

## PCPs.

Non-interactive version of IP.

def  $(r(n), g(n))$ -PCP. Have input  $x$ ,  $|x|=n$ , proof  $\pi$ .  
Verifier uses  $r$  coins and queries  $g$  positions of  $\pi$ .

Then:  $x \in L \Rightarrow \exists \pi \ V(x, \pi)$  accepts w/ pr 1  
 $x \notin L \Rightarrow \forall \pi \ V(x, \pi) \leq 1/2$ .

th<sup>1</sup>  $NP = PCP(O(\log n), O(1))$ . // in fact  $g=3$  enough  
th  $NEXP = PCP(\text{poly}, O(1)) = MIP$

MIP: multi-prover IP, where provers do not communicate

remarks about PCP thm.

$\rightarrow$  can assume  $\log |n| \leq g \cdot 2^r$ ; o/w cannot query some part of the string.

$\rightarrow$   $1/2$  not important.

$\rightarrow PCP(r, g) \in NTIME(2^r \cdot g)$

Example: PCP for GMI.

$\pi$  indexed by graphs.  $\pi[G] = i$  if  $G \subseteq G_i$ ; whatever o/w.

$V$  samples  $G$  and  $i$ ; checks  $\pi[G_i] = i$ .

PCP  $\equiv$  inapproximability.

given a function  $f: N \rightarrow N$ , a TM is a  $\epsilon$ -approx of  $f$  if  $TM(x)$  within a factor  $\epsilon$  of  $f(x)$   $\forall x$ .

For NP-optimization problems we also want a witness.

eg. MaxSAT:  $\text{val}(F) = \max_{\alpha} |\{e \in F : F(\alpha) = 1\}| / |F|$ .

$\epsilon$ -approx is  $\alpha$  st  $\text{val}(F, \alpha) \geq \epsilon \cdot \text{val}(F)$ .

obs  $F$  sat iff  $\text{val}(F) = 1$ .

obs 1-sided error is enough.

th<sup>2</sup>  $\exists \epsilon < 1$  st  $\forall L \in NP \exists f$  poly-time st

$x \in L \Rightarrow \text{val}(f(x)) = 1$

$x \notin L \Rightarrow \text{val}(f(x)) \leq \epsilon$ .

we have th<sup>1</sup>  $\Leftrightarrow$  th<sup>2</sup>.

def CSP:  $\varphi = \{ \varphi_i \}$ ;  $\varphi_i: \{0,1\}^{I_i} \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ .

$\text{val}(\varphi) = \max_{\alpha} |\{i : \varphi_i(\alpha) = 1\}|$ .

e.g. when  $\varphi_i = \bigvee_{j \in I_i} x_j$ , we have SAT.

when  $|I_i| \leq g$   $\forall i$ , we say  $\varphi$  is  $g$ -CSP.

def gap CSP: given  $\epsilon, \epsilon'$ , determine  $\text{val}(\varphi) = 1$  or  $\leq \epsilon'$ .

(if  $\epsilon < \text{val}(\varphi) < 1$ , can answer whatever).

th<sup>3</sup>  $\epsilon$ -gap- $g$ -CSP is NP-hard (in the th<sup>2</sup> sense)

claim: th<sup>1</sup>  $\equiv$  th<sup>3</sup>.

1  $\Rightarrow$  3. Assume  $NP = PCP(O(\log n), g)$ .

We show  $1/2$ -gap- $g$ -PCP NP-hard.  $\hookrightarrow$  SAT. By assumption

$\exists$  verifier that makes  $g$  queries using  $O(\log n)$  random bits.

so  $m = n^c$  possible queries.

let  $\varphi_i(\pi) = 1$  iff  $V$  accepts w. randomness  $i$ ;  $\varphi = \{ \varphi_i \}$ .

then  $x \text{ SAT} \Rightarrow \text{val}(\varphi) = 1$

$x \text{ UNSAT} \Rightarrow \text{val}(\varphi) \leq 1/2$ .

3  $\Rightarrow$  1. Assume  $1/2$ -gap- $g$ -PCP NP-hard.  $\hookrightarrow$  GMP. By assumption

$\exists f$  st  $x \in L \Rightarrow \text{val}(f(x)) = 1$

$x \notin L \Rightarrow \text{val}(f(x)) \leq 1/2$ .

Verifier: choose  $i \in f(x)$ ; check if  $\pi$  satisfies.

$x \in L \Rightarrow \varphi$  sat; can take  $\pi$  as asgn.

$x \notin L \Rightarrow \text{val}(f(x)) \leq 1/2$ .

2  $\Rightarrow$  3. Trivial

3  $\Rightarrow$  2. Build reduction.

We'll prove weak PCP theorem:  $NP \subseteq PCP(\text{poly}, O(1))$ .

Need robust way to encode strings, so they are resilient to errors: locally decodable error-correcting codes.

def Walsh-Hadamard code.  $WH: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^{2^n}$   
 $WH(u)(x) = \langle u, x \rangle \pmod{2}$ .

can think of  $WH(u)$  as tt of function  $\langle u, \cdot \rangle$ .

claim:  $u \neq v \Rightarrow \text{dist}(WH(u), WH(v)) \geq 1/2 \cdot 2^n$ .

How to know if  $w$  is a valid codeword? Obs  $WH(\{0,1\}^n)$

is set of all linear functions, hence enough to test if

$f$  is linear.

def. Linearity Testing.

$f, g$   $\epsilon$ -close if  $\Pr[f(x) = g(x)] \geq \epsilon$ .

$f$  close to linear if  $\exists g$  linear,  $f, g$   $\epsilon$ -close.

th: if  $\Pr[f(x+y) = f(x) + f(y)] \geq \epsilon$ , then  $f$   $\epsilon$ -close to linear.

From now on, can assume we're  $1-\delta$ -close to linear.

Can we recover real codeword  $\tilde{w}$  from  $w$ ?

Yes:  $\left( \begin{array}{ccc} u_1 & \xrightarrow{1/2} & u_2 \\ \uparrow & & \downarrow \\ w & & w \end{array} \right)$ . But locally & efficiently?

Also yes. Want  $\tilde{w}[x]$ .

Sample  $x'$ ; set  $x'' = x' + x$ .

Query  $y' = w[x']$ ,  $y'' = w[x'']$ .

Answer  $y = y' + y''$ .

obs  $\Pr[y' = \tilde{w}[x']] \geq 1-\delta$  }  $\Pr[y = \tilde{w}[x]] \geq 1-2\delta$ .  
 $\Pr[y'' = \tilde{w}[x'']] \geq 1-\delta$