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The Hamming distance of $f$ to the 16 affine Boolean functions is either 2,4 , or 6 . Therefore the nonlinearity of $f$ is 2 .
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## The case $n=9$

$$
2^{n-1}-2^{(n-1) / 2}=240 \quad\left\lfloor 2^{n-1}-2^{n / 2-1}\right\rfloor=244
$$

The search space is $2^{512}$.
subgroup \# orbits nonlinearity spectral radius

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
\mathbb{F}_{2^{3}}^{*} \times \operatorname{Gal}\left(\mathbb{F}_{2^{9}} / \mathbb{F}_{2}\right) & 8 & <240 & >\sqrt{2} \\
\operatorname{Gal}\left(\mathbb{F}_{2^{9}} / \mathbb{F}_{2}\right) & 60 & =241 & =1.3258 \ldots \\
\operatorname{Gal}\left(\mathbb{F}_{2^{9}} / \mathbb{F}_{2^{3}}\right) & 176 & \geq 242 & \leq 1.2374 \ldots
\end{array}
$$

Patterson-Wiedemann 1983
Kavut-Maitra-Yücel 2007
Kavut-Yücel 2010
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Theorem (Dobbertin 1995). $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{\prime}(2 m)=1$.
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Proposition (S. 2019). Let $v=7^{e}$. Then, for some odd $n$, there is a function $h: H \rightarrow\{-1,1\}$ such that $f$ satisfies

$$
\max _{a \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{n}}}|\hat{f}(a)| \leq 1+12 \sqrt{\log (2 v) / v}
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The main result follows by letting $e$ tend to infinity.
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## Fourier Near-Eigenfunctions

If $\mathbb{1}_{H}$ is an eigenfunction for the Fourier transform, then on $\mathbb{F}_{2^{n}}^{*}$,

$$
f(y)=\sum_{z \in T} \mathbb{1}_{H}(y / z) g(z) \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \hat{f}(a)=f\left(a^{-1}\right)
$$

Let $\chi$ be a multiplicative character of $\mathbb{F}_{2^{n}}$ of order $v$. Then

$$
\mathbb{1}_{H}(y)=\frac{1}{v} \sum_{j=0}^{v-1} \chi^{j}(y) \longleftrightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{1}_{H}}(a)=\frac{1}{v} \sum_{j=0}^{v-1} \chi^{j}(a) \frac{\overline{G\left(\chi^{j}\right)}}{2^{n / 2}} .
$$

Then $G\left(\chi^{j}\right) \in \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-7})$ and by the Davenport-Hasse Theorem
$\frac{G\left(\chi^{j}\right)}{2^{n / 2}} \approx 1$ for some odd $n$ and all $0<j<v$.
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Is there a $u \in\{-1,1\}^{N}$ such that $\|A u\|_{\infty}$ is "small"?
Standard probabilistic method:

$$
\|A u\|_{\infty}<\sqrt{2 N \log (2 M)} \quad \text { for almost all } u \in\{-1,1\}^{N} .
$$

Theorem (Spencer 1985). For all sufficiently large $N$, there exists $u \in\{-1,1\}^{N}$ such that

$$
\|A u\|_{\infty}<11 \sqrt{N \log (2 M / N)}
$$

This shows the existence of $h: H \rightarrow\{-1,1\}$ such that

$$
f(y)=\mathbb{1}_{H}(y) h(y) \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad|\hat{f}(a)| \leq 11 \sqrt{\log (2 v) / v}
$$

## More general functions

$$
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
f: \mathbb{F}_{3}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{3}, & f(x, y)=x^{2}+x y-y^{2} \\
(x, y) & 00 & 01 & 02 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 20 & 21 & 22 \\
\hline f(x, y) & 0 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1
\end{array}
$$

## More general functions

\[

\]

## More general functions

\[

\]

## More general functions

\[

\]

The Hamming distance of $f$ to each of the 27 affine functions is either 5 or 8 . Therefore the nonlinearity of $f$ is 5 .

## More general functions

\[

\]

The Hamming distance of $f$ to each of the 27 affine functions is either 5 or 8 . Therefore the nonlinearity of $f$ is 5 .

## A more general question

What is the largest nonlinearity of a function from $\mathbb{F}_{q}^{n}$ to $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ ?

## More general functions

\[

\]

The Hamming distance of $f$ to each of the 27 affine functions is either 5 or 8 . Therefore the nonlinearity of $f$ is 5 .

## A more general question

What is the largest nonlinearity of a function from $\mathbb{F}_{q}^{n}$ to $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ ?
Equivalently, what is the covering radius of the generalised first order Reed-Muller code $R_{q}(1, n)$ ?
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## The generalised Patterson-Wiedemann Conjecture

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{q}(n)=1 \quad \text { for all prime powers } q .
$$

## Asymptotic nonlinearities

Theorem (S. 2020). Let $q$ be a power of a prime $p$ and suppose that there is another prime $r>3$ such that $r \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$ and $-p$ is a primitive root modulo $r^{2}$. Then $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{q}(n)=1$.
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We now know that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(n)=1$, however without improving any specific value of $\mu(n)$.
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In general, $v$ is prime and $f(0)=1$ and

$$
f(y)=\mathbb{1}_{H}(y) h(y)+\sum_{k=0}^{v-1} \mathbb{1}_{H}\left(y / \theta^{k}\right)(k \mid v) \quad \text { for } y \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{n}}^{*}
$$

We still have to choose $h: H \rightarrow\{-1,1\}$.
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Choose $v$ prime, such that $v \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$ and such that -2 is a primitive root modulo $v$. For example, $v=7,23,47,71,79$.

If $\chi$ is a multiplicative character of $\mathbb{F}_{2^{n}}$ of order $v$, then

$$
G(\chi)=a+b \sqrt{-v}
$$

for some unique $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $a^{2}+v b^{2}=2^{n}$.
Then the Fourier transform of $\sum_{k=1}^{v-1} \mathbb{1}_{H}\left(y / \theta^{k}\right)(k \mid v)$ takes on the four values in the set
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The maximum modulus is close to 1 if and only if $\frac{G(\chi)}{2^{n / 2}} \approx \pm 1$.
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$$
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Take an $M \times N$ matrix $A$ with $M \geq N$ and real entries of magnitude at most 1.

Theorem (Spencer 1985). For all sufficiently large $N$, there exists $u \in\{-1,1\}^{N}$ such that

$$
\|A u\|_{\infty}<11 \sqrt{N \log (2 M / N)}
$$

Theorem (Goldammer-S. 2020). There exists $u \in\{-1,1\}^{N}$ such that

$$
\|A u\|_{\infty}<6 \sqrt{N \log (2 M / N)}
$$

This shows the existence of $h: H \rightarrow\{-1,1\}$ such that

$$
f(y)=\mathbb{1}_{H}(y) h(y) \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad|\hat{f}(a)| \leq 6 \sqrt{\log (2 v) / v}
$$



## Smallest known nonlinearities

- $\mu(3)=\sqrt{2}$ (easy to check)
- $\mu(5)=\sqrt{2}$ (Berlekamp-Welch 1972)

■ $\mu(7)=\sqrt{2}($ Mykkeltveit 1980 $),($ Hou 1996 $)$
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■ $\mu(n) \leq 1.193 \ldots$ for all $n \geq 15$ (Patterson-Wiedemann 1983)

## Smallest known nonlinearities

- $\mu(3)=\sqrt{2}$ (easy to check)
- $\mu(5)=\sqrt{2}$ (Berlekamp-Welch 1972)
- $\mu(7)=\sqrt{2}($ Mykkeltveit 1980),$($ Hou 1996)

■ $\mu(n) \leq 1.237 \ldots$ for all $n \geq 9$ (Kavut-Yücel 2010)
■ $\mu(n) \leq 1.193 \ldots$ for all $n \geq 15$ (Patterson-Wiedemann 1983)
■ $\mu(n) \leq 1.157 \ldots$ for all $n \geq 7515$ (Goldammer-S. 2020)

## Smallest known nonlinearities

- $\mu(3)=\sqrt{2}$ (easy to check)
- $\mu(5)=\sqrt{2}$ (Berlekamp-Welch 1972)
- $\mu(7)=\sqrt{2}($ Mykkeltveit 1980),$($ Hou 1996)

■ $\mu(n) \leq 1.237 \ldots$ for all $n \geq 9$ (Kavut-Yücel 2010)
■ $\mu(n) \leq 1.193 \ldots$ for all $n \geq 15$ (Patterson-Wiedemann 1983)
■ $\mu(n) \leq 1.157 \ldots$ for all $n \geq 7515$ (Goldammer-S. 2020)
■...

- $\mu(n) \leq 1.056 \ldots$ for all $n \geq 1211811$ (Goldammer-S. 2020)
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$$
C_{u}(f)=\sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n}}(-1)^{f(y)+f(y+u)}
$$

The absolute indicator of $f$ is

$$
\delta(f)=\frac{1}{2^{n / 2}} \max _{u \neq 0}\left|C_{u}(f)\right|
$$

This measures the resistance of a Boolean function against differential cryptanalysis.

## A related question

What is the smallest absolute indicator $\delta(n)$ of a Boolean function on $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{n}$ ?
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The autocorrelations can be computed from the Fourier transform:

$$
C_{u}(f)=\sum_{a \in \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n}} \widehat{f}(a)^{2}(-1)^{\langle a, u\rangle}
$$

For example, every bent function $f$ satisfies $\delta(f)=0$. Hence

$$
\delta(n)=0 \quad \text { for all even } n
$$

The best known general result is (Zhang-Zheng 1996)

$$
\delta(n) \leq \sqrt{2} \quad \text { for all odd } n
$$

## The Zhang-Zheng conjecture

(Zhang-Zheng 1996) constructed balanced Boolean functions $f$ on $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{n}$ satisfying

$$
\delta(f) \leq \begin{cases}2 & \text { for even } n \\ \sqrt{2} & \text { for odd } n\end{cases}
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## The Zhang-Zheng conjecture

(Zhang-Zheng 1996) constructed balanced Boolean functions $f$ on $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{n}$ satisfying

$$
\delta(f) \leq \begin{cases}2 & \text { for even } n \\ \sqrt{2} & \text { for odd } n\end{cases}
$$

Conjecture (Zhang-Zheng 1996). For every balanced Boolean function $f: \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2}$ we have

$$
\delta(f) \geq \sqrt{2}
$$

This conjecture has been disproved for several small values of $n$ by using the Patterson-Wiedemann approach together with heuristic search techniques.

## Infinitely many counterexamples

Theorem (Tang-Maitra 2018). For each $n \geq 46$ with $n \equiv 2$ $(\bmod 4)$ there is a balanced function $f: \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2}$ such that
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## Infinitely many counterexamples

Theorem (Tang-Maitra 2018). For each $n \geq 46$ with $n \equiv 2$ $(\bmod 4)$ there is a balanced function $f: \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2}$ such that

$$
\delta(f) \leq 1-o(1) \quad \text { and } \quad \mu(f) \leq \frac{7}{4}+o(1)
$$

Theorem (S. 2020). For each even $n \geq 6$ there exists a balanced function $f: \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2}$ such that

$$
\delta(f) \leq \frac{8 \sqrt{(n+3) \log (2)}}{2^{n / 4}} \quad \text { and } \quad \mu(f) \leq 1+o(1)
$$

Moreover there is a probabilistic algorithm that constructs such a function with probability at least $1 / 2$.

This gives counterexamples for all even $n \geq 20$.

## Tweaking bent functions

Let $f: \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2}$ be a bent function. Then $f$ is perfect:
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## Tweaking bent functions

Let $f: \mathbb{F}_{2}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2}$ be a bent function. Then $f$ is perfect:

$$
\delta(f)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \mu(f)=1
$$

but not balanced. Suppose that there are more 1's than 0's.

Flip every 1 with probability

$$
\frac{2^{n / 2-1}}{2^{n-1}+2^{n / 2-1}}
$$

Show that this does typically not change $\delta(f)$ and $\mu(f)$ by much and that we typically get a nearly balanced function. Then only a few more bit flips make the function balanced.
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## New conjectures

Let $\delta^{\prime}(n)$ be the smallest absolute indicator of a balanced
Boolean functions on $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{n}$.
Corollary (S. 2020). We have

$$
\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \delta^{\prime}(2 m)=0
$$

It is tempting to conjecture that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta^{\prime}(n)=0
$$

and hence also

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta(n)=0
$$

It seems that the functions used in the proof of the PattersonWiedemann Conjecture can be used to prove this.
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