

Deterministic Approximate Counting of Depth-2 Circuits

Michael Luby* Boban Velicković† Avi Wigderson ‡

Abstract

We describe deterministic algorithms which for a given depth-2 circuit F approximate the probability that on a random input F outputs a specific value α . Our approach gives an algorithm which for a given $GF[2]$ multivariate polynomial p and given $\epsilon > 0$ approximates the number of zeros of p within a multiplicative factor $1 + \epsilon$. The algorithm runs in time $\exp(\exp(O(\sqrt{\log(n/\epsilon)})))$, where n is the size of the circuit. We also obtain an algorithm which given a DNF formula F and $\epsilon > 0$ approximates the number of satisfying assignments of F within a factor of $1 + \epsilon$ and runs in time $\exp(O((\log(n/\epsilon))^4))$.

1 Introduction

This paper deals with the problem of approximating the accepting probability of general depth-2 boolean circuits. Examples of boolean functions which can be computed by such circuits are DNF formulas, polynomials over $GF[2]$, polynomials over other small fields, threshold functions, etc. There are easy probabilistic algorithms which for a given circuit F and a real parameter $\epsilon > 0$ approximate the probability that on a random input F evaluates to 0. The algorithm simply chooses $N = O(\ln(1/\delta)/\epsilon^2)$ assignments uniformly at random and outputs the ratio Y of the assignments which falsify F . The probability that $|\Pr[F = 0] - Y| \leq \epsilon$ is at least $1 - \delta$. It is easy to see that $1 - Y$ estimates the probability that F evaluates to 1. For the case of DNF formulas and polynomials over $GF[2]$ it has been shown that these algorithms can be transformed to efficient probabilistic algorithms which approximate the accepting or rejecting probability of F in the relative sense, i.e. that produce a Y_0 such that the probability that $|\Pr[F = 0] - Y_0| \leq \epsilon \Pr[F = 0]$ is at least

*International Computer Science Institute and UC Berkeley. Research supported in part by NSF Grant CCR-9016468 and grant No. 89-00312 from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), Jerusalem, Israel.

†Department of Mathematics, York University, Toronto. Research partially supported by NSF. Research partially done while at UC Berkeley.

‡Hebrew University and Princeton University. Research partially done while visiting the International Computer Science Institute, research partially supported by the Wolfson Research Awards, administered by the Israeli Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

$1 - \delta$ and that produce Y_1 such that the probability that $|\Pr[F = 1] - Y_1| \leq \epsilon \Pr[F = 1]$ is at least $1 - \delta$ (see [7], [9] and [8]).

The problem of finding such approximation algorithms which are deterministic is central to understanding the power of randomness in restricted classes of algorithms. Ajtai and Wigderson [1] showed that every probabilistic AC^0 circuit can be deterministically approximated in time $\exp(\exp(\sqrt{\log(n/\epsilon)}))$. Nisan [12] considerably strengthened this result, obtaining $\exp(\log(n)^{O(1)})$ running time for approximation algorithms for the same class of circuits. The case of DNF formulas, which is a subclass of AC^0 circuits, was treated in [11] and more efficient approximation algorithms are described for this case.

No nontrivial simulation of probabilistic constant depth circuits with modular gates was known. This may seem surprising at first, as exponential lower bounds on size existed for both classes of circuits, and these lower bounds were essential in the simulations of AC^0 circuits. The key difference is that in fact lower bounds are needed on *approximation* rather than *computation* of the given function. While for circuits with Boolean gates (AC^0) the lower bounds hold even for approximating (parity, say) to within exponential error [5], the bounds for circuits with modular gates (say over $GF[2]$) of [14], [15] apply only for approximating (majority, say) to within a polynomial error.

We provide the first subexponential simulation for probabilistic circuits with modular gates. We can approximate the accepting probability of any $GF[2]$ polynomial of size n to within error ϵ in deterministic time $\exp(\exp(\sqrt{\log(n/\epsilon)}))$. Our results can also be applied to approximate the accepting probability of a polynomial of size n over any finite field of size polynomial in n . Our technique is strongly based on the pseudorandom generator Nisan [12] used for AC^0 circuits. In [13] it was shown that the same generator can be applied for a variety of circuit families, provided appropriate lower bounds exist. Here we are able to apply this idea, and use the lower bounds on multiparty communication complexity of Babai, Nisan and Szegedy [3] (instead of the [14], [15] lower bounds). We in fact present our result in the general framework of symmetric circuits, and show that it also leads to an improved simulation time for DNF circuits, namely $\exp(\log(n)^4)$.

The paper is organized as follows. In §2 we present the outline of the main construction. §3 deals with the notion of a d -nearly disjoint family for a given (m, n, k) -system and contains a construction of such families. In §4 we deal with multiparty communication protocols and present the approximation algorithm for general symmetric depth-2 circuits. In §5 we show that the algorithm from [12] in the case of DNF formulas can be modified to significantly improve its running time. Finally, in §6 we make some remarks on converting the algorithms presented in this paper to relative approximation algorithms.

2 Construction outline

Let us consider a general depth-2 circuit which computes a boolean function F on n variables x_1, \dots, x_n . Suppose that the first level of the circuit has m nodes which compute functions T_1, \dots, T_m . In all our applications each T_i will be the conjunction of some of the variables or their negations. Let C_i be the set of indices of the variables on which T_i depends. We are interested in approximating the probability μ that F takes value 0 when all the variables are randomly, uniformly, and independently chosen. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be the error allowed. We follow the standard approach to such approximation problems which is to replace the uniform distribution \mathcal{U} on $\{0, 1\}^n$ by another efficiently constructible distribution \mathcal{V} which has much smaller sample space such that the probability with respect to \mathcal{V} that F evaluates to 0 is within ϵ of μ . The algorithm then queries exhaustively all sample points of \mathcal{V} and outputs the ratio of points for which F equals 0.

We now describe the construction of \mathcal{V} . We start with an integer l which is much smaller than n , define n random variables X_1, \dots, X_n on $\{0, 1\}^l$ and let \mathcal{V} be the probability distribution on $\{0, 1\}^n$ generated in this way. We arrange things so that the probability ν that F evaluates to 0 with these random variables as inputs is within ϵ of μ . The idea of Nisan [12] is to choose n subsets of $[l]$, say S_1, \dots, S_n , which are nearly disjoint in a certain technical sense and have size r and a simple function g on r variables which is hard to approximate in an appropriate model of computation. Let y_1, \dots, y_l be uniformly distributed and independent $\{0, 1\}$ -random variables and then let X_i be equal to $g(y_{S_i})$. Here y_{S_i} denotes the string consisting of the coordinates of y whose index is in S_i in the natural ordering. We show that if $|\mu - \nu| \geq \epsilon$ then there is an algorithm A with inputs from $\{0, 1\}^r$ which computes the correct value of $g(z)$ on at least $1/2 + \epsilon/n$ fraction of the inputs. This algorithm has special form and the choice of g is made such that there is no algorithm of such form which approximates it. It follows that we must have $|\mu - \nu| \leq \epsilon$. In the case of DNF formulas g is, as in [12], XOR and we use the lower bounds of Håstad and Bopanna (see [5]). In the case of modular or threshold circuits we use the generalized inner product function and a lower bound on the multiparty communication complexity of this function due to Babai, Nisan and Szegedy [3].

3 Nearly disjoint sets

Let I be a set of size l and \mathcal{S} a family of n subsets of I each of size at least r . For a positive integer d we say that \mathcal{S} is d -nearly disjoint provided $|S \cap T| < d$, for any two distinct $S, T \in \mathcal{S}$. We also call such a family an (n, l, d, r) -design. The existence of (n, l, d, r) -designs for appropriate values of n, l, d and r was used by Nisan [12] in his approximation algorithm. We now refine this notion and use it to derive an improved algorithm.

Suppose we are given in addition two integer parameters m and k and a family \mathcal{C} of

m subsets of $[n]$ each of size at most k . We call such a family \mathcal{C} an (m, n, k) -system. Let us say that a family $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ of subsets of I is d -nearly disjoint for \mathcal{C} if for every $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$ $|S_i \cap \bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{C}_j \setminus \{i\}} S_{i'}| < d$. Note that a d -nearly disjoint family is simply a d -nearly disjoint family for the family of all singletons from $[n]$. If, as before, the size of each member of \mathcal{S} is at least r we say that \mathcal{S} a (n, l, d, r) -design for \mathcal{C} . We shall need to construct efficiently (n, l, d, r) -designs for a given (m, n, k) -system. We first prove by a probabilistic argument the existence of such designs with appropriate parameters and then show how this can be converted to an efficient construction.

Let us fix nl biased $2d$ -independent $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variables x_{ij} , for $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [l]$, such that x_{ij} is equal 1 with probability $2r/l$ and 0 otherwise. For a fixed setting $x = \langle x_{i,j} : i \in [n], j \in [l] \rangle$ to the sequence of random variables and for each $i \in [n]$, let $S_i(x) = \{j : x_{ij} = 1\}$, and as before let $\mathcal{S}(x) = \{S_1(x), \dots, S_n(x)\}$.

Lemma 1 *Let \mathcal{C} be a given (m, n, k) -system. The probability that $\mathcal{S}(x)$ is not a (n, l, d, r) -design for \mathcal{C} is at most*

$$\frac{n}{r^d} + mn \left(\frac{12r^2k}{dl} \right)^d.$$

PROOF : Note first that for each i the expected value of $|S_i|$ is $2r$. By the $2d$ -moment extension of Chebyshev's inequality $\Pr[|S_i| < r] < r^{-d}$. Note that this bounds uses only $2d$ -wise independence between the random variables. Summing up over all $i \in [n]$ we deduce that the probability that there exists i such that $|S_i| < r$ is at most n/r^d .

Fix $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$. We give an upper bound of the probability that $|S_i \cap \bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{C}_j \setminus \{i\}} S_{i'}| \geq d$. For a fixed $A \subseteq [l]$ of size d the probability that A is contained in both S_i and $\bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{C}_j \setminus \{i\}} S_{i'}$ is at most $\left(\frac{4r^2k}{l^2} \right)^d$. This again uses only $2d$ -wise independence. Summing this up over all possible subsets of $[l]$ of size d we obtain the upper bound

$$\frac{l!}{d!(l-d)!} \left(\frac{4r^2k}{l^2} \right)^d.$$

Summing up over all possible pairs $(i, j) \in [n] \times [m]$ and combining the two upper bounds we obtain the desired result. \blacksquare

We shall apply this lemma in two different situation with different sets of parameters. We state this in the following corollary.

Corollary 2 *For a given (m, n, k) -system \mathcal{C} the probability that $\mathcal{S}(x)$ is not an (n, l, d, r) -design for \mathcal{C} is at most ϵ for the following choices of parameters:*

$$(a) \ d = \sqrt{\log(nm/\epsilon)}, \ r = 2^{4d}, \ \text{and} \ l = k2^{9d}.$$

(b) $d = \log(mn/\epsilon)$, $r = d^2$, and $l = 24kd^3$.

Note that in Lemma 1 we use only $2d$ -wise independence of the random variables. It will be crucial in our applications that there exist efficiently constructible $2d$ -wise independent probability distributions with small sample spaces (see [10], [2]). This allows us to convert these existence arguments into constructions by searching exhaustively all sample points. We state the result we shall need in the following proposition.

Proposition 3 *There is an explicit construction of a sample space of size $(nl)^{O(d)}$ for nl $\{0, 1\}$ -valued $2d$ -wise independent random variables $X_{i,j}$, for $(i, j) \in [n] \times [l]$, such that $X_{i,j}$ is equal to 1 with probability $2r/l$.*

In all of our applications, the time to construct the sample space and exhaustively search it to find a good design is negligible compared to the running time of the rest of the construction.

4 General symmetric gates

4.1 Multipart communication protocols

Let us recall the definition of d -party communication protocols [4]. Suppose $[r] = R_1 \dot{\cup} R_2 \dot{\cup} \dots \dot{\cup} R_d$ is a partition of $[r]$ into d disjoint parts. Imagine d players, P_1, P_2, \dots, P_d , who have access to an input string $z \in \{0, 1\}^r$ such that P_i knows all bits of z except those in positions belonging to R_i . We consider protocols in which the players exchange bits according to the part of the input they know and previous messages. For a function f on r boolean variables let the d -party complexity of f $c_d(f)$ be defined as the smallest number of bits which the players need to exchange in order to compute f on any given input. Clearly $c_d(f)$ depends on the particular partition of $[r]$ used. We shall need the following observation of Håstad and Goldmann [6]. We sketch the proof for completeness.

Lemma 4 *Suppose a boolean function f can be computed by a depth-2 circuit in which the top gate is any symmetric function of m arbitrary gates with fan-in less than d each. Then, for any given partition of $[r]$ into d disjoint parts, $c_d(f) \leq d \log(m)$.*

PROOF : Fix a partition $[r] = R_1 \dot{\cup} \dots \dot{\cup} R_d$. Assign each bottom gate to the first player P_i such that the indices of the variables in this gate do not belong to R_i . This can be done since each bottom gate uses less than d variables and there are d players. Note that P_i can evaluate this gate. Now given an input z each player simply broadcasts the number of gates assigned to him which evaluate to 1. As the top gate is symmetric, this information suffices to compute f . ■

We now define the generalized inner-product function $g_{s,d}$ considered in [3]. Suppose $r = sd$ and let $z_{i,j}$ be doubly indexed boolean variables where $i \in [s]$ and $j \in [d]$. Let $g_{s,d} : \{0,1\}^r \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ be defined as follows:

$$g_{s,d}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^s \prod_{j=1}^d z_{i,j}$$

where the sum is calculated modulo 2. We will be interested in communication protocols among d players P_i , for $i \in [d]$, where P_i knows the value of $z_{i',j}$ for all $(i',j) \in [s] \times [d]$ except for $i' = i$. Let $c_d(f)$ denote the d -party communication complexity of a function f relative to this partition. Recall that for two boolean functions f and g on r variables the bias of f and g is defined as:

$$\text{Bias}(f, g) = |\Pr[f(z) = g(z)] - \Pr[f(z) \neq g(z)]|.$$

where $z \in \{0,1\}^r$ is chosen uniformly at random. We shall use the following result of Babai, Nisan, and Szegedy [3].

Theorem 1 *Let $r = sd$ and let f be a boolean function on r variables such that $c_d(f) \leq t$. Then $\text{Bias}(f, g_{s,d}) \leq 2^t(1 - 4^{1-d})^s$.*

4.2 The pseudo-random generator

We now present a construction of a pseudo-random generator which allows us to approximate the accepting probability of a depth-2 circuit whose top gate is any symmetric boolean function σ .

Suppose we are given such a boolean circuit which computes a function F on n variables together with some $\epsilon > 0$. We are interested in approximating within ϵ the probability μ that on a random input F outputs 1. We think of the first level of the circuit as computing monomials T_1, \dots, T_m over (possibly negated) boolean variables x_1, \dots, x_n and of the top level as computing $F = \sigma(T_1, \dots, T_m)$. Let C_i denote the set of $j \in [n]$ such that x_j or its negation appears in T_i .

Note that for every $i \in [m]$ if C_i is larger than $\log(2m/\epsilon)$ and we replace T_i by the function which is constantly equal to 0 we change the output of the circuit on at most $\frac{\epsilon}{2m}$ of the inputs. Since the number of such i is at most m by replacing T_i in this way for each of them we obtain a new function which differs from the old one on at most $\epsilon/2$ fraction of the inputs and is computed by a similar circuit as the old one. Any $\epsilon/2$ -approximation of the accepting probability of the new circuit would then be an ϵ -approximation of the accepting probability of the old one. Thus, by changing ϵ to $\epsilon/2$ if necessary we may assume without loss of generality that the size of C_i is at most $k = \log(2m/\epsilon)$, for each i .

Let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$. We fix positive integers d, l and r such that there is an explicitly constructible (as described above) (n, l, d, r) -design $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ for \mathcal{C} . The key

ingredient to our generator is a function $g : \{0,1\}^r \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ which will typically be hard to compute in a certain model of computation. We define the function $G_{\mathcal{S}} : \{0,1\}^l \rightarrow \{0,1\}^n$ by

$$G_{\mathcal{S}}(y) = \langle g(y_{S_1}), \dots, g(y_{S_n}) \rangle,$$

where for each $i \in [n]$ y_{S_i} is the string consisting of the first r coordinates of y whose index is in S_i ordered in the natural ordering. $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the generator. The quality of $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ with respect to F is measured by

$$\delta(F, G_{\mathcal{S}}) = |\Pr[F(x) = 1] - \Pr[F(G_{\mathcal{S}}(y)) = 1]|$$

where the inputs x to F and y to $G_{\mathcal{S}}$ are chosen uniformly at random.

As described in the outline we relate this value to the complexity of approximating the function g on r inputs. The parameters r and d associated with the design \mathcal{S} are chosen so that there is no d -party communication protocol with a small number of rounds that approximates the function g on r inputs, whereas if $\delta(F, G_{\mathcal{S}}) \geq \epsilon$ then, using the properties of the design, we prove in the following main lemma that it is possible to construct a d -party communication protocol with a small number of rounds that approximates the function g on r inputs. From this we can conclude that $\delta(F, G_{\mathcal{S}}) < \epsilon$. The first part of the proof of the following lemma is based on a similar argument from [12].

Lemma 5 *If $\delta(F, G_{\mathcal{S}}) \geq \epsilon$ then there exists a boolean function h of r variables which can be computed by a d -party communication protocol for any partition of $[r]$ into d disjoint sets in $2d \log(m)$ rounds and such that $\text{Bias}(h, g) \geq \epsilon/n$.*

PROOF : Let $\nu = \Pr[F(G_{\mathcal{S}}(y)) = 1]$. The first part of the analysis is an interpolation technique which is borrowed from cryptography. We describe a sequence $\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_{n+1}$ of probability distributions on $\{0,1\}^n$. Let y_i , for $i = 1, \dots, l$ and x_j , for $j = 1, \dots, n$ be independent uniformly distributed $\{0,1\}$ -random variables and define \mathcal{U}_i to be the distribution given by the sequences of random variables $g(y_{S_1}), \dots, g(y_{S_{i-1}}), x_i, \dots, x_n$. Let μ_i be the probability that F evaluates to 0 with respect to \mathcal{U}_i . Then $\mu_1 = \mu$ and $\mu_{n+1} = \nu$. Assume that $|\mu - \nu| > \epsilon$ and without loss of generality that $\mu > \nu$. Then there is some i such that $\mu_i - \mu_{i+1} > \epsilon/n$. Fix such an i and define a function h for predicting the output of g as follows.

For fixed values $y_j = b_j$, for $j \in [l] \setminus S_i$ and $x_j = a_j$, for $j > i$ the value of $F(g(y_{S_1}), \dots, g(y_{S_{i-1}}), x_i, \dots, x_n)$ depends only on y_{S_i} and x_i . Let us denote this function by $H_{a,b}$. By an averaging argument we show that there are values \bar{a} and \bar{b} such that

$$\Pr[H_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, x_i) = 0] - \Pr[H_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, g(y_{S_i})) = 0] > \epsilon/n.$$

Fix such values \bar{a} and \bar{b} . Given y_{S_i} compute $H_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, 0)$ and $H_{\bar{a}, \bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, 1)$. If they are equal let $h(y_{S_i})$ be some fixed bit $\tau \in \{0,1\}$. We choose τ which gives the correct value of

$g(y_{S_i})$ for at least $1/2$ of such y_{S_i} . If $H_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, 0)$ and $H_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, 1)$ are not equal let $h(y_{S_i})$ be $\rho \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $H_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, \rho) = 1$. One can then easily show that such h predicts the value of g with advantage at least ϵ/n .

Let us now verify that h can be computed by a d -party communication protocol in $2d \log(m)$ rounds for any partition of $[r]$ into d disjoint sets. This is where we use the fact that the design \mathcal{S} for \mathcal{C} has the small intersection property with parameter d . Note that $H_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, 0)$ can be written as $\sigma(T_1^0(y_{S_i}), \dots, T_m^0(y_{S_i}))$ where $T_j^0(y_{S_i})$ is obtained from T_j by making the appropriate substitutions and fixing of variables. Now $T_j^0(y_{S_i})$ depends only on the variables whose index is in $S_i \cap \cup_{i' \in C_j \setminus \{i\}} S_{i'}$ and since \mathcal{S} is an (n, l, d, r) -design for \mathcal{C} this set has size less than d . Thus we are in a position to apply Lemma 4 to conclude that $H_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, 0)$ can be computed by a d -party communication protocol in at most $d \log(m)$ rounds. Similarly one can compute $H_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(y_{S_i}, 1)$ in another $d \log(m)$ rounds. Computing $h(y_{S_i})$ from these two values does not require any more communication. Thus the total number of communication bits needed to compute $h(y_{S_i})$ is at most $2d \log(m)$. ■

let $\mathcal{F}_{n,m}$ denote the collection of all depth-2 boolean circuits on n variables whose first level consists of at most m conjunctions and whose top level is a fixed but arbitrary symmetric function of these conjunctions. The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2 *Let n and m be positive integers and let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there is an integer $t = \exp(O(\sqrt{\log(nm/\epsilon)}))$ and an explicit generator $G : \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ such that, for any $F \in \mathcal{F}_{n,m}$, $\delta(F, G) < \epsilon$.*

PROOF : We assemble the pieces of the construction. Let $k = \log(3nm/\epsilon)$, $d = \sqrt{\log(3nm/\epsilon)}$, $r = 2^{4d}$, and $l = k2^{9d}$. Now using Proposition 3 fix $t' = O(d \log(nl))$ such that over $\{0, 1\}^{t'}$ there exist explicitly defined nl biased $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variables $X_{i,j}$ for $(i, j) \in [n] \times [l]$, which are $2d$ -wise independent and such that $X_{i,j}$ equals 1 with probability $2r/l$.

For $w \in \{0, 1\}^{t'}$ let $\mathcal{S}(w) = \{S_1(w), \dots, S_n(w)\}$ where $S_i(w) = \{j : X_{i,j}(w) = 1\}$. Let $s = r/d$ and let $g_{s,d}$ denote the generalized inner product function as defined in Section 4.1. Let $t = t' + l$ and define a generator $G : \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ as follows. Think of an input to G as a pair (w, y) where $w \in \{0, 1\}^{t'}$ and $y \in \{0, 1\}^l$. Then let:

$$G(w, y) = (g_{s,d}(y_{S_1(w)}), \dots, g_{s,d}(y_{S_n(w)})).$$

Here, as before, y_S denotes the projection of y to the first r coordinates of S if S has size at least r and otherwise equals 0^r .

Given a depth-2 circuit $F \in \mathcal{F}_{n,m}$ we show that $\delta(F, G) < \epsilon$. Suppose the first level of F consists of conjunctions T_1, \dots, T_m and let C_i be the set of variables on which T_i

depends. Let F' be the circuit obtained from F by replacing T_i by 0 for every i such that C_i has size more than k . Then clearly

$$|\Pr[F'] = 1] - \Pr[F = 1]| \leq \epsilon/3.$$

Let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_i : i \in [m] \text{ and } |C_i| \leq k\}$. Then by Corollary 2, part (a), $\mathcal{S}(w)$ is an (n, l, d, r) -design for \mathcal{C} with probability at least $1 - \epsilon/3$.

Fix $w = w_0$ such that $\mathcal{S}(w_0)$ is an (n, l, d, r) -design for \mathcal{C} and let $G_{\mathcal{S}(w)} : \{0, 1\}^l \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ be the induced generator. We claim that $\delta(F', G_{\mathcal{S}(w_0)}) < \epsilon/3$. Otherwise by Lemma 5 there is a boolean function $h : \{0, 1\}^r \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which can be computed by a d -party communication protocol for any partition of $[r]$ into d parts in $2d \log(m)$ rounds such that $\text{Bias}(h, g_{s,d}) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3n}$. On the other hand by Theorem 1 it follows that for such h $\text{Bias}(h, g_{s,d}) \leq m^{2d}(1 - 4^{1-d})^s < \frac{\epsilon}{3n}$, a contradiction.

Putting all of these pieces together we conclude that $\delta(F, G) < \epsilon$, as desired. ■

Corollary 6 *There is a deterministic algorithm A which given integers n, m , and $\epsilon > 0$, and $F \in \mathcal{F}_{n,m}$ outputs Y such that $|\Pr[F = 0] - Y| \leq \epsilon$. The running time of the algorithm is $\exp(\exp(O(\sqrt{\log(nm/\epsilon)})))$.*

5 Approximating DNF formulas

In this section we present a deterministic algorithm A which on input a DNF formula F and ϵ outputs a real number Y such that $|\Pr[F = 0] - Y| \leq \epsilon$. The running time of the algorithm is $\exp(O(\log(n/\epsilon)^4))$ where n is the size of the formula. The algorithm is a slight modification of the algorithm presented in [12] but uses our refined notion of (n, l, d, r) -design for a given (m, n, k) -system \mathcal{C} . The running time is better than the running time of the algorithm presented in [11] for formulas which have unrestricted clause length. Since the arguments in this case are very similar to the ones in [12] or in §4 we shall be sketchy in our description. As in [12] we use the following lower bound result of Boppana and Håstad [5, Chapter 8].

Theorem 3 *Let F be any DNF formula on r boolean variables with clauses of size at most b . Let \bigoplus_r denote the XOR function on r variables. Then $\text{Bias}(F, \bigoplus_r) \leq 2^{-r/b}$.*

For integers n and m let $\mathcal{D}_{n,m}$ denote the collection of all DNF formulas on n boolean variables with m clauses.

Theorem 4 *For every integers n, m and every $\epsilon > 0$ there is $t = O(\log(nm/\epsilon)^4)$ and an explicit generator $G : \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ such that, for every $F \in \mathcal{D}_{n,m}$, $\delta(F, G) \leq \epsilon$.*

PROOF: Let $d = k = \log(3nm/\epsilon)$, $r = d^2$ and $l = 24kd^3$. Use Proposition 3 to explicitly construct $2d$ -wise independent $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variables $X_{i,j}$, for $(i, j) \in [n] \times [l]$ such that $X_{i,j}$ is equal to 1 with probability $2r/l$. A sample point in this sample space is indexed by a bit string of length $t' = O(\log(3nm/\epsilon)^4)$. For $w \in \{0, 1\}^{t'}$ let $\mathcal{S}(w) = \{S_1(w), \dots, S_n(w)\}$, where $S_i(w) = \{j : X_{i,j}(w) = 1\}$. Then, by Corollary 2, part (b), for any given (m, n, k) -system \mathcal{C} , $\mathcal{S}(w)$ is an (n, l, d, r) -design for \mathcal{C} for all but at most $\epsilon/3$ fraction of w 's. Let \bigoplus_r denote the XOR function on r boolean variables. Let $t = t' + l$ and define a generator $G : \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ as follows. Represent an input to G as a pair (w, y) where $w \in \{0, 1\}^{t'}$ and $y \in \{0, 1\}^l$. Then let:

$$G(w, y) = \left(\bigoplus_r (y_{S_1(w)}), \dots, \bigoplus_r (y_{S_n(w)}) \right).$$

Again y_S represents the projection of y to the first r coordinates of S if S has size at least r and otherwise equals 0^r .

The analysis now proceeds as in [12] and uses Theorem 3 above. ■

Corollary 7 *There is a deterministic algorithm A which given integers n, m , and a real $\epsilon > 0$, and $F \in \mathcal{D}_{n,m}$ outputs Y such that $|\Pr[F = 0] - Y| \leq \epsilon$. The running time of the algorithm is $\exp(O(\log(nm/\epsilon)^4))$.*

6 Absolute versus relative error

All the approximation algorithms we have presented in this paper deal with absolute error approximation. They can easily be converted to relative error approximation algorithms, i.e. algorithms that output Y such that $|\Pr[F = 0] - Y| \leq \epsilon \Pr[F = 0]$, using the reduction techniques presented in [7], [8] for DNF formulas and in [9] for polynomials over $GF[2]$. We leave the details to the interested reader.

7 Acknowledgements

We thank Oded Goldreich for carefully reading this paper and providing us with comments which improved the presentation.

References

- [1] Ajtai, M., Wigderson, A., "Deterministic simulation of constant depth circuits", *Randomness and Computation*, eds. Preparata and Micali, Advances in Computing Research series (5), JAI Press, 1989, pp. 199–222.

- [2] Alon, N., Babai, L., Itai, A., “A Fast and Simple Randomized Parallel Algorithm for the Maximal Independent Set Problem”, *Journal of Algorithms*, 7, pp. 567–583, 1986.
- [3] Babai, L., Nisan, N., Szegedy, M., “Multiparty protocols and logspace-hard pseudo-random sequences”, preliminary version in *STOC*, 1989, pp. 1–11, journal version in *JCSS*, Vol. 45, No. 2, October 1992, pp. 204–232.
- [4] Chandra, A., Furst, M., and Lipton, R., “Multiparty protocols, *FOCS 1983*, pp. 94–99.
- [5] Håstad, J., “Computational limitations for small depth circuits”, Ph.D. thesis, *MIT press*, 1986.
- [6] Håstad, J., Goldmann, M., “On the power of small depth threshold circuits”, *FOCS 1990*, pp. 610–618.
- [7] Karp, R., Luby, M., “Monte-Carlo algorithms for enumeration and reliability problems”, 24th *STOC*, 1983, pp. 54–63.
- [8] Karp, R., Luby, M., Madras, N., “Monte-Carlo Approximation Algorithms for Enumeration Problems,” *J. of Algorithms*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Sept. 1989, pp. 429-448.
- [9] Karpinski, M., Luby, M., “Approximating the Number of Solutions to a $GF[2]$ Formula,” preliminary version *Proc. Second Annual Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 1991, pp. 300–303, final version in *Journal of Algorithms*, Vol. 14, No. 2, March 1993, pp. 280–287.
- [10] Luby, M., “A Simple Parallel Algorithm for the Maximal Independent Set Problem,” 17th *STOC*, May 6-8 1985, pp. 1-10, *SIAM J. on Computing*, November 1986, Volume 15, No. 4, pp. 1036–1053.
- [11] Luby, M., Veličković, B., “On Deterministic Approximation of DNF”, *STOC 1991*, pp. 430–438.
- [12] Nisan, N., “Pseudo-random bits for constant depth circuits”, *Combinatorica* 11 (1), 1991, pp. 63–70.
- [13] Nisan, N., Wigderson, A., “Hardness vs. Randomness”, *FOCS 88*, pp. 2–11.
- [14] Razborov, A., “Lower bounds on the size of bounded depth circuits in basis $\{\&, \wedge, \oplus\}$, (in Russian), *Usp. Mat. Nauk*, Vol. 41:4, 1986, pp. 219–220.
- [15] Smolensky, R., “Algebraic methods in the theory of lower bounds for boolean circuit complexity”, *STOC 1987*, pp. 77–82.