

Maximal independent set

trivial sequential algorithm

- inherently sequential
- from node point of view: each thinks can join MIS if others stay out
- randomization breaks this symmetry

Randomized idea

- each node joins with some probability
- all neighbors excluded
- many nodes join
- few phases needed

Algorithm:

- all degree 0 nodes join
- node v joins with probability $1/2d(v)$
- if edge (u, v) has both ends marked, unmark lower degree vertex
- put all marked nodes in IS
- delete all neighbors

Intuition: d -regular graph

- vertex vanishes if it or neighbor gets chosen
- mark with probability $1/2d$
- prob (no neighbor marked) is $(1 - 1/2d)^d$, constant
- so const prob. of neighbor of v marked—destroys v
- what about unmarking of v 's neighbor?
- prob(unmarking forced) only constant as argued above.
- So just changes constants
- const fraction of nodes vanish: $O(\log n)$ phases
- Implementing a phase trivial in $O(\log n)$.

Idea of staying marked applies to general case: prob. chosen for IS, given marked, exceeds $1/2$

- suppose w marked. only unmarked if higher degree neighbor marked
- higher degree neighbor marked with prob. $\leq 1/2d(w)$
- only $d(w)$ neighbors
- prob. any superior neighbor marked at most $1/2$.

How about prob. neighbor gets marked?

- Define **good** vertices: at least $1/3$ neighbors have lower degree
- Intuition: good means “high degree”
- Prob. lower degree neighbor marked exceeds $1/2d(v)$
- prob. no neighbor of good marked $\leq (1 - 1/2d(v))^{d(v)/3} \leq e^{-1/6}$.
- So some neighbor marked with prob. $1 - e^{-1/6}$
- Stays marked with prob. $1/2$
- deduce prob. good vertex killed exceeds $(1 - e^{-1/6})/2$
- Problem: perhaps only one good vertex?

Good edges

- Idea: since “high degree” vertices killed, means most edges killed
- any edge with a good neighbor
- has const prob. to vanish
- show half edges good
- deduce $O(\log n)$ iterations.

Proof

- Let V_B be bad vertices; we count edges with both ends in V_B .
- direct edges from lower to higher degree d_i is indegree, d_o outdegree
- if v bad, then $d_i(v) \leq d(v)/3$
- deduce

$$\sum_{V_B} d_i(v) \leq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{V_B} d(v) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{V_B} (d_i(v) + d_o(v))$$

- so $\sum_{V_B} d_i(v) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{V_B} d_o(v)$

- which means indegree can only “catch” half of outdegree; other half must go to good vertices.
- more carefully,
 - $d_o(v) - d_i(v) \geq \frac{1}{3}(d(v)) = \frac{1}{3}(d_o(v) + d_i(v))$.
 - Let V_G, V_B be good, bad vertices
 - degree of bad vertices is

$$\begin{aligned}
 2e(V_B, V_B) + e(V_B, V_G) + e(V_G, V_B) &= \sum_{v \in V_B} d_o(v) + d_i(v) \\
 &\leq 3 \sum (d_o(v) - d_i(v)) \\
 &= 3(e(V_B, V_G) - e(V_G, V_B)) \\
 &\leq 3(e(V_B, V_G) + e(V_G, V_B))
 \end{aligned}$$

Deduce $e(V_B, V_B) \leq e(V_B, V_G) + e(V_G, V_B)$. result follows.

Derandomization:

- Analysis focuses on edges,
- so unsurprisingly, pairwise independence sufficient
- prob vertex marked $1/2d$
- neighbors $1, \dots, d$ in increasing degree order
- Let E_i be event that i is marked.
- Let E'_i be E_i but no E_j for $j < i$ (makes disjoint events so can add probabilities)
- A_i event no neighbor of i chosen
- Then prob eliminate v at least

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum \Pr[E'_i \cap A_i] &= \sum \Pr[E'_i] \Pr[A_i | E'_i] \\
 &\geq \sum \Pr[E'_i] \Pr[A_i]
 \end{aligned}$$

(E'_i just forces some neighbors **not** marked so increases bound)

- But expected marked neighbors $1/2$, so by Markov $\Pr[A_i] > 1/2$
- so prob eliminate v exceeds $\sum \Pr[E'_i] = \Pr[\cup E_i]$
- lower bound as $\sum \Pr[E_i] - \sum \Pr[E_i \cap E_j] = 1/2 - d(d-1)/8d^2 > 1/4$
- so $1/2d$ prob. v marked but no neighbor marked, so v chosen
- Wait: show $\Pr[A_i | E'_i] \geq \Pr[A_i]$

- true if independent
- not obvious for pairwise, but again consider d -uniform case
- measure $\Pr[\neg A_i \mid E'_i] \leq \sum \Pr[E_w \mid E'_i]$ (sum over neighbors w of i)
- measure

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[E_w \mid E'_i] &= \frac{\Pr[E_w \cap E'_i]}{\Pr[E'_i]} \\
&= \frac{\Pr[(E_w \cap \neg E_1 \cap \dots) \cap E_i]}{\Pr[(\neg E_1 \cap \dots) \cap E_i]} \\
&= \frac{\Pr[E_w \cap \neg E_1 \cap \dots \mid E_i]}{\Pr[\neg E_1 \cap \dots \mid E_i]} \\
&\leq \frac{\Pr[E_w \mid E_i]}{1 - \sum_{j \leq i} \Pr[E_j \mid E_i]} \\
&\leq \frac{\Pr[E_w]}{1 - d(1/2d)} \\
&= 2 \Pr[E_w]
\end{aligned}$$

(last step assumes d -regular so only d neighbors with odds $1/2d$)

- Generate pairwise independent with $O(\log n)$ bits
- try all polynomial seeds in parallel
- one works
- gives deterministic NC algorithm

with care, $O(m)$ processors and $O(\log n)$ time (randomized)
LFMIS P-complete.

Project

Dates

- Classes end 12/13, wednesday
- Final homework due 12/12, tuesday
- Project due 12/8 (MIT restriction)

Options

- Reading project
 - Read some **hard** papers
 - Write about them *more clearly* than original
 - graded on delta

- best source: STOC/FOCS/SODA
- Implementation project
 - read some randomized algorithms papers,
 - implement
 - develop interesting test sets
 - identify hard cases
 - devise heuristics to improve
- In your work:
 - use a randomized algorithm in your research;
 - write about it

MST

Review Background

- kruskal
- boruvka
- verification

Intuition: “fences” like selection algorithm.

sampling theorem:

- Heavy edges
- pick F with probability p
- get n/p F -heavy edges

Recursive algorithm without boruvka:

$$T(m, n) = T(m/2, n) + O(m) + T(2n, n) = O(m + n \log n)$$

(sloppy on expectation on $T(2n, n)$)

Recursive algorithm with 3 boruvka steps:

$$\begin{aligned} T(m, n) &= T(m/2, n/8) + c_1(m + n) + T(n/4, n/8) \\ &\leq c(m/2 + n/8) + c_1(m + n) + c(n/4 + n/8) \\ &= (c/2 + c_1)m + (c/8 + c_1 + c/4 + c/8)n \\ &= (c/2 + c_1)(m + n) \end{aligned}$$

so set $c = 2c_1$ (not sloppy expectation thanks to linearity).

Notes:

- Chazelle $m \log \alpha(m, n)$ via relaxed heap
- Ramachandran and Peti optimal deterministic algorithm (runtime unknown)
- open questions.

Minimum Cut

deterministic algorithms

- Max-flow
- Gabow

Min-cut implementation

- data structure for contractions
- alternative view—permutations.
- deterministic leaf algo

Recursion:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{k+1} &= p_k - \frac{1}{4}p_k^2 \\ q_k &= 4/p_k + 1 \\ q_{k+1} &= q_k + 1 + 1/q_k \end{aligned}$$