

# { Csc 80030 | Lecture 9 }

PROBABILISTIC ANALYSIS &  
RANDOMIZED ALGORITHMS

Hoeteck Wee · [hoeteck@cs.qc.edu](mailto:hoeteck@cs.qc.edu)

## PART 0

- ▶ HOMEWORK: HW4 due today, HW5 due Apr 29
- ▶ PRESENTATIONS: May 6, 13 – 40-min student presentations
- ▶ TODAY: sublinear time algorithms

PART 1

| sublinear time algorithms

# Massive data sets

- ▶ EXAMPLES: genome project, sales logs, world-wide web, network traffic, clickstream patterns, health data, large remote database, ...
  - ▶ hardly fit in storage
- ▶ QUESTION: are traditional notions of an efficient algorithm sufficient?
  - ▶ is linear time good enough?
  - ▶ example: election vs polls
  - ▶ trade-off between efficiency and correctness

# Additional examples

- ▶ Outbreak of diseases
  - ▶ how rapidly? wide-spread? correlated with income level / zip code?
  - ▶ speed is paramount
- ▶ Is the lottery uniform?
  - ▶ approximate answer good enough
  - ▶ can work with fewer samples than statistical  $\chi^2$ -test
- ▶ Pattern matching in genome data
  - ▶ want quick answers, before further refinement
  - ▶ desire trade-off between running time and accuracy

# Monotonicity testing

- ▶ PROBLEM. Given a list  $L$  of  $n$  distinct integers, check if the list is monotone (i.e. sorted).
  - ▶ can append index of an item to enforce distinctness
  - ▶ model: comparisons and random access take  $O(1)$  time
  - ▶ need  $\Omega(n)$  time for exact answer

# Monotonicity testing

- ▶ PROBLEM. Given a list  $L$  of  $n$  distinct integers, check if the list is monotone (i.e. sorted).
- ▶ NOTION OF APPROXIMATION.  $L$  is  $\epsilon$ -close to monotone if changing/deleting  $\epsilon n$  entries makes it monotone.
- ▶ PROPERTY TESTER. randomized algorithm that on input  $L, \epsilon$ ,
  - ▶ If  $L$  is monotone, accept w.p.  $\geq 2/3$
  - ▶ If  $L$  is  $\epsilon$ -far from monotone, reject w.p.  $\geq 2/3$
  - ▶ “in-between” cases, don’t care.
- ▶ NOTE. can improve  $2/3$  to any  $1 - \delta$  by taking majority of  $O(\log 1/\delta)$  repetitions.

# Warm-up

- ▶ NAIVE ALGORITHM: Pick a random subset  $S$  of indices and check that  $L$  restricted to  $S$  is monotone.
  - ▶ consider  $L = (2, 1, 4, 3, 6, 5, \dots)$
  - ▶ requires  $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$  samples
- ▶ Can do do better! [Ergün et. al, STOC 98, JCSS 2000]

# Monotonicity testing

## monotonicity testing

Input: a list  $L = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of distinct integers

1. Repeat  $2/\epsilon$  times:
  - 1.1 Pick a random index  $i$  from  $[n]$ .
  - 1.2 Perform a binary search for  $x_i$ .
  - 1.3 Reject if we fail to find  $x_i$  or if we find out-of-order elements.
2. Accept if all the binary searches succeed.

- ▶ running time is  $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log n)$ .
- ▶ always accept if  $L$  is monotone.

- ▶ KEY LEMMA. Let  $G$  denote the set of indices for which binary search succeeds. Then, the elements of  $L$  restricted to  $G$  is monotone.
  - ▶ If  $|G| < (1 - \epsilon)n$ , then algorithm rejects with prob.  
 $1 - (1 - \epsilon)^{2/\epsilon} \geq 1 - e^{-2} \geq 2/3$ .
  - ▶ If  $|G| \geq (1 - \epsilon)n$ , then  $L$  is  $\epsilon$ -close to monotone.
- ▶ PROOF. for all  $i, j \in G$ , look at least common ancestor index where the binary searches for  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  diverge.

## PART 2 | student presentations

# Student presentations

- ▶ 40-min presentations on different papers
  - ▶ mandatory attendance
  - ▶ May 6 and 13, 4 pm - 6.15 pm
- ▶ Topics
  - ▶ Load balancing: Talwar, Wieder [STOC 2007]; Godfrey [SODA 2008]
  - ▶ Sublinear time algorithms: Chazelle, Rubinfeld, Trevisan [ICALP 2001]; Bogdanov, Obata, Trevisan [FOCS 2002]
  - ▶ Spectral algorithms: Trevisan [STOC 2009]

THE END | next, spring break!