

# CS 744: Pseudorandomness Generators

## Lecture 11: Computational Indistinguishability

January 25, 2015

In probability theory, we have various theorems which hold “with probability 1”, and capture some properties of random sequences - for example, the strong law of large numbers, which has the consequence that almost every binary sequence is *normal*, and the law of iterated logarithm, which *upper bounds* the speed of convergence of a random binary sequence to its expected behaviour, implying that if a binary sequence has approximately  $n/2$  zeroes from very small  $n$ , then it is not random.

However, in computational complexity, we abstract away from this notion and define the notion of an (algorithmic) statistical test, which allows the existence of *pseudorandom* distributions.

A *statistical test* on  $\{0,1\}^N$  is any algorithm  $A$  which outputs 0 or 1. An  $N$ -*source* is a probability distribution on  $\{0,1\}^N$ . We denote the uniform distribution on  $\{0,1\}^N$  by  $U_N$ . For a statistical test  $A$  and an  $N$ -source  $S$ , we define  $P(A; S)$  by

$$P(A; S) = \text{Probability}(B \sim S \mid A(B) = 1) = S(B \mid A(B) = 1).$$

**Definition 1.** We say that an  $N$ -source  $S$  passes the statistical test  $A$  with tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$  if

$$|P(A; S) - P(A; U_N)| \leq \epsilon.$$

Instead of arbitrary statistical test, we could reformulate the notion of being computationally indistinguishable from the uniform distribution using the notion of *predictors*.

**Definition 2.** For  $k \in \{0, \dots, N - 1\}$ , a predictor  $A_k : \{0,1\}^N \rightarrow \{0,1\}$  is an algorithm that depends only on the first  $k$  bits of the input. i.e. for any  $B \in \{0,1\}^N$  and  $C, D \in \{0,1\}^{N-k}$ ,

$$A(B_1 \dots B_k \cdot C) = A(B_1 \dots B_k \cdot D).$$

A prediction test  $A_k^P$  is defined as

$$A_k^P = A_k(B) \oplus B_{k+1} \oplus 1 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A_k(B) = B_{k+1} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

These two notions lead to almost equivalent notions of computational indistinguishability. Clearly, every a prediction test which distinguishes  $S$  from  $U_N$  with tolerance  $\epsilon$  is a statistical test which distinguishes it from  $U_N$  with the same tolerance. We have the following by way of the converse.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $S$  be an  $N$ -source which fails test  $A$  with tolerance  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then there is a  $k \in [0, N - 1]$  and a prediction test  $A_{k+1}^P$  on which  $S$  fails with tolerance  $\epsilon/N$ .*

The proof proceeds by a widely applicable technique called the “hybrid argument”, so called because it constructs “hybrids” of  $S$  and  $U_N$  to establish the result.

*Proof.* By complementing the output of  $A$  if necessary, we can assume that

$$P(A; S) - P(A; U_N) \geq \epsilon.$$

Consider the algorithms  $F_1, \dots, F_N$  where  $F_k$  works as follows. Given  $B \in \{0, 1\}^N$ , it flips  $N - k$  coins to produce a bit string  $B'_{k+1} \dots B'_N$ . Then it outputs  $A(B_1 \dots B_k B'_{k+1} \dots B'_N)$ . Clearly,  $P(F_0; S) = P(A; U_N)$  and  $P(F_N; S) = P(A; S)$ . Then, by assumption,  $P(F_N; S) - P(F_0; S) \geq \epsilon$ .

Now, writing the above as a telescoping sum, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} P(F_{k+1}; S) - P(F_k; S) \geq \epsilon,$$

whence it follows that there is a  $k \in [0, N - 1]$  where

$$P(F_{k+1}; S) - P(F_k; S) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{N}.$$

Now, we need to find a prediction test  $A_k^P$  with

$$P(A_k^P; S) - P(A_k^P; U_N) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{N}.$$

Define the predictor  $A_k(B) = F_k(B)$ . The corresponding predictor test  $A1_k^P(B) = F_k(B) \oplus B'_{k+1} \oplus 1$  can be written equivalently as

$$A2_k^P(B) = F_k(B) \oplus B'_{k+1} \oplus B_{k+1}?$$

It is certainly true that

$$P(A1_k^P(B); S) = P(A2_k^P(B); S).$$