

(a)

Since we know that  $\Phi$  has a solution, we can simply let  $y$  to be such a solution. Then based on  $y$ , we can construct  $z$  such that  $y_i + z_i = 1$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  ( $z$  is not necessary a solution of  $\Phi$ ). Then we can prove that such a construction of  $y$  and  $z$  will satisfy the inequality system: For the first inequality, since all  $y_i$  and  $z_i$  have only two values to take, either true (1) or false (0). Hence,  $y_i, z_i \geq 0$  will always be satisfied; For the second inequality, since we just constructed  $z$  using this equation, it is definitely always satisfied; For the third inequality,  $y$  is a solution of  $\Phi$ . We know that  $P_j = \{i \text{ such that } x_i \in C_j\}$ , and  $N_j = \{i \text{ such that } \bar{x}_i \in C_j\}$ .  $z$  is the “opposite” of  $y$  as we have constructed, so all  $z_i (i \in N_j)$  are the same variables as  $y_i (i \in P_j)$  with a negative sign ( $\bar{x}$ ). For example, assuming a clause  $C_j$  is  $(y_1 \vee \bar{y}_2 \vee y_3)$ , then  $y_i (i \in P_j) = \{y_1, y_3\}$ . According to our construction, the corresponding  $z_j$  should be  $(\bar{y}_1 \vee y_2 \vee \bar{y}_3)$ , so  $z_i (i \in N_j) = \{\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_3\}$ . Therefore the left side of the third inequality will be pairs of  $(x_i, \bar{x}_i)$ . Since there will always be a “True” (1) in  $(x_i, \bar{x}_i)$ , the left side will always be greater or equal to 1, which satisfies our third inequality. Hence, we showed that if  $\Phi$  has a solution, then this inequality system is also satisfiable.

(b)

We consider the case that the probability that  $C$  is not satisfied (then just use 1 minus unsatisfied probability we will get satisfied probability): There is only one case that  $C$  is not satisfied – both variables are false, the probability of which is  $z_1 z_2$ . According to the construction, since  $x_i$  and  $\bar{x}_i$  are opposite, then the probability that  $\bar{x}_i$  being false is exactly the same as  $x_i$  being true. Hence,  $\sum_{i \in P_j} y_i + \sum_{i \in N_j} z_i = \sum_{i \in C_j} y_i$ , which is  $y_1 + y_2$  in this case. Given the third inequality, we then have  $y_1 + y_2 \geq 1$ . Therefore we have  $(1 - z_1) + (1 - z_2) \geq 1$ , which means  $z_1 + z_2 \leq 1$ . From CAUCHY-SCHWARZ inequality we know  $z_1 z_2 \leq \left(\frac{z_1 + z_2}{2}\right)^2$ , so  $z_1 z_2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{4}$ . Hence, the probability that  $C$  is not satisfied is  $\frac{1}{4}$ . Then the probability that  $C$  is satisfied is  $1 - \frac{1}{4} = \frac{3}{4}$ .

(c)

From the last question we have already known that for each clause with 2 terms, the probability that such clause is satisfied is 0.75. Now we consider the clause with only 1 term. This is even simpler: since we have proved that the third inequality is equivalent to  $\sum_{i \in C_j} y_i \geq 1$ , then we have  $y_1 \geq 1$ , which means  $y_1 = 1$  because a probability cannot be greater than 1. Therefore for each clause with 1 term, the probability that such clause is satisfied is 1. Hence, the expected number of clauses satisfied by the above method in this case is within  $[0.75m, m]$  (we calculated the expectations based on Binomial Distribution rule), where the lower bound is reached when all clauses have 2 terms and the upper bound is reached when all clauses have only 1 term. Hence, we conclude that the expected number of clauses satisfied by the above method is at least  $0.75m$ .

(d)

Supposing the number of satisfied clauses is  $(m - X)$ , then the number of unsatisfied clauses is  $X$ . If the  $(m - X)$  is at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the clauses ( $m - X \geq \frac{1}{2}m$ ), then  $X \leq \frac{1}{2}m$ . So, if we would like to prove that the probability of  $m - X \geq \frac{1}{2}m$  is at least  $\frac{1}{2}$ , we can prove that the probability of  $X \leq \frac{1}{2}m$  is at least  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Then we take the opposite side, and **we only need to prove that the probability of  $X \geq \frac{1}{2}m$  is at most  $\frac{1}{2}$** . According to the MARKOV inequality:

$$P(X \geq \frac{1}{2}m) \leq \frac{E(X)}{\frac{1}{2}m} = \frac{2E(X)}{m}$$

From the last question we know that  $E(m - X) \geq 0.75m$ , so we have  $E(X) \leq 0.25m$ . Then we get the following:

$$P(X \geq \frac{1}{2}m) \leq \frac{2E(X)}{m} \leq \frac{2 \times 0.25m}{m} = \frac{1}{2}$$

Hence we proved that the probability of  $X \geq \frac{1}{2}m$  is at most  $\frac{1}{2}$ , which means that the probability that at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the clauses are satisfied, is at least  $\frac{1}{2}$ .