

(Circuit) Lower Bounds

- It's believed that $NP \neq P$.

One way to prove it could be to show a stronger result: $SAT \notin P/poly$.
It's a more "algebraic" question.

- This approach was tried in the 70/80s & lower bounds, for special circuit models, were proved.
Probabilistic methods were used!

Defn: • AC^0 := $\{L \subseteq \{0,1\}^* \mid \exists \text{ poly}(n)\text{-size, } O(1)\text{-depth}$
boolean circuits solving } L\}.

• Modular gate mod_m : $\{0,1\}^m \rightarrow \{0,1\}$
 $(x_1, \dots, x_m) \mapsto \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum x_i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{m} \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$

• AC^0 with Counters, $ACC^0[m]$:= $\{L \subseteq \{0,1\}^* \mid$
 $\exists \text{ poly}(n)\text{-size, } O(1)\text{-depth boolean circuits, using}$
 mod_m -gate, solving } L\}

Qn: $AC^0 \neq ACC^0[2]$? $\text{mod}_2 \notin AC^0$? $\text{mod}_2 \notin ACC^0[1]$
 \swarrow parity
 \nwarrow sensitive to each of the n -bits.

- In general, we suspect $\text{mod}_m \notin \text{Acc}^0[m']$ for coprime m, m' .

Theorem [Razborov '87, Smolensky '87]: For primes $p \neq q$, $\text{mod}_p \notin \text{Acc}^0[q]$.

Pf: • Idea: "Approximate" an $\text{Acc}^0[q]$ circuit by a polynomial over \mathbb{F}_q .

• We'll exhibit the proof for $p=2$ & $q=3$.

Lemma 1: Let $C(\bar{x})$ be a depth- d $\text{Acc}^0[3]$ circuit on n inputs & size- s . Then, \exists polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_3[\bar{x}]$ of $\text{deg} \leq (2t)^d$ which agrees with $C(\bar{x})$ on $\geq (1 - \frac{s}{2^e}) -$

fraction of the inputs $\bar{x} \in \{0,1\}^n$.

Lemma 2: No polynomial, in $\mathbb{F}_3[\bar{x}]$, of $\deg \leq \sqrt{n}$ can agree with mod_2 on ≥ 0.99 fraction of inputs.

• If mod_2 has size \rightarrow $\text{Acc}^0[3]$ circuit, then by Lemma 1 for $\ell := \lfloor \frac{1}{2} n^{1/2d} \rfloor$, \exists polynomial, of $\deg \leq (2\ell)^d \leq \sqrt{n}$, agreeing with mod_2 on $\geq (1 - \frac{\delta}{2^\ell})$ fraction of inputs.

• By Lemma 2, $1 - \delta/2^\ell < 0.99 \Rightarrow \delta > 0.01 \times 2^\ell > 2^{n^{1/2d}/3}$
 $\Rightarrow \text{mod}_2 \notin \text{Acc}^0[3] \Rightarrow \text{parity} \notin \text{Acc}^0. \quad \square$

- Remark: In fact, any depth d smaller than $o(\lg n / \lg \lg n)$ will work.

↗
small-oh

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore n^{1/d} = \omega(\lg n) & \text{ iff} \\ \frac{1}{d} \lg n = \omega(\lg \lg n) & \text{ iff } d = o(\lg n / \lg \lg n). \end{aligned}$$

- Proof of Lemma 1: • We construct an approximator, in $\mathbb{F}_3[\bar{x}]$, for circuit C by induction on size.

- Let g be a gate in C at height h .
- Define approximator \tilde{g} of $\text{deg} \leq (2\ell)^h$ s.t.
 $\tilde{g}(\bar{x}) = g(\bar{x})$ for "most" $\bar{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

1) g is NOT gate: Say, $g = \neg f$ for some gate f at height $(h-1)$. By induction hypothesis f has an approximator \tilde{f} , of $\text{deg} \leq (2\ell)^{h-1}$.

Define $\tilde{g} := 1 - \tilde{f}$

• Obviously, $\text{deg } \tilde{g} \leq (2\ell)^{h-1} < (2\ell)^h$ &

\tilde{g} doesn't introduce new errors.

2) g is mod₃ gate: Say, $g = \text{mod}_3(f_1, \dots, f_k)$. By induction, \exists approximators $\tilde{f}_1, \dots, \tilde{f}_k$ of $\text{deg} \leq (2\ell)^{h-1}$.

Define $\tilde{g} := \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \tilde{f}_i \right)^2$.

$\Rightarrow \text{deg } \tilde{g} \leq 2 \cdot (2\ell)^{h-1} \leq (2\ell)^h$ & \tilde{g} 's definition introduces no new error.

3) g is OR gate: Say, $g = \bigvee_{i \in [k]} f_i$.

• Naive arithmetization^k gives $\tilde{g} := 1 - \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - \tilde{f}_i)$. But, it increases the deg k times; too much.

Here, we need to use probability & approximation.

Pick a random set $S \subseteq [k]$ & consider $\text{mod}_3(f_i | i \in S)$.

Claim: $\forall \vec{x} \in \{0,1\}^n$ $\Pr_{\substack{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq [k] \\ \text{random}}} \left[\bigvee_{i=1}^k f_i = \text{mod}_3(f_i | i \in S) \right] \geq \frac{1}{2}$

Pf: • If $\forall i, f_i(\vec{x}) = \text{False}$, then $\Pr_S[\text{---}] = 1$.

- Otherwise, consider the linear form $L := \sum_{i \in [k]} f_i(\bar{\pi}) \cdot y_i$.
 L is a nonzero element of $\mathbb{F}_3[y_1, \dots, y_k]$.
- It's easy to see: $\Pr_{\bar{y} \in \{0,1\}^k} [L(\bar{y}) \neq 0] = 1/2$.

(\because On fixing all y_i 's, except one, the last one's value gets fixed.)

- In other words, $\Pr_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq [k]} [1 \equiv \sum_{i \in S} f_i(\bar{\pi}) \pmod{3}] \geq \frac{1}{2}$. \square

- To boost the probability we l subsets $S_1, \dots, S_l \subseteq [k]$
 & consider polynomial $\tilde{g}' := \text{OR} \left(\left(\sum_{i \in S_1} \tilde{f}_i \right)^2, \dots, \left(\sum_{i \in S_l} \tilde{f}_i \right)^2 \right)$.
 using \tilde{g} -defn. as given before \rightarrow

$$\triangleright \deg \tilde{g}' \leq \ell \cdot 2 \cdot (2\ell)^{h-1} = (2\ell)^h$$

$$\triangleright \forall \bar{\pi}, \Pr_{S_1, \dots, S_\ell \subseteq [k]} [\tilde{g}' \neq \bigvee_{i \in [k]} f_i] \leq 1/2^\ell.$$

• We deduce, $\exists S_1, \dots, S_\ell \subseteq [k]$, $\Pr_{\bar{\pi} \in \{0,1\}^h} [\tilde{g}' \neq \bigvee_{i=1}^k f_i] \leq 1/2^\ell.$

• Let's fix S_1, \dots, S_ℓ like this & denote the corresponding \tilde{g}' as the final approximator \tilde{g} .

$\triangleright \deg \tilde{g} \leq (2\ell)^h$ & introduces errors $\leq 2^{-\ell}$ fraction.

4) g is AND gate: Say, $g = \bigwedge_{i=1}^k f_i$. So, $(\neg g) = \bigvee_{i=1}^k (\neg f_i)$.

\Rightarrow Reduce to cases 1 & 3.

▷ By induction, the above four cases convert a circuit $C(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_3[\bar{x}]$ of $\deg \leq (2l)^d$; which disagrees with C on $\leq 8/2^e$ fraction of inputs in $\{0, 1\}^n$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2: • Suppose $f \in \mathbb{F}_3[\bar{x}]$ agrees with $\text{mod}_2(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ on $G' \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$, with $\deg f \leq \sqrt{n}$.

• Transform f to g as: $g(\bar{y}) := 1 + f(y_1 - 1, \dots, y_n - 1) \pmod{3}$.

▷ $g: \{-1, +1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ & $f: \{1, 0\}^n \rightarrow \{1, 0\}$ are

isomorphic functions. G' converts to $\underline{G} \subseteq \{-1, 1\}^n$.

▷ $\deg g \leq \sqrt{n}$ &

$g(\bar{y}) = y_1 \cdots y_n$ on $\bar{y} \in \underline{G}$.

\Rightarrow Intuitively, the $\deg = \sqrt{n}$ polynomial g shouldn't approximate $y_i - y_n$ well! We'll formalize this.

• More generally, consider F_G — the set of $u: G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_3$.

Any $u \in F_G$ has a multilinear representation

$$u =: \sum_{I \subseteq [n]} a_I \cdot \prod_{i \in I} y_i \quad [\because G \subseteq \{-1, 1\}^n, \text{ so we can use the identity } y_i^2 = 1, \forall i \in [n]]$$

• Replace each $(\deg > n/2)$ -monomial $\prod_{i \in I} y_i$ by $g \cdot \prod_{i \notin I} y_i$.

$$[\because g \cdot \prod_{i \notin I} y_i = \prod_{i \in [n]} y_i \cdot \prod_{i \notin I} y_i = \prod_{i \in I} y_i]$$

$$\deg < \left(\frac{n}{2} + \sqrt{n} \right)$$

$\triangleright \forall u \in F_G$, u has a representation of $\deg < n/2 + \sqrt{n}$.

$$\Rightarrow |F_G| \leq 3^m, \text{ where } m := \#\{I \subseteq [n] \mid |I| < n/2 + \sqrt{n}\}$$

$$\& \ |F_G| = 3^{|G|}$$

$$\Rightarrow |G| \leq m < 0.99 \times 2^n.$$

$$= \sum_{i < n/2 + \sqrt{n}} \binom{n}{i} < 0.99 \times 2^n.$$

↑ (Exercise)

No polynomial of $\text{deg} \leq \sqrt{n}$ agrees with mod_2 on 99% of the inputs. □

→ $\text{Acc}^\circ[\eta]$ has low-deg approximators,
 → mod_p " high-deg " !