

A Family of Dictatorship Tests with Perfect Completeness for 2-to-2 Label Cover

Joshua Brakensiek* Venkatesan Guruswami†

Received August 23, 2019; Revised June 23, 2023; Published June 30, 2023

Abstract: We give a family of dictatorship tests with perfect completeness and low-soundness for 2-to-2 constraints. The associated 2-to-2 conjecture has been the basis of a few inapproximability results with perfect completeness. Our result provides some indication of the expressiveness and non-triviality of 2-to-2 constraints, given the close connections between dictatorship tests and satisfiability and approximability of CSPs.

Key words and phrases: dictatorship test, hardness of approximation, 2-to-2 conjecture

1 Introduction

In the study of constraint satisfaction problems, dictatorship tests are a surrogate for understanding the problems' computational complexity. For a given constraint satisfaction problem over a domain D , a dictatorship test for a function $f : D^n \rightarrow D$ is a random distribution of queries based on the constraints from the CSP. For example, for NAE-3-SAT, $D = \{0, 1\}$, a query would pick uniformly at random three vectors $x, y, z \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that $x_i \vee y_i \vee z_i = 1$ and $x_i \wedge y_i \wedge z_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and then test whether $f(x) \vee f(y) \vee f(z) = 1$ and $f(x) \wedge f(y) \wedge f(z) = 0$. For a given function f , there is an associated probability $p \in [0, 1]$ for which it satisfies the dictatorship test. Typically some threshold $\tau > 0$ is assigned for which a function f 'passes' the test if $p \geq \tau$. As their name suggests, these tests are usually designed so that certain *dictator functions* (also known as projections), functions which depend on only a single coordinate, pass with probability 1 (or $1 - \epsilon$, depending on the application).

For constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs), dictatorship tests with a passing probability of $\tau = 1$ have been used to understand the computational complexity of the associated satisfiability problems. In

*This work was conducted while a student at Carnegie Mellon University. Research supported in part by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship and an REU supplement to NSF CCF-1526092.

†Research supported in part by NSF grants CCF-1422045, CCF-1526092, and CCF-1908125.

the universal algebraic approach to understanding CSPs, functions which pass such dictatorship tests are known as *polymorphisms*. (See [10] for a survey on the algebraic study of CSPs.) For a long time (e.g., [6]), it has been known that the computational complexity is completely characterized by which functions pass the dictatorship tests. The deep understanding of such connections has very recently culminated in two proofs of the Algebraic Dichotomy Conjecture [7, 38, 39]. Although the exact statement of the conjecture is quite technical, at a moral level it says that a CSP has a polynomial time algorithm if and only if one is able to satisfy the canonical dictatorship test with arbitrarily complex polymorphisms. (Formally, such functions are known as “weak near unanimity” operators.)

In the *optimization* version associated with a CSP, where the goal is to satisfy as many constraints of the instance as possible, one often seeks to prove that for some threshold $\tau \in (0, 1)$, if a function f passes the dictatorship test with probability at least τ , then f essentially depends on a small number of coordinates. In this setting, a similar close connection between approximability and the passing of dictatorship tests is also known. In particular, Raghavendra [33] showed that the threshold τ for which dictatorship tests can be passed by highly non-dictatorial functions (those with no influential coordinates), is exactly the approximation ratio which can be found by the Basic SDP relaxation. Further, under Khot’s Unique Games Conjecture [21], no polynomial time algorithm can deliver an approximation guarantee better than τ [20].

The complexity of approximate optimization of every CSP is known to have a sharp threshold¹ between algorithms and hardness under the Unique Games Conjecture (UGC). The UGC itself asserts the inapproximability of a particular CSP called Unique Games. The fascinating aspect of this landscape is that the hardness of the single Unique Games problem reduces the complexity-theoretic task of showing inapproximability of every other CSP to the combinatorial/analytic task of designing a good dictatorship test that works with checks allowed by the CSP.

The Unique Games problem is a special case of a more general family of CSPs called Label Cover (see Section 2.1 for formal definitions relating to Label Cover, but briefly these are arity two CSPs whose constraint relations are unions of disjoint complete bipartite graphs; Unique Games is the special case when the constraint relations are matchings). The decision version of Unique Games is easily seen to be polynomial time solvable. Therefore, the UGC is useless in understanding the complexity of approximating satisfiable instances of CSPs (which is an important goal in itself, and also crucial for problems such as graph and hypergraph coloring). The most general form of Label Cover has also led to numerous strong inapproximability results, but without some restriction on the structure of the allowed constraints, it is not flexible enough to give a broad understanding similar to what the UGC provides.

Towards this end, Khot himself in his original UGC paper [21] proposed a restricted form of Label Cover called 2-to-1 Label cover (where the constraint relations are 2-to-1 maps) as a possible UG surrogate in some settings where inapproximability for satisfiable CSPs is desired.

In this paper, we give a dictatorship test with perfect completeness and arbitrarily small soundness for 2-to-2 Label Cover (a closely related version to 2-to-1 Label Cover that is more symmetric with constraint relations that are union of $K_{2,2}$ ’s; see [11, Thm A.3] for a reduction).

The main theorem we prove is informally as follows. The formal version appears as Theorem 3.7.

Theorem 1.1 (Informal). *There is a family of dictatorship tests with 2-to-2 constraints, which have*

¹Even so, determining these thresholds is unsolved in many cases (c.f., [28]).

perfect completeness (i.e., dictators pass the test with probability 1), and if a function f passes one of these tests with noticeable probability, then f has a coordinate that has noticeable low-degree influence.

While dictatorship tests are probably not the combinatorial/analytic core underlying inapproximability in the perfect completeness land, nevertheless our result can be viewed as some indication of the expressiveness and non-triviality of 2-to-1 constraints.

1.1 Related results

The inapproximability results proved using 2-to-1 or 2-to-2 conjecture include hardness of $O(1)$ -coloring 4-colorable graphs [11], hardness of finding independent sets in 2-colorable 3-uniform hypergraphs [25], Max k -coloring on k -colorable graphs [17], and $\sqrt{2} - \varepsilon$ hardness of vertex cover (implicit in [21] and explicit in [22]).

There is evidence of the difficulty of the Unique Games problem, in the form of integrality gaps against strong semidefinite programming relaxations (from the so-called SA+ hierarchy) [26, 34, 24]. In contrast, at the time of original writing of this paper [4], there were no integrality gaps known for 2-to-2 Label Cover with perfect completeness, even for the most basic SDP. Thus, due to the perfect completeness requirement, the evidence toward the 2-to-2 conjecture was arguably even more slim compared to the UGC, though that has changed drastically recently (see Section 1.2).

We note that nontrivial approximation algorithms based on semidefinite programming are known for the 2-to-1 Label Cover. In particular, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, [9] found a $\tilde{O}(L)^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}-1+\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}+1-\varepsilon}}$ approximation algorithm for 2-to-1 Label Cover (where L is the label size of the instance).

Dictatorships tests on the road to hardness. For the Max- k -CSP problem with perfect completeness, dictatorship tests are known to exist within a constant factor of known polynomial time approximation algorithms [37, 3]. The best known NP-hardness results, however, are an $\exp(k^{\Omega(1)})$ factor off from the algorithmic guarantees [19] (this is when requiring perfect completeness; for near-perfect completeness, the best known NP-hardness result is only off by a constant factor [8]). Recently, a Unique Games-surrogate was proposed which closes this gap for satisfiable Max- k -CSP up to a polynomial in k factor [5].

In the case of the Not-Two (NTW) predicate, defined as the elements of $\{0, 1\}^3$ which have Hamming weight not equal to 2, a series of papers [31, 32, 18] went from a dictatorship test to conditional hardness (under the d -to-1 conjecture) to finally unconditional hardness. Establishing a dictatorship test is often an important step in the journey to hardness.

1.2 Subsequent work

Most notably, the 2-to-2 conjecture, albeit with imperfect completeness, was resolved by a line of papers [22, 13, 12, 23, 1].² This implies the Unique Games conjecture when the completeness is $1/2$, which allows the conversion of a select few UG-hardness results to NP-hardness [2]. In addition, this sequence of works establishes the first gaps in the sum-of-squares hierarchy for the 2-to-2 conjecture with perfect completeness. Earlier only a gap on a weakened SDP, where even simple non-negativity of inner products is not enforced, was known [16].

²At the time this paper was posted on ECCV [4], this research program was proposed but not completed.

Even with these developments, the dictatorship test is still of independent interest. Because there exist tractable CSPs, like 3-LIN, with sum-of-squares gaps but no dictatorship test [15, 36], this paper gives additional evidence that the 2-to-2 conjecture with perfect completeness is true.

2 Preliminaries

We first formally define what the 2-to-2 Label Cover problem and its corresponding conjecture are. Subsequently we review the Fourier analytical tools which shall be used to understand the dictatorship tests.

2.1 The d_1 -to- d_2 Label Cover problems

For a positive integer L , we let $[L]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, L\}$.

Let d_1, d_2, L_1 , and L_2 be positive integers. For any relation $R \subseteq [L_1] \times [L_2]$ we may consider the bipartite graph whose two sides are identified with $[L_1]$ and $[L_2]$ respectively, and two vertices $u \in [L_1]$ and $v \in [L_2]$ are connected by an edge if $(u, v) \in R$. We say that R is an d_1 -to- d_2 constraint if all connected components of this bipartite graph are complete bipartite and have at most d_1 components on the $[L_1]$ side and at most d_2 vertices on the $[L_2]$ side. Note in particular that a d'_1 -to- d'_2 relation is a d_1 -to- d_2 relation as long as $d'_1 \leq d_1$ and $d'_2 \leq d_2$.

An instance of d_1 -to- d_2 Label Cover consists of a bipartite graph $G = (U, V, E)$, positive integers L_1 and L_2 , and constraints d_1 -to- d_2 constraints $\pi_{(u,v)} \subseteq [L_1] \times [L_2]$ or all $(u, v) \in E$. The ‘goal’ is to find labelings $\sigma : U \rightarrow [L_1]$ and $\psi : V \rightarrow [L_2]$ such that for all $(u, v) \in E$, $(\sigma(u), \psi(v)) \in \pi_{(u,v)}$. Any edge which satisfies this property is said to be *satisfied* the labelings σ and ψ .

Conjecture 2.1 (d_1 -to- d_2 conjectures [21]). *Let $d_1, d_2 \geq 1$ be positive integers and $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant.*

The following promise decision problem is NP-hard. Let $\Psi = (U, V, E, L, \pi_{(u,v)})$ be an instance of d_1 -to- d_2 Label Cover. Distinguish between the following cases.

- **Completeness.** *There exist labelings $\sigma : U \rightarrow [L_1]$ and $\psi : V \rightarrow [L_2]$ which satisfy all of the constraints if $(d_1, d_2) \neq (1, 1)$ or at least $1 - \varepsilon$ fraction of the constraints if $d_1 = d_2 = 1$.*
- **Soundness.** *For all labelings at most ε fraction of the constraints are satisfied.*

The 1-to-1 conjecture is more well-known as the Unique Games Conjecture.

2.2 Fourier Analysis over \mathbb{Z}_p

Before we describe the dictatorship tests, we first remind the reader of some the basics of Fourier Analysis over $\mathbb{Z}_p = \{0, 1, \dots, p - 1\}$, with addition modulo p , where p is an odd prime.

Let $L^2(\mathbb{Z}_p^n; \mathbb{C})$ be the vector space of functions $f : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} f(x) \overline{g(x)}. \tag{2.1}$$

The Fourier basis we pick for \mathbb{Z}_p is the set of characters $\{\chi_0, \chi_1, \dots, \chi_{p-1}\}$, where $\chi_i(j) = \zeta^{ij}$, in which ζ is the primitive p th root of unity for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. We extend this basis to \mathbb{Z}_p^n multiplicatively. For all $\alpha, x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n$, let

$$\chi_\alpha(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \chi_{\alpha_i}(x_i).$$

It is well-known that the χ_α 's form an orthonormal basis with respect to the inner product (2.1). For a function $f : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, its *Fourier coefficients* $\hat{f} : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are the unique function which satisfies

$$f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \hat{f}(\alpha) \chi_\alpha.$$

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n$, we let $|\alpha| = \{i \in [n] : \alpha_i \neq 0\}$. We can now state/define few basic properties of a $f : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (e.g., from [30]):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f] &= \hat{f}(0, \dots, 0) \\ \text{Var}[f] &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, \alpha \neq (0, \dots, 0)} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 \\ \text{Inf}_i(f) &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, \alpha_i \neq 0} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 \\ \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}(f) &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, \alpha_i \neq 0, |\alpha| \leq d} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In our analysis of the dictatorship tests, we need a few results from [29, 20] on the *noise stability* of our function. There are many definitions, but we only need the Fourier analytic one (e.g., Proposition 8.28 of [30]).

Definition 2.2. For $f \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\eta \in [-1, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{S}_\eta(f) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \eta^{|\alpha|} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2,$$

where $0^0 = 1$.

We now cite a variant of the MOO theorem [29] as stated in [20]

Theorem 2.3 (Low-degree MOO theorem [29] from [20]). *Consider any $\eta \in [0, 1]$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $f : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$. If $\max_{i \in [n]} \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}(f) \leq \delta$, where $\delta(\varepsilon, \eta, p) > 0$ and $d(\varepsilon, \eta, p) \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\mathbb{S}_\eta(f) \leq \Lambda_\eta(\mathbb{E}[f]) + \varepsilon,$$

where $\Lambda_\eta(\mu)$ is the probability that two η -correlated Gaussians with mean 0 and variance 1 are in the upper μ fraction of their CDFs.

The only fact we need about Λ_η is the following upper bound.

Lemma 2.4 (Corollary 3 of [20]). *If $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and $q \geq 2$, then*

$$\Lambda_\eta\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{q}\right)^{\frac{2}{1+\eta}}.$$

3 A Family of Dictatorship Tests for 2-to-2 Label Cover

In this section, we construct the dictatorship tests for 2-to-2 constraints, and then analyze this construction using Fourier analysis.

3.1 The dictatorship tests

Consider the following 2-to-2 constraint. Let $S := \{0, 1, \dots, (p-1)/2\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_p$, where p is an odd prime. Then our constraints are

$$\pi_{a,b} := \bigcup_{x \in S} \{(x+a, x+b), (-x+a, x+b), (x+a, -x+b), (-x+a, -x+b)\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_p^2.$$

In fact, we can replace $x \in S$ with $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ in the above definition. When we identify $\pi_{a,b}$ as a probability distribution, we give double weight to the 1-to-1 constraint (a, b) so that the marginal distributions are uniform.

Our dictatorship test is then the following. Let $n \geq 1$ be a positive integer. The test is on a set of p^n variables, whose labeling is represented by a function $F : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$. The test proceeds by the following algorithm.

- Draw $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ uniformly and independently at random.
- Draw $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n$ uniformly at random from $\pi_{a,b}^{\otimes n}$.
- Test $(F(x), F(y)) \in \pi_{a,b}$.

By a standard trick, we may assume that F is *folded*. That is, for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n$, $F(x + (a, \dots, a)) = F(x) + a$. As usual, to enforce this, when querying $F(x)$, we instead query $F(x - (x_1, \dots, x_1))$ and add x_1 to the result. (For convenience, we write $1_n = (1, \dots, 1)$.) This technicality can be moved within the CSP, by adjusting checking $(F(x), F(y)) \in \pi_{a,b}$ to $(F(x - x_1 1_n), F(y - y_1 1_n)) \in \pi_{a-x_1, b-y_1}$.

Note that the dictator functions $F(x) = x_i$ for some $i \in [n]$ pass this test with probability 1. We now seek to show that if some F passes this test with probability at least ϵ , then F is ‘close’ to one of these dictator functions. Like O’Donnell and Wu [31] we measure closeness in terms of having a coordinate with a significant low-degree influence.

3.2 Analysis of the Dictatorship Tests

Identify F with the function $f : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, where $f(x) = 1$ iff $F(x) = 0$ and $f(x) = 0$ otherwise. Since F is folded, we must have that $\mathbb{E}[f] = \frac{1}{p}$. The success probability is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varepsilon &\leq \mathbb{E}_{a,b} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \pi_{a,b}^{\otimes n}} [\mathbf{1}[(F(x), F(y)) \in \pi_{a,b}]] \right] \\
 &\leq \mathbb{E}_{a,b} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \pi_{a,b}^{\otimes n}} \left[2p \mathbb{E}_{(i,j) \sim \pi_{a,b}} [f(x - i\mathbf{1}_n) \overline{f(y - j\mathbf{1}_n)}] \right] \right] \quad (\text{double counting when } (i,j) = (a,b)) \\
 &= 2p \mathbb{E}_{a,b} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \pi_{a,b}^{\otimes n}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(i,j) \sim \pi_{a,b}} \left[\sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) \chi_\alpha(x - i\mathbf{1}_n) \overline{\chi_\beta(y - j\mathbf{1}_n)} \right] \right] \right] \\
 &= 2p \mathbb{E}_{a,b} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(i,j) \sim \pi_{a,b}} \left[\sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) \prod_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{(x_k, y_k) \sim \pi_{a,b}} [\chi_{\alpha_k}(x_k - i) \overline{\chi_{\beta_k}(y_k - j)}] \right] \right] \\
 &= 2p \mathbb{E}_{a,b} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(i,j) \sim \pi_{a,b}} \left[\sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) \prod_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{x_k \sim \mathbb{Z}_p} \left[\frac{\chi_{\alpha_k}(x_k - i + a) \overline{\chi_{\beta_k}(x_k - j + b)} + \chi_{\beta_k}(-x_k - j + b)}{2} \right] \right] \right] \\
 &= 2p \mathbb{E}_{a,b} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(i,j) \sim \pi_{a,b}} \left[\sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) \chi_\alpha((a - i)\mathbf{1}_n) \overline{\chi_\beta((b - j)\mathbf{1}_n)} \prod_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{x_k \sim \mathbb{Z}_p} \left[\frac{\chi_{\alpha_k + \beta_k}(x_k) + \chi_{\alpha_k - \beta_k}(x_k)}{2} \right] \right] \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_k \sim \mathbb{Z}_p} \left[\frac{\chi_{\alpha_k + \beta_k}(x_k) + \chi_{\alpha_k - \beta_k}(x_k)}{2} \right] = \begin{cases} 1 & (\alpha_k, \beta_k) = (0, 0) \\ 1/2 & \alpha_k^2 = \beta_k^2 \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n$, define $\alpha\beta$ to be the pointwise product. Furthermore, define

$$C_\alpha = \{\alpha z \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid z \in \{1, p-1\}^n \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_p^n\}.$$

Then, it is easy to see that the above probability equals

$$\begin{aligned}
 \varepsilon &\leq 2p \mathbb{E}_{a,b} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(i,j) \sim \pi_{a,b}} \left[\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \sum_{\beta \in C_\alpha} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) \chi_\alpha((a - i)\mathbf{1}_n) \chi_\beta((b - j)\mathbf{1}_n) 2^{-|\alpha|} \right] \right] \\
 &= 2p \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \sum_{\beta \in C_\alpha} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) 2^{-|\alpha|} \mathbb{E}_{a,b} \left[\mathbb{E}_{(i,j) \sim \pi_{a,b}} [\chi_\alpha((a - i)\mathbf{1}_n) \chi_\beta((b - j)\mathbf{1}_n)] \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(i, j) \in \pi_{a,b}$ if and only if $a - i = \pm(b - j)$. In fact, we can rewrite the above expression as

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq 2p \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \sum_{\beta \in C_\alpha} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) 2^{-|\alpha|} \mathbb{E}_{c \sim \mathbb{Z}_p} \left[\chi_\alpha(c \mathbf{1}_n) \frac{\chi_\beta(c \mathbf{1}_n) + \chi_\beta(-c \mathbf{1}_n)}{2} \right] \\ &= p \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \sum_{\beta \in C_\alpha} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) 2^{-|\alpha|} (\mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha+\beta}(\mathbf{1}_n) = 1] + \mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{1}_n) = 1]) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the C_α 's are equivalence classes of size $2^{|\alpha|}$. In particular, $\beta \in C_\alpha$ iff $\alpha \in C_\beta$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n\}$. Thus, we then have that

$$\varepsilon \leq p \sum_{C_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{|C_\gamma|} \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in C_\gamma} \hat{f}(\alpha) \hat{f}(\beta) (\mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha+\beta}(\mathbf{1}_n) = 1] + \mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{1}_n) = 1])$$

Let $\hat{f}(C_\gamma)$ be the vector of length $|C_\gamma|$ whose entries are $\hat{f}(\alpha)$. Let $\hat{f}(C_\gamma)^*$ be the transpose-conjugate of $\hat{f}(C_\gamma)$. Let M^γ be the $|C_\gamma| \times |C_\gamma|$ matrix with entries

$$M_{\alpha,\beta}^\gamma = \frac{\mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha+\beta}(\mathbf{1}_n) = 1] + \mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{1}_n) = 1]}{|C_\gamma|}.$$

One can verify that M^γ is a real, symmetric, doubly stochastic matrix (modulo scaling of the entries). Thus, the largest eigenvalue of M^γ , λ^γ is this common row/column sum. Then, we can see that³

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &\leq p \sum_{C_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}} \hat{f}(C_\gamma)^* M^\gamma \hat{f}(C_\gamma) \\ &\leq p \sum_{C_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}} \lambda^\gamma \|\hat{f}(C_\gamma)\|^2 \\ &= p \sum_{C_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\alpha \in C_\gamma} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 \lambda^\gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

We next seek to show that λ^γ is bounded by a particular decreasing function of $|\gamma|$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, p odd prime, and $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n$:*

$$\lambda^\gamma \leq \frac{2}{p} + \frac{C}{|\gamma|^{1/4} + 1}.$$

Before we can do that, we need the following result.

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, p prime, and $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n$:*

$$\Pr_{z \sim \{0,1\}^n} [\chi_\beta(z) = 1] = \Pr_{z \sim \{0,1\}^n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i z_i = 0 \right] \leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{C}{|\beta|^{1/4} + 1}$$

³This deduction non-obviously uses the facts that $\hat{f}(\alpha) = \hat{f}(-\alpha)$, $-\alpha \in C_\alpha$, and $M_{\alpha,\beta}^\gamma = M_{\alpha,-\beta}^\gamma$

Remark 3.3. This lemma can be considered a finite-field analogue of a result of Littlewood and Offord [27].

The the exponent of $1/4$ can in fact be improved to $1/2 - o(1)$, but the former is all we need.

Proof. Let $k = |\beta|$. Assume $k \geq 1$. Assume without loss of generality that the nonzero terms of β are β_1, \dots, β_k . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{z \sim \{0,1\}^n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i z_i = 0 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \{0,1\}^n} \left[\mathbb{E}_{j \sim \mathbb{Z}_p} \left[\zeta^{j \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i z_i} \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{j \sim \mathbb{Z}_p} \left[\prod_{i=1}^k \frac{1 + \zeta^{j\beta_i}}{2} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \prod_{i=1}^k \left| \frac{1 + \zeta^{j\beta_i}}{2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since the β_i are nonzero for $i \in [k]$, we have that for a fixed i , $1 + \zeta^{j\beta_i}$ is a permutation of $1 + \zeta^0, \dots, 1 + \zeta^{p-1}$. By the k -wise rearrangement inequality [35], the above product is maximized when all the permutations are consistent. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \prod_{j=1}^k \left| \frac{1 + \zeta^{i\beta_j}}{2} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \left| \frac{1 + \zeta^j}{2} \right|^k \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \left| \frac{1 + \cos(2\pi j/p) + i \sin(2\pi j/p)}{2} \right|^k \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \left| \frac{2 \cos^2(\pi j/p) + 2i \cos(\pi j/p) \sin(\pi j/p)}{2} \right|^k \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} |\cos(\pi j/p)|^k \\ &= \frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} \cos^k(\pi j/p), \end{aligned}$$

To further bound, we need the following elementary inequality

Claim 3.4. For all $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$,

$$\cos \theta \leq 1 - \frac{\theta^2}{4}.$$

Proof. Note that $\sin \eta \geq \eta/2$ for all $\eta \in [0, \pi/2]$ since $\sin \eta - \eta/2$ is a concave function in $[0, \pi/2]$ which is nonnegative at its endpoints. We then integrate this from 0 to θ to obtain the above inequality. \square

Thus, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, (p-1)/2\}$,

$$\cos^k(\pi j/p) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2 j^2}{4p^2}\right)^k$$

Let $\ell = \lfloor 2p/(k^{1/4}) \rfloor$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} \cos^k(\pi j/p) &\leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{(p-1)/2} \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2 j^2}{4p^2}\right)^k \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2 j^2}{4p^2}\right)^k + \frac{2}{p} \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{(p-1)/2} \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2 j^2}{4p^2}\right)^k \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{2\ell}{p} + \max\left(\frac{2((p-1)/2 - \ell)}{p} \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2(\ell+1)^2}{4p^2}\right)^k, 0\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{4}{k^{1/4}} + \max\left(1 - \frac{\pi^2}{k^{1/2}}, 0\right)^k \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{4}{k^{1/4}} + e^{-\pi^2 \sqrt{k}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{C'}{k^{1/4} + 1}, \end{aligned}$$

for some universal constant $C' > 0$. To account for the case $k = 0$, we may set $C = \max(C', 1)$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.1. By the previously mentioned symmetries of M^γ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^\gamma &= \mathbb{E}_{\alpha \sim C_\gamma} [\mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha+\gamma}(1_n) = 1] + \mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha-\gamma}(1_n) = 1]] \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{\alpha \sim C_\gamma} [\mathbf{1}[\chi_{\alpha-\gamma}(1_n) = 1]] \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \{-1,1\}^n} [\mathbf{1}[\chi_{\gamma z - \gamma}(1_n) = 1]] \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \{-1,1\}^n} [\mathbf{1}[\chi_\gamma(z - 1_n) = 1]] \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{z' \sim \{0,1\}^n} [\mathbf{1}[\chi_\gamma((1_n - 2z') - 1_n) = 1]] \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{z' \sim \{0,1\}^n} [\mathbf{1}[\chi_\gamma(z') = 1]] \quad (\text{since } p \text{ odd prime}) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{p} + \frac{2C}{|\mathcal{Y}|^{1/4} + 1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Lemma 3.2. □

We also need to invoke the following analytical lemma.

Lemma 3.5. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $L \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $P(\varepsilon, L) \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all primes $p \geq P$, there exists $\delta(\varepsilon, L, p) > 0$ and $d(\varepsilon, L, p) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $f : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $\mathbb{E}[f] = 1/p$ the following holds. If $\text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}(f) \leq \delta$ for all $i \in [n]$ then

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, |\alpha| \leq L} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[f] = \frac{\varepsilon}{p}.$$

Remark 3.6. The LHS does not fundamentally depend on the choice of Fourier basis for \mathbb{Z}_p . For example, the Efron-Stein decomposition [14] works just as well.

Proof. First, we set the parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= 1/2 \\ P &= \lceil (\varepsilon \eta^L)^{-\frac{1+\eta}{1-\eta}} \rceil + 1 \\ \varepsilon' &= \frac{\varepsilon \eta^L}{p} - \left(\frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{2}{1+\eta}} \quad (\text{positive since } p \geq P) \end{aligned}$$

Let d and δ be the parameters guaranteed by the modified MOO theorem (Theorem 2.3) where their (ε, η, p) is our (ε', η, p) . If $\max_{i \in [n]} \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}(f) \leq \delta$, by a standard argument

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, |\alpha| \leq L} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 &\leq \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \eta^{|\alpha|-L} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 \\ &\leq \eta^{-L} \mathbb{S}_\eta(f) \\ &\leq \eta^{-L} (\Lambda_\eta(1/p) + \varepsilon') \quad (\text{modified MOO theorem, since } \max_i \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d}(f) \leq \delta) \\ &\leq \eta^{-L} \left(\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{2}{1+\eta}} + \varepsilon' \right) \quad (\text{Lemma 2.4}) \\ &= \eta^{-L} \frac{\varepsilon \eta^L}{p} = \frac{\varepsilon}{p}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Now, we may establish the main result.

Theorem 3.7. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $P \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all primes $p \geq P$, there exists $\delta > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. If $F : \mathbb{Z}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$ is a folded function which passes the 2-to-2 Label Cover modulo p dictatorship test with probability at least ε , then

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d} f \geq \delta,$$

where $f(x) = \mathbf{1}[F(x) = 0]$.

Proof. First select the following parameters

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon' &= \varepsilon / (8C) \\ L &= \left\lceil \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon'} \right)^4 \right\rceil.\end{aligned}$$

Let P' be the P guaranteed by Lemma 3.5 when $\varepsilon = \varepsilon' / 2$ and $L = L$. Let $P = \max(P', 4/\varepsilon)$. Assume $p \geq P$. Let δ and d be the values (independent of n) guaranteed by Lemma 3.5 for our choice of p .

From our previous analysis (3.1), we know that

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon &\leq p \sum_{C_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\alpha \in C_\gamma} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 \lambda^\gamma (3.1) \\ &\leq p \sum_{C_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\alpha \in C_\gamma} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 \left(\frac{2}{p} + \frac{C}{|\alpha|^{1/4} + 1} \right) (\text{Lemma 3.1}). \\ &= 2 \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 + Cp \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} \frac{|\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2}{|\alpha|^{1/4} + 1}.\end{aligned}$$

By Parseval's identity,

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} |\hat{f}(\alpha)|^2 = \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} f(x)^2 = 1/p < \varepsilon/4.$$

Thus, the first term contributes at most $\varepsilon/2$ to the sum. For the next part, note that $\frac{C}{L^{1/4} + 1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon &\leq \varepsilon/2 + pC \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, |\beta| \leq L} \frac{|\hat{f}(\beta)|^2}{|\beta|^{1/4} + 1} + p \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, |\beta| > L} \frac{C|\hat{f}(\beta)|^2}{|\beta|^{1/4} + 1} \\ &\leq \varepsilon/2 + pC \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, |\beta| \leq L} |\hat{f}(\beta)|^2 + p \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, |\beta| > L} \frac{\varepsilon}{8} |\hat{f}(\beta)|^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon/2 + pC \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, |\beta| \leq L} |\hat{f}(\beta)|^2 + \varepsilon/8.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have that

$$\sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n, |\beta| \leq L} |\hat{f}(\beta)|^2 \geq \frac{3\varepsilon}{8pC} > \frac{\varepsilon'}{2} \mathbb{E}[f].$$

By the contrapositive to Lemma 3.5, we have that $\max_{i \in [n]} \text{Inf}_i^{\leq d} f \geq \delta$, as desired. \square

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments, including pointing us to [27].

References

- [1] BOAZ BARAK, PRAVESH K. KOTHARI, AND DAVID STEURER: Small-Set Expansion in Shortcode Graph and the 2-to-2 Conjecture. In AVRIM BLUM, editor, *10th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2019)*, volume 124 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pp. 9:1–9:12, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2018. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. [[doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2019.9](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ITCS.2019.9)] 3
- [2] AMEY BHANGALE AND SUBHASH KHOT: UG-Hardness to NP-Hardness by Losing Half. In AMIR SHPILKA, editor, *34th Computational Complexity Conference (CCC 2019)*, volume 137 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pp. 3:1–3:20, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2019. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. [[doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.3](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.3)] 3
- [3] AMEY BHANGALE, SUBHASH KHOT, AND DEVANATHAN THIRUVENKATACHARI: An Improved Dictatorship Test with Perfect Completeness. In SATYA V. LOKAM AND R. RAMANUJAM, editors, *37th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2017, December 11-15, 2017, Kanpur, India*, volume 93 of *LIPIcs*, pp. 15:1–15:23. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017. [[doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2017.15](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2017.15)] 3
- [4] JOSHUA BRAKENSIEK AND VENKATESAN GURUSWAMI: A Family of Dictatorship Tests with Perfect Completeness for 2-to-2 Label Cover. *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, 24:141, 2017. 3
- [5] JOSHUA BRAKENSIEK AND VENKATESAN GURUSWAMI: The Quest for Strong Inapproximability Results with Perfect Completeness. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 17(3):27:1–27:35, 2021. [[doi:10.1145/3459668](https://doi.org/10.1145/3459668)] 3
- [6] A. BULATOV, P. JEAUVONS, AND A. KROKHIN: Classifying the Complexity of Constraints Using Finite Algebras. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 34(3):720–742, January 2005. [[doi:10.1137/S0097539700376676](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539700376676)] 2
- [7] ANDREI A. BULATOV: A Dichotomy Theorem for Nonuniform CSPs. In CHRIS UMANS, editor, *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017*, pp. 319–330. IEEE Computer Society, 2017. [[doi:10.1109/FOCS.2017.37](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2017.37)] 2
- [8] SIU ON CHAN: Approximation Resistance from Pairwise-Independent Subgroups. *J. ACM*, 63(3):27:1–27:32, August 2016. [[doi:10.1145/2873054](https://doi.org/10.1145/2873054)] 3
- [9] MOSES CHARIKAR, KONSTANTIN MAKARYCHEV, AND YURY MAKARYCHEV: Near-optimal algorithms for unique games. In JON M. KLEINBERG, editor, *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Seattle, WA, USA, May 21-23, 2006*, pp. 205–214. ACM, 2006. [[doi:10.1145/1132516.1132547](https://doi.org/10.1145/1132516.1132547)] 3
- [10] HUBIE CHEN: A Rendezvous of Logic, Complexity, and Algebra. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 42(1):2:1–2:32, December 2009. [[doi:10.1145/1592451.1592453](https://doi.org/10.1145/1592451.1592453)] 2

- [11] I. DINUR, E. MOSSEL, AND O. REGEV: Conditional Hardness for Approximate Coloring. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(3):843–873, January 2009. [[doi:10.1137/07068062X](https://doi.org/10.1137/07068062X)] 2, 3
- [12] IRIT DINUR, SUBHASH KHOT, GUY KINDLER, DOR MINZER, AND MULI SAFRA: On Non-optimally Expanding Sets in Grassmann Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2018, pp. 940–951, New York, NY, USA, 2018. ACM. [[doi:10.1145/3188745.3188806](https://doi.org/10.1145/3188745.3188806)] 3
- [13] IRIT DINUR, SUBHASH KHOT, GUY KINDLER, DOR MINZER, AND MULI SAFRA: Towards a Proof of the 2-to-1 Games Conjecture? In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2018, pp. 376–389, New York, NY, USA, 2018. ACM. [[doi:10.1145/3188745.3188804](https://doi.org/10.1145/3188745.3188804)] 3
- [14] B. EFRON AND C. STEIN: The Jackknife Estimate of Variance. *The Annals of Statistics*, 9(3):586–596, 1981. [[doi:10.1214/aos/1176345462](https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176345462)] 11
- [15] DIMA GRIGORIEV: Linear Lower Bound on Degrees of Positivstellensatz Calculus Proofs for the Parity. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 259(1):613–622, May 2001. [[doi:10.1016/S0304-3975\(00\)00157-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00157-2)] 4
- [16] VENKATESAN GURUSWAMI, SUBHASH KHOT, RYAN O’DONNELL, PREYAS POPAT, MADHUR TULSIANI, AND YI WU: SDP gaps for 2-to-1 and other label-cover variants. In SAMSON ABRAMSKY, CYRIL GAVOILLE, CLAUDE KIRCHNER, FRIEDHELM MEYER AUF DER HEIDE, AND PAUL G. SPIRAKIS, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 37th International Colloquium, ICALP 2010, Bordeaux, France, July 6-10, 2010, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 6198 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 617–628. Springer, 2010. [[doi:10.1007/978-3-642-14165-2_52](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14165-2_52)] 3
- [17] VENKATESAN GURUSWAMI AND ALI KEMAL SINOP: Improved Inapproximability Results for Maximum k-Colorable Subgraph. *Theory Comput.*, 9:413–435, 2013. [[doi:10.4086/toc.2013.v009a011](https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.2013.v009a011)] 3
- [18] JOHAN HÅSTAD: On the NP-Hardness of Max-Not-2. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(1):179–193, 2014. [[doi:10.1137/120882718](https://doi.org/10.1137/120882718)] 3
- [19] SANGXIA HUANG: Approximation resistance on satisfiable instances for predicates with few accepting inputs. In DAN BONEH, TIM ROUGHGARDEN, AND JOAN FEIGENBAUM, editors, *Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC’13, Palo Alto, CA, USA, June 1-4, 2013*, pp. 457–466. ACM, 2013. [[doi:10.1145/2488608.2488666](https://doi.org/10.1145/2488608.2488666)] 3
- [20] S. KHOT, G. KINDLER, E. MOSSEL, AND R. O’DONNELL: Optimal Inapproximability Results for MAX-CUT and Other 2-Variable CSPs? *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(1):319–357, January 2007. [[doi:10.1137/S0097539705447372](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539705447372)] 2, 5
- [21] SUBHASH KHOT: On the Power of Unique 2-prover 1-round Games. In JOHN H. REIF, editor, *Proceedings on 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 19-21, 2002, Montréal, Québec, Canada*, pp. 767–775. ACM, 2002. [[doi:10.1145/509907.510017](https://doi.org/10.1145/509907.510017)] 2, 3, 4

- [22] SUBHASH KHOT, DOR MINZER, AND MULI SAFRA: On Independent Sets, 2-to-2 Games and Grassmann Graphs. In HAMED HATAMI, PIERRE MCKENZIE, AND VALERIE KING, editors, *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017, Montreal, QC, Canada, June 19-23, 2017*, pp. 576–589. ACM, 2017. [doi:10.1145/3055399.3055432] 3
- [23] SUBHASH KHOT, DOR MINZER, AND MULI SAFRA: Pseudorandom Sets in Grassmann Graph Have Near-Perfect Expansion. In MIKKEL THORUP, editor, *59th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2018, Paris, France, October 7-9, 2018*, pp. 592–601. IEEE Computer Society, 2018. [doi:10.1109/FOCS.2018.00062] 3
- [24] SUBHASH KHOT AND RISHI SAKET: SDP Integrality Gaps with Local ℓ_1 -Embeddability. In *50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2009, October 25-27, 2009, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*, pp. 565–574. IEEE Computer Society, 2009. [doi:10.1109/FOCS.2009.37] 3
- [25] SUBHASH KHOT AND RISHI SAKET: Hardness of Finding Independent Sets in 2-Colorable and Almost 2-Colorable Hypergraphs. In CHANDRA CHEKURI, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pp. 1607–1625. SIAM, 2014. [doi:10.1137/1.9781611973402.117] 3
- [26] SUBHASH A. KHOT AND NISHEETH K. VISHNOI: The Unique Games Conjecture, Integrality Gap for Cut Problems and Embeddability of Negative-Type Metrics into 1. *J. ACM*, 62(1):8:1–8:39, March 2015. [doi:10.1145/2629614] 3
- [27] J. E. LITTLEWOOD AND A. C. OFFORD: On the number of real roots of a random algebraic equation. III. *Rec. Math. [Mat. Sbornik] N.S.*, 12(54):277–286, 1943. 9, 12
- [28] KONSTANTIN MAKARYCHEV AND YURY MAKARYCHEV: Approximation Algorithms for CSPs. In ANDREI A. KROKHIN AND STANISLAV ZIVNÝ, editors, *The Constraint Satisfaction Problem: Complexity and Approximability*, volume 7 of *Dagstuhl Follow-Ups*, pp. 287–325. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. [doi:10.4230/DFU.Vol7.15301.11] 2
- [29] ELCHANAN MOSSEL, RYAN O’DONNELL, AND KRZYSZTOF OLESZKIEWICZ: Noise stability of functions with low influences: invariance and optimality. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171(1):295–341, 2010. [doi:10.4007/annals.2010.171.295] 5
- [30] RYAN O’DONNELL: *Analysis of Boolean Functions*. Cambridge University Press, 2014. [doi:10.1017/CBO9781139814782] 5
- [31] RYAN O’DONNELL AND YI WU: 3-bit dictator testing: 1 vs. 5/8. In CLAIRE MATHIEU, editor, *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2009, New York, NY, USA, January 4-6, 2009*, pp. 365–373. SIAM, 2009. [doi:10.1137/1.9781611973068.41] 3, 6

- [32] RYAN O'DONNELL AND YI WU: Conditional Hardness for Satisfiable 3-CSPs. In *Proceedings of the Forty-first Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '09, pp. 493–502, New York, NY, USA, 2009. ACM. [[doi:10.1145/1536414.1536482](https://doi.org/10.1145/1536414.1536482)] 3
- [33] PRASAD RAGHAVENDRA: Optimal algorithms and inapproximability results for every CSP? In CYNTHIA DWORK, editor, *Proceedings of the 40th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, May 17-20, 2008*, pp. 245–254. ACM, 2008. [[doi:10.1145/1374376.1374414](https://doi.org/10.1145/1374376.1374414)] 2
- [34] PRASAD RAGHAVENDRA AND DAVID STEURER: Integrality Gaps for Strong SDP Relaxations of UNIQUE GAMES. In *50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2009, October 25-27, 2009, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*, pp. 575–585. IEEE Computer Society, 2009. [[doi:10.1109/FOCS.2009.73](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2009.73)] 3
- [35] H. D. RUDERMAN: Two New Inequalities. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 59(1):29–32, 1952. [[doi:10.2307/2307185](https://doi.org/10.2307/2307185)] 9
- [36] GRANT SCHOENEBECK: Linear Level Lasserre Lower Bounds for Certain k-CSPs. In *49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2008, October 25-28, 2008, Philadelphia, PA, USA*, pp. 593–602. IEEE Computer Society, 2008. [[doi:10.1109/FOCS.2008.74](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2008.74)] 4
- [37] SUGURU TAMAKI AND YUICHI YOSHIDA: A Query Efficient Non-Adaptive Long Code Test with Perfect Completeness. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 47(2):386–406, September 2015. [[doi:10.1002/rsa.20549](https://doi.org/10.1002/rsa.20549)] 3
- [38] DMITRIY ZHUK: A Proof of CSP Dichotomy Conjecture. In CHRIS UMANS, editor, *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017*, pp. 331–342. IEEE Computer Society, 2017. [[doi:10.1109/FOCS.2017.38](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2017.38)] 2
- [39] DMITRIY ZHUK: A Proof of the CSP Dichotomy Conjecture. *J. ACM*, 67(5):30:1–30:78, 2020. [[doi:10.1145/3402029](https://doi.org/10.1145/3402029)] 2

AUTHORS

Joshua Brakensiek
 Graduate Student
 Department of Computer Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA
jbrakens@cs.stanford.edu
<https://stanford.edu/~jbrakens/>

Venkatesan Guruswami
 Department of EECS and Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing, University of
 California, Berkeley, CA
venktag@berkeley.edu
<https://people.eecs.berkeley.edu/~venkatg/>