

# Efficient reductions and algorithms for variants of Subset Sum <sup>\*</sup>

Pranjal Dutta <sup>†</sup>

Mahesh Sreekumar Rajasree <sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

Given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ , the Subset Sum problem (SSUM) is to decide whether there exists  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$ . There is a close variant of the SSUM, called Subset Product. Given positive integers  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  and a target integer  $t$ , the Subset Product problem asks to determine whether there exists a subset  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\prod_{i \in S} a_i = t$ . There is a pseudopolynomial time dynamic programming algorithm, due to Bellman (1957) which solves the SSUM and Subset Product in  $O(nt)$  time and  $O(t)$  space.

In the first part, we present *search* algorithms for variants of the Subset Sum problem. Our algorithms are parameterized by  $k$ , which is a given upper bound on the number of realisable sets (i.e., number of solutions, summing exactly  $t$ ). We show that SSUM with a unique solution is already NP-hard, under randomized reduction. This makes the regime of parametrized algorithms, in terms of  $k$ , very interesting.

Subsequently, we present an  $\tilde{O}(k \cdot (n + t))$  time deterministic algorithm, which finds the hamming weight of all the realisable sets for a subset sum instance. We also give a  $\text{poly}(knt)$ -time and  $O(\log(knt))$ -space deterministic algorithm that finds all the realisable sets for a subset sum instance.

In the latter part, we present a simple and elegant randomized algorithm for Subset Product in  $\tilde{O}(n + t^{o(1)})$  expected-time. Moreover, we also present a  $\text{poly}(nt)$  time and  $O(\log^2(nt))$  space deterministic algorithm for the same. We study these problems in the unbounded setting as well. Our algorithms use multivariate FFT, power series and number-theoretic techniques, introduced by Jin and Wu (SOSA'19) and Kane (2010).

**Keywords.** subset sum, subset product, power series, isolation lemma, hamming weight, interpolation, logspace, Newton's identities, simultaneous, FFT, pseudo-prime-factor

---

<sup>\*</sup>A preliminary version of this work has been accepted to CALDAM 2022.

<sup>†</sup>Chennai Mathematical Institute, India (and Visiting Research Fellow, Department of CSE, IIT Kanpur).  
Email: pranjal@cmi.ac.in.

<sup>‡</sup>Department of CSE, IIT Kanpur. Email: mahesr@cse.iitk.ac.in.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Variants of Subset Sum	3
1.2	Our results	4
1.3	Related works	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries and Notations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Hardness results</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Time-efficient algorithms</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Time-efficient algorithm for Hamming $- k -$ SSSUM	11
<b>5</b>	<b>Time-efficient algorithm for Subset Product</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1	Proof of <a href="#">Theorem 2</a>	15
<b>6</b>	<b>Space-efficient algorithms</b>	<b>16</b>
6.1	Space-efficient algorithm for $k -$ SSSUM	16
6.2	Space-efficient algorithm for Subset Product	19
<b>7</b>	<b>An efficient reduction from Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum</b>	<b>21</b>
7.1	Polynomial time algorithm for computing pseudo-prime-factors	23
<b>8</b>	<b>Extending Theorem 1 and 2 to Unbounded Subset Sum</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Generalizing Jin and Wu’s technique [<a href="#">JW18</a>] to different settings</b>	<b>30</b>
A.1	Revisiting [ <a href="#">JW18</a> ] with weighted coefficient	30
A.2	Fast multivariate polynomial multiplication	32
A.3	Solving linear recurrence: Tool for <a href="#">subsection 4.1</a>	34
<b>B</b>	<b>Algorithms</b>	<b>35</b>
B.1	Trivial solution for $k -$ SSSUM	35
B.2	Trivial dynamic algorithm for SimulSubsetSum	36
<b>C</b>	<b>Dynamic programming approach for Subset Product</b>	<b>36</b>

# 1 Introduction

The Subset Sum problem (SSUM) is a well-known NP-complete problem [Lew83, p. 226], where given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{n+1}$ , the problem is to decide whether there exists  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$ . In the recent years, provable-secure cryptosystems based on SSUM such as private-key encryption schemes [LPS10], tag-based encryption schemes [FMV16], etc have been proposed. There are numerous improvements made in the algorithms that solve the SSUM problem in both the classical [BW21, Bri17, JW18, JVW21, EM20] and quantum world [BJLM13, HM18, LL19]. One of the first algorithms was due to Bellman [Bel57] who gave a  $O(nt)$  time (*pseudo-polynomial* time) algorithm which requires  $\Omega(t)$  space. In this paper, we give efficient algorithms for interesting variants of subset sum.

## 1.1 Variants of Subset Sum

To begin with, one can ask for a *search* version of the subset sum problem, i.e., to output all the solutions. Since there can be *exponentially* many solutions, it could take  $\exp(n)$ -time (and space), to output them. This motivates our first problem defined below.

**Problem 1** ( $k$  – SSSUM). *Given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{n+1}$ , the  $k$ -solution SSUM ( $k$  – SSSUM) problem asks to output all  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$  provided with the guarantee that the number of such subsets is at most  $k$ .*

► Remark. We denote 1 – SSSUM as unique Subset Sum problem (uSSSUM). In [stackexchange](#), a more restricted version was asked where it was assumed that  $k = 1$ , for *any* realizable  $t$ . Here we just want  $k = 1$  for some *fixed* target value  $t$  and we do not assume anything for any other value  $t'$ .

Now, we consider a different restricted version of the  $k$  – SSSUM, where we demand to output only the hamming weights of the  $k$ -solutions (we call it Hamming –  $k$  – SSSUM, for definition see [Problem 2](#)). By hamming weight of a solution, we mean the number of  $a_i$ 's in the solution set (which sums up to exactly  $t$ ). In other words, if  $\vec{a} \cdot \vec{v} = t$ , where  $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  and  $\vec{v} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , we want  $|\vec{v}|_1$ , the  $\ell_1$ -norm of the solution vector.

**Problem 2** (Hamming –  $k$  – SSSUM). *Given an instance of the  $k$  – SSSUM, say  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{n+1}$ , with the promise that there are at most  $k$ -many  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$ , Hamming –  $k$  – SSSUM asks to output all the hamming weights (i.e.,  $|S|$ ) of the solutions.*

It is obvious that solving  $k$  – SSSUM solves [Problem 2](#). Importantly, the decision problem, namely the HWSSUM is already NP-hard.

**HWSSUM and its NP-hardness.** The HWSSUM problem is : Given an instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t, w) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{n+2}$ , decide whether there is a solution to the subset sum with hamming weight equal to  $w$ . Note that, there is a trivial Cook's reduction from the SSUM to the HWSSUM: SSUM decides 'yes' to the instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$  iff at least one of the following HWSSUM instances  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t, i)$ , for  $i \in [n]$  decides 'yes'. Therefore, the search-version of HWSSUM, the Hamming –  $k$  – SSSUM problem, is already an interesting problem and worth investigating.

In parallel, we also study a well-known variant of the subset sum, called Subset Product.

**Problem 3** (Subset Product). *Given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{n+1}$ , the Subset Product problem asks to decide whether there exists an  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\prod_{i \in S} a_i = t$ .*

Subset Product is also known to be NP-complete [GJ79, p. 221]. Like SSUM, it has a trivial  $O(nt)$  time (*pseudo-polynomial* time) dynamic programming algorithm which requires  $\Omega(t)$  space [Bel57].

Subset Product has been studied and applied in many different forms. For e.g., 1) constructing a *smooth hash* (VSH) by Contini, Lenstra and Steinfeld [CLS06], 2) attack on the Naccache-Stern Knapsack (NSK) public key cryptosystem [DMT20]. Similar problem has also been studied in optimization, in the form of product knapsack problem [PST21], multiobjective knapsack problem [BHV09] and so on.

Next, we define a ‘seemingly’ unrelated problem at first. It asks to decide whether there is a ‘common’ solution to the given many instances of subset sum. This was first introduced by [Kan10, Section 3.3] (but no formal name was given). In this work, we study this as an intermediate problem which plays a crucial role to study the Subset Product problem, see [section 5](#).

**Problem 4** (SimulSubsetSum). *Given subset sum instances  $(a_{1j}, \dots, a_{nj}, t_j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ , for  $j \in [k]$ , where  $k$  is some parameter, the Simultaneous Subset Sum problem (in short, SimulSubsetSum) asks to decide whether there exists an  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_{ij} = t_j, \forall j \in [k]$ .*

► **Remarks.** 1. When  $k$  is fixed parameter (independent of  $n$ ), we call this  $k$  – SimulSubsetSum. There is a trivial  $O(n(t_1 + 1) \dots (t_k + 1))$  time deterministic algorithm for the SimulSubsetSum problem with  $k$  subset sum instances ( $k$  not necessarily a constant); for details see [subsection B.2](#).

2. It suffices to work with  $t_j \geq 1, \forall j \in [k]$ . To argue that, let us assume that  $t_j = 0$  for some  $j \in [k]$  and  $I_j := \{i \in [n] \mid a_{ij} = 0\}$ . Observe that if SimulSubsetSum has a solution set  $S \subseteq [n]$ , then  $S \subseteq I_j$ . Therefore, for every  $\ell \in [k]$ , instead of looking at  $(a_{1\ell}, \dots, a_{n\ell}, t_\ell)$ , it suffices to work with  $\{a_{i,\ell} \mid i \in I_j\}$  with the target  $t_\ell$ . Thus, we can trivially ignore the  $j^{\text{th}}$  SSUM instance.

**Hardness depends on  $k$ .** [Problem 4](#) asks to solve a system of  $k$ -linear equations in  $n$ -variables with 0/1 constraints on the variables in a linear algebraic way. If we assume that the set of vectors  $\{(a_{1j}, \dots, a_{nj}) \mid \forall j \in [k]\}$  are linearly independent; then we can perform Gaussian elimination to find a relation between the free variables (exactly  $n - k$ ) and dependent/leading variables. Then, by enumerating over all possible  $2^{n-k}$  values of the free variables and finding the corresponding values for leading variables, we can check whether there is a 0/1 solution. This takes  $\text{poly}(n, k) \cdot 2^{n-k}$  time.

In particular, when  $k \geq n - O(\log(n))$ , SimulSubsetSum (with assuming linear independence), it has a polynomial time solution. Whereas, we showed (in [Theorem 15](#)) that given a subset sum instance, we can convert this into a SimulSubsetSum instance in polynomial time even with  $k = O(\log(n))$ .

## 1.2 Our results

In this section, we briefly state our main results. The leitmotif of this paper is to give efficient (time, space) algorithms for all the aforementioned variants of subset sum.

### 1.2.1 Time-efficient algorithms for variants of Subset Sum

Our first theorem gives an efficient pseudo-linear  $\tilde{O}(n + t)$  time *deterministic* algorithm for [Problem 2](#), for constant  $k$ .

**Theorem 1** (Algorithm for hamming weight). *There is a  $\tilde{O}(k(n+t))$ -time deterministic algorithm for Hamming  $-k$  - SSSUM.*

► Remark (Optimality). We emphasize the fact that **Theorem 1** is likely to be *near-optimal* for bounded  $k$ , due to the following argument. An  $O(t^{1-\epsilon})$  time algorithm for Hamming  $-1$  - SSSUM can be directly used to solve  $1 - \text{SSSUM}$ , as discussed above. By using the *randomized reduction* (**Theorem 14**), this would give us a randomized  $n^{O(1)}t^{1-\epsilon}$ -time algorithm for SSSUM. But, in [ABHS19] the authors showed that SSSUM does not have  $n^{O(1)}t^{1-\epsilon}$  time algorithm unless the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) is false.

**Theorem 1 is better than the trivial.** Consider the usual ‘search-to-decision’ reduction for subset sum: First try to include  $a_1$  in the subset, and if it is feasible then we subtract  $t$  by  $a_1$  and add  $a_1$  into the solution, and then continue with  $a_2$ , and so on. This procedure finds a single solution, but if we implement it in a recursive way then it can find all the  $k$  solutions in  $k \cdot n \cdot$  (time complexity for decision version) time; we can think about an  $n$ -level binary recursion tree where all the infeasible subtrees are pruned. Since number of solutions is bounded by  $k$ , choosing a prime  $p > n + t + k$  suffices in [JW18], to make the algorithm deterministic. Thus, the time complexity of the decision version is  $\tilde{O}((n+t) \log k)$ . Hence, from the above, the search complexity is  $\tilde{O}(kn(n+t))$  which is *worse* than **Theorem 1**.

**Theorem 2** (Time-efficient algorithm for Subset Product). *There exists a randomized algorithm that solves Subset Product in  $\tilde{O}(n + t^{o(1)})$  expected-time.*

Remarks. 1. The result in the first part of the above theorem is reminiscent of the  $\tilde{O}(n+t)$  time randomized algorithms for the subset sum problem [JW18, Bri17], although the time complexity in our case is the expected time, and ours is better.

2. The expected time is because to factor an integer  $t$  takes expected  $\exp(O(\sqrt{\log(t)} \log \log(t)))$  time [LP92]. If one wants to remove expected time analysis (and do the worst case analysis), the same problem can be solved in  $\tilde{O}(n^2 + t^{o(1)})$  randomized-time. For details, see the end of **subsection 5.1**.

3. While it is true that Bellman’s algorithm gives  $O(nt)$  time algorithm, the state-space of this algorithm can be improved to (expected)  $nt^{o(1)}$ -time for Subset Product, using a similar dynamic algorithm with a careful analysis. For details, see **C**.

## 1.2.2 Space-efficient algorithms for variants of Subset Sum

**Theorem 3** (Algorithms for finding solutions in low space). *There is a  $\text{poly}(knt)$ -time and  $O(\log(knt))$ -space deterministic algorithm which solves  $k - \text{SSSUM}$ .*

► Remark. When considering low space algorithms outputting multiple values, the standard assumption is that the output is written onto a one-way tape which *does not* count into the space complexity; so an algorithm outputting  $kn \log n$  bits (like in the above case) could use much less working memory than  $kn \log n$ ; for a reference see McKay and Williams [MW18].

**Theorem 3 is better than the trivial.** Let us again compare with the trivial search-to-decision reduction time algorithm, as mentioned in **subsection 1.2.1**. For solving the decision problem in low space, we simply use Kane’s  $O(\log(nt))$ -space  $\text{poly}(nt)$ -time algorithm [Kan10]. As explained




Figure 1: Reductions among variants of the Subset Sum problem

(and improved) in [JVW21], the time complexity is actually  $O(n^3t)$  and the extra space usage is  $\tilde{O}(n)$  for remembering the recursion stack. Thus the total time complexity is  $O(kn^4t)$  and it takes  $\tilde{O}(n) + O(\log t)$  space. While [Theorem 3](#) takes  $O(\log(knt))$  space and  $\text{poly}(knt)$  time. Although our time complexity is worse<sup>1</sup>, when  $k \leq 2^{O((n \log t)^{1-\epsilon})}$ , for  $\epsilon > 0$ , our space complexity is better.

**Theorem 4.** (Algorithm for Subset Product) Subset Product can be solved deterministically in  $O(\log^2(nt))$  space and  $\text{poly}(nt)$ -time.

► Remark. We cannot directly invoke the theorem in [Kan10, Section 3.3] to conclude, since the reduction from Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum requires  $O(n \log(nt))$  space. Essentially, we use the same identity lemma as [Kan10] and carefully use the space; for details see [subsection 6.2](#).

### 1.2.3 Reductions among variants of Subset Sum

Using a pseudo-prime-factorization decomposition, we show that given a target  $t$  in Subset Product, it suffices to solve SimulSubsetSum with at most  $\log t$  many instances, where each of the targets are also ‘small’, at most  $O(\log \log t)$  bits.

**Theorem 5** (Reducing Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum). *There is a deterministic polynomial time reduction from Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum.*

► Remark. The reduction uses  $\tilde{O}(n \log t)$  space as opposed to the following chain of reductions: Subset Product  $\leq_P$  SSUM  $\leq_P$  SimulSubsetSum. The first reduction is a *natural* reduction, from an input  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$ , which takes  $\log$  both sides and adjust (multiply) a ‘large’  $M$  (it could be  $O(n \log t)$  bit [KP10, PST21]) with  $\log a_i$ , to reduce this to a SSUM instance with  $b_i := \lfloor M \log a_i \rfloor$ . Therefore, the total space required could be as large as  $\tilde{O}(n^2 \log t)$ . The second reduction follows from [Theorem 15](#). Therefore, ours is more space efficient. Motivated thus, we give an efficient randomized algorithm for SimulSubsetSum.

In the latter part, we present few reductions among SSUM,  $k$  – SSSUM and SimulSubsetSum problems. We also extend [Problem 1-2](#) to the *unbounded version* of the Subset Sum problem (UBSSUM) and show similar theorems as above. For details, see [section 7-8](#).

<sup>1</sup>Thm. 3 is not about time complexity; as long as it is pseudopolynomial time it’s ok.

### 1.3 Related works

Before going into the details, we briefly review the state of the art of the problems (& its variants). After Bellman’s  $O(nt)$  dynamic solution [Bel57], Pisinger [Pis99] first improved it to  $O(nt/\log t)$  on word-RAM models. Recently, Koiliaris and Xu gave a deterministic algorithm [KX19, KX18] in time  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nt})$ , which is the best deterministic algorithm so far. Bringmann [Bri17] & Jin et.al. [JW18] later improved the running time to randomized  $\tilde{O}(n+t)$ . All these algorithms require  $\Omega(t)$  space. Moreover, most of the recent algorithms solve the decision versions. Here we remark that in [ABHS19], the authors showed that SSUM has no  $t^{1-\epsilon}n^{O(1)}$  time algorithm for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , unless the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) is false. Therefore, the  $\tilde{O}(n+t)$  time bound is likely to be *near-optimal*.

There have been a very few attempts to classically solve Subset Product or its variants. It is known to be NP-complete and the reduction follows from the Exact Cover by 3-Sets (X3C) problem [GJ79, p. 221]. Though the knapsack and its approximation versions have been studied [KP10, PST21], we do not know many classical algorithms and attempts to solve this, unlike the recent attention for the subset sum problem [Bri17, JW18, Jvw21, BW21].

In [KX19] (also see [KX18, Lemma 2]), the authors gave a deterministic  $\tilde{O}(nt)$  algorithm that finds all the hamming weights for all realisable targets less than equal to  $t$ . Their algorithm *does not* depend on the number of solutions for a particular target. Compared to this, our **Theorem 1** is *faster* when  $k = o(n/(\log n)^c)$ , for a large constant  $c$ . Similarly, with the ‘extra’ information of  $k$ , we give a *faster* deterministic algorithm (which even outputs all the hamming weights of the solutions) compared to  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nt})$  decision algorithm in [KX18, KX19] (which outputs all the realisable subset sums  $\leq t$ ), when  $k = o(\sqrt{n}/(\log n)^c)$ , for a large constant  $c$ . Here we remark that the  $O(nt)$ -time dynamic programming algorithm [Bel57] can be easily modified to find all the solutions, but this gives an  $O(n(k+t))$ -time (and space) algorithm solution (for more details, see **subsection B.1**).

On the other hand, there have been quite some work on solving SSUM in LOGSPACE. Elberfeld, Jakoby, and Tantau [EJT10], and Kane [Kan10] (2010) gave  $O(\log nt)$  space  $\text{poly}(nt)$ -time deterministic algorithm, which have been very recently improved to  $\tilde{O}(n^2t)$ -time and  $\text{poly} \log(nt)$  space. On the other hand, Bringmann [Bri17] gave a  $nt^{1+\epsilon}$  time,  $O(n \log t)$  space *randomized* algorithm, which have been improved to  $O(\log n \log \log n + \log t)$  space by Jin et.al. [Jvw21]. Again, most of the algorithms are decision algorithms and do not output the solution set. In contrast to this, our algorithm (**algorithm 2**) in **Theorem 3** uses only  $O(\log(knt))$  and outputs all the solution sets, which is near-optimal.

Since subset sum can be solved in randomized  $\tilde{O}(n+t)$  time [JW18], as mentioned before, one obvious way to solve Subset Product would be to work with  $b_i := \lfloor M \log a_i \rfloor$  and a  $\mathcal{R}$ , a range of target values  $t'$  which could be as large as  $M \log t$  such that Subset Product is YES iff subset sum instance with  $b_i$  and  $t' \in \mathcal{R}$  is YES. But  $M$  could be as large as  $O(n \cdot (\prod_i a_i)^{1/2})$ . Therefore, although there is a randomized near-linear time algorithm for subset sum, when one reduces the instance of Subset Product to a subset sum instance, the target becomes very large, failing to give an  $\tilde{O}(n+t)$  algorithm.

Moreover, the general techniques, used for subset sum [Bri17, JW18, Jvw21] seem to fail to ‘directly’ give algorithms for Subset Product. This is exactly why, in this work, the efficient algorithms have been indirect, *via* solving SimulSubsetSum instances.



## 2 Preliminaries and Notations

**Notations.**  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}$  denotes the set of all natural numbers, integers and rational numbers respectively. Let  $a, b$  be two  $m$ -bit integers. Then,  $a // b$  denotes  $a/b^e$  where  $e$  is the largest non-negative integer such that  $b^e | a$ . Observe that  $a // b$  is not divisible by  $b$  and the time to compute  $a // b$  is  $O(m \log(m) \cdot \log(e))$ .

For any positive integer  $n > 0$ ,  $[n]$  denotes the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  while  $[a, b]$  denotes the set of integers  $i$  s.t.  $a \leq i \leq b$ . Also,  $2^{[n]}$  denotes the set of all subsets of  $[n]$ , while  $\log$  denotes  $\log_2$ . A weight function  $w : [n] \rightarrow [m]$ , can be naturally extended to a set  $S \in 2^{[n]}$ , by defining  $w(S) := \sum_{i \in S} w(i)$ . We also denote  $\tilde{O}(g)$  to be  $g \cdot \text{poly}(\log g)$ .

$\mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_k]$  denotes the ring of  $k$ -variate polynomials over field  $\mathbb{F}$  and  $\mathbb{F}[[x_1, \dots, x_k]]$  is the ring of power series in  $k$ -variables over  $\mathbb{F}$ . We will use the short-hand notation  $\mathbf{x}$  to denote the collection of variables  $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  for some  $k$ . For any non-negative integer vector  $\vec{e} \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ ,  $\mathbf{x}^{\vec{e}}$  denotes  $\prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{e_i}$ . Using these notations, we can will write any polynomial  $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{x}]$  as  $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\vec{e} \in S} f_{\vec{e}} \cdot \mathbf{x}^{\vec{e}}$  for some suitable set  $S$ .

We denote  $\text{coef}_{\mathbf{x}^{\vec{e}}}(f)$ , as the coefficient of  $\mathbf{x}^{\vec{e}}$  in the polynomial  $f(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\text{deg}_{x_i}(f)$  as the highest degree of  $x_i$  in  $f(\mathbf{x})$ . Sparsity of a polynomial  $f(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_k]$  over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ , denotes the number of nonzero terms in  $f$ .

**Definition 1** (Subset Sum problem (SSUM)). Given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ , the subset sum problem is to decide whether  $t$  is a realisable target with respect to  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , i.e., there exists  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$ . Here,  $n$  is called the size,  $t$  is the target and any  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$  is a realisable set of the subset sum instance.

**Assumptions.** Throughout the paper, we assume that  $t \geq \max a_i$  for simplicity.

**Lemma 6** ([MVV87, Isolation Lemma]). Let  $n$  and  $N$  be positive integers, and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an arbitrary family of subsets of  $[n]$ . Suppose  $w(x)$  is an integer weight given to each element  $x \in [n]$  uniformly and independently at random from  $[N]$ . The weight of  $S \in \mathcal{F}$  is defined as  $w(S) = \sum_{x \in S} w(x)$ . Then, with probability at least  $1 - n/N$ , there is a unique set  $S' \in \mathcal{F}$  that has the minimum weight among all sets of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Lemma 7** (Kane's Identity [Kan10]). Let  $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^d c_i x^i$  be a polynomial of degree at most  $d$  with coefficients  $c_i$  being integers. Let  $\mathbb{F}_q$  be the finite field of order  $q = p^k > d + 2$ . For  $0 \leq t \leq d$ , define

$$r_t = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^{q-1-t} f(x) = -c_t \in \mathbb{F}_q$$

Then,  $r_t = 0 \iff c_t$  is divisible by  $p$ .

**Lemma 8** (Newton's Identities). Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be  $n \geq 1$  variables. Let  $P_m(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i^m$ , be the  $m$ -th power sum and  $E_m(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  be the  $m$ -th elementary symmetric polynomials, i.e.,  $E_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{1 \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_m \leq n} X_{j_1} \cdots X_{j_m}$ , then

$$m \cdot E_m(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^{i-1} E_{m-i}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \cdot P_i(X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

*Remarks 1.*  $E_m(X_1, \dots, X_n) = 0$  when  $m > n$  (for a quick recollection, see [wiki](#)).



**Lemma 9** (Vieta's formulas). Let  $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - a_i)$  be a monic polynomial of degree  $n$ . Then,  $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n c_i x^i$  where  $c_{n-i} = (-1)^i E_i(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ ,  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $c_n = 1$ .

**Lemma 10** (Polynomial division with remainder [VZGG13, Theorem 9.6]). Given a  $d$ -degree polynomial  $f$  and a linear polynomial  $g$  over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , there exists a deterministic algorithm that finds the quotient and remainder of  $f$  divided by  $g$  in  $\tilde{O}(d \log p)$ -time.

Next, we define  $\text{ord}_p(a)$ ; this notion will be important later.

**Definition 2** (Order of a number mod  $p$ ). The order of  $a \pmod{p}$ , denoted as  $\text{ord}_p(a)$  is defined to be the smallest positive integer  $m$  such that  $a^m \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ .

**Theorem 11** ([Shp96]). There exists a  $\tilde{O}(p^{1/4+\epsilon})$  time algorithm to deterministically find a primitive root over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ .

**Theorem 12** ([Nag52]). For  $n \geq 25$ , there is a prime in the interval  $[n, \frac{6}{5} \cdot n]$ .

The following is a naive bound, but it is sufficient for our purpose.

**Lemma 13.** For integers  $a \geq b \geq 1$ , we have  $(a/b)^b \leq 2^{2\sqrt{ab}}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x = \sqrt{a/b}$ . We need to show that  $x^{2b} \leq 2^{2bx}$ , which is trivially true since  $x \leq 2^x$ , for  $x \geq 1$ .  $\square$

### 3 Hardness results

In this section, we prove some hardness results. These proofs are very standard, still after different feedback and reviews, we give the details for the brevity.

Some of the algorithms presented in this paper consider that the number of solutions is *bounded* by a parameter  $k$ . This naturally raises the question whether the SSUM problem is hard, when the number of solutions is bounded. We will show that this is true even for the case when  $k = 1$ , i.e., uSSUM is NP-hard under *randomized* reduction.

**Theorem 14** (Hardness of uSSUM). There exists a randomized reduction which takes a SSUM instance  $\mathcal{M} = (a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ , as an input, and produces multiple SSUM instances  $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}_\ell = (b_1, \dots, b_n, t^{(\ell)})$ , where  $\ell \in [2n^2]$ , such that if

- $\mathcal{M}$  is a YES instance of SSUM  $\implies \exists \ell$  such that  $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}_\ell$  is a YES instance of uSSUM;
- $\mathcal{M}$  is a NO instance of SSUM  $\implies \forall \ell, \mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}_\ell$  is a NO instance of uSSUM.

*Proof.* The core of the proof is based on the Lemma 6 (Isolation lemma). The reduction is as follows. Let  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  be chosen *uniformly at random* from  $[2n]$ . We define  $b_i = 4n^2 a_i + w_i, \forall i \in [n]$  and the  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  SSUM instance as  $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}_\ell = (b_1, \dots, b_n, t^{(\ell)} = 4n^2 t + \ell)$ . Observe that all the new instances are different only in the target values  $t^{(\ell)}$ .

Suppose  $\mathcal{M}$  is a YES instance, i.e.,  $\exists S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$ . Then, for  $\ell = \sum_{i \in S} w_i$ , the  $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}_\ell$  is a YES instance, because

$$\sum_{i \in S} b_i - t^{(\ell)} = 4n^2 \left( \sum_{i \in S} a_i - t \right) - \left( \ell - \sum_{i \in S} w_i \right) = 0.$$

If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a NO instance, consider any  $\ell$  and  $S \subseteq [n]$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}$  is a NO instance,  $4n^2(\sum_{i \in S} a_i - t)$  is a non-zero multiple of  $4n^2$ , whereas  $|\ell - \sum_{i \in S} w_i| < 4n^2$ , which implies that

$$4n^2(\sum_{i \in S} a_i - t) - (\ell - \sum_{i \in S} w_i) \neq 0 \implies \sum_{i \in S} b_i \neq t^{(\ell)}.$$

Hence,  $\mathcal{SS}_\ell$  is also a NO instance.

We now show that if  $\mathcal{M}$  is a YES instance, then one of  $\mathcal{SS}_\ell$  is a uSSSUM. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  contain all the solutions to the SSUM instance  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{F} = \{S \mid S \subseteq [n], \sum_{i \in S} a_i = t\}$ . Since  $w_i$ 's are chosen uniformly at random, **Lemma 6** says that there exists a *unique*  $S \in \mathcal{F}$ , such that  $w(S) = \sum_{i \in S} w_i$ , is *minimal* with probability at least  $1/2$ . Let us denote this minimal value  $w(S)$  as  $\ell^*$ . Then,  $\mathcal{SS}_{\ell^*}$  is uSSSUM because  $S$  is the only subset such that  $\sum_{i \in S} w_i = \ell^*$ .  $\square$

Next, we present a simple deterministic Cook's reduction from SSUM to 2 – SimulSubsetSum. It is obvious to see that 2 – SimulSubsetSum  $\in$  NP which implies that 2 – SimulSubsetSum is NP-complete.

**Theorem 15** (Hardness of 2 – SimulSubsetSum). *There is a deterministic polynomial time reduction from SSUM to 2 – SimulSubsetSum.*

*Proof.* Let  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$  be an instance of SSUM. Consider the following 2 – SimulSubsetSum instances,  $\mathcal{S}_b = [(a_1, \dots, a_n, t), (1, 0, \dots, 0, b)]$ , where  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ . If the SSUM instance is NO, then *both* the 2 – SimulSubsetSum are also NO. If the SSUM instance is a YES, then we argue that one of the  $\mathcal{S}_b$  instance must be YES. If SSUM instance has a solution which contains  $a_1$ , then  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is a YES instance whereas if it does not contain  $a_1$ , then  $\mathcal{S}_0$  is a YES instance.  $\square$

**Extension to log – SimulSubsetSum.** The above reduction can be trivially extended to reduce SSUM to SimulSubsetSum, with number of SSUM instances  $k = O(\log n)$ . In that case we will work with instances  $\mathcal{S}_b$ , for  $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}^k$ . Since the number of instances is  $2^k = \text{poly}(n)$ , the reduction goes through.

We will now show that 2 – SimulSubsetSum reduces to SSUM which again can be generalised to SimulSubsetSum, for any number of SSUM instances  $k$ .

**Theorem 16** (2 – SimulSubsetSum is easier than SSUM). *There is a deterministic polynomial time reduction from 2 – SimulSubsetSum to SSUM.*

*Proof.* Let  $[(a_1, \dots, a_n, t_1), (b_1, \dots, b_n, t_2)]$  be a 2 – SimulSubsetSum instance where without loss of generality  $t_1 \leq t_2$ . Also, we can assume that  $t_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ , otherwise it does not have a solution.

Now, consider the SSUM instance  $(\gamma b_1 + a_1, \dots, \gamma b_n + a_n, \gamma t_2 + t_1)$ , where  $\gamma := 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ . If the 2 – SimulSubsetSum instance is YES, this implies that there exist  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t_1$  and  $\sum_{i \in S} b_i = t_2$ . This implies that  $\sum_{i \in S} \gamma b_i + a_i = \gamma t_2 + t_1$  and hence the SSUM instance is also YES.

Now, assume that the SSUM instance is YES, i.e., there exists  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} \gamma b_i + a_i = \gamma t_2 + t_1$ . This implies that  $\gamma(t_2 - \sum_{i \in S} b_i) + (t_1 - \sum_{i \in S} a_i) = 0$ . If  $t_1 \neq \sum_{i \in S} a_i$ , then from the previous equality,  $(t_1 - \sum_{i \in S} a_i)$  is a non-zero multiple of  $\gamma \implies |t_1 - \sum_{i \in S} a_i| \geq \gamma$ . However, by our assumption,

$$t_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \implies t_1 - \sum_{i \in S} a_i \leq \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus S} a_i < 1 + \sum_{i \in [n]} a_i = \gamma.$$

Moreover,  $t_1 - \sum_{i \in S} a_i > -\gamma$ , holds trivially, since  $\gamma > \sum_{i \in [n]} a_i$  and  $t_1 > 0$ . Therefore,  $|t_1 - \sum_{i \in S} a_i| < \gamma$  which implies that both  $t_1 - \sum_{i \in S} a_i = 0$  and  $t_2 - \sum_{i \in S} b_i = 0$ . Hence, the 2-SimulSubsetSum instance is also YES.  $\square$

## 4 Time-efficient algorithms

### 4.1 Time-efficient algorithm for Hamming $-k$ - SSSUM

In this section, we present an  $\tilde{O}(k(n+t))$ -time deterministic algorithm for outputting all the hamming weight of the solutions, given a Hamming  $-k$  - SSSUM instance, i.e., there are only at most  $k$ -many solutions to the SSUM instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ . The basic idea is simple: We want to create a polynomial whose roots are of the form  $\mu^{w_i}$ , so that we can first find the roots  $\mu^{w_i}$  (over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ), and from them we can find  $w_i$ . To achieve that, we work with  $k$ -many polynomials  $f_j := \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + \mu^j \cdot x^{a_i})$ , for  $j \in [k]$ . Note that the coefficient of  $x^t$  in  $f_j$  is of the form  $\sum_{i \leq k} \lambda_i \cdot \mu^{j w_i}$  (**Claim 18**). By Newton's Identities (**Lemma 8**) and Vieta's formulas (**Lemma 9**), we can now *efficiently* construct a polynomial whose roots are  $\mu^{w_i}$ . The details are given below.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We start with some notations that we will use throughout the proof.

**Basic notations.** Assume that the SSUM instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$  has exactly  $m$  ( $m \leq k$ ) many solutions, and they have  $\ell$  many *distinct* hamming weights  $w_1, \dots, w_\ell$ ; since two solutions can have same hamming weight,  $\ell \leq m$ . Moreover, assume that there are  $\lambda_i$  many solutions which appear with hamming weight  $w_i$ , for  $i \in [\ell]$ . Thus,  $\sum_{i \in [\ell]} \lambda_i = m \leq k$ .

**Choosing prime  $q$  and a primitive root  $\mu$ .** We will work with a fixed  $q$  in this proof, where  $q > n + k + t := M$  (we will mention why such a requirement later). We can find a prime  $q$  in  $\tilde{O}(n + k + t)$  time, since we can go over every element in the interval  $[M, 6/5 \cdot M]$ , in which we know a prime exists (**Theorem 12**) and primality testing is efficient [**AKS04**]. Once we find  $q$ , we choose  $\mu$  such that  $\mu$  is a *primitive root* over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , i.e.,  $\text{ord}_q(\mu) = q - 1$ . This  $\mu$  can be found in  $\tilde{O}((n + k + t)^{1/4 + \epsilon})$  time using **Theorem 11**. Thus, the total time complexity of this step is  $\tilde{O}(n + k + t)$ .

**The polynomials.** Define the  $k$ -many univariate polynomials as follows:

$$f_j(x) := \prod_{i \in [n]} (1 + \mu^j x^{a_i}), \forall j \in [k].$$

We remark that we do not know  $\ell$  apriori, but we can find  $m$  efficiently.

**Claim 17** (Finding the exact number of solutions). *Given a Hamming  $-k$  - SSSUM instance, one can find the exact number of solutions,  $m$ , deterministically, in  $\tilde{O}((n + t))$  time.*

*Proof.* Use [**JW18**] (see **Lemma 30**, for the general statement) which gives a deterministic algorithm to find the coefficient of  $x^t$  of  $\prod_{i \in [n]} (1 + x^{a_i})$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ; this takes time  $\tilde{O}((n + t))$ .  $\square$

Since we know the exact value of  $m$ , we will just work with  $f_j$  for  $j \in [m]$ , which suffices for our algorithmic purpose. Here is an important claim about coefficients of  $x^t$  in  $f_j$ 's.

**Claim 18.**  $C_j = \text{coef}_{x^t}(f_j(x)) = \sum_{i \in [\ell]} \lambda_i \cdot \mu^{j w_i}$ , for each  $j \in [m]$ .

*Proof.* If  $S \subseteq [n]$  is a solution to the instance with hamming weight, say  $w$ , then this will contribute  $\mu^{j^w}$  to the coefficient of  $x^t$  of  $f_j(x)$ . Since, there are  $\ell$  many weights  $w_1, \dots, w_\ell$  with multiplicity  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$ , the claim easily follows.  $\square$

Using [Lemma 30](#), we can find  $C_j \pmod q$  for each  $j \in [m]$  in  $\tilde{O}((n + t \log(\mu j)))$  time, owing total  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t))$ , since  $q = O(n + k + t)$ ,  $\mu \leq q - 1$ , and  $\sum_{j \in [m]} \log j = \log(m!) \leq \log(k!) = \tilde{O}(k)$ .

Using the Newton's Identities ([Lemma 8](#)), we have the following relations, for  $j \in [m]$ :

$$E_j(\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_\ell}) \equiv j^{-1} \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^j (-1)^{i-1} E_{j-i}(\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_k}) \cdot P_i(\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_\ell}) \right) \pmod q. \quad (1)$$

In the above, by  $E_j(\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_\ell})$ , we mean  $E_j(\underbrace{\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_1}}_{\lambda_1 \text{ times}}, \underbrace{\mu^{w_2}, \dots, \mu^{w_2}}_{\lambda_2 \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{\mu^{w_\ell}, \dots, \mu^{w_\ell}}_{\lambda_\ell \text{ times}})$ , and similar for  $P_j$ . Since  $q > k$ ,  $j^{-1} \pmod q$  exists, and thus the above relations are valid. Here is another important and obvious observation, just from the definition of  $P_j$ 's:

**Observation 1.** For  $j \in [k]$ ,  $C_j \equiv P_j(\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_\ell}) \pmod q$ .

Note that we know  $E_0 = 1$  and  $P_j$ 's (and  $j^{-1} \pmod q$ ) are already computed. To compute  $E_j$ , we need to know  $E_1, \dots, E_{j-1}$  and additionally we need  $O(j)$  many additions and multiplications. Suppose,  $T(j)$  is the time to compute  $E_1, \dots, E_j$ . Then, the trivial complexity is  $T(m) \leq \tilde{O}(k^2) + \tilde{O}(k(n + t))$ . But one can do better than  $\tilde{O}(k^2)$  and make it  $\tilde{O}(k)$  (i.e solve the recurrence, using FFT), owing the total complexity to  $T(m) \leq \tilde{O}(k(n + t))$  (since  $q = O(n + k + t)$ ). For details, see [subsection A.3](#).

Once, we have computed  $E_j$ , for  $j \in [m]$ , define a new polynomial

$$g(x) := \sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \cdot E_j(\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_\ell}) \cdot x^j.$$

Using [Lemma 9](#), it is immediate that  $g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^\ell (x - \mu^{w_i})^{\lambda_i}$ . Further, by definition,  $\deg(g) = m$ . From  $g$ , now we want to extract the roots, namely  $\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_\ell}$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We do this, by checking whether  $(x - \mu^i)$  divides  $g$ , for  $i \in [n]$  (since  $w_i \leq n$ ). Using [Lemma 10](#), a single division with remainder takes  $\tilde{O}(k)$ , therefore, the total time to find all the  $w_i$  is  $\tilde{O}(nk) = \tilde{O}(nk)$ .

Here, we *remark* that we do not use the deterministic root finding or factoring algorithms (for e.g. [[Sho90](#), [BKS15](#)]), since it takes  $\tilde{O}(mq^{1/2}) = \tilde{O}(k \cdot (k + t)^{1/2})$  time, which could be larger than  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t))$ .

**Reason for choosing  $q$  and  $\mu$ .** In the hindsight, there are three important properties of the prime  $q$  that will suffice to successfully output the  $w_i$ 's using the above described steps:

1. Since, [Lemma 30](#) requires to compute the inverses of numbers upto  $t$ , hence, we would want  $q > t$ .
2. While computing  $E_j(\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_k})$  using [Lemma 8](#) in the above, one should be able to compute the inverse of all  $j$ 's less than equal to  $m$ . So, we want  $q > m$ .
3. To obtain  $w_i$  from  $\mu^{w_i} \pmod q$ , we want  $\text{ord}_q(\mu) > n$  (for definition see [Definition 2](#)). Since,  $w_i \leq n$ , this would ensure that we have found the correct  $w_i$ .

Here, we remark that we do not need to concern ourselves about the ‘largeness’ of the coefficients of  $C_j$  and make it nonzero mod  $q$ , as required in [JW18]. For the first two points, it suffices to choose  $q > k + t$ . Since  $\mu$  is a primitive root over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , this guarantees that  $\text{ord}_q(\mu) = q - 1 > n$  and thus we will find  $w_i$  from  $\mu^{w_i}$  correctly.

**Total time complexity.** The complexity to find the correct  $m, q$  and  $\mu$  is  $\tilde{O}(n + k + t)$ . Finding the coefficients of  $g$  takes  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t))$  and then finding  $w_i$  from  $g$  takes  $\tilde{O}(nk)$  time. Thus, the total complexity remains  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t))$ .  $\square$

► **Remark.** The above algorithm can be extended to find the multiplicities  $\lambda_i$ ’s in  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t) + k^{3/2})$  by finding the largest  $\lambda_i$ , by binary search, such that  $(x - \mu^{w_i})^{\lambda_i}$  divides  $g(x)$ . Finding each  $\lambda_i$  takes  $\tilde{O}(m \log(\lambda_i))$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , for the same  $q$  as above, since the polynomial division takes  $\tilde{O}(m)$  time and binary search introduces a multiplicative  $O(\log(\lambda_i))$  term. Since,  $\sum_{i \in [\ell]} \log(\lambda_i) = \log\left(\prod_{i \in [\ell]} \lambda_i\right)$ , using AM-GM,  $\prod_{i \in [\ell]} \lambda_i \leq (m/\ell)^\ell$ , which is maximized at  $\ell = \sqrt{m} \leq \sqrt{k}$ , implying  $\sum_{i \in [\ell]} \log(\lambda_i) \leq O(\sqrt{k} \log k)$ . Since,  $m \leq k$ , this explains the additive  $k^{3/2}$  term in the complexity.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Algorithm for Hamming  $- k - \text{SSSUM}$

---

**Input:** A  $k - \text{SSSUM}$  instance  $a_1, \dots, a_n, t$   
**Output:** Hamming weights of all subsets  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$

- 1 Using **Lemma 30**, find the number of solutions  $m$  for the  $k - \text{SSSUM}$  instance  $a_1, \dots, a_n, t$  and terminate if  $m = 0$ ;
- 2 Choose a prime  $q$  from the interval  $[k + t, 6/5 \cdot (k + t)]$ ;
- 3 Find a primitive root  $\mu$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ;
- 4 **for**  $j \in [m]$  **do**
- 5     Using  $q$  in **Lemma 30**, find  $C_j = \text{coef}_{x^t}(f_j(x))$  where  $f_j(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + \mu^j x^{a_i})$ ;
- 6 **end**
- 7 Compute  $E_0, E_1, \dots, E_m$  from  $P_1, \dots, P_m$  where  $P_i \equiv C_i \pmod{q}$  using FFT;
- 8  $W = \{\}$ ;
- 9 **for**  $i \in [n]$  **do**
- 10     **if**  $(x - \mu^i) \mid g(x)$  **then**
- 11          $W = W \cup \{i\}$ ;
- 12     **end**
- 13 **end**
- 14 **return**  $W$ ;

---

## 5 Time-efficient algorithm for Subset Product

In this section, we give a randomized  $\tilde{O}(n + t^{o(1)})$  expected time algorithm for Subset Product. Essentially, we factor all the entries in the instance in  $\tilde{O}(n + t^{o(1)})$  expected time. Once we have the exponents, it suffices to solve the corresponding SimulSubsetSum instance. Now, we can use the efficient randomized algorithm for SimulSubsetSum (**Theorem 19**) to finally solve Subset Product. So, first we give an efficient algorithm for SimulSubsetSum.

**Theorem 19** (Algorithm for SimulSubsetSum). *There is a randomized  $\tilde{O}(kn + \prod_{i \in [k]} (2t_i + 1))$ -time algorithm that solves SimulSubsetSum, with target instances  $t_1, \dots, t_k$ .*

*Proof.* Let us assume that the input to the SimulSubsetSum problem are  $k$  SSUM instance of the form  $(a_{1j}, \dots, a_{nj}, t_j)$ , for  $j \in [k]$ . Define a  $k$ -variate polynomial  $f(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ , as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left( 1 + \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij}} \right).$$

Here is an immediate but important claim. We denote the monomial  $\mathbf{m} := \prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{t_i}$  and  $\text{coef}_{\mathbf{m}}(f)$  as the coefficient of  $\mathbf{m}$  in the polynomial  $f(\mathbf{x})$ .

**Claim 20.** *There is a solution to the SimulSubsetSum instance, i.e.,  $\exists S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_{ij} = t_j, \forall j \in [k]$  iff  $\text{coef}_{\mathbf{m}}(f(\mathbf{x})) \neq 0$ .*

Therefore, it is enough to compute the coefficient of  $f(\mathbf{x})$ . The rest of the proof focuses on computing  $f(\mathbf{x})$  efficiently, to find  $\text{coef}_{\mathbf{m}}(f)$ .

Let  $p$  be prime such that  $p \in [N + 1, (n + N)^3]$ , where  $N := \prod_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1)$ . Define an ideal  $\mathcal{I}$ , over  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$  as follows:  $\mathcal{I} := \langle x_1^{t_1+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1}, p \rangle$ . Since, we are interested in  $\text{coef}_{\mathbf{m}}(f)$ , it suffices to compute  $f(\mathbf{x}) \bmod \langle x_1^{t_1+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1} \rangle$ , and we do it over a field  $\mathbb{F}_p$  (which introduces error); for details, see the proof in the end (Randomness and error probability paragraph).

Using [Lemma 32](#), we can compute all the coefficient of  $\ln(f(\mathbf{x})) \bmod \mathcal{I}$  in time  $\tilde{O}(kn + \prod_{i=1}^k t_i)$ . It is easy to see that the following equalities hold.

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \bmod \mathcal{I} \equiv \exp(\ln(f(\mathbf{x}))) \bmod \mathcal{I} \equiv \exp(\ln(f(\mathbf{x}) \bmod \mathcal{I})) \bmod \mathcal{I}.$$

Since, we have already computed  $\ln(f(\mathbf{x})) \bmod \mathcal{I}$ , the above equation implies that it is enough to compute the exponential which can be done using [Lemma 31](#). This also takes time  $\tilde{O}(kn + \prod_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1))$ .

**Randomness and error probability.** Note that there are  $\Omega(n + N)^2$  primes in the interval  $[N + 1, (n + N)^3]$ . Moreover, since  $\text{coef}_{\mathbf{m}}(f) \leq 2^n$ , at most  $n$  prime factors can divide  $\text{coef}_{\mathbf{m}}(f(\mathbf{x}))$ . Therefore, we can pick a prime  $p$  randomly from this interval in  $\text{poly}(\log(n + N))$  time and the probability of  $p$  dividing the coefficient is  $O(n + N)^{-1}$ . In other words, the probability that the algorithm fails is bounded by  $O((n + N)^{-1})$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

$\square$

We now compare the above result with some obvious attempts to solve SimulSubsetSum, before moving into solving Subset Product.

**A detailed comparison with time complexity of [\[Kan10\]](#).** Kane [\[Kan10, Section 3.3\]](#) showed that the above problem can be solved deterministically in  $C^{O(k)}$  time and  $O(k \log C)$  space, where  $C := \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} + \sum_j t_j + 1$ , which could be as large as  $(n + 1) \cdot (\sum_{j \in [k]} t_j) + 1$ , since  $a_{ij}$  can be as large as  $t_j$ . As argued in [\[JWV21, Corollary 3.4 and Remark 3.5\]](#), the constant in the exponent, inside the order notation, can be as large as 3 (in fact directly using [\[Kan10\]](#) gives larger than 3; but modified algorithm as used in [\[JWV21\]](#) gives 3). Use AM-GM inequality to get

$$\left( (n + 1) \cdot \left( \sum_j t_j \right) + 1 \right)^{3k} > \left( \frac{2}{k} \cdot \sum_j t_j + 1 \right)^{3k} \stackrel{\text{AM-GM}}{\geq} \prod_{j=1}^k (2t_j + 1)^3.$$



Assuming  $N = \prod_{j=1}^k (2t_j + 1)$ , our algorithm is near-linear in  $N$  while Kane's algorithm [Kan10] takes at  $O(N^3)$  time; thus ours is almost a cubic improvement.

**Comparison with the trivial algorithm.** It is easy to see that a trivial  $O(n \cdot (t_1 + 1)(t_2 + 1) \dots (t_k + 1))$  time *deterministic* algorithm for SimulSubsetSum exists. Since,  $t_i \geq 1$ , we have

$$\frac{n}{2} \cdot \prod_{i \in [k]} (1 + t_i) \geq \frac{n}{2} \cdot 2^k \geq kn, \text{ and } \frac{n}{2} \cdot \prod_{i \in [k]} (1 + t_i) \geq \frac{n}{2^{k+1}} \cdot \prod_{i \in [k]} (2t_i + 1).$$

Here, we used  $2(1 + x) > (2x + 1)$ , for any  $x \geq 1$ . Therefore,  $n \cdot \prod_{i \in [k]} (1 + t_i) \geq kn + n/2^{k+1} \cdot \prod_{i \in [k]} (2t_i + 1)$ . Thus, when  $k = o(\log n)$ , our complexity is better.

## 5.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Once we have designed the algorithm for SimulSubsetSum, we design time-efficient algorithm for Theorem 2.

*Proof.* Let  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$  be the input for Subset Product problem. Without loss of generality, we can assume that all the  $a_i$  divides  $t$  because if some  $a_i$  does not divide  $t$ , it will never be a part of any solution and we can discard it. Let us first consider the prime factorization of  $t$  and  $a_j$ , for all  $j \in [n]$ . We will discuss about its time complexity in the next paragraph. Let

$$t = \prod_{j=1}^k p_j^{t_j}, \quad a_i = \prod_{j=1}^k p_j^{e_{ij}}, \quad \forall i \in [n],$$

where  $p_j$  are distinct primes and  $t_j$  are positive integers and  $e_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Since,  $p_i \geq 2$ , trivially,  $\sum_{i=1}^k t_i \leq \log(t)$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^k e_{ij} \leq \log(t)$ ,  $j \in [n]$ . Also, the number of distinct prime factors of  $t$  is at most  $O(\log(t) / \log \log(t))$ ; therefore,  $k = O(\log(t) / \log \log(t))$ .

**Time complexity of factoring** To find all the primes that divides  $t$ , we will use the factoring algorithm given by Lenstra and Pomerance [LP92] which takes expected  $t^{o(1)}$ <sup>2</sup> time to completely factor  $t$  into prime factors  $p_j$  (including the exponents  $t_j$ ). Using the primes  $p_j$  and the fact that  $0 \leq e_{ij} \leq \log(t)$ , computing  $e_{ij}$  takes  $\log^2(t) \log \log(t)$  time, by performing binary search to find the largest  $x$  such that  $p_j^x \mid a_i$ . So, the time to compute all exponents  $e_{i,j}$ ,  $\forall i \in [n], j \in [k]$  is  $O(nk \log^2(t) \log \log(t))$ . Since,  $k \leq O(\log t / \log \log(t))$ , the total time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n + t^{o(1)})$ .

**Setting up SimulSubsetSum** Now suppose that  $S \subseteq [n]$  is a solution to the Subset Product problem, i.e.,  $\prod_{i \in S} a_i = t$ . This implies that

$$\sum_{i \in S} e_{ij} = t_j, \quad \forall j \in [k].$$

In other words, we have a SimulSubsetSum instance where the  $j^{\text{th}}$  SSUM instance is  $(e_{1j}, e_{2j}, \dots, e_{nj}, t_j)$ , for  $j \in [k]$ . The converse is also trivially true. We now show that there exists an  $\tilde{O}(kn + \prod_{i \in [k]} (2t_i + 1))$  time algorithm to solve SimulSubsetSum.

<sup>2</sup>Expected time complexity is  $\exp(O(\sqrt{\log t \log \log t}))$ , which is smaller than  $t^{O(1/\sqrt{\log \log t})} = t^{o(1)}$ , which will be the time taken in the next step. Moreover, we are interested in *randomized* algorithms, hence expected run-time is



**Randomized algorithm for Subset Product** Using [Theorem 19](#), we can decide the SimulSubsetSum problem with targets  $t_1, \dots, t_k$  in  $\tilde{O}(kn + \prod_{i \in [k]}(2t_i + 1))$  time (randomized) while working over  $\mathbb{F}_p$  for some suitable  $p$  (we point out towards the end). Since  $k \leq O(\log(t) / \log \log(t))$ , we need to bound the term  $\prod_{i \in [k]}(2t_i + 1)$ . Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i \in [k]} (2t_i + 1) &= \sum_{S \subseteq [k]} 2^{|S|} \cdot \left( \prod_{i \in S} t_i \right) \\ &\leq 2^{2k} \cdot \left( \prod_{i \in [k]} t_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now focus on bounding the term  $\prod_{i \in [k]} t_i$ . By AM-GM,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i \in [k]} t_i &\leq \left( \frac{\sum_{i \in [k]} t_i}{k} \right)^k \leq \left( \frac{\log(t)}{k} \right)^k \\ &\leq 2^{O(\sqrt{k \log(t)})} \quad [\text{Lemma 13}] \\ &\leq 2^{O(\sqrt{\log(t)^2 / \log \log(t)})} \\ &\leq t^{O(1/\sqrt{\log \log(t)})} = t^{o(1)} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the prime  $p$  in the [Theorem 19](#) was  $p \in [N + 1, (n + N)^3]$ , where  $N := \prod_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1) - 1$ . As shown above, we can bound  $N = t^{o(1)}$ . Thus,  $p \leq O((n + t^{o(1)})^3)$ , as desired. Therefore, the total time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n \log(t) / \log \log(t) + t^{o(1)}) = \tilde{O}(n + t^{o(1)})$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$   $\square$

**Removing the expected-time** If one wants to understand the worst-case analysis, we can use the polynomial time reduction from Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum in [section 7](#). Of course, we will not get prime factorization; but the pseudo-prime factors will also be good enough to set up the SimulSubsetSum with similar parameters as above, and the SimulSubsetSum instance can be similarly solved in  $\tilde{O}(n + t^{o(1)})$  time. Since the reduction takes  $n^2 \text{poly}(\log t)$  time, the total time complexity becomes  $\tilde{O}(n^2 + t^{o(1)})$ .

## 6 Space-efficient algorithms

### 6.1 Space-efficient algorithm for $k$ – SSSUM

In this section, we will present a low space algorithm ([algorithm 2](#)) for finding all the realisable sets for  $k$  – SSSUM. Unfortunately, proof of [Theorem 1](#) fails to give a low space algorithm, since [Lemma 30](#) requires  $\Omega(t)$  space (eventually it needs to store all the coefficients mod  $x^{t+1}$ ). Instead, we work with a multivariate polynomial  $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + y_i x^{a_i})$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , for a large prime  $q = O(nt)$  and its multiple evaluations  $f(\alpha, c_1, \dots, c_n)$ , where  $(\alpha, c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n+1}$ .

Observe that, the coefficient of  $x^t$  in  $f$  is a multivariate polynomial  $p_t(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ ; each of its monomial carries the *necessary information* of a solution, for the instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$ . More precisely,  $S$  is a realisable set of  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \iff \prod_{i \in S} y_i$  is a monomial in  $p_t$ . And, the sparsity

(number of monomials) of  $p_t$  is at most  $k$ . Therefore, it boils down to reconstruct the multivariate polynomial  $p_t$  efficiently. We cannot use the trivial multiplication since it takes  $\tilde{O}(2^{2t})$  time! Instead, we use ideas from [Kan10] and [KS01].

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Here are some notations that we will follow throughout the proof.

**Basic notations.** Let us assume that there are exactly  $m$  ( $m \leq k$ ) many realisable sets  $S_1, \dots, S_m$ , each  $S_i \subseteq [n]$ . We remark that for our algorithm we do not need to apriori calculate  $m$ .

**The multivariate polynomial.** For our purpose, we will be working with the following  $(n + 1)$ -variate polynomial:

$$f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) := \prod_{i \in [n]} (1 + y_i x^{a_i}) .$$

Since, we have a  $k - \text{SSSUM}$  instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$ ,  $\text{coef}_{x^t}(f)$  has the following properties.

1. It is an  $n$ -variate polynomial  $p_t(y_1, \dots, y_n)$  with sparsity *exactly*  $m$ .
2.  $p_t$  is a multilinear polynomial in  $y_1, \dots, y_n$ , i.e., individual degree of  $y_i$  is at most 1.
3. The total degree of  $p_t$  is at most  $n$ .
4. if  $S \subseteq [n]$  is a realisable set, then  $y_S := \prod_{i \in S} y_i$ , is a monomial in  $p_t$ .

In particular, the following is an immediate but important observation.

**Observation 2.**  $p_t(y_1, \dots, y_n) = \sum_{i \in [m]} y_{S_i}$ .

Therefore, it suffices to know the polynomial  $p_t$ . However, we cannot treat  $y_i$  as new variables and try to find the coefficient of  $x^t$  since the trivial multiplication algorithm (involving  $n + 1$  variables) takes  $\exp(n)$ -time. This is because,  $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \bmod x^{t+1}$  can have  $2^n \cdot t$  many monomials as coefficient of  $x^i$ , for any  $i \leq t$  can have  $2^n$  many multilinear monomials.

However, if we substitute  $y_i = c_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , for some prime  $q$ , we claim that we can figure out the value  $p_t(c_1, \dots, c_n)$  from the coefficient of  $x^t$  in  $f(x, c_1, \dots, c_n)$  efficiently (see Claim 22). Once we have figured out, we can simply interpolate using the following theorem to reconstruct the polynomial  $p_t$ . Before going into the technical details, we state the sparse interpolation theorem below; for simplicity we consider multilinearity (though [KS01] holds for general polynomials as well).

**Theorem 21** ([KS01]). *Given a black box access to a multilinear polynomial  $g(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of degree  $d$  and sparsity at most  $s$  over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}$  with  $|\mathbb{F}| \geq (nd)^6$ , there is a  $\text{poly}(snd)$ -time and  $O(\log(snd))$ -space algorithm that outputs all the monomials of  $g$ .*

► Remark. We represent one monomial in terms of indices (to make it consistent with the notion of realisable set), i.e., for a monomial  $x_1 x_5 x_9$ , the corresponding indices set is  $\{1, 5, 9\}$ . Also, we do not include the indices in the space complexity, as mentioned earlier.

**Brief analysis on the space complexity of [KS01].** Klivans and Spielman [KS01], did not explicitly mention the space complexity. However, it is not hard to show that the required space is indeed  $O(\log(snd))$ . [KS01] shows that substituting  $x_i = y^{ki-1 \bmod p}$ , for some  $k \in [2s^2n]$  and  $p > 2s^2n$ , makes the exponents of the new univariate polynomial (in  $y$ ) *distinct* (see [KS01, Lemma 3]); the algorithm actually tries for all  $k$  and find the correct  $k$ . Note that the degree becomes  $O(s^2nd)$ . Then, it tries to first find out the coefficients by simple univariate interpolation [KS01, Section 6.3]. Since we have blackbox access to  $g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , finding out a single coefficient, by univariate interpolation (which basically sets up linear equations and solve) takes  $O(\log(snd))$  space and  $\text{poly}(snd)$  time only. In the last step, to find one coefficient, we can use the standard univariate interpolation algorithm which uses the Vandermonde matrices and one entry of the inverse of the Vandermonde is log-space computable<sup>3</sup>.

At this stage, we know the coefficients (one by one), but we do not know which monomials the coefficients belong. However, it suffices to substitute  $x_i = 2y^{ki-1 \bmod p}$ . Using this, we can find the correct value of the first exponent in the monomial. For eg. if after the correct substitution,  $y^{10}$  appears with coefficient say 5, next step, when we change just  $x_1$ , if it does not affect the coefficient 5,  $y_1$  is not there in the monomial corresponding to the monomial which has coefficient 5, otherwise it is there (here we also use that it is multilinear and hence the change in the coefficient must be reflected). This step again requires univariate interpolation, and one has to repeat this experiment wrt each variable to know the monomial exactly corresponding to the coefficient we are working with. We can reuse the space for interpolation and after one round of checking with every variable, it outputs one exponent at this stage. This requires  $O(\log(snd))$ -space and  $\text{poly}(snd)$  time.

With a more careful analysis, one can further improve the field requirement to  $|\mathbb{F}| \geq (nd)^6$  only (and not dependent on  $s$ ); for details see [KS01, Thm. 5 & 11].

Now we come back to our subset sum problem. Since we want to reconstruct an  $n$ -variate  $m$  sparse polynomial  $p_t$  which has degree at most  $n$ , it suffices to work with  $|\mathbb{F}| \geq n^{12}$ . However, we also want to use Kane's identity (Lemma 7), which requires  $q > \deg(f(x, c_1, \dots, c_n)) + 2$ , and  $\deg(f(x, c_1, \dots, c_n)) \leq nt$ . Denote  $M := \max(nt + 3, n^{12})$ . Thus, it suffices to we work with  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$  where  $q \in [M, (6/5) \cdot M]$ , such prime exists (Theorem 12) and easy to find deterministically in  $\text{poly}(nt)$  time and  $O(\log(nt))$  space using [AKS04]. In particular, we will substitute  $y_i = c_i \in [0, q - 1]$ .

**Claim 22.** Fix  $c_i \in [0, q - 1]$ , where  $q \in [M, (6/5) \cdot M]$ . Then, there is a  $\text{poly}(nt)$ -time and  $O(\log(nt))$  space algorithm which computes  $p_t(c_1, \dots, c_n)$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

*Proof.* Note that, we can evaluate each  $1 + c_i x^{a_i}$ , at some  $x = \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , in  $\tilde{O}(\log nt)$  time and  $O(\log(nt))$  space. Multiplying  $n$  of them takes  $\tilde{O}(n \log(nt))$ -time and  $O(\log(nt))$  space.

Once we have computed  $f(\alpha, c_1, \dots, c_n)$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , using Kane's identity (Lemma 7), we can compute  $p_t(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ , since

$$p_t(c_1, \dots, c_n) = - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \alpha^{q-1-t} f(\alpha, c_1, \dots, c_n).$$

As each evaluation  $f(\alpha, c_1, \dots, c_n)$  takes  $\tilde{O}(n \log(nt))$  time, and we need  $q - 1$  many additions, multiplications and modular exponentiations, total time to compute is  $\text{poly}(nt)$ . The required space still remains  $O(\log(nt))$ .  $\square$

---

<sup>3</sup>In fact Vandermonde determinant and inverse computations are in  $\text{TC}^0 \subset \text{LOGSPACE}$ , see [MT98].

Once, we have calculated  $p_t(c_1, \dots, c_n)$  efficiently, now we try different values of  $(c_1, \dots, c_n)$  to reconstruct  $p_t$  using [Theorem 21](#). Since,  $p_t$  is a  $n$ -variate at most  $k$  sparse polynomial with degree at most  $n$ , it still takes  $\text{poly}(knt)$  time and  $O(\log(knt))$  space. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

---

**Algorithm 2:** Algorithm for  $k$  – SSSUM

---

**Input:** A  $k$  – SSSUM instance  $a_1, \dots, a_n, t$   
**Output:** All realisable subsets  $S \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = t$

- 1 Pick a prime  $q \in \{M, (6/5) \cdot M\}$  where  $M = \max(nt + 3, n^{12})$ ;
- 2 Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be the algorithm mentioned in [Theorem 21](#);
- 3 **for** each  $p_t(c_1, \dots, c_n)$  query requested by  $\mathcal{O}$  **do**
- 4     Send  $-\left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \alpha^{q-1-t} f(\alpha, c_1, \dots, c_n)\right)$  to  $\mathcal{O}$ ;
- 5 **end**
- 6  $p_t$  be the polynomial return by  $\mathcal{O}$ ;
- 7  $\mathcal{F} = \{\}$ ;
- 8 **for** each monomial  $y_S$  in  $p_t$  **do**
- 9      $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F} \cup \{S\}$
- 10 **end**
- 11 **return**  $\mathcal{F}$ ;

---

## 6.2 Space-efficient algorithm for Subset Product

The proof of [Theorem 4](#) uses the idea of reducing Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum and then solving SimulSubsetSum by computing the coefficient of  $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij}})$  where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  using an extension of [Lemma 7](#). We cannot directly use [[Kan10](#)] as it requires large space ( $O(n \log(nt))$  space to be precise) to store the SimulSubsetSum instance. Instead we compute the coefficient of  $f(x)$  without storing the SimulSubsetSum instance using [Lemma 23](#).

The low space algorithm presented in this proof depends on the generalisation of [Lemma 7](#). Here we present Kane’s identity for bivariate polynomials which can be easily extended to  $k$ -variate polynomials.

**Lemma 23** (Identity lemma [[Kan10](#)]). *Let  $f(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{d_1} \sum_{j=0}^{d_2} c_{i,j} x^i y^j$  be a polynomial of degree at most  $d_1 + d_2$  with coefficients  $c_{i,j}$  being integers. Let  $\mathbb{F}_q$  be the finite field of order  $q = p^m > \max(d_1, d_2) + 1$ . For  $0 \leq t_1 \leq d_1, 0 \leq t_2 \leq d_2$ , define*

$$r_{t_1, t_2} = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^{q-1-t_1} y^{q-1-t_2} f(x, y) = c_{t_1, t_2} \in \mathbb{F}_q$$

*Proof.* Let  $n$  be a positive integer, then the two following identities hold:

Identity 1.  $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^n = -1$  if  $q-1 \mid n$  because  $x^n = x^{(q-1)m} = 1$  due to Fermat’s Little theorem.

Identity 2.  $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^n = 0$ , if  $q-1 \nmid n$ . This is because we can rewrite the summation as  $\sum_{i=0}^{q-2} g^{i \cdot n} = \frac{g^{n(q-1)} - 1}{g^n - 1} = 0$  where  $g$  is a generator of  $\mathbb{F}_q^*$ .

Let us now consider  $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^{q-1-t_1} y^{q-1-t_2} f(x, y)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^{q-1-t_1} y^{q-1-t_2} f(x, y) &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^{q-1-t_1} y^{q-1-t_2} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{d_1} \sum_{j=0}^{d_2} c_{i,j} x^i y^j \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{d_1} \sum_{j=0}^{d_2} c_{i,j} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^{q-1-t_1+i} y^{q-1-t_2+j} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{i \in [0, d_1] \setminus \{t_1\} \\ j \in [0, d_2] \setminus \{t_2\}}} c_{i,j} \left( \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^{q-1-t_1+i} y^{q-1-t_2+j} \right) \\
&\quad + c_{t_1, t_2} \\
&= c_{t_1, t_2}
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that when  $i \in [0, d_1] \setminus \{t_1\}$ , we have  $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} x^{q-1-t_1+i} = 0$  because  $|i - t_1| \leq d_1 < q - 1 \implies q - 1 + i - t_1$  is not a multiple of  $q - 1$ . The same goes for  $j \in [0, d_2] \setminus \{t_2\}$ .  $\square$

► **Remark.** [Lemma 23](#) can be easily extended to  $k$  variables which was used by the authors of [\[Kan10\]](#) to solve SimulSubsetSum with  $k$  many SSUM instances in space  $O(k \log(n \sum_{i=1}^k t_i))$  and time  $(poly(n, t_1, \dots, t_k))^{O(k)}$ . In this case, the order of the finite field must be greater than  $\max(d_1, \dots, d_k) + 1$  where  $d_i$ 's are the individual degrees of the polynomial.

**Issue with directly invoking [\[Kan10\]](#).** Using [Theorem 5](#), we can reduce a Subset Product instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$  to a SimulSubsetSum instance containing  $k$  SSUM instances  $(e_{1i}, \dots, e_{ni}, t_i), \forall i \in [k]$  where  $k \leq \log(t)$ . The space required for the SimulSubsetSum instance is the number of bits in  $e_{ij}, t_j$ . We know that  $a_i = \prod_{j=1}^k p_i^{e_{ij}} \implies 2^{\sum_{j=1}^k \log(e_{ij})} \leq 2^{\sum_{j=1}^k e_{ij}} \leq a_i$  because  $p_i \geq 2, \forall i \in [k]$ . Therefore, we have  $\sum_{i,j} \log(e_{ij}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \log(a_i) \leq n \log(t)$ . Similarly,  $\sum_i \log(t_i) \leq \log(t)$ . Therefore, the space required for the SimulSubsetSum is  $O(n \log(t))$ . And, if we directly use the low-space algorithm for SimulSubsetSum from [\[Kan10\]](#), the total space complexity would become  $O((n + \log(nt)) \cdot \log(t))$ .

To avoid the  $n$ -factor in the space complexity, we will not be storing the entire SimulSubsetSum instance. Instead, for each summation in the  $k$  variate version of [Lemma 23](#), we will compute the values of  $e_{ij}$  and  $t_j$  and discard them after using it. To be precise, for  $\bar{g} = (t_1, \dots, t_k)$ , we have

$$c_{\bar{g}} = (-1)^k \sum_{x \in (\mathbb{F}_q^*)^k} f(x) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{q-1-t_i}$$

where  $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{e_{ij}}\right)$  and  $c_{\bar{g}} = \text{coef}_{\bar{g}}(f(x))$ . The values of  $e_{ij}$  and  $t_i$  is only required in  $f(x)$  and  $\prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{q-1-t_i}$  respectively. Since,  $e_{ij}$  and  $t_i$  are the powers of  $p_i$  in  $a_j$  and  $t$  respectively, we can't use pseudo-prime-factorization as this would require us to use  $O(n \log(t))$  space to compute a pseudo-prime-factor set. Therefore, we will use naive prime-factorization algorithm that runs in  $\tilde{O}(t)$  time which is affordable because we are interested in  $\text{poly}(knt)$ .

**Choosing the prime  $q$ .** Observe that the total degree of  $f(x)$  is  $\sum_{ij} e_{ij} \leq n \cdot (\sum_i t_i) \leq n \log t$  because  $0 \leq e_{ij} \leq t_j$  and  $\sum_i t_i \leq \log(t)$ . Therefore, the maximum individual degree is bounded by  $n \log(t)$ . Since, [Lemma 23](#) requires a prime  $q$  that depends on the maximum individual degree of the polynomial, it suffices to work with  $N = \lceil n \log(t) \rceil$  and  $q > N$ . Observe that we need to compute the coefficient modulo  $q$ , therefore, we need to ensure that  $q$  does not divide the coefficient. To achieve this, we will use [Lemma 23](#) for different primes  $q \in [N + 1, (n + N)^3]$  which contains  $\Omega(n + N)^2$  prime. This works because the coefficient can be at most  $2^n$ , therefore, it will have at most  $n$  prime factors. So, at least one prime in the range will not divide the coefficient.

**Computing  $f(x)$  and  $\prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{q-1-t_i}$  using low space.** We will make sure that  $t_i$  is the exponent of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  smallest prime factor of  $t$ . To find an  $e_{ij}$ , we will first find the  $i^{\text{th}}$  smallest prime  $p_i$  that divides  $t$  and then compute the largest power of  $p_i$  that divides  $a_j$ . Once, we find  $e_{ij}$ , we can use it to compute  $\prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{e_{ij}}$  part of  $f(x)$  and discard it as shown in [algorithm 3](#). Similarly, we can compute  $\prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{q-1-t_i}$ .

**Space and Time complexity.** Observe that [algorithm 3](#) uses only  $O(\log(nt))$  space for variables that are used through out the algorithm and reuses  $O(\log(t))$  space while computing  $t_i, e_{ij}, p_\ell$  values. It uses  $k \log(nt) = O(\log^2(nt))$  space for  $\bar{y}$ , therefore, the total space complexity is  $O(\log^2(nt))$ . Whereas the time complexity is  $\text{poly}(nt)$  because each loop runs for  $\text{poly}(nt)$  iterations and finding the exponents take  $\tilde{O}(t)$  time.

## 7 An efficient reduction from Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum

In this section, we will present a deterministic polynomial time reduction from Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum. In [section 5](#), we have given a pseudo-polynomial time reduction from Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum by performing prime-factorization of the input  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$ . The polynomial time reduction also requires to factorize the input, but the factors are not necessarily prime. To be precise, we define pseudo-prime-factorization which can be achieved in polynomial time.

**Definition 3** (Pseudo-prime-factorization). *A set of integers  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{N}$  is said to be pseudo-prime-factor set of  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$  if*

1. *the elements of  $\mathcal{P}$  are pair-wise coprime, i.e.,  $\forall p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}, \gcd(p_1, p_2) = 1$ ,*
2. *there are only non-trivial factors of  $a_i$ 's in  $\mathcal{P}$ , i.e.,  $\forall p \in \mathcal{P}, \exists i \in [n]$  such that  $p \mid a_i$ ,*
3. *every  $a_i$ 's can be uniquely expressed as product of powers of elements of  $\mathcal{P}$ , i.e.,  $\forall i \in [n], a_i = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} p^{e_p}, \forall i \in [n]$  where  $e_p \geq 0$ .*

For a given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}$  may not be unique. A trivial example of a pseudo-prime-factor set of  $\mathcal{P}$  for  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  is the set of all distinct prime factors of  $\prod_{i=1}^n a_i$ . The following is an important claim which will be used to give a *polynomial* time reduction from Subset Product to SimulSubsetSum.

**Claim 24.** *For any pseudo-prime-factor set  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , we have  $|\mathcal{P}| \leq k$  where  $k$  is the number of distinct prime factors of  $\prod_{i=1}^n a_i$ .*

---

**Algorithm 3:** Algorithm for solving Subset Product using low space

---

**Input:** A Subset Product instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$

**Output:** Decides whether the Subset Product instance has a solution

```
1  $k = 0$ ;  
2 for each prime  $p_i \mid t$  do  
3    $k = k + 1$ ;  
4 end  
5  $N = \lceil n \log(t) \rceil$ ;  
6 for each prime  $q \in [N + 1, (n + N)^3]$  do  
7    $c_g = 1$ ;  
8   for each  $\bar{y} \in (\mathbb{F}_q^*)^k$  do  
9      $prodx_1 = 1$ ;  
10    for  $i \in [k]$  do  
11      Compute  $i^{th}$  smallest prime that divides  $t$  and find  $t_i$ ;  
12       $prodx_1 = prodx_1 * y_i^{q-1-t_i}$ ;  
13      Discard  $t_i$ ;  
14    end  
15     $f = 1$ ;  
16    for  $i \in [n]$  do  
17       $prodx_2 = 1$ ;  
18      for  $j \in [k]$  do  
19        Compute  $j^{th}$  smallest prime  $p_j$  that divides  $t$ ;  
20        Using  $p_j$  compute  $e_{ij}$  which is the largest integer such that  $p_j^{e_{ij}} \mid a_i$ ;  
21         $prodx_2 = prodx_2 * y_j^{e_{ij}}$ ;  
22        Discard  $p_j$  and  $e_{ij}$ ;  
23      end  
24       $f = f * (1 + prodx_2)$ ;  
25    end  
26     $c_g = f * prodx_1$ ;  
27  end  
28  if  $c_g \neq 0$  then  
29    return True;  
30  end  
31 end  
32 return False;
```

---



*Proof.* The proof is using a simple pigeonhole principle argument. Let  $g_1, \dots, g_k$  be the distinct prime factors of  $\prod_{i=1}^n a_i$ . From the definition of  $\mathcal{P}$ , we know that  $g_1, \dots, g_k$  are the only distinct prime factors of  $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} p$ . Therefore, if there are more than  $k$  numbers in  $\mathcal{P}$ , then there must exist  $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $\gcd(p_1, p_2) \neq 1$  which violates pair-wise coprime property of  $\mathcal{P}$ .  $\square$

► Constructing  $\mathcal{P}$  suffices. We now show that having a pseudo-prime-factor set  $\mathcal{P}$  for  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$  helps us to reduce a Subset Product instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t)$  to SimulSubsetSum with number of instances  $|\mathcal{P}|$ , in polynomial time. Wlog, we can assume that  $a_i \mid t$  and  $a_i, t \leq 2^m, \forall i \in [n]$  for some  $m$ . Trivially,  $m \leq \log t$ . So, using [Claim 24](#), we have  $|\mathcal{P}| \leq (n+1) \cdot m = \text{poly}(n \log t)$ .

From [Definition 3](#), we have unique non-negative integers  $e_{ij}$  and  $t_j$  such that  $t = \prod_{j \in |\mathcal{P}|} p_j^{t_j}$  and  $a_i = \prod_{j \in |\mathcal{P}|} p_j^{e_{ij}}, \forall i \in [n]$ . Since,  $a_i \mid t$ , we have  $e_{ij} \leq t_j \leq m, \forall i \in [n], j \in [|\mathcal{P}|]$  and they can be computed in  $\text{poly}(m, n)$  time.

Let us consider the  $|\mathcal{P}|$  – SimulSubsetSum instance where the  $i^{\text{th}}$  SSUM instance is  $(e_{1i}, e_{2i}, \dots, e_{ni}, t_i)$ . Then, due to unique factorization property of  $\mathcal{P}$ , the Subset Product instance is YES, i.e.,  $\exists S \in [n]$  such that  $\prod_{i \in S} a_i = t$  iff the SimulSubsetSum instance with number of instances  $|\mathcal{P}|$ , is a YES.

## 7.1 Polynomial time algorithm for computing pseudo-prime-factors

We will now present a deterministic polynomial time algorithm for computing a pseudo-prime-factor set  $\mathcal{P}$  for  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . We will use the notation  $\mathcal{P}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  to denote a pseudo-prime-factor set for  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{S}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  be the set of all pseudo-prime-factor sets; this is a finite set.

The following lemma is a crucial component in [algorithm 4](#). We use  $a // b$  to denote  $a/b^e$  such that  $b^{e+1} \nmid a$ .

**Lemma 25.** *Let  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  be  $n$  integers. Then,*

1. *If  $a_1$  is coprime with  $a_i, \forall i > 1$ , then for any  $\mathcal{P}(a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathcal{S}(a_2, \dots, a_n)$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(a_2, \dots, a_n) \cup \{a_1\} \in \mathcal{S}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ .*
2.  *$\mathcal{P}(g, a_1 // g, a_2 // g, \dots, a_n // g) \in \mathcal{S}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , for given  $a_i, i \in [n]$  and any factor  $g$  of some  $a_i$ .*

*Proof.* The first part of the lemma is trivial. For the second part, let  $g$  be a non-trivial factor of some  $a_i$  and

$$\mathcal{P} := \{p_1, \dots, p_k\} \in \mathcal{S}(g, a_1 // g, a_2 // g, \dots, a_n // g),$$

be any pseudo-prime-factor set. Then,  $p_i$ 's are pair-wise coprime and since each  $p_i$  divides either  $g$  or  $a_i // g$  for some  $i \in [n]$ , it also divides some  $a_i$  because  $g$  is a factor of some  $a_i$ . Also, we have *unique* non-negative integers  $e_{ip}, e_{gp}$  s.t.

$$a_i // g = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} p^{e_{ip}}, \forall i \in [n] \text{ and } g = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} p^{e_{gp}}.$$

Combining these equation, we get  $a_i = a_i // g * g^{f_{ig}} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} p^{e_{ip} + e_{gp} * f_{ig}}$ . Here  $f_{ig}$  is the maximum power of  $g$  that divides  $a_i$ . Therefore,  $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$  is also a pseudo-prime-factor set for  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ .  $\square$

**Pre-processing.** Using Lemma 25, algorithm 4 performs a divide-and-conquer approach to find  $\mathcal{P}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . Observe that we can always remove duplicate elements and 1's from the input since it *does not* change the pseudo-prime-factors. Also, we can assume without loss of generality that  $a_i // a_1 =: a_i, \forall i > 1$  because of the second part in Lemma 25, with  $g = a_1$ , since it gives us  $\mathcal{P}(a_1, a_2 // g, \dots, a_n // g)$  and we know it suffices to work with these inputs.

If  $a_1$  is coprime to the rest of the  $a_i$ 's, then the algorithm will recursively call itself on  $(a_2, \dots, a_n)$  and combine  $\mathcal{P}(a_2, \dots, a_n)$  with  $\{a_1\}$ . Else, there exist an  $i > 1$  such that  $\gcd(a_1, a_i) \neq 1$ . So, the algorithm finds a factor  $g$  of  $a_1$  using Euclid's GCD algorithm and computes  $\mathcal{P}(g, a_1 // g, \dots, a_n // g)$ . At every step we remove duplicates and 1's. Hence, the correctness of algorithm 4 is immediate assuming it terminates.

To show the termination and time complexity of algorithm 4, we will use the 'potential function'  $\mathbb{P}(I) := \prod_{a \in I} a$ , where  $I$  is the input and show that at each recursive call, the value of the potential function is halved. Initially, the value of the potential function is  $\prod_{i=1}^n a_i$ . We also remark that since the algorithm removes duplicates and 1's; the potential function can *never* increase by the removal step and so it never matters in showing the decreasing nature of  $\mathbb{P}$ .

1.  $a_1$  is coprime to the rest of the  $a_i$ 's: In this case, the recursive call has input  $(a_2, \dots, a_n)$ . Since,  $a_1 \geq 2$ , the value of potential function is

$$\mathbb{P}(a_2, \dots, a_n) = \prod_{i=2}^n a_i < \left( \prod_{i=1}^n a_i \right) / 2 = \mathbb{P}(a_1, \dots, a_n) / 2.$$

2.  $a_1$  shares a common factor with some  $a_i$ . Let  $g = \gcd(a_1, a_i) \neq 1$ . Since, we have assumed  $a_i // a_1 = a_i$ , this implies that  $a_i$  is not a multiple of  $a_1$ . This implies that  $2 \leq g \leq a_1 / 2$ . Therefore, the new value of potential function is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(g, a_1 // g, \dots, a_n // g) &= g \prod_{j=1}^n a_j // g \\ &\leq (a_1 // g) \times ((a_i // g) \times g) \times \prod_{j \in [n] \setminus \{1, i\}} a_j \\ &\leq \frac{a_1}{g} \cdot \prod_{j=2}^n a_j \\ &\leq \left( \prod_{j=1}^n a_j \right) / 2 = \mathbb{P}(a_1, \dots, a_n) / 2. \end{aligned}$$

We used the fact that since,  $2 \leq g \mid a_i$ , therefore,  $g \times (a_i // g) \leq a_i$ .

**Time complexity.** In both the cases, the value of the potential function is halved. So, the depth of the recursion tree (in-fact, it is just a line) is at most  $\log(\prod_{i=1}^n a_i) \leq m \cdot n$ . Also, in each recursive call, the input size is increased at most by one but the integers are still bounded by  $2^m$ . This implies that input size, for any recurrence call, can be at most  $(m + 1) \cdot n$ . Since there is no branching, the total time complexity is  $\text{poly}(m, n) = \text{poly}(\log t, n)$ .

---

**Algorithm 4:** Algorithm for Pseudo-prime-factor set

---

**Input:**  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$  which are  $m$ -bit integers such that  $a_i / a_1 = a_i > 1, \forall i > 1$   
**Output:** Pseudo-prime-factor set  $\mathcal{P}$  for  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$

```
1 if  $n == 0$  then
2   | return  $\emptyset$ ;
3 end
4 if  $\exists i > 1$  such that  $\gcd(a_1, a_i) \neq 1$  then
5   |  $g = \gcd(a_1, a_i)$ ;
6   |  $I = \{g\}$ ;
7   | for  $i \in [n]$  do
8     |  $a'_i = a_i / g$ ;
9     | if  $a'_i \notin I$  and  $a'_i \neq 1$  then
10    |   |  $I = I \cup \{a'_i\}$ 
11    |   end
12    | end
13    | return  $\mathcal{P}(I)$ ;
14 end
15 else
16   | return  $\mathcal{P}(a_2, \dots, a_n) \cup \{a_1\}$ ;
17 end
```

---

## 8 Extending Theorem 1 and 2 to Unbounded Subset Sum

In this section, we efficient algorithm for UBSSUM. The UBSSUM is an unbounded variant of SSUM problem, which is also NP-hard [Joh85].

**Definition 4** (Unbounded Subset Sum (UBSSUM)). Given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ , the UBSSUM problem asks whether there exists  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$  such that  $\beta_i$  are non-negative integers and  $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i a_i = t$ .

Similar to the SSUM, the UBSSUM problem also has a  $O(nt)$  dynamic programming algorithm. Interestingly, this problem has a  $O(n + \min_i a_i^2)$ -time deterministic algorithm [HR96]. Recently, Bringmann [Bri17] gave an  $\tilde{O}(t)$  deterministic algorithm for UBSSUM. We now define two variants of the UBSSUM problem which is very similar to  $k$ -SSUM and Hamming- $k$ -SSUM.

**Problem 5** ( $k$ -SUBSSUM). Given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ , the  $k$ -SUBSSUM problem asks to output all  $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$  where  $\beta_i$  are non-negative integers and  $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i a_i = t$  provided the number of such solutions is at most  $k$ .

**Problem 6** (Hamming- $k$ -SUBSSUM). Given a  $k$ -SUBSSUM instance  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ , Hamming- $k$ -SUBSSUM asks to output all the hamming weights of the solutions, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i$ .

*Remarks 2.* We want  $\vec{a} \cdot \vec{v} = t$ , where  $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Similarly, like in the SSUM case (i.e.,  $\vec{v} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ), we want  $|v|_1$ , which is exactly the quantity  $\sum_i \beta_i$ , as above. Thus, this definition can be thought as a natural extension of the hamming weight of the solution, in the unbounded regime.

We will present a deterministic polynomial time reduction from UBSSUM to SimulSubsetSum which will be used latter in this section.

**Theorem 26** (UBSSUM reduces to SimulSubsetSum). *There exists a deterministic polynomial time reduction from UBSSUM to SimulSubsetSum.*

*Proof.* Let  $(a_1, \dots, a_n, t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$  be an instance of UBSSUM. The reduction generates the following SSUM instance  $(\underbrace{a_1, 2a_1, 4a_1, \dots, 2^\gamma a_1}_{\gamma+1 \text{ entries}}, \underbrace{a_2, 2a_2, \dots, 2^\gamma a_2}_{\gamma+1 \text{ entries}}, \dots, \underbrace{a_n, 2a_n, \dots, 2^\gamma a_n}_{\gamma+1 \text{ entries}}, t)$  of size  $n(\gamma + 1)$  where

$$\gamma = \lfloor \log(t) \rfloor.$$

Let  $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$  be a solution to the UBSSUM instance, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i a_i = t$ . Since,  $\beta_i, a_i, t$  are all non-negative integers, we have  $\beta_i \leq t, \forall i \in [n]$ . Therefore,  $\beta$  is at most  $(\gamma + 1)$ -bit integer. Let  $\beta_i^{(j)}$  be the  $j^{\text{th}}$  bit of  $\beta_i$ , then we have

$$t = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma} \beta_i^{(j)} 2^j \right) \cdot a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma} \beta_i^{(j)} \cdot (2^j a_i)$$

which implies that the SSUM instance also has a solution. Similarly, we can show the reverse direction, i.e., if SSUM instance has a solution, then UBSSUM is also has a solution. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

► **Remark.** Observe that in [Theorem 26](#), there is a one-to-one correspondence between the solutions of the UBSSUM and the solutions of the SimulSubsetSum instance. Therefore, the reduction *preserves* the number of solutions. Also, any  $T(n, t)$  time algorithm that solve SSUM gives an  $T(n \log(t), t)$ -time algorithm to solve UBSSUM.

We will now show that the [Theorem 1-3](#) can be extended to, in the UBSSUM regime.

**Theorem 27.** *There is an  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t))$ -time deterministic algorithm for Hamming  $- k -$  SUBSSUM.*

*Proof sketch.* The algorithm is almost similar to [algorithm 1](#), except the definitions of the polynomials  $f_j(x)$ . Here also, we fix  $q$  and  $\mu$  similarly. We require the exact number of solutions  $m (m \leq k)$  in [subsection 4.1](#) (see [Claim 17](#)). To do that, define the polynomial  $f_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(x) &:= \prod_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{1 - x^{a_i}} \right) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - x^{a_i}) \right)^{-1} = \left( \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + x^{a_i} + x^{2a_i} + \dots) \right)^{-1} \\ &=: (h_0(x))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, we used the *inverse identity*  $1/(1 - x) = \sum_{i \geq 0} x^i$ . Expanding the above, is easy to see that  $\text{coef}_{x^t}(f_0(x)) = m$ , where  $m$  is the *exact* number of solutions to the  $k -$  SUBSSUM. Note that, we can compute  $f_0^{-1} = h_0(x) \bmod x^{t+1}$ , over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  efficiently in  $\tilde{O}(k + t)$  time. Finding inverse is *easy* and can be done efficiently (see [[VZGG13](#), Theorem 9.4]).

Once, we know  $m$ , we define  $m$  many polynomials  $f_j$ , for  $j \in [m]$ , as follows.

$$f_j(x) := \prod_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{1}{1 - \mu^j x^{a_i}} \right) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \mu^j x^{a_i}) \right)^{-1} =: (h_j(x))^{-1}$$

It is not hard to observe that  $\text{coef}_{x^t}(f_j(x)) = \sum_{i \in [\ell]} \lambda_i \cdot \mu^{j w_i}$ , where  $w_1, \dots, w_\ell$  are the distinct hamming weights with multiplicities  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$  (similar to [Observation 1](#)). To find the coefficients of  $f_j(x)$ , we first compute the coefficients of  $h_j(x)$ , using [Lemma 30](#), in  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t))$  time and find its inverses, using [[VZGG13](#), Theorem 9.4], which can again be done in  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t))$  time. Once we have computed the coefficients of  $f_j(x)$ , the rest proceeds same as [subsection 4.1](#).

**Theorem 28.** *There is a  $\text{poly}(knt)$ -time and  $O(\log(knt))$ -space deterministic algorithm which solves  $k$  – SUBSSUM.*

*Proof idea.* The algorithm first reduces UBSSUM to SSUM using [Theorem 26](#) which preserves the number of solutions but the size of the SSUM instance is now  $n \log t$ . Then, it runs [algorithm 2](#) on the SSUM instance to find all its solutions. From the solutions of the SSUM instance, it constructs all the solutions of the UBSSUM instance. This gives  $\text{poly}(knt)$ -time and  $O(\log(knt \log t)) = O(\log(knt))$ -space algorithm.

## 9 Conclusion

This work introduces some interesting search versions of variants of SSUM problem and gives efficient algorithms for each of them. This opens a variety of questions which require further rigorous investigations.

1. Can we improve the time complexity of the [algorithm 2](#)? Because of using [Theorem 21](#), the complexity for interpolation is already cubic. Whether some other algebraic (non-algebraic) techniques can improve the time complexity, while keeping it low space, is not at all clear.
2. Can we use these algebraic-number-theoretic techniques, to give a *deterministic*  $\tilde{O}(n + t)$  algorithm for decision version of SSUM?
3. Can we improve [section 4.1](#) to find both the hamming weights  $w_i$  as well as the multiplicities  $\lambda_i$ , in  $\tilde{O}(k(n + t))$ ?
4. Can we improve the complexity of [Theorem 19](#) to  $\tilde{O}(kn + \prod_{i=1}^k t_i)$ ? Note that we cannot avoid the  $kn$  term in the time complexity because the number of bits in a SimulSubsetSum instance is at least  $kn$ .
5. What can we say about the hardness of SimulSubsetSum with  $k$  subset sum instances where  $k = \omega(\log(n))$ ?
6. Set Cover Conjecture (SeCoCo) [[CDL+16](#)] states that given  $n$  elements and  $m$  sets and for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a  $k$  such that Set Cover with sets of size at most  $k$  *cannot* be computed in time  $2^{(1-\epsilon)n} \cdot \text{poly}(m)$  time. Can we show that SeCoCo implies there is *no*  $t^{1-\epsilon} \text{poly}(n)$  time solution to Subset Product?

**Acknowledgement.** PD thanks Department of CSE, IIT Kanpur for the hospitality, and acknowledges the support of Google Ph. D. Fellowship. MSR acknowledges the support of Prime Minister’s Research Fellowship. The authors would like to thank Dr. Santanu Sarkar (Dept. of Mathematics, IIT Madras) for introducing us to various algorithms for subset sum. The authors would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for the suggestions to improve some parts of the presentation.

## References

- [ABHS19] Amir Abboud, Karl Bringmann, Danny Hermelin, and Dvir Shabtay. Seth-based lower bounds for subset sum and bicriteria path. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 41–57. SIAM, 2019. 5, 7

- [AKS04] Manindra Agrawal, Neeraj Kayal, and Nitin Saxena. Primes is in p. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 781–793, 2004. [11](#), [18](#)
- [Bel57] Richard E. Bellman. *Dynamic programming*, 1957. [3](#), [4](#), [7](#), [36](#)
- [BHV09] Cristina Bazgan, Hadrien Hugot, and Daniel Vanderpooten. Solving efficiently the 0–1 multi-objective knapsack problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 36(1):260–279, 2009. [4](#)
- [BJLM13] Daniel J Bernstein, Stacey Jeffery, Tanja Lange, and Alexander Meurer. Quantum algorithms for the subset-sum problem. In *International Workshop on Post-Quantum Cryptography*, pages 16–33. Springer, 2013. [3](#)
- [BKS15] Jean Bourgain, Sergei Konyagin, and Igor Shparlinski. Character sums and deterministic polynomial root finding in finite fields. *Mathematics of Computation*, 84(296):2969–2977, 2015. [12](#)
- [Bre76] Richard P Brent. Multiple-precision zero-finding methods and the complexity of elementary function evaluation. In *Analytic computational complexity*, pages 151–176. Elsevier, 1976. [31](#)
- [Bri17] Karl Bringmann. A near-linear pseudopolynomial time algorithm for subset sum. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1073–1084. SIAM, 2017. [3](#), [5](#), [7](#), [25](#)
- [BW21] Karl Bringmann and Philip Wellnitz. On near-linear-time algorithms for dense subset sum. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1777–1796. SIAM, 2021. [3](#), [7](#)
- [CDL<sup>+</sup>16] Marek Cygan, Holger Dell, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Jesper Nederlof, Yoshio Okamoto, Ramamohan Paturi, Saket Saurabh, and Magnus Wahlström. On problems as hard as cnf-sat. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 12(3):1–24, 2016. [27](#)
- [CLRS09] Thomas H Cormen, Charles E Leiserson, Ronald L Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT press, 2009. [33](#)
- [CLS06] Scott Contini, Arjen K Lenstra, and Ron Steinfeld. Vsh, an efficient and provable collision-resistant hash function. In *Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques*, pages 165–182. Springer, 2006. [4](#)
- [DMT20] Konstantinos A Draziotis, V Martidis, and S Tiganourias. Product subset problem: Applications to number theory and cryptography. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07095*, 2020. [4](#)
- [EJT10] Michael Elberfeld, Andreas Jakoby, and Till Tantau. Logspace versions of the theorems of bodlaender and courcelle. In *2010 IEEE 51st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 143–152. IEEE, 2010. [7](#)
- [EM20] Andre Esser and Alexander May. Low weight discrete logarithm and subset sum in  $20.65n$  with polynomial memory. *memory*, 1:2, 2020. [3](#)



- [FMV16] Sebastian Faust, Daniel Masny, and Daniele Venturi. Chosen-ciphertext security from subset sum. In *Public-Key Cryptography—PKC 2016*, pages 35–46. Springer, 2016. 3
- [GJ79] Michael R Garey and David S Johnson. *Computers and intractability*, volume 174. freeman San Francisco, 1979. 4, 7
- [HM18] Alexander Helm and Alexander May. Subset sum quantumly in  $1.17^n$ . In *13th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2018)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018. 3
- [HR96] Paul Hansen and Jennifer Ryan. Testing integer knapsacks for feasibility. *European journal of operational research*, 88(3):578–582, 1996. 25
- [Joh85] David S Johnson. The np-completeness column: an ongoing guide. *Journal of Algorithms*, 6(3):434–451, 1985. 25
- [JWV21] Ce Jin, Nikhil Vyas, and Ryan Williams. Fast low-space algorithms for subset sum. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1757–1776. SIAM, 2021. 3, 6, 7, 14
- [JW18] Ce Jin and Hongxun Wu. A simple near-linear pseudopolynomial time randomized algorithm for subset sum. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.11597*, 2018. 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35
- [Kan10] Daniel M Kane. Unary subset-sum is in logspace. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.1336*, 2010. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20
- [KP10] Mikhail Y Kovalyov and Erwin Pesch. A generic approach to proving np-hardness of partition type problems. *Discrete applied mathematics*, 158(17):1908–1912, 2010. 6, 7
- [KS01] Adam R Klivans and Daniel Spielman. Randomness efficient identity testing of multivariate polynomials. In *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 216–223, 2001. 17, 18
- [KX18] Konstantinos Koiliaris and Chao Xu. Subset sum made simple. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.08248*, 2018. 7
- [KX19] Konstantinos Koiliaris and Chao Xu. Faster pseudopolynomial time algorithms for subset sum. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 15(3):1–20, 2019. 7
- [Lew83] Harry R Lewis. *Computers and intractability. a guide to the theory of np-completeness*, 1983. 3
- [LL19] Yang Li and Hongbo Li. Improved quantum algorithm for the random subset sum problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.09264*, 2019. 3
- [LP92] Hendrik W Lenstra and Carl Pomerance. A rigorous time bound for factoring integers. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 5(3):483–516, 1992. 5, 15, 36
- [LPS10] Vadim Lyubashevsky, Adriana Palacio, and Gil Segev. Public-key cryptographic primitives provably as secure as subset sum. In *Theory of Cryptography Conference*, pages 382–400. Springer, 2010. 3



- [MT98] Alexis Maciel and Denis Therien. Threshold circuits of small majority-depth. *Information and Computation*, 146(1):55–83, 1998. 18
- [MVV87] Ketan Mulmuley, Umesh V Vazirani, and Vijay V Vazirani. Matching is as easy as matrix inversion. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 345–354, 1987. 8
- [MW18] Dylan M McKay and Richard Ryan Williams. Quadratic time-space lower bounds for computing natural functions with a random oracle. In *10th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018. 5
- [Nag52] Jitsuro Nagura. On the interval containing at least one prime number. *Proceedings of the Japan Academy*, 28(4):177–181, 1952. 9
- [Pis99] David Pisinger. Linear time algorithms for knapsack problems with bounded weights. *Journal of Algorithms*, 33(1):1–14, 1999. 7
- [PST21] Ulrich Pferschy, Joachim Schauer, and Clemens Thielen. Approximating the product knapsack problem. *Optimization Letters*, pages 1–12, 2021. 4, 6, 7
- [Sho90] Victor Shoup. On the deterministic complexity of factoring polynomials over finite fields. *Information Processing Letters*, 33(5):261–267, 1990. 12
- [Shp96] Igor Shparlinski. On finding primitive roots in finite fields. *Theoretical computer science*, 157(2):273–275, 1996. 9
- [VZGG13] Joachim Von Zur Gathen and Jürgen Gerhard. *Modern computer algebra*. Cambridge university press, 2013. 9, 26

## A Generalizing Jin and Wu’s technique [JW18] to different settings

### A.1 Revisiting [JW18] with weighted coefficient

In [JW18, Lemma 5], Jin and Wu established the main lemma which shows that one can compute

$$A(x) := \prod_{i \in [n]} (1 + x^{a_i}) \bmod \langle x^{t+1}, p \rangle, \text{ for any prime } p \in [t+1, (n+t)^3],$$

in  $\tilde{O}(t)$  time. Further, choosing a *random*  $p$ , one can decide nonzeroness of  $\text{coef}_{x^t}(A(x))$ , with high probability. In this paper, we will work with a more general polynomial

$$G(x) := \prod_{i \in [n]} (1 + W^b \cdot x^{a_i}) \bmod \langle x^{t+1}, p \rangle,$$

for some integer  $W$ , not necessarily 1 and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Therefore, the details slightly differ. For the completeness, we give the details. But before going into the details, we define some basics of power series and expansion of  $\exp$  (respectively  $\ln$ ), which will be crucially used in the proof of Lemma 30. In general, we will be working with primes  $p$  such that  $\log(p) = O(\log(n+t))$ , thus  $\log(p)$  terms in the complexity can be subsumed in  $\tilde{O}$  notation.

**Basic Power series tools.** We denote  $\mathbb{F}[x]$  as the ring of polynomials over a field  $\mathbb{F}$ , and  $\mathbb{F}[[x]]$  denote the ring of formal power series over  $\mathbb{F}$  which has elements of the form  $\sum_{i \geq 0} a_i x^i$ , for  $a_i \in \mathbb{F}$ . Two important power series over  $\mathbb{Q}[[x]]$  are:

$$\ln(1+x) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{(-1)^{k-1} x^k}{k}, \quad \text{and} \quad \exp(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{x^k}{k!}.$$

They are inverse to each other and satisfy the basic properties:

$$\exp(\ln(1+f(x))) = 1+f(x), \quad \text{and} \quad \ln((1+f(x)) \cdot (1+g(x))) = \ln(1+f(x)) + \ln(1+g(x)),$$

for every  $f(x), g(x) \in x\mathbb{Q}[x]$  (i.e., constant term is 0). Here is an important lemma to compute  $\exp(f(x)) \bmod x^{t+1}$ ; for details see [Bre76]; for an alternative proof, see [JW18, Lemma 2].

**Lemma 29** ([Bre76]). *Given a polynomial  $f(x) \in x\mathbb{F}[x]$  of degree at most  $t$  ( $t < p$ ), one can compute a polynomial  $g(x) \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$  in  $\tilde{O}(t)$  time such that  $g(x) \equiv \exp(f(x)) \bmod \langle x^{t+1}, p \rangle$ .*

Here is the most important lemma, which is an extension of [JW18, Lemma 4], where the authors considered the simplest form. In this paper, we need the extensions for the ‘robust’ usage of this lemma (in subsection 4.1).

**Lemma 30** (Coefficient Extraction Lemma). *Let  $A(x) = \prod_{i \in [n]} (1 + W^b \cdot x^{a_i})$ , for any non-negative integers  $a_i, b$  and  $W \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then, for a prime  $p > t$ , one can compute  $\text{coef}_{x^r}(A(x)) \bmod p$  for all  $0 \leq r \leq t$ , in time  $\tilde{O}(n + t \log(Wb))$ .*

*Proof.* Let us define  $B(x) := \ln(A(x)) \in \mathbb{Q}[[x]]$ . By definition,

$$B(x) = \ln \left( \prod_{i \in [n]} (1 + W^b \cdot x^{a_i}) \right) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \ln(1 + W^b \cdot x^{a_i}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{j} \cdot W^{jb} \cdot x^{a_i j}.$$

Let  $B_t(x) := B(x) \bmod \langle x^{t+1}, p \rangle$ . Define  $S_k := \{i \mid a_i = k\}$ . Moreover, let us define

$$d_{k,j} := \begin{cases} \sum_{i \in S_k} W^{jb}, & \text{if } S_k \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, rewriting the above expression, we get

$$B_t(x) \equiv \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor t/a_i \rfloor} \frac{(-1)^{j-1}}{j} \cdot W^{jb} \cdot x^{a_i j} \equiv \sum_{k \in [t]} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor t/k \rfloor} \frac{(-1)^{j-1} \cdot d_{k,j}}{j} \cdot x^{jk} \bmod p.$$

Since  $p > t$ ,  $j^{-1} \bmod p$  exists, for  $j \in [t]$ . So we pre-compute all  $j^{-1} \bmod p$ , which takes total  $\tilde{O}(t)$  time. Further, we can pre-compute  $|S_k|, \forall k \in [t]$  in  $\tilde{O}(n+t)$  time, just by a linear scan.

Moreover, computing each  $d_{k,j} = |S_k| \cdot W^{jb}$ , takes  $\tilde{O}(\log(Wbt))$  time, since  $j \leq t$  (assuming we have computed  $|S_k|$ ). Thus, the total time complexity to compute coefficients of  $B_t(x)$  is

$$\tilde{O}(n+t) + \tilde{O}(t) + \sum_{k \in [t]} \sum_{j \in [t/k]} \tilde{O}(\log(Wbt) \cdot j) = \tilde{O}(n + t \log(Wb)).$$

In the last, we use that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor t/k \rfloor} 1 = O(t \log t)$ , which gives the sum to be  $\tilde{O}((n + t \log(Wb)))$  ( $\log t$  is absorbed inside the  $\tilde{O}$ ).

The last step is to compute  $A(x) \equiv \exp(B_t(x)) \bmod \langle x^{t+1}, p \rangle$ . Since one can compute  $B_t(x)$  in time  $\tilde{O}((n + t \log(Wb)))$ , using [Lemma 29](#), one concludes to compute the coefficients of  $x^r$  of  $A(x)$ ,  $0 \leq r \leq t$ , over  $\mathbb{F}_p$  in similar time of  $\tilde{O}((n + t \log(Wb)))$ .  $\square$

► **Remark.** When  $|W| = 1$ , it is exactly [[JW18](#), Lemma 5]. One can also work with  $A(x) = \prod_{i \in [n]} (1 - W^b \cdot x^{a_i})$ ; the negative sign does not matter since we can use  $\ln(1 - x) = -\sum_{i \geq 1} x^i / i$  and the proof goes through.

## A.2 Fast multivariate polynomial multiplication

In this section, we will study the time required to compute

$$A(x_1, \dots, x_k) := \prod_{i=1}^n \left( 1 + \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij}} \right) \bmod \langle x_1^{t_1+1}, x_2^{t_2+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1}, p \rangle$$

for some prime  $p$ . The case when  $k = 1$  has been studied in [[JW18](#), Lemma 5] where the authors gave an  $\tilde{O}(n + t_1)$  time algorithm for  $p \in [t_1 + 1, (n + t_1)^3]$ . Here we will present the generalisation of this lemma which is used in [Theorem 19](#) using multivariate FFT.

**Lemma 31** (Fast multivariate exponentiation). *Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  and  $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{t_1} f_i(\mathbf{x}) \cdot x_1^i \in \mathbb{F}_p[\mathbf{x}]$  where  $f_i(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_p[x_2, \dots, x_k]$  such that*

1.  $f(\mathbf{x}) \bmod \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle = 0$ , i.e., the constant term of  $f(\mathbf{x})$  is 0, and,
2.  $\deg_{x_j}(f) = t_j$ , for positive integers  $t_j$ .

*Then, there is an  $\tilde{O}(\sum_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1))$  time deterministic algorithm that computes a polynomial  $g(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_p[\mathbf{x}]$  such that  $g(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \exp(f(\mathbf{x})) \bmod \langle x_1^{t_1+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1} \rangle$  over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $g(\mathbf{x}) = \exp(f(\mathbf{x})) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} g_i(x_2, \dots, x_k) \cdot x_1^i$ , where  $g_i \in \mathbb{F}_p[[x_2, \dots, x_k]]$ . Differentiate wrt  $x_1$  to get:

$$g'(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\partial g(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_1} = g(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_1}.$$

By comparing the coefficients of  $x_1^i$  on both sides, we get (over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ ):

$$g_i \equiv i^{-1} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} f_{i-j} \cdot g_j \bmod \langle x_2^{t_2+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1} \rangle,$$

$\square$

where  $g_0 = 1$ . By initializing  $g_0 = 1$ , the rest  $g_i$  to 0 and calling *Compute*(0,  $t_1$ ) procedure in [algorithm 5](#), we can compute all the coefficients up to  $x_1^{t_1}$ , in the polynomial  $g(\mathbf{x}) \bmod \langle x_2^{t_2+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1} \rangle$ , over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ .

To speed up this algorithm, we can set  $A(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{r-\ell} i f_i x_1^i$  and  $B(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-\ell} g_{i+\ell} x_1^i$ ; here the  $f_i$  and  $g_{i+\ell}$  have been computed modulo  $\langle x_2^{t_2+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1} \rangle$  already. Use multidimensional FFT

---

**Algorithm 5:** Algorithm for  $\text{Compute}(\ell, r)$ 


---

**Input:** integers  $\ell, r$  and polynomials  $f_i, g_i$   
**Output:** Updated values of  $g_i$

```

1 if  $\ell < r$  then
2    $m = \lfloor (\ell + r)/2 \rfloor$ ;
3    $\text{Compute}(\ell, m)$ ;
4   for  $i \in \{m + 1, \dots, r\}$  do
5      $g_i = g_i + i^{-1} \sum_{j=\ell}^m (i - j) f_{i-j} g_j \pmod{\langle x_2^{t_2+1}, x_3^{t_3+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1}, p \rangle}$ ;
6   end
7    $\text{Compute}(m + 1, r)$ ;
8 end
9 return  $g_\ell, \dots, g_r$ 

```

---

[CLRS09, Chapter 30] to compute  $C(x) = A(x)B(x)$  to speed up the for loop which takes  $O(\prod_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1) \log(\prod_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1)))$  time.

Observe that  $\sum_{j=\ell}^m (i - j) f_{i-j} g_j$  is the coefficient of  $x_1^{i-\ell}$  in  $C(x)$ ; importantly  $\deg_{x_i}(C) \leq 2t_i$ , for  $i \geq 2$ . The extraction of the coefficient of  $x_1^i$  in  $C(x)$  for all  $i$ ,  $\text{mod } \langle x_2^{t_2+1}, x_3^{t_3+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1} \rangle$  can be performed in  $O(\prod_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1))$  time. This is done by traversing through the polynomial and collecting coefficient along with monomials having the same  $x_1^i$  term (and there can be at most  $\prod_{i=2}^k (2t_i + 1)$  many terms). Thus, the total time complexity of computing  $g(x) \text{ mod } \langle x_2^{t_2+1}, x_3^{t_3+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1} \rangle$  is

$$T(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k) = 2T(t_1/2, t_2, \dots, t_k) + \tilde{O}\left(\prod_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1)\right) = \tilde{O}\left(\prod_{i=1}^k (2t_i + 1)\right),$$

as desired.

**Lemma 32** (Fast logarithm computation). *Let  $A(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij}}\right)$ . Then, there exists an  $\tilde{O}(kn + \prod_{i=1}^k t_i)$  time deterministic algorithm that computes  $\text{coef}_{x^e}(\ln(A(x))) \pmod p$  for all  $e$ , such that  $e = (e_1, \dots, e_k)$  with  $e_i \leq t_i$ .*

*Proof.* Let us define  $B(x) := \ln(A(x))$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} B(x) &= \ln\left(\prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij}}\right)\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \ln\left(1 + \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij}}\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(-1)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij}}\right)^\ell\right). \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $t_1 \leq t_i, \forall i > 1$ . Let  $C(x) := B(x) \pmod{\langle x_1^{t_1+1}, \dots, x_k^{t_k+1}, p \rangle}$ . Since, we are interested where the individual degree of  $x_j$  can be at most  $t_j$ , the index  $\ell$  in the above equation (for a fixed  $i$ ) must satisfy  $a_{ij} \cdot \ell \leq t_j$  for each  $j \in [k]$ . This implies  $\ell \leq t_j/a_{ij}$ , for  $j \in [k]$ .

Therefore, define  $M_i := \min_{j=1}^k \lfloor t_j / a_{ij} \rfloor$ . Now, one can express  $C(x)$  using  $M_i$  since it suffices to look the index  $\ell$  till  $M_i$  (for a fixed  $i$ ), as argued before.

Importantly, note that the above equation involves  $\prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij} \ell}$  which has individual degree  $> 0$ , since both  $a_{ij}, \ell \geq 1$ . Thus, define  $T := \{e = (e_1, \dots, e_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k \mid 1 \leq e_i \leq t_i, \forall i \in [k]\}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} C(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{M_i} \left( \frac{(-1)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \left( \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{a_{ij} \ell} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{e} \in T} \sum_{\ell=1}^{t_1/e_1} \left( \frac{s_{\bar{e}} \times (-1)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{e_j \ell} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $s_{\bar{e}} = |\{i \in [n] \mid (a_{i1}, \dots, a_{ik}) = \bar{e}\}|$ . Essentially, for a given  $s_e$ , the quantity computes how many times  $a_{ij}$  is equal to  $e_j$ , for all  $j \in [k]$ . Using  $s_e$ , we can interchange the order of the summation as shown above. Moreover, we can pre-compute  $s_e$ , for all  $e \in T$  in time  $O(kn + \prod_{i=1}^k t_i)$ .

Observe that  $\text{coef}_{x^e}(B(x)) = \text{coef}_{x^e}(C(x))$ , for any  $(e_1, \dots, e_k) \in T$ . Since,  $\ell \leq t_1 < p$ ,  $\ell^{-1}$  exists and can be pre-computed in  $\tilde{O}(t_1)$ .

**Time complexity.** Observe that we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(x) &= \sum_{\bar{e} \in T} \sum_{\ell=1}^{t_1/e_1} \left( \frac{s_{\bar{e}} \times (-1)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{e_j \ell} \right) \\ &= \sum_{e_2=1}^{t_2} \sum_{e_3=1}^{t_3} \dots \sum_{e_k=1}^{t_k} \left( \sum_{e_1=1}^{t_1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{t_1/e_1} \left( \frac{s_{\bar{e}} \times (-1)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{e_j \ell} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The time taken to compute all  $\text{coef}_{x^e}(C(x))$ , given  $s_e$ , is the number of iterations over all  $(e_2, \dots, e_k)$ , for  $1 \leq e_i \leq t_i$ ,  $i > 1$  and  $\ell \in [t_1/e_1]$ , which is atmost  $\sum_{j=1}^{t_1} \lfloor t_1/j \rfloor \times \prod_{i=2}^k t_i = \tilde{O}(\prod_{i=1}^k t_i)$ , since  $\sum_{j=1}^{t_1} t_1/j = O(t_1 \log t_1)$ . Thus, the total time is  $\tilde{O}(kn + \prod_{i=1}^k t_i)$ .  $\square$

### A.3 Solving linear recurrence: Tool for **subsection 4.1**

In this section, we briefly sketch how to speed up the algorithm of computing  $E_i$ , for  $i \in [m]$ , using FFT, rather than just going through one by one. **Equation 1** gives the following relation:

$$E_j \equiv j^{-1} \cdot \left( \sum_{i \in [j]} (-1)^{j-i-1} E_i \cdot P_{j-i} \right) \pmod{q}.$$

Here, by  $E_j$  (respectively  $P_j$ ), we mean  $E_j(\mu^{w_1}, \dots, \mu^{w_\ell})$  (respectively  $P_j$ ). We can assume that  $P_j$ 's are already pre-computed and hence contributes to the complexity only once. This calculation is very similar to [JW18, Lemma 2], with a similar relation. But we give the details, for the completeness.

Eventually, once we have computed  $P_j$ 's, we can use FFT (**algorithm 6**) to find  $E_j$ 's, which eventually gives  $T(m) \leq \tilde{O}(k(n+t))$ .

To elaborate, in the for-loop 7-8 in **algorithm 6**, we want to find  $\sum_{i=\ell}^s (-1)^{j-i} E_i \cdot P_{j-i}$  for all  $j \in \{s+1, \dots, u\}$ . To achieve this, we define the polynomials:

$$F(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{u-\ell} (-1)^{k-1} P_k x^k, \text{ and } G(x) := \sum_{j=0}^{s-\ell} E_{j+\ell} x^j.$$

Note that our  $F(x)$  is *different* than used in [JW18], because of slightly different recurrence relation. We can compute  $H(x) = F(x) \cdot G(x)$ , in time  $\tilde{O}((u-\ell))$ . Observe that  $\sum_{i=\ell}^u (-1)^{j-i-1} P_{j-i} \cdot E_i = \text{coef}_{x^{j-\ell}}(H(x))$  because  $(-1)^{j-i-1} P_{j-i} = \text{coef}_{x^{j-i}}(F(x))$  and  $E_i = \text{coef}_{x^{i-\ell}}(G(x))$ . Therefore, the inner for loop can be computed in  $\tilde{O}((u-\ell))$  time.

**Final time complexity.** Let  $T'(m)$  is the complexity of computing  $E_1, \dots, E_m$  assuming precomputations of  $P_j$  and  $j^{-1}$ . Then,

$$T'(m) \leq 2T'(m/2) + \tilde{O}(m) \implies T'(m) \leq \tilde{O}(m).$$

Therefore, the total complexity of computing  $E_1, \dots, E_m$ , is  $T(m) = T'(m) + \tilde{O}(k(n+t))$ , where  $\tilde{O}(k(n+t))$  is for the time for computing  $P_j$ 's (and  $j^{-1}$ ). Since,  $q = O(n+k+t)$  and  $m \leq k$ , we get  $T(m) = \tilde{O}(k(n+t))$ , as we wanted.

---

**Algorithm 6:** Algorithm for computing  $E_i$

---

**Input:**  $P_i$ , for  $i \in [m]$ ,  $q$  and  $E_0 = 1$

**Output:**  $E_i$  for  $i \in [m]$

- 1 Initialize  $E_j \leftarrow 0$ , for  $j \in [m]$ ;
  - 2 **return** Compute(0,  $m$ );
  - 3 **Procedure** Compute( $\ell, u$ )  $\triangleright$  the values returned by Compute( $\ell, u$ ) are the final values  $E_\ell, \dots, E_u$  are computed;
  - 4 **for**  $\ell < u$  **do**
  - 5      $s \leftarrow \lfloor \frac{\ell+u}{2} \rfloor$
  - 6     Compute( $\ell, s$ );
  - 7     **for**  $j \leftarrow s+1, \dots, u$  **do**
  - 8          $E_j \leftarrow E_j + j^{-1} \cdot (\sum_{i=\ell}^s (-1)^{j-i} E_i \cdot P_{j-i}) \pmod q$ ;
  - 9     **end**
  - 10    Compute( $s+1, u$ )
  - 11 **end**
  - 12 **return**  $E_\ell, \dots, E_u$ ;
- 

## B Algorithms

### B.1 Trivial solution for $k$ – SSSUM

Bellman's dynamic programming solution for the decision version of SSSUM is based on the recurrence relation  $S((a_1, \dots, a_n), t) = S((a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}), t) \oplus S((a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}), t - a_n)$  where  $S((a_1, \dots, a_j), t') = 1 \iff t'$  is a realisable target of  $(a_1, \dots, a_j)$ . Using this relation, the algorithm needs to store only the values of  $S((a_1, \dots, a_{j-1}), t')$  for all  $1 \leq t' \leq t$  to compute  $S((a_1, \dots, a_j), t')$  for all  $1 \leq t' \leq t$ . So, the time complexity is  $O(nt)$  whereas the space complexity is  $\Omega(t)$ .

For finding all the solutions, we modify the above algorithm by adding a pointer from  $S((a_1, \dots, a_j), t')$  to  $S((a_1, \dots, a_{j-1}), t - a_j)$  when both are equal to 1. The same is done for  $S((a_1, \dots, a_j), t')$  and  $S((a_1, \dots, a_{j-1}), t)$ . Apart from these, we also add a pointer from  $S(a_i, a_i)$  to a new node  $S(\{\}, 0)$  where  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . This gives a directed graph of size  $O(nt)$  because the out-degree of each node is at most 2. To find all the solutions to the SSUM, we simply run a modified version of DFS algorithm<sup>4</sup> on this graph to find all the paths from  $S((a_1, \dots, a_n), t)$  to  $S(\{\}, 0)$ .

It is evident that if the number of solutions to the SSUM instance is  $k$ , then the number of paths is also  $k$ . The modified DFS algorithm goes through all the neighbouring vertices of a given vertex, no matter if they are visited or not. Furthermore, any path that starts from  $S((a_1, \dots, a_n), t)$  will end at  $S(\{\}, 0)$ .

Clearly, this algorithm will terminate because the graph is directed acyclic. The running time and space of the modified DFS algorithm is  $O(nk)$  because each path is of length at most  $n$  and the algorithm traverses through each path at most twice (the first traversal ends at  $S(\{\}, 0)$  which finds the path and the second one is backtracking). Therefore, the total time and space complexity is  $O(n(t+k))$ .

## B.2 Trivial dynamic algorithm for SimulSubsetSum

In this section, we sketch a dynamic pseudo-polynomial time algorithm which solves SimulSubsetSum, with targets  $t_1, \dots, t_k$ , in  $O(n(t_1+1) \dots (t_k+1))$  time. This is a direct generalization of Bellman's work [Bel57].

The algorithm considers an  $n \times (t_1+1) \times \dots \times (t_k+1)$  boolean matrix  $M$  and populates it with 0/1 entries.  $M[i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k]$  has 1 iff the SimulSubsetSum instance with  $\ell^{\text{th}}$  SSUM instance  $(a_{1\ell}, a_{2\ell}, \dots, a_{i\ell}, j_i)$  has a solution. Here  $i \in [n]$  and  $j_i \in [0, t_i]$ . Even though we have remarked that wlog  $t_i \geq 1, \forall i \in [n]$ , we cannot do the same for  $a_{ij}$ 's. This forces us to look at  $j_i \in [0, t_i], \forall i \in [k]$ . The algorithm starts by setting  $M[1, a_{11}, a_{12}, \dots, a_{1k}] = 1$  and  $M[1, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k] = 0$  for the rest. Then, using the following recurrence relation, the algorithm populates the rest of the matrix.

$$M[i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k] = M[i-1, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k] + M[i-1, j_1 - a_{i1}, j_2 - a_{i2}, \dots, j_k - a_{ik}]$$

i.e.,  $M[i, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k]$  is set to 1 iff either  $M[i-1, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k] = 1$  or  $M[i-1, j_1 - a_{i1}, j_2 - a_{i2}, \dots, j_k - a_{ik}] = 1$ . Since, the size of the matrix is  $n(t_1+1) \dots (t_k+1)$ , the running time of the algorithm is  $O(n(t_1+1) \dots (t_k+1))$ .

## C Dynamic programming approach for Subset Product

In this section, we will briefly discuss the modification to Bellman's dynamic programming approach for SSUM to solve Subset Product in deterministic (expected) time  $O(nt^{o(1)})$ .

The algorithm starts by removing all  $a_i$  that does not divide  $t$ . Then using the factoring algorithm in [LP92], we can factor  $t$  into prime factor  $p_j$ , i.e.,  $t = \prod_{i \in [k]} p_j^{t_j} = t$ , where  $k = O(\log(t)/\log \log(t))$ . We now compute the DP table  $T$  of size  $n \times (t_1+1) \times \dots \times (t_k+1)$  such that

$$T[i, x_1, \dots, x_k] = 1, \text{ if and only if there exists } S \in [i], \text{ such that } \prod_{j \in S} a_j = \prod_{j \in [k]} p_j^{x_j}.$$

<sup>4</sup>The graph is a directed acyclic one and we can use the algorithm mentioned in <https://stackoverflow.com/questions/20262712/enumerating-all-paths-in-a-directed-acyclic-graph>



Observe that the time complexity of the algorithm is the time taken to populate the DP table with either 1 or 0. Since the size of the DP table is  $n \times \prod_{i \in [k]} (1 + t_i)$ , using the similar analyse mentioned in [subsection 5.1](#), we can bound the term  $\prod_{i \in [k]} (1 + t_i)$  by  $t^{o(1)}$ . Therefore, the total time complexity is  $O(nt^{o(1)})$ .