

## Lecture 14

- Recall J-S MC for sampling matchings in unweighted graphs  $G = (V, E)$ , according to the Gibbs distn':  $\pi_\lambda(M) = \frac{1}{Z(\lambda)} \lambda^{|M|}$ .
  - Running time:  $\text{poly}(n, \lambda)$  ,  $n = |V|$
  - $Z(\lambda) = \sum_k m_k \lambda^k$ 
    - $m_k$  # of  $k$ -matchings
    - partition function (or matching polynomial.)
  - Last time: Estimation of  $Z(\lambda)$ .
  - Today: Estimation of coefficients  $m_k$ .
  - Estimating coefficients  $m_k$
- exact estimation: when  $k = \frac{|V|}{2}$ ,  $m_k$  is # perfect matchings if  $G$  is bipartite with  $n$  vertices on each side, computing  $m_n \equiv \text{computing } \text{per}(A)$
- def: If  $A$  is  $n \times n$ ,  $\text{per}(A) = \sum_{\sigma} \prod_{i=1}^n A(i, \sigma(i))$ ,  
(permanent of a matrix) where the summation is over all permutations  $\sigma$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$
- Contrast this, with the determinant:

def: If  $A$  is  $n \times n$ , the determinant of  $A$  is

$$\det(A) = \sum_{\sigma} (-1)^{\text{sign}(\sigma)} \prod_{i=1}^n A(i, \sigma(i))$$

where  $\text{sign}(\sigma)$  is # of pairs  $i < j$  s.t.  $\sigma(i) > \sigma(j)$

Claim 2: If  $\lambda = \frac{m_{k-1}}{m_k}$ , then  $m_k \cdot \lambda^{k'}$  is maximized at  $k'=k$  &  $k'=k-1$ . (3)

Proof: First verify that:  $m_k \lambda^k = m_k \lambda \cdot \lambda^{k-1} = m_{k-1} \cdot \lambda^{k-1}$

• Moreover,

$$\text{for all } k' \leq k-1: \frac{m_{k'-1} \lambda^{k'-1}}{m_{k'} \lambda^{k'}} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{m_{k'-1}}{m_{k'}} = \frac{m_k}{m_{k-1}} \cdot \frac{m_{k'-1}}{m_{k'}} \stackrel{\substack{\text{using} \\ \text{claim 1}}}{\leq} \frac{m_k}{m_{k-1}} \cdot \frac{m_{k'-1}}{m_{k'}} \leq 1$$

$$\text{for all } k' \geq k: \frac{m_{k'+1} \cdot \lambda^{k'+1}}{m_{k'} \lambda^{k'}} = \lambda \frac{m_{k'+1}}{m_{k'}} = \frac{m_{k-1}}{m_k} \cdot \frac{m_{k'+1}}{m_{k'}} \stackrel{\substack{\text{using} \\ \text{claim 1}}}{\leq} \frac{m_{k-1}}{m_{k'+1}} \cdot \frac{m_{k'+1}}{m_k} \leq 1$$

□.

• Claims 1, 2 suggest the following algorithm; for estimating  $\frac{m_k}{m_{k-1}}$   
for  $k'=2, \dots, k$ :  
    i) gradually raise  $\lambda$  and sample from Gibbs distn  $\pi_\lambda$  repeatedly  
        until we see "lots of"  $(k'-1)$ - and  $k'$ -matchings,  
        where "lots of"  $\equiv$  they appear w/ prob. at least  $\frac{c}{n}$ , for  
        some constant  $c$  (Claim 2, confirms that we'll not  
        need to raise  $\lambda$  beyond  $\frac{m_{k+1}}{m_k}$ )

ii) For the  $\lambda$  chosen in step i, sample MC repeatedly to  
estimate  $\frac{m_k}{m_{k-1}}$ ; take as estimator the ratio  
of the number of  $k'$ -matchings to the number of  
 $(k'-1)$ -matchings multiplied by  $\frac{1}{\lambda}$ .

ex 1pt: Can estimate  $\frac{m_k}{m_{k-1}}$  to within a factor of  $(1 \pm \frac{\epsilon}{n})$ .

w/ probability at least  $1 - \frac{1}{4n}$  in time  $\text{poly}(n, \frac{1}{\epsilon}, \frac{m_{k-1}}{m_k})$ .

- computing  $\det(A)$  can be done efficiently w/ Gaussian Elimination
- computing  $\text{per}(A)$  is #P-complete (Valiant '79).

### estimation of $m_k$ :

- if we could compute  $Z(\lambda)$  exactly at any desired  $\lambda$ , we would obtain all the  $m_k$ 's exactly; indeed  $Z(\lambda)$  is a polynomial of degree  $n$  w/ coefficients  $m_0, \dots, m_n$ , so we could do that by computing  $Z(\lambda)$  at  $n+1$  points and interpolating.
- however, approach is not robust to error.
- We use a different approach, aiming at estimating ratios of the form  $\frac{m_k}{m_{k-1}}$  and taking a telescoping product:

$$m_k = \left( \prod_{k'=1}^k \frac{m_{k'}}{m_{k'-1}} \right) \cdot m_0 \quad (*)$$

$m_0 = 1$  (trivially)  
so we only need estimates of  $\frac{m_{k'}}{m_{k'-1}}$  for all  $k'=1, \dots, k$ .

- Claim 1: The sequence  $\{m_k\}_k$  is log-concave, i.e.

$$m_{k-1} \cdot m_{k+1} \leq m_k^2 \text{ , for all } k.$$

exercise (1 pt): Show Claim 1, by defining an injective mapping from pairs of  $(k+1)$ - and  $(k-1)$ -matchings to pairs of  $k$ -matchings

- plugging the above estimator into (\*) and noticing that the worst possible ratio  $\frac{m_{k'-1}}{m_k}$  is  $\frac{m_{k-1}}{m_k}$  (by claim 1), we obtain that we can estimate  $m_k$  to within a factor of  $(1 \pm \epsilon)$  w/ probability  $\geq \frac{3}{4}$  in time  $\text{poly}(n, \frac{1}{\epsilon}, \frac{m_{k-1}}{m_k})$ .

NOTE: there is nothing special about  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; we can boost this by repeating many times & outputting the median of the results

Ex 1pt: If  $k^*$  is the (unknown) size of a maximum matching in a given graph, show how to use the above algorithm to compute a matching of size  $\geq (1-\epsilon) \cdot k^*$  in time  $n^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ .

- How large can  $\frac{m_{k-1}}{m_k}$  be?
- In many interesting classes of graphs, such as dense graphs (every degree is  $\geq \frac{n}{2}$ ) random graphs (e.g. in the  $G_{n, 1/2}$  model, whp) regular lattices (finite square regions of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ )

the ratio  $\frac{m_{k-1}}{m_k}$  is polynomially bounded in  $n$ .

- However, in general it can be very bad, e.g.



- $|V| = 4\ell + 2 = 2^n$ , where  $\ell = \# \text{squares}$   
easy to see  $m_n = 1$  (unique perfect matching), but  $m_{n-1} \geq 2^\ell$ .