

Simple set cardinality estimation through random sampling

Marco Bressan
Sapienza Univ. Roma
bressan@di.uniroma1.it

Enoch Peserico
Univ. Padova
enoch@dei.unipd.it

Luca Pretto
Univ. Padova
pretto@dei.unipd.it

Abstract

We present a simple algorithm that estimates the cardinality n of a set V when allowed to sample elements of V uniformly and independently at random. Our algorithm with probability $(1 - \delta)$ returns a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of n drawing $O(\sqrt{n} \cdot \epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})})$ samples (for $\epsilon^{-1} \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})} = O(\sqrt{n})$).

Tasks like graph-size estimation (see e.g. [4] and [5]) have recently revived interest in the problem of estimating the cardinality of a set via random sampling. This short note presents a simple algorithm that estimates with a given precision the cardinality of a set, with a given probability of error. Although the basic estimator we use has been known for a long time (see [6] and [7]), we leverage a more recent martingale technique to obtain guarantees on the number of samples yielding the desired precision and error probability. Our algorithm and bounds can then be easily used “black box” in the design and analysis of other algorithms.

1 Estimating set cardinality via random sampling

The algorithm below estimates the cardinality n of a set V through repeated invocations of a primitive $\text{SAMPLE}(V)$ that, on each invocation, returns an element of V chosen uniformly and independently at random. We formally state and prove the bounds on the probability that the estimate \hat{n} of n is not accurate within a factor $(1 \pm \epsilon)$, or that $\text{SAMPLE}(V)$ is invoked “too many” times. We assume $\epsilon < 1$; otherwise the trivial estimate $\hat{n} = 0$ suffices.

Algorithm $\text{CARDAPPROX}(V, \epsilon, \delta)$

```
1:  $S \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ subset of  $V$  seen so far
2:  $w \leftarrow 0$  ▷ samples taken, each weighted by  $|S|$  when taken
3:  $r \leftarrow 0$  ▷ number of repeats
4:  $k \leftarrow \lceil \frac{2+4.4\epsilon}{\epsilon^2} \ln(\frac{3}{\delta}) \rceil$  ▷ stopping threshold on the number of repeats
5: repeat
6:    $w \leftarrow w + |S|$ 
7:    $e \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE}(V)$ 
8:    $r \leftarrow r + |S \cap e|$ 
9:    $S \leftarrow S \cup e$ 
10: until  $r \geq k$ 
11: return  $\frac{w}{r}$ 
```

Theorem 1. $\text{CARDAPPROX}(V, \epsilon, \delta)$ with probability greater than $(1 - \delta)$ returns an estimate \hat{n} such that $(1 - \epsilon)n \leq \hat{n} \leq (1 + \epsilon)n$ and invokes $\text{SAMPLE}(V)$ at most $\min(n, 2\lceil\sqrt{kn}\rceil) + k$ times.

Proof. We first show that $\Pr[|\hat{n} - n| > \epsilon n] < 2\delta/3$. We use a martingale tail inequality originally from [3] and stated (and proved) in the following form as Theorem 2.2 of [1], p. 8:

Theorem 2 ([1], Theorem 2.2). *Let (Z_0, Z_1, \dots) be a martingale with respect to the filter (\mathcal{F}_i) . Suppose that $Z_{i+1} - Z_i \leq M$ for all i , and write $V_t = \sum_{i=1}^t \text{Var}(Z_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1})$. Then for any $z, v > 0$ we have*

$$\Pr[Z_t \geq Z_0 + z, V_t \leq v \text{ for some } t] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2(v + Mz)}\right)$$

Let us plug into the formula of Theorem 2 the appropriate quantities from CARDAPPROX:

- For all $i \geq 1$ let $X_i \in V$ be the i -th sample, i.e. the value of e set by the i -th execution of line 7.
- For all $i \geq 0$ let \mathcal{F}_i be the event space generated by X_1, \dots, X_i – so that for any random variable Y , with $\mathbb{E}[Y | \mathcal{F}_i]$ we mean $\mathbb{E}[Y | X_1, \dots, X_i]$ and with $\text{Var}[Y | \mathcal{F}_i]$ we mean $\text{Var}[Y | X_1, \dots, X_i]$.
- For all $i \geq 1$ let $\chi_i = \mathbb{1}[X_i \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \{X_j\}]$ be the indicator variable of the event that the i -th sample is a repeat, i.e. that it coincides with some previous sample.
- For all $i \geq 1$ let $P_i = \mathbb{E}[\chi_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \frac{1}{n} |\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} \{X_j\}|$ be the probability that the i -th sample is a repeat, as a function of all previous samples.
- Let $Z_0 = 0$, and for all $i \geq 1$ let $Z_i = \sum_{j=1}^i (\chi_j - P_j)$. It is easy to see that $(Z_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is a martingale with respect to the filter $(\mathcal{F}_i)_{i \geq 0}$, since Z_i is obtained by adding to Z_{i-1} the indicator variable χ_i and subtracting P_i (i.e. its expectation in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}). More formally, $\mathbb{E}[Z_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \mathbb{E}[Z_{i-1} + \chi_i - P_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = Z_{i-1} + (\mathbb{E}[\chi_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - P_i) = Z_{i-1}$.
- Let $M = 1$, noting that $|Z_{i+1} - Z_i| = |\chi_{i+1} - P_{i+1}| \leq 1$ for all i .

Finally, note that $\text{Var}[Z_j | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] = \text{Var}[\chi_j | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}]$, since $Z_j = Z_{j-1} + \chi_j - P_j$, and Z_{j-1} and P_j are functions of X_1, \dots, X_{j-1} . Since $\text{Var}[\chi_j | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] = P_j(1 - P_j) \leq P_j$, we have $V_i = \sum_{j=1}^i \text{Var}[Z_j | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] \leq \sum_{j=1}^i P_j$. Theorem 2 then yields the following:

Lemma 1. *For all $z, v > 0$ we have*

$$\Pr\left[Z_i \geq z, \sum_{j=1}^i P_j \leq v \text{ for some } i\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2(v + z)}\right) \quad (1)$$

Let us now focus on CARDAPPROX. Note that $\sum_{j=1}^i \chi_j$ and $\sum_{j=1}^i P_j$ are respectively the values of r and of $\frac{w}{n}$ just after the cycle has been executed for the i -th time. Therefore Z_i is the value of $r - \frac{w}{n}$ just after the cycle has been executed for the i -th time. Suppose now that CARDAPPROX returns $\frac{w}{r} \leq n(1 - \epsilon)$. This event implies $r - \frac{w}{n} \geq \epsilon r$ and $\frac{w}{n} \leq (1 - \epsilon)r$; which in turn implies $Z_i \geq \epsilon k$ and $\sum_{j=1}^i P_j \leq (1 - \epsilon)k$, since $r - \frac{w}{n} = Z_i$ and $\frac{w}{n} = \sum_{j=1}^i P_j$, and $r = k$ when CARDAPPROX returns. Invoking Lemma 1 with $z = \epsilon k$ and $v = (1 - \epsilon)k$ yields:

$$\Pr\left[\frac{w}{r} \leq n(1 - \epsilon)\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 k^2}{2(\epsilon k + (1 - \epsilon)k)}\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 k}{2}\right) \quad (2)$$

which is smaller than $\delta/3$ since $k > \frac{2}{\epsilon^2} \ln \frac{3}{\delta}$.

Consider now the event that CARDAPPROX returns $\frac{w}{r} \geq n(1 + \epsilon)$, implying $\frac{w}{n} \geq r(1 + \epsilon)$. This means at return time $Z_i \leq -\epsilon k$ or, equivalently, $-Z_i \geq \epsilon k$. Clearly, $(-Z_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is a martingale too with respect to the filter $(\mathcal{F}_i)_{i \geq 0}$. Let then $i_0 = \min\{j : -Z_j \geq \epsilon k\}$. Since $|Z_j - Z_{j-1}| \leq 1$, it must be $-Z_{i_0} < \epsilon k + 1$. Furthermore, $\sum_{j=1}^{i_0} \chi_j \leq k$, or CARDAPPROX

would have stopped at time $i' < i_0 \leq i$. It follows that $\sum_{j=1}^{i_0} P_j = -Z_{i_0} + \sum_{j=0}^{i_0} \chi_j \leq \epsilon k + 1 + k = (1 + \epsilon)k + 1$. Invoking again Lemma 1 with $z = \epsilon k$ and $v = (1 + \epsilon)k + 1$, we obtain:

$$\Pr\left[\frac{w}{r} \geq n(1 + \epsilon)\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 k^2}{2((1 + 2\epsilon)k + 1)}\right) \quad (3)$$

Note that $\frac{1}{k} < \frac{\epsilon^2}{2+4.4\epsilon} < 0.2\epsilon$ since $\epsilon < 1$; so $2((1 + 2\epsilon) + \frac{1}{k}) < 2 + 4.4\epsilon$, and since $k \geq \frac{2+4.4\epsilon}{\epsilon^2} \ln \frac{3}{\delta}$ the right-hand term is at most $\delta/3$.

Finally, let us prove less than $\delta/3$ the probability that CARDAPPROX invokes SAMPLE(V) more than $2\lceil\sqrt{kn}\rceil + k$ times. For convenience let $s = 2\lceil\sqrt{kn}\rceil$, and let $R(d)$ be the random variable giving the total number of repeats yielded before the $(d + 1)$ -th distinct sample is obtained. Note that CARDAPPROX invokes SAMPLE(V) more than $s + k$ times if and only if $R(s) < k$. Let then ρ_i be the indicator random variable of the event that at least one repeat is drawn between the i -th and $(i + 1)$ -th distinct samples. By construction $R(d) \geq \sum_{i=1}^d \rho_i$ and thus $\Pr[R(s) < k] \leq \Pr[\sum_{i=1}^s \rho_i < k]$. But $\mathbb{E}[\rho_i] = \frac{i}{n}$, and therefore $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^s \rho_i] = \frac{s(s+1)}{2} > 2k$. Therefore $R(s) < k$ implies $\sum_{i=1}^s \rho_i < \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^s \rho_i]$. Noting that all ρ_i are independent, we can then invoke the following standard concentration bound:

Theorem 3 ([2], Theorem 1.1). *Let $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ where the Y_i are independently distributed in $[0, 1]$. Then for $0 < \epsilon < 1$ we have $\Pr[Y < (1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{E}[Y]] \leq \exp(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[Y])$.*

Applying Theorem 3 to $Y = \sum_{i=1}^s \rho_i$, we obtain:

$$\Pr[R(s) < k] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{0.5^2}{2}2k\right) \quad (4)$$

and straightforward manipulations show the right-hand term to be less than $\delta/3$. Since $n + k$ samples always yield at least k repeats, the probability that CARDAPPROX invokes SAMPLE(V) more than $\min(n, 2\lceil\sqrt{kn}\rceil) + k$ times is less than $\delta/3$.

A simple union bound completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] N. Alon, O. Gurel-Gurevich, and E. Lubetzky. Choice-memory tradeoff in allocations. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 20(4):1470–1511, 2010.
- [2] D. Dubhashi and A. Panconesi. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [3] David A. Freedman. On tail probabilities for martingales. *The Annals of Probability*, 3(1):100–118, 1975.
- [4] S. J. Hardiman and L. Katzir. Estimating Clustering Coefficients and Size of Social Networks via Random Walk. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 9(4):19:1–19:20, 2015.
- [5] L. Katzir, E. Liberty, O. Somekh, I. A. Cosma. Estimating Sizes of Social Networks via Biased Sampling. *Internet Mathematics*, 10(3–4):335–359, 2014.
- [6] Z. E. Schnabel. The Estimation of Total Fish Population of a Lake. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 45(6):348–352, 1938.
- [7] L. A. Goodman. Sequential Sampling Tagging for Population Size Problems. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 24(1):56–69, 1953.