

A Note about the Property of Frameproof Codes

Anu Kathuria

Assistant Professor, The Technological Institute of Textile and Sciences, Bhiwani, India
anu_sept24[at]rediffmail.com

Abstract: Chor, Fiat, and Naor[5] established traitor tracing codes in 1994 to secure Digital Content. Boneh and Shaw[3] proposed frameproof codes to prohibit privacy in 1994, and they also proposed c -secure codes with ϵ -error, which means that a traitor may be traced from an unlawful copy with a high likelihood. Hadamard Codes, t -Designs, and Balanced Incomplete Block Designs are all examples of frameproof and traceable code structures covered in this work (BIBD). Here in this work I show that Hadamard Code obtained from Hadamard matrix is not a 3-FPC.

Keywords: Balanced Incomplete Block Design, Hadamard Code and Hadamard Matrix

1. Introduction

Before being sold, each copy is stamped with a codeword to prevent illegal data redistribution and digital data copying. This marking allows the distributor to trace down and return any unauthorised copies to the intended receiver. With this in mind, a user may be wary to reproduce something without permission. However, if a group of dishonest users set out to identify some of the signs and devise a new codeword, they could be able to create a new copy that stands out from the rest. In 1994, Boneh and Shaw [3] suggested the concept of frameproof codes to prevent them from doing so because they have the ability to make markings at will. A c -frameproof code has the characteristic that no coalition of at most c users may frame a non-participant in the piracy. Let v and b be positive integers (b denotes the number of users in the scheme). A Set $T = \{w^{(1)}, w^{(2)}, \dots, w^{(b)}\} \subset \{0,1\}^v$ is called a (v,b) -code, and each $w^{(i)}$ is called a codeword. So a codeword is a binary v -tuple. We can use a $(b \times v)$ matrix S to depict a (v,b) -code, in which each row of S is a codeword in T .

Let T be a (v,b) -code. Suppose $C = \{w^{(u_1)}, w^{(u_2)}, \dots, w^{(u_d)}\}$. Then

For $i \in \{1,2,3,\dots,v\}$, we say that bit position i is detectable for C if

$$\{w_i^{(u_1)} = w_i^{(u_2)} = \dots = w_i^{(u_d)}\}.$$

Let $u(C)$ be the set of undetectable positions for C . Then

$$F(C) = \left\{ w \in \{0,1\}^v : \{w|_{u(C)} = w^{(u_i)} | u(C) \text{ for all } w^{(u_i)} \in C \right\}$$

is called feasible set of C . if $u(C) = \emptyset$, then we define $F(C) = \{0,1\}^v$. The feasible set C also represents the set of all possible v -tuples that could be produced by the coalition C by comparing the d codewords they jointly hold. if there is a codeword $w^{(j)} \in F(C) \setminus C$, then user j could be framed in this case.

Definition 1.1 [3]: A (v,b) -code T is called a c -frame proof code if, for every $W \subset T$ such that $|W| \leq c$, we have $F(W) \cap T = W$. We will say that T is a c -FPC (v,b) for short. Thus, in a c -frame proof code the only code words in the feasible set a coalition of at most c users are the code words of the members of the coalition. Hence, no coalition of at most c users can frame a user who is not in coalition.

Example 1.1.1: Let C be a code given by $C = \{(1,0,0), (0,2,0), (0,0,3)\}$ and $W = \{(1,0,0), (0,2,0)\}$, By the definition, $F(W) = \{(1,2,0), (0,0,0), (1,0,0), (0,2,0)\}$, i.e. $F(W) \cap C = W$.

Example 1.1.2: Let C be a code given by $C = \{(1,0,0), (1,2,0), (0,0,3), (1,2,3)\}$ and $W = \{(1,2,0), (0,0,3)\}$ by the definition of feasible set given above $F(W) = \{(1,2,3), (0,2,3), (1,0,3), (0,0,3), (0,2,0), (1,2,0), (1,0,0), (0,0,0)\}$ Here $F(W) \cap C \neq W$. So the above code is not a 2-frameproof code.

Section 1

Hadamard Code as 2-FP Code: in this section we show that "Hadamard Codes in general are also 2-FP Codes". Before discussing it in Detail, we recall its Definition.

Definition 1.1 [10.]: A Hadamard matrix M is a square matrix of order n with every entry equal to 1 or -1 such that $MM^T = I$, where M^T denotes the transpose of matrix M .

Definition 1.2 [10.]: A Hadamard matrix of order n in which every entry in the first row and in the first column is +1 is called Hadamard matrix of order n .

Example 1.2.1: The normalized Hadamard matrix of order 2 is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Definition 1.3 [10.]: A matrix obtained from Hadamard matrix M_n of order 'n' by changing 1's into 0's and -1's into 1's is called Binary Hadamard matrix of order n , let us denote it with A_n .

Definition 1.4 [10.]: Equidistant Constant Weight Code: A code C is called constant weight code if all the codewords have the same weight. A code is called equidistant if the distance between any two codewords is same. A code C having both properties is called Equidistant Constant Weight Code.

In this paper we are discussing that How Hadamard Codes prove to be a 2-frameproof code? In this context here we represent a Theorem.

Theorem 1.3.1: Hadamard Code with parameters $(n-1, n, \frac{n}{2})$ is always a 2-FP Code.

Here length of the code is $(n-1)$. The size of the code is n and distance d of the code is $n/2$.

Proof: Let M_n be a normalized Hadamard Matrix of order n and A_n be the Binary

Hadamard Matrix of order n obtained from M_n . Since any two rows of M_n agree in $\frac{n}{2}$ places. So it follows that

- (i) Distance between any two rows on A_n is $\frac{n}{2}$.
- (ii) Weight of every non-zero row of A_n is $\frac{n}{2}$.

So by the definition 1.4 [10] of Equidistant Constant Weight Code, Binary Hadamard Matrix A_n given by $(n, n, \frac{n}{2})$ is Equidistant Constant Weight Code. Also we can observe that every row of A_n has first entry zero.

Let A'_n be the matrix obtained from A_n , with first entry of every row deleted. Then the matrix A'_n has n elements of length $(n-1)$, and distance between any two rows of A'_n is $n/2$. The matrix A'_n so obtained is called Hadamard Code of type $(n-1, n, n/2)$. Now we show that it is 2-frameproof code. Since for this code $d = \frac{n}{2}$, and $l = n-1$. Therefore $d > (\frac{l}{2})$ i.e. $d > (1 - \frac{1}{2})l$. So by the definition [3] of frame proof code, Hadamard Code with $(n-1, n, \frac{n}{2})$ is 2-FP Code.

Example 1.3.1.1: Let us consider a normalized Hadamard Matrix of order 4 given as ;

$$M_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then as discussed above, the matrix A'_4 will be

$$A'_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

So it is a Hadamard Code of length 3 with $n=4$ and distance d is 2.

Therefore by the definition [3.] of frame proof code , $d > (1 - \frac{1}{2})n$ i.e. $d > \frac{3}{2}$. So it is 2-FP code.

Remark: In [6.], Cohen claims that ‘‘Hadamard Codes are $(n - 1, n, \frac{n}{2})$ are 3-FPC’’. But this result is not true always, for this case we present an example.

Example: Let H be a Hadamard matrix of order 8 given by,

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Now on replacing each 1 with 0 and -1 with 1, as discussed above we get

$$\text{that } A'_8 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

So it is a Hadamard Code H with parameters $(7,8,4)$ as discussed above. Now we show that it is not 3-FPC. Let each codeword of this matrix H is assigned as codewords $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5, c_6, c_7$ and c_8 . if any three users with codewords c_2, c_6 and c_3 collude, i.e.

$$W = \{c_2, c_6, c_3\} \text{ with}$$

$$c_2 = 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1$$

$$c_3 = 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0$$

$$c_6 = 0 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 1$$

Then by the definition of feasible set defined above , $F(c_2, c_3, c_6) = \{ (0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0), (1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0), (0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1), \dots \}$

Here in this feasible set , we note that the first codeword we have, is the codeword c_7 . Therefore, $F(c_2, c_3, c_6) \cap H \neq \{c_2, c_3, c_6\}$

Hence by the definition [3] of frameproof code, it is not 3-FPC.

2. Conclusion

In this paper we show that Hadamard Code in general is not a 3-Frameproof Code. In future we would like to prove the necessary and sufficient conditions for being a Hadamard Code to be 3-Frameproof Code.

References

- [1] Anu Kathuria, Sudhir Batra and S.K. Arora ” On traceability property of equidistant codes” Discrete Mathematics, Elsevier, vol.340, issue 4, April 2017, pg.713-721
- [2] D. Boneh and J. Shaw, ”Collusion –Secure fingerprinting for Digital Data”, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol.44, pp. 1897-1905, 1998.
- [3] D. Boneh and J. Shaw, ” Collusion –Secure fingerprinting for Digital Data”, in Advances in Cryptology-CRYPTO’95, (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)”, vol. 963 , pp.453-465, New York, 1995.

- [4] Hongxia Jin, Mario Blaum, "Combinatorial Properties of Traceability Codes using Error Correcting Codes" IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol.53, no.2, February 07.
- [5] B. Chor, A. Fiat and M. Naor, "Tracing Traitors", in Advances in Cryptology – CRYPTO 94 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science) Berlin, Germany, Springer Verlag, vol. 839, pp. 257-270, 1994.
- [6] Gerard Cohen, Encheva Sylvia "Frameproof Codes against coalition of pirates" Theoretical Computer Science, vol.273(2002),pp.295-304.
- [7] Gerard Cohen, S. Encheva, "Some new p-array Two Secure frame proof Codes" Applied Mathematical Letters 14(2001);pp.177-282
- [8] H. D. L. Hollman, Jack H. Van Lint, Jean-Paul Linnartz "On codes with the identifiable Parent Property" Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A-82, pp. 121-133, 1998.
- [9] J.N. Staddon, D. R. Stinson, R. Wei, "Combinatorial Properties of frameproof and Traceable Codes" IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol.47, pp. 1042-1049, 2001.
- [10] L. R. Variani, "The Theory of Error Correcting Codes", Chapman and Hall/CRC