A PROBABILISTIC CONSTRUCTION AND ITS DERANDOMIZATION

Mihalis Kolountzakis

University of Crete

Tripods NSF REU/GradStemForAll2020 (Rochester) August 12, 2020 Define random object; prove that it has required properties

Works suprisingly often.

"Non-constructive"

Color the edges of K_n for few monochromatic triangles



Method: Just randomly color every edge red or blue.

Example: edge coloring K_n : analysis

Write $I_j = \mathbf{1}$ (triangle *j* is monochromatic).

Number of monochromatic triangles is then $X = \sum_{j=1}^{\binom{n}{3}} I_j$

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{\binom{n}{3}} \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{4}\binom{n}{3} = \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{24}$$

There is a coloring with $X \leq \mathbb{E}[X]$.

How to construct such a coloring?

Method of conditional expectations:

- Toss your coins one by one.
- Take care to be on the right side of luck each time!

How to choose I_1 to be red or blue?

$$\mathbb{E}\left[X\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[X \mid I_1 = \mathsf{red}\right] \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{E}\left[X \mid I_1 = \mathsf{blue}\right] \frac{1}{2}$$

so one of $\mathbb{E}[X \mid I_1 = \mathsf{red}]$, $\mathbb{E}[X \mid I_1 = \mathsf{blue}]$ is $\leq \mathbb{E}[X]$.

Calculate and choose that one!

The method of conditional expectations

Having chosen
$$l_1 = c_1, ..., l_k = c_k$$
 we have
 $\mathbb{E}[X \mid l_1 = c_1, ..., l_k = c_k] =$
 $\mathbb{E}[X \mid l_1 = c_1, ..., l_k = c_k, l_{k+1} = red] \frac{1}{2} +$
 $\mathbb{E}[X \mid l_1 = c_1, ..., l_k = c_k, l_{k+1} = blue] \frac{1}{2}$

Choose the color $I_{k+1} = c_{k+1}$ so as to have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[X \mid I_1 = c_1, \dots, I_k = c_k, I_{k+1} = c_{k+1}\right] \le \mathbb{E}\left[X \mid I_1 = c_1, \dots, I_k = c_k\right]$$

In the end

$$\mathbb{E}\left[X \mid I_1 = c_1, \dots, I_n = c_n\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[X\right] = \frac{1}{4} \binom{n}{3}$$

Additive bases for the integers

$$E \subseteq \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots\}$$

 $\begin{array}{l} \hline \text{Representation function:} \\ \hline r_E(x) = \left| \left\{ (a, b) \in E^2 : x = a + b, a \le b \right\} \right| \\ = \text{ in how many ways we can write } x = e_1 + e_2 \end{array}$

$$\begin{array}{l} E \text{ is } \underline{\text{Additive basis:}} \\ \text{ for } x \geq 2 \text{ we have } r_E(x) > 0. \text{ E.g. } E = \{1, 2, 4, 6, \ldots\}. \end{array}$$

$\begin{array}{l} E \text{ is } \underline{\text{Asymptotic additive basis:}} \\ \text{ for all sufficiently large } x \in \mathbb{N} \text{ we have } r_E(x) > 0. \end{array}$

General problem:

find *thin* (asymptotic additive) bases (small but positive $r_E(x)$)

Thin asymptotic additive bases

THEOREM (ERDŐS 1956)

There are constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$, set $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and integer x_0 such that

$$c_1 \ln x \le r_E(x) \le c_2 \ln x, \ (x \ge x_0).$$

Probabilistic proof.

Open problems:

(a) Can the function $\ln x$ be reduced?

(b) Can we achieve the existence of $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{r_E(x)}{\ln x}$?

(c) Non-probabilistic proof?

Conjecture (Erdős-Turán)

If for $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we eventually have $r_E(x) > 0$ then

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} r_E(x) = \infty.$$

A RANDOM SET OF NATURAL NUMBERS

K > 0 is a constant to be determined later.

Define the probabilities (for x = 1, 2, ...)

$$p_{x} = \begin{cases} K \left(\frac{\ln x}{x}\right)^{1/2} & \text{if this is in } \in [0,1] \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Define the random set $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ by taking

$$\mathbb{P}\left[x\in E\right]=p_x,\quad (x\in\mathbb{N})$$

independently for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$.

In other words, we toss a coin for each natural number.

We show $\mathbb{P}[\text{our set has the required property}] > 0.$

Define RVs $\chi_j = \mathbf{1} (j \in E)$, for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Independent with $\mathbb{E} [\chi_j] = p_j$.

For the representation function we have

$$r_E(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \chi_j \chi_{x-j}.$$

 $r_E(x)$: sum of independent 0 – 1 valued RVs.

The Chernoff large deviation inequality

 X_1, \ldots, X_N independent 0 - 1 valued RVs and $S = X_1 + \cdots + X_N$, $\mu = \mathbb{E}[S]$. For $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|S-\mu| \geq \epsilon\mu\right] \leq 2e^{-c_{\epsilon}\mu},$$

where

$$0 < c_{\epsilon} = \min\left\{\epsilon^2/2, -\ln\left(e^{\epsilon}(1+\epsilon)^{-(1+\epsilon)}
ight)
ight\}$$

depends only on ϵ .

Exponential dependence on μ : due to structure of *S* as a sum of independent RVs.

Very easy to use for combinatorial problems. Only need to know μ .

Larger μ : better inequality \Rightarrow RVs *S* with large μ are easier to control.

CALCULATE THE MEAN VALUE

$$\text{Let } p_j \neq 0 \text{ for } j \geq j_0 \text{ and } p_j = 0 \text{ for } j < j_0.$$

For x odd and large (similarly for x even):

$$\mathbb{E}[r_{E}(x)] = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[\chi_{j}\chi_{x-j}]$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[\chi_{j}] \mathbb{E}[\chi_{x-j}] \quad (x \text{ odd} \Rightarrow j \neq x-j, \text{ independence})$$

$$= \sum_{j=j_{0}}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} p_{j}p_{x-j}$$

$$= \sum_{j=j_{0}}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} K^{2} \left(\frac{\ln j \ln(x-j)}{j(x-j)}\right)^{1/2}$$

CALCULATE THE MEAN VALUE (CONTINUED)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[r_{E}(x)\right] = \sum_{j=j_{0}}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \kappa^{2} \left(\frac{\ln j \ln(x-j)}{j(x-j)}\right)^{1/2}$$

Upper bound:
$$\mathbb{E}\left[r_{E}(x)\right] \leq K^{2} \ln x \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \left(\frac{1}{j(x-j)}\right)^{1/2}$$

Lower bound:
$$\mathbb{E}\left[r_{E}(x)\right] \geq \frac{K^{2}}{4} \ln x \sum_{j=\sqrt{x}}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \left(\frac{1}{j(x-j)}\right)^{1/2}$$

CALCULATE THE MEAN VALUE (CONTINUED)

But for $x \to \infty$: $\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \left(\frac{1}{j(x-j)} \right)^{1/2} = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{x} \left(\frac{1}{\frac{j}{x}(1-\frac{j}{x})} \right)^{1/2} \to \int_{0}^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{s(1-s)} \right)^{1/2} ds$ (Riemann sum for $I = \int_{0}^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{s(1-s)} \right)^{1/2} ds$ Similarly $\sum_{j=\sqrt{x}}^{\lfloor x/2 \rfloor} \left(\frac{1}{j(x-j)} \right)^{1/2} \to I = \int_{0}^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{s(1-s)} \right)^{1/2} ds$

So, for large x we have the right order of magnitude:

$$\frac{lK^2}{8}\ln x \le \mathbb{E}\left[r_E(x)\right] \le 2lK^2\ln x.$$

Control the deviation of the RVs

<u>Bad events</u>: $A_x = \{ |r_E(x) - \mathbb{E}[r_E(x)] | \ge \epsilon \mathbb{E}[r_E(x)] \}$ with $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$.

By Chernoff's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}[A_x] \leq 2e^{-c_{\epsilon}\mathbb{E}[r_E(x)]}$$

$$\leq 2e^{-c_{\epsilon}C_1\ln x}$$

$$= 2x^{-C_1c_{\epsilon}}$$

$$= 2x^{-c_{\epsilon}IK^2/8}.$$

Choose *K* so that the exponent $c_{\epsilon}IK^2/8 > 1$. It follows that

$$\sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left[A_x\right] \leq \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} 2x^{-c_{\epsilon}IK^2/8} < \infty.$$

CONTROL THE DEVIATION OF THE RVS (CONTINUED)

Convergence of $\sum_{x} \mathbb{P}[A_x] \Rightarrow$ there is x_0 such that

$$\sum_{x\geq x_0}\mathbb{P}\left[A_x\right] < \frac{1}{2},$$

so that with probability $\geq 1/2$ none of the $A_x, x \geq x_0$ holds.

For $x \ge x_0$: $r_E(x) \ge \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[r_E(x)\right] \ge \frac{IK^2}{16}\ln x$ and $r_E(x) \le \frac{3}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[r_E(x)\right] \le 3IK^2\ln x.$ Can we produce a good additive basis E by listing its elements one by one?

Not clear we can do so, however slowly.

Tricky point:

our choice for $n \in E$ affects the representation function forever.

A modified probabilistic proof

For
$$g(x) = (x \log x)^{1/2}$$
 define the modified representation function
 $r'(x) = |\{(a, b) \in E^2 : x = a + b \& g(x) \le a \le b\}|.$

Deciding $n \in E$ only affects

$$r'(x)$$
 for $x \leq G(n)$,

where

$$G(n)=g^{-1}(n)\sim \frac{n^2}{\log n}.$$

A modified probabilistic proof, continued

Also observe that

$$r'(x) \leq r(x) \leq r'(x) + s(x),$$

where

$$s(x) = |E \cap [x - g(x), x]|.$$

One can (as in Erdős' proof) calculate easily

T

$$\mathbb{E}\left[r'(x)
ight]\sim CK^2\log x$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[s(x)\right] \sim K \log x,$$

and the expectations of the r.v.'s r(x) and s(x) have the right order of magnitude.

A modified probabilistic proof, continued

The bad events are

$$A_{x} = \left\{ |r'(x) - \mathbb{E}\left[r'(x)\right]| > \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[r'(x)\right] \right\}$$
$$B_{x} = \left\{ s(x) - \mathbb{E}\left[s(x)\right] > \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[s(x)\right] \right\}.$$

Chernoff Large Deviation Lemma gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left[A_{x}\right] \leq 2x^{-\alpha}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left[B_{x}\right] \leq 2x^{-\beta}.$$

Can make $\alpha, \beta > 1$ by choosing K large.

A modified probabilistic proof, continued

We have

$$\sum_{x=n_0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left[A_x\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[B_x\right] < 1 \quad \text{ for some } n_0.$$

We get a set E with

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[r'(x)\right] \leq r'(x) \leq \frac{3}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[r'(x)\right]$$

and

$$s(x) \leq \frac{3}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[s(x)\right].$$

Together these imply

$$C_1 \log x \le r(x) \le C_2 \log x$$

for $x \ge n_0$.

This concludes the alternative probabilistic proof of Erdős' theorem.

DERANDOMIZING THE PROOF. THE STRATEGY.

We showed that for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ the complement of the bad event

$$B=\bigcup_{x\geq n_0}(A_x\cup B_x)$$

has positive probability, since

$$\sum_{x\geq n_0}\mathbb{P}\left[A_x
ight]+\mathbb{P}\left[B_x
ight]<1.$$

Have to construct a "point" (set of integers) $E \notin B$.

At the *n*-th step we output 1 or 0 to denote $n \in E$ or not.

Will take time *polynomial* in *n* to enumerate to *n*.

DERANDOMIZING THE PROOF. RESTRICTION EVENT.

Let the RVs $\chi_j = \mathbf{1} \ (j \in E)$.

Restriction event: $R(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = \{\chi_1 = a_1, \ldots, \chi_n = a_n\}.$

Goal: Pick the a_n successively so that

$$b(a_1,\ldots,a_n) := \sum_{x \ge n_0} \mathbb{P}\left[A_x \mid R(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[B_x \mid R(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\right]$$

is non-increasing.

If so then

$$E=(a_1,a_2,\ldots)$$

is in no bad event.

DERANDOMIZING THE PROOF. DECIDING THE NEXT $n \in E$.

If $p_n = \mathbb{P}[n \in E]$ in our probabilistic proof then

$$b(a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1}) = p_n b(a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1},1) + (1-p_n)b(a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1},0)$$

by the law of total probability.

Hence one of $b(a_1, ..., a_{n-1}, 1), b(a_1, ..., a_{n-1}, 0)$ is

$$\leq b(a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1}).$$

How to find which?

DERANDOMIZING THE PROOF. DECIDING IF $n \in E$.

We have to compute efficiently the sign of

$$\begin{split} \Delta &= b(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 1) - b(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 0) \\ &= \sum_{x=n}^{G(n)} \mathbb{P}\left[A_x \mid R(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 1)\right] - \mathbb{P}\left[A_x \mid R(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 0)\right] + \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\left[B_x \mid R(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 1)\right] - \mathbb{P}\left[B_x \mid R(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 0)\right]. \end{split}$$

Thanks to the modified representation function (remember $G(n) = g^{-1}(n) \sim \frac{n^2}{\log n})$ $r'(x) = |\{(a, b) \in E^2 : x = a + b \& g(x) \le a \le b\}|.$

this is a finite sum with a polynomial number of terms.

Thanks for your attention.