# PCP - Huji Course, Ex 2.

David Ponarovsky

July 7, 2023

## 1 Ex 1. Sumchecking with coefficients.

We would like to verify that a given polynomial box P satisfies that  $\sum_{x \in [d]^m} \varphi(x) f_P(x) = 0$  by accessing to at most O(md) variables. For any function  $\varphi: [d]^m \to \mathbb{F}_q$ . Denote by  $\varphi': \mathbb{F}_q^m \to \mathbb{F}_q$  the extension of  $\varphi$  into a polynomial over  $\mathbb{F}_q^m$ . We saw in that lectures (and also in the previews assignment) that there is such a uinq extension.

We are going to split the section into three, first we are going to show how to verify that  $\sum_{x\in[d]^m} f_P(x) = 0$ . When the polynomial is a function into  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . (I think, but not sure, that in the lecture we saw only the case when q=2). Then in the second part we will show how can one redact the coefficients case into the non-coefficients case. Finally, in the last part, we combine all together to show that the construction achieve the requirements.

## 1.1 Over non binary field.

Let's define a series of polynomial boxes  $f_i$  such that:

$$f_0 = f$$

$$f_{i+1}(x_1, ..., x_{m-i}) = \sum_{y \in [d]} f_i(x_1, ..., x_{m-i}, x_{m-i+1} = y)$$

Our verifier will ask for a proof which is a list of  $f_0, f_1, f_2..., f_m$ . Now, notice that if f is an honest assignment then  $f_m$  is just the summation of f over the cube  $[d]^m$ . So it sufficient to show the existences of verifier that reject with heigh probability any string far from been encoded by the previews structure.

- 1 Sample uniformly random  $i \sim [m]$  and check that  $f_i$  is a codeword of the polynomial code in m variables at degree at most  $m \cdot d$ .
- **2**  $r_1, r_2..., r_m \leftarrow$  sample uniformly m points of [d]
- з for  $i \in [1, m]$  do
- Check if  $f_{i+1}(r_1,...,r_{m-i-1},x_{m-i}) \sum_{y \in [d]} f_i(r_1,r_2,...,r_{m-i-1},x_{m-i},y)$  is the zero polynomial by a random test that uses at most single query. (Here  $x_{m-i} \in [d]$  is the only variable)
- 6 If not then reject.
- 7 end

5

8 Accept if  $f_0 = 0$ 

*Proof.* For convenient let's denote by  $g_i(x_{m-i})$  the difference that been queried in line number 3.

- 1. Correctness. Easy. If the assignment is honest then by definition  $g_i = 0$  for any  $i \in [m]$  and therefore for any  $x_{m-i}$  we will have that  $g_i(x_{m-i}) = 0$ . So, in that case iteration will pass. And whole proof will be aspected with probability 1.
- 2. Soundness. Assume that there is any deg  $f_{i+1} \leq \deg f_i$ , Thus asking

#### 1.2 Coefficients $\mapsto$ non-coefficients.

Now as we proved in the classes  $\deg f \cdot g \leq \deg f + \deg g$ . Therefore we can redact the problem of verifying whether the weight summation is zero by considering the summation of the polynomial  $\varphi' \cdot f$  over the cube  $[d]^m$ .

- 1 Sample uniformly random  $x \sim [d]^m$  and check that  $\varphi'(x) = \varphi(x)$
- **2** Check that  $\varphi$  is a polynomial at degree at most  $d \cdot m$ .
- **3** If both of the checks passed, accept.

Proof.

## 1.3 Combine all.

- 1 Use the first tester to check the validity of the pair  $(\varphi', \varphi)$ .
- **2** Check that the degree of  $\xi$  is at most 2md
- **3** Check that the polynomial  $f \cdot \varphi' \xi$  is the zero polynomial.
- 4 Using the first verifier, accept if the summation of  $\xi$  overt the cube  $[d]^m$  is zero.

Proof.

## 2 Ex 2.

The question concerns with the following test: [COMMENT] rewrite again.

- 1 Choose  $x, y \in \{\pm 1\}^k$  independently.
- **2** Choose  $\mu \in \{\pm\}$ .
- **3** Choose a random noise  $z \in \{\pm\}^k$  such that  $z_i$  gets +1 with probability  $1 \varepsilon$ .
- 4 Accept if  $\mu f(\mu x) \cdot g(y) = f(z \cdot xc^{-1}(y))$

#### 2.1 2.a.

Let  $f = \chi_{\{i\}}, g = \chi_{\{j\}}$  and j = c(i). In that case it holds that:

$$\mu f(\mu x) \cdot g(y) = \mu \chi_{\{i\}}(\mu x) \chi_{\{j\}}(y) = \mu^2 x_i y_j = x_i y_j$$
$$f(z \cdot x c^{-1}(y)) = \chi_{\{i\}}(z x c^{-1}(y)) = z_i x_i y_j$$

Thus, the test pass only if  $z_i = 1$  and it given that this event happens with probability  $1 - \varepsilon$ .

#### 2.2 2.b.

Denote by  $\alpha_I \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta_I \in \mathbb{R}$  the coefficients of f, g over the character  $\chi_{\{I\}}$ .

$$\begin{split} &\mathbf{E}\left[\mu f\left(\mu x\right)\cdot g\left(y\right) f\left(z\cdot xc^{-1}\left(y\right)\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{I,J,K} \alpha_{I}\alpha_{K}\beta_{J}\mathbf{E}\left[\mu\chi_{\left\{I\right\}}\left(\mu x\right)\chi_{\left\{J\right\}}\left(y\right)\chi_{\left\{K\right\}}\left(zxc^{-1}(y)\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{I,J,K} \alpha_{I}\alpha_{K}\beta_{J}\mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[\mu\chi_{\left\{I\right\}}\left(\mu x\right)\chi_{\left\{J\right\}}\left(y\right)\chi_{\left\{K\right\}}\left(zxc^{-1}(y)\right)|\mu\right]\right] \\ &= \sum_{I,J,K} \alpha_{I}\alpha_{K}\beta_{J}\frac{1}{2}\left((-1)^{|I|+1}+1\right)\mathbf{E}\left[\chi_{\left\{I\right\}}\left(x\right)\chi_{\left\{J\right\}}\left(y\right)\chi_{\left\{K\right\}}\left(zxc^{-1}(y)\right)\right] \end{split}$$

Thus, all the elements in which |I| is even contribute zero for the exception. Now, let's apply the conditional expectation formula again conditioning over I, J, K, x, y:

$$\begin{split} &= \sum_{I,J,K,|I| \text{is odd}} \alpha_{I} \alpha_{K} \beta_{J} \mathbf{E} \left[ \mathbf{E} \left[ \chi_{\{I\}} \left( x \right) \chi_{\{J\}} \left( y \right) \chi_{\{K\}} \left( zxc^{-1}(y) \right) | I,J,K \right] \right] \\ &= \sum_{I,J,K,|I| \text{is odd}} \alpha_{I} \alpha_{K} \beta_{J} \mathbf{E} \left[ \sum_{\xi=0}^{|K|} \binom{|K|}{\xi} \left( -\varepsilon \right)^{\xi} \left( 1-\varepsilon \right)^{|K|-\xi} \chi_{\{I\}} \left( x \right) \chi_{\{J\}} \left( y \right) \chi_{\{K\}} \left( xc^{-1}(y) \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{I,J,K,|I| \text{is odd}} \alpha_{I} \alpha_{K} \beta_{J} \mathbf{E} \left[ \left( 1-2\varepsilon \right)^{|K|} \chi_{\{I\}} \left( x \right) \chi_{\{J\}} \left( y \right) \chi_{\{K\}} \left( xc^{-1}(y) \right) \right] \end{split}$$

Let us denote by  $C^{-1}(K)$  the indices  $C^{-1}(K) = \{j : \exists i \in K, c(i) = j\}$ . Then we get that:

$$\chi_{\{K\}} \left( xc^{-1}(y) \right) = \prod_{i \in K} x_i y_{c_i} = \chi_{\{K\}} \left( K \right) \chi_{\{C^{-1}(K)\}} \left( y \right)$$

Recall that for any  $I, J \subset [n]$  it holds that:

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\chi_{\{I\}}(x)\chi_{\{J\}}(x)\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\chi_{\{I\Delta J\}}(x)\right] = \mathbf{1}_{I=J}$$

And therefore the above can be simplified into:

$$\sum_{|I| \text{is odd}} \alpha_I^2 \beta_{C^{-1}(I)} \left( 1 - 2\varepsilon \right)^{|I|}$$

[COMMENT] add explanation.

$$\sum_{|I| \text{is odd}} \alpha_I^2 \beta_{C^{-1}(I)} \left( 1 - 2\varepsilon \right)^{|I|} \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{|I| \text{is odd}, (1 - 2\varepsilon)^{|I|} < \frac{1}{4}} \alpha_I^2 \beta_{C^{-1}(I)} + \sum_{|I| \text{is odd}, (1 - 2\varepsilon)^{|I|} > \frac{1}{4}} \alpha_I^2 \beta_{C^{-1}(I)} \left( 1 - 2\varepsilon \right)^{|I|}$$

Observes that for any subset  $S \subset [n]$  it holds that:

$$\sum_{|I| \in S} \alpha_I^2 \beta_{C^{-1}(I)} \le \sum_{|I| \subset [n]} \alpha_I^2 \beta_{C^{-1}(I)} \le \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{|I| \subset [n]} \alpha_I^4 + \sum_{|I| \subset [n]} \beta_I^2 \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( |f|_4^4 + |g|_2^2 \right) = 1$$

So the inequality become:

$$\leq \frac{1}{4} + \sum_{\substack{|I| \text{is odd } (1-2\varepsilon)^{|I|} > \frac{1}{\tau}}} \alpha_I^2 \beta_{C^{-1}(I)} \left(1 - 2\varepsilon\right)^{|I|}$$

So it left to compute the expectation  $\mathbf{E}\left[\chi_{\{I\}}\left(x\right)\chi_{\{J\}}\left(y\right)\chi_{\{K\}}\left(xc^{-1}(y)\right)\right]$  and observes that if  $c^{-1}(y)$  has no intersection with K. Define by C(K) all the indices i such that there exist  $k \in K$  for which  $y_{c_k} = y_i$ .

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{i\in I} x_i \prod_{j\in J} y_j \prod_{k\in K} x_k \cdot y_{c_k}\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\prod_{i\in I\Delta K} x_i \prod_{j\in J\Delta C(K)} y_j\right]$$

Proof.

#### 2.3 Ex 3. The label cover problem.

Let us assume that that  $|\Sigma|$  is a power of 2. Associate for each vertex a vector in  $\mathbb{F}_2^{|\Sigma|}$  (Soon we will add more  $\Theta(|\Sigma|)$  variables for having a sparse sum checking, namely for checking that  $\sum_j^{|\Sigma|} x_{vj} = 1$ ). And for each constraint.

Idea, there are more than  $\mu$  equations that satisfied then  $\Rightarrow$  there are more than  $\Theta(|V|)$  which their local environment is  $\frac{1}{2}\mu$  satisfied.  $\Rightarrow$  the local  $T_{\varepsilon}(c)$  test accepts with probability  $\frac{1}{2} + \delta(\mu)$  and therefore there exist  $i \in L_{\delta}(f), j \in M_{\delta}(g)$  s.t c(i) = j.  $\Rightarrow$  we could pick f and g to be  $\chi_{\{i\}}$  on those vertices and get a solution such  $(1 - \varepsilon)$  are satisfied.

Other direction to consider, suppose that we satisfy more than  $\frac{1}{2} + \delta$  equations, than for at least  $\Theta$  () of the edges we success to fined i, j, i = c(j). Therefore we can construct another assignment in which at least  $1 - \varepsilon$  of the equations are satisfied.

## 3 Part 3.

Label cover when the aleph-bet depends on the vertex. Instead of showing reduction into the general label cover we will show a reduction to a similar problem in which vertices can have an additional restriction on the valid charters that one can sets on. In formal, we will say that  $\langle G, \{\Sigma_v : v \in V\}, \{c_e : e \in E\} \rangle$  instance of Generalized-Label-Cover if there is an labeling  $A : V \to \Sigma$  such that for any  $\{v, u\} \in E$  it holds that  $c_e A(v) = A(u)$  and in addition for any  $v \in V$  we have that  $A(v) \in \Sigma_v \subset \Sigma$ .

The reduction. Define the Bipartite graph G=(L,R,E). Associate the left vertices with the variables and the right with the closures. Define  $\{u,v\}$  to be an edge if the literal which associate with the vertex u is in the closure associate with vertex v. For the alphabet take  $\Sigma=\mathbb{Z}_2^3$ . For any right vertex  $v\in R$  define  $\Sigma_v$  be all the assignments for which the v-closures is satisfied and for any left vertex u define  $\Sigma_u=\{(1,0,0),(0,0,0)\}$ . Finally define  $c_e$  for  $e=\{v\in R,u\in L\}$  to be the projection of  $\sigma\in\Sigma$ , setted on v, to the coordinate corresponding with u. For example, assume that v associate with  $x\vee y\vee z$  and let u be the vertex associate with x, And assume that A(v)=(1,0,1), then  $c_eA_v=(1,0,0)$ .

**Compeletnce.** Suppose that  $\varphi \in \text{E3-CNF-SAT}$  and let  $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^*$  be the assignment that satisfies  $\varphi$ . That it,  $\varphi(x) = \text{True}$ . Let A be the labeling that sets for any vertex on the left the bit matched to that literal by x follows by zeros padding. And for any right vertex the triple of the bits corresponding to literals involving in the associated closure. By the fact that x satisfies  $\varphi$  any closure in  $\varphi$  is satisfied by x and therefore each of the right vertices (closures) see on his local view a character of  $\Sigma_v$ . In addition by the definition of the construction any pair of connected vertices satisfies the edge restriction.

**Soundness.** Suppose that  $\varphi \in \text{E3-CNF-SAT}$  but not satisfiable and  $\langle G, \{\Sigma_v : v \in V\}, \{c_e : e \in E\} \rangle$  is an instance obtained by the reduction above. Assume throawds contradiction that there exists labeling A such that more than  $\mu' = 6\mu$  of the restriction  $\{c_e\}$  are satisfied.

Define by  $\alpha_i$  to be the number of right vertices which satisfy exactly i edges, that it,

$$\alpha_i = |\{|\{c_e A(v) = A(u) : u \in L\}| = i : v \in R\}|$$

Claim 1. For any labeling A such that  $\alpha_3 \geq \mu$  there exists an assignment  $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^*$  satisfies at least  $\mu$  portion of the restrictions.

*Proof.* The proof is trivial.

Claim 2. For any labeling A that satisfy  $\xi$  constraints, there exists labeling A' such that any constraint that satisfied by A also satisfied by A' and in addition  $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = 0$ . Put it differently, we can assume that  $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $v \in R$  be a vertex that satisfies less than two edges. Recall that  $\Sigma_v$  contains all the triple that satisfy the closure associated with v. By the fact that for any 3-CNF closure there is exactly one assignment which does not satisfy it, It follows that  $|\Sigma_v| = 2^3 - 1 = 7 \ge 2^2$ . Therefore, we can replace A(v) by a triple that agree with the first two vertices connected to it.

Using the above claim we can infer that  $\alpha_2+\alpha_3=|R|$  and in addition  $2\cdot\alpha_2+3\cdot\alpha_3\geq\mu'\cdot 3|R|$ . Thus,  $\alpha_3\geq (3\mu'-2)\,|R|$ . Particularly if  $\mu'\geq\frac{\mu+2}{3}$  then  $\alpha_3\geq\mu|R|$ , Combining the claim above we get a contradiction to the fact that  $\varphi\in(\mu,1)$  gap-3E-CNF-SAT and not satisfiable.