

Lecture 36 Luby's Algorithm

In this lecture and the next we develop a probabilistic NC algorithm of Luby for finding a maximal independent set in an undirected graph. Recall that a set of vertices of a graph is *independent* if the induced subgraph on those vertices has no edges. A *maximal* independent set is one contained in no larger independent set. A maximal independent set need not be of maximum cardinality among all independent sets in the graph.

There is a simple deterministic polynomial-time algorithm for finding a maximal independent set in a graph: just start with an arbitrary vertex and keep adding vertices until all remaining vertices are connected to at least one vertex already taken. Luby [76] and independently Alon, Babai, and Itai [6] showed that the problem is in random NC (RNC), which means that there is a parallel algorithm using polynomially many processors that can make calls on a random number generator such that the *expected* running time is polylogarithmic in the size of the input.

The problem is also in (deterministic) NC . This was first shown by Karp and Wigderson [59]. Luby [76] also gives a deterministic NC algorithm, but his approach has a decidedly different flavor: he gives a probabilistic algorithm first, then develops a general technique for converting probabilistic algorithms to deterministic ones under certain conditions. We will see how to do this in the next lecture.

Luby's algorithm is a good vehicle for discussing probabilistic algorithms, since it illustrates several of the most common concepts used in the analysis of such algorithms:

Law of Sum. The *law of sum* says that if \mathcal{A} is a collection of pairwise disjoint events, *i.e.* if $A \cap B = \emptyset$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \neq B$, then the probability that at least one of the events in \mathcal{A} occurs is the sum of the probabilities:

$$\Pr(\bigcup \mathcal{A}) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr(A) .$$

Expectation. The *expected value* $\mathcal{E}X$ of a discrete random variable X is the weighted sum of its possible values, each weighted by the probability that X takes on that value:

$$\mathcal{E}X = \sum_n n \cdot \Pr(X = n) .$$

For example, consider the toss of a coin. Let

$$X = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the coin turns up heads} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

Then $\mathcal{E}X = \frac{1}{2}$ if the coin is unbiased. This is the expected number of heads in one flip. Any function $f(X)$ of a discrete random variable X is a random variable with expectation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}f(X) &= \sum_n n \cdot \Pr(f(X) = n) \\ &= \sum_m f(m) \cdot \Pr(X = m) . \end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately from the definition that the expectation function \mathcal{E} is linear. For example, if X_i are the random variables (57) associated with n coin flips, then

$$\mathcal{E}(X_1 + X_2 + \cdots + X_n) = \mathcal{E}X_1 + \mathcal{E}X_2 + \cdots + \mathcal{E}X_n ,$$

and this gives the expected number of heads in n flips. The X_i need not be independent; in fact, they might all be the same flip.

Conditional Probability and Conditional Expectation. The *conditional probability* $\Pr(A \mid B)$ is the probability that event A occurs given that event B occurs. Formally,

$$\Pr(A \mid B) = \frac{\Pr(A \cap B)}{\Pr(B)} .$$

The conditional probability is undefined if $\Pr(B) = 0$.

The *conditional expectation* $\mathcal{E}(X \mid B)$ is the expected value of the random variable X given that event B occurs. Formally,

$$\mathcal{E}(X \mid B) = \sum_n n \cdot \Pr(X = n \mid B) .$$

If the event B is that another random variable Y takes on a particular value m , then we get a real-valued function $\mathcal{E}(X | Y = m)$ of m . Composing this function with the random variable Y itself, we get a new random variable, denoted $\mathcal{E}(X | Y)$, which is a function of the random variable Y . The random variable $\mathcal{E}(X | Y)$ takes on value n with probability

$$\sum_{\mathcal{E}(X|Y=m)=n} \Pr(Y = m) ,$$

where the sum is over all m such that $\mathcal{E}(X | Y = m) = n$. The expected value of $\mathcal{E}(X | Y)$ is just $\mathcal{E}X$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}(X | Y)) &= \sum_m \mathcal{E}(X | Y = m) \cdot \Pr(Y = m) \\ &= \sum_m \sum_n n \cdot \Pr(X = n | Y = m) \cdot \Pr(Y = m) \\ &= \sum_n n \cdot \sum_m \Pr(X = n \wedge Y = m) \\ &= \sum_n n \cdot \Pr(X = n) \\ &= \mathcal{E}X \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

(see [33, p. 223]).

Independence and Pairwise Independence. A set of events \mathcal{A} are *independent* if for any subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$,

$$\Pr(\bigcap \mathcal{B}) = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{B}} \Pr(A) .$$

They are *pairwise independent* if for every $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \neq B$,

$$\Pr(A \cap B) = \Pr(A) \cdot \Pr(B) .$$

For example, the probability that two successive flips of a fair coin both come up heads is $\frac{1}{4}$. Pairwise independent events need not be independent: consider the three events

- the first flip gives heads
- the second flip gives heads
- of the two flips, one is heads and one is tails.

The probability of each pair is $\frac{1}{4}$, but the three cannot happen simultaneously. If A and B are independent, then $\Pr(A | B) = \Pr(A)$.

Inclusion-Exclusion Principle. It follows from the law of sum that for any events A and B , disjoint or not,

$$\Pr(A \cup B) = \Pr(A) + \Pr(B) - \Pr(A \cap B).$$

More generally, for any collection \mathcal{A} of events,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\bigcup \mathcal{A}) &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr(A) - \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \\ |\mathcal{B}|=2}} \Pr(\bigcap \mathcal{B}) + \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \\ |\mathcal{B}|=3}} \Pr(\bigcap \mathcal{B}) - \cdots \pm \Pr(\bigcap \mathcal{A}). \end{aligned}$$

This equation is often used to estimate the probability of a join of several events. The first term alone gives an upper bound and the first two terms give a lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\bigcup \mathcal{A}) &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr(A) \\ \Pr(\bigcup \mathcal{A}) &\geq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr(A) - \sum_{\substack{A, B \in \mathcal{A} \\ A \neq B}} \Pr(A \cap B). \end{aligned}$$

36.1 Luby's Maximal Independent Set Algorithm

Luby's algorithm is executed in stages. Each stage finds an independent set I in parallel, using calls on a random number generator. The set I , the set $N(I)$ of neighbors of I , and all edges incident to $I \cup N(I)$ are deleted from the graph. The process is repeated until the graph is empty. The final maximal independent set is the union of all the independent sets I found in each stage. We will show that the expected number of edges deleted in each stage is at least a constant fraction of the edges remaining; this will imply that the expected number of stages is $O(\log n)$ (Homework 10, Exercise 1).

If v is a vertex and A a set of vertices, define

$$\begin{aligned} N(v) &= \{u \mid (u, v) \in E\} = \{\text{neighbors of } v\} \\ N(A) &= \bigcup_{u \in A} N(u) = \{\text{neighbors of } A\} \\ d(v) &= \text{the degree of } v = |N(v)|. \end{aligned}$$

Here is the algorithm to find I in each stage.

Algorithm 36.1

1. Create a set S of candidates for I as follows. For each vertex v in parallel, include $v \in S$ with probability $\frac{1}{2d(v)}$.
2. For each edge in E , if both its endpoints are in S , discard the one of lower degree; ties are resolved arbitrarily (say by vertex number). The resulting set is I .

Note that in step 1 we favor vertices with low degree and in step 2 we favor vertices of high degree.

Define a vertex to be *good* if

$$\sum_{u \in N(v)} \frac{1}{2d(u)} \geq \frac{1}{6}.$$

Intuitively, a vertex is good if it has lots of neighbors of low degree. This will give it a decent chance of making it into $N(I)$. Define an edge to be *good* if at least one of its endpoints is good. A vertex or edge is *bad* if it is not good. We will show that at least half of the edges are good, and each stands a decent chance of being deleted, so we will expect to delete a reasonable fraction of the good edges in each stage.

Lemma 36.2 For all v , $\Pr(v \in I) \geq \frac{1}{4d(v)}$.

Proof. Let $L(v) = \{u \in N(v) \mid d(u) \geq d(v)\}$. If $v \in S$, then v does not make it into I only if some element of $L(v)$ is also in S . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(v \notin I \mid v \in S) &\leq \Pr(\exists u \in L(v) \cap S \mid v \in S) \\ &\leq \sum_{u \in L(v)} \Pr(u \in S \mid v \in S) \\ &= \sum_{u \in L(v)} \Pr(u \in S) \quad (\text{by pairwise independence}) \\ &\leq \sum_{u \in L(v)} \frac{1}{2d(u)} \\ &\leq \sum_{u \in L(v)} \frac{1}{2d(v)} \quad (\text{since } d(u) \geq d(v)) \\ &\leq \frac{d(v)}{2d(v)} = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(v \in I) &= \Pr(v \in I \mid v \in S) \cdot \Pr(v \in S) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2d(v)} = \frac{1}{4d(v)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 36.3 If v is good, then $\Pr(v \in N(I)) \geq \frac{1}{36}$.

Proof. If v has a neighbor u of degree 2 or less, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(v \in N(I)) &\geq \Pr(u \in I) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4d(u)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 36.2}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise $d(u) \geq 3$ for all $u \in N(v)$. Then for all $u \in N(v)$, $\frac{1}{2d(u)} \leq \frac{1}{6}$, and since v is good,

$$\sum_{u \in N(v)} \frac{1}{2d(u)} \geq \frac{1}{6}.$$

There must exist a subset $M(v) \subseteq N(v)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{6} \leq \sum_{u \in M(v)} \frac{1}{2d(u)} \leq \frac{1}{3}. \quad (59)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(v \in N(I)) &\geq \Pr(\exists u \in M(v) \cap I) \\ &\geq \sum_{u \in M(v)} \Pr(u \in I) - \sum_{\substack{u, w \in M(v) \\ u \neq w}} \Pr(u \in I \wedge w \in I) \\ &\quad \text{(by inclusion-exclusion)} \\ &\geq \sum_{u \in M(v)} \frac{1}{4d(u)} - \sum_{\substack{u, w \in M(v) \\ u \neq w}} \Pr(u \in S \wedge w \in S) \\ &\geq \sum_{u \in M(v)} \frac{1}{4d(u)} - \sum_{\substack{u, w \in M(v) \\ u \neq w}} \Pr(u \in S) \cdot \Pr(w \in S) \\ &\quad \text{(by pairwise independence)} \\ &= \sum_{u \in M(v)} \frac{1}{4d(u)} - \sum_{u \in M(v)} \sum_{w \in M(v)} \frac{1}{2d(u)} \cdot \frac{1}{2d(w)} \\ &= \left(\sum_{u \in M(v)} \frac{1}{2d(u)} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} - \sum_{w \in M(v)} \frac{1}{2d(w)} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{6} = \frac{1}{36} \text{ by (59).} \end{aligned}$$

□

We will continue the analysis of Luby's algorithm in the next lecture.