

A NOTE ON SPANOID RANK

YUZHOU GU

ABSTRACT. We construct a spanoid $\mathcal{S}$ on n elements with

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}) \geq n^c \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S})$$

where $c = \log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5 \approx 0.113283$. This answers a question of Dvir-Gopi-Wigderson [DGW18].

In this note we construct a spanoid with a polynomial gap between its functional rank and formal rank. We follow notations from [DGW18], including $\models$, **f-rank**, **rank**, Π_5 , etc.

Our construction is by using a semidirect product of spanoids that amplifies the gap between **f-rank** and **rank**.

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ be two spanoids on X_1, X_2 resp. Define $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ to be the spanoid on $X_1 \times X_2$ generated by the following rules.

- (1) For $B \subseteq X_2, j \in X_2$, if $B \models j$ in $\mathcal{S}_2$ then for every $i \in X_1, \{i\} \times B \models (i, j)$.
- (2) For $A \subseteq X_1, i \in X_1$, if $A \models i$ in $\mathcal{S}_1$ then for every $j \in X_2, A \times \{j\} \models (i, j)$.

This definition differs from $\mathcal{S}_1 \odot \mathcal{S}_2$ in [DGW18] in that in Case (2), $A \times \{j\}$ does not span (i, j) in general.

Proposition 2. $\text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) \leq \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_2)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \in \Sigma^{X_1 \times X_2}$ be a code consistent with $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$. For $i \in X_1$, define code $\mathcal{C}_2^i \subseteq \Sigma^{X_2}$ as

$$\mathcal{C}_2^i = \{c_{\{i\} \times X_2} : c \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Because $\mathcal{C}_2^i$ is consistent with $\mathcal{S}_2$, we have

$$\frac{\log \#\mathcal{C}_2^i}{\log \#\Sigma} \leq \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_2).$$

Let Φ be a set of size

$$\max_{i \in X_1} \#\mathcal{C}_2^i$$

and for each $i \in X_1$, choose an embedding $\iota_i : \mathcal{C}_2^i \hookrightarrow \Phi$. Clearly, we have

$$\frac{\log \#\Phi}{\log \#\Sigma} \leq \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_2).$$

Define $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \Phi^{X_1}$ as

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(\iota_i(c_{\{i\} \times X_2}))_{i \in X_1} : c \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Then $\#\mathcal{C}_1 = \#\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$ is consistent with $\mathcal{S}_1$. So we have

$$\frac{\log \#\mathcal{C}_1}{\log \#\Phi} \leq \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_1).$$

Combining the inequalities, we get

$$\frac{\log \# \mathcal{C}}{\log \# \Sigma} \leq \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_2).$$

□

Proposition 3. $\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_2)$.

Proof. If U_1 is a generating set for $\mathcal{S}_1$, and U_2 is a generating set for $\mathcal{S}_2$, then $U_1 \times U_2$ is a generating set for $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$. So $\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) \leq \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_2)$. We only need to prove that $\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) \geq \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_2)$.

Let T be a generating set for $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$. We would like to prove that $\#T \geq \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_2)$. Let $T_0 = T, \dots, T_r = T_1 \times T_2$, and $A_1, \dots, A_r$ be such that for all $k \in [r]$, we have $T_{k-1} \subsetneq T_k$, $A_k \subseteq T_{k-1}$, and one of the following is true:

- (1) $T_k = T_{k-1} \cup (\{i\} \times X_2)$ for some $i \in X_1$, $A_k = A \times X_2$ for some $A \subseteq X_1$, and $A \models i$ in $\mathcal{S}_1$.
- (2) We are not in Case (1), and $T_k = T_{k-1} \cup \{(i, j)\}$ for some $(i, j) \in X_1 \times X_2$, $A_k = \{i\} \times B$ for some $B \subseteq X_2$, and $B \models j$ in $\mathcal{S}_2$.

If Case (1) is true, we say step k is of type (1). If Case (2) is true, we say step k is of type (2).

Claim: We can choose $T_0, \dots, T_r, A_1, \dots, A_r$ such that there exists an integer l for which

- (1) for all $k \leq l$, step k is of type (2);
- (2) for all $k \geq l + 1$, step k is of type (1).

Proof of claim: Suppose there exists some k such that step k is of type (1) and step $k + 1$ is of type (2). It is not hard to see that we can swap step k and step $k + 1$. Repeatedly applying this until no such k exists, and we get the desired sequences.

Now we return to the proof of $\#T \geq \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_2)$. Let l be the integer in the above claim. Because steps $k \geq l + 1$ are all of type (1), we have

$$\#\{i : \{i\} \times X_2 \subseteq T_l\} \geq \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1).$$

Because steps $k \leq l$ are all of type (2), for each i such that $\{i\} \times X_2 \subseteq T_l$, we have

$$\#(T \cap (\{i\} \times X_2)) \geq \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_2).$$

Combining the two inequalities we get $\#T \geq \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_2)$. □

Theorem 4. *There exists a spanoid $\mathcal{S}$ on n elements with $\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}) \geq n^c \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S})$ where $c = \log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5 \approx 0.113283$.*

Proof. Define $\mathcal{S}_1 = \Pi_5$, and $\mathcal{S}_i = \Pi_5 \times \mathcal{S}_{i-1}$ for $i \geq 2$. Then $\mathcal{S}_n$ is a spanoid on 5^n elements.

By Proposition 2,

$$\text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_n) \leq \text{f-rank}(\Pi_5)^n = 2.5^n.$$

By Proposition 3,

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_n) = \text{rank}(\Pi_5)^n = 3^n.$$

So

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_n) \geq (5^n)^{\log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5} \text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}_n).$$

□

We are also able to prove a polynomial gap between LP^{ent} and rank , which implies Theorem 4 because $\text{f-rank}(\mathcal{S}) \leq \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S})$ by [DGW18] Claim 5.2. We need the following proposition.

Proposition 5. $\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_1 \ltimes \mathcal{S}_2) \leq \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)$.

Proof. Recall the linear program that defines LP^{ent} in [DGW18] page 23. For a spanoid $\mathcal{S}$ on X , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}) = \max & f(X) \\ \text{s.t. } & f(\emptyset) = 0, \\ & f(\{i\}) \leq 1 \ \forall i \in X, \\ & f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B) \leq f(A) + f(B) \ \forall A, B \subseteq X, \\ & f(A) \leq f(B) \ \forall A \subseteq B \subseteq X, \\ & f(A \cup \{i\}) = f(A) \text{ whenever } A \models i \text{ in } \mathcal{S}, \\ & f(A) \geq 0 \ \forall A \subseteq X. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f : 2^{X_1 \times X_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a function satisfying the linear program for $\mathcal{S}_1 \ltimes \mathcal{S}_2$. Define $f_1 : 2^{X_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as

$$f_1(A) = \frac{f(A \times X_2)}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)}.$$

We claim that f_1 satisfies the linear program for $\mathcal{S}_1$.

(1)

$$f_1(\emptyset) = \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} f(\emptyset) = 0.$$

(2) For all $i \in X_1$, the function $f_2^i : 2^{X_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined as

$$f_2^i(B) = f(\{i\} \times B)$$

satisfies the linear program for $\mathcal{S}_2$. So

$$f_1(\{i\}) = \frac{f_2^i(X_2)}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} \leq 1.$$

(3) For all $A, B \subseteq X_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1(A \cup B) + f_1(A \cap B) \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} (f((A \cup B) \times X_2) + f((A \cap B) \times X_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} (f((A \times X_2) \cup (B \times X_2)) + f((A \times X_2) \cap (B \times X_2))) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} (f(A \times X_2) + f(B \times X_2)) \\ &= f_1(A) + f_1(B). \end{aligned}$$

(4) Let $A \models i$ in $\mathcal{S}_1$. Then $A \times X_2 \models (i, j)$ for all $j \in X_2$. So

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(A \cup \{i\}) &= \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} f((A \cup \{i\}) \times X_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} f((A \times X_2) \cup (\{i\} \times X_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} f(A \times X_2) \\ &= f_1(A). \end{aligned}$$

(5) For all $A \subseteq X_1$ we have

$$f_1(A) = \frac{1}{\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2)} f(A \times X_2) \geq 0.$$

So f_1 satisfies the linear program for $\mathcal{S}_1$. By definition of LP^{ent} ,

$$f_1(X_1) \leq \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_1).$$

So

$$f(X_1 \times X_2) = f_1(X_1) \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2) \leq \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_1) \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_2).$$

□

Corollary 6. *There exists a spanoid $\mathcal{S}$ on n elements with $\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}) \geq n^c \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S})$ where $c = \log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5 \approx 0.113283$.*

Proof. Define $\mathcal{S}_1 = \Pi_5$, and $\mathcal{S}_i = \Pi_5 \times \mathcal{S}_{i-1}$ for $i \geq 2$. Then $\mathcal{S}_n$ is a spanoid on 5^n elements.

By Proposition 5,

$$\text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_n) \leq \text{LP}^{ent}(\Pi_5)^n = 2.5^n.$$

By Proposition 3,

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_n) = \text{rank}(\Pi_5)^n = 3^n.$$

So

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{S}_n) \geq (5^n)^{\log_5 3 - \log_5 2.5} \text{LP}^{ent}(\mathcal{S}_n).$$

□

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Yury Polyanskiy for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [DGW18] Z. Dvir, S. Gopi, and A. Wigderson. Spanoids - an abstraction of spanning structures, and a barrier for LCCs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10372*, 2018.