

## Lecture 4

Lecturer: Ronitt Rubinfeld

Scribe: Tossaporn Saengja

## 1 Randomized complexity classes RP, BPP

**Definition 1** A “language”  $L$  is a subset of  $0,1^*$

**Definition 2** “ $P$ ” is a class of languages with polynomial time **deterministic** algorithms  $A$  such that

$$X \in L \Rightarrow A(x) \text{ accepts}$$

$$X \notin L \Rightarrow A(x) \text{ rejects}$$

**Definition 3** “ $RP$ ” is a class of languages with polynomial time **probabilistic** algorithms  $A$  such that

$$X \in L \Rightarrow \Pr[A(x) \text{ accepts}] \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

$$X \notin L \Rightarrow \Pr[A(x) \text{ accepts}] = 0$$

This is called “1-sided error”

We can get more reliable answer by run  $A^k(x)$  which is running  $k$  times of  $A(x)$  with fresh random coins each time:

**Algorithm** If all  $k$  runs reject then reject, else accept

**Behavior of algorithms**

$$x \notin L \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{accept}] = 0$$

$$x \in L \Rightarrow \Pr[\text{accept}] \geq 1 - 2^{-k}$$

$$\beta = 2^{-k} \Rightarrow k \geq \log \frac{1}{\beta}$$

**Definition 4** “ $BPP$ ” is a class of languages with polynomial time **probabilistic** algorithms  $A$  such that

$$X \in L \Rightarrow \Pr[A(x) \text{ accepts}] \geq \frac{2}{3}$$

$$X \notin L \Rightarrow \Pr[A(x) \text{ accepts}] \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

This is called “2-sided error”

We can still get a more reliable answer by running  $A$  for  $k$  times and taking the majority answer, yielding the following behavior:

$$\Pr[\text{each run is correct}] \geq \frac{2}{3}$$

$$\Pr[\text{majority of runs correct}] \geq 1 - \Pr[\text{majority incorrect}]$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_{[i^{\text{th}} \text{ run correct}]} > \frac{k}{2}$$

$$E\left[\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_{[i^{\text{th}} \text{ run correct}]}\right] = \sum_{i=1}^k E[\sigma_{[i^{\text{th}} \text{ run correct}]}] \geq \frac{2}{3}k$$

By Chernoff bound with  $\beta = \frac{1}{4}$ ,

$$\Pr[\#runs\ correct < (1 - \frac{1}{4})\frac{2}{3}k] \leq e^{-\frac{(\frac{1}{4})^2(\frac{2}{3})k}{2}}$$

$$\Pr[\#runs\ correct < \frac{k}{2}] \leq e^{-\frac{k}{48}}$$

Let  $k = 48 \log \frac{1}{\delta}$ ,

$$\Pr[\#runs\ correct < \frac{k}{2}] \leq \delta$$

$$\Pr[\text{majority of runs correct}] \geq 1 - \delta$$

**Observation 5**  $P \subseteq RP \subseteq BPP$

An open question is whether  $P \stackrel{?}{=} BPP$

## 2 Derandomization

### 2.1 via enumeration

Given probabilistic algorithm  $A$  and input  $x$

$r(n)$  is the number of random bits used by  $A$  on inputs of size  $n$ .

1. Run  $A$  on **every** random string of length  $r(|x|)$   
 $r(n) \leq$  runtime of  $A$  on inputs of size  $n$
2. Output majority answer

**Runtime**  $O(2^{r(n)}t(n))$  where  $t(n)$  is the time bound of  $A$

### 2.2 via pairwise independence

#### 2.2.1 Max Cut problem

Given  $G(V, E)$ , output partition  $V$  into  $S, T$  to maximize  $|\{(u, v) | u \in S, v \in T\}|$  (i.e. number of cuts)

**Randomized algorithm**

- Flip  $n$  coins  $r_1 \cdots r_n$
- Put vertex  $i$  on side  $r_i$

**Analysis** let

$$\mathbb{1}_{u,v} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } r_u \neq r_v, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$E[\text{cut}] = E\left[\sum_{(u,v) \in E} \mathbb{1}_{u,v}\right] = \sum_{(u,v) \in E} E[\mathbb{1}_{(u,v)}] = \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \Pr[r_u \neq r_v] = \frac{|E|}{2}$$

This is “2-approximation” as the best answer could be  $|E|$

### 2.2.2 Pairwise Independence

**Definition 6**  $n$  values  $x_1 \cdots x_n, x_i \in T$  such that  $|T| = t$

“independent” if  $\forall b_1 \cdots b_n \in T^n, Pr[x_1 \cdots x_n = b_1 \cdots b_n] = \frac{1}{t^n}$

“pairwise independent” if  $\forall i \neq j, b_i b_j \in T^2, Pr[x_i x_j = b_i b_j] = \frac{1}{t^2}$

“ $k$ -wise independent” if  $\forall$  distinct  $i_1 \cdots i_k, b_{i_1} \cdots b_{i_k} \in T^k, Pr[x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k} = b_{i_1} \cdots b_{i_k}] = \frac{1}{t^k}$

	$r_1$	$r_2$	$r_3$	
	0	0	0	
<b>Example</b>	0	1	1	say for indices 1,2 $b_1 b_2 = 00 \Rightarrow Pr[x_1 = 0, x_2 = 0] = \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{t^2}$
	1	0	1	
	1	1	0	

### 2.2.3 Using Pairwise Independence in Max Cut

$b_1 \cdots b_m \Rightarrow$  “randomness generator”  $\Rightarrow r_1 \cdots r_n \Rightarrow$  Max Cut algorithm

From the above example:  $m = 2$   $n \geq m$   $n = 3$

**Observation 7** If the random bits of the generator are good enough for the algorithm, then one can derandomize the algorithm by doing enumeration on the  $m$  bits going into the randomness generator. This would require time  $O(2^m)$ , rather than the usual  $O(2^n)$

**Idea** Use  $m = \log n$  independent random bits, and turn them into  $n$  pairwise independent random bits

**How to generate?**

1. Choose  $m$  truly random bits  $b_1 \cdots b_m$
2.  $\forall s \subset [m]$  s.t.  $s \neq \emptyset$ , set  $c_s = \bigoplus_{i \in S} b_i$
3. Output all  $c_s \Rightarrow 2^{m-1}$  bits

exercise why are they pair-wise independent?

**Algorithm**

For all choices of  $b_1 \cdots b_{\log n+1}$

- Run Max Cut using random bits of randomness generator on input  $b_1 \cdots b_{\log n+1}$
- Evaluate cut size
- Output best cut size

**Runtime**  $2^{\log n+1} \times$  (runtime of Max Cut + runtime of generator)

**Randomness generator as a function**  $b_1 \cdots b_m, a, b \in Z_q$  where  $q$  prime

$$r_i \leftarrow a_i + b \pmod q, \forall i \in 0 \dots q-1$$

$$b, a + b \pmod q, 2a + b \pmod q$$

can take  $a, b, c$  and use  $ci^2 + ai + b \pmod q$  to do 3-wise  $\Rightarrow$  can generalize to  $k$ -wise