

Boolean Unateness Testing with $\tilde{O}(n^{3/4})$ Adaptive Queries

Xi Chen*

Erik Waingarten[†]

Jinyu Xie[‡]

February 6, 2022

Abstract

We give an adaptive algorithm which tests whether an unknown Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is unate, i.e. every variable of f is either non-decreasing or non-increasing, or ε -far from unate with one-sided error using $\tilde{O}(n^{3/4}/\varepsilon^2)$ queries. This improves on the best adaptive $O(n/\varepsilon)$ -query algorithm from Baleshazar, Chakrabarty, Pallavoor, Raskhodnikova and Seshadhri [BCP⁺17b] when $1/\varepsilon \ll n^{1/4}$. Combined with the $\tilde{\Omega}(n)$ -query lower bound for non-adaptive algorithms with one-sided error of [CWX17, BCP⁺17a], we conclude that adaptivity helps for the testing of unateness with one-sided error. A crucial component of our algorithm is a new subroutine for finding bi-chromatic edges in the Boolean hypercube called *adaptive edge search*.

*Columbia University, email: xichen@cs.columbia.edu.

[†]Columbia University, email: eaw@cs.columbia.edu.

[‡]Columbia University, email: jinyu@cs.columbia.edu

1 Introduction

A Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is *monotone* if every variable of f is non-decreasing, and is *unate* if every variable of f is either non-decreasing or non-increasing (or equivalently, there exists an $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that $g(x) = f(x \oplus r)$ is monotone, where \oplus is the bit-wise XOR). Both problems of testing *monotonicity* and *unateness* were first introduced in [GGL⁺00]. The goal is to design an algorithm that decides whether an unknown $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ has the property being tested or is far from having the property (see Section 2 for the formal definition) with as few queries as possible. After a sequence of developments from the past few years [CS14, CST14, KMS15, CDST15, BB16, CC16, CWX17], the query complexity of non-adaptive algorithms for monotonicity has been pinned down at $\tilde{\Theta}(n^{1/2})$; for adaptive monotonicity testing algorithms there remains a gap between $\tilde{O}(n^{1/2})$ and $\tilde{\Omega}(n^{1/3})$. The query complexity of testing unateness, however, is less well-understood.

The seminal work of [GGL⁺00] presented an $O(n^{3/2}/\varepsilon)$ -query algorithm for testing unateness of Boolean functions. It proceeds by sampling $O(n^{3/2}/\varepsilon)$ edges¹ of $\{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly at random, and rejects only when it finds a so-called *edge violation* — two edges (x, y) and (x', y') in the same direction i for some $i \in [n]$ such that one is monotone and the other is anti-monotone. By definition the existence of an edge violation ensures that the function is not unate and thus, the algorithm has one-sided error (i.e., it always accepts a unate function); we refer to algorithms which always accept unate functions as *one-sided*. This algorithm is non-adaptive as well (i.e., all queries can be made at once). For the correctness, [GGL⁺00] showed that after sampling $O(n^{3/2}/\varepsilon)$ random edges an edge violation is found with high probability when f is ε -far from unate.

Recently, [KS16] obtained the first improvement to the upper bound of [GGL⁺00] by presenting an $O(n \log n/\varepsilon)$ -query adaptive, one-sided algorithm. Later, [BMPR16] generalized the algorithm to work for real-valued functions over the n -dimensional hypergrid, $f: [m]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The current best upper bounds for testing unateness of Boolean functions are $O((n/\varepsilon) \log(n/\varepsilon))$ for non-adaptive algorithms [CS16, BCP⁺17b], and $O(n/\varepsilon)$ for adaptive algorithms [BCP⁺17b] (with a logarithmic advantage). Both algorithms work for real-valued functions and are shown to be optimal for real-valued functions in [BCP⁺17b].

On the lower bound side, [BMPR16] was the first to give a lower bound on testing unateness by showing that any non-adaptive algorithm with one-sided error must make $\Omega(\sqrt{n}/\varepsilon)$ many queries. Then, [CWX17] showed that unateness testing of Boolean functions requires $\tilde{\Omega}(n^{2/3})$ queries for adaptive algorithms with two-sided error, showing that a polynomial gap between testing monotonicity and unateness for Boolean functions.² For non-adaptive algorithms with one-sided error, [CWX17, BCP⁺17a] show $\tilde{\Omega}(n)$ queries are necessary (for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$), which shows the algorithm of [CS16, BCP⁺17b] is optimal among non-adaptive algorithms with one-sided error for Boolean functions.

Our Contribution. Generally, the power of adaptivity in property testing of Boolean functions is not yet well understood. Taking the examples of monotonicity and unateness, the current best algorithms are both non-adaptive³ (ignoring polylogarithmic factors), and polynomial gaps remain

¹A pair of points (x, y) in $\{0, 1\}^n$ is an edge in the Boolean hypercube if $x_i \neq y_i$ at exactly one coordinate $i \in [n]$. We will refer to i as the direction of (x, y) . An edge (x, y) along direction i is *bi-chromatic* (in f) if $f(x) \neq f(y)$; it is *monotone* if it is bi-chromatic and has $f(x) = x_i$; it is *anti-monotone* if it is bi-chromatic but not monotone.

²The conference version of the paper included a weaker lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n})$ for testing unateness. Since then, the authors have improved the lower bound to $\tilde{\Omega}(n^{2/3})$ and have updated the full-version of the paper, available as [arXiv:1702.06997](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.06997).

³For real-valued functions, [BCP⁺17b] showed that adaptivity helps by a logarithmic factor.

	Adaptive	Non-adaptive
Upper bounds	$\tilde{O}(n^{3/4})$ (this work)	$O(n)$ [BCP ⁺ 17b]
Lower bounds	$\tilde{\Omega}(n^{2/3})$ [CWX17]	$\tilde{\Omega}(n)$ (one-sided) [CWX17, BCP ⁺ 17a]

Table 1: Current knowledge on upper and lower bounds for testing unateness. We consider the regime where $\varepsilon = \Theta(1)$.

between the best upper and lower bounds for the query complexity of adaptive algorithms.

The main result of this work is an $\tilde{O}(n^{3/4}/\varepsilon^2)$ -query adaptive, one-sided algorithm for unateness testing of Boolean functions.

Theorem 1 (Main). *There is an $\tilde{O}(n^{3/4}/\varepsilon^2)$ -query,⁴ adaptive algorithm with the following property: Given an $\varepsilon > 0$ and query access to an unknown $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, it always returns “unate” if f is unate and returns “non-unate” with probability at least $2/3$ if f is ε -far from unate.*

Compared to the $\tilde{\Omega}(n)$ lower bound for non-adaptive, one-sided algorithms [CWX17], Theorem 1 implies that adaptivity helps by a polynomial factor for one-sided algorithms. Additionally, given the lower bound of $\Omega(n/\varepsilon)$ for unateness testing of real-valued functions over $\{0, 1\}^n$ [BCP⁺17b], our result shows that Boolean functions are polynomially easier to test than real-valued functions. The current known upper and lower bounds for testing unateness for $\varepsilon = \Theta(1)$ are summarized in the Table 1.

Our algorithm is heavily inspired by the work of [KMS15], where they prove a directed analogue of an isoperimetric inequality of Talagrand [Tal93] and used it to reveal strong connections between the structure of anti-monotone edges of a Boolean function and its distance to monotonicity. In particular, their inequality implies that when f is far from monotone, there must exist a highly regular bipartite graph of certain size that consists of anti-monotone edges of f only (see Theorem 2). The analysis of our algorithm relies on this implication. (See more discussion later in Section 1.1.)

A recent work of [CG17] introduced the notion of “rounds” of adaptivity to quantify the degree of adaptivity used by a property testing algorithm. We notice that our algorithm can be implemented using only two rounds of adaptivity.

1.1 Binary search versus adaptive edge search

We give some high-level ideas behind our main algorithm. First, it outputs “non-unate” only when an edge violation is found and thus, it is one-sided. Our analysis focuses on showing that, given a function that is ε -far from unate, the algorithm finds an edge violation with high probability.

An edge violation occurs when two bi-chromatic edges *collide*, i.e. they are in the same direction i but one is monotone and the other is anti-monotone. Thus, an algorithm may proceed by designing a subroutine for finding bi-chromatic edges and invoking this subroutine multiple times in hopes of finding a collision. A subroutine for finding bi-chromatic edges that has been widely used in the Boolean function property testing literature (e.g., [Bla09, BB16, KS16]) is *binary search* (see Figure 1):

1. Find two points $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $f(x) \neq f(y)$, and let $S = \{i \in [n] : x_i \neq y_i\}$.

⁴See (4) for the hidden polylogarithmic factor; we have made no effort to optimize the polynomial dependence on $\log n$ and $\log(1/\varepsilon)$ in the algorithm.




Figure 1: Pictorial representation of one step of the binary search strategy for finding bi-chromatic edges. The hypercube $\{0, 1\}^n$ is represented as the diamond. Points x and y are given with $f(x) = 0$ and $f(y) = 1$ and a particular path represents flipping variables in S one at a time. Finally $z = x^{(S')}$ corresponds to picking some z between x and y ; in this case, $f(z) = 1$, so y would be updated to z .

2. Pick a subset $S' \subset S$ of size $|S|/2$, let $z = x^{(S')}$,⁵ and query $f(z)$.
3. If $f(z) = f(x)$, let $x \leftarrow z$; if $f(z) = f(y)$, let $y \leftarrow z$. Repeat until (x, y) is an edge.

Clearly, the above procedure, if initiated with $f(x) \neq f(y)$, will always find a bi-chromatic edge in some direction $i \in S$ with $O(\log n)$ queries. One can further *randomize* the subroutine by drawing x and y uniformly at random at the beginning and drawing S' uniformly at random from S in each round. Given an f , the binary search subroutine naturally induces a distribution over bi-chromatic edges of f . A high-level question is: Can we analyze this distribution for functions f that are ε -far from unate? Can this strategy give better algorithms for finding an edge violation?

While we do not analyze the specific binary search strategy above in this paper, we introduce a new kind of edge search strategy, which we call *adaptive edge search* and denote by AE-SEARCH. It is a crucial component of our algorithm and allows for a relatively straightforward analysis. It takes two inputs, a point $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and a nonempty set $S \subseteq [n]$,⁶ with the goal of finding a bi-chromatic edge $(x, x^{(i)})$ for some $i \in S$ (using $O(\log n)$ queries only). The subroutine proceeds as follows:

1. Sample $L = O(\log n)$ subsets $T_1, \dots, T_L \subset S$ of size $|S|/2$ uniformly, and query $f(x^{(T_\ell)})$.
2. Consider all T_ℓ 's with $f(x^{(T_\ell)}) \neq f(x)$. If the intersection of such T_ℓ 's consists of exactly one index $i \in S$, query $f(x^{(i)})$ and output i if $f(x^{(i)}) \neq f(x)$ (meaning that a bi-chromatic edge $(x, x^{(i)})$ along direction i has been found); otherwise return “fail.”

⁵Here $x^{(S')} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is the point obtained from x by flipping its coordinates in S' ; we also write $x^{(i)}$ for $x^{\{i\}}$.

⁶It is not important for the moment but later we will always choose the size of $|S|$ to be smaller than \sqrt{n} .

See Figure 2 for a pictorial representation. While AE-SEARCH does not always find a bi-chromatic edge (unlike the binary search), its behavior is much easier to analyze. Informally when $(x, x^{(i)})$ is a bi-chromatic edge and $i \in S$ (otherwise it can never return i), AE-SEARCH(x, S) returns i with high probability if (1) *most* subsets $T \subset S$ of size $|S|/2$ with $i \notin T$ have $f(x^{(T)}) = f(x)$ and (2) *most* $T \subset S$ of size $|S|/2$ with $i \in T$ have $f(x^{(T)}) = f(x^{(i)}) \neq f(x)$. (See Figure 2 for an illustration.)

With the adaptive edge search in hand, the proof of Theorem 1 proceeds in two steps. For the first step, we show that when f is far from unate, there must be “many” bi-chromatic edges $(x, x^{(i)})$ such that running AE-SEARCH on x paired with a random subset $S \subset [n]$ *containing* i would lead to the discovery of $(x, x^{(i)})$ with high probability. There are a lot of technical details hidden in the word “many”: (i) subsets S of different size contribute differently (intuitively, the larger S , it is more likely for S to contain i when S is drawn from $[n]$ uniformly at random); (ii) we need to balance the contribution from monotone and anti-monotone edges in the same direction by taking their minimum. Intuitively, it will not help us find an edge violation if AE-SEARCH works well over many bi-chromatic edges in a direction i , but all these edges turn out to be monotone. Following the high-level discussion above, we formally introduce the notion of SCORE_i^+ and SCORE_i^- for a Boolean function in Section 4 (to measure the performance of AE-SEARCH), and prove in Section 6 that

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \min \{ \text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^- \} = \tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^2), \quad (1)$$

when f is ε -far from unate. The proof of (1) heavily relies on the directed isoperimetric inequality of [KMS15] and its combinatorial implications for functions far from monotone (see Theorem 2).

In the second step, we present an algorithm that keeps calling the adaptive edge search (strategically), and show that it finds an edge violation with high probability, given (1). At a high level, it starts by sampling a set $S \subset [n]$ of certain size and a sequence of K_+ points $\{x_i\}$ from $\{0, 1\}^n$. Then it runs AE-SEARCH(x_i, S) for each x_i and keeps the directions of monotone edges found in a set A . Next it samples M subsets $T_i \subseteq S$ of certain size and for each T_i , it samples K_- points $\{y_{i,j}\}$ to run AE-SEARCH($y_{i,j}, T_i$). Similarly, it keeps the directions of anti-monotone edges found in B . Finally, it outputs “non-unate” if $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$, i.e., an edge violation is found; otherwise, it outputs “unate”.

The tricky part is the choices of the size of sets S and T and the three parameters M, K_+ and K_- . For technical reasons, our algorithm is split into two cases, depending on how the $\tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^2)$ in (1) is achieved, e.g., what scale of $\min\{\text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^-\}$ contributes the most in the sum. The parameters are chosen differently in the cases and their proofs use slightly different techniques.

Organization. We formally introduce the adaptive edge search subroutine in Section 3. Next, we introduce the notion of scores and state (1) in Lemma 4.3 in Section 4. We present the algorithm and its analysis in Section 5, assuming Lemma 4.3. Finally we prove Lemma 4.3 in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

We use bold font letters such as \mathbf{T} and \mathbf{x} for random variables. Given $n \geq 1$, we write $[n]$ to denote $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Given a point x in the Boolean hypercube $\{0, 1\}^n$ and $S \subset [n]$, we use $x^{(S)}$ to denote the string obtained from x by flipping each entry x_i with $i \in S$. When $S = \{i\}$ is a singleton, we write $x^{(i)}$ instead of $x^{\{i\}}$ for convenience. Given $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $x \oplus y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is their bit-wise XOR.

We define the *distance* between two Boolean functions $f, g: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ using the uniform distribution: $\text{dist}(f, g) := \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \{0, 1\}^n} [f(\mathbf{x}) \neq g(\mathbf{x})]$. The distance of f to unateness is defined as the




Figure 2: Pictorial representation of the adaptive edge search strategy, $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S)$, for finding bi-chromatic edges. We consider the case when $(x, x^{(i)})$ is a bi-chromatic edge in direction i with $f(x) = 0$ and $i \in S$. The two sub-cubes in the picture above correspond to points that agree with x outside of $S \setminus \{i\}$, and points that agree with $x^{(i)}$ outside of $S \setminus \{i\}$, respectively. The points $x^{(T_\ell)}$ sampled in $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S)$ lie in one of the sub-cubes according to whether $i \in T_\ell$ or not. Under certain conditions one can show that with high probability, all T_ℓ 's with $f(x^{(T_\ell)}) = 1$ lie in the right sub-cube and furthermore, their intersection is exactly $\{i\}$. In this case, AE-SEARCH returns i .

minimum value of $\text{dist}(f, g)$ over all unate functions g ; we say f is ε -far from unate if its distance to unateness is at least ε , or equivalently, $\text{dist}(f, g) \geq \varepsilon$ for all unate functions g .

We say an algorithm tests the unateness of Boolean functions if, given ε and query access to a Boolean function f , (1) it outputs “unate” with probability at least $2/3$ when f is unate; and (2) it outputs “non-unate” with probability at least $2/3$ when f is ε -far from unate. We say the algorithm is one-sided if it always outputs “unate” when f is unate.

Recall that an *edge violation* of unateness for f consists of a pair of bi-chromatic edges along the same direction, one being monotone and one being anti-monotone. We remark that all algorithms discussed in this paper output “non-unate” only when an edge violation is found among the queries they made. We commonly refer to edge violations simply as violations.

The *total influence* I_f of a Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the number of bi-chromatic edges of f divided by 2^n . We combine a lemma from [KMS15] and a unateness testing algorithm of [BCP⁺17b] to find an edge violation in a function of *high* total influence using $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ queries only.⁷ The proof can be found in Appendix B.

⁷Here we do not need to assume that f is far from unate. Actually Lemma B.1 implies that any f with $I_f \geq 6\sqrt{n}$ cannot be unate, and the algorithm stated in Lemma 2.1 finds an edge violation with high probability.

Subroutine AE-SEARCH(x, S)

Input: Query access to $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, a nonempty set $S \subseteq [n]$ of even size.

Output: Either an index $i \in S$ with $f(x^{(i)}) \neq f(x)$, or “fail.”

1. Query $f(x)$ and set $b \leftarrow f(x)$.
2. If $|S| = 2$, pick one coordinate $i \in S$ uniformly at random. Query $f(x^{(i)})$ and return i if $f(x^{(i)}) \neq b$; otherwise return “fail.”
3. Sample $L = \lceil 4 \log n \rceil$ subsets $\mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_L \subset S$ of size $|S|/2$ uniformly at random. Query $f(x^{(\mathbf{T}_\ell)})$ and set the output to be \mathbf{b}_ℓ for each $\ell \in [L]$. Let $\mathbf{C} \subset S$ where

$$\mathbf{C} = \bigcap_{\ell \in [L]: \mathbf{b}_\ell \neq b} \mathbf{T}_\ell \quad (\mathbf{C} = \emptyset \text{ by default if } \mathbf{b}_\ell = b \text{ for all } \ell).$$

If $\mathbf{C} = \{i\}$ for some i , query $f(x^{(i)})$ and return i if $f(x^{(i)}) \neq b$; otherwise return “fail.”

Figure 3: Description of the adaptive edge search subroutine.

Lemma 2.1. *There is an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ -query, non-adaptive algorithm that, given any $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $I_f > 6\sqrt{n}$, finds an edge violation of f to unateness with probability at least $2/3$.*

Given Lemma 2.1, it suffices for us to give an $\tilde{O}(n^{3/4}/\varepsilon^2)$ -query algorithm that can find an edge violation of any function that is ε -far from unate and satisfies $I_f \leq 6\sqrt{n}$.

3 Adaptive edge search

In this section, we introduce a new subroutine called *adaptive edge search* (AE-SEARCH) which will be heavily used in our main algorithm for testing unateness. We present the subroutine in Figure 3. It has query access to a Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and takes two inputs: $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is a point in the hypercube and $S \subseteq [n]$ is a nonempty set of even size.

The goal of AE-SEARCH(x, S) is to find an index $i \in S$ such that $(x, x^{(i)})$ is a bi-chromatic edge in f . It returns an index $i \in S$ if it finds one (note that AE-SEARCH always checks and makes sure that $(x, x^{(i)})$ is bi-chromatic before it outputs i), or returns “fail” if it fails to find one (which does not necessarily mean that none of the edges $(x, x^{(i)})$, $i \in S$, are bi-chromatic). While a naive search would consider each $i \in S$ and query each $f(x^{(i)})$, as well as $f(x)$, incurring a cost of $|S| + 1$ queries that can be expensive when S is large, AE-SEARCH(x, S) only uses $L + 2 = O(\log n)$ queries, where we set the parameter $L = \lceil 4 \log n \rceil$ in Figure 3.

We will analyze the performance of AE-SEARCH in Section 6, where we show that, informally, under the assumption that f is far from unate, AE-SEARCH succeeds in finding a bi-chromatic edge $(x, x^{(i)})$ for some $i \in S$ for “many” input pairs (x, S) with high probability. For now, we just record the following simple observation that follows from the description of AE-SEARCH in Figure 3.

Fact 3.1. AE-SEARCH(x, S) makes $O(\log n)$ queries and returns either an index i or “fail.” Whenever it returns an index i , we have $i \in S$ and $(x, x^{(i)})$ is a bi-chromatic edge in f .

4 Scores

In this section, we use the AE-SEARCH subroutine to introduce the notion of *scores* for monotone and anti-monotone edges. We start with some notation.

We consider some fixed function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. For each $i \in [n]$, we let E_i^+ denote the set of monotone edges in direction i and E_i^- denote the set of anti-monotone edges in direction i . Let

$$\Lambda = \left\lfloor \log_2 \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n} \right) \right\rfloor = \Theta(\log n)$$

be a parameter which will be used in the rest of the paper. Given $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [\Lambda]$, we let

$$\mathcal{P}_{i,j} = \{S \subset [n] \setminus \{i\} : |S| = 2^j - 1\}.$$

We need the following definitions:

Definition 4.1 (Good pairs). *Let $(x, x^{(i)})$ be a monotone edge in E_i^+ for some $i \in [n]$ and let S be a set in $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ for some $j \in [\Lambda]$. We say (x, S) is a good pair for E_i^+ if AE-SEARCH($x, S \cup \{i\}$) returns i with probability at least $1/2$ (i.e., running the adaptive edge search subroutine over x and $S \cup \{i\}$ would help us discover the monotone edge $(x, x^{(i)})$ in E_i^+ with probability at least $1/2$).*

By definition, (x, S) can be a good pair for E_i^+ only if $(x, x^{(i)})$ is a monotone edge. Additionally, if $(x, x^{(i)})$ is a monotone edge, then (x, S) is always a good pair for all $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,1}$. This simply follows from the fact that, as $|S \cup \{i\}| = 2$, AE-SEARCH($x, S \cup \{i\}$) will pick i with probability $1/2$ on line 2 and find the monotone edge $(x, x^{(i)})$. Next we use good pairs to define *strong* points.

Definition 4.2 (Strong points). *A point $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E_i^+$ is said to be j -strong (or a j -strong point) for E_i^+ , for some $j \in [\Lambda]$, if (x, S) is a good pair for E_i^+ for at least $3/4$ of $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,j}$.*

Consider an $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ that is a j -strong for E_i^+ . Then, if we sample an \mathbf{S} from $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ uniformly and run AE-SEARCH($x, \mathbf{S} \cup \{i\}$), we will discover $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E_i^+$ with probability $(3/4) \cdot (1/2) = 3/8$. Note that if $(x, x^{(i)})$ is a monotone edge, then x is always 1-strong. We also extend both definitions of *good pairs* and *j -strong* points to E_i^- , so we may consider a good pair (x, S) for E_i^- , as well as, a point $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ which is j -strong for E_i^- , when $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E_i^-$ is an anti-monotone edge.

For each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [\Lambda]$, let $\text{SCORE}_{i,j}^+$ be the fraction of points that are j -strong for E_i^+ :

$$\text{SCORE}_{i,j}^+ = \frac{\text{the number of } j\text{-strong points for } E_i^+}{2^n} \in [0, 1].$$

Intuitively, when $\text{SCORE}_{i,j}^+$ is high, it becomes easy to discover a monotone edge in direction i using AE-SEARCH with 2^j -sized sets (as $|S \cup \{i\}| = 2^j$ in Definition 4.1) without using too many queries. This intuition will be made formal in the analysis of our main algorithm later in Section 6.

Finally we define SCORE_i^+ for each $i \in [n]$ as (recall that $2^j \leq \sqrt{n}/\log n$ by the choice of Λ)

$$\text{SCORE}_i^+ = \max_{j \in [\Lambda]} \left\{ \text{SCORE}_{i,j}^+ \cdot \frac{2^j}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \in [0, 1]. \quad (2)$$

Note that $\text{SCORE}_{i,j}^+$'s are adjusted in (2) with weights $2^j/\sqrt{n}$ before taking the maximum. Roughly speaking, this is done here to reflect the fact that with the same $\text{SCORE}_{i,j}^+$, the larger j is, the easier it becomes to discover an edge in E_i^+ using sets of size 2^j in AE-SEARCH. Consider some

point $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ which is j -strong for E_i^+ . Then as noted above, if the algorithm samples a set $\mathbf{S} \sim \mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ uniformly at random and runs $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, \mathbf{S} \cup \{i\})$, the algorithm will observe $(x, x^{(i)})$ with probability $\frac{3}{8}$; however, the algorithm does not know $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ or i . From the algorithm's perspective, there is a point $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with some bi-chromatic edge $(x, x^{(i)})$. The algorithm runs $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, \mathbf{S}')$ for some set \mathbf{S}' , and must hope that the set \mathbf{S}' of size 2^j contains i and $\mathbf{S}' \setminus \{i\} \in \mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ is a good pair. As j increases, it becomes easier for \mathbf{S}' to include i . (Again this will be made more formal in Section 6). We also extend $\text{SCORE}_{i,j}^+$, SCORE_i^+ to $\text{SCORE}_{i,j}^-$, SCORE_i^- for E_i^- .

4.1 Plan for the proof of Theorem 1

The plan is the following. Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a function that is ε -far from unate. Our goal is to give an $\tilde{O}(n^{3/4}/\varepsilon^2)$ -query algorithm which finds an edge violation of f with probability at least $2/3$. By Lemma 2.1, we may assume without loss of generality that f also satisfies $I_f \leq 6\sqrt{n}$.

We rely on the following technical lemma for the scores of f but delay its proof to Section 6.

Lemma 4.3. *If $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is ε -far from unate and satisfies $I_f \leq 6\sqrt{n}$, then we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \min \left\{ \text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^- \right\} \geq \Omega \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log^8 n} \right). \quad (3)$$

We present our main $\tilde{O}(n^{3/4}/\varepsilon^2)$ -query (adaptive) algorithm in the next section and show that, given any function f that satisfies (3), it finds an edge violation of f with probability at least $2/3$.

5 Main algorithm and its analysis

We present our main algorithm that, given any Boolean function f that satisfies (3), uses

$$O \left(\frac{n^{3/4}}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \log^{16} n \cdot \log^2(n/\varepsilon) \right) = \tilde{O}(n^{3/4}/\varepsilon^2) \quad (4)$$

queries to find an edge violation of f with probability at least $2/3$.

5.1 Preparation: Bucketing scores

We start with some preparation for the algorithm. First, we use standard bucketing techniques to make (3) easier to use (while only losing a polylogarithmic factor in the sum). Recall that

$$\text{SCORE}_i^+ = \max_{j \in [\Lambda]} \left\{ \text{SCORE}_{i,j}^+ \cdot \frac{2^j}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{SCORE}_i^- = \max_{j \in [\Lambda]} \left\{ \text{SCORE}_{i,j}^- \cdot \frac{2^j}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}.$$

We will say that the i th direction is of $\text{type-}(t, r)$, for some $t, r \in [\Lambda]$, if

$$\text{SCORE}_i^+ = \text{SCORE}_{i,t}^+ \cdot \frac{2^t}{\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{SCORE}_i^- = \text{SCORE}_{i,r}^- \cdot \frac{2^r}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

As $\Lambda = O(\log n)$, there are $O(\log^2 n)$ types. From (3) we know there is a pair (t, r) such that

$$\sum_{i: \text{type-}(t, r)} \min \left\{ \text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^- \right\} = \Omega \left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log^{10} n} \right). \quad (5)$$

In the remainder of the section, we fix such a type (t, r) that satisfies (5). (Looking ahead, we may assume that our algorithm knows (t, r) as it can afford to try all $O(\log^2 n)$ possible pairs of (t, r) .)

Let $I^* \subseteq [n]$ be the set of all type- (t, r) directions. We next divide I^* into $\lceil 2 \log(n/\varepsilon) \rceil$ buckets according to $\min\{\text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^-\}$. An $i \in I^*$ lies in the k -th bucket if it satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2^k} \leq \min\{\text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^-\} \leq \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}.$$

Note that some $i \in I^*$ may not lie in any bucket when $\min\{\text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^-\} \leq \varepsilon^2/n^2$; however, all such $i \in I^*$ in total contribute at most $O(\varepsilon^2/n)$ to the LHS of (5), which is negligible compared to its RHS. Since k has $\lceil 2 \log(n/\varepsilon) \rceil = O(\log(n/\varepsilon))$ possibilities, there exists an h such that

$$\sum_{i \in I^* : \text{bucket } h} \min\{\text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^-\} \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log^{10} n \cdot \log(n/\varepsilon)}\right). \quad (6)$$

Similarly we fix such an h in the rest of the section (and assume later that the algorithm knows h). We also let $I \subseteq I^*$ be the indices of I^* in bucket h . To simplify the notation, we let $H = 2^h$ and

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{c\varepsilon^2}{\log^{10} n \cdot \log(n/\varepsilon)},$$

where we use $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ to hide the polylogarithmic factor in ε and n , and c is some constant which ensures

$$\sum_{i \in I} \min\{\text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^-\} \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}^2.$$

Given that $H = 2^h$, we have

$$1/H \leq \min\{\text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^-\} \leq 2/H, \quad \text{for each } i \in I,$$

and $|I| \cdot (2/H) \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}^2$ from (6). This implies $H \leq 2|I|/\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 = O(n/\tilde{\varepsilon}^2)$ as $|I| \leq n$. Moreover, using

$$1/H \leq \text{SCORE}_i^+ = \text{SCORE}_{i,t}^+ \cdot (2^t/\sqrt{n}) \leq 2^t/\sqrt{n},$$

we have $H2^t \geq \sqrt{n}$ and similarly, $H2^r \geq \sqrt{n}$.

We summarize the above discussion with the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that f satisfies (3). Then there exist $t, r \in [\Lambda]$, $H = O(n/\tilde{\varepsilon}^2)$ as a power of 2 with $H2^t, H2^r \geq \sqrt{n}$, and a nonempty $I \subseteq [n]$ of size $|I| \geq H\tilde{\varepsilon}^2/2$ such that every $i \in I$ satisfies*

$$\min\{\text{SCORE}_i^+, \text{SCORE}_i^-\} = \min\left\{\text{SCORE}_{i,t}^+ \cdot \frac{2^t}{\sqrt{n}}, \text{SCORE}_{i,r}^- \cdot \frac{2^r}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \in [1/H, 2/H].$$

5.2 Preparation: Informative sets

We introduce more notation and state Lemma 5.3 that will be heavily used in the analysis of the algorithm. We will defer the proof of Lemma 5.3 to Subsection 5.6. Below t, r and H are considered as fixed parameters, and I is a set of indices that satisfies the condition of Lemma 5.1. We further

assume that $t \geq r$; all our discussion below holds when $t < r$ by switching the roles of t and r (and E_i^+ and E_i^-). We start with some useful notation related to good pairs.

Recall (x, S) is a good pair for E_i^+ (or E_i^-) if $(x, x^{(i)})$ is a monotone edge (or an anti-monotone edge) and $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S \cup \{i\})$ returns i with probability at least $1/2$. Given an $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,j}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GOOD-SET}_i^+(S) &= \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : (x, S) \text{ is a good pair for } E_i^+\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \text{GOOD-SET}_i^-(S) &= \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : (x, S) \text{ is a good pair for } E_i^-\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also use

$$\text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^+(S) = \frac{|\text{GOOD-SET}_i^+(S)|}{2^n} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^-(S) = \frac{|\text{GOOD-SET}_i^-(S)|}{2^n}$$

to denote the fraction of points in $\text{GOOD-SET}_i^+(S)$ and $\text{GOOD-SET}_i^-(S)$, respectively.

Recall that $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is j -strong for E_i^+ (or E_i^-) if (x, S) is a good pair for E_i^+ (or E_i^-) for at least $3/4$ of sets $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,j}$. Given an $i \in I$, we use STRONG_i^+ to denote the set of t -strong points for E_i^+ and STRONG_i^- to denote the set of r -strong points for E_i^- . By Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\text{SCORE}_{i,t}^+ = \frac{|\text{STRONG}_i^+|}{2^n} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{H \cdot 2^t} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{SCORE}_{i,r}^- = \frac{|\text{STRONG}_i^-|}{2^n} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{H \cdot 2^r}. \quad (7)$$

We define the following two parameters, which will be very important for the algorithm:

$$\alpha = \frac{|I| \cdot 2^t}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{|I| \cdot 2^r}{n}.$$

These parameters measure the expectation of $|I \cap \mathbf{S}|$ and $|I \cap \mathbf{T}|$, respectively, when \mathbf{S} is a random subset of $[n]$ of size 2^t and \mathbf{T} is a random subset of $[n]$ of size 2^r .

Finally we introduce the notion of *informative sets*.

Definition 5.2 (Informative Sets). *We say a set $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ for some $i \in I$ is informative for the i th coordinate if both of the following two conditions hold:*

1. $\text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^+(S) \geq 0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 / (\alpha \sqrt{n})$; and
2. $\text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^-(T) \geq 0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 / (\beta \sqrt{n})$ for at least 0.1-fraction of $(2^r - 1)$ -sized subsets T of S .
We refer to $T \cup \{i\}$ as an i -revealing set when T has $\text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^-(T) \geq 0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 / (\beta \sqrt{n})$.

Additionally, we say the set $S \cup \{i\}$ is i -informative if S is informative for the i th coordinate.

To gain some intuition, if the algorithm is given a set $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ for some $i \in I$ that is informative for the i th coordinate, then it can use S and i to find a violation along the i th direction as follows.

1. Sample $O(\alpha \sqrt{n} / \tilde{\varepsilon}^2)$ points $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly and run $\text{AE-SEARCH}(\mathbf{x}, S \cup \{i\})$.
2. Sample a subset $\mathbf{T} \subseteq S$ of size $2^r - 1$, sample $O(\beta \sqrt{n} / \tilde{\varepsilon}^2)$ points $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly at random, and then run $\text{AE-SEARCH}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{T} \cup \{i\})$.

We find a violation if we find a monotone edge in direction i in step 1 and an anti-monotone edge in direction i in step 2. By Definition 5.2, this occurs with probability $\Omega(1)$. Of course, the algorithm does not have knowledge of S and i , so we need to incorporate other ideas; however, the intuition is that informative sets can help reveal edge violations efficiently using the AE-SEARCH subroutine.

The key will be to show that there are many informative sets for each $i \in I$, which we do in the following lemma using standard averaging arguments, but delay its proof to Section 5.6.

Lemma 5.3. *For each $i \in I$, at least $1/8$ of sets $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ are informative for the i th coordinate.*

Subroutine **Alg-Case-1**, handling the case when $\alpha \geq \log^2 n$

Input: Query access to $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

Output: Either “unate,” or two edges constituting an edge violation for f .

Repeat the following $O(1)$ times for some sufficiently large constant:

1. Sample a set \mathbf{S} of size 2^t from $[n]$ uniformly at random.
2. Repeat M times:
 - Sample an $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly at random and run $\text{AE-SEARCH}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{S})$.
3. Let \mathbf{A} be the set of $i \in [n]$ such that a monotone edge in direction i is found.
4. Repeat M times:
 - Sample a subset $\mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ of size 2^r uniformly at random, as well as $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly and run $\text{AE-SEARCH}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{T})$.
5. Let \mathbf{B} be the set of $i \in [n]$ such that an anti-monotone edge in direction i is found.
6. If $\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B} \neq \emptyset$, output an edge violation of f to unateness.

If we have not found any edge violation in line 6, output “unate.”

Figure 4: Description of the **Alg-Case-1** for Case 1 of the algorithm.

5.3 Cases of the main algorithm

We are now ready to describe the main algorithm (which is one-sided and returns “non-unate” *only* when it finds an edge violation of unateness). As mentioned earlier, we focus on the case when f satisfies (3) and show that for any such f , the algorithm finds an edge violation with probability at least $2/3$. We assume that the algorithm knows the parameters r, t and H from Lemma 5.1 (algorithmically, we just try all possibilities for these parameters, which incurs a factor of $O(\log^2 n \cdot \log(n/\varepsilon))$ in the final query complexity). Let $I \subseteq [n]$ be the set promised in Lemma 5.1 (note that algorithm has no knowledge about I). We also assume that $t \geq r$; if not, one can switch the roles of monotone and anti-monotone edges by running the algorithm on $g(x) = f(x \oplus 1^n)$, where 1^n is the all-1’s string.

5.4 Case 1: $\alpha \geq \log^2 n$

In this case, we expect a random set \mathbf{S} of size 2^t to have intersection with (the unknown) I of size at least $\log^2 n$. The algorithm, **Alg-Case-1**, is presented in Figure 4 with the following parameter:

$$M = \left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{\alpha n}}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \log^3 n \right\rceil.$$

Fact 5.4 (Query complexity). *The number of queries used by **Alg-Case-1** is (using $\alpha \leq \sqrt{n}$)*

$$O(1) \cdot (M + M) \cdot O(\log n) = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\alpha n} \cdot \log^4 n}{\varepsilon^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{n^{3/4} \cdot \log^{14} n \cdot \log(n/\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2}\right).$$

Correctness of Case 1: Below, we prove that **Alg-Case-1** finds a violation with high probability. We split the proof into two lemmas. The first, Lemma 5.5, shows that a certain condition is satisfied with constant probability in each iteration of Step 1 of **Alg-Case-1**. The second, Lemma 5.6, shows that if the condition of Lemma 5.5 is satisfied at Step 1 of **Alg-Case-1**, then the algorithm finds a violation with high probability.

Lemma 5.5. *Let \mathbf{S} be a 2^t -sized subset drawn from $[n]$ uniformly at random and let $\mathbf{I_S} \subseteq I \cap \mathbf{S}$ be the set of $i \in I \cap \mathbf{S}$ such that \mathbf{S} is i -informative. Then $\alpha/10 \leq |\mathbf{I_S}| \leq 4\alpha$ with probability $\Omega(1)$.*

Proof. Recall that α is the expected size of $I \cap \mathbf{S}$. As a result of $\alpha \geq \log^2 n$, the fraction of $S \subset [n]$ of size 2^t with $|S \cap I| > 4\alpha$ is at most $\exp(-\Omega(\log^2 n))$ (see Lemma C.1 in Appendix C for a formal proof). In the rest of the proof, we let

$$\mathcal{S} = \{S \subset [n] : |S| = 2^t \text{ and } |S \cap I| \leq 4\alpha\}.$$

We define a bipartite graph H^* : vertices on the two sides correspond to I and \mathcal{S} , respectively; (i, S) is an edge if S is i -informative. By Lemma 5.3, the degree of each $i \in I$ is at least

$$\frac{1}{8} \cdot |\mathcal{P}_{i,t}| - \exp(-\Omega(\log^2 n)) \cdot \binom{n}{2^t} \geq \frac{1}{9} \cdot |\mathcal{P}_{i,t}| = \frac{1}{9} \cdot \binom{n-1}{2^t-1}.$$

Let γ denote the fraction of $S \in \mathcal{S}$ (among \mathcal{S}) with degree at least $\alpha/10$ in H^* . On the one hand, the number of edges in H^* is at least (counting from the I -side and using $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \binom{n}{2^t}$)

$$|I| \cdot \frac{1}{9} \cdot \binom{n-1}{2^t-1} \geq \frac{1}{9} \cdot |I| \cdot \frac{2^t}{n} \cdot |\mathcal{S}| = \frac{1}{9} \cdot \alpha |\mathcal{S}|.$$

On the other hand, the number of edges in H^* is at most (counting from the \mathcal{S} -side)

$$\gamma |\mathcal{S}| \cdot 4\alpha + (1 - \gamma) |\mathcal{S}| \cdot (\alpha/10) = \alpha |\mathcal{S}| \cdot \left(\frac{39\gamma}{40} + \frac{1}{10} \right).$$

As a result, $\gamma = \Omega(1)$. Since \mathcal{S} consists of $(1 - o(1))$ -fraction of all sets $S \subset [n]$ of size 2^t , the set \mathbf{S} sampled in Step 1 of **Alg-Case-1** lies in \mathcal{S} and has degree between $\alpha/10$ and 4α with probability at least $\Omega(1)$. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose **Alg-Case-1** samples a set S , and let $I_S \subseteq I \cap S$ be the set of i such that S is i -informative. If $\alpha/10 \leq |I_S| \leq 4\alpha$, **Alg-Case-1** finds an edge violation with probability $1 - o(1)$.*

The lemma is further divided into simple claims. We consider a fixed set $S \subset [n]$ of size 2^t such that $\alpha/10 \leq |I_S| \leq 4\alpha$. We let **Alg-Case-1** run up to Step 3, and let $\lambda = |\mathbf{A} \cap I_S|$.

Claim 5.7. *After the M iterations of Step 2 in **Alg-Case-1**, $\lambda \geq \sqrt{\alpha}$ with probability $1 - o(1)$.*

Proof. We divide the M samples of Step 2 into $\sqrt{\alpha}$ batches, each of

$$M/\sqrt{\alpha} = \Omega\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \log^3 n\right)$$

rounds of Step 2. For batch ℓ , we let \mathbf{X}_ℓ denote the indicator random variable for the event that at the start of the ℓ th batch, $|\mathbf{A} \cap I_S| < \sqrt{\alpha}$, and the ℓ th batch fails to discover a monotone edge

along a new direction in $I_S \setminus \mathbf{A}$. We will prove that all \mathbf{X}_ℓ are 0 with probability $1 - o(1)$. The lemma follows.

Suppose that at the start of the ℓ th batch, $|\mathbf{A} \cap I_S| < \sqrt{\alpha}$. Then consider the auxiliary bipartite graph H^* : vertices on the left-hand side consist of all points $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$; vertices on the right-hand side consist of indices of I_S ; an edge (x, i) is present if x and $S \setminus \{i\}$ forms a good pair for E_i^+ .

Note that every vertex on the right-hand side has degree at least $0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 / (\alpha \sqrt{n}) \cdot 2^n$; vertices on the left-hand side have degree at most 2 (because (x, i) is an edge only if $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S)$ returns $(x, x^{(i)})$ with probability at least $1/2$). Thus, the fraction of points on the left-hand side which are connected to at least one vertex on right-hand side that is currently not in \mathbf{A} is at least

$$\left(|I_S| - \sqrt{\alpha}\right) \cdot \frac{0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\alpha \sqrt{n}} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{|I_S|}{2} \cdot \frac{0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\alpha \sqrt{n}} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \Omega\left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Thus, by the setting of $M/\sqrt{\alpha}$, we discover a new index in I_S during the i th batch with probability at least $1 - \exp(-\log^3 n)$, and we may union bound over the $\sqrt{\alpha} \leq n^{1/4}$ batches. \square

We now turn to proving that in Step 4 of **Alg-Case-1**, we will discover an anti-monotone edge which, together with a monotone edge from Step 2, forms an edge violation. We divide the proof into two cases, corresponding to the value of β . The first two claims correspond to the case when $\beta \geq \alpha \log^2 n / \lambda$, and the second two claims correspond to the case when $\beta < \alpha \log^2 n / \lambda$.

Claim 5.8. *Suppose $\beta \geq \alpha \log^2 n / \lambda$. Let A be a fixed set after running up to Step 4 of **Alg-Case-1** satisfying $|A \cap I_S| = \lambda \geq \sqrt{\alpha}$. Then with probability at least $\Omega(1)$ over the draw of a 2^r -sized random subset \mathbf{T} of S , the number of indices $i \in A \cap I_S$ such that \mathbf{T} is i -revealing is at least $\beta / (100\sqrt{\alpha})$.*

Proof. First we let \mathcal{T} denote the following set:

$$\mathcal{T} = \{T \subseteq S : |T| = 2^r \text{ and } |T \cap A \cap I_S| \leq 4\lambda \cdot \beta / \alpha\}.$$

The expectation of $|\mathbf{T} \cap A \cap I_S|$ when \mathbf{T} is a random subset of S of size 2^r is at most $\lambda \cdot \beta / \alpha$. Since $\lambda \cdot \beta / \alpha \geq \log^2 n$ (by assumption), \mathcal{T} consists of all but an $\exp(-\Omega(\log^2 n))$ -fraction of subsets of S of size 2^r (See Lemma C.1 in Appendix C for a formal proof).

Next consider a bipartite graph H^* : vertices on the LHS correspond to $i \in A \cap I_S$; vertices on the RHS correspond to sets $T \in \mathcal{T}$; (i, T) is an edge if T is i -revealing. Note that since $i \in A \cap I_S$, S is i -informative and thus, the degree of each i in H^* is at least

$$0.1 \cdot \binom{2^t - 1}{2^r - 1} - \exp(-\Omega(\log^2 n)) \cdot \binom{2^t}{2^r} \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot \binom{2^t - 1}{2^r - 1}.$$

We show below that many $T \in \mathcal{T}$ have degree at least $\lambda\beta/(100\alpha)$. To this end let γ be the fraction of $T \in \mathcal{T}$ on the RHS which have degree at least $\lambda\beta/(100\alpha)$ (among all 2^r -subsets of S). Then

$$\gamma \cdot \binom{2^t}{2^r} \cdot \frac{4\lambda\beta}{\alpha} + (1 - \gamma) \cdot \binom{2^t}{2^r} \cdot \frac{\lambda\beta}{100\alpha} \geq \lambda \cdot \frac{1}{20} \cdot \binom{2^t - 1}{2^r - 1},$$

and because $2^t/2^r = \alpha/\beta$, canceling the factors, we obtain $\gamma = \Omega(1)$. This means that $\Omega(1)$ -fraction of 2^r -subsets of S have degree at least $\lambda\beta/(100\alpha) \geq \beta/(100\sqrt{\alpha})$, and the claim follows. \square

Claim 5.9. *Suppose $\beta \geq \alpha \log^2 n / \lambda$. Consider **Alg-Case-1** run up to Step 4, and we let $|A \cap I_S| = \lambda \geq \sqrt{\alpha}$. After M iterations of Step 4 in **Alg-Case-1**, we have $A \cap \mathbf{B} \neq \emptyset$ with probability $1 - o(1)$.*

Proof. Note that with probability $\Omega(1)$, $|\mathbf{T} \cap A \cap I_S| \geq \beta/(100\sqrt{\alpha})$. Similar to the proof of Claim 5.7 we let H^* denote an auxiliary bipartite graph: vertices on the left-hand side correspond to points $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$; vertices on the right-hand side correspond to indices $i \in \mathbf{T} \cap A \cap I_S$; (x, i) are connected if $(x, T \setminus \{i\})$ forms a good pair for E_i^- . Note that each i on the right-hand side has degree at least $0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2/(\beta\sqrt{n}) \cdot 2^n$; each point x on the left-hand side has degree at most 2. Hence the fraction of points on the left-hand side which are connected to points on the right-hand side is at least

$$\frac{\beta}{100\sqrt{\alpha}} \cdot \frac{0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\beta\sqrt{n}} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \Omega\left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\sqrt{\alpha n}}\right).$$

By our choice of M , we find a violation with probability at least $1 - o(1)$. \square

This finishes the case when $\beta \geq \alpha \log^2 n / \lambda$. Now we consider the case when $\beta < \alpha \log^2 n / \lambda$.

Claim 5.10. *Suppose $\beta < \alpha \log^2 n / \lambda$. Let A be a fixed set after running up to Step 4 of Alg-Case-1 with $|A \cap I_S| = \lambda \geq \sqrt{\alpha}$. Then with probability at least $\Omega(\beta/(\sqrt{\alpha} \log^2 n))$ over the draw of a 2^r -sized random subset \mathbf{T} of S , there is at least one index $i \in A \cap I_S$ such that \mathbf{T} is i -revealing.*

Proof. First we let \mathcal{T} denote the following set:

$$\mathcal{T} = \{T \subset S : |T| = 2^r \text{ and } |T \cap A \cap I_S| \leq 4 \log^2 n\}.$$

Since $|A \cap I_S| = \lambda$, the expectation of $|A \cap I_S \cap \mathbf{T}|$ when \mathbf{T} is a random 2^r -subset of S is at most $\lambda\beta/\alpha < \log^2 n$. As a result, \mathcal{T} consists of all but an $\exp(-\Omega(\log^2 n))$ -fraction of subsets of S of size 2^r (see Lemma C.1 in Appendix C for a formal proof).

Consider a bipartite graph H^* : vertices on the LHS correspond to indices $i \in A \cap I_S$; vertices on the RHS correspond to sets $T \in \mathcal{T}$; (i, T) is an edge if T is i -revealing. Note that since $i \in A \cap I_S$, S is i -informative and thus, the degree of each i in H^* is at least

$$0.1 \cdot \binom{2^t - 1}{2^r - 1} - \exp(-\Omega(\log^2 n)) \cdot \binom{2^t}{2^r} \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot \binom{2^t - 1}{2^r - 1}.$$

On the other hand, the degree of each vertex on the right-hand side is at most $4 \log^2 n$. Therefore, the fraction of vertices on the RHS (among all 2^r -subsets of S) which are not isolated is at least

$$|A \cap I_S| \cdot \frac{1}{20} \cdot \binom{2^t - 1}{2^r - 1} \cdot \frac{1}{4 \log^2 n} \cdot \frac{1}{\binom{2^t}{2^r}} \geq \frac{\lambda \cdot \beta}{20 \cdot \alpha \cdot 4 \log^2 n} \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \log^2 n}\right),$$

where the last inequality used $\lambda \geq \sqrt{\alpha}$. This finishes the proof of the claim. \square

Claim 5.11. *Suppose $\beta < \alpha \log^2 n / \lambda$. Consider Alg-Case-1 run up to Step 4 and we let $|A \cap I_S| = \lambda \geq \sqrt{\alpha}$. After M iterations of step 4 in Alg-Case-1, we have $A \cap \mathbf{B} \neq \emptyset$ with probability $1 - o(1)$.*

Proof. From Claim 5.10, with probability $\Omega(\beta/(\sqrt{\alpha} \log^2 n))$, there exists an index $i \in A \cap I_S$ such that $i \in \mathbf{T}$ and \mathbf{T} is i -revealing. When such a set T is sampled, since T is i -revealing, there exist at least $0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2/(\beta\sqrt{n}) \cdot 2^n$ points y for which AE-SEARCH(y, T) returns an anti-monotone edge in direction i with probability at least $1/2$. Thus, with probability at least

$$\Omega\left(\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{\alpha} \log^2 n} \cdot \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\beta\sqrt{n}}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\sqrt{\alpha n} \cdot \log^2 n}\right)$$

over the draw of \mathbf{T} , y , and the randomness of AE-SEARCH, we find a violation to unateness. This finishes the proof by our choice of the parameter M . \square

Subroutine **Alg-Case-2**, handling the case when $\log^2 n > \alpha \geq \beta$

Input: Query access to $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$

Output: Either “unate,” or two edges constituting an edge violation for f .

Repeat the following K times:

1. Sample a set \mathbf{S} of size 2^t from $[n]$ uniformly at random.
2. Repeat M times:
 - Sample an $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly at random and run $\text{AE-SEARCH}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{S})$.
3. Let \mathbf{A} be the set of $i \in [n]$ such that a monotone edge in direction i is found.
4. Repeat M times:
 - Sample a subset $\mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ of size 2^r uniformly at random, as well as a point $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly and run $\text{AE-SEARCH}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{T})$.
5. Let \mathbf{B} be the set of $i \in [n]$ such that an anti-monotone edge in direction i is found.
6. If $\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B} \neq \emptyset$, return a violation of f to unateness found.

If we have not found any violation in line 6, return “unate.”

Figure 5: Description of the **Alg-Case-2** for Case 2 of the algorithm.

5.5 Case 2: $\alpha < \log^2 n$

In this case, we expect a random set \mathbf{S} of size 2^t and a random set \mathbf{T} of size 2^r to have a relatively small intersection with (the unknown) I . We can actually achieve an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}/\varepsilon^2)$ query complexity in this case. The algorithm, **Alg-Case-2**, is presented in Figure 6 with the following parameters:

$$K = \left\lceil \frac{\log^3 n}{\alpha} \right\rceil = \Omega(\log n) \quad \text{and} \quad M = \left\lceil \frac{\alpha \sqrt{n} \cdot \log n}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2} \right\rceil = \Omega(\log n),$$

using $\alpha < \log^2 n$ and $\alpha = |I|2^t/n$, $|I| \geq H\tilde{\varepsilon}^2/2$ and $H2^t \geq \sqrt{n}$ from Lemma 5.1.

Fact 5.12 (Query Complexity). *The number of queries used by Alg-Case-2 is*

$$K \cdot (M + M) \cdot O(\log n) = O\left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \cdot \log^5 n}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}\right).$$

Correctness of Case 2: Below we prove that **Alg-Case-2** finds a violation with high probability. We divide the proof into two lemmas. The first lemma obtains a sufficient condition for finding an edge violation for f , and the second shows that the condition is satisfied with high probability.

Lemma 5.13. *Suppose Alg-Case-2 starts with a set S that is i -informative for some $i \in I$. Then during this loop, it finds an edge violation for f along the i th direction with probability $1 - o(1)$.*

Proof. Let $S' = S \setminus \{i\} \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$. Since S' is informative for the i th coordinate, we have

$$\text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^+(S') \geq 0.1 \cdot \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\alpha\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^-(T') \geq 0.1 \cdot \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\beta\sqrt{n}} \quad (8)$$

for at least 0.1-fraction of $(2^r - 1)$ -sized subsets $T' \subset S'$. We show below that $i \in \mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{B}$ at the end of the loop with probability at least $1 - o(1)$.

First, by the definition of good pairs, every time an x sampled in Step 2 lies in $\text{GOOD-SET}_i^+(S')$, we have $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S)$ outputs the monotone edge $(x, x^{(i)})$ with probability at least $1/2$. Using our choice of M we have $i \in \mathbf{A}$ at the end of Step 3 in this loop with probability at least $1 - o(1)$.

Next, the number of $(2^r - 1)$ -sized subsets T' of S' satisfying (8) is at least

$$0.1 \cdot \binom{2^t - 1}{2^r - 1}.$$

As a result, $T' \cup \{i\}$ obtained from such T' consist of at least an

$$\Omega\left(\binom{2^t - 1}{2^r - 1} / \binom{2^t}{2^r}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{2^r}{2^t}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)$$

fraction of 2^r -subsets of S . When such a $T' \cup \{i\}$ is sampled in Step 4, the fraction of points y that can help us discover an anti-monotone edge in direction i using $\text{AE-SEARCH}(y, T' \cup \{i\})$ is at least $\Omega(\tilde{\varepsilon}^2/(\beta\sqrt{n}))$. Thus we observe an anti-monotone edge in direction i with probability $\Omega(\tilde{\varepsilon}^2/\alpha\sqrt{n})$ over the draw of each pair of \mathbf{T} and \mathbf{y} in Step 4. So by our choice of M , we observe such a violation with probability at least $1 - o(1)$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 5.14. *The probability of a random 2^t -sized subset \mathbf{S} being i -informative for some $i \in I$ is at least $\Omega(\alpha/\log^2 n)$.*

Proof. We lowerbound the number of $S \subset [n]$ of size 2^t that are i -informative for some $i \in I$.

Using $\alpha < \log^2 n$, the fraction of 2^t -subsets S with $|S \cap I| \geq 4\log^2 n$ is at most $\exp(-\Omega(\log^2 n))$ (see Lemma C.1 in Appendix C for a formal proof). Next we let

$$\mathcal{S} = \{S \subset [n] : |S| = 2^t \text{ and } |S \cap I| \leq 4\log^2 n\}.$$

We consider the following auxiliary bipartite graph H^* : vertices on the LHS are $i \in I$; vertices on the RHS are $S \in \mathcal{S}$; a pair (i, S) is an edge if S contains i and is i -informative. Thus, it suffices to show that many $S \in \mathcal{S}$ on the RHS of H^* are not isolated.

By Lemma 5.3, for each $i \in I$, at least $1/8$ of $S' \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ are informative for the i th direction. If $S' \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ is one such set then $(i, S' \cup \{i\})$ is an edge when $S' \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{S}$. So the degree of i is at least

$$\frac{1}{8} \cdot |\mathcal{P}_{i,t}| - \exp(-\Omega(\log^2 n)) \cdot \binom{n}{2^t} = \Omega(|\mathcal{P}_{i,t}|) = \Omega\left(\binom{n-1}{2^t-1}\right).$$

On the other hand, each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ has degree at most $4\log^2 n$, since $|S \cap I| \leq 4\log^2 n$ for every $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, the number of vertices on the RHS that are not isolated is at least

$$|I| \cdot \Omega\left(\binom{n-1}{2^t-1}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{4\log^2 n} \geq \Omega\left(\frac{|I|}{\log^2 n} \cdot \binom{n-1}{2^t-1}\right).$$

As a result, the probability of a random 2^t -sized set \mathbf{S} being i -informative for some $i \in I$ is at least

$$\Omega \left(\frac{|I|}{\log^2 n} \cdot \frac{\binom{n-1}{2^t-1}}{\binom{n}{2^t}} \right) = \Omega \left(\frac{\alpha}{\log^2 n} \right).$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

By our choice of K , a set S that is i -informative for some $i \in I$ is sampled during the K main loops with probability $1 - o(1)$. By Lemma 5.13 a violation is found with probability $1 - o(1)$.

5.6 Proof of Lemma 5.3

Proof. Let γ denote the fraction of $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ that are not informative for the i th coordinate. Then by definition, at least one of the two conditions must hold:

1. At least $\gamma/2$ -fraction of $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ have $\text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^+(S) < 0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 / (\alpha\sqrt{n})$; or,
2. At least $\gamma/2$ fraction of $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ have at least 0.9-fraction of $(2^r - 1)$ -sized subsets $T \subseteq S$ have $\text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^-(T) < 0.1 \cdot \tilde{\varepsilon}^2 / (\beta\sqrt{n})$.

Below we show that $\gamma \leq 5/8$ in the first case and $\gamma \leq 7/8$ in the second case.

We start with the first case, where at least $\gamma/2$ fraction of $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ have

$$\text{GOOD-FRAC}_i^+(S) < 0.1 \cdot \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\alpha\sqrt{n}}.$$

Consider the following two methods of sampling a pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{S}) which is *not good* for E_i^+ :

- We first sample \mathbf{x} from STRONG_i^+ and then \mathbf{S} from $\mathcal{P}_{i,t}$, both uniformly at random.
- We first sample \mathbf{S} from $\mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ and then \mathbf{x} from STRONG_i^+ , both uniformly at random.

The probabilities of sampling a pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{S}) that is not good for E_i^+ under the two methods are the same since both are equal to the fraction of (x, S) that are not good among $\text{STRONG}_i^+ \times \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$. Using the first way of sampling, we have that the probability that (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{S}) is not good is at most $1/4$, since each $x \in \text{STRONG}_i^+$ has at least $(3/4)$ -fraction of $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ such that (x, S) is a good pair. Using the second method, on the other hand, we note that

$$\Pr[(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{S}) \text{ is not good}] \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \left(0.1 \cdot \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\alpha\sqrt{n}} \right) \cdot 2^n \cdot \frac{1}{|\text{STRONG}_i^+|} \right) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \cdot 0.8,$$

where we used $H \leq 2|I|/\tilde{\varepsilon}^2$ and thus,

$$\frac{|\text{STRONG}_i^+|}{2^n} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{H2^t} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{2|I|2^t} = \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{2\alpha\sqrt{n}}.$$

Combining both inequalities, we obtain that $\gamma \leq 5/8$.

Next we consider the second case using a similar argument. We sample a pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{T}) which is not good for E_i^- using the following two methods:

- We first sample \mathbf{x} from STRONG_i^- , \mathbf{S} from $\mathcal{P}_{i,t}$, and then sample $\mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ of size $2^r - 1$, which is essentially sampling \mathbf{T} uniformly from $\mathcal{P}_{i,r}$.

- We first sample $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ uniformly at random, and then sample a subset $\mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ of size $2^r - 1$ uniformly at random, and finally we sample \mathbf{x} from STRONG_i^- .

Similarly to the first case, the probability of sampling a pair (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{T}) that is not good is at most $1/4$ using the first method. Using the second method, we obtain a lower bound on the probability:

$$\Pr[(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{T}) \text{ is not good}] \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \cdot 0.9 \cdot \left(1 - \left(0.1 \cdot \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{\beta\sqrt{n}}\right) \cdot 2^n \cdot \frac{1}{|\text{STRONG}_i^-|}\right) \geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.8.$$

Combining the above two inequalities, we obtain that $\gamma \leq 7/8$. \square

6 Proof of Lemma 4.3

We first show that Lemma 4.3 follows from the following lemma that we prove in this section.

Lemma 6.1. *If $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is ε -far from unate and $I_f \leq 6\sqrt{n}$, then we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{SCORE}_i^- \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log^8 n}\right). \quad (9)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.3 assuming Lemma 6.1. Suppose that the LHS of (3) is achieved by

$$\sum_{i \in W} \text{SCORE}_i^+ + \sum_{i \notin W} \text{SCORE}_i^-$$

for some $W \subseteq [n]$. Then we let $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be the string with $r_i = 1$ if $i \in W$ and $r_i = 0$ if $i \notin W$, and let g be the Boolean function with $g(x) = f(x \oplus r)$. On the one hand, g has the same distance to unateness as f and satisfies $I_g = I_f$, so Lemma 6.1 applies to g . On the other hand, it follows from the description of AE-SEARCH and the definition of SCORE_i^- of g is exactly the same as SCORE_i^+ of f if $i \in W$ or SCORE_i^- of f if $i \notin W$. To see this is the case, note that the output distribution of AE-SEARCH(x, S) on g is exactly the same as that of AE-SEARCH($x \oplus r, S$) on f . As a result, whether (x, S) is a good pair or not in g is the same as that of $(x \oplus r, S)$ in f (except that the roles of E_i^+ and E_i^- may get switched depending on whether $i \in W$ or not). (3) for f then follows from (9) for g . \square

We prove Lemma 6.1 in the rest of the section. Let f be a function that is ε -far from unate and has $I_f = O(\sqrt{n})$. Let G_f be the bipartite graph of *anti-monotone edges* of f defined as follows:

1. Vertices on the LHS of G_f correspond to points $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $f(x) = 1$ and vertices on the RHS of G_f correspond to points $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $f(y) = 0$;
2. (x, y) is an edge in G_f if (x, y) is an anti-monotone edge.

We recall a key technical lemma from [KMS15] which states that when f is ε -far from monotone (which is the case here since f is ε -far from unate), G_f must contain a large and “good” subgraph.

Definition 6.2. *Let $G = (U, V, E)$ be a bipartite subgraph of G_f , where U is a set of points x with $f(x) = 1$, V is a set of points y with $f(y) = 0$, and E consists of anti-monotone edges of f . We say G is *right- d -good*, for some positive integer d , if the degree of every $y \in V$ is in the range $[d, 2d]$ and the degree of every $x \in U$ is at most $2d$, and G is *left- d -good* if the degree of every $x \in U$ is in the range $[d, 2d]$ and the degree of every $y \in V$ is at most $2d$.*

Theorem 2 (Lemma 7.1 in [KMS15]). *If f is ε -far from monotone, then G_f contains a bipartite subgraph $G = (U, V, E)$ that satisfies one of the following conditions:*

1. G is left- d -good for some positive integer d and $\sigma = |U|/2^n$ satisfies

$$\sigma^2 d = \Theta\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log^4 n}\right). \quad (10)$$

2. G is right- d -good for some positive integer d and $\sigma = |V|/2^n$ satisfies (10).

Since f is ε -far from unate and in particular, ε -far from monotone, Theorem 2 applies to f and we use $G = (U, V, E)$ to denote such a subgraph of G_f . In the rest of the proof we assume without loss of generality that G is left- d -good and $\sigma = |U|/2^n$ satisfies (10); the proof for the other case when G is right- d -good is symmetric. Given G and σ , we choose the t to be the largest integer with

$$2^{t-1} \leq \left\lceil \frac{\sigma\sqrt{n}}{\log^4 n} \right\rceil. \quad (11)$$

So we have $t \geq 1$. Using $\sigma \leq 1$, we also have $t < \Lambda$ and thus, $t \in [\Lambda]$.

Our goal is to show the following lemma from which Lemma 6.1 follows directly:

Lemma 6.3. *Let $G = (U, V, E)$ be a subgraph of G_f that is left- d -good and satisfies (10). Then*

$$\frac{2^t}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \text{SCORE}_{i,t}^- = \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log^8 n}\right). \quad (12)$$

To gain some intuition, assume that every $(x, y) \in E$ in direction i has x being t -strong for E_i^- (we always use x to denote points in U and y or $x^{(i)}$ to denote points in V in the rest of the proof). Then, each edge in E contributes $1/2^n$ to the sum on the LHS of (12) and thus, it is at least

$$\frac{2^t}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \frac{|E|}{2^n} \geq \frac{2^t}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \frac{d|U|}{2^n} = \frac{2^t}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \sigma d = \Omega\left(\frac{\sigma\sqrt{n}}{\log^4 n \cdot \sqrt{n}}\right) \cdot \sigma d = \Omega\left(\frac{\sigma^2 d}{\log^4 n}\right) = \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log^8 n}\right), \quad (13)$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that G is left- d -good and the last equation uses (10). Note that for the specific case when $t = 1$, every edge $(x, y) \in E$ in direction i is t -strong for E_i^- ; thus, this intuition holds formally, and we may assume for the rest of the proof that $t > 1$.

The plan for the rest of the proof is as follows. First we give a sufficient condition for a point $x \in U$ to be t -strong for E_i^- . Next, we prove a persistency lemma similar to that from [KMS15] to show that for most edges $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E$, x is t -strong for E_i^- . Finally, by a similar argument to (13), we obtain the same conclusion only losing only a constant factor in the inequality.

More specifically, in Section 6.1 we define the notion of *robust* sets, and show that if an edge $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E$ has many robust sets, its left endpoint x is t -strong for E_i^- . Then in Section 6.2, we introduce the notion of *solid* edges, and show that 1) most edges of E are solid and 2) every solid edge have many robust sets, which then finishes the proof.

6.1 Edges with many robust sets have strong left endpoints

We now introduce the notion of robust sets $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ for anti-monotone edges $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E$ (with $x \in U$ being the left endpoint and i being the direction). Intuitively, we would like to show that if $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ is a robust set for $(x, x^{(i)})$, then $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S \cup \{i\})$ returns i with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ and thus, (x, S) is a good pair for E_i^- . This is shown in Lemma 6.5. As a result, to show that x is t -strong for E_i^- , it suffices to show that most sets $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ are robust for $(x, x^{(i)})$.

Definition 6.4 (Robust Sets). *Let $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E$. We say $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ is a robust set for $(x, x^{(i)})$ if:*

1. *At least $(1 - (1/\log^2 n))$ -fraction of subsets $S' \subset S$ of size $2^{t-1} - 1$ has $f(x^{(S' \cup \{i\})}) \neq f(x)$.*
2. *At least $(1 - (1/\log^2 n))$ -fraction of subsets $S' \subset S$ of size 2^{t-1} has $f(x^{(S')}) = f(x)$.*

Note that for the special case when $t = 1$ (letting $S = \{j\}$ for some $j \neq i$), conditions 2 and 3 above require $f(x^{(i)}) \neq f(x)$ and $f(x^{(j)}) = f(x)$, respectively.

We show that if $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ is robust for an edge $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E$, then (x, S) is a good pair for E_i^- .

Lemma 6.5. *If $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ is a robust set for $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E$, then $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S \cup \{i\})$ returns i with high probability (and thus, (x, S) is a good pair for E_i^-).*

Proof. Let $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ be a robust set for $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E$. The proof consists of two claims. The first claim shows that in $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S \cup \{i\})$, we have $i \in C$ at the end of Step 3 with high probability. The second claim shows that C does not contain any $\ell \in S$ with high probability.

Claim 6.6. *With probability at least $1 - o(1)$, we have $i \in C$ in Step 3 of $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S \cup \{i\})$.*

Proof. We use $\mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_L$ to denote the L random subsets sampled in Step 3 of AE-SEARCH . For $i \notin C$ to happen, either every \mathbf{T}_ℓ satisfies $f(x^{(\mathbf{T}_\ell)}) = f(x)$, or one of the \mathbf{T}_ℓ satisfies $f(x^{(\mathbf{T}_\ell)}) \neq f(x)$ and $i \notin \mathbf{T}_\ell$. Below we upperbound the probability of each of these two events by $o(1)$. The claim then follows by a union bound on the two events.

First, by condition 1 of Definition 6.4, the probability of $f(x^{(\mathbf{T}_\ell)}) \neq f(x)$ for each ℓ is at least (by only considering the case when $i \in \mathbf{T}_\ell$)

$$(1/2) \cdot (1 - (1/\log^2 n))$$

and thus, the probability of the first event is $o(1)$ using our choice of $L = \lceil 4 \log n \rceil$.

Next by condition 2 of Definition 6.4, the probability of $i \notin \mathbf{T}_\ell$ and $f(x^{(\mathbf{T}_\ell)}) \neq f(x)$ is at most

$$(1/2) \cdot (1/\log^2 n) = 1/(2 \log^2 n).$$

By a union bound on $\ell \in [L]$ and our choice of L , the probability of the second event is also $o(1)$. \square

Claim 6.7. *With probability at least $1 - o(1)$, we have $C \cap S = \emptyset$ in Step 3 of $\text{AE-SEARCH}(x, S \cup \{i\})$.*

Proof. Consider an index $k \in S$ and note that $k \neq i$. Then, in order to have $k \in C$, none of the \mathbf{T}_ℓ can satisfy both $f(x^{(\mathbf{T}_\ell)}) \neq f(x)$ and $k \notin \mathbf{T}_\ell$. However, there are $\binom{2^t - 2}{2^{t-1} - 1}$ subsets of $S \cup \{i\}$ of size 2^{t-1} which include i and exclude k . Among them the number of T with $f(x^{(T)}) = f(x)$ is at most

$$\frac{1}{\log^2 n} \cdot \binom{2^t - 1}{2^{t-1} - 1}$$

by condition 2. So the fraction of T that includes i , excludes k , and has $f(x^{(T)}) \neq f(x)$ is at least

$$\frac{\binom{2^t-2}{2^{t-1}-1} - \frac{1}{\log^2 n} \cdot \binom{2^t-1}{2^{t-1}-1}}{\binom{2^t}{2^{t-1}}} \geq \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2 \log^2 n} = \frac{1}{4} - o(1).$$

Thus, the probability of $k \in \mathbf{C}$ is at most $(3/4 + o(1))^L$. This is $o(1/n)$ by our choice of $L = \lceil 4 \log n \rceil$. The lemma then follows by a union bound over all $k \in S$. \square

It follows that $\mathbf{C} = \{i\}$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 6.5. \square

6.2 Solid edges have many robust sets

We now introduce the notion of (τ, γ) -persistent. These are points x at which the value of f remains the same as $f(x)$ with high probability (at least $1 - \gamma$) after flipping τ random bits of x .

Definition 6.8 (Persistent Points). *Let $\tau : 0 \leq \tau \leq n$ be a nonnegative integer and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. We say a point $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is (τ, γ) -persistent in f if, by flipping a set $\mathbf{S} \subseteq [n]$ of size τ drawn uniformly at random, we have $\Pr_{\mathbf{S}}[f(x) \neq f(x^{(\mathbf{S})})] \leq \gamma$. For the special case of $\tau = 0$, every $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is $(0, \gamma)$ -persistent for all $\gamma \in [0, 1]$.*

Remark 3. *For readers familiar with [KMS15], our definition of persistency is slightly different from that of [KMS15]: 1) we need the second parameter γ while [KMS15] always sets $\gamma = 1/10$; 2) More importantly, [KMS15] only allows one to randomly flip 0-entries of x to 1 (since they are interested in monotonicity testing) while we flip all sets of τ coordinates of x uniformly at random.*

We need the following persistency lemma. Its proof is similar to Lemma 9.3 of [KMS15]. Due to differences discussed above, we give a self-contained proof adapted from [KMS15] in Appendix A.

Lemma 6.9 (Persistency lemma). *For $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $\tau \in [0, n]$, the fraction of (τ, γ) -non-persistent points is at most $O(I_f \cdot \tau / (n\gamma))$.*

Let $\gamma = 1/\log^3 n$. As $I_f = O(\sqrt{n})$, the fraction of (τ, γ) -non-persistent points is at most

$$O\left(\frac{\tau \cdot \log^3 n}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Next we introduce the notion of *solid* edges in G and prove using the persistency lemma that most edges in G are solid.

Definition 6.10 (Solid Edges). *An edge (x, y) in G (with $x \in U$ and $y \in V$ as usual) is solid if x is $(2^{t-1}, \gamma)$ -persistent and y is $(2^{t-1} - 1, \gamma)$ -persistent.*

Lemma 6.11. *At least $(1 - o(1))$ -fraction of edges of G are solid.*

Proof. First recall that the number of edges in G is $\Theta(\sigma 2^n \cdot d)$. Using the persistency lemma, the fraction of points (with respect to the full set of size 2^n) that are $(2^{t-1}, \gamma)$ -non-persistent is at most

$$O\left(\frac{2^{t-1} \cdot \log^3 n}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{14}$$

By our choice of t in (11), and the fact that $t > 1$, $\sigma\sqrt{n}/\log^4 n \geq 1$, in which case we have $2^{t-1} = O(\sigma\sqrt{n}/\log^4 n)$ and (14) becomes $O(\sigma/\log n) = o(\sigma)$,

As a result, the number of edges (x, y) in G with x being $(2^{t-1}, \gamma)$ -non-persistent is $o(\sigma 2^n \cdot d)$. By a similar argument one can show that the number of edges (x, y) in G with y being either $(2^{t-1} - 1, \gamma)$ -non-persistent is $o(\sigma 2^n \cdot d)$, at most a $o(1)$ -fraction of edges in G . \square

Finally we show that every solid edge in G has many robust sets in $\mathcal{P}_{i,t}$.

Lemma 6.12. *Suppose that $(x, x^{(i)}) \in E$ is a solid edge in G . Then the fraction of sets $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ that are not robust with respect to edge $(x, x^{(i)})$ is at most $4/\log n$.*

Proof. By definition, a set $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ is not robust for $(x, x^{(i)})$ if one of the following events occur:

1. At least $(1/\log^2 n)$ -fraction of subsets $T \subset S$ of size $2^{t-1} - 1$ have $f(x^{(T \cup \{i\})}) = f(x) \neq f(x^{(i)})$.
2. At least $(1/\log^2 n)$ -fraction of subsets $T \subset S$ of size 2^{t-1} satisfy $f(x^{(T)}) \neq f(x)$.

We bound the fraction of such S in $\mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ for each event separately.

For the second event, we consider the following bipartite graph H' . Vertices U' on the LHS of H' correspond to subsets T of $[n] \setminus \{i\}$ of size 2^{t-1} ; vertices on the RHS correspond to $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$; (T, S) is an edge iff $T \subset S$. Clearly H' is bi-regular. Let d_{left} and d_{right} denote the degrees. Let α be the fraction of S among $\mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ (the RHS) for which the second event occurs. Then the number of T with $f(x^{(T)}) \neq f(x)$ is at least

$$\alpha \cdot |\mathcal{P}_{i,t}| \cdot d_{\text{right}} \cdot \frac{1}{\log^2 n} \cdot \frac{1}{d_{\text{left}}} = \alpha \cdot |U'| \cdot \frac{1}{\log^2 n} = \alpha \cdot \frac{1}{\log^2 n} \cdot \binom{n-1}{2^{t-1}}.$$

However, as x is $(2^{t-1}, \gamma)$ -persistent, the number of such T is at most $\gamma \cdot \binom{n}{2^{t-1}}$. As a result we have

$$\alpha \leq \log^2 n \cdot \gamma \cdot \frac{\binom{n}{2^{t-1}}}{\binom{n-1}{2^{t-1}}} \leq \frac{2}{\log n}.$$

For the first event, we consider a similar regular bipartite graph H^* . Vertices U^* on the LHS correspond to subsets T of $[n] \setminus \{i\}$ of size $2^{t-1} - 1$; vertices on the RHS correspond to $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$; (T, S) is an edge iff $T \subset S$. Similarly, we let β be the fraction of S among $\mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ (the RHS) for which the first event occurs. Then the number of T with $f(x^{(T \cup \{i\})}) = f(x) \neq f(x^{(i)})$ is at least

$$\beta \cdot |\mathcal{P}_{i,t}| \cdot d_{\text{right}} \cdot \frac{1}{\log^2 n} \cdot \frac{1}{d_{\text{left}}} = \beta \cdot |U^*| \cdot \frac{1}{\log^2 n} = \beta \cdot \frac{1}{\log^2 n} \cdot \binom{n-1}{2^{t-1} - 1}.$$

However, since $x^{(i)}$ is $(2^{t-1} - 1, \gamma)$ -persistent, the number of such T is at most $\gamma \cdot \binom{n}{2^{t-1} - 1}$. Thus,

$$\beta \leq \log^2 n \cdot \gamma \cdot \frac{\binom{n}{2^{t-1} - 1}}{\binom{n-1}{2^{t-1} - 1}} \leq \frac{2}{\log n}.$$

So the total fraction of sets $S \in \mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ that satisfy one of the events is at most $4/\log n$. \square

6.3 Finishing the proof of Lemma 6.3

From Lemma 6.11, we know the number of solid edges in G is at least $\Omega(|E|)$. Combining Lemma 6.12 with Lemma 6.5, we know for each solid edge $(x, x^{(i)})$ in G , at least $(1 - 4/\log n)$ -fraction of sets in $\mathcal{P}_{i,t}$ are robust, and its left end point x is t -strong for E_i^- and contributes $1/2^n$ to $\text{SCORE}_{i,t}^-$ in the LHS of (12). Lemma 6.3 then follows from the same analysis done in (13), after replacing $|E|$ by $\Omega(|E|)$ at the beginning.

Acknowledgments

We thank Rocco Servedio and Li-Yang Tan for countless discussions and suggestions. This work is supported in part by NSF CCF-1149257, NSF CCF-142310, and a NSF Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE-16-44869.

References

- [BB16] Aleksandrs Belovs and Eric Blais. A polynomial lower bound for testing monotonicity. In *Proceedings of the 48th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC '2016)*, pages 1021–1032, 2016.
- [BCP⁺17a] Roksana Baleshzar, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, Ramesh Krishnan S. Pallavoor, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and C. Seshadhri. A lower bound for nonadaptive, one-sided error testing of unateness of boolean functions over the hypercube. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.00053*, 2017.
- [BCP⁺17b] Roksana Baleshzar, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, Ramesh Krishnan S. Pallavoor, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and C. Seshadhri. Optimal unateness testers for real-values functions: Adaptivity helps. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP '2017)*, 2017.
- [Bla09] Eric Blais. Testing juntas nearly optimally. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC '2009)*, pages 151–158, 2009.
- [BMPR16] Roksana Baleshzar, Meiram Murzabulatov, Ramesh Krishnan S. Pallavoor, and Sofya Raskhodnikova. Testing unateness of real-valued functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.07652*, 2016.
- [CC16] Deeparnab Chakrabarty and Seshadhri Comandur. An $o(n)$ monotonicity tester for boolean functions over the hypercube. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 45(2):461–472, 2016.
- [CDST15] Xi Chen, Anindya De, Rocco A. Servedio, and Li-Yang Tan. Boolean function monotonicity testing requires (almost) $n^{1/2}$ non-adaptive queries. In *Proceedings of the 47th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC '2015)*, pages 519–528, 2015.
- [CG17] Clément L. Canonne and Tom Gur. An adaptivity hierarchy theorem for property testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.05678*, 2017.

- [CS14] Deeparnab Chakrabarty and C. Seshadhri. An optimal lower bound for monotonicity testing over hypergrids. *Theory of Computing*, 10(17):453–464, 2014.
- [CS16] Deeparnab Chakrabarty and C. Seshadhri. A $\tilde{O}(n)$ non-adaptive tester for unateness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.06980*, 2016.
- [CST14] Xi Chen, Rocco A. Servedio, and Li-Yan Tan. New algorithms and lower bounds for monotonicity testing. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '2014)*, pages 285–295, 2014.
- [CWX17] Xi Chen, Erik Waingarten, and Jinyu Xie. Beyond talagrand functions: new lower bounds for testing monotonicity and unateness. In *Proceedings of the 49th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC '2017)*, 2017.
- [GGL⁺00] Oded Goldreich, Shafi Goldwasser, Eric Lehman, Dana Ron, and Alex Samordinsky. Testing monotonicity. *Combinatorica*, 20(3):301–337, 2000.
- [KMS15] Subhash Khot, Dor Minzer, and Muli Safra. On monotonicity testing and boolean isoperimetric type theorems. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '2015)*, pages 52–58. IEEE Computer Society, 2015.
- [KS16] Subhash Khot and Igor Shinkar. An $\tilde{O}(n)$ queries adaptive tester for unateness. In *Approximation, Randomization and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 37:1–37:7, 2016.
- [Tal93] Michel Talagrand. Isoperimetry, logarithmic sobolev inequalities on the discrete cube, and margulis’ graph connectivity theorem. *Geometric & Functional Analysis*, 3(3):295–314, 1993.

A Proof of the persistency lemma

We give a proof of Lemma 6.9, which is a slight modification of Lemma 9.3 of [KMS15].

Lemma A.1 (Persistency lemma). *For $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and $\tau \in [0, n]$, the fraction of (τ, γ) -non-persistent points is at most $O(I_f \cdot \tau / (n\gamma))$.*

Proof. Let η be the fraction of (τ, γ) -non-persistent points. Consider the following random process:

1. we draw $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ uniformly at random.
2. we flip τ bits from \mathbf{x} uniformly at random to get $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

Let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{D}$ be the distribution supported on pairs $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ given by the above procedure. Let \mathcal{D}_x be the distribution supported on $\{0, 1\}^n$ given by sampling \mathbf{y} where $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{D}$ conditioned on $\mathbf{x} = x$. For each $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, let

$$r_x = \begin{cases} \Pr_{\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{D}_x}[f(x) \neq f(\mathbf{y})] & \text{if } x \text{ is } (\tau, \gamma)\text{-non-persistent} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By definition, for (τ, γ) -non-persistent points x we have $r_x \geq \gamma$, which implies:

$$\Pr_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{D}} [f(\mathbf{x}) \neq f(\mathbf{y})] = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \Pr_{\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{D}_x} [f(x) \neq f(\mathbf{y})] \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} r_x \geq \gamma \cdot \eta$$

On the other hand, consider the following random process:

1. We draw $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \{0,1\}^n$ uniformly at random.
2. For each $k \in [\tau]$, pick a random coordinate $i \in [n]$ that has not been chosen and let $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_{k-1}^{(i)}$.

Note that $(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_\tau)$ is distributed as \mathcal{D} . Additionally, we have

$$\Pr_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \sim \mathcal{D}} [f(\mathbf{x}) \neq f(\mathbf{y})] \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \Pr_{\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_k} [f(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \neq f(\mathbf{x}_k)] \leq \tau \cdot \frac{I_f}{n},$$

where in the last step, we used the fact that each $(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{x}_k)$ is distributed as a uniform edge of the hypercube. Combining the two inequalities above, we obtain $\eta = O((I_f \cdot \tau)/(n \cdot \gamma))$. \square

B Unateness testing algorithm for high-influence functions

We note that implicitly, Lemma 9.1 of [KMS15] proves the following lemma:

Lemma B.1. *If $f: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ has $I_f > 6\sqrt{n}$, then*

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \min \{|E_i^+|, |E_i^-|\} \geq 2\sqrt{n}. \quad (15)$$

In particular, it implies that if $I_f \geq 6\sqrt{n}$ then f cannot be unate. Next we slightly modify the algorithm of [CS16] to obtain the following lemma:

Lemma B.2. *There is an $O(\sqrt{n} \cdot \log^2(n))$ -query, non-adaptive algorithm that, given any function f that satisfies (15), finds an edge violation of f to unateness with probability at least $2/3$.*

Lemma 2.1 follows by combining Lemma B.1 and Lemma B.2. For completeness, we include the algorithm of [CS16] (with modified parameters) in order to prove Lemma B.2.

Proof of Lemma B.2. Let $\mu_i = \frac{\min\{|E_i^+|, |E_i^-|\}}{2^n}$. For any $r = [L]$, let $i \in S_r$ be the set of directions where

$$\frac{1}{2^r} \leq \mu_i \leq \frac{1}{2^{r-1}}.$$

If $\mu_i \leq \frac{1}{8n}$, then all such directions i contribute at most $\frac{1}{8}$ to the RHS of (15). Thus, there exists one direction r^* such that

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{i \in S_{r^*}} \min\{|E_i^+|, |E_i^-|\} \geq \frac{2\sqrt{n} - 1/8}{\log(8n)} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log(8n)},$$

and $|S_{r^*}| \geq \frac{2^{r^*} \sqrt{n}}{2 \log(8n)}$. Thus, at the iteration corresponding to r^* of **Unate-E-Tester**, the probability $i \in S_{r^*}$ is at least $\frac{2^{r^*}}{2\sqrt{n} \log(8n)}$. Conditioned on having sampled some $i \in S_{r^*}$, the probability that

Unate-E-Tester, the unateness tester from [CS16] which rejects functions satisfying (15).

Input: Query access to $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ satisfying (15).

Output: Either “unate,” or two edges constituting an edge violation for f .

Repeat the following for $r = 1, 2, \dots, L = \lceil \log(8n) \rceil$:

1. Repeat the following $s_r = \left\lceil \frac{20\sqrt{n} \cdot \log(8n)}{2^r} \right\rceil$ times:
2. Sample a direction $i \sim [n]$ uniformly at random and sample $4 \cdot 2^r$ random edges in direction i and query all end points. Return an edge violation if one is found.

If we have not found any violation in line 2, return “unate.”

Figure 6: Description of the Alg-Case-2 for Case 2 of the algorithm.

we do not observe an edge in E_i^+ in the first $2 \cdot 2^{r^*}$ edges is at most $(1 - \mu_i)^{2 \cdot 2^{r^*}} \leq e^{-2}$. Likewise, the probability we do not observe an edge in E_i^- in the second $2 \cdot 2^{r^*}$ edges is at most e^{-2} , thus, with probability $1 - 2e^{-2} \geq \frac{7}{10}$, we observe an edge violation.

Putting things together, the probability that we observe an edge violation in one iteration of line 2 with $r = r^*$ is at least $\frac{7 \cdot 2^{r^*}}{20 \cdot \sqrt{n} \log(8n)}$. Since we repeat line 2 for $s_r = \left\lceil \frac{20\sqrt{n} \log(8n)}{2^{r^*}} \right\rceil$ times, we find an edge violation with high constant probability. \square

C Overlap of two random sets of certain size

Let $k, \ell \in [n]$ be two positive integers with $\alpha = k\ell/n$. We are interested in the size of $|\mathbf{S} \cap \mathbf{T}|$ where \mathbf{S} is a random k -sized subset of $[n]$ and \mathbf{T} is a random ℓ -sized subset of $[n]$, both drawn uniformly.

Lemma C.1. *For any $t \geq 4\alpha$, the probability of $|\mathbf{S} \cap \mathbf{T}| \geq t$ is at most $\exp(-\Omega(t))$.*

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that $k \geq \ell$. If $\ell > n/2$, the claim is trivial as $\alpha > n/4$ and $t \geq 4\alpha > n$. We assume $\ell \leq n/2$ below.

We consider the following process. We draw \mathbf{S} first. Then we add random (and distinct) indices of $[n]$ to \mathbf{T} round by round for ℓ rounds. In each round we pick an index uniformly at random from those that have not been added to \mathbf{T} yet. Clearly this process generates the same distribution of \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{T} that we are interested in.

For each $i \in [\ell]$, we let \mathbf{X}_i be the random variable that is set to 1 if the index in the i th round belongs to \mathbf{S} and is 0 otherwise. Although \mathbf{X}_i 's are not independent, the probability of $\mathbf{X}_i = 1$ is at most $k/(n - \ell) \leq 2k/n$ using $\ell \leq n/2$, for any fixed values of $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{i-1}$. Thus, the expectation of $\sum_{i \in [\ell]} \mathbf{X}_i$ is at most $2k\ell/n = 2\alpha$. The lemma follows directly from the Chernoff bound (together with a standard coupling argument). \square