

Hardness of Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search

Aviad Rubinstein*

January 19, 2022

Abstract

We prove conditional near-quadratic running time lower bounds for approximate Bichromatic Closest Pair with Euclidean, Manhattan, Hamming, or edit distance. Specifically, unless the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) is false, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that computing a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation to the Bichromatic Closest Pair requires $\Omega(n^{2-\delta})$ time. In particular, this implies a near-linear query time for Approximate Nearest Neighbor search with polynomial preprocessing time.

Our reduction uses the Distributed PCP framework of [ARW17], but obtains improved efficiency using Algebraic Geometry (AG) codes. Efficient PCPs from AG codes have been constructed in other settings before [BKK⁺16, BCG⁺17], but our construction is the first to yield new hardness results.

*Harvard University aviad@seas.harvard.edu. This research was supported by a Ra-bin Postdoctoral Fellowship. I thank Amir Abboud, Karl Bringmann, and Pasin Manu-rangsi for encouraging me to write up this paper. I am also grateful to Amir, Lijie Chen, and Ryan Williams for inspiring discussions. Thanks also to Amir, Lijie, Vasileios Nakos, Zhao Song and anonymous reviewers for comments on earlier versions. Finally, this work would not have been possible without the help of Gil Cohen and Madhu Sudan with AG codes.

1 Introduction

Approximate Nearest Neighbor (ANN) search is an important problem in practice as well as a fundamental problem in theory: preprocess a set A of N vectors so that given a query vector b , an (approximately) closest vector ($a^* \in A$ such that $\|a^* - b\| \approx \min_{a \in A} \|a - b\|$) can be found efficiently. In this paper we prove conditional hardness results for the easier offline variant, called Batch Approximate Nearest Neighbor or **BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR**¹: given sets A, B of N vectors, find a pair $a^* \in A$ and $b^* \in B$ that is approximately the closest (i.e. $\|a^* - b^*\| \approx \min_{\substack{a \in A \\ b \in B}} \|a - b\|$). Since this problem is easier, our hardness results extend to Approximate Nearest Neighbor search as well.

Many algorithms have been designed for Approximate Nearest Neighbor search and Closest Pair. Even for simple ℓ_p metrics, there are also many impossibility results, including: bounds on specific algorithmic approaches [MNP07, OWZ14, ALRW17], unconditional lower bounds in the cell-probe and related models (but those hold only against a very small number of cell probes) [AIP06, PT07, ACP08, PTW08, CR10, PTW10, KP12, AV15, ALRW17, LPY16], and conditional hardness assuming SETH² of the exact variants [Wil05, AW15, DKL16, Wil18].

We are particularly interested in subquadratic algorithms that give $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation to **BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR**, for arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$. For simplicity, we limit the following discussion to Euclidean metric, but similar results hold for Hamming and Manhattan metrics as well. LSH based techniques can solve this problem in $O(N^{2-\Theta(\varepsilon)})$ time [IM98], but not faster [MNP07, OWZ14]. Valiant's algorithm obtained an improved runtime of $O(N^{2-\Theta(\sqrt{\varepsilon})})$ [Val15]. The state of the art is an $O(N^{2-\tilde{\Theta}(\varepsilon^{1/3})})$ -time algorithm by Alman, Chan, and Williams [ACW16]. Can the dependence on ε be improved indefinitely? Note, for example, that the main result in [Val15] is an algorithm for an average case variant of the same problem which, for any constant ε , runs in time $O(N^{\frac{5-\omega}{4-\omega}}) = O(N^{1.62})$ ³ (where ω is the exponent of matrix multiplication). Can we hope for an $f(\varepsilon) \cdot N^{1.99}$ time algorithm (for any function f) for the general case? Our main result

¹*Bichromatic* distinguishes this problem from the yet easier *Monochromatic* Closest Pair problem, where the input is just one set of vectors and the algorithm can return any pair of vectors.

²The Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) postulates that for every ε there is a $k = k(\varepsilon)$ such that k -SAT over n variables requires $(2 - \varepsilon)^n$ time.

³The running time was later improved to $O(N^{\frac{2\omega}{3}}) = O(N^{1.59})$ by [KKK16].

in this paper rules out such algorithms:

Theorem 1.1. *Assuming SETH, for every constant $\delta > 0$ there exists a constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\delta)$ such that approximating BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR in Euclidean, Manhattan, or Hamming distance to within $(1 + \varepsilon)$ requires $O(N^{2-\delta})$ time.*

We also derive an analogous hardness result for BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR with edit distance⁴. However, we note that the best algorithms for approximate BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR with edit distance [OR07] are far from matching our hardness result.

Theorem 1.2. *Assuming SETH, for every constant $\delta > 0$ there exists a constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\delta)$ such that approximating BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR in edit distance to within $(1 + \varepsilon)$ requires $O(N^{2-\delta})$ time.*

As we mentioned earlier, these results also imply the first (to our knowledge) conditional hardness of Approximate Nearest Neighbor search. In particular, they imply a near-linear lower bound on query time for any data structure with a polynomial preprocessing time:

Corollary 1.3. *Assuming SETH, for every constants $\delta, c > 0$ there exists a constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\delta, c)$ such that no algorithm can preprocess a set of N vectors in $O(N^c)$ time, and subsequently answer $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -Approximate Nearest Neighbor queries in $O(N^{1-\delta})$ time (for Euclidean, Manhattan, Hamming, or edit distance).*

Remark 1.4. Informally, in terms of the dependence between δ and ε , our reduction loses roughly a single exponential factor ($\delta \approx \frac{\log \log 1/\varepsilon}{\log 1/\varepsilon}$; see Equation (1)); this is already quite far from best known algorithm [ACW16], which obtains $\delta = \tilde{\Theta}(\varepsilon^{1/3})$. Formally, things are worse: we are unable to deduce any specific relation between δ and ε from SETH, because our reduction also depends on the unspecified relation between ϵ and k in the formulation of SETH (alternatively, δ and c in the formulation of the Orthogonal Vectors Conjecture (OVC); see Conjectures 2.1 and 2.3).

1.1 Techniques

The main technical idea in this paper is a simple instantiation the Distributed PCP framework from [ARW17] with Algebraic Geometry (AG) codes.

⁴The *edit distance*, sometimes also Levenshtein distance, between two strings a, b is defined as the minimum number of character deletions, insertions, or substitutions required to transform a to b .

Distributed PCP

Most reductions from SETH to polynomial time problems use the following outline: Given a CNF φ over n variables, construct gadget(s) for each half assignment $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$. If the number of gadgets is $N \approx 2^{n/2}$, then SETH implies an $\approx N^2$ lower bound on the running time for solving the new instance. One obstacle for using Probabilistically Checkable Proofs (PCP) to prove hardness of approximation in P is the *PCP blowup*: given a 3-CNF φ over n variables, the PCP Theorem [AS98, ALM⁺98] gives an efficient construction of a 3-SAT φ' over n' variables which is hard to approximate. But if we construct $N' \approx 2^{n'/2} \gg 2^n$ gadgets, we do not obtain any meaningful running time lower bounds (even assuming SETH).

Our starting point is the *Distributed PCP* framework of [ARW17]. Another way to think about the PCP Theorem is as a way to, given assignment $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ to CNF φ , generate a proof $\pi(x)$ that x satisfies φ . The proof $\pi(x)$ should be “probabilistically checkable”, which means that a randomized verifier needs to read only a small number of bits from the proof. [ARW17] observed that if we construct the proof $\pi(x)$ in a distributed manner, namely construct a “half-proof” $\pi(\alpha), \pi(\beta)$ for each “half-assignment”, we overcome the PCP blowup because the number of gadgets remains small. Constructing distributed PCP in this way is not quite possible, but [ARW17] gave a construction using a short non-deterministic hint. Since we can enumerate over all short hints in deterministic subexponential time, this construction gives near-quadratic hardness of approximation for several problems such as MAXIMUM INNER PRODUCT over $\{0, 1\}$ -vectors.

The techniques of [ARW17] seem inherently doomed to fail to obtain results like Theorem 1.1 (or even Theorem 1.2⁵). To understand why, we must delve into some more details of the non-deterministic distributed PCP construction from [ARW17]. The construction is based on a generalization of an MA-communication protocol for Set Disjointness by Aaronson and Wigderson [AW09]. In the T -generalized protocol, (i) Merlin sends $O\left(\frac{n}{T} \log n\right)$ bits; (ii) Alice and Bob toss $O(\log n)$ coins; (iii) Bob sends $O(T \log n)$ bits; and then (iv) Alice decides to accept or reject. This protocol is tight up to the logarithmic factors [Kla03], but those logarithmic factors are crucial for our fine-grain applications!

Let n_{MERLIN} denote the length of Merlin’s message, and n_{BOB} for Bob’s message. The reduction needs to enumerate over all of Merlin’s and Bob’s potential messages. To enumerate over Merlin’s messages, we simply in-

⁵See also discussion on the closely related Open Question 3 in [ARW17]

crease the number of vectors by a $2^{n_{\text{MERLIN}}}$ factor; hence we must set $n_{\text{MERLIN}} < n$. For the above T -generalized protocol, this means $T = \Omega(\log n)$. The enumeration over Bob’s messages is a bit more subtle, but it roughly corresponds to a $(1 + 2^{-n_{\text{BOB}}})$ -factor hardness of approximation for Euclidean BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR. Hence we also want to set n_{BOB} as small as possible, and in particular constant. But if we use the same protocol with $T = \Omega(\log n)$, we get that $n_{\text{BOB}} = \Omega(\log^2 n)$, i.e. we don’t even recover the trivial $(1 + 1/\text{poly}(n))$ -hardness of approximation. In other words, our reduction is ultimately restricted by the PCP blowup even in the Distributed PCP framework.

AG codes

The reason that [AW09]’s MA-protocol incurs an $O(\log n)$ overhead is that it uses Reed-Solomon error correcting code (low degree polynomials), which has (relative) rate $\Theta(1/\log n)$. Indeed, there are many error correcting codes that achieve constant rate, but most of them don’t have some of the other nice properties of the Reed Solomon code, such as “systemicity” and “polynomial closure” (see Theorem 2.4). In fact, in accordance with the theme of [AW09], their protocol seems inherently based on “algebrization”. Building on ideas of [Mei13, BKK⁺16], we replace the Reed Solomon code with AG codes that do satisfy the same nice properties, and at the same time also achieve constant rate. This allows us to reduce Merlin’s and Bob’s message lengths to $O(\frac{n}{T} \log T)$ and $O(T \log T)$ (Theorem 3.1). In particular, we can now take T to be a (large) constant.

Edit distance

Our hardness for ANN with edit distance (Theorem 1.2) is obtained by a black-box reduction from the hardness of ANN with Hamming distance. The main challenge in the reduction is to rule out small edit distance solutions obtained by “shifting” the vectors with deletions. Our construction replaces each bit of the Hamming distance instance vectors with a short random string. Now for every i such that $a_i = b_i$, the corresponding random string gadgets are identical so the contribution to the edit distance is zero. For i such that $a_i \neq b_i$, the gadget corresponding to a_i is matched with a uniformly random string, regardless of the shift. Some care is required in the analysis since the behavior of edit distance of random strings is not so well understood (even the expected edit distance is not known).

1.2 Related work

Distributed PCP Most closely related to our work is [ARW17] that introduced the Distributed PCP framework and proved SETH-based near-quadratic hardness of approximation results for several problems in P . In particular, they show hardness of approximation for near-polynomial⁶ factors of BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR with the (non-metric) similarity measures of Maximum Inner Product and Longest Common Subsequence. More recently, [AR18] built on the Distributed PCP to show that *deterministic* truly subquadratic-time algorithms for Longest Common Subsequence (of two long strings) would imply new circuit lower bounds. [CLM18] use the Distributed PCP framework to rule out Fixed Parameter Time approximation algorithms for several fundamental problems; in particular their reduction from SETH relies on the more efficient construction of Distributed PCP (with AG codes) from our work.

The latest in this line of work is [Che18], who obtains several closely related results: (i) building on our techniques, he obtains more refined variants of our hardness results and the matching algorithms (in particular, more explicit dependence on the dimension d); (ii) he exhibits a hardness of approximation result (for $\{\pm 1\}$ -Maximum Inner Product) inspired by replacing MA-communication complexity with quantum communication complexity; (iii) he proves new hardness of exact Euclidean BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR in $2^{O(\log^* n)}$ dimensions by replacing MA-communication with $\mathsf{NP} \cdot \mathsf{UPP}$ -communication; and finally (iv) he makes significant progress on our Open Question 1.

Approximate Nearest Neighbor The list of algorithms for Approximate Nearest Neighbor search and Closest Pair in ℓ_p metrics is very long, e.g. [SH75, BS76, GBT84, AES91, AM93, AMN⁺94, KM95, Kle97, IM98, Ind99, KOR00, Ind00, AF03, Ind03, AI06, AMM09, AC14, AINR14, AIL⁺15, AR15, Val15, ACW16, ALRW17, Ahl17, Cha17]; see also Razenshteyn’s recent thesis [Raz17] for more details. As we mentioned earlier, previous impossibility results include bounds on progress via specific algorithmic approaches [MNP07, OWZ14, ALRW17], unconditional lower bounds in the cell-probe and related models (but those hold only against a very small number of cell probes) [AIP06, PT07, ACP08, PTW08, CR10, PTW10, KP12, AV15, ALRW17, LPY16], and conditional hardness assuming SETH of the exact Nearest Neighbor Search problem [Wil05, AW15, DKL16, Wil18]. For

⁶Building on our techniques, this was later improved to polynomial factors in [Che18].

edit distance Approximate Nearest Neighbor search, after a sequence of improving embedding-based algorithms [Ind04, BYJKK04, BES06, OR07], the state of the art for truly subquadratic time algorithms in d dimensions is a $2^{O(\sqrt{\log d \log \log d})}$ -approximation [OR07]. For embedding into specific norms, some lower bounds were proven, e.g. [ADG⁺03, KN05, AK07, AJP10]. SETH-hardness for the exact problem is also known [ABV15, BI15].

AG codes Algebraic Geometry (AG) codes generalize Reed Solomon and Reed Muller codes. The first construction is due to Goppa [Gop81], but we use an efficiently decodable construction from [SAK⁺01]. AG codes have received significant attention from computer scientists (e.g. [GS99, GP08, BT13, CT13, GX13, GX14, HRW17]). In particular, Meir [Mei13] observed that “algebrization-like” construction (in particular, the proof of $\text{IP} = \text{PSPACE}$) can be obtained with any error correcting codes that satisfy properties that he calls multiplicativity (polynomial closure) and systemacity. Ben-Sasson et al. [BKK⁺16] observed that AG codes satisfy those properties and at the same time achieve a constant rate. They used AG codes to construct PCP of linear size but polynomial query complexity. Finally, [BCG⁺17] used AG codes to construct Interactive Oracle Proofs of linear size, constant query complexity, and a constant number of rounds. We note that our construction is the first to obtain qualitatively new hardness results from AG codes (and our ideas have already inspired even more hardness results in followup work [CLM18, Che18]!).

1.3 Discussion and open problems

While our application of AG codes to the MA-communication protocol is very simple and easily yields strong results like Theorem 1.1, there are a few closely related applications where we are unable to shave the logarithmic factors using AG codes.

MA-communication complexity of Set Disjointness [AW09]’s original protocol gives an $O(\sqrt{n} \log n)$ MA-communication protocol for Set Disjointness. Naively, one would expect that it should be possible to obtain an $O(\sqrt{n})$ protocol using AG codes, which would be tight by [Kla03]. However, there is a step in the protocol that requires verifying that a vector in $\{0, 1\}^{\sqrt{n}}$ is all zeros by looking at its sum; we only know how to perform this step over a large field. In Theorem 3.2 we use related ideas to obtain an $O(\sqrt{n})$ AMA-communication complexity, but we don’t know how to do that for MA-communication. Note also that [AW09]’s protocol also solves the more

general Inner Product problem for the same communication complexity. In an earlier version of this paper, we asked whether the MA-communication complexity of (Set Disjointness / Inner Product) is $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ or $\Theta(\sqrt{n} \log n)$? This was partially answered by [Che18] who gave an $O(\sqrt{n \log n \log \log n})$ protocol using AG codes.

Open Question 1 (MA-communication complexity). *What are the MA-communication complexities of the Set Disjointness and Inner Product problems (known to be between $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ and $O(\sqrt{n \log n \log \log n})$)?*

IP-communication complexity of Set Disjointness [AW09]’s protocol also generalizes to an $O(\log n \log \log n)$ IP-protocol. The IP-protocol uses $O(\log n)$ rounds, where at each round a Reed Solomon code over field size $O(\log n)$ is used. One may hope to obtain an $O(\log n)$ bits protocol using AG codes. But it is crucial that the failure probability in each round is $1 - O(1/\log n)$, whereas AG codes of constant rate cannot obtain distance $1 - o(1)$. We note that this IP protocol is used in [AR18] in the context of Distributed PCP, and reducing the communication to $O(\log n)$ would imply stronger conditional circuit lower bounds.

Open Question 2 (IP-communication complexity). *Is there an $O(\log n)$ IP-communication complexity protocol for Set Disjointness?*

Exact BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR with short vectors Williams [Wil18] recently used a construction closely related to [AW09]’s protocol to prove that, assuming SETH, exact BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR with Euclidean distance requires near-quadratic time even for vectors of dimension $O(\log^2 \log N)$. (He also proves similar results for FURTHEST PAIR and ORTHOGONAL VECTORS.) He poses an open problem to obtain a similar result for constant dimension. Again, the bottleneck is the log-of-field-size factor in the communication protocol, which one may hope to overcome by using constant size fields. Recent work by Chen [Che18] significantly reduced the dimension to $2^{O(\log^* N)}$; but achieving constant dimension remains open.

1.3.1 Looser approximations of BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR

Our techniques can only rule out very good approximations of BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR in strongly-subquadratic time. Indeed for weaker approximation factors there are strongly subquadratic time algorithms. But can we rule out near-linear time algorithms for, say, any constant approximation factor? Even better, can we obtain tight conditional result for every

approximation factor, as [ALRW17] do for data-dependent LSH? Below we discuss some of the technical barriers that seem to arise toward proving such results. We stress that the discussion below is highly informal and should not be used to draw any definite conclusions.

Finer-grain PCP Reductions from SETH to problems in P are typically classified as “fine grain complexity” because they provide a very refined understanding of the running time of problems like BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR, up to sub-polynomial factors. This means that we have to nail the “correct” size of the reduction almost exactly — to within sub-polynomial factors. The PCP blowup we described earlier arises because the reduction size is exponential in the length of the PCP; so our PCP length should be optimal up to sub-*constant* factors!

The Distributed PCP can be seen as a technique for decoupling the size of the reduction into two parts: the exact part that reduces k -SAT to some problem in P (e.g. BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR), and the PCP-like part that is responsible for hardness or approximation gap amplification. In other words, the size of the new instance N_{APPROX} can roughly be described as the product of the size of the exact reduction, $N \approx 2^{n/2}$, and the gap amplification factor, N_{GAP} :

$$N_{\text{APPROX}} \approx N \cdot N_{\text{GAP}}.$$

The first (exact) part is still required to have the correct size, but if the “correct” blowup of gap amplification (N_{GAP}) is tiny, then we can afford some redundancy. For example, in [ARW17] the correct blowup for gap amplification was $N_{\text{GAP}} = N^{o(1)}$, so we could afford to use a much less efficient (losing super-polynomial factors) gap amplification $\widehat{N}_{\text{GAP}} = (N_{\text{GAP}})^{\omega(1)}$, while barely affecting the reduction size: $\widehat{N}_{\text{GAP}} = N^{o(1)}$. In the present paper, the correct gap blowup for proving $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -inapproximability is $N_{\text{GAP}} = N^{f(\varepsilon)}$; using AG codes we can obtain $\widehat{N}_{\text{GAP}} = N^{g(\varepsilon)}$ blowup, which is still OK when ε is sufficiently small. In contrast, by [AR15], a 2-approximation can be obtained in time

$$T(N) \approx (N_{\text{APPROX}})^{8/7} \approx (N \cdot N_{\text{GAP}})^{8/7};$$

plugging in an $T(N) \approx N^2$ lower bound from SETH and solving for N_{GAP} , we estimate that the correct blowup for a factor 2 gap has to be at least $N_{\text{GAP}} \approx N^{6/7}$. Therefore if we don’t get the correct exponent to within a $7/6$ -factor, we cannot keep the total instance size under N^2 , and hence cannot

obtain any super-linear lower bounds on the running time. Even using AG codes, it seems that we lack the techniques for obtaining such fine-grained gap amplification. In particular, all PCP constructions (including Dinur’s combinatorial PCP [Din07]) use error correcting codes, which are inherently redundant.

Triangle inequality This barrier is specific to obtaining hardness of approximation for factor 3 or greater. Consider a naive gadget reduction where we construct a vector for each half assignment. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$ be partial assignments to the first half of the variables, and $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \{0, 1\}^{n/2}$ for the second half. Suppose that $(\alpha_1; \beta_1), (\alpha_2; \beta_1), (\alpha_2; \beta_2)$ satisfy the formula, but (α_1, β_2) does not. Let $a^{\alpha_1}, a^{\alpha_2}, b^{\beta_1}, b^{\beta_2}$ be the corresponding vectors. Then, if our reduction has completeness c and soundness s , we would like to have

$$\|a^{\alpha_1} - b^{\beta_2}\| \geq s \geq 3c \geq \|a^{\alpha_1} - b^{\beta_1}\| + \|a^{\alpha_2} - b^{\beta_2}\| + \|a^{\alpha_2} - b^{\beta_1}\|.$$

But that would violate the triangle inequality. Note that this restricts our ability to prove stronger hardness of approximation even for more complicated metrics like edit distance. It is also important to remark that the reductions based on Distributed PCP (including the ones in this paper) do not exactly fall into this naive gadget reduction framework; nevertheless it is not at all clear that they can overcome this obstacle.

Open Question 3 (3-approximation). *Prove that, assuming SETH and for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$, approximating BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR with Euclidean metric to within factor 3 requires time $\Omega(N^{1+\varepsilon})$.*

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Complexity assumptions

Conjecture 2.1 (Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) [IP01]). *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $k = k(\epsilon)$ such that k -SAT on n variables cannot be solved in time $O(2^{(1-\epsilon)n})$.*

SETH is in particular known to imply the Orthogonal Vectors Conjecture (OVC) [Wil05], which postulates a quadratic-time hardness for the following ORTHOGONAL VECTORS problem:

Problem 2.2 (ORTHOGONAL VECTORS). Given two sets $A, B \subset \{0, 1\}^m$, decide whether there is a pair $(a, b) \in A \times B$ such that $a \cdot b = 0$.

Conjecture 2.3 (Orthogonal Vectors Conjecture (OVC)). *For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $c = c(\delta)$ such that given two sets $A, B \subset \{0, 1\}^m$ of cardinality N , where $m = c \log N$, deciding if there is a pair $(a, b) \in A \times B$ such that $a \cdot b = 0$ cannot be solved in time $O(N^{2-\delta})$.*

2.2 AG codes

Algebraic Geometry (AG) codes generalize Reed Solomon and Reed Muller codes. The first construction is due to Goppa [Gop81], but we use an efficiently decodable construction from [SAK⁺01]. The codewords of Reed Muller codes are low-degree multivariate polynomials. AG codewords are multivariate rational functions (quotients of polynomials). In particular, like Reed Solomon or Reed Muller codes, we can add codewords (for free) and multiply codewords (with some loss in the distance). Here, we only use the following basic properties of AG codes; for a thorough introduction, we refer the reader to [Sti09].

Theorem 2.4 ([SAK⁺01]). *There exists a constant $q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for every prime $q \geq q_0$, there exist two code families $\mathcal{C} \triangleq \{C_n\}$ and $\mathcal{C}' \triangleq \{C'_n\}$ whose codewords are given by functions $w : \mathcal{R}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{q^2}$, for $\mathcal{R}_n \subset \mathbb{F}_{q^2}^{O(\log n)}$. Furthermore, those code families satisfy the following properties:*

Systematicity *There exists a subset $\mathcal{S}_n \subset \mathcal{R}_n$ of cardinality $|\mathcal{S}_n| = \Theta(n)$, such that for any assignment $x : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{q^2}$, there exists a codeword $w \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $w|_{\mathcal{S}_n} = x$.*

Polynomial Closure *\mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' are linear codes; furthermore, for every $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists $w' \in \mathcal{C}'$ such that for every $i \in \mathcal{R}_n$, $w'(i) = w_1(i) \cdot w_2(i)$.*

Parameters *Both codes have (relative) rate at 0.1 and (relative) distance at least 0.1.*

Efficiency *Both codes can be encoded and checked in $\text{poly}(n)$ time.*

3 communication complexity

3.1 MA communication complexity

Theorem 3.1. *The following holds for every $T \in [2, m]$. There is a computationally efficient MA-communication protocol for Set Disjointness over universe $[m]$ where:*

1. Merlin sends Alice $O\left(\frac{m \log T}{T}\right)$ bits.
2. Alice and Bob toss $O(\log m)$ coins.
3. Bob sends Alice $O(T \log T)$ bits.
4. Alice returns Accept or Reject.

If the sets are disjoint, Alice always accepts. Otherwise, she accepts with probability at most $1/2$.

Proof. Assume wlog that T divides m . We partition the universe into T disjoint sets of size m/T : $[m] = U^1 \cup \dots \cup U^T$. Let $\alpha, \beta \subseteq [m]$ denote Alice and Bob's respective inputs; for $t \in [T]$, let $\alpha^t \triangleq \alpha \cap U^t$, and define β^t analogously.

Let C be an algebraic geometry code over field \mathbb{F}_{q^2} with characteristic at least $q \geq T$, as promised by Theorem 2.4; let ρ_C , δ_C , and $n_C = \frac{m}{T\rho_C} = O(m/T)$ denote the relative rate, relative distance, and the length of its codewords. For $t \in [T]$, let $C(\alpha^t), C(\beta^t)$ denote the encodings of α^t and β^t . Then, by the multiplicative (polynomial closure) property, their entry-wise product μ^t (i.e. $\mu^t_i \triangleq [C(\alpha^t)]_i \cdot [C(\beta^t)]_i$) is a codeword in C' . By linearity of C' , the entry-wise sum of the μ^t 's ($\mu_i \triangleq \sum_{t=1}^T \mu^t_i$) is also a codeword of C' .

Since C is a systematic code, we have that for each $i \in [n/T]$, $[C(\alpha^t)]_i, [C(\beta^t)]_i \in \{0, 1\}$, and therefore also $\mu^t_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Observe that the sets are disjoint iff $\mu^t_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$ and $t \in [T]$. Because the characteristic is at least T , this is equivalent to requiring that $\mu_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$.

Now the protocol proceeds as follows:

1. Merlin sends Alice $\hat{\mu}$, which is allegedly the encoding of μ .
2. Alice and Bob pick a random $i^* \in [n_C]$.
3. Bob sends Alice $[C(\beta^t)]_{i^*}$, for all $t \in [T]$.
4. Alice accepts iff all of the following hold:
 - (a) $\hat{\mu}$ is a codeword in C' ;
 - (b) $\hat{\mu}_{i^*} = \sum_{t=1}^T [C(\alpha^t)]_{i^*} \cdot [C(\beta^t)]_{i^*}$; and
 - (c) $\hat{\mu}_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$.

First, we observe that Merlin sends $n_C \cdot \lceil \log T \rceil = O(\log T \cdot m/T)$ bits, and Bob sends $T \cdot \lceil \log T \rceil$ bits, so the communication complexity is as promised in the theorem statement.

If Alice accepts with nonzero probability, then $\hat{\mu}$ is a codeword of C' . Therefore if Alice accepts with probability greater than $1 - \delta_{C'}$ (where $\delta_{C'} \geq 0.1$ is the relative distance of C') then $\hat{\mu}$ is also equal to the true μ . Then this also implies that $\mu_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$. Hence by our earlier observation, the sets are disjoint.

Finally, repeat Steps 2-4 of the protocol (in parallel) a constant number of times to obtain soundness 0.5. \square

3.2 AMA communication complexity

Theorem 3.2. *The following holds for every $T \in [2, m]$. There is a computationally efficient AMA-communication protocol for Set Disjointness over universe $[m]$ where:*

1. Alice and Bob toss $O(\log m)$ coins, and send them to Merlin.
2. Merlin sends Alice $O(m/T)$ bits.
3. Alice and Bob toss $O(\log m)$ coins.
4. Bob sends Alice $O(T)$ bits.
5. Alice returns Accept or Reject.

If the sets are disjoint, Alice always accepts. Otherwise, she accepts with probability at most 1/2.

Proof. The set up is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1, but we use error correcting codes C, C' over a field \mathbb{F}_{q^2} of constant size (that does not depend on T or m).

Partition the set $[m]$ into T parts, and let α^t, β^t be the restriction of α, β (respectively) to the t -th part. Let $C(\alpha^t), C(\beta^t)$ denote the encodings of α^t, β^t , respectively, and let μ^t denote their entrywise product ($\mu_i^t \triangleq [C(\alpha^t)]_i \cdot [C(\beta^t)]_i$).

At the first step of the protocol, Alice and Bob pick a random subset $S \subseteq [T]$. For now, let us assume that S is chosen uniformly at random (note that this already suffices to show $O(\sqrt{n})$ AMA-communication complexity). We will later reduce the number of coins tossed in this step using a standard argument due to Newman [New91].

We now define $\mu(S)$ as the entrywise sum of μ^t , taken only over $t \in S$:

$$\mu_i(S) \triangleq \sum_{t \in S} \mu_i^t.$$

Observe that the sets are disjoint iff $\mu_i^t = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$ and $t \in [T]$. If the sets are indeed disjoint, we also have that $\mu_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$. Otherwise, there exists $i \in [m/T]$ and $t \in [T]$ such that $\mu_i^t = 1$. Fix some choice of $S \setminus \{t\}$, and hence also the value of $\sum_{t' \in S \setminus \{t\}} \mu_i^{t'}$. Conditioned on those, $t \in S$ with probability exactly $1/2$. Therefore, for any value of $\sum_{t' \in S \setminus \{t\}} \mu_i^{t'}$, we have that the sum with t is nonzero with probability at least $1/2$.

Now the protocol proceeds as follows:

1. Alice and Bob pick $S \subseteq [T]$ at random, and send it to Merlin
2. Merlin sends Alice $\hat{\mu}(S)$, which is allegedly the encoding of $\mu(S)$.
3. Alice and Bob pick a random $i^* \in [n_C]$.
4. Bob sends Alice $[C(\beta^t)]_{i^*}$, for all $t \in [T]$.
5. Alice accepts iff all of the following hold:
 - (a) $\hat{\mu}$ is a codeword in C' ;
 - (b) $\hat{\mu}_{i^*}(S) = \sum_{t \in S} [C(\alpha^t)]_{i^*} \cdot [C(\beta^t)]_{i^*}$; and
 - (c) $\hat{\mu}_i(S) = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$.

If Alice accepts with nonzero probability, then $\hat{\mu}$ is a codeword of C' . Therefore if Alice accepts with probability greater than $1 - \delta_{C'}^*$ (where $\delta_{C'}^* \geq 0.1$ is the relative distance of C') then $\hat{\mu}$ is also equal to the true μ . Then this also implies that $\mu_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$. Hence by our earlier observation, if Alice accepts with probability greater than $1 - \delta_{C'}/2$, the sets must be disjoint.

To amplify the soundness to $1/2$, we need to repeat the protocol. For fixed non-disjoint input α, β , we say that Step 1 of the protocol fails if $\mu_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m/T]$. We repeat this step of the protocol twice (in parallel) so the probability that both repetitions fail is only $1/4$. Notice that it is safe to repeat this step in parallel (i.e. we do not need to invoke a “parallel repetition” theorem) because the failure probability of this step does not depend on Merlin’s actions. Similarly, we repeat Steps 3-5 of the protocol, in parallel to amplify the overall soundness of the protocol to $1/2$.

Finally, instead of sampling S uniformly at random, Alice, Bob and Merlin can agree in advance on a candidate family \mathcal{S} of sets S^j , chosen uniformly at random. For any fixed input α, β , the probability that Step 1 fails on significantly more than half of the S^j is $2^{-O(|\mathcal{S}|)}$. Setting $|\mathcal{S}| = \Theta(m)$ allows us to take a union bound over all choices of α, β . Therefore Alice and Bob only need $\log |\mathcal{S}| = O(\log m)$ coins to choose a random set $S^j \in \mathcal{S}$. \square

4 Approximate Closest Pair

Theorem 4.1 (Detailed version of Theorem 1.1). *Unless SETH and OVC are false, the following holds for any ℓ_p metric, for constant p (including Hamming, Manhattan, and Euclidean distance): for every $\delta > 0$ there exists an $\epsilon = \epsilon(\delta, p)$ such that given a set $A, B \subset \{0, 1\}^d$ of N vectors (where $d = O(\log N)$), computing a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation to BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR requires time $\Omega(N^{2-\delta})$.*

Proof. We consider the MA-protocol from Theorem 3.1, instantiated with parameter $T = T(\epsilon) = O\left(\frac{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}\right)$. Let $T' = 2^{O(\log T \cdot T)}$ denote the number of different possible messages sent by Bob in the protocol. We set T so that $T' = O(1/\epsilon)$.

Our reduction takes as input an instance $(A_{\text{OV}}, B_{\text{OV}})$ of ORTHOGONAL VECTORS over $\{0, 1\}^m$. For each vector $\beta \in B_{\text{OV}}$, we construct a new vector $\tilde{b}^\beta \in \{0, 1\}^{T' \times m}$ by setting $[\tilde{b}^\beta]_{i,j} \triangleq 1$ iff Bob sends message i on input β' and randomness j . For each Merlin-message $\mu \in \{0, 1\}^{O(\log T \cdot m/T)}$ and each vector $\alpha \in A_{\text{OV}}$, we construct a new vector $\tilde{a}^{\mu, \alpha} \in \{0, 1\}^{T' \times m}$ as follows: $[\tilde{a}^{\mu, \alpha}]_{i,j} \triangleq 1$ iff Alice accepts on input α , message μ from Merlin, message i from Bob, and randomness j . Notice also that the inner product of two vectors $\tilde{a}^{\mu, \alpha} \cdot \tilde{b}^\beta$ is exactly proportional to the probability that Alice and Bob accept on inputs α, β and message μ from Merlin. In particular, if α and β are not disjoint/orthogonal, the inner product is at most $\tilde{a}^{\mu, \alpha} \cdot \tilde{b}^\beta \leq m/2$. Otherwise, there exists a μ such that $\tilde{a}^{\mu, \alpha} \cdot \tilde{b}^\beta = m$.

To argue about distances we have to make one small modification. We replace vector $\tilde{a} \in \{0, 1\}^{T' \times m}$ by vector $a \in \{0, 1\}^{T' \times m \times 2}$ constructed as follows: $a_{i,j,1} \triangleq \tilde{a}_{i,j}$ and $a_{i,j,2} \triangleq 1 - \tilde{a}_{i,j}$. This guarantees that the number of 1's in every a -vector is the same ($T' \cdot m$). The number of 1's in b -vectors was already the same (m), so we can just define $b_{i,j,1} \triangleq \tilde{b}_{i,j}$ and $b_{i,j,2} \triangleq 0$.

We now have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{(i,j,b) \in [T'] \times [m] \times [2]} \left[[\tilde{a}^{\mu,\alpha}]_{i,j,b} \neq [\tilde{b}^\beta]_{i,j,b} \right] &= \Pr \left[[\tilde{a}^{\mu,\alpha}]_{i,j,b} = 1 \right] + \Pr \left[[\tilde{b}^\beta]_{i,j,b} = 1 \right] - 2 \left(\frac{\tilde{a}^{\mu,\alpha} \cdot \tilde{b}^\beta}{T' \cdot m \cdot 2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2T'} - \frac{1}{T'} \Pr[\text{Alice accepts}]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for every $p > 0$ we have that

$$\min_\mu \left\| \tilde{a}^{\mu,\alpha} - \tilde{b}^\beta \right\|_p^p = \begin{cases} m(T' - 1) & \alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset \\ \geq mT' & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

For any constant p , taking the $(1/p)$ -th power we have that ORTHOGONAL VECTORS reduces to approximating BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR in ℓ_p norm to within a factor of

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{T' - 1} \right)^{1/p} \geq 1 + \Omega_p \left(\frac{1}{T'} \right).$$

The result for Hamming distance follows from Manhattan distance since all the entries are in $\{0, 1\}$.

Finally, observe that our reduction increases the number of vectors by a factor of $2^{O(\log T \cdot m/T)} = 2^{O(m \cdot \frac{\log^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}})}$. Hence in total, if there are $N_{OV} = 2^{m/c}$ vectors in the OVC instance, our new instance of BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR has $N = 2^{m(1/c + O(\frac{\log^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}))}$ vectors. In particular, approximating BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR to within $1 + \epsilon$ is as hard as solving the original instance of ORTHOGONAL VECTORS, which by OVC requires time

$$\begin{aligned} (|A_{OV}| + |B_{OV}|)^{2-\delta_{OV}} &= \left(2^{m/c} \right)^{2-\delta_{OV}} \\ &= N^2 / 2^{m(\delta_{OV}/c - O(\frac{\log^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}))} \\ &= N^{2-\delta}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the last equality follows by choosing $\delta = O(\delta_{OV} + \frac{c \log^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}})$, where δ_{OV} and $c = c(\delta_{OV})$ are as in the OVC.

Finally, notice that the vectors we construct have dimension $2T' \cdot m = O(m) = O(\log N)$. \square

4.1 Edit distance

Below we restate and prove our hardness for BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR with edit distance. In the proof, we use a somewhat non-standard (but equivalent) notion of edit distance, where we think of characters from both strings being deleted or substituted (as opposed to inserting, deleting, and substituting characters from one string).

Theorem 4.2 (Detailed version of Theorem 1.2). *Unless SETH and OVC are false, the following holds for edit distance: for every $\delta > 0$ there exists an $\epsilon = \epsilon(\delta)$ such that given a set $A, B \subset \{0, 1\}^d$ of N vectors (where $d = O(\log N \log \log N)$), computing a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation to BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR requires time $\Omega(N^{2-\delta})$.*

Proof. We first provide a randomized construction. We will later describe how to efficiently derandomize it.

We begin with a hard instance (A_H, B_H) of Hamming distance BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR as guaranteed by Theorem 4.1. Let $d_H = O(\log N)$ be the dimension of the vectors in (A_H, B_H) . We draw $2d_H$ binary random strings of dimension $d' = O(\log d_H)$ uniformly at random, denoted $s_0^i, s_1^i \in \{0, 1\}^{d'}$, $\forall i \in [d_H]$. By Claim 4.4, for any two random strings $s_c^i, s_{c'}^{i'}$, the expectation of their edit distance $\lambda_{2,d'}^{\text{ED}} \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\text{ED}(s_c^i, s_{c'}^{i'})]$ is bounded from below by $\Omega(d')$. By Claim 4.3, their edit distance $\text{ED}(s_c^i, s_{c'}^{i'})$ also concentrates around its expectation to within $\pm o(d')$, with probability $1 - 1/\text{poly}(d_H)$. Furthermore, by applying the same claim with union bound, if we consider any choice c_1, \dots, c_{d_H} , and any contiguous substring of $s_{c_1}^1 \circ \dots \circ s_{c_{d_H}}^{d_H}$, its distance from any string $s_{1-c_i}^i$ is within $(1 \pm o(1))$ factor of the expected edit distance of two strings of those lengths (w.h.p.).

Our reduction is constructed as follows. For each vector $u_H \in A_H \cup B_H$ we construct a vector $u \in \{0, 1\}^d$, for $d \triangleq d_H \cdot d'$, by replacing the i -th bit of u_H with one of s_0^i, s_1^i . Let $[u_H]_i$ denote the i -th bit of u_H ; then define $u^i \triangleq s_{[u_H]_i}^i$, and also

$$u \triangleq u^1 \circ \dots \circ u^{d_H} = s_{[u_H]_1}^1 \circ \dots \circ s_{[u_H]_{d_H}}^{d_H}.$$

Analysis

We now argue that for any u_H, v_H , we have that

$$\text{ED}(u, v) = \lambda_{2,d'}^{\text{ED}} \cdot \Delta_{\text{HAMMING}}(u_H, v_H) \pm o(d).$$

By matching every pair of i -th strings, it is clear that $\text{ED}(u, v) \leq \lambda_{2,d'}^{\text{ED}} \cdot \Delta_{\text{HAMMING}}(u_H, v_H) + o(d)$. To see the other direction, it remains to show that there doesn't exist a much better way to edit u and v . Recall the partition of u into the d_H substrings u^1, \dots, u^{d_H} . Fix an optimal way to edit u and v , and partition v into d_H contiguous substrings $\hat{v}^1, \dots, \hat{v}^{d_H}$, where all the characters in each \hat{v}^i are either deleted or matched to a character from u^i . We now have that

$$\text{ED}(u, v) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_H} \text{ED}(u^i, \hat{v}^i). \quad (2)$$

Let $G \subseteq [d_H]$ denote the set of coordinates on which u_H, v_H agree (notice that $\Delta_{\text{HAMMING}}(u_H, v_H) = d_H - |G|$). We lower bound the sum on the RHS of (2) by considering $i \in G$ and $i \notin G$ separately.

- For $i \in G$, we lower bound the contribution to the edit distance by the difference in length, namely

$$\text{ED}(u^i, \hat{v}^i) \geq ||u^i| - |\hat{v}^i||, \quad (3)$$

where we use $|\hat{v}^i|$ to denote the length of \hat{v}^i (in particular, $|u^i| = d'$ for all i).

- Consider the sum of the edit distances over $i \notin G$. Let us first replace u^i, \hat{v}^i with freshly drawn random x^i, y^i of same lengths. By concentration, we have that

$$\sum_{i \notin G} \text{ED}(u^i, \hat{v}^i) \geq (1 - o(1)) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \notin G} \text{ED}(x^i, y^i) \right].$$

By subadditivity, the latter is at least the expected edit distance between two long strings x, y of respective lengths $\sum_{i \notin G} |u^i|, \sum_{i \notin G} |\hat{v}^i|$. Assume without loss of generality that $\sum_{i \notin G} |u^i| \geq \sum_{i \notin G} |\hat{v}^i|$ (i.e. x is longer). Let y' be a uniformly random string of length $\sum_{i \notin G} |u^i|$. We now have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \notin G} \text{ED}(x^i, y^i) \right] &\geq \mathbb{E} [\text{ED}(x, y)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} [\text{ED}(x, y')] - \left| \sum_{i \notin G} |u^i| - \sum_{i \notin G} |\hat{v}^i| \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where the second inequality follows by triangle inequality.

Summing (3) and (4), we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d_H} \text{ED}(u^i, \hat{v}^i) \geq (1 + o(1)) \mathbb{E}[\text{ED}(x, y')],$$

where x, y' are uniformly random strings of length at least $\sum_{i \notin G} |u^i| = d' \cdot \Delta_{\text{HAMMING}}(u_H, v_H)$. Finally, by subadditivity of the edit distance and Fekete's Lemma, the expected distance between two random strings over their lengths converges to some constant, so (for sufficiently large d),

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{ED}(x, y')] \geq (1 - o(1)) \frac{\sum_{i \notin G} |u^i|}{d'} \lambda_{2, d'}^{\text{ED}}.$$

Hence also

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d_H} \text{ED}(u^i, \hat{v}^i) \geq (1 - o(1)) \lambda_{2, d'}^{\text{ED}} \cdot \Delta_{\text{HAMMING}}(u_H, v_H).$$

Derandomizing the construction

In the construction above we used $2d = \Theta(\log N \log \log N)$ random bits to generate the strings s_c^i . We can reduce the number of random bits to $\text{poly} \log \log N$ by making the strings $\log \log N$ -wise independent (e.g. [Kop13]), over which we can enumerate in $N^{o(1)}$ time. (Note that there is another $O(\log \log N)$ factor because each string requires $d' = O(\log \log N)$ random bits, and yet another $\log d_H = O(\log \log N)$ random bits because we generate $2d_H$ random strings.)

If the strings are pairwise independent, this already suffices to guarantee that $\text{ED}(s_c^i, s_{c'}^{i'}) = (1 \pm o(1)) \lambda_{2, d'}^{\text{ED}}$ for every $s_c^i, s_{c'}^{i'}$, with high probability. But when we argued about the edit distance between any contiguous substring of $s_{c_1}^1 \circ \dots \circ s_{c_{d_H}}^{d_H}$ and $s_{1-c_i}^i$, we assumed the strings $s_{c_1}^1, \dots, s_{c_{d_H}}^{d_H}$ are all fully independent (in particular, we took a union bound over all 2^{d_H} choices of c_1, \dots, c_{d_H}). Instead, we observe that it suffices to use the probabilistic argument only for contiguous substrings of length $O(d')$, i.e. substrings that intersect with only a constant number of $s_{c_i}^i$: for longer substrings, their edit distance to $s_{1-c_i}^i$ is always almost maximal, because the $s_{1-c_i}^i$ is much shorter so we have to delete almost the entire longer substring. Therefore using $\log \log N = \omega(1)$ -wise independent strings suffices. \square

4.1.1 Edit distance between random strings

Claim 4.3 (Concentration of edit distance). Let $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be an arbitrary string, and let $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^m$ be chosen uniformly at random. Then for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\Pr_x [|\text{ED}(z, x) - \mathbb{E}_y [\text{ED}(z, y)]| > t] \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2t^2}{m} \right).$$

Proof. For any choice of $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$ and $i \in [n]$, let $\hat{x}^i \triangleq (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 1 - x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_m)$. Observe that by the triangle inequality,

$$|\text{ED}(z, x) - \text{ED}(z, \hat{x}^i)| \leq \text{ED}(x, \hat{x}^i) = 1.$$

The claim follows from McDiarmid's inequality. \square

Claim 4.4 (Expectation of edit distance). Let $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be an arbitrary string, and let $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be chosen uniformly at random. Then

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} [\text{ED}(z, x)] \geq 0.08686.$$

Proof. By [Lue09], the expected length of the longest common subsequence (Chvatal-Sankoff constant, γ_2) for sufficiently large n is at most

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} [\text{LCS}(z, x)] \leq 0.826280.$$

The claim follows from $\text{ED}(z, x) \geq (n - \mathbb{E} [\text{LCS}(z, x)]) / 2$. \square

4.2 Approximate Nearest Neighbor

For completeness, we present the proof of Corollary 1.3 from Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. Variants of this reduction have appeared many times before; to the best of our knowledge, the original idea is due to [WW10].

Proof of Corollary 1.3. We show that given an Approximate Nearest Neighbor data structure with preprocessing time $O(N^c)$ and query time $O(N^{1-\delta})$, we can obtain an algorithm for BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR that runs in time $O(N^{2-\delta'})$ for $\delta' = \delta'(\delta, c)$. Set $\gamma \triangleq 1/2c$. Given an instance (A, B) of BICHROMATIC CLOSEST PAIR, partition the set A into $N^{1-\gamma}$ disjoint subsets A_1, \dots, A_{N^γ} . Now preprocess each set A_i in time $O((N^\gamma)^c) = O(N^{1/2})$, so $O(N^{3/2-\gamma})$ in total for $O(N^{1-\gamma})$ subsets. For each $b \in B$, query each of the data structures in time $O((N^\gamma)^{1-\delta}) = O(N^{\gamma-\gamma\delta})$, so $O(N^{2-\gamma\delta})$ in

total. Note that if there exists a close pair (a^*, b^*) , when we query the subset that contains a^* with vector b^* we are guaranteed to find a pair which is approximately as close. \square

References

- [ABV15] Amir Abboud, Arturs Backurs, and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Tight hardness results for LCS and other sequence similarity measures. In *Proc. of the 56th FOCS*, pages 59–78, 2015.
- [AC14] Sunil Arya and Timothy M. Chan. Better ϵ -dependencies for offline approximate nearest neighbor search, euclidean minimum spanning trees, and ϵ -kernels. In *30th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry, SOCG’14, Kyoto, Japan, June 08 - 11, 2014*, page 416, 2014.
- [ACP08] Alexandr Andoni, Dorian Croitoru, and Mihai Patrascu. Hardness of nearest neighbor under l-infinity. In *Proc. of the 49th FOCS*, pages 424–433, 2008.
- [ACW16] Josh Alman, Timothy M. Chan, and R. Ryan Williams. Polynomial representations of threshold functions and algorithmic applications. In *IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2016, 9-11 October 2016, Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA*, pages 467–476, 2016.
- [ADG⁺03] Alexandr Andoni, Michel Deza, Anupam Gupta, Piotr Indyk, and Sofya Raskhodnikova. Lower bounds for embedding edit distance into normed spaces. In *Proc. of the 14th SODA*, pages 523–526, 2003.
- [AES91] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Herbert Edelsbrunner, and Otfried Schwarzkopf. Euclidean minimum spanning trees and bichromatic closest pairs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 6:407–422, 1991.
- [AF03] Sunil Arya and Ho-Yam Addy Fu. Expected-case complexity of approximate nearest neighbor searching. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 32(3):793–815, 2003.

- [Ahl17] Thomas Dybdahl Ahle. Optimal las vegas locality sensitive data structures. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017*, pages 938–949, 2017.
- [AI06] Alexandr Andoni and Piotr Indyk. Near-optimal hashing algorithms for approximate nearest neighbor in high dimensions. In *Proc. of the 47th FOCS*, pages 459–468. IEEE, 2006.
- [AIL⁺15] Alexandr Andoni, Piotr Indyk, Thijs Laarhoven, Ilya Razenshteyn, and Ludwig Schmidt. Practical and optimal lsh for angular distance. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1225–1233, 2015.
- [AINR14] Alexandr Andoni, Piotr Indyk, Huy L Nguyen, and Ilya Razenshteyn. Beyond locality-sensitive hashing. In *Proc. of the 25th SODA*, pages 1018–1028. SIAM, 2014.
- [AIP06] Alexandr Andoni, Piotr Indyk, and Mihai Patrascu. On the optimality of the dimensionality reduction method. In *Proc. of the 47th FOCS*, pages 449–458. IEEE, 2006.
- [AJP10] Alexandr Andoni, T. S. Jayram, and Mihai Patrascu. Lower bounds for edit distance and product metrics via poincaré-type inequalities. In *Proc. of the 21st SODA*, pages 184–192, 2010.
- [AK07] Alexandr Andoni and Robert Krauthgamer. The computational hardness of estimating edit distance [extended abstract]. In *Proc. of the 48th FOCS*, pages 724–734, 2007.
- [ALM⁺98] Sanjeev Arora, Carsten Lund, Rajeev Motwani, Madhu Sudan, and Mario Szegedy. Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems. *J. ACM*, 45(3):501–555, 1998.
- [ALRW17] Alexandr Andoni, Thijs Laarhoven, Ilya P. Razenshteyn, and Erik Waingarten. Optimal hashing-based time-space trade-offs for approximate near neighbors. In *Proc. of the 28th SODA*, pages 47–66, 2017.
- [AM93] Sunil Arya and David M. Mount. Approximate nearest neighbor queries in fixed dimensions. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual ACM/SIGACT-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, 25-27 January 1993, Austin, Texas.*, pages 271–280, 1993.

- [AMM09] Sunil Arya, Theocharis Malamatos, and David M. Mount. Space-time tradeoffs for approximate nearest neighbor searching. *J. ACM*, 57(1):1:1–1:54, 2009.
- [AMN⁺94] Sunil Arya, David M. Mount, Nathan S. Netanyahu, Ruth Silverman, and Angela Y. Wu. An optimal algorithm for approximate nearest neighbor searching. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. 23-25 January 1994, Arlington, Virginia.*, pages 573–582, 1994.
- [AR15] Alexandr Andoni and Ilya Razenshteyn. Optimal data-dependent hashing for approximate near neighbors. In *Proc. of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 793–801. ACM, 2015.
- [AR18] Amir Abboud and Aviad Rubinstein. Fast and deterministic constant factor approximation algorithms for LCS imply new circuit lower bounds. In *9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2018, January 11-14, 2018, Cambridge, MA, USA*, pages 35:1–35:14, 2018.
- [ARW17] Amir Abboud, Aviad Rubinstein, and R. Ryan Williams. Distributed PCP theorems for hardness of approximation in P. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017*, pages 25–36, 2017.
- [AS98] Sanjeev Arora and Shmuel Safra. Probabilistic checking of proofs: A new characterization of NP. *J. ACM*, 45(1):70–122, 1998.
- [AV15] Amirali Abdullah and Suresh Venkatasubramanian. A directed isoperimetric inequality with application to bregman near neighbor lower bounds. In *Proc. of the 47th STOC*, pages 509–518. ACM, 2015.
- [AW09] Scott Aaronson and Avi Wigderson. Algebrization: A new barrier in complexity theory. *TOCT*, 1(1):2:1–2:54, 2009.
- [AW15] Josh Alman and Ryan Williams. Probabilistic polynomials and hamming nearest neighbors. In *Proc. of the 56th FOCS*, pages 136–150. IEEE, 2015.

- [BCG⁺17] Eli Ben-Sasson, Alessandro Chiesa, Ariel Gabizon, Michael Riabzev, and Nicholas Spooner. Interactive oracle proofs with constant rate and query complexity. pages 40:1–40:15, 2017.
- [BES06] Tuğkan Batu, Funda Ergun, and Cenk Sahinalp. Oblivious string embeddings and edit distance approximations. In *Proc. of the seventeenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithm*, pages 792–801. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2006.
- [BI15] Arturs Backurs and Piotr Indyk. Edit Distance Cannot Be Computed in Strongly Subquadratic Time (unless SETH is false). In *Proc. of the 47th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 51–58, 2015.
- [BKK⁺16] Eli Ben-Sasson, Yohay Kaplan, Swastik Kopparty, Or Meir, and Henning Stichtenoth. Constant rate pcps for circuit-sat with sublinear query complexity. *J. ACM*, 63(4):32:1–32:57, 2016.
- [BS76] Jon Louis Bentley and Michael Ian Shamos. Divide-and-conquer in multidimensional space. In *Proceedings of the 8th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 3-5, 1976, Hershey, Pennsylvania, USA*, pages 220–230, 1976.
- [BT13] Avraham Ben-Aroya and Amnon Ta-Shma. Constructing small-bias sets from algebraic-geometric codes. *Theory of Computing*, 9:253–272, 2013.
- [BYJKK04] Ziv Bar-Yossef, TS Jayram, Robert Krauthgamer, and Ravi Kumar. Approximating edit distance efficiently. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2004. Proceedings. 45th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 550–559. IEEE, 2004.
- [Cha17] Timothy M. Chan. Orthogonal range searching in moderate dimensions: k-d trees and range trees strike back. In *33rd International Symposium on Computational Geometry, SoCG 2017, July 4-7, 2017, Brisbane, Australia*, pages 27:1–27:15, 2017.
- [Che18] Lijie Chen. On the hardness of approximate and exact (bichromatic) maximum inner product. *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, 25:26, 2018.

- [CLM18] Karthik C.S., Bundit Laekhanukit, and Pasin Manurangsi. On the parameterized complexity of approximating dominating set. In *STOC*, 2018. To appear.
- [CR10] Amit Chakrabarti and Oded Regev. An optimal randomized cell probe lower bound for approximate nearest neighbor searching. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(5):1919–1940, 2010.
- [CT13] Gil Cohen and Amnon Ta-Shma. Pseudorandom generators for low degree polynomials from algebraic geometry codes. *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, 20:155, 2013.
- [Din07] Irit Dinur. The PCP theorem by gap amplification. *J. ACM*, 54(3):12, 2007.
- [DKL16] Roe David, Karthik C. S., and Bundit Laekhanukit. The curse of medium dimension for geometric problems in almost every norm. *CoRR*, abs/1608.03245, 2016.
- [GBT84] Harold N. Gabow, Jon Louis Bentley, and Robert Endre Tarjan. Scaling and related techniques for geometry problems. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, April 30 - May 2, 1984, Washington, DC, USA*, pages 135–143, 1984.
- [Gop81] Valerii Denisovich Goppa. Codes on algebraic curves. *Soviet mathematics - Doklady*, 24:170–172, 1981.
- [GP08] Venkatesan Guruswami and Anindya C. Patthak. Correlated algebraic-geometric codes: Improved list decoding over bounded alphabets. *Math. Comput.*, 77(261):447–473, 2008.
- [GS99] Venkatesan Guruswami and Madhu Sudan. Improved decoding of reed-solomon and algebraic-geometry codes. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 45(6):1757–1767, 1999.
- [GX13] Venkatesan Guruswami and Chaoping Xing. List decoding reed-solomon, algebraic-geometric, and gabidulin subcodes up to the singleton bound. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC’13, Palo Alto, CA, USA, June 1-4, 2013*, pages 843–852, 2013.

- [GX14] Venkatesan Guruswami and Chaoping Xing. Optimal rate list decoding of folded algebraic-geometric codes over constant-sized alphabets. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 1858–1866, 2014.
- [HRW17] Brett Hemenway, Noga Ron-Zewi, and Mary Wootters. Local list recovery of high-rate tensor codes and applications. *CoRR*, abs/1706.03383, 2017.
- [IM98] Piotr Indyk and Rajeev Motwani. Approximate nearest neighbors: towards removing the curse of dimensionality. In *Proc. of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 604–613. ACM, 1998.
- [Ind99] Piotr Indyk. A sublinear time approximation scheme for clustering in metric spaces. In *40th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS*, pages 154–159, 1999.
- [Ind00] Piotr Indyk. Dimensionality reduction techniques for proximity problems. In *Proc. of the Eleventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 371–378, 2000.
- [Ind03] Piotr Indyk. Better algorithms for high-dimensional proximity problems via asymmetric embeddings. In *Proc. of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 539–545, 2003.
- [Ind04] Piotr Indyk. Approximate nearest neighbor under edit distance via product metrics. In *Proc. of the Fifteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 646–650, 2004.
- [IP01] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-sat. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
- [KKK16] Matti Karppa, Petteri Kaski, and Jukka Kohonen. A faster subquadratic algorithm for finding outlier correlations. In *Proc. of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1288–1305. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2016.

- [Kla03] Hartmut Klauck. Rectangle size bounds and threshold covers in communication complexity. In *18th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (Complexity 2003), 7-10 July 2003, Aarhus, Denmark*, pages 118–134, 2003.
- [Kle97] Jon M. Kleinberg. Two algorithms for nearest-neighbor search in high dimensions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, El Paso, Texas, USA, May 4-6, 1997*, pages 599–608, 1997.
- [KM95] Samir Khuller and Yossi Matias. A simple randomized sieve algorithm for the closest-pair problem. *Inf. Comput.*, 118(1):34–37, 1995.
- [KN05] Subhash Khot and Assaf Naor. Nonembeddability theorems via fourier analysis. In *Proc. of the 46th FOCS*, pages 101–110. IEEE, 2005.
- [Kop13] Swastik Kopparty. Lecture 5: k-wise independent hashing and applications, 2013. Lecture notes for Topics in Complexity Theory and Pseudorandomness (Rutgers University).
- [KOR00] Eyal Kushilevitz, Rafail Ostrovsky, and Yuval Rabani. Efficient search for approximate nearest neighbor in high dimensional spaces. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 30(2):457–474, 2000.
- [KP12] Michael Kapralov and Rina Panigrahy. Nns lower bounds via metric expansion for l_∞ and emd. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 545–556. Springer, 2012.
- [LPY16] Mingmou Liu, Xiaoyin Pan, and Yitong Yin. Randomized approximate nearest neighbor search with limited adaptivity. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures, SPAA 2016, Asilomar State Beach/Pacific Grove, CA, USA, July 11-13, 2016*, pages 23–33, 2016.
- [Lue09] George S. Lueker. Improved bounds on the average length of longest common subsequences. *J. ACM*, 56(3):17:1–17:38, 2009.
- [Mei13] Or Meir. IP = PSPACE using error-correcting codes. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(1):380–403, 2013.

- [MNP07] Rajeev Motwani, Assaf Naor, and Rina Panigrahy. Lower bounds on locality sensitive hashing. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 21(4):930–935, 2007.
- [New91] Ilan Newman. Private vs. common random bits in communication complexity. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 39(2):67–71, 1991.
- [OR07] Rafail Ostrovsky and Yuval Rabani. Low distortion embeddings for edit distance. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 54(5):23, 2007.
- [OWZ14] Ryan O’Donnell, Yi Wu, and Yuan Zhou. Optimal lower bounds for locality-sensitive hashing (except when q is tiny). *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)*, 6(1):5, 2014.
- [PT07] Mihai Patrascu and Mikkel Thorup. Randomization does not help searching predecessors. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2007, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 7-9, 2007*, pages 555–564, 2007.
- [PTW08] Rina Panigrahy, Kunal Talwar, and Udi Wieder. A geometric approach to lower bounds for approximate near-neighbor search and partial match. In *Proc. of the 49th FOCS*, pages 414–423. IEEE, 2008.
- [PTW10] Rina Panigrahy, Kunal Talwar, and Udi Wieder. Lower bounds on near neighbor search via metric expansion. In *Proc. of the 51st FOCS*, pages 805–814. IEEE, 2010.
- [Raz17] Ilya Razenshteyn. *High-Dimensional Similarity Search and Sketching: Algorithms and Hardness*. PhD thesis, MIT, 2017.
- [SAK⁺01] Kenneth W. Shum, Ilia Aleshnikov, P. Vijay Kumar, Henning Stichtenoth, and Vinay Deolalikar. A low-complexity algorithm for the construction of algebraic-geometric codes better than the gilbert-varshamov bound. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 47(6):2225–2241, 2001.
- [SH75] Michael Ian Shamos and Dan Hoey. Closest-point problems. In *16th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Berkeley, California, USA, October 13-15, 1975*, pages 151–162, 1975.

- [Sti09] Henning Stichtenoth. *Algebraic Function Fields and Codes*, chapter Algebraic Geometry Codes, pages 45–65. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [Val15] Gregory Valiant. Finding correlations in subquadratic time, with applications to learning parities and the closest pair problem. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 62(2):13, 2015.
- [Wil05] R. Ryan Williams. A new algorithm for optimal 2-constraint satisfaction and its implications. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 348(2–3):357–365, 2005.
- [Wil18] Ryan Williams. On the difference between closest, furthest, and orthogonal pairs: Nearly-linear vs barely-subquadratic complexity. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, pages 1207–1215, 2018.
- [WW10] Virginia Vassilevska Williams and Ryan Williams. Subcubic equivalences between path, matrix and triangle problems. In *51th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2010, October 23-26, 2010, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*, pages 645–654, 2010.