

Eric Tjon  
Yulan Jin  
Scott Fang  
April 8th, 2019

CS255 HW3

1. Devise a CREW PRAM algorithm that generates a random permutation in  $O(\log n)$  steps. Give a  $\Theta$ -bound on the number of bits randomness it uses and number of processors needed by your algorithm.

```
Permute-By-Sorting(A)
n := length[A]
Parallel for i := 1 to n
    P[i] = Random(1,n)
Box sort A, using P as sort keys
return A.
```

Recall that box sort from the class notes is a parallel sort that's likely to run in  $O(\log n)$  time. The parallel for loop for assigning the random keys also occurs in  $O(\log n)$  time.

Therefore, this permutation runs in  $O(\log n)$  time with  $O(n \log n)$  bits of randomness.

2. Give a concrete example with 16 processors where the faulty processor succeeds in foiling a threshold choice in the Byzantine agreement algorithm.

Out of 16 processors, there are 15 good processors and 1 faulty processor.

Recall that the three different thresholds are L, H, and G, and the processors follow the algorithm below.

$$L = (5n/8) + 1 = 11$$

$$H = (3n/4) + 1 = 13$$

$$G = 7n/8 = 14$$

Input: A value for  $b[i]$ , our current decision choice.

Output: A decision  $d[i]$ .

1.  $vote = b[i]$ .
2. For each round, do
3. Broadcast vote;
4. Receive votes from all the other processors.
5. Set  $maj =$  majority (0 or 1) value among the votes cast
6. Set  $tally =$  the number of votes that  $maj$  received.
7. If coin = heads then set threshold = L; else set threshold = H
8. If  $tally \geq$  threshold then set  $vote = maj$ ; else  $vote = 0$
9. If  $tally \geq G$  then set  $d[i] = maj$  permanently.

A threshold choice is foiled if some good processor tallies below the threshold, and another good processor tallies at or above the threshold.

An example foiled threshold:

Group A: 10 good processors vote = 1

Group B: 5 good processors vote = 0

The faulty processor says it votes 0 to group A, and says it votes 1 to group B. The coin flip is heads so threshold = L = 11.

Majority: 1

Group A Tally: 10/16 for majority

Group B Tally: 11/16 for majority

Since they are on opposite sides of the threshold, the threshold is foiled. Group A is set to 0 and group B is set to the majority which is 1.

Group A: 10 good processors vote = 0

Group B: 5 good processors vote = 1

3. Carefully give a DMRC algorithm for determining in a communications network the median incoming network traffic to a node. Assume the input consist of (key; value) pairs of the form  $((i,j);n_{i,j})$  where the key is the pair  $(i,j)$  and  $n_{i,j}$  is the number of bytes of traffic from node  $i$  to  $j$  in the network.

For each input pair, we want to map it to the accepting node  $j$  as the key, and the traffic  $n_{i,j}$  as the value.

Map( $k, v$ ):  
    Output( $j, n_{i,j}$ )

Next, we want to reduce all incoming traffic values  $n_{i,j}$  as  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$  under the key of the accepting node  $j$  as  $k$ .

reduce( $k, (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ ):  
    values = sort( $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ )  
    if  $n$  is odd:  
        median = values[  $(n+1)/2$  ]  
    else:  
        median = avg( values[ $n/2$ ] + values[ $n/2 + 1$ ]  
    output( $k, median$ )

The output would then be (key, value) where key is a node, and the value is the median of incoming traffic to that node.

Analysis:

The algorithm devised for parallel MTIS is very similar to the one proposed for performing parallel MIS search:

Given Graph = (Vertices  $V$ , Edges  $E$ ):

output = empty set

While  $V$  is not empty:

tempOutput = empty set

Parallel for each  $v$  in  $V$ :

If  $d(v) = 0$ , add to output and remove  $v$  from  $V$

Else mark  $v$  with  $\Pr(1/2d(v))$

Parallel for each  $(v_1, v_2)$  in  $E$ :

If  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are marked and  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are in the same triangle,

unmark vertex  $w$  w/ lower degree or lower id

Parallel for each  $v$  in  $V$ :

If  $v$  is marked, add  $v$  to tempOutput

output = output union tempOutput

Delete tempOutput from  $V$  and all vertices that share a triangle w/ tempOutput

Delete incident edges from  $E$

We want to see if this algorithm holds similar properties to the original algorithm.

Lemma: For good vertice  $v$  with  $d(v) > 0$ , the probability of  $\gamma(w)$  where  $w$  is a neighbor of  $v$  being marked is at least  $1 - \exp(-\frac{1}{2})$ .

Each vertice  $w$  has  $\Pr(1/2d(w))$  chance of being marked. Since  $v$  is good, it has at least  $d(v)/3$  vertices that have at most  $d(v)$  neighbors. Those adjacent vertices have  $\Pr(1/2d(v))$  chance of being marked. The chance that none of these are marked is  $(1 - (1/2d(v)))^{d(v)/3} \leq e^{-1/6}$

Lemma: During any iteration, if a vertex  $w$  is marked, it is selected to be in  $S$  w/ probability at least  $1 - P(\text{triangle} | w, v)$ .

A vertice is unmarked if it is neighbors with a vertice that is part of the same triangle and that vertice is marked as well. Each neighbor is marked w/ probability at most  $1/2d(w)$ , and the number of such neighbors is at most  $d(w)$ . Vertices are also unmarked if they share a triangle, that is, they share at least one other neighbor with each other. Without accounting for shared neighbors, the probability that the marked vertex  $v$  is selected to be in  $S$  is at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  (see March 4 slides). For some pair of selected vertices, let  $P(\text{triangle} | w, v)$  be the probability that the two vertices share at least one other neighbor. The probability that a vertex would be selected to be in  $S$  would be  $1 - d(w) * 1/(2d(w)) * P(\text{triangle} | w, v) = 1 - P(\text{triangle} | w, v)$ . Thus, we can see that the probability is bounded by the number of triangles in a graph. More triangles mean that a vertex is less likely to be selected while less triangles means a vertex is more likely to be selected.

Lemma: The probability that a good vertex belongs to  $S \cup \Gamma(S)$  is at least  $(1 - \exp(-\frac{1}{2})) / (1 - P(\text{triangle}|w,v))$

Let  $v$  be a good vertex with  $d(v) > 0$ . Consider vertex  $w$ , a neighbor of  $v$  with the lowest degree of those neighbors is marked. We know that it was marked with probability of at least  $1 - P(\text{triangle}|w,v)$ . If  $w$  is in  $S$ , then we know  $v$  is a neighbor of  $w$ . From the first lemma,  $E$  happens with chance  $1 - \exp(-\frac{1}{2})$ . Thus, the probability  $v$  is in  $S$  or a neighbor of a vertex in  $S$  is  $(1 - \exp(-\frac{1}{2})) / (1 - P(\text{triangle}|w,v))$

Theorem: The parallel MTIS algorithm runs in  $O(\log x \log n)$  using  $O(n + m)$  processors where  $x$  is the number of triangles in the graph.

Each round runs on  $O(\log n)$  time using  $O(n + m)$  processors. Since vertices are eliminated if either marked or as a part of a triangle, that means the expected number of edges eliminated during the iteration is a constant fraction of current number of triangles. If a marked vertex is part of a triangle, the triangle will be eliminated; if not, only the marked vertex will be eliminated. Thus, the algorithm eliminates more vertices more quickly if there are more triangles while non-triangle vertices are eliminated at a constant rate.

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/38iv1piy8we3llk/AAD7TCXgF\\_uySb6rr3uy9mXda?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/38iv1piy8we3llk/AAD7TCXgF_uySb6rr3uy9mXda?dl=0)