

On Separation between the Degree of a Boolean Function and the Block Sensitivity

Nikolay V. Proskurin

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia
 nproskurin@hse.ru

Abstract. In this paper we study the separation between two complexity measures: the degree of a Boolean function as a polynomial over the reals and its block sensitivity. We show that separation between these two measures can be improved from $d^2(f) \geq bs(f)$, established by Tal ([17]), to $d^2(f) \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)bs(f)$. As a corollary, we show that separations between some other complexity measures are not tight as well, for instance, we can improve recent sensitivity conjecture result by Huang ([8]) to $s^4(f) \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)bs(f)$. Our techniques are based on paper by Nisan and Szegedy ([12]) and include more detailed analysis of a symmetrization polynomial.

In our next result we show the same type of improvement in the separation between the approximate degree of a Boolean function and its block sensitivity: we show that $\deg_{1/3}^2(f) \geq \sqrt{6/10}bs(f)$ and improve the previous result by Nisan and Szegedy ([12]) $\deg_{1/3}(f) \geq \sqrt{bs(f)/6}$. In addition, we construct an example which shows that gap between constants in the lower bound and in the known upper bound is less than 0.2.

In our last result we study the properties of conjectured fully sensitive function on 10 variables of degree 4, existence of which would lead to improvement of the biggest known gap between these two measures. We prove that there is the only univariate polynomial that can be achieved by symmetrization of this function by using the combination of interpolation and linear programming techniques.

Keywords: degree of a Boolean function · approximate degree · block sensitivity

1 Introduction

Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a Boolean function. We can represent f in many ways, for example, as a polynomial over the reals. It is easy to show that every Boolean function can be uniquely represented as such polynomial (see [9, exercise 2.23]), so we can introduce a complexity measure that is the degree of polynomial that represents f , denoted as $d(f)$. Another representation of f related to polynomial is approximating one: we say that polynomial ε -approximates f if for any $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ we have $|f(x) - p(x)| \leq \varepsilon$. Such polynomial makes sense for any $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$,

and it is often assumed that $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{3}$. By $\deg_\varepsilon(f)$ we denote the minimum degree among polynomials which ε -approximates f .

Real and approximation degrees are closely related to the model called decision trees. The main measure in this model is decision tree complexity $D(f)$, which is equal to amount of bits in input we need to ask in order to give the value of f on such input. Other complexity measures includes sensitivity $s(f)$ and block sensitivity $bs(f)$. If we denote

$$x^{(R)} = \begin{cases} 1 - x_i & i \in R \\ x_i & i \notin R \end{cases}$$

then the local block sensitivity $bs(f, x)$ is the largest amount of disjoint blocks R_1, \dots, R_t for which $f(x) \neq f(x^{(R)})$. Block sensitivity in general is the maximum of local block sensitivities over $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Local sensitivity and sensitivity defined similarly with restriction that all blocks must be of size 1. See [4] for detailed survey about these and other complexity measures in decision tree model.

One of the questions involving various complexity measures is determining relations between them. For example, recently Huang resolved ([8]) the well-known sensitivity conjecture and established that $s^4(f) \geq bs(f)$. As for polynomials, the first result of this kind was made by Nisan and Szegedy: they analyzed symmetrizations of Boolean functions and showed that $2d^2(f) \geq bs(f)$ ([12]). Later, Tal improved this separation by a constant factor by studying the function composition, proving that $d^2(f) \geq bs(f)$ ([17]). However, the best known example with low degree and high block sensitivity is due to Kushilevitz [7, Example 6.3.2], in which $bs(f) = n = 6^k$ while $d(f) = 3^k = n^{\log_6 3} \simeq n^{0.61}$. That means there is still a large gap between upper and lower bounds in separation between these measures. Our result is the next constant factor improving:

Theorem 1.

$$d^2(f) \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)bs(f) \simeq 1.16bs(f) \quad (1)$$

As a corollary of this result, we also improve some other relations between complexity measures, including Huang's result: we prove that $s^4(f) \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)bs(f)$.

As for approximating polynomials, Nisan and Szegedy proved that $\deg_{1/3}(f) \geq \sqrt{bs(f)/6}$ and provided an example (namely, the OR_n function) for which result is tight up to a constant factor. Later, similar result were archived for this and other Boolean functions [16,5,2]. In presented papers, authors were not interested in constant factor in bounds. In our result, we improve the constant in the lower bound and proof that

Theorem 2.

$$\deg_{1/3}^2(f) \geq \sqrt{\frac{6}{101}}bs(f) \simeq 0.24bs(f) \quad (2)$$

We also provide an example of a Boolean function (namely, the NAE_n) which can be approximate with polynomial of degree asymptotically tight to our bound

and with low constant factor in it; in fact, this difference is less than 0.2, which shows that lower bound is not far from optimal.

Another way to approach the problem of separation between $d(f)$ and $bs(f)$ is to provide examples of functions of low degree and high sensitivity. The first known example was given by Nisan and Szegedy: like in Kushilevitz's function, f is fully sensitive, depends on $n = 3^k$ variables and $d(f) = 2^k = n^{\log_3 2} \simeq n^{0.63}$. Both examples achieved by composing the base function with itself arbitrary amount of times, and one can show that in fully sensitive case in such composition both $d(f)$ and $bs(f)$ remain the same in terms of n . This technique was later studied by Tal in [17]. In [12] base polynomial consists of 3 variables and has degree of 2, while in [7, Example 6.3.2] it has 6 variables and degree of 3. In both examples $2n = d(d+1)$, so the next natural step is the fully sensitive \tilde{f} on 10 variables with $d(\tilde{f}) = 4$. Existence of such function would lead to new best example of separation with $bs(\tilde{f}) = n$ and $d(\tilde{f}) = n^{\log_{10} 4} \simeq n^{0.60}$. While we do not provide an example of \tilde{f} , we prove that the only polynomial that can be achieved by symmetrization of it is:

$$\tilde{p}(x) = -\frac{x^4}{144} + \frac{5x^3}{36} - \frac{125x^2}{144} + \frac{125x}{72} \quad (3)$$

Our techniques for lower bounds are based on Nisan and Szegedy's paper. We use the same symmetrization approach but with more detailed analysis of symmetrization polynomial: we apply better bounds and study higher order derivatives. As for upper bound, we analyze the Chebyshev polynomials of the first kind for approximating polynomials and use the combination of interpolation and linear programming for real polynomials.

In Section 2 we provide necessary definitions and theorems. In Sections 3, 4 and 5 we prove the lower bound for real polynomials, the result for approximating polynomials and the property of the low degree function \tilde{f} respectively.

2 Preliminaries

In this paper we assume that in input of a Boolean function 1 corresponds to logical true while 0 corresponds to logical false. The weight of an input is the amount of bits that set to 1. We use the notation $\|P\| = \sup_{x \in [-1;1]} |P(x)|$ and denote the set of polynomial of degree at most d as \mathcal{P}_d .

The symmetrization of a polynomial $p: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows:

$$p^{sym}(x) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} p(\pi(x)) \quad (4)$$

S_n denotes the group of permutations of size n and $\pi(x)$ denotes the new input, in which bits from x are moved according to permutation π .

The following lemma allows us to represent p^{sym} as a univariate polynomial of a small degree:

Lemma 1 (Symmetrization lemma [11]). *If $p: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a multilinear polynomial, then there exists a univariate polynomial $\tilde{p}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of degree at most the degree of p such that:*

$$p^{\text{sym}}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \tilde{p}(x_1 + \dots + x_n), \quad \forall x \in \{0, 1\}^n$$

Note that the value of $\tilde{p}(k)$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ is equal to the fraction of inputs of weight k on which polynomial is equal to 1.

From the proof of this lemma we can also get the explicit formula for \tilde{p} :

$$\tilde{p}(x) = c_0 + c_1 \binom{x}{1} + c_2 \binom{x}{2} + \dots + c_d \binom{x}{d}, \quad d \leq \deg p \quad (5)$$

The original work of Nisan and Szegedy used the following theorem to bound the degree of a polynomial:

Theorem 3 ([6,14]). *Let $p: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial such that $b_1 \leq p(k) \leq b_2$ for every integer $0 \leq k \leq n$ and it's derivative satisfies $|p'(\eta)| \geq c$ for some real $0 \leq \eta \leq n$. Then*

$$\deg(p) \geq \sqrt{\frac{nc}{c + b_2 - b_1}}.$$

However, it is obvious that $\sqrt{\frac{c}{c + b_2 - b_1}} < 1$, so any bound achieved using this theorem would be weaker than Tal's $d^2(f) \geq bs(f)$. In order to make progress, we are going to use the following theorem by Ehlich and Zeller, as well as Markov brothers' inequality:

Theorem 4 ([6]). *Let $p: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial of degree d . If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies the following:*

1. $\rho = \frac{d^2(d^2 - 1)}{6n^2} < 1$, and
2. $\forall k = 0, 1, \dots, n: x_k = -1 + \frac{2k}{n}, |p(x_k)| < 1$

$$\text{then } \|p\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - \rho}.$$

Theorem 5 (Markov brothers' inequality). *For any $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $k < n$:*

$$\|p^{(k)}\| \leq \frac{n^2 \cdot (n^2 - 1) \cdot \dots \cdot (n^2 - k + 1)}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot \dots \cdot (2k - 1)} \|p\| \quad (6)$$

We say that Boolean function f is fully sensitive at 0 iff $f(0) = 0$ and $s(f, 0) = n$. The next theorem by Nisan and Szegedy explains why it is enough for us to focus only on fully sensitive functions.

Theorem 6 ([12]). *For every Boolean function f there exists the fully sensitive at 0 function \hat{f} which depends on $bs(f)$ variables and $d(\hat{f}) \leq d(f)$.*

Simple proofs of Theorems 1, 4 and 6 could be found in Appendix A. While proof of Markov brothers' inequality is significantly harder, two "book-proof"s of it are given in [15].

3 Real Polynomials

In this section we study the separation between the degree of a Boolean function as a real polynomial and its block sensitivity. The result organized as follows. Firstly, we will prove the warm-up result, in which we introduce the new approach for polynomial's degree bound. Secondly, we will prove a series of lemmas for the main proof. Lastly, we will prove the Theorem 1.

3.1 Warm-up

In order to show new techniques, we first going to proof the simpler result, which, however, still better then previously known separation:

Theorem 7.

$$d^2(f) \geq \sqrt{6/5}bs(f) \simeq 1.09bs(f) \quad (7)$$

First of all, we need to derive a new approach to bound the degree of polynomial that would be stronger than Theorem 3.

Theorem 8. *Let $p: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial of degree d for which holds:*

1. $\forall i = 0, 1, \dots, n: 0 \leq p(i) \leq 1$, and
2. $\sup_{x \in [0; n]} |p^{(k)}(x)| \geq c$.

Then either $d^2 \geq \sqrt{6}n$ or ratio $x = \frac{d^2}{n}$ satisfies the following inequality:

$$\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{6}\right) \frac{(2k-1)!!}{2^{k-1}} c < x^k \quad (8)$$

$(2k-1)!!$ denotes the double factorial: $(2k-1)!! = (2k-1) \cdot (2k-3) \cdot \dots \cdot 3 \cdot 1$.

Proof. Suppose that $d^2 < \sqrt{6}n$, otherwise the first statement holds. In terms of Theorem 4:

$$\rho = \frac{d^2(d^2-1)}{6n^2} < \frac{d^4}{6n^2} < 1 \quad (9)$$

Let $P(x)$ be defined as follows:

$$P(x) = p\left(\frac{n}{2}(x+1)\right) - \frac{1}{2}$$

By Theorem 4, $\|P\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\rho}$. On the other hand, $\|P^{(k)}\| \geq \frac{n^k}{2^k} \cdot c$. Combined with Markov brothers' inequality 5, we get

$$c \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^k \leq \|P^{(k)}\| \leq \frac{d^2 \cdot (d^2-1) \cdot \dots \cdot (d^2-k+1)}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot \dots \cdot (2k-1)} \|P\| < \frac{d^{2k}}{(2k-1)!!} \cdot \frac{1}{2(1-\rho)}$$

$$(1-\rho) \frac{(2k-1)!!}{2^{k-1}} c \leq \left(\frac{d^2}{n}\right)^k \quad (10)$$

By substituting (9) and $x = \frac{d^2}{n}$ into (10), we get exactly the inequality (8).

The same approach was used by Beigel ([1, lemma 3.2]), however he didn't parameterized his result and proved it only for the first derivative. If we apply his result with the trivial bound $\sup_{x \in [0; n]} |p'(x)| \geq 1$, we will get that $1 - \frac{x^2}{6} < x$ for $x = \frac{d^2}{n}$. As $x > 0$, the solution is $x \geq \sqrt{15} - 3 \simeq 0.87$, which is stronger than original bound, but weaker than Tal's result.

Now we are ready to proof the warm-up result.

Proof (Theorem 7). Because of the reduction 6, we can assume without loss of generality that f is fully sensitive at 0, and so polynomial p derived from Lemma 1 has $p(0) = 0$ and $p(1) = 1$. Also, it is obvious that if ρ from Theorem 4 is not less than 1 then $d^2 \geq \sqrt{6}n > \sqrt{6/5}n$, so we assume that $\rho < 1$.

Suppose that $p \in \mathcal{P}_2$, i.e. $p(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$. From values of $p(0)$, $p(1)$ and $p(2)$ we get the following constrains:

1. $p(0) = c = 0 \Rightarrow c = 0$.
2. $p(1) = a + b + c = 1 \Rightarrow a + b = 1$.
3. $p(2) = 4a + 2b \Rightarrow -2 \leq 2a \leq -1$.

As a result, $|p''(x)| = |2a| \geq 1$.

In general case, let $q(x)$ be the quadratic polynomial that equals to $p(x)$ at $x \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and let $\tilde{p}(x) = p(x) - q(x)$. From our definition we get that $\tilde{p}(0) = \tilde{p}(1) = \tilde{p}(2) = 0$, so there exists $\xi \in [0; 2]$: $\tilde{p}''(\xi) = 0$. Then $|p''(\xi)| = |q''(\xi) + \tilde{p}''(\xi)| \geq 1$, and as direct consequence $\sup_{x \in [0; n]} |p''(\xi)| \geq 1$. By substituting $c = 1$ and $k = 2$ in (8), we get the following inequality for $x = \frac{d^2}{n}$:

$$\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{6}\right) \frac{3}{2} < x^2 \quad (11)$$

Since $x \geq 0$, $x \geq \sqrt{6/5}$ and $d^2 \geq \sqrt{6/5}n$.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1

To increase the constant factor from $\sqrt{6/5}$ to $\sqrt{10} - 2$, we should analyze more than one derivative. In order to do so, we will use the representation (5). We also need to establish series of lemmas.

Lemma 2. *Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be fully sensitive at 0 and $n \geq 4$. Then for symmetric polynomial p we have $\sup_{x \in [0; n]} |p'''(x)| \geq 1 - p(3)$.*

Lemma 3.

$$\sum_{k=4}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k2^{k-2}} < \frac{1}{8} \quad (12)$$

Proofs are omitted to Appendix A. With this lemmas we are ready for the main proof.

Proof (Theorem 1). For $n < 4$ theorem follows from Tal's bound $d^2(f) \geq bs(f)$. As in Theorem 7, we can assume that f is fully sensitive at 0 and $\rho < 1$.

It is easy to show that

$$\binom{x}{k} \Big|_{x=0} = \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}$$

Using that fact and representation (5), we can get the formula for the first derivative of the symmetrization polynomial at 0:

$$p'(0) = \sum_{k=1}^d (-1)^{k+1} \frac{c_k}{k} \quad (13)$$

We can bound the first three coefficients with polynomial values:

1. $p(1) = c_1 = 1 \Rightarrow c_1 = 1$.
2. $p(2) = 2c_1 + c_2 \leq 1 \Rightarrow c_2 \leq -1$.
3. $p(3) = 3c_1 + 3c_2 + c_3 \geq 0 \Rightarrow c_3 \geq p(3)$.

If $p(3) < \frac{3}{8}$ then by Lemma 2 $\sup_{x \in [0; n]} |p'''(x)| > \frac{5}{8}$. Using (8) with $c = \frac{5}{8}$ and $k = 3$, we get the inequality for $x = \frac{d^2}{n}$:

$$\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{6}\right) \frac{75}{32} < x^3$$

Inequality implies that $x > 1.2$, which satisfies the statement of theorem. In other case, we have that $c_3 \geq \frac{3}{8}$. By substituting all constrains in (13), we get:

$$p'(0) \geq \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{8} + \sum_{k=4}^d (-1)^{k+1} \frac{c_k}{k} \quad (14)$$

Suppose that for $k > 3$ we have $|c_k| < \frac{1}{2^{k-2}}$, then

$$p'(0) \geq \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{8} - \sum_{k=4}^d \frac{1}{k2^{k-2}} > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{8} - \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k2^{k-2}} > \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{8} = \frac{3}{2}$$

Inequality (8) with $c = \frac{3}{2}$ and $k = 1$ implies that for $x = \frac{d^2}{n} \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{6}\right) \frac{3}{2} \leq x$. The solution is $x \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)$, which means that $d^2 \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)n$.

The only case is left to consider is if there exists such $k > 3$ that $|c_k| \geq \frac{1}{2^{k-2}}$. To deal with it, we first need to show that $\sup_{x \in [0; n]} |p^{(k)}(x)| \geq c_k$. If $d = k$, then derivative is constant and equals to c_k because $\binom{x}{k}^{(k)} = 1$. In other case, let $q(x)$ be the polynomial that consists of all terms from (5) up to one with c_k .

Then $\tilde{p}(x) = p(x) - q(x)$ equals to 0 for $x = 0, 1, \dots, k$, so $\exists \xi \in [0; k]: \tilde{p}^{(k)}(\xi) = 0$ and $|p^{(k)}(\xi)| = |c_k|$.

Now, for $k = 4, 5$ we get the following inequalities from (8):

$$\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{6}\right) \frac{105}{32} \leq x^4 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x > 1.24 > (\sqrt{10} - 2)$$

$$\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{6}\right) \frac{945}{128} \leq x^5 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x > 1.3 > (\sqrt{10} - 2)$$

For $k > 5$, we need to show that solution from inequality would not be worse than solution for $k = 5$. Notice that every time we increase k in inequality (8) we multiply the left hand side by $\frac{2k+1}{4} > \sqrt{6}$ and the right hand side by x . But because we only consider the case when $\rho < 1$, $x < \sqrt{6}$, and our inequality becomes tighter. As a result, the statement holds for $k > 5$ as well.

3.3 Corollaries

While our improvement may seem insignificant, it shows that currently known bound between $d(f)$ and $bs(f)$ is not tight. Next two corollaries shows that the same holds for some other pairs of complexity measures.

Corollary 1.

$$s^4(f) \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)bs(f) \tag{15}$$

Proof. In the proof of sensitivity conjecture ([8]), Huang established the following bound for $d(f)$:

$$s^2(f) \geq d(f) \tag{16}$$

Combined with our result 1, it implies that

$$s^4(f) \geq d^2(f) \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)bs(f)$$

Corollary 2.

$$d^3(f) \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)D(f) \tag{17}$$

Proof. By combining our result 1 with the bound from [10]

$$D(f) \leq bs(f) \cdot d(f) \tag{18}$$

we get

$$d^3(f) \geq d(f) \cdot (\sqrt{10} - 2)bs(f) \geq (\sqrt{10} - 2)D(f)$$

4 Approximating Polynomials

In this section, we improve the constant factor in the separation between the degree of an approximating polynomial and its block sensitivity and provide an example of polynomial for NAE_n function which shows that not only our bound is asymptotically tight, but the difference between the best known constant in the lower bound and the constant in our example is relatively small as well.

4.1 Lower bound

Before the proof we need to derive the similar to 8 lemma, but this time for approximating polynomials.

Lemma 4. *Let $p: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial of degree d for which holds:*

1. $\forall i = 0, 1, \dots, n: -\frac{1}{3} \leq p(i) \leq \frac{4}{3}$, and
2. $\sup_{x \in [0; n]} |p^{(k)}(x)| \geq c$.

Then either $d^2 \geq \sqrt{6}n$ or ratio $x = \frac{d^2}{n}$ satisfies the following inequality:

$$\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{6}\right) \frac{(2k-1)!!}{2^k} \cdot \frac{6c}{5} < x^k \quad (19)$$

Proof. The only difference between this lemma and Theorem 8 is bounds for $p(k)$, therefore now if we define $P(x)$ the same as earlier we will get the weaker upper bound: $\|P\| \leq \frac{5}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\rho}$. The remaining part of the proof repeats the proof of 8.

Proof (Theorem 2). Using reduction 6, we can assume that symmetrization polynomial of f has $-\frac{1}{3} \leq p(0) \leq \frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{2}{3} \leq p(1) \leq \frac{4}{3}$. As always, we can only consider case when $\rho < 1$. Also, for $n < 5$ theorem follows from original bound $6 \deg_{1/3}^2(f) \geq bs(f)$.

Suppose that $p \in \mathcal{P}_3$. By Lagrange's interpolation formula for $x \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $x \in \{0, 2, 5\}$:

$$p(x) = \frac{(x-1)(x-2)}{2}p(0) + x(2-x)p(1) + \frac{x(x-1)}{2}p(2) \quad (20)$$

$$p(x) = \frac{(x-2)(x-5)}{10}p(0) - \frac{x(x-5)}{6}p(2) + \frac{x(x-2)}{15}p(5) \quad (21)$$

From (20) we get that $\forall x \quad p''(x) = p(0) - 2p(1) + p(2) \leq -1 + p(2)$, and if $p(2) \leq \frac{14}{15}$, then $p''(x) \leq -\frac{1}{15}$. Otherwise, from (21) we get that $\forall x \quad p(x) = \frac{1}{5}p(0) - \frac{1}{3}p(2) + \frac{2}{15}p(5) \leq \frac{11}{45} - \frac{1}{3}p(2) \leq -\frac{1}{15}$. If $\deg p > 3$, we can use the same reduction as in the proof of Theorem 7.

By applying (19) with $c = \frac{1}{15}$ and $k = 2$, we get the following inequality:

$$\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{6}\right) \frac{3}{50} < x^2 \quad (22)$$

Which implies that $x \geq \sqrt{\frac{6}{101}}$ and $\deg_{1/3}^2(f) \geq \sqrt{\frac{6}{101}}bs(f)$.

4.2 Upper bound

The function $NAE_n: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ equals to 1 iff $x \in \{0^n, 1^n\}$, i.e. all the bits in the input are the same. The next theorem provides the polynomial that approximates NAE_n and gives the upper bound for $\deg_{1/3}(f)$ in terms of block sensitivity.

Theorem 9. Define $d = \lceil \sqrt{c(n-2)} \rceil$ with constant c satisfying the following inequality:

$$2c + \frac{2}{3}c^2 - \frac{2c}{3(n-2)} > 1 \quad (23)$$

Then there exists a polynomial of degree k where $k = d$ if d is even and $k = d + 1$ otherwise which is a $\frac{1}{3}$ -approximation of NAE_n .

Proof. In our construction, we will use the Chebyshev polynomials of the first kind, defined as $T_k(x) = \cos k \arccos x$. We will need the following properties of them; proof of property 3 is omitted to Appendix A, and property 4 is [15, lemma 5.17] for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$.

1. If k is even then $T_k(x) = T_k(-x)$.
2. $\forall x \in [-1; 1] \quad |T_k(x)| \leq 1$.
3. $T_k''(\theta) \geq T_k''(1)$ for $\theta \geq 1$.
4. $T_k'(1) = k^2$ and $T_k''(1) = \frac{k^4 - k^2}{3}$.

Define

$$p(x) = 1 - \frac{2T_k(\frac{2x-n}{n-2})}{3T_k(\frac{n}{n-2})} \quad (24)$$

It is clear from the first property above that $p(0) = p(n) = \frac{1}{3}$. If we show that $T_k(\frac{n}{n-2}) \geq 2$ then by the second property for all $1 \leq k \leq n-1$:

$$\left| \frac{2T_k(\frac{2x-n}{n-2})}{3T_k(\frac{n}{n-2})} \right| \leq \frac{2 \cdot 1}{3 \cdot 2} = \frac{1}{3} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{2}{3} \leq p(k) \leq \frac{4}{3}$$

and $q(x_1, \dots, x_n) = p(n - x_1 - \dots - x_n)$ is indeed the $\frac{1}{3}$ -approximation of NAE_n .

By using the Taylor series for $T_k(\frac{n}{n-2})$ and $x = 1$, we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} T_k\left(\frac{n}{n-2}\right) &= T_k(1) + \frac{2}{n-2}T_k'(1) + \frac{2}{(n-2)^2}T_k''(\theta) \geq \\ &\geq T_k(1) + \frac{2}{n-2}T_k'(1) + \frac{2}{(n-2)^2}T_k''(1) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Last inequality holds because of the property 3. Applying the property 4 and (23), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} T_k \left(\frac{n}{n-2} \right) &\geq 1 + 2c + \frac{2}{3(n-2)^2} (c^2(n-2)^2 - c(n-2)) = \\ &= 1 + 2c + \frac{2}{3}c^2 - \frac{2c}{3(n-2)} \geq 2 \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Because the last term in the left side of (23) tends to zero as n tends to infinity, the optimal c tends to solution of the following inequality: $2x + \frac{2}{3}x^2 > 1$. The solution is $x > \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{15} - 3) \simeq 0.43$, so difference between c and best known lower bound is less than 0.2, which shows that the bound 2 is close to be tight.

5 Fully Sensitive Function of Small Degree

The last result of this paper is about an example of a function with low degree and high block sensitivity. We study the properties of conjectured function \tilde{f} on 10 variables with $d(\tilde{f}) = 4$. By applying the same composition scheme as in previous examples, we can generalize \tilde{f} for arbitrary large n . While we do not provide examples of \tilde{f} , we prove that if \tilde{f} is fully sensitive at 0 then by applying Lemma 1 to it, the only univariate polynomial we can get is (3).

We will do this in two steps. Firstly, we will achieve such polynomial by interpolation. Secondly, we will prove its uniqueness using linear programming.

5.1 Interpolation

The first part of the prove is to construct the polynomial (3). We will do this by establishing the extremal property of all symmetrization of degree 4 for $n \geq 8$.

Theorem 10. *Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be fully sensitive at 0 and $n \geq 8$. Then for symmetric polynomial p we have $\sup_{x \in [0;n]} |p^{(4)}(x)| \geq \frac{1}{6}$. Moreover, the only polynomial for which inequality is tight is (3).*

Proof. Using Lagrange's interpolation formula for $x \in \{0, 1, 2, 7, 8\}$ and $x \in \{0, 1, 2, 5, 7\}$, we get the following representations:

1.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \quad p^{(4)}(x) &= -\frac{24}{1 \cdot 1 \cdot 6 \cdot 7} + \frac{24}{2 \cdot 1 \cdot 5 \cdot 6}p(2) - \frac{24}{7 \cdot 6 \cdot 5 \cdot 1}p(7) + \\ &+ \frac{24}{8 \cdot 7 \cdot 6 \cdot 1}p(8) = -\frac{4}{7} + \frac{2}{5}p(2) - \frac{4}{35}p(7) + \frac{1}{14}p(8) \leq -\frac{1}{10} - \frac{4}{35}p(7) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

2.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \quad p^{(4)}(x) &= -\frac{24}{1 \cdot 1 \cdot 4 \cdot 6} + \frac{24}{2 \cdot 1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5}p(2) - \frac{24}{5 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2}p(5) + \\ &+ \frac{24}{7 \cdot 6 \cdot 5 \cdot 2}p(7) = -1 + \frac{4}{5}p(2) - \frac{1}{5}p(5) + \frac{2}{35}p(7) \leq -\frac{1}{5} + \frac{2}{35}p(7) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

If $p(7) \leq \frac{7}{12}$, then from (27) we get that $p^{(4)}(x) \leq -\frac{1}{6}$, otherwise we get the same result from (28). Inequality is tight iff $p(7) = \frac{7}{12}$, $p(2) = 1$, $p(5) = 0$ and $p(8) = 1$. Combined with $p(0) = 0$ and $p(1) = 1$, we get that there is the only polynomial of degree at most 5 that satisfies all constrains. By applying Lagrange's interpolation formula, we get the polynomial (3).

Note that (3) is indeed the symmetrization polynomial for some function, because for $k = 0, \dots, 10$ values $p(k)$ represent the fraction of inputs for corresponding weight (i.e. $\binom{n}{k} \cdot p(k) \in \mathbb{N}_0$).

5.2 Linear programming

The second part of the prove is to show that (3) is the only symmetrization polynomial for $n = 10$ and $d(f) \leq 4$. This part could be done with a linear programming solver. In our case we are going to use `scipy.optimize.linprog`, full code for the problem could be found on Google Colab [13].

Theorem 11. *The only symmetrization polynomial for the fully sensitive at 0 function of 10 variables with degree at most 4 is (3).*

Proof. Suppose that $p(x) = c_1x + c_2x^2 + c_3x^3 + c_4x^4$ is the needed polynomial. We will use necessary (but not sufficient) conditions for $p(x)$ to create a linear programming task. Namely, we will require $p(1) = 1$, $\forall k = 2, \dots, n: 0 \leq p(k) \leq 1$ and some additional constrain for c_4 . We will require a solver to minimize c_4 .

If we add a constrain $c_4 > 0$, solver proves that problem has no solution. Without any constrains for c_4 , solver states that solution is $-\frac{1}{144}$, i.e. minimum $p^{(4)}(x)$ value for which solver can find a solution is $-\frac{1}{144} \cdot 24 = -\frac{1}{6}$. But we know that the only polynomial for this value is (3), which implies it's uniqueness.

6 Conclusion

Although we made improvements in relations between some complexity measures, we strongly suspect that current results are still not tight. For example, the choice of points for interpolation in many theorems was not really justified, so we think that finding a pattern for the choice of interpolation set is one of the keys for further improvements. Also, we suspect that using of Bernstein's inequality (see [3, theorem 5.1.7]) in Theorem 1 with or instead of Markov brothers' inequality for the first derivative might improve the result as well.

Acknowledgments. Author would like to thank Vladimir V. Podolskii for the proof idea for Theorem 7.

References

1. Beigel, R.: Perceptrons, pp, and the polynomial hierarchy. *Comput. Complex.* **4**, 339–349 (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01263422>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01263422>
2. Bogdanov, A., Mande, N.S., Thaler, J., Williamson, C.: Approximate degree, secret sharing, and concentration phenomena. In: Achlioptas, D., Vég, L.A. (eds.) *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2019*, September 20–22, 2019, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA. *LIPICs*, vol. 145, pp. 71:1–71:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.APPROX-RANDOM.2019.71>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.APPROX-RANDOM.2019.71>
3. Borwein, P., Erdelyi, T.: *Polynomials and Polynomial Inequalities*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer New York (1995), <https://books.google.ru/books?id=386CC7JnuuwC>
4. Buhrman, H., de Wolf, R.: Complexity measures and decision tree complexity: a survey. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **288**(1), 21–43 (2002). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(01\)00144-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(01)00144-X), [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(01\)00144-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(01)00144-X)
5. Bun, M., Thaler, J.: Dual lower bounds for approximate degree and markov-bernstein inequalities. In: Fomin, F.V., Freivalds, R., Kwiatkowska, M.Z., Peleg, D. (eds.) *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 40th International Colloquium, ICALP 2013*, Riga, Latvia, July 8–12, 2013, Proceedings, Part I. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7965, pp. 303–314. Springer (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39206-1_26, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39206-1_26
6. Ehlich, H., Zeller, K.: Schwankung von polynomen zwischen gitterpunkten. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* pp. 41–44 (1964)
7. Hatami, P., Kulkarni, R., Pankratov, D.: Variations on the sensitivity conjecture. *Theory Comput.* **4**, 1–27 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.gs.2011.004>, <https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.gs.2011.004>
8. Huang, H.: Induced subgraphs of hypercubes and a proof of the sensitivity conjecture. *Annals of Mathematics* **190**(3), 949–955 (2019), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.4007/annals.2019.190.3.6>
9. Jukna, S.: *Boolean Function Complexity - Advances and Frontiers, Algorithms and combinatorics*, vol. 27. Springer (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24508-4>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24508-4>
10. Midrijanis, G.: Exact quantum query complexity for total boolean functions. arXiv preprint [quant-ph/0403168](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0403168) (2004)
11. Minsky, M., Papert, S.: *Perceptrons - an introduction to computational geometry*. MIT Press (1987)
12. Nisan, N., Szegedy, M.: On the degree of boolean functions as real polynomials. *Comput. Complex.* **4**, 301–313 (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01263419>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01263419>
13. Proskurin, N.: Symmetrization linprog. <https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1XKJSYLE1VxGgZuwHaFy4BdoI> (2020)
14. Rivlin, T.J., Cheney, E.W.: A comparison of uniform approximations on an interval and a finite subset thereof. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* **3**(2), 311–320 (1966), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2949624>

15. Shadrin, A.: Twelve proofs of the markov inequality. Approximation theory: a volume dedicated to Borislav Bojanov pp. 233–298 (2004)
16. Spalek, R.: A dual polynomial for OR. CoRR **abs/0803.4516** (2008), <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.4516>
17. Tal, A.: Properties and applications of boolean function composition. In: Kleinberg, R.D. (ed.) Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science, ITCS '13, Berkeley, CA, USA, January 9–12, 2013. pp. 441–454. ACM (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2422436.2422485>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2422436.2422485>

A Omitted Proofs

Proof (Lemma 1). Define $d = \deg p^{sym}$ and $P_k = \sum_{|S|=k} \prod_{i \in S} x_i$ where all S are subsets of $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Suppose that S is a monomial in p , then by definition symmetrization adds all monomials of size $|S|$ to p^{sym} equal amount of times: in order to get a specific monomial S' one should fix the permutation of variables in S' and in $[n] \setminus S'$, thus amount of very monomial is equal. Therefore, we can rewrite p^{sym} as

$$p^{sym}(x) = c_0 + c_1 P_1(x) + \dots + c_d P_d(x)$$

Note that if we only interested in $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ then every term in P_k is equal to 1 if every variable in it is equal to 1 and otherwise it is equal to 0. Then it is obvious that if

$$\binom{x}{k} = \frac{x \cdot (x-1) \cdot \dots \cdot (x-k+1)}{k!}$$

and $z = x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n$ then

$$p^{sym}(x) = c_0 + c_1 \binom{z}{1} + \dots + c_d \binom{z}{d} = \tilde{p}(z)$$

$\deg \tilde{p} \leq \deg p$ because $\deg p^{sym} \leq \deg p$.

Proof (Theorem 4). Define $K = \inf\{k : \|p\| \leq 1 + k\}$. By Markov brothers' inequality 5,

$$\|p''(x)\| \leq \frac{d^2(d^2-1)}{3}(1+K) \quad (29)$$

Let ξ be the point of maximum on $[-1; 1]$, i.e. $\|p\| = |p(\xi)|$. Case $\xi = \pm 1$ is trivial because $|p(\xi)| \leq 1$, so we can assume that ξ is an inner point and $p'(\xi) = 0$. Also, because $\forall k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1 \quad x_{k+1} - x_k = \frac{2}{n}$ there exists such k that $|x_k - \xi| \leq \frac{1}{n}$. Applying Taylor series for $p(x)$ we get:

$$p(x_k) = p(\xi) + (x_k - \xi)p'(\xi) + \frac{(x_k - \xi)^2}{2} p''(\theta) = p(\xi) + \frac{(x_k - \xi)^2}{2} p''(\theta), \quad \theta \in [-1; 1]$$

Substituting (29) in the last equality, we can achieve another bound for $\|p\|$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|p\| = |p(\xi)| &= \left| p(x_k) - \frac{(x_k - \xi)^2}{2} p''(\theta) \right| \leq |p(x_k)| + \left| \frac{(x_k - \xi)^2}{2} p''(\theta) \right| \leq \\ &1 + \frac{1}{2n^2} \cdot \frac{d^2(d^2 - 1)}{3} (1 + K) = 1 + \rho(1 + K) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

By definition $K \leq \rho(1 + K)$ and as a corollary $K \leq \frac{\rho}{1 - \rho}$ and $\|p\| \leq 1 + K \leq \frac{1}{1 - \rho}$.

Proof (Theorem 6). Let x be the input on which $bs(f) = bs(f, x)$, and S_1, S_2, \dots, S_t are the blocks on which we can achieve such block sensitivity. Without loss of generality we can assume that $f(0) = 0$, otherwise we will introduce the new function $g(x) = 1 - f(x)$.

Let \tilde{f} be defined as follows

$$\tilde{f}(y_1, \dots, y_t) = f(x \oplus y_1 S_1 \oplus \dots \oplus y_t S_t) \quad (31)$$

i.e. we create a new input for f in which every bit x_j is left unchanged if it is not in any block or equals to $x_j \oplus y_i$ if $x_j \in S_i$.

$d(\tilde{f}) \leq d(f)$ because \tilde{f} is a linear substitution in f . On the other hand, \tilde{f} is fully sensitive at 0 as $\tilde{f}(0) = f(0) = 0$ and $\tilde{f}(e_j) = f(x^{(S_i)}) = 1$. Then \tilde{f} satisfies the statement as $t = bs(\tilde{f})$.

Proof (Lemma 2). Suppose that $p \in \mathcal{P}_3$. Using Lagrange's interpolation formula for $x \in \{0, 1, 3, 4\}$, we get the following representation:

$$\begin{aligned} p(x) &= \frac{x(x-3)(x-4)}{6} - \frac{x(x-1)(x-4)}{6} p(3) + \frac{x(x-1)(x-3)}{12} p(4) \\ \forall x \quad p'''(x) &= 1 - p(3) + \frac{p(4)}{2} \geq 1 - p(3) \end{aligned}$$

In general case, let $q \in \mathcal{P}_3$ be equal to p on the same set of points. Similarly to the Theorem 7, if $\tilde{p}(x) = p(x) - q(x)$ then $\exists \xi \in [0; 4]: \tilde{p}'''(\xi) = 0$ and $|\tilde{p}'''(\xi)| \geq 1 - p(3)$.

Proof (Lemma 3). The Maclaurin series for the natural logarithm converges for $-1 \leq x < 1$. By substituting $x = -\frac{1}{2}$, we can calculate and bound our sum:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(1+x) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} x^k \\ \ln \frac{1}{2} &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^k = -\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k 2^k} \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k 2^k} = \ln 2 \\ \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k 2^{k-2}} &= 4 \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k 2^k} = 4 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k 2^k} - \frac{2}{3} \right) = 4 \left(\ln 2 - \frac{2}{3} \right) < \frac{1}{8} \end{aligned}$$

Proof (Theorem 9, property 3). As $T_k(\cos x) = \cos kx$, we can see that all k roots of the Chebyshev polynomial lie on $[-1; 1]$. By Rolle's theorem, all the roots of any derivative of the Chebyshev polynomial also lie on $[-1; 1]$. From [15, lemma 5.17] we get that $T_k'''(1) = \frac{k^2(k^2 - 1)(k^2 - 2)}{15} > 0$, so $T_k'''(x) > 0$ for $x \geq 1$ and $T_k''(\theta) \geq T_k''(1)$ for $\theta \geq 0$.