

Homomorphism Testing with Resilience to Online Manipulations

Esty Kelman* Uri Meir† Debanuj Nayak‡ Sofya Raskhodnikova§

Abstract

A central challenge in property testing is verifying algebraic structure with minimal access to data. A landmark result addressing this challenge, the linearity test of Blum, Luby, and Rubinfeld (JCSS ‘93), spurred a rich body of work on testing algebraic properties such as linearity and its generalizations to low-degree polynomials and group homomorphisms. However, classical tests for these properties assume unrestricted, noise-free access to the input function—an assumption that breaks down in adversarial or dynamic settings. To address this, Kalemaj, Raskhodnikova, and Varma (Theory of Computing ‘23) introduced the online manipulation model, where an adversary may erase or corrupt query responses over time, based on the tester’s past queries.

We initiate the study of *manipulation-resilient* testing for *group homomorphism* in this online model. Our main result is an *optimal* tester that makes $O(1/\varepsilon + \log t)$ queries, where ε is the distance parameter and t is the number of function values the adversary can erase or corrupt per query. Our result recovers the celebrated $O(1/\varepsilon)$ bound by Ben-Or, Coppersmith, Luby, and Rubinfeld (Random Struct. Algorithms ‘08) for homomorphism testing in the standard property testing model, albeit with a different tester. Our tester, **Random Signs Test**, *lifts* known manipulation-resilient linearity testers for $\mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ to general group domains and codomains by introducing more randomness: instead of verifying the homomorphism condition for a sum of random elements, it uses additions and subtractions of random elements, randomly selecting a sign for each element. We also obtain improved group-specific query bounds for key families of groups. Our results show that despite the challenges of online manipulation, group homomorphism—a fundamental algebraic property—is efficiently testable across a wide range of domains and codomains. Along the way we formalize a general framework for proving resiliency of testers to online manipulations which we believe could be useful in future work.

*Boston University, Boston, MA, USA, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA. Email: ekelman@mit.edu

†Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel. Email: urimeir.cs@gmail.com

‡Boston University, Boston, MA, USA. Email: dnayak@bu.edu

§Boston University, Boston, MA, USA. Email: sofya@bu.edu

1 Introduction

Understanding how to verify algebraic structure with minimal access to data is a central question in *property testing*. A landmark result addressing this challenge is the linearity test of Blum, Luby, and Rubinfeld [BLR93], which checks whether a given function is linear by querying it on two random inputs and their sum. This test and its variants sparked a rich line of work on testing algebraic properties of functions, including linearity [BFL91, FGL⁺96, BCH⁺96], being a low-degree polynomial [BFLS91, GLR⁺91, FS95, RS96b, RS97, AKK⁺05, AS03, MR08, KR06, Sam07, ST09, JPRZ09, BKS⁺10, HSS13, RS13, DG13, KM22], and being a group homomorphism [BLR93, GKS06, BCLR08, GR16, BC22, MR15, GHV17, MR24], with deep connections to probabilistically-checkable proofs [ALM⁺98, Tre98, HW03].

However, classical property testing, as defined by [RS96a, GGR98], relies on the assumption of uninterrupted query access to the input function—an assumption that may break down in dynamic environments or under adversarial or incomplete access to data. Many testers, especially for algebraic properties, use structured queries that can be vulnerable to online adversarial interference. To address this, Kalemaj, Raskhodnikova, and Varma [KRV23] introduced the *online manipulation model*, where an adversary can erase or corrupt the input during the execution of the algorithm, based on prior queries. This framework has prompted the reexamination of classical testing problems under a new lens, seeking algorithms that remain correct and efficient despite adversarial interference.

In this work, we initiate the study of manipulation-resilient testing for group homomorphism, a fundamental property of functions between algebraic structures. Given finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , and a function $f : G \rightarrow H$, the goal is to determine whether f is a *homomorphism*—i.e., satisfies $f(x_1 + x_2) = f(x_1) \oplus f(x_2)$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in G$ —or is ε -far from every homomorphism.¹ The tester accesses the input function f by querying its values $f(x)$ on elements x of the group, but must contend with an *online adversary* that knows all queries made by the tester and can manipulate the data over time. Two types of manipulation are considered: an *erasure*, where $f(x)$ is replaced by a special symbol \perp , and a *corruption*, where $f(x)$ is replaced by an arbitrary element of H . The rate of manipulations is controlled by a parameter t . Two types of adversaries have been studied: *fixed rate*, which can manipulate t values after every query is answered [KRV23], and *budget-managing*, which accumulates a budget of t manipulations per query and may deploy them later at any point in the computation [BKMR24].

Linearity and low-degree testing are well understood in the online adversarial model. Linearity and quadraticity were among the first properties studied in this setting, with [KRV23] proving a query lower bound of $\Omega(\log t)$ for testing linearity of functions $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$. The linearity tester of [KRV23] was improved by Ben-Eliezer, Kelman, Meir and Raskhodnikova [BKMR24], who achieved the optimal query complexity of $O(1/\varepsilon + \log t)$, and further refined by Arora, Kelman, and Meir [AKM25] to handle the full range of the parameter t . For testing whether a function $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ has degree at most d , [BKMR24] showed a lower bound of $\Omega(\log^d t)$ on query complexity, whereas the elegant tester of Minzer and Zheng [MZ24] works for functions $f : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ and makes $\log^{O(d)} t/\varepsilon$ queries where q is a prime power. While both lower bounds [KRV23, BKMR24] apply to the weakest model of online adversary (fixed-rate with erasures), the final algorithms of [BKMR24, AKM25, MZ24] are resilient even in the strongest online adversary model considered (budget-managing with corruptions).

These developments raise a natural question: Can one design testers resilient to online manipulations for the other natural generalization of linearity—namely, group homomorphism?² We answer this question

¹As noted in the Encyclopedia of Algorithms [RR16], the set of all homomorphisms from G to H can be viewed as an error-correcting code, known as the *homomorphism code*. In the specific setting where $G = \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $H = \mathbb{F}_2$, this corresponds to the well-known Hadamard code. From this perspective, the task of homomorphism testing is equivalent to testing whether a given word is a codeword in the corresponding code.

²It is important to note that the existence of an efficient tester for a property \mathcal{P} in the standard property testing model does not guarantee that \mathcal{P} is testable with online adversary. For instance, [KRV23] show that *sortedness* of integer sequences—despite having many efficient testers in the standard model [EKK⁺00, DGL⁺99, Ras99, BGJ⁺12, CS13, Ras16, Bel18], cannot be tested at all even with one online erasure per query (no matter how many queries the tester makes).

affirmatively by designing testers that are resilient to the strongest type of online adversary in our framework—budget-managing with corruptions. Our main result is that homomorphism of functions $f : G \rightarrow H$ can be tested with $O(1/\varepsilon + \log t)$ queries in the presence of t -online corruption adversary for all groups G and H . This bound is optimal: even without manipulations, $\Omega(1/\varepsilon)$ queries are required, and the $\Omega(\log t)$ lower bound of [KRV23] holds for the special case $G = \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $H = \mathbb{F}_2$.

Since the lower bound applies to specific groups G and H , a natural next question is whether some groups admit better testers. We obtain improved group-specific query bounds for many important families of groups. In particular, we design an online-manipulation-resilient homomorphism tester that makes $O(1/\varepsilon + E(G))$ queries, where $E(G)$ is the expected number of samples needed to generate G . This tester is optimal, for instance, when G is a cyclic, symmetric, alternating, or simple group. For vector spaces over finite fields of prime order, we obtain nearly tight bounds: when $G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $H = \mathbb{F}_p^r$, homomorphism can be tested with $O(1/\varepsilon + \log_p t)$ queries, and we prove a matching $\Omega(\log_p t)$ lower bound for the case $r = 1$; when $H = \mathbb{F}_q^r$ where $q \neq p$, testing reduces to checking whether f is identically zero.

Our results demonstrate that group homomorphism—a fundamental algebraic property—admits efficient and manipulation-resilient testers across the board: we give a general optimal tester for all finite groups and complement it with sharper bounds for prominent families of domains and codomains.

1.1 Our results

Our main result is an *optimal* online-manipulations-resilient homomorphism tester of $f : G \rightarrow H$ for all groups G and H . As all our testers, it works in the strongest online adversary model considered: budget-managing with corruptions.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a constant $c \geq 0$ such that for all finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $t \leq c \cdot \min\{\varepsilon^2, 1/\log^2 |G|\} \cdot |G|$, there exists an ε -tester for group homomorphism of functions of the form $f : G \rightarrow H$ that works in the presence of every t -online erasure (or corruption) budget-managing adversary and makes $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log_2 t)$ queries. For erasures, the tester has 1-sided error.*

Our result recovers the celebrated $O(1/\varepsilon)$ bound by [BLR93, BCLR08] for testing homomorphism in the standard property testing model, albeit with a different tester. Our tester, which we call **Random Signs Test**, can be viewed as *lifting* the linearity testers developed by [KRV23, BKMR24, AKM25] for functions $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ to work for general groups G and H . As noted by [KRV23], the original [BLR93] tester breaks in the online manipulations model, and as we explain in Section 1.2, the known online-manipulation-resilient testers for the case $G = \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $H = \mathbb{F}_2$ are not sound for general groups. Let $(G, +)$ be the domain group and (H, \oplus) be the codomain group. For the case without manipulations, our tester picks k points (for any even k) x_1, \dots, x_k from the domain group G and k signs $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ from $\{+, -\}^k$ uniformly and independently at random. Then it obtains an element $a = \sigma_1 x_1 + \dots + \sigma_k x_k$, where $\sigma_i x_i$ denotes x_i when $\sigma_i = +$ and the inverse of x_i (in G) when $\sigma_i = -$. Finally, it queries f on x_1, \dots, x_k , and a , and tests whether the homomorphism condition is satisfied for these elements, that is, whether $f(a) = \sigma_1 f(x_1) \oplus \dots \oplus \sigma_k f(x_k)$, where $\sigma_i = -$ denotes the inverse in the group H . The manipulation-resilient version of the tester first samples a reserve of elements of G and then runs **Random Signs Test** with carefully selected k and elements x_1, \dots, x_k from the reserve. We provide a technical overview of the tester and its analysis in Section 1.2. Section 3 presents and analyzes **Random Signs Test**, and Section 5—a manipulation-resilient version of **Random Signs Test**.

1.1.1 Group-specific homomorphism testing

Our first group-specific result, Theorem 1.3, gives a homomorphism tester with complexity expressed in terms of the parameter $E(G)$, defined next.

Definition 1.2 ([Pom02]). For all finite groups $(G, +)$, let $E(G)$ be the expected number of independent and uniform samples from G needed to obtain a set that generates G .

This group specific tester has an additional advantage of being *sample-based*, i.e., querying only independent and uniform elements of G . Its guarantees are summarized in [Theorem 1.3](#), which is proved in [Section 6.1](#).

Theorem 1.3 (Group-specific sample-based tester). *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $t \leq c \cdot \min \{\varepsilon^2, 1/E(G)^2\} \cdot |G|$, there exists a sample-based ε -tester for group homomorphism of functions of the form $f : G \rightarrow H$ that works in the presence of every t -online erasure (or corruption) budget-managing adversary and makes $O(1/\varepsilon + E(G))$ queries. For erasures, the tester has 1-sided error.*

In the model without manipulations, Goldreich and Ron [\[GR16\]](#) gave a sample-based homomorphism tester with $O(1/\varepsilon + \log |G|)$ queries and showed this bound is tight for some groups G and H (in particular, $G = \mathbb{F}_2^n$, $H = \mathbb{F}_2$). The query bound in [Theorem 1.3](#) improves on the bound in [\[GR16\]](#) for many natural groups and is tight when $E(G)$ is constant—e.g., for cyclic groups of prime order \mathbb{Z}_p , symmetric groups S_n and alternating groups A_n [\[Dix69\]](#), and, more generally, finite simple groups [\[LS95\]](#). This gives us the following corollary.

Corollary 1.4 (Homomorphism tester for simple groups). *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , where G is a finite simple group, all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and all $t \leq c \cdot \varepsilon^2 |G|$, there exists a sample-based ε -tester for group homomorphism of functions of the form $f : G \rightarrow H$ that works in the presence of a t -online-erasure adversary and makes $\Theta(1/\varepsilon)$ queries.*

To improve the bound in [\[GR16\]](#) and prove [Theorem 1.3](#), we analyze the subgroup generated by the sample S , rather than only partial sums that can be obtained from S , obtaining better group-specific bounds on the number of samples needed to properly learn the input homomorphism. Our analysis relies on work in group theory [\[Dix69, LS95, Pom02, Lub02, Luc16, Men13\]](#) that relates $E(G)$ from [Definition 1.2](#) to the size of the smallest set generating G and other structural parameters of the group.

Bounds for prime fields. Finally, we consider groups of the form $G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $H = \mathbb{F}_q^r$, where p and q are primes and $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$. Our next result shows that if $p = q$, the query complexity is below the general bound of $O(1/\varepsilon + \log_2 t)$ from [Theorem 1.1](#).

Theorem 1.5. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all primes p , all $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$, all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $t \leq c \cdot \min \{\varepsilon^2, 1/n^2\} p^n$, there exists an ε -tester for homomorphism of functions of the form $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^r$ that works in the presence of every t -online erasure (or corruption) budget-managing adversary and makes $O(1/\varepsilon + \log_p t)$ queries. For erasures, the tester has 1-sided error.*

Next we show that, when the range is \mathbb{F}_p (that is, $r = 1$), the bound in [Theorem 1.5](#) is tight.

Theorem 1.6. *For all primes p , there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq n_0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{p-1}{2p}]$, every t -online erasure-resilient ε -tester for homomorphism of functions of the form $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ must make $\Omega(\log_p t)$ queries.*

We prove [Theorems 1.5](#) and [1.6](#) in [Section 6.2](#). Finally, we observe that the case when $p \neq q$ is easy.

Remark 1.7. *For all finite groups G and H such that the zero map is the only homomorphism from G to H (e.g., when $G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $H = \mathbb{F}_q^r$, where p and q are distinct primes and $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$), testing if a function $f : G \rightarrow H$ is a homomorphism is equivalent to testing if f is identically zero and can be done with $\Theta(1/\varepsilon)$ queries, even in the presence of a t -online manipulation budget-managing adversary.*

1.1.2 A generic framework for resiliency

Resiliency to online manipulations calls for testers that query f on elements of G which cannot be easily predicted ahead and tempered with. This desirable trait of *unpredictability* interferes with the

tester’s ability to query the most useful (but potentially predictable) elements, which results in the need for more queries overall. The tension between the number of queries and how unpredictable they are could be seen as an interpolation between two well-known extremes: query-based testers (in the vanilla testing model), and sample-based testers where each sample is a pair $(x, f(x))$ for a uniformly random $x \in G$, independent of other samples. Goldreich and Ron [GR16] defined a related notion: a tester is α -fair if the marginal distribution of each query is α -flat, that is, the probability of any element in G to be queried is at most α at any given query.³ They showed that if a property has an α -fair ε -tester that makes q queries with $\alpha = \frac{1}{\Theta(|G|)}$ and constant ε then it also has a sample-based tester (in a sense, a “completely fair” tester) with $|G|^{1-\frac{1}{q}}$ samples. While this result is an intriguing instance of a trade-off between number of queries and how predictable they are, the notion of fairness seems to be ill-suited for resilience to online manipulations. Indeed, the 3 queries in the [BLR93] test each have a marginal distribution that is uniformly random over the domain, which makes it fully fair, yet as noted by [KRV23] it is susceptible to online manipulations as the third query is completely fixed *given the previous two*.

The key to our general framework to prove resiliency is a new notion of unpredictability of a tester (Definition 4.2). Roughly speaking, we say that a tester is (q, α, β) -unpredictable if, other than low probability β , all q queries combined are sufficiently unpredictable. More precisely, we require that for all $i \in [q]$, the i^{th} query is α_i -flat with probability at least $1 - \beta_i$, where $\alpha = \sum_{i \in [q]} \alpha_i$ and $\beta = \sum_{i \in [q]} \beta_i$. The sequential and conditional nature is reminiscent of the well-known Santha-Vazirani sources that proved immensely useful in the literature on extractors [SV86].

We show this notion is well-suited to show resilience to the online manipulation model: no matter which manipulations were made in the past, an unpredictable tester is highly likely to *never* query a manipulated entry. To be precise, a (q, α, β) -unpredictable tester has probability of at most $\alpha T + \beta$ of seeing a manipulation, where T is the total amount of manipulated entries by the end of the execution. To establish our results, we separately prove the soundness and the unpredictability of a core tester, which we then repeat to amplify the success probability to a constant. We also address some nuances of amplification in the online manipulation model (e.g., later iterations are less reliable due to manipulations) and give an amplification lemma that helps sorting out the choice of certain parameters (the “size” of the core algorithm, and the number of repetitions made).

1.2 Technical overview of the tester for general groups

The starting point for the classical homomorphism testers, as well as for manipulation-resilient linearity testers, is a basic test (which can also be described as a local characterization of a property). All basic tests we discuss have perfect completeness, i.e., they always accept every homomorphism. For the standard model, if the basic test has good soundness, it can be repeated to obtain the desired tester. For the online adversarial model, the basic test, in addition to soundness, has to be sufficiently unpredictable in order to evade interference by the adversary. Then (as in [KRV23]) the tester can build a *reservoir* by querying uniformly random elements and then use the final query to simulate the basic test on a random subset of the reservoir. Our main technical contribution is the design and analysis of a new basic test. While its full analysis with the reservoir requires additional ideas, we focus here on why a natural extension of the manipulation-resilient linearity test fails for our setting, how our test is constructed, and key insights behind its correctness.

The $(k+1)$ -point linearity test of [KRV23] queries the input function f on k independent and uniformly random elements x_1, \dots, x_k and their sum $x_{k+1} := \sum_{i \in [k]} x_i$ and checks whether $\sum_{i \in [k]} f(x_i)$ equals $f(\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i)$. Let $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) be finite groups and $f : G \rightarrow H$ be a function. A natural extension

³To be precise, the parameter α is used a bit differently in [GR16], where an α -fair tester queries any element with probability at most $1/(\alpha n)$ with n being the size of the domain. The two notions are equivalent by taking $\alpha' = 1/(\alpha n)$.

of the [KRV23] test to the homomorphism property is to check whether⁴

$$f(x_1) \oplus f(x_2) \oplus \cdots \oplus f(x_k) \stackrel{?}{=} f(x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_k). \quad (1)$$

If f is a homomorphism, then (1) holds for all tuples (x_1, \dots, x_k) , but the converse is false: for $G = H = \mathbb{Z}_{k-1}$ (the additive cyclic group over $k-1$ elements) and any homomorphism $h : G \rightarrow H$, the shifted homomorphism function $f(x) = h(x) \oplus s$ with shift $s \in H$ also satisfies (1) for all tuples.⁵

To resolve this issue, our homomorphism tester uses a more robust local characterization.

Before introducing our tester, we discuss our desired soundness guarantee and sketch a simple argument showing that many NO instances are rejected by the $(k+1)$ -point test with sufficient probability. (In the example above, we saw that this tester fails on functions that are really far from any homomorphism, but it turns out it works well for functions which are closer to a homomorphism). Let h_f be a closest homomorphism to f and ε_f be the distance from f to h_f . Define $\Delta_f := \{x \in G : f(x) \neq h_f(x)\}$ (so that $|\Delta_f| = \varepsilon_f \cdot |G|$). Since (1) holds for h_f with all tuples (x_1, \dots, x_k) , one could analyze how often it holds for f by comparing f and h_f on each tuple. The following “wishful thinking” argument is an easy assertion when ε_f is small enough, and was used before, e.g., for optimal analysis of low-degree testing over \mathbb{F}_2 [BKS⁺10].

Simple case: $\varepsilon_f < \frac{1}{2k}$. We view each point x_i (including the sum x_{k+1}) as a random variable, and ask whether $x_i \in \Delta_f$. Marginally, each x_i is distributed uniformly over G and so this occurs with probability ε_f for all $i \in [k+1]$. Intuitively, the points are “independent enough” so when $\varepsilon_f < \frac{1}{2k}$, w.h.p. at most one of them falls in Δ_f , and if exactly one point does - then the tester rejects f (by cancellation rule on the group H). Formally, when $\varepsilon_f < \frac{1}{2k}$ the probability of exactly one x_i falling in Δ_f can be lower bounded by $k\varepsilon_f/2$ using the premise and pairwise independence of the points and inclusion-exclusion (Bonferroni inequality of order 2), as was done, e.g., in [BKS⁺10, BKMR24] to analyze low-degree tests of polynomials over fields. Note that by a union bound, the rejection probability is at most $k\varepsilon_f$ so the analysis above is optimal (up to a factor of 2) for inputs with small distance ε_f .

However, larger values of ε_f lead to more than a single point in Δ_f for a typical tuple, and the guaranteed pairwise independence is no longer enough. Luckily, the $k+1$ points used in (1) are in fact k -wise independent, which is a stronger guarantee for $k > 2$, and we leverage this fact.

The elementary argument. Let p_m denote the probability that m independent and uniformly random elements $z_1, \dots, z_m \in G$ satisfy $\bigoplus_{i \in [m]} f(z_i) = \bigoplus_{i \in [m]} h_f(z_i)$, and let $\gamma_m = 1 - p_m$ be the probability of an inequality. By definition, $\gamma_1 = \varepsilon_f$. We utilize the k -wise independence by splitting the last point, x_{k+1} , from the rest and comparing the RHS and LHS of (1) with f to those with h_f where the equality holds. In particular, the event that the RHS of f and h_f agree but the LHS are different, leads to rejection on f . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} f(x_i) \neq f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i\right) \right] \\ & \geq \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} h_f(x_i) \wedge f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i\right) = h_f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i\right) \right] \\ & \geq \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} h_f(x_i) \right] - \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i\right) \neq h_f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i\right) \right] \\ & = \gamma_k - \gamma_1, \end{aligned}$$

⁴From now on, we use compact notation to represent our sums: e.g., (1) can also be written as $\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} f(x_i) = f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i\right)$. In non-Abelian groups, the order matters. The terms in the sums are ordered according to the index: in increasing index order for $\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i$ or $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k y_i$, and in decreasing index order for $\sum_{i=k}^1 x_i$.

⁵A similar phenomenon occurs for functions $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$: the k -point tester with even k works for linearity, but odd k produces a test for *affinity* instead.

where the second inequality uses $\Pr[A \wedge B] \geq \Pr[A] - \Pr[\bar{B}]$ for two events A, B (where \bar{B} is the complement of B). The equality is since (x_1, \dots, x_k) are i.i.d. samples taken uniformly at random from G .

From here on, the goal is to lower bound γ_k . To showcase the argument we restrict ourselves to $H = \mathbb{F}_2$ (which in particular captures linearity over \mathbb{F}_2), and discuss the extension later. Here, $f(x) - h_f(x) = 1$ if $x \in \Delta_f$, and otherwise $f(x) = h_f(x)$. That is, γ_k is the probability that there is an odd number of indices $i \in [k]$ for which $x_i \in \Delta_f$. Since these points are independent and each has probability ε_f to fall inside Δ_f , this equals to the probability of a binomial random variable $Z \sim \text{Bin}(k, \varepsilon_f)$ being odd, which is known to equal $\frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_f)^k}{2}$ (see [Fact A.2](#)). This expression has a known lower bound of $\Omega(\min\{k\varepsilon_f, 1\})$, which absorbs the subtraction of $\gamma_1 = \varepsilon_f$ for any $\varepsilon_f \leq 1/8$ and completes the proof.⁶

To generalize this argument, note that $H = \mathbb{F}_2$ is essentially the worst-case scenario, as “coincidental cancellations” are most probable when $f(x) - h_f(x) \in \{0, 1\}$. In [Section 3.1](#) we prove the claim for our modified tester, described shortly, and any codomain H , by analyzing an inductive recurrence directly on p_m (rather than $\gamma_m = 1 - p_m$).

The random signs test. We make the local characterization more robust by adding *signs*. That is, we rely on the inverse operation that is guaranteed in every group, and use $-x$ to express addition of the inverse of x , for both groups G and H . Since every homomorphism satisfies $f(-x) = -f(x)$ for all $x \in G$, it respects not only summations of elements but signed summations as well. The corresponding tester is this: given a function $f : G \rightarrow H$, choose uniformly at random (and independently) a tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_k, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$ consisting of k elements $x_1, \dots, x_k \in G$, and k signs $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k \in \{+, -\}$. Finally, check whether

$$\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \stackrel{?}{=} f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i\right). \quad (2)$$

As before, if f is a homomorphism, all tuples satisfy equation (2). The difference is that now, when k is even, the converse holds as well.⁷ To analyze the soundness of Random Signs Test, we consider two cases. For $\varepsilon_f < 1/8$, the elementary argument ([lemma 3.2](#)) suffices. To prove this tester rejects functions with $\varepsilon_f \geq 1/8$ (unlike the unmodified k -point tester), we show the contrapositive via a corrector argument based on that of [\[BCLR08\]](#).

In the corrector method, a corrector function $g(x)$ is defined as the value satisfying the most instances of equation (2), where each instance corresponds to a signed tuples for which $\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i = x$. Differently put, each tuple of elements and signs that sum to x “votes” for a value it wishes $f(x)$ to be — then $g(x)$ is defined as the plurality of these votes. To prove soundness, one shows that if the test rejects f with probability $\mu \leq 1/10$, then two key assertions follow: (a) f is 2μ -close to g ; (b) g is a homomorphism. The two assertions are proved in [Lemma 3.12](#) and [Lemma 3.13](#) respectively, with the latter employing the probabilistic method. Both rely on an auxiliary step, [Lemma 3.11](#), which shows that the choice of $g(a)$ as a plurality of votes, is in fact a strong majority of at least $1 - 2\mu$ of the votes, for every input $a \in G$.

We focus here on the proof of this step, which demonstrates the techniques of the full argument, and the role of random signs. The proof analyzes the collision probability — the probability that two signed tuples $(\sigma, x), (\tau, y)$ that sum to a vote for the same value for $f(a)$. By re-arranging, we get

$$\underbrace{\bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)}_{S_{\sigma, x}} = \underbrace{\bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \tau_i f(y_i)}_{S_{\tau, y}} \iff \underbrace{\bigoplus_{i=0}^{k-1} -\tau_{k-i} f(y_{k-i}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)}_{S_1} = \underbrace{\bigoplus_{i=k+1}^{2k} \tau_i f(y_i) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=0}^{k-1} -\sigma_{2k-i} f(x_{2k-i})}_{S_2}.$$

⁶We use a precise version $\frac{1 - (1 - \varepsilon_f)^k}{2} = \Omega(\min\{k\varepsilon_f, 1\})$ with particular constant, by applying [\[BKMR24, Lemma 3.1\]](#).

⁷Indeed, if f always satisfies equation (2), then given $x_1, x_2 \in G$ we use the tuple with elements x_1, x_2 and $x_j = 0$ for $j \geq 3$, and signs $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = +$, and σ_j for $j \geq 3$ alternates between addition and subtraction. The $k - 2$ alterations of $+0, -0$ cancel out on the RHS, and similarly the alterations of $+f(0) - f(0)$ cancel out on the LHS (even if $f(0) \neq 0_H$), which asserts that $f(x_1) + f(x_2) = f(x_1 + x_2)$. This holds for any $x_1, x_2 \in G$, showing that f is a homomorphism.

Crucially, the tuples underlying the sums S_1, S_2 are each a mix from (σ, x) and (τ, y) and we show that both have the distribution of the random sign test, but they sum (in G) to the same element, a' . Therefore

$$\Pr[S_{\sigma,x} \neq S_{\tau,y}] = \Pr[S_1 \neq S_2] \leq \Pr[S_1 \neq f(a') \vee S_2 \neq f(a')] \leq \Pr[S_1 \neq f(a')] + \Pr[S_2 \neq f(a')] = 2\mu.$$

The necessity of random signs in the technique is apparent: without them, the sums $S_{\sigma,x}, S_{\tau,y}, S_1, S_2$ correspond to tuples with different sign vector, failing to relate the probability of this event to μ (the rejection probability of the test). By adding random signs, each element has a symmetric role in the test, which leaves the connection between test and equation even after one rearranges the elements, which is a delicate matter especially in non-abelian groups. Similar issues arise for odd k , as there is no way to split the two summations “down the middle”. Both technical requirements appear to be tight: we have seen a choice for G, H where fixed signs (say, all are $+$) fail to characterize homomorphisms. Yet for $G = \mathbb{F}_2^n, H = \mathbb{F}_2$ the signs have no meaning ($x = -x$ always), and our test coincides the simple k -point test, which requires an even value of k to test linearity (otherwise, it tests affinity).

1.3 Related work

Injecting more randomness vs. derandomization. Interestingly, while a significant amount of work [Tre98, ST00, HW03, BSVW03, SW06] went into reducing the number of random bits used by homomorphism tests, the online manipulation model presents a contrasting goal: increasing randomness to make future queries less predictable to the adversary. Indeed, Kelman, Linder and Raskhodnikova [KLR25] show that for certain properties, testing in the online model requires exponentially more random bits than in the offline setting (even with erasures), despite comparable query complexity. This increased randomness requirement motivates the design of testers that are more *sample-based*, i.e., use uniformly random labeled samples in place of some arbitrary (potentially adaptive) queries. This trend aligns with learning-theoretic settings, where labeled samples are typically modeled as less costly than arbitrary queries.

Low-error regime. Different versions of k -point testers recently appear in the context of testing in the 1% regime, in the classic model (with no online manipulations). A recent work by Khot and Mittal [KM25] gives testing results for linearity over the *biased* hypercube. A work concurrent to ours by Mittal and Roy [MR25] presents a general framework for homomorphism testing in the 1% regime, and apply it to various choices of G, H . Specifically for the case of vector spaces over prime fields, [MR25] show a k -point test with random coefficients, identical to the test we devise specifically for such choice of G, H (Algorithm 7). Curiously, the exact same algorithm is well-suited for both tasks (1% regime in the classic model, and 99% in the online manipulations model).

The k -point testers of both work do not choose their points uniformly at random, but rather according to “importance”. The former according to the weight of each point in the biased hypercube, and the latter chooses a k -tuple from G according to a newly defined measure of its “importance” in the structure of the group (which roughly speaking comes from the order of the elements in the group G). This sophisticated choice of k -tuples makes it unclear whether such strategies are resilient to online manipulations, as an adversary is prone to manipulate the important data points the test is likely to use.

1.4 Open questions

Our main results are in a sense orthogonal: Theorem 1.1 applies to all finite groups G and H , regardless of their structure, precisely quantifying the dependence on t . In contrast, Theorem 1.3 shows that $E(G)$ samples, rather than $\log |G|$ samples, suffice to generate the entire domain group G , and successfully apply the learn-and-test approach. Combining both aspects should yield stronger results in the online manipulation model, as in the case of finite fields (Theorem 1.5). More results of this flavor

would be interesting, focusing on the following question: given a group G and $t \in \mathbb{N}$, how many random samples from G are required to generate w.h.p. a subgroup $G' \subseteq G$ of size $|G'|$ that exceeds t ?

A different avenue is utilizing the structure of H and its *compatibility* to G , both for upper and lower bounds. As mentioned in [Remark 1.7](#), H could reduce the complexity dramatically when it is incompatible with G . Is it possible to define a measure of compatibility that dictates the complexity of testing homomorphism from G to H ? For lower bounds, could we find for each G a group H so that [Theorem 1.3](#) is tight? One candidate would be $H = \text{Aut}(G)$, the group of automorphisms from G to G .

Organization. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We begin in [Section 2](#) with formal definitions of the problem and the online manipulation model. In [Section 3](#), we introduce our core technical contribution, the Random Signs Test ([Algorithm 1](#)), and analyze its soundness in the standard (non-adversarial) model. In [Section 4](#), we present the general framework for achieving online manipulation resilience, defining ‘unpredictable testers’ and proving our generic amplification lemma ([Lemma 4.4](#)). We then apply this framework in [Section 5](#) to prove our main optimal bound for general groups ([Theorem 1.1](#)). Finally, [Section 6](#) is dedicated to our group-specific results, where we prove the bounds for sample-based testers ([Theorem 1.3](#)) and for functions over prime fields ([Theorem 1.5](#) and [Theorem 1.6](#)).

2 Preliminaries

For two groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , the function $h : G \rightarrow H$ is a group *homomorphism* if $h(x_1 + x_2) = h(x_1) \oplus h(x_2)$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in G$. In non-Abelian groups, the order matters. The terms in the sums are ordered according to the index: in increasing index order for $\sum_{i \in [k]} x_i$ or $\bigoplus_{i=1}^k y_i$, and in decreasing index order for $\sum_{i=k}^1 x_i$. The set of all group homomorphisms from G to H is denoted $\text{HOM}(G, H)$. The (relative) Hamming *distance* between two functions $f, g : G \rightarrow H$ is $\text{dist}(f, g) := \Pr_{x \in G}[f(x) \neq g(x)]$. The *distance from $f : G \rightarrow H$ to a property* (i.e., a set) \mathcal{P} of functions of the same form is $\text{dist}(f, \mathcal{P}) := \inf_{g \in \mathcal{P}} \text{dist}(f, g)$. For every function $f : G \rightarrow H$, let $\varepsilon_f := \text{dist}(f, \text{HOM}(G, H))$. A function f is ε -close to a homomorphism if $\varepsilon_f \leq \varepsilon$ and is ε -far from a homomorphism otherwise.

Definition 2.1 (Online ε -tester [[KRV23](#), [BKMR24](#)]). Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. An online ε -tester \mathcal{T} for a property \mathcal{P} that works in the presence of a specified adversary (e.g., t -online erasure budget-managing) is given access to an input function f via oracle access to a related function f' that is initially equal to f and, after each query answered, may be modified by the adversary. For all adversarial strategies of the specified type,

1. if $f \in \mathcal{P}$, then \mathcal{T} accepts with probability at least $2/3$, and
2. if f is ε -far from \mathcal{P} , then \mathcal{T} rejects with probability at least $2/3$,

where the probability is over the internal randomness of \mathcal{T} . If \mathcal{T} works in the presence of an erasure (resp., corruption) adversary, we refer to it as an online-erasure-resilient (resp., online-corruption-resilient) tester. If \mathcal{T} always accepts every function $f \in \mathcal{P}$, then \mathcal{T} has *1-sided error*. If all queries of \mathcal{T} are chosen uniformly and independently from the domain of f , then \mathcal{T} is *sample-based*.

3 Random Signs Test

In this section, we present our Random Signs Test ([Algorithm 1](#)) for testing group homomorphism. This test always accepts functions that are homomorphisms because it only rejects if a violation of the homomorphism property is found. We analyze the soundness of the test in [Theorem 3.1](#).

Algorithm 1 Random Signs Test_k

Parameters: $k \in \mathbb{N}$

Input: Query access to a function $f : G \rightarrow H$ where $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) are finite groups.

- 1: Draw k independent and uniformly random elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k from G .
 - 2: Draw k independent and uniformly random signs $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ from $\{+, -\}$.
 - 3: Query $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_k)$ and $f(a)$, where $a \leftarrow \sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i$. $\triangleright +b = b$ and $-b$ is the inverse of b
 - 4: **Accept** if $\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) = f(a)$; otherwise, **reject**. \triangleright for both $b \in G$ and $b \in H$.
-

Theorem 3.1. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , and functions $f : G \rightarrow H$ such that f is ε -far from being a homomorphism,

$$\Pr[\text{Random Signs Test}_{2k} \text{ rejects}] \geq \min \left\{ \frac{(2k-3) \cdot \varepsilon}{3}, \frac{1}{16} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Recall that ε_f denotes the (relative) distance from f to $\text{HOM}(G, H)$. We analyze the soundness of Random Signs Test for small ε_f in Section 3.1 and for large ε_f in Section 3.2. We put these two results together and complete the proof of Theorem 3.1 in Section 3.3.

3.1 Soundness analysis for small ε_f

In this section, we state and prove Lemma 3.2, establishing the soundness of Algorithm 1 for $\varepsilon_f < \frac{1}{8}$.

Lemma 3.2. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , and functions $f : G \rightarrow H$ with $\varepsilon_f < \frac{1}{8}$,

$$\Pr[\text{Random Signs Test}_k \text{ rejects}] \geq \min \left\{ \frac{(k-3) \cdot \varepsilon_f}{3}, \frac{1}{6} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

To prove Lemma 3.2, we introduce Fixed Test_k (Algorithm 2) which uses a fixed sequence of k signs $\bar{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k)$, in contrast to the uniform and independent signs from $+, -$ used in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 2 Fixed Test_k($\bar{\sigma}$)

Parameters: $k \in \mathbb{N}$, sign sequence $\bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^k$

Input: Query access to a function $f : G \rightarrow H$ where $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) are finite groups.

- 1: Draw k independent and uniformly random elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k from G .
 - 2: Query $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_k)$ and $f(a)$, where $a \leftarrow \sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i$.
 - 3: **Accept** if $\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) = f(a)$; otherwise, **reject**.
-

Note that Algorithm 2 with $\bar{\sigma}$ set to $+^k$ recovers the tester of [KRV23].

Lemma 3.3. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, all sign sequences $\bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^k$, finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , and functions $f : G \rightarrow H$ with $\varepsilon_f < \frac{1}{8}$,

$$\Pr[\text{Fixed Test}_k(\bar{\sigma}) \text{ rejects}] \geq \min \left\{ \frac{(k-3) \cdot \varepsilon_f}{3}, \frac{1}{6} \right\}. \quad (5)$$

We prove Lemma 3.3 after showing that it implies Lemma 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.2 assuming Lemma 3.3. Random Signs Test_k (Algorithm 1) chooses the signs $\bar{\sigma}$ independently and uniformly at random from $\{+, -\}^k$. Thus, the rejection probability of Random Signs Test_k is the expected rejection probability of Fixed Test_k($\bar{\sigma}$) for uniformly random $\bar{\sigma}$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Fix a sign sequence $\bar{\sigma}$ in $\{+, -\}^k$. Let $g : G \rightarrow H$ be a closest homomorphism to f , i.e., $\Pr_{x \in G} [f(x) \neq g(x)] = \varepsilon_f$. Then **Fixed Test_k**($\bar{\sigma}$) always accepts g , since for all $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \in G$,

$$\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) = g\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i\right). \quad (6)$$

The core of the analysis is to compare **Algorithm 2** behaves on f and g for each sample. One way **Algorithm 2** can reject f is by selecting x_1, \dots, x_k such that the right-hand side (RHS) of (6) remains unchanged when replacing g with f , but the left-hand side (LHS) does not. Therefore,

$$\Pr[\text{Fixed Test}_k(\bar{\sigma}) \text{ rejects}] \geq \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \wedge f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i\right) = g\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i\right) \right]. \quad (7)$$

We consider the probabilities of the complements of the two events—on the LHS and the RHS of (7)—obtaining the complement of the event on the RHS by applying the De Morgan's law:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\text{Fixed Test}_k(\bar{\sigma}) \text{ accepts}] &\leq \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) = \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \vee f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i\right) \neq g\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i\right) \right] \\ &\leq \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) = \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \right] + \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[f\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i\right) \neq g\left(\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i\right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where (8) holds by a union bound. The second term of (8) is exactly ε_f , as $\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i$ is a uniformly random element from G , as shown in **Claim A.1**. Let p_k denote the first term of (8) where the subscript k indicates the number of elements the probability is taken over.

We next use induction on k to prove the following: Let $k_0 = \lfloor 1/\varepsilon_f \rfloor$, then

$$p_k \leq \begin{cases} 1 - k\varepsilon_f/e & \text{for } k \in [k_0]; \\ \max\{p_{k_0}, 1/2 + \varepsilon_f\} & \text{for } k > k_0. \end{cases}$$

Claim 3.4 (Base Case). *For all $k \leq 1/\varepsilon_f$, we have $p_k \leq 1 - k\varepsilon_f/e$.*

Proof. We analyze the probability of the complement:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - p_k &= \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \right] \\ &\geq \Pr[\sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \sigma_i g(x_i) \text{ for exactly one } i \in [k]] = k\varepsilon_f(1 - \varepsilon_f)^{k-1} \geq \frac{k\varepsilon_f}{e}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality holds because $\sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \sigma_i g(x_i)$ iff $f(x_i) \neq g(x_i)$ and the last inequality holds since $(1 - \varepsilon_f)^{k-1} \geq (1 - \varepsilon_f)^{1/\varepsilon_f - 1}$ for $k \leq 1/\varepsilon_f$ and $(1 - \varepsilon_f)^{1/\varepsilon_f - 1} \geq 1/e$ for $\varepsilon_f \in (0, 1]$. \square

Claim 3.5 (Inductive Step). *For all $k > 1$, we have $p_k \leq \max\{p_{k-1}, 1/2 + \varepsilon_f\}$.*

Proof. We represent the event that defines p_k as a union of two disjoint events:

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &= \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) = \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \right] \\ &= \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i f(x_i) = \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \wedge \sigma_k f(x_k) = \sigma_k g(x_k) \right] \\ &\quad + \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \wedge \sigma_k f(x_k) = \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} (-\sigma_{k-i} f(x_{k-i})) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first summand is $p_{k-1}(1 - \varepsilon_f)$ by the independence of x_i 's and the fact that $\sigma_k f(x_k) = \sigma_k g(x_k)$ iff $f(x_k) = g(x_k)$. For the second summand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_k \in G} \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \wedge \sigma_k f(x_k) = \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} (-\sigma_{k-i} f(x_{k-i})) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[\bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \right] \\ & \quad \times \Pr \left[\sigma_k f(x_k) = \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} (-\sigma_{k-i} f(x_{k-i})) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \mid \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\leq (1 - p_{k-1})\varepsilon_f, \quad (10)$$

where the inequality in (10) holds, since $\bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} \sigma_i g(x_i)$ implies $\bigoplus_{i \in [k-1]} (-\sigma_{k-i} f(x_{k-i})) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i g(x_i) \neq \sigma_k g(x_k)$, and thus (9) is at most $\Pr[\sigma_k f(x_k) \neq \sigma_k g(x_k)] = \varepsilon_f$. Combining all the above, we conclude that

$$p_k \leq p_{k-1}(1 - \varepsilon_f) + (1 - p_{k-1})\varepsilon_f = p_{k-1} + \varepsilon_f(1 - 2p_{k-1}) \leq \max\{p_{k-1}, 1/2 + \varepsilon_f\}.$$

The first bound in the last inequality holds when $p_{k-1} \geq 1/2$ and the second otherwise. \square

Note that $k_0 = \lfloor 1/\varepsilon_f \rfloor > 1/\varepsilon_f - 1$. Using Claim 3.4 we have $p_{k_0} \leq 1 - k_0\varepsilon_f/e < 1 - (1 - \varepsilon_f)/e$. If $\varepsilon_f \leq 1/8$, then $p_{k_0} \leq 0.7$. Using Claim 3.5 we have for all $k \geq k_0$, $p_k \leq \max\{p_{k_0}, 1/2 + \varepsilon_f\} \leq 0.7$ for $\varepsilon_f \leq 1/8$. We complete the proof by noting that $\Pr[\text{Fixed Test}_k(\bar{\sigma}) \text{ accepts}] \leq p_k + \varepsilon_f$ from (8). Thus, $\Pr[\text{Fixed Test}_k(\bar{\sigma}) \text{ rejects}] \geq (1 - p_k) - \varepsilon_f \geq \min\{k\varepsilon_f/e - \varepsilon_f, 0.3 - \varepsilon_f\} \geq \min\{(k-3)\varepsilon_f/3, 1/6\}$. \square

3.2 Soundness analysis for large ε_f

In this section, we show that Random Signs Test used with even k provides soundness proportional to ε_f . Specifically, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , and functions $f : G \rightarrow H$,*

$$\Pr[\text{Random Signs Test}_{2k} \text{ rejects}] \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_f}{2}, \frac{1}{10} \right\}. \quad (11)$$

Proof. Lemma 3.6 immediately follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\mu := \Pr[\text{Random Signs Test}_{2k} \text{ rejects } f]$. If $\mu < \frac{1}{10}$, then f is 2μ -close to a homomorphism.*

Before proving Lemma 3.7, we explain why it implies Lemma 3.6. By Lemma 3.7, if $\mu < 1/10$ then f is 2μ -close to some homomorphism. Since f has distance ε_f to $\text{HOM}(G, H)$, we get $2\mu \geq \varepsilon_f \implies \mu \geq \frac{\varepsilon_f}{2}$. Thus, $\mu \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_f}{2}, \frac{1}{10} \right\}$. The rest of the proof is dedicated to proving Lemma 3.7.

First observations. In the test, the distribution of the element a , as specified in Algorithm 2, Line 3, is uniform over all elements of G , since for each realization of the signs $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2k}$ and x_1, \dots, x_{2k-1} , there is a single choice of x_{2k} leading to each a . Define $\text{FIX}(a)$ to be the set of realizations for σ 's and x 's leading to a ,

$$\text{FIX}(a) := \{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2k}, x_1, \dots, x_{2k}) : \sum_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i x_i = a\}.$$

We use $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ as a short hand for $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2k}, x_1, \dots, x_{2k})$. A random tuple from $\text{FIX}(a)$ is k -wise independent in the following sense.

Claim 3.8. For all $a \in G$, all sets of indices $S \subseteq [2k]$ of size $|S| = k$, let $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ be a uniformly random tuple from $\text{FIX}(a)$. Then

1. The vector $(\sigma_i, x_i)_{i \in S}$ is a uniformly distributed vector of k signs and k elements from G .
2. The partial sum $\sum_{i \in S} \sigma_i x_i$ is a uniformly distributed element in G .

Proof. Part 1. Consider a tuple $(\sigma_i, x_i)_{i \in [2k]}$, not necessarily in $\text{FIX}(a)$, and fix a partial assignment that gives values only to $(\sigma_i, x_i)_{i \in S}$. Now choose an index $j \in [2k] \setminus S$ and let (σ_j, x_j) be chosen uniformly at random. Fill up the remaining indices, (σ_i, x_i) for $i \in [2k] \setminus (S \cup \{j\})$ with arbitrary values. Since (σ_j, x_j) is chosen uniformly at random, the sum $\sum_{i=1}^j \sigma_i x_i$ is a uniformly random element in G . Also, for any group G , the function $x \rightarrow x + g$ is a bijection from G to G for all $g \in G$ (the same holds true for $g + x, x - g, -g + x$). Thus, the rest of additions and subtractions (for $i = j + 1, \dots, 2k$) are all bijections and therefore the entire sum $\sum_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i x_i$ is also a uniformly random element of G . This means that exactly $1/|G|$ of the tuples with a particular partial assignment to $(\sigma_i, x_i)_{i \in S}$ are in fact in $\text{FIX}(a)$. The same argument applies for any partial assignment of $(\sigma_i, x_i)_{i \in S}$, so each such partial assignment produces the exact same number of tuples in $\text{FIX}(a)$.

Part 2. Consider the set F_z which consists of all assignments to $(\sigma_i, x_i)_{i \in S}$ for which $\sum_{i \in S} \sigma_i x_i = z$. Using similar arguments as in the proof of part 1, each set F_z has the same size, and the same number of ways to complete the assignment to a tuple in $\text{FIX}(a)$. Therefore, the number of tuples in $\text{FIX}(a)$ for which $\sum_{i \in S} \sigma_i x_i = z$ is the same for each z . \square

We consider tuples whose signed sums over either their left or right halves equal a fixed value. Define

$$\text{LEFT}(z) := \{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x}) : \sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i = z\}, \quad \text{RIGHT}(z) := \{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x}) : \sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_{k+i} x_{k+i} = z\}.$$

Corollary 3.9. Consider the sets $S_L = [k]$ and $S_R = [2k] \setminus [k]$. The following process produces a uniformly random tuple in $\text{FIX}(a)$:

1. Draw a uniformly random element $z \in G$.
2. Draw a uniformly random tuple $(\bar{\sigma}^L, \bar{x}^L)$ from $\text{LEFT}(a - z)$ and take its “left” part, $(\bar{\sigma}^L, \bar{x}^L)_{i \in S_L}$.
3. Draw a uniformly random tuple $(\bar{\sigma}^R, \bar{x}^R)$ from $\text{RIGHT}(z)$ and take its “right” part, $(\bar{\sigma}^R, \bar{x}^R)_{i \in S_R}$.
4. Return the tuple $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ where $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})_{i \in S_L} = (\bar{\sigma}^L, \bar{x}^L)_{i \in S_L}$ and $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})_{i \in S_R} = (\bar{\sigma}^R, \bar{x}^R)_{i \in S_R}$.

Proof. By the second part of [Claim 3.8](#), the number of tuples $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2k}, x_1, \dots, x_{2k}) \in \text{FIX}(a)$ such that their right part is in $\text{RIGHT}(z)$ (that is, $\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_{k+i} x_{k+i} = z$) is the same for each z . The same holds for the $\text{LEFT}(a - z)$. Since each tuple in $\text{FIX}(a)$ has a unique such pair $(a - z, z)$, the process gives an equal probability for each tuple in $\text{FIX}(a)$, concluding the proof. \square

Definition 3.10 (Vote of $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ for the value of a). For all $a \in G$ and $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x}) \in \text{FIX}(a)$, define $\bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)$ as the vote of $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ for the value of a .

Corrector. Define g to be the local corrector for f , that is, the value that has the most votes as defined in [Definition 3.10](#):

$$g(a) := \operatorname{argmax}_{h \in H} \left\{ \Pr_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x}) \in \text{FIX}(a)} \bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) = h \right\} \text{ for all } a \in G.$$

Define the following probabilities, all relating to how close f is to being homomorphic:

$$\eta_a := \Pr_{(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x}) \in \text{FIX}(a)} [g(a) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)] \quad \eta := \max_a \eta_a \quad \delta := \Pr_{x \in G} [f(x) \neq g(x)]$$

We follow the standard self-correction paradigm introduced by [BLR93, BCLR08], by showing that if the test fails with a small probability (e.g., $\mu < 1/10$), then: (1) η is bounded; (2) $\delta \leq 2\mu$; and (3) g is a homomorphism. The last part (3) is evidently the harder one, although similar simpler arguments are used to prove (1). Altogether, they show that if the test fails with a small probability, then f is close to being a homomorphism (and in particular, the homomorphism g). By contrapositive, this proves a soundness guarantee for the tester.

We start by formally stating and proving the first assertion.

Lemma 3.11. $\eta \leq 2\mu$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $\eta_a \leq 2\mu$ for each $a \in G$. Fix some a and consider two tuples $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x}), (\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$ chosen independently and uniformly at random from $\text{FIX}(a)$. We show that the probability of the event that the votes of $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ and $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$ for the value of a are equal is close to 1, which implies the most common vote among all tuples in $\text{FIX}(a)$ occurs with probability close to 1. To check whether they give the same vote we manipulate both summations as follows: apply from the left side $-\tau_k f(y_k) \cdots -\tau_1 f(y_1)$ to cancel out the first k summands from the tuple $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$, and similarly from the right side for the last k summands of the other tuple. We get the following equivalence:

$$\underbrace{\bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)}_{S_{\sigma, x}} = \underbrace{\bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \tau_i f(y_i)}_{S_{\tau, y}} \iff \underbrace{\bigoplus_{i=0}^{k-1} -\tau_{k-i} f(y_{k-i}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)}_{S_1} = \underbrace{\bigoplus_{i=k+1}^{2k} \tau_i f(y_i) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=0}^{k-1} -\sigma_{2k-i} f(x_{2k-i})}_{S_2}.$$

Importantly, each of the new sums S_1, S_2 contains exactly k summands respectively from $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ and $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$, but with different signs. By Claim 3.8 and independence between $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ and $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$, the tuple of $2k$ signs and $2k$ elements used in S_1 is uniformly random (and similarly for S_2). Since the original tuples are taken from $\text{FIX}(a)$,

$$\sum_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i x_i = a = \sum_{i \in [2k]} \tau_i y_i.$$

By the same reasoning as before but with x_i, y_i instead of $f(x_i), f(y_i)$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} -\tau_{k-i} y_{k-i} + \sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i = \sum_{i=k+1}^{2k} \tau_i y_i + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} -\sigma_{2k-i} x_{2k-i}.$$

Thus, the two tuples defining the sums or votes S_1, S_2 are both in $\text{FIX}(a')$, for the same uniformly random element $a' \in G$. The event $\{S_1 \neq S_2\}$ implies that at least one of the votes did not agree with $f(a')$.

$$\Pr[S_1 \neq S_2] \leq \Pr[S_1 \neq f(a') \vee S_2 \neq f(a')] \leq \Pr[S_1 \neq f(a')] + \Pr[S_2 \neq f(a')] = 2\mu,$$

where the second inequality is by a union bound, and the last equality holds since both the probabilities are equal to the probability of the check in Line 4 of Algorithm 1 holds, thus simulating our test. Indeed, $S_i \in \text{FIX}(a')$ for $i = 1, 2$, where a' is a uniformly random element of G . We denote by p_h the probability that a correction using a random tuple $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x}) \in \text{FIX}(a)$ produces $h \in H$, then:

$$2\mu \geq \Pr[S_1 \neq S_2] = \Pr[S_{\sigma, x} \neq S_{\tau, y}] = \sum_{h \in H} p_h(1 - p_h) = \sum_{h \in H} (p_h - p_h^2) = 1 - \sum_{h \in H} p_h^2.$$

By definition, $g(a) = \arg \max_{h \in H} p_h$ is the most common vote or correction outcome (ties broken arbitrarily). We have

$$1 - \eta_a = p_{g(a)} = p_{g(a)} \cdot \sum_{h \in H} p_h = \sum_{h \in H} p_h p_{g(a)} \geq \sum_{h \in H} p_h^2 \geq 1 - 2\mu,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

The next simple lemma shows the second easy assertion as a corollary of the first.

Lemma 3.12. *If $\mu < 1/10$, then $\delta \leq 2\mu$.*

Proof. For each element $a \in G$ we have high agreement for corrections, and in particular $\eta_a \leq 1/2$. Denote the set where f and g disagree by $\Delta := \{x \in G : f(x) \neq g(x)\}$, noting that $\delta = |\Delta| / |G|$. Then,

$$\mu = \Pr_{\substack{a \in G \\ (\sigma, x) \in \text{FIX}(a)}} [f(a) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)] = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{a \in G} \Pr_{(\sigma, x) \in \text{FIX}(a)} [f(a) \neq \bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)].$$

The latest expression is only reduced if we take a subset of (positive) summands, only those from $\Delta \subseteq G$. It further reduces if we replace each event of the sum differing from $f(a)$ with the subevent that it specifically equals $g(a)$ (this is indeed a subevent for any $a \in \Delta$). We get

$$\mu \geq \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{a \in \Delta} \Pr_{(\sigma, x) \in \text{FIX}(a)} [g(a) = \bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i)] = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{a \in \Delta} (1 - \eta_a) \geq \frac{1}{|G|} \cdot |\Delta| \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{\delta}{2},$$

where the last inequality uses $1 - \eta_a \geq 1/2$ for any $a \in \Delta$. This concludes the proof. \square

The last assertion uses the probabilistic method and the accuracy of corrections shown above, to prove that g is a homomorphism.

Lemma 3.13. *If $\mu < 1/10$, then g is a homomorphism.*

Proof. Given $a, b \in G$, we need to show that $g(a) \oplus g(b) = g(a + b)$. Consider the following process:

- Draw a uniformly random $r \in G$.
- Draw a uniformly random tuple $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x}) \in \text{LEFT}(a - r) \cap \text{RIGHT}(r)$.
- Let CL be the set “cancelling left” whose left side cancels exactly the right side of the previous tuple, defined as, $CL := \{(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y}) : \forall i \in [k]. (\tau_i, y_i) = (-\sigma_{2k+1-i}, x_{2k+1-i})\}$, and choose uniformly at random a tuple $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$ from $CL \cap \text{RIGHT}(r + b)$.

Applying [Corollary 3.9](#) three times, note that $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ is a uniformly random tuple in $\text{FIX}(a)$, the tuple $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$ is a uniformly random tuple in $\text{FIX}(b)$. Furthermore, we define the tuple $(\bar{\phi}, \bar{z})$ that has the left side taken from $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$ and the right side taken from $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$, that is $(\phi_i, z_i) = (\sigma_i, x_i)$ for $i \in [k]$ and $(\phi_i, z_i) = (\tau_i, y_i)$ for $i \in [2k] \setminus [k]$. Applying [Corollary 3.9](#) again, we get that $(\bar{\phi}, \bar{z})$ is a uniformly random tuple from $\text{FIX}(a + b)$. Hence, each of the following three equalities holds with probability at least $1 - \eta$:

$$g(a) = \bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) \quad g(b) = \bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \tau_i f(y_i) \quad g(a + b) = \bigoplus_{i \in [2k]} \phi_i f(z_i)$$

Next, recall we specifically chose the left side of $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{y})$ to cancel out the right side of $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{x})$. This cancellation also happens when applying the function f , since pairs of summands cancel each other from inside out. The following equality thus holds with probability 1:

$$\bigoplus_{i=k+1}^{2k} \sigma_i f(x_i) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in [k]} \tau_i f(y_i) = \sigma_{k+1} f(x_{k+1}) \oplus \cdots \oplus \sigma_{2k} f(x_{2k}) \oplus \tau_1 f(y_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus \tau_k f(y_k) = e_H.$$

Over the random choice of tuples, the event that all 4 equalities above hold has probability at least $1 - 3\eta \geq 1 - 6\mu > 0$ (by applying [Lemma 3.11](#), a union bound, and the premise $\mu < 1/6$). This event implies that $g(a) \oplus g(b) = g(a + b)$, which also occurs with positive probability. However, the last equality does not depend on the probability space, and therefore it must hold with probability 1. \square

This completes the proof of [Lemma 3.6](#). \square

3.3 Completing the soundness analysis

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since f is ε -far from being a homomorphism, $\varepsilon_f \geq \varepsilon$. When $\varepsilon_f \geq 1/8$, then by Lemma 3.6,

$$\Pr[\text{Random Signs Test}_{2k} \text{ rejects}] \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_f}{2}, \frac{1}{10} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{16}.$$

On the other hand, if $\varepsilon_f < 1/8$, then by Lemma 3.2,

$$\Pr[\text{Random Signs Test}_{2k} \text{ rejects}] \geq \min \left\{ \frac{(2k-3) \cdot \varepsilon_f}{3}, \frac{1}{6} \right\} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{(2k-3) \cdot \varepsilon}{3}, \frac{1}{6} \right\}.$$

Combining the two cases, we get

$$\Pr[\text{Random Signs Test}_{2k} \text{ rejects}] \geq \min \left\{ \frac{(2k-3) \cdot \varepsilon}{3}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{16} \right\} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{(2k-3) \cdot \varepsilon}{3}, \frac{1}{16} \right\}. \quad \square$$

4 General framework for online manipulation resiliency

The previous section provided a sound basic test for homomorphism. To make this test resilient to online manipulations, we now introduce the general framework used to build our final testers. This framework, based on the concept of an ‘unpredictable tester’ and an amplification lemma, provides a generic recipe for converting a basic test with certain unpredictability properties into one that is robust against online adversaries. We will then apply this framework in the following sections to prove our main results.

4.1 Unpredictable tester

We define flatness of a distribution, which closely relate to its “min-entropy”:⁸

Definition 4.1 (α -flat). A distribution \mathcal{P} over a finite domain D is α -flat if

$$\max_{z \in D} \Pr_{x \sim \mathcal{P}}[x = z] \leq \alpha.$$

The following definition, loosely speaking, requires that other than probability β of “losing its unpredictability”, a q -query test maintains “aggregated flatness” of α . In the lemma that follows we show such a tester is resilient to online manipulations.

Definition 4.2 ((q, α, β) -Unpredictable Test). A test making q sequential queries x_1, \dots, x_q to a function $f : D \rightarrow R$ is (q, α, β) -**unpredictable** if there exist non-negative flatness parameters $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q)$ and error terms $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q)$ satisfying two conditions:

1. **Sequential Unpredictability:** For each $i \in [q]$, let \mathcal{D}_i be the probability distribution for the i -th query x_i , which may depend on all the previous queries (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) . Then for each $i \in [q]$, with probability at least $1 - \beta_i$ (taken over the random outcomes of the previous $i - 1$ queries), \mathcal{D}_i is α_i -flat i.e.,

$$\Pr_{x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}}[\mathcal{D}_i \text{ is } \alpha_i\text{-flat}] \geq 1 - \beta_i$$

2. **Aggregate Parameters:** The sum of flatness parameters and error terms is bounded:

$$\sum_{i \in [q]} \alpha_i \leq \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in [q]} \beta_i \leq \beta$$

⁸If a distribution is α -flat, then by definition it has min-entropy at least $\log(1/\alpha)$.

Lemma 4.3 (Probability of seeing a manipulation). *Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm that runs a (q, α, β) -unpredictable test for r independent iterations against any t -online budget-managing adversary. Then the probability that a manipulation is encountered in any single iteration, $P_{\text{manipulation}}$ is bounded by:*

$$P_{\text{manipulation}} \leq \alpha qrt + \beta.$$

where qrt is the maximum number of manipulations that the adversary can perform.

Proof. Fix any adversarial strategy. We solely rely on the bound on the number of manipulated entries and the unpredictability of the test. Since \mathcal{A} runs a (q, α, β) -unpredictable test, there exist flatness parameters $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q)$ and error terms $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q)$ satisfying the conditions in [Definition 4.2](#).

Fix any iteration of the loop in algorithm \mathcal{A} . Let E_i be the event that the i -th query of this iteration, x_i , encounters a manipulation.

We now bound the probability $\Pr[E_i]$ for a single i . Let B_i be the bad event that the distribution \mathcal{D}_i is not α_i -flat. Then $\Pr[B_i] \leq \beta_i$.

Suppose the bad event did not happen, i.e., the distribution \mathcal{D}_i is α_i -flat. Let \mathcal{M}_i be the set of manipulated entries when query i is made, and note $|\mathcal{M}_i| \leq qrt$. Thus, the probability that \mathcal{A} encounters a manipulation while querying x_i conditioned on $\overline{B_i}$ is

$$\Pr[E_i | \overline{B_i}] = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{M}_i} \Pr_{x_i \sim \mathcal{D}_i} [x_i = z] \leq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{M}_i} \alpha_i \leq \alpha_i qrt.$$

The probability of seeing a manipulation while querying x_i is thus bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[E_i] &= \Pr[E_i | \overline{B_i}] \Pr[\overline{B_i}] + \Pr[E_i | B_i] \Pr[B_i] \\ &\leq \Pr[E_i | \overline{B_i}] + \Pr[B_i] \\ &\leq \alpha_i qrt + \beta_i. \end{aligned}$$

By a union bound, the probability of seeing a manipulation in this iteration is

$$P_{\text{erase}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^q \Pr[E_i] = \sum_{i=1}^q (\alpha_i qrt + \beta_i) \leq \alpha qrt + \beta. \quad \square$$

4.2 Generic Amplification Lemma

In this section, we prove a generic amplification lemma. This result provides a recipe for converting a base test into a full, online manipulation-resilient tester, provided the base test has sufficient unpredictability. Specifically, we show that if a (q, α, β) -unpredictable test satisfies a condition linking its soundness $p_w(\varepsilon)$ to its aggregate unpredictability parameters (α, β) and the adversary's power (t), then running the test $O(1/p_w(\varepsilon))$ times yields a new tester with a constant soundness guarantee against the adversary.

Lemma 4.4 (Generic Amplification for Online Resilience). *Let \mathcal{P} be a property (a set of functions $f : D \rightarrow R$). Let \mathcal{T} be a (q, α, β) -unpredictable test for ε -testing property \mathcal{P} with the following guarantees:*

- **Completeness:** *If $f \in \mathcal{P}$, the test \mathcal{T} always accepts.*
- **Soundness:** *If f is ε -far from \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{T} finds a witness (i.e., rejects) with probability at least $p_w(\varepsilon)$.*

If the following condition is true,

$$\alpha qt \cdot \left\lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \right\rceil + \beta \leq \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12} \quad (12)$$

then there is an online manipulation-resilient ε -tester \mathcal{A} for the property \mathcal{P} which uses $q \cdot \lceil 3/p_w(\varepsilon) \rceil$ queries.

Moreover \mathcal{A} has the structure that it runs $\lceil 3/p_w(\varepsilon) \rceil$ iterations of the (q, α, β) -unpredictable proximity oblivious test where the queries chosen in each iteration are independent of all queries chosen in previous iterations. If the manipulations were instead erasures, then \mathcal{A} has 1-sided error.

Proof. Let $r = \lceil 3/p_w(\varepsilon) \rceil$ be the number of iterations of the online-resilient tester \mathcal{A} .

Completeness: The tester \mathcal{A} accepts if all r iterations accept. Thus \mathcal{A} can fail only if one of the iterations rejects. Since the base test \mathcal{T} has perfect completeness in the standard property testing model i.e., it always accepts functions in \mathcal{P} when there are no online manipulations, the rejection in an iteration can only happen because of a manipulation. By Lemma 4.3 and condition (12) in the lemma statement, the probability of manipulation in any single iteration is at most

$$\alpha qrt + \beta = \alpha q t \left\lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \right\rceil + \beta \leq \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}.$$

By a union bound over all the $r = \lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \rceil$ iterations, the probability that \mathcal{A} sees a manipulation and errors is at most

$$\frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12} \cdot \left\lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \right\rceil \leq 1/3.$$

Note that if the manipulations were instead erasures, \mathcal{A} will always accept f with probability 1 because \mathcal{A} can be designed to accept in any iteration where it sees an erasure.

Soundness: Assume f is ε -far from \mathcal{P} . The amplified tester \mathcal{A} fails only if all r independent iterations fail to find a witness. Fix an iteration i . This iteration fails if one of the following two events happen, the base test \mathcal{T} fails to find a witness (denoted by event \overline{W}_i) or a manipulation occurs during its execution (denoted by event M_i). By a union bound,

$$\Pr[\text{Iteration } i \text{ fails}] = \Pr[\overline{W}_i \cup M_i] \leq \Pr[\overline{W}_i] + \Pr[M_i]$$

The probability that the base test \mathcal{T} finds a witness is at least $p_w(\varepsilon)$. Thus $\Pr[W_i] \geq p_w(\varepsilon)$ which implies $\Pr[\overline{W}_i] \leq 1 - p_w(\varepsilon)$. By Lemma 4.3, the probability that iteration i sees a manipulation,

$$\Pr[M_i] \leq \alpha qrt + \beta = \alpha q t \left\lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \right\rceil + \beta.$$

Using condition (12) from the lemma statement, we get $\Pr[M_i] \leq \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}$. Thus,

$$\Pr[\text{Iteration } i \text{ fails}] \leq \Pr[\overline{W}_i] + \Pr[M_i] \leq (1 - p_w(\varepsilon)) + \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12} = 1 - \frac{11p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}.$$

Let Q_i be the random variable representing the set of queries made in iteration i . We know that for all choices of sets of queries for the previous $i - 1$ iterations z_1, \dots, z_{i-1} , we have,

$$\Pr_{Q_i}[\text{Iteration } i \text{ fails} | Q_1 = z_1, \dots, Q_{i-1} = z_{i-1}] \leq 1 - \frac{11p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}.$$

Thus, the expected probability of iteration i failing over all the random choices of sets of queries made in all the previous $i - 1$ iterations is

$$\Pr_{Q_i}[\text{Iteration } i \text{ fails}] = \mathbb{E}_{z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}} \left[\Pr_{Q_i}[\text{Iteration } i \text{ fails} | Q_1 = z_1, \dots, Q_{i-1} = z_{i-1}] \right] \leq 1 - \frac{11p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}.$$

Now, using the independence of the set of queries Q_i for all $i \in [r]$,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ fails}] = \prod_{i \in [r]} \Pr[Q_i \text{ fails}] \leq \prod_{i \in [r]} \left(1 - \frac{11p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{11p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}\right)^r.$$

Substituting $r = \lceil 3/p_w(\varepsilon) \rceil$, we know $r \geq 3/p_w(\varepsilon)$, thus

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ fails}] \leq \left(1 - \frac{11p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}\right)^{3/p_w(\varepsilon)} \leq e^{-\frac{11p_w(\varepsilon)}{12} \cdot \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)}} = \left(\frac{1}{e}\right)^{11/4} \leq \frac{1}{3},$$

where the second inequality holds since $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$ for all x . Thus, the failure probability of \mathcal{A} is at most $1/3$, and \mathcal{A} successfully finds a witness and rejects f with probability at least $2/3$. \square

5 Resilience to online manipulations for general groups

In this section, we prove [Theorem 1.1](#) by lifting the linearity tester in [\[AKM25\]](#) which is based on the manipulation-resilient tester of [\[BKMR24\]](#) and the sample-based tester of Goldreich and Ron [\[GR16\]](#). Define a parameter $m := 4\lceil \log_2 t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$. Depending on the value of m , we invoke one of the two different algorithms against the t -online-erasure adversary. When $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4}$, we use [Algorithm 4](#), a lift of the linearity tester of [\[BKMR24\]](#) to the general group setting. When $2^m > |G|^{1/4}$, we instead use the sample-based tester by [\[GR16\]](#), following the same case-based strategy as [\[AKM25\]](#). We analyze the two cases separately. Our main contribution here is in the analysis of the distribution of the element y in [Algorithm 3](#) where we need to handle random signs along with random elements for any group G , whereas previous work did not have to worry about the random signs.

Case 1: If $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4}$. In this case, we use [Algorithm 4](#) which internally runs [Algorithm 3](#) a constant number of times.

Algorithm 3 Unpredictable Random Signs Test

Parameters: $m \in \mathbb{N}$, m is even.

Input: Query access to $f : G \rightarrow H$ where $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) are finite groups.

- 1: Draw m independent and uniformly random elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m from G .
 - 2: Query $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_m)$.
 - 3: Draw independent and uniformly random signs σ_j for all $j \in [m]$ from the set $\{+, -\}$.
 - 4: Let S be a uniformly random subset of $[m]$ of size $m/2$.
 - 5: Query $f(y)$ where $y \leftarrow \sum_{j \in S} \sigma_j x_j$
 - 6: **Accept** if $\bigoplus_{j \in S} \sigma_j f(x_j) \neq f(y)$; otherwise **reject**
-

Algorithm 4 Online Erasure-Resilient Random Signs Test

Parameters: $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$

Input: Query access to $f : G \rightarrow H$ via t -erasure oracle, where $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) are finite groups.

- 1: Set $m = 4\lceil \log_2 t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$
 - 2: **for** $i \in [48]$ **do**
 - 3: Run [Algorithm 3](#) with parameter m and independent random coins with query access to f .
 - 4: **Reject** if [Algorithm 3](#) rejects.
 - 5: **Accept**
-

Firstly, [Lemma 5.1](#) shows that [Algorithm 3](#) has the same completeness and soundness guarantees as Random Signs Test_{2k} if $k = m/4$.

Lemma 5.1. *For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ divisible by 4, the Unpredictable Random Signs Test stated in Algorithm 3 with parameter m has the same completeness and soundness guarantees as Random Signs Test $_{2k}$ where $k = m/4$.*

Proof. Notice that Algorithm 3 is essentially the same as Random Signs Test stated in Algorithm 1 with the some addition queries being made. The final check in line 5 of Algorithm 3 uses $m/2$ independent and uniformly random elements and signs from G and $\{+, -\}$ respectively which is the same check done in Algorithm 1 since $2k = m/2$. As a result the completeness and soundness guarantees for Algorithm 3 are the same as of Random Signs Test $_{2k}$ for $k = m/4$. \square

Next we will show that Algorithm 3 apart from simulating the Random Signs Test also has some unpredictability. To do that, we first prove Lemma 5.2 which shows that the distribution of the last query y in Algorithm 3 is flat with high probability.

Lemma 5.2. *If $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4}$, then the distribution of the last query y in Algorithm 3 which depends on the m initial queries X , denoted as \mathcal{D}^X is $1/\binom{m}{m/2}$ -flat except with probability $1/2^m$ over the randomness of X .*

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Once Algorithm 3 chooses $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ the distribution of y , \mathcal{D}^X is determined by the random choices of the signs $\bar{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ and the subset $S \subseteq [m]$. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{\sigma}}^X$ be distribution conditioned on X and the choice of signs $\bar{\sigma}$. Since the sequence of signs is chosen uniformly at random and independently from S , \mathcal{D}^X is a uniform mixture of all distributions $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{\sigma}}^X$ for each choice of $\bar{\sigma}$. We can denote this mixture as follows.

$$\mathcal{D}^X = \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^m} \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\sigma}}^X.$$

Definition 5.3 (Support of $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{\sigma}}^X$). For all $X \in G^m$ and for all sequences of signs $\bar{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_m) \in \{+, -\}^m$, let $Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X$ be the support of the distribution $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{\sigma}}^X$, defined as

$$Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X = \{y \in G : \exists S \subseteq [m], |S| = m/2 \text{ such that } \sum_{j \in S} \sigma_j x_j = y\}.$$

By definition, the size of the support $Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X$ can be at most $\binom{m}{m/2}$ as there can be at most $\binom{m}{m/2}$ distinct choices for y , one for each subset $S \subseteq [m]$ of size $m/2$. However, we show that the size of the support i.e., $|Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X|$ is exactly equal to $\binom{m}{m/2}$ for all $\bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^m$ simultaneously with high probability.

Let E be the event that the above statement is false, i.e., there exists a sequence of signs $\bar{\sigma}$ such that $|Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X| < \binom{m}{m/2}$. The following claim bounds the probability of event E .

Claim 5.4. $\Pr_X[E] = \Pr_X[\exists \bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^m \text{ such that } |Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X| < \binom{m}{m/2}] \leq \frac{1}{2^m}.$

Proof of Claim 5.4. For all subsets $S \subseteq [m]$, let $y_S = \sum_{j \in S} \sigma_j x_j$. The size of the support i.e., $|Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X|$ can be strictly less than $\binom{m}{m/2}$ only if some of the y_S collide for different choices of S . We first show that for any $\bar{\sigma}$, the probability of such collisions is low and then show the above holds simultaneously for all sequences of signs.

Let $S_1, S_2 \subseteq [m]$ (not necessarily of size $m/2$) such that $S_1 \neq S_2$. Without loss of generality, assume $S_1 \setminus S_2$ is not empty and select an index $i \in S_1 \setminus S_2$. Fix all values in X apart from x_i . Then the value y_{S_2} is fixed, but y_{S_1} is uniformly random over G as x_i (or $-x_i$ depending on what σ_i is) is uniformly random over G . Thus,

$$\Pr_X[y_{S_1} = y_{S_2}] = \mathbb{E} \left[\Pr_{x_i}[y_{S_1} = y_{S_2}] \right] = \frac{1}{|G|},$$

where the expectation is over all $x_j \in X, j \neq i$. By a union bound over all choices of S_1 and S_2 ,

$$\Pr_X [\exists S_1 \neq S_2 : y_{S_1} = y_{S_2}] \leq \frac{2^{2m}}{|G|} \implies \Pr_X \left[|Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X| < \binom{m}{m/2} \right] \leq \frac{2^{2m}}{|G|}$$

By a union bound over all choices of signs $\bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^m$, we get

$$\Pr_X \left[\exists \bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^m \text{ such that } |Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X| < \binom{m}{m/2} \right] \leq \frac{2^{3m}}{|G|} \leq \frac{1}{2^m},$$

where the last inequality is due to $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4} \implies 2^{4m} \leq |G| \implies 1/|G| \leq 1/2^{4m}$. \square

Now, we show that the distribution \mathcal{D}^X is $1/\binom{m}{m/2}$ -flat with probability at most $1/2^m$. Let B be the event that $\Pr_{y \sim \mathcal{D}^X} [y = z] > 1/\binom{m}{m/2}$ for some element $z \in G$. Assume event E does not happen, i.e., all the supports have size $|Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X| = \binom{m}{m/2}$ for all $\bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^m$. Since the set $S \subseteq [m]$ of size $m/2$ is chosen uniformly at random, the distribution $\mathcal{D}_{\bar{\sigma}}^X$ is uniform over the set $Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X$. Thus,

$$\Pr_{y \sim \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\sigma}}^X} [y = z] = \begin{cases} 1/\binom{m}{m/2} & z \in Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X \\ 0 & z \in G \setminus Y_{\bar{\sigma}}^X, \end{cases}$$

which implies that for all $z \in G$,

$$\Pr_{y \sim \mathcal{D}^X} [y = z] = \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^m} \Pr_{y \sim \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\sigma}}^X} [y = z] \leq \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{\bar{\sigma} \in \{+, -\}^m} \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}} = \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}}.$$

If event E does not occur, then event B cannot occur either. Thus, E is a necessary condition for B , which implies $\Pr_X [B] \leq \Pr_X [E] \leq 1/2^m$. This completes the proof of [Lemma 5.2](#). \square

Now, we are ready to show that [Algorithm 3](#) is an unpredictable tester in [Lemma 5.5](#).

Lemma 5.5. *Fix a finite group G . If $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4}$, then [Algorithm 3](#) with parameter m is*

$$\left(m + 1, \frac{m}{2^m} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}}, \frac{1}{2^m} \right)\text{-unpredictable}.$$

Proof. Firstly, note the [Algorithm 3](#) makes exactly $m + 1$ queries. Consider all queries x_i for $i \in [m]$ i.e., except the last one. From line 1 of [Algorithm 3](#), we know that irrespective of the previous $i - 1$ queries, x_i is chosen independently and uniformly at random from G . Thus, the distribution of x_i is the uniform distribution over G which is $1/|G|$ -flat with probability 1. Thus $\alpha_i = 1/|G|$ and $\beta_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m]$.

Next we analyze what happens for the last query y . Let \mathcal{D}^X be the final distribution of y conditioned on X . Using [Lemma 5.2](#) we know that \mathcal{D}^X is $1/\binom{m}{m/2}$ -flat except with probability $1/2^m$ over the randomness of X . Thus $\alpha_{m+1} = 1/\binom{m}{m/2}$ and $\beta_{m+1} = 1/2^m$. Thus [Algorithm 3](#) is unpredictable with

$$\sum_{i \in [m+1]} \alpha_i = \frac{m}{|G|} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}} \leq \frac{m}{2^m} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}} = \alpha \text{ and } \sum_{i \in [m+1]} \beta_i = \frac{1}{2^m} = \beta.$$

using the fact $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4}$. \square

Finally, we show that [Algorithm 4](#) satisfies [Theorem 1.1](#) for case 1, when $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4}$.

Proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) when $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4}$. We will use [Lemma 4.4](#) to show that [Algorithm 4](#) is an online erasure resilient tester. Let m be as defined in line 1 of [Algorithm 4](#), i.e., $m = 4\lceil \log_2 t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$.

Let [Algorithm 3](#) be the base test needed in the statement of [Lemma 4.4](#). Using [Lemma 5.1](#), we know that [Algorithm 3](#) with parameter m has the same completeness and soundness guarantees as

Random Signs Test_{2k} where $k = m/4$. Thus, by [Theorem 3.1](#), [Algorithm 3](#) accepts all homomorphisms from G to H and rejects functions that are ε -far from $\text{HOM}(G, H)$ with probability at least $\min \left\{ \frac{(m/2-3) \cdot \varepsilon}{3}, \frac{1}{16} \right\} = \min \left\{ \frac{(m-6) \cdot \varepsilon}{6}, \frac{1}{16} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{16}$ as

$$\frac{(m-6) \cdot \varepsilon}{6} = \frac{(4 \lceil \log_2 t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 6) \cdot \varepsilon}{6} > \frac{(1/\varepsilon) \cdot \varepsilon}{6} = \frac{1}{6} > \frac{1}{16}.$$

Thus, the quantity $p_w(\varepsilon) = 1/16$ as needed for using [Lemma 4.4](#). Using [Lemma 5.5](#), we know that [Algorithm 3](#) is (q, α, β) -unpredictable where

$$q = m + 1, \alpha = \frac{m}{2^m} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}}, \beta = \frac{1}{2^m}.$$

To apply [Lemma 4.4](#), we need the following condition (inequality (12) in the statemnt of [Lemma 4.4](#)) to be satisfied.

$$\alpha q t \cdot \left\lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \right\rceil + \beta \leq \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}$$

Now we show that the above condition is satisfied by the values $\alpha, \beta, p_w(\varepsilon)$ that we derived above.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha q t \cdot \left\lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \right\rceil + \beta &= \left(\frac{m}{2^m} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}} \right) \cdot (m+1)t \cdot 48 + \frac{1}{2^m} \\ &\leq \frac{48t(m+1)m}{2^m} + \frac{48t(m+1)}{\binom{m}{m/2}} + \frac{1}{2^m} \\ &\leq \frac{48t(m+1)m}{2^m} + \frac{48t(m+1)\sqrt{2m}}{2^m} + \frac{1}{2^m} \leq \frac{256t(m+1)m}{2^m}. \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\binom{m}{m/2} \geq 2^m/\sqrt{2m}$ in the second inequality. Using $m = 4 \lceil \log_2 t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$, we get $t \leq 2^{m/4-15/\varepsilon-3} \leq 2^{m/4-18}$. Thus,

$$\frac{256t(m+1)m}{2^m} \leq \frac{256(m+1)m}{2^{\frac{3m}{4}+18}} = \frac{(m+1)m}{2^{\frac{3m}{4}} \cdot 1024} \leq \frac{3}{1024} < \frac{1}{12 \cdot 16} = \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}.$$

where the last inequality holds since $\frac{(m+1)m}{2^{\frac{3m}{4}}} \leq 3$ for all m .

Thus using [Lemma 4.4](#), we conclude that [Algorithm 4](#) that runs $\lceil 3/p_w(\varepsilon) \rceil = 48$ independent iterations of [Algorithm 3](#) with $m = 4 \lceil \log_2 t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$ is an online manipulation resilient tester. \square

Case 2: If $2^m > |G|^{1/4}$. In this case, we use the sample-based tester by Goldreich and Ron [[GR16](#)] stated in [Algorithm 5](#).

Definition 5.6 (Partial Sums of X). For all groups G and all sequences of m elements $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ from G , let $\text{PartialSums}(X)$ be the set of all partial sums of X i.e., all sums of the form $\sum_{i \in I} x_i$ for all $I \subseteq [m]$.

Theorem 5.7 (Theorem 5.1 of [[GR16](#)]). For all finite groups $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) , all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, [Algorithm 5](#) is a sample-based ε -tester for group homomorphism for functions $f : G \rightarrow H$ that makes $O(1/\varepsilon + \log |G|)$ queries.

Now we state a theorem by Arora, Kelman and Meir [[AKM25](#)] about online-manipulation-resilience of sample-based testers.

Theorem 5.8 (Theorem 2.1 of [[AKM25](#)]). Let \mathcal{T} be a sample-based tester for a property \mathcal{P} with input length N and distance parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ that uses q uniformly random samples and succeeds with probability $1 - \delta$. Then \mathcal{T} with q queries succeeds with probability $1 - 2\delta$ in the presence of every budget-managing t -online-manipulation adversary for all $t \leq \delta \cdot N/q^2$.

Algorithm 5 Sample-based homomorphism tester by Goldreich and Ron [GR16]

Parameters: $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$

Input: Query access to a function $f : G \rightarrow H$ where $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) are finite groups.

- 1: Sample a set S of $O(\log |G|)$ elements chosen independently and uniformly at random from G .
 - 2: If $\text{PartialSums}(S) \neq G$; **accept**.
 - 3: Query $f(x)$ for all $x \in S$.
 - 4: Let $h : G \rightarrow H$ be the unique homomorphism with $h(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in S$; **reject** if no such h exists.
 - 5: Query f on $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ uniform and independent elements from G .
 - 6: **Reject** if $f(x) \neq h(x)$ for any sampled point x ; otherwise, **accept**.
-

Finally we show that **Algorithm 5** satisfies **Theorem 1.1** for case 2, when $2^m > |G|^{1/4}$.

*Proof of **Theorem 1.1** when $2^m > |G|^{1/4}$.* Using **Theorem 5.7** we know **Algorithm 5** is a sample-based tester. By **Theorem 5.8**, **Algorithm 5** also works in presence of a t -online-manipulation adversary for $t \leq c \cdot \min \{\varepsilon^2, 1/\log^2 |G|\} \cdot |G|$ for some $c > 0$ and succeeds with probability at least $2/3$. The query complexity of **Algorithm 5** is $O(1/\varepsilon + \log |G|)$, which is at most $O(1/\varepsilon + m) = O(1/\varepsilon + \log t)$. \square

6 Group-specific testing

In this section, we present two approaches for improving testing bounds by leveraging the structure of specific groups G and H . We present two approaches: one based on group-specific sample-based testing, and another that applies when G and H are finite fields.

6.1 Group-specific sample-based homomorphism testing

In this section, we prove **Theorem 1.3**, which gives a group-specific homomorphism tester with complexity expressed in terms of the parameter $E(G)$, specified in **Definition 1.2**. The tester that satisfies **Theorem 1.3** is **Algorithm 6**. It samples elements of the group until it is likely to get a set that generates the entire group and then compares the homomorphism defined by the values of the input function f on the generating set with the values of f on another random sample of points.

Definition 6.1 (Subgroup $\langle S \rangle$). The *subgroup generated by a subset S* of a group G , denoted by $\langle S \rangle$, consists of all elements of G that can be expressed as the finite product of elements of S and their inverses.

Algorithm 6 Generated Subgroup Test

Parameters: $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$

Input: Query access to a function $f : G \rightarrow H$ where $(G, +)$ and (H, \oplus) are finite groups.

- 1: Set $m \leftarrow E(G) + 9$.
 - 2: Sample a set S of m elements chosen independently and uniformly at random from G .
 - 3: If $\langle S \rangle \neq G$; **accept**.
 - 4: Query $f(x)$ for all $x \in S$.
 - 5: Let $h : G \rightarrow H$ be the unique homomorphism with $h(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in S$; **reject** if no such h exists.
 - 6: Query f on $\frac{3}{\varepsilon}$ uniform and independent elements from G .
 - 7: **Reject** if $f(x) \neq h(x)$ for any sampled point x ; otherwise, **accept**.
-

Observe Generated Subgroup Test ([Algorithm 6](#)) is sample-based, i.e., it queries only independent and uniform random elements of G . To analyze the tester, we first examine the probability that $\langle S \rangle = G$ for a set S sampled from G . The relevant group parameters were introduced by Menezes [[Men13](#)] and Lubotzky [[Lub02](#)]. We relate them to $E(G)$, the expected number of elements needed to sample a generator for the whole group, in [Lemma 6.5](#). Then we use [Theorem 5.8](#) that shows that every sample-based tester is also online-erasure-resilient.

Finally, we complete the proof of [Theorem 1.3](#) by putting all ingredients together.

Definition 6.2 (Group parameters $d^\beta(G)$ [[Men13](#)] and $\mathcal{M}(G)$ [[Lub02](#)]). Let G be a finite group.

- For $\beta \in (0, 1)$, let $d^\beta(G)$ be the number of independent, uniformly distributed elements of G needed to generate G with probability at least $1 - \beta$.
- Let $\mathcal{M}(G) := \sup_{r \geq 2} \frac{\log m_r(G)}{\log r}$ where $m_r(G)$ is the number of maximal subgroups of G of index r .

Menezes [[Men13](#), Proposition 9.2.7] showed a family of inequalities relating the group parameters, $d^\beta(G)$ and $\mathcal{M}(G)$.

Lemma 6.3 (Relating $d_\beta(G)$ and $\mathcal{M}(G)$ [[Men13](#)]). *Let $\zeta(x)$ be the Reimann Zeta function. For each $w \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\zeta(w) \leq 1 + \beta$, we have $d^\beta(G) \leq \mathcal{M}(G) + w$.*

Lucchini and Moscatiello [[LM20](#), Theorem 1.1] showed a result relating the group parameters $\mathcal{M}(G)$ and $E(G)$.

Lemma 6.4 (Relating $E(G)$ and $\mathcal{M}(G)$ [[LM20](#)]). *Let G be any finite group. Then, $\lceil \mathcal{M}(G) \rceil \leq E(G) + 4$.*

Next we use [Lemma 6.3](#) and [Lemma 6.4](#) to relate $d^\beta(G)$ and $E(G)$.

Lemma 6.5 (Relating $d_\beta(G)$ and $E(G)$). *For all $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and for all finite groups G ,*

$$d^\beta(G) \leq E(G) + 5 + \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right).$$

Proof. Let $\zeta(x)$ be the Reimann Zeta function. Using [Claim A.3](#), we know that for $w = 1 + \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right)$, we have $\zeta(w) \leq 1 + \beta$. Applying the upper bound for $d^\beta(G)$ from [Lemma 6.3](#) using $w = 1 + \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right)$, we get

$$d^\beta(G) \leq \mathcal{M}(G) + 1 + \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right) \leq E(G) + 5 + \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right),$$

where the last equality follows from [Lemma 6.4](#) and the fact that $\mathcal{M}(G) \leq \lceil \mathcal{M}(G) \rceil$. \square

Now we complete the proof of the main theorem from this section.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. First, we analyze [Algorithm 6](#) in the standard property testing model (without adversarial manipulations). The tester always accepts every homomorphism $f \in \text{HOM}(G, H)$ because it only rejects if it finds an inconsistency.

Now assume f is ε -far from $\text{HOM}(G, H)$. In this case, there are two bad events when [Algorithm 6](#) incorrectly accepts: B_1 when S does not generate G and B_2 when S generates G but the algorithm still accepts f . By [Lemma 6.5](#) with $\beta = \frac{1}{12}$, one needs at most $E(G) + 5 + \log_2(13) \leq E(G) + 9$ samples from G to generate G with probability at least $\frac{11}{12}$. Since [Algorithm 6](#) uses $E(G) + 9$ samples, $\Pr[B_1] \leq \frac{1}{12}$. Now suppose that S generates G . If no unique homomorphism h exists, the algorithm rejects. Otherwise, f is ε -far from h as f is ε -far from $\text{HOM}(G, H)$. The probability f and h agree on all $\frac{3}{\varepsilon}$ random checks is at most $(1 - \varepsilon)^{3/\varepsilon} \leq e^{-3} < \frac{1}{12}$. Thus, $\Pr[B_2] \leq \frac{1}{12}$. The total acceptance probability is at most $\frac{1}{6}$.

Query complexity. The number of queries made by [Algorithm 6](#) is $E(G) + 9 + \frac{3}{\varepsilon} = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + E(G)\right)$.

Manipulation Resilience. We proved that [Algorithm 6](#) is a sample-based ε -tester for homomorphisms from $G \rightarrow H$ that succeeds with probability at least $\frac{5}{6}$. By [Theorem 5.8](#), [Algorithm 6](#) also works in presence of a t -online-manipulation adversary for $t \leq c \cdot \min\{\varepsilon^2, 1/E(G)^2\} \cdot |G|$ and succeeds with probability at least $\frac{2}{3}$ for some constant $c > 0$. \square

6.2 Bounds for prime fields

In this section, we prove [Theorems 1.5](#) and [1.6](#), which give a homomorphism tester for $G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $H = \mathbb{F}_p^r$ and the corresponding lower bound $G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $H = \mathbb{F}_p$. The tester that satisfies [Theorem 1.5](#) is [Algorithm 9](#) which is based on the Random Coefficients Test ([Algorithm 7](#)). This algorithm is similar to Random Signs Test ([Algorithm 1](#)) but uses coefficients from $[p-1]$ instead of signs. For any vector $v \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and coefficient $\sigma \in [p-1]$, we define σv as the vector $(\sigma v[1], \dots, \sigma v[n])$ where each $v[i] \in \mathbb{F}_p$ for $i \in [n]$ and the operation $\sigma v[i]$ is the result of the multiplication operation of the field \mathbb{F}_p .

Algorithm 7 Random Coefficients Test_k

Parameters: $k \in \mathbb{N}$

Input: Query access to a function $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^r$.

- 1: Draw k independent and uniformly random elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k from \mathbb{F}_p^n .
 - 2: Draw k independent and uniformly random coefficients $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ from $[p-1]$.
 - 3: Query $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_k)$ and $f(a)$, where $a \leftarrow \sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i$.
 - 4: **Accept** if $\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i f(x_i) = f(a)$; otherwise, **reject**.
-

Random Coefficients Test accepts all homomorphisms from $\mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^r$. Next we look at the soundness of this test in [Theorem 6.6](#).

Theorem 6.6. *For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, all primes p and $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$, and functions $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^r$ such that f is ε -far from being a group homomorphism,*

$$\Pr[\text{Random Coefficients Test}_{2k} \text{ rejects}] \geq \min \left\{ \frac{(2k-3) \cdot \varepsilon}{3}, \frac{1}{16} \right\}. \quad (13)$$

The proof of [Theorem 6.6](#) closely parallels that of [Theorem 3.1](#), with each use of a sign sequence from $\{+, -\}^k$ replaced with a coefficient sequence from $[p-1]^k$. The rest of the argument is the same.

Next, we prove [Theorem 1.5](#), following the case-based strategy of [\[AKM25\]](#), as in the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#). Define the parameter $m := 4\lceil \log_p t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$. When $m \leq n/4$, we use [Algorithm 9](#), a lift of the online erasure-resilient tester of [\[BKMR24\]](#) to prime fields. Otherwise, we use the sample-based Generated Subgroup Test ([Algorithm 6](#)). Our main contribution here is again in the analysis of the distribution of the element y in [Algorithm 8](#) where we need to handle random coefficients along with random elements for any group G .

Case 1: If $m \leq n/4$. In this case, we use [Algorithm 9](#) which internally runs [Algorithm 8](#) a constant number of times.

We first prove [Lemma 6.7](#) that shows that if we choose $n/2$ random elements from \mathbb{F}_p^n , then they are linearly independent with high probability.

Lemma 6.7. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, all primes p , let $v_1, \dots, v_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ be vectors chosen independently and uniformly at random from \mathbb{F}_p^n . Then with probability at least $1 - \frac{2}{p^{n/2}}$, the vectors $v_1, \dots, v_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ are linearly independent.*

Proof. Let B_1 be the bad event that $v_1 = 0$. Then $\Pr[B_1] = 1/p^n$. For $i \geq 2$, let B_i be the bad event that v_i lies in $\text{span}(v_1, \dots, v_{i-1})$ conditioned on the fact that v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} are linearly independent.

Algorithm 8 Unpredictable Random Coefficients Test

Parameters: $m \in \mathbb{N}$, m even

Input: Query access to $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^r$ via t -erasure oracle.

- 1: Draw m independent and uniformly random elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m from \mathbb{F}_p^n .
 - 2: Query $f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_m)$.
 - 3: Draw independent and uniformly random coefficients σ_j for all $j \in [m]$ from $[p-1]$.
 - 4: Let S be a uniformly random subset of $[m]$ of size $m/2$.
 - 5: Query $f(y)$ where $y \leftarrow \sum_{j \in S} \sigma_j x_j$
 - 6: **Accept** if $\sum_{j \in S} \sigma_j f(x_j) = f(y)$; otherwise **reject**.
-

Algorithm 9 Online Erasure-Resilient Random Coefficients Test

Parameters: $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$

Input: Query access to $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^r$ via t -erasure oracle.

- 1: Set $m = 4\lceil \log_p t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$
 - 2: **for** $i \in [48]$ **do**
 - 3: Run **Algorithm 8** with parameter m and independent random coins with query access to f .
 - 4: **Reject** if **Algorithm 8** rejects.
 - 5: **Accept**
-

Then $\Pr[B_i] = p^{i-1}/p^n$ since v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} span a $i-1$ dimensional subspace of \mathbb{F}_p^n when they are linearly independent. The vectors $v_1, \dots, v_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ are linearly independent when none of the bad events $B_1, \dots, B_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ happen. By a union bound, the probability that at least one of the bad events happen is at most

$$\Pr[B_i \text{ is true for at least one } i] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \Pr[B_i] = \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \frac{p^{i-1}}{p^n}.$$

Since this is a geometric sum, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \frac{p^{i-1}}{p^n} = \frac{1}{p^n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} p^{i-1} \right) = \frac{1}{p^n} \cdot \left(\frac{p^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} - 1}{p - 1} \right) \leq \frac{2 \cdot p^{n/2+1}}{p^{n+1}} = \frac{2}{p^{n/2}},$$

where the third inequality follows from $\frac{1}{p-1} \leq \frac{2}{p}$ for all $p \geq 2$ and $\lceil n/2 \rceil \leq n/2 + 1$.

Thus, with probability at least $1 - 2/p^{n/2}$, none of the bad events occur, and $v_1, \dots, v_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ are linearly independent. \square

Next, **Lemma 6.8** shows that in the case $k = m/4$, **Algorithm 8** has the same completeness and soundness as **Random Coefficients Test**_{2k}. The proof is the same as the proof of **Lemma 5.1**.

Lemma 6.8. *For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ divisible by 4, the Unpredictable Random Coefficients Test stated in **Algorithm 8** with parameter m has the same completeness and soundness guarantees as **Random Coefficients Test**_{2k} where $k = m/4$.*

Next we will show that **Algorithm 8** apart from simulating the **Random Coefficients Test** also has some unpredictability. To do that, we first prove **Lemma 6.9** which shows that the distribution of the last query y in **Algorithm 8** is flat with high probability.

Lemma 6.9. *If $m \leq n/4$, then the distribution of the last query y in **Algorithm 8** which depends on the m initial queries X , denoted as \mathcal{D}^X is $1/\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}$ -flat except with probability $2/p^m$ over the randomness of X .*

Proof of Lemma 6.9. Once Algorithm 8 chooses X for this iteration, the distribution of y , \mathcal{D}^X is determined by the random choices of the coefficients $\bar{\sigma}$ and the subset S . Let \mathcal{D}^X be the distribution of y conditioned on X and \mathcal{D}_S^X be distribution conditioned on X and the choice of the subset $S \subseteq [m]$ of size $m/2$. Since the subset is chosen uniformly at random, \mathcal{D}^X is a uniform mixture of the distributions \mathcal{D}_S^X for all $S \subseteq [m]$ of size $m/2$. Thus we can write

$$\mathcal{D}^X = \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}} \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq [m] \\ |S|=m/2}} \mathcal{D}_S^X.$$

Definition 6.10 (Support of \mathcal{D}_S^X). For all $X \in (\mathbb{F}_p^n)^m$ and for all subsets $S \subseteq [m]$ of size $m/2$, let Y_S^X be the support of the distribution \mathcal{D}_S^X , which is an affine space consisting of $(p-1)^{m/2}$ elements spanned by X using all possible coefficient sequences of length $m/2$. Note that Y_S^X is an affine space with $(p-1)^{m/2}$ elements and not a subspace with $p^{m/2}$ elements as the coefficients are from $[p-1]$ and can't be zero.

Next we show that if X is linearly independent and $S_1 \neq S_2$ then the supports $Y_{S_1}^X$ and $Y_{S_2}^X$ do not intersect.

Claim 6.11. *If the set X is linearly independent, then for all subsets $S_1, S_2 \subseteq [m]$ of size $m/2$ such that $S_1 \neq S_2$, the supports $Y_{S_1}^X$ and $Y_{S_2}^X$ do not intersect.*

Proof of Claim 6.11. Without loss of generality assume that there exists $j \in S_1 \setminus S_2$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that there exists an element v which is present both in $Y_{S_1}^X$ and $Y_{S_2}^X$. Then v can be written as two separate linear combinations, one with elements from $\{x_i\}_{i \in S_1}$ and the other with elements from $\{x_i\}_{i \in S_2}$ where the coefficients are from $[p-1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in S_1} \alpha_i x_i = v &= \sum_{i \in S_2} \beta_i x_i \\ \implies \sum_{i \in S_1 \cap S_2} (\alpha_i - \beta_i) x_i + \sum_{i \in S_1 \setminus S_2} \alpha_i x_i + \sum_{i \in S_2 \setminus S_2} (-\beta_i) x_i &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $-\beta$ is the inverse of β in \mathbb{F}_p . If X is linearly independent, then the set $\{x_i\}_{i \in S_1 \cup S_2}$ is also linearly independent. Also, since $j \in S_1 \setminus S_2$, the coefficient of x_j in (14) is not zero. This means that (14) gives an equation involving linearly independent vectors and scalars not all zero which add up to zero. However this is a contradiction, as this implies that the vectors in $\{x_i\}_{i \in S_1 \cup S_2}$ are linearly dependent. Thus, our initial assumption is wrong and the supports $Y_{S_1}^X$ and $Y_{S_2}^X$ do not intersect. \square

Now, we show that the distribution \mathcal{D}^X is $1/\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}$ -flat with probability at most $2/p^m$. If X is linearly independent, then using Claim 6.11 we see that every element z from \mathbb{F}_p^n can only be present in at most one Y_S^X for some subset S . Since the coefficient sequence $\bar{\sigma}$ is chosen independently and uniformly at random, the probability that z is chosen under the distribution \mathcal{D}_S^X is at most $\frac{1}{(p-1)^{m/2}}$, which implies that the probability of z being chosen under \mathcal{D}^X is at most $\frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$.

Let B be the event that $\Pr_{y \sim \mathcal{D}^X} [y = z] > \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}}$ from some element $z \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. If X is linearly independent, then the event B cannot occur, thus $\Pr_X[B]$ is at most the probability of X being linearly dependent. By Lemma 6.7, since $m \leq n/4 < n/2$, we get

$$\Pr_X[B] \leq \Pr_X[X \text{ is linearly dependent}] \leq \frac{2}{p^{n/2}} \leq \frac{2}{p^m}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.9. \square

Now, we are ready to show that Algorithm 8 is an unpredictable tester in Lemma 6.12.

Lemma 6.12. *If $m \leq n/4$, then Algorithm 8 with parameter m is*

$$\left(m+1, \frac{m}{p^m} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}}, \frac{2}{p^m}\right)\text{-unpredictable.}$$

Proof. Firstly, note the Algorithm 8 makes exactly $m+1$ queries. Consider all queries x_i for $i \in [m]$ i.e., except the last one. From line 1 of Algorithm 8, we know that irrespective of the previous $i-1$ queries, x_i is chosen independently and uniformly at random from \mathbb{F}_p^n . Thus, the distribution of x_i is the uniform distribution over \mathbb{F}_p^n which is $1/p^n$ -flat with probability 1. Thus $\alpha_i = 1/p^n$ and $\beta_i = 0$ for all $i \in [m]$.

Next we analyze what happens for the last query y . Let \mathcal{D}^X be the final distribution of y conditioned on X . Using Lemma 6.9 we know that \mathcal{D}^X is $1/\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}$ -flat except with probability $2/p^m$ over the randomness of X . Thus $\alpha_{m+1} = 1/\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}$ and $\beta_{m+1} = 2/p^m$. Thus Algorithm 8 is unpredictable with

$$\sum_{i \in [m+1]} \alpha_i = \frac{m}{p^n} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}} \leq \frac{m}{p^m} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}} = \alpha \text{ and } \sum_{i \in [m+1]} \beta_i = \frac{2}{p^m} = \beta.$$

using the fact $m \leq n/4 \leq n \implies p^m \leq p^n \implies 1/p^n \leq 1/p^m$. \square

Finally, we show that Algorithm 9 satisfies Theorem 1.5 for case 1, when $m \leq n/4$.

Proof of Theorem 1.5 when $m \leq n/4$. The proof of this is similar to that of Theorem 1.1 when $2^m \leq |G|^{1/4}$. We will use Lemma 4.4 to show that Algorithm 9 is an online erasure resilient tester. Let m be as defined in line 1 of Algorithm 9, i.e., $m = 4\lceil \log_p t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$.

Let Algorithm 8 be the base test needed in the statement of Lemma 4.4. Using Lemma 6.8, we know that Algorithm 8 with parameter m has the same completeness and soundness as Random Coefficients Test_{2k} where $k = m/4$. Thus, by Theorem 6.6, Algorithm 8 accepts all homomorphisms in $\text{HOM}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, \mathbb{F}_p^r)$ and rejects functions that are ε -far from $\text{HOM}(\mathbb{F}_p^n, \mathbb{F}_p^r)$ with probability at least $\min\left\{\frac{(m-6)\cdot\varepsilon}{6}, \frac{1}{16}\right\} \geq 1/16$ as

$$\frac{(m-6)\cdot\varepsilon}{6} = \frac{(4\lceil \log_p t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 6)\cdot\varepsilon}{6} > \frac{(1/\varepsilon)\cdot\varepsilon}{6} = 1/6 > 1/16.$$

Thus, the quantity $p_w(\varepsilon) = 1/16$ as needed for using Lemma 4.4. Using Lemma 6.12, we know that Algorithm 8 is (q, α, β) -unpredictable where

$$q = m+1, \alpha = \frac{m}{p^m} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}}, \beta = \frac{2}{p^m}.$$

To apply Lemma 4.4, we need the following condition (inequality (12) in the statemnt of Lemma 4.4) to be satisfied.

$$\alpha q t \cdot \left\lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \right\rceil + \beta \leq \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}$$

Now we show that the above condition is satisfied by the values $\alpha, \beta, p_w(\varepsilon)$ that we derived above.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha q t \cdot \left\lceil \frac{3}{p_w(\varepsilon)} \right\rceil + \beta &= \left(\frac{m}{p^m} + \frac{1}{\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}} \right) \cdot (m+1)t \cdot 48 + \frac{2}{p^m} \\ &\leq \frac{48t(m+1)m}{p^m} + \frac{48t(m+1)}{\binom{m}{m/2}(p-1)^{m/2}} + \frac{2}{p^m} \\ &\leq \frac{48t(m+1)m}{p^m} + \frac{48t(m+1)\sqrt{2m}}{2^m(p-1)^{m/2}} + \frac{2}{p^m} \leq \frac{256t(m+1)m}{2^m(p-1)^{m/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\binom{m}{m/2} \geq 2^m/\sqrt{2m}$ in the second inequality and for the third inequality, we use $\sqrt{2m} \leq m$ for all $m > 2$ and $2^m(p-1)^{m/2} \leq p^m$ for all m .

Now using $m = 4\lceil \log_p t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$, we get $t \leq p^{m/4-15/\varepsilon-3} \leq p^{m/4-18}$. Thus,

$$\frac{256 \cdot t(m+1)m}{2^m(p-1)^{m/2}} \leq \frac{256 \cdot (m+1)m \cdot p^{m/4}}{2^m(p-1)^{m/2}p^{18}}. \quad (15)$$

- If $p = 2$, the above quantity in RHS of (15) reduces to

$$\frac{256 \cdot (m+1)m}{2^{3m/4+18}} \leq \frac{256 \cdot 3}{2^{18}} \leq \frac{3}{1024} \leq \frac{1}{12 \cdot 16} = \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}$$

where we use $\frac{(m+1)m}{2^{\frac{3m}{4}}} \leq 3$ for all m .

- Otherwise, if $p > 2$, then $p \leq (p-1)^2 \implies p^{m/4} \leq (p-1)^{m/2}$ for all m . Thus, the RHS of (15) at most

$$\frac{256 \cdot (m+1)m}{2^m p^{18}} \leq \frac{256 \cdot 3}{2^{18}} \leq \frac{3}{1024} \leq \frac{1}{12 \cdot 16} = \frac{p_w(\varepsilon)}{12}$$

where we use $\frac{(m+1)m}{2^{\frac{3m}{4}}} \leq \frac{(m+1)m}{2^{\frac{3m}{4}}} \leq 3$ for all m .

Thus using Lemma 4.4, we conclude that Algorithm 9 that runs $\lceil 3/p_w(\varepsilon) \rceil = 48$ independent iterations of Algorithm 8 with $m = 4\lceil \log_p t + 15/\varepsilon \rceil + 12$ is an online manipulation resilient tester. \square

Case 2: If $m > n/4$. In this case, we use Generated Subgroup Test (Algorithm 6) from Section 6.

Proof of Theorem 1.5 when $m > n/4$. The size of the minimum size of any generating set for \mathbb{F}_p^n , i.e., $d(\mathbb{F}_p^n) = n$. This follows from the fact that any set of less than n vectors from \mathbb{F}_p^n cannot span the whole space, however the n unit vectors along each coordinate can span \mathbb{F}_p^n .

Since the additive group structure of \mathbb{F}_p^n is Abelian the expected number of random elements to generate \mathbb{F}_p^n , i.e., $E(\mathbb{F}_p^n)$ is at most $n + 3$ [Pom02]. Using Theorem 1.3, we get that Algorithm 6 is a t -online manipulation-resilient tester for $t \leq c \cdot \min\{\varepsilon^2, 1/n^2\} p^n$ for some constant $c > 0$ which uses $O(1/\varepsilon + n)$ which is at most $O(1/\varepsilon + m) = O(1/\varepsilon + \log_p t)$ queries. \square

Next we prove Theorem 1.6 which shows that Theorem 1.5 is essentially tight when the range is \mathbb{F}_p . The proof of Theorem 1.6 closely follows the proof structure of [KRV23, Theorem 1.3] which proves a lower bound of $\Omega(\log t)$ on the query complexity of online erasure-resilient testing of linearity of functions from $\mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$. The proof uses Yao's minimax principle for the online-erasures model from [KRV23, Corollary 9.4] stated in Theorem 6.14.

Definition 6.13 (\mathcal{D} -view). Given a q -query deterministic algorithm \mathcal{A} , let $a(x)$ be the string of q answers that \mathcal{A} receives when making queries to input object x . For a distribution \mathcal{D} and adversarial strategy \mathcal{S} , let \mathcal{D} -view be the distribution on strings $a(x)$ where the input object x is sampled from \mathcal{D} and accessed via a t -online-erasure oracle using strategy \mathcal{S} .

Theorem 6.14 (Yao's minimax principle for the online-erasures model [KRV23]). *To prove a lower bound q on the worst-case query complexity of online-erasure-resilient randomized algorithms for a promise decision problem, it is enough to give*

- a randomized adversarial strategy \mathcal{S} ,
- a distribution \mathcal{D}^+ on positive instances of size n ,
- a distribution \mathcal{D}^- on instances of size n that are negative with probability at least $6/7$

such that the statistical distance between \mathcal{D}^+ -view and \mathcal{D}^- -view is at most $1/6$ for every deterministic q -query algorithm that accesses its input via an online-erasure oracle using strategy \mathcal{S} .

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let \mathcal{D}^+ be the uniform distribution over all homomorphisms from $\mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ and \mathcal{D}^- be the uniform distribution over all functions from $\mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$.

Claim 6.15. *The probability that a function f sampled from \mathcal{D}^- is $\frac{p-1}{2p}$ -far from being a homomorphism is at least $6/7$.*

Proof. Fix a homomorphism $h : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$. For each $x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$, define the indicator random variable $Z_x = 1$ if $f(x) \neq h(x)$ and 0 otherwise. Since f is sampled from \mathcal{D}^- , the value $f(x)$ is chosen uniformly at random over \mathbb{F}_p , independently for each x . Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_x] = \Pr[f(x) \neq h(x)] = \frac{p-1}{p}.$$

The distance between f and h is defined as $\text{dist}(f, h) = \frac{1}{p^n} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} Z_x$. Applying Hoeffding's inequality to the sum of p^n independent bounded random variables $Z_x \in \{0, 1\}$ with $\delta = \frac{p-1}{2p}$, we get

$$\Pr \left[\text{dist}(f, h) \leq \frac{p-1}{2p} \right] = \Pr \left[\text{dist}(f, h) \leq \frac{p-1}{p} - \delta \right] \leq \exp(-2\delta^2 p^n) = \exp\left(-\frac{(p-1)^2 p^{n-2}}{2}\right).$$

Note that the number of group homomorphisms $h : \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ is exactly p^n , since each such map corresponds to a linear function determined by n coefficients in \mathbb{F}_p . Taking a union bound over all p^n homomorphisms, we obtain

$$\Pr \left[\exists h \text{ such that } \text{dist}(f, h) \leq \frac{p-1}{2p} \right] \leq p^n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(p-1)^2 p^{n-2}}{2}\right).$$

This is exponentially small in p^n . For large enough n , this probability is at most $\frac{1}{7}$. \square

We fix the following strategy for a t -online-erasure adversary: after each query is answered, erase a subset T of t elements from the subspace spanned by the queries so far. If there are multiple possibilities for T , break ties arbitrarily. Notice that if at most $\log_p t$ queries are made, then the adversary can erase all the elements from the subspace spanned by the queries, except the queries themselves.

Let \mathcal{A} be a deterministic algorithm that makes $q \leq \log_p t$ queries. Let \mathcal{P}^+ and \mathcal{P}^- be two random processes that interact with \mathcal{A} while \mathcal{A} makes its queries. For each query, if the query was erased by the adversary, then both \mathcal{P}^+ and \mathcal{P}^- return \perp , otherwise they return a uniformly random value from \mathbb{F}_p . From the above description, it is clear that the distribution over the transcripts when \mathcal{A} interacts with \mathcal{P}^+ is identical to the distribution over the transcripts when \mathcal{A} interacts with \mathcal{P}^- .

Next we describe how \mathcal{P}^+ and \mathcal{P}^- assigns values to the *undisclosed* (i.e., unqueried or erased) elements.

- **\mathcal{P}^- outputs a function sampled from \mathcal{D}^- .** Here \mathcal{P}^- assigns a uniformly random value from \mathbb{F}_p to each undisclosed element. Thus, \mathcal{P}^- outputs a random function from \mathcal{D}^- .
- **\mathcal{P}^+ outputs a function sampled from \mathcal{D}^+ .** Let V be the set of queries among the q queries \mathcal{A} made, where it received a value from \mathbb{F}_p not \perp . The adversary's strategy ensures that the queries in V are linearly independent. Then \mathcal{P}^+ completes V to a basis B that spans \mathbb{F}_p^n . Let the elements of B be denoted as x_1, \dots, x_n . Next \mathcal{P}^+ assigns a uniformly random value from \mathbb{F}_p to each element in $B \setminus V$. Since B spans \mathbb{F}_p^n , all elements in \mathbb{F}_p^n can be written as a linear combination of elements from B . For each undisclosed element y in $\mathbb{F}_p^n \setminus B$, let $y = \sum_{i \in [n]} a_i x_i$ where $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p$, then \mathcal{P}^+ assigns the value $\sum_{i \in [n]} a_i f(x_i)$ to y . Thus, \mathcal{P}^+ outputs a random function from \mathcal{D}^+ .

Thus, we conclude that \mathcal{D}^+ -view is equal to \mathcal{D}^- -view. All functions in the support of \mathcal{D}^+ are homomorphisms, whereas, by Claim 6.15, a function $f \sim \mathcal{D}^-$ is $\frac{p-1}{2p}$ -far from any homomorphism with probability $\frac{6}{7}$. Applying Theorem 6.14 gives the desired lower bound of $\Omega(\log_p t)$. \square

References

- [AKK⁺05] Noga Alon, Tali Kaufman, Michael Krivelevich, Simon Litsyn, and Dana Ron. Testing Reed-Muller codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(11):4032–4039, 2005.
- [AKM25] Vipul Arora, Esty Kelman, and Uri Meir. On optimal testing of linearity. In Ioana Oriana Bercea and Rasmus Pagh, editors, *2025 Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms, SOSA 2025, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 13-15, 2025*, pages 65–76. SIAM, 2025.
- [ALM⁺98] Sanjeev Arora, Carsten Lund, Rajeev Motwani, Madhu Sudan, and Mario Szegedy. Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems. *J. ACM*, 45(3):501–555, 1998.
- [AS03] Sanjeev Arora and Madhu Sudan. Improved low-degree testing and its applications. *Combinatorica*, 23(3):365–426, 2003.
- [BC22] Oren Becker and Michael Chapman. Stability of approximate group actions: uniform and probabilistic. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 25(9):3599–3632, 2022.
- [BCH⁺96] Mihir Bellare, Don Coppersmith, Johan Håstad, Marcos A. Kiwi, and Madhu Sudan. Linearity testing in characteristic two. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 42(6):1781–1795, 1996.
- [BCLR08] Michael Ben-Or, Don Coppersmith, Michael Luby, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Non-abelian homomorphism testing, and distributions close to their self-convolutions. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 32(1):49–70, 2008.
- [Bel18] Aleksandrs Belovs. Adaptive lower bound for testing monotonicity on the line. In *Proceedings of Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM)*, pages 31:1–31:10, 2018.
- [BFL91] László Babai, Lance Fortnow, and Carsten Lund. Non-deterministic exponential time has two-prover interactive protocols. *Computational Complexity*, 1:3–40, 1991.
- [BFLS91] László Babai, Lance Fortnow, Leonid A. Levin, and Mario Szegedy. Checking computations in polylogarithmic time. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 21–31, 1991.
- [BGJ⁺12] Arnab Bhattacharyya, Elena Grigorescu, Kyomin Jung, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and David P. Woodruff. Transitive-closure spanners. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 41(6):1380–1425, 2012.
- [BKMR24] Omri Ben-Eliezer, Esty Kelman, Uri Meir, and Sofya Raskhodnikova. Property testing with online adversaries. In Venkatesan Guruswami, editor, *15th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2024, January 30 to February 2, 2024, Berkeley, CA, USA*, volume 287 of *LIPIcs*, pages 11:1–11:25. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024.
- [BKS⁺10] Arnab Bhattacharyya, Swastik Kopparty, Grant Schoenebeck, Madhu Sudan, and David Zuckerman. Optimal testing of Reed-Muller codes. In *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 488–497, 2010.
- [BLR93] Manuel Blum, Michael Luby, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Self-testing/correcting with applications to numerical problems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 47(3):549–595, 1993.

- [BSVW03] Eli Ben-Sasson, Madhu Sudan, Salil P. Vadhan, and Avi Wigderson. Randomness-efficient low degree tests and short PCPs via epsilon-biased sets. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 612–621, 2003.
- [CS13] Deeparnab Chakrabarty and C. Seshadhri. Optimal bounds for monotonicity and Lipschitz testing over hypercubes and hypergrids. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 419–428, 2013.
- [DG13] Irit Dinur and Venkatesan Guruswami. PCPs via low-degree long code and hardness for constrained hypergraph coloring. In *Proceedings, IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 340–349, 2013.
- [DGL⁺99] Yevgeniy Dodis, Oded Goldreich, Eric Lehman, Sofya Raskhodnikova, Dana Ron, and Alex Samorodnitsky. Improved testing algorithms for monotonicity. In *Proceedings of Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM)*, pages 97–108, 1999.
- [Dix69] John D Dixon. The probability of generating the symmetric group. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 110:199–205, 1969.
- [EKK⁺00] Funda Ergün, Sampath Kannan, Ravi Kumar, Ronitt Rubinfeld, and Mahesh Viswanathan. Spot-checkers. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 60(3):717–751, 2000.
- [FGL⁺96] Uriel Feige, Shafi Goldwasser, László Lovász, Shmuel Safra, and Mario Szegedy. Interactive proofs and the hardness of approximating cliques. *Journal of the ACM*, 43(2):268–292, 1996.
- [FS95] Katalin Friedl and Madhu Sudan. Some improvements to total degree tests. In *Third Israel Symposium on Theory of Computing and Systems (ISTCS)*, pages 190–198, 1995.
- [GGR98] Oded Goldreich, Shafi Goldwasser, and Dana Ron. Property testing and its connection to learning and approximation. *Journal of the ACM*, 45(4):653–750, 1998.
- [GHV17] William Timothy Gowers and Omid Hatami Varzaneh. Inverse and stability theorems for approximate representations of finite groups. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 208(12):70–106, 2017.
- [GKS06] Elena Grigorescu, Swastik Kopparty, and Madhu Sudan. Local decoding and testing for homomorphisms. In Josep Díaz, Klaus Jansen, José D. P. Rolim, and Uri Zwick, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, 9th International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems, APPROX 2006 and 10th International Workshop on Randomization and Computation, RANDOM 2006, Barcelona, Spain, August 28-30 2006, Proceedings*, volume 4110 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 375–385. Springer, 2006.
- [GLR⁺91] Peter Gemmell, Richard J. Lipton, Ronitt Rubinfeld, Madhu Sudan, and Avi Wigderson. Self-testing/correcting for polynomials and for approximate functions. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 32–42, 1991.
- [GR16] Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. On sample-based testers. *ACM Trans. Comput. Theory*, 8(2):7:1–7:54, 2016.
- [HSS13] Elad Haramaty, Amir Shpilka, and Madhu Sudan. Optimal testing of multivariate polynomials over small prime fields. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 42(2):536–562, 2013.

- [HW03] Johan Håstad and Avi Wigderson. Simple analysis of graph tests for linearity and PCP. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 22(2):139–160, 2003.
- [JPRZ09] Charanjit S. Jutla, Anindya C. Patthak, Atri Rudra, and David Zuckerman. Testing low-degree polynomials over prime fields. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 35(2):163–193, 2009.
- [KLR25] Esty Kelman, Ephraim Linder, and Sofya Raskhodnikova. Online versus offline adversaries in property testing. In Raghu Meka, editor, *16th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2025, January 7-10, 2025, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA*, volume 325 of *LIPIcs*, pages 65:1–65:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2025.
- [KM22] Tali Kaufman and Dor Minzer. Improved optimal testing results from global hypercontractivity. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 98–109. IEEE, 2022.
- [KM25] Subhash Khot and Kunal Mittal. Biased Linearity Testing in the 1% Regime. In Srikanth Srinivasan, editor, *40th Computational Complexity Conference (CCC 2025)*, volume 339 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 10:1–10:23, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2025. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [KR06] Tali Kaufman and Dana Ron. Testing polynomials over general fields. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 36(3):779–802, 2006.
- [KRV23] Iden Kalemaj, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Nithin Varma. Sublinear-time computation in the presence of online erasures. *Theory of Computing*, 19(1):1–48, 2023.
- [LM20] Andrea Lucchini and Mariapia Moscatiello. Generation of finite groups and maximal subgroup growth. *Advances in Group Theory and Applications*, 9:39–49, 2020.
- [LS95] Martin W Liebeck and Aner Shalev. The probability of generating a finite simple group. *Geometriae dedicata*, 56:103–113, 1995.
- [Lub02] Alexander Lubotzky. The expected number of random elements to generate a finite group. *Journal of Algebra*, 257(2):452–459, 2002.
- [Luc16] Andrea Lucchini. The expected number of random elements to generate a finite group. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 181(1):123–142, 2016.
- [Men13] Nina E Menezes. *Random generation and chief length of finite groups*. PhD thesis, University of St Andrews, 2013.
- [MR08] Dana Moshkovitz and Ran Raz. Sub-constant error low degree test of almost-linear size. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 38(1):140–180, 2008.
- [MR15] Cristopher Moore and Alexander Russell. Approximate representations, approximate homomorphisms, and low-dimensional embeddings of groups. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 29(1):182–197, 2015.
- [MR24] Tushant Mittal and Sourya Roy. Derandomized non-abelian homomorphism testing in low soundness regime. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18998*, 2024.
- [MR25] Tushant Mittal and Sourya Roy. A general framework for low soundness homomorphism testing, 2025.

- [MZ24] Dor Minzer and Kai Zhe Zheng. Adversarial low degree testing. In David P. Woodruff, editor, *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2024, Alexandria, VA, USA, January 7-10, 2024*, pages 4395–4409. SIAM, 2024.
- [Pom02] Carl Pomerance. The expected number of random elements to generate a finite abelian group. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica*, 43(1):191–198, 2002.
- [Ras99] Sofya Raskhodnikova. Monotonicity testing. *Masters Thesis, MIT*, 1999.
- [Ras16] Sofya Raskhodnikova. Testing if an array is sorted. In *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, pages 2219–2222. 2016.
- [RR16] Sofya Raskhodnikova and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Linearity testing/testing hadamard codes. In *Encyclopedia of Algorithms*, pages 1107–1110. 2016.
- [RS96a] R. Rubinfeld and M. Sudan. Robust characterization of polynomials with applications to program testing. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 25:647–668, 1996.
- [RS96b] Ronitt Rubinfeld and Madhu Sudan. Robust characterizations of polynomials with applications to program testing. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 25(2):252–271, 1996.
- [RS97] Ran Raz and Shmuel Safra. A sub-constant error-probability low-degree test, and a sub-constant error-probability PCP characterization of NP. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 475–484, 1997.
- [RS13] Noga Ron-Zewi and Madhu Sudan. A new upper bound on the query complexity of testing generalized Reed-Muller codes. *Theory of Computing*, 9:783–807, 2013.
- [Sam07] Alex Samorodnitsky. Low-degree tests at large distances. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 506–515, 2007.
- [ST00] Alex Samorodnitsky and Luca Trevisan. A PCP characterization of NP with optimal amortized query complexity. In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 191–199, 2000.
- [ST09] Alex Samorodnitsky and Luca Trevisan. Gowers uniformity, influence of variables, and PCPs. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 39(1):323–360, 2009.
- [SV86] Miklos Santha and Umesh V Vazirani. Generating quasi-random sequences from semi-random sources. *Journal of computer and system sciences*, 33(1):75–87, 1986.
- [SW06] Amir Shpilka and Avi Wigderson. Derandomizing homomorphism testing in general groups. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 36(4):1215–1230, 2006.
- [Tre98] Luca Trevisan. Recycling queries in PCPs and in linearity tests (extended abstract). In *Proceedings, ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 299–308, 1998.

A Miscellaneous proofs

Claim A.1. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, all sign sequences $\bar{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k) \in \{+, -\}^k$ and all finite groups G , if x_1, \dots, x_k are chosen independently and uniformly at random from G , then the sum $\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i$ is a uniformly distributed element in G .

Proof. Let a be an element in G . Then

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i = a \right] = \mathbb{E}_{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}} \left[\Pr_{x_k} \left[\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i = a \right] \right]. \quad (16)$$

Fix the values of the first $k-1$ elements, so the only randomness is in x_k . The condition $\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i = a$ is equivalent to $\sigma_k x_k = \sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_{k-i} x_{k-i} + a$. Therefore, there is only one choice of x_k out of $|G|$ that satisfies the equality: the element $\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_{k-i} x_{k-i} + a$ if $\sigma_k = +$ and the inverse of this element if $\sigma_k = -$. Thus, the probability term inside the expectation in (16) is $1/|G|$. Taking the expectation over these terms yields $\Pr \left[\sum_{i \in [k]} \sigma_i x_i = a \right] = 1/|G|$. \square

The following fact is folklore. For the sake of completeness, we add a short proof of it .

Fact A.2. *Let $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$. Then the probability that X is even is given by:*

$$\Pr(X \text{ is even}) = \frac{1 + (1 - 2p)^n}{2}.$$

Proof. Let $q = 1 - p$. Consider the function $f(z)$ defined as,

$$f(z) = (q + pz)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} p^k q^{n-k} z^k.$$

Evaluating at $z = 1$ and $z = -1$, we get:

$$f(1) = (p + q)^n = 1, \quad f(-1) = (q - p)^n = (1 - 2p)^n.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} f(1) + f(-1) &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} p^k q^{n-k} (1 + (-1)^k) \\ &= 2 \sum_{\substack{k=0 \\ k \text{ even}}}^n \binom{n}{k} p^k q^{n-k}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\Pr(X \text{ is even}) = \sum_{\substack{k=0 \\ k \text{ even}}}^n \binom{n}{k} p^k q^{n-k} = \frac{f(1) + f(-1)}{2} = \frac{1 + (1 - 2p)^n}{2}. \quad \square$$

Claim A.3. *Let $\zeta(x)$ be the Reimann Zeta function. Then $\zeta(x) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2^{x-1}-1}$ for all $x \geq 2$. Moreover, for all $\beta \in (0, 1)$, if $x = 1 + \log_2(1 + 1/\beta)$, then $\zeta(x) \leq 1 + \beta$.*

Proof. By the definition of the Reimann Zeta function,

$$\zeta(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^x} = 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^x}.$$

We partition the tail sum $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^x}$ into dyadic intervals:

$$[2, 4), [4, 8), [8, 16), \dots, [2^k, 2^{k+1}) \text{ and so on.}$$

Each interval $[2^k, 2^{k+1})$ contains 2^k integers, and for all integers $n \in [2^k, 2^{k+1})$, we have:

$$n \geq 2^k \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{n^x} \leq \frac{1}{(2^k)^x} = 2^{-kx}.$$

Therefore, the contribution from each block is bounded by

$$\sum_{n=2^k}^{2^{k+1}-1} \frac{1}{n^x} \leq 2^k \cdot 2^{-kx} = 2^{k(1-x)}.$$

Summing over $k \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^x} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{k(1-x)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (2^{1-x})^k = \frac{2^{1-x}}{1 - 2^{1-x}} = \frac{1}{2^{x-1} - 1}.$$

The geometric series converges as the ratio between successive terms, $2^{1-x} < 1$ as $x \geq 2$. Thus,

$$\zeta(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^x} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2^{x-1} - 1}.$$

Substituting $t = 1 + \log_2(1 + 1/\beta)$, we get $\zeta(t) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2^{\log_2(1+1/\beta)} - 1} = 1 + \beta$. □