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Randomization

Algorithmic design patterns.

- Greedy.
- Divide-and-conquer.
- Dynamic programming.
- Network flow.
- Randomization.

Randomization. Allow fair coin flip in unit time.

Why randomize? Can lead to simplest, fastest, or only known algorithm for a particular problem.

Ex. Symmetry-breaking protocols, graph algorithms, quicksort, hashing, load balancing, closest pair, Monte Carlo integration, cryptography, ....
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Contention resolution. Given $n$ processes $P_1, \ldots, P_n$, each competing for access to a shared database. If two or more processes access the database simultaneously, all processes are locked out. Devise protocol to ensure all processes get through on a regular basis.

Restriction. Processes can’t communicate.

Challenge. Need symmetry-breaking paradigm.
Contest resolution: randomized protocol

Protocol. Each process requests access to the database at time $t$ with probability $p = 1/n$.

Claim. Let $S[i, t] = \text{event that process } i \text{ succeeds in accessing the database at time } t$. Then $1 / (e \cdot n) \leq \Pr [S(i, t)] \leq 1/(2n)$.

Pf. By independence, \( \Pr [S(i, t)] = p (1 - p)^{n-1} \).

- Setting $p = 1/n$, we have $\Pr [S(i, t)] = 1/n (1 - 1/n)^{n-1}$.

Useful facts from calculus. As $n$ increases from 2, the function:
- $(1 - 1/n)^{n-1}$ converges monotonically from $1/4$ up to $1/e$.
- $(1 - 1/n)^{n-1}$ converges monotonically from $1/2$ down to $1/e$. 
Contestation resolution: randomized protocol

Claim. The probability that process $i$ fails to access the database in $n$ rounds is at most $1/e$. After $e \cdot n (c \ln n)$ rounds, the probability $\leq n^{-c}$.

Pf. Let $F[i, t] = \text{event that process } i \text{ fails to access database in rounds } 1 \text{ through } t$. By independence and previous claim, we have $\Pr[F[i, t]] \leq (1 - 1/(en))^t$.

- Choose $t = \lceil e \cdot n \rceil$: $\Pr[F(i, t)] \leq (1 - \frac{1}{en})^{en} \leq (1 - \frac{1}{en})^e \leq \frac{1}{e}$

- Choose $t = \lceil e \cdot n \rceil \lceil c \ln n \rceil$: $\Pr[F(i, t)] \leq \left( \frac{1}{e} \right)^{c \ln n} = n^{-c}$
Contention resolution: randomized protocol

Claim. The probability that all processes succeed within $2e \cdot n \ln n$ rounds is $\geq 1 - 1/n$.

Pf. Let $F[t]$ = event that at least one of the $n$ processes fails to access database in any of the rounds 1 through $t$.

$$\Pr[F[t]] = \Pr \left[ \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} F[i,t] \right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Pr[F[i,t]] \leq n \left(1 - \frac{1}{en}\right)^t$$

- Choosing $t = 2 \lceil en \rceil \lceil c \ln n \rceil$ yields $\Pr[F[t]] \leq n \cdot n^2 = 1/n$. ■

Union bound. Given events $E_1, \ldots, E_n$, $\Pr \left[ \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} E_i \right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Pr[E_i]$
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Global minimum cut

Global min cut. Given a connected, undirected graph \( G = (V, E) \), find a cut \((A, B)\) of minimum cardinality.

Applications. Partitioning items in a database, identify clusters of related documents, network reliability, network design, circuit design, TSP solvers.

Network flow solution.
  • Replace every edge \((u, v)\) with two antiparallel edges \((u, v)\) and \((v, u)\).
  • Pick some vertex \(s\) and compute min \(s-v\) cut separating \(s\) from each other node \(v \in V\).

False intuition. Global min-cut is harder than min \(s-t\) cut.
**Contraction algorithm.** [Karger 1995]

- **Pick an edge** $e = (u, v)$ uniformly at random.
- **Contract** edge $e$.
  - replace $u$ and $v$ by single new super-node $w$
  - preserve edges, updating endpoints of $u$ and $v$ to $w$
  - keep parallel edges, but delete self-loops
- Repeat until graph has just two nodes $u_1$ and $v_1$.
- Return the cut (all nodes that were contracted to form $v_1$).
Contraction algorithm

Contraction algorithm. [Karger 1995]

- Pick an edge \( e = (u, v) \) uniformly at random.
- **Contract** edge \( e \).
  - replace \( u \) and \( v \) by single new super-node \( w \)
  - preserve edges, updating endpoints of \( u \) and \( v \) to \( w \)
  - keep parallel edges, but delete self-loops
- Repeat until graph has just two nodes \( u_1 \) and \( v_1 \).
- Return the cut (all nodes that were contracted to form \( v_1 \)).

Reference: Thore Husfeldt
Contraction algorithm

**Claim.** The contraction algorithm returns a min cut with prob $\geq 2 / n^2$.

**Pf.** Consider a global min-cut $(A^*, B^*)$ of $G$.

- Let $F^*$ be edges with one endpoint in $A^*$ and the other in $B^*$.
- Let $k = |F^*| = $ size of min cut.
- In **first step**, algorithm contracts an edge in $F^*$ probability $k / |E|$.
- Every node has degree $\geq k$ since otherwise $(A^*, B^*)$ would not be a min-cut $\Rightarrow |E| \geq \frac{1}{2} k n \iff k / |E| \leq 2 / n$.
- Thus, algorithm contracts an edge in $F^*$ with probability $\leq 2 / n$. 

![Diagram of contraction algorithm](image_url)
Contraction algorithm

Claim. The contraction algorithm returns a min cut with prob $\geq 2/n^2$.

Pf. Consider a global min-cut $(A^*, B^*)$ of $G$.

- Let $F^*$ be edges with one endpoint in $A^*$ and the other in $B^*$.
- Let $k = |F^*| = \text{size of min cut}$.
- Let $G'$ be graph after $j$ iterations. There are $n' = n - j$ supernodes.
- Suppose no edge in $F^*$ has been contracted. The min-cut in $G'$ is still $k$.
- Since value of min-cut is $k$, $|E'| \geq \frac{1}{2} kn' \iff k / |E'| \leq 2/n'$.
- Thus, algorithm contracts an edge in $F^*$ with probability $\leq 2/n'$.
- Let $E_j = \text{event that an edge in } F^* \text{ is not contracted in iteration } j$.

\[
\Pr[E_1 \cap E_2 \cdots \cap E_{n-2}] = \Pr[E_1] \times \Pr[E_2 \mid E_1] \times \cdots \times \Pr[E_{n-2} \mid E_1 \cap E_2 \cdots \cap E_{n-3}]
\geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{n-1}\right) \cdots \left(1 - \frac{2}{4}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\right)
\approx \left(\frac{n-2}{n}\right) \left(\frac{n-3}{n-1}\right) \cdots \left(\frac{2}{4}\right) \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)
= \frac{2}{n(n-1)}
\geq \frac{2}{n^2}
\]
**Contraction algorithm**

**Amplification.** To amplify the probability of success, run the contraction algorithm many times.

**Claim.** If we repeat the contraction algorithm \( n^2 \ln n \) times, then the probability of failing to find the global min-cut is \( \leq 1 / n^2 \).

**Pf.** By independence, the probability of failure is at most

\[
\left(1 - \frac{2}{n^2}\right)^{n^2 \ln n} = \left[\left(1 - \frac{2}{n^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2} n^2}\right]^{2 \ln n} \leq \left(e^{-1}\right)^{2 \ln n} = \frac{1}{n^2}
\]

\( (1 - 1/x)^x \leq 1/e \)
Contraction algorithm: example execution

Reference: Thore Husfeldt
Global min cut: context

Remark. Overall running time is slow since we perform $\Theta(n^2 \log n)$ iterations and each takes $\Omega(m)$ time.

Improvement. [Karger–Stein 1996] $O(n^2 \log^3 n)$.

- Early iterations are less risky than later ones: probability of contracting an edge in min cut hits 50% when $n/\sqrt{2}$ nodes remain.
- Run contraction algorithm until $n/\sqrt{2}$ nodes remain.
- Run contraction algorithm twice on resulting graph and return best of two cuts.

Extensions. Naturally generalizes to handle positive weights.

Best known. [Karger 2000] $O(m \log^3 n)$.

faster than best known max flow algorithm or deterministic global min cut algorithm
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Expectation

**Expectation.** Given a discrete random variable $X$, its expectation $E[X]$ is defined by:

$$E[X] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \Pr[X = j]$$

**Waiting for a first success.** Coin is heads with probability $p$ and tails with probability $1-p$. How many independent flips $X$ until first heads?

$$E[X] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \cdot \Pr[X = j] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j (1-p)^{j-1} p = \frac{p}{1-p} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j (1-p)^j = \frac{p}{1-p} \cdot \frac{1-p}{p^2} = \frac{1}{p}$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j x^j = \frac{x}{(1-x)^2}$$
Expectation: two properties

**Useful property.** If \( X \) is a 0/1 random variable, \( E[X] = \Pr[X = 1] \).

**Pf.** \[
E[X] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \cdot \Pr[X = j] = \sum_{j=0}^{1} j \cdot \Pr[X = j] = \Pr[X = 1]
\]

not necessarily independent

**Linearity of expectation.** Given two random variables \( X \) and \( Y \) defined over the same probability space, \( E[X + Y] = E[X] + E[Y] \).

**Benefit.** Decouples a complex calculation into simpler pieces.
Guessing cards

Game. Shuffle a deck of $n$ cards; turn them over one at a time; try to guess each card.

Memoryless guessing. No psychic abilities; can’t even remember what’s been turned over already. Guess a card from full deck uniformly at random.

Claim. The expected number of correct guesses is 1.

Pf. [ surprisingly effortless using linearity of expectation ]

- Let $X_i = 1$ if $i^{th}$ prediction is correct and 0 otherwise.
- Let $X = \text{number of correct guesses} = X_1 + \ldots + X_n$.
- $E[X_i] = \Pr[X_i = 1] = 1/n$.
- $E[X] = E[X_1] + \ldots + E[X_n] = 1/n + \ldots + 1/n = 1$. 

\[ \text{linearity of expectation} \]
Guessing cards

**Game.** Shuffle a deck of \( n \) cards; turn them over one at a time; try to guess each card.

**Guessing with memory.** Guess a card uniformly at random from cards not yet seen.

**Claim.** The expected number of correct guesses is \( \Theta(\log n) \).

**Pf.**
- Let \( X_i = 1 \) if \( i^{th} \) prediction is correct and 0 otherwise.
- Let \( X = \) number of correct guesses = \( X_1 + \ldots + X_n \).
- \( E[X_i] = \Pr[X_i = 1] = 1 / (n - (i - 1)). \)
- \( E[X] = E[X_1] + \ldots + E[X_n] = 1/n + \ldots + 1/2 + 1/1 = H(n). \)

\[\ln(n+1) < H(n) < 1 + \ln n\]

\[\text{linearity of expectation}\]
Coupon collector

Each box of cereal contains a coupon. There are $n$ different types of coupons. Assuming all boxes are equally likely to contain each coupon, how many boxes before you have $\geq 1$ coupon of each type?

Claim. The expected number of steps is $\Theta(n \log n)$.

Pf.

- Phase $j$ = time between $j$ and $j + 1$ distinct coupons.
- Let $X_j$ = number of steps you spend in phase $j$.
- Let $X = $ number of steps in total $= X_0 + X_1 + \ldots + X_{n-1}$.

$$E[X] = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} E[X_j] = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{n}{n-j} = n \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{i} = nH(n)$$

prob of success $= (n - j) / n$ 

expected waiting time $= n / (n - j)$
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Maximum 3-satisfiability

Maximum 3-satisfiability. Given a 3-SAT formula, find a truth assignment that satisfies as many clauses as possible.

\[
C_1 = x_2 \lor \overline{x}_3 \lor \overline{x}_4 \\
C_2 = x_2 \lor x_3 \lor x_4 \\
C_3 = \overline{x}_1 \lor x_2 \lor x_4 \\
C_4 = \overline{x}_1 \lor \overline{x}_2 \lor x_3 \\
C_5 = x_1 \lor x_2 \lor \overline{x}_4
\]

Remark. NP-hard search problem.

Simple idea. Flip a coin, and set each variable true with probability \(\frac{1}{2}\), independently for each variable.
Maximum 3-satisfiability: analysis

Claim. Given a 3-SAT formula with $k$ clauses, the expected number of clauses satisfied by a random assignment is $7k/8$.

Pf. Consider random variable $Z_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if clause } C_j \text{ is satisfied} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

- Let $Z = \text{number of clauses satisfied by random assignment}$.

$$E[Z] = \sum_{j=1}^{k} E[Z_j]$$

(linearity of expectation)

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{k} \Pr[\text{clause } C_j \text{ is satisfied}]$$

$$= \frac{7}{8} k$$
The probabilistic method

Corollary. For any instance of 3-SAT, there exists a truth assignment that satisfies at least a $7/8$ fraction of all clauses.

Pf. Random variable is at least its expectation some of the time. □

Probabilistic method. [Paul Erdős] Prove the existence of a non-obvious property by showing that a random construction produces it with positive probability!
Maximum 3-satisfiability: analysis

Q. Can we turn this idea into a \(7/8\)-approximation algorithm?
A. Yes (but a random variable can almost always be below its mean).

Lemma. The probability that a random assignment satisfies \(\geq 7k/8\) clauses is at least \(1/(8k)\).

Pf. Let \(p_j\) be probability that exactly \(j\) clauses are satisfied; let \(p\) be probability that \(\geq 7k/8\) clauses are satisfied.

\[
\frac{7}{8}k = E[Z] = \sum_{j \geq 0} j p_j
\]

\[
= \sum_{j < 7k/8} j p_j + \sum_{j \geq 7k/8} j p_j
\]

\[
\leq \left(\frac{7k}{8} - \frac{1}{8}\right) \sum_{j < 7k/8} p_j + k \sum_{j \geq 7k/8} p_j
\]

\[
\leq \left(\frac{7}{8}k - \frac{1}{8}\right) \cdot 1 + k p
\]

Rearranging terms yields \(p \geq 1/(8k)\). □
Maximum 3-satisfiability: analysis

Johnson’s algorithm. Repeatedly generate random truth assignments until one of them satisfies $\geq 7k / 8$ clauses.

Theorem. Johnson’s algorithm is a $7/8$-approximation algorithm.

Pf. By previous lemma, each iteration succeeds with probability $\geq 1 / (8k)$. By the waiting-time bound, the expected number of trials to find the satisfying assignment is at most $8k$. $\blacksquare$
Maximum satisfiability

Extensions.

- Allow one, two, or more literals per clause.
- Find max weighted set of satisfied clauses.

**Theorem.** [Asano–Williamson 2000] There exists a 0.784-approximation algorithm for $\text{MAX-SAT}$.

**Theorem.** [Karloff–Zwick 1997, Zwick+computer 2002] There exists a $7/8$-approximation algorithm for version of $\text{MAX-3-SAT}$ in which each clause has at most 3 literals.

**Theorem.** [Håstad 1997] Unless $P = NP$, no $\rho$-approximation algorithm for $\text{MAX-3-SAT}$ (and hence $\text{MAX-SAT}$) for any $\rho > 7/8$.

\[ \text{very unlikely to improve over simple randomized algorithm for } \text{MAX-3-SAT} \]
Monte Carlo vs. Las Vegas algorithms

Monte Carlo. Guaranteed to run in poly-time, likely to find correct answer. 
Ex: Contraction algorithm for global min cut.

Las Vegas. Guaranteed to find correct answer, likely to run in poly-time. 
Ex: Randomized quicksort, Johnson’s MAX-3-SAT algorithm.

Remark. Can always convert a Las Vegas algorithm into Monte Carlo, but no known method (in general) to convert the other way.
**RP and ZPP**

**RP.** [Monte Carlo] Decision problems solvable with **one-sided error** in poly-time.

**One-sided error.**
- If the correct answer is *no*, always return *no*.
- If the correct answer is *yes*, return *yes* with probability $\geq \frac{1}{2}$.

**ZPP.** [Las Vegas] Decision problems solvable in **expected** poly-time.

**Theorem.** $P \subseteq ZPP \subseteq RP \subseteq NP$.

**Fundamental open questions.** To what extent does randomization help?
Does $P = ZPP$? Does $ZPP = RP$? Does $RP = NP$?
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Dictionary data type

**Dictionary.** Given a universe $U$ of possible elements, maintain a subset $S \subseteq U$ so that inserting, deleting, and searching in $S$ is efficient.

**Dictionary interface.**
- `create()`: initialize a dictionary with $S = \emptyset$.
- `insert(u)`: add element $u \in U$ to $S$.
- `delete(u)`: delete $u$ from $S$ (if $u$ is currently in $S$).
- `lookup(u)`: is $u$ in $S$?

**Challenge.** Universe $U$ can be extremely large so defining an array of size $|U|$ is infeasible.

**Applications.** File systems, databases, Google, compilers, checksums, P2P networks, associative arrays, cryptography, web caching, etc.
Hashing

**Hash function.** \( h : U \rightarrow \{ 0, 1, ..., n - 1 \}. \)

**Hashing.** Create an array \( a \) of length \( n \). When processing element \( u \), access array element \( a[h(u)] \).

**Collision.** When \( h(u) = h(v) \) but \( u \neq v \).

- A collision is expected after \( \Theta(\sqrt{n}) \) random insertions.
- Separate chaining: \( a[i] \) stores linked list of elements \( u \) with \( h(u) = i \).
Ad-hoc hash function

Ad-hoc hash function.

```java
int hash(String s, int n) {
    int hash = 0;
    for (int i = 0; i < s.length(); i++)
        hash = (31 * hash) + s[i];
    return hash % n;
}
```

Deterministic hashing. If $|U| \geq n^2$, then for any fixed hash function $h$, there is a subset $S \subseteq U$ of $n$ elements that all hash to same slot. Thus, $\Theta(n)$ time per lookup in worst-case.

Q. But isn’t ad-hoc hash function good enough in practice?
Algorithmic complexity attacks

When can’t we live with ad-hoc hash function?

- Obvious situations: aircraft control, nuclear reactor, pace maker, ....
- Surprising situations: denial-of-service (DOS) attacks.

Real world exploits. [Crosby–Wallach 2003]

- Linux 2.4.20 kernel: save files with carefully chosen names.
- Perl 5.8.0: insert carefully chosen strings into associative array.
- Bro server: send carefully chosen packets to DOS the server, using less bandwidth than a dial-up modem.
Hashing performance

Ideal hash function. Maps $m$ elements uniformly at random to $n$ hash slots.
- Running time depends on length of chains.
- Average length of chain $= \alpha = m / n$.
- Choose $n \approx m \Rightarrow$ expect $O(1)$ per insert, lookup, or delete.

Challenge. Explicit hash function $h$ that achieves $O(1)$ per operation.
Approach. Use randomization for the choice of $h$.

adversary knows the randomized algorithm you’re using, but doesn’t know random choice that the algorithm makes
Universal hashing (Carter–Wegman 1980s)

A universal family of hash functions is a set of hash functions \( H \) mapping a universe \( U \) to the set \( \{ 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1 \} \) such that

- For any pair of elements \( u \neq v \): \( \Pr_{h \in H} [ h(u) = h(v) ] \leq 1/n \)
- Can select random \( h \) efficiently.
- Can compute \( h(u) \) efficiently.

**Ex.** \( U = \{ a, b, c, d, e, f \} \), \( n = 2 \).

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
  & a & b & c & d & e & f \\
 h_1(x) & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
 h_2(x) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

\( H = \{ h_1, h_2 \} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\Pr_{h \in H} [ h(a) = h(b) ] &= 1/2 \\
\Pr_{h \in H} [ h(a) = h(c) ] &= 1 \\
\Pr_{h \in H} [ h(a) = h(d) ] &= 0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Not universal

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
  & a & b & c & d & e & f \\
 h_1(x) & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
 h_2(x) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
 h_3(x) & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
 h_4(x) & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

\( H = \{ h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4 \} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\Pr_{h \in H} [ h(a) = h(b) ] &= 1/2 \\
\Pr_{h \in H} [ h(a) = h(c) ] &= 1/2 \\
\Pr_{h \in H} [ h(a) = h(d) ] &= 1/2 \\
\Pr_{h \in H} [ h(a) = h(e) ] &= 1/2 \\
\Pr_{h \in H} [ h(a) = h(f) ] &= 0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Universal
Universal hashing: analysis

**Proposition.** Let $H$ be a universal family of hash functions mapping a universe $U$ to the set $\{ 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1 \}$; let $h \in H$ be chosen uniformly at random from $H$; let $S \subseteq U$ be a subset of size at most $n$; and let $u \notin S$. Then, the expected number of items in $S$ that collide with $u$ is at most 1.

**Pf.** For any $s \in S$, define random variable $X_s = 1$ if $h(s) = h(u)$, and 0 otherwise. Let $X$ be a random variable counting the total number of collisions with $u$.

$$E_{h \in H} [X] = E[\sum_{s \in S} X_s] = \sum_{s \in S} E[X_s] = \sum_{s \in S} \Pr[X_s = 1] \leq \sum_{s \in S} \frac{1}{n} = \frac{|S|}{n} \leq 1$$

- linearity of expectation
- $X_s$ is a 0–1 random variable
- universal

**Q.** OK, but how do we design a universal class of hash functions?
Designing a universal family of hash functions

**Modulus.** We will use a prime number $p$ for the size of the hash table.

**Integer encoding.** Identify each element $u \in U$ with a base-$p$ integer of $r$ digits: $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_r)$.

**Hash function.** Let $A =$ set of all $r$-digit, base-$p$ integers. For each $a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_r)$ where $0 \leq a_i < p$, define

$$h_a(x) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i x_i \right) \mod p \quad \text{maps universe } U \text{ to set } \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$$

**Hash function family.** $H = \{ h_a : a \in A \}$. 
Designing a universal family of hash functions

**Theorem.** \( H = \{ h_a : a \in A \} \) is a universal family of hash functions.

**Pf.** Let \( x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_r) \) and \( y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_r) \) be two distinct elements of \( U \).

We need to show that \( \Pr[h_a(x) = h_a(y)] \leq 1 / p \).

- Since \( x \neq y \), there exists an integer \( j \) such that \( x_j \neq y_j \).
- We have \( h_a(x) = h_a(y) \) iff

\[
\sum_{i \neq j} a_i (x_i - y_i) \mod p
\]

- Can assume \( a \) was chosen uniformly at random by first selecting all coordinates \( a_i \) where \( i \neq j \), then selecting \( a_j \) at random. Thus, we can assume \( a_i \) is fixed for all coordinates \( i \neq j \).
- Since \( p \) is prime, \( a_j z \equiv m \mod p \) has at most one solution among \( p \) possibilities.  

Thus \( \Pr[h_a(x) = h_a(y)] \leq 1 / p \).
Number theory fact

Fact. Let $p$ be prime, and let $z \not\equiv 0 \mod p$. Then $\alpha z \equiv m \mod p$ has at most one solution $0 \leq \alpha < p$.

Pf.

- Suppose $0 \leq \alpha_1 < p$ and $0 \leq \alpha_2 < p$ are two different solutions.
- Then $(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) z \equiv 0 \mod p$; hence $(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) z$ is divisible by $p$.
- Since $z \not\equiv 0 \mod p$, we know that $z$ is not divisible by $p$.
- It follows that $(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)$ is divisible by $p$.
- This implies $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$. •

Bonus fact. Can replace “at most one” with “exactly one” in above fact.

Pf idea. Euclid’s algorithm.
Universal hashing: summary

**Goal.** Given a universe $U$, maintain a subset $S \subseteq U$ so that insert, delete, and lookup are efficient.

**Universal hash function family.** $H = \{ h_a : a \in A \}$.

$$h_a(x) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i x_i \right) \mod p$$

- Choose $p$ prime so that $m \leq p \leq 2m$, where $m = |S|$.
- Fact: there exists a prime between $m$ and $2m$. can find such a prime using another randomized algorithm (!)

**Consequence.**
- Space used = $\Theta(m)$.
- Expected number of collisions per operation is $\leq 1$
  $\Rightarrow O(1)$ time per insert, delete, or lookup.
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Chernoff Bounds (above mean)

**Theorem.** Suppose $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are independent 0-1 random variables. Let $X = X_1 + \ldots + X_n$. Then for any $\mu \geq E[X]$ and for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$Pr[X > (1 + \delta)\mu] < \left[ \frac{e^\delta}{(1 + \delta)^{1+\delta}} \right]^\mu$$

sum of independent 0-1 random variables is tightly centered on the mean

**Pf.** We apply a number of simple transformations.

- For any $t > 0$,

$$Pr[X > (1 + \delta)\mu] = Pr\left[ e^{tX} > e^{t(1+\delta)\mu} \right] \leq e^{-t(1+\delta)\mu} \cdot E[e^{tX}]$$

  - $f(x) = e^{tx}$ is monotone in $x$
  - Markov's inequality: $Pr[X > a] \leq E[X] / a$

- Now

$$E[e^{tX}] = E[e^{t \sum_i X_i}] = \prod_i E[e^{tX_i}]$$

  - definition of $X$
  - independence
Chernoff Bounds (above mean)

**Pf.** [ continued ]

- Let \( p_i = \Pr [X_i = 1] \). Then,

\[
E[e^{tX_i}] = p_i e^t + (1 - p_i)e^0 = 1 + p_i(e^t - 1) \leq e^{p_i(e^t - 1)}
\]

\*for any \( \alpha \geq 0, \ 1 + \alpha \leq e^\alpha \)\*

- Combining everything:

\[
\Pr[X > (1+\delta)\mu] \leq e^{-t(1+\delta)\mu} \prod_i E[e^{tX_i}] \leq e^{-t(1+\delta)\mu} \prod_i e^{p_i(e^t - 1)} \leq e^{-t(1+\delta)\mu} \mu^{(e^t - 1)}
\]

\*previous slide\* \*inequality above\* \*\[\sum_i p_i = E[X] \leq \mu\] \*\*

- Finally, choose \( t = \ln(1 + \delta) \). \( \blacksquare \)
Chernoff Bounds (below mean)

**Theorem.** Suppose $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are independent 0-1 random variables. Let $X = X_1 + \ldots + X_n$. Then for any $\mu \leq E[X]$ and for any $0 < \delta < 1$, we have

$$\Pr[X < (1-\delta)\mu] < e^{-\delta^2 \mu / 2}$$

**Pf idea.** Similar.

**Remark.** Not quite symmetric since only makes sense to consider $\delta < 1$. 


13. Randomized Algorithms

- contention resolution
- global min cut
- linearity of expectation
- max 3-satisfiability
- universal hashing
- Chernoff bounds
- load balancing
Load balancing

Load balancing. System in which $m$ jobs arrive in a stream and need to be processed immediately on $m$ identical processors. Find an assignment that balances the workload across processors.

Centralized controller. Assign jobs in round-robin manner. Each processor receives at most $\left\lfloor \frac{m}{n} \right\rfloor$ jobs.

Decentralized controller. Assign jobs to processors uniformly at random. How likely is it that some processor is assigned “too many” jobs?
Load balancing

Analysis.

- Let \( X_i \) = number of jobs assigned to processor \( i \).
- Let \( Y_{ij} = 1 \) if job \( j \) assigned to processor \( i \), and 0 otherwise.
- We have \( \mathbb{E}[Y_{ij}] = 1/n \).
- Thus, \( X_i = \sum_j Y_{ij} \), and \( \mu = \mathbb{E}[X_i] = 1 \).
- Applying Chernoff bounds with \( \delta = c - 1 \) yields \( \Pr[X_i > c] < \frac{e^{c-1}}{c^c} \).

- Let \( \gamma(n) \) be number \( x \) such that \( x^x = n \), and choose \( c = e \gamma(n) \).

\[
\Pr[X_i > c] < \frac{e^{c-1}}{c^c} < \left( \frac{e}{c} \right)^c = \left( \frac{1}{\gamma(n)} \right)^{e\gamma(n)} < \left( \frac{1}{\gamma(n)} \right)^{2\gamma(n)} = \frac{1}{n^2}
\]

- Union bound \( \Rightarrow \) with probability \( \geq 1 - 1/n \) no processor receives more than \( e \gamma(n) = \Theta(\log n / \log \log n) \) jobs.

Bonus fact: with high probability, some processor receives \( \Theta(\log n / \log \log n) \) jobs.
Load balancing: many jobs

**Theorem.** Suppose the number of jobs $m = 16 \, n \, \ln n$. Then on average, each of the $n$ processors handles $\mu = 16 \ln n$ jobs. With high probability, every processor will have between half and twice the average load.

**Pf.**

- Let $X_i, Y_{ij}$ be as before.
- Applying Chernoff bounds with $\delta = 1$ yields

\[
\Pr[X_i > 2\mu] < \left(\frac{e}{4}\right)^{16n \ln n} < \left(\frac{1}{e}\right)^{\ln n} = \frac{1}{n^2}
\]

\[
\Pr[X_i < \frac{1}{2}\mu] < e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\frac{1}{2})^2 16n \ln n} = \frac{1}{n^2}
\]

- Union bound $\Rightarrow$ every processor has load between half and twice the average with probability $\geq 1 - 2/n$.  ■