## Homework 9 – Due Tuesday, April 4

Consider a cryptographic hash function f: {0,1}<sup>n</sup> → {0,1}<sup>h</sup> that satisfies the preimage resistance property and second preimage resistance property, even though it only works on fixed-size input blocks. Joe needs a function like this, but it has to work on *pairs* of *n*-bit inputs, so he defines g: {0,1}<sup>n</sup> × {0,1}<sup>n</sup> → {0,1}<sup>h</sup> as

$$g(x,y) = f(x \oplus y).$$

Is this function preimage resistant? Does it satisfy the second preimage resistance property? Justify both answers!

- 2. Prove that a hash function that satisfies the collision resistance property also satisfies the second preimage resistance property. (*Hint: Write the statement you're trying to prove as an implication, and then prove the logical contrapositive.*)
- 3. Does a hash function that has second preimage resistance also satisfy the preimage resistance property? To answer this question, consider a hash function H(x) that produces k-bit hash codes, and satisfies all three of the hash function security properties. Now construct a hash function H'(x) that produces (k + 1)-bit hash codes as follows: If x is exactly k bits long, then output 0||x (a single 0 bit followed by x); otherwise output 1||H(x) (a single 1 bit followed by the H-hash code of x). Is H'(x) second preimage resistant? Is it preimage resistant? Justify your answers!