

A lightweight PUF-based authentication protocol

Yu Zhuang, *IEEE Member*, and Gaoxiang Li

Abstract—Lightweight authentication is essential for resource-constrained Internet-of-Things (IoT). Implementable with low resource and operable with low power, Physical Unclonable Functions (PUFs) have the potential as hardware primitives for implementing lightweight authentication protocols. The arbiter PUF (APUF) is probably the most lightweight strong PUF capable of generating exponentially many challenge-response pairs (CRPs), a desirable property for authentication protocols, but APUF is severely weak against modeling attacks. Efforts on PUF design have led to many PUFs of higher resistance to modeling attacks and also higher area overhead. There are also substantial efforts on protocol development, some leverage PUFs' strength in fighting modeling attacks, and some others employ carefully designed protocol techniques to obfuscate either the challenges or the responses with modest increase of area overhead for some or increased operations for some others. To attain both low resource footprint and high modeling attack resistance, in this paper we propose a co-design of PUF and protocol, where the PUF consists of an APUF and a zero-transistor interface that obfuscates the true challenge bits fed to the PUF. The obfuscated PUF possesses rigorously proven potential and experimentally supported performance against modeling attacks when a condition is met, and the protocol provides the condition required by the PUF and leverages the PUF's modeling resistance to arrive at low resource overhead and high operational simplicity, enabling lightweight authentications while resisting modeling attacks.

Index Terms—IoT Authentication, Physical Unclonable Function (PUF), PUF-based authentication protocol.

I. INTRODUCTION

PHYSICAL Unclonable Functions (PUFs) are hardware primitives for implementing security protocols. Small scale variations of integrated circuits exist in fabricated silicon chips. These variations are regarded as side effects for conventional circuits [1], [2], but they make each chip unique and can be exploited to prevent semiconductor re-fabrication. PUFs utilize these variations to produce responses unique for individual circuits [1]–[6], and hence are not physically reproducible. These physical variations are hardware fingerprints that can be used for security purposes. Instead of storing secret keys in nonvolatile memories, PUFs retrieve the secret information of physical variations to produce unique responses as signatures of silicon chips. Implementable with simplistic circuits with thousands of transistors, PUFs incur low area overhead and energy consumption, rendering them potential candidates for resource-constrained IoT devices.

Though physically unclonable, PUFs face non-physical threats from modeling attacks. Many PUF-based protocols use open communication channels for sending-receiving challenge response pairs (CRPs) of the PUF, since such channels incur lower implementation cost than secure communication channels. The CRPs used in authentications can be collected by attackers to build machine learning models that enable attackers to develop software to impersonate the PUF.

Delay-based PUFs, leveraging different gate delays at multiple locations, can create exponentially many combinations of delay differences to produce circuit-dependent responses, leading to exponentially many CRPs. PUFs that admit exponentially many CRPs are called strong PUFs, which are essential for implementing authentication protocols that need to execute more than a small number of authentications in their operation lifespan. In addition, the huge number of CRPs can generate an unlimited supply of “keys”, enabling each to be used only once without having to be stored in devices' memories. Due to the unlimited CRPs, PUF-based protocols usually do not encrypt CRPs, in order to reduce resource overhead for implementing encryption on IoT devices. The unencrypted CRPs sent over open communication channels can be collected by attackers who use the CRPs to train machine learning models to predict responses to challenges, giving rise to what is called modeling attacks on strong PUFs.

The Arbiter PUF (APUF) [7], [8] is probably is most lightweight delay-based strong PUFs with an area overhead of about $6n$ gate-equivalents (GEs) for an n -bit APUF, but is severely vulnerable to modeling attacks. Efforts to improve modeling-attack-resistance over the APUF have resulted in many sophisticated PUF designs, e.g. the XOR PUF (XPUF) [2], the FFPUF [7]–[9], the LSPUF [10], the IPUF [11], the LPPUF [12]. These PUFs improved security against modeling attacks, but all have area overhead multiple times that of the APUF. Many of them still succumb to modeling attacks [12]–[15] unless large circuit architecture sizes are adopted, e.g. 7 or more component APUFs for a 64-bit LSPUF [14], [16], over 10 component PUFs for a 64-bit XPUF [15], and over 9 component APUFs for a 64-bit IPUF [17]. Large circuit architecture sizes obviously lead to higher area overhead. For instance, a PUF with 8 component APUFs has an area overhead 8 times that of the APUF. In addition, some of PUFs also succumb to reliability machine learning attacks [18] even with large circuit architecture sizes.

Besides sophisticated PUFs, there have also been protocol-level efforts to fight modeling attacks. One approach is to use highly attack-resistant PUFs as is done by the Lockdown Protocol II in [6]. Another approach is to obfuscate the challenge [19]–[21], and a more broadly used approach is to

arXiv:2405.13146v1 [cs.CR] 21 May 2024

Manuscript received Month XX, 2024; revised Month XX, 2024.

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant No. 2103563 (Corresponding author: Yu Zhuang).

Yu Zhuang is with Department of Computer Science, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409 USA (e-mail: yu.zhuang@ttu.edu).

Gaoxiang Li is with Department of Computer Science, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409 USA (e-mail: gaoli@ttu.edu).

obfuscate or hide the responses [22]–[25]. We also saw two protocols [26], [27] that obfuscates both the challenge and the responses.

To defend against modeling attacks while maintaining low hardware overhead, in this paper we introduce a highly simplistic mutual authentication protocol which is itself lightweight in addition to use a highly lightweight PUF. The protocol is tailor-designed to (i) shield a weak spot of the PUF from being attacked and (ii) utilize the strength of the PUF in resisting modeling attacks.

The protocol employs an APUF equipped with a zero-transistor challenge interface that takes ghost input bits, bits that are not fed to any PUF stage, leading to more input bits than PUF stages. The ghost bits are inserted into the input vector at random positions with different ghost bit positions for different interface instances, obfuscating the bits fed to the PUF. The challenge interface was proven to turn an APUF into a binary classification problem whose separation surface is defined by a high-order multivariate polynomial with the polynomial order approximately proportional to the number of ghost bits when a condition on the ghost bits is met. This theoretical result shows that an APUF equipped with ghost bits becomes a highly nonlinear classification problem. Increased nonlinearity in general leads to lower machine-learnability, and this theoretical analysis has been supported by experimental attacks on instances of APUFs equipped with the challenge interface.

II. THE CHALLENGE OBFUSCATION INTERFACE

A. The Design Philosophy

Feature generation is important for machine learning, and it is especially true for machine learning attacks, or modeling attacks, of PUFs. To the best of our knowledge, all modeling attacks [13], [15], [28] of delay-based strong PUFs transform the challenge (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) into the feature vector $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$ according to

$$\phi_i = (2c_i - 1)(2c_{i+1} - 1) \cdots (2c_n - 1), \quad (1)$$

before applying machine learning procedures, where c_i is the bit fed to the i -th PUF stage. The transform (1) turns the relation between the response of the APUF and the feature vector $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$ into a linear classification problem, and turns other delay-based PUFs into more easily learnable classification problems. The work of Xu, et al. [29] shows that without the transform (1), APUF has withstood modeling attacks with one million CRPs. We also tried machine learning methods to attack APUFs with even more CRPs without using the transform (1), and all our attacks failed, showing the necessity of the feature-generating transform for machine learning attacks of APUFs.

We observed that the feature-generating transform (1) requires the knowledge of the positions of all challenge bits that are fed to the PUF. Specifically, the generation of feature bit ϕ_i needs challenge bits c_i, c_{i+1}, \dots, c_n . Thus, we are motivated to think that if attackers do not know which input bit is fed to which PUF stage, then the feature-generation transform (1) will not have adequate information to generate the correct

feature vector $(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$, and thereby machine learning attacks can probably be defeated. Our approach to obfuscating the positions of challenge bits is to insert ghost bits randomly into the input challenge.

B. The Challenge Input Interface

We propose an interface for the input challenge which, as elaborated below, accepts more input bits than the number of stages of the PUF.

The m -plus-bits Interface

- For a PUF with n -stages, the challenge input interface has $(n+m)$ input bits and n output bits. Input bits are denoted by $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n+m})$ and the output bits (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) with c_i being the bit fed to the i -th stage of the PUF.
- For each PUF instance, n out of the $(n+m)$ input bits are randomly selected, and the remaining m bits, called ghost bits, are not fed to the PUF. Denote the set of ghost bits by $G_m = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m\}$ with $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m$.
- The selected n bits are fed to the PUF circuit in the original order, that is,

$$\begin{cases} c_i = b_i & \text{for } i < i_1, \\ c_{i-j} = b_i & \text{for } i_j < i < i_{j+1}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1, \\ c_{i-m} = b_i & \text{for } i_m < i. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

The effectiveness of this interface in obfuscating the true challenge bits requires the preclusion of open access to the interfaced PUF, where open access to the PUF means that the PUF returns a response when any $(n+m)$ -bit challenge is fed to it. If the PUF is openly accessible, an attacker can find out the ghost bits by a chosen-challenge attack described below.

The Chosen-Challenge Attack

An attacker chooses a small set S_0 of random challenges, say 10 challenges. To see if the i -th challenge bit is a ghost bit, the attacker constructs a set S_i of challenges which are generated from S_0 by flipping the i -th bit of all challenges in S_0 . A challenge from S_0 and a challenge from S_i form a corresponding pair if the two challenges differ only in the i -th bit. Then, the attacker feeds both sets of challenges to the PUF, and if for all or almost all corresponding pairs of challenges the interfaced PUF produces the same responses, then the i -th bit is a ghost bit.

Thus, to prevent chosen-challenge attack, open accesses to the PUF must be disabled. Then, an attacker can only passively collect CRPs from eavesdropping on the communications between the PUF and the PUF's legitimate partner server.

Then, a natural question is if it is feasible for an attacker to launch chosen-challenge attacks when all CRPs are passively collected. More specifically, if an attacker has millions of CRPs accumulated passively, what is the likelihood that the millions of CRPs contain two small subsets which have the same property as S_0 and S_1 described in the chosen-challenge attack? A careful examination of the attack led us to the following observation.

If all challenges fed to the PUF interface are random in the sense that every bit in every challenge has an equal probability to be 0 or 1, then the probability for an attacker to find two sets S_0 and S_1 as described in the Chosen-Challenge Attack from 1 million passively accumulated CRPs is lower than 2^{-450} for $n = 64$ and $m = 20$.

Let us give the analysis that led to the estimate of probability given above. Since each bit is equally likely to be 0 or 1, the probability of having a corresponding pair of challenges which differ in only one bit that are chosen from the N CRPs is $\frac{N(N-1)}{2}2^{-(n+m)}$, since there are $\frac{N(N-1)}{2}$ possible pairs and the second challenge in the pair has all $(n+m)$ bits fully determined. For $N = 1$ million, $n = 64$ and $m = 20$, $\frac{N(N-1)}{2}2^{-(n+m)} < 2^{-45}$. The probability to have 10 corresponding pairs of challenges in sets S_0 and S_1 is $\frac{N!}{20!(N-20)!}2^{-10(n+m)}$, which is less than 2^{-450} for $n = 64$, $m = 20$, and $N = 1$ million. Even if $N = 1$ billion, the probability of having a corresponding pair of challenges is less than 2^{-25} , and the probability to have 10 corresponding pairs of challenges in sets S_0 and S_1 is less than 2^{-250} . It can be reasonably assumed that the number of challenges used by a protocol during the entire operating lifespan of the protocol is bounded by 1 billion. Thus, the probability to find a pair of subsets like S_0 and S_1 from passively accumulated CRPs is close to zero. A chosen-challenge attack needs multiple pairs of sets like S_0 and S_i with multiple challenges in each of S_0 and S_i , and the probability to find multiple pairs of sets like S_0 and S_i will be even lower.

While the chosen-challenge attack can completely destroy the challenge obfuscation interface, our observation shows that such attacks can be defeated if all challenge bits fed to the PUF interface are random with equal likelihood of being 0 or 1.

C. Resistance to Conventional Machine Learning Attacks

Since the interface randomly chooses n bits out of the $(n+m)$ input bits and feed the n chosen bits to the n stages of a PUF instance as challenge bits, attackers have no knowledge about which n bits are used and which input bits are not used, leading to an obfuscation of the challenge. However, a trusted server of the PUF knows which of the input bits are challenge bits and will be able to generate the response using a PUF model stored in the server to verify the PUF.

But how many ghost bits are needed and how the ghost bits are distributed among the input bits in order to thwart attacks are important questions. That means, we need to identify

- (i) a set of interfaces, each member of the set have high potential to secure APUFs against machine learning attacks.

However, it is not enough to find a set consisting of a small number of such interfaces. What we need is a set with huge number of PUF-securing interfaces, that is,

- (ii) the set meeting the condition (i) must have exponentially many members.

If the set has a small cardinality, a brutal force exhaustive search of all interfaces in the set can identify which interface is implemented on a PUF instance. But if there are exponentially

many interfaces meeting condition (i), the ghost bits of an interface behaves like a secret key. Thus, we need condition (ii) to make the interfaces secret-key-like. Our study on issue (i) has led to the following.

Theorem 1: For an n -stage APUF equipped with an m -plus-bits challenge interface, if no pair of ghost bits are consecutive in the sense that $i_j + 1 < i_{j+1}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$, then the response of the interfaced APUF as a function of the feature vector $(\phi(1), \phi(2), \dots, \phi(n+m))$ transformed from input $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n+m})$ according to

$$\phi(i) = (2b_i - 1)(2b_{i+1} - 1) \cdots (2b_{n+m} - 1). \quad (3)$$

is represented by a classification whose separation surface is defined by an $(n+m)$ -variable polynomial of an order between $2m-2$ and $2m+1$.

Proof of Theorem 1: Since c_i is the bit fed to the i -th PUF stage, according to [9], the response of the interfaced APUF satisfies

$$r = Sgn\left(v(n) + \sum_{i=1}^n w(i)\phi^*(i)\right), \quad (4)$$

where v and w 's are parameters quantifying gate delay differences at different stages, $Sgn(\cdot)$ is the sign function, and ϕ^* 's are features transformed from challenge bits c 's according to

$$\phi^*(i) = (2c_i - 1)(2c_{i+1} - 1) \cdots (2c_n - 1) \quad (5)$$

for $i=1, \dots, n$. However, attackers do not know (c_1, \dots, c_n) , but know (b_1, \dots, b_{n+m}) , so they are not able to calculate ϕ^* but can calculate ϕ from $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n+m})$ according to (3).

Comparing (5) and (3) and utilizing (2), one can see that

$$\begin{cases} \phi(i) = \phi^*(i) \prod_{j=1}^m (2b_{i_j} - 1) & \text{for } i < i_1. \\ \phi(i) = \phi^*(i-k) \prod_{j=k+1}^m (2b_{i_j} - 1) & \text{for } i_k < i < i_{k+1}, \\ \phi(i) = \phi^*(i-m) & \text{for } i > i_m, \end{cases}$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$. Since $(2b_{i_j} - 1)$ is either 1 or -1 , from the equations above we can obtain

$$\begin{cases} \phi^*(i) = \phi(i) \prod_{j=1}^m (2b_{i_j} - 1) & \text{for } i < i_1. \\ \phi^*(i-k) = \phi(i) \prod_{j=k+1}^m (2b_{i_j} - 1) & \text{for } i_k < i < i_{k+1}, \\ \phi^*(i-m) = \phi(i) & \text{for } i > i_m, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$.

When $i_m < n+m$, from the definition of ϕ in (3) and utilizing the fact that $\phi(i)$ is either 1 or -1 , one can obtain $(2b_{i_j} - 1) = \phi(i_j)\phi(i_j+1)$ for all i_j , which, combining with (6) to imply that

$$\begin{cases} \phi^*(i) = \phi(i) \left(\prod_{j=1}^m \phi(i_j)\phi(i_j+1) \right) & \text{for } i < i_1, \\ \phi^*(i-k) = \phi(i) \left(\prod_{j=k+1}^m \phi(i_j)\phi(i_j+1) \right) & \text{for } i_k < i < i_{k+1}, \\ \phi^*(i-m) = \phi(i) & \text{for } i > i_m. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Thus, when $i_m < n+m$, Eqs. (7) and (4) combine to show that an n -stage APUF equipped with an m -plus-bits interface is a classification problem defined by a polynomial with ϕ 's being the variables, and the order of the polynomial is $(2m+1)$ if $i_1 > 1$, but of order $(2m-1)$ if $i_1 = 1$, since all these ϕ 's on the right hand side of (7) are different when any two ghost bits i_j and i_{j+1} are not consecutive.

When $i_m = n+m$, the term $(2b_{i_m} - 1)$ in (6) is equal to $\phi(n+m)$, not $\phi(i_m)\phi(i_m+1)$. So the representing polynomial will be of $(2m-2)$ -th order or $2m$ -th order depending on whether $i_1 > 1$ or not, one order lower than that for the case $i_m < n_m$ which corresponds to Eq.(7). This completes the proof of the theorem. ■

Theorem 1 has addressed issue (i) that was raised in the paragraph before the theorem, that is, the the interfaced APUFs are potentially secure against machine learning attacks when sufficient many ghost bits are used. For instance, when $m \geq 20$, the representing polynomial of the classification separation surface is of 38-th order or higher.

Theorem 1 indicates high potential for these interfaces to secure APUFs against machine learning attacks when the interfaces have a large number of ghost bits. But exactly how large the value of the parameter m can lead to secure APUFs have to be experimentally determined. Thus, in Sec. VI-A, we will experimentally examine how well interfaced PUFs perform against attacks with different values for interface parameters.

For issue (ii), it can be verified that the number of sets G_m 's satisfying $n/3 \leq m \leq n/2$ and $i_j + 1 < i_{j+1}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$ grows exponentially with n . This can be seen by choosing $m = n/2$ and i_1 from $\{1, 2\}$, i_2 from $\{4, 5\}$, \dots , i_j from $\{3j-2, 3j-1\}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, resulting in $2^m = 2^{n/2}$ possible sets G_m 's whose associated polynomials are of order of $2(m-2)$ or higher. So there are exponentially m -plus-bits interfaces which will turn an APUF into a classification problem defined by high-order polynomials.

III. THE AUTHENTICATION PROTOCOL

Communications between an IoT device and a server may involve commands from the server to the device or sensor data from the device to the server. It is helpful, and sometimes necessary, for the device to authenticate the source of a command it receives and for the sever to verify the source of the sensor data. Hence, we are focused on mutual authentication.

A. Technical Assumptions

Our protocol is to authenticate the communications between a resource-constrained PUF-embedded device and a securely protected resource-rich server. We assume that

1. the communication channel between the server and PUF is publicly accessible and all communication data, including CRPs, can be seen by third parties;
2. intermediate transient operation results on the device, including data temporally stored in registers, are not accessible by any party other than the device itself;
3. the device has a small nonvolatile memory (NVM) with a capacity far inadequate for storing all challenges used

or to be used in the operation life of the protocol, and data on the NVM are openly accessible but can be altered only by the device (or intrusions are detectable and will lead to suspension of device operation); and

4. the PUF physical variations that determine the PUF responses and the PUF internal wiring are inaccessible to any third-party.

One of the goals of our authentication protocol is to prevent successful modeling attacks of the PUF, including both conventional and reliability-based machine learning (ML) attacks. A reliability-based ML attack requires that each challenge be evaluated by the PUF multiple times and the CRPs be accessible by attackers. Conventional ML attacks are a more prevalent type of non-physical threats to strong PUFs. Suck attacks refer to those where attackers accumulate CRPs passively, like eavesdropping on the communications between the PUF and its trusted party. The accumulated CRPs are then used by the attackers to build machine learning models that can predict future responses of the PUFs after the models are trained with sufficient CRPs. Passive CRP accumulation becomes a choice for attackers when the PUF, under the control of its managing protocol, responds to an input challenge only after some security hurdle is cleared, e.g. after authentication of the source of some message received by the device, as in mutual authentication protocols.

B. Technical Requirements

1) Requirements to Fight Reliability-based ML Attacks:

Given the assumptions, we starts with discussing technical requirements on the protocol. These requirements are to be implemented on legitimate operations of the protocol with a goal of thwarting illegitimate activities including conventional and reliability-based modeling attacks.

Since reliability-based ML attacks require (i) repeated evaluation of same challenges and (ii) access to these CRPs by attackers, denying one of the two can prevent such attacks. Hiding or obfuscating either the challenges or the responses can prevent third-party accesses to CRPs, and repeated evaluations of challenges can be prevented if every challenge fed to the device is a fresh challenge never used before. Challenge freshness has been adopted by many protocols and will be part of our strategy to prevent reliability-based machine learning attacks. The following challenge freshness is the start of a technical requirement that will be presented later.

- R0. Every challenge used in legitimate authentications must be a fresh challenge never used in earlier authentications.

We wish to comment that the resource-constraint as specified in Assumption 3 is a factor for R0 in order to fight reliability-based machine learning attacks. This can be seen from a case of a resource-rich device with a large secure NVM. For such a device, during the enrollment event before deployment of the device, in a secure environment all challenges needed for the entire operational life are stored into the device's secure NVM and also into server's secure storage. Then, in each authentication, the device selects the first challenge in the challenge database, feeds it to the

PUF, send the responses to prove itself, and then deletes the challenge after the authentication. The server does the same to pick the first challenge from its own database and deletes it after the authentication. Since only responses but no challenges are transmitted through the communication channel, attackers have access only to responses but no access to CRPs, and hence authentications can function effectively and securely even if there are some repeated challenges. Thus, R0 would not be necessary for fighting reliability-based machine learning attacks without Assumption 3.

If attackers are restricted to collect CRPs only by passively listening to legitimate communications in and out of the PUF, R0 will be sufficient for preventing reliability-based ML attacks. But R0 stipulates only that every challenge used in legitimate authentications be fresh, but does not specify solution for limiting attackers to only passive CRP collection. Let us look at a scenario where a mutual authentication protocol is designed to have met R0 in a way that a PUF's trusted server supplies a fresh challenge together with a subsequence of responses to authenticate the server itself to the PUF. Then, attackers can collect legitimate CRPs passively, but can illegitimately supply to the PUF a used challenge together with the response subsequence to masquerade as the server.

The scenario shows that, in addition to R0, we must also fight replay attacks, where a replay attack is one in which some challenges already used by the protocol in earlier authentications are re-supplied to the device by an attacker, raising the risk of allowing adversaries to issue commands to the device. The replay attack is itself a threat and also a possible enabler of reliability-based attacks. Thus, we impose the following requirement for the protocol.

- R1. For the challenge used in each legitimate authentication,
- a. the device supplies some bits of the challenge, and
 - b. the device-supplied part of any challenge is fresh.

The R1.b is a stronger requirement than R0, since a fresh challenge (satisfying R0) can still have device-supplied part of the challenge not fresh. An implication of R1 is that the number of device-supplied challenge bits needs to be large enough, because it is not possible to maintain the freshness of a short device-supplied part of the challenge for the protocol designed to handle a large number of authentications during its operation life. For instance, if only 10 bits are device-supplied in a protocol that is expected to execute over thousands of authentications, challenge freshness cannot be maintained after executing 1024 authentications.

Requirement R1 is to prevent replay attacks like the one discussed in the paragraph preceding R1. For a device without a large NVM to store all used challenges (Assumption 3), the device has no way to keep track of used challenges. Without R1, even R0 cannot prevent an attacker from re-sending used challenges and response subsequences collected from the open communication channel (Assumption 1). Thus, Requirement 1 is essential for fighting replay attacks under the assumptions given in Sec. III-A. A rigorous statement on the security of the Requirement R1 against replay attacks is given below.

Theorem 2: Under the assumptions given in Sec. III-A, Requirement R1 is a sufficient and necessary condition for

a PUF-based mutual authentication protocol to defeat replay attacks.

Proof of Theorem 2: For a protocol meeting Requirement R1, any replay attack has to send non-device-supplied part of a used challenge and a response subsequence for the used challenge. But the device-supplied part of any used challenge will not be supplied by the device due to R1.b, and hence any replay attack cannot be successful, which establishes R1 as a sufficient condition.

To prove R1 as a necessary condition, we will examine two cases, where in case one R1.a is violated, and in case two, R1.a holds but R1.b is invalid. In case one, the scenario given in the paragraph that is two paragraphs ahead of Requirement R1 shows that there exist room for replay attacks when R1.a does not hold.

In case two where R1.b does not hold, the device will not reject an authentication request if the device-supplied part of a challenge is the same as the device-supplied part of an earlier legitimate challenge. Hence, an attacker can send a non-device-supplied part of the earlier challenge together with the response subsequence, and the device will likely accept the authentication request since the device has no way to keep track of all not-device-supplied parts of challenges without a large NVM to store all of them (Assumption 3), leading to the success of a replay attack.

We wish to comment that when R1.b is violated but R0 holds (meaning the not-device-supplied part of challenges used in legitimate operations are fresh), the attack described in case two of the necessary condition will remain successful, showing that R1.a plus R0 is insufficient to fight replay attacks.

Thus, under either case one or case two, replay attacks become possible, meaning that Requirement R1 is a necessary condition. This completes the proof of the theorem. ■

2) Requirements to Fight Conventional ML Attacks:

To fight conventional modeling attacks, we plan to use a modeling-attack-resistant PUF. Our philosophy is that if the PUF used in an authentication protocol is resistant to modeling attacks, the protocol itself, without considering the PUF which could be sophisticated, can be designed with high simplicity and low resource overhead by relying on the PUF to deliver security against modeling attacks. Simplistic protocols would take people less effort to identify their possible vulnerabilities and also incur low implementation overhead for the PUF-excluded part of the protocol. Protocol II in [6] employs this approach with the use of a component-differential-challenged XOR PUFs.

We are considering to use the highly lightweight interfaced APUF proposed in Sec II. The challenge obfuscation interface requires a condition to protect the obfuscation from being exposed. If the interfaced PUF is openly accessible and responds to any challenge, an attacker can choose challenges of particular bit patterns and the responses of the interfaced PUF could reveal the mapping function of the obfuscation. An exposed obfuscation mapping function will enable easy machine learning attacks of the interfaced APUF.

Requirement R1 helps reduce the exposure of the obfuscation by eliminating the opportunity for attackers to choose the

device-supplied challenge bits. But challenge bits that are not supplied by the device could possibly leave room for attackers if the protocol is not carefully designed. From the discussion near the end of Sec. II-B, the likelihood to defeat chosen-challenge attacks also depends on the number of bits which are random with an equal probability of being 0 or 1.

Even if device-supplied challenge bits are random and fresh, as long as the number of such challenge bits is not large enough, there might be chances for chosen-challenge attacks. The number of device-supplied challenge bits needed for fighting chosen-challenge attacks could be much larger than that required by R1 for fighting replay attacks.

For instance, if in a mutual authentication protocol designed for executing less than 4 billion authentications with the use of a 64-bit PUF, 32 challenge bits are device-supplied and made fresh by using a 32-bit maximum-length LFSR, and 32 remaining challenge bits together with 32 response bits are supplied by the server, and the device accepts an authentication request after the first 32 response bits generated by the device for the challenge match the received 32 response bits, within the protocol's error threshold. Then, upon an authentication request from an attacker, the device may generate 32 device-supplied challenge bits that are the same as the device-supplied part of an used legitimate challenge on exactly 31 bits (hence still fresh due to difference on 1 bit), the attacker can reply with the 32 server-supplied bits of the used challenge and the 32 response bits from the earlier legitimate authentication. If the authentication request is accepted by the device, the mismatched challenge bit on the device-supplied part has a high probability to be a ghost bit, and if multiple attacks of the this type happen to have the same mis-matched challenge bit on the device-supplied part, this bit is almost certainly a ghost bit. Of course, such an attack could take long time since it may take many authentication requests to have one pair of requests that have the two device-supplied challenge parts identical on 31 bits, and take even substantially more authentication requests to have multiple requests that have the same mis-matched bit. But after all, chosen-challenge attacks become possible under this protocol.

Thus, our strategy to eliminate opportunities for chosen-challenge attacks is that in every legitimate authentication, R2. all challenge bits are random with an equal probability of being 0 or 1, and the device-supplied part of the challenge is long enough to make chosen-challenge attacks impossible.

C. The Proposed Mutual Authentication Protocol

In the following, we presents a protocol that performs mutual authentication of communications between a device and a server, where an interfaced APUF has been embedded on the device and soft model of the PUF is available on the server. The protocol consists of an enrollment phase and an authentication phase, where the enrollment is a one-time event. We use the terminology an authentication session to denote a sequence of authentications in a duration in which the device is in continuous operation without being powered off, and an authentication session consists of one or multiple authentications. We also use the terminology master challenge to denote

the seed fed to a pseudo-random generator (implemented by an LFSR) to generate a sequence of derived challenges to be evaluated by the PUF.

Before presenting the enrollment and authentication, we list the device-side protocol-supporting architectural composition.

- An n -stage challenge obfuscation interfaced APUF with $(n+m)$ input bits, where $n \geq 64$ and m is an integer between $n/3$ and $n/2$;
- an $(n+m)$ -bit maximal-length Linear Feedback Shift Register (LFSR) as a pseudo-random number generator (PRNG);
- an $n/2$ -bit register R2 to hold $n/2$ response bits received from the server;
- an n -bit register R3 to store n responses generated by the PUF from a master challenge;
- a comparator for comparing if two $n/2$ -bit vectors have a Hamming distance below an authentication acceptance threshold; and
- a small NVM to store an $(n+m)$ -bit ID of the device, which will be updated during each authentication. This ID is denoted by C_{nvm} and is made publicly accessible.

The server has the following units and variables for the authentication protocol.

- An $(n+m)$ -bit LFSR which behaves exactly the same as the LFSR on the device;
- a soft model of the PUF on device, which is to be trained during the enrollment phase and assumed to generate, with a high probability of correctness, the response of the PUF for a challenge given to the PUF;
- a comparator for comparing if two $n/2$ -bit vectors have a Hamming distance below an authentication acceptance threshold; and
- an $(m+n)$ -bit variable $\text{ID}_{\text{device}}$ that stores the changing ID of the device. It is the server counterpart of C_{nvm} on the device, will be initialized during enrollment, and updated in each authentication.

Now, we are ready to present the authentication protocol, and we start with the enrollment.

The One-Time Enrollment Phase

- E1. Before the PUF is embedded into the device, the server collects a number of CRPs from the challenge obfuscated APUF to train a soft model to a satisfactory accuracy level. With the challenge obfuscation known to the server, the model training needs only a small number of CRPs, but the obfuscation is assumed to be unknown to any third party.
- E2. After completion of the training of the soft PUF model, the PUF is embedded into the device.
- E3. Assign an $(n+m)$ -bit initial id to the device, store this initial id in C_{nvm} on the device NVM, and also store it in an $(n+m)$ -bit $\text{ID}_{\text{device}}$ on the server. This device id will be updated in authentications, so it is called the initial device id during enrollment.

We choose to let the server initiate an authentication, as is done in several PUF-based authentication protocols [6], [24], [30]. In a server-initiated communication operation, the

server sends to the device a message containing metadata to authenticate the server as the source of the message, and also enable the device to prove itself as the source of a response message sent by the device to the server.

The Authentication Phase

Server

- A1. The server loads ID_{device} into the LFSR as the seed for the LFSR to generate n challenges of $(n+m)$ bits each, feeds the n challenges to the soft PUF model to get n responses.
- A2. Then the server sends a vector of $(n/2)$ bits to the device, with the $(n/2)$ bits from the first half of the n responses generated by the soft PUF model.

Device

- A3. The device receives the $(n/2)$ -bit vector from the sever and stores them into R2, and then loads C_{nvmm} into the LFSR as the master challenge for this authentication.
- A4. The device goes through n iterations as in the following: starting with the master challenge as the first challenge, in each iteration the bit vector in the LFSR is used as the challenge to the PUF to get 1-bit PUF response and store it into R3, and then the LFSR generate the next $(n+m)$ -bit vector.
(Comment: After the n iterations, all n bits of PUF responses are generated and stored into R3, and what remains in the LFSR is a bit vector that has not been fed to the PUF)
- A5. The device compares R2 with the first $n/2$ bits of R3.
- A6. if Hamming distance of comparison is larger than threshold, the device aborts the authentication;
else
the device authenticates the server, sends the last $n/2$ bits of R3 to the server, and stores the bit vector in the LFSR into C_{nvmm} on the NVM.

Server

- A7. The server receives $n/2$ bits from the device and compares them with the second half of the n response bits out of the PUF soft model,
- A8. if the Hamming distance is larger than the threshold, the server rejects the received message;
else
the server authenticates the device as the source of the message, and then stores the current bit vector in the LFSR into ID_{device} .

End of an authentication

IV. DISCUSSIONS ON THE LIGHTWEIGHTNESS OF THE PROTOCOL

In this section, we discuss the device-side hardware, operation and communication overheads of the protocol proposed in the preceding section, and compare the overheads with those of existing PUF-based authentication protocols.

A. Communication and Operation Overheads for the Device

1) Communication Overhead:

One difference with most, if not all, PUF-based protocols is that our protocol does not use a permanent-value device ID, but a value-changing device ID which is also used as the master challenge. By sharing this ID with the server during enrollment and updating it with an LFSR which is known to the server (and also assumed to be known to attackers), we have eliminated the need to communicate the challenges between the device and the server. Actually, all communication metadata used for one authentication event are $(n/2)$ bits from the server to the device in Steps A2-A3 and $(n/2)$ bits from the device to the server in Steps A6-A7.

On the amount of communication data and number of PUF evaluations used in protocols, Idriss et al. [27] compared four PUF-based authentication protocols [6], [22], [24], [27], and the protocol of Gu et al. [24] has the lowest amount of communication data among the four protocols and also the lowest number of PUF evaluations. Upon examining the protocol [24], we found that the amount of the communication metadata of our protocol is about half of that of the protocol [24]. Specifically, the protocol [24] sends a half-length challenge from server to device and sends another half-length challenge concatenated with device ID from device to server, which, at this point, has already passed amount of the communication data of our protocol (due to sending the device ID), and then executes a pair of send-recv operations between the device and server. We also found that the number of PUF evaluation of our protocol might be slightly lower than that of the protocol of Gu et al. [24], which performs evaluations of the False PUF and the Genuine PUF. The numbers of response bits generated from the evaluations of the False PUF and the Genuine PUF are not known, but understanding of the protocol [24] leads to an estimate of $n/2$ response bits out of evaluations of the False PUF and n response bits out of evaluations of the Genuine PUF, amounting to a total of $3n/2$ bits. As a comparison, our protocol evaluates the PUF to get n response bits.

2) Operation Overhead:

For device-side operation complexity, our protocol is operationally simplistic, and the major operations executed on the device include generation of n challenges for the PUF, n evaluations of the PUF, and a comparison of two $(n/2)$ -bit vectors. Mutual authentication protocols usually need to perform these operations on the device if the device receives only one challenge to produce n responses. The only protocols under which the device does not need to generate n challenges are protocols that let the device receive n challenges, but at the communication overhead of receiving n challenges in addition to the remaining operations our protocol executes (n evaluations of the PUF and a comparison of two bit-vectors of about $(n/2)$ bits).

B. Hardware Overhead for the Device

1) PUF-Excluded Hardware Overhead:

The supporting architecture of our protocol consists of an $(n+m)$ -bit LFSR (a PRNG), two other registers (one $n/2$ bits and the other n bits), and a comparator of two $(n/2)$ -bit

vectors, and an PUF. To the best of our knowledge, all mutual authentication protocols that receive only one master challenge for generating n bits of responses need similar hardware units for the device.

Some protocols [25]–[27] do not use LFSR for the device but either let the device receive n challenges for generating n bits of responses, or use a TRNG to generate challenges which need to send to the server. One protocol [20] does not explicitly mention LFSR, and from the description of the protocol an LFSR or a bit-vectors generator is necessary since one challenge is sent to the device to generate a multiple bits of PUF responses.

In addition, most of existing protocols [6], [20], [22]–[27] need a TRNG for the device, and to the best of our knowledge only one protocol [21] uses an LFSR but does not need a device-side TRNG. The protocols [25]–[27] do not have device-side LFSR (or PRNG) but have a TRNG on the device. As shown in [25], a TRNG implemented on FPGA has about twice hardware overhead as that of an APUF. We estimate that an $(n+m)$ -bit LFSR, for $m \leq n/2$, has an area overhead below 0.9 times of that of an n -bit APUF, meaning that our LFSR probably incurs a lower hardware overhead than a TRNG. Thus, before considering the PUF, our protocol is among the protocols with the lowest device-side hardware overhead among all protocols we are aware of [6], [20]–[27].

2) *Overhead of the PUF:*

On the overhead of the PUF, our protocol uses one APUF with a zero-transistor obfuscation interface. Several of the highly secure protocols either use multiple APUFs or use a PUF with multiple APUFs as components. For instances, the protocol of Gao et al. [20] also uses the highly lightweight APUF, but uses three APUF instances to resolve collisions resulting from the intersection of a randomly selected bit groups from two pre-given bit groups. The highly simplistic lockdown technique-based protocol II [6] uses a CDC XPUF, which, at the time the paper is under preparation, has to have more than 6 component APUFs [31], [32] to stay secure against the logistic regression-based modeling attack [13]. The communication-efficient and operation-efficient protocol of Gu et al. [24] uses two PUFs. So our protocol has a lower PUF area overhead than these protocols.

There are also protocols [21], [25]–[27] that use only one APUF. The protocol of Zalivaka et al. [21] uses an APUF with its input challenge obfuscated by an MISR unit consisting of a D flip-flop, two XOR gates and two AND gates for each challenge bit, which we estimated to have about 1.5 times area overhead of that of an APUF.

The two protocols A and B of Chen et al. [25] use a device-side TRNG and other hardware units but no LFSR, and each protocol sums up a device-side overhead much higher than that of an LFSR. Specifically, the one-sided authentication protocol A of Chen et al. [25] employs TRNG-based random shuffle of response groups to obfuscate the response, where the TRNG and the shuffle are additional overhead besides the APUF with the shuffle estimated by us to have an area overhead of at least half of that of an APUF and the TRNG shown in [25] to have a higher FPGA implementation overhead than the APUF. The mutual authentication protocol B of Chen

et al. [25] uses an APUF, a TRNG, and a major additional hardware overhead which was shown by themselves [25] to have an FPGA implementation close to that of the APUF. Both protocols A and B in [25] do not need LFSR for the device but at the cost of receiving $n = k \cdot q$ challenges for generating n responses. The one-sided authentication protocol of Zhang and Shen [26] has a low device-side hardware overhead with a PUF, a TRNG, a small NVM, and no LFSR, slightly higher than the overhead of our protocol. But it is unknown if it is possible to modify the protocol of Zhang and Shen [26] into a mutual authentication protocol at an affordable additional hardware/operational overhead. The mutual authentication protocol of Idriss et al. [27] introduces a new technique to obfuscate both the challenge to and the response from an single APUF, and its major device hardware overhead besides the APUF is a TRNG (LFSR is not needed). Thus, compared with these five single-APUF-based protocols, our protocol also has an advantage in hardware overhead.

V. SECURITY OF THE PROTOCOL AGAINST REPLAY AND RELIABILITY-BASED MODELING ATTACKS

Letting the device take all challenge bits from the device and using a maximal-length LFSR as a PRNG to generate challenges using the initial value of the device ID as the seed, the protocol practically guarantees the freshness of the device-supplied part of every challenge used in legitimate authentications due to the extremely long cycle of 2^{n+m} for a maximal-length LFSR. This means that the protocol satisfies Requirement R1, which prevents replay attacks and reliability attacks as revealed by Theorem 2.

VI. SECURITY OF THE PROTOCOL AGAINST CONVENTIONAL MODELING ATTACKS

The security of the protocol against conventional modeling attacks obviously depends on the protocol's capability of defeating chosen-challenge attacks. The use of a maximal-length LFSR means that every bit of the challenge is random with equal probability of being 0 or 1 within the cycle of the LFSR. In addition, by letting the device take all challenge bits from the device, the protocol meets Requirement R2 as long as the the number of challenge bits 2^{n+m} is large enough, and discussions near the end of Sec. II-B show that $n = 64$ and $m = 20$ is sufficient. Thus, chosen-challenge attacks are prevented by the protocol.

According to Kerckhoff's principle, attackers are assumed to know the design of a security system but not the secret key. For this protocol, all responses are sent over open communication channels, and all challenges fed to the interfaced PUF are also publicly known since the initial value of the device ID is known publicly and the LFSR is assumed to be known publicly. The "secret key" of the PUF, as specified in Assumption 4, is made up of the physical variations that determine the PUF responses and the mapping that implements the challenge obfuscation. Thus, all CRPs used in authentications are available to attackers, providing abundant data for training machine learning attack models. Thus, the security of the protocol against conventional modeling attacks is determined




Fig. 1. The neural network architecture of the attack method

by the security of the interfaced APUF against modeling attacks when all CRPs are openly accessible CRPs.

In general, classification problems with highly nonlinear separation surfaces are more difficult to be machine learned than ones with less nonlinear separation surfaces. Theorem 1 shows that the separation surface of an interfaced APUF is defined by a high-order multivariate polynomial when the number of ghost bits, m , is large. But exactly how large the value of m can lead to secure APUFs have to be experimentally determined. In the following, we will experimentally examine how well interfaced APUFs perform against modeling attacks with different numbers of ghost bits.

A. Experimental Attack Study of Interfaced APUFs

1) The Modeling Attack Method Used in Attack Study:

Among existing modeling attack methods, some are tailor designed for the circuit architectures of the PUFs, including the popular attack on XOR PUFs (XPUFs) of Rührmair et al. [13] which employs the logistic regression (LR) for each component APUF of the XOR PUF, which has also been used in combination with other techniques for attacking the noise bifurcation protocol [31] and the IPUF [33]. Some other attack methods employ generally applicable machine learning methods, like neural network methods [14], [15], [17], [28], [34], [35], which have cracked an extensive range of sophisticated PUFs, including XPUFs, FPUFs, MPUFs [36], LSPUFs, IPUFs, FF-XPUFs [37]. Among the generally applicable machine learning attack methods, the neural network method [35] that employs hyperbolic tangent activation functions (\tanh) for hidden layers exhibits the highest attack power for the most extensive range of PUFs, taking magnitudes lower training times and magnitudes fewer training data than earlier attack methods, even showed higher attack power on XPUFs than the LR-based method [13] tailor-designed for attacking XPUFs. The attack power of this method [35] on a range of PUFs was confirmed by the study [15]. Thus, the attack method [35] is chosen for our experimental attack study of the interfaced PUFs.

2) Parameters of Our Attack Method:

To choose values for parameters of the neural network attack method [35] for our experimental attack study, we ran test

attacks using ranges of neural network parameter values on different PUF types, including the XOR PUF, the Interpose PUF, and the interfaced APUF, and choose the following neural network architecture, with other parameters listed in Table I.

- The input layer of $n + m$ bits b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n+m} , where n is the number of PUF stages and m is the number of ghost bits;
- the transform layer that transforms input bits from input layer to ϕ 's according to
$$\phi(i) = (2b_i - 1)(2b_{i+1} - 1) \cdots (2b_{n+m} - 1);$$
- four layers of densely connected neurons whose weights for all neurons are to be trained, where the numbers of neurons at these layers are specified in Table I;
- the single-bit output layer to produce the output that models the response of the PUF.

TABLE I
NEURAL NETWORK FOR ATTACKING 64-STAGE PUFs

Parameter	Description
Optimizing Method	ADAM
Hidden Lyr. Actv. Fx.	\tanh
Output Lyr. Actv. Fx.	Sigmoid
Learning Rate	Adaptive
Hidden Layers	4 hidden lyr. (64, 32, 32, 64)
Loss Function	Binary cross entropy
Mini-batch Size	100K
Kernel Initializer	Random Normal
Epoch	500
Early Stopping	Validation accuracy $\geq 98\%$

3) The Attack Software, Platform, and Set-ups:

The attack method was implemented in Python using the TensorFlow machine learning library, and run on a single core of a multicore Intel Xeon Broadwell E5-2695 v4 processor of 2.1 GHz clock rate. The machine learning method for each PUF-interface instance is run for up to 500 epochs with an early stopping when the training validation accuracy reaches 98%. The experiments used an 84-1-15 training-testing split, with 84% of CRP data for training, 1% of data for validation, and 15% of the data for testing the trained model by predicting the response of the PUF using the trained model.

B. Comparative Experimental Attack Studies

We have chosen a set of interfaces with different interface parameters for 64-stage APUFs. Interface notations with different interface parameter values as indicated by the first column in Table II, where G_m indicates interfaces with 18 ghost bits.

In the experiments, for each type of interfaces listed in Table II, 20 different instances of interface-PUF pairs were generated. In the generation of instances of interface-PUF pairs, for each interface-PUF pair,

- interface parameters were chosen to satisfy the specifications of the interface type of the row, with some parameters randomly chosen (e.g. positions of ghost

bits are random while meeting the requirements of the interface) and some other parameters selected uniquely (e.g. number of ghost bits), and

- gate delay differences for APUF instances were randomly chosen.

TABLE II
EXPERIMENTAL ATTACK RESULTS

PUF Type	Total CRPs	Success Rate
9-XOR PUF	1 M	0%
	10 M	50%
	40 M	90%
(1,8)-Interpose PUF	1 M	0%
	10 M	10%
	40 M	90%
(7,7)-Interpose PUF	1 M	0%
	10 M	0%
	40 M	70%
G ₁₅ -interfaced APUF	1 M	0%
	10 M	5%
	40 M	10%
G ₁₈ -interfaced APUF	1 M	0%
	10 M	0%
	40 M	10%
G ₂₁ -interfaced APUF	1 M	0%
	10 M	0%
	40 M	0%
G ₂₄ -interfaced APUF	1 M	0%
	10 M	0%
	40 M	0%
G ₂₇ -interfaced APUF	1 M	0%
	10 M	0%
	40 M	0%

In the experiments, from each instance of interface-PUF pair, random CRPs were generated using the simulation software [38]. In each attack of a PUF-interface instance, the number of CRPs listed in a row in Table II is the total number of CRPs used for the training, validation and testing, the Success Rate column lists the percentage of attacks that produced testing accuracy of at least 80%. An accuracy of 80% is chosen as the threshold for the success of an attack, because PUF-based protocols employing APUFs or interfaced APUFs can easily use 90% bit-matching as authentication threshold due to APUFs' high reliability usually at upper 90%, much higher than the reliability of many sophisticated more modeling-attack-resistant PUFs (e.g. XPUFs, IPUFs). For such protocols, attacks with prediction accuracy below 80% will have no chance to successfully impersonate a PUF. Besides, 80% is a reasonably high standard for examining the security of an interface against modeling attacks since choosing 90% will make a lot more interfaces look secure.

We carried out attacks on the computer described in Section VI-A and have listed The attack results in Table II. Due the high modeling-attack resistance of large XOR PUFs and IPUFs, for comparison, we also used neural networks of the same specifications as given in Table I to attack some XOR

PUFs and IPUFs, and the attack results are also listed in Table II.

The data in the table clearly show the effectiveness of the interface, and the success rate of attacks on all tested interfaced APUFs were much lower than that of attacks on XPUFs and IPUFs. In addition, the success rate for attacks on interfaced PUFs decreases with the increase of ghost bits, supporting Theorem 1 which reveals that the polynomial order of the separation surface of interfaced APUFs increases with the ghost bits. Attack success rate reaches 0% success rate for all tested cases when the number of ghost bits hits 21 or higher, and these experimental attack results, together with Theorem 1, indicate that interfaced APUFs with ghost bits beyond 21 will very likely stay secure against modeling attacks.

The number of ghost bits needed to attain 0% success rate is less than $n/2$ with n being the number of PUF stages. Then, the data in Table II together with the discussion on issue (ii) in Sec. II-C suggest that there are exponentially many interfaces which can secure 64-stage APUFs against the currently most powerful machine learning attack method.

VII. CONCLUSION

Many IoT devices are resource-constrained, and call for authentication protocols implementable with low hardware overhead and operable with low power. Strong PUFs have the potential as hardware primitives for implementing lightweight authentication protocols, but many of them are vulnerable to modeling attacks. Modeling-attack-resistant PUFs are clearly more advantageous in enabling the development of simplistic authentication protocols with simple and lightweight operations and lower hardware overhead (when not counting the PUF), but most existing PUFs attain high security with large PUF circuit architectural sizes, and large architectural sizes lead to higher hardware overhead. Ingeniously designed protocols exist that obfuscate the challenges, the responses, or both while using lightweight PUFs.

In this paper, we are investigating the possibility of protocol-PUF co-design for a mutual authentication protocol using only probably the most lightweight strong PUF while maintaining hardware overhead at a level competitive with existing protocols of low overhead in both hardware and operation. The security of our protocol is designed to resist both conventional and reliability-based machine learning attacks, where reliability-based attacks are taken care of by protocol-level techniques and the resistance to conventional machine learning attacks is enabled by a zero-transistor challenge input interface which has a weakness protected by the protocol.

The interface admits more input bits than the number of PUF stages, and these additional input bits are called ghost challenge bits. When enough ghost bits are used, the challenge input interface has thwarted currently the most powerful modeling attack method in experimental attack studies, and the experimentally observed growth in security against modeling attacks matches theoretical analysis which reveals that the polynomial order of the separation surface of the interfaced APUF increases with the ghost bits.

With a low hardware-and-operation overhead and high security against modeling attacks, the co-designed protocol-PUF pair presents itself an excellent candidate for securely authenticating resource-constrained IoT devices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Computing resources at the High Performance Computing Center (HPCC) of Texas Tech University were used for part of the work.

REFERENCES

- [1] U. Rührmair and D. E. Holcomb, "Pufs at a glance," in *2014 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 1–6.
- [2] G. E. Suh and S. Devadas, "Physical unclonable functions for device authentication and secret key generation," in *2007 44th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 9–14.
- [3] B. Gassend, D. Clarke, M. Van Dijk, and S. Devadas, "Controlled physical random functions," in *18th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference, 2002. Proceedings*. IEEE, 2002, pp. 149–160.
- [4] —, "Silicon physical random functions," in *Proceedings of the 9th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*. ACM, 2002, pp. 148–160.
- [5] C. Herder, M.-D. Yu, F. Koushanfar, and S. Devadas, "Physical unclonable functions and applications: A tutorial," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 102, no. 8, pp. 1126–1141, 2014.
- [6] M.-D. Yu, M. Hiller, J. Delvaux, R. Sowell, S. Devadas, and I. Verbauwhede, "A lockdown technique to prevent machine learning on pufs for lightweight authentication," *IEEE Transactions on Multi-Scale Computing Systems*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 146–159, 2016.
- [7] B. Gassend, D. Lim, D. Clarke, M. Van Dijk, and S. Devadas, "Identification and authentication of integrated circuits," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 16, no. 11, pp. 1077–1098, 2004.
- [8] J. W. Lee, D. Lim, B. Gassend, G. E. Suh, M. Van Dijk, and S. Devadas, "A technique to build a secret key in integrated circuits for identification and authentication applications," in *2004 Symposium on VLSI Circuits. Digest of Technical Papers (IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37525)*. IEEE, 2004, pp. 176–179.
- [9] D. Lim, J. W. Lee, B. Gassend, G. E. Suh, M. Van Dijk, and S. Devadas, "Extracting secret keys from integrated circuits," *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems*, vol. 13, no. 10, pp. 1200–1205, 2005.
- [10] M. Majzoobi, F. Koushanfar, and M. Potkonjak, "Lightweight secure pufs," in *2008 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 670–673.
- [11] P. H. Nguyen, D. P. Sahoo, C. Jin, K. Mahmood, U. Rührmair, and M. van Dijk, "The interpose puf: Secure puf design against state-of-the-art machine learning attacks," *IACR Transactions on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*, pp. 243–290, 2019.
- [12] N. Wisiol, "Towards attack resilient delay-based strong pufs," in *IEEE International Symposium on Hardware Oriented Security and Trust (HOST)*, 2022, pp. 5–8.
- [13] U. Rührmair, F. Sehnke, J. Sölter, G. Dror, S. Devadas, and J. Schmidhuber, "Modeling attacks on physical unclonable functions," in *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*. ACM, 2010, pp. 237–249.
- [14] P. Santikellur, A. Bhattacharyay, and R. S. Chakraborty, "Deep learning based model building attacks on arbiter puf compositions," *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, vol. 2019, p. 566, 2019.
- [15] N. Wisiol, B. Thapaliya, K. T. Mursi, J.-P. Seifert, and Y. Zhuang, "Neural-network modeling attacks on arbiter-puf-based designs," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 2719–2731, 2022.
- [16] N. Wisiol, G. Becker, M. Margraf, T. Soroceanu, J. Tobisch, and B. Zengin, "Breaking the lightweight secure puf: Understanding the relation of input transformations and machine learning resistance," in *International Conference on Smart Card Research and Advanced Applications*. Springer, 2019, pp. 40–54.
- [17] B. Thapaliya, K. T. Mursi, and Y. Zhuang, "Machine learning-based vulnerability study of interpose pufs as security primitives for iot networks," in *IEEE International Conference on Networking, Architecture and Storage (NAS)*, 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [18] J. Tobisch, A. Aghaie, and G. T. Becker, "Combining optimization objectives: New modeling attacks on strong pufs," *IACR Transactions on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*, vol. 2021, pp. 357–389, 2021.
- [19] J. Ye, Y. Hu, and X. Li, "Rpuf: Physical unclonable function with randomized challenge to resist modeling attack," in *2016 IEEE Asian Hardware-Oriented Security and Trust (AsianHOST)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [20] Y. Gao, G. Li, H. Ma, S. F. Al-Sarawi, O. Kavehei, D. Abbott, and D. C. Ranasinghe, "Obfuscated challenge-response: A secure lightweight authentication mechanism for puf-based pervasive devices," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communication Workshops (PerCom Workshops)*, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [21] S. S. Zalivaka, A. A. Ivaniuk, and C.-H. Chang, "Reliable and modeling attack resistant authentication of arbiter puf in fpga implementation with trinary quadruple response," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1109–1123, 2019.
- [22] M. Majzoobi, M. Rostami, F. Koushanfar, D. S. Wallach, and S. Devadas, "Slender puf protocol: A lightweight, robust, and secure authentication by substring matching," in *2012 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops*, 2012, pp. 33–44.
- [23] M.-D. Yu, D. M'Raihi, I. Verbauwhede, and S. Devadas, "A noise bifurcation architecture for linear additive physical functions," in *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Hardware-Oriented Security and Trust (HOST)*, 2014, pp. 124–129.
- [24] C. Gu, C.-H. Chang, W. Liu, S. Yu, Y. Wang, and M. O'Neill, "A modeling attack resistant deception technique for securing lightweight-puf-based authentication," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1183–1196, 2021.
- [25] S. Chen, B. Li, Z. Chen, Y. Zhang, C. Wang, and C. Tao, "Novel strong-puf-based authentication protocols leveraging shamir's secret sharing," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 16, pp. 14408–14425, 2022.
- [26] J. Zhang and C. Shen, "Set-based obfuscation for strong pufs against machine learning attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 288–300, 2021.
- [27] T. A. Idriss, H. A. Idriss, and M. A. Bayoumi, "A lightweight puf-based authentication protocol using secret pattern recognition for constrained iot devices," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 80546–80558, 2021.
- [28] A. O. Aseeri, Y. Zhuang, and M. S. Alkathiri, "A machine learning-based security vulnerability study on xor pufs for resource-constraint internet of things," in *2018 IEEE International Congress on Internet of Things (ICIOT)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 49–56.
- [29] C. Xu, L. Zhang, M.-K. Law, X. Zhao, P.-I. Mak, and R. P. Martins, "Modeling-attack-resistant strong puf exploiting stagewise obfuscated interconnections with improved reliability," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 18, pp. 16300–16315, 2023.
- [30] M. A. Qureshi and A. Munir, "Puf-rla: A puf-based reliable and lightweight authentication protocol employing binary string shuffling," in *2019 IEEE 37th International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD)*, 2019, pp. 576–584.
- [31] J. Tobisch and G. T. Becker, "On the scaling of machine learning attacks on pufs with application to noise bifurcation," in *International Workshop on Radio Frequency Identification: Security and Privacy Issues*. Springer, 2015, pp. 17–31.
- [32] G. Li, K. T. Mursi, A. O. Aseeri, M. S. Alkathiri, and Y. Zhuang, "A new security boundary of component differentially challenged xor pufs against machine learning modeling attacks," *International Journal of Computer Networks & Communications*, vol. 14, p. 3, May 2022.
- [33] N. Wisiol, C. Mühl, N. Pirnay, P. H. Nguyen, M. Margraf, J.-P. Seifert, M. van Dijk, and U. Rührmair, "Splitting the Interpose PUF: A Novel Modeling Attack Strategy," *IACR Transactions on Cryptographic Hardware and Embedded Systems*, pp. 97–120, June 2020.
- [34] G. Hospodar, R. Maes, and I. Verbauwhede, "Machine learning attacks on 65nm arbiter pufs: Accurate modeling poses strict bounds on usability," in *2012 IEEE international workshop on Information forensics and security (WIFS)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 37–42.
- [35] K. T. Mursi, B. Thapaliya, Y. Zhuang, A. O. Aseeri, and M. S. Alkathiri, "A fast deep learning method for security vulnerability study of xor pufs," *Electronics*, vol. 9, no. 10, p. 1715, 2020.
- [36] D. P. Sahoo, D. Mukhopadhyay, R. S. Chakraborty, and P. H. Nguyen, "A multiplexer-based arbiter puf composition with enhanced reliability and security," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 403–417, 2017.
- [37] S. V. S. Avvaru, Z. Zeng, and K. K. Parhi, "Homogeneous and heterogeneous feed-forward xor physical unclonable functions," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 2485–2498, 2020.

- [38] N. Wisiol, C. Gräbnitz, C. Mühl, B. Zengin, T. Soroceanu, N. Pirnay, and K. T. Mursi, *pypuf: Cryptanalysis of Physically Unclonable Functions*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3901410>.



Yu Zhuang received his PhD in Computer Science and PhD in Mathematics both in 2000 at Louisiana State University. He was a visiting assistant professor at the computer science department of Illinois Institute of Technology from April to July of 2001, and has been with Texas Tech computer science department since September 2001. Dr. Zhuang's research interests include IoT security, high-dimensional data modeling and mining, high performance scientific computing.



Gaoxiang Li received the B.S. degree in Computer Science and Technology from Shandong Normal University, Jinan, China, in 2017 and the M.S. degree in Computer Science from Auburn University, Auburn, USA, in 2020. He is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science with the Department of Computer Science, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA. His research interests include machine learning, IoT security, and physical unclonable functions.