

## Lecture 23: Colorings with Low Discrepancy

1

Bansal's algorithm (2010). This computes the desired coloring through a sequence of semicolorings, where a semicoloring is an arbitrary mapping  $c: V \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ .

The algorithm starts with the semicoloring  $x_0 = 0$ . Then it produces a sequence

$x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell \in [-1, 1]^n$  of semicolorings. What  $\ell$  should be will be determined later.

The  $t$ -th step.  $x_t$  is obtained from  $x_{t-1}$  as follows.

Let  $A_t = \{j \in V: (x_{t-1})_j \neq \pm 1\}$  is the set of coordinates that are still active in the  $t$ -th step.

We will use semidefinite programming to compute a coloring of  $A_t$  by unit vectors (rather than  $\pm 1$ ).

More explicitly, we compute unit vectors  $u_{t,j}$  where  $j \in A_t$  so that

$$\left\| \sum_{j \in A_t \cap S_i} u_{t,j} \right\|^2 \leq D^2$$

for all  $i$ , with  $D \geq 0$  as small as possible.

For convenience, we also set  $u_{t,j} = 0$  for  $j \notin A_t$ .

Next, we generate a random vector  $r_t$  from the  $n$ -dimensional standard normal distribution, i.e., the coordinates of  $r_t$  are independent  $N(0, 1)$  random variables.

Then we set  $(\Delta_t)_j = \gamma \cdot r_t^T u_{t,j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

Here  $\gamma$  is a small parameter.

We will update  $x_{t-1}$  to  $x_t$  as follows: (2)

- A tentative value of  $x_t$  is  $\tilde{x}_t = x_{t-1} + \Delta_t$ .
- But we need to truncate each coordinate to the interval  $[-1, 1]$ . So we update  $\tilde{x}_t$  as:

$$(x_t)_j = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } (\tilde{x}_t)_j \geq 1 \\ -1 & \text{if } (\tilde{x}_t)_j \leq -1 \\ (\tilde{x}_t)_j & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

The length  $l$  of the sequence  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_l$  of semicolons will be set to  $\frac{C_1 \cdot \log n}{\sqrt{2}}$  for a suitable constant  $C_1$ .

As we will see in due time  $\sigma = \frac{1}{C_0 n \sqrt{\log n}}$  for another suitable constant  $C_0$ .

This concludes the description of Bansal's algorithm.

---

Roughly speaking, why does the algorithm work? The algorithm can be regarded as a random walk in the cube  $[-1, 1]^n$ . The projection of the random walk to a given coordinate axis behaves like a 1-dimensional random walk with increments having the normal distribution  $\sigma \cdot N(0, 1) = N(0, \sigma^2)$ . Such a walk will typically cross the boundary of the interval  $[-1, 1]$  in about  $1/\sigma^2$  steps. After  $\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{2}}$  steps, it is very likely to have crossed the boundary. This means that  $x_l$  is very likely to be a  $\pm 1$  vector.

Regarding the imbalance of any  $S_i$ , it starts out

at 0 under the semicoloring  $\alpha_0$  and in the  $t$ -th step, it is changed by  $\sum_{j \in S_i} \top \cdot r_t^T u_{t,j} = \top r_t^T v_{t,i}$  ③

where  $v_{t,i} = \sum_{j \in S_i} u_{t,j}$ . But the  $u_{t,j}$  were selected with the goal of making  $\|v_{t,i}\|$  small. So the imbalance of each  $S_i$  grows slowly during the algorithm.

We will now make these arguments formally.

Claim 1. The algorithm produces a coloring with probability  $\geq 1 - 1/n$ .

Proof. Let  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$  be the sequence of semicolorings generated by the algorithm. Let  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  be a fixed index. We will call the sequence  $(\alpha_0)_j, (\alpha_1)_j, \dots, (\alpha_\ell)_j$  the  $j$ -th coordinate random walk.

We will say that the  $j$ -th coordinate random walk terminates if  $(\alpha_\ell)_j \in \{\pm 1\}$ . To prove Claim 1, it is enough to show that, for every  $j$ , the probability that the  $j$ -th coordinate random walk does not terminate is  $\leq 1/n^2$ . Then w.p.  $\geq 1 - 1/n$ , all of the coordinate random walks terminate (by the union bound).

To simplify notation, let us fix  $j$  and write  $X_t = (\alpha_t)_j - (\alpha_{t-1})_j$ , for  $t = 1, \dots, \ell$ .

We want to claim that  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\ell$  are independent random variables but this is not true.

This is because once  $(x_t)_j \in \{\pm 1\}$ , this value stays fixed. Let us define  $t_0 \leq l$  to be the last step of the  $j$ -th coordinate walk for which  $(x_{t_0})_j \in (-1, 1)$ .

For  $t \leq t_0$ , we have  $X_t = (\Delta_t)_j = \sigma \cdot r_t^T u_{t,j}$  for some unit vector  $u_{t,j}$ . Recall that  $r_t$  is  $n$ -dimensional Gaussian, independent of  $u_{t,j}$ . Recall that  $r_t$  is spherically symmetric — so  $r_t^T u_{t,j}$  has the <sup>1-dimensional</sup> standard normal distribution  $N(0, 1)$  and  $\sigma \cdot r_t^T u_{t,j}$  has the 1-dimensional normal distribution  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ .   
  $\rightarrow$  this is  $X_t$

We want to claim that  $X_1, \dots, X_{t_0}$  are independent random variables. Again, one has to be careful since  $t_0$  itself is not independent of  $X_1, X_2, \dots$ , so even the formulation of such a claim may not be clear.

So we will formulate our claim of independence in the following way. Let  $Z'_1, \dots, Z'_l$  be a new sequence of independent random variables, each with the  $N(0, \sigma^2)$  distribution. We define another sequence of random variables  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_l$  as follows:

$$Z_t = \begin{cases} X_t & \text{for } t \leq t_0 \\ Z'_t & \text{for } t > t_0. \end{cases}$$

We claim that  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_l$  are independent.

The justification is that if we fix the values of  $r_1, \dots, r_t$  in the algorithm and also the values of the auxiliary variables  $Z'_1, \dots, Z'_{t-1}$  arbitrarily, the values of  $Z_1, \dots, Z_{t-1}$  are determined uniquely, while  $Z_t$  has the  $N(0, \sigma^2)$  distribution.

(5)

So if the  $j$ -th coordinate walk does not terminate, then all the partial sums  $Z_1 + Z_2 + \dots + Z_t$  belong to  $(-1, 1)$ ,  $t = 1, 2, \dots, l$ .

Lemma. Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_l$  be independent random variables, each with the  $N(0, \sigma^2)$  distribution. Then the probability that all of the partial sums  $\sum_{i=1}^t Z_i$ ,  $t = 1, 2, \dots, l$  are in  $(-1, 1)$  is at most  $e^{-k_1 \lfloor \sigma^2 l \rfloor}$  for a suitable constant  $k_1$ .

So Claim 1 follows from the above lemma (since  $l = \frac{C_1 \cdot \log n}{\sigma^2}$ ). Note that the above lemma implies that the probability the  $j$ -th coordinate random walk does not terminate  $\leq e^{-k_1 \lfloor C_1 \log n \rfloor} \leq \frac{1}{n^2}$  for  $C_1 = \frac{3}{k_1}$  and  $n$  sufficiently large.

Proof of the lemma. Let  $k = \sigma^{-2}$ . Let us assume for convenience that  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let us partition the sequence  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  into contiguous blocks of length  $k$  and let  $s_j$  be the sum of the  $j$ -th block. Formally,  $s_j = \sum_{i=(j-1)k+1}^{jk} Z_i$ . The number of blocks is  $\lfloor \frac{l}{k} \rfloor$ .

Fact. If  $X, Y$  are independent  $N(0, 1)$  random variables and  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $aX + bY$  has the 1-dimensional normal distribution  $N(0, a^2 + b^2)$ .

So each  $s_j$  has the standard normal distribution  $N(0, k\sigma^2) = N(0, 1)$ . Thus  $\Pr[|s_j| \geq 2] \geq c_0$  for a suitable  $c_0$  (in fact,  $c_0 \approx 0.0455$ ).

If  $\sum_{i=1}^t z_i \in (-1, 1)$  for all  $t = 1, 2, \dots, l$ , then necessarily  $|s_j| < 2$  for all  $j$ . The  $s_j$  are independent, thus the probability that  $|s_j| < 2$  for all  $j$  is  $\leq (1 - c_0)^{\lfloor l/k \rfloor} = e^{-k_1 \lfloor l/k \rfloor}$ . Thus the lemma is proved.  $\square$

We will next show the following claim.

Claim 2. The discrepancy of the (semi)coloring  $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$  returned by the algo. is  $O(H \cdot \log(mn))$ , where  $H$  is the hereditary vector discrepancy of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

(Note that if  $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$  is not a coloring (this happens w.p.  $\leq 1/n$ ), we restart the algorithm from scratch. Thus  $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$  is always a coloring.)

The vector discrepancy of  $\mathcal{F}$  (denoted by  $\text{vecdisc}(\mathcal{F})$ ) is  $\min D \geq 0$  s.t.  $\|\sum_{j \in S_i} u_j\|^2 \leq D^2$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  and  $\|u_j\|^2 = 1$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . The hereditary vector discrepancy of  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\max_{A \subseteq V} \text{vecdisc}(\mathcal{F}|_A)$ .

In order to prove Claim 2, we will prove

$$\Pr[\text{disc}(\mathcal{F}, \alpha_{\mathcal{F}}) > D_{\max}] \leq 1/n,$$

where  $D_{\max} = O(H \cdot \log(mn))$ .

Let us fix a set  $S_i \in \mathcal{F}$  and let  $D_i = \sum_{j \in S_i} (\alpha_{\mathcal{F}})_j$  be its imbalance in  $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}$ . We will show  $\Pr[|D_i| > D_{\max}] \leq \frac{1}{mn}$  for every  $i$ . Then Claim 2 will follow from the union bound.