

## Lecture 5. Alteration. Second moment method.

Derandomization via expectation: finding independent sets.

Algorithmic proof of the Caro-Wei inequality: sorting vertices in degree-non-increasing order. Assign each vertex weight  $\frac{1}{\deg(v)+1}$ .

Greedy construct independent sets: at each step, take the first vertex and remove all its neighbours. Then total weight removed  $\leq 1$ .

Another algorithm based on conditional expectation: check vertices in an arbitrary order. For each vertex, there are 2 choices. Note

that  $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{E}] \Pr[\mathcal{E}] + \mathbb{E}[X|\bar{\mathcal{E}}] \Pr[\bar{\mathcal{E}}]$  where  $X$  is

the size of independent sets and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the event of taking  $v$ . At

least one of  $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{E}]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X|\bar{\mathcal{E}}]$  is not less than  $\mathbb{E}[X]$ .

Another example: Max Cut. For each vertex, uniformly mark 0 or 1.

Ramsey number revisit: Alteration.

Theorem (Erdős, 1947) If  $\binom{n}{k} 2^{1-\binom{k}{2}} < 1$ ,  $R(k, k) > n$

Proof. Randomly color each edge.  $\forall S \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ ,  $\Pr[S \text{ monochromatic}] = 2^{1-\binom{k}{2}}$ .

original: union bound      present:  $\mathbb{E}[\# \text{ of monochromatic } K_k] = \binom{n}{k} 2^{1-\binom{k}{2}}$ .

Alteration:  $\forall$  同色  $K_k$  delete a vertex from it.  $\rightarrow$  no 同色  $K_k$

$\exists$  coloring s.t. # of 同色  $K_k \leq \mathbb{E}[\#] \Rightarrow$  remaining size  $\geq n - \mathbb{E}[\#]$

Theorem.  $\forall k, n$ , we have  $R(k, k) > n - \binom{n}{k} 2^{1 - \binom{k}{2}}$

Remark.  $R(k, k) > \left(\frac{1}{e\sqrt{2}} + o(1)\right) k \cdot 2^{k/2}$  originally, now  $\left(\frac{1}{e} + o(1)\right) k \cdot 2^{k/2}$

Analogously.  $\forall s, t, n, p \in [0, 1]$ .  $R(s, t) > n - \binom{n}{s} p^{\binom{s}{2}} - \binom{n}{t} (1-p)^{\binom{t}{2}}$

Dominating set:  $G = (V, E)$ .  $U \subseteq V$  dominating if  $N^+(U) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ .

Theorem.  $\forall$  graph of size  $n$  with minimum degree  $\delta > 1$  has a dominating

set of size at most  $\left(\frac{\log(\delta+1)+1}{\delta+1}\right) n$ .

Naive attempt: take out vertices greedily, the first one remove  $\delta+1$

vertices, but subsequent ones eliminate possibly fewer vertices.

Proof: alteration method: choose a random subset then add vertices.

Let  $p \in [0, 1]$  to be determined later. Independently pick each vertex

with probability  $p$  into  $X$ ,  $Y = V \setminus N^+(X)$ . then  $X \cup Y$  dominating.

$\forall v \in V$ ,  $\Pr[v \in Y] \leq (1-p)^{1+\delta} \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[|X \cup Y|] = \mathbb{E}[|X|] + \mathbb{E}[|Y|]$

$\leq pn + (1-p)^{1+\delta} n \leq \left(p + e^{-p(1+\delta)}\right) n \leq \left(\frac{\log(\delta+1)+1}{\delta+1}\right) n$  by setting  $p = \frac{\log(\delta+1)}{\delta+1}$   $\square$

Independent set: pick  $v \in V$  with probability  $p$ . for each edge  $(u, v)$ .

If both of them are chosen. remove anyone.  $\mathbb{E} = pn - p^2 m \Rightarrow$

$\mathbb{E} \geq \frac{n^2}{4m}$  by setting  $p = \frac{n}{2m}$ . However,  $\mathbb{E} \geq \frac{n^2}{2m+n}$  by Caro-Wei.

Graph with high girth (min length of cycles) and high chromatic number.

If a graph has a  $k$ -clique. then  $\chi \geq k$ . Conversely if  $\chi$  is large

is it always possible to verify it by observing local information?

Surprisingly, this is far from being true. even for "locally tree-like".

Theorem (Erdős, 1959)  $\forall k, l. \exists$  graph with girth  $> l$  and  $\chi > k$ .

Proof. Let  $G \sim \mathcal{G}(n, p)$  with  $p = (\log n)^2/n$ .  $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ : Erdős-Rényi.

Let  $X$  be # of cycles of length  $\leq l$ . In  $K_n$ , there are exactly

$\binom{n}{i} (i-1)!/2$  cycles of length  $i$ . So  $\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{i=3}^l \binom{n}{i} \frac{(i-1)!}{2} p^i$

$\leq \sum_{i=3}^l n^i p^i = o(n)$ . By alteration, we now want to get rid of

all short cycles. However we have another bad event:  $\chi(G) \leq k$ .

Proposition (Markov's inequality).  $X \geq 0 \Rightarrow \forall a > 0. \Pr[X \geq a] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{a}$ .

Proof cont'd. By Markov's inequality.  $\Pr[X \geq \frac{n}{2}] = o(1) < \frac{1}{2}$ .

Note that  $\chi(G) \geq \frac{n}{\alpha(G)}$ . It suffices to show  $\alpha(G) \leq n/k$ . let

$t = \frac{3 \log n}{p}$ .  $\Pr[\alpha(G) \geq t] \leq \binom{n}{t} (1-p)^{\binom{t}{2}} < n^t e^{-p \binom{t+1}{2} t} = o(1) < \frac{1}{2}$ .

Let  $n$  be sufficiently large s.t.  $\Pr[X < \frac{n}{2} \text{ and } \alpha(G) < t] > 0$ .

Remove a vertex from each cycle to get  $G'$ . Then  $|V(G')| \geq \frac{n}{2}$ ,

girth  $> l$  and  $\alpha(G') \leq \alpha(G) \leq \frac{3 \log n}{p}$ , thus  $\chi(G') \geq \frac{np}{6 \log n} > k$ .  $\square$

Remark: Construct such a graph is not easy. Example for  $\Delta$ -free:

Let  $G_2$  be graph  $K_2$  (a single edge). Given  $G_n = (V, E)$ , construct

$G_{n+1} = (V \cup V' \cup \{w\}, E \cup E')$  where  $V'$  is a copy of  $V$ .  $\forall (u, v) \in E$

add  $(u', v)$  in  $E'$ ,  $u'$  is the copy of  $u$  in  $V'$ .  $\forall v' \in V'$ , add  $(v', w)$

in  $E'$ . Then  $G_n$  is triangle-free and  $\chi(G_n) = n$ .

Local coloring: even observing  $\epsilon n$  vertices cannot certify high  $\chi$ .

Theorem (Erdős 1962)  $\forall k > 0$ .  $\exists \epsilon > 0$  s.t.  $\forall$  sufficiently large  $n$

$\exists G$  on  $n$  vertices with  $\chi \geq k$  but  $\chi(G[S]) \leq 3$  for all  $|S| \leq \epsilon n$ .

Proof. Given  $k$ , let  $c, \epsilon$  satisfy  $c > 2k^2 H(1/k) \ln 2$ ,  $\epsilon < e^{-5} 3^3 c^{-3}$

where  $H(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1-x) \log_2 (1-x)$  is the entropy function. Set

$p = c/n$  and let  $G \sim \mathcal{G}(n, p)$ . Claim:  $G$  almost surely as desired.

①  $\chi(G) > k$ : If  $\chi(G) \leq k$ , then  $\alpha(G) \geq n/k$ . Let  $X = \#$  of IS

of size  $n/k$ .  $\mathbb{E}[X] = \binom{n}{n/k} (1-p)^{\binom{n/k}{2}} < 2 \frac{n^{(H(1/k)+o(1))}}{e^{-cn/2k^2(1+o(1))}}$ .

which is  $o(1)$  by our condition on  $c \Rightarrow \chi(G) > k$  almost surely.

②  $\forall |S| \leq \varepsilon n$ .  $\chi(G[S]) \leq 3$ : otherwise. let  $S$  be a minimal set

s.t.  $\chi(G[S]) = 4$ . Thus  $\forall v \in S$ .  $\chi(G[S \setminus v]) = 3 \Rightarrow v$  has

$\geq 3$  neighbours in  $S \Rightarrow G[S \setminus v]$  has  $\geq 3|S|/2$  edges. Let  $t = |S|$ .

$\Pr[\exists \text{ size-}t \text{ induced subgraph has } \geq 3t/2 \text{ edges}] \leq \binom{n}{t} \binom{t}{3t/2} \left(\frac{c}{n}\right)^{3t/2}$ .

$\leq \left(\frac{ne}{t} \left(\frac{te}{3}\right)^{3/2} \left(\frac{c}{n}\right)^{3/2}\right)^t \leq \left(e^{5/2} 3^{-3/2} c^{3/2} \sqrt{t/n}\right)^t \triangleq P_t$ .  $\sum_{t \leq \varepsilon n} P_t = o(1)$ .  $\square$

2-colorable hypergraph revisit.  $m(k)$ : min  $|E|$  for non 2-colorable

$k$ -uniform hypergraph  $H = (V, E)$ .  $2^{k-1} \leq m(k) \leq k^2 \cdot 2^k$

Theorem (Radhakrishnan & Srinivasan, 2000)  $m(k) = \Omega\left(2^k \sqrt{\frac{k}{\log k}}\right)$ .

Original proof contains a deterministic algorithm to switch colorings.

Proof (by Cherkashin & Kozik, 2015). Suppose  $H = (V, E)$  with  $|E| = m$ .

Map  $V \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and color vertices greedily from left to right.

For each  $v$ , color it 0 unless forming an all-0 edge, o.w. color

it 1. The resulting coloring has no all-0 edge. Bound  $\Pr[\exists \text{ all-1}]$ .

Observation:  $\forall$  color-1  $v$ ,  $\exists e \in E$  s.t.  $v$  is the last one in  $e$ .

$\Rightarrow \forall$  all-1 edge  $f$ ,  $\exists e \in E$  s.t. the last of  $e$  = the first of  $f$ .

Call  $(e, f)$  conflicting. Let  $[0, 1] = L \cup M \cup R$  where  $L = [0, \frac{1-p}{2}]$ .

$M = [\frac{1-p}{2}, \frac{1+p}{2}]$ ,  $R = (\frac{1+p}{2}, 1]$ .  $p$  to be determined.  $\forall e \in E$ ,

$\Pr[\forall v \in e \text{ lies in } L/R] = (\frac{1-p}{2})^k \Rightarrow \Pr[\exists \text{ all } L \text{ or } R \text{ edge}] = 2m(\frac{1-p}{2})^k$

Suppose no all-L or all-R edges. If  $(e, f)$  conflicts,  $e \cap f$  is a

single vertex and lies in  $M$ . Let  $v = e \cap f$ .  $\Pr[v \text{ lies last in } e,$

and lies first in  $f] = \int_{(1-p)/2}^{(1+p)/2} x^{k-1} (1-x)^{k-1} dx \leq p/4^{k-1}$ . Thus

$\Pr[\exists \text{ conflicting } (e, f)] \leq 2m(\frac{1-p}{2})^k + m^2 \frac{p}{4^{k-1}} < 2^{1-k} m e^{-pk} + (2^{1-k} m)^2 p$ .

Setting  $p = \log(2^{2-k} k/m)/k$ . above  $\Pr < 1$  for  $m = \Omega(2^k \sqrt{\log k})$ .  $\square$

Recall Markov's inequality  $\Pr[X \geq a] \leq \frac{E[X]}{a}$ . Can we do better?

Theorem (Chebyshev's inequality).  $\Pr[|X - E[X]| \geq t] \leq \frac{\text{Var}[X]}{t^2}$ .

where variance  $\text{Var}[X] = E[(X - E[X])^2] = E[X^2] - E[X]^2$ .

Usually denoted by  $\sigma^2$ , and  $E[X]$  is usually denoted by  $\mu$ .

Proof.  $\sigma^2 = E[(X - \mu)^2] \geq \Pr[|X - \mu| \geq t] \cdot t^2$ .  $\square$

The use of Chebyshev's inequality is called the second moment method.

If  $X = \sum X_i$ . then  $\text{Var}[X] = \sum_{i \neq j} \text{Cov}(X_i, X_j) + \sum_i \text{Var}[X_i]$

Distinct sums:  $|S| = k$ . all  $2^k$  subset sums of  $S$  are distinct.

What is the minimum possible  $\max S$ . Example  $S = \{1, 2, 4, \dots, 2^{k-1}\}$

Trivial bound:  $2^k$  sums are distinct and  $\leq k \max S \Rightarrow \max S \geq \frac{2^k}{k}$ .

Theorem:  $\max S \gtrsim \frac{2^k}{\sqrt{k}}$ .  $\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} + o(1)\right) \frac{2^k}{\sqrt{k}}$  by Dubroff - Fox - Xu.

Proof. Let  $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  and  $n = \max S$ . Choose  $\varepsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}$

independently and u.a.r. Let  $X = \sum \varepsilon_i x_i$  and  $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X] = \frac{\sum x_i}{2}$ .

The variance  $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}[X] = \frac{\sum x_i^2}{4} \leq \frac{nk^2}{4}$ . By Chebyshev's inequality,

$\Pr[|X - \mu| < n\sqrt{k}] \geq \frac{3}{4}$ . Since  $X$  takes distinct values for distinct

$(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k) \in \{0, 1\}^k$ ,  $\Pr[X = x] \leq 2^{-k}$  for all  $x$ . Thus we have

$\Pr[|X - \mu| < n\sqrt{k}] \leq 2^{-k} \cdot 2n\sqrt{k} \Rightarrow 2^{-k} 2n\sqrt{k} \leq \frac{3}{4}$ .  $\square$ .

Application to analysis: Weierstrass approximation theorem.

Theorem (Weierstrass, 1885). Suppose  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous.

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $\exists$  polynomial  $p(x)$  s.t.  $\forall x \in [0, 1] |p(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ .

Proof (by Bernstein, 1912). Since  $[0, 1]$  is compact,  $f$  is uniformly

continuous and bounded. W.l.o.g. assume  $|f(x)| \leq 1$ . Also  $\exists \delta > 0$

s.t.  $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  for all  $|x - y| \leq \delta$ . Now we approximate

$f$  by  $P_n(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} x^i (1-x)^{n-i} f(i/n)$ , where  $n$  is sufficiently large, and

$E_i(x)$  peaks at  $\frac{i}{n}$  and decays away from  $\frac{i}{n}$ . By setting  $E_i(x) = \Pr[\text{Bin}(n, x) = i] = \binom{n}{i} x^i (1-x)^{n-i}$ , we have (since  $\text{Bin}(n, x)$  has mean  $nx$  and variance  $nx(1-x) \leq \frac{n}{4}$  then by Chebyshev's inequality)

$\sum_{i: |i-nx| > n^{2/3}} E_i(x) = \Pr[|\text{Bin}(n, x) - nx| > n^{2/3}] \leq n^{-1/3}$ . Note that

$\sum_{i=0}^n E_i(x) = 1$ . Taking  $n > \max\{64\varepsilon^{-3}, 8^{-3}\}$  we have  $|P_n(x) - f(x)|$

$\leq \sum_{i=0}^n E_i(x) |f(\frac{i}{n}) - f(x)| \leq \sum_{|i-nx| \leq n^{2/3}} E_i(x) \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + 2n^{-1/3} < \varepsilon. \quad \square$