

Near-Optimal Erasure List-Decodable Codes

Avraham Ben-Aroya

The Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Tel-Aviv University, Israel

Dean Doron

Department of Computer Science, Stanford University, CA, US

ddoron@stanford.edu

Amnon Ta-Shma

The Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Tel-Aviv University, Israel

amnon@tau.ac.il

Abstract

A code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\bar{n}}$ is (s, L) erasure list-decodable if for every word w , after erasing any s symbols of w , the remaining $\bar{n} - s$ symbols have at most L possible completions into a codeword of \mathcal{C} . Non-explicitly, there exist binary $((1 - \tau)\bar{n}, L)$ erasure list-decodable codes with rate approaching τ and tiny list-size $L = O(\log \frac{1}{\tau})$. Achieving either of these parameters explicitly is a natural open problem (see, e.g., [26, 24, 25]). While partial progress on the problem has been achieved, no prior nontrivial explicit construction achieved rate better than $\Omega(\tau^2)$ or list-size smaller than $\Omega(1/\tau)$. Furthermore, Guruswami showed no *linear* code can have list-size smaller than $\Omega(1/\tau)$ [24]. We construct an explicit binary $((1 - \tau)\bar{n}, L)$ erasure list-decodable code having rate $\tau^{1+\gamma}$ (for any constant $\gamma > 0$ and small τ) and list-size $\text{poly}(\log \frac{1}{\tau})$, answering simultaneously both questions, and exhibiting an explicit non-linear code that provably beats the best possible linear code.

The binary erasure list-decoding problem is equivalent to the construction of explicit, low-error, strong dispersers outputting one bit with minimal entropy-loss and seed-length. For error ε , no prior explicit construction achieved seed-length better than $2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ or entropy-loss smaller than $2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$, which are the best possible parameters for extractors. We explicitly construct an ε -error one-bit strong disperser with near-optimal seed-length $(1 + \gamma) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ and entropy-loss $O(\log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$.

The main ingredient in our construction is a new (and almost-optimal) *unbalanced* two-source extractor. The extractor extracts one bit with constant error from two independent sources, where one source has length n and tiny min-entropy $O(\log \log n)$ and the other source has length $O(\log n)$ and arbitrarily small constant min-entropy rate. When instantiated as a balanced two-source extractor, it improves upon Raz's extractor [39] in the constant error regime. The construction incorporates recent components and ideas from extractor theory with a delicate and novel analysis needed in order to solve dependency and error issues that prevented previous papers (such as [27, 9, 13]) from achieving the above results.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Expander graphs and randomness extractors; Theory of computation → Error-correcting codes; Theory of computation → Pseudorandomness and derandomization

Keywords and phrases Dispersers, Erasure codes, List decoding, Ramsey graphs, Two-source extractors

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CCC.2020.1

Funding Research supported by the Israel science Foundation grant no. 952/18 and by Len Blavatnik and the Blavatnik Family foundation.

1 Introduction

Extractors and dispersers are important derandomization tools with numerous applications (see, e.g., [40, 43]). Both extractors and dispersers are hash functions $C : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ that take an input string $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and an auxiliary seed $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$, and output an element $C(x, y)$ in a smaller universe $\{0, 1\}^m$ where $m \ll n$. Both extractors and dispersers



© Avraham Ben-Aroya, Dean Doron, and Amnon Ta-Shma; licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

35th Computational Complexity Conference (CCC 2020).

Editor: Shubhangi Saraf; Article No. 1; pp. 1:1–1:27



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany



are meant to hash any input distribution X that has some crude uniformity to a nearly uniform distribution. Also, the measure of crude uniformity is the same for both objects: We say a distribution X is a k -source if it has k min-entropy, i.e., the probability of each $x \sim X$ is at most 2^{-k} .

Extractors and dispersers differ in the way they measure the proximity of the output distribution to the uniform distribution: Extractors use the total-variation distance, whereas dispersers use support-size distance (that is, they count the number of elements not in the image of the hash function). Extractors are stronger objects, and, roughly speaking, extractors are needed to derandomize two-sided error algorithms whereas dispersers suffice for one-sided error derandomization.

More formally, a function $C : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is a *strong* (k, ε) *extractor* if for any k -source X the output distribution $(U_d, C(X, U_d))$, containing the seed y along with output $C(x, y)$, is ε -close to the uniform distribution over $\{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^m$. We say C is a *strong* (k, ε) *disperser* if for any k -source X , the support of $(U_d, C(X, U_d))$ covers at least $(1 - \varepsilon)2^{d+m}$ elements from $\{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^m$.

There are two natural parameters measuring the quality of extractors and dispersers:

1. **Seed length.** Both extractors and dispersers use an auxiliary uniform independent source to extract the entropy from the weak source X . The length d of the auxiliary source is called the *seed-length*. We would like the seed-length to be as small as possible.
2. **Entropy loss.** There are $k + d$ bits of entropy in the system: k bits coming from the k -source X , and d bits from the independent uniform seed. The *entropy-loss* is $k - m$, i.e., the difference between the entropy in the input system (including the seed) and the output system (of length $d + m$).

As noted, strong dispersers are weaker objects than strong extractors. The interest in dispersers stems from the fact that their parameters can outperform those of extractors. For extractors, [37] showed that every strong extractor requires seed-length $d \geq 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + \log(n - k) - O(1)$ and has an unavoidable entropy-loss of $k - m \geq 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) - O(1)$. Non-explicitly there exist strong extractors with seed-length $d \leq 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + \log(n - k) + O(1)$ and entropy-loss $k - m \leq 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + O(1)$. For strong dispersers, [37] showed that every strong disperser requires seed-length $d \geq \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + \log(n - k) - O(1)$ and has an unavoidable entropy-loss $k - m \geq \log \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) - O(1)$. Again, non-explicitly, there exist strong dispersers with seed-length $d \leq \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + \log(n - k) + O(1)$ and entropy-loss $k - m \leq \log \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + O(1)$ [37, 33].

For strong dispersers, even the case of outputting just one bit in a way that outperforms extractor constructions has been widely open. Indeed, Gradwohl et al. [22] noticed that such strong dispersers imply good Ramsey graphs, another problem that withstood many attempts for many years, until the recent breakthrough result of Chattopadhyay and Zuckerman [9].

In this paper we go in the reverse direction of that taken in [22]. By using the recent machinery of *non-malleable* extractors and their connection to two-source extractors [9, 7, 15, 28, 29], we construct near-optimal *unbalanced* two-source extractors (which imply near-optimal *unbalanced* bipartite Ramsey graphs). We use these extractors to obtain explicit strong dispersers that output a single bit, with near-optimal seed-length and near-optimal entropy-loss.

► **Theorem 1** (see also Theorem 40). *For every constant $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $\varepsilon = n^{-\Omega_\gamma(1)}$ there exists an explicit strong (k, ε) disperser $\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $d = (1 + \gamma) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ and $k = O_\gamma(\log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$.*

We remark that the dependence of the seed-length on the error is $(1 + \gamma) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) < 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$, and the entropy-loss is $O(\log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) < 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ and both these bounds are optimal for dispersers up to small factors and are *impossible* for extractors. Most previous disperser constructions have not obtained parameters better than the extractors lower bounds, and we are only aware of one exception: Meka et al. [33], extending the techniques in [22], gave a strong disperser with optimal entropy-loss. However, their construction works only for extremely high min-entropy $k = n - \Theta(1)$ and has suboptimal seed-length.¹

1.1 Erasure List-Decodable Codes

We now turn our attention to binary list-decodable codes in the erasures model. A code \mathcal{C} is a set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$. We call elements in \mathbb{F}_2^n *words* and elements in \mathcal{C} *codewords*. Two interesting parameters of a code are its *redundancy* and its *noise-resiliency*. The redundancy is measured by the *rate* of the code, $\frac{\log |\mathcal{C}|}{n}$. The noise-resiliency is measured according to the model of noise.

In the errors model: A code \mathcal{C} is $(\tau n, L)$ *list-decodable* if for every word $w \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ there exist at most L codewords in the Hamming ball of radius τn around w .

In the erasures model: A code \mathcal{C} is $(\tau n, L)$ *erasure list-decodable* if for every $z \in \mathbb{F}_2^{(1-\tau)n}$ and every set $T \subseteq [n]$ of size $(1 - \tau)n$, the number of codewords that have z in the coordinates indexed by T is at most L .

If \mathcal{C} is $(\tau n, L)$ list-decodable we can recover from τn errors in the following sense: Given a word $w \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ that was obtained by corrupting at most τn entries of some codeword c , one can (perhaps non-efficiently) produce a small set of size L that necessarily contains c .

Similarly, if \mathcal{C} is $(\tau n, L)$ erasure list-decodable we can recover from τn erasures in the following sense: Given a word $w \in \{0, 1, ?\}^n$ that was obtained by replacing at most τn entries of some codeword c with the erasure sign '?', one can (perhaps non-efficiently) produce a small set of size L that necessarily contains c .

A strong (k, ε) extractor with one output bit is roughly equivalent to a binary $(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} 2^d, L = 2^k)$ list-decodable code [42]. In the same spirit, Guruswami [25] observed that strong dispersers with one output bit can be used to construct erasure list-decodable codes. In this paper we complement his argument with the converse statement, showing that erasure list-decodable codes are essentially *equivalent* to strong dispersers with one output bit. Specifically, $\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a strong (k, ε) disperser if and only if the code $\mathcal{C} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{2^d}$ defined by $\mathcal{C}(x)_i = \text{Disp}(x, i)$ is $((1 - 2\varepsilon)2^d, 2^k)$ erasure list-decodable (see Lemma 44).

As we can see, for both extractors and dispersers, the seed-length corresponds to the rate of the code, $\frac{n}{2^d}$, whereas the entropy-loss corresponds to the list-size of the code. Thus, the gap between the seed-lengths of dispersers (which is $\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$) and extractors (which is $2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$) translates to a difference between rate ε in the erasures model compared with rate ε^2 in the errors model. Similarly, the gap between the entropy-loss of dispersers (which is $\log \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$) and extractors (which is $2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$) translates to a difference between list-size $\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ in the erasures model compared with list-size $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ in the errors model. Formally:

- Non-explicitly there exist binary codes having rate $\Omega(\varepsilon^2)$ that are $(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \cdot n, \text{poly}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$ list-decodable and these parameters are tight.
- Non-explicitly there exist binary codes having rate $\Omega(\varepsilon)$ that are $((1 - \varepsilon)n, O(\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$ erasure list-decodable, and up to a constant multiplicative factor in the list-size these parameters are tight [24].

¹ Specifically, they support min-entropy $k = n - c$ with seed-length $O(2^c \log(1/\varepsilon))$.

Thus, erasure list-decodable codes can have quadratically better rate and exponentially smaller list-size than list-decodable codes. In fact, Guruswami proved that any *linear* erasure list-decodable codes must have $L = \Omega(1/\varepsilon)$ [24], and so the exponential improvement (or any better than polynomial improvement) is necessarily only possible for non-linear constructions.

The state of affairs for *explicit* binary erasure list-decodable codes is similar to that of *explicit* dispersers. That is, only a few explicit binary erasure list-decodable codes are known to have rate below $\Omega(\varepsilon^2)$ or list-size below $\Omega(1/\varepsilon)$. Guruswami and Indyk [26] gave a *probabilistic* polynomial-time algorithm that outputs with high probability an erasure list-decodable code of rate $\Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$ and optimal list-size (their construction can be explicitly derandomized when ε is constant). The natural open problem of obtaining erasure list-decodable codes having rate better than ε^2 was explicitly mentioned several times, e.g., in [26, 25]. More concretely, in [23, Open Question 10.2], Guruswami posed the open problem of constructing efficient erasure list-decodable codes of rate ε^{2-a} .

Incorporating the above discussion with Theorem 1, we get the best explicit construction to date:

► **Theorem 2** (see also Theorem 46). *For every constant $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $\varepsilon = n^{-\Omega_\gamma(1)}$ there exists an explicit $((1 - \varepsilon)\bar{n}, L = \log^{O_\gamma(1)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ erasure list-decodable code $\mathcal{C} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\bar{n}}$ of rate $\varepsilon^{1+\gamma}$.*

Thus, Theorem 2 solves Guruswami’s problem for the interesting regime of polynomially small ε . We stress that the codes we present are explicit in the sense that they have explicit encoding, but we do not know whether the codes we construct admit *efficient* erasure list-decoding algorithms. We also mention that the list-size $\text{poly}(\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ achieved by our code is exponentially smaller than the best possible list-size by any *linear* code.

1.2 Two-Source Extractors

A function $2\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is an $((n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2), \varepsilon)$ *two-source extractor* if for any two independent sources X and Y , where X is an (n_1, k_1) source and Y is an (n_2, k_2) source, the output distribution $2\text{Ext}(X, Y)$ is ε -close to uniform.

Often, the two-source extractor terminology is more expressive than the extractor notation, as we explain now. Suppose $\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^k \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a strong (k, ε) extractor. Fix an (n, k) source X , and let ε_i be the distance of the distribution $\text{Ext}(X, i)$ from uniform. By the extractor definition we know that $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i] \leq \varepsilon$. However, the extractor definition does not distinguish between the case where the ε error occurs because all seeds $y \in \text{Supp}(Y)$ have the same error ε , and the case where ε fraction of the seeds have constant error and the rest have none. The situation is different with two-source extractors. Roughly speaking, in an $((n, k), (d, d'), \varepsilon)$ two-source extractor, there are at most $2^{d'-d}$ bad “seeds” y with distance $\varepsilon_y \geq \varepsilon$. Thus, the two-source extractor notation allows separating the fraction of bad seeds from the quality of good seeds.

We would like to explicitly construct a strong (k, ε) disperser $\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ with parameters better than those of (k, ε) extractors. Thus, on the one hand, for almost every seed y , $\text{Disp}(X, y)$ covers almost all of $\{0, 1\}^m$, and, on the other hand, Disp is not a strong extractor, so for almost every seed y , $\text{Disp}(X, y)$ is *far* from uniform. How can this happen?

The situation becomes clearer if we look at strong dispersers with only one additional output bit, i.e., when $m = 1$. As $\text{Disp}(X, y)$ is distributed over one bit, for almost every seed y , $\text{Supp}(\text{Disp}(X, y)) = \{0, 1\}$. Yet, it is possible (even necessary, since Disp is not an extractor) that for many seeds y , $\text{Disp}(X, y)$ is ε_0 away from uniform for some constant $\varepsilon_0 \gg \varepsilon > 0$, e.g., when $\text{Disp}(X, y)$ has much more weight on 0 than on 1.

One clean way of capturing this is by using the two-source extractor terminology. We are looking for a two-source extractor 2Ext where almost all seeds (except for ε fraction) are “good” in the sense that y is good if $2\text{Ext}(X, y)$ covers both 0 and 1. Roughly speaking, this amounts to an explicit construction of an $((n, k), (d, d'), \varepsilon_0)$ two-source extractor having $\varepsilon = 2^{d'-d}$ and any non-trivial error $\varepsilon_0 < 1$. Two-source extractors with arbitrary $\varepsilon_0 < 1$ are also called bipartite Ramsey graphs (see Claim 49).

Explicitly constructing two-source extractors (and Ramsey graphs) is a long standing and important challenge. A long line of research (e.g., [10, 39, 8, 5, 6]) culminated in $((n, k), (n, k), \varepsilon_0)$ two-source extractors supporting poly-log min-entropy [14, 9, 32]. This was later improved to $k = O(\log n \frac{\log \log n}{\log \log \log n})$ [7, 15, 28, 29]. However, using the latter two-source extractors gives dispersers with suboptimal entropy-loss and long seed, or, equivalently, erasure list-decodable codes with large list-size and low rate.

Another natural two-source extractor is Raz’s two-source extractor [39]. Raz’s function is an $((n, k), (d = O(\log \frac{n}{\varepsilon}), d'), \varepsilon_{\text{Raz}})$ two-source extractor that has an unbalanced entropy requirement; the first source is long and very weak (k can be as small as, roughly, $\log \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon_{\text{Raz}}}$), the second source is short and somewhat dense with $d' \geq \delta d$, for any constant $\delta > \frac{1}{2}$. The fact that k can be very small corresponds to a disperser with small entropy-loss, which is good for us. Moreover, d is small, which is again what we want because the length of the corresponding erasure list-decodable code is 2^d . The error ε_{Raz} of Raz’s extractor is exponentially-small in $\min\{k, d'\}$ which is much better than the mere non-trivial error that we need. However, the second source must be relatively dense, satisfying $\frac{d'}{d} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. This implies that the error ε of the disperser is given by $2^{-d+d'}$ and as a consequence $d \geq 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$.

In this paper we show how to explicitly construct the necessary two-source extractor. We show:

► **Theorem 3** (see also Theorem 27). *For every two constants $\delta, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ and every $k \geq \Omega_{\delta, \varepsilon_0}(\log \log n)$ there exists an explicit $((n, k), (d, \delta d), \varepsilon_0)$ two-source extractor $2\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $d = O_{\delta, \varepsilon_0}(\log n)$.*

Theorem 3 is interesting on its own right. The entropy requirement in both sources is optimal up to constant factors, as both sources have entropy which is logarithmic in the length of the other source. This property is also true for Raz’s extractor. On the negative side, Theorem 3 has a large error ε_0 , whereas Raz’s extractor has a very small error. On the positive side, Raz’s extractor works only when $d' = \delta d > 0.5d$ whereas Theorem 3 works with $d' = \delta d$ for any $\delta > 0$, and it is this feature that gives a disperser construction with parameters better than those possible for extractors. Having Theorem 3 immediately gives the strong one output bit disperser and the non-linear near-optimal erasure list-decodable code discussed above.

We also obtain a variant of Theorem 3 that gives a new construction of *balanced* two-source extractors.

► **Theorem 4.** *For every two constants $\delta, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ and every $k \geq \Omega_{\delta, \varepsilon_0}(\log n)$ there exists an explicit $((n, k), (n, \delta n), \varepsilon_0)$ two-source extractor $2\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$.*

We see that one source has a minimal entropy requirement of $O(\log n)$ while the other has arbitrarily small constant entropy rate. Again, this improves upon [39] in terms of entropy requirement but is worse in terms of error. Theorem 4 is also incomparable to [29] as there, both sources require min-entropy at least $O(\log n \frac{\log \log n}{\log \log \log n})$.

Both Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 follow directly from Theorem 27.

1.3 The Two-Source Extractor Construction

We now give an informal presentation of the two-source extractor construction. We try to keep the discussion intuitive, and for that we omit (or ignore) some technical details. We also assume some familiarity with the field, sometimes using notions that will be formally presented in Section 2.

The input to the $((n, k), (d, \delta d), \varepsilon_0)$ two-source extractor is an (n, k) source X and a $(d, \delta d)$ source Y , for some $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$. At a high level, we do the following:

1. Increase the entropy rate of Y from δ to, say, 0.7. For that, we use a constant-error *condenser*. We cannot do it deterministically (because the condenser needs a uniformly random seed) and we still want to keep X fresh. Therefore, we apply the condenser on Y and every possible seed, letting the output of this procedure be a table Y' in which each row corresponds to an application with a different seed. The table Y' has the guarantee that most of the rows of Y' are close to having entropy rate 0.7.
2. Next, we would like to transform the dense rows of Y' to uniformly random strings. For that, we use Raz's extractor with the first source X and the rows of Y' as (independent) seeds. Call the resulting table Y'' and note that it is a function of both X and Y . Also note that although it is now guaranteed that a constant fraction of the rows of Y'' are uniform (Raz's extractor works with entropy rate above half), it is *not* guaranteed (and also not true) that the rows of Y'' are independent of each other.
3. Now we wish to break the dependence between the rows of Y'' so that (ideally) every t of them are uniform and independent (think of t as being poly-logarithmic in the number of rows of Y''). For that, we use a *correlation-breaker* that outputs one bit. The correlation-breaker requires two independent sources, which we do *not* have. Instead, we apply it on Y and Y'' . Call the output table Y''' . We shall prove that with high probability, Y''' has many good rows and every t good rows of Y''' are *very* close to being uniform and independent.
4. Finally, we apply a *resilient function* f on the bits of Y''' . The output of our construction is the function's output $f(Y''')$.

The property that we want from f is that it is nearly balanced and that its output cannot be heavily influenced by any small set of bad bits (the bad rows of Y'''). We need these properties to hold not only when the “good” bits are perfectly uniform and independent, but also under weaker conditions (e.g., that the good players are t -wise independent).

Thus, the coarse structure of our construction is essentially the same as many previous two-source extractor constructions. Namely, we use the two-sources to get a non-oblivious bit-fixing source and then apply a resilient function. There are two known approaches how to implement the first step of getting a non-oblivious bit-fixing source from two independent sources. The first approach was developed by Li [27] and uses alternating extraction (or equivalently, correlation breakers).² The second approach, used by Chattopadhyay and Zuckerman [9], uses a non-malleable extractor combined with a sampler. The second approach is more modular, while the first is more flexible.

² In [27] Li uses *three* independent sources in his construction. However, Chattopadhyay and Zuckerman [9] remark that their two source extractors could also have been obtained using Li's approach, once a low-depth, highly resilient function is constructed (as is done in [9]). Thus, we view Li's construction as a reduction from *two* independent sources to a non-oblivious bit-fixing source.

We now elaborate more on how Li obtained the above reduction and compare it with our work. The input to Li's protocol are samples from two independent $(n, k = \text{polylog } n)$ sources X and Y . The protocol works by applying an extractor E_1 to Y , where we enumerate over every possible seed of E_1 and build a table. Then, each such row is fed as a seed to an extractor E_2 , applied on the source X . Li then proceeds to use alternating extraction to get a non-oblivious bit fixing source. (Eventually, he also uses the lightest-bin protocol to obtain a three-source extractor.)

Li's reduction and our construction are very similar, except that:

- In step (1) we replace E_1 with a *constant degree condenser*, and as a result,
- In step (2) the role of E_2 in our construction is played by a *two-source extractor* (of Raz). This is necessary because the output of the condenser is only guaranteed to have high min-entropy. Finally,
- In step (3) a correlation breaker replaces alternating extraction.

While the change seems small it is essential, and the reason why the problem waited its solution for so long. Next, we elaborate on why we use condensers instead of the extractor E_1 and which condensers should be used.

First, we notice that the two-source extractor we are set to construct is different than that of [27] and [9]. [27, 9] construct *balanced* two-source extractors, where each of the two sources is weak (an in particular might have densities well below linear) whereas we are set to construct a highly *non-balanced* extractor where one of the sources (the small one) has *linear* density.

The key observation of the paper is that in such a situation (where the density of one source is linear) the condenser of step (1) has a huge advantage over the extractor E_1 since the condenser might have *constant* seed length (hence a constant number of rows in the table) independent of the row length, and therefore also independent of n , which is totally impossible with extractors. The fact that such explicit condensers exist is a beautiful result of [16]. The analysis (done in Section 4.3) critically uses this fact (that the number of output rows of the condenser is a *constant*) in a delicate way to prove the correctness of the construction.

We also mention that our construction shares steps that are similar to Cohen's construction [12] of three-source extractors. The vital difference is that in [12], a third source is used to achieve complete independence between the rows of a table and then a simple parity can be applied, even if only one row is close to uniform. Here, we only use *two* sources.

To conclude this part, we discuss the dependence problem (to be explained soon), and what aspects of our solution to this problem differ from previous solutions:

- First, there is the issue of lack of independence between the source Y and the seed Y'' in item (3) of the construction. To overcome this, we show a conditioning under which Y'' is still good, Y is independent of Y'' and even after the conditioning the two sources have enough min-entropy. In recent years, such conditioning methods were very successful in constructing an abundance of primitives (e.g., correlation breakers, independence-preserving mergers and non-malleable extractors, etc.).
- Next, there is a delicate issue with the errors. The error $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}$ of the condenser is high (think of it as a constant). In a naive analysis we would argue that each t good rows are $\varepsilon' > \varepsilon_{\text{cond}}$ close to uniform, and therefore the whole table Y''' is $A^t \varepsilon'$ -close to a table where the good rows are perfectly t -wise independent, where A is the number of rows in the table Y''' . However, such an approach is doomed to fail, as necessarily $A \varepsilon_{\text{cond}} > 1$. Our solution for this problem is the heart of the argument. We observe that some of the errors in the construction depend on A , the number of rows in the table, while others depend on the *row length*. In the construction we make sure that A is small (think of it

as a fixed constant) while the row length is unbounded (and, e.g., grows to infinity as n grows to infinity). Thus, we have a natural separation between *large* errors that depend on the number of rows A , and *small* errors that depend on the row length. A similar distinction between large and small errors appears in [27].

The condenser of step (1) and the resilient function of step (4) incur large errors. Raz's extractor (step (2)) and the correlation breaker with advice (step (3)) incur small errors that are exponentially-small in the row length. We show that with some constant probability we succeed in step (1), and that once we have succeeded, the errors δ in steps (2) and (3) are so small that $A^t\delta$ is still small, hence Y''' is close to a table with t -wise independent good players, and so the resilient function in step (4) works (and incurs another constant error). Thus, while the failure probability is high, when we succeed we are exponentially-close to uniform.

Notice that the fact that A is a constant (independent of the row length) is crucial for the argument to work, and this is why we resort to using condensers rather than extractors as in previous solutions.

- Finally, the argument used in the last bullet raises a difficulty regarding the set of good rows. Specifically, in [9], the set of good rows is a function of one of the sources. In our analysis the set of good rows is not just a function of the *sources* X and Y , but also depends on the specific *sample* $y \sim Y$.

Indeed, as we said before, this strategy leads to better unbalanced two-source constructions, and consequently to constructions of near-optimal erasure list-decodable codes (with high rate and small list-size), and one output-bit strong dispersers (with almost optimal seed length and entropy requirement) overcoming barriers that stood open for many years without seeing any progress.

1.4 Non-Strong Dispersers

Strong dispersers are the focal point of this paper. One may wonder why we insist on the strongness property, and whether the problem becomes easier when the strongness property is dropped.

- The answer to the first question is that the strongness property is essential. The equivalence between erasure list-decodable codes and dispersers requires the dispersers to be strong (see Lemma 44, and also notice the correspondence between code coordinates and seeds). Similarly, the connection to Ramsey graphs also requires the disperser to be strong, as already observed by Gradwohl et al. [22]. [22] constructed dispersers that are strong in almost all of the seed, but not strong in some part of the seed, and this drawback is severe enough that none of the applications go through.
- The answer to the second question is that it is easier to construct non-strong dispersers with good parameters. In the paper we prove that it is possible to output more bits from the source at the expense of being strong in only most of the bits (we are non-strong in only $O(1)$ bits of the seed). We prove:
 - ▶ **Theorem 5.** *For every constant $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $\varepsilon = n^{-\Omega_\gamma(1)}$ there exists an explicit (k, ε) disperser $\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ with $d = (1 + \gamma) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$, $k \geq \Omega_\gamma(\log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ and $m = d + \Omega_\gamma(k)$. The disperser is strong in $d - O_\gamma(1)$ bits of the seed.*

We sketch a proof of the above theorem in Section 5.2.

1.5 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 covers the preliminaries and notations we use. Section 3 describes the *constant degree* condenser that is used in step (1). Following the above discussion, it is important for us that A , the number of rows in the table, and equivalently the seed-length of the condenser, is a constant independent of the row length. In that section we show one can combine existing constructions of somewhere-random condensers and mergers to achieve that. Next, in Section 4, we describe and analyze the new unbalanced two-source extractor. In Section 5 we use the new two-source extractor to obtain near-optimal strong seeded dispersers, erasure list-decodable codes and unbalanced Ramsey graphs. We conclude with a few open problems in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper we use the convention that lowercase variables are the logarithm (in base 2) of their corresponding uppercase variables, e.g., $n = \log N$, $d = \log D$. We denote by $[A]$ the set $\{1, \dots, A\}$. The density of a set $B \subseteq A$ is $\rho(B) = \frac{|B|}{|A|}$. We say a function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is *explicit* if there exists a deterministic polynomial algorithm that runs in time $\text{poly}(\log |A|)$ and computes f .

2.1 Random Variables and Min-Entropy

The *statistical distance* between two distributions X and Y on the same domain Ω is defined as $|X - Y| = \max_{A \subseteq \Omega} (\Pr[X \in A] - \Pr[Y \in A])$. If $|X - Y| \leq \varepsilon$ we say X is ε -close to Y and denote it by $X \approx_\varepsilon Y$. We denote by U_n the random variable distributed uniformly over $\{0, 1\}^n$. We say a random variable is *flat* if it is uniform over its support.

For a function $f : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ and a random variable X distributed over Ω_1 , $f(X)$ is the random variable distributed over Ω_2 obtained by choosing x according to X and computing $f(x)$. For a set $A \subseteq \Omega_1$, $f(A) = \{f(x) \mid x \in A\}$. For every $f : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ and two random variables X and Y distributed over Ω_1 , it holds that $|f(X) - f(Y)| \leq |X - Y|$.

The *min-entropy* of a random variable X is defined by

$$H_\infty(X) = \min_{x \in \text{Supp}(X)} \log \frac{1}{\Pr[X = x]}.$$

A random variable X is an (n, k) source if X is distributed over $\{0, 1\}^n$ and has min-entropy at least k . When n is clear from the context we sometimes omit it and simply say that X is a k -source. Every k -source X can be expressed as a convex combination of *flat* distributions each with min-entropy at least k .

► **Definition 6** (average conditional min-entropy). *Let X, Y be two random variables. The average conditional min-entropy of X given Y is*

$$\tilde{H}_\infty(X|Y) = -\log \left(\mathbb{E}_{y \sim Y} \left[2^{-H_\infty(X|Y=y)} \right] \right).$$

We will use the following simple claim about average conditional min-entropy:

▷ **Claim 7.** For any random variables X, Y , $\tilde{H}_\infty(X|Y) \geq H_\infty(X) - \log |\text{Supp}(Y)|$.

2.2 Condensers

► **Definition 8** (condenser). *A function $C : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an $(n, k) \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} (m, k')$ condenser, if for every (n, k) source X , $C(X, U_d)$ is $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}$ -close to an (m, k') source. If $k = \delta n$ and $k' = \delta' m$ we say C is a $\delta \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} \delta'$ condenser.*

► **Lemma 9.** *Suppose $C : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an $(n, k) \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} (m, k' + d)$ condenser. Let X be an (n, k) source. Let ε_i be the minimal distance of $C(X, i)$ to an (m, k') source. Then, $\mathbb{E}_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d}[\varepsilon_i] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{cond}}$.*

Proof. Fix an (n, k) source X . For $i \in \{0, 1\}^d$, let $H_i \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$ be the set of “heavy” elements of $C(X, i)$,

$$H_i = \left\{ w \in \{0, 1\}^m : \Pr_{x \in X}[C(x, i) = w] \geq 2^{-k'} \right\}.$$

The distance of $C(X, i)$ from a k' -source is

$$\varepsilon_i = \Pr_{x \in X}[C(x, i) \in H_i] - 2^{-k'} |H_i|,$$

by redistributing the mass of the heavy elements. Let $H = \bigcup_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d} H_i$. Then,

- For every $w \in H$, $\Pr_{x \in X, i \in \{0, 1\}^d}[C(x, i) = w] \geq 2^{-d} 2^{-k'} = 2^{-(k'+d)}$, and,
- it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\text{cond}} &= \Pr_{x \in X, i \in \{0, 1\}^d}[C(x, i) \in H] - |H| 2^{-(k'+d)} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d} 2^{-d} \Pr_x[C(x, i) \in H] - |H| 2^{-(k'+d)} \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d} 2^{-d} \Pr_x[C(x, i) \in H_i] - 2^{-(k'+d)} \sum_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d} |H_i| \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d} 2^{-d} \left(\Pr_x[C(x, i) \in H_i] - 2^{-k'} |H_i| \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d} 2^{-d} \varepsilon_i = \mathbb{E}_{i \in \{0, 1\}^d}[\varepsilon_i]. \quad \blacktriangleleft \end{aligned}$$

2.3 Two-Source Extractors

► **Definition 10** (two-source extractor). *A function $2\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is an $((n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2), \varepsilon)$ two-source extractor if for every two independent sources X_1 and X_2 where X_1 is an (n_1, k_1) source and X_2 is an (n_2, k_2) source, it holds that $2\text{Ext}(X_1, X_2) \approx_{\varepsilon} U_m$. We say that 2Ext is strong if*

$$(2\text{Ext}(X_1, X_2), X_1) \approx_{\varepsilon} (U_m, X_1)$$

and

$$(2\text{Ext}(X_1, X_2), X_2) \approx_{\varepsilon} (U_m, X_2).$$

In our construction, we will use the following two-source extractor:

► **Theorem 11** ([39]). *For every constant $\delta_{\text{Raz}} > \frac{1}{2}$ there exist constants $c_1 = c_1(\delta_{\text{Raz}})$, $c_2 = c_2(\delta_{\text{Raz}}) > 1$ such that for every n_1, k_1, n_2, k_2 satisfying*

■ $k_1 \geq c_1 \log n_2$,

■ $k_2 \geq c_2 \log n_1$,

there exists an explicit strong $((n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2 = \delta_{\text{Raz}} n_2), \varepsilon_{\text{Raz}})$ two-source extractor

$$\text{Raz} : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$$

with $m = \Omega(\min\{k_1, k_2\})$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{Raz}} = 2^{-\Omega(m)}$, where the constants hiding in the asymptotic notation may depend on δ_{Raz} .

▷ **Claim 12.** Suppose $2\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is a strong $((n_1, k_1), (n_2, k_2), \varepsilon)$ two-source extractor. Let X be an (n, k_1) source. Call an element $y \in \{0, 1\}^{n_2}$ *bad* if $|2\text{Ext}(X, y) - U_m| > \varepsilon$, and let B_Y denote the set of all bad elements. Then, $|B_Y| < 2^{k_2}$.

Proof. Assume towards contradiction that $|B_Y| \geq 2^{k_2}$ and let Y be the uniform distribution over the set B_Y . Then, $H_\infty(Y) \geq k_2$ and so $(2\text{Ext}(X, Y), Y) \approx_\varepsilon (U_m, Y)$ which implies that

$$\frac{1}{|B_Y|} \sum_{y \in B_Y} |2\text{Ext}(X, y) - U_m| \leq \varepsilon.$$

However, $|2\text{Ext}(X, y) - U_m| > \varepsilon$ for every $y \in B_Y$, in contradiction. ◀

2.4 Mergers

A *merger* takes as input a list of possibly correlated random variables along with a short uniform seed and outputs one random variable which is close to having high min-entropy, provided at least one of the input variables has high min-entropy. Formally:

► **Definition 13** (somewhere-random source). *A source $X = X_1 \circ \dots \circ X_A$ is an $(n, k, (\alpha, \beta))$ somewhere-random (s.r.) source if there is a random variable $I \in \{0, \dots, A\}$ such that for every $i \in [A]$, $(X_i | I = i)$ is α -close to an (n, k) source and $\Pr[I = 0] \leq \beta$. The variable I is called the *indicator of source*. If $\alpha = \beta = 0$ we say X is a (n, k) s.r. source.*

► **Definition 14** (merger). *A function $B : (\{0, 1\}^n)^D \times \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is a (k, k', ε) merger, if for every (n, k) s.r. source $X = X_1 \circ \dots \circ X_A$, the output $M(X, U_t)$ is ε -close to a k' -source.*

There are explicit constructions of good mergers. Dvir and Wigderson [17] constructed the *curve merger* and proved that it works with $t = O(\log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})$. This was further improved in [16] who proved that $t = O(\log \frac{D}{\varepsilon})$ suffices. Notice that now t only depends on the number of sources D and the requested error ε , but *not* on the source length n , and this remarkable property will be crucial for us. Formally,

► **Theorem 15** ([17, 16]). *There exists a constant $c_{\text{DKSS}} \geq 1$ such that the following holds. Fix $\beta, \delta, \varepsilon > 0$. There exists an explicit function $B : (\{0, 1\}^n)^D \times \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$ that is a $(k = \delta n, k' = (1 - \beta)\delta n, \varepsilon)$ merger, with $t = c_{\text{DKSS}} \cdot \frac{1}{\beta} \log \frac{D}{\varepsilon}$.*

2.5 Correlation Breakers with Advice

A correlation-breaker with advice is a function $\text{CBA} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^\ell \times [A] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ where we think of the first input as a weak source, the second as an independent short seed and the last as an advice string. Roughly speaking, applying CBA on t possibly correlated seeds with t distinct advice strings results in independent random variables. For example, $\text{CBA}(X, Y, \alpha)$ is (nearly) independent of $\text{CBA}(X, Y, \alpha')$ for any $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. Formally,

1:12 Near-Optimal Erasure List-Decodable Codes

► **Definition 16.** A function $\text{CBA} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^\ell \times [A] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is a $(t, k, \varepsilon_{\text{CBA}})$ correlation-breaker with advice if the following holds. If Y is a distribution over $\{0, 1\}^n$, $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_t)$ is a distribution on $(\{0, 1\}^\ell)^t$, \mathcal{H} is a random variable and $\delta > 0$ satisfy:

- Y and Z are independent, conditioned on \mathcal{H} ,
- $\tilde{H}_\infty(Y|\mathcal{H}) \geq k + \log(1/\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}})$,
- $(Z_1, \mathcal{H}) \approx_\delta (U_\ell, \mathcal{H})$, and,
- $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t \in [A]$ are distinct strings.

Then,

$$\left(\text{CBA}(Y, Z_1, \alpha_1), (\text{CBA}(Y, Z_i, \alpha_i))_{i=2}^t, \mathcal{H} \right) \approx_{\delta + 2\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}}} \left(U_m, (\text{CBA}(Y, Z_i, \alpha_i))_{i=2}^t, \mathcal{H} \right).$$

We use the following result:

► **Theorem 17** ([13, Theorem 4.12]). *There exists a constant $c_{\text{CBA}} \geq 1$ such that the following holds. Let n, a be integers and $\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}} > 0$. Then, there exists an explicit $(t, k_{\text{CBA}}, \varepsilon_{\text{CBA}})$ correlation-breaker with advice*

$$\text{CBA} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^\ell \times [A] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$$

with $\ell = c_{\text{CBA}} \cdot at \cdot \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}}}$ and $k_{\text{CBA}} \geq \ell$.

In our setting, the number of rows A is a constant independent of n . For this reason we work with a “basic” correlation-breaker, where there is no attempt to optimize the dependence of ℓ on a . This gives a seed-length which is optimal up to constant multiplicative factors.

We also need the following lemma.

► **Lemma 18.** *Let X_1, \dots, X_t be random variables over $\{0, 1\}^m$. Further suppose that for any $i \in [t]$,*

$$\left(X_i, \{X_j\}_{j \neq i} \right) \approx_\varepsilon \left(U_m, \{X_j\}_{j \neq i} \right).$$

Then, $(X_1, \dots, X_t) \approx_{t\varepsilon} U_{tm}$.

2.6 Limited Independence and Non-Oblivious Bit-Fixing Sources

► **Definition 19.** A distribution X over $\{0, 1\}^A$ is called (t, γ) -wise independent if the restriction of X to every t coordinates is γ -close to U_t . A source X over $\{0, 1\}^A$ is called a (q, t, γ) non-oblivious bit-fixing source if there exists a subset $Q \subseteq A$ of size at most q such that the joint distribution of the bits in $A \setminus Q$ is (t, γ) -wise independent. The bits in Q are allowed to arbitrarily depend on the bits in $A \setminus Q$. If $\gamma = 0$ we often say that X is a (q, t) non-oblivious bit-fixing source.

► **Lemma 20** ([3]). *A (t, γ) -wise distribution over A bits is $(A^t \gamma)$ -close to some t -wise independent distribution.*

► **Definition 21.** Let $f : \{0, 1\}^A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, \mathcal{D} a distribution over $\{0, 1\}^A$ and $Q \subseteq A$. Let $I_{Q, \mathcal{D}}(f)$ denote the probability that f is undetermined when the variables outside Q are sampled from \mathcal{D} . We define $I_{q, t, \gamma}(f)$ to be the maximum of $I_{Q, \mathcal{D}}(f)$ over all $Q \subseteq A$ of size q and all \mathcal{D} that is a (t, γ) -wise independent distribution. We say that f is (t, γ) -independent (q, ε) -resilient if $I_{q, t, \gamma}(f) \leq \varepsilon$.

► **Theorem 22** ([9, 32]). *For every $0 < \gamma < 1$ there exists a constant $c_\gamma \geq 1$ such that for all $A > 0$ there exists an explicit function $f : \{0, 1\}^A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with the following property:*

For every $t \geq c_\gamma \log^4 A$,

- *f is almost balanced: For any t -wise independent distribution \mathcal{D} on $\{0, 1\}^A$,*

$$\Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{D}} [f(x) = 1] = 1/2 \pm A^{-1/c_\gamma}, \text{ and,}$$

- *f is resilient: $I_{q,t,\gamma}(f) \leq c_\gamma \cdot \frac{q}{A^{1-\gamma}}$.*

3 Constant Degree Condensers

In this section we prove:

► **Theorem 23.** *For every constant $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2 = 0.7$, every $s \geq s_0(\delta_1)$ and every integer n_1 and $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} \geq 2^{-\Omega(n_1)}$ there exists an explicit $\delta_1 \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} \delta_2$ condenser $C : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_2}$ with $n_2 = (\frac{2}{3})^s n_1$ and $d = 4c_{\text{DKSS}} \left(s + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} \right)$, where c_{DKSS} is the constant from Theorem 15. Note that d is independent of n_1 .*

Note that, in particular, for every $\delta_1 > 0$ there exists an explicit $\delta_1 \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} \delta_2 = 0.7$ condenser $C : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{n_2}$ with $n_2 = \Omega(n_1)$ and $d = O(\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}})$. However, we will need the more precise version that appears in Theorem 23.

The proof goes through *somewhere-random condensers*, so let us first discuss the similarities and differences between condensers and somewhere-random condensers. We begin with the necessary definitions:

► **Definition 24** (s.r. condenser). *A function $C : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^m)^A$ is an $(n, k) \rightarrow_\varepsilon (m, k')$ s.r. condenser if for every (n, k) source X it holds that $C(X) = C(X, 1) \circ \dots \circ C(X, A)$ is ε -close to a k' s.r. source. If $k = \delta n$ and $k' = \delta m$ we say C is $\delta \rightarrow_\varepsilon \delta'$ s.r. condenser.*

We may take a condenser $C : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ and expand it to a table with the outputs of all possible seeds, i.e., define $S : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^m)^D$, with $D = 2^d$, where $S(x)_i = C(x, i)$. The condenser property guarantees that for every k -source X , most rows in the table are close to having k' min-entropy. In contrast, a s.r. condenser is a weaker object, because it only guarantees that *one* row has k' entropy (or more precisely that we are in a convex combination of such cases).

The major question we consider now is the dependence of the degree (2^d for condensers and A for s.r. condensers) on n, m, k, k' and ε . We focus on the case where $m = \Omega(n)$, $k = \delta n$, $k' = \delta' m$ and $\delta < \delta'$ are constants. A priori, we could have expected the degree to depend on n and ε , as is indeed the case when m might be arbitrarily small. However, remarkably, things are drastically different when $m = \Omega(n)$. In this case both condensers and s.r. condensers may be of degree that is independent of n and this will be crucial for us. If we consider the dependence on the error, then s.r. condensers may have exponentially-small error and constant D , whereas the degree of a condenser is at least $d \geq \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Remarkably, all of that can be explicitly achieved, as we now explain.

The basic building block we use is the following beautiful result of Zuckerman, which is based on additive combinatorics:

► **Theorem 25** ([45, Theorem 8.3]). *For every constant $0 < c < 1$ there exists a constant $\alpha = \alpha(c)$ such that for every constant $\delta \leq c$ and integer n there exists an explicit function $C : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^{\frac{2}{3}n})^2$ that is a $\delta \rightarrow_\varepsilon (1 + \alpha)\delta$ s.r. condenser with $\varepsilon = 2^{-\Omega(\alpha\delta n)}$.*

Somewhere-random condensers can be easily composed. Specifically, Barak et al. [5] showed that if $C_1 : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^{n_2})^{\ell_1}$ is a $\delta_1 \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_1} \delta_2$ s.r. condenser and $C_2 : \{0, 1\}^{n_2} \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^{n_3})^{\ell_2}$ a $\delta_2 \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_2} \delta_3$ s.r. condenser then $C_2 \circ C_1 : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^{n_3})^{\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2}$ defined by $C_2 \circ C_1(x)_{(i_1, i_2)} = C_2(C_1(x)_{i_1})_{i_2}$ is a $\delta_1 \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2} \delta_3$ s.r. condenser.

Composing the s.r. condenser of Theorem 25 with itself s times we get an explicit function $C : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^m)^D$ with $D = 2^s$ and $m = (\frac{2}{3})^s n$ that is a $\delta \rightarrow_{\varepsilon} \delta'$ s.r. condenser with $\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^s 2^{-\Omega((1+\alpha)^i \delta (\frac{2}{3})^{i n})} = 2^{-\Omega(m)}$ and $\delta' \geq (1 + \alpha(\delta'))^s \delta$. Therefore:

► **Lemma 26.** *For every constants $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_2 < 1$ there exists a constant $s = s(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ and an explicit function $C : \{0, 1\}^{n_1} \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^{n_2})^D$ that is a $\delta_1 \rightarrow_{\varepsilon} \delta_2$ s.r. condenser with $D = 2^s$, $n_2 = (\frac{2}{3})^s n_1$ and $\varepsilon = 2^{-\Omega(n_2)}$. Note that D is independent of n and ε .*

Right now, if X is a k -source, the table $C(X)$ has D rows, and, roughly speaking, the guarantee is that one of these rows has density δ' . We want to change this to get a condenser, i.e., we are willing to invest a short seed (that is independent of n) and we want to get *one* output which is close to uniform. (Alternatively, we can write the condenser as a table with one row per seed, the number of rows is independent of n and most rows are close to uniform.) This is exactly what a *merger* does and applying the merger of Theorem 15 with $\beta = \frac{1}{4}$ on the s.r. condenser of Lemma 26 (with δ_2 close to 1) gives Theorem 23.

4 The Unbalanced Two-Source Extractor Construction

The main result of this section is the following two-source extractor.

► **Theorem 27.** *For every integer n and two constants $\delta_0, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ there exists a constant c such that for $d \geq c \log n$ and $k \geq c \log d$ there exists an explicit $((n, k), (d, \delta_0 d), \varepsilon_0)$ two-source extractor $2\text{Ext} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$.*

The extractor in the above theorem has constant error, and works when:

1. Each source's entropy is in the order of the logarithm of the length of the other source.
2. The shorter source, of length d , has an arbitrarily small constant density δ_0 .

We think of n and $d = d(n)$ as growing parameters while ε_0 and δ_0 are constants. We use asymptotic notations (such as $\Omega(\cdot)$) to hide constants that are independent of n and d (but may depend on ε_0 and δ_0).

4.1 The Construction

Recall that ε_0 is the target error of the extractor 2Ext . The input to 2Ext is a pair (x, y) where x is drawn from an (n, k) source X , and y is drawn from an independent $(d, \delta_0 d)$ source Y . Our problem is that the y comes from a $\delta_0 d$ -source for some $\delta_0 < \frac{1}{2}$. To overcome this, we do the following:

- We apply the condenser of Theorem 23 on y to get a table y' that is 1-wise 0.7-dense. Notice that the output of this step is a table rather than a single output.
- We apply Raz's extractor (Theorem 11) on the table and the input x from the other source to convert the table y' to another table y'' that is 1-wise uniform.
- We apply the t correlation-breaker with advice of Theorem 17 on y , using the table y'' as the seed, to get a table y''' that is t -wise uniform.
- Finally, we apply the resilient function f of Theorem 22 on the table y''' to collapse the many rows of the table to a single, close to uniform, output.

Formally, these steps work as follows:

Condense the short source: We are given $\delta_0 < \frac{1}{2}$. Set $\delta' = 0.69$ and $\delta_2 = 0.7$.

By Theorem 23 there exists a constant $s_0 = s_0(\delta_0)$ such that for every $s \geq s_0$ there exists an explicit

$$C : \{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^a \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{d'}$$

that is a $\delta_0 \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} \delta_2 = 0.7$ condenser with $a = 4c_{\text{DKSS}}(s + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}})$ and $d' = (\frac{2}{3})^s d$.

We set

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{2^5 c_{\text{DKSS}}},$$

and this also fixes c_γ as in Theorem 22. Notice that γ and c_γ are fixed constants independent of all other parameters in our system.

Now, choose $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}$ so that

$$\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}}\right)^{\log(3/2)} \geq \frac{4}{\delta_0} 2^{12} c_\gamma c_{\text{DKSS}}^4 \log^4 \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}}, \quad (1)$$

and also so that $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} \leq \xi(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0)$, where

$$\xi(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0) = \min \left\{ 2^{-s_0}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{8}\right)^2, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{5}\right)^{c_\gamma}, \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{5c_\gamma}\right)^{1/\gamma} \right\}. \quad (2)$$

Given $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}$, we set $s = \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} \geq s_0$, giving $a = 8c_{\text{DKSS}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}}$. Note that the degree of the condenser, $A = 2^a$, satisfies

$$\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} A = 2^{-\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} + a} = 2^{-\frac{a}{2^4 c_{\text{DKSS}}} + a} = A^{1-2\gamma}.$$

Observe that $s \geq s_0$ and that $d' = \Omega(d)$. Also, notice that $(\delta_2 - \delta')d' = d'/100 \geq a = \log A$ for large enough d . Thus, C is a $(d, \delta d) \rightarrow_{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} (d', \log(A) + \delta' d')$ condenser.

Define an $A \times d'$ table Y' where

$$Y'_i = C(Y, i) \in \{0, 1\}^{d'}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, A$.

1-wise uniformity: Let c_1, c_2 be the constants from Theorem 11 for $\delta_{\text{Raz}} = 0.6$.

Notice that $\delta_{\text{Raz}} d' = \Omega(d')$. Therefore, for a constant c large enough, $d \geq c \log n$ is large enough so that $\delta_{\text{Raz}} d' \geq c_2 \log n$. We can, in particular, choose c such that in addition $c \geq c_1$. Recalling that $k \geq c \log d$, we have $k \geq c_1 \log d'$. By Theorem 11, there exists an explicit function

$$\text{Raz} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^{d'} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{d''}$$

that is a strong $((n, k), (d', \delta_{\text{Raz}} d'), \varepsilon_{\text{Raz}} = 2^{-\Omega(d'')})$ two-source extractor with $d'' = \Omega(\min\{k, \delta_{\text{Raz}} d'\}) = \Omega(k)$.³ Define an $A \times d''$ table Y'' where

$$Y''_i = \text{Raz}(X, Y'_i)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, A$.

³ Although $k \geq c \log d$ we can always assume w.l.o.g. that $k = c \log d$ and so $k \leq \delta_{\text{Raz}} d' = \Omega(d)$.

1:16 Near-Optimal Erasure List-Decodable Codes

t -wise uniformity: Let $k_{\text{CBA}} = \frac{\delta_0 d}{8}$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}} = \frac{1}{d}$. Set

$$t = \frac{\delta_0}{4} \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^s.$$

Notice that for a large enough constant c we have $d'' = \Omega(k) = \Omega(c \log d) \geq c_{\text{CBA}} t \log \frac{d}{\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}}}$, where the latter is the seed-length required by the correlation-breaker from Theorem 17. Also, $k_{\text{CBA}} = \frac{\delta_0 d}{8} \geq d''$ for large enough d , as $d'' = \Omega(k) = \Omega(\log d)$. Hence, by Theorem 17 there exists an explicit function

$$\text{CBA} : \{0, 1\}^d \times \{0, 1\}^{d''} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$$

that is a $(t, k_{\text{CBA}}, \varepsilon_{\text{CBA}})$ correlation-breaker with advice.

Define an $A \times 1$ table Y''' where

$$Y_i''' = \text{CBA}(Y, Y_i'', i)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, A$.

Keep in mind that the entropy in Y suffices for CBA since $H_\infty(Y) = 8k_{\text{CBA}}$.

Collapse: Take $f : \{0, 1\}^A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to be the $(q = A^{1-2\gamma}, t, \varepsilon_f = c_\gamma A^{-\gamma})$ resilient function of Theorem 22 and output $f(y_1''', \dots, y_A''')$.

4.2 Two Subtleties

As mentioned in the introduction, there are several delicate issues in the analysis:

1. Circular dependence: Y'' depends on both X and Y , and is used as a seed in the application of the correlation-breaker with advice on Y .
2. We need Y''' to be close to a perfect t -wise independent table, while the correlation-breaker with advice only guarantees that every t good rows are close to uniform. To bridge the gap we need the error to be at least polynomially-small in the number of rows, but some of the steps incur a large constant error.

To overcome the first issue we show a conditioning under which Y'' is still good, Y is independent of Y'' and even after the conditioning the two sources have enough min-entropy.

To overcome the second issue we distinguish between large errors that depend on the number of rows A , and small errors that depend on the row length (see Section 1.3 in the introduction). In particular, the errors are of three types:

- The probability p_1 that a value we condition upon is bad. This error is incurred by the condenser and is high (think of it as being a constant).
- We show that when we condition on a good value, every t good rows in Y''' are p_2 -close to uniform. We then claim that Y''' as a table is $A^t p_2$ -close to a table where the good rows are truly t -wise independent (where A is the number of rows in the table Y'''). The error p_2 is incurred by Raz's extractor and by the correlation-breaker, and can be made very small if we deal with a source X having enough min-entropy. We make p_2 small enough so that $A^t p_2$ is also small.
- A third error p_3 is incurred by the resilient function f . This error is large, say, a constant, and we are fine with that.

Note that we cannot just accumulate all errors as $A^t p_1$ is way larger than 1. Instead, we argue that with a constant probability $1 - p_1$, we get extremely close to perfect behavior, and then we get such a small error p_2 so that $A^t p_2$ is also small.

4.3 The Analysis

Proof of Theorem 27. Fix an (n, k) source X and an independent $(d, \delta d)$ source Y . We decompose the proof into three parts:

- In the first part we prove that very often (except for a small constant probability) the table Y'' contains many rows that are marginally close to uniform.
- Next, we prove that every set of t rows $\{i, j_1, \dots, j_{t-1}\}$ in Y'' are *product* in the sense that if i is a good row (intuitively meaning that Y_i'' is close to uniform) and j_1, \dots, j_{t-1} are $t-1$ other rows, then in Y'' , Y_i'' is close to uniform and *independent* of $Y_{j_1}'', \dots, Y_{j_{t-1}}''$. This part involves applying a correlation-breaker with advice on Y and Y'' . In order to ensure that Y and Y'' are independent, we condition on the values of Y' in the t rows $\{i, j_1, \dots, j_{t-1}\}$.
- Together, except for a small constant probability, there are many good rows, and every t rows of Y'' are product, hence the table Y'' is close to a (q, t) non-oblivious bit-fixing source, where every good row is a good bit in the bit-fixing source. Hence, $f(Y'')$ is close to uniform.

Part 1: Often, many rows in Y' are good

Let ε_i be the minimal distance of $C(Y, i)$ from a $\delta' d'$ -source. According to Lemma 9,

$$\mathbb{E}_{i \in [A]}[\varepsilon_i] \leq \varepsilon_{\text{cond}}.$$

► **Definition 28.** We say $z \in \{0, 1\}^{d'}$ is good if $\text{Raz}(X, z)$ is ε_{Raz} -close to uniform. Let GZ be the set of all good z -s, and BZ the rest. We say $i \in [A]$ is good for $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$ if $C(y, i) \in GZ$ and bad otherwise. We define a random variable B_i , where the sample space is Y , and $B_i(y) = 1$ if i is bad for y and 0 otherwise.

By Claim 12, $|BZ| \leq 2^{\delta_{\text{Raz}} d'}$. Therefore, in expectation, the number of bad rows for y is small:

$$\triangleright \text{Claim 29. } \mathbb{E}_{y \in Y} \left[\sum_{i \in [A]} B_i(y) \right] \leq 2\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A.$$

Proof. Fix an $i \in [A]$. We have that $C(Y, i)$ is ε_i -close to some $\delta' d' = 0.69d'$ -source R . Hence:

$$\mathbb{E}_y[B_i(y)] = \Pr_{y \in Y}[C(y, i) \in BZ] \leq \varepsilon_i + \Pr_{r \in R}[r \in BZ] \leq \varepsilon_i + \frac{|BZ|}{2^{\delta' d'}} = \varepsilon_i + 2^{-0.09d'}.$$

Thus, for d large enough,

$$\mathbb{E}_y \left[\sum_{i \in [A]} B_i(y) \right] = \sum_{i \in [A]} \mathbb{E}_y[B_i(y)] \leq \sum_{i \in [A]} \left(\varepsilon_i + 2^{-0.09d'} \right) \leq \varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A + 2^{-0.09d'} A \leq 2\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A. \triangleleft$$

► **Definition 30.** We say $y \in \text{Supp}(Y)$ has many bad rows if $\sum_{i \in [A]} B_i(y) \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A}$.

Denote $p_{1,1} = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4}$.

► **Claim 31.** $\Pr_{y \in Y}[y \text{ has many bad rows}] \leq p_{1,1}$.

Proof. By Markov,

$$\Pr_{y \in Y} \left[\sum_i B_i(y) \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A} \right] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i B_i(y) \right]}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A}} \leq \frac{2\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A}} = 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4},$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} \leq \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{8}\right)^2$. ◁

Part 2: The good rows are t -wise independent

We introduce some notations to simplify the expressions in the proof. For $y_0 \in \{0, 1\}^d$ and $k \in [A]$, let $Y_k'''(y_0)$ denote $(Y_k'''|Y = y_0)$. Also, for a set $S \subseteq [A]$, define $Y_S'''(y_0) = \{Y_j'''(y_0)\}_{j \in S}$. Denote $p_2 = \varepsilon_{\text{Raz}} + 2\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}}$.

► **Definition 32.** Let $y_0 \in \{0, 1\}^d$ (not necessarily in the support of Y). Let $i \in [A]$ and $S \subseteq [A] \setminus \{i\}$ of cardinality $t - 1$. We say y_0 violates the product rule for (i, S) if $B_i(y_0) = 0$ and

$$(Y_i'''(y_0), Y_S'''(y_0)) \not\approx_{p_2} U_1 \times Y_S'''(y_0).$$

► **Definition 33.** Let $y_0 \in \{0, 1\}^d$ (not necessarily in the support of Y). Let $i \in [A]$ and $S \subseteq [A] \setminus \{i\}$ of cardinality $t - 1$. We say y_0 violates the product rule with distinguisher $\Delta : \{0, 1\}^t \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ for (i, S) if $B_i(y_0) = 0$ and

$$\left| \Pr[\Delta(Y_i'''(y_0), Y_S'''(y_0)) = 1] - \Pr[\Delta(U_1, Y_S'''(y_0)) = 1] \right| > p_2.$$

Observe that if y_0 violates the product rule then there exists some Δ such that y_0 violates the product rule with distinguisher Δ .

► **Lemma 34.** For every i and S as above, the number of $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$ that violate the product rule for (i, S) is at most $2^{\delta_0 d/2 + 2^t}$.⁴

Proof. Suppose the lemma is false for some (i, S) . Then, by the pigeonhole principle there exists some Δ such that the number of elements $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$ that violate the product rule for (i, S) with distinguisher Δ is at least $2^{\delta_0 d/2}$. Let BY denote the set of these elements. Identify BY with the uniform distribution over the set BY .

Let $BY'_i = C(BY, i)$, $BY''_i = \text{Raz}(X, BY'_i)$ and $BY'''_i = \text{CBA}(BY, BY''_i, i)$. For a subset $T \subseteq [A]$ Let BY'_T denote the sub-table of BY' corresponding to the rows of T , and similarly BY''_T and BY'''_T . Since for every $y \in BY$, we have that

$$\Delta(BY'''_i(y), BY'''_S(y)) \not\approx_{p_2} \Delta(U_1, BY'''_S(y)),$$

this holds also on average, that is

$$\Delta(BY'''_i, BY'''_S) \not\approx_{p_2} \Delta(U_1, BY'''_S).$$

Thus, it follows that

$$BY'''_{S \cup \{i\}} \not\approx_{p_2} U_1 \times BY'''_S. \quad (3)$$

On the other hand, when we condition on the values of $\mathcal{H} = BY'_{S \cup \{i\}}$, the conditions for the correlation-breaker with advice hold:

- BY and $BY''_{S \cup \{i\}}$ are independent given $\mathcal{H} = BY'_{S \cup \{i\}}$, since \mathcal{H} is a function of BY alone, and given that $\mathcal{H} = BY'_{S \cup \{i\}} = h$ for some h , $BY''_{S \cup \{i\}}$ is a function of X alone.

⁴ We could have used an alternative argument that avoids the 2^{2^t} factor here by a minor deterioration in the error of the CBA. However, since the t we use is constant the 2^{2^t} factor is negligible.

- It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H}_\infty(BY|\mathcal{H}) &\geq H_\infty(BY) - \log(|\text{Supp}(\mathcal{H})|) \\ &= H_\infty(BY) - td' \geq \frac{\delta_0 d}{2} - td' \geq \frac{\delta_0 d}{4},\end{aligned}$$

because

$$\frac{td'}{d} = t \cdot \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^s = \frac{\delta_0}{4}.$$

Now, since $k_{\text{CBA}} = \frac{\delta_0 d}{8}$ and $\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}} = \frac{1}{d}$ we also have for d large enough,

$$\tilde{H}_\infty(BY|\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{\delta_0 d}{4} \geq k_{\text{CBA}} + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}}}.$$

- $B_i(y) = 0$, hence $BY'_i \in GZ$ and $BY''_i = \text{Raz}(X, BY'_i)$ is ε_{Raz} -close to uniform.

Thus, by the correlation-breaker with advice property,

$$\left(\text{CBA}(BY, BY''_i, i), \{\text{CBA}(BY, BY''_j, j)\}_{j \in S}\right) \approx_{\varepsilon_{\text{Raz}} + 2\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}}} \left(U_1, \{\text{CBA}(BY, BY''_j, j)\}_{j \in S}\right),$$

or, equivalently,

$$(BY'''_i, BY'''_S) \approx_{p_2} U_1 \times BY'''_S,$$

in contradiction to Equation (3). ◀

- **Definition 35.** Say $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$ violates the product rule if it violates it for some $i \in [A]$ and $S \subseteq [A] \setminus \{i\}$ of cardinality $t - 1$.

As $H_\infty(Y) \geq \delta_0 d$, the probability $y \in Y$ violates the product rule for a specific (i, S) is at most $2^{\delta_0 d/2 + 2^t - \delta_0 d} = 2^{2^t - \delta_0 d/2}$. Let $p_{1,2} = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{10}$. Then, by the union bound, for d large enough:

- **Corollary 36.** $\Pr_{y \in Y}[y \text{ violates the product rule}] \leq 2^{2^t - \delta_0 d/2} \cdot A^t \leq p_{1,2}$.

Part 3: Completing the proof

- **Definition 37.** We say y is bad if it has many bad rows or if it violates the product rule. If y is not bad we say it is good.

Let $p_1 = p_{1,1} + p_{1,2}$. Clearly, by Claim 31 and Corollary 36, $\Pr_{y \in Y}[y \text{ is bad}] \leq p_1 = \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{10}\right) \varepsilon_0$.

▷ **Claim 38.** Fix any good $y \in Y$. Then, $Y'''(y)$ is a (q, t, tp_2) non-oblivious bit-fixing source, for $q = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A}$.

Proof. Let $Q(y) \subseteq [A]$ be the set of bad rows for y . As y does not have many bad rows, $|Q(y)| = \sum_{i \in [A]} B_i(y) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} A} = q$.

Now, fix any set $S \subseteq [A] \setminus Q(y)$ of cardinality t . Let $i \in S$. As $S \subseteq [A] \setminus Q(y)$ and $i \in S$ we have $i \notin Q(y)$ and therefore $B_i(y) = 0$. Also, y does not violate the product rule, hence,

$$\left(Y'''_i(y), Y'''_{S \setminus \{i\}}(y)\right) \approx_{p_2} U_1 \times Y'''_{S \setminus \{i\}}(y).$$

As this is true for any $i \in S$, by Lemma 18,

$$Y'''_S(y) \approx_{tp_2} U_t.$$

Thus, $Y'''(y)$ is a (q, t, tp_2) non-oblivious bit-fixing source. ◁

1:20 Near-Optimal Erasure List-Decodable Codes

In particular, by Lemma 20, for every good y , $Y'''(y)$ is $tA^t p_2$ -close to a (q, t) non-oblivious bit-fixing source. By the choices we have made above $q = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}}A \leq A^{1-2\gamma}$. Equation (1) implies that

$$t = \frac{\delta_0}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}} \right)^{\log(3/2)} \geq c_\gamma \log^4 A.$$

Using the resiliency of f from Theorem 22 (and the fact that it is almost balanced), the output when y is good is p_3 -close to uniform for $p_3 = tA^t p_2 + \varepsilon_f + A^{-1/c_\gamma}$, where the first term is due to the distance from a t -wise distribution, the second is due to the resiliency and the third is due to the bias of f (see, e.g., Lemma 2.11 in [9]). To that we also have to add the probability p_1 that y is not good. To finish the proof we notice that:

■ It holds that

$$\varepsilon_f \leq c_\gamma \frac{q}{A^{1-\gamma}} \leq c_\gamma \frac{A^{1-2\gamma}}{A^{1-\gamma}} = c_\gamma A^{-\gamma} \leq c_\gamma 2^{-\gamma \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{5},$$

because $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} \leq (\frac{\varepsilon_0}{5c_\gamma})^{1/\gamma}$.

■ Also,

$$A^{-1/c_\gamma} \leq 2^{-\frac{1}{c_\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\text{cond}}}} = \varepsilon_{\text{cond}}^{1/c_\gamma} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{5},$$

because $\varepsilon_{\text{cond}} \leq (\frac{\varepsilon_0}{5})^{c_\gamma}$.

■ Finally, $tp_2 = t(\varepsilon_{\text{Raz}} + 2\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}})$, $\varepsilon_{\text{Raz}} = 2^{-\Omega(k)} = d^{-\Omega(1)}$, $\varepsilon_{\text{CBA}} = \frac{1}{d}$. Thus, $tp_2 \leq 4td^{-\Omega(1)}$. A and t are constants, so for d large enough, $tA^t p_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{5}$.

Together, the error is at most $p_1 + p_3 \leq \varepsilon_0$ completing the proof of the theorem. ◀

5 Strong Seeded Dispersers and Friends

5.1 Strong Seeded Dispersers

► **Definition 39** (strong disperser). *A function $\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ is a strong (k, ε) disperser, if for every (n, k) source X ,*

$$|\text{Supp}((Y, \text{Disp}(X, Y)))| > (1 - \varepsilon)DM.$$

We say Disp is (source) linear if for every $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$ and every $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, $\text{Disp}(x_1 + x_2, y) = \text{Disp}(x_1, y) + \text{Disp}(x_2, y)$.

We are interested in the important special case where $m = 1$. In this case, non-explicitly, a random function is (w.h.p.) a strong (k, ε) disperser with $d = \log n + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + O(1)$ provided that $k \geq \log \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + O(1)$ [37, 33]. A matching lower bound, up to additive constant factors, was given by [37].

Using the translation between strong seeded dispersers and erasure list-decodable codes which we discuss in Section 5.3, Guruswami and Indyk's result [26] gives a probabilistic polynomial time algorithm that outputs with high probability a strong seeded disperser with seed-length $d = 2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + \log n + \log \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ and optimal entropy-loss. The construction can be made deterministic, but with running time exponential in $1/\varepsilon$. See Table 1 for a summary of previous results.

Note that as we discuss the one output bit case, the required entropy is essentially the *entropy-loss*. From Theorem 27 we can derive a better explicit construction of a strong disperser with small error.

■ **Table 1** Parameters of strong (k, ε) one-bit dispersers, up to additive $O(1)$ terms. γ is an arbitrarily small positive constant.

	Required entropy k	Seed length d	
Lower-bound, non-explicit	$\log \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	$\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + \log n$	[37, 33]
[26]	$\log \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	$(2 + \gamma) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + \log n$	Constant ε , or randomized construction
This work (Theorem 40)	$O(\log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	$(1 + \gamma) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	poly($1/n$) error

► **Theorem 40.** *For every constant $0 < \gamma < 1$ there exists a constant $c \geq 1$ such that for every integer n and $\varepsilon \leq n^{-\frac{c}{1+\gamma}}$ there exists an explicit strong (k, ε) disperser $\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $d = (1 + \gamma) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ and $k = c \log d$.*

Proof. Set $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{4}$ and $\delta_0 = \frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}$. Let c be the constant from Theorem 27 for δ_0 and ε_0 and let $2\text{Ext} : [N] \times [D] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the $((n, k), (d, k_2 = \delta_0 d), \varepsilon_0)$ two-source extractor where $d = (1 + \gamma) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ and $k = c \log d$. Notice that $d \geq c \log n$ (because $\varepsilon \leq n^{-\frac{c}{1+\gamma}}$) as required. Let $\text{Disp}(x, y) = 2\text{Ext}(x, y)$.

Let $X \subseteq [N]$ be a set of size K and call a value $y \in [D]$ *b-bad* if $\text{Disp}(X, y) = \{b\}$. It follows that the sets of 0-bad y -s and 1-bad y -s are each of size less than K_2 . Therefore,

$$|\text{Supp}((U_d, \text{Disp}(X, U_d)))| > 2K_2 + 2(D - 2K_2) = 2D - 2K_2 = \left(1 - \frac{K_2}{D}\right) 2D = (1 - \varepsilon) 2D,$$

because $\frac{K_2}{D} = 2^{-(1-\delta_0)d} = 2^{-\frac{1}{1+\gamma}d} = 2^{-\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})} = \varepsilon$. ◀

5.2 Non-strong dispersers

We now prove Theorem 5 and output more bits from the source at the expense of being strong in only most of the seed. We construct

$$\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^{d_1} \times \{0, 1\}^{d_2} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m,$$

where we think of d_1 and d_2 as two parts of the seed. Disp will be strong in the first d_1 bits of the seed. Using the notations of Section 4 we let

$$\text{Disp}(x, y, i) = (y, \text{Raz}(x, C(y, i))).$$

We now prove (in sketch) Theorem 5.

Proof. We adopt the notations of Section 4. In those notations, $\text{Disp}(X, Y, I) = (Y, Y_I'')$. First note that the length of $i \in \{0, 1\}^{d_2}$ is the logarithm of the number of rows in the table Y'' which is $a = O(1)$. By Claim 31 we know that for nearly every $y \in \{0, 1\}^{d_1}$ we have many values $i \in \{0, 1\}^{d_2}$ such that $\text{Raz}(X, C(y, i))$ is ε_{Raz} -close to uniform. In particular, for every y that has many good rows, let i_y be any such row. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Supp}(\text{Disp}(X, U_{d_1}, U_{d_2}))| &\geq \sum_{y \text{ has many good rows}} |\text{Supp}(\text{Disp}(X, y, i_y))| \\ &\geq \sum_{y \text{ has many good rows}} (1 - \varepsilon_{\text{Raz}}) 2^{d''}. \end{aligned}$$

The theorem now follows since $d'' = \Omega(k)$ and ε_{Raz} is smaller than $2^{-\Omega(d'')}$, which implies that we can truncate the output of Raz such that when $\text{Raz}(X, C(y, i))$ is ε_{Raz} -close to uniform it covers its entire support. ◀

■ **Table 2** Parameters of $(\bar{n}, N)_2$ codes, $((1 - \varepsilon)\bar{n}, L)$ erasure list-decodable, up to constant multiplicative factors. γ is an arbitrarily small positive constant.

	Rate $R = n/\bar{n}$	List size L	
Lower-bound, non-explicit	ε	$\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	[24]
[26]	$\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}$	$\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	Constant ε , or randomized construction
This work (Theorem 46)	$\varepsilon^{1+\gamma}$	$\log^{O(1)}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	poly($1/n$) error

5.3 Erasure List-Decodable Codes

An (\bar{n}, n) (binary) code is a mapping $\mathcal{C} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\bar{n}}$. The code \mathcal{C} is *linear* if \mathcal{C} is linear, and is denoted by $[\bar{n}, n]$. We identify a code with the image of \mathcal{C} . For a linear \mathcal{C} this image is a linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}_2^{\bar{n}}$ of dimension n . A generator matrix for an $[\bar{n}, n]$ code \mathcal{C} is any matrix whose columns form a basis for \mathcal{C} . In the *erasures* noise model, an adversarially chosen subset of the codeword's symbols are erased and the positions where erasures have occurred are known.

► **Definition 41** (erasure list-decodable code). *A code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\bar{n}}$ is (s, L) erasure list-decodable if for every $r \in \{0, 1\}^{\bar{n}-s}$ and every set $T \subseteq [\bar{n}]$ of size $\bar{n} - s$,*

$$|\{c \in \mathcal{C} \mid c|_T = r\}| < L,$$

where $c|_T$ denotes the projection of c to the coordinates in T .

The following folklore lemma (see, e.g., [24, Lemma 1]) gives an alternative characterization of *linear* erasure list-decodable codes.

► **Lemma 42.** *An $[\bar{n}, n]_2$ linear code \mathcal{C} is $((1 - \varepsilon)\bar{n}, L)$ erasure list-decodable if and only if its $\bar{n} \times n$ generator matrix G has the property that every $\varepsilon\bar{n} \times n$ sub-matrix of G has rank greater than $n - \log L$.*

Non-explicitly, we have:

► **Theorem 43** ([24]). *For every n and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an (\bar{n}, n) binary code that is $((1 - \varepsilon)\bar{n}, L)$ -erasure list-decodable of rate $\frac{n}{\bar{n}} = \Omega(\varepsilon)$ and $L = O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$.*

See Table 2 for a summary of previous results.

Guruswami [25] observed that strong dispersers can be used to construct erasure list-decodable codes. Here we complement his argument, and note that strong dispersers are *equivalent* to erasure list-decodable codes. Given a function $\text{Disp} : [N] \times [D] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we consider the (D, n) code $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^D$ defined by $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}(x)_i = \text{Disp}(x, i)$. Note that the code is linear if and only if Disp is linear.

► **Lemma 44** (following [25, Lemma 12]). *The function $\text{Disp} : [N] \times [D] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a strong (k, ε) disperser if and only if $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}$ is $((1 - 2\varepsilon)D, K)$ erasure list-decodable.*

Proof. For one direction, assume Disp is a strong (k, ε) disperser. We wish to prove that $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}$ is $((1 - 2\varepsilon)D, K)$ erasure list-decodable. Let $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_{2\varepsilon D}\} \subseteq [D]$ be an arbitrary set of size $2\varepsilon D$ and $r \in \{0, 1\}^{2\varepsilon D}$ an arbitrary string. Let $X_{T,r} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ denote the set of all the messages x for which $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}(x)|_T = r$. Then,

$$|\text{Supp}((U_d, \text{Disp}(X_{T,r}, U_d)))| \leq |T| \cdot 1 + (D - |T|) \cdot 2 \leq (1 - \varepsilon)2D,$$

where the first inequality follows by considering seeds in T and seeds in $[D] \setminus T$. For a seed $t_i \in T$ we have that $\text{Disp}(X_{T,r}, t_i)$ is fixed, hence each such seed contributes 1 to the support size. For any other seed y , the support size of $\text{Disp}(X_{T,r}, y)$ is at most 2. As Disp is a strong (k, ε) disperser, we conclude that $|X_{T,r}| \leq K$ as desired.

For the other direction assume Disp is not a strong (k, ε) disperser. Then, there exists a set $X \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ such that $|X| \geq K$ and $|\text{Supp}((U_d, \text{Disp}(X, U_d)))| \leq (1 - 2\varepsilon)2D$. Note that for every $y \in [D]$ we have $|\text{Supp}(\text{Disp}(X, y))| \in \{1, 2\}$. Therefore, following the above calculation, there exists a set $T \subseteq D$ of size at least $2\varepsilon D$ such that for each $y \in T$, $|\text{Supp}(\text{Disp}(X, y))| = 1$. But this means that for every $x \in X$, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}(x)|_T$ is the same (punctured) codeword. It follows that $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}$ is not $((1 - 2\varepsilon)D, K)$ erasure list-decodable. \blacktriangleleft

► **Corollary 45.** *If $\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a strong (k, ε) disperser with seed-length $d = a_1 \log n + a_2 \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + a_3$ (for some $a_1 \geq 1, a_2 \geq 1$ and a_3) then $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}$ is a $((1 - 2\varepsilon)D, K)$ erasure list-decodable code of rate $2^{-a_3} \cdot n^{1-a_1} \cdot \varepsilon^{a_2}$.*

When ε is much smaller than $\frac{1}{n}$ the dominant factor is determined by a_2 . As we mentioned earlier (and as Guruswami also notes in [25]) previous explicit constructions for binary codes had $a_2 \geq 2$ (usually inherited from extractor constructions). Our construction is the first to get arbitrary close to $a_2 = 1$ and small list-size. Combining Corollary 45 and Theorem 40, we obtain:

► **Theorem 46.** *For every constant $0 < \gamma < 1$ there exists a constant $c \geq 1$ such that for every integer n and $\varepsilon \leq n^{-\frac{c}{1-\gamma}}$ there exists an explicit code $\mathcal{C} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{1+\gamma}}$ that is*

$$\left((1 - 2\varepsilon) \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{1+\gamma}, \left((1 + \gamma) \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right)^c \right)$$

erasure list-decodable of rate $n\varepsilon^{1+\gamma}$.

5.4 Ramsey Graphs

Ramsey theory studies inevitable order that appears in large structures. It was initiated by Ramsey [38], who showed that any graph over $N = 2^n$ vertices must contain a clique or an independent set of size $n/2$. A graph over N vertices is called K -Ramsey if it contains neither a clique nor an independent set of size K . Inaugurating the probabilistic method, Erdős [18] showed that there are $2n$ -Ramsey graphs. He also offered a bounty of \$100 for an explicit construction of an $O(n)$ -Ramsey graph.

Erdős's challenge initiated a line of beautiful constructions of Ramsey graphs [1, 34, 19, 11, 20]. The study of pseudorandomness gave a new perspective on Ramsey graphs. Specifically, any two-source disperser or extractor gives rise to a bipartite Ramsey graph (and hence, also to a non-bipartite Ramsey graph [41]). This connection led to new constructions of Ramsey graph [10, 35, 2, 39, 8, 4, 21, 5, 6, 14, 9, 32, 15, 28] culminating in $(N, n^{O(\log \log n / \log \log \log n)})$ -Ramsey graphs [7, 29].

In this section we tackle the problem of constructing *unbalanced* Ramsey graphs.

► **Definition 47** (Ramsey graph). *A bipartite graph $\text{Ram} : [N_1] \times [N_2] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a (K_1, K_2) bipartite Ramsey graph if every $K_1 \times K_2$ induced subgraph of Ram is neither a bipartite clique nor a bipartite independent set.*

While it is possible to interpret some pseudorandom objects as unbalanced Ramsey graphs, they were less studied explicitly. See Table 3 for a summary of previous results.

■ **Table 3** Parameters of (K_1, K_2) Ramsey graphs in the unbalanced case, $[N_1 = 2^n] \times [N_2]$. c is any large enough constant and γ is an arbitrarily small positive constant.

	$K_1 : N_1$	$K_2 : N_2$	
Lower-bound	$(c-1) \log n : 2^n$	$n : n^c$	By [37] and Claim 49
Non-explicit	$O(c \log n) : 2^n$	$n : n^c$	Probabilistic method
[39]	$\log^{O(1)} n : 2^n$	$N_2^{0.5+\gamma} : n^{O(1)}$	$O(1)$ terms depend on γ
This work (Theorem 27)	$\log^{O(1)} n : 2^n$	$N_2^\gamma : n^{O(1)}$	$O(1)$ terms depend on γ

It is easy to see that a two-source extractor with any nontrivial error is, in fact, a bipartite Ramsey graph, so as a corollary of Theorem 27, we obtain:

► **Corollary 48.** *For every integer N_1 and a constant $0 < \delta < 1$ there exists a constant $c = c(\delta) \geq 1$ and an explicit function $\text{Ram} : [N_1] \times [N_2] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that is a bipartite $(K_1, K_2 = N_2^\delta)$ Ramsey graph, for $N_2 = \log^c N_1$ and $K_1 = \log^c N_2$.*

We start with the easy claim that bipartite Ramsey graphs are equivalent to strong one-bit dispersers.

▷ **Claim 49.** If $\text{Ram} : [N_1] \times [N_2] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a (K_1, K_2) bipartite Ramsey graph then Ram is a strong $(k_1, \varepsilon \geq \frac{K_2}{N_2})$ disperser with seed-length $n_2 = k_2 + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Also, if Ram is a strong $(k_1, \varepsilon = \frac{K_2}{2N_2})$ disperser then it is a (K_1, K_2) bipartite Ramsey graph.

Proof. The first claim follows from the proof of Theorem 40.

For the other claim, which was already observed in [22], assume Ram is a $(k_1, \varepsilon = \frac{K_2}{2N_2})$ disperser and assume towards contradiction that it is not a $(K_1, K_2 = 2\varepsilon N_2)$ bipartite Ramsey graph. Hence, there exist some $S \subseteq [N_1]$ and $T \subseteq [N_2]$ so that $|S| \geq K_1$ and $|T| \geq K_2$ such that either $\text{Ram}(S, T) = \{0\}$ or $\text{Ram}(S, T) = \{1\}$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $\text{Ram}(S, T) = \{0\}$, so for every $t \in T$, $(t, 1) \notin \text{Supp}((U_{n_2}, \text{Ram}(S, U_{n_2})))$. But then,

$$|\text{Supp}((U_{n_2}, \text{Ram}(S, U_{n_2})))| \leq 2(N_2 - |T|) + |T| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)2N_2,$$

a contradiction. ◁

As observed in [22], the quality of the Ramsey graph implied by the above theorem crucially depends on the seed-length of the given disperser. Specifically, if the seed-length dependence on the error ε is $2 \cdot \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ then $K_2 = 2\varepsilon N_2 > \sqrt{N_2}$ and if it is $1 \cdot \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ then K_2 can be very small.

We mention a more frugal way of obtaining Ramsey graphs from *linear* dispersers. The argument is a straightforward adaptation of an argument of Alon [23, Proposition 10.15].⁵ The parameters we obtain are identical to the above claim (and [22]), except that one side of the graph is scaled down (from N to n) as is its entropy (from K to k).

► **Theorem 50.** *Suppose $\text{Disp} : \{0, 1\}^n \times \{0, 1\}^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a linear strong (K, ε) disperser. Let G be the $D \times n$ generating matrix of the $[D, n]_2$ linear code $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}$. Then, G is a $(2\varepsilon D, k+1)$ bipartite-Ramsey-graph.*

⁵ Alon's argument is aimed at obtaining *balanced* Ramsey graphs, while we are more concerned with the entropy they can handle.

Proof. Assume Disp is a linear strong (K, ε) disperser. By Lemma 44, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{Disp}}$ is a $((1-2\varepsilon)D, K)$ erasure list-decodable code. Assume towards contradiction that G is not a $(2\varepsilon D, k+1)$ bipartite Ramsey graph. Let M' be a monochromatic $2\varepsilon D \times k+1$ sub-matrix of G . Assume that M' is the all-ones matrix (a similar argument handles the all-zeros matrix). Denote by M the $2\varepsilon D \times n$ sub-matrix of G that is formed by taking the rows of M' and all columns of G . On the one hand, by Lemma 44 and Lemma 42, $\text{rank}(M) > n - \log K = n - k$. On the other hand, as M contains $k+1$ columns of rank 1, $\text{rank}(M) \leq n - k$, a contradiction. \blacktriangleleft

It is natural to ask whether the other direction also holds, namely whether an adjacency matrix of a bipartite Ramsey graph is in fact a generating matrix of a linear, erasure list-decodable code. Stated differently, whether a low-rank matrix must contain large monochromatic rectangles. That question received much attention, as it is tightly related to the famous “log-rank conjecture” in communication complexity [30, 36]. Unfortunately, the acclaimed unconditional upper bound of Lovett [31] still does not give us a meaningful result.

6 Concluding Remarks and Open Problems

- The strong disperser we construct in this paper outputs one bit, and for $k = O(\log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$,
 - has $O(\log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ entropy-loss, and,
 - $(1 + \gamma) \cdot \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ dependence of the seed-length on the error.

It is natural to ask to extend the results of the paper to arbitrarily large values of k , matching (up to multiplicative factors) the non-explicit results.

- Our dispersers are inherently non-linear, and therefore we also get non-linear erasure list-decodable codes. How can we obtain near optimal *linear* codes?
- The erasure list-decodable code we construct is explicit in the sense that the code can be efficiently encoded. Does it also admit an efficient erasure list-*decoding* algorithm?
- The seed-length of our strong disperser is $c \log n + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. Pushing c closer to 1 is an important open problem. In particular it would imply erasure list-decodable codes of near-optimal rate even for relatively large ε . Such a disperser with many output bits can also be used for simulating one-sided error randomized algorithms using weak random sources with nearly linear overhead [44].

References

- 1 HL Abbott. Lower bounds for some Ramsey numbers. *Discrete Mathematics*, 2(4):289–293, 1972.
- 2 Noga Alon. The Shannon capacity of a union. *Combinatorica*, 18(3):301–310, 1998.
- 3 Noga Alon, Oded Goldreich, and Yishay Mansour. Almost k -wise independence versus k -wise independence. *Information Processing Letters*, 88(3):107–110, 2003.
- 4 Boaz Barak. A simple explicit construction of an $n^{\tilde{O}(\log n)}$ -Ramsey graph. *arXiv preprint*, 2006. [arXiv:math/0601651](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0601651).
- 5 Boaz Barak, Guy Kindler, Ronen Shaltiel, Benny Sudakov, and Avi Wigderson. Simulating independence: New constructions of condensers, Ramsey graphs, dispersers, and extractors. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 57(4):20, 2010.
- 6 Boaz Barak, Anup Rao, Ronen Shaltiel, and Avi Wigderson. 2-source dispersers for $n^{o(1)}$ entropy, and Ramsey graphs beating the frankl-wilson construction. *Annals of Mathematics*, 176(3):1483–1544, 2012.
- 7 Avraham Ben-Aroya, Dean Doron, and Amnon Ta-Shma. An efficient reduction from two-source to nonmalleable extractors: achieving near-logarithmic min-entropy. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, pages STOC17–31–STOC17–49, 2019.

- 8 Jean Bourgain. More on the sum-product phenomenon in prime fields and its applications. *International Journal of Number Theory*, 1(01):1–32, 2005.
- 9 Eshan Chattopadhyay and David Zuckerman. Explicit two-source extractors and resilient functions. *Annals of Mathematics*, 189(3):653–705, 2019.
- 10 Benny Chor and Oded Goldreich. Unbiased bits from sources of weak randomness and probabilistic communication complexity. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 17(2):230–261, 1988.
- 11 Fan RK Chung. A note on constructive methods for Ramsey numbers. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 5(1):109–113, 1981.
- 12 Gil Cohen. Local correlation breakers and applications to three-source extractors and mergers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 45(4):1297–1338, 2016.
- 13 Gil Cohen. Non-malleable extractors-new tools and improved constructions. In *LIPICs-Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, volume 50. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016.
- 14 Gil Cohen. Two-source dispersers for polylogarithmic entropy and improved Ramsey graphs. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2016)*, pages 278–284, 2016.
- 15 Gil Cohen. Two-source extractors for quasi-logarithmic min-entropy and improved privacy amplification protocols. In *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, volume 23, page 114, 2016.
- 16 Zeev Dvir, Swastik Kopparty, Shubhangi Saraf, and Madhu Sudan. Extensions to the method of multiplicities, with applications to kakeya sets and mergers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42(6):2305–2328, 2013.
- 17 Zeev Dvir and Avi Wigderson. Kakeya sets, new mergers, and old extractors. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(3):778–792, 2011.
- 18 Paul Erdős. Some remarks on the theory of graphs. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 53(4):292–294, 1947.
- 19 Peter Frankl. A constructive lower bound for Ramsey numbers. *Ars Combinatoria*, 3(297-302):28, 1977.
- 20 Peter Frankl and Richard M. Wilson. Intersection theorems with geometric consequences. *Combinatorica*, 1(4):357–368, 1981.
- 21 Parikshit Gopalan. Constructing Ramsey graphs from boolean function representations. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC 2006)*, pages 14–pp, 2006.
- 22 Ronen Gradwohl, Guy Kindler, Omer Reingold, and Amnon Ta-Shma. On the error parameter of dispersers. In *Approximation, Randomization and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 294–305. Springer, 2005.
- 23 Venkatesan Guruswami. *List decoding of error-correcting codes*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2001.
- 24 Venkatesan Guruswami. List decoding from erasures: Bounds and code constructions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(11):2826–2833, 2003.
- 25 Venkatesan Guruswami. Better extractors for better codes? In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2004)*, pages 436–444, 2004.
- 26 Venkatesan Guruswami and Piotr Indyk. Near-optimal linear-time codes for unique decoding and new list-decodable codes over smaller alphabets. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2002)*, pages 812–821, 2002.
- 27 Xin Li. Three-source extractors for polylogarithmic min-entropy. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2015)*, pages 863–882. IEEE, 2015.
- 28 Xin Li. Improved non-malleable extractors, non-malleable codes and independent source extractors. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2017)*, pages 1144–1156, 2017.

- 29 Xin Li. Non-malleable extractors and non-malleable codes: Partially optimal constructions. In *Proceedings of the 34th Computational Complexity Conference (CCC 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- 30 Shachar Lovett. Recent advances on the log-rank conjecture in communication complexity. *Bulletin of EATCS*, 1(112), 2014.
- 31 Shachar Lovett. Communication is bounded by root of rank. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 63(1):1, 2016.
- 32 Raghu Meka. Explicit resilient functions matching Ajtai-Linial. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2017)*, pages 1132–1148, 2017.
- 33 Raghu Meka, Omer Reingold, and Yuan Zhou. Deterministic coupon collection and better strong dispersers. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2014)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2014.
- 34 Zs Nagy. A constructive estimation of the Ramsey numbers. *Mat. Lapok*, 23:301–302, 1975.
- 35 Moni Naor. Constructing Ramsey graphs from small probability spaces. *IBM Research Report RJ*, 8810, 1992.
- 36 Noam Nisan and Avi Wigderson. On rank vs. communication complexity. *Combinatorica*, 15(4):557–565, 1995.
- 37 Jaikumar Radhakrishnan and Amnon Ta-Shma. Bounds for dispersers, extractors, and depth-two superconcentrators. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 13(1):2–24, 2000.
- 38 FP Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(1):264–286, 1930.
- 39 Ran Raz. Extractors with weak random seeds. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2005)*, pages 11–20, 2005.
- 40 Ronen Shaltiel. Recent developments in explicit constructions of extractors. *Bulletin of the EATCS*, 77(67-95):10, 2002.
- 41 Ronen Shaltiel. An introduction to randomness extractors. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 21–41. Springer, 2011.
- 42 Luca Trevisan. Extractors and pseudorandom generators. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 48(4):860–879, 2001.
- 43 Avi Wigderson. Randomness extractors – applications and constructions. In *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2009.
- 44 David Zuckerman. Simulating BPP using a general weak random source. *Algorithmica*, 16(4):367–391, 1996.
- 45 David Zuckerman. Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number. *Theory of Computing*, 3:103–128, 2007.