

# Optimal Testing of Reed-Muller Codes

Arnab Bhattacharya (MIT)

Swastik Kopparty (MIT)

Grant Schoenebeck (UC Berkeley)

Madhu Sudan (Microsoft/MIT)

David Zuckerman (UT Austin)



# Testing Reed-Muller Codes

- An RM-test  $T$

given  $f: \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$

– If  $f \in \text{RM}(n,d)$  then

$$\Pr[T(f) \text{ accepts}] = 1$$

– If  $\Delta(f, \text{RM}(n,d)) > 0.1$ , then

$$\Pr[T(f) \text{ accepts}] < 0.9$$

# The subspace test

- [AKKLR03] proposed, analyzed  $T_{d+1}$ 
  - Pick a random  $d+1$  dimensional subspace  $A$
  - Check that  $f|_A$  is degree  $d$
- **Theorem:** If  $\Delta(f, \text{RM}(n,d)) > 0.1$  then
$$\Pr[T_{d+1}(f) \text{ rejects}] > O(1/2^d)$$
- **Corollary:**  $\text{RM}(n,d)$  is testable with  $O(4^d)$  queries

# The Question

- How many queries are needed to test  $RM(n,d)$ ?
- $\geq 2^{d+1}$ 
  - no dual constraints on fewer coordinates
- $\leq O(4^d)$ 
  - by AKKLR

# Main Result

- Theorem  $T_{d+1}$  is a tester for  $RM(n,d)$ .

Specifically, if  $\Delta(f, RM(n,d)) > 0.1$ , then

$$\Pr[T_{d+1}(f) \text{ rejects}] > 0.01$$

So  $O(2^d)$  queries suffice for testing  $RM(n,d)$ .

# $T_{d+1}$

- $T_{d+1}$  doesn't do more
  - For infinitely many  $d$ ,
  - $\exists$  functions  $f: F_2^n \rightarrow F_2$  s.t.
    - $\Pr[ T_{d+1}(f) \text{ rejects} ] = 0.3$
    - $\Delta(f, \text{RM}(n,d)) = 1/2 - o_n(1)$
  - Builds on “counterexamples to inverse Gowers conjecture” [LMS, GT]

# Proof Plan

Induction on  $n$



# Structure of induction on n

## Want to show:

- $\Delta(f, \text{RM}(n, d)) > 0.1$   •  $\Pr[\text{T}(f) \text{ rejects}] > 0.01$

## By induction, for each hyperplane A:

- $\Delta(f|_A, \text{RM}(n-1, d)) > 0.1$   •  $\Pr[\text{T}(f|_A) \text{ rejects}] > 0.01$

## Any Relation?

$$\mathbf{E}_A[\Pr[\text{T}(f|_A) \text{ rejects}]] = \Pr[\text{T}(f) \text{ rejects}]$$

# Main Lemma

- Lemma Let  $A_1, \dots, A_K$  be hyperplanes with:
  - $K > 4 \cdot 2^d$
  - For each  $i$ ,

$$\Delta(f|_{A_i}, \text{RM}(n-1, d)) < \beta < \frac{1}{4} 2^{-d}$$

Then,

$$\Delta(f, \text{RM}(n, d)) < 3\beta + (9/K)$$

# Analysis of the RM test

- **Induction claim:**

$$\Delta(f, \text{RM}(n,d)) > (0.01) 2^{-d}$$

$$\Rightarrow \Pr[T(f) \text{ rejects}] > 0.1 + 2^d 2^{-n}$$

- **Proof:**

- **Case 1 :** If less than  $4 \cdot 2^d$  hyperplanes  $A$  with  $\Delta(f|_A, \text{RM}(n-1,d)) < (0.01) 2^{-d}$

- **Case 2:** Else, by the lemma:

$$\Delta(f, \text{RM}(n,d)) < 0.03 2^{-d} + 0.25 2^{-d}$$

$f$  is moderately close to  $\text{RM}(n,d)$

# Actually ...

- Induction analyzing the test  $T_{d+20}$

- Claim:

$$\Pr[T_{d+20}(f) \text{ rejects}] \geq 2^{-20} \Pr[T_{d+1}(f) \text{ rejects}]$$

# The Lemma

- We have hyperplanes  $A_1, \dots, A_K$ , and polynomials  $P_1, \dots, P_K$  with

$$\Delta(f|_{A_i}, P_i) < \beta$$

- How to produce  $P$  on  $F_2^n$ ?
  - The unique  $P$  consistent with all the  $P_i$
  - (if any)

# Getting $P$ consistent with the $P_i$

- $P_i$  and  $P_h$  are mutually consistent

$$\Delta(P_i|_{A_i \cap A_h}, P_h|_{A_i \cap A_h}) < 2^{-d}$$

- Let  $A_1, \dots, A_{d+1}$  be *independent*
  - Make them  $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 0, \dots, x_{d+1} = 0$
- Let

$$P_i(x_{[1, d+1] - i}, y) = \sum_{S, i \notin S} c_{S,i}(y) \prod_{i \in S} x_i$$

- Mutual consistency  $\Rightarrow c_{S,i} = c_{S,j} (= c_S)$

$$P(x_{[1, d+1]}, y) = \sum_S c_S(y) \prod_{i \in S} x_i$$

# The Lemma III

- $P$  consistent with the  $P_i$  on  $A_1, \dots, A_{d+1}$
- $P$  consistent with the  $P_i$  on all  $A_i$
- Claim:  $\Delta(P, f) < 3\beta + 9/K$ 
  - $\geq (1 - 9/K)$  fraction of  $x \in F_2^n$  are in  $> 1/3$   $A_j$ 's
  - For such  $x$ ,  $f(x) \neq P(x)$  causes  $f(x) \neq P_i(x)$  for  $\geq 1/3$  of the  $i$ 's.