

Derandomization of Euclidean Random Walks

Ilia Binder^{1*} and Mark Braverman^{2**}

¹ Dept. of Mathematics, University of Toronto

² Dept. of Computer Science, University of Toronto

Abstract. We consider the problem of derandomizing random walks in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^k . We show that for $k = 2$, and in some cases in higher dimensions, such walks can be simulated in Logspace using only poly-logarithmically many truly random bits.

As a corollary, we show that the Dirichlet Problem can be deterministically simulated in space $O(\log n \sqrt{\log \log n})$, where $1/n$ is the desired precision of the simulation.

1 Introduction

1.1 Space-bounded derandomization and the Dirichlet Problem on graphs

We are interested in derandomizing some problems that can be solved by a *probabilistic* log-space Turing Machine. There are many ways to view a probabilistic log-space computation. By definition, a probabilistic space bounded TM has a special state where it can request a random bit. It has to use its working tape if it wants to store the bits it has seen so far. If the machine M uses $S = S(n)$ cells on its working tape and queries at most $R = R(n)$ random bits, it is said to have a space/randomness complexity of (S, R) . We require the machine to terminate in $2^{O(S)}$ steps, thus making sure that for all possible random bits the machine halts (cf. discussion in [1]).

Denote the set of valid configurations of M by C_M , $|C_M| = 2^{O(S)}$. Denote the set of accepting configurations (i.e. configurations where M has terminated in the accepting state) by C_{acc} , and the set of rejecting configurations by C_{rej} . Denote the initial configuration by c_{init} . We can view the evaluation path of the machine M on input x as a random process $M(x)_t$ where $M(x)_t \in C_M$ is the configuration of the computation of M on x at time t . Let $T(x) = 2^{O(S)}$ be the time at which the computation terminates. $T(x)$ is a random variable and furthermore, by definition, $M(x)_{T(x)} \in C_{acc} \cup C_{rej}$. The “result” of the computation of M on an input x is its acceptance probability, $p_{acc}(x) := P[M(x)_{T(x)} \in C_{acc}]$. *Derandomizing* the machine M involves giving an algorithm for computing p_{acc} within some error ε , with ε usually being 2^{-S} .

One way to present the computation of the probabilistic log-space machine M is by considering configurations graph G of the machine. The nodes of G are

* Partially supported by NSERC Discovery grant 5810-2004-298433

** Partially supported by NSERC CGS Scholarship

C_M . If a configuration $U \in C_M$ corresponds to a random bit querying state, then it is connected to two configurations, V_0 and V_1 , one corresponding to the configuration when the requested random bit is 0, and the other when it is 1. If U corresponds to any other configuration, then it is connected to the unique next state V of U , unless $U \in C_{acc} \cup C_{rej}$, in which case it is connected to itself. There is a natural correspondence between runs of the machine and random walks on G originating at c_{init} and terminating on the set $C_{acc} \cup C_{rej}$. The probability that the random walk terminates on C_{acc} is exactly $p_{acc}(x)$. We can formulate this problem in slightly more general terms. The name, which arises from connection to the classical Dirichlet Problem, will be explained later.

Definition 1. *The Directed Dirichlet Problem **DirDP** is defined as follows.*

Input: A directed graph G , a vertex v_0 , a set B of vertices, a parameter ε and a function $f : B \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Output: Assuming all vertices of $V - B$ have out-degree of at least 1 and the random walk on the graph originating at v_0 hits the set B in time $\text{Poly}(|V|, 1/\varepsilon)$ with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon/2$, the output should be the expected value of $f(b)$, where b is the first vertex in B that a random walk originating at v_0 hits, computed with precision ε . We denote this value by $\Phi(v_0)$.

Here the “random walk” takes all the edges from a vertex v with equal probability. Note that we do not need to worry about the representation of the function f , because it is not hard to see that in order to estimate $\Phi(v_0)$ with precision ε we only need to know f with precision $\Theta(\varepsilon)$.

From the discussion above, it follows that derandomizing **DirDP** is as hard as derandomizing space-bounded machines.

Theorem 1. *The following problems are (deterministic) space- $O(S)$ reducible to each other:*

- Given a probabilistic machine M running in space $S = S(n)$ and randomness $R = 2^{O(S)}$, and an input x , $|x| = n$, compute $p_{acc}(x)$ within an error of $\varepsilon = 2^{-S}$.
- Solve the **DirDP** problem on a graph of size 2^S within an error of $\varepsilon = 2^{-S}$.

An equivalent view on the general Dirichlet problem on graphs is a global one. Suppose that instead of considering only *one* starting point v_0 , we consider *all* possible starting points. Assuming that for any initial v the random walk originating at v eventually hits B with probability 1, we see that the function $\Phi(v)$ satisfies the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \Phi(v) = \frac{1}{\text{deg}(v)} \cdot \sum_{(v,u) \in E} \Phi(u) & \text{for } v \notin B \\ \Phi(v) = f(v) & \text{for } v \in B \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

It can be shown that under the conditions above, the equation (1) has a unique solution. Note that the first condition can be restated as $(\Delta G)\Phi = 0$, where ΔG is the Laplacian matrix of the graph G .

Attempts to solve **DirDP**, which is at least as hard as derandomizing the class **BPSPACE**(S), can now be restricted to different classes of graphs. One restriction would be to consider the undirected graphs, to obtain the corresponding **UndirDP** problem. To our knowledge, even in this case no results better than the general space $O(S^{3/2})$ derandomization [2] are known. In this paper we consider an important special case of the problem, where the underlying graph has a geometric Euclidean structure.

1.2 The classical Dirichlet Problem and its derandomization

First, we describe the classical Dirichlet problem on \mathbb{R}^k . Given a bounded domain Ω and a continuous function on the boundary of Ω , $f : \partial\Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the goal is to find a function $\Phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\Phi(x) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\partial^2\Phi(x)}{\partial x_i^2} = 0 & \text{for } x \in \text{Interior}(\Omega) \\ \Phi(x) = f(x) & \text{for } x \in \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

This classical problem, dating back to the 1840s has numerous applications in Science and Engineering (see for example [3]).

Equation (2) can be viewed as a continuous version of equation (1) because the condition $\Delta\Phi(x) = 0$ on the interior of Ω can be shown to be equivalent to the following condition. For a point x denote by $B(x, \varepsilon)$ the (open) ball of radius ε around x . Then for any $x \in \text{Interior}(\Omega)$, and for any ε such that $B(x, \varepsilon) \subset \text{Interior}(\Omega)$, $\Phi(x)$ is equal to the average value of $\Phi(x)$ on $B(x, \varepsilon)$. Thus, just as in equation (1), we have that for any x , $\Phi(x)$ is equal to the average value of Φ on its “neighbors”.




Fig. 1. Examples of solutions to the two-dimensional Dirichlet problem where Ω is a square domain and the boundary condition f is either 1 (black) or 0 (white); the color inside Ω represents the value of Φ . It is equal to the probability that a Brownian motion originating at a point will hit a black segment on the boundary.

As in the graph case above, Brownian motion, the continuous version of a random walk, can be used to solve the Dirichlet problem. For any $x \in \text{Interior}(\Omega)$,

denote by B_t the Brownian motion process originating at x : $B_0 = x$. Let the random variable T be the first time B_t hits the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Then the solution to (2) is the expected value of f at B_T :

$$\Phi(x) = E[f(B_T)].$$

Solutions of a Dirichlet problem are illustrated on Fig. 1.

In order to approximately solve the Dirichlet problem in practice, one would need to discretize it first. This is possible under some mild conditions on the continuous problem, that will be discussed in Section 2. We define a discrete *grid* version of the continuous Dirichlet problem in \mathbb{R}^k .

Definition 2. *Consider the subdivision of the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^k by a grid with step $1/n$. Let Ω be a subset of the unit cube formed by a collection of small cubes in the grid. The boundary of Ω is comprised of a finite collection \mathcal{C} of $k - 1$ -dimensional squares. Let the boundary condition $f : \partial\Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be given within a precision of n^{-3} . f is continuous and linear on each of the squares of the boundary. In other words, it is specified by the values it takes on each piece $s \in \mathcal{C}$ of the boundary.*

*The discrete Euclidean Dirichlet problem is, given a grid point x inside Ω , to compute the solution $\Phi(x)$ within an error of $1/n$. We call this problems **EucDP**.*

The most interesting case of **EucDP** is for \mathbb{R}^2 , because of its connections to the Riemann Mapping Problem and to conformal geometry (see, for example, [4]). We almost completely derandomize the problem in this case.

Theorem 2. *The **EucDP** over \mathbb{R}^2 is solvable by a randomized TM in space $S = O(\log n)$ using $R = O(\log^4 n)$ random bits.*

The randomness complexity of the machine in Theorem 2 is very low compared to the $O(n)$ complexity of the naïve solution. This allows us to further derandomize it while paying only a small overhead in terms of space complexity. By using various known derandomization results, we obtain:

Corollary 1. *The problem **EucDP** is solvable by*

- (a) [2] *a deterministic machine that uses $O(\log n \sqrt{\log \log n})$ space;*
- (b) [5] *a deterministic machine that uses $O(\log n \log \log n)$ space and runs in poly-time;*
- (c) [6] *a deterministic logspace machine that solves the problem within an error of $\frac{1}{2^{\log^{\gamma} n}}$ for any $\gamma > 0$.*

As an application, one obtains a derandomized space-efficient algorithm for computing conformal maps. For a simply-connected planar domain $\Omega \subsetneq \mathbb{C}$ with $w \in \Omega$, *Riemann Uniformization Theorem* states that there is unique conformal map ψ of Ω onto the unit disk \mathbb{D} with $\psi(w) = 0$, $\psi'(w) > 0$. Conformal maps and Uniformization are used extensively in many areas, such as solving Partial Differential Equations [7], Hydrodynamics [8], Electrostatics [9], and in computer tomography such as brain mapping [10].

Theorem 3. *There is an algorithm A of complexity described in Corollary 1 that computes the uniformizing map in the following sense.*

Let Ω be a bounded simply-connected domain, and $w_0 \in \Omega$. Suppose that for some n , $\partial\Omega$ is given to A with precision $\frac{1}{n}$ by $O(n^2)$ pixels. Then A computes the absolute value of the uniformizing map $\psi : (\Omega, w) \rightarrow (\mathbb{D}, 0)$ within an error of $O(1/n)$. Furthermore, the algorithm computes the value of $\psi(w)$ with precision $1/n$ as long as $|\psi(w)| < 1 - 1/n$.

The reduction of Theorem 3 to Corollary 1 is given in [11].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we discuss the discretization of the continuous Dirichlet problem. In Section 3, we describe our algorithm and prove the main lemma, Lemma 3. The lemma implies Theorem 2 and, using the methods of [11], Theorem 3. In Section 4, we discuss the generalization of the Theorem 2 to higher dimensions.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Elchanan Mossel for his valuable advice on stochastic processes. The authors are also grateful to Stephen Cook for the numerous enlightening discussions.

2 Discretizing the Euclidean Dirichlet problem

In this section we discuss the discretization of continuous Dirichlet problem. We start with a technical result about stability of the Dirichlet problem. Informally, it states that a slight change in boundary and boundary data induces an insignificant change in the solution.

Lemma 1. *Let γ_1, γ_2 be two closed Jordan curves, $\text{dist}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) < 1/n^3$. Let $f_1(t), f_2(t)$ be two continuous functions on γ_1, γ_2 respectively with the following continuity property: if $x \in \gamma_1, y \in \gamma_2$, and $|x - y| < 1/n^2$, then $|f_1(x) - f_2(y)| < 1/n$. Let Φ_1 and Φ_2 be the solutions of the corresponding Dirichlet problems. Let z be a point inside both γ_1 and γ_2 that is at least $1/n$ -away from both curves. Then $|\Phi_1(z) - \Phi_2(z)| < 2/n$.*

Here $\text{dist}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) < 1/n^3$ if no point in γ_1 is more than $1/n^3$ away from γ_2 and vice versa. The lemma follows from the standard estimates in Geometric Function Theory (see, for example, [12]).

Lemma 1 allows us to approximate the solution of the Dirichlet problem on a Jordan curve γ by approximating it using a $1/n^3$ -grid curve, and by approximating the boundary data by a continuous piecewise-linear function on the grid-curve, a process illustrated on Fig. 2. Thus the continuous Dirichlet problem, at least for domains bounded by finitely-many Jordan curves, can be solved with an arbitrarily high precision using **EucDP**.




Fig. 2. Discretization of the continuous Dirichlet Problem

3 Derandomizing the Dirichlet problem

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be as in the definition of **EucDP** (Definition 2). Let $x \in \Omega$ with $R(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$. We define a stochastic jump point process x_t inductively. At each iteration the process jumps one half of the distance to the boundary at random direction. More precisely, x_t is defined, using complex numbers to parameterize \mathbb{R}^2 , by

$$x_0 = x, \quad x_t = x_{t-1} + \frac{1}{2}e^{2\pi i\theta_t}R(x_{t-1}).$$

Here $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$ is a sequence of independent random variables, uniformly distributed on the interval $[0, 1]$.

In the limit, this process can be used to solve Dirichlet problem. Specifically, the following Kakutani's theorem is classical.

Lemma 2 (Kakutani's theorem). *Let f be a continuous function on $\partial\Omega$, Φ be the solution of the corresponding Dirichlet problem. With probability 1, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_t = x_\infty$ exists, $x_\infty \in \partial\Omega$, and $\mathbf{E}[f(x_\infty)] = \Phi(x)$.*

For the proof of the lemma, see for example [13], Appendix G. Let us remark that the theorem is also true for domains in \mathbb{R}^k .

Our algorithm is based on a discretized version of Lemma 2 and the following observation. The stochastic process $y_t = \log \text{dist}(x_t, \partial\Omega)$ is a supermartingale with $\Theta(1)$ -jump at every step. Note that y_t is bounded from above by a constant, since Ω is bounded. Hence y_t is a random walk on $(-\infty, C)$ with constant-magnitude steps and a downwards drift. Thus it is expected to hit the point $-T$ in time $t = O(T^2)$. In particular, y_t will drop below $-\log n$ in time $\log^3 n$ with high probability. At that point, x_t will be $1/n$ -close to $\partial\Omega$.

In the discretized world, we need to take care of the rounding errors, which may affect both the expected solution and the rate of convergence of the algorithm.

Historic remarks Our algorithm is a variant of a celebrated ‘‘Walk on Spheres’’ algorithm, first proposed by M. Muller in [14]. The exponential rate of convergence of the process x_t to the boundary was established for convex domains by M. Motoo in [15] and was later generalized for a wider class of planar

and 3-dimensional domains by G. A. Mikhailov in [16]. See also [17] for additional historical background and the use of the method for solving other boundary value problems.

Let us note that in addition to taking care of rounding error, our proof controls the rate of convergence for a wider class of domains, including all regular planar domains.

To discretize the process, we fix a square grid of size n^{-c} for sufficiently large constant c (we can take any $c > 6$). The process will only run on points on the grid. Note that storing the coordinates of a point on the grid requires $O(\log n)$ space.

For a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, let the snapping $S(x)$ be one of the points on the grid closest to x . Note that $|x - S(x)| < n^{-c}$. Let $R_d(x)$ be the distance from x to the (discretized) boundary of Ω computed with precision of n^{-c} (and requiring only $O(\log n)$ bits to store). Note that it is easy to compute in space $O(\log n)$, since the discretized boundary is just a polygon with $O(n^{2c})$ vertices.

Let us now discretize the process x_t . Let X_t be the stochastic process on the grid defined by

$$X_0 = S(x), \quad X_t = S\left(X_{t-1} + \frac{1}{2}e^{2\pi i\theta_t} R_d(X_{t-1})\right).$$

Here $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$ is a sequence of independent random variables taking values $0, 1/n^{2c}, 2/n^{2c}, \dots, (n^{2c} - 1)/n^{2c}$ with equal probabilities. Note that computing one iteration of X_t requires $O(\log n)$ random bits. The process X_t is illustrated on Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. Illustration of the process X_t . (a) one step of the process; (b) a sample path of five steps of the process

Now let us define the stopping time T by $T = \min(\min\{t : R_d(X_t) < n^{-3}\}, B \log^3 n)$, for a sufficiently large constant B . In other words, we stop the process once we are n^{-3} -close to the boundary but never after time $t = B \log^3 n$.

By the definition of T and our discussion about the complexity of computing each jump, X_T is computable in space $O(\log n)$ using $O(\log^4 n)$ random bits.

We claim that the values $f(X_T)$ computed with precision n^{-2} can be used to approximate the solution of the continuous Dirichlet problem.

Note that the boundary data f from **EucDP** satisfies the following condition

If $x, y \in \partial\Omega$ with $|x - y| < n^{-3}$, then

$$|f(x) - f(y)| < An^{-2} \text{ for some constant } A. \quad (*)$$

If f is a continuous function satisfying (*), then we can extend it to a grid point $x \in \Omega$ with $R_d(x) < n^{-3}$ by assigning $f(x)$ to be equal to $f(y)$, where y is a closest to x point of $\partial\Omega$. By (*), it is well defined up to an error of $O(n^{-2})$. For other points of the grid we take $f(x) = 0$.

Lemma 3. *Let f be a continuous function on $\partial\Omega$ satisfying (*). Let Φ be the solution of the Dirichlet problem with boundary values f . Let $R_d(x) > 1/n$. Then*

$$|\mathbf{E}[f(X_T)] - \Phi(x)| = O(n^{-2}).$$

Lemma 3 implies Theorem 2 by the discussion above.

To simplify the notations, we normalize Ω so that $\text{Diameter}(\Omega) \leq 1$. Define the one-dimensional stochastic process $Y_t = \log R_d(X_t)$.

Strategy of the proof of Lemma 3. First, we establish that with high probability X_T is n^{-3} -close to the boundary. We use the mean-value property of the logarithm in \mathbb{R}^2 to show that the expected value of Y_t is non-increasing with time. We also show that the variance of each step of Y_t is bounded from below by some constant. Note that Y_t is always in the interval $[-4 \log n, 0]$, and this implies that Y_t will hit the lower boundary with probability at least $1/2$ in $O(\log^2 n)$ steps, and with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$ in $O(\log^3 n)$ steps.

We also have to take care of the effects of discretization of the jumps and snapping to the grid. To deal with this problem, we use estimates on the derivative of the logarithm. Then, using the mean-value property of Φ and the fact that with high probability X_T is close to the boundary, so that $\Phi(X_T)$ is not much different from $f(X_T)$, we establish the statement of the lemma. The snapping and discretization are controlled using Harnack's inequality (Lemma 4).

We split the proof of the lemma into several steps.

Step 1: The process Y_t does not have a significant drift upwards. More specifically,

$$\mathbf{E}[Y_t | Y_{t-1}] < Y_{t-1} + n^{-3} \quad (3)$$

Proof. Let z be the point near $\partial\Omega$ realizing $R_d(X_t)$. Note also, that for any two numbers $a_1, a_2 > n^{-3}$ we have $|\log a_1 - \log a_2| < n^3 |a_1 - a_2|$. Using the fact that the function $g(x) = \log |z - x|$ is harmonic on \mathbb{R}^2 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{t-1} = g(X_{t-1}) &= \int_0^1 g \left(X_{t-1} + \frac{R_d(X_{t-1})}{2} e^{2\pi i \theta} \right) d\theta > \\ &\frac{1}{n^{2c}} \sum_{j=0}^{n^{2c}-1} g \left(X_{t-1} + \frac{R_d(X_{t-1})}{2} e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{n^{2c}}} \right) - \\ &\pi R_d(X_{t-1}) n^{-2c} \cdot (2/R_d(X_{t-1})) \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

To obtain the last inequality, we approximate the integral using n^{2c} equally spaced points, the distance between adjacent points is $\pi R_d(X_{t-1})n^{-2c}$, and the derivative of g is bounded by $2/R_d(X_{t-1})$. We continue the chain of inequalities (4) by noting that the snapping operator S only changes the value of $|x - z|$ by at most n^{-c} , and hence the value of $g(x)$ is changed by at most n^{3-c} ,

$$Y_{t-1} > \frac{1}{n^{2c}} \sum_{j=0}^{n^{2c}-1} g\left(S\left(X_{t-1} + \frac{R_d(X_{t-1})}{2} e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{n^{2c}}}\right)\right) - 2\pi n^{-2c} - n^{3-c} > \mathbf{E}[Y_t|Y_{t-1}] - n^{-3}. \quad (5)$$




Fig. 4. with probability at least $1/3$, the jump brings X_t closer to z by a factor of at least $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$

Step 2: For some absolute constant $\beta > 0$, $\mathbf{E}[(Y_t - Y_{t-1})^2 | t \leq T] > 2\beta > 0$

Proof. Let z be the point near $\partial\Omega$ realizing $R_d(X_t)$. With probability at least $1/3$, $Y_t \leq \log |z - X_t| < \log \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} + \log(|z - X_{t-1}| + n^{-c}) < \log \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} + \log(1 + n^{3-c}) + \log |z - X_{t-1}| < -0.1 + Y_{t-1}$, provided X_{t-1} is a way from the boundary (see Fig. 4). Thus

$$\mathbf{E}[(Y_t - Y_{t-1})^2 | t \leq T] > 1/3(-0.1)^2 > 0.002 > 0,$$

hence we can take $\beta = 0.001$.

Define yet another process $Z_t = Y_t - n^{-3}t$, when $t \leq T$, and $Z_t = Z_T$ for $t > T$. Note that by Step 1 the process $Z_t = Y_t - n^{-3}t$ is a supermartingale. By Doob-Meyer decomposition (see [18]), we can write $Z_t = M_t + I_t$, where M is a martingale and I_t is a decreasing adapted process.

We have $Z_t \leq Y_t \leq 0$, since the diameter of Ω is at most 1. Also, by the definition of the stopping time T , $Z_t \geq -3 \log n - n^{-3} \log^3 n > -4 \log n$. Observe that, like Y_t , Z_t has definite quadratic variation at each jump. More specifically,

$$\mathbf{E}[(Z_t - Z_{t-1})^2 | t \leq T] = \mathbf{E}[(Y_t - Y_{t-1})^2 | t \leq T] + 2n^{-3}\mathbf{E}[(Y_t - Y_{t-1}) | t \leq T] + n^{-6} > \beta, \quad (6)$$

provided n is large enough.

Step 3: $\mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}(Z_t - Z_{t-1})] \geq 0$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}(Z_t - Z_{t-1})] &= \mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}\mathbf{E}[Z_t - Z_{t-1}|Z_{t-1}]] = \\ &= \mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}\mathbf{E}[M_t - M_{t-1}|Z_{t-1}]] + \mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}\mathbf{E}[I_t - I_{t-1}|Z_{t-1}]] \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

since $\mathbf{E}[M_t - M_{t-1}|Z_{t-1}] = 0$, $I_t - I_{t-1} \leq 0$, $Z_{t-1} \leq 0$.

Let $T' = C \log^2 n$, where C is a large constant to be defined later.

Step 4: $\mathbf{P}[T < T'] > 1/2$.

Proof. Assume the contrary. It means that for all $t \leq T'$, $\mathbf{P}[T \geq t] = 1 - \mathbf{P}[T < t] \geq 1/2$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[Z_t^2] &= \mathbf{E}[(Z_t - Z_{t-1}) + Z_{t-1}]^2 = \\ &= \mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}^2] + \mathbf{E}[(Z_t - Z_{t-1})^2] + 2\mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}(Z_t - Z_{t-1})] = \\ &= \mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}^2] + \mathbf{E}[(Z_t - Z_{t-1})^2 | t \leq T] \mathbf{P}[T \geq t] + 2\mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}(Z_t - Z_{t-1})] \geq \\ &= \mathbf{E}[Z_{t-1}^2] + \beta/2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The last inequality follows from the equations (6) and (7). It implies that $\mathbf{E}[Z_{T'}^2] \geq \frac{\beta}{2}T' = C\frac{\beta}{2}\log^2 n$. But $0 \geq Z_{T'} > -4\log n$, so $\mathbf{E}[Z_{T'}^2] < 16\log^2 n$. Thus, if we choose $C = 32/\beta$, we get a contradiction.

Step 5: $\mathbf{P}[T < B \log^3 n] > 1 - n^{-2}$. In other words, with high probability X_T stops near the boundary before the time expires.

Proof. By repeating the process from Step 4 independently $2 \log n$ times, we get that after $2C \log^3 n$ steps,

$$\mathbf{P}[T < 2C \log^3 n] > 1 - n^{-2}.$$

It means that with probability at least $1 - n^{-2}$, for some $t < 2C \log^3 n$, X_t is n^{-3} -close to $\partial\Omega$. Thus, if we take $B = 2C$ in the definition of the stopping time T , we arrive at the desired conclusion.

In the next step, we use Harnack's inequality (see, for example, [19]) to estimate the distortion of the map Φ :

Lemma 4 (Harnack's inequality). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, $x, y \in \Omega$, $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) = R$, $|x - y| = r$. Let Ψ be a positive harmonic function in Ω . Then*

$$\left(\frac{R-r}{R+r}\right)^k \leq \frac{\Psi(x)}{\Psi(y)} \leq \left(\frac{R+r}{R-r}\right)^k$$

Let us define two random processes we use to estimate $|\mathbf{E}[f(x_T)] - \Phi(x)|$:

$$\Phi_t^+ = \Phi(X_t) + n^{3-ct}, \quad \Phi_t^- = \Phi(X_t) - n^{3-ct}$$

Step 6: Φ_t^+ is a submartingale and Φ_t^- is a supermartingale

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of Step 1. Harnack's Inequality and $0 < \Phi < 1$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi(X_{t-1}) &= \int_0^1 \Phi \left(X_{t-1} + \frac{R_d(X_{t-1})}{2} e^{2\pi i \theta} \right) d\theta > \\
\frac{1}{n^{2c}} \sum_{j=0}^{n^{2c}-1} \Phi \left(X_{t-1} + \frac{R_d(X_{t-1})}{2} e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{n^{2c}}} \right) (1 - \pi R_d(X_{t-1}) n^{-2c} \cdot (2/R_d(X_{t-1}))) &> \\
\frac{1}{n^{2c}} \sum_{j=0}^{n^{2c}-1} \Phi \left(S \left(X_{t-1} + \frac{R_d(X_{t-1})}{2} e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{n^{2c}}} \right) \right) (1 - 2\pi n^{-2c} - n^{3-c}) &> \\
\frac{1}{n^{2c}} \sum_{j=0}^{n^{2c}-1} \Phi \left(S \left(X_{t-1} + \frac{R_d(X_{t-1})}{2} e^{2\pi i \frac{j}{n^{2c}}} \right) \right) - 2\pi n^{-2c} - n^{3-c} &> \\
&= \mathbf{E}[\Phi(X_t) | \Phi(X_{t-1})] - n^{-3}. \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

It implies the first statement. The proof of the second statement is the same.

Now we are in position to prove Lemma 3.

Proof (Proof of Lemma 3). By the Submartingale Theorem (see [20]), $\Phi(x) = \Phi_0^+ \leq \mathbf{E}[\Phi_T^+]$. But $\Phi_T^+ = \Phi(X_T) + n^{3-c} T \leq \Phi(X_T) + n^{3-c} \log^3 n$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi(x) &\leq \mathbf{E}[\Phi(X_T)] + n^{3-c} \log^3 n \leq \mathbf{E}[f(X_T)] + n^{3-c} \log^3 n + \\
&\quad \mathbf{E}[\Phi(X_T) | T = B \log^3 n] \mathbf{P}[T = B \log^3 n] + \\
&\quad \max_{T < B \log^3 n} (\Phi(X_T) - f(X_T)) \leq \mathbf{E}[f(X_T)] + 3Ln^{-2}
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large L and c . Here we use the fact that the modulus of continuity of Φ is no greater than the modulus of continuity of f (see [13]). We also use the Step 4 to obtain an estimate on $\mathbf{P}[T = B \log^3 n]$. Using the same reasoning for Φ_t^- we get

$$\Phi(x) \geq \mathbf{E}[f(X_T)] - 3Ln^{-2}.$$

Finally, by combining the two inequalities we obtain the statement of the lemma.

4 Higher dimensions: planar-like domains

The proposed algorithm for solving the planar Dirichlet problem does not work for general higher dimensional domains. The only obstacle to literally repeating our proof in higher dimensions comes from the absence of the superharmonicity of the function $\log \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ (the mean-value property used in equation (4)). In other words, it is no longer true that the value of $\log \text{dist}(X_t, \partial\Omega)$ is non-increasing on average. It turns out that the difficulty leads to an example of a domain for which our method does not converge in logarithmic number of steps, and will thus require a large number of random bits.

Let us describe an example of such a domain in \mathbb{R}^3 . The domain Ω will be the unit cube with cubes of size $1/n$ removed around every nonzero point of a $2/\sqrt{n}$ grid. Standard results about the random walk in \mathbb{R}^3 (see, for example, [20]) imply that a random walk started at the center of the cube hits its surface before it hits the removed cubes with probability greater than $1/2$. Thus if the Dirichlet boundary condition f is changed on the surface of the unit cube, $\Phi(\text{center})$ will change significantly. On the other hand, since for any point $x \in \Omega$, $\text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < 1/\sqrt{n}$, it will take $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ steps for our process to reach the boundary of the unit cube. So our algorithm will require $\Omega(\sqrt{n} \log n)$ random bits.

On the other hand, for a large class of domains, which we call planar-like, our algorithm still works.

Definition 3. A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is called planar-like if for every point $y \notin \Omega$ there is a $k - 2$ -dimensional plane containing y and not intersecting Ω .

Note that since $2 - 2 = 0$ -dimensional planes are points, every planar domain is automatically planar-like. We can also observe that any convex domain is planar-like, since in this case for every $y \notin \Omega$ there is a $k - 1$ -dimensional plane containing y and not intersecting Ω .

It is very easy to see that the function $\log \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ is superharmonic for planar-like domains (because logarithm of the distance to a $k - 2$ -dimensional plane is harmonic away from the plane). This allows us to slightly modify the proof of Lemma 3 (only Step 6 requires a minimal change in the constants in Harnack's principle) to obtain the following Theorem.

Theorem 4. The **EucDP** over \mathbb{R}^k is solvable by a randomized TM in space $S = O(\log n)$ using $R = O(\log^4 n)$ random bits for planar-like domains.

We defer the details of the proof to the full version of the paper.

References

1. Saks, M.: Randomization and derandomization in space-bounded computation. In: Proceedings of 11th Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC). (1996) 128–149
2. Saks, M., Zhou, S.: $BP_HSPACE(S) \subseteq DSPACE(S^{3/2})$. Journal of Computer and System Sciences **58**(2) (1999) 376–403
3. Courant, R., Hilbert, D.: Methods of Mathematical Physics. Volume 1. Wiley, New York (1989)
4. Ahlfors, L.: Complex Analysis. McGraw-Hill (1953)
5. Nisan, N.: $RL \subset SC$. Computational Complexity **4**(1) (1994) 1–11
6. Nisan, N., Zuckerman, D.: Randomness is linear in space. Journal of Computer and System Sciences **52**(1) (1996) 43–52
7. Fuchs, B.A., Shabat, B.V.: Functions of a Complex Variable and Some of Their Applications. Volume 1. Pergamon Press (1964)
8. Lavrentiev, M.A., Shabat, B.V.: Problems of Hydrodynamics and Their Mathematical Models. Nauka, Moscow (1973)

9. Feynman, R.P., Leighton, R.B., Sands, M.: The Feynman Lectures on Physics. Volume 2. Addison-Wesley (1989)
10. Gu, X., Wang, Y., Chan, T.F., Thompson, P.M., Yau, S.T.: Genus zero surface conformal mapping and its application to brain surface mapping. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* **23**(8) (2004) 949–958
11. Binder, I., Braverman, M., Yampolsky, M.: On computational complexity of riemann mapping. *Arkiv för Matematik* (2007) to appear.
12. Pommerenke, C.: *Boundary Behaviour of Conformal Maps*. Springer Verlag (1992)
13. Garnett, J.B., Marshall, D.E.: *Harmonic Measure*. Cambridge Univ Press (2004)
14. Muller, M.E.: Some continuous Monte Carlo methods for the Dirichlet problem. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **27** (1956) 569–589
15. Motoo, M.: Some evaluations for continuous Monte Carlo method by using Brownian hitting process. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math. Tokyo* **11** (1959) 49–54
16. Miĥailov, G.A.: Estimation of the difficulty of simulating the process of “random walk on spheres” for some types of regions. *Zh. Vychisl. Mat. i Mat. Fiz.* **19**(2) (1979) 510–515, 558–559
17. Elepov, B.S., Kronberg, A.A., Miĥailov, G.A., Sabel’fel’d, K.K.: *Reshenie kraevykh zadach metodom Monte-Karlo*. “Nauka” Sibirsk. Otdel., Novosibirsk (1980)
18. Karatzas, I., Shreve, S.E.: *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. 2 edn. Springer Verlag (1991)
19. Stein, E.M.: *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*. Princeton University Press (1993)
20. Durrett, R.: *Probability, Theory and Examples*. Wadsworth and Brooks (1991)