```
Define V(x) := \sum_{x} C_x \cdot V_x(x)
          W(0) := = Cx · Wx(x)
          Y(x) := I ci. yi(x)
                                                         P vanishes on all the target points.
          P(x) := V(x) \cdot \omega(x) - \gamma(x).
                                                   ( P(rg) = o for all g.
Then, (C_1, \dots, C_{pr}) is a legal assignment iff P(1) = P(2) = 0 \Rightarrow \pm (x) \mid P(x).
 Note that P(1) = V(1)·W(1) - Y(1)
                                                                     : P(8) = ±(s) h(s)
                                                                           for some pdy . h(x).
                = G1. V1(1) · G2. W2(1) - C4. 44(1)
                 = G.C2 - C4 =0
            P(2) = V(2) \cdot W(2) - Y(2)
                 = C4. V4(2). (G.W1(2)+C3.W3(2)) - C5. 45(2)
                 = Cq. ( G+Cg) - C5 = 0
  \Rightarrow "I know c1. c2. c3 s.t. 9.6.(9+6)=7 is translated into
        an agriculent statement about polynomials V(x). W(x). Y(x) . P(x) using QAB.
     For an illegal assignment (c1, ..., cm), t(x) does not divide P(x).
Suppose Alice wants to prove to Bob she knows a.c. a = Fp st. a.c. (C1+c3) = 7.
i) Alice computes polynomials V(x). W(x). Y(x). and h(x).
II) Bob chooses a roundom point s \in \mathbb{F}_p and computes Com(\pm(s)).
IT) Alice computes Com (V(S)), Com (W(S)), Com (Y(S)), Com (H(S)), Managed too)?
                                                                how to compute it
     and sends to Bob.
                                                                    w/0
iv) Bob checks Com(V(s)\cdot W(s) - Y(s)) = Com(t(s)\cdot h(s))
      if Alice doesn't have a satisfying assignment,
           she doesn't find any polynomials v(x). W(x). Y(x), W(x) s.t. v(x) W(x) - Y(x) = h(x) + t(x).
```

>> the last equation does not hold.