



Lecturers: **Evangelos Kipouridis and Tomasz Kociumaka**
Tutors: **Anouk Duyster and Yonggang Jiang**

Winter 2025/26

————— **Randomized and Approximation Algorithms, Exercise Sheet 4** —————

<https://www.mpi-inf.mpg.de/departments/algorithms-complexity/teaching/winter-2025/26/randomized-and-approximation-algorithms>

Total Points: **100** + 100 bonus points

Due: **14:00** on Thursday, **November 20**, 2025

————— **Exercise 1** —————

10 points

Recall the balls-into-bins setting, where m balls are placed independently and uniformly at random into n bins. Prove that, if $m = \Omega(n \log n)$, then the maximum bin load is at most

$$\frac{m}{n} + \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m \log n}{n}}\right)$$

with probability at least $1 - n^{-c}$ for every constant $c = \Theta(1)$.

————— **Exercise 2** —————

10 + 10 + 10 points + 15 bonus points

Recall the frequency estimation setting: a finite universe U of size n and an unknown subset $S \subseteq U$. We estimate each $|S|$ by sampling s elements $u_1, \dots, u_s \in U$ uniformly at random and computing

$$E = \frac{n}{s} |\{i \in [1..s] : u_i \in S\}|.$$

We proved that, for $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, a sufficiently large sample size $s = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2} \ln \delta^{-1})$ guarantees

$$\mathbb{P}[||S| - E| \geq \epsilon n] \leq \delta.$$

- a** Show that, for $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{P}[||S| - E| \geq \epsilon |S|] \leq \delta$$

holds for sufficiently large $s = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n}{|S|} \epsilon^{-2} \ln \delta^{-1}\right)$. *Hint:* Use multiplicative Chernoff bounds.

- b** Prove that, for every $k \in [1..N]$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, a sufficiently large $s = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n}{k} \epsilon^{-2} \ln \delta^{-1}\right)$ suffices to distinguish between the cases $|S| \leq (1 - \epsilon)k$ and $|S| > k$, with error probability at most δ .

- c** Suppose Alice has n strings A_1, \dots, A_n , each of length m . For any given indices $i \in [1..m]$ and $j \in [1..n]$, she can reveal the character $A_j[i]$ to Bob. Bob wants to distinguish between the following two cases for some $k \in [1..m]$:

- For all distinct indices j, j' , the Hamming distance¹ between A_j and $A_{j'}$ is $\text{hd}(A_j, A_{j'}) > k$.
- There exist distinct indices j, j' such that $\text{hd}(A_j, A_{j'}) \leq (1 - \epsilon)k$.

Show that Bob can succeed with probability at least $1 - \delta$ using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{nm}{k} \epsilon^{-2} \ln \frac{n}{\delta}\right)$ queries.

- d** (*) Suppose that $n = m$ and Alice's strings are substrings of a single longer string A of length $2n - 1$, so that $A_j = A[j..j + n - 1]$. If Bob can directly query characters of A , how many queries are sufficient? *Hint:* Do not worry about the time complexity of your algorithm.

————— **Exercise 3** —————

15 + 15 points + 5 bonus points

Random variables X_1, \dots, X_n are said to be *negatively correlated* if the following inequality is satisfied for every subset $S \subseteq [1..n]$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i \in S} X_i\right] \leq \prod_{i \in S} \mathbb{E}[X_i].$$

¹ $\text{hd}(A_j, A_{j'}) = |\{i \in [1..m] : A_j[i] \neq A_{j'}[i]\}|.$

- a** Suppose that we sample elements s_1, \dots, s_n uniformly at random **without replacement** from a universe U of size at least n (s_i is a uniformly random element of $U \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}\}$). For a subset $V \subseteq U$, define indicator variables $X_i = \mathbb{1}_{s_i \in V}$. Prove that these variables are negatively correlated.
- b** Let $X_1, \dots, X_n : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be negatively correlated random variables, and let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ with expected value $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X]$. Prove that the multiplicative Chernoff bound for the upper tail still holds; that is, for every $\delta > 0$:

$$\mathbb{P}[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq \left(\frac{e^\delta}{(1 + \delta)^{1+\delta}} \right)^\mu.$$

Hint: It suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}[e^{tX}] \leq e^{\mu(e^t - 1)}$ for every $t > 0$; note that $e^{tX_i} = 1 + X_i(e^t - 1)$.

- c** (*) Extend the previous statement to the case where $X_1, \dots, X_n : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

— **Exercise 4** ————— **10 + 15 + 5 points + 10 bonus points** —

Consider a casino that offers a game consisting of n rounds:

- You start with a budget of 1.
 - In each round, you first choose a wager (any amount between 0 and your current budget). Then the casino tosses an unbiased coin. Depending on the outcome, your wager is either lost or doubled, and your budget is updated accordingly.
 - Your final score is the budget after n rounds.
- a** Show that, regardless of your strategy, your expected final score is 1.
- b** Suppose a fortune-teller informs you that the number of rounds you will win (double your wager) will be at least $(1 + \delta)\frac{n}{2}$ for some $0 < \delta < 1$ (without revealing which rounds you will win). Design a strategy that guarantees a final score of at least $\exp(\Omega(\delta^2 n))$, assuming the fortune-teller is correct.
Hint: Use the inequality $\ln(1 + x) \geq x - x^2$ for $-0.5 \leq x \leq 0.5$; equivalently, $1 + x \geq e^{x - x^2}$ for $-0.5 \leq x \leq 0.5$.
- c** Deduce that the probability of observing at least $(1 + \delta)\frac{n}{2}$ successful tosses is at most $\exp(-\Omega(\delta^2 n))$.
- d** (*) Improve the bound in part b to $\exp(\delta^2 n/2)$. *Hint:* Use the Taylor expansion of $\ln(1 + x)$ for $-1 < x < 1$.

— **Exercise 5** ————— **15 + 5 + 10 + 40 bonus points** —

Recall the Floyd–Rivest median selection algorithm discussed in lecture. We showed that it performs $\frac{3}{2}n + \mathcal{O}(n^{3/4} \log n)$ comparisons, runs in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time, and fails with probability $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/4})$.

- a** (*) Prove that the failure probability is in fact $\exp(-\Omega(n^{1/4}))$. *Hint:* Derive a tighter bound on $\mathbb{P}[|Y_i - (is)/n| \geq c]$, where Y_i is the number of samples among the i smallest elements.
- b** (*) Choose different parameters for which the algorithm succeeds with high probability and makes at most $\frac{3}{2}n + \mathcal{O}(n^{2/3} \text{polylog } n)$ comparisons.
- c** (*) Show that the analysis remains valid if samples are drawn *without replacement*. *Hint:* Tail bounds on Y_i are sufficient.
- d** (**) Design an algorithm that succeeds with high probability and makes at most $\frac{3}{2}n + \mathcal{O}(n^{1/2} \text{polylog } n)$ comparisons. *Hint:* Permute the input array uniformly at random so that the sample can be chosen as a prefix. Imagine running multiple instances of the original algorithm with varying sample sizes s_t , starting small and gradually increasing up to n . View the t th instance as using the $(t - 1)$ th instance to filter out irrelevant samples.