

## Communication Complexity Examples

Parity

$$f(x, y) = \bigoplus_{\overline{1}} xy$$

$\overline{\Pi}$	
Player 1	Player 2
$x = 101$	$y = 110$
$P_1(101) = \bigoplus 101 = 1$	$P_2(110, 1) = (\bigoplus 110) \oplus 1$
$p_2 = 1$	

$$C(\overline{\Pi}) = 2$$

$C(F)$  is at least 2 because  $F$  depends on both  $x$  and  $y$  so there must be some communication.

Thus  $C(F) \geq 2$  via  $\overline{\Pi}$

Halting

Function  $H: \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

$$x = \overline{P} \quad y = \langle M \rangle$$

$H$  returns 1 if  $M$  halts on  $x$

$\overline{\Pi}$

Player 1	Player 2
$x = 1^{10}$	$y = \langle M_{\text{accept}} \rangle$
$P_1(1^{10}) = 1$	$P_2(\langle M \rangle, 1) = M(1^{10}) = M(1^{10}) = 1$
$P_2 = 1$	

In communication complexity problems, both players have unlimited computational power. This allows Player 2 to solve the halting problem.

This property allows us to focus on solely the communication between players.

## Multi-party Communication

So far, we've dealt with functions computed by the communication of 2 parties.

This can be generalized to multi-party functions.

### Problem Setup:

In 2 party problems, Player 1 knew nothing about Player 2's input and Player

2 know nothing about Player 2's input

However, in n-party problems:

Player i knows the input of every player except itself.

And

Messages are broadcasted to all other players

What does that mean?

Consider a "real-life" example.

All of us place a sticky note with some value on our heads (we don't know what's on our sticky note) and we stand in front of a whiteboard.

The only way we're allowed to communicate is by writing on the whiteboard for all to see.

The goal is for one player, after some amount of communication, to write the output of function  $f$  on the board.

Let's look at a ~~real~~ example:

$$F(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \text{maj}(x_{1i}, x_{2i}, x_{3i})$$

$$F(1101, 1001, 1011) =$$

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{---} \\ 1 \text{ ---} \\ 1 0 \text{ --} \\ 1 0 0 \text{ -} \\ \oplus 1 0 0 1 = 0 \end{array}$$

$\Pi$		
Player 1	Player 2	Player 3
$x_2 = 1001$	$x_1 = 1101$	$x_1 = 1101$
$x_3 = 1011$	$x_3 = 1011$	$x_2 = 1001$
$\oplus 1 0 - 1$	$\oplus 1 - - 1$	$\oplus 1 - 0 1$
$p_1 = 0$	$p_2 = 0$	$p_3 = 0$
$\underbrace{\oplus p_1 p_2 p_3 = \oplus 000 = 0}$		

$$C(\Pi) = 3$$

By the same argument as 2-party

parity,  $f$  depends on all 3 inputs  
thus the lowest  $C(f) = 3$ .

By showing that  $\Pi$  exists for  $f$ ,  
 $C(f) \geq 3$

## Non deterministic Protocols

"Nondeterministic communication complexity"

Defined akin to NP

Each players are given their input  
along with some  $z$  of length  
 $m$  that may depend on the given  
inputs.

$z$  is a nondeterministic guess

Otherwise the protocol is deterministic

$f(x,y) = 1$  iff  $\exists z$  that makes the players output 1  
 $C(f) = m + \text{communication}$

Inequality / intersection example?

coNP is defined similarly

$$g(x,y) = l - f(x,y)$$

However, it can be shown that  
in terms of communication complexity:

$$\text{NPI coNP} = P$$

This is shown by relating the communication complexities of  $f \in NP$  and  $\bar{f} \in coNP$ .

$$C(f) = k$$

$$C(\bar{f}) = l \text{ for some complexity } l$$