Definition 1.1 ***Dynamic weakly verifiable puzzle (non interactive version)***
A dynamic weakly verifiable puzzle (DWVP) is defined by a probabilistic algorithm $P(\pi)$, called a problem poser, that takes as input chosen uniformly at random bitstring $\pi \in \{0,1\}^l$, and produces circuits Γ_V, Γ_H and a puzzle $x \in \{0,1\}^*$. The circuit Γ_V takes as its input $q \in Q$ and an answer y. If $\Gamma_V(q, y) = 1$ then y is a correct solution of puzzle x for q. The circuit Γ_H on input q provides a hint such that $\Gamma_V(q, \Gamma_H(q)) = 1$. The algorithm S, called a solver, has oracle access to Γ_V and Γ_H. The calls of S to Γ_V are called verification queries and the calls to Γ_H are hint queries. The solver S can ask at most h hint queries, v verification queries, and successfully solves a DWVP if and only if it makes a verification query (q, y) such that $\Gamma_V(q, y) = 1$, when it has not previously asked for a hint query on this q.

Definition 1.2 ***k-wise direct product of dynamic weakly verifiable puzzles***
Let $g : \{0,1\}^k \to \{0,1\}$ be a monotone function, and $P^{(1)}$ a probabilistic algorithm used to generate an instance of DWVP. A k-wise direct product of dynamic weakly verifiable puzzles is defined by a probabilistic algorithm $P^{(g)}(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$, where $(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) \in \{0,1\}^{k \cdot l}$ are chosen uniformly at random. $P^{(g)}(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$ sequentially generates k independent instances of dynamic weakly verifiable puzzles, where in the i-th round $P^{(g)}$ runs $P^{(1)}(\pi_i)$ and obtains $(x_i, \Gamma_V^{(i)}, \Gamma_H^{(i)})$. Finally, $P^{(g)}$ outputs a verification circuit

$$\Gamma_V^{(g)}(q, y_1, \ldots, y_k) := g(\Gamma_V^{(1)}(q, y_1), \ldots, \Gamma_V^{(k)}(q, y_k)),$$

a hint circuit

$$\Gamma_H^{(k)}(q) := (\Gamma_H^{(1)}(q), \ldots, \Gamma_H^{(k)}(q)),$$

and a puzzle $x^{(k)} := (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$.
The probabilistic algorithm S, called a solver, has oracle access to $\Gamma_V^{(g)}, \Gamma_H^{(k)}$. The solver S can ask at most v verification queries to $\Gamma_V^{(g)}$, h hint queries to $\Gamma_H^{(k)}$ and successfully solves the puzzle $x^{(k)}$ if and only if it asks a verification query $(q, y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ such that $\Gamma_V^{(g)}(q, y_1, \ldots, y_k) = 1$, and it has not previously asked for a hint query on this q.

Experiment $A^{P^{(\cdot)}, C^{(\cdot,\cdot)}}(\pi^{(\cdot)})$

Oracle: A problem poser $P^{(\cdot)}$ and a solver circuit $D^{(\cdot,\cdot)}$.
Input: A bitstring $\pi^{(\cdot)}$.

$(x^{(\cdot)}, \Gamma_V^{(\cdot)}, \Gamma_H^{(\cdot)}) := P^{(\cdot)}(\pi^{(\cdot)})$
Run $D^{(\Gamma_V^{(\cdot)}, \Gamma_H^{(\cdot)})}(x^{(\cdot)})$
    $Q_{Solved} := \{q : D^{\Gamma_V^{(\cdot)}, \Gamma_V^{(\cdot)}}(x^{(\cdot)})$ asked a verification query $(q, y^{(\cdot)})$ and $\Gamma_V^{(\cdot)}(q, y^{(\cdot)}) = 1\}$
    $Q_{Hint} := \{q : D^{\Gamma_V^{(\cdot)}, \Gamma_H^{(\cdot)}}(x^{(\cdot)})$ asked a hint query on q$\}$
If $\exists q \in Q_{solved} : q \notin Q_{Hint}$
    return 1
else
    return 0

Theorem 1.3 ***Security amplification of a dynamic weakly verifiable puzzle.***
For a fixed problem poser $P^{(1)}$ there exists an algorithm $Gen(C, g, \varepsilon, \delta, n, v, h)$ which takes as input a solver circuit C for k-wise direct product of DWVP, a monotone function g, parameters

ε, δ, n, the number of verification v, and hint h queries asked by C, and outputs a circuit D such that following holds:
If C is such that

$$\Pr_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)\in\{0,1\}^{kl}}[A^{P^{(g)},C}(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)=1] \geq \Pr_{\mu\leftarrow\mu_\delta^k}[g(\mu)=1]+\varepsilon$$

then D satisfies almost surely

$$\Pr_{\pi\in\{0,1\}^l}[A^{P^{(1)},D}(\pi)=1] \geq (\delta+\frac{\varepsilon}{6k})$$

Additionally, D and Gen require only oracle access to g and C. Furthermore, D asks at most h hint queries, v verification queries and $Size(D) \leq Size(C)\frac{6k}{\varepsilon}$ and $Time(Gen) = poly(k, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, n, v, h)$.

Let $hash : Q \to \{0, 1, \ldots, 2(h + v) - 1\}$ and P_{hash}, defined with respect to $hash$, is a preimage of 0 for function $hash$.

Lemma 1.4 ***Success probability with respect to hash function.***
For a fixed $P^{(g)}$ let C succeed in solving the k-wise direct product of DWVP produced by $P^{(g)}$ with probability γ making h hint and v verification queries. There exists a probabilistic algorithm, with oracle access to C, that runs in time $O((h + v)^4/\gamma^4)$ and with high probability outputs a function $hash : Q \to \{0, \ldots, 2(h + v) - 1\}$ such that success probability of C in random experiment E with respect to the set P_{hash} is at least $\frac{\gamma}{8(h+v)}$.

Proof Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a family of pairwise independent hash functions $Q \to \{0, 1, \ldots, 2(h + v) - 1\}$. By a pairwise independence property of $\mathcal{H}$ we know that for all $i \neq j \in \{1, \ldots, (h + v)\}$ and $k, l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 2(h + v) - 1\}$ we have the following

$$\forall q_i, q_j \in Q : \Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[hash(q_i) = k \mid hash(q_j) = l] = \Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[hash(q_i) = k] = \frac{1}{2(h+v)}. \quad (0.0.1)$$

For a fixed $P^{(g)}$ and $(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$ in the random experiment A we define a binary random variable X for the event that $hash(q_j) = 0$, and for every query q_i asked before q_j $hash(q_i) \neq 0$. By definition of conditional probability

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[X=1] &= \Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[hash(q_j)=0 \wedge \forall i<j : hash(q_i)\neq 0] \\ &= \Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[\forall i<j : hash(q_i)\neq 0 \mid hash(q_j)=0]\Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[hash(q_j)=0].\end{aligned}$$

Now we use (**??**) and obtain

$$\Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[X=1] = \frac{1}{2(h+v)}\left(1-\Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[\exists i<j : hash(q_i)=0 \mid hash(q_j)=0]\right)$$

Using pairwise independence property we conclude

$$\Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[X=1] = \frac{1}{2(h+v)}\left(1-\Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[\exists i<j : hash(q_i)=0]\right).$$

Finally, we use union bound and the fact $j \leq (h + v)$ to get

$$\Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[X=1] \geq \frac{1}{2(h+v)}\left(1-\sum_{i<j}\Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[hash(q_i)=0]\right) \geq \frac{1}{4(h+v)}$$

Let G denote the set of all $(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$ for which C succeeds in the random experiment A. Then

$$\Pr_{\substack{hash \leftarrow \mathcal{H} \\ (\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)}}[X = 1] = \sum_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)\in G} \Pr_{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H}}[X = 1 \mid (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)] \cdot \Pr_{(\widetilde{\pi}_1,\ldots,\widetilde{\pi}_k)}[(\widetilde{\pi}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{\pi}_k) = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)]$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{4(h+v)} \sum_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)\in G} \Pr_{(\widetilde{\pi}_1,\ldots,\widetilde{\pi}_k)}[(\widetilde{\pi}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{\pi}_k) = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)] = \frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}$$

Algorithm: FindHash

Oracle: A solver circuit for k-wise direct product of DWVP $C^{(\cdot,\cdot)}$ with oracle access to hint and verification oracle.
Input: $\mathcal{H}$ a family of pairwise independent hash functions $Q \to \{0, 1, \ldots, 2(h+v)-1\}$

For $i = 1$ to $16(h+v)^2/\gamma^2$
    $hash \xleftarrow{\$} \mathcal{H}$
    $count := 0$
    For $j := 1$ to $16(h+v)^2/\gamma^2$
        $(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) \xleftarrow{\$} \{0,1\}^{kl}$
        Run $A^{P^{(g)},C^{(\cdot,\cdot)}}(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$
            Let $(\widetilde{q}, y^{(k)})$ be the first successful verification query.
            Let G be a set of all q used in hint or verification queries asked before $(\widetilde{q}, y^{(k)})$.
        If $\Gamma_V^{(g)}(\widetilde{q}, y^{(k)}) = 1 \wedge G \subseteq P_{hash}$
            $count := count + 1$
    If $count \geq 4(h+v)/\gamma$
        return $hash$
return $\perp$

We show that the algorithm **FindHash** chooses a hash function such that almost surly the success probability of C in random experiment E with respect to set P_{hash} is at least $\frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{Good}$ denote the family of hash functions for which $\Pr_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)}[X] \geq \frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}$ and $X_1, \ldots, X_i$ be binary random variables such that for a fixed hash function

$$X_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if in } i\text{th iteration variable } count \text{ is increased} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

We first show that it is unlikely that the algorithm **FindHash** returns $hash \notin \mathcal{H}_{Good}$. For $hash \notin \mathcal{H}_{Good}$ we have $\mathbb{E}_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)}[X_i] < \frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}$. We use Chernoff inequality and obtain

$$\Pr_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \geq (1+\delta)\frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}\right] \leq \Pr_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \geq (1+\delta)\mathbb{E}[X_i]\right] \leq e^{-\frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}N\delta^2/3}$$

The probability that $hash \in \mathcal{H}_{Good}$ is not returned by the algorithm is

$$\Pr_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)}[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \leq (1-\delta)\frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}] \leq \Pr_{(\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)}[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \leq (1-\delta)\mathbb{E}[X_i]] \leq e^{-\frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}N\delta^2/3}$$

Finally, we show that almost surely **FindHash** picks in one of its iteration a hash function that is in $\mathcal{H}_{Good}$. From the fact that the random variable X is binary distributed we have

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\substack{hash\leftarrow\mathcal{H} \\ (\pi_1,\ldots,\pi_k)}}[X] \geq \frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}$$

Let Y_i be a binary random variable

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{in } i\text{th iteration } hash \in \mathcal{H}_{Good} \text{ is picked} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

We make use of the fact that if a function from $\mathcal{H}_{Good}$ is picked, then it is returned almost surely. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[Y_i] \geq \frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)}$ and we can use Chernoff bound to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{hash \leftarrow \mathcal{H}} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^{K} Y_i = 0 \right] &\leq \Pr_{hash \leftarrow \mathcal{H}} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^{K} Y_i \leq (1-\delta) \frac{\gamma}{4(h+v)} \right] \\ &\leq \Pr_{hash \leftarrow \mathcal{H}} \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^{K} Y_i \leq (1-\delta) \mathbb{E}[Y_i] \right] \leq e^{-\delta^2 K \mathbb{E}[Y_i]/2} \end{aligned}$$

We see that the bound stated in the lemma **??** is achieved for valid for $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$ and $K = N = 16(h+v)^2/\gamma^2$ □

Experiment $E^{P^{(g)}, C^{(\cdot)(\cdot)}, hash}(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$
Solving k-wise direct product of DWVP with respect to the set P_{hash}

Oracle: Problem poser for k-wise direct product $P^{(g)}$
  A solver circuit for k-wise direct product $C^{(\cdot,\cdot)}$
  A function $hash : Q \leftarrow \{0, \ldots, 2(h+v)-1\}$
Input: Random bitstring $(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) \in \{0,1\}^{kl}$

$\pi^{(k)} := (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$
$(x^k, \Gamma_V^{(g)}, \Gamma_H^{(k)}) := P^{(g)}(\pi^k)$
Run $C^{\Gamma_V^{(g)}, \Gamma_H^{(k)}}(x^{(k)})$
  Let $(q_j, y_j^{(k)})$ be the first successful verification query if $C^{\Gamma_V^{(g)}, \Gamma_H^{(k)}}$ succeeds or an arbitrary verification query when it fails.
If $(\forall i < j : q_i \notin P_{hash})$ and $q_j \in P_{hash}$ and $\Gamma_V^{(g)}(q_j, y_j^{(k)}) = 1$
  return 1
else
  return 0

A canonical success is a situation when a solver C for fixed $hash$ and $P^{(1)}$ succeeds in a random experiment E.

Random experiment $F^{P^{(1)}, D, hash}(\pi)$
Solving a single DWVP with respect to the set P_{hash}

Oracle: A dynamic weakly verifiable puzzle $P^{(1)}$
  A solver circuit for a single DWVP D
  A function $hash : Q \rightarrow \{0, 1, \ldots, 2(h+v)-1\}$
Input: Random bitstring $\pi \in \{0,1\}^l$

$(x, \Gamma_v, \Gamma_H) := P^{(1)}(\pi)$
Run $D^{\Gamma_V, \Gamma_H}(x)$
  Let $(\widetilde{q}_j, \widetilde{r}_j)$ be the first successful verification query if $D^{\Gamma_V, \Gamma_H}(x)$ succeeds or

an arbitrary verification query when it fails.
If $(\forall i < j : q_i \notin P_{hash})$ and $q_j \in P_{hash}$ and $\Gamma_V(q_j) = 1$ **then**
  return 1
else
  return 0

Lemma 1.5 ***Security amplification of a dynamic weakly verifiable puzzle with respect to set*** P_{hash}.
For a fixed dynamic weakly verifiable puzzle $P^{(1)}$ *there exists an algorithm* $Gen(C, g, \varepsilon, \delta, n, v, h, hash)$, *which takes as input a circuit* C, *a monotone function* g, *a function* $hash : Q \to \{0, \dots, 2(h+v)-1\}$, *parameters* ε, δ, n, *number of verification* v, *and hint* h *queries asked by* C, *and outputs a circuit* D *such that following holds:*
If C *is such that*

$$\Pr_{(\pi_1,\dots,\pi_k)}[E^{P^{(g)},C,Hash}(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k)] \geq \Pr_{\mu \leftarrow \mu_\delta^k}[g(\mu) = 1] + \varepsilon$$

then D *satisfies almost surely*

$$\Pr_{\pi}[F^{P^{(1)},D,Hash}(\pi) = 1] \geq (\delta + \frac{\varepsilon}{6k})$$

and $Size(D) \leq Size(C)\frac{6k}{\varepsilon}$ *and* $Time(Gen) = poly(k, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, n, v, h)$.

Circuit $\widetilde{C}^{\Gamma_V^{(g)},\Gamma_H^{(g)},hash,C}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$
Circuit $\widetilde{C}$ has good canonical success probability.

Oracle: $\Gamma_V^{(g)}, \Gamma_H^{(g)}, hash, C$
Input: k-wise direct product of puzzles $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$

Run $C^{(\cdot,\cdot)}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$
  If C asks a hint query q **then**
    If $q \in P_{hash}$ **then**
      return $\perp$
    else
      answer the hint query with $\Gamma_H^{(k)}(q)$

  If C asks a verification query $(q, y_1, \dots, y_k)$ **then**
    If $q \in P_{hash}$ **then**
      ask the verification query $(q, y_1, \dots, y_k)$
      stop the execution
    else
      answer verification query with 0
return $\perp$

The key difference between circuits C and $\widetilde{C}$ is that if $\widetilde{C}$ asks a verification query $(q, y_1, \dots, y_k)$ then $q \in P_{hash}$. This means that if $\widetilde{C}$ succeeds then it also succeeds canonically.

Lemma 1.6 *For fixed* $P^{(g)}$ *it is true that*

$$\Pr_{(\pi_1,\dots,\pi_k)}[E^{P^{(g)},C,Hash}(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k) = 1] \leq \Pr_{(\pi_1,\dots,\pi_k)}[\Gamma_V^{(g)}(\widetilde{C}^{\Gamma_V^{(g)},\Gamma_H^{(g)},Hash}(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k)) = 1].$$

Proof We fix the randomness $(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k)$ used in the random experiment E. Let $x^{(k)} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ be a set of puzzles generated in the random experiment E for the randomness $(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k)$. If C succeeds canonically for the set of puzzles $x^{(k)}$, then also circuit $\widetilde{C}$ that runs C on the same set of puzzles succeeds. Using the definition of conditional expectation, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[E^{P^{(g)},C,hash}(\pi^{(k)}) = 1] &= \sum_{\pi^{(k)} \in \{0,1\}^{kl}} \Pr[E^{P^{(g)},C,hash}(\widetilde{\pi}^{(k)}) = 1 | \pi^{(k)} = \widetilde{\pi}^{(k)}] \Pr[\pi^{(k)} = \widetilde{\pi}^{(k)}] \\
&\leq \sum_{\pi^{(k)} \in \{0,1\}^{kl}} \Pr[E^{P^{(g)},\widetilde{C},hash}(\widetilde{\pi}^{(k)}) = 1 | \pi^{(k)} = \widetilde{\pi}^{(k)}] \Pr[\pi^{(k)} = \widetilde{\pi}^{(k)}] \\
&= \Pr[E^{P^{(g)},\widetilde{C},hash}(\pi^{(k)}) = 1]
\end{aligned}$$

Algorithm $Gen(\widetilde{C}, g, \varepsilon, \delta, n)$

Oracle: $\widetilde{C}, g$
Input: ε, δ, n
Output: A circuit D

For $i := 1$ to $\frac{6k}{\varepsilon} \log(n)$
    $\pi^* \leftarrow \{0,1\}^l$
    $\widetilde{S}_{\pi^*,0} := EvaluateSurplus(\pi^*, 0)$
    $\widetilde{S}_{\pi^*,1} := EvaluateSurplus(\pi^*, 1)$
    If $\widetilde{S}_{\pi^*,0} \geq (1 - \frac{3}{4k})\varepsilon$ or $\widetilde{S}_{\pi^*,1} \geq (1 - \frac{3}{4k})\varepsilon$
        $\widetilde{C}' := \widetilde{C}$ with the first input fixed on π^*
        return $Gen(\widetilde{C}', g, \varepsilon, \delta, n)$
// all estimates are lower than $(1 - \frac{3}{4k})\varepsilon$
return $D^{\widetilde{C}}$

EvaluateSurplus(π^*, b)
    For $i := 1$ to N_k
        $\pi^{(k)} \leftarrow \{0,1\}^{lk}$
        $(c_1, \dots, c_k) := EvalutePuzzles(\pi^*, \pi^{(k)})$
        $\widetilde{S}^i_{\pi^*,b} := g(b, c_2, \dots, c_k) - \Pr_{(u_2,\dots,u_k)}[g(b, u_2, \dots, u_k) = 1]$
    return $\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \widetilde{S}^i_{\pi^*,b}$

EvalutePuzzles$(\pi^*, \pi^{(k)})$
    $(x^k, \Gamma^{(g)}_V, \Gamma^{(g)}_H) := P^{(g)}(\pi^*, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_k)$
    For $i = 2$ to k
        $(x_1, \Gamma^{(i)}_v, \Gamma^{(i)}_H) := P^{(1)}(\pi_i)$
    $(q, y^k) := \widetilde{C}^{\Gamma^{(g)}_V, \Gamma^{(g)}_H}(x^*, x_2, \dots, x_k)$
    For $i = 1$ to k
        $c_i := \Gamma^i_v(q, y_i)$
    return $(c_1, \dots, c_k)$

Circuit $D^{\widetilde{C}}$

Oracle: $\widetilde{C}, P^{(1)}$
Input: puzzle x

For $i := 1$ to $\frac{6k}{\varepsilon}\log(\frac{6k}{\varepsilon})$
  $\pi^k \leftarrow \{0,1\}^k$
  $(c_1,\ldots,c_k) := EvaluatePuzzles(\pi, \pi^{(k)})$
  If $g(1,c_2,\ldots,c_k)=1$ and $g(0,c_2,\ldots,c_k)=0$
    $(q,y_1,\ldots,y_k) := \widetilde{C}(\pi^*,\pi_2,\ldots,\pi_k)$
    return y_1
return $\perp$

Let $(q, y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ denote the output of $\widetilde{C}$. Additionally, let us denote by $c_i = \Gamma_V(q, y_i)$ whether (q, y_i) is a correct solution for a single puzzle. We define surplus as the following quantity

$$S_{\pi^*,b} = \Pr_{\pi^{(k)}}[g(b,c_2,\ldots,c_k)=1] - \Pr_{\mu^{(k)}}[g(b,u_2,\ldots,u_k)=1]$$

The surplus $S_{\pi^*,b}$ tells how good the algorithm $\widetilde{C}$ performs when the first puzzle is fixed, and the fact whether it is correctly solved is neglected. The procedure **EvaluateSurplus** returns the estimate $\widetilde{S}_{\pi^*,b}$ that differs from $\widetilde{S}_{\pi*,b}$ by at most $\frac{\varepsilon}{4k}$ almost surely. Therefore, we conclude $S_{\pi*,b} \geq (1-\frac{1}{k})\varepsilon$. We use a new monotone binary function $g'(b_2,\ldots,b_k) := g(b,b_2,\ldots,b_k)$, and fix the first input puzzle of $\widetilde{C}$ for the one generated by using the randomness π^*. The new circuit satisfies the conditions of Lemma **??** which means that we can use algorithm *Gen* for the new circuit $\widetilde{C}$ and monotone function g'. For $k=1$ function $g(b)$ is either identity or a constant function. If g is identity then the success probability of $\widetilde{C}$ is as least $(\delta+\varepsilon$ and we can simply use $\widetilde{C}$ to solve the single puzzle. If the function g is constant the vacuously true.