

# Lecture Note on LCSSX's Lower Bounds for Non-Adaptive Distribution-free Property Testing

**Nader H. Bshouty**

Dept. of Computer Science  
Technion, Haifa, 32000

April 14, 2020

## Abstract

In this lecture note we give Liu-Chen-Servedio-Sheng-Xie's (LCSSX) lower bound for property testing in the non-adaptive distribution-free model [2].

## 1 Introduction

Here we give the following LCSSX's lower bound (Zhengyang Liu, Xi Chen, Rocco A. Servedio, Ying Sheng, and Jinyu Xie. Distribution-free junta testing.)

**Theorem 1.** [2] *Let  $k \geq 10$ . Let  $C$  be a class of boolean functions  $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$  that contains all the  $k$ -junta functions where  $n \geq 15 + 2 \log \log |C|$ . Any non-adaptive algorithm that distribution-free  $(1/3)$ -tests  $C$  must have query complexity at least*

$$q = \frac{1}{8(1+2\lambda)^{k/2}} \cdot 2^{k/2},$$

where

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{5 + \ln \ln |C| + k/2}{n}}.$$

In particular, when  $\log \log |C| = o(n)$  then<sup>1</sup>

$$q = (2 - o_n(1))^{k/2}.$$

The proof in this note is the same as of LCSSX [2].

For the definition of the model and other definitions, read from [2] Subsection “**Distribution-free property testing**” in Section 1 and Section 2 and Subsection “**Junta and literals**” in Section 2. For other results when  $C$  is the set of  $k$ -juntas read the introduction in [1].

---

<sup>1</sup>Because  $C$  contains all the  $k$ -junta functions, if  $\log \log |C| = o(n)$  then  $k = o(n)$

## 2 Notations

We follow the same notations as in [2]. Denote  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . For  $X \subseteq [n]$  we denote by  $\{0, 1\}^X$  the set of all binary strings of length  $|X|$  with coordinates indexed by  $i \in X$ . For  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $X \subseteq [n]$  we write  $x_X \in \{0, 1\}^X$  to denote the projection of  $x$  over coordinates in  $X$ .

Given a sequence  $Y = (y^{(i)} : i \in [q])$  of  $q$  strings in  $\{0, 1\}^n$  and a Boolean function  $\phi : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , we write  $\phi(Y)$  to denote the  $q$ -bit string  $\alpha$  with  $\alpha_i = \phi(y^{(i)})$  for  $i \in [q]$ . For a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , we write  $\mathbf{y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}$  to denote that  $\mathbf{y}$  is a draw from the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{y}^{(i)} : i \in [q]) \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$  to denote a sequence of  $q$  independent draws from the same probability distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ .

For convenience, we refer to an algorithm as a  $q$ -query algorithm if it makes  $q$  sample queries and  $q$  black-box queries each. Such algorithms are clearly at least as powerful as those that make  $q$  queries in total.

## 3 Preliminary Results

In this section we give some preliminary results

### 3.1 Chernoff Bound

We will use the following version of Chernoff Bound

**Lemma 2. Chernoff's Bound.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_m$  be independent random variables taking values in  $\{0, 1\}$ . Let  $X = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i$  denotes their sum and let  $\mu = \mathbf{E}[X]$  denotes the sum's expected value. Then*

$$\Pr[X > (1 + \eta)\mu] \leq \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{\eta^2\mu}{3}} & \text{if } 0 < \eta \leq 1 \\ e^{-\frac{\eta\mu}{3}} & \text{if } \eta > 1 \end{cases}. \quad (1)$$

For  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$  we have

$$\Pr[X < (1 - \eta)\mu] \leq e^{-\frac{\eta^2\mu}{2}}. \quad (2)$$

### 3.2 Some Results in Probability

Let  $D$  be a probability distribution over a finite set  $\Omega$ . We will use the following (In the following two lemmas  $\Pr = \Pr_D$ )

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $A, B \subseteq \Omega$  where  $B \neq \emptyset$ . Then*

$$\Pr[A|B] - \Pr[\overline{B}] \leq \Pr[A] \leq \Pr[A|B] + \Pr[\overline{B}].$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[A] &= \Pr[A|B]\Pr[B] + \Pr[A|\overline{B}]\Pr[\overline{B}] \\ &\leq \Pr[A|B] + \Pr[\overline{B}] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[A] &= 1 - \Pr[\overline{A}] \\ &\geq 1 - \Pr[\overline{A}|B] - \Pr[\overline{B}] = \Pr[A|B] - \Pr[\overline{B}]. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 4.** Let  $A, B, W \subseteq \Omega$  where  $W \neq \emptyset$ . If  $\Pr[A|W] \leq \Pr[B|W]$  then  $\Pr[A] \leq \Pr[B] + \Pr[\overline{W}]$ .

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[A] &= \Pr[A|W]\Pr[W] + \Pr[A|\overline{W}]\Pr[\overline{W}] \\ &\leq \Pr[B|W]\Pr[W] + \Pr[\overline{W}] \leq \Pr[B] + \Pr[\overline{W}]. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 5. Birthday Paradox:** Let  $X$  be a finite set and let  $\mathbf{Y}$  be a set obtained by making  $r$  draws from  $X$  uniformly at random with replacement. Then

$$\Pr[|\mathbf{Y}| \neq r] \leq \frac{r^2}{2|X|}.$$

*Proof.* Since for  $x_1, \dots, x_j \in [0, 1]$ ,  $(1 - x_1) \cdots (1 - x_j) \geq 1 - (x_1 + \cdots + x_j)$ , we have

$$\Pr[|\mathbf{Y}| \neq r] = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} \left(1 - \frac{i}{|X|}\right) \leq \frac{r^2}{2|X|}.$$

□

### 3.3 Total Variation Distance

Let  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be two probability distributions over a finite set  $\Omega$ . The *total variation distance* between  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  (also called statistical distance) is

$$\|D_1 - D_2\|_{tv} := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} |\Pr_{D_1}[\omega] - \Pr_{D_2}[\omega]|.$$

The following lemmas are well known and easy to prove

**Lemma 6.** The total variation distance between  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  is

$$\|D_1 - D_2\|_{tv} = \max_{E \subseteq \Omega} |\Pr_{D_1}[E] - \Pr_{D_2}[E]|.$$

**Lemma 7.** Let  $X : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a random variable. Then

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{D_1}[X] - \mathbf{E}_{D_2}[X] \right| \leq \|D_1 - D_2\|_{tv}.$$

**Lemma 8.** Let  $W$  be an event such that  $\Pr_{D_1}[\omega] = \Pr_{D_2}[\omega|W]$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Then

$$\|D_1 - D_2\|_{tv} = \Pr_{D_2}[\overline{W}].$$

*Proof.* First, we have  $\Pr_{D_1}[W] = \Pr_{D_2}[W|W] = 1$ . Now

$$\|D_1 - D_2\|_{tv} = \max_{E \subseteq \Omega} |\Pr_{D_1}[E] - \Pr_{D_2}[E]| \stackrel{E=W}{\geq} \Pr_{D_2}[\overline{W}]$$

and by Lemma 3, for any  $E$ ,

$$|\Pr_{D_1}[E] - \Pr_{D_2}[E]| = |\Pr_{D_2}[E|W] - \Pr_{D_2}[E]| \leq \Pr_{D_2}[\overline{W}].$$

□

**Lemma 9.** Let  $W$  be an event such that  $\Pr_{D_1}[\omega|W] = \Pr_{D_2}[\omega|W]$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Then

$$\|D_1 - D_2\|_{tv} \leq \Pr_{D_1}[\overline{W}] + \Pr_{D_2}[\overline{W}].$$

*Proof.* Let  $D_3$  be the conditional distribution of  $D_1$  given  $W$ . Then  $\Pr_{D_2}[\omega|W] = \Pr_{D_1}[\omega|W] = \Pr_{D_3}[\omega]$ . By Lemma 8,  $\|D_1 - D_3\|_{tv} = \Pr_{D_1}[\overline{W}]$  and  $\|D_2 - D_3\|_{tv} = \Pr_{D_2}[\overline{W}]$  and therefore

$$\|D_1 - D_2\|_{tv} \leq \|D_1 - D_3\|_{tv} + \|D_2 - D_3\|_{tv} = \Pr_{D_1}[\overline{W}] + \Pr_{D_2}[\overline{W}].$$

□

**Lemma 10.** Let  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  be two probability distributions over  $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ . If for every  $\omega \in \Omega_1$ ,  $\Pr_{(\omega_1, \omega_2) \leftarrow D_1}[\omega_1 = \omega] = \Pr_{(\omega_1, \omega_2) \leftarrow D_2}[\omega_1 = \omega]$  then the total variation distance between the distributions  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  is less than or equal to the maximum over  $w_1 \in \Omega_1$  of the total variation distance between the distributions of  $\omega_2$  conditioning on  $\omega_1 = w_1$  in  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ .

### 3.4 Lower Bound Technique

Our goal is to show that there exists no  $q$ -query non-adaptive (randomized) algorithm that distribution-free (1/3)-tests  $C$ .

We can think of a distribution-free (1/3)-tester for  $C$  as a randomized algorithm  $T$  that receives as an input a pair  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$  where  $\phi : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  is a probability distribution over  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . If  $\phi \in C$  then  $T$  accepts with probability at least 2/3 and if  $f$  is (1/3)-far from every function in  $C$  with respect to  $\mathcal{D}$  then it rejects with probability at least 2/3.

The (folklore) technique introduced here shows that it is enough to focus on  $q$ -query non-adaptive **deterministic** algorithms. Such an algorithm  $A$  consists of two deterministic maps  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  works as follows. Upon an input pair  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$ , where  $\phi : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  is a probability distribution over  $\{0, 1\}^n$ , the algorithm receives in the first phase a sequence  $Y = (y^{(i)} : i \in [q])$  of  $q$  strings (which should be thought of as samples from  $\mathcal{D}$ ) and a binary string  $\alpha = \phi(Y)$  of length  $q$ . In the second phase, the algorithm  $A$  uses the first map  $A_1$  to obtain a sequence of  $q$  strings  $Z = (z^{(i)} : i \in [q]) = A_1(Y, \alpha)$  and feeds them to the black-box oracle. Once the query results  $\beta = \phi(Z)$  are back,  $A_2(Y, \alpha, \beta)$  returns either 0 or 1 in which cases the algorithm  $A$  either rejects or accepts, respectively. Notice that we do not need to include  $Z$  as an input of  $A_2$ , since it is determined by  $Y$  and  $\alpha$ . A randomized algorithm  $T$  works similarly and consists of two similar maps  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  but both are randomized. The following are the two algorithms  $A$  and  $T$ . The (infinite length) strings  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are two random seeds

**Deterministic Algorithm  $A$** 

1. Input  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$
2. Get  $Y = (y^{(i)} : i \in [q])$
3.  $\alpha = \phi(Y)$
4.  $Z = (z^{(i)} : i \in [q]) = A_1(Y, \alpha)$
5.  $\beta = \phi(Z)$
6. Output  $A_2(Y, \alpha, \beta)$

**Randomized Algorithm  $T$** 

1. Input  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$
2. Get  $Y = (y^{(i)} : i \in [q])$
3.  $\alpha = \phi(Y)$
4.  $Z = (z^{(i)} : i \in [q]) = T_1(Y, \alpha, s_1)$
5.  $\beta = \phi(Z)$
6. Output  $T_2(Y, \alpha, \beta, s_2)$

Given the above deterministic algorithm, unlike typical deterministic algorithms, whether  $A$  accepts or not depends on not only  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$  but also the sample strings  $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$  it draws. Formally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[A \text{ accepts } (\phi, \mathcal{D})] &= \Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q}[A \text{ accepts } (\phi, \mathcal{D})] \\ &= \Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q}[A_2(\mathbf{Y}, \phi(\mathbf{Y}), \phi(A_1(\mathbf{Y}, \phi(\mathbf{Y})))) = 1]. \end{aligned}$$

For the randomized algorithm  $T$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T \text{ accepts } (\phi, \mathcal{D})] &= \Pr_{s_1, s_2, \mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q}[T \text{ accepts } (\phi, \mathcal{D})] \\ &= \Pr_{s_1, s_2, \mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q}[T_2(\mathbf{Y}, \phi(\mathbf{Y}), \phi(T_1(\mathbf{Y}, \phi(\mathbf{Y}), s_1)), s_2) = 1]. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove

**Lemma 11.** [2] *Let  $\mathcal{YES}$  and  $\mathcal{NO}$  be probability distributions over pairs  $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$ , where  $\phi : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a Boolean function over  $n$  variables and  $\mathcal{D}$  is a distribution over  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . For clarity, we use  $(f, \mathcal{D})$  to denote pairs in the support of  $\mathcal{YES}$  and  $(g, \mathcal{D})$  to denote pairs in the support of  $\mathcal{NO}$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{YES}$  and  $\mathcal{NO}$  satisfy*

**C1:** *Every  $(f, \mathcal{D})$  in the support of  $\mathcal{YES}$  satisfies that  $f$  is in  $C$ .*

**C2:** *With probability at least  $12/13$ ,  $(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}$  satisfies that  $g$  is  $(1/3)$ -far from every function in  $C$  with respect to  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

**C3:** *Any  $q$ -query non-adaptive deterministic algorithm must behave similarly when it is run on  $(f, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}$  versus  $(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}$ : That is, any  $q$ -query deterministic algorithm  $A$  satisfies*

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}}[\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})]] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}}[\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})]] \right| \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

*Then any non-adaptive (randomized) algorithm  $T$  that distribution-free  $(1/3)$ -tests  $C$  must have query complexity at least  $q$ .*

*Proof.* Assume for a contradiction that there exists a  $q$ -query non-adaptive randomized algorithm  $T_{s_1, s_2}$  that distribution-free  $(1/3)$ -tests  $C$  where  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are the random seeds of the algorithm. Then, by **C1**, for every  $(f, \mathcal{D})$  in the support of  $\mathcal{YES}$  we have  $\Pr[T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})] \geq 2/3$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}} [\Pr[T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})]] \geq \frac{2}{3}. \quad (3)$$

Define  $U := [g \text{ is } (1/3)\text{-far from every function in } C \text{ with respect to } \mathcal{D}]$  and  $\mathbf{W} := \Pr[T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})]$ . Then, by **C2**,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\mathbf{W}] &= \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\mathbf{W}|U] \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [U] + \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\mathbf{W}|\bar{U}] \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\bar{U}] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\mathbf{W}|U] + \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\bar{U}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{13} < \frac{5}{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

By (3) and (4) we have that

$$\mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}} [\Pr[T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})]] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\Pr[T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})]] > \frac{2}{3} - \frac{5}{12} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Since,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (\phi, \mathcal{D})] &= \Pr_{s_1, s_2, Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q} [T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (\phi, \mathcal{D})] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{s_1, s_2} \left[ \Pr_{Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q} [T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (\phi, \mathcal{D})] \right] \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{s_1, s_2} \left[ \mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}} \left[ \Pr_{Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q} [T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})] \right] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} \left[ \Pr_{Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q} [T_{s_1, s_2} \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})] \right] \right] > \frac{1}{4}.$$

Thus, there exist  $s'_1$  and  $s'_2$ , and therefore a  $q$ -query nonadaptive deterministic algorithm  $A = T_{s'_1, s'_2}$ , that satisfies

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})]] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})]] \right| > \frac{1}{4}.$$

A contradiction to **C3**. □

## 4 The $\mathcal{YES}$ and $\mathcal{NO}$ Distributions

Given  $J \subseteq [n]$ , we partition  $\{0, 1\}^n$  into sections (with respect to  $J$ ) where the  $z$ -section,  $z \in \{0, 1\}^J$ , consists of those  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  that have  $x_J = z$ . We write  $\mathcal{JUNTA}_J$  to denote the uniform distribution over all juntas over  $J$ . More precisely, a Boolean function  $\mathbf{h} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  drawn from  $\mathcal{JUNTA}_J$  is generated as follows: For each  $z \in \{0, 1\}^J$ , a bit  $\mathbf{b}(z)$  is chosen independently and uniformly at random, and for each  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  the value of  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  is set to  $\mathbf{b}(x_J)$ . That is, if  $x$  is in the  $z$ -section then  $\mathbf{h}(x) = \mathbf{b}(z)$ .

We now define two probability distributions: Let

$$m = 18 \ln |C|.$$

**The probability distribution  $\mathcal{YES}$**

A pair  $(f, \mathcal{D})$  drawn from  $\mathcal{YES}$  is generated as follows:

1. Draw a subset  $J$  of  $[n]$  of size  $k$  uniformly at random
2. Draw a subset  $S$  of  $\{0, 1\}^n$  of size  $m$  uniformly at random.
3. Draw  $f \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNTA}_J$
4. Set  $\mathcal{D}$  to be the uniform distribution over  $S$ .

**The probability distribution  $\mathcal{NO}$**

A pair  $(g, \mathcal{D})$  drawn from  $\mathcal{NO}$  is generated as follows:

1. Draw a subset  $J$  of  $[n]$  of size  $k$  uniformly at random
2. Draw a subset  $S$  of  $\{0, 1\}^n$  of size  $m$  uniformly at random.
3. Draw  $h \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNTA}_J$ . We usually refer to  $h$  as the background junta.
4. Draw a map  $\gamma : S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  uniformly at random by choosing a bit independently and uniformly at random for each string in  $S$ .
5. The distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  is set to be the uniform distribution over  $S$ , which is the same as  $\mathcal{YES}$ .
6. The function  $g : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is defined using  $h, S$  and  $\gamma$  as follows:

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \gamma(x) & x \in S \\ h(x) & x \notin S, (\forall y \in S) x_J \neq y_J \text{ or } d(x, y) > (0.5 - \lambda)n \\ \gamma(y) & x \notin S, (\exists y \in S) x_J = y_J \text{ and } d(x, y) \leq (0.5 - \lambda)n \end{cases} \quad (*)$$

(\*) The choice of the tie-breaking rule here is not important; we can, for example, order the elements of  $S$  in a lexicographic order  $(s^{(i)} : i \in [m])$  and define  $g(x) = \gamma(s^{(i)})$  for the smallest  $i$  that satisfies  $x_J = s_J^{(i)}$  and  $d(x, s^{(i)}) \leq (0.5 - \lambda)n$ . This makes  $g$  well defined.

For technical reasons that will become clear in the sequel we use  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  to denote the probability distribution supported over triples  $(f, \mathcal{D}, J)$ , with  $(f, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*$  being generated by the same steps above. So, the only difference is that we include  $J$  in elements of  $\mathcal{YES}^*$ . Similarly, we let  $\mathcal{NO}^*$  denote the distribution supported on triples  $(g, \mathcal{D}, J)$  as generated above.

To understand the intuition behind the above definitions, read subsection **The lower bound** in subsection 1.2 and the last paragraph in page 1:17 in [2] (when  $C$  is the class of all  $k$ -juntas).

## 5 The Proofs of C1 and C2

In this section we prove

**C1:** Every  $(f, \mathcal{D})$  in the support of  $\mathcal{YES}$  satisfies that  $f$  is in  $C$ .

**C2:** With probability at least  $12/13$ ,  $(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}$  satisfies that  $g$  is  $(1/3)$ -far from every function in  $C$  with respect to  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Proof of C1:** By the definition of  $\mathcal{YES}$  we have that  $f$  is  $k$ -junta. Since  $C$  contains all the  $k$ -juntas we have that  $f$  is in  $C$ .  $\square$

**Proof of C2:** Let  $\beta \in C$ . Since  $\mathcal{D}$  is the uniform distribution over  $\mathcal{S}$ , we have that  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{D}}(g, \beta)$  is equal to the fraction of strings  $z \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\gamma(z) \neq \beta(z)$ . By the union bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\text{dist}(g, C) < 1/3] &= \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [(\exists \beta \in C) \text{dist}(g, \beta) < 1/3] \\ &= \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} \left[ (\exists \beta \in C) \Pr_{z \leftarrow \mathcal{D}} [g(z) \neq \beta(z)] < 1/3 \right] \\ &\leq |C| \cdot \max_{\beta \in C} \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} \left[ \Pr_{z \leftarrow \mathcal{D}} [g(z) \neq \beta(z)] < 1/3 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Now let  $\mathbf{1}_{g \neq \beta}(z)$  be the indicator random variable of  $g(z) \neq \beta(z)$ , i.e,  $\mathbf{1}_{g \neq \beta}(z) = 1$  if  $g(z) \neq \beta(z)$  and zero otherwise. Since each bit  $\gamma(z)$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{S}$ , is drawn independently and uniformly at random, we have that, for every  $z \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\mathbf{1}_{g \neq \beta}(z)] = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then, by Chernoff bound (2) in Lemma 2 ( $m = 18 \ln |C|$ ,  $k \geq 10$ ,  $C$  contains all  $k$ -Junta functions and therefore  $|C| \geq 2^{2^k} > 13$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} \left[ \Pr_{z \leftarrow \mathcal{D}} [g(z) \neq \beta(z)] < \frac{1}{3} \right] &= \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} \left[ \sum_{z \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{1}_{g \neq \beta}(z) < \frac{1}{3} m \right] \\ &\leq e^{-m/9} \leq \frac{1}{13|C|}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$|C| \cdot \max_{\beta \in C} \Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} \left[ \Pr_{z \leftarrow \mathcal{D}} [g(z) \neq \beta(z)] < \frac{1}{3} \right] \leq \frac{1}{13}. \quad (6)$$

By (5) and (6) we get

$$\Pr_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\text{dist}(g, C) < 1/3] \leq \frac{1}{13}. \quad \square$$

## 6 The Proof of C3

In this section we prove

**C3:** Any  $q$ -query non-adaptive *deterministic* algorithm must behave similarly when it is run on  $(f, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}$  versus  $(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}$ : That is, any  $q$ -query deterministic algorithm  $A$  satisfies

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})]] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})]] \right| \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$



Let  $A$  be a  $q$ -query non-adaptive deterministic algorithm where

$$q = \frac{1}{8(1+2\lambda)^{k/2}} \cdot 2^{k/2},$$

and

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{5 + \ln \ln |C| + k/2}{n}}.$$

We will use the following definition. Let  $Y = (y_i : i \in [q])$  be a sequence of  $q$  strings in  $\{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $\alpha$  be a  $q$ -bit string, and  $J \subset [n]$  be a set of size  $k$ . We say that  $(Y, \alpha, J)$  is consistent if

$$\alpha_i = \alpha_j \text{ for all } i, j \in [q] \text{ with } y_J^{(i)} = y_J^{(j)}.$$

Given a consistent triple  $(Y, \alpha, J)$ , we write  $\mathcal{JUNTA}_{Y, \alpha, J}$  to denote the uniform distribution over all juntas  $h$  over  $J$  that are consistent with  $(Y, \alpha)$ . More precisely, a draw of  $\mathbf{h} \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNTA}_{Y, \alpha, J}$  is generated as follows: For each  $z \in \{0, 1\}^J$ , if there exists a  $y^{(i)}$  such that  $y_J^{(i)} = z$ , then  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  is set to  $\alpha_i$  for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  with  $x_J = z$ ; if no such  $y^{(i)}$  exists, then a uniform random bit  $\mathbf{b}(z)$  is chosen independently and  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  is set to  $\mathbf{b}(z)$  for all  $x$  with  $x_J = z$ .

To prove **C3**, we first derive from  $A$  the following randomized algorithm  $A'$  that works on triples  $(\phi, \mathcal{D}, J)$  from the support of either  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  or  $\mathcal{NO}^*$ . Again for clarity we use  $\phi$  to denote a function from the support of  $\mathcal{YES}/\mathcal{YES}^*$  or  $\mathcal{NO}/\mathcal{NO}^*$ ,  $f$  to denote a function from  $\mathcal{YES}/\mathcal{YES}^*$  and  $g$  to denote a function from  $\mathcal{NO}/\mathcal{NO}^*$ .

| Deterministic Algorithm $A$                | Randomized Algorithm $A'$   |
|--|---|
| 1. Input $(\phi, \mathcal{D})$             | 1. Input $(\phi, \mathcal{D}, J)$   |
| 2. $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$   | 2. $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$ ;  |
| 3. $\alpha = \phi(\mathbf{Y})$             | 3. $\alpha = \phi(\mathbf{Y})$<br>If $(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, J)$ is not consistent reject                         |
| 4. $\mathbf{Z} = A_1(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha)$  | 4. $\mathbf{Z} = A_1(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha)$   |
| 5. $\beta = \phi(\mathbf{Z})$              | 5. Draw $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNTA}_{\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, J}$ ;<br>$\beta = \mathbf{h}'(\mathbf{Z})$ |
| 6. Output $A_2(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \beta)$ | 6. Output $A_2(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \beta)$  |

From the description of  $A'$  above, we have

$$\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (\phi, \mathcal{D}, J)] = \mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{h}'}[(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, J) \text{ is consistent and } A_2(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{h}'(\mathbf{Z})) = 1].$$

To prove **C3** we will prove the following

**C3.1**  $A'$  behaves similarly on  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  and  $\mathcal{NO}^*$ , i.e.,

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D}, J)]] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D}, J)]] \right| \leq \frac{1}{8}.$$

**C3.2**  $A$  and  $A'$  behave identically on  $\mathcal{YES}$  and  $\mathcal{YES}^*$ , respectively. i.e.,

$$\mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J})]] = \mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})]].$$

**C3.3**  $A'$  and  $A$  behave similarly on  $\mathcal{NO}$  and  $\mathcal{NO}^*$ , respectively. i.e.,

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J})]] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})]] \right| \leq \frac{1}{8}.$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \boxed{\mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J})]]} & \stackrel{\leq \frac{1}{8}}{=} & \boxed{\mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J})]]} \\ \boxed{\mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})]]} & = & \boxed{\mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})]]} \end{array}$$

Obviously, **C3.1-C3.3** imply **C3**.

## 6.1 Proof of C3.1

In this subsection we prove

**C3.1**  $A'$  behaves similarly on  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  and  $\mathcal{NO}^*$ , i.e.,

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J})]] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J})]] \right| \leq \frac{1}{8}.$$

| Algorithm $A'$ - $\mathcal{YES}$ distribution   | Algorithm $A'$ - $\mathcal{NO}$ distribution  |
|---|---|
| 1. $(f, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*$   | 1. $(g, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{J}) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*$  |
| 2. $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$ ;  | 2. $\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$ ;  |
| 3. $\alpha = f(\mathbf{Y})$<br>If $(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathcal{J})$ is not consistent reject                            | 3. $\alpha = g(\mathbf{Y})$<br>If $(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathcal{J})$ is not consistent reject                            |
| 4. $\mathbf{Z} = A_1(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha)$   | 4. $\mathbf{Z} = A_1(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha)$   |
| 5. Draw $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNT}A_{\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathcal{J}}$ ;<br>$\beta = \mathbf{h}'(\mathbf{Z})$ | 5. Draw $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNT}A_{\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathcal{J}}$ ;<br>$\beta = \mathbf{h}'(\mathbf{Z})$ |
| 6. Output $A_2(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \beta)$  | 6. Output $A_2(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \beta)$  |

We say  $Y$  is *scattered* by  $J$  if there is no  $i \neq j$  such that  $y_j^{(i)} = y_j^{(j)}$ . The following claim shows that  $\mathbf{Y}$  is scattered by  $\mathcal{J}$  with high probability.

**Claim 1.** *We have that  $\mathbf{Y}$  is scattered by  $\mathcal{J}$  with probability at least 15/16*

*Proof.* We fix  $J$  and show that  $\mathbf{Y}$  is scattered by  $J$  with probability at least  $15/16$ . We now define the following distributions  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  for  $\mathbf{Y}$ .

1.  $D_1$ : Draw a subset  $\mathbf{S}$  of  $\{0, 1\}^n$  of size  $m$  uniformly at random. Then choose  $q$  strings  $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{y}^{(i)} : i \in [q])$  independently and uniformly at random from  $\mathbf{S}$  with replacement.
2.  $D_2$ : Choose  $q$  strings  $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{y}^{(i)} : i \in [q])$  independently and uniformly at random from  $\{0, 1\}^n$  with replacement.

Let  $F$  be the event:  $\mathbf{Y}$  is not scattered by  $J$ . We need to show that

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_1} [F] \leq \frac{1}{16}.$$

Let  $U$  be the event that the strings in  $\mathbf{Y}$  are distinct. It is clear that for any event  $E$  we have that  $\Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_1} [E|U] = \Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_2} [E|U]$ . By Lemma 9 and Lemma 5, the total variation distance between  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  is ( $q \leq 2^{k/2-3}$  and  $m = 18 \ln |C| \geq 2^k$ )

$$\|D_1 - D_2\|_{tv} \leq \Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_1} [\bar{U}] + \Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_2} [\bar{U}] \leq \frac{q^2}{2m} + \frac{q^2}{2^{n+1}} \leq \frac{q^2}{m} \leq \frac{1}{32}.$$

Since, by Lemma 7,  $\Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_1} [F] \leq \Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_2} [F] + 1/32$ , it remains to show that  $\Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_2} [F] \leq 1/32$ .

Since  $(\mathbf{y}^{(i)} : i \in [q])$  are chosen independently and uniformly at random from  $\{0, 1\}^n$  with replacement, we have that  $(\mathbf{y}_J^{(i)} : i \in [q])$  are chosen independently and uniformly at random from  $\{0, 1\}^k$  with replacement. Thus, by Lemma 5 ( $q \leq 2^{k/2-3}$ ),

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{Y} \leftarrow D_2} [F] \leq \frac{q^2}{2^{k+1}} \leq \frac{1}{32} \tag{7}$$

and the result follows. □

Since  $A'$  runs on  $(Y, \alpha, J)$ , by Lemma 7, it suffices to show that the distributions of  $(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha, \mathbf{J})$  induced from  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  and  $\mathcal{NO}^*$  have total variation distance less than or equal to  $1/8$ . For this purpose, we first note that the distributions of  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{J})$  induced from  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  and  $\mathcal{NO}^*$  are identical: In both cases,  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{J}$  are independent;  $\mathbf{J}$  is a random subset of  $[n]$  of size  $k$ ;  $\mathbf{Y}$  is obtained by first sampling a subset  $\mathbf{S}$  of  $\{0, 1\}^n$  of size  $m$  and then drawing a sequence of  $q$  strings from  $\mathbf{S}$  with replacement.

Fix any  $(Y, J)$  in the support of  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{J})$ . By Lemma 10, it is enough to show that the total variation of the distributions of  $\alpha$  conditioning on  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{J}) = (Y, J)$  in the  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  case and the  $\mathcal{NO}^*$  case is less than  $1/8$ .

Fix any  $(Y, J)$  in the support of  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{J})$  such that  $Y$  is scattered by  $J$ . By Claim 1 and Lemma 9 it is enough to show that the distributions of  $\alpha$  conditioning on  $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{J}) = (Y, J)$  in the  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  case and the  $\mathcal{NO}^*$  case are identical.

For  $Y = (y^{(i)} : i \in [q])$  the string  $\alpha = (\alpha_i : i \in [q])$  is uniform over strings of length  $q$  in both cases. This is trivial for  $\mathcal{NO}^*$ . For  $\mathcal{YES}^*$  note that  $\alpha$  is determined by the random  $k$ -junta  $\mathbf{f} \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNTA}_J$ ; the claim follows from the assumption that  $Y$  is scattered by  $J$ .

## 6.2 Proof of C3.2

In this subsection we prove

**C3.2**  $A$  and  $A'$  behave identically on  $\mathcal{YES}$  and  $\mathcal{YES}^*$ , respectively. i.e,

$$\mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D}, J)]] = \mathbf{E}_{(f, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (f, \mathcal{D})]].$$

| Algorithm $A'$  | Algorithm $A$                                       |
|---|---|
| 1. $(f, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*$                         | 1. $(f, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*$ |
| 2. $Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$   | 2. $Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$                     |
| 3. $\alpha = f(Y)$<br>If $(Y, \alpha, J)$ is not consistent reject          | 3. $\alpha = f(Y)$                                  |
| 4. $Z = A_1(Y, \alpha)$   | 4. $Z = A_1(Y, \alpha)$                             |
| 5. Draw $h' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNT}A_{Y, \alpha, J}$ ;<br>$\beta = h'(Z)$ | 5. Let<br>$\beta = f(Z)$                            |
| 6. Output $A_2(Y, \alpha, \beta)$   | 6. Output $A_2(Y, \alpha, \beta)$                   |

For the first expectation in **C3.2**, since the triple  $(Y, \alpha, J)$  on which we run  $A'$  is always consistent, we can rewrite it as the probability that

$$A_2(Y, \alpha, h'(A_1(Y, \alpha))) = 1,$$

where  $(f, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*$ ,  $Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$ ,  $\alpha = f(Y)$  and  $h' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNT}A_{Y, \alpha, J}$ .

The second expectation is equal to the probability that

$$A_2(Y, \alpha, f(A_1(Y, \alpha))) = 1$$

where  $(f, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{YES}^*$ ,  $Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$  and  $\alpha = f(Y)$ .

To show that these two probabilities are equal, we first note that the distributions of  $(Y, \alpha, J)$  are identical. Fixing any triple  $(Y, \alpha, J)$  in the support of  $(Y, \alpha, J)$ , which must be consistent, we claim that the distribution of  $f$  conditioning on  $(Y, \alpha, J) = (Y, \alpha, J)$  is exactly  $\mathcal{JUNT}A_{Y, \alpha, J}$ . This is because, for each  $z \in \{0, 1\}^J$ , if  $y_J^{(i)} = z$  for some  $y^{(i)}$  in  $Y$ , then we have  $f(x) = \alpha_i$  for all strings  $x$  with  $x_J = z$ ; otherwise, we have  $f(x) = b(z)$  for all  $x$  with  $x_J = z$ , where  $b(z)$  is an independent and uniform bit. This is the same as how  $h' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNT}A_{Y, \alpha, J}$  is generated. It follows directly from this claim that the two probabilities are the same. This finishes the proof of **C3.2**.

## 6.3 Proof of C3.3

In this subsection we prove

**C3.3**  $A'$  and  $A$  behave similarly on  $\mathcal{NO}$  and  $\mathcal{NO}^*$ , respectively. i.e,

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*} [\Pr[A' \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D}, J)]] - \mathbf{E}_{(g, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}} [\Pr[A \text{ accepts } (g, \mathcal{D})]] \right| \leq \frac{1}{8}.$$

**Algorithm  $A'$** 

1.  $(g, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*$
2.  $Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$
3.  $\alpha = g(Y)$   
If  $(Y, \alpha, J)$  is not consistent reject
4.  $Z = A_1(Y, \alpha)$
5. Draw  $h' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNT}A_{Y, \alpha, J}$ ;  
 $\beta = h'(Z)$
6. Output  $A_2(Y, \alpha, \beta)$

**Algorithm  $A$** 

1.  $(g, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*$
2.  $Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$
3.  $\alpha = g(Y)$
4.  $Z = A_1(Y, \alpha)$
5. Let  
 $\beta = g(Z)$
6. Output  $A_2(Y, \alpha, \beta)$

We remind the reader that

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \gamma(x) & x \in S \\ \mathbf{h}(x) & x \notin S, (\forall y \in S) x_J \neq y_J \text{ or } d(x, y) > (0.5 - \lambda)n \\ \gamma(y) & x \notin S, (\exists y \in S) x_J = y_J \text{ and } d(x, y) \leq (0.5 - \lambda)n \end{cases} .$$

The first expectation in **C3.3** is equal to the probability of

$$(Y, \alpha, J) \text{ is consistent and } A_2(Y, \alpha, h'(A_1(Y, \alpha))) = 1,$$

where  $(g, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*$ ,  $Y \leftarrow \mathcal{D}^q$ ,  $\alpha = g(Y)$ , and  $h' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNT}A_{Y, \alpha, J}$ .

The second expectation is the probability of

$$A_2(Y, \alpha, g(A_1(Y, \alpha))) = 1,$$

where  $(g, \mathcal{D}, J) \leftarrow \mathcal{NO}^*$  and  $\alpha = g(Y)$ .

The distributions of  $(Y, \alpha, J, \mathcal{D})$  in the two cases are identical.

We say that a tuple  $(Y, \alpha, J, \mathcal{D})$  in the support of  $(Y, \alpha, J, \mathcal{D})$  is *good* if it satisfies the following three conditions: Here  $Z = A_1(Y, \alpha)$  and  $S$  is the support of  $\mathcal{D}$

$E_0$  :  $Y$  is scattered by  $J$ .

$E_1$  : Every  $z$  in  $Z$  and every  $x \in S \setminus \{y^{(i)} : i \in [q]\}$  have  $d(x, z) > (0.5 - \lambda)n$ .

$E_2$  : If a string  $z$  in  $Z$  satisfies  $z_J = y_J$  for some  $y$  in  $Y$ , then we have  $d(y, z) \leq (0.5 - \lambda)n$ .

We delay the proof of the following claim to the end.

**Claim 2.** *We have that  $(Y, \alpha, J, \mathcal{D})$  is good with probability at least  $7/8$ .*

Fix any good  $(Y, \alpha, J, \mathcal{D})$  in the support and let  $Z = A_1(Y, \alpha)$ . We first show that since  $Y$  is scattered by  $J$  we have that  $(Y, \alpha, J)$  is consistent. Let  $i, j \in [q]$  with  $y_j^{(i)} = y_j^{(i)}$ . Since  $Y$  is scattered by  $J$  we have  $i = j$  and therefore  $\alpha_i = g(y^{(i)}) = g(y^{(j)}) = \alpha_j$ . Therefore  $(Y, \alpha, J)$  is consistent.

We finish the proof by showing that the distribution of  $g(Z)$ , a binary string of length  $q$ , conditioning on  $(Y, \alpha, J, \mathcal{D}) = (Y, \alpha, J, \mathcal{D})$  is the same as that of  $h'(Z)$  with  $h' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNT}A_{Y, \alpha, J}$ .

This combined with Lemmas 8, 10 and Claim 2 implies that the difference of the two probabilities has absolute value at most  $1/8$ . To see this is the case, we partition strings of  $Z$  into  $Z_w$ , where each  $Z_w$  is a nonempty set that contains all  $z$  in  $Z$  with  $z_J = w \in \{0,1\}^J$ . For each  $Z_w$ , we consider the following two cases:

**Case I.** There exists  $y^{(i)}$  in  $Y$  with  $y_J^{(i)} = w$ . By  $E_0$ ,  $y^{(i)}$  is the only string  $y$  in  $Y$  that satisfies  $y_J = w$ . By  $E_2$ , every  $z \in Z_w$  satisfies  $d(z, y^{(i)}) \leq (0.5 - \lambda)n$ . By  $E_1$ , every  $z \in Z_w$  and every  $y \in S \setminus \{y^{(i)} : i \in [q]\}$  we have  $d(x, z) > (0.5 - \lambda)n$ . Therefore, the only  $y$  in  $S$  that satisfies  $y_J = w$  and  $d(z, y) \leq (0.5 - \lambda)n$  is  $y^{(i)}$ . Therefore, for every  $z \in Z_w$  we have  $\mathbf{g}(z) = \gamma(y^{(i)}) = \alpha_i$ . On the other hand, for every  $z \in Z_w$  and  $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNTAY}_{Y, \alpha, J}$  we have  $\mathbf{h}'(z) = \alpha_i$ .

**Case II.** There exists no  $y$  in  $Y$  with  $y_J = w$ . By  $E_1$  for every  $z \in Z_w$  and every  $x \in S \setminus \{y^{(i)} : i \in [q]\}$  we have that  $d(x, z) \geq (0.5 - \lambda)n$ . Therefore for every  $z \in Z_w$  and every  $x \in S$  we have that  $x_J \neq z_J$  or  $d(x, z) \geq (0.5 - \lambda)n$ . Thus, for every  $z \in Z_w$  we have that  $\mathbf{g}(z) = \mathbf{h}(z) = \mathbf{b}(w)$  for some uniform bit  $\mathbf{b}(w)$ . The same is true for  $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNTAY}_{Y, \alpha, J}$ .

So the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{g}(Z)$  is identical to that of  $\mathbf{h}'(Z)$  with  $\mathbf{h}' \leftarrow \mathcal{JUNTAY}_{Y, \alpha, J}$ . This finishes the proof of **C3**.

Now to prove Claim 2, we show that  $\Pr[\overline{E_0}] \leq 1/16$  and  $\Pr[\overline{E_1}], \Pr[\overline{E_2}] \leq 1/32$ . By the union bound we get

$$\Pr[E_1 \text{ and } E_2 \text{ and } E_3] \geq 1 - \Pr[\overline{E_0}] - \Pr[\overline{E_1}] - \Pr[\overline{E_2}] \geq \frac{7}{8}.$$

## 6.4 The Proof for $E_0$ and $E_1$

From Claim 1, we have

$$\Pr[\overline{E_0}] \leq \frac{1}{16}.$$

We now prove that with probability at most  $1/32$ ,

$\overline{E_1}$ : There exists  $z$  in  $Z$  and  $x \in S \setminus \{y^{(i)} : i \in [q]\}$  such that  $d(x, z) \leq (0.5 - \lambda)n$ .

To prove that  $\Pr[\overline{E_1}] \leq 1/32$ , we fix a pair  $(Y, \alpha)$  in the support and let  $\ell \leq q$  be the number of distinct strings in  $Y$  and  $Z = A_1(Y, \alpha)$ . Conditioning on  $\mathbf{Y} = Y$ ,  $S \setminus \mathbf{Y}$  is a uniformly random subset of  $\{0,1\}^n \setminus Y$  of size  $m - \ell$ . Instead of working with  $S \setminus \mathbf{Y}$ , we let  $\mathbf{T}$  denote a set obtained by making  $m - \ell$  draws from  $\{0,1\}^n$  uniformly at random (with replacements). On the one hand, by Lemma 8, the total variation distance between  $S \setminus \mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  is exactly the probability that either (1)  $\mathbf{T} \cap Y$  is nonempty or (2)  $|\mathbf{T}| < m - \ell$ . By two union bounds, (1) happens with probability  $1 - (1 - \ell/2^n)^{m-\ell} \leq (m - \ell) \cdot (\ell/2^n) \leq mq/2^n$  and, by Lemma 5, (2) happens with probability at most  $m^2/2^n$ . As a result, the total variation distance is at most  $(mq + m^2)/2^n$ . On the other hand, by Chernoff bound (2) in Lemma 2, the probability that one of the strings of  $\mathbf{T}$  has distance at most  $(0.5 - \lambda)n$  with one of the strings of  $Z$  is at most  $mq \exp(-\lambda^2 n)$ . Thus, by union bound ( $n \geq 15 + 2 \log \log |C|$ ,  $q \leq 2^{k/2-3}$  and  $m = 18 \ln |C|$ )

$$\Pr[\overline{E_2}] \leq \frac{mq + m^2}{2^n} + mq \cdot e^{-\lambda^2 n} \leq \frac{m^2}{2^{n-1}} + mq \cdot e^{-\lambda^2 n} \leq \frac{1}{64} + \frac{1}{64} \leq \frac{1}{32}.$$

## 6.5 The Proof for $E_2$

We now prove that with probability at most  $1/32$ ,

$\overline{E_2}$ : There exists two strings  $z$  in  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $y$  in  $\mathbf{Y}$  that satisfies  $z_{\mathbf{J}} = y_{\mathbf{J}}$  and  $d(y, z) > (0.5 - \lambda)n$ .

Fix a pair  $(Y, \alpha)$  in the support and let  $Z = A_2(Y, \alpha)$ . Because  $\mathbf{J}$  is independent from  $(\mathbf{Y}, \alpha)$ , it remains a subset of  $[n]$  of size  $k$  drawn uniformly at random. For each pair  $(y, z)$  with  $y$  from  $Y$  and  $z$  from  $Z$  that satisfy  $d(y, z) > (0.5 - \lambda)n$ , the probability of  $y_{\mathbf{J}} = z_{\mathbf{J}}$  is at most

$$\frac{\binom{(0.5+\lambda)n}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \leq (0.5 + \lambda)^k.$$

Then

$$\Pr[\overline{E_2}] \leq q^2 \cdot \frac{\binom{(0.5+\lambda)n}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \leq q^2(0.5 + \lambda)^k \leq \frac{1}{32}.$$

## References

- [1] Nader H. Bshouty. Almost optimal distribution-free junta testing. In *34th Computational Complexity Conference, CCC 2019, July 18-20, 2019, New Brunswick, NJ, USA*, pages 2:1–2:13, 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.2>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2019.2.
- [2] Zhengyang Liu, Xi Chen, Rocco A. Servedio, Ying Sheng, and Jinyu Xie. Distribution-free junta testing. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2018, Los Angeles, CA, USA, June 25-29, 2018*, pages 749–759, 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3188745.3188842>, doi:10.1145/3188745.3188842.