Probability and Computing – Approximation Algorithms

Stefan Walzer | WS 2025/2026

Lecture Notes by Worsch

This lecture's content is covered in Thomas Worsch's notes from 2019. 📎

Content

Randomised Approximate Counting

Definition

A randomised algorithm *A approximates* a quantity $f(x)$ if for any input x the output $A(x)$ satisfies:

$$\Pr[|A(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon \cdot f(x)] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

The parameters are the *relative error* ε and the *failure probability* δ.

only $A(z) = 0$ is acceptable if $f(z) = 0$

interval for $A(x)$ interval for $A(y)$ $(\varepsilon = \frac{1}{4})$

0          $f(x)$ $f(y)$

Remark: Related Complexity Classes

PRAS. Problems admitting A with running time polynomial in $|x|$, but not necessarily in $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ (for $\delta = 1/4$).

FPRAS. Problems admitting A with running time polynomial in $|x|$ and $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ (for $\delta = 1/4$).

Note: Also defined where $f(x)$ is not a *number*. For instance: Want to compute a *vertex cover* with a size close to optimal.

Counting Satisfiable Assignments of Boolean Formulas

A counting problem

For Boolean formula $B(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ let $\#B$ be the number of satisfying assignments:

$$\#B = |\{(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \{0,1\}^n \mid B(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 1\}|.$$

Example

$B = (x_1 \vee \bar{x}_2) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee x_3)$

$\#B = |\{(0,0,0), (0,0,1), (1,0,1), (1,1,1)\}| = 4$

Approximation algorithm for $\#B$ in general? Unlikely.

Assume A satisfies $\Pr[|A(B) - \#B| \leq \varepsilon(\#B)] \leq 1 - \delta$ for $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\delta = \frac{1}{4}$. Then

$$B \text{ is UNSAT} \Leftrightarrow \#B = 0 \Leftrightarrow \Pr[A(B) = 0] \geq \tfrac{3}{4}$$
$$B \text{ is SAT} \Leftrightarrow \#B > 0 \Leftrightarrow \Pr[A(B) > 0] \geq \tfrac{3}{4}$$

If A is polynomial time then A is BPP algorithm for SAT.
Then SAT $\in$ BPP and NP $\subseteq$ BPP. Hard to believe...

What could be a tractable special case?

UNSAT $\to$ 0 .... $\#B_1$ .... $\#B_2$ .... 2^n $\leftarrow$ TAUT

We must distinguish: B is UNSAT $\Leftrightarrow \#B = 0$ from B is SAT $\Leftrightarrow \#B \geq 1$.

We need not distinguish: B is TAUT $\Leftrightarrow \#B = 2^n$ from B is NON-TAUT $\Leftrightarrow \#B < 2^n$.

CNF is hard on the wrong end

$$(x_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee \bar{x_{42}}) \wedge \ldots \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x_{37}})$$

Deciding UNSAT is NP-hard.
Deciding TAUT is easy.
$\hookrightarrow$ only empty CNF-formula is TAUT.

DNF looks good

$$(\bar{x}_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_{42}) \vee \ldots \vee (x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge x_{37})$$

Deciding UNSAT is easy.
$\hookrightarrow$ only empty DNF-formula is UNSAT.
Deciding TAUT is hard.

## Goal: Approximate $\#B$ for DNF formula B.

(Equivalently: Approximate $2^n - \#B$ for CNF formula B.)

number of sample points ⎯⎯⎯⎯◯⎯⎯⎯ ☐ 10 000

graph background color ⎯⎯⎯⎯◯⎯⎯⎯ ☐ 5

point size ⎯◯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯⎯ ☐ 1

$$\pi \approx \frac{1987}{625} = 3.17920$$

https://demonstrations.wolfram.com/ApproximatingPiByTheMonteCarloMethod/

Intuition: Approximate $|S|$ for $S \subseteq D$ by sampling from D

$$|S| \approx |D| \cdot \frac{0}{16}$$

Requirements

For this to work we must be able to

1. compute the size of D
2. sample uniformly from D
3. decide for $x \in D$ whether $x \in S$

soft requirement:

4. $\frac{|S|}{|D|}$ should not be too small

Approximate $|S|$ for $S \subseteq D$ by sampling from D

Algorithm approxSetSize**:**

    hits $\leftarrow 0$

    for $i = 1$ *to* N **do**

        sample $x \sim \mathcal{U}(D)$

        hits $\leftarrow$ hits $+ \mathbb{1}_{x \in S}$

    return $\frac{\text{hits}}{N} \cdot |D|$

Simple Theorem

Let D be a finite set and $S \subseteq D$ such that we can efficiently

1. compute $|D|$
2. sample uniformly from D
3. decide for $x \in D$ whether $x \in S$

Let $p = |S|/|D|$. Then approxSetSize with $N = \frac{3 \log(2/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2 p}$ approximates $|S|$ with relative error ε and failure probability δ.

$\hookrightarrow$ Special Case $\varepsilon, \delta = \Theta(1)$: Need $N = \Omega(1/p)$ samples.

Chernoff

For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $X \sim \text{Bin}(N, p)$:

$$\Pr[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| > \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[X]] < 2 \exp(-\varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[X]/3).$$

Proof: Apply Chernoff to hits $\sim \text{Bin}(N, p)$.

$$\Pr[\text{fail}] = \Pr[|\text{result} - |S|| > \varepsilon|S|] = \Pr[|\tfrac{\text{hits}}{N} \cdot |D| - |S|| > \varepsilon|S|] = \Pr[|\text{hits} - \tfrac{|S|}{|D|}N| > \varepsilon \tfrac{|S|}{|D|}N]$$

$$= \Pr[|\text{hits} - pN| > \varepsilon pN] = \Pr[|\text{hits} - \mathbb{E}[\text{hits}]| > \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\text{hits}]] \leq 2 \exp(-\varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\text{hits}]/3) = 2 \exp(-\varepsilon^2 pN/3) = \delta.$$

Approximate $|S|$ for $S \subseteq D$ by sampling from D

Algorithm approxSetSize**:**
  hits $\leftarrow 0$
  for $i = 1$ *to* N **do**
    sample $x \sim \mathcal{U}(D)$
    hits $\leftarrow$ hits $+ \mathbb{1}_{x \in S}$
  return $\frac{\text{hits}}{N} \cdot |D|$

Simple Theorem

Let D be a finite set and $S \subseteq D$ such that we can efficiently

1. compute $|D|$
2. sample uniformly from D
3. decide for $x \in D$ whether $x \in S$

Let $p = |S|/|D|$. Then approxSetSize with $N = \frac{3 \log(2/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2 p}$ approximates $|S|$ with relative error ε and failure probability δ.

$\hookrightarrow$ Special Case $\varepsilon, \delta = \Theta(1)$: Need $N = \Omega(1/p)$ samples.

Chernoff

For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $X \sim \text{Bin}(N, p)$:

$\Pr[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| > \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[X]] < 2 \exp(-\varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[X]/3)$.

Application to $\#B$

- $S =$ satisfying assignments of B
- $D = \{0, 1\}^n$

- $p = \frac{|S|}{|D|} = \frac{\#B}{2^n}$
- We may have $p = 1/2^n$

- $N = \Omega(2^n)$ required
- :-(

No Surprise

Of course this didn't work

Did not exploit that B is in DNF.

Approximating $\#B$ for B in DNF

Assume $B = C_1 \vee \ldots \vee C_m$
where C_i contains ℓ_i literals.

- $D_i := \{x \in \{0,1\}^n \mid C_i(x) = 1\}$ (satisfying assignments of C_i)
- $D := \{(i,x) \mid i \in [m], x \in D_i\}$ $(= D_1 \dot{\cup} \ldots \dot{\cup} D_m)$
- $S := \{(i,x) \mid i \in [m], x \in D_i, x \notin D_1 \cup \ldots D_{i-1}\}$

## Claim: We can approximate $|S| = \#B$ by sampling from D

1 We can compute $|D_i| = 2^{n-\ell_i}$ and $|D| = \sum_{i=1}^m |D_i|$. ✓

2 We can efficiently sample $(I, X) \sim \mathcal{U}(D)$ ✓
  - sample I such that $\Pr[I = i] = \frac{|D_i|}{|D|}$
  - sample $X \sim \mathcal{U}(D_i)$
    $\hookrightarrow$ set variables appearing in C_i as required, sample others from $\mathrm{Ber}(1/2)$.
  - Yields $\Pr[(I,X) = (i,x)] = \frac{|D_i|}{|D|} \cdot \frac{1}{|D_i|} = \frac{1}{|D|}$ for all $(i,x) \in D$.

3 We can efficiently decide "is $(i,x) \in S$?" ✓
  $\hookrightarrow$ just plug x into all clauses $C_1, \ldots, C_i$ // time $\mathcal{O}(mn)$

4 $p = \frac{|S|}{|D|}$ satisfies $p \geq \frac{1}{m}$. ✓

Takeaway

Theorem

If B is in DNF, then we can approximate $\#B$ in polynomial time (using $N = m \cdot \frac{3 \log(2/\delta)}{\varepsilon^2}$ samples) with relative error ε and failure probability δ.

Intuition: Why did this work?

Naive strategy:

$\{0,1\}^n$

S

Problem: $|S|/|\{0,1\}^n|$ may be exponentially small

Improved strategy:

D

S

Advantage: $|S|/|D|$ is $\Omega(1/m)$.

Conclusion

Randomised Approximation is Powerful

For *B* in DNF:

- Computing $\#B$ *exactly* is $\#\mathbf{P}$-complete.

- no *deterministic approximation* algorithm for such problems is known

- we analysed an efficient *randomised approximation* algorithm

Appendix: Possible Exam Questions

- What is a randomized approximation algorithm (for a counting problem)?
- We considered the counting problem $\#B$ for Boolean formulas. Did we succeed in the general case? Why not?
- Which special case did we focus on? Why does the problem of general case not apply?
- We studied an algorithm that estimates the size of $|S|$ for two sets $S \subseteq D$.
  - Under which assumptions is this applicable?
  - How did the algorithm work?
  - How does the number of required samples depend on $|S|$ and $|D|$?
- To estimate $\#B$ for a DNF formula B, we learned a more clever approach.
  - How did this approach work?
  - How does it avoid the problem of the naive approach?