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Abstract

In this note, we show that a “Toy Conjecture” made by (Boyle, Ishai, Pass, Wootters, 2017) is false, and propose a new one. Our attack does not falsify the full (“non-toy”) conjecture in that work, and it is our hope that this note will help further the analysis of that conjecture. Independently, (Boyle, Holmgren, Ma, Weiss, 2021) have obtained similar results.

1 Introduction

Recently, two independent works [BIPW17, CHR17] proposed a notion called oblivious locally decodable codes, (OLDCs), motivated by applications in private information retrieval (PIR). These works gave candidate constructions of OLDCs based on a new conjecture regarding the hardness of distinguishing a uniformly random set of points from a permutation of local-decoding queries in a Reed-Muller code. In order to encourage study of this conjecture, [BIPW17] proposed a simplified “Toy Conjecture,” which we reproduce below as Conjecture 1. In this note, we show that this Toy Conjecture is false, and propose a new one that is resistant to our attack. We note that this does not refute the full conjecture of [BIPW17, CHR17]. Independently of this note, Boyle, Holmgren, Ma and Weiss have also established that the Toy Conjecture is false [EBW21], and have proposed a new Toy Conjecture.

2 The Toy Conjecture and an Attack

The Toy Conjecture of [BIPW17] is the following.

Conjecture 1 (Toy Conjecture 4.6 in [BIPW17]). Let \( \mathbb{F} \) be a finite field with \( |\mathbb{F}| = q \approx \lambda^2 \). Let \( p_1, \ldots, p_m \) be uniformly random polynomials of degree at most \( \lambda \) in \( \mathbb{F}[X] \). Let \( q_1, \ldots, q_m \) be uniformly random functions from \( \mathbb{F} \) to \( \mathbb{F} \). Let \( \pi \in S_{\mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F}} \) be a uniformly random permutation. Then the following two distributions are computationally indistinguishable:

1. \( (S_1, \ldots, S_m) \), where \( S_i = \{ \pi(x, p_i(x)) : x \in \mathbb{F} \} \).
2. \( (T_1, \ldots, T_m) \), where \( T_i = \{ \pi(x, q_i(x)) : x \in \mathbb{F} \} \).

To show that this conjecture is false, we give below an efficient algorithm to distinguish the two distributions.

- **Input:** \( (U_1, \ldots, U_m) \), where \( U_i \subset \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F} \)
- **Construct** that matrix \( M \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times (\mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F})} \) that is given by

\[
M_{i, (\alpha, \beta)} = 1[(\alpha, \beta) \in U_i].
\]
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1The OLDC terminology is from [BIPW17]; in [CHR17], the corresponding notion is designated-client doubly-efficient PIR.
On the other hand, suppose that

First, observe that

Proof. To prove that this algorithm is correct, we will show that under distribution (2), the matrix $M$ has rank exactly $q^2 - q + 1$ with high probability; while under distribution (1), the matrix has rank strictly less than that.

Suppose that $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ are the functions that drawn (either $f_i = p_i$ in case (1), or $f_i = q_i$ in case (2)). Let $A \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times (F \times F)}$ be the matrix that is given by

$$A_{i,(\alpha,\beta)} = 1[f_i(\alpha) = \beta].$$

Notice that $M$ is a column permutation of $A$, so $\operatorname{rank}(A) = \operatorname{rank}(M)$. Thus, to show that the algorithm above is correct, it suffices to study the random of $A$ in cases (1) and (2). In the following, we let $A_i$ denote the $i$'th row of $A$.

Let

$$K = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{F}^{F \times F} : v_{(\alpha,\beta)} = w_{\alpha} \text{ for some } w_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{F}^F \text{ so that } \sum_{\alpha \in F} w_{\alpha} = 0 \right\}.$$ 

Notice that $K$ is a subspace of $\mathbb{F}^{F \times F}$ and that $\dim(K) = q - 1$.

Claim 1. Suppose that case (2) holds, so $f_i = q_i$ is a uniformly random function. Then $\operatorname{Ker}(A) = K$ with probability at least $1 - \lambda^{-97}$ over the choice of the functions $f_i$.

Proof. First, observe that $K \subseteq \operatorname{Ker}(A)$, since for any $i \in [m]$,

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta \in F} A_{i,(\alpha,\beta)} v_{(\alpha,\beta)} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta \in F} 1[f_i(\alpha) = \beta] w_{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha \in F} w_{\alpha} = 0.$$ 

On the other hand, suppose that $v \notin K$. If $v_{(\alpha,\beta)} = w_{\alpha}$ for some $w_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{F}^F$ so that $\sum_{\alpha \in F} w_{\alpha} \neq 0$, then clearly $v \notin \operatorname{Ker}(A)$. So suppose that $v_{(a,b)} \neq v_{(a,b')}$ for some $a, b, b' \in \mathbb{F}$. Then let

$$X_i = \sum_{\alpha \neq a, \beta \in F} A_{i,(\alpha,\beta)} v_{(\alpha,\beta)}.$$ 

This is a random variable over the choice of $f_i$. Now, for any $i$, and for any $x \in \mathbb{F}$,

$$\Pr[A_i^T v = 0 \mid X_i = x] = \Pr \left[ \sum_{\beta \in F} A_{i,(\alpha,\beta)} v_{(\alpha,\beta)} = -x \right] = \Pr[v_{a, f_i(a)} = -x],$$ 

where again the probability is over the choice of $f_i$. Since $v_{(a,b)} \neq v_{(a,b')}$, there is at least a $1 - 1/q$ chance that $v_{a, f_i(a)} \neq -x$, if $f_i = q_i$ is a uniformly random function. Thus, for all $i \in [m]$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{F}_q$,

$$\Pr[v_{(a,f_i(a))} \neq -x] \leq 1 - 1/q.$$ 

This implies that for all $i \in [m]$,

$$\Pr[A_i^T v = 0] = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}} \Pr[X_i = x] \Pr[A_i^T v = 0 \mid X_i = x] \leq 1 - 1/q.$$ 
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By the independence of the $f_i$,
\[ \Pr[A_i^T v = 0 \forall i \in [m]] \leq (1 - 1/q)^m \leq e^{-m/q}. \]
By the union bound over all $v$ of this form,
\[ \Pr[\exists v \notin K, A_i^T v = 0 \forall i \in [m]] \leq q^2 e^{-m/q} \leq q^2 \log q^{-m/q} \leq e^{-\lambda \theta}, \]
using the choice of $q \approx \lambda^2$ and $m = \lambda^{100}$.
This establishes that, in case (2), with probability at least $e^{-\lambda \theta}$, $A$ has rank
\[ \text{rank}(K) = q^2 - \text{dim}(K) = q^2 - q + 1. \]
On the other hand, in case (1), $A$ has kernel vectors that are not in $K$. One example is the vector $v \in \mathbb{F}^2$ given by $v(\alpha, \beta) = \beta$. To see that $v \in \text{Ker}(A)$, when $f_i = p_i$ is a polynomial of degree $\lambda < q - 1$, observe that
\[ A_i^T v = \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}} 1[p_i(\alpha) = \beta] \cdot \beta = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} p_i(\alpha) = 0, \]
where in the final equality we have used the fact that $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} \alpha^c = 0$ for any $0 \leq c < q - 1$.
This establishes that, in case (1), $\text{Ker}(A) \supseteq K$, which implies that $A$ has rank
\[ \text{rank}(K) = q^2 - \text{dim}(K) < q^2 - q + 1. \]
This shows that the algorithm above correctly distinguishes between cases (1) and (2), with probability at least $1 - e^{-\lambda \theta}$.

\section{A New Toy Conjecture}
We note that the attack above does not work if the evaluation points for the $f_i$ are a random subset. Thus, we propose the following replacement toy conjecture:

\begin{conjecture} (New Toy Conjecture). Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q \approx \lambda^2$. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_m$ be uniformly random polynomials of degree at most $\lambda$ in $\mathbb{F}[X]$. Let $q_1, \ldots, q_m$ be uniformly random functions from $\mathbb{F}$ to $\mathbb{F}$. Let $\pi \in S_{\mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F}}$ be a uniformly random permutation. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{F}$ be a random set of size $100 \cdot \lambda$. Then the following two distributions are computationally indistinguishable:

(1) $(S_1, \ldots, S_m)$, where $S_i = \{\pi(x, p_i(x)) : x \in \Omega\}$.

(2) $(T_1, \ldots, T_m)$, where $T_i = \{\pi(x, q_i(x)) : x \in \Omega\}$.
\end{conjecture}
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