

# Chapter 2

## Locally Testable Codes with an Application in Hardness Amplification

Angsheng Li

Institute of Software  
Chinese Academy of Sciences

Advanced Algorithms, U CAS  
14th, March, 2016

# Outline

1. Backgrounds
2. Yao's XOR
3. Impagliazzo's hard core
4. Error correcting codes
5. Decoding ECC
6. Local decoding and hardness amplification
7. Local algorithms in networks

# Algebraic fundamental theorem

Given a polynomial  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of (total) degree  $d$ , and a finite field  $\mathbb{F}$ . If  $p \not\equiv 0$ , then

$$\Pr_{x \in \mathbb{F}^n} [p(x) = 0] \leq \frac{d}{|\mathbb{F}|}.$$

# IP=PSPACE

**Completeness:** If a QSAT instance  $\phi$  is satisfied, then the honest prover convinces the verifier to accept with probability 1.

**Soundness:** If a prover  $P$  is false, then with probability at least

$$(1 - \frac{d}{p})^n$$

an error is kept to the final stage, at which the verifier  $V$  works with only constants and certainly detects the error.

# Applications of the locally testable codes

1. IP and PCP
2. Hardness amplification
3. Codes and information theory (research project)
4. Networks (research project)

# Idea

- Why hardness amplification?
- XOR ensures that:  
mild average-case hard  $\Rightarrow$  strong average-case hard

# Average-case hardness

## Definition

For  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $\rho \in [0, 1]$ , we define the  $\rho$ -average case hardness of  $f$ , written  $H_{\text{avg}}^\rho(f)$ , to be the largest size  $s$  such that for every circuit  $C$  of size  $\leq s$ ,

$$\Pr_{x \in_R \{0, 1\}^n} [C(x) = f(x)] < \rho.$$

For  $f : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$H_{\text{avg}}^\rho(f_n) = H_{\text{avg}}^\rho(f)(n),$$

$f_n$  is the restriction of  $f$  on  $\{0, 1\}^n$ , denoted by  $f_n = f \upharpoonright \{0, 1\}^n$ .

# Worst-case hardness

## Definition

We define the *worst-case hardness* of  $f$  to be

$$H_{\text{wts}}(f) = H_{\text{avg}}^1(f).$$

We define the *average-case hardness* of  $f$  by

$$H_{\text{avg}}(f) = \max\{s : H_{\text{avg}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{s}}(f) \geq s\}.$$



# Yao's XOR lemma

## Theorem

(Yao, 1982) For every  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $\epsilon > 2(1 - \delta)^k$ , then

$$H_{\text{avg}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}(f^{\oplus k}) \geq \frac{\epsilon^2}{400n} \cdot H_{\text{avg}}^{1 - \delta}(f), \quad (1)$$

where  $f^{\oplus k}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k f(x_i) \pmod{2}$ .

**Intuition** If small circuits fail to compute  $f$  with prob better than  $1 - \delta$ , then some smaller circuits fail to compute  $f^{\oplus k}$  with prob better than  $\frac{1}{2} + 2(1 - \delta)^k$ .

## Intuition

By assumption, for a small circuit  $C$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1) = C(x_1) & - < 1 - \delta \\ & \vdots \\ f(x_k) = C(x_k) & - < 1 - \delta. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

With probability  $< (1 - \delta)^k$ , for each  $i$ ,  $f(x_i) = C(x_i)$ , giving the correct  $f^{\oplus k}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ .

Suppose it is not the case, then we can only guess

$f^{\oplus k}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ , for which the prob of correctness is  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Therefore, the correctness of computation for  $f^{\oplus k}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  by small circuits is

$$< (1 - \delta)^k + \frac{1}{2}.$$

# Hardcore lemma

We say that a distribution  $H$  over  $\{0, 1\}^n$  has density  $\delta$ , if for every  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,

$$\Pr[H = x] \leq 1/\delta \cdot \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

## Lemma

(Impagliazzo, 95) For every  $\delta > 0$ ,  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , and  $\epsilon > 0$ , if  $H_{\text{avg}}^{1-\delta}(f) \geq s$ , then there is a density  $\delta$  distribution  $H$  such that for every circuit  $V$  of size at most  $\epsilon^2 s / 100n$ ,

$$\Pr_{x \in H}[C(x) = f(x)] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon.$$

# Intuition of hardcore

$$\forall C \exists H \Rightarrow \exists H \forall C$$

$$\forall C \exists H$$

For every small circuit  $C$ ,  $C$  fails to compute  $f$  on at least  $\delta \cdot 2^n$  inputs.

$$\exists H \forall C$$

There exists a  $\delta$ -dense distribution  $H$  on which every small circuit fails to compute  $f$  slightly better than random guess.

# Hardcore implies Yao's XOR lemma

Given  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  with  $H_{\text{avg}}^{1-\delta}(f) \geq s$ , and  $k$ , suppose to the contrary that there is a circuit  $C$  of size  $s' = \frac{\epsilon^2}{400n}s$  such that

$$\Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in_R U_n} [C(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k f(x_i) \pmod{2}] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon,$$

where  $\epsilon > 2(1 - \delta)^k$ .

Fix  $k = 2$ .

## Proof - I

By hardcore lemma, let  $H$  be a density  $\delta$  distribution such that for every circuit  $C'$  of size  $s'$ ,  $C'$  fails to compute  $f^{\oplus k}$  better than  $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ .

Define a distribution  $G$  by

$$\Pr[G = x] = \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \cdot (2^{-n} - \delta \cdot \Pr[H = x]).$$

Then,

$$U_n = (1 - \delta)G + \delta H.$$

$$(U_n)^2 = (1 - \delta^2)G^2 + (1 - \delta)\delta GH + \delta(1 - \delta)HG + \delta^2 H^2.$$

## Proof - II

Given a distribution  $D$  over  $\{0, 1\}^{2n}$ , let  $P_D$  be the probability that

$$C(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{i=1}^2 f(x_i) \pmod{2}$$

where  $(x_1, x_2) \in_R D$ .

By the assumption of  $f$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon &\leq P_{(U_n)^2} \\ &= (1 - \delta)^2 P_{G^2} + (1 - \delta)\delta P_{GH} + \delta(1 - \delta) P_{HG} + \delta^2 P_{H^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

## Proof - III

Since  $P_{G^2} \leq 1$  and  $\epsilon > 2(1 - \delta)^2$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < (1 - \delta)\delta P_{GH} + \delta(1 - \delta)P_{HG} + \delta^2 P_{H^2}.$$

Note  $(1 - \delta)\delta + \delta(1 - \delta) + \delta^2 < 1$ . One of the following holds

- (i)  $P_{GH} > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$
- (ii)  $P_{HG} > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$
- (iii)  $P_{H^2} > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$



## Proof - IV

Assume WLOG (i). Then,

$$\Pr_{x_1 \in_R G, x_2 \in_R H} [C(x_1, x_2) = f(x_1) + f(x_2) \pmod{2}] > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

By averaging, there is a fixed  $x_1$  such that

$$\Pr_{x_2 \in_R H} [C(x_1, x_2) + f(x_1) = f(x_2) \pmod{2}] > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Therefore is a circuit  $D$  of size  $s'$  such that

$$\Pr_{x \in_R H} [D(x) = f(x)] > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

A contradiction.

The same proof works for  $k > 2$ .

# Proof - I

Assume:  $H_{\text{avg}}^{1-\delta}(f) \geq s$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ .

Goal: To show the existence of  $\delta$ -dense distribution  $H$  on which all circuits of size  $s'$  fail to compute better than  $\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$ .

A game approach:

Alice:

Chooses a  $\delta$ -dense distribution  $H$ ,

Bob: Chooses a circuit of size  $s'$ .

Alice pays Bob:

$$p(H, C) = \Pr_{x \in_R H}[C(x) = f(x)]$$

Alice wants to minimise  $p(H, C)$ , and Bob wants to maximise  $p(H, C)$ .

This is a zero-sum game.

## Proof - II

Toward a contradiction. Then,

For every  $\delta$ -dense distribution  $H$  chosen by Alice, Bob is able to choose a circuit  $C$  of size  $s'$  with which his payoff is:

$$\Pr_{x \in_R H} [C(x) = f(x)] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon.$$

That is, Bob always has an advantage  $\epsilon$ , whatever  $H$  Alice chose.

By the min-max theorem,

$$\min_{\mathcal{H}} \max_C \Pr_{x \in_R H} [C(x) = f(x)] = \max_C \min_{\mathcal{H}} \Pr_{x \in_R H} [C(x) = f(x)].$$

By the hypothesis,

$$\min_{\mathcal{H}} \max_C \Pr_{x \in_R H} [C(x) = f(x)] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon.$$

## Proof - III

Therefore

$$\max_{\mathcal{C}} \min_{\mathcal{H}} \Pr_{x \in_{\mathcal{R}} H} [C(x) = f(x)] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon.$$

So, there is a distribution  $\mathcal{C}$  of circuits of size  $s'$  such that for every  $H$ ,

$$\Pr_{C \in_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{C}, x \in_{\mathcal{R}} H} [C(x) = f(x)] \geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon.$$

For  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , we say that  $x$  is “bad”, if

$$\Pr_{C \in_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{C}} [C(x) = f(x)] < \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon,$$

and “good”, otherwise.

## Proof - IV

### Lemma

*The number of bad  $x$ 's is  $< \delta \cdot 2^n$ .*

Towards a contradiction. Let  $H$  be the uniform distribution of the bad  $x$ 's. Then,

$$\Pr_{C \in \mathcal{C}, x \in H} [C(x) = f(x)] < \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon,$$

A contradiction.

For  $t = \frac{50n}{\epsilon^2}$ , pick circuits

$$C_1, C_2, \dots, C_t$$

independently from  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  
define

$$C(x) = \text{majority}\{C_i(x) : 1 \leq i \leq t\}.$$

Then  $|C| = t \cdot s' < s$ .

# Proof - V

## Lemma

For every good  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,

$$\Pr[C(x) \neq f(x)] < 2^{-n}.$$

If  $x$  is good, then for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , the probability that  $C_i(x) = f(x)$  is  $\geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$ .

For  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , define  $X_i = 1$  if  $C_i(x) = f(x)$ , and 0, otherwise.

Let

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^t X_i.$$

By Chenoff bound, with probability  $< 2^{-n}$ ,  $X < \frac{1}{2}t$ .

## Proof - VI

Therefore,

$$\Pr_{x \in_R \{0,1\}^n} [C(x) = f(x)] > 1 - \delta,$$

contradicting  $H_{\text{avg}}^{1-\delta}(f) \geq s$ .

A general method:

For every good  $x$ , for a random circuit  $C'$  of size  $s'$ ,

$C'(x) = f(x)$  with a nontrivial advantage  $\epsilon$ .

Then there is a slightly larger circuit  $C$  that computes  $f$  with prob 1 on all good inputs.

# The min-max theorem

## Theorem

*Let  $A$  be the payoff matrix of a zero-sum game. Then*

$$\min_p \max_q qAp = \max_q \min_p qAp,$$

*$p, q$  are distributions of strategies.*



# Hardness amplification

Worst-case hardness

↓ (ECC) error correcting codes

Average case hardness.

# Error correcting code

## Definition

For  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^m$ , the fractional Hamming distance of  $x$  and  $y$ , written,  $\Delta(x, y)$  is defined by

$$\frac{1}{m} |\{i : x_i \neq y_i\}|.$$

For  $\delta \in [0, 1]$ ,  $E : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ ,  $E$  is called an *error correcting code with distance  $\delta$* , if for every  $x \neq y$ ,

$$\Delta(E(x), E(y)) \geq \delta.$$

$E(x)$ : the *codeword* of  $x$ .

# Intuition of ECC

## Why ECC?

- To increase slightly the dimensionality allows us to amplify errors largely
- To amplify errors is to rectify the errors.
- Increasing errors amplifies hardness.

# Existence of ECC

## Lemma

*For every  $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$  and large  $n$ , there is a function  $E : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$  that is an ECC with distance  $\delta$  for  $m = n/(1 - H(\delta))$ , where  $H(\delta) = -\delta \log_2 \delta - (1 - \delta) \log_2 (1 - \delta)$ , the Shannon entropy of  $\delta$ .*

# Proof

Each  $\delta$ -ball in  $\{0, 1\}^m$  contains at most  $o(1) \cdot 2^{H(\delta)n}$  elements.  
 $m = n/(1 - H(\delta))$ , there are at least  $2^n$  many  $\delta$ -balls in  $\{0, 1\}^m$ .  
Random enumeration of the  $\delta$ -balls will define an ECC  $E$  with distance  $\delta$ .

Why  $\delta < 1/2$ ?

# High-dimensional geometry

The math principle of ECC is a high-dimensional geometry theorem:

The volume of a ball of radius  $r$  in  $m$ -dimensional space is approximately

$$\frac{\pi^{m/2}}{(m/2)!} r^m.$$

The volume increases exponentially as the dimensionality increases.

# Efficient ECC

We will need explicitly defined ECC that are both efficiently encoded and decoded.

Decoding an ECC:

If  $\Delta(E(x), y) < \frac{\delta}{2}$ , then efficiently compute  $x$ .

# Walsh-Hadamard code

$$\begin{aligned} WH : \{0, 1\}^n &\rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2^n} \\ a &\mapsto \langle a \cdot x \rangle, x \in \{0, 1\}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

## Lemma

*WH is an ECC of distance  $\frac{1}{2}$ .*



# ECC over $\Sigma$

Given alphabet  $\Sigma$ ,  $x, y \in \Sigma^m$ ,

$$\Delta(x, y) = \frac{1}{m} |\{i : x_i \neq y_i\}|.$$

A function  $E : \Sigma^n \rightarrow \Sigma^m$  is an ECC with distance  $\delta$  over  $\Sigma$  if for  $x \neq y$ ,  $\Delta(E(x), E(y)) \geq \delta$ .

# Reed-Solomon code

Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be a field and  $n, m$  numbers with  $n \leq m \leq |\mathbb{F}|$ . The Reed-Solomon code is

$$RS : \mathbb{F}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^m$$

$$(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \mapsto (z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{m-1}),$$

where  $z_j = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i f_j^i$ ,  $f_j$  is the  $j$ th element of  $\mathbb{F}$ .

Let

$$A(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i.$$

Then  $z_j = A(f_j)$ .

# RS lemma

## Lemma

*The Reed-Solomon code  $RS : \mathbb{F}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^m$  has distance  $1 - \frac{n}{m}$ .*

# Reed-Muller code

RM maps a polynomial  $P$  of  $l$  variables and degree  $d$  to the values of the polynomial.

That is,

$$P \mapsto \langle P(x_1, \dots, x_l) \rangle, \quad x_1, \dots, x_l \in \mathbb{F}$$

for each  $l$  variable degree  $d$  polynomial  $P$ .

# Concatenated codes

# Lagrange interpolation

For any set of pairs  $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_{d+1}, b_{d+1})$ , there exists a unique polynomial  $g(x)$  of degree at most  $d$  such that  $g(a_i) = b_i$ , for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d+1\}$ .

Proof.

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} b_i \frac{\prod_{j \neq i} (x - a_j)}{\prod_{j \neq i} (a_i - a_j)}. \quad (5)$$

□

# Unique decoding for Reed-Solomon

## Theorem

*There is a polynomial time algorithm that, given a list  $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_m, b_m)$  of pairs of elements of a finite field  $\mathbb{F}$  such that there is a unique degree  $d$  polynomial  $G: \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  satisfying  $G(a_i) = b_i$  for  $t$  of the numbers  $i \in [m]$ , where  $t > \frac{m}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$ , recovers  $G$ .*

Let  $t \geq \frac{m}{2} + \frac{d}{2} + 1$ , let  $L = \frac{m}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$ , and  $l = \frac{m}{2} - \frac{d}{2}$ .  
Set

$$C(x) = c_0 + c_1x + \dots + c_Lx^L$$

$$E(x) = e_0 + e_1x + \dots + e_{l-1}x^{l-1} + e_lx^l$$

# Proofs

For each  $i \in [m]$ , set

$$C(a_i) = b_i E(a_i)$$

This is a homogenous system of linear equations with  $m$  equations, and  $m + 2$  unknowns. It must have nonzero solutions.

Solving the system, get polynomials  $C(c)$  and  $E(x)$ .

Consider  $C(x) - G(g)E(x)$ .

The degree of the polynomial is  $\frac{m}{2} + \frac{d}{2}$ . However, for every  $i$ , if  $G(a_i) = b_i$ , then  $C(a_i) - G(a_i)E(a_i) = 0$ , for which the number of such  $i$ 's is  $t \geq \frac{m}{2} + \frac{d}{2} + 1$ .

Therefore  $C(x) - G(x)E(x) \equiv 0$ . Set  $P = \frac{C(x)}{E(x)}$ . Then

$$P \equiv G.$$



# Decoding and hardness amplification

Decoding: Given a string  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,

$$x \Rightarrow E(x) \Rightarrow \text{corrupted } E(x) \Rightarrow x \quad (6)$$

Worst case hardness to mildly average case hardness: Given a function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , interpreted as a string,

$$f \Rightarrow E(f) \Rightarrow \text{computes } f \text{ with prob } 1 - \rho \Rightarrow \text{perfectly computes } f \quad (7)$$

## Local decoder

Let  $E : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$  be an ECC and let  $\rho$  and  $q$  be some numbers. A *local decoder* for  $E$  handling  $\rho$  errors is an algorithm  $D$ , that given random access to a string  $y$  this is  $\rho$ -close to some codeword  $E(x)$  for some unknown  $x$ , and an index  $j$ , runs for poly log  $m$  time and outputs  $x_j$  with probability at least  $\frac{2}{3}$ .

$$x \Rightarrow E(x) \Rightarrow y : \text{corrupted } E(x) \Rightarrow x_j$$

- The decoder  $D$  is allowed to randomly read some bits of  $y$  only, the corrupted  $E(x)$ , where  $x$  is an unknown.
- The running time of  $D$  is poly log  $m$ ,  $m$  is the length of  $y$ .

# Hardness amplification from local decoder

## Theorem

*Suppose that there exists an ECC with a poly time encoding algorithm and a local decoding algorithm handling  $\rho$  errors. Then for a function  $f \in \text{EXP}$  with  $H_{\text{wrs}}(f)(n) \geq s(n)$  for some  $s(n) \geq n$ . There is an  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\hat{f}$  such that*

$$H_{\text{avg}}^{1-\rho}(\hat{f})(n) \geq (s(\epsilon n))^\epsilon.$$

# Local decoder for WH

## Theorem

*For  $\rho < \frac{1}{4}$ , there exists a local decoder for the Walsh-Hadamard code handling  $\rho$  errors.*

### Input:

- (i)  $j \in [n]$ ,
- (ii) random access to  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , where

$$\Pr_{y \in_R \{0,1\}^n} [f(y) \neq x \cdot y] \leq \rho$$

for  $\rho < \frac{1}{4}$  and some unknown  $x$ .

**Output:** A bit  $b$ , that is expected to be  $x_j$ .

## D for WH

The local decoder  $D$  proceeds:

- 1) Let  $e^j$  be the vector that is 1 in the  $j$ th bit, and 0 on the all other bits
- 2) Randomly pick  $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$
- 3) Query  $f$  for  $f(y)$  and  $f(y + e^j)$
- 4) Output  $b = f(y) + f(y + e^j) \pmod{2}$ .

Then:

$$f(y) = x \cdot y \text{ with prob } 1 - \rho$$

$$f(y + e^j) = x \cdot (y + e^j) \text{ with prob } 1 - \rho$$

So with prob  $1 - 2\rho$ ,

$$b = x_j.$$

Run several times, then with prob almost 1,  $b = x_j$ .

# Computing the correct $f(x)$ from a corrupted $f$

Compute  $f(x)$  as follows:

1. Randomly pick  $y$
2. Let  $b = f(y) + f(y + x) \pmod{2}$

Then with prob  $1 - 2\rho$ ,  
 $b$  is the correct value of  $f(x)$ .

We say that  $f$  has the *self-correction property*.

# Local decoder for Reed-Muller

## Theorem

*For every field  $F$  and numbers  $d, l$ , there is a local decoder for the Reed-Muller code handling  $(1 - \frac{d}{|F|})/6$  errors.*

*That is, there is a poly time algorithm  $D$ , that given random access to a function  $f : F^l \rightarrow F$  that agrees with some degree  $d$   $l$  variable polynomial  $P$  on  $1 - (1 - \frac{d}{|F|})/6$  fraction of the inputs and  $x \in F^l$ , outputs  $P(x)$  with prob  $\geq \frac{2}{3}$ .*

**Goal:** Given  $f : F^l \rightarrow F$  that agrees  $P$  on  $1 - (1 - \frac{d}{|F|})/6$  fraction of the inputs, then we can compute  $P(x)$ , for each  $x \in F^l$ .

# Local decoder - I

Let  $\rho \leq (1 - \frac{d}{|F|})/6$ .

Then

$$\Pr_{y \in_{\mathbb{R}} F^l} [P(y) \neq f(y)] < \rho,$$

where  $P$  is an unknown polynomial of degree  $d$  and  $l$  variables.

**Input:**  $x \in F^l$

**Output:**  $P(x)$ .



## Local decoder $D$

$D$  proceeds as follows:

- 1) Pick a random line  $L_x$ , i.e.,  $z \in_R F^l$ , with

$$L_x = \{x + tz : t \in F\}$$

- 2) Query  $f$  to obtain a set of pairs

$$\{(t, f(x + tz)) \mid t \in F\}$$

– agrees with  $P(x + tz)$  for many  $t$ 's

- 3) Run Reed-Solomon decoding to gain a poly  $Q$  such that

$$Q(t) = f(x + tz)$$

for a large number of  $t$ 's, which solves  $P(x + tz)$ .

- 4) Output  $Q(0)$ , expected to be  $f(x)$ .

# Proofs - I

For  $t \neq 0$ ,  $x + tz$  is uniformly distributed, so the expected number of points  $x + tz$  at which  $f(x + tz) \neq P(x + tz)$  is  $\rho|F|$ . Define  $X_t = 1$  if  $f(x + tz) \neq P(x + tz)$ , and 0, otherwise. Let  $X = \sum_{t \neq 0, t \in F} X_t$ . Then

$$E[X] = \rho \cdot |F|.$$

## Proofs - II

By Markov inequality

$$\Pr[X > 3E[X]] < \frac{1}{3}.$$

So with prob  $\geq \frac{2}{3}$ ,

$$X \leq 3E[X] = (1 - \frac{d}{|F|})|F|/2$$

By Reed-Solomon, with prob  $\geq \frac{2}{3}$ ,

$$Q(t) \equiv P(x + tz),$$

in which case,

$$Q(0) = P(x).$$

# Local decoder for concatenated codes

# Reference

Chapters 8, 11, 19, 21, 22

Sanjeev Arora, Boaz Barak, Computational Complexity, A  
Modern approach, Cambridge University Press, 2010

# New directions

1. Local algorithms for networks
  - Network algorithms must be local
2. Structure and algorithms for big data
  - The noisy big data require new theory of structures and algorithms

## Grand challenge

We have seen that given a corrupted function  $f$ , it is possible to have an algorithm to compute the true  $f$  by random access the bits of the corrupted  $f$ . Here a function is either a linear function or a low degree polynomial.

What we can do for general functions?

More importantly, in nature, we often have a noisy data structure  $G$ , which is evolved by the rules, regulations and laws of specific objects, perturbed by random variations and noises. That is,  $G$  is a structured noisy data, consisting of a “true structure”  $T$  formed by laws and a noisy part  $N$ . A grand challenge is to define the true structure  $T$  of a noisy data  $G$ , excluding the perturbation by the random variations and noises occurred in  $G$ . Once such a true structure  $T$  of  $G$  is defined, we are able to discover the true knowledge of  $G$ .

## Exercises 1

- Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent random variables such that  $X_i$  is equal to 1 with probability  $1 - \delta$  and equal to 0 with probability  $\delta$ . Let  $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \pmod{2}$ . Prove that

$$\Pr[X = 1] = \frac{1}{2} + (1 - 2\delta)^k / 2.$$

- Prove that if there exists a  $\delta$ -density distribution  $H$  such that  $\Pr_{x \in_R H}[C(x) = f(x)] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$  for every circuit  $c$  of size at most  $S$  with  $S \leq \sqrt{\epsilon^2 \delta 2^n / 100}$ , then there exists a subset  $I \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$  of size at least  $\frac{\delta}{2} 2^n$  such that

$$\Pr_{x \in_R I}[C(x) = f(x)] \leq \frac{1}{2} + 2\epsilon$$

for every circuit  $C$  of size at most  $S$ .

- Prove the hardcore lemma for general  $k$ .



## Exercises 2

1. Let  $f : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  be any function. Suppose integer  $d \geq 0$  and number  $\epsilon > 2\sqrt{\frac{d}{|\mathbb{F}|}}$ . Prove that there are at most  $2/\epsilon$  degree  $d$  polynomials that agree with  $f$  on at least an  $\epsilon$  fraction of its coordinates.
2. Prove that if  $Q(x, y)$  is a bivariate polynomial over some field  $\mathbb{F}$  and  $P(x)$  is a univariate polynomial over  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $Q(P(x), x)$  is the zero polynomial, then  $Q(x, y) = (y - P(x))A(x, y)$  for some polynomial  $A(x, y)$ .

## Exercises 3

**Linear codes** We say that an ECC  $E : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$  is *linear*, if for every  $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $E(x + x') = E(x) + E(x')$  (componentwise addition modulo 2). A linear ECC can be seen as an  $M \times n$  matrix  $A$  such that  $E(x) = Ax$ , thinking of  $x$  as a column vector.

1. Prove that the distance of a linear ECC is equal to the minimum over all nonzero  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  of the fraction of 1's in  $E(x)$ .
2. Prove that for every  $\delta > 0$ , there exists a linear ECC  $E : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$  for  $m = n/(1 - H(\delta))$  with distance  $\delta$ .
3. Prove that for some  $\delta > 0$ , there is an ECC  $E : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\text{poly}(n)}$  of distance  $\delta$  with poly time encoding, and decoding algorithms.