

# Freivalds Trick and Schwartz-Zippel Lemma

Lecture 12  
October 8, 2019

# Outline

- Freivald's randomized algorithm to verify matrix multiplication
- Generalization to polynomial identity testing via Schwartz-Zippel Lemma

# Part I

## Freivalds Algorithm for checking Matrix Multiplication

# Verifying Matrix Multiplication

## Problem

Given three  $n \times n$  matrices  $A, B, C$ , is  $AB = C$ ?

# Verifying Matrix Multiplication

## Problem

Given three  $n \times n$  matrices  $A, B, C$ , is  $AB = C$ ?

Naive algorithm: compute  $D = AB$  and check if  $D = C$

**Running time:**  $T(n) + n^2$  time where  $T(n)$  is time to multiply  $n \times n$  matrices. Current best bound on  $T(n)$  is  $n^{2.33728}$ .

**Question:** Can we do better with randomization?

# Freivald's Algorithm

- Pick random vector  $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$  — each coordinate is independent and uniform over  $\{0, 1\}$ .
- Output YES if  $ABr = Cr$  and NO otherwise.

# Freivald's Algorithm

- Pick random vector  $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$  — each coordinate is independent and uniform over  $\{0, 1\}$ .
- Output YES if  $ABr = Cr$  and NO otherwise.

**Running time:**  $O(n^2)$

# Freivald's Algorithm

- Pick random vector  $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$  — each coordinate is independent and uniform over  $\{0, 1\}$ .
- Output YES if  $ABr = Cr$  and NO otherwise.

Running time:  $O(n^2)$

## Theorem

If  $AB = C$  the algorithm outputs YES with probability 1. If  $AB \neq C$  algorithm outputs YES with probability at most  $1/2$ .

Repeating  $k$  times the probability of error is  $\leq 1/2^k$  and running time is  $O(kn^2)$ .



## Lemma

Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  be two vectors in  $\mathbb{F}^n$  for some field/ring  $\mathbb{F}$ . If  $\mathbf{r} \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is a random vector then  $\Pr[\mathbf{x}^t \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{y}^t \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}] \leq 1/2$ .

## Lemma

Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  be two vectors in  $\mathbb{F}^n$  for some field/ring  $\mathbb{F}$ . If  $\mathbf{r} \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is a random vector then  $\Pr[\mathbf{x}^t \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{y}^t \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}] \leq 1/2$ .

- Assume  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ . Without loss of generality  $x_1 \neq y_1$ .
- Fix  $r_2, r_3, \dots, r_n$ . Let  $\alpha = x_2 r_2 + \dots + x_n r_n$  and  $\beta = y_2 r_2 + \dots + y_n r_n$ .
- If  $r_1$  is uniformly random in  $\{0, 1\}$  what is  $\Pr[x_1 r_1 + \alpha = y_1 r_1 + \beta]$ ?

## Lemma

Let  $x, y$  be two vectors in  $\mathbb{F}^n$  for some field/ring  $\mathbb{F}$ . If  $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$  is a random vector then  $\Pr[x^t r = y^t r \mid x \neq y] \leq 1/2$ .

- Assume  $x \neq y$ . Without loss of generality  $x_1 \neq y_1$ .
- Fix  $r_2, r_3, \dots, r_n$ . Let  $\alpha = x_2 r_2 + \dots + x_n r_n$  and  $\beta = y_2 r_2 + \dots + y_n r_n$ .
- If  $r_1$  is uniformly random in  $\{0, 1\}$  what is  $\Pr[x_1 r_1 + \alpha = y_1 r_1 + \beta]$ ? At most  $1/2$ . If  $\alpha \neq \beta$  then  $r_1 = 0$  will distinguish and if  $\alpha = \beta$  then  $r_1 = 1$  will distinguish.
- Holds for any fixed  $r_2, \dots, r_n$  and  $r_1$  random. Since  $r_1$  is independent of  $r_2, \dots, r_n$ , holds for random  $r$ .

# Proof of Theorem

## Theorem

*If  $AB = C$  the algorithm outputs YES with probability 1. If  $AB \neq C$  algorithm outputs YES with probability at most  $1/2$ .*

Suppose  $AB \neq C$ . Let  $D = AB$ . Since  $D \neq C$  there is some  $i, j$  where  $D_{i,j} \neq C_{i,j}$ . Assume wlog that  $i, j = 1, 1$ .

Let  $x$  be first row of  $D$  and  $y$  be first row of  $C$ .  $x \neq y$ . Apply preceding lemma.

## Part II

# Polynomial Identity Testing and Schwartz-Zippel Lemma

# Polynomials

## Definition

A **(univariate) polynomial** over a field  $\mathbb{F}$  is a finite sum of terms of the form  $a_j x^j$  where  $a_j \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $x$  is a variable.

$$p(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_j x^j$$

The numbers  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$  are the **coefficients** of the polynomial. The **degree** is the highest power of  $x$  with a non-zero coefficient.

## Example

$$p(x) = 3 - 4x + 5x^3$$

$a_0 = 3, a_1 = -4, a_2 = 0, a_3 = 5$  and  $\deg(p) = 3$

# Polynomials

## Definition

A **(univariate) polynomial** over a field  $\mathbb{F}$  is a finite sum of terms of the form  $a_i x^i$  where  $a_i \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $x$  is a variable.

$$p(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_j x^j$$

The numbers  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$  are the **coefficients** of the polynomial. The **degree** is the highest power of  $x$  with a non-zero coefficient.

## Coefficient Representation

Polynomials represented by vector  $a = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$  of coefficients.

# Polynomial Identity Testing

## Definition

A polynomial  $p(x)$  is identically **0** if  $p(x) = 0$  for all  $x$ . Equivalently it corresponds to all coefficients being **0**.



# Polynomial Identity Testing

## Definition

A polynomial  $p(x)$  is identically **0** if  $p(x) = 0$  for all  $x$ . Equivalently it corresponds to all coefficients being **0**.

## Question (PIT)

Given a polynomial  $p$  in some **implicit** fashion, is  $p$  identically **0**?

# Polynomial Identity Testing

## Definition

A polynomial  $p(x)$  is identically  $0$  if  $p(x) = 0$  for all  $x$ . Equivalently it corresponds to all coefficients being  $0$ .

## Question (PIT)

Given a polynomial  $p$  in some **implicit** fashion, is  $p$  identically  $0$ ?

## Examples:

- $p(x) = p_1(x)p_2(x) \cdots p_k(x) - q_1(x)q_2(x) \cdots q_\ell(x)$  for some complicated polynomials  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k, q_1, \dots, q_\ell$ .
- $p$  is given as a black box via only an evaluation oracle.

# Randomized Algorithm for Univariate Case

- Pick a random element  $a$  from a finite subset  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  where  $F$  is the underlying field.
- Evaluate  $p(a)$ . If  $p(a) = 0$  output  $p$  is identically  $0$ . Otherwise say no.

# Randomized Algorithm for Univariate Case

- Pick a random element  $a$  from a finite subset  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  where  $F$  is the underlying field.
- Evaluate  $p(a)$ . If  $p(a) = 0$  output  $p$  is identically  $0$ . Otherwise say no.

## Lemma

*Suppose  $p$  is not  $0$ . Then the algorithm says YES with probability at most  $d/|S|$  where  $d$  is the degree of  $p$ .*

# Randomized Algorithm for Univariate Case

- Pick a random element  $a$  from a finite subset  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  where  $F$  is the underlying field.
- Evaluate  $p(a)$ . If  $p(a) = 0$  output  $p$  is identically  $0$ . Otherwise say no.

## Lemma

*Suppose  $p$  is not  $0$ . Then the algorithm says YES with probability at most  $d/|S|$  where  $d$  is the degree of  $p$ .*

- $p(a) = 0$  only if  $a$  is a root of  $p$ , or if  $p = 0$  identically.
- $p$  has at most  $d$  roots over  $F$  via fundamental theorem of algebra.

# Computational considerations

## Lemma

Suppose  $p$  is not  $0$ . Then the algorithm says YES with probability at most  $d/|S|$  where  $d$  is the degree of  $p$ .

Why restrict to  $S$ ? Isn't probability  $0$  when  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  if we pick a random real/integer?

# Computational considerations

## Lemma

Suppose  $p$  is not  $0$ . Then the algorithm says YES with probability at most  $d/|S|$  where  $d$  is the degree of  $p$ .

Why restrict to  $S$ ? Isn't probability  $0$  when  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  if we pick a random real/integer?

Restricting  $S$  is for computational purposes since evaluation  $p(a)$  depends on both  $p$  and bit representation of  $a$  so picking an arbitrary integer/real would require large precision.

# Computational considerations

## Lemma

Suppose  $p$  is not  $0$ . Then the algorithm says YES with probability at most  $d/|S|$  where  $d$  is the degree of  $p$ .

Why restrict to  $S$ ? Isn't probability  $0$  when  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  if we pick a random real/integer?

Restricting  $S$  is for computational purposes since evaluation  $p(a)$  depends on both  $p$  and bit representation of  $a$  so picking an arbitrary integer/real would require large precision.

**Derandomization:** Evaluate  $p$  on any *distinct*  $d + 1$  values and if  $p(a) = 0$  for all of them output  $p = 0$ .



# Multivariate Polynomials

## Definition

A **multivariate polynomial** over a field  $\mathbb{F}$  with  $n$  variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  is a finite sum of terms of the form  $ax_1^{i_1}x_2^{i_2}\dots x_n^{i_n}$  where  $a \in \mathbb{F}$  and  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . The **degree** of the term  $x_1^{i_1}x_2^{i_2}\dots x_n^{i_n}$  is  $\sum_{j=1}^n i_j$  and the **total degree** of  $p$  is the maximum degree over all terms in  $p$ .

## Example

$$p(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1 + x_1^2 + x_1x_2x_3 + x_2^3x_3^5$$
$$\deg(p) = 8.$$

## Definition

A polynomial  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is identically **0** if  $p$  is equal **0** for all  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{F}$ .

## Question (PIT)

Given a polynomial  $p$  in some **implicit** fashion, is  $p$  identically **0**?

Multivariate polynomials are very powerful and can model many problems. PIT is a fundamental algorithmic tool.

# Randomized Algorithm for PIT

- Pick independent random elements  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  from a finite subset  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  where  $F$  is the underlying field.
- If  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = 0$  output  $p$  is identically  $0$ . Otherwise say no.

# Randomized Algorithm for PIT

- Pick independent random elements  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  from a finite subset  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  where  $F$  is the underlying field.
- If  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = 0$  output  $p$  is identically  $0$ . Otherwise say no.

## Theorem (Schwartz-Zippel Lemma)

*Suppose  $p$  is a multivariate polynomial with degree  $d$  that is not identically  $0$ . Then the algorithm says YES with probability at most  $d/|S|$ .*

# Randomized Algorithm for PIT

- Pick independent random elements  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  from a finite subset  $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}$  where  $F$  is the underlying field.
- If  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = 0$  output  $p$  is identically  $0$ . Otherwise say no.

## Theorem (Schwartz-Zippel Lemma)

*Suppose  $p$  is a multivariate polynomial with degree  $d$  that is not identically  $0$ . Then the algorithm says YES with probability at most  $d/|S|$ .*

The zero-set of multivariate polynomials is very complex, nevertheless the simple lemma for univariate case generalizes relatively easily and has numerous powerful applications.

# Proof of Schwartz-Zippel Lemma

Proof based on induction on  $n$ .

**Base case:**  $n = 1$  then follows from univariate case.

**Induction step:** Assume theorem holds if num variables  $< n$  and consider case with  $n$  variables. Let  $p$  be non-zero polynomial. All variables occur in  $p$  with non-zero degree. Hence

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{j=0}^d x_1^j p_j(x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

# Proof of Schwartz-Zippel Lemma

Proof based on induction on  $n$ .

**Base case:**  $n = 1$  then follows from univariate case.

**Induction step:** Assume theorem holds if num variables  $< n$  and consider case with  $n$  variables. Let  $p$  be non-zero polynomial. All variables occur in  $p$  with non-zero degree. Hence

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{j=0}^d x_1^j p_j(x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

Since  $p \neq 0$  let  $t$  be largest  $j$  such that  $p_j(x_2, \dots, x_n) \neq 0$ .

# Proof of Schwartz-Zippel Lemma

Proof based on induction on  $n$ .

**Base case:**  $n = 1$  then follows from univariate case.

**Induction step:** Assume theorem holds if num variables  $< n$  and consider case with  $n$  variables. Let  $p$  be non-zero polynomial. All variables occur in  $p$  with non-zero degree. Hence

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{j=0}^d x_1^j p_j(x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

Since  $p \neq 0$  let  $t$  be largest  $j$  such that  $p_j(x_2, \dots, x_n) \neq 0$ .  
 $\deg(p_t) \leq d - t$ .



# Proof continued

Think of algorithm as picking  $a_2, \dots, a_n$  first and creating univariate polynomial

$$q(x_1) = \sum_{j=0}^t x_1^j p_j(a_2, \dots, a_n)$$

and then picking  $a_1$  independently and evaluating  $q(a_1)$ .

# Proof continued

Think of algorithm as picking  $\mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  first and creating univariate polynomial

$$q(x_1) = \sum_{j=0}^t x_1^j p_j(\mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$$

and then picking  $\mathbf{a}_1$  independently and evaluating  $q(\mathbf{a}_1)$ .

**Pr[Alg is correct]**

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \Pr[p_t(\mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n) \neq 0] \Pr[q(\mathbf{a}_1) \neq 0 \mid p_t(\mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n) \neq 0] \\ &\geq \Pr[p_t(\mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n) \neq 0] (1 - t/|\mathbf{S}|) \quad (\text{since } q \text{ is a deg } t \text{ polynomial}) \\ &\geq (1 - (d - t)/|\mathbf{S}|)(1 - t/|\mathbf{S}|) \quad (\text{by induction}) \\ &\geq (1 - d/|\mathbf{S}|). \end{aligned}$$

# Derandomization?

**Question:** To derandomize algorithm in the naive way one would need to evaluate  $p$  on  $(d + 1)^n$  tuples. Exponential when  $n$  is large.

Whether PIT has a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm is a major open problem in complexity theory and algorithms.