

# Randomness and Computation

or, “Randomized Algorithms”

Mary Cryan

School of Informatics  
University of Edinburgh



RC (2018/19) – Lecture 13 – slide 1

## The Lovász Local lemma

### Definition (6.1)

A *dependency graph* for a set of events  $E_1, \dots, E_N$  is a graph  $G = (V, E)$  such that  $V = \{1, \dots, N\}$  and for each  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , the event  $i$  is mutually independent with the events  $\{E_j \mid (i, j) \notin E\}$ . The *degree* of the dependency graph is the max degree vertex of  $G$ .

### Theorem (6.11, Lovász Local Lemma)

Let  $E_1, \dots, E_N$  be a set of events and assume we know  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  such that all the following conditions hold:

1. For all  $i$ ,  $\Pr[E_i] \leq p$ ;
2. The degree of the dependency graph on  $\{E_1, \dots, E_N\}$  is  $\leq d$ ;
3.  $4dp \leq 1$

Then

$$\Pr \left[ \bigcap_{i=1}^N \overline{E}_i \right] > 0.$$



RC (2018/19) – Lecture 13 – slide 3

## The Lovász Local lemma

In our work so far on the probabilistic method, we have often been concerned with avoiding “bad events”, our goal to prove existence of some structure that manages to avoid all the bad events.

Life (“life” meaning the proof of these results) would be easier if we were dealing with collections of bad events which were independent.

Recall that the collection of events  $E_1, \dots, E_N$  are *mutually independent* if for every  $\{F_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  such that  $F_i$  is either  $E_i$  or  $\overline{E}_i$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ \bigcap_{i=1}^N F_i \right] = \prod_{i=1}^N \Pr[F_i].$$

With mutual independence, we would only need the condition  $E_i \in (0, 1)$  for all  $i$  to guarantee a structure without any bad events.

Unfortunately usually (monochromatic  $K_k$ , 4-cliques in  $G_{n,p}$ ) we have to deal with situations where the bad events may be *dependent* (eg two vertex subsets  $f, f'$  each of size 4, may intersect).



RC (2018/19) – Lecture 13 – slide 2

## Sketch of Lovász Local Lemma

The proof depends on showing the following **claim** by induction:

For  $s = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ , if  $|S| \leq s$ ,  $\Pr \left[ \bigcap_{j \in S} \overline{E}_j \right] > 0$ , and for every  $k \in [n] \setminus S$ ,

$$\Pr[E_k \mid \bigcap_{j \in S} \overline{E}_j] \leq 2p.$$

Once the claim is shown, it is not hard to obtain our result:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ \bigcup_{j=1}^n \overline{E}_j \right] &= \prod_{i=1}^n \Pr \left[ \overline{E}_i \mid \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \overline{E}_j \right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left( 1 - \Pr \left[ E_i \mid \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \overline{E}_j \right] \right) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - 2p) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last step uses the fact that  $4dp \leq 1$  (hence certainly  $2p < 1$ ).



RC (2018/19) – Lecture 13 – slide 4

## SAT and $k$ -SAT (standard probabilistic method)

Recall that in propositional logic, a *Boolean variable*  $x_i$  can take on 0 or 1 values, a *literal* is either  $x_i$  or  $\bar{x}_i$ , and for the set of variables  $\{x_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  a SAT problem is any conjunction (AND) of a set of clauses, each individual clause being a disjunction (OR) of literals. For example,

$$\{x_4, \bar{x}_7, \bar{x}_8\}, \{\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_3, \bar{x}_5\}, \{x_1, x_2, \bar{x}_6\}, \{x_3, x_8, \bar{x}_4\}$$

is an instance of SAT. Since all clauses are of length 3, the one above is also an instance of 3-SAT.

Suppose we have  $m$  clauses, with  $k_i$  literals in the  $i$ th clause,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Then on a *uniform random* assignment of boolean values to the  $n$  variables, the probability clause  $i$  is *satisfied* is  $(1 - 2^{-k_i})$ . ( $2^{-k_i}$  is the probability we would set all  $k_i$  literals of this clause to be false.)



## $k$ -SAT with Lovász Local Lemma

Now consider the “bad events”  $E_i$  to be the event where clause  $i$  becomes unsatisfied, and consider the dependency graph.

### Theorem (6.13)

If we have a  $k$ -SAT formula where no variable appears in more than  $T = \frac{2^k}{4k}$  clauses, then that formula has some satisfying assignment.

**Proof** We assume a uniform random assignment to all the  $x_j$  and hence  $E_i$  is the event that all the  $k$  variables get the “wrong” assignment.  $\Pr[E_i] \leq 2^{-k}$  for all  $i$ .

The event  $E_i$  is mutually dependent of any  $E_{i'}$ , where clause  $i'$  shares no logical variables with clause  $i$ . For each of the variables in clause  $i$ , they may appear in  $T = \frac{2^k}{4k}$  clauses, so taking all  $k$  variables, there are at most  $k \cdot T = \frac{2^k}{4}$  clauses which share *some* variable(s) with clause  $i$ . So  $d \leq \frac{2^k}{4}$ .

Then  $4dp \leq 4 \cdot \frac{2^k}{4} \cdot 2^{-k} = 1$ , and the LLL implies there is some assignment where none of the bad events occur (ie, all clauses are satisfiable).



## SAT and $k$ -SAT (standard probabilistic method)

Suppose we have  $m$  clauses, with  $k_i$  literals in the  $i$ th clause,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Then on a *uniform random* assignment of boolean values to the  $n$  variables, the expected number of *satisfied* clauses is  $\sum_{i=1}^m (1 - 2^{-k_i})$ .

- ▶ This is at least  $m \cdot (1 - 2^{-k})$ , where  $k = \min_{i=1}^m k_i$ .
- ▶ If the instance is  $k$ -SAT (all clauses length  $k$ ), the expected number of satisfied clauses is *exactly* this.
- ▶ Hence (by probabilistic method) there is at least one assignment to  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  with at least  $\sum_{i=1}^m (1 - 2^{-k_i})$  satisfied clauses.
- ▶ Can't get any condition guaranteeing “satisfiability” (all  $m$  clauses) even for  $k$ -SAT as  $m \cdot (1 - 2^{-k})$  is strictly less than  $m$ . Would need to do a different kind of analysis.



## LLL: can we de-randomize?

The only negative aspect of using LLL is that we don't get an explicit randomized process linked to the existence result. So we don't have a handle on how we might go about finding such a object.

There are ways to convert a LLL result into an explicit construction, but usually you need a lower dependency value.

We won't cover this (see Sections 6.8, 6.10 of the book)



## LLL: can we de-randomize?

The only negative aspect of using LLL is that we don't get an explicit randomized process linked to the existence result. So we don't have a handle on how we might go about finding such an object.

There are ways to convert a LLL result into an explicit construction, but usually you need a lower dependency value.

We won't cover this (see Sections 6.8, 6.10 of the book)



*RC (2018/19) – Lecture 13 – slide 8*

## Notes

### Reading

- ▶ Section 6.7 from the book.

### Doing

- ▶ Tutorial sheet for 5th, 6th March (week 7).
- ▶ Coursework 2 specification has been released.



*RC (2018/19) – Lecture 13 – slide 9*