

A Rank Technique for Formula Size Lower Bounds

Troy Lee

LRI, Université Paris-Sud

Formula size

- Weakening of the circuit model—a formula is a binary tree with internal nodes labeled by AND, OR and leaves labeled by literals. The size of a formula is its number of leaves.
- **PARITY** has formula size $\theta(n^2)$ [Khr71].
- The best lower bound for a function in NP is $n^{3-o(1)}$ [Hås98].
- Many open questions:

$$\frac{n^2}{4} \leq L(\text{MAJORITY}) \leq n^{4.57}$$

A new rank technique

- We devise a new lower bound technique based on matrix rank.
- We exactly determine the formula size of PARITY: if $n = 2^\ell + k$ then

$$L(\text{PARITY}) = 2^\ell(2^\ell + 3k) = n^2 + k2^\ell - k^2.$$

- Bound can be viewed as a simultaneous matrix rigidity game

Karchmer–Wigderson game [KW88]

- Elegant characterization of formula size in terms of a communication game.


- For a Boolean function f , let $X = f^{-1}(0)$, $Y = f^{-1}(1)$ and

$$R_f = \{(x, y, i) : x \in X, y \in Y, x_i \neq y_i\}$$

- The game is then the following: Alice is given $x \in X$, Bob is given $y \in Y$ and they wish to find i such that $(x, y, i) \in R_f$.
- Karchmer–Wigderson Thm: The number of leaves in a best communication protocol for R_f equals the formula size of f .

Communication complexity of relations

$$R \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$$



Communication protocol is a binary tree:

Alice's nodes labelled by a function:

$$a_v : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$$


Similarly, Bob's nodes labelled

$$b_v : Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$$

Leaves labelled by elements $z \in Z$.

Denote by $C^P(R)$ the number of leaves in a best protocol for R .


Proof by picture: $C^P(R_f) \leq L(f)$.



General idea: Alice speaks at AND nodes and Bob speaks at OR nodes.

Initially, $f(x) \neq f(y)$ and we maintain this disagreement on subformulas as we move down the tree.

Proof by picture: $C^P(R_f) \leq L(f)$.




First we define Alice's action at the top node:

If x does not satisfy the left subformula,


then Alice sends the bit 0;

otherwise she sends the bit 1.

Proof by picture: $C^P(R_f) \leq L(f)$.



Proof by picture: $C^P(R_f) \leq L(f)$.




Now Bob speaks at the OR gate:

If y satisfies the left subformula, Bob says 0.

Otherwise, he says 1.

Proof by picture: $C^P(R_f) \leq L(f)$.




Now Bob speaks at the OR gate:

If y satisfies the left subformula, Bob says 0.

Otherwise, he says 1.

Proof by picture: $C^P(R_f) \leq L(f)$.




We continue down the tree in a similar fashion, maintaining the property that x and y take different values on subformulas.

Eventually, we reach a literal ℓ_i such that $\ell_i(x) \neq \ell_i(y)$ and so x and y differ on bit i .

Communication Complexity and the Rectangle

Bound

$$R \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$$




Communication Complexity and the Rectangle

Bound

$$R \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$$

Bob
Y

Alice
X




Communication Complexity and the Rectangle

Bound

$$R \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$$

Bob
Y

Alice
X



Communication Complexity and the Rectangle

Bound

$$R \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$$

Bob
Y

Alice
X

001		
000	010	011
		101
111	110	100


Communication Complexity and the Rectangle

Bound

$$R \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$$

Bob
Y

Alice
X



A rectangle S is monochromatic if there exists z such that $(x, y, z) \in S$ for all $(x, y) \in S$.

A successful protocol partitions $X \times Y$ into monochromatic rectangles.


Communication Complexity and the Rectangle

Bound

$$R \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$$

Bob
Y

Alice
X



Rectangles and rank

- Rank is one of the most successful ways to prove lower bounds on communication complexity of functions.
- Let $M_f[x, y] = f(x, y)$. A monochromatic 1-rectangle has rank one, $\text{rk}(M_f) \leq C^P(f)$.
- Rank conjectured to be nearly tight: $\log C^P(f) \leq (\log \text{rk}(M_f))^{O(1)}$.
- It has been difficult to adapt the rank technique to communication complexity of relations.

Rank for relations

- The key idea is a selection function $S : X \times Y \rightarrow Z$.
- A selection function turns a relation into a function, by selecting one valid output.
- Let $R|_S = \{(x, y, z) : S(x, y) = z\}$. Then

$$C^P(R) = \min_S C^P(R|_S).$$

Rank for relations

- With the help of selection functions, we can now apply the rank method as before.
- Let S_z be a matrix where $S_z[x, y] = 1$ if $S(x, y) = z$ and 0 otherwise.

$$\min_S \sum_{z \in Z} \text{rk}(S_z) \leq \min_S C^P(R|_S) = C^P(R)$$

A rigidity type problem

Given an identity matrix, what is fastest way to reduce rank by flipping zeros to ones?

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array}$$

A rigidity type problem

Given an identity matrix, what is fastest way to reduce rank by flipping zeros to ones?

1	1	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	1

A rigidity type problem

Given an identity matrix, what is fastest way to reduce rank by flipping zeros to ones?

1	1	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	1

A rigidity type problem

Given an identity matrix, what is fastest way to reduce rank by flipping zeros to ones?

1	1	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	1	1

This construction is optimal

- To reduce rank to n/k need to add $n(k - 1)$ many ones.

This can be seen as, by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\left[\frac{\|M\|_{\text{tr}}^2}{\|M\|_F^2} \right] \leq \text{rk}(M)$$

where

- $\|M\|_{\text{tr}} = \sum_i |\lambda_i(M)|$
- $\|M\|_F^2 = \sum_{x,y} M[x,y]^2 = \sum_i \lambda_i^2(M)$

Simple form of rank bound



- Let $S : X \times Y \rightarrow [n]$ be a selection function, and let s_i be number of entries (x, y) where S chooses i .

- Applying lower bound on rank:

$$\min_{s_i} \sum_i \left[\frac{\|S_i\|_{\text{tr}}^2}{s_i} \right] \leq \min_S \sum_i \text{rk}(S_i) \leq C^P(R).$$

- Simple form depends not on *which* pairs (x, y) are selected to output i , but only on number.

Application to Parity

	1x	0y
0x		?
1y	?	

selection function for $i=1$

Application to Parity

- Because of sensitive pairs $\|S_i\|_{\text{tr}} \geq 2^{n-1}$ for every i .
- We have the bound

$$\min_{s_i} \sum_i \left\lceil \frac{(2^{n-1})^2}{s_i} \right\rceil \leq L(\text{PARITY})$$

where $\sum_i s_i = (2^{n-1})^2$.

- Ignoring the ceilings, Jensen's inequality says minimum attained when all s_i equal, $s_i = (2^{n-1})^2/n$, which gives bound n^2 .

Application to Parity

Recall our bound:

$$\min_{s_i} \sum_i \left\lceil \frac{(2^{n-1})^2}{s_i} \right\rceil \leq L(\text{PARITY})$$

where $\sum_i s_i = (2^{n-1})^2$.

If n is not a power of two, cannot take all s_i equal. If $n = 2^\ell + k$, best thing to do: take each s_i a power of two, as evenly as possible:

$$L(\text{PARITY}) \geq 2^\ell(2^\ell + 3k) = n^2 + k2^\ell - k^2$$

Upper bound

- In upper bound, we have exactly the same optimization
- Basic idea: binary search. Alice says parity of left half of x , Bob says parity of left half of y . Continue on half which disagree.
- When n is not power of 2, balance search tree as evenly as possible.

Open problems

- Application to threshold functions?

$$\frac{n^2}{4} \leq L(\text{MAJORITY}) \leq n^{4.57}$$

- More subtle lower bound on rank? Use not just number of ones in each S_i but also their placement...