

On some Σ_0^B -generalizations of the pigeonhole and the modular counting principles over V^0 ¹

Eitetsu Ken²

February 28, 2023

¹This is master's thesis of the author at the University of Tokyo with some minor changes.

²email: yeongcheol-kwon@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

Ajtai's discovery of $V^0 \not\vdash \text{ontoPHP}_n^{n+1}$, where ontoPHP_n^{n+1} is a Σ_0^B formalization of the statement “there does not exist a bijection between $(n+1)$ pigeons and n holes,” was a significant breakthrough in proof complexity, and there have been many interesting generalizations and variations of this result.

In this paper, we first focus on the following result: for any $p \geq 2$,

$$V^0 + \text{Count}_k^p \not\vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1},$$

where Count_k^p denotes a Σ_0^B formalization of the modular counting principle mod p and injPHP_n^{n+1} denotes that of the pigeonhole principle for injections. We try to make this result uniform for p . We give three types of (first-order and propositional) formulae which at first glance seem to be generalized versions of counting principles. In particular, we see two of them, $\text{UCP}_n^{l,d}$ and GCP , actually serve as uniform versions of Count_n^p ($p \geq 2$).

Then we conjecture that

$$V^0 + \text{UCP}_k^{l,d} \not\vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1},$$

and give a sufficient condition to prove it. To be precise, we define the notions *injPHP-tree* and *k-evaluation using injPHP-tree*, which are analogies of *PHP-tree* and *k-evaluation* used in standard proofs of Ajtai's theorem, and we show the following: suppose $(\pi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of AC^0 -Frege proofs of injPHP_n^{n+1} admitting $\text{UCP}_k^{l,d}$ as an axiom scheme. Then π_n cannot have $o(n)$ -evaluation.

On the other hand, we see $V^0 + \text{GCP} \vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1}$, and therefore GCP is a generalization of both the modular counting principles and the pigeonhole principle. Seeing this, we observe that a Σ_0^B formalization oddtown_n of oddtown theorem is also in a similar situation, that is, it is a generalization of the pigeonhole principle and Count_k^p for $p = 2^l$. We conjecture that

$$V^0 + \text{oddtown}_k \not\vdash \text{Count}_n^p$$

for p which is not a power of 2, and give a sufficient condition to prove it. Roughly saying, the statement is as follows; if $V^0 + \text{oddtown}_k \vdash \text{Count}_n^p$, then there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for each n , we can construct a vector of $n^{O(1)}$ many \mathbb{F}_2 -polynomials whose violating oddtown condition can be verified by a Nullstellensatz proof from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ over \mathbb{F}_2 with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$.

We lastly see that a condition of similar form but not specifying the particular field \mathbb{F}_2 appears when we consider the strength of Fisher's inequality over V^0 . To be concrete, we consider a Σ_0^B formalization FIE_n of Fisher's inequality, another generalization of the pigeonhole principle. We conjecture that

$$V^0 + \text{FIE}_k \not\vdash \text{Count}_n^p$$

for any $p \geq 2$, and give a sufficient condition of above form to prove it.

1 Keywords

Proof complexity, AC^0 -Frege system, bounded arithmetic, V^0 , Ajtai's theorem, Nullstellensatz proof system, pigeonhole principle, modular counting principle, uniform counting principle, general counting principle, oddtown theorem, Fisher's inequality.

2 Introduction

Ajtai's discovery ([1]) of $V^0 \not\vdash \text{ontoPHP}_n^{n+1}$, where ontoPHP_n^{n+1} is a formalization of the statement “there does not exist a bijection between $(n + 1)$ pigeons and n holes,” was a significant breakthrough in proof complexity. The technique which was later formalized in [8] as k -evaluation and switching lemma have been utilized to further works in the area such as the comparison between various types of counting principles (such as [2] and [3]). In the course of the works, it turned out that degree lower bounds of Nullstellensatz proofs are essential when one would like to give lower bounds for the lengths of proofs from constant depth Frege system equipped with $\{\text{Count}_k^p\}_{1 \leq k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (i.e. the modular counting principle mod p) as an axiom scheme. One of the most important open problems in the current proof complexity is whether $V^0(p) \vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1}$ or not (here, injPHP_n^{n+1} denotes the pigeonhole principle for injections). This problem is interesting because it would deepen our understanding of how hard it is to count a set (recall that $VTC^0 \vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1}$ and $V^0(p) \vdash \text{Count}_n^p$). Furthermore, if the problem is solved for composite p , it would give us tips to solve the separation problem $AC^0(p)$ versus TC^0 . As for this problem, [10] has made a huge progress. The paper has given good degree lower bounds for polynomial calculus proofs of injPHP_n^m ($m > n$) which does not depend on the specific coefficient field.

This paper aims to connect the result of [10] to a superpolynomial lower bound for proof length of injPHP_n^{n+1} from AC^0 -Frege system equipped with *Uniform Counting Principle*, which can be seen as a uniform version of infinite formulae $\{\text{Count}_n^p\}_{p,n}$, as an axiom scheme. Tackling the issue, we obtain natural and interesting open problems. We also consider some of them, too. The detailed content and the organization of the article are as follows.

First, as the preliminary, we define three types of (first-order and propositional) formulae which at first glance seem to be generalized versions of modular counting principles (which does not fix the modulus). We name them as:

1. *Modular Pigeonhole Principle modPHP* _{n} ^{d,m} .
2. *Uniform Counting Principle UCP* _{n} ^{l,m} .
3. *Generalized Counting Principle GCP*.

Then, we compare the relative strength of these versions over V^0 , and also develop some independence results over V^0 . It immediately turns out that

- $V^0 + \text{ontoPHP}_l^L \vdash \text{modPHP}_k^{q,m}$, and
- $V^0 + \text{modPHP}_k^{q,m} \vdash \text{ontoPHP}_l^L$.

(For the precise meaning of the statements, see section 3)

Therefore, we see $\text{modPHP}_n^{d,m}$ is actually not appropriate to be called a generalized version of modular counting principles because it cannot imply them.

On the other hand, we observe that

- For any natural number $p \geq 2$, $V^0 + \text{UCP}_k^{l,m} \vdash \text{Count}_n^p$.
- $V^0 + \text{UCP}_k^{l,m} \vdash \text{ontoPHP}_n^{n+1}$.
- $V^0 + \text{GCP} \vdash \text{UCP}_n^{l,m}$.
- $V^0 + \text{GCP} \vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1}$.

Hence, we see $\text{UCP}_n^{l,m}$ and GCP can be seen as generalizations of counting principles.

In the latter sections, we tackle natural questions rising from the observations above.

In section 4, we consider the problem: $V^0 + \text{UCP}_k^{l,m} \vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1}$? The author conjectures $V^0 + \text{UCP}_k^{l,m} \not\vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1}$, and give a sufficient condition to prove it. We define a suitable analogies of *PHP-tree* and *k-evaluation* in the proof of Ajtai's theorem given in [7], and show that if a *h-evaluation using injPHP-trees* exists for a Frege proof of injPHP_n^{n+1} admitting $\text{UCP}_k^{l,m}$ as an axiom scheme, h cannot be of order $o(n)$. Our main work is the manipulation of the trees which connect the order of h with the degrees of Nullstellensatz proofs of it.

In section 5, we consider a “more natural” combinatorial principle than GCP such that implies both injPHP_n^{n+1} and Count_n^p for some p . Namely, we consider the (propositional and first-order) formulae oddtown_n which formalize the oddtown theorem. We observe:

- $V^0 + \text{oddtown}_k \vdash \text{Count}_n^p$ for $p = 2^l$.
- $V^0 + \text{oddtown}_k \vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1}$.

The author conjectures $V^0 + \text{oddtown}_k \not\vdash \text{Count}_n^p$ for any prime $p \neq 2$, and give a sufficient condition to prove it. Roughly saying, the statement is as follows; if $V^0 + \text{oddtown}_k \vdash \text{Count}_n^p$, then there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for each n , we can construct a vector of $n^{O(1)}$ many \mathbb{F}_2 -polynomials whose violating oddtown condition can be verified by a Nullstellensatz proof from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$.

In section 6, we consider the (propositional and first-order) formulae FIE_n which formalize Fisher's inequality. We observe

- $V^0 + \text{FIE}_k \vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{n+1}$.

On the other hand, the author conjectures $V^0 + \text{FIE}_k \not\vdash \text{Count}_n^p$ for any $p \geq 2$, and give a sufficient condition whose form is similar to the previous one to prove it.

3 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, p and q denote natural numbers. The cardinality of a finite set S is denoted by $\#S$. We prioritize the readability and often use natural abbreviations to express logical formulae. We assume that the reader is familiar with the basics of bounded arithmetics and Frege systems (such as the concepts treated in [5]). Unless stated otherwise, we follow the convention of [5].

As propositional connectives, we use only \vee and \neg . We assume \vee has unbounded arity. When the arity is small, we also use \vee to denote \bigvee . We define an abbreviation \bigwedge by

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^k \varphi_i := \neg \bigvee_{i=1}^k \neg \varphi_i.$$

When the arity of \bigwedge is small, we also use \wedge to denote it. We give the operators \bigvee and \bigwedge precedence over \vee and \wedge as for the order of application.

Example 1. $\bigwedge_i \varphi_i \vee \bigwedge_j \psi_j$ means $(\bigwedge_i \varphi_i) \vee (\bigwedge_j \psi_j)$.

We also define an abbreviation \rightarrow by

$$(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) := \neg \varphi \vee \psi.$$

For a set S of propositional variables, an S -formula means a propositional formula whose propositional variables are among S . For a set $S = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \{s_i^j\}_{i \in I_j}$ of propositional variables where each s_i^j is distinct, an S -formula ψ , and a family $\{\varphi_i^j\}_{i \in I_j}$ ($j = 1, \dots, k$) of propositional formulae,

$$\psi[\varphi_i^1/s_i^1, \dots, \varphi_i^k/s_i^k]$$

denotes the formula obtained by substituting each φ_i^j for s_i^j simultaneously.

It is well-known that a $\Sigma_0^B \mathcal{L}_A^2$ -formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k, R_1, \dots, R_l)$ can be translated into a family $\{\varphi[n_1, \dots, n_k, m_1, \dots, m_l]\}_{n_1, \dots, n_k, m_1, \dots, m_l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of propositional formulae (see Theorem VII 2.3 in [5]).

Now, we define several formulae which express so-called “counting principle.”

Definition 2. For each $p \geq 2$, let $Count^p(n, X)$ be an \mathcal{L}_A^2 -formula as follows (intuitively, it says for $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, $[n]$ cannot be p -partitioned):

$$\begin{aligned} Count^p(n, X) := & \neg p|n \rightarrow \neg((\forall e \in X. (e < (n+1)^p \rightarrow Code(e, n)) \\ & \wedge (\forall k \in [n]. \exists e \in X. k \in^* e) \\ & \wedge (\forall e, e' \in X. \neg(e \perp e')))) \end{aligned}$$

Here,

- $p|n$ is a Σ_0^B formula expressing p divides n .

- $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$.
- We code a p -subset

$$e = \{e_1 < \dots < e_p\}$$

of $[n]$ by the number

$$\sum_{i=1}^p e_i (n+1)^{p-i}.$$

- $Code(e, n)$ is a natural Σ_0^B -predicate saying “ e is a code of p -subset of n .”
- The elementship relation \in^* is expressed by a natural Σ_0^B -predicate.
- $e \perp e'$ means

$$e \neq e' \text{ and } e \cap e' \neq \emptyset,$$

and it is also expressed by a natural Σ_0^B -predicate.

We also define the propositional formula $Count_n^p$ as in [6]:

$$Count_n^p := \begin{cases} \neg(\bigwedge_{k \in [n]} \bigvee_{e: k \in e \in [n]^p} r_e \wedge \bigwedge_{e, e' \in [n]^p: e \perp e'} (\neg r_e \vee \neg r_{e'})) & (\text{if } p|n) \\ 1 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

Here, $[n]^p$ denotes the set of all p -subsets of $[n]$, and $\{r_e\}_{e \in [n]^p}$ is a family of distinct propositional variables.

Convention 3. It is easy to see that we may assume $|X| = (n+1)^p$ in $Count^p(n, X)$ over V^0 . Furthermore, with suitable identification of propositional variables, $Count^p(x, X)[n, (n+1)^p]$ is equivalent to $Count_n^p$ over AC^0 -Frege system modulo polynomial-sized proofs. Thus we often abuse the notation and write $Count_n^p$ for $Count^p(n, X)$.

Definition 4. The $\Sigma_0^B \mathcal{L}_A^2$ -formula $ontoPHP(m, n, R)$ is a natural expression of the statement “If $m > n$, then R does not give a graph of a bijection between $[m]$ and $[n]$,” in a similar way as $Count^p(n, X)$. Similarly, the $\Sigma_0^B \mathcal{L}_A^2$ -formula $injPHP(m, n, R)$ is a natural expression of the statement “If $m > n$, then R does not give a graph of an injection from $[m]$ to $[n]$.”

We also define the propositional formulae $ontoPHP_n^m$ and $injPHP_n^m$ by

$$ontoPHP_n^m := \begin{cases} \neg(\bigwedge_{i \in [m]} \bigvee_{j \in [n]} r_{ij} \wedge \bigwedge_{i \neq i' \in [m]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} (\neg r_{ij} \vee \neg r_{i'j}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} \bigvee_{i \in [m]} r_{ij} \wedge \bigwedge_{j \neq j' \in [n]} \bigwedge_{i \in [m]} (\neg r_{ij} \vee \neg r_{ij'})) & (\text{if } m > n) \\ 1 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

and

$$injPHP_n^m := \begin{cases} \neg(\bigwedge_{i \in [m]} \bigvee_{j \in [n]} r_{ij} \wedge \bigwedge_{i \neq i' \in [m]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} (\neg r_{ij} \vee \neg r_{i'j}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{j \neq j' \in [n]} \bigwedge_{i \in [m]} (\neg r_{ij} \vee \neg r_{ij'})) & (\text{if } m > n) \\ 1 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

With reasons similar to the one stated in Convention 3, we abuse the notations and use $ontoPHP_n^m$ to denote $ontoPHP(m, n, R)$ and $injPHP_n^m$ to denote $injPHP(m, n, R)$.

The following are well-known:

Theorem 5 ([1], improved by [8] and [9]).

$$V^0 \not\models ontoPHP_n^{n+1}.$$

Here, we adopt the following convention.

Convention 6. For Σ_0^B -formulae ψ_1, \dots, ψ_l and φ , we write

$$V^0 + \psi_1 + \dots + \psi_l \vdash \varphi$$

to express the fact that the theory $V^0 \cup \{\forall \psi_i \mid i \in [l]\}$ implies $\forall \varphi$. Here, \forall means the universal closure.

We use different parameters to express concrete $\vec{\psi}$ and φ in order to avoid the confusion. We also use letters p, q for fixed parameters of formulae (which is not universally quantified in the theory). For example,

$$V^0 + Count_k^p \not\models Count_n^q$$

means

$$V^0 + \forall k, X. Count^p(k, X) \not\models \forall n, X. Count^q(n, X),$$

while

$$V^0 \not\models UCP_n^{l,d}$$

means

$$V^0 \not\models \forall l, d, n, R. UCP(l, d, n, R)$$

(for the definition of $UCP_n^{l,d}$ and $UCP(l, d, n, R)$, see Definition 13).

In the former example, note that we have used the different variables k, n in order to avoid confusions on the dependency of variables.

Theorem 7 ([2]). For $p, q \geq 2$, $V^0 + Count_k^p \vdash Count_n^q$ if and only if $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}. q \mid p^N$.

Theorem 8 ([3]). For any $p \geq 2$, $V^0 + Count_k^p \not\models injPHP_n^{n+1}$.

Also, the following is a corollary of the arguments given in [6]:

Theorem 9 (essentially in [6]). For all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $V^0 + injPHP_k^{k+1} \not\models Count_n^p$.

Remark 10. Note that the exact statement Theorem 12.5.7 in [6] shows is

$$V^0 + ontoPHP_k^{k+1} \not\models Count_n^2.$$

However, with a slight change of the argument, it is easy to see that Theorem 9 actually holds.

From now on, we consider several seemingly generalized versions of $Count_n^p$ which does not fix the modulus p , and evaluate their strengths. Naively, the generalized counting principle should be a statement like: “For any $d \geq 2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if d does not divide n , then n cannot be partitioned into d -sets.” The following is one of the straightforward formalizations of this statement:

Definition 11. The $\Sigma_0^B \mathcal{L}_A^2$ -formula $modPHP(d, m, n, R)$ is a natural formalization of the statement “If $m \not\equiv n \pmod{d}$, then R does not give the graph of a bijection between $[m]$ and $[n]$.”

We also define the propositional formulae $modPHP_n^{d,m}$ as follows:

$$modPHP_n^{d,m} := \begin{cases} \text{same as the case of } m > n \text{ in the definition of } ontoPHP_n^m & (\text{if } m \not\equiv n \pmod{d}) \\ 1 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

With a similar reason as the one given in Convention 3, we abuse the notation and use $modPHP_n^{d,m}$ to denote $modPHP(d, m, n, R)$.

Intuitively, $modPHP_n^{d,m}$ expresses “if $n \not\equiv m \pmod{d}$ and $m = ds + r$ ($0 \leq r < d$), then there does not exist a family $\{S_i\}_{i \in [q]}$ of d -sets and an r -set S_0 which give a partition of $[n]$.” However, it does not imply even $Count_n^2$:

Proposition 12. The following hold:

1. $V^0 + ontoPHP_l^L \vdash modPHP_k^{d,m}$.
2. $V^0 + modPHP_k^{d,m} \vdash ontoPHP_l^L$.

In particular, for any $p \geq 2$, $V^0 + modPHP_k^{d,m} \not\vdash Count_n^p$.

Proof. As for 1, argue in V^0 as follows: assume $m \not\equiv k \pmod{d}$, and R gives a bijection between $[m]$ and $[k]$. It easily follows that $m \neq k$, and hence R or R^{-1} violates $ontoPHP_k^m$ or $ontoPHP_m^k$.

As for 2, argue in V^0 as follows: suppose $L > l$ and R gives a bijection between $[L]$ and $[l]$. Then R violates $modPHP_l^{L,L}$.

The last part follows from Theorem 9. ■

Therefore, $modPHP_n^{d,m}$ is actually not a generalization of counting principles over V^0 .

Next, we consider the following version:

Definition 13. $UCP(l, d, n, R)$ (which stands for *Uniform Counting Principle*) is an \mathcal{L}_A^2 formula defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (d \geq 1 \wedge \neg d|n) \rightarrow & \neg \forall i \in [l]. (\forall j \in [d]. \exists e \in [n]. R(i, j, e) \vee \forall j \in [d]. \neg \exists e \in [n]. R(i, j, e)) \\ & \wedge \forall (i, j) \in [l] \times [d]. \forall e \neq e' \in [n]. (\neg R(i, j, e) \vee \neg R(i, j, e')) \\ & \wedge \forall (i, j) \neq (i', j') \in [l] \times [d]. \forall e \in [n]. (\neg R(i, j, e) \vee \neg R(i', j', e)) \\ & \wedge \forall e \in [n]. \exists (i, j) \in [l] \times [d]. R(i, j, e) \end{aligned}$$

The propositional formula $UCP_n^{l,d}$ is defined as follows:

$$UCP_n^{l,d} := \begin{cases} \neg \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^l \left(\left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \bigvee_{e \in [n]} r_{i,j,e} \right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \neg \bigvee_{e \in [n]} r_{i,j,e} \right) \right) \right. \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{(i,j) \in [l] \times [d]} \bigwedge_{e \neq e' \in [n]} (\neg r_{i,j,e} \vee \neg r_{i,j,e'}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{(i,j) \neq (i',j') \in [l] \times [d]} \bigwedge_{e \in [n]} (\neg r_{i,j,e} \vee \neg r_{i',j',e}) \\ \quad \left. \wedge \bigwedge_{e \in [n]} \bigvee_{(i,j) \in [l] \times [d]} r_{i,j,e} \right) & (\text{if } n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{d}, d \geq 1) \\ 1 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

As in the previous definitions, we abuse the notation and use $UCP_n^{l,d}$ to express $UCP(l, d, n, R)$.

Intuitively, $UCP_n^{l,d}$ states “if $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{d}$, then there does not exist a family $\{S_i\}_{i \in [l]}$ which consists of d -sets and emptysets which give a partition of $[n]$.” Each variable $r_{i,j,e}$ reads “the j -th element of S_i is e .”

We observe the following:

Proposition 14. The following hold:

1. For any $p \geq 2$, $V^0 + UCP_k^{l,d} \vdash Count_n^p$.
2. $V^0 + UCP_k^{l,d} \vdash ontoPHP_n^m$.

Proof. As for 1, argue in V^0 as follows: suppose $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, and R gives a p -partition of $[n]$. Set the family $\{S_r\}_{r \in [(n+1)^p]}$ by:

$$S_r := \begin{cases} \text{the set coded by } r & (\text{if } r \in R) \\ \emptyset & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

Then $\{S_r\}_{r \in [(n+1)^p]}$ indeed violates $UCP_n^{(n+1)^p, p}$.

As for 2, argue in V^0 as follows: suppose $m > n$ and R gives a bijection between $[m]$ and $[n]$. Then, $\{[n]\}$ violates $UCP_n^{1,m}$. \blacksquare

Hence, $UCP_n^{l,d}$ is indeed a generalization of counting principles. It is natural to ask

Question 1. Does the following hold?:

$$V^0 + UCP_k^{l,d} \vdash injPHP_n^{n+1},$$

or, at least,

$$V^0 + ontoPHP_m^M \vdash injPHP_n^{n+1}.$$

Seeing theorem 8, the author conjectures the answer to the problems is no. We tackle this issue in section 4.

Here, we consider one more generalization of counting principles (which relates to the above problem):

Definition 15. $GCP(P, Q_1, Q_2, R_1, R_2, M_0, M_1, M_2)$ (which stands for *Generalized Counting Principle*) is a $\Sigma_0^B \mathcal{L}_A^2$ -formula expressing the following statement: bounded sets

$$P, Q_1, Q_2, R_1, R_2, M_0, M_1, M_2$$

cannot satisfy the conjunction of following properties:

1. M_0 codes a bijection between $(P \times Q_1) \sqcup R_1$ and $(P \times Q_2) \sqcup R_2$.
2. M_1 is an injection from R_1 to R_2 such that some element $a \in R_2$ is out of its range.
3. M_2 is an injection from R_2 to P such that some element $b \in P$ is out of its range.

Remark 16. We can consider the propositional translation of GCP as well as the previous examples $UCP_n^{l,d}$, $Count_n^p$, etc. However, we do not write it down here because we do not use it this time.

It is easy to see that:

Proposition 17. 1. $V^0 + GCP \vdash UCP_n^{l,d}$.

2. $V^0 + GCP \vdash injPHP_n^{n+1}$.

Proof. Work in $V^0 + GCP$.

We first prove $UCP_n^{l,d}$. Suppose $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{d}$, and $\{S_i\}_{i \in [l]}$ is a family consisting of d -sets and emptysets, and $[n] = \bigsqcup_{i \in [l]} S_i$. Set

$$Q := \{i \in [l] \mid S_i \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then the partition gives a bijection between $[n]$ and $Q \times [d] \sqcup \emptyset$.

On the other hand, since $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{d}$, we can write $n = ds + r$ where $1 \leq r < d$. This gives a natural bijection between $[n]$ and $[d] \times [s] \sqcup [r]$.

Using Σ_0^B -COMP (cf. Definition V.1.2 in [5]), it is straightforward to construct proper injections from \emptyset to $[r]$ and from $[r]$ to $[d]$. Thus GCP is violated, a contradiction.

We next prove $injPHP_n^{n+1}$. Suppose R gives an injection from $[n+1]$ to $[n]$. Then, there is a natural bijection between $[n]$ and $[n+1] \times [1] \sqcup ([n] \setminus \text{ran } R)$.

On the other hand, there is a natural bijection between $[n]$ and $[n+1] \times \emptyset \sqcup [n]$.

It is easy to construct proper injections from $[n] \setminus \text{ran } R$ to $[n]$, and from $[n]$ to $[n+1]$. Thus GCP is violated, a contradiction. \blacksquare

It is natural to ask:

Question 2. 1. Does the following hold?: $V^0 + UCP_k^{l,d} \vdash GCP$.

2. Is there any other combinatorial principle than GCP which also implies $injPHP_n^{n+1}$ and some of $Count_n^p$?

On question 1, the author conjectures the answer is no (since GCP implies $injPHP_n^{n+1}$).

As for question 2, we consider oddtown theorem in section 5.

In the analysis of this paper, Nullstellensatz proofs (which is written shortly as “NS-proofs”) play an essential role in the arguments. We set up our terminology on NS-proofs and end this section.

Definition 18. Let R be a commutative ring, and \mathcal{F} be a set of multivariate R -polynomials. For multivariate R -polynomials g_1, g_2 and h_f ($f \in \mathcal{F}$), $\{h_f\}_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$ is a NS-proof of $g_1 = g_2$ from \mathcal{F} if and only if

$$g_1 - g_2 = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} h_f f.$$

Especially, for $a \in R \setminus \{0\}$, a NS-proof of $a = 0$ from \mathcal{F} is called a NS-refutation of \mathcal{F} .

The *degree* of an NS-proof $\{h_f\}_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$ is defined by $\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \deg(h_f)$. Here, we adopt the convention; $\deg 0 := -\infty$.

4 On Question 1

On question 1, the author conjectures the following:

Conjecture 1.

$$F_c + UCP_k^{l,d} \not\vdash_{poly(n)} injPHP_n^{n+1}.$$

Here, for a family $\{\alpha_{\vec{k}}\}_{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{N}}$ of propositional formulae, $F_c + \alpha_{\vec{k}}$ is the fragment of Frege system allowing the formulae with depth $\leq c$ only and admitting $\{\alpha_{\vec{k}}\}_{\vec{k}}$ as an axiom scheme. Furthermore, $P \vdash_{poly(n)} \varphi_n$ means each φ_n has a $poly(n)$ -sized P -proof.

If this conjecture is true, then it follows that $V^0 + UCP_k^{l,d} \not\vdash injPHP_n^{n+1}$ by the witnessing theorem and the translation theorem.

In this section, we give a sufficient condition to prove this conjecture. Our strategy is to adapt the proof technique of Ajtai’s theorem to the situation. We define *injPHP-tree*, and a *k-evaluation using injPHP-tree*, and show that a Frege-proof of $injPHP_n^{n+1}$ admitting $UCP_k^{l,d}$ as an axiom scheme cannot have $o(n)$ -evaluation. Taking the contraposition, we obtain our sufficient condition.

We begin with the following notion:

Definition 19. Let D and R be disjoint sets. A *partial injection from D to R* is a set ρ which satisfies the following:

1. Each $x \in \rho$ is either a 2-set having one element from D and one element from R , or a singleton contained in R (in the former case, if $x = \{i, j\}$ where $i \in D$ and $j \in R$, then we use a tuple $\langle i, j \rangle$ to denote x , In the latter case, if $x = \{j\}$ where $j \in R$, then we use 1-tuple $\langle j \rangle$ to denote x).

2. Each pair $x \neq x' \in \rho$ are disjoint.

The 2-sets in a partial injection ρ gives a partial bijection from D to R . We denote it by ρ_{bij} . Also, we set $\rho_{sing} := \rho \setminus \rho_{bij}$.

We define $v(\rho) := \bigcup_{x \in \rho} x$, $\text{dom}(\rho) := v(\rho) \cap D$, and $\text{ran}(\rho) := v(\rho) \cap R$.

For two partial injections ρ and τ from D to R ,

1. $\rho || \tau$ if and only if $\rho \cup \tau$ is again a partial injection.
2. $\rho \perp \tau$ if and only if $\rho || \tau$ does not hold. In other words, there exist $x \in \rho$ and $y \in \tau$ such that $x \neq y$ and $x \cap y \neq \emptyset$.
3. $\sigma\tau := \sigma \cup \tau$.

In the following, if there is no problem, we identify domains having the same size n , and denote them D_n . Similarly, we identify ranges R having the same size n , and denote them R_n . We also assume that for every pair m and n , D_m and R_n are mutually disjoint.

Definition 20. For each $m > n$, \mathcal{M}_n^m denotes the set of all partial injections from D_m to R_n .

Definition 21. Let D and R be disjoint finite sets. *injPHP-tree over (D, R)* is a vertex-labelled and edge-labelled rooted tree defined inductively as follows:

1. The tree whose only vertex is its root and has no labels is an *injPHP-tree over (D, R)* .
2. If the root is labelled by " $i \mapsto ?$ " having $|R|$ children and each of its edges corresponding to each label " $\langle i, j \rangle$ " ($j \in R$), and the subtree which the child under the edge labelled by " $\langle i, j \rangle$ " induces is an *injPHP-tree over $(D \setminus \{i\}, R \setminus \{j\})$* , then the whole labelled tree is again an *injPHP-tree over (D, R)* .
3. If the root is labelled by " $? \mapsto j$ " having $(|D| + 1)$ children and each of its edges corresponding to each label " $\langle i, j \rangle$ " ($i \in D$) and " $\langle j \rangle$," and the subtree which the child under the edge indexed by $\langle i, j \rangle$ induces is an *injPHP-tree over $(D \setminus \{i\}, R \setminus \{j\})$* while the subtree which the child under the edge labelled by " $\langle j \rangle$ " induces is an *injPHP-tree over $(D, R \setminus \{j\})$* , then the whole tree is again an *injPHP-tree over (D, R)* .

For an *injPHP-tree* T , we denote the *height* (the maximum number of edges in its branches) of T by $\text{height}(T)$ and the set of its branches by $\text{br}(T)$.

The pair $(T, L: \text{br}(T) \rightarrow S)$ is called a *labelled injPHP-tree with label set S* . For each label $s \in S$, we set $\text{br}_s(T) := L^{-1}(s)$.

Convention 22. When T is an *injPHP-tree over (D, R)* , each branch $b \in \text{br}(T)$ naturally gives a partial injection, which is the collection of labels of edges contained in b . We often abuse the notation and use b to denote the partial injection given by b .

Definition 23. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_n^m$ ($m > n$). Let T be an *injPHP*-tree over (D_m, R_n) with height $\leq n - \#\rho$. We define the *restriction* T^ρ as the *injPHP*-tree over $(D_m \setminus \text{dom}(\rho), R_n \setminus \text{ran}(\rho))$ obtained from T by deleting the edges with label incompatible with ρ , contracting the edges whose label are contained in ρ (we leave the label of the child), and taking the connected component including the root of the tree.

Remark 24. Note that the condition $\text{height}(T) \leq n - \#\rho$ is necessary to obtain an *injPHP*-tree.

Definition 25. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_n^m$ ($m > n$). For $\{r_{ij}\}_{i \in D_m, j \in R_n}$ -propositional formula φ (by a natural identification of variables, we regard each variable r_{ij} is utilized to construct the propositional formula injPHP_n^m), we define the *restriction* φ^ρ by applying φ the following partial assignment: for each $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [n]$,

$$r_{ij} \mapsto \begin{cases} 1 & (\text{if } \langle i, j \rangle \in \rho) \\ 0 & (\text{if } \{\langle i, j \rangle\} \perp \rho) \\ r_{ij} & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

For a set Γ of $\{r_{ij}\}_{i \in D_m, j \in R_n}$ -propositional formulae, define

$$\Gamma^\rho := \{\varphi^\rho \mid \varphi \in \Gamma\}.$$

Also, for $\tau \in \mathcal{M}_n^m$ such that $\tau \parallel \rho$, we set

$$\tau^\rho := \tau \setminus \rho$$

Example 26. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_n^m$ ($m > n$). Then, by suitable change of variables, $(\text{injPHP}_n^m)^\rho$ is equivalent to $\text{injPHP}_{n-\#\text{ran}(\rho)}^{m-\#\text{dom}(\rho)}$ (over AC^0 -Frege system, mod $\text{poly}(m, n)$ -sized proofs).

Definition 27. Let $m > n$. Let T be an *injPHP*-tree over (D_m, R_n) with height h . Given a set $S \subset \text{br}(T)$ and a family $(T_b)_{b \in \text{br}(T)}$ of *injPHP*-trees where each T_b is over $(D_m \setminus \text{dom}(b), R_n \setminus \text{ran}(b))$ with height $\leq n - h$, we define the *concatenated tree*

$$T * \sum_{b \in S} T_b$$

as follows: for each $b \in S$, concatenate T_b under b in T identifying the leaf of b and the root of T_b (and leaving the label of the root of T_b).

For two *injPHP*-trees T and U over (D_m, R_n) satisfying

$$\text{height}(T) + \text{height}(U) \leq n,$$

we define

$$T * U := T * \sum_{b \in \text{br}(T)} U^b.$$

Definition 28. Let Γ be a subformula closed set of $\{r_{ij}\}_{i \in D_m, j \in R_n}$ -formulae ($m > n$). A k -evaluation (using *injPHP-trees*) of Γ is a map

$$T : \varphi \in \Gamma \mapsto T_\varphi$$

satisfying the following:

1. Each T_φ is a labelled *injPHP*-tree over (D_m, R_n) with label set $\{0, 1\}$.
2. T_0 is the *injPHP*-tree with height 0, whose only branch is labeled by 0.
3. T_1 is the *injPHP*-tree with height 0, whose only branch is labeled by 1.
4. $T_{r_{ij}}$ is the *injPHP*-tree over (D_m, R_n) with height 1, whose label of the root is $i \mapsto ?$ and $br_1(T_{r_{ij}}) = \{\langle i, j \rangle\}$.
5. $T_{\neg\varphi} = T_\varphi^c$, that is, $T_{\neg\varphi}$ is obtained from T_φ by flipping the labels 0 and 1.
6. $T_{\bigvee_{i \in I} \varphi_i}$ (where each φ_i does not begin from \vee) represents $\bigcup_{i \in I} br_1(T_{\varphi_i})$. Here, we say a $\{0, 1\}$ -labelled *injPHP*-tree T represents a set \mathcal{F} of partial injections if and only if the following hold:
 - (a) For each $b \in br_1(T)$, there exists a $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\sigma \subset b$.
 - (b) For each $b \in br_0(T)$, every $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfies $\sigma \perp b$.

Example 29. Given a list $F = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N\}$, where $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N$ are partial injections from D to R , we define the $\{0, 1\}$ -labelled *injPHP*-tree T_F over (D, R) inductively as follows:

1. If F is empty, $T_F := T_0$.
2. If some σ_i is an empty map, $T_F := T_1$.
3. Otherwise, find the first $\sigma_i \neq \emptyset$. Let ν_1 be the index. Ask where to go for each $v \in v(\sigma_{\nu_1})$. Let T be the obtained *injPHP*-tree.
4. For each branch $b \in br(T)$, consider F^b below:

$$F^b := \{\sigma_i^b \mid \sigma_i \parallel b\}.$$

Construct T_{F^b} over $(D \setminus \text{dom}(b), R \setminus \text{ran}(b))$ inductively, and set

$$T_F := T * \sum_{b \in br(T)} T_{F^b}.$$

T_F clearly represents F (we regard F as a set here).

Example 30. If an *injPHP*-tree T over (D_m, R_n) ($m > n$) represents \mathcal{F} , $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_n^m$, and $\text{height}(T) \leq n - \#\rho$, then T^ρ represents \mathcal{F}^ρ . Indeed, for $b^\rho \in br_1(T^\rho)$, where $b \in br_1(T)$, there exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\sigma \subset b$. Hence $\sigma \parallel \rho$ and it gives $\sigma^\rho \in \mathcal{F}^\rho$, $\sigma^\rho \subset b^\rho$. On the other hand, for $b^\rho \in br_0(T^\rho)$, each $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfies $\sigma \perp b$. Therefore, for all σ such that $\sigma \parallel \rho$, $\sigma^\rho \perp b^\rho$ holds.

Proposition 31. Let T be a k -evaluation of a subformula-closed set Γ of $\{r_{ij}\}_{i \in D_m, j \in R_n}$ -formulae ($m > n$), $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_n^m$, $k \leq n - \#\rho$.

Consider

$$U_\varphi := (T_\varphi)^\rho.$$

Here, the right-hand side means the following: let $T_\varphi = (S, L)$, where

$$L: br(S) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}.$$

Then

$$(T_\varphi)^\rho := (S^\rho, L^\rho),$$

where L^ρ is the labelling induced by L and ρ .

Then U_φ is an *injPHP*-tree over $(D_m \setminus \text{dom}(\rho), R_n \setminus \text{ran}(\rho))$, which can be regarded as $(D_{m-\#\text{dom}(\rho)}, R_{n-\#\text{ran}(\rho)})$.

In particular, we can regard U as a k -evaluation of Γ^ρ of $\{r_{ij}\}_{i \in D_{m-\#\text{dom}(\rho)}, j \in R_{n-\#\text{ran}(\rho)}}$ -formulae.

Proof. Clear. ■

Theorem 32. Let $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function satisfying $n < f(n) \leq n^{O(1)}$. Suppose $(\pi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of Frege-proofs such that π_n proves $\text{injPHP}_n^{f(n)}$ using $UCP_k^{l,d}$ as an axiom scheme.

Then there cannot be a sequence $(T^n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying the following: each T^n is an $o(n)$ -evaluation using *injPHP*-trees over $(D_{f(n)}, R_n)$ of Γ_n , where Γ_n is the set of all subformulae appearing in π_n .

Proof. Suppose otherwise. There exist $o(n)$ -evaluations T^n of Γ_n . Fix a large enough n , and we suppress the superscript n of T^n , and denote it simply by T .

For $\varphi \in \Gamma_n$, define

$$T \models \varphi :\Leftrightarrow br_1(T_\varphi) = br(T_\varphi).$$

Then we can show the following claims analogously with Lemma 15.1.7 and Lemma 15.1.6 in [7]:

Claim 33. If φ is derived from $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k \in \pi_n$ by a Frege rule in π_n , and $\forall i \in [k]. T \models \psi_i$, then $T \models \varphi$.

Claim 34. $br_1(T_{\text{injPHP}_n^{f(n)}}) = \emptyset$. In particular, $T \not\models \text{injPHP}_n^{f(n)}$.

Also, the following fact is useful:

Claim 35.

$$T \models \bigwedge_{i=1}^L \varphi_i \implies \forall i \in [n]. T \models \varphi_i.$$

Proof of the claim. The hypothesis means

$$T \models \neg \bigvee_{i=1}^L \neg \varphi_i,$$

that is,

$$br_0(T_{\bigvee_{i=1}^L \neg \varphi_i}) = br(T_{\bigvee_{i=1}^L \neg \varphi_i}).$$

Therefore, for each $b \in br(T_{\bigvee_{i=1}^L \neg \varphi_i})$ and $d \in br_1(T_{\neg \varphi_i})$, $b \perp d$ holds. Now, assume some $br_0(T_{\varphi_i})$ is nonempty, and d_0 be one of its elements. Since

$$\#d_0 \leq o(n) \text{ and } height(T_{\bigvee_{i=1}^L \neg \varphi_i}) \leq o(n),$$

there exists a branch $b \in br(T_{\bigvee_{i=1}^L \neg \varphi_i})$ such that $b || d$, which is a contradiction. \blacksquare

Therefore, there exists an instance

$$I = UCP_k^{l,d}[\psi_{i,j,e}/r_{i,j,e}]$$

such that $T \not\models I$. Hence, $k \not\equiv 0 \pmod{d}$. By restricting the formulae and T by some $\rho \in br_0(T_I)$, we obtain the proof π_n^ρ of $(injPHP_n^{n+1})^\rho$ and the $o(n)$ -evaluation T^ρ of Γ_n^ρ (note that $\#\rho \leq o(n)$, hence T^ρ is well-defined). Therefore, we may assume that $br_0(T_I) = br(T_I)$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,j,e} &:= T_{\psi_{i,j,e}}, \\ S_e &:= T_{\bigvee_{(i,j) \in [l] \times [d]} \psi_{i,j,e}}, \\ S_{i,j} &:= T_{\bigvee_{e \in [k]} \psi_{i,j,e}}, \\ P_i &:= T_{\bigvee_{j \in [d]} \neg \bigvee_{e \in [k]} \psi_{i,j,e}}, \\ N_i &:= T_{\bigvee_{j \in [d]} \bigvee_{e \in [k]} \psi_{i,j,e}}, \\ U_i &:= T_{(\neg \bigvee_{j \in [d]} \neg \bigvee_{e \in [k]} \psi_{i,j,e}) \vee (\neg \bigvee_{j \in [d]} \bigvee_{e \in [k]} \psi_{i,j,e})}. \end{aligned}$$

$(i \in [l], j \in [d], e \in [k])$

Since $br_0(T_I) = br(T_I)$, we observe the following facts:

1. For each $e \in [k]$, $T \models S_e$, that is, for all $b \in br(S_e)$ is an extension of some $b' \in br(S_{i,j,e})$.
2. For each $e \in [k]$ and $(i,j) \neq (i',j') \in [l] \times [d]$, every pair of branches $b \in br_1(S_{i,j,e})$ and $b' \in br_1(S_{i',j',e})$ satisfies $b \perp b'$.
3. For each $e \neq e' \in [k]$ and $(i,j) \in [l] \times [d]$, each $b \in br_1(S_{i,j,e})$ and $b' \in br_1(S_{i,j,e'})$ satisfies $b \perp b'$.

4. For each $i \in [l]$, $T \models U_i$, that is, every $b \in br(U_i)$ is an extension of some $b' \in br_1(P_i^c)$ or some $b' \in br_1(N_i^c)$. In the former case, b is incompatible with every $b'' \in \bigcup_j br_0(S_{i,j})$. In the latter case, b is incompatible with every $b'' \in \bigcup_{j,e} br_1(S_{i,j,e})$. Therefore, the two cases are mutually disjoint. Indeed, if b satisfies the both cases, then take $b' \in br(S_{i,j})$ such that $b \parallel b'$ (which exists since $\#b$ and $height(S_{i,j})$ are both $o(n)$). It follows that $b' \in br_1(S_{i,j})$, and therefore b' is an extension of some $b'' \in \bigcup_e br_1(S_{i,j,e})$, which contradicts the observation of the latter case.

With the observations above, we construct labeled *injPHP*-trees $(X_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in [l] \times [d]}$ and $(Y_e)_{e \in [k]}$ as follows

- We define Y_e for fixed e first. Consider S_e . By observation 1 and 2, each $b \in br(S_e)$ has a unique $(i_b, j_b) \in [l] \times [d]$ such that b is an extension of some $b' \in br_1(S_{i_b, j_b, e})$. Consider the tree

$$S_e * \sum_{b \in br(S_e)} (U_{i_b} * S_{i_b, j_b})^b$$

(here, we have concatenated the trees ignoring their labels).

Label each branch extending $b \in br(S_e)$ with $\langle i_b, j_b, e \rangle$. Let Y_e be the obtained labelled *injPHP*-tree. Note that $height(Y_e)$ is still $o(n)$.

- Next, we define $X_{i,j}$ for fixed i, j . Consider U_i . Let $B \subset br(U_i)$ be the set of all $b \in br(U_i)$ satisfying the former case of observation 4. Consider the tree $\tilde{X}_{i,j} := U_i * \sum_{b \in B} S_{i,j}^b$. Each branch $\tilde{b} \in br(\tilde{X}_{i,j})$ satisfies one of the following:

1. $\tilde{b} \in br(U_i) \setminus B$.
2. Otherwise, we can decompose $\tilde{b} = bs^b$ ($b \in B, s \in br(S_{i,j})$). Since b is an extension of some $b' \in br_1(P_i^c)$, $br_1(S_{i,j}^b) = br(S_{i,j}^b)$. Therefore, by observation 3, each $s^b \in br(S_{i,j}^b)$ has a unique $e_{\tilde{b}} \in [k]$ such that b extends some $b'' \in br_1(S_{i,j,e_{\tilde{b}}})$.

Let \tilde{B} be the all branches of $\tilde{X}_{i,j}$ satisfying the second item. We define

$$\hat{X}_{i,j} := \tilde{X}_{i,j} * \sum_{\tilde{b} \in \tilde{B}} (S_{e_{\tilde{b}}})^{\tilde{b}}.$$

We label each branch $b \in br(\hat{X}_{i,j})$ as follows, and define $X_{i,j}$ to be the obtained labeled *injPHP*-tree.

1. If $b \in br(U_i) \setminus B$, then label it with the symbol \perp .
2. Otherwise, there exists a unique $\tilde{b} \in \tilde{B}$ such that $\tilde{b} \subset b$. Label the branch b with $\langle i, j, e_{\tilde{b}} \rangle$.

By observation 3, we see that $(X_{i,j})_{i \in [l], j \in [d]}$ and $(Y_e)_{e \in [k]}$ satisfy the following:

- For each $(i, j), e$, $br_{\langle i, j, e \rangle}(X_{i, j}) = br_{\langle i, j, e \rangle}(Y_e)$ (as sets of partial injections).
- For each i , $ibr_{\perp}(X_{i, 1}) = \dots = br_{\perp}(X_{i, d})$.

Now, we consider Nullstellensatz refutations over the ring \mathbb{Z}_d of the following system, which we call $\neg inj^*PHP_m^M$ (M and m are general numbers satisfying $M > m$):

$$x_{ij}^2 - x_{ij} \quad (1)$$

$$x_{ij}x_{ij'} \quad (i \in [M], j \neq j' \in [m]), \quad (2)$$

$$x_{ij}x_{i'j} \quad (i \neq i' \in [M], j \in [m]), \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^m x_{ij} - 1 \quad (i \in [M]), \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^M x_{ij} + u_j - 1 \quad (j \in [m]) \quad (5)$$

(x_{ij} and u_j are distinct indeterminates).

By the properties of $(X_{i, j})_{i \in [l], j \in [d]}$ and $(Y_e)_{e \in [k]}$, the following holds:

$$\sum_{(i, j) \in [l] \times [d]} \sum_{\alpha \in br(X_{i, j})} x_{\alpha} = \sum_{e \in [k]} \sum_{\beta \in br(Y_e)} x_{\beta} \pmod{d}.$$

(Here, for a partial injection ρ , $x_{\rho} := (\prod_{\langle p, h \rangle \in \rho_{bij}} x_{p, h}) (\prod_{\langle h \rangle \in \rho_{sing}} u_h)$).

It is easy to see that for any $injPHP$ -tree T over (D_M, R_m) , $\sum_{\alpha \in br(T)} x_{\alpha} = 1$ has an NS -refutation from $\neg inj^*PHP_m^M$ with degree $\leq height(T)$. Hence, we obtain a NS -refutation of $\neg inj^*PHP_{n-\# \text{ran}(\rho)}^{f(n)-\# \text{dom}(\rho)}$ over \mathbb{Z}_d such that the degree is $o(n)$. Applying the substitution $u_j := 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m x_{ij}$, we obtain a NS -refutation of $\neg injPHP_{n-\# \text{ran}(\rho)}^{f(n)-\# \text{dom}(\rho)}$ over \mathbb{Z}_d such that the degree is $o(n)$ (Here, $\neg injPHP_m^M$ denotes the system of polynomials given by (2), (3), (4)).

By Chinese remainder theorem, \mathbb{Z}_d can be written as a direct product of some finite fields. Projecting the NS -refutation to an appropriate component, we obtain a NS -refutation of $\neg injPHP_{n-\# \text{ran}(\rho)}^{f(n)-\# \text{dom}(\rho)}$ over a finite field with degree $o(n)$. Recall $\# \rho \leq o(n)$. This contradicts the linear degree lower bound with respect to m of PC -proofs of $injPHP_m^M$, given in [10]. Note that the coefficient of the lower bound given in [10] does not depend on the specific field. \blacksquare

Setting $f(n) := n+1$ and taking the contraposition of Theorem 32, we obtain a sufficient condition for Conjecture 1:

Corollary 36. Assume $F_c + UCP_k^{l, d} \vdash_{poly(n)} injPHP_n^{n+1}$ is witnessed by AC^0 -proofs $(\pi_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Suppose there are partial injections $(\rho_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfying

- For each n , $\rho_n \in \mathcal{M}_n^{n+1}$.

- $n - \#\text{ran}(\rho_n) \rightarrow \infty$ ($n \rightarrow \infty$).
- There exist $o(n - \#\text{ran}(\rho_n))$ -evaluations $(T^n)_{n \geq 1}$ of Γ_n^ρ , where Γ_n is the all subformulae appearing in π_n .

Then we obtain a contradiction.

Remark 37. The condition above is an analogue of the switching lemma used in a standard proof of Ajtai's theorem (see Lemma 15.2.2 and the section 15.7 in [7] for reference and the historical remarks). It seems the proof of that this condition holds is beyond the current proof techniques. The difficulty is relevant to that of the famous open problem; does $V^0 \vdash \text{injPHP}_n^{2n}$ hold?

5 On the strength of oddtown theorem

Oddtown theorem is a combinatorial principle stating that there cannot be $(n+1)$ -orthogonal normal vectors in \mathbb{F}_2^n . In other words, (regarding each $v \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ as the characteristic vector of a subset $S \subset [n]$) there cannot be a family $(S_i)_{i \in [n+1]}$ satisfying the following:

- Each S_i has an odd cardinality.
- Each $S_i \cap S_{i'}$ ($i < i'$) has an even cardinality.

Historically, oddtown theorem and Fisher's inequality (introduced in Section 6) have been candidates for statements which are easy to prove in extended Frege system but not in Frege system ([4]). However, we still do not know the exact strengths of the principles.

In this section, we prove that a natural formalization of oddtown theorem over V^0 is stronger than several combinatorial principles related to counting.

Definition 38. Define the $\Sigma_0^B \mathcal{L}_A^2$ -formula $\text{oddtown}(n, P, Q, R, S)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \neg[\forall i \in [n+1]. \forall j \in [n]. (S(i, j) \leftrightarrow Q(i, j) \vee \exists e \in [n]^2. (j \in^* e \wedge P(i, e))) \\
& \wedge \forall i \in [n+1]. \exists j \in [n]. Q(i, j) \\
& \wedge \forall i \in [n+1]. \forall j \neq j' \in [n]. (\neg Q(i, j) \vee \neg Q(i, j')) \\
& \wedge \forall i \in [n+1]. \forall j \in [n]. \forall e \in [n]^2 (j \in^* e \rightarrow \neg Q(i, j) \vee \neg P(i, e)) \\
& \wedge \forall i \in [n+1]. \forall e \neq e' \in [n]^2 (e \cap e' \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \neg P(i, e) \vee \neg P(i, e')) \\
& \wedge \forall i < i' \in [n+1]. \forall j \in [n]. (S(i, j) \wedge S(i', j) \leftrightarrow \exists e \in [n]^2 (j \in^* e \wedge R(i, i', e))) \\
& \wedge \forall i < i' \in [n+1]. \forall e \neq e' \in [n]^2. (e \cap e' \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \neg R(i, i', e) \vee \neg R(i, i', e'))]
\end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, S above gives sets $S_i := \{j \in [n] \mid S(i, j)\}$, P gives a 2-partition of each S_i leaving one element, which is specified by Q , and R gives a 2-partition of each $S_i \cap S_{i'}$ ($i < i'$).

Definition 39. Define the propositional formula $oddtown_n$ as follows:

$$oddtown_n := \begin{cases} 1 & (n = 0) \\ \neg[\bigwedge_{i \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} (\neg s_{ij} \vee q_{ij} \vee \bigvee_{e: j \in e \in [n]^2} p_{ie}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} (s_{ij} \vee \neg q_{ij}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} \bigwedge_{e: j \in e \in [n]^2} (s_{ij} \vee \neg p_{ie}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n+1]} \bigvee_{j \in [n]} q_{ij} \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j < j' \in [n]} (\neg q_{ij} \vee \neg q_{ij'}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} \bigwedge_{e: j \in e \in [n]^2} (\neg q_{ij} \vee \neg p_{ie}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{e \perp e' \in [n]^2} (\neg p_{ie} \vee \neg p_{ie'}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i < i' \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} (\neg s_{ij} \vee \neg s_{i'j} \vee \bigvee_{e: j \in e \in [n]^2} r_{ii'e}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i < i' \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} \bigwedge_{e: j \in e \in [n]^2} (s_{ij} \vee \neg r_{ii'e}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i < i' \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} \bigwedge_{e: j \in e \in [n]^2} (s_{i'j} \vee \neg r_{ii'e}) \\ \quad \wedge \bigwedge_{i < i' \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{e \perp e' \in [n]^2} (\neg r_{ii'e} \vee \neg r_{ii'e'})] & (n \geq 1) \end{cases}$$

By a reason similar to that of Convention 3, we abuse the notation and write $oddtown_n$ to express $oddtown(n, P, Q, R, S)$, too.

Now, we first show that $oddtown_k$ above implies (over V^0) both $injPHP_n^{n+1}$ and $Count_n^2$.

Proposition 40. 1. $V^0 + oddtown_k \vdash injPHP_n^{n+1}$.

2. $V^0 + oddtown_k \vdash Count_n^2$.

Proof. We first prove 1. Argue in V^0 . We prove the contraposition. Suppose there exists an injection $f: [n+1] \rightarrow [n]$. Define

$$S_i := \{f(i)\}.$$

Then it violates $oddtown_n$.

We next prove 2. Argue in V^0 . We prove the contraposition. Suppose $[2n+1]$ is partitioned by 2-sets. Let R be the 2-partition. Then setting

$$S_i := \{[2n+1]\}_{i \in [2n+2]},$$

we can easily violate $oddtown_{2n+2}$ (since $[2n+1] \cap [2n+1]$ can be 2-partitioned by R while $[2n+1] \setminus \{2n+1\}$ has a natural 2-partition). ■

Remark 41. Observing the proof above, one may think that we might obtain another interesting formalization of oddtown theorem imposing $\{S_i\}_{i \in [n+1]}$ to be a family of *distinct* sets. Let $oddtown'$ be this version. Actually, we can show the following:

1. $V^0 + oddtown_k \vdash oddtown'_n$.

2. $V^0 + oddtown'_k + Count_k^2 \vdash oddtown_n$.

3. $V^0 + \text{oddtown}'_k \vdash \text{Count}_n^2$.

Hence, oddtown_n and $\text{oddtown}'_n$ have the same strength over V^0 .

The proof of the remark. The item 1 is clear.

We show the item 2. Work in $V^0 + \text{oddtown}'_k + \text{Count}_k^2$. Assume $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ (where $S_i \subset [n]$) violates oddtown_n . Since each $S_i \cap S_{i'}$ ($i < i'$) is 2-partitioned, it follows that $S_i \neq S_{i'}$. Indeed, if $S_i = S_{i'} =: S$, then both S and $S \setminus \{s_0\}$ ($s_0 \in S$) is 2-partitioned by the hypothesis. Consider a straightforward bijection
:

$$[2n-1] \cong ([n] \setminus S) \sqcup ([n] \setminus S) \sqcup S \sqcup (S \setminus \{s_0\}).$$

The right-hand side gives a natural 2-partition using those of S and $S \setminus \{s_0\}$, and it induces a 2-partition of the left-hand side, which violates Count_{2n-1}^2 . Hence, it follows that each S_i is distinct. However, it contradicts $\text{oddtown}'_n$. This shows the item 2.

Lastly, we show the item 3. Argue in V^0 . Assume R is a 2-partition of $[2n+1]$. Note that R has a natural linear ordering induced by that of whole numbers. Define $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^{2n+2}$ as follows: it is easy to see that R has at least four elements. Take distinct $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in R$. For each $i = 1, \dots, 2n+1$, take the unique j such that $\{i, j\} \in R$. Then,

Case1. If $i < j$, set $S_i := [2n+1] \setminus \{i, j\}$.

Case2. If $i > j$, set $S_i := [2n+1] \setminus (\{i, j\} \cup s_i)$, where s_i is the successor of $\{i, j\}$ in R . If there is none (i.e. $\{i, j\} = \max R$), let s_i be $\min R$.

Furthermore, we define $S_{2n+2} := [2n+1] \setminus (r_1 \cup r_2 \cup r_3)$.

Now, we see that $\{S_i\}_{i=1}^{2n+2}$ violates oddtown_{2n+2} . Indeed, each S_i is distinct, we can take natural 2-partitions leaving one element for each S_i , and we can obtain 2-partitions for each $S_i \cap S_j$ ($i < j$) removing at most five elements from R . ■

By theorem 8 and 9, we obtain

Corollary 42.

$$\begin{aligned} V^0 + \text{injPHP}_k^{k+1} &\not\vdash \text{oddtown}_n, \\ V^0 + \text{Count}_k^2 &\not\vdash \text{oddtown}_n. \end{aligned}$$

This raises the following natural problems:

Question 3. 1. $V^0 + \text{injPHP}_k^{k+1} + \text{Count}_k^2 \vdash \text{oddtown}_n$? How about $V^0 + \text{GCP} \vdash \text{oddtown}_n$?

2. $V^0 + \text{oddtown}_k \vdash \text{Count}_n^p$ for which p ?

The author cannot answer these questions for now. However, we tackle the item 2 in the rest of this section.

From Proposition 40 and Theorem 7, it is easy to see:

Corollary 43. If p is a power of 2, $V^0 + \text{oddtown}_k \vdash \text{Count}_n^p$.

The author conjectures that the converse of this corollary holds. Furthermore, the author conjectures the following:

Conjecture 2. For each $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and a prime $p \neq 2$,

$$F_d + \text{oddtown}_k \not\vdash_{\text{poly}(n)} \text{Count}_n^p.$$

Using Theorem 7, it is easy to see that Conjecture 2 implies the converse of Corollary 43. We give a sufficient condition to prove Conjecture 2:

Theorem 44. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ be a prime other than 2. Suppose

$$F_d + \text{oddtown}_k \vdash_{\text{poly}(n)} \text{Count}_n^p.$$

Then there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for large enough $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a family $(f_{ij})_{i \in [m+1], j \in [m]}$ of \mathbb{F}_2 -polynomials such that:

1. $m \leq n^{O(1)}$.
2. For each $i \in [m+1]$, there exists a NS -proof over \mathbb{F}_2 of

$$\sum_{j \in [m]} f_{ij} + 1 = 0$$

from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$ (here, we round n^ϵ to the nearest integer which is not a multiple of p).

3. For each $i \neq i' \in [m+1]$, there exists a NS -proof over \mathbb{F}_2 of

$$\sum_{j \in [m]} f_{ij} f_{i'j} = 0$$

from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$.

Here, $\neg \text{Count}_M^p$ (where $M \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$) means the following system of polynomials:

$$\sum_{e: j \in e \in [M]^p} x_e - 1, x_e x_{e'}, x_e^2 - x_e \\ (j \in [M], e, e' \in [M]^p, e \perp e')$$

Hence, if we can prove that such ϵ does not exist, then the Conjecture 2 is true.

Proof. We assume the basics of p -trees and *partial p -partitions* (see section 15.5 in [7] for reference), and we also use the notations $br(T)$, $T \models \varphi$, $T * \sum_{b \in S} T_b$

etc. as the straightforward analogous meanings to the ones given in section 4. In this proof, we assume $p = 3$ for readability. Let proofs $(\pi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ witness

$$F_d + \text{oddtown}_k \vdash_{\text{poly}(n)} \text{Count}_n^3.$$

Let Γ_n be the all subformulae appearing in π_n . Apply the switching lemma for 3-trees, and obtain a restriction ρ leaving n^ϵ elements of the universe $[n]$ such that there exists an $O(\log n)$ -evaluation T of Γ_n^ρ . Recall that this evaluation is sound for Frege rules in π_n , and $(\text{Count}_n^3)^\rho$, which can be identified with $\text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^3$, satisfies $T \models (\text{Count}_n^3)^\rho$. It follows that some instance

$$I := \text{oddtown}_m[\sigma_{ij}/s_{ij}, \tau_{ij}/q_{ij}, \varphi_{ie}/p_{ie}, \psi_{ii'e}/r_{ii'e}]$$

satisfies $T \models I$. Restricting $O(\log(n))$ -elements more if necessary, we may assume that actually $br_0(T_I) = br(T_i)$ holds. Clearly, $m \leq n^{O(1)}$. For $i \in [m+1]$ and $j \in [m]$,

$$f_{ij} := \sum_{e \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{ij}})} x_e.$$

We prove that these polynomials satisfy the required properties.

First, for $i < i'$, we construct an NS -proof of $\sum_{j=1}^m f_{ij} f_{i'j} = 0$ over \mathbb{F}_2 from the system $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^3$. For each $j \in [m]$, construct U_j^1 ($j \in [m]$) as follows:

$$U_j^1 := T_{\sigma_{ij}} * \sum_{b \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{ij}})} (T_{\sigma_{i'j}} * \sum_{b' \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{i'j}})} (T_{i,i',j})^{b'})^b,$$

where

$$T_{i,i',j} := T_{\neg \sigma_{ij} \vee \neg \sigma_{i'j} \vee \bigvee_{e: j \in e \in [m]^2} \psi_{ii'e}}.$$

Now, define U_j ($j \in [m]$) as follows:

- Consider each branch $r \in br(U_j^1)$ of the form $r = b(b')^b d^{bb'}$, where

$$b \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{ij}}), b' \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{i'j}}), d \in br(T_{i,i',j}).$$

Let S_j^1 be the set of all branches of U_j^1 of the above form. Since $d \models bb'$ and

$$\begin{aligned} T &\models \neg \sigma_{ij} \vee \neg \sigma_{i'j} \vee \bigvee_{e: j \in e \in [m]^2} \psi_{ii'e}, \\ T &\models \neg \psi_{ii'e} \vee \neg \psi_{ii'e'} \quad (\forall e' \perp e) \end{aligned}$$

There is a unique $e_r \in [m]^2$ such that

- $j \in e_r$, and
- d is an extension of some $d' \in br_1(T_{\psi_{ii'e_r}})$.

- Let $j'_{r,j}$ be the element of e_r other than j (that is, $e_r = \{j, j'_{r,j}\}$).
- We define $U_j^2 := U_j^1 * \sum_{r \in S_j^1} (T_{\sigma_{ij'_{r,j}} \vee \neg \psi_{ii'_{e_r}}} * T_{\sigma_{i'_{j'_{r,j}} \vee \neg \psi_{ii'_{e_r}}}})^r$.
- Let $S_j^2 \subset br(U_j^2)$ be the set of all branches extending some element of S_j^1 .
- For each

$$u = rs^r \in S_j^2 \quad (r \in S_j^1, s \in br(T_{\sigma_{ij'_{r,j}} \vee \neg \psi_{ii'_{e_r}}} * T_{\sigma_{i'_{j'_{r,j}} \vee \neg \psi_{ii'_{e_r}}}})),$$

Let $J'_{u,j} := j'_{r,j}$.

- We set $U_j := U_j^2 * \sum_{u \in S_j^2} (U_{J'_{u,j}}^2)^u$.

For each $j \in [m]$, let $B_j \subset br(U_j)$ be the set of branches extending some element of S_j^2 . Under $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$, we see the equation

$$\sum_{\alpha \in B_j} x_\alpha = f_{ij} f_{i'j}$$

has an NS -proof over \mathbb{F}_2 with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$. Therefore, we obtain an NS -proof of

$$\sum_{j \in [m]} \sum_{\alpha \in B_j} x_\alpha = \sum_{j \in [m]} f_{ij} f_{i'j}$$

over \mathbb{F}_2 with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$. The left-hand side is actually 0 by the following reasoning. Let $b = uv^u \in B_j$, where $u \in S_j^2$ and $v \in br(U_{J'_{u,j}}^2)$. Let $l := J'_{u,j}$. It is easy to see that $v \in S_l^2$, and $b \in B_l$. Decomposing $b = cd^c$, where $c \in S_l$ and $d \in S_{J'_{c,l}}$, we obtain $J'_{c,l} = j$. This argument gives a natural 2-partition of the disjoint union $\bigsqcup_{j \in [m]} B_j$, pairing the branches giving the same partial injections.

Lastly, we prove that $\sum_{j=1}^m f_{ij} = 1$ has an NS -proof from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$. For $j \in [m]$, let

$$V_j := T_{\sigma_{ij}} * \sum_{b \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{ij}})} (T_{i,j})^b.$$

where $T_{i,j} := T_{\neg \sigma_{ij} \vee \tau_{ij} \vee \bigvee_{e: j \in e \in [n]^2} \varphi_{ie}}$.

Let B_j be the set of branches $b \in br(B_j)$ extending some $b' \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{ij}})$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} T &\models \neg \tau_{ij} \vee \neg \varphi_{ie} \quad (j \in e \in [n]^2) \quad \text{and} \\ T &\models \neg \varphi_{ie} \vee \neg \varphi_{ie'} \quad (e \perp e'), \end{aligned}$$

each $b \in B_j$ satisfies exactly one of the following:

1. b is an extension of some $b' \in br_1(T_{\tau_{ij}})$.

2. There exists a unique $e \in [m]^2$ ($j \in e$) such that b is an extension of some $b' \in br_1(T_{\varphi_{ie}})$.

Define R_b as follows:

1. If the condition 1 is satisfied,

$$R_b := T_i * T_{\sigma_{ij} \vee \neg \tau_{ij}},$$

where $T_i := T_{\bigvee_j \tau_{ij}}$.

2. If the condition 2 is satisfied, and $\{j, j'\} := e$, then

$$R_b := T_{\sigma_{ij'} \vee \neg \varphi_{ie}} * (V_{j'} * T_{\sigma_{ij} \vee \neg \varphi_{ie}}).$$

Consider

$$W_j := V_j * \sum_{b \in B_j} (R_b)^b.$$

Let C_j be the set of all branches $r \in br(W_j)$ of the form $r = bd^b$, where $b \in B_j$. The equation

$$\sum_{r \in C_j} x_r = f_{ij}$$

has a *NS*-proof over \mathbb{F}_2 from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$. Now, we define Q_i as follows: since

$$T \models \bigvee_j \tau_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad T \models \neg \tau_{ij} \vee \neg \tau_{ij'},$$

we see each branch $b \in br(T_i)$ has the unique j_b such that b is an extension of $b' \in br_1(T_{\tau_{ij_b}})$. We set

$$Q_i := T_i * \sum_{b \in br(T_i)} (T_{\sigma_{ij_b} \vee \neg \tau_{ij_b}} * (T_{\sigma_{ij_b}} * T_{i, j_b}))^b.$$

We already know that there exists a *NS*-proof of $\sum_{\beta \in br(Q_i)} x_\beta = 1$ from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$. Observing

$$\sum_j \sum_{r \in C_j} x_r + \sum_{\beta \in br(Q_i)} x_\beta = 0, \tag{6}$$

we obtain a *NS*-proof of $\sum_{j=1}^m f_{ij} = 1$ from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$. The observation follows from a 2-partition of $(\bigsqcup_j C_j) \sqcup br(Q_i)$ similar to the one appearing in the proof of item 3. To be concrete, consider the following labeling of $r = bd^b \in C_j$ (where $b \in B_j$):

- If b satisfies the condition 1 in the definition of W_j , label it by $\{j\}$.

- If b satisfies the condition 2 in the definition of W_j , and $\{j, j'\} := e$, label b by e .

In order to make W_j fully labeled, we label each $b \in br(W_j) \setminus C_j$ by a symbol \perp . Then we obtain:

- For each $j \neq j'$, $br_{\{j, j'\}}(W_j) = br_{\{j, j'\}}(W_{j'})$.
- $\bigsqcup_{j \in [m]} br_{\{j\}}(W_j) = br(Q_i)$.

These give the equation (6). ■

6 On the strength of Fisher's inequality

When we discuss whether the condition given in Theorem 44 actually holds or not, it is natural to also consider the \mathbb{K} -analogue of the condition, where \mathbb{K} is an arbitrary field other than \mathbb{F}_2 . The next combinatoial principle (see Remark 46 for the informal meaning) relates to a condition which has a similar form to the analogue.

Definition 45. We define the $\Sigma_0^B \mathcal{L}_A^2$ formula $FIE(n, S, R)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
FIE(n, S, R) := & \neg[\forall i \in [n+1] \exists j \in [n] S(i, j) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \exists j \in [n] ((S(i_1, j) \wedge \neg S(i_2, j)) \vee (\neg S(i_1, j) \wedge S(i_2, j))) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \forall i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1] \forall j \in [n] (\neg S(i_1, j) \vee \neg S(i_2, j) \vee \exists j' \in [n] R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j')) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \forall i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1] \forall j' \in [n] (\neg S(i'_1, j) \vee \neg S(i'_2, j) \vee \exists j \in [n] R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j')) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \forall i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1] \forall j, j' \in [n] (\neg R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j') \vee S(i_1, j)) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \forall i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1] \forall j, j' \in [n] (\neg R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j') \vee S(i_2, j)) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \forall i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1] \forall j, j' \in [n] (\neg R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j') \vee S(i'_1, j')) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \forall i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1] \forall j, j' \in [n] (\neg R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j') \vee S(i'_2, j')) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \forall i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1] \forall j \in [n] \forall j' \neq j'' \in [n] (\neg R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j') \vee \neg R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j'')) \\
& \wedge \forall i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1] \forall i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1] \forall j' \in [n] \forall \tilde{j} \in [n] (\neg R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, j, j') \vee \neg R(i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2, \tilde{j}, j')))]
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we define the propositional formula FIE_n as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
FIE_n := & \neg \left(\bigwedge_{i \in [n+1]} \bigvee_{j \in [n]} s_{ij} \right. \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigvee_{j \in [n]} ((s_{i_1 j} \wedge \neg s_{i_2 j}) \vee (\neg s_{i_1 j} \wedge s_{i_2 j})) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} (\neg s_{i_1 j} \vee \neg s_{i_2 j} \vee \bigvee_{j' \in [n]} r_{j, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2}) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j' \in [n]} (\neg s_{i'_1 j'} \vee \neg s_{i'_2 j'} \vee \bigvee_{j \in [n]} r_{j, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2}) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j, j' \in [n]} (\neg r_{j, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2} \vee s_{i_1 j}) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j, j' \in [n]} (\neg r_{j, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2} \vee s_{i_2 j}) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j, j' \in [n]} (\neg r_{j, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2} \vee s_{i'_1 j'}) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j, j' \in [n]} (\neg r_{j, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2} \vee s_{i'_2 j'}) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j \in [n]} \bigwedge_{j' \neq j'' \in [n]} (\neg r_{j, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2} \vee \neg r_{j, j''}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2}) \\
& \wedge \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{i'_1 < i'_2 \in [n+1]} \bigwedge_{j' \in [n]} \bigwedge_{j \neq \tilde{j} \in [n]} (\neg r_{j, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2} \vee \neg r_{\tilde{j}, j'}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2}))
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 46. The above formulae are formalizations of Fisher's inequality: there does not exist a family $\{S_i\}_{i \in [n+1]}$ satisfying the following:

- For each i , $\emptyset \neq S_i \subset [n]$.
- For each $i_1 < i_2$, $S_{i_1} \neq S_{i_2}$.
- For each $i_1 < i_2$ and $i'_1 < i'_2$, $\#(S_{i_1} \cap S_{i_2}) = \#(S_{i'_1} \cap S_{i'_2})$.

In the definition of $FIE(n, S, R)$, S intuitively gives a family $\{S_i\}_{i \in [n+1]}$, and R gives a family of bijections

$$\{R^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2} : S_{i_1} \cap S_{i_2} \rightarrow S_{i'_1} \cap S_{i'_2}\}_{i_1 < i_2 \& i'_1 < i'_2}.$$

It is easy to see that FIE_n is a generalization of the pigeonhole principle.

Proposition 47. $V^0 + FIE_k \vdash injPHP_n^{n+1}$. Hence, for each $p \geq 2$,

$$V^0 + Count_k^p \not\vdash FIE_n.$$

Proof. Argue in V^0 . Suppose f is an injection from $[n+1]$ to $[n]$. We set $S_i := \{f(i)\}$ ($i \in [n+1]$). Then, S_i is distinct and $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$ for every $i < j$. Hence, FIE_n is violated.

The latter part follows immediately by Theorem 8. ■

It is natural to ask the following:

Question 4. Which p satisfies $V^0 + FIE_k \vdash \text{Count}_n^p$?

We conjecture that there is no such p . The next theorem gives a criterion of proving this conjecture.

Theorem 48. Let \mathbb{K} be a field. Suppose $F_d + FIE_k \vdash_{\text{poly}(n)} \text{Count}_n^p$. Then there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for large enough $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and families $(f_{ij})_{i \in [m+1], j \in [m]}$, $(a_{ij})_{i \in [m+1], j \in [m]}$ and $(b_{ii'j})_{i < i' \in [m+1], j \in [m]}$ of \mathbb{K} -polynomials satisfying the following:

1. $m \leq n^{O(1)}$.
2. For each $i_1 < i_2 \in [m+1]$ and $i'_1 < i'_2 \in [m+1]$, there exists a *NS*-proof of

$$\sum_{j=1}^m f_{i_1 j} f_{i_2 j} = \sum_{j=1}^m f_{i'_1 j} f_{i'_2 j}$$

from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ over \mathbb{K} with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$ (note that we round n^ϵ to the nearest integer which is not a multiple of p).

3. For $i \in [m+1]$, there exists a *NS*-proof of

$$a_{ij}(1 - f_{ij}) = 0$$

from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ over \mathbb{K} with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$.

4. For $i \in [m+1]$, there exists a *NS*-proof of

$$\sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} = 1$$

from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ over \mathbb{K} with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$.

5. For $i < i' \in [m+1]$ and $j \in [m]$, there exists a *NS*-proof of

$$b_{ii'j} f_{ij} f_{i'j} = 0 \text{ and } b_{ii'j}(1 - f_{ij})(1 - f_{i'j}) = 0$$

from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ over \mathbb{K} with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$.

6. For each $i < i' \in [m+1]$, there exists a *NS*-proof of

$$\sum_{j=1}^m b_{ii'j} = 1$$

from $\neg \text{Count}_{n^\epsilon}^p$ over \mathbb{K} with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$.

Proof. For readability, we assume $p = 3$. Assume proofs $(\pi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ witness

$$F_d + FIE_k \vdash_{poly(n)} Count_n^3.$$

Let Γ_n be the set of subformulae of π_n . Apply the switching lemma for 3-tree, and obtain a constant $\epsilon > 0$ and a restriction ρ_n leaving n^ϵ elements of the universe $[n]$ such that there exists an $O(\log n)$ -evaluation T^n of Γ_n^ρ . We fix a large enough $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, and suppress scripts n of T^n , ρ_n , etc. $(Count_n^3)^\rho$ (which can be identified with $Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$) satisfies $T \not\models (Count_n^3)^\rho$. Soundness gives that some instance

$$I := FIE_m[\sigma_{ij}/s_{ij}, \varphi_{j,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2}/r_{j,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2}]$$

satisfies $T \not\models I$. With an additional restriction, we may assume that

$$br_0(T_I) = br(T_I).$$

We obtain the following

1. Let $T_i := T_{\bigvee_{j \in [m]} \sigma_{ij}}$. Since

$$T \models \bigvee_{j \in [m]} \sigma_{ij},$$

each $b \in br(T_i)$ has at least one $j_b \in [m]$ and $b' \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{ij_b}})$ such that $b' \subset b$. We relabel each branch $b \in br(T_i)$ with $\langle j_b \rangle$ and obtain a labelled *injPHP*-tree \tilde{T}_i .

2. Let $T_{i_1,i_2} := T_{\bigvee_{j \in [m]} ((\sigma_{i_1 j} \wedge \neg \sigma_{i_2 j}) \vee (\neg \sigma_{i_1 j} \wedge \sigma_{i_2 j}))}$. Since

$$T \models \bigvee_{j \in [m]} ((\sigma_{i_1 j} \wedge \neg \sigma_{i_2 j}) \vee (\neg \sigma_{i_1 j} \wedge \sigma_{i_2 j})),$$

each $b \in br(T_{i_1,i_2})$ has at least one j_b satisfying one of the following

- (a) For all $b' \in br_0(T_{\sigma_{i_1 j_b}}) \cup br_1(T_{\sigma_{i_2 j_b}})$, $b \perp b'$
- (b) For all $b' \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{i_1 j_b}}) \cup br_0(T_{\sigma_{i_2 j_b}})$, $b \perp b'$

We relabel each branch $b \in br(T_{i_1,i_2})$ with $\langle j_b \rangle$ and obtain a labelled *injPHP*-tree \tilde{T}_{i_1,i_2} .

3. Let $T_{1,j}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2} := T_{\neg \sigma_{i_1 j} \vee \neg \sigma_{i_2 j} \vee \bigvee_{j' \in [m]} \varphi_{j,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2}}$. Each $b \in br(T_{1,j}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2})$ is an extension of some element of $br_0(T_{\sigma_{i_1 j}}), br_0(T_{\sigma_{i_2 j}}), \bigcup_{j'} br_1(T_{\varphi_{j,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2}})$. If b is an extension of an element of $br_1(T_{\varphi_{j,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2}})$, such j' is unique.

4. Let $T_{2,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2} := T_{\neg\sigma_{i'_1j} \vee \neg\sigma_{i'_2j} \vee \bigvee_{j \in [m]} \varphi_{j,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2}}$. Each $b \in br(T_{2,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2})$ is an extension of an element of $br_0(T_{\sigma_{i'_1j'}}, br_0(T_{\sigma_{i'_2j'}}), \bigcup_j br_1(T_{r_{j,j'}}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2}))$. If b is an extension of an element of $br_1(T_{r_{j,j'}^{i_1,i_2,i'_1,i'_2}})$, such j is unique.

Now, we set

$$\begin{aligned} f_{ij} &:= \sum_{\alpha \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{ij}})} x_\alpha, \\ a_{ij} &:= \sum_{\alpha \in br_{(j)}(\tilde{T}_i)} x_\alpha \\ b_{i_1i_2j} &:= \sum_{\alpha \in br_{(j)}(\tilde{T}_{i_1,i_2})} x_\alpha. \\ (i &\in [m+1], j \in [m]) \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $m \leq n^{O(1)}$.

We show that each of the following has a NS -proof from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ over \mathbb{K} with $O(\log(n))$ -degree

$$\sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} = 1, \quad (7)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^m b_{i_1i_2j} = 1, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^m f_{i_1j} f_{i_2j} = \sum_{j=1}^m f_{i'_1j} f_{i'_2j}, \quad (9)$$

$$a_{ij}(1 - f_{ij}) = 0, \quad (10)$$

$$b_{i_1i_2j} f_{i_1j} f_{i_2j} = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$b_{i_1i_2j}(1 - f_{i_1j})(1 - f_{i_2j}) = 0. \quad (12)$$

$$(i, i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2 \in [m+1] \& i_1 < i_2 \& i'_1 < i'_2 \& j \in [m])$$

(7): Since the left-hand side is the sum of all branches of the 3-partition tree \tilde{T}_i

(8): Since the left-hand side is the sum of all branches of the 3-partition tree \tilde{T}_{i_1,i_2}

(9): We first define $A_{i_1,i_2,j} := T_{\sigma_{i_1j}} * T_{\sigma_{i_2j}}$ ($i_1, i_2 \in [m+1], j \in [m], i_1 < i_2$). Let $B_{i_1,i_2,j}$ be the set of all branches $b \in A_{i_1,i_2,j}$ having the form

$$b = cd^c \quad (c \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{i_1j}}), d \in br_1(T_{\sigma_{i_2j}})).$$

It is easy to construct a NS -proof of

$$f_{i_1j} f_{i_2j} = \sum_{b \in B_{i_1,i_2,j}} x_b \quad (13)$$

from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ over \mathbb{K} with degree $\leq O(\log(n))$.

Now, fix $i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2 \in [m+1]$ such that $i_1 < i_2$ and $i'_1 < i'_2$. For each $j \in [m]$, consider the trees

$$R_j := A_{i_1, i_2, j} * \sum_{b \in B_{i_1, i_2, j}} (T_{1, j}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2})^b$$

$$R'_j := A_{i'_1, i'_2, j} * \sum_{b \in B_{i'_1, i'_2, j}} (T_{2, j}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2})^b.$$

For each $r = bd^b$ ($b \in B_{i_1, i_2, j}$, $d \in br(T_{1, j}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2})$), since $d \parallel b$, there exists a unique j'_r such that d is an extension of some $c \in br_1(T_{\varphi_{j, j'_r}}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2})$. Let

$B_j \subset br(R_j)$ be the set of all branches having the above form.

Similarly, for each $r' = bd^b$ ($b \in B_{i'_1, i'_2, j}$, $d \in br(T_{2, j}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2})$), since $d \parallel b$, there exists a unique $\hat{j}_{r'}$ such that d is an extension of some $c \in br_1(T_{\varphi_{\hat{j}_{r'}, j}}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2})$.

Let $B'_j \subset br(R'_j)$ be the set of all branches having the above form.

Now, we define

$$T_{j, j'} := (((T_{\neg r_{j, j'}}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2 \vee s_{i_1 j}} * T_{\neg r_{j, j'}}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2 \vee s_{i_2 j}}) * T_{\neg r_{j, j'}}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2 \vee s_{i'_1 j'}}) * T_{\neg r_{j, j'}}^{i_1, i_2, i'_1, i'_2 \vee s_{i'_2 j'}}).$$

for each $j \neq j' \in [m]$. Using these trees, we define

$$S_j := R_j * \sum_{r \in B_j} (T_{j, j'_r} * \sum_{t \in br(T_{j, j'_r})} (R'_{j'_r})^t)^r,$$

$$S'_j := R'_j * \sum_{r' \in B'_j} (T_{\hat{j}_{r'}, j} * \sum_{t \in br(T_{\hat{j}_{r'}, j})} (R_{\hat{j}_{r'}})^t)^{r'}.$$

Label each branch $b \in br(S_j)$ as follows:

- If b extends some $r \in B_j$, then label b with $\langle j, j'_r \rangle$.
- Otherwise, label b with the symbol \perp .

Similarly, we label each branch $b' \in br(S'_j)$ as follows:

- If b extends some $r' \in B'_j$, then label b with $\langle \hat{j}_{r'}, j \rangle$.
- Otherwise, label b with the symbol \perp .

It is easy to see that for each j, j' , $br_{\langle j, j' \rangle}(S_j) = br_{\langle j, j' \rangle}(S'_{j'})$. Hence,

$$\sum_{j, j' \in [m]} \sum_{\alpha \in br_{\langle j, j' \rangle}(S_j)} x_\alpha = \sum_{j, j' \in [m]} \sum_{\beta \in br_{\langle j, j' \rangle}(S'_{j'})} x_\beta.$$

Furthermore, it is easy to see that the following have NS -proofs from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ over \mathbb{K} with $\leq O(\log(n))$ -degree:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j' \in [m]} \sum_{\alpha \in br_{\langle j, j' \rangle}(S_j)} x_\alpha &= \sum_{b \in B_{i_1, i_2, j}} x_b \quad (j \in [m]), \\ \sum_{j \in [m]} \sum_{\beta \in br_{\langle j, j' \rangle}(S'_{j'})} x_\beta &= \sum_{b \in B_{i'_1, i'_2, j'}} x_b \quad (j' \in [m]). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, combined with (13), they give a NS -proof of $\sum_j f_{i_1 j} f_{i_2 j} = \sum_{j'} f_{i'_1 j'} f_{i'_2 j'}$ satisfying the required conditions.

(10) It follows similarly as (12) below.

(11): $b_{i_1 i_2 j} f_{i_1 j} f_{i_2 j} = 0$ follows easily from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ since each $\alpha \in br_{\langle j \rangle}(\tilde{T}_{i_1, i_2})$ satisfies $\alpha \perp b$ for all $b \in B_{i_1, i_2, j}$.

(12): Note that we have NS -proofs of the following:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i_1 j} + \sum_{\beta \in br_0(T_{\sigma_{i_1 j}})} x_\beta &= 1, \\ f_{i_2 j} + \sum_{\beta \in br_0(T_{\sigma_{i_2 j}})} x_\beta &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (j \in [m])$$

Hence, $b_{i_1 i_2 j}(1 - f_{i_1 j})(1 - f_{i_2 j}) = 0$ follows easily from $\neg Count_{n^\epsilon}^3$ by a similar reason as the previous item. ■

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Toshiyasu Arai for helpful discussions and his patient support. The author also thanks to Jan Krajíček for his valuable comments. This work was supported by the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, an International Joint Usage/Research Center located in Kyoto University.

References

- [1] Ajtai, M. The complexity of the Pigeonhole Principle. *Combinatorica*, vol. 14 (1994), 417-433.
- [2] Beame, P., Impagliazzo, R., Krajíček, J., Pitassi, T. & Pudlak, P. Lower bounds on Hilbert's Nullstellensatz and propositional proofs, *Proceedings 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (1994), 794-806.

- [3] Beame, P., & Riis, S. More on the relative strength of counting principles, in *Proof Complexity and Feasible Arithmetics*, P. Beame, & S. Buss (Eds.), DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, vol.39, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1998), 13-35.
- [4] Bonet, M., Buss, S., & Pitassi, T. Are there hard examples for Frege systems?, in *Feasible Mathematics II*, Progress in Computer Science and Applied Logic, 13, P. Clote, & J.B. Remmel (Eds.), Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA (1995), 30-56.
- [5] Cook, S., & Nguyen, P. *Logical foundations of proof complexity*, Perspectives in Logic. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY (2010).
- [6] Krajíček, J. *Bounded arithmetic, propositional logic, and complexity theory*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, 60. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995).
- [7] Krajíček, J. *Proof complexity*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, 170. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2019).
- [8] Krajíček, J., Pudlák, P., & Woods, A. An exponential lower bound to the size of bounded depth Frege proofs of the pigeonhole principle, *Random Structures and Algorithms*, vol. 7, no. 1 (1995), 15-39.
- [9] Pitassi, T., Beame, P., & Impagliazzo, R. Exponential lower bounds for the pigeonhole principle, *Computational Complexity*, vol. 3, no.2 (1993), 97-140.
- [10] Razborov, A. A. Lower bounds for the polynomial calculus, *Computational Complexity*, vol. 7, no. 4 (1998), 291-324.