

## Homework 4 – Due Thursday, April 3 *before 11am* on Gradescope

### Instructions

- Solutions written in  $\text{\LaTeX}$  are strongly preferred, but you can upload any pdf files, including scanned hand-written solutions. Template latex files are on the course webpage.
- Collaboration is allowed and encouraged. However, each of you should think about a problem before discussing it with others and write up your solution independently. You may consult books and online sources to get information about well-known theorems, such as the Chernoff bound. But you are not allowed to look up solutions directly in papers or any other sources. You *must* list all collaborators and sources! (See full details in the General Information Handout.)
- Correctness, clarity, and succinctness of the solution will determine your score.

### Problems

1. This is a collection of questions with short answers on testers in the adjacency matrix model.
  - (a) Based on our analysis in class, give a new  $\epsilon$ -test for bipartiteness with query and time complexity  $O(\frac{\log^2 1/\epsilon}{\epsilon^3})$  instead of  $O(\frac{\log^2 1/\epsilon}{\epsilon^4})$ . Provide a one-line explanation.
  - (b) In class we saw an  $\epsilon$ -additive approximation algorithm for the edge density of the max cut with running time exponential in  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ . Explain why it is unlikely that there is such an algorithm with  $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  running time that works for all  $\epsilon$ . (Hint: it would imply  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{BPP}$ .)
  - (c) Improve the running time of the probabilistic algorithm (from class) that finds a cut with density at least  $\mu(G) - \epsilon$  from  $2^{\text{poly} \frac{1}{\epsilon}} n^2$  to  $2^{\text{poly} \frac{1}{\epsilon}} + O(n \cdot \text{poly} \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ . Explain the new algorithm and give a one-line justification. Hint: we proved all the necessary lemmas in class.
2. (**An Application of the Regularity Lemma**) In this problem, you are asked to show that the number of triangle-free labeled graphs on  $n$  nodes is  $2^{(\frac{1}{4}+o(1))n^2}$ , as indicated in the following parts.
  - (a) Show that there are at least  $2^{\frac{1}{4}n^2}$  triangle-free labeled graphs on  $n$  nodes, where  $n > 1$ . (Make sure you consider both odd and even  $n$ .)
  - (b) Prove (e.g., by induction) that every triangle-free graph contains at most  $\frac{n^2}{4}$  edges.
  - (c) Using the Regularity Lemma and 2b, show that there are at most  $2^{(\frac{1}{4}+o(1))n^2}$  triangle-free labeled graphs on  $n$  nodes.

*Hint:* Consider a sufficiently large triangle-free graph  $G$  and a tiny  $\epsilon > 0$ . Equipartition the vertices of  $G$  into  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$  sets, apply the Regularity Lemma, and carefully count the number of possibilities.

You may use the following facts without a proof:

$$\binom{n}{\alpha n} \leq 2^{n(H(\alpha)+o(1))} \text{ where } H(\alpha) = -\alpha \log_2 \alpha - (1 - \alpha) \log_2(1 - \alpha). \quad (1)$$

$$\text{The entropy function } H(\alpha) \text{ tends to 0 as } \alpha \text{ tends to 0.} \quad (2)$$

3. (**Linearity Testing**) Consider Algorithm 1, which is a generalization of the BLR linearity test.

---

**Algorithm 1:** LINEARITYTEST<sub>k</sub>

---

- Input:** Even integer parameter  $k \geq 2$  and query access to a function  $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$
- 1 Query  $k$  points  $x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(k)} \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  chosen uniformly at random (with replacement).
  - 2 Query point  $y = \sum_{i \in [k]} x^{(i)}$ .
  - 3 **Reject** if  $f(y) \neq \prod_{i \in [k]} f(x_i)$ ; otherwise, **accept**.
- 

- (a) Let  $k$  be even and  $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$  be a function that is  $\epsilon$ -far from linear. Prove that the probability that LINEARITYTEST<sub>k</sub>( $f$ ) rejects is

$$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \widehat{f}(S)^{k+1}.$$

- (b) Argue that

$$\sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \widehat{f}(S)^{k+1} \leq (1 - 2\epsilon)^{k-1}.$$

- (c) How many iterations of Algorithm 1 are needed to get a linearity tester that has probability of error at most  $\frac{1}{3}$ ? How does your linearity tester compare to the BLR tester in terms of query complexity?

In your explanation for this part, you can use the following fact without a proof:

$$\frac{1 - (1 - 2\epsilon)^{k-1}}{2} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \frac{k\epsilon}{2} \right\}.$$

- (d) Would your algorithm from the previous part work if  $k$  were odd?