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## Introduction <br> Definitions: Deciphering the Title

## Def. Alternating Product



## Def. Provable Security Comparisons

- (provable security) comparisons
- Inequalities like $\operatorname{Adv}(Z)<\operatorname{Adv}(Y)$
- provable (security comparisons)
- Other security metrics $H_{a}, W, G_{a}$



## Indeed



## Part I <br> Alternating Product Ciphers

## Under "Random" Cipher Approx



## Cipher "is Group"



## Could be =



## MITM uses ideal approx



## Pliam, 1998-99



## This Paper



## 3-Fold Collapse



## By Extension



## General Collapse



## Report Card: F



## 3-Fold Expansion


support: $|H| \rightarrow|H \pi H|$

## 3-Fold Collapse


when $\sigma \in H \pi^{-1}$, support: $|H \pi H| \rightarrow|H|$

## Simplest Counterexample


when $k_{1}=k_{2}$, support collapses

## Cosets

- Fact: the set of all permutations taking plaintext $p$ to ciphertext $c$
- Is coset gH,
- Where $H$ is subgroup, $\operatorname{Stab}(p)$


## Structure of Cosets



## Extends to Nonabelian Case

abelian

| cosets | $x+V$ | $g H$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lagrange | $W=\bigcup x+V$ | $G=\bigcup g H$ |
| action | $\mathrm{y}+(\mathrm{x}+\mathrm{V})=(\mathrm{y}+\mathrm{x})+\mathrm{V}$ | $\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{gH})=(\mathrm{kg}) \mathrm{H}$ |
| stabilizer | V | H |

## Orbit-Stabilizer Theorem

- Thm. Any (transitive) group action is equivalent to a coset action.


## Double Cosets



$$
m_{i}=\left[H: H \cap{ }^{g_{i}} K\right]
$$

## Theorem 2



Thm. $T=X Y Z, t=x * y * z$ is a convex direct sum

$$
t=\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{i} z_{i}
$$

where $m=\left[H: H \cap{ }^{\pi} K\right]$ and $z_{i} \preceq z$.

## Corollaries



$$
T=X Y Z \text { and } D=X Z
$$

case1: $T=\Lambda D$
case2: $D=\Lambda^{\prime} T$

## Part II

Provable Security Comparisons

# Passwords by Non-Increasing Likelihood 



## Cumulative Probability



## Sounds Familiar? "99\%"



Financial wealth distribution, 2007

## Lorenz Curve c. 1910




## Theory of Inequalities

- Schur, 1923
- Hardy, Littlewood \& Polya, 1929
- Birkhoff, von Neumann ca. 1950


## Majorization, Schur Convexity



## Higher-Dim Diagrams



## Higher Data Complexity?



## Kronecker-Like Formula

When $z \preceq y$ with $z=D y$ and $D$ "like" $Z=X Y$,

$$
z_{\downarrow}^{(i)}=\sum_{i=1}^{[G: H]} \omega_{i j} D_{i j} y_{\downarrow}^{(i)}
$$

where $\left[\omega_{i j}\right]$ and each $D_{i j}$ are doubly stochastic.

## Diagram Chase ...



## Filling In Details


$T=X Y Z$ and $D=X Z$
case1: $T=\Lambda D$;

$$
t \preceq_{q} d, H(T) \geq H(D), \mathbf{A d v}(T) \leq \mathbf{A d v}(D), \ldots
$$

case2: $D=\Lambda^{\prime} T$;

$$
d \preceq_{q} t, H(D) \geq H(T), \mathbf{A d v}(D) \leq \mathbf{A d v}(T), \ldots
$$

## Summary



- Security ordering of alternating product depends strongly on internal structure.
- Expansion/Collapse along double cosets
- Comparing via majorization leads to coherence across many (Schur-convex) metrics


## Epilogue Provable Security Implications

## Provable Security



## Indistinguishability



## Advantage Proliferation



## Need To Prune

- Hypothesis: To prune out the "bad" Adv's, focus on those preserving order (majorization).

