

Three announcements

- ① 3 problem sets (not 4)
Pset 2 was posted on Friday
- ② You have to provide at least one solution on Piazza to pass a pset. This holds also for pset 1
(Plus you need at least a C on the pset itself to pass, but local TCS students usually get an A)
- ③ Time to start thinking about a research paper to present

LAST TIME

Saw an application of the POLYNOMIAL METHOD

- ① Given subset K satisfying some algebraic conditions, construct nonzero low-degree polynomial g that vanishes on all $x \in K$
- ② Use algebraic conditions on K to show that in fact g (or some relative g^*) vanishes on a set K' such that $|K'| \gg |K|$
- ③ Conclude that g (or g^*) has to be identically zero. Contradiction. Hence properties of K "impossibly good"

Recall Kakeya set $K \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$
 "contains a line in every direction"

$$\forall \vec{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \exists \vec{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$$

$$L_{\vec{y}, \vec{x}} = \{y + ax \mid a \in \mathbb{F}_q\} \subseteq K$$

Also considered "somewhat" Kakeya sets
 or "statistical" Kakeya sets

$K \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ (δ, γ) -Kakeya set if

$$\exists L \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n \text{ (good directions)}, |L| \geq \delta \cdot q^n$$

$$\forall \vec{x} \in L \exists \vec{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$$

$$|L_{\vec{y}, \vec{x}} \cap K| \geq \gamma \cdot q$$

First proved lower bound

$$|K| \geq C_n \cdot q^{n-1}$$

using statistical Kakeya set

(1) Construct low-degree homogeneous $g \in \mathbb{F}_q[\vec{x}]$
 s.t. $g(\vec{x}) = 0 \quad \forall \vec{x} \in K$

(2) By homogeneity $g(\vec{y}) = 0 \quad \forall \vec{y}$ on lines
 through 0 and $\vec{x} \in K$

(3) For direction $\vec{x} \in L$, can find line
 $\ell = \{\vec{a} + t\vec{x} \mid t \in \mathbb{F}_q\}$ such that

(a) $x \in \ell$

(b) $g|_{\ell}$ has many zeros (and is univariate polynomial
 in t).

(4) Hence $g(x) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{L}$

But this set is too large!

Contradicts Schwartz-Zippel lemma $\Rightarrow$

g zero after all $\rightarrow$

Contradicts that K can be small

Then proved lower bound

$$|K| \geq C_n \cdot q^n$$

(1) Let K real Kakeya set (not statistical).
Construct low-degree poly that vanishes on K .

(2) write $g = \bar{g} + g^*$

$\bar{g}$ homogeneous part of max degree d ($d \neq 0$)

(3) For any $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \exists \vec{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ s.t.
 $\{\vec{y} + a\vec{x} \mid a \in \mathbb{F}_q\} \subseteq K$

Then $h(t) = g(\vec{y} + t\vec{x})$ has many zeros and must be identically zero $\Rightarrow h = \sum_{i=0}^d a_i t^i$ with all $a_i = 0$

(4) But coefficient a_d in $h(t)$ is $a_d = \bar{g}(\vec{x})$, so $\bar{g}(\vec{x}) = 0 \quad \forall \vec{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$

Contradicts Schwartz-Zippel, so K cannot be this small.

OK, so now we know

$$|K| \geq C_n \cdot q^n$$

and question is settled, right?

Not quite ... What is C_n ?

IV

$C_n \leq 1$ since $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ is a Kakeya set

In fact, Dvir showed there are Kakeya sets for

$$C_n \approx \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$$

Lower bound from last lecture yields

$$C_n \geq 1/n!$$

[Saraf & Sudan]: $C_n \geq 1/(2.6)^n$

TODAY AND NEXT LECTURE

Show result from

(Conference version earlier)

[Dvir, Kopparty, Saraf & Sudan '13]

that $C_n \geq 1/2^n$

Effectively closes the gap (except for factor 2)

Improves state-of-the-art randomness extractors (we won't have time to talk about this)

- ① Given set K satisfying algebraic properties, construct nonzero low-degree $g \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ that vanishes on K with high multiplicity
- ② Use algebraic conditions on K to show that g (or relative g^*) vanishes on larger set with high multiplicity
- ③ Conclude that g (or g^*) has to be identically zero, using beefed-up version of Schwartz - Zippel. Contradicts "too good" properties of K

To warm up, look at univariate polynomials. over, say, $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{Q}$.

$$p(a) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad (x-a) \mid p(x)$$

$$a \text{ multiple zero if } (x-a)^2 \mid p(x)$$

$$p(x) = (x-a)^2 q(x)$$

$$p'(x) = 2(x-a)q(x) + (x-a)^2 q'(x)$$

so p and derivative p' share zero a .

$$p(x) = x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$$

$$p(x) = (x-1)^3$$

1 zero of multiplicity 3

$$p'(x) = 3(x-1)^2$$

$$p''(x) = 6(x-1)$$

} also have 1 as zero

Now look at $(x-1)^3$ over, say, $\mathbb{F}_3$

$$p(x) = (x-1)^3 = x^3 - 1$$

$$p'(x) = 0$$

lost all info. Can't distinguish between, e.g.,

$(x-1)^3$ and identically zero polynomial.

Not nice.

Standard derivative not so helpful in positive characteristic.

Define instead HASSE DERIVATIVE

For $p(x) = \sum a_k x^k$, the i th Hasse derivative is

$$p^{(i)}(x) = \sum \binom{k}{i} a_k x^{k-i}$$

Need to generalize this to multivariate case.

From now on, write

$$\vec{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$$

$$\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

etc (perhaps sometimes even without vector arrow)

$\vec{i}$ will denote vector of (non-negative) exponents

$$\text{WEIGHT } w(\vec{i}) = \sum_{j=1}^n i_j$$

For compactness of notation

$$\vec{x}^{\vec{i}} = \prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{i_j}$$

$$\text{Note that } \deg(\vec{x}^{\vec{i}}) = w(\vec{i})$$

Also use notation

$$\binom{\vec{i}}{\vec{j}} = \prod_{k=1}^n \binom{i_k}{j_k}$$

LEMMA 1 Let $\vec{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ and

$\vec{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ and $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$

and consider

$$(\vec{z} + \vec{w})^{\vec{r}} = (z_1 + w_1)^{r_1} \dots (z_n + w_n)^{r_n} \quad (*)$$

Then the coefficient of $\vec{z}^{\vec{i}} w^{\vec{r}-\vec{i}}$ in (*) equals $\binom{\vec{r}}{\vec{i}}$

Proof Exercise.

DEF 2 For $p(\vec{x}) \in F[\vec{x}]$ and $\vec{v} = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ non-negative, the $\vec{v}$ th HATSE DERIVATIVE of p , denoted $p^{(\vec{v})}(\vec{x})$ is the coefficient of $\vec{x}^{\vec{v}}$ in the polynomial

$$\hat{p}(\vec{x}, \vec{z}) := p(\vec{x} + \vec{z}) \in F[\vec{x}, \vec{z}].$$

In particular

$$p(\vec{x} + \vec{z}) = \sum_{\vec{v}} p^{(\vec{v})}(\vec{x}) \vec{z}^{\vec{v}} \quad (*)$$

EXAMPLE A Let $p(\vec{x}) = 2x_1^3 + x_2x_3^2$

$$p(\vec{x} + \vec{z}) = 2(x_1 + z_1)^3 + (x_2 + z_2)(x_3 + z_3)^2$$

$$= 2x_1^3 + 6x_1^2z_1 + 6x_1z_1^2 + 2z_1^3$$

$$+ x_2x_3^2 + 2x_2x_3z_3 + x_2z_3^2$$

$$+ z_3^2z_2 + 2z_3z_2z_3 + z_2z_3^2$$

$$= (2x_1^3 + x_2x_3^2) \cdot \vec{z}^{(0,0,0)}$$

$$+ (6x_1^2) \cdot \vec{z}^{(1,0,0)}$$

$$+ (6x_1) \cdot \vec{z}^{(2,0,0)}$$

$$+ (2) \cdot \vec{z}^{(3,0,0)}$$

$$+ (x_3^2) \cdot \vec{z}^{(0,1,0)}$$

$$+ (2x_2x_3) \cdot \vec{z}^{(0,0,1)}$$

$$+ (2x_3) \cdot \vec{z}^{(0,1,1)}$$

$$+ (x_2) \cdot \vec{z}^{(0,0,2)}$$

$$+ (2x_1) \cdot \vec{z}^{(0,1,2)}$$

$$p^{(0,0,0)} = 2x_1^3 + x_2x_3^2$$

$$p^{(1,0,0)} = 6x_1^2$$

$$p^{(2,0,0)} = 6x_1$$

$$p^{(3,0,0)} = 2$$

$$p^{(0,1,0)} = x_3^2$$

$$p^{(0,0,1)} = 2x_2x_3$$

$$p^{(0,1,1)} = 2x_3$$

$$p^{(0,0,2)} = x_2$$

$$p^{(0,1,2)} = 1$$

PROPOSITION 3 (Basic properties of Hasse derivatives)

IX

$$1. \quad p^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{x}) + q^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{x}) = (p+q)^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{x})$$

2. If $p(\vec{x})$ is homogeneous of degree d , then either $p^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{x})$ is homogeneous of degree $d - \text{wt}(\vec{i})$ or $p^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{x}) = 0$

3. Let $H_Q(\vec{x})$ denote the homogeneous part of Q of highest total degree.

Then either $(H_p)^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{x}) = H_{p^{(\vec{i})}}(\vec{x})$

or $(H_p)^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{x}) = 0$

$$4. \quad (p^{(\vec{i})})^{(\vec{j})}(\vec{x}) = \binom{\vec{i}+\vec{j}}{\vec{i}} p^{(\vec{i},\vec{j})}(\vec{x})$$

Note that (1)-(3) are the same as for standard derivatives but (4) is not!

However (4) says that if $(\vec{i}+\vec{j})$ th derivative is zero, then $\vec{j}$ th derivative of $\vec{i}$ th derivative is also zero, which will be critical

Proof of Prop 3

Exercise.

DEF 4 (MULTIPLICITY)

X

For $p(\vec{x}) \in \mathbb{F}[\vec{x}]$ and $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{F}^n$, the MULTIPLICITY OF p AT $\vec{a}$, denoted $\text{mult}(p, \vec{a})$, is the largest integer M such that for every nonnegative $\vec{i}$ with $\text{wt}(\vec{i}) < M$ it holds that $p^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{a}) = 0$

If M can be taken arbitrarily large, we set $\text{mult}(p, \vec{a}) = \infty$

Note that:

- (1) $\text{mult}(p, \vec{a}) \geq 0$ for every $\vec{a}$ (vacuously)
- (2) $p(\vec{a}) = 0$ if and only if $\text{mult}(p, \vec{a}) \geq 1$ (since $p^{(\vec{0})}(\vec{x}) = p(\vec{x})$)
- (3) Condition $p^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{a}) = 0$ imposes homogeneous linear constraint on coefficients of p

Suppose weight limit M

$$\begin{aligned} & \# \vec{i} \text{ s.t. } \text{wt}(\vec{i}) < M \\ & \equiv \# \vec{i} \text{ s.t. } i_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^n i_j \leq M-1 \\ & = \binom{M+n-1}{n} \end{aligned}$$

So $\text{mult}(p, \vec{a}) \geq M$ imposes at most $\binom{M+n-1}{n}$ homogeneous linear constraints of coefficients of $p(\vec{x})$

In a further twist, we will need to extend this definition to tuples of polynomials

$$\vec{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m) \in \mathbb{F}[\vec{x}]^m$$

Define

$$\vec{p}^{(\vec{i})} = (p_1^{(\vec{i})}, \dots, p_m^{(\vec{i})})$$

then

$$\text{mult}(\vec{p}, \vec{a}) = \min_{j \in [m]} (\text{mult}(p_j, \vec{a}))$$

We need to translate some of the properties of Hasse derivatives into properties of multiplicities

LEMMA 5 If $\text{mult}(p, \vec{a}) = s$,
then $\text{mult}(p^{(\vec{i})}, \vec{a}) \geq s - \text{wt}(\vec{i})$

Proof By assumption, for any $\vec{k}$ with $\text{wt}(\vec{k}) < s$ we have $p^{(\vec{k})}(\vec{a}) = 0$.

Take any $\vec{j}$ s.t. ~~$\text{wt}(\vec{j}) < s - \text{wt}(\vec{i})$~~
 ~~$\text{wt}(\vec{j}) < s - \text{wt}(\vec{i})$~~ $\text{wt}(\vec{j}) \leq s - \text{wt}(\vec{i})$.

$$\text{We have } (p^{(\vec{i})})^{(\vec{j})}(\vec{a}) = \binom{\vec{i} + \vec{j}}{\vec{i} \vec{j}} p^{(\vec{i} + \vec{j})}(\vec{a})$$

Since $\text{wt}(\vec{i} + \vec{j}) = \text{wt}(\vec{i}) + \text{wt}(\vec{j}) < s$
 $p^{(\vec{i} + \vec{j})}(\vec{a}) = 0$ and hence $(p^{(\vec{i})})^{(\vec{j})}(\vec{a}) = 0$.

Thus $\text{mult}(p^{(\vec{i})}, \vec{a}) \geq s - \text{wt}(\vec{i})$.

Now let us see what happens with multiplicities when we compose polynomial tuples.

XII

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{x} &= (x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ \vec{y} &= (y_1, \dots, y_\ell)\end{aligned}$$

$$\vec{p} = (p_1(\vec{x}), \dots, p_m(\vec{x})) \in F[\vec{x}]^m$$

$$\vec{q} = (q_1(\vec{y}), \dots, q_n(\vec{y})) \in F[\vec{y}]^n$$

Define the polynomial tuple

$$\vec{p} \circ \vec{q}(\vec{y}) \in F[\vec{y}]^m$$

by

$$\vec{p} \circ \vec{q}(\vec{y}) =$$

$$(p_1(q_1(\vec{y}), \dots, q_n(\vec{y})), \dots, p_m(q_1(\vec{y}), \dots, q_n(\vec{y})))$$

PROPOSITION 6

For any $\vec{a} \in F^\ell$ it holds that

$$\text{mult}(\vec{p} \circ \vec{q}, \vec{a}) \geq \text{mult}(\vec{p}, \vec{q}(\vec{a})) \cdot \text{mult}(\vec{q} - \vec{q}(\vec{a}), \vec{a}).$$

In particular, since $\text{mult}(\vec{q} - \vec{q}(\vec{a}), \vec{a}) \geq 1$, we have

$$\text{mult}(\vec{p} \circ \vec{q}, \vec{a}) \geq \text{mult}(\vec{p}, \vec{q}(\vec{a}))$$

Proof

$$\text{Let } m_1 = \text{mult}(\vec{p}, \vec{q}(\vec{a}))$$

$$m_2 = \text{mult}(\vec{q} - \vec{q}(\vec{a}), \vec{a}) > 0$$

If $m_1 = 0$ there is nothing to prove

Assume $m_1 > 0$ (so that $\vec{p}(\vec{q}(\vec{a})) = \vec{0}$.)

By liberal use of (+) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{p}(\vec{q}(\vec{a} + \vec{z})) &= \\ &= \vec{p}\left(\vec{q}(\vec{a}) + \sum_{\vec{i} \neq 0} q^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{a}) \vec{z}^{\vec{i}}\right) \quad [\text{by (+)}] \\ &= \vec{p}\left(\vec{q}(\vec{a}) + \sum_{\text{wt}(\vec{i}) \geq m_2} \vec{q}^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{a}) \vec{z}^{\vec{i}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

[smaller derivatives of $\vec{q} = 0$ since $\text{mult}(\vec{q} - \vec{q}(\vec{a}), \vec{a}) = m_2$]

$$= \vec{p}\left(\vec{q}(\vec{a}) + \vec{h}(\vec{z})\right)$$

$$\left[\vec{h}(\vec{z}) = \sum_{\text{wt}(\vec{i}) \geq m_2} \vec{q}^{(\vec{i})}(\vec{a}) \vec{z}^{\vec{i}} \right]$$

$$= \vec{p}(\vec{q}(\vec{a})) + \sum_{\vec{j} \neq 0} \vec{p}^{(\vec{j})}(\vec{q}(\vec{a})) \vec{h}(\vec{z})^{\vec{j}}$$

[by (+)]

$$= \sum_{\text{wt}(\vec{f}) \geq m_1} \vec{p}(\vec{f}) (\vec{q}(\vec{a})) \vec{h}(\vec{z})$$

XIV
(*)

[since $\text{mult}(\vec{p}, \vec{q}(\vec{a})) = m_1 > 0$]

Now:

- Each monomial $\vec{z}^{\vec{l}}$ in $\vec{h}$ has $\text{wt}(\vec{l}) \geq m_2$.

- Also, each occurrence of $\vec{h}(\vec{z})$ is raised to $\vec{f}$ with $\text{wt}(\vec{f}) \geq m_1$.

It follows that (*) can be written in the form

$$\sum_{\text{wt}(\vec{k}) \geq m_1 + m_2} c_{\vec{k}} \vec{z}^{\vec{k}}$$

By using (+) again, it follows that $(\vec{p} \circ \vec{q})^{\vec{k}}(\vec{a}) = 0$ for $\text{wt}(\vec{k}) < m_1 + m_2$ and the proposition follows. □

COROLLARY 7

XV

Let $p(\vec{x}) \in \mathbb{F}[\vec{x}] = \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$

Let $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in \mathbb{F}^n$

Let

$$p_{\vec{a}, \vec{b}}(t) := p(\vec{a} + t \cdot \vec{b}) \in \mathbb{F}[t]^*$$

Then for any $t \in \mathbb{F}$ it holds that

$$\text{mult}(p_{\vec{a}, \vec{b}}, t) \geq \text{mult}(p, \vec{a} + t \cdot \vec{b}).$$

Proof Let $\vec{q}(t) = \vec{a} + t \vec{b} \in \mathbb{F}[t]^n$

Apply previous proposition to $p, \vec{q}$

and $p \circ \vec{q} = p_{\vec{a}, \vec{b}}$. □

Our previous lower bounds on Kakeya sets boiled down to applications of Schwartz-Zippel. We want to extend Schwartz-Zippel to take multiplicities of zeros into account

Standard form of Schwartz-Zippel says that for $p(\vec{x}) \in \mathbb{F}[\vec{x}]$ of degree d and $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, probability that

$p(\vec{a}) = 0$ when $\vec{a}$ drawn uniformly at random from S^n is $\leq d / |S|$

*) Apologies for not warning sensitive viewers, but yes, this is suddenly a univariate, standard, non-vector polynomial

Note that

$$\min(1, \text{mult}(p, \vec{a})) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p(\vec{a}) = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

then we can write Schwartz-Zippel as follows

Schwartz-Zippel Lemma, standard version

Let $p(\vec{x}) \in \mathbb{F}[\vec{x}]$, $\deg(p) \leq d$, $p \neq 0$,
and let $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$. Then

$$\sum_{\vec{a} \in S^n} \min(1, \text{mult}(p, \vec{a})) \leq d \cdot |S|^{n-1}$$

But what if p vanishes with higher multiplicity ~~of~~ on some $\vec{a}$?

Look at univariate case

Suppose $\text{mult}(p, a) \geq 2$

Then $p(x) = (x-a)^2 \cdot p^*(x)$

for $\deg(p^*) = d-2$

so p can only have $d-2$ other zeroes,
since it "wasted" multiplicity 2
on a .

The key insight (or one of them) in
[Dvir, Kopparty, Saraf, Sudan '13] is
that this holds also in general.

LEMMA 8 (SCHWARTZ-ZIPPEL WITH MULTIPLICITIES) XVII

Let $p \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ non-zero polynomial of total degree $\deg(p) \leq d$.

Then for any finite $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ it holds that

$$\sum_{a \in S^n} \text{mult}(p, \vec{a}) \leq d \cdot |S|^{n-1}$$