# Computer Science 294 Lecture 13 Notes

### Daniel Raban

February 28, 2023

# 1 Pseudorandomness

#### 1.1 Pseudorandom distributions and generators

Suppose we have some function f, which we can think of as a randomized algorithm. We give f n uniformly random bits, and it takes in an input x. Now we want to consider another situation in which we give f n bits which are not uniformly random but may have some dependence. We want these bits to be **pseudorandom** in the sense that the output of f on input x should be similar to if we were using uniformly random bits.

**Definition 1.1.** A distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\{\pm 1\}^n$  is  $\varepsilon$ -pseudorandom against a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of tests (or  $\varepsilon$ -fools  $\mathcal{C}$ ) if for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}$ ,

 $|\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim U_n}[f(Y)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{D}}[f(X)]| \le \varepsilon.$ 

The uniform distribution is pseudorandom by this definition, but we really care about pseudorandom distributions which depend on some small random seed of s bits.

**Definition 1.2.** A pseudorandom generator against C with error  $\varepsilon$  and seed-length s is an explicit (deterministic) function  $F : \{\pm 1\}^s \to \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that for all  $f \in C$ ,

 $|\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim U_n}[f(Y)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim U_s}[f(X)]| \le \varepsilon.$ 

In other words, we want  $G(U_s)$  to be  $\varepsilon$ -pseudorandom against C. Today we will care about two classes of functions:

- k-juntas: These correspond to k-wise independent distributions.
- Parity tests: These correspond to  $\varepsilon$ -biased distributions.

## **1.2** Small-biased and $(k, \delta)$ -wise independent distributions

Here is a definition due to Naor and Naor.

**Definition 1.3.** A distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $\{\pm 1\}^n$  is called  $\varepsilon$ -biased if for all nonempty sets  $S \subseteq [n]$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{D}}[\chi_S(X)]| \le \varepsilon$$

Equivalently,

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \le \mathbb{P}_{X \sim \mathcal{D}}\left(\prod_{i \in S} X_i = 1\right) \le \frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}.$$

**Definition 1.4.** A distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $(k, \delta)$ -independent if for all k-juntas  $f : \{\pm 1\}^n \to \{\pm 1\},\$ 

$$|\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim U_n}[f(Y)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{D}}[f(X)]| \le \delta.$$

**Remark 1.1.** (k, 0) independence is sometimes called k-wise independence, which can be sampled using  $O(k \log n)$  seed-length. This is optimal, as it can be shown that k-wise independence can't be sampled with  $< \frac{k \log n}{2}$  bits.

Our goal today is to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** (Naor-Naor). There is an explicit  $G : \{\pm 1\}^s \to \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $G(U_s)$  is a  $\varepsilon$ -biased distribution and  $s = O(\log n + \log(1/\varepsilon))$ .

We will be following the proof of AGHP, rather than the original proof. The following lemma will help us connect the ideas of small-biased and  $(k, \delta)$ -independent distributions.

**Lemma 1.1.** Suppose  $\mathcal{D}$  is a  $\varepsilon$ -biased distribution. Then

$$|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{D}}[f(X)] - \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim U_n}[f(Y)]| \le \varepsilon L_1(f),$$

where

$$L_1(f) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} |\widehat{f}(S)|.$$

Proof of Lemma. Use the Fourier expansion for both expectations.

$$|\mathbb{E}_{X\sim\mathcal{D}}[f(X)] - \mathbb{E}_{Y\sim U_n}[f(Y)]| = \left| \sum_{S\subseteq [n]} \widehat{f}(S)(\mathbb{E}_{X\sim\mathcal{D}}[\chi_S(X)] - \mathbb{E}_{Y\sim U_n}[\chi_S(Y)]) \right|$$
$$= \left| \sum_{\varnothing\neq S\subseteq [n]} \widehat{f}(S) \mathbb{E}_{X\sim\mathcal{D}}[\chi_S(X)] \right|$$
$$\leq \sum_{\varnothing\neq S\subseteq [n]} |\widehat{f}(S)| \cdot |\mathbb{E}_{X\sim\mathcal{D}}[\chi_S(X)]|$$
$$\leq \varepsilon.$$

**Corollary 1.1** (Vazirani's XOR Lemma). Any  $\varepsilon$ -biased distribution is also a  $(k, \delta)$ -wise distribution with  $\delta = \varepsilon 2^{k/2}$ .

Before proving this corollary, let's see what it, along with the Naor-Naor theorem, tells us.

**Corollary 1.2.** There is an explicit  $G : \{\pm 1\}^s \to \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $G(U_s)$  is a  $(k, \delta)$ -wise independent distribution and  $s = O(\log n + \log(1/\varepsilon))$ .

*Proof of Corollary.* Just apply the Naor-Naor theorem with  $\varepsilon = \delta/2^{k/2}$  and then apply Vazirani's XOR lemma. Then

$$s = O(\log n + \log(1/\varepsilon)) = O(\log n + \log(1/\delta) + k/2).$$

 $\cdot 2^k$ 

**Remark 1.2.** This can be improved to finding a  $(k, \delta)$ -wise independent distribution with seed-length  $O(k + \log \log n + \log(1/\delta))$ .

Proof of Vazirani's XOR Lemma. Let  $g : \{\pm 1\}^n \to \{\pm 1\}$  be any k-junta. So  $g(x) = h(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k})$  for some  $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$  and  $h : \{\pm 1\}^k \to \{\pm 1\}$ . Then

$$L_1(g) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} |\widehat{g}(S)|$$
$$= \sum_{S' \subseteq [k]} |\widehat{h}(S)|$$
$$\leq \sqrt{\sum_{S' \subseteq [k]} \widehat{h}(S')^2}$$

$$= \sqrt{2^k}$$
$$= 2^{k/2}.$$

Now apply the previous lemma.

Using Cauchy-Schwarz,

#### 1.3 Small-biased distributions and error-correcting codes

The intuition for our construction for the Naor-Naor theorem will be based on composing the Reed-Solomon and Hadamard error-correcting codes.

**Definition 1.5.** A multiset  $A \subseteq \{\pm 1\}^n$  is called an  $\varepsilon$ -biased set if the uniform distribution over A, denoted  $U_A$ , is  $\varepsilon$ -biased.

Think of this as a long matrix with m = |A| rows and n columns. We want the XOR of every subset of columns to be  $(1/2 \pm \varepsilon)$ -balanced. In  $\mathbb{F}_2$  notation, we want any column

spanned by the columns of this matrix to have  $(1/2 \pm \varepsilon)m$  1s. This is saying that this is an error-correcting code over  $\mathbb{F}_2^m$  with dimension n and distance  $\geq m(1/2 - \varepsilon)$ .

Pick a random multiset  $A \subseteq \{\pm 1\}^n$  by picking  $m = O(n/\varepsilon^2)$  elements independently and uniformly at random  $a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}, \ldots, a^{(m)} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ . Then  $A = \{a^{(1)}, \ldots, a^{(m)}\}$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -biased set with high probability. This is because of the following claim:

**Proposition 1.1.** For all nonempty  $S \subseteq [n]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{a^{(1)},\dots,a^{(m)}}\left(\left|\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\chi_{S}(a^{(i)})\right| > \varepsilon\right) \le 2e^{-m\varepsilon^{2}/2}.$$

*Proof.* This follows from the Chernoff bound, since the  $a^{(i)}$  are independent.

If we pick  $m = 2n/\varepsilon^2$ , then this probability is  $\ll 2^{-n}$ . This however, is non-constructive, so we will use a constructive argument.

## 1.4 AGHP construction of a pseudorandom generator for small-biased distributions

AGHP gave an explicit function  $G : \{\pm 1\}^s \to \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $G(U_s)$  is  $\varepsilon$ -biased and  $s = 2 \log_2(n/\varepsilon)$ .

Proof of Naor-Naor theorem. Here is the construction: Take  $\ell = \lceil \log_2(n/\varepsilon) \rceil$ . We will define  $G : \{\pm 1\}^{2\ell} \to \{\pm 1\}^n$ . Identify the first  $\ell$  bits with an element  $x \in \mathbb{F}_{2^\ell}$  and the second  $\ell$  bits with an element  $y \in (\mathbb{F}_2)^{\ell}$ . Let bin :  $\mathbb{F}_{2^\ell} \to (\mathbb{F}_2)^{\ell}$  be 1 to 1 and linear over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ ; that is,

$$\min(x+y) = \min(x) \oplus \min(y), \qquad \min(0) = 0^{\ell}.$$

Sample  $X \sim \mathbb{F}_{2^{\ell}}$  uniformly at random and  $Y \sim (\mathbb{F}_2)^{\ell}$  uniformly at random. Output  $(Z_0, \ldots, Z_{n-1})$ , where

$$Z_i = \langle \operatorname{bin}(X^i), Y \rangle_2, \qquad \langle a, b \rangle_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} a_j b_j \pmod{2}.$$

Here is the analysis: Let  $\alpha \in \{0,1\}^n$  be nonzero. Then it suffices to show that  $\mathbb{E}_Z[(-1)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \alpha_i Z_i] \leq \varepsilon$ .

$$\mathbb{E}_{Z}\left[(-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\alpha_{i}Z_{i}}\right] = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\left[(-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\alpha_{i}\langle \operatorname{bin}(X^{i}),Y\rangle_{2}}\right]$$

By the linearity of the inner product,

$$= \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left[ (-1)^{\langle \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \alpha_i \operatorname{bin}(X^i), Y \rangle_2} \right]$$

By the linearity of bin,

$$= \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left[ (-1)^{\langle \operatorname{bin}(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \alpha_i X^i), Y \rangle_2} \right]$$

 $P_{\alpha}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \alpha_i t^i \text{ is a polynomial in one variable over } \mathbb{F}_{2^{\ell}}, \text{ so it has at most } n-1 \text{ roots.}$  $= \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \mathbb{E}_Y \left[ (-1)^{\langle \operatorname{bin}(P_{\alpha}(X)), Y \rangle_2} \right] \right]$ 

For a fixed x, if  $P_{\alpha}(x) = 0$ , then  $\mathbb{E}_{Y}[(-1)^{\langle P_{\alpha}(x), Y \rangle_{2}}] = 1$ . Otherwise,  $\mathbb{E}_{Y}[(-1)^{\langle P_{\alpha}(x), Y \rangle_{2}}] = 0$ .

$$= \mathbb{P}_X(P_\alpha(X) = 0)$$
  
$$\leq \frac{n-1}{2^{\ell}}$$
  
$$\leq \varepsilon.$$