# Theoretical Computer Science III Term 2 Summative

#### wtxd25

#### March 11, 2020

## 1 Advanced Algorithms

## **Question 1**

We have a hash table of size n, with arbitrary hash function  $h: \mathcal{U} \to \{0, ..., n-1\}$ .  $|\mathcal{U}| \ge n \cdot m$  for some  $m \ge 1$ . Want to prove that  $\mathcal{U}$  contains a subset  $\mathcal{U}_0$  of size m such that  $h(x_1) = h(x_2)$  (1).

**Proof By Induction:** 

Let  $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{1}$ : This implies that  $|\mathcal{U}| \ge n$ , and we need to find a subset  $\mathcal{U}_0$ ,  $|\mathcal{U}_0| = 1$ . The above condition is trivially true for this case because there will only be one element in the subset which obviously hashes to the same value as itself.

**Assume true for m** = **k**: This means that  $|\mathcal{U}| \ge k \cdot n$  and there exists a subset  $\mathcal{U}_0$  of size k where each of the pairs of values hash to the same key.

Let  $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{1}$ : Assume each of the keys that the values can be hashed to are called buckets  $(\{0,...,n-1\})$ . When  $|\mathcal{U}| \geq (k+1) \cdot n$ , the smallest maximum size of a bucket is when all of the values are evenly distributed over all the keys. In the case where  $|\mathcal{U}| = (k+1) \cdot n$ , this would mean that all buckets would have k+1 entries. If this were the case then any of the buckets could be the subset  $\mathcal{U}_0$ . For a bucket to have fewer than k+1 values hashed to it, another bucket would have greater than k+1 values hashed to it. As such, the latter of these two buckets could be  $\mathcal{U}_0$ ;  $\mathcal{U}_0$  equals some random selection of k+1 elements from this bucket.

By the principle of induction (1) is true for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\square$ .

If you have to hash v values, and k keys, and for the first value of m for which  $v \ge m \cdot k$ , then there is a subset of size m values which hash to the same key. As such in hashing with chaining, the worst case time complexity to find a value is  $\Omega(m)$ .

### Question 2

(a)

There are n = 1000 different buckets that values could be hashed into. This means that the probability that two values are hashed to two different buckets is  $1 - \frac{1}{1000} = \frac{999}{1000}$ . This means

that the probability of two values hashing to the same bucket in k turns is  $1-(\frac{999}{1000})^{\binom{k}{2}}$ . As such, we need to solve the inequality  $1-(\frac{999}{1000})^{\binom{k}{2}} \geq 0.8$  for k. Let k=57, then  $1-(\frac{999}{1000})^{\binom{57}{2}}=1-(\frac{999}{1000})^{1596}=0.7975$ . Now let k=58, then  $1-(\frac{999}{1000})^{\binom{58}{2}}=1-(\frac{999}{1000})^{1653}=0.8087$ . This means that on the 58th insertion the probability of collision exceeds 80% for the first time.

**(b)** 

We are given that in the first k-1 insertions there have been no collisions and that on the k-th insertion the probability of collision must be strictly less than 20%. The first fact means that k-1 buckets are used in the hash table  $\Rightarrow$  the probability of collision in the k-th insertion should be less than  $\frac{k-1}{1000}$ .

From the second fact provided, we know that  $\frac{k-1}{1000} < 0.2 \Rightarrow k - 1 < 200 \Rightarrow k < 201$ . As such, the value of k when the size of the hash table should be increased and thus the first time that the collision probability is greater than or equal to 20% is on the **200th insertion**.

### **Question 3**

Need to prove that the expected running time of an entire sequence of m operations, on a hash table of size n, is upper bounded by  $m \cdot (1 + \frac{m}{2n})$ . H is a 2-universal family of hash functions from which we use hash functions.  $E_i$  denotes the expected running time of i-th operation, and  $K_i$  is the expected number of collisions on the i-th operation. Can assume that  $E_i = 1 + K_i$ .

There are m operations, therefore, using the notation above, the overall expected running time, E is  $\sum_{i=1}^{m} E_i$ . Let  $E_{max} = max(E_1, ..., E_m)$ .  $\therefore E \leq m \cdot E_{max}$ , and thus  $E \leq m \cdot (1 + K_{max})$ . As the family of hash functions we are using is 2-universal we can say that  $K_i = P(h(x_i) = h(x_j)) \leq \frac{1}{n}$  where h is an arbitrary hash function from H and  $x_j$  is some random value in the hash table. Let K be the expected number of collisions over all m operations, we can say that  $K \leq {m \choose 2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{m^2}{2n}$ . The expected number of collisions for one key is  $K_i \leq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \frac{m^2}{2n} = \frac{m}{2n}$ . Using the earlier relation  $(E_i = 1 + K_i)$ , we get  $E_i \leq 1 + \frac{m}{2n}$ . There are m operations and so the total expected running time is upper bounded as follows:  $E \leq m \cdot E_i \leq m \cdot (1 + \frac{m}{2n})$   $\square$ .

# 2 Information Theory

### **Question 4**

The capacity of a channel is defined as follows:  $C = \max_{p(x)} I(X;Y)$ . I(X;Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X). This gives us I(X;Y) = H(Y) because of the fact that the channel is deterministic; if Y = f(X), then H(Y|X) = 0.  $C = \max_{p(x)} H(Y) = \max_{p(x)} H(f(X))$ . P(X) is the probability distribution of, which maximises entropy when the distribution is uniform.  $C = \log|f(X)|$  when P(X) is a uniform distribution  $\square$ .

### **Question 5**

### **Property 2**

**Line 1:** The sum of probabilities of all input sequences  $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$  is equal to 1.

**Line 2:** The typical set  $A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}$  is a subset of  $\mathscr{X}^n$  with particular properties. Therefore, it is obvious that the number of sequences in the typical set is not greater than the number of sequences in  $\mathscr{X}^n$ . Thus, the sum of the probabilities for this subset is  $\leq 1$ .

**Line 3:** One of the properties of typical set is that  $H(X) - \varepsilon \le -\frac{1}{n} \log p(x^n) \le H(X) + \varepsilon$ . Will focus on the RHS of this inequality;  $-\frac{1}{n} \log p(x^n) \le H(X) + \varepsilon$ . Rearranging this we get  $p(x^n) \ge 2^{-n(H(X)+\varepsilon)}$ .  $\therefore$  we get the inequality shown.

**Line 4:** The value  $2^{-n(H(X)+\varepsilon)}$  is constant so we can pull it out of the sum  $\sum_{x^n\in A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}}2^{-n(H(X)+\varepsilon)}=2^{-n(H(X)+\varepsilon)}\sum_{x^n\in A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}}1=2^{-n(H(X)+\varepsilon)}|A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}|$ . To complete the proof simply multiply both sides of the inequality by  $2^{n(H(X)+\varepsilon)}$ . This leaves  $|A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}|\leq 2^{n(H(X)+\varepsilon)}$ , as required.

## **Property 3**

**Line 1:** The first line makes use of Property 1 of the AEP theorem for typical sequences. It states that, for n large enough, the probability of typical set is nearly 1. Should be noted that  $Pr\{A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}\} = \sum_{x^n \in A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}} p(x^n)$ .

**Line 2:** One of the properties of typical set is that  $H(X) - \varepsilon \le -\frac{1}{n} \log p(x^n) \le H(X) + \varepsilon$ . Will now focus on the LHS of this inequality;  $-\frac{1}{n} \log p(x^n) \ge H(X) - \varepsilon$ . Rearranging this we get  $p(x^n) \le 2^{-n(H(X) - \varepsilon)}$ .  $\therefore$  we get the inequality shown.

**Line 3:** The value  $2^{-n(H(X)-\varepsilon)}$  is constant so we can pull it out of the sum  $\sum_{x^n \in A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}} 2^{-n(H(X)-\varepsilon)} = 2^{-n(H(X)-\varepsilon)} \sum_{x^n \in A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}} 1 = 2^{-n(H(X)-\varepsilon)} |A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}|$ . To complete the proof simply multiply both sides of the inequality by  $2^{n(H(X)-\varepsilon)}$ . This leaves  $|A_{\varepsilon}^{(n)}| \ge (1-\varepsilon)2^{n(H(X)+\varepsilon)}$ , as required.

### **Question 6**

(a)

 $H(X_{S \cup T})$  is the joint entropy of all the discrete random variables that are members of sets  $X_S$  or  $X_T$  or both. We can see that  $X_S, X_T = X_{s_1}, ..., X_{s_k}, X_{t_1}, ..., X_{t_m}$  and  $X_{S \cup T} = X_S, X_T = X_{s_1}, ..., X_{s_k}, X_{t_1}, ..., X_{t_m} \Rightarrow H(X_{S \cup T}) = H(X_S, X_T)$  (def. 1).

 $H(X_{S\cap T})$  is the joint entropy of all the discrete random variables that are members of both  $X_S$  and  $X_T$ . Intuitively, the mutual information,  $I(X_S; X_T)$  is the amount of information in common about  $X_S$  and  $X_T : H(X_{S\cap T}) \leq I(X_S; X_T)$ . We prove this below:

$$I(X_S; X_T) = H(X_S, X_T) - H(X_T|X_S) - H(X_S|X_T)$$
 - Using the Venn Diagram  $\geq H(X_S, X_T) = H(X_{S \cup T})$  - Using def. ① (def. ②)

The number of members of the set  $S \cap T$  is less than or equal to the number of members of  $S \cup T$ . This means that the number of random variables in the joint entropy of  $H(X_{S \cap T})$  is less than or equal to the number in  $H(X_{S \cup T})$ . The joint entropy can be rewritten as:

$$H(X_1,...,X_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n H(X_i|X_{i-1},...,X_1)$$

 $\therefore$  as the number of variables in the joint entropy  $H(X_{S\cap T})$  is less than or equal to the number in  $H(X_{S\cup T})$ , this means that the number of entries in the sum if also fewer for  $H(X_{S\cap T})$ . Hence, because conditional entropy is always greater than 0, the summation for  $H(X_{S\cup T})$  is greater than or equal to the summation for  $H(X_{S\cap T})$ , and thus the following is true:

$$H(X_{S \cup T}) \ge H(X_{S \cap T})$$
  
 
$$\Rightarrow I(X_S; X_T) \ge H(X_S \cap X_T) \text{ - from def. } \textcircled{2} \square.$$

$$H(X_{S \cap T}) + H(X_{S \cup T}) \le H(X_S, X_T) + I(X_S; X_T) = H(X_S, X_T) + H(X_S) + H(X_T) - H(X_S, X_T) = H(X_S) + H(X_T) \square.$$

**(b)** 

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_{[m]/\{i\}}) &= H(X_2, ..., X_m) + H(X_1, X_3, ..., X_m) + ... + H(X_1, ..., X_{m-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_i | X_{i-1}, ..., X_2) - H(X_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_i | X_{i-1}, ..., X_3, X_1) \\ &- H(X_2 | X_1) + ... + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} H(X_i | X_{i-1}, ..., X_1) \end{split}$$

**Conditioning reduces entropy** which means that adding the respective missing discrete random variable to RHS of each conditional entropy reduces the overall entropy.

$$\begin{split} \therefore \sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_{[m]/\{i\}}) &\geq m \sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_{i}|X_{i-1},...,X_{1}) - H(X_{1}) - H(X_{2}|X_{1}) - ... - H(X_{m}|X_{m-1},...,X_{1}) \\ &= m \sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_{i}|X_{i-1},...,X_{1}) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_{i}|X_{i-1},...,X_{1}) \\ &= (m-1) \sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_{i}|X_{i-1},...,X_{1}) \\ &= (m-1) H(X_{1},...,X_{m}) = (m-1) H(X_{[m]}). \end{split}$$

Thus,  $\sum_{i=1}^{m} H(X_{[m]/\{i\}}) \leq (m-1)H(X_{[m]}) \square$ .