

Monday August 25, 2014

We proved that for every graph, every min cut  $(S^*, \overline{S^*})$

$$\Pr(\text{Karger's alg. finds } (S^*, \overline{S^*})) \geq \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}}$$

That is true for every cut of minimum size.

So what is the maximum # of cuts of minimum size that a graph can have?

Say there are  $l$  min cuts for a graph  $G$ .

Let  $(S_1, \overline{S}_1), (S_2, \overline{S}_2), \dots, (S_l, \overline{S}_l)$

denote these min cuts.

Let  $E_i$  denote the event that Karger's algorithm outputs cut  $(S_i, \overline{S}_i)$

We know that for all  $i$ ,

$$\Pr(E_i) \geq \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}}$$

Therefore,  $\Pr(E_1) + \Pr(E_2) + \dots + \Pr(E_l) \geq l / \binom{n}{2}$

Only 1 cut is output so  $\Pr(\epsilon_i \cap \epsilon_j) = 0$

Thus, since these events are disjoint,

$$\Pr(\epsilon_1 \cup \epsilon_2 \cup \dots \cup \epsilon_\ell) = \Pr(\epsilon_1) + \Pr(\epsilon_2) + \dots + \Pr(\epsilon_\ell)$$

$$\leq 1$$

Since it's a Probability

$$\geq \ell / \binom{n}{2}$$

as we pointed out earlier

Hence,  $1 \geq \frac{\ell}{\binom{n}{2}}$

Therefore,  $\ell \leq \binom{n}{2}$

So every graph has  $\leq \binom{n}{2}$  cuts of minimum size.

In contrast, for min st-cuts there can be an exponential # of cuts of minimum size - see HW 1.

③

Min-cut: Given a graph  $G=(V,E)$  find a cut of minimum size.

Max-cut: Given  $G=(V,E)$  find a cut of maximum size

Min-cut  $\in P$

Max-cut (decision version) is NP-complete.

In fact, NP-hard to approximate Max-cut within a factor better than  $\frac{16}{17} \approx 94\%$  of optimal.

We'll see an easy way to find a cut within a factor  $\frac{1}{2}$  of optimal.

First we'll show that every graph has a large cut.

Lemma: For a graph  $G=(V,E)$  with  $n=|V|, m=|E|$ ,<sup>(4)</sup>  
there is a cut of size  $\geq \frac{m}{2}$ .

In other words, for every graph, there is  
a partition of the vertices  $V$  into  $S, \bar{S}$   
where  $\geq \frac{m}{2}$  edges cross between  $S \leftrightarrow \bar{S}$ .

Proof:

We'll construct  $S$  randomly.

For every vertex  $v$ , independently,  
add  $v$  into  $S$  with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$   
& into  $\bar{S}$  with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Let  $X = \#$  of edges crossing  $S \leftrightarrow \bar{S}$ .

$X$  is a random variable.

Look at its expectation:

$$E[X] = \sum_{j=1}^m j \Pr(X=j)$$

Would like an easier way to compute  $E[X]$ .

Let  $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$ .

Let  $X_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if edge } e_i \text{ crosses } S \leftrightarrow \bar{S} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Hence,  $X = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i$

Say  $e_i = (v, w)$ ,

then  $X_i = 1$  if  $v \in S, w \notin S$  or  $v \notin S, w \in S$ ,

fix where  $v$  lands (in  $S$  or  $\bar{S}$ )

then with prob.  $\frac{1}{2}$   $w$  lands in the same set  
& with  $\frac{1}{2}$   $w$  lands in the other set.

Hence,  $\Pr(X_i=1) = \frac{1}{2}$ .

$$E[X_i] = (1) \Pr(X_i=1) + (0) \Pr(X_i=0) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

$$E[X] = E\left[\sum_j X_j\right] = \sum_j E[X_j] \quad \text{by linearity of expectation.} \quad (6)$$

$$= \frac{m}{2}$$

So  $E[X] = \frac{m}{2}$ .

There must be at least one cut with size  $\geq E[X]$ .

Let  $l = \text{size of max cut in a graph } G$ .

Suppose  $l \leq \frac{m}{2} - 1$ .

$$E[X] = \sum_j j \Pr(X=j)$$

$$= \sum_{j \leq \frac{m}{2} - 1} j \Pr(X=j) + \sum_{j \geq \frac{m}{2}} j \Pr(X=j)$$

Since the max-cut is of size  $\leq \frac{m}{2} - 1$ , then for  $j \geq \frac{m}{2}$ ,  $\Pr(X=j) = 0$  (otherwise we have a cut of size  $\geq \frac{m}{2}$ )

$$\rightarrow \leq \left(\frac{m}{2} - 1\right) \Pr(X \leq \frac{m}{2} - 1) + m \Pr(X \geq \frac{m}{2}) \rightarrow 0$$

$$\leq \frac{m}{2} - 1.$$

(7)

So if  $l = \text{max cut size}$  is  $\leq \frac{m}{2} - 1$

then  $E[X] \leq \frac{m}{2} - 1$ .

But  $E[X] = \frac{m}{2}$  so this is a contradiction.

Hence, it is not true that  $l \leq \frac{m}{2} - 1$ ,

so  $l > \frac{m}{2} - 1$ , i.e.,  $l \geq \frac{m}{2}$ .  $\square$

Another way to view it is that the random variable  $X$  is the size of a cut for a random partition  $(S, \bar{S})$ .

Since  $E[X] = \frac{m}{2}$  there must be at least one partition where its size is  $\geq \frac{m}{2}$ .

# SAT:

input: Boolean formula  $f$  with  $n$  variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$   
 &  $m$  clauses  $C_1, \dots, C_m$   
 in CNF (conjunctive normal form)

output: satisfying assignment, if one exists

# Max-SAT:

input: Same as SAT  
output: assignment that maximizes the # of satisfied clauses.

Max-SAT (decision version) is NP-hard.  
 & NP-hard within some constant factor  
 (as with Max-cut)



(9)

Lemma: For a CNF formula  $F$  with  $m$  clauses,  
there is an assignment satisfying  $\geq \frac{m}{2}$  clauses.

Proof: Fix a formula  $F$ .

Make a random assignment.

Independently for each variable  $x_i$ ,

set  $x_i = T$  with prob.  $\frac{1}{2}$

&  $x_i = F$  with prob.  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Let  $Y = \#$  of satisfied clauses

$$E[Y] = \sum_{j=1}^m j \Pr(Y=j)$$

For the  $i^{\text{th}}$  clause, let

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ clause is satisfied} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{Then, } Y = \sum_{i=1}^m Y_i$$

$$\text{and } E[Y] = E\left[\sum_{i=1}^m Y_i\right] = \sum_{i=1}^m E[Y_i]$$

$$\begin{aligned} E[Y_i] &= 1 \times \Pr(Y_i=1) + 0 \times \Pr(Y_i=0) \\ &= \Pr(Y_i=1) \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$E[Y] = \sum_{i=1}^m \Pr(Y_i=1)$$

What's  $\Pr(Y_i=1)$ ?

Say the  $i^{\text{th}}$  clause has  $k$  literals,

then ~~it's~~ there's 1 assignment where it's unsatisfied & there are  $2^k$  total assignments.

$$\Rightarrow \Pr(Y_i=0) = \frac{1}{2^k}$$

Hence,  $\Pr(Y_i=1) = 1 - 2^{-k}$

Since  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\Pr(Y_i=1) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$E[Y] \geq \frac{m}{2}$$

∴ So there must be at least one assignment satisfying at least  $\frac{m}{2}$  clauses.

□

Linearity of expectation: random variables  $X$  &  $Y$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E[X+Y] &= \sum_i \sum_j (i+j) \Pr(X=i, Y=j) \\ &= \sum_i i \sum_j \Pr(X=i, Y=j) \\ &\quad + \sum_j j \sum_i \Pr(X=i, Y=j) \\ &= \sum_i i \Pr(X=i) + \sum_j j \Pr(Y=j) \\ &= E[X] + E[Y]. \end{aligned}$$