Is Bigger Better? Comparing User-Generated Passwords on 3x3 vs. 4x4 Grids Sizes for Android's Pattern Unlock

Adam J. AvivDevon BudzitowskiRavi KuberImage: Adam J. AvivImage: AvivImage: AvivImage: AvivImage: Aviv</t

Android's Pattern Unlock



Android pattern unlock is an authentication method to lock (and unlock) Android phones

Rules of the Game

(1) Maintain contact with the screen and connect **4** points **without repetition**



(2) Can only connect adjacent contact points (3) Can trace over previously contacted points



Recent Work on Android Unlock Patterns



Measurement



Figure 8: The most frequent 3-grams, from most frequent (left) to less frequent (right).



[UDWH:CCS'13]

How strong are patterns?

- There are 389,112 total 3x3 patterns
 - Users do not select uniformly from the set of total available patterns
 - "

Consequently, **the entropy of patterns is rather low**, and our results indicate that the security offered by the scheme **is less than the security of only three digit randomly-assigned PINs** for guessing 20% of all passwords (i. e., we estimate a partial guessing entropy G_0.2 of 9.10 bit).

Uellenbeck et. al at CCS'13

//

How to increase the security?

Password Meters?



[SCOKH:CHI'15]

[SWZ:JISA'15]

Increasing the Grid Size

Cyanogen Mod







EMERGENCY CALL

Research Question

Does <u>increasing</u> the grid size <u>increase</u> the security of human generated patterns?



389,112 possible patterns

4,350,069,823,024 possible patterns

Talk Outline

Motivation



Methodology



Data Analysis

© ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;	$ \begin{array}{c} & \cdot & \\ & \bullet & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \bullet \\ \hline & \bullet & \bullet \\ \hline & Freq=11 \end{array} $	© • • • • • • Freq=8	$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \\ \circ & \bigcirc \\ \circ & \bigcirc \\ \bullet & \bigcirc \\ \bullet & \bigcirc \\ Freq=8 \\ \hline$	© · · ·				
	(a)	Self-Report 3	x3					
$\bigcirc \cdot \cdot \bigcirc \bigcirc$								
μ		<u>aa</u> d		$\tilde{\odot} \cdot \tilde{\Box}$				
Laa	Loo			A A A				
990	990	660	0.0	999				
Erag=11	Frag-0	Erag=0	Erag-9	Erec-7				
Freq=11	Freq=9	Freq=9	Freq=8	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3:	Freq=8 x3	Freq=7				
Freq=11 ⊕⊕⊕∲	Freq=9 (b) @ · · ·	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3:	Freq=8 x3 @ @ @ @ @	Freq=7				
Freq=11 [©] ⊖ ⊖ ⊖ · · ∕ ∕ ·	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3:	Freq=8 x3 $\bigcirc \bigcirc $	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3:	Freq=8 x^3 $\bigcirc \bigcirc $	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3:	Freq=8	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3: COMPANY COMPANY COMPANY Freq=9	Freq=8	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b) $0 \cdot \cdot$	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3: Control Control Co	$Freq=8$ x3 $\bigcirc \bigcirc $	Freq=7				

Security Analysis

				Perc. Guessed	Perc. Guessed
	$\alpha = 0.1$	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.5$	Total	with 20 attempts
Self-Reported 3x3	6.62	6.95	9.49	95.9%	15.0%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (all)	6.59	6.99	8.93	97.2%	16.7%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (Off.)	6.98	7.69	9.31	95.3%	12.5%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (Def.)	9.43	9,79	10.98	90.2%	4.0%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (all)	6.23	6.64	11.61	66.7%	19.9%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (Off.)	6.46	7.57	10.40	67.7%	16.7%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (Def.)	6.23	6.64	11.61	37.4%	3.2%
Uellenbeck et. al 3x3 (Off.) [23]	7.56	7.74	8.19		
Uellenbeck et. al 3x3 (Def.) [23]	8.72	9.10	10.90		
Song et. al 3x3 (w/ Meter) [18]	8.96	10.33	12.29		
Song et. al 3x3 (w/o Meter) [18]	7.38	9.56	10.83		
Random 3x3 Pattern (U389,112)	18.57	18.57	18.57		
Random 4x4 Pattern (U4,350,069,823,024)	41.98	41.98	41.98		
Random 6-dit PIN (U1,000,000)	19.93	19.93	19.93		
Random 5-dit PIN (U100,000)	16.60	16.60	16.60		
Random 4-dit PIN (U10,000)	13.29	13.29	13.29		
Random 3-dit PIN (U1,000)	9.97	9.97	9.97		
Random 2-dit PIN (U100)	6.64	6.64	6.64		
Real Users' 4-Digit PINs [18, 15]	5.19	7.04	10.08		

Table 3: Partial Guessing Entropy Comparisons

METHODOLOGY

Methodology Challenges

<u>No good</u> datasets of 3x3 graphical passwords

How to collect real 3x3 patterns?



4x4 patterns are <u>not</u> widely used

How to collect realistic 4x4 patterns?



All protocols were reviewed by the USNA and UMBC Institutional Review Board

Online Self-Report Survey

- Pay people to self-report their pattern or provide statistics about their pattern
- Amazon Mechanical Turk
 - Paid participants \$0.50 or \$0.75 (two runs)
 - 750 respondents data was included
- Must complete the survey on their mobile devices

Not for Everyone

Turk Opticom



Procedure



Report Pattern or Stats

Pattern Entry on Device

	Pattern recorded
۲	
•	$\bigcirc -\bigcirc$
•	•
Retry	Continue

Select Features of Pattern



Select all that might apply:



Attention Tests

- Device Completion
 - Elaborate code/token system
 - Check user agents (yes, I know that can be forged)
- Must enter in results twice
 - Report pattern, then survey, then report again
 - If results don't match, throw data out
- Rejections
 - We do not reject people within Mturk
 - Just don't include their data

Pen and Paper Survey



Adversarial Model

Participant Number

Directions: You will be required to select three graphical passwords of your own and also guess others passwords.

 Passwords are selected by drawing connections between dots in the grid without lifting your pen from the paper, circling the initial dot. Like below.



 Passwords must select at least 4 dots using straight lines, and you may not avoid unselected dots along a straight line between points.



You may not select a dot more than once; however, you may cross over previously selected dots.



Participant Number _____

Directions: You will be required to select three graphical passwords of your own and also guess others passwords.

 Passwords are selected by drawing connections between dots in the grid without lifting your pen from the paper, circling the initial dot. Like below.



Passwords must select at least 4 dots using straight lines, and you may not avoid unselected dots along a straight line between points.



You may not select a dot more than once; however, you may cross over previously selected dots.



Defensive Selection



but hard for others to guess

but hard for others to guess

Offensive Selection



Recall



Sample Data







Demographics and Collection

Self Report

- 750 Respondents
- 440 Self-Reported their password, remaining provided statistics
- 251 Males, 189 Females
- Age range: 18 55+
- Location: USA

Pen and Paper

- 80 Participants
 - 10 Focus Groups over
 6 weeks
 - 8 to 20 members per group
- 494 3x3 Patterns
 - 380 offensive
 - 114 defensive
- 504 4x4 Patterns
 - 385 Offensive
 - 114 Defensive
- 48 males, 24 Females
- Age range: 18-40
- Location: @USNA and @UMBC

Limitations

• Drawing patterns with Pen and Paper

Comparison between 3x3 pen and paper and 3x3 self reported patterns

• Veracity of Self Reported Data

- Similar features as other reported publications
- Provide on their own mobile devices
- Not required to report, can provide stats, which seem to match those that are reported

Cannot cross reference 4x4 patterns

- Comparison between 3x3 suggest consistency

• Priming: Knowing that others will guess

- Trend patterns towards strong patterns for defensive
- Have offensive and defensive in analysis

• Entry Exhaustion: Entering too many patterns

- Entering too many patterns in a row can reduce creativity and result in less realistic patterns
- Impact apears small when comparison between pen and paper and self reported

DATA ANALYSIS

Characterizing Data

- What are the most common patterns?
 - Symmetries and Embeddings
 - Common tri- and quad- grams
- Other Data Features
 - Length/stroke-length, start and end



Figure 6: Top 5 Most Frequently Occurring Patterns

Symmetries and Embeddings

	Size	Repetitions	Symmetries	Embedding
Self-Report 3x3	440	203 (46.1%)	336 (76.36%)	n/a
Pen-Paper 3x3 (All)	491	245 (49.9%)	398 (81.1%)	n/a
Pen-Paper 3x3 (Off.)	378	187 (48.3%)	309 (79.8%)	n/a
Pen-Paper 3x3 (Def.)	113	16 (14%)	54 (47%)	n/a
Pen-Paper 4x4 (All)	501	179 (35.7%)	204 (40.7%)	166 (33.1%)
Pen-Paper 4x4 (Off.)	382	156 (40.8%)	177 (46.3%)	142 (37.1%)
Pen-Paper 4x4 (Def.)	119	10 (8.4%)	10 (8.4%)	24 (20.1%)
_	•			

Symmetries: Two patterns that can be converted into the other through a series of flips or rotations

Embedding: A 3x3 pattern that can be drawn into a 4x4 space by the addition of a row or column

GOAL

Use all this information to build a guesser for patterns to measure the security using <u>guessability</u>

STRENGTH METRICS

Guessability

- How many guesses does it take for an attacker to guess a given password?
- **PARTIAL GUESSABILITY** (alpha-guesswork)
 - How many guesses does it take to guess a fraction of the dataset?
 - Measured in bits of information

• Offline Attack:

- Assumes attack can crack passwords without having to engage the authentication method (e.g., cracking hashes)
- No lockouts (traditionally, 20 guesses on Android)

Guessing Algorithm

- Input: Training Set, Guessing Set
- Train Likelihood Measure (Markov model)
 - Use training set and symmetries of training set with different weights
- Guess Order
 - 1. All patterns in training set order based on frequency with ties broken by likelihood measure
 - 2. All rotations/symmetries of training set ordered based on likelihood measure (added embeds of 3x3 patterns for 4x4 guessing)
 - 3. Set of generated patterns using the Markov Model ordered by likelihood measure

Experimental Design

• Testing and Training

- Trained on the pen-and-paper 3x3 and 4x4 data using a cross-fold validation
- Used 3x3 pen-and-paper as additional embedding training for the 4x4 data.
- Tested on self-reported 3x3 data using the pen and paper data as the training set.

Data Sets

- Pen and Paper:
 3x3,4x4, 3x3-off, 3x3-def, 4x4-off,4x4-def
- Self Reported: 3x3

Entropy

				Perc. Guessed	Perc. Guessed
	lpha=0.1	lpha=0.2	lpha=0.5	Total	with 20 attempts
Self-Reported 3x3	6.62	6.95	9.49	95.9%	15.0%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (all)	6.59	6.99	8.93	97.2%	16.7%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (Off.)	6.98	7.69	9.31	95.3%	12.5%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (Def.)	9.43	9.79	10.98	90.2%	4.0%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (all)	6.23	6.64	11.61	66.7%	19.9%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (Off.)	6.46	7.57	10.40	67.7%	16.7%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (Def.)	6.23	6.64	11.61	37.4%	3.2%
Uellenbeck et. al 3x3 (Off.) [23]	7.56	7.74	8.19		
Uellenbeck et. al 3x3 (Def.) [23]	8.72	9.10	10.90	-	
Song et. al 3x3 (w/ Meter) [18]	8.96	10.33	12.29		
Song et. al 3x3 (w/o Meter) [18]	7.38	9.56	10.83		
Random $3x3$ Pattern ($U_{389,112}$)	18.57	18.57	18.57		
Random 4x4 Pattern ($U_{4,350,069,823,024}$)	41.98	41.98	41.98		
Random 6-dit PIN ($U_{1,000,000}$)	19.93	19.93	19.93		
Random 5-dit PIN ($U_{100,000}$)	16.60	16.60	16.60		
Random 4-dit PIN ($U_{10,000}$)	13.29	13 29	13.29		
Random 3-dit PIN ($U_{1,000}$)	9.97	9.97	9.97		
Random 2-dit PIN (U_{100})	6.64	6.64	6.64		
Real Users' 4-Digit PINs [18, 15]	5.19	7.04	10.08		

Table 3: Partial Guessing Entropy Comparisons

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions: Is 4x4 really better than 3x3?

- NO: The strength of *most* of the 4x4 patterns are similar to that of 3x3 patterns
- **YES:** The fraction of total guessed is less for 4x4 patterns
- NO: The fraction of most common 4x4 patterns are *more* guessable than the most common 3x3
- YES: User recall rates for 4x4 are the same for 3x3 but 4x4 patterns are less easily naïvely guessed

Would bigger grid sizes help?

Probably not

- More complex patterns become harder to enter and remember
- May revert more common forms even more so than 4x4 patterns

Maybe yes

- Even less naively guessed more starting contact points
- SO MANY MORE PATTERNS
- Open question: Future work.



Summary

Motivation



Methodology



Data Analysis

© 🗇 – • Ø • • Ø • Freq=17	$\begin{array}{c} & \cdot & \\ & \bullet & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \bullet \\ & & Freq=11 \end{array}$	© • • • • • • Freq=8	$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \\ \circ & \bigcirc \\ \circ & \bigcirc \\ \bullet & \bigcirc \\ \bullet & \bigcirc \\ Freq=8 \\ \hline$					
	(a)	Self-Report 3	x3					
$0 \cdot \cdot 0 - 0 0 0 0 0 \cdot 0 0 - 0$								
Τ				$\tilde{\odot}$				
\mathcal{L}	200			$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$				
000	000	000	$\odot \cdot \odot$	$\Theta \odot \Theta$				
Freq=11	Freq=9	Freq=9	Freq=8	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3:	Freq=8 x3	Freq=7				
Freq=11 ⊕⊕⊕⊕	Freq=9 (b) @ · · ·	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3:	Freq=8 x3 ♀ ⊕ ⊕ ⊕ ⊕	Freq=7				
Freq=11 ©⊖⊖⊕ · · ⊘ ·	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3: $\bigcirc \bigcirc $	Freq=8 x3 $\bigcirc \bigcirc $	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3:	Freq=8	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b) ○ · · · · ○ · · · · ○ · · · ·	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3: 000000000000000000000000000000000000	Freq=8 (x) $($	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3: CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR Freq=9	Freq=8 x3 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	Freq=7				
Freq=11	Freq=9 (b)	Freq=9 Pen-Paper 3: OCOMPANY Freq=9 Pen-Paper 4:	$Freq=8$ x3 $\bigcirc \bigcirc $	Freq=7				

Security Analysis

				Perc. Guessed	Perc. Guessed
	$\alpha = 0.1$	$\alpha = 0.2$	$\alpha = 0.5$	Total	with 20 attempts
Self-Reported 3x3	6.62	6.95	9.49	95.9%	15.0%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (all)	6.59	6.99	8.93	97.2%	16.7%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (Off.)	6.98	7.69	9.31	95.3%	12.5%
Pen-Paper 3x3 (Def.)	9.43	9,79	10.98	90.2%	4.0%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (all)	6.23	6.64	11.61	66.7%	19.9%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (Off.)	6.46	7.57	10.40	67.7%	16.7%
Pen-Paper 4x4 (Def.)	6.23	6.64	11.61	37.4%	3.2%
Uellenbeck et. al 3x3 (Off.) [23]	7.56	7.74	8.19		
Uellenbeck et. al 3x3 (Def.) [23]	8.72	9.10	10.90		
Song et. al 3x3 (w/ Meter) [18]	8.96	10.33	12.29		
Song et. al 3x3 (w/o Meter) [18]	7.38	9.56	10.83		
Random 3x3 Pattern (U389,112)	18.57	18.57	18.57		
Random 4x4 Pattern (U4,350,069,823,024)	41.98	41.98	41.98		
Random 6-dit PIN (U1,000,000)	19.93	19.93	19.93		
Random 5-dit PIN (U100,000)	16.60	16.60	16.60		
Random 4-dit PIN (U10,000)	13.29	13.29	13.29		
Random 3-dit PIN (U1,000)	9.97	9.97	9.97		
Random 2-dit PIN (U100)	6.64	6.64	6.64		
Real Users' 4-Digit PINs [18, 15]	5.19	7.04	10.08		

Table 3: Partial Guessing Entropy Comparisons



Is bigger better? Comparing User-Generated Passwords on 3x3 vs 4x4 Grid Sizes for Android's Pattern Unlock

THANKS AND QUESTIONS?

BACKUP

Start and End Conditions



(c) Pen-Paper 4x4

Sub-Sequences

						$ \begin{array}{ccc} \bigcirc & \ddots & \ddots \\ \bigcirc & \ddots & \ddots \\ \bigcirc & \ddots & \ddots \\ \bigcirc & \ddots & \ddots \end{array} $					· · · ·
Freq=82	Freq=75	Freq=63	Freq=53	Freq=52	Freq=50	Freq=49	Freq=46	Freq=42	Freq=41	Freq=40	Freq=40
	(a) Self-Report 3x3										
· · · · ○ ⊖ ⊖ ⊖	$\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \bigcirc \\ \cdot & \cdot & \bigcirc \\ \cdot & \cdot & \bigcirc \end{array}$					$\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \bigcirc \\ \cdot & \bigcirc \\ \end{array}$		$\bigcirc \bigcirc $			
Freq=107	Freq=92	Freq=86	Freq=85	Freq=79	Freq=76	Freq=71	Freq=70	Freq=67	Freq=62	Freq=50	Freq=50
\succ					(b) Pen-P	aper 3x3					
	 	$ \bigcirc \ \cdot \$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · ·	• • • •	••••	• • • • •	· · · · · ·	· · · @	* * * * * * * *
• <u>⊕</u> ⊕ ⊕ Freq=100	© ⊕ ⊕ Freq=96	Freq=96	Freq=92	Freq=91	Freq=87	Freq=87	Freq=86	Freq=78	Freq=75	Freq=68	· ⊖ ⊖ © Freq=68
		•		(c)) Pen-Paper 4	x4 (tri-grams	s)	•			
· · · · ·			$\bigcirc \odot \odot \odot \odot$		• • • • • • • • • • • • • •			• • • • • • • •	••••• ••••		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
$\bigcirc \bigcirc \odot \odot \odot \odot$ Freq=84	① Freq=77	Freq=77	Freq=72	⊕-⊙ · · · Freq=72	⊕⊕⊕ Freq=64	•••••	· · ⊚-€ Freq=58	$\odot \odot \odot \odot \odot$ Freq=56	- 🕞 🕁 Freq=50	Freq=48	- ⊚ ⊖ ⊕ Freq=47

(d) Pen-Paper 4x4 (quad-grams)

Length and Stroke Length



Figure 3: The distribution of stroke-lengths in the data set

Guessing Rates



(a) *All* patterns using the average of 10 runs of a 5-fold cross-validation with 500 randomly selected patterns and self-reported 3x3 patterns

Offensive vs. Defensive





(b) *Offensive* patterns using the average of 10 runs of a 5-fold cross-validation with 100 randomly selected patterns

(c) *Defensive* patterns using the average of 10 runs of a 5-fold cross-validation with 100 patterns

Repeats and Symmetries



Figure 7: Cumulative fraction of patterns that repeat



Figure 8: Cumulative fraction of patterns that have symmetries