

On streaming approximation algorithms for constraint satisfaction problems

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED

BY

NOAH SINGER

TO

THE DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

BACHELOR OF ARTS

IN THE SUBJECTS OF

COMPUTER SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

MARCH 2022

On streaming approximation algorithms for constraint satisfaction problems

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, we explore *streaming algorithms* for *approximating constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs)*. The setup is roughly the following: A computer has limited memory space, sees a long “stream” of local constraints on a set of variables, and tries to estimate how many of the constraints may be simultaneously satisfied. The past ten years have seen a number of works in this area, and this thesis includes both expository material and novel contributions. Throughout, we emphasize connections to the broader theories of CSPs, approximability, and streaming models, and highlight interesting open problems.

The first part of our thesis is expository: We present aspects of previous works that completely characterize the approximability of specific CSPs like **Max-Cut** and **Max-DiCut** with \sqrt{n} -space streaming algorithm (on n -variable instances), while characterizing the approximability of all CSPs in \sqrt{n} space in the special case of “composable” (i.e., *sketching*) algorithms, and of a particular subclass of CSPs with *linear-space* streaming algorithms.

In the second part of the thesis, we present two of our own joint works. We begin with a work with Madhu Sudan and Santhoshini Velusamy in which we prove linear-space streaming approximation-resistance for all *ordering CSPs (OCSPs)*, which “CSP-like” problems maximizing over sets of permutations. Previous works considered the *maximum acyclic subgraph* problem (**MAS**), the prototypical OCSP; even for **MAS**, we improve on both the inapproximability factor and the space bound.

Next, we present joint work with Joanna Boyland, Michael Hwang, Tarun Prasad, and Santhoshini Velusamy in which we investigate the \sqrt{n} -space streaming approximability of Boolean CSPs with negations. In particular, we give explicit \sqrt{n} -space sketching approximability ratios for several families of CSPs, including **Max- k AND**; develop simpler optimal sketching approximation algorithms for *threshold* predicates; and show that previous

Thesis advisor: Prof. Madhu Sudan

Noah Singer

streaming lower bounds are “incomplete” in that they fail to characterize the \sqrt{n} -space streaming approximability of Max-3AND.

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Summary of prior work	4
1.2	Contributions and outline	5
1.3	Important themes and motivations	7
2	PRELIMINARIES	14
2.1	Constraint satisfaction problems	15
2.2	Streaming and sketching algorithms	17
2.3	Hypergraphs	18
2.4	Fourier analysis	19
2.5	Concentration inequalities	21
2.6	Advantage and total variation distance	21
2.7	Lower bound basics	22
I	Prior results	26
3	MAX-CUT IS APPROXIMATION-RESISTANT	27
3.1	Boolean partition detection problems	28
3.2	BPD is hard: Proving Theorem 3.3	33
3.3	The hybrid argument: Proving Lemma 3.5	38
3.4	Discussion	40
4	MAX-DICUT IS MILDLY APPROXIMABLE	43
4.1	Bias-based algorithms for Max-2AND	44
4.2	Proving hardness for Max-DiCut	48
4.3	Discussion	52

5	PRIOR RESULTS: GENERAL CSPs	56
5.1	\sqrt{n} -space algorithms and the sketching dichotomy	57
5.2	Lower bounds for linear-space streaming	66
II	Contributions	70
6	ORDERING CONSTRAINT SATISFACTION PROBLEMS	71
6.1	OCSPs: Definitions, motivations, history	72
6.2	Proof outline for MAS	74
6.3	Linear-space approximation resistance of all OCSPs: Proving Theorem 6.1	78
6.4	The coarsening analysis: Proving Lemma 6.7	80
7	SYMMETRIC BOOLEAN PREDICATES	84
7.1	Results	85
7.2	Setup for the symmetric case	89
7.3	Techniques	92
7.4	Explicit formulas for λ_S and $\gamma_{S,k}$	96
7.5	Sketching approximation ratio analyses	98
7.6	Simple sketching algorithms for threshold predicates	108
7.7	[CGSV21a] is incomplete: Streaming lower bounds for Max-3AND?	112
8	CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	114
8.1	Unique games-hardness vs. streaming hardness	114
8.2	Random-ordering and linear-space streaming	116
8.3	Streaming (vs. sketching) lower bounds	117
8.4	Multi-pass lower bounds	118
	GLOSSARY	120
	REFERENCES	123

TO MY PARENTS AND GRANDPARENTS.

Program a map to display frequency of data exchange, every thousand megabytes a single pixel on a very large screen. Manhattan and Atlanta burn solid white. Then they start to pulse, the rate of traffic threatening to overload your simulation. Your map is about to go nova. Cool it down. Up your scale. Each pixel a million megabytes. At a hundred million megabytes per second, you begin to make out certain blocks in midtown Manhattan, outlines of hundred-year-old industrial parks ringing the old core of Atlanta...

William Gibson, *Neuromancer*

También se descifró el contenido: nociones de análisis combinatorico, ilustradas por ejemplos de variaciones con repetición ilimitada... Observó que todos los libros, por diversos que sean, constan de elementos iguales: el espacio, el punto, la coma, las veintidós letras del alfabeto.

Jorge Luis Borges, "La biblioteca de Babel"

Acknowledgments

I am deeply grateful to Madhu Sudan for being a wonderfully supportive research advisor and all-around mentor throughout my time at Harvard. I've fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with and learn from him, and I'm still amazed at his patience and generosity in responding to my seemingly never-ending Slack messages, and providing a similarly never-ending stream of advice, feedback, and insights.

Santhoshini Velusamy has been a fantastic collaborator on both joint works presented in this thesis [SSV21; BHP⁺22]. Her suggestion to work on streaming algorithms for the MAS problem, an interesting question left open from her own undergraduate research internship (cf. [GVV17]), kicked off my work on streaming CSPs which, almost two years later, has blossomed into this thesis. (Chapter 6 presents joint work with Madhu [SSV21] which includes a resolution of her original question.) Thanks also to my other coauthors on our joint work [BHP⁺22] (Chapter 7): Joanna Boyland, Tarun Prasad, and Michael Hwang; to Sumegha Garg, Chi-Ning Chou, Sasha Golovnev, Ameya Velingker, and Raghuvansh Saxena for helpful insights and discussions; and to the Harvard College Research Program for supporting my work on [BHP⁺22] in Fall 2021.

Thank you to Salil Vadhan for being my second thesis reader; to Boaz Barak for his years of advice and encouragement, beginning with a welcoming and friendly series of emails about CS at Harvard which, as much as anything, convinced me to attend; and to Eric Allender for being a wonderful mentor during the DIMACS REU program at Rutgers over Summer 2021. Additionally, I am grateful for the deeply influential experience of serving as an undergraduate Teaching Fellow (TF) in courses taught by Madhu and Boaz as well as Adam Hesterberg, James Mickens, and Michael Mitzenmacher.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents Mindy Weinstein and Joel Singer, my brother Ethan, the rest of my family, and many friends including Braxton Marion, Clara Li, James Roney, Joshua Doolan, Jyotsna Rao, Nari Johnson, Shuvom Sadhuka, and Sahana Srinivasan for providing immeasurable support on my journey throughout college towards research and graduate school.

1

Introduction

THIS THESIS SITS AT THE INTERSECTION of two broad subfields of computer science: *combinatorial optimization* and *big data*. The former is an umbrella term for computational problems whose goal is to find the “best” solution among a finite, “structured” set of solutions, including tasks such as routing, packing, scheduling, and resource allocation. The latter encompasses a similar breadth of computational settings involving “massive” amounts of input data which necessitate “highly efficient” resource usage (quantified in terms of memory, time, energy, etc.), leading to e.g. online, distributed, parallel, and sublinear-time algorithms.

In this thesis, more specifically, we consider a particular class of combinatorial optimization problems called *constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs)*, and a particular class of algorithms for big data called *streaming algorithms*. Roughly, the goal of a CSP is to find a “global solution” satisfying as many “local constraints” as possible. More precisely, fix a finite set Σ , called the *alphabet*. A *k-ary predicate* is a function $\Sigma^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. A set \mathcal{F} of *k-ary predicates* defines a CSP denoted $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$. An *instance* of $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ is defined by *n variables*, each of which can be *assigned* to a value drawn from the alphabet Σ , and *m constraints*, each of which applies a predicate from \mathcal{F} to some subset of *k variables*. The goal of the $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ problem is to find an assignment of variables to values

satisfying as many constraints as possible. (See §2.1 below for a formal definition.) For instance, consider the *maximum cut* problem (Max-Cut), arguably the simplest CSP, which is defined over the Boolean alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ by the binary predicate $\text{Cut}(a, b) = a \oplus b$ (i.e., $\text{Cut}(a, b) = 1$ iff $a \neq b$). Thus in a Max-Cut instance, we have n variables which can be assigned to one of two values (0 or 1), and m constraints, each of which says “variable i and variable j should have different values”. Max-Cut has practical applications in e.g. circuit design and statistical physics [BGJR88]; a toy application is splitting children into two groups on a field trip so as to minimize conflict, given a list of pairs of children who dislike each other. The CSP framework includes many other problems which are widely studied both in theory and in practice, such as Max- k SAT and Max- q Cut.

Now, suppose that we want to solve a CSP such as Max-Cut — that is, find a good assignment, or at least understand whether good assignments exist — on instances which are “big” in the following sense: The constraints are generated in some sequence, and there are too many of them to store. For example, we could imagine a setting in which many clients transmit many constraints to a server, which tries to satisfy as many of the constraints as possible. The theoretical model of *streaming algorithms* attempts to capture these challenges: An algorithm is presented with a sequence of inputs, has limited memory space, and can only access the inputs in a single sequential pass.*† (See §2.2 for a formal definition of the model.) Streaming algorithms were introduced by Alon, Matias, and Szegedy [AMS99], and model practical settings such as real-time analysis of network traffic and scientific data. For more on streaming algorithms, see the surveys [Mut05; Cha20].

Concretely, a “streaming CSP algorithm” is presented with the constraints of an input instance Ψ and is tasked with *estimating* the *value* of Ψ , denoted val_Ψ , which is the maximum fraction of constraints satisfiable by any assignment to the variables.‡ See Fig. 1.1 on the next page for a visual representation. To be precise, we use the following standard notion of “estimation” for CSP values: For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we say \tilde{v} α -*approximates* val_Ψ if

*I.e., the algorithm lacks *random access* to the inputs — it only sees the first input C_1 , then C_2 , etc., and cannot access an input C_j before or after its position in the sequence. Of course, it can choose to *store* an input C_j once it’s seen it, but its storage space is very limited.

†This particular streaming model can be relaxed in various ways, such as allowing multiple passes over the stream, or randomly ordering the stream’s contents. See §1.3.3.

‡We don’t typically require that the algorithm actually *output* a good assignment, since even writing down such an assignment may take too much space.




Figure 1.1: A visual representation of an instance of Max-Cut on $n = 6$ variables (“vertices”) with $m = 5$ constraints (“edges”). The streaming algorithm Alg makes a single linear pass through the list of constraints, and tries to decide whether it’s possible to find a partition of the vertices which is crossed by most of the edges.

$\alpha \text{val}_\Psi \leq \tilde{v} \leq \text{val}_\Psi$. In other words, \tilde{v} is an underestimate for val_Ψ , but not by a factor smaller than α .

Every Max-Cut instance has value at least $\frac{1}{2}$; indeed, a random assignment satisfies half the constraints in expectation. Thus, the estimate $\frac{1}{2}$ is always a $\frac{1}{2}$ -approximation to val_Ψ . Conversely, instances of Max-Cut on many variables with many uniformly random constraints have values arbitrarily close to $\frac{1}{2}$ (see §3.1). Thus, $\frac{1}{2}$ is the infimum of val_Ψ over all Max-Cut instances Ψ , so it is the best possible “trivial” (i.e., input-independent) estimate. A *nontrivial* approximation to Max-Cut is therefore a $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximation for some $\epsilon > 0$. For other CSPs we similarly term an α -approximation nontrivial if α exceeds the infimum of all instances’ values [CGSV21b]. If a CSP cannot be nontrivially approximated, it is *approximation-resistant*.

The central question is now:

For which families of predicates, which desired approximation ratios α , and which classes of streaming algorithms can we prove positive (a.k.a. algorithmic) or negative (a.k.a. hardness) results for Max-CSP(\mathcal{F})?

Strikingly, until 2015 no research explored the intersection of CSPs and streaming algorithms, though alone each area had been explored extensively. But since then, based on open questions posed at the 2011 Bertorino Workshop on Sublinear Algorithms [IMNO11, Question 10], there has been a significant line of research on streaming algorithms for CSPs [KK15; KKS15; GVV17; KKS17; KK19; CGV20; CGSV21a; CGSV21b; SSV21; BHP⁺22; CGS⁺22] which has both resolved a good number of the initial questions and advanced a number of new and interesting ones.

1.1 SUMMARY OF PRIOR WORK

Kogan and Krauthgamer [KK15] and Kapralov, Khanna, and Sudan [KKS15] studied streaming approximations for Max-Cut; the latter proved that for every $\epsilon > 0$, streaming $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximations to Max-Cut on instances with n variables require $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space (see Theorem 3.1 below).[§] Their result actually holds in a stronger model than we’ve described so far, in which the constraints of an instance Ψ are “randomly ordered”. Guruswami, Velingker, and Velusamy [GVV17] gave an $O(\log n)$ -space streaming $(\frac{2}{5} - \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the *maximum directed cut* (Max-DiCut) problem, and also showed, via reduction from Max-Cut, that $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximations require $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space. Chou, Golovnev, and Velusamy [CGV20] closed this gap, by showing that for every $\epsilon > 0$, Max-DiCut can be $(\frac{4}{9} - \epsilon)$ -approximated in $O(\log n)$ space, but $(\frac{4}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximations require $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space (Theorem 4.1 below). [CGV20] also analyzes the approximability of several other problems, including Max- k SAT.

Building on [CGV20], for every Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) problem, Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, and Velusamy [CGSV21b] proved a *dichotomy theorem* for *sketching algorithms*, which are “composable” streaming algorithms (see §2.2 for the definition). Their theorem says that for every family of predicates \mathcal{F} , there exists some *sketching approximability threshold* $\alpha(\mathcal{F}) \in [0, 1]$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$, Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) can be $(\alpha(\mathcal{F}) - \epsilon)$ -approximated in $O(\text{polylog } n)$ space, but $(\alpha(\mathcal{F}) + \epsilon)$ -approximations require $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space. In an earlier paper [CGSV21a], they prove the same result in the special case of so-called “Boolean CSPs with negations”: For a Boolean predicate $f : \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, consider the family \mathcal{F}_{-f} of 2^k predicates corresponding to negating subsets of f ’s inputs, which define a CSP Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F}_{-f})$. [CGSV21a] provides a sketching dichotomy theorem for Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$, yielding a sketching approximability threshold $\alpha(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha(\mathcal{F}_{-f})$. However, neither [CGSV21a; CGSV21b] provide explicit procedures for calculating these thresholds; indeed, it is not *a priori* clear that they even have closed-form expressions. On the other hand, [CGSV21a; CGSV21b] include a number of other results, in particular conditions under which the dichotomy’s lower bound extends to *streaming* algorithms. See §5.1 below for formal descriptions of the [CGSV21a] results.

[§]Note that the implicit constant in the $\Omega(\cdot)$ notation can depend on the desired constant in the approximation factor, i.e., on ϵ . To simplify the language, we refer to this as a “ \sqrt{n} -space inapproximability result”, but we are carefully to make the quantifiers explicit in theorem statements.

Another line of work [KKS^V17; KK19; CGS⁺22] extends some of the above inapproximability results to the setting of *linear*-space algorithms. In particular, Kapralov and Krachun [KK19] show that streaming $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximations for Max-Cut require $\Omega(n)$ space, and Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, Velingker, and Velusamy [CGS⁺22] extend this tight inapproximability to certain other “linear” CSPs (see Corollary 5.14 in §5.2 below).

1.2 CONTRIBUTIONS AND OUTLINE

Chapter 2 contains formal definitions for CSPs and streaming algorithms, along with miscellaneous preliminary material.

EXPOSITIONS OF PRIOR WORK. In Part I of this thesis, we present several of the foundational works on streaming algorithms for CSPs. The aim here is to make these results accessible to a general theory audience and take advantage of newer perspectives from later papers which, in some cases, have substantially simplified earlier constructions.

Chapter 3 contains the first self-contained writeup of the result, implied by [KKS15], that nontrivially approximating Max-Cut requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ streaming space. Recall, [KKS15] includes a stronger version of this statement for “randomly ordered” streams of constraints; the proof of this stronger statement requires some additional steps which are somewhat tangential to the fundamental question of Max-Cut’s approximability. Our proof combines and simplifies pieces of [GKK⁺08; KKS15; CGS^V21a]. We then discuss various ways in which Max-Cut’s hardness has been strengthened in [KKS15; KK19].

In Chapter 4, we present [CGV20]’s proof that Max-DiCut’s streaming approximability threshold (for $\log n$ vs. \sqrt{n} space) is $\frac{4}{9}$. Our exposition differs from the original in [CGV20] in two important ways. Firstly, we describe a substantially simpler algorithm, which is based on observations from our joint work [BHP⁺22] (which we later explore in Chapter 7). Secondly, we emphasize structural similarities between the $(\frac{4}{9} - \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm and the hardness proof for $(\frac{4}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximation, namely the use of so-called *template distributions*, which later become the basis for the dichotomy theorems for *all* CSPs of [CGS^V21a; CGS^V21b].

We turn to these dichotomy theorems, as well as the [CGS⁺22] linear-space lower bounds, in Chapter 5. We give high-level surveys of these works, which are less technical than our

discussions in the previous two chapters.[¶] However, we do take care when stating results which we’ll require in our own work, presented in [Part II](#).

ORDERING CSPs. In [Chapter 6](#) (which begins [Part II](#)), we present the main result of our joint work with Sudan and Velusamy [[SSV21](#)], published in APPROX’21. This result ([Theorem 6.1](#) below) states that for a certain class of “CSP-like” problems called *ordering constraint satisfaction problems (OCSPs)*, all nontrivial streaming approximations require $\Omega(n)$ space. Recall that in a CSP, the solution space is the set of assignments from variables to alphabet values; in an OCSP, the solution space is instead the set of permutations on the variables (see [§6.1](#) below for details), and thus, OCSPs are good models for scheduling problems.

Our result in [[SSV21](#)] is “triple optimal”: It rules out *all* nontrivial approximations for *all* OCSPs, and the $\Omega(n)$ -space bound is *tight* (up to polylogarithmic factors, see [Remark 3.19](#) below). Previous works [[GVV17](#); [GT19](#)] studied the *maximum acyclic subgraph (MAS)* problem — a simple OCSP defined by the predicate “variable i is before variable j ” — and proved that some approximations require $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space; thus, our result in [[SSV21](#)] is an improvement in all three “parameters”.

Additionally, our inapproximability proof for OCSPs relies on linear-space inapproximability results for (non-ordering) CSPs from [[CGS⁺22](#)], which we’ll have described earlier in [§5.2](#). Given this context, in [Chapter 6](#) we develop a more modular version of the proof than appeared originally in [[SSV21](#)].

SYMMETRIC BOOLEAN CSPs. In [Chapter 7](#), we present our joint work with Boyland, Hwang, Prasad, and Velusamy [[BHP⁺22](#)] which investigates streaming algorithms for specific types of CSPs over the Boolean alphabet $\{0, 1\}$, namely those with *symmetric* predicates (i.e., predicates which depend only on the number of 1’s, a.k.a. Hamming weight, of their inputs). These CSPs are an interesting “lens” through which we examine several questions left open by the work of Chou *et al.* [[CGSV21a](#); [CGSV21b](#)].

Our main goal in this work is to discover and exploit “structural” properties of the [[CGSV21a](#)] dichotomy theorem in order to give explicit expressions for the sketching

[¶]In [Chapters 3](#) and [4](#) we sometimes omit concentration bounds in proofs in order to focus on more important quantitative aspects; these places are carefully noted.

approximability threshold $\alpha(f)$ for several classes of predicates f . For instance, letting $\alpha'_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2^{-(k-1)}(1 - k^{-2})^{(k-1)/2}$, we show that $\alpha(k\text{AND}) = \alpha'_k$ for odd k ; $\alpha(k\text{AND}) = 2\alpha'_{k+1}$ for even k ([Theorem 7.2](#) below); and $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^{k-1}) = \frac{k}{2}\alpha'_{k-1}$ for odd k ([Theorem 7.4](#) below). We also resolve the thresholds for fifteen other specific functions ([§7.5.4](#) below).

We also present two other results based on our study of symmetric Boolean predicates. Firstly, for *threshold* predicates (which equal 1 iff their input’s Hamming weight is at least t for some constant t , a.k.a. monotone symmetric predicates), we develop substantially simpler sketching algorithms which also achieve the optimal approximation thresholds given by [\[CGSV21a\]](#) (see [Theorem 7.7](#) below). Secondly, we show that the criteria in [\[CGSV21a\]](#) for proving *streaming* hardness results are “incomplete”, in the sense that they cannot establish a sharp approximability threshold for **Max-3AND**.

Most proofs and discussions in [Chapter 7](#) are reproduced with few changes from our paper [\[BHP⁺22\]](#).

OPEN QUESTIONS. Finally, in [Chapter 8](#), we collect several interesting open questions and directions for further investigation into streaming algorithms for CSPs. Some were posed already in prior work, while others arose in our work with collaborators and appear for the first time here.

1.3 IMPORTANT THEMES AND MOTIVATIONS

What are the theoretical implications of all this work on streaming algorithms for approximating CSPs? In contrast to streaming algorithms, there is an extensive theory of CSP approximability for *classical* algorithms, where the performance requirement is only running in $\text{poly}(n)$ time; see e.g. the survey [\[Tre04\]](#). However, this theory assumes complexity-theoretic conjectures such as $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$. By contrast, as we’ll see, the hardness results for streaming CSPs discussed in this thesis are all *unconditional*, i.e., they do not rely on any unproven conjectures!

In some sense, the fact that we have unconditional hardness results may more of a “bug” than a “feature” of the streaming model. Indeed, almost all useful algorithms from the world of classical CSPs seemingly cannot be implemented as streaming algorithms; thus, it’s arguably unsurprising that it is feasible to prove hardness results against the remaining

algorithms (though when we instead manage to develop streaming algorithms, it’s quite exciting!).

In this section, we argue that the streaming CSP theory has more to offer than the technical statements “in it of themselves”. In particular, we highlight three themes which seem relevant to the broader areas of CSPs or streaming models, and which will be helpful to keep in mind for the remainder of the thesis. This section may be safely skipped (and hopefully revisited!) for readers unfamiliar with the preliminaries discussed in [Chapter 2](#).

1.3.1 PARALLELS TO CLASSICAL HARDNESS-OF-APPROXIMATION

Many of the first classical hardness-of-approximation results for CSPs, and other combinatorial optimization problems, were proven using the machinery of *probabilistically checkable proofs (PCPs)* [[AS98](#); [ALM⁺98](#)]. Indeed, the classical approximability of many problems have been tightly resolved using PCP techniques, such as the CSP Max-3SAT [[Hås01](#)] as well as non-CSPs including set cover [[Fei98](#)], chromatic number [[FK98](#)], and max-clique [[Hås99](#)]. PCP-based hardness results typically only assume the $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$ conjecture. Later, Khot [[Kho02](#)] introduced a new complexity-theoretic hypothesis (stronger than $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$) called the *unique games conjecture (UGC)*, with an aim towards further understanding the classical approximability of combinatorial optimization problems.[‡] The UGC is now known to imply tight approximability results for CSPs including Max-Cut [[KKMO07](#)], Max-2SAT [[Aus07](#)], and Max- k AND (up to a constant factor) [[ST09](#); [CMM09](#)] as well as for other combinatorial optimization problems including OCSPs [[GHM⁺11](#)], Max-Cut on instances of value $\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$ [[KO09](#)], and vertex cover [[KR08](#)].

Consider two “worlds” for a programmer hoping to approximately solve combinatorial optimization problems: World U, where the UGC is true and the programmer can employ polynomial-time algorithms, and World S, where the programmer is restricted to polylogarithmic-space streaming algorithms. There are surprising parallels between what we know about approximability in these two worlds:

- The Chou *et al.* [[CGSV21b](#)] dichotomy theorem for \sqrt{n} -space sketching in World

[‡]The UGC roughly posits optimal hardness for the CSP Max-UG which allows binary predicates with the property fixing one variable uniquely specifies the other variable, over an arbitrarily large alphabet Σ . In other words, $\text{Max-UG} = \text{Max-CSP}(\{f_\pi : \pi \text{ is a bijection on } \Sigma\})$, where $f_\pi : \Sigma^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is defined by $f_\pi(a, b) = 1$ iff $b = \pi(a)$.

S, presented in §5.1, is analogous to Raghavendra’s dichotomy theorem [Rag08] in World U. The former shows that in World S, bias-based linear sketching algorithms à la [GVV17] are optimal for every CSP; the latter shows that in World U, the optimal algorithms are *semidefinite programming (SDP)* “relax and round” algorithms à la [GW95] for Max-Cut (see [MM17] for a recent survey).**

- In World S, [CGSV21b] also shows that every CSP satisfying a natural property called “supporting one-wise independence” is streaming approximation-resistant in \sqrt{n} space (see Example 5.6 below). Austrin and Mossel [AM09] proved an analogous result in World U for CSPs satisfying a higher-order condition called “supporting two-wise independence”.
- For ordering CSPs in World S, the linear-space approximation-resistance result from our joint work [SSV21], presented in Chapter 6, is analogous to a theorem of Guruswami, Håstad, Manokaran, Raghavendra, and Charikar [GHM⁺11] which states that OCSFs are approximation-resistant in World U. As we’ll see in Chapter 6, there are striking similarities between the proof methods for these two results — both rely on reducing from inapproximability results for “coarse” CSP variants of OCSFs.
- Max- k AND is the most “approximable” Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ problem (see Remark 7.9 below), intuitively because its constraints are the most “informative” — every constraint tells us *exactly* what its variables need to be assigned to. Thus, it is fortunate that we can resolve its approximability in both worlds: In World S, our joint work [BHP⁺22], presented in Chapter 7, shows that the \sqrt{n} -space sketching approximability of the Max- k AND problem is $(2 - o(1))2^{-k}$ (Theorem 7.2 below). In World U, Max- k AND is $\Theta(k2^{-k})$ -approximable [ST09; CMM09].†† Moreover, with regard to the algorithmic aspects discussed in the first bullet point, for Max- k AND, our optimal sketching algorithms from [BHP⁺22] and the optimal SDP rounding algorithms from [Has05; CMM09] have a surprisingly similar structure: Find a good “guess” assign-

**There are a number of other “classical dichotomy theorems” for CSPs, specifically concerning *exact computation* (i.e., deciding whether $\text{val}_\Psi = 1$) [Sch78; FV98; Bul17; Zhu20] and so-called *coarse approximation* (see [KSTW01] and the book [CKS01]).

††Indeed, [ST09] show even that $O(k2^{-k})$ -approximation is NP-hard, though their result is stronger assuming the UGC.

ment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and then randomly perturb each of its bits independently with some small constant probability. However, our algorithm chooses \mathbf{x} purely combinatorially — based on whether a variable occurs more often positively or negatively — while the [Has05; CMM09] algorithms produce it by randomly rounding an SDP.

These parallels may be evidence that there is some truth to World U’s hardness results, at least for weak classes of algorithms.

1.3.2 RANDOM INSTANCES OF CSPs (AND AVERAGE-CASE HARDNESS)

In the classical setting, there has also been a great deal of interest in algorithms for “random instances” of CSPs; in a typical example, constraints are sampled by uniformly sampling variables and predicates. Feige’s well-known *random 3SAT hypothesis* [Fei02] states that classical algorithms cannot “refute” random instances of Max-3SAT for any constant ratio $\frac{m}{n}$ of constraints to variables; we very roughly define “refuting” as “distinguishing from perfectly satisfiable instances.” Feige’s and related conjectures have numerous applications in hardness-of-approximation, cryptography, and learning (see [KMOW17, §1.2] for a review). On the other hand, there has been significant algorithmic progress for a wide variety of CSPs in the setting where the constraint-to-variable ratio is larger [BKPS98; FGK05; CGL07; FO07; AOW15; BM16; RRS17; GKM22].

In contrast, in the setting of streaming algorithms, all our lower bounds come from random instances! Specifically, we’ll show that streaming algorithms cannot distinguish between “No” instances which are sampled fully randomly and “Yes” instances sampled randomly *conditioned on having high value on a random “planted” assignment*. We’ll explore this paradigm in the simple case of Max-Cut in Chapter 3.

Both the algorithmic results in the classical setting, and the hardness results in the streaming setting, rely on careful combinatorial analyses of random graphs. Again, streaming hardness may also be heuristic evidence for the truth of e.g. Feige’s random 3SAT hypothesis, at least for weak classes of algorithms.

1.3.3 SUBTLETIES OF STREAMING MODELS

An instance of a binary CSP can be viewed as a (directed) graph in which edges are labeled with predicates; more broadly, k -ary CSPs are so-called “ k -uniform hypergraphs”,

or *k-hypergraphs* for short, with predicates labeling the hyperedges. Thus, the streaming approximation algorithms for CSPs which we’ve discussed fall under the purview of algorithms for “graph streams”, which are problems in which the input is a stream of labeled (hyper)edges in a (hyper)graph (see e.g. the survey [McG14]).

There are a number of interesting variations on the basic graph streaming model of “small space, one pass”. In this subsection, we focus specifically on two ways in which the model can be weakened, namely randomly ordering the input or allowing multiple passes, and one way it can be strengthened, namely requiring the algorithms to be *composable* (resulting in so-called “sketching algorithms”). For each of these, we’ll cite known separations for various approximate combinatorial optimization problems.

INPUT ORDERING. What happens when we require that a streaming algorithm succeeds only on randomly ordered input streams (with high probability), instead of on *all* input orderings? Intuitively, this may lessen the burden on the algorithm, because since the algorithm is very “forgetful” about its input in the long term, a short sequence of bad inputs may cause catastrophic failures; in randomly ordered streams, such sequences may be less likely. This phenomenon has been widely explored throughout the literature on “big data” algorithms; see §1 of the survey [GS21] for an instructive exposition in the simple case of online algorithms for calculating the maximum element in a list. In the more immediate setting of graph streaming, Peng and Sohler [PS18] established provable separations between the “random-order” and “adversarial-rder” settings for graph problems including approximately counting components and approximating minimum spanning tree weight. See Sections 3.4.2 and 8.2 for discussions in the setting of streaming algorithms for CSPs.

SKETCHING VS. STREAMING. *Sketching* algorithms are special streaming algorithms which roughly have the following “composability” property: We can choose to split the input stream into pieces, and the algorithm has to “support” being run independently on each piece and then combining the results; See §2.2 for a formal definition. Kapralov, Kallaugher, and Price [KKP18; KP20] proved separations between sketching and streaming algorithms for the problem approximate triangle counting in graphs.

MULTIPLE PASSES. Finally, we can consider allowing the streaming algorithm to make multiple passes over the input data. Proving lower bounds against streaming algorithms even in two passes is typically very difficult, outside of highly structured contexts such as following paths in graphs (an example of so-called “pointer chasing” problems, see e.g. [GO16]). Provable separations between single- and multi-pass streaming algorithms are known for estimating matrix norms [BCK⁺18; BKKS20] and approximately counting subgraphs (see [BC17]). Recently, Assadi, Kol, Saxena, and Yu [AKSY20] and Assadi and N [AN21] proved multipass lower bounds for approximating (variants of) cycle counting in graphs, which rule out *some* nontrivial approximations for CSPs (though we seem quite far from even ruling out all nontrivial approximations for Max-Cut in two passes).

Furthermore, as we’ll see in §2.7, lower bounds for streaming problems are typically proven by reducing from *communication problems*. In these problems, several players each get a “chunk” of the input stream, and in the corresponding *communication-to-streaming reduction*, each player will run the streaming algorithm on their input chunk and then pass the current state of the streaming algorithm onto the next player. Thus, small-space streaming algorithms make for efficient communication protocols (and our goal is then to prove lower bounds against efficient communication protocols).

Details in the definitions of these communication problems crucially affect the streaming models we can prove lower bounds against. We give some high-level intuition for why this is the case. For starters, proving lower bounds against random-ordering algorithms generally requires *symmetry* between the players: They should receive inputs drawn from the same sources, and behave the same way on these inputs. Otherwise, they’ll be constructing a stream in the reduction which is far from randomly-ordered. On the other hand, to prove lower bounds against sketching algorithms, it suffices to consider communication games in which the players communicate in *parallel* instead of sequentially, because the composability property implies that each player can independently run the algorithm on their own “chunk”. Finally, the difficulty in proving multi-pass lower bounds is that the communication problem has multiple “rounds” (corresponding to each pass) in which each player gets to see their chunk again. All of these subtleties mean that the communication problems arising from the study of streaming approximations for CSPs are arguably quite interesting even apart from applications to streaming lower bounds. Finally, another mo-

tivation is that these communication problems have compelling connections to Fourier analysis and random graph combinatorics.

2

Preliminaries

WE BEGIN WITH TOOLS AND DEFINITIONS which are necessary background for the remainder of the thesis. This chapter reviews topics including CSPs (§2.1), streaming and sketching algorithms (§2.2), random (hyper)graphs (§2.3), Fourier analysis over \mathbb{Z}_q^n (§2.4), and, importantly, the use of one-way communication lower bounds and Fourier analysis to prove streaming lower bounds (§2.7).

We let $[n]$ denote the set of natural numbers $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and \mathbb{Z}_q the integers modulo q .^{*} We typically use bold to denote vectors but not their components, e.g., $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$. Sequences of vectors are indexed with parentheses (e.g., $\mathbf{b}(\ell) = (b(\ell)_1, \dots, b(\ell)_k)$). For a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$, we define its *Hamming weight* (a.k.a. *0-norm*) $\|\mathbf{b}\|_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\{i \in [n] : b_i \neq 0\}|$ as its number of nonzero entries. For a finite alphabet Σ , we let Σ^k , $\Sigma^{\leq k}$, and Σ^* denote strings over Σ of length k , length at most k , and arbitrary length, respectively. Let $\mathbb{1}_S$ denote the indicator variable/function for an event S , and given any finite set Ω , let $\Delta(\Omega)$ denote the space of probability distributions over Ω .

We typically write distributions and some sets (such as function families) using calligraphic letters. For instance, \mathcal{U}_S denotes the uniform distribution over S , \mathcal{B}_p the Bernoulli

^{*}The main difference between $[q]$ and \mathbb{Z}_q is the implied addition operation.

distribution taking value 0 with probability p and 1 with probability $1 - p$, and \mathcal{P}_X the probability distribution for a (discrete) random variable X . We use functional notation for distribution probabilities, i.e., $\mathcal{D}(\omega) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr_{\omega' \sim \mathcal{D}}[\omega = \omega']$. The *support* of a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\Omega)$ is the set $\text{supp}(\mathcal{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\omega \in \Omega : \mathcal{D}(\omega) \neq 0\}$. We similarly define $\text{supp}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\omega \in \Omega : f(\omega) \neq 0\}$ for functions $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in [n] : v_i \neq 0\}$ for vectors $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ (so that $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 = |\text{supp}(\mathbf{v})|$).

2.1 CONSTRAINT SATISFACTION PROBLEMS

A *constraint satisfaction problem* $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ is defined by $2 \leq q, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a labeled set of *predicates* $\mathcal{F} = \{f_b : \mathbb{Z}_q^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}_{b \in B_{\mathcal{F}}}$ for some finite set of labels $B_{\mathcal{F}}$.[†] A *constraint* C on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *variables* is given by a triple (b, \mathbf{j}, w) consisting of a label $b \in B_{\mathcal{F}}$, a k -tuple $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k) \in [n]^k$ of distinct indices, and a weight $w \geq 0$. An *instance* Ψ of $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ consists of a list of m constraints $(C_\ell = (b(\ell), \mathbf{j}(\ell), w(\ell)))_{\ell \in [m]}$. We sometimes omit weights for the constraints, in which case we take them to be identically 1; similarly, if $|\mathcal{F}| = 1$, we omit labels for the constraints.

The *union* of two instances Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 of $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$, denoted $\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2$, is the instance given by concatenating the lists of constraints for Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 .

For an *assignment* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$, let $\mathbf{x}|_{\mathbf{j}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_k}) \in \mathbb{Z}_q^k$ denote \mathbf{x} 's “restriction” to the indices \mathbf{j} . An assignment \mathbf{x} *satisfies* $C = (b, \mathbf{j}, w)$ iff $f_b(\mathbf{x}|_{\mathbf{j}}) = 1$. The *value* of an assignment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ on an instance Ψ , denoted $\text{val}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{x})$, is the (fractional) weight of constraints satisfied by \mathbf{x} , i.e.,

$$\text{val}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{W_{\Psi}} \sum_{\ell=1}^m w(\ell) f_{b(\ell)}(\mathbf{x}|_{\mathbf{j}(\ell)})$$

where $W_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\ell=1}^m w(\ell)$ is the total weight in Ψ . Finally, the *value* of Ψ , denoted val_{Ψ} , is the maximum value of any assignment, i.e.,

$$\text{val}_{\Psi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} (\text{val}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{x})).$$

Computationally, the goal of the $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ problem is to “approximate” val_{Ψ} . More

[†]Properly speaking, the CSP is defined only by the family of predicates; we include labels for notational convenience.

precisely, for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we say a randomized algorithm Alg α -approximates $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ if $\alpha \text{val}_\Psi \leq \text{Alg}(\Psi) \leq \text{val}_\Psi$ with probability at least, say, $\frac{2}{3}$ over the choice of randomness. For $\beta < \gamma \in [0, 1]$, we also consider the closely-related (β, γ) - $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ *gap problem*, the goal of which is to distinguish between the cases $\text{val}_\Psi \leq \beta$ and $\text{val}_\Psi \geq \gamma$, again with probability at least $\frac{2}{3}$ over the choice of randomness.[‡]

APPROXIMATION RESISTANCE

For a CSP $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$, define

$$\rho(\mathcal{F}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\Psi} \text{val}_\Psi.$$

$\rho(\mathcal{F})$ has the following explicit formula:

Proposition 2.1 ([CGSV21b, Proposition 2.12]). *For every \mathcal{F} ,*

$$\rho(\mathcal{F}) = \min_{\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathcal{F})} \max_{\mathcal{D}' \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_q)} \left(\mathbb{E}_{f \sim \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{a} \sim (\mathcal{D}')^k} [f(\mathbf{a})] \right).$$

In the prototypical case $|\mathcal{F}| = 1$, $\rho(\mathcal{F})$ captures the maximum value of any probabilistic assignment to f which is *symmetric* in the sense that every variable is assigned values from the same distribution independently.

By definition, $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ has a $\rho(\mathcal{F})$ -approximation given by simply outputting $\rho(\mathcal{F})$ on every input; we call this the *trivial approximation*. We say $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ is *approximation-resistant* (for a certain class \mathcal{S} of algorithms) if for every $\epsilon > 0$, no algorithm in \mathcal{S} can $(\rho(\mathcal{F}) + \epsilon)$ -approximate $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$. Otherwise, we say $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ is *approximable* (for \mathcal{S}).

CSPS OF INTEREST

Specific CSPs which we study in this thesis include the following. In the case $k = q = 2$, we let $\text{Cut}(x_1, x_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=}} x_1 + x_2 = \mathbb{1}_{x_1 \neq x_2}$, and we consider the problem $\text{Max-Cut} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=}$

[‡]One direction of this “close relationship” is that if Alg α -approximates $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\frac{\beta}{\gamma} < \alpha$, then Alg also solves the (β, γ) - $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ problem. For the other direction, see the proof sketch of [Corollary 5.3](#) below.

Max-CSP($\{\text{Cut}\}$). Similarly, we let $\text{DiCut}(x_1, x_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_1(x_2 + 1) = \mathbb{1}_{x_1=1, x_2=0}$, and we consider the problem $\text{Max-DiCut} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Max-CSP}(\{\text{DiCut}\})$.

In the case $q = 2$, for a predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we define the problem $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Max-CSP}(\{f_{\mathbf{b}} : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k})$ where $f_{\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{x})$; the predicates of this CSP correspond to “ f with negations”. For instance, for $k = 2$ we let $2\text{AND}(x_1, x_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x_1 x_2 = \mathbb{1}_{x_1=x_2=1}$. Then $\text{Max-}2\text{AND} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(2\text{AND})$ contains the four predicates $2\text{AND}_{b_1, b_2}(x_1, x_2) = (x_1 + b_1)(x_2 + b_2)$ for $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. (Note that $2\text{AND}_{0,0} = 2\text{AND}$ and $2\text{AND}_{0,1} = \text{DiCut}$.) More generally we define $k\text{AND}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \prod_{i=1}^k x_i$ and consider $\text{Max-}k\text{AND}$.

The reader can check that the trivial approximation ratios $\rho(\mathcal{F})$ for Max-Cut , Max-DiCut , and $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ are $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, and $\rho(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^k}}[f(\mathbf{a})]$, respectively.

2.2 STREAMING AND SKETCHING ALGORITHMS

For predicate families \mathcal{F} , we consider algorithms which attempt to solve the approximation problem $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ or the distinguishing problem $(\beta, \gamma)\text{-Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ in the $s(n)$ -space streaming setting, where $s(n)$ is typically small (e.g., $\text{polylog}(n)$). First, we give an informal definition. On input Ψ with n variables, a streaming algorithm is limited to $s(n)$ space and can only access the constraints in Ψ via a single pass through some ordering of Ψ 's constraints; this ordering can be chosen either *adversarially* or (uniformly) *randomly*. (When not specified, we assume the input is ordered adversarially.) On the other hand, the algorithm can use randomness and has no time or uniformity restrictions. We also consider a subclass of streaming algorithms called *sketching* algorithms, which have the property that the algorithm can be run independently on two halves of the input stream and the resulting states can be composed. A sketching algorithm is *linear* if the algorithm's state encodes an element of a vector space and composition corresponds to vector addition.

To be (somewhat) more formal, we define streaming and sketching algorithms as follows. Let Σ denote the *input space* of the stream (e.g., constraints of a $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ instance on n variables). A *deterministic space- s streaming algorithm* Alg is specified by a pair of functions $\text{NextState} : \{0, 1\}^s \times \Sigma \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^s$ and $\text{Output} : \{0, 1\}^s \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$. For an input stream $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m) \in \Sigma^*$, we define $\text{FinalState}(\sigma) \in \{0, 1\}^s$ as the result of initializing the state $S \leftarrow 0^s$ and iterating $S \leftarrow \text{NextState}(S, \sigma_\ell)$ for $\ell \in [m]$; then

Alg outputs $\text{Output}(\text{FinalState}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}))$. Moreover, Alg is a *sketching algorithm* if there exists another function $\text{Compose} : \{0, 1\}^s \times \{0, 1\}^s \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^s$ such that for every two input streams $\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}' \in \Sigma^*$, we have

$$\text{FinalState}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\sigma}') = \text{Compose}(\text{FinalState}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}), \text{FinalState}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}')),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\boldsymbol{\sigma}'$ denotes concatenation. *Randomized* streaming and sketching algorithms are distributions over streaming and sketching algorithms, respectively, which succeed with at least $\frac{2}{3}$ probability.[§]

One particular sketching algorithm of interest is the following classic algorithm for sketching 1-norms, which we use as a black box in later chapters:

Theorem 2.2 ([Ind06; KNW10]). *For every $\epsilon > 0$ and $c < \infty$, there exists an $O(\log n/\epsilon^2)$ -space randomized sketching algorithm for the following problem: The input is an (adversarially ordered) stream $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ of updates from the set $\Sigma = [n] \times \{-O(n^c), \dots, O(n^c)\}$, and the goal is to estimate the 1-norm of the vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ defined by $x_i = \sum_{(i,v) \in \boldsymbol{\sigma}} v$, up to a multiplicative factor of $1 \pm \epsilon$.*

2.3 HYPERGRAPHS

Let $2 \leq k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. A *k-hyperedge* on $[n]$ is simply a k -tuple $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, \dots, e_k) \in [n]^k$ of distinct indices, and a *k-hypergraph* (a.k.a. “ k -uniform hypergraph”) G on $[n]$ is a sequence $(\mathbf{e}(1), \dots, \mathbf{e}(m))$ of (not necessarily distinct) k -hyperedges. We assume $k = 2$ when k is omitted, and in this case, we drop the prefix “hyper”. Given an instance Ψ of a k -ary CSP $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ with constraints $(\mathbf{b}(\ell), \mathbf{j}(\ell), w(\ell))_{\ell \in [m]}$, we can define the *constraint (hyper)graph* $G(\Psi)$ of Ψ as the k -hypergraph with hyperedges $(\mathbf{j}(\ell))_{\ell \in [m]}$. Note that when $|\mathcal{F}| = 1$ (as is the case for e.g., **Max-Cut** and **Max-DiCut**) and we restrict our attention to unweighted instances, Ψ and $G(\Psi)$ carry the exact same data.

[§]Technical note: Since we allow repeated stream elements (and in particular, repeated constraints in $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ instances), we have to pick some *a priori* bound on stream lengths in order to get polylog(n)-space algorithms. Throughout the paper, we assume instances contain at most $O(n^c)$ constraints for some (large) fixed $c < \infty$. Moreover, in order to store constraint weights in the algorithms’ states, we assume that they are integers and are bounded by $O(n^c)$ in absolute value. We generally omit these details throughout the paper for ease of presentation.

To a k -hypergraph G with m edges, we associate an *adjacency matrix* $M \in \{0, 1\}^{km \times n}$, whose $(\ell k + j, i)$ -th entry is 1 iff $e(\ell)_j = i$ (for $\ell \in [m], j \in [k], i \in [n]$). Since they encode the same information, we will often treat adjacency matrices and k -hypergraphs as interchangeable. Importantly, we will often consider products of M and M^\top with vectors over \mathbb{Z}_q . Given $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ and $\mathbf{s} = M\mathbf{v}$, let $\mathbf{s}(\ell) = (s_{(k-1)\ell+1}, \dots, s_{k\ell})$ denote the ℓ -th block of k coordinates in \mathbf{s} ; then $\mathbf{s}(\ell) = \mathbf{v}|_{\mathbf{e}(\ell)}$. Thus, we can view \mathbf{v} as a “ \mathbb{Z}_q -labeling of vertices”, and \mathbf{s} as the corresponding “ \mathbb{Z}_q -labeling of hyperedge-vertex incidences”, where each hyperedge $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, \dots, e_k)$ determines k unique incidences $(\mathbf{e}, e_1), \dots, (\mathbf{e}, e_k)$. Conversely, given $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^m$, if $\mathbf{v} = M^\top \mathbf{s}$, for each $i \in [n]$, we have

$$v_i = \sum_{\ell \in [m], j \in [k]} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{e}(\ell)_j = i} \mathbf{s}(\ell)_j.$$

We again view \mathbf{s} as labeling hyperedge-vertex incidences; \mathbf{v} then describes the sums of \mathbf{s} -labels over the hyperedges incident at each vertex. Also, we will sometimes consider “folded” variants of the adjacency matrix M which “compress” each block of k columns (corresponding to a k -hyperedge) into fewer columns, e.g., by summing them into a single column, and these will have corresponding interpretations for $M\mathbf{v}$ and $M^\top \mathbf{s}$.

For $\alpha \in (0, 1), n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{G}_{k,\alpha}(n)$ denote the uniform distribution over k -hypergraphs on $[n]$ with αn hyperedges. A k -hypergraph G is a *k -hypermatching* if no vertex is shared by any hyperedge, i.e., if $v \in e(\ell), e(\ell')$ then $\ell = \ell'$; equivalently, the adjacency matrix M contains at most a single 1 in each row. We refer to a k -hypermatching G with αn edges as *α -partial*. We let $\mathcal{M}_{k,\alpha}(n)$ denote the uniform distribution over k -hypermatchings on $[n]$ with αn hyperedges (for $\alpha \in (0, 1), n \in \mathbb{N}$).

2.4 FOURIER ANALYSIS

Let $q \geq 2 \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{2\pi i/q}$ denote a (fixed primitive) q -th root of unity. Here, we summarize relevant aspects of Fourier analysis over \mathbb{Z}_q^n ; see e.g. [O’D14, §8] for details.[¶]

[¶][O’D14] uses a different normalization for norms and inner products, essentially because it considers expectations instead of sums over inputs.

Given a function $f : \mathbb{Z}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$, we define the *Fourier coefficient*

$$\widehat{f}(\mathbf{s}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} \omega^{-\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x})$$

where \cdot denotes the inner product over \mathbb{Z}_q . For $p \in (0, \infty)$, we define f 's p -norm

$$\|f\|_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} |f(\mathbf{x})|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

We also define f 's 0-norm

$$\|f\|_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} \mathbb{1}_{f(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0}$$

(a.k.a. the size of its support and the Hamming weight of its “truth table”). Also, for $\ell \in \{0\} \cup [n]$, we define the *level- ℓ Fourier (2-)weight* as

$$\mathbb{W}^\ell[f] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n: \|\mathbf{s}\|_0 = \ell} |\widehat{f}(\mathbf{s})|^2.$$

These weights are closely connected to f 's 2-norm:

Proposition 2.3 (Parseval's identity). *For every $q, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f : \mathbb{Z}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$\|f\|_2^2 = q^n \sum_{\ell=0}^n \mathbb{W}^\ell[f].$$

Moreover, let $\mathbb{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{w \in \mathbb{C} : |w| \leq 1\}$ denote the (closed) unit disk in the complex plane. The following lemma bounding the low-level Fourier weights for functions mapping into \mathbb{D} is derived from hypercontractivity theorems in [CGS⁺22]:

Lemma 2.4 ([CGS⁺22, Lemma 2.11]). *There exists $\zeta > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $q \geq 2, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider any function $f : \mathbb{Z}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$. If for $c \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|f\|_0 \geq q^{n-c}$, then for every $\ell \in \{1, \dots, 4c\}$, we have*

$$\frac{q^{2n}}{\|f\|_0^2} \mathbb{W}^\ell[f] \leq \left(\frac{\zeta c}{\ell} \right)^\ell.$$

2.5 CONCENTRATION INEQUALITIES

We'll use the following concentration inequality for submartingales:

Lemma 2.5 ([KK19, Lemma 2.5]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_m be (not necessarily independent) $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variables, such that for some $p \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbb{E}[X_\ell \mid X_0, \dots, X_{\ell-1}] \leq p$ for every $\ell \in [m]$. Let $\mu = pm$. Then for every $\eta > 0$,*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^m X_\ell \geq \mu + \eta \right] \leq e^{-\eta^2 / (2(\mu + \eta))}.$$

2.6 ADVANTAGE AND TOTAL VARIATION DISTANCE

Let $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N} \in \Delta(\Omega)$, and consider a *test function* $\text{Test} : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which attempts to distinguish between \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{N} by outputting 1 more often on inputs sampled from \mathcal{Y} than those sampled from \mathcal{N} (or vice versa). The *advantage* of f measures its success at this distinguishing task:

$$\text{adv}_{\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N}}(\text{Test}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\mathbb{E}[\text{Test}(\mathcal{Y})] - \mathbb{E}[\text{Test}(\mathcal{N})]| \in [0, 1].$$

The *total variation distance* between two distributions \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N} is the maximum advantage any test f achieves in distinguishing \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{N} . The optimal f is the so-called “maximum likelihood estimator” which, on input $\omega \in \Omega$, outputs $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{Y}(\omega) \geq \mathcal{N}(\omega)}$. Thus,

$$\|\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\text{tv}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\text{Test}: \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}} (\text{adv}_{\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N}}(\text{Test})) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} |\mathcal{Y}(\omega) - \mathcal{N}(\omega)|.$$

Also, for two random variables Y and N , we use $\|Y - N\|_{\text{tv}}$ as shorthand for $\|\mathcal{P}_Y - \mathcal{P}_N\|_{\text{tv}}$ (recall that e.g. \mathcal{P}_Y denotes the distribution of Y).

The total variation distance satisfies two important inequalities for our purposes:

Lemma 2.6 (Triangle inequality). *Let $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{Z} \in \Delta(\Omega)$. Then*

$$\|\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\text{tv}} \geq \|\mathcal{Y} - \mathcal{Z}\|_{\text{tv}} - \|\mathcal{Z} - \mathcal{N}\|_{\text{tv}}.$$

Lemma 2.7 (Data processing inequality). *Let Y, N be random variables with sample space Ω , and let Z be a random variable with sample space Ω' which is independent of Y and N . If $g : \Omega \times \Omega' \rightarrow \Omega''$ is any function, then*

$$\|Y - N\|_{\text{tv}} \geq \|g(Y, Z) - g(N, Z)\|_{\text{tv}}.$$

Intuitively, [Lemma 2.7](#) says that to distinguish the distributions of two random variables Y and N , it is not helpful to perform any additional (possibly random) transformations first.

2.7 LOWER BOUND BASICS

Finally, we consider several specific types of tests for distinguishing distributions over particular kinds of sets. These notions will be crucial for the proofs of lower bounds against streaming approximations for CSPs.

Firstly, let Σ be a finite input space and consider the case $\Omega = \Sigma^*$. Given a pair of distributions $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N} \in \Delta(\Omega)$, we can view a deterministic streaming algorithm Alg as a test for distinguishing \mathcal{Y} from \mathcal{N} . This perspective lets us rule out algorithms for (β, γ) - $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ (and by extension $(\frac{\beta}{\gamma} + \epsilon)$ -approximations to $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$) by constructing *indistinguishable* \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{N} distributions:

Proposition 2.8 (Minimax lemma [[Yao77](#)], informal statement for $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$). *Consider a CSP $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$, and let \mathcal{S} denote a “class” of randomized algorithms (e.g., $O(\sqrt{n})$ -space streaming algorithms with adversarial input ordering). Let $\beta < \gamma \in [0, 1]$, and suppose that \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{N} are distributions over $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ instances such that*

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim \mathcal{N}}[\text{val}_{\Psi} \geq \beta] \leq 0.01 \text{ and } \Pr_{\Psi \sim \mathcal{Y}}[\text{val}_{\Psi} \leq \gamma] \leq 0.01.$$

Then if there exists $\text{Alg} \in \mathcal{S}$ solving the (β, γ) - $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ problem, there is a deterministic algorithm in \mathcal{S} distinguishing \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{N} with advantage at least $\frac{1}{6}$.

Now consider the case of a product set $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_T$. A set of functions $\text{Prot}_t : \{0, 1\}^s \times \Omega_t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^s$ for $t \in [T]$ defines a *space- s communication protocol* $\text{Prot} : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^s$ in the following way. Given input $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_T) \in \Omega$, set $S \leftarrow 0^s$ and iteratively

apply $S \leftarrow \text{Prot}_t(S, \omega_t)$ for $t \in [T]$; finally, output S . (We assume that Prot_T 's codomain is $\{0, 1\}$.) Prot is a special type of test for distinguishing distributions $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N} \in \Delta(\Omega)$. We can also interpret such a protocol as a strategy in the following *one-way communication game* (or *problem*) with players $\text{Player}_1, \dots, \text{Player}_T$:

- We sample $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_T)$ either from \mathcal{Y} (the **Yes case**) or \mathcal{N} (the **No case**). Player_t receives the input ω_t .
- Player_1 sends a message, based on their input ω_1 , to Player_2 . For $t \in \{2, \dots, T-1\}$, Player_t sends a message, based on Player_{t-1} 's message and their own input ω_t , to Player_{t+1} . Player_T decides, based on Player_{T-1} 's message and their own input ω_T , whether to output 1 or 0.
- The players' collective goal is to maximize their advantage in distinguishing the **Yes** and **No** cases.

This type of game can be used to model the flow of information during the execution of a streaming algorithm. The intuitive picture is that we can think of a streaming algorithm on a stream of length m as a protocol for an m -player one-way communication game, where Player_t gets the t -th element of the stream, and each player transmits the state of the streaming algorithm onto the next player. To prove lower bounds for such a protocol, it suffices to prove lower bounds in the “coarser” game with only a constant number $T = O(1)$ of players, each of which gets a “chunk” of, say, m/T stream elements. This corresponds to relaxing the definition of the streaming model to only require that the state is succinct in T “bottleneck” locations along the stream; thus, to prove streaming lower bounds, we are proving the sufficient condition that at these bottlenecks, the algorithm's state cannot capture enough information about the elements it's already seen in the stream. Through this “reduction”, lower bounds for a streaming problem can follow from lower bounds for an appropriately defined communication game. (See §3.1 for a more concrete description in the particular case of **Max-Cut**.)

We now make this *communication-to-streaming (C2S)* reduction precise in a more convenient and general formulation where each player's input is not necessarily a chunk of constraints; rather, each player constructs constraints from their input according to some pre-defined “reduction functions”. Suppose Σ is a finite input space, while $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_T$

is still a product space. Given a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\Omega)$ and reduction functions $R_t : \Omega_t \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ for $t \in [T]$, define $(R_1, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{D}$ as the distribution over Σ^* given by sampling $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_T) \sim \mathcal{D}$ and outputting the concatenation $R_1(\omega_1) \cdots R_T(\omega_T)$.

Lemma 2.9 (Communication-to-streaming reduction). *Let $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_t$ and Σ be finite sets. Let $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N} \in \Delta(\Omega)$ and $R_t : \Omega_t \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ for $t \in [T]$. If there exists a deterministic space-s streaming algorithm Alg for distinguishing $(R_1, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{Y}$ from $(R_1, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{N}$ with advantage δ , then there exists a space-s communication protocol Prot for distinguishing \mathcal{Y} from \mathcal{N} with advantage δ .*

Proof. Let Alg be given by $(\text{NextState}, \text{Output})$. Consider the protocol Prot in which Player_1 , on input ω_1 , sets $S \leftarrow \text{NextState}(R_1(\omega_1), 0^s)$ and sends S to Player_2 . Now for $t \in \{2, \dots, T-1\}$, Player_t receives S from Player_{t-1} , sets $S \leftarrow \text{NextState}(R_t(\omega_t), S)$, and sends S to Player_{t+1} . Finally, Player_T outputs $\text{Output}(\text{NextState}(R_T(\omega_T), S))$. By definition, when the players receive input $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_T)$, they are running Alg on the stream $\sigma = R_1(\omega_1) \cdots R_T(\omega_T)$. If the players' input comes from \mathcal{Y} , then σ is distributed as $(R_1, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{Y}$, and similarly for \mathcal{N} . \square

In our setting, where the reduction produces CSP instances, we typically think of each reduction function as outputting “subinstances” for each player, whose union is the output instance Ψ .

The final special case of advantage we consider is distinguishing $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_q^n)$ from the uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q^n}$. Recalling that we view $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_q^n)$ as a function $\mathbb{Z}_q^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we can consider the Fourier coefficients $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{s})$ for $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$. The following simple but crucial lemma relates the distance-to-uniformity of \mathcal{D} with these coefficients:

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_q^n)$ and let $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q^n}$. Then*

$$\|\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}}^2 \leq q^{2n} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} |\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{s})|^2.$$

Proof. We have $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{0}) = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{z}) = 1$. Similarly, $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbf{0}) = 1$, while for $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$, we have $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{q^{n\alpha}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} (-1)^{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{z}} = 0$ by symmetry. Also by definition, $\|\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}} = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{U}\|_1$, where $\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{U} : \mathbb{Z}_q^n \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ is the difference of the probability mass functions of \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{U} .

Thus using Cauchy-Schwarz and Parseval's identity ([Proposition 2.3](#)), we have

$$\|\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}}^2 \leq q^n \|\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{U}\|_2^2 = q^{2n} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} |\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{s}) - \widehat{\mathcal{U}}(\mathbf{s})|^2 = q^{2n} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n} |\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{s})|^2,$$

as desired. □

[Lemma 2.10](#) is an example of a so-called “XOR lemma” (see [[Gol11](#), §1]). In the $q = 2$ case, for each $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$, $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{s})$ is the advantage of the *linear test* on \mathcal{D} which, given a sample $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{D}$, outputs $\sum_{i \in [n]: s_i=1} z_i$. The lemma roughly says that if none of these tests work well, then \mathcal{D} is in fact close to uniform.

Together, [Proposition 2.8](#) and [Lemmas 2.9](#) and [2.10](#) give us a “roadmap” for proving CSP streaming inapproximability results. Namely, we design a one-way communication game with the following two properties:

1. The players can use reduction functions (à la [Lemma 2.9](#)) to produce CSP instances from their inputs with the property that there is a large gap between the instances' values in the **Yes** and **No** cases (with high probability).
2. The game's hardness itself can be proven using [Lemma 2.10](#) and additional Fourier analysis and combinatorics.

In the CSP context, this was first introduced by Kapralov, Khanna, and Sudan [[KKS15](#)] for Max-Cut. We turn to this proof in the next chapter.

I

Prior results

3

Max-Cut is approximation-resistant

The problem is defined as follows: given a stream of edges of an n -node graph G , estimate the value of the maximum cut in G . *Question:* Is there an algorithm with an approximation factor strictly better than $1/2$ that uses $o(n)$ space?

[IMNO11, Question 10], attributed to Robert Krauthgamer

MAX-CUT WAS THE FIRST CSP whose streaming approximability was tightly characterized. To be precise, Kapralov, Khanna, and Sudan [KKS15] proved the following theorem:

Theorem 3.1 ([KKS15]). *For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, any streaming algorithm which $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximates Max-Cut requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space.*

This chapter is devoted to proving **Theorem 3.1**. We remark also that in the classical setting, Goemans and Williamson [GW95] gave an algorithm based on SDP rounding which α_{GW} -approximates Max-Cut, where $\alpha_{\text{GW}} = \min_{\theta \in [0, \text{Prot}]} \frac{2\theta}{\text{Prot}(1 - \cos(\theta))} \approx 0.87856$;^{*}

^{*}Khot, Kindler, Mossel, and O’Donnell [KKMO07] showed that $(\alpha_{\text{GW}} + \epsilon)$ -approximations are UG-hard. Without the UGC, Trevisan *et al.* [TSSW00] show that $(\frac{16}{17} + \epsilon)$ -approximation is NP-hard, but $\frac{16}{17} \approx 0.94118$.

thus, [Theorem 3.1](#) shows that **Max-Cut** is comparatively much *less* approximable in the streaming setting relative to the classical setting.

Now, we begin with some intuition for why **Max-Cut** should be hard to approximate with a small-space streaming algorithm. Consider a streaming algorithm solving **Max-Cut** on an input instance Ψ . Suppose that we pause it halfway through the input stream, and at this point, the algorithm is fairly confident that val_Ψ is large and has a “guess” $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ for an assignment with high value. Then during the second half of the stream, the algorithm should be able to confirm that the constraints it sees are also (mostly) consistent with \mathbf{x} .

In order to prove streaming approximation-resistance for **Max-Cut**, we begin in [§3.1](#) by defining a one-way communication problem which formalizes this difficulty, which we’ll call *Boolean partition detection* (BPD),[†] and we give a roadmap for how BPD’s hardness implies **Max-Cut**’s hardness via the intermediate “*sequential Boolean partition detection* problem (sBPD)”. Next, in [§3.2](#), we describe the Fourier-analytic proof, originally due to Gavinsky *et al.* [[GKK⁺08](#)], that BPD is hard, and in [§3.3](#), we show how sBPD reduces to BPD via the *hybrid argument* of Kapralov, Khanna, and Sudan [[KKS15](#)]. Finally, in [§3.4](#), we make several comments on important features of the **Max-Cut** lower bound which will remain important for the other CSPs considered in this thesis.

3.1 BOOLEAN PARTITION DETECTION PROBLEMS

Let $M \in \{0, 1\}^{2\alpha n \times n}$ be an adjacency matrix for a graph on n vertices and αn edges. Recall that in M , each edge corresponds to a $2 \times n$ block. We define a *folded* variant of M , denoted $M^{\text{fold}} \in \{0, 1\}^{\alpha n \times n}$ by replacing each $2 \times n$ edge-block with the sum of its columns; thus, each column of M^{fold} corresponds to a single edge, and has 1’s indicating the two vertices incident to that edge. Then the BPD problem is defined as follows.

Definition 3.2 (BPD). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\text{BPD}_\alpha(n)$ is the following two-player one-way communication problem, with players Alice and Bob:*

- Alice receives a random vector $\mathbf{x}^* \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^n}$.

[†]The typical name in the literature is the *Boolean hidden matching problem* (see e.g., [[KKS15](#)]). In this thesis, however, we have to accommodate a variety of communication problems and so have chosen to adopt a more consistent naming scheme.

- **Bob** receives an adjacency matrix $M \in \{0, 1\}^{2\alpha n \times n}$ sampled from $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)$, and a vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}$ labelling each edge of M defined as follows:
 - **Yes** case: $\mathbf{z} = (M^{\text{fold}})\mathbf{x}^*$.
 - **No** case: $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}}$.
- **Alice** can send a message to **Bob**, who must then decide whether they are in the **Yes** or **No** case.

We can view **Alice**'s vector \mathbf{x}^* as a partition of M 's vertices. In the **Yes** case, **Bob**'s vector \mathbf{z} can be interpreted as follows: If $\mathbf{e}(\ell) = (u, v)$ is the ℓ -th edge of M , then $z_\ell = x_u^* + x_v^*$. Thus, \mathbf{z} precisely encodes which edges in M cross the partition \mathbf{x}^* . On the other hand, in the **No** case, \mathbf{z} is uniformly random. Thus, **Bob**'s goal is to decide whether his input \mathbf{z} is consistent with partition \mathbf{x}^* based on **Alice**'s message.

In §3.2 below, we will prove that this task requires significant communication from **Alice** to **Bob**:

Theorem 3.3 ([GKK⁺08]). *For every $\alpha, \delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\tau > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, any protocol for $\text{BPD}_\alpha(n)$ achieving advantage at least δ requires $\tau\sqrt{n}$ communication.*

While **Theorem 3.3** captures the essential obstacle to computing **Max-Cut** in the streaming setting, it is not alone sufficient to prove inapproximability. For this purpose, we want **Alice** and **Bob** to produce **Max-Cut** instances using a streaming-to-communication reduction (see **Lemma 2.9**) which have a high value gap between the **Yes** and **No** cases. Indeed, to rule out $\approx \frac{1}{2}$ -approximations, the **Yes** instances should have value ≈ 1 while the **No** instances should have value $\approx \frac{1}{2}$. *A priori*, we might hope to produce such instances via a direct reduction from **BPD** to **Max-Cut**. In the **Yes** case of **BPD**, suppose that for each edge which crosses the cut (i.e., those for which $z_\ell = 1$), **Bob** creates a corresponding **Max-Cut** constraint; encouragingly, the resulting instance has value 1! But unfortunately, the same is true in the **No** case, because every \mathbf{z} is consistent with *some* partition \mathbf{x}' of M . For instance, for each $\mathbf{e}(\ell) = (u, v)$, we could set $x'_u = 0$ and $x'_v = z_\ell$ (and assign all remaining x -values arbitrarily); in particular, since M is a matching, none of these assignments will interfere with each other.‡

‡In other words, the graph corresponding to the **Max-Cut** instance **Bob** creates will always be a matching, and matchings are always bipartite; thus **Bob**'s instances always have value 1.

The issue, in brief, is that the underlying graph in BPD is too sparse to be of use in constructing low-value Max-Cut instances. To remedy this, we introduce a *sequential* variant of BPD which can give rise to much denser graphs:

Definition 3.4 (sBPD). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $T, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\text{sBPD}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ is the following $(T + 1)$ -player one-way communication problem, with players Alice and $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_T$:*

- Alice receives a random vector $\mathbf{x}^* \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^n}$.
- Each Bob_t receives an adjacency matrix $M_t \in \{0, 1\}^{2\alpha n \times n}$ sampled from $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)$, and a vector $\mathbf{z}(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}$ labelling each edge of M_t as follows:
 - **Yes** case: $\mathbf{z}(t) = (M_t^{\text{fold}})\mathbf{x}^*$.
 - **No** case: $\mathbf{z}(t) \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}}$.
- Alice can send a message to Bob_1 ; each Bob_t can send a message to Bob_{t+1} ; and at the end, Bob_T must decide whether they are in the **Yes** or **No** case.

sBPD is a “happy medium” which allows us to effect reductions both *from* BPD and to Max-Cut. Indeed, we have:

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\alpha, \delta \in (0, 1)$ and $T, n, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose there is a protocol for $\text{sBPD}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ achieving advantage δ using s communication. Then there is a protocol for $\text{BPD}_\alpha(n)$ achieving advantage at least $\frac{\delta}{T}$ using s communication.*

We prove [Lemma 3.5](#) in [§3.3](#) below using the *hybrid argument* of Kapralov, Khanna, and Sudan [[KKS15](#)]. We also have:

Construction 3.6 (C2S reduction from sBPD to Max-Cut). *Alice’s reduction function, denoted R_0 , outputs no constraints. For each $t \in [T]$, Bob_t ’s reduction function R_t outputs an instance Ψ_t as follows: For each $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell) = (u, v)$ in M_t , Bob_t adds $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)$ to Ψ_t iff $z(t)_\ell = 1$.*

The hard instances for Max-Cut produced by [Construction 3.6](#) are represented pictorially in [Fig. 3.1](#).

Lemma 3.7. *For all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, there exist $T, n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$, the following holds. Let \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{N} denote the **Yes** and **No** distributions for*




Figure 3.1: Example hard instances for Max-Cut. Figs. 3.1a and 3.1b depict samples from the **Yes** and **No** distributions of sBPD, respectively. Recall, in sBPD, Alice receives a hidden partition $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and each Bob_t receive a matching M_t along with a vector $\mathbf{z}(t)$ annotating M_t 's edges. In the **Yes** case, $\mathbf{z}(t)$ marks the edges of M_t which cross the partition \mathbf{x}^* , while in the **No** case, $\mathbf{z}(t)$ is uniformly random. The graphs in Figs. 3.1a and 3.1b represent the union of the matchings M_1, \dots, M_t ; \mathbf{x}^* partitions the vertices into “left” (0) and “right” (1); and the edges’ z -values are either “green” (1) or “red” (0). In our reduction from sBPD to Max-Cut (Construction 3.6), Alice adds no edges, and each Bob_t adds all edges with z -value “green” (1). In the **Yes** case, the resulting graph is bipartite (Fig. 3.1c) and thus has Max-Cut value 1, while in the **No** case, the graph is random (Fig. 3.1d) and has value $\approx \frac{1}{2}$ with high probability (for sufficiently large T).

$s\text{BPD}_{\alpha,T}(n)$, and let (R_0, \dots, R_T) be the reduction functions from [Construction 3.6](#). Then

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim (R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{Y}} [\text{val}_{\Psi} = 1] = 1 \text{ and } \Pr_{\Psi \sim (R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{N}} \left[\text{val}_{\Psi} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \right] \leq \exp(-n).$$

Note that [Lemma 3.7](#) may force us to make T very large; yet it is constant, in which case [Lemma 3.5](#) gives a small-but-constant advantage for BPD, and fortunately, [Theorem 3.3](#) rules out *every* constant advantage for BPD.

To conclude this section, we give proofs for [Theorem 3.1](#) and [Lemma 3.7](#).

Proof of [Theorem 3.1](#). Consider any $\epsilon > 0$, let $\tau > 0$ be determined later, and let Alg be a randomized space- $s(n)$ streaming algorithm which $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximates Max-Cut. By [Lemma 3.7](#), we can pick sufficiently large $T, n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if we fix any $n \geq n_0$, we have

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim (R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{Y}} [\text{val}_{\Psi} = 1] = 1 \text{ and } \Pr_{\Psi \sim (R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{N}} \left[\text{val}_{\Psi} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \right] \leq \exp(-n)$$

where \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{N} are the **Yes** and **No** distributions for $s\text{BPD}_{\alpha,T}(n)$ and (R_0, \dots, R_T) are as in [Construction 3.6](#). Since Alg solves the $(1, 1 - \epsilon/2)$ -Max-Cut problem, by [Proposition 2.8](#), there is a *deterministic* space- $s(n)$ streaming algorithm which distinguishes $(R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{Y}$ and $(R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{N}$ with advantage at least $\frac{1}{6}$. By [Lemma 2.9](#), there is a deterministic space- $s(n)$ communication protocol for $s\text{BPD}_{\alpha,T}(n)$ with advantage at least $\frac{1}{6}$. By [Lemma 3.5](#), there is a deterministic space- $s(n)$ communication protocol for $\text{BPD}_{\alpha}(n)$ with advantage at least $\frac{1}{6T}$. Finally, by [Theorem 3.3](#), there is some $\tau > 0$ and $n'_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that further assuming $n \geq n'_0$, we can conclude $s(n) \geq \tau\sqrt{n}$, as desired. \square

Proof sketch of [Lemma 3.7](#). Let $\Psi = \Psi_1 \cup \dots \cup \Psi_T$ be the instance created by the reduction. In the **Yes** case, regardless of T , we always have $\text{val}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}^*) = 1$, since every constraint (u, v) in Ψ is chosen such that $x_u^* + x_v^* = 1$.

For the **No** case, it is sufficient to show that for every fixed assignment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$,

$$\Pr \left[\text{val}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \right] \leq \exp(-\epsilon^2 \alpha T n), \tag{3.8}$$

since then we can take a union bound over \mathbf{x} and set T sufficiently large. In the “nicer” model where Ψ has $\alpha T n$ constraints chosen uniformly at random, [Eq. \(3.8\)](#) would follow

immediately from the Chernoff bound, since \mathbf{x} would satisfy each of the αTn constraints independently w.p. $\frac{1}{2}$. Unfortunately, there are two issues:

1. Since $\mathbf{z}(t)$ is uniformly random, **Bob** _{t} adds each edge in M_t as a constraint in Ψ_t only w.p. $\frac{1}{2}$ (independently). Thus, the number of constraints in each sub-instance Ψ_t is distributed binomially. In particular, *the number of constraints in Ψ is not constant*.
2. Each M_t is a random *matching*, so its edges are not independent. Thus, *Ψ 's constraints are not independent*, although Ψ_t and $\Psi_{t'}$ have independent constraints if $t \neq t'$.

Issue (1) can be addressed by treating the number of constraints in each Ψ_t as a random variable and conditioning. To be precise, we define $\beta_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{m(\Psi_t)}{n}$ for each $t \in [T]$ and $\beta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{m(\Psi)}{Tn} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\beta_1] = \dots = \mathbb{E}[\beta_T] = \mathbb{E}[\beta] = \frac{\alpha}{2}$ and condition on fixed values β_1, \dots, β_T . We can then treat the constraints of each Ψ_t as the edges of a random matching drawn from $\mathcal{M}_{\beta_t}(n)$.

Now, suppose we define random variables $\{X_{t,\ell}\}_{t \in [T], \ell \in [\beta_t n]}$, each of which is the indicator for the event that \mathbf{x} satisfies the ℓ -th constraint of Ψ_t . We have $\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\beta T n} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\ell=1}^{\beta_t n} X_{t,\ell}$. Because of Issue (2), we can't use the Chernoff bound on $\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x})$, but we can use [Lemma 2.5](#). For $t \neq t'$, $X_{t,\ell}$ and $X_{t',\ell'}$ will be independent, and even though $X_{t,\ell}$ is not independent of $X_{t,1}, \dots, X_{t,\ell-1}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[X_{t,\ell} \mid X_{t,1}, \dots, X_{t,\ell-1}] \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Indeed, the ℓ -th constraint in Ψ_t is sampled uniformly from the set of constraints which do not share variables with the first $\ell - 1$ constraints, and at most half of these are satisfied by \mathbf{x} .

(There's one other small issue: The probability bound [Lemma 2.5](#) gives us will be exponentially small in βTn , not αTn . But by the Chernoff bound, we can assume WLOG, say, $\beta \geq \frac{\alpha}{4}$. This contributes an additional union bound term which is exponentially small in αn .) □

3.2 BPD IS HARD: PROVING [THEOREM 3.3](#)

The goal of this section is to prove [Theorem 3.3](#), due to Gavinsky, Kempe, Kerenidis, Raz, and de Wolf [[GKK⁺08](#)], which states that BPD requires significant communication.

Let $\mathcal{U} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}}$. To begin, suppose that Alice, using a deterministic protocol, sends some fixed message $a \in \{0, 1\}^s$ to **Bob**, and let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ be the set of \mathbf{x}^* 's consistent with this

message. For each matching $M \in \{0, 1\}^{2\alpha n \times n}$, we consider the conditional distribution of Bob's second input $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}$ in the **Yes** case:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{A,M}(\mathbf{z}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr_{\mathbf{x}^* \sim \mathcal{U}_A} [\mathbf{z} = (M^{\text{fold}})\mathbf{x}^*].$$

We prove [Theorem 3.3](#) by showing that if A is sufficiently large (which will be the case w.h.p. when the communication s is sufficiently small), then w.h.p. over M , the distribution $\mathcal{Z}_{A,M}$ is statistically close to \mathcal{U} , and so Bob cannot distinguish the **Yes** and **No** cases. To achieve this, we rely crucially on the following “reduction”:

Lemma 3.9 (Fourier-analytic reduction). *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and $\mathbb{1}_A : \mathbb{Z}_2^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the indicator for A , and let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)} [\|\mathcal{Z}_{A,M} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}}^2] \leq \frac{2^{2n}}{|A|^2} \sum_{\ell \geq 2}^{2\alpha n} h_\alpha(\ell, n) \mathbb{W}^\ell[\mathbb{1}_A]$$

where for $\ell \in [n]$,

$$h_\alpha(\ell, n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n, \|\mathbf{v}\|_0 = \ell} \left(\Pr_{M \sim \mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)} [\exists \mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n} \text{ s.t. } (M^{\text{fold}})^\top \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{v}] \right).$$

To interpret the definition of $h_\alpha(\ell, n)$, we can view \mathbf{s} as “marking” some edges of the matching M with 1's; then the vector $(M^{\text{fold}})^\top \mathbf{s}$ simply marks which vertices are incident to a marked edge.

To bound the sum from [Lemma 3.9](#), we rely on two separate inequalities in the regimes of small and large ℓ . In the small- ℓ regime, we apply [Lemma 2.4](#), and in the large- ℓ regime, we apply the following bound:

Lemma 3.10 (Combinatorial bound on h). *Let $h_\alpha(\ell, n)$ be defined as in [Lemma 3.9](#). For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and for every $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with even $\ell \leq n/2$, we have*

$$h_\alpha(\ell, n) = \frac{\binom{\alpha n}{k/2}}{\binom{n}{\ell}} \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha \ell}{n} \right)^{\ell/2}.$$

For odd ℓ , $h_\alpha(\ell, n) = 0$.

Before proving [Lemmas 3.9](#) and [3.10](#), let us show how they suffice to prove [Theorem 3.3](#).

Proof of [Theorem 3.3](#). Suppose Alice and Bob use a one-way communication protocol Prot for BPD_α which uses at most $s = \tau\sqrt{n}$ communication and achieves advantage δ , where τ is a constant to be determined later. From Bob's perspective, Alice's message partitions the set of possible \mathbf{x}^* 's into sets $\{A_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^n\}_{i \in [2^s]}$. Conditioned on a fixed set $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, Prot is distinguishing the distributions $\mathcal{Z}_{A,M}$ and \mathcal{U} for random $M \sim \mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)$, and thus it achieves advantage at most $\delta_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)}[\|\mathcal{Z}_{A,M} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}}]$. Letting \mathcal{A} denote the distribution which samples each A_i w.p. $|A_i|/2^n$, we have

$$\delta \leq \mathbb{E}_{A \sim \mathcal{A}}[\delta_A]. \quad (3.11)$$

Our goal is to find a contradiction to [Eq. \(3.11\)](#) for a sufficiently small choice of τ . We set $\tau = 2\tau'$, where $\tau' > 0$ is to be determined later, and let $s' = \tau'\sqrt{n}$.

A "typical" $A \sim \mathcal{A}$ is large, so to contradict [Eq. \(3.11\)](#), it is sufficient to show that δ_A is small for large A . Indeed, since $s' < s - \log(2/\delta)$ (for sufficiently large n), we have $\Pr_{A \sim \mathcal{A}}[|A| \leq 2^{n-s'}] \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$, and it therefore suffices to prove that if $|A| \geq 2^{n-s'}$, then $\delta_A \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$.

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ with $|A| \geq 2^{n-s'}$. By Jensen's inequality,

$$\delta_A \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)}[\|\mathcal{Z}_{A,M} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}}^2]}. \quad (3.12)$$

Now we apply [Lemma 3.9](#):

$$\mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)}[\|\mathcal{Z}_{A,M} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}}^2] \leq \frac{2^{2n}}{|A|^2} \sum_{\ell=2}^{2\alpha n} h_\alpha(\ell, n) \mathbb{W}^\ell[\mathbb{1}_A].$$

We split the sum at $\ell = 4s'$, using [Lemma 2.4](#) for the first term and [Proposition 2.3](#) for the second:

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{2^{2n}}{|A|^2} \sum_{\ell=2}^{4s'} h_\alpha(\ell, n) \mathbb{W}^\ell[\mathbb{1}_A] + \frac{2^{2n}}{|A|^2} \sum_{\ell=4s'}^{2\alpha n} h_\alpha(\ell, n) \mathbb{W}^\ell[\mathbb{1}_A] \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=2}^{4s'} h_\alpha(\ell, n) \left(\frac{\zeta s'}{\ell}\right)^\ell + \frac{2^{2n}}{|A|^2} \max_{4s' \leq \ell \leq 2\alpha n} h_\alpha(\ell, n). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Applying [Lemma 3.10](#) and the inequality $|A| \geq 2^{n-s'}$:

$$\leq \sum_{\text{even } \ell=2}^{4s'} \left(\frac{2\alpha e(\zeta s')^2}{\ell n} \right)^{\ell/2} + \left(\frac{16\alpha e s'}{n} \right)^{2s'}.$$

Finally, we use the inequalities $\frac{s'}{n} \leq \frac{(s')^2}{n} = (\tau')^2$, $\ell \geq 2$, $2s' \geq 1$ and upper-bound with a geometric series:

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{\text{even } \ell=2}^{4s'} (\tau' \zeta \sqrt{\alpha e})^\ell + 16\alpha e (\tau')^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{\text{even } \ell=2}^{\infty} (\tau' \zeta \sqrt{\alpha e})^\ell + 16\alpha e (\tau')^2 \\ &= \frac{\alpha e (\tau' \zeta)^2}{1 - \alpha e (\tau' \zeta)^2} + 16\alpha e (\tau')^2. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming WLOG $\alpha e (\tau' \zeta)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, [Eq. \(3.12\)](#) then gives $\delta_A \leq \tau' \sqrt{4\zeta^2 + 8}$, yielding $\delta_A \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ for a small enough choice of $\tau' = \Theta(\delta)$, as desired. \square

Remark 3.14. In [Eq. \(3.13\)](#), the “low- ℓ terms” are qualitatively the most important; they are the site of “balancing” between powers of n between the low-level Fourier weight bounds ([Lemma 2.4](#)) and the random-graph analysis ([Lemma 3.10](#)). In particular, for $\ell \in \{2, \dots, 4s'\}$ we get terms of the form $h_\alpha(\ell, n) \left(\frac{\zeta s'}{\ell}\right)^\ell$, which are $\left(O\left(\frac{(s')^2}{\ell n}\right)\right)^{\ell/2}$ by [Lemma 3.10](#). Even for e.g. $\ell = 2$, this term is super-constant if $s = \omega(\sqrt{n})$.

We now prove [Lemmas 3.9](#) and [3.10](#).

Proof of [Lemma 3.9](#). Let $M \in \{0, 1\}^{2\alpha n \times n}$ be a fixed matching. For fixed $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \{0, 1\}^{\alpha n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{A,M}(\mathbf{s}) &= \frac{1}{2^{\alpha n}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}} (-1)^{-\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{z}} \mathcal{Z}_{A,M}(\mathbf{z}) && \text{(definition of } \widehat{\mathcal{Z}}_{A,M}\text{)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{\alpha n}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}} (-1)^{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{z}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^* \sim \mathcal{U}_A} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{z} = (M^{\text{fold}})_{\mathbf{x}^*}} \right] \right) && \text{(definition of } \mathcal{Z}_{A,M}\text{)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2^{\alpha n}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^* \sim \mathcal{U}_A} \left[(-1)^{-\mathbf{s} \cdot ((M^{\text{fold}})^{\top} \mathbf{x}^*)} \right] && \text{(linearity of expectation)} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^{\alpha n}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^* \sim \mathcal{U}_A} \left[(-1)^{-((M^{\text{fold}})^{\top} \mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{x}^*} \right] && \text{(adjointness)} \\
&= \frac{2^n}{2^{\alpha n} |A|} \widehat{\mathbb{1}}_A((M^{\text{fold}})^{\top} \mathbf{s}). && \text{(definition of } \widehat{\mathbb{1}}_A)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining with [Lemma 2.10](#), we get

$$\|\mathcal{Z}_{A,M} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}}^2 \leq \frac{2^{2n}}{|A|^2} \sum_{\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}} \widehat{\mathbb{1}}_A((M^{\text{fold}})^{\top} \mathbf{s}).$$

Finally, we observe that $(M^{\text{fold}})^{\top}$ is an injective map, since there is at most a single 1 in each row (because M is a matching). Hence, taking expectation over M , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_M[\|\mathcal{Z}_{A,M} - \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{tv}}^2] \leq \frac{2^{2n}}{|A|^2} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n} \widehat{\mathbb{1}}_A(\mathbf{v}) \left(\Pr_M[\exists \mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n} \text{ s.t. } (M^{\text{fold}})^{\top} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{v}] \right),$$

proving the lemma. □

Proof of [Lemma 3.10](#). Suppose $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and M is an α -partial matching on $[n]$. A vector $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ such that $(M^{\text{fold}})^{\top} \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{v}$ marks edges of M such that \mathbf{v} marks vertices incident to a marked edge. Thus, such a vector exists iff every pair of vertices in \mathbf{v} is connected by an edge in M .

Under uniform relabeling of vertices, a fixed matching M becomes a uniform matching. Thus, it is equivalent to fix M to WLOG have edges $\{(1, 2), (3, 4), \dots, (2\alpha n - 1, 2\alpha n)\}$ and let \mathbf{v} be uniform among vectors in \mathbb{Z}_2^n with Hamming weight ℓ . \mathbf{s} exists iff \mathbf{v} is supported entirely on $[2\alpha n]$ and whenever \mathbf{v} is supported on $2i - 1$ it is also supported on $2i$ and vice versa. There are $\binom{n}{\ell}$ total possibilities for \mathbf{v} , but only $\binom{\alpha n}{\ell/2}$ ways to pick \mathbf{v} 's support on odd vertices up to $2\alpha n - 1$. Thus,

$$h_{\alpha}(\ell, n) = \frac{\binom{\alpha n}{\ell/2}}{\binom{n}{\ell}},$$

as desired.[§]

Finally, using the inequalities $\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^b \leq \binom{a}{b} \leq \left(\frac{ea}{b}\right)^b$, we have

$$\frac{\binom{\alpha n}{\ell/2}}{\binom{n}{\ell}} \leq \frac{\left(\frac{e\alpha n}{\ell/2}\right)^{\ell/2}}{\left(\frac{n}{\ell}\right)^\ell} = (2\alpha e)^{\ell/2} \left(\frac{\ell}{n}\right)^{\ell/2},$$

as desired. □

3.3 THE HYBRID ARGUMENT: PROVING LEMMA 3.5

To reduce $\text{sBPD}_{\alpha,T}(n)$ to $\text{BPD}_\alpha(n)$ (and prove Lemma 3.5), we use a standard *hybrid argument*, introduced in this context by Kapralov, Khanna, and Sudan [KKS15]. Intuitively, in $\text{sBPD}_{\alpha,T}(n)$, each Bob_t has to solve his own $\text{BPD}_\alpha(n)$ instance (though he “gets help” from $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_{t-1}$). Thus, in our proof, we use the triangle inequality to show that one of these Bob_t ’s must be “doing a decent job” at solving his $\text{BPD}_\alpha(n)$ instance, and then we convert this to a general algorithm for $\text{BPD}_\alpha(n)$ by simulating the “help” of $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_{t-1}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Let Prot be a space- s protocol for $\text{sBPD}_{\alpha,T}(n)$, given by message functions $\text{Prot}_0, \dots, \text{Prot}_t$, such that Alice’s message is determined by the function Prot_0 , which takes input $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, and Bob_t ’s by the function Prot_t , which takes input $(m_{t-1}, M_t, \mathbf{z}(t)) \in \{0, 1\}^s \times \{0, 1\}^{\alpha n \times n} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}$.

Now, we consider the “coupled” experiment where we sample Alice’s input and then examine Bob’s behavior in both the **Yes** and **No** cases. Let $S_0^{\mathbf{Y}} = S_0^{\mathbf{N}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Prot}_0(\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^n})$ denote Alice’s output (as a random variable). Then for $t \in [T]$, define

$$S_t^{\mathbf{Y}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Prot}_t(S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{Y}}, M_t, (M^{\text{fold}})^\top \mathbf{x}^*) \text{ and } S_t^{\mathbf{N}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Prot}_t(S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{N}}, M_t, \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}}) \in \Delta(\{0, 1\}^s)$$

[§]The original proof of Gavinsky *et al.* [GKK⁺08] used a different argument to arrive at the same answer. Consider a fixed vector \mathbf{v} , WLOG $1^\ell 0^{n-\ell}$, and a random matching M . \mathbf{s} exists iff M is the disjoint union of a total matching on $[\ell]$ and a $(\alpha - \frac{\ell}{2n})$ -partial matching on $[n] \setminus [\ell]$. Let $m_{\alpha,n}$ denote the number of α -partial matchings on n vertices. Then it can be shown that

$$m_{\alpha,n} = \frac{n!}{2^{\alpha n} (\alpha n)! (n - 2\alpha n)!} \text{ and therefore } \frac{m_{1,\ell} \cdot m_{\alpha - \frac{\ell}{2n}, n-\ell}}{m_{\alpha,n}} = \frac{\binom{\alpha n}{\ell/2}}{\binom{n}{\ell}}.$$

as Bob_t 's output message in the **Yes** and **No** cases, respectively. Since Prot distinguishes the **Yes** and **No** distributions with advantage δ , we have

$$\|S_T^{\mathbf{Y}} - S_T^{\mathbf{N}}\|_{\text{tv}} \geq \delta.$$

By the triangle inequality ([Lemma 2.6](#)), there exists $t \in [T]$ such that

$$\|S_t^{\mathbf{Y}} - S_t^{\mathbf{N}}\|_{\text{tv}} - \|S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{Y}} - S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{N}}\|_{\text{tv}} \geq \frac{\delta}{T}. \quad (3.15)$$

Now, let $\tilde{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Prot}_t(S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{Y}}, M_t, \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}})$, i.e., \tilde{S} is Bob_t 's output message in the following *hybrid* experiment: $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_{t-1}$ receive **Yes** inputs, and Bob_t receives a **No** input. By the triangle inequality,

$$\|S_t^{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{S}\|_{\text{tv}} \geq \|S_t^{\mathbf{Y}} - S_t^{\mathbf{N}}\|_{\text{tv}} - \|S_t^{\mathbf{N}} - \tilde{S}\|_{\text{tv}}. \quad (3.16)$$

Note that $S_t^{\mathbf{N}} = \text{Prot}_t(S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{N}}, M_t, \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}})$ and $\tilde{S} = \text{Prot}_t(S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{Y}}, M_t, \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}})$. (I.e., in the two experiments, Bob_t receives an input sampled from the **No** distribution, while $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_{t-1}$ receive inputs from the **No** and **Yes** distributions, respectively.) In both cases, Bob_t 's **No** input $(M_t, \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}})$ is independent of both $S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{N}}$ and $S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{Y}}$. Thus, by the data processing inequality ([Lemma 2.7](#)), we have:

$$\|S_t^{\mathbf{N}} - \tilde{S}\|_{\text{tv}} \leq \|S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{Y}} - S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{N}}\|_{\text{tv}}. \quad (3.17)$$

Putting [Eqs. \(3.15\)](#) to [\(3.17\)](#) together gives

$$\|S_t^{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{S}\|_{\text{tv}} \geq \frac{\delta}{T}.$$

But $\tilde{S} = \text{Prot}_t(S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{Y}}, M_t, \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n}})$ and $S_t^{\mathbf{Y}} = \text{Prot}_t(S_{t-1}^{\mathbf{Y}}, M_t, (M_t^{\text{fold}})\mathbf{x}^*)$. (I.e., in the two experiments, $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_{t-1}$ receive inputs sampled from the **Yes** distribution, while Bob_t receives input from the **No** and **Yes** distributions, respectively.) This yields an algorithm for BPD achieving advantage $\frac{\delta}{T}$: Alice can simulate **Yes** inputs for $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_{t-1}$, and then send Bob_{t-1} 's message to Bob , who can distinguish $S_t^{\mathbf{Y}}$ and \tilde{S} with advantage

$$\|S_t^{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{S}\|_{\text{tv}}. \spadesuit$$

□

3.4 DISCUSSION

We conclude this chapter by discussing some key features of the proof of [Theorem 3.1](#) which will be relevant for the remainder of this thesis.

3.4.1 STRENGTHS OF THE MODEL

We proved [Theorem 3.1](#) using a reduction from sBPD to Max-Cut. The lower bound holds against “streaming algorithms”, but what properties, exactly, of these algorithms do we require? We make no assumptions about their uniformity or time complexity. We do assume $O(\sqrt{n})$ space, but only actually invoke this assumption when each player sends the state of the algorithm onto the next player. Moreover, the instances are *constant-degree*, that is, each variable is involved in at most $O(1)$ constraints. Indeed, Ψ is a union of $T = O(1)$ subinstances $\Psi_1 \cup \dots \cup \Psi_T$, and each Ψ_t corresponds to a matching, so each variable has degree at most T . Thus, the lower bounds actually hold in a stronger model where the streaming algorithm can process the input instance in $O(1)$ “equally spaced chunks” and the instance is promised to have constant degree.

3.4.2 WEAKNESSES OF THE MODEL: INPUT ORDERING

Yet the lower bounds, and the techniques used to prove them so far, also have a number of weaknesses. Firstly, we focus on the assumption of adversarially-ordered input streams. The instances produced by the reduction ([Construction 3.6](#)) are not randomly ordered. Indeed, recall that in [Construction 3.6](#), Alice adds no constraints, and each Bob_t adds a subinstance Ψ_t corresponding to a random matching. Thus, the instance $\Psi = \Psi_1 \cup \dots \cup \Psi_t$ has the property that in each chunk of αn constraints corresponding to Ψ_t , there are no repeated variables; this property is unlikely if we randomly reorder the constraints. Fortunately, Kapralov, Khanna, and Sudan [[KKS15](#)] were able to fix this issue by considering a variant of BPD based on Erdős-Rényi graphs (i.e., $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(n)$), instead of random matchings

[‡]Explicitly, Bob should output **Yes** or **No** based on whether Bob_t ’s output message has higher probability in $S_t^{\mathbf{Y}}$ or \tilde{S} , respectively.

(i.e., $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(n)$).[‡] This change slightly complicates the proof of hardness; specifically, in the Fourier-analytic reduction (i.e., [Lemma 3.9](#)), $(M^{\text{fold}})^\top$ is no longer an injection, so $h_\alpha(\ell, n)$ must be redefined as

$$\max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n, \|\mathbf{v}\|_0 = \ell} \left(\mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{G}_\alpha(n)} \left[\left| \left\{ \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{\alpha n} : \mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0}, (M^{\text{fold}})^\top \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{v} \right\} \right| \right] \right).$$

Correspondingly, the bound on $h_\alpha(\ell, n)$ (cf. [Lemma 3.10](#)) becomes slightly more intricate, but the proof ultimately goes through.

3.4.3 WEAKNESSES OF THE MODEL: SPACE BOUND

There is also the question of extending the space bound for Max-Cut’s hardness beyond $o(\sqrt{n})$. As discussed in [Remark 3.14](#) above, the [[GKK⁺08](#)] proof of BPD’s hardness ([Theorem 3.3](#)) only works for \sqrt{n} -space protocols. But \sqrt{n} -dependence is not simply an artifact of this proof. Indeed, the [Theorem 3.3](#) is tight in the following sense: For any $\alpha, \delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a protocol for $\text{BPD}_\alpha(n)$ achieving advantage δ in $O(\sqrt{n})$ communication. Indeed, Alice can just uniformly sample a set $S \subseteq [n]$ of size \tilde{n} to be chosen later, and sends x_s to Bob for each $s \in S$. Let \tilde{m} denote the number of edges in Bob’s matching between vertices in S . In the **Yes** case, Bob’s input \mathbf{z} will always match the information he receives from Alice on each of these edges, while in the **No** case, they will all match only with probability $2^{-\tilde{m}}$. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{m}] \approx \frac{\alpha \tilde{n}^2}{n}$ by linearity of expectation, so (using concentration bounds, w.h.p.) \tilde{m} is an arbitrarily large constant for arbitrarily large choice of $\tilde{n} = O(\sqrt{n})$. (The fact that $\tilde{n} = O(\sqrt{n})$ is the right number of vertices to sample in order to expect to see edges in the induced subgraph was termed an example of the “birthday paradox” by [[GKK⁺08](#)].) Therefore, Bob can distinguish the **Yes** and **No** cases. Since this protocol also works for sBPD, it implies that better space lower bounds for Max-Cut cannot rely on reductions from the sBPD problem.

To get around this issue, Kapralov, Khanna, Sudan, and Velingker [[KKS^V17](#)] introduced an *implicit* variant of sBPD, which we’ll denote by siBPD. In the siBPD problem, unlike

[‡]Note that graphs sampled from $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(n)$ are simple, so the instances will still have the property that there are no repeated *constraints* in each “chunk” of αn constraints. However, since there are only $O(1)$ chunks, this property remains likely when the constraints are randomly reordered; see [[KKS¹⁵](#), Lemma 4.7].

sBPD, no party receives the hidden partition as input (i.e., there is no Alice). Building on [KKS^V17], Kapralov and Krachun [KK19] proved the following:

Theorem 3.18 ([KK19]). *For every $\alpha, \delta \in (0, 1)$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, any protocol for $\text{siBPD}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ achieving advantage at least δ requires $\Omega(n)$ communication.*

The [KK19] proof of **Theorem 3.18** and its extensions in [CGS⁺22] are very technically demanding; see the discussion at the end of §5.2 for some brief insights.

Recall that in **Construction 3.6**, Alice did not contribute any constraints, and so **Construction 3.6** might as well be a reduction from siBPD, instead of sBPD, to Max-Cut. Thus, **Theorem 3.18** immediately implies an extension of Max-Cut’s hardness to the linear-space setting. That is, any $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximation to Max-Cut requires $\Omega(n)$ space.

Remark 3.19. *The $\Omega(n)$ bound is optimal up to logarithmic factors. Indeed, for every $\epsilon > 0$, we can pick a large constant C , and given an input instance Ψ , we can sample Cn constraints to get a subinstance $\tilde{\Psi}$ of Ψ , and outputting $\text{val}_{\tilde{\Psi}}$ will give a $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximation to val_{Ψ} for sufficiently large C ! This “sparsification” algorithm only requires $\tilde{O}(n)$ space, and the same technique yields arbitrarily-good approximations in $\tilde{O}(n)$ space for every CSP.*

3.4.4 WEAKNESSES OF THE PROOF: CHOOSING THE HYBRID

Finally, we highlight a subtlety in the choice of the hybrid variable \tilde{S} in the reduction from BPD to sBPD (**Lemma 3.5**, see §3.3). Recall that we applied the data processing inequality (**Lemma 2.7**) to argue that Bob_t can’t help distinguish \tilde{S} from the **No** case S_t^{N} (see **Eq. (3.17)**). But using this inequality relies on the fact that Bob_t ’s **No** input is independent of the inputs to $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_{t-1}$ in both the **Yes** and **No** cases. Thus, we couldn’t have, for instance, defined \tilde{S} by mixing **No** inputs for $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_{t-1}$ and a **Yes** input for Bob_t . This same issue occurs in later works in streaming hybrid arguments for general CSPs [CGSV21a; CGSV21b]. In particular, in the appropriate generalizations of BPD and sBPD, Bob_t must have a uniformly distributed input, (typically) in the **No** case.

4

Max-DiCut is mildly approximable

[Max-Cut] raises the question whether streaming algorithms operating in small space can non-trivially approximate (i.e., beat the random assignment threshold) for *some* CSP, or whether every CSP is approximation resistant in the streaming model.

Guruswami *et al.* [GVV17]

UNLIKE MAX-CUT, MAX-DICUT IS APPROXIMABLE in the streaming setting. Indeed, Guruswami, Velingker, and Velusamy [GVV17] showed that Max-DiCut can be $(\frac{2}{5} - \epsilon)$ -approximated by $O(\log n)$ -space linear sketching algorithms, but not $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximated by \sqrt{n} -space streaming algorithms, for every $\epsilon > 0$. A tighter characterization was later given by Chou, Golovnev, and Velusamy [CGV20]:

Theorem 4.1 ([CGV20]). *For every constant $\epsilon > 0$:*

- i. There is a $O(\log n)$ -space linear sketching algorithm which $(\frac{4}{9} - \epsilon)$ -approximates Max-DiCut (and even Max-2AND).*
- ii. Any streaming algorithm which $(\frac{4}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximates Max-DiCut requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space.*

We remark that in the classical setting, several works [GW95; FG95; Zwi00; MM01; LLZ02] have given algorithms achieving increasingly good approximation ratios for Max-2AND and/or Max-DiCut. Most recently, Lewin, Livnat, and Zwick [LLZ02] presented and analyzed an algorithm for Max-2AND which achieves an approximation ratio $\alpha_{LLZ} \geq 0.87401$.^{*} Thus, although Max-2AND is nontrivially approximable in the streaming setting, its streaming approximability still falls far short of its classical approximability.

The goal of this chapter is to prove [Theorem 4.1](#). We prove its two components separately — addressing the algorithmic result, [Item i](#), in [§4.1](#), and the hardness result, [Item ii](#), in [§4.2](#). In both cases, we highlight the crucial role played by certain information about CSP instances which we’ll call *template distributions*. Later, these will form the basis of the dichotomy theorems from [CGSV21a; CGSV21b] (see [§5.1](#) below). Finally, we conclude with more discussion in [§4.3](#).

4.1 BIAS-BASED ALGORITHMS FOR MAX-2AND

The optimal $(\frac{4}{9} - \epsilon)$ -approximate sketching algorithm for Max-2AND from [CGV20] (i.e., [Item i](#) of [Theorem 4.1](#)) is based on measuring a quantity called the *bias* of the input instance Ψ . This quantity was introduced by Guruswami, Velingker, and Velusamy [GVV17] (who used it to achieve a weaker approximation factor of $\frac{2}{5}$). In this section, we present a cleaner analysis due to subsequent simplifications in our joint work [BHP⁺22]. The analysis in this latter work, which we present in [§7.6](#) below, generalizes our argument for Max-2AND to Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ for every “threshold function” f .

4.1.1 SETUP: BIAS-BASED ALGORITHMS

Throughout this section, we assume Ψ has constraints $(\mathbf{b}(\ell), \mathbf{j}(\ell), w(\ell))_{\ell \in [m]}$. For each variable $i \in [n]$ we let

$$\text{bias}_{\Psi}(i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\ell \in [m], t \in [2]: j(\ell)_t = i} (-1)^{b(\ell)_t} w_{\ell}, \tag{4.2}$$

^{*}Austrin [Aus10] shows that $(\alpha_{\text{Aus}} + \epsilon)$ -approximating Max-2AND is UG-hard, where $\alpha_{\text{Aus}} \approx 0.87435$. Without the UGC, Trevisan *et al.* [TSSW00] show that $(\frac{12}{13} + \epsilon)$ -approximation is NP-hard.

and then we define

$$\text{bias}_\Psi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2W} \sum_{i \in [n]} |\text{bias}_\Psi(i)|. \quad (4.3)$$

(Note that $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) \in [-W_\Psi, W_\Psi]$ where W_Ψ is the total weight in Ψ , while $\text{bias}_\Psi \in [0, 1]$.)

For each variable i , $|\text{bias}_\Psi(i)|$ measures the imbalance between i 's negated and non-negated appearances, and thus correlates with “how easy i is to assign”. For instance, if $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) \gg 0$, then x_i is rarely negated (i.e., the b -value is typically 0), and so we should assign $x_i = 1$. Thus, we should expect to see some positive relationship between bias_Ψ and val_Ψ . Indeed, we have:

Lemma 4.4 ([GVV17, Theorem 11]). *Let Ψ be a Max-2AND instance. Then*

$$\text{val}_\Psi \geq \frac{2}{9}(1 + \text{bias}_\Psi).$$

Lemma 4.5 ([CGV20, Lemma 3.3]). *Let Ψ be a Max-2AND instance. Then*

$$\text{val}_\Psi \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \text{bias}_\Psi).$$

Together **Lemmas 4.4** and **4.5** imply that outputting $\frac{2}{9}(1 + \text{bias}_\Psi)$ gives a $\frac{4}{9}$ -approximation to val_Ψ . To implement measure bias_Ψ in the $O(\log n)$ -space streaming setting algorithm, we observe that bias_Ψ is the ℓ_1 -norm of the vector $\text{bias}(\Psi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{bias}_1(\Psi), \dots, \text{bias}_n(\Psi))$. We can thus calculate it using ℓ_1 -sketching (**Theorem 2.2**) for $\text{bias}(\Psi)$: Given each new constraint $(\mathbf{b}(\ell), \mathbf{j}(\ell))$ with weight w_ℓ , we simply add $(-1)^{b(\ell)_t} w_\ell$ to $\text{bias}(\Psi)_{j(\ell)_t}$ for each $t \in [2]$.

4.1.2 ANALYSIS: TEMPLATE DISTRIBUTIONS

To prove **Lemmas 4.4** and **4.5**, we define a few useful notions. For a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^2)$, let $\mathcal{D}\langle 0 \rangle = \mathcal{D}(0, 0)$, $\mathcal{D}\langle 1 \rangle = \mathcal{D}(1, 0) + \mathcal{D}(0, 1)$, and $\mathcal{D}\langle 2 \rangle = \mathcal{D}(1, 1)$, i.e., $\mathcal{D}\langle t \rangle$ is the probability mass on Hamming weight t .

Given an assignment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ to an instance Ψ of Max-2AND with constraints $((\mathbf{b}(\ell), \mathbf{j}(\ell), w(\ell))_{\ell \in [m]}$, we define a *template distribution* $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^2)$ as follows: We sample ℓ with probability $\frac{w(\ell)}{W_\Psi}$ and output $\mathbf{b}(\ell) + \mathbf{x}|_{\mathbf{j}(\ell)}$. Thus, $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^\mathbf{x}\langle t \rangle$ is the fraction weight of constraints such that t of the variables equal 1 under assignment \mathbf{x} .

Example 4.6. Let Ψ consist of $n = 2$ variables and $m = 3$ constraints $((0, 0), (1, 2)), ((0, 1), (1, 2)),$ and $((1, 1), (1, 2))$ with weights 2, 1, and 3, respectively. (In Boolean notation, these constraints would be written $x_1 \wedge x_2, x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2, \bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2.$) Let $\mathbf{x} = (1, 1)$. Then $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}\langle 2 \rangle = \frac{1}{3}, \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}\langle 1 \rangle = \frac{1}{6},$ and $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}\langle 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{2}.$

The distribution $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}$ succinctly describes several important properties of the assignment \mathbf{x} , and helps us to bridge between what we *can* measure (bias) and what we *would like* to measure (value). For instance, we define

$$\mu_S(\mathcal{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{D}\langle 2 \rangle - \mathcal{D}\langle 0 \rangle. \quad (4.7)$$

Roughly, $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})$ measures how well \mathbf{x} performs at assigning i to $\text{sign}(\text{bias}_\Psi(i))$ when $|\text{bias}_\Psi(i)|$ is large:

Fact 4.8. For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$, $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{1}{2W} \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{x_i} \text{bias}_\Psi(i)$. In particular, $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \text{bias}_\Psi$, and moreover, $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) = \text{bias}_\Psi$ iff for each $i \in [n]$, $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) > 0 \implies x_i = 1$ and $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) < 0 \implies x_i = 0$.

Fact 4.8 is a special case of [Items ii and iii of Proposition 7.42](#).

Now to a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^2)$ we associate a *canonical instance* $\Psi^{\mathcal{D}}$ of Max-2AND on 2 variables, which puts weight $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{b})$ on the constraint $((1, 2), \mathbf{b})$ for each $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^2$. We can thus define the quantity

$$\gamma(\mathcal{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{val}_{\Psi^{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathcal{D}\langle 2 \rangle. \quad (4.9)$$

$\gamma(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})$ measures \mathbf{x} 's value:

Fact 4.10. For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, $\gamma(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) = \text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x})$.

Fact 4.10 is a special case of [Item i of Proposition 7.42](#) below. Now we have:

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Let $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ be the optimal assignment for Ψ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{val}_\Psi &= \text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}^*) && \text{(optimality of } \mathbf{x}^*) \\ &= \gamma(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}) && \text{(Fact 4.10)} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}\langle 2 \rangle && \text{(definition of } \gamma) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}\langle 0 \rangle + \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}\langle 1 \rangle + \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}\langle 2 \rangle) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}\langle 2 \rangle - \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}\langle 0 \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*})) && \text{(definition of } \mu_S) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \text{bias}_\Psi). && \text{(Fact 4.8)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

On the other hand, to prove [Lemma 4.5](#), for $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^2)$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, we define the quantity

$$\lambda(\mathcal{D}, p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{B}_p^2} [\text{val}_{\Psi^{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{b})] = q^2 \mathcal{D}\langle 0 \rangle + pq \mathcal{D}\langle 1 \rangle + p^2 \mathcal{D}\langle 2 \rangle \quad (4.11)$$

where $q = 1 - p$. In particular, $\lambda(\mathcal{D}, 1) = \gamma(\mathcal{D})$. We can also define $\beta(\mathcal{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{p \in [0, 1]} \lambda(\mathcal{D}, p)$, in which case $\beta(\mathcal{D}) \geq \gamma(\mathcal{D})$.

Fact 4.12. *For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, $\lambda(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}, p) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{B}_p^n} [\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{x})]$. In particular, $\beta(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \text{val}_\Psi$.*

[Fact 4.12](#) is a special case of [Item i](#) of [Proposition 7.42](#) below. We have:

Proof of [Lemma 4.4](#). Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ be the “majority assignment”, i.e., $\tilde{x}_i = \mathbb{1}_{\text{bias}_\Psi(i) \geq 0}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{val}_\Psi &\geq \lambda\left(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}, \frac{2}{3}\right) && \text{(Fact 4.12)} \\
&= \frac{4}{9} \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 2 \rangle + \frac{2}{9} \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 1 \rangle + \frac{1}{9} \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 0 \rangle && \text{(definition of } \lambda) \\
&= \frac{2}{9} (\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 0 \rangle + \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 1 \rangle + \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 2 \rangle) + \frac{2}{9} (\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 2 \rangle - \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 0 \rangle) + \frac{1}{9} \mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\langle 0 \rangle && \text{(definition of } \mu_S) \\
&\geq \frac{2}{9} (1 + \mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}})) \\
&= \frac{2}{9} (1 + \text{bias}_\Psi) && \text{(Fact 4.8 and definition of } \tilde{\mathbf{x}})
\end{aligned}$$

□

The proof of [Lemma 4.4](#) contains the inequality

$$\lambda\left(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}, \frac{2}{3}\right) \geq \frac{2}{9} (1 + \text{bias}_\Psi).$$

Combined with [Lemma 4.5](#), this gives

$$\lambda\left(\mathcal{D}_{\Psi}^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}, \frac{2}{3}\right) \geq \frac{4}{9}\text{val}_{\Psi}.$$

This yields a simple streaming algorithm for a different problem, namely *outputting* an assignment with expected value at least $\frac{4}{9}\text{val}_{\Psi}$, in linear time and space: We simply calculate the majority assignment $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ and then flip each bit independently with probability $\frac{1}{3}$.

Remark 4.13. *The original proof of [Lemma 4.4](#) in [CGV20] was substantially more complex than the one presented here (see the proof of [Lemma 3.3](#) in that paper), because it considers the value $p \in [0, 1]$ which maximizes the quadratic $\lambda(\mathcal{D}_{\Psi}^{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}, p)$ (which is $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\text{bias}_{\Psi}}{2(1-2\text{bias}_{\Psi})}$ in the regime $\text{bias}_{\Psi} \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$). The insight that this is “overkill” and setting $p = \frac{2}{3}$ is sufficient to get $(\frac{4}{9} - \epsilon)$ -approximations is due to our joint work [BHP⁺22]. This issue will become more prominent when we consider k AND for $k > 2$, since λ will have degree k and thus its maximizer over $[0, 1]$ has no simple expression; see the discussion in [§7.3.1](#) below.*

4.2 PROVING HARDNESS FOR MAX-DICUT

In this section, we prove [Item ii](#) of [Theorem 4.1](#), which is a hardness-of-approximation result for Max-DiCut in the streaming setting. To begin, we give some intuition for the construction.

4.2.1 INTUITION: WHAT’S WRONG WITH SBPD?

Our first hope might be to directly reduce from sBPD using [Construction 3.6](#) (i.e., the reduction we used for Max-Cut), by converting each Max-Cut constraint (u, v) into the pair of Max-DiCut constraints $\{(u, v), (v, u)\}$. Could we hope to prove an analogue of [Lemma 3.7](#) in this setting, with a $\frac{4}{9}$ gap? In the **No** case, $\mathbf{z}(t)$ is random and so for a fixed assignment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, $\mathbb{E}[\text{val}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{1}{4}$. But in the **Yes** case, if $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ is Alice’s input, when $z(t)_{\ell} = 1$ for $\mathbf{e}(\ell) = (u, v)$, then (x_u^*, x_v^*) is either $(0, 1)$ or $(1, 0)$, so exactly one of the constraints $(u, v), (v, u)$ will be satisfied! Thus, we have $\text{val}_{\Psi}(\mathbf{x}^*) = \frac{1}{2}$. Hence [Construction 3.6](#) only seems to rule out $\approx \frac{1}{2}$ -approximations to Max-Cut.

We can frame the issue with [Construction 3.6](#) in the following way: Its **Yes** instances have low values because they are too “symmetric”. In particular, we also have $\text{val}_{\Psi}(1 + \mathbf{x}^*) =$

$\frac{1}{2}$. To break this symmetry, we can have **Alice** add constraints (u, v) where $x_u^* = 1, x_v^* = 0$. These have the effect of biasing towards \mathbf{x}^* and away from $\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{x}^*$. But this increases the value of \mathbf{x}^* even in the **No** case (because $\frac{1}{4}$ -fraction of each **Bob_t**'s constraints will be satisfied by \mathbf{x}^* in expectation). To compensate, we change the game **sBPD** slightly, so that in the **No** case, **Bob_t**'s constraints are never satisfied by \mathbf{x}^* ; that is, when he adds $\{(u, v), (v, u)\}$, we guarantee that $(x_u^*, x_v^*) \in \{(1, 1), (0, 0)\}$.

4.2.2 A NEW PROBLEM AND A NEW REDUCTION

We carry out the proof of **Item ii** using a close cousin of **sBPD**:

Definition 4.14. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $T, n \in \mathbb{N}$. $\mathbf{sBPD}'_{\alpha, T}(n)$ is defined identically to $\mathbf{sBPD}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ (**Definition 3.4**), except that in the **No** case, we set **Bob_t**'s vector $\mathbf{z}(t)$ to the opposite of its value in the **Yes** case. That is, $\mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{1} + (M^{\text{fold}})\mathbf{x}^*$.

Now we can formally state the reduction:

Construction 4.15 (C2S reduction from **sBPD'** to **Max-DiCut**). *Alice's reduction function, denoted R_0 , outputs an instance Ψ_0 consisting of $\frac{\alpha T n}{4}$ uniformly random constraints (u, v) such that $x_u^* = 1, x_v^* = 0$. For each $t \in [T]$, **Bob_t**'s reduction function R_t outputs an instance Ψ_t as follows: For each $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell) = (u, v)$ in M_t , **Bob_t** adds (u, v) and (v, u) to Ψ_t iff $z(t)_\ell = 1$.*

The hard instances for **Max-DiCut** produced by **Construction 4.15** are represented pictorially in **Fig. 4.1**.

Luckily, there is a simple proof by “symmetry” that **sBPD'** is also hard:

Lemma 4.16. *Suppose that for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $T, n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a protocol for $\mathbf{sBPD}'_{\alpha, T}(n)$ achieving advantage δ with communication s . Then there is a protocol for $\mathbf{sBPD}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ achieving advantage $\frac{\delta}{2}$, also with communication s .*

Proof. Suppose Π is a protocol for **sBPD'** achieving advantage δ . By the triangle inequality, Π achieves advantage $\frac{\delta}{2}$ in distinguishing one of the following pairs of distributions:

1. **Yes** instances of **sBPD'** and **No** instances of **sBPD**.
2. **No** instances of **sBPD'** and **No** instances of **sBPD**.




Figure 4.1: Figs. 4.1a and 4.1b depict samples from the **Yes** and **No** distributions of sBPD', respectively. The **Yes** distribution for sBPD' is the same as for sBPD (Fig. 3.1a); that is, $z(t)$ marks which edges cross the cut. However, the **No** distribution of sBPD' marks which edges do *not* cross the cut, as opposed to sBPD's **No** distribution, which marks uniformly random edges (Fig. 3.1b). The graphs in Figs. 4.1a and 4.1b again represent the union of the matchings M_1, \dots, M_t ; x^* partitions the vertices into "left" (0) and "right" (1); and the edges' z -values are either "green" (1) or "red" (0). In the reduction from sBPD' to Max-Cut (Construction 3.6), Alice adds edges crossing the cut from left to right ("blue"), and each Bob_t adds (undirected copies of) edges with z -value "green" (1). We pick parameters so that there are four times as many "green" edges as "blue" edges. In the **Yes** case, x^* cuts all "blue" edges and half of the (directed) "green" edges, so the **Yes** instances (Fig. 4.1c) have Max-DiCut value $\approx \frac{3}{5}$. In the **No** case, x^* cuts all "blue" edges but none of the "green" edges, and we show that these instances (Fig. 4.1d) have Max-DiCut value $\approx \frac{4}{15}$ (for sufficiently large T) in Lemma 4.17.

Case (1) immediately gives the desired result, since **sBPD'** and **sBPD** have the same **Yes** instances. Case (2) also gives the desired result, since by applying the “reduction” of adding 1 to all input $\mathbf{z}(t)$ vectors, **No** instances of **sBPD'** become **Yes** instances of **sBPD**, while **No** instances of **sBPD'** remain **No** instances of **sBPD**. \square

To finally prove **Item ii**, it suffices to prove the following lemma (analogous to **Lemma 3.7**):

Lemma 4.17. *For all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, there exist $T, n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$, the following holds. Let \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{N} denote the **Yes** and **No** distributions for $\mathbf{sBPD}'_{\alpha, T}(n)$, and let (R_0, \dots, R_T) be the reduction functions from **Construction 4.15**. Then*

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim (R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{Y}} \left[\text{val}_{\Psi} \leq \frac{3}{5} - \epsilon \right] \leq \exp(-n) \text{ and } \Pr_{\Psi \sim (R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{N}} \left[\text{val}_{\Psi} \geq \frac{4}{15} + \epsilon \right] \leq \exp(-n).$$

However, we only give a heuristic proof, omitting concentration bounds and independence arguments. The full proof can be found in e.g. [CGV20, §5].

Proof sketch of Lemma 4.17. Recall our definition of template distributions from the previous section; let's compute the expected template distributions $\mathcal{D}_{\Psi}^{\mathbf{x}^*}$ in the **Yes** and **No** cases, which we will denote \mathcal{D}_Y and \mathcal{D}_N , respectively. In expectation, **Alice** adds $\frac{\alpha}{4}Tn$ constraints, and **Bob_t** adds αTn constraints. In both the **Yes** and **No** cases, the constraints introduced by **Alice** are always satisfied by \mathbf{x}^* . In the **Yes** case, **Bob_t** sees edges (u, v) such that $x_u^* \neq x_v^*$, and he adds the constraints $\{(u, v), (v, u)\}$; thus, \mathbf{x}^* satisfies both literals in one of the clauses, and neither in the other. Thus, $\mathcal{D}_Y \langle 2 \rangle = \frac{1/4+1/2}{1/4+1} = \frac{3}{5}$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y \langle 0 \rangle = \frac{1/2}{1/4+1} = \frac{2}{5}$; and so $\gamma(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \frac{3}{5}$. On the other hand, in the **No** case, **Bob_t**'s edges (u, v) satisfy $x_u^* = x_v^*$; thus, \mathbf{x}^* satisfies one literal in both of the clauses (u, v) and (v, u) . Hence in expectation, $\mathcal{D}_N \langle 2 \rangle = \frac{1/4}{1/4+1} = \frac{1}{5}$ and $\mathcal{D}_N \langle 1 \rangle = \frac{1}{1/4+1} = \frac{4}{5}$. Now

$$\lambda(\mathcal{D}_N, p) = \frac{4}{5}p(1-p) + \frac{2}{5}p^2 = \frac{1}{5}p(4-3p),$$

so $\lambda(\mathcal{D}_N, p)$ is maximized at $p = \frac{2}{3}$, yielding $\beta(\mathcal{D}_N) = \frac{4}{15}$.[†]

[†]Note also that $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \mu_S(\mathcal{D}_N) = \frac{1}{5}$; thus, the algorithm presented in the previous section (§4.1) fails to solve the $(\frac{4}{15}, \frac{3}{5})$ -Max-2AND problem.

To prove the claimed bound on **Yes**-instance values, [Fact 4.10](#) implies that $\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq \gamma(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}) \approx \gamma(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \frac{3}{5}$. The bound on **No**-instance values is trickier. The key observation is that the distribution $(R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{N}$ is invariant under permutations of variables. Thus, it suffices to show that for each $\ell \in \{0\} \cup [n]$, a uniformly random solution of Hamming weight ℓ has value below $\frac{4}{15} + \epsilon$; but the expected value of such a solution is precisely $\lambda(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*}, \frac{\ell}{n}) \approx \lambda(\mathcal{D}_N, \frac{\ell}{n}) \leq \beta(\mathcal{D}_N) = \frac{4}{15}$. \square

4.3 DISCUSSION

Again, we conclude with some discussion on various aspects of the reductions and algorithms in this chapter.

4.3.1 WEAKNESSES OF THE REDUCTION (IT'S ALICE'S FAULT)

Thinking back to our discussion for **Max-Cut** ([§4.3](#)), the fact that Alice did not add any constraints in **Max-Cut** reduction ([Construction 3.6](#)) was crucial in extending **Max-Cut**'s hardness to the random-ordering and linear-space settings [[KKS15](#); [KK19](#)]. For **Max-DiCut**, the picture is much less rosy, because in the **Max-DiCut** reduction ([Construction 4.15](#)), Alice has a significant role to play, creating around $\frac{1}{5}$ -fraction of the constraints. Thus, it is not clear at all how to derive randomly ordered instances — even if each **Bob**_{*t*} receives a random graph instead of a random matching — since the distribution of constraints created by Alice is very different from the distribution of constraints created by each **Bob**_{*t*}, and the constraints are added to the stream in sequence. Nor is it clear how to define an appropriate variant of **siBPD** (which, recall, omitted Alice entirely!) to effect a linear-space hardness reduction. (However, $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -hardness for **Max-Cut** in these settings does imply $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -hardness for **Max-DiCut**, by the reduction which given a **Max-Cut** constraint (u, v) randomly outputs either (u, v) or (v, u) as a **Max-DiCut** constraint.)

Indeed, we know from personal communication with Chen, Kol, Paramonov, Saxena, Song, and Yu [[CKP⁺21](#)] and Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, Velingker, and Velusamy [[CGS⁺21](#)] that the hard instances produced by [Construction 4.15](#) are distinguishable by streaming algorithms in the $O(\log n)$ -space random-order and $o(n)$ -space adversarial-order settings, respectively. In the remainder of this subsection, we roughly sketch both algorithms.

Recall the definition of the bias $\text{bias}_\Psi(i)$ of variable i in an instance Ψ of **Max-2AND**. We can view instances of **Max-DiCut** as instances of **Max-2AND** where every constraint has negation pattern $(0, 1)$ (since $\text{DiCut}(a, b) = \text{2AND}(a, b + 1)$). Then by definition, $\text{bias}_\Psi(i)$ is the difference in total weight of constraints in which i appears on the left vs. on the right. On the other hand, we can also view an instance of **Max-DiCut** as a (weighted) graph on n vertices (see §2.3); under this interpretation, the bias $\text{bias}_\Psi(i)$ of a vertex i is the difference between its out-weight and its in-weight.

Now let's examine the distributions of **Yes** and **No** instances for **Max-DiCut** from [CGV20] (produced by Construction 4.15 from **sBPD'**, see Fig. 4.1). Letting $b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\alpha T n}{4}$, we see that vertices with $x^* = 1$ have nonnegative bias (b in expectation) and vertices with $x^* = 0$ have nonpositive bias ($-b$ in expectation). Furthermore, in the **Yes** case, all edges go from vertices with nonnegative bias to those with nonpositive bias, while in the **No** case, there is a mixture of nonnegative to nonpositive ($\approx \frac{1}{5}$ fraction of edges), nonnegative to nonnegative ($\approx \frac{2}{5}$ fraction), and nonpositive to nonpositive ($\approx \frac{2}{5}$ fraction).

THE RANDOM-ORDERING ALGORITHM. If we have the ability to randomly sample edges and measure the biases of their endpoints, it will quickly become apparent whether we are seeing **Yes** or **No** instances, and this can be accomplished in the random-ordering setting. Indeed, it is sufficient even to store the first m' edges for some large constant $m' = O(1)$ and measure the biases of all their endpoints. This technique is similar in spirit to the random-ordering algorithms for counting components and calculating minimum spanning trees in [PS18]. Note that while randomly sampling edges is still possible in the adversarial-ordering setting (with e.g. reservoir sampling), there is no clear way to do so while also measuring the biases of their endpoints; indeed, the adversarial-ordering lower bound shows that this is impossible.

THE SUPER- \sqrt{n} -SPACE ALGORITHM. Another strategy to distinguish **Yes** and **No** instances is to randomly sample a subset $V \subseteq [n]$ of the vertices and, during the stream, both measure the bias of every vertex in V and store the induced subgraph on V .[‡] At the end of the stream, we can simply check for the presence of any edge in the induced

[‡]We can store the induced subgraph in $O(|V|)$ space since the instances produced in the reduction have constant max-degree (with high probability).

subgraph which does not go from a nonnegative-bias vertex to a nonpositive-bias vertex. However, in order for this to succeed, $|V|$ needs to be sufficiently large; picking a random set of $n^{0.51}$ vertices will suffice by the “birthday paradox” argument of §3.4.3.

4.3.2 DUALITY, TOWARDS DICHOTOMY

It is quite surprising that using the lower bound $\text{val}_\Psi \geq \lambda(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}, \frac{2}{3})$, instead of the more general $\text{val}_\Psi \geq \beta(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})$, suffices to prove Lemma 4.4. In particular, we can’t get a better approximation ratio using the latter inequality, since $\frac{4}{9}$ is already optimal given Item ii.[§] However, one significant reason for studying the quantity $\beta(\mathcal{D})$ is that it also arises in the proof of the hardness result (see the end of the proof sketch of Lemma 4.17).

To give further perspective on the quantities $\beta(\mathcal{D})$ and $\gamma(\mathcal{D})$, we shift gears slightly to the (β, γ) -Max-2AND problem for fixed $\beta < \gamma \in [0, 1]$, and interpret the algorithm from §4.1 for this problem. Suppose that (β, γ) satisfies the equation

$$\max_{\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathcal{D}_2^n): \beta(\mathcal{D}) \leq \beta} \mu_S(\mathcal{D}) < \min_{\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathcal{D}_2^n): \gamma(\mathcal{D}) \geq \gamma} \mu_S(\mathcal{D}) \quad (4.18)$$

and consider some fixed threshold τ in between these two values. Fact 4.10 and Fact 4.12 imply, respectively, that (1) there exists $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ such that $\text{val}_\Psi = \gamma(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}^*})$ and (2) for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, $\text{val}_\Psi \geq \beta(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})$. Thus, Eq. (4.18) implies that measuring $\text{bias}_\Psi = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n} \mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})$ and comparing it to τ suffices to distinguish the cases $\text{val}_\Psi \leq \beta$ and $\text{val}_\Psi \geq \gamma$. On the other hand, from the proofs of Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5 we can extract the inequalities

$$\beta(\mathcal{D}) \geq \frac{2}{9}(1 + \mu_S(\mathcal{D})) \text{ and } \gamma(\mathcal{D}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \mu_S(\mathcal{D})),$$

respectively. Thus, whenever $\frac{\beta}{\gamma} > \frac{4}{9}$, Eq. (4.18) holds, and the (β, γ) -Max-2AND problem is tractable!

On the other hand, the lower bound (ruling out $(\frac{4}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximations) we proved in §4.2 was based on constructing $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^2)$ with $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_N) = \mu_S(\mathcal{D}_Y)$ and $\frac{\beta(\mathcal{D}_N)}{\gamma(\mathcal{D}_Y)} = \frac{4}{9}$. So there is a kind of duality between the algorithm and the lower bound for Max-DiCut.

[§]However, we certainly can do worse! Guruswami *et al.*’s $(\frac{2}{5} - \epsilon)$ -approximation uses $p = 1$, i.e., it *greedily* assigns positively-biased variables to 1 and negatively-biased variables to 0. This algorithm is “overconfident” and setting $p = \frac{2}{3}$ instead improves the approximation ratio.

Indeed, the algorithm works whenever [Eq. \(4.18\)](#) holds — that is, there is a separation between the μ_S -values. On the other hand, the lower bound’s hard distributions have matching μ_S -values. A natural question becomes, can we hope to generalize this “matching μ_S -value” criterion to give an algorithm-or-hardness dichotomy for CSPs beyond **Max-DiCut** and **Max-Cut**? In the next chapter, we’ll see the answer from [[CGSV21a](#); [CGSV21b](#)]: *Yes!*, at least for sketching algorithms.

5

Prior results: General CSPs

At the heart of our characterization is a family of algorithms for $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ in the linear sketching streaming setting. We will describe this family soon, but the main idea of our proof is that if no algorithm in this family solves $(\beta, \gamma)\text{-Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$, then we can extract a pair of instances, roughly a family of γ -satisfiable “**Yes**” instances and a family of at most β -satisfiable “no” instances, that certify this inability. We then show how this pair of instances can be exploited as gadgets in a negative result.

Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, and Velusamy [CGSV21b]

A WIDE VARIETY OF CSPs FALL UNDER several recent generalizations [CGSV21a; CGSV21b; CGS⁺22] of the Max-Cut and Max-DiCut results described in the previous two chapters. Our primary goal is to articulate technical statements of these results, since we’ll use them later in Chapters 6 and 7. We also give some broad-strokes discussions of the techniques involved, building on our work in the previous two chapters.

Specifically, in §5.1, we describe the results of Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, and Velusamy [CGSV21a; CGSV21b] on \sqrt{n} -space streaming algorithms, which generalize the results we’ve already seen for Max-Cut (Theorem 3.1, due to [KKS15]) and Max-DiCut (Theorem 4.1, due to

[CGV20]). They include a so-called *dichotomy theorem*, which completely characterizes CSP approximability for \sqrt{n} -space *sketching* algorithms (see §2.2) and builds on our “template distribution” analysis for Max-DiCut in Chapter 4. This dichotomy will later be the basis for the [BHP⁺22] analysis of Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ problems for symmetric $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, described in Chapter 7 below. Next, in §5.2, we present results due to Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, Velingker, and Velusamy [CGS⁺22] in the linear-space streaming setting, which generalize the result we’ve seen for Max-Cut (discussed in §3.4.3, due to [KK19]). We will use these in Chapter 6 to prove linear-space streaming approximation-resistance results for so-called “ordering constraint satisfaction problems” from our joint work [SSV21].

5.1 \sqrt{n} -SPACE ALGORITHMS AND THE SKETCHING DICHOTOMY

In the case of Max-2AND, we discussed in §4.3.2 how the presence or absence of “template distributions” with certain properties imply $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ -space streaming lower bounds (§4.2.2) and $O(\log n)$ -space sketching algorithms (§4.1.2) for (β, γ) -Max-2AND problems, respectively. Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, and Velusamy [CGSV21b] proved a dichotomy theorem which generalizes this result to every Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) problem (and every $\beta < \gamma \in [0, 1]$): Either (β, γ) -Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) has an $O(\text{polylog } n)$ -space sketching algorithm, or for every $\epsilon > 0$, sketching algorithms for $(\beta + \epsilon, \gamma - \epsilon)$ -Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) must use at least $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space! Importantly, however, the lower bound holds in generality only against sketching algorithms, though we’ll discuss important special cases in which it extends to streaming algorithms below.

In §5.1.1, we give precise definitions of template distributions, their properties, and the ensuing upper and lower bounds for the important special case of Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ problems. These statements are from [CGSV21a], and we’ll require them in Chapter 7 below, where we present results from [BHP⁺22] which further investigate the case where $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is symmetric. Defining templates and their properties for general Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) problems requires significant elaboration which is out of scope for this thesis, but in §5.1.2, we outline these notions and provide some structural overviews of the techniques used in [CGSV21a; CGSV21b].

5.1.1 TECHNICAL STATEMENTS (BOOLEAN CASE)

Recall that $\Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ denotes the space of all distributions over \mathbb{Z}_2^k . Following the example of 2AND (see §4.1.2), for a “template distribution” $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ and a predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ we define a “canonical instance” $\Psi^{\mathcal{D}}$ of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ on k variables putting weight $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{b})$ on the constraint $((1, \dots, k), \mathbf{b})$. Then we define

$$\lambda_f(\mathcal{D}, p) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{B}_p^k} [\text{val}_{\Psi^{\mathcal{D}}}(\mathbf{a})], \quad \gamma_f(\mathcal{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda_f(\mathcal{D}, 1), \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_f(\mathcal{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{p \in [0, 1]} (\lambda_f(\mathcal{D}, p)). \quad (5.1)$$

Like we did for Max-2AND in §4.1.2, we can interpret these template distributions as distributions of negation patterns for a particular assignment to an instance; see the beginning of §7.6.1 below.

We also define a *marginal vector* $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}) = (\mu(\mathcal{D})_1, \dots, \mu(\mathcal{D})_k) \in [-1, 1]^k$ whose i -th entry $\mu(\mathcal{D})_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}}[(-1)^{a_i}]$.^{*†}

Now for a predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we define two sets of marginals

$$K_{f,N}(\beta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) : \beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N) \leq \beta\} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{f,Y}(\gamma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y) : \gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y) \geq \gamma\}.$$

The dichotomy theorem of [CGSV21a] states, roughly, that (β, γ) -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ is hard iff these two sets intersect:

Theorem 5.2 (Sketching dichotomy, [CGSV21a, Theorem 2.3]). *For every $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and $\beta < \gamma \in [0, 1]$:*

- i. If $K_{f,N}(\beta) \cap K_{f,Y}(\gamma) = \emptyset$, then there exists $\tau > 0$ and a linear sketching algorithm for (β, γ) -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ using at most $\tau \log n$ space.*
- ii. If $K_{f,N}(\beta) \cap K_{f,Y}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$, then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that every sketching algorithm for $(\beta + \epsilon, \gamma - \epsilon)$ -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ uses at least $\tau \sqrt{n}$ space (for*

^{*}Note that in the 2AND case discussed in §4.1.2, for $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^2)$ we defined a *scalar* quantity $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{D}(1, 1) - \mathcal{D}(0, 0)$. According to the definition we just made, however, $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}) = (\mu(\mathcal{D})_1, \mu(\mathcal{D})_2)$ where $\mu(\mathcal{D})_1 = \mathcal{D}(1, 1) + \mathcal{D}(1, 0) - \mathcal{D}(0, 1) - \mathcal{D}(0, 0)$ and $\mu(\mathcal{D})_2 = \mathcal{D}(1, 1) + \mathcal{D}(0, 1) - \mathcal{D}(1, 0) - \mathcal{D}(0, 0)$. Thus, $\mu_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(\mathcal{D})_1 + \mu(\mathcal{D})_2)$. As we’ll discuss in §7.2, for Max-2AND it suffices to only consider a “symmetric” distributions \mathcal{D} and a “scalar” marginal because 2AND is a *symmetric* predicate.

[†]We add an extra negative sign in order to agree with the convention for 2AND we established in §4.1.2 that “positively biased vertices want to be assigned 1.”

sufficiently large n).

Temporarily peeling back the K_f notation, **Item ii** is a statement about “hard templates” à la §4.2.2: If $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y)$ for some $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$, then sketching $(\beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N) + \epsilon, \gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y) - \epsilon)$ -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space for every $\epsilon > 0$.

Using a standard reduction, **Theorem 5.2** implies a dichotomy for *approximation* problems:

Corollary 5.3 ([CGSV21a, Proposition 2.10]). *For $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, let*

$$\alpha(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k): \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y)} \left(\frac{\beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N)}{\gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y)} \right).$$

Then:

- i. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ and a $\tau \log n$ -space linear sketching algorithm which $(\alpha(f) - \epsilon)$ -approximates Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$.*
- ii. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that every sketching algorithm which $(\alpha(f) + \epsilon)$ -approximates Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ uses at least $\tau\sqrt{n}$ space (for sufficiently large n).*

We sketch the proof in order to provide a point of comparison for the simpler sketching algorithms (for certain Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ problems) from our joint work [BHP⁺22], which we present in §7.6 below.

Proof sketch. To prove **Item ii**, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y)$ such that $\beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N)/\gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y) \leq \alpha(f) + \epsilon/2$. Letting $\beta' = \beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N) + \epsilon/2$ and $\gamma' = \gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_N) - \epsilon/2$, by **Theorem 5.2**, (β', γ') -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space. But for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $\beta'/\gamma' \leq \alpha(f) + \epsilon$ and thus Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space to $(\alpha(f) + \epsilon)$ -approximate.

The proof of **Item i** uses the following observation: If an algorithm for (β, γ) -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ is correct on an instance Ψ , then outputs of **Yes** and **No** imply $\text{val}_\Psi \geq \beta$ and $\text{val}_\Psi \leq \gamma$, respectively.[‡] Thus, given an instance Ψ , a reasonable strategy for approximating val_Ψ is to pick some pairs $\{(\beta_s, \gamma_s)\}_{s \in S}$ such that $K_{f,N}(\beta_s) \cap K_{f,Y}(\gamma_s) = \emptyset$ for each s ; calculate

[‡]Note that since (β, γ) -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ is a promise problem, if $\beta \leq \text{val}_\Psi \leq \gamma$ then the algorithm’s output can be arbitrary.

an output A_s for each (β_s, γ_s) -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ problem using [Theorem 5.2](#),[§] and then output β_{s^*} , where s^* maximizes β_s over $\{s \in S : A_s = \mathbf{Yes}\}$. β_{s^*} is an underestimate for val_Ψ by our observation, but how can we guarantee that it is at least $(\alpha(f) - \epsilon)\text{val}_\Psi$?

The idea is to pick some $\delta > 0$, and consider a “distinguisher grid” $S = \{(b\delta, g\delta) : b, g \in \lceil [1/\delta] \rceil, K_{f,N}(b\delta) \cap K_{f,Y}(g\delta) = \emptyset\}$. Then given $s^* = (b^*, g^*)$ maximizing β_s over $\{s \in S : A_s = \mathbf{Yes}\}$, we set $b' = b + 1$ and $g' = \lceil (b + 1)/\alpha \rceil$. By construction, $g'/b' > \alpha$; thus by assumption, $K_{f,N}(b'\delta) \cap K_{f,Y}(g'\delta) = \emptyset$, and so $s' = (b', g') \in S$. Now by maximality of β_{s^*} , we have $A_{(b',g')} = \mathbf{No}$. Hence

$$b^*\delta \leq \text{val}_\Psi \leq g'\delta,$$

and we chose g' such that $b^*/g' \approx \alpha$. Setting $\delta = \epsilon\rho(f)/2$ and tweaking the algorithm to output $\max\{\beta_{s^*}, \rho(f)\}$ suffices; see the proof of [[CGSV21a](#), Proposition 2.10] for details. \square

While the lower bounds from [[CGSV21a](#)] (i.e., [Item ii](#) of [Theorem 5.2](#), and by extension, [Item ii](#) of [Corollary 5.3](#)) only apply generally for *sketching* algorithms, [[CGSV21a](#)] also provides an extension of the lower bound to streaming algorithms when a certain condition holds. In particular, it is a condition on distributions $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ which is *stronger* than the condition $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y)$. We say $\mathcal{D} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ is *one-wise independent* (or has *uniform marginals*) if $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}) = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., for all $i \in [k]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{D}}[a_i] = 0$. Then $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ are a *padded one-wise pair* if there exists $\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}'_N, \mathcal{D}'_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ and $\eta \in [0, 1]$ such that \mathcal{D}'_N and \mathcal{D}'_Y have uniform marginals, $\mathcal{D}_N = \eta\mathcal{D}_0 + (1 - \eta)\mathcal{D}'_N$, and $\mathcal{D}_Y = \eta\mathcal{D}_0 + (1 - \eta)\mathcal{D}'_Y$. Then:

Theorem 5.4 ([[CGSV21a](#), Theorem 2.11]). *For every $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and padded one-wise pair $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that every streaming algorithm for $(\beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N) + \epsilon, \gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y) - \epsilon)$ -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ requires at least $\tau\sqrt{n}$ space (for sufficiently large n). Thus, for every $\epsilon > 0$, every streaming algorithm which $(\beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N)/\gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y) + \epsilon)$ -approximates Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ requires at least $\tau\sqrt{n}$ space (for sufficiently large n).*

[§]The algorithms given by [Theorem 5.2](#) for (β_s, γ_s) -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ are randomized, and thus each will fail with some constant probability. However, as long as $|S|$ is a constant (given ϵ), we can amplify every algorithm’s success probability and take a union bound.

Example 5.5. In §4.2.2, we constructed a pair of hard template distributions for Max-DiCut: \mathcal{D}_Y , which is $(1, 1)$ w.p. $\frac{3}{5}$ and $(0, 0)$ w.p. $\frac{2}{5}$, and \mathcal{D}_N , which is $(1, 1)$ w.p. $\frac{1}{5}$ and $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ each w.p. $\frac{2}{5}$. Recalling that Max-2AND is a generalization of Max-Cut, we can consider this pair $(\mathcal{D}_Y, \mathcal{D}_N)$ in light of Theorem 5.4 for Max-2AND. Our calculations in §4.2.2 imply that $\beta_{2\text{AND}}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \frac{4}{15}$ and $\gamma_{2\text{AND}}(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \frac{3}{5}$. Now setting $\eta = \frac{1}{5}$, \mathcal{D}_0 to be $(1, 1)$ w.p. 1, $\mathcal{D}'_Y = \mathcal{U}_{\{(1,1), (0,0)\}}$, and $\mathcal{D}'_N = \mathcal{U}_{\{(1,0), (0,1)\}}$, we see that \mathcal{D}_Y and \mathcal{D}_N are a padded one-wise pair. Thus, Theorem 5.4 implies that $(\frac{4}{15} + \epsilon, \frac{3}{5} - \epsilon)$ -Max-2AND requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ streaming space, and hence that $(\frac{4}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximating Max-2AND requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$. This morally recovers the Max-DiCut lower bound we proved in §4.2 (Item ii of Theorem 4.1), although it is formally weaker (since Max-DiCut has a smaller set of predicates). Recovering the full bound requires the more general framework of [CGSV21b].

On the other hand, in §4.1.2, we showed that if $\frac{\beta}{\gamma} < \frac{4}{9}$, then $\max_{\mathcal{D}_N: \beta_{2\text{AND}}(\mathcal{D})} \mu_S(\mathcal{D}) < \min_{\mathcal{D}_Y: \gamma_{2\text{AND}}(\mathcal{D})} \mu_S(\mathcal{D})$, and hence that $K_{2\text{AND}, N}(\beta) \cap K_{2\text{AND}, Y}(\gamma) = \emptyset$. Thus, $\alpha(2\text{AND}) = \frac{4}{9}$.

Example 5.6. An important special case of Theorem 5.4 is when $\mathcal{D}_N = \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^k}$ and $\gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y) = 1$. In this case, $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y$ are one-wise independent (since $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^k}) = \mathbf{0}$ by definition), and thus they form a trivial padded one-wise pair (with $\eta = 0$). Furthermore, all $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and $p \in [0, 1]$,

$$\lambda_f(\mathcal{D}_N, p) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^k}, \mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{B}_p^k} [f(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^k}} [f(\mathbf{a})] = \rho(f)$$

and thus $\beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N) = \rho(f)$. Hence Theorem 5.4 states implies that Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ is streaming approximation-resistant (in \sqrt{n} space), i.e., \sqrt{n} -space streaming algorithms cannot $(\rho(f) + \epsilon)$ -approximate Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

If there exists one-wise independent $\mathcal{D}_Y \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ with $\gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y) = 1$, we say that the predicate f supports one-wise independence, since the support of any distribution $\mathcal{D}_Y \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ with $\gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y) = 1$ is necessarily contained in the support of f . Thus, if f supports one-wise independence, then Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ is streaming approximation-resistant [CGSV21a, Theorem 1.3].

5.1.2 DISCUSSION

In this subsection, we (briefly) discuss various aspects of the [CGSV21a] results presented in the previous subsection, as well as their extension in [CGSV21b] to CSPs defined by general predicate families over all alphabets. To begin, we mention that the dichotomy criterion for (β, γ) -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ in [Theorem 5.2](#) is “expressible in the quantified theory of reals”, i.e., it is equivalent to some quantified polynomial system of (in)equalities over real variables; thus, it is known to be decidable, in particular in polynomial-space relative to the size of f ’s truth table and the bit complexities of β and γ (see [CGSV21a, Theorem 1.1] for the formal statement). This is an exciting property of [Theorem 5.2](#) because, in contrast, the dichotomy criterion of Raghavendra [[Rag08](#)] for polynomial-time algorithms (assuming the UGC) is not known to be decidable.

The proof of [Item i](#) of [Theorem 5.2](#) is quite similar to the proof of [Item i](#) of [Theorem 4.1](#) for Max-DiCut. Recall the proof for (β, γ) -Max-2AND which we discussed in [§4.3.2](#): We used a “separation” between μ_S values ([Eq. \(4.18\)](#)) to get an algorithm for (β, γ) -Max-2AND. Now, for arbitrary (β, γ) -Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ problems, we still harness the disjointness of $K_{f,N}(\beta)$ and $K_{f,Y}(\gamma)$: As in [CGSV21a, §4], we consider “template distributions” $\mathcal{D}_{\Psi}^{\mathbf{x}} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ for potential assignments \mathbf{x} ; we invoke the separating hyperplane theorem on the sets $K_{f,N}(\beta)$ and $K_{f,Y}(\gamma)$ (after checking that they are compact and convex), which we think of as sets of template distributions; and then use 1-norm sketching (i.e., [Theorem 2.2](#)) to “maximize over \mathbf{x} ”.

The hardness results from [CGSV21a] ([Item ii](#) of [Theorem 5.2](#) and [Theorem 5.4](#)) also share certain similarities with [Item ii](#) of [Theorem 4.1](#). Indeed, [CGSV21a, §5] considers a variant of BPD (see [Definition 3.2](#)) called *randomized mask detection* (RMD). In the $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ -RMD $_{\alpha}(n)$ problem, Alice gets a hidden assignment $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and communicates with Bob, who gets a random hypermatching $M \sim \mathcal{M}_{k,\alpha}(n)$ and a vector $\mathbf{z} = M^{\top} \mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{b} \in (\mathbb{Z}_2^k)^{\alpha n}$, where in the **Yes** case $\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}_Y^{\alpha n}$ and in the **No** case $\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}_N^{\alpha n}$. That is, for each edge-index $\ell \in [\alpha n]$, if we let $\mathbf{z}(\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ denote the ℓ -th block of k coordinates in \mathbf{z} and $\mathbf{e}(\ell)$ the ℓ -th edge in M , $\mathbf{z}(\ell)$ equals $\mathbf{x}^*|_{\mathbf{e}(\ell)}$ plus a random “mask” drawn either from \mathcal{D}_Y (**Yes** case) or \mathcal{D}_N (**No** case). The core communication lower bound from [CGSV21a] is an analogue of [[GKK⁺08](#)]’s hardness for BPD ([Theorem 3.3](#)):

Theorem 5.7 ([CGSV21a, Theorem 6.2]). *For every $k \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ such that*

$\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}) = \mathbf{0}$, there exists $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0), \delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\tau > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, any protocol for $(\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^k}, \mathcal{D})$ -RMD $_{\alpha}(n)$ achieving advantage at least δ requires $\tau\sqrt{n}$ communication.

We briefly describe why the one-wise independence of \mathcal{D} is important for proving this lower bound. In the generalization of the Fourier-analytic reduction (Lemma 3.9), we have to consider an analogue of $h_{\alpha}(\ell, n)$, which we'll denote $h_{k,\alpha}(\ell, n)$, which naïvely measures the probability that there exists $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{k\alpha n}$ such that $M^{\top}\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{v}$ for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ of Hamming weight $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 = \ell$.[¶] Unfortunately, this naïve event is “too likely” because it occurs whenever every vertex in $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v})$ is touched by M ; this has probability roughly α^{ℓ} , which is not small enough even for the $\ell = 2$ term, which contains a factor of n from Lemma 2.4 (see Remark 3.14). Fortunately, one-wise independence actually lets us restrict the set of \mathbf{s} vectors we consider. In particular, we can derive the equation for the Fourier coefficients of Bob's conditional input distribution $\mathcal{Z}_{A,M}$:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{Z}_{A,M}}(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{2^{k\alpha n}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^* \sim \mathcal{U}_A, \mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}^{\alpha n}} [(-1)^{-\mathbf{s} \cdot (M\mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{b})}]$$

(compare to the proof of Lemma 3.9). By independence, we can pull out a factor of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}^n} [(-1)^{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{b}}] = \prod_{\ell=1}^{\alpha n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}^n} [(-1)^{\mathbf{s}(\ell) \cdot \mathbf{b}}]$ where $\mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{s}(1), \dots, \mathbf{s}(\alpha n))$. Suppose $\|\mathbf{s}(\ell)\|_0 = 1$ for some ℓ ; WLOG, $\mathbf{s}(1) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, in which case $\widehat{\mathcal{Z}_{A,M}}(\mathbf{s})$ is a multiple of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}^n} [(-1)^{\mathbf{s}(1) \cdot \mathbf{b}}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}^n} [(-1)^{b_1}] = -\mu(\mathbf{b})_1 = 0$. In other words, all Fourier coefficients of $\mathcal{Z}_{A,M}$ which are supported on exactly one coordinate in any block vanish. Thus, we can redefine $h_{k,\alpha}(\ell, n)$ as the probability that $\mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{s}(1), \dots, \mathbf{s}(\alpha n))$ exists satisfying *both* (1) for all $\ell \in [\alpha n]$, $\mathbf{s}(\ell) = \mathbf{0}$ or $\|\mathbf{s}(\ell)\|_0 \geq 2$, and (2) $M^{\top}\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{v}$. $h_{k,\alpha}(\ell, n)$ then becomes sufficiently small to carry out the proof of the lower bound.

At this point, the [CGSV21a] hardness result “bifurcates” into Theorem 5.4 and Item ii of Theorem 5.2. On one hand, we can define a sequential $(T+1)$ -player version $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ -sRMD $_{\alpha,T}(n)$ of $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ -RMD where — as in sBPD vs. BPD — there are T players Bob $_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_T$, each of whom receive independent Bob inputs. Suppose we want to apply the hybrid argument we used to reduce sBPD to BPD (Lemma 3.5, see §3.3) to reduce sRMD to RMD. As we mentioned in §3.4.4, this requires applying the data processing inequality, which holds

[¶]Note that unlike in our analysis in Lemma 3.9, M is not folded, and \mathbf{s} has length $k\alpha n$.

only when one of the distributions is the uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^k}$. By doing so, and then using the same triangle inequality argument we used to prove [Lemma 4.16](#), we get that if $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \mathbf{0}$ then $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ -sRMD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$ also requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space.

Now for a padded one-wise pair $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ with $\mathcal{D}_N = \eta\mathcal{D}_0 + (1 - \eta)\mathcal{D}'_N$, $\mathcal{D}_Y = \eta\mathcal{D}_0 + (1 - \eta)\mathcal{D}'_Y$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \mathbf{0}$, we can apply the following C2S reduction from $(\mathcal{D}'_N, \mathcal{D}'_Y)$ -sRMD to Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$: Let $m = \alpha Tn$. Alice uniformly samples a list of k -hyperedges $\mathbf{e}(0, 1), \dots, \mathbf{e}(0, \eta m / (1 - \eta))$ on $[n]$, and she creates the subinstance Ψ_0 with constraints $(\mathbf{e}(0, \ell), \mathbf{x}^*_{|\mathbf{e}(0, \ell)} + \mathbf{b}(0, \ell))$ where $\mathbf{b}(0, \ell) \sim \mathcal{D}_0$ for $\ell \in [\eta m / (1 - \eta)]$. Bob_t , on input $(M_t, \mathbf{z}(t))$ where M_t has edges $(\mathbf{e}(t, 1), \dots, \mathbf{e}(t, \alpha n))$, creates the subinstance Ψ_t with constraints $(\mathbf{e}(t, \ell), \mathbf{z}(t, \ell))$ for $\ell \in [\alpha n]$. Now since $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell) = \mathbf{x}^*_{|\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)} + \mathbf{b}(t, \ell)$ where $\mathbf{b}(t, \ell) \sim \mathcal{D}'_Y$ (**Yes** case) or $\mathbf{b}(t, \ell) \sim \mathcal{D}'_N$ (**No** case), the effect is that the template distributions of the **Yes** and **No** instances are \mathcal{D}_Y (**Yes** case) or \mathcal{D}_N (**No** case), which roughly proves [Theorem 5.4](#).

On the other hand, what happens if $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}) \neq \mathbf{0}$? In this case, [\[CGSV21a\]](#) also proves hardness of $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ -RMD $_{\alpha}(n)$:

Theorem 5.8 ([\[CGSV21a, Theorem 5.3\]](#)). *For every $k \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ such that $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y)$, there exists $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0), \delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\tau > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, any protocol for $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ -RMD $_{\alpha}(n)$ achieving advantage at least δ requires $\tau\sqrt{n}$ communication.*

There are a few “disadvantages” to [Theorem 5.8](#) in comparison with its special case [Theorem 5.7](#). Firstly, we can no longer use the hybrid argument to get hardness for $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ -sRMD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$, since the data processing inequality no longer applies. Thus, we have to settle for proving lower bounds for the *parallel* randomized mask detection problem $(\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y)$ -pRMD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$, which is a $(T + 1)$ -player game with the following structure: $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_T$ each get an independent **Bob** input for RMD and send a message to a “referee” **Carol**, who has to decide which case they are in; in particular, the Bob_t ’s cannot communicate with each other in any way, unlike in the sRMD game. By independence, hardness for RMD (i.e., [Theorem 5.8](#)) extends immediately to hardness for pRMD, but this “parallel” communication game can only rule out *sketching* algorithms.

Moreover, [Theorem 5.8](#) has a significantly more complex proof. The basic outline is the following. Let’s think of \mathbb{Z}_2^k as a *lattice*: it has a partial order, namely entrywise com-

parison, denoted \leq , where we define $0 \leq 1$. Moreover, we can define $\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \vee \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ as entrywise AND's and OR's for $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$.[‡] If $\mathbf{u} \not\leq \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{v} \not\leq \mathbf{u}$, we say \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are *incomparable*, denoted $\mathbf{u} \parallel \mathbf{v}$. Now given a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ supported on two incomparable elements $\mathbf{u} \parallel \mathbf{v}$, we can consider the *polarized* distribution $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}$ which, letting $\epsilon = \min\{\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}), \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{v})\}$, decreases $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{v})$ by ϵ , and increases $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u} \vee \mathbf{v})$ by ϵ . Note that polarization preserves marginals, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}})$. [CGSV21a] proves two key theorems about this operation:

- i. $(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}})$ - $\text{RMD}_\alpha(n)$ requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ communication. This is essentially because we can write \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}}$ as “mixtures”

$$\mathcal{D} = (1 - 2\epsilon)\mathcal{D}_0 + 2\epsilon \mathcal{U}_{\{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\}} \text{ and } \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}} = (1 - 2\epsilon)\mathcal{D}_0 + 2\epsilon \mathcal{U}_{\{\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \vee \mathbf{v}\}}$$

for the same “base” distribution $\mathcal{D}_0 \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$, which (roughly) allows us to reduce from $(\mathcal{U}_{\{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\}}, \mathcal{U}_{\{\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \vee \mathbf{v}\}})$ - $\text{RMD}_\alpha(n)$. Moreover, on the coordinates where \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} differ, $\mathcal{U}_{\{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}\}}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\{\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \vee \mathbf{v}\}}$ have zero marginals; thus, we can (roughly) reduce from the “restrictions” to these coordinates and apply [Theorem 5.7](#).

- ii. There is some constant $C \in \mathbb{N}$ such that after applying at most C polarizations, \mathcal{D} is no longer polarizable, i.e., its support is a *chain*. Moreover, this final distribution is unique for each starting marginal vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [-1, 1]^k$; we call it the “canonical distribution”, denoted $\mathcal{D}_\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

Together, [Items i](#) and [ii](#) suffice to prove [Theorem 3.3](#). Indeed, given two starting distributions $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ with matching marginals $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y)$, we can use [Item ii](#) to repeatedly polarize both \mathcal{D}_Y and \mathcal{D}_N to produce a “path” of distributions of length at most $2C$ connecting them via their common canonical distribution, such that each adjacent pair of distributions is the result of polarization; [Item i](#) then implies RMD-hardness for each such pair; finally, we apply the triangle inequality to conclude RMD-hardness for the path’s endpoints, i.e., \mathcal{D}_Y and \mathcal{D}_N . For more details, see [CGSV21a, §7].

Finally, we mention that [CGSV21b] reproves all the algorithmic and hardness results of [CGSV21a] which we’ve discussed so far in the much more general setting of $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$

[‡]In the context of lattices, \wedge and \vee are typically called the *join* and *meet* operations.

problems defined by families of predicates over general alphabets \mathbb{Z}_q . We briefly describe some of these results. For a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_q^k)$, let $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}) \in (\Delta(\mathbb{Z}_q))^k$ denote the vector of “marginal distributions” resulting from projecting onto each coordinate. \mathcal{D} is *one-wise independent* if $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}) = (\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q})^k$; \mathcal{F} *weakly supports one-wise independence* if there exists $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $\rho(\mathcal{F}') = \rho(\mathcal{F})$ and for each $f \in \mathcal{F}'$, there exists a one-wise independent distribution $\mathcal{D}_f \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_q^k)$ supported on $f^{-1}(1)$. In this case, [CGSV21b, Theorem 2.17] shows that $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ is streaming approximation-resistant in \sqrt{n} space. More generally, [CGSV21b] proves a dichotomy theorem for $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ along the lines of [Theorem 5.2](#), based on distributions $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathcal{F} \times \mathbb{Z}_q^k)$ such that projected onto each $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the marginals $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ match. Defining λ, β, γ for these distributions is out of scope for this thesis — see [CGSV21b, §2.1] — but we do mention that the algorithmic result now requires computing the so-called “ $(1, \infty)$ -norm” of an $n \times k$ matrix, which is the 1-norm of the vector consisting of the largest element in each row, corresponding to greedily assigning each variable to the element in \mathbb{Z}_q it “most wants to be”, while the hardness result goes through a more complex version of “polarization”.

5.2 LOWER BOUNDS FOR LINEAR-SPACE STREAMING

In this section, we discuss the recent linear-space streaming lower bound of Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, Velingker, and Velusamy [CGS⁺22], which extend the Max-Cut lower bound of Kapralov and Krachun [KK19] to a large family of so-called “wide” CSPs. We’ll begin with some statements of these lower bounds, which we’ll need in order to prove lower bounds against ordering CSPs in [Chapter 6](#). (Specifically, we mostly restrict to the single-predicate case $|\mathcal{F}| = 1$; the general formulation is given in [CGS⁺22].)

Fix $k, q \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [q]^k$ denote the subspace of constant vectors (i.e., vectors (a, \dots, a) for $a \in \mathbb{Z}_q$). Roughly, a predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_q^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is “wide” if its support has a large intersection with a coset of \mathcal{C} in \mathbb{Z}_q^k . To be precise, for $\mathbf{b} \in [q]^k$, let

$$\omega_{\mathbf{b}}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c} \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}}} [f(\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b})], \tag{5.9}$$

and define the *width* of f by

$$\omega(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^k} (\omega_{\mathbf{b}}(f)).$$

The lower bounds for wide predicates in [CGS⁺22] are based on the following communication problem, called *sequential implicit randomized shift detection (siRSD)*.^{**}

Definition 5.10 (siRSD). *Let $2 \leq q, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $T, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then (k, q) -siRSD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$ is the following T -player one-way communication problem with players $\text{Bob}_1, \dots, \text{Bob}_T$:*

- Sample $\mathbf{x}^* \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q^n}$.
- Each Bob_t receives an adjacency matrix $M_t \in \{0, 1\}^{k\alpha n \times n}$ sampled from $\mathcal{M}_{k, \alpha}(n)$, and a vector $\mathbf{z}(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_q^{k\alpha n}$ labelling each edge of M_t as follows:
 - **Yes** case: $\mathbf{z}(t) = M_t \mathbf{x}^* + \mathbf{b}(t)$, where $\mathbf{b}(t) \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\alpha n}$.
 - **No** case: $\mathbf{z}(t) \sim (\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q^k}^{\alpha n})^{\alpha n}$.
- Each Bob_t can send a message to Bob_{t+1} , and at the end, Bob_T must decide whether they are in the **Yes** or **No** case.

To provide some interpretation for this definition, for each player Bob_t and edge-index $\ell \in [\alpha n]$, let $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)$ denote the ℓ -th edge in M_t and write $\mathbf{z}(t) = (\mathbf{z}(t, 1), \dots, \mathbf{z}(t, \alpha n))$ for $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_q^k$. In the **Yes** case, each block $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell)$ equals $\mathbf{x}^*|_{\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)}$ plus a random shift (i.e., a random element of \mathcal{C}); in the **No** case, each block $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell)$ is uniformly random. Note also that this problem is “implicit”, like the siBPD problem we described in §3.4.3, in the sense that there is no Alice who knows the hidden assignment.

Moreover, consider the case $k = q = 2$. For $t \in [T], \ell \in [\alpha n]$, if $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell) = (u, v)$, then in the **Yes** case Bob_t ’s ℓ -th block $\mathbf{z}(t, i) = (x_u^* + b(t)_\ell, x_v^* + b(t)_\ell)$ where $b(t)_\ell \sim \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}}$; hence, $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell)$ is information-theoretically equivalent to the bit $x_u^* + x_v^*$. On the other hand, in the **No** case, $\mathbf{z}(t, i)$ is simply uniformly random. Thus, in the $k = q = 2$ case (k, q) -siRSD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$ is equivalent to the siBPD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$ problem which we described in §3.4, used in [KK19] to prove linear-space hardness of approximating Max-Cut.

The technical core of the lower bounds in [CGS⁺22] is the following hardness result for siRSD:

Theorem 5.11 ([CGS⁺22, Theorem 3.2]). *For every $2 \leq q, k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$, $T \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $\tau > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

^{**}[CGS⁺22] defines more generally a “(sequential) implicit randomized *mask* detection” problem, but proves hardness only when the masks are uniform shifts (i.e., uniform elements of \mathcal{C}).

for all $n \geq n_0$, any protocol for (k, q) -siRSD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$ achieving advantage at least δ requires τn communication.

The following construction and analysis generalize [Construction 3.6](#) and [Lemma 3.7](#) for Max-Cut, respectively:

Construction 5.12 (C2S reduction from siRSD to Max-CSP($\{f\}$)). Let $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^k$ and $f : \mathbb{Z}_q^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. For each $t \in [T]$, Bob_t 's reduction function R_t outputs an instance Ψ_t as follows: For each $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell) \in M_t$ and corresponding block $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_q^k$ of $\mathbf{z}(t)$, Bob_t adds $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)$ to Ψ_t iff $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell) - \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 5.13. For all $f : \mathbb{Z}_q^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^k$, there exist $T, n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$, the following holds. Let \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{N} denote the **Yes** and **No** distributions for (k, q) -siRSD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$, and let (R_0, \dots, R_T) be the reduction functions from [Construction 5.12](#). Then

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim (R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{Y}} [\text{val}_{\Psi} \leq \omega_{\mathbf{b}}(f) - \epsilon] \leq \exp(-n) \text{ and } \Pr_{\Psi \sim (R_0, \dots, R_T) \circ \mathcal{N}} [\text{val}_{\Psi} \geq \rho(f) + \epsilon] \leq \exp(-n).$$

Together, [Theorem 5.11](#) and [Lemma 5.13](#) give the following corollary (which, without too much extra work, can be generalized to all families of predicates):

Corollary 5.14 ([\[CGS⁺22, Theorem 4.3\]](#)). For every $f : \mathbb{Z}_q^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and constant $\epsilon > 0$, any streaming algorithm which $(\frac{\omega(f)}{\rho(f)} + \epsilon)$ -approximates Max-CSP($\{f\}$) requires $\Omega(n)$ space. Moreover, for every family of predicates \mathcal{F} , streaming algorithms which $(\frac{\omega(\mathcal{F})}{\rho(\mathcal{F})} + \epsilon)$ -approximate Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) require $\Omega(n)$ space, where $\omega(\mathcal{F}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \omega(f)$.

Noting that by definition $\omega(f) \geq \frac{1}{q}$ for every $f : \mathbb{Z}_q^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we have a further corollary which narrows the linear-space streaming approximability of every predicate family \mathcal{F} to the interval $[\rho(\mathcal{F}), q \cdot \rho(\mathcal{F})]$:

Corollary 5.15 ([\[CGS⁺22, Theorem 1.2\]](#)). For every family of predicates \mathcal{F} over \mathbb{Z}_q and every $\epsilon > 0$, every streaming algorithm which $(q \cdot \rho(\mathcal{F}) + \epsilon)$ -approximates Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) uses at least $\Omega(n)$ space.

Finally, we remark that qualitatively, the main obstacle involved in proving linear-space lower bounds (i.e., [Theorem 5.11](#), or its special case [Theorem 3.18](#) for Max-Cut) is in “im-

proving the low-Fourier weight bounds to $(\frac{\xi c}{\ell})^{\ell/2}$, in comparison to [Lemma 2.4](#). (See [Remark 3.14](#) for a discussion in the special case of siBPD for Max-Cut.) Though [Lemma 2.4](#) itself is tight, if we consider the distribution \mathcal{Z}_{A_t, M_t} of Bob_t 's second input, where M_t is Bob_t 's matching and A_t the set of \mathbf{x}^* 's consistent with Bob_{t-1} 's output message, and directly apply [Lemma 2.4](#), we will immediately disqualify ourselves from proving linear-space lower bounds. The key observation is that we can do better than directly applying [Lemma 2.4](#) because \mathcal{Z}_{A_t, M_t} is a “structured” distribution, in the sense that when we draw $\mathbf{z}(t) \sim \mathcal{Z}_{A_t, M_t}$, each entry of $\mathbf{z}(t)$ only tells us about *sums* of entries of \mathbf{x}^* . The proof ultimately does succeed by showing inductively that the indicators of the sets A_t satisfy certain Fourier weight bounds (with high probability) by applying [Lemma 2.4](#) to a carefully defined “reduced” version of \mathcal{Z}_{A_t, M_t} . However, exactly stating these bounds, and formulating the right inductive hypothesis with which to prove them, is much more involved than in the BPD case; see [\[CGS⁺22, §5\]](#) for details.

II

Contributions

6

Ordering constraint satisfaction problems

A natural direction would be to pose the MAS [problem] as a CSP. MAS is fairly similar to a CSP, with each vertex being a variable taking values in domain $[n]$ and each directed edge a constraint between two variables. However, the domain, $[n]$, of the CSP is not fixed but grows with input size. We stress here that this is not a superficial distinction but an essential characteristic of the problem.

Guruswami, Håstad, Raghavendra, Manokaran, and Charikar [GHM⁺11]

SCHEDULING PROBLEMS CAN BE MODELED as *ordering constraint satisfaction problems (OCSPs)*, variants of CSPs in which assignments correspond to orderings of n objects, and constraints to allowed orderings for small sets of objects. That is, in the scheduling interpretation, the goal of an OCSP is to find the best “schedule” for n “tasks” given a list of *precedence* constraints such as “task j must come between task i and task k ”. In this chapter, we prove a strong streaming approximation-resistance result for every OCSP from our joint work with Sudan and Velusamy [SSV21]: For every OCSP, linear-space streaming algorithms cannot perform better than the trivial approximation ratio (see

Theorem 6.1 below). But we begin by formally defining OCSPs and two specific examples, the *maximum acyclic subgraph* and *maximum betweenness* problems.

6.1 OCSPs: DEFINITIONS, MOTIVATIONS, HISTORY

A vector $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in [n]^n$ is a *permutation* if all its elements are distinct, i.e., if $\sigma_i = \sigma_{i'}$ then $i = i'$. Let $\mathfrak{S}_n \subseteq [n]^n$ denote the set of all permutations.* We interpret a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ as an ordering on n objects, labeled 1 through n , which places the i -th object in position σ_i .†

Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ be a k -tuple of integers. We define a symbol $\mathbf{ord}(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathfrak{S}_k \cup \{\perp\}$ which captures the ordering of the entries of \mathbf{a} , in the following way: If \mathbf{a} 's entries are not all distinct, then $\mathbf{ord}(\mathbf{a}) = \perp$; otherwise, $\mathbf{ord}(\mathbf{a})$ is the unique permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ such that $a_{\pi_1^{-1}} < \dots < a_{\pi_k^{-1}}$, where π^{-1} is the inverse permutation to π . In particular, if $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ is a permutation then $\mathbf{ord}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}$.

For a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and a k -tuple of distinct indices $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k) \in [n]^k$, we define the *induced permutation* $\sigma|_{\mathbf{j}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{ord}(\sigma_{j_1}, \dots, \sigma_{j_k})$. Thus, for instance, the permutation $\sigma = (5, 1, 3, 2, 4) \in \mathfrak{S}_5$ places the third object in the third position, and since $\sigma|_{(1,5,3)} = (3, 2, 1) \in \mathfrak{S}_3$, we see that if we restrict to only the first, third, and fifth objects, the fifth is in the second position.

For $k \leq 2 \in \mathbb{N}$, an *ordering predicate* $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defines the *ordering constraint satisfaction problem* Max-OCSP(Π) as follows. A *constraint* on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ variables is given by a k -tuple $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k) \in [n]^k$ of distinct indices.‡ An assignment $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ *satisfies* $C = \mathbf{j}$ iff $\Pi(\sigma|_{\mathbf{j}}) = 1$. An *instance* Φ of Max-OCSP(Π) consists of m constraints $(C_\ell = (\mathbf{j}(\ell)))_{\ell \in [m]}$, and the *value* of an assignment $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ on Φ , denoted $\text{ordval}_\Phi(\sigma)$, is the (fractional) weight of constraints satisfied by σ , i.e.,

$$\text{ordval}_\Phi(\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^m \Pi(\sigma|_{\mathbf{j}(\ell)}).$$

*We use this non-standard “vector notation” for permutations to emphasize the analogy with CSP assignments, which come from $[q]^n$.

†I.e., this is an interpretative convention; the other would be that the σ_i -th object is in position i .

‡For simplicity, and since we’re proving lower bounds, we define only unweighted instances of OCSPs.

The *value* of Φ , denoted ordval_Φ , is the maximum value of any assignment, i.e.,

$$\text{ordval}_\Phi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} (\text{ordval}_\Phi(\sigma)).$$

We consider, in the streaming setting, the problem of α -approximating $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$, as well as the distinguishing problem $(\beta, \gamma)\text{-Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$; the setup is the same as in the standard, non-ordering CSP case (see [Sections 2.1](#) and [2.2](#)). One important difference between OCSPs and (non-ordering) CSPs is that the solution space of an OCSP has super-exponential size $|\mathfrak{S}_n| = n! \geq (n/e)^n$, while a CSP over \mathbb{Z}_q has exponential solution space size $|\mathbb{Z}_q^n| = q^n$.

The *maximum acyclic subgraph* problem (MAS) is the prototypical ordering CSP. MAS is the problem $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}})$ for the predicate $\Pi_{\text{MAS}} : \mathfrak{S}_2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which is supported on $(1, 2)$. Thus, an MAS constraint (u, v) is satisfied by an ordering $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ iff $\sigma_u < \sigma_v$.[§] In the scheduling interpretation, a constraint (u, v) is satisfied by a schedule $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ iff u is scheduled earlier than v in σ . Karp’s classic enumeration of 21 **NP**-complete problems [[Kar72](#)] includes the problem of, given an instance Φ of MAS and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, deciding whether $\text{ordval}_\Phi \geq \gamma$.[¶] Several works [[New00](#); [AMW15](#); [BK19](#)] have studied the **NP**-hardness of *approximating* MAS; [[BK19](#)] shows that $(\frac{2}{3} + \epsilon)$ -approximating MAS is **NP**-hard for every $\epsilon > 0$.

Another ordering CSP of interest is the *maximum betweenness* problem Max-Btw $\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi_{\text{Btw}})$ where $\Pi_{\text{Btw}} : \mathfrak{S}_3 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is supported on $(1, 2, 3)$ and $(3, 2, 1)$. Thus, a Max-Btw constraint (u, v, w) is satisfied by an ordering $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ iff $\sigma_u < \sigma_v < \sigma_w$ or $\sigma_w < \sigma_v < \sigma_u$. This OCSP was introduced by Opatrny [[Opa79](#)], who showed that even deciding whether $\text{ordval}_\Phi = 1$ is **NP**-hard. Max-Btw ’s **NP**-hardness of approximation has been studied in [[CS98](#); [AMW15](#)]; the latter work shows that $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximating Max-Btw is **NP**-hard for every $\epsilon > 0$.

[§]Like in the standard CSP case, an instance Φ of MAS corresponds to a directed constraint graph $G(\Psi)$, where each constraint (u, v) corresponds to a directed edge. Any ordering $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ induces an acyclic subgraph of $G(\Psi)$ consisting of all the *forward* edges with respect to σ , i.e., those such that $\sigma_u < \sigma_v$. Thus, val_Ψ corresponds to measuring the size of the largest acyclic subgraph in $G(\Psi)$, justifying the name “maximum acyclic subgraph”.

[¶]Also, in the classical setting, depth-first search can be used to decide whether $\text{val}_\Psi = 1$, i.e., to test whether $G(\Psi)$ is *acyclic*. In the streaming setting, however, acyclicity testing is known to take $\Theta(n^2)$ space [[CGMV20](#)].

However, in another analogy with the CSP case, for every $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, defining $\rho(\Pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{\pi \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathfrak{S}_k}}[\Pi(\pi)]$, every instance of $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$ has value at least $\rho(\Pi)$, and thus every $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$ is trivially $\rho(\Pi)$ -approximable. Again, we consider, for various predicates Π and classes of algorithms \mathcal{S} , whether $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$ is *approximation-resistant* (for every $\epsilon > 0$, no algorithm in \mathcal{S} can $(\rho(\Pi) + \epsilon)$ -approximate $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$) or *nontrivially approximable* (there is some $(\rho(\Pi) + \epsilon)$ -approximation). Note that $\rho(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho(\Pi_{\text{Btwn}}) = \frac{1}{3}$; thus, the results of [AMW15; BK19] are not strong enough to show that it is **NP**-hard to nontrivially approximate **MAS** or **Max-Btwn**. However, Guruswami, Håstad, Manokaran, Raghavendra, and Charikar [GHM⁺11] showed that it is *unique games*-hard to $(\rho(\Pi) + \epsilon)$ -approximate $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$, for every $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

The result of our work [SSV21] is that $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$ is also approximation-resistant in the streaming setting, even to *linear-space* algorithms:

Theorem 6.1 ([SSV21]). *For every $k \leq 2 \in \mathbb{N}$, predicate $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that every streaming algorithm which $(\rho(\Pi) + \epsilon)$ -approximates $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$ uses at least τn space.*

The space bound in this theorem is optimal up to logarithmic factors; indeed, just as in the case of CSPs, $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximations are possible for every $\epsilon > 0$ in $\tilde{O}(n)$ space (see [Remark 3.19](#) above)!

In the next section, we begin by giving some intuition for this theorem, and highlighting surprising similarities with the classical proof of [GHM⁺11].

6.2 PROOF OUTLINE FOR MAS

The following observation is due to Guruswami *et al.* [GHM⁺11]. Since $\mathfrak{S}_n \subseteq [n]^n$, we can view **MAS** as a CSP over the alphabet $[n]$, with predicate $f_{\text{MAS}} : [n]^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ given by $f_{\text{MAS}}(b_1, b_2) = \mathbb{1}_{b_1 < b_2}$. The hope is then to analyze this predicate using machinery for CSPs. Unfortunately, this predicate does not actually define a CSP, since the alphabet size n is non-constant. We can, however, attempt to salvage this strategy by decreasing the alphabet size to a large constant and “seeing what happens”. To be precise, for $q \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\iota_q : \mathbb{Z}_q \rightarrow [q]$ denote the map taking elements of \mathbb{Z}_q to their representatives in $\{1, \dots, q\}$.

We define the predicate $\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q} : \mathbb{Z}_q^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by $\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}(b_1, b_2) = \mathbb{1}_{\iota_q(b_1) < \iota_q(b_2)}$,[‡] and consider the problem $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$.

In the previous section, we observed that MAS can be interpreted as a scheduling problem in which a constraint (u, v) is satisfied iff u 's position is earlier than v 's position. Under this view, $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$ is a “batched” scheduling problem, where the goal is to assign n tasks to $q = O(1)$ batches, and a constraint (u, v) is satisfied iff u 's batch is earlier than v 's batch. Thus, $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$ is a *coarser* version of MAS , because in MAS we have flexibility in assigning execution orders even *within* the same batch.

To make this precise, for every instance Φ of MAS and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Phi^{\downarrow q}$ denote the instance of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$ with the exact same list of constraints. Conversely, given an instance Ψ of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$, let Ψ^\uparrow denote the instance of MAS with the same list of constraints. The operations $\downarrow q$ (*q-coarsening*) and \uparrow (*refinement*) are inverses. Also, for an assignment $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ to $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}_q$, let $\mathbf{x}^{-1}(b) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in [n] : x_i = b\}$. (If \mathbf{x} is a batched schedule, then $\mathbf{x}^{-1}(b)$ is the set of jobs in batch b .) Then we have the following:

Claim 6.2. *For every $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and instance Ψ of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$,*

$$\text{val}_\Psi \leq \text{ordval}_{\Psi^\uparrow}.$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$, let $s_b = |\mathbf{x}^{-1}(b)|$ for each $b \in \mathbb{Z}_q$. We construct an ordering $\mathbf{x}^\uparrow \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ by assigning $\mathbf{x}^{-1}(1)$ the first s_0 positions (in some arbitrary order), and then iteratively assigning $\mathbf{x}^{-1}(b)$ the next s_b positions for $b \in \{2, \dots, q\}$. Then if $\iota_q(x_u) < \iota_q(x_v)$, $\mathbf{x}_u^\uparrow < \mathbf{x}_v^\uparrow$ by construction. Thus, $\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}) \leq \text{ordval}_{\Psi^\uparrow}(\mathbf{x}^\uparrow)$, and [Claim 6.2](#) follows. \square

Now how can this notion of coarsening help us prove that MAS is streaming approximation-resistant? Recall the linear-space streaming lower bounds of Chou *et al.* [[CGS⁺22](#)] which rule out $(\omega(\mathcal{F})/\rho(\mathcal{F}) + \epsilon)$ -approximations for $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ (see [Corollary 5.14](#) and the definitions in [§5.2](#) above). Fix a large constant $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the trivial approximation threshold

[‡]Note that the comparison operator is not *a priori* defined for \mathbb{Z}_q , only for \mathbb{Z} . Under the convention we just picked, $\iota(0) = q$, and in particular, $\iota(0) > \iota(1)$. This choice is for intercompatibility with the notation $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and can be safely ignored.

for $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$ is

$$\rho(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}) = \Pr_{(b_1, b_2) \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q^2}} [\iota_q(b_1) < \iota_q(b_2)] = \frac{q(q-1)}{2q^2} \approx \frac{1}{2}.$$

On the other hand, for $\mathbf{b} = (1, 2) \in \mathbb{Z}_q^2$, we have

$$\omega_{\mathbf{b}}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}) = \Pr_{c \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q}} [\iota_q(c) < \iota_q(c+1)] = \frac{q-1}{q} \approx 1,$$

since the only way that $\iota_q(c) \not< \iota_q(c+1)$ is if $c = 0$. Thus, $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$ is almost approximation-resistant to linear-space streaming algorithms! Indeed, [Theorem 5.11](#), [Construction 5.12](#), and [Lemma 5.13](#) together give us a pair of distributions \mathcal{Y}' and \mathcal{N}' over instances of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q})$ which (1) require $\Omega(n)$ space to distinguish and (2) have values close to $\omega_{\mathbf{b}}(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}) \approx 1$ and $\rho(\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}) \approx \frac{1}{2}$, respectively, with high probability.

Now to get back to MAS, [Claim 6.2](#) shows that for $\Psi \sim \mathcal{Y}'$, $\text{ordval}_{\Psi \uparrow} \geq \text{val}_{\Psi}$, and thus $\text{ordval}_{\Psi \uparrow} \approx 1$ with high probability. To show that MAS is approximation-resistant, therefore, it suffices to show that for $\Psi \sim \mathcal{N}'$, $\text{ordval}_{\Psi \uparrow} \approx \frac{1}{2}$ — i.e., the inequality in [Claim 6.2](#) is not too loose — with high probability. To do this, we need to actually look at the structure of \mathcal{N}' . Recall, \mathcal{N}' is defined by composing [Construction 5.12](#) with the **No**-distribution of $\text{siRSD}_{T, \alpha}$.** We make the following (informal) claim:

Claim 6.3. *For fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large choice of q ,*

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim \mathcal{N}'} [\text{ordval}_{\Psi \uparrow} > \text{val}_{\Psi} + \epsilon] \leq \exp(-n).$$

[Claim 6.3](#) is sufficient to complete the proof, since we know that $\text{val}_{\Psi} \approx \frac{1}{2}$ with high probability over $\Psi \sim \mathcal{N}'$. [Claim 6.3](#) is stated and proven formally for general OCSPs below as [Lemma 6.7](#), but for now, we give a proof sketch. For any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, define an assignment $\sigma^{\downarrow q} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ by $\sigma_i^{\downarrow q} = \lceil q\sigma_i/n \rceil$. In the scheduling interpretation, $\sigma^{\downarrow q}$'s first batch contains the first $\approx n/q$ tasks scheduled by σ , the second batch the next $\approx n/q$, etc. Then we have:

A natural idea, following the **No-case analysis for e.g. Max-Cut (see [§3.1](#)), is to show using concentration bounds that for every fixed ordering $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, $\Pr_{\Psi \sim \mathcal{N}'} [\text{ordval}_{\Psi \uparrow}(\sigma) > \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon] \leq \exp(-n)$, and then take a union bound over σ . However, $|\mathfrak{S}_n| = n!$ grows faster than $\exp(n)$, so the union bound fails.

Proof sketch of Claim 6.3. It suffices to show that with probability $1 - \exp(-n)$ over the choice of Ψ , for every $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, $\text{ordval}_{\Psi^\uparrow} < \text{val}_\Psi + \epsilon$. A constraint (u, v) is satisfied by σ (in Ψ^\uparrow) but not by $\sigma^{\downarrow q}$ (in Ψ) iff $\sigma_u < \sigma_v$ but $\sigma_u^{\downarrow q} = \sigma_v^{\downarrow q}$. Thus, it suffices to upper-bound, for every partition of $[n]$ into subsets of size $\leq q$, the fraction of constraints for which both variables are in the same subset.

Looking at the definition of siRSD (Definition 5.10) and the reduction which produces \mathcal{N}' (Construction 5.12), we see that the constraints of a Max-CSP($\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}$) instances drawn from \mathcal{N}' correspond to a random graph in a particular model: we sample a union of random matchings and then subsample each edge independently with probability q^{-1} . This graph is, with high probability, a “small set expander” in the following sense: For every subset $S \subseteq [n]$ of size at most q , at most $O(q^{-2})$ fraction of the edges lie entirely within S . (This fact can be proven using concentration inequalities, although the subsampling makes the calculations a bit messy — just like in the analysis of Max-Cut (see §3.1).) This small set expansion implies another property, which we’ll call “balanced partition expansion”: In any partition of $[n]$ into subsets S_1, \dots, S_t of size at most q , at most $O(q^{-1})$ fraction of the edges do not cross between two distinct subsets. Thus, setting $q = \Omega(\epsilon^{-1})$ gives the desired bound. \square

We formalize exactly what we mean by small set expansion and balanced partition expansion (including for hypergraphs) below; see §6.4.

In summary, we can show that MAS is streaming approximation-resistant by (1) defining an appropriate predicate $\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}$ over \mathbb{Z}_q which is “coarser” than MAS (in the sense of Claim 6.2), (2) showing the corresponding problem Max-CSP($\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}$) is almost approximation-resistant using pre-existing tools for CSPs (i.e., the results of [CGS+22]), and (3) ensuring that the values of the **No** instances for Max-CSP($\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}$) do not increase “too much” when refined into instances of MAS (Claim 6.3).^{††} In the next subsection, we carry out this proof formally and generalize it to OCSPs.

^{††}The same “coarsening” construction arises in the classical UG-hardness proof of Guruswami *et al.* [GHM+11], but its usage is significantly more sophisticated. In particular, the [GHM+11] proof follows the typical UG-hardness paradigm which constructs so-called *dictatorship tests* using the predicate at hand (in this case, MAS); the construction and soundness analysis of these tests is based on Raghavendra’s CSP dichotomy theorem [Rag08] applied to the coarsened CSP Max-CSP($\Pi_{\text{MAS}}^{\downarrow q}$). For an introduction to this approach to classical UG-hardness, see the surveys of Khot [Kho10] and Trevisan [Tre12] as well as [O’D14, §7 and §11.7].

6.3 LINEAR-SPACE APPROXIMATION RESISTANCE OF ALL OCSPs: PROVING [THEOREM 6.1](#)

The goal of this section is to prove [Theorem 6.1](#), which states that every OCSP is approximation-resistant to linear-space streaming algorithms. We begin by generalizing the definitions of “coarsening” and “refinement” from the previous subsection to all OCSPs. Consider an arbitrary ordering predicate $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and an alphabet size $q \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the coarse predicate $\Pi^{\downarrow q} : \mathbb{Z}_q^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by $\Pi^{\downarrow q}(a_1, \dots, a_k) = \Pi(\mathbf{ord}(\iota_q(a_1), \dots, \iota_q(a_k)))$.^{‡‡} For every instance Φ of $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\Phi^{\downarrow q}$ denote the instance of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ with the same constraints, and given an instance Ψ of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$, we let Ψ^\uparrow denote the instance of MAS with the same constraints. Then we have the following analogue of [Claim 6.2](#):

Lemma 6.4. *For every $k, q \leq 2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, and instance Ψ of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$,*

$$\text{val}_\Psi \leq \text{ordval}_{\Psi^\uparrow}.$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$, we construct $\mathbf{x}^\uparrow \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ as in the proof of [Claim 6.2](#), which has the “monotonicity” property that $\iota_q(x_u) < \iota_q(x_v) \implies x_u^\uparrow < x_v^\uparrow$. Consider some constraint $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k)$. If \mathbf{x} satisfies \mathbf{j} (as a $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ constraint), then $\Pi(\mathbf{ord}(\iota_q(x_{j_1}), \dots, \iota_q(x_{j_k}))) = 1$. By monotonicity, $\mathbf{ord}(\iota_q(x_{j_1}), \dots, \iota_q(x_{j_k})) = \mathbf{x}^\uparrow|_{\mathbf{j}}$, and so \mathbf{x}^\uparrow satisfies \mathbf{j} (as a $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$ constraint). Thus, $\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}) \leq \text{ordval}_{\Psi^\uparrow}(\mathbf{x}^\uparrow)$. \square

Now, we “import” the linear-space hardness results of [[CGS⁺22](#)] we need from [§5.2](#). Specifically, for $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and $k \leq q \in \mathbb{N}$, we define a hard pair of distributions over $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ instances which, under refinement (\uparrow), will become hard instances for $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$. Fix $\mathbf{b} \in \text{supp}(\Pi)$, and let R_1, \dots, R_T denote the reduction functions from [Construction 5.12](#) (using \mathbf{b} and $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$). For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $T, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(k, q)\text{-}\mathcal{Y}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ and $(k, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ denote the **Yes** and **No** distributions for $(k, q)\text{-siRSD}_{\alpha, T}(n)$, respectively. Then we let $(\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q)\text{-}\mathcal{Y}'_{\alpha, T}(n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (R_1, \dots, R_T) \circ (k, q)\text{-}\mathcal{Y}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ and $(\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha, T}(n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (R_1, \dots, R_T) \circ (k, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}_{\alpha, T}(n)$. These are distributions over $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ instances, which are indistinguishable to linear-space algorithms ([Corollary 5.14](#)), and which have values close to $\omega_{\mathbf{b}}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ and $\rho(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ with high probability for large enough T and n , respectively ([Lemma 5.13](#)).

^{‡‡} $\Pi^{\downarrow q}(a_1, \dots, a_k) = 0$ in the case $\mathbf{ord}(\iota_q(a_1), \dots, \iota_q(a_k)) = \perp$, i.e., a_1, \dots, a_k are not all distinct.

Now we have

$$\omega_{\mathbf{b}}(\Pi^{\downarrow q}) \geq 1 - \frac{k-1}{q} \quad (6.5)$$

since by definition $\omega_{\mathbf{b}}(\Pi^{\downarrow q}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c} \sim \mathcal{C}}[\Pi^{\downarrow q}(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c})]$ (see [Eq. \(5.9\)](#)), $\Pi^{\downarrow q}(\mathbf{ord}(\mathbf{b})) = 1$ by definition, and $\mathbf{ord}(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) = \mathbf{ord}(\mathbf{b})$ unless $c \geq q - (k-1)$ (where $\mathbf{c} = (c, \dots, c)$). On the other hand,

$$\rho(\Pi^{\downarrow q}) = \frac{q!}{(q-k)!q^k} \rho(\Pi) \leq \rho(\Pi), \quad (6.6)$$

since by definition $\rho(\Pi^{\downarrow q}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q^k}}[\Pi^{\downarrow q}(\mathbf{a})]$; $\mathbf{ord}(\mathbf{a}) \neq \perp$ (i.e., \mathbf{a} 's entries are all distinct) with probability $\frac{q \cdots (q-(k-1))}{q^k} = \frac{q!}{(q-k)!q^k} \leq 1$, and if \mathbf{a} 's entries are all distinct, it satisfies $\Pi^{\downarrow q}$ with probability $\rho(\Pi)$. We also claim the following lemma, which generalizes [Claim 6.3](#):

Lemma 6.7. *For every $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \text{supp}(\Pi)$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that for all $q \geq q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$, there exists $T_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $T \geq T_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim (\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha, T}(n)}[\text{ordval}_{\Psi^\uparrow} \geq \text{val}_{\Psi} + \epsilon] \leq \exp(-n).$$

Modulo the proof of [Lemma 6.7](#), we can now prove [Theorem 6.1](#):

Proof of [Theorem 6.1](#). Let $\epsilon' = \epsilon/4$. Pick $q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that [Lemma 6.7](#) holds with error probability ϵ' , and let $q = \max\{q_0, (k-1)/\epsilon'\}$. Now let α be the smaller of the α_0 's from [Corollary 5.14](#) and [Lemma 6.7](#), and let T be the larger of the T_0 's from [Lemmas 6.7](#) and [5.13](#) applied with error probabilities ϵ' . Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the larger of the n_0 's from [Corollary 5.14](#) and [Lemma 5.13](#).

Now fix $\mathbf{b} \in \text{supp}(\Pi)$. For $n \geq n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathcal{Y}^\uparrow and \mathcal{N}^\uparrow denote the distributions of Max-OCSP(Π) instances Ψ^\uparrow where $\Psi \sim (\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q)\text{-}\mathcal{Y}'_{\alpha, T}(n)$ and $(\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha, T}(n)$, respectively. By [Corollary 5.14](#), distinguishing \mathcal{Y}^\uparrow and \mathcal{N}^\uparrow requires space τn for some $\tau > 0$. On the other hand, by [Lemmas 6.4](#) and [5.13](#) and [Eq. \(6.5\)](#),

$$\Pr_{\Phi \sim \mathcal{Y}^\uparrow}[\text{ordval}_{\Phi} \leq 1 - \epsilon/2] \leq \exp(-n),$$

while by [Lemmas 6.7](#) and [5.13](#) and [Eq. \(6.6\)](#),

$$\Pr_{\Phi \sim \mathcal{N}^\uparrow} [\text{ordval}_\Phi \geq \rho(\Pi) + \epsilon/2] \leq \exp(-n).$$

Thus, $(\rho(\Pi) + \epsilon)$ -approximating $\text{Max-OCSP}(\Pi)$ requires at least τn space, as desired (see [Proposition 2.8](#)). \square

It remains to prove [Lemma 6.7](#); we do so in the final section.

6.4 THE COARSENING ANALYSIS: PROVING [LEMMA 6.7](#)

The goal of this section is to prove [Lemma 6.7](#). We do so by carrying out the plan based on “balanced partition expanders”, as described in the proof sketch for [Claim 6.3](#).

Given an instance Ψ of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ on n variables and a subset $S \subseteq [n]$, we denote by $N(\Psi, S)$ the number of constraints $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k)$ in Ψ which “touch S twice”, i.e., such that $j_i, j_{i'} \in S$ for some $i \neq i'$.

Definition 6.8 (Small set expansion (SSE)). *Let Ψ be an instance of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ on n variables and m constraints. For $\gamma, \epsilon \in (0, 1)$, Ψ is a (γ, ϵ) -small set expander (SSE) if for every subset $S \subseteq [n]$ of size at most γn , $N(\Psi, S) \leq \epsilon m$.*

Definition 6.9 (Balanced partition expansion (BPE)). *Let Ψ be an instance of $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ on n variables and m constraints. For $\gamma, \epsilon \in (0, 1)$, Ψ is a (γ, ϵ) -balanced partition expander (BPE) if for every $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ where each block $\mathbf{b}^{-1}(a)$ has size at most γn ,*

$$\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_q} N(\Psi, \mathbf{b}^{-1}(a)) \leq \epsilon m.$$

Now we give several lemmas which connect these notions to the \mathbf{No} -distribution \mathcal{N}' of the previous subsection:

Lemma 6.10. *Let $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \text{supp}(\Pi)$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\gamma > 0$. There exists $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$, there exists $T_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $T \geq T_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim (\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha, T}(n)} [\Psi \text{ is not a } (\gamma, 8k^2\gamma^2)\text{-SSE}] \leq \exp(-n).$$

We defer the proof of [Lemma 6.10](#) until the end of this subsection, as it involves some somewhat messy concentration bounds.

Lemma 6.11 (Good SSEs are good BPEs). *For every $\gamma, \epsilon \in (0, 1)$, if Ψ is a (γ, ϵ) -SSE, then it is a $(\gamma, 3\gamma/\epsilon)$ -BPE.*

Proof. Consider any $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ of $[n]$ where each block $\mathbf{b}^{-1}(a)$ has size at most γn . Firstly, note that if two blocks have sizes $|\mathbf{b}^{-1}(a)|, |\mathbf{b}^{-1}(a')|$ both smaller than $\frac{\gamma n}{2}$, we can reassign $\mathbf{b}^{-1}(a')$ to a , since this only increases the sum $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_q} N(\Psi, \mathbf{b}^{-1}(a))$ and every block still has size at most γn . Thus, we can assume WLOG that \mathbf{b} consists of empty blocks, a single block of size at most $\frac{\gamma n}{2}$, and blocks of size between $\frac{\gamma n}{2}$ and γn . The number of non-empty blocks is at most $\frac{n}{\lceil \gamma n/2 \rceil} + 1 \leq 3\gamma$, and each such block has $N(\Psi, \mathbf{b}^{-1}(a)) \leq \epsilon m$ by the SSE assumption. \square

Lemma 6.12 (Refining roughly preserves value in BPEs). *Let $\Pi : \mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. If Ψ is a $\text{Max-CSP}(\Pi^{\downarrow q})$ instance which is a $(1/q, \epsilon)$ -BPE, then*

$$\text{ordval}_{\Psi^\uparrow} \leq \text{val}_\Psi + \epsilon.$$

Proof. Let n and m denote the number of variables and constraints in Ψ , respectively. Consider any ordering $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, and, as in the proof sketch of [Claim 6.3](#), let $\sigma^{\downarrow q} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$ be defined by $\sigma_i^{\downarrow q} = \lceil q\sigma_i/n \rceil$. It suffices to show that $\text{ordval}_{\Psi^\uparrow}(\sigma) \leq \text{val}_\Psi(\sigma^{\downarrow q}) + \epsilon$. $\sigma^{\downarrow q}$ has the ‘‘monotonicity’’ property that for every $u, v \in [n]$, if $\sigma_u < \sigma_v$ then $\sigma_u^{\downarrow q} \leq \sigma_v^{\downarrow q}$, and each block $(\sigma^{\downarrow q})^{-1}(a)$ has size at most $\frac{n}{q}$.

Suppose a constraint $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k)$ is satisfied by σ (in Ψ^\uparrow). If $\sigma_{j_1}^{\downarrow q}, \dots, \sigma_{j_k}^{\downarrow q}$ are all distinct, then by monotonicity $\text{ord}(\sigma^{\downarrow q}|_{\mathbf{j}}) = \sigma|_{\mathbf{j}}$ and so \mathbf{j} is satisfied by $\sigma^{\downarrow q}$ (in Ψ). Thus, it suffices to show that at most ϵm constraints \mathbf{j} have the property that $\sigma_{j_1}^{\downarrow q}, \dots, \sigma_{j_k}^{\downarrow q}$ are not all distinct; this is precisely the BPE property of Ψ . \square

Modulo the proof of [Lemma 6.10](#), we can now prove [Lemma 6.7](#):

Proof of [Lemma 6.7](#). Let $q_0 = \lceil 24k^2/\epsilon \rceil$; consider $q \geq q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\gamma = 1/q$; let α_0 be as in [Lemma 6.10](#); for any $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$, let T_0 be as in [Lemma 6.10](#); and consider any $T \geq T_0 \in \mathbb{N}$.

If Ψ is a $(\gamma, 8k^2\gamma^2)$ -SSE, then by [Lemma 6.11](#) it is a $(\gamma, 24k^2\gamma)$ -BPE, in which case by [Lemma 6.12](#) we have $\text{ordval}_{\Psi^\dagger} \leq \text{val}_\Psi + 24k^2\gamma$, and $24k^2\gamma \leq \epsilon$ by assumption. But by [Lemma 6.10](#), $\Psi \sim (\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha, T}(n)$ is a $(\gamma, 8k^2\gamma^2)$ -SSE except with probability $\exp(-n)$. \square

Finally, we prove [Lemma 6.7](#).

Proof of Lemma 6.7. Recall that we sample instances $\Psi \sim (\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}'_{\alpha, T}(n)$ by first sampling from the **No** distribution $(k, q)\text{-}\mathcal{N}_{\alpha, T}(n)$ of (k, q) -siRSD $_{\alpha, T}(n)$ (see [Definition 5.10](#)) and then applying the reduction functions R_1, \dots, R_T from [Construction 5.12](#) with some fixed base vector $\mathbf{b} \in \text{supp}(\Pi)$.

For concreteness, we'll repeat the definitions for this case here. For each $t \in [T]$, we get an instance Ψ_t (produced by **Bob**_{*t*}):

1. Sample a matching $M_t \sim \mathcal{M}_{k, \alpha}(n)$ and a vector $\mathbf{z}(t) \sim (\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q}^k)^{\alpha n}$, which we think of as consisting of αn independently sampled blocks $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell) \sim \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}_q}^k$.
2. Including the ℓ -th hyperedge $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell) = (e(t, \ell)_1, \dots, e(t, \ell)_k)$ of M_t as a constraint in Ψ_t iff $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell) - \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}$ where $\mathcal{C} = \{(c, \dots, c) : c \in \mathbb{Z}_q\}$.

and then $\Psi = \Psi_1 \cup \dots \cup \Psi_T$. Since $\mathbf{z}(t, \ell)$ is a uniform vector in \mathbb{Z}_q^k and \mathcal{C} is a one-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{Z}_q^k , each hyperedge of M_t is included in Ψ_t independently w.p. $q^{-(k-1)}$.

Let m_t denote the number of constraints in Ψ_t for each t , and $m = \sum_{t=1}^T m_t$ the number of constraints in Π . Therefore, each m_t is distributed as the sum of αn independent $\mathcal{B}(q^{-(k-1)})$ random variables. Now, consider the event that $m \geq \alpha T n / (2q^{k-1})$. Since m is distributed as the sum of $\alpha T n$ independent $\mathcal{B}(q^{-(k-1)})$'s, by the Chernoff bound, this event fails to occur with probability at most $\exp(-\alpha T n / (8q^{k-1}))$, which is $\exp(-n)$ for sufficiently large T_0 . Thus, it suffices to prove the lemma conditioned on fixed m_1, \dots, m_T satisfying $m \geq \alpha T n / (2q^{k-1})$. With this conditioning, each sub-instance Ψ_t is the result of a simpler sampling process: the constraints are the hyperedges of a hypermatching drawn from $\mathcal{M}_{k, m/n}(n)$.

Now fix any set $S \subseteq [n]$ of size at most γn . (We will later take a union bound over all S .) Label the hyperedges of each M_t as $\mathbf{e}(t, 1), \dots, \mathbf{e}(t, m_t)$. Consider the collection of m

random variables $\{X_{t,\ell}\}_{t \in [T], \ell \in [m_t]}$, each of which is the indicator for the event that two distinct vertices of $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)$ are in S . By definition, $N(\Psi, S) = \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_t} X_{t,\ell}$.

For fixed $t \in [T]$, we first bound $\mathbb{E}[X_{t,\ell} \mid X_{t,1}, \dots, X_{t,\ell-1}]$ for each $\ell \in [m_t]$. Conditioned on $\mathbf{e}(t, 1), \dots, \mathbf{e}(t, \ell-1)$ incident to some subset $V_{t,\ell} \subseteq [n]$ of $k(\ell-1)$ vertices, the hyperedge $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)$ is uniformly distributed over $[n] \setminus V_{t,\ell}$. It suffices to union-bound, over distinct pairs $\{j_1, j_2\} \in \binom{[k]}{2}$, the probability that the j_1 -st and j_2 -nd vertices of $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)$ are in S (conditioned on $X_{t,0}, \dots, X_{t,\ell-1}$). We can sample the j_1 -st and j_2 -nd vertices of $\mathbf{e}(t, \ell)$ first, and then ignore the remaining vertices. Setting $\alpha_0 = 1/(2k)$, we have the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_{t,\ell} \mid X_{t,1}, \dots, X_{t,\ell-1}] &\leq \binom{k}{2} \cdot \frac{|S|(|S| - 1)}{(n - k(\ell - 1))(n - k(\ell - 1) - 1)} \\ &\leq \binom{k}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{|S|}{n - k(\ell - 1)} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \binom{k}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{|S|}{n - km_t} \right)^2 \\ &\leq 4k^2\gamma^2, \end{aligned}$$

since $m_t \leq \alpha n \leq n/(2k)$.

Now $X_{t,\ell}$ is independent of $X_{t',\ell'}$ if $t \neq t'$ since M_t and $M_{t'}$ are independent. Thus, [Lemma 2.5](#) implies that

$$\Pr_{\Psi \sim (\Pi, \mathbf{b}, q) - \mathcal{N}'_{\alpha, T}(n)} [N(\Psi, S) \geq 8k^2\gamma^2 m \mid m_1, \dots, m_T] \leq \exp(-2k^2\gamma^2 m).$$

Finally, we use the inequality $m \geq \alpha Tn/(2k^2)$, take the union bound over $S \subseteq [n]$, and set T_0 large enough to ensure that $2^n \exp(-\gamma^2 \alpha Tn) \leq \exp(-n)$. \square

7

Symmetric Boolean predicates

In our algorithm [for Max- k AND], we use the approach of Hast [Has05]: We first obtain a “preliminary” solution $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ and then independently flip the values of z_i using a slightly biased distribution (i.e., we keep the old value of z_i with probability slightly larger than $1/2$).

Charikar, Makarychev, and Makarychev [CMM09]

MAX- k AND IS THE SIMPLEST k -ARY BOOLEAN CSP which is nontrivially approximable, and is also, in some sense, the easiest to approximate (see Remark 7.9 below). In this chapter, we present our joint work with Boyland, Hwang, Prasad, and Velusamy [BHP⁺22] which studies several questions regarding the results of [CGSV21a; CGS⁺22] (Chapter 5 above) for Max- k AND and other Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ problems:

1. Can the dichotomy theorem in [CGSV21a] (i.e., Theorem 5.2) be used to find closed-form sketching approximability ratios $\alpha(f)$ for nontrivially approximable problems Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ beyond Max-2AND (Example 5.5)? We note that to the best of our knowledge, in the classical setting Raghavendra’s UG-dichotomy theorem [Rag08]

has never been used for this purpose, but we may have more “hope” for using [CGSV21a]’s dichotomy since it is at least decidable (see the beginning of §5.1.2 above).

2. [CGS+22] shows that for every predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, $(2\rho(f) + \epsilon)$ -approximating $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ with a streaming algorithm requires $\Omega(n)$ space (Corollary 5.15). How tight is this upper bound on the approximation ratio?
3. Does the streaming lower bound in [CGSV21a] based on padded one-wise pairs (Theorem 5.4) suffice to resolve the streaming approximability of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ for every predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$?
4. For every predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, [CGSV21a] gives an optimal sketching $(\alpha(f) - \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ in [CGSV21a], but this algorithm runs a “grid” of $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ distinguishers for (β, γ) - $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ distinguishing problems in parallel (see Corollary 5.3 and its proof sketch). Can we obtain simpler optimal sketching approximations for interesting predicates?

Specifically, we investigate the sketching (and streaming) approximability of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ when $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a *symmetric* predicate; that is, f depends only on the Hamming weight (a.k.a. number of 1’s) $\|\mathbf{b}\|_0$ of its input $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$. For a set $S \subseteq [k]$, let $f_{S,k} : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ denote the symmetric predicate defined by $f_{S,k}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbb{1}_{\|\mathbf{b}\|_0 \in S}$. Some well-studied examples of predicates in this class include $k\text{AND} = f_{\{k\},k}$ and the *threshold functions* $\text{Th}_k^t = f_{\{t,t+1,\dots,k\},k}$. As we’ll see in §7.2 below, we consider symmetric predicates because for such predicates, the [CGSV21a] results (specifically Corollary 5.3 and Theorem 5.4) take on significantly simpler forms.

We use computer assistance for algebraic manipulations in several of the proofs in this chapter; our code is available on the Mathematica Notebook Archive at <https://notebookarchive.org/2022-03-a5vpzhg>.

7.1 RESULTS

We begin by presenting the major results of our work [BHP+22].

7.1.1 THE SKETCHING APPROXIMABILITY OF MAX- k AND

Recall from [Example 5.5](#) that the \sqrt{n} -space sketching approximability of Max-2AND is $\alpha(2\text{AND}) = \frac{4}{9}$, and $(\frac{4}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximations can be ruled out even for \sqrt{n} -space *streaming* algorithms using the padded one-wise pair criterion ([Theorem 5.4](#)). We build on this result by obtaining closed-form expressions for the \sqrt{n} -space sketching approximation ratio $\alpha(k\text{AND})$ for every k . For odd $k \geq 3$, define the constant

$$\alpha'_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\frac{(k-1)(k+1)}{4k^2} \right)^{(k-1)/2} = 2^{-(k-1)} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{k^2} \right)^{(k-1)/2}. \quad (7.1)$$

Then in [§7.5.1](#), we prove the following:

Theorem 7.2. *For odd $k \geq 3$, $\alpha(k\text{AND}) = \alpha'_k$, and for even $k \geq 2$, $\alpha(k\text{AND}) = 2\alpha'_{k+1}$.*

For instance, $\alpha(3\text{AND}) = \alpha'_3 = \frac{2}{9}$. Since $\rho(k\text{AND}) = 2^{-k}$, [Theorem 7.2](#) also has the following important corollary:

Corollary 7.3. $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha(k\text{AND})}{2\rho(k\text{AND})} = 1$.

Recall that Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, Velusamy, and Velingker [[CGS⁺22](#)] show that any predicate f cannot be $(2\rho(f) + \epsilon)$ -approximated even by linear-space streaming algorithms (see [Corollary 5.15](#)). On the other hand, in [§7.1.3](#) below, we describe simple $O(\log n)$ -space sketching algorithms for Max- k AND achieving the optimal ratio from [[CGSV21a](#)]. Thus, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, these algorithms achieve an asymptotically optimal approximation ratio even among linear-space streaming algorithms!

7.1.2 THE SKETCHING APPROXIMABILITY OF OTHER SYMMETRIC PREDICATES

We also analyze the sketching approximability of a number of other symmetric Boolean predicates. For instance, we show that:

Theorem 7.4. *For even $k \geq 2$, $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^{k-1}) = \frac{k}{2}\alpha'_{k-1}$.*

We prove [Theorem 7.4](#) in [§7.5.2](#) using techniques similar to our proof of [Theorem 7.2](#). We also provide partial results for $f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}$, including closed forms for small k and an asymptotic analysis of $\alpha(f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k})$:

Theorem 7.5 (Informal version of [Theorem 7.38](#)). *For odd $k \in \{3, \dots, 51\}$, there is an explicit expression for $\alpha(f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k})$ as a function of k .*

Theorem 7.6. $\lim_{\text{odd } k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha(f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k})}{\rho(f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k})} = 1.$

We prove [Theorems 7.5](#) and [7.6](#) in [§7.5.3](#). Finally, in [§7.5.4](#), we explicitly resolve fifteen other cases (e.g., $f_{\{2,3\},3}$ and $f_{\{4\},5}$) not covered by [Theorems 7.2](#), [7.4](#) and [7.5](#).

7.1.3 SIMPLE APPROXIMATION ALGORITHMS FOR THRESHOLD FUNCTIONS

Recall from [§4.1](#) that [\[CGV20\]](#) gives optimal $(\frac{4}{9} - \epsilon)$ -approximation sketching algorithms for Max-2AND based on measuring a quantity $\text{bias}_\Psi \in [0, 1]$ of the input instance Ψ (see [Eq. \(4.3\)](#)) using 1-norm sketching algorithms [\[Ind06; KNW10\]](#). In [§7.6](#), we extend the definition of bias to arbitrary CSPs and give simple optimal bias-based approximation algorithms for threshold predicates:

Theorem 7.7. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}, i \leq k$. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a piecewise linear function $\gamma : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and a constant $\epsilon' > 0$ such that the following is a sketching $(\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) - \epsilon)$ -approximation for Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_k^t)$: On input Ψ , compute an estimate \widehat{b} for bias_Ψ up to a multiplicative $(1 \pm \epsilon')$ error and output $\gamma(\widehat{b})$.*

Our construction generalizes the algorithm in [\[CGV20\]](#) for 2AND to all threshold predicates, and is also a simplification, since the [\[CGV20\]](#) algorithm computes a more complicated function of \widehat{b} ; see [Remark 4.13](#).

For all CSPs whose approximability we resolve in this chapter, we apply an analytical technique which we term the “max-min method;” see the discussion in [§7.3.2](#) below. For such CSPs, our algorithm can be extended to solve the problem of outputting an approximately optimal *assignment*, instead of just an estimate for the value, following the example for Max-2AND we discussed at the end of [§4.1.2](#). Indeed, for this problem, we give a simple randomized streaming algorithm using $O(n)$ space and time:

Theorem 7.8 (Informal version of [Theorem 7.43](#)). *Let Th_k^t be a threshold predicate for which the max-min method applies, such as $k\text{AND}$, or Th_k^{k-1} (for even k). Then there exists a constant $p^* \in [0, 1]$ such that following algorithm, on input Ψ , outputs an assignment with expected value at least $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t)\text{val}_\Psi$: Assign variable i to 1 if $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) \geq 0$ and 0 otherwise, and then flip each variable’s assignment independently with probability p^* .*

In particular, it is not *a priori* implied by [CGSV21a; CGSV21b] that setting p^* to be a fixed constant is sufficient (and this was not noticed by [CGV20] in the 2AND case); we view this as an important contribution to the general understanding of sketching approximability of CSPs. Also, our algorithm can potentially be derandomized using universal hash families, as in Biswas and Raman’s recent derandomization [BR21] of the Max-2AND algorithm in [CGV20].

7.1.4 SKETCHING VS. STREAMING APPROXIMABILITY

Theorem 7.2 implies that $\alpha(3\text{AND}) = \frac{2}{9}$, and thus for every $\epsilon > 0$, Max-3AND can be $(\frac{2}{9} - \epsilon)$ -approximated by $O(\log n)$ -space linear sketching algorithms, but not $(\frac{2}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximated by \sqrt{n} -space sketching algorithms. We prove that the padded one-wise pair criterion of Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, and Velusamy [CGSV21a] (**Theorem 5.4**) is not sufficient to completely resolve the *streaming* approximability of Max-3AND, i.e., to show that \sqrt{n} -space *streaming* algorithms cannot $(\frac{2}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximate Max-3AND for every $\epsilon > 0$; however, it does show that \sqrt{n} -space streaming algorithms cannot 0.2362-approximate Max-3AND. We state these results formally in §7.3.3 below. Separately, **Theorem 7.4** implies that $\alpha(\text{Th}_4^3) = \frac{4}{9}$, and the padded one-wise pair criterion *can* be used to show that $(\frac{4}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximating $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_4^3)$ requires $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space in the streaming setting (see **Observation 7.34** below).

RELATED WORK

The classical approximability of Max- k AND has been the subject of intense study, both in terms of algorithms [GW95; FG95; Zwi98; Tre98a; TSSW00; Has04; Has05; CMM09] and hardness-of-approximation [Hås01; Tre98b; ST98; ST00; EH08; ST09], given its intimate connections to k -bit PCPs. Charikar, Makarychev, and Makarychev [CMM09] constructed an $\Omega(k2^{-k})$ -approximation to Max- k AND, while Samorodnitsky and Trevisan [ST09] showed that $k2^{-(k-1)}$ -approximations and $(k+1)2^{-k}$ -approximations are NP- and UG-hard, respectively.

Interestingly, recalling that $\alpha(k\text{AND}) \rightarrow 2\rho(k\text{AND}) = 2^{-(k-1)}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, in the large- k limit our simple randomized algorithm (given in **Theorem 7.8**) matches the performance of Trevisan’s [Tre98a] parallelizable LP-based algorithm for k AND, which (to the best of

our knowledge) was the first work on the general k AND problem! The subsequent works [Has04; Has05; CMM09] superseding [Tre98a] use more complex techniques involving semidefinite programming, but are structurally similar to our algorithm in [Theorem 7.8](#): They all involve “guessing” an assignment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ and then perturbing each bit with constant probability.

Remark 7.9. *Trevisan [Tre98a, Theorem 18] observes that for every predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $\alpha(f)/\rho(f) \leq \alpha(k\text{AND})/\rho(k\text{AND})$ (in the classical setting, but the proof carries over easily to the sketching setting). Thus, $\alpha(f)$ is “easiest to approximate” among all Boolean functions, relative to the threshold of nontrivial approximability. Intuitively, it holds because k AND is the most “informative” predicate: It exactly specifies what values its variables should be assigned to. More precisely, given any predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, let $t = |\text{supp}(f)|$. Given any instance Ψ of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$, we can create an instance Ψ' of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(k\text{AND})$ by replacing each constraint C in Ψ with t constraints in Ψ' corresponding to C 's t satisfying assignments; that is, $C = (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{j}, w)$ becomes $C_1 = (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a}(1) + \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{j}, w), \dots, C_t = (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a}(t) + \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{j}, w)$ where $\text{supp}(f) = \{\mathbf{a}(1), \dots, \mathbf{a}(t)\}$. Every assignment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ satisfies either one or zero of the constraints $\{C_1, \dots, C_t\}$, corresponding to whether it satisfies or fails to satisfy C , respectively. Thus, $\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}) = t \text{val}_{\Psi'}(\mathbf{x})$ for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$. The inequality then follows from the fact that $\rho(f)/\rho(k\text{AND}) = t$.*

Classical approximability for various classes of symmetric predicates has been studied in [CHIS12; ABM12; GL17].

7.2 SETUP FOR THE SYMMETRIC CASE

We begin by showing how the [CGSV21a] results (specifically, [Corollary 5.3](#) and [Theorem 5.4](#)) are significantly simpler to instantiate when the predicates are symmetric (as observed by [CGSV21a] in the 2AND case). Let $\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}, p), \gamma_S(\mathcal{D}_Y), \beta_S(\mathcal{D}_N)$ denote the λ, γ, β functions from [CGSV21a], respectively, for a symmetric predicate $f_{S,k}$ (see [Eq. \(5.1\)](#)).

We will show in [§7.4](#) below that $\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}, p)$ is in general a multivariate polynomial in p and $\mathcal{D}\langle 0 \rangle, \dots, \mathcal{D}\langle k \rangle$, which is degree- k and linear in $\mathcal{D}\langle t \rangle$.

A distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ is *symmetric* if strings of equal Hamming weight are equiprobable, i.e., $\|\mathbf{a}\|_0 = \|\mathbf{a}'\|_0 \implies \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}')$. Let $\Delta_k \subseteq \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ denote the space of

symmetric distributions over \mathbb{Z}_2^k . For a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ and $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$, let $\mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\|\mathbf{a}\|_0=i} \mathcal{D}(i)$ denote the total mass on strings of Hamming weight i . We can view symmetric distributions $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k$ as distributions over $[k] \cup \{0\}$ which take value i with probability $\mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle$. There is also a natural projection of $\Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ onto Δ_k given by the *symmetrization* operation: For a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$, we let $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D}) \in \Delta_k$ denote the unique *symmetric* distribution such that $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D})\langle i \rangle = \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle$ for all $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$. (In other words, symmetrization redistributes probability in \mathcal{D} over all strings of equal Hamming weight.) Finally, if $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k$ is symmetric, then we define $\mu(\mathcal{D}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{D}}[(-1)^{a_1+1}]$; $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D})$ is then the constant vector $(\mu(\mathcal{D}), \dots, \mu(\mathcal{D}))$.

The following proposition states that to use the tools from [CGSV21a] (i.e., [Theorems 5.2](#) and [5.4](#) and [Corollary 5.3](#)) for symmetric predicates $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, it suffices to examine only symmetric distributions:

- Proposition 7.10.** *i. For every symmetric predicate $f_{S,k} : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$, and $p \in [0, 1]$, $\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}, p) = \lambda_S(\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D}), p)$.*
- ii. For all $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ with matching marginals (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y)$), $\mu(\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D}_N)) = \mu(\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D}_Y))$.*
- iii. For all padded one-wise pairs $\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$, $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D}_N)$ and $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D}_Y)$ are also a padded one-wise pair.*

Proof. Omitted (follows immediately from definitions and linearity of expectation). □

In particular, together with [Corollary 5.3](#) we have:

Corollary 7.11. *For every symmetric predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$,*

$$\alpha(f) = \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta_k: \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_Y)} \left(\frac{\beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N)}{\gamma_f(\mathcal{D}_Y)} \right).$$

Then:

- i. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ and a $\tau \log n$ -space linear sketching algorithm which $(\alpha(f) - \epsilon)$ -approximates $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$.*

ii. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that every sketching algorithm which $(\alpha(f) + \epsilon)$ -approximates $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ uses at least $\tau\sqrt{n}$ space (for sufficiently large n).

Our focus on symmetric predicates f is motivated by the simpler form of [Corollary 7.11](#), in comparison with [Corollary 5.3](#) for general predicates. Since we need to consider only symmetric distributions in the infimum, \mathcal{D}_Y and \mathcal{D}_N are each parameterized by $k + 1$ variables (as opposed to 2^k variables), and there is a single linear equality constraint (as opposed to k constraints).

Next, we give an explicit formula for $\mu(\mathcal{D})$ for a symmetric distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k$. For $i \in [k]$, let $\epsilon_{i,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -1 + \frac{2i}{k}$.

Lemma 7.12. For any $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k$,

$$\mu(\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{i=0}^k \epsilon_{i,k} \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle.$$

Proof. Recall that we defined $\epsilon_{i,k} = -1 + \frac{2i}{k}$. By definition, $\mu(\mathcal{D}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}}[b_1]$. We use linearity of expectation; the contribution of weight- i vectors to $\mu(\mathcal{D})$ is $\mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle \cdot \frac{1}{k}(i \cdot 1 + (k - i) \cdot (-1)) = \epsilon_{i,k} \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle$. \square

Example 7.13. In [Example 5.6](#), we showed that if a predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ supports one-wise independence, i.e., there exists $\mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ supported on $\text{supp}(f)$ such that $\mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \mathbf{0}$, then $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ is approximation-resistant for \sqrt{n} -space streaming algorithms. [[CGSV21a](#), Lemma 2.14] shows that if $f = f_{S,k}$ is symmetric, this condition is also necessary for \sqrt{n} -space streaming approximation-resistance. By [Proposition 7.10](#), this condition is equivalent to the existence of a symmetric distribution $\mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta_k$ supported on S (in the sense that $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle = 0$ for all $s \notin S$) such that $\mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = 0$.

Now if k is even and $k/2 \in S$, then the distribution $\mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta_k$ with $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle k/2 \rangle = 1$ has $\mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = 0$ (by [Lemma 7.12](#)) and is supported on S ; thus, $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f_{S,k})$ is streaming approximation-resistant. Moreover, if S contains elements $s \leq k/2$ and $t \geq k/2$, we can let $\delta = \frac{\epsilon_{t,k}}{\epsilon_{t,k} - \epsilon_{s,k}}$ (note that $\epsilon_{t,k} > 0$ and $\epsilon_{s,k} < 0$), and let $\mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta_k$ be defined by $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle = \delta$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle = 1 - \delta$. Then again, $\mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = 0$ and \mathcal{D}_Y is supported on S , so $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f_{S,k})$ is streaming approximation-resistant.

Given [Example 7.13](#), in the remainder of this chapter we focus on the case where all elements of S are either larger than or smaller than $k/2$. Note also that if $S' = \{k - s : s \in S\}$, every instance of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f_{S,k})$ can be viewed as an instance of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f_{S',k})$ with the same value, since for any constraint $C = (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{j}, w)$ and assignment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, we have $f_{S,k}(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{x} |_{\mathbf{j}}) = f_{S',k}(\mathbf{b} + (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}) |_{\mathbf{j}})$. Thus, we further narrow our focus to the case where every element of S is larger than $k/2$.

7.3 TECHNIQUES

7.3.1 FORMULATIONS OF THE OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM

In order to show that $\alpha(2\text{AND}) = \frac{4}{9}$, Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, and Velusamy [[CGSV21a](#), Example 1] use the following reformulation of the optimization problem from [Corollary 5.3](#). For a symmetric predicate $f_{S,k}$ and $\mu \in [-1, 1]$, let

$$\beta_{S,k}(\mu) = \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k: \mu(\mathcal{D}_N) = \mu} \beta_S(\mathcal{D}_N) \text{ and } \gamma_{S,k}(\mu) = \sup_{\mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta_k: \mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \mu} \gamma_S(\mathcal{D}_Y); \quad (7.14)$$

then

$$\alpha(f_{S,k}) = \inf_{\mu \in [-1, 1]} \left(\frac{\beta_{S,k}(\mu)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu)} \right). \quad (7.15)$$

The optimization problem on the right-hand side of [Eq. \(7.15\)](#) appears simpler than that of [Corollary 5.3](#) because it is univariate, but there is a hidden difficulty: Finding an explicit solution requires giving explicit formulas for $\beta_{S,k}(\mu)$ and $\gamma_{S,k}(\mu)$. In the case of $2\text{AND} = f_{\{2\},2}$, Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, and Velusamy [[CGSV21a](#)] first show that $\gamma_{\{2\},2}(\mu)$ is a linear function in μ . Then, to find $\beta_{S,k}(\mu)$, they maximize the quadratic $\lambda_{\{2\}}(\mathcal{D}_N, p)$ over $p \in [0, 1]$ to find $\beta_{\{2\}}(\mathcal{D}_N)$ (see [Example 5.5](#)), and then optimize over \mathcal{D}_N such that $\mu(\mathcal{D}_N) = \mu$ to find $\beta_{\{2\},2}(\mu)$.

While we'll see in [§7.4](#) below that $\gamma_{S,k}(\mu)$ is piecewise linear in μ for all symmetric predicates $f_{S,k}$, we do not know how to find closed forms for $\beta_{S,k}(\mu)$ even for 3AND (though $\gamma_{S,k}(\mu)$ is in general a piecewise linear function of μ , see [Lemma 7.22](#) below). Thus, in this work we introduce a different formulation of the optimization problem:

$$\alpha(f_{S,k}) = \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k} \left(\frac{\beta_S(\mathcal{D}_N)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))} \right). \quad (7.16)$$

We view optimizing directly over $\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k$ as an important conceptual switch. In particular, our formulation emphasizes the calculation of $\beta_S(\mathcal{D}_N)$ as the centrally difficult feature, yet we can still take advantage of the relative simplicity of calculating $\gamma_{S,k}(\mu)$.

7.3.2 OUR CONTRIBUTION: THE MAX-MIN METHOD

A priori, solving the optimization problem on the right-hand side of Eq. (7.16) still requires calculating $\beta_S(\mathcal{D}_N)$, which involves maximizing a degree- k polynomial. To get around this difficulty, we have made a key discovery, which was not noticed by Chou, Golovnev, Sudan, and Velusamy [CGSV21a] even in the 2AND case (see Remark 4.13). Let \mathcal{D}_N^* minimize the right-hand side of Eq. (7.16), and p^* maximize $\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$. After substituting $\beta_S(\mathcal{D}) = \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \lambda_S(\mathcal{D}, p)$ in Eq. (7.16), and applying the max-min inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(f_{S,k}) &= \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k} \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left(\frac{\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N, p)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))} \right) \geq \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k} \left(\frac{\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N, p)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))} \right) \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k} \left(\frac{\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N, p^*)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

Given p^* , the right-hand side of Eq. (7.17) is relatively easy to calculate, being a ratio of a linear and piecewise linear function of \mathcal{D}_N . Our discovery is that, in a wide variety of cases, the quantity on the right-hand side of Eq. (7.17) equals $\alpha(f_{S,k})$; that is, (\mathcal{D}_N^*, p^*) is a *saddle point* of $\frac{\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N, p)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))}$.*

This yields a novel technique, which we call the “max-min method”, for finding a closed form for $\alpha(f_{S,k})$. First, we guess \mathcal{D}_N^* and p^* , and then, we show analytically that $\frac{\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N, p)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))}$ has a saddle point at (\mathcal{D}_N^*, p^*) and that $\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N, p)$ is maximized at p^* . These imply that $\frac{\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N^*, p^*)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*))}$ is a lower and upper bound on $\alpha(f_{S,k})$, respectively. For instance, in §7.5.1, in order to give a closed form for $\alpha(k\text{AND})$ for odd k (i.e., the odd case of Theorem 7.2), we guess $\mathcal{D}_N^* \langle (k+1)/2 \rangle = 1$ and $p^* = \frac{k+1}{2k}$ (by using Mathematica for small cases), and then check the saddle-point and maximization conditions in two separate lemmas (Lemmas 7.23

*This term comes from the optimization literature; such points are also said to satisfy the “strong max-min property” (see, e.g., [BV04, pp. 115, 238]). The saddle-point property is guaranteed by von Neumann’s minimax theorem for functions which are concave and convex in the first and second arguments, respectively, but this theorem and the generalizations we are aware of do not apply even to 3AND.

and 7.24, respectively). Then, we show that $\alpha(k\text{AND}) = \alpha'_k$ by analyzing the right hand side of the appropriate instantiation of Eq. (7.17). We use similar techniques for $k\text{AND}$ for even k (also Theorem 7.2) and for various other cases in Sections 7.5.2 to 7.5.4.

In all of these cases, the \mathcal{D}_N^* we construct is supported on at most two distinct Hamming weights, which is the property which makes finding \mathcal{D}_N^* tractable (using computer assistance). However, this technique is not a “silver bullet”: it is not the case that the sketching approximability of every symmetric Boolean CSP can be exactly calculated by finding the optimal \mathcal{D}_N^* supported on two elements and using the max-min method. Indeed, (as mentioned in §7.5.4) we verify using computer assistance that this is not the case for $f_{\{3\},4}$.

Finally, we remark that the saddle-point property is precisely what defines the value p^* required for our simple classical algorithm for outputting approximately optimal assignments for $\text{Max-}\bar{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_k^t)$ where $f_{S,k} = \text{Th}_k^t$ is a threshold function (see Theorem 7.43).

To actually carry out the max-min method, we rely on the following simple inequality for optimizing ratios of linear functions:

Proposition 7.18. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by the equation $f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{x}}$ for some $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. For every $\mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(r) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, and every $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \mathbf{y}(i)$ with each $\alpha_i \geq 0$, we have $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq \min_i f(\mathbf{y}(i))$. In particular, taking $r = n$ and $\mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(n)$ as the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^n , for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, we have $f(\mathbf{x}) \geq \min_i \frac{a_i}{b_i}$.*

Proof. Firstly, we show that it suffices WLOG to take the special case where $r = n$ and $\mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(n)$ is the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^n . Indeed, assume the special case and note that for a general case, we can let $\mathbf{a}' = (\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{y}(r))$, $\mathbf{b}' = (\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{y}(r))$, $\mathbf{x}' = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$, and let $\mathbf{y}'(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}'(r)$ be the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^r . Then $\mathbf{x}' = \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha_i \mathbf{y}'(i)$ and

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r (\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{y}(i)) \alpha_i}{\sum_{i=1}^r (\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{y}(i)) \alpha_i} = \frac{\mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{x}'}{\mathbf{b}' \cdot \mathbf{x}'} \geq \min_{i \in [r]} \frac{\mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{y}'(i)}{\mathbf{b}' \cdot \mathbf{y}'(i)} = \min_{i \in [r]} \frac{\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{y}(i)}{\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{y}(i)}.$$

Now we prove the special case: Assume $r = n$ and $\mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(n)$ is the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^n . We have $f(\mathbf{y}(i)) = \frac{a_i}{b_i}$. Assume WLOG that $f(\mathbf{y}(1)) = \min\{f(\mathbf{y}(i)) : i \in [n]\}$, i.e., $\frac{a_1}{b_1} \leq \frac{a_i}{b_i}$ for all $i \in [n]$. Then $a_i \geq \frac{a_1 b_i}{b_1}$ for all $i \in [n]$, so

$$\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_1 b_i}{b_1} \alpha_i = \frac{a_1}{b_1} (\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{x}).$$

Hence

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \geq \frac{a_1}{b_1} = f(\mathbf{y}(1)),$$

as desired. \square

7.3.3 STREAMING LOWER BOUNDS

Given this setup, we also can state our results on [CGSV21a]'s streaming lower bounds' applicability (or lack thereof) to Max-3AND:

Theorem 7.19. *There is no infinite sequence $(\mathcal{D}_Y^{(1)}, \mathcal{D}_N^{(1)}), (\mathcal{D}_Y^{(2)}, \mathcal{D}_N^{(2)}), \dots$ of padded one-wise pairs on Δ_3 such that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^{(t)})}{\gamma_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}_Y^{(t)})} = \frac{2}{9}.$$

Yet we still can achieve decent bounds using padded one-wise pairs:

Observation 7.20. *The padded one-wise pair $\mathcal{D}_N = (0, 0.45, 0.45, 0.1)$, $\mathcal{D}_Y = (0.45, 0, 0, 0.55)$ (discovered by numerical search) does prove a streaming approximability upper bound of $\approx .2362$ for 3AND, which is still quite close to $\alpha(3\text{AND}) = \frac{2}{9}$.*

Theorem 7.19 is proven formally in §7.7; here is a proof outline:

Proof outline. As discussed in §7.3.2, since $k = 3$ is odd, to prove **Theorem 7.2** we show, using the max-min method, that $\mathcal{D}_N^* = (0, 0, 1, 0)$ minimizes $\frac{\beta_{\{3\}}(\cdot)}{\gamma_{\{3\},3}(\mu(\cdot))}$. We can show that the corresponding $\gamma_{\{3\},3}$ value is achieved by $\mathcal{D}_Y^* = (\frac{1}{3}, 0, 0, \frac{2}{3})$. In particular, $(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \mathcal{D}_Y^*)$ are not a padded one-wise pair.

We can show that the minimizer of $\gamma_{\{3\}}$ for a particular μ is in general unique. Hence, it suffices to furthermore show that \mathcal{D}_N^* is the *unique* minimizer of $\frac{\beta_{\{3\}}(\cdot)}{\gamma_{\{3\},3}(\mu(\cdot))}$. For this purpose, the max-min method is not sufficient because $\frac{\lambda_{\{3\}}(\cdot, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{3\},3}(\mu(\cdot))}$ is not uniquely minimized at \mathcal{D}_N^* (where we chose $p^* = \frac{2}{3}$). Intuitively, this is because p^* is not a good enough estimate for the maximizer of $\lambda_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}_N, \cdot)$. To remedy this, we observe that $\lambda_{\{3\}}((1, 0, 0, 0), \cdot)$, $\lambda_{\{3\}}((0, 1, 0, 0), \cdot)$, $\lambda_{\{3\}}((0, 0, 1, 0), \cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\{3\}}((0, 0, 0, 1), \cdot)$ are minimized at $0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}$, and 1 , respectively. Hence, we instead lower-bound $\lambda_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}_N, \cdot)$ by evaluating at $\frac{1}{3}\mathcal{D}_N\langle 1 \rangle + \frac{2}{3}\mathcal{D}_N\langle 2 \rangle + \mathcal{D}_N\langle 3 \rangle$, which does suffice to prove the uniqueness of \mathcal{D}_N^* . The theorem then follows from continuity arguments. \square

7.4 EXPLICIT FORMULAS FOR λ_S AND $\gamma_{S,k}$

In this section, we state and prove explicit formula for $\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}, p)$ and $\gamma_{S,k}(\mu)$ which will be useful in later sections.

Lemma 7.21. *For any $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}, p) = \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{i=0}^k \left(\sum_{j=\max\{0, s-(k-i)\}}^{\min\{i, s\}} \binom{i}{j} \binom{k-i}{s-j} q^{s+i-2j} p^{k-s-i+2j} \right) \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle$$

where $q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - p$.

Proof. By linearity of expectation and symmetry, it suffices to fix s and i and calculate, given a fixed string $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$ of Hamming weight i and a random string $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \sim \mathcal{B}_p^k$, the probability of the event $\|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|_0 = s$.

Let $A = \text{supp}(\mathbf{a}) = \{t \in [k] : a_t = 1\}$ and similarly $B = \text{supp}(\mathbf{b})$. We have $|A| = i$ and

$$s = \|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|_0 = |A \cap B| + |([k] \setminus A) \cap ([k] \setminus B)|.$$

Let $j = |A \cap B|$, and consider cases based on j .

Given fixed j , we must have $|A \cap B| = j$ and $|([k] \setminus A) \cap ([k] \setminus B)| = s - j$. Thus if j satisfies $j \leq i, s - j \leq k - i, j \geq 0, j \leq s$, we have $\binom{i}{j}$ choices for $A \cap B$ and $\binom{k-i}{s-j}$ choices for $([k] \setminus A) \cap ([k] \setminus B)$; together, these completely determine B . Moreover $\|\mathbf{b}\|_0 = |B| = |B \cap A| + |B \cap ([k] \setminus A)| = j + (k - i) - (s - j) = k - s - i + 2j$, yielding the desired formula. \square

Lemma 7.22. *Let $S \subseteq [k]$, and let s be its smallest element and t its largest element (they need not be distinct). Then for $\mu \in [-1, 1]$,*

$$\gamma_{S,k}(\mu) = \begin{cases} \frac{1+\mu}{1+\epsilon_{s,k}} & \mu \in [-1, \epsilon_{s,k}) \\ 1 & \mu \in [\epsilon_{s,k}, \epsilon_{t,k}] \\ \frac{1-\mu}{1-\epsilon_{t,k}} & \mu \in (\epsilon_{t,k}, 1] \end{cases}$$

(which also equals $\min \left\{ \frac{1+\mu}{1+\epsilon_{s,k}}, 1, \frac{1-\mu}{1-\epsilon_{t,k}} \right\}$).

Proof. For $\mu \in [-1, 1]$, in (Eq. (7.14)) we defined

$$\gamma_{S,k}(\mu) = \sup_{\mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta_k: \mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \mu} \gamma_S(\mathcal{D}_Y),$$

where by Eq. (5.1), $\gamma_S(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \sum_{i \in S} \mathcal{D}_Y\langle i \rangle$. For $\mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta_k$, let $\text{supp}(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \{i \in [k] : \mathcal{D}_Y\langle i \rangle > 0\}$. We handle cases based on μ .

CASE 1: $\mu \in [-1, \epsilon_{s,k}]$. Our strategy is to reduce to the case $\text{supp}(\mathcal{D}_Y) \subseteq \{0, s\}$ while preserving the marginal μ and (non-strictly) increasing the value of γ_S .

Consider the following operation on a distribution $\mathcal{D}_Y \in \Delta_k$: For $u < v < w \in [k]$, increase $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle u \rangle$ by $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle v \rangle \frac{w-v}{w-u}$, increase $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle w \rangle$ by $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle v \rangle \frac{v-u}{w-u}$, and set $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle v \rangle$ to zero. Note that this results in a new distribution with the same marginal, since

$$\mathcal{D}_Y\langle v \rangle \frac{w-v}{w-u} \epsilon_{u,k} + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle v \rangle \frac{v-u}{w-u} \epsilon_{w,k} = \mathcal{D}_Y\langle v \rangle \epsilon_{v,k}.$$

Given an initial distribution \mathcal{D}_Y , we can apply this operation to zero out $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle v \rangle$ for $v \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$ by redistributing to $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle 0 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle$, preserving the marginal and only increasing the value of γ_S (since $v \notin S$ while $s \in S$). Similarly, we can redistribute $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle v \rangle$ to $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle$ when $v \in \{t+1, \dots, k-1\}$, and to $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle$ when $v \in \{s+1, \dots, t-1\}$. Thus, we need only consider the case $\text{supp}(\mathcal{D}) \subseteq \{0, s, t, k\}$. We assume for simplicity that $0, s, t, k$ are distinct.

By definition of $\epsilon_{i,k}$ we have

$$\mu(\mathcal{D}) = -\mathcal{D}_Y\langle 0 \rangle + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle \left(-1 + \frac{2s}{k}\right) + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle \left(-1 + \frac{2t}{k}\right) + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle \leq -1 + \frac{2s}{k}$$

(by assumption for this case). Substituting $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle = 1 - \mathcal{D}_Y\langle 0 \rangle - \mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle - \mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle$ and multiplying through by $\frac{k}{2}$, we have

$$k\mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle - s\mathcal{D}_Y\langle 0 \rangle - s\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle - s\mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle + t\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle \leq 0;$$

defining $\delta = \mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle \left(\frac{t}{s} - 1\right) + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle \left(\frac{k}{s} - 1\right)$, we can rearrange to get $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle 0 \rangle \geq \delta$. Then given \mathcal{D}_Y , we can zero out $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle$, decrease $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle 0 \rangle$ by δ , and correspondingly increase

$\mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle$ by $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle + \delta$. This preserves the marginal since

$$(\delta + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle) \epsilon_{s,k} = -\delta + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle \epsilon_{t,k} + \mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle$$

and can only increase γ_S .

Thus, it suffices to only consider the case $\text{supp}(\mathcal{D}_Y) \subseteq \{0, s\}$. This uniquely determines \mathcal{D}_Y (because μ is fixed); we have $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle 0 \rangle = \frac{\epsilon_{s,k} - \mu}{\epsilon_{s,k} + 1}$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle = \frac{1 + \mu}{\epsilon_{s,k} + 1}$, yielding the desired value of γ_S .

CASE 2: $\mu \in [\epsilon_{s,k}, \epsilon_{t,k}]$. We simply construct \mathcal{D}_Y with $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle s \rangle = \frac{\epsilon_{t,k} - \mu}{\epsilon_{s,k} - \epsilon_{t,k}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle = \frac{\mu - \epsilon_{s,k}}{\epsilon_{s,k} - \epsilon_{t,k}}$; we have $\mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \mu$ and $\gamma_S(\mathcal{D}_Y) = 1$.

CASE 3: $\mu \in [\epsilon_{t,k}, 1]$. Following the symmetric logic to Case 1, we consider \mathcal{D}_Y supported on $\{t, k\}$ and set $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle = \frac{1 - \mu}{1 - \epsilon_{t,k}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_Y\langle k \rangle = \frac{\mu - \epsilon_{t,k}}{1 - \epsilon_{t,k}}$, yielding $\mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \mu$ and $\gamma_S(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \mathcal{D}_Y\langle t \rangle$. \square

7.5 SKETCHING APPROXIMATION RATIO ANALYSES

7.5.1 MAX- k AND

In this section, we prove [Theorem 7.2](#) (on the sketching approximability of Max- k AND). Recall that in [Eq. \(7.1\)](#), we defined

$$\alpha'_k = \left(\frac{(k-1)(k+1)}{4k^2} \right)^{(k-1)/2}.$$

[Theorem 7.2](#) follows immediately from the following two lemmas:

Lemma 7.23. *For all odd $k \geq 3$, $\alpha(k\text{AND}) \leq \alpha'_k$. For all even $k \geq 2$, $\alpha(k\text{AND}) \leq 2\alpha'_{k+1}$.*

Lemma 7.24. *For all odd $k \geq 3$, $\alpha(k\text{AND}) \geq \alpha'_k$. For all even $k \geq 2$, $\alpha(k\text{AND}) \geq 2\alpha'_{k+1}$.*

To begin, we give explicit formulas for $\gamma_{\{k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}))$ and $\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}, p)$. Note that the smallest element of $\{k\}$ is k , and $\epsilon_{k,k} = 1$. Thus, for $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k$, we have by [Lemmas 7.12](#) and [7.22](#)

that

$$\gamma_{\{k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D})) = \frac{1 + \sum_{i=0}^k (-1 + \frac{2i}{k}) \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle}{2} = \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{i}{k} \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle. \quad (7.25)$$

Similarly, we can apply [Lemma 7.21](#) with $s = k$; for each $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$, $\max\{0, s - (k - i)\} = \min\{i, k\} = i$, so we need only consider $j = i$, and then $\binom{i}{j} = \binom{k-i}{s-j} = 1$. Thus, for $q = 1 - p$, we have

$$\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}, p) = \sum_{i=0}^k q^{k-i} p^i \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle \quad (7.26)$$

Now, we prove [Lemma 7.23](#) directly:

Proof of Lemma 7.23. Consider the case where k is odd. Define \mathcal{D}_N^* by $\mathcal{D}_N^*\langle (k+1)/2 \rangle = 1$ and let $p^* = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2k}$. Since

$$\alpha(k\text{AND}) \leq \frac{\beta_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*)}{\gamma_{\{k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*))} \text{ and } \beta_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N) = \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, p),$$

by [Eqs. \(5.1\)](#) and [\(7.16\)](#), respectively, it suffices to check that p^* maximizes $\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$ and

$$\frac{\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*))} = \alpha'_k.$$

Indeed, by [Eq. \(7.26\)](#),

$$\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, p) = (1-p)^{(k-1)/2} p^{(k+1)/2}.$$

To show p^* maximizes $\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$, we calculate its derivative:

$$\frac{d}{dp} [(1-p)^{(k-1)/2} p^{(k+1)/2}] = -(1-p)^{(k-3)/2} p^{(k-1)/2} \left(kp - \frac{k+1}{2} \right),$$

which has zeros only at 0, 1, and p^* . Thus, $\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$ has critical points only at 0, 1, and p^* , and it is maximized at p^* since it vanishes at 0 and 1. Finally, by [Eqs. \(7.25\)](#) and [\(7.26\)](#) and the definition of α'_k ,

$$\frac{\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*))} = \frac{\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}\right)^{(k-1)/2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2k}\right)^{(k+1)/2}}{\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)} = \alpha'_k,$$

as desired.

Similarly, consider the case where k is even; here, we define \mathcal{D}_N^* by $\mathcal{D}_N^*\langle k/2 \rangle = \frac{\left(\frac{k}{2}+1\right)^2}{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2}+1\right)^2}$ and $\mathcal{D}_N^*\langle \frac{k}{2} + 1 \rangle = \frac{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2}+1\right)^2}$, and set $p^* = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(k+1)}$. Using [Eq. \(7.26\)](#) to calculate the derivative of $\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dp} & \left[\frac{\left(\frac{k}{2} + 1\right)^2}{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2} + 1\right)^2} (1-p)^{k/2} p^{k/2} + \frac{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2} + 1\right)^2} (1-p)^{k/2-1} p^{k/2+1} \right] \\ & = -\frac{k}{2 + 2k + 2k^2} (1-p)^{k/2-2} p^{k/2-1} \left(\frac{k}{2} + 1 - 2p \right) \left((k+1)p - \left(\frac{k}{2} + 1 \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

so $\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$ has critical points at $0, 1, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{k}{4}$, and p^* ; p^* is the only critical point in the interval $[0, 1]$ for which $\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$ is positive, and hence is its maximum. Finally, it can be verified algebraically using [Eqs. \(7.25\)](#) and [\(7.26\)](#) that $\frac{\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*; p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k\}, k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*))} = 2\alpha'_{k+1}$, as desired. \square

We prove [Lemma 7.24](#) using the max-min method.

Proof of Lemma 7.24. First, suppose $k \geq 3$ is odd. Set $p^* = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2k} = \frac{k+1}{2k}$. We want to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha'_k & \leq \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k} \frac{\lambda_{\{k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k\}, k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))} && \text{(max-min inequality, i.e., [Eq. \(7.17\)](#))} \\ & = \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^k (1-p^*)^{k-i} (p^*)^i \mathcal{D}_N\langle i \rangle}{\sum_{i=0}^k \frac{i}{k} \mathcal{D}_N\langle i \rangle}. && \text{(Eqs. (7.25) and (7.26))} \end{aligned}$$

By [Proposition 7.18](#), it suffices to check that

$$\forall i \in [k] \cup \{0\}, \quad (1-p^*)^{k-i} (p^*)^i \geq \alpha'_k \cdot \frac{i}{k}.$$

By definition of α'_k , we have that $\alpha'_k = (1-p^*)^{(k-1)/2} (p^*)^{(k-1)/2}$. Defining $r = \frac{p^*}{1-p^*} = \frac{k+1}{k-1}$ (so that $p^* = r(1-p^*)$), factoring out $(1-p^*)^k$, and simplifying, we can rewrite our desired inequality as

$$\forall i \in [k] \cup \{0\}, \quad \frac{1}{2}(k-1)r^{i-\frac{k-1}{2}} \geq i. \quad (7.27)$$

When $i = (k + 1)/2$ or $(k - 1)/2$, we have equality in [Eq. \(7.27\)](#). We extend to the other values of i by induction. Indeed, when $i \geq (k + 1)/2$, then “ i satisfies [Eq. \(7.27\)](#)” implies “ $i + 1$ satisfies [Eq. \(7.27\)](#)” because $ri \geq i + 1$, and when $i \leq (k - 1)/2$, then “ i satisfies [Eq. \(7.27\)](#)” implies “ $i - 1$ satisfies [Eq. \(7.27\)](#)” because $\frac{1}{r}i \geq i - 1$.

Similarly, in the case where $k \geq 2$ is even, we set $p^* = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(k+1)}$ and $r = \frac{p^*}{1-p^*} = \frac{k+2}{k}$. In this case, for $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$ the following analogue of [Eq. \(7.27\)](#) can be derived:

$$\forall i \in [k] \cup \{0\}, \quad \frac{1}{2}kr^{i-\frac{k}{2}} \geq i,$$

and these inequalities follow from the same inductive argument. \square

7.5.2 Th_k^{k-1} FOR EVEN k

In this subsection, we prove [Theorem 7.4](#) (on the sketching approximability of Th_k^{k-1} for even $k \geq 2$). It is necessary and sufficient to prove the following two lemmas:

Lemma 7.28. *For all even $k \geq 2$, $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^{k-1}) \leq \frac{k}{2}\alpha'_{k-1}$.*

Lemma 7.29. *For all even $k \geq 2$, $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^{k-1}) \geq \frac{k}{2}\alpha'_{k-1}$.*

Firstly, we give explicit formulas for $\gamma_{\{k-1,k\},k}$ and $\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}$. We have $\text{Th}_k^{k-1} = f_{\{k-1,k\},k}$, and $\epsilon_{k-1,k} = -1 + \frac{2(k-1)}{k} = 1 - \frac{2}{k}$. Thus, [Lemmas 7.12](#) and [7.22](#) give

$$\gamma_{\{k-1,k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D})) = \min \left\{ \frac{1 + \sum_{i=0}^k (-1 + \frac{2i}{k}) \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle}{2 - \frac{2}{k}}, 1 \right\} = \min \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{i}{k-1} \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle, 1 \right\}. \quad (7.30)$$

Next, we calculate $\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\mathcal{D}, p)$ with [Lemma 7.21](#). Let $q = 1 - p$, and let us examine the coefficient on $\mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle$. $s = k$ contributes $q^{k-i}p^k$. In the case $i \leq k - 1$, $s = k - 1$ contributes $(k - i)q^{k-i-1}p^{i+1}$ for $j = i$, and in the case $i \geq 1$, $s = k - 1$ contributes $iq^{k-i+1}p^{i-1}$ for $j = i - 1$. Thus, altogether we can write

$$\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\mathcal{D}, p) = \sum_{i=0}^k q^{k-i-1}p^{i-1} ((k - i)p^2 + pq + iq^2) \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle. \quad (7.31)$$

Now, we prove [Lemmas 7.28](#) and [7.29](#).

Proof of Lemma 7.28. As in the proof of Lemma 7.23, it suffices to construct \mathcal{D}_N^* and p^* such that p^* maximizes $\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$ and $\frac{\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k-1,k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*))} = \frac{k}{2}\alpha'_{k-1}$.

We again let $p^* = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(k-1)}$, but define \mathcal{D}_N^* by $\mathcal{D}_N^*\langle k/2 \rangle = \frac{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2}-1\right)^2}$ and $\mathcal{D}_N^*\langle \frac{k}{2} + 1 \rangle = \frac{\left(\frac{k}{2}-1\right)^2}{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2}-1\right)^2}$. By Eq. (7.31), the derivative of $\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$ is now

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dp} & \left[\frac{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2}-1\right)^2} (1-p)^{k/2-1} p^{k/2-1} \left(\frac{k}{2} p^2 + pq + \frac{k}{2} q^2 \right) + \right. \\ & \left. \frac{\left(\frac{k}{2}-1\right)^2}{\left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k}{2}-1\right)^2} (1-p)^{k/2-2} p^{k/2} \left(\left(\frac{k}{2}-1\right) p^2 + pq + \left(\frac{k}{2}+1\right) q^2 \right) \right] \\ & = -\frac{1}{8(k^2-2k+2)} (1-p)^{k/2-3} p^{k/2-2} (-k + (2(k-1)p)\xi(p), \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi(p)$ is the cubic

$$\xi(p) = -8k(k-1)p^3 + 2(k^3 + k^2 + 6k - 12)p^2 - 2(k^3 - 4)p + k^2(k-2).$$

Thus, $\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}$'s critical points on the interval $[0, 1]$ are $0, 1, p^*$ and any roots of ξ in this interval. We claim that ξ has no additional roots in the interval $(0, 1)$. This can be verified directly by calculating roots for $k = 2, 4$, so assume WLOG $k \geq 6$.

Suppose $\xi(p) = 0$ for some $p \in (0, 1)$, and let $x = \frac{1}{p} - 1 \in (0, \infty)$. Then $p = \frac{1}{1+x}$; plugging this in for p and multiplying through by $(x+1)^3$ gives the new cubic

$$(k^3 - 2k^2)x^3 + (k^3 - 6k^2 + 8)x^2 + (k^3 - 4k^2 + 12k - 8)x + (k^3 - 8k^2 + 20k - 16) = 0 \quad (7.32)$$

whose coefficients are cubic in k . It can be verified by calculating the roots of each coefficient of x in Eq. (7.32) that all coefficients are positive for $k \geq 6$. Thus, Eq. (7.32) cannot have roots for positive x , a contradiction. Hence $\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \cdot)$ is maximized at p^* . Finally, it can be verified that $\frac{\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k-1,k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*))} = \frac{k}{2}\alpha'_{k-1}$, as desired. \square

Proof of Lemma 7.29. Define $p^* = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(k-1)}$. Following the proof of Lemma 7.24 and using

the lower bound $\gamma_{\{k-1,k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N)) \leq \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{i}{k-1} \mathcal{D}_N\langle i \rangle$, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{k}{2} \alpha'_{k-1} \leq \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^k (1-p^*)^{k-i-1} (p^*)^{i-1} ((k-i)(p^*)^2 + p^*(1-p^*) + i(1-p^*)^2) \mathcal{D}_N\langle i \rangle}{\sum_{i=0}^k \frac{i}{k-1} \mathcal{D}_N\langle i \rangle}$$

for which by [Proposition 7.18](#), it in turn suffices to prove that for each $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$,

$$\frac{k}{2} \alpha'_{k-1} \frac{i}{k-1} \leq (1-p^*)^{k-i-1} (p^*)^{i-1} ((k-i)(p^*)^2 + p^*(1-p^*) + i(1-p^*)^2).$$

We again observe that $\alpha'_{k-1} = (1-p^*)^{k/2-1} (p^*)^{k/2-1}$, define $r = \frac{p^*}{1-p^*} = \frac{k}{k-2}$, and factor out $(1-p^*)^{k-1}$, which simplifies our desired inequality to

$$\frac{1}{2} r^{i-\frac{k}{2}-1} \cdot \frac{k-2}{k-1} (i+r+(k-i)r^2) \geq i. \quad (7.33)$$

for each $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$. Again, we assume $k \geq 6$ WLOG; the bases cases $i = k/2 - 1, k/2$ can be verified directly, and we proceed by induction. If [Eq. \(7.33\)](#) holds for i , and we seek to prove it for $i+1$, it suffices to cross-multiply and instead prove the inequality

$$r(i+1+r+(k-(i+1))r^2)i \geq (i+1)(i+r+(k-i)r^2),$$

which simplifies to

$$(k-2i)(k-1)(k^2-4i-4) \leq 0,$$

which holds whenever $k/2 \leq i \leq (k^2-4)/4$ (and $(k^2-4)/4 \geq k$ for all $k \geq 6$). The other direction (where $i \leq k/2 - 1$ and we induct downwards) is similar. \square

Observation 7.34. For Th_4^3 the optimal $\mathcal{D}_N^* = (0, 0, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{1}{5}, 0)$ does participate in a padded one-wise pair with $\mathcal{D}_Y^* = (\frac{4}{15}, 0, 0, \frac{11}{15}, 0)$ (given by $\mathcal{D}_0 = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$, $\tau = \frac{1}{5}$, $\mathcal{D}'_N = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$, and $\mathcal{D}'_Y = (\frac{4}{15}, 0, 0, \frac{8}{15}, 0)$) so we can rule out streaming $(\frac{4}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximations to $Max\text{-}\overline{BCSP}(Th_4^3)$ in $o(\sqrt{n})$ space.

7.5.3 $f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}$ FOR (SMALL) ODD k

In this subsection, we prove bounds on the sketching approximability of $f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}$ for odd $k \in \{3, \dots, 51\}$. Define $\mathcal{D}_{0,k} \in \Delta_k$ by $\mathcal{D}_{0,k}\langle 0 \rangle = \frac{k-1}{2k}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{0,k}\langle k \rangle = \frac{k+1}{2k}$. We prove the

following two lemmas:

Lemma 7.35. For all odd $k \geq 3$, $\alpha(f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}) \leq \lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}(\mathcal{D}_{0,k}, p'_k)$, where $p'_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{3k-k^2+\sqrt{4k+k^2-2k^3+k^4}}{4k}$.

Lemma 7.36. The following holds for all odd $k \in \{3, \dots, 51\}$. For all $p \in [0, 1]$, the expression $\frac{\lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}(\cdot, p)}{\gamma_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}(\mu(\cdot))}$ is minimized at $\mathcal{D}_{0,k}$.

We begin by writing an explicit formula for $\lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}$. Lemma 7.21 gives

$$\lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}(\mathcal{D}, p) = \sum_{i=0}^k \left(\sum_{j=\max\{0, i-(k-1)/2\}}^{\min\{i, (k+1)/2\}} \binom{i}{j} \binom{k}{(k+1)/2-j} (1-p)^{(k+1)/2+i-2j} p^{(k-1)/2-i+2j} \right) \mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle.$$

For $i \leq (k-1)/2$, the sum over j goes from 0 to i , and for $i \geq (k+1)/2$, it goes from $i-(k-1)/2$ to $(k+1)/2$. Thus, plugging in $\mathcal{D}_{0,k}$, we get:

$$\lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}(\mathcal{D}_{0,k}, p) = \binom{k}{(k+1)/2} \left(\frac{k-1}{2k} (1-p)^{(k+1)/2} p^{(k-1)/2} + \frac{k+1}{2k} (1-p)^{(k-1)/2} p^{(k+1)/2} \right). \quad (7.37)$$

By Lemmas 7.12 and 7.22, $\gamma_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_{0,k})) = \gamma_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}(\frac{1}{k}) = 1$. Thus, Lemmas 7.35 and 7.36 together imply the following theorem:

Theorem 7.38. For odd $k \in \{3, \dots, 51\}$,

$$\alpha(f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}) = \binom{k}{(k+1)/2} \left(\frac{k-1}{2k} (1-p'_k)^{(k+1)/2} (p'_k)^{(k-1)/2} + \frac{k+1}{2k} (1-p'_k)^{(k-1)/2} (p'_k)^{(k+1)/2} \right),$$

where $p'_k = \frac{3k-k^2+\sqrt{4k+k^2-2k^3+k^4}}{4k}$ as in Lemma 7.35.

Recall that $\rho(f_{(k+1)/2,k}) = \binom{k}{(k+1)/2} 2^{-k}$. Although we currently lack a lower bound on $\alpha(f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k})$ for large odd k , the upper bound from Lemma 7.35 suffices to prove Theorem 7.6, i.e., it can be verified that

$$\lim_{k \text{ odd} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\binom{k}{(k+1)/2} \left(\frac{k-1}{2k} (1-p'_k)^{(k+1)/2} (p'_k)^{(k-1)/2} + \frac{k+1}{2k} (1-p'_k)^{(k-1)/2} (p'_k)^{(k+1)/2} \right)}{\rho(f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k})} = 1.$$

We remark that for $f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}$, our lower bound (Lemma 7.36) is *stronger* than what we were able to prove for k AND (Lemma 7.24) and Th_k^{k-1} (Lemma 7.29) because the inequality holds regardless of p . This is fortunate for us, as the optimal p^* from Lemma 7.35 is rather messy.[†] It remains to prove Lemmas 7.35 and 7.36.

Proof of Lemma 7.35. Taking the derivative with respect to p of Eq. (7.37) yields

$$\frac{d}{dp} [\lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}(\mathcal{D}_{0,k}, p)] = -\frac{1}{4k} \binom{k}{(k+1)/2} (pq)^{(k-3)/2} (4kp^2 + (2k^2 - 6k)p + (-k^2 + 2k - 1)),$$

where $q = 1-p$. Thus, $\lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}(\mathcal{D}_{0,k}, \cdot)$ has critical points at $p = 0, 1, p'_k$, and $\frac{3k-k^2-\sqrt{4k+k^2-2k^3+k^4}}{4k}$. This last value is nonpositive for all $k \geq 0$ (since $(3k - k^2)^2 - (4k + k^2 - 2k^3 + k^4) = -4k(k-1)^2$). \square

The proof of our lower bound (Lemma 7.36) is slightly different than those of our earlier lower bounds (i.e., Lemmas 7.24 and 7.29) in the following sense. For $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$, let $\mathcal{D}_i \in \Delta_k$ be defined by $\mathcal{D}_i \langle i \rangle = 1$. For k AND (Lemma 7.24), we used the fact that $\frac{\lambda_{\{k\}}(\cdot, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k\},k}(\mu(\cdot))}$ is a ratio of linear functions, and thus using Proposition 7.18, it is sufficient to verify the lower bound at $\mathcal{D}_0, \dots, \mathcal{D}_k$. For Th_k^{k-1} (Lemma 7.29), $\frac{\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\cdot, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k-1,k\},k}(\mu(\cdot))}$ is *not* a ratio of linear functions, because the denominator $\gamma_{\{k-1,k\},k}(\mu(\mathcal{D})) = \min\{\sum_{i=0}^k \frac{i}{k-1} \mathcal{D} \langle i \rangle, 1\}$ is not linear over Δ_k . However, we managed to carry out the proof by upper-bounding the denominator with the linear function $\gamma'(\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{i}{k-1} \mathcal{D} \langle i \rangle$, and then invoking Proposition 7.18 (again, to show that it suffices to verify the lower bound at $\mathcal{D}_0, \dots, \mathcal{D}_k$).

For $f_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}$, we show that it suffices to verify the lower bound on a larger (but still finite) set of distributions.

Proof of Lemma 7.36. Recalling that $\epsilon_{(k+1)/2,k} = \frac{1}{k}$, let $\Delta_k^+ = \{\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k : \mu(\mathcal{D}) \leq \frac{1}{k}\}$ and $\Delta_k^- = \{\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k : \mu(\mathcal{D}) \geq \frac{1}{k}\}$. Note that $\Delta_k^+ \cup \Delta_k^- = \Delta_k$, and restricted to either Δ_k^+ or Δ_k^- , $\gamma_{\{(k+1)/2\},k}(\mu(\cdot))$ is linear and thus we can apply Proposition 7.18 to $\frac{\lambda_{\{k-1,k\}}(\cdot, p^*)}{\gamma_{\{k-1,k\},k}(\mu(\cdot))}$.

[†]The analogous statement is false for e.g. 3AND, where we had $\mathcal{D}_N^* = (0, 0, 1, 0)$, but at $p = \frac{3}{4}$,

$$\frac{\lambda_{\{3\}}((0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0), \frac{3}{4})}{\gamma_{\{3\},3}(\mu(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0))} = \frac{3}{16} \leq \frac{27}{128} = \frac{\lambda_{\{3\}}((0, 0, 1, 0), \frac{3}{4})}{\gamma_{\{3\},3}(\mu(0, 0, 1, 0))}.$$

Let $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \in \Delta_k$, for $i < (k+1)/2, j > (k+1)/2$, be defined by $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}\langle i \rangle = \frac{2j-(k+1)}{2(j-i)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}\langle j \rangle = \frac{(k+1)-2i}{2(j-i)}$. Note that $\mu(\mathcal{D}_{i,j}) = \frac{1}{k}$ for each i, j . We claim that $\{\mathcal{D}_i\}_{i \leq (k+1)/2} \cup \{\mathcal{D}_{i,j}\}$ are the extreme points of Δ_k^+ , or more precisely, that every distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k^+$ can be represented as a convex combination of these distributions. Indeed, this follows constructively from the procedure which, given a distribution \mathcal{D} , subtracts from each $\mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle$ for $i < (k+1)/2$ (adding to the coefficient of the corresponding \mathcal{D}_i) until the marginal of the (renormalized) distribution is $\frac{1}{k}$, and then subtracts from pairs $\mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle, \mathcal{D}\langle j \rangle$ with $i < (k+1)/2$ and $j > (k+1)/2$, adding it to the coefficient of the appropriate $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ until \mathcal{D} vanishes (i.e., $\mathcal{D}\langle i \rangle$ is zero for all $i \in [k] \cup \{0\}$). Similarly, every distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_k^-$ can be represented as a convex combination of the distributions $\{\mathcal{D}_i\}_{i \geq (k+1)/2} \cup \{\mathcal{D}_{i,j}\}$. Thus, by [Proposition 7.18](#), it is sufficient to verify that

$$\frac{\lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}(\mathcal{D}, p)}{\gamma_{\{(k+1)/2\}, k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}))} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\{(k+1)/2\}}(\mathcal{D}_N^*, p)}{\gamma_{\{(k+1)/2\}, k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*))}$$

for each $\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{D}_i\} \cup \{\mathcal{D}_{i,j}\}$. Treating p as a variable, for each odd $k \in \{3, \dots, 51\}$ we produce a list of $O(k^2)$ degree- k polynomial inequalities in p which we verify using Mathematica. □

7.5.4 OTHER SYMMETRIC PREDICATES

In [Table 7.1](#) below, we list four more symmetric Boolean predicates (beyond k AND, Th_k^{k-1} , and $f_{\{(k+1)/2\}, k}$) whose sketching approximability we have analytically resolved using the “max-min method”. These values were calculated using two subroutines in the Mathematica code, `estimateAlpha` — which numerically or symbolically estimates the \mathcal{D}_N , with a given support, which minimizes α — and `testMinMax` — which, given a particular \mathcal{D}_N , calculates p^* for that \mathcal{D}_N and checks analytically whether lower-bounding by evaluating λ_S at p^* proves that \mathcal{D}_N is minimal.

We remark that two of the cases in [Table 7.1](#) (as well as k AND), the optimal \mathcal{D}_N is rational and supported on two coordinates. However, in the other two cases in [Table 7.1](#), the optimal \mathcal{D}_N involves roots of a cubic.

In [§7.5.3](#), we showed that \mathcal{D}_N^* defined by $\mathcal{D}_N^*\langle 0 \rangle = \frac{k-1}{2k}$ and $\mathcal{D}_N^*\langle k \rangle = \frac{k+1}{2k}$ is optimal for $f_{\{(k+1)/2\}, k}$ for odd $k \in \{3, \dots, 51\}$. Using the same \mathcal{D}_N^* , we are also able to resolve 11

S	k	α	\mathcal{D}_N^*
$\{2, 3\}$	3	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{18} \approx 0.5962$	$(0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2})$
$\{4, 5\}$	5	$8\text{root}_{\mathbb{R}}(P_1) \approx 0.2831$	$(0, 0, 1 - \text{root}_{\mathbb{R}}(P_2), \text{root}_{\mathbb{R}}(P_2), 0, 0)$
$\{4\}$	5	$8\text{root}_{\mathbb{R}}(P_3) \approx 0.2394$	$(0, 0, 1 - \text{root}_{\mathbb{R}}(P_4), \text{root}_{\mathbb{R}}(P_4), 0, 0)$
$\{3, 4, 5\}$	5	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{125} \approx 0.5537$	$(0, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2})$

Table 7.1: Symmetric predicates for which we have analytically calculated exact α values using the “max-min method”. For a polynomial $P : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with a *unique* positive real root, let $\text{root}_{\mathbb{R}}(p)$ denote that root, and define the polynomials $P_1(z) = -72 + 4890z - 108999z^2 + 800000z^3$, $P_2(z) = -908 + 5021z - 9001z^2 + 5158z^3$, $P_3(z) = -60 + 5745z - 183426z^2 + 1953125z^3$, $P_4(z) = -344 + 1770z - 3102z^2 + 1811z^3$. (We note that in the $f_{\{4\},5}$ and $f_{\{4,5\},5}$ calculations, we were required to check equality of roots numerically (to high precision) instead of analytically).

other cases in which S is “close to” $\{(k+1)/2\}$; for instance, $S = \{5, 6\}, \{5, 6, 7\}, \{5, 7\}$ for $k = 9$. (We have omitted the values of α and \mathcal{D}_N because they are defined using the roots of polynomials of degree up to 8.)

In all previously-mentioned cases, the condition “ \mathcal{D}_N^* has support size 2” was helpful, as it makes the optimization problem over \mathcal{D}_N^* essentially univariate; however, we have confirmed analytically in two other cases ($S = \{3\}, k = 4$ and $S = \{3, 5\}, k = 5$) that “max-min method on distributions with support size two” does not suffice for tight bounds on α (see `testDistsWithSupportSize2` in the Mathematica code). However, using the max-min method with \mathcal{D}_N supported on two levels still achieves decent (but not tight) bounds on α . For $S = \{3\}, k = 4$, using $\mathcal{D}_N = (\frac{1}{4}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{3}{4})$, we get the bounds $\alpha(f_{\{3\},4}) \in [0.3209, 0.3295]$ (the difference being 2.67%). For $S = \{3, 5\}, k = 5$, using $\mathcal{D}_N = (\frac{1}{4}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{3}{4}, 0)$, we get $\alpha(f_{\{3,5\},5}) \in [0.3416, 0.3635]$ (the difference being 6.42%).

Finally, we have also analyzed cases where we get numerical solutions which are very close to tight, but we lack analytical solutions because they likely involve roots of high-degree polynomials. For instance, in the case $S = \{4, 5, 6\}, k = 6$, setting $\mathcal{D}_N = (0, 0, 0, 0.930013, 0, 0, 0.069987)$ gives $\alpha(f_{\{4,5,6\},6}) \in [0.44409972, 0.44409973]$, differing only by 0.000003%. (We conjecture here that $\alpha = \frac{4}{9}$.) For $S = \{6, 7, 8\}, k = 8$, using $\mathcal{D}_N = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0.699501, 0.300499)$, we get the bounds $\alpha(f_{\{6,7,8\},8}) \in [0.20848, 0.20854]$ (the difference being 0.02%).[‡]

[‡]Interestingly, in this latter case, we get bounds differing by 2.12% using $\mathcal{D}_N = (0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{9}{13}, \frac{4}{13}, 0, 0, 0)$ in an attempt to continue the pattern from $f_{\{7,8\},8}$ and $f_{\{8\},8}$ (where we set $\mathcal{D}_N^* = (0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{16}{25}, \frac{9}{25}, 0, 0, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 0, 0, \frac{25}{41}, \frac{16}{41}, 0, 0, 0)$ in §7.5.2 and §7.5.1, respectively).

7.6 SIMPLE SKETCHING ALGORITHMS FOR THRESHOLD PREDICATES

Let $f_{S,k} = \text{Th}_k^t$ be a threshold predicate (so that $S = \{t, \dots, k\}$). The main goal of this section is to prove [Theorem 7.7](#), giving a simple “bias-based” sketching algorithm for $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_k^t)$. Following our definition of the bias of a variable for Max-2AND instances in [§4.1](#), given an instance Ψ of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_k^t)$, for $i \in [n]$, let $\text{bias}_\Psi(i)$ denote the total weight of clauses in which x_i appears positively minus the weight of those in which it appears negatively; that is, if Ψ consists of clauses $((\mathbf{b}(\ell), \mathbf{j}(\ell), w(\ell)))_{\ell \in [m]}$, then

$$\text{bias}_\Psi(i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\ell \in [m]: j(\ell)_t = i} (-1)^{b(\ell)_t} w_\ell,$$

and $\text{bias}_\Psi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{kW_\Psi} \sum_{i=1}^n |\text{bias}_\Psi(i)|$. bias_Ψ is measurable using 1-norm sketching algorithms (i.e., [Theorem 2.2](#) due to [[Ind06](#); [KNW10](#)], as used also in [[GVV17](#); [CGV20](#); [CGSV21a](#)]):

Corollary 7.39. *For every predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $O(\log n / \epsilon^2)$ -space randomized sketching algorithm for the following problem: The input is an instance Ψ of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_k^t)$ (given as a stream of constraints), and the goal is to estimate bias_Ψ up to a multiplicative factor of $1 \pm \epsilon$.*

Proof. Invoke the 1-norm sketching algorithm from [Theorem 2.2](#) as follows: On each input constraint $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{j}, \ell)$ with weight w , insert the updates $(j_1, wb_1), \dots, (j_k, wb_k)$ into the stream (and normalize appropriately). \square

Now recall the definitions of $\beta_{S,k}(\mu)$ and $\gamma_{S,k}(\mu)$ from [Eq. \(7.15\)](#). Our simple algorithm for $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_k^t)$ relies on the following two lemmas, which we prove below:

Lemma 7.40. $\text{val}_\Psi \leq \gamma_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi)$.

Lemma 7.41. $\text{val}_\Psi \geq \beta_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi)$.

Together, these two lemmas imply that outputting $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) \cdot \gamma_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi)$ gives an $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t)$ -approximation to $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_k^t)$, since $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) = \inf_{\mu \in [-1, 1]} \frac{\beta_{S,k}(\mu)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu)}$ ([Eq. \(7.15\)](#)). We can implement this as a small-space sketching algorithm (losing an arbitrarily small additive constant $\epsilon > 0$ in the approximation ratio) because $\gamma_{S,k}(\cdot)$ is piecewise linear by [Lemma 7.22](#):

Proof of Theorem 7.7. To get an $(\alpha - \epsilon)$ -approximation to val_Ψ , let $\delta > 0$ be small enough such that $\frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta}\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) \geq \alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) - \epsilon$. We claim that calculating an estimate \widehat{b} for bias_Ψ (using Corollary 7.39) up to a multiplicative δ factor and outputting $\widehat{v} = \alpha(\text{Th}_k^t)\gamma_{S,k}(\frac{\widehat{b}}{1+\delta})$ is sufficient. Note that $\gamma_{S,k}$ is monotone by Lemma 7.22 because Th_k^t is a threshold function.

Indeed, suppose $\widehat{b} \in [(1 - \delta)\text{bias}_\Psi, (1 + \delta)\text{bias}_\Psi]$; then $\frac{\widehat{b}}{1+\delta} \in [\frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta}\text{bias}_\Psi, \text{bias}_\Psi]$. Now we observe

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{S,k} \left(\frac{\widehat{b}}{1+\delta} \right) &\geq \gamma_{S,k} \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \text{bias}_\Psi \right) && \text{(monotonicity of } \gamma_{S,k} \text{)} \\
&= \min \left\{ \frac{1 + \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \text{bias}_\Psi}{1 + \epsilon_{s,k}}, 1 \right\} && \text{(Lemma 7.22)} \\
&\geq \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \min \left\{ \frac{1 + \text{bias}_\Psi}{1 + \epsilon_{s,k}}, 1 \right\} && (\delta > 0) \\
&= \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \gamma_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi). && \text{(Lemma 7.22)}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
(\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) - \epsilon)\text{val}_\Psi &\leq (\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) - \epsilon)\gamma_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi) && \text{(Lemma 7.40)} \\
&\leq \alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) \cdot \frac{1-\delta}{1+\delta} \gamma_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi) && \text{(assumption on } \delta \text{)} \\
&\leq \widehat{v} && \text{(our observation)} \\
&\leq \alpha(\text{Th}_k^t)\gamma_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi) && \text{(monotonicity of } \gamma_{S,k} \text{)} \\
&\leq \beta_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi) && \text{(Eq. (7.15))} \\
&\leq \text{val}_\Psi, && \text{(Lemma 7.41)}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

7.6.1 PROVING THE LEMMAS

To prove Lemmas 7.40 and 7.41, we generalize the definition of template distributions for Max-2AND from §4.1.2 to all Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ problems. For a predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, an instance Ψ of Max- $\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ on n variables, and an assignment $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, let $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^\mathbf{x} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$

denote the following *template distribution*: If Ψ 's constraints are $(\mathbf{b}(\ell), \mathbf{j}(\ell), w(\ell))_{\ell \in [m]}$, we sample ℓ with probability $\frac{w(\ell)}{W_\Psi}$ and output $\mathbf{b}(\ell) + \mathbf{x}|_{\mathbf{j}(\ell)}$. That is, $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{a})$ is the fractional weight of constraints ℓ such that plugging in the assignment \mathbf{x} and negating according to $\mathbf{b}(\ell)$ results in \mathbf{a} . Note that $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}$ is not necessarily symmetric; however, we can still define a scalar ‘‘marginal’’ $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu(\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D}))$. The important properties of $\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}$ are summarized in the following proposition:

Proposition 7.42. *Let Ψ be an instance of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(\text{Th}_k^t)$. Then:*

- i. For any $p \in [0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{B}_p^n}[\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{x})] = \lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}, p)$.*
- ii. For every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$, $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{1}{kW_\Psi} \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{x_i+1} \text{bias}_\Psi(i) \leq \text{bias}_\Psi$.*
- iii. If for every i , $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) > 0 \implies x_i = 1$ and $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) < 0 \implies x_i = 0$, then $\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) = \text{bias}_\Psi$.*

Proof. Omitted (follows immediately from definitions and linearity of expectation). □

Now, we are equipped to prove the lemmas:

Proof of Lemma 7.40. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ denote the optimal assignment for Ψ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{val}_\Psi &= \text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x}) && \text{(def. of } \mathbf{x}\text{)} \\
&= \lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}, 1) && \text{(Item i of Proposition 7.42 with } p = 1\text{)} \\
&= \gamma_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) && \text{(Eq. (5.1))} \\
&\leq \gamma_{S,k}(\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})) && \text{(Eq. (7.14) and Proposition 7.10)} \\
&\leq \gamma_{S,k}(\text{bias}(\Psi)) && \text{(Item ii of Proposition 7.42 and monotonicity of } \gamma_{S,k}\text{)}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Proof of Lemma 7.41. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ denote the assignment assigning x_i to 1 if $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) \geq 0$ and 0 otherwise. Now

$$\text{val}_\Psi \geq \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{B}_p^n} [\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{x})] \right) \quad \text{(probabilistic method)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{p \in [0,1]} (\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}, p)) && \text{(Item i of Proposition 7.42)} \\
&\geq \beta_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}) && \text{(Eq. (5.1))} \\
&\geq \beta_{S,k}(\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})) && \text{(Eq. (7.14) and Proposition 7.10)} \\
&= \beta_{S,k}(\text{bias}(\Psi)) && \text{(Item iii of Proposition 7.42)}
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

7.6.2 THE CLASSICAL ALGORITHM

Finally, we state another consequence of [Lemma 7.40](#) — a simple randomized, $O(n)$ -time-and-space streaming algorithm for *outputting* approximately-optimal assignments when the max-min method applies.

Theorem 7.43. *Let Th_k^t be a threshold predicate and $p^* \in [0, 1]$ be such that the max-min method applies, i.e.,*

$$\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) = \inf_{\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta_k} \left(\frac{\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_N, p^*)}{\gamma_{S,k}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))} \right).$$

Then the following algorithm, on input Ψ , outputs an assignment with expected value at least $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) \cdot \text{val}_\Psi$: Assign every variable to 1 if $\text{bias}_\Psi(i) \geq 0$, and 0 otherwise, and then flip each variable's assignment independently with probability p^ .*

Proof of [Theorem 7.43](#). Let p^* be as in the theorem statement, and define \mathbf{x} as in the proof of [Lemma 7.41](#). We output the assignment $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}$ for $\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{B}_{p^*}^n$, and our goal is to show that its expected value is at least $\alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) \text{val}_\Psi$.

Applying the max-min method to $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})$ and using [Proposition 7.10](#), we have:

$$\lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}, p^*) \geq \alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) \gamma_{S,k}(\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})). \quad (7.44)$$

Thus our expected output value is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{B}_{p^*}} [\text{val}_\Psi(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a})] &= \lambda_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}}, p^*) && \text{(Item i of Proposition 7.42)} \\
&\geq \alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) \gamma_{S,k}(\mu_S(\mathcal{D}_\Psi^{\mathbf{x}})) && \text{(Eq. (7.44))} \\
&= \alpha(\text{Th}_k^t) \gamma_{S,k}(\text{bias}_\Psi) && \text{(Item iii of Proposition 7.42)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \alpha(\text{Th}_k^t)\text{val}_\Psi, \quad (\text{Lemma 7.40})$$

as desired. \square

7.7 [CGSV21A] IS INCOMPLETE: STREAMING LOWER BOUNDS FOR MAX-3AND?

In this section, we prove [Theorem 7.19](#). We begin with a few lemmas.

Lemma 7.45. *For $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_3$, the expression*

$$\frac{\lambda_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}, \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{D}\langle 1 \rangle + \frac{2}{3}\langle 2 \rangle + \mathcal{D}\langle 3 \rangle)}{\gamma_{\{3\},3}(\mu(\mathcal{D}))}$$

is minimized uniquely at $\mathcal{D} = (0, 0, 1, 0)$, with value $\frac{2}{9}$.

Proof. Letting $p = \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{D}\langle 1 \rangle + \frac{2}{3}\mathcal{D}\langle 2 \rangle + \mathcal{D}\langle 3 \rangle$ and $q = 1 - p$, by [Lemmas 7.12](#), [7.21](#) and [7.22](#) the expression expands to

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}\langle 0 \rangle p^3 + \mathcal{D}\langle 1 \rangle p^2(1-p) + \mathcal{D}\langle 3 \rangle p(1-p)^2 + \mathcal{D}\langle 3 \rangle (1-p)^3}{\frac{1}{2}(1 - \mathcal{D}\langle 0 \rangle - \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{D}\langle 1 \rangle + \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{D}\langle 2 \rangle + \mathcal{D}\langle 3 \rangle)}.$$

The expression's minimum, and its uniqueness, are confirmed analytically in the Mathematica code. \square

Lemma 7.46. *Let X be a compact topological space, $Y \subseteq X$ a closed subspace, Z a topological space, and $f : X \rightarrow Z$ a continuous map. Let $x^* \in X, z^* \in Z$ be such that $f^{-1}(z^*) = \{x^*\}$. Let $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of points in Y such that $\{f(x_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to z^* . Then $x^* \in Y$.*

Proof. By compactness of X , there is a subsequence $\{x_{j_i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ which converges to a limit \tilde{x} . By closure, $\tilde{x} \in Y$. By continuity, $f(\tilde{x}) = z^*$, so $\tilde{x} = x^*$. \square

Finally, we have:

Proof of [Theorem 7.19](#). By [Lemma 7.45](#), $\frac{\beta_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}_N)}{\gamma_{\{3\},3}(\mu(\mathcal{D}_N))}$ is minimized uniquely at $\mathcal{D}_N^* = (0, 0, 1, 0)$. By [Lemma 7.12](#) we have $\mu(\mathcal{D}_N^*) = \frac{1}{3}$, and by inspection from the proof of [Lemma 7.22](#) below, $\gamma_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}_Y)$ with $\mu(\mathcal{D}_Y) = \frac{1}{3}$ is uniquely minimized by $\mathcal{D}_Y^* = (\frac{1}{3}, 0, 0, \frac{2}{3})$.

Finally, we rule out the possibility of an infinite sequence of padded one-wise pairs which achieve ratios arbitrarily close to $\frac{2}{9}$ using topological properties. View a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta_3$ as the vector $(\mathcal{D}\langle 0 \rangle, \mathcal{D}\langle 1 \rangle, \mathcal{D}\langle 2 \rangle, \mathcal{D}\langle 3 \rangle) \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ denote the set of such distributions. Let $M \subset D \times D \subset \mathbb{R}^8$ denote the subset of pairs of distributions with matching marginals, and let $M' \subset M$ denote the subset of pairs with uniform marginals and $P \subset M$ the subset of padded one-wise pairs. D , M , M' , and P are compact (under the Euclidean topology); indeed, D , M , and M' are bounded and defined by a finite collection of linear equalities and strict inequalities, and letting $M' \subset M$ denote the subset of pairs of distributions with matching *uniform* marginals, P is the image of the compact set $[0, 1] \times D \times M' \subset \mathbb{R}^{13}$ under the continuous map $\tau \times \mathcal{D}_0 \times (\mathcal{D}'_Y, \mathcal{D}'_N) \mapsto (\tau \mathcal{D}_0 + (1 - \tau) \mathcal{D}'_Y, \tau \mathcal{D}_0 + (1 - \tau) \mathcal{D}'_N)$. Hence, P is closed.

Now the function

$$\alpha : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} : (\mathcal{D}_N, \mathcal{D}_Y) \mapsto \frac{\beta_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}_N)}{\gamma_{\{3\}}(\mathcal{D}_Y)}$$

is continuous, since a ratio of continuous functions is continuous, and $\beta_{\{3\}}$ is a single-variable supremum of a continuous function (i.e., λ_S) over a compact interval, which is in general continuous in the remaining variables. Thus, if there were a sequence of padded one-wise pairs $\{(\mathcal{D}_N^{(i)}, \mathcal{D}_Y^{(i)}) \in P\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\alpha(\mathcal{D}_N^{(i)}, \mathcal{D}_Y^{(i)})$ converges to $\frac{2}{9}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, since M is compact and P is closed, [Lemmas 7.45](#) and [7.46](#) imply that $(\mathcal{D}_N^*, \mathcal{D}_Y^*) \in P$, a contradiction. \square

8

Conclusions and future directions

OPEN DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER PROGRESS ABOUND in the quest to understand the approximability of CSPs in the streaming setting. In this chapter, we collect several such questions.

8.1 UNIQUE GAMES-HARDNESS VS. STREAMING HARDNESS

We begin by giving a concrete account of a problem suggested by Chou *et al.* [CGSV21a], who write:

“[There are] some strange gaps in our knowledge. For instance, it would be natural to suspect that (conditional) inapproximability in the polynomial time setting should also lead to (unconditional) inapproximability in the streaming setting. But we don’t have a formal theorem proving this.”

That is, the question is the following: If (β, γ) -Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) is classically UG-hard according to the dichotomy theorem of Raghavendra [Rag08], then is it also necessarily hard for \sqrt{n} -space streaming algorithms? An interesting special case is when Raghavendra’s dichotomy theorem [Rag08] implies that Max-CSP(\mathcal{F}) is *approximation resistant* (under

the UGC). Must it also be streaming approximation-resistant according to [CGSV21a; CGSV21b]? Specifically, [CGSV21a] considers the construction by Potechin [Pot19] of a balanced linear threshold predicate $f_{\text{Pot}} : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f_{\text{Pot}})$ is UG-approximation resistant according to [Rag08]; they observe that since f_{Pot} is a balanced linear threshold function, it cannot support one-wise independence (cf. Example 5.6), so new tools are needed to prove the streaming approximation-resistance of $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f_{\text{Pot}})$.

Here, we give an explicit formulation of this open problem. For a distribution $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$, let $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(2)}(\mathcal{D}) \in [-1, 1]^{k \times k}$ denote \mathcal{D} 's matrix of *second-order marginals*, which is the symmetric matrix with entries $\mu^{(2)}(\mathcal{D})_{i,j} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{D}}[(-1)^{b_i + b_j}]$ for $i, j \in [k]$. Now [Pot19] phrases the [Rag08] criterion for approximation-resistance in the following way:

Definition 8.1. *A Boolean predicate $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ supports a perfect integrality gap instance for the standard SDP if there exists $\mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{Y,\mathbf{b}} \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_2^k)$ for each $\mathbf{b} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D}_N)$ such that:*

- i. For all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$, $\text{val}_{\Psi(\mathcal{D}_N)}(\mathbf{a}) = \rho(f)$.*
- ii. For all $\mathbf{b} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D}_N)$, $\text{val}_{\Psi(\mathcal{D}_{Y,\mathbf{b}})}(\mathbf{b}) = 1$.*
- iii. For all $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}' \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D}_N)$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_{Y,\mathbf{b}}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_{Y,\mathbf{b}'})$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(2)}(\mathcal{D}_{Y,\mathbf{b}}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}^{(2)}(\mathcal{D}_{Y,\mathbf{b}'})$.*

In comparison with the [CGSV21a] dichotomy theorem for streaming (Theorem 5.2), note that Item i of Definition 8.1 is *stronger* than the condition $\beta_f(\mathcal{D}_N) = \rho(f)$ since $\Psi(\mathcal{D}_N)$'s value is bounded on *every* assignment, not just random symmetric assignments. On the other hand, there is no single **Yes** distribution \mathcal{D}_Y ; instead, we have a *collection* of **Yes** distributions with identical (first-order) marginals and second-order marginals.

Example 8.2. *Guruswami, Levin, Sudan, and Trevisan [GLST98] studied the predicate $f_{\text{GLST}} : \mathbb{Z}_2^4 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined by $f_{\text{GLST}}(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) = 1 + b_2 + b_1 b_3 + (1 - b_1) b_4$. As Potechin [Pot19] observes, f_{GLST} supports a perfect integrality gap instance. Indeed, take $\mathcal{D}_N = \mathcal{U}_{\{(0,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0)\}}$, $\mathcal{D}_{Y,(0,0,0,0)} = \mathcal{U}_{\{(0,0,0,1), (0,1,1,0), (1,0,1,0), (1,1,0,1)\}}$, and $\mathcal{D}_{Y,(0,1,0,0)} = \mathcal{U}_{\{(1,0,0,1), (0,1,0,1), (0,0,1,0), (1,1,1,0)\}}$; in particular, $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_{Y,(0,0,0,0)}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathcal{D}_{Y,(0,1,0,0)}) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(2)}(\mathcal{D}_{Y,(0,0,0,0)})$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(2)}(\mathcal{D}_{Y,(0,1,0,0)})$ are both identically zero except for the (3, 4)/(4, 3) entries, which are -1 . We observe that f_{GLST} also supports one-wise independence, e.g., it supports the one-wise independent $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_{\{(0,1,0,0), (1,0,1,1)\}}$.*

Open Problem 1. *Show that if $f : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ supports a perfect integrality gap instance for the standard SDP, then $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ is streaming approximation-resistant in \sqrt{n} space, i.e., for every $\epsilon > 0$, every streaming algorithm which $(\rho(f) + \epsilon)$ -approximates $\text{Max-}\overline{\text{BCSP}}(f)$ uses at least $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space.*

One interesting aspect of **Open Problem 1** is that the perfect integrality gap assumption for f does not seem to suggest any particular **Yes** distribution to use to prove a streaming lower bound.

8.2 RANDOM-ORDERING AND LINEAR-SPACE STREAMING

Recall from our discussion in §3.4 that [KKS15] and [KK19] proved \sqrt{n} -space random-ordering and linear-space adversarial-ordering lower bounds against **Max-Cut**, respectively. As discussed in §5.2, [CGS⁺22] subsequently extended the linear-space lower bounds to so-called “wide” families of predicates. However, to the best of our knowledge there is no evidence that either of these lower bounds doesn’t extend to all families which are \sqrt{n} -space, adversarial-ordering streaming approximation-resistant according to [CGSV21b], i.e., all families which “weakly support one-wise independence” (see the end of §5.1.2 above). An ambitious goal along these lines would be to prove lower bounds against algorithms which can use *both* linear space and random input order:

Open Problem 2. *Show that if \mathcal{F} is a family of predicates weakly supporting one-wise independence, then for every $\epsilon > 0$, $(\rho(\mathcal{F}) + \epsilon)$ -approximating $\text{Max-CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ with a random-order streaming algorithm requires $\Omega(n)$ space.*

We view **Open Problem 2** as likely being true but requiring substantially more “in-the-weeds” combinatorial analyses than were required even in [KK19; CGS⁺22].

For families which don’t have these one-wise independence properties, on the other hand, the situation appears to be much murkier. Even in the simplest case, that of **Max-DiCut**, we discussed in §4.3.1 the fact that our hard instances for \sqrt{n} -space adversarial-order streaming break down both for $O(\log n)$ -space random-ordering streaming and $o(n)$ -space adversarial-order streaming. Indeed, the only lower bounds in these settings for **Max-DiCut** we are aware of come from the trivial reduction from **Max-Cut**, which implies only hardness of $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximation. We conjecture, therefore, that the ideas of [CKP⁺21; CGS⁺21]

used for distinguishing the hard instances from [CGV20] extend to general approximation algorithms for Max-DiCut in these settings:

Open Problem 3. *Show that for every $\epsilon > 0$, Max-DiCut can be $(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon)$ -approximated by:*

- i. $O(\text{polylog } n)$ -space random-order streaming algorithms.*
- ii. $o(n)$ -space adversarial-order streaming algorithms.*

8.3 STREAMING (VS. SKETCHING) LOWER BOUNDS

In our joint work [BHP⁺22], we show that [CGSV21a]’s streaming lower bounds, in particular the padded one-wise pair criterion (Theorem 5.4), cannot rule out streaming approximations which beat the best sketching approximations in \sqrt{n} space. That is, while \sqrt{n} -space sketching algorithms cannot $(\frac{2}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximate Max-DiCut for every $\epsilon > 0$, the techniques in [CGSV21a] cannot strengthen this statement to hold for all streaming algorithms (Theorem 7.19). However, as we mentioned in Observation 7.20, [CGSV21a]’s techniques do show that \sqrt{n} -space streaming algorithms cannot ≈ 0.2362 -approximate Max-DiCut. Thus, we believe the following conjecture is quite plausible:

Open Problem 4. *Show that for every $\epsilon > 0$, streaming algorithms which $(\frac{2}{9} + \epsilon)$ -approximate Max-3AND use at least $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ space.*

However, we are not currently aware of any candidate communication game which could be used to prove Open Problem 4.

Another potential direction for \sqrt{n} -space streaming is to try to extend to the setting $k = 2, q > 2$. ([CGSV21a, Proposition 2.12] shows that in the case $k = q = 2$, distributions with matching marginals are always padded one-wise pairs.) Indeed, we construct the following example in the case $q = 3, k = 2$:

Example 8.3. *We’ll construct two distributions $\mathcal{D}_Y, \mathcal{D}_N \in \Delta(\mathbb{Z}_3^2)$ corresponding to distributions in the $k = 2, q = 3$ case (as discussed at the end of §5.1.2). Let*

$$\mathcal{D}_Y = \left\{ (0, 1) \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{4}, (1, 1) \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{4}, (2, 2) \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{2} \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_N = \left\{ (0, 2) \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{4}, (1, 2) \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{4}, (2, 1) \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

Then both \mathcal{D}_Y and \mathcal{D}_N have first-coordinate marginals $\{0 \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{4}, 1 \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{4}, 2 \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{2}\}$ and second-coordinate marginals $\{1 \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{2}, 2 \text{ w.p. } \frac{1}{2}\}$. Thus, their marginals match, but are not uniform; moreover, \mathcal{D}_Y and \mathcal{D}_N have disjoint supports, and so they are not a padded one-wise pair.

8.4 MULTI-PASS LOWER BOUNDS

The recent multi-pass cycle-counting lower bounds of Assadi and N [AN21] imply roughly that for every fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $(1 - 3\epsilon, 1 - 2\epsilon)$ -Max-Cut requires $\Omega(n^{1-O(p\epsilon)})$ space for p -pass streaming algorithms (see §5.3 in their paper).

Open Problem 5. *Prove that for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that every p -pass streaming algorithm which $(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)$ -approximates Max-Cut uses $\Omega(n^\delta)$ space. (Even better, $\Omega(n)$ space, and in the random-ordering setting!)*

Such a bound could not follow from reductions from cycle-counting à la [AKSY20; AN21], which have the following general structure: The **Yes** and **No** instances are unions of vertex-disjoint cycles and paths, and among the cycles, more are even in the **Yes** instances and more are odd in the **No** instances. **No** instances have lower value than **Yes** instances because every cut fails to cut at least one edge in every odd cycle. However, since odd cycles have length at least 3, the **No** instances have value at least $\frac{2}{3}$ and thus cannot be used to prove approximation-resistance.

Instead, if it is indeed possible, we expect **Open Problem 5** to be resolved using a version of the sBPD game (see **Definition 3.4**) which has p “rounds” in which each Bob_t gets to see his input again (at the end of each round, Bob_T gets to send a message to Bob_1). Note that this “ p -round, T -player” sBPD game is *not* the same as (standard) sBPD with pT players; e.g., in Round 1 Bob_1 can store some “hash” of his input and then verify this hash in Round 2. Thus, Bob_1 ’s input in Round 2 is not “independent” of the previous inputs, unlike in single-round sBPD. We would therefore have to carry out a sBPD hardness analysis à la [KK19] in the setting where, starting in Round 2, the input $(M_t, \mathbf{z}(t))$ for

each Bob_t 's is drawn from a “typical”, but not uniform, distribution. Proving hardness in this setting seems far beyond current lower-bound techniques.



Glossary

NOTATIONS

k	arity of CSP/hypergraph
i	variable index ($\in [n]$)
ℓ	edge index ($\in [m]$)
m	number of constraints/hyperedges
n	number of variables/vertices
q	alphabet size ($\in [m]$)
T	number of players/subinstances
$[k]$	natural numbers $\{1, \dots, q\}$
\mathbb{Z}_q	group of integers modulo q
f	predicate ($\mathbb{Z}_q^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$)
\mathcal{F}	family of predicates
α	constraint/hyperedge density (w.r.t. n)
\mathbf{b}	CSP predicate label/negation pattern
\mathbf{e}	vertex-indices for hyperedge ($\in [n]^k$)
\mathbf{j}	variable-indices for constraint ($\in [n]^k$)
\mathbf{x}	CSP assignment ($\in \mathbb{Z}_q^n$)
$\mathbf{x} _{\mathbf{j}}$	projection of \mathbf{x} onto coordinates \mathbf{j} ($\in \mathbb{Z}_q^k$)
\mathcal{U}_S	uniform distribution
$\mathcal{M}_{k,\alpha}(n)$	\mathcal{U} on k -hypermatchings
$\mathcal{G}_{k,\alpha}(n)$	\mathcal{U} on k -hypergraphs
\mathcal{B}_p	Bernoulli- p distribution ($= 0$ w.p. p , 1 o.w.)
M	vertex-hyperedge adjacency matrix
M^{fold}	folded version of M
$\widehat{f}(\mathbf{s})$	Fourier coefficient of f
$\mathbb{1}_S$	indicator function for S
supp	support of vector/function/distribution
\mathfrak{S}_k	set of permutations on $[k]$

ABBREVIATIONS

CSP	constraint satisfaction problem
C2S	communication-to-streaming (reduction)
SDP	semidefinite programming
UGC	unique games conjecture

COMMUNICATION GAMES

BPD	Boolean partition detection
sBPD	sequential BPD
siBPD	implicit sBPD
RMD	randomized mask detection
sRMD	sequential RMD
siRSD	sequential implicit randomized shift detection

Bibliography

- [ABM12] Per Austrin, Siavosh Benabbas, and Avner Magen. “On Quadratic Threshold CSPs”. In: *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science* 14.2 (Nov. 2012). Conference version in LATIN 2010, pp. 205–228.
- [AKSY20] Sepehr Assadi, Gillat Kol, Raghuvansh R. Saxena, and Huacheng Yu. “Multi-Pass Graph Streaming Lower Bounds for Cycle Counting, MAX-CUT, Matching Size, and Other Problems”. In: *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. FOCS 2020 (virtual, Nov. 16–19, 2020). Nov. 2020, pp. 354–364. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00041](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00041).
- [ALM⁺98] Sanjeev Arora, Carsten Lund, Rajeev Motwani, Madhu Sudan, and Mario Szegedy. “Proof Verification and the Hardness of Approximation Problems”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 45.3 (May 1, 1998). Conference version in FOCS 1992, pp. 501–555. ISSN: 0004-5411. DOI: [10.1145/278298.278306](https://doi.org/10.1145/278298.278306).
- [AM09] Per Austrin and Elchanan Mossel. “Approximation Resistant Predicates from Pairwise Independence”. In: *Computational Complexity* 18.2 (June 1, 2009). Conference version in CCC 2008, pp. 249–271. DOI: [10.1007/s00037-009-0272-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00037-009-0272-6).
- [AMS99] Noga Alon, Yossi Matias, and Mario Szegedy. “The Space Complexity of Approximating the Frequency Moments”. In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 58.1 (Feb. 1, 1999). Conference version in STOC 1996, pp. 137–147. DOI: [10.1006/jcss.1997.1545](https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.1997.1545).
- [AMW15] Per Austrin, Rajsekar Manokaran, and Cenny Wenner. “On the NP-hardness of Approximating Ordering-Constraint Satisfaction Problems”. In: *Theory of Computing* 11 (2015). Conference version in APPROX 2013, pp. 257–283. DOI: [10.4086/toc.2015.v011a010](https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.2015.v011a010).
- [AN21] Sepehr Assadi and Vishvajeet N. “Graph Streaming Lower Bounds for Parameter Estimation and Property Testing via a Streaming XOR Lemma”. In: *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2021 (virtual, June 21–25, 2021). Association for Computing Machinery, June 15, 2021, pp. 612–625. DOI: [10.1145/3406325.3451110](https://doi.org/10.1145/3406325.3451110).
- [AOW15] Sarah R. Allen, Ryan O’Donnell, and David Witmer. “How to Refute a Random CSP”. In: *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. FOCS 2015. Oct. 2015. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS.2015.48](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.48).

- [AS98] Sanjeev Arora and Shmuel Safra. “Probabilistic Checking of Proofs: A New Characterization of NP”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 45.1 (Jan. 1, 1998). Conference version in FOCS 1992, pp. 70–122. DOI: [10.1145/273865.273901](https://doi.org/10.1145/273865.273901).
- [Aus07] Per Austrin. “Balanced Max 2-SAT Might Not Be the Hardest”. In: *Proceedings of the 39th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2007 (San Diego, CA, USA, June 11–13, 2007). Association for Computing Machinery, June 11, 2007, pp. 189–197. DOI: [10.1145/1250790.1250818](https://doi.org/10.1145/1250790.1250818).
- [Aus10] Per Austrin. “Towards Sharp Inapproximability for Any 2-CSP”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 39.6 (Jan. 2010). Conference version in FOCS 2007, pp. 2430–2463. DOI: [10.1137/070711670](https://doi.org/10.1137/070711670).
- [BC17] Suman K. Bera and Amit Chakrabarti. “Towards Tighter Space Bounds for Counting Triangles and Other Substructures in Graph Streams”. In: *34th Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*. STACS 2017 (Hanover, Germany, Mar. 8–11, 2017). Ed. by Heribert Vollmer and Brigitte Vallée. Vol. 66. LIPIcs. Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017, 11:1–11:14. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2017.11](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2017.11).
- [BCK⁺18] Vladimir Braverman, Stephen Chestnut, Robert Krauthgamer, Yi Li, David Woodruff, and Lin Yang. “Matrix Norms in Data Streams: Faster, Multi-Pass and Row-Order”. In: *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*. ICLR 2018 (Vancouver, BC, Canada, Apr. 30–May 3, 2018). Vol. 80. PMLR. July 3, 2018, pp. 649–658.
- [BGJR88] Francisco Barahona, Martin Grötschel, Michael Jünger, and Gerhard Reinelt. “An Application of Combinatorial Optimization to Statistical Physics and Circuit Layout Design”. In: *Operations Research* 36.3 (1988), pp. 493–513. DOI: [10.1287/opre.36.3.493](https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.36.3.493).
- [BHP⁺22] Joanna Boyland, Michael Hwang, Tarun Prasad, Noah Singer, and Santhoshini Velusamy. *Sketching Approximations for (Some) Symmetric Boolean CSPs: Closed-Form Ratios and Simple Algorithms*. Feb. 2022. arXiv: [2112.06319](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.06319) [cs.DS].
- [BK19] Amey Bhangale and Subhash Khot. “UG-Hardness to NP-Hardness by Losing Half”. In: *34th Computational Complexity Conference*. CCC 2019 (New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA, Aug. 18–20, 2019). Vol. 137. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.3](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.3).
- [BKKS20] Vladimir Braverman, Robert Krauthgamer, Aditya Krishnan, and Roi Sinoff. “Schatten Norms in Matrix Streams: Hello Sparsity, Goodbye Dimension”. In: *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*. ICLR 2020 (Apr. 26–May 1, 2020). Vol. 119. PMLR. Nov. 21, 2020, pp. 1100–1110.

- [BKPS98] Paul Beame, Richard Karp, Toniann Pitassi, and Michael Saks. “On the Complexity of Unsatisfiability Proofs for Random k -CNF Formulas”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 1998 (Dallas, TX, USA, May 24–26, 1998). May 23, 1998, pp. 561–571. DOI: [10.1145/276698.276870](https://doi.org/10.1145/276698.276870).
- [BM16] Boaz Barak and Ankur Moitra. “Noisy Tensor Completion via the Sum-of-Squares Hierarchy”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*. COLT 2016 (New York, NY, USA, June 23–26, 2016). Vol. 49. PMLR. 2016, pp. 417–445.
- [BR21] Arindam Biswas and Venkatesh Raman. “Sublinear-Space Approximation Algorithms for Max r -SAT”. In: *Computing and Combinatorics*. COCOON 2021 (Tainan, Taiwan, Oct. 24–26, 2021). Vol. 13025. LNCS. Springer, Cham, 2021, pp. 124–136.
- [Bul17] Andrei A. Bulatov. “A Dichotomy Theorem for Nonuniform CSPs”. In: *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. FOCS 2017 (Berkeley, CA, USA, Oct. 15–17, 2017). Oct. 2017, pp. 319–330. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS.2017.37](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2017.37).
- [BV04] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenbergh. *Convex Optimization*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, Mar. 2004. 727 pp. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511804441](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511804441).
- [CGL07] Amin Coja-Oghlan, Andreas Goerdt, and André Lanka. “Strong Refutation Heuristics for Random k -SAT”. In: *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 16.1 (Jan. 2007). Conference version in APPROX 2004, pp. 5–28. DOI: [10.1017/S096354830600784X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830600784X).
- [CGMV20] Amit Chakrabarti, Prantar Ghosh, Andrew McGregor, and Sofya Vorotnikova. “Vertex Ordering Problems in Directed Graph Streams”. In: *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA 2020 (Salt Lake City, Utah, USA, Jan. 5–9, 2020). Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jan. 2020, pp. 1786–1802. DOI: [10.5555/3381089.3381198](https://doi.org/10.5555/3381089.3381198).
- [CGS⁺21] Chi-Ning Chou, Alexander Golovnev, Madhu Sudan, Ameya Velingker, and Santhoshini Velusamy. E-mail. Personal communication. 2021.
- [CGS⁺22] Chi-Ning Chou, Alexander Golovnev, Madhu Sudan, Ameya Velingker, and Santhoshini Velusamy. “Linear Space Streaming Lower Bounds for Approximating CSPs”. In: *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2022 (Rome, Italy, June 20–24, 2022). To appear. 2022.
- [CGSV21a] Chi-Ning Chou, Alexander Golovnev, Madhu Sudan, and Santhoshini Velusamy. *Approximability of All Boolean CSPs with Linear Sketches*. Feb. 24, 2021. arXiv: [2102.12351v7](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.12351v7) [cs.CC].

- [CGSV21b] Chi-Ning Chou, Alexander Golovnev, Madhu Sudan, and Santhoshini Velusamy. “Approximability of All Finite CSPs with Linear Sketches”. In: *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. FOCS 2021 (Denver, CO, USA, Feb. 7–10, 2022). IEEE Computer Society, 2021. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS52979.2021.00117](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS52979.2021.00117).
- [CGV20] Chi-Ning Chou, Alexander Golovnev, and Santhoshini Velusamy. “Optimal Streaming Approximations for All Boolean Max-2CSPs and Max- k SAT”. In: *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. FOCS 2020 (virtual, Nov. 16–19, 2020). IEEE Computer Society, Nov. 2020, pp. 330–341. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00039](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00039).
- [Cha20] Amit Chakrabarti. *Data Stream Algorithms*. Lecture notes (draft). Lecture notes (draft). July 2, 2020. URL: <https://www.cs.dartmouth.edu/~ac/Teach/CS35-Spring20/Notes/lecnotes.pdf>.
- [CHIS12] Mahdi Cheraghchi, Johan Håstad, Marcus Isaksson, and Ola Svensson. “Approximating Linear Threshold Predicates”. In: *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory* 4.1 (Mar. 1, 2012). Conference version in APPROX 2010, 2:1–2:31. DOI: [10.1145/2141938.2141940](https://doi.org/10.1145/2141938.2141940).
- [CKP⁺21] Lijie Chen, Gillat Kol, Dmitry Paramonov, Raghuvansh Saxena, Zhao Song, and Huacheng Yu. E-mail. Mar. 16, 2021.
- [CKS01] Nadia Creignou, Sanjeev Khanna, and Madhu Sudan. *Complexity Classifications of Boolean Constraint Satisfaction Problems*. Discrete Mathematics and Applications. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2001. DOI: [10.1137/1.9780898718546](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898718546).
- [CMM09] Moses Charikar, Konstantin Makarychev, and Yury Makarychev. “Near-Optimal Algorithms for Maximum Constraint Satisfaction Problems”. In: *ACM Transactions on Algorithms* 5.3 (July 2009). Conference version in SODA 2007, pp. 1–14. DOI: [10.1145/1541885.1541893](https://doi.org/10.1145/1541885.1541893).
- [CS98] Benny Chor and Madhu Sudan. “A Geometric Approach to Betweenness”. In: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 11.4 (1998). Conference version in Algorithms, ESA 1995, pp. 511–523. DOI: [10.1137/S0895480195296221](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895480195296221).
- [EH08] Lars Engebretsen and Jonas Holmerin. “More Efficient Queries in PCPs for NP and Improved Approximation Hardness of Maximum CSP”. In: *Random Structures and Algorithms* 33.4 (Dec. 2008). Conference version in STACS 2005, pp. 497–514. DOI: [10.1002/rsa.20226](https://doi.org/10.1002/rsa.20226).
- [Fei02] Uriel Feige. “Relations between Average Case Complexity and Approximation Complexity”. In: *Proceedings of the 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2002. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, May 19, 2002, pp. 534–543. DOI: [10.1145/509907.509985](https://doi.org/10.1145/509907.509985).

- [Fei98] Uriel Feige. “A Threshold of $\ln n$ for Approximating Set Cover”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 45.4 (July 1998). Conference version in STOC 1996, pp. 634–652. DOI: [10.1145/285055.285059](https://doi.org/10.1145/285055.285059).
- [FG95] Uriel Feige and Michel X. Goemans. “Approximating the Value of Two Prover Proof Systems, with Applications to MAX 2SAT and MAX DICUT”. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd Israel Symposium on the Theory of Computing and Systems*. ISTCS 2003 (Jan. 4–6, 1995). IEEE Computer Society, 1995, pp. 182–189. DOI: [10.1109/ISTCS.1995.377033](https://doi.org/10.1109/ISTCS.1995.377033).
- [FGK05] Joel Friedman, Andreas Goerdt, and Michael Krivelevich. “Recognizing More Unsatisfiable Random k -SAT Instances Efficiently”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 35.2 (Jan. 2005). Conference version in STACS 2001, pp. 408–430. DOI: [10.1137/S009753970444096X](https://doi.org/10.1137/S009753970444096X).
- [FK98] Uriel Feige and Joe Kilian. “Zero Knowledge and the Chromatic Number”. In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 57.2 (Oct. 1, 1998). Conference version in CCC 1996, pp. 187–199. DOI: [10.1006/jcss.1998.1587](https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.1998.1587). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000098915872>.
- [FO07] Uriel Feige and Eran Ofek. “Easily Refutable Subformulas of Large Random 3CNF Formulas”. In: *Theory of Computing* 3 (Feb. 9, 2007), pp. 25–43. DOI: [10.4086/toc.2007.v003a002](https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.2007.v003a002).
- [FV98] Tomás Feder and Moshe Y. Vardi. “The Computational Structure of Monotone Monadic SNP and Constraint Satisfaction: A Study through Datalog and Group Theory”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 28.1 (Jan. 1998), pp. 57–104. DOI: [10.1137/S0097539794266766](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539794266766).
- [GHM⁺11] Venkatesan Guruswami, Johan Håstad, Rajsekar Manokaran, Prasad Raghavendra, and Moses Charikar. “Beating the Random Ordering Is Hard: Every Ordering CSP Is Approximation Resistant”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 40.3 (2011). Conference version in FOCS 2008, pp. 878–914. DOI: [10.1137/090756144](https://doi.org/10.1137/090756144).
- [GKK⁺08] Dmitry Gavinsky, Julia Kempe, Iordanis Kerenidis, Ran Raz, and Ronald de Wolf. “Exponential Separation for One-Way Quantum Communication Complexity, with Applications to Cryptography”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 38.5 (Dec. 2008). Conference version in STOC 2007, pp. 1695–1708. ISSN: 0097-5397. DOI: [10.1137/070706550](https://doi.org/10.1137/070706550).
- [GKM22] Venkatesan Guruswami, Pravesh K. Kothari, and Peter Manohar. “Algorithms and Certificates for Boolean CSP Refutation: “Smoothed Is No Harder than Random””. In: *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2022 (Rome, Italy, June 20–24, 2022). 2022.

- [GL17] Venkatesan Guruswami and Euiwoong Lee. “Towards a Characterization of Approximation Resistance for Symmetric CSPs”. In: *Theory of Computing* 13.1 (June 13, 2017). Conference version in APPROX 2015, pp. 1–24. DOI: [10.4086/toc.2017.v013a003](https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.2017.v013a003).
- [GLST98] V. Guruswami, D. Lewin, M. Sudan, and L. Trevisan. “A Tight Characterization of NP with 3 Query PCPs”. In: *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. FOCS 1998 (Palo Alto, CA, USA, Nov. 8–11, 1998). Nov. 1998, pp. 8–17. DOI: [10.1109/SFCS.1998.743424](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1998.743424).
- [GO16] Venkatesan Guruswami and Krzysztof Onak. “Superlinear Lower Bounds for Multi-pass Graph Processing”. In: *Algorithmica* 76.3 (Mar. 2016). Conference version in CCC 2013, pp. 654–683. DOI: [10.1007/s00453-016-0138-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-016-0138-7).
- [Gol11] Oded Goldreich. “Three XOR-Lemmas — An Exposition”. In: *Studies in Complexity and Cryptography: Miscellanea on the Interplay between Randomness and Computation*. Ed. by Oded Goldreich. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2011, pp. 248–272. ISBN: 978-3-642-22670-0. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-22670-0_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22670-0_22).
- [GS21] Anupam Gupta and Sahil Singla. “Random-Order Models”. In: *Beyond the Worst-Case Analysis of Algorithms*. Ed. by Tim Roughgarden. 234–258: Cambridge University Press, Jan. 14, 2021. ISBN: 978-1-108-49431-1. URL: [10.1017/9781108637435.015](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108637435.015).
- [GT19] Venkatesan Guruswami and Runzhou Tao. “Streaming Hardness of Unique Games”. In: *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*. APPROX 2019 (Cambridge, MA, USA, Sept. 20–22, 2019). Ed. by Dimitris Achlioptas and László A. Végh. Vol. 145. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Sept. 2019, 5:1–5:12. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2019.5](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2019.5).
- [GVV17] Venkatesan Guruswami, Ameya Velingker, and Santhoshini Velusamy. “Streaming Complexity of Approximating Max 2CSP and Max Acyclic Subgraph”. In: *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*. APPROX 2017 (Berkeley, CA, USA, Aug. 16–18, 2017). Ed. by Klaus Jansen, José D. P. Rolim, David Williamson, and Santosh S. Vempala. Vol. 81. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Aug. 2017, 8:1–8:19. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2017.8](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2017.8).
- [GW95] Michel X. Goemans and David P. Williamson. “Improved Approximation Algorithms for Maximum Cut and Satisfiability Problems Using Semidefinite Programming”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 42.6 (Nov. 1995). Conference version in STOC 1994, pp. 1115–1145. ISSN: 0004-5411, 1557-735X. DOI: [10.1145/227683.227684](https://doi.org/10.1145/227683.227684).

- [Hås01] Johan Håstad. “Some Optimal Inapproximability Results”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 48.4 (2001), pp. 798–859. DOI: [10.1145/502090.502098](https://doi.org/10.1145/502090.502098).
- [Has04] Gustav Hast. “Approximating Max k CSP Using Random Restrictions”. In: *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*. APPROX 2004 (Cambridge, MA, USA, Aug. 22–24, 2004). Ed. by Klaus Jansen, Sanjeev Khanna, José D. P. Rolim, and Dana Ron. Vol. 3122. LNCS. Springer, 2004, pp. 151–162. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-27821-4_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-27821-4_14).
- [Has05] Gustav Hast. “Approximating Max k CSP – Outperforming a Random Assignment with Almost a Linear Factor”. In: *Automata, Languages and Programming*. ICALP 2005 (July 11–15, 2005). Ed. by Luís Caires, Giuseppe F. Italiano, Luís Monteiro, Catuscia Palamidessi, and Moti Yung. Vol. 3580. LNCS. Springer, 2005, pp. 956–968. DOI: [10.1007/11523468_77](https://doi.org/10.1007/11523468_77).
- [Hås99] Johan Håstad. “Clique Is Hard to Approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$ ”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 182.1 (Mar. 1, 1999). Conference version in FOCS 1996, pp. 105–142. ISSN: 1871-2509. DOI: [10.1007/BF02392825](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02392825).
- [IMNO11] Piotr Indyk, Andrew McGregor, Ilan Newman, and Krzysztof Onak. *Open Problems in Data Streams, Property Testing, and Related Topics*. Compiled from IITK Workshop on Algorithms for Processing Massive Data Sets (2009) and Bertinoro Workshop on Sublinear Algorithms (2011). June 14, 2011. URL: https://sublinear.info/files/bertinoro2011_kanpur2009.pdf.
- [Ind06] Piotr Indyk. “Stable Distributions, Pseudorandom Generators, Embeddings, and Data Stream Computation”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 53.3 (May 2006). Conference version in FOCS 2000, pp. 307–323. DOI: [10.1145/1147954.1147955](https://doi.org/10.1145/1147954.1147955).
- [Kar72] Richard M. Karp. “Reducibility among Combinatorial Problems”. In: *The IBM Research Symposia Series*. Ed. by R.E. Miller, J.W. Thatcher, and J.D. Bohlinger. Springer, 1972, pp. 85–103. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9).
- [Kho02] Subhash Khot. “On the Power of Unique 2-Prover 1-Round Games”. In: *Proceedings of the 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2002 (Québec, Canada, May 19–21, 2002). Association for Computing Machinery, May 2002, pp. 767–775. DOI: [10.1145/509907.510017](https://doi.org/10.1145/509907.510017).
- [Kho10] Subhash Khot. “On the Unique Games Conjecture (Invited Survey)”. In: *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE 25th Annual Conference on Computational Complexity*. CCC 2010 (Cambridge, MA, USA, June 9–11, 2010). IEEE Computer Society, June 9, 2010, pp. 99–121. DOI: [10.1109/CCC.2010.19](https://doi.org/10.1109/CCC.2010.19).
- [KK15] Dmitry Kogan and Robert Krauthgamer. “Sketching Cuts in Graphs and Hypergraphs”. In: *Proceedings of the 6th Annual Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*. ITCS 2015 (Rehovot, Israel, Jan. 11–13, 2015). Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, pp. 367–376. DOI: [10.1145/2688073.2688093](https://doi.org/10.1145/2688073.2688093).

- [KK19] Michael Kapralov and Dmitry Krachun. “An Optimal Space Lower Bound for Approximating MAX-CUT”. In: *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2019 (Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 23–26, 2019). Association for Computing Machinery, June 2019, pp. 277–288. DOI: [10.1145/3313276.3316364](https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316364).
- [KKMO07] Subhash Khot, Guy Kindler, Elchanan Mossel, and Ryan O’Donnell. “Optimal Inapproximability Results for MAX-CUT and Other 2-Variable CSPs?” In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 37.1 (May 14, 2007). Conference version in FOCS 2004. DOI: [10.1137/S0097539705447372](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539705447372).
- [KKP18] John Kallaugher, Michael Kapralov, and Eric Price. “The Sketching Complexity of Graph and Hypergraph Counting”. In: *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. FOCS 2018 (Paris, France, Oct. 7–9, 2018). Oct. 2018, pp. 556–567. DOI: [10.1109/FOCS.2018.00059](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2018.00059).
- [KKS15] Michael Kapralov, Sanjeev Khanna, and Madhu Sudan. “Streaming Lower Bounds for Approximating MAX-CUT”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA 2015 (San Diego, California, USA, Jan. 4–6, 2015). Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jan. 2015, pp. 1263–1282. DOI: [10.1137/1.9781611973730.84](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973730.84).
- [KKS17] Michael Kapralov, Sanjeev Khanna, Madhu Sudan, and Ameya Velingker. “ $(1+\omega(1))$ -Approximation to MAX-CUT Requires Linear Space”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA 2017 (Barcelona, Spain, Jan. 16–19, 2017). Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jan. 2017, pp. 1703–1722. DOI: [10.5555/3039686.3039798](https://doi.org/10.5555/3039686.3039798).
- [KMOW17] Pravesh K. Kothari, Ryuhei Mori, Ryan O’Donnell, and David Witmer. “Sum of Squares Lower Bounds for Refuting Any CSP”. In: *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2017. To appear. Association for Computing Machinery, June 19, 2017, pp. 132–145. DOI: [10.1145/3055399.3055485](https://doi.org/10.1145/3055399.3055485).
- [KNW10] Daniel M. Kane, Jelani Nelson, and David P. Woodruff. “On the Exact Space Complexity of Sketching and Streaming Small Norms”. In: *Proceedings of the 2010 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA 2010 (Austin, TX, USA, Jan. 17–19, 2010). Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010, pp. 1161–1178. DOI: [10.1137/1.9781611973075.93](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973075.93).
- [KO09] Subhash Khot and Ryan O’Donnell. “SDP Gaps and UGC-hardness for Max-Cut-Gain”. In: *Theory of Computing* 5.4 (May 29, 2009). Conference version in STOC 2006, pp. 83–117. DOI: [10.4086/toc.2009.v005a004](https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.2009.v005a004).

- [KP20] John Kallaugher and Eric Price. “Separations and Equivalences between Turnstile Streaming and Linear Sketching”. In: *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2020 (virtual, June 22–26, 2020). New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 1223–1236. URL: <http://doi.org/10.1145/3357713.3384278>.
- [KR08] Subhash Khot and Oded Regev. “Vertex Cover Might Be Hard to Approximate to within $2 - \epsilon$ ”. In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*. Computational Complexity 2003 74.3 (May 1, 2008). Conference version in CCC 2003, pp. 335–349. DOI: [10.1016/j.jcss.2007.06.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2007.06.019).
- [KSTW01] Sanjeev Khanna, Madhu Sudan, Luca Trevisan, and David P. Williamson. “The Approximability of Constraint Satisfaction Problems”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 30.6 (Jan. 1, 2001). Conference versions in STOC 1997 and CCC 1997, pp. 1863–1920. ISSN: 0097-5397. DOI: [10.1137/S0097539799349948](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539799349948). URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/10.1137/S0097539799349948> (visited on 10/29/2021).
- [LLZ02] Michael Lewin, Dror Livnat, and Uri Zwick. “Improved Rounding Techniques for the MAX 2-SAT and MAX DI-CUT Problems”. In: *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*. IPCO 2002. Ed. by William J. Cook and Andreas S. Schulz. 2002, pp. 67–82. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-47867-1_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-47867-1_6).
- [McG14] Andrew McGregor. “Graph Stream Algorithms: A Survey”. In: *ACM SIGMOD Record* 43.1 (May 13, 2014), pp. 9–20. DOI: [10.1145/2627692.2627694](https://doi.org/10.1145/2627692.2627694).
- [MM01] Shiro Matuura and Tomomi Matsui. “0.863-Approximation Algorithm for MAX DI-CUT”. In: *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Techniques*. APPROX 2001 (Berkeley, CA, USA, Aug. 18–20, 2001). Ed. by Michel Goemans, Klaus Jansen, José D. P. Rolim, and Luca Trevisan. Vol. 2129. LNCS. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2001, pp. 138–146. DOI: [10.1007/3-540-44666-4_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44666-4_17).
- [MM17] Konstantin Makarychev and Yury Makarychev. “Approximation Algorithms for CSPs”. In: *The Constraint Satisfaction Problem: Complexity and Approximability*. Ed. by Andrei Krokhin and Stanislav Zivny. Vol. 7. Dagstuhl Follow-Ups. Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017, pp. 287–325. DOI: [10.4230/DFU.Vol17.15301.287](https://doi.org/10.4230/DFU.Vol17.15301.287).
- [Mut05] S. Muthukrishnan. *Data Streams: Algorithms and Applications*. Vol. 1. Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science 2. Now Publishers, Inc., Sept. 26, 2005. 119 pp. DOI: [10.1561/0400000002](https://doi.org/10.1561/0400000002).
- [New00] Alantha Newman. “Approximating the Maximum Acyclic Subgraph”. MA thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2000.
- [O’D14] Ryan O’Donnell. *Analysis of Boolean Functions*. 1st edition. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, June 1, 2014. 444 pp. ISBN: 978-1-107-03832-5.

- [Opa79] Jaroslav Opatrny. “Total Ordering Problem”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 8.1 (Feb. 1979), pp. 111–114. DOI: [10.1137/0208008](https://doi.org/10.1137/0208008).
- [Pot19] Aaron Potechin. “On the Approximation Resistance of Balanced Linear Threshold Functions”. In: *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2019 (Phoenix, AZ, USA, June 23–26, 2019). Association for Computing Machinery, June 23, 2019, pp. 430–441. DOI: [10.1145/3313276.3316374](https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316374).
- [PS18] Pan Peng and Christian Sohler. “Estimating Graph Parameters from Random Order Streams”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA 2018 (New Orleans, LA, USA, Jan. 7–10, 2018). Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jan. 2018. DOI: [10.1137/1.9781611975031.157](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975031.157).
- [Rag08] Prasad Raghavendra. “Optimal Algorithms and Inapproximability Results for Every CSP?”. In: *Proceedings of the 40th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2008 (Victoria, BC, Canada, May 17–20, 2008). 2008, pp. 245–254. DOI: [10.1145/1374376.1374414](https://doi.org/10.1145/1374376.1374414).
- [RRS17] Prasad Raghavendra, Satish Rao, and Tselil Schramm. “Strongly Refuting Random CSPs below the Spectral Threshold”. In: *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2017 (Montreal, Quebec, CA, June 19–23, 2017). June 19, 2017, pp. 121–131. DOI: [10.1145/3055399.3055417](https://doi.org/10.1145/3055399.3055417).
- [Sch78] Thomas J. Schaefer. “The Complexity of Satisfiability Problems”. In: *Proceedings of the 10th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 1978 (San Diego, CA, USA, May 1–3, 1978). Association for Computing Machinery, May 1, 1978, pp. 216–226. DOI: [10.1145/800133.804350](https://doi.org/10.1145/800133.804350).
- [SSV21] Noah Singer, Madhu Sudan, and Santhoshini Velusamy. “Streaming Approximation Resistance of Every Ordering CSP”. In: *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*. APPROX 2021 (Aug. 16–18, 2021). Ed. by Mary Wootters and Laura Sanità. Vol. 207. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Sept. 2021, 17:1–17:19. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2021.17](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2021.17).
- [ST00] Alex Samorodnitsky and Luca Trevisan. “A PCP Characterization of NP with Optimal Amortized Query Complexity”. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2000 (Portland, OR, USA, May 21–23, 2000). Portland, Oregon, United States: Association for Computing Machinery, 2000, pp. 191–199. DOI: [10.1145/335305.335329](https://doi.org/10.1145/335305.335329).
- [ST09] Alex Samorodnitsky and Luca Trevisan. “Gowers Uniformity, Influence of Variables, and PCPs”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 39.1 (Jan. 2009). Conference version in STOC 2006, pp. 323–360. DOI: [10.1137/070681612](https://doi.org/10.1137/070681612).

- [ST98] Madhu Sudan and Luca Trevisan. “Probabilistically Checkable Proofs with Low Amortized Query Complexity”. In: *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. SFCS 1998 (Palo Alto, CA, USA, Nov. 8–11, 1998). IEEE Computer Society, 1998, pp. 18–27. DOI: [10.1109/SFCS.1998.743425](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1998.743425).
- [Tre04] Luca Trevisan. *Inapproximability of Combinatorial Optimization Problems*. Sept. 23, 2004. arXiv: [cs/0409043](https://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0409043).
- [Tre12] Luca Trevisan. “On Khot’s Unique Games Conjecture”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 49.1 (Jan. 2012), pp. 91–111. DOI: [10.1090/S0273-0979-2011-01361-1](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0273-0979-2011-01361-1).
- [Tre98a] Luca Trevisan. “Parallel Approximation Algorithms by Positive Linear Programming”. In: *Algorithmica* 21.1 (May 1998), pp. 72–88. DOI: [10.1007/PL00009209](https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00009209).
- [Tre98b] Luca Trevisan. “Recycling Queries in PCPs and in Linearity Tests”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 1998 (Dallas, Texas, USA, May 24–26, 1998). Association for Computing Machinery, 1998, pp. 299–308. DOI: [10.1145/276698.276769](https://doi.org/10.1145/276698.276769).
- [TSSW00] Luca Trevisan, Gregory B. Sorkin, Madhu Sudan, and David P. Williamson. “Gadgets, Approximation, and Linear Programming”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 29.6 (Jan. 1, 2000). Conference version in FOCS 1996, pp. 2074–2097. DOI: [10.1137/S0097539797328847](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539797328847).
- [Yao77] Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. “Probabilistic Computations: Toward a Unified Measure of Complexity”. In: *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. SFCS 1977 (Providence, RI, USA, Oct. 31–Nov. 2, 1977). IEEE Computer Society, Sept. 30, 1977, pp. 222–227. DOI: [10.1109/SFCS.1977.24](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1977.24).
- [Zhu20] Dmitriy Zhuk. “A Proof of the CSP Dichotomy Conjecture”. In: *Journal of the ACM* 67.5 (Aug. 26, 2020). Conference version in FOCS 2017, 30:1–30:78. DOI: [10.1145/3402029](https://doi.org/10.1145/3402029).
- [Zwi00] Uri Zwick. *Analyzing the MAX 2-SAT and MAX DI-CUT Approximation Algorithms of Feige and Goemans*. Mar. 2, 2000. URL: <https://www.cs.tau.ac.il/~zwick/papers/max2sat-maxdicut.ps.gz>.
- [Zwi98] Uri Zwick. “Approximation Algorithms for Constraint Satisfaction Problems Involving at Most Three Variables per Constraint”. In: *Proceedings of the 9th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA 1998 (San Francisco, CA, USA, Jan. 25–27, 1998). Association for Computing Machinery, 1998, pp. 201–210. DOI: [10.5555/314613.314701](https://doi.org/10.5555/314613.314701).



HIS THESIS WAS TYPESET using \LaTeX , originally developed by Leslie Lamport and based on Donald Knuth's \TeX . The above illustration, *Science Experiment 02*, was created by Ben Schlitter and released under [CC BY-NC-ND 3.0](#). A template that can be used to format a PhD dissertation with this look & feel has been released under the permissive AGPL license, and can be found online at github.com/suchow/Dissertate or from its lead author, Jordan Suchow, at suchow@post.harvard.edu.