

# (CE7456 Lecture Notes 1) Weighted Sampling

Yufei Tao

Today, we will discuss the *weighted sampling* problem defined as follows.

**Weighted Sampling.** The input is a set  $S$  of  $n$  elements where each element  $e \in S$  carries a positive integer *weight*  $w(e)$ . Define  $W = \sum_{e \in S} w(e)$ . A sampling operation draws a random element  $X$  from  $S$  such that  $\Pr[X = e] = w(e)/W$  for each  $e \in S$ . The goal is to preprocess  $S$  into a data structure that can support sampling operations efficiently. The output of each sampling operation must be independent of those of all previous operations.

## 1 Computation Model and Mathematical Conventions

We will assume the standard RAM (random access machine) model, augmented with a constant-time operation **RAND**. Given an integer  $x \geq 1$ , **RAND**( $x$ ) returns a number chosen from  $[x]$  uniformly at random, where  $[x]$  represents the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, x\}$ . All the logarithms have base 2 by default.

## 2 A Simple but Slow Method

Let  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n$  be the elements of  $S$  (the ordering does not matter). In preprocessing, break the interval  $[1, W]$  into  $n$  disjoint intervals  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n$  such that  $I_i$  ( $i \in [n]$ ) contains exactly  $w(e_i)$  integers. Store the set of intervals in an array  $A$ , which constitutes our data structure. It is rudimentary to finish the preprocessing in  $O(n)$  time.

To sample from  $S$ , first draw an integer  $X$  from  $[n]$  uniformly at random. Then, use binary search to identify the unique interval  $I_i$  — among  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n$  — covering  $X$ . Finally, return the element  $e_i$  (i.e., the element  $I_i$  corresponds to). The correctness is straightforward, and the sample time is  $O(\log n)$ .

## 3 The Alias Method

Next, we will discuss the *alias method* [2], which improves the above solution by reducing the sampling time to constant.

**Structure.** The method produces a set  $U$  of  $n$  *urns*, each containing one or two elements from  $S$ . An element may appear in multiple urns. For an urn  $\Lambda \in U$ , each element  $e$  in  $\Lambda$  is assigned a positive value  $v(\Lambda, e)$  — referred to as *the value of  $e$  in urn  $\Lambda$* . These values satisfy two conditions:

1. For each urn  $\Lambda \in U$ , if it has only one element  $e$ , then  $v(\Lambda, e) = W/n$ ; otherwise, it has two elements  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , in which case  $v(\Lambda, e_1) + v(\Lambda, e_2) = W/n$ .
2. For every element  $e \in S$ , it holds that

$$w(e) = \sum_{\Lambda \in U: e \in \Lambda} v(\Lambda, e) \tag{1}$$

namely, its weight equals the sum of its values in all the urns where it appears.

As each urn requires only constant space, the total space consumption is  $O(n)$ .

**Sampling.** To perform a weighted sampling operation, we carry out the steps below.

- First, pick an urn  $\Lambda$  from  $U$  uniformly at random.
- Second, return an element  $X$  from  $U$  as follows.
  - If  $\Lambda$  has only a single element  $e$ , then  $X = e$ .
  - If  $\Lambda$  has two elements  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , then generate  $X \in \{e_1, e_2\}$  such that

$$\Pr[X = e_i] = \frac{v(\Lambda, e_i)}{W/n}$$

for  $i = 1$  and  $2$ .

We insert a remark here that will be useful later. If  $e$  is an element in  $\Lambda$ , in both cases we have  $\Pr[X = e] = v(\Lambda, e) \cdot (n/W)$ .

It is clear that the above steps can be implemented in constant time.

To prove correctness, denote by  $Y$  the output of the algorithm; we must show that  $\Pr[Y = e] = w(e)/W$  for each element  $e \in S$ . Fix an arbitrary element  $e \in S$ . Let  $U_e$  be the set of urns in  $U$  containing  $e$ . The event  $Y = e$  can be decomposed into  $|U_e|$  disjoint events  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_{|U_e|}$ , where  $E_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq |U_e|$ ) represents the event that  $e$  is sampled from the  $i$ -th urn of  $U_e$ . Specifically,  $E_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq |U_e|$ ) is the conjunction (i.e., AND) of the following two events:

- The urn  $\Lambda$  picked in the first step is the  $i$ -th urn in  $U_e$ , which occurs with probability  $1/n$ .
- The element  $X$  returned in the second step is  $e$ , which occurs with probability  $v(\Lambda, e) \cdot (n/W)$  (as remarked earlier).

As the above two events are independent, we know  $\Pr[E_i] = v(\Lambda, e)/W$ . Therefore:

$$\Pr[Y = e] = \sum_{i=1}^{|U_e|} \Pr[E_i] = \sum_{\Lambda \in U_e} \frac{v(\Lambda, e)}{W} = \frac{w(e)}{W}$$

where the last equality used (1).

**Construction.** We can build the urns in  $n$  iterations. Each iteration produces a new urn, removes an element from  $S$ , and possibly adjusts the weight of another element remaining in  $S$ . The algorithm maintains an invariant.

**Invariant:** when step  $i \in [1, n]$  starts, the weights of all the  $n - i + 1$  elements still in  $S$  sum up to  $W \cdot \frac{n-i+1}{n}$ .

Specifically, in the  $i$ -th iteration ( $i \geq 1$ ), we first check whether there is an element  $e \in S$  whose *current* weight is  $W/n$ . If so, the iteration creates an urn  $\Lambda$  containing just  $e$ , assigns  $v(\Lambda, e) = w(e)$  — here  $w(e)$  is the current weight of  $e$  — and then removes  $e$  from  $S$ .

We now consider the case where no element in  $S$  has a current weight  $W/n$ . In this case, there must be an element  $e_1 \in S$  whose current weight  $w(e_1)$  is *strictly* smaller than  $W/n$ , and another element  $e_2 \in S$  whose current weight  $w(e_2)$  is *strictly* larger than  $W/n$  — think: why?

Pick any two such elements. Create an urn  $\Lambda$  containing  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , assigning  $v(\Lambda, e_1) = w(e_1)$  and  $v(\Lambda, e_2) = \frac{W}{n} - w(e_1)$ . After that, the iteration removes  $e_1$  from  $S$  and decreases  $w(e_2)$  by  $\frac{W}{n} - w(e_1)$ . It is easy to verify that the invariant holds for the next iteration.

The above algorithm can be implemented in  $O(n)$  time. The details make an interesting exercise for you (hint: maintain three linked lists).

## 4 Remark

It is possible to update the alias structure in constant time [1] when inserting a new element in  $S$  or deleting an existing element from  $S$ .

## References

- [1] Torben Hagerup, Kurt Mehlhorn, and J. Ian Munro. Maintaining discrete probability distributions optimally. In *ICALP*, pages 253–264, 1993.
- [2] Alastair J. Walker. New fast method for generating discrete random numbers with arbitrary frequency distributions. *Electronics Letters*, 10(8):127–128, 1974.