduction possible with $t = 2$.*

Corollary 4 (Informal). *If every (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness requires a (δ, m) -extractable class of randomness sources, then so does every $(t' = n', n', \varepsilon)$ -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness whenever $n' \geq \binom{n}{t-1}$. Moreover, this is the best reduction possible with $t' = n'$.*

We note that while this falls short of showing it for 2-out-of-2 secret sharing, we cover a wide class of secret sharing schemes (for both leakage resilient and non-malleable). Furthermore, we can view our above two corollaries as philosophically showing that the “true randomness” requirement for 2-out-of-2 secret sharing requires showing it for t -out-of- n schemes with a broad parameter regime (in n and t). This also means that to show a negative result (for 2-out-of-2), one can also show use a non-extractable source for one of these choices of parameters.

2.3.2 Explicit (Collision-Resistant/Non-malleable) Extractors

Collision resistance is a common concept for cryptographic hash functions, which can be used to create other primitives like one-time signature schemes. Formally, a collision resistant hash function h is defined as follows:

Definition 5 (Collision Resistance Hash Function (CRHF)). *A hash function family \mathcal{H} of hash functions $h : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ (with $m < n$) is collision-resistant if for all efficient (i.e. randomised, polynomial time in n) adversaries A :*

$$\Pr_{A, h \leftarrow \mathcal{H}} [(x_0, x_1) \leftarrow A(h) : x_0 \neq x_1, h(x_0) = h(x_1)] \leq \varepsilon(n),$$

where $\varepsilon(n)$ is negligible in n .

We further note an interesting connection between collision resistance and randomness extraction.

A universal hash family is a family of hash functions \mathcal{H} , each of which of the form $h : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that for all $x \neq y$:

$$\Pr_{h \leftarrow \mathcal{H}} [h(x) = h(y)] \leq 2^{-m}.$$

I.e. the probability of two inputs colliding is small. The leftover hash lemma states that \mathcal{H} is actually a good seeded extractor.

Theorem 6. *Let X be a random variable such that $H_\infty(X) \geq k$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, letting \mathcal{H} be a universal hash family that outputs $m = k - 2 \log(1/\varepsilon)$ bits, then the extractor $\text{ext}(X, S)$ that uses S as a uniform seed source to sample $h \leftarrow \mathcal{H}$ is such that $\text{ext}(X, S) \approx_\varepsilon U_m$.*

(Our Contribution) We introduce a novel and analogous extension for seeded extractors called *collision resistant* extractors.

Definition 7 (Collision Resistant Extractors). *An extractor $\text{crExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is δ -collision resistant if for all fixed-point-free functions f , we have that $\Pr[\text{crExt}(X, S) = \text{crExt}(f(X), S)] \leq \delta$, where the probability is taken over the randomness of S and X .*

Such an object can be seen as having parallels to collision resistant hash functions in cryptography. We also note that such extractors are somewhat weaker than non-malleable extractors since we only require that the outputs differ, but potentially still arbitrarily correlated.

We show that any efficient seeded extractor $\text{ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ can be made collision resistant with the cost of a slightly longer seed $d' = d + O(\log(1/\delta))$.

Theorem 8. *Let $\text{ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ be a strong seeded extractor. Then there exists a strong seeded extractor $\text{crExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^{d+z} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ with collision probability δ and $z = O(\log(1/\delta) \log^2(\log(1/\delta)) \log(1/\varepsilon))$, where δ is the collision probability, and ε is the statistical distance of the output of the extractor from the distribution that is uniform over m bits.*

Turning our attention to existing extractors with this new notion, we also show that Raz's (two-source) extractor is collision resistant.

Theorem 9 (Informal). *There exists a two-source extractor $r\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$, $r\text{Ext}(X_1, X_2) \approx_\varepsilon U_m$, with: (1) The first source X_1 on n_1 bits that has min-entropy $\Omega(\log(n_1))$, (2) second source X_2 on n_2 has min-entropy $(\frac{1}{2} + \delta)n_2$, and (3) the statistical distance ε is at most $2^{-\frac{3m}{2}}$ with (4) collision probability 2^{-m+1} , and (5) $m = \Omega(k_1, n_2)$.*

Collision resistant extractors are not just interesting in isolation, we further use both of our results in collision resistant extractors to give better two-source non-malleable extractors with lower entropy requirements.

As mentioned, the prior best 2-source non-malleable extractor is by Li in [134]. Namely, their extractor requires the min-entropy rate in both sources nearly 1 (i.e. both n -bit sources have min-entropy nearly n). This is less than ideal for applications like privacy amplification, where the entropy requirement of the extractor translates to the initial min-entropy of the shared weakly random string between Alice and Bob.

Combining our extractors with the standard technique of alternating extraction, we obtain breakthrough the following breakthrough result:

Theorem 10. *There exists a two-source non-malleable extractor $2nmext : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$, $2nmext(X_1, X_2) \approx_\varepsilon U_m$, with: (1) The first source X_1 on n_1 bits that has min-entropy $\Omega(\log(n_1))$, (2) second second source X_2 on n_2 has min-entropy $(\frac{4}{5} + \delta)n_2$, and (3) the statistical distance ε is at most $2^{-\frac{3m}{2}}$ with (4) collision probability 2^{-m+1} , and (5) has an output length $m = \Omega(k_1, n_2)$.*

We note that this nearly matches the current best known two-source extractor (without non-malleability) with negligible error. (Raz’s extractor uses $> 0.5n$ entropy in one source, and $poly(\log(n))$ entropy in the other). Thus, there cannot be asymptotic improvements to our construction without further improvements in two-source extractors as well (since non-malleable two-source extractors are stronger objects than two-source extractors). We further note, that doing so constitutes a significant breakthrough on a nearly two decade old problem.

One other aspect we will point out, is that, as noted by Eshan Chattopadhyay in his survey [50], prior to our work, the other best known method for constructing t -source seed non-malleable extractors is via two objects known as *advice correlation breakers*, and *advice generators*.³ We view our work as taking a completely different approach and breaking away from the norm. As such, we hope this novel construction and approach will also be of independent interest.

³Note the subtle difference here that the extractors being considered only have their seed tampered

(Applications) Let us turn our attention to privacy amplification. Known constructions of privacy amplification either additionally require access to a fully random source, or to a nearly full min-entropy source. Furthermore, prior protocols limit the adversary’s ability to only tamper messages that were sent. We use our two-source non-malleable extractor to give a 6-round protocol with lower entropy requirements, and where the adversary is additionally allowed to arbitrarily tamper the internal memory of one of the two parties (we refer to such adversaries as *memory-tampering* adversaries, introduced by Aggarwal et al in [11]). In fact, we would like to point out that this construction directly addresses a remark made at the end of Section 3 in [11]: “We currently do not know explicit constructions of non-malleable two-source extractors with parameters matching those required for Corollary 2, although it is known that there exist such (in-efficient) extractors with significantly better parameters [CGGL20]. Thus, we leave this connection between non-malleable two-source extractors and privacy amplification with a very strong adversary as an interesting motivation for further study of such extractors with lower min-entropy requirement in the information-theoretic setting.”.

Theorem 11 (Informal). *There is a 6-round protocol where the shared random string W has min-entropy $0.81n$, Alice and Bob additionally have independent sources of randomness that have min-entropy $0.001n$, and the protocol outputs $0.8n$ bits. Furthermore, the privacy guarantee holds even against memory-tampering adversaries.*

2.3.3 Stronger Bounds for Immunizing Random Backdoored Oracles

Finally, we end our overview on immunizing backdoors, and mention some interesting links to the study of static data structure lower bounds.

As mentioned, prior work models one-way functions in the ideal way — as a random oracle R , and pre-processing adversaries are allowed T query accesses into R , and into an S -length advice string $s(R)$. And in this setting, lower bounds are known. Namely, [66] show the probability of inverting a uniformly and randomly chosen x is at most $O\left(\frac{T(S+N)}{N}\right)$, with $N = 2^n$.

However, this begs the following questions:

1. If R is compromised in some way, can we still build one-way functions?
2. Can we use R in some smarter way to bootstrap ourselves to build a better one-way function?

Guo et al in [102] proposed a way to immunize the random oracle R against pre-processing adversaries by relying on the hardness of k SUM. In other words, they created one-way functions that were immune against adversaries that were allowed to pre-process information about R . They also proved their construction in two steps: (1) By showing a direct equivalence between immunizing R against pre-processing adversaries and the existence of corresponding hard-on-average data structure problems, and (2) giving data structure lower bounds for 3SUM.

Definition 12 (Data Structure Solution). *A data structure solution is a pair of algorithms A_1, A_2 where:*

1. A_1 on some input $x \in \mathcal{X}$ outputs S memory cells, each of w bits (as a data structure).
2. A_2 on some input $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, obtains at most T memory cells (each of at most w bits) from the data structure, outputs an answer.

We say the solution is adaptive, if A_2 's memory accesses may depend on the answers to its previous accesses. We call it non-adaptive otherwise.

Typically \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Q} are clear from context.

We begin by sketching their construction. Let $(G, +)$ be an abelian group, and let $R : [N] \rightarrow G$ be a random oracle. Then, the proposed one-way function $f = A^R$ is given as: $f(x) = R(x_1) + R(x_2)$, where the input distribution is uniform over all strings $x = x_1, x_2$, where $x_1 \neq x_2$.

They then show that inverting a random output of this function reduces to solving the following data structure problem:

Definition 13 (3SUM-Indexing). *On input $\vec{Z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in G^n$, $A_1(Z)$ outputs at most S memory cells of w bits, such that for any $q \in G$, $A_2(q)$ accesses at most T memory cells (by probing them) to output either: (i, j) such that $z_i + z_j = q$ or \perp if no such pair exists.*

However, their lower bound has a few shortcomings: (1) They only rule out *non-adaptive* algorithms. That is to say, the algorithm's access pattern into the memory cells can only depend on its input and not subsequent contents of the memory cells it accesses. This rules out common data structures such as hash tables, or search trees and so on. Which, in turn, rules out security against adversaries that are can make adaptive queries. (2) They require the group size $|G|$ to be at least quadratic in the number of input elements n .

In this thesis, we give various stronger data structure lower bounds for variants of 3SUM, thereby giving stronger guarantees to their construction. Of the three lower bounds, two of them match the barrier for existing data structure lower bounds. And any further advancement necessitates a breakthrough in circuit lower bound results. The last lower bound, is a novel result in the special case of bit-probes.

(Our Contribution) Our first contribution improves upon their result in a both ways: (1) Our lower bound now holds for adaptive data structures, and (2) the lower bound holds for group sizes nearly linear in the number of input elements.

Theorem 14. *Any data structure answering 3SUM-Indexing queries for input sets of size n for abelian groups $([m], + \bmod m)$, with $m = O(n^{1+\delta})$ and $(\{0, 1\}^{(1+\delta)\log(n)+O(1)}, \oplus)$ for a constant $\delta > 0$, using S cells of $w = \Omega(\lg n)$ bits must have query time $T = \Omega(\log n / \log(Sw/n))$.*

Next, we also give a slightly stronger result for non-adaptive data structures (when $|G|$ is superpolynomial in n).

Theorem 15. *Any non-adaptive cell probe data structure answering 3SUM-Indexing queries for input sets of size n for an abelian group G of size $\omega(n^2)$, using S cells of $w = \Omega(\lg n)$ bits must have query time $T = \Omega(\min\{\log |G| / \log(Sw/n), n/w\})$.*

Both the above results are tight: A stronger lower bound for T would imply circuit lower bounds.

Lastly, we given a novel result for the special case of $w = 1$ (i.e. bit-probe data structures), and show tight results in this regime.

Theorem 16. *Any non-adaptive data structure for 3SUM-Indexing such that $T = 2$ and $w = 1$ requires $S = \Omega(|G|)$ for an abelian group $(G, +)$.*

This result is the first of its kind, and we view this as a first step in potentially improving lower bounds for the regime of constant T and/or constant w . We also note that the core techniques used for this result may be general enough to be used for other well known data structure problems.

2.4 Preliminaries

In this section we will cover commonly used theorems and lemmas. We will defer more chapter-specific background to a different preliminary section in each chapter.

2.4.1 Notation

We usually denote sets by uppercase calligraphic letters like \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , and write $[n]$ for the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Random variables are denoted by uppercase letters such as X , Y , and Z , and we write U_m for the uniform distribution over $\{0, 1\}^m$. For any set \mathcal{S} , we denote by $U_{\mathcal{S}}$ the uniform distribution over the set \mathcal{S} .

For any random variable X , we denote the support of X by $\mathbf{supp}(X)$. Also, for any random variable X and event E , we denote by $X|_E$ the random variable X' such that for all $x \in \mathbf{supp}(X)$, $\Pr[X' = x] = \Pr[X = x|E]$.

Given a vector $x \in \mathcal{S}^n$ and set $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$, we define $x_{\mathcal{T}} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{T}}$. We denote the \mathbb{F}_2 -inner product between vectors $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ by $\langle x, y \rangle$. All logarithms in are taken with respect to base 2.

2.4.2 Probability Theory

In this section, we introduce basic notions from probability theory that will be useful throughout this work.

Definition 17. The *statistical distance between random variables X and Y* over a set \mathcal{X} , denoted by $\Delta(X, Y)$, is defined as

$$\Delta(X, Y) = \max_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X}} |\Pr[X \in \mathcal{S}] - \Pr[Y \in \mathcal{S}]| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\Pr[X = x] - \Pr[Y = x]|.$$

Moreover, we say that X and Y are ε -close, denoted by $X \approx_{\varepsilon} Y$, if $\Delta(X, Y) \leq \varepsilon$, and ε -far if this does not hold.

The following lemma is a version of the well-known XOR lemma (see [100] for a detailed exposition of these types of results).

Lemma 18 (XOR Lemma). *If X and Y are distributions supported on $\{0, 1\}^t$ such that*

$$\langle a, X \rangle \approx_\varepsilon \langle a, Y \rangle$$

for all non-zero vectors $a \in \{0, 1\}^t$, then

$$X \approx_{\varepsilon'} Y$$

for $\varepsilon' = 2^{t/2}\varepsilon$.

For any random variables A, B, C , and event E , we shorthand $\Delta(A, C; B, C)$ by $\Delta(A; B|C)$, and $\Delta(A|_E; B|_E)$ by $\Delta(A; B|E)$ i.e.,

$$\Delta(A; B|C) = \Delta(A, C; B, C) ,$$

and

$$\Delta(A; B|E) = \Delta(A|_E; B|_E) .$$

The following lemma is immediate from the definitions and triangle inequality.

Lemma 19. *Let A, B, C be random variables such that $A, B \in S$ and $\text{supp}(C) = \mathcal{T}$ with $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_1 \cap \mathcal{T}_2 = \emptyset$. Then:*

1. $\Delta(A; B|C) \leq \sum_{c \in \mathcal{T}} \Pr[C = c] \Delta(A; B|C = c)$
2. $\Delta(A; B|C) \leq \Pr[C \in \mathcal{T}_1] \Delta(A; B|C \in \mathcal{T}_1) + \Pr[C \in \mathcal{T}_2] \Delta(A; B|C \in \mathcal{T}_2)$

Lemma 20 (Corollary of Lemma 18, where $Y = U_m$). *Let X_1, \dots, X_m be binary random variables and for any non-empty $\tau \subseteq [m]$, $|\Pr[\bigoplus_{i \in \tau} X_i = 0] - \frac{1}{2}| \leq \varepsilon$, then $\Delta(X_1, \dots, X_m; U_m) \leq \varepsilon \cdot 2^{\frac{m}{2}}$.*

2.4.3 Min-entropy

Definition 21 (Min-entropy). *Given a distribution X over \mathcal{X} , the min-entropy of X , denoted by $H_\infty(X)$, is defined as*

$$H_\infty(X) = -\log\left(\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \Pr[X = x]\right).$$

Definition 22 (Average min-entropy). *Given distributions X and Z , the average min-entropy of X given Z , denoted by $\tilde{H}_\infty(X|Z)$, is defined as*

$$\tilde{H}_\infty(X|Z) = -\log\left(\mathbb{E}_{z \leftarrow Z}\left[\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \Pr[X = x|Z = z]\right]\right).$$

Lemma 23 ([76]). *Given arbitrary distributions X and Z such that $|\text{supp}(Z)| \leq 2^\lambda$, we have*

$$\tilde{H}_\infty(X|Z) \geq H_\infty(X, Z) - \lambda \geq H_\infty(X) - \lambda.$$

Lemma 24 ([140]). *For arbitrary distributions X and Z , it holds that*

$$\Pr_{z \leftarrow Z}[H_\infty(X|Z = z) \geq \tilde{H}_\infty(X|Z) - s] \geq 1 - 2^{-s}.$$

Definition 25 ((n, k) -sources). *We say that a random variable X is an (n, k) -source if $\text{supp}(X) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ and $H_\infty(X) \geq k$. Additionally, we say that X is a flat (n, k) -source if for any $a \in \text{supp}(X)$, $\Pr[X = a] = 2^{-k}$, i.e., X is uniform over its support.*

$X \sim (n, k)$ denotes the fact that X is an (n, k) -source. Further, we call X (n, k) -flat if $X \sim (n, k)$ and is flat. We say that X is ε -close to a flat distribution if there exists a set \mathcal{S} such that $X \approx_\varepsilon U_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Definition 26 (ε -smooth min-entropy). *A random variable X is said to have ε -smooth min-entropy at least k if there exists Y such that $\Delta(X; Y) \leq \varepsilon$, and*

$$H_\infty(Y) \geq k.$$

2.4.4 Extractors

Definition 27 ((Strong) Two-Source Extractor, Collision Resistance). *Call $\text{ext} : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ a two-source extractor for input lengths n_1, n_2 , min-entropy k_1, k_2 , output length m , and error ε if for any two independent sources X, Y with $X \sim (n_1, k_1)$, $Y \sim (n_2, k_2)$, the following holds:*

$$\Delta(\text{ext}(X, Y); U_m) \leq \varepsilon$$

If $n_2 = k_2$, we call such an extractor seeded. We use $\text{ext} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2)] \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon$ to denote the fact that ext is such an extractor.

Additionally, we call the extractor \mathbf{ext} right strong, if:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | Y) \leq \varepsilon ,$$

and we call the extractor \mathbf{ext} left strong, if:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | X) \leq \varepsilon .$$

(Strong Extractors) We call an extractor \mathbf{ext} strong if it is both left strong and right strong.

(Collision Resistance) The extractor is said to be $\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}$ -collision resistant if $\Pr_{X, Y}[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y) = \mathbf{ext}(f(X), Y)] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}$ for all fixed-point-free functions f .

Lemma 28. If $\mathbf{ext} : [(n, k), (d, d) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon]$ is a strong seeded extractor, then for any X, W such that $\text{supp}(X) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\tilde{H}_\infty(X|W) \geq k + \log(1/\eta)$ with $\eta > 0$, it holds that:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, U_d); U_m | U_d, W) \leq \varepsilon + \eta$$

Proof. Let \mathbf{ext} , X and W be defined as above. Then, given that $\tilde{H}_\infty(X|W) \geq k + \log(1/\eta)$, it follows from Markov's inequality that there exists a "bad" set \mathcal{B} such that $\Pr[W \in \mathcal{B}] \leq \eta$, and for all $w \notin \mathcal{B}$, $H_\infty(X|W = w) \geq k$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, U_d); U_m | U_d, W) &\leq \Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, U_d); U_m | U_d, W \in \mathcal{B}) \Pr[W \in \mathcal{B}] \\ &\quad + \Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, U_d); U_m | U_d, W \notin \mathcal{B}) \Pr[W \notin \mathcal{B}] \\ &\leq 1 \cdot \Pr[W \in \mathcal{B}] + \Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, U_d); U_m | U_d, W \notin \mathcal{B}) \\ &= \Pr[W \in \mathcal{B}] + \sum_{w \notin \mathcal{B}} \Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, U_d); U_m | U_d, W = w) \\ &\leq \eta + \varepsilon . \end{aligned}$$

□

Chapter 3

Randomness Requirements for Leakage-Resilient and Non-malleable Secret Sharing

In this chapter (based on the paper [3]), we first study leakage-resilience. Modern cryptographic primitives are typically designed in such a way where adversaries are only allowed access to information that the primitive needs to publicise (perhaps by sending over to other parties). Metaphorically, there is a line drawn between what information must be made “publicly available”, and what can be kept private from the rest of the world. This does not account for adversaries that are capable of crossing this boundary. Indeed, adversaries might have physical access to the machines running these primitives and thus measure voltages [122], or EM radiation emitted from the hardware [13], etc [138, 47]. In doing so, they potentially obtain even more information about the execution of the primitive than assumed for the proof of security. To address this, leakage-resilient cryptography broadly studies cryptography where the adversary is able to obtain such additional information (via a side-channel) in the form of a leakage function g , or several leakage functions g_1, g_2, \dots, g_t (depending on the model).

For example, the adversary may obtain information about intermediate values or steps that were performed during the computation (referred to as computational leaks¹), or the adversary may obtain information from bits stored in memory (referred to as memory leakage). For a general survey on leakage-resilient cryptography, one may refer to [117, 91]. Leakage-resilient storage was first introduced by Davi, Dziembowski, and Venturi in [65] as a way to store information in an encoded

¹For examples, see [143, 115]

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

manner such that any adversary that is able to obtain a leakages about the encoded bits is unable to distinguish between two possible original messages. Dziembowski and Faust in [89] also scheme for a similar case but where the adversary is allowed to make small but multiple leakages over a period of time.

We will focus on a different leakage-resilient cryptographic primitive — secret sharing. Secret sharing, introduced by Blakley [37] and Shamir [156], strikes a meaningful balance between availability and confidentiality of secret information. This fundamental cryptographic primitive has found a host of applications, most notably to threshold cryptography and multi-party computation (see [64] for an extensive discussion). In a secret sharing scheme for n parties, a dealer who holds a secret s chosen from a domain \mathcal{M} can compute a set of n shares by evaluating a randomized function on s which we write as $\mathbf{Sh}(s) = (\mathbf{Sh}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Sh}_n)$. The notion of *threshold* secret sharing is particularly important: A t -out-of- n secret sharing scheme ensures that any t shares are sufficient to recover the secret s , but any $t - 1$ shares reveal no information about the secret s .

Motivated by practice, several variants of secret sharing have been suggested which guarantee security under stronger adversarial models. The notion of *leakage-resilient* secret sharing was put forth in order to model and handle side-channel attacks to secret shared data. In more detail, the adversary, who holds an unauthorized subset of shares, is furthermore allowed to specify a leakage function \mathbf{Leak} from a restricted family of functions and learn $\mathbf{Leak}(\mathbf{Sh}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Sh}_n)$. The goal is that this additional side information reveals almost no information about the secret. Typically one considers *local leakage*, where $\mathbf{Leak}(\mathbf{Sh}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Sh}_n) = (\mathbf{Leak}_1(\mathbf{Sh}_1), \dots, \mathbf{Leak}_n(\mathbf{Sh}_n))$ for local leakage functions \mathbf{Leak}_i with bounded output length. This makes sense in a scenario where shares are stored in physically separated locations. The alternative setting where adversaries are allowed to *corrupt* all shares (e.g., by infecting storage devices with viruses) led to the introduction of *non-malleable* secret sharing. In this case, the adversary specifies tampering functions f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n which act on the shares, and then the reconstruction algorithm is applied to the tampered shares $f_1(\mathbf{Sh}_1), \dots, f_n(\mathbf{Sh}_n)$. The requirement, roughly speaking, is that either the original secret is reconstructed or it is destroyed, i.e., the reconstruction result is unrelated to the original secret. Both leakage-resilient and non-malleable secret sharing have received significant attention in the past few years.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

Cryptography with weak randomness. It is well-known that randomness plays a fundamental role in cryptography and other areas of computer science. In fact, most cryptographic goals cannot be achieved without access to a source of randomness. Almost all settings considered in the literature assume that this source of randomness is perfectly random: It outputs uniformly random and independent bits. However, in practice it is extremely hard to generate perfect randomness. The randomness needed for the task at hand is generated from some physical process, such as electromagnetic noise or user dependent behavior. While these sources have some inherent randomness, in the sense that they contain entropy, samples from such sources are not necessarily uniformly distributed. Additionally, the randomness generation procedure may be partially accessible to the adversary, in which case the quality of the randomness provided degrades even further. The difficulty in working with such imperfect randomness sources not only arises from the fact that they are not uniformly random, but also because the exact distribution of these sources is unknown. One can at best assume that they satisfy some minimal property, for example that none of the outcomes is highly likely as first considered by Chor and Goldreich [58].

The best one can hope for is to deterministically extract a nearly perfect random string for direct usage in the desired application. While there are source models which allow for deterministic randomness extraction, such as von Neumann sources [144], bit-fixing sources [59], affine sources [43], and other efficiently generated or recognizable sources [38, 155, 136, 163, 85, 118, 84, 36, 54], all these models make strong assumptions about the structure of the source. On the other hand, the most natural, flexible, and well-studied source model where we only assume a lower bound on the min-entropy of the source² does not allow deterministic extraction of even 1 almost uniformly random bit [58]. This holds even in the highly optimistic case where the source is supported on $\{0, 1\}^d$ and has min-entropy $d - 1$. Nevertheless, it has been long known, for example, that min-entropy sources are sufficient for simulating certain randomized algorithms and interactive protocols [58].

This discussion naturally leads us to wonder whether perfect randomness is essential in different cryptographic primitives, in the sense that the underlying class

²A source is said to have *min-entropy* k if the probability that it takes any fixed value is upper bounded by 2^{-k} .

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

of sources of randomness allows deterministic extraction of nearly uniformly random bits. We call such classes of sources *extractable*. More concretely, the following is our main question.

Question 29. *Does secret sharing, or any of its useful variants such as leakage-resilient or non-malleable secret sharing, require access to extractable randomness?*

This question was first asked by Bosley and Dodis [41] (for 2-out-of-2 secret sharing) and it remains open. Bosley and Dodis settled the analogous question for the case of information-theoretic private-key encryption, motivated by a series of (im)possibility results for such schemes in more specific source models [141, 78, 75]. More precisely, they showed that encryption schemes using d bits of randomness and encrypting messages of size $b > \log d$ require extractable randomness, while those encrypting messages of size $b < \log d - \log \log d - 1$ do not.

As noted in [77, 41], private-key encryption schemes yield 2-out-of-2 secret sharing schemes by seeing the uniformly random key as the left share and the ciphertext as the right share. Therefore, we may interpret the main result of [41] as settling Question 29 for the artificial and highly restrictive class of secret sharing schemes where the left share is uniformly random and independent of the secret, and the right share is a deterministic function of the secret and the left share. No progress has been made on Question 29 since.

Random-less Reductions for Secret Sharing. Given that the problem of whether 2-out-of-2 secret sharing requires extractable randomness has been open for 15 years, it is reasonable to consider intermediate problems towards resolving the open question. In a spirit similar to computational complexity, we consider how the question whether t out of n secret sharing requires extractable randomness is related to the same question for a different choice of the parameters t, n i.e.,

Question 30. *Given t, n, t', n' , does the fact that t -out-of- n secret sharing require extractable randomness imply that t' -out-of- n' secret sharing require extractable randomness?*

A natural approach towards resolving this question is to try to construct a t -out-of- n secret sharing scheme from a t' -out-of- n' secret sharing scheme in a black-box

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

manner without any additional randomness. Intuitively, since we don't have access to any additional randomness, it seems that the most obvious strategy to achieve such reductions is to choose n subsets of the set of n' shares in such a way that any t out of these n subsets contain at least t' out of the original n' shares and any $t - 1$ subsets contain at most $t' - 1$ of the original n' shares. In particular, there is a trivial reduction when $t = n = 2$ that chooses the first subset to contain the first of the n' shares, and the second subset to contain any $t' - 1$ of the remaining shares. This shows the completeness of the extractability of 2-out-of-2 secret sharing with respect to these reductions. Such reductions can be formalized via distribution designs [161].

3.1 Our Results

In this work, we make progress on both Question 29 and Question 30. Before we proceed to discuss our results, we formalize the notions of an extractable class of randomness sources and threshold secret sharing.

Definition 31 (Extractable class of sources). We say a class of randomness sources \mathcal{Y} over $\{0, 1\}^d$ is (δ, m) -*extractable* if there exists a deterministic function $\mathbf{ext} : \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that³ $\mathbf{ext}(Y) \approx_\delta U_m$ for every $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, where U_m denotes the uniform distribution over $\{0, 1\}^m$.

Note that we may consider the support of all sources in \mathcal{Y} to be contained in some set $\{0, 1\}^d$ without loss of generality. Since we will be interested in studying the quality of randomness used by secret sharing schemes, we make the class of randomness sources allowed for a secret sharing scheme explicit in the definition of t -out-of- n threshold secret sharing below.

Definition 32 (Threshold secret sharing scheme). A tuple $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ with $\mathbf{Sh} : \{0, 1\}^b \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^\ell)^n$ and $\mathbf{Rec} : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ deterministic algorithms and \mathcal{Y} a class of randomness sources over $\{0, 1\}^d$ is a (t, n, ε) -*secret sharing scheme* (for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness) if for every randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ the following hold:

³We use the notation $X \approx_\delta Y$ to denote the fact that $\Delta(X; Y) \leq \delta$, where $\Delta(\cdot; \cdot)$ corresponds to statistical distance (see Definition 17).

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

1. If $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$ satisfies $|\mathcal{T}| \geq t$ (i.e., \mathcal{T} is *authorized*), then

$$\Pr_Y[\text{Rec}(\text{Sh}(x, Y)_{\mathcal{T}}) = x] = 1$$

for every $x \in \{0, 1\}^b$;

2. If $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$ satisfies $|\mathcal{T}| < t$ (i.e., \mathcal{T} is *unauthorized*), then for any $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$ we have

$$\text{Sh}(x, Y)_{\mathcal{T}} \approx_{\varepsilon} \text{Sh}(x', Y)_{\mathcal{T}},$$

where $\text{Sh}(x, Y)_{\mathcal{T}}$ denotes the shares of parties $i \in \mathcal{T}$.

3.1.1 Leakage-Resilient 2-out-of-2 Secret Sharing Requires Extractable Randomness.

As our first contribution, we settle Question 29 for the important sub-class of *leakage-resilient* 2-out-of-2 secret sharing. Intuitively, we consider 2-out-of-2 secret sharing schemes with the additional property that the adversary learns almost nothing about the message when they obtain bounded information from each share. More formally, we have the following definition.

Definition 33 (Leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme). We say that a tuple $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ with $\text{Sh} : \{0, 1\}^b \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^{\ell})^2$ and $\text{Rec} : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ deterministic algorithms and \mathcal{Y} a class of randomness sources over $\{0, 1\}^d$ is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -*leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme* (for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness) if $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a $(t = 2, n = 2, \varepsilon_1)$ -secret sharing scheme and the following additional property is satisfied: For any two messages $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$ and randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let $(\text{Sh}_1, \text{Sh}_2) = \text{Sh}(x, Y)$ and $(\text{Sh}'_1, \text{Sh}'_2) = \text{Sh}(x', Y)$. Then, for any leakage functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^{\ell} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ it holds that

$$f(\text{Sh}_1), g(\text{Sh}_2) \approx_{\varepsilon_2} f(\text{Sh}'_1), g(\text{Sh}'_2).$$

Leakage-resilient secret sharing has received significant attention recently, with several constructions and leakage models being analyzed [33, 4, 124, 160, 51, 137, 139]. Comparatively, Definition 33 considers a significantly weaker notion of leakage-resilience than all works just mentioned. In particular, we do not require leakage-resilience to hold even when the adversary has full access to one of the shares on top

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

of the leakage. This means that our results are widely applicable. Roughly speaking, we prove that every leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages either requires a huge number of bits of randomness, or we can extract several bits of perfect randomness with low error from its underlying class of randomness sources. More formally, we prove the following.

Theorem 34. *Let (Sh, Rec, \mathcal{Y}) be an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages. (Where the scheme tolerates single bit leakage.) Then, either:*

1. *The scheme uses $d \geq \min(2^{\Omega(b)}, (1/\varepsilon_2)^{\Omega(1)})$ bits of randomness, or;*
2. *The class of sources \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable with $\delta \leq \max(2^{-\Omega(b)}, \varepsilon_2^{\Omega(1)})$ and $m = \Omega(\min(b, \log(1/\varepsilon_2)))$. Moreover, if Sh is computable by a $\text{poly}(b)$ -time algorithm, then \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable by a family of $\text{poly}(b)$ -size circuits.*

An important corollary of Theorem 34 is that every efficient negligible-error leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme requires extractable randomness with negligible error.

Corollary 35. *If (Sh, Rec, \mathcal{Y}) is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages running in time $\text{poly}(b)$ with $\varepsilon_2 = \text{negl}(b)$,⁴ it follows that \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable with $\delta = \text{negl}(b)$ and $m = \Omega(\min(b, \log(1/\varepsilon_2)))$.*

Split-state non-malleable coding requires extractable randomness. Non-malleable coding, introduced by Dziembowski, Pietrzak, and Wichs [92], is another recent notion which has attracted much attention, in particular regarding the *split-state* setting (see [10] and references therein). Informally, a split-state non-malleable code has the guarantee that if an adversary is allowed to split a codeword in half and tamper with each half arbitrarily but separately, then the tampered codeword either decodes to the same message, or the output of the decoder is nearly independent of the original message. More formally, we have the following definition.

Definition 36 (Split-state non-malleable code [92]). A tuple $(\mathbf{Enc}, \mathbf{Dec}, \mathcal{Y})$ with $\mathbf{Enc} : \{0, 1\}^b \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^\ell)^2$ and $\mathbf{Dec} : (\{0, 1\}^\ell)^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b \cup \{\perp\}$ determinis-

⁴By $\varepsilon_2 = \text{negl}(b)$, we mean that $\varepsilon_2 = o(1/b^c)$ for every constant $c > 0$ as $b \rightarrow \infty$.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

tic algorithms and \mathcal{Y} a class of randomness sources is a (*split-state*) ε -*non-malleable code* if the following holds for every randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$:

1. $\Pr[\mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{Enc}(x, Y)) = x] = 1$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^b$;
2. For tampering functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$, denote by $\mathbf{Tamp}_x^{f,g}$ the tampering random experiment which computes $(L, R) = \mathbf{Enc}(x, Y)$ and outputs $\mathbf{Dec}(f(L), g(R))$. Then, for any tampering functions f and g there exists a distribution $D^{f,g}$ over $\{0, 1\}^b \cup \{\perp, \mathbf{same}^*\}$ such that

$$\mathbf{Tamp}_x^{f,g} \approx_\varepsilon \mathbf{Sim}_x^{f,g}$$

for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^b$, where $\mathbf{Sim}_x^{f,g}$ denotes the random experiment which samples z according to $D^{f,g}$ and outputs z if $z \neq \mathbf{same}^*$ and x if $z = \mathbf{same}^*$.

The notion of non-malleable code in the split-state model is equivalent to the notion of a **2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme** [103].

It is known by [9, Lemmas 3 and 4] that every ε -non-malleable coding scheme $(\mathbf{Enc}, \mathbf{Dec}, \mathcal{Y})$ for b -bit messages is also a $(2\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme, provided $b \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon < 1/20$. Combining this observation with Theorem 34 yields the following corollary, which states that every split-state non-malleable code either uses a huge number of bits of randomness, or requires extractable randomness with low error and large output length.

Corollary 37. *Let $(\mathbf{Enc}, \mathbf{Dec}, \mathcal{Y})$ be an ε -non-malleable code (i.e., 2-out-of-2 ε -non-malleable secret sharing scheme) for b -bit messages with $b \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon < 1/20$. Then, either:*

1. *The scheme uses $d \geq \min(2^{\Omega(b)}, (1/\varepsilon)^{\Omega(1)})$ bits of randomness, or;*
2. *The class of sources \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable with $\delta \leq \max(2^{-\Omega(b)}, \varepsilon^{\Omega(1)})$ and $m = \Omega(\min(b, \log(1/\varepsilon)))$. Moreover, if \mathbf{Enc} is computable by a $\text{poly}(b)$ -time algorithm, then \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable by a family of $\text{poly}(b)$ -size circuits.*

As a result, an analogous version of Corollary 35 also holds for split-state non-malleable coding. This resolves Question 29 for 2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing.

3.1.2 Random-less Reductions for Secret Sharing.

In this section, we discuss our contribution towards resolving Question 30. We focus on the following complementary scenario: Suppose we have proved that all (t, n, ε) -secret sharing schemes for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness require a (δ, m) -extractable class of randomness sources. It is then natural to wonder whether such a result can be bootstrapped to conclude that all (t', n', ε) -secret sharing schemes for the same message length b and number of randomness bits d also require (δ, m) -extractable randomness, for different threshold t' and number of parties n' . A natural approach is to set up general *black-box reductions* between different types of secret sharing which, crucially, do not use extra randomness. In fact, if we can obtain from a (t', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme $(\text{Sh}', \text{Rec}', \mathcal{Y})$ another (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ for b -bit messages which uses the same class of randomness sources \mathcal{Y} , then our initial assumption would allow us to conclude that \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable.

Remarkably, we are able to obtain the desired reductions for a broad range of parameters by exploiting a connection to the construction of combinatorial objects called *distribution designs*, a term coined by Stinson and Wei [161] for the old technique of devising a new secret sharing scheme by giving multiple shares of the original scheme to each party. Surprisingly, although these objects have roots going back to early work on secret sharing [32], they have not been the subject of a general study. In this work, we obtain general and simple constructions of, and bounds for, distribution designs, which are tight in certain parameter regimes. We give two examples of reductions we derive from these results.

Corollary 38 (Informal, Restated). *If every $(t = 2, n, \varepsilon)$ -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness requires a (δ, m) -extractable class of randomness sources, then so does every (t', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness whenever $n \leq \binom{n'}{t'-1}$. Moreover, this is the best distribution-design-based reduction possible with $t = 2$.*

Corollary 39 (Informal, Restated). *If every (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness requires a (δ, m) -extractable class of randomness sources, then so does every $(t' = n', n', \varepsilon)$ -secret sharing scheme for b -bit*

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

messages using d bits of randomness whenever $n' \geq \binom{n}{t-1}$. Moreover, this is the best distribution-design-based reduction possible with $t' = n'$.

3.2 Related Work

We begin by discussing the results on private-key encryption that led to the work of Bosley and Dodis [41] in more detail. Early work by McInnes and Pinkas [141] showed that min-entropy sources and Santha-Vazirani sources are insufficient for information-theoretic private-key encryption of even 1-bit messages. This negative result was later extended to *computationally* secure private-key encryption by Dodis, Ong, Prabhakaran, and Sahai [75], and was complemented by Dodis and Spencer [78], who showed that, in fact, non-extractable randomness *is* sufficient for information-theoretic private-key encryption of 1-bit messages. Later, the picture was completed by the aforementioned groundbreaking work of Bosley and Dodis [41].

Besides the results already discussed above for private-key encryption and secret sharing, the possibility of realizing other cryptographic primitives using certain classes of imperfect randomness sources has also been studied. Non-extractable randomness is known to be sufficient for message authentication [140, 78], signature schemes [75, 22], differential privacy [74, 80, 169], secret-key agreement [22], identification protocols [22], and interactive proofs [75]. On the other hand, Santha-Vazirani sources are insufficient for bit commitment, secret sharing, zero knowledge, and two-party computation [75], and in some cases this negative result even holds for Santha-Vazirani sources with efficient tampering procedures [22].

In other directions, the security loss incurred by replacing uniform randomness by imperfect randomness was studied in [28, 23], and the scenario where a perfect common reference string is replaced by certain types of imperfect randomness has also been considered [48, 12]. The security of keyed cryptographic primitives with non-uniformly random keys has also been studied [81].

3.3 Preliminaries

Let us first detail the chapter specific lemmas.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

We will use a folklore/standard lemma stemming from a straightforward application of the probabilistic method, which states that, with high probability, a random function extracts almost perfect randomness from a fixed source with sufficient min-entropy. By a union bound, this result also implies that a random function is a great extractor for all sufficiently small classes of flat sources (and convex combinations thereof), an observation we will exploit later on.

Lemma 40. *Fix an (n, k) -source X . Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it holds that a uniformly random function $F : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ with $m \leq k - 2 \log(1/\varepsilon)$ satisfies $F(X) \approx_\varepsilon U_m$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\varepsilon^2 2^k}$ over the choice of F .*

Proof. Fix an (n, k) -source X and pick a function $F : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ with $m \leq k - 2 \log(1/\varepsilon)$ uniformly at random. It suffices to bound the probability that

$$|\Pr[F(X) \in \mathcal{T}] - \mu(\mathcal{T})| \leq \varepsilon$$

holds for every set $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$, where $\mu(\mathcal{T}) = |\mathcal{T}|/2^m$ denotes the density of \mathcal{T} . Fix such a set \mathcal{T} , and let $Z_x = \Pr[X = x] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{F(x) \in \mathcal{T}}$. Then, we have $\Pr[F(X) \in \mathcal{T}] = \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} Z_x$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} Z_x] = \mu(\mathcal{T})$. As a result, since $Z_x \in [0, \Pr[X = x]]$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, Hoeffding's inequality⁵ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left[\left|\sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} Z_x - \mu(\mathcal{T})\right| > \varepsilon\right] &\leq 2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{\sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} \Pr[X = x]^2}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \cdot e^{-2\varepsilon^2 2^k}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that

$$\sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} \Pr[X = x]^2 \leq \max_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} \Pr[X = x] \leq 2^{-k},$$

since X is an (n, k) -source. Finally, a union bound over all 2^{2^m} sets $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ shows that the event in question holds with probability at least

$$1 - 2 \cdot 2^{2^m} \cdot e^{-2\varepsilon^2 2^k} \geq 1 - 2e^{-\varepsilon^2 2^k}$$

over the choice of F , given the upper bound on m . □

⁵The version of Hoeffding's inequality we use here states that if X_1, \dots, X_N are independent random variables and $X_i \in [m_i, M_i]$ for each i , then $\Pr\left[\left|\sum_{i=1}^N X_i - \mu\right| > \varepsilon\right] \leq 2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{2\varepsilon^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (M_i - m_i)^2}\right)$, where $\mu = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^N X_i\right]$.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

The following extension of Lemma 40, stating that a random function condenses weak sources with high probability, will also be useful.

Lemma 41. *Fix an (n, k) -source X . Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it holds that a uniformly random function $F : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ satisfies $F(X) \approx_\varepsilon W$ for some W such that $H_\infty(W) \geq \min(m, k - 2\log(1/\varepsilon))$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\varepsilon^2 2^k}$ over the choice of F .*

Proof. For $m' = \min(m, k - 2\log(1/\varepsilon))$, let $F' : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'}$ be the restriction of F to its first m' bits. Then, Lemma 40 ensures that $F'(X) \approx_\varepsilon U_{m'}$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\varepsilon^2 2^k}$ over the choice of F . Via a coupling argument, this implies that $F(X) \approx W$ for some W with $H_\infty(W) \geq m'$. □

3.3.1 Secret Sharing

Definition 42 (Threshold secret sharing scheme). A tuple $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ with $\mathbf{Sh} : \{0, 1\}^b \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^\ell)^n$ and $\mathbf{Rec} : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ deterministic algorithms and \mathcal{Y} a class of randomness sources over $\{0, 1\}^d$ is a (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme (for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness) if for every randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ the following hold:

1. If $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$ satisfies $|\mathcal{T}| \geq t$ (i.e., \mathcal{T} is *authorized*), then

$$\Pr_Y[\mathbf{Rec}(\mathbf{Sh}(x, Y)_{\mathcal{T}}) = x] = 1$$

for every $x \in \{0, 1\}^b$;

2. If $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$ satisfies $|\mathcal{T}| < t$ (i.e., \mathcal{T} is *unauthorized*), then for any $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$ we have

$$\mathbf{Sh}(x, Y)_{\mathcal{T}} \approx_\varepsilon \mathbf{Sh}(x', Y)_{\mathcal{T}},$$

where $\mathbf{Sh}(x, Y)_{\mathcal{T}}$ denotes the shares of parties $i \in \mathcal{T}$.

We consider two natural extensions: leakage-resilient secret sharing, and non-malleable secret sharing.

Definition 43 (Leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme). We say that a tuple $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ with $\mathbf{Sh} : \{0, 1\}^b \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^\ell)^2$ and $\mathbf{Rec} : (\{0, 1\}^\ell)^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ deterministic algorithms and \mathcal{Y} a class of randomness sources over $\{0, 1\}^d$ is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme (for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness) if $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a $(t = 2, n = 2, \varepsilon_1)$ -secret sharing scheme and the following additional property is satisfied: For any two messages $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$ and randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let $(\mathbf{Sh}_1, \mathbf{Sh}_2) = \mathbf{Sh}(x, Y)$ and $(\mathbf{Sh}'_1, \mathbf{Sh}'_2) = \mathbf{Sh}(x', Y)$. Then, for any leakage functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ it holds that

$$f(\mathbf{Sh}_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}_2) \approx_{\varepsilon_2} f(\mathbf{Sh}'_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}'_2).$$

Definition 44 (Split-state non-malleable code [92]). A tuple $(\mathbf{Enc}, \mathbf{Dec}, \mathcal{Y})$ with $\mathbf{Enc} : \{0, 1\}^b \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^\ell)^2$ and $\mathbf{Dec} : (\{0, 1\}^\ell)^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b \cup \{\perp\}$ deterministic algorithms and \mathcal{Y} a class of randomness sources is a (split-state) ε -non-malleable code if the following holds for every randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$:

1. $\Pr[\mathbf{Dec}(\mathbf{Enc}(x, Y)) = x] = 1$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^b$;
2. For tampering functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$, denote by $\mathbf{Tamp}_x^{f,g}$ the tampering random experiment which computes $(L, R) = \mathbf{Enc}(x, Y)$ and outputs $\mathbf{Dec}(f(L), g(R))$. Then, for any tampering functions f and g there exists a distribution $D^{f,g}$ over $\{0, 1\}^b \cup \{\perp, \mathbf{same}^*\}$ such that

$$\mathbf{Tamp}_x^{f,g} \approx_\varepsilon \mathbf{Sim}_x^{f,g}$$

for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^b$, where $\mathbf{Sim}_x^{f,g}$ denotes the random experiment which samples z according to $D^{f,g}$ and outputs z if $z \neq \mathbf{same}^*$ and x if $z = \mathbf{same}^*$.

The notion of non-malleable code in the split-state model is equivalent to the notion of a **2-out-of-2 non-malleable secret sharing scheme** [103].

3.3.2 Amplifying Leakage-Resilience

The following lemma states that every secret sharing scheme withstanding 1 bit of leakage also withstands $t > 1$ bits of leakage from each share, at the cost of an increase in statistical error.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

Lemma 45. *Let $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ be an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme. Then, for all secrets $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$, randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^t$ we have*

$$f(\text{Sh}_1), g(\text{Sh}_2) \approx_{\varepsilon'} f(\text{Sh}'_1), g(\text{Sh}'_2)$$

with $\varepsilon' = 2^t \varepsilon_2$, where $(\text{Sh}_1, \text{Sh}_2) = \text{Sh}(x, Y)$ and $(\text{Sh}'_1, \text{Sh}'_2) = \text{Sh}(x', Y)$.

Proof. Fix arbitrary secrets $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$ and a randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and define $(\text{Sh}_1, \text{Sh}_2) = \text{Sh}(x, Y)$ and $(\text{Sh}'_1, \text{Sh}'_2) = \text{Sh}(x', Y)$. Suppose that there exist functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^t$ such that the distributions $(f(\text{Sh}_1), g(\text{Sh}_2))$ and $(f(\text{Sh}'_1), g(\text{Sh}'_2))$ are $(\varepsilon' = 2^t \varepsilon_2)$ -far. Then, the XOR lemma (Lemma 18) implies that there is a non-zero vector $a \in \{0, 1\}^{2t}$, which we may write as $a = (a^{(1)}, a^{(2)})$ for $a^{(1)}, a^{(2)} \in \{0, 1\}^t$, such that the distributions

$$\langle a, (f(\text{Sh}_1), g(\text{Sh}_2)) \rangle = \langle a^{(1)}, f(\text{Sh}_1) \rangle + \langle a^{(2)}, g(\text{Sh}_2) \rangle$$

and

$$\langle a, (f(\text{Sh}'_1), g(\text{Sh}'_2)) \rangle = \langle a^{(1)}, f(\text{Sh}'_1) \rangle + \langle a^{(2)}, g(\text{Sh}'_2) \rangle$$

are ε_2 -far. Consequently, for $f', g' : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined as $f'(z) = \langle a^{(1)}, f(z) \rangle$ and $g'(z) = \langle a^{(2)}, g(z) \rangle$ it holds that

$$f'(\text{Sh}_1), g'(\text{Sh}_2) \not\approx_{\varepsilon_2} f'(\text{Sh}'_1), g'(\text{Sh}'_2),$$

contradicting the fact that $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme. □

3.4 Technical Overview

3.4.1 Leakage-Resilient Secret Sharing Requires Extractable Randomness.

We present a high-level overview of our approach towards proving Theorem 34. Recall that our goal is to show that if $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness, then there exists a

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

deterministic function $\mathbf{ext} : \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that $\mathbf{ext}(Y) \approx_\delta U_m$ for all sources $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, provided that the number of randomness bits d used is not huge.

Our candidate extractor \mathbf{ext} works as follows on input some $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$:

1. Compute $(\mathbf{Sh}_1, \mathbf{Sh}_2) = \mathbf{Sh}(0^b, y) \in \{0, 1\}^\ell \times \{0, 1\}^\ell$;
2. For appropriate leakage functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^s$, compute the tuple $(f(\mathbf{Sh}_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}_2))$;
3. For an appropriate function $h : \{0, 1\}^{2s} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$, output

$$\mathbf{ext}(y) = h(f(\mathbf{Sh}_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}_2)).$$

The proof of Theorem 34 follows from an analysis of this candidate construction, and we show the existence of appropriate functions f , g , and h via the probabilistic method. Note that the number of sources in \mathcal{Y} may be extremely large. Consequently, our first step, which is similar in spirit to the first step of the related result for private-key encryption in [41], is to exploit the leakage-resilience of the scheme in question to show that it suffices to focus on a restricted family to prove the desired result. More precisely, it suffices to show the existence of functions f , g , and h as above satisfying

$$h(f(Z_1), g(Z_2)) \approx_{\delta'} U_m, \tag{3.1}$$

with δ' an appropriate error parameter, for all $(Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{\mathbf{Sh}(U_b, y) : y \in \{0, 1\}^d\},$$

which contains at most 2^d distributions. Our analysis then proceeds in three steps:

1. We show that each $(Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$ is close in statistical distance to a convex combination of joint distributions $(D_{1,i}, D_{2,i})$ with the property that $H_\infty(D_{1,i}) + H_\infty(D_{2,i})$ is sufficiently large for all i , where $H_\infty(\cdot)$ denotes the min-entropy of a distribution;
2. Exploiting the previous step, we prove that if we pick f and g uniformly at random, then with high probability over this choice it holds that the joint distribution $(f(Z_1), g(Z_2))$ is close in statistical distance to a high min-entropy distribution;

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

3. A well known, standard application of the probabilistic method then shows that a uniformly random function h will extract many perfectly random bits from $(f(Z_1), g(Z_2))$ with high probability over the choice of h .

While this proves that there exist functions f , g , and h such that Equation 3.1 holds for a given $(Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$, we need Equation 3.1 to be true simultaneously for all $(Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$. We resolve this by employing a union bound over the at most 2^d distributions in \mathcal{Z} . Therefore, if d is not extremely large, we succeed in showing the existence of appropriate functions f , g , and h , and the desired result follows. More details can be found in Section 3.5.

3.4.1.1 Random-less Reductions for Secret Sharing.

In this section, we define distribution designs and briefly discuss how they can be used to provide the desired black-box reductions between different types of threshold secret sharing, in particular Corollaries 38 and 39. Intuitively, a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design distributes shares $(\mathbf{Sh}_1, \mathbf{Sh}_2, \dots, \mathbf{Sh}_{n'})$ of some (t', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme into subsets of shares $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$, with the property that $(\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n)$ are now shares of a (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme. More formally, we have the following definition, which also appears in [161].

Definition 46 (Distribution design). We say a family of sets $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \subseteq [n']$ is a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design if for every $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$ it holds that

$$\left| \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{D}_i \right| \geq t'$$

if and only if $|\mathcal{T}| \geq t$.

Given a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \subseteq [n']$, it is clear how to set up a black-box reduction without extra randomness from (t', n', ε) -secret sharing to (t, n, ε) -secret sharing: If $(\mathbf{Sh}', \mathbf{Rec}', \mathcal{Y})$ is an arbitrary (t', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages, we can obtain a (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ for b -bit messages by defining

$$\mathbf{Sh}(x, y)_i = \mathbf{Sh}'(x, y)_{\mathcal{D}_i}$$

for each $i \in [n]$, and

$$\mathbf{Rec}(\mathbf{Sh}(x, y)_{\mathcal{T}}) = \mathbf{Rec}'(\mathbf{Sh}'(x, y)_{\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{D}_i})$$

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

for each $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$. The following lemma is then straightforward from the definitions of threshold secret sharing and distribution designs, and this construction.

Lemma 47. *If every (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness requires (δ, m) -extractable randomness and there exists a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design, then so does every (t', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness.*

Details of our constructions of distribution designs and associated bounds can be found in Section 3.6. The black-box reductions then follow immediately by combining these constructions with Lemma 47.

3.4.2 Open Questions

We obtain distribution designs for a wide variety of parameters, but for some of these constructions we could not prove optimality or find a better construction. We leave this as an open question. A naturally related question is whether there is an alternative approach to obtain a random-less reduction for secret sharing that does not use distribution designs.

Finally, we hope this work further motivates research on the main open question of whether 2-out-of-2 secret sharing (or even t -out-of- n secret sharing for any t and n) requires extractable randomness.

3.4.3 Amplifying Leakage-Resilience

Recall the definition of leakage-resilient secret sharing from Definition 33 already discussed in the beginning of this chapter. The following lemma states that every secret sharing scheme withstanding 1 bit of leakage also withstands $t > 1$ bits of leakage from each share, at the cost of an increase in statistical error.

Lemma 48. *Let (Sh, Rec, \mathcal{Y}) be an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme. Then, for all secrets $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$, randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^t$ we have*

$$f(Sh_1), g(Sh_2) \approx_{\varepsilon'} f(Sh'_1), g(Sh'_2)$$

with $\varepsilon' = 2^t \varepsilon_2$, where $(Sh_1, Sh_2) = Sh(x, Y)$ and $(Sh'_1, Sh'_2) = Sh(x', Y)$.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

Proof. Fix arbitrary secrets $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$ and a randomness source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and define $(\mathbf{Sh}_1, \mathbf{Sh}_2) = \mathbf{Sh}(x, Y)$ and $(\mathbf{Sh}'_1, \mathbf{Sh}'_2) = \mathbf{Sh}(x', Y)$. Suppose that there exist functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^t$ such that the distributions $(f(\mathbf{Sh}_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}_2))$ and $(f(\mathbf{Sh}'_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}'_2))$ are $(\varepsilon' = 2^t \varepsilon_2)$ -far. Then, the XOR lemma implies that there is a non-zero vector $a \in \{0, 1\}^{2t}$, which we may write as $a = (a^{(1)}, a^{(2)})$ for $a^{(1)}, a^{(2)} \in \{0, 1\}^t$, such that the distributions

$$\langle a, (f(\mathbf{Sh}_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}_2)) \rangle = \langle a^{(1)}, f(\mathbf{Sh}_1) \rangle + \langle a^{(2)}, g(\mathbf{Sh}_2) \rangle$$

and

$$\langle a, (f(\mathbf{Sh}'_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}'_2)) \rangle = \langle a^{(1)}, f(\mathbf{Sh}'_1) \rangle + \langle a^{(2)}, g(\mathbf{Sh}'_2) \rangle$$

are ε_2 -far. Consequently, for $f', g' : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined as $f'(z) = \langle a^{(1)}, f(z) \rangle$ and $g'(z) = \langle a^{(2)}, g(z) \rangle$ it holds that

$$f'(\mathbf{Sh}_1), g'(\mathbf{Sh}_2) \not\approx_{\varepsilon_2} f'(\mathbf{Sh}'_1), g'(\mathbf{Sh}'_2),$$

contradicting the fact that $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme. □

3.5 Randomness Extraction from Leakage-Resilient Secret Sharing Schemes

In this section, we show that all 2-out-of-2 secret sharing schemes satisfying the weak leakage-resilience requirement from Definition 32 require extractable randomness with good parameters.

Theorem 49. *Given any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, there are absolute constants $c_\gamma, c'_\gamma, c''_\gamma > 0$ such that the following holds: Suppose $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness. Then, if $b \geq c_\gamma$ and $d \leq 2^{c'_\gamma b}$ it holds that \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable with $\delta \leq 2^b \varepsilon_2 + 2^{-c''_\gamma b}$ and $m \geq (1 - \gamma)b$.*

We prove Theorem 49 via a sequence of lemmas by showing the existence of an extractor $\mathbf{ext} : \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ for the class \mathcal{Y} with appropriate parameters. Our construction works as follows: On input $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$, the extractor \mathbf{ext} computes

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

$(L_y, R_y) = \text{Sh}(0^b, y)$, applies special leakage functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ to be determined in order to obtain local leakage $(f(L_y), g(R_y))$, and finally outputs $\text{ext}(y) = h(f(L_y), g(R_y))$ for an appropriate function $h : \{0, 1\}^{2b} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$. Our goal is to show that

$$\text{ext}(Y) \approx_\delta U_m \tag{3.2}$$

for all sources $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Similarly in spirit to [41], our first lemma shows that in order to prove Equation 3.2 we can instead focus on extracting randomness from the family of distributions

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{\text{Sh}(U_b, y) : y \in \{0, 1\}^d\}.$$

Lemma 50. *Fix functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ and $h : \{0, 1\}^{2b} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$, and suppose that*

$$\text{ext}'(Z) = h(f(Z_1), g(Z_2)) \approx_{\delta'} U_m \tag{3.3}$$

for all $Z = (Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$. Then, it holds that ext given by $\text{ext}(y) = h(f(L_y), g(R_y))$, where $(L_y, R_y) = \text{Sh}(0^b, y)$, satisfies

$$\text{ext}(Y) \approx_\delta U_m$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $\delta = 2^b \varepsilon_2 + \delta'$.

Proof. Lemma 48 implies that

$$f(L_Y), g(R_Y) \approx_{\varepsilon'} f(L'_Y), g(R'_Y),$$

where $(L'_Y, R'_Y) = \text{Sh}(U_b, Y)$ holds with $\varepsilon' = 2^b \varepsilon_2$ for all $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and so $\text{ext}(Y) \approx_{\varepsilon'} h(f(L'_Y), g(R'_Y))$. Since Equation 3.3 holds for all $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\text{Sh}(U_b, Y)$ is a convex combination of distributions in \mathcal{Z} , it follows that $h(f(L'_Y), g(R'_Y)) \approx_{\delta'} U_m$. The triangle inequality yields the desired result. □

Given Lemma 50, we will focus on proving Equation 3.3 for appropriate functions f, g , and h and error δ' in the remainder of this section. We show the following lemma, which implies Theorem 49 together with Lemma 50.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

Lemma 51. *Given any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, there are absolute constants $c_\gamma, c'_\gamma, c''_\gamma > 0$ such that if $b \geq c_\gamma$ and $d \leq 2^{c'_\gamma b}$, then there exist functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ and $h : \{0, 1\}^{2b} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that*

$$\mathbf{ext}'(Z) = h(f(Z_1), g(Z_2)) \approx_{\delta'} U_m$$

for all $Z = (Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$ with $\delta' \leq 2^{-c''_\gamma b}$ and $m \geq (1 - \gamma)b$.

The roadmap for the proof ahead is that we are first going to fix a $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$, and then do the following:

1. Justify that $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$ is statistically close to an appropriate convex combination of distributions with linear min-entropy that suit our purposes. (Lemma 52)
2. Show that if we pick f and g uniformly at random, then with high probability over this choice it holds that $(f(Z_1), g(Z_2))$ is statistically close to a distribution with decent min-entropy. (Lemma 53)
3. Note that a random function h extracts uniformly random bits from the tuple $(f(Z_1), g(Z_2))$ with high probability, provided that this distribution contains enough min-entropy. A union bound over the 2^d distributions in \mathcal{Z} concludes the argument.

Lemma 52. *Fix $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and an integer $r > 0$. Then, for all $(Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$ it holds that (Z_1, Z_2) is $(r \cdot 2^{-(1-\beta-1/r)b})$ -close to a distribution $D = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} p_i \cdot (D_{1,i}, D_{2,i})$ where for each $i \in \mathcal{I} \subseteq [r]$ it holds that $D_{1,i}, D_{2,i} \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$, and $H_\infty(D_{1,i}) \geq (\beta - (\frac{i-1}{r}))b$ and $H_\infty(D_{2,i} | D_{1,i} = \mathbf{sh}_1) \geq (\frac{i-1}{r})b$ for every $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathbf{supp}(D_{1,i})$.*

Proof. Fix some $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$ and set $(Z_1, Z_2) = \mathbf{Sh}(U_b, y)$. It will be helpful for us to see $\mathbf{Sh}(\cdot, y)$ as a bipartite graph G with left and right vertex sets $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ and an edge between \mathbf{sh}_1 and \mathbf{sh}_2 if $(\mathbf{sh}_1, \mathbf{sh}_2) \in \mathbf{supp}(Z_1, Z_2)$. Then, (Z_1, Z_2) is the uniform distribution on the 2^b edges of G by the correctness of the scheme. For every left vertex $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$, we define its neighborhood

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{sh}_1) = \{\mathbf{sh}_2 : (\mathbf{sh}_1, \mathbf{sh}_2) \in \mathbf{supp}(Z_1, Z_2)\}$$

and its degree

$$\deg(\mathbf{sh}_1) = |\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{sh}_1)|.$$

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

Note that $(Z_2|Z_1 = \mathbf{sh}_1)$ is uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{sh}_1)$, and so

$$H_\infty(Z_2|Z_1 = \mathbf{sh}_1) = \log \deg(\mathbf{sh}_1).$$

Partition $\mathbf{supp}(Z_1)$ into sets

$$\mathcal{S}_i = \left\{ \mathbf{sh}_1 : 2^{\left(\frac{i-1}{r}\right)b} \leq \deg(\mathbf{sh}_1) < 2^{\left(\frac{i}{r}\right)b} \right\}$$

for $i \in [r]$. With this definition in mind, we can express (Z_1, Z_2) as

$$\sum_{i \in [r]} \Pr[Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i] (Z_1, Z_2|Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i),$$

where $(Z_1, Z_2|Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i)$ denotes the distribution (Z_1, Z_2) conditioned on the event that $Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i$. Call a non-empty set \mathcal{S}_i *good* if $\sum_{\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i} \deg(\mathbf{sh}_1) \geq 2^{(\beta+1/r)b}$. Otherwise the set \mathcal{S}_i is *bad*. Let \mathcal{I} denote the set of indices $i \in [r]$ such that \mathcal{S}_i is good. We proceed to show that we can take the target distribution D in the lemma statement to be $D = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} p_i \cdot (D_{1,i}, D_{2,i})$ for

$$p_i = \frac{\Pr[Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i]}{\Pr[Z_1 \text{ lands on good set}]}$$

with $(D_{1,i}, D_{2,i}) = (Z_1, Z_2|Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i)$ when $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

To see this, consider the case where \mathcal{S}_i is good, i.e., we have $\sum_{\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i} \deg(\mathbf{sh}_1) \geq 2^{(\beta+1/r)b}$. For each $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Z_1 = \mathbf{sh}_1|Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i] &= \frac{\deg(\mathbf{sh}_1)}{\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_i} \deg(s)} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{\frac{i}{r}b}}{2^{(\beta+1/r)b}} \\ &= 2^{-(\beta - (\frac{i-1}{r}))b}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for any $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i$ and \mathbf{sh}_2 we know that

$$\Pr[Z_2 = \mathbf{sh}_2|Z_1 = \mathbf{sh}_1] \leq 2^{-\left(\frac{i-1}{r}\right)b}.$$

Combining these two observations shows that in this case we have $H_\infty(Z_1|Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i) \geq \left(\beta - \left(\frac{i-1}{r}\right)\right)b$ and $H_\infty(Z_2|Z_1 = \mathbf{sh}_1) \geq \left(\frac{i-1}{r}\right)b$ for all valid fixings $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i$.

To conclude the proof, consider D as above, which we have shown satisfies the properties described in the lemma statement. Noting that D corresponds exactly to (Z_1, Z_2) conditioned on Z_1 landing on a good set, we have

$$\Delta((Z_1, Z_2); D) \leq \Pr[Z_1 \text{ lands in a bad set}].$$

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

It remains to bound this probability on the right-hand side. Assuming the set \mathcal{S}_i is bad, it holds that $\sum_{\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i} \deg(\mathbf{sh}_1) < 2^{(\beta+1/r)b}$. Therefore, since (Z_1, Z_2) takes on any edge with probability 2^{-b} , it holds that Z_1 lands in \mathcal{S}_i with probability at most $2^{-b} \cdot 2^{(\beta+1/r)b} = 2^{-(1-\beta-1/r)b}$. There are at most r bad sets, so by a union bound we have $\Pr[Z_1 \text{ lands in a bad set}] \leq r \cdot 2^{-(1-\beta-1/r)b}$.

□

Lemma 53. *Fix $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ and an integer r . Then, with probability at least $1 - 3r \cdot e^{b-\alpha^2 2^{\min(b/r, (\beta-1/r)b)}}$ over the choice of uniformly random functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ it holds that $(f(Z_1), g(Z_2))$ is $(2\alpha + r \cdot 2^{-(1-\beta-1/r)b})$ -close to a $(2b, (\beta - 1/r)b - 4 \log(1/\alpha))$ -source.*

Proof. Suppose we pick functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ uniformly at random. We begin by expressing $(f(Z_1), g(Z_2))$ as

$$\sum_{i \in [r]} \Pr[Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i] (f(Z_1), g(Z_2) | Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i),$$

which by Lemma 52 is $(r \cdot 2^{-(1-\beta-1/r)b})$ -close to

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \Pr[Z_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i] (f(D_{1,i}), g(D_{2,i})).$$

We proceed by cases:

1. $\frac{i-1}{r} \geq \beta - 1/r$: We know from Lemma 52 that $H_\infty(D_{2,i} | D_{1,i} = \mathbf{sh}_1) \geq (\beta - 1/r)b$ for all $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathbf{supp}(D_{1,i})$. By Lemma 41, we have

$$(g(D_{2,i}) | D_{1,i} = \mathbf{sh}_1) \approx_\alpha V$$

for some V with $H_\infty(V) \geq (\beta - 1/r)b - 2 \log(1/\alpha)$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\alpha^2 2^{(\beta-1/r)b}}$ over the choice of g . Since this holds for any valid fixing $D_{1,i} = \mathbf{sh}_1$, we conclude via a union bound over the at most 2^b possible fixings that

$$f(D_{1,i}), g(D_{2,i}) \approx_\alpha W_i$$

for some W_i with $H_\infty(W_i) \geq (\beta - 1/r)b - 2 \log(1/\alpha)$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{b-\alpha^2 2^{(\beta-1/r)b}}$ over the choice of f and g .

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

2. $1/r \leq \frac{i-1}{r} < \beta - 1/r$: We know from Lemma 52 that $H_\infty(D_{1,i}) \geq \left(\beta - \frac{i-1}{r}\right)b$ and $H_\infty(D_{2,i}|D_{1,i} = \mathbf{sh}_1) \geq \left(\frac{i-1}{r}\right)b$ for all $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathbf{supp}(D_{1,i})$. First, by Lemma 41 we conclude that with probability at least

$$1 - 2e^{-\alpha^2 2^{\left(\beta - \frac{i-1}{r}\right)b}} \geq 1 - 2e^{-\alpha^2 2^{b/r}}$$

over the choice of f it holds that

$$f(D_{1,i}) \approx_\alpha V_1 \tag{3.4}$$

for some V_1 with $H_\infty(V_1) \geq \left(\beta - \frac{i-1}{r}\right)b - 2\log(1/\alpha)$. Analogously, for every $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathbf{supp}(D_{1,i})$, we can again invoke Lemma 41 to see that with probability at least

$$1 - 2e^{-\alpha^2 2^{\left(\frac{i-1}{r}\right)b}} \geq 1 - 2e^{-\alpha^2 2^{b/r}}$$

over the choice of g , for any $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathbf{supp}(D_{1,i})$ it holds that

$$(g(D_{2,i})|D_{1,i} = \mathbf{sh}_1) \approx_\alpha V_{2,\mathbf{sh}_1} \tag{3.5}$$

for some V_{2,\mathbf{sh}_1} with $H_\infty(V_{2,\mathbf{sh}_1}) \geq \left(\frac{i-1}{r}\right)b - 2\log(1/\alpha)$. By a union bound over the at most 2^b possible fixings \mathbf{sh}_1 , we conclude that Equation 3.5 holds simultaneously for all $\mathbf{sh}_1 \in \mathbf{supp}(D_{1,i})$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{b-\alpha^2 2^{b/r}}$ over the choice of g . An additional union bound shows that this holds simultaneously along Equation 3.4 with probability at least $1 - 3e^{b-\alpha^2 2^{b/r}}$ over the choice of f and g , which implies that

$$f(D_{1,i}), g(D_{2,i}) \approx_{2\alpha} W_i$$

for some W_i with

$$\begin{aligned} H_\infty(W_i) &\geq \left(\beta - \frac{i-1}{r}\right)b - 2\log(1/\alpha) + \left(\frac{i-1}{r}\right)b - 2\log(1/\alpha) \\ &= \beta b - 4\log(1/\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

3. $i = 1$: In this case, by Lemma 52 we know that $H_\infty(D_{1,i}) \geq \beta b$. Therefore, Lemma 41 implies that $f(D_{1,i}) \approx_\alpha V_1$ for some V_1 such that $H_\infty(V_1) \geq \beta b - 2\log(1/\alpha)$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\alpha^2 2^{\beta b}} \geq 1 - 2e^{-\alpha^2 2^{b/r}}$. This implies that $f(D_{1,i}), g(D_{2,i}) \approx_\alpha W_i$ for some W_i with $H_\infty(W_i) \geq \beta b - 2\log(1/\alpha)$.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

Finally, a union bound over the at most r indices $i \in \mathcal{I}$ yields the desired statement. \square

We are now ready to prove Lemma 51 with the help of Lemma 53.

Proof of Lemma 51. Fix some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Then, we set $\beta = 1 - \gamma/2 > 1 - \gamma$, $\alpha = 2^{-cb}$ for a sufficiently small constant $c > 0$, and $r > 0$ a sufficiently large integer so that

$$1 - \gamma \leq \beta - 1/r - 6c \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$1/r + 6c \leq \frac{\min(\beta, 1 - \beta)}{100}. \quad (3.7)$$

According to Lemma 53, we know that for any given $Z = (Z_1, Z_2) \in \mathcal{Z}$ it holds that $(f(Z_1), g(Z_2))$ is $(2\alpha + r \cdot 2^{-(1-\beta-1/r)b})$ -close to some $(2b, (\beta - 1/r)b - 4 \log(1/\alpha))$ -source W with probability at least $1 - 3r \cdot e^{b - \alpha 2^{2\min(b/r, (\beta-1/r)b)}}$ over the choice of f and g .

Let $m = (1 - \gamma)b$ and pick a uniformly random function $h : \{0, 1\}^{2b} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$. Then, since $m \leq H_\infty(W) - 2 \log(1/\alpha)$ by Equation 3.6, Lemma 40 implies that $h(W) \approx_\alpha U_m$, and hence

$$h(f(Z_1), g(Z_2)) \approx_{3\alpha + r \cdot 2^{-(1-\beta-1/r)b}} U_m, \quad (3.8)$$

with probability at least

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - 2e^{-\alpha 2^{2(\beta-1/r)b - 4 \log(1/\alpha)}} - 3r \cdot e^{b - \alpha 2^{2\min(b/r, (\beta-1/r)b)}} \\ & \geq 1 - 5r \cdot e^{b - \alpha 2^{2\min(b/r, (\beta-1/r)b) - 4 \log(1/\alpha)}} \end{aligned}$$

over the choice of f , g , and h , via a union bound.

Now, observe that from Equation 3.7, if $b \geq c_\gamma$ for a sufficiently large constant $c_\gamma > 0$, it follows that

$$5r \cdot e^{b - \alpha 2^{2\min(b/r, (\beta-1/r)b) - 4 \log(1/\alpha)}} \leq 2^{-2^{c'_\gamma} b}$$

for some constant $c'_\gamma > 0$. Moreover, under Equation 3.7 we also have that

$$\delta' := 3\alpha + r \cdot 2^{-(1-\beta-1/r)b} \leq 2^{-c''_\gamma b}$$

for some constant $c''_\gamma > 0$. Finally, a union bound over the 2^d distributions in \mathcal{Z} shows that Equation 3.8 holds simultaneously for all $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ with probability at

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

least $1 - 2^{d-2^{2c'_\gamma b}}$. Consequently, if $d \leq 2^{c'_\gamma b}$ it follows that there exist functions f , g , and h such that Equation 3.8 holds for all $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ with the appropriate error δ' and output length m . □

3.5.1 The Main Result

We now use Theorem 49 to obtain the main result of this section.

Theorem 54 (First part of Theorem 34, restated). *Suppose $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages. Then, either:*

- *The scheme uses $d \geq \min(2^{\Omega(b)}, (1/\varepsilon_2)^{\Omega(1)})$ bits of randomness, or;*
- *The class of sources \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable with $\delta \leq \max(2^{-\Omega(b)}, \varepsilon_2^{\Omega(1)})$ and $m = \Omega(\min(b, \log(1/\varepsilon_2)))$.*

Proof. Given the scheme $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ from the theorem statement, let $b' = \min(b, \lceil \frac{\log(1/\varepsilon_2)}{100} \rceil)$ and consider the modified scheme $(\text{Sh}', \text{Rec}', \mathcal{Y})$ for b' -bit messages obtained by appending $0^{b-b'}$ to every b' -bit message and running the original scheme $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$. Applying Theorem 49 to $(\text{Sh}', \text{Rec}', \mathcal{Y})$ we conclude that either Sh' , and hence Sh , uses at least

$$2^{\Omega(b')} = \min(2^{\Omega(b)}, (1/\varepsilon_2)^{\Omega(1)})$$

bits of randomness, or \mathcal{Y} is (δ, m) -extractable with

$$\delta \leq 2^{-\Omega(b')} = \max(2^{-\Omega(b)}, \varepsilon_2^{\Omega(1)})$$

and $m = \Omega(b') = \Omega(\min(b, \log(1/\varepsilon_2)))$. □

3.5.2 Efficient Leakage-Resilient Secret Sharing Requires Efficiently Extractable Randomness

In this section, we prove the remaining part of Theorem 34. We show that every low-error leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme $(\text{Sh}, \text{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ for b -bit messages where Sh is computed by a $\text{poly}(b)$ -time algorithm admits a low-error extractor for

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

\mathcal{Y} computable by a family of $\text{poly}(b)$ -size circuits. Similarly to [41, Section 3.1], this is done by replacing the uniformly random functions f , g , and h in the proof of Theorem 49 by *t-wise independent functions*, for an appropriate parameter t .

We say that a family of functions \mathcal{F}_t from $\{0, 1\}^p$ to $\{0, 1\}^q$ is *t-wise independent* if for F sampled uniformly at random from \mathcal{F}_t it holds that the random variables $F(x_1), F(x_2), \dots, F(x_t)$ are independent and uniformly distributed over $\{0, 1\}^q$ for any distinct $x_1, \dots, x_t \in \{0, 1\}^p$. There exist *t-wise independent families of functions* \mathcal{F}_t such that every $f \in \mathcal{F}_t$ can be computed in time $\text{poly}(b)$ and can be described by $\text{poly}(b)$ bits whenever p , q , and t are $\text{poly}(b)$ [70, 163, 41]. Therefore, since Sh admits a $\text{poly}(b)$ -time algorithm, it suffices to show the existence of functions f , g , and h belonging to appropriate $\text{poly}(b)$ -wise independent families of functions such that $\mathbf{ext}(Y) = h(f(\text{Sh}_1), g(\text{Sh}_2))$ is statistically close to uniform, where $(\text{Sh}_1, \text{Sh}_2) = \text{Sh}(0^b, Y)$, for every source $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ (the advice required to compute \mathbf{ext} would be the description of f , g , and h). We accomplish this with the help of some auxiliary lemmas. The first lemma states a standard concentration bound for the sum of *t-wise independent random variables*.

Lemma 55 ([70, Theorem 5], see also [27, Lemma 2.2]). *Fix an even integer $t \geq 2$ and suppose that X_1, \dots, X_N are *t-wise independent random variables in $[0, 1]$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ and $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X]$. Then, it holds that**

$$\Pr[|X - \mu| \geq \varepsilon \cdot \mu] \leq 3 \left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon^2 \mu} \right)^{t/2}$$

for every $\varepsilon < 1$.

We can use Lemma 55 to derive analogues of Lemmas 40 and 41 for *t-wise independent functions*.

Lemma 56. *Suppose $f : \{0, 1\}^p \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^q$ is sampled uniformly at random from a $2t$ -wise independent family of functions with $q \leq k - \log t - 2 \log(1/\varepsilon) - 5$ and $t \geq q$, and let Y be a (p, k) -source. Then, it follows that*

$$f(Y) \approx_\varepsilon U_q$$

with probability at least $1 - 2^{-t}$ over the choice of f .

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

Proof. Fix a (p, k) -source Y and suppose $f : \{0, 1\}^p \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^q$ is sampled from a family of $2t$ -wise independent functions. Note that

$$\Delta(f(Y); U_q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z \in \{0, 1\}^q} |\Pr[f(Y) = z] - 2^{-q}|.$$

For each $y \in \{0, 1\}^p$ and $z \in \{0, 1\}^q$, consider the random variable $W_{y,z} = \Pr[Y = y] \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{f(y)=z\}}$. Then, we may write

$$\Delta(f(Y); U_q) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z \in \{0, 1\}^q} \left| \sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}^p} W_{y,z} - 2^{-q} \right|.$$

Note that the $W_{y,z}$'s are $2t$ -wise independent, $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}^p} W_{y,z}] = 2^{-q}$, and that $2^k \cdot W_{y,z} \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, an application of Lemma 55 with the random variables $(2^k \cdot W_{y,z})_{y \in \{0, 1\}^p, z \in \{0, 1\}^q}$ shows that

$$\Pr \left[\left| \sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}^p} W_{y,z} - 2^{-q} \right| > 2\varepsilon \cdot 2^{-q} \right] \leq 3 \left(\frac{t \cdot 2^q}{2\varepsilon^2 \cdot 2^k} \right)^t.$$

Therefore, a union bound over all $z \in \{0, 1\}^q$ shows that $f(Y) \approx_\varepsilon U_q$ fails to hold with probability at most $3 \cdot 2^q \cdot 2^{-t} \left(\frac{t \cdot 2^q}{\varepsilon^2 \cdot 2^k} \right)^t \leq 2^{-t}$ over the choice of f , where the inequality follows by the upper bound on q . □

The proof of the following lemma is analogous to the proof of Lemma 41, but using Lemma 56 instead of Lemma 40.

Lemma 57. *Suppose $f : \{0, 1\}^p \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^q$ is sampled uniformly at random from a $2t$ -wise independent family of functions with $t \geq q$, and let Y be a (p, k) -source. Then, it follows that $f(Y) \approx_\varepsilon W$ for some W such that $H_\infty(W) \geq \min(q, k - \log t - 2 \log(1/\varepsilon) - 5)$ with probability at least $1 - 2^{-t}$ over the choice of f .*

Following the reasoning used in the proof of Theorem 49 but sampling $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^b$ and $h : \{0, 1\}^b \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ from $2t$ -wise independent families of functions with $t = 100 \max(b, d) = \text{poly}(b)$, and using Lemmas 56 and 57 in place of Lemmas 40 and 41, respectively, yields the following result analogous to Theorem 49. Informally, it states that efficient low-error leakage-resilient secret sharing schemes require low-complexity extractors for the associated class of randomness sources.

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

Theorem 58. *There exist absolute constants $c, c' > 0$ such that the following holds for b large enough: Suppose $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is an $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ -leakage-resilient secret sharing for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness such that \mathbf{Sh} is computable by a $\text{poly}(b)$ -time algorithm. Then, there exists a deterministic extractor $\mathbf{ext} : \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ computable by a family of $\text{poly}(b)$ -size circuits with output length $m \geq c \cdot b$ such that*

$$\mathbf{ext}(Y) \approx_{\delta} U_m$$

with $\delta = 2^b \varepsilon_2 + 2^{-c' \cdot b}$ for every $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Finally, replacing Theorem 49 by Theorem 58 in the reasoning from Section 3.5.1 yields the remaining part of Theorem 34.

3.5.3 An Extension to the Setting of Computational Security

In this work we focus on secret sharing schemes with information-theoretic security. However, it is also natural to wonder whether our result extends to secret sharing schemes satisfying a reasonable notion of computational security. Indeed, a slight modification to the argument used to prove Theorem 34 also shows that computationally-secure efficient leakage-resilient secret sharing schemes require randomness sources from which one can efficiently extract bits which are pseudorandom (i.e., computationally indistinguishable from the uniform distribution). We briefly discuss the required modifications in this section. For the sake of exposition, we refrain from presenting fully formal definitions and theorem statements.

First, we introduce a computational analogue of Definition 33. We say that $(\mathbf{Sh}, \mathbf{Rec}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a *computationally secure leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme (for b -bit messages)* if the scheme satisfies Definition 33 except that the leakage-resilience property is replaced by the following computational analogue: “For any leakage functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^{\ell} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ computed by $\text{poly}(b)$ -sized circuits and any two secrets $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^b$, it holds that any adversary computable by $\text{poly}(b)$ -sized circuits cannot distinguish between the distributions $(f(\mathbf{Sh}_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}_2))$ and $(f(\mathbf{Sh}'_1), g(\mathbf{Sh}'_2))$ with non-negligible advantage (in some security parameter λ), where $(\mathbf{Sh}_1, \mathbf{Sh}_2) = \mathbf{Sh}(x)$ and $(\mathbf{Sh}'_1, \mathbf{Sh}'_2) = \mathbf{Sh}(x')$.”

Using this definition, the exact argument we used to prove Theorem 34 combined with a modified version of Lemma 50 then shows that we can extract bits which

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

are *computationally indistinguishable* from the uniform distribution using the class of randomness sources used to implement such a computationally-secure leakage-resilient secret sharing scheme. In fact, the proof of Theorem 34 only uses the leakage-resilience property of the secret sharing scheme in the proof of Lemma 50. The remaining lemmas only make use of the correctness property of the scheme, which remains unchanged in the computational analogue of Definition 33. Crucially, as shown in Section 3.5.2, we can construct the functions f , g , and h so that they are computed by $\text{poly}(b)$ -sized circuits assuming that the sharing procedure is itself computable by $\text{poly}(b)$ -sized circuits. Therefore, the following computational analogue of Lemma 50, which suffices to conclude the proof of the computational analogue of Theorem 34, holds: “Suppose that there are functions $f, g : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and a function $h : \{0, 1\}^{2b} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ computable by $\text{poly}(b)$ -sized circuits such that

$$h(f(Z_1), g(Z_1)) \approx_\delta U_m$$

for $\delta = \text{negl}(\lambda)$ and for all (Z_1, Z_2) in \mathcal{Z} . Then, it holds that no adversary computable by $\text{poly}(b)$ -sized circuits can distinguish $\mathbf{ext}(Y)$ from a uniformly random string with $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, where $\mathbf{ext}(Y) = h(f(L_Y), g(R_Y))$ and $(L_y, R_y) = \text{Sh}(0^b, Y)$.”

3.6 Random-less Reductions for Secret Sharing

In this section, we study black-box deterministic reductions between different types of threshold secret sharing. Such reductions from (t', n', ε) -secret sharing schemes to (t, n, ε) -secret sharing schemes (for the same message length b and number of randomness bits d) would allow us to conclude that if all these (t, n, ε) -secret sharing schemes require a (δ, m) -extractable class of randomness sources, then so do all (t', n', ε) -secret sharing schemes. We provide reductions which work over a large range of parameters and prove complementary results showcasing the limits of such reductions. As previously discussed, our starting point for devising black-box reductions is the notion of a *distribution design* as formalized by Stinson and Wei [161] (with roots going back to early work on secret sharing [32]), which we defined in Definition 46. As stated in Lemma 47, the existence of a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design yields the desired reduction from (t', n', ε) -secret sharing to

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

(t, n, ε) -secret sharing. Therefore, we focus directly on the study of distribution designs in this section.

We begin with a naive construction.

Theorem 59. *There exists a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design whenever $t' \geq t$ and $n' \geq n + (t' - t)$. In particular, if every (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages and using d bits of randomness requires a (δ, m) -extractable class of randomness sources, then so does every (t', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness whenever $t' \geq t$ and $n' \geq n + (t' - t)$.*

Proof. Consider the (t, n, t', n') -distribution design $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n$ obtained by setting $\mathcal{D}_i = \{i\} \cup \{n' - (t' - t) + 1, n' - (t' - t) + 2, \dots, n'\}$, which is valid exactly when the conditions of the theorem are satisfied. □

The following result shows the limits of distribution designs, and will be used to show the optimality of our constructions when $t = 2$ or $t' = n'$.

Theorem 60. *A (t, n, t', n') -distribution design exists only if $\binom{n'}{t'-1} \geq \binom{n}{t-1}$ and $t' \geq t$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary (t, n, t', n') -distribution design $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n$. First, note that it must be the case that all the \mathcal{D}_i 's are non-empty. This implies that we must have $t' \geq t$. Second, to see that $\binom{n'}{t'-1} \geq \binom{n}{t-1}$, consider all $\binom{n}{t-1}$ distinct subsets $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$ of size $t - 1$, and denote $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{D}_i$. By the definition of distribution design, it must hold that

$$|\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}| \leq t' - 1.$$

Consider now modified sets $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{T}}$ obtained by adding arbitrary elements to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}$ so that $|\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{T}}| = t' - 1$. Then, from the definition of distribution design, for any two distinct subsets $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}' \subseteq [n]$ of size $t - 1$ it must be the case that

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{T}} \cup \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{T}'}| \geq t'.$$

This implies that $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{T}} \neq \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ for all distinct subsets $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}' \subseteq [n]$ of size $t - 1$, which can only hold if $\binom{n'}{t'-1} \geq \binom{n}{t-1}$. □

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

We now show that Theorem 60 is tight for a broad range of parameters. In particular, when $t = 2$ or $t' = n'$ we are able to characterize exactly under which parameters a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design exists.

Theorem 61. *There exists a $(t = 2, n, t', n')$ -distribution design if and only if $n \leq \binom{n'}{t'-1}$. In particular, if every $(t = 2, n, \varepsilon)$ -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness requires (δ, m) -extractable randomness, then so does every (t', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness whenever $n \leq \binom{n'}{t'-1}$.*

Proof. Note that the condition $n \leq \binom{n'}{t'-1}$ implies that we can take $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n$ to be distinct subsets of $[n']$ of size $t' - 1$, and so $|\mathcal{D}_i \cup \mathcal{D}_j| \geq t'$ for any distinct indices i and j . The reverse implication follows from Theorem 60. □

Theorem 62. *There exists a $(t, n, t' = n', n')$ -distribution design if and only if $n' \geq \binom{n}{t-1}$. In particular, if every (t, n, ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness requires (δ, m) -extractable randomness, then so does every (n', n', ε) -secret sharing scheme for b -bit messages using d bits of randomness whenever $n' \geq \binom{n}{t-1}$.*

Proof. We show that a (t, n, n', n') -distribution design exists whenever $n' = \binom{n}{t-1}$, which implies the desired result. Let \mathcal{P} denote the family of all subsets of $[n]$ of size $t - 1$, and set $n' = |\mathcal{P}| = \binom{n}{t-1}$ (we may use any correspondence between elements of \mathcal{P} and integers in $[n']$). Then, we define the set $\mathcal{D}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ for $i \in [n]$ to contain all elements of \mathcal{P} except the subsets of $[n]$ which contain i . We argue that $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n$ is a distribution design with the desired parameters. First, observe that for any distinct indices $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{t-1} \in [n]$ it holds that

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{t-1} \mathcal{D}_{i_j} = \mathcal{P} \setminus \{\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{t-1}\}\}.$$

On the other hand, since $\{i_1, \dots, i_{t-1}\} \in \mathcal{D}_{i_t}$ for any index $i_t \neq i_1, \dots, i_{t-1}$, it follows that $\bigcup_{j=1}^t \mathcal{D}_{i_j} = \mathcal{P}$, as desired.

The reverse implication follows from Theorem 60. □

3.6.1 Distribution Designs from Partial Steiner Systems

In this section, we show that every partial Steiner system is also a distribution design which beats the naive construction from Theorem 59 for certain parameter regimes. Such set systems have been previously used in seminal constructions of pseudorandom generators and extractors [145, 162], and are also called combinatorial designs.

Definition 63 (Partial Steiner system). We say a family of sets $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \subseteq [n']$ is an (n, n', ℓ, a) -partial Steiner system if it holds that $|\mathcal{D}_i| = \ell$ for every $i \in [n]$ and $|\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_j| \leq a$ for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$.

The conditions required for the existence of a partial Steiner system are well-understood, as showcased in the following result from [93, 145, 162], which is nearly optimal [152, 151].

Lemma 64 ([93, 145, 162]). *Fix positive integers n, ℓ , and $a \leq \ell$. Then, there exists an (n, n', ℓ, a) -partial Steiner system for every integer $n' \geq e \cdot n^{1/a} \cdot \frac{\ell^2}{a}$.*

Noting that every partial Steiner system with appropriate parameters is also a distribution design, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 65. *Fix an integer $a \geq 1$. Then, there exists a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design whenever $t' \geq t^2 + \frac{at(t-1)^2}{2}$ and $n' \geq \frac{en^{1/a}}{a} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{t'}{t} + \frac{a(t-1)}{2}\right)^2$.*

Proof. Fix an integer $a \geq 1$ and an (n, n', ℓ, a) -partial Steiner system $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n \subseteq [n']$ with $\ell = \left\lceil \frac{t'}{t} + \frac{a(t-1)}{2} \right\rceil$. By Lemma 64 and the choice of ℓ , such a partial Steiner system is guaranteed to exist whenever n' satisfies the condition in the theorem statement. We proceed to argue that this partial Steiner system is also a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design. First, fix an arbitrary set $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$ of size $t - 1$. Then, we have

$$|\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}| \leq \ell(t - 1) \leq t' - 1,$$

where the rightmost inequality holds by our choice of ℓ and the condition on t' and t in the theorem statement. Second, fix an arbitrary set $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [n]$ of size t . Then, it

CHAPTER 3. RANDOMNESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEAKAGE-RESILIENT
AND NON-MALLEABLE SECRET SHARING

holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{T}}| &\geq \ell + (\ell - a) + (\ell - 2a) + \cdots + (\ell - a(t - 1)) \\ &= \ell \cdot t - \frac{at(t - 1)}{2} \\ &\geq t', \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows again from our choice of ℓ and the condition on t' and t in the theorem statement. □

When n is sufficiently larger than t and t' and t' is sufficiently larger than t , the parameters in Theorem 65 cannot be attained by the naive construction from Theorem 59, which always requires choosing $t' \geq t$ and $n' \geq n$. For example, if $t^3 \leq t' \leq Ct^3$ for some constant $C \geq 1$ then we can choose $a = 2$, in which case we have

$$t^2 + \frac{at(t - 1)^2}{2} \leq t^3 \leq t'. \quad (3.9)$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{en^{1/a}}{a} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{t'}{t} + \frac{a(t - 1)}{2}\right)^2 &\leq \frac{e\sqrt{n}}{2} \cdot (Ct^2 + t)^2 \\ &\leq 2eC^2\sqrt{nt^4}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Combining Equation 3.9 and Equation 3.10 with Theorem 65, we obtain the following example result showing it is possible to improve on Theorem 59 in some parameter regimes.

Corollary 66. *Suppose $t^3 \leq t' \leq Ct^3$ for some constant $C \geq 1$. Then, there exists a (t, n, t', n') -distribution design for any $n' \geq 2eC^2\sqrt{nt^4}$. In particular, if $t \leq n^{1/9}$ and n is large enough, we may choose n' significantly smaller than n .*

Chapter 4

Non-malleable Extraction, and Privacy Amplification

In this chapter (based on the paper [2]) we turn our attention to non-malleable cryptography. Expanding again on adversaries that may not respect the boundaries on what information or states are accessible during the design of cryptographic primitives, while some adversaries may choose to be passive by only collecting information, others may take on a more active role by tampering with public communication between parties, execution states, or the computation of the primitives themselves. Indeed, there are certain real life attacks that work by flipping RAM bits (and therefore tamper with states/memory) on targeted machines [120], or heating up devices to cause hardware faults that influence execution of the protocol [39]. To address this, non-malleable cryptography addresses adversaries that are allowed to actively tamper or “mall” certain states or stored information in an attempt to influence the outcome of the protocol in a meaningful manner. Here are a few examples in non-malleable cryptography: *Non-malleable encryption* was firstly introduced by Dolev, Dwork, and Naor in [82] where the adversary is allowed to actively tamper with or “mall” ciphertexts into other ciphertexts that can be decrypted to related plaintexts. Boaz Barak gave a non-malleable commitment scheme in [24] which allows a party to commit to a value to eventually reveal it where an adversary is allowed to tamper with messages used in the communication. Dziembowski, Pietrzak, and Wichs in [92] introduce non-malleable codes, which are an extension of error-correcting codes, where one can think of the error as being adversarially chosen, and the decoding algorithm must either detect potential tampering or output something unrelated to the initially encoded message. We note that the aforementioned primitives are extensions of pre-existing primitives, namely:

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

public-key encryption, commitment schemes, and error-correcting codes.

Along similar lines, we turn our attention to studying extractors, and their non-malleable extensions. The problem of constructing efficient two-source extractors for low min-entropy sources with negligible error has been an important focus of research in pseudorandomness for more than 30 years, with fundamental connections to combinatorics and many applications in computer science. The first non-trivial construction was given by Chor and Goldreich [58] who showed that the inner product function is a low-error two-source extractor for n -bit sources with min-entropy $(1/2 + \gamma)n$, where $\gamma > 0$ is an arbitrarily small constant. A standard application of the probabilistic method shows that (inefficient) low-error two-source extractors exist for polylogarithmic min-entropy. While several attempts were made to improve the construction of [58] to allow for sources with smaller min-entropy, the major breakthrough results were obtained after almost two decades. Raz [150] gave an explicit low-error two-source extractor where one of the sources must have min-entropy $(1/2 + \gamma)n$ for an arbitrarily small constant $\gamma > 0$, while the other source is allowed to have logarithmic min-entropy. In an incomparable result, Bourgain [42] gave an explicit low-error two-source extractor for sources with min-entropy $(1/2 - \gamma)n$, where $\gamma > 0$ is a small constant. An improved analysis by Lewko [130] shows that Bourgain's extractor can handle sources with min-entropy $4n/9$.

((Seeded) non-malleable extractors.) The problem of privacy amplification against active adversaries was first considered by Maurer and Wolf [140]. In a breakthrough result, Dodis and Wichs [79] introduced the notion of seeded non-malleable extractors as a natural tool towards achieving a privacy amplification protocol in a minimal number of rounds, and with minimal entropy loss. Roughly speaking, the output of a seeded non-malleable extractor with a uniformly random seed Y , and a source X with some min-entropy independent of Y , should look uniformly random to an adversary who can tamper the seed, and obtain the output of the non-malleable extractor on a tampered seed.

More precisely, we require that

$$\left(\mathbf{nmExt}(X, Y), \mathbf{nmExt}(X, g(Y)), Y \right) \approx_\varepsilon \left(U_m, \mathbf{nmExt}(X, g(Y)), Y \right),$$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

where X and Y are independent sources with X having sufficient min-entropy and Y uniformly random, g is an arbitrary tampering function with no fixed points, U_m is uniform over $\{0, 1\}^m$ and independent of X, Y , and \approx_ε denotes the fact that the two distributions are ε -close in statistical distance (for small ε).

Prior works have also studied seeded extractors with weaker non-malleability guarantees such as look-ahead extractors [79] or affine-malleable extractors [7], and used these to construct privacy amplification protocols.

(Non-malleable two-source extractors.) A natural strengthening of both seeded non-malleable extractors, and two-source extractors are two-source *non-malleable* extractors. Two-source non-malleable extractors were introduced by Cheraghchi and Guruswami [57]. Roughly speaking, a function $\mathbf{2NMExt} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is said to be a non-malleable extractor if the output of the extractor remains close to uniform (in statistical distance), even conditioned on the output of the extractor inputs correlated with the original sources. In other words, we require that

$$\left(\mathbf{2NMExt}(X, Y), \mathbf{2NMExt}(f(X), g(Y)), Y \right) \approx_\varepsilon \left(U_m, \mathbf{2NMExt}(f(X), g(Y)), Y \right).$$

where X and Y are independent sources with enough min-entropy, f, g are arbitrary tampering functions such that one of f, g has no fixed points.

The original motivation for studying efficient two-source non-malleable extractors stems from the fact that they directly yield explicit split-state non-malleable codes [92] (provided the extractor also supports efficient preimage sampling).

The first constructions of non-malleable codes [90, 6] relied heavily on the (limited) non-malleability of the inner-product two-source extractor. Subsequent improved constructions of non-malleable codes in the split-state model relied on both the inner-product two-source extractor [5, 10], and on more sophisticated constructions of the two-source non-malleable extractors [52, 133, 134]. Soon after they were introduced, non-malleable extractors have found other applications such as non-malleable secret sharing [103, 4].

(Connections, and state-of-the-art constructions.) As one might expect, the various notions of extractors mentioned above are closely connected to each other.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

Li [131] obtained the first connection between seeded non-malleable extractors and two-source extractors based on inner products. This result shows that an improvement of Bourgain’s result would immediately lead to better seeded non-malleable extractors, and a novel construction of seeded non-malleable extractors with a small enough min-entropy requirement and a small enough seed size would immediately lead to two-source extractors that only require small min-entropy. However, [131] could only obtain seeded non-malleable extractors for entropy rate above $1/2$.

In yet another breakthrough result, [52] obtained a sophisticated construction of seeded non-malleable extractors for polylogarithmic min-entropy. Additionally, they showed that similar techniques can also be used to obtain two-source non-malleable extractors. This immediately led to improved privacy amplification protocols and improved constructions of non-malleable codes in the split-state model. Building on this result, in a groundbreaking work, Chattopadhyay and Zuckerman [55] gave a construction of two-source extractors with polylogarithmic min-entropy and polynomially small error. All of these results have subsequently been improved in [132, 30, 61, 133, 134]. We summarize the parameters of the best known constructions of seeded extractors, two-source extractors, seeded non-malleable extractors, and two-source non-malleable extractors alongside those of our construction in Table 4.1. We note here that all prior constructions of two-source non-malleable extractors required both sources to have almost full min-entropy. A recent result [105] has not been included in this table since it constructs a weaker variant of a non-malleable two-source extractor (that does not fulfil the standard definition) that is sufficient for their application to network extraction. Even if one is willing to relax the definition to that in [105], the final parameters of our two-source non-malleable extractor are better!

The research over the past few years has shown that non-malleable two-source extractors, seeded non-malleable extractors, two-source extractors, non-malleable codes, and privacy amplification protocols are strongly connected to each other in the sense that improved construction of one of these objects has led to improvements in the construction of others. Some results have made these connections formal by transforming a construction of one object into a construction of another object. For instance, in addition to the connections already mentioned, Ben-Aroya et al.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

Citation	Left Rate	Right Rate	Non-malleability
Seeded			
[151] Theorem 1	$\text{polylog}(n)/n$	1	None
[107] Theorem 4.17	$\log(n)/n$	1	None
Seeded, Non-malleable			
[131]	$1/2 - \gamma$	1	Right source
[62]	$1/2 + \gamma$	1	Right source
[73] Theorem 1.4	$1/2 + \gamma$	1	Right source
[52]	$\log^2 n/n$	1	Right-source
[133] Theorem 6.2	$\log(n)/n$	1	Right source
[134]	$\log(n)/n$	1	Right-source
Two-source			
[58]	$1/2$	$1/2$	None
[42]	$1/2 - \gamma$	$1/2 - \gamma$	None
[150]	$\log(n)/n$	$1/2 + \gamma$	None
Two-source, Non-malleable			
[52]	$1 - \frac{1}{n^\gamma}$	$1 - \frac{1}{n^\gamma}$	Two-sided
[133]	$(1 - \gamma)$	$(1 - \gamma)$	Two-sided
[134] Theorem 1.11	$(1 - \gamma)$	$(1 - \gamma)$	Two-sided
This Work	$\text{polylog}(n)/n$	$4/5 + \gamma$	Two-sided

Table 4.1: In the table, we assume that the left source has length n , and γ is a very small universal constant that has a different value for different results. Most of the constructions two-source non-malleable extractors including ours allow for t -time tampering at the cost of a higher min-entropy requirement. In particular (as described in Remark 91, 101, and 103), for our extractor we require the left source to have min-entropy rate $\text{polylog}(n)/n$, and the right source has min-entropy rate $(1 - \frac{1}{2t+3})$.

[29] adapt the approach of [55] to show explicit *seeded* non-malleable extractors with improved seed length lead to explicit low-error two-source extractors for low min-entropy.

Also, [11] showed that some improvement in the parameters of non-malleable two-source extractor constructions from [52, 133, 134] leads to explicit low-error two-source extractors for min-entropy δn with a very small constant $\delta > 0$.

Parameters for each extractor were chosen such that the error is $2^{-\kappa^c}$ and the output length is $\Omega(\kappa)$ for some constant c , where κ is the amount of entropy in the left source.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

(Best of all worlds.) Notice that the seeded non-malleable extractor, and the two-source extractors can be seen as special case of a two-source non-malleable extractor. With this view, the known constructions of negligible error (non-malleable) two-source extractors can be broadly classified in three categories:

- Constructions where one source has min-entropy rate about $1/2$, the other source can have small min-entropy rate, but the extractor doesn't guarantee non-malleability.
- Constructions where one source is uniform, and the other can have small min-entropy rate, and the extractor guarantees non-malleability when the uniform source is tampered.
- Constructions where both sources have entropy rate very close to 1 and the extractor guarantees non-malleability against the tampering of both sources.

The main focus of this work is the question whether we can have one construction that subsumes all the above constructions.

Question 67. *Is there an explicit construction of a two-source non-malleable extractor which requires two sources of length n_1 and n_2 , and min-entropy requirement cn_1 (for some constant $c < 1$), and $\text{polylog } n_2$, respectively, that guarantees non-malleability against the tampering of both sources, and for which the error is negligible? In particular, can we obtain a construction with parameters suitable for application to privacy amplification with tamperable memory [11]?*

In this work, we make progress towards answering this question.

(Applications of two-source non-malleable extractors.) Two-source non-malleable extractors have in the recent years attracted a lot of attention, and have very quickly become fundamental objects in cryptosystems involving communication channels that cannot be fully trusted. As we discussed earlier, two-source non-malleable extractors have applications in the construction of non-malleable codes, and in constructing two-source extractors. The other primary applications of two-source non-malleable extractors include non-malleable secret sharing [103, 4], non-malleable commitments [104], network extractors [105], and privacy amplification [53, 11].

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

In particular, in [11], the authors introduce an extension of privacy amplification (PA) against active adversaries where, Eve as the active adversary is additionally allowed to *fully corrupt* the internal memory of one of the honest parties, Alice and Bob, before the execution of the protocol. Their construction required two-source non-malleable extractors with one source having a small entropy rate δ (where δ is a constant close to 0). Since no prior construction of two-source non-malleable extractor satisfied these requirements, the authors constructed such extractors under computational assumptions and left the construction of the information-theoretic extractor with the desired parameters as an open problem. Our construction in this work resolves this open problem. We do not include here the details of the PA protocol due to space constraints. We refer the reader to [11] for the PA protocol.

(Subsequent work.) Li, inspired by our work and that of [105], in [135] gives a two-source non-malleable extractor construction with $\frac{2}{3}$ -rate entropy in one source and $\frac{\log(n)}{n}$ -rate entropy in the other. Based on the proof sketch in [135], the key idea of the construction and proof seems similar, the fundamental difference being the use of an correlation breaker with advice instead of a collision resistant extractor.

4.1 Chapter Organisation and Our Results

We build two-source non-malleable extractors, with one source having poly-logarithmic min-entropy, and the other source having min-entropy rate 0.81. We introduce collision-resistant extractors, and extend and improve efficiency of the privacy amplification protocol from [11]. The following is a roadmap of this chapter.

- In Section 4.3, we give an overview of our technical details.
- In Section 4.5, we give a generic transformation that, takes in (1) a non-malleable two-source extractor which requires sources with high min-entropy, and (2) a two-source extractor which requires sources with smaller min-entropy and an additional collision-resistance property, and constructs a two-source non-malleable extractor with min-entropy requirement comparable to (but slightly worse) that of the two-source extractor used by the construction.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

- In Section 4.6.1, we give a generic transformation that converts any seeded extractor (two-source extractor where one of the source is uniformly distributed) to a collision-resistant seeded extractor with essentially the same parameters.
- In Section 4.6.2, we show that the two-source extractor from [150] is collision resistant.
- In Section 4.7, we apply our generic transformation from Section 4.6.1 to the seeded extractor from [151] to obtain a collision-resistant seeded extractor. We then use the generic transformation from Section 4.5 along with the non-malleable extractor from [134] to obtain a two-source non-malleable extractor, where one of the source is uniform and the other has min-entropy polylogarithmic in the length of the sources.
- In Section 4.8, we apply the generic transformation from Section 4.5 to the non-malleable extractor from Section 4.7, and the two-source extractor from [150] to obtain a two-source non-malleable extractor where one source is required to have polylogarithmic min-entropy and the source is required to have min-entropy rate greater than 0.8.
- Applications:
 - In Section 4.9, we use a generic transformation from [8] to obtain a non-malleable two-source extractor where the length of the output is $1/2 - o(1)$ times the length of the input. Notice that via the probabilistic method, it can be shown that the output length of this construction is optimal.¹
 - In Section 4.10, we sketch the details of the privacy amplification protocol that uses our non-malleable two-source extractor. We extend the protocol by [11] to obtain a secret of optimal size while maintaining security against a memory tampering adversary.

¹The main drawback of this construction compared to the construction from Section 4.8 is that this is not a strong two-source non-malleable extractor, and hence cannot be used in most applications.

4.2 Preliminaries

Lemma 68. *Let X, Y be random variables. Further let $f_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a family of functions f indexed by set \mathcal{I} and let S be a random variable supported on \mathcal{I} that is independent of both X and Y . Then f_S can be thought of as a randomised function such that $f_S(x) = f_s(x)$ with probability $\Pr[S = s]$.*

Then it holds that:

$$\Delta(f_S(X); f_S(Y)) \leq \Delta(X; Y).$$

Lemma 69 (Lemma 4 of [65], Lemma 9 of [5]). *Let A, B be independent random variables and consider a sequence V_1, \dots, V_i of random variables, where for some function ϕ , $V_i = \phi_i(C_i) = \phi(V_1, \dots, V_{i-1}, C_i)$ with each $C_i \in \{A, B\}$. Then A and B are independent conditioned on V_1, \dots, V_i . That is, $I(A; B|V_1, \dots, V_i) = 0$.*

Definition 70. *Call a sequence of variables Z_1, \dots, Z_N (k, ε) -biased against linear tests if for any non-empty $\tau \subseteq [N]$ such that $|\tau| \leq k$, $|\Pr[\bigoplus_{i \in \tau} Z_i = 0] - \frac{1}{2}| \leq \varepsilon$.*

Lemma 71 (Theorem 2 of [15]). *Let $N = 2^t - 1$ and let k be an odd integer. Then it is possible to construct N random variables Z_i with $i \in [N]$ which are (k, ε) -biased against linear tests using a seed of size at most $2\lceil \log(1/\varepsilon) + \log \log N + \log k \rceil + 1$ bits.*

4.2.1 Rejection Sampling for Extractors

In this section we present two lemmas that use rejection sampling to lower the entropy requirement for strong two-source extractors and their collision resistance.

We first define a sampling algorithm **samp** that given a flat distribution $Y' \sim (n, k)$, tries to approximate some distribution $Y \sim (n, k - \delta)$ (with $\text{supp}(Y) \subseteq \text{supp}(Y')$). Letting $d = \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y)} \left\{ \frac{\Pr[Y=y]}{\Pr[Y'=y]} \right\}$:

$$\mathbf{samp}(y) = \begin{cases} y, & w.p. \frac{\Pr[Y=y]}{d \cdot \Pr[Y'=y]} \\ \perp, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 72. *The probability $\mathbf{samp}(Y') = y$ is $\frac{\Pr[Y=y]}{d}$ and furthermore, the probability that $\mathbf{samp}(Y') \neq \perp$ is $\frac{1}{d}$. Consequently, the distribution $\mathbf{samp}(Y')$ conditioned on the event that $\mathbf{samp}(Y') \neq \perp$ is identical to Y .*

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

Proof. Letting \mathbf{samp} and d be defined as above, then:

$$\Pr[\mathbf{samp}(Y') = y] = \frac{1}{d} \frac{\Pr[Y = y]}{\Pr[Y' = y]} \cdot \Pr[Y' = y] = \frac{\Pr[Y = y]}{d}$$

Then it follows that:

$$\Pr[\mathbf{samp}(Y') \neq \perp] = \sum_y \Pr[\mathbf{samp}(Y) = y] = \sum_y \frac{\Pr[Y = y]}{d} = \frac{1}{d}$$

Thus, conditioned on the event that $\mathbf{samp}(Y') \neq \perp$, $\mathbf{samp}(Y')$ is the distribution Y .

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{samp}(Y') = y | \mathbf{samp}(Y') \neq \perp] &= \frac{\Pr[\mathbf{samp}(Y') \neq \perp | \mathbf{samp}(Y') = y] \Pr[\mathbf{samp}(Y') = y]}{\Pr[\mathbf{samp}(Y') \neq \perp]} \\ &= \Pr[Y = y] \end{aligned}$$

□

Lowering the Entropy Requirement for Strong Two-Source Extractors.

We will use rejection sampling now to show that we can lower entropy requirements for extractors, at the cost of increased statistical distance in its output from the full uniform distribution.

Lemma 73. *Let $\mathbf{ext} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2)] \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon$ be a strong two-source extractor using input distributions X and Y' . Then letting $Y \sim (n_2, k_2 - \delta)$:*

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | Y) \leq 2^\delta \varepsilon$$

Proof. Assume by contradiction that there exists a distribution $Y \sim (n, k - \delta)$ for which $\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | Y) > 2^\delta \varepsilon$, i.e. there exists a distinguisher $A : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $|\Pr[A(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y), Y) = 1] - \Pr[A(U_m, Y) = 1]| > 2^\delta \varepsilon$. We want to use this fact to create a distinguisher D that distinguishes $\mathbf{ext}(X, Y')$ from U_m for some distribution $Y' \sim (n, k)$. Note that Y can be expressed as a convex combination of $(n, k - \delta)$ flat distributions, i.e. $Y = \sum_i \alpha_i Y_i$. We define Y' in the following way: Y' is a convex combination of flat distributions Y'_i where each Y'_i is some (n, k) flat distribution such that $\text{supp}(Y_i) \subseteq \text{supp}(Y'_i)$. We first note that for all $y \in \text{supp}(Y)$:

$$\frac{\Pr[Y = y]}{\Pr[Y' = y]} = \frac{\sum_i \alpha_i \Pr[Y_i = y]}{\sum_i \alpha_i \Pr[Y'_i = y]} \leq \frac{2^{-k+\delta}}{2^{-k}} \leq 2^\delta$$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

Furthermore, note that Y' has min-entropy k . To see this, note that for any $y \in \text{supp}(Y)$:

$$\Pr[Y' = y] = \sum_i \alpha_i \Pr[Y'_i = y] \leq \sum_i \alpha_i 2^{-k} \leq 2^{-k}$$

Let samp be a rejection sampler that on input distribution Y , samples for Y' . Now, D is defined as follows:

$$D(Z, Y') = \begin{cases} A(Z, Y') & , \text{ if } \text{samp}(Y') \neq \perp \\ 1 & , \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{2}, \text{ if } \text{samp}(Y') = \perp \\ 0 & , \text{ else} \end{cases}$$

Note that by Lemma 72, $\Pr[\text{samp}(Y') \neq \perp] \geq \frac{1}{2^\delta}$ and $\text{samp}(Y')$ is identical to Y conditioned on the event that $\text{samp}(Y') = \perp$. Then the advantage that D distinguishes between $\text{ext}(X, Y')$ and U_m given Y' is given as:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Pr[D(\text{ext}(X, Y'), Y') = 1] - \Pr[D(U_m, Y') = 1]| \\ & \geq \Pr[\text{samp}(Y) \neq \perp] |\Pr[A(\text{ext}(X, Y), Y) = 1] - \Pr[A(U_m, Y) = 1]| \\ & > \frac{1}{2^\delta} 2^\delta \varepsilon = \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Which in turn implies that $\Delta(\text{ext}(X, Y'); U_m | Y') > \varepsilon$, which implies the desired contradiction. \square

Lowering the Entropy Requirement for Collision Resistance in Extractors.

Similarly, it will be useful for us to first show that we can lower the entropy requirement (again, at the cost of increased distance in the output from the uniform distribution)

Lemma 74. *Let $\text{ext} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2)] \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon$ be a strong two-source extractor using input distributions X and Y' that has collision probability $\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}$. Then letting $Y \sim (n_2, k_2 - \delta)$ and f be any fixed-point-free function:*

$$\Pr[\text{ext}(X, Y) = \text{ext}(f(X), Y)] \leq 2^\delta \varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}$$

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, Y be any $(n, k - \delta)$ distribution for which the collision probability is at least $2^\delta \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}$.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

Note that Y can be expressed as a convex combination of $(n, k - \delta)$ flat distributions, i.e. $Y = \sum_i \alpha_i Y_i$. We define Y' in the following way: Y' is a convex combination of flat distributions Y'_i where each Y'_i is some (n, k) flat distribution such that $\text{supp}(Y_i) \subseteq \text{supp}(Y'_i)$. We first note that for all $y \in \text{supp}(Y)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Pr[Y = y]}{\Pr[Y' = y]} &= \frac{\sum_i \alpha_i \Pr[Y_i = y]}{\sum_i \alpha_i \Pr[Y'_i = y]} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{-k+\delta}}{2^{-k}} \leq 2^\delta \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, note that Y' has min-entropy k . To see this, note that for any $y \in \text{supp}(Y)$:

$$\Pr[Y' = y] = \sum_i \alpha_i \Pr[Y'_i = y] \leq \sum_i \alpha_i 2^{-k} \leq 2^{-k}$$

Let samp be a rejection sampler that on input distribution Y' , samples for Y . By the collision resilience property of \mathbf{ext} , it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\text{Collision}} &\geq \Pr[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y') = \mathbf{ext}(f(X), Y')] \\ &\geq \Pr[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y) = \mathbf{ext}(f(X), Y) \mid \text{samp}(Y) \neq \perp] \Pr[\text{samp}(Y) \neq \perp] \\ &= \Pr[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y) = \mathbf{ext}(f(X), Y)] 2^{-\delta} \end{aligned}$$

□

4.2.2 Extractors

Definition 75 (Two Source Non-malleable Extractor). *Call $\mathbf{ext} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2)] \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon$ a two source non-malleable extractor if additionally for any pair of functions $f : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_1}$, $g : \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_2}$ such at least one of f, g is fixed-point-free², the following holds:*

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m \mid \mathbf{ext}(f(X), g(Y))) \leq \varepsilon$$

Additionally, we call the extractor \mathbf{ext} a right strong non-malleable two-source extractor if:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m \mid \mathbf{ext}(f(X), g(Y)), Y) \leq \varepsilon,$$

²A function f is said to be fixed-point-free if for any x , $f(x) \neq x$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

and we call the extractor \mathbf{ext} a left strong non-malleable two-source extractor if:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | \mathbf{ext}(f(X), g(Y)), X) \leq \varepsilon ,$$

Definition 76 ((Fully) Non-malleable Seeded Extractor). Call $\mathbf{ext} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, n_2) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon]$ a non-malleable seeded extractor if additionally for some fixed-point-free function $g : \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_2}$, the following holds:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | \mathbf{ext}(X, g(Y))) \leq \varepsilon$$

A natural strengthening of a non-malleable seeded extractor is to consider a pair of tampering functions on both its inputs rather than on just the seed. Thus call a \mathbf{ext} a fully non-malleable seeded extractor if additionally for some pair of fixed-point-free functions $g : \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_2}$, and $f : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_1}$, the following holds:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | \mathbf{ext}(f(X), g(Y))) \leq \varepsilon$$

One useful thing to note is that the extractor remains non-malleable even if the functions f, g are randomised with shared coins (independent of X and Y).

Lemma 77. Let \mathbf{ext} be a two source non-malleable extractor for (n, k) -sources X, Y with output length m and error ε . Let f_S, g_S random functions over the shared randomness of S independent of X and Y such that for all $s \in \mathbf{supp}(S)$, at least one of f_s or g_s is fixed-point-free. Then

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y))) \leq \varepsilon$$

Proof. Let $X \sim (n, k)$ and $Y \sim (n, k)$ be independent sources. Let $f_S, g_S : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ be fixed-point-free random functions over the randomness of S which is

independent of X and Y .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y))) \\
&= \sum_{a,b} |\Pr[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y) = a, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b] - \Pr[U_m, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b]| \\
&= \sum_{a,b} \left| \sum_s \Pr[S = s] \Pr[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y) = a, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b | S = s] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_s \Pr[S = s] \Pr[U_m, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b | S = s] \right| \\
&= \sum_{a,b} \sum_s \Pr[S = s] |\Pr[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y) = a, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b | S = s] \\
&\quad - \Pr[U_m, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b | S = s]| \\
&= \sum_{a,b} \sum_s \Pr[S = s] |\Pr[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y) = a, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b] \\
&\quad - \Pr[U_m, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b]| \\
&= \sum_s \Pr[S = s] \sum_{a,b} |\Pr[\mathbf{ext}(X, Y) = a, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b] \\
&\quad - \Pr[U_m, \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y)) = b]| \\
&= \sum_s \Pr[S = s] \Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, Y); U_m | \mathbf{ext}(f_S(X), g_S(Y))) \\
&\leq \sum_s \Pr[S = s] \cdot \varepsilon \\
&= \varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

Note that S is independent of X and Y and thus $\mathbf{ext}(X, Y)$ is independent of S . Now for a fixed s , f_s and g_s are fixed functions. So the last inequality follows as \mathbf{ext} is a two source non-malleable extractor. \square

4.2.3 Privacy Amplification

The following two definitions are taken verbatim from [11].

Definition 78 (Protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries). *An $(r, \ell_1, k_1, \ell_2, k_2, m)$ -protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries is a protocol between Alice and Bob, with a man-in-the-middle Eve, that proceeds in r rounds. Initially, we assume that Alice and Bob have access to random variables (W, A) and (W, B) , respectively, where W is an (ℓ_1, k_1) -source (the secret), and A, B are (ℓ_2, k_2) -sources*

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

(the randomness tapes) independent of each other and of W . The protocol proceeds as follows:

In the first stage, Eve submits an arbitrary function $F : \{0, 1\}^{\ell_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{\ell_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\ell_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{\ell_2}$ and chooses one of Alice and Bob to be corrupted, so that either (W, A) is replaced by $F(W, A)$ (if Alice is chosen), or (W, B) is replaced by $F(W, B)$ (if Bob is chosen).

In the second stage, Alice and Bob exchange messages (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_r) over a non-authenticated channel, with Alice sending the odd-numbered messages and Bob the even-numbered messages, and Eve is allowed to replace each message C_i by C'_i based on $(C_1, C'_1, \dots, C_{i-1}, C'_{i-1}, C_i)$ and independent random coins, so that the recipient of the i -th message observes C'_i . Messages C_i sent by Alice are deterministic functions of (W, A) and $(C'_2, C'_4, \dots, C'_{i-1})$, and messages C_i sent by Bob are deterministic functions of (W, B) and $(C'_1, C'_3, \dots, C'_{i-1})$.

In the third stage, Alice outputs $S_A \in \{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\perp\}$ as a deterministic function of (W, A) and (C'_2, C'_4, \dots) , and Bob outputs $S_B \in \{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\perp\}$ as a deterministic function of (W, B) and (C'_2, C'_4, \dots) .

Furthermore, we will use the following explicit constructions of extractors in this chapter. We will need the following constructions of extractors.

Lemma 79 (Theorem 6.9 of [134]). *There exists a constant $0 < \gamma < 1$ and an explicit two-source non-malleable extractor $\mathbf{Li} : [(n, (1 - \gamma)n), (n, (1 - \gamma)n) \mapsto \Omega(n) \sim \varepsilon_L]$ such that $\varepsilon_L = 2^{-\Omega(n \frac{\log \log n}{\log n})}$.*

Lemma 80 (Theorem 2 of [151]). *For every n, k there exists an explicit strong seeded extractor $\mathbf{Tre} : [(n, k), (d, d) \mapsto \Omega(k) \sim \varepsilon]$ such that $d = O(\log^2(n) \log(1/\varepsilon))$.*

Lemma 81 (Theorem 1 of [150]). *For any n_1, n_2, k_1, k_2, m and any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that:*

1. $k_1 \geq 5 \log(n_2 - k_2)$
2. $n_2 \geq 6 \log n_2 + 2 \log n_1$,
3. $k_2 \geq (\frac{1}{2} + \delta) \cdot n_2 + 3 \log n_2 + \log n_1$,

4. $m = \Omega(\min\{n_2, k_1\})$,

there exists a strong two-source extractor $\mathbf{Raz} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon]$, such that $\varepsilon = 2^{-\frac{3m}{2}}$.

Definition 82 (Privacy amplification protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries). An $(r, \ell_1, k_1, \ell_2, k_2, m, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -privacy amplification protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries is an $(r, \ell_1, k_1, \ell_2, k_2, m)$ -protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries with the following additional properties:

- **If Eve is passive:** In this case, F is the identity function and Eve only wiretaps. Then, $S_A = S_B \neq \perp$ with S_A satisfying

$$S_A, C \approx_\varepsilon U_m, C, \tag{4.1}$$

where $C = (C_1, C'_1, C_2, C'_2, \dots, C_r, C'_r)$ denotes Eve's view.

- **If Eve is active:** Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ either $S_A = \perp$ or $S_B = \perp$ (i.e., one of Alice and Bob detects tampering), or $S_A = S_B \neq \perp$ with S_A satisfying Equation 4.12.

4.3 Technical overview

4.3.1 Collision Resistant Extractors

At the core of our non-malleable extractor compiler is a new object we call a *collision resistant extractor*. An extractor is an object that takes as input two sources of randomness X and Y (in case of the seeded extractors Y but uniform) and guarantees that, as long as X and Y are independent and have sufficient min-entropy, the output $\mathbf{ext}(X, Y)$ will be uniform (even given Y ³). A *collision resistant extractor* \mathbf{CRExt} has the added property that for all fixed-point-free functions f (i.e. $f(x) \neq x$ for all x) the probability that $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, Y) = \mathbf{CRExt}(f(X), Y)$ is negligible⁴.

³This property is often referred to as strong extraction

⁴This notion might somewhat resemble various non-malleability notions, however in case of the non-malleability one would expect $\mathbf{CRExt}(f(X), Y)$ to be independent of $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, Y)$, here we only expect that those two outputs don't collide

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

Readers might notice the resemblance to the collision resistant hashing families and the leftover hash lemma. The leftover hash lemma states that if the probability that $h(x_0, Y) = h(x_1, Y)$ is sufficiently small then $h(., .)$ is an extractor. Obremski and Skorski ([146]) showed that the inverse is almost true — there exists a ‘core’ of inputs on which every extractor has to fulfill the small collision probability property. This inverse leftover hash lemma is sadly not constructive and not efficient (the description of the core might be exponential), and thus we are unable to use it to obtain an efficient *collision resistant extractor*.

We show that Raz’s extractor ([150]) is a *collision resistant extractor* with essentially the same parameters. We obtain this result by carefully modifying the original proof. The proof techniques are similar and we do not discuss the details in this section. One other aspect to note is that while Cohen, Raz, and Segev did indeed show that the same extractor is non-malleable. Their exact construction actually has Raz use $\log(n)$ fully uniform bits as a seed, and the non-malleability requirement is in the seed. Our result differs, in the sense that we show Raz on input with $\log(n)$ min-entropy is collision-resistant — we weaken the guarantee from non-malleability to collision-resistance, in exchange for also improving the requirement from fully-uniform to just min-entropic.

We also show a generic transform that turns any seeded extractor (a two-source extractor where one source is uniform) into a *collision resistant extractor* with a slight increase in the size of the seed.

4.4 General Compiler for Seeded Extractors

We first construct a collision-resistant extractor h with a short output based on the Nisan-Widgerson generator [145] or Trevisan’s extractor [151]. Given the input X and the seed Z , function h will output $\hat{X}(Z_1) \circ \hat{X}(Z_2) \circ \dots \circ \hat{X}(Z_t)$ where EC is an error-correcting code of appropriate minimum distance, and $a \circ b$ denotes the concatenation of a and b , $\hat{X} = \text{EC}(X)$, and $Z = Z_1 \circ Z_2 \circ \dots \circ Z_t$, and $\hat{X}(Z_i)$ denotes Z_i -th bit of \hat{X} . Proof that this is an extractor follows directly from Nisan-Widgerson generator properties, while the collision resistance follows from the large distance of the error-correcting code.

We can now use any seeded extractor and the collision resistant extractor

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

mentioned above to obtain a collision resistant seeded extractor with output size comparable to the seeded extractor. Consider seeded extractors that take as input a random source X and a short but uniform source S and output $\mathbf{ext}(X, S)$ which is uniform (even given S ³). Let us require on input a slightly longer uniform seed $S \circ Z$ (where \circ denotes concatenation), and consider the following extractor: $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, S \circ Z) = \mathbf{ext}(X, S) \circ h(X, Z)$, where h is either a collision resistant hash function or a collision resistant extractor.

The proof follows quite easily. Function h ensures that collisions indeed happen with negligible probability, the only thing left to show is that $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, S \circ Z)$ is uniform. First notice that by the definition the seeded extractor $\mathbf{ext}(X, S)$ is uniform, so we only have to show that $h(X, Z)$ is uniform even given $\mathbf{ext}(X, S)$. Observe that Z is uniform and independent given X, S , so it suffices to show that X has some remaining entropy given $\mathbf{ext}(X, S), S$, then $h(X, Z)$ will be uniform (either by leftover hash lemma, if h is a collision resistant hash function, or by the definition of collision resistant extractor). This last step can be ensured simply by setting \mathbf{ext} to extract fewer bits than the entropy of X , thus a slight penalty in the parameters. Also notice that h above can be a fairly bad extractor in terms of the rate or the output size and seed size. We can make the output and the seed of h very small since we only need it to help provide collision resistance and thus the parameters of \mathbf{CRExt} will be dominated by the parameters of \mathbf{ext} .

4.4.1 Our Non-Malleable Extractor Compiler

Our compiler takes as an input two objects, one is a collision resistant extractor (as discussed in the previous section), the other object is a strong two-source non-malleable extractor. A right-strong⁵ non-malleable extractor gives the guarantee that $\mathbf{ext}(X, Y)$ is uniform even given $\mathbf{ext}(f(X), g(Y))$ and Y (or X in case of a left-strong non-malleable extractor) for any tampering functions f, g where at least one of them are fixed-point-free. When we refer to a non-malleable extractor as strong without specifying if it's left-strong or right-strong we mean that the non-malleable extractor is both left-strong and right-strong. The construction is as follows: For a collision resistant extractor \mathbf{CRExt} , and a strong non-malleable extractor \mathbf{NMExt}

⁵Notice that unlike many results in the literature, we need to distinguish between left strong and right strong for our extractor since the construction is inherently not symmetric.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

we consider following extractor:

$$\mathbf{2NMExt}(X, Y_\ell \circ Y_r) := \mathbf{NMExt}(Y_\ell \circ Y_r, \mathbf{CRExt}(X, Y_\ell)) . \quad (4.2)$$

We will show that $\mathbf{2NMExt}$ inherits the best of both worlds — strong non-malleability of \mathbf{NMExt} and the good entropy requirements of \mathbf{CRExt} .

There are two main issues to handle:

(Issue of the independent tampering.) Notice that the definition of the non-malleable extractor guarantees that $\mathbf{ext}(X, Y)$ is uniform given $\mathbf{ext}(X', Y')$ only if the sources are tampered independently (i.e. X' is a function of only X , and Y' is a function of only Y).

To leverage the non-malleability of \mathbf{NMExt} , we need to ensure that the tampering $X \rightarrow X'$ and $Y_\ell \circ Y_r \rightarrow Y'_\ell \circ Y'_r$ translates to the independent tampering of $Y_\ell \circ Y_r \rightarrow Y'_\ell \circ Y'_r$ and $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, Y_\ell) \rightarrow \mathbf{CRExt}(X', Y'_\ell)$. The problem is that both tamperings depend on Y_ℓ . To address this issue we will simply reveal Y_ℓ and Y'_ℓ (notice that Y'_ℓ can depend on Y_r thus revealing Y_ℓ alone is not sufficient). Once $Y_\ell = y_\ell$ and $Y'_\ell = y'_\ell$ are revealed (and therefore fixed) the tampering $y_\ell \circ Y_r \rightarrow y'_\ell \circ Y'_r$ and $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, y_\ell) \rightarrow \mathbf{CRExt}(X', y'_\ell)$ becomes independent since right tampering depends only on X , which is independent of $Y_\ell \circ Y_r$ and remains independent of Y_r even after we reveal Y_ℓ and Y'_ℓ (this extra information only lowers the entropy of Y_r).

(Issue of the fixed points (or why we use collision resistance).) Non-malleable extractors guarantee that $\mathbf{ext}(X, Y)$ is uniform given $\mathbf{ext}(X', Y')$ if and only if $(X, Y) \neq (X', Y')$.

The issue in our compiler is clear: If $Y_\ell \circ Y_r$ do not change, and X is tampered to be $X' \neq X$ but $\mathbf{CRExt}(X', Y_\ell) = \mathbf{CRExt}(X, Y_\ell)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{2NMExt}(X, Y_\ell \circ Y_r) &= \mathbf{NMExt}(Y_\ell \circ Y_r, \mathbf{CRExt}(X, Y_\ell)) \\ &= \mathbf{NMExt}(Y_\ell \circ Y_r, \mathbf{CRExt}(X', Y_\ell)) \\ &= \mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y_\ell \circ Y_r) . \end{aligned}$$

To mitigate this problem, we require \mathbf{CRExt} to be collision resistant, which means the probability that $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, Y_\ell) = \mathbf{CRExt}(X', Y_\ell)$ is negligible thereby resolving this issue. It is also possible to use \mathbf{CRExt} without the collision resilience property, this gives a weaker notion of non-malleable extractor as was done in [105] .

(Is 2NMExt strong?) Here we briefly argue that if **NMExt** is strong (i.e. both left and right strong) then **2NMExt** will also be strong. To argue that compiled extractor is left-strong, we notice that revealing X on top of Y_ℓ and Y'_ℓ (which we had to reveal to maintain independence of tampering) translates to revealing **CRExt**(X, Y_ℓ) which reveals right input of **NMExt** (revealing of Y_ℓ and Y'_ℓ is irrelevant since Y_r maintains high enough entropy). As for the right-strongness, revealing Y_r on top of Y_ℓ and Y'_ℓ translates to revealing of the left input of **NMExt**, notice that **CRExt**(X, Y_ℓ) remains uniform given Y_ℓ by the strong extraction property of **CRExt**.

For our construction, we will apply the compiler twice. First, we will use a collision resistant seeded extractor and the Li's extractor [134]. This gives us a strong non-malleable extractor **FNMEExt** for the first source with poly-logarithmic entropy, and the second source being uniform. We will refer to this object as a *fully non-malleable seeded extractor*. We emphasize that this object is stronger than the seeded non-malleable extractor since it guarantees non-malleability for both sources. Then, we will then apply our compiler to Raz's extractor [150] and **FNMEExt** which will produce an extractor **nmRaz** that is a strong non-malleable extractor for the first source with poly-logarithmic entropy and the second source with entropy rate⁶ 0.8.

4.4.1.1 Compiling Seeded Extractor with Li's Extractor

In this section we will apply our compiler to the collision resistant seeded extractor **crTre** and strong non-malleable extractor **Li** from [134], yielding the following construction:

$$\mathbf{FNMEExt}(X, Y_\ell \circ Y_r) = \mathbf{Li}(Y_\ell \circ Y_r, \mathbf{crTre}(X, Y_\ell)). \quad (4.3)$$

The extractor **Li**(0.99, 0.99) requires both sources to have a high entropy rate of 99%⁷, while the extractor **crTre**(poly-log, uniform) requires first source to have poly-logarithmic entropy, and the second source to be uniform. Let us analyse the entropy requirements of the extractor **FNMEExt**: Since part of the construction is **crTre**(X, Y_ℓ) we require Y_ℓ to be uniform, which means that whole $Y_\ell \circ Y_r$ has

⁶Entropy rate is a ratio of min-entropy of the random variable to its length: $\frac{H_\infty(X)}{|X|}$

⁷This is a simplification, formally speaking there exist a constant δ such that sources are required to have entropy rate above $1 - \delta$. The reader may think of δ as 0.01.

to be uniform. On the other hand X has to only have a poly-logarithmic entropy. The output of $\mathbf{crTre}(X, Y_\ell)$ will be uniform which will fulfill the 0.99 entropy rate requirement of **Li**. There is a small caveat: While $Y_\ell \circ Y_r$ is uniform one has to remember that we had to reveal Y_ℓ and Y'_ℓ to ensure independent tampering, therefore we only have to make sure that Y_ℓ is very short so $Y_\ell \circ Y_r$ will have over 0.99 entropy rate even given Y_ℓ and Y'_ℓ . This is possible since \mathbf{crTre} requires only a very short seed length. Thus we get that $\mathbf{FNMEExt}(\text{poly-log}, \text{uniform})$ requires first source to have poly-logarithmic entropy, while the second source is uniform, and non-malleability is guaranteed for both sources.

4.4.1.2 Compiling Raz's Extractor with the Above

Now we will compile Raz's extractor [150] with above obtained $\mathbf{FNMEExt}$. The result will be:

$$\mathbf{nmRaz}(X, Y_\ell \circ Y_r) = \mathbf{FNMEExt}(Y_\ell \circ Y_r, \mathbf{Raz}(X, Y_\ell)). \quad (4.4)$$

As we discussed above $\mathbf{FNMEExt}(\text{poly-log}, \text{uniform})$ requires first source to have poly-logarithmic entropy, while the second source has to be uniform, $\mathbf{Raz}(\text{poly-log}, 0.5)$ requires first source to have poly-logarithmic entropy while the second source has to have over 0.5 entropy rate. Therefore we require Y_ℓ to have an entropy rate above 0.5 and it is sufficient if X has poly-logarithmic entropy. As for requirements enforced by $\mathbf{FNMEExt}$, since the output of \mathbf{Raz} will be uniform we only have to check if $Y_\ell \circ Y_r$ has poly-logarithmic entropy given Y_ℓ and Y'_ℓ . Given that Y'_ℓ can not lower the entropy of Y_r by more than its size $|Y'_\ell|$ we have two equations:

$$\begin{aligned} H_\infty(Y_r) &> |Y_\ell| \\ H_\infty(Y_\ell) &> 0.5|Y_\ell| \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} H_\infty(Y_\ell \circ Y_r) &> 2|Y_\ell| \\ H_\infty(Y_\ell \circ Y_r) &> |Y_r| + 0.5|Y_\ell| \end{aligned}$$

which asserts that $\frac{H_\infty(Y_\ell \circ Y_r)}{|Y_\ell \circ Y_r|} > 0.8$. Therefore $\mathbf{nmRaz}(\text{poly-log}, 0.8)$ requires first source to have poly-logarithmic entropy, while second source has to have entropy rate above 0.8.

Finally notice that **Raz** has a relatively short output (shorter than both inputs) but that is not a problem since **FNMEExt** can have its first input much longer than the second input. We can adjust the output size of **crTre** to accommodate the input size requirements of **Li** (this extractor requires both inputs to have the same length). We stress however that taking into consideration all inputs requirements both in terms of entropy and in terms of sizes is not trivial and our construction is tuned towards seeded-extractors and the Raz's extractor.

4.5 A Generic Construction of a Two-Source Non-Malleable Extractor

In this section we present a generic construction that transforms a non-malleable two-source extractor **NMEExt** into another non-malleable two-source extractor with a much smaller entropy rate requirement via a two-source extractor. We note that the below theorem statement depends on **NMEExt** and **CREExt**. We will subsequently give an explicit construction for **CREExt**.

Theorem 83. *For any integers $n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, m$ and $\delta_{\mathbf{NMEExt}}, \delta_{\mathbf{CREExt}}, \varepsilon_{\text{Collision}} > 0, n_4 < n_1$, given an efficient construction of*

- *a strong non-malleable extractor $\mathbf{NMEExt} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2)] \mapsto m \sim \delta_{\mathbf{NMEExt}}$,*
- *a right strong two-source extractor $\mathbf{CREExt} : [(n_3, k_3), (n_4, k_4)] \mapsto n_2 \sim \delta_{\mathbf{CREExt}}$
that is $\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}$ -collision resistant,*

then for any integers $k_1^, k_2^*, \varepsilon, \tau > 0$ that satisfy the following conditions, there is an efficient construction of a left and right strong non-malleable two-source extractor $\mathbf{2NMEExt} : [(n_3, k_1^*), (n_1, k_2^*)] \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon$.*

$$k_1^* \geq k_3 ,$$

$$k_2^* \geq \log 1/\tau + \max(k_4 + (n_1 - n_4), k_1 + 2n_4) ,$$

and

$$\varepsilon \leq 3\tau + 3\delta_{\mathbf{NMEExt}} + 2\delta_{\mathbf{CREExt}} + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} .$$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

Proof. Our construction is as follows: Given inputs $x \in \{0, 1\}^{n_3}$ and $y = y_\ell \circ y_r$, where $y_\ell \in \{0, 1\}^{n_4}$, and $y_r \in \{0, 1\}^{n_1 - n_4}$ our extractor is defined as:

$$\mathbf{2NMEExt}(x, y) := \mathbf{NMEExt}(y_\ell \circ y_r, \mathbf{CREExt}(x, y_\ell)) . \quad (4.5)$$

Let $f : \{0, 1\}^{n_3} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_3}$ and $g : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_1}$. For any $y \in \{0, 1\}^{n_1}$, by $g(y)_\ell$ we denote the n_4 bit prefix of $g(y)$. We assume that f does not have any fixed points. The proof for the case when g not having any fixed points is similar (in fact, simpler) as we explain later.

(Right strongness.) We first prove that our non-malleable extractor is right strong.

Claim 84. *Let \tilde{Y} be a random variable with min-entropy $k_2^* - \log 1/\tau$ and is independent of X . Consider the randomized function $T_{f,g}$ that given a, b, c , samples $\mathbf{CREExt}(f(X), c)$ conditioned on $\mathbf{CREExt}(X, b) = a$, i.e.,*

$$T_{f,g} : a, b, c \mapsto \mathbf{CREExt}(f(X), c)_{|\mathbf{CREExt}(X, b) = a} .$$

, then it holds that:

$$\Delta \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell) & U_d \\ \mathbf{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \mathbf{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) ; \mathbf{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_d) & \\ T & T' \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_r \\ \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \end{array} \right) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{CREExt}} \quad (4.6)$$

, with $T = \mathbf{NMEExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), \mathbf{CREExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$ and $T' = \mathbf{NMEExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), T_{f,g}(U_d, \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$.

Proof. We have that $H_\infty(X) \geq k_1^* \geq k_3$ and $H_\infty(\tilde{Y}_\ell) \geq k_2^* - \log 1/\tau - |\tilde{Y}_r| = k_2^* - \log 1/\tau - (n_1 - n_4) \geq k_4$, and X, \tilde{Y}_ℓ are independently distributed. It follows that $\Delta(\mathbf{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell); U_d | \tilde{Y}_\ell) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{CREExt}}$. Then, Lemma 68 implies that

$$\Delta \left(\mathbf{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell); U_d \middle| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ \tilde{Y}_r \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \end{array} \right) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{CREExt}} .$$

Observing that since \tilde{Y}_r is independent of $\mathbf{CREExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)$, $\mathbf{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)$ given $\tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell$, we have that the tuple $\mathbf{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell), \tilde{Y}_\ell, \tilde{Y}_r, T_{f,g}(\mathbf{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell), \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

is identically distributed as $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell), \tilde{Y}_\ell, \tilde{Y}_r, \mathbf{CRExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)$. Again applying Lemma 68, we get the desired statement. \square

Now, let \mathcal{Y}_0 be the set of y such that $g(y)_\ell = y_\ell$, and \mathcal{Y}_1 be the set of all y such that $g(y)_\ell \neq y_\ell$ (in other words, \mathcal{Y}_0 contains all the fixed-points of g , and \mathcal{Y}_1 is the complement set). Also, let $\mathcal{Y}_{0,0}$ be the set of all $y \in \mathcal{Y}_0$ such that $\Pr[C(X, y_\ell) = C(f(X), y_\ell)] \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}$, and $\mathcal{Y}_{0,1} = \mathcal{Y}_0 \setminus \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}$.

Claim 85. *If $\Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_1] \geq \tau$, then:*

$$\Delta \left(\mathbf{NMExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) ; U_m \left| \begin{array}{c} T \\ \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ \tilde{Y}_r \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}} + \delta_{\mathbf{NMExt}} \quad , \quad (4.7)$$

where $\tilde{Y} = Y|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_1}$, $T = \mathbf{NMExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), \mathbf{CRExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$.

Proof. Notice that conditioned on Y being in \mathcal{Y}_1 , g does not have a fixed point. Thus, since U_{n_2} is independent of \tilde{Y}_r given $\tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell$, and $H_\infty(U_{n_2}) = n_2 \geq k_2$, $H_\infty(\tilde{Y}_r | \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y}_r)) \geq k_2^* - \log 1/\tau - 2n_4 \geq k_1$, by the definition of a strong non-malleable extractor, we have that (letting $V = \mathbf{NMExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), T_{f,g}(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$)

$$\Delta \left(\mathbf{NMExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_{n_2}) ; U_m \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ \tilde{Y}_r \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{NMExt}} \quad .$$

Furthermore, from Claim 84 and Lemma 68, we get that:

$$\Delta \left(\mathbf{NMExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_{n_2}) ; \mathbf{NMExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ \tilde{Y}_r \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}} \quad .$$

The desired statement follows from triangle inequality. \square

Similarly, we prove the following claim:

Claim 86. *If $\Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}] \geq \tau$, then*

$$\Delta \left(\mathbf{NMExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) ; U_m \left| \begin{array}{c} T \\ \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ \tilde{Y}_r \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \begin{array}{l} \delta_{\mathbf{NMExt}} \\ +2\delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}} \\ +\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} \end{array} \quad , \quad (4.8)$$

where $\tilde{Y} = Y|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}}$, $T = \mathbf{NMExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), \mathbf{CRExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

Proof. Notice that the probability that $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}) = \mathbf{CRExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)$ is at most $\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}$. Thus, by Claim 84, the probability that $U_{n_2} = T_{f,g}(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)$ is at most $\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} + \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}}$. Also, since U_{n_2} is independent of \tilde{Y}_r given $\tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell$, and $H_\infty(U_{n_2}) = n_2 \geq k_2$, $H_\infty(\tilde{Y}_r | \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell) \geq k^* - \log 1/\tau - 2n_4 \geq k_2$, by the definition of a strong non-malleable extractor, we have that (letting $V = \mathbf{NMExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), T_{f,g}(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$):

$$\Delta \left(\mathbf{NMExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_{n_2}) ; U_m \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ \tilde{Y}_r \\ V \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{NMExt}} + \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}} + \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} .$$

Furthermore, from Claim 84 and Lemma 68, we get that:

$$\Delta \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{NMExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_{n_2}) \\ V \end{array} ; \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{NMExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) \\ T \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ \tilde{Y}_r \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}} .$$

The desired statement follows from triangle inequality. \square

We now show that $Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,1}$ with small probability.

Claim 87.

$$\Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,1}] \leq \tau + \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} .$$

Proof. If $\Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_0] < \tau$, then the statement trivially holds. So, we assume $\Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_0] \geq \tau$. Let $\tilde{Y} = Y|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_0}$. Then $H_\infty(\tilde{Y}) \geq k_2^* - \log 1/\tau - (n_1 - n_4) \geq k_4$. Since \mathbf{C} is collision-resistant, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\text{Collision}} &\geq \Pr[\mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell) = \mathbf{CRExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)] \Pr[\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,1}] \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} \\ &\geq \Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,1}] \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} . \end{aligned}$$

\square

We now conclude the proof of right strongness of our non-malleable extractor as follows. We shorthand $\mathbf{2NMExt}(X, Y), Y, \mathbf{2NMExt}(f(X), g(Y))$ by $\phi(X, Y)$, and

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

$U_m, Y, \mathbf{2NMExt}(f(X), g(Y))$ by $\psi(X, Y)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(\phi(X, Y); \psi(X, Y)) &\leq \Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,1}] \\
&\quad + \Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_1] \cdot \Delta(\phi(X, Y)|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_1}; \psi(X, Y)|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_1}) \\
&\quad + \Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}] \cdot \Delta(\phi(X, Y)|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}}; \psi(X, Y)|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}}) \\
&\leq (\tau + \delta_{\mathbf{NMExt}} + \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}}) \\
&\quad + (\tau + 2\delta_{\mathbf{NMExt}} + \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}} + \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}) \\
&\quad + (\tau + \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}) \\
&= 3\tau + 3\delta_{\mathbf{NMExt}} + 2\delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}} + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} .
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we assumed that f does not have fixed points. On the other hand, if g does not have fixed points then a simpler proof works that does not need to partition the domain into $\mathcal{Y}_{0,0}, \mathcal{Y}_{0,1}, \mathcal{Y}_1$. Since the first source for the non-malleable extractor \mathbf{NMExt} , we can conclude the statement similar to Claim 85 with Y instead of \tilde{Y} .

(Left strongness.) The proof of left strongness is nearly the same (the statistical distance statements include X instead of Y_r), but we include it here for completeness.

Claim 88. *Let \tilde{Y} be a random variable with min-entropy $k^* - \log 1/\tau$ and is independent of X . Consider the randomized function S that given a, b , samples X conditioned on $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, b) = a$, i.e.,*

$$S : a, b \mapsto X|_{\mathbf{CRExt}(X, b) = a} .$$

Then:

$$\Delta \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell) \\ X \end{array} ; \begin{array}{c} U_d, \\ S(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell) \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ \tilde{Y}_r \end{array} \right) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}} . \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. We have that $H_\infty(X) \geq k_1^* \geq k_3$ and $H_\infty(\tilde{Y}_\ell) \geq k_2^* - \log 1/\tau - |\tilde{Y}_r| = k_2^* - \log 1/\tau - (n_1 - n_4) \geq k_4$, and X, \tilde{Y}_ℓ are independently distributed. It follows that $\Delta(\mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell); U_d | \tilde{Y}_\ell) \leq \delta_{\mathbf{CRExt}}$. Then, using Lemma 68 and observing that since \tilde{Y}_r is independent of X given \tilde{Y}_ℓ , we have that $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell), \tilde{Y}_\ell, \tilde{Y}_r, S(\mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell), \tilde{Y}_\ell)$ is identically distributed as $\mathbf{CRExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell), \tilde{Y}_\ell, \tilde{Y}_r, X$, we get the desired statement. \square

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

Now, let \mathcal{Y}_0 be the set of y such that $g(y)_\ell = y_\ell$, and \mathcal{Y}_1 be the set of all y such that $g(y)_\ell \neq y_\ell$. Also, let $\mathcal{Y}_{0,0}$ be the set of all $y \in \mathcal{Y}_0$ such that $\Pr[C(X, y_\ell) = C(f(X), y_\ell)] \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}$, and $\mathcal{Y}_{0,1} = \mathcal{Y}_0 \setminus \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}$.

Claim 89. *If $\Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_1] \geq \tau$, then:*

$$\Delta \left(\text{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \text{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) ; U_m \left| \begin{array}{c} T \\ \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \\ X \end{array} \right. \right) \leq 2\delta_{\text{CREExt}} + \delta_{\text{NMEExt}} , \quad (4.10)$$

where $\tilde{Y} = Y|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_1}$, $T = \text{NMEExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), \text{CREExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$.

Proof. Notice that conditioned on Y being in \mathcal{Y}_1 , g does not have a fixed point. Thus, since U_{n_2} is independent of \tilde{Y}_r given $\tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell$, and $H_\infty(U_{n_2}) = n_2 \geq k_2$, $H_\infty(\tilde{Y}_r | \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell) \geq k^* - \log 1/\tau - 2n_4 \geq k_1$, by the definition of a strong non-malleable extractor, we have that (letting $V = \text{NMEExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), \text{CREExt}(f(S(U_{n_2}), \tilde{Y}_\ell), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$):

$$\Delta \left(\text{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_{n_2}) ; U_m \left| \begin{array}{c} U_{n_2} \\ V \\ \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\text{NMEExt}} ,$$

Furthermore, by applying Claim 84 and Lemma 68 twice, we get that:

$$\Delta \left(\begin{array}{cc} U_m & U_m \\ S(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell) & X \\ V & T \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\text{CREExt}} .$$

and also

$$\Delta \left(\begin{array}{cc} \text{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_{n_2}) & \text{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \text{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) \\ S(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell) & X \\ V & T \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\text{CREExt}} .$$

The desired statement follows from triangle inequality. \square

Similarly, we prove the following claim.

Claim 90. *If $\Pr[Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}] \geq \tau$, then*

$$\Delta \left(\text{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \text{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) ; U_m \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \\ X \\ T \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \frac{\delta_{\text{NMEExt}} + 3\delta_{\text{CREExt}}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}} \quad , \quad (4.11)$$

where $\tilde{Y} = Y|_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{0,0}}$, $T = \text{NMEExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), \text{CREExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell))$.

Proof. Notice that the probability that $\text{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}) = \text{CREExt}(f(X), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)$ is at most $\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}$. Thus, by Claim 84, the probability that $U_{n_2} = \text{CREExt}(S(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)$ is at most $\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}} + \delta_{\text{CREExt}}$. Also, since U_{n_2} is independent of \tilde{Y}_r given $\tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell$, and $H_\infty(U_{n_2}) = n_2 \geq k_2$, $H_\infty(\tilde{Y}_r | \tilde{Y}_\ell, g(\tilde{Y})_\ell) \geq k^* - \log 1/\tau - 2n_4 \geq k_1$, by the definition of a strong non-malleable extractor, we have that (letting $V = \text{NMEExt}(g(\tilde{Y}), \text{CREExt}(f(S(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell), g(\tilde{Y})_\ell)))$):

$$\Delta \left(\text{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_{n_2}) ; U_m \left| \begin{array}{c} U_{n_2} \\ V \\ \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \frac{\delta_{\text{NMEExt}} + \delta_{\text{CREExt}}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}} \quad .$$

Furthermore, by applying Claim 84 and Lemma 68 twice, we get that:

$$\Delta \left(\begin{array}{cc} U_m & U_m \\ S(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell) & X \\ V & T \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\text{CREExt}} \quad .$$

and:

$$\Delta \left(\begin{array}{cc} \text{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, U_{n_2}) & \text{NMEExt}(\tilde{Y}_\ell \circ \tilde{Y}_r, \text{CREExt}(X, \tilde{Y}_\ell)) \\ S(U_{n_2}, \tilde{Y}_\ell) & X \\ V & T \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{Y}_\ell \\ g(\tilde{Y})_\ell \end{array} \right. \right) \leq \delta_{\text{CREExt}} \quad .$$

The desired statement follows from triangle inequality. \square

We then conclude the proof of right strongness of our non-malleable extractor exactly as we obtained left strongness. \square

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

Remark 91. *We remark that one can apply the above compiler to multi-tampering non-malleable extractors as a **NMExt**. Briefly speaking t -tampering non-malleable extractor guarantees that extraction output remains uniform even given not one but t tampering outputs:*

$$\Delta(E(X, Y); U_m | E(f_1(X), g_1(Y)), \dots, E(f_t(X), g_t(Y))) \leq \varepsilon.$$

As a result, compiled extractor will also be t -tamperable. The proof is almost identical, there are only two differences:

1. *To ensure the reduction to split state tampering it is not sufficient to reveal \tilde{Y}_ℓ and $g_1(\tilde{Y})_\ell$, but also all other tamperings: $g_2(\tilde{Y})_\ell, \dots, g_t(\tilde{Y})_\ell$. This will have an impact of the calculations of entropy requirement.*
2. *Notice that when considering the collision resistance adversary has now t chances instead of 1, but since the attempts are non-adaptive we can easily bound the collision probability by $t \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}$, this impacts the error calculations.*

4.6 Collision resistance of Extractors

4.6.1 Generic Collision Resistance for Seeded Extractors

Lemma 92. *Let $\text{ext} : [(n, k), (d, d) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon]$ be a strong seeded extractor. Then there exists a strong seeded extractor $\text{crTre} : [(n, k), (d + z, d + z) \mapsto m - 2 \log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}) \sim \varepsilon + \varepsilon_T + \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}]$ with collision probability $\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}$ and $z = O(\log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}) \log^2(\log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}})) \log(1/\varepsilon_T))$.*

Proof. We will first mention [151]’s construction of **Tre**. The aforementioned construction uses an error correcting code and a weak design, defined respectively as below:

Lemma 93 (Error Correcting Code, Lemma 35 of [151]). *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\delta > 0$, there exists a code $\text{EC} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\hat{n}}$ where $\hat{n} = \text{poly}(n, 1/\delta)$ such that for $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $x \neq x'$, it is the case that $\text{EC}(x)$ and $\text{EC}(x')$ disagree in at least $(\frac{1}{2} - \delta)\hat{n}$ positions.*

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

Definition 94 (Weak Design, Definition 6 of [151]). *A family of sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_m \subseteq [d]$ is a weak (ℓ, ρ) -design if:*

1. For all i , $|\mathcal{S}_i| = \ell$;
2. For all i ,

$$\sum_{j < i} 2^{|\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_j|} \leq \rho \cdot (m - 1).$$

In particular, any family of disjoint sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_m \subseteq [d]$ with $|\mathcal{S}_i| = \ell$ is trivially a weak design as well.

Extractor **Tre** operates in the following way: X is firstly evaluated on an error correcting code **EC** to obtain \hat{X} . Then viewing seed bits Z as $Z_1 \circ Z_2 \circ \dots \circ Z_d$, then the i^{th} bit of **Tre**(X, Z) is given as the $(Z_{|\mathcal{S}_i})^{\text{th}}$ bit of \hat{X} where $Z_{|\mathcal{S}_i}$ is understood to specify an ℓ -bit index $Z_{j_1} \circ Z_{j_2} \circ \dots \circ Z_{j_\ell}$ for $\mathcal{S}_i = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell\}$. In short, the output is given as:

$$\mathbf{Tre}(X, Z) = \hat{X}(Z_{|\mathcal{S}_1}) \circ \hat{X}(Z_{|\mathcal{S}_2}) \circ \dots \circ \hat{X}(Z_{|\mathcal{S}_m}).$$

The modification is to truncate the output of **ext**(X, S) by $t = \frac{5}{2} \log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}})$ bits, and then treating Z as $\frac{4t}{5}$ blocks of $\ell = O(\log^2(t) \log(1/\varepsilon_T))$ many bits, we concatenate the output with $\frac{4t}{5}$ bits. In short, the output is given as:

$$\mathbf{crTre}(X, S \circ Z)_i = \begin{cases} \mathbf{ext}(X, S)_i & , \text{if } i \leq m - t \\ \hat{X}(Z_{i-(m-t)}) & , \text{if } i > m - t \end{cases}$$

where Z_j denotes the j^{th} block of Z .

To show that **crTre** is indeed a strong extractor, note that S and Z are independent and furthermore by Lemma 23 $\tilde{H}_\infty(X|\mathbf{ext}(X, S), S) \geq k - m + t \geq t$. Instantiating **crTre** with a family of disjoint sets, an error correcting code **EC** with minimum distance $(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon_T}{4m})\hat{n}$ for inputs of min-entropy $(t, \frac{4t}{5})$ and seed length $O(\log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}) \log^2(t) \log(1/\varepsilon_T))$, Lemma 28 implies that:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, S) \circ \mathbf{Tre}(X, Z); \mathbf{ext}(X, S), U_{\Omega(t)}|S, Z) \leq \varepsilon_T + 2^{-\frac{t}{5}}$$

which in turn yields us:

$$\Delta(\mathbf{ext}(X, S) \circ \mathbf{Tre}(X, Z); U_{m-O(t)}|S, Z) \leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon_T + 2^{-\frac{t}{5}} = \varepsilon + \varepsilon_T + \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{Collision}}}$$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

As for the collision probability, note that for any x and fixed-point-free function f :

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{crTre}(x, S \circ Z) = \mathbf{crTre}(f(x), S \circ Z)] &\leq \Pr[\forall i, \mathbf{EC}(x)(Z_i) = \mathbf{EC}(f(x))(Z_i)] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon_T}{4m}\right)^{2 \log(1/\varepsilon_{Collision})} \\ &\leq \varepsilon_{Collision} \end{aligned}$$

Since this bound holds for all possible values x , it follows that it holds for any random variable X as well. \square

An instantiation that will suit our purpose will be to use Trevisan's extractor \mathbf{Tre} as \mathbf{ext} . Then for any n, k , we have $\mathbf{crTre} : [(n, k), (d, d) \mapsto \Omega(k) \sim 3\varepsilon_T]$ with $d = O(\log^2(n) \log(1/\varepsilon_T)) + O(\log(1/\varepsilon_T) \log^2(\log(1/\varepsilon_T)) \log(1/\varepsilon_T)) = O(\log^2(n) \log^2(1/\varepsilon_T))$ such that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_T$ and with collision probability $\varepsilon_{Collision} = (\varepsilon_T)^2 < 2^{-\Omega(k)}$.

4.6.2 Collision Resistance of the Raz Extractor

Lemma 95. *For any n_1, n_2, k_1, k_2, m and any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that:*

1. $k_1 \geq 12 \log(n_2 - k_2) + 15$,
2. $n_2 \geq 6 \log n_2 + 2 \log n_1 + 4$,
3. $k_2 \geq (\frac{1}{2} + \delta) \cdot n_2 + 3 \log n_2 + \log n_1 + 4$,
4. $m = \Omega(\min\{n_2, k_1\})$,

there exists a strong two-source extractor $\mathbf{Raz} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon]$, such that $\varepsilon = 2^{-\frac{3m}{2}}$ with collision probability 2^{-m+1} .

Proof. We will show that the two-source extractor by Raz satisfies the collision resistant property. We first recap [150]'s construction. Given independent sources $X \sim (n_1, k_1)$ and $Y \sim (n_2, k_2)$, $\mathbf{Raz}(X, Y)$ uses Y as seed (using Lemma 71) to construct $m \cdot 2^{n_2}$ many 0-1 random variables $Z_{(i,X)}(Y)$ with $i \in [m]$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^{n_1}$, where random variables are (t', ε) -biased for $t' \geq t \cdot m$.

The idea is to generate a sequence random variables are ε -biased for tests of size $2tm$, and then the probability of collision can be bounded in a similar manner as

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

the proof that function is a two-source extractor. Define $\gamma_i(X, Y) = (-1)^{Z_{i,x}(Y)}$ and let f be any fixed-point-free function. Furthermore let $t' \geq 2 \cdot mt$ for some value of t such that the set of random variables $Z_{(i,x)}(Y)$ are (t', ε) -biased. The idea will be to show that we can leverage the (t, ε) -biasedness to show that with high probability over the choice of X , for each $i \in [m]$, the probability of the extractor colliding on the i^{th} bit is close to $1/2$. Then we use the Lemma 20 to argue that overall the probability of colliding on all bits is small.

More formally, define $\gamma_i(X, Y) = \mathbb{E}[(-1)^{Z_{i,x}(Y)}]$, and let f be any fixed-point free function. We will first bound $|\gamma_i(X, Y)|$.

Claim 96 (Claim 3.2 in [150]). *For any $i \in [m]$, any $r \in [t']$ and any set of distinct values $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \{0, 1\}^{n_1}$:*

$$\sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n_2}} \prod_{j=1}^r (-1)^{Z_{i,x_j}(y)} \leq 2^{n_2} \cdot \varepsilon$$

Proof. Since $Z_{i,x}$ are (t', ε) -biased:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n_2}} \prod_{j=1}^r (-1)^{Z_{i,x_j}(y)} &= \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n_2}} (-1)^{\bigoplus_j Z_{i,x_j}(y)} \\ &= 2^{n_2} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n_2}} \Pr[U_{n_2} = y] (-1)^{\bigoplus_j Z_{i,x_j}(y)} \\ &= 2^{n_2} (-1)^{\bigoplus_j Z_{i,x_j}(U_{n_2})} \leq 2^{n_2} \cdot \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

□

Claim 97. *Letting $Z_{(i,x)}(Y)$ be $(2t, \varepsilon)$ -biased, $\Pr[Z_{(i,x)}(Y) = Z_{(i,f(x))}(Y)] = \Pr[Z_{(i,x)}(Y) \oplus Z_{(i,f(x))}(Y) = 0] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon'$ where:*

$$\varepsilon' = 2^{(n_2 - k_2)/t} \cdot \left(\varepsilon^{1/t} + (2t) \cdot 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}} \right)$$

Proof. Let t be some even positive integer, then consider $(\gamma(X, Y)\gamma(f(X), Y))^t$. By

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

Jensen's inequality we can bound the term as:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma(X, Y)\gamma(f(X), Y))^t &= \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_1+k_2}} \sum_{(x,y) \in \text{supp}(X,Y)} (-1)^{Z_{(i,x)}(y) \oplus Z_{(i,f(x))}(y)} \right)^t \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_2}} \right) \sum_{y \in \text{supp}(Y)} \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_1}} \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(X)} (-1)^{Z_{(i,x)}(y) \oplus Z_{(i,f(x))}(y)} \right)^t \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_2}} \right) \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n_2}} \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_1}} \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(X)} (-1)^{Z_{(i,x)}(y) \oplus Z_{(i,f(x))}(y)} \right)^t \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_2+k_1 \cdot t}} \right) \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_t \in \text{supp}(X)} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n_2}} \prod_{j=1}^t (-1)^{Z_{(i,x_j)}(y) \oplus Z_{(i,f(x_j))}(y)}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we partition the summands (based on x_1, \dots, x_t) into two categories: (1) When the values $x_1, \dots, x_t, f(x_1), \dots, f(x_t)$ has at least one unique value x that does not otherwise occur in x_1, \dots, x_t and $f(x_1), \dots, f(x_t)$ or else (2) when the every value in $x_1, \dots, x_t, f(x_1), \dots, f(x_t)$ occurs at least twice.

(1) In the first case, Claim 96 implies the respective summands can be bounded by $2^{n_1} \cdot \varepsilon$ and there are at most $2^{k_1 \cdot t}$ many of these summands. (2) In the latter case, we will bound the sum using the following claim:

Claim 98. *If $x_1, \dots, x_t, f(x_1), \dots, f(x_t)$ are such that every value occurs at least twice and $f(x_i) \neq x_i$ for all $i \in [t]$, then there exists a subset of indices $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [t]$ such that $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \frac{2}{3}t$ and $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\} \subseteq \{x : s \in \mathcal{S}\} \cup \{f(x) : s \in \mathcal{S}\}$.*

Proof. Define set \mathcal{A} to contain the values of x_1, \dots, x_t that occur at least twice within x_1, \dots, x_t . Define $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the set of indices of the first occurrence of each value in \mathcal{A} , and furthermore define \mathcal{B} to be $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\} \setminus \{x_j, f(x_j) : j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}\}$. Then if $|\mathcal{A}| = \ell$, $|\mathcal{B}| = r \leq t - 2\ell$. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{b_1, \dots, b_r\}$.

Since each $x_1, \dots, x_t, f(x_1), \dots, f(x_t)$ has that every value occurs twice, and b_i for any $i \in [r]$ does not occur in $\{x, f(x) : x \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A}}\}$, it implies that $b_1, \dots, b_r \in \mathcal{B}$ must be a fixed-point-free permutation of $f(b_1), \dots, f(b_r)$. Thus, the permutation f defines a disjoint union of cycles over the set \mathcal{B} . Define $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B}}$ to be the set that for each such cycle includes every alternate element. More precisely, for each such cycle, say $(b_{i_1}, \dots, b_{i_q})$ with

$$f(b_{i_1}) = b_{i_2}, f(b_{i_2}) = b_{i_3}, \dots, f(b_{i_{q-1}}) = b_{i_q}, f(b_{i_q}) = b_{i_1},$$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

we include $b_{i_1}, b_{i_3}, \dots, b_{i_{1+2\lfloor (q-1)/2 \rfloor}}$ in the set \mathcal{S}_B . Then $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_A \cup \mathcal{S}_B$ satisfy the desired condition. Also,

$$|\mathcal{S}_B| \leq r \max_{q \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}} \frac{\lceil q/2 \rceil}{q} \leq \frac{2r}{3},$$

since $\frac{\lceil q/2 \rceil}{q}$ is $1/2$ when q is even, and $(q+1)/2q$ when n is odd, and hence is maximized for $q = 3$. Thus,

$$|S| \leq \ell + \frac{2r}{3} \leq \ell + \frac{2(t-2\ell)}{3} = \frac{2t}{3} - \frac{\ell}{3} \leq \frac{2t}{3},$$

as needed. \square

To obtain the bound on the number of summands in the case (2), note that there are $\binom{2^{k_1}}{\frac{2}{3}t}$ possible sets \mathcal{S} , and for each set, there are $\left(\frac{4t}{3}\right)^t$ possible sequences that satisfy Case 2. In each such case, we bound the summand by 2^{n_2} . Combining the two cases, we get that:

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma(X, Y)\gamma(f(X), Y))^t &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_2+k_1 \cdot t}}\right) \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_t \in \text{supp}(X)} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n_2}} \prod_{j=1}^t (-1)^{Z_{(i,x_j)}(y) \oplus Z_{(i,f(x_j))}(y)} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_2+k_1 \cdot t}}\right) \left(2^{k_1 \cdot t} 2^{n_2} \cdot \varepsilon + 2^{n_2} \binom{2^{k_1}}{\frac{2}{3}t} \left(\frac{4t}{3}\right)^t\right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2^{k_2+k_1 \cdot t}}\right) \left(2^{k_1 \cdot t} 2^{n_2} \cdot \varepsilon + 2^{n_2} (2t)^t \cdot 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}t}\right) \\ |\gamma(X, Y)\gamma(f(X), Y)| &\leq 2^{(n_2-k_2)/t} \cdot \left(\varepsilon^{1/t} + (2t) \cdot 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

\square

Now that we have shown that for any coordinate $i \in [m]$, the probability the extractor collides on the i^{th} bit is at most $\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon'$, we wish to invoke the Lemma 20 to argue that the probability the extractor collides on all the coordinates is small.

Define $\tau \subseteq [m]$, and consider the set of random variables $\{\bigoplus_{i \in \tau} Z_{i,x}(Y) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \tau} Z_{i,f(x)}(Y) : x \in \{0,1\}^{n_1}\}$. Since $|\tau| \leq m$, the set of random variables is ε -biased for linear tests of size up to $\frac{2t'}{m}$, and hence $\bigoplus_{i \in \tau} Z_{i,x}(Y) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in \tau} Z_{i,f(x)}(Y)$ is ε' -biased by Claim 97. Then by the Lemma 20, since this holds for any $\tau \subseteq [m]$, the sequence $(Z_{1,X}(Y) \oplus Z_{1,f(X)}(Y), \dots, Z_{m,X}(Y) \oplus Z_{m,f(X)}(Y))$ is $\varepsilon' \cdot 2^{\frac{m}{2}}$ -close to U_m . It follows that, the probability of collision is at most:

$$2^{-m} + \varepsilon' \cdot 2^{\frac{m}{2}} = 2^{-m} + 2^{\frac{m}{2}} \cdot 2^{(n_2-k_2)/t} \cdot \left(\varepsilon^{1/t} + (2t) \cdot 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}}\right).$$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

We now bound the probability of collision based on our choice of parameters. Recall that Lemma 71 asserts that we can construct $m \cdot 2^{n_2}$ many variables $Z_{(i,x)}$ that are (t', ε) -biased using $2\lceil \log(1/\varepsilon) + \log \log(m2^{n_2}) + \log(t') \rceil = 2\lceil \log(1/\varepsilon) + \log \log(m2^{n_2}) + \log(2mt) \rceil$ random bits. Set $\varepsilon = 2^{-r}$ where $r = \frac{1}{2}n_2 + 3 \log n_2 + \log n_1$, $n_2 \geq 16$ and $k_1 \geq 64$. We then bound the probability separately depending on k_1 's value relative to $4(n_2 - k_2)$.

If $k_1 \leq 4(n_2 - k_2)$: Choose t to be the smallest even integer such that $t \geq \frac{8(n_2 - k_2)}{k_1}$. Then $t \leq n_2 - k_2$, or else that would imply that $k_1 \leq 8$. Then it follows that:

$$\frac{8(n_2 - k_2)}{k_1} \leq t \leq \frac{16(n_2 - k_2)}{k_1} \leq \frac{8n_2}{k_1}$$

Using the inequality above:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{(n_2 - k_2)/t} \cdot \left(\varepsilon^{1/t} + (2t) \cdot 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}} \right) &\leq 2^{(n_2 - k_2 - r)/t} + \frac{32(n_2 - k_2)}{k_1} 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}} \\ &\leq 2^{-\delta n_2/t} + \frac{32(n_2 - k_2)}{k_1} 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}} \\ &\leq 2^{-\delta n_2/t} + 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3} + \frac{k_1}{12}} \\ &\leq 2^{-\delta \frac{k_1}{8}} + 2^{-\frac{k_1}{4}} \\ &\leq 2^{-\delta \frac{k_1}{8} + 1} \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, if $k_1 > 4(n_2 - k_2)$: Set $t = 2$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{(n_2 - k_2)/2} \cdot \left(\varepsilon^{1/2} + 4 \cdot 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}} \right) &= 2^{(n_2 - k_2 - r)/2} + 2^{(n_2 - k_2)/2} \cdot 4 \cdot 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}} \\ &\leq 2^{-\delta n_2/2} + 2^{(n_2 - k_2)/2} \cdot 4 \cdot 2^{-\frac{k_1}{3}} \\ &\leq 2^{-\delta n_2/2} + 2^{-\frac{k_1}{8}} \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $m \leq \delta \min\{\frac{n_2}{4}, \frac{k_1}{16}\} - 1$, we get that the collision probability is at most $2^{-m} + 2^{\frac{m}{2} - 2m - 1} \leq 2^{-m+1}$. □

4.7 A Fully Non-malleable Seeded Extractor

In this section, we will use **crTre** as **CRExt** and **Li** as **NMExt** for Theorem 83 with the following instantiations:

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

1. **crTre** is an extractor given by $[(n_x, k_x), (s, s) \mapsto d \sim \varepsilon_T]$ for $s = O(\log^2(n_x) \log^2(1/\varepsilon_T))$, and $d = \Omega(k_x)$, with collision probability $\left(\frac{\varepsilon_T}{3}\right)^2$.
2. **Li** is an extractor given by $[(d, (1 - \gamma)d), (d, (1 - \gamma)d) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon_L]$ for some constant γ , $m = \Omega(d)$, and $\varepsilon_L = 2^{-d\left(\frac{\log \log d}{\log d}\right)}$.

with $\varepsilon_{Collision} = 2^{-(k_x)^c}$ for some $c < \frac{1}{2}$. It follows that $s = o(d)$.

Theorem 99. *For any n_x, k_x , there exists a fully non-malleable seeded extractor **FNMEExt** : $[(n_x, k_x), (s + d, s + d) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon_{f_{nm}}]$ with $m = \Omega(d)$, $d < k_x$, $s = O(\log^2(n_x) \log^2(\varepsilon_T))$, $\varepsilon_{f_{nm}} < 10\varepsilon_T$ with $\varepsilon_T = 2^{-(\frac{k_x}{2})^c}$ for some $c < \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for our choice of parameters, the entropy requirements of **crTre** (from Lemma 92) and **Li** (from Lemma 79) are met for Theorem 83.

Setting input parameters $n_3 = n_x$, $k_1^* = k_x$, $n_4 = k_4 = s$, $k_2^* = s + d$, and extractor parameters $n_1 = n_2 = d$, $k_1 = k_2 = (1 - \gamma)d$, $k_3 = k_x$, note that indeed $k_1^* \geq k_3$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} k_2^* &= s + d = s + k_4 + n_1 - n_4 \\ k_2^* &= d + s \geq \left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)d + (1 - \gamma)d + 2s. \end{aligned}$$

And thus by our choice of s , $\varepsilon_{f_{nm}} \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-(\frac{k_x}{2})^{2c}} + 7\varepsilon_T < 10\varepsilon_T$ with $\varepsilon_T = 2^{-(\frac{k_x}{2})^c}$ for some $c < \frac{1}{2}$. □

It will also be useful in the subsequent subsection that we relax the entropy requirement of this extractor.

Theorem 100. *For any n_x, k_x , there exists a fully non-malleable seeded extractor **FNMEExt** : $[(n_x, k_x), (s + d, s + d - 1) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon_{f_{nm}}]$ with $m = \Omega(k_x)$, $d < k_x$, $s = O(\log^2(n_x) \log^2(\varepsilon_T))$, $\varepsilon_{f_{nm}} < 12\varepsilon_T$ with $\varepsilon_T = 2^{-(\frac{k_x}{2})^c}$ for some $c < \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 73 and Lemma 74, **crTre** can also be viewed as

crTre : $[(n_x, k_x), (s, s - 1) \mapsto \Omega(k_x) \sim 2\varepsilon_T]$ with collision probability $2\varepsilon_{Collision} = 2\left(\frac{\varepsilon_T}{3}\right)^2 \leq \varepsilon_T^2$.

For a similar choice of parameters: $n_3 = n_x$, $k_1^* = k_x$, $n_4 = s$, $k_4 = s - 1$, $k_2^* = s + d$, and extractor parameters $n_1 = n_2 = d$, $k_1 = k_2 = (1 - \gamma)d$, $k_3 = k_x$,

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

note that indeed $k_1^* \geq k_3$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} k_2^* &= s + d - 1 = s + s - 1 + d - s = s + k_4 + n_1 - n_4 \\ k_2^* &= s + d - 1 \geq \left(\frac{\gamma}{2}\right)d + (1 - \gamma)d + 2s - 1 \end{aligned}$$

And thus by our choice of s , $\varepsilon_{f_{nm}} \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-\left(\frac{k_x}{2}\right)^{2c}} + 9\varepsilon_T < 12\varepsilon_T$ with $\varepsilon_T = 2^{-\left(\frac{k_x}{2}\right)^c}$ for some $c < \frac{1}{2}$. □

Remark 101. *As we have already mentioned in the Remark 91, we can use t -tamperable extractor like [133]. As a result our **FNMEExt** will be t -tamperable non-malleable extractor with negligible error. One only has to make sure that $|y_\ell| < \frac{\gamma n}{t+1}$, which follows from the first point in the Remark 91, where $(1 - \gamma) \cdot n$ is the entropy requirement from [133] extractor. The error one obtains is therefore at least $2^{-\Omega(n/\log n)} + 2^{-\Omega\left(\frac{\gamma n}{t+1} - \log^2(n)\right)} + t \cdot 2^{-\Omega\left(\frac{\gamma n}{t+1}\right)} \geq 2^{-\Omega(n^c)}$, for $c < 1$ depending on t only. Please notice that the entropy requirements for this extractor do not change.*

4.8 A Two-Source Non-malleable Extractor

In this section, we will use **Raz** as **CRExt** and **FNMEExt** as **NMEExt** from Theorem 100 with the following instantiations:

1. **Raz** : $[(n_x, k_x), (n_\ell, k_\ell)] \mapsto d \sim 2^{-(1.5)d}$ with $d = \Omega(\min\{k_x, k_\ell\})$ and collision probability 2^{-d+1} .
2. **FNMEExt** : $[(n_y, \tau \cdot d), (d, d - 1)] \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon_{f_{nm}}$ is a two-source non-malleable extractor for some $0 < \tau < 1$, $m = \Omega(d)$, and $\varepsilon_{f_{nm}} < 12 \cdot \varepsilon_T$ with $\varepsilon_T < 2^{-\Omega((m)^c)}$ for some $c < \frac{1}{2}$.

Theorem 102. *There exists a two source non-malleable seeded extractor **2NMEExt** : $[(n_x, k_x), (n_y, k_y)] \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon_{tnm}$, and $m = \Omega(\min\{n_y, k_x\})$, such that:*

1. $k_x \geq 12 \log(n_y - k_y) + 15$,
2. $n_y \geq 30 \log(n_y) + 10 \log(n_x) + 20$,
3. $k_y \geq \left(\frac{4}{5} + \gamma\right)n_y + 3 \log(n_y) + \log(n_x) + 4$,

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

4. $\varepsilon_{tnm} \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-\frac{9\gamma}{10}n_y} + 40 \cdot \varepsilon_T$ where $\varepsilon_T = 2^{-\Omega(d^c)}$ with $c < \frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. For any given $Y \sim (n_y, k_y)$, we treat it as $Y = Y_\ell \circ Y_r$ where $|Y_\ell| = n_\ell$ and $|Y_r| = n_r$.

The extractor **Raz** : $[(n_x, k_x), (n_\ell, k_\ell) \mapsto d \sim 2^{-(1.5)d}]$ from Lemma 95 requires the following conditions:

1. $k_x \geq 12 \log(n_\ell - k_\ell) + 15$
2. $n_\ell \geq 6 \log n_\ell + 2 \log n_x + 4$,
3. $k_\ell \geq (\frac{1}{2} + \gamma) \cdot n_\ell + 3 \log n_\ell + \log n_x + 4$,
4. $d \leq \gamma \min\{\frac{n_\ell}{4}, \frac{k_x}{16}\} - 1$

for some $0 < \gamma < \frac{1}{2}$.

Setting $n_\ell = (\frac{2}{5} - \gamma)n_y$ (and consequently $n_r = (\frac{3}{5} + \gamma)n_y$), we first show that indeed the input requirements for **Raz** are met. Note that

$$(n_y - k_y) - (n_\ell - k_\ell) = n_y - k_y - (n_\ell - (k_y - n_r)) = 0$$

which implies that:

$$k_x \geq 12 \log(n_y - k_y) + 15 = 12 \log(n_\ell - k_\ell) + 15$$

Next:

$$n_\ell \geq \frac{1}{5}n_y \geq 6 \log(n_y) + 2 \log(n_x) + 4 \geq 6 \log(n_\ell) + 2 \log(n_x) + 4$$

And lastly:

$$\begin{aligned} k_\ell &\geq k_y - n_r = \left(\frac{4}{5} + \gamma\right)n_y + 3 \log(n_\ell) + \log(n_x) + 4 - \left(\frac{3}{5} + \gamma\right)n_y \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{5}\right)n_y + 3 \log(n_\ell) + \log(n_x) + 4 \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{5}\right)\left(\frac{1}{0.4 - \gamma}\right)n_\ell + 3 \log(n_\ell) + \log(n_x) + 4 \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{5\gamma}{4}\right)n_\ell + 3 \log(n_\ell) + \log(n_x) + 4 \end{aligned}$$

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

Setting input parameters $n_3 = n_x$, $k_1^* = k_x$, $n_1 = n_y$, $k_2^* = (\frac{4}{5} + \gamma)n_y$, and extractor parameters $n_4 = n_\ell$, $k_4 = k_\ell$, $n_1 = n_y$, $k_1 = \tau \cdot d$, $n_2 = d$, $k_2 = d - 1$ for some $0 < \tau < 1$, we get that $k_1^* \geq k_3$. Furthermore:

$$\begin{aligned} k_2^* - k_4 - n_1 + n_4 &= k_y - k_\ell - n_y + n_\ell = k_y - k_\ell - \left(\frac{3}{4} + \gamma\right)n_y \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{5} + \gamma\right)n_y - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \gamma\right)\left(\frac{2}{5} - \gamma\right)n_y \\ &= \left(\frac{11}{10}\gamma + \gamma^2\right)n_y \end{aligned}$$

and:

$$k_2^* - k_1 - 2n_4 = k_2^* - \tau \cdot d - 2n_\ell \geq \gamma n_y - \tau \gamma \frac{n_\ell}{4} \geq \frac{9\gamma}{10} n_y$$

Thus, by Theorem 83 it follows that $\mathbf{2NMEExt} : [(n_3, k_1^*), (n_1, k_2^*)] \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon_{tnm}$ is a strong non-malleable extractor with error:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{tnm} &\leq 3 \cdot 2^{-\frac{9\gamma}{10}n_y} + 36 \cdot \varepsilon_T + 2 \cdot 2^{-\frac{3}{2}d} + 2\sqrt{2^{-d+1}} \\ &\leq 3 \cdot 2^{-\frac{9\gamma}{10}n_y} + 40 \cdot \varepsilon_T \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon_T = 2^{-\Omega(d^c)}$ with $c < \frac{1}{2}$. □

Remark 103. *As we noted in Remark 91 we can use multi-tampering extractor from Remark 101, and obtain a t -tamperable non-malleable extractor. The error of such extractor remains negligible. Entropy requirements change due to first point from Remark 91: One source can have poly-logarithmic entropy, while the other requires entropy rate $(1 - \frac{1}{2t+3})$.*

4.9 A Two-Source Non-malleable Extractor With Rate $\frac{1}{2}$

In [8] the authors give a compiler that turns any left-strong non-malleable extractor into a non-malleable extractor with optimal output rate of $\frac{1}{2}$. The construction looks as follows:

$$\mathbf{2NMEExt}^*(X, Y) = \mathbf{SExt}(X, \mathbf{2NMEExt}(X, Y)),$$

where \mathbf{SExt} is a seeded extractor from [107] with output size equal $\frac{1}{2}H_\infty(X)$, and $\mathbf{2NMEExt}$ is a left-strong non-malleable extractor.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

We will briefly discuss the idea behind that construction. Let X' be a tampering of X , and Y' be a tampering of Y . We need to argue that if $X \neq X' \vee Y \neq Y'$ then $\mathbf{2NMExt}^*(X, Y)$ remains uniform even given $\mathbf{2NMExt}^*(X', Y')$.

If $X \neq X' \vee Y \neq Y'$ then left-strong non-malleable extractor $\mathbf{2NMExt}(X, Y)$ is uniform even given $\mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y')$, X . The final idea crucially relies on the fact that \mathbf{SExt} extracts only half of the entropy of X : we can reveal $\mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y')$ and then $\mathbf{SExt}(X', \mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y'))$ becomes a leakage from X (i.e. it is just a deterministic function of X with a small output). We get that

$$\tilde{H}_\infty(X | \mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y'), \mathbf{SExt}(X', \mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y'))) \approx \frac{1}{2} H_\infty(X)$$

(size of $\mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y')$ is tiny so it's asymptotically irrelevant). Moreover by the left-strong property of $\mathbf{2NMExt}$ we get that X and $\mathbf{2NMExt}(X, Y)$ remain independent given $\mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y')$, $\mathbf{SExt}(X', \mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y'))$, this means that $\mathbf{SExt}(X, \mathbf{2NMExt}(X, Y))$ is uniform given $\mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y')$ and $\mathbf{SExt}(X', \mathbf{2NMExt}(X', Y'))$ which gives the result.

If we make use of $\mathbf{2NMExt}$ from the previous section we can obtain a two-source unbalanced non-malleable extractor with rate $\frac{1}{2}$.

Lemma 104 (Theorem 5 of [8]). *If $\mathbf{2NMExt} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2)] \mapsto d \sim \varepsilon_1$ is a strong two-source unbalanced non-malleable extractor, with $n_2 = o(n_1)$ and $\mathbf{ext} : [(n_1, k_1), (d, d)] \mapsto \ell \sim \varepsilon_2$ is a strong seeded extractor, then there exists a two source non-malleable extractor $\mathbf{2NMExt}^* : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2)] \mapsto \ell \sim \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2$. Furthermore, if $k_1, \ell < \frac{n_1}{2}$, then $\mathbf{2NMExt}^*$ has a rate of $\frac{1}{2}$.*

Theorem 105. *There exists an extractor $\mathbf{2NMExt}^* : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2)] \mapsto \ell \sim \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2$ such that:*

1. $k_1 \geq \max\{12 \log(n_2 - k_2) + 15, \log^3(n_1) \log(1/\varepsilon_2)\}$
2. $n_2 \geq \max\{30 \log(n_2) + 10 \log(n_1) + 20, \log^3(n_1) \log(1/\varepsilon_2)\}$
3. $k_2 \geq (\frac{4}{5} + \gamma)n_2 + 3 \log(n_2) + \log(n_1) + 4$
4. $\varepsilon_1 \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-\frac{9\gamma}{10}n_2} + 40 \cdot \varepsilon_T$ where $\varepsilon_T = 2^{-\Omega(d^c)}$ with $c < \frac{1}{2}$
5. $\ell < \frac{k_1}{2}$

Furthermore, if $n_2 = o(n_1)$, $k_1, \ell < \frac{n_1}{2}$, then $\mathbf{2NMExt}^$ has a rate of $\frac{1}{2}$.*

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

Proof. By Theorem 102 there exists an extractor $\mathbf{2NMEExt} : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2) \mapsto m \sim \varepsilon_1]$ such that:

1. $k_1 \geq 12 \log(n_2 - k_2) + 15$
2. $n_2 \geq 30 \log(n_2) + 10 \log(n_1) + 20$
3. $k_2 \geq (\frac{4}{5} + \gamma)n_2 + 3 \log(n_2) + \log(n_1) + 4$
4. $\varepsilon_1 \leq 3 \cdot 2^{-\frac{9\gamma}{10}n_2} + 40 \cdot \varepsilon_T$ where $\varepsilon_T = 2^{-\Omega(d^c)}$ with $c < \frac{1}{2}$
5. $m = \Omega(\min\{n_2, k_1\})$

Using Lemma 80, $\mathbf{Tre} : [(n_1, k_1), (m, m) \mapsto \Omega(k_1) \sim \varepsilon_2]$ is a strong seeded extractor with $m = O(\log^2(n_1) \log(1/\varepsilon_2))$. Thus by Lemma 104 there exists a two source non-malleable extractor $\mathbf{2NMEExt}^* : [(n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2) \mapsto \Omega(k_1) \sim \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2]$.

Furthermore, with $n_2 = o(n_1)$ and $k_1, \ell < \frac{n_1}{2}$, we get that $\mathbf{2NMEExt}^*$ has a rate of at most $\frac{n_1}{2(n_1+n_2)} < \frac{1}{2}$. □

4.10 Privacy Amplification against Memory Tampering Active Adversaries.

Imagine Alice and Bob sharing some random but not uniform string W , they would like to "upgrade" their random string W to uniformly random string. However Eve is fully controlling a channel between Alice and Bob and can arbitrarily tamper with the messages sent. The Privacy Amplification (PA) protocol guarantees that either Alice and Bob will end up with the same uniform string (unknown to Eve), or at least one of them will abort⁸.

In [11] the authors consider a stronger version of PA which they call a *privacy amplification resilient against memory-tampering active adversaries*. In their model, Alice and Bob have access to a shared string W and their local sources of (not necessarily uniform) randomness A and B respectively. At the beginning of the protocol Eve can select one party, say Alice, and corrupt her memory $F(W, A) = (\tilde{W}, \tilde{A})$ (or $F(W, B) = (\tilde{W}, \tilde{B})$ if Eve decides to corrupt Bob). If Eve did not corrupt

⁸If one of the parties, say Alice, aborts but Bob generates random string R_B then we require R_B to be uniform and unknown to Eve.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION

the memory of any of the parties then the standard PA guarantees follow. On the other hand if Eve decides to corrupt one of the parties then either Alice and Bob agree on a uniformly random string (unknown to Eve) or the non-corrupted party will detect the tampering.

The following two definitions are taken verbatim from [11].

Definition 106 (Protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries). *An $(r, \ell_1, k_1, \ell_2, k_2, m)$ -protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries is a protocol between Alice and Bob, with a man-in-the-middle Eve, that proceeds in r rounds. Initially, we assume that Alice and Bob have access to random variables (W, A) and (W, B) , respectively, where W is an (ℓ_1, k_1) -source (the secret), and A, B are (ℓ_2, k_2) -sources (the randomness tapes) independent of each other and of W . The protocol proceeds as follows:*

In the first stage, Eve submits an arbitrary function $F : \{0, 1\}^{\ell_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{\ell_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\ell_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{\ell_2}$ and chooses one of Alice and Bob to be corrupted, so that either (W, A) is replaced by $F(W, A)$ (if Alice is chosen), or (W, B) is replaced by $F(W, B)$ (if Bob is chosen).

In the second stage, Alice and Bob exchange messages (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_r) over a non-authenticated channel, with Alice sending the odd-numbered messages and Bob the even-numbered messages, and Eve is allowed to replace each message C_i by C'_i based on $(C_1, C'_1, \dots, C_{i-1}, C'_{i-1}, C_i)$ and independent random coins, so that the recipient of the i -th message observes C'_i . Messages C_i sent by Alice are deterministic functions of (W, A) and $(C'_2, C'_4, \dots, C'_{i-1})$, and messages C_i sent by Bob are deterministic functions of (W, B) and $(C'_1, C'_3, \dots, C'_{i-1})$.

In the third stage, Alice outputs $S_A \in \{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\perp\}$ as a deterministic function of (W, A) and (C'_2, C'_4, \dots) , and Bob outputs $S_B \in \{0, 1\}^m \cup \{\perp\}$ as a deterministic function of (W, B) and (C'_2, C'_4, \dots) .

Definition 107 (Privacy amplification protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries). *An $(r, \ell_1, k_1, \ell_2, k_2, m, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -privacy amplification protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries is an $(r, \ell_1, k_1, \ell_2, k_2, m)$ -protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries with the following additional properties:*

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

- **If Eve is passive:** In this case, F is the identity function and Eve only wiretaps. Then, $S_A = S_B \neq \perp$ with S_A satisfying

$$S_A, C \approx_\varepsilon U_m, C, \quad (4.12)$$

where $C = (C_1, C'_1, C_2, C'_2, \dots, C_r, C'_r)$ denotes Eve's view.

- **If Eve is active:** Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ either $S_A = \perp$ or $S_B = \perp$ (i.e., one of Alice and Bob detects tampering), or $S_A = S_B \neq \perp$ with S_A satisfying Equation 4.12.

One building block of our extension is MAC:

Definition 108. A family of functions $\text{MAC} : \{0, 1\}^\gamma \times \{0, 1\}^\tau \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\delta$, $\text{Verify} : \{0, 1\}^\gamma \times \{0, 1\}^\delta \times \{0, 1\}^\tau \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is said to be a μ -secure one time message authentication code if

1. For $k_a \in_R \{0, 1\}^\tau$, $\forall m \in \{0, 1\}^\gamma$, $\Pr[\text{Verify}(m, \text{MAC}_{k_a}(m), k_a) = 1] = 1$,
 where for any (m, t) , $\text{Verify}(m, t, k_a) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{MAC}(m, k_a) = t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
2. For any $m \neq m', t, t', \Pr_{k_a}[\text{MAC}(m, k_a) = t | \text{MAC}(m', k_a) = t'] \leq \mu$, where $k_a \in_R \{0, 1\}^\tau$.

Lemma 109. [116, 72] For any $\gamma, \varepsilon > 0$ there is an efficient ε -secure one time MAC with $\delta \leq (\log(\gamma) + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$, $\tau \leq 2\delta$, where τ, γ, δ are key, message, tag length respectively.

In the [11] protocol Alice and Bob exchange the random strings A and B and then locally compute $R = \mathbf{2NMEExt}(A \circ B, W)$. They then split R into 3 parts, Alice sends the first part to Bob to prove she has gotten the right output, Bob then sends the second part to Alice to do the same. If this phase was successful then last part of R is the shared uniform string. Figure 4.1 illustrates the protocol.

Since one of the sources of randomness might be faulty, even if the original A, B were uniform, one requires a left-strong non-malleable extractor $\mathbf{2NMEExt}$ to remain secure for the first source with entropy below 0.5, the construction of such an extractor prior to this work was unknown⁹.

⁹Authors of [11] proceed to construct a computational non-malleable extractors with parameters that would allow for this protocol to go through.

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION




Figure 4.1: Verbatim from [11]. Privacy amplification protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries. In the above, for an n -bit string x we define $[x]_i = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i)$, $[x]_{i:j} = (x_{i+1}, \dots, x_j)$, and $[x]_j = (x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)$.

The above protocol obtains very short output compared to entropy of W , whereas ideally we would like to obtain something close to entropy of W . If Alice and Bob have access to uniform randomness, one can extend this protocol to output almost as many bits as W 's entropy (see Figure 4.2). After the execution of the [11] protocol we have the additional guarantee (see proof of Theorem 6, point (b)) that if $S_A \neq \perp$ and $S_B \neq \perp$ then we know that $S_A = S_B$ and are close to uniform and moreover Eve did not tamper with W of either of the parties (this is only achieved with standard notion of non-malleability, not the one from [105]). If Alice and Bob have access to some extra uniform bits (if A and B were uniform to start with then we could cut them in half $A = A_1 \circ A_2$ and $B = B_1 \circ B_2$, use the first half to run the original protocol by [11] and save the other half for later) then we can continue the protocol (in the spirit of [79]): Alice will send A_2, σ_A to Bob, where σ_A is a Message Authentication Code of A_2 with first half of S_A as a key. Bob will do the same: send B_2, σ_B to Alice using other half of S_B as a MAC key. There is a one final problem, we know that one of A_2 or B_2 is uniform but we don't know which (Eve could have left W unchanged but could have tampered with random coins A and B), moreover one of them might depend on W . Notice that A_2 and B_2 will remain independent, and one of them is independent of W and uniform. Therefore $A_2 + B_2$ is uniform and independent of W . Now all we have to do is plug in W and $A_2 + B_2$ into seeded extractor $\mathbf{SExt}(W, A_2 + B_2)$ and we can extract almost whole entropy out of W (and the output remains hidden from the view of Eve).

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY
AMPLIFICATION




Figure 4.2: Extension of the original PA protocol. R is split into 4 parts instead of 3. Here \mathbf{MAC} is a standard information theoretic message authentication code (MAC). And \mathbf{SExt} is any seeded extractor. When party Aborts it stops responding and the final output is \perp .

Let us analyse the protocol described in Figure 4.2 (we copy the figure below). Let $\mathbf{2NMEExt}$ be a $[(\ell_1, k_1 - 2\ell_2 - 2\gamma - 1), (2 \cdot \ell_2, \ell_2 - \gamma - 1) \mapsto 4\alpha \sim \epsilon]$ strong non-malleable extractor for some parameter $\gamma > 0$. Let shared secret $W \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell_1}$ have min-entropy k_1 , let $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{\ell_2}$ be uniform random variables. If Eve is passive the security is straight forward thus we will only consider the case of active Eve. We will follow the original proof [11] very closely. Let us focus on the case where Alice is the one with corrupted memory $F(W, (A_1, A_2)) = \tilde{W}, (\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2)$. Since randomness $(\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2)$ is controlled by the adversary we can simply reveal $(\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2) = (\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2)$ it along with original randomness $(a_1, a_2) = (A_1, A_2)$, this makes \tilde{W} only a function of W , let's denote it as $\tilde{W} = f(W)$, moreover let us denote $B'_1 = g(B_1)$. We define $\mathcal{L} = \{w : f(w) = w\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{b_1 : g(b) = b\}$.

In the proof of Theorem 6 in [11] in point (2.b) authors prove that if

CHAPTER 4. NON-MALLEABLE EXTRACTION, AND PRIVACY AMPLIFICATION

$\Pr(W \notin \mathcal{L} \vee B_1 \notin \mathcal{R} \vee a_1 = \tilde{a}_1) > 2^{-\gamma}$ then $\Pr(S_B \neq \perp \mid W \notin \mathcal{L} \vee B_1 \notin \mathcal{R}) < \epsilon + 2^{-\alpha}$, thus Bob will abort.

The only case left to analyse is the point (2.a) where $W \in \mathcal{L} \wedge B_1 \in \mathcal{R} \wedge a_1 = \tilde{a}_1$. We assume that $\Pr(W \in \mathcal{L} \wedge B_1 \in \mathcal{R} \wedge a_1 = \tilde{a}_1) > 2^{-\gamma}$ (else this case happens with negligible probability). Authors argue that W has enough entropy and thus R_A is ϵ close to uniform. If $[R_A]'_\alpha = [R_A]_\alpha$ and $[R_B]_{\alpha:2\alpha}' = [R_B]_{\alpha:2\alpha}$, then $S_A^1 \circ S_A^2 = S_B^1 \circ S_B^2 \neq \perp$ and $S_A^1 \circ S_A^2$ is ϵ close to uniform given Eve's view. Now we know that $S_A^1 \circ S_A^2 = S_B^1 \circ S_B^2 \neq \perp$ and $\tilde{W} = W$ so we can follow with the analysis of the extension: First of all the $\tilde{H}_\infty(W \mid A_1, A_2, \tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2, W \in \mathcal{L}) > k_1 - 2\ell_2 - \gamma$ (where $|A_i| = \ell$, and γ penalty comes from probability of the event $W \in \mathcal{L}$). Now notice that by the security of MAC either $\Pr((A_2 \neq A_2' \vee B_2 \neq B_2') \wedge \text{neither Alice or Bob Aborts}) < 2 \cdot 2^{-\Omega(\alpha)}$.

Further observe that even if Eve controls A_2 , and A_2 has no entropy and it might depend on W , still B_2 is uniform and independent of (A_2) . Thus $A_2 + B_2$ is uniform¹⁰ and independent of W . Now we have uniform independent seed, all we have to do is extract:

Let **SExt** : $\{0, 1\}^{\ell_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{\ell_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{0.999 \cdot (k_1 - 2\ell_2 - \gamma)}$ is a strong seeded extractor¹¹ with the error $2^{-\Omega(\ell_2)}$. Since W has enough entropy **SExt**($W, A_2 + B_2$) is $2^{-\Omega(\ell_2)}$ close to uniform given the view of Eve. The analysis for Eve corrupting Bob is symmetrical. Thus we obtain the following:

Theorem 110. *Let **2NMExt** be a $[(\ell_1, k_1 - 2\ell_2 - 2\gamma - 1), (2 \cdot \ell_2, \ell_2 - \gamma - 1)] \mapsto 4\alpha \sim \epsilon$ strong non-malleable extractor. Then, there exists an $(r = 6, \ell_1, k_1, 2 \cdot \ell_2, 2 \cdot \ell_2, 0.999 \cdot (k_1 - 2\ell_2 - \gamma), 2^{-\Omega(\ell_2)}, \delta = \epsilon + 2^{-\alpha} + 2 \cdot 2^{-\gamma} + 2^{-\Omega(\alpha)})$ -privacy amplification protocol against memory-tampering active adversaries.*

And thus when we plug in our extractor and some example parameters we get:

Corollary 111. *For shared secret W with $|W| = n$ and $H_\infty(W) > 0.803 \cdot n$ and $|A_i| = |B_i| = 0.001n$ we get privacy amplification protocol that outputs $0.8 \cdot n$ uniform bits, and has a security $2^{-\Omega(\sqrt{n})}$.*

¹⁰Technically speaking Eve can abort protocol by tampering with A_2 or B_2 , Alice and Bob will simply abort. However A_2 and B_2 are no longer fully uniform conditioned on the event that Eve let them through. This is not a problem, by Lemma 73, this only doubles extraction epsilons.

¹¹Constant 0.999 is just a placeholder for any constant less than 1. By [107] we know that such explicit extractor exists.

Chapter 5

Stronger 3SUM-Indexing Lower Bounds

Finally, in this chapter (based on the paper [60]), we study one-way functions against pre-processing adversaries. One-way functions have been studied in this setting first by Hellman in [111]. A pre-processing adversary has two phases. During the *online phase*, the adversary is first given oracle access to a function $F : [N] \rightarrow [N]$ and is given unbounded time, and an unbounded number of oracle accesses to F , and has to output S memory cells of w bits. Subsequently during the *offline phase*, the adversary is then given an input y on which it must output an x for which $F(x) = y$, in T time steps (including number of accesses into the memory cells, and oracle accesses to F). Hellman showed that there exists a pre-processing adversary with S space and time T with $S^2T = O(N^2)$ when F is chosen uniformly at random. Fiat and Naor then followed up in [97], showing that adversaries exist when $S^3T = O(N^3)$ for any function (not just randomly chosen ones). Lastly, De, Trevisan, and Tulsiani in [66] give an adversary that inverts on at least ε fraction of inputs, with S and T both being at most $\max\{\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{4}}N^{\frac{3}{4}}, \sqrt{\varepsilon N}\}$. We can think of these as the first step in creating one-way functions against pre-processing adversaries — by using F directly as the one-way function.

(Backdoors, and Immunization) Following this, Golovnev et al. in [102] observe that there is a “trivial” adversary that breaks F by essentially storing a huge inversion table (and thus having $S = N$). At face value, while this might look infeasible for most people, it might be possible for big organisations (such as the NSA) to afford that one-time cost, such that all subsequent inversions are cheap. Worse still, adversaries may take the initiative by influencing the design of protocols to use such compromised primitives. An often cited case is when the cryptographic PRG known as Dual_EC_DRBG was standardised by NIST, which was widely

suspected to contain a backdoor by the NSA [21, 98, 71]. Golovnev et al. in the same work [102] also propose an interesting follow-up to address this by creating one-way functions based on F that potentially circumvent this shortcoming. They refer to this as *immunization*. They do this by relying on the hardness of the data structure variant of the 3SUM problem, called 3SUM-Indexing. More concretely, the proposed one-way function F' on input $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, cuts the input x into two parts $x_1, x_2 = x$, and then outputs $F(x_1) \oplus F(x_2)$. Golovnev et al. further show that inverting F' is essentially equivalent to solving 3SUM-Indexing¹. Thus, the hardness of 3SUM-Indexing is directly linked to the security of this construction.

(The 3SUM Problem) We will first give a brief exposition on the rich history of the 3SUM problem in algorithms and complexity. In the 3SUM Problem, we are given a set \mathcal{S} of n group elements from an abelian group $(\mathcal{G}, +)$ and the goal is to determine whether there is a triple $a, b, c \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $a + b = c$. The 3SUM Problem was originally introduced by Gajentaan and Overmars [99] as a means of establishing hardness of geometric problems. Concretely, it was conjectured that 3SUM requires $\Omega(n^2)$ time when the underlying group is the set of reals and we use the Real-RAM computational model. By reductions, this conjecture implies similar lower bounds for a wealth of geometric problems, see e.g. [25, 159].

While originally being restricted mostly to geometric problems, the seminal work by Pătraşcu [147] showed that a suitable integer version of 3SUM (e.g. \mathcal{G} is the integers modulo n^3), may be used to prove hardness of numerous fundamental algorithmic problems (see e.g. [123, 18, 1, 147]) in the more realistic word-RAM model. These lower bounds are based on the so-called 3SUM Conjecture, asserting that no $n^{2-\delta}$ time 3SUM algorithm exists for any constant $\delta > 0$. To date, the fastest 3SUM algorithm runs in time $O(n^2(\lg \lg n)^{O(1)}/\lg^2 n)$ [49], which is far from refuting the conjecture. The 3SUM Conjecture is now one of the pillars in fine-grained complexity and much effort has gone into understanding its implications for algorithm lower bounds. In fact, recently the fine-grained hardness of k SUM was used by LaVigne, Lincoln, and Williams in [129] to construct fine-grained one-way functions.

¹In [102] they give a construction using k SUM, but all other complexity related results are for the case of $k = 3$.

CHAPTER 5. STRONGER 3SUM-INDEXING LOWER BOUNDS

Highly related to algorithm lower bounds is lower bounds for data structures, which is the setting that we are interested in. While more progress has been made on proving unconditional lower bounds for data structures compared to algorithms, current state-of-the-art lower bounds are still only polylogarithmic [126, 128, 125]. This lack of progress motivates fine-grained conditional lower bounds also for data structures. The first approach in this direction, is via the Online Matrix-Vector Problem by Henzinger et al. [112]. Their framework yields polynomial conditional lower bounds for dynamic data structures via reductions from multiplication of a boolean matrix and a boolean vector, with addition replaced by OR and multiplication replaced by AND. However, their framework is inherently tied to *dynamic* data structure problems, where a data set is to be maintained under update operations. As a means to addressing *static* data structure problems, Goldstein, Kopelowitz, Lewenstein, and Porat in [101] introduced the 3SUM-Indexing Problem.

(3SUM-Indexing) The 3SUM-Indexing problem was first defined by Demaine and Vadhan in an unpublished manuscript [67] and then by Goldstein, Kopelowitz, Lewenstein, and Porat in [101] and is as follows:

Definition 112 (3SUM-Indexing). *Let $(\mathcal{G}, +)$ be a finite abelian group. Preprocess two sets of group elements $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ each of size n into a data structure of S memory cells of w bits so that given any query group element z , deciding whether there exists $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$ such that $a_1 + a_2 = z$ is done by accessing at most T memory cells.*

A number of hardness conjectures were provided together with the definition of the 3SUM-Indexing Problem. Combined with reductions, these conjectures allow establishment of conditional lower bounds for static data structures. To be consistent with the terminology used for unconditional data structure lower bounds, which are typically proved in the cell probe model [168], we refer to accessing a memory cell as *probing* the cell. The following conjectures were made regarding the hardness of 3SUM-Indexing:

Conjecture 1 ([101]). *Any data structure for 3SUM-Indexing with space S and $T = O(1)$ probes must have $S = \tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$.*

Conjecture 2 ([67]). *Any data structure for 3SUM-Indexing with space S and T probes must have $ST = \tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$.*

Conjecture 3 ([101]). *Any data structure for 3SUM-Indexing with space S and $T = O(n^{1-\delta})$ probes must have $S = \tilde{\Omega}(n^2)$.*

Clearly the last conjecture is the strongest, and in general, we have the following implications:

$$\text{Conjecture 3} \Rightarrow \text{Conjecture 2} \Rightarrow \text{Conjecture 1}$$

These conjectures have been successfully used to prove fine-grained hardness of several natural static data structure problems ranging from Set Disjointness, Set Intersection, Histogram Indexing to Forbidden Pattern Document Retrieval [101]. Furthermore, the security of the aforementioned construction of one-way function F' relies on the hardness of 3SUM-Indexing.

Very surprisingly, Golovnev et al. [102] showed that the strongest of these conjectures, Conjecture 3, is false. Concretely, they gave a data structure for 3SUM-Indexing with $T = \tilde{O}(n^{3\delta})$ and $S = \tilde{O}(n^{2-\delta})$ for any constant $\delta > 0$. This refutes Conjecture 3, but not the remaining two conjectures. Their data structure is based on an elegant use of Fiat and Naor's [96] general time-space tradeoff for function inversion.

The refutation of Conjecture 3 only makes it more urgent that we replace these conjectured lower bounds by unconditional ones. However, depressingly little is still known in terms of unconditional hardness of 3SUM-Indexing. First, [67] proved Conjecture 1 in the special case of $T = 1$. Secondly, in the recent work by Golovnev et al. [102], the following was proved for *non-adaptive* data structures:

Theorem 113 ([102]). *Any non-adaptive cell probe data structure answering 3SUM-Indexing queries for input sets of size n from an abelian group G of size $O(n^2)$ using S words of w bits must have query time $T = \Omega(\log n / \log(Sw/n))$.*

A non-adaptive data structure is one in which the cells to probe are chosen beforehand as a function *only* of the query element z . That is, the data structure is not allowed to choose which memory cells to probe based on the contents of previously probed cells. Proving lower bounds for non-adaptive data structures is often easier than allowing adaptivity, see e.g. [46, 40, 149], and Golovnev et al.

remark: "*It is crucial for our proof that the input is chosen at random after the subset of data structure cells, yielding a lower bound only for non-adaptive algorithms.*" [102]. Golovnev et al. explicitly raised it as an interesting open problem (Open Question 3 in [102]) whether a similar lower bound can be proved also for adaptive data structures.

5.0.1 Our Results

Our main contribution is a lower bound for 3SUM-Indexing that holds also for adaptive data structures:

Theorem 114. *Any cell probe data structure answering 3SUM-Indexing queries for input sets of size n for abelian groups $([m], + \text{ mod } m)$ with $m = O(n^2)$ and $(\{0, 1\}^{2^{\log(n)+O(1)}}, \oplus)$ using S words of $w = \Omega(\lg n)$ bits must have query time $T = \Omega(\log n / \log(Sw/n))$.*

Our lower bound matches the previous bound from [102], this time however allowing adaptivity. Moreover, it (essentially) matches the strongest known lower bounds for static data structures (the strongest lower bounds peak at $T = \Omega(\log n / \log(Sw/n))$ [125]), thus ruling out further progress without a major breakthrough (also in circuit complexity [165, 86]).

Our proof is based on a novel reduction from Pătraşcu's Reachability Oracles in the Butterfly graph problem [148]. This problem, while rather abstract, has been shown to capture the hardness of a wealth of static data structure problems such as 2D Range Counting, 2D Rectangle Stabbing, 2D Skyline Counting and Range Mode Queries, see e.g. [158, 45, 106] as well as for dynamic data structure problems, including Range Selection and Median [128] and recently also all dynamic problems that the Marked Ancestor Problem reduces to [127, 17], which includes 2D Range Emptiness, Partial Sums and Worst-Case Union-Find. Our work adds 3SUM-Indexing and all problems it reduces to, to the list.

Even Smaller Universes. The reduction from Reachability Oracles in the Butterfly Graph problem gives lower bounds for abelian groups of size $\Omega(n^2)$, leaving open the possibility of more efficient data structures for smaller groups. Indeed, $\Omega(n^2)$ cardinality of the groups seems like a natural requirement for hardness, as

there are n^2 pairs of elements $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$ and thus for smaller groups, one might start to exploit structures in the sumset $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ to obtain more efficient data structures. We therefore investigate whether the lower bound in Theorem 114 can be generalized to smaller groups. Quite surprisingly, we show that:

Theorem 115. *Any cell probe data structure answering 3SUM-Indexing queries for input sets of size n for abelian groups $([m], + \bmod m)$, with $m = O(n^{1+\delta})$ and $(\{0, 1\}^{(1+\delta)\log(n)+O(1)}, \oplus)$ for a constant $\delta > 0$, using S words of $w = \Omega(\lg n)$ bits must have query time $T = \Omega(\log n / \log(Sw/n))$.*

Thus we get logarithmic lower bounds for linear space data structures, even when the group has size only $n^{1+\delta}$.

To prove Theorem 115, we revisit Pătraşcu’s Lopsided Set Disjointness (LSD) communication game, which he also used to prove his lower bound for Reachability Oracles in the Butterfly graph problem. We give a careful reduction from LSD to 3SUM-Indexing on small universes, thereby establishing Theorem 115.

Non-Adaptive Data Structures. As another contribution, we revisit the non-adaptive setting considered by Golovnev et al. [102]. Here we present a significantly shorter proof of their lower bound and also improve it from $T = \Omega(\lg n / \lg(Sw/n))$ to $T = \Omega(\lg |G| / \lg(Sw/n))$. Concretely, we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 116. *Any non-adaptive cell probe data structure answering 3SUM-Indexing queries for input sets of size n for an abelian group \mathcal{G} of size $\omega(n^2)$, using S words of $w = \Omega(\lg n)$ bits must have query time $T = \Omega(\min\{\log |\mathcal{G}| / \log(Sw/n), n/w\})$.*

We remark that the proof of Golovnev et al. [102] cannot be extended to a $\lg |\mathcal{G}|$ (technically, they require $|\mathcal{G}|/n$ queries to survive a cell sampling, whereas we only require n queries to survive).

Our improvement has a subtle, but interesting consequence. Concretely, if the size of the group grows to sub-exponential in n , say $|\mathcal{G}| = 2^{\sqrt{n}}$, then the lower bound becomes $T = \Omega(\min\{\sqrt{n} / \log(\frac{Sw}{n}), n/w\})$. Since it is most natural to assume the cell size is large enough to store a group element, i.e. $w = \Omega(\lg |\mathcal{G}|) = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$, the lower bound is still at least $T = \Omega(\sqrt{n} / \lg S)$. While such large groups are perhaps unrealistic, one can also interpret the result as saying that if we are non-adaptive and

attempt to design a data structure that does not exploit the size of the underlying group, then we are doomed to have a slow query time.

Non-Adaptive 2-Bit-Probe Data Structures. Finally, we consider non-adaptive data structures restricted to $T = 2$ probes in the *bit probe model*, meaning that each memory cell has $w = 1$ bits. The lower bound from Theorem 113 by [102] in this case is $S = \tilde{\Omega}(n^{3/2})$ (see the paper [102] for the general formulation $S = \tilde{\Omega}(n^{1+1/T})$) and our lower bound from Theorem 116 is $S = \tilde{\Omega}(n(|\mathcal{G}|/n)^{1/T}) = \tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n|\mathcal{G}|})$. We significantly strengthen this result by proving an $S = \Omega(|\mathcal{G}|)$ lower bound for an abelian group $(\mathcal{G}, +)$, completely ruling out any non-trivial data structure with 2 non-adaptive bit probes (with $|\mathcal{G}|$ space, we can trivially store a bit vector representing the sumset $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ and have $T = 1$ while being non-adaptive):

Theorem 117. *Any non-adaptive data structure for 3SUM-Indexing such that $T = 2$ and $w = 1$ requires $S = \Omega(|\mathcal{G}|)$ for an abelian group $(\mathcal{G}, +)$.*

Our proof takes an interesting new approach to data structure lower bounds and we find that the proof itself is a valuable contribution to data structure lower bounds. The basic idea is to view the memory cells of the data structure as a graph with one node per cell. The queries then become edges corresponding to the $T = 2$ memory cells probed. If the number of memory cells is $o(|\mathcal{G}|)$, then the graph has a super-linear number of edges. This implies that its girth is at most logarithmic and hence we can find a short cycle in the graph. A cycle is a set of m queries being answered by m memory cells. The standard cell sampling lower bounds (often used in data structure lower bounds) cannot derive a contradiction from this, as the m memory bits intuitively are sufficient to encode the m query answers. However, our novel contribution is to examine the different types of possible query algorithms (i.e. which function of the two bits probed does it compute) and argue that in all cases, such a short cycle is impossible. Directly examining the types of query algorithms has not been done before in data structure lower bounds and we find this a valuable contribution that we hope may prove useful in future work.

5.1 Preliminaries

In this section we will formally define data structure problems, and the 3SUM Indexing problem.

5.1.1 Data Structures

A data structure problem \mathcal{P} is a subset of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Q}$. A cell probe data structure solving \mathcal{P} is a pair of algorithms $(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ such that \mathcal{A}_1 is a computationally unbounded algorithm that takes as input $D \in \mathcal{S}$ and outputs S memory cells, where each cell consists w bits. Then, \mathcal{A}_2 is a computationally unbounded algorithm that takes $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and uses at most T accesses to the data structure output by \mathcal{A}_1 in deciding if $(D, q) \in \mathcal{P}$.

5.1.2 3SUM-Indexing

The 3SUM-Indexing problem was first defined by Demaine and Vadhan in an unpublished manuscript [67] and then by Goldstein, Kopelowitz, Lewenstein, and Porat in [101].

Definition 118 (3SUM-Indexing). *Let $(\mathcal{G}, +)$ be an finite abelian group. Pre-process two sets of group elements $A_1, A_2 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ each of size n into a data structure D of S memory cells of w bits so that given any query group element z , deciding whether there exists $a_1 \in A_1$ and $a_2 \in A_2$ such that $a_1 + a_2 = z$ is done by accessing at most T memory cells.*

Golovnev, Guo, Horel, Park, and Vaikuntanathan in [102] then defined a similar variant of the problem which additionally asserted that the input sets A_1 and A_2 should be the same. We first show that the two definitions are essentially equivalent up to a small change in the group. i.e. Any solution that solves the [102] variant of 3SUM-Indexing can also be adapted to solve the variant in Definition 112.

Lemma 119. *Any pre-processing solution that solves 3SUM-Indexing as defined in Definition 112 for input sets of size n and universe sizes of u can also be used to solve 3SUM-Indexing as defined in [102].*

Proof. For any abelian group $(\mathcal{G}', +')$, we define $(\mathcal{G}, +)$ to be the group obtained as the direct product of $(\{0, 1\}, +)$ and $(\mathcal{G}', +')$. Then, given any two sets \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 , we construct set $\mathcal{A} = \{0\} \times \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \{1\} \times \mathcal{A}_2$. For any query value z , we then form the query as $(1, z)$. In our transformation, the group size and input array length is doubled.

Assuming that there exists a pair $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$ such that $a_1 + a_2 = z$, then $(0, a_1), (1, a_2)$ is in \mathcal{A} and so $(0, a_1) + (1, a_2) = (1, z)$. On the other hand, assuming that no such pairing exists, then no such pairing $(0, a_1), (1, a_2) \in \mathcal{A}$ sums to $(1, z)$ as well. \square

5.2 Reduction from Reachability Oracles in the Butterfly Graph

In this section, we give a reduction from the problem of *Reachability Oracles in the Butterfly Graph* to 3SUM-Indexing with the cyclic group and the XOR group, proving Theorem 114. In both cases, the size of the group is at most quadratic with respect to the input set sizes.

Definition 120 (Butterfly Graphs). *A Butterfly graph of degree B and depth d is a directed graph with $d + 1$ layers, each comprising of B^d nodes. For each layer, the i^{th} node can be associated with a d -digit number in base B which we will refer to as its label v_i where $v_i[0]$ denotes the least significant digit. Then there is an edge from node i on the k^{th} layer to node j on the $(k + 1)^{\text{th}}$ layer if and only if $v_i[h] = v_j[h]$ for all $h \neq k$. That is to say, that there is an edge if and only if i and j may differ only on the k^{th} digit of their labels. We will denote such an edge by $e_k(i, j)$.*

Nodes in the layer 0 of the graph are called source nodes, whereas nodes in layer d of the graph are called sink nodes.

Definition 121 (Reachability Oracles in the Butterfly Graph). *The problem of Reachability Oracles in the Butterfly Graph is that one has to pre-process into a data structure a subset of the edges E of the butterfly graph of degree B and depth d . Queries come in the form of (s, t) and the goal is decide if there exists a path from source node s to sink node t using the subset of edges E .*

Pătraşcu proved the following lower bound for the problem in the cell probe model:

Lemma 122 (Section 5 of [148]). *Any cell probe data structure answering reachability queries in subgraphs of the butterfly graph with degree B and depth d , using S words of w bits must have query time $t = \Omega(d)$, assuming that $B = \Omega(w^2)$ and $\log(B) = \Omega(\log(Sd/N))$ where $N = dB^d$.*

A few remarks about reachability in the Butterfly graph are in order. Firstly, note that for any source-sink pair (s, t) , there exists a unique path from source s to sink t in the Butterfly graph. Namely, the path uses exactly edges of the form $e_k(i, j)$ such that for $k \in [d]$, $e_k(i, j)$ is the edge from node i on layer k to node j on layer $k + 1$ such that:

1. $v_s[h] = v_i[h]$ for all $h \geq k$. That is to say that the $d - k$ most significant digits of the labels of nodes s and i are the same.
2. $v_t[h] = v_j[h]$ for all $h \leq k$. That is to say that the $k + 1$ least significant digits of the labels of nodes t and j are the same.

Conversely, we can also say that the edge $e_k(i, j)$ connects all pairs of nodes s, t such that the label for s shares the most significant $d - k$ digits with i and the label for t shares the least significant $k + 1$ digits with t .

Intuitively, this is because the traversing from node i in the k^{th} layer to node j in the $(k + 1)^{\text{th}}$ layer can be seen as “setting” the k^{th} digit of the label for node i into the k^{th} digit of the label for node j while leaving the rest of the digits unaltered.

The general idea of the reduction to 3SUM-Indexing is to test whether all the required edges are present when querying for s and t . This should be done by asking one 3SUM-Indexing query. We will design it such that a sum $z = a_1 + a_2$ exists for our query z if and only if there is at least one edge missing on the path from s to t .

Constructing \mathcal{A}_1 . Our basic idea is to take every edge $e_k(i, j)$ in the Butterfly graph and encode it into a group element g in \mathcal{A}_1 . We construct g such that its digits can be broken up into 5 blocks so that conceptually the:

1. first block encodes the layer the edge is from;

2. second block encodes the presence of edge $e_k(i, j)$ in E ;
3. third block encodes the $d - k$ most significant bits of i followed by k zeroes;
4. fourth block holds $d - k - 1$ zeroes followed by the $k + 1$ least significant digits of j ;
5. fifth block holds 2 zeroes.

In short, for every edge $e_k(i, j)$, we add group element to \mathcal{A}_1 whose digits are in the following form:

$$(k, \mathbb{1}\{e_k(i, j) \in E\}, v_i[d-1], \dots, v_i[k], \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{d-1}, v_j[k], \dots, v_j[0], 0, 0)$$

where $\mathbb{1}\{e_k(i, j) \in E\}$ is 1 if $e_k(i, j) \in E$ and 0 otherwise. Note that the Butterfly graph has dB^d nodes with degree B , hence a total of $n = dB^{d+1}$ edges. Since \mathcal{A}_1 has one element for each such edge, we have $|\mathcal{A}_1| = n$.

Constructing \mathcal{A}_2 . Next, we construct the set \mathcal{A}_2 of group elements such that for every k , it “helps” any group element g in \mathcal{A}_1 , originating from an edge $e_k(i, j)$, to sum to any value where the third block shares the $d - k$ most significant bits with i and the fourth block shares the $k + 1$ least significant digits of j . This can be done by adding into set \mathcal{A}_2 every group element such that the:

1. first block holds some value $-k$;
2. second block is zero;
3. third block is $d - k$ zeroes followed by any possible k digit value;
4. fourth block holds any possible $d - k - 1$ digit value followed by $k + 1$ zeroes;
5. fifth block holds any possible digit value from $[0, B - 1]$.

Thus for $k \in [0, d - 1]$, we add any number of the following form into \mathcal{A}_2 :

$$(-k, 0, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{d-k}, \underbrace{\star, \dots, \star}_{d-1}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{k+1}, \star, \star)$$

where \star denotes wildcard. Note that the least significant digits is not strictly necessary but is included to enforce that the size of the sets \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 are the same. Observe that $|\mathcal{A}_2| = dB^{d+1} = n = |\mathcal{A}_1|$.

Different Groups. For the reduction to 3SUM-indexing in the cyclic group, we will consider the set of integers in $[(dB^{d+1})^2]$. To that end, the encoding works by understanding the $2(d+2)$ digits as specifying a mixed-radix number, where the most significant digit is in base $4d$, the second most significant digit is in base 3 and the remaining digits are in base B . In which case, we can take $-k$ to be $4d - k$.

On the other hand, for the XOR group, assuming that d and B are powers of 2, we can then also naturally transform each digit into their binary representation with the exception of the most significant digit whose bit representation should be based on the number's complement and the second most significant digit may be in base 2.

Translating a Query. What remains is to explain how we answer a reachability query (s, t) . We will first consider the reduction for the group $([(dB^{d+1})^2], + \text{ mod } (dB^{d+1})^2)$ and subsequently argue that the same reduction basically holds for the XOR group assuming that d and B are powers of 2. We claim that there exists $a_1 \in A_1$ and $a_2 \in A_2$ whose sum is

$$z_{(s,t)} = (0, 0, v_s[d-1], \dots, v_s[0], v_t[d-1], \dots, v_t[0], 0, 0)$$

if and only if there does not exist a path from s to t in the Butterfly graph.

To see this, we first argue that for a pair $a_1 + a_2$ that could potentially sum to $z_{(s,t)}$, we need not worry about carries amongst the digits of the numbers. To see this, we start by observing that $a_1 + a_2$ must have its most significant digit equal to 0. We claim this is only possible if a_1 's most significant digit is k and a_2 's is $4d - k = -k$. To see this, observe that the second most significant digit of a_1 is at most 1 and the second most significant of a_2 is always 0. Since the second most significant digit is in base 3, this means that we cannot get a carry from these digits. Now that we have established this, we observe that for all remaining digits of any valid pair a_1 and a_2 (pairs where the most significant digit in the sum is 0), there is at most one of the elements that has a non-zero digit, hence we will not see any carries.

Now assume there does not exist a path from some source node s to some sink node t . This must mean that there exists a $k \in [0, d-1]$ and an edge $e_k(i, j)$ not in

E where:

$$\begin{aligned} v_i &= (v_s[d-1], \dots, v_s[k], v_t[k-1], \dots, v_t[0]) \\ v_j &= (v_s[d-1], \dots, v_s[k+1], v_t[k], \dots, v_t[0]) \end{aligned}$$

By construction, this implies that the following group element exists in the set A_1 :

$$(k, 0, v_s[d-1], \dots, v_s[k], \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{d-1}, v_t[k], \dots, v_t[0], 0, 0)$$

Furthermore, the following group element always exists in A_2 :

$$(-k, 0, 0, \dots, 0, v_t[k-1], \dots, v_t[0], v_s[d-1], \dots, v_s[k+1], 0, \dots, 0, 0)$$

This means that the value $(0, 0, v_s[d-1], \dots, v_s[0], v_t[d-1], \dots, v_t[0], 0)$ is obtainable as a sum $a_1 + a_2$. If on the other hand there is a path between s and t , then all elements in A_1 of the form

$$(k, \star, v_s[d-1], \dots, v_s[k], \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{d-1}, v_t[k], \dots, v_t[0], 0)$$

must have $\star = 1$ and thus it is not possible to write $z_{(s,t)}$ as $a_1 + a_2$.

The XOR Group. For a reduction to the XOR group setting, we consider each element coordinate-wise using their binary representations with the exception that in the first coordinate the value is represented using the number's complement representation. Using the previous remark we also assert that for any pair $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$, the only common digit that is both non-zero is the most significant digit and thus the addition being done digit-wise. For that reason, the sum behaves exactly the same way over the XOR group as it does over the cyclic group that we have defined. Thus the size of the universe and input sets $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ remain unchanged and the reduction holds in the XOR group as well.

Analysis. Now by setting $B = \frac{Sw^2}{n}$, note that $B = \Omega(w^2)$ and:

$$\log(Sd/N) \leq \log\left(\frac{SB \log(n)}{n}\right) \leq \log(SBw/n) \leq \log(B^2) = O(\log B)$$

Furthermore, it holds that

$$\log(Sw/n) = \frac{1}{2} \log((Sw/n)^2) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log(Sw^2/n) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log B$$

Using Lemma 122, it then follows that for any cell-probe solution for 3SUM-Indexing for the cyclic group $([m], + \bmod m)$ where $m = O(n^2)$ and XOR group $(\{0, 1\}^{2 \log(n)+O(1)}, \oplus)$ any static data structure that uses $S \geq n$ cells of $w \geq \log(n)$ bits has query time $T = \Omega(d) = \Omega(\lg_B n) = \Omega(\log n / \log(Sw/n))$.

5.3 Reduction from Lopsided Set Disjointness

In this section, we prove Theorem 115, establishing hardness of 3SUM-Indexing also for abelian groups of size $\Delta = n^{1+\delta}$. For the proof, we focus on the integers modulo Δ , but remark that the proof readily adapts to the XOR group as well.

For the proof, we use Pătrașcu's Blocked Lopsided Set Disjointness (Blocked LSD) problem. In this problem, there are two players, Alice and Bob. Bob receives as input a set \mathcal{X} , which is an arbitrary subset of a universe $[N] \times [B]$. Alice receives a set $\mathcal{Y} \subset [N] \times [B]$ with the restriction that \mathcal{Y} contains exactly one element (i, b_i) for every $i = 0, \dots, N - 1$. The goal for Alice and Bob is to determine whether $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$ while minimizing communication. The following is known regarding the communication complexity of Blocked LSD:

Lemma 123 (Theorem 4 of [148]). *Fix $\delta > 0$. Any communication protocol for Blocked LSD requires either Alice sending at least $\delta N \log B$ bits, or Bob sending at least $NB^{1-O(\delta)}$ bits.*

The basic idea in the reduction, is to have Bob interpret his set \mathcal{X} as two input sets $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ of $n = NB$ group elements to 3SUM-Indexing (we may have $|\mathcal{A}_1|$ and $|\mathcal{A}_2|$ smaller than NB , but we can always pad with dummy elements, so we assume $n = NB$). Given a data structure D for 3SUM-Indexing, Bob then builds D on this input. Alice on the other hand interprets her set \mathcal{Y} (which has cardinality N) as a set of N/ℓ queries to 3SUM-Indexing, where ℓ is a parameter to be determined. The key property of the reduction, is that the answers to all N/ℓ queries of Alice on D , determines whether $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$.

Communication Protocol. Assume for now that we can give such a reduction. Alice and Bob then obtains a communication protocol for Blocked LSD as follows: Let T be the query time of D . For $i = 1, \dots, T$, Alice simulates the i 'th step of

the query algorithm for each of her N/ℓ queries, *in parallel*. This is done by asking Bob for the set of at most N/ℓ cells that they probe in the i 'th step. This costs $O(\lg \binom{S}{N/\ell}) = O((N/\ell) \lg(S\ell/N))$ bits of communication by specifying the required cells as a subset of the S memory cells of D . Bob replies with the contents of the cells, costing $((N/\ell)w)$ bits. This is done for T rounds, resulting in a communication protocol where Alice sends $O((N/\ell)T \lg(S\ell/N))$ bits and Bob sends $O((N/\ell)Tw)$ bits. If we fix $B = w^4$ and δ as a small enough constant, then Lemma 123 says that either Alice sends $\Omega(N \lg w)$ bits or Bob sends $\Omega(N\sqrt{B}) = \Omega(Nw^2)$ bits. In our protocol, Bob's communication is $O((N/\ell)Tw) = O(NTw)$ bits. We assume $w = \Omega(\lg n)$, thus we conclude that either $NTw = \Omega(Nw^2) \Rightarrow T = \Omega(\lg n)$, or Alice's communication must be $\Omega(N \lg B) = \Omega(N \lg w)$ bits. In the first case, we are done with the proof, hence we examine the latter case. Alice's communication is $O((N/\ell)T \lg(S\ell/N))$ bits, which implies $T = \Omega(\ell \lg w / \lg(S\ell/N))$. Thus to derive our lower bound, we have to argue that it suffices for Alice to answer N/ℓ queries for a large enough ℓ .

Asking Few Queries. We will show that it suffices for Alice to ask N/ℓ queries with $\ell = \varepsilon \lg n / \lg w$. Here $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small constant depending on δ in the group size $\Delta = n^{1+\delta}$. Thus we get a lower bound of $T = \Omega(\lg n / \lg((S \lg n) / (N \lg w)))$. Since $N = n/B = n/w^4$, this simplifies to $T = \Omega(\lg n / \lg(Sw/n))$ as claimed in Theorem 115.

Thus what remains is to show how Alice and Bob computes the input and queries. For this, they conceptually partition the universe $[N] \times [B]$ into groups $\{i\ell, \dots, (i+1)\ell - 1\} \times [B]$ for $i = 0, \dots, N/\ell$. Alice will ask precisely one query for each such group. Denote by \mathcal{Y}_i the subset of \mathcal{Y} that falls in the i 'th group and denote by \mathcal{X}_i the subset of \mathcal{X} that falls in the i 'th group. Clearly $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathcal{X}_i \cap \mathcal{Y}_i = \emptyset$ for all i . Thus Alice will use her i 'th query to determine whether $\mathcal{X}_i \cap \mathcal{Y}_i = \emptyset$.

Constructing \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 . To support this, Bob first constructs the set \mathcal{A}_1 based on his elements \mathcal{X} . He examines each group \mathcal{X}_i , and for every $(j, b) \in \mathcal{X}_i$, he adds the integer $i(2B+1)^{\ell+1} + (b+1)(2B+1)^{j-i\ell}$ to \mathcal{A}_1 . Next, he constructs the set \mathcal{A}_2 . For this, he considers all vectors $Z = (b_0, \dots, b_{\ell-1})$ for which the numbers are all between

0 and B and precisely one of them is 0. He adds the integer $\sum_{j \in [\ell]} b_j (2B + 1)^j$ to \mathcal{A}_2 . This completes Bob's construction of the input sets \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 . We have $|\mathcal{A}_1| \leq NB = n$ and $|\mathcal{A}_2| \leq (2B + 1)^\ell$.

Asking the Queries. We next describe how Alice translates her set Y into queries. For each Y_i , she needs to construct one query z_i whose answer determines whether $X_i \cap Y_i = \emptyset$. Recall that Y_i is of the form $\{(i\ell, b_0), (i\ell + 1, b_1), \dots, ((i+1)\ell - 1, b_{\ell-1})\}$. She starts by subtracting off $i\ell$ from the first index in each pair, obtaining the set $\{(0, b_0), (1, b_1), \dots, (\ell - 1, b_{\ell-1})\}$. Alice now asks the query $z_i = i(2B + 1)^{\ell+1} + \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (b_j + 1)(2B + 1)^j$.

Correctness. We claim that z_i is part of a 3SUM if and only if $\mathcal{X}_i \cap \mathcal{Y}_i \neq \emptyset$. To see this, observe first that to write z_i as $a_1 + a_2$, it must be the case that a_1 was constructed from \mathcal{X}_i as otherwise we cannot obtain the $i(2B + 1)^{\ell+1}$ parts of z_i . Next, observe that if we write the integers in base $2B + 1$, then \mathcal{A}_2 contains precisely every integer of the form where there is a single digit $j \in [\ell]$ that is zero and all remaining are non-zero. Also, the numbers obtained from $(j, b) \in \mathcal{X}_i$ are of the form $i(2B + 1)^{\ell+1} + (b + 1)(2B + 1)^{j-i\ell}$ and thus have exactly one non-zero digit among the first ℓ . Since z_i has exclusive non-zero digits in the first ℓ , it follows that $z_i = i(2B + 1)^{\ell+1} + \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (b_j + 1)(2B + 1)^j$ can be written as $a_1 + a_2$ if and only if a_1 was obtained from a $(j, b) \in X_i$ for which b is equal to $b_{j-i\ell}$. This is the case if and only if \mathcal{X}_i and \mathcal{Y}_i intersect in (j, b) .

Analysis. We now determine ℓ . Recall that $B = w^4$ and observe that all possible integers are bounded by $N(2B + 1)^{\ell+2} \leq n(2B + 1)^{\ell+2}$. If we insist on a group of size $\Delta = n^{1+\delta}$, this means we can set $\ell = \delta \lg n / \lg(2B + 1) - 2 \geq \varepsilon \lg n / \lg w$ for a sufficiently small constant $\varepsilon > 0$. This also implies that $|\mathcal{A}_2| \leq n^\delta \leq n$ and thus completes the proof of Theorem 115.

5.4 Lower Bound for Non-Adaptive Data Structures

In this section, we prove an $\Omega(\min\{\lg |\mathcal{G}|/\lg(Sw/n), n/w\})$ lower bound for non-adaptive 3SUM-Indexing data structures when $|\mathcal{G}| = \omega(n^2)$. Similarly to the previous approach by Golovnev et al. [102], we use a cell sampling approach.

Consider a data structure using S memory cells of w bits and answering queries non-adaptively in T probes. Consider all subsets of $\Delta = n/(2w)$ memory cells. There are $\binom{S}{\Delta}$ such subsets. We say that a query z is answered by a set of cells \mathcal{C} , if all the (non-adaptively chosen) cells it probes are contained in \mathcal{C} . Any query z is answered by at least $\binom{S-T}{\Delta-T}$ sets of Δ cells, namely all those containing the T cells probed on z . It follows by averaging over the $|\mathcal{G}|$ queries that there is a set of cells \mathcal{C}^* answering at least

$$|\mathcal{G}| \frac{\binom{S-T}{\Delta-T}}{\binom{S}{\Delta}} = |\mathcal{G}| \frac{\Delta(\Delta-1)\cdots(\Delta-T+1)}{S(S-1)\cdots(S-T+1)} \geq |\mathcal{G}| \left(\frac{\Delta-T+1}{S}\right)^T$$

queries.

If $T \geq \Delta/2$, we are already done as we have proven $T = \Omega(n/w)$. Otherwise, $T \leq \Delta/2$ and thus the above is at least $|\mathcal{G}|(\Delta/(2S))^T = |\mathcal{G}|(n/(4Sw))^T$. If we assume for contradiction that $T = o(\lg |\mathcal{G}|/\lg(Sw/n))$, this is at least $|\mathcal{G}|^{1-o(1)} > n$. Let \mathcal{Q} be the group elements corresponding to an arbitrary subset of n of those queries. We argue that we can construct a distribution over inputs $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ such that the queries \mathcal{Q} cannot be answered from few cells, contradicting that we have answered them from \mathcal{C}^* . More precisely, we show:

Lemma 124. *Let $(\mathcal{G}, +)$ be an abelian group with $\omega(n^2)$ elements. Given any subset $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ of at most n elements, there exists an input distribution D of $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ such that, all the events of the form $q \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ (defined as $\{a_1 + a_2 : a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2\}$) for all q in \mathcal{Q} is fully independent. That is, for any subset $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_r\}$ of \mathcal{Q} of r elements, and any sequence of r events E_1, E_2, \dots, E_r either of the form $s_i \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ or the form $s_i \notin (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$, it holds that $\Pr[\bigwedge_{i=1}^r E_i] = \prod_{i=1}^r \Pr[E_i]$. Furthermore, for any $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, it is the case that $\Pr_{(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2) \sim D}[q \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)] = \frac{1}{2}$.*

The proof is deferred to the end of the section.

CHAPTER 5. STRONGER 3SUM-INDEXING LOWER BOUNDS

We now use Lemma 124 to derive a contradiction to the assumption that $T = o(\lg |\mathcal{G}| / \lg(Sw/n))$. Concretely, we invoke the lemma with the \mathcal{Q} defined above. This implies that the answers to the queries in \mathcal{Q} has entropy n bits. However, they are being answered from a fixed set of $n/2w$ cells. These cells together have $n/2$ bits. Since their addresses are fixed, their contents must uniquely determine the n query answers, yielding the contradiction and hence $T = \Omega(\min\{\lg |\mathcal{G}| / \lg(Sw/n), n/w\})$. This completes the proof of Theorem 116. What remains is to prove Lemma 124:

Proof of Lemma 124. We prove the lemma by first showing that given $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ of n elements, for any $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ there exists an input pair $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq (\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}} + \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}})$ and $(\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P}) \cap (\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}} + \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}}) = \emptyset$. That is to say that for every possible subset \mathcal{P} of \mathcal{Q} , there exists a pair of sets $(\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}}, \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}})$ such that $(\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}} + \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}})$ contains all the pair sums of \mathcal{P} and none of the pair sums outside of \mathcal{P} and in \mathcal{Q} . Then D is the distribution that is uniform over all possible pairs of sets $(\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}}, \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}})$ with \mathcal{P} ranging over all subsets of \mathcal{Q} . Another way to view D is the distribution that first randomly samples $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ before deterministically outputting pairs of sets $(\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}}, \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}})$.

Given any \mathcal{P} , we build the sets $\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}}$ iteratively, where they are both initially empty. Let p_1, p_2, \dots enumerate the elements of \mathcal{P} . At each iteration, let p_i be the first value not in $(\mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}} + \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}})$. There are $|\mathcal{G}|$ ordered pairs of elements (a_1, a_2) such that $a_1 + a_2 = p_i$. To see this, note that letting $a_1 = p_i + (-t)$ and $a_2 = t$ for any $t \in \mathcal{G}$ yields us a distinct pair of elements for which the sum holds. We want to show that we can add n pairs of elements (thus enumerating all of the elements in \mathcal{P} and beyond) without ever having any pair sum to an element in $(\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P})$. For each element $q \in (\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P})$, and each element in $a \in \mathcal{A}_1$, there is exactly one element $b \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $a + b = q$ (likewise for each element $a \in \mathcal{A}_2$). Therefore, for any given q , there are $|\mathcal{A}_1|$ elements $b \in \mathcal{G}$ that if added into set \mathcal{A}_2 , would imply that $q \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ (likewise for set \mathcal{A}_2). Since $|\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P}| \leq n$, and at every iteration $|\mathcal{A}_1| = |\mathcal{A}_2| \leq n$, we have that there are at most $2n^2$ elements that cannot be added into either set \mathcal{A}_1 or set \mathcal{A}_2 (otherwise sets $(\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P})$ and $(\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ are no longer disjoint).

Therefore there must still exist a pair (a_1, a_2) such that $a_1 + a_2 = p_i$ and $(\{a_1\} \cup \mathcal{A}_1^{\mathcal{P}} + \{a_2\} \cup \mathcal{A}_2^{\mathcal{P}}) \cap (\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P}) = \emptyset$, assuming that $|\mathcal{G}| = \omega(n^2)$. In the case that every element in \mathcal{P} is enumerated before we have added n pairs, we can still pad

with more arbitrary pairs of elements from \mathcal{G} whilst avoiding creating any element in $(\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P})$ for the same reason as laid out above.

It remains to show that our distribution D indeed witnesses full independence and that each individual event occurs with probability $\frac{1}{2}$. Let \mathcal{S} be an arbitrary subset of \mathcal{Q} of size $r \leq n$. Further, let E_i be either the event that $s_i \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ or $s_i \notin (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$, and let $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ contain the elements s_i such that E_i is the event that $s_i \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ (so $\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}'$ is precisely the set of elements s_i for which there is the event $s_i \notin (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$). In the support of D , there are exactly 2^n pairs of sets $(\mathcal{A}_1^P, \mathcal{A}_2^P)$, each realising a distinct subset $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ of elements such that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)$ and $(\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P}) \cap (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2) = \emptyset$. Thus, given any set $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$, there are 2^{n-r} pairs of sets $(\mathcal{A}_1^P, \mathcal{A}_2^P)$ each with for set \mathcal{P} such that $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ and $(\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}') \subseteq (\mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P})$. Thus we argue that

$$\Pr \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^r E_i \right] = \frac{2^{n-r}}{2^n} = 2^{-r}.$$

Note that for individual events, we can take the subset \mathcal{S} to contain only a single element q from \mathcal{Q} and the above argument would imply that $\Pr[q \in (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)] = \frac{1}{2}$ and that $\Pr[q \notin (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)] = \frac{1}{2}$. Thus the conclusion readily follows from the fact that

$$\prod_{i=1}^r \Pr[E_i] = 2^{-r}.$$

5.5 Bit Probe Lower Bound for 3SUM-Indexing

In this section we give the bit probe lower bound for 3SUM-Indexing stated in Theorem 117.

The proof idea is based on an incompressibility argument. We will inspect the way the queries are structured and construct a specific input distribution that the data structure algorithm end up using too few bits for and therefore derive a contradiction. For this, we will again use Lemma 124 from the previous section. The key difference between this proof and the proof in the previous section, lies in how we find a set of queries answered by too few cells. Moreover, in this proof, we will derive a contradiction even with m queries being answered by m cells, and thus intuitively the cells actually have enough information, but yet cannot answer the queries. We start by introducing some graph theory that we need:

Lemma 125. *[Theorem 1 of [16]] Let (V, E) be a graph with n nodes, average degree $d > 2$ and girth r . Then $n \geq 2(d - 2)^{r/2-2}$.*

From Lemma 125 we conclude that for a graph with $o(|\mathcal{G}|)$ nodes and $|\mathcal{G}|$ edges, it is the case that the graph has a girth of $O(\log(n))$. To see this, note that the average degree d of such a graph is $\omega(1)$ and thus it follows that for some constant $c > 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} o(|\mathcal{G}|) &\geq 2(d - 2)^{r/2-2} \Rightarrow \\ o(|\mathcal{G}|) &\gg 2(c)^{r/2} \Rightarrow \\ r &\in O(\log_c(n)) \end{aligned}$$

Given any non-adaptive pre-processing algorithm with $T = 2$, $S = o(|\mathcal{G}|)$, and $w = 1$, define \mathcal{V} to be the set of S nodes each representing a memory cell and let E be the set of edges such that an edge $e_g = (u, v)$ is in the edge set if and only there exists some group element $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that the querying algorithm on input g accesses both memory cell u and v . Furthermore, associate with each edge e_g a function $f_g : \{0, 1\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that defines the output behaviour of the querying algorithm upon reading the bits at node u and v . We broadly categorise the possible functions f_g into 4 types:

1. **Copy type functions.** The type of functions f_g that depend only one of its two inputs. There are 4 of such functions.
2. **Constant type functions.** The type of functions f_g that are completely independent of its two inputs. There are 2 such functions.
3. **AND type functions.** The type of functions f_g whose truth table is such that exactly 3 of the 4 possible inputs leads to the same output where the last input differs. There are 8 such functions.
4. **XOR type functions.** The type of functions f_g that are either the XOR of its 2 inputs or the negation of the XOR of its 2 inputs. There are 2 such functions.

CHAPTER 5. STRONGER 3SUM-INDEXING LOWER BOUNDS

Note that none of the edges can be the constant type, since this means that the querying algorithm's answer is independent of the input set. Also, by an averaging argument there is at least one type of function that $\Omega(|\mathcal{G}|)$ edges are associated with. Furthermore, Lemma 124 asserts that there can be at most 2 edges that are parallel to each other, otherwise we can construct an input distribution D such that the data structure manages to use 2 bits to encode the outcome of a random variable that has Shannon entropy at least 3, which is a contradiction. Thus there are $\Omega(|\mathcal{G}|)$ many edges that are not parallel to each other and are all of the same type. We analyse the different types separately. We start with the simplest COPY type:

(COPY type) Assuming that there are $\Omega(|\mathcal{G}|)$ edges that are associated with the copy type function, there must exist at least one node u such that $\omega(1)$ edges e_g are such that the associated function f_g depend only on the bit at this node. Letting \mathcal{Q} contain two such group elements, this yields a contradiction using Lemma 124 to construct a distribution over \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 such that the entropy of the two query answers in \mathcal{Q} is 2 bits.

For the remaining types, we look for a short cycle. Using Lemma 125, we get that there is a cycle of $O(\log n)$ length using only edges associated with functions of the same type. Denote by \mathcal{Y} the set of group elements g such that e_g is in the cycle and y_1, \dots, y_t enumerates the elements of \mathcal{Y} based on a traversal of the cycle. That is, the edge corresponding to y_i shares endpoints with edges corresponding to y_{i-1} and y_{i+1} , where $y_{t+1} = y_1$ and $y_0 = y_t$. We use Lemma 124 with $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Y}$ to get a distribution D over $(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ such that the answers to queries in \mathcal{Y} are independent and they are all uniform random. We now handle the two remaining types separately.

(AND type) Let b be the output of f_{y_1} that is only obtainable by exactly 1 of the 4 possible inputs. Consider the distribution D conditioned on the event that $\mathbb{1}\{y_1 \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)\} = b$. Since only 1 of the 4 inputs to f_{y_1} is consistent with this output, this fixes the two input bits to f_{y_1} . Therefore, there are $t - 2$ bits left to encode $t - 1$ independent and fully random outputs (namely, whether y_2, \dots, y_t are in $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$), which yields us the desired contradiction.

(XOR type) Let $(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2) \sim D$ be drawn from the input distribution constructed using Lemma 124 with $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Y}$. Let the endpoints of y_i be u_i, v_i , such that $v_t = u_1$. Note for all i , it is necessarily the case that $\mathbb{1}\{y_i \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)\} = u_i \oplus v_i$ or

CHAPTER 5. STRONGER 3SUM-INDEXING LOWER BOUNDS

$\mathbb{1}\{y_i \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)\} = 1 \oplus u_i \oplus v_i$. Then $\bigoplus_2^t \mathbb{1}\{y_i \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)\}$ is either $u_1 \oplus v_1$ or $1 \oplus u_1 \oplus v_1$ which means that $\mathbb{1}\{y_1 \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)\}$ is either $\bigoplus_2^t \mathbb{1}\{y_i \in (\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2)\}$ or its negation. Then Lemma 124 yields the desired contradiction.

Chapter 6

Conclusion and Future Work

6.1 Conclusion

In this thesis, we have worked on giving “negative” (or impossibility) results in the form of randomness requirements for extensions of secret sharing, and “positive” (or feasibility) results in the form of either giving privacy amplification with better guarantees, or confirming a certain level of security guarantees for one-way functions against pre-processing adversaries from random oracles.

6.2 Future Work

6.2.1 Randomness Requirements

(Does plain secret sharing need extractable randomness?) The main question posed by Dodis in [41] remains: Do we need extractable randomness to share even a single bit to two parties? Given that secret sharing is a fundamental cryptographic primitive used as a building block in many other primitives, being able to find an answer to this will also shed light on the complexity (in terms of randomness) of other primitives as well.

6.2.2 Non-malleable Extractors

(Even better entropy rates) After our work, Li in [135] improved the entropy requirement from $> 0.8n$ from one source to $> \frac{2}{3}n$. This falls slightly short of the

$\frac{1}{2}n$ threshold witnessed by the Raz extractor. Are we able to close the gap any further to the halfway point? We also note that we get a t -non-malleable extractor instead. As mentioned by [11], “good enough” t -non-malleable extractors will yield a breakthrough in two-source extractors as well. While our extractor falls short of accomplishing that, a question might be whether our ideas can be improved upon to yield such an extractor.

(Better Multi-Tampering for Two-Source Extractors) In Theorem 7 of [11], it was mentioned that two-source non-malleable extractors that have entropy-rate $m(1 - \gamma) - 3 \log(m)$ entropy in both sources, and can handle $\frac{C_\delta}{\gamma^5}$ tamperings will lead to two source extractors with for entropy rates δn . Both extractors here in the statement extract a single bit.

Our extractor in Chapter 4, at a one-sided rate of $(1 - \frac{1}{2t+3})$, allows for t tampering functions, instead of t^5 tamperings. On the other hand, our very same extractor is lopsided (in that the other entropy requirement is $\approx n^\alpha$, for any $\alpha > 0$ in the second source). Can we somehow perform a trade-off to increase the entropy requirement in the second source to also increase the number of tampering functions that we can allow for (from t to $O(t^5)$)?

6.2.3 Collision Resistant Extractors

(Improving the seed length for collision resistant extractors) One other thing to note is that our result of constructing collision resistant extractors from seeded extractors incurs a blowup in the seed by an *additive* term of $\log(1/\varepsilon) \log(1/\delta) \log^2(\log(1/\delta))$ for a collision probability of δ , and distance ε from m uniform bits.

Using Trevisan’s extractor [151], we note that for $\delta \leq \varepsilon$, this additive term is dominated by the original seed length requirement of the extractor anyway, and thus we get collision resistance “for free”. However, Trevisan’s extractor excels at extracting k bits from a source with min-entropy k . If one were content with extracting $\Omega(k)$ bits instead, they can use the GUV extractor from [107]. In this case, the seed requirement is actually quadratically smaller — $d = O(\log(n) + \log(1/\varepsilon))$, and thus our term dominates instead (by a factor of $\log(1/\delta) \log^2(\log(1/\delta))$). It

seems pretty clear from our construction that we will not be able to shave off this additional factor. But it does beg the question (since we were able to match, up to constant factors, the parameters in the $m = k$ regime) whether it is also possible to create an extractor with the same parameters as the GUV extractor, but while retaining collision resilience?

6.2.4 Pre-processing Adversaries

(Improving lower bounds for 3SUM-Indexing) While we have some results based on the hardness of 3SUM, this is far less than desirable in a few ways:

1. The lower bounds are worst-case hardness, rather than average case. For this to be useful in a cryptographic setting, average case results would be required. Can we get lower bounds for a random queries?
2. The initial construction introduced by Guo et al. in [102] used k SUM. While all confirmed hardness results used 3SUM. Can we derive potentially stronger results using k SUM?
3. Our lower bounds only work in a low-space setting. Are we able to obtain lower bounds for the other extreme: High space but low oracle access. One of our results takes a step in this direction but still in a highly restricted setting: non-adaptive, and for $T = 2, w = 1$. Can we at least increase w to $O(\log(n))$? What about $T = O(1)$?

We want to additionally note that slight improvements to the results will lead to explicit circuit lower bounds (c.f. works by Dvir, Golovnev, and Weinstein [87], and Viola [166]). Thus, we view our results as nearly tight without new techniques.

Bibliography

- [1] A. Abboud and K. Lewi, “Exact weight subgraphs and the k-sum conjecture”, in *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 40th International Colloquium, ICALP 2013, Riga, Latvia, July 8-12, 2013, Proceedings, Part I*, F. V. Fomin, R. Freivalds, M. Z. Kwiatkowska, and D. Peleg, Eds., ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7965, Springer, 2013, pp. 1–12. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39206-1%5C_1.
- [2] D. Aggarwal, E. Chung, and M. Obremski, “Extractors: Low entropy requirements colliding with non-malleability”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2023*, H. Handschuh and A. Lysyanskaya, Eds., Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023, pp. 580–610, ISBN: 978-3-031-38545-2.
- [3] D. Aggarwal, E. Chung, M. Obremski, and J. Ribeiro, “On secret sharing, randomness, and random-less reductions for secret sharing”, in *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, Springer, 2022, pp. 327–354.
- [4] D. Aggarwal, I. Damgård, J. B. Nielsen, M. Obremski, E. Purwanto, J. Ribeiro, and M. Simkin, “Stronger leakage-resilient and non-malleable secret sharing schemes for general access structures”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2019*, A. Boldyreva and D. Micciancio, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 510–539, ISBN: 978-3-030-26951-7.
- [5] D. Aggarwal, Y. Dodis, T. Kazana, and M. Obremski, “Non-malleable reductions and applications”, in *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’15, Portland, Oregon, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, pp. 459–468, ISBN: 9781450335362.
- [6] D. Aggarwal, Y. Dodis, and S. Lovett, “Non-malleable codes from additive combinatorics”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 524–546, 2018.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [7] D. Aggarwal, K. Hosseini, and S. Lovett, “Affine-malleable extractors, spectrum doubling, and application to privacy amplification”, in *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Ieee, 2016, pp. 2913–2917.
- [8] D. Aggarwal, B. Kanukurthi, S. L. B. Obbattu, M. Obremski, and S. Sekar, “Rate one-third non-malleable codes”, in *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC 2022, Rome, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 1364–1377, ISBN: 9781450392648. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519935.3519972>.
- [9] D. Aggarwal, T. Kazana, and M. Obremski, “Inception makes non-malleable codes stronger”, in *Theory of Cryptography*, Y. Kalai and L. Reyzin, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 319–343, ISBN: 978-3-319-70503-3.
- [10] D. Aggarwal and M. Obremski, “A constant rate non-malleable code in the split-state model”, in *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2020, pp. 1285–1294.
- [11] D. Aggarwal, M. Obremski, J. Ribeiro, M. Simkin, and L. Siniscalchi, “Privacy amplification with tamperable memory via non-malleable two-source extractors”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 5475–5495, 2022.
- [12] D. Aggarwal, M. Obremski, J. Ribeiro, L. Siniscalchi, and I. Visconti, “How to extract useful randomness from unreliable sources”, in *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2020*, A. Canteaut and Y. Ishai, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 343–372, ISBN: 978-3-030-45721-1.
- [13] D. Agrawal, B. Archambeault, J. R. Rao, and P. Rohatgi, “The em side-channel(s)”, in *Revised Papers from the 4th International Workshop on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*, ser. CHES ’02, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2002, pp. 29–45, ISBN: 3540004092.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [14] A. Akavia, S. Goldwasser, and V. Vaikuntanathan, “Simultaneous hardcore bits and cryptography against memory attacks”, in *Theory of Cryptography*, O. Reingold, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 474–495, ISBN: 978-3-642-00457-5.
- [15] N. Alon, O. Goldreich, J. Hastad, and R. Peralta, “Simple construction of almost k-wise independent random variables”, in *Proceedings [1990] 31st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 1990, 544–553 vol.2.
- [16] N. Alon, S. Hoory, and N. Linial, “The moore bound for irregular graphs”, *Graphs and Combinatorics*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 53–57, 2002.
- [17] S. Alstrup, T. Husfeldt, and T. Rauhe, “Marked ancestor problems”, in *39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS '98, November 8-11, 1998, Palo Alto, California, USA*, IEEE Computer Society, 1998, pp. 534–544. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1998.743504>.
- [18] A. Amir, T. M. Chan, M. Lewenstein, and N. Lewenstein, “On hardness of jumbled indexing”, in *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 41st International Colloquium, ICALP 2014, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 8-11, 2014, Proceedings, Part I*, J. Esparza, P. Fraigniaud, T. Husfeldt, and E. Koutsoupias, Eds., ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8572, Springer, 2014, pp. 114–125. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-43948-7_5C_10.
- [19] G. I. Apecechea, M. S. Inci, T. Eisenbarth, and B. Sunar, “Wait a minute! a fast, cross-vm attack on aes.” In *RAID*, vol. 8688, 2014, pp. 299–319.
- [20] C. Ashokkumar, R. P. Giri, and B. Menezes, “Highly efficient algorithms for aes key retrieval in cache access attacks”, in *2016 IEEE European symposium on security and privacy (EuroS&P)*, IEEE, 2016, pp. 261–275.
- [21] G. Ateniese, D. Francati, B. Magri, and D. Venturi, “Public immunization against complete subversion without random oracles”, in *Applied Cryptography and Network Security*, R. H. Deng, V. Gauthier-Umaña, M. Ochoa, and M. Yung, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 465–485, ISBN: 978-3-030-21568-2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [22] P. Austrin, K.-M. Chung, M. Mahmoody, R. Pass, and K. Seth, “On the impossibility of cryptography with tamperable randomness”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2014*, J. A. Garay and R. Gennaro, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014, pp. 462–479, ISBN: 978-3-662-44371-2.
- [23] M. Backes, A. Kate, S. Meiser, and T. Ruffing, “Secrecy without perfect randomness: Cryptography with (bounded) weak sources”, in *Applied Cryptography and Network Security*, T. Malkin, V. Kolesnikov, A. B. Lewko, and M. Polychronakis, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 675–695, ISBN: 978-3-319-28166-7.
- [24] B. Barak, “Constant-round coin-tossing with a man in the middle or realizing the shared random string model”, in *The 43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2002. Proceedings.*, 2002, pp. 345–355.
- [25] G. Barequet and S. Har-Peled, “Polygon containment and translational min-hausdorff-distance between segment sets are 3sum-hard”, *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 465–474, 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218195901000596>.
- [26] B. Bauer, P. Farshim, and S. Mazaheri, “Combiners for backdoored random oracles”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2018*, H. Shacham and A. Boldyreva, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 272–302, ISBN: 978-3-319-96881-0.
- [27] M. Bellare and J. Rompel, “Randomness-efficient oblivious sampling”, in *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, ser. SFCS ’94, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 1994, pp. 276–287, ISBN: 0818665807. [Online]. Available: <https://doi-org.libproxy1.nus.edu.sg/10.1109/SFCS.1994.365687>.
- [28] M. Bellare, Z. Brakerski, M. Naor, T. Ristenpart, G. Segev, H. Shacham, and S. Yilek, “Hedged public-key encryption: How to protect against bad randomness”, in *Advances in Cryptology – ASIACRYPT 2009*, M. Matsui, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 232–249, ISBN: 978-3-642-10366-7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [29] A. Ben-Aroya, E. Chattopadhyay, D. Doron, X. Li, and A. Ta-Shma, “A new approach for constructing low-error, two-source extractors”, in *Proceedings of the 33rd Computational Complexity Conference*, ser. CCC '18, San Diego, California: Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018, 3:1–3:19, ISBN: 978-3-95977-069-9.
- [30] A. Ben-Aroya, D. Doron, and A. Ta-Shma, “An efficient reduction from two-source to non-malleable extractors: Achieving near-logarithmic min-entropy”, in *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC 2017, Montreal, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 1185–1194, ISBN: 9781450345286.
- [31] M. Ben-Or, S. Goldwasser, and A. Wigderson, “Completeness theorems for non-cryptographic fault-tolerant distributed computation”, in *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC '88, Chicago, Illinois, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1988, pp. 1–10, ISBN: 0897912640. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/62212.62213>.
- [32] J. Benaloh and J. Leichter, “Generalized secret sharing and monotone functions”, in *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO '88, 8th Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 21-25, 1988, Proceedings*, S. Goldwasser, Ed., ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 403, Springer, 1988, pp. 27–35. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-34799-2%5C_3.
- [33] F. Benhamouda, A. Degwekar, Y. Ishai, and T. Rabin, “On the local leakage resilience of linear secret sharing schemes”, *J. Cryptol.*, vol. 34, no. 2, p. 10, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00145-021-09375-2>.
- [34] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, and M.-H. Skubiszewska, “Practical quantum oblivious transfer”, in *Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO '91*, J. Feigenbaum, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1992, pp. 351–366, ISBN: 978-3-540-46766-3.
- [35] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, and J.-M. Robert, “Privacy amplification by public discussion”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 210–229,

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1988. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0217014>. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0217014>.
- [36] A. Bhowmick, A. Gabizon, T. H. Lê, and D. Zuckerman, “Deterministic extractors for additive sources: Extended abstract”, in *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS 2015, Rehovot, Israel, January 11-13, 2015*, T. Roughgarden, Ed., ACM, 2015, pp. 277–286. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2688073.2688090>.
- [37] G. R. BLAKLEY, “Safeguarding cryptographic keys”, in *1979 International Workshop on Managing Requirements Knowledge (MARK)*, 1979, pp. 313–318.
- [38] M. Blum, “Independent unbiased coin flips from a correlated biased source—a finite state Markov chain”, *Combinatorica*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 97–108, 1986.
- [39] D. Boneh, R. A. Demillo, and R. J. Lipton, “On the importance of eliminating errors in cryptographic computations”, *J. Cryptol.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 101–119, Jan. 2001, ISSN: 0933-2790. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s001450010016>.
- [40] J. Boninger, J. Brody, and O. Kephart, “Non-adaptive data structure bounds for dynamic predecessor”, in *37th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2017, December 11-15, 2017, Kanpur, India*, S. V. Lokam and R. Ramanujam, Eds., ser. LIPIcs, vol. 93, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017, pp. 20:1–20:12. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2017.20>.
- [41] C. Bosley and Y. Dodis, “Does privacy require true randomness?” In *Theory of Cryptography*, S. P. Vadhan, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 1–20, ISBN: 978-3-540-70936-7.
- [42] J. Bourgain, “More on the sum-product phenomenon in prime fields and its applications”, *International Journal of Number Theory*, vol. 1, no. 01, pp. 1–32, 2005.
- [43] J. Bourgain, “On the construction of affine extractors”, *GAFSA Geometric And Functional Analysis*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 33–57, 2007.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [44] G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, and D. Langlois, “A quantum bit commitment scheme provably unbreakable by both parties”, in *Proceedings of 1993 IEEE 34th Annual Foundations of Computer Science*, 1993, pp. 362–371.
- [45] G. S. Brodal and K. G. Larsen, “Optimal planar orthogonal skyline counting queries”, in *Algorithm Theory - SWAT 2014 - 14th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 2-4, 2014. Proceedings*, R. Ravi and I. L. Gørtz, Eds., ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8503, Springer, 2014, pp. 110–121. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08404-6_5C_10.
- [46] J. Brody and K. G. Larsen, “Adapt or die: Polynomial lower bounds for non-adaptive dynamic data structures”, *Theory Comput.*, vol. 11, pp. 471–489, 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.2015.v011a019>.
- [47] R. Canetti, Y. Dodis, S. Halevi, E. Kushilevitz, and A. Sahai, “Exposure-resilient functions and all-or-nothing transforms”, in *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2000, International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques, Bruges, Belgium, May 14-18, 2000, Proceeding*, B. Preneel, Ed., ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1807, Springer, 2000, pp. 453–469. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45539-6_5C_33.
- [48] R. Canetti, R. Pass, and A. Shelat, “Cryptography from sunspots: How to use an imperfect reference string”, in *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)*, 2007, pp. 249–259.
- [49] T. M. Chan, “More logarithmic-factor speedups for 3sum, (median, +)-convolution, and some geometric 3sum-hard problems”, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, A. Czumaj, Ed., SIAM, 2018, pp. 881–897. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975031.57>.
- [50] E. Chattopadhyay, “A recipe for constructing two-source extractors”, 2020.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [51] E. Chattopadhyay, J. Goodman, V. Goyal, A. Kumar, X. Li, R. Meka, and D. Zuckerman, “Extractors and secret sharing against bounded collusion protocols”, in *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2020, pp. 1226–1242.
- [52] E. Chattopadhyay, V. Goyal, and X. Li, “Nonmalleable extractors and codes, with their many tampered extensions”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 999–1040, 2020. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1176622>. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1176622>.
- [53] E. Chattopadhyay, B. Kanukurthi, S. L. B. Obbattu, and S. Sekar, “Privacy amplification from non-malleable codes”, in *Progress in Cryptology – INDOCRYPT 2019*, F. Hao, S. Ruj, and S. Sen Gupta, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 318–337, ISBN: 978-3-030-35423-7.
- [54] E. Chattopadhyay and X. Li, “Extractors for sunset sources”, in *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, ACM, 2016, pp. 299–311.
- [55] E. Chattopadhyay and D. Zuckerman, “Explicit two-source extractors and resilient functions”, *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 189, no. 3, pp. 653–705, 2019, ISSN: 0003486X, 19398980. [Online]. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.4007/annals.2019.189.3.1>.
- [56] D. Chaum, C. Crépeau, and I. Damgard, “Multiparty unconditionally secure protocols”, in *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’88, Chicago, Illinois, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1988, pp. 11–19, ISBN: 0897912640. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/62212.62214>.
- [57] M. Cheraghchi and V. Guruswami, “Non-malleable coding against bit-wise and split-state tampering”, *Journal of Cryptology*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 191–241, Jan. 2017, ISSN: 1432-1378.
- [58] B. Chor and O. Goldreich, “Unbiased bits from sources of weak randomness and probabilistic communication complexity”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 230–261, 1988. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0217015>. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0217015>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [59] B. Chor, O. Goldreich, J. Håstad, J. Friedman, S. Rudich, and R. Smolensky, “The bit extraction problem or t -resilient functions”, in *Proceedings of the 26th IEEE Symposium on Foundation of Computer Science*, 1985, pp. 396–407.
- [60] E. Chung and K. G. Larsen, “Stronger 3sum-indexing lower bounds”, in *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp. 444–455. eprint: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611977554.ch19>. [Online]. Available: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611977554.ch19>.
- [61] G. Cohen, “Towards optimal two-source extractors and ramsey graphs”, in *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC 2017, Montreal, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 1157–1170, ISBN: 9781450345286. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3055399.3055429>.
- [62] G. Cohen, R. Raz, and G. Segev, “Nonmalleable extractors with short seeds and applications to privacy amplification”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 450–476, 2014.
- [63] R. Cramer, I. B. Damgård, and J. B. Nielsen, “Mpc from general linear secret-sharing schemes”, in *Secure Multiparty Computation and Secret Sharing*. Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 139–158.
- [64] R. Cramer, I. B. Damgård, and J. B. Nielsen, “Secure Multiparty Computation and Secret Sharing”, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [65] F. Davì, S. Dziembowski, and D. Venturi, “Leakage-resilient storage”, in *Security and Cryptography for Networks*, J. A. Garay and R. De Prisco, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 121–137, ISBN: 978-3-642-15317-4.
- [66] A. De, L. Trevisan, and M. Tuliani, “Time space tradeoffs for attacks against one-way functions and prgs”, in *Annual Cryptology Conference*, Springer, 2010, pp. 649–665.
- [67] E. D. Demaine and S. P. Vadhan, “Some notes on 3sum”, Unpublished manuscript, 2001.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [68] Y. Desmedt and Y. Frankel, “Shared generation of authenticators and signatures”, in *Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO ’91*, J. Feigenbaum, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1992, pp. 457–469, ISBN: 978-3-540-46766-3.
- [69] G. Di Crescenzo, R. Lipton, and S. Walfish, “Perfectly secure password protocols in the bounded retrieval model”, in *Theory of Cryptography*, S. Halevi and T. Rabin, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 225–244, ISBN: 978-3-540-32732-5.
- [70] Y. Dodis, “Exposure-resilient cryptography”, Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2000.
- [71] Y. Dodis, C. Ganesh, A. Golovnev, A. Juels, and T. Ristenpart, “A formal treatment of backdoored pseudorandom generators”, in *Advances in Cryptology – EUROCRYPT 2015*, E. Oswald and M. Fischlin, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015, pp. 101–126, ISBN: 978-3-662-46800-5.
- [72] Y. Dodis, B. Kanukurthi, J. Katz, L. Reyzin, and A. Smith, “Robust fuzzy extractors and authenticated key agreement from close secrets”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2012.
- [73] Y. Dodis, X. Li, T. D. Wooley, and D. Zuckerman, “Privacy amplification and nonmalleable extractors via character sums”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 800–830, 2014. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/120868414>. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/120868414>.
- [74] Y. Dodis, A. López-Alt, I. Mironov, and S. Vadhan, “Differential privacy with imperfect randomness”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2012*, R. Safavi-Naini and R. Canetti, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 497–516, ISBN: 978-3-642-32009-5.
- [75] Y. Dodis, S. J. Ong, M. Prabhakaran, and A. Sahai, “On the (im)possibility of cryptography with imperfect randomness”, in *45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 2004, pp. 196–205.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [76] Y. Dodis, R. Ostrovsky, L. Reyzin, and A. Smith, “Fuzzy extractors: How to generate strong keys from biometrics and other noisy data”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 97–139, 2008.
- [77] Y. Dodis, K. Pietrzak, and B. Przydatek, “Separating sources for encryption and secret sharing”, in *Theory of Cryptography*, S. Halevi and T. Rabin, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 601–616, ISBN: 978-3-540-32732-5.
- [78] Y. Dodis and J. Spencer, “On the (non)universality of the one-time pad”, in *43rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 2002, pp. 376–385.
- [79] Y. Dodis and D. Wichs, “Non-malleable extractors and symmetric key cryptography from weak secrets”, in *Proceedings of the Forty-first Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’09, Bethesda, MD, USA: ACM, 2009, pp. 601–610, ISBN: 978-1-60558-506-2.
- [80] Y. Dodis and Y. Yao, “Privacy with imperfect randomness”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2015*, R. Gennaro and M. Robshaw, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015, pp. 463–482, ISBN: 978-3-662-48000-7.
- [81] Y. Dodis and Y. Yu, “Overcoming weak expectations”, in *Theory of Cryptography*, A. Sahai, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 1–22, ISBN: 978-3-642-36594-2.
- [82] D. Dolev, C. Dwork, and M. Naor, “Non-malleable cryptography”, in *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 1991, pp. 542–552.
- [83] D. Dolev, C. Dwork, and M. Naor, “Nonmalleable cryptography”, *SIAM Review*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 727–784, 2003. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036144503429856>. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036144503429856>.
- [84] Z. Dvir, “Extractors for varieties”, *Comput. Complex.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 515–572, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00037-011-0023-3>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [85] Z. Dvir, A. Gabizon, and A. Wigderson, “Extractors and rank extractors for polynomial sources”, *Comput. Complex.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–58, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00037-009-0258-4>.
- [86] Z. Dvir, A. Golovnev, and O. Weinstein, “Static data structure lower bounds imply rigidity”, in *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 23-26, 2019*, M. Charikar and E. Cohen, Eds., ACM, 2019, pp. 967–978. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316348>.
- [87] Z. Dvir, A. Golovnev, and O. Weinstein, “Static data structure lower bounds imply rigidity”, in *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC 2019, Phoenix, AZ, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 967–978, ISBN: 9781450367059. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316348>.
- [88] S. Dziembowski, “Intrusion-resilience via the bounded-storage model”, in *Theory of Cryptography*, S. Halevi and T. Rabin, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 207–224, ISBN: 978-3-540-32732-5.
- [89] S. Dziembowski and S. Faust, “Leakage-resilient cryptography from the inner-product extractor”, in *International Conference on the Theory and Application of Cryptology and Information Security*, Springer, 2011, pp. 702–721.
- [90] S. Dziembowski, T. Kazana, and M. Obremski, “Non-malleable codes from two-source extractors”, in *Annual Cryptology Conference*, Springer, 2013, pp. 239–257.
- [91] S. Dziembowski and K. Pietrzak, “Leakage-resilient cryptography”, in *2008 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 2008, pp. 293–302.
- [92] S. Dziembowski, K. Pietrzak, and D. Wichs, “Non-malleable codes”, *J. ACM*, vol. 65, no. 4, Apr. 2018, ISSN: 0004-5411. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178432>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [93] P. Erdős, P. Frankl, and Z. Füredi, “Families of finite sets in which no set is covered by the union of r others”, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 51, no. 1-2, pp. 79–89, 1985.
- [94] D. Escudero, “An introduction to secret-sharing-based secure multiparty computation”, Cryptology ePrint Archive, Paper 2022/062, <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/062>, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/062>.
- [95] S. Faust, P. Mukherjee, J. B. Nielsen, and D. Venturi, “Continuous non-malleable codes”, in *Theory of Cryptography*, Y. Lindell, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014, pp. 465–488, ISBN: 978-3-642-54242-8.
- [96] A. Fiat and M. Naor, “Rigorous time/space tradeoffs for inverting functions”, in *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 5-8, 1991, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA*, C. Koutsougeras and J. S. Vitter, Eds., ACM, 1991, pp. 534–541. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/103418.103473>.
- [97] A. Fiat and M. Naor, “Rigorous time/space trade-offs for inverting functions”, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 790–803, 2000.
- [98] M. Fischlin, C. Janson, and S. Mazaheri, “Backdoored hash functions: Immunizing hmac and hkdf”, in *2018 IEEE 31st Computer Security Foundations Symposium (CSF)*, IEEE, 2018, pp. 105–118.
- [99] A. Gajentaan and M. H. Overmars, “On a class of $o(n^2)$ problems in computational geometry”, *Comput. Geom.*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 140–152, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2011.11.006>.
- [100] O. Goldreich, “Three XOR-lemmas — An exposition”, in *Studies in Complexity and Cryptography. Miscellanea on the Interplay between Randomness and Computation*, O. Goldreich, Ed., Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 248–272, ISBN: 978-3-642-22670-0.
- [101] I. Goldstein, T. Kopelowitz, M. Lewenstein, and E. Porat, “Conditional lower bounds for space/time tradeoffs”, in *Algorithms and Data Structures - 15th International Symposium, WADS 2017, St. John's, NL, Canada, July 31 - August 2, 2017, Proceedings*, F. Ellen, A. Kolokolova, and J. Sack, Eds.,

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10389, Springer, 2017, pp. 421–436. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62127-2%5C_36.
- [102] A. Golovnev, S. Guo, T. Horel, S. Park, and V. Vaikuntanathan, “Data structures meet cryptography: 3sum with preprocessing”, in *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC 2020, Chicago, IL, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 294–307, ISBN: 9781450369794. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3357713.3384342>.
- [103] V. Goyal and A. Kumar, “Non-malleable secret sharing”, in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC 2018, Los Angeles, CA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, pp. 685–698, ISBN: 9781450355599.
- [104] V. Goyal, O. Pandey, and S. Richelson, “Textbook non-malleable commitments”, in *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2016, pp. 1128–1141.
- [105] V. Goyal, A. Srinivasan, and C. Zhu, “Multi-source non-malleable extractors and applications”, in *Eurocrypt*, 2021.
- [106] M. Greve, A. G. Jørgensen, K. D. Larsen, and J. Truelsen, “Cell probe lower bounds and approximations for range mode”, in *Automata, Languages and Programming, 37th International Colloquium, ICALP 2010, Bordeaux, France, July 6-10, 2010, Proceedings, Part I*, S. Abramsky, C. Gavoille, C. Kirchner, F. M. auf der Heide, and P. G. Spirakis, Eds., ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6198, Springer, 2010, pp. 605–616. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14165-2%5C_51.
- [107] V. Guruswami, C. Umans, and S. Vadhan, “Unbalanced expanders and randomness extractors from parvaresh–vardy codes”, *J. ACM*, vol. 56, no. 4, Jul. 2009, ISSN: 0004-5411. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1538902.1538904>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [108] I. Haitner and O. Reingold, “Statistically-hiding commitment from any one-way function”, in *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2007, pp. 1–10.
- [109] J. A. Halderman, S. D. Schoen, N. Heninger, W. Clarkson, W. Paul, J. A. Calandrino, A. J. Feldman, J. Appelbaum, and E. W. Felten, “Lest we remember: Cold-boot attacks on encryption keys”, *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 91–98, 2009.
- [110] C. Hazay, M. Venkatasubramanian, and M. Weiss, “Zk-pcps from leakage-resilient secret sharing”, *Journal of Cryptology*, vol. 35, no. 4, p. 23, 2022.
- [111] M. Hellman, “A cryptanalytic time-memory trade-off”, *IEEE transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 401–406, 1980.
- [112] M. Henzinger, S. Krininger, D. Nanongkai, and T. Saranurak, “Unifying and strengthening hardness for dynamic problems via the online matrix-vector multiplication conjecture”, in *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015*, R. A. Servedio and R. Rubinfeld, Eds., ACM, 2015, pp. 21–30. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2746539.2746609>.
- [113] T. Holenstein, “Pseudorandom generators from one-way functions: A simple construction for any hardness”, in *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, Springer, 2006, pp. 443–461.
- [114] R. Impagliazzo and S. Rudich, “Limits on the provable consequences of one-way permutations”, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’89, Seattle, Washington, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1989, pp. 44–61, ISBN: 0897913078. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/73007.73012>.
- [115] Y. Ishai, A. Sahai, and D. Wagner, “Private circuits: Securing hardware against probing attacks”, in *Advances in Cryptology-CRYPTO 2003: 23rd Annual International Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 17-21, 2003. Proceedings 23*, Springer, 2003, pp. 463–481.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [116] T. Johansson, G. Kabatianskii, and B. J. M. Smeets, “On the relation between a-codes and codes correcting independent errors”, in *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT '93, Workshop on the Theory and Application of Cryptographic Techniques, Lofthus, Norway, May 23-27, 1993, Proceedings*, 1993, pp. 1–11.
- [117] Y. T. Kalai and L. Reyzin, “A survey of leakage-resilient cryptography”, in *Providing Sound Foundations for Cryptography: On the Work of Shafi Goldwasser and Silvio Micali*, 2019, pp. 727–794.
- [118] J. Kamp, A. Rao, S. P. Vadhan, and D. Zuckerman, “Deterministic extractors for small-space sources”, *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 191–220, 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2010.06.014>.
- [119] Y. Kim, R. Daly, J. Kim, C. Fallin, J. H. Lee, D. Lee, C. Wilkerson, K. Lai, and O. Mutlu, “Flipping bits in memory without accessing them: An experimental study of dram disturbance errors”, *SIGARCH Comput. Archit. News*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 361–372, Jun. 2014, ISSN: 0163-5964. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2678373.2665726>.
- [120] Y. Kim, R. Daly, J. Kim, C. Fallin, J. H. Lee, D. Lee, C. Wilkerson, K. Lai, and O. Mutlu, “Flipping bits in memory without accessing them: An experimental study of dram disturbance errors”, *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 361–372, 2014.
- [121] P. Kocher, J. Horn, A. Fogh, D. Genkin, D. Gruss, W. Haas, M. Hamburg, M. Lipp, S. Mangard, T. Prescher, *et al.*, “Spectre attacks: Exploiting speculative execution”, *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 93–101, 2020.
- [122] P. Kocher, J. Jaffe, and B. Jun, “Differential power analysis”, in *Advances in Cryptology—CRYPTO'99: 19th Annual International Cryptology Conference Santa Barbara, California, USA, August 15–19, 1999 Proceedings 19*, Springer, 1999, pp. 388–397.
- [123] T. Kopelowitz, S. Pettie, and E. Porat, “Higher lower bounds from the 3sum conjecture”, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 10-12, 2016, R. Krauthgamer, Ed., SIAM, 2016, pp. 1272–1287. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch89>.
- [124] A. Kumar, R. Meka, and A. Sahai, “Leakage-resilient secret sharing against colluding parties”, in *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2019, pp. 636–660.
- [125] K. G. Larsen, “Higher cell probe lower bounds for evaluating polynomials”, in *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012, New Brunswick, NJ, USA, October 20-23, 2012*, IEEE Computer Society, 2012, pp. 293–301. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2012.21>.
- [126] K. G. Larsen, “The cell probe complexity of dynamic range counting”, in *Proceedings of the 44th Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC 2012, New York, NY, USA, May 19 - 22, 2012*, H. J. Karloff and T. Pitassi, Eds., ACM, 2012, pp. 85–94. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2213977.2213987>.
- [127] K. G. Larsen, J. L. Starup, and J. Steensgaard, “Further unifying the landscape of cell probe lower bounds”, in *4th Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms, SOSA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 11-12, 2021*, H. V. Le and V. King, Eds., SIAM, 2021, pp. 224–231. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611976496.25>.
- [128] K. G. Larsen, O. Weinstein, and H. Yu, “Crossing the logarithmic barrier for dynamic boolean data structure lower bounds”, *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 49, no. 5, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1198429>.
- [129] R. LaVigne, A. Lincoln, and V. Vassilevska Williams, “Public-key cryptography in the fine-grained setting”, in *Annual International Cryptology Conference*, Springer, 2019, pp. 605–635.
- [130] M. Lewko, “An explicit two-source extractor with min-entropy rate near $4/9$ ”, *Mathematika*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 950–957, 2019.
- [131] X. Li, “Non-malleable extractors, two-source extractors and privacy amplification”, in *2012 IEEE 53rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 2012, pp. 688–697.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [132] X. Li, “Improved two-source extractors, and affine extractors for polylogarithmic entropy”, in *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, Oct. 2016, pp. 168–177.
- [133] X. Li, “Improved non-malleable extractors, non-malleable codes and independent source extractors”, in *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC 2017, Montreal, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 1144–1156, ISBN: 9781450345286. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3055399.3055486>.
- [134] X. Li, “Non-malleable extractors and non-malleable codes: Partially optimal constructions”, in *Proceedings of the 34th Computational Complexity Conference*, ser. CCC ’19, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2020, ISBN: 9783959771160. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.28>.
- [135] X. Li, “Two source extractors for asymptotically optimal entropy, and (many) more”, in *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, IEEE, 2023, pp. 1271–1281.
- [136] D. Lichtenstein, N. Linial, and M. Saks, “Some extremal problems arising from discrete control processes”, *Combinatorica*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 269–287, 1989.
- [137] F. Lin, M. Cheraghchi, V. Guruswami, R. Safavi-Naini, and H. Wang, “Leakage-resilient secret sharing in non-compartmentalized models”, in *1st Conference on Information-Theoretic Cryptography (ITC 2020)*, Y. T. Kalai, A. D. Smith, and D. Wichs, Eds., ser. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), vol. 163, Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020, 7:1–7:24, ISBN: 978-3-95977-151-1. [Online]. Available: <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2020/12112>.
- [138] M. Lipp, M. Schwarz, D. Gruss, T. Prescher, W. Haas, J. Horn, S. Mangard, P. Kocher, D. Genkin, Y. Yarom, *et al.*, “Meltdown: Reading kernel memory from user space”, *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 46–56, 2020.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [139] H. K. Maji, A. Paskin-Cherniavsky, T. Suad, and M. Wang, “Constructing locally leakage-resilient linear secret-sharing schemes”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2021*, T. Malkin and C. Peikert, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 779–808, ISBN: 978-3-030-84252-9.
- [140] U. Maurer and S. Wolf, “Privacy amplification secure against active adversaries”, in *Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO ’97*, B. S. Kaliski, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1997, pp. 307–321, ISBN: 978-3-540-69528-8.
- [141] J. L. McInnes and B. Pinkas, “On the impossibility of private key cryptography with weakly random keys”, in *Advances in Cryptology-CRYPTO’ 90*, A. J. Menezes and S. A. Vanstone, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1991, pp. 421–435, ISBN: 978-3-540-38424-3.
- [142] J. Menn, “Exclusive: Secret contract tied nsa and security industry pioneer”, Dec. 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-security-rsa-idUSBRE9BJ1C220131220>.
- [143] S. Micali and L. Reyzin, “Physically observable cryptography”, in *Theory of Cryptography: First Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2004, Cambridge, MA, USA, February 19-21, 2004. Proceedings 1*, Springer, 2004, pp. 278–296.
- [144] J. von Neumann, “Various techniques used in connection with random digits”, *Monte Carlo Method, U.S. National Bureau of Standards, Applied Mathematics Series*, vol. 12, pp. 36–38, 1951.
- [145] N. Nisan and A. Wigderson, “Hardness vs randomness”, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 149–167, 1994, ISSN: 0022-0000. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000005800431>.
- [146] M. Obremski and M. Skórski, “Inverted leftover hash lemma”, ISIT, 2018.
- [147] M. Patrascu, “Towards polynomial lower bounds for dynamic problems”, in *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, L. J. Schulman, Ed.,

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACM, 2010, pp. 603–610. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806772>.
- [148] M. Patrascu, “Unifying the landscape of cell-probe lower bounds”, *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 827–847, 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/09075336X>.
- [149] S. N. Ramamoorthy and A. Rao, “Lower Bounds on Non-Adaptive Data Structures Maintaining Sets of Numbers, from Sunflowers”, in *33rd Computational Complexity Conference (CCC 2018)*, R. A. Servedio, Ed., ser. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), vol. 102, Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018, 27:1–27:16, ISBN: 978-3-95977-069-9. [Online]. Available: <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2018/8862>.
- [150] R. Raz, “Extractors with weak random seeds”, in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’05, Baltimore, MD, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2005, pp. 11–20, ISBN: 1581139608.
- [151] R. Raz, O. Reingold, and S. Vadhan, “Extracting all the randomness and reducing the error in Trevisan’s extractors”, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 97–128, 2002, ISSN: 0022-0000. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000002918246>.
- [152] V. Rödl, “On a packing and covering problem”, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 69–78, 1985, ISSN: 0195-6698. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195669885800238>.
- [153] J. Rompel, “One-way functions are necessary and sufficient for secure signatures”, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’90, Baltimore, Maryland, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1990, pp. 387–394, ISBN: 0897913612. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/100216.100269>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [154] A. Russell, Q. Tang, M. Yung, and H.-S. Zhou, “Correcting subverted random oracles”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2018*, H. Shacham and A. Boldyreva, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 241–271, ISBN: 978-3-319-96881-0.
- [155] M. Santha and U. V. Vazirani, “Generating quasi-random sequences from semi-random sources”, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 75–87, 1986, ISSN: 0022-0000. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022000086900449>.
- [156] A. Shamir, “How to share a secret”, *Commun. ACM*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 612–613, Nov. 1979, ISSN: 0001-0782. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/359168.359176>.
- [157] B. Shankar, K. Srinathan, and C. P. Rangan, “Alternative protocols for generalized oblivious transfer”, in *Distributed Computing and Networking*, S. Rao, M. Chatterjee, P. Jayanti, C. S. R. Murthy, and S. K. Saha, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 304–309, ISBN: 978-3-540-77444-0.
- [158] C. Sommer, E. Verbin, and W. Yu, “Distance oracles for sparse graphs”, in *50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2009, October 25-27, 2009, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*, IEEE Computer Society, 2009, pp. 703–712. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2009.27>.
- [159] M. A. Soss, J. Erickson, and M. H. Overmars, “Preprocessing chains for fast dihedral rotations is hard or even impossible”, *Comput. Geom.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 235–246, 2003. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7721\(02\)00156-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7721(02)00156-6).
- [160] A. Srinivasan and P. N. Vasudevan, “Leakage resilient secret sharing and applications”, in *Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 2019*, A. Boldyreva and D. Micciancio, Eds., Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 480–509, ISBN: 978-3-030-26951-7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [161] D. R. Stinson and R. Wei, “Combinatorial repairability for threshold schemes”, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 195–210, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10623-017-0336-6>.
- [162] L. Trevisan, “Extractors and pseudorandom generators”, *J. ACM*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 860–879, Jul. 2001, ISSN: 0004-5411. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/502090.502099>.
- [163] L. Trevisan and S. Vadhan, “Extracting randomness from samplable distributions”, in *Proceedings 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, Nov. 2000, pp. 32–42.
- [164] S. P. Vadhan *et al.*, “Pseudorandomness”, *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 7, no. 1–3, pp. 1–336, 2012.
- [165] E. Viola, “Lower bounds for data structures with space close to maximum imply circuit lower bounds”, *Theory Comput.*, vol. 15, pp. 1–9, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.2019.v015a018>.
- [166] E. Viola, “Lower bounds for data structures with space close to maximum imply circuit lower bounds”, *Theory of Computing*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2019.
- [167] G. Wright and A. S. Gillis, “What is a side-channel attack?” Apr. 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.techtarget.com/searchsecurity/definition/side-channel-attack>.
- [168] A. C. Yao, “Should tables be sorted?” *J. ACM*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 615–628, 1981. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/322261.322274>.
- [169] Y. Yao and Z. Li, “Differential privacy with bias-control limited sources”, *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 1230–1241, 2018.
- [170] Y. Yarom and K. Falkner, “{Flush+ reload}: A high resolution, low noise, l3 cache {side-channel} attack”, in *23rd USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 14)*, 2014, pp. 719–732.
- [171] M. Zimand, “Efficient privatization of random bits”, in *Randomized Algorithms Satellite Workshop of the 23rd International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, 1998.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [172] D. Zuckerman, “Simulating bpp using a general weak random source”, in [1991] *Proceedings 32nd Annual Symposium of Foundations of Computer Science*, 1991, pp. 79–89.