Homework 8 Due Saturday, November 7

Since we haven't introduced any new algorithms this week, there will be no implementation part.

Written Part

- 1. In Hw 7 problem 7c you described an algorithm that recovered the first k bits of the discrete log modulo p, assuming that p-1 is divisible by 2^k . Prove the correctness of this algorithm. In particular, there is some ambiguity when you take the square root in last week's algorithm. Why does the assumption that p-1 is divisible by 2^k alleviate this ambiguity?
- 2. We've given several proofs of Fermat's Little Theorem. This exercise outlines another one that is of a very different flavor. Throughout we fix a prime number p.
 - (a) Let j be an integer with $1 \le j \le p-1$. Prove that $\binom{j}{p}$ is divisible by p.
 - (b) For any integers a, b, show that:

$$(a+b)^p \equiv a^p + b^p \mod p.$$

(This identity is often called the *freshman's dream* by jaded calculus professors).

- (c) Prove Fermat's Little Theorem: $a^p \equiv a \mod p$ by induction on a using part (b) with b = 1.
- 3. Suppose we flip a coin times. Compute the probability of the following event.
 - (a) The probability that the first and last coins are both heads.
 - (b) The probability that at least one of the first and last coins is heads.
 - (c) The probability that exactly 5 coin tosses are heads.
 - (d) The probability that exactly k coin tosses are heads.
 - (e) The probability that an even number of coin tosses are heads.
 - (f) The probability that an odd number of coin tosses are heads.
- 4. We let $Pr: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a probability theory.
 - (a) Let E be an event, and E^c its complement. Prove $Pr(E^c) = 1 Pr(E)$.
 - (b) Let E and F be disjoint events. Prove that

$$Pr(E \cup F) = Pr(E) + Pr(F).$$

(c) Let E and F be any two events (not necessarily disjoint). Prove that

$$Pr(E \cup F) = Pr(E) + Pr(F) - Pr(E \cap F).$$

(d) Let E_1, E_2 , and E_3 be events. Prove that:

$$Pr(E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3) = Pr(E_1) + Pr(E_2) + Pr(E_3) - Pr(E_1 \cap E_2) - Pr(E_1 \cap E_3) - Pr(E_2 \cap E_3) + Pr(E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3).$$

(e) Let E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n be n events. We say that the events are pariwise disjoint if $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. Show that if the events are pairwise disjoint then:

$$Pr(E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \cdots \cup E_n) = Pr(E_1) + Pr(E_2) + \cdots + Pr(E_n).$$

- (f) Let E_1, \dots, E_n be n (not necessarily disjoint) events. Conjecture a general formula for $Pr(E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_n)$ in terms of the probability of the E_i and their various intersections. This is called the *inclusion-exclusion* principle.
- 5. Let E, F be events.
 - (a) Show that Pr(E|E) = 1. Explain in words why this is reasonable.
 - (b) Suppose that E and F are disjoint. Show that Pr(E|F) = 0. Explain in words why this is reasonable.
 - (c) Let F_1, \dots, F_n be pairwise disjoint and suppose $F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n = \Omega$. Prove the following decomposition formula:

$$Pr(E) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Pr(E|F_i) Pr(F_i).$$

(d) Prove the following general version of Bayes' formula:

$$Pr(F_i|E) = \frac{Pr(E|F_i)Pr(F_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} Pr(E|F_j)Pr(F_j)}.$$

- 6. This is the famous Monty Hall Problem. Ralph is on a game show, and Monty Hall gives Ralph the choice of a prize, behind one of 3 closed doors. Monty tell's Ralph that behind 2 of the doors are goats, and behind the third is a new car. Ralph chooses a door, and then Monty opens one of the remaining 2 doors revealing a goat! Monty then asks Ralph: would you rather stick to the door you chose? Or switch to the other closed door?
 - (a) If Ralph always sticks with the same closed door, what are his chances of winning a car? What about if Ralph always switches? What is Ralph's best strategy?
 - (b) More generally, suppose that there are N doors, M cars, and Monty hall reveals K goats after Ralphs first choice. Compute the probabilities:

$$Pr(Ralph wins a car | Ralph switches).$$

Which is the better strategy? (Letting N = 1000, M = 1, K = 998 makes the solution to part (a) seem less paradoxical).

7. In this exercise we study the probability of success of a Monte Carlo algorithm in quite a bit more generality that we considered in class. Let \mathcal{S} be a set (of integers), and \mathscr{A} an interesting property of elements of \mathcal{S} . Suppose that:

$$Pr(x \in \mathcal{S} \text{ is not } \mathscr{A}) = \delta.$$

Suppose that you have a Monte-Carlo algorithm that takes as input a random number r and some $m \in \mathcal{S}$ and returns Yes or No satisfying:

- (1) If the algorithm returns Yes m is definitely \mathscr{A} .
- (2) If m has A, then the property that the algorithm returns Yes is at least P.
- (a) Express conditions (1) and (2) as conditional probabilities
- (b) Suppose we run the algorithm N times on a fixed $m \in \mathcal{S}$, and the algorithm returns No each time. Derive a lower bound in terms of δ , P and N for the probabilit that m is not \mathscr{A} . (In class we did this for $\delta = .01$ and P = 1/2. Here you will have to be more careful about distinguishing P and 1 P.)
- 8. We can now compute the probability of correctness for probablyPrime. Recall that if n is a composite number, then 75% of integers between 2 and n-1 are Miller-Rabin witnesses to the compositeness of n. You will also need the prime number theorem, which we interpret as saying the probability of an integer n being prime is approximately $\ln(n)/n$.
 - (a) Suppose probablyPrime(n) returns True. Compute the probability that n is prime.
 - (b) Suppose instead of running the Miller-Rabin test on 20 potential witnesses, probablyPrime runs the test on N potential witnesses. If probablyPrime(n) returns True, compute the probability that n is prime in terms of N.