

# Chapter 16

## Discrepancy and Derandomization

By Sarel Har-Peled, March 19, 2024<sup>①</sup>

“Shortly after the celebration of the four thousandth anniversary of the opening of space, Angary J. Gustible discovered Gustible’s planet. The discovery turned out to be a tragic mistake.

Gustible’s planet was inhabited by highly intelligent life forms. They had moderate telepathic powers. They immediately mind-read Angary J. Gustible’s entire mind and life history, and embarrassed him very deeply by making up an opera concerning his recent divorce.”

---

Gustible’s Planet, Cordwainer Smith

### 16.1. Discrepancy

Consider a set system  $(X, \mathcal{R})$ , where  $n = |X|$ , and  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq 2^X$ . A natural task is to partition  $X$  into two sets  $S, T$ , such that for any range  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}$ , we have that  $\chi(\mathbf{r}) = ||S \cap \mathbf{r}| - |T \cap \mathbf{r}||$  is minimized. In a perfect partition, we would have that  $\chi(\mathbf{r}) = 0$  – the two sets  $S, T$  partition every range perfectly in half. A natural way to do so, is to consider this as a coloring problem – an element of  $X$  is colored by  $+1$  if it is in  $S$ , and  $-1$  if it is in  $T$ .

**Definition 16.1.1.** Consider a set system  $\mathbf{S} = (X, \mathcal{R})$ , and let  $\chi : X \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}$  be a function (i.e., a coloring). The **discrepancy** of  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}$  is  $\chi(\mathbf{r}) = |\sum_{x \in \mathbf{r}} \chi(x)|$ . The **discrepancy of  $\chi$**  is the maximum discrepancy over all the ranges – that is

$$\text{disc}(\chi) = \max_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}} \chi(\mathbf{r}).$$

The **discrepancy** of  $\mathbf{S}$  is

$$\text{disc}(\mathbf{S}) = \min_{\chi: X \rightarrow \{-1, +1\}} \text{disc}(\chi).$$

Bounding the discrepancy of a set system is quite important, as it provides a way to shrink the size of the set system, while introducing small error. Computing the discrepancy of a set system is generally quite challenging. A rather decent bound follows by using random coloring.

**Definition 16.1.2.** For a vector  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty = \max_i |v_i|$ .

For technical reasons, it is easy to think about the set system as an incidence matrix.

**Definition 16.1.3.** For a  $m \times n$  binary matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  (i.e., each entry is either 0 or 1), consider a vector  $\mathbf{b} \in \{-1, +1\}^n$ . The **discrepancy** of  $\mathbf{b}$  is  $\|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{b}\|_\infty$ .

**Theorem 16.1.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be an  $n \times n$  binary matrix (i.e., each entry is either 0 or 1), then there always exists a vector  $\mathbf{b} \in \{-1, +1\}^n$ , such that  $\|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{b}\|_\infty \leq 4\sqrt{n \log n}$ . Specifically, a random coloring provides such a coloring with high probability.*

---

<sup>①</sup>This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

*Proof:* Let  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$  be a row of  $M$ . Chose a random  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \{-1, +1\}^n$ . Let  $i_1, \dots, i_\tau$  be the indices such that  $v_{i_j} = 1$ , and let

$$Y = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i b_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} v_{i_j} b_{i_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} b_{i_j}.$$

As such  $Y$  is the sum of  $m$  independent random variables that accept values in  $\{-1, +1\}$ . Clearly,

$$\mathbb{E}[Y] = \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{b} \rangle] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_i v_i b_i\right] = \sum_i \mathbb{E}[v_i b_i] = \sum_i v_i \mathbb{E}[b_i] = 0.$$

By **Chernoff inequality** and the symmetry of  $Y$ , we have that, for  $\Delta = 4\sqrt{n \ln m}$ , it holds

$$\mathbb{P}[|Y| \geq \Delta] = 2\mathbb{P}[\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \geq \Delta] = 2\mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{\tau} b_{i_j} \geq \Delta\right] \leq 2\exp\left(-\frac{\Delta^2}{2\tau}\right) = 2\exp\left(-8\frac{n \ln m}{\tau}\right) \leq \frac{2}{m^8},$$

since  $\tau \leq n$ . In words, the probability that any entry in  $M\mathbf{b}$  exceeds (in absolute values)  $4\sqrt{n \ln m}$ , is smaller than  $2/m^7$ . Thus, with probability at least  $1 - 2/m^7$ , all the entries of  $M\mathbf{b}$  have absolute value smaller than  $4\sqrt{n \ln m}$ .

In particular, there exists a vector  $\mathbf{b} \in \{-1, +1\}^n$  such that  $\|M\mathbf{b}\|_{\infty} \leq 4\sqrt{n \ln m}$ .  $\blacksquare$

We might spend more time on discrepancy later on – it is a fascinating topic, well worth its own course.

## 16.2. The Method of Conditional Probabilities

In previous lectures, we encountered the following problem.

**Problem 16.2.1 (Set Balancing/Discrepancy).** Given a binary matrix  $M$  of size  $n \times n$ , find a vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \{-1, +1\}^n$ , such that  $\|M\mathbf{v}\|_{\infty}$  is minimized.

Using random assignment and the Chernoff inequality, we showed that there exists  $\mathbf{v}$ , such that  $\|M\mathbf{v}\|_{\infty} \leq 4\sqrt{n \ln n}$ . Can we derandomize this algorithm? Namely, can we come up with an efficient *deterministic* algorithm that has low discrepancy?

To derandomize our algorithm, construct a computation tree of depth  $n$ , where in the  $i$ th level we expose the  $i$ th coordinate of  $\mathbf{v}$ . This tree  $T$  has depth  $n$ . The root represents all possible random choices, while a node at depth  $i$ , represents all computations when the first  $i$  bits are fixed. For a node  $v \in T$ , let  $P(v)$  be the probability that a random computation starting from  $v$  succeeds – here randomly assigning the remaining bits can be interpreted as a random walk down the tree to a leaf.

Formally, the algorithm is **successful** if ends up with a vector  $\mathbf{v}$ , such that  $\|M\mathbf{v}\|_{\infty} \leq 4\sqrt{n \ln n}$ .

Let  $v_l$  and  $v_r$  be the two children of  $v$ . Clearly,  $P(v) = (P(v_l) + P(v_r))/2$ . In particular,  $\max(P(v_l), P(v_r)) \geq P(v)$ . Thus, if we could compute  $P(\cdot)$  quickly (and deterministically), then we could derandomize the algorithm.

Let  $C_m^+$  be the bad event that  $\mathbf{r}_m \cdot \mathbf{v} > 4\sqrt{n \log n}$ , where  $\mathbf{r}_m$  is the  $m$ th row of  $M$ . Similarly,  $C_m^-$  is the bad event that  $\mathbf{r}_m \cdot \mathbf{v} < -4\sqrt{n \log n}$ , and let  $C_m = C_m^+ \cup C_m^-$ . Consider the probability,  $\mathbb{P}[C_m^+ \mid \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k]$  (namely, the first  $k$  coordinates of  $\mathbf{v}$  are specified). Let  $\mathbf{r}_m = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$ . We have that

$$\mathbb{P}[C_m^+ \mid \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k] = \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i=k+1}^n \mathbf{v}_i r_i > 4\sqrt{n \log n} - \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{v}_i r_i\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i \geq k+1, r_i \neq 0} \mathbf{v}_i r_i > L\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{i \geq k+1, r_i = 1} \mathbf{v}_i > L\right],$$

where  $L = 4\sqrt{n \log n} - \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{v}_i r_i$  is a known quantity (since  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$  are known). Let  $V = \sum_{i \geq k+1, r_i = 1} 1$ . We have,

$$\mathbb{P}[C_m^+ \mid \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k] = \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{\substack{i \geq k+1 \\ a_i = 1}} (\mathbf{v}_i + 1) > L + V\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[\sum_{\substack{i \geq k+1 \\ a_i = 1}} \frac{\mathbf{v}_i + 1}{2} > \frac{L + V}{2}\right],$$

The last quantity is the probability that in  $V$  flips of a fair 0/1 coin one gets more than  $(L + V)/2$  heads. Thus,

$$P_m^+ = \mathbb{P}[C_m^+ \mid \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k] = \sum_{i=\lceil (L+V)/2 \rceil}^V \binom{V}{i} \frac{1}{2^V} = \frac{1}{2^V} \sum_{i=\lceil (L+V)/2 \rceil}^V \binom{V}{i}.$$

This implies, that we can compute  $P_m^+$  in polynomial time! Indeed, we are adding  $V \leq n$  numbers, each one of them is a binomial coefficient that has polynomial size representation in  $n$ , and can be computed in polynomial time (why?). One can define in similar fashion  $P_m^-$ , and let  $P_m = P_m^+ + P_m^-$ . Clearly,  $P_m$  can be computed in polynomial time, by applying a similar argument to the computation of  $P_m^- = \mathbb{P}[C_m^- \mid \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k]$ .

For a node  $v \in T$ , let  $\mathbf{v}_v$  denote the portion of  $\mathbf{v}$  that was fixed when traversing from the root of  $T$  to  $v$ . Let  $P(v) = \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbb{P}[C_m \mid \mathbf{v}_v]$ . By the above discussion  $P(v)$  can be computed in polynomial time. Furthermore, we know, by the previous result on discrepancy that  $P(r) < 1$  (that was the bound used to show that there exist a good assignment).

As before, for any  $v \in T$ , we have  $P(v) \geq \min(P(v_l), P(v_r))$ . Thus, we have a polynomial *deterministic* algorithm for computing a set balancing with discrepancy smaller than  $4\sqrt{n \log n}$ . Indeed, set  $v = \text{root}(T)$ . And start traversing down the tree. At each stage, compute  $P(v_l)$  and  $P(v_r)$  (in polynomial time), and set  $v$  to the child with lower value of  $P(\cdot)$ . Clearly, after  $n$  steps, we reach a leaf, that corresponds to a vector  $\mathbf{v}'$  such that  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}'\|_\infty \leq 4\sqrt{n \log n}$ .

**Theorem 16.2.2.** *Using the method of conditional probabilities, one can compute in polynomial time in  $n$ , a vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ , such that  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq 4\sqrt{n \log n}$ .*

Note, that this method might fail to find the best assignment.

## 16.3. Bibliographical Notes

There is a lot of nice work on discrepancy in geometric settings. See the books [c-dmr-01, Mat99].

## 16.4. From previous lectures

**Theorem 16.4.1.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be  $n$  independent random variables, such that  $\mathbb{P}[X_i = 1] = \mathbb{P}[X_i = -1] = \frac{1}{2}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ . Then, for any  $\Delta > 0$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{P}[Y \geq \Delta] \leq \exp(-\Delta^2/2n).$$

## References

[Mat99] J. Matoušek. *Geometric Discrepancy*. Vol. 18. Algorithms and Combinatorics. Springer, 1999.