

Cryptanalysis of “Cryptanalysis and Improvement of Yan et al.’s Biometric-Based Authentication Scheme for TMIS”

Mrudula Sarvabhatla
Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupathi-517518, A.P.
Mrudula.s911@gmail.com

M.Giri
Professor and H.O.D
SITAMS , Chittoor,A.P
prof.m.giri@gmail.com

Chandra Sekhar Vorugunti
Dhirubhai Ambani Institute of ICT
Gandhinagar-Gujarat.
vorugunti_chandra_sekhar@daiict.ac.in

Abstract— Remote user authentication is critical requirement in Telecare Medicine Information System (TMIS) to protect the patient personal details, security and integrity of the critical medical records of the patient as the patient data is transmitted over insecure public communication channel called Internet. In 2013, Yan proposed a biometric based remote user authentication scheme and claimed that his scheme is secure. Recently, Dheerendra et al. demonstrated some drawbacks in Yan’s scheme and proposed an improved scheme to erase the drawbacks of Yan’s scheme. We analyze Dheerendra et al.’s scheme and identify that their scheme is vulnerable to off-line identity guessing attack, and on successfully mounting it , the attacker can perform all major cryptographic attacks.

Keywords- TMIS, Tele Medicine, Identity guessing attack, User Authentication.

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapid development in network and communication technology has presented a scalable platform for Telecare Medicine Information System (TMIS). The communication between the user and server is always a subject of security and privacy risk in TMIS as user accesses remote server via public channel and an adversary is considered to be enough powerful to perform various attacks. Thus the secure and efficient authenticated key agreement schemes should be adopted to ensure security and integrity of transmitting data [1]. The smart card based authentication scheme provides efficient solution for remote user authentication [6,7]. In recent times, many password based authentication schemes have been proposed for TMIS [9,10]. These schemes try to provide two factor authentication.

The password cannot be considered as a unique identity identifier and it’s needed to be remembered. Moreover, possibility of password guessing attack is also a concern. However, biometrics cannot be lost or forgotten, have the merits of uniqueness and need not be remembered; but they can be compromised [8]. Additionally, these bio-metric keys are not easy to guess [11,12]. Due to these advantages, the biometrics based authentication schemes present efficient solution to mutually authenticate and session key agreement. In 2013, Tan [1] presented a biometric based remote user

authentication scheme for the Telecare medical information system. In Tan’s scheme, a remote user and server can mutually authenticate each other and draw a session key. Moreover, the Tan’s scheme presents a user-friendly password and biometric update phase where a user can change his password and biometric keys without server assistance. Recently, Yan et al.’s [2] pointed out that Tan’s scheme is vulnerable to denial-of-service attack. Further, they proposed an improved scheme to eliminate the draw-backs of Tan’s scheme. Their scheme also preserves all the merits of Tan’s scheme.

In this article, we analyze the Yan et al.’s biometrics based remote user authentication scheme for TMIS. We show that Yan et al.’s scheme login phase is inefficient such that the smart card executes the login session in spite of incorrect input. The inefficiency of the login phase in incorrect input detection causes extra communication and computation overhead. Yan et al.’s password and biometrics update phase is also inefficient to detect incorrect input, which causes denial of service attack in case of wrong password input. Yan et al.’s scheme does not withstand password guessing attacks. Furthermore, we present a modified scheme which overcomes the weaknesses of Yan et al.’s scheme and preserves its merits.

The remaining part of the article is organized as follows: Section “Review of Dheerendra et al.’s scheme” presents a brief review of Dheerendra et al.’s scheme. Section “Weaknesses of Dheerendra et al.’s scheme” demonstrates the weaknesses of Dheerendra et al.’s scheme. The conclusion is drawn in section “Conclusion”.

The remaining fragment of the paper is structured as follows. In fragment II a brief analysis of Dheerendra et al scheme is given. Fragment III explain the security flaws of Dheerendra et al. scheme and fragment IV gives the conclusion of the paper.

II. ANALYSIS OF DHEERENDRA ET AL SCHEME

In this part, we inspect the improvement of Dheerendra et al. [3] authentication scheme for TMIS. The scheme is a collection of three phases: the registration, login, authentication and password and biometrics update stage.

A. Registration Phase

This stage is a one time execution process, when user U_i wish to list with the remote system.

Step 1. U_i selects an identity ID_i and secret password PW_i of his choice, and imprint his biometrics B_i . He/She generates a random number b_i , and computes $W_i = h(ID_i || PW_i || r_i)$. U_i submits the registration request with ID_i and W_i to S via secure channel.

Step 2. S computes $X_i = h(ID_i || x)$, $Y_i = X_i \oplus W_i$, where x is the server's 1024-bits or 2048-bits secret key. S generates a random number R and computes user's dynamic identity by encrypting the user identity using symmetric key encryption algorithm such as AES-256, i.e., $NID = E_x(ID_i || R)$. The server selects the long key to resist server's secret key guessing attack. Then S embeds $\{NID_i, Y_i, h(\bullet)\}$ into the smart card and issues the smart card to U_i . Step 3. Upon receiving the smart card, U_i stores $N = r_i \oplus H(B_i)$ and $V_i = h(ID_i || PW_i || r_i)$ into the smart card.

B. Login and Authentication Phase

At any time the user in need to access the far-off server S , the subsequent procedure is made. (L1) U_i inputs ID_i and PW_i , and imprints his biometrics B_i at the sensor. The smart card computes $N_i = N \oplus H(B_i)$, and verifies $V_i = h(ID_i || PW_i || r_i)$ if the verification does not hold, the smart card terminates the session. The smart card computes $W_i = h(ID_i || PW_i || r_u)$ to achieve $X_i = Y_i \oplus W_i$. $S.C$ generates a random $a_i = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u)$. Then sends the login message $\langle NID, a_i, r_u \rangle$ to S .

C. Validation Phase

On intercepting U_i 's login request message at time T^* , the server S executes the subsequent steps:

(V1) S retrieves ID_i by decrypting NID and computes $X_i = h(ID_i || x)$. S verifies a_i equal to $h(ID_i || X_i || r_u)$. If the verification does not hold, S terminates the session.

(V2) S generates random numbers r_s and R^* , and computes $SK = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u || r_s)$, $NID^* = E_x(ID_i || R^*)$ and $B_i = h(ID_i || NID || SK || NID^*)$. S sends the message $\langle r_s, B_i, h(SK || ID_i) \oplus NID^* \rangle$ to the user.

(V3) On receiving the login reply message message $\langle r_s, B_i, h(SK || ID_i) \oplus NID^* \rangle$ from S , the SC computes the session key $S.K = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u || r_s)$, and retrieves $NID^* = (SK || ID_i) \oplus NID^* \oplus (SK || ID_i)$.

$S.C$ computes $B_i^* = h(ID_i || NID || SK || NID^*)$ and compares with B_i , if both are equal $S.C$ authenticates S else rejects the login request. On authenticating the server, $S.C$ computes $C_i = h(ID_i || NID^* || S.K)$ and the session key verification message to S .

(V4) On receiving the session key reply message, S computes $C_i^* = h(ID_i || NID^* || S.K)$ and compares with the received C_i , if both are equal, S fully authenticates U_i .

III. CRYPTANALYSIS OF DHEERAJ ET AL SCHEME

In this segment, we will cryptanalysis the Dheerendra et al scheme and show that Dheerendra et al's authentication scheme is insecure against offline Identity guessing attack and on successful mounting Identity attack, the attacker can perform all major cryptographic attacks

A. Through stolen smart card of legitimate user:

A legal adversary 'E', if gets the smart card of a valid user U_i of the system for a while or stolen the card, 'E' can extract the secret data stored in U_i 's smart card as discussed in [4, 5]. In Dheerendra et al scheme, as discussed in registration stage, 'E' can get $\{NID, Y_i, h(\cdot), N, V_i\}$ which are stored in the U_i smart card, Where $W = h(ID_i || PW_i || N_i)$, $X_i = h(ID_i || x)$, $Y_i = X_i \oplus W_i$, $V_i = h(ID_i || PW_i || N_i)$ which means V_i equal to W_i .

Y_i is available to the attacker as it is stored in the U_i smart card. Now 'E' can proceed as follows:

$$V_i = W_i = h(ID_i || PW_i || r_i) \quad (1)$$

$$Y_i = X_i \oplus W_i \quad (2)$$

$$\text{From (1) } Y_i = X_i \oplus V_i \quad (3)$$

$$\text{From (3) E can intercept } X_i = Y_i \oplus V_i \quad (4)$$

B. Through intermediate messages exchanged between legitimate user and the server S:

Once legal user U_i logs into the system, the legal adversary 'E' can capture the intermediate login request, login reply messages exchanged between the user and the server S . In Dheerendra et al scheme, the adversary can capture login request $\{NID, a_i, r_i\}$ exchanged between U_i and the server S .

In below subsections, we discuss how Dheerendra et al scheme is vulnerable when an adversary is provided with one or more set of above discussed values.

C. Failure to Offline Identity Guessing Attack

The identity of a patient is often known to all in the TMIS system. The users usually choose easy recollective names as identity like social security ID, email, phone number and so on as their identities. In authentication and key agreement phase, the user need to input his identity and password to login the server. Even the user intends to keep his identity in secret, however, a easy-to-remember identity for the user is also easy-to-guess for an attacker. Assume that identity is selected from a limited set of uniformly distributed dictionary, then the adversary can proceed as follows :

When the patient U_i logs in to the system and sends the login message $\{NID, a_i, r_i\}$ to S , where $NID = E_x(ID_i || R)$, the attacker records it as it is transferred through a public channel. In the login request sent by U_i , $a_i = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u)$. Among ID_i, X_i, r_u the attacker intercepted X_i, r_u as discussed above. Only unknown value is ID_i . The attacker can proceed as follows to get the identity of U_i .

Step1 : The attacker selects a candidate identity ID as ID^* from a limited set of uniformly distributed dictionary and computes $a_i^* = h(ID_i^* || X_i || r_u)$.

Step 2: Check a_i^* equals a_i , If both are equal then the U_i identity is ID_i^* , else proceed to step 1 until the correct identity is found .

On successfully getting the identity ID_i of U_i , the attacker can proceed with following attacks:

D. Failure to resist user Impersonation attack

In user impersonation attack, the adversary ‘E’ can impersonate as a valid user U_i by forging the login message contents. In Dheerendra et al., scheme a valid user U_i sends the login message i.e., $\langle NID, a_i, r_u \rangle$ where $NID = E_x(ID_i || R)$, $a_i = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u)$. The adversary ‘E’ can perform the impersonate attack, when U_i logged into the system as follows.

Step 1: $NID = E_x(ID_i || R)$, is static entity which doesn’t changes with each login, So only value the attacker needs to modify is $a_i = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u)$, attacker knows ID_i , X_i , r_u . (ID_i from (C), X_i from (A), r_u from (B)).

Step 2: To frame a valid login request the attacker can modify a_i by chosing a new random number i.e $a_i^* = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u^*)$ and sending $\langle NID, a_i^*, r_u^* \rangle$. The login message will sure pass the checks made by server S.

Therefore, we can conclude that in Dheerendra et al. scheme, the adversary can impersonate as a valid user U_i , by replaying the previously intercepted authentication messages as discussed above. Hence, Dheerendra et al. scheme is vulnerable to user impersonation and replay attacks.

E. Attacker can frame the session Key

An attacker can frame the session key framed between U_i and S as follows:

An attacker can intercept the login reply message from S to U_i i.e $\langle r_s, B_i, M_i \rangle$, where $SK = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u || r_s)$, $NID^* = E_x(ID_i || R^*)$ and $B_i = h(ID_i || NID || SK || NID^*)$, $M_i = h(SK || ID_i) \oplus NID^*$.

‘E’ knows all the parameters to compute session key i.e ID_i, X_i, r_u, r_s . (‘E’ can get r_s from login reply message).

Step 1: As discussed above , ‘E’ knows ID_i, NID, X_i, r_u, r_s . ‘E’ can frame $S.K = h(ID_i || X_i || r_u || r_s)$,

Hence, ‘E’ can decrypt all the messages exchanged between U_i and S.

Therefore, we can conclude that in Dheeraj et al. scheme, the adversary can frame the session key and read all the messages exchanged between U_i and S. Hence, Dheeraj et al scheme failed to satisfy the fundamental requirement of the remote user authentication scheme i.e data security.

Therefore, we can conclude that in Dheerendra et al. scheme, Once the identity of U_i is known to the adversary ‘E’, he can impersonate the user and frame the session key.

IV. CONCLUSION

The present paper analyzed the security vulnerabilities in Dheeraj et al biometric based remote user authentication scheme. We have shown that that if an adversary gets the identity of the legal user, then he can frame the session key. In future, we will propose our improved scheme which fixes the vulnerabilities found in Dherendra et al and other related schemes.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z.Tan, "An efficient biometrics-based authentication scheme for telecare medicine information systems" , Network 2(3):200–204, 2013.
- [2] X.Yan, W.Li, P.Li, J. Wang, X.Hao, and P.Gong, "A secure biometrics-based authentication scheme for telecare medicine information systems.", springer journal of Medical Systems 37(5):1–6, 2013.
- [3] D.Mishra, S.Mukhopadhyay, A.Chaturvedi, S.Kumari, and M.K.Khan, "Cryptanalysis and Improvement of Yan et al.’s Biometric-Based Authentication Scheme for Telecare Medicine Information Systems", springer urnal of Medical Systems, June 2014.
- [4] P.Kocher,J. Jaffe, and B.Jun, "Differential power analysis. In: Advances in Cryptology", CRYPTO99: Springer, 388–397, 1999.
- [5] T.S Messerges, E.A Dabbish, and R.H Sloan, "Examining smart-card security under the threat of power analysis attacks", IEEE Trans. Comput. 51(5):541–552, 2002.
- [6] Khan, M.K., and Kumari, S., An authentication scheme for secure access to healthcare services. J. Med. Syst. 37(4):1–12, 2012
- [7] .Kumari, S., Khan, M.K., and Kumar, R., Cryptanalysis and improvement of a privacy enhanced scheme for telecare medical information systems. J. Med. Syst. 37(4):1–11, 2012.
- [8] M.K Khan, J. Zhang, and K.Alghathbar, "Challenge-response-based biometric image scrambling for secure personal identification", Futur. Gener. Comput. Syst. 27(4):411–418, 2011.
- [9] T.Cao, and J. Zhai, " Improved dynamic ID-based authentication scheme for telecare medical information systems" , J. Med. Syst. 37(2):1–7, 2013.
- [10] H.M Chen, J.W. Lo, and C.K Yeh, "An efficient and secure dynamic ID-based authentication scheme for telecare medical information systems" J. Med. Syst. 36(6):3907–3915, 2012.
- [11] M.K Khan, J. Zhang, K. and Alghathbar, "Challenge-response-based biometric image scrambling for secure personal identification", Futur. Gener. Comput. Syst. 27(4):411–418, 2011
- [12] M.K Khan, J. Zhang,, and L.Tian, " Protecting biometric data for personal identification", In: Advances in Biometric Person Authentication: Springer, 629–638, 2005.