

# On the Complexity of Hazard-Free Formulas

Leah London Arazi\*

Amir Shpilka\*

## Abstract

This paper studies the *hazard-free formula complexity* of Boolean functions.

As our main result, we prove thatunate functions are the only Boolean functions for which the monotone formula complexity of the hazard-derivative equals the hazard-free formula complexity of the function itself. Consequently, every non-unate function breaks the so-called monotone barrier, as introduced and discussed by Ikenmeyer, Komarath, and Saurabh (ITCS 2023).

Our second main result shows that the hazard-free formula complexity of random Boolean functions is at most  $2^{(1+o(1))n}$ . Prior to this, no better upper bound than  $O(3^n)$  was known. Notably, unlike in the general case of Boolean circuits and formulas, where the typical complexity matches that of the multiplexer function, the hazard-free formula complexity is smaller than the optimal hazard-free formula for the multiplexer by an exponential factor in  $n$ .

Additionally, we explore the hazard-free formula complexity of block composition of Boolean functions and obtain a result in the hazard-free setting that is analogous to a result of Karchmer, Raz, and Wigderson (Computational Complexity, 1995) in the monotone setting. We demonstrate that our result implies a lower bound on the hazard-free formula depth of the block composition of the set covering function with the multiplexer function, which breaks the monotone barrier.

---

\*This research was co-funded by the European Union by the European Union (ERC, EACTP, 101142020), the Israel Science Foundation (grant number 514/20) and the Len Blavatnik and the Blavatnik Family Foundation. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Our results . . . . .	7
1.2	Proof overview . . . . .	9
1.3	Organization of the paper . . . . .	10
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	The hazard-derivative . . . . .	11
2.2	Implicants and implicates . . . . .	12
2.2.1	Monotone Boolean functions . . . . .	13
2.2.2	Unate Boolean functions . . . . .	14
2.3	Communication complexity . . . . .	14
2.3.1	Karchmer-Wigderson games . . . . .	16
<b>3</b>	<b>Tightness of the hazard-derivative method</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	KW game of the hazard-derivative . . . . .	17
3.2	Unateness as a criterion . . . . .	22
<b>4</b>	<b>A universal upper bound for most Boolean functions</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1	The hazard-derivative of a random Boolean function . . . . .	24
4.2	Hazard-derivatives upper bound . . . . .	26
4.2.1	Tight bound for range functions . . . . .	28
<b>5</b>	<b>Composition of Boolean functions in hazard-free setting</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Andreev’s function</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Open problems</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Communication complexity</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Missing proofs from Section 2</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Missing proof from Section 5</b>	<b>40</b>

# 1 Introduction

*Hazards* are a critical issue in the design of combinational circuits, which are key components in digital systems, realizing Boolean functions in the physical domain. A combinational circuit consists of gates connected by electrical wires. When setting voltage at the inputs, the signal propagates through the gates and wires until it reaches the output gate. This propagation involves inevitable signal *delays*, which may vary on each path in the circuit. As a result, when the inputs change, some gates may respond faster than others, potentially leading to *static hazards*. A static hazard occurs when an input change causes a momentary fluctuation in the output, when the output is expected to remain constant.

Hazards in combinational circuits can cause unpredictable system behavior. While they can be mitigated by introducing delays, our focus is on designing circuits whose structure inherently prevents hazards. Huffman was the first to provide hazard-free formula implementation for all Boolean functions, achieving a size of  $O(\sqrt{n} \cdot 3^n)$  [Huf57]. There is a broad body literature on hazard-free computation, and we refer the interested reader to [McC86, IKL<sup>+</sup>19, IKS23] and references therein.

The study of hazards involves Kleene’s three-valued logic, which extends the standard Boolean values 0/1 by introducing a third symbol,  $u$ , representing an undefined or unstable value.

**Definition 1.1** (Kleene three-valued logic [Kle52]). *Kleene’s three-valued strong logic of indeterminacy extends the two-valued Boolean logic by a third value  $u$ . The Boolean values  $\{0, 1\}$  are called “stable” and  $u$  is called “unstable”. The De Morgan gates are appropriately extended, as shown in Table 1.*

or	0	$u$	1
0	0	$u$	1
$u$	$u$	$u$	1
1	1	1	1

and	0	$u$	1
0	0	0	0
$u$	0	$u$	$u$
1	0	$u$	1

not	0	$u$	1
	1	$u$	0

Table 1: Extended De Morgan gates.

Using this definition, we can view any Boolean circuit or formula as taking an input  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  and outputting a value in  $\{0, u, 1\}$ . Since Boolean circuits always output Boolean values when given a Boolean input, only a subset of all ternary functions,  $f : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}$ , can be computed by such circuits. [Muk72] refers to these functions as *natural functions*.

**Definition 1.2** ( $\stackrel{u}{\leq}$  [Muk72]). *The relation  $\stackrel{u}{\leq}$  is a partial order in which  $u \stackrel{u}{\leq} 1$ ,  $u \stackrel{u}{\leq} 0$  and  $0, 1$  are not comparable. For  $x, y \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$ , we denote  $x \stackrel{u}{\leq} y$  if for every  $i \in [n]$ ,  $x_i \stackrel{u}{\leq} y_i$ .<sup>1</sup>*

**Definition 1.3** (Natural function). *A function  $f : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}$  is called a natural function if it satisfies the following:*

- $f$  preserves stable values, i.e., for every Boolean input  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  we have  $f(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- $f$  is monotone with respect to  $\stackrel{u}{\leq}$ . Intuitively, replacing stable bits in an input with  $u$  can only cause the output to change to  $u$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>As usual,  $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

Since the extended De Morgan gates are monotone with respect to  $\leq^u$  and preserve stable values, it can be shown that:

**Proposition 1.4** ([Muk72, Theorem 3]). *A function  $f : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}$  can be calculated by a Boolean circuit if and only if  $f$  is natural.*

We are now ready to present the abstraction of hazards using ternary algebra. We follow the basic definitions and notations from [IKL<sup>+</sup>19]:

**Definition 1.5** (Resolution). *Let  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$ . A resolution  $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$  of  $x$  is obtained by replacing every occurrence of  $u$  in  $x$  by either 0 or 1. We denote by  $R(x)$  the set of all resolutions of  $x$ . Stated differently,  $R(x) := \{y \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid x \leq^u y\}$ .*

**Definition 1.6** (Hazard). *Let  $C$  be a Boolean circuit.  $C$  has a hazard at input  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  if and only if  $C(x) = u$  and there exists  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  such that for every  $y \in R(x)$ , it holds that  $C(y) = b$ .*

In words, there is a hazard at input  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  if the function is constant on every resolution of the input  $x$  (i.e., regardless of how the unstable coordinates are resolved into stable values, the output remains unchanged), yet the circuit still outputs  $u$ . Put differently, a hazard-free circuit outputs  $u$  if and only if the output cannot be determined solely by the stable bits.

**Definition 1.7** (Hazard-free circuit). *Let  $C$  be a Boolean circuit.  $C$  is said to be hazard-free if for every  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$ ,  $C$  does not have a hazard at  $x$ .*

An equivalent way of defining a hazard-free circuit is by the ternary function it computes. A circuit is considered hazard-free if it calculates the hazard-free extension of  $f$ :

**Definition 1.8** (The hazard-free extension). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. The hazard-free extension of  $f$ , denoted  $\tilde{f} : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}$ , is defined as follows:*

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } f(y) = 0 \text{ for all } y \in R(x), \\ 1, & \text{if } f(y) = 1 \text{ for all } y \in R(x), \\ u, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It can be easily proved that the hazard-free extension is a natural function. By examining the truth tables in Table 1, we observe that the extended De Morgan gates are hazard-free. However, circuits composed of these gates do not necessarily retain the hazard-free property.<sup>2</sup>

[IKL<sup>+</sup>19] showed a profound correspondence between monotone complexity and hazard-free complexity. Recall that a Boolean function is monotone if changing the value of an input coordinate from 0 to 1 cannot change the value of the function from 1 to 0. Monotone functions can be computed by monotone circuits, which are circuits that do not use negation gates. Using the hazard-derivatives method, which we discuss next, they proved that for monotone functions, the hazard-free complexity and the monotone complexity are identical.

**Theorem 1.9** (Hazard-free and monotone circuit complexity are equivalent [IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Theorem 1.3]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function, then:*

$$\text{size}_C^u(f) = \text{size}_C^+(f),$$

where  $\text{size}_C^+(f)$  and  $\text{size}_C^u(f)$  denote the minimal size of a monotone Boolean circuit and a hazard-free circuit computing  $f$ , respectively.

<sup>2</sup>For example, a Boolean circuit exhibiting hazards is shown in [IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Figure 1].

In fact, [Juk21] further proved that an optimal hazard-free circuit for a monotone function must be a monotone circuit. As superpolynomial lower bounds for monotone circuits [Raz85, AB87, Tar88] are known, [IKL<sup>+</sup>19] used Theorem 1.9 to prove lower bound on the hazard-free circuit complexity of monotone functions whose Boolean circuit complexity is only polynomial.

While Theorem 1.9 only concerns monotone functions, [IKL<sup>+</sup>19] found a striking connection between hazard-free complexity and monotone complexity for all Boolean functions. They defined the *hazard-derivative* of a Boolean function  $f$ , denoted  $\text{df}(x; y)$ , where  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is a point and  $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is the change applied to  $x$ . For a fixed  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , the function  $\text{df}(x; y)$  is a monotone Boolean function in  $y$ , which indicates whether perturbing  $x$  according to  $u \cdot y$  causes  $\tilde{f}$  to output an unstable value (see Definition 2.2). The importance of this definition stems from the fact that, for a fixed  $x$ , the monotone complexity of  $\text{df}(x; \cdot)$  is upper bounded by the hazard-free complexity of  $f$ . Moreover, every hazard-free circuit (or formula) for  $f$  can be tweaked to yield a monotone circuit (or formula) for  $\text{df}(x; \cdot)$ .<sup>3</sup>

**Theorem 1.10** (The hazard-derivative lower bound [IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Theorem 4.11]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  be a fixed Boolean input, then:*

$$\text{size}_C^+(\text{df}(x; \cdot)) \leq \text{size}_C^u(f) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{size}_F^+(\text{df}(x; \cdot)) \leq \text{size}_F^u(f),$$

where  $\text{size}_F^+(f)$  and  $\text{size}_F^u(f)$  denote the minimal size of a monotone Boolean formula and a hazard-free formula computing  $f$ , respectively.

[IKL<sup>+</sup>19], and later [Juk21], provided examples of non-monotone Boolean functions that have polynomial-sized Boolean circuits but whose hazard-derivatives require large monotone circuit complexity, thereby establishing strong lower bounds on the hazard-free circuit complexity of these functions. This motivates the study of the hazard-free model as a bridge between monotone complexity and Boolean circuit complexity.

We note that until [IKL<sup>+</sup>19], hazard-free lower bounds were proved only for restricted models such as hazard-free depth 2 circuits [Eic65, ND95].

Additionally, [IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Theorem 1.3] proved that the hazard-derivative method yields *tight* bounds for monotone Boolean functions. That is,  $\text{size}_C^+(\text{df}(x; \cdot)) = \text{size}_C^u(f)$  and  $\text{size}_F^+(\text{df}(x; \cdot)) = \text{size}_F^u(f)$  for monotone functions when  $x = \bar{0}$ . This raises the following intriguing question.

**Question 1.11.** *Is there a criterion that determines whether the hazard-derivative method yields an exact lower bound? If so, is this criterion easy to verify?*

**The monotone barrier.** [IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Juk21] obtained exponential lower bounds on the hazard-free computation of many Boolean functions using Theorem 1.10. However, there are Boolean functions for which the hazard-derivative method fails to provide optimal lower bounds on hazard-free complexity due to the low monotone complexity of the hazard-derivatives. [IKS23] highlights this issue and refers to it as the *monotone barrier*. They define breaking the monotone barrier as achieving stronger lower bounds than those obtained by the hazard-derivative method.

As an example of a result that breaks the monotone barrier, [IKS23] note that the hazard-derivatives of the parity function on  $n$  variables,  $\text{XOR}_n$ , are simply OR functions on  $n$  literals,

---

<sup>3</sup>[IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Theorem 4.11] only speaks about circuit size, but the same proof holds for formulas as well. Corollary 3.12 also proves the claim for formulas.

which have trivial formulas of size  $n$ . On the other hand, it is known that the De Morgan formula complexity of  $\text{XOR}_n$  is  $\Omega(n^2)$ , while it is not hard to see that any formula for  $\text{XOR}_n$  is hazard-free.

To quantify the gap between the hazard-free complexity of a given Boolean function and the monotone complexity of its hazard-derivatives, we define a measure, similar to those defined in [Juk21, Section 7], which we refer to as the *monotone gap*.

**Definition 1.12** (The monotone gap). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. The monotone gap of  $f$  is defined as:*

$$\text{mono-gap}(f) := \frac{\text{size}_F^u(f)}{\max_{x \in \{0, 1\}^n} \text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot))}.$$

For example, the monotone gap of  $\text{XOR}_n$  is  $\Omega(n)$ . In an attempt to understand the power of the hazard-derivative method (or its weaknesses), we need to determine by how much a function breaks the monotone barrier.

**Question 1.13.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. How large can  $\text{mono-gap}(f)$  be? What is  $\text{mono-gap}(f)$  for a typical Boolean function?*

**The hazard-free KW game.** To overcome the monotone barrier, [IKS23] studied a generalization of the classic Karchmer-Wigderson game [KW90] in the hazard-free setting (see Section 2.3 for background on KW games).

**Definition 1.14** (Hazard-free KW game [IKS23, Definition 4.4]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. The hazard-free Karchmer-Wigderson game of  $f$ , denoted  $KW_f^u$ , is defined as follows: Alice receives  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  such that  $\tilde{f}(x) = 1$ , Bob receives  $y \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  such that  $\tilde{f}(y) = 0$ , and their goal is to output a coordinate  $i \in [n]$  such that  $x_i \neq y_i$  and  $x_i, y_i \neq u$ .*

As  $KW_f^u \subseteq \tilde{f}^{-1}(1) \times \tilde{f}^{-1}(0) \times [n]$ , and every  $x \in \tilde{f}^{-1}(1)$  and  $y \in \tilde{f}^{-1}(0)$  are valid inputs<sup>4</sup>,  $KW_f^u$  has a potentially larger set of inputs than the classic game. As a result, the communication matrix may be more complex. The hazard-free KW game preserves a tight connection between the underlying communication problem complexity and the optimal *hazard-free* formula depth and size.

**Theorem 1.15** ([IKS23, Theorem 4.6]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. Then,*

$$\text{depth}_F^u(f) = CC(KW_f^u) \text{ and } \text{size}_F^u(f) = \text{mono-rec}(KW_f^u),$$

where  $\text{depth}_F^u(f)$  is the depth of the shallowest hazard-free formula computing  $f$ ,  $CC(\mathcal{R})$  is the communication complexity of the relation  $\mathcal{R}$ , and  $\text{mono-rec}(\mathcal{R})$  is the minimal number of leaves in a protocol that solves  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Consequently, communication complexity methods can be used to prove lower bounds on hazard-free formulas. Using this approach, [IKS23, Theorems 5.8, 5.12] determined the exact hazard-free formula size of the multiplexer function.

---

<sup>4</sup>There must exist a coordinate  $i \in [n]$  such that  $x_i \neq y_i$  and  $x_i, y_i$  are stable. Otherwise,  $x, y$  have a common resolution, in contradiction to Definition 1.8.

**Definition 1.16** (The multiplexer function [IKS23]). *The multiplexer function  $MUX_n : \{0, 1\}^{n+2^n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is defined as follows:*

$$MUX_n(s, x) = x_{bin(s)},$$

where  $s \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^{2^n}$ .

**Theorem 1.17** (Hazard-free formula size for the multiplexer function [IKS23, Exact Bounds]).

$$size_F^u(MUX_n) = 2 \cdot 3^n - 1.$$

This result also breaks the monotone barrier, since the hazard-derivatives of the multiplexer function have quasi-linear monotone formula complexity.

**Proposition 1.18** (Hazard-derivatives of the multiplexer function [IKS23, Proposition 3,1]). *For every  $(s, x) \in \{0, 1\}^{n+2^n}$ , the function  $dMUX_n(s, x; \cdot, \cdot) : \{0, 1\}^{n+2^n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  has a monotone formula of size at most  $(n+1)2^n$ .*

Another interesting observation is that, for a monotone function, the hazard-free KW game captures the monotone formula complexity.

**Theorem 1.19** ([IKS23, Theorem 4.11]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function. Then,  $KW_f^u$  and  $KW_f^+$  are equivalent.*

Consequently, the size and depth of an optimal hazard-free formula are identical to those of its monotone counterpart. This provides a proof of Theorem 1.9 for formulas instead of circuits.

**A universal upper bound.** An immediate consequence of Theorem 1.17 is that any Boolean function  $f$  can be implemented by a hazard-free formula of size  $2 \cdot 3^n - 1$ . Indeed, since

$$f(x) = MUX_n(x, f(0, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, f(1, 1, \dots, 1)),$$

the hazard-free formula for the multiplexer, when hardwired the truth table of  $f$ , gives a hazard-free formula for  $f$ . This result is the first to break the  $O(\sqrt{n} \cdot 3^n)$  upper bound of Huffman [Huf57].

We note that this state of knowledge is much poorer compared to what is known for hazard-free circuits. Analogous to [Sha49, Mul56], Jukna proved that any Boolean function has a hazard-free circuit of size  $O(2^n/n)$ , which matched the lower bound one obtains from counting arguments [Juk21, Section 7]. In particular, for a typical (i.e., random) Boolean function  $size_C^u(f) = \Theta(size_C(f))$ .

On the other hand, counting arguments give a lower bound of order  $\Omega(2^n/\log n)$  for the size of the hazard-free formula of a random Boolean function, whereas Theorem 1.17 only implies an  $O(3^n)$  upper bound. Thus, there is an exponential gap between the two bounds. This naturally leads to the following question.

**Question 1.20.** *Denote with  $size_F^u(n)$  the maximal hazard-free complexity of an  $n$ -bit Boolean function. What is the asymptotic value of  $size_F^u(n)$ ? What is  $size_F^u(f)$  of a typical (random) Boolean function?*

**The hazard-free KRW conjecture.** Karchmer, Raz and Wigderson [KRW95] introduced the KRW conjecture as an approach for establishing super-polynomial lower bounds for De Morgan formulas. Proving this conjecture would imply  $P \not\subseteq NC^1$ . A detailed discussion can be found in [Mei20].

To state the conjecture, we define the block-composition of two Boolean functions  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  as

$$f \diamond g(X) := f(g(X_1), \dots, g(X_n)),$$

where  $X$  is a  $n \times m$  Boolean matrix, and  $X_i \in \{0, 1\}^m$  is the  $i$ 'th row of  $X$ . For a Boolean function  $f$ , we denote with  $\text{depth}_F(f)$  the depth of the shallowest formula computing  $f$ .

**Conjecture 1.21** (The KRW conjecture [KRW95]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be non-constant Boolean functions. Then it holds that:<sup>5</sup>*

$$\text{depth}_F(f \diamond g) \approx \text{depth}_F(f) + \text{depth}_F(g).$$

Following Theorem 2.24, the conjecture can be rephrased as:

$$CC(KW_{f \diamond g}) \approx CC(KW_f) + CC(KW_g).$$

Roughly, the conjecture states that the smallest depth formula for computing  $f \diamond g$  is obtained from the composition of the shallowest formula for  $f$  and the shallowest formula for  $g$ .

The monotone version of the KRW conjecture is most related to the hazard-free setting due to the connection to the hazard-derivative, which is a monotone function.

**Conjecture 1.22** (Monotone KRW conjecture [KRW95]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be monotone Boolean functions. Then the following holds:*

$$\text{depth}_F^+(f \diamond g) \approx \text{depth}_F^+(f) + \text{depth}_F^+(g).$$

[KRW95] observed that the monotone KW game can be played on the prime implicants and implicates (see Definition 2.8) of the monotone function, aligning well with the results concerning the hazard-free KW game, as presented in Theorem 1.19. Moreover, for monotone functions  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , one can describe the prime implicants (implicates) of  $f \diamond g$  using the prime implicants (implicates) of  $f$  and  $g$ . This observation yields the following reduction, where  $\otimes$  denotes the direct sum of relations, as in Definition 2.19:

**Lemma 1.23** ([KRW95, Lemma 4]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be monotone Boolean functions, then:*

$$KW_f^+ \otimes KW_g^+ \leq KW_{f \diamond g}^+.$$

In [RMN<sup>+</sup>24, Theorem 3.1], Conjecture 1.22 was proved for monotone inner functions  $g$  whose depth complexity can be lower-bounded by a lifting theorem.

We next state an analogous conjecture in the hazard-free setting.

---

<sup>5</sup>We use  $\approx$  instead of  $\geq$  as we can allow a less exact inequality, see [KRW95, GMWW17].



**Conjecture 1.24** (Hazard-Free KRW conjecture). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be non-constant Boolean functions. Then the following holds:*

$$\text{depth}_F^u(f \diamond g) \approx \text{depth}_F^u(f) + \text{depth}_F^u(g).$$

Similarly to [DM18, RMN<sup>+</sup>24], we state a stronger version of the conjecture on the formula size.

**Conjecture 1.25** (Hazard-free strong KRW conjecture). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be non-constant Boolean functions. Then the following holds:*

$$\text{size}_F^u(f \diamond g) \approx \text{size}_F^u(f) \cdot \text{size}_F^u(g).$$

## 1.1 Our results

**Unateness and the monotone barrier.** We provide a complete answer to Question 1.11 by proving that the hazard-derivative method yields exact lower bounds only for unate Boolean functions. Monotone functions are a subset of unate functions, which increase or decrease monotonically in each variable (see Definition 2.15). Determining whether a function is unate can be easily done by inspecting its truth table.

**Theorem 1.26** (Unateness as a criterion). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-constant Boolean function. Then, there exists  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that:*

$$\text{size}_F^\pm(\text{df}(x; \cdot)) = \text{size}_F^u(f),$$

*if and only if  $f$  is a unate function.*

We prove this result by analyzing the hazard-free KW game of the function and its hazard-derivatives. See Section 1.2 for more details.

**A universal formula upper bound for most Boolean functions.** We prove that the hazard-free formula size of a random Boolean function is  $2^{(1+o(1))n}$ . This gives an exponential improvement over the best known  $O(3^n)$  upper bound of [IKS23]. It is important to note that the upper bound of [IKS23] holds for all functions, so it is conceivable that some functions require hazard-free formula size larger than  $2^{(1+o(1))n}$ . Even if this is the case, then neither counting arguments nor the hazard-derivative method, which can only provide a lower bound of at most  $2^n$ , will be able to prove it.

**Theorem 1.27** (A universal upper bound for most Boolean functions). *For a random Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , we get that with high probability:*

$$\frac{2^n}{\log n} \leq \text{size}_F^u(f) \leq 2^n \cdot n^{(1-o(1)) \log n}.$$

Thus, we demonstrate that, unlike Boolean circuits, Boolean formulas, and hazard-free circuits – where the typical complexity matches that of the multiplexer function – the hazard-free formula complexity is smaller than the optimal hazard-free formula for the multiplexer function by an exponential factor in  $n$ .

The proof of Theorem 1.27 relies on two other results that are interesting on their own. The first shows that, with high probability, the hazard-derivatives of a random Boolean function do not have too large monotone formulas. In particular, this significantly breaks the monotone barrier.

**Proposition 1.28.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a random Boolean function. With high probability,  $f(x)$  breaks the monotone barrier with the following gap:*

$$\text{mono-gap}(f) = \omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n^{\log n}}\right).$$

The second ingredient is an *upper-bound* using hazard-derivatives. We denote by  $P_1^{(f)}$  and  $P_0^{(f)}$  the set of prime implicants and prime implicates of  $f$ , respectively. We say that  $p \in P_1^{(f)}$  derives  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  if  $p \preceq^u x$ . We also denote the implicants that derive  $x$  with  $P_1^{(f)}|_x$ , and define  $P_0^{(f)}|_x$  analogously (see Section 2.2 for definitions).

**Theorem 1.29** (Hazard-derivatives upper bound). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and let  $X_0 \subseteq f^{-1}(0)$  and  $X_1 \subseteq f^{-1}(1)$ . Then,*

$$\text{if } P_0^{(f)} = \bigcup_{x \in X_0} P_0^{(f)}|_x, \text{ then it holds that } \text{size}_F^u(f) \leq \sum_{x \in X_0} \text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot)).$$

Similarly,

$$\text{if } P_1^{(f)} = \bigcup_{x \in X_1} P_1^{(f)}|_x, \text{ then it holds that } \text{size}_F^u(f) \leq \sum_{x \in X_1} \text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot)).$$

We also provide an example in Section 4.2.1 that shows that Theorem 1.29 yields tight bounds for range functions (functions that accept all inputs whose weight is within some range).

**Composition of hazard-free functions.** Following [KRW95], we establish a lower bound on the hazard-free complexity of block-composition of functions and demonstrate how it can be used to break the monotone barrier.

**Proposition 1.30** (Lower bound via direct sum). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function. Let  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  a Boolean function. Let  $\Phi : X \times Y \rightarrow Z$  and  $\Psi : X' \times Y' \rightarrow Z'$  be functions such that  $\Phi$  reduces to  $KW_f^+$  and  $\Psi$  reduces to  $KW_g^u$ . Then, the following holds:*

$$CC(KW_{f \diamond g}^u) \geq \log(\text{Rank}(M_\Phi)) + \log(\text{Rank}(M_\Psi)).$$

As an application, we prove a lower bound on the depth of the composition of the set covering function and the multiplexer function (see Section 5 for definitions).

**Proposition 1.31** (Composition of a set covering and the multiplexer function). *Let  $MUX_m$  be the multiplexer function and  $MC_{k,n}$  be the set covering function, such that  $k = c \log n$  for some suitable constant  $c > 0$ . Then,*

$$\text{depth}_F^u(MC_{k,n} \diamond MUX_m) \geq \log(3^m) + \log\binom{n}{c \log n} \geq \log(3) \cdot m + \Omega(c(\log n)^2).$$

Finally, we note that Andreev's function, exhibits a larger mono-gap than the XOR function. However, similar to the XOR function, we do not have a separation between the formula size and the hazard-free formula size of Andreev's function.

**Proposition 1.32** (Andreev's function has near quadratic monotone gap).

$$\text{mono-gap}(ANDREEV_{k,m}) = \Omega\left(\frac{n^2}{\log n}\right).$$

## 1.2 Proof overview

We first present the outline of the proof of Theorem 1.26, which states that  $\text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot)) = \text{size}_F^u(f)$ , if and only if  $f$  is a unate function.

Our proof relies on the framework of hazard-free KW games and consists of two main steps. First, we demonstrate how to derive the prime implicants and prime implicants of the hazard-derivatives of a Boolean function from those of the function itself. We further prove that the communication matrix for the KW game of the hazard-derivative is a submatrix of the communication matrix for the hazard-free KW game of the original function (see Section 3.1). In the second step, we analyze the communication matrix of the hazard-free KW game of the function and show that if the function is unate, then it can be reduced to the communication matrix of a suitable hazard-derivative. If the function is not unate, we prove that any protocol must have more leaves than the optimal protocol for any of its derivatives (see Section 3.2).

Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function, and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  a fixed Boolean input such that  $f(x) = b \in \{0, 1\}$ . Recall that  $p_b \in P_b^{(f)}$  derives  $x$  if  $p_b \leq^u x$ , and  $P_b^{(f)}|_x$  represents the subset of elements deriving  $x$ . We study the hazard-free KW game, restricted to the prime implicants and prime implicants of  $f$  (see Theorem 3.1).

In the first step of the proof, we consider several communication matrices. Let  $M_{KW_f^u}$  represent the communication matrix of the hazard-free KW game of  $f$ . Let  $M_x$  be the submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  with labels  $P_{-b}^{(f)} \times P_b^{(f)}|_x$ , and  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$  denote the communication matrix of the hazard-free KW game of  $df(x; \cdot)$ .

Using our characterization of the prime implicants and prime implicants of  $df(x; \cdot)$ , we prove in Proposition 3.10 that  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$  is a submatrix of  $M_x$ , so both  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$  and  $M_x$  are submatrices of  $M_{KW_f^u}$ , as illustrated in Figure 1a. We note that this can be viewed as an alternative proof for Theorem 1.10 for formulas.




Figure 1: Sketch of  $M_{KW_f^u}$ .

Next, we make a simple but important observation in Lemma 2.21: certain rows can be removed from a communication matrix without affecting its complexity. Specifically, a row  $r$  can be removed if there exists another row  $r'$  in the matrix such that every entry of  $r'$  is a subset of the matching entry in  $r$ . In Proposition 3.13, we show that removing these rows from  $M_x$  results in  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$ . Hence,  $M_x$  and  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$  are equivalent in terms of communication complexity. This concludes the first stage of the proof.

To complete the proof we have to show that the communication complexity of  $M_x$  equals that

of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  if and only if  $f$  is unate. Similarly to the proof that a monotone function equals one of its hazard-derivatives, we prove that for a unate function  $f$ , there exists some  $x'$  such that  $M_{x'} = M_{KW_f^u}$ .

The proof of the second direction requires more work. Let  $f$  be a non-unate function. Consider a coordinate  $d \in [n]$  that demonstrates that  $f$  is not unate. Let  $s \in \{0, u, 1\}$ ,  $a \in \{0, 1\}$  and denote by  $P_a^{d=s}$  the subset of  $P_a^{(f)}$  for which the  $d$ 'th coordinate equals  $s$ . By examining the prime implicants and the prime implicates of  $f$ , we prove in Proposition 3.15 that for every protocol solving  $KW_f^u$ , there exists a monochromatic rectangle  $\text{Rec} \subseteq P_{-b}^{d=x_i} \times (P_b^{(f)} \setminus P_b^{(f)}|_x)$  in the partition induced by the protocol ( $x_i$  is the  $i$ 'th coordinate of  $x$ ). In addition,  $\text{Rec}$  must be colored with  $d$ , as illustrated in Figure 1b. Therefore, removing the leaf associated with  $\text{Rec}$  from the protocol tree results in a protocol for  $M_x$  that has one less leaf. This implies that there must be some gap in the number of leaves in the optimal protocol, thus proving the claim.

The proof of Theorem 1.27 also consists of two steps. First, we prove Proposition 1.28, showing that for a random Boolean function, any hazard-derivative has a monotone formula that is not too large. This stems from the observation that, with high probability, a random function is not constant on any large Boolean subcube. The second step consists of proving Theorem 1.29, which gives a weak converse to Theorem 1.10: Building on the analysis of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  discussed above, we prove that  $M_{KW_f^u}$  can be decomposed into submatrices, each with communication complexity bounded from above by that of a specific hazard-derivative. By combining this with the upper bound on the monotone complexity of hazard-derivatives, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.27.

The proofs of Propositions 1.30, 1.31 and 1.32 are more direct. For the first, we follow the argument of [KRW95, Lemma 4] to obtain  $KW_f^+ \otimes KW_g^u \leq KW_{f \circ g}^u$  (see Lemma 5.3). The proof of Proposition 1.31 then follows from plugging known upper bounds into Proposition 1.30. The proof of Proposition 1.32 is rather straightforward and follows from analyzing the hazard-derivatives of Andreev's function.

### 1.3 Organization of the paper

In Section 2, we present some basic definitions and required background regarding hazard-free computation, as well as the implicates and implicants of Boolean functions, with a focus on monotone and unate functions. Additionally, we provide background on communication complexity and prove the simplification lemma (Lemma 2.21). In Section 3, we study the KW hazard-free game of the hazard-derivative and prove our first main result (Theorem 1.26). Section 4 contains the proof of the universal upper bound for most Boolean functions (Theorem 1.27), as well as the proof that a random Boolean function exhibits a large mono-gap (Proposition 1.28), and the hazard-derivatives upper bound result (Theorem 1.29). In Section 5, we study the composition of Boolean functions in the hazard-free setting and prove Proposition 1.30. We also demonstrate its applicability by proving Proposition 1.31. Section 6 contains the proof of Proposition 1.32. We conclude by presenting some open problems in Section 7.

## 2 Preliminaries

For an integer  $n$ , we set  $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ . For  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , we denote  $x \leq y$  if for every  $i \in [n]$ ,  $x_i \leq y_i$  (as integers).<sup>6</sup> A Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is *monotone* if for every  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $x \leq y$  it holds that  $f(x) \leq f(y)$ .

A (De Morgan) Boolean circuit is a directed acyclic graph in which nodes of in-degree 0 are labeled with input variables, and each internal node is labeled with one of the Boolean operations  $\{\wedge, \vee, \neg\}$ , where the first two have fan-in 2 and the third has fan-in 1. Nodes of fan-out 0 are called outputs. An output gate computes a Boolean function in the natural way. A (De Morgan) formula is a circuit whose graph is a tree. As in Definition 1.7, we say that a formula is hazard-free if it has no hazards.

A circuit (formula) is monotone if it does not involve  $\neg$  gates. Each monotone circuit (formula) computes a monotone function, and each monotone function can be computed by a monotone circuit (formula). From now on, we only speak of De Morgan circuits and formulas, and so we shall drop the term “De Morgan”.

The *size* of a Boolean circuit  $C$ , denoted  $\text{size}(C)$ , is defined as the number of vertices and edges in the underlying graph. The *depth* of a Boolean circuit  $C$ , denoted  $\text{depth}(C)$ , is defined as the length of the longest directed path from an input to an output gate. The size of a formula  $F$ , denoted  $\text{size}(F)$ , is defined as the number of leaves in the underlying tree.

We denote the minimal size of a circuit computing  $f$  by  $\text{size}_C(f)$ , and the minimal depth of a formula computing  $f$  by  $\text{depth}_F(f)$ . We add a superscript from  $\{u, +\}$  to the notation whenever we work in the hazard-free ( $u$ ) or the monotone ( $+$ ) setting, respectively. For example,  $\text{depth}_F^u(f)$  is the minimal depth of a hazard-free formula computing  $f$ .

### 2.1 The hazard-derivative

We first define the XOR operation in the context of hazard-free computation.

**Definition 2.1** (XOR operation). *We use  $+$  to denote the XOR operation in the hazard-free setting. Let  $b, s \in \{0, u, 1\}$ , then:*

$$b + s := \begin{cases} 0, & b = s \text{ and } b, s \neq u, \\ 1, & b \neq s \text{ and } b, s \neq u, \\ u, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Computing  $x + y$  for  $x, y \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  is done coordinatewise.*

**Definition 2.2** (The hazard-derivative of a natural function [IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Definition 4.3]). *Let  $f \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  be a natural ternary function. The hazard-derivative of  $f$ , denoted  $\text{df} : \{0, 1\}^{2n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , is defined as follows:*

$$\forall x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n. \text{df}(x; y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } f(x + uy) = f(x), \\ 1, & \text{if } f(x + uy) = u. \end{cases}$$

*Where for every  $i \in [n]$ :*

$$(x + uy)_i = \begin{cases} x_i, & \text{if } y_i = 0, \\ u, & \text{if } y_i = 1. \end{cases}$$

---

<sup>6</sup>Note the difference with Definition 1.2 in which 0 and 1 are incomparable, whereas here  $u$  is not included in the ordering.

For a Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , we define  $\text{df} := \tilde{\text{d}}f$ .

It is not difficult to see that the hazard-derivative is a monotone function, as if we perturb more bits in  $x$ , we are more likely to have two resolutions on which  $f$  outputs different values.

**Lemma 2.3** (The hazard-derivative is monotone [IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Lemma 4.8]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  be a fixed input, then  $\text{df}(x; \cdot)$  is a monotone Boolean function.*

**Definition 2.4** (Natural vector function). *A function  $\mathbf{f} : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}^m$  is called a natural vector function if there exist natural functions  $f_1, \dots, f_m : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}$ , such that for every  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  we have  $\mathbf{f}(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x))$ .*

*For a natural vector function  $\mathbf{f} : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}^m$ , the hazard-derivative is defined as  $\text{df}(x; y) = (\text{df}_1(x; y), \dots, \text{df}_m(x; y))$ .*

**Lemma 2.5** (The chain rule [IKL<sup>+</sup>19, Lemma 4.9]). *Let  $\mathbf{f} : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}^m$ ,  $\mathbf{g} : \{0, u, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}^k$  and  $\mathbf{h} : \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}^k$  be natural vector functions such that  $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{g} \circ \mathbf{f}$ , then it holds that:*

$$\text{dh}(x; y) = \text{dg}(\mathbf{f}(x); \text{df}(x; y)).$$

## 2.2 Implicants and implicates

We define the implicants and implicates of a Boolean function using ternary algebra. We shall make heavy use of the following notation.

**Definition 2.6.** *Denote the result of replacing the  $i$ 'th bit of  $x$  with  $b \in \{0, u, 1\}$  by  $x|_{i \leftarrow b}$ :*

$$x|_{i \leftarrow b} := \forall j \in [n]. (x|_{i \leftarrow b})_j = \begin{cases} x_j, & j \neq i, \\ b, & j = i. \end{cases}$$

*Similarly, denote the result of replacing all the occurrences of  $s \in \{0, u, 1\}$  with  $b \in \{0, u, 1\}$  by  $x|_{s \leftarrow b}$ :*

$$x|_{s \leftarrow b} := \forall j \in [n]. (x|_{s \leftarrow b})_j = \begin{cases} x_j, & x_j \neq s, \\ b, & x_j = s. \end{cases}$$

**Definition 2.7** (Implicants and implicates of a Boolean function). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. We define the implicants of  $f$ , denoted by  $I_1^{(f)}$ , and the implicates of  $f$ , denoted by  $I_0^{(f)}$ , as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} I_1^{(f)} &:= \tilde{f}^{-1}(1), \\ I_0^{(f)} &:= \tilde{f}^{-1}(0). \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 2.8** (Prime implicants and prime implicates of a Boolean function). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. We say  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  is a prime implicant of  $f$  if the following holds:*

- $x$  is an implicant of  $f$ .
- For every stable bit  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$  in  $x$ , we have  $\tilde{f}(x|_{i \leftarrow u}) = u$ .

*A prime implicate is defined analogously. We denote the set of prime implicants of  $f$  by  $P_1^{(f)}$  and the set of prime implicates of  $f$  by  $P_0^{(f)}$ .*

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. Let  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  and  $p_0 \in P_0^{(f)}$ . Let  $i, j \in [n]$  such that  $(p_1)_i \neq u$  and  $(p_0)_j \neq u$ . Then,*

1. *There exists  $q_0 \in P_0^{(f)}$  such that  $i$  is the only different and stable coordinate of  $q_0$  and  $p_1$ .*
2. *There exists  $q_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  such that  $j$  is the only different and stable coordinate of  $q_1$  and  $p_0$ .*

*Proof.* We prove (1), the proof of (2) is interchangeable. Denote  $b := (p_1)_i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Consider  $p'_1 = p_1|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}$ . Since  $p_1$  is a prime implicant, we have  $\tilde{f}(p'_1) = u$  and therefore there exists  $z \in R(p'_1)$  such that  $f(z) = -b$ . Let  $q_0 \in P_0^{(f)}$  such that  $z \in R(q_0)$ . As  $p'_1 \stackrel{u}{\leq} z$  and  $q_0 \stackrel{u}{\leq} z$ ,  $z$  agrees with  $p_1$  and  $q_0$  on every stable coordinate except  $i$ . We must have  $(q_0)_i = \neg(p_1)_i = -b$ , as otherwise  $p_1, q_0$  would have a common resolution. Therefore, the  $i$ 'th coordinate is the only different and stable coordinate.  $\square$

### 2.2.1 Monotone Boolean functions

The implicants and implicates of a monotone Boolean function can be studied by considering only the maximal and minimal resolutions with respect to  $\leq$ .

**Definition 2.10** (The maximal and the minimal resolutions w.r.t  $\leq$ ). *Let  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$ . We call  $\hat{x} := x|_{u \leftarrow 1}$  the maximal resolution of  $x$  with respect to  $\leq$  and  $\check{x} := x|_{u \leftarrow 0}$  the minimal resolution of  $x$  with respect to  $\leq$ .*

**Lemma 2.11** (Implicants and implicates of a monotone function). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function. Let  $p \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$ , then:*

1.  *$p \in I_1^{(f)}$  if and only if  $f(\check{p}) = 1$ .*
2.  *$p \in I_0^{(f)}$  if and only if  $f(\hat{p}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We prove (1), the proof of (2) is analogous.  $p \in I_1^{(f)}$  if and only if  $\forall z \in R(p). f(z) = 1$ . Since  $f$  is monotone w.r.t  $\leq$  and  $\check{p} \in R(p)$  is minimal w.r.t  $\leq$ , the later holds if and only if  $f(\check{p}) = 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.12** (Prime Implicants and prime implicates of a monotone function). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function. Let  $p \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  and denote  $S := \{i \in [n] : p_i \neq u\}$ , then:*

1.  *$p \in P_1^{(f)}$  if and only if  $f(\check{p}) = 1$  and for every  $i \in S$  it holds that  $f(\check{p}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}) = 0$ .*
2.  *$p \in P_0^{(f)}$  if and only if  $f(\hat{p}) = 0$  and for every  $i \in S$  it holds that  $f(\hat{p}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* We prove (1), the proof of (2) is similar. By Definition 2.8,  $p$  is a prime implicant of  $f$  if and only if  $p \in I_1^{(f)}$  and  $\forall i \in S. \tilde{f}(p|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}) = u$ . By Lemma 2.11, we get  $p \in I_1^{(f)}$  if and only if  $f(\check{p}) = 1$ , so it is left to prove  $\forall i \in S. \tilde{f}(p|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}) = u$  if and only if  $\forall i \in S. f(\check{p}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}) = 0$ :

$\Rightarrow$  Let  $i \in S$ . Assume toward contradiction that  $f(\check{p}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}) = 1$ . As  $\check{p}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}$  is the minimal resolution w.r.t  $\leq$  of  $p|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}$ , it follows from Lemma 2.12 that  $f(p|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}) = 1$ , a contradiction since  $\tilde{f}(p|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}) = u$ .

$\Leftarrow$  Let  $i \in S$ . Assume  $f(\check{p}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}) = 0$ . Since  $\check{p}, \check{p}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0} \in R(p|_{i \rightsquigarrow u})$  we have  $\tilde{f}(p|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}) = u$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.13.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function, then:*

1. *Every  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  satisfies  $p_1 \in \{1, u\}^n$ .*



2. Similarly,  $P_0^{(f)} \subseteq \{0, u\}^n$ .

*Proof.* We prove (1), the proof of (2) is similar. By Lemma 2.12, if there exists a coordinate  $i \in [n]$  such that  $(p_1)_i = 0$  then  $\check{p}_1 = \check{p}_1|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}$ , and hence  $\check{p}_1|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}$  is also an implicant, in contradiction to the choice of  $p_1$ .  $\square$

## 2.2.2 Unate Boolean functions

Next, we prove basic properties of the prime implicants and prime implicates of unate Boolean functions.

**Definition 2.14** (Unate function in  $x_i$ ). *A Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is positive unate in  $x_i$  if for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  the following holds:*

$$f(x|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}) \leq f(x|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}).$$

*Similarly, a function is negative unate in  $x_i$  if for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  the following holds:*

$$f(x|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}) \geq f(x|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}).$$

*We say  $f$  is unate in  $x_i$  if  $f$  is either positive or negative unate in  $x_i$ .*

**Definition 2.15** (Unate function). *A Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is unate if it is unate in  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .*

The next lemmata are analogous to Lemma 2.11. For completeness, we give their proof in Appendix B.

**Lemma 2.16** (The prime implicants of a unate Boolean function in  $x_i$ ). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. Then:*

1.  *$f$  is positive unate in variable  $x_i$  if and only if there is no  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  such that  $(p_1)_i = 0$ .*
2.  *$f$  is negative unate in variable  $x_i$  if and only if there is no  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  such that  $(p_1)_i = 1$ .*

**Lemma 2.17** (The prime implicates of a unate Boolean function in  $x_i$ ). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. Then:*

1.  *$f$  is positive unate in variable  $x_i$  if and only if there is no  $p_0 \in P_0^{(f)}$  such that  $(p_0)_i = 1$ .*
2.  *$f$  is negative unate in variable  $x_i$  if and only if there is no  $p_0 \in P_0^{(f)}$  such that  $(p_0)_i = 0$ .*

## 2.3 Communication complexity

In this section, we provide some basic notation and definitions from communication complexity. We assume familiarity with the basic concepts, but for completeness, we give some basic definitions in Appendix A. See [KN96, RY20] for text books on communication complexity.

For a relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$ , we denote by  $CC(\mathcal{R})$  the minimal communication complexity required to solve  $\mathcal{R}$ . Any protocol  $P$  that solves a relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  induces a partition of  $X \times Y$  into  $\mathcal{R}$ -monochromatic rectangles. The number of rectangles, denoted  $\text{mono-rec}(P)$ , is



the number of the leaves in  $P$ . We denote by  $\text{mono-rec}(\mathcal{R})$  the minimum of  $\text{mono-rec}(P)$  among all protocols  $P$  that solve  $\mathcal{R}$ . We shall abuse notation and use  $CC(M)$  or  $\text{mono-rec}(M)$  instead of  $CC(\mathcal{R})$  or  $\text{mono-rec}(\mathcal{R})$  when  $M$  is the communication matrix of  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  be a relation and let a protocol  $P$  for  $\mathcal{R}$ . Say there exists an input  $(x, y)$  for which there is only one valid output,  $z^* \in Z$ . Since  $P$  solves  $\mathcal{R}$ ,  $(x, y)$  reaches a leaf in the protocol tree that is labeled with  $z^*$ . The associated rectangle is referred as a  $z^*$ -uniform rectangle:

**Definition 2.18** ( $z^*$ -uniform combinatorial rectangle). *Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  be a communication problem. Let  $\text{Rec}$  be a  $\mathcal{R}$ -monochromatic rectangle. We call  $\text{Rec}$  a  $z^*$ -uniform rectangle if there exists an entry  $(x^*, y^*) \in \text{Rec}$  such that  $\{z \in Z : (x^*, y^*, z) \in \mathcal{R}\} = \{z^*\}$ .*

Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  and  $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq X' \times Y' \times Z'$  be relations. We say that  $\mathcal{R}$  is *reducible* to  $\mathcal{R}'$ , denoted  $\mathcal{R} \leq \mathcal{R}'$ , if there exist functions  $\phi_1 : X \rightarrow X'$ ,  $\phi_2 : Y \rightarrow Y'$  and  $\psi : Z' \rightarrow Z$  such that for every  $x \in X, y \in Y$  and  $z' \in Z'$

$$(\phi_1(x), \phi_2(y), z') \in \mathcal{R}' \Rightarrow (x, y, \psi(z')) \in \mathcal{R}.$$

It is clear that if  $\mathcal{R} \leq \mathcal{R}'$  then  $CC(\mathcal{R}) \leq CC(\mathcal{R}')$ .

We shall also need the notion of direct sum of two relations.

**Definition 2.19** (Direct sum of relations [KRW95, Definition 2]). *Given two relations  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  and  $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq X' \times Y' \times Z'$ , we define the direct sum of  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}'$  as:*

$$\mathcal{R} \otimes \mathcal{R}' \subseteq (X \times X') \times (Y \times Y') \times (Z \times Z'),$$

where  $((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2), (z_1, z_2)) \in \mathcal{R} \otimes \mathcal{R}'$  if and only if  $(x_1, y_1, z_1) \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $(x_2, y_2, z_2) \in \mathcal{R}'$ .

It is clear that if  $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{S}' \leq \mathcal{R}'$ , then:  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{S}' \leq \mathcal{R} \otimes \mathcal{R}'$  and  $CC(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{S}') \leq CC(\mathcal{R} \otimes \mathcal{R}')$ . The rank lower bound also implies that  $CC(\mathcal{R} \otimes \mathcal{R}') \geq \log(\text{Rank}(M_{\mathcal{R}})) + \log(\text{Rank}(M_{\mathcal{R}'}))$ , where  $M_{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $M_{\mathcal{R}'}$  are the communication matrices of  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}'$ , respectively.

**Simplification lemma for communication matrices.** We next present a lemma that will be important in our analysis of the communication matrices of the hazard-derivatives.

Let  $Z$  be a finite subset. Denote by  $\mathbf{P}(Z)$  the power set of  $Z$ . Let  $M \in \mathbf{P}(Z)^{k \times \ell}$  and  $M' \in \mathbf{P}(Z)^{k' \times \ell}$  be matrices with entries in  $\mathbf{P}(Z)$  such that  $k \geq k'$ . Additionally, let  $X, Y$  be sets such that  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}' \subseteq X$  are the row labels and  $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}' \subseteq Y$  are the column labels of  $M$  and  $M'$ , respectively. Note that the row and column labels of  $M$  and  $M'$  are allowed to be different. The matrices  $M$  and  $M'$  can be naturally associated with communication problems.

**Definition 2.20** (A sub-row and a super-row). *Let  $M$  and  $M'$  be matrices as in the above settings. Let  $i \in [k]$  and  $i' \in [k']$ . We say that a row  $M'_{i'}$  is a sub-row of  $M_i$  if the following holds:*

$$\forall j \in [\ell]. M'_{i',j} \subseteq M_{i,j}.$$

We say that  $M_i$  is a super-row in  $M'$  if there exists some  $i' \in [k']$  such that  $M'_{i'}$  is a sub-row of  $M_i$ .

**Lemma 2.21** (Communication matrix simplification). *Let  $M$  and  $M'$  be matrices as in the above setting. Without the loss of generality, assume that the rows in  $M$  and  $M'$  are distinct. Moreover, assume:*

1. For every  $i \in [k]$ ,  $M_i$  is a super-row in  $M'$ .
2. For every  $i' \in [k']$  there exists  $i \in [k]$  such that  $M'_{i'} = M_i$ .

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mono-rec}(M) &= \text{mono-rec}(M'), \\ CC(M) &= CC(M'). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $P'$  be a protocol for  $M'$ . We construct a protocol  $P$  for  $M$  as follows: let  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  be Alice's input and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  be Bob's input. Say  $x$  is the label for the  $i$ 'th row of  $M$ , and  $y$  is a label for the  $j$ 'th column in  $M$ . From assumption 1, there exists  $i' \in [k']$  such that  $M'_{i'}$  is a sub-row of  $M_i$ . Say  $x' \in \mathcal{X}'$  is the label for the row  $M'_{i'}$ . Note that Alice can translate  $x$  to  $x'$  without any knowledge of Bob's input. Bob, independently of Alice's input, translates  $y$  to  $y' \in \mathcal{Y}'$ , the label of the  $j$ 'th column in  $M'$ . Next, Alice and Bob run  $P'(x', y')$  and output the same answer. From Definition 2.20 and the definition of a deterministic protocol, we get that  $P'(x', y') \in M'_{i',j} \subseteq M_{i,j}$ , hence  $P$  returns a correct answer. Therefore,  $\text{mono-rec}(M') \geq \text{mono-rec}(M)$ ,  $CC(M') \geq CC(M)$ .

The claim follows, since by assumption 2 we get  $M'$  is a submatrix of  $M$  and so  $\text{mono-rec}(M) \geq \text{mono-rec}(M')$  and  $CC(M) \geq CC(M')$  is immediate.  $\square$

### 2.3.1 Karchmer-Wigderson games

Karchmer and Wigderson [KW90] showed an equivalence between the depth and size of a formula and the cost of an associated communication search problem, both in the general setting and the monotone setting.

**Definition 2.22** (KW game [KW90]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. The Karchmer-Wigderson game of  $f$ , denoted  $KW_f$ , is the following communication problem: Alice receives  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $f(x) = 1$ , Bob receives  $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $f(y) = 0$  and their goal is to determine a coordinate  $i \in [n]$  such that  $x_i \neq y_i$ .*

Note that for a Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , the communication problem can be defined as the relation  $KW_f \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  where  $X = f^{-1}(1)$ ,  $Y = f^{-1}(0)$  and  $Z = [n]$ .

**Remark 2.23** (The communication matrix of KW game). *According to Definition A.3, the communication matrix  $M_{KW_f}^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$  is defined such that each entry  $(M_{KW_f}^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}})_{i,j}$  contains the set of coordinates where  $x^{(i)}$  and  $y^{(j)}$  differ:*

$$\forall i \in [k], j \in [l]. (M_{KW_f}^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}})_{i,j} = \{z \in [n] : (x^{(i)} + y^{(j)})_z = 1\}.$$

We use  $x^{(i)} + y^{(j)} := \{z \in [n] : (x^{(i)} + y^{(j)})_z = 1\}$  as an abbreviated notation.

**Theorem 2.24** (Communication vs. formula [KW90]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. Then,*

$$\text{depth}_F(f) = CC(KW_f) \text{ and } \text{size}_F(f) = \text{mono-rec}(KW_f).$$

Similarly, a monotone version of the game is defined, with the distinction that Alice and Bob must output a coordinate where Alice's input has a 1 and Bob's input has a 0. This version of the game captures the complexity of monotone computation:

**Definition 2.25** (Monotone KW game [KW90]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function. The Monotone Karchmer-Wigderson game of  $f$ , denoted  $KW_f^+$ , is the following communication problem: Alice receives  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $f(x) = 1$ , Bob receives  $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $f(y) = 0$  and their goal is to determine a coordinate  $i \in [n]$  such that  $1 = x_i \neq y_i = 0$ .*

**Theorem 2.26** (Communication vs. monotone formula [KW90]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function. Then,*

$$\text{depth}_F^+(f) = CC(KW_f^+) \text{ and } \text{size}_F^+(f) = \text{mono-rec}(KW_f^+).$$

### 3 Tightness of the hazard-derivative method

In this section, we extend the hazard-derivative lower bound method of [IKL<sup>+</sup>19] to hazard-free formulas. We show that the hazard-derivative method yields *exact* bounds if and only if the function is unate, thus proving Theorem 1.26. Hence, whether a function is *unate* or not, can be seen as a criterion to breaking the monotone barrier, which in particular answers Question 1.11.

#### 3.1 KW game of the hazard-derivative

We first recall the definition of the hazard-free KW game.

**Definition 1.14** (Hazard-free KW game [IKS23, Definition 4.4]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. The hazard-free Karchmer-Wigderson game of  $f$ , denoted  $KW_f^u$ , is defined as follows: Alice receives  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  such that  $\tilde{f}(x) = 1$ , Bob receives  $y \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  such that  $\tilde{f}(y) = 0$ , and their goal is to output a coordinate  $i \in [n]$  such that  $x_i \neq y_i$  and  $x_i, y_i \neq u$ .*

[IKS23] proved that the communication complexity of  $KW_f^u$  does not decrease even if it is played only on the *prime implicants* of  $f$ , denoted by  $P_1^{(f)}$ , and the *prime implicates* of  $f$ , denoted by  $P_0^{(f)}$ .

**Theorem 3.1** ([IKS23, Theorem 4.9]). *For any Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , the communication complexity of  $KW_f^u$  remains unchanged even if we restrict Alices's input to the prime implicants of  $f$  and Bob's input to the prime implicates of  $f$ .*

For the remainder of the paper, we abuse notation and use  $KW_f^u$  as the notation of the restricted game. Following the notations in Definition A.3, we define the Communication matrix of the  $KW_f^u$  game.

**Definition 3.2** (Communication matrix of  $KW_f^u$ ). *The communication matrix of  $KW_f^u$ , denoted  $M_{KW_f^u}^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ , is defined as follows: Every entry of  $M_{KW_f^u}^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$  contains the set of all stable coordinates in which  $x^{(i)}$  and  $y^{(j)}$  differ:*

$$\forall i \in [k], j \in [l]. (M_{KW_f^u}^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}})_{i,j} = \{d \in [n] : (x^{(i)} + y^{(j)})_d = 1\}.$$

We use  $(x^{(i)} + y^{(j)})|_{u \leftarrow 0} := \{z \in [n] : (x^{(i)} + y^{(j)})_z = 1\}$  as an abbreviated notation. When  $\mathcal{X} = P_1^{(f)}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = P_0^{(f)}$ , we denote  $M_{KW_f^u} := M_{KW_f^u}^{P_1^{(f)}, P_0^{(f)}}$ .

We prove insights on the structure of the  $KW^u$  communication matrices of the *hazard-derivatives*. Our main observation is that for every  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , the communication matrix of  $KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^+$  is a submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$ .

Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-constant Boolean function and let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  be a fixed Boolean input such that  $f(x) = b \in \{0, 1\}$ . We begin with studying the prime implicants and prime implicates of  $df(x;\cdot)$ , since they are the inputs of the hazard-free KW game for  $df(x;\cdot)$ . We show how to infer  $P_1^{(df(x;\cdot))}$  and  $P_0^{(df(x;\cdot))}$  from  $P_1^{(f)}$  and  $P_0^{(f)}$ . In fact, every  $q_1 \in P_1^{(df(x;\cdot))}$  is generated by one (or more)  $p_{-b} \in P_{-b}^{(f)}$ , and every  $q_0 \in P_0^{(df(x;\cdot))}$  is generated by exactly one  $p_b \in P_b^{(f)}$ . This translation preserves the set of stable and different coordinates between  $p_{-b}$  and  $p_b$ , the generators of  $q_1$  and  $q_0$ , respectively.

**Definition 3.3.** We say that  $p_b \in P_b^{(f)}$  derives  $x$  if  $p_b \stackrel{u}{\leq} x$ . We denote the subset of  $P_b^{(f)}$  that derives  $x$  by  $P_b^{(f)}|_x$ .

**Lemma 3.4** (The prime implicates of the derivative).

$$P_0^{(df(x;\cdot))} = \{p_b + x : p_b \in P_b^{(f)}|_x\}.$$

*Proof.*  $\subseteq$ : Let  $q_0 \in P_0^{(df(x;\cdot))}$ . Let  $\hat{q}_0$  be the maximal resolution of  $q_0$  as in Definition 2.10. By Lemma 2.3 and Corollary 2.13, we have that  $q_0 \in \{0, u\}^n$  and therefore,  $q_0 = u\hat{q}_0$ . Following Lemma 2.12,  $q_0 \in P_0^{(df(x;\cdot))}$  if and only if:

1.  $df(x; \hat{q}_0) = 0$ .
2. For every coordinate  $i \in [n]$  such that  $(q_0)_i \neq u$ , it holds that  $df(x; \hat{q}_0|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}) = 1$ .

Assumption 1 implies that  $\tilde{f}(x + u\hat{q}_0) = f(x) = b$ . By assumption 2, for every  $i \in [n]$  that is a stable coordinate in  $q_0$ , we get  $\tilde{f}(x + u(\hat{q}_0|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1})) = \tilde{f}(x + (u\hat{q}_0)|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}) = \tilde{f}((x + u\hat{q}_0)|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}) = u$ . As a coordinate  $i$  is stable in  $x + u\hat{q}_0$  if and only if it is stable in  $u\hat{q}_0$ , it follows from  $u\hat{q}_0 = q_0$  that  $(x + u\hat{q}_0) \in P_b^{(f)}$ .

Denote  $p_b := x + u\hat{q}_0$ . It follows that  $p_b + x = (x + u\hat{q}_0) + x = u\hat{q}_0 = q_0$  and  $p_b \stackrel{u}{\leq} x$  as required.

$\supseteq$ : Let  $p_b \in P_b^{(f)}|_x$ . Denote  $q := p_b + x$ . As  $x \in R(p_b)$ , we have for every  $i \in [n]$ :

$$(q)_i = \begin{cases} 0, & (p_b)_i \neq u, \\ u, & (p_b)_i = u. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We show that  $q \in P_0^{(df(x;\cdot))}$  by proving the conditions of Lemma 2.12 hold. First, following (1) and Definition 2.10, we have  $x + u\hat{q} = x + q = p_b$ . Since  $p_b \in P_b^{(f)}$ , we have  $\tilde{f}(x + u\hat{q}) = \tilde{f}(p_b) = f(x) = b$  and therefore  $df(x; \hat{q}) = 0$ .

Next, let  $i \in [n]$  be a stable coordinate in  $q$ . By the definition of  $q$ , it is also a stable coordinate in  $p_b$ . Since  $x + u(\hat{q}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}) = (x + u\hat{q})|_{i \rightsquigarrow u} = p_b|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}$ , and  $p_b \in P_b^{(f)}$ , we have  $\tilde{f}(x + u(\hat{q}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1})) = \tilde{f}(p_b|_{i \rightsquigarrow u}) = u$  and therefore  $df(x; \hat{q}|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}) = 1$ .  $\square$

Before studying the structure of the prime implicants of  $df(x;\cdot)$ , we prove the following auxiliary lemma:

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function, and let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  be a fixed Boolean input such that  $f(x) = b \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then,  $q_1 \in P_1^{(df(x; \cdot))}$  if and only if  $q_1 \in \{1, u\}^n$  and the following  $z \in R(x + u\check{q}_1)$  is the only resolution for which  $f(z) = \neg b$ :*

$$z := \forall i \in [n]. (z)_i = \begin{cases} x_i, & (\check{q}_1)_i = 0, \\ \neg x_i, & (\check{q}_1)_i = 1. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.*  $\Rightarrow$  By Lemma 2.12 it holds that:

1.  $\tilde{f}(x + u\check{q}_1) = u$ .
2. for every  $i \in [n]$  such that  $(q_1)_i \neq u$ ,  $\tilde{f}(x + u(\check{q}_1|_{i \leftarrow 0})) = f(x) = b$ .

Assume toward contradiction there exists  $z' \in R(x + u\check{q}_1)$  such that  $z' \neq z$  and  $f(z') = \neg b$ . There exists  $j \in [n]$  such that  $z_j \neq (z')_j$ . For every  $i \in [n]$ , when  $(\check{q}_1)_i = 0$  we have that  $z_i = (z')_i = x_i$ . Hence,  $(\check{q}_1)_j = 1$ ,  $(z')_j = x_j$ ,  $z_j = \neg x_j$  and  $(q_1)_j = 1$ . Therefore,  $z' \in R(x + u(\check{q}_1|_{j \leftarrow 0}))$  and by assumption 2,  $f(z') = b$  in contradiction. As  $\tilde{f}(x + u\check{q}_1) = u$ , it must be the case that  $f(z) = \neg b$ . Corollary 2.13 completes the proof.

$\Leftarrow$  Since  $x, z \in R(x + u\check{q}_1)$ , it holds that  $\tilde{f}(x + u\check{q}_1) = u$ , implying  $df(x; \check{q}_1) = 1$ . Let  $i \in [n]$  such that  $(q_1)_i \neq u$ , so  $(q_1)_i = 1$  and  $(\check{q}_1)_i = 1$ . Since  $R(x + u(\check{q}_1|_{i \leftarrow 0})) \subsetneq R(x + u\check{q}_1)$  and  $z \notin R(x + u(\check{q}_1|_{i \leftarrow 0}))$  we get from our assumption that  $\tilde{f}(x + u(\check{q}_1|_{i \leftarrow 0})) = f(x) = b$ . Hence,  $df(x; \check{q}_1|_{i \leftarrow 0}) = 0$ . Following Lemma 2.12, we get  $q_1 \in P_1^{(df(x; \cdot))}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6** (The prime implicants of the derivative).

$$P_1^{(df(x; \cdot))} \subseteq \{(p_{\neg b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u} : p_{\neg b} \in P_{\neg b}^{(f)}\} \subseteq I_1^{df(x; \cdot)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $q_1 \in P_1^{(df(x; \cdot))}$ . Following Corollary 2.13, we have  $q_1 \in \{1, u\}^n$ . Let  $z \in R(x + u\check{q}_1)$  such that  $f(z) = \neg b$  as in Lemma 3.5. Let  $p_{\neg b} \in P_{\neg b}^{(f)}$  such that  $p_{\neg b} \stackrel{u}{\leq} z$ .<sup>7</sup> By Lemma 3.5, for  $i \in [n]$  we have that:

$$(p_{\neg b} + x + \check{q}_1)_i = \begin{cases} u, & (p_{\neg b})_i = u, \\ x_i + x_i + 0 = 0, & (p_{\neg b})_i \neq u, (\check{q}_1)_i = 0, \\ \neg x_i + x_i + 1 = 0, & (p_{\neg b})_i \neq u, (\check{q}_1)_i = 1. \end{cases}$$

This implies that if  $(p_{\neg b} + x)_i = 1$  then  $(\check{q}_1)_i = 1$ . We next show that this is an if and only if statement: Assume toward contradiction that there exists  $i \in [n]$  such that  $(p_{\neg b})_i = u$  and  $(\check{q}_1)_i = 1$ . Then  $z' = z|_{i \leftarrow x_i}$  satisfies  $p_{\neg b} \stackrel{u}{\leq} z'$  so  $f(z') = \neg b$ . As  $(\check{q}_1)_i = 1$  we have  $z_i = \neg x_i$  and so  $(z')_i \neq z_i$ . Since  $z' \in R(x + u\check{q}_1)$  and  $z' \neq z$  we get a contradiction to Lemma 3.5.

Consequently,  $(p_{\neg b} + x)_i = 1 \iff (\check{q}_1)_i = 1 \iff (q_1)_i = 1$ . Since  $q_1 \in \{1, u\}^n$ , we get  $(p_{\neg b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u} = q_1$ . This holds for every  $q_1 \in P_1^{(df(x; \cdot))}$ , so we get the first containment.

Let  $p_{\neg b} \in P_{\neg b}^{(f)}$  and denote  $p := (p_{\neg b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$ . We prove that  $p \in I_1^{df(x; \cdot)}$ . As  $df(x; \cdot)$  is monotone, following Lemma 2.11 it is enough to show that  $\check{p}$  satisfies  $df(x; \check{p}) = 1$ . Therefore, we prove that  $\tilde{f}(x + u\check{p}) = u$ . Indeed, for every  $i \in [n]$ :

$$(x + u\check{p})_i = \begin{cases} u, & (p_{\neg b})_i = \neg x_i, \\ x_i, & (p_{\neg b})_i = x_i \text{ or } (p_{\neg b})_i = u. \end{cases}$$

<sup>7</sup>There may be several  $p_{\neg b} \in P_{\neg b}^{(f)}$  such that  $p_{\neg b} \stackrel{u}{\leq} z'$  as in Example 3.7. For this reason we can get strict containment  $P_1^{(df(x; \cdot))} \subsetneq \{(p_{\neg b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u} : p_{\neg b} \in P_{\neg b}^{(f)}\}$  in such cases.

Let  $x' \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that:

$$x'_i := \begin{cases} (p_{-b})_i, & (p_{-b})_i \neq u, \\ x_i, & (p_{-b})_i = u. \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $x' \in R(p_{-b})$ , therefore  $f(x') = -b$ . Moreover,  $x', x \in R(x + u\check{p})$  and so  $\tilde{f}(x + u\check{p}) = u$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.7** (In Lemma 3.6 equality does not necessarily hold). We present a simple example where  $P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)} \neq \{(p_{-b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u} : p_{-b} \in P_{-b}^{(f)}\}$ . Consider  $f : \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $f^{-1}(1) = \{000, 001, 011, 111\}$ . It is not hard to see that  $P_1^{(f)} = \{u11, 0u1, 00u\}$ . When setting  $x_0 := 110$ , we get  $b := f(x_0) = 0$  and:

$$\{(p_{-b} + x_0)|_{0 \leftarrow u} : p_{-b} \in P_{-b}^{(f)}\} = \{uu1, 1u1, 11u\}.$$

Clearly,  $1u1$  is not a prime implicant of  $\text{df}(x_0; \cdot)$ , since  $uu1$  is also an implicant. Therefore,  $\{uu1, 1u1, 11u\} \neq P_1^{\text{df}(x_0;\cdot)}$ .

**Lemma 3.8.** Let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . Assume without the loss of generality  $f(x) = 0$ . Let  $q_1 \in P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}$  and  $q_0 \in P_0^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}$ . According to Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.4 there exist  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  and  $p_0 \in P_0^{(f)}|_x$  such that  $q_1 = (p_1 + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$  and  $q_0 = p_0 + x$ . Then, for every  $d \in [n]$  the following holds:

$$(q_1 + q_0)_d = 1 \iff (p_1 + p_0)_d = 1.$$

*Proof.*  $(q_1 + q_0)_d = 1$  iff<sup>8</sup>  $(q_1)_d = 1, (q_0)_d = 0$  iff  $(p_1)_d = \neg x_d, (p_0)_d = x_d$  iff<sup>9</sup>  $(p_1)_d, (p_0)_d \neq u$  and  $(p_0)_d \neq (p_1)_d$  iff  $(p_1 + p_0)_d = 1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.9.** Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function, and let  $M$  represent the communication matrix for  $KW_f^u$ . Denote the row labels of  $M$  by  $P_1^{(f)} := \{p_1^{(1)} \dots, p_1^{(k)}\}$  and the column labels by  $P_0^{(f)} := \{p_0^{(1)}, \dots, p_0^{(l)}\}$ . Then, for a monotone  $f$ , all rows and columns in  $M$  are distinct.

*Proof.* We prove the rows are distinct. The proof for distinct columns is similar. Let  $i \neq j \in [k]$ . By Corollary 2.13, we have  $p_1^{(i)}, p_1^{(j)} \in \{1, u\}^n$ . W.l.o.g there exists  $d \in [n]$  such that  $(p_1^{(i)})_d = 1$  and  $(p_1^{(j)})_d = u$ . By Proposition 2.9, there exists  $p_0^{(i')} \in P_0^{(f)}$  such that the only different stable coordinate in  $p_0^{(i')}$  and  $p_1^{(i)}$  is  $d$ . Therefore,  $M_{i,i'} = \{d\}$ , but  $d \notin M_{j,i'}$  as  $(p_1^{(j)})_d = u$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.10.** Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-constant Boolean function. For every  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $M_{KW_{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}^u}$  is a submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . Without the loss of generality, assume  $f(x) = 0$ . Denote the rows labels of  $M_{KW_{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}^u}$  by  $P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)} = \{q_1^{(1)}, \dots, q_1^{(k)}\}$  and the column labels by  $P_0^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)} = \{q_0^{(1)}, \dots, q_0^{(l)}\}$ . Similarly, denote the row labels of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  by  $P_1^{(f)} = \{p_1^{(1)}, \dots, p_1^{(K)}\}$  and the column labels by  $P_0^{(f)} = \{p_0^{(1)}, \dots, p_0^{(L)}\}$ .

To prove the claim, we show that for every  $i \in [k]$  there exists  $\pi(i) \in [K]$  and for every  $j \in [l]$  there exists  $\sigma(j) \in [L]$  so that  $(M_{KW_{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}^u})_{i,j} = (M_{KW_f^u})_{\pi(i),\sigma(j)}$ . In other words, if we only consider

<sup>8</sup>By Corollary 2.13,  $\text{df}(x; \cdot)$  is a monotone function.

<sup>9</sup>By our assumptions we have that  $p_0 \preceq^u x$ .

the set of rows  $I = \{\pi(i) : i \in [k]\}$  and the set of columns  $J = \{\sigma(j) : j \in [l]\}$  then we get that, up to reordering,  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u} = M_{KW_f^u}|_{I \times J}$ . Indeed, note that if such  $\pi$  and  $\sigma$  exist, then by Proposition 3.9,  $\pi$  and  $\sigma$  must be injective.

Let  $i \in [k]$ . Lemma 3.6 implies that there exists  $\pi(i) \in [K]$  such that  $q_1^{(i)} = (p_1^{(\pi(i))} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$ . Similarly, let  $j \in [l]$ , then by Lemma 3.4, there exists  $\sigma(j) \in [L]$  such that  $q_0^{(j)} = p_0^{(\sigma(j))} + x$ . By Lemma 3.8, we have  $(M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u})_{i,j} = (M_{KW_f^u})_{\pi(i),\sigma(j)}$ , which implies the claim.  $\square$

**Remark 3.11.** Observe that in the proof of Proposition 3.10, for every  $j$  it holds that  $p_0^{(\sigma(j))} \in P_b^{(f)}|_x$ . Thus,  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$  is actually a submatrix of another submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  whose labels are  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_x$ .

**Corollary 3.12.** Let  $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$  be a non-constant Boolean function and let  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$  be a fixed Boolean input. It holds that

$$\text{size}_F^+(df(x;\cdot)) \leq \text{size}_F^u(f).$$

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ . Say  $P$  is a protocol that solves  $KW_f^u$ . By Proposition A.7, we get that  $P$  induces a partition of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  to  $KW_f^u$ -monochromatic rectangles. We proved in Proposition 3.10 that  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$  is a submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$ , and so the partition that  $P$  induces on  $M_{KW_f^u}$  is also a valid<sup>10</sup> partition of  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$ . Note that  $df(x;\cdot)$  is a monotone Boolean function according to Lemma 2.3. The claim follows since:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{size}_F^u(f) &\stackrel{\text{Theorem 1.15}}{=} \text{mono-rec}(KW_f^u) \geq \text{mono-rec}(KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Theorem 1.19}}{=} \text{mono-rec}(KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^+) \stackrel{\text{Theorem 2.26}}{=} \text{size}_F^+(df(x;\cdot)). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We now prove another important observation regarding  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$ . Let  $M$  be the submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  with labels  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_x$ . Using Lemma 2.21, we show that the protocol complexity of  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$  is equal to that of  $M$ . The intuition comes from Lemma 3.6, where we prove that for every  $p_{-b} \in P_{-b}^{(f)}$  it holds that  $(p_{-b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u} \in I_1^{df(x;\cdot)}$ . Moreover, for every  $p_{-b}$  and the associated  $(p_{-b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$  we get that the corresponding rows in  $M$  and  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$ , respectively, are equal. Some of the implicants  $p_{-b}$  are *prime* implicant of the derivative, but not all of them, as illustrated in Example 3.7. The rows that “disappear”, are those associated with  $p_{-b}$  for which  $(p_{-b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$  is not a prime implicant of the hazard-derivative. Therefore,  $(p_{-b} + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$  contains less  $u$ 's, and the associated row in  $M$  can potentially have more valid answers. These rows are super rows in  $M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$ .

**Proposition 3.13.** Let  $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$  and  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$  such that  $f(x) = 0$ . We denote by  $M$  the submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  with labels  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_x$ . We also denote the communication matrix of  $KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u$  by  $M' := M_{KW_{df(x;\cdot)}^u}$ . The following holds:

$$\text{mono-rec}(M) = \text{mono-rec}(M'),$$

$$CC(M) = CC(M').$$

---

<sup>10</sup>A partition that can be induced by a protocol.



*Proof.* Following Lemma 3.4, we denote the column labels of  $M$  by  $P_0^{(f)}|_x := \{p_0^{(1)}, \dots, p_0^{(\ell)}\}$  and the column labels of  $M'$  by  $P_0^{(\text{df}(x;\cdot))} := \{p_0^{(1)} + x, \dots, p_0^{(\ell)} + x\}$ . We prove that the assumptions of Lemma 2.21 hold for  $M, M'$ ,  $k := |P_1^{(f)}|, k' := |P_1^{(\text{df}(x;\cdot))}|, \ell := |P_0^{(f)}|_x$  and the  $\text{KW}_f^u$  relation. By Remark 3.11, we get that  $M'$  is a submatrix of  $M$ , so assumption 2 of Lemma 2.21 holds.

We now prove that for every  $i \in k$ ,  $M_i$  is a super-row in  $M'$ . Let  $i \in [k]$  and let  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  be the associated row label in  $M$ . Following Lemma 3.6 we have  $(p_1 + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u} \in I_1^{(\text{df}(x;\cdot))}$ , so there exists  $q_1 \in P_1^{(\text{df}(x;\cdot))}$  such that  $q_1 \stackrel{u}{\leq} (p_1 + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$ . We prove that the row associated with  $q_1$  in  $M'$  is a sub-row of  $M_i$ . By the first inclusion in Lemma 3.6, there exists  $\tilde{p}_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  such that  $q_1 = (\tilde{p}_1 + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$ . We denote by  $\tilde{i} \in [k]$  the row index of  $\tilde{p}_1$  in  $M$ . According to Lemma 3.8, the row associated with  $\tilde{p}_1$  in  $M$  and the row associated with  $q_1$  in  $M'$  are equal, so it is enough to show that  $M_{\tilde{i}}$  is a sub-row of  $M_i$ . Let  $j \in [\ell]$  and  $p_0^{(j)} \in P_0^{(f)}|_x$  be the associated column label in  $M$ . Recall that  $p_0^{(j)} \stackrel{u}{\leq} x$ . Let a coordinate  $d \in [n]$ . Since  $(\tilde{p}_1 + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u} \stackrel{u}{\leq} (p_1 + x)|_{0 \leftarrow u}$ , we have  $(\tilde{p}_1)_d = \neg x_d \Rightarrow (p_1)_d = \neg x_d$ , and so:

$$\begin{aligned} d \in M_{\tilde{i},j} &\Rightarrow (\tilde{p}_1 + p_0^{(j)})_d = 1 \Rightarrow (\tilde{p}_1)_d = \neg x_d, (p_0^{(j)})_d = x_d \\ &\Rightarrow (p_1)_d = \neg x_d, (p_0^{(j)})_d = x_d \Rightarrow (p_1 + p_0^{(j)})_d = 1 \Rightarrow d \in M_{i,j}. \end{aligned}$$

As for every  $j \in [\ell]$ ,  $M_{\tilde{i},j} \subseteq M_{i,j}$ ,  $M_{i'}$  is a sub-row of  $M_i$ , therefore, assumption 1 of Lemma 2.21 holds.  $\square$

### 3.2 Unateness as a criterion

We prove the proposition below by applying Proposition 3.13, which immediately shows that the hazard-derivative lower bound method is tight for unate functions.

**Proposition 3.14** (Unate functions do not break the monotone barrier). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-constant unate Boolean function. Then, there exists  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that:*

$$\text{size}_F^+(\text{df}(x; \cdot)) = \text{size}_F^u(f).$$

*Proof.* A unate function is positive or negative unate in each of its variables. By Lemma 2.17, it is not possible for a unate function to have two prime implicants with *stable and different* coordinates. Hence, there exists  $x' \in \{0, 1\}^n$  that satisfies  $P_0^{(f)}|_{x'} = P_0^{(f)}$ . In particular,  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{x'} = P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}$ . Following Proposition 3.13, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} CC(M_{KW_f^u}) &= CC(M_{KW_{\text{df}(x'; \cdot)}^u}), \\ \text{mono-rec}(M_{KW_f^u}) &= \text{mono-rec}(M_{KW_{\text{df}(x'; \cdot)}^u}). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude, as in Equation (2), that  $\text{size}_F^u(f) = \text{size}_F^+(\text{df}(x'; \cdot))$ .  $\square$

The opposite direction requires more work. Using “fooling-set” arguments, we show that for a non-unate function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , there are two entries in  $M_{KW_f^u}$  that cannot be in the same  $\text{KW}_f^u$ -monochromatic rectangle. However, this special structure does not appear in the communication matrices of the hazard-derivatives of  $f$ , allowing us to show a gap of at least one rectangle.



**Proposition 3.15.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-unate Boolean function. Then, there exists a coordinate  $d \in [n]$ ,  $p_1, q_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  and  $p_0, q_0 \in P_0^{(f)}$  such that:*

1.  $(p_1)_d = 0, (p_0)_d = 1$  and  $d$  is the only different and stable coordinate between  $p_1$  and  $p_0$ .
2.  $(q_1)_d = 1, (q_0)_d = 0$  and  $d$  is the only different and stable coordinate between  $q_1$  and  $q_0$ .

*Proof.* As  $f$  is non-unate, there exists  $d \in [n]$  such that  $f$  is not positive or negative unate in  $x_d$ . Hence, there exist  $z, s \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that:

$$f(z|_{d \leftarrow 0}) > f(z|_{d \leftarrow 1}), f(s|_{d \leftarrow 1}) > f(s|_{d \leftarrow 0}).$$

Therefore, there exist  $p_1, q_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  such that  $p_1 \stackrel{u}{\leq} z|_{d \leftarrow 0}$  and  $q_1 \stackrel{u}{\leq} s|_{d \leftarrow 1}$ . By Proposition 2.9, there exist  $p_0, q_0 \in P_0^{(f)}$  such that only the  $d$ 'th coordinate in  $p_1, p_0$  and in  $q_1, q_0$  is stable and different. As  $0 = (p_1)_d \neq (q_1)_d = 1$ , we conclude that  $1 = (p_0)_d \neq (q_0)_d = 0$  and the claim follows.  $\square$

We can divide the prime implicants of a non-unate  $f$  according to the value of the  $d$ 'th coordinate:  $P_1^{(f)} = P_1^{d=1} \cup P_1^{d=0} \cup P_1^{d=u}$ . We use the same notations for the prime implicants, with  $P_0^{(f)}$  instead of  $P_1^{(f)}$ . We proved in Proposition 3.15 that  $P_1^{d=1}, P_1^{d=0}, P_0^{d=1}, P_0^{d=0} \neq \emptyset$ , therefore we have the following picture:




Figure 2: Sketch of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  for a non-unate  $f$ .

Empty entries do not contain the  $d$ 'th coordinate. We use the notation ' $d, \dots$ ' when there may be stable coordinates other than  $d$  on which the row labels and column labels differ.

**Proposition 3.16.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-unate Boolean function. Then for every  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , it holds that:*

$$\text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot)) < \text{size}_F^u(f).$$

*Proof.* Let  $d \in [n]$ ,  $p_0, p_1, q_0, q_1$  be as in Proposition 3.15. Let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . Assume without the loss of generality that  $f(x) = 0$  and  $x_d = 0$ . We denote by  $M'$  the communication matrix for the monotone KW game of  $df(x; \cdot)$ . We denote by  $M$  the submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  with column labels  $P_0^{(f)}|_x \subseteq P_0^{d=0} \cup P_0^{d=u}$ . According to Proposition 3.10 and Remark 3.11,  $M'$  is a submatrix of  $M$ .

Let  $P$  be a protocol for  $M_{KW_f^u}$ . As the  $d$ 'th coordinate in  $p_0, p_1$  is the only coordinate that is both stable and different, there exists a  $d$ -uniform rectangle  $\text{Rec}$  as in Definition 2.18, which contains  $(p_1, p_0)$ , in the partition induced by  $P$ . Moreover,  $\text{Rec}$  has to be a subset of  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{d=1}$ .

Next, consider the following protocol  $P'$  for  $M'$ : Alice and Bob follow  $P$ , but since  $P'$  operates only on  $P_1^{(f)} \times (P_0^{d=0} \cup P_0^{d=u})$ , we may get empty leaves which can be removed. We must have removed the leaf associated with  $\text{Rec}$ , so:

$$\text{mono-rec}(P') < \text{mono-rec}(P).$$

As before, the claim follows from Theorem 1.15, Theorem 1.19 and Theorem 2.26.  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 1.26 follows immediately from Proposition 3.14 and Proposition 3.16.

## 4 A universal upper bound for most Boolean functions

In this section, we study the hazard-free formula complexity of random Boolean functions. While these functions have maximal formula complexity in the standard setting, we show that their hazard-derivatives are significantly simpler. This observation reveals a considerable gap between the hazard-free complexity of a random function and the monotone complexity of its hazard-derivatives. Consequently, random functions break the monotone barrier in a strong way, thus answering Question 1.13.

Combining this result with Theorem 1.29, we derive an  $2^{(1+o(1))n}$  upper bound for the hazard-free formula complexity of random functions. This greatly improves upon the best-known upper bound for arbitrary functions, currently  $O(3^n)$ .

### 4.1 The hazard-derivative of a random Boolean function

**Definition 4.1.** *We say that  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a random function if it is sampled uniformly at random among all Boolean functions on  $n$  variables. Alternatively, we can think as generating  $f$  by sampling, for every  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , a value  $f(x) \in \{0, 1\}$  uniformly and independently.*

It is well known that the formula complexity of a random function is maximal.

**Theorem 4.2** ([RS42, Sha49]). *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , almost all Boolean functions on  $n$  variables require formula size of at least  $\frac{(1-\epsilon)2^n}{\log n}$ .*

Since  $\text{size}_F^u(f) \geq \text{size}_F(f)$ , an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.2 is that with high probability, a random Boolean function over  $n$  variables requires hazard-free formulas of size at least  $\Omega(\frac{2^n}{\log n})$ .

In contrast, we expect the hazard-derivatives of a randomly sampled function to have low monotone complexity. Hazard-derivatives indicate whether the function's output changes when perturbing a fixed input. As more bits in the input are perturbed, the probability that the function's output would not change is low, since there are a lot of resolutions. Consequently, the derivative's output is likely to be 1, making the hazard-derivative nearly constant.

In what follows, we denote the *weight* of  $x \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  as  $|x| := |\{i : x_i = 1\}|$ .

**Lemma 4.3** ( $P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}$  for a random  $f$  tend to have more unstable bits). *Let  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$  and let  $q_1 \in \{0,u,1\}^n$  be fixed such that  $|q_1| = k$ . The probability that  $q_1 \in P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}$ , for a random Boolean function  $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ , is  $(\frac{1}{2})^{2^k-1}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.5,  $q_1 \in P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}$  if and only if  $q_1 \in \{1,u\}^n$  and there exists exactly one  $z \in R(x+u\check{q}_1)$  such that  $f(z) = \neg f(x)$ . The probability of this event is  $2 \cdot (\frac{1}{2})^{|R(x+u\check{q}_1)|} = 2 \cdot (\frac{1}{2})^{2^k} = (\frac{1}{2})^{2^k-1}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *A random Boolean function  $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ , sampled uniformly at random, satisfies that with high probability, for every  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ :*

$$\text{size}_F^+(\text{df}(x;\cdot)) = \frac{n^{\log n}}{\log n^{(1-o(1)) \log n}}.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ . Taking the union bound over all  $q_1 \in \{0,u,1\}^n$  with weight  $k > \log n$  and using Lemma 4.3, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\exists q_1 \in P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}, |q_1| > \log n] &\leq \sum_{\log n < k \leq n} \Pr[\exists q_1 \in P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}, |q_1| = k] \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{\log n < k \leq n} \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the union bound over all Boolean inputs of length  $n$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\exists x, q_1 \in P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}, |q_1| > \log n] &\leq 2^n \cdot \sum_{\log n < k \leq n} \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k-1} \leq 2^{n+1} \cdot \sum_{\log n < k \leq n} n^k \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k} \\ &= \sum_{\log n < k \leq n} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^k - (k \log n + n + 1)} \leq 11n \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2^{\log n+1} - ((\log n + 1) \log n + n + 1)} = \frac{n}{2^{\Omega(n)}}. \end{aligned}$$

By the calculation above, we have that with high probability, all prime implicants of all hazard-derivatives of  $f$  are of weight at most  $\log n$ . Fix  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ . It holds that:

$$\text{df}(x; y) = \bigvee_{p_1 \in P_1^{\text{df}(x;\cdot)}} \bigwedge_{(p_1)_i=1} y_i.$$

This is a monotone DNF formula for  $\text{df}(x;\cdot)$ , where each term is a prime implicant. Since the weight of all prime implicants is at most  $\log n$ , each term contains at most  $\log n$  literals. The number of prime implicants is upper bounded by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\log n} \binom{n}{k} \leq \log n \cdot \binom{n}{\log n} \leq \log n \cdot \left(\frac{en}{\log n}\right)^{\log n} = \frac{n^{\log n}}{\log n^{(1-o(1)) \log n}},$$

where in the last inequality we used the well known estimate  $\binom{a}{b} \leq (ea/b)^b$  where  $e$  is the basis of the natural log. Hence, we get a monotone formula of size  $\frac{n^{\log n}}{\log n^{(1-o(1)) \log n}}$ .  $\square$

---

<sup>11</sup>Since  $g(k) = 2^k - (k \log n + n + 1)$  is monotone increasing in  $k$ .

The proof of Proposition 1.28, which we restate for ease of reading, follows immediately.

**Proposition 1.28.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a random Boolean function. With high probability,  $f(x)$  breaks the monotone barrier with the following gap:*

$$\text{mono-gap}(f) = \omega\left(\frac{2^n}{n^{\log n}}\right).$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.2, for the majority of Boolean functions it holds that  $\text{size}_F^u(f) \geq \text{size}_F(f) = \Omega\left(\frac{2^n}{\log n}\right)$ . Combining this with Lemma 4.4, we conclude the result.  $\square$

This provides a strong answer to Question 1.13, showing that the gap can be exponential in the number of variables.

## 4.2 Hazard-derivatives upper bound

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.29, which upper bounds the hazard-free formula size in terms of the monotone formula size of several of its hazard-derivatives, corresponding to inputs that cover all the prime implicants of  $f$  (or prime implicants, by considering  $\neg f$ ).

We leverage this result to obtain an improved upper bound on the hazard-free formula complexity of random Boolean functions, thus proving Theorem 1.27 (see Theorem 4.5). Furthermore, Theorem 4.5 demonstrates that the upper bound in Theorem 1.29 is not too far from the truth for random Boolean functions. We then provide an example showing that Theorem 1.29 can yield a tight bound.

To ease the reading, we repeat the statement of Theorem 1.29.

**Theorem 1.29** (Hazard-derivatives upper bound). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and let  $X_0 \subseteq f^{-1}(0)$  and  $X_1 \subseteq f^{-1}(1)$ . Then,*

$$\text{if } P_0^{(f)} = \bigcup_{x \in X_0} P_0^{(f)}|_x, \text{ then it holds that } \text{size}_F^u(f) \leq \sum_{x \in X_0} \text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot)).$$

Similarly,

$$\text{if } P_1^{(f)} = \bigcup_{x \in X_1} P_1^{(f)}|_x, \text{ then it holds that } \text{size}_F^u(f) \leq \sum_{x \in X_1} \text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot)).$$

*Proof.* All derivatives are monotone Boolean functions (Lemma 2.3), so following Theorem 1.19, it is enough to prove:

$$\text{size}_F^u(f) \leq \sum_{x \in X_0} \text{size}_F^u(df(x; \cdot)).$$

We design a protocol  $P$  for  $\text{KW}_f^u$  that has at most  $\sum_{x \in X_0} \text{mono-rec}(M_{\text{KW}_{df(x; \cdot)}^u})$  many leaves.

Let  $M_{\text{KW}_f^u}$  be the communication matrix for the  $\text{KW}_f^u$  game. Note that the column labels of this matrix are  $P_0^{(f)}$ . We denote  $X_0 = \{x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(k)}\}$  and partition  $P_0^{(f)}$  to  $\leq k$  distinct subsets  $A_1, \dots, A_k \subseteq P_0^{(f)}$  according to  $X_0$ :

$$A_1 := P_0^{(f)}|_{x^{(1)}},$$

$$A_i := P_0^{(f)}|_{x^{(i)}} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j.$$

It is easy to see that:

$$P_0^{(f)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^k A_i,$$

and for every  $i \in [k]$ :

$$A_i \subseteq P_0^{(f)}|_{x^{(i)}}.$$

Therefore, if we consider the protocol  $P$  that starts with partitioning  $M_{KW_f^u}$  into distinct submatrices of  $M_{KW_f^u}$  with labels  $P_1^{(f)} \times A_i$ , denoted as  $M_i$ , we get:

$$\text{mono-rec}(M_{KW_f^u}) \leq \sum_{x \in X} \text{mono-rec}(M_i).$$

Since each  $M_i$  is contained in the corresponding submatrix of  $M_{KW_f^u}$ , which is labeled by  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{x^{(i)}}$ , it follows from Proposition 3.13 that  $\text{mono-rec}(M_i) \leq \text{mono-rec}(M_{KW_f^u}|_{df(x^{(i)}; \cdot)})$ , and thus the claim follows.

The proof for the case where the implicants are covered follows by considering  $\neg f$ , since  $\text{size}_F^u(f) = \text{size}_F^u(\neg f)$  and  $df(x; \cdot) = d(\neg f)(x; \cdot)$  for every  $x$ .  $\square$

As a corollary, we get a universal upper bound on the hazard-free formula complexity of random Boolean functions, which in particular proves Theorem 1.27.

**Theorem 4.5** (A universal upper bound for most Boolean functions). *For a random Boolean function  $f$ , we get that with high probability, for a minimally sized  $X$  such that*

$$P_0^{(f)} = \bigcup_{x \in X} P_0^{(f)}|_x,$$

*the following holds:*

$$\left( \sum_{x \in X} \text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot)) \right)^{1-o(1)} \leq \text{size}_F^u(f) \leq \sum_{x \in X} \text{size}_F^+(df(x; \cdot)).$$

*In particular, for a random Boolean function  $f$ , with high probability, we get that:*

$$\frac{2^n}{\log n} \leq \text{size}_F^u(f) \leq 2^n \cdot \frac{n^{\log n}}{\log n^{(1-o(1)) \log n}}.$$

*Proof.* The claims follow immediately from Theorem 4.2, Lemma 4.4 and Theorem 1.29.  $\square$

### 4.2.1 Tight bound for range functions

Here, we prove that Theorem 1.29 can give exact bounds. We consider the special case where there exists  $x_0 \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $P_0^{(f)} = P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0} \cup P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$ . Later, we discuss a family of explicit functions that satisfy the above property.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-constant Boolean function. If there exists  $x_0 \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that  $P_0^{(f)} = P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0} \cup P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$ , then:*

$$\text{size}_F^u(f) = \text{size}_F^+(df(x_0; \cdot)) + \text{size}_F^+(df(\neg x_0; \cdot)).$$

*Proof.* Let  $P$  a protocol for  $\text{KW}_f^u$  and let  $M := M_{\text{KW}_f^u}$ . Let  $\text{Rec} = A \times B$  be a  $\text{KW}_f^u$ -monochromatic rectangle in the partition induced by  $P$  (in particular,  $A \subseteq P_1^{(f)}$  and  $B \subseteq P_0^{(f)}$ ). We first prove that  $\text{Rec} \subseteq P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0}$  or  $\text{Rec} \subseteq P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$ . Indeed, assume toward contradiction that  $B \cap P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0} \neq \emptyset$  and  $B \cap P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0} \neq \emptyset$ . Hence, there exist  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$ ,  $p_0 \in P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0}$  and  $q_0 \in P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$  such that  $(p_1, p_0), (p_1, q_0) \in \text{Rec}$ . Since  $\text{Rec}$  is  $\text{KW}_f^u$ -monochromatic there must exist  $d \in [n]$  such that  $d \in M_{p_1, p_0} \cap M_{p_1, q_0}$ . Meaning  $(p_1)_d \neq (p_0)_d$  and  $(p_1)_d \neq (q_0)_d$  and  $(p_1)_d, (p_0)_d, (q_0)_d$  are stable. Therefore,  $(p_0)_d = (q_0)_d$ . This is a contradiction, since  $p_0$  derives  $x_0$  and  $q_0$  derives  $\neg x_0$ , their stable coordinates must be different.

Next, we prove that every protocol  $P$  for  $\text{KW}_f^u$  can start, without increasing the number of leaves, with partitioning  $P_0^{(f)}$  to  $P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0}$  and  $P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$ . We present a protocol  $P'$  for  $\text{KW}_f^u$ . Bob starts by partitioning  $P_0^{(f)}$  to  $P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0}$  and  $P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$ , this step requires 1 bit of communication. After this step, Alice and Bob follow  $P$  on the inputs in  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0}$  or  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$ , according to the first bit, and return the obtained answer.

We denote by  $P_{x_0}$  the protocol  $P$  played only on inputs in  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0}$ , and by  $P_{\neg x_0}$  the protocol  $P$  played only on inputs in  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$ . Since every monochromatic rectangle in the partition induced by  $P$  is contained in exactly one of these inputs subsets, we can eliminate leaves in  $P_{x_0}$  and in  $P_{\neg x_0}$  that the players would never reach. We get:

$$\text{mono-rec}(P) = \text{mono-rec}(P_{x_0}) + \text{mono-rec}(P_{\neg x_0}) = \text{mono-rec}(P'). \quad (3)$$

Notice that  $P_{x_0}$  and  $P_{\neg x_0}$  are protocols for the submatrices of  $M_{\text{KW}_f^u}$  with labels  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{x_0}$  and  $P_1^{(f)} \times P_0^{(f)}|_{\neg x_0}$ , respectively. According to Proposition 3.13, these submatrices are equivalent in terms of communication complexity to  $M_{\text{KW}_{df(x_0; \cdot)}^u}$  and  $M_{\text{KW}_{df(\neg x_0; \cdot)}^u}$ , hence, we get:

$$\text{mono-rec}(P_{x_0}) \geq \text{size}_F^u(\text{KW}_{df(x_0; \cdot)}^+), \quad (4)$$

$$\text{mono-rec}(P_{\neg x_0}) \geq \text{size}_F^u(\text{KW}_{df(\neg x_0; \cdot)}^+). \quad (5)$$

Following (3), (4), (5) and Theorem 1.19 we have:

$$\text{size}_F^u(f) \geq \text{size}_F^+(df(x_0; \cdot)) + \text{size}_F^+(df(\neg x_0; \cdot)). \quad (6)$$

Theorem 1.29 implies that the lower bound in (6) is tight.  $\square$

We next present an example of an explicit function that satisfies the assumption of Proposition 4.6.

**Definition 4.7** (Threshold and Range functions). *Let  $k \in [n]$ . A threshold- $k$  function  $T_k^n : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is defined such that  $T_k^n = 1$  iff  $x_1 + \dots + x_n \geq k$ .*

*Let  $a, b \in [n]$  such that  $0 < a < b \leq n$ . We call  $R_{a,b}^n$  an  $a$ - $b$ -range function, if for every  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $R_{a,b}^n(x) = 1$  iff  $a \leq x_1 + \dots + x_n < b$ . In other words,  $R_{a,b}^n(x) = T_a^n(x) \wedge \neg T_b^n(x)$ .*

**Lemma 4.8** (Prime implicants and prime implicates of range functions). *Let  $R_{a,b}^n : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be an  $a$ - $b$ -range function for some  $a, b$ . Let  $p \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$ . We denote the number of 1s in  $p$  by  $n_1$  and the number of 0s in  $p$  by  $n_0$ . Then:*

1.  $p \in P_1^{(R_{a,b}^n)}$  if and only if  $n_1 = a$  and  $n_0 = n - (b - 1)$ .
2.  $p \in P_0^{(R_{a,b}^n)}$  if and only if  $n_0 = 0$  and  $n_1 = b$  or  $n_1 = 0$  and  $n_0 = n - (a - 1)$ .

*Proof.* We prove Property 2, since Property 1 can be proved similarly.

It is clear that if an input satisfies Property 2 then it is an implicate. To prove that these are the only prime implicates consider  $p \in P_0^{(R_{a,b}^n)}$ . In order for  $p$  to be an implicate of  $R_{a,b}^n$ , every resolution must have at most  $a - 1$  1s or at least  $b$  1s. Therefore, we have to set at least  $n - (a - 1)$  coordinates of  $p$  to 0 or at least  $b$  coordinates of  $p$  to 1. Naturally, the minimal implicates with respect to  $\leq^u$  are those with  $n_0 = 0$  and  $n_1 = b$  or  $n_1 = 0$  and  $n_0 = n - (a - 1)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $R_{a,b}^n : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be an  $a$ - $b$ -range function for some  $a, b$ , then:*

$$dR_{a,b}^n(\bar{0}; \cdot) = T_a^n,$$

$$dR_{a,b}^n(\bar{1}; \cdot) = T_{n-(b-1)}^n.$$

*Proof.* Note that  $R_{a,b}^n(\bar{0}) = 0$  and  $R_{a,b}^n(\bar{1}) = 0$ . Considering Lemma 4.8, we calculate the prime implicants and prime implicates of  $dR_{a,b}^n(\bar{0}; \cdot)$ :

- Following Lemma 3.6, every  $p \in P_1^{(R_{a,b}^n)}$  has  $a$  1s and  $n - (b - 1)$  0s. Therefore,  $(p + \bar{0})|_{0 \leftarrow u}$  would have exactly  $a$  1s. Hence, we get that all  $\binom{n}{a}$  choices of  $a$  1s from  $n$  bits are a subset of the implicants of  $dR_{a,b}^n(\bar{0}; \cdot)$ .
- Let  $p \in P_0^{(R_{a,b}^n)}$ . As in the previous lemma, we denote  $n_0$  as the number of 0s and  $n_1$  as the number of 1s in  $p$ . Following Lemma 3.4,  $p$  derives  $\bar{0}$  iff  $n_1 = 0, n_0 = n - (a - 1)$ . Therefore,  $p_0 \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  is a prime implicate of  $dR_{a,b}^n(\bar{0}; \cdot)$  iff  $p_0$  has exactly  $n - (a - 1)$  0s.

It is not difficult to prove that the prime implicants and the prime implicates above are the ones of  $T_a^n$ .

Similarly, we follow the above steps on  $dR_{a,b}^n(\bar{1}; \cdot)$  to get that the implicates are those with exactly  $b$  0s, and the prime implicants are those with exactly  $n - (b - 1)$  1s.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.10** (Tight lower bound for range functions). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be an  $a$ - $b$ -range function, then:*

$$\text{size}_F^u(f) = \text{size}_F^+(T_a^n) + \text{size}_F^+(T_{n-(b-1)}^n).$$

*Proof.* Lemma 4.8 implies the following for  $x_0 := \bar{0}$ :

$$P_0^{(R_{a,b}^n)} = P_0^{(R_{a,b}^n)}|_{\bar{0}} \cup P_0^{(R_{a,b}^n)}|_{\bar{1}}.$$

We derive the claim following Proposition 4.6 and Lemma 4.9.  $\square$

## 5 Composition of Boolean functions in hazard-free setting

In this section, we prove Proposition 1.30, which establishes a lower bound on the communication complexity of the hazard-free KW game for the composition of a monotone function with an arbitrary inner function. This result is inspired by [KRW95, Lemma 4], which obtains a similar result in the monotone setting. By Theorem 1.19, the monotone KW game is equivalent to the hazard-free KW game, enabling us to extend the proof of [KRW95] to a partially hazard-free setting. The lower bound is then derived through a reduction to the direct sum of functions, as shown in [KRW95, Corollary 5].

The hazard-free KW game is played on the prime implicants (and implicates). We show in Proposition 5.1 that the prime implicants (and implicates) of the composed function,  $f \diamond g$ , can be derived from the prime implicants (and implicates) of  $f$  and  $g$ .

We first introduce some notation. For  $s_1 \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  and  $s_2 \in \{0, u, 1\}^m$ , we denote as  $s_1 \cdot s_2$  the concatenation of  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . Let  $g : \{0, u, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}$  be a ternary function, and let  $X \in \{0, u, 1\}^{nm}$  be a ternary  $n \times m$  matrix. For brevity, we denote  $g[X] := (g(X_1), \dots, g(X_n))$  and  $dg[X; Y] := (dg(X_1; Y_1), \dots, dg(X_n; Y_n))$ , where  $X_i$  is the  $i$ 'th row of  $X$ .

**Proposition 5.1** (Prime Implicants of composition). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be Boolean functions. Then  $P \in P_1^{(f \diamond g)} \subseteq \{0, u, 1\}^{nm}$  if and only if:*

1.  $\tilde{g}[P] \in P_1^{(f)}$ .
2. For every  $i \in [n]$ , if  $\tilde{g}(P_i) = b \in \{0, 1\}$  then  $P_i \in P_b^{(g)}$ . Otherwise,  $P_i = u^m$ .

We also need the following simple lemma, which shows that the hazard-free extension of the block composition of two Boolean functions is the same as the block composition of their hazard-free extensions. We define the block composition of ternary functions exactly as in the Boolean case.

**Lemma 5.2** (Hazard-free extension of composition). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be Boolean functions. Then:*

$$\widetilde{f \diamond g} = \tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}.$$

We defer the proof to Appendix C.

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* Following Lemma 5.2, we refer to  $\tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}$  and  $\widetilde{f \diamond g}$  interchangeably.

$\subseteq$ : Let  $P \in P_1^{(f \diamond g)}$ . Clearly,  $\widetilde{f \diamond g}(P) = \tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}(P) = \tilde{f}(\tilde{g}[P]) = 1$ . Condition 1 now follows from Definition 2.8.

Let  $i \in [n]$ . We prove that condition 2 is satisfied. Let  $j \in [m]$  such that  $P_{i,j}$  is stable.  $P$  is a prime implicant of  $f \diamond g$ , hence,  $\tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}(P|_{i,j \rightsquigarrow u}) = u$ . We conclude that  $\tilde{g}(P_i) = b \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\tilde{g}(P_i|_{j \rightsquigarrow u}) = u$ , otherwise, the output of  $\tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}$  would not change. Since  $P_{i,j}$  is stable if and only if



$(P_i)_j$  is stable, we get that every  $P_i$  with some stable coordinate is a prime implicant (if  $\tilde{g}(P_i) = 1$ ) or implicate (if  $\tilde{g}(P_i) = 0$ ) of  $g$ .

$\supseteq$ : Let  $P \in \{0, u, 1\}^{nm}$  that satisfies conditions 1 and 2. Condition 1 implies that  $\tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}(P) = \tilde{f}(\tilde{g}[P]) = 1$ , and so  $P$  is an implicant of  $f \diamond g$ . Let  $(i, j) \in [n] \times [m]$  such that  $P_{i,j}$  is stable. Denote  $P' = P|_{(i,j) \leftarrow u}$ . We conclude from condition 2 that there exists  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  such that  $P_i \in P_b^{(g)}$ . Therefore,  $\tilde{g}(P'_i) = u$  and  $\tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}(P') = \tilde{f}(\tilde{g}[P']) = \tilde{f}(\tilde{g}[P]|_{i \leftarrow u}) = u$  since  $\tilde{g}[P]$  is a prime implicant of  $f$ .  $\square$

We use Proposition 5.1 to obtain an analog of [KRW95, Lemma 4].

**Lemma 5.3** (Direct sum is reducible to  $KW_{f \diamond g}^u$ ). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function, and let  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. Then, it holds that:*

$$KW_f^+ \otimes KW_g^u \leq KW_{f \diamond g}^u.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\phi : \{0, u, 1\}^n \times \{0, u, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, u, 1\}^{nm}$  be the following function: given  $p_f \in \{0, u, 1\}^n$  and  $p_g \in \{0, u, 1\}^m$ ,  $\phi(p_f, p_g)$  returns  $P \in \{0, u, 1\}^{nm}$  such that:

$$\forall i \in [n]. P_i := \begin{cases} p_g, & (p_f)_i \neq u, \\ u^m, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $\psi : [nm] \rightarrow [n] \times [m]$  be the following function: given  $k \in [nm]$ ,  $\psi(k) = (\lfloor \frac{k-1}{m} \rfloor + 1, k - m \cdot (\lfloor \frac{k-1}{m} \rfloor))$ . We next show that every  $k \in [nm]$ ,  $(p_f^{(1)}, p_g^{(1)}) \in P_1^{(f)} \times P_1^{(g)}$  and  $(p_f^{(0)}, p_g^{(0)}) \in P_0^{(f)} \times P_0^{(g)}$  satisfy:

$$(\phi(p_f^{(1)}, p_g^{(1)}), \phi(p_f^{(0)}, p_g^{(0)}), k) \in KW_{f \diamond g}^u \Rightarrow ((p_f^{(1)}, p_g^{(1)}), (p_f^{(0)}, p_g^{(0)}), \psi(k)) \in KW_f^+ \otimes KW_g^u.$$

Corollary 2.13 implies that  $p_f^{(1)} \in \{1, u\}^n$ . From Proposition 5.1, it follows that  $\phi(p_f^{(1)}, p_g^{(1)}) \in P_1^{(f \diamond g)}$ . Similarly,  $\phi(p_f^{(0)}, p_g^{(0)}) \in P_0^{(f \diamond g)}$ . Let  $k \in [nm]$  be a valid answer for  $KW_{f \diamond g}^u$  on the aforementioned inputs. From the definition of hazard-free  $KW$  game,  $k$  is a coordinate where  $\phi(p_f^{(1)}, p_g^{(1)})$  and  $\phi(p_f^{(0)}, p_g^{(0)})$  are both *stable* and *different*. Hence, from the definition of  $\phi$ ,  $i = \lfloor \frac{k-1}{m} \rfloor + 1$  is an index of a row that satisfies  $1 = (p_f^{(1)})_i \neq (p_f^{(0)})_i = 0$ . Moreover, the entry corresponding to  $k$  in the  $i$ 'th row is  $j = k - m(i - 1)$ , and it must be the case that  $(p_g^{(1)})_j \neq (p_g^{(0)})_j$  and they are both stable. Therefore,  $\psi(k)$  is a valid answer for  $KW_f^+ \otimes KW_g^u$ , as required.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 1.30, which we restate to ease the reading.

**Proposition 1.30** (Lower bound via direct sum). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a monotone Boolean function. Let  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  a Boolean function. Let  $\Phi : X \times Y \rightarrow Z$  and  $\Psi : X' \times Y' \rightarrow Z'$  be functions such that  $\Phi$  reduces to  $KW_f^+$  and  $\Psi$  reduces to  $KW_g^u$ . Then, the following holds:*

$$CC(KW_{f \diamond g}^u) \geq \log(\text{Rank}(M_\Phi)) + \log(\text{Rank}(M_\Psi)).$$

*Proof.* The claim follows from Lemma 5.3 and the rank lower bound method in communication complexity (see Lemma A.10).  $\square$

As an application of Proposition 1.30, we prove a lower bound on the hazard-free formula depth of the set covering function composed with the multiplexer function. The set covering function is also used in [KRW95, Theorem 13], where it is composed with itself.

**Definition 5.4** (Set covering  $MC_{k,n}$  [Kar89, Example 5.2.1]). *Given a bipartite graph  $G = (U \cup V, E)$  with  $|U| = |V| = n$  we have  $MC_{k,n}(G, k) = 1 \iff$  there exists a  $U' \subseteq U$  such that  $|U'| = k$  and every node in  $V$  has a neighbor in  $U'$ .*

It is not hard to see that  $MC_{k,n}$  is monotone (in the edge set of  $G$ ). Moreover, the disjointness function reduces to  $KW_{MC_{k,n}}^+$ .

**Definition 5.5** (The disjointness function). *Let  $\mathbf{P}([n])$  denote all subsets of  $[n]$ , and let  $\mathbf{P}_l([n])$  denote all subsets of  $[n]$  of size  $l$ :*

- Let  $I_n : \mathbf{P}([n]) \times \mathbf{P}([n]) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  where  $I_n(S, T) = 0 \iff S \cap T = \emptyset$ .
- For  $l \leq n/2$ , let  $I_{l,n} : \mathbf{P}_l([n]) \times \mathbf{P}_l([n]) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  where  $I_{l,n}(S, T) = 0 \iff S \cap T = \emptyset$ .

**Theorem 5.6** ( $I_{l,n}$  is reducible to set covering [Raz90], [Kar89, Theorem 5.2.1]). *Let  $k = c \log n$  for some suitable  $c > 0$ . Then  $I_{k,n} \leq KW_{MC_{k,n}}^+$ .*

[IKS23] proved that the subcube-intersect $_n$  reduces to  $KW_{MUX_n}^u$ .

**Definition 5.7** (subcube-intersect [IKS23, p.15]). *Let  $subcube\text{-}intersect_n : \{0, u, 1\}^n \times \{0, u, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a function such that  $subcube\text{-}intersect(x, y) = 1$  if and only if  $x$  and  $y$  have a common resolution.*

**Lemma 5.8** ([IKS23, Lemma 5.10]). *The  $subcube\text{-}intersect_n$  communication problem reduces to the communication problem  $KW_{MUX_n}^u$  with no extra cost.*

Since both  $I_{l,n}$  and  $subcube\text{-}intersect_n$  are functions, the communication complexity of the associated problem can be lower bounded by the rank of the corresponding matrices.

**Theorem 5.9** ([Kan72]).

$$Rank(M_{I_n}) = 2^n, Rank(M_{I_{l,n}}) = \binom{n}{l}.$$

**Lemma 5.10** ([IKS23, Lemma 5.12]).  *$Rank(M_{subcube\text{-}intersect_n}) = 3^n$  for every  $n \geq 1$ .*

**Proposition 5.11** (Composition of the set covering and multiplexer functions). *Let  $MUX_m$  be the multiplexer function as in Definition 1.16. Let  $MC_{k,n}$  be the set covering function as in Definition 5.4, such that  $k = c \log n$  for some suitable constant  $c > 0$  as in Theorem 5.6. Then,*

$$depth_F^u(MC_{k,n} \diamond MUX_m) \geq \log(3^m) + \log \binom{n}{c \log n} \geq \log(3) \cdot m + \Omega(c(\log n)^2).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.8, we have  $KW_{MUX_m}^u \geq subcube\text{-}intersect_m$ . Theorem 5.6 shows that  $MC_{k,n} \geq I_{k,n}$ . Following Proposition 1.30, we get:

$$CC(KW_{MC_{k,n} \diamond MUX_m}^u) \geq \log(Rank(M_{subcube\text{-}intersect_m})) + \log(Rank(M_{I_{k,n}})).$$

By Lemma 5.10 and Theorem 5.9, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \log(\text{Rank}(M_{\text{subcube-intersect}_m})) + \log(\text{Rank}(M_{I_{k,n}})) = \\ & \log(3^m) + \log\binom{n}{k} \geq \log(3) \cdot m + k \cdot \log\left(\frac{n}{k}\right) = \log(3) \cdot m + c \log^2 n - c \log(n) \log(c \log n) = \\ & \log(3) \cdot m + (1 + o(1))c \log^2 n. \end{aligned}$$

The claim now follows from Theorem 1.15.  $\square$

**Remark 5.12.** *As  $MC_{k,n}$  is monotone, it equals its hazard-derivative at  $\bar{0}$ , which is also the “hardest” derivative (this can be inferred from the proof of Theorem 1.10). Hence, a formula for the hazard-derivative of  $MC_{k,n} \diamond MUX_m$  can be obtained from composing the monotone formula for  $MC_{k,n}$  with that of the hazard-derivative of  $MUX_m$  (recall Lemma 2.5). As shown in [IKS23, Proposition 3.1], every hazard-derivative of  $MUX_m$ , has a formula of depth  $m + \lceil \log(m+1) \rceil$ . Thus, every hazard-derivative of  $MC_{k,n} \diamond MUX_m$  has a monotone formula of depth  $\lceil \log\binom{n}{k} \rceil + \lceil \log n \rceil + \lceil \log k \rceil + m + \lceil \log(m+1) \rceil$ , which for our setting of parameters would give a lower bounds of  $m + (1 + o(1))c \log^2 n$ , which is worse than what Proposition 5.11 yields. Thus, Proposition 5.11 breaks the monotone barrier.*

**Remark 5.13.** *Since we are using a monotone outer function, the advantage that we can get compared to the monotone barrier must come from the inner function. Thus, Proposition 1.30 cannot yield better results from the point of view of the monotone barrier than those of the inner function.*

## 6 Andreev’s function

[IKS23] observed that the  $\text{XOR}_n$  function requires formulas of size  $\Theta(n^2)$ , while its derivative is simply the OR function. This gives mono-gap =  $\Omega(n)$ . In this section, we prove that Andreev’s function gives mono-gap of  $\Omega\left(\frac{n^2}{\log n}\right)$ .

**Definition 6.1** (Andreev’s function [And87]). *Andreev’s function, with parameters  $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , is a Boolean function over  $n = 2^k + km$  variables:*

$$\text{ANDREEV}_{k,m} : \{0,1\}^{2^k} \times \{0,1\}^{km} \rightarrow \{0,1\}.$$

*Andreev’s function receives as inputs  $f \in \{0,1\}^{2^k}$  and  $X \in \{0,1\}^{km}$ , a truth table of a Boolean function over  $k$  bits and a Boolean  $k \times m$  matrix, respectively:*

$$\text{ANDREEV}_{k,m}(f, X) := (f \diamond \text{XOR}_m)(X),$$

*where  $\text{XOR}_m : \{0,1\}^m \rightarrow \{0,1\}$  is the parity function over  $m$  bits:*

$$\text{XOR}_m(x) := x_1 + \cdots + x_m.$$

In the rest of this section, we shall use the following parameters  $n := 2^k + km$ ,  $k := \log(n/2)$ , and  $m = \frac{n}{2 \log(n/2)}$ .<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>We can take  $k$  and  $n$  to be powers of 2 so we ignore ceiling and floors for readability.

Håstad was the first to prove a near-cubic lower bound on the formula complexity of Andreev's function [Hås98] using the random restriction technique. Later, Tal [Tal14] improved the analysis to obtain the currently best lower bound of  $\Omega\left(\frac{n^3}{\log^2 n \log \log n}\right)$ . This lower bound is tight up to the  $\log \log n$  factor.

**Theorem 6.2** (Andreev's function requires cubic formulas [Tal14, Theorem 7.2]).

$$\Omega\left(\frac{n^3}{\log^2 n \log \log n}\right) \leq \text{size}_F(\text{ANDREEV}_{k,m}) \leq O\left(\frac{n^3}{\log^2 n}\right).$$

As  $\text{size}_F^u(f) \geq \text{size}_F(f)$ , this lower bound also holds in the hazard-free setting. We next bound the complexity of the hazard-derivatives of Andreev's function.

**Fact 6.3** (Parity has linear hazard-derivatives). *For every  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^m$ , it holds that  $\text{dXOR}_m(x; y) = \bigvee_{i=1}^m y_i$ .*

We denote  $\text{dXOR}_m(y) := \text{dXOR}_m(x; y)$ , since the hazard-derivative of  $\text{XOR}_m$  w.r.t to  $x$  does not depend on  $x$ .

**Claim 6.4** (Andreev's function has near linear derivatives). *For every  $f \in \{0, 1\}^{2^k}$  and  $X \in \{0, 1\}^{km}$ , it holds that:*

$$\text{size}_F^+(\text{dANDREEV}_{k,m}(f, X; \cdot, \cdot)) = (k+1)2^k + km = O(n \log(n)).$$

*Proof.* By Definition 1.16, we have:

$$\text{ANDREEV}_{k,m}(f; X) = (f \diamond \text{XOR}_m)(X) = f(\text{XOR}_m[X]) = \text{MUX}_k(f, \text{XOR}_m[X]).$$

Let  $f \in \{0, 1\}^{2^k}$  and  $X \in \{0, 1\}^{km}$ . We describe a monotone formula for the hazard-derivative of  $\text{ANDREEV}_{k,m}$  w.r.t to  $f$  and  $X$ , denoted  $\text{dANDREEV}_{k,m}(f, X; \cdot)$ . Let  $t \in \{0, 1\}^{2^k}$  be a perturbation for  $f$  and  $Y \in \{0, 1\}^{km}$  be a perturbation for  $X$ . Since the hazard-derivative of  $\text{XOR}_m$  does not depend on  $x$ , by Fact 6.3 we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{XOR}_m[X] + \text{udXOR}_m[Y] &= \\ &= (\text{XOR}_m(X_1) + \text{udXOR}_m(X_1; Y_1), \dots, \text{XOR}_m(X_n) + \text{udXOR}_m(X_n; Y_n)) = \\ &= \text{XOR}_m[X + uY]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dANDREEV}_{k,m}(f, X; t, Y) = 1 &\iff \\ \widetilde{\text{ANDREEV}}_{k,m}(f + ut, X + uY) = u &\iff \\ \widetilde{\text{MUX}}_k(f + ut, \text{XOR}_m[X + uY]) = u &\iff \\ \widetilde{\text{MUX}}_k(f + ut, \text{XOR}_m[X] + \text{udXOR}_m[Y]) = u &\iff \\ \text{dMUX}_k(f, \text{XOR}_m[X]; t, \text{dXOR}_m[Y]) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can use a monotone formula for  $\text{dXOR}_m[Y]$ , which is a simply  $k$  disjoint  $\text{OR}_m$  formulas, that feed into the monotone formula for  $\text{dMUX}_k(f, \text{XOR}_m[X]; t, y)$ , as described in Proposition 1.18.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.5** (Andreev’s function has near quadratic monotone gap).

$$\text{mono-gap}(\text{ANDREEV}_{k,m}) = \Omega\left(\frac{n^2}{\log n}\right).$$

*Proof.* Immediate result of Theorem 6.2 and Claim 6.4. □

## 7 Open problems

The most obvious open problem is determining whether the universal hazard-free formula size upper bound in the worst case is equal to that of a random function.

**Question 7.1.** *Is it true that for every Boolean function  $n : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\text{size}_F^u(f) \leq 2^{(1+o(1))n}$ ?*

Another interesting question is whether our Theorem 1.26 also holds for circuits.

**Question 7.2.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-constant Boolean function. Is it true that there exists  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that:*

$$\text{size}_C^+(df(x; \cdot)) = \text{size}_C^u(f),$$

*if and only if  $f$  is a unate function?*

The validity of the KRW conjecture in the hazard-free setting is also an intriguing question. Many previous works on the KRW conjecture have considered restricted versions to gain intuition and develop tools, including [KRW95, HW93, EIRS01, GMWW17, KM18, Mei20], among others. We believe that the hazard-free KRW conjecture presents an interesting restricted model to study, with potential applications to all Boolean functions.

**Conjecture 1.24** (Hazard-Free KRW conjecture). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be non-constant Boolean functions. Then the following holds:*

$$\text{depth}_F^u(f \diamond g) \approx \text{depth}_F^u(f) + \text{depth}_F^u(g).$$

Finally, we consider block compositions with the XOR function. Recall that the hazard-free complexity of  $\text{XOR}_n$  is equal to its standard formula complexity. Additionally, its prime implicants and prime implicates are  $f^{-1}(1)$  and  $f^{-1}(0)$ , respectively, meaning its hazard-free and the classic KW games are equivalent. This naturally leads to the question of whether the lower bound proof of Dinur and Meir [DM18] can be adapted to the hazard-free setting. Specifically, we wonder if, in the following theorem, one can replace  $\text{size}_F$  with  $\text{size}_F^u$ .

**Theorem 7.3** (Composition over parity [DM18, Theorem 3.1]). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a non-constant Boolean function. Then:*

$$\text{size}_F(f \diamond \text{XOR}_m) \geq \frac{\text{size}_F(f) \cdot \text{size}_F(\text{XOR}_m)}{2^{\tilde{O}(\sqrt{k+\log m})}},$$

where  $\tilde{O}(t) := O(t \cdot \log^{O(1)} t)$ .

## Acknowledgements

The first author would like to thank Maya Baruch for her invaluable discussions on various topics, insightful feedback on the proofs, and support in articulating ideas clearly. She is also grateful to Ido Weinstein and Rotem Zaluf for their willingness to listen to her early ideas, which contributed to identifying and correcting mistakes in the initial stages of this project.

## References

- [AB87] Noga Alon and Ravi B. Boppana. The monotone circuit complexity of boolean functions. *Combinatorica*, 7:1–22, 1987. doi:[10.1007/BF02579196](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02579196).
- [And87] Alexander E. Andreev. On a method for obtaining more than quadratic effective lower bounds for the complexity of  $\pi$ -schemes. *Moscow Univ. Math. Bull.*, 42(1):63–66, 1987.
- [DM18] Irit Dinur and Or Meir. Toward the krw composition conjecture: Cubic formula lower bounds via communication complexity. *Computational Complexity*, 27:375–462, 09 2018. doi:[10.1007/s00037-017-0159-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00037-017-0159-x).
- [Eic65] Edward B. Eichelberger. Hazard detection in combinational and sequential switching circuits. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 9(2):90–99, 1965. doi:[10.1147/rd.92.0090](https://doi.org/10.1147/rd.92.0090).
- [EIRS01] Jeff Edmonds, Russell Impagliazzo, Steven Rudich, and Jiří Sgall. Communication complexity towards lower bounds on circuit depth. *Comput. Complexity*, 10(3):210–246, 2001. doi:[10.1007/s00037-001-8195-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00037-001-8195-x).
- [GMWW17] Dmitry Gavinsky, Or Meir, Omri Weinstein, and Avi Wigderson. Toward better formula lower bounds: The composition of a function and a universal relation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 46(1):114–131, 2017. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1018319>, doi:[10.1137/15M1018319](https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1018319).
- [Hås98] Johan Håstad. The shrinkage exponent of de morgan formulas is 2. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 27(1):48–64, 1998. doi:[10.1137/S0097539794261556](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539794261556).
- [Huf57] David A. Huffman. The design and use of hazard-free switching networks. *J. ACM*, 4(1):47–62, 1 1957. doi:[10.1145/320856.320866](https://doi.org/10.1145/320856.320866).
- [HW93] Johan Håstad and Avi Wigderson. Composition of the universal relation. In *Advances in computational complexity theory (New Brunswick, NJ, 1990)*, volume 13 of *DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, pages 119–134. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1993. doi:[10.1090/dimacs/013/07](https://doi.org/10.1090/dimacs/013/07).
- [IKL<sup>+</sup>19] Christian Ikenmeyer, Balagopal Komarath, Christoph Lenzen, Vladimir Lysikov, Andrey Mokhov, and KartEEK SreenivasaiAH. On the complexity of hazard-free circuits. *J. ACM*, 66(4), August 2019. doi:[10.1145/3320123](https://doi.org/10.1145/3320123).

- [IKS23] Christian Ikenmeyer, Balagopal Komarath, and Nitin Saurabh. Karchmer-Wigderson Games for Hazard-Free Computation. In *14th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2023)*, volume 251 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 74:1–74:25. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/lipics.itcs.2023.74>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2023.74.
- [Juk21] Stasys Jukna. Notes on hazard-free circuits. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 35(2):770–787, 2021. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1355240>, doi:10.1137/20M1355240.
- [Kan72] William M. Kantor. On incidence matrices of finite projective and affine spaces. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 124:315–318, 1972. doi:10.1007/BF01113923.
- [Kar89] Mauricio Karchmer. *Communication Complexity: A New Approach to Circuit Depth*. The MIT Press, 08 1989. doi:10.7551/mitpress/1948.001.0001.
- [Kle52] Stephen Cole Kleene. *Introduction to metamathematics*. D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., New York, 1952.
- [KM18] Sajin Koroth and Or Meir. Improved composition theorems for functions and relations. In *Approximation, randomization, and combinatorial optimization. Algorithms and techniques*, volume 116 of *LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform.*, pages Art. No. 48, 18. Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2018.
- [KN96] Eyal Kushilevitz and Noam Nisan. *Communication Complexity*. Cambridge University Press, 1996. doi:10.1017/CB09780511574948.
- [KRW95] Mauricio Karchmer, Ran Raz, and Avi Wigderson. Super-logarithmic depth lower bounds via the direct sum in communication complexity. *Computational Complexity*, 5:191–204, 1995. doi:10.1007/BF01206317.
- [KW90] Mauricio Karchmer and Avi Wigderson. Monotone circuits for connectivity require super-logarithmic depth. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 3(2):255–265, 1990. arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1137/0403021>, doi:10.1137/0403021.
- [McC86] Edward J. McCluskey. *Logic design principles with emphasis on testable semicustom circuits*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., USA, 1986.
- [Mei20] Or Meir. Toward better depth lower bounds: Two results on the multiplexor relation. *Computational Complexity*, 29(1):4, 2020. doi:10.1007/s00037-020-00194-8.
- [Muk72] Masao Mukaidono. On the B-ternary logical function—A ternary logic considering ambiguity. *Syst. Comput. Controls*, 3(3):27–36, 1972.
- [Mul56] David E. Muller. Complexity in electronic switching circuits. *IRE Transactions on Electronic Computers*, EC-5(1):15–19, 1956. doi:10.1109/TEC.1956.5219786.
- [ND95] Steven M. Nowick and David L. Dill. Exact two-level minimization of hazard-free logic with multiple-input changes. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 14(8):986–997, 1995. doi:10.1109/43.402498.



- [Raz85] Alexander A. Razborov. Lower bounds on the monotone complexity of some Boolean function. *Soviet Math. Dokl.*, 31:354–357, 1985.
- [Raz90] Alexander A. Razborov. Applications of matrix methods to the theory of lower bounds in computational complexity. *Combinatorica*, 10:81–93, 1990. [doi:10.1007/BF02122698](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02122698).
- [RMN<sup>+</sup>24] Susanna F. de Rezende, Or Meir, Jakob Nordström, Toniann Pitassi, and Robert Robere. Krw composition theorems via lifting. *Computational Complexity*, 33(1):1–97, 2024. [doi:10.1007/s00037-024-00250-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00037-024-00250-7).
- [RS42] John Riordan and Claude E. Shannon. The number of two-terminal series-parallel networks. *Journal of Mathematics and Physics*, 21(1-4):83–93, 1942. [doi:10.1002/sapm194221183](https://doi.org/10.1002/sapm194221183).
- [RY20] Anup Rao and Amir Yehudayoff. *Communication Complexity: and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2020. [doi:10.1017/9781108671644](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108671644).
- [Sha49] Claude E. Shannon. The synthesis of two-terminal switching circuits. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 28(1):59–98, 1949. URL: <https://10.1002/j.1538-7305.1949.tb03624.x>, [doi:10.1002/j.1538-7305.1949.tb03624.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1949.tb03624.x).
- [Tal14] Avishay Tal. Shrinkage of de morgan formulae by spectral techniques. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 551–560, 2014. [doi:10.1109/FOCS.2014.65](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2014.65).
- [Tar88] Éva Tardos. The gap between monotone and non-monotone circuit complexity is exponential. *Combinatorica*, 8:141–142, 1988. [doi:10.1007/BF02122563](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02122563).

## A Communication complexity

We consider Yao’s communication model. We mostly follow definitions from [KN96]

When the communication problem is defined as a function  $\Phi : X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ , Alice and Bob must output a *unique* value  $f(x, y)$  for every input  $(x, y)$ . However, communication problems can be generalized to *relations*, where for some inputs  $(x, y)$ , there may be multiple valid outputs.

**Definition A.1** (Communication problem [KN96, Definition 5.1]). *Let  $X, Y$  and  $Z$  be arbitrary finite sets. Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  be a relation. The communication problem  $\mathcal{R}$  is defined as follows: Alice receives  $x \in X$ , Bob receives  $y \in Y$  and they have to output some  $z \in Z$  such that  $(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$ .*

Note that there can be *illegal* inputs  $(x, y)$  for which no  $z$  satisfies  $(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since such inputs are never given to Alice and Bob, we can assume that every  $z \in Z$  is a valid answer.

**Definition A.2** (Communication protocol [KN96, Definition 1.2]). *A protocol  $P$  over domain  $X \times Y$  with range  $Z$  is represented as binary tree where each internal node  $v$  is labeled either by a function  $a_v : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  or by a function  $b_v : Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , and each leaf is labeled with an element  $z \in Z$ . For every node  $v$  in the protocol tree, we denote by  $N_v$  as the set of inputs  $(x, y)$  that reach this node.*



The protocol  $P$  is said to calculate a relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  [KN96, Definition 5.2] if, for every legal input  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ , the protocol reaches a leaf marked by a value  $z$  such that  $(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$ .

The *cost* of the protocol  $P$ , denoted  $CC(P)$ , is the height of the binary tree, which is the maximum number of bits sent in the worst-case scenario.

**Definition A.3** (Communication matrix). *Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  be a communication problem. Let  $\mathcal{X} = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(k)})$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = (y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(l)})$  be an arbitrary ordering of the elements of  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively. The communication matrix of  $\mathcal{R}$ , denoted  $M_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}} \in \mathbf{P}(Z)^{k \times l}$ , is defined as follows:*

$$\forall i \in [k], j \in [l]. (M_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}})_{i,j} = \{z \in Z : (x^{(i)}, y^{(j)}, z) \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

We sometimes refer to  $\mathcal{X}$  as the row labels and to  $\mathcal{Y}$  as the column labels of the matrix.

**Definition A.4** (Combinatorial rectangle [KN96, Definition 1.12]). *A combinatorial rectangle in  $X \times Y$  is a subset  $Rec \subseteq X \times Y$ , such that  $Rec = A \times B$  for some  $A \subseteq X$  and  $B \subseteq Y$ .*

**Definition A.5** ( $\mathcal{R}$ -monochromatic rectangle [KN96, Definition 5.3]). *Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  be a relation. A combinatorial rectangle  $Rec = A \times B$  is a  $\mathcal{R}$ -monochromatic rectangle if there exists a value  $z \in Z$ , such that for every  $(x, y) \in A \times B$  either  $(x, y, z) \in \mathcal{R}$  or  $(x, y)$  is an illegal input.*

The following propositions, proven in [KN96] for communication problems that are functions, also apply to relations:

**Proposition A.6** (Protocol leaf as a  $\mathcal{R}$ -monochromatic rectangle [KN96, Proposition 1.14]). *Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  be a relation. Let  $P$  be a protocol that solves  $\mathcal{R}$ . Let  $\ell$  be a leaf in  $P$ 's binary tree, then  $N_{\ell}$  is a  $\mathcal{R}$ -monochromatic rectangle.*

**Proposition A.7** (Protocol as a partition [KN96, Proposition 5.4]). *Any protocol  $P$  that solves a relation  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  induces a partition of  $X \times Y$  into  $\mathcal{R}$ -monochromatic rectangles. The number of rectangles, denoted  $mono-rec(P)$ , is the number of the leaves in  $P$ .*

**Remark A.8.** *Every protocol  $P$  induces a partition, but not every partition can be induced by protocol. An example is given in [KN96, Figure 2.1].*

**Definition A.9** (Communication complexity of a relation [KN96, Definition 1.2] [KN96, Definition 5.2]). *Let  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$  be a relation. The communication complexity of  $\mathcal{R}$ , denoted  $CC(\mathcal{R})$ , is the minimum cost of  $P$  over all protocols that compute  $\mathcal{R}$ . Another complexity measure we consider is the minimum number of leaves in  $P$  over all protocols that compute  $\mathcal{R}$ , denoted  $mono-rec(\mathcal{R})$ .*

When the associated relation is a *Boolean function*, we have the following rank lower bound.

**Lemma A.10** (Rank lower bound [KN96, Lemma 1.28]). *For any function  $f : X \times Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  it holds that:*

$$CC(f) \geq \log_2(2Rank(M_f) - 1),$$

$$mono-rec(f) \geq 2Rank(M_f) - 1.$$

## B Missing proofs from Section 2

We restate and prove Lemma 2.16.

**Lemma 2.16** (The prime implicants of a unate Boolean function in  $x_i$ ). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a Boolean function. Then:*

1.  $f$  is positive unate in variable  $x_i$  if and only if there is no  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  such that  $(p_1)_i = 0$ .
2.  $f$  is negative unate in variable  $x_i$  if and only if there is no  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  such that  $(p_1)_i = 1$ .

*Proof.* We prove (1), as (2) can be proved analogously.

$\Rightarrow$  Assume toward contradiction that there exists  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  such that  $(p_1)_i = 0$ . Since  $f$  is positive unate in  $x_i$ , then for every  $z \in R(p_1)$  it holds that:

$$1 = f(z) \leq f(z|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}).$$

Hence,  $p_1|_{i \rightsquigarrow u} \in I_1^{(f)}$ , in contradiction to our assumption that  $p_1$  is a *prime* implicant of  $f$ .

$\Leftarrow$  Assume toward contradiction  $f$  is not positive unate in  $x_i$ . Therefore, there exists  $z \in \{0, 1\}^n$  such that:

$$0 = f(z|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}) < f(z|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}) = 1.$$

Hence, there exist  $p_1 \in P_1^{(f)}$  and  $p_0 \in P_0^{(f)}$  such that  $p_1 \stackrel{u}{\leq} z|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}$  and  $p_0 \stackrel{u}{\leq} z|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}$ . We must have  $(p_1)_i = 0$ , otherwise,  $(p_1)_i = u$  and then we get  $f(z|_{i \rightsquigarrow 1}) = f(z|_{i \rightsquigarrow 0}) = 1$ .  $\square$

The proof of Lemma 2.17 is similar.

## C Missing proof from Section 5

Here we prove Lemma 5.2. For the proof we require the next simple lemma.

**Lemma C.1.** *Let  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a ternary function. Let  $P \in \{0, u, 1\}^{nm}$  be a ternary  $n \times m$  matrix. Then:*

$$R(\tilde{g}[P]) = \{g[Z] : Z \in R(P)\}.$$

*Proof.*  $\subseteq$ : Let  $z \in R(\tilde{g}[P]) = R((\tilde{g}(P_1), \dots, \tilde{g}(P_n)))$ . Let  $i \in [n]$ . We show that there exists  $Z_i \in R(P_i)$  such that  $g(Z_i) = z_i$ . Indeed, if  $\tilde{g}(P_i) = z_i$ , we can choose any  $Z_i \in R(P_i)$ . Otherwise,  $\tilde{g}(P_i) = u$ . Therefore, we can choose  $Z_i \in R(P_i)$  such that  $g(Z_i) = z_i$ . Hence, we get that the matrix  $Z$ , whose rows are  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$ , satisfies that  $Z \in R(P)$  and  $g[Z] = z$  as required.

$\supseteq$ : Let  $Z \in R(P)$ . Assume toward contradiction that  $g[Z] \notin R(\tilde{g}[P])$ . Since  $g[Z]$  is Boolean, there must exist some  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $i \in [n]$  such that  $(\tilde{g}[P])_i = \tilde{g}(P_i) = b$  and  $(g[Z])_i = g(Z_i) = -b$ . As  $Z_i \in R(P_i)$ , by Definition 1.8 we have that  $g(Z_i) = b$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

We now restate and prove Lemma 5.2.

**Lemma 5.2** (Hazard-free extension of composition). *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $g : \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be Boolean functions. Then:*

$$\widetilde{f \diamond g} = \tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $P \in \{0, u, 1\}^{nm}$  be a ternary input and let  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ . By Definition 1.8 and Lemma C.1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \widetilde{f \diamond g}(P) = b \\
& \iff \forall Z \in R(P). f \diamond g(Z) = b \\
& \iff \forall Z \in R(P). f(g[Z]) = b \\
& \iff \forall z \in R(\tilde{g}[P]). f(z) = b \\
& \iff \tilde{f}(\tilde{g}[P]) = b \\
& \iff \tilde{f} \diamond \tilde{g}(P) = b.
\end{aligned}$$

□