

$NP \subseteq PCP(\text{poly}(n), 1)$ from the Walsh-Hadamard Code.

Note Title

5/22/2013

(Source: Arora-Barack Section 11.5.)

Theorem: (Exponential-size PCP system for NP)
 $NP \subseteq PCP(\text{poly}(n), 1)$.

Verifier will expect prover to supply an encoded (i.e. expanded) encoding of the usual certificate for the problem in NP.
Here's a description of the encoding scheme.

Walsh-Hadamard Code:

Encode binary strings of length n by linear functions in n variables over $\mathbb{F}(2)$ ← binary arithmetic mod 2.

WH: $\{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$

$u \rightarrow$ truth table for fun $f_u: x \rightarrow x \odot u = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i u_i$
 $|u|=n \quad |WH(u)|=2^n$

↳ we will also refer to f_u as the string describing the truth table for function f_u .

if $f \in \{0, 1\}^{2^n}$ is $= WH(u)$ for some u , then it is a Walsh-Hadamard code word.

Random Subsum Principle: if $u \neq v$ then for $1/2$ of the x 's
 $u \odot x \neq v \odot x$.

WH is an error-correcting code w/ min dist $1/2$.
for every $u \neq v$ $WH(u) + WH(v)$ differ in at least $1/2$ of the bits.

The WH code words are the set of all linear functions

$$f(x) + f(y) = f(x+y) \quad \forall x, y \Rightarrow \exists u \quad f(x) = u \otimes x \quad \forall x$$

\hookrightarrow can determine f by $f(e_i) \quad \forall i \quad e_i = (0 \dots 0 \underset{\substack{\uparrow \\ i\text{th location}}}{1} \dots 0)$

$$\rightarrow f(e_i) = u_i.$$

Given f , we want to test if it is $WH(u)$ for some u .
(i.e. we want to test if f is linear).

We want to test: $\forall x, y \quad \underbrace{f(x) + f(y)}_{\substack{\text{L} \\ f(x+y)}} = \underbrace{f(x+y)}_{\substack{\text{Rector condition over} \\ f(x+y)}}$.

We can't afford to do this test exhaustively. We want to be able to do the test with only a constant # of probes to f . \Rightarrow natural test: pick x, y at random. and test $f(x) + f(y) = f(x+y)$.

Clearly if f really is linear then we will always accept.

However if f is very close to being linear, we could easily miss that! With local tests, we can only hope to reject functions f that are far from linear.

Definition: Let $p \in [0, 1]$ $f, g: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

are p -close if $\Pr_x [f(x) = g(x)] \geq p$.

f is p -close to a linear function if \exists linear g s.t. $f + g$ are p -close.

Theorem: (linearity testing) [BLR]

Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be such that

$$\Pr_{x, y} [f(x) + f(y) = f(x+y)] \geq p \quad \text{for } p > 1/2.$$

Then f is p close to a linear function.

For $\delta \leq 1/2$

If f is not $(1-\delta)$ close to a linear function then the prob one probe fails to detect this is $(1-\delta)$.

Can repeat $(1/\delta)$ times to get the prob of failure to detect non-linearity $\leq 1/2$

Suppose that for some $\delta < 1/4$ $f: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ is $(1-\delta)$ -close to some linear \bar{f} .

\bar{f} is uniquely determined by f because two linear \bar{f} s differ in at least $1/2$ of their bits.

Given x , we want to determine $\bar{f}(x)$ but only have access to f .

We could assume $\bar{f}(x) = f(x)$ but x is not randomly chosen and could be one of the places where $f \neq \bar{f}$ differ.

We want a randomized test that works for all x w/ some good probability.

The following test requires two calls to f :

1. pick $x' \in_R \{0,1\}^n$
2. $x'' = x' + x$
3. $y' = f(x')$ $y'' = f(x'')$
4. Output $y' + y''$.

$x'' + x'$ are distributed uniformly (although dependent).
The probability that either is "bad" $\leq 2\delta$.

$\hookrightarrow f \neq \bar{f}$ at that point.

$$\Pr [f(x') = \bar{f}(x') \text{ and } f(x'') = \bar{f}(x'')] > 1 - 2\delta.$$

this is known as the self-correction of the WH code. //

Proof that $NP \subseteq PCP(\text{poly}(n), 1)$:

Will show an NP-complete language in $PCP(\log(n), 1)$.

The NP-complete language will be QUADEQ:

= language of systems of quadratic equations over $GF(2)$ that are satisfiable.

Note $GF(2) = \{0, 1\}$ with arithmetic mod 2.

Here is an instance of QUADEQ:

$$\begin{aligned}u_1 u_2 + u_3 u_4 + u_1 u_5 &= 1. \\u_2 u_3 + u_1 u_4 &= 0. \\u_1 u_4 + u_3 u_5 + u_3 u_4 &= 1\end{aligned}$$

This system is satisfiable by the all 1's assignment.

Can show that Circuit-SAT \leq QUADEQ.

Idea: have a variable for each wire



$$\Rightarrow (1-x)(1-y) = (1-z) \text{ etc.}$$

... details omitted.

Since $u_i = u_i^2$, we can assume there are no linear terms.

Then m linear equations over n unknowns can be described by an $m \times n^2$ matrix A and an m -vector b .

The system is satisfiable if \exists n^2 -vector U which can be expressed as $u \otimes u$ for some n -vector u such that $AU = b$.

We now describe a PCP system for QUADEQ

Let A, b be an instance of QUADEQ

Suppose (A, b) satisfiable by $u \in \{0, 1\}^n$.
 Verifier V gets access to a proof $\pi \in \{0, 1\}^{2^n + 2^{n^2}}$
 π is interpreted as a pair of functions:

$$\begin{aligned} f: \{0, 1\}^n &\rightarrow \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \text{WH encoding of } u \\ g: \{0, 1\}^{n^2} &\rightarrow \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \text{WH encoding of } u \circ u. \end{aligned}$$

So for u satisfying assignment, the verifier will accept the corresponding π w.p. 1.

Step 1: Check that $f + g$ are linear functions.

Do a $(1 - \epsilon)$ -linearity test on $f + g$.

If either f or g is not $(1 - \epsilon)$ -close to a linear function, the test fails w/ high probability.

\Rightarrow assume \exists linear $\tilde{f}: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

$\tilde{g}: \{0, 1\}^{n^2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

ϵ : arbitrarily small constant.

f is $(1 - \epsilon)$ close to \tilde{f} , g is $(1 - \epsilon)$ close to \tilde{g} .

(In a correct proof, test passes and $f = \tilde{f}$, $g = \tilde{g}$).

We will assume in fact that we can query \tilde{f} and \tilde{g} directly at any point. This because local decoding allows us to recover any $\tilde{f}(x)$ with prob at least $(1 - 2\epsilon)$.

The number of queries to \tilde{f} or \tilde{g} in later steps is ~ 20 .

So the prob that any of these queries fails $\leq 40\epsilon$.

We will assume that ϵ is small enough that all these queries succeed with prob $\geq .9$.

From now on: rename $\tilde{f} + \tilde{g}$ to be $f + g$.

Furthermore, assume $f + g$ are linear.

$$f(x) = x \cdot u \quad \text{for some } u. \quad x, u \in \{0, \pm 1\}^n$$

$$g(y) = y \cdot w \quad \text{for some } w. \quad y, w \in \{0, \pm 1\}^{n^2}$$

Step 2 Verify that $w = u \otimes u$.

Do the following test ten times:

pick $r + r'$ at random from $\{0, \pm 1\}^n$.

Verify $f(r) f(r') = g(r \otimes r')$. if not \Rightarrow reject.

In a correct proof:

a correct proof is not rejected here.

$$f(r) f(r') = \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} u_i r_i \right) \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} u_i r'_i \right) = \sum_{i, j \in [n]} u_i u_j r_i r'_j$$

$$= (u \otimes u) \cdot (r \otimes r')$$

$$= g(r \otimes r').$$

Now suppose $w \neq u \otimes u$.

We claim that one test fails w.p. $\geq 1/4$.
 Prob of rejecting at least one trial is $1 - (3/4)^{10} > .9$.

Let U be an $n \times n$ matrix: $U_{ij} = u_i u_j$.

Let W be an $n \times n$ matrix $W_{SDN}, \text{SDNN} = W_g$.

Representing W in the same way

$$g(r \otimes r') = W \cdot (r \otimes r') = \sum_{i, j \in [n]} W_{i, n+j} r_i r'_j = r W r'$$

$$f(r) f(r') = (u \cdot r) (u \cdot r') = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i r_i \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n u_j r'_j \right) = \sum_{i, j} u_i u_j r_i r'_j = r U r'$$

V rejects if $rWr' \neq rUr'$.

Random Subsum principle: if $W \neq U$

then at least $1/2$ of all r satisfy $rW \neq rU$
(let e be the column where $W \neq U$ differ.)

$$\text{prob } \underbrace{r \cdot (j^{\text{th}} \text{ col of } U)}_{j^{\text{th}} \text{ bit of } rU} \neq \underbrace{r \cdot (j^{\text{th}} \text{ col of } W)}_{j^{\text{th}} \text{ bit of } rW} \text{ w.p. } \geq 1/2.$$

Now conditioning on $rW \neq rU$, the prob
that a random r' has $rWr' \neq rUr'$ is $\geq 1/2$.

Trial rejects w.p. $\geq 1/4$.

Step 3: Verify that g encodes a satisfying assignment.

First show how to verify that the k^{th} equation is verified.

Check:

$$\sum_{ij} A_{k, (i,j)} u_i u_j = b_k$$

$$\text{Let } z_k \in \{0, \pm 1\}^{n^2} = \underline{\underline{A_{k, (i,j)}}}.$$

↳ known to verifier.

$$\sum_{ij} A_{k, (i,j)} u_i u_j = g(z_k) \Rightarrow \text{can } g(z_k) = b_k.$$

But we can't check all $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

We can check a random subset of the k 's and use
random subsum principle.

Pick random $r \in \{0, 1\}^m$.

Compute $rA = z_r = \sum_{i=1}^m r_i z_i$ \leftarrow i^{th} row of matrix A .

test if $g(z_r) = rb$.

Suppose $\exists k. g(z_k) \neq b_k$.

$$g(z_r) = g\left(\sum_i r_i z_i\right) = \sum_i r_i \cdot g(z_i) \quad \text{this is } \neq r \cdot b$$

w.p. $\geq 1/2$.