

# Testing Junta Truncation

William He\*

Shivam Nadimpalli†

September 6, 2023

## Abstract

We consider the basic statistical problem of detecting truncation of the uniform distribution on the Boolean hypercube by juntas. More concretely, we give upper and lower bounds on the problem of distinguishing between i.i.d. sample access to either (a) the uniform distribution over  $\{0, 1\}^n$ , or (b) the uniform distribution over  $\{0, 1\}^n$  conditioned on the satisfying assignments of a  $k$ -junta  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ .

We show that (up to constant factors)  $\min\{2^k + \log \binom{n}{k}, 2^{k/2} \log^{1/2} \binom{n}{k}\}$  samples suffice for this task and also show that a  $\log \binom{n}{k}$  dependence on sample complexity is unavoidable. Our results suggest that testing junta truncation requires learning the set of relevant variables of the junta.

---

\*Carnegie Mellon University. Email: [wrhe@cs.cmu.edu](mailto:wrhe@cs.cmu.edu).

†Columbia University. Email: [sn2855@columbia.edu](mailto:sn2855@columbia.edu).

# 1 Introduction

Estimation via samples acquired from a *truncated* distribution—i.e. a distribution that has undergone some form of conditioning—is a classic statistical challenge dating back to the works of Bernoulli [Ber60], Galton [Gal97], and Pearson [Pea02]. The premise of inference and learning from truncated distributions suggests an arguably more basic statistical task, namely that of *detecting* if a distribution has been truncated in the first place. We instantiate this question in perhaps its simplest high-dimensional setting by testing for truncations of the uniform distribution on the Boolean hypercube  $\{0, 1\}^n$  by functions of few variables.

The concept of a “function of few variables” can be made precise via the notion of *juntas*: A function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a  $k$ -*junta* if there is a set of coordinates  $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \subseteq [n]$  such that the value of  $f(x)$  is completely determined by  $(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k})$ . Starting with the work of Blum [Blu94], the problem of learning juntas (which abstracts the problem of learning in the presence of irrelevant features) as well as the related problem of *testing* juntas (i.e. the problem of distinguishing whether a function is a  $k$ -junta or is “far” from every  $k$ -junta) have been—and continue to be—the subject of intensive study in theoretical computer science [BL97, MOS04, FKR<sup>+</sup>04, Bla08, Val15, BCE<sup>+</sup>18, DMN19, ITW21, PRW22, CNY23, CP23, BKST23].

We now turn to a more precise formulation of the question we consider in this paper: Given i.i.d. sample access to an unknown distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\{0, 1\}^n$ , distinguish with high probability between (a)  $\mathcal{D}$  being the uniform distribution on  $\{0, 1\}^n$ , and (b) the uniform distribution on the satisfying assignments<sup>1</sup> of some  $k$ -junta (assuming there are not too many satisfying assignments). While the learnability and testability of the truncated distributions we consider (namely those in Item (b) above) are well studied problems [ABR16, CJLW21], the question we consider is an arguably more basic question and adds to a nascent line of inquiry on testing distribution truncation [DNS23, DLNS23]; we defer a detailed discussion of related work to [Section 1.2](#).<sup>2</sup>

**Notation.** Before formally stating our results, we first introduce some notation. We will denote the uniform distribution over the  $n$ -dimensional Boolean hypercube  $\{0, 1\}^n$  by  $\mathcal{U}_n$ . For a function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , we define its *volume*  $\text{Vol}(f)$  as

$$\text{Vol}(f) := \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \{0, 1\}^n} [f(\mathbf{x})].$$

Finally, we introduce notation for the class of distributions we consider:

$$\mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon) := \left\{ \mathcal{U}_n|_{f^{-1}(1)} \text{ for a } k\text{-junta } f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \text{ with } \text{Vol}(f) \leq 1 - \varepsilon \right\}, \quad (1)$$

namely the collection of uniform distributions on satisfying assignments of  $k$ -juntas with volume at most  $1 - \varepsilon$ . We note that  $\mathcal{U}_n$  can be viewed as a truncation of  $\mathcal{U}_n$  by the constant-1 function which is a 0-junta; as such, the assumption on the volume of the junta not being too large is necessary.

## 1.1 Our Results

We obtain both upper and lower bounds on the sample complexity of distinguishing truncations of the uniform distribution on  $\{0, 1\}^n$  by juntas.

---

<sup>1</sup>We say that  $x$  is a *satisfying assignment* of a Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  if  $f(x) = 1$ .

<sup>2</sup>[ABR16] and [CJLW21] consider the broader class of distributions on  $\{0, 1\}^n$  whose density function is a  $k$ -junta; our upper bound partially (in particular, [Algorithm 2](#)) holds for this broader class of distributions as well—see the discussion following [Theorem 1](#) for more on this.

### 1.1.1 Upper Bound

We obtain the following upper bound:

**Theorem 1.** There exists an algorithm JUNTA-TESTER with the following performance guarantee: Given i.i.d. sample access to an unknown distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , the algorithm draws  $O(\min\{T_1, T_2\})$  samples where

$$T_1 := 2^k + \log \binom{n}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad T_2 := 2^{k/2} \log^{1/2} \binom{n}{k} + \log \binom{n}{k},$$

and has the following performance guarantee:

- If  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs “un-truncated” with probability at least 99/100; and
- If  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs “truncated” with probability at least 99/100.

Our upper bound, which we prove in [Section 3](#), is based on two distinct and strikingly simple algorithms for testing junta truncation:

1. The first algorithm, CONSISTENT-JUNTA-CHECKER (cf. [Algorithm 1](#)), assumes the distribution is truncated as long as there is a junta consistent with the samples. As such, it can be viewed as a “consistent hypothesis checker” [[KV94](#)] and has sample complexity  $T_1$ . Note that if the samples are from a truncated distribution, then this algorithm learns the truncating junta.
2. The second algorithm, JUNTA-UNIFORMITY-TEST (cf. [Algorithm 2](#)), relies on the easy observation that in the truncated case, the distribution over the relevant variables in the junta will be far from uniform (thanks to the assumption on the volume on the function, cf. [Equation \(1\)](#) and the following discussion). The algorithm thus draws a sufficiently large number of samples and iterates over all subsets of  $k$  variables, and relies on the uniformity test of Diakonikolas et al. [[DGPP18](#)] to distinguish between the untruncated and truncated distributions.

Note that CONSISTENT-JUNTA-CHECKER is computationally inefficient as it iterates over all  $\Theta(2^{2^k} \binom{n}{k})$   $k$ -juntas over  $\{0, 1\}^n$  whereas JUNTA-UNIFORMITY-TEST runs in time  $O(T_2)$  due to the uniformity test subroutine of [[DGPP18](#)].

**Remark 2.** The combined use of the two algorithms points to an intriguing sample-versus-time complexity trade-off with the parameter  $k$ . In particular, note that when

$$2^k \ll \log \binom{n}{k} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad k \ll \log \log n,$$

we have that computationally inefficient CONSISTENT-JUNTA-CHECKER has lower sample complexity than the computationally efficient JUNTA-UNIFORMITY-TEST.

### 1.1.2 Lower Bound

We now turn to our lower bound on the sample complexity of testing junta truncation:

**Theorem 3.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any algorithm with the same performance guarantee as in [Theorem 1](#). Then  $\mathcal{A}$  must draw  $\Omega(\log \binom{n}{k})$  samples from  $\mathcal{D}$ .

Our lower bound, which we prove in [Section 4](#), is obtained by proving that  $\log \binom{n}{k}$  samples are required to distinguish between  $\mathcal{U}_n$  and  $\mathcal{U}_n$  conditioned on the satisfying assignments of a parity function on a uniformly random set of coordinates of size  $k$ ; our proof is linear algebraic and reduces to proving an elementary anti-concentration property of a coding-theoretic random variable. We remark that the lower bound in [Theorem 3](#) matches the upper bounds in [Theorem 1](#) up to constant factors for  $k = \Theta(1)$  and  $k = \Theta(\log \log n)$ . Our lower bound also suggests that in order to test truncation by a  $k$ -junta, *learning* the set of relevant variables of the junta is in a sense necessary.

## 1.2 Related Work

Estimation and inference over truncated distributions have been increasingly studied by the theoretical computer science community in recent years [[DGTZ19](#), [FKT20](#), [FKT20](#), [DKTZ21](#)]; we refer the reader to Section 1.3 of [[DNS23](#)] for more on this. The question we consider can be viewed as a specific instance of the following broader question:

**Question 4.** Given independently drawn samples from some unknown distribution, determine whether the data was drawn from a known underlying probability distribution  $\mathcal{P}$ , versus from  $\mathcal{P}$  conditioned on some unknown *truncation set*  $S$  of measure bounded away from 1.

The work of Rubinfeld and Servedio [[RS09](#)] considers the problem of testing for truncations of the uniform distribution on  $\{0, 1\}^n$  by monotone Boolean functions, and the work of De, Nadimpalli, and Servedio [[DNS23](#)] considers an instant of [Question 4](#) where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the  $n$ -dimensional standard Gaussian distribution and the truncating set  $S$  can be an arbitrary convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We note that both [[RS09](#)] and [[DNS23](#)] obtain a striking separation between the sample complexities of learning and testing truncation by their respective classes of truncating sets: For both monotone functions and convex sets, the best known learning algorithms require essentially  $n^{O(\sqrt{n})}$  samples, whereas testing truncation in both cases requires  $O(n)$  samples.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to [[RS09](#), [DNS23](#)], a forthcoming manuscript of De, Li, Nadimpalli, and Servedio [[DLNS23](#)] considers a broader instantiation of [Question 4](#) wherein  $\mathcal{P}$  is taken to be an arbitrary “hypercontractive” distribution (cf. Chapters 9 and 10 of [[O’D14](#)]) and the truncating set  $S$  can be the satisfying assignments of a low-degree polynomial threshold function.

## 2 Preliminaries

All probabilities and expectations will be with respect to the uniform distribution, unless otherwise indicated. We use boldfaced characters such as  $\mathbf{w}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $\mathbf{V}$  to denote random variables (which may be real-valued, vector-valued or set-valued; the intended type will be clear from the context). We write  $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}$  to indicate that the random variable  $\mathbf{x}$  is distributed according to the probability distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ . We write  $d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2)$  to denote the *total variation distance* or *statistical distance* between the distributions  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ .

We will sometimes identify the Boolean hypercube  $\{0, 1\}^n$  with the vector space  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ . For  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  we will write  $|x|$  to denote the Hamming weight of  $x$ , i.e.  $|x| := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ ; viewed as an element of  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ , we have  $|x| = |\{i \in [n] : x_i \neq 0\}|$ . Given a subset  $S \subseteq [n]$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , we will write

$$x_S := (x_i)_{i \in S}$$

and will view  $x_S$  as an element of  $\{0, 1\}^S$  in the natural way.

---

<sup>3</sup>This can be viewed as yet another case of the “emerging analogy between monotone Boolean functions and convex sets” [[DNS22](#)].

**Input:**  $\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{U}_n\} \sqcup \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)$

**Output:** “Un-truncated” or “truncated”

CONSISTENT-JUNTA-CHECKER( $\mathcal{D}$ ):

1. Set

$$T := 100 \left( 2^k + \log \binom{n}{k} \right) \log^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \right)$$

and draw  $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(T)} \sim \mathcal{D}$ .

2. If there exists a  $k$ -junta  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  with  $\text{Vol}(f) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$  such that for all  $i \in [T]$  we have  $f(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = 1$ , then output “truncated;” otherwise, output “un-truncated.”

**Algorithm 1:** Testing junta truncation via a consistent hypothesis checker.

### 3 Upper Bounds

In this section, we establish our upper bound on testing junta truncation (cf. [Theorem 1](#)). As discussed earlier, we give two distinct algorithms for detecting truncation by juntas: In [Section 3.1](#), we show that it is possible to test junta truncation using  $O(2^k + \log \binom{n}{k})$  samples via learning. Our second algorithm, which we present in [Section 3.2](#), relies on a uniformity test due to Diakonikolas et al. [[DGPP18](#)] and requires  $O(2^{k/2} \log^{1/2} \binom{n}{k} + \log \binom{n}{k})$  samples.

#### 3.1 Testing Truncation via a Consistent Hypothesis Checker

The truncation tester we present in this section can be viewed as a “consistent hypothesis finder” (see for example [[KV94](#)]) where the algorithm simply checks if there exists a junta that is consistent with all the samples and outputs “truncated” if this is indeed the case. We note that this algorithm is computationally inefficient, and has runtime  $O(2^{2k} \binom{n}{k})$  as it must iterate over all  $k$ -juntas over  $\{0, 1\}^n$ .

**Proposition 5.** The algorithm CONSISTENT-JUNTA-CHECKER (cf. [Algorithm 1](#)) has the following performance guarantee:

- If  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n$ , then it outputs “un-truncated” with probability at least 99/100; and
- If  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)$ , then it outputs “truncated” with probability 1.

*Proof.* Note that if  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)$ , then clearly the algorithm never outputs “un-truncated.” It therefore suffices to show that when  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n$ , the algorithm outputs “truncated” with probability at most 1/100. Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be the random variable that counts the number of  $k$ -juntas with volume at most  $(1 - \varepsilon)$  that are consistent with the sample set  $(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(T)})$ , i.e.

$$\mathbf{X} := \sum_{\mathcal{D}' \in \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)} \mathbf{1} \left\{ \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D}') \text{ for all } i \in [T] \right\}$$

where  $\text{supp}(\mathcal{D}')$  denotes the support of the distribution  $\mathcal{D}'$ . We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{U}_n}[\mathbf{X}] &= \sum_{\mathcal{D}' \in \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)} \Pr_{\mathcal{U}_n} \left[ \mathbf{x}^{(i)} \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{D}') \text{ for all } i \in [T] \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathcal{D}' \in \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)} (1 - \varepsilon)^T \\
&\leq 2^{2k} \binom{n}{k} \cdot (1 - \varepsilon)^T \\
&= 2^{2k} \binom{n}{k} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{100(2^k + \log \binom{n}{k})} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{100},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that  $d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{U}_n, \mathcal{D}') \geq \varepsilon$ , and the second inequality follows from the fact that there are at most  $2^{2k} \binom{n}{k}$  many  $k$ -juntas over  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . Using Markov's inequality, we thus have that

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(T)} \sim \mathcal{U}_n} [\text{Algorithm 1 outputs "truncated"}] = \Pr_{\mathcal{U}_n} [\mathbf{X} \geq 1] \leq \frac{1}{100},$$

completing the proof.  $\square$

### 3.2 Testing Truncation via Uniformity Testing

We now give a different algorithm for testing junta truncation that relies on the uniformity test of Diakonikolas et al. [DGPP18]. The algorithm relies on the simple observation that if the input distribution has been truncated by a junta on the variables in some set  $S$ , then the resulting distribution on  $\{0, 1\}^S$  is far from uniform. We first formally state the guarantee of the uniformity test of Diakonikolas et al. [DGPP18]:

**Proposition 6** (Theorem 2 of [DGPP18]). Given  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ , there exists an algorithm, `UNIFORMITY-TEST`( $\varepsilon, \delta$ ), which given i.i.d. sample access to a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $[m]$ , draws

$$T := \Theta \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \left( \sqrt{m \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right)} + \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right) \right)$$

samples from  $\mathcal{D}$ , does an  $O(T)$ -time computation, and has the following performance guarantee:

- If  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_{[m]}$  where  $\mathcal{U}_{[m]}$  is the uniform distribution over  $[m]$ , then it outputs “un-truncated” with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ; and
- If  $d_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{U}_{[m]}, \mathcal{D}) \geq \varepsilon$ , then it outputs “truncated” with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

With this in hand, the analysis of [Algorithm 2](#) is rather straightforward:

**Proposition 7.** The algorithm `JUNTA-UNIFORMITY-TEST` (cf. [Algorithm 2](#)) has the following performance guarantee:

- If  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n$ , then it outputs “un-truncated” with probability at least 99/100; and

**Input:**  $\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{U}_n\} \sqcup \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)$

**Output:** “Un-truncated” or “truncated”

JUNTA-UNIFORMITY-TEST( $\mathcal{D}$ ):

1. Set

$$T := \Theta \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \left( 2^{k/2} \cdot \log^{1/2} \binom{n}{k} + \log \binom{n}{k} \right) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta := \Theta \left( \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \right),$$

and draw  $T$  samples  $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(T)} \sim \mathcal{D}$ .

2. For each  $S \subseteq [n]$  with  $|S| = k$ :

(a) Run UNIFORMITY-TEST( $\varepsilon, \delta$ ) (cf. [Proposition 6](#)) on samples  $(\mathbf{x}_S^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_S^{(T)})$  identifying  $[m] \equiv \{0, 1\}^S$ .

(b) If UNIFORMITY-TEST outputs “truncated,” halt and output “truncated.”

3. Otherwise, output “un-truncated.”

**Algorithm 2:** Testing junta truncation via uniformity testing.

- If  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)$ , then it outputs “truncated” with probability at least 99/100.

*Proof.* Note that if  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n$ , then for each  $S \subseteq [n]$  with  $|S| = k$ , we have that  $(\mathbf{x}_S^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_S^{(T)})$  is distributed according to the uniform distribution on  $\{0, 1\}^S$ . It thus follows by the guarantee of UNIFORMITY-TEST (cf. [Proposition 6](#)) that we output “truncated” with probability at most  $\delta$  with  $\delta$  as defined in Item 1 of [Algorithm 2](#). Union bounding over all  $\binom{n}{k}$  sets  $S \subseteq [n]$  of size  $k$ , we get (for an appropriate choice of constant hidden by the  $\Theta(\cdot)$  when setting  $\delta$ ) that the JUNTA-UNIFORMITY-TEST outputs “truncated” with probability at most 1/100.

On the other hand, suppose  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{J}_n(k, \varepsilon)$ ; in particular, suppose  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n|_{f^{-1}(1)}$  where the function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a  $k$ -junta on the variables in  $S^* \subseteq [n]$  with  $|f^{-1}(1)| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)2^n$ . In this case, note that the  $(\mathbf{x}_{S^*}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{S^*}^{(T)})$  is drawn from a distribution on  $\{0, 1\}^{S^*}$  which has variation distance at least  $\varepsilon$  from the uniform distribution on  $\{0, 1\}^{S^*}$ , and so UNIFORMITY-TEST will output “truncated” with probability at least  $1 - \delta \gg 99/100$  (once again, for an appropriate choice of constant hidden by the  $\Theta(\cdot)$  when setting  $\delta$ ).  $\square$

## 4 Lower Bound

In this section, we establish [Theorem 3](#) by showing that any algorithm with the performance guarantee as in [Theorem 1](#) must draw  $\Omega(\log \binom{n}{k})$  samples from  $\mathcal{D}$ . We obtain our lower bound by showing that it is hard to distinguish between the uniform distribution  $\mathcal{U}_n$  and the uniform distribution truncated by a (negated) *parity* function. Throughout this section, it will be convenient for us to identify  $\{0, 1\}^n$  with  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ .

**Definition 8.** Given a subset  $S \subseteq [n]$ , we write  $\chi_S : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$  for the (negated) *parity* function on

$S$  defined by

$$\chi_S(x) := 1 - \sum_{i \in S} x_i.$$

In particular, note that each  $\chi_S$  is a  $|S|$ -junta. Let  $\mathcal{P}_n(k)$  be the collection of truncations of the uniform distribution over  $\{0, 1\}^n$  by parities on  $k$  variables, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}_n(k) := \left\{ \mathcal{U}_n|_{\chi_S^{-1}(1)} : |S| = k \right\}.$$

**Theorem 3** follows immediately from the following:

**Proposition 9.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any algorithm which given i.i.d. sample access to a distribution  $\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{U}_n\} \cup \mathcal{P}_n(k)$ , has the following performance guarantee:

- If  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs “un-truncated” with probability 99/100; and
- If  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{P}_n(k)$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  outputs “truncated” with probability at least 99/100.

Then  $\mathcal{A}$  must draw  $\Omega\binom{n}{k}$  samples from  $\mathcal{D}$ .

Note that any algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  with the performance guarantee as in **Proposition 9** can distinguish between  $\mathcal{U}_n$  and the (uniform) *mixture* distribution on  $\mathcal{P}_n(k)$  with probability at least 99/100; in particular, it suffices for us to prove a sample-complexity lower bound against algorithms that distinguish between these two distributions. It thus suffices to prove a sample complexity lower bound against the natural “maximum likelihood estimate”-based distinguisher.

**Notation 10.** We will sometimes write  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} := (\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(T)})$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{y}} := (\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(T)})$  for brevity.

We next formally define the MLE-based distinguisher:

**Definition 11.** Given  $T$  i.i.d. samples  $(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(T)})$  drawn from some unknown distribution  $\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{U}_n\} \cup \mathcal{P}_n(k)$ , we write  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$  for the algorithm that outputs “truncated” if

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{P}_n(k)} \left[ \Pr_{\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(T)} \sim \mathcal{D}} [\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}] \right] \geq \Pr_{\mathbf{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(T)} \sim \mathcal{U}_n} [\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}],$$

and “un-truncated” otherwise.

#### 4.1 A Lower Bound Against $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$

In the rest of this section, we establish the following proposition which together with **Definition 11** implies **Proposition 9**, which in turn implies **Theorem 3**.

**Proposition 12.** Given i.i.d. sample access to  $\mathcal{D}$  where

$$\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{U}_n\} \cup \mathcal{P}_n(k),$$

suppose  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$  has the following performance guarantee:

- If  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}_n$ , then  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$  outputs “un-truncated” with probability at least 99/100; and
- If  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{P}_n(k)$ , then  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$  outputs “truncated” with probability at least 99/100.

Then  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$  must draw at least  $\log \binom{n}{k}$  samples from  $\mathcal{D}$ .



To prove that  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$  drawing  $\log \binom{n}{k}$  samples does not satisfy the performance guarantee, we prove [Lemma 14](#) which reduces our problem to proving an anticoncentration bound for a coding-theoretic random variable. Finally, [Lemma 15](#) completes the proof by providing the anticoncentration bound needed.

We define our random variable as follows:

**Definition 13.** Let  $\mathbf{V} \leq \mathbb{F}_2^n$  be a random linear subspace obtained by the following process:

1. Draw  $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(T)} \sim \mathbb{F}_2^n$  uniformly at random where  $T := \log \binom{n}{k}$ .
2. Set  $\mathbf{V} := \text{span}(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(T)})^\perp$ .

We also define

$$\mathbf{w} := |\{x \in \mathbf{V} : |x| = k\}|.$$

The following lemma relates the failure probability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$  to a tail probability of the random variable  $\mathbf{w}$ :

**Lemma 14.** Given  $T := \log \binom{n}{k}$  samples  $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(T)}$  drawn from  $\mathcal{U}_n$ , we have

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{U}_n} \left[ \mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(T)}) \text{ outputs "truncated"} \right] = \Pr_{\mathcal{U}_n} [\mathbf{w} \geq 1]$$

with  $\mathbf{w}$  as in [Definition 13](#).

*Proof.* By [Definition 11](#), we have that the probability of  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}}$  outputting "truncated" given samples from  $\mathcal{U}$  is given by

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{x}^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{U}_n} \left[ \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{P}_n(k)} \left[ \Pr_{\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{D}} [\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}] \geq \Pr_{\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{U}_n} [\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}] \right] \right]. \quad (2)$$

Note, however, that for fixed  $x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(T)}$  we have

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{U}_n} [\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}] = \frac{1}{2^{nT}}, \quad (3)$$

and also that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{P}_n(k)} \left[ \Pr_{\mathbf{y}^{(i)} \sim \mathcal{D}} [\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \bar{\mathbf{x}}] \right] = \frac{\left| \left\{ S : |S| = k \text{ and } \chi_S(x^{(i)}) = 1 \text{ for } i \in [T] \right\} \right|}{|\mathcal{P}_n(k)| 2^{(n-1)T}}. \quad (4)$$

This relies on the fact that  $\text{Vol}(\chi_S) = 1/2$  for all  $S \neq \emptyset$ . Combining [Equations \(2\)](#) to [\(4\)](#), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\mathcal{U}_n} [\mathcal{A}_{\text{MLE}} \text{ outputs "truncated"}] &= \Pr_{\mathcal{U}_n} \left[ \left| \left\{ S : |S| = k \text{ and for all } i \in [T], \chi_S(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = 1 \right\} \right| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{P}_n(k)|}{2^T} \right] \\ &= \Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq 1] \end{aligned}$$

as  $|\mathcal{P}_n(k)| = \binom{n}{k}$  and recalling our choice of  $T = \log \binom{n}{k}$ .  $\square$

With [Lemma 14](#) in hand, the proof of the lower bound is completed by the following lemma:

**Lemma 15.** We have  $\Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq 1] > 0.01$ .

*Proof.* We will first establish that  $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{w}] = 1$ . To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{w}] &= \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \\ |x|=k}} \Pr_{\mathbf{V}} [x \in \mathbf{V}] \\
&= \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \\ |x|=k}} \Pr_{\mathbf{V}} \left[ \langle \mathbf{v}^{(i)}, x \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } i \in [T] \right] \\
&= \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \\ |x|=k}} \prod_{i=1}^T \Pr_{\mathbf{V}} \left[ \langle \mathbf{v}^{(i)}, x \rangle = 0 \right] \\
&= \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \\ |x|=k}} \frac{1}{2^T} \\
&= 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

recalling that  $T = \log \binom{n}{k}$ . We will next obtain an upper bound on the second moment of  $\mathbf{w}$ . Recalling that  $\mathbf{w} = \sum_{|x|=k} \mathbf{1}\{x \in \mathbf{V}\}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{w}^2] &= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{V}} \left[ \left( \sum_{|x|=k} \mathbf{1}\{x \in \mathbf{V}\} \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{V}} \left[ \sum_{|x|,|y|=k} \mathbf{1}\{x \in \mathbf{V}\} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{y \in \mathbf{V}\} \right] \\
&= \sum_{\substack{x,y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \\ |x|=|y|=k}} \Pr_{\mathbf{V}} [x \in \mathbf{V}, y \in \mathbf{V}] \\
&= \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \\ |x|=k}} \Pr_{\mathbf{V}} [x \in \mathbf{V}] + \sum_{\substack{x \neq y \\ |x|=|y|=k}} \Pr_{\mathbf{V}} [x \in \mathbf{V}, y \in \mathbf{V}],
\end{aligned}$$

but when  $x \neq y$ , note that the events  $\{x \in \mathbf{V}\}$  and  $\{y \in \mathbf{V}\}$  are independent, and so we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 + \sum_{\substack{x \neq y \\ |x|=|y|=k}} \Pr_{\mathbf{V}} [x \in \mathbf{V}] \Pr_{\mathbf{V}} [y \in \mathbf{V}] \\
&\leq 2,
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where the last two expressions relied on our choice of  $T$ .

We now turn to the proof of [Lemma 15](#). Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that  $\Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq 1] \leq 0.01$ . Now, from [Equation \(5\)](#) we have that

$$1 = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{w}] = \sum_{i \geq 1} \Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq i].$$

By assumption we then have that

$$0.01 \geq \Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq 1] = 1 - \sum_{i \geq 2} \Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq i], \quad \text{and so} \quad \sum_{i \geq 2} \Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq i] \geq 0.99. \quad (7)$$

Note, however, that by [Equations \(5\) and \(6\)](#) it follows that  $\mathbf{Var}[\mathbf{w}] \leq 1$  and so by Chebyshev's inequality we have that for any  $i \geq 2$ ,

$$\Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq i] \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)^2}.$$

We also have that for  $i \geq 2$ ,  $\Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq i] \leq \Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq 1] \leq 0.01$  by assumption, and so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \geq 2} \Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq i] &\leq \sum_{i \geq 2} \min \left\{ \frac{1}{(i-1)^2}, 0.01 \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=2}^{15} 0.01 + \sum_{i > 15} \frac{1}{(i-1)^2} \\ &\leq 0.15 + 0.25 \\ &\leq 0.4, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts [Equation \(7\)](#). It follows that  $\Pr[\mathbf{w} \geq 1] > 0.01$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

## Acknowledgements

S.N. is supported by NSF grants IIS-1838154, CCF-2106429, CCF-2211238, CCF-1763970, and CCF-2107187. The authors would like to thank Lucas Gretta, Fermi Ma and Avishay Tal for helpful discussions. This work was partially completed while the authors were visiting the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing.

## References

- [ABR16] Maryam Aliakbarpour, Eric Blais, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Learning and testing junta distributions. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 19–46, 2016.
- [BCE<sup>+</sup>18] Eric Blais, Clément Canonne, Talya Eden, Amit Levi, and Dana Ron. Tolerant junta testing and the connection to submodular optimization and function isomorphism. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2113–2132, 2018.
- [Ber60] Daniel Bernoulli. Essai d'une nouvelle analyse de la mortalité causée par la petite vérole, et des avantages de l'inoculation pour la prévenir. *Histoire de l'Acad., Roy. Sci.(Paris) avec Mem*, pages 1–45, 1760.
- [BKST23] Guy Blanc, Caleb Koch, Carmen Strassle, and Li-Yang Tan. A Strong Composition Theorem for Junta Complexity and the Boosting of Property Testers. *FOCS*, 2023. To appear.
- [BL97] Avrim Blum and Pat Langley. Selection of relevant features and examples in machine learning. *Artificial Intelligence*, 97(1-2):245–271, 1997.

- [Bla08] Eric Blais. Improved bounds for testing juntas. In *Proceedings of the 12th Intl. Workshop on Randomization and Computation (RANDOM)*, pages 317–330. Springer, 2008.
- [Blu94] Avrim Blum. Relevant examples and relevant features: Thoughts from computational learning theory. In *AAAI Fall Symposium on ‘Relevance*, volume 5, page 1, 1994.
- [CJLW21] Xi Chen, Rajesh Jayaram, Amit Levi, and Erik Waingarten. Learning and testing junta distributions with sub cube conditioning. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 1060–1113, 2021.
- [CNY23] Thomas Chen, Shivam Nadimpalli, and Henry Yuen. Testing and learning quantum juntas nearly optimally. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1163–1185, 2023.
- [CP23] Xi Chen and Shyamal Patel. New lower bounds for adaptive tolerant junta testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10647*, 2023.
- [DGPP18] Ilias Diakonikolas, Themis Gouleakis, John Peebles, and Eric Price. Sample-optimal identity testing with high probability. In *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2018)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- [DGTZ19] Constantinos Daskalakis, Themis Gouleakis, Christos Tzamos, and Manolis Zampetakis. Computationally and statistically efficient truncated regression. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, volume 99 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 955–960, 2019.
- [DKTZ21] Constantinos Daskalakis, Vasilis Kontonis, Christos Tzamos, and Emmanouil Zampetakis. A Statistical Taylor Theorem and Extrapolation of Truncated Densities. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, volume 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1395–1398, 2021.
- [DLNS23] Anindya De, Huan Li, Shivam Nadimpalli, and Rocco A. Servedio. Testing Low-Degree Truncation, 2023. Manuscript.
- [DMN19] Anindya De, Elchanan Mossel, and Joe Neeman. Junta correlation is testable. In David Zuckerman, editor, *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, November 9-12, 2019*, pages 1549–1563. IEEE Computer Society, 2019.
- [DNS22] Anindya De, Shivam Nadimpalli, and Rocco A. Servedio. Convex influences. In Mark Braverman, editor, *13th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS*, volume 215 of *LIPICs*, pages 53:1–53:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [DNS23] Anindya De, Shivam Nadimpalli, and Rocco A. Servedio. Testing Convex Truncation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 4050–4082. 2023.
- [FKR<sup>+</sup>04] Eldar Fischer, Guy Kindler, Dana Ron, Shmuel Safra, and Alex Samorodnitsky. Testing juntas. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 68(4):753–787, 2004.

- [FKT20] Dimitris Fotakis, Alkis Kalavasis, and Christos Tzamos. Efficient parameter estimation of truncated boolean product distributions. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1586–1600, 2020.
- [Gal97] Francis Galton. An examination into the registered speeds of American trotting horses, with remarks on their value as hereditary data. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 62(379-387):310–315, 1897.
- [ITW21] Vishnu Iyer, Avishay Tal, and Michael Whitmeyer. Junta distance approximation with sub-exponential queries. In Valentine Kabanets, editor, *36th Computational Complexity Conference, CCC 2021, July 20-23, 2021, Toronto, Ontario, Canada (Virtual Conference)*, volume 200 of *LIPICs*, pages 24:1–24:38. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [KV94] Michael J Kearns and Umesh Vazirani. *An introduction to computational learning theory*. MIT press, 1994.
- [MOS04] Elchanan Mossel, Ryan O’Donnell, and Rocco A. Servedio. Learning functions of  $k$  relevant variables. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 69(3):421–434, 2004.
- [O’D14] Ryan O’Donnell. *Analysis of Boolean Functions*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [Pea02] Karl Pearson. On the systematic fitting of frequency curves. *Biometrika*, 2:2–7, 1902.
- [PRW22] Ramesh Krishnan S. Pallavoor, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Erik Waingarten. Approximating the distance to monotonicity of boolean functions. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 60(2):233–260, 2022.
- [RS09] Ronitt Rubinfeld and Rocco A. Servedio. Testing monotone high-dimensional distributions. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 34(1):24–44, 2009.
- [Val15] Gregory Valiant. Finding correlations in subquadratic time, with applications to learning parities and the closest pair problem. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 62(2):1–45, 2015.