

Zeitschrift: L'Enseignement Mathématique
Herausgeber: Commission Internationale de l'Enseignement Mathématique
Band: 28 (1982)
Heft: 1-2: L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE

Artikel: RFDUCIBILITY BY ALGEBRAIC PROJECTIONS
Autor: Valiant, L. G.
Anhang: Appendix 1
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-52240>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 11.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

implies that $x_i \geq 1$ since $x_i - x_j \geq 0$. Similarly if $x_k \geq 1$. If $x_j, x_k \leq 0$ then $x_j + x_k - x_i \geq 0$ ensures that $x_i \leq 0$. \square

Claim 2. If $\text{val}(v_i) = 0$ then $E_i \cup \{x_i \leq 0\}$ has a solution. If $\text{val}(v_i) = 1$ then $E_i \cup \{x_i \geq 1\}$ has a solution.

Proof. By induction on i it is easy to see that the point

$$x_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{val}(v_j) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{val}(v_j) = 0 \end{cases}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq i$ is a solution of E_i . \square

Claim 3. If for some i, j ($j \leq i$) $E_i \cup \{x_j \geq 1\}$ has a solution in reals then $\text{val}(v_j) = 1$.

Proof. By Claim 1, if $E_i \cup \{x_j \geq 1\}$ has a solution then $E_i \cup \{x_j \leq 0\}$ has no solution. Hence by Claim 2 $\text{val}(v_j) = 1$. \square

Finally we observe that the given program of size C for P_m translates to $3C + 2m$ inequalities in E_C , of which the $2m$ of E_o depend on the values of y_1, \dots, y_m , while the remaining $3C$ are fixed. It remains to note that P_m is the projection under σ of $LP_{2n(n+1)}$ for $n = 3C + 2m$, where σ maps $3C$ of the inequalities to those of $E_C - E_o$, and the remaining $2m$ values of i as follows. If v_i equals y_j or \bar{y}_j then: $\sigma(a_{ik}) = \sigma(b_{ik}) = 0$ if $j \neq k$, $\sigma(d_i) = 0$, $\sigma(a_{ij}) = \sigma(e_i) = v_i$, $\sigma(b_{ij}) = \bar{v}_i$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. It is a pleasure to thank Volker Strassen and Mark Jerrum for suggesting corrections and simplifications on a first draft of this paper.

APPENDIX 1

We show here that in the concept of p -definability it is immaterial whether the defining polynomials allowed are the p -computable ones or merely those of p -bounded formula size. We shall suppose that the family P is p -definable in the sense of Definition 3, i.e.

$$P_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^{m-n}} Q_m(x_1, \dots, x_n, b_{n+1}, \dots, b_m)$$

It will suffice to prove that any p -computable family, such as Q , is p -definable in the sense of Definition 4. By Theorem 5 it then follows that P itself is also p -definable in the sense of Definition 4.

It is known that any p -computable family of homogeneous polynomials has homogeneous program size at most polynomially larger than its unrestricted program size [12]. The inductive proof to follow assumes the former measure throughout and supports homogeneity. We shall assume that Q_m is itself homogeneous. If it were not then we would consider each of its homogeneous components separately in the same way.

Suppose that $Q_m(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ has degree d and a minimal program ρ of complexity C . Let U be the subset of the computed terms $\{v_i\}$ such that (i) $\deg(v_i) > d/2$ and (ii) $v_i \leftarrow v_j \times v_k$ with $\deg(v_j) \leq d/2$ and $\deg(v_k) \leq d/2$. Let W be the subset $\{v_j\}$ such that $v_i \leftarrow v_j \times v_k$ or $v_j \leftarrow v_k \times v_j$ for some $v_i \in U$. For convenience rename the elements of U and W by $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ and $\{w_1, \dots, w_s\}$ respectively.

Claim 1. There is a polynomial $S_{m+r+1}(x_1, \dots, x_m, e_0, \dots, e_r)$ of degree $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor + 1$ and homogeneous program complexity at most $2C + d$ such that

$$Q_m(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \text{val}(u_i) \cdot \text{compl}_i$$

where $\text{compl}_i = S_{m+r+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e})$ when $e_0 = e_i = 1$ and $e_j = 0$ for $0 \neq j \neq i$.

Proof. In ρ replace each occurrence of u_i on the right hand side of an assignment by an occurrence of $e_i e_0^{\deg(u_i) - \lfloor d/2 \rfloor - 1}$. (Actually this would be simulated by a subprogram that raises e_0 to every power and multiplies by e_i as appropriate.) \square

Claim 2. There is a polynomial $T_{m+s+1}(x_1, \dots, x_m, c_0, \dots, c_s)$ of degree $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor + 1$ and homogeneous program complexity at most $3C + d$ such that for each i ($1 \leq i \leq s$)

$$\text{val}(w_i) = T_{m+s+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})$$

when $c_0 = c_i = 1$ and $c_j = 0$ for $0 \neq j \neq i$.

Proof. Delete from ρ every instruction with degree greater than $d/2$. Add a subprogram equivalent to the set of instructions

$$z_i \leftarrow w_i \times c_i c_0^{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor - \deg(w_i)}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, s$. Add further instructions to sum z_1, \dots, z_s . \square

Now for each i $\text{val}(u_i) = \text{val}(w_j) \text{val}(w_k)$ for some j, k specified by ρ . Hence each of the r additive contributions to Q_m is some product

$$T_{m+s+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) T_{m+s+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}') S_{m+r+1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e})$$

where $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}', \mathbf{e})$ is a fixed $(0, 1)$ -vector of $2s+r+3$ elements. But any such vector can be specified by a conjunction of $2s+r+3$ Boolean literals. Consider the disjunction of the r such conjunctions and let $R(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}', \mathbf{e})$ be the polynomial that simulates this Boolean formula at $(0, 1)$ values. Then clearly

$$Q_m(x) = \sum T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}) T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}') S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{e}) R(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}', \mathbf{e}),$$

where summation is over $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}', \mathbf{e}) \in \{0, 1\}^{2s+r+3}$.

Let $A(C, d)$ be the upper bound over every homogeneous polynomial having degree d and homogeneous program complexity C , of the minimal size of formula needed to define it in Definition 4. Then the above recursive expression ensures that

$$A(C, d) \leq 3A(3C+d, \lfloor d/2 \rfloor + 1) + O(C).$$

Clearly also $A(C, 1) \leq 2C$. Hence if d is p -bounded in m then so is the solution to this recurrence. \square

APPENDIX 2

For completeness we describe here a direct proof of the p -definability of HC in the sense of Definition 1. $HC_{n \times n}(x_{i,j})$ will be the projection under

$$\sigma(u_{k,m}) = 1 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq k, m \leq n$$

of the polynomial in $\{x_{i,j}, u_{k,m}\}$ defined by

$$Q_{n \times n}(y_{i,j}) \cdot Q_{n \times n}(z_{k,m}) \cdot R^1 \dots R^n$$

with the association $y_{i,j} \leftrightarrow x_{i,j}$ and $z_{k,m} \leftrightarrow u_{k,m}$. Here $Q_{n \times n}$ is the polynomial that defines the permanent in §3. Its first occurrence with argument y plays exactly the same role as in the permanent and ensures a cycle cover. The intention of $z_{k,m}$ is to denote whether the k^{th} node in the circuit (starting from node 1, say) is node m . $Q_{n \times n}(z_{k,m})$ ensures that this intention is realised. For each k R^k captures the fact that if $z_{k,m}$ and $z_{k+1,r}$ are both 1 then $y_{m,r}$ must be also. In Boolean notation we require

$$y_{m,r} \vee (\bar{z}_{k,m} \vee \bar{z}_{k+1,r}).$$

As is well known such Boolean formulae can be simulated by polynomials at $\{0, 1\}$ values (e.g. see Proposition 2 in [13]). To guarantee just one monomial for each cycle we fix $R^1 = z_{11}$. \square