

# Boolean Functions with Minimal Spectral Sensitivity

Krišjānis Prūsis and Jevgēnijs Vihrovs

Centre for Quantum Computer Science, Faculty of Science and Technology,  
University of Latvia, Raiņa 19, Riga, Latvia, LV-1050

## Abstract

In this note we show examples of total Boolean functions that depend on  $n$  variables and have spectral sensitivity  $\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$ , which is asymptotically minimal.

## 1 Introduction

We investigate the question of the minimum possible spectral sensitivity of a total Boolean function  $f$  that depends on all  $n$  variables. This question has been answered for other major measures, with matching examples:<sup>1</sup>

- sensitivity:  $s(f) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log n - \log \log n + 2$  [Sim82; Weg85];
- degree:  $\deg(f) \geq \log n - O(\log \log n)$  [NS94];
- approximate degree:  $\widetilde{\deg}(f) \geq \log n / \log \log n - O(1)$  [AW14].

These in a sense were the lowest measures known, as at least one of them lower bounds most other important complexity measures like the deterministic, randomized and quantum query complexities, block sensitivity, certificate complexity etc. Lower bounds for these measures were further studied in [Wel22].

Spectral sensitivity  $\lambda(f)$  is a relatively new measure used to prove the Sensitivity Conjecture [Hua19], which lower bounds  $s(f)$ ,  $\deg(f)$  and  $\widetilde{\deg}(f)$  [Aar+21]. In this note we show functions with  $\lambda(f) = \Theta(\sqrt{\log n})$ , which is asymptotically minimal.

In order to lower bound the minimal spectral sensitivity, we will use the following known relations. On the one hand, we have that the sensitivity of such a function is at least logarithmic:

**Lemma 1** ([Sim82]). *For any total non-degenerate Boolean function  $f$ ,*

$$s(f) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log n - \log \log n + 2.$$

We also have an upper bound on sensitivity in terms of spectral sensitivity:

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout the note, we use  $\log n$  to denote the logarithm base 2.

**Lemma 2** (Lemma 34 in [Aar+21]). *For any Boolean function  $f$ ,  $s(f) \leq \lambda(f)^2$ .*

Thus, any total non-degenerate function will have  $\lambda(f) = \Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$ . On the other hand, there is the following upper bound on spectral sensitivity:

**Lemma 3** (Lemma 31 in [Aar+21]). *For any Boolean function  $f$ ,  $\lambda(f) \leq \sqrt{s_0(f) s_1(f)}$ .*

Therefore, in order to construct a function with minimal spectral sensitivity, one approach is to construct a function with  $s_0(f) = 1$  and  $s_1(f) = O(\log n)$ . For such a function,  $\lambda(f) = \sqrt{s_1(f)}$  by the fact that  $\sqrt{s_1(f)} = \sqrt{s(f)} \leq \lambda(f) \leq \sqrt{s_0(f) s_1(f)} = \sqrt{s_1(f)}$  by the above lemmas.

We give two methods to obtain such functions. The first is based on combining Hamming codes with the Boolean address function, and achieves  $\lambda(f) = \sqrt{(1 + o(1)) \log n}$ . The second, using the desensitization of [BHT17] on known low-sensitivity functions, is more general but achieves a worse constant factor:  $\lambda(f) = \sqrt{(3/2 + o(1)) \log n}$ .

## 2 Definitions

Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a total non-degenerate Boolean function: for every  $i \in [n]$ , there is an input  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $f(x) \neq f(x^{(i)})$ , where  $x^{(i)}$  is  $x$  with the  $i$ -th variable flipped.

The *sensitivity* of  $f$  on an input  $x$ , denoted by  $s(f, x)$ , is defined as the number of  $i \in [n]$  such that  $f(x) \neq f(x^{(i)})$ . For  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , the  $b$ -*sensitivity* of  $f$  is defined as  $s_b(f) = \max_{x \in f^{-1}(b)} s(f, x)$ . The *sensitivity* of  $f$  is defined as  $s(f) = \max\{s_0(f), s_1(f)\}$ .

The *sensitivity graph* of  $f$  is defined as a subgraph  $G_f = (V, E)$  of the  $n$ -dimensional Boolean hypercube, where  $V = \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $E = \{\{x, x^{(i)}\} \mid f(x) \neq f(x^{(i)})\}$ . Let  $A_f$  be the adjacency matrix of  $G_f$ ; then the *spectral sensitivity* of  $f$ , denoted by  $\lambda(f)$ , is defined as  $\|A_f\|$ , the largest eigenvalue of  $A_f$ .

We say that an input  $x$  *satisfies* a partial assignment  $p : [n] \rightarrow \{0, 1, *\}$  and write  $x \in p$  if for all  $i \in [n]$  either  $x_i = p(i)$  or  $p(i) = *$ . The set of all inputs satisfying  $p$  forms a subcube of the  $n$ -dimensional Boolean hypercube. The dimension of this subcube is the number of  $*$  in  $p$ , called the *dimension* of  $p$  and denoted by  $\dim(p)$ ; the total number of 0s and 1s is called the *co-dimension* of  $p$  and denoted by  $\text{codim}(p) = n - \dim(p)$ .

A *certificate* is a partial assignment  $p$  such that  $f(x)$  is constant for all inputs  $x \in p$ . The *certificate complexity* of  $x$  with respect to  $f$  is defined as  $C(f, x) = \min_{p: x \in p} \text{codim}(p)$ . The  $b$ -*certificate complexity* of  $f$  is defined as  $C_b(f) = \max_{x \in f^{-1}(b)} C(f, x)$ . The *certificate complexity* of  $f$  is defined as  $C(f) = \max\{C_0(f), C_1(f)\}$ .

A set of  $b$ -certificates  $S$  such that each input  $x \in f^{-1}(b)$  satisfies exactly one  $p \in S$  is called an *unambiguous collection* of  $b$ -certificates. The  $b$ -*unambiguous certificate complexity* of  $f$  is defined as  $\text{UC}_b(f) = \min_S \max_{p \in S} \text{codim}(p)$ . The *unambiguous certificate complexity* of  $f$  is defined as  $\text{UC}(f) = \max\{\text{UC}_0(f), \text{UC}_1(f)\}$ .

## 3 Hamming Address Function

For the first approach, we directly construct a function family with minimal spectral sensitivity. The construction is a variation of the well known address function, where the address will be encoded using Hamming codes [Ham50].

For any integer  $r \geq 2$ , the Hamming code  $H_r$  encodes messages of length  $2^r - r - 1$  into codewords of length  $2^r - 1$  so that any two codewords differ in at least 3 positions. The total number of different messages for such a code is  $|H_r| = 2^{2^r - r - 1}$ .

**Theorem 4.** *There is a family of total non-degenerate Boolean functions  $\text{HADDR}_r$  for  $r \geq 2$  such that  $s_0(\text{HADDR}_r) = 1$ ,  $s_1(\text{HADDR}_r) \leq 2^r$ ,  $n \geq 2^{2^r - r - 1}$ . For these functions  $\lambda(\text{HADDR}_r) = \sqrt{(1 + o(1)) \log n}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $k = 2^r - 1$ . For any message  $m \in [2^{2^r - r - 1}]$ , denote by  $w_m$  the corresponding codeword of length  $k$ . We construct the following 1-certificate  $p_m$  for  $\text{HADDR}_r$  for each such message:

$$p_m = w_m *^{m-1} 1 *^{2^{2^r - r - 1} - m}.$$

We define  $\text{HADDR}_r(x) = 1$  iff  $x$  satisfies  $p_m$  for some  $m$ . Each such 1-certificate differs from any other in at least 3 of the first  $k$  positions, as they correspond to different codewords. Thus, any 0-input can be adjacent to at most one such certificate and we have  $s_0(\text{HADDR}_r) = 1$ .

Such a function is non-degenerate, as each of the first  $k$  positions is sensitive for every 1-input, and each of the remaining  $2^{2^r - r - 1}$  positions is sensitive for 1-inputs corresponding to one of these certificates.

We have that  $s_1(\text{HADDR}_r) \leq C_1(\text{HADDR}_r) = k + 1 = 2^r$ . Lastly,  $n(\text{HADDR}_r) = k + 2^{2^r - r - 1} \geq 2^{2^r - r - 1}$ .

Then for spectral sensitivity we have

$$\lambda(\text{HADDR}_r) = \sqrt{s_1(\text{HADDR}_r)} = \sqrt{(1 + o(1)) \log n}. \quad \square$$

## 4 Desensitized Functions

The second approach is to examine functions known to achieve  $s_0(f) = s_1(f) = O(\log(n))$  and apply the desensitizing transformation of [BHT17] to reduce their 0-sensitivity to 1. While in general this transformation can asymptotically increase  $s_1(f)$ , we show that this is not the case for some well-known functions with  $s(f) = O(\log(n))$ .

It suffices to show that for these functions  $D(f) = O(\log n)$ . Some examples of such low-sensitivity functions include the Boolean address function, the balanced binary tree [DS19] (Definition 3.1.), the function constructed in [CHS20], and the monotone Boolean address function [Weg85].

**Lemma 5** (Desensitization, Lemma 12 in [BHT17]). *For any  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , there exists an  $f' : \{0, 1\}^{3n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $s_0(f') = 1$  and  $\text{UC}_1(f') \leq 3 \text{UC}_1(f)$ .*

We can observe that  $s_1(f') \leq 3D(f)$ , since  $s_1(f') \leq \text{UC}_1(f') \leq 3 \text{UC}_1(f) \leq 3D(f)$ , which follows from the basic properties of UC [BHT17]. For each of the examples, we have  $D(f) = O(\log n)$ , therefore we also have  $s_1(f') = O(\log n)$ . Thus,  $\lambda(f') = O(\sqrt{s_1(f')}) = O(\sqrt{\log n})$ .

On the other hand, we can lower bound  $\lambda(f')$  in terms of  $s_1(f)$ . The desensitized function  $f'$  in Lemma 5 is defined as follows. Let  $S$  be a collection of unambiguous 1-certificates with co-dimension  $\text{UC}_1(f)$ . Define  $x' = x_1 x_2 x_3$ , then  $f'(x') = 1$  iff there

exists a 1-certificate  $p \in S$  such that  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in p$ . If  $x_1$  is an input to  $f$  with the largest 1-sensitivity, then  $x' = x_1 x_1 x_1$  has sensitivity at least  $3 s_1(f)$  with respect to  $f'$ . Therefore,  $s_1(f') \geq 3 s_1(f)$  and  $\lambda(f') \geq \sqrt{3 s_1(f)}$  by Lemma 2.

The example that achieves the lowest known sensitivity in terms of  $n$  is the monotone Boolean address function  $\text{MAF}_k$  [Weg85]. For this function,  $s(\text{MAF}_k) = (1/2 + o(1)) \log n$ . By desensitizing it, we obtain

$$\lambda(\text{MAF}'_k) \geq \sqrt{\left(\frac{3}{2} + o(1)\right) \log n}.$$

Hence, the  $\text{HADDR}_r$  function has a slightly lower constant factor than what we can obtain with desensitization.

## 5 Optimality

One can check that Simon’s proof [Sim82] actually implies a stronger statement than Lemma 1,

$$s_0(f) + s_1(f) \geq (1 + o(1)) \log n.$$

Thus, if  $s_0(f) = O(1)$ , then  $s_1(f) \geq (1 + o(1)) \log n$ . Otherwise, if  $s_0(f) = \omega(1)$ , then our approach will give an upper bound on  $\lambda(f)$  that is  $\omega(\sqrt{\log n})$ . However, it does not exclude the possibility of a function with, for example,  $s_0(f), s_1(f) = (1/2 + o(1)) \log n$  and  $\lambda(f) = \sqrt{(1/2 + o(1)) \log n}$ . Therefore, closing the gap to get the optimal constant factor remains open.

## 6 Acknowledgements

We thank Manaswi Paraashar for introducing us to this problem, and Juris Smotrovs and Andris Ambainis for helpful discussions.

This work was supported by the Latvian Quantum Initiative under European Union Recovery and Resilience Facility project no. 2.3.1.1.i.0/1/22/I/CFLA/001.

## References

- [Aar+21] Scott Aaronson, Shalev Ben-David, Robin Kothari, Shramas Rao, and Avishay Tal. “Degree vs. Approximate Degree and Quantum Implications of Huang’s Sensitivity Theorem”. In: *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2021. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, pp. 1330–1342. ISBN: 9781450380539. DOI: [10.1145/3406325.3451047](https://doi.org/10.1145/3406325.3451047). arXiv: [2010.12629](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.12629) [quant-ph].
- [AW14] Andris Ambainis and Ronald de Wolf. “How Low can Approximate Degree and Quantum Query Complexity be for Total Boolean Functions?” In: *Computational Complexity* 23 (2 2014), pp. 305–322. ISSN: 1420-8954. DOI: [10.1007/s00037-014-0083-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00037-014-0083-2).

- [BHT17] Shalev Ben-David, Pooya Hatami, and Avishay Tal. “Low-Sensitivity Functions from Unambiguous Certificates”. In: *8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2017)*. Vol. 67. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs). Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017, 28:1–28:23. ISBN: 978-3-95977-029-3. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2017.28](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2017.28). arXiv: [1605.07084](https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.07084) [quant-ph].
- [CHS20] John Chiarelli, Pooya Hatami, and Michael Saks. “An Asymptotically Tight Bound on the Number of Relevant Variables in a Bounded Degree Boolean function”. In: *Combinatorica* 40.2 (2020), pp. 237–244. ISSN: 1439-6912. DOI: [10.1007/s00493-019-4136-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-019-4136-7). arXiv: [1801.08564](https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.08564) [quant-ph].
- [DS19] Krishnamoorthy Dinesh and Jayalal Sarma. “Alternation, sparsity and sensitivity: Bounds and exponential gaps”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 771 (2019), pp. 71–82. ISSN: 0304-3975. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2018.11.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2018.11.015). arXiv: [1712.05735](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.05735) [quant-ph].
- [Ham50] R. W. Hamming. “Error Detecting and Error Correcting Codes”. In: *The Bell System Technical Journal* 29.2 (1950), pp. 147–160. DOI: [10.1002/j.1538-7305.1950.tb00463.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1950.tb00463.x).
- [Hua19] Hao Huang. “Induced subgraphs of hypercubes and a proof of the Sensitivity Conjecture”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 190.3 (2019), pp. 949–955. DOI: [10.4007/annals.2019.190.3.6](https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2019.190.3.6). arXiv: [1907.00847](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.00847) [quant-ph].
- [NS94] Noam Nisan and Mario Szegedy. “On the Degree of Boolean Functions as Real Polynomials”. In: *Computational Complexity* 4 (4 1994), pp. 301–313. DOI: [10.1007/BF01263419](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01263419).
- [Sim82] Hans-Ulrich Simon. “A Tight  $\Omega(\log \log n)$ -Bound on the Time for Parallel RAM’s to Compute Nondegenerated Boolean Functions”. In: *Information and Control* 55.1 (1982), pp. 102–107. ISSN: 0019-9958. DOI: [10.1016/S0019-9958\(82\)90477-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(82)90477-6).
- [Weg85] Ingo Wegener. “The Critical Complexity of All (Monotone) Boolean Functions and Monotone Graph Properties”. In: *Information and Control* 67.1 (1985), pp. 212–222. ISSN: 0019-9958. DOI: [10.1016/S0019-9958\(85\)80036-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(85)80036-X).
- [Wel22] Jake Wellens. “Relationships between the number of inputs and other complexity measures of Boolean functions”. In: *Discrete Analysis* (2022). arXiv: [2005.00566](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.00566) [quant-ph].