

VOLODYMYR MASOL AND MYKOLA SLOBODIAN

**ESTIMATION OF THE RATE OF  
CONVERGENCE TO THE LIMIT DISTRIBUTION  
OF THE NUMBER OF FALSE SOLUTIONS OF A  
SYSTEM OF NONLINEAR RANDOM BOOLEAN  
EQUATIONS THAT HAS A LINEAR PART**

The theorem on a estimation of the rate of convergence ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) to the Poisson distribution of the number of false solutions of a beforehand consistent system of nonlinear random equations, that has a linear part, over the field GF(2) is proved.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let us consider a system of equations over the field GF(2) consisting of two elements

$$\sum_{k=1}^{g_i(n)} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_k \leq n} a_{j_1 \dots j_k}^{(i)} x_{j_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{j_k} = b_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

that satisfies condition (A)

1) coefficients  $a_{j_1 \dots j_k}^{(i)}$ ,  $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_k \leq n, k = 1, \dots, g_i(n), i = 1, \dots, N$ , are independent random variables that take value 1 with probability  $P\{a_{j_1 \dots j_k}^{(i)} = 1\} = p_{ik}$  and value 0 with probability  $P\{a_{j_1 \dots j_k}^{(i)} = 0\} = 1 - p_{ik}$ ;

2) elements  $b_i, i = 1, \dots, N$ , are the result of the substitution of a fixed  $n$ -dimensional vector  $\bar{x}^0$ , which has  $\rho(n)$  components equal to one, into the left-hand side of the system (1);

3) function  $g_i(n), i = 1, \dots, N$ , is nonrandom,  $g_i(n) \in \{2, \dots, n\}, i = 1, \dots, N$ .

Denote by  $\nu_n$  the number of false solutions of the system (1), i.e. the number of solutions of the system (1) different from the vector  $\bar{x}^0$ . We are interested in estimation of the rate of convergence to the limit distribution

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classifications*. Primary 60C05, 15A52, 15A03.

*Key words and phrases*. System of nonlinear random Boolean equations, field GF(2), rate of convergence.

of random variable  $\nu_n, n \rightarrow \infty$ . Such an estimation was considered in [2] under condition that there are no linear terms in each equation of the system (1) with probability 1. Besides, the essential in [2] was the condition  $\rho(n) = \rho n, 0 < \rho < 1$ .

**Theorem.** *Assume that the following conditions hold: (A);*

$$n - N = m, \quad m = \text{const}, \quad -\infty < m < \infty; \quad (2)$$

$$0 \leq \delta_{i1}(n) \leq p_{i1} \leq 1 - \delta_{i1}(n), \quad i = \overline{1, N}; \quad (3)$$

there exists a function  $\varphi(n)$  such that for any  $\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0 \in (0; 1)$ , there exists  $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon_0), n_0 \in N$ , such that for any  $n \geq n_0$  there exists  $\varepsilon, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \exp\{-\varepsilon \varphi(n) \delta_{i1}(n)\} \leq \varepsilon_0; \quad (4)$$

for any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  there exists a set  $T_i \neq \emptyset$  such that for all sufficiently large values  $n$

$$T_i \subseteq \{2, \dots, g_i(n)\}, \quad 0 \leq \delta_{it}(n) \leq p_{it} \leq 1 - \delta_{it}(n), \quad t \in T_i; \quad (5)$$

for any  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 \in (0; 1)$  and any integer  $k \geq 0$  there exists  $n_1 = n_1(\varepsilon_1, k), n_1 \in N$  such that for any  $n \geq n_1$

$$2^\beta B(n) < \varepsilon_1, \quad (6)$$

where  $B(n) = \sum_{i=1}^N \exp\{-2 \sum_{t \in T_i} \delta_{it}(n) C_{f(n)}^t\}$ ,  $\beta = \left[ \frac{\log_2 \mu(n)}{3} \right]$ ,  $\mu(n) = \frac{n}{\varphi(n) \ln n}$ ,  $\mu(n) \geq 2^{3k}$ ,  $f(n)$  takes integer positive values,  $f(n) = o(\varphi(n)), n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $[\cdot]$  is a sign of integer part.

Then for fixed  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| P\{\nu_n = k\} - \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda} \right| \leq \left( \frac{2e\lambda}{\beta} \right)^\beta [2 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) + \\ & + \Theta_2 (1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n)) + 6 \Theta_1] + \left( \frac{2e\lambda}{k} \right)^k \beta e^{2\lambda} B(n) + \\ & + \left( \frac{e\lambda}{k} \right)^k \beta e^\lambda [\Theta_2 (1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n)) + 6 \Theta_1], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\lambda = 2^m, \delta_i = \min \left\{ \delta_{i1}(n), \frac{2 \ln n}{\sqrt{\varepsilon \varphi(n)}} \right\}$ ,

$$\Theta_1 = \exp \left\{ -2^{-2\beta} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i + 2^\beta + \beta + \ln n - m \ln 2 \right\},$$

$$\Theta_2 = 2^{-n} \exp \left\{ \varepsilon 2^\beta \varphi(n) \left( \beta + \ln \left( \frac{ne}{\varepsilon 2^\beta \varphi(n)} \right) \right) + 2^\beta + 2 \ln(\varepsilon 2^\beta \varphi(n)) \right\}.$$

## 3. AUXILIARY STATEMENTS

Let  $x^1, \dots, x^k$  be  $n$ -dimensional Boolean vectors which are all distinct and do not coincide with  $x^0$ ,  $x^\nu = (x_1^\nu, \dots, x_n^\nu)$ ,  $\nu = \overline{0, k}$ ,  $1 \leq k < \infty$ . Let  $i_{\{u_1, \dots, u_s\}}$  ( $j_{\{u_1, \dots, u_s\}}$ ) denote the number of units (zeros) standing at those and only those positions of all vectors  $x^{u_1}, \dots, x^{u_s}$ , where all vectors  $x^{u_{s+1}}, \dots, x^{u_k}, x^0$  have zeros (units),  $u_\nu \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $u_{s+1}, \dots, u_k \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_s\}$ . See details [1].

Denote by  $M\nu_n^{[k]}$   $k$ -th factorial moments of a random variable  $\nu_n$ ; let  $M\nu_n^{[0]} \equiv 1$ .

**Statement.** ([1]) Under condition (A) for  $k \geq 1$

$$M\nu_n^{[k]} = 2^{-kN} S(n, k; Q), \quad (8)$$

where

$$S(n, k; Q) = \sum_{s=0}^{n-\rho(n)} \sum (n - \rho(n))! \left( (n - \rho(n) - s)! \prod_{i \in I} i! \right)^{-1} \times \\ \sum_{s'=0}^{\rho(n)} \sum' \rho(n)! \left( (\rho(n) - s')! \prod_{j \in J} j! \right)^{-1} Q, \quad s + s' \geq 1 \quad (9)$$

$$Q = \prod_{i=1}^N \left( 1 + \sum_{\nu=1}^k \sum_{1 \leq u_1 < \dots < u_\nu \leq k} \prod_{t=1}^{g_i(n)} (1 - 2p_{it})^{\Gamma_{t,k}^{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}}} \right); \quad (10)$$

summation  $\sum' (\sum')$  is taken over all  $i \in I$  ( $j \in J$ ), where  $I = \{i_{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}} : 1 \leq u_1 < \dots < u_\nu \leq k, \nu = 1, \dots, k\}$  ( $J = \{j_{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}} : 1 \leq u_1 < \dots < u_\nu \leq k, \nu = 1, \dots, k\}$ ) such that

$$\sum_{i \in I} i = s \quad \left( \sum_{j \in J} j = s' \right);$$

numbers  $i$  ( $i \in I$ ),  $j$  ( $j \in J$ ) in (9) satisfy the following relations

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\{u\}}, j \in J_{\{u\}}} (i + j) \geq 1, \quad u = 1, \dots, k,$$

$$\sum_{l=0}^{k-2} \sum_{1 \leq \mu_1 < \dots < \mu_l \leq k} \left( i_{\{u_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_l\}} + j_{\{u_1, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_l\}} + i_{\{u_2, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_l\}} + j_{\{u_2, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_l\}} \right) \geq 1,$$

$$1 \leq u_1 < u_2 \leq k;$$

for  $1 \leq u_1 < \dots < u_\nu \leq k$ ,  $\nu \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , and  $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  the inequality

$$\Gamma_{t,k}^{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}} \geq \sum_{(i,j) \in T} (C_i^t + C_j^t) \quad (11)$$

holds, where  $T = I_{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}} \times J_{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}}$ .

Here

$$I_{\{u_r, \dots, u_\nu\}} = \left\{ i_{\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_\psi, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_l\}} : A(\psi, l, k) \right\},$$

$$J_{\{u_r, \dots, u_\nu\}} = \left\{ j_{\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_\psi, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_l\}} : A(\psi, l, k) \right\},$$

where  $A(\psi, l, k)$  denotes the following constraint set:  $1 \leq \sigma_1 < \dots < \sigma_\psi \leq k$ ,  $\sigma_z \in \{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}$ ,  $z = 1, \dots, \psi$ ,  $\psi = 1, \dots, \nu$ ,  $\psi \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ ,  $1 \leq \mu_1 < \dots < \mu_l \leq k$ ,  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l \notin \{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}$ ,  $l = 0, \dots, k - \nu$ .

The explicit form of  $\Gamma_{t, k}^{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}}$  for  $1 \leq u_1 < \dots < u_\nu \leq k$ ,  $\nu \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $t = 1, 2, \dots, g_i(n)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  is given in [1].

We use statement 1 and divide the expression (8) into finite number of addends:

$$M\nu_n^{[k]} = 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta \geq 0} S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q), \quad (12)$$

where  $S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  differs from  $S(n, k; Q)$  by all  $i$  and  $j$  ( $i \in I$ ,  $j \in J$ ) involved in the expression  $S(n, k; Q)$  according to (9), but accept values such that there exist exactly  $\Delta$  distinct collections  $\omega_\alpha = \{u_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, u_{\xi_\alpha}^{(\alpha)}\}$   $1 \leq u_1^{(\alpha)} < \dots < u_{\xi_\alpha}^{(\alpha)} \leq k$ ,  $\xi_\alpha \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, \Delta$ , such that for each of them there is a  $t^{(\alpha)} \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ , satisfying the inequality

$$\Gamma_{t^{(\alpha)}, k}^{\omega_\alpha} < C_r^{t^{(\alpha)}}, \quad (13)$$

and for all collections  $\{v_1, \dots, v_\gamma\}$ ,  $1 \leq v_1 < \dots < v_\gamma \leq k$ ,  $\gamma = 1, \dots, k$ , that satisfy  $\{v_1, \dots, v_\gamma\} \neq \omega_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, \Delta$  the estimate

$$\Gamma_{t, k}^{\{v_1, \dots, v_\gamma\}} \geq C_r^t \quad (14)$$

holds for all  $t \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ , where

$$r = [\varepsilon\varphi(n)].$$

To prove the theorem, we use the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *If conditions (2), (5) and (6) hold, then*

$$S_1 = \lambda^k + \theta(k, n), \quad (15)$$

where

$$S_1 = 2^{-kN} S^{(0)}(n, k; Q),$$

$$|\theta(k, n)| \leq 2^{k+1} u(k) + 2^{mk} \Theta_2 \left( 1 + 2^{-mk+k+1} u(k) \right),$$

$$u(k) = 2^{mk} \sum_{i=1}^N \exp \left\{ -2 \sum_{t \in T_i} \delta_{it}(n) C_r^t \right\},$$

$$0 \leq k \leq \beta. \tag{16}$$

The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 1 in [2], provided  $\Delta = 0$ .

Further we will prove that for  $\Delta \geq 1$  the following statement takes place:

**Lemma 2.** *Under conditions of the theorem, for such  $k, k \in Z_+ \cup \{0\}$ , that satisfy formula (16), and for all sufficiently large values of  $n$*

$$p_1 \leq 6 \left(2^{2^k}\right) 2^{(m+1)k-m} \exp \left\{ -2^{-2k} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i + \ln n \right\}, \tag{17}$$

where  $p_1 = 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$ .

*Proof.* Denote by  $M_1 \left(\tilde{M}_1\right)$  the set of all  $i, i \in I \left(j, j \in J\right)$  that does not belong to  $I_{\omega_\alpha} \left(J_{\omega_\alpha}\right), \alpha = 1, \dots, \Delta$ ; and by  $M_2 = I \setminus M_1, \tilde{M}_2 = J \setminus \tilde{M}_1$ . Let  $R_1 \left(\tilde{R}_1\right)$  be the cardinal number of  $M_1 \left(\tilde{M}_1\right)$ . Let  $z$  be the smallest integer such that

$$\Delta \leq 2^z - 1, \quad 1 \leq z \leq k. \tag{18}$$

According to Statement 2.1 in [1] we obtain:

$$R_1 \leq 2^{k-z} - 1; \quad \tilde{R}_1 \leq 2^{k-z} - 1. \tag{19}$$

If

$$\Gamma_{t,k}^{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}} < C_r^t, \tag{20}$$

for some collection  $\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}, 1 \leq u_1 < \dots < u_\nu \leq k, \nu = 1, \dots, k$ , and some  $t \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ , then from (11) we get

$$0 \leq i < r, \quad i \in I_{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}}; \quad 0 \leq j < r, \quad j \in J_{\{u_1, \dots, u_\nu\}}. \tag{21}$$

Further, it follows from (13), (20) and (21) that the inequalities

$$0 \leq i < r \quad (0 \leq j < r) \tag{22}$$

hold for all  $i \in M_2 \left(j \in \tilde{M}_2\right)$ . Using (3) at  $i = \overline{1, N}$  and  $\alpha = \overline{1, \Delta}$  we obtain

$$\left| \prod_{t=1}^{g_i(n)} (1 - 2p_{it})^{\Gamma_{t,k}^{\omega_\alpha}} \right| \leq (1 - 2\delta_{i1}(n))^{\Gamma_{1,k}^{\omega_\alpha}}. \tag{23}$$

Let restriction  $G_1$  hold: there exist  $i \in M_2$  and (or)  $j \in \tilde{M}_2$  such that  $i \in \left(\frac{r}{E_n}, r\right]$  and (or)  $j \in \left(\frac{r}{E_n}, r\right]$  where

$$E_n > 3, \quad E_n = o(\ln n), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Put

$$p_2 = p_1 - S_2, \quad (24)$$

where

$$S_2 = 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S_{(G_1)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q),$$

$S_{(G_1)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  differs from  $S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  in such a way that summation over parameter  $s'$  in (9) is restricted by  $G_1$ .

Let  $G_1$  hold. Using (11) for the some  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, \Delta$ , we get

$$\Gamma_{1,k}^{\omega_\alpha} \geq \frac{r}{E_n}. \quad (25)$$

Taking into account (23) and (25), we find the estimate

$$\left| \prod_{t=1}^{g_i(n)} (1 - 2p_{it})^{\Gamma_{t,k}^{\omega_\alpha}} \right| \leq \exp \left\{ -2\delta_{i1}(n) \frac{r}{E_n} \right\},$$

for  $i, i = 1, \dots, N$  and some  $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, \Delta\}$ . Now using (18) we obtain

$$Q \leq 2^{zN} \exp \left\{ -2^{-z} \left( N - \sum_{i=1}^N \exp \left\{ -2\delta_{i1}(n) \frac{r}{E_n} \right\} \right) \right\}. \quad (26)$$

Thus, using Gelder inequality and relation (4), we estimate  $Q$  as

$$Q \leq \hat{Q}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\hat{Q} = 2^{zN} \exp \left\{ -2^{-z} \left( N - N^{1-A_n} \right) \right\}$ ,  $A_n = \frac{2\varepsilon}{E_n}$ .

Taking into account restriction  $G_1$ , relations (19) and (22) we find

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\leq 2^{-kN} \sum_{z=1}^k \sum_{\Delta=2^{z-1}}^{2^z-1} \sum_{1 \leq \zeta_1 < \dots < \zeta_d \leq 2^k-1} \times \\ &\times \sum_{s=0}^{n-\rho n} C_{n-\rho(n)}^{s'} \sum_{s_1+s_2=s} C_s^{s_1} \left( \sum_{i \in \tilde{M}_2} \frac{s_1!}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{M}_2} i!} \right) \left( \sum_{i \in \tilde{M}_1} \frac{s_2!}{\prod_{i \in \tilde{M}_1} i!} \right) \times \\ &\times \sum_{s'=0}^{\rho(n)} C_{\rho(n)}^{s'_1} \sum_{s'_1+s'_2=s'} C_{s'}^{s'_1} \left( \sum_{j \in \tilde{M}_2} \frac{s'_1!}{\prod_{j \in \tilde{M}_2} j!} \right) \left( \sum_{j \in \tilde{M}_1} \frac{s'_2!}{\prod_{j \in \tilde{M}_1} j!} \right) \hat{Q}. \quad (28) \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (27) and (28) that

$$S_2 \leq \frac{2^{2k} 2^{mk}}{2^m} \exp \left\{ -2^{-k} N \left( 1 - N^{-A_n} \right) + 2^k \varepsilon \varphi(n) \ln \left( \frac{ne}{2^k \varepsilon \varphi(n)} \right) \right\}. \quad (29)$$

Let restriction  $G_2$  hold: there exist  $i \in M_2$  and (or)  $j \in \tilde{M}_2$  such that  $i \in \left(\frac{r}{\ln n}, \frac{r}{E_n}\right]$  and (or)  $j \in \left(\frac{r}{\ln n}, \frac{r}{E_n}\right]$ .  
Let us consider sum  $p_3$ . Put

$$p_3 = p_2 - S_3, \quad (30)$$

where

$$S_3 = 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S_{(G_2)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q).$$

Here  $S_{(G_2)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  differs from  $S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  in such a way that summation in (9) is restricted by  $G_2$ .

If  $G_2$  hold, then similarly to (27) (we just replace  $A_n$  by  $\tilde{A}_n = \frac{2\varepsilon}{\ln n}$ ) we obtain

$$Q \leq 2^{zN} \exp \left\{ -2^{-k} (1 - e^{-2\varepsilon}) N \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Using  $G_2$  and relation (19), we find an estimate  $S_3$  (similarly to  $S_2$ ):

$$S_3 \leq \frac{2^{2k} 2^{mk}}{2^m} \exp \left\{ -2^{-k} (1 - e^{-2\varepsilon}) N + \frac{2^k \varepsilon \varphi(n)}{E_n} \ln \left( \frac{neE_n}{2^k \varepsilon \varphi(n)} \right) \right\}. \quad (32)$$

Let restriction  $G_3$  hold: for all  $i \in M_2$  and  $j \in \tilde{M}_2$

$$0 \leq i \leq \frac{r}{\ln n}, \quad 0 \leq j \leq \frac{r}{\ln n}. \quad (33)$$

Let us consider sum  $p_4$ . Put

$$p_4 = p_3 - S_4, \quad (34)$$

where

$$S_4 = 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S_{(G_3, 2^z-2)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q).$$

In (34),  $S_{(G_3, 2^z-2)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  differs from  $S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  in such a way that summation in (9) is restricted by  $G_3$  and  $\Delta < 2^z - 1$ .

Using (11) we obtain

$$\Gamma_{1,k}^{\omega_\alpha} \geq (s^{(\alpha)} + \tilde{s}^{(\alpha)}) \quad (35)$$

for all  $\alpha = 1, \dots, \Delta$ , where  $s^{(\alpha)} = \sum_{i \in I_{\omega_\alpha}} i$ ,  $\tilde{s}^{(\alpha)} = \sum_{j \in J_{\omega_\alpha}} j$ .

Taking into account (23) and (35) for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $\alpha = 1, \dots, \Delta$ ,

$$\left| \prod_{t=1}^{g_i(n)} (1 - 2p_{it})^{\Gamma_{t,k}^{\omega_\alpha}} \right| \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{2\delta_i}{2^k} (s^{(\alpha)} + \tilde{s}^{(\alpha)}) \right\}.$$

Using equality  $e^{-y} \leq 1 - \frac{y}{2}$ ,  $0 \leq y < 1$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $\alpha = 1, \dots, \Delta$ , we get

$$\left| \prod_{t=1}^{g_i(n)} (1 - 2p_{it})^{\Gamma_{t,k}^{\omega,\alpha}} \right| \leq 1 - \frac{\delta_i}{2^k} (s^{(\alpha)} + \tilde{s}^{(\alpha)}). \quad (36)$$

Taking into account (5), (6), (14) and (36) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S_{(G_3)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q) &\leq 2^{-kN} 2^{2^k} \sum_{s=0}^{n-\rho(n)} C_{n-\rho(n)}^s \sum_{s_*=0}^s R_1^{s-s_*} \times \\ &\left( \sum_{i \in M_2} \sum_{i=s_*} \frac{s!}{(s-s_*)!} \left( \prod_{i \in M_2} i! \right)^{-1} \right) \times \\ &\sum_{s'=0}^{\rho(n)} C_{\rho(n)}^{s'} \sum_{\tilde{s}_*=0}^{s'} \tilde{R}_1^{s'-\tilde{s}_*} \left( \sum_{i \in \tilde{M}_2} \sum_{i=\tilde{s}_*} \frac{s'!}{(s'-\tilde{s}_*)!} \left( \prod_{j \in \tilde{M}_2} j! \right)^{-1} \right) \times \\ &\times \exp \left\{ -2^{-z} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{2^k} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\Delta} (s^{(\alpha)} + \tilde{s}^{(\alpha)}) + 2^{k-mk} u(k) \right\}, \quad s + s' \geq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Now, taking into consideration (2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S_{(G_3)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q) \leq \\ &\leq 2^{2^k} 2^{mk} 2^{-zn} (\Delta + 1)^N \exp \left\{ \frac{k 2^k \varepsilon \varphi(n) \ln 2}{\ln n} + \frac{2^k \varepsilon \varphi(n)}{\ln n} \ln \left( \frac{en \ln n}{2^k \varepsilon \varphi(n)} \right) \right\} \times \\ &\times \exp \left\{ -2^{-z+1} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta_i}{2^k} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\Delta} (s^{(\alpha)} + \tilde{s}^{(\alpha)}) + 2^{k-mk} u(k) \right\}, \quad s + s' \geq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where  $S_{(G_3)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  differs from  $S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  in such a way that summation in (9) is restricted by  $G_3$ .

If  $\Delta < 2^z - 1$ , then it follows from (38) and the inequality  $\max\{s_*, \tilde{s}_*\} \leq \frac{2^k \varepsilon \varphi(n)}{\ln n}$ , that

$$S_4 \leq \frac{2^{2^k} 2^{mk}}{2^m} \exp \left\{ -2^{-k} N + 2^{k+1} \varepsilon \varphi(n) \right\}. \quad (39)$$

Let  $\Delta = 2^z - 1$ . Then we can put

$$p_5 = p_4 - S_5, \quad (40)$$

where

$$S_5 = 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S_{(G_3, 2^z-1)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q).$$



Here,  $S_{(G_3, 2^z-1)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  differs from  $S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  in such a way that summation in (9) is restricted by  $G_3$  and condition  $\Delta = 2^z - 1$ . Using (2), (6), (19), the inequality

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{\Delta} (s^{(\alpha)} + \tilde{s}^{(\alpha)}) \geq s_* + \tilde{s}_*, \quad (41)$$

where

$$s_* = \sum_{i \in M_2} i, \quad \tilde{s}_* = \sum_{j \in \tilde{M}_2} j,$$

and relation (37) it is easy to verify that

$$S_5 \leq \frac{2^{2^k} 2^{(m+1)k}}{2^m} \exp \left\{ -2^{-2k} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i + \ln n \right\}, \quad (42)$$

provided

$$s_* + \tilde{s}_* \geq 1. \quad (43)$$

Now, let us check that if  $\Delta = 2^z - 1$ ,  $1 \leq z \leq k$ , and  $z \in \{k, k-1\}$  or  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ , then there exists some  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \in \{1, 2, \dots, \Delta\}$ , such that  $\xi_\alpha \leq 2$ . Indeed, when  $z = k$  or  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ , the existence of the mentioned parameter  $\alpha$  is obvious. For  $z = k-1$  the existence of the parameter  $\alpha$  such that  $\xi_\alpha \leq 2$ , follows from Remark 2 in [1, p.1217].

Let restrictions  $G_4$  hold:

$$s_* + \tilde{s}_* = 0, \quad (44)$$

$$\xi_\alpha \geq 3, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, \Delta, \quad \Delta = 2^z - 1, \quad 1 \leq z \leq k-2, \quad 3 \leq k < \infty. \quad (45)$$

We can put

$$p_6 = p_5 - S_6, \quad (46)$$

$$S_6 = 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S_{(G_4)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q),$$

where  $S_{(G_4)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  differs from  $S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  in such a way that summation in (9) is restricted by  $G_4$ .

Let restriction (44),  $\Delta = 2^z - 1$ ,  $R_1 < 2^{k-z} - 1$ , and  $\tilde{R}_1 < 2^{k-z} - 1$  hold. Then using (38), by virtue of (19), we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} S_6 &\leq (1 + o(1)) 2^{2^k + zN - kN} \sum_{s=0}^{n-\rho(n)} C_{n-\rho(n)}^s |M_1|^s \sum_{s'=0, s'+s \geq 1}^{\rho(n)} C_{\rho(n)}^{s'} |\tilde{M}_1|^{s'} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{2^{2^k+1} 2^{mk}}{2^m} (1 - 2^{1-k})^n. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

It remains to check the relation

$$S_7 \leq \frac{2^{2^k} 2^{mk}}{2^m} \exp \left\{ -n2^{-k+1} + \varepsilon \varphi(n) \ln \left( \frac{ne}{\varepsilon \varphi(n)} \right) + \ln \sqrt{\varphi(n)} \right\}, \quad (48)$$

where

$$S_7 = p_6 = 2^{-kN} \sum_{\Delta=1}^{2^k-1} S_{(G_4, \tilde{R}_1)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q), \quad (49)$$

under restrictions  $G_4$  and

$$R_1 = \tilde{R}_1 = 2^{k-z} - 1. \quad (50)$$

In (49),  $S_{(G_4, \tilde{R}_1)}^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  differs from  $S^{(\Delta)}(n, k; Q)$  in such a way that summation in (9) is restricted by  $G_4$  and (50).

In analogy to how it was done in [1], we make use of conditions (50) and relations  $G_4$  to verify that there exists an element  $j_*$ ,  $j_* \in \tilde{M}_1$ , satisfying the inequality  $j_* \leq r$ . Therefore, under the restrictions  $G_4$  and (50) we get

$$S_7 \leq 2^{2^k} 2^{(k-z)m} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2^{k-z}} \right)^n \sum_{l=0}^r C_n^l.$$

Next, taking into account Stirling formula, we obtain (48).

Analyzing restrictions  $(G_i), i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , it is easy to verify that (9) holds for all possible values of parameter  $s, s', i$  and  $j$  ( $i \in I, j \in J$ ), that satisfy (13) for which  $\Delta \geq 1$ .

Equalities (24), (30), (34), (40), (46) and (49) combined with (29), (32), (39), (42), (47) and (48) prove (17) under the conditions of the theorem.

**Lemma 3.** *Under conditions of the theorem, for such  $k, k \in Z_+ \cup \{0\}$ , that satisfy formula (16),*

$$M\nu_n^{[k]} = \lambda^k + \Phi(k, n), \quad (51)$$

where  $\Phi(k, n) = \theta(k, n) + p_1$ .

*Proof.* By virtue of (12), Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 imply, obviously, (51), where

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(k, n)| &\leq 2^{mk} \left( 2^{k(1-m)+1} u(k) + \Theta_2 \left( 1 + 2^{-mk+k+1} u(k) \right) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 6 \exp \left\{ -2^{-2k} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i + 2^k + k + \ln n - m \ln 2 \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

### 3. PROOF OF THE THEOREM

To prove the theorem, we will consider the following inequality for all integer  $q, q \geq 0$ ,

$$\left| P\{\nu_n = q\} - \frac{\lambda^q}{q!} e^{-\lambda} \right| \leq R_1 + R_2 + R_3, \quad (52)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \left| P\{\nu_n = q\} - \sum_{k=q}^{q+2\nu-1} (-1)^{k-q} C_k^q B_{kn} \right|, \\ R_2 &= \left| \sum_{k=q}^{q+2\nu-1} (-1)^{k-q} C_k^q \left[ B_{kn} - \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \right] \right|, \\ R_3 &= \left| \sum_{k=q}^{q+2\nu-1} (-1)^{k-q} C_k^q \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} - \frac{\lambda^q}{q!} e^{-\lambda} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

$B_{kn}$  is the  $k$ -th binomial moment of the random variable  $\nu_n$ .

Choose  $n$  such that for any integer  $q \geq 0$

$$\frac{\lambda^{q+2\nu}}{q!(2\nu)!} < \left( \frac{2e\lambda}{\beta} \right)^\beta, \quad (53)$$

where  $2\nu = \beta - q$ .

It follows from the inequality

$$R_3 < \frac{\lambda^{q+2\nu}}{q!(2\nu)!} \quad (54)$$

and (53) that

$$R_3 < \left( \frac{2e\lambda}{\beta} \right)^\beta. \quad (55)$$

Taking into account (51) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| B_{q+2\nu, n} - \frac{\lambda^{q+2\nu}}{(q+2\nu)!} \right| = \frac{|\Phi(q+2\nu, n)|}{(q+2\nu)!} \leq \\ & \leq \frac{2^{(q+2\nu)m}}{(q+2\nu)!} \left( 6 \exp \left\{ -2^{-2(q+2\nu)} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_i + 2^{q+2\nu} + q + 2\nu + \ln n - m \ln 2 \right\} \right) + \\ & + \frac{2^{(q+2\nu)m}}{(q+2\nu)!} \left( 2^{q+2\nu+1} B(n) + \Theta_2 \left( 1 + 2^{q+2\nu+1} B(n) \right) \right). \quad (56) \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\left| B_{q+2\nu, n} - \frac{\lambda^{q+2\nu}}{(q+2\nu)!} \right| \leq \frac{2^{m\beta}}{\beta!} \left( 6 \Theta_1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) + \Theta_2 \left( 1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) \right) \right). \quad (57)$$

It follows from Bonferroni's inequality [3, p. 68] that

$$0 \leq P\{\nu_n = q\} - \sum_{k=q}^{q+2\nu-1} (-1)^{k-q} C_k^q B_{kn} \leq C_{q+2\nu}^q B_{q+2\nu, n}. \quad (58)$$

Applying (53) and (58) to (57), we obtain

$$B_{q+2\nu, n} C_{q+2\nu}^q < \left( \frac{2e\lambda}{\beta} \right)^\beta \left( 1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) + 6\Theta_1 + \Theta_2 \left( 1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) \right) \right). \quad (59)$$

Hence

$$R_1 < \left( \frac{2e\lambda}{\beta} \right)^\beta \left( 1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) + 6\Theta_1 + \Theta_2 \left( 1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) \right) \right). \quad (60)$$

Further, taking into account (51), it is easy to check that

$$\sup_{q \leq k \leq q+2\nu-1} C_k^q \left| B_{kn} - \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \right| \leq \left( \frac{2e\lambda}{q} \right)^q e^{2\lambda} B(n) + \left( \frac{e\lambda}{q} \right)^q e^\lambda \left( \Theta_2 \left( 1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) \right) + 6\Theta_1 \right). \quad (61)$$

Now, using inequality (61), it is easy to verify that

$$R_2 < \sum_{k=q}^{q+2\nu-1} C_k^q \left| B_{kn} - \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \right| \leq \left( \frac{2e\lambda}{q} \right)^q e^{2\lambda} \beta B(n) + \left( \frac{e\lambda}{q} \right)^q e^\lambda \beta \left( \Theta_2 \left( 1 + 2^{\beta+1} B(n) \right) + 6\Theta_1 \right). \quad (62)$$

Thus, with the help (52), (55), (60), and (62) we obtain (7). The theorem is proved.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Masol, V. I., *Limit distribution of the number of solutions of a system of random Boolean equations that has a linear part*, Ukr. math. jour., (1998), v. 50, no. 9, 1214–1226 (in Ukrainian).
2. Masol, V. I., Slobodian, M. V., *Estimation of the rate of convergence to the limit distribution of the number of false solutions of a system of nonlinear random Boolean equations*, PT&MS, (2007), (Submitted) (in Ukrainian).
3. Sachkov, V. N., *Introduction to combinatorial methods in discrete mathematics*, M.: Nauka, (1982) (in Russian).

DEPARTMENT OF PROBABILITY THEORY AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS,  
KYIV NATIONAL TARAS SHEVCHENCO UNIVERSITY, KYIV, UKRAINE.

*E-mail address:* vimasol@ukr.net

DEPARTMENT OF PROBABILITY THEORY AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS,  
KYIV NATIONAL TARAS SHEVCHENCO UNIVERSITY, KYIV, UKRAINE.

*E-mail address:* mslob@ukr.net