

A nondeterministic space-time tradeoff for linear codes

S. Jukna[‡]

To appear in IPL

Abstract

We are interested in proving exponential lower bounds on the size of *nondeterministic* D -way branching programs computing functions $f : D^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ in linear time, that is, in time at most kn for a constant k . Ajtai has proved such lower bounds for explicit functions over domains D of size about n , and Beame, Saks and Thathachar for functions over domains of size about 2^{2^k} . We prove an exponential lower bound $2^{\Omega(n/c^k)}$ for an explicit function over substantially smaller domain D of size about 2^k . Our function is a universal function of linear codes.

1 Introduction

We consider functions $f : D^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, where D is a finite domain. A standard model to compute such functions $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is that of *deterministic* branching programs, called also D -way branching programs. Such a program is a directed acyclic graph with a unique start node. Each non-sink node is labeled by a variable and the edges out of a node correspond to the possible values of the variable. Each sink node is labeled by 0 or 1. Executing the program on a given input corresponds to following a path from the start node using the values of the input variables to determine the edges to follow. The output of such a computation is the label of the sink node reached. If $D = \{0, 1\}$ then the program is called *boolean*.

The *nondeterminism* can be introduced by allowing so-called guessing nodes. These nodes are unlabeled and have an arbitrary out-degree. If a computation reaches such a node, then it can proceed further by following any of the outgoing edges. Such a program accepts an input vector if and only if at least one path from the source to a 1-sink is consistent with this input. The *size* of a branching program is the number of non-guessing nodes. The logarithm of this number gives the space required to compute a given function.

If we put no further restrictions on the branching programs, then the best remains the lower bound $\Omega(n^2/\log^2 n)$ for nondeterministic boolean branching programs proved by Nechiporuk in [9]. Exponential lower bounds were only proved under additional restrictions on the structure of branching programs; see [11] or the monograph [13] for a comprehensive survey.

In this paper we are interested in proving large lower bounds on the size of branching programs when the computation time is bounded by kn for some constant k . More precisely, we say that a program computes a given function f in *time* T if for every input $a \in f^{-1}(1)$ there is a path from the source to a 1-sink which is consistent with a and along which at most T tests are made.

Important here is that the restriction concerns only *consistent* paths, that is, paths along which no two tests $x_i = d_1$ and $x_i = d_2$ for $d_1 \neq d_2$ are made. The “syntactic” case, where we require that along *all* paths—be they consistent or not—at most kn tests can be made, is easier to deal with and exponential lower bounds are known even for $D = \{0, 1\}$ and for nondeterministic branching programs [10, 5, 6].

The boolean “non-syntactic” case is more difficult. In this case, exponential lower bounds were first proved for *deterministic* branching programs working in time $T \leq n + o(n/\log n)$ [12, 8], then

*Research supported by a DFG grant SCHN 503/4-1.

†Address: Institute of Mathematics, Akademijos 4, LT-80663 Vilnius, Lithuania

for deterministic programs working in time $T \leq n + \epsilon n$ for a very small (but constant!) $\epsilon > 0$ [3, 7], and finally, for deterministic programs working in time $T \leq kn$ for any constant k [2]; this was extended to randomized branching programs in [4].

The situation with *nondeterministic* branching programs is much worse. In the boolean case, when $D = \{0, 1\}$, no exponential lower bounds are known even for programs working in time $T > n$. Such bounds were only proved for functions working on large domains, namely – when $|D|$ is either linear in n [1], or is about 2^{2^k} [3].

In this paper we do this for a substantially smaller domain containing about 2^k elements. As a domain D we take a Galois field $\text{GF}(q)$ with q about 2^k . The function $g(Y, \vec{x})$ itself has $n^2 + n$ variables, the first n^2 of which are arranged in an $n \times n$ matrix Y . The values of the function are defined by $g(Y, \vec{x}) = 1$ iff the vector \vec{x} is orthogonal over $\text{GF}(q)$ to all rows of Y . In other words, $g(Y, \vec{x}) = 1$ iff the vector \vec{x} belongs to a linear code defined by the parity-check matrix Y .

Theorem 1. *For every $k \geq 1$ and every prime power $q \geq 2^{3k+10}$, every nondeterministic branching program computing $g(Y, \vec{x})$ in time kn must have size exponential in $\Omega(n/k^2 4^k)$.*

The time restriction in this theorem concerns only the last n variables—the first n^2 variables from Y can be tested an arbitrary number of times.

Like in [5] and in subsequent papers, our goal is to show that, if the size of a branching program is small, then it must accept all vectors of a large “rectangle”. Given a set X of variables, an *m-rectangle* is a set of vectors $R \subseteq D^X$ of the form $R = R_0 \times \{w\} \times R_1$, where $R_0 \subseteq D^{X_0}$ and $R_1 \subseteq D^{X_1}$ for some pair of disjoint m -element subsets X_0 and X_1 of X . Note that every *m-rectangle* can have at most $|D|^{2m}$ vectors.

A function $f : D^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a *code function* if any two accepted vectors differ in at least two coordinates. The only property of such functions we will use is that in any branching program computing such a function, along any accepting computation each variable must be tested at least once.

The density of $f : D^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is $\mu(f) = |f^{-1}(1)|/|D|^n$.

Lemma 1. *If a code function $f : D^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ can be computed by a nondeterministic branching program of size s working in time kn , then for every $m \leq n/2^{k+1}$ the function accepts all vectors of some *m-rectangle* $R = R_0 \times \{w\} \times R_1$ of size*

$$|R| \geq \frac{\mu(f)}{(2s)^r \binom{n}{m}^2} \cdot |D|^{2m}, \quad (1)$$

where $r = 8k^2 2^k$.

2 Proof of Lemma 1

For each input $a \in f^{-1}(1)$, fix one accepting computation path $\text{comp}(a)$, and split it into r sub-paths p_1, \dots, p_r of length at most $\ell = kn/r$; the length of a sub-path p_i is the number of tests made along it. That is, we have r *time segments* $1, \dots, r$, and in the i -th of them the computation on a follows the sub-path p_i .

Say that two inputs a and b in $f^{-1}(1)$ are equivalent if the starting nodes of the corresponding sub-paths $\text{comp}(a) = (p_1, \dots, p_r)$ and $\text{comp}(b) = (q_1, \dots, q_r)$ coincide. Since we have at most s nodes in the program, the number of possible equivalence classes does not exceed s^r . Fix some largest equivalence class $A \subseteq f^{-1}(1)$; hence,

$$|A| \geq |f^{-1}(1)|/s^r.$$

We say that a pair of disjoint subsets of variables X_0 and X_1 is *good* for a set of vectors B if there is a coloring of time segments $1, \dots, r$ in red and blue such that, along each computation $\text{comp}(a) = (p_1, \dots, p_r)$ on a vector $a \in B$, the variables from X_0 are tested only in red and those from X_1 only in blue sub-paths.

Claim 1 ([3]). *Let $r = 8k^22^k$. Then for every vector $a \in f^{-1}(1)$, at least one pair of disjoint m -element subsets of variables with $m \geq n/2^{k+1}$ is good for a .*

Proof. For a variable $x \in X$, let d_x be the number of sub-paths in $\text{comp}(a) = (p_1, \dots, p_r)$ along which this variable is tested. Since the computed function $f(X)$ is a code function, we know that each variable $x \in X$ is tested at least once along $\text{comp}(a)$. Since the program computes $f(X)$ in time kn , we also know that at most kn tests can be made along the whole computation $\text{comp}(a)$. Hence, $\sum_{x \in X} d_x \leq kn$, implying that average number $\sum_{x \in X} d_x/n$ of tests made on a single variable does not exceed k . Finally, we know that each sub-path can make at most $\ell = kn/r$ tests.

Color the sub-paths p_1, \dots, p_r red or blue uniformly and independently. Call a variable $x \in X$ red (resp., blue) if all sub-paths testing this variable are red (resp., blue). This way, each variable is red as well as blue with probability 2^{-d_x} . Hence, we can expect

$$\sum_{x \in X} 2^{-d_x} \geq n \left(\prod_{x \in X} 2^{-d_x} \right)^{1/n} = n 2^{-\sum_x d_x/n} \geq n 2^{-k}$$

red variables as well as at least $n 2^{-k}$ blue variables. Using the Chebyshev inequality it is not difficult to show (see Lemma 12 in [3]) that then at least one coloring must produce at least $m \geq (1 - \delta)n 2^{-k}$ red variables *and* at least so many blue variables, where $\delta = \sqrt{k\ell 2^{1+k}/n} = \sqrt{k^2 2^{1+k}/r} = \sqrt{1/4} = 1/2$. \square

We have only 2^r possible colorings of time intervals $1, \dots, r$, and at most $\binom{n}{m}^2$ pairs of disjoint m -element subsets of variables. Hence, by Claim 1, some of these pairs X_0, X_1 must be good for a subset $B \subseteq A$ of size

$$|B| \geq \frac{|A|}{2^r \binom{n}{m}^2}.$$

We can write each vector $a \in D^n$ as $a = (a_0, w, a_1)$, where a_0 is the projection of a onto X_0 , a_1 is the projection of a onto X_1 , and w is the projection of a onto $X \setminus (X_0 \cup X_1)$. Say that two vectors $a = (a_0, w, a_1)$ and $b = (b_0, w', b_1)$ are equivalent if $w = w'$. Since the sets of variables X_0 and X_1 are disjoint, each equivalence class is a rectangle.

Let $R \subseteq B$ be a largest equivalence class lying in B ; hence

$$\begin{aligned} |R| &\geq \frac{|B|}{|D|^{n-2m}} \geq \frac{|A|}{2^r \binom{n}{m}^2 |D|^{n-2m}} \\ &\geq \frac{|f^{-1}(1)|}{s^r 2^r \binom{n}{m}^2 |D|^{n-2m}} = \frac{\mu(f)}{(2s)^r \binom{n}{m}^2} \cdot |D|^{2m}. \end{aligned}$$

So, it remains to show that all vectors of the rectangle R are accepted by the program. This is a direct consequence of the following more general claim.

Claim 2. *If both vectors $a = (a_0, w, a_1)$ and $b = (b_0, w, b_1)$ belong to B , then the combined vector (a_0, w, b_1) belongs to A .*

Proof. Let $\text{comp}(a) = (p_1, \dots, p_r)$ be an accepting computation on $a = (a_0, w, a_1)$, and $\text{comp}(b) = (q_1, \dots, q_r)$ an accepting computation on $b = (b_0, w, b_1)$. Consider the combined vector $c = (a_0, w, b_1)$. Our goal is to show that then $p_t(c) \vee q_t(c) = 1$ for all $t = 1, \dots, r$. That is, that for each $t = 1, \dots, r$, the combined vector c must be accepted by (must be consistent with) at least one of the sub-paths p_t or q_t .

To show this, assume that c is not accepted by p_t . Since p_t accepts the vector $a = (a_0, w, a_1)$, and this vector coincides with the combined vector $c = (a_0, w, b_1)$ on all the variables outside X_1 , this means that at least one variable from X_1 must be tested along p_t . But then, by the goodness of the pair X_0, X_1 , no variable from X_0 can be tested along the sub-path q_t . Since q_t accepts the vector $b = (b_0, w, b_1)$, and the combined vector $c = (a_0, w, b_1)$ coincides with this vector on all the variables outside X_0 , the sub-path q_t must accept the vector c , as desired.

This completes the proof of Claim 2, and thus the proof of Lemma 1. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 1

Fix an arbitrary prime power $q \geq 2^{3k+10}$, and let $d = m + 1$ where $m := \lfloor n/2^{k+1} \rfloor$. By the Gilbert–Varshamov bound, linear codes $C \subseteq \text{GF}(q)^n$ of distance d and size $|C| \geq q^n/V(n, m)$ exist, where

$$V(n, m) = \sum_{i=0}^m (q-1)^i \binom{n}{i} \leq dq^m \binom{n}{m}$$

is the number of vectors in a Hamming ball of radius m around a vector in $\text{GF}(q)^n$.

Let Y be the parity-check matrix of such a code, and consider the function $f : \text{GF}(q)^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $f(\vec{x}) = 1$ iff $Y \cdot \vec{x} = \vec{0}$. That is, $f(\vec{x}) = 1$ iff $\vec{x} \in C$. The function $f(\vec{x})$ is a sub-function of $g(Y, \vec{x})$. Hence, if the function $g(Y, \vec{x})$ can be computed by a nondeterministic branching program working in time kn , then the size of this program must be at least the size s of a nondeterministic branching program computing $f(\vec{x})$ in time kn . To finish the proof of Theorem 1, it remains therefore to show that s must be exponential in m/r , where $r = 8k^2 2^k$ is from Lemma 1.

The function $f(\vec{x})$ has density $\mu(f) = 1/V(n, m)$. Hence, by Lemma 1, the code C must contain an m -rectangle $R = R_0 \times \{w\} \times R_1$ of size

$$\begin{aligned} |R| &\geq \frac{\mu(f)}{(2s)^r \binom{n}{m}^2} \cdot q^{2m} = \frac{q^{2m}}{(2s)^r \binom{n}{m}^2 V(n, m)} \\ &\geq \frac{q^m}{(2s)^r d \binom{n}{m}^3}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, since the Hamming distance between any two vectors in C is at least $d = m + 1$, none of the sets R_0 and R_1 can have more than one vector. Hence, $|R| \leq 1$. Remembering that $m = \lfloor n/2^{k+1} \rfloor$ and $q \geq 2^{3k+10}$ this, together with (2) and

$$\binom{n}{m}^3 \leq \left(\frac{en}{m}\right)^{3m} \leq (2^{3k+9})^m \leq (q/2)^m,$$

implies that $(2s)^r \geq 2^m/d = 2^{\Omega(m)}$, and the desired lower bound $s = 2^{\Omega(m/r)} = 2^{\Omega(n/k^2 4^k)}$ follows.

4 Conclusion

We have proved an exponential lower bound on the size of *nondeterministic* branching programs computing explicit function $f : D^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ in time $T = o(n \log n)$. Our contribution is that the bound holds for a function working over much smaller domain D than those considered in [1] and [3]. However, the *boolean* case (where $D = \{0, 1\}$) remains open: in this case no non-trivial lower bounds are known even for $T \leq (1 + \epsilon)n$ for an arbitrary small constant $\epsilon > 0$.

Even worse, no exponential lower bounds are known for read-once(!) switching networks. A switching network is just a directed acyclic graph whose edges are labeled by variables and their negations (see, e.g., [11]). A vector $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is accepted iff it is consistent with all the labels of at least one path from the source to a sink. A network is read-once if, along any consistent path each variable is tested at most once. Important here, again, is that the restriction only concerns *consistent* paths—along paths, containing a variable and its negation, each variable may appear many times. As noted in [8], such networks seem to be the weakest nondeterministic model for which no nontrivial lower bounds are known.

References

- [1] M. Ajtai, Determinism versus non-determinism for linear time RAMs with memory restrictions, J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 65 (2002) 2–37.

- [2] M. Ajtai, A non-linear time lower bound for boolean branching programs, *Theory of Comput.* 1 (2005) 149–17.
- [3] P. W. Beame, T. S. Jayram,¹ M. Saks, Time-space tradeoffs for branching programs, *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 63(4) (2001) 542–572.
- [4] P. Beame, M. Saks, X. Sun, E. Vee, Time-space trade-off lower bounds for randomized computation of decision problems, *J. ACM* 50(2) (2003) 154–195.
- [5] A. Borodin, A. Razborov, R. Smolensky, On lower bounds for read- k -times branching programs, *Comput. Complexity* 3 (1993) 1–18.
- [6] S. Jukna, A note on read- k -times branching programs, *Theoret. Informat. and Appl.* 29(1) (1995) 75–83.
- [7] S. Jukna, Expanders and time-restricted branching programs, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, DOI 10.1016/j.tcs.2008.09.012.
- [8] S. Jukna, A. Razborov, Neither reading few bits twice nor reading illegally helps much, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 85 (1998) 223–238.
- [9] E. I. Nečiporuk, On a Boolean function, *Soviet Math. Doklady* 7(4) (1966) 999–1000.
- [10] E. A. Okolnishnikova, Lower bounds for branching programs computing characteristic functions of binary codes, *Metody discretnogo analiza* 51 (1991) 61–83 (in Russian).
- [11] A. A. Razborov, Lower bounds for deterministic and nondeterministic branching programs, in: *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, vol. 529, Springer, Berlin, 1991, pp. 47–60.
- [12] P. Savický, S. Žák, A lower bound on branching programs reading some bits twice, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 172(1-2) (1997) 293–301.
- [13] I. Wegener, *Branching Programs and Binary Decision Diagrams*, SIAM, 2000.

¹Formely Jayram S. Thathachar