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Abstract. We construct a spanoid $S$ on $n$ elements with
$$\text{rank}(S) \geq n^c \text{f-rank}(S)$$
where $c = \log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5 \approx 0.113283$. This answers a question of Dvir-Gopi-Wigderson [DGW18].

In this note we construct a spanoid with a polynomial gap between its functional rank and formal rank. We follow notations from [DGW18], including $\models$, f-rank, rank, $\Pi_5$, etc.

Our construction is by using a semidirect product of spanoids that amplifies the gap between f-rank and rank.

Definition 1. Let $S_1, S_2$ be two spanoids on $X_1, X_2$ resp. Define $S_1 \ltimes S_2$ to be the spanoid on $X_1 \times X_2$ generated by the following rules.

(1) For $B \subseteq X_2, j \in X_2$, if $B \models j$ in $S_2$ then for every $i \in X_1$,
$$\{i\} \times B \models (i, j).$$

(2) For $A \subseteq X_1, i \in X_1$, if $A \models i$ in $S_1$ then for every $j \in X_2$,
$$A \times X_2 \models (i, j).$$

This definition differs from $S_1 \circ S_2$ in [DGW18] in that in Case (2), $A \times \{j\}$ does not span $(i, j)$ in general.

Proposition 2. f-rank$(S_1 \ltimes S_2) \leq$ f-rank$(S_1)$ f-rank$(S_2)$.

Proof. Let $C \in \Sigma_{X_1 \times X_2}$ be a code consistent with $S_1 \ltimes S_2$. For $i \in X_1$, define code $C^i_2 \subseteq \Sigma_{X_2}$ as
$$C^i_2 = \{c_{\{i\} \times X_2} : c \in C\}.$$

Because $C^i_2$ is consistent with $S_2$, we have
$$\frac{\log \#C^i_2}{\log \#\Sigma} \leq \text{f-rank}(S_2).$$

Let $\Phi$ be a set of size
$$\max_{i \in X_1} \#C^i_2$$
and for each $i \in X_1$, choose an embedding $\iota_i : C^i_2 \hookrightarrow \Phi$. Clearly, we have
$$\frac{\log \#\Phi}{\log \#\Sigma} \leq \text{f-rank}(S_2).$$

Define $C_1 \subseteq \Phi^{X_1}$ as
$$C_1 = \{(\iota_i(c_{\{i\} \times X_2}))_{i \in X_1} : c \in C\}.$$

Then $\#C_1 = \#C$ and $C_1$ is consistent with $S_1$. So we have
$$\frac{\log \#C_1}{\log \#\Phi} \leq \text{f-rank}(S_1).$$
Combining the inequalities, we get
\[
\frac{\log \#C}{\log \#\Sigma} \leq f\text{-}\text{rank}(S_1) f\text{-}\text{rank}(S_2).
\]

**Proposition 3.** \(\text{rank}(S_1 \times S_2) = \text{rank}(S_1) \text{rank}(S_2)\).

**Proof.** If \(U_1\) is a generating set for \(S_1\), and \(U_2\) is a generating set for \(S_2\), then \(U_1 \times U_2\) is a generating set for \(S_1 \times S_2\). So \(\text{rank}(S_1 \times S_2) \leq \text{rank}(S_1) \text{rank}(S_2)\). We only need to prove that \(\text{rank}(S_1 \times S_2) \geq \text{rank}(S_1) \text{rank}(S_2)\).

Let \(T\) be a generating set for \(S_1 \times S_2\). We would like to prove that \(\#T \geq \text{rank}(S_1) \text{rank}(S_2)\). Let \(T_0 = T, \ldots, T_r = T_1 \times T_2\), and \(A_1, \ldots, A_r\) be such that for all \(k \in [r]\), we have \(T_k \subseteq T_{k-1}\), \(A_k \subseteq T_k\), and one of the following is true:

1. \(T_k = T_{k-1} \cup \{i\} \times X_2\) for some \(i \in X_1\), \(A_k = A \times X_2\) for some \(A \subseteq X_1\), and \(A \not\models i\) in \(S_1\).

2. We are not in Case (1), and \(T_k = T_{k-1} \cup \{i, j\}\) for some \((i, j) \in X_1 \times X_2\), \(A_k = \{i\} \times B\) for some \(B \subseteq X_2\), and \(B \not\models j\) in \(S_2\).

If Case (1) is true, we say step \(k\) is of type (1). If Case (2) is true, we say step \(k\) is of type (2).

Claim: We can choose \(T_0, \ldots, T_r, A_1, \ldots, A_r\) such that there exists an integer \(l\) for which

1. for all \(k \leq l\), step \(k\) is of type (2);
2. for all \(k \geq l + 1\), step \(k\) is of type (1).

Proof of claim: Suppose there exists some \(k\) such that step \(k\) is of type (1) and step \(k+1\) is of type (2). It is not hard to see that we can swap step \(k\) and step \(k+1\). Repeatedly applying this until no such \(k\) exists, and we get the desired sequences.

Now we return to the proof of \(\#T \geq \text{rank}(S_1) \text{rank}(S_2)\). Let \(l\) be the integer in the above claim. Because steps \(k \geq l + 1\) are all of type (1), we have

\[
\#\{i : \{i\} \times X_2 \subseteq T_l\} \geq \text{rank}(S_1).
\]

Because steps \(k \leq l\) are all of type (2), for each \(i\) such that \(\{i\} \times X_2 \subseteq T_l\), we have

\[
\#(T \cap \{i\} \times X_2) \geq \text{rank}(S_2).
\]

Combining the two inequalities we get \(\#T \geq \text{rank}(S_1) \text{rank}(S_2)\).

**Theorem 4.** There exists a spanoid \(S\) on \(n\) elements with \(\text{rank}(S) \geq n^{c \text{-}\text{f-rank}(S)}\) where \(c = \log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5 \approx 0.113823\).

**Proof.** Define \(S_1 = \Pi_5\), and \(S_i = \Pi_5 \times S_{i-1}\) for \(i \geq 2\). Then \(S_n\) is a spanoid on \(5^n\) elements.

By Proposition 2,

\[
\text{f-rank}(S_n) \leq \text{f-rank}(\Pi_5)^n = 2.5^n.
\]

By Proposition 3,

\[
\text{rank}(S_n) = \text{rank}(\Pi_5)^n = 3^n.
\]

So

\[
\text{rank}(S_n) \geq (5^n)^{\log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5} \text{f-rank}(S_n).
\]

\(\square\)
We are also able to prove a polynomial gap between $LP_{ent}$ and $\text{rank}$, which implies Theorem 4 because $f\text{-rank}(S) \leq LP_{ent}(S)$ by [DGW18] Claim 5.2. We need the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.** $LP_{ent}(S_1 \times S_2) \leq LP_{ent}(S_1)LP_{ent}(S_2)$.

**Proof.** Recall the linear program that defines $LP_{ent}$ in [DGW18] page 23. For a spanoid $S$ on $X$, we have

$$LP_{ent}(S) = \max f(X)$$

s.t. $f(\emptyset) = 0$,

$$f(\{i\}) \leq 1 \forall i \in X,$$

$$f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B) \leq f(A) + f(B) \quad \forall A, B \subseteq X,$$

$$f(A) \leq f(B) \quad \forall A \subseteq B \subseteq X,$$

$$f(A \cup \{i\}) = f(A) \quad \text{whenever} \ A \models i \text{ in } S,$$

$$f(A) \geq 0 \quad \forall A \subseteq X.$$

Let $f : 2^{X_1 \times X_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a function satisfying the linear program for $S_1 \times S_2$. Define $f_1 : 2^{X_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as

$$f_1(A) = \frac{f(A \times X_2)}{LP_{ent}(S_2)}.$$

We claim that $f_1$ satisfies the linear program for $S_1$.

(1)

$$f_1(\emptyset) = \frac{1}{LP_{ent}(S_2)}f(\emptyset) = 0.$$

(2) For all $i \in X_1$, the function $f_2^i : 2^{X_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined as

$$f_2^i(B) = f(\{i\} \times B)$$

satisfies the linear program for $S_2$. So

$$f_1(\{i\}) = \frac{f_2^i(X_2)}{LP_{ent}(S_2)} \leq 1.$$

(3) For all $A, B \subseteq X_1$, we have

$$f_1(A \cup B) + f_1(A \cap B)$$

$$= \frac{1}{LP_{ent}(S_2)}(f((A \cup B) \times X_2) + f((A \cap B) \times X_2))$$

$$= \frac{1}{LP_{ent}(S_2)}(f(A \times X_2) \cup (B \times X_2)) + f((A \times X_2) \cap (B \times X_2)))$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{LP_{ent}(S_2)}(f(A \times X_2) + f(B \times X_2))$$

$$= f_1(A) + f_1(B).$$
(4) Let $A \models i$ in $S_1$. Then $A \times X_2 \models (i, j)$ for all $j \in X_2$. So

$$f_1(A \cup \{i\}) = \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_2)} f((A \cup \{i\}) \times X_2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_2)} f((A \times X_2) \cup (\{i\} \times X_2))$$

$$= \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_2)} f(A \times X_2)$$

$$= f_1(A).$$

(5) For all $A \subseteq X_1$ we have

$$f_1(A) = \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_2)} f(A \times X_2) \geq 0.$$ 

So $f_1$ satisfies the linear program for $S_1$. By definition of $\text{LP}^{\text{ent}}$, 

$$f_1(X_1) \leq \text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_1).$$

So

$$f(X_1 \times X_2) = f_1(X_1)\text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_2) \leq \text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_1)\text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_2).$$

□

**Corollary 6.** There exists a spanoid $S$ on $n$ elements with $\text{rank}(S) \geq n^c \text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S)$ where $c = \log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5 \approx 0.113283$.

**Proof.** Define $S_1 = \Pi_5$, and $S_i = \Pi_5 \times S_{i-1}$ for $i \geq 2$. Then $S_n$ is a spanoid on $5^n$ elements.

By Proposition 5,

$$\text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_n) \leq \text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(\Pi_5)^n = 2.5^n.$$ 

By Proposition 3,

$$\text{rank}(S_n) = \text{rank}(\Pi_5)^n = 3^n.$$ 

So

$$\text{rank}(S_n) \geq (5^n)^{\log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5} \text{LP}^{\text{ent}}(S_n).$$

□
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