

Quasi-Linear Size PCPs with Small Soundness from HDX

Mitali Bafna*

Dor Minzer*

Nikhil Vyas†

With an Appendix by Zhiwei Yun*

Abstract

We construct 2-query, quasi-linear sized probabilistically checkable proofs (PCPs) with arbitrarily small constant soundness, improving upon Dinur’s 2-query quasi-linear size PCPs with soundness $1 - \Omega(1)$. As an immediate corollary, we get that under the exponential time hypothesis, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ no approximation algorithm for 3-SAT can obtain an approximation ratio of $7/8 + \varepsilon$ in time $2^{n/\log^C n}$, where C is a constant depending on ε . Our result builds on a recent line of works showing the existence of linear sized direct product testers with small soundness [BM24, DD24a, BLM24, DD24b, DDL24].

The main new ingredient in our proof is a technique that embeds a given PCP construction into a PCP on a prescribed graph, provided that the latter is a graph underlying a sufficiently good high-dimensional expander. Towards this end, we use ideas from fault-tolerant distributed computing, and more precisely from the literature of the almost everywhere agreement problem [DPPU86, Upf92, CGO10, CGO12, JRV20]. We show that graphs underlying HDXs admit routing protocols that are tolerant to adversarial edge corruptions, and in doing so we also improve the state of the art in this line of work.

Our PCP construction requires variants of the aforementioned direct product testers with poly-logarithmic degree. The existence and constructability of these variants is shown in an appendix by Zhiwei Yun.

1 Introduction

The PCP Theorem [FGL⁺91, AS98, ALM⁺98] is a cornerstone of theoretical computer science, with many applications in hardness of approximation, cryptography and interactive protocols. It will be convenient for us to take the following combinatorial view of PCPs, using the language of the Label Cover problem.

Definition 1.1. *An instance of Label Cover $\Psi = (G = (L \cup R, E), \Sigma_L, \Sigma_R, \Phi = \{\Phi_e\}_{e \in E})$ consists of a bipartite graph G , alphabets Σ_L, Σ_R and constraints $\Phi_e \subseteq \Sigma_L \times \Sigma_R$, one for each edge. Each one of the constraints is a projection constraint, meaning that for every $e \in E$ there is a map $\phi_e: \Sigma_L \rightarrow \Sigma_R$ such that*

$$\Phi_e = \{(\sigma, \phi_e(\sigma)) \mid \sigma \in \Sigma_L\}.$$

Given a label cover instance Ψ , the goal is to find assignments $A_L: L \rightarrow \Sigma_L$ and $A_R: R \rightarrow \Sigma_R$ that satisfy as many of the constraints as possible, namely that maximize the quantity

$$\text{val}_\Psi(A_L, A_R) = \frac{1}{|E|} |\{e = (u, v) \in E \mid (A_L(u), A_R(v)) \in \Phi_e\}|.$$

*Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

†SEAS, Harvard University.

We denote $\text{val}(\Psi) = \max_{A_L, A_R} \text{val}_\Psi(A_L, A_R)$. Finally, we denote by $\text{gap-LabelCover}[c, s]$ the promise problem wherein the input is an instance Ψ of label cover promised to either have $\text{val}(\Psi) \geq c$ or else $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq s$, and the goal is to distinguish between these two cases. In this language, versions of the PCP theorem assert that the problem $\text{gap-LabelCover}[c, s]$ is NP-hard in some cases, and there are a few parameters of interest:

1. Completeness - the completeness parameter is c , and one often wants it to be as large as possible. In this paper we will always have perfect completeness, that is, $c = 1$.
2. Soundness - the soundness of a PCP is the parameter s , and one wants it to be as small as possible.
3. Alphabet size - the alphabet size is defined as $\max(|\Sigma_L|, |\Sigma_R|)$, and one often wants it to be of constant size.
4. Instance size - finally, the instance size refers to the blow-up of the reduction showing that $\text{gap-LabelCover}[c, s]$ is NP-hard. The assertion of NP-hardness means that there is a polynomial time reduction mapping 3-CNF formulas ϕ to instances of label cover Ψ such that: if ϕ is satisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \geq c$, and if ϕ is unsatisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq s$. Letting the size of the 3-CNF formula ϕ be denoted by n , the size of the PCP is measured by the size of Ψ as a function of n .

The original proof of the PCP Theorem [FGL⁺91, AS98, ALM⁺98] was able to achieve perfect completeness, soundness $s \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ for some absolute (but tiny) constant $\varepsilon > 0$, constant size alphabet and polynomial instance size. Using the parallel repetition theorem of Raz [Raz98, Hol09, Rao11], one is able to get a stronger version of the PCP theorem wherein the soundness parameter s can be taken to be an arbitrarily small constant, and the rest of the parameters remain qualitatively the same.

One feature of parallel repetition that we wish to highlight is that it increases the alphabet size and the instance size at a polynomial rate, and decreases the soundness at the same rate. The question of whether one can come up with soundness amplification techniques that increase the instance size more mildly (while still decreasing the soundness) is often referred to as “derandomized parallel repetition” in the literature. This question will be central to the current paper, and we remark that there are known barriers to general results along these lines [FK95, MRY16]. Morally speaking, these results show that there is no general amplification technique that obtains the same amplification rate as standard parallel repetition but is more size efficient. Still, one may hope that there are size efficient procedures that amplify soundness in a slightly weaker way. The main result of this paper is such a procedure.

1.1 Near-linear Size PCPs

Following the proof of the PCP theorem, the question of constructing size efficient PCPs has naturally emerged. Polishchuk and Spielman [PS94] were the first to construct nearly linear-sized 2-query PCPs with soundness $1 - \varepsilon$ and size $n^{1+c(\varepsilon)}$, where $c(\varepsilon)$ approaches 0 as ε tends to 0.

In her combinatorial proof of the PCP theorem, Dinur [Din07] established a quasi-linear version of the PCP theorem, namely a 2-query PCP with size $n \cdot \text{poly}(\log n)$, soundness $s = 1 - \Omega(1)$ and constant alphabet size. Her proof used a novel gap-amplification procedure for PCPs via graph powering, which we discuss below. Bogdanov [Bog05] observed that the soundness achievable by this approach plateaus at $1/2$, suggesting that other ideas are necessary for a quasi-linear size PCP with arbitrarily small soundness.

Moshkovitz and Raz [MR08] were the first to construct 2-query PCPs with near linear size and small soundness. Specifically, they proved the hardness of Label Cover with soundness $s = \frac{1}{k^{\Omega(1)}}$, size $n \cdot$

$2^{\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})}$ and alphabet $2^{\Theta(k)}$, for any $k \leq \log n$. The most notable feature of this work is that it allows one to even get sub-constant soundness that vanishes with the instance size (at the price of having quite a large alphabet). The size of the PCP though is larger than the size of Dinur’s PCP, blowing up by a factor of $2^{\Theta(\sqrt{\log n})}$ whereas Dinur only incurs a factor of $\text{poly}(\log n)$.

The above discussion brings us to the main result of this paper:

Theorem 1.2. *For all $\delta > 0$, there is $C = C(\delta) > 0$ and a polynomial time procedure such that given an instance ϕ of 3-SAT of size n produces a label cover instance Ψ with the following properties:*

1. *The size of Ψ is at most $n(\log n)^C$ and the alphabet size of Ψ is at most $O_\delta(1)$.*
2. *If ϕ is satisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$.*
3. *If ϕ is unsatisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq \delta$.*

In words, Theorem 1.2 gives a version of the PCP theorem of Dinur [Din07] in the low soundness regime.

The structure of the proof of Theorem 1.2 The proof of Theorem 1.2 has three components. The first component involves modifying a PCP construction to transform the underlying graph into an explicit graph of our choosing. Building on [DM11], we show that one can embed an arbitrary 2-CSP on a prescribed graph G , if G has a fault-tolerant routing protocol. We then show such routing protocols for graphs derived from high-dimensional expanders, using their edge-expansion properties and the presence of numerous well-distributed dense subgraphs. This is the primary contribution of our work that draws inspiration from fault-tolerant distributed computing [DPPU86, Upf92, CGO10, CGO12, JRV20], and in the process also improves upon the best-known construction of edge fault-tolerant sparse networks [CGO12]. The second component is a size-efficient direct product tester from HDX, which was conjectured to exist in [DK17] and recently established in a series of works [BM24, BLM24, DD24a, DDL24]. By appropriately combining the first and second components, we construct a size-efficient PCP with small soundness but a large alphabet. The third and final component is a classical alphabet reduction technique. We use the results of [MR08, DH13] to reduce the alphabet size to a constant, thus concluding the proof of Theorem 1.2.

1.2 Implications

Many hardness of approximation results in the literature start off with the hardness of Label Cover with small soundness, which is typically achieved by parallel repetition or by appealing to the result of [MR08]. We are able to reproduce any such result, that does not use any other features of parallel repetition, with only quasi-linear blow-up. These implications are easiest to phrase in terms of the exponential time hypothesis (ETH) of [IP01] and using the work of Håstad [Hås01], we have the following two corollaries.

Corollary 1.3. *Assuming ETH, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that solving $\text{gap-3SAT}[1, 7/8 + \varepsilon]$ requires time at least $2^{n/\log^C n}$.¹*

In the 3-LIN problem one is given a system of linear equations over \mathbb{F}_2 where each equation contains 3 variables, and the goal is to find an assignment satisfying as many of the constraints as possible. We have:

¹We remark that in his proof of the hardness of 3-SAT [Hås01, Lemma 6.9], Håstad uses a feature of the outer PCP construction that our PCP lacks. However, as observed by Khot [Kho02], a weaker property called “smoothness” suffices for the analysis of the reduction, which our PCP construction in Theorem 1.2 has. This is because in the end we compose with the Hadamard code and the associated manifold versus point test, which is smooth.

Corollary 1.4. *Assuming ETH, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that solving $\text{gap-3LIN}[1 - \varepsilon, 1/2 + \varepsilon]$ requires time at least $2^{n/\log^C n}$.*

Our proof techniques can be used to obtain improvements for the almost everywhere reliable transmission problem [DPPU86]. This problem is very similar to the routing problem (given in Definition 3.4) which is central to this paper. The almost everywhere reliable transmission problem involves designing a sparse graph G along with communication protocols between all pairs of vertices of G , that are resilient against corruptions in the network. Our results nearly match the performance of the best-known protocols for vertex corruptions [CGO10, JRV20], while addressing the more challenging scenario of edge corruptions, thus improving upon the results of [CGO12]. For further details, see Section C.1.

Theorem 1.5. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a graph $G = (V, E)$ on $\Theta(n)$ vertices with degree polylogn and $O(\log n)$ -round protocols $\{\mathcal{R}_{u,v}\}_{u,v \in V}$ on it such that, for all adversaries corrupting $\varepsilon|E|$ edges, all but $O(\varepsilon)$ of the message transfers between pairs of vertices (u, v) will be successful. Further, running a single $\mathcal{R}_{u,v}$ protocol can be done in polylogn computation across all nodes.*

The rest of this introductory section is organized as follows. In Section 1.3 we discuss hardness amplification in PCPs. In Section 1.4 we discuss fault-tolerant routing protocols and in Section 1.5 we discuss the ideas going into the proof of Theorem 1.2.

1.3 History of Gap Amplification

1.3.1 Parallel Repetition

The parallel repetition theorem of Raz [Raz98, Hol09, Rao11] is a powerful technique in hardness of approximation and interactive protocols. Most relevant to us is its application to PCPs, wherein it is used to boost the soundness of a given PCP construction. Indeed, given a label cover instance Ψ and an integer $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the t -fold repeated game $\Psi^{\otimes t}$ which consists of the graph $G_t = (L^t \cup R^t, E_t)$ where

$$E_t = \{((u_1, \dots, u_t), (v_1, \dots, v_t)) \mid (u_i, v_i) \in E, \forall i = 1, \dots, t\},$$

as well as alphabets Σ_L^t, Σ_R^t and constraints $\Phi' = \{\Phi'_e\}_{e \in E_t}$ where

$$\Phi_{(\vec{u}, \vec{v})} = \{((\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t), (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_t)) \mid (\sigma_i, \tau_i) \in \Phi_{(u_i, v_i)} \forall i = 1, \dots, t\}.$$

It is clear that if $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$ then $\text{val}(\Psi^{\otimes t}) = 1$, and the content of the parallel repetition theorem asserts that if $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$, then $\text{val}(\Psi^{\otimes t}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon')^t$, where $\varepsilon' = \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$. Thus, parallel repetition can be used to decrease the soundness to be as close to 0 as we wish. However, as $\text{size}(\Psi^{\otimes t}) = \text{size}(\Psi)^t$, parallel repetition cannot be used on a given PCP construction to get small soundness while maintaining quasi-linear size.

In light of this issue, it makes sense to look for sparse analogs of parallel repetition that still amplify soundness. This task is known as derandomizing parallel repetition in the literature – given a label cover instance Ψ and an integer t , one would like to come up with sparse subsets of L^t and R^t such that the induced label over instance $\Psi^{\otimes t}$ on them would still have significantly smaller soundness than the original instance Ψ . Ideally, one would like the subsets to be as small as $O_t(|L|), O_t(|R|)$ while retaining arbitrarily small constant soundness s . Towards this end, it makes sense to consider the simpler combinatorial analog of this question known as *direct product testing*, which we define next.

1.3.2 Direct Product Testing

In an effort to simplify the proof of the PCP theorem, Goldreich and Safra [GS00] introduced the notion of direct product testing. In direct product testing, one wishes to encode a function $f: [n] \rightarrow \Sigma$ (which, in the context of PCPs is thought of as an assignment) via local views in a way that admits local testing. The most natural direct product encoding, which we refer to as the Johnson direct product scheme, has a parameter $k \in \mathbb{N}$ which is thought of as a large constant. The function f is encoded via the assignment $F: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ defined as $F(\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}) = (f(a_1), \dots, f(a_k))$.² The natural 2-query direct product test associated with this encoding is the following consistency check:

1. Sample $B \subseteq [n]$ of size \sqrt{k} .
2. Sample $A, A' \supseteq B$ independently of size k .
3. Read $F[A]$ and $F[A']$ and check that $F[A]|_B = F[A']|_B$.

It is clear that if F is a valid encoding of a function f , then the tester passes with probability 1. The work of [DG08] shows that this test is also sound. Namely, for all $\delta > 0$, taking $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, if an assignment $F: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ passes the Johnson direct product test with probability at least δ , then there is a function $f': [n] \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that

$$\Pr_A[\Delta(F[A], f'|_A) \leq 0.01] \geq \text{poly}(\delta), \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta(F[A], f'|_A) = \frac{1}{|A|} \#\{i \in A \mid F[A](i) \neq f'(i)\}$ is the relative Hamming distance between $F[A]$ and $f'|_A$.

The main drawback of the Johnson direct product encoding is its size blow up: the size of the encoding of F is roughly the size of f to the power k . This is the same behaviour that occurs in parallel repetition, which raises a combinatorial analog of the derandomized parallel repetition problem: is there a sparse collection of k -sets $\mathcal{S}_k \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$, ideally $|\mathcal{S}_k| = O_k(n)$, such that the encoding of $f: [n] \rightarrow \Sigma$ given by $F: \mathcal{S}_k \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ defined as $F(\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}) = (f(a_1), \dots, f(a_k))$, admits a sound 2-query consistency test.

1.3.3 Graph Powering

Underlying the proof of Dinur [Din07] is a derandomized direct product tester in the 99% soundness regime. Dinur proved that the set system formed by constant sized neighbourhoods of vertices in a spectral expander supports a natural 2-query test with soundness bounded away from 1³. She used these ideas to show a gap amplification result for PCPs achieved via graph powering. To present it, we expand the definition of label cover to graphs that are not necessarily bipartite.

Definition 1.6. *A constraint satisfaction problem (2-CSP in short) $\Psi = (G = (V, E), \Sigma, \Phi)$ is composed of a graph G , an alphabet Σ , and a collection of constraints $\Phi = \{\Phi_e\}_{e \in E}$, one for each edge. Each constraint is $\Phi_e \subseteq \Sigma \times \Sigma$, describing the tuples of labels to the endpoints of e that are considered satisfying.*

Dinur started with an instance of a 2-CSP Ψ over a d -regular expander graph G with soundness $1 - 1/\text{polylog}$ and constant alphabet. Given a parameter $t \in \mathbb{N}$, she considered the 2-CSP Ψ' over the graph G'

²We fix an arbitrary ordering on $[n]$.

³Although her original result is not stated in terms of direct product testing, a later work of [DD19] observes that her proof indeed implies such a tester.

whose vertex set is V and u, v are adjacent if they have a path of length t between them in G . The alphabet of a vertex u is $\Sigma^{d^{t/2}}$, which is thought of as an assignment to the neighbourhood of u of radius $t/2$. The allowed symbols on u are assignments to the neighbourhood of u satisfying all of the constraints of Ψ inside it. Finally, the constraint between u and v is that the assignment they give to their neighbourhoods agree on any common vertex to them.

She showed that if most constraints of Ψ' are satisfied (equivalently, the direct product test passes), the assignment to the neighborhoods must be consistent with a global assignment to the vertices, which in turn must satisfy a large fraction of the edges of Ψ . This implies that if $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \delta$, then $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - \min(2\delta, c)$ where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant. Thus, each invocation of graph powering improves the soundness of the 2-CSP, and after $\Theta(\log(1/\delta))$ iterations the resulting 2-CSP will have value at most $1 - \Omega(1)$. Every iteration of graph powering blows up the alphabet size though, which Dinur resolved via an alternating step of alphabet reduction.

1.3.4 The Soundness Limit of Graph Powering

Following Dinur's result [Din07], Bogdanov [Bog05] observed that graph powering on an arbitrary expander fails to decrease the soundness below $1/2$. Towards this end, he considers any locally-tree-like expander graph G with large girth, such as the construction in [LPS88], and defines a CSP Ψ over G whose alphabet is $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$, and constraints are inequality constraints. The graph G has n vertices, girth $g = \Theta(\log n)$, and the largest cut in it has fractional size $1/2 + o(1)$. The latter fact implies that $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1/2 + o(1)$. On the other hand, as long as $t < g/2$, for each vertex v the $t/2$ -neighborhood of v has two possible assignments. If u and v are within distance t , then there is a 1-to-1 correspondence between the assignments of u and the assignments of v . Thus, randomly choosing one of these possible assignments for each u leads to an assignment that satisfies $1/2$ of the constraints in G^t in expectation, and in particular $\text{val}(G^t) \geq 1/2$. This means that graph powering fails to decrease the soundness below $1/2$.

1.3.5 Subspace-based Direct Product Testers

The work of Impagliazzo, Kabanets and Wigderson [IKW09] made progress on derandomized direct product testing in the 1% regime by analyzing a more efficient, albeit still polynomial-sized version of the Johnson direct product tester based on subspaces, which we refer to as the Grassmann direct product tester. In this context, we identify the universe $[n]$ with \mathbb{F}_q^d (where \mathbb{F}_q is a field), so that an assignment $f: [n] \rightarrow \Sigma$ is interpreted as a function $f: \mathbb{F}_q^d \rightarrow \Sigma$. The Grassmann direct product encoding of f is a table F that specifies the restriction of f to each d' -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^d , where $d' < d$ is a parameter chosen appropriately. The Grassmann direct product test is the natural consistency check, wherein one chooses B of prescribed dimension, then two d' -dimensional subspaces A and A' containing B , and checks that $F[A]$ and $F[A']$ agree on B . Their work proves that this test has small soundness in a sense similar to (1).

The work [IKW09] also strengthened the connection between gap amplification and direct product testing. Namely, they showed an amplification procedure for PCPs using the Johnson direct product tester. Just like parallel repetition though, this procedure incurs a polynomial blow-up in the instance size, and one could hope to use the more efficient Grassmann direct product encoding to improve upon this size blow-up. This turns out to be harder, and the work [IKW09] leaves this as an open possibility. To use the Grassmann direct product tester effectively, one must start with a 2-CSP whose constraint graph is compatible with the structure of subspaces, in the sense that a d' -dimensional subspace must contain multiple edges of the initial 2-CSP, otherwise one cannot hope for any gap amplification.

1.3.6 Derandomized Parallel Repetition using Subspace-based Direct Product Testers

Dinur and Meir [DM11] obtained this compatibility by reducing an arbitrary 2-CSP with soundness $1 - \Omega(1)$ to a 2-CSP on the De-Bruijn graph with soundness $1 - \Omega(1/\log n)$. The benefit of switching to a De-Bruijn graph G is that, if $V(G)$ is denoted by \mathbb{F}_q^d , then the set of edges $E(G)$ forms a linear subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^{2d} . This made G compatible with the Grassmann direct product tester, which then allowed the authors to amplify the soundness of any 2-CSP on G to soundness close to 0.

The idea of embedding CSPs on De-Bruijn graphs first appeared in a similar context in [BFLS91, PS94]. Towards this end, these works used the property that De-Bruijn graphs have efficient routing protocols. The work of [DM11] demonstrates that, in some cases, derandomized direct product testing theorems can be used to construct PCPs. Their construction however falls short of getting size efficient PCPs since the Grassmann direct product encoding itself has a polynomial size blow-up.

1.3.7 Linear Sized Direct Product Testers from HDX

The work [DK17] identified high dimensional expanders as a potential avenue towards constructing size efficient direct product testers. Roughly speaking, high-dimensional expansion is a generalization of the usual notion of spectral expansion in graphs. An HDX is an expander graph G which in addition has a lot of well-connected constant-sized cliques, with $X(k)$ denoting the k -sized cliques in G and $X = \{X(k)\}_{k=1}^d$ referred to as the clique complex of G . Indeed, their work showed that for any sufficiently good HDX the natural direct product encoding using the set system $X(k)$ (which typically has size $O_k(n)$) admits a natural 2-query tester with soundness $1 - \Omega(1)$. They conjectured that there are high-dimensional expanders that support a direct product tester in the more challenging, 1% regime of soundness.

Motivated by this problem and potential applications to PCPs, the works [BM24, BLM24, DD24a, DD24b, DDL24] studied the soundness of the natural direct product tester on $X(k)$. First, the works [BM24, DD24a] identified that for the test to have a small soundness, it is necessary that the HDX is a “coboundary expander”, which is a notion of topological expansion. In particular any graph which is locally tree like, such as the one used by Bogdanov [Bog05], is automatically not a coboundary expander, giving a more comprehensive explanation to his counterexample. Secondly, the works [BM24, DD24a] established that sufficiently strong high-dimensional expansion and coboundary expansion imply that $X(k)$ admits a direct product tester with small soundness. Following this, the works [BLM24, DD24b, DDL24] constructed sparse HDX, that are also coboundary expanders. Their construction is a variant of the Chapman-Lubotzky complex [CL23] with an appropriate choice of parameters. In particular, they established that:

Theorem 1.7. *For all $\delta > 0$, there is $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all large enough $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$ the following holds. There is an infinite sequence of d -dimensional clique complexes $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with degree Δ such that the set system $X_n(k)$ admits a 2-query direct product test with soundness δ .⁴*

With Theorem 1.7 in hand, one may hope to obtain a derandomized parallel repetition result, just like Dinur and Meir [DM11] turned the tester of [IKW09] into a small soundness PCP. Thus, one again wishes to be able to convert a given CSP Ψ into a CSP Ψ' whose underlying graph is compatible with the HDXs from Theorem 1.7. As we elaborate below, this task entails several challenges, and the main contribution of the current work is to perform such a conversion via routing protocols for the almost-everywhere reliable transmission problem.

⁴We remark that in the works [BM24, BLM24], only the case of Boolean alphabets $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ was considered. Their proof however is easy to adapt to any alphabet, and in Section A we explain these adaptations for the sake of completeness.

1.4 Almost-Everywhere Reliable Transmission

In the almost everywhere reliable transmission problem from [DPPU86],⁵ the goal is to design a sparse graph $G = (V, E)$, that allows transference of messages in a fault tolerant way. More precisely, for any permutation $\pi: V \rightarrow V$ and an alphabet Σ , the goal is to design a L -round protocol; at every round of the protocol each node can send messages in Σ to its neighbours in G , and at the end of the protocol the message of v should be transmitted to $\pi(v)$ for most v . This guarantee should hold even if a small fraction of vertices or edges in the graph behave maliciously. The parameters of interest in this problem are as follows:

1. **Work Complexity:** The work complexity of a protocol is defined as the maximum computational complexity any node in the graph G incurs throughout the protocol.
2. **Degree:** This is the degree of G , which we aim to minimize.
3. **Tolerance:** A protocol is considered $(\varepsilon(n), \nu(n))$ -vertex (edge) tolerant if, when an adversary corrupts up to $\varepsilon(n)$ -fraction of vertices (edges) of the graph (allowing them to deviate arbitrarily from the protocol), at most $\nu(n)$ -fraction of the transmissions from $u \rightarrow \pi(u)$ are disrupted.

With this in mind, the simplest protocol one can design on is a “pebble-routing protocol” by showing that for any permutation $\pi: V \rightarrow V$, there exists a set of L -length paths in G from $u \rightarrow \pi(u)$ such that at any time step every vertex is used exactly once across all the paths. This protocol has work complexity $O(L)$ and is $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon L)$ -vertex-tolerant for all $\varepsilon > 0$. The work of Dwork et al. [DPPU86] shows that the constant-degree “butterfly network” has pebble-routing protocols with $L = O(\log n)$, thus giving a network that can tolerate $\varepsilon \lesssim \frac{1}{\log n}$ -fraction of vertex corruptions. All protocols which improve upon this result do so by considering more complicated protocols that use error correction. The first such protocol which could tolerate a linear number of vertex corruptions was given by [Upf92], but it has $\exp(n)$ work complexity. In [CGO10] a routing network with $\text{poly}(\log n)$ degree and $O(n)$ work complexity is constructed, and in [JRV20] a routing network with $O(\log n)$ degree and $\text{poly}(\log n)$ work complexity. As per tolerance, the last two works show that for all ε less than some universal constant $c > 0$, their network is $(\varepsilon, \varepsilon + O(\frac{\varepsilon}{\log n}))$ -vertex tolerant.

1.5 Our Techniques

We begin by describing the connection between routing protocols and PCPs. We then discuss our construction of routing protocols over HDX and elaborate on the rest of the proof of Theorem 1.2.

1.5.1 The Connection between Fault-Tolerant Routing Protocols and PCPs

The works of [PS94, DM11] both used the fact that the De-Bruijn graph G on n vertices has a pebble-routing protocol of length $O(\log n)$ to transform the constraint graph of any 2-CSP to the De-Bruijn graph. Their argument proceeds as follows. Suppose that we have a CSP instance Ψ over a d -regular graph H on n vertices. First, break the graph H into a union of d disjoint perfect matchings $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_d: [n] \rightarrow [n]$,⁶ thought of as permutations on $V(H)$. For each permutation π_i , we have a pebble-routing protocol \mathcal{P}_i on the De-Bruijn graph, where a vertex v transmits its supposed label to $\pi_i(v)$ along the path from $v \rightarrow \pi_i(v)$.

With this in mind, in the new CSP Ψ' the alphabet of each vertex v consists of the messages that it sent and received throughout each one of the d routing protocols. The constraints of Ψ' over $(u, v) \in E(G)$ are

⁵For ease of application, our formalization slightly deviates from the standard one used in the literature.

⁶Strictly speaking, we can only guarantee that this is possible to do in the case that H is bipartite, and we show an easy reduction to this case.

that for all t , the label sent by u at step t matches the label received by v from u at step $t + 1$. Thus, for each i the vertex $\pi_i(v)$ will also have as part of their assignment the symbol they supposedly got from v at the end of the routing protocol, and we only allow labels that satisfy the constraint $(v, M_i(v))$ in Ψ . It is easy to see that if $O(\varepsilon/d \log n)$ -fraction of the edges of Ψ' are violated, at most ε -fraction of the paths are unsuccessful. As $d = O(1)$, this implies that

1. If $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$, then $\text{val}(\Psi') = 1$.
2. If $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$, then $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\log n}\right)$.
3. If the alphabet of Ψ is of constant size, then the alphabet of Ψ' is of polynomial size.

Note that any constant degree graph (including the graph underlying X_n) can at best have a pebble-routing protocol of length $\Theta(\log n)$, which is the source of the $\log n$ -factor loss in soundness above. This loss is unaffordable to us since the subsequent gap amplification via the direct-product tester in Theorem 1.7 would lead to a huge size blow-up. Fortunately we observe that their argument generalizes to arbitrary routing protocols giving us the following general connection:

Lemma 1.8. *Suppose G is a regular graph on $2n$ vertices such that for all permutations $\pi : V(G) \rightarrow V(G)$, G has a (ε, ν) -edge-tolerant protocol with work complexity W that can be constructed in time $\text{poly}(n)$. Then there is a polynomial time reduction that given any 2-CSP Ψ' on a k -regular graph H with $|V(H)| \leq n$ produces a 2-CSP Ψ on G such that,*

- If $\text{val}(\Psi') = 1$ then $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$.
- If $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - O(\nu)$ then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$.
- If the alphabet of Ψ' is Σ then the alphabet of Ψ is Σ^{kW} .

We can now hope to instantiate the above lemma with routing protocols for HDX that are tolerant to a constant fraction of edge-corruptions to embed a 2-CSP onto an HDX without losing much in the soundness.

1.5.2 Challenges in Using Existing Routing Protocols for PCPs

With Lemma 1.8 in mind, the result of [JRV20] achieves the type of parameters we are after. There are two significant differences between their setting and ours, though:

1. **Picking the graph:** in the setting of the almost everywhere reliable transmission problem, one is free to design the routing graph G as long as it has the desired parameters. In our case, we need to use the graphs G underlying complexes that supports a direct product tester with low soundness, for which we currently know of only one example – the complexes from Theorem 1.7.
2. **The corruption model:** The prior works discussed in Section 1.4 have mostly considered the vertex corruption model, whereas to apply Lemma 1.8 one must design protocols resilient in the more challenging *edge corruption* model. This model was studied by [CGO12] who give a protocol with work complexity is $n^{\Theta(1)}$, which is again unaffordable to us.

The main new tool in the current paper is efficient routing protocols on high dimensional expanders in the edge corruption model. Below, we elaborate on the two protocols that we give in this paper.

1.5.3 Clique Based Routing Network on HDX

A key idea introduced by [CGO10] (also used by [JRV20]) is that to construct tolerant routing protocols on a graph G , it is beneficial for it to contain many well inter-connected large cliques. In these cliques, messages can be transmitted very quickly, and they can be used for error correction. As the complexes X_n from Theorem 1.7 naturally have many well-connected cliques, it stands to reason that they too admit routing protocols with similar performance to the protocols in [JRV20].

Indeed, this turns out to be true; see Section 4.5 for a formal statement of our clique-based routing scheme. Our analysis of this scheme though requires the complex X_n to have dimension $d = \Theta((\log \log n)^2)$ and to achieve that, the complexes from Theorem 1.7 have size $nd^{C \cdot d^2} = n2^{\text{poly}(\log \log n)}$, which falls short of being quasi-linear. We therefore resort to an alternative routing scheme, based on yet another highly connected structure found in HDX – links.

1.5.4 Link-based Routing Network on HDX

Our link-based routing scheme requires milder expansion properties from X , and these properties can be achieved by the complexes from Theorem 1.7 with quasi-linear size. More concretely, take a complex $X = X_n$ as in Theorem 1.7 with spectral expansion $\gamma = (\log n)^{-C}$ and dimension $d = C$ for a large constant $C > 0$.⁷ Let $G = (X(1), X(2))$ be the underlying graph with n vertices and $n \text{polylog} n$ edges. We show how to use the graph G for routing, and towards this end we use the following properties of X :

1. **Expansion:** the complex X is a d -partite one-sided γ -local spectral expander. We defer the formal definition of high-dimensional expansion to Section 2, but for the purposes of this overview it is sufficient to think of this as saying that many graphs associated with X , such as the underlying graph G as well as the underlying graph of each link L_u , are partite graphs with second largest eigenvalue at most γ . Here and throughout, the link of u refers to the complex consisting of all faces of X containing u , where we omit the vertex u from them.
2. **Very well connected links:** the links of X are highly connected. By that, we mean that inside every vertex-link L we can set up a collection of constant length paths inside it satisfying: (a) the collection includes a path between almost all pairs of vertices in L , and (b) no edge is overly used.

At a high level, the first property implies that links sample the vertices of G very well and the second property allows us to pretend that links behave very closely to cliques. With this in mind, we now present an overview of our link-based routing network. We first consider the simplified case that the graph G is regular; even though our graph G is not regular, it is a helpful case to consider and we later explain how to remove this assumption.

Formalizing the setup: Let $V = X(1)$ and fix a permutation $\pi: V \rightarrow V$. In our setup, for each vertex v in X , the vertices in its link L_v hold a common message m_v . If Δ denotes the degree of G , then note that every vertex holds Δ symbols, and for each one of these it knows which link the message is associated with. By the end of the protocol on G , we want that for at least $1 - 1/\text{polylog} n$ -fraction of v , the majority of vertices in $L_{\pi(v)}$ hold m_v .

Setting up external paths: Recall the graph $G = (X(1), X(2))$. By the spectral expansion of X it follows that the graph G is an expander. At this point we can use the results of [ACG94, Nen23], which

⁷In Theorem 1.7 the degree is thought of as a constant, giving an HDX with arbitrarily small (but constant) expansion. In Section D, Yun shows how to modify this construction to achieve better spectral expansion at the expense of having poly-logarithmic degree.

show $O(\log n)$ -length pebble-routing protocols for regular, sufficiently good spectral expanders⁸. At each point in the routing protocol each vertex holds multiple symbols (being part of several links), and we stress that it always knows which symbol it is supposed to transmit at each point of the protocol.

With this set-up we describe the protocol. At a high level, the goal in the t -th step is to transmit the message from a link L_w to the link $L_{w'}$ that occur consecutively in a path above. Note that it must be the case that the vertices w and w' are neighbours in G , and hence we may consider the link $L_{w,w'}$.

The analysis in an idealized “clique” setting: to get a sense for the protocol, we first pretend that each one of the links L_w , $L_{w'}$ and $L_{w,w'}$ in fact forms a clique. In this case, the t^{th} step of our protocol begins by the vertices in L_w sending their message to the vertices in $L_{w,w'}$. Each vertex in $L_{w,w'}$ computes the majority value among the symbols they received in this step, and then forwards this symbol to all of the vertices in $L_{w'}$. Each vertex in $L_{w'}$ also computes the majority value among the symbols it receives, at which point the t^{th} step of the protocol is over.

The key idea behind the analysis of this protocol is that vertices compute the correct value they were supposed to so long as they are not over-saturated with corrupted edges. More precisely, let $\mathcal{E} \subseteq X(2)$ be the set of corrupted edges, which therefore is at most ε fraction of the edges. We say a 1-link L_w is good if at most $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ fraction of the edges in it are corrupted. Let $V_w \subseteq L_w$ be the set of vertices for which at most $\varepsilon^{1/4}$ -fraction of the edges adjacent to them in L_w are corrupted; note that if L_w is good then by an averaging argument, $|V_w| \geq (1 - \varepsilon^{1/4})|L_w|$. We refer to the vertices outside V_w as the doomed vertices of L_w . For a 2-link $L_{w,w'}$, we say it is good if both $L_w, L_{w'}$ are good and at most $\varepsilon^{1/8}$ -fraction of the vertices in it are doomed with respect to L_w or $L_{w'}$. Using spectral arguments it is easy to show that a $1 - 1/\text{polylogn}$ -fraction of 1-links and 2-links are good.

One can now show that if $L_w, L_{w'}$ and $L_{w,w'}$ are all good then the majority value is transmitted from L_w to $L_{w'}$. We can conclude the argument by a simple union bound – since at most $1/\text{polylogn}$ -fraction of 1-links and 2-links are bad and the external paths $L_w \rightarrow L_{\pi(v)}$ are of length $O(\log n)$, at most $1/\text{polylogn}$ -fraction paths contain at least one bad link, therefore all but $1/\text{polylogn}$ -fraction of the transmissions are successful⁹.

Back to the real “link” setting: Links are not as well connected as cliques, but they turn out to be connected enough to almost make the above protocol go through. Indeed, the “clique” assumption in the above paragraph was mainly used to argue that the transmission from L_w to $L_{w,w'}$ and from $L_{w,w'}$ to $L_{w'}$ can each be done cleanly in a single round. While this property is no longer true for links, we use the “very well connected links” property above to circumvent it. At a high level, we simply replace the immediate transmission between a pair of vertices u, v in the above idealized setting, with a short path between $u \rightarrow v$ inside L_w . Using the fact that edges in L_w are used uniformly across the internal paths in L_w , we can show that very few of these short paths can be corrupted and a similar error analysis for the link to link transfer goes through.

Lifting the regularity assumption: Finally we remark that in our actual protocol we use the zig-zag product of [RVW00], a powerful tool from derandomization. It allows us to define a closely related graph Z which is regular and has constant degree. This move is compatible with routing: paths in Z have natural correspondence to paths in G , and the uniform distribution over Z corresponds to the stationary distribution over G . Although the routing still takes place on G , moving to Z allows us to deal with the irregularity of G and with other technical issues that come up in implementing the union bound above.

⁸In reality we use a simple deterministic polynomial time algorithm to find paths with much weaker guarantees than a pebble-routing protocol (see Theorem 3.3). This is because while it is likely that the constructions of [ACG94, Nen23] can be made algorithmic and deterministic, the conclusion of Theorem 3.3 suffices for our purposes.

⁹Technically, the number of 2-links is asymptotically greater than the number of paths, therefore this union bound does not work. We handle this issue by moving to the zig-zag product of G where the number of paths is equal to the number of 2-links.

Remark 1.9. We note here that the link-to-link routing protocol works for any simplicial complex with the properties stated above – sufficiently good local spectral expansion of X and the well-connectedness of links of X . In particular, one can pick any other complex X with these properties such as the d -partite LSV complexes [LSV05b, LSV05a] and the complexes of Kaufman and Oppenheim [KM20], to get the same tolerance guarantees as above.

1.5.5 Composing the Links Based Routing Protocol with Known PCP Constructions

Using our link based routing protocol along with Lemma 1.8 on the existing PCP results gives a quasi-linear size PCP on the graphs underlying the complexes from Theorem 1.7 with soundness bounded away from 1.

Theorem 1.10. *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $\{X_{n'}\}_{n' \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the infinite family of clique complexes from Theorem 1.7. Then for sufficiently large $d \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $C > 0$ and a polynomial time reduction mapping a 3SAT instance ϕ of size n to a CSP Ψ over $(X_N(1), X_N(2))$, for some d -dimensional X_N , such that:*

1. *If ϕ is satisfiable, then Ψ is satisfiable.*
2. *If ϕ is unsatisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$.*
3. *The size of the graph underlying Ψ is at most $n(\log n)^C$, the alphabet Σ of it satisfies that $\log(|\Sigma|) \leq (\log n)^C$, and the decision complexity of the constraints (i.e., the circuit complexity of a circuit checking if a given pair of labels satisfies a constraint) is at most $(\log n)^C$.*

We stress that the key point of Theorem 1.10 is that the CSP is over the graph underlying the complex from Theorem 1.7, making it potentially compatible with derandomized parallel repetition.

Remark 1.11. *One can take the size efficient PCP construction of Dinur [Din07] as the starting point towards the proof of Theorem 1.10. Interestingly though, we can exploit the fact that the link-to-link protocol is $(\varepsilon, \frac{1}{\text{polylog} n})$ -tolerant to get an improved version of Lemma 1.8 as an unexpected, positive side-effect. In Lemma 5.3, we show that one can embed an arbitrary 2-CSP with soundness $1 - \frac{1}{\text{polylog} n}$ to a 2-CSP on G with soundness $1 - \Omega(1)$, where G is the graph underlying any complex that supports a link-to-link protocol. This provides a 1-shot amplification procedure giving an alternative to the step by step approach of Dinur [Din07]. The CSP Ψ however has a large alphabet, so (just like in Dinur’s proof) we require an alphabet reduction procedure to bring the alphabet back to constant, while not affecting the soundness or size by much. Thus to prove Theorem 1.10 one can also start with a size efficient PCP construction with weaker soundness guarantees, such as that of Ben-Sasson and Sudan [BS06], and apply Lemma 5.3.*

1.5.6 Derandomized Parallel Repetition using HDX

Given the 2-CSP in Theorem 1.10 on the graphs underlying the complexes from Theorem 1.7, we can now use the direct-product testing theorem to amplify the soundness of the 2-CSP to any constant close to 0. To be more specific, suppose that we have a CSP Ψ over the graph underlying the complex X , one can naturally define a label cover instance, Ψ' , coming from faces of X as follows. Given a parameter k , the PCP verifier reads symbols from the tables $F: X(k) \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ and $G: X(\sqrt{k}) \rightarrow \Sigma^{\sqrt{k}}$, and performs the following test:

1. Sample $A \sim \pi_k$ and $B \subseteq A$ of size \sqrt{k} uniformly.

2. Read $F[A]$ and $G[B]$. Check that all of the constraints of Ψ inside A are satisfied by the local labeling $F[A]$, and that $F[A]|_B = G[B]$.

The instance Ψ' has asymptotically the same size and alphabet. We show that if the direct product test on $X(k)$ has soundness δ , then given that $\text{val}(\Psi') \geq \delta$, one can get an assignment to $X(1)$ that is consistent with $X(k)$ and in particular satisfies a large fraction of the edges of Ψ , implying that $\text{val}(\Psi) \geq 1 - O(\delta)$. Using Theorem 1.10 along with Theorem 1.7 thus gives us the following conclusion:

Theorem 1.12. *For all $\delta > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that the following holds. There is a polynomial time reduction mapping a 3SAT instance ϕ of size n to a label cover instance Ψ with the following properties:*

1. *If ϕ is satisfiable, then Ψ is satisfiable.*
2. *If ϕ is unsatisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq \delta$.*
3. *The size of the graph underlying Ψ is at most $n(\log n)^C$, the alphabet Σ of it satisfies that $\log(|\Sigma|) \leq (\log n)^C$, and the decision complexity of the constraints (i.e., the circuit complexity of a circuit checking if a given pair of labels satisfies a constraint) is at most $(\log n)^C$.*

1.5.7 Applying Alphabet Reduction

Using Theorem 1.12 and alphabet reduction we conclude the main result of this paper, Theorem 1.2. More specifically, we use the 2-query PCP composition technique of Moshkovitz and Raz [MR08] and its abstraction by Dinur and Harsha [DH13]. To apply the latter result, we use two folklore constructions of decodable PCPs, one based on the Reed-Muller code [DH13, Section 6] and a similar construction based on the Hadamard code.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we give a few basic preliminaries that will be used throughout the paper.

Notations: We use standard big- O notations: we denote $A = O(B)$ or $A \lesssim B$ if $A \leq C \cdot B$ for some absolute constant $C > 0$. Similarly, we denote $A = \Omega(B)$ or $A \gtrsim B$ if $A \geq cB$ for some absolute constant $c > 0$. We also denote $k \ll d$ to denote the fact that d is taken to be sufficiently large compared to any function of k . If A is a finite set and $i \leq |A|$, the notation $B \subseteq_i A$ means that we sample a subset of size i of A uniformly. Given a domain X and a measure μ over it, we denote by $L_2(X; \mu)$ the space of real-valued functions over X endowed with the expectation inner product.

2.1 Properties of Expanders

We need the following well known version of the expander mixing lemma for bipartite graphs.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $G = (U, V, E)$ be a bipartite graph in which the second singular value of the normalized adjacency matrix is at most λ , and let μ be the stationary distribution over G . Then for all $A \subseteq U$ and $B \subseteq V$ we have that*

$$\left| \Pr_{(u,v) \in E} [u \in A, v \in B] - \mu(A)\mu(B) \right| \leq \lambda \sqrt{\mu(A)(1 - \mu(A))\mu(B)(1 - \mu(B))}.$$

We also use the following standard sampling property of bipartite expanders.

Lemma 2.2. Let $G = (U, V, E)$ be a weighted bipartite graph with second singular value at most λ . Let $B \subseteq U$ be a subset with $\mu(B) = \delta$ and set

$$T = \left\{ v \in V \mid \left| \Pr_{u \text{ neighbour of } v} [u \in B] - \delta \right| > \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Then $\Pr[T] \leq \lambda^2 \delta / \varepsilon^2$.

2.2 High-Dimensional Expanders

A d -dimensional simplicial complex $X = (X(0), \dots, X(d))$ with vertex set $X(1) = [n]$ is a downwards closed collection of subsets of $[n]$. We follow the convention that $X(0) = \{\emptyset\}$, and for each $i > 1$ the set of i -faces $X(i)$ is a collection of subsets of $X(1)$ of size i . The size of X is the total number of faces in X . The degree of a vertex $v \in X(1)$ is the number of faces containing it, and the degree of X is the maximum degree over all $v \in X(1)$.

Definition 2.3. For a d -dimensional simplicial complex $X = (X(0), X(1), \dots, X(d))$, $0 \leq i \leq d - 2$ and $I \in X(i)$, the link of I is the $(d - i)$ -dimensional complex X_I whose faces are given as

$$X_I(j - i) = \{J \setminus I \mid J \in X(j), J \supseteq I\}.$$

For a d -dimensional complex $X = (X(0), X(1), \dots, X(d))$ and $I \in X$ of size at most $d - 2$, the graph underlying the link of I is the graph whose vertices are $X_I(1)$ and whose edges are $X_I(2)$. We associate with X a collection of distributions over faces. The distribution μ_d is the uniform distribution over $X(d)$, and for each $i < d$ the distribution μ_i is a distribution over $X(i)$ which results by picking $D \sim \mu_d$, and then taking $I \subseteq D$ of size i uniformly. The distribution $\mu_{I, j-i}$ associated to the link of $I \in X(i)$ is the conditional distribution, $\mu_j \mid J \supseteq I$.

Density, average and average on links: for a set $S \subseteq X(i)$, let $\mu_i(S)$ denote its density with respect to μ_i . For $j > i$, $I \in X(i)$ and $S \subseteq X_I(j - i)$ let $\mu_{I, j-i}(S)$ denote the density of S with respect to $\mu_{I, j-i}$. We often omit the subscript and simply write $\mu(S)$ and $\mu_I(S)$ in these cases when there is no risk of confusion. We extend the definition for functions, and for $F : X(j) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define $\mu(F) = \mathbb{E}_{J \sim \mu_j} [F(J)]$ as well as $\mu_I(F) = \mathbb{E}_{J \sim \mu_{I, j-i}} [F(J)]$. For a set $K \in X(k)$ for $k \geq j$, we define the restricted function $F|_K : \{J \in X(j) \mid J \subseteq K\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F|_K(J) = F(J)$; we think of $\{J \in X(j) \mid J \subseteq K\}$ as being endowed with the natural condition measure of μ_j on this set, and hence define

$$\mu(F|_K) = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{J \sim \mu_j \\ J \subseteq K}} [F(J)].$$

Definition 2.4. We say a d -dimensional simplicial complex X is a γ one-sided local spectral expander if for every $I \in X$ of size at most $d - 2$, the second eigenvalue of the normalized adjacency matrix of the graph $(X_I(1), X_I(2))$ is at most γ .

2.3 Properties of Local Spectral Expanders

Recall that we associated with each d -dimensional simplicial complex X a sequence of measures $\{\mu_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq d}$, where μ_k is a probability measure over $X(k)$. Note that for all $0 \leq t \leq r \leq d$, a sample according to μ_t can be drawn by first sampling $R \sim \mu_r$, and then sampling $T \subseteq_t R$ uniformly. The converse is also true:

a sample from μ_r can be drawn by first sampling $T \sim \mu_t$, and then sampling R from μ_r conditioned on containing T . These observations give rise to the standard “up” and “down” operators, which we present next.

Definition 2.5. The operator U_i^{i+1} is a map from $L_2(X(i); \mu_i)$ to $L_2(X(i+1); \mu_{i+1})$ defined as

$$U_i^{i+1}f(u) = \mathbb{E}_{v \subseteq_{i+1} u} [f(v)]$$

for all $u \in X(i+1)$. For $j \geq k+1$, we define U_k^j via composition of up operators: $U_k^j = U_{j-1}^j \circ \dots \circ U_k^{k+1}$.

Definition 2.6. The operator D_i^{i+1} is a map from $L_2(X(i+1); \mu_{i+1})$ to $L_2(X(i); \mu_i)$ defined as

$$D_i^{i+1}f(u) = \mathbb{E}_{v \supseteq_{i+1} u} [f(v)]$$

for all $u \in X(i)$. For $j \geq k+1$, we define D_k^j via composition of down operators: $D_k^j = D_k^{k+1} \circ \dots \circ D_{j-1}^j$.

Abusing notations, we use the notations U_k^j, D_k^j to denote the operators, as well as the real valued matrices associated with them. A key property of the down and up operators is that they are adjoint:

Claim 2.7. For all $k \leq j \leq d$, U_k^j and D_k^j are adjoint operators: for all functions $f: X(k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g: X(j) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $\langle U_k^j f, g \rangle = \langle f, D_k^j g \rangle$.

We need the following lemma regarding the second eigenvalue of the down-up walks $U_k^j D_k^j$ on $X(j)$ ($j \geq k$), that can be found in [AL20]. Roughly speaking, the lemma asserts that for a one-sided spectral expander X , the singular values of the operators $U_{\alpha i}^i$ and $D_{\alpha i}^i$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ are upper bounded by the eigenvalues of the corresponding operators in the complete complex, up to an additive factor if $\text{poly}(i)\gamma$:

Lemma 2.8. Let (X, μ) be a d -dimensional γ one-sided local spectral expander. For all $i \leq d$ and $\alpha \in (1/i, 1)$, the largest singular value of $U_{\alpha i}^i$ and $D_{\alpha i}^i$ is at most $\sqrt{\alpha} + \text{poly}(i)\gamma$. Thus the down-up random walk $U_{\alpha i}^i D_{\alpha i}^i$ on $X(i)$ has second largest singular value at most $\alpha + \text{poly}(i)\gamma$.

2.4 Partite Complexes

In this section we define partite complexes and state some of their properties.

Definition 2.9. A d -dimensional complex X is said to be d -partite if $X(1)$ can be partitioned into d disjoint parts called “colors”, $X(1) = \cup_{i \in [d]} X_i(1)$, such that every d -face in $X(d)$ contains one vertex from each color. For a face $I \in X$ we let $\text{col}(I)$ denote the set of colors of the vertices it contains. For an i -sized set $S \subseteq [d]$, we will use $X_S(i) \subseteq X(i)$ to denote i -faces I for which $\text{col}(I) = S$.

The following result is a trickle-down theorem for partite complexes from [DD19, Lemma 7.5]. Let X be a d -partite complex, and let $L, R \subseteq [d]$ be two disjoint color classes. We define the bipartite weighted graph $(X_L(|L|), X_R(|R|))$ to be the graph where the weight of an edge (u, v) is equal to

$$w(u, v) = \Pr_{x \sim \mu_d} [x_L = u, x_R = v].$$

Lemma 2.10. Let X be a d -partite simplicial complex, and suppose that for all $v \in X(1)$ the graph underlying X_v is a λ -one sided $(d-1)$ -partite expander, for $\lambda < \frac{1}{2}$. Suppose that the underlying graph of X is connected. Then for every $i \neq j$, the bipartite graph between $X_{\{i\}}(1)$ and $X_{\{j\}}(1)$ is a $\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}$ -bipartite expander.

For color sets L and R that are larger than 1, the following lemma bounds the eigenvalues the graph $(X_L(|L|), X_R(|R|))$ provided bounds on the second eigenvalue of associated graphs on links of X .

Lemma 2.11. *Let X be a d -partite complex. Suppose that for each link L of X and for any two colors $i, j \notin \text{col}(L)$, we have that the bipartite graph $(L_i(1), L_j(1))$ has second largest eigenvalue at most λ . Then, for any pair of disjoint sets $L, R \subseteq [d]$, the bipartite graph $(X_L(|L|), X_R(|R|))$ has second largest eigenvalue at most $\text{poly}(d)\lambda$.*

2.5 Variants of the Chapman-Lubotzky Complex

In this section we discuss variants of the Chapman and Lubotzky complex [CL23] and some of their properties. In their paper, Chapman and Lubotzky [CL23] construct an infinite family of complexes that are 2-dimensional coboundary expanders over \mathbb{F}_2 . In the works [BLM24, DDL24] the authors extend this construction, and show that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, one can construct variants of the Chapman and Lubotzky complexes that are 2-dimensional coboundary expanders over S_m . They used this fact to prove that the natural 2-query direct product tester has small soundness δ (that can be taken to be arbitrarily close to 0 so long as one takes m large enough), as defined formally below.

Definition 2.12. *Given a supposed encoding $F: X(k) \rightarrow \Sigma^k$, the direct product tester associated with X proceeds as follows:*

1. Sample $D \sim \pi_d$.
2. Sample $B \subseteq D$ of size \sqrt{k} uniformly.
3. Independently and uniformly sample k -faces A, A' satisfying $B \subseteq A, A' \subseteq D$.
4. Check that $F[A]|_B = F[A']|_B$.

We say that the (k, \sqrt{k}) -direct product test on X has soundness δ if the following holds. Let $F: X(k) \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ be any function that passes the (k, \sqrt{k}) -direct-product test above. Then there exists a function $f: X(1) \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that,

$$\Pr_{A \sim X(k)} [\Delta(F[A], f|_A) \leq \delta] \geq \text{poly}(\delta).$$

In the lemma below, we state the properties that we need from the complexes of [BLM24, DDL24]. This includes the aforementioned fact about direct product testing and the fact that these complexes are polynomial-time constructible, which was established by Dikstein, Dinur and Lubotzky [DDL24]. We also need some other features that are easier to conclude.

Theorem 2.13. *For all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds for all $C > 0$. For large enough $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and for large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one can construct in time $\text{poly}(n)$ a d -dimensional complex X for which $n \leq |X(1)| \leq O_{\ell, d}(n)$ such that for any prime $q = \Theta(\log^C n)$ the following holds:*

1. The complex X is d -partite.
2. Every vertex participates in at most $q^{O(d^2)}$ d -cliques.
3. For every vertex link L of X there is a group $\text{Sym}(L)$ that acts transitively on the d -faces $L(d)$.
4. For links $L \neq L_\emptyset$ and any $i \neq j$, the bipartite graph $(L_i(1), L_j(1))$ is uniformly weighted and has diameter $O\left(\frac{d}{|i-j|}\right)$.

5. For all links L of X , every bipartite graph $(L_i(1), L_j(1))$ for $i \neq j \in [d] \setminus \text{col}(L)$ has second largest eigenvalue at most $\frac{2}{\sqrt{q}}$.
6. The second largest singular value of $G = (X(1), X(2))$ is at most $\frac{1}{d} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{q}} \leq \frac{2}{d}$.
7. The (k, \sqrt{k}) -direct product test on X has soundness δ .

Proof. First fix the parameters δ, C, d, n and a prime $q = \Theta(\log^C n)$. To construct a complex with $\Theta(n)$ vertices and parameter q , we follow the presentation in [DDL24, Section 5].

Therein the authors pick a pro- ℓ subgroup $H_0 \subseteq SU_q(H^\ell(\mathbb{Q}_\ell))$ and define the lattice Γ_0 in Section 5.1.3. Then using Fact 5.12 and Claim 2.31 they show that for some finite i , one can pick a normal subgroup H_i of H_0 with $[H_0 : H_i] = \ell^i$, for which the action of the corresponding lattice Γ_i does not merge vertices at distance at most 4. That is, for all $1 \neq \gamma \in \Gamma_i, \gamma$ and v in \tilde{C}_d , $\text{dist}(\gamma, \gamma v) \geq 4$. Then to increase the size of the vertex set, they choose j which is large enough and output the complex $\Gamma_j \setminus \tilde{C}_d$ so that the number of vertices is between n and ℓn .

Since a priori the size of $\Gamma_i \setminus \tilde{C}_d$ could already be much larger than n , we instead use an explicit choice of subgroups as constructed in Appendix D, with $H(1)$ replacing H_0 , and $H(i)$ in Corollary D.4 replacing H_i from above. Here we used the fact that $H(i)$'s form a filtration of $H(1)$, such that for all $k \geq 1$, $H(k)$ is a pro- ℓ subgroup and for all $k \geq 2$, $H(k)$ is an open compact normal subgroup of $H(k-1)$. Let X_i denote the complex $\Gamma_i \setminus \tilde{C}_d$ where Γ_i is the lattice corresponding to H_i . Corollary D.4 gives us that there is an i for which the compact open subgroup $H_i \subset G(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ satisfies that for any element $1 \neq \gamma \in \Gamma_i$, and any vertex $v \in \tilde{C}_d(0)$, $\text{dist}(v, \gamma v) \geq 4$. And moreover, $|X_i(d)| \leq C_{\ell, d} q^{O(d^2)}$ for some constant $C_{\ell, d}$ depending only on ℓ and d , implying that $|X_i(0)| \leq \text{polylogn}$.

To construct a complex X with $\Theta(n)$ vertices we can set $X = X_j$ for some j which is large enough so that $X_j(0)$ has size between n and $n \cdot \ell^{O(d^2)}$. This is possible since $[H_{i'} : H_{i'+1}] = \ell^{O(d^2)}$ for all i' , by the properties of the construction in Appendix D.2, therefore increasing i by 1 increases the size of X_i by a factor of at most $\ell^{O(d^2)}$. Since the construction of $H(1)$ and $H(i)$ in Appendix D is explicit, the time to construct Γ_i only depends on ℓ, d (which are constants). Therefore the construction of Γ_j and the final complex X is in $\text{poly}(n)$ time.

X is d -partite: For the first item, we note that the complex X is a quotient of the affine spherical building \tilde{C}_d with some group Γ . The affine building \tilde{C}_d is a d -partite complex and the symplectic group over \mathbb{Q}_q , $\text{SP}(2d, \mathbb{Q}_q)$, acts transitively on the top faces of \tilde{C}_d . The complexes constructed in [BLM24, DDL24] are quotients of \tilde{C}_d by subgroups of $\text{SP}(2d, \mathbb{Q}_q)$, and in particular it follows that all of these quotients are also d -partite.

Properties of vertex-links: The next three items follow because the link of each vertex in v is a product of two spherical buildings of dimension at most d over \mathbb{F}_q (see [DDL24, Fact 3.14] and [BLM24, Lemma 6.8]). These are well-known properties of spherical buildings and can be found in both the papers.

Local spectral expansion of X : For the fifth item, we first note that the statement holds for every non-empty link L of X since these are tensor products of spherical buildings and the eigenvalue computations for them are well-known (see [DDL24, Claims 3.2, Lemma 3.10] or [BLM24, Lemmas 2.15, 2.20]). Using this we get that the underlying graph of each vertex link L of X is a $1/\sqrt{q}$ -one-sided d -partite expander. The conclusion for the empty-link now follows by an application of the trickling down result for partite complexes, Lemma 2.10.

Second largest singular value of G : For the sixth item, write $X(0) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_d$, let M be the normalized adjacency operator of X , and let $f: X(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function with $\mathbb{E}[f] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[f^2] = 1$. As X is d -partite, we have that $\mu_1(V_i) = \frac{1}{d}$ for all i , and we denote $a_i = \mathbb{E}_{v \sim \mu_1}[f(v) \mid v \in V_i]$.

$$\langle f, Mf \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{i,j \in [d] \\ i \neq j}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(u,v) \sim M_{i,j}} [f(u)f(v)] \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{i,j \in [d] \\ i \neq j}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(u,v) \sim M_{i,j}} [(f(u) - a_i)(f(v) - a_j)] \right] + \mathbb{E}_{i,j \in [d], i \neq j} [a_i a_j], \quad (2)$$

where $M_{i,j}$ is the normalized adjacency operator of the bipartite graph $G_{i,j}$. Using the fourth item we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\substack{i,j \in [d] \\ i \neq j}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(u,v) \sim M_{i,j}} [(f(u) - a_i)(f(v) - a_j)] \right] \right| &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{q}} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{i,j \in [d] \\ i \neq j}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{u \in V_i} (f(u) - a_i)^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{v \in V_j} (f(v) - a_j)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{q}} \mathbb{E}_i \mathbb{E}_{u \in V_i} (f(u) - a_i)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{q}} \mathbb{E}_i \mathbb{E}_{u \in V_i} [f(u)^2] \\ &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the second transition is by Cauchy Schwarz. Next, we have

$$0 = \mathbb{E}_{i,j} [a_i a_j] = \frac{1}{d} \mathbb{E}_i [a_i^2] + \mathbb{E}_{i,j \in [d], i \neq j} [a_i a_j],$$

so $\mathbb{E}_{i,j \in [d], i \neq j} [a_i a_j] = -\frac{1}{d} \mathbb{E}_i [a_i^2]$. Finally,

$$\mathbb{E}_i [a_i^2] = \sum_i \mu(V_i) \mathbb{E}_v [f(v) \mid v \in V_i]^2 \leq \sum_i \mu(V_i) \mathbb{E}_v [f(v)^2 \mid v \in V_i] = \mathbb{E}[f^2] = 1,$$

so overall $|\mathbb{E}_{i,j \in [d], i \neq j} [a_i a_j]| \leq \frac{1}{d}$. Plugging this and (3) into (2) finishes the proof of the sixth item.

Soundness of the Direct-Product Test: The seventh item follows from [BLM24, Theorem 1.3] as well as from [DDL24, Theorem 1.1]. The works [DD24a, DD24b, DDL24] established the statement above as is, whereas the proof of [BM24, BLM24] established the statement for the alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$. For the sake of completeness, in Section A we explain how to adapt the argument from the latter papers to the case of general alphabets Σ . \square

3 Background on Routing Protocols

In this section we discuss routing protocols, the pebble routing problem and a relaxation of it that is sufficient for us.

3.1 Pebble Routing Protocols

We start the discussion by formally defining routing/communication protocols on a graph G , as well as defining other related notions.

Definition 3.1. Given a graph G , an r -round routing protocol \mathcal{R} on G is a set of rules where at each round vertices can send and receive messages to and from their neighbours in G . To decide what messages to send forward, each vertex is allowed to perform an arbitrary computation on all of its received messages.

The work complexity¹⁰ of \mathcal{R} is the total computation that any vertex performs throughout the protocol, as measured by the circuit size for the equivalent Boolean functions that the vertex computes.

At round 0, the protocol starts out with an arbitrary function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$ on the vertices of G , and after \mathcal{R} is implemented, at the final round r , we end up with a function $g : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$ on the vertices, also referred to as the function computed by the protocol \mathcal{R} .

We now formally define the pebble routing problem, first studied in [ACG94].

Definition 3.2. We say that a graph G has an r -round pebble-routing protocol, denoted by $rt(G) = r$, if the following holds. For all permutations $\pi : V(G) \rightarrow V(G)$ there is an r -round communication protocol on G such that in each round every vertex receives exactly one message symbol in Σ , and then sends this message forward to exactly one of its neighbors. If the protocol starts with $f : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$, then at the r^{th} -round we have the function $g : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$ on the vertices satisfying $g(\pi(u)) = f(u)$.

Note that this protocol can also be thought of as a set of $|V(G)|$ paths, each one transmitting a message from $u \rightarrow \pi(u)$, where at each round any vertex is involved in exactly one path. We encourage the reader to think of pebble routing in this way. We remark that any pebble-routing protocol has work complexity at most $r \log |\Sigma|$.¹¹ In a sense, pebble routing is the simplest possible protocol, where no computation is performed by any vertex as it only forwards its received message. The works [ACG94, Nen23] study the pebble routing problem and prove that a sufficiently good expander graph admits an $O(\log n)$ -length protocol.

For our purposes, it suffices to consider a relaxation of the pebble routing problem, in which the protocol is required to satisfy that $g(\pi(u)) = f(u)$ for all but $o(1)$ fraction of the vertices. Also, we relax the condition that at each round, each vertex is used once. Instead, we only require that throughout the protocol, each vertex is a part of at most $\text{poly}(\log n)$ paths. Formally, we need the following result:

Theorem 3.3. There exists a universal constant $\alpha > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a regular, expander graph with second largest singular value $\sigma_2(G) \leq \alpha$. Let $c \geq 0$ be a fixed constant and $\pi : V \rightarrow V$ be a permutation. Then there is a $\text{poly}(|E|)$ -time algorithm to construct a protocol with $O(\log n)$ -length paths \mathcal{P} from u to $\pi(u)$ for all but $O\left(\frac{1}{\log^c(n)}\right)$ -fraction of u . Furthermore, every vertex in V is used in at most $t = O(\log^{c+1} n)$ paths in \mathcal{P} .

Proof. We note that [Upf92, Theorem 2] is the case of $c = 0$ in the above theorem. The proof for the case of $c > 0$ is an easy generalization of the argument therein, and we give the formal argument in Section C for the sake of completeness. \square

3.2 Routing Protocols under Adversarial Corruption

We now formally introduce the notion of almost-everywhere (a.e.) reliable transmission in the presence of adversarial corruptions. The goal in this problem is to design sparse networks and routing protocols for them, which allow a large fraction of honest nodes to communicate reliably even under adversarial corruptions of the communication network. Our setting is slightly different from most prior works in two ways. First, we need to consider a more general model of adversarial corruptions, where an arbitrary constant fraction of the

¹⁰We note that the notion of work complexity used in prior work of [JRV20] is slightly different from ours.

¹¹We are accounting for the input length at a vertex in its computation cost.

edges may behave maliciously (as opposed to vertices being corrupted). Second, we are given a permutation π on V , and we need to design a routing protocol that succeeds in transmitting all but a small fraction of messages from $u \rightarrow \pi(u)$ correctly. Formally:

Definition 3.4. We say an edge $(u, v) \in G$ is *uncorrupted* if whenever u transfers a message σ across (u, v) , then v receives σ ; otherwise, we say the edge (u, v) is *corrupted*. We say that a graph G has a $(\varepsilon(n), \nu(n))$ -edge-tolerant routing protocol with work complexity $w(n)$ and round complexity $r(n)$ if the following holds. Let $\pi : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be any permutation of $V(G)$. Then there is an r -round communication protocol on G such that for all functions $f : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$, after running the protocol for r -rounds each vertex v computes a value $g(v) \in \Sigma$ with the following guarantee: any adversary that corrupts at most $\varepsilon(n)$ -fraction of the edges,

$$\Pr_{u \in V(G)} [f(u) \neq g(\pi(u))] \leq \nu(n).$$

As in Definition 3.1, the work complexity $w(n)$ of the protocol is the maximum computation that any node performs throughout the protocol, as measured by circuit size.

Recall that if G is a constant degree graph which admits a pebble routing protocol of length at most r , then G admits a simple routing protocol that is $(\varepsilon, r\varepsilon)$ -tolerant under edge corruptions. This simple connection though is insufficient for us: on a constant degree graph, the best we can hope for is $\text{rt}(G) = \Theta(\log n)$, which necessitates taking $\varepsilon \leq \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\log n}\right)$. Using such a protocol in conjunction with Lemma 1.8 only leads to a 2-CSP on G with soundness $1 - \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\log n}\right)$, which is too weak for our purposes.

In the next section we will construct more involved protocols on the graphs underlying sufficiently good HDX, that are tolerant to a constant fraction of edge corruptions and have poly-logarithmic work complexity. Our main idea is to perform a message transfer on highly connected dense subgraphs in G , which naturally makes the protocol error-resilient, similar to the protocols of [CGO10, JRV20].

4 Link to Link Routing on CL-complexes

The goal of this section is to present a routing protocol over graphs underlying high-dimensional expanders. We begin by giving a high-level overview of the idea in Section 4.1, followed by a detailed description of the protocol and its analysis.

4.1 High-level Overview

Throughout this section, we denote by $\text{Maj}_\nu(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$ the value σ such that $\sigma_i = \sigma$ or at least ν fraction of i 's if such value exists, and \perp otherwise. Typically ν will be close to 1 (say, $\nu = 0.99$).

Recall that ultimately, we want to use our routing protocol to embed a regular 2-CSP instance Ψ' on the graph G . Since the instance Ψ' is over a regular graph and the graph G is not, there is some incompatibility between the two. In particular, it doesn't make much sense to identify vertices of Ψ' with vertices of G in an arbitrary way.

To circumvent this issue we use the zig-zag product: we choose an appropriate family of expander graphs \mathcal{H} and take the zig-zag product graph $Z = G \circledast \mathcal{H}$. Thus, we get a graph Z which is a regular expander graph, and additionally there is a natural correspondence between vertices in Z and in G . Indeed, a vertex v in Z is naturally composed of a cloud-name, which we denote by v_1 and is actually a name of a vertex from G , and additionally an inner index that we denote by v_2 (corresponding to an edge of $v_1 \in G$).

We associate a vertex of the 2-CSP Ψ' with a vertex of $v \in V(Z)$ (this makes sense now as these two graphs are regular), and this in turn is associated to the vertex v_1 in G . As discussed in Section 1.5.1, we break Ψ into k permutations π_1, \dots, π_k each one thought of as a permutation on $V(Z)$, and our goal is to transfer the value of v to $\pi(v)$ for some fixed permutation π from $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\}$. We will instead think of the value of v , as held by all the vertices in the link of v_1 , denoted by L_{v_1} , and this value needs to be transferred to the link $L_{\pi(v)_1}$. Once we have this kind of transfer, in Section 5 we show how to reduce Ψ to a 2-CSP on G .

Formally, the initial function A_0 that has to be routed will be on the links associated to each $v \in V(Z)$. First define the set $\mathcal{S} = \{(v, u) : v \in V(Z), u \in X_{v_1}(1)\}$. Then $A_0 : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Sigma$ should be thought of as a function that for every $v \in V(Z)$, assigns the link $X_{v_1}(1)$ values that are mostly the same across vertices of the link, in the sense that there exists $\sigma_v \in \Sigma$ such that $\text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_0(v, u) | u \in X_{v_1}(1)) = \sigma_v$. For the overview, it is helpful to think of all the vertices in L_{v_1} holding the same value, σ_v ¹². Note that every value $A_0(v, u)$ is held at the vertex $u \in G$ (v is a label for this value) and every vertex in G holds multiple such values. Even though the actual routing takes place on G , it is convenient to keep the graph Z in mind for the analysis, think of A_0 as a function on the links X_{v_1} (for all $v \in Z$) and the protocol as a link to link transfer.

After the routing protocol ends, we will have a function $A_T : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Sigma$. Our main result in this section, Lemma 4.6, shows that the majority value on the link X_{v_1} gets transferred to the link $X_{\pi(v)_1}$ for most $v \in Z$.

With this setup in mind, we first find a collection of paths \mathcal{P} on Z , each path being from $v \rightarrow \pi(v)$, using the relaxed pebble routing protocol in Theorem 3.3. This is possible since Z is a regular expander graph. We now use these paths to implement the link to link transfer.

Transmitting on Links: Each path $P = u_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow u_T$ in \mathcal{P} , for $T = O(\log n)$ and $u_T = \pi(u_1)$, can equivalently be thought of as a path over vertex-links: $L_{u_1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L_{(u_T)_1}$. Pretending for a moment that each link is in fact a clique, the protocol proceeds as follows: vertices of L_{u_1} send their message to L_{u_1, u_2} ; the vertices in L_{u_1, u_2} each compute a majority value and pass it on to the vertices in L_{u_2} , and so on. We show that for any adversarial strategy, this protocol succeeds in transmitting the correct message on almost all of the paths in \mathcal{P} . The key here is that vertices are allowed to take majority values, so as long as they are not over-saturated with corrupted edges, they will compute the correct value.

Returning to our actual scenario, the vertex links in X do not actually form cliques and so we cannot use the protocol as described above. To remedy this situation, we show that for each vertex link L in X we can set up a collection of short paths \mathcal{P}_L such that for almost all vertex pairs $u, v \in L$, the collection \mathcal{P}_L contains a short path between u and v . Furthermore, no edge is used in the paths \mathcal{P}_L too often. The collection of paths \mathcal{P}_L allows us to pretend that the link L almost forms a clique, in the sense that we transmit a message between pairs $u, v \in L$ using the path from \mathcal{P}_L between them (as opposed to directly as in the case of cliques).

Gap amplification: Finally we remark that one additional benefit of having A_0 on links is that only $o(1)$ -fraction of the message transfers from $L_{v_1} \rightarrow L_{\pi(v)_1}$ are unsuccessful. We show that our protocol is $(\varepsilon, 1/\text{polylog}n)$ -tolerant, a guarantee which is impossible if the initial function was on $V(G)$. Therefore associating the vertices of Ψ' to links, as we show in Section 5, translates to a gap amplification result for PCPs. More precisely, if we start with a 2-CSP Ψ' such that $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - 1/\text{polylog}n$, then we get a 2-CSP Ψ on G with $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \Omega(1)$, where Ψ is obtained using our link to link routing protocol. This gives the same amplification as achieved in the gap amplification procedure of Dinur [Din07], but the alphabet size is $\exp(\text{polylog}n)$. This can be brought down to constant-sized alphabet by incurring a size blow-up by a factor $\text{polylog}n$ using the alphabet reduction technique (which we anyway have to do, see Section 8).

¹²We need to start with the weaker condition of almost all vertices holding σ_v to make the embedding result in Section 5.2 go through. Our proof easily ports over to this more general setting, so it is useful to think of all vertices in L_{v_1} holding σ_v for the overview.

Throughout this section we fix X a complex as in Theorem 2.13 with the parameters $\delta \in (0, 1)$ chosen arbitrarily,¹³ $q = (\log n)^C$ for sufficiently large constant $C > 0$, d a large constant, and $|X(1)| = n$. We also fix the graph $G = (X(1), X(2))$.

4.2 Routing Inside a Link

In this section we describe a routing procedure inside individual links. This routing procedure will help us to facilitate the intuition that links in X are almost as well connected as cliques, supporting the approach presented in Section 4.1.

We now show that inside each vertex link L , we can construct (in polynomial time) a set of short paths \mathcal{P} between almost all pairs of vertices in L . More precisely, we construct a collection of paths \mathcal{P} between all pairs of vertices $U \in L_i(1), V \in L_j(1)$ for two indices i, j that are far apart. Our algorithm will give up on a small fraction of such pairs; we refer to the path between them as “invalid” and denote $P(u, v) = \perp$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and fix a pair of indices $i, j \in [d - 1]$ with $|i - j| \geq (d - 1)\varepsilon$. Then there is a poly($|L_{ij}(2)|$)-time algorithm that constructs a set of paths $\mathcal{P}_{ij} = \{P(u, v)\}_{u \in L_i(1), v \in L_j(1)}$, where each valid path is of length $O(1/\varepsilon)$ and at most $O(\varepsilon)$ fraction of paths are invalid. Furthermore, each edge in $L_{ij}(2)$ is used in at most $O\left(\frac{|L_i(1)||L_j(1)|}{\varepsilon^3|L_{ij}(2)|}\right)$ paths in \mathcal{P}_{ij} .*

Proof. Consider any pair of indices $i, j \in [d]$ with $|j - i| \geq (d - 1)\varepsilon$. Fix $\ell = \Theta(1/\varepsilon)$ and $t = \Theta\left(\frac{|L_i(1)||L_j(1)|}{\varepsilon^3|L_{ij}(2)|}\right)$. By the fourth item in Theorem 2.13 the diameter of $(L_i(1), L_j(1))$ is at most $O(1/\varepsilon)$. The algorithm to construct the paths simply picks the shortest paths between a pair of vertices iteratively, and deletes any edges that has been used at least t -times. Note that since paths are of length $\leq \ell$, in an ideal scenario where every edge occurs equally often, each edge would belong to $O\left(\frac{|L_i(1)||L_j(1)|}{\varepsilon|L_{ij}(2)|}\right)$ paths. We take t to be larger so as to allow some slack, which still gives us the uniformity over edges as in the statement of the lemma. We now proceed to the formal argument.

For a set of edges $\mathcal{E} \subseteq L_{ij}(2)$, let $L_{ij}(\mathcal{E})$ denote the bipartite graph with vertices $(L_i(1), L_j(1))$ and the set of edges \mathcal{E} . Formally our algorithm is as follows:

- Instantiate $\mathcal{P}_{ij} = \emptyset, \mathcal{E} = L_{ij}(2)$.
- For every $u \in L_i(1), v \in L_j(1)$ do the following:
 1. Find the shortest path $P(u, v)$ between u and v in the graph $L_{ij}(\mathcal{E})$. If the length of $P(u, v)$ is at most ℓ then add it to the set \mathcal{P}_{ij} , else set $P(u, v) = \perp$.
 2. If any edge e in $L_{ij}(2)$ has been used in at least t paths in \mathcal{P}_{ij} then remove it from \mathcal{E} .

It is easy to see that the above algorithm runs in polynomial time in $|L_{ij}(2)|$ and that every edge in $L_{ij}(2)$ is used in at most t paths in \mathcal{P}_{ij} . It remains to show that the algorithm finds a path of length at most ℓ between almost all pairs of vertices.

Let \mathcal{E}_f denote the set \mathcal{E} when the algorithm terminates and $\mathcal{E}_0 = L_{ij}(2)$ denote the set at the start. It is easy to check that the number of edges that the algorithm removes from \mathcal{E}_0 is at most $|L_i||L_j|\ell \cdot 1/t = \Theta(\varepsilon^2|L_{ij}(2)|)$, implying that $\Pr_{e \sim L_{ij}(2)}[e \notin \mathcal{E}_f] \leq \varepsilon^2$. Since the diameter of $(L_i(1), L_j(1))$ is at most ℓ , for every $u \in L_i, v \in L_j$ we may fix an arbitrary shortest path $P_{u,v}$ (length $\leq \ell$) between them. By the third item in Theorem 2.13 there is a group of symmetries $\text{Sym}(L)$ that acts transitively on the top faces of

¹³The parameter δ dictates the soundness of our final PCP. The results in this section and the next hold for all δ .

L . Thus, we may consider the path $g \circ P_{u,v}$ for any $g \in \text{Sym}(L)$, with goes between $g \circ u$ and $g \circ v$. We consider the distribution \mathcal{D} over paths, obtained as sample $u \sim L_i, v \sim L_j, g \sim \text{Sym}(L)$, and output the path $P = g \circ P_{u,v}$. Note that a random edge drawn from a random path $P \sim \mathcal{D}$, is a uniformly random edge in $L_{ij}(2)$ due to the transitive symmetry of the group $\text{Sym}(L)$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{P \sim \mathcal{D} \\ e \sim P}} [\mathbb{1}_{e \notin \mathcal{E}_f}] \lesssim \varepsilon^2.$$

Since the marginal of the starting and ending point of $P \sim \mathcal{D}$ is the uniform distribution over $u \sim L_i, v \sim L_j$ and the length of the path is $O(1/\varepsilon)$, we can rearrange the left hand side above and apply a union bound to get

$$\mathbb{E}_{u \sim L_i, v \sim L_j} \left[\mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{D} | u, v} [\mathbb{1}_{\exists e \in P, e \notin \mathcal{E}_f}] \right] \lesssim \ell \varepsilon^2 \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Thus, by an averaging argument for at least a $(1 - O(\varepsilon))$ -fraction of the pairs u, v ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{D} | u, v} [\mathbb{1}_{\exists e \in P, e \notin \mathcal{E}_f}] \leq 1/2.$$

This means that when the algorithm terminates, for at least $(1 - O(\varepsilon))$ fraction of vertex pairs u, v there is at least one path of length at most ℓ between them. We argue that for each such pair u, v , the collection $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ already contains a path between u and v upon the termination of the algorithm, since we have only deleted edges. \square

We now use the short paths \mathcal{P} between all pairs of vertices in L to argue that an adversary that corrupts a small fraction of the edges can only corrupt a small fraction of the paths in \mathcal{P} . Recall that some of the paths in \mathcal{P} might be invalid, and to simplify notation we account these as paths that are corrupted by default. Thus, we say that a path in \mathcal{P} is corrupted if it equals \perp or if at least one of the edges in it is corrupted.

Lemma 4.2. *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and a vertex link L of X . Then there is a poly($|L|$)-time algorithm to construct a set of paths $\mathcal{P} = \{P_{U,V}\}_{U \neq V \in L}$ in which each valid path has length at most $O(1/\varepsilon^{1/8})$. Furthermore, any adversary that corrupts at most ε -fraction of the edges in L , corrupts at most $O(\varepsilon^{1/8})$ -fraction of the paths in \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. For every pair of indices $i, j \in [d-1]$ with $|j-i| \geq \varepsilon^{1/8}(d-1)$, run the polynomial time algorithm in Lemma 4.1 with the parameter $\varepsilon^{1/8}$, to get a set of paths \mathcal{P}_{ij} of length $O(1/\varepsilon^{1/8})$ each, between all pairs $u \in L_i(1), v \in L_j(1)$ such that at most $O(\varepsilon^{1/8})$ -fraction of the paths are invalid and every edge in $L_{ij}(2)$ is used in at most $O\left(\frac{|L_i(1)||L_j(1)|}{\varepsilon^{3/8}|L_{ij}(2)|}\right)$ paths. For every pair $i, j \in [d-1]$ with $|j-i| < \varepsilon^{1/8}d$, set $\mathcal{P}_{ij} = \{P(u, v)\}_{u \in L_i(1), v \in L_j(1)}$ with $P(u, v) = \perp$.

Fix any adversary that corrupts at most ε -fraction of the edges in L , and let \mathcal{E} denote the set of corrupted edges. Let the fraction of corrupted edges inside $L_{ij}(2)$ be denoted by $\mu_{ij}(\mathcal{E})$. Let Good denote the set of indices $i, j \in [d-1]$ that satisfy, $|j-i| \geq \varepsilon^{1/8}(d-1)$ and $\mu_{ij}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. By Markov's inequality it follows that the a random pair $i, j \sim [d]$ is in Good with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon^{1/8} - \sqrt{\varepsilon} \geq 1 - O(\varepsilon^{1/8})$.

Fix any pair $(i, j) \in \text{Good}$ and consider the set of paths \mathcal{P}_{ij} . Recall that say that a path $P(u, v)$ is corrupted if either $P(u, v) = \perp$ or any of its edges is corrupted. Since at most $\sqrt{\varepsilon}|L_{ij}(2)|$ edges are corrupted and each such edge is used in at most $O\left(\frac{|L_i(1)||L_j(1)|}{\varepsilon^{3/8}|L_{ij}(2)|}\right)$ paths, we get that the number of corrupted paths in \mathcal{P}_{ij} is at most

$$\sqrt{\varepsilon}|L_{ij}(2)| \cdot \Theta\left(\frac{|L_i(1)||L_j(1)|}{\varepsilon^{3/8}|L_{ij}(2)|}\right) \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/8}|L_i(1)||L_j(1)|.$$

It follows from the union bound that the fraction of corrupted paths is at most

$$\Pr_{i,j \sim [d]} [(i, j) \notin \text{Good}] + \Pr_{\substack{i,j \sim [d] \\ u \sim L_i(1) \\ v \sim L_j(1)}} [P(u, v) \text{ is corrupted} \mid (i, j) \in \text{Good}] \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/8}. \quad \square$$

4.3 Moving to the Zig-Zag Product of G

As discussed earlier in Section 4.1, the fact that graph G is not regular introduces several technical difficulties; this prohibits us from using Theorem 3.3 directly, and it also poses difficulties later on when we use routing schemes to embed a regular 2-CSP instance onto G . In this section we circumvent these issues by considering the zig-zag product of G with appropriate expanders. The resulting graph Z will be a virtual, regular graph; by virtual, we mean that the graph Z will help us in choosing appropriate paths in G (for the routing) and in the analysis. The routing itself is still done on the graph G .

For a set $S \in X(s)$, let $\Delta_S = |X_S(d - s)|$. Henceforth we will think of G as an undirected graph without weights, and for that we replace each edge (u, v) with $\Delta_{\{uv\}}$ parallel edges. Since the probability of drawing (u, v) from μ_2 is $\frac{\Delta_{\{u,v\}}}{\binom{d}{2}|X(d)|}$, this gives us the same random walk matrix over $X(1)$.

We use the zig-zag product to get a regular graph Z from G . The additional benefit of this operation is that Z has constant degree graph while also being an expander. The zig-zag product was first defined in [RVW00] and is typically stated for regular graphs, but below we state a similar construction for irregular graphs G . We follow the exposition from the lecture notes [TT06], except that we use the extension to irregular graphs.

4.3.1 The Replacement Product and the Zig-Zag Product

The following fact is well-known.

Lemma 4.3. *For all $\sigma > 0$, there exist $k, m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a family of k -regular graphs $\mathcal{H} = \{H_m\}_{m \geq m_0}$ which is polynomial-time constructible, where for each $m \geq m_0$ that graph H_m has m vertices and $\sigma_2(H_m) \leq \sigma$.*

For σ to be determined later, fix the family \mathcal{H} of expander graphs as in Lemma 4.3, and fix an undirected (possibly irregular) graph G with minimum degree at least m_0 .

Our presentation of the zig-zag product follows [TT06] almost verbatim, and it is convenient to first define the replacement product of G with \mathcal{H} , denoted by $G \circledast \mathcal{H}$. Assume that for each vertex of G , there is some ordering on its D neighbors. Then the replacement product $G \circledast \mathcal{H}$ is constructed as follows:

- Replace a vertex u of G with a copy of $H_{\deg(i)}$, that is the graph from \mathcal{H} on $\deg(i)$ many vertices (henceforth called a cloud). For $u \in V(G)$, $c \in V(H_{\deg(i)})$, let (u, c) denote the c^{th} vertex in the cloud of u .
- Let $(u, v) \in E(G)$ be such that v is the c_1^{th} neighbor of u and u is the c_2^{th} neighbor of v . Then $((u, c_1), (v, c_2)) \in E(G \circledast \mathcal{H})$. Also $\forall u \in V(G)$, if $(c_1, c_2) \in E(H_{\deg(i)})$, then $((u, c_1), (u, c_2)) \in E(G \circledast \mathcal{H})$.

Note that the replacement product constructed as above has $2|E(G)|$ vertices and is $(k + 1)$ -regular. The zig-zag product $G \circledcirc \mathcal{H}$ is constructed as follows:

- The vertex set $V(G \circledcirc \mathcal{H})$ is the same as that of $G \circledast \mathcal{H}$.

- $((u, c_1), (v, c_4)) \in E(G \circledast \mathcal{H})$ if there exist c_2 and c_3 such that $((u, c_1), (u, c_2)), ((u, c_2), (v, c_3))$ and $((v, c_3), (v, c_4))$ are edges in $E(G \oplus \mathcal{H})$, i.e. (v, c_4) can be reached from (u, c_1) by taking a step in the cloud of u to go to (u, c_2) , then a step between the clouds of u and v to go to (v, c_3) , and finally a step in the cloud of v to reach (v, c_4) .

It is easy to see that the zig-zag product is a k^2 -regular graph on $2|E(G)|$ vertices. Given that G is an expander, the zig-zag product graph $G \circledast \mathcal{H}$ is also an expander. The proof when G is a regular graph can be found in [TT06, RVW00]. The proof for the irregular case above is exactly the same hence we omit it here.

Lemma 4.4. *If G is a graph on n vertices with $\sigma_2(G) \leq \alpha$, and $\mathcal{H} = \{H_m\}_{m \geq m_0}$ is a family of k -regular graphs with $\sigma_2(H_m) \leq \beta$ for all $m \geq m_0$, then $G \circledast \mathcal{H}$ is a k^2 -regular graph with second largest singular value at most $\alpha + \beta + \beta^2$.*

Along with the above statement, we will use the following obvious but important fact,

Fact 4.5. *For $G = (X(1), X(2))$ and $Z = G \circledast \mathcal{H}$, the distribution that samples a uniformly random vertex (v, c) of Z and outputs v , is equal to $v \sim X(1)$. Similarly the distribution that samples a uniformly random edge $((u, c_1), (v, c_2))$ of Z and outputs (u, v) is equal to the distribution over edges $(u, v) \sim X(2)$.*

4.4 The Routing Protocol using Links

Fix $\alpha > 0$ from Theorem 3.3. Consider the graph $G = (X(1), X(2))$, viewed as an undirected and unweighted graph with multi-edges. Let \mathcal{H} be the family of expanders from Lemma 4.3 with $\sigma_2(\mathcal{H}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}$ and $Z = G \circledast \mathcal{H}$. For every vertex $v \in Z$ we will let v_1 denote its component in $X(1)$ and v_2 denote its position in the cloud of v_1 , that is, $v = (v_1, v_2)$. We have the following link-to-link transfer lemma:

Lemma 4.6. *There exist $\varepsilon_0, \alpha > 0$ such that for all $C \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist constants $C', d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the following holds. Let X be a complex from Theorem 2.13 with dimension $d \geq d_0$, $|X(1)| = n$ and the parameter $q = \log^{C'} n$. Let $Z = G \circledast \mathcal{H}$ be the zig-zag product of G with the family of expander graphs with $\sigma_2(\mathcal{H}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}$ as in Lemma 4.3. Let $\pi : V(Z) \rightarrow V(Z)$ be any permutation. Then there is a routing protocol on $G = (X(1), X(2))$ with round complexity $T = O(\log n)$ and work complexity $q^{O(d^2)} \log |\Sigma|$ such that for all initial functions $A_0 : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Sigma$ satisfying*

$$\Pr_{v \sim V(Z)} [\text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_0(v, u) \mid u \sim X_{v_1}(1)) \neq \perp] \geq 1 - \eta,$$

and for all possible adversaries that corrupt at most ε -fraction of edges with $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, the protocol computes the function $A_T : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Sigma$ satisfying

$$\Pr_{v \sim V(Z)} [\text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_T(\pi(v), w) \mid w \sim X_{\pi(v_1)}(1)) = \text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_0(v, u) \mid u \in X_{v_1}(1))] \geq 1 - \eta - \frac{1}{\log^C n}.$$

Proof. Fix a permutation π on $V(Z)$ and an initial function $A_0 : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Sigma$.

Setting up paths over 1-links: Using Lemma 4.4 we know that the zig-zag product $Z = G \circledast \mathcal{H}$ is a k -regular graph, for $k = \Theta(1)$, with $\sigma_2(Z) \leq \frac{2}{d} + \frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{\alpha^2}{4} \leq \alpha$. By Theorem 3.3, we may fix a relaxed-pebble-routing protocol \mathcal{R} that has $|V(Z)|$ paths each of length $T' \leq O(\log N)$ where every vertex and edge in Z is used in at most $\log^{C_1} n$ paths, for some constant C_1 that depends on C , and at most $\frac{1}{3 \log^C n}$ paths are invalid. It will be convenient for us notationally to have all of the paths in \mathcal{R} have the same length T' , and we do so by repeating the final vertex of the paths the amount of times necessary.

Each path in \mathcal{R} is of the form $P = u_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow u_{T'}$, with $u_i \in V(Z)$, $u_{T'} = \pi(u_1)$ and for all i , (u_i, u_{i+1}) is an edge in the zig-zag product $Z = G \circledast \mathcal{H}$. This implies that $((u_i)_1, (u_{i+1})_1)$ must be an edge in G . Therefore given P , we will think of the following link to link message transfer,

$$X_{(u_1)_1}(1) \rightarrow X_{(u_1)_1, (u_2)_1}(1) \rightarrow X_{(u_2)_1}(1) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_{(u_{T'})_1}(1),$$

to implement the required transfer from $X_{(u_1)_1}(1)$ to $X_{(u_{T'})_1}(1)$.

Let $T := 2T'$. Expand each path in \mathcal{R} as shown above into 1-links connected by 2-links. For even $t \in [0, T]$ let $L_{j,t}$ denote the 1-link that occurs in the $(t/2)^{\text{th}}$ -time-step of the j^{th} path in \mathcal{R} , and for odd $t \in [T]$ let $L_{j,t}$ denote the intermediate 2-link that is the intersection of the 1-links $L_{j,t-1}$ and $L_{j,t+1}$.

Setting up paths inside 1-links: For every 1-link X_u for $u \in X(1)$, we use the algorithm in Lemma 4.2 with the parameter $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$, to construct a collection of short paths $\mathcal{P}_u = \{P_u(v, w)\}_{v, w \in X_u(1)}$ between all pairs of vertices v, w inside the link X_u . We will refer to these as the internal paths in X_u .

The description of the routing protocol: for each path j and time-step $t > 0$, each vertex $u \in L_{j,t}$ takes the majority of the values it receives from $v \in L_{j,t-1}$; this occurs through the path $P_{L_{j,t-1}}(v, u)$ if t is odd or the path $P_{L_{j,t}}(v, u)$ if t is even (some paths may be invalid, in which case we interpret the received value on them as “ \perp ”). Then u passes on this value to $w \in L_{j,t+1}$ through the path $P_{L_{j,t}}(u, w)$ if t is even and the path $P_{L_{j,t+1}}(u, w)$ if t is odd. To formalize this, let the “outgoing message” from u at time-step 0, path j be $\text{OUT}(u, j, 0) = A_0(v_j, u)$ where $v_j \in V(Z)$ is the start vertex on the j^{th} path. For a vertex $u \in X(1)$, for every path $j \in [N]$ and time-step $t \in [T]$ where $u \in L_{j,t}$, u maintains a set of “incoming messages” $\text{IN}(u, v, j, t)$ that it receives from vertices $v \in L_{j,t-1}$. The vertex u then sets its outgoing message as $\text{OUT}(u, j, t) = \text{Maj}_{v \in L_{j,t-1}}(\text{IN}(u, v, j, t))$ if more than $1/2$ -fraction (computed according to the distribution on $L_{j,t-1}$) of the list has the same value, else sets it to \perp . This outgoing message is then sent to every vertex in $L_{j,t+1}$ through the paths $\mathcal{P}_{L_{j,t}}$ if t is even and $\mathcal{P}_{L_{j,t+1}}$ if t is odd.

Bad links and bounding them: We now begin the analysis of the protocol, and for that we need to introduce a few notions. First, at most ε -fraction of the edges are corrupted, and we denote the set of corrupted edges by $\mathcal{E} \subseteq X(2)$. A 1-link X_u is called bad if it contains too many corrupted edges, more precisely, if $\mu_u(\mathcal{E}) \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and good otherwise.

Claim 4.7. $\Pr_{u \sim X(1)}[X_u \text{ is bad}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q}$.

Proof. Deferred to Section 4.4.1. □

For any 1-link X_u and $v, w \in L(1)$, we say an internal path $P_u(v, w)$ is corrupted if it equals \perp or any of the edges on it are corrupted. We define the set $\mathcal{D}_u \subseteq X_u(1)$ of doomed vertices of X_u as those vertices $v \in X_u(1)$ for which at least $\varepsilon^{1/32}$ -fraction of the paths $P_u(v, w)$ for $w \sim X_u(1)$ are corrupted, i.e.

$$\mathcal{D}_u = \left\{ v \in X_u(1) : \Pr_{w \sim X_u(1)} [P_u(v, w) \text{ is corrupted}] \geq \varepsilon^{1/32} \right\}.$$

The following claim asserts that a good 1-link cannot have too many doomed vertices.

Claim 4.8. *If X_u is a good link then, $\Pr_{v \sim X_u(1)}[v \in \mathcal{D}_u] \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/32}$.*

Proof. Deferred to Section 4.4.1. □

A 2-link $X_{u,v}$ is said to be bad if either X_u or X_v is a bad 1-link, or one of $\mu_{uv}(\mathcal{D}_u)$ or $\mu_{uv}(\mathcal{D}_v)$ is at least $\varepsilon^{1/64}$.

Claim 4.9. $\Pr_{(u,v) \sim X(2)}[X_{u,v} \text{ is bad}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q}$.

Proof. Deferred to Section 4.4.1. □

Link to Link Transfer on Good Paths: We now use Claims 4.7, 4.8, 4.9 to finish the analysis of the protocol. Recall that every path contains a 1-link at an even time-step and a 2-link at an odd time-step. Consider any path j where (1) $\text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_0(v_j, u)) \neq \perp$, (2) it is a valid path in \mathcal{R} , and (3) for all times steps t , $L_{j,t}$ is a good link. On such a path we will show that $\text{Maj}_{0.99}(\text{OUT}(u, j, t) \mid u \in L_{j,t}) = \text{Maj}_{0.99}(\text{OUT}(v, j, t+1))$ for all t . After that, we argue that almost all paths satisfy these properties. The proof of the former fact is broken into two steps: the message transfer from $L_{j,t}$ to $L_{j,t+1}$ and then the message transfer from $L_{j,t+1}$ to $L_{j,t+2}$, and we argue about each step separately.

The argument proceeds by induction on t . Fix some even $t \in [T-2]$ and let $\text{Maj}_{0.99}(\text{OUT}(v, j, t)) = \sigma \neq \perp$. The vertices $u \in L_{j,t+1}$ that are not doomed with respect to $L_{j,t}$ ($u \notin \mathcal{D}_{L_{j,t}}$) will receive the value σ on at least $1 - O(\varepsilon^{1/32}) - 0.01 \geq 1/2$ -fraction of the paths $P_{L_{j,t}}(v, u)$ and therefore will compute the correct majority, setting $\text{OUT}(u, j, t+1) = \sigma$. Since $L_{j,t+1}$ is a good 2-link we know that at most $O(\varepsilon^{1/64}) \leq 0.01$ -fraction of its vertices are doomed, which gives that $\text{Maj}_{0.99}(\text{OUT}(u, j, t+1) \mid u \in L_{j,t+1}) = \sigma$.

The argument for odd t is exactly the same. Fix some odd $t \in [T-2]$ and let $\text{Maj}_{0.99}(\text{OUT}(v, j, t)) = \sigma \neq \perp$. The vertices $u \in L_{j,t+1}$ that are not doomed with respect to $L_{j,t}$ ($u \notin \mathcal{D}_{L_{j,t}}$) will receive the value σ on at least $1 - O(\varepsilon^{1/32}) - 0.01 \geq 1/2$ -fraction of the paths $P_{L_{j,t}}(v, u)$ and therefore will compute the correct majority, setting $\text{OUT}(u, j, t+1) = \sigma$. Since $L_{j,t+1}$ is a good 1-link, Claim 4.8 implies that at most $O(\varepsilon^{1/32}) \leq 0.01$ -fraction of its vertices are doomed, which immediately implies that $\text{Maj}_{0.99}(\text{OUT}(u, j, t+1) \mid u \in L_{j,t+1}) = \sigma$.

Setting $A_T(\pi(v_j), v) = \text{OUT}(v, j, T)$ we conclude that for the j^{th} -path, $\text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_T(\pi(v_j), v)) = \text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_0(v_j, u))$.

Bounding the number of Good Paths: We now finish off the proof by calculating the number of paths j satisfying conditions (1), (2) and (3) above. By the assumption of the lemma we know that there are at most η -fraction paths violating (1) and by construction of \mathcal{R} at most $\frac{1}{3 \log^c n}$ -fraction paths violate (2).

To account for condition (3) it will be useful to switch back to the equivalent view of \mathcal{R} as a set of paths over Z . We call a vertex $v \in Z$ bad if the corresponding 1-link X_{v_1} is bad and an edge $(v, w) \in Z$ bad if the corresponding 2-link X_{v_1, w_1} is bad. Using Claims 4.7 and 4.9 we get

$$\Pr_{v \sim Z}[v \text{ is bad}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q}, \quad \Pr_{(v,w) \sim Z}[(v, w) \text{ is bad}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q},$$

since by Fact 4.5 we have equality of the distributions in question.

Now note that condition (3) is equivalent to saying that path j contains only good vertices and good edges (from Z) in it. The protocol \mathcal{R} uses every vertex at most $\log^{C_1} n$ times which implies that at most $\frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q} \cdot |V(Z)| \cdot \log^{C_1} n \leq \frac{|V(Z)|}{3 \log^c n}$ -paths contain bad vertices on them (by setting q to be a large enough polynomial of $\log n$). Similarly since \mathcal{R} uses an edge in Z at most $\log^{C_1} n$ times, we get that at most $\frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q} \cdot |E(Z)| \cdot \log^{C_1} n \leq \frac{|V(Z)|}{3 \log^c n}$ where we used that $|E(Z)| = \Theta(|V(Z)|)$ and q is large enough. Therefore by a union bound we get that at most $\eta + \frac{1}{\log^c n}$ -fraction paths fail in transmitting the majority symbol to the link $L_{\pi(v_j)}$ correctly, giving us the conclusion in the lemma. □

4.4.1 Proofs of Omitted Claims

In this section we give the proofs of several claims used throughout the proof of Lemma 4.6.

Claim 4.10 (Claim 4.7 restated). $\Pr_{u \sim X(1)}[X_u \text{ is bad}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q}$.

Proof. Recall that \mathcal{E} is a set of corrupted edges, and let \mathcal{E}_{jk} denote the set of edges $\mathcal{E} \cap X_{jk}(2)$ with $\mu_{jk}(\mathcal{E})$ denoting its measure in $X_{jk}(2)$. Note that $\mathbb{E}_{j \neq k \in [d]}[\mu_{jk}(\mathcal{E})] = \mu(\mathcal{E}) \leq \varepsilon$.

Fix some $i \in [d]$ and consider the bipartite graph, $B_i = (X_i(1), \cup_{j \neq k \in [d] \setminus i} X_{jk}(2))$. We say that a vertex in the right side of B_i is corrupted if the corresponding edge belongs to \mathcal{E} .

First note that for all $u \in X_i(1)$, the link X_u is bad if the fraction of u 's neighbors in B_i that are corrupted is at least $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Therefore let us bound the probability that this event occurs. By item 5 of Theorem 2.13 and Lemma 2.11, the bipartite graphs $(X_i(1), X_{jk}(2))$ have second largest singular value at most $\text{poly}(d)/\sqrt{q}$ for all $j \neq k$. Therefore the second largest singular value of B_i is also at most $\text{poly}(d)/\sqrt{q}$. Applying Lemma 2.2 we get

$$\Pr_{u \sim X_i(1)}[X_u \text{ is bad}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q},$$

where we used that the expected fraction of bad neighbors is $\mathbb{E}_{j \neq k \in [d] \setminus i}[\mu_{jk}(\mathcal{E})] \leq 2\varepsilon$.

Since the above bound holds for all i , we get the conclusion in the lemma. \square

Claim 4.11 (Claim 4.8 restated). *If X_u is a good link then, $\Pr_{v \sim X_u(1)}[v \in \mathcal{D}_u] \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/32}$.*

Proof. Since X_u is a good link we know that $\mu_u(\mathcal{E}) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. By the construction of the internal paths \mathcal{P}_u from Lemma 4.2 we know that at most $O(\varepsilon^{1/16})$ -fraction of the paths $P_u(v, w)$ for $v, w \sim X_u(1)$ are corrupted. Therefore by Markov's inequality we get that for at most $O(\varepsilon^{1/32})$ -fraction of $v \sim X_u(1)$, $\Pr_{w \sim X_u(1)}[P_u(v, w) \text{ is corrupted}] \geq \varepsilon^{1/32}$. Therefore $v \in \mathcal{D}_u$ with probability at most $O(\varepsilon^{1/32})$. \square

Claim 4.12 (Claim 4.9 restated). $\Pr_{(u,v) \sim X(2)}[X_{u,v} \text{ is bad}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q}$.

Proof. Recall that the link $X_{u,v}$ is bad if either X_u or X_v is a bad 1-link or one of $\mu_{uv}(\mathcal{D}_u)$ or $\mu_{uv}(\mathcal{D}_v)$ is at least $\varepsilon^{1/64}$. Using Claim 4.7 we can bound the probability that one of X_u or X_v is bad, so let us now bound the probability of the latter events.

Fix a good 1-link X_u henceforth and let us bound the fraction of $v \sim X_u(1)$ for which $\mu_{uv}(\mathcal{D}_u)$ is large. Using Claim 4.8 we get that $\mu_u(\mathcal{D}_u) \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/32}$. The link X_u is a $(d-1)$ -partite complex with colors $[d-1]$ and the property that for all $i \neq j \in [d-1]$ the bipartite graph $(X_{u,i}(1), X_{u,j}(1))$ has second largest eigenvalue at most $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{q}}\right)$. Let $\mu_j(\mathcal{D}_u)$ denote the measure of $\mathcal{D}_u \cap X_{u,j}(1)$ inside $X_{u,j}(1)$. One can check that $\mathbb{E}_{j \sim [d-1]}[\mu_j(\mathcal{D}_u)] = \mu_u(\mathcal{D}_u)$.

Fix a color $i \in [d-1]$ of X_u and consider the bipartite graph, $B_i = (X_{u,i}(1), \cup_{j \in [d-1] \setminus i} X_{u,j}(1))$. This graph has second largest singular value at most $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{q}}\right)$. We say that a vertex in the right side of B_i is doomed if it belongs to \mathcal{D}_u . Noting that for all $v \in X_i(1)$, $\mu_{uv}(\mathcal{D}_u)$ is the fraction of doomed neighbors of v in B_i and applying Lemma 2.2 we get

$$\Pr_{v \sim X_{u,i}(1)}[\mu_{uv}(\mathcal{D}_u) \geq \varepsilon^{1/64}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q},$$

where we used that the expected fraction of bad neighbors is $\mathbb{E}_{j \sim [d-1] \setminus \{i\}}[\mu_j(\mathcal{D}_u)] \leq 2\mu_u(\mathcal{D}_u) \lesssim \varepsilon^{1/32}$. Since the above bound holds for all i , we get that,

$$\Pr_{v \sim X_u(1)}[\mu_v(\mathcal{D}_u) \geq \varepsilon^{1/64}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q}.$$

We can now bound the fraction of 2-links that are bad by a union bound:

$$\Pr_{(u,v) \sim X(2)} [X_{u,v} \text{ is bad}] \leq 2 \Pr_{u \sim X(1)} [X_u \text{ is bad}] + 2 \Pr_{v \sim X_u(1)} [\mu_{uv}(\mathcal{D}_u) \geq \varepsilon^{1/64} \mid X_u \text{ is good}] \leq \frac{\text{poly}(d)}{q},$$

where we used Claim 4.7 to bound the first term. \square

4.5 A Routing Protocol based on Cliques

In this section, we formally state the performance of the clique-to-clique routing protocol. This protocol is similar in spirit to the link-to-link protocol and it is where most of our intuition comes from.

Lemma 4.13. *There is $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $C \in \mathbb{N}$, for large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the following holds. Let X be a d -dimensional complex with $|X(1)| = n$, $|X(d)| = N$, $d = \Theta(\log \log^2 n)$ and $N \leq n^2$, that is a γ -one-sided local spectral expander with $\gamma < 1/\text{poly}(d)$. Let $\pi : X(d) \rightarrow X(d)$ be any permutation. Then there is a routing protocol on $G = (X(1), X(2))$ with round complexity $T = O(\log N)$ and work complexity $\max_u O(Td|X_u(d-1)|)$ such that for all initial functions $A_0 : X(d) \times [d] \rightarrow \Sigma$ satisfying*

$$\Pr_{D \sim X(d)} [\text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_0(D, u) \mid u \in D) \neq \perp] \geq 1 - \eta,$$

and for all possible adversaries that corrupt at most ε -fraction of edges with $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, the protocol computes the function $A_T : X(d) \times [d] \rightarrow \Sigma$ satisfying

$$\Pr_{D \sim X(d)} [\text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_T(\pi(D), v) \mid v \in \pi(D)) = \text{Maj}_{0.99}(A_0(D, u) \mid u \in D)] \geq 1 - \eta - \frac{1}{\log^C N}.$$

Proof. We omit the formal proof and instead provide a brief sketch, as it is very similar to the proof of Lemma 4.6 (also, we do not use this statement later on in the paper). Analogously to the proof therein, one sets up a collection of paths, this time in the clique to clique graph, whose vertices are $X(d)$ and edges correspond to cliques that intersect in size αd (the zig-zag product trick is not necessary in this case). One defines the notion of “bad vertices”, which are vertices that have many corrupted edges adjacent to them, and subsequently defines the notion of bad cliques, which are cliques that contain many bad vertices. In contrast to the proof of Lemma 4.6, an upper bound of the fraction of bad cliques is not established by spectral bounds this time; instead one appeals to the Chernoff-type bound of [DH24], which gives bounds of the form $2^{-\Theta_\varepsilon(\sqrt{d})}$. This is ultimately the reason that the argument requires the dimension of the complex to be somewhat super constant. \square

5 Embedding a PCP on an HDX

The works of [PS94, DM11] used routing networks to transform the graph underlying 2-CSPs to an explicit graph. Towards this end, they used a pebble routing protocol on De-Bruijn graphs. In this section we generalize their argument and show that any tolerant routing protocol on G gives rise to a PCP embedding result on G . We then apply this connection to our specific link-to-link routing protocol. We show that in this case, this connection is in fact stronger and gives a gap amplification statement.

5.1 Connection between Routing Protocols and PCPs

The transformation we describe for modifying the underlying graph of a 2-CSP has one significant downside: it increases the alphabet size considerably. Since the routing length is always $\Omega(\log n)$ on constant degree graphs, the alphabet size always increases to be at least polynomial. In fact, since in our case the work complexity is poly-logarithmic, the alphabet size will increase further and will be $2^{\text{poly}(\log n)}$. Therefore, to facilitate alphabet reduction steps later on, we need a more refined notion related to the alphabet size of CSPs, called the *decision complexity*. Additionally, to simplify the presentation, we also generalize the notion of 2-CSPs, and allow for varying alphabets $\Sigma(u) \subseteq \Sigma$ for the vertices $u \in G$.¹⁴

Definition 5.1. *An instance $\Psi = (G = (V, E), \Sigma, \{\Sigma(u)\}_{u \in V}, \{\Psi_e\}_{e \in E})$ of a generalized 2-CSP consists of a weighted graph G , alphabets $\Sigma, \{\Sigma(u)\}$ with $\Sigma(u) \subseteq \Sigma$ for all $u \in V$, and constraints $\Psi_e \subseteq \Sigma \times \Sigma$, one for each edge. The decision complexity of Ψ is defined as the maximum, over all edges $e = (u, v)$, of the sum of the following circuit complexities: the circuit complexity of checking membership in $\Psi_{(u,v)}$ i.e. the circuit complexity of deciding if $(\sigma, \sigma') \in \Psi_{(u,v)}$, the circuit complexity of checking membership in $\Sigma(u)$, and the circuit complexity of checking membership in $\Sigma(v)$.*

Informally, the decision complexity of a CSP is the complexity of the constraints of it. In many PCP reductions, the alphabet size is a constant, and as the decision complexity is always upper bounded by $\text{poly}(|\Sigma|)$, it is often omitted from the discussion. In our case the decision complexity will be $\text{poly}(\log |\Sigma|)$, and it is closely related to the notion of work complexity in the context of the almost everywhere reliable transmission problem (as we exhibit next).

The following lemma translates routing protocols for a graph G to PCPs on the graph G , generalizing [DM11, Lemma 3.4].

Lemma 5.2 (Lemma 1.8 restated). *Suppose G is a regular graph on $2n$ vertices that has an (ε, ν) -edge-tolerant routing protocol on the alphabet Σ with work complexity W , that can be constructed in time $\text{poly}(n)$. Then there is a $\text{poly}(n)$ time reduction that, given a 2-CSP instance Ψ' on a k -regular graph H and alphabet Σ , with $|V(H)| \leq n$, produces a 2-CSP instance Ψ on G such that:*

- If $\text{val}(\Psi') = 1$ then $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$.
- If $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - 8\nu$ then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$.
- The alphabet size of Ψ is at most $|\Sigma|^{kW}$.
- The decision complexity of Ψ is $O(W) + O(k|\Sigma|)$.

Proof. We begin by reducing the 2-CSP Ψ' to a 2-CSP Φ on a bipartite $2k$ -regular graph G' on $|V(G)|$ vertices such that if Ψ' is satisfiable then so is Φ and if $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - 8\nu$ then $\text{val}(\Phi) \leq 1 - \nu$. The goal here is to obtain a regular bipartite graph (which can hence be decomposed into perfect matchings), as well as align the number of vertices of Φ to match the number of vertices in G .

Reducing to Φ : Let $n = a \cdot |V(H)| + r$ for some $a, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \leq |V(H)|$. Define a graph G'' on the vertex set $[n]$ which is formed by taking a -many disjoint copies of the k -regular graph H and an arbitrary k -regular graph (possibly with multi-edges) on the remaining r vertices. Define a 2-CSP Ψ'' on G'' which is equal to Ψ' on each of the disjoint copies of H and has the “equality” constraint on the edges of the

¹⁴This helps us to restrict the provers’ strategy to be one that satisfies additional constraints. This technique is usually referred to as folding, and it makes the soundness analysis slightly cleaner.

remaining r vertices. It is easy to see that if $\text{val}(\Psi') = 1$ then $\text{val}(\Psi'') = 1$ and if $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - 8\nu$ then $\text{val}(\Psi'') \leq 1 - 4\nu$.

We will now reduce the 2-CSP Ψ'' to a 2-CSP Φ whose constraint graph $G' = (L \cup R, E')$ is bipartite. Let L, R be equal to $V(G'')$. The left vertex set is defined as $L = V(G'') \times \{1\}$ and the right vertex set is defined as $R = V(G'') \times \{2\}$. Let E' be the set of edges $((u, 1), (v, 2))$ where (u, v) is an edge in G'' and additionally add k edges between each pair $((u, 1), (u, 2))$. For the former edges put the constraints corresponding to Ψ'' and for the latter put in equality constraints. The completeness is clear, so let us prove the soundness of the reduction. Assume that $\text{val}(\Phi) \geq 1 - \nu$ via the assignment A . Define the assignment B on G'' as $B(u) = A((u, 1))$. For at least $1 - 2\nu$ -fraction of u , $A((u, 1)) = A((u, 2))$, denoted by the set Good. Sampling a constraint $((u, 1), (v, 2))$, with probability at least $1 - 4\nu$ we have that v is in Good and the constraint is satisfied in Φ , in which case B satisfies the constraint (u, v) in Ψ'' . In particular, it follows that $\text{val}(\Psi'') \geq 1 - 4\nu$, finishing the proof of the soundness.

Routing Setup: Let $[2n]$ denote the vertex set of both G, G' ; abusing notation we will use the same letters to denote a vertex in G and in G' . Since the graph G' is a bipartite $2k$ -regular graph, we may partition the edge set of G' into $2k$ perfect matchings, which we denote by π_1, \dots, π_{2k} . We think of π_1, \dots, π_{2k} both as matchings and also as the permutations on $V(G)$. Note that since each π_i is a perfect matching we have that $\pi_i^2 = \text{id}$.

Let \mathcal{R}_i denote the protocol that routes the matching π_i on $V(G)$. We know that \mathcal{R}_i has round complexity T and every vertex $u \in X(1)$ receives at most T_u messages (over all rounds), and has work complexity W . We now describe the CSP Ψ .

The graph: The graph underlying the CSP Ψ' is G .

The alphabet: Let Σ be the alphabet of Φ . The alphabet of each vertex u is a subset of $\Sigma^{O(kT_u)}$ and we think of a label to u as describing the messages received by u throughout all the protocols \mathcal{R}_i . The messages that u sends to its neighbor v at every round is a deterministic function of the messages it has received so far. With this in mind, an assignment to the CSP can be thought of as a transcript of the messages that were routed in the protocol, and our goal in designing the constraints is to check that the message that is sent by a vertex u to its neighbor v at round t , is received correctly by v at round $t + 1$.

Formally, we think of an assignment to the CSP as a maps $A_0: V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma$, and maps $\text{IN}_{i,t}: 2E(G) \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ for each $i \in [2k]$ and round $t \in [T]$; here $2E(G)$ denoted the set of ordered tuples $[u, v]$ for each $(u, v) \in E(G)$. As part of its alphabet, every vertex u holds the value $A_0(u) \in \Sigma$ and the symbols $\text{IN}_{i,t}[u, v]$ that specify the messages that u receives from its neighbors v in the protocol \mathcal{R}_i at round t .

Viewing the rules of each protocol as maps: We now define certain maps that are useful for specifying the constraints of Ψ . First, the rules of each protocol \mathcal{R}_i can be described using the following maps $\text{OUT}_{i,t}: 2E(G) \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^* \cup \{\perp\}$, for $i \in [2k], t \in [T - 1]$; the symbol $\text{OUT}_{i,t}[u, v, \sigma]$ is the message that u sends to v in round t in the protocol \mathcal{R}_i if the messages u received in previous rounds are given by σ , for a valid σ of the correct length, and otherwise $\text{OUT}_{i,t}[u, v, \sigma] = \perp$. Given the transcript $\text{IN}_{i,t'}[u, \cdot]$ for all $t' \leq t$ (which is part of the assignment to u), the message that u sends to v is $\text{OUT}_{i,t}[u, v, A_0[\cdot, u] \circ \text{IN}_{i,1}[u, \cdot] \circ \dots \circ \text{IN}_{i,t}[u, \cdot]]$ which we will denote by $\text{OUT}_{i,t}[u, v]$ for brevity. We stress that this value only depends on the assignment given to u .

Finally define the output of the protocol \mathcal{R}_i as the map $A_{i,T}$. Formally, for all $i \in [2k]$, consider the map $A_{i,T}: V(G) \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma$ where the symbol $A_{i,T}[u, \sigma]$ specifies the output of the routing algorithm at a vertex u in \mathcal{R}_i when given as input the transcript σ , which in our case equals $A_0[\cdot, u] \circ \text{IN}_{i,1}[u, \cdot] \circ \dots \circ \text{IN}_{i,T-1}[u, \cdot]$. Again for brevity, we omit the dependence on σ as it is clear from context, and use $A_{i,T}(u)$ to denote the corresponding output symbol.

We emphasize that the maps $A_{i,T}$ and $\text{OUT}_{i,t}$ are not part of the alphabet, but since they are a deterministic function of the messages received at a vertex, we use them while defining the constraints.

Intuition towards defining constraints: In an ideal proof we want A_0 to be a satisfying assignment to Φ , and the maps $\text{IN}_{i,t}$, $\text{OUT}_{i,t}$ to be the transcript when the protocol \mathcal{R}_i is executed on G .

It is therefore convenient to view the maps A_0 , $A_{i,T}$ and $\text{IN}_{i,t}$, $\text{OUT}_{i,t}$ from the point of view of what happens in the routing protocol. We want to ensure that the message transmission across every edge behaves as it is supposed to – for the edge (u, v) the outgoing message that v sends to u at any round should equal the message that u receives at the next round and vice versa. Note that this check only depends on the alphabet of u and v . Secondly, suppose that the routing protocol was successful and that A_0 was indeed a satisfying assignment to Φ . Then for every u , the protocol \mathcal{R}_i successfully transmitted the symbol $A_0(\pi_i(u))$ from the vertex $\pi_i(u)$ to the vertex $\pi_i(\pi_i(u)) = u$, that is, $A_{i,T}(u)$ equals $A_0(\pi_i(u))$. In particular, we would have that $(A_0(u), A_{i,T}(u))$ would satisfy the constraint $(u, \pi_i(u))$ in Φ . Since this only depends on u , we enforce this as a hard constraint on the alphabet of u via folding.

Folding: We constrain the label set of u to only be tuples where $(A_0(u), A_{i,T}(u))$ satisfies the constraint $\Phi(u, \pi_i(u))$ in Φ , for all $i \in [2k]$. By that, we mean that only labels that satisfy this condition are allowed in an assignment to Ψ .

The constraints of Ψ : For an edge $(v, u) \sim E(G)$, read the labels of u, v and for each $i \in [2k]$ and $t \in [T - 1]$ check that $\text{IN}_{i,t+1}(u, v) = \text{OUT}_{i,t}(v, u)$ and $\text{IN}_{i,t+1}(v, u) = \text{OUT}_{i,t}(u, v)$.

In words, the constraint on v, u checks that the message that u receives from v at round $t + 1$ is the message that v sent to it at the prior round and vice versa. The decision complexity of the constraints is the sum of the circuit complexity of (1) computing $\text{OUT}_{i,t}(v, u)$, $\text{OUT}_{i,t}(u, v)$ and $A_{i,T}(u)$, $A_{i,T}(v)$ over i and t , (2) checking $(A_0(u), A_{i,T}(u)) \in \Phi(u, \pi_i(u))$ and $(A_0(v), A_{i,T}(v)) \in \Phi(v, \pi_i(v))$ over all i , and (3) checking if $\text{IN}_{i,t+1}(u, v) = \text{OUT}_{i,t}(v, u)$ and vice versa for all i, t . This in total amounts to $O(W) + O(k|\Sigma|)$.

This completes the description of Ψ , and we now analyze the completeness and the soundness of the reduction.

Completeness: Suppose that $\text{val}(\Phi) = 1$ and that $A : V(G') \rightarrow \Sigma$ is satisfying assignment for Φ . We take $A_0(u) = A(u)$ for all $u \in V(G)$ and define the maps $\text{IN}_{i,t}$, $\text{OUT}_{i,t}$ and $A_{i,T}$ according to the execution of the routing protocols \mathcal{R}_i for each $i \in [2k]$ when instantiated with A_0 . To argue that this is a valid assignment we must check that it satisfies the folding constraints; to check that its value is 1, we must verify that it satisfies all the constraints of Ψ . The latter condition is clear since the assignments $\text{IN}_{i,t}$ satisfy all of the routing constraints of Ψ by definition. To check the folding constraint, fix a vertex u and $i \in [2k]$. Since $A_{i,T}$ is the output of \mathcal{R}_i when executed on a graph with no corrupted edges we get that $A_{i,T}(u) = A_0(\pi_i(u)) = A(\pi_i(u))$ for all u . Since A is a satisfying assignment, $(A_0(u), A_{i,T}(u))$ satisfies the constraint $\Phi(u, \pi_i(u))$ as required.

Soundness: Suppose that $\text{val}(\Psi) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. Let $(A_0, \{\text{IN}_{i,t}\}_{i \in [2k], t \in [T]})$ be the assignment achieving this value. Let $\{\text{OUT}_{i,t}\}, A_{i,T}$ be the deduced maps with $A_0, \text{IN}_{i,t}$ as input.

We will show that this implies that $\text{val}(\Phi) \geq 1 - \nu$ by exhibiting that the assignment B defined as $B(u) = A_0(u)$ has high value for Φ . Let $\mathcal{E} \subseteq E(G)$ be the set of edges violated by $(A_0, \{A_{i,t}\}_{i \in [2k], t \in [T]})$; we know that $\mu(\mathcal{E}) \leq \varepsilon$.

Fix any $i \in [2k]$. We know that for all edges $(u, v) \notin \mathcal{E}$, any message that u sends to v is received correctly by v , in which case the tables $\text{IN}_{i,t}$ describe a correct simulation of the routing protocol initiated

with the assignment A_0 and the set of corrupted edges \mathcal{E} . For every $i \in [2k]$, the tolerance guarantee of the routing protocol \mathcal{R}_i gives that

$$\Pr_{u \sim [2n]} [A_0(u) \neq A_{i,T}(\pi_i(u))] \leq \nu.$$

By folding, for all i and $u \in [2n]$, $(A_0(u), A_{i,T}(u)) \in \Phi(u, \pi_i(u))$. Therefore letting $\text{viol}(B)$ denote the fraction of edges violated by B , we get that,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{viol}(B) &= \Pr_{i \sim [2k], u \in [2n]} [(B(u), B(\pi_i(u))) \notin \Phi(u, \pi_i(u))] \\ &\leq \Pr_{i,u} [(A_0(u), A_{i,T}(u)) \notin \Phi(u, \pi_i(u))] + \Pr_{i,u} [A_{i,T}(u) \neq A_0(\pi_i(u))] \\ &\leq \nu, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Pr_{i,u} [(A_0(u), A_{i,T}(u)) \notin \Phi(u, \pi_i(u))] = 0$ by folding. The conclusion now follows by the fact that $\text{val}(\Phi) \geq 1 - \nu$ implies that $\text{val}(\Psi') \geq 1 - 8\nu$. \square

5.2 Embedding PCPs on an HDX, with amplification

In this section we show how to use the link-to-link routing protocol from Section 4 to convert a 2-CSP Ψ to a 2-CSP Ψ' on a graph underlying an HDX. The idea is similar to the idea in the proof of Lemma 5.2, but since our graph $G = (X(1), X(2))$ may not be regular we cannot directly apply the lemma. As remarked earlier, by associating a vertex of the CSP to a link of X though, we can handle these regularity issues, as well as get an amplification result. More precisely, we have:

Lemma 5.3. *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $C > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ there are constants $C', d_0, n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds for all $n \geq n_0$ and $d \geq d_0$. Let X be the d -dimensional complex from Theorem 2.13 with parameters $q = \log^{C'} n$ and δ , and $2n \leq |X(1)| \leq O_\delta(1)n$ (which can be constructed in time $\text{poly}(n)$). Then there is a $\text{poly}(n)$ time procedure mapping any 2-CSP Ψ' with n vertices on a k -regular graph H and alphabet Σ , to a 2-CSP Ψ on the graph $G = (X(1), X(2))$ with alphabet size at most $|\Sigma|^{kq^{O(d^2)}}$, satisfying the following properties:*

1. *Completeness: If $\text{val}(\Psi') = 1$ then $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$.*
2. *Soundness: If $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\log^{C'} n}$, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$.*
3. *The decision complexity of Ψ is at most $kq^{O(d^2)}|\Sigma|$.*

Proof. We first use Theorem 2.13 to construct a complex X in $\text{poly}(n)$ -time which is a d -dimensional complex with $2n \leq |X(1)| \leq O_\delta(1)n$ and $q = \Theta(\log^{C'} n)$ for C' chosen to be large enough. As before, for $S \in X(i)$ let Δ_S be the number of d -faces containing S , i.e. $\Delta_S = |X_S(d-i)|$. Let $G = (X(1), X(2))$ and let $Z = G \circledast \mathcal{H}$ be the zig-zag product of G (thought of as an undirected graph with multi-edges) with the family of expanders \mathcal{H} from Lemma 4.3, as described in Section 4.3. The number of vertices of Z is equal to the number of multi-edges in G , which is $\sum_{u \in X(1)} \Delta_{uv} = \binom{d}{2} |X(d)|$ and is denoted by N throughout.

We start by reducing to a 2-CSP Φ on a bipartite $2k$ -regular graph G' on $|V(Z)|$ vertices (which is at least $2n$) such that if Ψ' is satisfiable then so is Φ and if $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - 8\nu$ then $\text{val}(\Phi) \leq 1 - \nu$. This reduction is the same as that in Lemma 1.8, and we omit the details.

Since the graph G' is a bipartite $2k$ -regular graph, we may partition the edge set of G' into $2k$ perfect matchings, which we denote by π_1, \dots, π_{2k} . Abusing notation, we think of π_1, \dots, π_{2k} also as the permutations on $V(Z)$ corresponding to the matchings. Note that since each π_i is a perfect matching, we have that $\pi_i^2 = \text{id}$.

Let \mathcal{R}_i denote the protocol from Lemma 4.6 that routes the matching π_i on $V(Z)$ with the parameter $2C$ in place of C . We know that \mathcal{R}_i has round complexity $T = O(\log n)$ and work complexity $q^{O(d^2)} \log |\Sigma|$. We now describe the CSP Ψ .

The graph: the graph underlying the CSP Ψ is $G = (X(1), X(2))$.

The alphabet: For every $u \in X(1)$ let T_u denote the number of messages that u receives over all rounds. The alphabet of each vertex u is a subset of $\Sigma^{O(kT_u)}$.

First recall that a vertex $j \in V(Z)$ is a tuple (j_1, j_2) with $j_1 \in X(1)$ and j_2 in the cloud of j_1 . We think of an assignment to the CSP as a collection of maps, $A_0: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Sigma$, for $\mathcal{S} = \{(j, u) : j \in V(Z), u \in X_{j_1}(1)\}$ and $\text{IN}_{i,t}: 2E(G) \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ for each $i \in [2k]$ and round $t \in [T]$.

As a part of its alphabet, every vertex $u \in X(1)$ holds the symbols $\{A_0(j, u) \mid j \in V(Z), u \in X_{j_1}(1)\}$. Additionally it holds the symbols $\text{IN}_{i,t}[u, v]$, which denotes the message that u receives from its neighbors v in the protocol \mathcal{R}_i at round t .

Viewing the rules of each protocol as maps: We define the maps $\text{OUT}_{i,t}: 2E(G) \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^* \cup \{\perp\}$, for $i \in [2k], t \in [T-1]$ in the following way. The symbol $\text{OUT}_{i,t}[u, v, \sigma]$ is the message that u sends to v in round t and protocol \mathcal{R}_i if the messages received by it in previous rounds are given by σ , for a valid σ of the correct length; otherwise $\text{OUT}_{i,t}[u, v, \sigma] = \perp$. We let $\text{OUT}_{i,t}[u, v]$ denote the message that u sends to v at round t , on the transcript $\text{IN}_{i,\cdot}[u, \cdot]$.

Similarly define the output of the protocol \mathcal{R}_i as the map $A_{i,T}$ like in Lemma 4.6. Formally, for all $i \in [2k]$, consider the map $A_{i,T}: \mathcal{S} \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma$ where the symbol $A_{i,T}[(j, u), \sigma]$ specifies the output of the routing algorithm at a vertex u in \mathcal{R}_i with respect to $j \in V(Z)$ (for some $u \in X_{j_1}(1)$) when given as input the transcript σ . On the transcript $\text{IN}_{i,\cdot}[u, \cdot]$ we use $A_{i,T}(j, u)$ to denote the corresponding output symbol.

Intuition towards defining constraints: In an ideal proof we want $A_0(j, u)$ to be the same on all $u \in X_{j_1}(1)$ and $A_0(j, \cdot)$ to be a satisfying assignment for Φ . The maps $\text{IN}_{i,t}, \text{OUT}_{i,t}$ should be the transcript when the protocol \mathcal{R}_i is executed on G .

We want to ensure that the message transmission across every edge behaves as it is supposed to – for the edge (u, v) the outgoing message that v sends to u at any round should equal the message that u receives at the next round and vice versa.

Secondly, suppose that $A_0(j, \cdot)$ was a satisfying assignment to Φ and that no edge in the protocol is corrupted. Then, for every j for which $u \in X_{j_1}(1)$, the protocol \mathcal{R}_i successfully transmitted the symbol $A_0(\pi_i(j), \cdot)$ from the link $X_{\pi_i(j)_1}$ to the link X_{j_1} , that is, $A_{i,T}(j, \cdot)$ equals $A_0(\pi_i(j), \cdot)$. In particular, we would have that $(A_0(j, u), A_{i,T}(j, u))$ satisfies the constraint $(j, \pi_i(j))$ in Φ . Since this only depends on u , we enforce this as a hard constraint on the alphabet of u .

Folding: We constrain the label set of u to only be tuples where $(A_0(j, u), A_{i,T}(j, u))$ satisfies the constraint $\Phi(j, \pi_i(j))$ in Φ , for all $i \in [2k]$ and $j \in V(Z)$ where $u \in X_{j_1}(1)$. By that, we mean that only labels that satisfy this condition are allowed in an assignment to Φ .

The constraints of Ψ : For an edge $(v, u) \sim X(2)$, read the labels of u, v and check that,

1. For each $j \in V(Z)$ for which u, v are both in $X_{j_1}(1)$: $A_0(j, u) = A_0(j, v)$, and for all $i \in [2k]$ it holds that $A_{i,T}(j, u) = A_{i,T}(j, v)$.

2. For each $i \in [2k]$ and $t \in [T - 1]$: $\text{IN}_{i,t+1}(u, v) = \text{OUT}_{i,t}(v, u)$ and $\text{IN}_{i,t+1}(v, u) = \text{OUT}_{i,t}(u, v)$.

In words, the constraint on v, u check that they hold the same value when they are inside the same link at the beginning and end of the protocols, and that the message that u receives from v at round $t + 1$ is the message that v sent to it at the prior round and vice versa.

One can check that the decision complexity of the constraints is the sum of the circuit complexity of 1) computing $\text{OUT}_{i,t}(v, u)$ and $\text{OUT}_{i,t}(u, v)$ over i and t , 2) checking the routing constraints hold, 3) $(A_0(j, u), A_{i,T}(j, u)) \in \Phi(j, \pi_i(j))$ and $(A_0(j, v), A_{i,T}(j, v)) \in \Phi(j, \pi_i(j))$ over all i, j . Since the work complexity of \mathcal{R}_i is $q^{O(d^2)} \log |\Sigma|$ and the complexity of computing (2) is at most $kq^{O(d^2)} |\Sigma|$ the decision complexity amounts to $kq^{O(d^2)} |\Sigma|$. This completes the description of Ψ , and we now analyze the completeness and the soundness of the reduction.

Completeness: Suppose that $\text{val}(\Phi) = 1$, and let $A : V(G') \rightarrow \Sigma$ be a satisfying assignment. We take $A_0(j, u) = A(j)$ for all $u \in X_{j_1}(1)$ and define the maps $\text{IN}_{i,t}$, $\text{OUT}_{i,t}$ and $A_{i,T}$ according to the execution of the routing protocols \mathcal{R}_i for each $i \in [2k]$ when instantiated with A_0 . To argue that this is a valid assignment we must check that it satisfies the folding constraints; to check that its value is 1, we must verify that it satisfies all the constraints of Ψ . The latter condition is clear since the assignment A_0 is equal on all the vertices in the link X_{j_1} for all j , and the assignments $\text{IN}_{i,t}$ satisfy all of the routing constraints of Ψ by definition. To check the folding constraints, fix a vertex u , take $j \in V(Z)$ with $u \in X_{j_1}(1)$, and take $i \in [2k]$. Since $A_{i,T}$ is the output of \mathcal{R}_i when executed on a graph with no corrupted edges we get that $A_{i,T}(j, u) = A_0(\pi_i(j), u') = A(\pi_i(j))$ for all $u' \in X_{\pi_i(j)_1}$. Since A is a satisfying assignment, $(A_0(j, u), A_{i,T}(j, u))$ satisfies the constraint $\Phi(j, \pi_i(j))$ as required.

Soundness: Suppose that $\text{val}(\Psi) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$, where ε is less than ε_0 , the absolute constant in Lemma 4.6. Let $(A_0, \{\text{IN}_{i,t}\}_{i \in [2k], t \in [T]})$ be the assignment achieving this value. Let $\{\text{OUT}_{i,t}, A_{i,T}\}$ be the deduced maps with $A_0, \text{IN}_{i,t}$ as input. We will show that this implies that $\text{val}(\Phi) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{8 \log^C n}$ by exhibiting a high-valued assignment B for it. In fact, our assignment for G' will be $B(j) = \text{Maj}_{u \in X_{j_1}(1)}(A_0(j, u))$ if a clear majority of at least 99% inside X_{j_1} exists, and \perp otherwise.

Let us upper bound $\text{viol}(B)$, where we count every edge on the vertices assigned \perp as violated. Let $\mathcal{E} \subseteq X(2)$ be the set of edges violated by $A_0, \{A_{i,t}\}_{i \in [2k], t \in [T]}$; we know that $\mu(\mathcal{E}) \leq \varepsilon$.

We first upper bound the probability that $B(j) = \perp$. Suppose that $j \in V(Z)$ is such that, $\mu_{j_1}(\mathcal{E}) \leq 0.05$. Then there exists $\sigma_j \in \Sigma$ such that $A_0(j, v) = \sigma_j$ for at least 0.99-fraction of $v \sim X_{j_1}$ (since the spectral gap of the graph $(X_u(1), X_u(2))$ is at least $1/2$). This in turn implies that $B(j) \neq \perp$. Therefore,

$$\Pr_{j \sim V(Z)} [B(j) = \perp] \leq \Pr_{j \sim V(Z)} [\mu_{j_1}(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0.05] = \Pr_{u \sim X(1)} [\mu_u(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0.05] \leq \frac{1}{\log^{2C} n},$$

where we used Fact 4.5 in the second transition and Claim 4.7 in the last transition.

For convenience of analysis, we also define $B(i, \pi_i(j), T)$ as $\text{Maj}_{u \in X_{j_1}(1)}(A_{i,T}(\pi_i(j), u))$ if at least 99% of the vertices in $X_{j_1}(1)$ have the same value in $A_{i,T}$, and \perp otherwise. As is the case above, for $B(i, j, T)$ to be \perp it holds that at least 0.05-fraction of the edges in $X_{\pi_i(j)_1}$ are in \mathcal{E} too, so for all $i \in [2k]$,

$$\Pr_{j \sim V(Z)} [B(i, j, T) = \perp] \leq \frac{1}{\log^{2C} n}.$$

Fix any $i \in [2k]$. We know that for all edges $(u, v) \notin \mathcal{E}$, any message that u sends to v is received correctly by v , in which case the tables $\text{IN}_{i,t}$ describe a correct simulation of the routing protocol in Lemma 4.6

initiated with the assignment A_0 . Provided that ε is small enough, Lemma 4.6 tells us that

$$\Pr_{j \sim V(Z)} [B(j) \neq B(i, \pi_i(j), T)] \leq \Pr_{j \sim V(Z)} [B(j) = \perp] + \frac{1}{\log^{2C} N} \leq \frac{2}{\log^{2C} n}.$$

By folding, for all i, j and $u \in X_{j_1}(1)$, $(A_0(j, u), A_{i,T}(j, u)) \in \Phi(j, \pi_i(j))$, therefore we get that

$$\Pr_{i,j} [(B(j), B(i, j, T)) \notin \Phi(j, \pi_i(j))] \leq \Pr_{i,j} [B(j) \neq \perp] + \Pr_{i,j} [B(i, j, T) \neq \perp] \leq \frac{2}{\log^{2C} n}.$$

Using the union bound we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{viol}(B) &= \Pr_{i \sim [2k], j \in [N]} [(B(j), B(\pi_i(j))) \notin \Phi(j, \pi_i(j))] \\ &\leq \Pr_{i,j} [(B(j), B(i, j, T)) \notin \Phi(j, \pi_i(j))] + \Pr_{i,j} [B(i, j, T) \neq B(\pi_i(j))] \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\log^{2C} n}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\text{val}(\Phi) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{8 \log^C n}$. This implies that $\text{val}(\Psi') \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\log^C n}$ as required. \square

6 Amplification of 2-CSPs on Complexes with Direct Product Testers

In this section, we show how to amplify the soundness of a 2-CSP on $G = (X(1), X(2))$ where X is an HDX that supports a direct product test. If X is a sparse complex, then this result is a derandomized parallel repetition procedure for 2-CSPs on G . In the time of writing this paper we only know of one family of sparse complexes with this property: the Chapman-Lubotzky complexes from Theorem 2.13. Thus, in Section 8 we instantiate this idea with these complexes.

6.1 Gap Amplification to Low Soundness

Fix any complex X for which the (k, \sqrt{k}) -direct-product tester on X has soundness δ , and consider any 2-CSP Ψ on $G = (X(1), X(2))$. Our reduction will produce a Label Cover instance Φ on the bipartite inclusion graph $G' = (X(k), X(\sqrt{k}))$ with left alphabet Σ^k and right alphabet $\Sigma^{\sqrt{k}}$. The constraint on (U, V) check whether the label on $U \in X(k)$ satisfies all the constraints in G (since for all $u, v \in U$, $(u, v) \in X(2)$) and further if projected to B it equals the label given to B .

As we did in Definition 5.1, to simplify the presentation of the proof, we define a generalized version of the Label Cover problem from Definition 1.1. In particular we allow for varying alphabets $\Sigma_L(U) \subseteq \Sigma_L$ to the left-side of vertices $U \in L$. This helps us to restrict the prover to provide a label to U that satisfies additional constraints (which in our case would be that the label in Σ^k given to U satisfies all the constraints inside U) which makes our soundness analysis cleaner to carry out.

Definition 6.1. An instance $\Phi = (G = (L \cup R, E, w), \Sigma_L, \Sigma_R, \{\Sigma_L(U)\}_{U \in L}, \{\Phi_e\}_{e \in E})$ of generalized label cover consists of a weighted bipartite graph G , alphabets $\Sigma_L, \Sigma_R, \{\Sigma_L(U)\}$ with $\Sigma_L(U) \subseteq \Sigma_L$ for all $U \in L$, and constraints $\Phi_e \subseteq \Sigma_L \times \Sigma_R$, one for each edge. Each one of the constraints is a projection constraint, meaning that for every $e = (U, V) \in E$ there is a map $\phi_e: \Sigma_L(U) \rightarrow \Sigma_R$ such that

$$\Phi_e = \{(\sigma, \phi_e(\sigma)) \mid \sigma \in \Sigma_L(U)\}.$$

We remark that a hardness result for generalized label cover can be easily converted to a hardness result for the standard definition. When the alphabet size is super-constant though, one needs to be careful so as to preserve the decision complexity of the constraints while performing this translation. Therefore, since our alphabet size is large, in all the intermediate step in our reductions from now on we use the generalized Label Cover problem. After performing alphabet reduction to get a generalized Label Cover instance with constant-sized alphabet in Section 8, we use this simple translation to go back to the standard label cover problem.

The main result of this section is the following statement:

Lemma 6.2. *For all $\delta > 0$ there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Suppose that X is a complex for which the (k, \sqrt{k}) -direct product tester has soundness δ^2 . Then there is a polynomial time procedure such that given a generalized 2-CSP instance Ψ over the weighted graph $G = (X(1), X(2))$ with alphabets $\Sigma, \{\Sigma(u)\}_{u \in G}$ and decision complexity D , produces an instance of generalized Label Cover Φ over the weighted inclusion graph $(X(\sqrt{k}), X(k))$ over left alphabet Σ^k and right alphabet $\Sigma^{\sqrt{k}}$ such that:*

1. *The projection map $\phi_{(A,B)}$ associated to the edge (A, B) is defined as the restriction of the assignment to A to the coordinates in B . That is, $\forall \sigma \in \Sigma_L(A), \phi_{(A,B)}(\sigma) = \sigma|_B$.*
2. *For all $A \in X(k)$, the circuit complexity of checking membership in $\Sigma_L(A)$ is $O(k^2 D)$.*
3. *If $\text{val}(\Phi) = 1$, then $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$.*
4. *If $\text{val}(\Phi) \leq 1 - 4\delta$, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq \delta$.*

Proof. Our label cover instance Φ has vertices $L = X(k)$, $R = X(\sqrt{k})$ and edges between them given by inclusion. Letting Σ be the alphabet of Ψ , we take $\Sigma_L = \Sigma^k$ to be the alphabet of the left side of Φ and $\Sigma^{\sqrt{k}}$ to be the alphabet of the right side of Φ . For every vertex $A = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in U$ let $\Sigma_L(A)$ be the set of assignments $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k) \in \Sigma^k$ where for every i , $\sigma_i \in \Sigma(a_i)$ and for every $i \neq j$, (σ_i, σ_j) satisfies the constraint $\Psi_{(a_i, a_j)}$ on the edge $(a_i, a_j) \in G$. The decision complexity of membership in $\Sigma_L(A)$ is easily seen to be $O(k^2 D)$. The constraints Φ_e are as defined as in the lemma statement.

The completeness of the reduction is clear, and we move on to the soundness analysis. Suppose that $\text{val}(\Phi) \geq \delta$, and fix assignments $F : X(k) \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ and $G : X(\sqrt{k}) \rightarrow \Sigma^{\sqrt{k}}$ realizing $\text{val}(\Phi)$, where $F(A) \in \Sigma_L(A)$ for all $A \in X(k)$. Thus,

$$\text{val}(\Phi) = \Pr_{\substack{B \sim X(\sqrt{k}) \\ A \supset_k B}} [F[A]|_B = G[B]] \geq \delta.$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\substack{D \sim X(d) \\ B \sim X(\sqrt{k}) \\ B \subset A, A' \subset D}} [F[A]|_B = F[A']|_B] &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{D \sim X(d) \\ B \sim X(\sqrt{k})}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{B \subset A, A' \subset D} [\mathbb{1}(F[A]|_B = G[B]) \mathbb{1}(F[A']|_B = G[B])] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{D \sim X(d) \\ B \sim X(\sqrt{k})}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{B \subset A \subset D} [\mathbb{1}(F[A]|_B = G[B])^2] \right] \\ &\geq \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{D \sim X(d) \\ B \sim X(\sqrt{k})}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{B \subset A \subset D} [\mathbb{1}(F[A]|_B = G[B])] \right] \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\mathbb{E}_{\substack{D \sim X(d) \\ A \subset_k D \\ B \subset_{\sqrt{k}} A}} [\mathbb{1}(F[A]|_B = G[B])] \right)^2 \\
&\geq \delta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that F passes the direct product test and therefore using the soundness of the test we get a function $f : X(1) \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that,

$$\Pr_{A \sim X(k)} [\Delta(F[A], f|_A) \leq \delta] \geq \text{poly}(\delta).$$

Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq X(2)$ be the set of constraints that f violates. By construction $F[A]$ satisfies all the constraints inside A , therefore wherever it holds that $\Delta(F[A], f|_A) \leq \delta k$ we get that f satisfies at least $(1-\delta)^2 \geq 1-2\delta$ fraction of the constraints inside A . In particular, we conclude that

$$\Pr_{A \sim X(k)} [\mu(\mathcal{B}|_A) \leq 2\delta] \geq \text{poly}(\delta). \quad (4)$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\mu(\mathcal{B}) > 4\delta$. Applying Lemma 2.2 we get,

$$\Pr_{A \sim X(k)} [\mu(\mathcal{B}|_K) \leq 2\delta] \lesssim \frac{1}{k\delta},$$

since the bipartite graph $(X(2), X(k))$ has second largest eigenvalue at most $O(1/\sqrt{k})$ by Lemma 2.8. Since k is chosen to be large enough as a function of δ , in particular at least $\frac{1}{\text{poly}(\delta)}$, this is a contradiction to (4). Thus we get that $\mu(\mathcal{B}) \leq 4\delta$, which in turn means that $\text{val}(\Psi) \geq 1 - 4\delta$. \square

7 Alphabet Reduction via Decodable PCPs

In this section we discuss the construction of PCPs for Circuit-SAT with small alphabet but large size (polynomial, or even exponential). The tools presented in the paper so far lead to size efficient PCPs with large alphabets, and our goal here is to facilitate the use the efficient composition theorems of [MR08, DH13] to reduce the alphabet size.

To apply the abstract composition theorem of [DH13] we require PCP constructions in which one has a “decodable verifier”. By that, we mean that the PCP verifier not only probabilistically checks whether a proof of satisfiability is correct or not, but it is also able to decode a symbol of the satisfying assignment with high probability. We present the formal definition in Section 7.2. These constructions will be used as inner PCPs in our composition.

We remark that so far in the paper we discussed 2-query PCPs using the framework as label cover, and in [DH13] the proof composition is presented in the language of “robust PCPs”. The language of robust PCPs can be seen to be an equivalent formulation of label cover, but it is easier to use in the context of composition. Thus, for convenience we carry out most of the argument in the language of robust PCPs, formally defined in Section 7.1. The material presented in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 is almost verbatim repeat of [DH13], but we give it here for the sake of completeness.

7.1 Robust PCPs

We now discuss the notion of robust PCPs, which will be the outer PCPs in our composition. First defined in [BGH⁺06, DR06], robust PCPs have been implicit in all PCP constructions. The only difference between robust PCPs and standard PCPs is in the soundness condition: while the standard soundness condition measures how often the PCP verifier accepts a false proof, the robust soundness condition measures the average distance between the local view of the verifier and an accepting local view. The definition given below is from [DH13]:

Definition 7.1 (Robust PCPs). *For functions $r, q, m, a, s : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\delta : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$, a verifier V is a robust probabilistically checkable proof (robust PCP) system for a language L with randomness complexity r , query complexity q , proof length m , alphabet size a , decision complexity s and robust soundness error δ if V is a probabilistic polynomial-time algorithm that behaves as follows: On input x of length n and oracle access to a proof string $\pi \in \Sigma^{m(n)}$ over the (proof) alphabet Σ where $|\Sigma| = a(n)$, V reads the input x , tosses at most $r(n)$ random coins, and generates a sequence of locations $I = (i_1, \dots, i_q) \in [m]^{q(n)}$ and a predicate $f : \Sigma^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ of decision complexity $s(n)$, which satisfies the following properties: **Completeness:** If $x \in L$ then there exists π such that*

$$\Pr_{(I, f)} [f(\pi_I) = 1] = 1.$$

Robust Soundness: If $x \notin L$ then for every π

$$\mathbb{E}_{(I, f)} [\text{agr}(\pi_I, f^{-1}(1))] \leq \delta,$$

where the distribution over (I, f) is determined by x and the random coins of V .

Next we define the notion of proof degree and regularity for a robust PCP.

Definition 7.2. *Given a robust PCP system, we will refer to the maximum number of local windows any index in the proof participates in, as the proof degree, denoted by $d(n)$. More precisely, for each $i \in [m(n)]$, if we let*

$$R_i = \{r \in \{0, 1\}^{r(n)} \mid i \in I(r)\},$$

then $d(n) = \max_i |R_i|$. Furthermore, if $|R_i| = d(n)$ for all i , we will say the PCP system is regular.

Equivalence of Label Cover and Robust PCPs: the notion of robust PCP is in fact equivalent to generalized label cover (Definition 6.1) as shown in [DH13, Lemma 2.5], and we now give some intuition for this equivalence. If a language L has a robust PCP, then here is a reduction from L to generalized Label Cover: the set of left vertices is the set of random strings of the robust PCP, the set of right vertices is the set of the proof locations. An edge (r, i) exists if the proof location i is probed on random string r . The label to a left vertex r is an accepting local view of the verifier on random string r while a label to the right vertex i is the proof symbol in the corresponding proof location i . An edge (r, i) is consistent if the local view is consistent with the proof symbol. Conversely, given a reduction from L to generalized label cover, we can get a robust PCP verifier for L as follows: the verifier expects as proof a labeling of the set of right vertices, the verifier chooses a random left vertex, queries all its neighbors and accepts if there exists a label to the left vertex that satisfies all the corresponding edges. We summarize this discussion with the following lemma (see [DH13] for a formal proof):

Lemma 7.3. For every $\delta : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, and $r, q, m, a : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$, the following two statements are equivalent:

1. *Gap-Generalized-Label-Cover* $[1, \delta]$ is **NP**-hard for instances with the following parameters:
 - left degree at most $q(n)$,
 - right degree at most $d(n)$
 - right alphabet $\Sigma(n)$ with $|\Sigma| = a(n)$,
 - left alphabet $\{\Sigma_L(U)\}_{U \in L}$,
 - size of right vertex set at most $m(n)$, and
 - size of left vertex set at most $2^{r(n)}$.
2. Every $L \in \mathbf{NP}$ has a robust PCP with completeness 1, robust soundness error δ and the following parameters:
 - query complexity $q(n)$,
 - proof degree at most $d(n)$
 - proof alphabet $\Sigma(n)$ with $|\Sigma| = a(n)$,
 - maximum number of accepting local views $\max_{U \in L} (|\Sigma_L(U)|)$,
 - proof length $m(n)$, and
 - randomness complexity $r(n)$

Furthermore, suppose that $\Sigma_L = \Sigma^k$ and $\Sigma_R = \Sigma^t$ for some alphabet Σ and $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$, all the constraints $\phi_{(u,v)}$ of the Label Cover instance check if the label of u restricted to v is equal to the label of v , and the circuit complexity of checking membership in the language $\Sigma_L(U)$ is at most D , then the decision complexity of the robust PCP is $O(D + q(n))$.

It is important to note that this is a syntactic correspondence between the notions of generalized Label-Cover and robust PCPs and there is no loss of parameters in going from one framework to another. In particular, going from label cover to a robust PCP and back, one gets back the original label cover instance. Even though these two notions are syntactically equivalent, some results are easier to state/prove in one framework than the other. In Section 6 we proved a hardness of generalized label cover with large alphabet, but applying alphabet reduction will be easier to carry out in the robust PCP framework.

7.2 Decodable PCP

We now describe the notion of a decodable PCP (dPCP) from [DH13], which will serve as our inner PCP in the composition. It is sufficient to define dPCPs for the problem CircuitSAT_Σ for our purposes, and as such we focus the discussion on it. The problem CircuitSAT_Σ is concerned with circuits C whose input is a string from Σ^n . It will often be more convenient for us to think of circuits over large alphabet as the equivalent Boolean circuit $\tilde{C} : \{0, 1\}^{n \log |\Sigma|} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ in which each input wire of C is split into $\log |\Sigma|$ wires in \tilde{C} in the obvious way. With this in mind, we define the circuit size of C to be the size of \tilde{C} , and define the $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(N, S)$ problem in the following way:

Definition 7.4 (Circuit-SAT). An instance of $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(N, S)$ is a circuit $C : \Sigma^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ of size at most S . The goal is to decide whether there exists an input $x \in \Sigma^N$ such that $C(x) = 1$.

Given an instance C of CircuitSAT, a probabilistically checkable proof for $C \in \text{CircuitSAT}$ often takes a string y such that $C(y) = 1$ and encodes it using a probabilistically checkable proof. We refer to such a y as an NP-witness of the fact that $C \in \text{CircuitSAT}$.

A standard PCP verifier for the language CircuitSAT would verify that the input circuit is satisfiable, with the help of a PCP, which is typically (but not necessarily) an encoding of the NP-witness y . A PCP decoder for CircuitSAT is a stronger notion. Just like a PCP verifier, it expects the PCP to be an encoding of the NP witness. However, in addition to that, after performing its local check, a PCP decoder is expected to decode back a location in the NP witness.

Definition 7.5 (PCP Decoders). A PCP decoder for CircuitSAT_Σ over a proof alphabet σ is a probabilistic polynomial-time algorithm D that on input a circuit $C : \Sigma^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ of size n and an index $j \in [k]$, tosses $r = r(n)$ random coins and generates (1) a sequence of $q = q(n)$ locations $I = (i_1, \dots, i_q)$ in a proof of length $m(n)$ over the alphabet σ and (2) a (local decoding) function $f : \sigma^q \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ whose corresponding circuit has size at most $s(n)$, referred to henceforth as the decision complexity of the decoder.

With this in mind we can now define decodable PCPs, where a verifier either rejects a proof, or decodes a symbol that belongs to a small list of satisfying assignments for the CircuitSAT instance.

Definition 7.6. [Decodable PCPs] For functions $\delta : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $L : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$, we say that a PCP decoder D is a decodable probabilistically checkable proof (dPCP) system for CircuitSAT_Σ with soundness error δ and list size L if the following completeness and soundness properties hold for every circuit $C : \Sigma^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$:

- **Completeness:** For any $y \in \Sigma^k$ such that $C(y) = 1$ there exists a proof $\pi \in \sigma^m$, also called a decodable PCP, such that

$$\Pr_{j,I,f} [f(\pi_I) = y_j] = 1,$$

where $j \in [k]$ is chosen uniformly at random and I, f are distributed according to C_j and the verifier's random coins.

- **Soundness:** For any $\pi \in \sigma^m$, there is a list of $0 \leq \ell \leq L$ strings y^1, \dots, y^ℓ satisfying $C(y^i) = 1$ for all i , and furthermore that

$$\Pr_{j,I,f} [f(\pi_I) \notin \{\perp, y_j^1, \dots, y_j^\ell\}] \leq \delta.$$

- **Robust Soundness:** We say that D is a robust dPCP system for CircuitSAT_Σ with robust soundness error δ , if the soundness criterion in can be strengthened to the following robust soundness criterion,

$$\mathbb{E}_{j,I,f} [\text{agr}(\pi_I, \text{BAD}(f))] \leq \delta,$$

where $\text{BAD}(f) := \{w \in \sigma^q \mid f(w) \notin \{\perp, y_j^1, \dots, y_j^\ell\}\}$.

7.3 Constructions of Decodable PCPs from Reed-Muller and Hadamard Codes

In this section we discuss two well-known constructions of decodable PCPs. These constructions are based on classical primitives in PCP literature, and we include them in full details for the sake of completeness.

First, we have the following construction of dPCPs based on Hadamard codes.

Lemma 7.7. For all $\delta > 0$, for $q = 1/\delta^{O(1)}$ and for all alphabets Σ , the language $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(N, S)$ has a regular decodable PCP with the following parameters:

1. Robust soundness error δ .
2. Proof alphabet size q .
3. Proof length $q^{O(S^2)}$.
4. Randomness complexity $O(S^2 \log(q))$.
5. Query complexity and decision complexity $q^{O(\log |\Sigma|)}$.
6. List size $1/\delta^{O(1)}$.

Proof. Deferred to Appendix B.2. □

Second, we have the following construction of dPCPs based on Reed-Muller codes.

Lemma 7.8. *For all $\delta > 0$ and all alphabets Σ , $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(N, S)$ has a regular decodable PCP with the following parameters:*

1. Robust soundness error δ .
2. Proof alphabet size and proof length at most $S^{O(1)}$.
3. Randomness complexity at most $O(\log S)$.
4. Query and decision complexity at most $(\log(S))^{O(\log |\Sigma|)}$.
5. List size at most $1/\delta^{O(1)}$.

Proof. Deferred to Appendix B.3. □

8 The Final PCP: Putting it All Together

In this section we combine all the components from the previous sections to get a 2-query PCP of quasi-linear size, constant alphabet and small soundness, thereby proving Theorem 1.2. We begin by presenting a few tools from [Din07, DH13] that are necessary for us, namely their regularization and alphabet reduction lemmas and their composition theorem.

8.1 Regularization Procedures for PCPs

First we state the following lemma [Din07, Lemma 4.2] to convert an arbitrary constraint graph to a 2-CSP on a regular graph with constant degree.

Lemma 8.1. *There exist constants $c, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a polynomial time procedure that when given as input a 2-CSP instance Ψ over a constraint graph G' with $|V(G')| + |E(G')| = n$ over alphabet Σ , outputs a 2-CSP Ψ' over a constraint graph G' with $|V(G')| \leq 2|E(G)|$ and $|E(G')| = \Theta(kn)$ over alphabet Σ such that,*

- G is k -regular.
- If $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$ then $\text{val}(\Psi') = 1$.
- If $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1 - \rho$ then $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - \rho/c$.

Next we state a similar procedure that converts a robust PCP into a robust PCP that is also regular. Additionally it also reduces the alphabet of a robust PCP.

Lemma 8.2. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the following holds. Suppose L has a robust PCP verifier V with randomness complexity r , query complexity q , proof length m , average proof degree d , robust soundness error δ over a proof alphabet Σ . Then L has a regular reduced robust PCP verifier, which we shall denote by $\text{regular}_\varepsilon(V)$ with:*

- randomness complexity $\log m + \log d$,
- query complexity $Cq \log |\Sigma|^{1/4}$,
- proof length $Cq^{2^2r} \log |\Sigma|^{1/10}$,
- proof degree C/ε^4 ,
- proof alphabet of size at most C/ε^6 ,
- and robust soundness error $\delta + \varepsilon$.

8.2 PCP Composition

We need the following efficient and abstract composition theorem due to [DH13]:

Theorem 8.3. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ the following holds. Suppose 3SAT has a regular robust PCP verifier V with robust soundness error Δ , proof alphabet Σ , query complexity Q , decision complexity $S(n)$ and suppose $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(Q, S(n))$ has a robust PCP decoder \mathcal{D} with proof alphabet σ , robust soundness error δ and list size ℓ . Then, 3SAT has a robust PCP verifier $V' = V \circledast \mathcal{D}$, with query complexity $O(q/\varepsilon^4)$, robust soundness error $\Delta\ell + 4\ell\varepsilon + \delta$ and other parameters as stated in Table 1. Furthermore, if the PCP decoder \mathcal{D} is regular, then so is the composed verifier V' .*

Table 1: Parameters for Efficient Composition.

	V	\mathcal{D}	$V' = V \circledast \mathcal{D}$
Proof Alphabet	Σ	σ	σ
Randomness Complexity	R	r	$\log M + r + \log D$
Query Complexity	Q	q	$\frac{4}{\varepsilon^4} \cdot q$
Decision Complexity	S	s	$4s/\varepsilon^4 + D \log \sigma$
Proof Degree	D	d	d
Proof Length	M	m	$2^R \cdot m$
Robust Soundness Error	Δ	δ	$\Delta\ell + 4\ell\varepsilon + \delta$
List Size	-	ℓ	-
Input Size	n	$S(n)$	n

Note that all the parameters (for V) with capitalized letters are functions of n and the parameters (for \mathcal{D}) with uncapitalized letters are functions of $S(n)$. The parameters of the composed PCP should be read accordingly.

8.3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

We start from a known size efficient PCP construction; either the construction of [BS06] that has soundness $1 - 1/\text{polylog}n$ or the construction of [Din07] that has soundness $1 - \Omega(1)$, will do. For a graph $G = (V, E)$, let $\text{size}(G) = |V| + |E|$. Below we state the result of [BS06] in its more convenient formulation in terms of hardness of 2-CSPs; this formulation can be found in [Din07, Lemma 8.3].

Theorem 8.4. *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that there is a polynomial time reduction mapping a 3SAT instance φ of size n to a 2-CSP instance Ψ over the graph $G = (V, E)$ and alphabet Σ where*

- We have $\text{size}(G) \leq n(\log n)^{c_1}$ and $|\Sigma| = O(1)$.
- If φ is satisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$.
- If φ is not satisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{(\log n)^{c_2}}$.

The work of [Din07] showed how to get to constant soundness while maintaining quasi-linear size. Again we state her result in the more convenient 2-CSP formulation.

Theorem 8.5. *There exist constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that there is a polynomial time reduction mapping a 3SAT instance φ of size n to a 2-CSP instance Ψ over the graph $G = (V, E)$ and alphabet Σ where,*

- $\text{size}(G) \leq n(\log n)^{c_1}$ and $|\Sigma| = c_2$.
- If φ is satisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$.
- If φ is not satisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - c_3$.

Using Dinur's PCP in conjunction with Lemma 5.3, we get a 2-CSP instance with soundness $1 - \Omega(1)$ whose constraint graph is the base graph of the complex from Theorem 2.13.

Lemma 8.6 (Theorem 1.10 restated). *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ there exist constants $C, C' > 0$ so that the following holds for all sufficiently large integers d and n . Let $\{X_{n'}\}_{n' \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the infinite sequence of complexes from Theorem 2.13, where every $X_{n'}$ is a d -dimensional complex on n' vertices with parameters $q = \Theta(\log^{C'} n')$ and δ , that is constructible in time $\text{poly}(n')$. Then there is a polynomial time reduction mapping any 3SAT instance φ of size n to a 2-CSP Ψ over the graph $G = (X_{n'}(1), X_{n'}(2))$, for some complex $X_{n'}$ from the family, such that:*

1. We have that $n' \leq n \log^C n$, the alphabet Σ satisfies that $\log(|\Sigma|) \leq q^{Cd^2}$, and the decision complexity of the constraints of Ψ is at most q^{Cd^2} .
2. If φ is satisfiable, then Ψ is satisfiable.
3. If φ is unsatisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$.

Proof. Applying Dinur's reduction from Theorem 8.5 to φ and then applying the regularization procedure in Lemma 8.1, in $\text{poly}(n)$ time we get a 2-CSP Ψ' whose constraint graph G' is k -regular for an absolute constant k , with $|V(G')| \leq n \log^{O(1)} n$, and alphabet size $|\Sigma'| = O(1)$. We have that $\text{val}(\Psi') = 1$ if $\text{val}(\varphi) = 1$ and $\text{val}(\Psi') = 1 - \varepsilon'$ if $\text{val}(\varphi) < 1$, for some universal constants $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1)$.

We will now apply the polynomial time reduction in Lemma 5.3 to Ψ' . This gives us a 2-CSP Ψ on the constraint graph $G = (X_{n'}(1), X_{n'}(2))$, where $X_{n'}$ is a d -dimensional complex with $|V(G')| \leq n' \leq O_\delta(1)|V(G')|$ and parameters $q = \Theta(\log^{C'} n')$ for some large enough constant C' and δ . The alphabet size

of Ψ satisfies $\log |\Sigma| = kq^{O(d^2)} \log |\Sigma'| = q^{O(d^2)}$ and the decision complexity is $kq^{O(d^2)} |\Sigma| = q^{O(d^2)}$. If Ψ' is satisfiable then so is Ψ , and if $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - \varepsilon'$ then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ for some absolute constant $\varepsilon > 0$, as required.¹⁵ \square

Now that we have a constant soundness PCP on the graphs underlying the complexes from Theorem 2.13, we can apply the gap amplification procedure from Lemma 6.2 to get a 2-CSP with small soundness (but large alphabet size). This uses the fact that these complexes support a direct product test with small soundness.

Lemma 8.7. *For all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ there exist constants $C, C' > 0$ so that the following holds for all sufficiently large integers k, d and n . Let $\{X_{n'}\}_{n' \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the infinite sequence of complexes from Theorem 2.13, where every $X_{n'}$ is a d -dimensional complex on n' vertices with parameters $q = \Theta(\log^{C'} n')$ and δ that is constructible in time $\text{poly}(n')$. There is a polynomial time reduction mapping a 3SAT instance φ of size n to a generalized label cover instance Ψ over the weighted inclusion graph $(X_{n'}(k), X_{n'}(\sqrt{k}))$ for some $n' \leq n \log^C n$, such that,*

1. *If φ is satisfiable, then Ψ is satisfiable.*
2. *If φ is unsatisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq \delta$.*
3. *The left alphabet of Ψ is Σ^k and right alphabet is $\Sigma^{\sqrt{k}}$ for some alphabet Σ with $\log |\Sigma| \leq q^{Cd^2}$.*
4. *The projection map $\phi_{(A,B)}$ associated to the edge (A, B) in Ψ is defined as: $\forall \sigma \in \Sigma_L(A), \phi_{(A,B)}(\sigma) = \sigma|_B$. Furthermore, for all $A \in X(k)$, the circuit complexity of checking membership in $\Sigma_L(A)$ is at most q^{Cd^2} .*

Proof. Fix δ and then fix $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$ to be sufficiently large constants depending on δ , as dictated by Theorem 2.13 and Lemma 8.6. Applying the polynomial time reduction in Lemma 8.6 on φ , we get a 2-CSP Ψ' on the weighted graph $(X_{n'}(1), X_{n'}(2))$, where $X_{n'}$ is a d -dimensional complex from Theorem 2.13 with $n' \leq n \log^{O(1)} n$ and parameters $q = \Theta(\log^{C'} n)$ and δ . The alphabet size of Ψ' satisfies $\log |\Sigma| \leq q^{O(d^2)}$ and the decision complexity is at most $q^{O(d^2)}$. If φ is satisfiable then so is Ψ' and if not then $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ for some absolute constant $\varepsilon > 0$.

Theorem 2.13 states that the (k, \sqrt{k}) -direct product test on $X_{n'}$ has soundness δ . Thus applying the polynomial time reduction in Lemma 6.2 on Ψ' we get a generalized label cover instance Ψ with $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq \delta$ if $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ which is at most $1 - 4\delta$ (by lowering δ if required). The other properties required of Ψ follow immediately from Lemma 6.2. \square

We now apply alphabet reduction using the standard technique of proof composition of PCPs, and for that we switch to the framework of robust PCPs using Lemma 7.3. Alphabet reduction for label cover corresponds to query/decision complexity reduction for the equivalent robust PCP, therefore applying proof composition with the PCP above as an outer PCP and the decodable PCP based on the Reed-Muller code from Lemma 7.8 as an inner PCP, we can reduce the queries to $\text{poly}(\log \log \log n)$, while maintaining the almost-linear size.

Lemma 8.8. *For all $\delta > 0$ there exists $C \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, 3SAT on n variables has a regular robust PCP with proof length $\leq n(\log n)^C$, randomness complexity $\leq \log_2(n) + C \log \log n$, query and decision complexity $\leq (\log \log \log n)^C$ and robust soundness error δ .*

¹⁵One can check that the proof above works even if we apply the result of [BS06], Theorem 8.4, instead of Theorem 8.5, since Lemma 5.3 only requires that $\text{val}(\Psi') \leq 1 - \frac{1}{(\log n)^c}$ to get the desired conclusion.

Proof. Let δ' be a function of δ that we will set later. Applying the polynomial time reduction in Lemma 8.7 on φ with soundness parameter δ' and parameters k, d chosen to be a large enough constants, we get a generalized label cover instance Ψ' on the weighted graph $(X_{n'}(k), X_{n'}(\sqrt{k}))$ for $n' \leq n \log^{O(1)} n$, and alphabet Σ satisfying, $\log |\Sigma|$ and decision complexity at most $\log^{O(1)} n$. Note that the distribution over the left side of vertices in Ψ' equals μ_k , which is not uniform. The randomness complexity of sampling from μ_k is at most $\log_2(|X(d)|) + \log_2(\binom{d}{k}) = \log_2(n \log^{O(1)} n)$, therefore we can replace the left side by putting in a vertex for every random string. Now, using the equivalence between generalized Label Cover and robust PCPs from Lemma 7.3 this gives us a robust PCP P_φ for 3SAT with the parameters in Table 2.

Now we can conclude by applying the composition from Theorem 8.3 with the Reed-Muller based dPCP from Lemma 7.8. Our goal is to reduce the decision complexity of P_φ to $\text{poly}(\log \log \log n)$. To get some intuition of the parameters, note that one step of composition with the Reed-Muller dPCP roughly reduces the original decision complexity D to roughly $\text{poly} \log(D)$, while increasing the proof size by a factor of $\text{poly}(D)$. Since the PCP P_φ has a decision complexity of $\text{poly} \log n$, if we apply the composition twice we will reduce the decision complexity to $\text{poly} \log \log \log n$, while incurring a factor of $\text{poly} \log n$ blow-up in size.

Regularizing: before applying composition we must ensure that we have a regular robust PCP with constant-sized alphabet. The robust PCP P_φ produced in Lemma 8.7 may not have these properties. To remedy this we first apply Lemma 8.2 with the parameter δ' that regularizes the PCP and also reduces its alphabet while paying nominally in the proof length, to get the PCP verifier P'_φ .

A first composition step with Reed-Muller based robust dPCP: we apply composition, namely Theorem 8.3, with the parameter $\varepsilon_1 = \delta'^{c_1}$ for large enough $c_1 > 0$, with the decodable PCP D_{δ_1} from Lemma 7.8 with soundness $\delta_1 = \delta'^{c_2}$ for small enough $c_2 \in (0, 1)$, to get the PCP verifier $V_1 = P'_\varphi \otimes D_{\delta_1}$ with soundness $\delta' \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta_1}) + \varepsilon_1 \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta_1}) + \delta_1$ which is δ'^c for some constant $c \in (0, 1)$. The parameter evolution of both these operations is summarized below in Table 2.

Table 2: Parameters after One Step of Composition with Reed-Muller dPCP.

	P_φ	P'_φ	$V_1 = P'_\varphi \otimes D_{\delta_1}$
Proof Alphabet	$\exp(\text{poly} \log n)$	$\text{poly}(1/\delta')$	$\text{poly} \log n$
Randomness Complexity	$\log_2(n \text{poly} \log n)$	$\log(n \text{poly} \log n)$	$\log(n \text{poly} \log n)$
Query Complexity	$O(1)$	$\text{poly} \log n$	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta'}) (\log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta'))}$
Decision Complexity	$\text{poly} \log n$	$\text{poly} \log n$	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta'}) (\log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta'))}$
Proof Length	$n \text{poly} \log n$	$n \text{poly} \log n$	$n \text{poly} \log n$
Robust Soundness Error	δ'	$2\delta'$	δ'^c

A second composition step with Reed-Muller based robust dPCP: we again apply the alphabet reduction procedure in Lemma 8.2 with the parameter δ'^c to get a regular robust PCP verifier V'_2 . After that we apply one more step of composition, with the parameter $\varepsilon_2 = \delta'^{c_3}$, using the Reed-Muller dPCP D_{δ_2} with the soundness parameter $\delta_2 = \delta'^{c_4}$. This gives us the regular robust PCP verifier $V_2 = V'_2 \otimes D_{\delta_2}$ with soundness error $\delta'^{c'}$ for some constant $c' \in (0, 1)$. Setting $\delta' = \delta^{1/c'}$ finishes the proof. The parameter evolution is summarized below in Table 3.

Table 3: Parameters after Second Step of Composition with Reed-Muller dPCP.

	V'_2	$V_2 = V'_2 \otimes D_{\delta_2}$
Proof Alphabet	$\text{poly}(1/\delta')$	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta})(\log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta))}$
Randomness Complexity	$\log(n \text{polylog} n)$	$\log(n \text{polylog} n)$
Query Complexity	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta'}) (\log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta'))}$	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta})(\log \log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta))}$
Decision Complexity	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta'}) (\log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta'))}$	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta})(\log \log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta))}$
Proof Length	$n \text{polylog} n$	$n \text{polylog} n$
Robust Soundness Error	$2\delta'^c$	δ

□

The PCP construction in Lemma 8.8 is size efficient and has a moderately small alphabet size (which is not constant yet). Thus, we now apply another step of query reduction and composition, this time using the Hadamard code based dPCP as an inner PCP from Lemma 7.7. The result of this process will be a robust PCP with constant query complexity and small soundness, which in the language of label cover corresponds to constant size alphabet and small soundness, thereby establishing Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 8.9 (Theorem 1.2 restated). *For all $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ and a polynomial time procedure such that given an instance φ of 3-SAT of size n produces a label cover instance Ψ with the following properties:*

1. *The size of Ψ is at most $n \log^C n$ and the alphabet size of Ψ is at most $\text{poly}(1/\delta)$.*
2. *If φ is satisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) = 1$.*
3. *If φ is unsatisfiable, then $\text{val}(\Psi) \leq \delta$.*

Proof. Let $\delta' > 0$ be a function of δ that we will set later. Given a 3SAT instance φ , using Lemma 8.8 we get a robust and regular PCP P_φ with soundness δ' . We first apply alphabet reduction using Lemma 8.2 with the parameter δ' to get a robust PCP P'_φ with constant-sized alphabet. We then apply composition, with the parameter δ'^{c_1} for $c_1 \in (0, 1)$ chosen to be a large enough absolute constant, and then apply composition with the Hadamard-based decodable PCP from Lemma 7.7 with soundness δ_1 , denoted by D_{δ_1} . This gives us a regular PCP V with constant query complexity and robust soundness error δ by setting $\delta' = \delta^c$ for some absolute constant $c > 0$. The evolution of parameters is summarized below in Table 4.

Table 4: Parameters after Composition with Hadamard dPCP.

	P'_φ	$V = P'_\varphi \otimes D_{\delta_1}$
Proof Alphabet	$\text{poly}(1/\delta')$	$\text{poly}(1/\delta)$
Randomness Complexity	$\log(n \text{polylog} n)$	$\log(n \text{polylog} n)$
Query Complexity	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta'}) (\log \log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta'))}$	$(1/\delta)^{O(\log 1/\delta)}$
Decision Complexity	$\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\delta'}) (\log \log \log n)^{O(\log(1/\delta'))}$	$\text{poly}(1/\delta)$
Proof Length	$n \text{polylog} n$	$n \text{polylog} n$
Robust Soundness Error	$2\delta'$	δ

Using Lemma 7.3 to view the robust PCP V as a generalized label cover instance, gives us the instance Ψ as required. Note that this is a generalized label cover instance, with $|\Sigma_L| \leq O_\delta(1)$, but where for

every vertex $U \in L$ the alphabet $\Sigma_L(U)$ might be a subset of Σ_L . To convert this to a usual Label cover instance, we can simply allow the left alphabet to be all of Σ_L , where for every $U \in L$ we fix a mapping $G_U : \Sigma_L \rightarrow \Sigma_L(U)$ with $G_U(\sigma) = \sigma$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_L(U)$, and interpret the prover's assignment $A(U)$ as the assignment $G_U(A(U))$. It is easy to see that the modified instance has the same soundness. \square

Acknowledgements

We thank Pavel Etingof for bringing us into contact with Zhiwei Yun. We sincerely thank Zhiwei Yun for helpful communication about Theorem 2.13 and for kindly agreeing to write an appendix to this paper showing that variants of the Chapman-Lubotzky complexes can be constructed with $q = \text{polylogn}$. We thank Shiva Chidambaram for helpful conversations about pro- p groups.

Dor Minzer is supported by NSF CCF award 2227876, and NSF CAREER award 2239160. Nikhil Vyas is supported by a Simons Investigator Fellowship, NSF grant DMS-2134157, DARPA grant W911NF2010021, and DOE grant DE-SC0022199.

References

- [ACG94] Noga Alon, Fan R. K. Chung, and Ronald L. Graham. Routing permutations on graphs via matchings. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 7(3):513–530, 1994.
- [AdIVKK02] Noga Alon, Wenceslas Fernandez de la Vega, Ravi Kannan, and Marek Karpinski. Random sampling and approximation of MAX-CSP problems. In *Proceedings on 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 19-21, 2002, Montréal, Québec, Canada*, pages 232–239. ACM, 2002.
- [AL20] Vedat Levi Alev and Lap Chi Lau. Improved analysis of higher order random walks and applications. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020, Chicago, IL, USA, June 22-26, 2020*, pages 1198–1211. ACM, 2020.
- [ALM⁺98] Sanjeev Arora, Carsten Lund, Rajeev Motwani, Madhu Sudan, and Mario Szegedy. Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(3):501–555, 1998.
- [AS98] Sanjeev Arora and Shmuel Safra. Probabilistic checking of proofs: A new characterization of np . *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(1):70–122, 1998.
- [BFLS91] László Babai, Lance Fortnow, Leonid A Levin, and Mario Szegedy. Checking computations in polylogarithmic time. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 21–32, 1991.
- [BGH⁺06] Eli Ben-Sasson, Oded Goldreich, Prahladh Harsha, Madhu Sudan, and Salil P. Vadhan. Robust PCPs of proximity, shorter PCPs, and applications to coding. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(4):889–974, 2006.
- [BHHS11] Boaz Barak, Moritz Hardt, Thomas Holenstein, and David Steurer. Subsampling mathematical relaxations and average-case complexity. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2011, San Francisco, California, USA, January 23-25, 2011*, pages 512–531. SIAM, 2011.

- [BLM24] Mitali Bafna, Noam Lifshitz, and Dor Minzer. Constant degree direct product testers with small soundness. *CoRR*, abs/2402.00850, 2024. To appear in FOCS 2024.
- [BM24] Mitali Bafna and Dor Minzer. Characterizing direct product testing via coboundary expansion. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 24-28, 2024*, pages 1978–1989. ACM, 2024.
- [Bog05] Andrej Bogdanov. Gap amplification fails below $1/2$. *Comment on ECCC TR05-046, can be found at <http://eccc.uni-trier.de/eccc-reports/2005/TR05-046/commt01.pdf>*, 2005.
- [BS06] Eli Ben-Sasson and Madhu Sudan. Robust locally testable codes and products of codes. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 28(4):387–402, 2006.
- [CGO10] Nishanth Chandran, Juan Garay, and Rafail Ostrovsky. Improved fault tolerance and secure computation on sparse networks. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 249–260. Springer, 2010.
- [CGO12] Nishanth Chandran, Juan Garay, and Rafail Ostrovsky. Edge fault tolerance on sparse networks. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming: 39th International Colloquium, ICALP 2012, Warwick, UK, July 9-13, 2012, Proceedings, Part II 39*, pages 452–463. Springer, 2012.
- [CL23] Michael Chapman and Alexander Lubotzky. Stability of homomorphisms, coverings and cocycles ii: Examples, applications and open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06706*, 2023.
- [DD19] Yotam Dikstein and Irit Dinur. Agreement testing theorems on layered set systems. In *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, November 9-12, 2019*, pages 1495–1524. IEEE Computer Society, 2019.
- [DD24a] Yotam Dikstein and Irit Dinur. Agreement theorems for high dimensional expanders in the low acceptance regime: The role of covers. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 24-28, 2024*, pages 1967–1977. ACM, 2024.
- [DD24b] Yotam Dikstein and Irit Dinur. Swap cosystolic expansion. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 24-28, 2024*, pages 1956–1966. ACM, 2024.
- [DDL24] Yotam Dikstein, Irit Dinur, and Alexander Lubotzky. Low acceptance agreement tests via bounded-degree symplectic hdxs. *CoRR*, abs/2402.01078, 2024. To appear in FOCS 2024.
- [DG08] Irit Dinur and Elazar Goldenberg. Locally testing direct product in the low error range. In *49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2008, October 25-28, 2008, Philadelphia, PA, USA*, pages 613–622. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- [DH13] Irit Dinur and Prahladh Harsha. Composition of low-error 2-query PCPs using decodable PCPs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(6):2452–2486, 2013.
- [DH24] Yotam Dikstein and Max Hopkins. Chernoff bounds and reverse hypercontractivity on hdx, 2024. To appear in FOCS 2024.

- [Din07] Irit Dinur. The PCP theorem by gap amplification. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 54(3):12–es, 2007.
- [DK17] Irit Dinur and Tali Kaufman. High dimensional expanders imply agreement expanders. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017*, pages 974–985. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [DM11] Irit Dinur and Or Meir. Derandomized parallel repetition via structured PCPs. *Comput. Complex.*, 20(2):207–327, 2011.
- [DPPU86] Cynthia Dwork, David Peleg, Nicholas Pippenger, and Eli Upfal. Fault tolerance in networks of bounded degree. In *Proceedings of the eighteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 370–379, 1986.
- [DR06] Irit Dinur and Omer Reingold. Assignment testers: Towards a combinatorial proof of the PCP theorem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(4):975–1024, 2006.
- [FGL⁺91] Uriel Feige, Shafi Goldwasser, László Lovász, Shmuel Safra, and Mario Szegedy. Approximating clique is almost np-complete. In *32nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1-4 October 1991*, pages 2–12. IEEE Computer Society, 1991.
- [FK95] Uriel Feige and Joe Kilian. Impossibility results for recycling random bits in two-prover proof systems. In *Proceedings of the twenty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 457–468, 1995.
- [GS00] Oded Goldreich and Shmuel Safra. A combinatorial consistency lemma with application to proving the PCP theorem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 29(4):1132–1154, 2000.
- [Hås01] Johan Håstad. Some optimal inapproximability results. *J. ACM*, 48(4):798–859, 2001.
- [Hol09] Thomas Holenstein. Parallel repetition: Simplification and the no-signaling case. *Theory Comput.*, 5(1):141–172, 2009.
- [HS10] Prahladh Harsha and Srikanth Srinivasan. Lecture 9: PCP constructions via low degree polynomials. *Limits of Approximation Algorithms*, 2010. Available online: <https://www.tcs.tifr.res.in/~prahladh/teaching/2009-10/limits/lectures/lecture9.html>
- [HW01] Johan Håstad and Avi Wigderson. Simple analysis of graph tests for linearity and PCP. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity, Chicago, Illinois, USA, June 18-21, 2001*, pages 244–254. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.
- [IKW09] Russell Impagliazzo, Valentine Kabanets, and Avi Wigderson. New direct-product testers and 2-query PCPs. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2009, Bethesda, MD, USA, May 31 - June 2, 2009*, pages 131–140. ACM, 2009.
- [IP01] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-SAT. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.

- [JRV20] Siddhartha Jayanti, Srinivasan Raghuraman, and Nikhil Vyas. Efficient constructions for almost-everywhere secure computation. In *Advances in Cryptology—EUROCRYPT 2020: 39th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Zagreb, Croatia, May 10–14, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 30*, pages 159–183. Springer, 2020.
- [Kho02] Subhash Khot. Hardness results for coloring 3-colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs. In *43rd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2002), 16-19 November 2002, Vancouver, BC, Canada, Proceedings*, pages 23–32. IEEE Computer Society, 2002.
- [KM20] Tali Kaufman and David Mass. Local-to-global agreement expansion via the variance method. In *11th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [LPS88] Alexander Lubotzky, Ralph Phillips, and Peter Sarnak. Ramanujan graphs. *Combinatorica*, 8(3):261–277, 1988.
- [LSV05a] Alexander Lubotzky, Beth Samuels, and Uzi Vishne. Explicit constructions of Ramanujan complexes of type A_d . *Eur. J. Comb.*, 26(6):965–993, 2005.
- [LSV05b] Alexander Lubotzky, Beth Samuels, and Uzi Vishne. Ramanujan complexes of type \tilde{A}_d . *Israel journal of Mathematics*, 149:267–299, 2005.
- [MR08] Dana Moshkovitz and Ran Raz. Two query PCP with sub-constant error. In *49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2008, October 25-28, 2008, Philadelphia, PA, USA*, pages 314–323. IEEE Computer Society, 2008.
- [MRY16] Dana Moshkovitz, Govind Ramnarayan, and Henry Yuen. A no-go theorem for derandomized parallel repetition: Beyond Feige-Kilian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.07130*, 2016.
- [Nen23] Rajko Nenadov. Routing permutations on spectral expanders via matchings. *Comb.*, 43(4):737–742, 2023.
- [PS94] Alexander Polishchuk and Daniel A Spielman. Nearly-linear size holographic proofs. In *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 194–203, 1994.
- [Rao11] Anup Rao. Parallel repetition in projection games and a concentration bound. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(6):1871–1891, 2011.
- [Raz98] Ran Raz. A parallel repetition theorem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 27(3):763–803, 1998.
- [RS97] Ran Raz and Shmuel Safra. A sub-constant error-probability low-degree test, and a sub-constant error-probability PCP characterization of NP. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, El Paso, Texas, USA, May 4-6, 1997*, pages 475–484. ACM, 1997.
- [RVW00] Omer Reingold, Salil P. Vadhan, and Avi Wigderson. Entropy waves, the zig-zag graph product, and new constant-degree expanders and extractors. In *41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2000, 12-14 November 2000, Redondo Beach, California, USA*, pages 3–13. IEEE Computer Society, 2000.

- [TT06] Luca Trevisan and Madhur Tulsiani. Lecture 11: PCP and hardness of approximation, 2006. Available online: <https://lucatrevisan.github.io/pcp/lecture11.pdf>.
- [Upf92] Eli Upfal. Tolerating linear number of faults in networks of bounded degree. In *Proceedings of the eleventh annual ACM symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, pages 83–89, 1992.

A Proof of Theorem 1.7

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.7 in the case of large alphabet Σ . We first recall how the proof proceeds in the case $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$. In that case, the argument consists of two parts. The first part is the work of [BM24], which shows that complexes that possess coboundary expansion support a direct product tester over $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$. The second part is the work [BLM24], which constructs sufficiently good coboundary expanders using variants of the Chapman-Lubotzky complexes [CL23]. Combining the two results gives Theorem A in the case that $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$.

The only part of the argument that changes for larger alphabets is the first one, and in particular [BM24, Theorem B.1]. Below we verify that the result of [BM24, Theorem B.1] in fact works for all Σ , and combined with [BLM24] this implies Theorem 1.7. The main result of this section is the following strengthening of [BM24, Theorem B.1]:

Theorem A.1. *There is $c > 0$ such that for all $\delta > 0$ there are $m, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for sufficiently large k , sufficiently large d and γ small enough function of d the following holds. If a d -dimensional simplicial complex X is a γ -spectral expander and $(m, r, 2^{-o(r)}, c)$ weak UG coboundary expander, then the direct product test over $X(k)$ with respect to every alphabet Σ has soundness δ . Namely, if $F: X(k) \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ passes the (k, \sqrt{k}) direct product tester with respect to X with probability at least δ , then there is $f: X(1) \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that*

$$\Pr_{A \sim \mu_k} [\Delta(F[A], f|_A) \leq \delta] \geq \text{poly}(\delta).$$

A.1 Direct Product Testing over Moderately Sized Alphabets

In this section we prove Theorem 1.7 for “moderately large” alphabet. By that, we mean that final result will depend on the alphabet size $|\Sigma|$. We use the notation from [BM24, Section 4], and more specifically: the definition of agreement of a global function $g: [d] \rightarrow \Sigma$ with respect to $G: X(k) \rightarrow \Sigma^k$, denoted by $\text{agr}_\nu(g, G)$, the definition of Unique-Games coboundary expansion, and the definition of list-agreement-testing. We refer the reader to [BM24, Section 4] for a formal presentation of these notions.

Lemma A.2. *There is $c > 0$ such that for all $\delta > 0$ there are $m, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $R \in \mathbb{N}$, sufficiently large k , sufficiently large d and γ small enough function of d the following holds. If a d -dimensional simplicial complex X is a γ -spectral expander and $(m, r, \exp(-o(r)), c)$ weak UG coboundary expander, then the direct product test over $X(k)$ with respect to every alphabet Σ with $|\Sigma| \leq R$ has soundness δ . Namely, if $F: X(k) \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ passes the (k, \sqrt{k}) direct product tester with respect to X with probability at least δ , then there is $f: X(1) \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that*

$$\Pr_{A \sim \mu_k} [\Delta(F[A], f|_A) \leq \delta] \geq \text{poly}(\delta).$$

Note here that d is allowed to depend on the alphabet size, which means that $|\Sigma|$ cannot be arbitrarily large as a function of n or d . The proof of Lemma A.2 follows the argument in [BM24] closely. That proof has two major components:

1. The first of which is [BM24, Lemma B.2], which reduces the 1% agreement testing problem to the 99%-list-agreement testing.
2. The second of which is [BM24, Lemma B.5], which deduces the soundness of the list-agreement test from coboundary expansion.

Below we explain how to adapt each one of these components in the case of moderate size alphabets.

A.1.1 Modifying [BM24, Lemma B.2]

Their proof utilizes [AdiVKK02, Theorem 1] that says that the value of a dense max- k -CSP is preserved up-to small additive factors under sub-sampling of the variables of the CSP. This result is proved only for CSPs over $\{0, 1\}$. Below we use the generalization of the statement from [AdiVKK02] to larger alphabet due to [BHHS11]. We state it in a format analogous to [BM24, Theorem 2.3] and show how it follows from [BHHS11, Theorem 8.2].

Lemma A.3. *For all $k, R \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d \geq \max(\text{poly}(k), \text{poly} \log R)$, consider a k -CSP Ψ over the alphabet $[R]$ with $\binom{d}{k}$ constraints that each depend on a unique k -set of variables. Then*

$$\Pr_{Q \subset_{d/2}[d]} \left[|\text{val}(\Psi|_Q) - \text{val}(\Psi)| \leq \frac{1}{d^{1/8}} \right] \geq 1 - O\left(\frac{1}{d^{1/8}}\right).$$

Proof. Let $\zeta = 1/d^{1/4}$. We start by proving that $\text{val}(\Psi|_Q)$ is at least $\text{val}(\Psi) - \zeta$ with high probability. Let f be the maximizer of $\text{val}(\Psi)$. Using Lemma 2.2, with the set of constraints $B \subseteq \binom{[d]}{k}$ that f satisfies, we get that,

$$\Pr_{Q \subset_{d/2}[d]} [\text{val}(\Psi|_Q) \leq \text{val}(\Psi) - \zeta] \leq \frac{k \text{val}(\Psi)}{d \zeta^2} \leq \frac{k}{\sqrt{d}}.$$

For proving the other direction, let p denote $\Pr_{Q \subset_{d/2}[d]} [\text{val}(\Psi|_Q) \geq \text{val}(\Psi) + \sqrt{\zeta}]$. Combining with the above equation, we can lower bound the expectation of $\text{val}(\Psi|_Q)$ as follows,

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q \subset_{d/2}[d]} [\text{val}(\Psi|_Q)] \geq p(\text{val}(\Psi) + \sqrt{\zeta}) + \left(1 - \frac{k}{\sqrt{d}} - p\right) (\text{val}(\Psi) - \zeta).$$

To upper bound the expectation we use [BHHS11, Theorem 8.2] which asserts that

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q \subset_{d/2}[d]} [\text{val}(\Psi|_Q)] \leq \text{val}(\Psi) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}},$$

in the parameter regime under consideration here. Combining the lower and upper bound on the expectation and solving for p we get that, $p \leq O(\sqrt{\zeta})$ as required. \square

Analogously to [BM24, Lemma 4.12], Lemma A.3 implies the following result (we omit the formal proof).

Lemma A.4. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, alphabets Σ , $d \geq \max(\text{poly}(k), \text{poly} \log |\Sigma|)$, and all functions $G : \binom{[d]}{k} \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ that satisfy $\text{agr}_t(g, G) \leq \alpha$ for all $g : [d] \rightarrow \Sigma$, the following holds:

$$\Pr_{B \subseteq_{d/2} [d]} \left[\max_g \text{agr}_t(g|_B, G|_B) < \alpha + \frac{1}{d^{1/8}} \right] \geq 1 - O\left(\frac{1}{d^{1/8}}\right).$$

We remark that the dependence of d on the alphabet size in the above lemma is ultimately why Lemma A.2 only works for moderately sized alphabet. Using this statement we get the following lemma that reduces the 1% agreement test to the 99% list agreement test.

Lemma A.5. For all $\delta > 0$, all alphabets Σ , for sufficiently large $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$, sufficiently small γ compared to d , some $i \in [1/\delta^{80}]$, and $\tau = 1/\text{tower}_i(1/\delta)$, the following holds. Suppose that X is a d -dimensional simplicial complex which is a γ -spectral expander, and $F : X(k) \rightarrow \Sigma^k$ passes the (k, \sqrt{k}) -agreement-test with probability δ . Then, there exists lists $(L[D])_{D \in X(d)}$ satisfying:

1. **Short, non-empty lists:** With probability $1 - O(\tau)$ over the choice of $D \sim X(d)$, the list $L[D]$ is non-empty and has size at most $O(1/\delta^{12})$.
2. **Good agreement:** For all $D \in X(d)$ and every $f \in L[D]$, we have that $\text{agr}_\nu(f, F|_D) \geq \Omega(\delta^{12})$ for $\nu = 1/k^{\Omega(1)}$.
3. **Distance in the lists:** With probability at least $1 - O(\tau)$ over the choice of $D \sim X(d)$, the list $L[D]$ has distance at least $\Omega(1/\log(1/\tau))$.

Furthermore the lists above pass the List-Agreement-Test with parameter $\Theta(\tau)$, with probability $1 - \tau$.

Proof. In the proof of [BM24, Lemma B.2], the direct product testing result for the complete complex from [DG08] is used to get a list of functions $L[D]$, such that for most $D \sim X(d)$ the lists satisfy properties (1), (2) and (3) from the lemma statement. The result of [DG08] is alphabet independent hence this part of the proof ports over easily. To show that these lists are consistent with each other, i.e. they pass the list-agreement-test, they use [BM24, Lemma 4.12] that asserts that the maximum agreement that G has with any global function $g : [d] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ doesn't increase after restricting to a random subset $B \subset_{d/2} D$ with high probability. We replace that invocation with the analogous statement for large alphabet—namely Lemma A.3 in place of [BM24, Lemma 4.12], gives us that the list-agreement test passes with probability $1 - \tau$. \square

A.1.2 Modifying [BM24, Lemma B.5]

We now explain how the analysis of the list agreement testing problem is reduced to coboundary expansion, again following the argument in [BM24] closely.

Lemma A.6. Assume there exists a collection of lists $\{L[D]\}_{D \in X(d)}$ that satisfy the premise of Lemma A.5, and assume that X is a γ -spectral expander for $\gamma < 1/\text{poly}(d)$ and a weak $(O(1/\delta^{12}), t, \exp(-o(t)), c)$ UG coboundary expander for $t = \Theta(\text{tower}_{i-1}(1/\delta)^2)$. Then there exists $G : X(1) \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that

$$\Pr_{D \sim X(d)} [\Delta(G(D), L[D]) \leq \delta/3] \geq 1 - O(c^{1/2} + \exp(-\sqrt{t}) + \gamma).$$

Proof. The proof uses the UG coboundary expansion of X to reduce the 99% list agreement testing problem to the 99%-agreement testing problem on HDX. This part of the proof is alphabet-independent. It then uses the result of [DK17] that showed soundness for the 99%-agreement test on HDX to get a global function G that agrees with some element of the lists on D with high probability. It is easy to verify that the [DK17] result holds for any alphabet Σ , therefore in the large alphabet case too we get a global function G as required, finishing the proof of the lemma. \square

We can now prove Lemma A.2.

Proof of Lemma A.2. Combining Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.6 we get that there are lists $L[D]$ as in the former lemma and a function $G: X(1) \rightarrow \Sigma$ as in the latter lemma. Sampling $D \sim X(d)$ we get that with probability at least $1/2$ we have that $G|_D$ is $\delta/3$ -close to some $f \in L[D]$. Conditioned on that, with probability at least $\Omega(\delta^{12})$ we have that $\Delta(f|_K, F[K]) \leq \nu$ and $\Delta(f|_K, G|_K) \leq 2\delta/3 - \nu$, in which case $\Delta(G|_K, F[K]) \leq \delta$, as required. \square

A.2 Direct Product Testing over All Alphabets

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem A.1 by a reduction to Lemma A.2. We start with a simple claim that relates the singular value of a large induced subgraph in terms of the singular value of the full graph.

Claim A.7. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and $\mathcal{R} : L^2(V) \rightarrow L^2(V)$ be a random walk with stationary distribution μ over V and second singular value σ . Then for all subgraphs $H \subseteq V(G)$ with $\mu(H) \geq 2\sigma$, the random walk $\mathcal{R}_H : L^2(H) \rightarrow L^2(H)$ defined as \mathcal{R} conditioned on H , i.e.*

$$\mathcal{R}_H f(v) = \mathbb{E}_{u \sim \mathcal{R}(v)} [f(u) | u \in H],$$

has singular value at most $O(\sigma/\mu(H))$.

Proof. We know that the second singular value of \mathcal{R} is $\sigma_2(\mathcal{R}) = \sup_{f \perp \vec{1}} \frac{\langle f, \mathcal{R}f \rangle}{\langle f, f \rangle}$ and the same holds for \mathcal{R}_H . Let $f \perp \vec{1} \in L^2(H)$ be a vector achieving $\sigma_2(\mathcal{R}_H)$ and define $\tilde{f} \in L^2(G)$ as the vector which is equal to f on H and 0 outside it. Note that \tilde{f} is also perpendicular to $\vec{1}$.

Let $(u, v) \sim E(G)$ and $(u, v) \sim E(H)$ denote an edge picked according to the random walk \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}_H respectively. We have that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_2(\mathcal{R}_H) &= \frac{\langle f, \mathcal{R}_H f \rangle}{\langle f, f \rangle} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{(u,v) \sim E(H)} [f(u)f(v)]}{\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \pi_H} [f(u)^2]} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{(u,v) \sim E(G)} [\tilde{f}(u)\tilde{f}(v) | u \in H, v \in H]}{\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \pi} [\tilde{f}(u)^2 | u \in H]} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{(u,v) \sim E(G)} [\tilde{f}(u)\tilde{f}(v)]}{\Pr_{(u,v) \sim E(G)} [u \in H, v \in H]} \cdot \frac{\Pr_{u \sim \pi} [u \in H]}{\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \pi} [\tilde{f}(u)^2]}. \end{aligned}$$

By the expander mixing lemma we have that,

$$\Pr_{(u,v) \sim E(G)} [u \in H, v \in H] \geq \mu(H)^2 - \sigma_2(\mathcal{R})\mu(H)(1 - \mu(H)) \geq \mu(H)^2/2.$$

Plugging this in we get,

$$\sigma(\mathcal{R}_H) \leq \frac{2}{\mu(H)} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E}_{(u,v) \sim E(G)} [\tilde{f}(u)\tilde{f}(v)]}{\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \pi} [\tilde{f}(u)^2]} \leq \frac{2}{\mu(H)} \sigma_2(\mathcal{R}). \quad \square$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem A.1.

Proof of Theorem A.1. We first explain the high level overview of the argument. Given the function F that passes the test with probability δ , we choose a large constant $R \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and create a function $G: X(k) \rightarrow [R]^k$ using a random hash function $h: \Sigma \rightarrow [R]$. We apply the direct product testing result, Lemma A.2 on G to get a global function g agreeing with G on a large fraction of k -sets. Then using g we finally deduce a global function f taking values in Σ that agrees with F on a large fraction of k -sets.

Hashing to smaller alphabet: Given δ we choose $\delta_1 \ll \delta$ appropriately, and then set $\eta_1 = \text{poly}(\delta_1)$ as dictated by Lemma A.2, and finally choose $R \gg 1/\eta_1$. The constants k, d for the complex are chosen to be large in terms of δ_1, δ, R as required by Lemma A.2. To summarize our parameters satisfy,

$$\delta \gg \delta_1 \gg \eta_1 \gg 1/R \gg 1/k \gg 1/d.$$

Fix such a choice henceforth. Let $h: \Sigma \rightarrow [R]$ be a randomly chosen function. For $A \in \Sigma^k$ let $h(A)$ denote the string obtained by applying h to every coordinate separately. Consider the function $G_h: X(k) \rightarrow [R]^k$ defined as $G_h = h \circ F$. We know that the distance between two distinct strings $S_1, S_2 \in \Sigma^k$ can only decrease under hashing, therefore for every h , G_h passes the agreement test with probability $\geq \delta$. Moreover for all $S_1 \neq S_2 \in \Sigma^k$, $\Pr_h[\Delta(h(S_1), h(S_2)) < \Delta(S_1, S_2) - \delta_1] \leq \frac{1}{\delta_1 R} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{R}}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_h \left[\Pr_{\substack{B \sim X(\sqrt{k}) \\ A, A' \supset_k B}} [\Delta(G_h[A]|_B, G_h[A']|_B) \leq \Delta(F[A]|_B, F[A']|_B) - \delta_1] \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{R}}. \quad (5)$$

Fix any hash function h for which the inner probability above is at most $1/\sqrt{R}$. Since G_h passes the agreement test with probability δ , we can apply the agreement testing result for moderate alphabet, Lemma A.2, with δ_1 to get a function $g: X(1) \rightarrow [R]$ such that

$$\Pr_{A \sim X(k)} [\Delta(G_h[A], g|_A) \leq \delta_1] \geq \eta_1.$$

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A \in X(k) : \Delta(G_h[A], g|_A) \leq \delta_1\}$; then the above inequality translates to $\mu(\mathcal{A}) \geq \eta_1$. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, applying Chernoff-type bound gives that

$$\Pr_{\substack{B \sim X(\sqrt{k}) \\ A \supset_k B}} [\Delta(G_h[A]|_B, g|_B) \leq 2\delta_1 \mid A \in \mathcal{A}] \geq 1 - \exp(-\sqrt{k}).$$

From here on we will draw the tuple (B, A, A') from the distribution $B \sim X(\sqrt{k}), A, A' \supset_k B$ and omit this notation. Applying the triangle inequality and a union bound we get,

$$\Pr_{B, A, A'} [\Delta(G_h[A]|_B, G_h[A']|_B) \leq 4\delta_1 \mid A, A' \in \mathcal{A}] \geq 1 - \exp(-\sqrt{k}). \quad (6)$$

By the expander mixing lemma we have that $\Pr_{B, A, A'} [A, A' \in \mathcal{A}] \geq \mu(\mathcal{A})^2 - O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \geq \text{poly}(\eta_1)$. We now show that $F[A]|_B, F[A']|_B$ are close, analogously to (6), and for that we use (5) and a union bound as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{B, A, A'} [\Delta(F[A]|_B, F[A']|_B) > 5\delta_1 \mid A, A' \in \mathcal{A}] \\ & \leq \Pr_{B, A, A'} [\Delta(F[A]|_B, F[A']|_B) > \Delta(G_h[A]|_B, G_h[A']|_B) + \delta_1 \mid A, A' \in \mathcal{A}] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \Pr_{B,A,A'} [\Delta(G_h[A]|_B, G_h[A']|_B) > 4\delta_1 \mid A, A' \in \mathcal{A}] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\text{poly}(\eta_1)\sqrt{R}} + \exp(-\sqrt{k}) \leq \delta_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since R, k are both much larger than δ_1, δ and therefore also $\text{poly}(\eta_1)$.

For the rest of the proof it will be convenient to work with the simplicial complex $Y(k) = \mathcal{A}$ and its downward closure, endowed with the set of measures $\{\pi_i\}_{i \in [k]}$, where π_k is the conditional distribution $\mu_k|_{\mathcal{A}}$, and as is usually the case, for all $i < k$, π_i is defined as $A \sim \pi_i, I \subset_i A$. Rewriting the above equation we get that F passes the direct-product test (allowing for approximate equality on the intersection) with probability close to 1:

$$\Pr_{\substack{B \sim Y(k) \\ A, A' \supset_k B}} [\Delta(F[A]|_B, F[A']|_B) > 5\delta_1] \leq \delta_1. \quad (7)$$

We will use this observation to find a global function f that agrees with F on $Y(k)$. The proof is essentially the same as proving the soundness of the direct product test on HDX in the 99% regime. We use Claim A.7 to get that the relevant random walks on Y have good expansion since they are derived from restricting X to \mathcal{A} which has large measure.

Finding a global function on $Y(1)$: To find a global function that agrees with F on $Y(k)$, let us first define a set of good indices in $I \subseteq Y(1)$ as follows:

1. For every $i \in Y(1)$ define the quantity, $p_i := \Pr_{\substack{B \sim Y_i(\sqrt{k}-1) \\ B \subset A, A' \sim Y(k)}} [F[A]|_i \neq F[A']|_i]$. If $p_i > \sqrt{6\delta_1}$, do not include i in I .
2. Consider $\mu_i(\mathcal{A})$, the measure of \mathcal{A} in the link of i (with respect to X). Do not include i in I if $\mu_i(\mathcal{A}) < \mu(\mathcal{A})/2$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_i := \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid i \in A\}$ which also equals $Y_i(k-1)$. Our global function f is defined as: $f(i) = \text{Maj}(F[A]|_i \mid A \sim \mathcal{A}_i)$ if the majority exists and arbitrary otherwise.

For every $i \in I$, we will show that this is an overwhelming majority, i.e. with high probability over $A \sim \mathcal{A}_i$, $F[A]|_i = f(i)$. To do so we will first bound the second singular value of the down-up random walk \mathcal{R}_i on $Y_i(k-1)$ defined as: $B \sim Y_i(\sqrt{k}-1), B \subset A, A' \sim Y_i(k-1)$. Let \mathcal{R}'_i be the random walk: $B \sim X_i(\sqrt{k}-1), B \subset A, A' \sim X_i(k-1)$. One can check that $\mathcal{R}_i = \mathcal{R}'_i \mid A, A' \in \mathcal{A}_i$. Lemma 2.8 implies that the second singular value of \mathcal{R}'_i is bounded by $O(1/k)$. Since $\mu(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq \mu(\mathcal{A})/2 \gg 1/k$, by Claim A.7 we get that the induced random walk \mathcal{R}_i has singular value $\sigma_2(\mathcal{R}_i) \leq O(1/k\mu(\mathcal{A}_i)) \leq 1/\sqrt{k}$.

We are ready to prove that $f(i)$ agrees with $F[A]|_i$ for most $A \sim \mathcal{A}_i$. For every $\sigma \in \Sigma$ let $\mathcal{A}_{i,\sigma}$ be the set of $A \in \mathcal{A}_i$ where $F[A]|_i = \sigma$ and let $\pi_{i,\sigma}$ denote its measure inside $Y_i(k-1)$. Using Cheeger's inequality we get that,

$$\frac{1}{2} \Pr_{(A,A') \sim \mathcal{R}_i} [A \in \mathcal{A}_{i,\sigma}, A' \notin \mathcal{A}_{i,\sigma}] \geq (1 - \lambda_2(\mathcal{R}_i))\pi_{i,\sigma}(1 - \pi_{i,\sigma}).$$

Using that $\lambda_2(\mathcal{R}_i) \leq 1/\sqrt{k}$ and summing up the above over $\sigma \in \Sigma$ we get,

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\sigma} \Pr_{(A,A') \sim \mathcal{R}_i} [A \in \mathcal{A}_{i,\sigma}, A' \notin \mathcal{A}_{i,\sigma}] \geq (1 - 1/\sqrt{k})(1 - \sum_{\sigma} \pi_{i,\sigma}^2).$$

The LHS above is equal to $\Pr_{(A,A') \sim \mathcal{R}_i} [F[A]|_i \neq F[A']|_i]$ which equals p_i . By the assumption that i is in I , p_i is less than $\sqrt{6\delta_1}$ so rearranging the above equation we get $\max_{\sigma} \pi_{i,\sigma} \geq 1 - O(\sqrt{\delta_1})$. Since $f(i) = \arg \max_{\sigma} \pi_{i,\sigma}$ it follows that

$$\Pr_{A \sim Y_i(k-1)} [F[A]|_i = f(i)] \geq 1 - O(\sqrt{\delta_1}). \quad (8)$$

Bounding the measure of $I \subseteq Y(1)$: We bound the measure of I , $\pi_1(I)$, by showing that each of the two conditions defining I is violated with small probability. Let us start with condition (1). First we bound the expectation of p_i as follows,

$$\mathbb{E}_{i \sim Y(1)} [p_i] = \Pr_{\substack{i \sim Y(1) \\ B \sim Y_i(\sqrt{k}-1) \\ A, A' \supset_k B}} [F[A]|_i \neq F[A']|_i] = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{B \sim Y(\sqrt{k}) \\ A, A' \supset_k B}} [\Delta(F[A]|_B, F[A']|_B)] \leq 5\delta_1,$$

where we used (7) in the last inequality. Applying Markov's inequality we get that,

$$\Pr_{i \sim Y(1)} [p_i > \sqrt{6\delta_1}] \leq \sqrt{6\delta_1}.$$

Now we will bound the probability of violating condition (2). Using Lemma 2.2 we have that,

$$\Pr_{i \sim X(1)} \left[\mu_i(\mathcal{A}) \leq \frac{\mu(\mathcal{A})}{2} \right] \leq O\left(\frac{1}{k\eta_1}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}.$$

We can translate this bound to $i \sim Y(1)$ in a straightforward way:

$$\Pr_{i \sim Y(1)} \left[\mu_i(\mathcal{A}) \leq \frac{\mu(\mathcal{A})}{2} \right] = \sum_{i \in Y(1)} \pi_1(i) \frac{\mu_i(\mathcal{A})}{\mu(\mathcal{A})} \mathbb{1} \left[\mu_i(\mathcal{A}) \leq \frac{\mu(\mathcal{A})}{2} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \Pr_{i \sim X(1)} \left[\mu_i(\mathcal{A}) \leq \frac{\mu(\mathcal{A})}{2} \right] \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{k}}.$$

By a union bound we conclude that

$$\Pr_{i \sim Y(1)} [i \notin I] \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\right) + \sqrt{6\delta_1} \lesssim \sqrt{\delta_1}. \quad (9)$$

Direct-Product Test Soundness on Y : We are ready to conclude that $\Delta(F[A], f|_A) \lesssim \delta_1^{1/4}$ for a large fraction of $A \sim Y(k)$. We do so by calculating the expectation of $\Delta(F[A], f|_A)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{A \sim Y(k)} [\Delta(F[A], f|_A)] &= \mathbb{E}_{A \sim Y(k)} \mathbb{E}_{i \sim A} [\mathbb{1}[F[A]|_i \neq f(i)]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim Y(1)} \left[\Pr_{A \sim Y_i(k-1)} [F[A]|_i \neq f(i)] \right] \\ &\leq \Pr_{i \sim Y(1)} [i \notin I] + \mathbb{E}_{i \sim Y(1)} \left[\Pr_{A \sim Y_i(k-1)} [F[A]|_i \neq f(i)] \mid i \in I \right] \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\delta_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (9) and (8) in the last inequality. Applying Markov's inequality we get

$$\Pr_{A \sim Y(k)} [\Delta(F[A], f|_A) \leq \delta_1^{1/4}] \geq 1 - O(\delta_1^{1/4}).$$

Moving from the complex Y to the complex X we conclude that

$$\Pr_{A \sim X(k)} [\Delta(F[A], f|_A) \leq \delta_1^{1/4}] \geq \mu(\mathcal{A})(1 - O(\delta_1^{1/4})) \geq \frac{\eta_1}{2},$$

which gives us the desired conclusion if we set $\delta_1 = \Theta(\delta^4)$. \square

B Construction of Decodable PCPs

In this section we prove Lemmas 7.7 and 7.8. Both constructions are based on low-degree testing, and in Section B.1 we begin by covering the necessary background about it. In Section B.2 we construct a decodable PCP that has exponential size but constant alphabet size, establishing Lemma 7.7. This construction is based on the Hadamard Code. In Section B.3 we construct a decodable PCP that has polynomial size and quasi-polynomial alphabet size, establishing Lemma 7.8. This construction is based on the Reed-Muller code.

B.1 Preliminaries of Low Degree Testing

Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field. A linear plane $P \subseteq \mathbb{F}^m$ is associated with two points $x, y \in \mathbb{F}^m$ and is equal to the set $P = \{t_1x + t_2y : t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{F}\}$. Suppose $f : \mathbb{F}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a purported linear function. Let \mathcal{A} be an oracle that assigns every plane P in \mathbb{F}^m a linear function $\mathcal{A}(P)$ that is supposedly the restriction of f onto P . Then one can perform the following “plane-vs-point” test to verify if f is indeed linear.

Definition B.1. *Given a function $f : \mathbb{F}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ and a planes oracle \mathcal{A} the plane-vs-point tester proceeds as follows:*

1. *Sample a uniformly random linear plane $P \subset \mathbb{F}^m$ and a random point $x \in P$.*
2. *Accept if $\mathcal{A}(P)(x) = f(x)$, reject otherwise.*

In general we can perform a subspaces-vs-point test given an arbitrary distribution over subspaces that is well-behaved in the following sense:

Definition B.2. *Let π be a distribution over tuples of vectors $(x_1, \dots, x_t) \in \mathbb{F}_q^t$. Abusing notation, we use π to also denote the induced distribution of $\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_t)$ where (x_1, \dots, x_t) are sampled according to π . Let \mathcal{D}_1 be the joint distribution over $(\text{span}(x_1, \dots, x_t), P)$ where $(x_1, \dots, x_t) \sim \pi$ and $P = \text{span}(\sum c_i x_i, \sum c'_i x_i)$ for $c_i, c'_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ chosen independently and uniformly. Let \mathcal{D}_2 be the distribution over (Ω, P) where a plane P is drawn uniformly from \mathbb{F}_q^n and Ω is then drawn from π conditioned on containing P . We say that π is η -good if the total-variation distance of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 is at most η .*

The following linearity-testing theorem, first proved in [HW01], provides a list-decoding guarantee for the plane-vs-point linearity test. One can get soundness for the generalized subspaces-vs-point test using a simple reduction, so long as the associated distribution over subspaces is good. We use a version of the linearity-testing as stated in [MR08].

Lemma B.3. *There exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds. For all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and primes q that are large enough the following holds. Let \mathbb{F} be a field of size q and let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\delta \geq \frac{1}{q^c}$. For any function $f : \mathbb{F}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, there exists a list of linear functions L_1, L_2, \dots, L_t for $t = O(\frac{1}{\delta^3})$ such that the following holds for any planes oracle \mathcal{A} (even for a randomized one):*

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, P, x \in P} [\mathcal{A}(P)(x) \neq f(x) \vee \exists i \in [t], L_i|_P \equiv \mathcal{A}(P)] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Furthermore the same holds for subspaces Ω sampled from an η -good distribution π ,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, \Omega \sim \pi, x \in \Omega} [\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) \neq f(x) \vee \exists i \in [t], L_i|_P \equiv \mathcal{A}(P)] \geq 1 - \delta - \eta.$$

Proof. The proof of the first statement can be found in [HW01, MR08], and we provide a proof of the second statement by reducing it to the first.

Let π be an η -good distribution over subspaces and let \mathcal{A} be any subspace oracle. Consider a randomized planes oracle \mathcal{B} defined as follows: given a plane P , $\mathcal{B}(P)$ is defined as $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)|_P$ for $\Omega \sim \pi \mid \Omega \supset P$. By the soundness of linearity testing, there is a list of $t = \text{poly}(1/\delta)$ linear functions L_1, \dots, L_t such that

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{B}, P, x \in P} [\mathcal{B}(P)(x) = f(x) \vee \exists i, L_i|_P \equiv \mathcal{B}(P)] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Let \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 be the distribution over (Ω, P) as specified in Definition B.2. Rewriting the above we get,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, (\Omega, P) \sim \mathcal{D}_2, x} [\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) = f(x) \vee \exists i : L_i|_P \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)|_P] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2},$$

and since π is η -good we conclude that

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, (\Omega, P) \sim \mathcal{D}_1, x} [\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) = f(x) \vee \exists i : L_i|_P = \mathcal{A}(\Omega)|_P] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} - \eta.$$

Above we have the agreement of L_i with $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ on a random P chosen from Ω instead of over all of Ω . However, by a standard Schwartz-Zippel argument, for any i and Ω , since P contains a random point in Ω we get

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, P} [L_i \neq \mathcal{A}(\Omega) \wedge L_i|_P = \mathcal{A}(\Omega)|_P] \leq \frac{1}{q}.$$

Hence, by a union bound over i , we have:

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, \Omega \sim \pi, x} [\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) = f(x) \vee \exists i : L_i|_\Omega = \mathcal{A}(\Omega)] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} - \eta - \frac{t}{q} \geq 1 - \delta - \eta. \quad \square$$

Suppose that now we want to verify whether a function $f : \mathbb{F}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ has degree at most d . Let \mathcal{A} be an oracle that assigns every affine plane $P \subset \mathbb{F}^m$ (namely, a set of the form $P = \{x + t_1y + t_2z \mid t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{F}\}$ for some $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}^m$) a polynomial of degree at most d , denoted by $\mathcal{A}(P)$. The polynomial $\mathcal{A}(P)$ is supposedly the restriction of f onto P . Then one can perform the same plane-vs-point test as above. The theorem below, first proved in [RS97], provides a list-decoding guarantee for the plane-vs-point test, and by the same reduction as above we also get soundness for the subspaces-vs-point low-degree test. The analogous statement for η -good distributions for subspaces follows by a reduction to the plane-vs-point test along the lines of the proof of Lemma B.3, hence we omit it.

Lemma B.4. *There exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds. Let \mathbb{F} be a field of size q . Let $m, d \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\delta > \left(\frac{md}{q}\right)^c$. For any function $f : \mathbb{F}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, there exists a list of polynomials Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_t of degree at most d where $t = O\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)$, such that the following holds for any planes table \mathcal{A} (even a randomized one):*

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, P, x \in P} [\mathcal{A}(P)(x) \neq f(x) \vee \exists i \in [t], Q_i|_P \equiv \mathcal{A}(P)] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Furthermore the same holds for subspaces sampled from an η -good distribution π ,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, \Omega \sim \pi, x \in \Omega} [\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) \neq f(x) \vee \exists i \in [t], Q_i|_P \equiv \mathcal{A}(P)] \geq 1 - \delta - \eta.$$

B.2 Proof of Lemma 7.7: Hadamard-based dPCP

In this section we build a dPCP for Circuit-SAT that encodes a satisfying assignment of n bits using $2^{O(n^2)}$ symbols from an alphabet of size $O(1)$. Our reduction goes through the Quadratic Equations problem, defined as follows:

Definition B.5. An instance (X, E) of Quadratic Equations over a field \mathbb{F} , abbreviated as $QE_{m,n}(\mathbb{F})$, is a system of m quadratic equations E in the variables $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and the goal is to decide whether the system is satisfiable or not. The value of an instance Q of QE is the maximum fraction of equations satisfied by any $x \in \mathbb{F}$ and is denoted by $\text{val}(Q)$.

Lemma B.6 (Lemma 7.7 restated). For all $\delta > 0$, for $q = 1/\delta^{O(1)}$ and for all alphabets Σ , the language $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(N, S)$ has a regular decodable PCP with the following parameters:

1. Robust soundness error δ .
2. Proof alphabet size q .
3. Proof length $q^{O(S^2)}$.
4. Randomness complexity $O(S^2 \log(q))$.
5. Query complexity $q^{O(\log|\Sigma|)}$.
6. Decision complexity $q^{O(\log|\Sigma|)}$.
7. List size $1/\delta^{O(1)}$.

Proof. We start with an overview of this proof. We reduce the CircuitSAT problem to Gap-Quadratic-Equations (QE) over \mathbb{F}_q , i.e. the problem of deciding whether a system of quadratic equations over \mathbb{F}_q is satisfiable or has value at most $O(1/q)$. Then we reduce this to Gap-Generalized Label Cover, with the right side of vertices being points in $\mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ and the left side of vertices is low-dimensional subspaces, where n is the number of variables in the QE instance Q . The assignment $X \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ to Q is thought of as coefficients of a linear function; in fact, to facilitate checking quadratic equations in X we encode the vector $(X, X^{\otimes 2}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ using the Hadamard code. The prover is supposed to provide the evaluation of this function on the left and right side of vertices. Additionally the left side is constructed so that it contains a random equation and vectors corresponding to the locations of X that the verifier wants to decode at. Using the soundness of linearity testing, by querying a random left vertex and a random right vertex inside it, the verifier can reject if the prover assignment is not an evaluation of $(X, X^{\otimes 2})$ or if X does not satisfy Q . If it does not reject, then with high probability, it is able to decode the required values of X .

We now proceed to the formal proof.

Reduction to Quadratic Equations: Let $\Sigma = [r]$ and C be an instance of $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(N, S)$, i.e. C is a Boolean function, $C : \Sigma^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ also represented by an S -sized circuit C that computes the equivalent function, $C : \{0, 1\}^{N \log r} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Let the Σ -valued variables be denoted by $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$, and each y_i is associated to a block of $\log r$ Boolean variables, denoted by $(z_{(i,1)}, \dots, z_{(i,\log r)})$. We will use this identification to move back and forth between the Y and Z variables.

Let us start by reducing the CircuitSAT problem to $\text{QE}(\mathbb{F}_2)$ while preserving satisfiability. This reduction is standard, following the proof of the Cook-Levin theorem. Formally, we get an instance $Q_1 = (X, E_1)$ on $n = O(S)$ Boolean variables denoted by $X = (Z, B)$ (where B is a set of auxiliary variables that the reduction produces) and $m_1 = O(n)$ equations, and we have the property that X is a satisfying assignment for Q_1 if and only if Z satisfies the circuit C .

Generating a gap for QE: Fix a prime number $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q = 1/\delta^C$ for a large enough absolute constant $C > 0$ to be chosen later. Firstly, consider the instance $Q_2 = (X, E_2)$ over \mathbb{F}_q where $E_2 = E_1 \cup \{x_i^2 - x_1 = 0\}_{i \in [n]}$ with $|E_2| = m_2$. It is easy to see that X is a satisfying assignment for E_1 if and only if it satisfies E_2 . Let C be any linear code with the generating matrix $G \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times m_2}$ with $m = O(m_2)$ and distance $\geq 1 - 2/q$ (such a code can be constructed in polynomial time by concatenation of standard error correcting codes). Then consider the instance $Q = (X, E)$ with $|E| = m$, where the j^{th} -equation in E is the linear combination of equations from Q_1 where the k th equation is multiplied by $G_{j,k}$. If X satisfies Q_1 then it also satisfies Q_2 , but if Q_1 is unsatisfiable then using the distance of C we get that every assignment X satisfies at most $2/q$ -fraction of the equations in E , i.e. $\text{val}(Q_2) \leq 2/q$.

Construction of Label-Cover Instance: We now construct a generalized label cover instance Ψ using the Hadamard code. The left vertex set L of Ψ , is $(\log r + O(1))$ -dimensional linear subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ endowed with a distribution π_L and the right side R is points in $\mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$.

To describe π_L we start with some notation. Recall that the i^{th} variable y_i for $i \in [N]$ is associated to a block of variables $(z_{(i,1)}, \dots, z_{(i, \log r)})$ whose indices are a subset of $[n]$. Each variable $z_{(i,k)}$ corresponds to the vector $\vec{e}_{(i,k)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ that has a 1 in the (i, k) -location (that occurs in the first block of n indices) and 0 everywhere else. Let $S_i = \{\vec{e}_{(i,k)} : k \leq \log r\}$. Additionally, let the j^{th} -equation in E be $\langle (X, X \otimes X), E_j \rangle = b_j$ for some $E_j \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$, $b_j \in \mathbb{F}_q$.

To pick a random vertex from π_L , sample $i \sim [N]$, $j \sim [m]$, $y \sim \mathbb{F}_q^n$, $z, z' \sim \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ and then pick the subspace $\Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ defined as $\text{span}(S_i, E_j, (y, 0), (0, y \otimes y), z, z')$. For notational convenience, we drop the subscript in Ω when clear from context.

We now discuss the alphabets for Ψ , also viewed as a prover assignment. As an assignment to the right-side, the prover is supposed to provide us with a linear function $L = (A, A \otimes A)$ mapping a point $C \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ to $\langle L, C \rangle = \sum_{i \in [n]} C_i L_i + \sum_{i,j \in [n]} C_{ij} L_{ij}$, where A is a satisfying assignment for Q . On the left side the prover is supposed to provide the restriction of L to each subspace. Formally,

1. **Right Alphabet:** For each point in $V = \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ the prover provides a value in \mathbb{F}_q . That is, an assignment of the prover to the vertices on the right side is thought of as a points oracle $f : \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$.
2. **Left Alphabet:** For each subspace $\Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'}$ the prover provides a degree 1 polynomial $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ via its coefficients ($\dim(\Omega)$ -many) on the subspace. For convenience of notation we represent $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ as a vector in $\mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$, although this choice is not unique. The evaluations of $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ must satisfy,
 - $\langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), E_j \rangle = b_j$.
 - $\langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), (0, y \otimes y) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), (y, 0) \rangle^2$.

Note that the right alphabet size is q and left alphabet size is at most $q^{O(\log r)}$. Given this we have the following PCP decoder— at input $i \in [N]$,

1. Randomly sample $\Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'} \sim \pi_L|_i$ and $x \sim \Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'}$.
2. If $\langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), x \rangle \neq L(x)$ output \perp , else output the symbol $F(\Omega, x) \in \Sigma$ corresponding to the tuple $(\langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), \vec{e}_{(i,1)} \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), \vec{e}_{(i, \log r)} \rangle)$.

Completeness: Suppose the CircuitSAT instance C we started with is satisfiable, and let A' be a satisfying assignment. In that case the QE instance Q we generated is satisfiable, and we can pick an assignment B to the auxiliary variables so that the assignment $A = (A', B)$ satisfies Q . Assign the right-side of the label cover according to the linear function $L = (A, A \otimes A)$, i.e. every point $v \in V$ is assigned the value $\langle L, v \rangle$. For each subspace $\Omega \in U$ assign the linear function $\mathcal{A}(\Omega) = L|_{\Omega}$. It is easy to check that the left assignment satisfies all the conditions that the left alphabet is supposed to. Furthermore,

$$\Pr_{\substack{i \sim [N] \\ \Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'} \sim \pi_L | i \\ x \sim \Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'}}} [F(\Omega, x) = (A(i, 1), \dots, A(i, \log r))] = 1.$$

Soundness: We will now verify the soundness condition, and assume that the initial CircuitSAT instance C is unsatisfiable. Fix an assignment f to the right vertices of the label cover instance. We start by verifying that the distribution π_L is good.

Claim B.7. *The distribution π_L is $O(1/q)$ -good.*

Proof. Consider the distribution \mathcal{D}_1 that samples $\Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'} \sim \pi$ where

$$\Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'} = \text{span}(S_i, E_j, (y, 0), (0, y \otimes y), z, z'),$$

and then samples $P \subseteq \Omega$ with

$$P = \text{span}(c_1 \vec{e}_{(i,1)} + \dots + c_{r+4} z + c_{r+5} z', c'_1 \vec{e}_{(i,1)} + \dots + c'_{r+4} z + c'_{r+5} z')$$

for uniformly and independently chosen $c_i, c'_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$. If c_{r+4}, c'_{r+5} are both not equal to zero and both $z, z' \neq 0$, which happens with probability at least $1 - O(1/q)$, then the marginal on $P \sim \mathcal{D}_1$ is the same as a uniformly random plane. Therefore the total variation distance between the distributions $P \sim \mathcal{D}_1, \Omega \sim \mathcal{D}_1 | P$ and $P \sim \mathcal{D}_2, \Omega \sim \mathcal{D}_2 | P$ is at most $O(1/q)$, as required. \square

By Claim B.7 we may use Lemma B.3 to get a list of linear functions $L_1, \dots, L_t \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$ for $t = O\left(\frac{1}{\delta^3}\right)$ such that for all plane oracles \mathcal{A} ,

$$\Pr_{\Omega, x} [\langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), x \rangle \neq f(x) \vee \exists j \text{ such that } L_j|_{\Omega} \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{4} - O\left(\frac{1}{q}\right). \quad (10)$$

We will now prune the above list of linear functions so that we are only left with L_j such that:

1. $L_j = (A_j, A_j \otimes A_j)$ for some $A_j \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$.
2. L_j satisfies the quadratic system Q , i.e. $\langle L_j, E_k \rangle = b_k$ for all $k \in [m]$.

Denote by Good the set of indices $j \in [t]$ for which L_j satisfies both of the conditions above. First note that if L_j is good then A_j is a satisfying assignment for Q . Therefore let us bound the probability that for some $j \notin \text{Good}$, $\mathcal{A}(\Omega) \equiv L_j|_{\Omega}$.

Fix such an index j . Suppose condition (1) is violated for $L_j = (A_j, B_j)$, i.e. $B_j \neq A_j \otimes A_j$. Then consider the degree 2 polynomials $B_j(y) = \langle B_j, y \otimes y \rangle$ and $A_j'(y) = \langle A_j \otimes A_j, y \otimes y \rangle = \langle A_j, y \rangle^2$ for $y \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. By the Schwartz-Zippel lemma $B_j(y) \neq A_j'(y)$ for at least $\left(1 - \frac{2}{q}\right)$ -fraction of y . Since $\Omega \sim \pi_L$ contains a random y we get that $\langle L_j, (0, y \otimes y) \rangle \neq \langle A_j, y \rangle^2$, thus implying that $\langle L_j, (0, y \otimes y) \rangle \neq$

$\langle L_j, (y, 0) \rangle^2$ with probability at least $1 - O(1/q)$ over π_L . However, since our assignment \mathcal{A} always satisfies $\langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), (0, y \otimes y) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), (y, 0) \rangle^2$, we see that the probability, for a random Ω , that $L_j|_\Omega \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ is at most $O(1/q)$.

Let us now suppose that L_j violates (2). Then it can only satisfy $\frac{2}{q}$ -fraction of the equations in E since $\text{val}(Q) \leq \frac{2}{q}$ (when it is unsatisfiable). Again since a random Ω contains a random equation $E_k \sim E$, and $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ satisfies E_k , we get that $L_j|_\Omega \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ with probability at most $O(1/q)$. Thus, we have shown that for any bad L_j ,

$$\Pr_{\Omega} [L_j|_{\Omega} \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)] \lesssim 1/q.$$

Hence, a simple union bound gives us that a modification of (10) holds,

$$\Pr_{\Omega, x} [\langle \mathcal{A}(\Omega), x \rangle \neq f(x) \vee \exists j \in \text{Good} : L_j|_{\Omega} \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{4} - O\left(\frac{t}{q}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (11)$$

where the last inequality holds by choosing $q \geq \Omega(1/\delta^4)$. Reformulating (11) we get that there is a list of satisfying assignments $(A_j)_{j \in \text{Good}}$ for Q such that for all \mathcal{A} ,

$$\Pr_{\substack{i \sim [N] \\ \Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'} \sim \pi_L|_i \\ x \sim \Omega_{i,j,y,z,z'}}} [F(\Omega, x) \in \{\perp\} \cup \{(A_j(i, 1), \dots, A_j(i, \log r)) : j \in \text{Good}\}] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (12)$$

which completes the proof of soundness of Ψ .

Modifying Ψ to be regular: The label cover instance Ψ may not be regular, but this is easy to fix as we explain now. First for simplicity we put in a vertex on the left for every choice of randomness so that we now have a uniform distribution over the left-side of vertices (instead of π_L). Note that the degree of a subspace Ω on the left is equal to $q^{\dim(\Omega)}$, therefore we can make it regular by throwing away the subspaces that have small dimension, which are at most a $O(1/q)$ -fraction of all the subspaces.

To make the instance right-regular first note that the distribution on the right side of Ψ is $\varepsilon := O(1/q)$ -TV-close to uniform (the proof is the same as that of Claim B.7). Let d_u be the degree of $u \in R$, let d be the average right degree, and let N be the number of vertices on the right. We discard the right vertices u for which $|d_u - d| \geq d\sqrt{\varepsilon}$, which is at most $\leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ -fraction of all points in $\mathbb{F}_q^{n+n^2}$. Next we add some dummy vertices on the left, and then to each vertex on the right we add at most $\sqrt{\varepsilon}d$ edges to the dummy vertices so that the resulting right vertex set is regular. By discarding the high-degree vertices on the right we might have ruined the left regularity by a bit, so we add some dummy vertices on the right to bring the left degree back to the original. This whole operation costs us at most $1/\sqrt{q}$ in the soundness, which means that (12) holds with probability $\geq 1 - \delta$.

Converting to a robust PCP: Using the equivalence between generalized Label Cover and robust PCPs in Lemma 7.3, one gets that this is a regular robust decodable PCP, thus finishing the proof. \square

B.3 Proof of Lemma 7.8: Reed-Muller based dPCP

In this section we build a dPCP for $\text{CircuitSAT}_{\Sigma}$ that has polynomial size and uses an alphabet of quasi-polynomial size. We follow the exposition from the lecture notes [HS10] very closely.

B.3.1 Zero on Subcube Test

The Zero-on-Subcube Testing problem is the following: given a subset $H \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ and a function f we want to test if $f \equiv 0$ on H^m and $\deg(f) \leq d$. This section contains several helpful tools about the zero-on-subcube testing problem, and as the proofs are straightforward we omit them. The claim below is a useful starting point in designing a local test for this problem.

Claim B.8. *A polynomial f of degree at most d is identically zero over H^m if and only if there exist polynomials P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m of degree at most d such that*

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m g_H(x_i) P_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m),$$

where $g_H(x)$ denotes the univariate polynomial $\prod_{h \in H} (x - h)$.

Let us now state a local test for verifying if $f \equiv 0$ on H^m along with $\deg(f) \leq d$. Let \mathcal{A} be a planes oracle such that for each affine plane P , $\mathcal{A}(P)$ is an $(m+1)$ -tuple $(P_0, P_1, P_2, \dots, P_m)$ of polynomials of degree at most d such that

$$P_0 = \sum_i g_H(x_i) P_i.$$

Similarly let \bar{f} be a points oracle that is an $(m+1)$ -tuple of functions $\bar{f} = (f, f_1, \dots, f_m)$ from \mathbb{F}^m to \mathbb{F} .

Definition B.9. *The zero-on-subcube test then proceeds as follows,*

1. *Sample an affine plane P uniformly at random and a random point x from it.*
2. *Query the planes oracle for $\mathcal{A}(P)$ and the points oracle for $\bar{f}(x)$.*
3. *Accept iff $\mathcal{A}(P)(x) = \bar{f}(x)$.*

It is easy to prove the soundness of the Zero-on-Subcube test using the soundness of the plane-vs-point test, namely Claim B.8, and an application of the Schwartz-Zippel lemma.

Lemma B.10. *There exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds. Let \mathbb{F} be a field of size q , let $H \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, let $m, d \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ and let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\delta \geq \left(\frac{(d+|H|)^m}{q}\right)^c$. For any function $f : \mathbb{F}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, there exists a list of polynomial maps $\overline{Q^{(1)}}, \dots, \overline{Q^{(t)}}$, with $\deg(\overline{Q^{(i)}}) \leq d$ and $\overline{Q^{(i)}} \equiv 0$ on H^m , where $t = O\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ such that the following holds for any planes oracle \mathcal{A} (even for a randomized one):*

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, P, x \sim P} \left[\mathcal{A}(P)(x) \neq \bar{f}(x) \vee \exists i \in [t], \overline{Q^{(i)}}|_P \equiv \mathcal{A}(P) \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Furthermore the same holds for subspaces sampled from an η -good distribution π ,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}, \Omega \sim \pi, x \sim \Omega} \left[\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) \neq \bar{f}(x) \vee \exists i \in [t], \overline{Q^{(i)}}|_P \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega) \right] \geq 1 - \delta - \eta.$$

Proof. The proof can be found in [HS10]. □

B.3.2 Proof of Lemma 7.8

In this section we prove Lemma 7.8, restated below.

Lemma B.11 (Lemma 7.8 restated). *For all $\delta > 0$ and all alphabets Σ , $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(N, S)$ has a regular decodable PCP with the following parameters:*

1. *Robust soundness error δ .*
2. *Proof alphabet size and proof length at most $S^{O(1)}$.*
3. *Randomness complexity at most $O(\log S)$.*
4. *Query and decision complexity at most $(\log(S))^{O(\log |\Sigma|)}$.*
5. *List size at most $1/\delta^{O(1)}$.*

Proof. The proof is broken into several steps.

Reduction to 3-SAT: Let $\Sigma = [r]$ and \mathcal{C} be an instance of $\text{CircuitSAT}_\Sigma(N, S)$, i.e. \mathcal{C} is a Boolean function, $\mathcal{C} : \Sigma^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ also represented by an S -sized circuit \mathcal{C} that computes the equivalent function, $\mathcal{C} : \{0, 1\}^{N \log r} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Let the Σ -valued variables be denoted by $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$, and each y_i is associated to a block of $\log r$ Boolean variables, denoted by $(z_{(i,1)}, \dots, z_{(i,\log r)})$. We will use this identification to move back and forth between the Y and Z variables.

Let us start by reducing the CircuitSAT problem to 3-SAT while preserving satisfiability, again using the Cook-Levin reduction. Formally, we get a 3-SAT instance φ on $n = O(S)$ Boolean variables denoted by $X = (z, b)$ where b is a set of auxiliary variables that the reduction produces, and we have the property that X is a satisfying assignment for φ if and only if Z satisfies \mathcal{C} .

Arithmetization: Next, we perform an ‘‘arithmetization’’ procedure on φ . Let \mathbb{F} be a field of size $q = \log^C n$, for some large absolute constant $C > 0$ to be chosen later. Fix any subset H of \mathbb{F} such that H contains $\{0, 1\}$, $|H| = \Theta(\log n)$ and there is an integer $m = \Theta(\log n / \log \log n)$ such that $|H|^m = n$; we will identify $[n]$ with H^m and use these interchangeably. We will get a polynomial representation of the formula φ . For each possible clause of 3 variables, the polynomial encodes whether the clause belongs to φ or not. We think of the formula φ as a function mapping $[n]^3 \times \{0, 1\}^3$ to $\{0, 1\}$ as follows:

$$\varphi(i, j, k, b_1, b_2, b_3) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_i^{b_1} \vee x_j^{b_2} \vee x_k^{b_3} \text{ is a clause in } \varphi, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where x_i^0 and x_i^1 represent the negative and positive instances of x_i , respectively. Since we have identified H^m with $[n]$ and H contains $\{0, 1\}$, we can think of φ as a function from H^{3m+3} to \mathbb{F} (define φ to be 0 outside the points mentioned above). As in the case of the assignment, we can define a polynomial $\tilde{\varphi}$ over $3m + 3$ variables of degree $O(m|H|)$ that agrees with φ on H^{3m} . Similarly, every Boolean assignment $A : [n] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ can also be thought of as a function mapping H^m to \mathbb{F} . Let $A(x)$ also denote the polynomial of degree $O(m|H|)$ on \mathbb{F}^m that agrees with A when evaluated on inputs from H^m . Given the polynomials $\tilde{\varphi}$ and A define $p_{\varphi, A}$ on \mathbb{F}^{3m+3} as follows,

$$p_{\varphi, A}(i, j, k, b_1, b_2, b_3) = \tilde{\varphi}(i, j, k, b_1, b_2, b_3)(A(i) - b_1)(A(j) - b_2)(A(k) - b_3).$$

Note that $\deg(p_{\varphi, A}) \leq O(m|H|)$. We have the following claim (we omit the straightforward proof).

Claim B.12. *Let A be any polynomial defined on m variables. Assume the polynomial $p_{\varphi, A}$ is constructed from A as above. Then, $p_{\varphi, A}$ is identically zero on H^{3m+3} if and only if $A|_{H^m}$ is a satisfying assignment for the formula φ .*

Construction of Label-Cover Instance: Given φ we will construct the label cover instance Ψ . The left-side L will be $O(\log r)$ -dimensional linear subspaces of \mathbb{F}^{3m+3} endowed with a distribution π_L and the right side R will be \mathbb{F}^{3m+3} . First define the linear map $\rho : \mathbb{F}^{3m+3} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{3m+3}$ as

$$\rho(i, j, k, b_1, b_2, b_3) = (k, i, j, b_1, b_2, b_3).$$

Recall that the i^{th} variable for $i \in [N]$ is associated to a block of variables $\{(i, 1), \dots, (i, \log r)\} \subseteq [n]$ which in turn corresponds to a $\log r$ -sized set $S_i \subset H^m$. To pick a random subspace from π_L first sample $i \sim [N]$, extend each element in S_i randomly to $3m + 3$ coordinates to get a $\log r$ -sized set $\tilde{S}_i \subset \mathbb{F}^{3m+3}$. Then sample $y, y', z \sim \mathbb{F}^m$, and $z' \sim \mathbb{F}^m$ such that the first m coordinates of z' are the same as the first m coordinates of z and the remaining coordinates are uniformly chosen from \mathbb{F}^{2m+3} . Then pick the subspace $\Omega_{\tilde{S}_i, y, y', z, z'}$ defined as $\text{span}(\tilde{S}_i, y, y', z, z', \rho(z), \rho^2(z))$. For notational convenience, we drop the subscript in $\Omega_{\tilde{S}_i, y, y', z, z'}$ when clear from context. The PCP we construct is based on the zero-on-subcube test for subspaces, where the prover is supposed to prove that $p_{\varphi, A}$ is zero over H^m while also allowing us to decode coordinates of A .

1. **Right Alphabet:** For each point in $R = \mathbb{F}^{3m+3}$, the prover provides a $(3m + 5)$ -tuple of values in \mathbb{F} . This can also be thought of as a “points oracle” or a collection of functions $\bar{f} : \mathbb{F}^{3m+3} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{3m+5}$, $\bar{f} = (f_{-1}, f_0, \dots, f_{3m+3})$.
2. **Left Alphabet:** For each subspace $\Omega_{\tilde{S}_i, y, y', z, z'} \in L$, the prover provides $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ which is a $(3m + 5)$ -tuple of polynomials $(p_{-1}, p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{3m+3})$ of degree $O(m|H|)$ defined on Ω such that:
 - $p_0(x) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3m+3} g_H(x_j) p_j(x)$ for each $x \in L(\Omega)$.
 - $p_{-1}(z) = p_{-1}(z')$.
 - $p_0(z) = \tilde{\varphi}(z)(p_{-1}(z) - z_{3m+1})(p_{-1}(\rho(z)) - z_{3m+2})(p_{-1}(\rho^2(z)) - z_{3m+3})$.

This can be thought of as a “subspaces oracle”. Each polynomial p_i is provided via its values on the subspace.

Note that the right alphabet has size $q = \text{poly} \log(S)$ and the left alphabet for each subspace is a subset of $[q]^{(3m+5)D}$, where D denotes the number of points in any $O(\log r)$ -dimensional subspace, which is at most $q^{O(\log r)}$. It is easy to check that given $\sigma \in [q]^{(3m+5)D}$, one can decide whether it belongs to $\Sigma_L(\Omega)$ (that is, it satisfies the three properties that the left-alphabet is supposed to) with a circuit of polynomial size, i.e. size equal to $(3m + 5)q^{O(\log r)} \log q = (\log S)^{O(\log r)}$.

Given this our PCP decoder is simple – given $i \in [N]$:

1. Randomly sample $\Omega_{\tilde{S}_i, y, y', z, z'} \sim \pi_L|_i$ and $x \sim \Omega_{\tilde{S}_i, y, y', z, z'}$.
2. If $\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) \neq \bar{f}(x)$, output \perp , else output the symbol $F(\Omega, x) \in \Sigma$ that corresponds to the tuple $(p_{-1}(z))_{z \in \tilde{S}_i}$.

Completeness: Suppose \mathcal{C} is satisfiable. Then φ is also satisfiable, and we let A be some satisfying assignment for it (whose first $N \log r$ variables correspond to a satisfiable assignment of \mathcal{C}). Additionally let $\tilde{A} : \mathbb{F}^{3m+3} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ be the polynomial $\tilde{A}(i, j, k, b_1, b_2, b_3) = A(i)$. Let $f_{-1} = \tilde{A}$ and $f_0 = p_{\varphi, A}$. We know that $p_{\varphi, A}$ is zero on H^m therefore by Claim B.8 we get the witness polynomials $f_1 = P_1, \dots, f_{3m+3} = P_{3m+3}$, with $p_{\varphi, A} = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 3m+3} g_H(x_j) P_j(x)$. Then assign the right-side of the label cover to be $\bar{f} = (f_{-1}, f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{3m+3})$. To assign the left-side of Ψ , for each subspace Ω let $\mathcal{A}(\Omega) = (p_{-1}, \dots, p_{3m+3})$

with p_i being the restriction of f_i to Ω . It is easy to check that the p_i 's satisfy all the conditions they are supposed to. Furthermore,

$$\Pr_{\substack{i \sim [N] \\ \Omega_{\tilde{S}_i, y, y', z, z'} \sim \pi_L | i \\ x \sim \Omega_{\tilde{S}_i, y, y', z, z'}}} [F(\Omega, x) = (A(i, 1), \dots, A(i, \log r))] = 1.$$

Soundness: Towards establishing the soundness of the reduction, we first prove that π_L is good.

Claim B.13. *The distribution π_L is $O(1/q)$ -good.*

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Claim B.7. \square

Fix an assignment f to the label cover instance. Using Lemma B.10 we get that there exists a short list of polynomial maps $\overline{Q^{(1)}}, \dots, \overline{Q^{(t)}}$ for $t = O(\frac{1}{\delta})$, such that for all j , $Q_0^{(j)}$ is zero on the subcube H^m and $\deg(\overline{Q^{(j)}}) \leq d$, and for all plane oracles \mathcal{A}

$$\Pr_{\Omega \sim \pi_L, x \sim \Omega} [\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) \neq \overline{f}(x) \vee \exists j \text{ such that } \overline{Q^{(j)}}|_{\Omega} \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (13)$$

We will now prune the above list of polynomial maps so that we are only left with those tuples $Q^{(j)}$ such that $Q_0^{(j)}$ is $p_{\varphi, A}$ for some satisfying assignment A of the formula φ , and yet the above condition holds for this smaller list of polynomials. Let Good be the set of indices $j \in [t]$ for which $\overline{Q^{(j)}}$ satisfies:

1. For all $x \in \mathbb{F}^{3m+3}$,

$$\overline{Q_0^{(j)}}(x) = \tilde{\varphi}(x)(\overline{Q_{-1}^{(j)}}(x) - x_{3m+1})(\overline{Q_{-1}^{(j)}}(\rho(x)) - x_{3m+2})(\overline{Q_{-1}^{(j)}}(\rho^2(x)) - x_{3m+3}).$$

2. For all $z_1 \in \mathbb{F}^m$ and $z_2, z_3 \in \mathbb{F}^{2m+3}$,

$$\overline{Q_{-1}^{(j)}}(z_1, z_2) = \overline{Q_{-1}^{(j)}}(z_1, z_3).$$

First note that if j is good then $\overline{Q_0^{(j)}}$ can be associated with a satisfying assignment $A^{(j)}$ for φ . Therefore let us bound the probability that for some $j \notin \text{Good}$, $\mathcal{A}(\Omega) \equiv \overline{Q^{(j)}}|_{\Omega}$.

Fix such an index j . Suppose condition (1) is violated for $\overline{Q^{(j)}}$. By the Schwartz-Zippel lemma, this implies that with probability at least $1 - \frac{d}{q}$ over the choice of a random Ω , the above inequality continues to hold when restricted to Ω , since Ω contains a random z such that z , $\rho(z)$, and $\rho^2(z)$ lie in Ω . However, since our assignment \mathcal{A} always satisfies condition (1) with equality, we see that the probability, for a random Ω , that $\overline{Q^{(j)}}|_{\Omega} \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ is at most $\frac{d}{q}$. Similarly, if (2) above is violated, then it is violated with probability at least $1 - \frac{d}{q}$ over $\Omega \sim \pi_L$, since Ω contains a random z, z' that agree on the first m coordinates. Hence, the probability that $\overline{Q^{(j)}}|_{\Omega} \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)$ is at most d/q . Thus, we have shown that for any bad j ,

$$\Pr_{\Omega} [\overline{Q^{(j)}}|_{\Omega} \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega)] \lesssim \frac{d}{q}.$$

Hence, a simple union bound gives us that a modification of (13) holds:

$$\Pr_{\Omega, x} \left[\mathcal{A}(\Omega)(x) \neq \bar{f}(x) \vee \exists j \in \text{Good} : \overline{Q^{(j)}} \mid_{\Omega} \equiv \mathcal{A}(\Omega) \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} - O\left(\frac{td}{q}\right) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (14)$$

where in the last inequality we used that $\delta \geq \text{poly}(m, |H|/q)$. Reformulating (14) we get that there is a list of satisfying assignments $(A^{(j)})_{j \in \text{Good}}$ such that

$$\Pr_{\substack{i \sim [N] \\ (\tilde{i}, y, y', z, z') \sim \pi_L | i \\ x \sim \Omega_{\tilde{i}, y, y', z, z'}}} \left[F(\Omega, x) \in \{\perp\} \cup \{(A^{(j)}(i, 1), \dots, A^{(j)}(i, \log r)) : j \in \text{Good}\} \right] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

which completes the proof of soundness.

Modifying Ψ to be regular: The proof of regularization of Ψ is the same as that of Lemma B.6, hence we omit it here.

Converting to Robust dPCP: Using the equivalence between generalized Label Cover and robust PCPs in Lemma 7.3, one gets that this is a regular robust decodable PCP. \square

C Proof of Theorem 3.3

Notation: For a graph $G = (V, E)$ let $E(u, S)$ denote the fraction of edges incident of u which are also incident on set $S \subseteq V$. For a set of vertices $\mathcal{V} \subseteq V$, let $G(\mathcal{V})$ denote the induced graph with vertices \mathcal{V} .

Definition C.1. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a subset of vertices $T \subseteq V$ define $Q(T)$ by the following algorithm: Set $Q(T) = V \setminus T$. We now iteratively remove a vertex u from $Q(T)$ if $E(u, V \setminus Q(T)) \geq 1/5$, until $Q(T)$ halts.

The proof of Theorem 3.3 requires the following two lemmas, which are easy consequences of [Upf92, Lemma 1] and [Upf92, Lemma 2].

Lemma C.2. There exists an absolute constant $\alpha > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a regular expander graph with second largest singular value $\sigma_2(G) \leq \alpha$. Let $T \subset V$ be any set such that $|T| \leq \alpha n$. At convergence $|Q(T)| \geq |V| - \mu|T|$ for some universal constant μ .

Lemma C.3. There exists an absolute constant $\alpha > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a regular expander graph with second largest singular value $\sigma_2(G) \leq \alpha$. Let $T \subset V$ be any set such that $|T| \leq \alpha n$. For all $v_1, v_2 \in Q(T)$ there exists a path of length $O(\log n)$ between v_1 and v_2 in $G(V \setminus T)$.

Proof. The conclusion follows immediately from [Upf92, Lemma 2] by setting $T_2 = \emptyset$ and $T_1 = T$ therein. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let $|V| = n, |E| = m$, and $\delta = \frac{n}{m}$. For a pair $u, \pi(u)$, we wish to construct a path between them, which we denote by $P(u)$. Fix $\ell = \Theta(\log n)$ and $t = \Theta(\log^{c+1}(n))$. To construct the paths $P(u)$, we present an algorithm that simply picks the shortest paths between a pair of vertices iteratively and deletes any vertex that has been used at least t times. Note that since paths are of length ℓ , in an ideal scenario where every edge occurred equally then each edge would belong to $O(\delta \cdot \log n)$ paths. Therefore, by taking t to be larger, we allow some slack, which still gives us the uniformity over edges that is sufficient for the later arguments.

We now proceed to the formal argument. Our algorithm proceeds as follows:

- (a) Instantiate $\forall u, P(u) = \perp, \mathcal{V} = V$.
- (b) For every $u \in V$ do the following:
- (i) If $u \notin \mathcal{V}$ set $P(u) = \perp$.
 - (ii) Otherwise, find the shortest path p between u and $\pi(u)$ in the graph $G(\mathcal{V})$. If the length of p is at most ℓ then set $P(u) = p$, else set $P(u) = \perp$.
 - (iii) If any vertex v in \mathcal{V} has been used $\geq t$ times in the paths $\{P(u)\}_u$, then remove it from \mathcal{V} .

It is easy to see that the above algorithm runs in polynomial time in $|E|$ and that every vertex is used at most t times over all paths in $\{P(u)\}_u$. It remains to argue that the algorithm finds paths of length at most ℓ between all but $O\left(\frac{1}{\log^c(n)}\right)$ fraction of the $(u, \pi(u))$ pairs. Let \mathcal{V}_f denote the set \mathcal{V} when the algorithm terminates, and let $\mathcal{V}_0 = V$ denote the set at the start. It is easy to check that the number of vertices that the algorithm removes from \mathcal{V}_0 to get \mathcal{V}_f is at most $\frac{|\mathcal{V}_0| \cdot \ell}{t} = \Theta\left(\frac{n}{\log^c(n)}\right)$ implying that for $T = V \setminus \mathcal{V}_f$, we have that $|T| = |V \setminus \mathcal{V}_f| \leq O\left(\frac{n}{\log^c(n)}\right)$. Using Lemma C.2 we get that $|V \setminus Q(T)| \leq \mu \cdot O\left(\frac{n}{\log^c(n)}\right) = O\left(\frac{n}{\log^c(n)}\right)$. Finally, using Lemma C.3 we get that for all $v_1, v_2 \in Q(T)$ there exists a path of length $O(\log n)$ between v_1 and v_2 in $G(\mathcal{V}_f)$. Hence, our algorithm would also have found a path of length ℓ between them. Since the set $V \setminus Q(T)$ can touch at most $2 \cdot O\left(\frac{1}{\log^c(n)}\right)$ of the $(u, \pi(u))$ pairs, we get that we can find a path of length ℓ for all but $O\left(\frac{1}{\log^c(n)}\right)$ fraction of the $(u, \pi(u))$ pairs. \square

C.1 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Proof Sketch for Theorem 1.5. Note that we say an edge $(u, v) \in G$ is uncorrupted if whenever u transfers a message σ across (u, v) , then v receives σ . Conversely when it is corrupted it behaves arbitrarily. The two main differences between Lemma 4.6 and Theorem 1.5 are:

- Unlike Lemma 4.6, where the value of a single variable is held by all the vertices in a link, in Theorem 1.5 each vertex holds its own message.
- In Lemma 4.6 we transferred a message from u to $\pi(u)$ for a given permutation π , while in Theorem 1.5 we want to transfer messages between all u, v pairs.

To resolve the first difference, the first step in the protocol is to have each vertex u send its message to all the vertices in its link L_u . Similarly, the last step will be to transfer the message from the link of v , L_v , to v . Let E_u be the edges going from u to L_u . Then, each edge only occurs in two of the sets in $\{E_u\}_u$. Hence, it is easy to show by Markov's inequality that if $\leq \varepsilon$ fraction of the edges are corrupted, at most $O(\varepsilon)$ links L_u will have greater than 0.01 fraction of incorrect values. For transferring the message from L_v to v , each vertex in L_v sends its message to v , and v takes the majority of these messages. Hence, if a majority of vertices in L_v hold the correct message, v will receive the correct message. This reduces the problem to the transfer of messages from L_u to L_v . To resolve the aforementioned second difference between Lemma 4.6 and Theorem 1.5, consider $n - 1$ permutations $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_{n-1}$, such that all pairs (u, v) , where $u \neq v$, occur in exactly one of these permutations. We can apply Lemma 4.6 with each of these permutations π_i to obtain a protocol \mathcal{R}_i for message transfer from L_u to $L_{\pi_i(u)}$ such that the message is transmitted correctly for all but $O(\varepsilon)$ fraction of u 's. This gives us a protocol for transferring messages

from L_u to L_v by using the appropriate \mathcal{R}_i such that the message is transmitted correctly for all but $O(\varepsilon)$ fraction of the (u, v) pairs. Finally, using Lemma C.3 and the fact that links are of polylogn size, it follows that each message transmission only requires polylogn computation. \square

D Construction of Variants of the Chapman-Lubotzky Complexes

BY ZHIWEI YUN

D.1 Setup

Fix an odd prime ℓ . Let D be the quaternion algebra over \mathbb{Q} ramified at ℓ and ∞ . Let $V = D^g$ be a D -vector space of dimension g , equipped with a standard Hermitian form $h(x_1, \dots, x_g) = \sum_{i=1}^g N(x_i)$. Let $G = \mathrm{U}(V, h)$ be the unitary group for (V, h) , which is a reductive group over \mathbb{Q} . Then G is a form of the symplectic group Sp_{2g} over \mathbb{Q} .

We have a conjugation-invariant algebraic function (over \mathbb{Q})

$$\mathrm{Tr} : G \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$$

that sends $A : V \rightarrow V$, written as a $g \times g$ matrix with entries in D under a basis of V , to the reduced trace of the sum of diagonal entries of A .

For each prime $p \neq \ell$, $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g, \mathbb{Q}_p}$. The trace function base changed to \mathbb{Q}_p is the usual trace for $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g, \mathbb{Q}_p}$. We choose a subgroup $K_p \subset G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ that is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ under some isomorphism $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \cong \mathrm{Sp}_{2g, \mathbb{Q}_p}$. These subgroups $\{K_p\}_{p \neq \ell}$ are chosen so that for some (equivalently any) integral model \mathcal{G} of G over $\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{Z}[1/N]$, $K_p = \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ for all but finitely many p .

The Lie group $G(\mathbb{R})$ is a compact form of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{C})$. By writing $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}j$, we may identify $G(\mathbb{R})$ with a subgroup of the compact unitary group U_{2g} . The trace function on $G(\mathbb{R})$ becomes the usual trace of a $2g \times 2g$ unitary matrix. In particular, if $A \in G(\mathbb{R})$ has $\mathrm{Tr}(A) = 2g$, then all eigenvalues of A are equal to 1, hence $A = I$ is the identity element.

For each compact open subgroup $H \subset G(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)$, let

$$K_H = G(\mathbb{R}) \times H \times \prod_{p \neq \ell} K_p, \quad \Gamma_H = K_H \cap G(\mathbb{Q}).$$

Let p be a prime different from ℓ . Let \mathcal{B} be the building of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \cong \mathrm{Sp}_{2g, \mathbb{Q}_p}$. Then $G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ acts on \mathcal{B} simplicially. Let

$$K'_H = G(\mathbb{R}) \times H \times G(\mathbb{Q}_p) \times \prod_{q \neq \ell, p} K_q, \quad \Gamma'_H = K'_H \cap G(\mathbb{Q}).$$

Consider the action of Γ'_H on \mathcal{B} via the embedding $\Gamma'_H \subset G(\mathbb{Q}) \subset G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

Proposition D.1. *Suppose the image of H under the trace map is contained in $2g + \ell^b \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ with $\ell^b > 4gp^3$, then for any $1 \neq \gamma \in \Gamma'_H$ and any vertex $v \in \mathcal{B}(0)$, $d(v, \gamma v) \geq 4$.*

Proof. Suppose $\gamma \in \Gamma'_H$ and $v \in \mathcal{B}(0)$ are such that $d(v, \gamma v) < 4$. Consider the rational number $\mathrm{Tr}(\gamma)$. By Lemma D.2 below, the p -adic valuation of $\mathrm{Tr}(\gamma)$ is at least -3 . For any prime $q \neq \ell$ and $q \neq p$, since $\gamma \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_q)$ under an isomorphism $G(\mathbb{Q}_q) \cong \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Q}_q)$, we have that the q -adic valuation of $\mathrm{Tr}(\gamma)$ is ≥ 0 . By assumption, the ℓ -adic valuation of $\mathrm{Tr}(\gamma) - 2g$ is at least b . Finally, by considering trace on $G(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathrm{U}_{2g}$,

we have $|\text{Tr}(\gamma)| \leq 2g$. Combining the above information we see that $2g - \text{Tr}(\gamma)$ takes the form $\frac{a}{p^3}$ for some $\ell^b |a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $|a/p| \leq 4g$, or $|a| \leq 4gp^3$. So if $\ell^b > 4gp^3$, we must have $a = 0$, which means $\text{Tr}(\gamma) = 2g$. Viewing γ as an element in U_{2g} , $\text{Tr}(\gamma)$ is the sum of $2g$ eigenvalues of γ all of which have complex norm 1. The fact $\text{Tr}(\gamma) = 2g$ then forces all eigenvalues of γ to be equal to 1, hence $\gamma = I \in G(\mathbb{Q}) \subset U_{2g}$. \square

Lemma D.2. *If $\gamma \in G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and $v \in \mathcal{B}(0)$ is a vertex such that $d(v, \gamma v) \leq k$, then $\text{Tr}(\gamma) \in p^{-k}\mathbb{Z}_p$.*

Proof. Fix an isomorphism $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \cong \text{Sp}_{2g, \mathbb{Q}_p}$. Let $v = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k = \gamma v$ be a sequence of vertices in \mathcal{B} such that v_i is adjacent to v_{i-1} for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Recall that each vertex of \mathcal{B} corresponds uniquely to a \mathbb{Z}_p -lattice $L \subset \mathbb{Q}_p^{2g}$ such that

$$pL^\vee \subset L \subset L^\vee \subset p^{-1}L.$$

Here, for a \mathbb{Z}_p -lattice $L \subset \mathbb{Q}_p^{2g}$, we write $L^\vee = \{x \in \mathbb{Q}_p^{2g} \mid \langle x, y \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_p, \forall y \in L\}$ (where $\langle -, - \rangle$ is the symplectic form on \mathbb{Q}_p^{2g}).

Two vertices v and v' are adjacent if and only if their corresponding lattices L and L' satisfy either

$$L \subset L' \subset L^\vee$$

or

$$L' \subset L \subset L^\vee.$$

In either case, we have $L' \subset p^{-1}L$.

Let L_i be the lattice corresponding to v_i . Since v_i is adjacent to v_{i-1} , we have $L_i \subset p^{-1}L_{i-1}$. Therefore $\gamma L = L_k \subset p^{-k}L_0 = p^{-k}L$. Under a \mathbb{Z}_p -basis of Λ , γ is then a matrix with $p^{-k}\mathbb{Z}_p$ -entries, hence $\text{Tr}(\gamma) \in p^{-k}\mathbb{Z}_p$. \square

D.2 Construction of H at ℓ

Let $\mathcal{O}_{D, \ell} \subset D_\ell = D \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{Q}_\ell$ be the maximal order. Let $\varpi \in \mathcal{O}_{D, \ell}$ be an element such that $N(\varpi)$ has ℓ -adic valuation 1. For example if D is generated over \mathbb{Q} by i, j such that $i^2 = -1, j^2 = -\ell$ and $ij = -ji$ (where $\ell \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$), then we can take ϖ to be j .

Now $\varpi^i \mathcal{O}_{D, \ell}$ is the two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{D, \ell}$ consisting of elements whose reduced norm is in $\ell^i \mathbb{Z}_\ell$. We have $\varpi^i \mathcal{O}_{D, \ell} / \varpi^{i+1} \mathcal{O}_{D, \ell} \cong \mathbb{F}_{\ell^2}$. The reduced traces of elements in $\varpi^i \mathcal{O}_{D, \ell}$ lie in $\ell^{\lceil i/2 \rceil} \mathbb{Z}_\ell$.

Identify $G(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ with a subgroup of $M_g(D_\ell)$ using the standard basis of $V = D^g$. For $i \geq 0$, let $H(i) \subset G(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ be the subgroup consisting of elements $A \in M_g(\mathcal{O}_{D, \ell})$ such that $A \equiv 1 \pmod{\varpi^i \mathcal{O}_{D, \ell}}$. Then $\text{Tr}(H(i)) \subset 2g + \ell^{\lceil i/2 \rceil} \mathbb{Z}_\ell$.

We have $H(0)/H(1) \cong U_g(\mathbb{F}_\ell)$ (unitary group for a Hermitian space of dimension g over \mathbb{F}_{ℓ^2}), whose cardinality is $\ell^{O(g^2)}$. Direct calculation shows that $H(i)/H(i+1) \cong \text{Sym}^2(\mathbb{F}_{\ell^2}^g)$ if i is odd, which has cardinality ℓ^{g^2+g} , and $H(i)/H(i+1)$ can be identified with $g \times g$ skew-Hermitian matrices with entries in \mathbb{F}_{ℓ^2} , if $i > 0$ is even, which has cardinality ℓ^{g^2} . We conclude that

$$[H(0) : H(i)] = \ell^{i/2 \cdot O(g^2)}. \tag{D.15}$$

The above discussion also shows that $H(1)/H(i)$ is an ℓ -group for $i \geq 1$. Since $H(1) = \varprojlim_i H(1)/H(i)$, $H(1)$ is a pro- ℓ -group. Therefore, for any $i \geq 1$, $H(i)$ is also a pro- ℓ -group.

D.3 Upper bound for $|\Gamma'_H \backslash \mathcal{B}(g)|$

Let $\mathcal{B}(g)$ be the set of g -dimensional (maximal) simplices of \mathcal{B} .

Lemma D.3. *We have $|\Gamma'_{H(0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}(g)| \leq Cp^{O(g^2)}$ for a constant C independent of p (and depending only on g and ℓ).*

Proof. Identify $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ with $\mathrm{Sp}_{2g, \mathbb{Q}_p}$ and let $\mathcal{B}[0]$ be the set of type 0 vertices of \mathcal{B} , namely vertices corresponding to self-dual \mathbb{Z}_p -lattices in \mathbb{Q}_p^{2g} under the symplectic form. Then $\mathcal{B}[0] = \mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Q}_p)/\mathrm{Sp}_{2g}(\mathbb{Z}_p) = G(\mathbb{Q}_p)/K_p$. By construction we have an injection

$$\Gamma'_{H(0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}[0] = \Gamma'_{H(0)} \backslash G(\mathbb{Q}_p)/K_p \hookrightarrow G(\mathbb{Q}) \backslash G(\mathbb{A})/K_{H(0)}.$$

The right side is independent of p and depends only on ℓ and g . Denote by C is cardinality of the right side.

Consider the map $v_0 : \mathcal{B}(g) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}[0]$ sending each g -dimensional simplex to its unique type 0 vertex. The fibers of this map are in bijection with $X(\mathbb{F}_p)$ where X is the flag variety of Sp_{2g} . Therefore fibers of v_0 have cardinality $p^{O(g^2)}$. Passing to the quotient, the fibers of the map $\Gamma'_{H(0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}(g) \rightarrow \Gamma'_{H(0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}[0]$ then also have cardinality $\leq p^{O(g^2)}$. \square

Corollary D.4. *There exists a compact open subgroup $H \subset G(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ such that:*

1. *For any $1 \neq \gamma \in \Gamma'_H$ and any vertex $v \in \mathcal{B}(0)$, $d(v, \gamma v) \geq 4$.*
2. *$|\Gamma'_H \backslash \mathcal{B}(g)| \leq C_{\ell, g} p^{O(g^2)}$ for some constant $C_{\ell, g}$ depending only on ℓ and g .*

Proof. Take a positive integer i such that $4gp^3 < \ell^{\lceil i/2 \rceil} \leq 4gp^3 \ell$. Let $H = H(i)$ as constructed in §D.2. Since $\mathrm{Tr}(H(i)) \subset \ell^{\lceil i/2 \rceil} \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ and $\ell^{\lceil i/2 \rceil} > 4gp^3$, $H = H(i)$ satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition D.1, therefore (1) is satisfied.

For (2), we have

$$|\Gamma'_H \backslash \mathcal{B}(g)| \leq [H(0) : H] |\Gamma'_{H(0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}(g)|. \quad (\text{D.16})$$

By (D.15), we have

$$[H(0) : H] = \ell^{i/2 \cdot O(g^2)} \leq (4gp^3 \ell)^{O(g^2)}. \quad (\text{D.17})$$

By Lemma D.3 we have $|\Gamma'_{H(0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}(g)| \leq Cp^{O(g^2)}$ for a constant C depending only on ℓ and g . Using (D.16) and (D.17) we get

$$|\Gamma'_H \backslash \mathcal{B}(g)| \leq [H(0) : H] |\Gamma'_{H(0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}(g)| \leq (4gp^3 \ell)^{O(g^2)} \cdot Cp^{O(g^2)} = C_{\ell, g} p^{O(g^2)}. \quad \square$$