

Constant-Cost Communication is not Reducible to k -Hamming Distance

Yuting Fang
Ohio State University

Mika Göös
EPFL

Nathaniel Harms
EPFL

Pooya Hatami
Ohio State University

July 30, 2024

Abstract

Every known communication problem whose randomized communication cost is constant (independent of the input size) can be reduced to k -Hamming Distance, that is, solved with a constant number of deterministic queries to some k -Hamming Distance oracle. We exhibit the first examples of constant-cost problems which *cannot* be reduced to k -Hamming Distance.

To prove this separation, we relate it to a natural coding-theoretic question. For $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we say an encoding function $E: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an f -code if it transforms Hamming distances according to $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = f(\text{dist}(x, y))$ whenever f is defined. We prove that, if there exist f -codes for infinitely many n , then f must be affine: $f(4) = (f(2) + f(6))/2$.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	A New Constant-Cost Problem	2
1.2	Hamming Distance Encoding Theorem	3
1.3	Hierarchies and a General Class of Constant-Cost Problems	5
1.4	Constant-Cost Communication: the Story so Far and Farther	7
2	Proof Overview	7
2.1	Step 1: Structure Theorem for f -Codes	8
2.2	Step 2: Extracting f -Codes from Oracle Protocols	9
3	Single-Player f-Codes	11
3.1	Sparsification	14
3.2	Sunflowers to sunflowers	14
4	Two-Player f-Codes	16
4.1	Sparsification	18
5	Separations from the k-Hamming Distance Hierarchy	20
5.1	Definitions: Communication, Oracles, and Reductions	20
5.2	Extracting f -Codes from k -Hamming Distance Oracles	21
5.3	A $\{k, k\}$ -Hamming Distance Hierarchy	25
6	Invariance Lemmas	26
6.1	A General Invariance Lemma for Hamming Distance	26
6.2	Invariance Lemma for Single-Player Code Extension	30
6.3	Invariance Lemma for Two-Player Code Extension	30
6.4	Invariance Lemma for $\{4, 4\}$ -Hamming Distance	32
7	Distance-r Composed Functions	42
7.1	Definition and Theorem Statement	42
7.2	Parallel Simulation of Communication Protocols	43
7.3	Distance- r Composition Protocol	45
A	Appendix: Reduction to Gap Hamming Distance	46
B	Appendix: Previously-studied problems reduce to k-Hamming Distance	48
B.1	Survey of Known Problems	48
B.2	Reduction to k -Hamming Distance	49
	References	52

1 Introduction

Some of the most extreme examples of the power of randomness in computing come from communication complexity, where (shared) randomness can allow two parties to solve non-trivial problems with communication cost *independent* of the input size. The textbook example [KN96, RY20] is the EQUALITY problem, where Alice holds $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, Bob holds $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$, and they wish to decide whether $x = y$. While n bits of *deterministic* communication are necessary, it is well-known that a public-coin *randomized* protocol, with error probability $1/4$, only requires 2 bits of communication, regardless of the input length n . When and why does randomness allow such extreme efficiency? The more general example of k -HAMMING DISTANCE will be central to this paper:

Example 1 (Hamming distance). Let $\text{dist}(x, y)$ denote the Hamming distance between binary strings x and y . The k -HAMMING DISTANCE function $\text{HD}_k: \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is

$$\text{HD}_k(x, y) := 1 \iff \text{dist}(x, y) = k.$$

In particular, EQUALITY = HD_0 . When k is a constant, this problem admits a constant-cost protocol: the randomized complexity of HD_k is known to be $\mathcal{O}(k \log k)$ [Yao03, HSZZ06, Sağ18]. \square

Randomized communication has of course been studied for decades, and constant-cost communication specifically has been studied by many recent works [HHH22b, HWZ22, HHH22a, EHK22, HHP⁺22, HZ24, HH24, FHHH24]. One reason that randomized communication is poorly understood is that there are few examples of efficient randomized protocols: the k -HAMMING DISTANCE problems remain, essentially, the only examples of constant-cost problems discovered so far. All previously-studied constant-cost problems *reduce* to HD_k : they can be computed by a constant-cost *deterministic* “oracle protocol” with access to an oracle that computes HD_k for some constant k . That is, in each round of the oracle protocol, Alice and Bob can construct strings a, b respectively and query the oracle, which answers with the value $\text{HD}_k(a, b)$ (see Section 5.1 for formal definitions). Therefore, randomness is used *only* for computing HD_k , and it seems natural to guess that the HD_k problems are the end of the story for extremely efficient communication.

We survey previously-known examples of constant-cost problems (and why they all reduce to HD_k , which can be non-trivial) in Appendix B. For now, we offer two simple examples:

Example 2 (Planar adjacency). First suppose Alice and Bob have vertices x, y in a shared (rooted) tree T , and they wish to decide whether x, y are adjacent in T . If $p(z)$ denotes the parent of z in T , then Alice and Bob can decide adjacency by making two queries “ $x = p(y)$?” and “ $y = p(x)$?” to an EQUALITY oracle. Now suppose Alice and Bob instead have vertices x, y in a shared planar graph. It is known that the edges of any planar graph can be partitioned into 3 forests. Then Alice and Bob can perform the tree adjacency protocol in each forest. So adjacency in planar graphs can be computed by a constant number of EQUALITY oracle queries. \square

Example 3 (Large-alphabet Hamming distance). For any $q \in \mathbb{N}$, Alice and Bob are given strings $x, y \in [q]^n$ and wish to decide whether the q -ary Hamming distance $\text{dist}_q(x, y)$ (i.e. the number of unequal coordinates) is k . Let $E: [q] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^q$ be the *indicator code* where $E(i)$ is defined as the binary string with 1 in coordinate i and 0 elsewhere. Since $\text{dist}(E(i), E(j)) = 2$ when $i \neq j$, the concatenations $E(x_1)E(x_2) \cdots E(x_n)$ and $E(y_1)E(y_2) \cdots E(y_n)$ have *binary* Hamming distance $2 \cdot \text{dist}(x, y)$. Therefore, the problem can be solved by the single $2k$ -HAMMING DISTANCE query

$$\text{HD}_{2k}(E(x_1)E(x_2) \cdots E(x_n), E(y_1)E(y_2) \cdots E(y_n)),$$

regardless of the original alphabet size q . Note that, in the constant-cost setting, the inputs to the oracle may be of arbitrary size. \square

Constant-cost communication seems quite restrictive, so one may expect only a very simple class of problems to exhibit this behaviour—one might first hope to find a simple *complete* problem for this class: a single¹ constant-cost problem \mathcal{P} that all others reduce to, as in the examples above. This would grant us good understanding of the most extreme examples of the power of randomness in communication. But [FHHH24] proved that there is *no* complete problem, because for every constant-cost problem \mathcal{P} , there is a large enough constant k such that HD_k does not reduce to \mathcal{P} . This emphasizes the natural possibility that the hierarchy of k -HAMMING DISTANCE problems captures *all* of the extreme examples of the power of randomness in communication:

Question 1. *For every constant-cost communication problem \mathcal{P} , is there a sufficiently large constant k such that \mathcal{P} can be computed by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ oracle queries to HD_k ?*

We show that the answer is *no*, by relating it to a new coding-theoretic question about Hamming distance encodings. This is in contrast to the case for *partial* problems, where an analogous positive answer has been known since [LS09]: every constant-cost communication problem \mathcal{P} can be computed by 1 query to some constant-cost GAP HAMMING DISTANCE problem, but this does not give the same satisfying insight as would Question 1 (see Appendix A for a discussion and a new elementary proof of this).

1.1 A New Constant-Cost Problem

We introduce a constant-cost communication problem, called $\{4, 4\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE, which we show does not reduce to HD_k for any constant k .

Example 4 ($\{4, 4\}$ -Hamming distance). We define $\text{HD}_{4,4}: \{0, 1\}^{n^2} \times \{0, 1\}^{n^2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as follows. The inputs $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{n^2}$ are interpreted as $n \times n$ Boolean matrices and we write $x_i, y_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ for their i -th rows. We set $\text{HD}_{4,4}(x, y) := 1$ iff there are two distinct rows $i, j \in [n]$ such that $\text{dist}(x_i, y_i) = \text{dist}(x_j, y_j) = 4$, and all other rows $\ell \notin \{i, j\}$ are equal, $x_\ell = y_\ell$. \square

There is a simple constant-cost randomized protocol for $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ given in Protocol 1 below.

Randomized protocol for $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ on input (x, y) :

1. The players think of each of their rows $x_i, y_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ as a symbol in a 2^n -ary alphabet. Using the large-alphabet Hamming distance protocol for $\text{HD}_2^{(2^n)}$ from Example 3, the players can check that $\text{dist}_{2^n}(x, y) = 2$, meaning there are precisely two unequal rows.
2. It remains to verify that the two unequal rows both have distance 4. The players use public coins to partition the rows uniformly into two parts as $A \sqcup B = [n]$. Note that with probability $1/2$ (which can be boosted by repeating this step) the two unequal rows end up in different parts. Using a protocol for HD_4 the players can check that $\text{dist}(x_A, y_A) = 4$ and $\text{dist}(x_B, y_B) = 4$ (here x_A denotes the matrix x restricted to rows A).

Protocol 1: Constant-cost randomized protocol for the $\{4, 4\}$ -Hamming distance problem.

Protocol 1 invokes HD_4 as a subroutine several times, but it is not a deterministic HD_k -oracle protocol due to the random partition in Step 2. Our main result states that, indeed, $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ cannot be computed with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ queries to HD_k , no matter which constant k we choose.

¹To clarify, the HD_k problems together for each k are an infinite family of problems, not a single problem.

Theorem 1 (Main result). *The problem $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ does not admit a constant-cost deterministic oracle-protocol with query access to HD_k , for any constant k .*

Why $\{4, 4\}$? What is so special about using $\{4, 4\}$ as the multiset of distances of the two unequal rows? Consider the similar problem $\text{HD}_{2,2}$ defined on matrices $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ where the answer should be 1 iff there are exactly 2 unequal rows, each with distance 2. Unlike $\text{HD}_{4,4}$, this problem can be solved by a 4-HAMMING DISTANCE oracle protocol, [Protocol 2](#). To find a deeper explanation for why $\text{HD}_{2,2}$ reduces to HD_k , while $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ does not, we study in the next section the types of Hamming distance encodings $E(\cdot)$ that can be used in [Step 3](#) of this protocol.

Oracle-protocol for $\text{HD}_{2,2}$ on input (x, y) :

1. The players verify that there are precisely two unequal rows, as in [Step 1](#) of [Protocol 1](#).
2. The players verify that total Hamming distance is $\text{dist}(x, y) = 4$ using a HD_4 oracle. The players now know the multiset of distances of the two unequal rows is one of

$$\{1, 3\}, \quad \{2, 2\}.$$

3. It remains to distinguish the above two cases. Let $E: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the *parity code*, where $E(z)$ is the parity of z . The players query an EQUALITY oracle* to check if

$$E(x_1)E(x_2) \cdots E(x_n) = E(y_1)E(y_2) \cdots E(y_n).$$

These strings are equal iff $\text{dist}(x_i, y_i)$ is *even* for every row $i \in [n]$, meaning that the distances must be $\{2, 2\}$.

*Note that an EQUALITY oracle can be simulated by one query to any HD_k oracle, by padding the input.

Protocol 2: Constant-cost HD_k -oracle protocol for the $\{2, 2\}$ -Hamming distance problem.

1.2 Hamming Distance Encoding Theorem

One reason that constant-cost communication is interesting is that it has many connections to other areas like graph theory, learning theory, and operator theory; see e.g. [\[FX14, HHH22b, HWZ22, EHK22, HHP⁺22, HZ24, HH24\]](#). We find a new connection here: we prove [Theorem 1](#) by relating it to a new coding-theoretic question about encodings that preserve small Hamming distances.

Definition 1 (Hamming Distance f -Codes). Let f be a partial function $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, that is, defined only on some subset $\text{dom}(f) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. We say that an encoding function $E: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an f -code if it transforms Hamming distances according to

$$\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = f(\text{dist}(x, y)) \quad \forall x, y \text{ s.t. } \text{dist}(x, y) \in \text{dom}(f).$$

We also say that $f: \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is *realizable* if there is some function $m: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for infinitely many values of n there exists an f -code $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$.

For example, the *parity code* used in [Protocol 2](#) mapped strings x, y with $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2$ to strings $E(x), E(y)$ (actually single bits) with $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = 0$, and strings x, y with $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \{1, 3\}$

to strings $E(x), E(y)$ with $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = 1$, so this encoding is an f -code for $f: \{1, 2, 3\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $f(1) = f(3) = 1$ and $f(2) = 0$. This encoding exists for every n , and hence f is realizable.

More generally, we ask:

Question 2. *Which partial functions f are realizable?*

Note that the function f in this question is *constant*, i.e. it is a fixed function that does not depend on the domain size n . We think **Question 2** is interesting independent of our application to constant-cost communication. Our main technical contribution is the following:

Theorem 2 (Structure theorem). *If $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is realizable, then it must be affine:*

$$f(4) = \frac{1}{2}(f(2) + f(6)).$$

In fact, this theorem can be generalized to state that if $f: \{2, 4, 6, \dots, 2t\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is realizable, then $f(2), f(4), \dots, f(2t)$ must be an arithmetic progression. To better understand **Theorem 2**, consider the following examples:

- (i) The *repetition code* $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ mapping $x \mapsto xx$ (concatenation) is an f -code for $f(d) := 2d$, which is affine.
- (ii) The *indicator code* $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2n}$ (used in **Example 3**) is an f -code for $f(0) := 0$ and $f(d) := 2$ for $d \geq 1$. This is *not* affine, although it becomes so when restricted to $d \geq 1$.
- (iii) A *merged-indicator code* $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is obtained by partitioning $\{0, 1\}^n$ into sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m such that every pair $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ belonging to the same part S_i must have $\text{dist}(x, y) > 6$. Encode $E(x)$ as the string that is all 0 except having bit i set to 1, where i is the index of S_i containing x . This code has $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = 2$ when $0 < \text{dist}(x, y) \leq 6$, but otherwise $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y))$ could be 0 or 2, so it may not have “uniform” behavior on larger distances, but it is an f -code for $f(d) := 2$ on domain $d \in [6]$ and affine on that domain.
- (iv) The *parity code* $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ (used in **Protocol 2**) mapping $x \mapsto \sum_i x_i \bmod 2$ is an f -code for $f(d) := d \bmod 2$. This is *not* affine, although it becomes so when restricted to even d .
- (v) The *product code*² $\binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2n \times 2n}$ (where $\binom{[2n]}{n}$ denotes the set of $2n$ -bit strings with Hamming weight n) mapping $x \mapsto x \otimes x$ where $(x \otimes x)_{i,j} = x_i \wedge x_j$ (outer product) is an f_n -code for $f_n(d) := 4dn - 2d^2$ when d is even. This is *not* affine, but since f_n depends on n , it does not yield an infinite family of f -codes for a fixed function f , and does not fall in the purview of **Theorem 2**.

By using α repetitions followed by β instances of the indicator or merged-indicator codes, one may realize f -codes for any given $f: [t] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of the form $f(d) = \alpha d + 2\beta$. **Theorem 2** states that this is essentially the only form that f can take in an infinite f -code family.

Relation to $\{4, 4\}$ -Hamming Distance. To relate this question back to the $\{4, 4\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE problem, notice that, by an adaptation of **Protocol 2** for $\text{HD}_{2,2}$, the f -code structure theorem is *necessary* for **Theorem 1**. Suppose that the structure theorem was false, so that there existed an f -code family for $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ where $f(4) \neq \frac{1}{2}(f(2) + f(6))$. Then **Protocol 3** describes how to use that code to construct a HD_k -oracle protocol for $\text{HD}_{4,4}$.

²This example uses the slice $\binom{[2n]}{n}$ as the domain of E instead of $\{0, 1\}^n$; for our purposes it suffices to consider the slice. In this example we could reduce to the slice by taking $x \mapsto x\bar{x}$ where $\bar{x} = x \oplus \vec{1}$.

Therefore any proof of the separation of $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ from the hierarchy of k -HAMMING DISTANCE problems must involve a proof of [Theorem 2](#). It is much more challenging to show that [Theorem 2](#) is *sufficient* to prove our main [Theorem 1](#). We will show that a reduction from $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ to some HD_k would allow us to extract impossible f -codes; see [Section 2](#) for a proof overview.

Oracle-protocol for $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ on input (x, y) — assuming [Theorem 2](#) is false!

1. The players verify that there are precisely two unequal rows, as in Step 1 of [Protocol 1](#).
2. The players verify that $\text{dist}(x, y) = 8$ using a HD_8 oracle. The players now know the multiset of distances of the two unequal rows is one of

$$\{1, 7\}, \quad \{2, 6\}, \quad \{3, 5\}, \quad \{4, 4\}.$$

3. The players verify that $\text{dist}(x_i, y_i)$ is even for every row $i \in [n]$, using the parity code as in Step 3 of [Protocol 2](#). The multiset of distances must now be one of

$$\{2, 6\}, \quad \{4, 4\}.$$

4. It remains to distinguish the above two cases. Let $E: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$ be an f -code with $f(4) \neq \frac{1}{2}(f(2) + f(6))$, and let $i \neq j$ be the two rows where $x_i \neq y_i$ and $x_j \neq y_j$. Then the concatenations of these codes for each row satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(E(x_1) \cdots E(x_n), E(y_1) \cdots E(y_n)) &= \text{dist}(E(x_i)E(x_j), E(y_i)E(y_j)) \\ &= f(\text{dist}(x_i, y_i)) + f(\text{dist}(x_j, y_j)). \end{aligned}$$

If these distances are $\{4, 4\}$, then $f(\text{dist}(x_i, y_i)) + f(\text{dist}(x_j, y_j)) = 2 \cdot f(4) \neq f(2) + f(6)$. So we can distinguish between the two cases using a query to $\text{HD}_{2f(4)}$.

Protocol 3: The structure theorem for f -codes is *necessary* for [Theorem 1](#): If the structure theorem fails (meaning there exists an infinite family of non-affine f -codes), then we are able to design a deterministic HD_k -oracle protocol for $\text{HD}_{4,4}$.

1.3 Hierarchies and a General Class of Constant-Cost Problems

Let us briefly review the new state of knowledge about constant-cost communication protocols, and introduce a new class of communication problems which generalizes k -HAMMING DISTANCE, $\{k, k\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE, and in fact all of the constant-cost problems prior to this work³.

Hierarchies. Prior work [[HHH22b](#), [HWZ22](#)] showed that 1-HAMMING DISTANCE cannot be computed by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ EQUALITY queries, and [[FHHH24](#)] showed more generally that there is no single complete problem, and that the k -HAMMING DISTANCE problems form a *hierarchy*: there are infinitely many constants k such that HD_{k+1} cannot be computed by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ HD_k queries. Applying a theorem of [[FHHH24](#)] (see [Section 5.3](#)), we see that the $\{k, k\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE problems also form a hierarchy. [Theorem 1](#) shows that this new hierarchy is *separate* from the k -HAMMING DISTANCE hierarchy.

³See the discussion in [Section 1.4](#), and [Remark 2](#) in particular.

Proposition 3. For infinitely many k , $\{k, k\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE does not admit a constant-cost deterministic oracle-protocol with query access to a $\{k - 1, k - 1\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE oracle.

A general class of problems. Having shown that k -HAMMING DISTANCE does not capture the class of constant-cost problems, we think it is useful now to present the k -HAMMING DISTANCE and $\{k, k\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE problems as special cases of a general class of constant-cost problems, described informally as follows. Suppose Alice and Bob each have n inputs, x_1, \dots, x_n and y_1, \dots, y_n respectively, to an arbitrary number n of independent instances P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n of a communication problem \mathcal{P} . We assume each of these instances is *symmetric*, meaning that $P_i(x_i, y_i) = P_i(y_i, x_i)$.

They also have some number r and a *permutation-invariant* function g , meaning that $g(u) = g(v)$ whenever u, v are permutations of each other. Now Alice and Bob wish to accomplish:

1. If the number of inputs (x_i, y_i) such that $x_i \neq y_i$ is larger than r , output 0;
2. Otherwise, compute the function $g(P_{i_1}(x_{i_1}, y_{i_1}), \dots, P_{i_\ell}(x_{i_\ell}, y_{i_\ell}))$ applied to the answers of P_{i_j} , but *only* on the $\ell \leq r$ instances i_j where their inputs are unequal, $x_{i_j} \neq y_{i_j}$.

We call these problems “distance- r compositions” since they combine function composition with r -HAMMING DISTANCE.

Example 5. If we take each P_i to be the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and let $g(z) := 1$ iff z has Hamming weight $|z| = r$, then we obtain the r -HAMMING DISTANCE problem.

Example 6. If we take each P_i to be the k -HAMMING DISTANCE matrix, let $r = 2$, and let $g(z) := 1$ iff $|z| = 2$, then we obtain the $\{k, k\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE problem.

Example 7. If we take each P_i to be the adjacency matrix of (say) a planar graph G , let $r = 1$, and let $g(z) := 1$ be the constant 1 function, then we obtain the problem of computing adjacency in the n -wise Cartesian product of G (shown to have constant cost in [HWZ22]).

Example 8. If we take each P_i to be the threshold-path-distance function $\max(\text{dist}(x_i, y_i), k)$ on vertices x_i, y_i in a planar graph G_i , let $r = k$, and let $g: \mathbb{N}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be defined as $g(z) := \max(\sum_i z_i, k)$, then we obtain the problem of computing THRESHOLD-PATH-DISTANCE, i.e. $\max(\text{dist}(x, y), k)$, in the n -wise Cartesian product graph $G = G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$ (shown to have constant cost in [HWZ22]).

Examples 2, 5, 7 and 8 are representative of the constant-cost problems that have been explicitly studied in prior work; all other problems are either similar to Examples 2, 7 and 8 (being defined on more general classes of graphs than planar graphs, see [HWZ22, EHK22]), or they are obtained via oracle-protocols to such problems; see Appendix B for a more detailed survey.

Surprisingly, two players can compute g applied to r unequal instances of P_i , even though they do not have enough communication to determine *which* instances those are: in particular, we show in Section 7 that distance- r compositions preserve constant-cost communication. Write $R_\delta(\cdot)$ for the public-coin randomized two-way communication cost with error probability δ . Then:

Theorem 4. If P_1, \dots, P_n are any symmetric communication problems, then any distance- r composition of them has a randomized communication cost $\mathcal{O}(r \log r + r \cdot \max_i R_{1/r}(P_i))$. In particular, if the P_i are constant-cost problems then their distance- r composition has cost $\mathcal{O}(r \log r)$.

This is optimal in terms of r , due to the $\Omega(r \log r)$ lower bound on r -HAMMING DISTANCE [Sag18].

Remark 1. Example 7, or the more complicated Example 8, may also appear as if they could be separated from the k -HAMMING DISTANCE hierarchy. But this is not the case: we show in Appendix B that there is a (non-trivial) HD_k -oracle protocol for computing problems of this form. This emphasizes our choice of the $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ problem.

1.4 Constant-Cost Communication: the Story so Far and Farther

The focused study of constant-cost communication was initiated in [HHH22b, HWZ22], see also the recent survey [HH24]. Constant-cost communication is interesting not only as an extreme case of the power of randomness in computation, but also for its many connections to other areas: see [HHH22b] for connections to algebra and operator theory; [HWZ22, EHK22, EHZ23, HZ24] for connections to structural graph theory and distributed data structures; [LS09, HHP⁺22, HZ24] (and Appendix A) for connections to learning theory; and constant-cost communication problems are also equivalent to the hypothesis classes learnable under pure differential privacy [FX14].

We write BPP^0 for the class of constant-cost randomized communication problems. The distance- r composed functions defined in this paper (and oracle reductions to these) capture all known ways to obtain problems in BPP^0 up until the preparation of this manuscript (but see Remark 2). These problems use randomness to partition of coordinates and solve subproblems using hashing. It would be interesting to find problems in BPP^0 with substantially different flavor. We can ask for a problem in BPP^0 that does not reduce to any distance- r composition of k -HAMMING DISTANCE, though it is not clear that such a problem would have “substantially different flavor”.

Remark 2. After we prepared the current manuscript, Tsun-Ming Cheung [Che24] independently constructed a new constant-cost problem which generalizes k -HAMMING DISTANCE in a way that does not seem to reduce to our “distance- r composition” problems (but this is not yet proved), and which uses randomness in a new way.

One-sided error, and large rectangles. All known problems in BPP^0 can be solved with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ queries to constant-cost problems with one-sided error (i.e. the class RP^0). Is this always true? (See also [HH24]). Also, all known $N \times N$ matrices in BPP^0 have monochromatic rectangles of size $\Omega(N) \times \Omega(N)$, and [CLV19, HHH22b] conjecture that this is always true (it is true for problems solved by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ queries to RP^0). We mentioned above that finding a complete problem (or hierarchy) could have answered many questions about BPP^0 (depending on the properties of the complete problem itself); these two open problems are examples of that.

Sign-rank. An interesting place to look for new examples is the class UPP^0 . These are the problems with constant-cost *unbounded-error* randomized protocols, or equivalently the matrices of bounded *sign-rank* (which can be represented as point-halfspace incidences in a constant dimensional Euclidean space) [PS86]. The relationship between UPP^0 and BPP^0 is the subject of several open problems. [HZ24] ask if $\text{UPP}^0 \cap \text{BPP}^0$ is exactly the class of problems which reduce to EQUALITY, which would rule out any new examples in this class. This would imply $\text{UPP}^0 \not\subseteq \text{BPP}^0$, and in particular the conjecture of [HHP⁺22] that $\text{HD}_1 \in \text{BPP}^0 \setminus \text{UPP}^0$. It would also imply the conjecture of [CHHS23] that the INTEGER INNER PRODUCT functions (which belong to UPP^0 and form a hierarchy in BPP [CLV19]) do not belong to BPP^0 . These conjectures suggest a negative answer to question of [HZ24] would require a problem with “substantially different flavor”.

2 Proof Overview

Step 1 is to prove the structure theorem for f -codes (Theorem 2), which rules out non-affine f -codes. Step 2 is to show why a constant-cost oracle protocol for $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ would allow us to extract a non-affine f -code, contradicting the structure theorem.

Notation. For any set T and number ℓ , we write $\binom{T}{\ell}$ (resp. $\binom{T}{\leq \ell}$) for the set of subsets $S \subseteq T$ of size $|S| = \ell$ (resp. $|S| \leq \ell$). We identify strings in $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ with the subset $\{i \in [n] : x_i = 1\}$. This way, $\binom{[n]}{\ell}$ is the set of all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ of Hamming weight ℓ .

2.1 Step 1: Structure Theorem for f -Codes

Our goal is to prove [Theorem 2](#): every realizable $f: \{2,4,6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is affine. Given an f -code $E: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^m$ it is helpful to study its behavior locally inside a small Hamming ball, instead of worrying about the whole exponential-size domain $\{0,1\}^n$. We restrict E to strings of some large constant weight k (to be chosen later), and view E as a *sparse* code

$$E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{\leq r}.$$

Since any two input strings x, y have $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq 2k$, it follows from the triangle inequality that $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) \leq k \cdot f(2)$. By shifting the output if necessary (defining $E'(x) = E(x) \oplus z$ for some fixed z), we may assume that the output weight is a constant, too:

$$r \leq k \cdot f(2). \tag{1}$$

Example 9 (Sparse codes). Let us illustrate sparse codes through examples. Suppose that E has a particularly simple form: each output bit $E(x)_j$, $j \in [m]$, is a monotone term (conjunction) of some set of input variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. That is, $E(x)_j = \prod_{i \in S_j} x_i$ for some $S_j \subseteq [n]$; we call $|S_j|$ the *degree* of the term. Which example codes from [Section 1.2](#) can be built this way?

- The repetition code [\(i\)](#) has two output bits for each degree-1 term.
- The indicator code [\(ii\)](#) has one output bit for each degree- k term.
- The product code [\(v\)](#) has one output bit for each (ordered) degree-2 term.

We know that degree-1 [\(i\)](#) and degree- k [\(ii\)](#) examples are valid (affine) f -codes, whereas the degree-2 encoding [\(v\)](#) is not: it is impossible for [\(v\)](#) to be an f -code because it maps an input x of weight k to an output $E(x)$ of weight k^2 . But we have $k^2 \leq r \leq k \cdot f(2)$ from the “triangle inequality bound” [\(1\)](#). This is a contradiction when k is chosen as a large enough constant, $k \gg f(2)$.

Another extreme example is the “homogeneous” degree- $(k-1)$ encoding E that has $m := \binom{n}{k-1}$ output bits, one for each degree- $(k-1)$ term. If we consider inputs $x := [k]$ and $y := [k-1] \cup \{k+1\}$, we have $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2$ and hence $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = f(2)$ from the definition of an f -code. On the other hand, we have $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = 2k-4$ from the definition of E . This is again a contradiction if we choose $k \gg f(2)$, and hence this does not yield a valid f -code. \square

The above examples suggest that 1 and k are the only possible degrees in a sparse f -code built homogeneously using monotone terms. Our main idea is to formalise this phenomenon more generally. We show that—after some cleanup operations—any sparse f -code satisfies two properties:

- (1) Every sparse f -code can be thought of as being built from monotone terms.
- (2) Every sparse f -code is *homogeneous*: if some degree- ℓ term appears as an output bit (with some multiplicity), then every other degree- ℓ terms appears, too (with the same multiplicity).

These properties imply that the only possible sparse f -codes are essentially those discussed in [Example 9](#). We generalize the impossibility arguments for degree-2 and degree- $(k-1)$ examples there and conclude that, indeed, the only possible term degrees are 1 and k , and such codes are affine as desired. We next discuss some of the main ideas towards proving [Items \(1\) and \(2\)](#).

We start by extending the definition of E to the whole Hamming ball of radius k by

$$\forall y \in \binom{[n]}{\leq k}: \quad E(y) := \bigcap_{x \supseteq y, x \in \binom{[n]}{k}} E(x).$$

The resulting function, still denoted by $E: \binom{[n]}{\leq k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{\leq r}$, is monotone: $E(y) \subseteq E(y')$ for $y \subseteq y'$. Each output bit can be thought of as a monotone DNF (disjunction of monotone terms), and moreover, $E(y)$ is the set of output bits whose DNF contains the term $\prod_{i \in y} x_i$. Finally, we let

$$\Delta(y) := E(y) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{z \subsetneq y} E(z) \right).$$

In words, $\Delta(y)$ is the set of output bits whose DNF contains $\prod_{i \in y} x_i$ and does not contain any of its subterms (that is, $\prod_{i \in z} x_i$ for some $z \subsetneq y$). We can now rephrase [Items \(1\) and \(2\)](#) as:

- (1) $\Delta(y) \cap \Delta(y') = \emptyset$ for every $y \neq y'$.
- (2) $|\Delta(y)|$ depends only on $|y|$.

To establish these properties, the main technical crux of the proof is to show that E maps sunflowers to sunflowers. A sunflower \mathcal{F} is a collection of sets S_1, \dots, S_t with a kernel K such that $S_i \cap S_j = K$ for all distinct S_i, S_j . We show that if \mathcal{F} is a sunflower of ℓ -sets in the domain then their image $E(\mathcal{F})$ is also a sunflower. See [Section 3](#) for the full proof.

Extension to two-player codes. In order to prove the separation of $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ from HD_k , we actually need a structure theorem for a slightly more general class of *two-player f -codes*: when Alice and Bob query the HD_k oracle, they need not apply the *same* code E to their inputs—Alice applies some E_1 and Bob applies some other E_2 . Formally, a *two-player f -code* is a pair of encodings $E_1, E_2: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that

$$\text{dist}(E_1(x), E_2(y)) = f(\text{dist}(x, y)) \quad \forall x, y \text{ s.t. } \text{dist}(x, y) \in \text{dom}(f).$$

Single-player f -codes are now the special case $E_1 = E_2$ where $f(0) = 0$.

We again show that the only families of two-player f -codes are affine. The difficulty in the two-player case is that the encodings E_1 and E_2 have no structural guarantees *a priori*. For example, E_1 may not itself be a single-player g -code for any nontrivial g . To get around this, we use an invariance lemma (see [Section 2.2](#) below) to show that E_1 can be transformed into a g -code for some function g , which is related to f by $g(2) \leq f(0) + f(2)$ (so that it is also constant). We may then sparsify the code as in the single-player case and reuse the same decomposition given by the $\Delta(\cdot)$ functions. See [Section 4](#) for the full proof.

2.2 Step 2: Extracting f -Codes from Oracle Protocols

Next, we prove our main [Theorem 1](#) by showing that a constant-cost HD_k -oracle protocol for $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ would imply the existence of an (impossible) non-affine two-player f -code. Our main tools for this proof are *invariance lemmas*, which, informally, state the following:

Invariance lemma (informal): Suppose $P(x, y)$ is invariant under a group of permutations \mathcal{G} acting on the inputs, so that $P(\pi x, \pi y) = P(x, y)$ for all $\pi \in \mathcal{G}$. Suppose also that P can be computed as

$$P(x, y) = f(M(x, y))$$

where M is a “stable matrix”, meaning that it does not contain large instances of the GREATER-THAN communication problem. Then we may assume M is *also* invariant under permutations in \mathcal{G} . In other words, not only is the *value* $P(x, y)$ invariant, but so is the “computation” of $P(x, y)$.

We use such lemmas frequently – some lightweight versions are already used inside the proofs of the structure theorems for f -codes. To prove these invariance lemmas, we use Ramsey-theoretic arguments generalizing the methods of [FHHH24] (who showed BPP^0 admits no complete problem). We defer the proofs to Section 6, dedicated to the invariance lemmas used throughout the paper. This method of applying Ramsey theory for communication complexity appears new to the current paper and [FHHH24]; see [Gas] for a survey of applications of Ramsey theory in computer science.

Using invariance. We formally define oracle reductions in Section 5.1, but for now we use a convenient alternate form of reductions (used also in prior works e.g. [HWZ22, HZ24, FHHH24]). If we assume $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ can be reduced to HD_k , then for every n we can write the matrix $\text{HD}_{4,4}^n : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as

$$\text{HD}_{4,4}^n = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q)$$


where q is a constant, each Q_i is an HD_k query matrix (i.e. submatrix of HD_k), and ρ is a “reduction function” that takes the answers to each query and produces the answer to $\text{HD}_{4,4}$.

To apply an invariance lemma, we define the *distance signature*. Let $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{2n \times 2n}$ be inputs to $\text{HD}_{4,4}$, which we think of as $2n \times 2n$ Boolean matrices. We restrict ourselves to the case where each $x_i, y_i \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ is in the Hamming slice of weight n . We then define $\text{sig}(x, y) := \{\text{dist}(x_i, y_i) \mid x_i \neq y_i\}$ as the (unordered) multiset of non-zero distances between rows. Restricted to the slice,

$$\text{HD}_{4,4}(x, y) = 1 \iff \text{sig}(x, y) = \{4, 4\}.$$

The intuition for the proof is that it is difficult for k -HAMMING DISTANCE queries to tell the difference between signatures $\{4, 4\}$ and $\{2, 6\}$: after all, the *total* Hamming distance is the same in both cases, and it ought to be difficult to tell which row each difference belongs to.

Changing perspective, we think of the pair x, y comprising $2n$ blocks of $2n$ bits as being arranged as a sequence



where we think of larger blocks as “outer dominoes”, each composed of smaller “inner dominoes”. Observe that the signatures are invariant under “inner permutations” of small dominoes within any block, and “outer permutations” of large blocks. Assuming a reduction from $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ to HD_k , we apply an invariance lemma to (a suitable generalization of) the computation

$$\text{HD}_{4,4} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_d)$$

(obtained from Proposition 19) to show that each *query* Q_i to HD_k must *also* be invariant under inner- and outer-permutations, meaning that they also are determined by $\text{sig}(x, y)$.

Since $\text{HD}_{4,4}(x, y)$ has different value depending on whether $\text{sig}(x, y)$ is $\{4, 4\}$ or $\{2, 6\}$, this means there must be a query Q_i which itself distinguishes these signatures. In other words, there is an encoding $\binom{[2n]}{n}^{2n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that inputs with signature $\{4, 4\}$ and signature $\{2, 2\}$ are encoded with different (constant) Hamming distances. From this query Q_i we show that we can extract an impossible two-player f -code and complete the proof by contradiction.

3 Single-Player f -Codes

In this section, we prove the structure theorem for single-player f -codes, restated below.

Theorem 2 (Restated). *If $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is realizable, then it must be affine:*

$$f(4) = \frac{1}{2}(f(2) + f(6)).$$

We consider a more general setting than that of [Definition 1](#) where the encoding function E is a partial function, i.e. $E: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$ where $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$. We say that E is an f -code if

$$\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = f(\text{dist}(x, y)) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \text{dist}(x, y) \in \text{dom}(f).$$

We start our proof with a cleanup step. Recall the example of the *merged-indicator code* from [Section 1.2](#): we can have functions $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that f -codes $E: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ exist for every n , but where inputs $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $\text{dist}(x, y) > 6$ may have several different possible values of $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y))$. That is, the f -code may not behave uniformly on large distances, meaning that E may not be a g -code for any total function $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Our first step is to eliminate these non-uniformities by extending the code to the full domain.

Definition 2 (Extended f -code). An encoding $E: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an *extended f -code* if it is a g_n -code for some *total extension* $g_n: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of f . We emphasize that, in an infinite family of extended f -codes, g_n may depend on n (although g_n and f must still agree on $\text{dom}(f)$).

We obtain this code extension using a “permutation-invariance lemma” whose proof we postpone until [Section 6.2](#), inside [Section 6](#) dedicated to similar invariance lemmas used throughout the paper.

Lemma 5. *Suppose $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is such that, for infinitely many n , there exists an f -code $E: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then for every n , there exists an extended f -code $E': \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'(n)}$.*

Next, we “sparsify” the code and focus only on strings with bounded Hamming weight.

Proposition 6. *Let $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that, for infinitely many n , there exists an extended f -code $F: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then for any fixed constant k , there is a constant $r \leq f(2) \cdot k$ such that, for infinitely many values n , there exists an extended f -code*

$$E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m'(n)]}{r}.$$

We defer the proof of [Proposition 6](#) to [Section 3.1](#). As discussed in the proof overview ([Section 2.1](#)), the fact that the weight r in the range of the encoding is bounded by $f(2) \cdot k$ will be crucial in our proof later.

The next step is to decompose the extended f -code $E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}$ into component codes for each Hamming weight $\ell \leq k$.

Definition 3. For any $E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}$ and $\ell \leq k$, we define the function $E_\ell: \binom{[n]}{\ell} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{\leq r}$ as

$$E_\ell(y) := \bigcap_{x \supseteq y, x \in \binom{[n]}{k}} E(x).$$

Observe that this function is monotone in the sense that, if $u, v \in \binom{[n]}{\leq k}$ are such that $u \subseteq v$, then

$$E_{|u|}(u) = \bigcap_{x \supseteq u, x \in \binom{[n]}{k}} E(x) \subseteq \bigcap_{x \supseteq v, x \in \binom{[n]}{k}} E(x) = E_{|v|}(v). \quad (2)$$

The main lemma we require about these component codes is that they preserve sunflowers. A *sunflower* is a collection $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \dots, F_t\}$ of sets such that there is some set K (called the *kernel* of \mathcal{F}) which satisfies $F_i \cap F_j = K$ for every distinct $i \neq j$. The sets $F_i \setminus K$ are called the *petals*. The proof of the next lemma is deferred to [Section 3.2](#).

Lemma 7 (Sunflowers to sunflowers). *For any k, r and sufficiently large $n > k$, let $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that there exists a g -code $E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}$. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, $\ell \leq k$, is a sunflower with kernel $y \in \binom{[n]}{\ell'}$, then $E_\ell(\mathcal{F})$ is a sunflower with kernel $E_{\ell'}(y)$.*

We will use this lemma to establish an important structure of codewords. (This will be reused in [Section 4](#) on two-player f -codes.)

Definition 4. For any $E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}$ and any $y \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$ for $\ell \leq k$, we define

$$\Delta_E(y) := E_\ell(y) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{z \subseteq y} E_{|z|}(z) \right).$$

Lemma 8. *For any k, r where $r < \binom{k}{2}$ and sufficiently large $n \geq 2k$, let $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function with $g(2) + 2 < k$, such that there exists a g -code $E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}$. Then:*

1. *For any distinct sets $x, y \in \binom{[n]}{\leq k}$, $\Delta_E(x) \cap \Delta_E(y) = \emptyset$.*
2. *For every $\ell \leq k$, there is δ_ℓ such that every $x \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$ has $|\Delta_E(x)| = \delta_\ell$;*
3. *For every $\ell \notin \{0, 1, k\}$, $\delta_\ell = 0$.*

As a consequence, for each $x \in \binom{[n]}{k}$, $E(x)$ is the disjoint union

$$E(x) = \Delta_E(x) \cup \Delta_E(\emptyset) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in x} \Delta_E(\{i\}) \right).$$

Proof. We use [Lemma 7](#) to guarantee that for each $\ell \leq k$, the map $E_\ell: \binom{[n]}{\ell} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{\leq r}$ maps sunflowers in $\binom{[n]}{\ell}$ to sunflowers in $\binom{[m]}{\leq r}$.

To prove [Item 1](#), let $x, y \in \binom{[n]}{\leq k}$ be distinct and let $z = x \cap y$. Assume $|x| \geq |y|$ and let $\ell = |x|$. Since $n \geq 2k$ then we may choose $y' \supseteq y$ with $|y'| = \ell$ and $x \cap y' = z$. Then x and y' form a sunflower in $\binom{[n]}{\ell}$ with kernel z , so $E_\ell(x), E_\ell(y')$ form a sunflower with kernel $E_{|z|}(z)$ and disjoint petals $E_\ell(x) \setminus E_{|z|}(z), E_\ell(y') \setminus E_{|z|}(z)$. Then

$$\Delta_E(x) \subseteq E_\ell(x) \setminus E_{|z|}(z),$$

and by [Equation \(2\)](#),

$$\Delta_E(y) \subseteq E_{|y|}(y) \setminus E_{|z|}(z) \subseteq E_\ell(y') \setminus E_{|z|}(z).$$

So $\Delta_E(x)$ and $\Delta_E(y)$ must be disjoint since they are contained in disjoint petals.

To prove [Item 2](#), we first show that for any $\ell \leq k$, if $x, y \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, then $|E_\ell(x)| = |E_\ell(y)|$. Let $u, v \in \binom{[2k]}{k}$ have $u \cap v = x$, so $\text{dist}(u, v) = 2k - 2\ell$. Then $E(u), E(v)$ form a sunflower with kernel $E_\ell(x)$, and therefore

$$g(\text{dist}(u, v)) = g(2k - 2\ell) = \text{dist}(E(u), E(v)) = |E(u)| + |E(v)| - 2|E_\ell(x)| = 2r - 2|E_\ell(x)|.$$

Since the same holds for any $x \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, the claim holds. Therefore for each $\ell \leq k$ there is γ_ℓ such that $|E_\ell(x)| = \gamma_\ell$ for every $x \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$.

We now prove **Item 2** by induction on the size of the sets ℓ . In the base case, consider $\ell = 1$. For any $i \in [n]$, we have $|\Delta_E(\{i\})| = |E_1(\{i\})| - |E_0(\emptyset)| = \gamma_1 - \gamma_0$, so the claim holds. Now consider $\ell > 1$ and let $x \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$. By disjointness of $\Delta_E(\cdot)$ and the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\gamma_\ell = |E_\ell(x)| = |\Delta_E(x)| + \sum_{z \subsetneq x} |\Delta_E(z)| = |\Delta_E(x)| + \sum_{z \subsetneq x} \delta_{|z|}.$$

Since the sum is the same for any $x \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, we may conclude that $|\Delta_E(x)|$ is the same for any $x \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, which concludes the proof of **Item 2**.

To prove **Item 3**, first consider $\ell \in \{2, \dots, k-2\}$. Then for any $x \in \binom{[n]}{k}$, by disjointness of $\Delta_E(\cdot)$, we have

$$r = |E(x)| = \sum_{z \subseteq x} |\Delta_E(z)| \geq \sum_{z \subseteq x, |z|=\ell} \delta_\ell = \binom{k}{\ell} \delta_\ell \geq \binom{k}{2} \delta_\ell.$$

But $r < \binom{k}{2}$, so we must have $\delta_\ell = 0$. The only case remains is $\ell = k-1$.

Let $x, y \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ have $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2$, so $z = x \cap y$ has $|z| = \ell = k-1$. Then there are $k-2$ sets $u \subsetneq x$ such that $|u| = k-1$ but $u \neq z$, so u is not a subset of y . Then

$$g(2) = g(\text{dist}(x, y)) = \text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) \geq (k-2)\delta_{k-2}.$$

But since $g(2) + 2 < k$ we must have $\delta_{k-2} = 0$, which concludes the proof of **Item 3**. \square

We may now complete the proof of the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that, for infinitely many n , there exists an f -code $E: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Set $k > 2(f(2) + 2)$. By **Proposition 6**, there is a constant $r \leq f(2) \cdot k$ such that, for infinitely many n , there exists an f -code $F: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}$. Fix a sufficiently large $n > k$ so that by **Lemma 5**, for some function $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $g(t) = f(t)$ for all $t \in \{2, 4, 6\}$, there exists a g -code

$$G: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}.$$

For any $t \in [k]$, we may choose $x, y \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ such that $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2t$, and write $s = (x \setminus y) \cup (y \setminus x)$ for the symmetric difference, which has cardinality $|s| = 2t$. Then, since $k > 2(g(2) + 2) > g(2) + 2$ and $r < g(2) \cdot k < \binom{k}{2}$, by **Lemma 8** there are integers δ_1 and δ_k such that

$$\begin{aligned} g(2t) &= g(\text{dist}(x, y)) = \text{dist}(G(x), G(y)) \\ &= |\Delta_G(x)| + |\Delta_G(y)| + \sum_{i \in s} |\Delta_G(\{i\})| = 2 \cdot \delta_k + 2t \cdot \delta_1. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion now follows since $f(2t) = g(2t)$ for $t \in [3]$. \square

3.1 Sparsification

We will require the following elementary fact about f -codes.

Proposition 9. *Let $f: \{2\} \cup \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, let $k \leq n$ be arbitrary, and suppose $E: \binom{[2n]}{k} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an f -code. Then for any $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{k}$,*

$$\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) \leq \frac{f(2)}{2} \text{dist}(x, y).$$

Proof. For any $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{k}$ with $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2d$, there exists a sequence u_0, u_1, \dots, u_d with $u_0 = x$, $u_d = y$ such that $\text{dist}(u_i, u_{i+1}) = 2$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. Therefore,

$$\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \text{dist}(E(u_{2i-1}), E(u_{2i})) = f(2) \cdot d = \frac{f(2)}{2} \text{dist}(x, y). \quad \square$$

We may now restate and prove **Proposition 6**.

Proposition 6 (Restated). *Let $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that, for infinitely many n , there exists an extended f -code $F: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then for any fixed constant k , there is a constant $r \leq f(2) \cdot k$ such that, for infinitely many values n , there exists an extended f -code*

$$E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m'(n)]}{r}.$$

Proof. Let k be a fixed constant. For any given n , let $N = n + k$. Let $F: \binom{[2N]}{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$ be an extended f -code, with extension $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Define $F': \binom{[N]}{k} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$ as

$$F'(x) := F(x \cup ([2N] \setminus [N+k])).$$

Observe that $\text{dist}(F'(x), F'(y)) = \text{dist}(F(x), F(y))$ for all $x, y \in \binom{[N]}{k}$, so F' is also an extended f -code. Now we define $E: \binom{[N] \setminus [k]}{k} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$ as

$$E(x) := F'(x) \oplus F'([k]).$$

This transformation again preserves distances, so E remains an extended f -code with extension g . All $x \in \binom{[N] \setminus [k]}{k}$ have $\text{dist}(x, [k]) = 2k$, so by **Proposition 9**, for all $x \in \binom{[N] \setminus [k]}{k}$,

$$|E(x)| = \text{dist}(F'(x), F'([k])) = g(2k) \leq f(2) \cdot k.$$

The domain of E is the set of weight- k subsets of $[N] \setminus [k]$ where $|[N] \setminus [k]| = n$, so by relabeling the domain as $[n]$ and letting $r = g(2k)$, E satisfies the required conditions. \square

3.2 Sunflowers to sunflowers

Our goal here is to prove **Lemma 7**:

Lemma 7 (Restated). *For any k, r and sufficiently large $n > k$, let $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that there exists a g -code $E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}$. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, $\ell \leq k$, is a sunflower with kernel $y \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, then $E_\ell(\mathcal{F})$ is a sunflower with kernel $E_\ell(y)$.*

We start by proving a simple but useful fact about sunflowers.

Proposition 10. Fix any n, k and let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$. If $|\mathcal{F}| > k2^k$ and every pair of sets in \mathcal{F} has the same size of intersection (i.e. $\exists s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{dist}(x, y) = s$ for all distinct $x, y \in \mathcal{F}$), then \mathcal{F} is a sunflower.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{F}$ be any set and consider all possible intersections of x with other sets $x' \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{x\}$. There are at most 2^k such intersections. Thus there must exist an intersection $z := x \cap x'$ such that $\mathcal{F}_z := \{x \in \mathcal{F} : z \subseteq x\}$ has size $|\mathcal{F}_z| > k$. Note that \mathcal{F}_z itself is a sunflower with kernel z .

We claim that $\mathcal{F}_z = \mathcal{F}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is a set $y \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_z$. Then $z \not\subseteq y$ and y has intersection of size $|z|$ with every $x \in \mathcal{F}_z$. Thus $y \setminus z$ has to intersect every petal of \mathcal{F}_z . But $|y \setminus z| \leq k$ and \mathcal{F}_z has more than k petals, a contradiction. \square

We may assume $k \geq 1$, as the $k = 0$ case of [Lemma 7](#) is trivial. In the remainder of [Section 3.2](#), we assume $E: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m]}{r}$ is a g -code for some $g: [2k] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 11 (Distance-2 sunflowers). Let $y \in \binom{[n]}{k-1}$ and let $\mathcal{F} = \{x \in \binom{[n]}{k} : x \supseteq y\}$ be a sunflower with singleton petals. Then $E(\mathcal{F})$ is a sunflower with kernel $E_{k-1}(y)$.

Proof. For any two distinct $x, x' \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\text{dist}(E(x), E(x')) = f(\text{dist}(x, x')) = g(2)$. Since $|E(x)| = |E(x')| = r$, it must be the case that $|E(x) \cap E(x')| = r - g(2)/2$, which means that every pair of x, x' in \mathcal{F} has the same size of intersection. According to [Proposition 10](#), $E(\mathcal{F})$ is a sunflower. The claim about its kernel is straightforward. \square

Proposition 12 (Kernels are robust). Let $y \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$ for any $\ell \leq k$ and let $j \in [m] \setminus E_\ell(y)$. Let \mathbf{x} be a uniformly random set $\mathbf{x} \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ such that $y \subseteq \mathbf{x}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}[j \notin E(\mathbf{x})] \geq 1 - \mathcal{O}(k/n).$$

Proof. Since $j \notin E_\ell(y)$, by definition of E_ℓ , there is some k -set x such that $y \subseteq x$ and $j \notin E(x)$. Suppose $x = [k]$ and $y = [\ell]$ for simplicity of notation. Let $\pi: [k - \ell] \rightarrow [n] \setminus [\ell]$ be a uniform random injection. Consider the following random process:

- Initialize $\mathbf{x}_0 := x$
- For step $i = 1, \dots, k - \ell$:
 - Let $\mathbf{z}_i := \mathbf{x}_{i-1} \setminus \{\ell + i\}$
 - Let $\mathbf{x}_i := \mathbf{z}_i \cup \{\pi(i)\}$

At each step i , we swap out the i -th element of $x \setminus y$ and add an element $\pi(i)$ which can be considered as a uniform random element from $([n] \setminus [\ell]) \setminus \{\pi(1), \dots, \pi(i-1)\}$.

Looking at the first step $i = 1$, $j \notin E(\mathbf{x}_0)$ so that $j \notin E_\ell(\mathbf{z}_1)$. By [Lemma 11](#), $E(\mathbf{z}_1 \cup \{p\})$ for $p \in [n] \setminus \mathbf{z}_1$ is a sunflower with kernel $E_{k-1}(\mathbf{z}_1)$. Thus adding $\pi(1)$ to \mathbf{z}_1 , corresponds to adding a random petal to kernel in the output domain, i.e., $E(\mathbf{x}_1)$ equals to the kernel $E_{k-1}(\mathbf{z}_1)$ plus a random petal. The petal of $E(\mathbf{x}_1)$ contains j with probability at most $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$. Hence $\mathbb{P}[j \notin E(\mathbf{x}_1)] \geq 1 - \mathcal{O}(1/n)$.

Subsequent steps are handled similarly. A union bound over all steps shows that with probability at least $1 - \mathcal{O}(k/n)$, $j \notin E(\mathbf{x}_i)$ for every $i \in [k - \ell]$. This concludes the proof observing that $\mathbf{x}_{k-\ell}$ is $\mathcal{O}(k/n)$ -close to uniform over supersets of y in $\binom{[n]}{k}$. \square

We first prove [Lemma 7](#) for the case $\ell = k$.

Proposition 13. Under the assumptions of [Lemma 7](#), for sufficiently large n , if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ is a sunflower with kernel $y \in \binom{[n]}{\ell}$, then $E(\mathcal{F})$ is a sunflower with kernel $E_\ell(y)$.

Proof. Since n is sufficiently large, if $|\mathcal{F}| \leq k2^k$ then we can find a set $\mathcal{F}' \supseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $|\mathcal{F}'| = k2^k$ such that \mathcal{F}' is also a sunflower with kernel y , by taking sufficiently many sets $y \cup z$ where $z \subset [n]$ has cardinality $|z| = k - \ell$ and z is disjoint from all $x \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore we may assume that $|\mathcal{F}| > k2^k$.

Since \mathcal{F} is a sunflower of sets x with $|x| = k$, there is some r such that $\text{dist}(x, y) = r$ for every distinct $x, y \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, by assumption,

$$\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = g(\text{dist}(x, y)) = g(r)$$

for every distinct $x, y \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $E(\mathcal{F})$ satisfies the conditions of [Proposition 10](#), so it is a sunflower with some kernel K .

It remains to show that $K = E_\ell(y)$. By definition,

$$E_\ell(y) = \bigcap_{x \supseteq y, |x|=k} E(x) \subseteq \bigcap_{x \in \mathcal{F}} E(x) = K.$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists $j \in K \setminus E_\ell(y)$. Fix any distinct pair $u, v \in \mathcal{F}$, so that by definition, $K = E(u) \cap E(v)$. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ be a uniformly random set satisfying $\mathbf{x} \supseteq y$. Then:

1. $\mathbb{P}[\{u, v, \mathbf{x}\} \text{ is a sunflower with kernel } y] \geq 1 - o(1)$ (as a function of n), and
2. $\mathbb{P}[j \notin E(\mathbf{x})] \geq 1 - o(1)$ by [Proposition 12](#).

Therefore, for sufficiently large n , the probability that both of these events occur is greater than 0. Thus there exists $x \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ such that u, v, x form a sunflower with kernel y , and $j \notin E(u) \cap E(v) \cap E(x)$. But then, by the argument above, $E(u), E(v), E(x)$ form a sunflower with kernel $E(u) \cap E(v) \cap E(x) = E(u) \cap E(v) = K$, and $j \notin E(x)$ so $j \notin K$, a contradiction. \square

We may now complete the proof of [Lemma 7](#).

Proof of Lemma 7. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{\ell}$ be a sunflower with kernel $y \in \binom{[n]}{\ell'}$. Let $u, v \in \mathcal{F}$ be distinct members of \mathcal{F} ; then $u \cap v = y$. Write $K = E_\ell(u) \cap E_\ell(v)$. By definition, $E_{\ell'}(y) \subseteq K$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that there is $j \in K \setminus E_{\ell'}(y)$.

If n is sufficiently large, we may choose sets u', v' disjoint from each other and from $u \cup v$, such that $|u'| = |v'| = k - \ell$. Then $y = u \cap v = (u \cup u') \cap (v \cup v')$, and $|u \cup u'| = |v \cup v'| = k$. Then $\{u \cup u', v \cup v'\}$ is a sunflower with kernel y , so by [Proposition 13](#) we have $E_{\ell'}(y) = E(u \cup u') \cap E(v \cup v')$. But since $j \in E_\ell(u) \cap E_\ell(v)$, we must also have by definition $j \in E(u \cup u') \cap E(v \cup v') = E_{\ell'}(y)$, which is a contradiction, so $E_{\ell'}(y) = E_\ell(u) \cap E_\ell(v)$ for any distinct $u, v \in \mathcal{F}$, as desired. \square

4 Two-Player f -Codes

In this section we prove the structure theorem for two-player f -codes.

Theorem 14. *Let $f: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that, for infinitely many values $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a two-player f -code $E_1, E_2: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then $f(4) = \frac{f(2)+f(6)}{2}$.*

Similar to the single-player case, the first step is to extend the code beyond domain $\{0, 2, 4, 6\}$. We will also force each player's individual encoding E_1, E_2 to also be a g_1, g_2 -code for some functions g_1, g_2 . This will allow us to use the established structure of single-player codes.

Definition 5 (Extended Two-Player f -Codes). Let $f: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. We will say that a pair of encodings $E_1, E_2: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an *extended two-player f -code* if it is a two-player f -code such that there exist *extensions* $g, g_1, g_2: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$:

1. $\text{dist}(E_1(x), E_2(y)) = g(\text{dist}(x, y))$;
2. $\text{dist}(E_1(x), E_1(y)) = g_1(\text{dist}(x, y))$; and
3. $\text{dist}(E_2(x), E_2(y)) = g_2(\text{dist}(x, y))$.

As in the single-player case, we defer the proof of the next lemma to the later section on invariances; see [Section 6.3](#).

Lemma 15. *Let $f: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that, for infinitely many n , there exists a two-player f -code $F_1, F_2: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then for every n , there exists an extended two-player f -code $E_1, E_2: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'(n)}$.*

Again following the strategy for single-player codes, we “sparsify” and focus on strings with bounded Hamming weight. As before, we postpone the proof, to [Section 4.1](#).

Proposition 16. *Let $f: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that, for infinitely many n , there exists an extended two-player f -code $F_1, F_2: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then for any fixed constant k , there are constants $r_1, r_2 \leq 2f(0) + f(2) \cdot k$ such that, for infinitely many values n , there exists an extended two-player f -code E_1, E_2 where*

$$E_1: \binom{[2n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m'(n)]}{r_1} \qquad E_2: \binom{[2n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m'(n)]}{r_2}.$$

For a given extended two-player f -code E_1, E_2 , we now define the functions $\Delta_1 := \Delta_{E_1}$ and $\Delta_2 := \Delta_{E_2}$ as in [Definition 4](#). Since E_1, E_2 is an *extended* two-player f -code, each E_i is also an extended single-player g_i -code for some function g_i , which means we may apply the single-player structure lemma, [Lemma 8](#), to conclude the proof as follows. We require the following elementary inequality, proved in [Section 4.1](#).

Proposition 17. *Let $f: \{2\} \cup \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, let $k \leq n$ be arbitrary, and suppose $E_1, E_2: \binom{[2n]}{k} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is a two-player f -code. Then for any $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{k}$,*

$$\max \{ \text{dist}(E_1(x), E_2(y)), \text{dist}(E_1(x), E_1(y)), \text{dist}(E_2(x), E_2(y)) \} \leq 2f(0) + \frac{f(2)}{2} \text{dist}(x, y).$$

We now prove the main theorem about two-player codes:

Proof of [Theorem 14](#). Let $k > 2(2f(0) + f(2)) + 2$ so that $2f(0) + f(2)k < \binom{k}{2}$ and let $n > k$ be sufficiently large. Let $E_1: \binom{[2n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m'(n)]}{r_1}, E_2: \binom{[2n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m'(n)]}{r_2}$ be an extended two-player f -code provided by [Proposition 16](#) with associated extensions g, g_1, g_2 such that $r_1, r_2 \leq 2f(0) + f(2) \cdot k$. By [Proposition 17](#), we have

$$g_1(2) \leq 2f(0) + f(2) < k - 2,$$

so we may apply [Lemma 8](#) to E_1 . Then for each $x \in \binom{[2n]}{k}$, $E_1(x)$ is the disjoint union

$$E_1(x) = \Delta_1(x) \cup \Delta_1(\emptyset) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in x} \Delta_1(\{i\}) \right),$$

with $|\Delta_1(x)| = \delta_k$ and $|\Delta_1(\{i\})| = \delta_1$ for some constants δ_k, δ_1 .

For any $i \in [k], j \in [n] \setminus [k]$, define $y^{i \rightarrow j} := ([k] - \{i\}) \cup \{j\} \in \binom{[n]}{k}$, and denote its compositions as $y^{(i_1, i_2) \rightarrow (j_1, j_2)} := (y^{i_1 \rightarrow j_1})^{i_2 \rightarrow j_2}$ for distinct $i_1, i_2 \in [k], j_1, j_2 \in [n] \setminus [k]$.

Claim 18. *There exist distinct $j_1, j_2, j_3 \in [n] \setminus [k]$ such that*

1. $\forall a \in [3], \Delta_1(\{j_a\}) \cap E_2([k]) = \emptyset;$
2. $\forall a \in [3], \Delta_1(y^{a \rightarrow j_1}) \cap E_2([k]) = \emptyset;$
3. $\Delta_1(y^{(1,2) \rightarrow (j_1, j_2)}) \cap E_2([k]) = \emptyset;$
4. $\Delta_1(y^{(1,2,3) \rightarrow (j_1, j_2, j_3)}) \cap E_2([k]) = \emptyset.$

Proof of claim. Let $R := 2f(0) + f(2)$. Since $|E_2([k])| < Rk$ and the sets $\Delta_1(S)$ are pairwise disjoint for all $S \in \binom{[n]}{k}$, there are at most $Rk(n-k)^2$ choices of $\{j_1, j_2, j_3\}$ which fail condition 1; at most $Rk(n-k)^2$ choices which fail condition 2; at most $Rk(n-k)$ choices which fail condition 3; and at most Rk choices which fail condition 4. So there are at most $4Rk(n-k)^2$ choices of $\{j_1, j_2, j_3\}$ which fail any of the conditions, which is less than the $\binom{n-k}{3}$ total choices when n is sufficiently large. \square

For simplicity, let $S := E_2([k])$. Let j_1, j_2, j_3 be such that S is disjoint from the sets considered in **Claim 18**. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(4) - f(2) &= \text{dist}(E_1(y^{(1,2) \rightarrow (j_1, j_2)}), S) - \text{dist}(E_1(y^{1 \rightarrow j_1}), S) \\
&= |\Delta_1(\{2\}) \cap S| - |\Delta_1(\{2\}) \setminus S| + |\Delta_1(\{j_2\})| \\
&= |\Delta_1(\{2\}) \cap S| - |\Delta_1(\{2\}) \setminus S| + \delta_1 \\
f(6) - f(4) &= \text{dist}(E_1(y^{(1,2,3) \rightarrow (j_1, j_2, j_3)}), S) - \text{dist}(E_1(y^{(1,2) \rightarrow (j_1, j_2)}), S) \\
&= |\Delta_1(\{3\}) \cap S| - |\Delta_1(\{3\}) \setminus S| + |\Delta_1(\{j_3\})| \\
&= |\Delta_1(\{3\}) \cap S| - |\Delta_1(\{3\}) \setminus S| + \delta_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Now since S is disjoint from $E_1(y^{2 \rightarrow j_1})$ and $E_1(y^{3 \rightarrow j_1})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= f(2) - f(2) \\
&= \text{dist}(E_1(y^{2 \rightarrow j_1}), S) - \text{dist}(E_1(y^{3 \rightarrow j_1}), S) \\
&= (|\Delta_1(\{2\}) \cap S| - |\Delta_1(\{2\}) \setminus S|) - (|\Delta_1(\{3\}) \cap S| - |\Delta_1(\{3\}) \setminus S|),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $f(4) - f(2) = f(6) - f(4)$, as desired. \square

4.1 Sparsification

Let us now prove the sparsification proposition and triangle inequality that were used above. Starting with the triangle inequality:

Proof of Proposition 17. For any $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{k}$ with $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2d$, there exists a sequence u_0, u_1, \dots, u_d with $u_0 = x, u_d = y$ such that $\text{dist}(u_i, u_{i+1}) = 2$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. Therefore, if d is odd,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{dist}(E_1(x), E_2(y)) &\leq \text{dist}(E_1(u_0), E_2(u_1)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{(d-1)/2} (\text{dist}(E_2(u_{2i-1}), E_1(u_{2i})) + \text{dist}(E_1(u_{2i}), E_2(u_{2i+1}))) \\
&= f(2) \cdot d = \frac{f(2)}{2} \text{dist}(x, y),
\end{aligned}$$

and if d is even,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(E_1(x), E_2(y)) &\leq \text{dist}(E_1(u_0), E_2(u_0)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{d/2-1} (\text{dist}(E_2(u_{2i}), E_1(u_{2i+1})) + \text{dist}(E_1(u_{2i+1}), E_2(u_{2i+2}))) \\ &= f(0) + f(2) \cdot d = f(0) + \frac{f(2)}{2} \text{dist}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

The remaining bounds are obtained by adding $f(0)$ to the upper bound to change between $E_1(x)$ and $E_2(x)$. \square

Proposition 16 (Restated). *Let $f: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that, for infinitely many n , there exists an extended two-player f -code $F_1, F_2: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then for any fixed constant k , there are constants $r_1, r_2 \leq 2f(0) + f(2) \cdot k$ such that, for infinitely many values n , there exists an extended two-player f -code E_1, E_2 where*

$$E_1: \binom{[2n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m'(n)]}{r_1} \quad E_2: \binom{[2n]}{k} \rightarrow \binom{[m'(n)]}{r_2}.$$

Proof. Fix any constant k , any n , and let $N > n$ be sufficiently large (to be determined later). Let $F_1, F_2: \binom{[2N]}{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$ be an extended two-player f -code, and write g, g_1, g_2 for the functions such that for all $X, Y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(F_1(X), F_2(Y)) &= g(\text{dist}(X, Y)) \\ \text{dist}(F_1(X), F_1(Y)) &= g_1(\text{dist}(X, Y)) \\ \text{dist}(F_2(X), F_2(Y)) &= g_2(\text{dist}(X, Y)). \end{aligned}$$

Let $F'_1, F'_2: \binom{[N]}{k} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$ be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} F'_1(x) &:= F_1(x \cup ([2N] \setminus [N+k])) \\ F'_2(y) &:= F_2(y \cup ([2N] \setminus [N+k])), \end{aligned}$$

and observe that the padding does not change the distance, so $F'_1, F'_2: \binom{[2N]}{k} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$ is also an extended two-player f -code with associated functions g, g_1, g_2 . Now define $F''_1, F''_2: \binom{[N]}{k} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} F''_1(x) &:= F'_1(x) \oplus F'_1([k]) \\ F''_2(x) &:= F'_2(x) \oplus F'_1([k]), \end{aligned}$$

noting that the same string $F'_1([k])$ is used in both cases. This transformation preserves distances between encodings, so F''_1, F''_2 remains an extended two-player f -code, but now, using [Proposition 17](#), for any $x \in \binom{[N]}{k}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F''_1(x)| &= \text{dist}(F'_1(x), F'_1([k])) \leq 2f(0) + \frac{f(2)}{2} \cdot 2k \\ |F''_2(y)| &= \text{dist}(F'_2(y), F'_1([k])) \leq 2f(0) + \frac{f(2)}{2} \cdot 2k. \end{aligned}$$

Now we assign to every subset $S \subseteq [N]$ with cardinality $|S| = k$ the color $\text{col}(S) = (|F_1''(S)|, |F_2''(S)|)$. By the hypergraph Ramsey theorem ([Theorem 30](#)), if N is sufficiently large, there exists a subset $T \subseteq [N]$ of cardinality $|T| = n$ such that all subsets $S \subseteq T$ of cardinality $|S| = k$ have the same color (r_1, r_2) with $r_1, r_2 \leq 2f(0) + f(2) \cdot k$. Then we obtain the desired extended two-player f -code by restricting F_1'', F_2'' to the coordinates T and relabeling the coordinates as $[n]$. Since there is a constant number of options for $r_1, r_2 \leq 2f(0) + f(2) \cdot k$, there must be two fixed values r_1, r_2 which are obtained by the above argument for infinitely many values of n . \square

5 Separations from the k -Hamming Distance Hierarchy

We now apply the f -code theorems to prove our main result about communication complexity. We prove that the $\{4, 4\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE problem cannot be computed by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ queries to a k -HAMMING DISTANCE oracle, no matter which constant k we choose.

5.1 Definitions: Communication, Oracles, and Reductions

Let us begin with some definitions since they will differ slightly from the standard definitions (e.g. [\[KN96, RY20\]](#)).

Definition 6 (Communication Problem). For any alphabet Λ , a Λ -valued communication problem is a set \mathcal{P} of Λ -valued matrices. For a fixed matrix P , we write $R_\delta(P)$ for the randomized, public-coin, two-way communication cost of P with error probability at most δ . A communication problem \mathcal{P} has *constant-cost* if there is a constant c such that $R_{1/4}(P) \leq c$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

Definition 7 (Query set). A *query set* is a set \mathcal{Q} of matrices that is closed under (1) row and column copying; (2) row and column permutations; and (3) row and column deletions. For any set \mathcal{M} of matrices, we write $\text{QS}(\mathcal{M})$ for the closure of \mathcal{M} under these operations (i.e. the minimal query set containing \mathcal{M}).

Definition 8 (Communication with Oracle Queries). Let \mathcal{Q} be any set of Boolean matrices and let \mathcal{P} be any communication problem. A deterministic *communication protocol* for $P : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \Lambda$ with oracle access to \mathcal{Q} is defined by a binary tree T , where each inner node v of T is labeled by a $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ submatrix $Q_v \in \text{QS}(\mathcal{Q})$ in the query set of \mathcal{Q} , and each leaf of T is labeled with an element of Λ . Any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ then naturally corresponds to a path from the root to a leaf $\ell(x, y)$, where at each node v , $Q_v(x, y)$ is used to decide whether to travel to the left or right child. The protocol correctly computes P if $P(x, y)$ is equal to the label of $\ell(x, y)$ for every x, y . The cost of the protocol is the maximum number of internal nodes on any path from the root to a leaf of T . The minimum cost of such a protocol for P is denoted by $D^{\mathcal{Q}}(P)$.

Remark 3. The above definition does not allow “normal” communication—Alice and Bob cannot send messages directly to each other. But, as long as \mathcal{Q} is non-trivial (i.e. contains a matrix Q with either a row or column that is not monochromatic), messages can be simulated by oracle queries.

Definition 9 (Reduction). We say that a communication problem \mathcal{P} *reduces to* a problem \mathcal{Q} if there is a constant c such that $D^{\mathcal{Q}}(P) \leq c$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$.

In the introduction, we informally stated an alternate definition of reduction. Here is the formal statement, common in [\[HWZ22, HZ24, FHHH24\]](#):

Proposition 19. *Let \mathcal{P} be any communication problem and let \mathcal{Q} be any query set of matrices with entries in the alphabet Λ . If $D^{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ then there exists a constant q and a function $\rho: \Lambda^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that, for every $N \times M$ matrix $P \in \mathcal{P}$, there exist $N \times M$ matrices $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$P = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q). \quad (3)$$

Proof sketch. Think of the function ρ as simulating the protocol for P given the answers to each query. This may depend on the protocol itself, but since it is only constant-size, there is only a constant number of possible functions, so we can pad the protocol with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ queries to encode the specific choice of ρ . \square

5.2 Extracting f -Codes from k -Hamming Distance Oracles

We will now show how to obtain a non-affine two-player f -code using a reduction from $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ to HD_k . Together with [Theorem 14](#) this will imply our main result, [Theorem 1](#).

Lemma 20. *Suppose that there exists a constant k such that $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ reduces to HD_k . Then there exists a function $f: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(4) \neq \frac{1}{2}(f(2) + f(6))$, and for infinitely many n there is a two-player f -code $E_1, E_2: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$.*

The starting point of our proof is [Proposition 19](#). The first step will be to use an invariance lemma to strengthen this proposition and impose structure on the query matrices Q_i in [Equation \(3\)](#). The query set of matrices $\text{QS}(\text{HD}_k)$ is the set of matrices obtained by performing row and column copies, deletions, and permutations from the base set of matrices $\text{HD}_k: \{0, 1\}^t \times \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. We augment these query matrices as follows; it is clear that these augmented queries are more powerful, so that a reduction to HD_k implies a reduction to the augmented query set:

Definition 10 (Augmented Query Set). Let $k \leq K$ be any constants. We will define the following set of matrices. We define the set $\Lambda := \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $H_t: \{0, 1\}^t \times \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \Lambda$ as the matrix defined by

$$H_t(u, v) := (\mathbb{1}[\text{dist}(u, v) \leq k], \max(\text{dist}(x, y), K)) .$$

We then let $\mathcal{Q} := \text{QS}(\{H_t : t \in \mathbb{N}\})$ be the query set obtained from these matrices by taking the closure under row and column duplications, deletions, and permutations.

Our analysis will focus on the inputs x, y to $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ which have $2n$ blocks of $2n$ bits and Hamming weight exactly n in each block. For simplicity of notation, write $\Sigma_n := \binom{[2n]}{n}$ for the weight n slice, so that we are interested in the subset of inputs to $\text{HD}_{4,4}^{2n}$ belonging to Σ_n^{2n} . We use the following definition:

Definition 11 (Distance Signatures). For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $x, y \in \Sigma_n^{2n}$, we let the *distance signature* of x, y be the (unordered) multiset of nonzero distances each of the $2n$ blocks:

$$\text{sig}(x, y) := \{\text{dist}(x_i, y_i) : i \in [2n], \text{dist}(x_i, y_i) > 0\} .$$

Note that $\text{HD}_{4,4}^{2n}(x, y) = 1$ if and only if $\text{sig}(x, y) = \{4, 4\}$. In particular, the value of $\text{HD}_{4,4}^{2n}(x, y)$ on inputs $x, y \in \Sigma_n^{2n}$ depends only on their distance signature. Our strengthened version of [Proposition 19](#) shows that we may force the (augmented) query matrices to *also* depend only on the distance signatures. This lemma will be proved in the section dedicated to invariance lemmas; see [Section 6.4](#).

Lemma 21. *Suppose there exists a constant k such that $D^{\text{HD}_k}(\text{HD}_{4,4}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Let $K \geq k$ be any constant and let \mathcal{Q} be the query set on values $\Lambda := \{0, 1\} \times \{0, \dots, K\}$ defined in [Definition 10](#). Then there exists a constant q and a function $\rho: \Lambda^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which depends only on the first bit of each input in Λ , such that: $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$\text{HD}_{4,4}^{2n} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q),$$

and for every $x, y, u, v \in \Sigma_n^{2n}$ and $i \in [q]$,

$$\text{sig}(x, y) = \text{sig}(u, v) \implies Q_i(x, y) = Q_i(u, v).$$

We may now prove our main lemma, which shows that if there is a reduction from $\{4, 4\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE to k -HAMMING DISTANCE, then we can extract two-player f -codes E_1, E_2 for constant functions $f: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $f(4) \neq \frac{1}{2}(f(2) + f(6))$.

Proof of [Lemma 20](#). Fix any constant k and suppose $D^{\text{HD}_k}(\text{HD}_{4,4}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Let $K = 10k$ and let $\Lambda = \{0, 1\} \times \{0, \dots, K\}$ and \mathcal{Q} be the Λ -valued matrices of [Definition 10](#). Then we apply [Lemma 21](#) so that there exists a constant q and a function $\rho: \Lambda^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which depends only on the first bit of each of its q inputs, such that for all n there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ with

$$\text{HD}_{4,4}^{2n} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q),$$

such that $Q_i(x, y) = Q_i(u, v)$ whenever $x, y, u, v \in \Sigma_n$ satisfy $\text{sig}(x, y) = \text{sig}(u, v)$.

Now suppose that x, y have $\text{sig}(x, y) = \{4, 4\}$ while x', y' have $\text{sig}(x', y') = \{2, 6\}$. Recall that $\rho: \Lambda^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ depends only on the first bit of each input in Λ . Assume for the sake of contradiction that

$$\forall i \in [q] : \text{first bit of } Q_i(x, y) = \text{first bit of } Q_i(x', y').$$

Then $\text{HD}_{4,4}(x, y) = \rho(Q_1(x, y), \dots, Q_q(x, y)) = \rho(Q_1(x', y'), \dots, Q_q(x', y')) = \text{HD}_{4,4}(x', y')$, which is a contradiction, so it must be the case that there exists some $j \in [q]$ such that

$$\text{first bit of } Q_j(x, y) \neq \text{first bit of } Q_j(x', y'). \quad (4)$$

By definition of \mathcal{Q} , there is some matrix $H_m: \{0, 1\}^m \times \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \Lambda$ and some pair of maps $\phi, \psi: \Sigma_n^{2n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that

$$\forall x, y \in \Sigma_n^n : \quad Q_j(x, y) = H_m(\phi(x), \psi(y)).$$

We now choose arbitrary pairs of strings $(x^{(0)}, y^{(0)}), (x^{(2)}, y^{(2)}), (x^{(4)}, y^{(4)}), (x^{(6)}, y^{(6)}) \in \Sigma_n^2$ which satisfy $\text{dist}(x^{(\beta)}, y^{(\beta)}) = \beta$ for each $\beta \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$, and we also choose an arbitrary $z \in \Sigma_n$. Define the functions $f_2, f_4, f_6, g: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(\beta) &:= \text{dist} \left(\phi \left((x^{(2)}, x^{(\beta)}, z, z, \dots, z) \right), \psi \left((y^{(2)}, y^{(\beta)}, z, z, \dots, z) \right) \right) \\ f_4(\beta) &:= \text{dist} \left(\phi \left((x^{(4)}, x^{(\beta)}, z, z, \dots, z) \right), \psi \left((y^{(4)}, y^{(\beta)}, z, z, \dots, z) \right) \right) \\ f_6(\beta) &:= \text{dist} \left(\phi \left((x^{(6)}, x^{(\beta)}, z, z, \dots, z) \right), \psi \left((y^{(6)}, y^{(\beta)}, z, z, \dots, z) \right) \right) \\ g(\beta) &:= \text{dist} \left(\phi \left((x^{(\beta)}, x^{(\beta)}, z, z, \dots, z) \right), \psi \left((y^{(\beta)}, y^{(\beta)}, z, z, \dots, z) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We now define maps on domain Σ_n as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^{(f_\alpha)}(u) &:= \phi \left((x^{(\alpha)}, u, z, z, \dots, z) \right) & E_2^{(f_\alpha)}(u) &:= \psi \left((y^{(\alpha)}, u, z, z, \dots, z) \right) \\ E_1^{(g)}(u) &:= \phi \left((u, u, z, z, \dots, z) \right) & E_2^{(g)}(u) &:= \psi \left((u, u, z, z, \dots, z) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Our goal is to show that that each $E_1^{(h)}, E_2^{(h)}$ is a two-player h -code. For convenience, for each $h \in \{f_2, f_4, f_6, g\}$, we define

$$H_m^{(h)}(u, v) := H_m(E_1^{(h)}(u), E_2^{(h)}(v)).$$

As desired, these values are invariant under permutations:

Claim 22. *For any $u, v, u', v' \in \Sigma_n$, if $\text{dist}(u, v) = \text{dist}(u', v')$ then $H_m^{(h)}(u, v) = H_m^{(h)}(u', v')$.*

Proof of claim. Any $u, v, u', v' \in \Sigma_n$ with $\text{dist}(u, v) = \text{dist}(u', v')$ have the same signature in the inputs defined in Equation (6), and the value of $H_m(\phi(\cdot), \psi(\cdot))$ depends only on the signature. \square

We cannot immediately conclude from Claim 22 that each pair $E_1^{(h)}, E_2^{(h)}$ is a two-player h -code, because the value

$$H_m^{(h)}(u, v) = \left(\mathbb{1} \left[\text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(u), E_2^{(h)}(v)) \leq k \right], \max\{K, \text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(u), E_2^{(h)}(v))\} \right) \quad (7)$$

is not yet guaranteed to determine the value $\text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(u), E_2^{(h)}(v))$, because of the max in the second part. We must show that these distances are less than K in order to obtain the two-player h -codes:

Claim 23. *For any $h \in \{f_2, f_4, f_6, g\}$ and any $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$:*

1. *If $h(\beta) < K$ then every $u, v \in \Sigma_n$ with $\text{dist}(u, v) = \beta$ satisfies $\text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(u), E_2^{(h)}(v)) = h(\beta)$.*
2. *If $f_\alpha(\beta) < K$ then $f_\alpha(\beta) = f_\beta(\alpha)$, and if $f_\beta(\beta) < K$ then $g(\beta) = f_\beta(\beta)$.*

Proof of claim. Let $u, v \in \Sigma_n$ satisfy $\text{dist}(u, v) = \beta$. From Claim 22, we know the entry $H_m^{(h)}(u, v)$ in Equation (7) remains the same if we replace u, v with $x^{(\beta)}, y^{(\beta)}$. Since $\text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(x^{(\beta)}), E_2^{(h)}(y^{(\beta)})) = h(\beta) < K$, the maximum K in the second part of the entry is not achieved. So

$$\text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(u), E_2^{(h)}(v)) = \text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(x^{(\beta)}), E_2^{(h)}(y^{(\beta)})) = h(\beta).$$

The second conclusion of the claim follows from the fact that, assuming the maximum K is not achieved, swapping the first two blocks in the strings in Equation (5) will not change the signature and therefore will not change the entry of $H_m(\phi(\cdot), \psi(\cdot))$, which means the distance also will not change. \square

We observe that $f_6(2) \neq f_4(4)$, which follows from Equation (4) because $Q_j(x, y)$ depends only on $\text{sig}(x, y)$, and the inputs defining $f_6(2)$ and $f_4(4)$ have signatures $\{2, 6\}$ and $\{4, 4\}$. From Equation (4) and the definition of H_m , this means that either

$$f_6(2) \leq k \text{ or } f_4(4) \leq k, . \quad (8)$$

This will be sufficient to bound the other values of $h(\beta)$ using the triangle inequality. We will require Fact 26, proved below.

Claim 24. *Assume $n \geq 12$. Let $h \in \{f_2, f_4, f_6, g\}$ and $\beta \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$. Then $h(\beta) < K$.*

Proof of claim. From Equation (8), we have either $f_6(2) \leq k$ or $f_4(4) \leq k$. Assume $f_6(2) \leq k$; a nearly identical proof will hold if we instead assume $f_4(4) \leq k$. Let $u, v \in \Sigma_n$ have $\text{dist}(u, v) = \beta$ for any $\beta \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$. Then by Fact 26, there exists $w_1, w_2 \in \Sigma_n$ such that $\text{dist}(u, w_1) = \text{dist}(w_1, w_2) = \text{dist}(w_2, u) = 2$. Then by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(u), E_2^{(h)}(u)) &\leq \text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(u), E_2^{(h)}(w_1)) + \text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(w_1), E_2^{(h)}(w_2)) + \text{dist}(E_1^{(h)}(w_2), E_2^{(h)}(v)) \\ &\leq 3 \cdot f_6(2) \leq 3k, \end{aligned}$$

where the final line follows from Claim 23. This establishes $f_6(\beta) \leq 3k < K$ for any $\beta \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$. Again using Claim 23, we have $f_\alpha(6) = f_6(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$. Repeating similar arguments with the assumption that $f_\alpha(6) \leq 3k$, we get $f_\alpha(\beta) \leq 3 \cdot 3k$ for any $\beta \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$, so $f_\alpha(\beta) \leq 9k$ for all $\alpha \in \{2, 4, 6\}, \beta \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$. Again using Claim 23, we also have $g(\beta) = f_\beta(\beta) \leq 9k$. \square

From Claim 23 and Claim 24, we may now conclude that each $E_1^{(h)}, E_2^{(h)}$ is a two-player h -code with all values $h(\beta) < K$. Now we claim that at least one of these h -codes must be non-affine:

Claim 25. *One of the functions $h \in \{f_2, f_4, f_6, g\}$ satisfies $h(4) \neq \frac{1}{2}(h(2) + h(6))$.*

Proof of claim. Assume for the sake of contradiction that for all functions $h \in \{f_2, f_4, f_6, g\}$ we have $h(4) = \frac{1}{2}(h(2) + h(6))$. In other words, for each h there is a constant λ such that the values $h(2), h(4), h(6)$ are an arithmetic progression with step size λ (i.e. $h(4) = h(2) + \lambda, h(6) = h(4) + \lambda$). We denote by $\lambda_2, \lambda_4, \lambda_6, \lambda_g$ the constants for f_2, f_4, f_6, g , respectively. Recall from Claim 24 and Claim 23 that $f_\alpha(\beta) = f_\beta(\alpha)$ and $g(\beta) = f_\beta(\beta)$. Then we may write $f(\alpha, \beta) = f_\alpha(\beta) = f_\beta(\alpha)$ and put the values in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} f(6, 2) & \xrightarrow{+\lambda_6} & f(6, 4) & \xrightarrow{+\lambda_6} & f(6, 6) \\ \uparrow +\lambda_2 & & \uparrow +\lambda_4 & \nearrow +\lambda_g & \uparrow +\lambda_6 \\ f(4, 2) & \xrightarrow{+\lambda_4} & f(4, 4) & \xrightarrow{+\lambda_4} & f(4, 6) \\ \uparrow +\lambda_2 & \nearrow +\lambda_g & \uparrow +\lambda_4 & & \uparrow +\lambda_6 \\ f(2, 2) & \xrightarrow{+\lambda_2} & f(2, 4) & \xrightarrow{+\lambda_2} & f(2, 6) \end{array}$$

Recall from Equation (8) that that $f(2, 6) \neq f(4, 4)$. From the upper left quadrant of the diagram, we have $2\lambda_4 = \lambda_2 + \lambda_6$. On the diagonal, $\lambda_g = \lambda_2 + \lambda_4 = \lambda_4 + \lambda_6$ so $\lambda_2 = \lambda_6$. Then $\lambda_2 = \lambda_4 = \lambda_6$, which contradicts $f(4, 4) \neq f(2, 6)$. \square


To conclude the proof of Lemma 20, we observe that, since $h(\beta) < K$ for each $\beta \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$, there is only a constant number of functions $\{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow [K] \cup \{0\}$ to choose from. For every sufficiently large n , one of the chosen functions must be non-affine and admit a two-player h -code. Therefore there must be some non-affine function $f: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow [K] \cup \{0\}$ which admits a two-player f -code for infinitely many values of n . \square

Let us prove the simple fact that was used above to apply the triangle inequality:

Fact 26. Let $n \geq 12$, let $u, v \in \Sigma_n$ have $\text{dist}(u, v) \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ and let $s \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then there exist $w_1, w_2 \in \Sigma_n$ such that

$$\text{dist}(u, w_1) = \text{dist}(w_1, w_2) = \text{dist}(w_2, v) = 2s.$$

Proof. We verify the statement for the case $\text{dist}(u, v) = 2, s = 3$; the other cases are similar. Without loss of generality we may consider $n = 12$, and one may check that the following construction suffices (up to permutations):



□

5.3 A $\{k, k\}$ -Hamming Distance Hierarchy

Having proved that $\{4, 4\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE is not reducible to the k -HAMMING DISTANCE hierarchy, we can now show that there is another infinite hierarchy of $\{k, k\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE problems which are each separate from the k -HAMMING DISTANCE hierarchy. This is a simple consequence of the main result of [FHHH24]:

Theorem 27 ([FHHH24]). *For every constant-cost communication problem \mathcal{Q} , there exists a constant k such that k -HAMMING DISTANCE does not reduce to \mathcal{Q} .*

Corollary 28. *For every constant k , there exists a constant $k' > k$ such that $\{k', k'\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE does not reduce to $\{k, k\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE.*

Proof. Fix any constant k and let k' be the constant obtained from **Theorem 27** by letting \mathcal{Q} be the constant-cost problem $\text{HD}_{k,k}$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that there is a reduction from $\text{HD}_{k',k'}$ to $\text{HD}_{k,k}$, so that

$$D^{\text{HD}_{k,k}}(\text{HD}_{k',k'}^n) = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

We then obtain a reduction from $\text{HD}_{k'}$ to HD_k as follows. For $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, define

$$p(x) := (x, x, \vec{0}, \dots, \vec{0}) \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^n$$

where the all-0 vector is repeated $n - 2$ times. Then for $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$, we have

$$\text{HD}_{k'}^n(x, y) = 1 \iff \text{HD}_{k',k'}^n(p(x), p(y)) = 1.$$

Then on inputs x, y to $\text{HD}_{k'}$, the two players can use one query to $\text{HD}_{k',k'}^n$ to solve the problem, so $D^{\text{HD}_{k',k'}}(\text{HD}_{k'}) = 1$. But then

$$D^{\text{HD}_{k,k}}(\text{HD}_{k'}^n) \leq D^{\text{HD}_{k,k}}(\text{HD}_{k',k'}^n) = \mathcal{O}(1),$$

which contradicts the fact that $\text{HD}_{k'}$ does not reduce to $\text{HD}_{k,k}$. □

6 Invariance Lemmas

In this section we prove the “invariance lemmas” (Lemmas 5, 15 and 21) that were used in several places in the above proofs. These lemmas all use a similar type of argument, which generalizes the main argument of [FHHH24].

Throughout this section, for any string x and any subset I of its indices, we write x_I for the substring of x on coordinates I . Moreover, we write $x_{[i:j]}$ for the substring of x on coordinates $\{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$.

We require the definition of a *stable matrix set*.

Definition 12 (Stable Matrix Set). Let Λ be any fixed, finite alphabet and let \mathcal{Q} be any set of matrices with entries in Λ . For any $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we say that sequences r_1, \dots, r_t of rows and c_1, \dots, c_t of columns form a GREATER-THAN submatrix of size t if there exist distinct $a, b \in \Lambda$ such that

$$Q(r_i, c_j) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } i \leq j \\ b & \text{if } i > j. \end{cases}$$

We say the set \mathcal{Q} is *stable* if there exists a constant t such that every GREATER-THAN submatrix of every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ has size at most t .

The following proposition has been used in [HWZ22, HZ24, FHHH24] and follows easily from the fact that the GREATER-THAN communication problem has non-constant communication cost (see e.g. [Nis93, Vio15]).

Proposition 29. *Let \mathcal{Q} be any set of matrices. If $R(\mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ then \mathcal{Q} is stable.*

Several of the proofs in this section will use the following “domino notation”:

Definition 13 (Domino). Let Σ be an arbitrary finite alphabet. We call a pair $ab \in \Sigma^2$ a *domino* and we denote it as $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any pair $(x, y) \in \Sigma^n \times \Sigma^n$, the *dominoes* of (x, y) is the sequence

$$\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} := \left(\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} x_n \\ y_n \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

We make frequent use of the hypergraph Ramsey theorem, which we state here for convenience.

Theorem 30 (Hypergraph Ramsey theorem). *For any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \geq \alpha$, there exists $R = R(\alpha, \beta, \sigma)$ such that for any coloring $\kappa: \binom{[R]}{\alpha} \rightarrow [\beta]$, there exists a subset $T \subseteq [R]$ of size σ such that κ is constant on $\binom{T}{\alpha}$.*

We use an easy corollary of this theorem (see e.g. [FHHH24] for an elementary proof of this). For any set T and any $0 \leq t \leq |T|$, write $\binom{T}{\leq t}$ for the set of subsets of T of cardinality at most t .

Corollary 31. *For any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \geq \alpha$, there exists $N = N(\alpha, \beta, \sigma)$ such that for any coloring $\kappa: \binom{[N]}{\leq \alpha} \rightarrow [\beta]$, there exists $T \subseteq [N]$ of size σ such that κ is constant on $\binom{T}{\alpha'}$ for every $\alpha' \leq \alpha$.*

6.1 A General Invariance Lemma for Hamming Distance

A function $f: \{0, 1\}^* \times \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is permutation invariant if for every $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and every permutation $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [n]$, it holds that $f(x, y) = f(\pi x, \pi y)$.

The following lemma is essentially the main tool of [FHHH24], although we need it in a more general form that is not obviously obtained from [FHHH24] without carefully inspecting the proof. This argument will also be the basis for some other arguments later in the paper.

The general lemma may be difficult to parse, but it essentially says the following. Suppose that $\gamma(\text{dist}(x, y))$ can be computed from x, y , in the form of $h(Q(\phi(x), \phi(y)))$ for some functions ϕ and h , where Q is a stable matrix. Then we can without loss of generality assume that $Q(\phi(x), \phi(y))$ is permutation invariant.

Lemma 32. *Let $\gamma: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ be any function with domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and any range \mathcal{R} . For any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathcal{Q}_n be any stable set of matrices with entries in a fixed, finite set Λ_n such that the following holds: there exists $h_n: \Lambda_n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ such that for infinitely many values of N , there exists an $m(N) \times m(N)$ matrix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and a map $\phi_N: \{0, 1\}^N \rightarrow [m(N)]$ which satisfy*

$$\forall x, y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}, \text{ if } \text{dist}(x, y) \in \mathcal{D} \text{ then } h_n(Q(\phi_N(x), \phi_N(y))) = \gamma(\text{dist}(x, y)). \quad (9)$$

Then there exists an $m' \times m'$ matrix $Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and a map $\phi'_n: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow [m']$ which satisfy

$$\forall x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{n}, \text{ if } \text{dist}(x, y) \in \mathcal{D} \text{ then } h_n(Q'(\phi'_n(x), \phi'_n(y))) = \gamma(\text{dist}(x, y)).$$

and $Q'(\phi'_n(x), \phi'_n(y))$ is permutation-invariant.

Proof. Under the assumptions of the lemma, we first prove the following claim.

Claim 33. *For every N , there exists a matrix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and a map ϕ_N which satisfy Equation (9) and such that $Q(\phi_N(x), \phi_N(y))$ is $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ -swap invariant.*

Proof. Let $N' > N$ be sufficiently large and let $Q, \phi_{N'}, \phi_{N'}$ satisfy Equation (9). For every subset $S \subseteq [N']$ with cardinality $|S| \leq N$ we assign a color $\text{col}(S)$ as follows. For every $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^{|S|}$, we append the value $Q(\phi_{N'}(X), \phi_{N'}(Y)) \in \Lambda_n$ to $\text{col}(S)$, where X and Y are defined as follows. Define $X \in \{0, 1\}^{N'}$ to be the unique string such that $X_S = x$ and is 0 on all coordinates $[N'] \setminus S$. Define $Y \in \{0, 1\}^{N'}$ similarly with respect to y .

Observe that the total number of distinct colors is at most $\Lambda_n^{2^{2N}}$ which is independent of N' . Therefore for sufficiently large N' the hypergraph Ramsey theorem (Corollary 31) guarantees the existence of $T \subseteq [N']$ of cardinality $|T| = N$ such that any two subsets $S, S' \subseteq T$ with $|S| = |S'|$ have $\text{col}(S) = \text{col}(S')$.

Now for every $x \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$, define $\text{pad}(x)$ as the unique string equal to x on coordinates T and 0 elsewhere, and define $\phi_N(x) := \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x))$. Observe the following properties:

- For all $x, y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$, $\text{dist}(\text{pad}(x), \text{pad}(y)) = \text{dist}(x, y)$. So if $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(Q(\phi_N(x), \phi_N(y))) &= h_n(Q(\phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(y)))) \\ &= \gamma(\text{dist}(\text{pad}(x), \text{pad}(y))) \\ &= \gamma(\text{dist}(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

- If $x, y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ are obtained from $x', y' \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ by swapping a $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ domino with one of its neighbors, then the subsequences of non- $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes of $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix}$ are identical. Let $S, S' \subseteq$

T be, respectively, the subsets of coordinates $i \in T$ where $\begin{pmatrix} \text{pad}(x)_i \\ \text{pad}(y)_i \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} \text{pad}(x')_i \\ \text{pad}(y')_i \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Then the subsequence of dominos $\begin{pmatrix} \text{pad}(x) \\ \text{pad}(y) \end{pmatrix}$ on coordinates S is equal to the subsequence of dominoes $\begin{pmatrix} \text{pad}(x') \\ \text{pad}(y') \end{pmatrix}$ on coordinates S' . By definition of the colors, we have

$$Q(\phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(y))) = Q(\phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x')), \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(y'))),$$

and therefore

$$Q(\phi_N(x), \phi_N(y)) = Q(\phi_N(x'), \phi_N(y')).$$

This concludes the proof of the claim. \square

Claim 34. For every N , there exists a matrix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and map ϕ_N which satisfy Equation (9) and such that $Q(\phi_N(x), \phi_N(y))$ is $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ -swap invariant.

Proof. Using Claim 33, for a sufficiently large $N' > N$ there are $Q, \phi_{N'}, \phi_{N'}$ that satisfy Equation (9) with the guarantee that $Q(\phi_{N'}(X), \phi_{N'}(Y))$ is $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ -swap invariant for $X, Y \in \binom{[2N']}{N'}$. Proceed to define colors and apply the Ramsey theorem; as in the proof of Claim 33, except here we pad the inputs with 1s instead of 0s.

For every $x \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$, define $\text{pad}(x) \in \binom{[2N']}{N'}$ as the unique string equal to x on coordinates T and 1 elsewhere, and define $\phi_N(x) := \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x))$. Observe the following properties:

- For all $x, y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$, $\text{dist}(\text{pad}(x), \text{pad}(y)) = \text{dist}(x, y)$. So if $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(Q(\phi_N(x), \phi_N(y))) &= h_n(Q(\phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(y)))) \\ &= \gamma(\text{dist}(\text{pad}(x), \text{pad}(y))) = \gamma(\text{dist}(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

- If $x, y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ are obtained from $x', y' \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ by swapping a $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ domino with one of its neighbors, then the corresponding $\text{pad}(x), \text{pad}(y) \in \binom{[2N']}{N'}$ is obtained from $\text{pad}(x'), \text{pad}(y') \in \binom{[2N']}{N'}$ by a sequence of swaps of a $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ domino with one of its neighbors. By assumption, each one of these swaps preserves the value of $Q(\phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(y)))$, so we have

$$Q(\phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(y))) = Q(\phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(x')), \phi_{N'}(\text{pad}(y'))),$$

and therefore

$$Q(\phi_N(x), \phi_N(y)) = Q(\phi_N(x'), \phi_N(y')).$$

- The same argument as in Claim 33 shows that if $x, y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ are obtained from $x', y' \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ by a sequence of swaps of a $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ with its neighbors, then

$$Q(\phi_N(x), \phi_N(y)) = Q(\phi_N(x'), \phi_N(y')).$$

This concludes the proof of the claim. \square

The final claim necessary to complete the proof of [Lemma 32](#) is the following.

Claim 35. *There exists a matrix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and a map ϕ_n which satisfy [Equation \(9\)](#) and such that $Q(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y))$ is permutation-invariant.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{Q}_n is stable, there exists some $t = t(n)$ such that no $t \times t$ GREATER-THAN instance appears as a submatrix in \mathcal{Q}_n . Let $N > n + 4t$ and, using [Claim 34](#), let Q, ϕ_N satisfy [Equation \(9\)](#) with the guarantee that $Q(\phi_N(X), \phi_N(Y))$ is $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}, \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ -swap invariant for on $X, Y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$.

For each $x \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ we define $\text{pad}(x) = x0^{2t}1^{2t} \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ and $\phi_n(x) := \phi_N(\text{pad}(x))$. Observe that for every $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ with $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(Q(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y))) &= h_n(Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y)))) \\ &= \gamma(\text{dist}(\text{pad}(x), \text{pad}(y))) = \gamma(\text{dist}(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ is obtained from $x', y' \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ by swapping one $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}$ - or $\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}$ -domino with one of its neighbors. Then $\text{pad}(x), \text{pad}(y)$ is also obtained from $\text{pad}(x'), \text{pad}(y')$ by swapping one of these dominoes with one of its neighbors, so by the guarantee given by [Claim 34](#) we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)) &= Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y))) \\ &= Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x')), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y'))) = Q(\phi_n(x'), \phi_n(y')). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, suppose that x, y is obtained from x', y' by swapping two consecutive $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}$ and $\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}$ dominoes. Then for some $\ell \in [n]$, we may write without loss of generality

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} \text{pad}(x) \\ \text{pad}(y) \end{array} &= \begin{array}{c} x_{[1:\ell]} \\ y_{[1:\ell]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} x_{[\ell+2:n]} \\ y_{[\ell+2:n]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{pad}(x') \\ \text{pad}(y') \end{array} &= \begin{array}{c} x_{[1:\ell]} \\ y_{[1:\ell]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} x_{[\ell+2:n]} \\ y_{[\ell+2:n]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that

$$Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y))) \neq Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x')), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y'))).$$

For any $i, j \in [t+1]$ with $i < j$, we can rearrange $\begin{array}{c} \text{pad}(x) \\ \text{pad}(y) \end{array}$ by swapping only $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}$ dominoes with their neighbors, and therefore without changing the value of $Q(\phi_N(\cdot), \phi_N(\cdot))$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} X^{(i)} \\ Y^{(j)} \end{array} := \begin{array}{c} x_{[1:\ell]} \\ y_{[1:\ell]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \dots \underbrace{\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}}_{2t+2} \begin{array}{c} x_{[\ell+2:n]} \\ y_{[\ell+2:n]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array},$$

where $X^{(i)}$ has 1 in coordinate $\ell + 2i$ and $Y^{(j)}$ has 1 in coordinate $\ell + 2j - 1$. On the other hand, if $j \geq i$, we can rearrange $\begin{array}{c} \text{pad}(x') \\ \text{pad}(y') \end{array}$ without changing the value of $Q(\phi_N(\cdot), \phi_N(\cdot))$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} X^{(i)} \\ Y^{(j)} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} x_{[1:\ell]} \\ y_{[1:\ell]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} x_{[\ell+2:n]} \\ y_{[\ell+2:n]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array}.$$

But then if $Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y))) \neq Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x')), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y')))$ then the rows $X^{(i)}$ and columns $Y^{(j)}$ form a $(t+1) \times (t+1)$ GREATER-THAN submatrix, which is a contradiction. So it must be the case that

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)) &= Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x)), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y))) \\ &= Q(\phi_N(\text{pad}(x')), \phi_N(\text{pad}(y'))) = Q(\phi_n(x'), \phi_n(y')), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. This proves the claim. \square

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

6.2 Invariance Lemma for Single-Player Code Extension

Lemma 5 (Restated). *Suppose $f: \{2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is such that, for infinitely many n , there exists an f -code $E: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then for every n , there exists an extended f -code $E': \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'(n)}$.*

Proof. Fix any n and let $n' = \frac{f(2)}{2} \cdot n$. Define \mathcal{Q}_n by including for every $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, the matrix $Q: \{0, 1\}^\ell \times \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, n'\}$ defined as $Q(x, y) = \max(\text{dist}(x, y), n')$. Then by [Proposition 29](#), \mathcal{Q}_n is stable since each matrix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ has $D^{\text{EHD}}_{n'}(Q) \leq n'$ which is independent of the size $2^\ell \times 2^\ell$ of Q .

There are infinitely many values N such that there exists an f -code $E: \binom{[2N]}{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$. Thus for any such N and any $x, y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ with $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$, we have $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) \leq n'$, and so

$$f(\text{dist}(x, y)) = \text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = Q(E(x), E(y)),$$

where $Q: \{0, 1\}^{m(N)} \times \{0, 1\}^{m(N)} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n'\}$ is a matrix in \mathcal{Q}_n . So the hypothesis of [Lemma 32](#) is satisfied, so there exists a matrix $Q': \{0, 1\}^{m'(n)} \times \{0, 1\}^{m'(n)} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n'\}$ in \mathcal{Q}_n and functions $\phi_n: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'(n)}$ such that, for all $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$, if $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \{2, 4, 6\}$ then (using the fact that $f(\text{dist}(x, y)) \leq n'$)

$$f(\text{dist}(x, y)) = Q'(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)) = \max\{\text{dist}(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)), n'\} = \text{dist}(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)) \quad (10)$$

and $Q'(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)) = \max\{\text{dist}(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)), n'\}$ is permutation-invariant on (x, y) . So there is some function g such that

$$\forall x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{n}, \max\{\text{dist}(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)), n'\} = g(\text{dist}(x, y)).$$

Since ϕ_n is an f -code due to [Equation \(10\)](#), [Proposition 9](#) ensures that for all $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$,

$$\text{dist}(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y)) \leq n',$$

so $g(\text{dist}(x, y)) = \text{dist}(\phi_n(x), \phi_n(y))$. Then ϕ_n is an extended f -code, as desired. \square

6.3 Invariance Lemma for Two-Player Code Extension

Lemma 15 (Restated). *Let $f: \{0, 2, 4, 6\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be any function such that, for infinitely many n , there exists a two-player f -code $F_1, F_2: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(n)}$. Then for every n , there exists an extended two-player f -code $E_1, E_2: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m'(n)}$.*

Proof. Fix any n and let $n' = 2f(0) + \frac{f(2)}{2}n$. Define \mathcal{Q}_n as the set of matrices obtained by choosing any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and including the matrix $Q: \{0, 1\}^{2\ell} \times \{0, 1\}^{2\ell} \rightarrow \Lambda_n$ defined next, where

$$\Lambda_n := \{0, \dots, n'\} \times \{0, \dots, n'\} \times \{0, \dots, n'\},$$

For row $uv \in \{0, 1\}^\ell \times \{0, 1\}^\ell$ and column $u'v' \in \{0, 1\}^\ell \times \{0, 1\}^\ell$ we define

$$Q(uv', vv') := (\max(\text{dist}(u, v), n'), \max(\text{dist}(u', v'), n'), \max(\text{dist}(u, v'), n')).$$

By **Proposition 29**, \mathcal{Q}_n is stable since each matrix $D^{\text{EHD}_{n'}}(Q) \leq 3n'$ which is independent of the size $2^{2\ell} \times 2^{2\ell}$ of Q . Now we define $h_n: \Lambda_n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as the function $h_n(a_1, a_2, a_3) := a_3$.

There are infinitely many values N such that there exists a two-player f -code $E_1, E_2: \binom{[2N]}{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$. For any such N , if $x, y \in \binom{[2N]}{N}$ satisfy $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$, then $\text{dist}(E_1(x), E_2(y)) \leq n'$, and so

$$f(\text{dist}(x, y)) = \text{dist}(E_1(x), E_2(y)) = h_n(Q(E_1(x)E_2(x), E_1(y)E_2(y))),$$

where $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ has entry

$$Q(E_1(x)E_2(x), E_1(y)E_2(y)) = (\text{dist}(E_1(x), E_1(y)), \text{dist}(E_2(x), E_2(y)), \text{dist}(E_1(x), E_2(y))).$$

Then the hypothesis of **Lemma 32** is satisfied, so there exists a matrix $Q': \{0, 1\}^{2\ell} \times \{0, 1\}^{2\ell} \rightarrow \Lambda_n$ in \mathcal{Q}_n and a function $\phi_n: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2\ell}$ where, if we write $E'_1(x)$ as the first ℓ bits of $\phi_n(x)$ and $E'_2(x)$ as the last ℓ bits of $\phi_n(x)$, so that $\phi_n(x) = E'_1(x)E'_2(x)$, then for all $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ where $\text{dist}(x, y) \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\text{dist}(x, y)) &= h_n(Q'(E'_1(x)E'_2(x), E'_1(y)E'_2(y))) \\ &= \max(\text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_2(y)), n') = \text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_2(y)), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where we used the fact $f(\text{dist}(x, y)) \leq n'$ (so E'_1, E'_2 is a two-player f -code), and where

$$Q'(E'_1(x)E'_2(x), E'_1(y)E'_2(y))$$

is permutation-invariant. Due to permutation invariance, there exist functions g, g_1, g_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} &Q'(E'_1(x)E'_2(x), E'_1(y)E'_2(y)) \\ &= (\max(\text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_1(y)), n'), \max(\text{dist}(E'_2(x), E'_2(y)), n'), \max(\text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_2(y)), n')) \\ &= (g_1(\text{dist}(x, y)), g_2(\text{dist}(x, y)), g(\text{dist}(x, y))). \end{aligned}$$

Since $E'_1, E'_2: \binom{[2n]}{n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$ is a two-player f -code, by **Proposition 17**, we have for all $x, y \in \binom{[2n]}{n}$ that

$$\text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_1(y)), \text{dist}(E'_2(x), E'_2(y)), \text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_2(y)) \leq n'.$$

Hence, $g_1(\text{dist}(x, y)) = \max(\text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_1(y)), n') = \text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_1(y))$, $g_2(\text{dist}(x, y)) = \text{dist}(E'_2(x), E'_2(y))$, and $g(\text{dist}(x, y)) = \text{dist}(E'_1(x), E'_2(y))$. So, E'_1, E'_2 form an extended two-player f -code, as desired. \square

6.4 Invariance Lemma for $\{4, 4\}$ -Hamming Distance

We prove the invariance lemma that was used in [Section 5.2](#) to extract two-player f -codes out of reductions from $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ to HD_k . This proof follows a similar plan as the proof of [Lemma 32](#), but requires more effort because the $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ function is not fully permutation-invariant.

Recall the notation $\Sigma_n := \binom{[2n]}{n}$ and the definition of distance signatures $\text{sig}(x, y)$ from [Definition 11](#), and the definition of the query set

$$\mathcal{Q} := \text{QS}(\{H_t : t \in \mathbb{N}\}) \quad (12)$$

from [Definition 10](#), where $H_t: \{0, 1\}^t \times \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \times \{0, \dots, K\}$ is defined as

$$H_t(u, v) := (\mathbb{1}[\text{dist}(x, y) \leq k], \max(\text{dist}(x, y), K)),$$

for fixed constants $k \leq K$. We want to prove:

Lemma 21 (Restated). *Suppose there exists a constant k such that $\text{D}^{\text{HD}_k}(\text{HD}_{4,4}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Let $K \geq k$ be any constant and let \mathcal{Q} be the query set on values $\Lambda := \{0, 1\} \times \{0, \dots, K\}$ defined in [Definition 10](#). Then there exists a constant q and a function $\rho: \Lambda^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which depends only on the first bit of each input in Λ , such that: $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*


$$\text{HD}_{4,4}^{2n} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q),$$

and for every $x, y, u, v \in \Sigma_n^{2n}$ and $i \in [q]$,

$$\text{sig}(x, y) = \text{sig}(u, v) \implies Q_i(x, y) = Q_i(u, v).$$

$\text{HD}_{4,4}^n$ is defined on inputs $x, y \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^n$ comprising n blocks of n bits per block. It will be helpful to decouple the number of blocks from the number of bits in each block. For any d, n , we define $\text{HD}_{4,4}^{d,n}$ as the subproblem of $\text{HD}_{4,4}$ defined on strings $x, y \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ comprising d blocks of n bits per block. It is easy to see, via padding, that $\text{HD}_{4,4}^{d,n}$ is a submatrix of $\text{HD}_{4,4}^{\max(d,n)}$.

For inputs $x, y \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$, we think of the pair x, y as being arranged as a sequence



where we think of larger blocks as “outer dominoes” on alphabet $\{0, 1\}^n$, and each block is composed of smaller “inner dominoes” on alphabet $\{0, 1\}$. Observe that the value of $\text{HD}_{4,4}^{d,n}(x, y)$ is invariant under:

1. *Inner permutations:* permutations of small dominoes within any block; and
2. *Outer permutations:* permutations of the large dominoes.

Definition 14 (Inner- and outer-permutation invariance). A matrix $M: (\{0, 1\}^n)^d \times (\{0, 1\}^n)^d \rightarrow \Lambda$ is *inner-permutation invariant* if, for every $x, y, u, v \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ such that (u, v) is obtained from (x, y) by permuting inner dominoes within some block $j \in [d]$, we have

$$M(x, y) = M(u, v).$$

M is *outer-permutation invariant* if, for every $x, y, u, v \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ such that (u, v) is obtained from (x, y) by permuting the outer dominoes, we have

$$M(x, y) = M(u, v).$$

We say a set \mathcal{M} of matrices is *inner-permutation invariant* if each $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is inner-permutation invariant, and say \mathcal{M} is *outer-permutation invariant* if each $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is outer-permutation invariant.

Our goal will be to prove inner- and outer-permutation invariance of the query matrices Q_i in the statement of [Lemma 21](#). This will suffice due to the following easy statement:

Fact 36. *If $M: (\{0, 1\}^{2n})^d \times (\{0, 1\}^{2n})^d \rightarrow \Lambda$ is both inner- and outer-permutation invariant, then for any $x, y, u, v \in \Sigma_n^d$ we have $\text{sig}(x, y) = \text{sig}(u, v) \implies M(x, y) = M(u, v)$.*

Our proof will hold not only for $\text{HD}_{4,4}^{d,n}$ but for any set of inner- and outer-permutation invariant matrices, so we will let $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathcal{H}^{n,d} \mid d, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an arbitrary set of matrices with values in any fixed set Λ , such that each matrix $\mathcal{H}^{n,d}: (\{0, 1\}^n)^d \times (\{0, 1\}^n)^d \rightarrow \Lambda$ is both inner- and outer-permutation invariant. In the remainder of this section, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 1. *Let \mathcal{H} be a set of matrices which is both inner- and outer-permutation invariant. Let \mathcal{Q} be any stable query set and assume there is a constant q and a function $\rho: \Lambda^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that, for every n, d , there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q). \tag{13}$$

We will prove the following lemma.

Lemma 37. *Under [Assumption 1](#), for every n, d there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q),$$

and each Q_i is both inner- and outer-permutation invariant.

With this lemma we can prove the main invariance lemma for $\text{HD}_{4,4}$, [Lemma 21](#), as follows.

Proof of [Lemma 21](#). Suppose there exists a constant k such that $\text{D}^{\text{HD}_k}(\text{HD}_{4,4}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$. By [Proposition 19](#), there exists a constant q and a function $\rho: \{0, 1\}^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that for any d, n there exist matrices $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \text{QS}(\text{HD}_k)$ such that

$$\text{HD}_{4,4}^{d,n} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q).$$

Let $K \geq k$ and let \mathcal{Q} be the query set from [Equation \(12\)](#). By [Proposition 29](#), \mathcal{Q} is stable because $\text{D}^{\text{EHD}_K}(\mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Note that for any $Q \in \text{QS}(\text{HD}_k)$ there is a matrix $Q^* \in \mathcal{Q}$ with values in $\Lambda = \{0, 1\} \times \{0, \dots, K\}$, with the same number of rows and columns as Q , such that the first bit of each entry $Q^*(i, j)$ is equal to $Q(i, j)$. Therefore there exists a function $\rho^*: \Lambda^q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, defined as $\rho^*(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q) = \rho(\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_q^{(1)})$ where $\lambda_i^{(1)}$ is the first bit of λ_i , and matrices $Q_1^*, \dots, Q_q^* \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\text{HD}_{4,4}^{d,n} = \rho^*(Q_1^*, Q_2^*, \dots, Q_q^*).$$

Then [Assumption 1](#) is satisfied, so using [Lemma 37](#) (with the set \mathcal{Q}^* and function ρ^*) and [Fact 36](#) we may conclude the proof. \square

We prove [Lemma 37](#) by gradually building up invariance of the query matrices under larger classes of permutations. In [Section 6.4.1](#) we prove inner-permutation invariance, and in [Section 6.4.2](#) we conclude the proof with outer-permutation invariance.

Remark 4. Let us clarify some notation. The matrix $\mathcal{H}^{n,d}$ is defined on row and column set $(\{0,1\}^n)^d$ whereas the query set \mathcal{Q} is an abstract set of matrices, closed under permutations. Since \mathcal{Q} is closed under permutations, we may assume for simplicity of notation that each Q_i in [Equation \(13\)](#) is also defined on row and column set $(\{0,1\}^n)^d$. In our application, we took \mathcal{Q} to be a query set of matrices H_t defined on row and column set $\{0,1\}^t$. Since we will be using $x, y \in (\{0,1\}^n)^d$ as the row and column index sets, we write

$$Q_i(x, y) = H_t(\phi(x), \psi(y))$$

for some maps $\phi, \psi: (\{0,1\}^n)^d \rightarrow \{0,1\}^t$ which translate between the row and column index sets of the matrices.

6.4.1 Inner-Permutation Invariance

We prove:

Lemma 38. *Under [Assumption 1](#), for any $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q),$$

and each $Q_i(x, y)$ is inner-permutation invariant.

We will prove [Lemma 37](#) by gradually building up the inner-permutation invariance. We will keep track of three variables: $J \subseteq [d]$, the set of blocks where inner-permutation invariance already holds; $j \in [d]$, a new block where we are in the process of building up inner-permutation invariance; and Δ , which records the types of permutations in block j that we have already established invariance for, defined below. For strings $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$ we consider their Boolean domino sequence

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{x} \\ \boxed{y} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{x_1} \\ \boxed{y_1} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \boxed{x_2} \\ \boxed{y_2} \end{array} \cdots \begin{array}{c} \boxed{x_n} \\ \boxed{y_n} \end{array},$$

with each $\begin{array}{c} \boxed{x_i} \\ \boxed{y_i} \end{array} \in \{0,1\}^2$.

Definition 15 (Inner (J, j, Δ) -Shuffle Property). Fix any $d, J \subseteq [d]$, and $j \in [d] \setminus J$. Let $\Delta \subset (\{0,1\}^2)$ be a set of unordered pairs of dominoes. We say the *inner (J, j, Δ) -shuffle property* holds if for every n there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d} = \rho(Q_1, \dots, Q_q),$$

and each Q_i satisfies the following two conditions:

1. Q_i is J -inner-permutation invariant: for $x, y \in (\{0,1\}^n)^d$, if $x', y' \in (\{0,1\}^n)^d$ are obtained from x, y by swapping any two consecutive dominoes within a block $j' \in J$, then $Q_i(x, y) = Q_i(x', y')$.
2. Let $x, y \in (\{0,1\}^n)^d$ and suppose that $x', y' \in (\{0,1\}^n)^d$ are obtained from x, y by swapping two consecutive dominoes $\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a} \\ \boxed{b} \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \boxed{c} \\ \boxed{d} \end{array} \right\} \in \Delta$ within block j . Then $Q_i(x, y) = Q_i(x', y')$.

Note that, in the base case where $J = \emptyset$, the \emptyset -inner-permutation invariance property holds trivially. We first establish that we may swap any consecutive pairs of dominoes where one of the dominoes is $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ or $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Define

$$\Delta_0 := \left\{ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \right\} \mid a, b \in \{0, 1\} \right\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_1 := \left\{ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \right\} \mid a, b \in \{0, 1\} \right\}.$$

Proposition 39. *Fix any $J \subseteq [d]$ and $j \in [d] \setminus J$. Assume the inner (J, j, \emptyset) -shuffle property holds. Then the inner $(J, j, \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1)$ -shuffle property holds.*

Proof. We first establish the inner Δ_0 -shuffle property, and then the inner $(\Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1)$ -shuffle property. Let $N > n$ be sufficiently large (to be determined later). By assumption, there exist Q_1, \dots, Q_q such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N,d} = \rho(Q_1, \dots, Q_q),$$

and each Q_i satisfies (1) of Definition 15. For every subset $S \subseteq [N]$ with cardinality $|S| \leq n$, we assign a color $\text{col}(S)$ as follows.

For every $u, v \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ such that the j^{th} block of dominoes $\begin{pmatrix} u_j \\ v_j \end{pmatrix} \in (\{0, 1\}^2)^n$ does not contain the $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ domino, we let $U, V \in (\{0, 1\}^N)^d$ be the unique strings such that:

1. For each $j' \neq j$, $U_{j'} := u_{j'} 0^{N-n} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ and $V_{j'} := v_{j'} 0^{N-n} \in \{0, 1\}^N$
2. In block j , the substring $(U_j)_S \in \{0, 1\}^{|S|}$ of $U_j \in \{0, 1\}^N$ on coordinates S is equal to $u_j \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and the remaining bits are 0, and V_j is defined similarly.

We now append to $\text{col}(S)$ the values $Q_1(U, V), \dots, Q_q(U, V)$. Observe that the total number of colors depends on n, d, k , and the number of colors in the coloring \mathcal{Q} , but not on N . So for a sufficiently large N , by the hypergraph Ramsey theorem (Corollary 31), there is a set $T \subseteq [N]$ where every two subsets $S, S' \subseteq T$ with $|S| = |S'|$ have $\text{col}(S) = \text{col}(S')$.

For each $x \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ we define $p(x) \in (\{0, 1\}^N)^d$ as follows:

1. For each $j' \neq j$, let $p(x)_{j'} := x_{j'} 0^{N-n} \in \{0, 1\}^N$.
2. Let $p(x)_j \in \{0, 1\}^N$ be the string such that $(p(x)_j)_T := x_j$, and its remaining bits are 0.

We claim that the matrices $P_i(x, y) := Q_i(p(x), p(y))$ satisfy the desired conditions. First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{n,d}(x, y) &= \mathcal{H}^{N,d}(p(x), p(y)) \\ &= \rho(Q_1(p(x), p(y)), \dots, Q_q(p(x), p(y))) \\ &= \rho(P_1(x, y), \dots, P_q(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

Next, let $x, y \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ and suppose that $x', y' \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ are obtained from x, y by swapping two consecutive dominoes within a block $j' \in J$. Then $p(x'), p(y')$ are obtained from $p(x), p(y)$ by some permutation on dominoes in block j' ; by decomposing this permutation into a sequence of domino swaps, condition (1) of Definition 15 implies that $P_i(x, y) = Q_i(p(x), p(y)) = Q_i(p(x'), p(y')) = P_i(x', y')$, as desired.

Finally, let $x, y \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ and suppose that $x', y' \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ are obtained from x, y by swapping a domino $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ in block j with one of its neighbors $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$ for some $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $S \subseteq T$

be the set of coordinates $s \in [N]$ in block j of $(\{0, 1\}^N)^d$ where the sequence $\begin{pmatrix} p(x)_j \\ p(y)_j \end{pmatrix} \in (\{0, 1\}^2)^N$ is nonzero, i.e. $\begin{pmatrix} p(x)_j \\ p(y)_j \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Similarly, let $S' \subseteq T$ be the analogous set of coordinates for $p(x'), p(y')$. Observe that the subsequence of dominoes $\begin{pmatrix} p(x)_j \\ p(y)_j \end{pmatrix}$ on coordinates S in block j , is equal to the subsequence of dominoes $\begin{pmatrix} p(x')_j \\ p(y')_j \end{pmatrix}$ on coordinates S' in block j , and that $p(x), p(x')$ and $p(y), p(y')$ are equal outside of block j . Therefore, since $\text{col}(S) = \text{col}(S')$, we have $Q_i(p(x), p(y)) = Q_i(p(x'), p(y'))$ by definition of the colors. So

$$P_i(x, y) = Q_i(p(x), p(y)) = Q_i(p(x'), p(y')) = P_i(x', y'),$$

as desired. This establishes the inner Δ_0 -shuffle property.

It remains to establish the inner $(\Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1)$ -shuffle property, assuming the inner Δ_0 -shuffle property. This is achieved by following a nearly identical argument as above, with a few adjustments. First, when constructing U, V in the definition of $\text{col}(S)$, we pad the strings with 1s instead of 0s, and in the definition of $p(x)$ we also pad with 1s instead of 0s.

Second, it becomes necessary to verify that, for $x, y \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ and x', y' obtained from x, y by swapping a $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ domino in block j with its neighbor, it should remain the case that $P_i(x, y) = P_i(x', y')$. This follows from the assumption of inner Δ_0 -shuffle invariance: moving the $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes $\begin{pmatrix} p(x)_j \\ p(y)_j \end{pmatrix}$ in block j to the end of the block does not change the color of the set $S \subseteq T$ of non- $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes. Similarly, moving the $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes $\begin{pmatrix} p(x')_j \\ p(y')_j \end{pmatrix}$ in block j to the end of the block does not change the color of the set S' . After this transformation, the subsequence of $\begin{pmatrix} p(x)_j \\ p(y)_j \end{pmatrix}$ on S is equal to the subsequence of $\begin{pmatrix} p(x')_j \\ p(y')_j \end{pmatrix}$ on S' and $\text{col}(S) = \text{col}(S')$. \square

Now we establish that we may swap any remaining consecutive pairs of dominoes, i.e. the pairs involving both $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Define

$$\Delta_{01} := \left\{ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \right\}.$$

Note that $\Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_{01}$ is simply the set of all domino pairs, so that if the inner $(J, j, \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_{01})$ -shuffle property holds, then we may assume each Q_i is $(J \cup \{j\})$ -inner-permutation invariant.

Proposition 40. *Fix any $J \subseteq [d], j \in [d]$ and assume the inner $(J, j, \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1)$ -shuffle property holds. Then the inner $(J, j, \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_{01})$ -shuffle property holds. In particular, the inner $(J \cup \{j\}, j', \emptyset)$ -shuffle property holds for any j' .*

Proof. Since \mathcal{Q} is stable, there exists a constant t such that no $t \times t$ instance of GREATER-THAN appears in \mathcal{Q} . Let $N > n + 2t$ and let $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ be the matrices guaranteed by the inner $(\Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1)$ -shuffle property to satisfy

$$\mathcal{H}^{N,d} = \rho(Q_1, \dots, Q_q)$$

and the other conditions of [Definition 15](#). For each $x \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ we define $p(x) \in (\{0, 1\}^N)^d$ as follows: for each block $j' \in [d]$, we define $p(x)_{j'} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ as the string whose first n bits are equal to $x_{j'}$, and whose remaining bits are 0. We then define matrices $P_i(x, y) = Q_i(p(x), p(y))$ for all $x, y \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$. We claim that these matrices satisfy the required conditions. First observe that the conditions required for the inner $(\Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1)$ -shuffle property are preserved, since any two consecutive dominoes in any block of x, y are also consecutive in $p(x), p(y)$.

Now suppose that $x, y \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ and $x', y' \in (\{0, 1\}^n)^d$ are obtained from x, y from swapping two consecutive $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes in block j . Assume for the sake of contradiction that $P_i(x, y) \neq P_i(x', y')$, so $Q_i(p(x), p(y)) \neq Q_i(p(x'), p(y'))$. Observe that x, x' , and y, y' respectively, are identical in every block except block j , and that in block j , we may assume without loss of generality that there is some ℓ such that

$$\begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{c} p(x)_j \\ p(y)_j \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} (x_j)_{[1:\ell]} \\ (y_j)_{[1:\ell]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (x_j)_{[\ell+3:n]} \\ (y_j)_{[\ell+3:n]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \cdots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \\ \\ \begin{array}{c} p(x')_j \\ p(y')_j \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} (x_j)_{[1:\ell]} \\ (y_j)_{[1:\ell]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (x_j)_{[\ell+3:n]} \\ (y_j)_{[\ell+3:n]} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \cdots \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \end{array}.$$

For $\alpha, \beta \in [t]$, we now define the following. Let $X_\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^{2t}$ be the string which is 1 at index 2α and 0 elsewhere, and let $Y_\beta \in \{0, 1\}^{2t}$ be the string which is 1 at index $2\beta - 1$ and 0 elsewhere. Then extend these strings into $\{0, 1\}^N$ by defining the concatenations

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X}_\alpha &:= (x_j)_{[1:\ell]} X_\alpha (x_j)_{[\ell+3:n]} \\ \widehat{Y}_\beta &:= (y_j)_{[1:\ell]} Y_\beta (y_j)_{[\ell+3:n]}, \end{aligned}$$

and finally extend these strings into $(\{0, 1\}^N)^d$ by inserting these strings into block j :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\widehat{X}}_\alpha &:= (p(x)_1, p(x)_2, \dots, p(x)_{j-1}, \widehat{X}_\alpha, p(x)_{j+1}, \dots, p(x)_d) \\ \widehat{\widehat{Y}}_\beta &:= (p(y)_1, p(y)_2, \dots, p(y)_{j-1}, \widehat{Y}_\beta, p(y)_{j+1}, \dots, p(y)_d). \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that when $\alpha < \beta$, the pair $\widehat{\widehat{X}}_\alpha, \widehat{\widehat{Y}}_\beta$ is obtained from $p(x), p(y)$ by swapping $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes in block j with their neighbors. Then, by assumption,

$$Q_i(\widehat{\widehat{X}}_\alpha, \widehat{\widehat{Y}}_\beta) = Q_i(p(x), p(y)).$$

Similarly, when $\alpha \geq \beta$, the pair $\widehat{\widehat{X}}_\alpha, \widehat{\widehat{Y}}_\beta$ is obtained from $p(x'), p(y')$ by swapping $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes in block j with their neighbors. Then, by assumption,

$$Q_i(\widehat{\widehat{X}}_\alpha, \widehat{\widehat{Y}}_\beta) = Q_i(p(x'), p(y')).$$

But then if $Q_i(p(x), p(y)) \neq Q_i(p(x'), p(y'))$, it means the $t \times t$ submatrix of Q_i on rows $\widehat{\widehat{X}}_\alpha$ and columns $\widehat{\widehat{Y}}_\beta$ is a GREATER-THAN matrix, which is a contradiction. So it must be the case that $P_i(x, y) = Q_i(p(x), p(y)) = Q_i(p(x'), p(y')) = P_i(x', y')$, as desired. This concludes the proof. \square

We may now conclude the proof of [Lemma 38](#).

Proof of Lemma 38. Fix any d . We prove the lemma by induction on $|J|$. In the base case $J = \emptyset$, the inner $(\emptyset, 1, \emptyset)$ -shuffle property holds trivially, so we may apply [Proposition 39](#) to establish the inner $(\emptyset, 1, \Delta_0 \cup \Delta_1)$ -shuffle property. Then we may apply [Proposition 40](#) to establish the inner $(\{1\}, 2, \emptyset)$ -shuffle property. By induction, we obtain the inner $([d], d, \emptyset)$ -shuffle property, which implies that for every n there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that each Q_i is inner-permutation invariant and

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d} = \rho(Q_1, \dots, Q_q),$$

as desired. \square

6.4.2 Outer-Permutation Invariance

Lemma 37 (Restated). *Under [Assumption 1](#), for every n, d there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q),$$

and each Q_i is both inner- and outer-permutation invariant.

As before, we will build up outer-permutation invariance gradually. We will now fix some n and for simplicity of notation define $\Sigma := \Sigma_n$ which we recall is the weight n slice $\Sigma_n := \binom{[2n]}{n}$.

Definition 16 (Swap Invariance). Fix any set Δ of unordered pairs $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a' \\ b' \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ of dominoes in Σ^2 . For any matrix $Q: \Sigma^d \times \Sigma^d \rightarrow \Lambda$, we say Q is Δ -swap invariant if

$$Q(x, y) = Q(u, v)$$

whenever the domino sequences $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \in (\Sigma^2)^d$ are obtained from each other by swapping two consecutive dominoes $\begin{pmatrix} a & a' \\ b & b' \end{pmatrix} \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} a' & a \\ b' & b \end{pmatrix}$ which satisfy $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a' \\ b' \end{pmatrix} \right\} \in \Delta$.

Definition 17 (Outer Δ -Shuffle Property). Fix any $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\Delta \subseteq \binom{\Sigma^2}{2}$ be a set of unordered pairs of dominoes on this alphabet. We say that the *outer Δ -shuffle property* holds for $\mathcal{H}^{n,d}$ if there exist matrices $Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q),$$

with each matrix $Q_i(x, y)$ being inner-permutation invariant, and Δ -swap invariant on the strings $(x, y) \in \Sigma^d$.

The first lemma says that we may improve the invariance of query matrices by enforcing that they are invariant under any swap involving a new $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ domino. For any fixed $a \in \Sigma$, we define

$$\Delta_a := \left\{ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix} \right\} \mid b, c \in \Sigma \right\}.$$

Proposition 41. *Fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $B \subseteq \Sigma$, and let $\Delta = \bigcup_{b \in B} \Delta_b$. Let $a \in \Sigma$. If the outer Δ -shuffle property holds for every d , then the outer $(\Delta \cup \Delta_a)$ -shuffle property also holds for every d .*

Proof. Fix any sufficiently large D to be determined later; by assumption, the Δ -shuffle property holds for D , so there exist $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,D} = \rho(Q_1, \dots, Q_q)$$

and each Q_i is inner-permutation invariant and invariant under swaps of consecutive domino pairs in Δ . For every set $S \subseteq [D]$ of cardinality $s = |S| \leq d$, we assign a color $\text{col}(S)$ as follows. For every two strings $u, v \in \Sigma^s$ which do not contain $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ in the sequence $\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}$, we let $U, V \in \Sigma^D$ be the unique strings such that the substrings U_S, V_S on coordinates S satisfy $U_S = u$ and $V_S = v$, and every other coordinate is a . We then append to $\text{col}(S)$ the values $Q_1(U, V), \dots, Q_q(U, V)$. The number of possible colors depends only on $|\Sigma|$, d , k , and the number of colors applied to the matrices in \mathcal{Q} , which do not depend on D . Therefore, by [Corollary 31](#), there exists a set $T \subseteq [D]$ of cardinality $|T| = d$ such that every two sets $S, S' \subseteq T$ with $|S| = |S'|$ satisfy $\text{col}(S) = \text{col}(S')$.

We now define matrices P_1, \dots, P_q on inputs $x, y \in \Sigma^d$ as follows. For each $x \in \Sigma^d$, we let $p(x) \in \Sigma^D$ be the unique string whose substring $p(x)_T$ on coordinates T is x , and all other coordinates are a . We then define $P_i(x, y) = Q_i(p(x), p(y))$ and claim that these matrices satisfy the required conditions.

We first verify that each P_j is invariant under swaps of consecutive $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes. Let $x, y, x', y' \in \Sigma^d$ be such that $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix}$ differ only by swapping a consecutive pair $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix}$ for some $b, c \in \Sigma$. Let $S \subseteq T$ be the set of coordinates $i \in [D]$ where $\begin{pmatrix} p(x)_i \\ p(y)_i \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}$, and let $S' \subseteq T$ be the set of coordinates $i \in [D]$ where $\begin{pmatrix} p(x')_i \\ p(y')_i \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}$. Then $|S| = |S'|$ so $\text{col}(S) = \text{col}(S')$. Observe also that the subsequence of $\begin{pmatrix} p(x) \\ p(y) \end{pmatrix}$ on coordinates S is equal to the subsequence of $\begin{pmatrix} p(x') \\ p(y') \end{pmatrix}$ on coordinates S' . Then, by definition of the colors, we must have $Q_j(p(x), p(y)) = Q_j(p(x'), p(y'))$, so $P_j(x, y) = P_j(x', y')$ as desired.

Now we verify that each P_j remains invariant under swaps of consecutive dominoes $\begin{pmatrix} a' \\ a' \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix}$ whenever $a' \in B$. Let $a' \in B$ and let $x, y, x', y' \in \Sigma^d$ be such that $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix}$ differ only by swapping a consecutive pair $\begin{pmatrix} a' \\ a' \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix}$ for some $b, c \in \Sigma$. Observe that $\begin{pmatrix} p(x) \\ p(y) \end{pmatrix}$ may then be transformed into $\begin{pmatrix} p(x') \\ p(y') \end{pmatrix}$ by a sequence of swaps of consecutive dominoes of the form either $\begin{pmatrix} a' \\ a' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ or $\begin{pmatrix} a' \\ a' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix}$, each of which appears in Δ . Since each Q_j is invariant under swaps of consecutive dominoes in Δ , we have

$$P_j(x, y) = Q_j(p(x), p(y)) = Q_j(p(x'), p(y')) = P_j(x', y'),$$

as desired. This concludes the proof. \square

The second lemma says that we may improve the invariance of query matrices by enforcing that they are invariant under any swap of consecutive $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes. Let $\Delta^{(1)}$ be the set of all domino pairs where one domino has the same top and bottom part:

$$\Delta^{(1)} := \left\{ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix} \right\} \mid a, b, c \in \Sigma \right\}.$$

Proposition 42. Fix any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\Delta \subseteq \binom{\Sigma^2}{2}$ be any set of pairs of dominoes that contains $\Delta^{(1)}$. Let $a, u, v \in \Sigma$ and define

$$\Delta_{a,u,v} := \left\{ \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} v \\ a \end{pmatrix} \right\} \mid a, u, v \in \Sigma \right\}.$$

If the outer Δ -shuffle property holds for every d , then the outer $(\Delta \cup \Delta_{a,u,v})$ -shuffle property also holds for every d .

Proof. Fix any d . Since \mathcal{Q} is a stable coloring, there exists some constant t such that the $t \times t$ GREATER-THAN matrix does not appear as a (colored) submatrix of any $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $D = 2t + d - 2$. By assumption, the outer Δ -shuffle property holds for D , so there are matrices $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,D} = \rho(Q_1, \dots, Q_q)$$

and each Q_j is inner-permutation invariant and Δ -swap invariant. We define matrices $P_1, \dots, P_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ on inputs $x, y \in \Sigma^d$ by extending each x to $p(x) \in \Sigma^D$ by appending $D - d$ copies of a as a suffix. We then define $P_j(x, y) = Q_j(p(x), p(y))$ and observe that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d}(x, y) = \mathcal{H}^{n,D}(p(x), p(y)) = \rho(Q_1(p(x), p(y)), \dots, Q_q(p(x), p(y))) = \rho(P_1(x, y), \dots, P_q(x, y)).$$

We claim that the matrices P_j are invariant under swaps of consecutive $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} v \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes on inputs $x, y \in \Sigma^d$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exist $x, y, x', y' \in \Sigma^d$ which are obtained from each other by the swap of consecutive $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} v \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ dominoes, but for which $P_j(x, y) \neq P_j(x', y')$. Then $Q_j(p(x), p(y)) \neq Q_j(p(x'), p(y'))$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} p(x) \\ p(y) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} x_{[1:i-1]} \\ y_{[1:i-1]} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v \\ a \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_{[i+2:d]} \\ y_{[i+2:d]} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} p(x') \\ p(y') \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} x_{[1:i-1]} \\ y_{[1:i-1]} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v \\ a \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_{[i+2:d]} \\ y_{[i+2:d]} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider any two $\alpha, \beta \in [t]$ define the strings $X_\alpha = (a, a, \dots, v, \dots, a) \in \Sigma^{2t}$ which has a in every coordinate except v in coordinate 2α , and $Y_\beta = (a, a, \dots, u, \dots, a) \in \Sigma^{2t}$ which has a in every coordinate except u in coordinate $2\beta - 1$. Extend these strings to $\widehat{X}_\alpha = x_{[1:i-1]} X_\alpha x_{[i+2:d]} \in \Sigma^D$ and $\widehat{Y}_\beta = y_{[1:i-1]} Y_\beta y_{[i+2,d]} \in \Sigma^D$. Observe that, for $\alpha \geq \beta$, the dominoes of \widehat{X}_α and \widehat{Y}_β appear as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{X}_\alpha \\ \widehat{Y}_\beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{[1:i-1]} \\ y_{[1:i-1]} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{a} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_{[i+2,d]} \\ y_{[i+2,d]} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, since Q_j is invariant under swaps involving the $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ domino, we have

$$Q_j(p(x), p(y)) = Q_j(\widehat{X}_\alpha, \widehat{Y}_\beta).$$

Similarly, when $\alpha < \beta$, we have

$$Q_j(p(x'), p(y')) = Q_j(\widehat{X}_\alpha, \widehat{Y}_\beta).$$

But then if $Q_j(p(x), p(y)) \neq Q_j(p(x'), p(y'))$ we have found a $t \times t$ GREATER-THAN submatrix on the rows and columns indexed by \widehat{X}_α and \widehat{Y}_β respectively, which is a contradiction. This concludes the proof. \square

The third lemma now says that we may improve the invariance of query matrices by enforcing that they are invariant under any swap. Let $\Delta^{(2)}$ be $\Delta^{(1)}$ plus the set of all domino pairs $\left(\frac{a}{u}, \frac{v}{a}\right)$:

$$\Delta^{(2)} := \Delta^{(1)} \cup \left\{ \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{u}, \frac{v}{a}\right) \mid a, u, v \in \Sigma \right\} \right\}.$$

Proposition 43. *Fix any $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\Delta \subseteq \binom{\Sigma^2}{2}$ be any set of pairs of dominoes which contains $\Delta^{(2)}$. Let $a, b, u, v \in \Sigma$. If the outer Δ -shuffle property holds, then the outer $\left(\Delta \cup \left\{ \left\{ \left(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{u}{v}\right) \right\} \right\}\right)$ -shuffle property also holds.*

Proof. Fix the matrices $Q_1, \dots, Q_q \in \mathcal{Q}$ which witness

$$\mathcal{H}^{n,d} = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q)$$

satisfying the outer Δ -shuffle property. Let $x, y, x', y' \in \Sigma^d$ be such that $\left(\frac{x'}{y'}\right)$ is obtained from $\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)$ by swapping consecutive $\left(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{u}{v}\right)$ dominoes. For some $i \in [d]$, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{x}{y}\right) &= \left(\frac{x_{[1:i-1]}}{y_{[1:i-1]}}\right) \left(\frac{a}{b} \frac{u}{v}\right) \left(\frac{x_{[i+2:d]}}{y_{[i+2:d]}}\right) \\ \left(\frac{x'}{y'}\right) &= \left(\frac{x_{[1:i-1]}}{y_{[1:i-1]}}\right) \left(\frac{u}{v} \frac{a}{b}\right) \left(\frac{x_{[i+2:d]}}{y_{[i+2:d]}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\Sigma = \binom{2n}{2}$ is the set of n -bit binary strings with weight n , so that there exists a permutation $\pi: [2n] \rightarrow [2n]$ such that $\pi v = a$. Due to the outer Δ -property, each matrix Q_j is inner-permutation invariant and therefore satisfies $Q_j(x, y) = Q_j(x'', y'')$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{x''}{y''}\right) &= \left(\frac{x_{[1:i-1]}}{y_{[1:i-1]}}\right) \left(\frac{a}{b} \frac{\pi u}{\pi v}\right) \left(\frac{x_{[i+2,d]}}{y_{[i+2,d]}}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{x_{[1:i-1]}}{y_{[1:i-1]}}\right) \left(\frac{a}{b} \frac{\pi u}{a}\right) \left(\frac{x_{[i+2,d]}}{y_{[i+2,d]}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $\Delta^{(2)} \subseteq \Delta$ and $\left\{ \left(\frac{a}{b}, \frac{\pi u}{a}\right) \right\} \in \Delta^{(2)}$, we have $Q_j(x'', y'') = Q_j(x''', y''')$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{x'''}{y'''}\right) &= \left(\frac{x_{[1:i-1]}}{y_{[1:i-1]}}\right) \left(\frac{a}{b} \frac{\pi u}{\pi v}\right) \left(\frac{x_{[i+2,d]}}{y_{[i+2,d]}}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{x_{[1:i-1]}}{y_{[1:i-1]}}\right) \left(\frac{\pi u}{a} \frac{a}{b}\right) \left(\frac{x_{[i+2,d]}}{y_{[i+2,d]}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, again using inner-permutation invariance, we may invert the permutation π to transform $\left(\frac{\pi u}{a}\right)$ back to $\left(\frac{u}{v}\right)$, and conclude $Q_j(x''', y''') = Q_j(x', y')$. Since this holds for each $j \in [k]$, this concludes the proof. \square

These propositions suffice to prove [Lemma 37](#).

Proof of Lemma 37. We apply [Proposition 41](#) repeatedly for each $a \in \Sigma$ until we achieve the outer $\Delta^{(1)}$ -shuffle property. Then we apply [Proposition 42](#) until we achieve the outer $\Delta^{(2)}$ -shuffle property. Finally, repeatedly apply [Proposition 43](#) to achieve the outer Δ -shuffle property where Δ contains every pair of dominoes, which implies inner- and outer-permutation invariance. \square

7 Distance- r Composed Functions

Here we define a new type of function composition that generalizes the k -HAMMING DISTANCE and $\{4,4\}$ -HAMMING DISTANCE problem. One goal here is to present the most general form of the algorithmic technique which leads to these constant-cost protocols as well as all constant-cost problems known up until the preparation of this manuscript – but as far as we know it does not capture the new examples of [Che24] mentioned in Remark 2. We make some effort to optimize the protocol, since this type of function composition may also be of independent interest.

7.1 Definition and Theorem Statement

For any set of square matrices \mathcal{P} and any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we write \mathcal{P}_N for the set of $N \times N$ matrices in \mathcal{P} . We write

$$R_\delta(\mathcal{P}_N) := \max\{R_\delta(P) \mid P \in \mathcal{P}_N\}.$$

We say a communication problem \mathcal{P} is *symmetric* if every matrix $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is symmetric; in particular, $P(x, y) = P(y, x)$ for all inputs x, y .

Given a sequence of matrices P_1, \dots, P_n , and corresponding sequences of rows x_1, \dots, x_n and columns y_1, \dots, y_n , define

$$(P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n)(x, y) := (P_i(x_i, y_i) : i \in [n], x_i \neq y_i),$$

where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$.

Definition 18 (Distance- r Composed Function). Let Λ be any fixed finite alphabet and let \mathcal{P} be any Λ -valued symmetric communication problem. For any r , let $g: \Lambda^{\leq r} \rightarrow \Lambda$ be any permutation-invariant function defined on strings of characters in Δ , of length at most r . We define the class

$$g[\mathcal{P}]$$

as the set of problems obtained in the following way. For any $n \geq 1$ and $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n \in \mathcal{P}$, define the communication problem $g[P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n]$, as

$$g[P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n](x, y) := \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } |\{i \in [n] : x_i \neq y_i\}| > r \\ g(P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n(x, y)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$, and x_i is a row of P_i and y_i is a column of P_i .

Example 10. The r -HAMMING DISTANCE problem is obtained as follows. Take $\Delta = \{0, 1\}$, define $g(s) := \mathbf{1}[|s| = r]$ on strings $\{0, 1\}^n$, and let $\mathcal{P} := \{I_{2 \times 2}\}$ contain only the 2×2 identity matrix. Then $g[\mathcal{P}]$ is the r -HAMMING DISTANCE problem HD_r .

Recall from [HSZZ06, Saĝ18] that

$$R_\delta(\text{HD}_r) = \mathcal{O}\left(r \log \frac{r}{\delta}\right).$$

We show that a similar bound holds when the base matrices \mathcal{P} are arbitrary constant-cost problems; the proof is in Section 7.2.

Theorem 44. *For any symmetric Λ -valued communication problem \mathcal{P} , any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and permutation-invariant function $g: \Lambda^{\leq r} \rightarrow \Lambda$,*

$$R_\delta(g[P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n]) = \mathcal{O}\left(r \log \frac{r}{\delta} + r \left(\max_i R_{\delta/10r}(P_i) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

In particular, if \mathcal{P} has a constant-cost protocol, then

$$R_\delta(g[\mathcal{P}]) = \mathcal{O}\left(r \log \frac{r}{\delta}\right).$$

7.2 Parallel Simulation of Communication Protocols

We first show how to solve a subproblem, where Alice and Bob receive inputs $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$ which are promised to be equal on all coordinates $i \in [n]$ except one.

We will use the notion of a *Sidon encoding*. A *Sidon set* is in general a set S where every pair has a unique sum. We will use generalized Sidon sets in $\{0, 1\}^m$ to encode messages in the protocol (this idea comes from [EHZ23]):

Definition 19 (Sidon encoding). For any $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ a k -*Sidon encoding* of size $s(n)$ is a function $\text{enc}: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{s(n)}$ with the property that, for any two subsets $U, V \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ of cardinality $|U|, |V| \leq k$, if

$$\bigoplus_{u \in U} \text{enc}(u) = \bigoplus_{v \in V} \text{enc}(v),$$

then $U = V$.

Proposition 45. For any $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a k -*Sidon encoding* $\text{enc}: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{s(n)}$ of size $s(n) = \mathcal{O}(kn)$.

Proof. Assign each $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ a uniformly random string $\text{enc}(x) \sim \{0, 1\}^t$ for $t > 2kn$. Let $U, V \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ be distinct sets with $|U|, |V| \leq k$ and without loss of generality suppose that there exists $w \in U \setminus V$. Then we wish to bound the probability that

$$\vec{0} = \left(\bigoplus_{u \in U} \text{enc}(u) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{v \in V} \text{enc}(v) \right) = \text{enc}(w) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{u \in U \setminus \{w\}} \text{enc}(u) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{v \in V} \text{enc}(v) \right) \quad (14)$$

where $\text{enc}(w) \sim \{0, 1\}^t$ is independent of the latter terms. So the probability that the whole term is $\vec{0}$ is 2^{-t} . By the union bound, the probability that there exist two distinct sets U, V which satisfy (14) is at most $(2^{kn})^2 \cdot 2^{-t} < 1$ when $t > 2kn$, so there exists a fixed k -*Sidon encoding* $\text{enc}: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2k+1}$ of size $2kn + 1$. \square

We first solve a version of the problem where it is promised that there is exactly one coordinate $i \in [n]$ where the inputs $x_i \neq y_i$ differ. Note that under this promise, the entry of $P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n(x, y)$ is just $P_i(x_i, y_i)$ where $i \in [n]$ is the unique coordinate where $x_i \neq y_i$.

Lemma 46. Let $P_1, \dots, P_n \in \mathcal{P}$ be matrices with entries in Λ . There is a randomized protocol for computing $P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n$ on inputs $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$, under the promise that there is exactly one coordinate $i \in [n]$ such that $x_i \neq y_i$, with error probability $\leq \delta$ and communication cost $\mathcal{O}(\max_i R_\delta(P_i) + \log \frac{1}{\delta})$.

Proof. For a communication tree T we assume that each inner node v of T is labeled with either A or B depending on whether it is Alice's turn or Bob's turn to send a message. For each node v labeled A, we define the function $A_v(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ which determines Alice's message at that node on input x ; we may assume that this function is always defined. Similarly, $B_v(y) \in \{0, 1\}$ is Bob's message on node v labeled B with input y . We will extend these functions by setting $A_v(x) := \perp$ when v is labeled B, and similarly setting $B_v(y) := \perp$ when v is labeled A.

We assume, without loss of generality, that P_i is an $N \times N$ matrix with rows and columns indexed by $[N]$, and that for all δ and j , the randomized communication tree T_j for P_j is complete with depth $R_\delta := \max_i R_\delta(P_i)$.

Now the protocol for computing $P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n(x, y)$ under the promise of exactly one difference is as follows. Below, for clarity, we will use the notation $a \diamond b$ to denote string concatenation.

1. For each $j \in [n]$ and each $z \in [N]$, assign a uniformly random $\text{hash}_j(z) \sim [10/\delta]$.
 \triangleright We will write $i \in [n]$ for the unique coordinate where $x_i \neq y_i$. With probability at least $1 - \delta/10$, $\text{hash}_i(x_i) \neq \text{hash}_i(y_i)$. Assume this is the case below.
2. For each $j \in [n]$ and each $z \in [N]$, assign a uniformly random $p_j(z) \sim \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^{10+\log(1/\delta)}$ (treat \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} as $\{0, 1\}$). Let $\text{enc}_1: \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\delta))} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\delta))}$ be a 2-Sidon encoding. The players exchange $\bigoplus_{j \in [n]} \text{enc}(\text{hash}_j(x_j) \diamond p_j(x_j))$ and $\bigoplus_{j \in [n]} \text{enc}(\text{hash}_j(y_j) \diamond p_j(y_j))$, and compute

$$\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^n \text{enc}(\text{hash}_j(x_j) \diamond p_j(x_j)) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^n \text{enc}(\text{hash}_j(y_j) \diamond p_j(y_j)) \right) \\ = (\text{hash}_i(x_i) \diamond p_i(x_i)) \oplus (\text{hash}_i(y_i) \diamond p_i(y_i)).$$

Using the properties of the 2-Sidon encoding, they then determine the unordered pair $\{\text{hash}_i(x_i) \diamond p_i(x_i), \text{hash}_i(y_i) \diamond p_i(y_i)\}$. The players return 0 if $p_i(x_i) = p_i(y_i)$.

\triangleright The probability that this line outputs 0 is at most $2^{-(10+\log(1/\delta))} < \delta/10$.

Otherwise, the players obtain strings

$$\text{hash}_i(x_i) \diamond \mathbf{P} \text{ and } \text{hash}_i(y_i) \diamond (\neg \mathbf{P}) \tag{15}$$

where $(\mathbf{P}, \neg \mathbf{P}) \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^2$ is the value of $p_i(x_i), p_i(y_i)$ on the first coordinate where they differ.

\triangleright Note that the players don't know i , so they see the strings but do not know which one is associated with x_i and which one with y_i . These strings will tell the players to simulate player "P" if their input hashes to $\text{hash}_i(x_i)$, and simulate player "(¬P)" if their input hashes to $\text{hash}_i(y_i)$.

3. For each $j \in [n]$, randomly choose the communication tree T_j for the problem $P_j(x_j, y_j)$, with depth $R_{\delta/10}$, and error probability $\delta/10$. Here we assume without loss of generality that all trees are complete with the same depth.
 \triangleright The probability that we generate a tree T_i with the incorrect output value on inputs x_i, y_i is at most $\delta/10$. Assume T_i is correct below.
4. Let $S \subseteq [n]$ be the set of coordinates j such that $\text{hash}_j(x_j) \in \{\text{hash}_i(x_i), \text{hash}_i(y_i)\}$, which is equivalently the set of coordinates j such that $\text{hash}_j(y_j) \in \{\text{hash}_i(x_i), \text{hash}_i(y_i)\}$. The players will each compute S , and next they simulate all protocols T_j with $j \in S$ in parallel as follows.
For each $j \in S$, initialize t_j to be the root of T_j . In every round, until every t_j becomes a leaf:

(a) For each $j \in S$, Alice and Bob define, respectively:

$$a_j(x_j) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{P} \diamond \mathbf{P}_{t_j}(x_j) & \text{if } \text{hash}_j(x_j) = \text{hash}_i(x_i) \\ (\neg \mathbf{P}) \diamond (\neg \mathbf{P})_{t_j}(x_j) & \text{if } \text{hash}_j(x_j) = \text{hash}_i(y_i), \end{cases} \\ b_j(y_j) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{P} \diamond \mathbf{P}_{t_j}(y_j) & \text{if } \text{hash}_j(y_j) = \text{hash}_i(x_i) \\ (\neg \mathbf{P}) \diamond ((\neg \mathbf{P})_{t_j}(y_j)) & \text{if } \text{hash}_j(y_j) = \text{hash}_i(y_i). \end{cases}$$

\triangleright Note that for $x_j = y_j$ either $\text{hash}_j(x_j) = \text{hash}_j(y_j) = \text{hash}_i(x_i)$ and

$$a_j(x_j) = \mathbf{P} \diamond \mathbf{P}_{t_j}(x_j) = \mathbf{P} \diamond \mathbf{P}_{t_j}(y_j) = b_j(y_j),$$

or $\text{hash}_j(x_j) = \text{hash}_j(y_j) = \text{hash}_i(y_i)$, in which case

$$a_j(x_j) = (\neg P) \diamond (\neg P)_{t_j}(x_j) = (\neg P) \diamond (\neg P)_{t_j}(y_j) = b_j(y_j).$$

However, for $j = i$ where $x_i \neq y_i$, we have $a_i(x_i) = P \diamond P_{t_i}(x_i)$ and $b_i(y_i) = (\neg P) \diamond (\neg P)_{t_i}(y_i)$.

- (b) Let $\text{enc}_2: \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ be a 2-Sidon encoding. Alice and Bob communicate $\mathcal{O}(1)$ bits to compute

$$\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^n \text{enc}(a_j(x_j)) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^n \text{enc}(b_j(y_j)) \right) = \text{enc}(a_i(x_i)) \oplus \text{enc}(b_i(y_i)),$$

from which they determine the strings $a_i(x_i) = P \diamond P_{t_i}(x_i)$ and $b_i(y_i) = (\neg P) \diamond (\neg P)_{t_i}(y_i)$.

- (c) For each $j \in [n]$, if node t_j is labeled P then both Alice and Bob update it using the message $P_{t_i}(x_i)$; otherwise they update it using the message $(\neg P)_{t_i}(y_i)$.

▷ Observe that Alice and Bob agree on the update made to each protocol, and that protocol T_i is updated as if Alice was simulating player P and Bob was simulating player $(\neg P)$.

5. When all t_j have reached a leaf, let $\ell_j(t_j) \in \Lambda$ be the value of each leaf. The players use a 2-Sidon encoding $\text{enc}_3: \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{O}(\log(|\Lambda|/\delta))} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{O}(\log(|\Lambda|/\delta))}$ to compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^n \text{enc}(\text{hash}_j(x_j) \diamond \ell_j(t_j)) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^n \text{enc}(\text{hash}_j(y_j) \diamond \ell_j(t_j)) \right) \\ & = \text{enc}(\text{hash}_i(x_i) \diamond \ell_i(t_i)) \oplus \text{enc}(\text{hash}_i(y_i) \diamond \ell_i(t_i)) \end{aligned}$$

and recover the strings $\text{hash}_i(x_i) \diamond \ell_i(t_i)$, $\text{hash}_i(y_i) \diamond \ell_i(t_i)$, from which they can output $\ell_i(t_i)$.

▷ The output is either $T_i(x_i, y_i)$ or $T_i(y_i, x_i)$ depending on the value of P ; in either case the output is correct since $P_i(x_i, y_i) = P_i(y_i, x_i)$.

The correctness of the protocol is guaranteed by the comments within. □

7.3 Distance- r Composition Protocol

We now prove the upper bound on the distance- r composed problem.

Proof of Theorem 44. The protocol for $g[P_1 \bullet P_2 \bullet \dots \bullet P_n]$ is as follows. For inputs x, y , we will write $\Delta := \{i \in [n] : x_i \neq y_i\}$. Once again, we assume each P_i has rows and columns indexed by $[N]$.

1. As in the large-alphabet Hamming distance [Example 3](#), with alphabet $[N]$, check that there are at most r coordinates $i \in [n]$ such that $x_i \neq y_i$, with probability of error $\delta/10$.

▷ We now assume there are at most r coordinates that differ. Let $\Delta \subseteq [n]$ be these coordinates.

2. For each $j \in [n]$, assign a uniformly random value $h(j) \sim [5r^2/\delta]$, and for each $x_j \in [N]$ we assign a uniformly random value $\text{hash}_j(x_j) \sim [10r/\delta]$.

▷ The probability that there are distinct $i, j \in \Delta$ with $h(i) = h(j)$ is at most $\binom{r}{2} \cdot \frac{\delta}{5r^2} \leq \frac{\delta}{10}$, and probability that there is $i \in \Delta$ such that $\text{hash}(x_i) = \text{hash}(y_i)$ is at most $r \cdot \frac{\delta}{10r} = \frac{\delta}{10}$

3. Let $\text{enc} : \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{O}(\log(r/\delta))} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{O}(r \log(r/\delta))}$ be a $2r$ -Sidon encoding. Alice and Bob exchange

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \text{enc}(h(i) \diamond \text{hash}_i(x_i)) \text{ and } \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \text{enc}(h(i) \diamond \text{hash}_i(y_i)),$$

and take the XOR of these strings to obtain

$$\bigoplus_{i \in \Delta} (\text{enc}(h(i) \diamond \text{hash}_i(x_i)) \oplus \text{enc}(h(i) \diamond \text{hash}_i(y_i))).$$

From this by the properties of the $2r$ -Sidon encoding they deduce the unordered set

$$\{h(i) \diamond \text{hash}_i(x_i) : i \in \Delta\} \cup \{h(i) \diamond \text{hash}_i(y_i) : i \in \Delta\}, \quad (16)$$

and they may now agree on the set $H := \{h(i) : i \in \Delta\}$ with cardinality $|\Delta|$.

4. For each $h \in H$, the players obtain $B_h := \{j \in [n] : h(j) = h\}$. They then perform the protocol from [Lemma 46](#) restricted to the coordinates B_h , with error probability $\delta/10r$. \triangleright *Since $h(i)$ is unique for each $i \in \Delta$, it is promised that there is at most one coordinate $i \in \Delta$ in each B_h .*

The comments within explain the correctness of the protocol, and [Lemma 46](#). The cost of the protocol is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(r \log \frac{r}{\delta} + r \log \frac{r}{\delta} + r \cdot \left(\mathcal{R}_{\delta/10r}(\mathcal{P}_N) + \log \frac{|\Lambda|}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

We may assume $\mathcal{R}_{\delta/10r}(\mathcal{P}_N) = \Omega(\log |\Lambda|)$ since the number of possible outputs Λ of a protocol cannot exceed the number of leaves in the communication tree, so we obtain the desired bound. \square

A Appendix: Reduction to Gap Hamming Distance

Before the present paper, one reason that it would make sense to expect every constant-cost problem to reduce to k -HAMMING DISTANCE is that an analogous statement is true for *partial* problems: every constant-cost problem reduces to an appropriately chosen instance of the GAP HAMMING DISTANCE (GAPHD) problem.

Definition 20 (Gap Hamming Distance). For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$, on inputs $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ we define the partial function

$$\text{GAPHD}_\gamma(x, y) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{dist}(x, y) \leq \gamma n \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{dist}(x, y) \geq (1 - \gamma)n \\ * & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For any constant $\gamma < 1/2$, this problem has a constant-cost protocol, where the shared randomness is used to sample a sufficiently large set S of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ coordinates, and Alice sends the substring x_S on those coordinates to Bob, who compares it with the substring y_S . The Chernoff bound guarantees that $\text{dist}(x_S, y_S)$ is sufficiently concentrated around $|S| \cdot \text{dist}(x, y)/n$, so that the players can determine $\text{GAPHD}_\gamma(x, y)$ correctly with high probability. Every constant-cost problem can be reduced to GAPHD_γ for appropriately chosen constant γ :

Theorem 47. *For any constant c there is a constant γ such that the following holds. Let $P = (P_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any communication problem with randomized communication complexity at most c . Then $\mathcal{D}^{\text{GAPHD}_\gamma}(P) = 1$; i.e. the problem P can be solved by a single query to GAPHD_γ .*

This theorem is not as satisfactory as a reduction to k -HAMMING DISTANCE would have been, since a reduction to GAPHD_γ cannot be used to answer questions such as whether membership in BPP^0 implies existence of large rectangles or whether BPP^0 reduces to RP^0 (see e.g. [HH24]). This is because GAPHD_γ is a *partial* problem, and it is not known whether any of its completions into a total communication problem has a constant-cost protocol. Moreover, GAPHD_γ does not contain large monochromatic rectangles (see e.g. [FF81, Son14]), and consequently it only admits constant-cost two-sided error protocols since constant-cost one-sided error protocols have large monochromatic rectangles [HHH22b].

One way to prove [Theorem 47](#) is to use the fact that public-coin communication complexity is related to *discrepancy*, which is related to *margin* [CG88, LS09]: a problem is in BPP^0 if and only if it has constant discrepancy, and an application of Grothendieck's inequality shows that discrepancy equals margin up to a constant factor [LS09]. Starting from an assumption on the margin of the communication problem being bounded away from 0 then allows for a geometric argument, similar to the one used in [HHM23] to embed Gap Inner Product function into Gap Hamming Distance function.

Below we give an alternative direct and elementary proof, that avoids discrepancy and margin.

Proof. Consider a cost c public-coin protocol π for P in the one-way model, where Alice, given x , sends Bob a message $A(r, x)$, where r is the public randomness, and then Bob announces the output $B(A(r, x), y, r) \in \{0, 1\}$.

Let $w = 2^c$ be the number of potential messages by Alice. Define $S(r, y)$ as the set of messages $\tau \in \{0, 1\}^c$ such that Bob will output 1, given shared randomness r and input y , i.e. such that $B(\tau, r, y) = 1$. Define two w -bit strings $\phi_r(x), \psi_r(y) \in \{0, 1\}^w$ where we index their bits by Boolean strings from $\{0, 1\}^c$, as following. For any $i \in [w]$, the i -th bit of $\psi_r(x)$ is 1 iff the $A(r, x)$ is lexicographically the i -th string in $\{0, 1\}^c$. Define $\psi_r(y)$ similarly based on $S(r, y)$.

Finally, we obtain $\phi'_r(x)$ by padding $\phi_r(x)$ with a suffix of w 0s, and $\psi'_r(y)$ by padding $\psi_r(y)$ with a suffix of $\neg\psi_r(y)$. Then we have $|\phi'_r(x)| = 1$, and $|\psi'_r(y)| = w$ for any r, x, y .

Note that, whenever the protocol outputs 1 with random seed r , we have $\text{dist}(\phi'_r(x), \psi'_r(y)) = w - 1$, and when the protocol outputs 0, we have $\text{dist}(\phi'_r(x), \psi'_r(y)) = w + 1$.

By definition, with probability $\geq 2/3$ over r , the protocol will output the correct answer $P(x, y)$. Choose t independent random seeds r_1, \dots, r_t . Define $\Phi(x) = \phi_{r_1}(x) \cdots \phi_{r_t}(x)$, and $\Psi(y) = \psi_{r_1}(y) \cdots \psi_{r_t}(y)$ both of which are of length $L = 2tw$.

Now, when $P(x, y) = 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(\Phi(x), \Psi(y))] \leq (w - 1/3)t = (1/2 - 1/6w)L$. Applying the Chernoff Bound,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\text{dist}(\Phi(x), \Psi(y)) > \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6w}\right)L + \epsilon \cdot t\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 t\right)$$

Similarly, when $P(x, y) = 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\text{dist}(\Phi(x), \Psi(y))] \geq (w + 1/3)t = (1/2 + 1/6w)L$, and

$$\mathbb{P}\left[(\text{dist}(\Phi(x), \Psi(y))) < \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6w}\right)L - \epsilon \cdot t\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 t\right)$$

Let $t = \lceil 3/\epsilon^2 \cdot n \rceil$, $\epsilon = \frac{1}{6}$, and $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{12w}$. Then for every x, y with probability at least $1 - \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 t) > 1 - 4^{-n}$ we have that if $P(x, y) = 1$, then $\text{dist}(\Phi(x), \Psi(y)) \leq \gamma L$, and otherwise $\text{dist}(\Phi(x), \Psi(y)) \geq (1 - \gamma)L$,

Applying the union bound, there exists a choice of t fixed seeds r_1, \dots, r_t such that for all $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $P(x, y) = \text{GAPHD}_\gamma(\Phi(x), \Psi(y))$. In other words, P can be solved by a single query to GAPHD_γ . \square

B Appendix: Previously-studied problems reduce to k -Hamming Distance

We survey the constant-cost problems which have been explicitly studied in the literature, and show that they reduce to k -HAMMING DISTANCE, along with their distance- r compositions.

To show that the distance- r compositions reduce to k -HAMMING DISTANCE, we will need to define a certain restricted type of an EQUALITY-oracle protocol, where, informally, the two players Alice and Bob would always supply the same query strings to each oracle if they were given the same input x .

Recall that a communication problem \mathcal{P} is *symmetric* if every communication matrix $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is symmetric, i.e. $P(x, y) = P(y, x)$.

Definition 21 (Tandem Equality Protocol). A symmetric communication problem \mathcal{P} has a constant-cost *tandem EQUALITY protocol* if for every matrix $P \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$ in \mathcal{P} , there is a constant-cost deterministic EQUALITY-oracle communication protocol for P such that, for every node v in the communication tree, the two parties' query functions $a_v: [N] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $b_v: [N] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfy $a_v(x) = b_v(x)$ for all $x \in [N]$.

We will prove the following in [Appendix B.2](#).

Theorem 48. *Let \mathcal{P} be any symmetric communication problem with a constant-cost tandem EQUALITY protocol. Then for any constant r , there exists a constant k such that any distance- r composition of \mathcal{P} reduces to HD_k .*

Let us now survey the constant-cost problems which have been studied in the literature and classify them using the notion of tandem EQUALITY protocols.

B.1 Survey of Known Problems

The constant-cost communication problems which have been explicitly studied in prior work, aside from the k -HAMMING DISTANCE problem, fall into three categories.

Cartesian products. [\[HWZ22\]](#) show that if there is a constant-cost protocol for computing adjacency or $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq k$ in graphs G belonging to graph class \mathcal{G} (where $\text{dist}(x, y)$ is the shortest path distance), then there is a constant-cost protocol for computing adjacency or $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq k$ in the class of *Cartesian product* graphs \mathcal{G}^\times defined as the set of all graphs obtained by taking the Cartesian product graph

$$G_1 \times G_2 \times \cdots \times G_n$$

of arbitrarily-many graphs $G_i \in \mathcal{G}$. This is generalized by our distance- r compositions, since computing adjacency or distance in a graph is a symmetric problem.

Graph problems with tandem Equality protocols. These protocols are of the form “compute adjacency or $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq k$ in graphs G of a certain class”, where $\text{dist}(x, y)$ is the path distance in G . The most general problems of this form are

- Computing $\text{dist}(x, y) \leq k$ in graphs G belonging to any class of *structurally bounded expansion* (including planar graphs, graphs with an excluded minor, etc.) [\[EHK22\]](#). An inspection of their EQUALITY-oracle protocol reveals that it is in fact a tandem protocol. (Note that these problems generalize the planar graphs in [Example 2](#) but our protocol in [Example 2](#) was *not* a tandem protocol.)

- Computing adjacency in stable unit-disk graphs [HZ24]. The EQUALITY-oracle protocol in [HZ24] is not tandem, but it is not difficult to transform it into a tandem protocol.

These protocols reduce to EQUALITY, but we may also take the Cartesian product to get a new problem; [Theorem 48](#) shows that the resulting problems still reduce to k -HAMMING DISTANCE.

Asymmetric Equality protocols. These problems are of the form “compute adjacency in a bipartite graph $G = (X, Y, E)$, where Alice has $x \in X$ and Bob has $y \in Y$ ”. The most general problems of this type are:

1. Computing adjacency in bipartite graphs G forbidding certain choices of a single induced subgraph H [HWZ22].
2. Deciding incidence in “stable” point-halfspace arrangements in small dimensions [HZ24].

To apply the Cartesian product or distance- r composition to these problems, we first need to “symmetrize” the problem by allowing Alice and Bob to have inputs x, y belonging to the union $X \cup Y$ (and define the output to be a constant value, say 0, when $x, y \in X$ or $x, y \in Y$). Symmetrizing the problem in this way allows a tandem EQUALITY protocol to be obtained from the original EQUALITY oracle protocol: simply include a round of communication at the beginning for them to check whether their inputs are in the same set X or Y). So the problems obtained in this way also reduce to k -HAMMING DISTANCE by [Theorem 48](#).

B.2 Reduction to k -Hamming Distance

We prove [Theorem 48](#) which states that if \mathcal{P} admits a constant-cost tandem EQUALITY protocol, then the distance- r composition of \mathcal{P} is reducible to k -HAMMING DISTANCE. The first step is to show that we can encode a tandem EQUALITY protocol using a map $E: [N] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ such that the output $P(x, y)$ can be determined from $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y))$.

Lemma 49. *Let \mathcal{P} be any communication problem over an alphabet Λ which admits a constant-cost tandem EQUALITY protocol. Then there exists a constant k and a fixed map $D: \{0, 2, 4, \dots, 2k\} \rightarrow \Lambda$ such that, for any N and any $N \times N$ matrix $P \in \mathcal{P}$, there is a map $E: [N] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{m(N)}$ such that $|E(x)| = k$ for every $x \in [N]$, and*

$$\forall x, y \in [N] : \quad P(x, y) = D(\text{dist}(E(x), E(y))). \quad (17)$$

Proof. Since \mathcal{P} admits a constant-cost tandem EQUALITY protocol, there is a constant q and a fixed function $\rho: \{0, 1\}^q \rightarrow \Lambda$ such that the following holds. For every N , every $N \times N$ matrix $P \in \mathcal{P}$ can be computed as

$$P = \rho(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_q), \quad (18)$$

where each $Q_i: [N] \times [N] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a matrix of the form $Q_i(x, y) := \mathbb{1}[a_i(x) = a_i(y)]$ for some function $a_i: [N] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The proof of this fact is similar to that of [Proposition 19](#), where ρ may be taken to be the function that produces the output of the protocol, given the answer to each query. We may assume without loss of generality that each a_i has the range $[N]$.

Now define $E_i: [N] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2^{i-1}N}$ so that $E_i(x)$ is obtained by starting with the N -bit vector with value 1 in coordinate $a_i(x)$ and 0 elsewhere, and then duplicating each coordinate 2^{i-1} times. Note that the Hamming weight is $|E_i(x)| = 2^{i-1}$, $\text{dist}(E_i(x), E_i(y)) \in \{0, 2^i\}$, and $\text{dist}(E_i(x), E_i(y)) = 0$ if and only if $Q_i(x, y) = 1$.

Finally, define $E(x) := E_1(x)E_2(x) \cdots E_q(x)$. The weight is $|E(x)| = \sum_{i=1}^q 2^{i-1} = 2^q - 1$, and

$$\text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) = \text{dist}(E_1(x) \cdots E_q(x), E_1(y) \cdots E_q(y)) = \sum_{i=1}^q 2^{i-1} \mathbf{1}[Q_i(x, y) = 1].$$

Let $k = 2^q - 1$, and note that $0 \leq \text{dist}(E(x), E(y)) \leq 2k$, and the binary representation of $\text{dist}(E(x), E(y))$ has 1 in the i^{th} least-significant bit if and only if $Q_i(x, y) = 1$. This combined with Equation (18) shows that the map D where $D(t)$ is obtained by applying ρ to the binary representation of t , satisfies Equation (17) as desired. \square

We will further transform the encodings E obtained from Lemma 49. For this transformation we need the next fact, which follows from Newton's identities for the elementary symmetric polynomials⁴:

Fact 50. Fix any r and consider sequences $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \cdots \leq a_r$ and $b_1 \leq b_2 \leq \cdots \leq b_r$. Suppose that

$$\forall d \in [r] : \sum_{i=1}^r a_i^d = \sum_{i=1}^r b_i^d.$$

Then $a_i = b_i$ for all $i \in [r]$, i.e. the sequences are equal.

Fix any d, k , consider the following encoding $F_d: \binom{[n]}{k} \rightarrow [n]^d$:

$$F_d(x) := \left\{ (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) \in [n]^d \mid \forall s, i_s \in x \right\}. \quad (19)$$

Observe that for $x \in \binom{[n]}{k}$, $F_d(x) = |x|^d = k^d$. For $x, y \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ with $\text{dist}(x, y) = \Delta$, we have

$$\text{dist}(F_d(x), F_d(y)) = (|x| + |y|)^d - (2k - \Delta)^d = 2^d k^d - 2^d (k - \Delta/2)^d. \quad (20)$$

These encodings have the following property:

Proposition 51. Fix any $r, k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. For $x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_r, x'_1, \dots, x'_r, y'_1, \dots, y'_r \in \binom{[n]}{k}$, write $a_i := \text{dist}(x_i, y_i)$ and $b_i := \text{dist}(x'_i, y'_i)$. Suppose that

$$\forall d \in [r] : \sum_{i=1}^r \text{dist}(F_d(x_i), F_d(y_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^r \text{dist}(F_d(x'_i), F_d(y'_i)).$$

Then the multisets $\{a_i : i \in [r]\}$ and $\{b_i : i \in [r]\}$ are equal.

Proof. For all $d \in [r]$, we have from Equation (20) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \text{dist}(F_d(x_i), F_d(y_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^r \left(2^d k^d - 2^d (k - a_i/2)^d \right) = r 2^d k^d - 2^d \sum_{i=1}^r (k - a_i/2)^d,$$

and similarly

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \text{dist}(F_d(x'_i), F_d(y'_i)) = r 2^d k^d - 2^d \sum_{i=1}^r (k - b_i/2)^d,$$

⁴Under the assumption of Fact 50, Newton's identity implies that the polynomials $\prod_{i=1}^r (x - a_i)$ and $\prod_{i=1}^r (x - b_i)$ have the same coefficients and therefore the same multisets of roots.

so for all $d \in [r]$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^r (k - a_i/2)^d = \sum_{i=1}^r (k - b_i/2)^d.$$

By [Fact 50](#), this means the multisets $\{a_i : i \in [r]\}$ and $\{b_i : i \in [r]\}$ are equal. \square

We now prove the theorem that distance- r compositions of constant-cost problems with tandem EQUALITY protocols can be reduced to k -HAMMING DISTANCE.

Proof of [Theorem 48](#). Suppose \mathcal{P} is a Λ -valued symmetric communication problem with a constant-cost tandem EQUALITY protocol. Let k and D be as provided by [Lemma 49](#), and let $E_i : [N] \rightarrow \binom{[m(N)]}{k}$ be the encoding obtained for each P_i from [Lemma 49](#).

Fix any r and consider any distance- r composition of \mathcal{P} defined by a function $g : \Lambda^r \rightarrow \Lambda$ and $N \times N$ matrices $P_1, \dots, P_n \in \mathcal{P}$. For $d \in [r]$, define F_d as in equation (19).

We describe in [Protocol 4](#) how the resulting distance- r composition function can be solved by $\mathcal{O}(r^2 k^d)$ queries (i.e. independent of the input size) to a K -HAMMING DISTANCE oracle, where $K = 2rk^r$.

Hamming Distance oracle protocol for $P(x, y)$:

1. Let $\Delta := \{i \in [n] : x_i \neq y_i\}$.
2. Use r queries to HD_r to determine whether $|\Delta| > r$ and if so, output \perp as desired. Otherwise, we have computed $|\Delta|$ exactly.
3. For each $d \in [r]$, use $2rk^d$ queries to HD_{2rk^d} to compute
$$T_d := \text{dist}(F_d(E_1(x_1))F_d(E_2(x_2)) \cdots F_d(E_n(x_n)), F_d(E_1(y_1))F_d(E_2(y_2)) \cdots F_d(E_n(y_n))) ,$$
4. From [Proposition 51](#), the values $a_i := \text{dist}(E_i(x_i), E_i(y_i))$ are now determined uniquely (since there are at most $|\Delta| \leq r$ nonzero of these values).
5. Compute the multiset $\{D(a_i) : i \in [n], a_i \neq 0\}$ using the function D from [Lemma 49](#). Since g is permutation-invariant, we may compute it by applying it to the values $D(a_i) = P_i(x_i, y_i)$ where $a_i \neq 0$, in any order.

Protocol 4: Reduction from tandem EQUALITY-oracle protocols to HAMMING DISTANCE

\square

Acknowledgments

Big thanks to Lianna Hambardzumyan for many helpful discussions on this topic. Much of the work in this paper was done simultaneously with [\[FHHH24\]](#) which was coauthored with Lianna.

Mika Göös and Nathaniel Harms are supported by the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research, and Innovation (SERI) under contract number MB22.00026, and Nathaniel Harms is partly supported by an NSERC postdoctoral fellowship. Pooya Hatami is supported by NSF grant CCF-1947546.

References

- [CG88] Benny Chor and Oded Goldreich. Unbiased bits from sources of weak randomness and probabilistic communication complexity. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 17, 1988. doi:[10.1137/0217015](https://doi.org/10.1137/0217015).
- [Che24] Tsun-Ming Cheung. Personal communication, 2024.
- [CHHS23] Tsun-Ming Cheung, Hamed Hatami, Kaave Hosseini, and Morgan Shirley. Separation of the factorization norm and randomized communication complexity. In *Proceedings, IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC)*, volume 264, 2023. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2023.1](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2023.1).
- [CLV19] Arkadev Chattopadhyay, Shachar Lovett, and Marc Vinyals. Equality alone does not simulate randomness. In *Proceedings, IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC)*, volume 137, 2019. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.14](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.14).
- [EHK22] Louis Esperet, Nathaniel Harms, and Andrey Kupavskii. Sketching distances in monotone graph classes. In *Proceedings, International Workshop on Randomization and Computation (RANDOM)*, 2022. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2022.18](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2022.18).
- [EHZ23] Louis Esperet, Nathaniel Harms, and Viktor Zamaraev. Optimal adjacency labels for subgraphs of cartesian products. In *Proceedings, International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, 2023. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2023.57](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2023.57).
- [FF81] P. Frankl and Z. Füredi. A short proof for a theorem of Harper about Hamming-spheres. *Discrete Math.*, 34(3):311–313, 1981. doi:[10.1016/0012-365X\(81\)90009-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(81)90009-1).
- [FHHS24] Yuting Fang, Lianna Hambardzumyan, Nathaniel Harms, and Pooya Hatami. No complete problem for constant-cost randomized communication. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2024. doi:[10.1145/3618260.3649716](https://doi.org/10.1145/3618260.3649716).
- [FX14] Vitaly Feldman and David Xiao. Sample complexity bounds on differentially private learning via communication complexity. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1000–1019. PMLR, 2014. doi:[10.1137/140991844](https://doi.org/10.1137/140991844).
- [Gas] William Gasarch. Applications of Ramsey theory to computer science. <https://www.cs.umd.edu/~gasarch/TOPICS/ramsey/ramsey.html>. Accessed: July 2, 2024.
- [HH24] Hamed Hatami and Pooya Hatami. Guest column: Structure in communication complexity and constant-cost complexity classes. *SIGACT News*, 55(1):67–93, 2024. doi:[10.1145/3654780.3654788](https://doi.org/10.1145/3654780.3654788).
- [HHH22a] Lianna Hambardzumyan, Hamed Hatami, and Pooya Hatami. A counter-example to the probabilistic universal graph conjecture via randomized communication complexity. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 322:117–122, 2022. doi:[10.1016/j.dam.2022.07.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2022.07.023).
- [HHH22b] Lianna Hambardzumyan, Hamed Hatami, and Pooya Hatami. Dimension-free bounds and structural results in communication complexity. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 253(2):555–616, 2022. doi:[10.1007/s11856-022-2365-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11856-022-2365-8).

- [HHM23] Hamed Hatami, Kaave Hosseini, and Xiang Meng. A Borsuk-Ulam lower bound for sign-rank and its applications. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2023. doi:10.1145/3564246.3585210.
- [HHP⁺22] Hamed Hatami, Pooya Hatami, William Pires, Ran Tao, and Rosie Zhao. Lower bound methods for sign-rank and their limitations. In *Proceedings, International Workshop on Randomization and Computation (RANDOM)*, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2022.22.
- [HSZZ06] Wei Huang, Yaoyun Shi, Shengyu Zhang, and Yufan Zhu. The communication complexity of the hamming distance problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 99(4):149–153, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.ipl.2006.01.014.
- [HWZ22] Nathaniel Harms, Sebastian Wild, and Viktor Zamaraev. Randomized communication and implicit graph representations. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 2022. doi:10.1145/3519935.3519978.
- [HZ24] Nathaniel Harms and Viktor Zamaraev. Randomized communication and implicit representations for matrices and graphs of small sign-rank. In *Proceedings, ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2024. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977912.72.
- [KN96] Eyal Kushilevitz and Noam Nisan. *Communication Complexity*. Cambridge University Press, 1996. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511574948.
- [LS09] Nati Linial and Adi Shraibman. Learning complexity vs. communication complexity. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 2009. doi:10.1017/S0963548308009656.
- [Nis93] Noam Nisan. The communication complexity of threshold gates. *Combinatorics, Paul Erdős is Eighty*, 1:301–315, 1993.
- [PS86] Ramamohan Paturi and Janos Simon. Probabilistic communication complexity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 33(1):106–123, 1986. doi:10.1016/0022-0000(86)90046-2.
- [RY20] Anup Rao and Amir Yehudayoff. *Communication Complexity and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2020. doi:10.1017/9781108671644.
- [Sağ18] Mert Sağlam. Near log-convexity of measured heat in (discrete) time and consequences. In *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2018. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2018.00095.
- [Son14] Hao Song. *Space-Bounded Communication Complexity*. PhD thesis, Tsinghua University, 2014.
- [Vio15] Emanuele Viola. The communication complexity of addition. *Combinatorica*, 35:703–747, 2015. doi:10.1007/s00493-014-3078-3.
- [Yao03] Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. On the power of quantum fingerprinting. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 77–81. ACM, New York, 2003. doi:10.1145/780542.780554.