

HOMEWORK 8

Due: 10:00am, Tuesday November 7

1. **(Interactive proofs vs. instance checkers.)** Suppose languages L and \bar{L} have polynomial-round interactive proofs in which Merlin's strategy is implementable in P^L . Show that L has an instance checker. You may use a slightly weaker definition of "instance checker" wherein, if the provided oracle C actually computes L exactly, the checker only has to output the correct answer about $x \in L$ with high probability (rather than with probability 1).

2. **(Derandomization implies circuit lower bounds.)** Suppose you wanted to prove $BPP = P$. Well, you'd better be able to at least prove $coRP = P$. And hence you'd better be able to at least prove that the PIT problem (Polynomial Identity Testing, which we know is in $coRP$) is in P . And hence you'd better be able to at least prove that it's in NP . And hence you'd better be able to at least prove that it's in $NSUBEXP := \bigcap_{\epsilon > 0} NTIME(2^{n^\epsilon})$. In this problem, you'll show this implies that you'd better be able to prove superpolynomial circuit lower bounds.

In this problem, let $AlgP^0/poly$ denote the class of all polynomial-degree families computable by polynomial-size algebraic circuits using $+$, $-$, \times over \mathbb{Z} , where the only constants allowed are 0 and 1 (equivalently, where the constants must be of $poly(n)$ bit-length).

- Show that if $PERMANENT \in AlgP^0/poly$ and $PIT \in NSUBEXP$, then $\Sigma_2P \subseteq NSUBEXP$. (You can definitely use Valiant's Theorem on $\#P$ -completeness of $PERMANENT_{0,1}$. You can also use Toda's 1st and 2nd Theorems if you like, though you don't need them.)
- Show that if, furthermore, $NEXP \subseteq P/poly$, then $\Sigma_2P \subseteq NE \subseteq SIZE(n^c)$ for some constant c . (Here $NE = NTIME(2^{O(n)})$.)
- Deduce that

$$PIT \in NSUBEXP \implies \left(PERMANENT \notin AlgP^0/poly \quad \vee \quad NEXP \not\subseteq P/poly \right).$$

3. **(Worst-case hardness to slight hardness-on-average for EXP.)** Suppose that $L \in EXP$ but L requires superpolynomial-size circuits; more precisely, for all c and all sufficiently large n it holds that there is no Boolean circuit of size n^c computing $L_n : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$, the indicator function for presence in $L \cap \{0,1\}^n$.

- Show that there is a language $L' \in E := TIME(2^{O(n)})$ with the same property.
- Let p stand for the first prime larger than $n+1$ (this can certainly be deterministically computed in $poly(n)$ time, as we'll have $p < 2n$) and write \mathbb{Z}_p for the field of integers modulo p . Show that there is a multilinear polynomial $f_n : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$, agreeing with L'_n on all inputs in $\{0,1\}^n$, such that the family of functions (f_n) can be computed in $2^{O(n)}$ time.
- Show that for every polynomial-size circuit family (C_n) (where C_n has $n(\log n + 1)$ inputs and $\log n + 1$ outputs¹)

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{Z}_p^n} [C_n(\mathbf{x}) = f_n(\mathbf{x})] < 1 - \frac{1}{3n}.$$

¹Here $\log n + 1$ is enough to encode an element of \mathbb{Z}_p ; I'm too lazy to put ceilings/floors in the right spots here, and you may be equally lazy about this point.

(Hint: recall where this $1 - \frac{1}{3n}$ came up elsewhere in class; also recall $\text{BPP} \in \text{P/poly}$.)

- (d) Define a decision problem (language) H as follows: on input $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ and integer $0 \leq j \leq \log n$, output the j th bit of $f_n(x)$. Show that $H \in \text{E}$, and that for every polynomial-size circuit family (D_n) it holds that

$$\Pr_{\substack{x \sim \mathbb{Z}_p^n \\ j \sim \{0, \dots, \log n\}}} [D_{n'}(x, j) = H(x, j)] < 1 - \frac{1}{O(n \log n)}$$

(where $n' = n(\log n + 1) + \log \log n$).

Remark: Thus from a language in EXP that is hard for polynomial-size circuits in the worst case, we may construct a language in E that is slightly hard-on-average for polynomial-size circuits, where “slightly” involves error at least $\frac{1}{O(n')}$ on inputs of length n' .

(Incredibly minor notes: Strictly speaking, we have not quite shown hardness-on-average with respect to the purely uniform distribution on inputs, because of the issue of how exactly to encode the pair $\langle x, j \rangle$ by a single string. Also, strictly speaking, H might be trivial for some input lengths (those not of the appropriate form $n(\log n + 1) + \log \log n$), and we’d rather have it hard for circuits at almost all input lengths. Both issues are easy and boring to fix.)