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Abstract—Gait has been proposed as a feature for mobile device pairing across arbitrary positions on the human body. Results indicate that the correlation in gait-based features across different body locations is sufficient to establish secure device pairing. However, the population size of the studies is limited and powerful attackers with e.g. capability of video recording are not considered. We present a concise discussion of security properties of gait-based pairing schemes including a discussion of popular quantization schemes, classification and analysis of attack surfaces, analysis of statistical properties of generated sequences, an entropy analysis, as well as possible threats and security weaknesses of gait-based pairing systems. For one of the schemes considered, we present modifications to fix an identified security flaw. As a general limitation of gait-based authentication or pairing systems, we further demonstrate that an adversary with video support can create key sequences that are sufficiently close to on-body generated acceleration sequences to breach gait-based security mechanisms.

1 INTRODUCTION

With the proliferation of mobile devices and the upcoming Internet of Things, interaction between these devices will drastically increase [1]. In particular, on-body devices covering smart appliances, smart textile and digital assistants are to generate a dense body area network of connected devices [2]. This is extended by spontaneous pairings with devices interacted with during the context of use [3]. In such environment where the number of device pairings raises by \( n \) with each \( n + 1 \)st new device, and where device count and type changes on a sub-day schedule, manual pairing is impractical. Implicit pairing schemes have therefore been proposed e.g. based on acceleration [4], audio [5], magnetometer [6] and RF features [7]. From these, especially gait [8] is well suited in wearable settings as it is confined to a single person’s body and can be easily read out at arbitrary location on the body [9].

Supported by user studies, it has been argued that gait can even be exploited as a biometric feature for user authentication e.g. unlocking smartphones [10], [11], [12], [13]. However, criticism on this assertion has been raised since the usual population considered is small and also powerful informed attackers have seldom been assumed [14]. Such attacker constitutes e.g. trained professional impostors, video supported attackers or sophisticated exploitation of the underlying protocols. Given that gait is continuously exposed in everyday interaction, it is further valid to ask whether such attackers might be able to steal gait [15] and use it for authentication at some different point in time.

In contrast to such gait-based authentication approaches, this paper investigates gait-based pairing of devices co-located on the same body. In particular, device-pairing exploits correlation in instantaneous gait features and does not assume or require that gait can be exploited as a biometric feature. It is therefore not feasible to use historical gait information in order to break a gait-based pairing scheme.

A number of gait-based pairing schemes have been proposed recently [16], [17], [18], [19]. However, no concise study of the security properties of quantization approaches for gait-based pairing has been presented to-date.

With this article, we close this gap by providing a comprehensive classification of attack surfaces for gait-based device-pairing and authentication schemes. Furthermore, we present an in-depth analysis of four popular quantization schemes presented recently for gait-based on-body device pairing. This analysis covers protocol-specific attack surfaces and potential security weaknesses of these schemes, as well as distribution, statistical and entropy analysis of the key sequences generated. In particular, for one of the schemes, we identify and present an improvement to the quantization scheme that can mitigate the security weakness found. Finally, we show that a sophisticated adversary using video recordings is able to break gait-based pairing schemes if executed in real-time. This also constitutes a first empirical example of how gait can be stolen in gait-based authentication systems. Summarizing, our contributions are

- a concise investigation and comparison of popular quantization schemes for gait-based device-pairing,
- a comprehensive discussion of attack surfaces for gait-based pairing approaches,
- an entropy, pattern and statistical analysis for popular quantization schemes for gait-based pairing,
- an improved quantization approach for one of the
investigated approaches to mitigate the identified security weakness, as well as

- the first ever empirical demonstration that video is capable to estimate gait sufficiently accurate to break gait-based security schemes.

2 RELATED WORK

We discuss recent related studies on gait-based security mechanisms. In particular, we first discuss gait recognition approaches, before we summarize recent progress in gait-based authentication and gait-based pairing. In the remainder of the discussion, we are then focusing on using acceleration sequences from natural gait for device pairing. In particular, we do not consider the use of gait for user authentication. As discussed in Section 2.2, gait as a biometric measure has several limitations and its strength as the seed for the authentication is, even after many years of research, questioned by some. In contrast, we consider attempts to exploit gait as a stimuli acceleration-based ad-hoc pairing, which utilizes the correlation in sensor readings for devices in the same context. In contrast to authentication, ad-hoc pairing generates instantaneous one-time keys. It is therefore not affected by stolen historical gait sequences but relies on the entropy in short-time fluctuation of simultaneous readings from correlated sources. Specifically, machine learning is not feasible for ad-hoc pairing as the challenges created are always fresh and shall not follow common predictable or learnable patterns. The features exploited for key generation can further not have their origin in activity recognition, as such coarse classes would result in small, and therefore weak key spaces.

2.1 Gait Recognition

Traditionally, gait recognition has been applied exploiting machine vision [20], [21], [22], [23]. Systems then comprise one or multiple cameras to capture natural gait and contain image recognition steps including background subtraction, feature extraction and recognition [24]. First work goes back to perception experiments on light point displays conducted in [10]. This work was further developed in [25] with computer vision approaches to recognize people from gait. In preceding years drastic improvements have been made in gait recognition algorithms [26], [27]. Gait recognition approaches can be grouped into (1) temporal alignment-based, (2) static parameter-based and (3) silhouette shape-based approaches [22]. From these, [28] found that shape is more significant for person identification than kinematics.

Temporal alignment-based approaches emphasize both shape and dynamics and first extract silhouette features before aligning sequences of these e.g. with temporal correlation, dynamic time warping or hidden Markov models.

Static parameter-based approaches exploit gait dynamics such as stride length, cadence and stride speed [29]. However, they are less successful for gait-based identification due to their need for 3D calibration information.

Finally, silhouette shape-based approaches use silhouette shape similarity and disregard temporal information, often considering averaged silhouettes or treating silhouette shapes as collection without specific order [22]. For all above methods, gait recognition can be improved by combining statistical gait features from real and synthetic templates [21].

Due to the increasing availability of wearable sensors such as gyroscopes (rotation), accelerometers (acceleration) or force sensors (force during walking), gait recognition via such wearable sensors is increasingly investigated [11], [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], [35]. In these approaches, acceleration sequences are recorded from devices located at various body locations, most prominently at the waist. The acceleration signal is then denoised e.g. by applying wavelet transformation [34] and changes in walking speed are mitigated utilizing dynamic time warping [36] or similar approaches. Individual steps are identified from the resulting signal by searching for minima and by applying pattern or template matching [34]. Similarity can be estimated by the computation of cross-correlation [33]. Alternatively, machine learning classifiers are trained and applied [32].

Finally, a recent technique employed to acquire human gait is to monitor phase changes of an electromagnetic signal reflected from a subject walking towards a transceiver [37], [38]. The authors exploit changes in channel state information (CSI) from WiFi devices for the detection of gait. After generating spectrograms from CSI measurements, similar to Doppler radars, and applying autocorrelation on the torso reflection to remove imperfections in these spectrograms, fine-grained gait patterns are extracted.

Note that frequently, sensors installed in the floor such as pressure sensing mats are also mentioned as modalities for gait recognition [39], [40]. However, in these cases, not gait itself is extracted but other features such as footprints [40], ground reaction force [41] or heel-to-toe ratio [42].

2.2 Gait as a Biometric Pattern for Authentication

Authentication systems comprise sensors converting analog stimuli to digital input that can then be quantized and compared to a database of previously stored features. Thus, these systems allow authentication based on biometric features. Gait as a discriminating feature was first studied in [10], [43]. It has been realized that characteristic features in gait enable identification of subjects also in larger gait databases [44], [45], [46], [47]. In addition, multiple studies have demonstrated that the success probability of an imposter trying to mimic a subject's gait are low even when trained professionals with similar physical characteristics are employed [9]. For instance, Hoang et al. [48] generated a key fingerprint from the difference of a mean gait spanning the complete population to the individual’s mean gait. In this way, the authors assured that the resulting sequence is well balanced and uniformly distributed. A good overview on gait-based user authentication is provided in [49], [50].

However, despite studies asserting that gait can be used as biometric feature [11], [12], [13], we remark that there is a lack of studies investigating the security features and entropy of gait as an authentication mechanism.

Several attacks though, most significantly impersonation attacks, have been considered (cf. Table [1]). For instance, Mjaaland et al [53] trained seven individuals to imitate one specific victim. Even after intensive training over two weeks (5 hours every day), and for one subject even for six weeks, it was not possible for the subjects to accurately imitate the
walking pattern of the victim. Also, the provision of continuous visual feedback did not suffice to assist imitators in [54]. Furthermore, the authors of [14] investigated the success probability of an attacker towards a particular subject on a database of 100 subjects and concluded that it is unlikely for an adversary to mimic the subjects gait with sufficient accuracy. This result has been confirmed by [8] who employed professional actors to mimic the gait of 15 subjects with close physical properties. Indeed, the attempt to mimic gait incorporates the risk of asymmetric gait cycles and thus even lowers the chance of success. However, as indicated in [14], the probability of random matches significantly exceeds the expected probability in the birthday paradox. An attacker with knowledge to her closest person poses a serious threat to gait-based authentication, and does not exceed the expected probability in the birthday paradoxon.

In [53], the probability of random matches significantly exceeds the expected probability in the birthday paradoxon. In addition, the increasing accuracy of video-based gait recognition systems also empowers an adversary to generate a database of gait information on multiple subjects unnoticed. Video-based attacks on gait-authentication systems are insufficiently investigated in the literature. In Section 5.5 we demonstrate that a sophisticated adversary with video support can estimate gait sufficiently accurate in order to break gait-based authentication and pairing schemes.

We conclude that gait-based authentication faces serious security threats and gait appears not feasible as sole basis for authentication, especially in systems where the adversary is targeting not a specific but any subject in the system. Furthermore, gait changes over time [24] and is affected by clothing, footwear, walking surface [20], walking speed [24] and emotion [56]. These effects are insufficiently studied and render gait-based authentication a challenging undertaking.

### 2.3 Acceleration-Based Pairing of Devices

Device pairing protocols execute quantization on one or more devices at the same time to generate similar bit sequences. In contrast to user authentications, these sequences are not matched against a template database. Instead they are used to authenticate a key agreement between all participating parties. Recently, several authors have considered acceleration or gait for the pairing of devices co-present on the same body [55], [57], [58]. In particular, these approaches exploit correlation in acceleration signals when devices are worn on the same body [59], [60] or shaken together [4], [61]. Note that for these approaches, in contrast to exploiting gait for authentication, the existence of a unique and reproducible biometric gait sequence is not required. Instead, the protocols exploit instantaneous, correlated acceleration sequences that can not be re-used at different times as the system can be restricted to single attempts [16]. The above weaknesses for gait as biometric pattern therefore do not apply. The strength of the pairing approach is, instead, conditioned on the quantization used, what entropy that approach can guarantee and whether or not it leaks information to a powerful (realistic) attacker.

In [4], [61] the ShakeUnlock protocol is presented to unlock a mobile device when it is shaken simultaneously with a smartwatch. The individual steps of this protocol are briefly described in Figure 1. This approach, however, requires the direct comparison of acceleration sequences in order to compute correlation and therefore needs an established secure channel to exchange this information.

Furthermore, other approaches that do not require already established secure connection between devices have been proposed recently. For authentication based on arbitrary co-aligned sensor data, Mayrhofer [62] proposes the candidate key protocol. A variant of it is also implemented in SAPHE [18]. It interactively exchanges hashes from feature sequences as short secrets and concatenates the key from the secrets with matching hashes (cf. Figure 1).

Walkie-Talkie, an alternative approach conditioned on correlated acceleration sequences from a person’s gait, is presented in [19]. The authors achieve a high bitrate by using individual samples for the key if they deviate by at least $\alpha$ standard deviations from the mean (cf. Figure 1).

Furthermore, the BANDANA protocol [16] exploits acceleration along the z-axis only and conditions the gait fingerprint on the difference between instantaneous gait and mean gait at that body location. It thereby achieves normalization among acceleration sequences across body locations. Remaining dissimilarities in fingerprints are corrected with fuzzy cryptography exploiting BCH codes (cf. Figure 1).

Recently, the Inter-Pulse-Interval (IPI) between consecutive steps has been exploited for secure key generation from gait [17]. The protocol exploits the acceleration along the z-axis and concatenates the key sequence as gray-coded, scaled and rounded IPIs. As reported in [17] (cf. Table 2 in Section 4) the security and inter-class similarity depends on the speed of consecutive steps and steplength. The protocol was verified on gait captured from devices on the torso of subjects (lower back, upper right arm and right ear).

The quantization methods in these approaches diverge and result in different properties of the generated binary fingerprints. In brief, in SAPHE, challenge-threshold points are randomly drawn around the acceleration sequence. Conditioned on whether a challenge point falls above or below the acceleration sequence, it is interpreted as 1 or 0 for the fingerprint. In contrast, the quantization in Walkie-Talkie interprets samples that exceed (deceed) the mean by

---

1. Equal rates for false acceptance and false rejection
It has to preserve a crucial part in gait-based pairing is the quantization used.

### 3.1 SAPHE

SAPHE is able to generate keys that fulfill the requirement of withstanding interference at the resonant frequency of materials in MEMS sensors can control or modify measured acceleration, and thus inject changes to acceleration sequences.

**Candidate Key protocol (SAPHE)**
1. Extract features on devices
2. Hash feature values
3. Exchange hashes to identify matching values
4. When sufficient entropy collected (matching values), concatenate matching values to give secure key.

**Walkie-Talkie protocol**
1. Agree on heel-strike count. Then, record acceleration.
2. Use ICA for source separation; apply FFT on independent components
3. Low-pass filter (3Hz) in gravity direction (reduce noise and detect local maxima (heel-strikes))
4. Rotate acceleration data using gyroscope to same body coordinate system
5. Low-pass filter (10Hz); normalize 3D acceleration to zero mean, unit length
6. Samples $\pm \mu + \sigma$ are interpreted as 1/0
7. Matching samples chosen define key. IFF $\leq 0.5 + \epsilon$ overlap, abort (counter impersonation)
8. XOR bit sequences between consecutive windows to obtain keys

**BANDANA protocol**
1. Collect acceleration readings from the z-axis
2. Correct rotation wrt gravity (gyroscope)
3. Bandpass between 0.5Hz and 12Hz
4. Resampling (40 samples/gait) and gait detection
5. Compute mean gait

**Inter-Pulse-Interval (IPI) protocol**
(1-4) Analog to the BANDANA Protocol
5. Detect left/right-foot-flat peaks from acceleration
6. $TPI_{yay} = \text{Graycode}(\left\lfloor \frac{TPI_{yay}}{1000/f} \right\rfloor)$
7. Obtain key as first $k$ bits in $TPI_{yay}$

---

Fig. 1: Description of acceleration-based device-pairing protocols

In a quantization scheme, a high similarity between generated keys on different body locations, as described in [32], is achieved by comparing instantaneous gait with the mean of preceding gait cycles. Areas in a quarter of a gait cycle where the instantaneous gait exceeds (decreases) the mean are mapped to 1 (0). Finally, the IPI-protocol generates keys as concatenation of gray-coded, scaled and rounded IPIs.

An attack on acceleration-based pairing is described in [32]. An active adversary emitting modulated acoustic interference at the resonant frequency of materials in MEMS sensors can control or modify measured acceleration, and thus inject changes to acceleration sequences.

### 3 Comparison of Quantization Schemes

A crucial part in gait-based pairing is the quantization used. It has to preserve a high similarity between generated keys on different body parts, and generates sufficiently unpredictable bit sequences for the use as cryptographic keys that withstand a computationally unconstrained adversary.

In this section, we analyze the quantization of SAPHE, Walkie-Talkie, BANDANA and IPI and describe their working principles along Figure 2. Additionally, we evaluate how they fulfill the first requirement, i.e., to generate keys with high similarity between different locations on the same body (intra-body) and no similarity between different bodies (inter-body). Their second requirement of withstandings adversaries will be discussed in Section 4. In the following, we applied Madgwick’s algorithm first to each scheme to initialize them on the same accelerometer orientation.

#### 3.1 SAPHE

In the SAPHE [18] protocol, after generating and exchanging the hash $H(r_A)(H(r_B))$ of the random seed $r_A(r_B)$ to compute threshold values $\bar{T}_A(\bar{T}_B)$, as points in an Acceleration-time coordinate system $\mathbb{R}$, devices derive acceleration sequences $\tau_A(\tau_B)$ in $\mathbb{R}$. Challenges $c_A(c_B)$ that describe whether $\bar{T}_A$ ($\bar{T}_B$) exceed $\tau_A(\tau_B)$ are exchanged together with $r_A(r_B)$. The protocol does not disclose information on the acceleration during this communication.

We remark though, that the authors propose a second version which leaks information on the acceleration since, in addition, a distance ordering $\sigma_A(\sigma_B)$ between $\bar{T}_A(\bar{T}_B)$ and $\tau_A(\tau_B)$ is exchanged. The purpose of this distance ordering is to guard against a specific attack on the hash function (described in [18]). However, an adversary could exploit that the threshold points $\bar{T}_A(\bar{T}_B)$ with small distance to $\tau_A(\tau_B)$ are good estimates of actual acceleration samples from $\tau_A(\tau_B)$. In addition, those threshold points $\bar{T}_A(\bar{T}_B)$ with large distance to $\tau_A(\tau_B)$ leak information on the probability of the resulting bit (0 or 1 for larger or smaller threshold).

We investigated the pairwise performance of SAPHE on walking data recorded in [63]. We applied Madgwick’s algorithm first and executed SAPHE on the axis perpendicular to earth gravity to correct rotation at arbitrary body locations. We then removed the gravity by subtracting 9.81 from each value and restricted the range where random seeds are chosen from to $\pm 1g$ (cf. Section 4). In particular, we studied the similarity of keys generated for pairs of devices on different body locations. As depicted in Figure 3a, although affected by outliers, SAPHE’s generated key pairs match with high probability of 85% (lower body) to 86.87% (upper body) on average on devices worn on the same body (intra-body). The inter-body case matches on average with 55% i.e. is 5% higher than a random guess. Conclusively, SAPHE is able to generate keys that fulfill the requirement of a clear boundary between intra- and inter-body similarity.

#### 3.2 Walkie-Talkie

The Walkie-Talkie protocol is (in principle) able to extract up to 1 key bit per acceleration sample and variants that

1. 15 subjects, 10 minutes walking each, acceleration sensors at 7 different body locations
3.3 BANDANA

In BANDANA, key sequences are generated as a function of the difference between mean and instantaneous acceleration [15]. The approach of comparing to the mean at a particular body location serves as a normalisation procedure. The offset to the mean has a better correlation across various body locations than comparing absolute acceleration values. Furthermore, [65] argues that this approach might positively impact the distribution of bits in the key sequences towards uniformity as gait patterns are compared to their mean. To further amplify similarity of sequences of bits generated at different body locations, bits with low difference between mean and instantaneous gait are disregarded.

The similarity between keys generated from devices located at different positions on the body (evaluated on the walking data from [63]) is depicted in Figure 3c for the BANDANA protocol. The protocol achieves similarity results above 75% for all location-pairs and is still able to render the chances of the adversary (inter-body) to random guess. The protocol employs fuzzy cryptography in order to mitigate the remaining 25% of difference in the key sequences. We observe, however, a high variance for the inter-body case, which is due to a non-uniform distribution of the key sequences in the key space (cf. Section 4 and Section 5). In Section 6 we discuss how this problem can be addressed with a revised quantization approach.

3.4 IPI

The Inter-Pulse-Interval (IPI) protocol [17] exploits the random offset by which individual steps deviate from the mean gait cycle in time domain (cf. Figure 2c). The number of secret bits that can be extracted from the gait signal then depends on the sampling frequency as gait cycle estimation is more accurate with higher sampling rate. The authors report a standard deviation of 40.8 milliseconds for the IPI.

Figure 3d shows the similarity achieved for IPI between keys generated from devices located at different positions on the body (for the walking data in [63]). The similarity in the intra-body case is good and close to the performance of BANDANA. IPI also employs fuzzy cryptography to correct
Fig. 3: Comparison of intra-body against inter-body similarity for the evaluated quantization schemes. Each value in the intra-body boxplot is defined by the similarity of two different sensor locations on the same subject (all possible combinations within each subject). For inter-body, each boxplot defines a different sensor location. Only different subjects are tested against each other with the same sensor location.

remaining bit-errors in the keys generated for devices across the same body. However, the figure also shows that the protocol does not prevent a remote adversary from paring with on-body devices, since inter-body similarities are as high as in the intra-body case. This is due to limited variation in the generated bit sequences. Inter-pulse intervals resemble a normal distribution centered around its mean. This variation around the mean is similar across subjects and the resolution employed is 4 bits only so that naturally similarity across generated bit sequences is high (cf. Section 5).

4 RANDOMNESS OF KEYS

We have so far evaluated quantization schemes regarding their property of generating similar keys for locations on the same body and different keys for different bodies. In this section we investigate whether these keys are sufficiently unpredictable to withstand a computationally unconstrained adversary. For this, we analyze the randomness of keys by observing graphs generated from random walks and interpreting the results from the DieHarder and ENT Pseudorandom Number Sequence Tests.

4.1 Bit Distribution

To describe the randomness of keys, we compare their structure with random walks on a Galton board. Plotting a sufficient amount of these sequences will eventually show a binomial distribution [66]. Figure 4 shows heatmaps of random walks corresponding to the sequences generated by different quantization approaches. In addition, Figure 5 depicts each individual random walk such that specific patterns are observable. Based on the last row of each heatmap, Figure 7 depicts the cumulative sums distribution.

Assuming each bit position to be a state in a Markov chain, Figure 6 shows the resulting transition probabilities. We note that we do not analyze Markov properties of higher order.

The input data consisted of triaxial accelerometers, gyroscopes and magnetometers sampled at 50Hz for walking subjects [63]. Our focus rather lies on same key lengths which means that the time to generate a key may vary heavily between the different approaches. We generated 128 bit fingerprints for each quantization approach.

SAPHE shows a close-to symmetric distribution centered around the mean with a tail reaching almost to the minimum value (cf. Figure 4a). Most likely, this is due to the special characteristic of acceleration readings which do not necessarily have to have zero-mean. Thus, while SAPHE shows good behaviour regarding similarity and usage of space in the Galton board, it carries some characteristics of the input into the output data. Still, this does not pave the way
for a successful attack. The cumulative sums distribution is properly centered but shows deviations to include more ‘0’s for a specific set of keys (cf. Figure 4a). Note that with regard to the binomial distribution, SAPHE is skewed as it does not adhere to the sigma rule with 68% of the keys in one standard deviation of $\sigma = \sqrt{npq} = \sqrt{1288 \cdot 0.5 \cdot 0.5} = 53.12$. SAPHE shows a very good Markov property (cf. Figure 6).

The heatmap and distribution of Walkie-Talkie are depicted in Figure 4b and Figure 7b. The individual sequences do not show a bias (cf. Figure 5b). Walkie-Talkie, however, shows periodicity in the Markov property (cf. Figure 6). The BANDANA approach features symmetric behaviour but with low variance (cf. Figure 4c, 4d). We can observe from Figure 5c that this weakness occurs since bit sequences consist of repetitive ‘zig-zag’ patterns. We discuss this problem in Section 5 and propose an improved quantization to mitigate it in Section 6. BANDANA shows a similar Markov property as SAPHE (cf. Figure 5). Finally, IPI shows good variance but a bias towards including more ones than zeros due to low variation in the quadruples generated as discussed above. IPI clearly deviates from a binomial distribution (cf. Figure 7d). We observed that consecutive 4-bit chunks repeat with a probability of 60%. This clearly shows in IPI’s Markov property in Figure 6. Summarizing, while SAPHE and Walkie-Talkie exhibit reasonable randomness, BANDANA and IPI show biases in the generated keys.

4.2 Statistical Tests

To test if the evaluated quantization schemes against bias in the produced random sequences, we ran the DieHarder statistical tests for each scheme. Figure 8 depicts the p-values computed from 20 runs of the DieHarder tests.

In SAPHE, the dna and sts monobit tests appear to be outliers. The dna test considers biases in the occurrence of 10 letter words from an alphabet of 4 letters: C,G,A,T, determined by two designated bits in the sequence of random integers being tested. The sts monobit test counts the 1 bits in a long string of random entries and compares this to the expected number. Similar to SAPHE, Walkie-Talkie also shows a weakness in the dna test. In addition, the rgb Kullback-Leibler Smirnov test falls out slightly and the 2D sphere test features some outliers. The Kullback-Leibler Smirnov test applies a Kuiper KS test [67] and the 2D circle test as well as the rgb permutation test finds the minimum distance between pairs of randomly selected points to evaluate their randomness. BANDANA shows the most stable distribution of p-values. A slight bias might be associated with the squeeze test, which employs a chi-square test for cell frequencies on the number of multiplication with random integers that are required to reduce 231 to 1. IPI shows potential weaknesses towards the birthdays test, the Overlapping Quadruples Sparse Occupancy (oqso) test, the 3D sphere test as well as the rgb permutation and rgb Kullback-Leibler Smirnov test. The rgb permutation test counts the order of permutations of random numbers. Birthdays test determines the number of matching intervals from 512 ‘birthdays’ drawn from a 24-bit ‘year’ while the oqso test, similar to the dna test, considers 4-letter words from an alphabet of 32 letters.

Additionally, we ran the Ent Pseudorandom Number Sequence Test [1]. The information density of bit sequences is computed together with reduction through optimal compression, chi square distribution, arithmetic mean of data bytes as well as serial correlation coefficient (cf. Table 3). We caution that these results are only showing the interdependence of single bits. Evaluating chunk instead of single bit interdependence, such as 4-bit chunks for BANDANA due to its 4 bit per gait cycle or 30-bit chunks for Walkie-Talkie’s privacy amplification, heavily influences the test results.


5 Security Analysis

As in most security applications, although much effort against it may have been taken, unwanted vulnerabilities might anyway sustain within an approach’s conceptual design. In [55, 68], a general concept to analyse security applications and to identify possible pitfalls has been introduced. Furthermore, adversaries of different strength necessitate the weighting of the impact of certain weaknesses. Figure 9 shows such a conceptual view for sensor-based device-to-device pairing including possible attack vectors A-G. A pair of devices measure data from sensors, quantize the data to bit strings after some preprocessing, apply potentially error correction, and finally agree on a key. An obvious attack surface is exposed by the sensors themselves (A). A device or its owner could be forced to behave in a certain way, e.g., by an adversary controlling stride speed with a treadmill. Depending on the pairing protocol, it could be also possible to bypass the sensor data acquisition (B) and reuse data from the past. With a biased quantization, a naı̈ve brute force attack would become feasible (C). Some protocols employ a special communication phase before the actual key agreement (SAPHE: random seed and distance ordering, Walkie-Talkie: reconciliation phase, BANDANA: exchange of reliability indices). The exchanged indices could potentially be exploited as a side channel (D). After error correction (e.g., in BANDANA and IPI), the key agreement is executed between both participants. Here, the risk of a Man-in-the-Middle (MitM) attack (E) or impersonation attack on one participant (G) must be considered. Finally, the key agreement itself could be weak or based on false security assumptions, especially if it has been designed for this protocol only and is not based on established standards (F). In the following, we will discuss attacks we found during our analysis. No discussion on attack vector B is included as it assumes that the device is already compromised by malware, which falls outside the focus of this work.

5.1 One-Shot Success Probability (E, G)

Without requiring additional knowledge about the victim’s gait, an attacker may want to exhaust the keyspace $C$ of all keys $k$ to execute a MitM (E) or impersonation attack (G). However, in all discussed protocols, after each single try, a completely new authentication process (new $k$ independent from the previous one) is started. Thus, it is impossible to exhaust $C$ making this a one-shot attack. For comparison between protocols, we target the same length of 16 bit for $k$. The length of sequences sampled for a target key $k$ of 16 bit may vary depending on the quantization scheme.

5.1.1 Candidate Key Protocol Variants

The candidate key protocol is, for instance, realized in SAPHE [18], which resolves its original vulnerability.
against MitM attacks. In particular, first, random challenges are chosen, as depicted in Figure 2a, and committed by sharing their hashes. Afterwards, the acceleration sequence is challenged with respect to these random thresholds where an acceleration point with value lower (higher) than a threshold is interpreted as 0 (1). The success probability for a single randomly drawn key \( k \) in SAPHE is

\[
\frac{1}{2^k} \approx 1.52588 \cdot 10^{-5}
\]  

(1)

5.1.2 Walkie-Talkie Protocol

The bits generated in the Walkie-Talkie protocol feature a high bit rate of 15–55 bits per second as reported in [19] (Figure 12(e)). However, high agreement rates are reached only for \( \alpha > 0.8 \) (Figure 12(d) and 12(f) in [19]), which corresponds to 15–25 bits per second. A 16 bit binary key can therefore be generated in approximately 1 second and the success probability of an adversary for a single randomly drawn \( k \) is then

\[
\frac{1}{2^k} \approx 1.52588 \cdot 10^{-5}
\]  

(2)

5.1.3 BANDANA Protocol

In the BANDANA protocol, \( M = 48 \) bit long sequences are generated in about 12 s. From each 48 bit sequence, 16 bit are disregarded for reliability amplification. From the remaining 32 bit fingerprints, up to 8 bit are corrected by BCH codes, resulting in \( |k| = 16 \) bit long keys. The success probability of a single randomly drawn fingerprint is therefore (cf. Section 5.3)

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{8} \binom{32}{k} / 2^{32} = \sum_{k=0}^{8} \frac{32!}{(32-k)!k!} / 2^{32} \approx 0.0035
\]  

(3)

5.1.4 IPI Protocol

In the IPI protocol, dependent on the sampling frequency, between 2 and 20 secure bits are extracted from each gait cycle (cf. Table I in [17]). Depending on the sample rate of the accelerometer, the generation of 32 bits in the IPI protocol might therefore require from 2 to 16 seconds. Since the protocol also employs fuzzy cryptography protocol for error correction, the same success probability as in the BANDANA protocol of 0.0035 applies for a single randomly drawn fingerprint.

5.2 Quantization-Specific Attacks (C, D)

An attacker with insight to the quantization schemes might be able to exploit this knowledge in order to boost her one-shot success probability. We discuss our observations in the Walkie-Talkie, BANDANA and IPI protocols. For SAPHE, we did not identify any quantization-specific weakness.

5.2.1 Walkie-Talkie Protocol

As discussed in [34], Walkie-Talkie is biased towards generating alternating sequences of 1-bits and 0-bits. We note that an adversary overhearing the disregarded bit positions during reconciliation (D) is able to formulate an educated guess on the sequence after reconciliation, as 0-1 (1-0) changes in the generated sequences are marked by missing bit positions. Figure 10a shows key similarities achieved by this attack when guessed sequences are compared to actual acceleration-based sequences.

The application of the XOR in the protocol does not protect against this attack since the adversary can apply the same operation on her estimated sequence.

5.2.2 BANDANA Protocol

As indicated in Section 5.3 we found that the random success probability for the BANDANA protocol exceeds random guess. Indeed, as observed in Section 3.4 (Figure 4c), the variance in generated sequences is low and, in particular, sequences follow specific patterns (cf. Figure 5c). As depicted in Figure 10b we found as the reason for this weakness that in the 4-bit chunks, which are generated per gait cycle (and before throwing away bits for reliability amplification), sequences of alternating binary value are significantly more frequent than others. In particular, sequences 1111 or 0000, where the instantaneous acceleration constantly exceeds or deceeds the mean acceleration, are seldom. Consequently, the distribution of key sequences in the key space is not uniform, and an adversary could utilize this knowledge to launch an attack (C). We propose an approach to mitigate this problem in Section 6.

5.2.3 IPI Protocol

As discussed in Section 5.4 the IPI protocol suffers from measurement noise in accurately capturing the inter pulse interval due to the limited sampling rate of accelerometers. Especially for lower sampling rates, this significantly restricts the size of the key space. For instance, with 50 Hz (500Hz) sampling rate, one sample is taken every 20 milliseconds (every 2 ms). Since devices are not synchronized, this translates to an unavoidable inaccuracy of up to 10ms (1ms) for the sampled gait on devices (cf. Figure 2a). This measurement noise, compared with only 40.8ms standard deviation for the IPI results in a small keyspace and, since gray codes are employed (modulo 16; \( q = 4 \)), not all bits in the generated quadruples change. In particular, we investigated the variation in 4 bit chunks generated by the IPI protocol on the walking data from [63]. In about 63% of the consecutive 4 bit chunks, all bits are identical. Furthermore, in 24% of all cases, just one bit changed, with 11% 2 bits changed and with only 0.02%, 3 bits were different. An adversary with approximate information on

4. For a 0-1 change to occur in two consecutive samples, with a guard band size of \( 5 m/s^2 \) an accelerometer sampling at 50Hz would be required to accelerate at \( 5m/s^2/0.02s = 250m/s^2 \) or 25g per second.
In this section, we investigate the threat of video-based side-channel attacks. In particular, we consider how accurate acceleration sequences describing gait can be estimated by tracking movement of body parts from video.

For our experiment, we captured movement of a subject both by a wearable inertial measurement unit (smartphone) and with a high-speed camera. The smartphone was attached to one leg. We chose this location since it is easy to track from video. If it is possible to pair with a device on that location, it is also possible to pair with devices on any part of the body, as demonstrated by the Walkie-Talkie, BANDANA and IPI protocols. Five subjects (4 male; height: 1.63-1.95m; μ = 1.76m) walked in a straight line in approximately 8m distance to the camera (1080p resolution; 90fps) mounted on a tripod (cf. Figure 11). Acceleration data was sampled at 50Hz. For synchronization between video and inertial sensor, a single jump both at the beginning and at the end framed the walking segment. Each subject conducted the experiment twice.

We utilized Tracker\(^5\) to manually track the location of the smartphone on the recorded video. Although human pose estimation\(^6\) is able to estimate leg movements, we achieved higher accuracy by manually marking the location of the smartphone on the video frames. From the tracked trajectory we estimated the acceleration of the smartphone. This estimated acceleration sequence is then re-sampled to match the 50Hz sampling rate of the inertial sensor. Note that we estimated movement orthogonal to ground only while the inertial sensor might be rotated. However, such rotation is implicitly corrected by the pairing scheme. Figure 12\(^a\) illustrates example sequences.

Since accurate manual frame-based tracking of 90fps videos is extremely labour-intensive, a large-scale study including high number of subjects and hours of gait-acceleration is not feasible. We instead estimated the mean μ\(^v\) = 2.092 and standard deviation σ\(^v\) = 6.0210 of disparity values between optimally synchronized gait acceleration sequences (estimated and recorded) in our experiment. These values were then used as parameters for noise distributions, which we added to the walking data recorded by the dataset in \(^7\). We generated Gaussian \(p\(_n\)(n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma}e^{-\frac{(n-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}\) and Laplacian \(p\(_n\)(n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}|n-\mu|}{\sigma}}\), respectively.

\(^5\) http://physlets.org/tracker/
\(^6\) This mean originates from the amplitude estimation error of the adversary due to inaccurate distance measurement between camera and walking subject. Since the adversary does not know the mean offset of the estimated sequence to the actual sequence, we keep this constant error also in our investigation.
\(^7\) We refined the synchronization between the estimated and recorded acceleration sequences by shifting both sequences until a minimum root mean squared error is achieved.

### 5.3 Benefits and Pitfalls in using Error Correction

In biometric authentication systems, noise of the biometric information is an intrinsic property (here: measurement noise in acceleration sensors). Prominently, Fuzzy cryptography has been proposed in order to employ error correcting codes to mitigate such noise. Error correcting codes encode messages from a messagespace \(m \in \mathcal{M}\) into codewords of the (larger) codespace \(c \in \mathcal{C}\) introducing redundancies. This process allows to correct errors introduced to \(c\) by decoding it back to \(m\). In fuzzy cryptography, the biometric information or fingerprints contain noise or errors that can be corrected after mapping into \(\mathcal{C}\). The redundancy introduced in the encoding process, however, dictates that an adversary also does not have to guess all bits in the fingerprint correctly, but can be sloppy. For instance, assume a key length of \(K\) and an error correcting code able to correct a fraction of \(u\) bits from the total fingerprint length \(N\). Since we know that a \((K,N)\)-error correcting code can correct up to \(\lfloor \frac{N-K}{2} \rfloor\) errors, it follows that \(N = K + \frac{\sum^{u}_{k=0} \lfloor \frac{N-K}{2} \rfloor!}{2^N}\). This means that the success probability of a single randomly drawn fingerprint is not \(2^N\), but instead only

\[
\sum^{u}_{k=0} \left( \begin{array}{c} N \\ k \end{array} \right) /2^N = \sum^{u}_{k=0} \left( \frac{N!}{(N-k)!k!} \right) /2^N
\]

since up to \(K\) errors are allowed at arbitrary position in the fingerprint sequence. Careful choice of the parameters is therefore demanded to limit the advantage gained by an adversary through the use of fuzzy cryptography. From the protocols we investigated, BANDANA and the IPI-protocol employ fuzzy cryptography.

### 5.4 Gait Mimicry (A)

As recently discussed in \(^69\), it is unlikely that an attacker would be able to mimic natural gait of a victim to a degree where gait sequences were sufficiently similar to break gait-based authentication or pairing schemes. In particular, the authors employed professional actors to mimic the gait of victims with similar physical properties (age, weight, height, shoe size, upper leg length) and showed that after guided training and instructions, all actors failed to mimic the observed gait of victims. In a second test, by walking next to a victim one out of five attackers was able though to achieve sufficient similarity in the gait acceleration sequence. In particular, the authors assumed that the victim instinctively adapted her walking speed to the common step pattern with the adversary. This was, however, not further investigated.

### 5.5 Impersonation via Video Recording (G)

Cameras are omnipresent in these days, for instance as CCTV systems, personal camcorders, or mobile phones. The quality of captured videos is sufficient to discriminate subtle movements. An adversary with camera-support might therefore be able to extract pairing keys from recorded video (G). In this section, we investigate the threat of video-based
We then generated noisy acceleration signals with $\mathcal{N}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)$ (noise observed from video-based acceleration estimation), $\mathcal{N}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)$ (low noise) and $\mathcal{N}(2 \cdot \mu_n, 4 \cdot \sigma_n^2)$ (high noise) as illustrated in Figure 12 for Gaussian additive noise. Note that higher noise causes more fluctuation to the original data. Other noise models are treated similarly, i.e. values following certain distributions are added to original acceleration signals.

Finally, we extracted fingerprints of the augmented data to evaluate their similarity. Figure 13 details the similarity for intra-body pairings (cf. Figure 16a). As one feasible solution, we investigate a mapping of gait-fingerprints with different noise levels over four pairing schemes. The estimation based on the video noise level is able to generate fingerprints which are sufficiently close to the actually recorded acceleration sequence, so that this attack can break the gait-based pairing protocol for all three noise distributions considered. Walkie-Talkie [19] is the most sensitive protocol under video-based attacks. That means in this scheme attackers have the highest chance to obtain pairing keys if an accurate and real-time object tracking system is employed. On the other hand, SAPHE [18] is the most secure protocol against video-based attacks.

6 Potential Improvements

As shown, SAPHE is a promising approach as it introduces randomness instead of just observing it. As a potential improvement to our current implementation with a range of 1g, we propose to implement a dynamic range. This would prevent threshold values that are outliers and produce the same bit independent of the acceleration. Due to SAPHE’s quantization, an attack, where a simple sinusoidal acceleration signal is artificially generated in alignment with the heel-strike, might lead to a good estimate of the key. We propose to choose the threshold values as close to the acceleration reading as possible while still not revealing the actual unique gait features. This could be achieved by filtering out the dominant gait frequencies. Finally, instead of using hashed heuristic trees [18], we propose the usage of extensively studied cryptographic building blocks, such as fuzzy cryptography and a Password Authenticated Key Exchange.

As discussed in Section 3, the quantization approach of BANDANA is biased towards specific patterns which are generated significantly more often than others. A straightforward solution to this problem is to disregard these 4-bit patterns with probability inverse to their occurrence frequency. However, due to the significant distortion of the histogram (cf. Figure 10b), this is not feasible. Since some patterns occur with a frequency of only 1% or less, close to all frequent patterns would have to be discarded to arrive at a balanced random distribution.

As one feasible solution, we investigate a mapping of each pair of consecutive bits in the generated key sequence to a single bit (01, 11 → 1, 10, 00 → 0) Figure 14a and 15a show the distribution of bit sequences in patterns after the mapping as well as the heatmap for fingerprints generated with the modified quantization protocol.

Another solution is to modify the comparison of gait sequences. The mean gait features an average amplitude with
respect to the instantaneous gait sequences. Also, the acceleration peaks of the instantaneous gait fall with about equal probability to the left or right of the mean gait sequence. Consequently, the quantization, exploiting the difference between mean and instantaneous gait generates 0101 and 1010 patterns more often than other patterns. We suggest to normalize both mean and instantaneous gait prior to comparing them for gait generation. The heatmap and histogram for bit sequences generated with this modified versions are depicted in figures [14b] and [15c]. We observe that the distribution is significantly improved. Unfortunately, a bias towards including more ‘1’-s is introduced. However, since this bias is less severe than in the original BANDANA protocol, it can be addressed by disregarding patterns with probability inverse to their observed occurrence frequency (cf. Figure 15d). We observe in Figure 16b that the similarity for intra-body pairing is slightly reduced.

7 Conclusion

We have analyzed the quantization approaches of four popular recent acceleration-based pairing schemes. For this, we have compared their quantization schemes and discussed quantization-specific attacks on the protocols. Furthermore, their on-body pairing performance, statistical properties and entropy of generated key sequences have been investigated based on walking data from 15 subjects and with devices located at 7 on-body locations.

In particular, the SAPHE protocol was designed to pair devices that share acceleration sequences e.g. because they are shaken together. Although it could therefore not achieve similar sequences across different locations on the body, its security properties, distribution of generated keys and statistical properties exceed those of the other protocols.

The Walkie-Talkie protocol, which is able to generate the highest number of key bits from the gait acceleration achieves exact matching keys only across upper body locations and with low confidence. Together with the SAPHE protocol, it has the lowest one-shot success probability. This is, however, put into different perspective by a design flaw in the protocol. Even a naive adversary is able to boost her success probability to 0.125 by analysing the communication during the pairing process.

The BANDANA protocol is specifically designed for on-body pairing between devices and produces high similarity between sequences generated for different and also remote locations on the same body. However, the keys generated are insufficiently distributed and show a bias towards specific binary patterns. This problem originates from the quantization approach utilized and we proposed alternative quantization mechanisms that fix these issues.

Finally, the IPI protocol is also able to achieve high similarity across keys generated at different location on the same body. Our investigation revealed that the protocol suffers from a low variance in the generated binary patterns, so that similarity is also high for random gait sequences.

We further analyzed the threat of a video-based attack on gait authentication and gait-based pairing schemes and found that a sophisticated attacker with video support is able to estimate gait sequences sufficiently well to break the studied gait-based pairing approaches.
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