

# CS5314

## Randomized Algorithms

Lecture 2: Events and Probability  
(verifying polynomial identities)

# Objectives

- This lecture will give a simple randomized algorithm for checking if two polynomials are equivalent
- Introduce two concepts:
  - (1) Independent events
  - (2) Conditional Probability
- Introduce two techniques:
  - (1) Sampling with replacement,
  - (2) Sampling without replacement

# Verifying Polynomial Identities

- Suppose that we have written a program to multiply polynomials
- For example, given an input

$$(x-1)(x-2)(x+3)(x-4)(x+5)$$

our program outputs:

$$x^5 + x^4 - 18x^3 + 36x^2 - 12x + 120$$

- How shall we check if this output is correct?

# Verifying Polynomial Identities

In general, we are given two polynomials,

$F(x)$  in the product form  $(\prod_{i=1,2,\dots,d} (x-a_i))$ ,

$G(x)$  in the canonical form  $(\sum_{i=0,1,\dots,d} c_i x^i)$ .

Our target is to check if

$$F(x) \equiv G(x)$$

# Verifying Polynomial Identities

## Method 1:

Convert  $F(x)$  into the canonical form by repeatedly multiplying the  $i^{\text{th}}$  monomial to the product of the first  $i-1$  monomials

- It takes  $O(d^2)$  multiplications of coefficients.  
(No faster than the original computation)
- Also, there is a potential problem ...

# A Randomized Algorithm

Method 2:

- Let  $d$  be maximum degree of  $F(x)$  or  $G(x)$
- Pick an integer  $r$ , uniformly at random, from the set  $[1, 2, \dots, 100d]$
- Compute  $F(r)$  and  $G(r)$
- If  $F(r) = G(r)$ , we conclude  $F(x) \equiv G(x)$ .  
Otherwise, we conclude  $F(x) \not\equiv G(x)$

# A Randomized Algorithm (Performance Analysis)

## Questions

- What is the runtime of the algorithm?

Ans.  $O(d)$  time

- Will the algorithm always give a correct answer? If not, when?

Ans. Not always. It will make an error when  $F(x) \neq G(x)$ , and the  $r$  we choose satisfies  $F(r) = G(r)$

# A Randomized Algorithm (Performance Analysis)

## Questions

- If  $F(x) \neq G(x)$ , how many  $r$  can we choose so that  $F(r) = G(r)$ ?

Ans. At most  $d$  of them, since each such  $r$  is a root of the polynomial  $F(x) - G(x)$ , whose degree is at most  $d$ .

(Fundamental theorem of algebra)



# A Randomized Algorithm (Performance Analysis)

## Conclusion

- If  $F(x) \neq G(x)$ , the probability that the randomized algorithm returns an incorrect answer is at most  $d/100d$
- Thus, in case  $F(x) \neq G(x)$ , the randomized algorithm is correct in at least 99% of the time

Can we further improve this probability?

# A Randomized Algorithm (Modification)

- One idea is to run the algorithm multiple times, say  $k$  times, so that it concludes  $F(x) \equiv G(x)$  if all the  $r$ 's we pick in these  $k$  different runs will satisfy  $F(r) = G(r)$
- This is unlikely to happen if  $F(x) \not\equiv G(x)$
- Can we bound the probability for this modified algorithm to return a correct conclusion?

# Independent Events

Definition: Two events  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are **independent** if and only if

$$\Pr(E_1 \cap E_2) = \Pr(E_1) \Pr(E_2)$$

Definition (general version): Events  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_k$  are **mutually independent** if and only if for any subset  $I \subseteq [1, k]$ ,

$$\Pr\left(\bigcap_{i \in I} E_i\right) = \prod_{i \in I} \Pr(E_i)$$

# Independent Events

Example 1:

**Experiment:** Throw a fair die and flip a fair coin, observe the result

$E_1$  = the outcome of the die throw is 2

$E_2$  = the outcome of the coin flip is Tail

What are the probabilities

$\Pr(E_1 \cap E_2)$ ,  $\Pr(E_1)$ , and  $\Pr(E_2)$  ?

# Independent Events

## Remark:

- Usually, if "event  $E_1$  occurs" does not affect "event  $E_2$  to occur", the two events are independent
- The converse may not be true

# Independent Events

Example 2:

**Experiment:** Throw a fair die twice, observe the result

$E_1$  = the outcome of 1st throw is even

$E_2$  = the sum of the outcomes in the two throws is odd

What are the probabilities

$\Pr(E_1 \cap E_2)$ ,  $\Pr(E_1)$ , and  $\Pr(E_2)$  ?

# Back to our algorithm...

## (Performance Analysis)

- Suppose that  $F(x) \not\equiv G(x)$
- Let  $E_i$  be the event that at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  run, the  $r$  we choose satisfies  $F(r) = G(r)$
- The probability that the modified algorithm makes an error after  $k$  runs is

$$\Pr\left(\bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k} E_i\right)$$

Note: The event  $\bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k} E_i$  corresponds to the case that for all  $r$ 's chosen in the  $k$  runs, they all satisfy  $F(r) = G(r)$ .

## Back to our algorithm... (Performance Analysis)

- Since the choice of the integer  $r$  in each run is independent of the choice of  $r$  in other runs, the events  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_k$  are mutually independent
- So,  $\Pr(\bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k} E_i) = \prod_{i=1,2,\dots,k} \Pr(E_i)$ , which is at most  $(1/100)^k$
- Thus, the probability that the algorithm is correct is at least  $1 - (1/100)^k$



# Back to our algorithm...

## (Remark)

- In the previous algorithm, the random choice  $r$  we make in each run is drawn from the same set, with the same distribution of probabilities
- This technique is called **sampling with replacement**
  - This corresponds to choosing an item from a set, and **replace** it back after choosing, so that the same item can be chosen next time

## Our 2<sup>nd</sup> algorithm... (Remark)

- We can also modify the algorithm so that for the  $k$  runs, any integer can be chosen at most once
- This technique is called **sampling without replacement**
- Intuitively, this increases the probability that the algorithm will make a correct conclusion

Can we bound this probability?

# Conditional Probability

Definition: Suppose that  $\Pr(E_2) > 0$ . The **conditional probability** that event  $E_1$  occurs given that  $E_2$  occurs is the ratio

$$\Pr(E_1 \cap E_2) / \Pr(E_2).$$

Such a value is denoted by  $\Pr(E_1 | E_2)$ .

Lemma: Suppose that  $\Pr(E_2) > 0$ . Then

$$\Pr(E_1 \cap E_2) = \Pr(E_1 | E_2) \Pr(E_2).$$

# Conditional Probability

Example 1:

**Experiment:** Given a bag that contains two **red** balls and two **green** balls. Draw the first ball from the bag (uniformly at random), and draw the second ball from the remaining balls (uniformly at random)

**E** = the first ball is **red**

**F** = the second ball is **green**

# Conditional Probability

- What is  $\Pr(F | E)$ ?
- By definition, it is equal to  $\Pr(E \cap F) / \Pr(E)$ , which equals  $(4/12) / (6/12) = 2/3$
- Intuitively, given that we know the first ball is **red**, the remaining balls for the second draw must be one **red** and two **greens**. So we expect that the probability  $\Pr(F | E)$  should be  $2/3$ , which turns out to be true

# Conditional Probability

Example 2:

**Experiment:** Given a deck of cards (with 26 red cards and 26 black cards). Draw three cards from the deck, one by one, without replacement (uniformly at random)

$E$  = the first two cards are red

$F$  = the third card is black

- What is  $\Pr(F | E)$ ?

## Back to our 2<sup>nd</sup> algorithm... (the one without replacement)

- Suppose that  $F(x) \neq G(x)$
- Let  $E_i$  be the event that at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  run, the integer  $r$  satisfies  $F(r) = G(r)$
- The probability that the modified algorithm makes an error is still

$$\Pr\left(\bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k} E_i\right)$$

## Back to our 2<sup>nd</sup> algorithm... (the one without replacement)

- The value  $\Pr(\bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k} E_i)$  is equal to  
 $\Pr(E_k \mid \bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k-1} E_i) \Pr(\bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k-1} E_i)$
- Repeating this argument, the value will be equal to  
 $\Pr(E_1) \times \Pr(E_2 \mid E_1) \times \Pr(E_3 \mid E_1 \cap E_2) \times$   
 $\dots \times \Pr(E_k \mid \bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k-1} E_i)$



## Back to our 2<sup>nd</sup> algorithm... (the one without replacement)

- We can bound  $\Pr(E_j \mid \bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,j-1} E_i)$  to be at most  $(d - (j-1)) / (100d - (j-1))$ .

- Thus,  $\Pr(\bigcap_{i=1,2,\dots,k} E_i)$  is at most

$$\prod_{j=1,2,\dots,k} [(d - (j-1)) / (100d - (j-1))]$$

# With replacement? Or without?

- Normally, sampling without replacement gives better (tighter) bounds
- However, sometimes, we will prefer sampling with replacement because
  - Algorithm is simpler, easier to code
  - Performance is easier to analyze