

# CS406 Project

## The Goldreich-Levin Theorem

Arpon Basu and Hastyn Doshi

Department of Computer Science & Engineering  
IIT Bombay

April 28, 2023

## One-Way Functions

A family of functions  $f_n : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{k(n)}$  are called one-way functions if they are computable in polynomial time and for every non-uniform PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (f_n(\mathcal{A}(f_n(x))) = f_n(x)) = \text{negligible}(n)$$

where  $\text{negligible}(n)$  is a function which decays super-polynomially with  $n$ .

## Hard-Core Predicate

A predicate  $h : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is called a hard-core predicate for a one-way function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^{k(n)}$  if  $h$  is computable in polynomial time and for every non-uniform PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$

$$\Pr_{x \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(1^n, f(x)) = h(x)) = \frac{1}{2} + \text{negligible}(n)$$

# The Goldreich-Levin theorem

## Theorem (Goldreich-Levin Theorem)

*Let  $f$  be a one-way function with domain  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . Note that for any  $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $g(x, r) := (f(x), r)$  is a one-way function too. Then  $h(x, r) := \langle x, r \rangle$  is a hard-core predicate for  $g$ , where  $\langle x, r \rangle$  denotes the dot product of  $x$  and  $r$  (in  $\mathbb{F}_2$ ).*

# The Proof

We proceed via contradiction: Consider a PPT adversary which can guess the hardcore bit with non-negligible probability over  $\frac{1}{2}$ . We shall construct a PPT adversary which can invert  $f$  with non-negligible probability.

However establishing the theorem requires some lemmata, which we shall now prove.

# Lemma 1

## Lemma

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any PPT adversary, let  $\delta > 0$ . Define

$$G_{\mathcal{A},\delta} := \left\{ x : \Pr_{r \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(f(x), r) = \langle x, r \rangle) \geq \frac{1+\delta}{2} \right\}$$

If  $\Pr_{x,r \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(f(x), r) = \langle x, r \rangle) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \delta$ , then  
 $\Pr_{x \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (x \in G_{\mathcal{A},\delta}) \geq \frac{\delta}{2}$ .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{x,r \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(f(x), r) = \langle x, r \rangle) &= \Pr_{x,r \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(f(x), r) \\ &= \langle x, r \rangle | x \in G_{\mathcal{A}, \delta}) \Pr_{x \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (x \in G_{\mathcal{A}, \delta}) + \Pr_{x,r \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(f(x), r) \\ &= \langle x, r \rangle | x \notin G_{\mathcal{A}, \delta}) \Pr_{x \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (x \notin G_{\mathcal{A}, \delta}) \\ &\leq 1 \cdot \Pr_{x \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (x \in G_{\mathcal{A}, \delta}) + \frac{1 + \delta}{2} \cdot 1 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Pr_{x,r \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n} (\mathcal{A}(f(x), r) = \langle x, r \rangle) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \delta$ , we get our desired result.

# Lemma 2

## Lemma

Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{m'}$  be pairwise independent Bernoulli random variables with parameter  $p$ . Define  $X := \sum_{i=1}^{m'} X_i$ . Then

$$\Pr(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq m'\delta) \leq \frac{1}{4m'\delta^2}$$



# The Proof

Denote by  $\mu$  the value of  $\mathbb{E}[X]$ .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}(X) &= \mathbb{E}[(X - \mu)^2] = \mathbb{E}[X^2 - 2\mu X + \mu^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X^2] - 2\mu\mathbb{E}[X] + \mu^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{m'} X_i^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m'} X_i X_j\right] - 2\mu\mathbb{E}[X] + \mu^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m'} \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m'} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] - 2\mu^2 + \mu^2\end{aligned}$$

# The Proof

Since  $X_i, X_j$  are pairwise independent for  $i \neq j$ ,  
 $\mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] = \mathbb{E}[X_i] \mathbb{E}[X_j] = p^2$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] = p$ . Consequently

$$\text{Var}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m'} p + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m'} p^2 - \mu^2 = m' p (1 - p)$$

where the last equality follows since  $\mu = m' p$ .

The desired result then follows by invoking Chebyshev's inequality and noting that  $p(1 - p) \leq \frac{1}{4}$  for every  $p \in [0, 1]$ .

# The Proof (Continued)

Now, let  $\delta = \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)} > 0$  be the advantage of our adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  in calculating the hardcore bit, ie:-

$\Pr_{x,r \leftarrow \{0,1\}^n}(\mathcal{A}(f(x), r) = \langle x, r \rangle) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \delta$ . Set

$m := \lceil \frac{2^n}{\delta^2} \rceil$ ,  $k := 1 + \lceil \log_2(m) \rceil$ . Uniformly choose  $k$  random vectors  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k$  from  $\{0, 1\}^k$ . Now, let

$S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k\} =: [k]$  be any non-empty set. Then we define  $r_S$  as  $r_S := \sum_{i \in S} t_i$ . This way we can generate  $2^k - 1 = m' \geq m$  random vectors. Note that all the vectors  $r_S$  are themselves distributed uniformly in  $\{0, 1\}^n$  since a linear combination of uniform random vectors from  $\{0, 1\}^n$  is itself a uniform random vector <sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>this can be seen through induction

# The Proof (Continued)

Note that for any two sets  $S_1 \neq S_2$ ,  $r_{S_1}, r_{S_2}$  are independent. Consequently, all our  $m'$  random vectors are pairwise independent. Now assume we already know the correct values of  $\langle x, t_i \rangle$  for every  $i \in [k]$ . Then we know the values  $\langle x, r_S \rangle$  for every  $S \subseteq [k]$ , since  $\langle x, r_S \rangle = \langle x, \sum_{i \in S} t_i \rangle = \sum_{i \in S} \langle x, t_i \rangle$ . Let  $e_i$  be the  $i^{\text{th}}$  unit vector of  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . For any  $S \subseteq [k]$ , since  $r_S$  are uniformly random, we get that  $r_S \oplus e_i$  is uniformly random too. Moreover, note that  $\langle x, r_S \oplus e_i \rangle - \langle x, r_S \rangle = \langle x, e_i \rangle = x_i$ . Consequently, for every  $S \subseteq [k]$ , calculate the value of  $\mathcal{A}(f(x), r_S \oplus e_i) - \langle x, r_S \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the adversary calculating the hardcore bit, obtain  $m'$  votes for the value of  $x_i$ , and take the *majority vote* of these values <sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup>since  $m' = 2^k - 1$  is an odd number, a tie is not possible

# The Proof (Continued)

Let  $\xi_S$  be the Bernoulli random variable denoting the probability distribution of  $\mathcal{A}(f(x), r_S \oplus e_i)$  correctly calculating  $\langle x, r_S \oplus e_i \rangle$ . If  $x \in G_{\mathcal{A}, \delta}$ , then the parameter of  $\xi_S$  is at least  $\frac{1+\delta}{2}$ , by the definition given in the first lemma.

Consequently, the expected number of correct answers in the  $m'$  votes for the value of  $x_i$  is at least  $\frac{m'(1+\delta)}{2}$ , and thus if the majority vote turns up the wrong answer, that implies a deviation from the mean of more than  $\frac{m'\delta}{2}$ . By the second lemma, the probability of this happening is at most  $\frac{1}{m'\delta^2} \leq \frac{1}{m\delta^2} \leq \frac{1}{2n}$ .

# The Proof (Continued)

Consequently, the probability that any bit is calculated wrongly is at most  $\frac{1}{2n}$ , which implies, by the union bound, that the probability that  $x$  is determined wrongly is at most  $\frac{1}{2n} \cdot n = \frac{1}{2}$ . Note that  $x$  is simply determined by a concatenation of the bits  $x_i$  for  $i \in [n]$ .

Consequently, we managed to invert  $f(x)$  with probability  $\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \Pr(x \in G_{\mathcal{A}, \delta}) \geq \frac{\delta}{4}$ . However since  $\delta$  is not negligible, neither is  $\frac{\delta}{4}$ , which implies that with non-negligible probability we can invert  $f(x)$ , violating the assumption that it was a one-way function.

Hence proved, contradiction!

# The Proof: A small catch

We assumed that we know  $\langle x, t_i \rangle$  for every  $i \in [n]$ . But obviously, that is not true *a priori*. We deal with this as follows: We run the aforementioned algorithm for all  $2^k = m' + 1 = \text{poly}(n)$  possible values of  $(\langle x, t_i \rangle)_{i \in [k]}$ . Every time, we end up with a possible value of  $x$ , whose correctness we test for by checking if applying  $f(x)$  is the correct answer. Since we know that for the correct values of  $(\langle x, t_i \rangle)_{i \in [k]}$ , we obtain the correct value of  $x$  with probability at least  $\frac{1}{2}$ , we can consequently conclude that we will get the correct answer with probability at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  by the end of all the  $2^k$  iterations.

The above step blows up our runtime by  $2^k$ , but since  $2^k$  is polynomial in  $n$ , our algorithm remains polynomial time, and thus our overall construction of a PPT adversary continues to hold.

The most immediate and useful applications of this theorem is to construct *pseudo-random generators* (PRGs): Indeed, let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \mapsto \{0, 1\}^n$  be a one-way permutation. Then  $g(x, r) = f(x) || r || \langle x, r \rangle$  is a pseudo-random generator<sup>3</sup>. Indeed, through this construction, the Goldreich-Levin theorem lays the foundation for constructing a large class of PRGs.

---

<sup>3</sup>this can be proved through the equivalence of the definitions of pseudo-randomness and next-bit unpredictability



## Theorem

If  $f$  is a one-way permutation, then

$$g_N(x, r) := r \parallel \langle f^N(x), r \rangle \parallel \langle f^{(N-1)}(x), r \rangle \parallel \dots \parallel \langle f(x), r \rangle \parallel \langle x, r \rangle$$

is a PRG for any  $N \sim \text{poly}(n)$ , and  $f^k$  denotes the  $k$ -fold composition of  $f$ .

# The Proof

We know that pseudorandomness is equivalent to a next-bit prediction by Yao's theorem.

Now assume for the sake of contradiction that  $g$  is not a PRG:

Then there would exist  $i \in [N]$  and a PPT adversary  $\mathcal{A}$  such that

$$\Pr\left(\mathcal{A}(r \parallel \langle f^N(x), r \rangle \parallel \langle f^{N-1}(x), r \rangle \parallel \dots \parallel \langle f^{i+1}(x), r \rangle) = \langle f^i(x), r \rangle\right) = \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon$$

We describe a PPT adversary  $\mathcal{B}$  such that given  $(f(z), r)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}$  tells us the value of  $\langle z, r \rangle$  with non-negligible probability, thus violating the Goldreich-Levin theorem.

# The Proof

$\mathcal{B}$  chooses an  $i \in [N]$  randomly. Consider  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $f^i(x) = z$ <sup>4</sup>. Note that for  $\ell \geq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{B}$  can efficiently calculate  $f^{i+\ell}(x) = f^{\ell-1}(f(z))$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{B}$  can, in polynomial time, generate the string  $r \|\langle f^N(x), r \rangle\| \langle f^{N-1}(x), r \rangle\| \dots \|\langle f^{i+1}(x), r \rangle$  on it's own and feed it to  $\mathcal{A}$  as an input, which would then return to  $\mathcal{B}$  the value of  $\langle z, r \rangle$  with non-negligible probability, allowing  $\mathcal{B}$  to violate the Goldreich-Levin theorem.

---

<sup>4</sup>Such a  $x$  must necessarily exist since the composition of two permutations is also a permutation, and consequently every element in our co-domain has a (unique) pre-image