

# Theory Group Seminar Notes

Rishit Dagli

October 2022

## Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1 Lower Bounds for Locally Decodable Codes from Semirandom CSP Refutation</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Abstract . . . . .	3
1.2 Locally Decodable Codes . . . . .	3
1.3 How to prove the Theorem . . . . .	4
1.4 Normally Decodable Codes . . . . .	4
1.5 Proof: Going from LDC to XOR . . . . .	5
1.6 Proof: Existing $q$ -LDC lower bound for $q$ even . . . . .	6
1.7 Proof: $k^3$ lower bound . . . . .	8
1.8 Conclusion . . . . .	9
<b>2 Algorithms for the ferromagnetic Potts model on expanders</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Abstract . . . . .	10
2.2 The Ferromagnetic Potts Model . . . . .	10

## Introduction

These are my notes for the seminars that happen in the [Theory Group](#) at The University of Toronto. Many thanks to [Professor Allan Borodin](#) for allowing me to attend the Theory Group seminars and helping out.

A PDF of these notes is available at <https://rishit-dagli.github.io/cs-theory-notes/main.pdf>. An online version of these notes are available at <https://rishit-dagli.github.io/cs-theory-notes>.

The Theory Group focuses on theory of computation. The group is interested in using mathematical techniques to understand the nature of computation and to design and analyze algorithms for important and fundamental problems.

The members of the theory group are all interested, in one way or another, in the limitations of computation: What problems are not feasible to solve on a computer? How can the infeasibility of a problem be used to rigorously construct secure cryptographic protocols? What problems cannot be solved faster using more machines? What are the limits to how fast a particular problem can be solved or how much space is needed to solve it? How do randomness, parallelism, the operations that are allowed, and the need for fault tolerance or security affect this?

# 1 Lower Bounds for Locally Decodable Codes from Semirandom CSP Refutation

7th October 2022

The related paper: Combinatorial lower bounds for 3-query LDCs by Alrabiah et al. [1]. Seminar by Peter Manohar. [2] [3]

## 1.1 Abstract

A code  $C$  is a  $q$ -locally decodable code ( $q$ -LDC) if one can recover any chosen bit  $b_i$  of the  $k$ -bit message  $b$  with good confidence by randomly querying the  $n$ -bit encoding  $x$  on at most  $q$  coordinates. Existing constructions of 2-LDCs achieve blocklength  $n = \exp(O(k))$ , and lower bounds show that this is in fact tight. However, when  $q = 3$ , far less is known: the best constructions have  $n = \text{subexp}(k)$ , while the best known lower bounds, that have stood for nearly two decades, only show a quadratic lower bound of  $n \geq \Omega(k^2)$  on the blocklength.

In this talk, we will survey a new approach to prove lower bounds for LDCs using recent advances in refuting semirandom instances of constraint satisfaction problems. These new tools yield, in the 3-query case, a near-cubic lower bound of  $n \geq \Omega(k^3)$ , improving on prior work by a polynomial factor in  $k$ .

## 1.2 Locally Decodable Codes

Take codes  $b \in \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow x \in \{0, 1\}^n$

Codes  $x$  are read by the decoder,  $i \in [k]$ ,  $\hat{b}_i \in \{0, 1\}$

**Definition 1.**  $C$  is a  $(q, \delta, \epsilon)$ -locally decodable if for any  $x$  with  $\Delta(x, \text{Enc}(b)) \leq \delta n$ ,  $\text{Dec}^x(i) = b_i$  w.p.  $\geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$  for any  $i$ .

Ask the question, what is the best possible rate for a  $q$ -LDC given a  $q$ ?

$q$	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
2	$2^{\Omega(k)} \leq n$	$n \leq 2^k$
3	$k^2 \leq n$	$n \leq \exp(k^{o(1)})$
$O(1)$ , even	$k^{\frac{q}{q+1}} \leq n$	$n \leq \exp(k^{o(1)})$
$O(1)$ , odd	$k^{\frac{q+1}{q-1}} \leq n$	$n \leq \exp(k^{o(1)})$

Focus on the case  $q = 3$ , we have gotten better bounds:

$$k \leq n \leq 2^k \tag{1}$$

$$k^2 \leq n \leq \exp(\exp(\sqrt{\log k \log \log k}))$$

In [1], they show that a better minimum bound can be found than these existing ones for  $q = 3$ :

$$k^3 \leq n \quad (2)$$

The main result is that:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $C$  be a  $(3, \delta, \epsilon)$ -locally decodable codes. Then  $n \geq \tilde{\Omega}_{\delta, \epsilon}(k^3)$ .*

Semi-random CSP refutation comes to our aid to prove this! The intuitive way to put this theorem is that  $q$ -LDC lower bound is same as refuting "LDC"  $q$ -XOR.

### 1.3 How to prove the Theorem

The idea:

- $q$ -LDC lower bound is same as refuting "LDC"  $q$ -XOR
  - CSP Refutation
- Proof of existing  $q$ -LDC lower bound for  $q$  even
- Proof sketch of  $k^3$  lower bound

### 1.4 Normally Decodable Codes

We can see that the decoder we have can arbitrary but WLOG we can assume there are  $q$ -unif hypergraphs  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_k$  where every  $H_i$  is such that:

$$H_i \subseteq \binom{[n]}{q}$$

We can also see that:

Each  $H_i$  is a matching such that  $|H_i| \geq \delta n$   
and,  $Dec(i)$  picks  $C \leftarrow H_i$  and outputs  $\sum_{j \in C} x_j$

One such example is the Hadmard code:

$$b \in 0, 1^k \mapsto f = (\langle b, v \rangle)_{v \in 0, 1}^k \quad (3)$$

$$b_i = f(e_i) = f(v) + f(v + e_i)$$

Can think of this as  $v$  and  $v + e_i$  are connected.

Matching vector codes are  $\approx \mathbb{Z}_m^h$

## 1.5 Proof: Going from LDC to XOR

We suppose that our code is linear and that there exists  $q$ -unif hypergraphs  $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_k$ .

We also know that:

Each  $H_i$  is a matching such that  $|H_i| \geq \delta n$   
and,  $Dec(i)$  picks  $C \leftarrow H_i$  and outputs  $\sum_{j \in C} x_j$

So, we start by considering a  $q$ -XOR instance  $\psi_b$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vars: } & \{x_j\}_{j \in [n]} \\ \text{Over Equations: } & \sum_{j \in C} x_j = b_i, \forall i \in [k], C \in H_i \end{aligned}$$

We can write down the maximum fraction of satisfiable constraints:  $val(\psi_b) = 1$  for any  $b \in 0, 1^k$ .

It is sufficient now if we can argue that  $\psi_b$  is unsat with high probability for some random  $b$  when  $n \ll k^{\frac{q}{q-2}}$ .

Now we need to refute XOR, there are many ways to argue unsatisfiability of an XOR instance. One reason why we can not use probabilistic approaches here is that  $\psi_b$  only has  $k$  bits of randomness.

One way we can have some success here is to use a refutation algorithm

$$\psi \rightarrow A \rightarrow algval(\psi)$$

With this the guarantee then would be  $val(\psi) \leq algval(\psi)$  which is similar to saying that if  $algval(\psi) < 1$  then  $A$  refutes  $\psi$ . The ideal goal would be to refute random  $\psi$  with  $m$  constraints with high probability

However, we take a look at semi-random XOR. Our refutation algorithm and the guarantee will still be the same:

$$\psi \rightarrow A \rightarrow algval(\psi)$$

with the guarantee that  $val(\psi) \leq algval(\psi)$ .

So, now we generate semi-random  $\psi w/m$  constraints:

- The worst case would be random  $q$ -unif hypergraph
- Random RHS  $b_c$  for each  $C \in H$

The equation we have is:

$$\sum_{j \in C} x_j = b_c \quad (4)$$

And we also already know that

$$\psi_b \text{ is } \sum_{j \in C}$$

And,  $x_j = b_i, i \in [k], C \in H_i$ .  
 $\psi_b$  is almost semi-random.

Thus, we have shown 1.3 Part 1 of Proof.

### 1.6 Proof: Existing $q$ -LDC lower bound for $q$ even

$q$ -LDC XOR instance  $\psi_b$  is encoded by:

- $q$ -uniform hypergraph matchings  $\{H_1 \cdots H_k\}$
- right-hand sides are random  $b_i \in \{\pm 1\}$
- We have constraints  $\prod_{j \in C} x_j = b_i$  for all  $i$  and  $C \in H_i$

We now have a goal to argue that  $\psi_b$  unsat with high probability for random  $b$  when  $n \ll k^{q/(q-2)}$

frac. constraints satisfied by  $x \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  is  $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{f(x)}{2}$ .

Here  $f(x)$  is:

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_i b_i \sum_{C \in H_i} \prod_{j \in C} x_j \quad (5)$$

$$m = k \cdot \delta n$$

This makes our goal to be to certify with high probability that:

$$\max_{x \in \{\pm 1\}^n} f(x) < 1 \text{ when } n \ll k^{\frac{q}{q-2}} \quad (6)$$

We will now try to refute  $\psi_b$ . With Equation 5 and Equation 6 to refute  $\psi_b$  is like showing:

$$w.h.p. \max_{x \in \{\pm 1\}^n} f(x) < 1 \text{ where } f(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_i b_i \sum_{C \in H_i} \prod_{j \in C} x_j \quad (7)$$

when  $n \ll k^{\frac{q}{q-2}}$ .

The idea is to design a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  so that:

$$f(x) \leq \|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} = \max_{z, w \in \{\pm 1\}^N} z^T A w$$

As shown by Wein et al. [4] the matrix  $A$  can be indexed by

$$S \in \binom{[n]}{l}$$

Assign  $x \mapsto y$  such that  $y^T A y \propto f(x)$

and  $y_s := \prod_{j \in S} x_j$  which is simply the tensor product.

We need to now be able to answer how to set  $A(S, T)$

$$y^T A y = \sum_{S, T} y_S y_T A(S, T) = \sum_{S, T} A(S, T) \prod_{j \in S \oplus T} x_j \quad (8)$$

Which shows that we are actually using symmetric difference here.

We say that if  $S \oplus T = C \in h_i$  then  $\prod_{j \in S \oplus T} x_j = b_i$

$\implies A(S, T) = b_i$  if  $S \oplus T = C \in H_i$

$$y^T A y = \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \sum_{C \in h_i} \sum_{S \oplus T = C} \prod_{j \in C} x_j = D m f(x) \quad (9)$$

Here  $D$  = number of  $S, T$  where  $S \oplus T = C$ .

Simplifying an earlier statement we can also say from here that:  $A_C(S, T) = 1$  if  $S \oplus T = C$ .

For which  $A_i = \sum_{C \in h_i} A_C$  and  $A = \sum_{i=1}^k b_i A_i$

Set  $y_S := \prod_{j \in S} x_j$

$$y^T A y = D m f(x) \implies D m f(x) \leq \|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1}$$

Note that the way we defined  $D$  here it only depends on  $|C| = q$ , we can say:

$$D = \binom{q}{\frac{q}{2}} \binom{n-q}{l - \frac{q}{2}}$$

Also we know  $A_c \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  and  $N = \binom{n}{l}$ .

We have already proven that  $\|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} \geq D m \max_x f(x) \geq D m \geq D \delta n k$

It is also interesting to note that  $\|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} \leq N\|A\|_2$  and we still need to be able to show that with high probability that  $\|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1}$  is not too large.

Matrix Bernstein: with high probability over  $b_i$ ,  $\|A\|_2 \leq \Delta\sqrt{kl}$  where  $\Delta$  is the maximum number of 1's in a row in any  $A_i$ .

Expected number of 1's per row is  $\delta n \frac{D}{N} \sim n(\frac{l}{n})^{q/2}$ .

We can optimistically suppose that  $\Delta \sim n(\frac{l}{n})^{q/2}$  however this also needs  $l \geq n^{1-2/q}$ .

Then  $D \cdot \delta nk \leq \|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} \leq N\Delta\sqrt{kl}$

$\implies k \leq l$  since  $\Delta \sim \delta n \frac{D}{N}$

Now take  $l = n^{1-2/q} \implies k^{q/(q-2)} \leq n$

So,  $\Delta = \frac{2l}{q}$

Because  $H_i$  are matchings, a random row will have only  $\approx \frac{\delta n D}{N}$  1's.

The idea now is to prune off all the bad rows or columns in  $A$  to get  $B$  such that:

$$\|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} \leq \|B\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} + o(N)$$

And,  $\Delta_B \sim \delta n(\frac{l}{n})^{q/2}$

And now we can just use  $B$  instead which will prove  $q$ -LDC lower bound for  $q$  even.

## 1.7 Proof: $k^3$ lower bound

Recall,  $q$ -LDC XOR instance  $\psi_b$  is encoded by:

- $q$ -uniform hypergraph matchings  $\{H_1 \cdots H_k\}$
- right-hand sides are random  $b_i \in \{\pm 1\}$
- We have constraints  $\prod_{j \in C} x_j = b_i$  for all  $i$  and  $C \in H_i$

The goal is argue that  $\psi_b$  is unsatisfiable with high probability for random  $b$ . And the idea is to design a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  so that:

$$f(x) \leq \|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} = \max_{z, w \in \{\pm 1\}^N} z^T A w$$



The previous approach fails because the  $A$  from before requires  $q$  to be even.

One attempt is to represent rows as  $|S| = l$  and columns as  $|T| = l + 1$ . However this will only get us to  $k \leq \sqrt{n}$ .

We need to derive more constraints, using  $C_i \oplus C_j$  get us to  $nk$  constraints so each  $n_j$  is in  $\approx k$  constraints  $\implies$  new  $nk^2$  constraints.

The matrix  $A$  is indexed by  $S$ ,  $A(S, T) = b_i b_j$ . The calculation is now:

$$nk^2 D \leq \|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow 1} \leq N \Delta \sqrt{kl}$$

An optimist approach is  $\Delta \sim Nk \frac{D}{N} = nk(\frac{l}{n})^2$

$$\implies l \geq \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}$$

$$\implies k \leq n \implies k^3 \leq n$$

The row pruning tricks would still work provided that any  $\{u, v\}$  is in at most  $\text{polylog}(n)$  constraints.

## 1.8 Conclusion

This proof for  $q = 3$  is not generalizable for all odd  $q$  and neither is a reduction to 2-LDC. This is particularly true because of the row pruning step.

## 2 Algorithms for the ferromagnetic Potts model on expanders

14th October 2022

The related paper: Algorithms for the ferromagnetic Potts model on expanders by Carlson et al. [5]. Seminar by [Aditya Potukuchi](#).

### 2.1 Abstract

The ferromagnetic Potts model is a canonical example of a Markov random field from statistical physics that is of great probabilistic and algorithmic interest. This is a distribution over all 1-colorings of the vertices of a graph where monochromatic edges are favored. The algorithmic problem of efficiently sampling approximately from this model is known to be  $\#BIS$ -hard, and has seen a lot of recent interest. I will outline some recently developed algorithms for approximately sampling from the ferromagnetic Potts model on  $d$ -regular weakly expanding graphs. This is achieved by a significantly sharper analysis of standard "polymer methods" using extremal graph theory and applications of Karger's algorithm to count cuts that may be of independent interest. I will give an introduction to all the topics that are relevant to the results.

### 2.2 The Ferromagnetic Potts Model




Figure 1: A sample graph

## References

- [1] Omar Alrabiah, Venkatesan Guruswami, Pravesh Kothari, and Peter Manohar. A near-cubic lower bound for 3-query locally decodable codes from semirandom CSP refutation. Technical Report TR22-101, Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC), July 2022.
- [2] Arnab Bhattacharyya, L. Sunil Chandran, and Suprovat Ghoshal. Combinatorial lower bounds for 3-query ldcs, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.10698>.
- [3] Venkatesan Guruswami, Pravesh K. Kothari, and Peter Manohar. Algorithms and certificates for boolean csp refutation: "smoothed is no harder than random", 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.04415>.
- [4] Alexander S. Wein, Ahmed El Alaoui, and Cristopher Moore. The kikuchi hierarchy and tensor pca, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.03858>.
- [5] Charlie Carlson, Ewan Davies, Nicolas Fraiman, Alexandra Kolla, Aditya Potukuchi, and Corrine Yap. Algorithms for the ferromagnetic potts model on expanders, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.01923>.