

SUBSPACE-INVARIANT AC^0 FORMULAS

BENJAMIN ROSSMAN

University of Toronto
e-mail address: ben.rossman@utoronto.ca

ABSTRACT. We consider the action of a linear subspace U of $\{0,1\}^n$ on the set of AC^0 formulas with inputs labeled by literals in the set $\{X_1, \bar{X}_1, \dots, X_n, \bar{X}_n\}$, where an element $u \in U$ acts on formulas by transposing the i th pair of literals for all $i \in [n]$ such that $u_i = 1$. A formula is U -invariant if it is fixed by this action. For example, there is a well-known recursive construction of depth $d+1$ formulas of size $O(n \cdot 2^{dn^{1/d}})$ computing the n -variable PARITY function; these formulas are easily seen to be P -invariant where P is the subspace of even-weight elements of $\{0,1\}^n$. In this paper we establish a nearly matching $2^{d(n^{1/d}-1)}$ lower bound on the P -invariant depth $d+1$ formula size of PARITY. Quantitatively this improves the best known $\Omega(2^{\frac{1}{84}d(n^{1/d}-1)})$ lower bound for *unrestricted* depth $d+1$ formulas [Ros15], while avoiding the use of the switching lemma. More generally, for any linear subspaces $U \subset V$, we show that if a Boolean function is U -invariant and non-constant over V , then its U -invariant depth $d+1$ formula size is at least $2^{d(m^{1/d}-1)}$ where m is the minimum Hamming weight of a vector in $U^\perp \setminus V^\perp$.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are two natural group actions on the set of literals $\{X_1, \bar{X}_1, \dots, X_n, \bar{X}_n\}$: the symmetric group S_n acts by permuting indices, while Z_2^n acts by toggling negations. These group actions extend to the set of n -variable Boolean functions, as well as the set of n -variable Boolean circuits. Here we consider bounded-depth circuits with unbounded fan-in AND and OR gates and inputs labeled by literals, also known as AC^0 circuits. If G is subgroup of S_n or Z_2^n (or more generally of the group $Z_2^n \rtimes S_n$ that they generate), we say that a function or circuit is G -invariant if it is fixed under the action of G on the set of n -variable functions or circuits. Note that every G -invariant circuit computes a G -invariant function, and conversely every G -invariant function is computable by a G -invariant circuit.

We define the G -invariant circuit size of a G -invariant function f as the minimum number of gates in a G -invariant circuit that computes f . This may be compared to the *unrestricted circuit size* of f , noting that f can be computed (possibly more efficiently) by circuits that are not G -invariant. Several questions arise. What gap, if any, exists between the G -invariant vs. unrestricted circuit size of G -invariant functions? Are lower bounds on

Key words and phrases: circuit complexity, formula size, AC^0 , parity, symmetric computation.

A preliminary version of this paper appeared in ICALP 2017.

Supported by NSERC and Sloan Research Fellowship.

G -invariant circuit size easier to obtain, and do they suggest new strategies for proving lower bounds for unrestricted circuits? Is there a nice characterization of functions computable by polynomial-size G -invariant circuits? The same questions may be asked with respect to G -invariant versions of other complexity measures, such as formula (leaf)size, as well as bounded-depth versions of both circuit and formula size, noting that the action of G on circuits preserves both depth and fan-out.

The answer to these questions appears to be very different for subgroups of S_n and subgroups of Z_2^n . This is illustrated by considering the n -variable parity function, which maps each element of $\{0,1\}^n$ to its Hamming weight modulo 2. This function is both S_n -invariant (it is a so-called “symmetric function”) and P -invariant where $P \subset Z_2^n$ is the index-2 subgroup of even-weight elements in Z_2^n . The smallest known circuits and formulas for PARITY_n have size $O(n)$ and leafsize $O(n^2)$, respectively. These circuits and formulas turn out to be P -invariant, as do the smallest known bounded-depth circuits and formulas (which we describe in §2.3). In contrast, the S_n -invariant circuit size of PARITY_n is known to be exponential [AD16].

1.1. Invariance under subgroups of S_n . G -invariant circuit complexity for subgroups G of the symmetric group S_n has been previously studied from the standpoint of Descriptive Complexity, an area of research concerned with the characterization of complexity classes in terms of definability in different logics [Imm12]. Here one considers Boolean functions that encode isomorphism-invariant properties of relational structures. Properties of m -vertex simple graphs, for instance, are identified with G -invariant functions $\{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ of $n = \binom{m}{2}$ variables, each corresponding to a potential edge, where G is the group S_m acting on the set of potential edges. More generally, if σ is a finite relational signature σ , one considers the action of S_m on $n = \sum_{R \in \sigma} m^{\text{arity}(R)}$ variables encoding the possible σ -structures with universe $[m]$.

Denenberg et al [DGS86] showed that S_m -invariant circuits of polynomial size and constant depth (subject to a certain uniformity condition) capture precisely the first-order definable properties of finite σ -structures. Otto [Ott96] introduced a certain limit object of finite circuits (imposing uniformity in a different way) and showed a correspondence between the logic $L_{\infty\omega}^\omega$ (infinitary logic with a bounded number of variables) and S_m -invariant circuits of polynomial size and arbitrary depth. Otto also gave characterizations of fixed-point logic and partial-fixed-point logic in terms of S_m -invariant Boolean networks. Recently, Anderson and Dawar [AD16] showed a correspondence between fixed-point logic and polynomial-size S_m -invariant circuits, as well as between fixed-point logic with counting and polynomial-size S_m -invariant circuits in the basis that includes majority gates.

Choiceless Polynomial Time [BGS99, BGS02, Daw15, Ros10] provides a different example of a G -invariant model of computation, where $G \subseteq S_n$ is the automorphism group of the input structure. Invariance under subgroups of S_n has been explored in other settings as well, see for instance [Ajt94, RS00, RB88].

1.2. Invariance under subgroups of Z_2^n . This paper initiates a study of invariant complexity with respect to subgroups of Z_2^n . Since our methods are linear algebraic, we shall henceforth identify Z_2^n with the \mathbb{F}_2 -vector space $\{0,1\}^n$ under coordinate-wise addition modulo 2, denoted \oplus . We identify subgroups of Z_2^n with linear subspaces U of $\{0,1\}^n$. A function $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ is U -invariant if $f(x) = f(x \oplus u)$ for all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $u \in U$.

Note that U -invariant functions are in one-to-one correspondence with functions from the quotient space $\{0, 1\}^n / U$ to $\{0, 1\}$.

Our focus is on bounded-depth circuits and formulas. Returning to the example of the P -invariant function PARITY_n (where P is the even-weight subgroup of $\{0, 1\}^n$), there is a well-known recursive construction of depth $d + 1$ circuits for PARITY_n , which we describe in §2.3. Roughly speaking, one combines a depth 2 circuit for $\text{PARITY}_{n^{1/d}}$ with depth d circuits for $\text{PARITY}_{n^{(d-1)/d}}$ on disjoint blocks of variables. This produces a depth $d + 1$ circuit of size $O(n^{1/d} \cdot 2^{n^{1/d}})$, which converts to a depth $d + 1$ formula of leafsize $O(n \cdot 2^{dn^{1/d}})$. Up to constant factors, these circuit and formulas are the smallest known computing PARITY_n and they are easily seen to be P -invariant, as we explain in §2.3.

The main result of this paper gives a nearly matching lower bound of $2^{d(n^{1/d}-1)}$ on the P -invariant depth $d + 1$ formula size of PARITY_n . This implies a $2^{n^{1/d}-1}$ lower bound on the P -invariant depth $d + 1$ circuit size, via the basic fact that every (U -invariant) depth $d + 1$ circuit of size s is equivalent to a (U -invariant) depth $d + 1$ formula of size at most s^d . Quantitatively, the lower bounds are stronger than the best known $\Omega(2^{\frac{1}{10}n^{1/d}})$ and $\Omega(2^{\frac{1}{84}d(n^{1/d}-1)})$ lower bounds for unrestricted depth $d + 1$ circuits [Hås86] and formulas [Ros15], respectively. Of course, P -invariance is a severe restriction for circuits and formulas, so it is no surprise that the lower bounds we obtain is stronger and significantly easier to prove. The linear-algebraic technique in this paper is entirely different from the “switching lemma” approach of [Hås86, Ros15].

The general form of our lower bound is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $U \subset V$ be linear subspaces of $\{0, 1\}^n$, and suppose F is a U -invariant depth $d + 1$ formula which is non-constant over V . Then F has size at least $2^{d(m^{1/d}-1)}$ where $m = \min\{|x| : x \in U^\perp \setminus V^\perp\}$, that is, the minimum Hamming weight of a vector x which is orthogonal to U and non-orthogonal to V .*

Here *size* refers to the number of depth 1 subformulas, as opposed to *leafsize*. Note that the bound in Theorem 1.1 does not depend on the dimension n of the ambient space. Also note that aforementioned $2^{d(n^{1/d}-1)}$ lower bound for PARITY_n follows from the case $U = P$ and $V = \{0, 1\}^n$. (Here $m = n$ is witnessed by the all-1 vector, which is an element of $P^\perp \setminus (\{0, 1\}^n)^\perp$.)

We remark that, since $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} d(m^{1/d} - 1) = \ln(m)$, Theorem 1.1 implies an $m^{\ln(2)}$ lower bound on the size of *unbounded-depth* formulas which are U -invariant and non-constant over V . Theorem 1.1 also implies a $2^{m^{1/d}-1}$ lower bound for depth $d + 1$ circuits; however, we get no nontrivial lower bound for unbounded-depth circuits, since $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} m^{1/d} - 1 = 0$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let n range over positive integers. $[n]$ is the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. $\ln(n)$ is the natural logarithm and $\log(n)$ is the base-2 logarithm.

The Hamming weight of a vector $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, denoted $|x|$, is the cardinality of the set $\{i \in [n] : x_i = 1\}$. For vectors $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$, let $x \oplus y$ denote the coordinate-wise sum modulo 2 and let $\langle x, y \rangle$ denote the inner product modulo 2.

Let \mathcal{L} denote the lattice of linear subspaces of $\{0, 1\}^n$. For $U, V \in \mathcal{L}$, let $U + V$ denote the subspace spanned by U and V . Let V^\perp denote the orthogonal complement

$V^\perp = \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \langle x, v \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } v \in V\}$. We make use of the following facts about orthogonal complements over finite fields:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(V) + \dim(V^\perp) &= n, & U \subseteq V &\iff V^\perp \subseteq U^\perp, \\ V &= (V^\perp)^\perp, & (U + V)^\perp &= U^\perp \cap V^\perp, & (U \cap V)^\perp &= U^\perp + V^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

2.1. AC^0 formulas. We write \mathcal{F} for the set of n -variable AC^0 formulas (with unbounded fan-in AND and OR gates and leaves labeled by literals). Formally, let $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{d \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_d$ where \mathcal{F}_d is the set of *depth d formulas*, defined inductively:

- \mathcal{F}_0 is the set $\{X_1, \bar{X}_1, \dots, X_n, \bar{X}_n\} \cup \{0, 1\}$,
- \mathcal{F}_{d+1} is the set of ordered pairs

$$\{(\text{gate}, \mathcal{G}) : \text{gate} \in \{\text{AND}, \text{OR}\} \text{ and } \mathcal{G} \text{ is a nonempty subset of } \mathcal{F}_d\}.$$

Every formula $F \in \mathcal{F}$ computes a Boolean function $\{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ in the usual way. For $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, we write $F(x)$ for the value of F on x . For a nonempty set $S \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ and $b \in \{0,1\}$, notation $F(S) \equiv b$ denotes that $F(x) = b$ for all $x \in S$. We say that F is *non-constant* on S if $F(S) \neq 0$ and $F(S) \neq 1$.

The *depth* of F is the unique $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $F \in \mathcal{F}_d$. *Leafsize* is the number of depth 0 subformulas, and *size* is the number of depth 1 subformulas. Inductively,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{leafsize}(F) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } F \in \mathcal{F}_0, \\ \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \text{leafsize}(G) & \text{if } F = (\text{gate}, \mathcal{G}) \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_0, \end{cases} \\ \text{size}(F) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } F \in \mathcal{F}_0, \\ 1 & \text{if } F \in \mathcal{F}_1, \\ \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \text{size}(G) & \text{if } F = (\text{gate}, \mathcal{G}) \in \mathcal{F} \setminus (\mathcal{F}_0 \cup \mathcal{F}_1). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $\text{size}(F) \leq \text{leafsize}(F)$. Note that *size* is within a factor 2 of the number of gates in F , which is how one usually measures the size of circuits. Our lower bound naturally applies to *size*, while the upper bound that we present in §2.3 is naturally presented in terms of *leafsize*.

2.2. The action of $\{0,1\}^n$. We now formally define the action of $\{0,1\}^n$ (as the group Z_2^n) on the set \mathcal{F} . For $u \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}$, let F^u be the formula obtained from F by exchanging literals X_i and \bar{X}_i for every $i \in [n]$ with $u_i = 1$. Formally, this action is defined inductively by

$$F^u = \begin{cases} F & \text{if } F \in \{0,1\}, \\ X_i \text{ (resp. } \bar{X}_i) & \text{if } F = X_i \text{ (resp. } \bar{X}_i) \text{ and } u_i = 0, \\ \bar{X}_i \text{ (resp. } X_i) & \text{if } F = X_i \text{ (resp. } \bar{X}_i) \text{ and } u_i = 1, \\ (\text{gate}, \{G^u : G \in \mathcal{G}\}) & \text{if } F = (\text{gate}, \mathcal{G}). \end{cases}$$

Note that F^u has the same depth and size as F and computes the function $F^u(x) = F(x \oplus u)$ for all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$.

Let U be a linear subspace of $\{0,1\}^n$ (i.e., subgroup of Z_2^n). We say that an AC^0 formula F is:

- *U -invariant* if $F^u = F$ (i.e., these are syntactically identical formulas) for every $u \in U$,

- *semantically U -invariant* if F computes a U -invariant function (i.e., $F(x) = F(x \oplus u)$ for every $u \in U$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$).

Note that every U -invariant formula is semantically U -invariant, but not conversely. For example, the formula $(\text{AND}, \{0, X_1, \dots, X_n\})$ computes the identically zero function and is therefore semantically U -invariant (for any U); however, this formula is not U -invariant (for any nontrivial U).

2.3. Upper bound. We review the smallest known construction of bounded-depth formulas for PARITY_n (see [Hås86]) and observe that these formulas are P -invariant where P is the even-weight subspace of $\{0, 1\}^n$.

Proposition 2.1. *For all $d, n \geq 1$, PARITY_n is computable by P -invariant depth $d + 1$ formulas with either AND or OR as output gate and leafsize at most $n \cdot 2^{dn^{1/d}}$. If $n^{1/d}$ is an integer, this bound improves to $n \cdot 2^{d(n^{1/d}-1)}$.*

Proof. Define $\beta(d, n)$ by the following recurrence:

$$\beta(1, n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 1, \\ \infty & \text{if } n > 1, \end{cases} \quad \beta(d + 1, n) = \min_{\substack{k, n_1, \dots, n_k \geq 1: \\ n_1 + \dots + n_k = n}} 2^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \beta(d, n_i).$$

We will construct depth $d + 1$ formulas of leafsize $\beta(d + 1, n)$. If $n^{1/d}$ is an integer, we get the bound $\beta(d + 1, n) \leq n \cdot 2^{d(n^{1/d}-1)}$ by setting $k = n^{1/d}$ and $n_1 = \dots = n_k = n^{(d-1)/d}$. For arbitrary $d, n \geq 1$, we get the bound $\beta(d + 1, n) \leq n \cdot 2^{dn^{1/d}}$ by setting $k = \lceil n^{1/d} \rceil$ and $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \{\lfloor n/k \rfloor, \lceil n/k \rceil\}$. In particular, note that $\beta(2, n) = n2^{n-1}$.

In the base case $d = 1$, we have the brute-force DNF (OR-of-ANDs) and CNF (AND-of-ORs) formulas of leafsize $n2^{n-1}$ for PARITY_n . These formulas are clearly P -invariant. Otherwise (if $d \geq 2$), fix the optimal choice of parameters k, n_1, \dots, n_k for $\beta(d + 1, n)$. Partition $[n]$ into sets $J_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup J_k$ of size $|J_i| = n_i$. Let PARITY_{J_i} be the parity function over variables $\{X_j : j \in J_i\}$ and let P_{J_i} be the subspace $\{u \in \{0, 1\}^n : \bigoplus_{j \in J_i} u_j = 0\}$.

By the induction hypothesis, for each $i \in [k]$ there exists a P_{J_i} -invariant formula G_i computing PARITY_{J_i} with depth d and leafsize at most $\beta(d, n_i)$ and output gate AND. Let H_i be the formula obtained from G_i by transposing literals X_j and \bar{X}_j for any choice of $j \in J_i$; note that H_i computes $1 - \text{PARITY}_{J_i}$. Let F be the brute-force DNF formula for PARITY_k over variables Y_1, \dots, Y_k . We first form a depth $d + 2$ formula F' by replacing each literal Y_i (resp. \bar{Y}_i) in F with the formula G_i (resp. H_i). The two layers of gates in F' below the output consist entirely of AND gates; these two layers may be combined into a single layer, producing a formula F'' of depth $d + 1$. Since each variable Y_i occurs in 2^{k-1} literals of F , the leafsize of F'' is $2^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \beta(d, n_i)$ as required.

Finally, to see that F'' is P -invariant, consider an even-weight vector $u \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Note that u projects to an even-weight vector in $\{0, 1\}^k$ whose i th coordinate is $\bigoplus_{j \in J_i} u_j$. Then u acts on F'' by transposing subformulas G_i and H_i for all $i \in [k]$ such that $\bigoplus_{j \in J_i} u_j = 1$; therefore, P -invariance of F'' follows from $P_{\{Y_1, \dots, Y_k\}}$ -invariance of F . If we take F to be a CNF instead of a DNF, the same construction produces F'' with OR instead of AND as its output gate. \square

Remark 2.2. PARITY_n is known to be computable by P -invariant formulas of depth $\lceil \log n \rceil + 1$ and leafsize $O(n^2)$ [Tar10, Yab54]. The $n \cdot 2^{dn^{1/d}}$ upper bound of Proposition 2.1 is

therefore slack, as this equals n^3 when $d = \log n$, whereas $n \cdot 2^{d(n^{1/d}-1)} = n^2$. We suspect that the upper bound of Proposition 2.1 can be improved that $O(n \cdot 2^{d(n^{1/d}-1)})$ for all $d \leq \log n$, perhaps by a more careful analysis of the recurrence for $\beta(d+1, n)$. Let us add that $\Omega(n^2)$ is a well-known lower bound for any depth, without the assumption of P -invariance [Khr71].

3. LINEAR-ALGEBRAIC LEMMAS

Recall that \mathcal{L} denotes the lattice of linear subspaces of $\{0, 1\}^n$. Let U, V, S, T range over elements of \mathcal{L} . If U is a subspace of V , recall that a *projection* from V to U is a linear map $\rho : V \rightarrow U$ such that $\rho(u) = u$ for every $u \in U$. We begin by showing that if U is a codimension- k subspace of V (i.e., $\dim(V) - \dim(U) = k$), then there exists a projection $\rho : V \rightarrow U$ with “Hamming-weight stretch” $k+1$.

Lemma 3.1. *If U is a codimension- k subspace of V , then there exists a projection ρ from V to U such that $|\rho(v)| \leq (k+1)|v|$ for all $v \in V$.*

Proof. Greedily choose a basis w_1, \dots, w_k for V over U such that w_i has minimal Hamming weight among elements of $V \setminus \text{Span}(U \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}\})$ for all $i \in [k]$. Each $v \in V$ has a unique representation $v = u \oplus a_1 w_1 \oplus \dots \oplus a_k w_k$ where $u \in U$ and $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $\rho : V \rightarrow U$ be the map $v \mapsto u$ and observe that this is a projection.

To show that $|\rho(v)| \leq (k+1)|v|$, we first observe that $|a_i w_i| \leq |v|$ for all $i \in [k]$. If $a_i = 0$, this is obvious, as $|a_i w_i| = 0$. If $a_i = 1$, then $v \in V \setminus \text{Span}(U \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}\})$, so by our choice of w_i we have $|a_i w_i| = |w_i| \leq |v|$. Completing the proof, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho(v)| &= |v \oplus a_1 w_1 \oplus \dots \oplus a_k w_k| \\ &\leq |v| + |a_1 w_1| + \dots + |a_k w_k| \\ &\leq (k+1)|v|. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Definition 3.2. Define sets \mathcal{L}_2 and \mathcal{L}_4 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2 &= \{(U, V) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L} : U \text{ is a codimension-1 subspace of } V\}, \\ \mathcal{L}_4 &= \{((S, T), (U, V)) \in \mathcal{L}_2 \times \mathcal{L}_2 : T \cap U = S \text{ and } T + U = V\}. \end{aligned}$$

The next lemma shows that \mathcal{L}_4 is anti-symmetric under orthogonal complementation.

Lemma 3.3. *For all $((S, T), (U, V)) \in \mathcal{L}_4$, we have $((V^\perp, U^\perp), (T^\perp, S^\perp)) \in \mathcal{L}_4$.*

Proof. We use the properties of orthogonal complements stated in §2. Consider any $((S, T), (U, V)) \in \mathcal{L}_4$. First note that $(V^\perp, U^\perp) \in \mathcal{L}_2$ by the fact that $U \subseteq V \implies V^\perp \subseteq U^\perp$ and $\dim(U^\perp) - \dim(V^\perp) = (n - \dim(U)) - (n - \dim(V)) = \dim(V) - \dim(U) = 1$. Similarly, we have $(T^\perp, S^\perp) \in \mathcal{L}_2$. We now have $((V^\perp, U^\perp), (T^\perp, S^\perp)) \in \mathcal{L}_4$ since $U^\perp \cap T^\perp = (T + U)^\perp = V^\perp$ and $U^\perp + T^\perp = (T \cap U)^\perp = S^\perp$. \square

Finally, we state a dual pair of lemmas which play a key role in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.4. *For all $(S, T) \in \mathcal{L}_2$ and $V \supseteq T$, there exists $U \supseteq S$ such that $((S, T), (U, V)) \in \mathcal{L}_4$ and*

$$\min_{x \in V \setminus U} |x| \geq \frac{1}{\dim(V) - \dim(T) + 1} \min_{y \in T \setminus S} |y|.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, there exists a projection ρ from V onto T such that $|\rho(v)| \leq (\dim(V) - \dim(T) + 1)|v|$ for all $v \in V$. Let $U = \rho^{-1}(S)$ and note that U is a codimension-1 subspace of V . (This follows by applying the rank-nullity theorem to linear maps $\rho : V \rightarrow T$ and $\rho|_U : U \rightarrow S$ and noting that $\ker(\rho) = \ker(\rho|_U)$.) We have $S = T \cap U$ and $T + U = V$, hence $((S, T), (U, V)) \in \mathcal{L}_4$. Choosing x with minimum Hamming weight in $V \setminus U$, we observe that $\rho(x) \in T \setminus S$ and $|x| \geq |\rho(x)|/(\dim(V) - \dim(T) + 1)$, which proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.5. *For all $(U, V) \in \mathcal{L}_2$ and $S \subseteq U$, there exists $T \subseteq V$ such that $((S, T), (U, V)) \in \mathcal{L}_4$ and*

$$\min_{x \in S^\perp \setminus T^\perp} |x| \geq \frac{1}{\dim(U) - \dim(S) + 1} \min_{y \in U^\perp \setminus V^\perp} |y|.$$

Proof. Follows directly from Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We first prove the base case of Theorem 1.1 for depth 2 formulas, also known as DNFs and CNFs.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose F is a depth 2 formula and $(U, V) \in \mathcal{L}_2$ such that $F(U) \equiv b$ and $F(V \setminus U) \equiv 1 - b$ for some $b \in \{0, 1\}$. Then $\text{size}(F) \geq 2^{m-1}$ and $\text{leafsize}(F) \geq m \cdot 2^{m-1}$ where $m = \min\{|x| : x \in U^\perp \setminus V^\perp\}$.*

Note that Lemma 4.1 does not involve the assumption that F is U -invariant.

Proof. Assume that F is a DNF formula (i.e., an OR-of-ANDs formula) and $F(U) \equiv 0$ and $F(V \setminus U) \equiv 1$. This is without loss of generality: if F were a DNF formula and $F(U) \equiv 1$ and $F(V \setminus U) \equiv 0$, then we may consider F^w for any choice of $w \in V \setminus U$; this is a DNF formula of the same size and leafsize, but has $F^w(U) \equiv 0$ and $F^w(V \setminus U) \equiv 1$. The argument for CNF formulas is similar.

We may further assume that F is minimal firstly with respect to the number of clauses and secondly with respect to the number of literals in each clause.

Consider any clause G of F . This clause G is the AND of some number ℓ of literals. Without loss of generality, suppose these literals involve the first ℓ coordinates. Let π be the projection $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$ onto the first ℓ coordinates. There is a unique element $p \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ such that $G(x) = 1 \iff \pi(x) = p$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Observe that $G(U) \equiv 0$ (since $F(U) \equiv 0$) and, therefore, $p \notin \pi(U)$.

We claim that $p \in \pi(V)$. To see why, assume for contradiction that $p \notin \pi(V)$. Then $G(V) \equiv 0$. But this means that the clause G can be removed from F and the resulting function F' would still satisfy $F'(U) \equiv 0$ and $F'(V \setminus U) \equiv 1$, contradicting the minimality of F with respect to number of clauses.

For each $i \in [\ell]$, let $p^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$ be the element obtained from p by flipping its i th coordinate. We claim that $p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(\ell)} \in \pi(U)$. Without loss of generality, we give the argument showing $p^{(\ell)} \in \pi(U)$. Let G' be the AND of the first $\ell - 1$ literals in G , and let F' be the formula obtained from F by replacing G with G' . For all $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, we have $G(x) \leq G'(x)$ and hence $F(x) \leq F'(x)$. Therefore, $F'(V \setminus U) \equiv 1$. Now note that there exists $u \in U$ such that $F'(u) = 1$ (otherwise, we would have $F'(u) \equiv 0$, contradicting the minimality of F with respect to the width of each clause). Since $F(u) = 0$ and G' is the only clause of F' distinct from the clauses of F , it follows that $G'(u) = 1$. This means that

$u_{\{1,\dots,\ell-1\}} = p_{\{1,\dots,\ell-1\}}$. We now have $\pi(u) = p^{(\ell)}$ (otherwise, we would have $\pi(u) = p$ and therefore $G(u) = 1$ and $F(u) = 1$, contradicting that fact that $F(U) \equiv 0$).

Note that $p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(\ell)}$ span either the even-weight subspace of $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ (if p has odd weight) or all of $\{0, 1\}^\ell$ (if p has even weight). Since $p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(\ell)} \in \pi(U)$ and $p \in \pi(V) \setminus \pi(U)$, only the former is possible. That is, we have $\pi(V) = \{0, 1\}^\ell$ and $\pi(U) = \{q \in \{0, 1\}^\ell : |q| \text{ is even}\}$. Therefore, $1^\ell \in \pi(U)^\perp \setminus \pi(V)^\perp$ (writing 1^ℓ for the all-1 vector in $\{0, 1\}^\ell$). It follows that $1^\ell 0^{n-\ell} \in U^\perp \setminus V^\perp$ and, therefore, $\ell = |1^\ell 0^{n-\ell}| \geq m$ (by definition of m).

We now observe that

$$\Pr_{v \in V}[G(v) = 1] = \Pr_{v \in V}[\pi(v) = p] = \Pr_{q \in \pi(V)}[q = p] = \Pr_{q \in \{0, 1\}^\ell}[q = p] = 2^{-\ell} \leq 2^{-m}.$$

That is, each clause in F has value 1 over at most 2^{-m} fraction of points in V . Since the set $V \setminus U$ has density $1/2$ in V , we see that 2^{m-1} clauses are required to cover $V \setminus U$.

Subject to the stated minimality assumptions on F (first with respect to the number of clauses and second to the width of each clause), we conclude that F contains $\geq 2^{m-1}$ clauses, each of width $\geq m$. Therefore, $\text{size}(F) \geq 2^{m-1}$ and $\text{leafsize}(F) \geq m \cdot 2^{m-1}$. \square

The induction step of Theorem 1.1 makes use of the following inequality.

Lemma 4.2. *For all real $a, b, c \geq 1$, we have $a + c(b/a)^{1/c} \geq (c+1)b^{1/(c+1)}$. This holds with equality iff $a = b^{1/(c+1)}$.*

Proof. Taking the derivative of the lefthand side with respect to a , we get $\frac{\partial}{\partial a}(a + c(b/a)^{1/c}) = 1 - (b/a^{c+1})^{1/c}$. The function $a \mapsto a + c(b/a)^{1/c}$ is thus seen to have a unique minimum at $a = b^{1/(c+1)}$, where it takes value $(c+1)b^{1/(c+1)}$. \square

Onto the main result:

Theorem 1.1 (restated) . *Let $U \subset V$ be linear subspaces of $\{0, 1\}^n$, and suppose F is a U -invariant depth $d+1$ formula which is non-constant over V . Then F has size at least $2^{d(m^{1/d}-1)}$ where $m = \min\{|x| : x \in U^\perp \setminus V^\perp\}$.*

Proof. We first observe that it suffices to prove the theorem in the case where $(U, V) \in \mathcal{L}_2$, that is, U has codimension-1 in V . To see why, note that for any $U \subset V$ such that F is U -invariant and non-constant over V , there must exist $U \subset W \subseteq V$ such that $(U, W) \in \mathcal{L}_2$ and F is non-constant over W . Assuming the theorem holds with respect to $U \subset W$, it also holds with respect to $U \subset V$, since $U^\perp \setminus W^\perp \subseteq U^\perp \setminus V^\perp$ and hence $\min\{|x| : x \in U^\perp \setminus W^\perp\} \geq \min\{|x| : x \in U^\perp \setminus V^\perp\}$.

Therefore, we assume $(U, V) \in \mathcal{L}_2$ and prove the theorem by induction on d . The base case $d = 1$ is established by Lemma 4.1. For the induction step, let $d \geq 2$ and assume $F \in \mathcal{F}_{d+1}$ is a U -invariant and non-constant over V . Without loss of generality, we consider the case where $F = (\text{OR}, \mathcal{G})$ for some nonempty $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_d$. (The case where $F = (\text{AND}, \mathcal{G})$ is symmetric, with the roles of 0 and 1 exchanged.)

Since F is U -invariant, we have $G^u \in \mathcal{G}$ for every $u \in U$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}$. We claim that it suffices to prove the theorem in the case where the action of U on \mathcal{G} is transitive (i.e. $\mathcal{G} = \{G^u : u \in U\}$ for every $G \in \mathcal{G}$). To see why, consider the partition $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{G}_t$, $t \geq 1$, into orbits under U . For each $i \in [t]$, let F_i be the formula $(\text{OR}, \mathcal{G}_i)$. Note that F_i is U -invariant and U acts transitively on \mathcal{G}_i . Clearly, we have $F(v) = \bigvee_{i \in [t]} F_i(v)$ for all $v \in V$. Since every U -invariant Boolean function is constant over sets U and $V \setminus U$ (using the fact that U has codimension-1 in V), it follows that each F_i satisfies either $F_i(V) \equiv 0$ or $F(v) = F_i(v)$ for all $v \in V$. (It cannot happen that $F_i(V) \equiv 1$ for any i , since that would

imply $F(V) \equiv 1$.) Because F is non-constant over V , it follows that there exists $i \in [t]$ such that $F(v) = F_i(v)$ for all $v \in V$. In particular, this F_i is non-constant over V . Since $\text{size}(F) \geq \text{size}(F_i)$, we have reduced proving the theorem for F to proving to theorem for F_i .

In light of the preceding paragraph, we proceed under the assumption that U acts transitively on \mathcal{G} . Fix an arbitrary choice of $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Let

$$S = \text{Stab}_U(G) (= \{u \in U : G^u = G\}),$$

$$a = \dim(U) - \dim(S) + 1.$$

By the orbit-stabilizer theorem,

$$|\mathcal{G}| = |\text{Orbit}_U(G)| = [U : S] = |U|/|S| = 2^{a-1}.$$

Since $\text{size}(G') = \text{size}(G)$ for every $G' \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$\text{size}(F) = \sum_{G' \in \mathcal{G}} \text{size}(G') = |\mathcal{G}| \cdot \text{size}(G) = 2^{a-1} \cdot \text{size}(G). \quad (4.1)$$

We next observe that G^u is S -invariant for every $u \in U$ (in fact, $S = \text{Stab}_U(G^u)$). This follows from the fact that $(G^u)^s = G^{u \oplus s} = (G^s)^u = G^u$ for every $s \in S$.

By Lemma 3.5, there exists T such that $((S, T), (U, V)) \in \mathcal{L}_4$ and

$$\min_{x \in S^\perp \setminus T^\perp} |x| \geq \frac{1}{\dim(U) - \dim(S) + 1} \min_{y \in U^\perp \setminus V^\perp} |y| = \frac{m}{a}.$$

We claim that there exists $u \in U$ such that G^u is non-constant on T . There are two cases to consider:

Case 1: Suppose $F(U) \equiv 0$ and $F(V \setminus U) \equiv 1$.

We have $G(U) \equiv 0$ and $G(V) \not\equiv 0$. Fix any $v \in V \setminus U$ such that $G(v) = 1$. In addition, fix any $w \in T \setminus U$ (noting that $T \setminus U$ is nonempty since $U + T = V$ and $U \subset V$). Let $u = v \oplus w$ and note that $u \in U$ (since U is a codimension-1 subspace of V and $v, w \in V \setminus U$). We have $G^u(U) \equiv 0$ and $G^u(w) = G(w \oplus u) = G(v) = 1$. By the S -invariance of G^u , it follows that $G^u(S) \equiv 0$ and $G^u(T \setminus S) \equiv 1$. In particular, G^u is non-constant on T .

Case 2: Suppose $F(U) \equiv 1$ and $F(V \setminus U) \equiv 0$.

We have $G(U) \not\equiv 0$ and $G(V \setminus U) \equiv 0$. Fix any $u \in U$ such that $G(u) = 1$. In addition, fix any $w \in T \setminus U$ and let $v = w \oplus u$. We have $G^u(v) = G(v \oplus u) = G(w) = 0$ (since $w \in V \setminus U$ and $G(V \setminus U) \equiv 0$). We also have $G^u(\vec{0}) = G(u) = 1$ where $\vec{0}$ is the origin in $\{0, 1\}^n$. By S -invariance of G^u , it follows that $G^u(S) \equiv 1$ and $G^u(T \setminus S) \equiv 0$. In particular, G^u is non-constant on T .

Since G^u is S -invariant and non-constant on T and $\text{depth}(G^u) = (d-1) + 1$, we may apply the induction hypothesis to G^u . Thus, we have

$$\text{size}(G) = \text{size}(G^u) \geq 2^{(d-1)((m/a)^{1/(d-1)} - 1)}. \quad (4.2)$$

Since $d \geq 2$, Lemma 4.2 tells us

$$a + (d-1)(m/a)^{1/(d-1)} \geq d(m/a)^{1/d}. \quad (4.3)$$

Putting together (4.1), (4.2), (4.3), we get the desired bound

$$\begin{aligned} \text{size}(F) &\geq 2^{a-1} \cdot 2^{(d-1)((m/a)^{1/(d-1)}-1)} \\ &= 2^{a+(d-1)(m/a)^{1/(d-1)}-d} \\ &\geq 2^{d(m^{1/d}-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

5. REMARKS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

5.1. Another application of Theorem 1.1. Theorem 1.1 applies to interesting subspaces U of $\{0,1\}^n$ besides the even-weight subspace P . Here we describe one example. Let G be a simple graph with n edges, so that $\{0,1\}^n$ may be identified with the set of spanning subgraphs of G . The *cycle space* of G is the subspace $Z \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ consisting of *even subgraphs* of G (i.e., spanning subgraphs in which every vertex has even degree). Consider the even-weight subspace $Z_0 = \{z \in Z : |z| \text{ is even}\}$. Provided that G is non-bipartite, Z_0 is a codimension-1 subspace of Z .

Let $m = \min\{|x| : x \in Z_0^\perp \setminus Z^\perp\}$ as in Theorem 1.1 with $U = Z_0$ and $V = Z$. This number m is seen to be equal to the minimum number of edges whose removal makes G bipartite. It follows that $m = n - c$ where c is the number edges in a maximum cut in G . Now suppose G is generated as a uniform random 3-regular graph with n edges (and $\frac{2}{3}n$ vertices). There is a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $c \leq (1 - \varepsilon)n$ (and hence $m \geq \varepsilon n$) holds asymptotically almost surely [Bol88]. From these observations, we have

Corollary 5.1. *Every Z_0 -invariant depth $d+1$ formula that computes PARITY_n over Z has size at least $2^{d((\varepsilon n)^{1/d}-1)}$ asymptotically almost surely.*

The AC^0 complexity of computing PARITY_n over the cycle space of a graph G is loosely related to the AC^0 -Frege proof complexity of the Tseitin tautology on G , which has been explored recently in [Hås17, PRST16]. In general, however, we do not have techniques to lower bound the (non-subspace-invariant) AC^0 complexity of PARITY_n over arbitrary subspaces of $\{0,1\}^n$.

5.2. The $V \setminus U$ search problem. For linear subspaces $U \subset V$ of $\{0,1\}^n$, consider the following “ $V \setminus U$ search problem”. There is a hidden vector $w \in V \setminus U$ and the goal is to learn a nonzero coordinate of w (any $i \in [n]$ such that $w_i = 1$) by asking queries (yes/no questions) in the form of linear functions $\{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$. The *d -round query complexity* of this problem is the minimum number of queries required by a deterministic protocol which issues batches of queries over d consecutive rounds. By an argument similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1, we get a $d(m^{1/d} - 1)$ lower bound on the d -round query complexity of the $V \setminus U$ -search problem where $m = \min\{|x| : x \in U^\perp \setminus V^\perp\}$. We remark that this $V \setminus U$ search problem may be viewed as an U -invariant version of the Karchmer-Wigderson game.

5.3. Open questions. We conclude by mentioning some open questions and challenges raised by this work:

- Does the $2^{d(m^{1/d}-1)}$ lower bound of Theorem 1.1 (or even a weaker bound like $2^{\Omega(m^{1/d})}$ or $2^{m^{\Omega(1/d)}}$) apply to depth $d+1$ formulas which are *semantically U -invariant* and non-constant on V ?
- Counting leafsize instead of size, improve the lower bound of Theorem 1.1 from $2^{d(m^{1/d}-1)}$ to $m \cdot 2^{d(m^{1/d}-1)}$.
- Improve the upper bound of Proposition 2.1 from $n \cdot 2^{dn^{1/d}}$ to $O(n \cdot 2^{d(n^{1/d}-1)})$ for all $d \leq \log n$.
- What is the maximum gap, if any, between the U -invariant vs. unrestricted AC^0 complexity of a U -invariant Boolean function?

REFERENCES

- [AD16] Matthew Anderson and Anuj Dawar. On symmetric circuits and fixed-point logics. *Theory of Computing Systems*, pages 1–31, 2016.
- [Ajt94] Miklos Ajtai. Symmetric systems of linear equations modulo p . In *TR94-015 of the Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity*, 1994.
- [BGS99] Andreas Blass, Yuri Gurevich, and Saharon Shelah. Choiceless polynomial time. *Ann. Pure & Applied Logic*, 100(1–3):141–187, 1999.
- [BGS02] Andreas Blass, Yuri Gurevich, and Saharon Shelah. On polynomial time computation over unordered structures. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 67(3):1093–1125, 2002.
- [Bol88] Béla Bollobás. The isoperimetric number of random regular graphs. *European Journal of combinatorics*, 9(3):241–244, 1988.
- [Daw15] Anuj Dawar. On symmetric and choiceless computation. In *International Conference on Topics in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 23–29. Springer, 2015.
- [DGS86] Larry Denenberg, Yuri Gurevich, and Saharon Shelah. Definability by constant-depth polynomial-size circuits. *Information and Control*, 70(2-3):216–240, 1986.
- [Hås86] Johan Håstad. Almost optimal lower bounds for small depth circuits. In *STOC '86: Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 6–20, 1986.
- [Hås17] Johan Håstad. On small-depth Frege proofs for Tseitin for grids. In *Proc. 58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 97–108. IEEE, 2017.
- [Imm12] Neil Immerman. *Descriptive complexity*. Springer, 2012.
- [Khr71] V. M. Khrapchenko. Complexity of the realization of a linear function in the class of π -circuits. *Mathematical Notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR*, 9(1):21–23, 1971.
- [Ott96] Martin Otto. The logic of explicitly presentation-invariant circuits. In *International Workshop on Computer Science Logic*, pages 369–384. Springer, 1996.
- [PRST16] Toniann Pitassi, Benjamin Rossman, Rocco A Servedio, and Li-Yang Tan. Poly-logarithmic Frege depth lower bounds via an expander switching lemma. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 644–657. ACM, 2016.
- [RB88] Steven Rudich and Leonard Berman. Optimal circuits and transitive automorphism groups. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 516–524. Springer, 1988.
- [Ros10] Benjamin Rossman. Choiceless computation and symmetry. In *Fields of logic and computation*, pages 565–580. Springer, 2010.
- [Ros15] Benjamin Rossman. The average sensitivity of bounded-depth formulas. In *Proc. 56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 424–430. IEEE, 2015.
- [RS00] Søren Riis and Meera Sitharam. Generating hard tautologies using predicate logic and the symmetric group. *Logic Journal of IGPL*, 8(6):787–795, 2000.
- [Tar10] Jun Tarui. Smallest formulas for the parity of 2^k variables are essentially unique. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411(26):2623–2627, 2010.

- [Yab54] Sergei V. Yablonskii. Realization of the linear function in the class of π -schemes. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 94(805–806), 1954.