

# On depth-3 circuits and covering number: an explicit counter-example

Lianna Hambarzumyan <sup>\*</sup>    Hamed Hatami <sup>†</sup>    Ndiamé Ndiaye <sup>‡</sup>

October 18, 2022

## Abstract

We give a simple construction of  $n \times n$  Boolean matrices with  $\Omega(n^{4/3})$  zero entries that are free of  $2 \times 2$  all-zero submatrices and have covering number  $O(\log^4(n))$ . This construction provides an *explicit* counterexample to a conjecture of Pudlák, Rödl and Savický [9] and Research Problems 1.33, 4.9, 11.17 of Jukna [5]. These conjectures were previously refuted by Katz [6] using a probabilistic construction.

## 1 Introduction

The *covering number* of a Boolean matrix  $A$ , denoted by  $\text{Cov}(A)$ , is the smallest number of all-one submatrices covering all the one-entries of  $A$ . Covering number is a well-studied notion in complexity theory as its logarithm is the nondeterministic communication complexity of the matrix [7, Definition 2.3]. However, our study of this notion is motivated by its connections to circuit complexity. A fruitful line of work [2, 1, 10] in the 80's lead to Håstad's [4] lower bound of  $2^{\Omega(k^{\frac{1}{d-1}})}$  on the size of any depth- $d$  AC-circuit computing the parity function on  $k$  bits. While these bounds are optimal for parity, a counting argument shows that (regardless of the depth of the circuit) most functions require circuits of size  $2^{\Omega(k)}$ . However, to this day, Håstad's bound remains the strongest explicit known lower bound against small-depth circuits for any function, even in the case of  $d = 3$ .

The special case of depth-3 in particular has received significant attention as one of the simplest restricted models where our understanding is lacking [9, 3, 8]. In [9, page 523], Pudlák, Rödl and Savický proposed a graph theoretical approach towards obtaining stronger explicit lower bounds on size of these circuits. Later, Jukna refined this approach further and showed that a positive answer to the following problem would imply the incredibly strong explicit lower bound of  $2^{\Omega(k)}$  against depth-3 circuits (See [5, Problem 11.17] and the discussion that follows it).

**Problem 1.1.** *Does every  $n \times n$  Boolean matrix  $A$  with at least  $dn$  zero-entries and no  $2 \times 2$  all-zero submatrix satisfy  $\text{Cov}(A) = d^{\Omega(1)}$ ?*

Unfortunately, [Problem 1.1](#) has been resolved in the negative by Katz [6] using a probabilistic argument. The purpose of this note is to provide a simple *explicit* counter-example for [Problem 1.1](#).

---

<sup>\*</sup>School of Computer Science, McGill University. [lianna.hambarzumyan@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:lianna.hambarzumyan@mail.mcgill.ca)

<sup>†</sup>School of Computer Science, McGill University. [hatami@cs.mcgill.ca](mailto:hatami@cs.mcgill.ca). Supported by an NSERC grant.

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University. [ndiame.ndiaye@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:ndiame.ndiaye@mail.mcgill.ca)

## 2 Main result

Our main result refutes [Problem 1.1](#) with  $d = \Omega(n^{1/3})$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *There exist  $n \times n$  Boolean matrices  $A$  with  $\Omega(n^{4/3})$  zero-entries and no  $2 \times 2$  all-zero submatrices that satisfy*

$$\text{Cov}(A) = O(\log^4(n)).$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Let  $m$  be a positive integer and define the sets  $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{L} := [m] \times [2m^2]$ . We think of the elements  $\ell = (\ell_1, \ell_2) \in \mathcal{L}$  as lines  $y = \ell_1 x + \ell_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , and the elements  $p = (p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{P}$  as points in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Define the Boolean matrix  $M_{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{L}}$  according to point line incidences:

$$M_{p, \ell} = \begin{cases} 0 & p \in \ell \\ 1 & p \notin \ell \end{cases},$$

or equivalently

$$M_{p, \ell} = \begin{cases} 0 & \ell_1 p_1 + \ell_2 = p_2 \\ 1 & \ell_1 p_1 + \ell_2 \neq p_2 \end{cases},$$

for every  $p = (p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $\ell = (\ell_1, \ell_2) \in \mathcal{L}$ . Let  $n = 2m^3$ , and observe that  $M$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix that satisfies the conditions of [Theorem 2.1](#):

- (i)  $M$  has no  $2 \times 2$  all-zero submatrices since there is at most one line in  $\mathcal{L}$  that passes through any two distinct points in  $\mathcal{P}$ .
- (ii)  $M$  has at least  $m^4$  zero-entries: For any fixed  $p_1, \ell_1 \in [m]$ , and  $\ell_2 \in [m^2]$ , the point  $(p_1, p_2) := (p_1, \ell_1 p_1 + \ell_2) \in \mathcal{P}$  is on the line  $(\ell_1, \ell_2) \in \mathcal{L}$ .

We begin constructing the cover for  $M$ . Let  $q$  be a prime number and take  $(a, b, c) \in [q]^3$ . Define the sets

$$\mathcal{P}_{a,b,c}^q = \{(p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{P} : (p_1 \equiv a \pmod{q} \text{ and } p_2 \not\equiv ab + c \pmod{q})\},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{a,b,c}^q = \{(\ell_1, \ell_2) \in \mathcal{L} : (\ell_1 \equiv b \pmod{q} \text{ and } \ell_2 \equiv c \pmod{q})\},$$

and

$$R_{a,b,c}^q = \mathcal{P}_{a,b,c}^q \times \mathcal{L}_{a,b,c}^q.$$

It is clear that for any choice of  $q$  and for any  $(a, b, c) \in [q]^3$ , the set  $R_{a,b,c}^q$  is a 1-monochromatic rectangle of  $M$  because any  $[(p_1, p_2), (\ell_1, \ell_2)] \in R_{a,b,c}^q$  satisfies  $\ell_1 p_1 + \ell_2 \not\equiv p_2 \pmod{q}$ . Next, fix  $k = \lceil \log_2(2m^2) \rceil$  and let  $Q_k = \{q : q < k \text{ and } q \text{ is a prime number}\}$ . Define the set

$$S_k = \bigcup_{q \in Q_k} \bigcup_{(a,b,c) \in [q]^3} R_{a,b,c}^q.$$

We claim that  $S_k$  covers all the one-entries of  $M$ . If  $((p_1, p_2), (\ell_1, \ell_2))$  is not covered by  $S_k$ , then for all  $q \in Q_k$ , we have  $p_2 = (\ell_1 p_1 + \ell_2) \pmod{q}$ . Consequently,  $p_2 = (\ell_1 p_1 + \ell_2) \pmod{\prod_{q \in Q_k} q}$ . However, since both  $p_2$  and  $\ell_1 p_1 + \ell_2$  are at most  $2m^2 < \prod_{q \in Q_k} q$ , they can only be equal modulo  $\prod_{q \in Q_k} q$  if they are equal. This implies that  $M_{p, \ell} = 0$ , so all the 1's are covered. Thus, by the choice of  $k$  and  $S_k$ , all the one-entries of  $M$  can be covered using  $O(\log^4 m)$  monochromatic rectangles.  $\square$

Lastly, we note that even though the answer to [Problem 1.1](#) is negative, the general approach of using covering number to obtain explicit lower bounds against depth-3 circuits could still be possible. For example, [\[5, Research Problem 4.8\]](#) remains open.

## References

- [1] Miklós Ajtai.  $\Sigma^1_1$ -formulae on finite structures. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.*, 24(1):1–48, 1983.
- [2] Merrick Furst, James B. Saxe, and Michael Sipser. Parity, circuits, and the polynomial-time hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, SFCS '81*, page 260–270, USA, 1981. IEEE Computer Society.
- [3] Johan Håstad, Stasys Jukna, and Pavel Pudlák. Top-down lower bounds for depth-three circuits. *Comput. Complex.*, 5(2):99–112, 1995.
- [4] Johan Torkel Håstad. *Computational Limitations for Small-Depth Circuits*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1987.
- [5] Stasys Jukna. *Boolean function complexity*, volume 27 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012. Advances and frontiers.
- [6] Nets Hawk Katz. On the CNF-complexity of bipartite graphs containing no squares. *Lith. Math. J.*, 52(4):385–389, 2012.
- [7] Eyal Kushilevitz and Noam Nisan. *Communication complexity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [8] Victor Lecomte, Prasanna Ramakrishnan, and Li-Yang Tan. The composition complexity of majority. In *Conference on Computational Complexity, CCC 2022, July 20–23, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2022*. to appear.
- [9] Pavel Pudlák, Vojtěch Rödl, and Petr Savický. Graph complexity. *Acta Inform.*, 25(5):515–535, 1988.
- [10] Andrew Chi-Chih Yao. Separating the polynomial-time hierarchy by oracles. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, SFCS '85*, page 1–10, USA, 1985. IEEE Computer Society.