

On the Algorithmic Lovász Local Lemma

Ioannis Giotis^{1,2}, Lefteris Kirousis^{1,2}, Kostas I. Psaromiligkos¹, and Dimitrios M. Thilikos^{1,2,3}

¹ Department of Mathematics, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

² Computer Technology Institute & Press “Diophantus”, Patras, Greece

³ ALGCo project-team, CNRS, LIRMM, France

Abstract. The algorithm for Lovász Local Lemma by Moser and Tardos gives a constructive way to prove the existence of combinatorial objects that satisfy a system of constraints. We present an alternative and simpler analysis of the algorithm that does not involve counting witness-trees.

1 Introduction

The Lovász Local Lemma (LLL) first appeared in 1975 in a paper by Erdős and Lovász [3].

“The proof is so elementary that it could, and I think it should, be taught in a first course in probability. It has had and continues to have a profound effect on probabilistic method.”

J. Spencer wrote about it in the book on his Durango lectures [10]. This elegant proof however was non-constructive. Up until the seminal work by Moser [6] and Moser and Tardos [7], and despite important work on the question of supplying a constructive proof by Beck [2], Alon [1], Srinivasan [11] and others, the question and its answer succinctly given in the book on the Durango lectures [10]: “Algorithm? Sometimes!” remained valid.

The constructive proof of Moser [6] and Moser and Tardos [7] essentially showed how to algorithmically produce a satisfying assignment to a Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP), given that the variables are independent random variables. Their randomized algorithm roughly did nothing more than locating unsatisfied constraints and resampling their variables. It continues doing so until no constraint is left unsatisfied. They proved that the expected time of steps for this algorithm to halt is linear in the number of variables, given that the degree of the dependency graph of the constraints does not exceed a certain constant fraction of the inverse of the probability of a constraint not to be satisfied. Their proof depended on supplying a witness structure for the history of the algorithm in a way that witness structures of size n can be put into 1–1 correspondence with histories entailing n steps. They then estimated the expected size of the witness structures. An elegant presentation of this approach, also referred to as a kind of “*entropy compression method*”, is given by Spencer in [8].

In this work, we analyze Moser’s algorithm directly, using probabilistic arguments to estimate its number of steps. The essence of our approach is the observation (based on the Principle of Deferred Decisions of Knuth [5]) that each resampling renders the current assignment with the same as the original distribution, conditional on the previous event being satisfied. Thus the probability that the number of steps needed until the algorithm halts is at least n can be given by a simple recurrence relation, whose solution can be asymptotically analyzed by classical methods. It turns out that given that the degree of the dependency graph does not exceed a certain constant fraction of the inverse probability of an undesirable event to occur, the probability that the algorithm lasts for n steps is exponentially small in n , after a cutoff point. We believe that this direct and completely elementary probabilistic proof avoids some of the intricacies of the entropy compression method, especially in applications. It also completely unveils, we think, the extreme elegance of Moser’s algorithm (we adopted the original version of the algorithm in [6]).

2 Algorithmic Lovász Local Lemma

Let $X_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ be mutually independent random variables on a common probability space, taking values in the sets $D_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, respectively.

Let $E_j, j = 1, \dots, m$ be a sequence of events, each depending on a sequence of the random variables X_i . The sequence of variables that an event E_j depends on is called the *scope* of E_j and is denoted by e^j . The events E_j are considered “undesirable”. i.e. the objective is to design a randomized algorithm that will return an assignment α to the variables X_i for which none of the events E_j hold.

ALGORITHM:

1. Sample the variables X_i and let α be the resulting assignment of values to them.
2. While there exist an event that occurs under the current assignment, let E_i be the least indexed such event
 - 2.1 RESAMPLE(E_i)
3. Output current assignment α .

RESAMPLE(E_i):

1. Resample the variables in the scope e^i .
2. While some $E_j \in N_i$ occurs for the current assignment α , let E_j be the least indexed such event
 - 2.1 RESAMPLE(E_j)

Fig. 1. *Random sampling* algorithm

We say that two events overlap, and write $E_i \sim E_j$, if $e^i \cap e^j \neq \emptyset$. The binary, reflexive and symmetric binary relation \sim defines a graph with loops (but no multiple edges) called the *dependency graph* of the events.

For $j = 1, \dots, m$, let N_j be the neighborhood of the event E_j in the dependency graph, i.e. $N_j = \{E_i \mid E_i \sim E_j\}$ (observe that $E_j \in N_j$).

Let Δ be the maximum of the cardinalities $|N_j|$ (i.e. the max degree of the dependency graph counting the loop as contributing 1 to the degree) and let p be the max of the probabilities $\Pr[E_j]$.

Theorem 1 (Lovász Local Lemma). *If $ep\Delta < 1$, then $\Pr[\overline{E_1} \wedge \overline{E_2} \wedge \dots \wedge \overline{E_m}] > 0$, i.e. there exists an assignment to the variables X_i for which none of the events E_i hold.*

The original proof of Theorem 1, first presented essentially in this form in [9], was non-constructive, but was given for arbitrary events, i.e. without the assumption that the events depended on independent random variables. Below, we will give an algorithmic proof Theorem 1 within the framework already described, i.e. assuming the dependence of the events on independent variables.

We first present our algorithm in Figure 1, which is a direct derivation of the one given by Moser in [6]⁴.

On a particular execution of our algorithm, let us call a *phase* the execution period within a *root* call of RESAMPLE, more specifically the period spent in an execution of RESAMPLE from line 2.1 of ALGORITHM. For clarity, we will refer to calls of RESAMPLE from within another RESAMPLE execution as *recursive* calls.

Our goal is to bound the probability ALGORITHM makes at least n RESAMPLE calls. We will first show that the number of phases in any execution is bounded. Then, we will argue that the probability of an event occurring at a given step of the algorithm can still be bounded by p conditional on the various resamplings performed so far. This will allow us to bound the total number of steps by a function of p .

Lemma 1. *Consider an arbitrary call of RESAMPLE(E_i). Let \mathcal{E} be the set of events that do not occur at the beginning of this call. Then, if the call terminates, events in \mathcal{E} will also not occur at the end of the call.*

⁴ The algorithm in [6] was presented and analyzed only for the SAT problem, and an alternative algorithm for a collection of arbitrary events determined by independent variables was subsequently presented and analyzed by Moser and Tardos in [7]; the generalization of the original algorithm in [6] for arbitrary events is straightforward, however the analysis in [6] does not immediately generalize.

Proof. Suppose some event E_j in \mathcal{E} occurs during the call. But this means that some variable in its scope changed value. This implies that E_j is in the neighborhood of some other event E'_j and a call $\text{RESAMPLE}(E'_j)$ was made, potentially a recursive call within our original call $\text{RESAMPLE}(E_i)$. But this call will not terminate until all the events in this neighborhood $N_{j'}$ do not occur. Assuming $\text{RESAMPLE}(E_i)$ terminates, $\text{RESAMPLE}(E'_j)$ must have also terminated and E_j does not occur. The same argument can be reapplied every time some event in \mathcal{E} occurs during the call. ■

By Lemma 1, we know that the set of events that do not occur at the start of a phase cannot be smaller at the end of the phase. But it will strictly increase because the event for which the root call RESAMPLE occurred also has to not occur at the end of the call. Therefore, a root call of RESAMPLE can only occur at most once for each event.

Corollary 1. *There are at most m phases in any execution of ALGORITHM.*

Let us now examine the probability distribution of the variables after a resampling caused by a call of $\text{RESAMPLE}(E_i)$.

Lemma 2 (Randomness lemma). *Let α be a random assignment sampled from the probability distribution of the variables X_1, \dots, X_n and E_i an event. Let α' be the assignment obtained from α by resampling the variables in e^i if E_i occurs for α , and let α' be α otherwise. Then, conditional that E_i occurs under α , the distribution of α' is the random distribution of assignments sampled from all variables i.e. it is the same as the distribution of α . Therefore the probability that any event E occurs under α' is equal to the probability that E occurs under α .*

Proof. This immediately follows from the principle of deferred decisions. One only needs to consider the values of the variables in e^i after the resampling and since these are sampled from the same distribution, α' can be seen as sampled from the same distribution as α . Notice that without the conditional that E_i occurs under α , the lemma is not, in general, correct as then the resampling does not necessarily take place. ■

Definition 1. *A sequence of events $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k$ is called an witness sequence if, when the ALGORITHM is initialized on an assignment α obtained by sampling the variables X_1, \dots, X_n , the first k RESAMPLE calls (recursive or root) are applied to $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k$, respectively.*

Notice that if $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k$ is a witness sequence, then there is a sequence $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ of assignments, such that $\alpha_1 = \alpha$ and \mathcal{E}_i occurs for α_i ($i = 1, \dots, k$) and α_{i+1} is obtained from α_i by resampling the variables in e^i ($i = 1, \dots, k-1$).

For the rest of this paper, all trees to be considered are ordered, i.e. the children of any node are ordered, and labeled, i.e. their nodes have labels from a given set. Also forest are comprised of (ordered) sequences of ordered labeled trees.

Notice now that since recursive RESAMPLE calls that are made within a root call $\text{RESAMPLE}(\mathcal{E})$ are applied to neighbors of the corresponding previous call, by following the order that the events first appear on the recursion stack of $\text{RESAMPLE}(\mathcal{E})$, we see that the ordering in a witness sequence of the events that belong to a phase with root call $\text{RESAMPLE}(\mathcal{E})$ coincides with the preorder of the labels of a rooted labeled ordered tree of degree at most Δ whose root is labeled with \mathcal{E} and whose other labels are the other than \mathcal{E} events of the phase. Similarly, a witness sequence corresponds to the preorder of the labels of an ordered forest of ordered rooted trees, each of degree at most Δ .

Notice that by Lemma 1, the forest that corresponds to a witness sequence has at most m trees (m is the number of events).

Notice also that the events in a witness sequence must satisfy conditions that correspond to characteristics of ALGORITHM like e.g. that each time the least indexed event that occurs is chosen and that the while loop in a call $\text{RESAMPLE}\mathcal{E}$ lasts until no neighbor of \mathcal{E} occurs under the current assignment.

Now let \hat{P}_n be the probability that ALGORITHM performs at least n RESAMPLE calls. Obviously,

$$\hat{P}_n \leq \Pr [\text{ a witness sequence of length } n \text{ exists }]. \quad (1)$$

To bound the probability in the rhs of (2), we will relax the definition of a witness sequence:

Definition 2. A sequence of events $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k$ is called a valid sequence if

- the order of the events in the sequence coincides with the preorder of the labels of a rooted labelled forest with at most m trees, each of out-degree (number of children of a node) at most Δ , and
- the label of a non-root node v in the forest is a neighbor of the label of the parent of v and
- there is a sequence $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ of assignments, such that α_1 is a random assignment sampled from the variables X_1, \dots, X_n and \mathcal{E}_i occurs for α_i ($i = 1, \dots, k$) and α_{i+1} is obtained from α_i by resampling the variables in e^i ($i = 1, \dots, k - 1$).

By the preceding remarks, the random property of a sequence being a witness sequence is stronger than the property of it being a valid sequence. Intuitively being valid is weaker than being witness in the sense that (a) the labels of the children of a node v are no more ordered according to their indices (b) the same is true for the root labels and (c) it is not necessary that all neighbors of the label of a node v do not occur under the assignment that immediately follows the assignment corresponding to the label of the last child of v . However, the (forest-) tree-like structure that characterizes witness sequences has been retained in the definition of a valid sequence, because this tree-like structure is necessary to express the probability of a valid sequence having more than n terms by a recurrence relation.

If we now define:

$$P_n = \Pr [\text{ a valid sequence of length } n \text{ exists }]. \quad (2)$$

and assuming $P_0 = 1$ we have

$$\hat{P}_n \leq P_n.$$

Below, we will bound P_n . We first notice that by repeated applications of Lemma 2, any assignment α_{i+1} , $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$ in the sequence $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ of assignments that correspond to a valid sequence $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k$ is distributed randomly in the sense that follows the distribution of an assignment obtained by sampling the variables X_1, \dots, X_n .

Define a *valid phase-sequence* to be a valid sequence with the restriction that the corresponding forest is a tree. Let Q_n be the probability that a valid phase-sequence of length n exists. Assume also $Q_0 = 1$. By the preceding remarks on the distributions of assignments pertaining to valid sequences (and valid phase-sequences), we immediately have:

$$Q_n = p \sum_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_\Delta = n-1 \\ n_1, \dots, n_\Delta \geq 0}} Q_{n_1} \cdots Q_{n_\Delta} \quad (3)$$

and also

$$P_n = \sum_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_m = n \\ n_1, \dots, n_m \geq 0}} Q_{n_1} \cdots Q_{n_m}. \quad (4)$$

Lemma 3 (Phase bound). Q_n is asymptotically bounded from above by $A(ep\Delta)^n$, where $A = \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\Delta-1}}$.

Proof. Let $Q(z)$ be the OGF of Q_n . To find Q , multiply both sides of (3) with z^n and sum for $n \geq 1$ to get (since $Q_0 = 1$):

$$Q(z) - 1 = zpQ(z)^\Delta \quad (5)$$

Let now $W = W(z) = Q(z) - 1$. Then by (5), we have $W = zp(W + 1)^\Delta$.

Let now $\phi(W) = p(W + 1)^\Delta$. Then Equation (5) is equivalent to

$$W(z) = z\phi(W(z)). \quad (6)$$

Now apply Lagrange's Inversion Formula (see e.g. [4, Theorem A.2]) to get that for $n \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} q_n &= [z^n]w = [z^n]W = (1/n)[u^{n-1}](\phi(u))^n = (1/n)p^n \binom{\Delta n}{n-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\Delta-1)n+1} p^n \binom{\Delta n}{n} \\ (\text{by Stirling approximation}) &\sim \frac{1}{(\Delta-1)n+1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\Delta-1}} \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\Delta-1}\right)^{\Delta-1} p\Delta \right)^n \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(\Delta-1)n+1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\Delta-1}} (ep\Delta)^n \leq A(ep\Delta)^n. \end{aligned}$$

where, for notational convenience $A = \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\Delta-1}}$. Also, $[z^0]w = 1$. ■

Lemma 4 (Algorithm bound). P_n is asymptotically bounded from above by $n^m A^m (ep\Delta)^n$, where $A = \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{\Delta-1}}$.

Proof. Indeed, by 4 and Lemma 3 we have that P_n is asymptotically bounded from above by

$$\sum_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_m = n \\ n_1, \dots, n_m \geq 0}} A(ep\Delta)^{n_1} \dots A(ep\Delta)^{n_m} \leq n^m A^m (ep\Delta)^n. \quad (7)$$

Now to have that the bound $n^m A^m (ep\Delta)^n$ becomes exponentially small in n when $ep\Delta < 1$, we must have that $m \log n + m \log A < n \log(1/(ep\Delta))$.

Therefore:

Theorem 2. Assuming p and Δ are constants, there exists an integer N , which depends linearly on m , and a constant $c \in (0, 1)$ such that if $n/\log n \geq N$ then the probability that ALGORITHM executes more than n calls of RESAMPLE is $< c^n$.

The integer N in the above theorem is referred to as a *cut-off* point because the probability of ALGORITHM taking more than N “steps” (calls of RESAMPLE) before it stops is subexponential. Clearly, when the algorithm stops we have found an assignment such that none of the events occurs. And since this happens with probability close to 1 for large enough n , Theorem 1 easily follows. ■

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to J. Rué for showing to us how to deal with the asymptotics of the coefficients of inverse generating functions. The second and fourth authors are grateful to D. Achlioptas and his student F. Iliopoulos for initiating them in this line of research. We are indebted to S. Messaris and Z. Terzopoulou, both undergraduate students, for their valuable comments during informal presentations of the results in this work.

References

1. Noga Alon. A parallel algorithmic version of the local lemma. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 2(4):367–378, 1991.
2. József Beck. An algorithmic approach to the Lovász Local Lemma. I. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 2(4):343–365, 1991.
3. Paul Erdős and László Lovász. Problems and results on 3-chromatic hypergraphs and some related questions. *Infinite and finite sets*, 10:609–627, 1975.
4. Philippe Flajolet and Robert Sedgewick. *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1 edition, 2009.
5. Donald Ervin Knuth. *Stable marriage and its relation to other combinatorial problems: An introduction to the mathematical analysis of algorithms*, volume 10. American Mathematical Soc., 1997.
6. Robin A Moser. A constructive proof of the Lovász Local Lemma. In *Proceedings of the 41st annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 343–350. ACM, 2009.
7. Robin A Moser and Gábor Tardos. A constructive proof of the general Lovász Local Lemma. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 57(2):11, 2010.
8. J. Spencer. Robin Moser makes Lovász Local Lemma algorithmic! 2010. <http://cs.nyu.edu/spencer/moserlovasz1.pdf>.
9. Joel Spencer. Asymptotic lower bounds for ramsey functions. *Discrete Mathematics*, 20(0):69 – 76, 1977.
10. Joel Spencer. *Ten lectures on the probabilistic method*, volume 64. SIAM, 1994.
11. Aravind Srinivasan. Improved algorithmic versions of the Lovász Local Lemma. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 611–620. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2008.