

1. **(A Hiring Strategy.)** You need a new staff assistant and you have  $n$  people to interview. You want to hire the best candidate for the position. You interview the candidate one by one. After you interview the  $k$ th candidate, you either offer the candidate the job before the next interview or you forever lose the chance to hire that candidate. We suppose the candidates are interviewed in a random order (all  $n!$  possible orderings being equally likely).

We consider the following strategy. First, interview  $m$  candidates but reject them all. After that, hire the first candidate who is better than the first  $m$  candidates.

- (a) Conditioned upon the best candidate being the  $j$ th candidate, show that the probability that we hire the best candidate is given by:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{m}{j-1} & \text{if } j > m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- (b) Compute the probability that we hire the best candidate (this should be an expression in terms of  $m$  and  $n$ ). In addition, show that if we set  $m = n/e$ , then the probability that we hire the best candidate is approximately  $1/e$ . [HINT: Use the fact that  $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{n} \approx \ln n$ .]

2. **(Parameter Estimation.)** Suppose we have population of  $n = 20$  million people and we want to estimate the fraction  $p$  of Republicans (assume  $p > 0.01$ ). Here's one way to do it:

Interview a sample of  $s$  people chosen independently and uniformly at random from the population, with replacement. Output the fraction of them who are Republicans.

Suppose we want the algorithm to output a value in the interval  $(p - \delta, p + \delta)$  (where  $\delta \leq 0.01$ ) with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ . Then, how large should  $s$  be? Compute an upper bound on  $s$  (as a function of  $n, \delta$  and  $\epsilon$ ) using both the Chebyshev's inequality and the Chernoff bound. Then, compare the bounds for the specific values  $n = 20$  million,  $\delta = 0.01$  and  $\epsilon = 0.01$ .

3. **(Much Ado About Max-Cuts.)** In the problem MAXCUT, we are given an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  and asked to find a cut of *maximum* size in  $G$ . In contrast to the seemingly very similar problem MINCUT discussed in class (Karger's algorithm), MAXCUT is a famous NP-hard problem, so we do not expect to find an efficient algorithm that solves it exactly. Here is a very simple linear-time randomized algorithm that gives a pretty good approximation:

- randomly and independently color each vertex  $v \in V$  red or blue with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  each;
- output the cut defined by the red/blue partition of vertices.

- (a) Let the r.v.  $X$  denote the size of the cut output by the algorithm. Compute  $E[X]$  as a function of the number of edges in  $G$ , and deduce that  $E[X] \geq \frac{\text{OPT}}{2}$ , where OPT is the size of a maximum cut in  $G$ .

- (b) Let  $p$  denote the probability that the cut output by the algorithm has size at least  $0.49\text{OPT}$ . Show that  $p \geq 1/51$ .  
[HINT: Applying Markov's inequality to  $X$  will not work here. Try applying Markov's inequality to a different r.v.]
- (c) Now compute the variance  $\text{Var}[X]$ .  
[HINT: Again write  $X$  as the sum of indicators, as in part (a).]
- (d) Let  $p$  be the probability as defined in part (b). Use Chebyshev's inequality together with part (c) to show that  $p = 1 - O(1/|E|)$ . [Note how Chebyshev's inequality gives us a much sharper bound here than Markov.]
- (e) How would you modify the algorithm so that it *always* finds a cut of size at least  $0.49\text{OPT}$  but has only *expected* linear running time?