

# The Probabilistic Method

- ① If  $E[X] = C$ , then there are values  $c_1 \leq C$  and  $c_2 \geq C$  such that  $Pr(X = c_1) > 0$  and  $Pr(X = c_2) > 0$ .
- ② If a random object in a set satisfies some property with positive probability then there is an object in that set that satisfies that property.

## Theorem

Given any graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges, there is a partition of  $V$  into two disjoint sets  $A$  and  $B$  such that at least  $m/2$  edges connect vertex in  $A$  to a vertex in  $B$ .

## Proof.

Construct sets  $A$  and  $B$  by randomly assign each vertex to one of the two sets.

The probability that a given edge connect  $A$  to  $B$  is  $1/2$ , thus the expected number of such edges is  $m/2$ .

Thus, there exists such a partition. □

# Maximum Satisfiability

Given  $m$  clauses in CNF (Conjunctive Normal Form), assume that no clause contains a variable and its complement.

## Theorem

*For any set of  $m$  clauses there is a truth assignment that satisfy at least  $m/2$  of the clauses.*

## Proof.

Assign random values to the variables. The probability that a given clause (with  $k$  literals) is not satisfied is  $2^{-k}$ , so the probability that it is satisfied is

$$1 - 2^{-k} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$



# Monochromatic Complete Subgraphs

Given a complete graph on 1000 vertices, can you color the edges in two colors such that no clique of 20 vertices is monochromatic?

## Theorem

*If  $n \leq 2^{k/2}$  then it is possible to edge color the edges of a complete graph on  $n$  points ( $K_n$ ), such that it has no monochromatic  $K_k$  subgraph.*

## Proof:

Consider a random coloring.

For a given set of  $k$  vertices, the probability that the clique defined by that set is monochromatic is bounded by

$$2 \times 2^{-\binom{k}{2}}.$$

There are  $\binom{n}{k}$  such cliques, thus the probability that **any** clique is monochromatic is bounded by

$$\binom{n}{k} 2 \times 2^{-\binom{k}{2}} \leq \frac{n^k}{k!} 2 \times 2^{-\binom{k}{2}}$$

$$\leq 2^{(k)^2/2 - k(k-1)/2 + 1} \frac{1}{k!} < 1.$$

$$= 2^{k/2} + 1/k! < 1$$

Thus, there is a coloring with the required property.

When  $n = 1000 \leq 2^{10} = 2^{k/2}$  we get that there exists a 2-colouring of  $K_{1000}$  with no monochromatics  $K_{20}$ .

# Sample and Modify

An *independent set* in a graph  $G$  is a set of vertices with no edges between them.

Finding the largest independent set in a graph is an NP-hard problem.

## Theorem

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph on  $n$  vertices with  $dn/2$  edges. Then  $G$  has an independent set with at least  $n/2d$  vertices.

## Algorithm:

- 1 Delete each vertex of  $G$  (together with its incident edges) independently with probability  $1 - 1/d$ .
- 2 For each remaining edge, remove it and one of its adjacent vertices.

$X$  = number of vertices that survive the first step of the algorithm.

$$E[X] = \frac{n}{d}.$$

$Y$  = number of edges that survive the first step.

An edge survives if and only if its two adjacent vertices survive.

$$E[Y] = \frac{nd}{2} \left(\frac{1}{d}\right)^2 = \frac{n}{2d}.$$

The second step of the algorithm removes all the remaining edges, and at most  $Y$  vertices.

Size of output independent set:

$$E[X - Y] = \frac{n}{d} - \frac{n}{2d} = \frac{n}{2d}.$$

# Conditional Expectation

## Definition

$$E[Y | Z = z] = \sum_y y \Pr(Y = y | Z = z),$$

where the summation is over all  $y$  in the range of  $Y$ .

## Lemma

For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$ ,

$$E[X] = \sum_y \Pr(Y = y) E[X | Y = y],$$

where the sum is over all values in the range of  $Y$ .



## Derandomization using Conditional Expectations

Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges, we showed that there is a partition of  $V$  into  $A$  and  $B$  such that at least  $m/2$  edges connect  $A$  to  $B$ .

How do we find such a partition?

$C(A, B)$  = number of edges connecting  $A$  to  $B$ .

If  $A, B$  is a random partition  $E[C(A, B)] = \frac{m}{2}$ .

**Algorithm:**

- 1 Let  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$  be an arbitrary enumeration of the vertices.
- 2 Let  $x_i$  be the set where  $v_i$  is placed ( $x_i \in \{A, B\}$ ).
- 3 For  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do:
  - 1 Place  $v_i$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i] \\ & \geq E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}] \geq m/2. \end{aligned}$$

## Lemma

For all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  there is an assignment of  $v_i$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i] \\ & \geq E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}] \geq m/2. \end{aligned}$$

## Proof.

By induction on  $i$ .

For  $i = 1$ ,  $E[C(A, B) \mid x_1] = E[C(A, B)] = m/2$

For  $i > 1$ , if we place  $v_i$  randomly in one of the two sets,

$$\begin{aligned} & E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}] \\ = & \frac{1}{2} E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i = A] \\ & + \frac{1}{2} E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i = B]. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max(E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i = A], \\ & E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i = B]) \\ \geq & E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}] \\ \geq & m/2 \end{aligned}$$

How do we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \max(E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i = A], \\ & E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i = B]) \\ & \geq E[C(A, B) \mid x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}] \end{aligned}$$

We just need to consider edges between  $v_i$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}$ .

**Simple Algorithm:**

- 1 Place  $v_1$  arbitrarily.
- 2 For  $i = 2$  to  $n$  do
  - 1 Place  $v_i$  in the set with smaller number of neighbors.

## Dense graphs with no short cycles

### Theorem

For every integer  $k \geq 3$  there exists a graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices, at least  $\frac{1}{4}n^{1+\frac{1}{k}}$  edges and no cycle of length less than  $k$ .

**Proof:** Consider a random graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$  with  $p = n^{\frac{1}{k}-1}$  and let the random variable  $X$  denote the number of edges in the graph. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[X] &= p \binom{n}{2} \\ &= n^{\frac{1}{k}-1} \frac{1}{2} n(n-1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) n^{\frac{1}{k}+1} \end{aligned}$$

## Dense graphs with no short cycles

Let  $Y$  be the random variable whose value (for the given graph  $G$ ) is number of cycles of length at most  $k-1$  in  $G$ .

Each  $i$ -cycle occurs with probability  $p^i$  and there are  $\binom{n}{i} \frac{(i-1)!}{2}$  possible cycles of length  $i$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[Y] &= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \binom{n}{i} \frac{(i-1)!}{2} p^i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} n^i p^i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} n \frac{i}{k} \\ &< kn \frac{k-1}{k} \end{aligned}$$

## Dense graphs with no short cycles

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[X - Y] &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) n^{\frac{1}{k}+1} - kn^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} n^{\frac{1}{k}+1} \end{aligned}$$

So, if we delete one edge from every cycle of length at most  $k - 1$  in  $G$  the expected number of edges in the resulting graph  $G'$  is at least  $\frac{1}{4} n^{\frac{1}{k}+1}$ . This means that there exists a graph that has at least  $\frac{1}{4} n^{\frac{1}{k}+1}$  and no cycles with less than  $k$  vertices.



# High chromatic number and no triangles

The **Chromatic** number,  $\chi(G)$  of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is the minimum integer  $k$  so that we can partition  $V$  into disjoint sets  $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k$  with the property that no edge is inside any  $V_i$ .

## Theorem

*For every  $k \geq 1$  there exists a graph with no clique of size 3 (triangle-free) and chromatic number at least  $k$ .*

## High chromatic number and no triangles

**Proof** Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$  where  $p = n^{-\frac{2}{3}}$

To prove that  $\chi(G) > k$  it suffices to show that  $G$  has no independent set of size  $\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$ . In fact we prove that with high probability  $G$  no has independent set of size  $\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil$ .

Let the random variable  $I$  count the number of independent sets of size  $\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil$  in  $G$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the set of all  $S \subseteq V$  of size  $\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil$ . Let the indicator variable  $I_S$  be one if  $S$  is an independent set and 0 otherwise. So  $I = \sum_{\{S \in \mathcal{S}\}} I_S$ .

Then we have  $E[I_S] = (1 - p)^{\binom{\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil}{2}}$

## High chromatic number and no triangles

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[I] &= \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{E}[I_S] \\ &= \binom{n}{\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil} (1-p)^{\binom{\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil}{2}} \\ &< \binom{n}{\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil} (1-p)^{\frac{n}{2k}} \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $\binom{n}{r} \leq 2^n$  for all  $0 \leq r \leq n$  and  $1-x < e^{-x}$  when  $x > 0$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[I] &< 2^n e^{-\frac{pn(n-2k)}{8k^2}} \\ &< 2^n e^{-\frac{n^{\frac{4}{3}}}{16k^2}} \\ &< \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

when  $n > 2^{12} k^6$ .

## High chromatic number and no triangles

When  $n \geq 2^{12}k^6$  we have  $E[I] < \frac{1}{2}$ .

By Markov's inequality  $Pr(I > 0) < \frac{1}{2}$  when  $n \geq 2^{12}k^6$ .

Let  $T$  be the number of triangles in  $G$ . Now we need to show that  $E[T]$  is also much less than one, BUT that is not true!

$$E[T] = \binom{n}{3} p^3 < \frac{n^3}{3!} (n^{-\frac{2}{3}})^3 = \frac{n}{6} \quad (1)$$

## High chromatic number and no triangles

We found that  $E[T] = \frac{n}{6}$ .

By Markov's inequality,  $Pr(T \geq \frac{n}{2}) \leq \frac{\frac{n}{6}}{\frac{n}{2}} = \frac{1}{3}$  for large  $n$

Now we have  $Pr(I \geq 1) + Pr(T \geq \frac{n}{2}) < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} < 1$  so there exists a graph  $G$  with  $I = 0$  and  $T \leq \frac{n}{2}$ .

## High chromatic number and no triangles

Choose a set  $M$  of at most  $\frac{n}{2}$  vertices which meets all triangles in  $G$  and let  $G' = G - M$ .

Then  $G'$  is triangle-free and has at least  $\frac{n}{2}$  vertices. Also  $G'$  has no independent set of size  $\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil$  (because  $G$  has no such set) so

$$\chi(G') > \frac{\frac{n}{2}}{\frac{n}{2k}} = k.$$

# Randomization as a Resource

Complexity is usually studied in terms of resources, **TIME** and **SPACE**.

We add a new resource, **RANDOMNESS**, measured by the number of independent random bits used by the algorithm (= the entropy of the random source).

## Example: Packet Routing

We proved:

### Theorem

*There is an algorithm for permutation routing on an  $N = 2^n$ -cube that uses a total of  $O(nN)$  random bits and terminates with high probability in  $cn$  steps, for some constant  $c$ .*

Can we achieve the same result with fewer random bits?

### Theorem

*There is an algorithm for permutation routing on an  $N = 2^n$ -cube that uses a total of  $O(n)$  random bits and terminates with high probability in  $cn$  steps, for some constant  $c$ .*



# Proof

Let  $A(X)$  be a randomized algorithm with input  $x$  that uses (up to)  $s$  random bits.

Let  $A(x, r)$  be the execution of algorithm  $A$  with input  $x$  and a fixed sequence  $r$  on  $s$  bits.

We can write  $A(X)$  as

- 1 Choose  $r$  uniformly at random in  $[0, 2^s - 1]$ .
- 2 Run  $A(X, r)$ .

In the two phase routing algorithm  $s = \log(N^N) = nN$  (it chooses a random destination independently for each packet).

Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_r\}$  be the a collection of  $2^s$  deterministic algorithms  $A(l, r)$ .

We proved:

### Lemma

*For a given input permutation  $\pi$  and a deterministic algorithm  $B_i$  chosen uniformly at random from  $\mathcal{B}$ , the probability that  $B_i$  fails to route  $\pi$  in  $cn$  steps is bounded by  $1/N$ .*

Choose a random set  $\mathcal{D} = \{D_1, \dots, D_{N^3}\}$  of  $N^3$  elements in  $\mathcal{B}$ .  
Let  $X_i^\pi = 1$  if algorithm  $D_i$  does NOT route permutation  $\pi$  in  $cn$  steps, else  $X_i^\pi = 0$

$$E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N^3} X_i^\pi\right] \leq N^2$$

$$\text{Prob}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N^3} X_i^\pi \geq 2N^2\right) \leq e^{-N^2/3}$$

$$\text{Prob}(\exists \pi \sum_{i=1}^{N^3} X_i^\pi \geq 2N^2) \leq N!e^{-N^2/3} < 1$$

$$\text{Prob}(\exists \pi, \sum_{i=1}^{N^3} X_i^\pi \geq 2N^2) \leq N!e^{-N^2/3} < 1$$

## Theorem

There exists a set  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $N^3$  deterministic algorithms, such that for any given permutation  $\pi$  and an algorithm  $D$  chosen uniformly at random from  $\mathcal{D}$ , algorithm  $D$  routes  $\pi$  in  $cn$  steps with probability  $1 - 1/N$ . The random choice requires  $O(n)$  random bits.

# Can we do better?

Do we need any random bits?

## Definition

A routing algorithm is **oblivious** if the path taken by one packet is independent of the source and destinations of any other packets in the system.

## Theorem

*Given an  $N$ -node network with maximum degree  $d$  the routing time of any deterministic oblivious routing scheme is*

$$\Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{N}{d^3}}\right).$$

## Theorem

*For any deterministic oblivious algorithm for permutation routing on the  $N = 2^n$  cube there is an input permutation that requires  $\Omega(\sqrt{N}/n^3)$  steps.*

## Theorem

*Any randomized oblivious routing algorithm for permutation routing on the  $N = 2^n$  cube must use  $\Omega(n)$  random bits to route an arbitrary permutation in  $O(n)$  expected time.*

## proof

Assume that the algorithm uses  $k$  random bits.

It can choose between no more than  $2^k$  possible deterministic executions.

There is a deterministic execution  $\tilde{A}$  that is chosen with probability  $\geq 1/2^k$ .

Let  $\pi$  be an input permutation that requires  $\Omega(\sqrt{N}/n^3)$  steps in  $\tilde{A}$ .

The expected running time of this input permutation on the randomized algorithm is  $\Omega(\sqrt{N}/(2^k n^3))$

So, if we want this to be  $O(n)$  we must take  $k$  roughly  $\log N = n$ .