

An FPRAS for #nFBDD *

Kuldeep S. Meel¹  Alexis de Colnet²

¹University of Toronto, Canada

²TU Wien, Austria

Abstract

#nFBDD is the problem of counting the number of satisfying assignments, or models, of a non-deterministic free binary decision diagram (nFBDD). The problem is #P-hard. We study the approximate variant of this problem where one seeks an estimate of the model count. It is known that there exists a quasi-polynomial-time randomized approximation scheme (QPRAS) for #nFBDD. We provide the first FPRAS for #nFBDD.

1 Introduction


We study the problem #nFBDD of approximating the number of satisfying assignments of non-deterministic free binary decision diagrams (nFBDDs). nFBDDs represent Boolean functions as decision diagrams with additional nodes called guess nodes, where every path from the source to a sink (*True* or *False*) reads each variable at most once. Contrary to non-deterministic ordered binary decision diagrams (nOBDDs), variables can appear in any order in nFBDD paths. Counting the number of satisfying assignments, or models, when there is no guess node in the nFBDD (making it an FBDD), is feasible in linear time. However, the same task becomes #P-hard when even a single guess node (of unbounded arity) is allowed, as the problem of counting the models of a DNF formula reduces to it.

Prior work on approximate model counting for nFBDDs includes a proof that there is a quasi-polynomial-time randomized algorithm [GJK⁺97]. In a recent work, there was fully polynomial randomized approximation scheme (FPRAS) for model counting for nOBDDs [ACJR21a]. The FPRAS for #nOBDD has a rather intimidating running time, which was improved in [MCM24]. Neither the proof in [ACJR21a] nor the one in [MCM24] for #nOBDD extends to #nFBDD.

Yet, demonstrating that an FPRAS for #nFBDD exists would be valuable, as nFBDDs are generally exponentially smaller than nOBDDs [ACMS20], making them more attractive in practice. In this paper, we address this gap by providing an FPRAS called `approxMC_nFBDD` for #nFBDD.

Theorem 1. *Let B be an nFBDD over n variables. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. `approxMC_nFBDD`(B, ε, δ) runs in time $O(n^6 |B|^4 (1/\varepsilon)^4 \log(|B|)^2 \log(1/\delta))$ and returns `Est` with the guarantee that*

$$\Pr [\text{Est} \in (1 \pm \varepsilon) |B^{-1}(1)|] \geq 1 - \delta$$

*The authors decided to forgo the old convention of alphabetical ordering of authors in favor of a randomized ordering, denoted by . The publicly verifiable record of the randomization is available at <https://www.aeaweb.org/journals/policies/random-author-order/search>

2 Background

Given a positive integer n , $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For m an integer with $m \leq n$ (potentially $m = 0$), $[m, n]$ denotes the set $\{m, m+1, \dots, n\}$. For a, b and ε three real numbers with $\varepsilon > 0$, we use $a \in (1 \pm \varepsilon)b$ to denote that $(1 - \varepsilon)b \leq a \leq (1 + \varepsilon)b$ holds and, similarly, we use $a \in \frac{b}{1 \pm \varepsilon}$ to denote that $\frac{b}{1 + \varepsilon} \leq a \leq \frac{b}{1 - \varepsilon}$ holds.

Boolean variables can take value 0 (*False*) or 1 (*True*). A literal for a Boolean variable x is either x or its negation $\neg x$. A (truth) assignment α to a set X of Boolean variables is a mapping from X to $\{0, 1\}$. We also see α as the set of literals $\{x \mid x \in \alpha^{-1}(1)\} \cup \{\neg x \mid x \in \alpha^{-1}(0)\}$. With this set notation, we can define the empty assignment α_\emptyset as the only assignment to an empty set of variable. The set representation of α_\emptyset is \emptyset . For two assignments α and β to X and Y , respectively, such that $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, we denote by $\alpha \cup \beta$ the assignment to $X \cup Y$ that reduces to α when restricted to X , and that reduces to β when restricted to Y . For A a set of assignments to X and B a set of assignments to Y , again with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, we write $A \otimes B := \{\alpha \cup \beta \mid \alpha \in A, \beta \in B\}$.

FPRAS. For a counting problem that, given an input x , aims at computing some integer value $N(x)$, a fully polynomial-time randomized approximation scheme (FPRAS) is an algorithm \mathcal{A} that, given x , $0 < \varepsilon$ and $0 < \delta < 1$, runs in time polynomial in $|x|$ (the size of the input), $1/\varepsilon$, and $\log(1/\delta)$, and returns \tilde{N} with the guarantee that

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}} \left[\tilde{N} \in (1 \pm \varepsilon)N(x) \right] \geq 1 - \delta.$$

2.1 Non-deterministic FBDD

A *non-deterministic BDD* is a directed acyclic graph with a single *source*, two *sinks* called the 0-sink and the 1-sink, and two types of internal nodes: *decision nodes* and \vee -nodes. A decision node q is labeled with a Boolean variable x and has two children q_0 and q_1 . It is written as $q = \text{ite}(x, q_1, q_0)$ (if x then q_1 else q_0) and interpreted as a Boolean function $\langle q \rangle = (\neg x \wedge \langle q_0 \rangle) \vee (x \wedge \langle q_1 \rangle)$ over $\text{var}(q) = \{x\} \cup \text{var}(q_0) \cup \text{var}(q_1)$. An \vee -node q is labeled with the symbol \vee , has an unbounded number of children q_1, \dots, q_k , and is interpreted as a Boolean function $\langle q \rangle = \langle q_1 \rangle \vee \dots \vee \langle q_k \rangle$ over $\text{var}(q) = \text{var}(q_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{var}(q_k)$. The 0-sink is interpreted as 0 (*False*) and the 1-sink is interpreted as 1 (*True*). The non-deterministic BDD B with source node q represents the function $\langle q \rangle$ over $\text{var}(B) := \text{var}(q)$. The set $M(B) := B^{-1}(1)$ is the set of *models* of B . Graphically, the models of B are the truth assignments α to the variables such that there is a path from the source to the 1-sink that, on each decision node $\text{ite}(x, q_1, q_0)$ encountered, follows the child q_1 if $\alpha(x) = 1$, and q_0 if $\alpha(x) = 0$.

An example of an nBDD is shown in Figure 1. In the figure, the children q_0 and q_1 of a decision node $q = \text{ite}(x, q_1, q_0)$ are distinguished by connecting q to q_0 with a dashed edge and q to q_1 with a solid edge. For every node q in B , we denote by $M(q)$ the set of models of $\langle q \rangle$. Thus, when q is the source node of B , $M(q) = M(B)$. By convention, the empty assignment α_\emptyset is the only assignment to the empty set of variables, and $M(1\text{-sink}) = \{\alpha_\emptyset\}$ (whereas $M(0\text{-sink}) = \emptyset$). The size of B , denoted by $|B|$, is its number of nodes.

A *non-deterministic free BDD* (nFBDD) is a non-deterministic BDD where, on every path from the source to a sink, every variable appears at most once. An nFBDD is *complete* when, on every path from the source to a sink, every variable appears *exactly* once. An nFBDD is *alternating* when its source node is an \vee -node, and when every child of every \vee -node is a decision node, and when every child of every decision node is an \vee -node or a sink. Every nFBDD B over n variables can be made complete and alternating in time $O(n|B|)$ by adding \vee -nodes with a single child and decision nodes of the form $\text{ite}(x, q, q)$. A complete alternating nFBDD over n variables thus has $2n + 1$ layers:

$$Q^0, Q^1, Q^2, \dots, Q^{2n}$$

where Q^{2n} contains only the source \vee -node, Q^i contains the children of Q^{i+1} for every $i \geq 0$, and Q^0




Figure 1: A complete alternating nFBDD. The 0-sink is omitted. All missing edges go to the 0-sink (possibly through a chain of decision nodes and fan-in-1 \vee -nodes to preserve completeness and alternation).

contains only the two sinks. Thus, the Q^{2j} s with $j \geq 1$ are layers of \vee -nodes and the Q^{2j+1} s are layers of decision nodes. Therefore, in this paper, we consider nFBDDs that are complete and alternating.

The nBDD of Figure 1 is actually a complete alternating nFBDD. We write $Q^{\leq i} := Q^0 \cup \dots \cup Q^i$ and $Q^{< i} := Q^0 \cup \dots \cup Q^{i-1}$. For every node q , we denote by $children(q)$ its set of children. The children of every single \vee -node q are ordered in an arbitrary way. We denote by $children_{<}(q)$ the sequence of ordered children of q .

3 Algorithm

To compute a good estimate of $|M(B)|$, the algorithm constructs in a bottom-up manner an estimate $p(q)$ of $|M(q)|^{-1}$ and *sample sets* $S(q) \subseteq M(q)$ for every node q of the nFBDD B . In fact, for every q we construct several samples sets $S^1(q), \dots, S^{n_s n_t}(q)$, all subsets of $M(q)$, where the values of n_s and n_t are given in `approxMC_nFBDD`. The $S^r(q)$ s and $p(q)$ s are computed through random processes, thus they are random variables. For some q though the values of $p(q)$ and $S^r(q)$ are fixed. In particular, $p(1\text{-sink}) = 1$ and $S^r(1\text{-sink}) = \{\alpha_\emptyset\}$ for every r and, for every $q \in B$ such that $M(q) = 0$, we set $p(q) = \infty$ and $S^r(q) = \emptyset$ for every r . In the algorithm, the rules for manipulating ∞ are the followings: $\infty + \infty = \infty$, $1/\infty = 0$ and $1/0 = \infty$. Finding all nodes q such that $M(q) = 0$ can be done in time $O(|B|)$.

At the heart of the process to generate the $S^r(q)$ and the $p(q)$ is a technique from [?]. We break it into two procedures: **reduce** and **union**. Given a set S and some rational number $0 \leq p \leq 1$, **reduce** returns a subset of S where each element of S is kept with probability p .

Algorithm 1 `reduce(S, p)`

- 1: $S' \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 2: **for** $s \in S$ **do**
 - 3: add s to S' with probability p
 - 4: **return** S'
-

Algorithm 2 `union(q, S_1, \dots, S_k)`

- 1: Let $children_{<}(q) = (q_1, \dots, q_k)$
 - 2: **for** $1 \leq i \leq k$ **do**
 - 3: $S'_i = S_i \setminus (M(q_1) \cup \dots \cup M(q_{i-1}))$
 - 4: **return** $S'_1 \cup \dots \cup S'_k$
-

`union` takes in an \vee -node q with $children_{<}(q) = (q_1, \dots, q_k)$ and sets of samples $S_i \subseteq M(q_i)$. It computes $S'_1 = S_1$ and $S'_i = S_i \setminus (M(q_1) \cup \dots \cup M(q_{i-1}))$ for all $i \geq 2$. It then returns $S'_1 \cup \dots \cup S'_k$. Computing S'_i takes time polynomial in $|S_i|$ and $|B|$ since checking whether an assignment α satisfies an nFBDD is takes time linear in $|B|$. We often remove q from the argument of `union`.

Based on `reduce` and `union`. We have two procedures that, assuming the $p(q')$ s and $S^r(q')$ s have been computed for all $q' \in Q^{i-1}$ and all $r \in [n_s n_t]$, constructs all $p(q)$ s and $S(q)$ s for $q \in Q^i$. The procedure `OR_estimateSample` deals with the layers of \vee -nodes, and the procedure `DEC_estimateSample` deals with the layers of decision nodes. The layer Q^0 , that contains only the sinks, is handled beforehand by setting $p(1\text{-sink}) = 1$ and $S^r(1\text{-sink}) = \{\alpha_\emptyset\}$ for every $r \in [n_s n_t]$.

Algorithm 3 `OR_estimateSample(Q^i)` with Q^i a layer of \vee -nodes

- 1: **for all** $q \in Q^i$ with $M(q) > 0$ **do**
 - 2: Let $children_{<}(q) = (q_1, \dots, q_k)$
 - 3: $\rho = \min(p(q_1), \dots, p(q_k))$
 - 4: **for** $1 \leq r \leq n_s n_t$ **do**
 - 5: $\widehat{S}^r(q) = \text{union}\left(q, \text{reduce}\left(S^r(q_1), \frac{\rho}{p(q_1)}\right), \dots, \text{reduce}\left(S^r(q_k), \frac{\rho}{p(q_k)}\right)\right)$
 - 6: $\hat{\rho} = \text{Median}_{0 \leq j < n_t} \left(\frac{1}{\rho \cdot n_s} \sum_{r=j \cdot n_s + 1}^{(j+1)n_s} |\widehat{S}^r(q)| \right)^{-1}$
 - 7: $p(q) = \min(\rho, \hat{\rho})$
 - 8: **for** $1 \leq r \leq n_s n_t$ **do**
 - 9: $S^r(q) = \text{reduce}\left(\widehat{S}^r(q), \frac{\rho}{p(q)}\right)$
-

Algorithm 4 `DEC_estimateSample(Q^i)` with Q^i a layer of decision nodes

- 1: **for all** $q \in Q^i$ with $M(q) > 0$ **do**
 - 2: $p(q) = 1/(p(q_0)^{-1} + p(q_1)^{-1})$
 - 3: **for** $1 \leq r \leq n_s n_t$ **do**
 - 4: $S^r(q) = \left(\text{reduce}\left(S^r(q_0), \frac{p(q)}{p(q_0)}\right) \otimes \{\bar{x}\} \right) \cup \left(\text{reduce}\left(S^r(q_1), \frac{p(q)}{p(q_1)}\right) \otimes \{x\} \right)$
-

Note that when $M(q_0) = 0$ (resp. $M(q_1) = 0$), `DEC_estimateSample` computes $p(q) = p(q_1)$ (resp. $p(q) = p(q_0)$) and $S^r(q) = S^r(q_1)$ (resp. $S^r(q) = S^r(q_0)$).

With these two procedures, the core part of the algorithm, described in `approxMC_nFBDD_core`, is straightforward: after initializing $p(1\text{-sink})$ the $S^r(1\text{-sink})$, process the layers of nodes one after the other, from bottom to top. The idea is that, after processing Q^i , all $p(q)$ for $q \in Q^i$ should be good

estimates of $1/|M(q)|$. Once all layers have been processed the value $1/p(q)$ is returned. However, if at any point, some sample set $S^r(q)$ contains more than $\theta = \text{poly}(|B| + 1/\varepsilon)$ elements (the exact value of θ is given in `approxMC_nFBDD`), then we interrupt the algorithm and returns 0. This *sanity check* allows us to ensure that the algorithm works in polynomial time. We will later argue that the probability of this event happening can be made as small as desired.

Algorithm 5 `approxMC_nFBDD_core`(B, n_s, n_t, θ)

```

1:  $n = |\text{var}(B)|$ 
2:  $p(\text{1-sink}) = 1$  // initialize for the 1-sink
3:  $S^r(\text{1-sink}) = \{\alpha_q\}$  for all  $r \in [n_s n_t]$ 
4: for  $q \in B$  with  $M(q) = 0$  do
5:    $p(q) = \infty$ 
6:    $S^r(q) = \emptyset$  for all  $r \in [n_s n_t]$  // initialize for unsatisfiable nodes
7: for  $1 \leq i \leq 2n$  do
8:   if  $i$  is odd then //process layer of decision nodes
9:     DEC_estimateSample( $Q^i$ )
10:  else
11:    OR_estimateSample( $Q^i$ ) //process layer of  $\vee$ -nodes
12:    $Q^i =$  the  $i$ th layer of  $B$  (from sinks (layer 0) to source)
13:   for  $q \in Q^i$  and  $1 \leq r \leq n_s$  do
14:     if  $|S^r(q)| \geq \theta$  then
15:       return 0 // interrupt when sample sets become too big
16:    $q =$  source node of  $B$ 
17: return  $1/p(q)$ 

```

The full FPRAS is `approxMC_nFBDD`. The algorithm takes in the nFBDD B , and the real numbers $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1$. After setting the values of n_s and n_t (which give the number of sample sets to be computed per node) and the value of θ (the size limit that sample sets must not exceed), `approxMC_nFBDD` calls `approxMC_nFBDD_core` m times and returns the median of the m outputs as final estimate for $|M(B)|$.

Algorithm 6 `approxMC_nFBDD`(B, ε, δ)

```

1: if  $B$  has no model then return 0
2: Make  $B$  complete and alternating
3:  $n = |\text{var}(B)|$ 
4:  $\kappa = \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$ 
5:  $n_s = \lceil 16n/\kappa^2 \rceil$ 
6:  $n_t = \lceil 8 \ln(16|B|) \rceil$ 
7:  $\theta = 16n_s n_t (1 + \kappa)$ 
8:  $m = \lceil 8 \ln(1/\delta) \rceil$ 
9: for  $1 \leq j \leq m$  do
10:   $\hat{L}_j = \text{approxMC_nFBDD_core}(B, n_s, n_t, \theta)$  //  $m$  independent runs
11: return Median( $\hat{L}_1, \dots, \hat{L}_m$ )

```

4 Derivation paths

Derivation paths are an important concept for the analysis of the algorithms. Paths in the nFBDD are represented by sequences of nodes that are connected in *bottom-up* fashion. If q is the last node in a path \mathcal{P} and q^* is a parent of q , then $\mathcal{P} \cdot q^*$ is the path where q^* is appended to \mathcal{P} . Assuming \mathcal{P}

contains at least k nodes, $\mathcal{P}[1, k]$ is the path restricted to the first k nodes of \mathcal{P} . $\mathcal{P}[1, k]$ is called a *prefix* of \mathcal{P} . If \mathcal{P} has less than k nodes, then $\mathcal{P}[1, k]$ equals \mathcal{P} .

Let q be a node of the nFBDD and let $\alpha \in M(q)$. We associate to the pair (α, q) a unique *derivation path* denoted by $path(\alpha, q)$. This path goes from the 1-sink to q . It is constructed as follows:

- if q is the 1-sink, then $M(q) = \{\alpha_\emptyset\}$ and the only derivation path is $path(\alpha_\emptyset, q) = (q)$.
- if $q \in Q^i$ is a decision node $ite(x, q_1, q_0)$, and $\alpha \in M(q)$, then α assigns the variable x . Let α' be the assignment α restricted to $var(\alpha) \setminus \{x\}$. If $\alpha(x) = 0$ then $\alpha' \in M(q_0)$ and the derivation path of α is $path(\alpha, q) = path(\alpha', q_0) \cdot q$. If otherwise $\alpha(x) = 1$ then $\alpha' \in M(q_1)$ and the derivation path of α is $path(\alpha, q) = path(\alpha', q_1) \cdot q$.
- If q is an \vee -node. Since its children are ordered, we define q' as the first child of q where $\alpha \in M(q')$ and $path(\alpha, q) = path(\alpha, q') \cdot q$.

Derivation paths are defined independently of the algorithm. However, the algorithm respects derivation paths: for every r , the assignment $\alpha \in M(q)$ can end up in the sample set $S^r(q)$ only if it is derived through the derivation path $path(\alpha, q)$. For instance, suppose that q is an \vee -node with $children_{<}(q) = (q_1, q_2)$ and suppose $\alpha \in M(q_1) \cap M(q_2)$. The derivation path $path(\alpha, q)$ contains q and q_1 but not q_2 because q_1 is the first child of q of which α is a model. Thus, for any set of samples $S^r(q)$ constructed by the algorithm, $\alpha \in S^r(q)$ may occur only if $\alpha \in S^r(q_1)$ (note that this is a necessary condition but not a sufficient condition). If the algorithm finds itself in the situation where $\alpha \notin S^r(q_1)$ and $\alpha \in S^r(q_2)$ hold, then α will not be in $S^r(q)$.

Lemma 1. *For $q \in Q^{i+1}$ and $\alpha \in M(q)$, let $path(\alpha, q) = (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_i, q_{i+1} = q)$ and let α_i be the restriction of α to $var(q_i)$. Then, in every run of `approxMC_nFBDD_core`, $\alpha \in S^r(q)$ holds only if $\alpha_j \in S^r(q_j)$ holds for every $0 \leq j \leq i$.*

Proof. Suppose, toward a contradiction, that $\alpha \in S^r(q)$ and $\alpha_j \notin S^r(q_j)$ for some $j \leq i$. We can assume that $j > 0$ since $\alpha_0 = \alpha_\emptyset$ and $S^r(q_0) = S^r(1\text{-sink}) = \{\alpha_\emptyset\} = \{\alpha_0\}$. Consider the largest j such that $\alpha_j \notin S^r(q_j)$.

Suppose q_{j+1} is a decision node for x and let $b = \alpha(x)$, then q_j is the b -child of q_{j+1} . For $\beta \in M(q_{j+1})$, let β' be its restriction to $var(\beta) \setminus \{x\}$. Looking at `DEC_estimateSample`(Q^{j+1}), one sees that, if $\beta(x) = b$, then β is added to $S^r(q_{j+1})$ only if β' is in the $S^r(q_j)$. Since $\alpha'_{j+1} = \alpha_j$, it follows that $\alpha_{j+1} \notin S^r(q_{j+1})$, a contradiction.

Now suppose q_{j+1} is an \vee -node with children q'_1, q'_2, \dots, q'_k . Here we have $\alpha_{j+1} = \alpha_j$. Recall that the children of q_{j+1} are ordered and that q_j is, by definition of a derivation path, the first child of q_{j+1} of which α_{j+1} is a model. Say $q_j = q'_h$. `OR_estimateSample`(Q^{j+1}) constructs $S^r(q_{j+1})$ by sampling from the $S^r(q'_\ell)$ s, $1 \leq \ell \leq k$, but rejects every assignment sampled from $S^r(q'_\ell)$ that belong to $M(q'_l)$ for some $l < \ell$. Now the assignment α_{j+1} cannot be sampled from $S^r(q'_\ell)$ for $\ell < h$ because $\alpha_{j+1} \notin M(q'_1) \cup \dots \cup M(q'_{h-1})$ by definition of h . But neither can it be sampled from $S^r(q'_h)$ because $\alpha_{j+1} = \alpha_j \notin S^r(q_j) = S^r(q'_h)$ by assumption. And if α_{j+1} is sampled from $S^r(q'_\ell)$ for $\ell > h$, then it is rejected. So $\alpha_{j+1} \notin S^r(q_{j+1})$, a contradiction. \square

Given two different derivation paths \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' of the nFBDD B . We call their *last common prefix node* denoted by $lcpn(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}')$, the highest node in the nFBDD contained in both \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' such that the two paths are consistent up to that node. In other words, $lcpn(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}')$ is the k -th node in \mathcal{P} if and only if $\mathcal{P}[1, k] = \mathcal{P}'[1, k]$ but $\mathcal{P}[1, k+1] \neq \mathcal{P}'[1, k+1]$. Note that every derivation path contains the 1-sink, so the last common prefix node is well-defined when $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{P}'$. And if $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}'$, then $lcpn(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}')$ is simply defined as the last node of \mathcal{P} .

Let $q \in Q^{i+1}$ and $path(\alpha, q) = (q_\alpha^0, q_\alpha^1, \dots, q_\alpha^i, q_\alpha^{i+1})$ with $q = q_\alpha^{i+1}$. For every $0 \leq \ell \leq i+1$ we define the set

$$I(\alpha, q, \ell) := \{\alpha' \in M(q) \mid lcpn(path(\alpha, q), path(\alpha', q)) = q_\alpha^\ell\}.$$

Lemma 2. *For every $\alpha \in M(q)$ and $0 \leq \ell \leq |path(\alpha, q)|$, $|I(\alpha, q, \ell)| \leq \frac{|M(q)|}{|M(q_\alpha^\ell)|}$.*

Proof. Let $I(\alpha, q, \ell) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots\}$. Let α^* be the restriction of α to $\text{var}(q_\alpha^\ell)$. By definition, every α_i is of the form $\alpha^* \cup \beta_i$. If α' is an assignment in $M(q_\alpha^\ell)$, then every $\alpha' \cup \beta_i$ is in $M(q)$. But since the α_i s must differ on the β_i , we have $|I(\alpha, q, \ell)|$ distinct assignments in $M(q)$. Considering all $|M(q_\alpha^\ell)|$ possible values for α' , we end up with $|M(q_\alpha^\ell)| \cdot |I(\alpha, q, \ell)|$ distinct assignments in $M(q)$. \square

5 Random Process

We will analyse our FPRAS using a random process that simulates `approxMC_nFBDD_core`. Basically, our intuition is that, for every $\alpha \in M(q)$, we should have statement similar to “ $\Pr[\alpha \in S^r(q)] = p(q)$ ” holds by construction of $S^r(q)$ and $p(q)$. The problem is that this equality makes no sense because $\Pr[\alpha \in S^r(q)]$ is a real value between 0 and 1 whereas $p(q)$ is a random variable. The random process allows us to circumvent this issue. The idea is a coupling argument that allows us to replace the random variables $S^r(q)$ by ideally behaved random variables.

The random process actually simulates the version `approxMC_nFBDD_core` without the test of Lines 14 and 15. That is, `approxMC_nFBDD_core` where the sets $S^r(q)$ are allowed to grow very large. This modified algorithm will later be referred to as `approxMC_nFBDD_core*`.

5.1 Definition of the Random Process

The random process is defined with respect to the nFBDD B . Before defining the random process, we need the notion of *history*.

History. Informally, an history h for a node q corresponds to information in a possible run of the algorithm necessary to compute $p(q)$. Formally, an history h of node q is a set

$$h = \{(q', t^h(q')) \mid q' \text{ a strict descendant of } q\}$$

with $t^h(q') \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1]) \cup \{\infty\}$. We only consider histories that are *realizable*, that is, such that there is a run of the algorithm that gives the value $t^h(q')$ to $p(q')$. The only history of a sink is the empty set (because no descendants). An history h of q and an history h' of q' are *compatible* when $t^h(q'') = t^{h'}(q'')$ for all q'' that are descendants of q and q' . A *global history before layer i* is a set $\{h_q \mid q \in Q^{\leq i-1}\}$ of pairwise compatible histories. For h a global history before layer i and $q \in Q^{\leq i}$, we define by $p^h(q)$, $S^{r,h}(q)$ and $\widehat{S}^{r,h}(q)$ the random variables for the value given to $p(q)$, $S^r(q)$ and $\widehat{S}^r(q)$ by a run of the algorithm that has given the value $t^h(q')$ to $p(q')$ for all $q' \in Q^{\leq i-1}$. Note that if $q \in Q^{\leq i-1}$, then $p^h(q)$ is the random variable that takes value $t^h(q)$ with probability 1 (do note that $t^h(q)$ is a constant, not a random variable).

Random variables. The random process comprises a random variable $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ which domain is the subsets of $M(q)$ for every $q \in B$, every $r \in [n_s n_t]$, $t \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1]) \cup \{\infty\}$ and every history h of q . The point of $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ is to simulate $S^{r,h}(q)$ when the run of the algorithm is compatible with h and when $p(q)$ is given the value t . For the 1-sink there is a single variable $Y_{1\text{-sink},1,\emptyset}^r = \{\alpha_\emptyset\}$ for each r . For the 0-sink there also is a single nodes q with $M(q) = 0$, there also is a single variable $Y_{0\text{-sink},\infty,\emptyset}^r = \emptyset$ for each r . For $i > 0$, the variables $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ for $q \in Q^i$, are defined from the variables $Y_{q',t',h'}^r$ for $q' \in Q^{i-1}$. We distinguish the case of decision nodes and \vee -nodes.

- Let Q^i be a layer of \vee -nodes. Let $q = q_1 \vee \dots \vee q_k$ be a node in Q^i and consider

$$Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}^r, Y_{q_2,t_2,h_2}^r, \dots, Y_{q_k,t_k,h_k}^r$$

where the h_j s are pairwise compatible. Let h be the history $h_1 \cup \dots \cup h_k \cup \{(q_1, t_1), \dots, (q_k, t_k)\}$. Let $t_{\min} = \min(t_1, \dots, t_k)$. We define a random variable $Z_{q,h}^r$ by

$$Z_{q,h}^r = \text{union}(q, \text{reduce}(Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}^r, t_{\min}/t_1), \text{reduce}(Y_{q_2,t_2,h_2}^r, t_{\min}/t_2), \dots, \text{reduce}(Y_{q_k,t_k,h_k}^r, t_{\min}/t_k)).$$

$Z_{q,h}^r$ is meant to simulate $\widehat{S}^{r,h}(q)$. For every $t \leq t_{\min}$, $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ is defined as $\text{reduce}(Z_{q,h}^r, t/t_{\min})$.

- Now suppose Q^i is a layer of decision nodes and let $q = \text{ite}(x, q_1, q_0)$ in Q^i . Consider Y_{q_0,t_0,h_0}^r and Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}^r such that h_0 and h_1 are compatible, and define $h = h_0 \cup h_1 \cup \{(q_0, t_0), (q_1, t_1)\}$. Then, for every $t \leq \min(t_0, t_1)$, $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ is defined as $(\text{reduce}(Y_{q_0,t_0,h_0}^r, t/t_0) \otimes \{\neg x\}) \cup (\text{reduce}(Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}^r, t/t_1) \otimes \{x\})$.

We will abuse notation and use the variables $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ and $Z_{q,h}^r$ for histories h that are not histories of q . When $q \in Q^i$ and h is an history of an ancestor of q , or a global history before layer $j \geq i$, $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ and $Z_{q,h}^r$ should be thought of as the variables $Y_{q,t,h'}^r$ and $Z_{q,h'}^r$ where h' is the history for q compatible with h .

5.2 Analysis of the Random Process

We first make a key observation that motivates the interest of the random process for analyzing the algorithms.

Observation 1. Let \mathcal{A}^* be `approxMC_nFBDD_core` without the interrupt mechanism of Lines 14 and 15 (so \mathcal{A}^* keeps going even when the sample sets grow big). Let $i \in [0, 2n+1]$ and let H be a the random variable over all realizable histories of \mathcal{A}^* before layer i . Then, for every $q \in Q^{\leq i}$ and every $r \in [n_s n_t]$,

$$(H, p^H(q), S^{r,H}(q)) = (H, p^H(q), Y_{q,p^H(q),H}^r)$$

and if q is an \vee -node then

$$(H, p^H(q), \widehat{S}^{r,H}(q)) = (H, p^H(q), Z_{q,H}^r)$$

A second key observation is that, for a fixed history h , the random variables $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ and $Z_{q,h}^r$ are independent of the random variable H . This is because H is a random variable defined with respect to \mathcal{A}^* while the $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ and $Z_{q,h}^r$ are defined within the random process that is separate of \mathcal{A}^* .

Observation 2. Let \mathcal{A}^* be `approxMC_nFBDD_core` without the interrupt mechanism of Lines 14 and 15. Let $i \in [0, 2n+1]$ and let H be a the random variable over all realizable histories of \mathcal{A}^* before layer i . Then, for every $q \in B$, every t , every r and every fixed history h for q the random variable H is independent of the variables $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ and $Z_{q,h}^r$ (defined when q is an \vee -node).

Now we study the properties of the $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ and $Z_{q,h}^r$ variables.

Lemma 3. For every $q \in B$ with $M(q) > 0$, every $r \in [n_s n_t]$, every $t \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1]) \cup \infty$, every $\alpha \in M(q)$ and every history h for q , we have

$$\Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h}^r] = t.$$

And if q is a \vee -node $q_1 \vee \dots \vee q_k$, then $\Pr[\alpha \in Z_{q,h}^r] = \min(t^h(q_1), \dots, t^h(q_k))$.

Proof. The only history for the 1-sink is \emptyset . Since $Y_{1\text{-sink},1,\emptyset}^r = \{\alpha_\emptyset\}$ the claim holds for the layer Q^0 . Now we proceed by induction. Suppose that the claim holds for all $q' \in Q^{\leq i-1}$, all $t', r, \alpha' \in M(q')$ and all histories h' for q' . For convenience we drop the superscript r .

- Suppose Q^i is a layer of decision nodes and let $q \in Q^i$ be the decision node $\text{ite}(x, q_1, q_0)$. By definition, $Y_{q,t,h}$ follows the distribution given by

$$(\text{reduce}(Y_{q_0,t_0,h_0}, t/t_0) \otimes \{\neg x\}) \cup (\text{reduce}(Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}, t/t_1) \otimes \{x\})$$

where $h = h_0 \cup h_1 \cup \{(q_0, t_0), (q_1, t_1)\}$. Let α' be the restriction of α to $\text{var}(q) \setminus \{x\} = \text{var}(q_0) = \text{var}(q_1)$ (by completeness of the nFBDD). If $\alpha(x) = 0$ then $\alpha' \in M(q_0)$, then the induction hypothesis gives that $\Pr[\alpha' \in Y_{q_0,t_0,h_0}] = t_0$ and therefore $\Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h}] = \frac{t}{t_0} \Pr[\alpha' \in Y_{q_0,t_0,h_0}] = t$. If $\alpha(x) = 1$ then $\alpha' \in M(q_1)$, then the induction hypothesis gives that $\Pr[\alpha' \in Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}] = t_1$ and therefore $\Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h}] = \frac{t}{t_1} \Pr[\alpha' \in Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}] = t$.

- Suppose Q^i is a layer of \vee -nodes and let $q \in Q^i$ with $children_{<}(q) = (q_1, \dots, q_k)$. All q_j are in Q^{i-1} . By definition, $Y_{q,t,h}$ follows the distribution $\mathbf{reduce}(Z_{q,h}, t/t_{\min})$ where $h = h_1 \cup \dots \cup h_k \cup \{(q_1, t_1), \dots, (q_k, t_k)\}$ and $t \leq t_{\min} = \min(t_1, \dots, t_k)$. By definition, $Z_{q,h}$ follows the distribution given by

$$\mathbf{union}(\mathbf{reduce}(Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}, t_{\min}/t_1), \mathbf{reduce}(Y_{q_2,t_2,h_2}, t_{\min}/t_2), \dots, \mathbf{reduce}(Y_{q_k,t_k,h_k}, t_{\min}/t_k)).$$

There is a unique smallest j such that $\alpha \in M(q_j) \setminus (M(q_1) \cup \dots \cup M(q_{j-1}))$ holds. It follows from the induction hypothesis that $\Pr[\alpha \in Z_{q,h}] = \Pr[\alpha \in \mathbf{reduce}(Y_{q_j,t_j,h_j}, t_{\min}/t_j)] = \frac{t_{\min}}{t_j} \Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q_j,t_j,h_j}] = t_{\min}$. Finally, $\Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h}] = \Pr[\alpha \in \mathbf{reduce}(Z_{q,h}, t/t_{\min})] = \frac{t}{t_{\min}} \Pr[\alpha \in Z_{q,h}] = t$.

□

Lemma 4. For every $q \in B$ every $r \in [n_s n_t]$, $t \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1]) \cup \infty$, $\alpha, \alpha' \in M(q)$ with $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ and every history h for q we have that,

$$\Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h}^r \mid \alpha' \in Y_{q,t,h}^r] \leq \frac{t}{t^*}$$

where $t^* = t^h(\text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\alpha, q), \text{path}(\alpha', q) \setminus \{q\}))$. Moreover, if q is a \vee -node, then

$$\Pr[\alpha \in Z_{q,h}^r \mid \alpha' \in Z_{q,h}^r] \leq \frac{\min(t^h(q_1), \dots, t^h(q_k))}{t^*}$$

Proof. We are going to prove a stronger statement, namely, that for every i and every q and q' two nodes in Q^i (potentially $q = q'$), and every t and t' such that $t = t'$ when $q = q'$, and every $\alpha \in M(q)$ and $\alpha' \in M(q')$, and h and h' two compatible histories for q and q' , respectively, we have that

$$\Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h}^r \text{ and } \alpha' \in Y_{q',t',h'}^r] \leq \frac{tt'}{t^*} \quad (1)$$

where $t^* = t$ if $q = q'$ and $\alpha = \alpha'$, and $t^* = t^h(\text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\alpha, q), \text{path}(\alpha', q') \setminus \{q\}))$ otherwise.

This statement is straightforward when $q = q'$ and $\alpha = \alpha'$ because then $t = t'$ and we can use Lemma 3. In particular, the statement holds when q and q' both are the 1-sink. Now we assume $(\alpha, q) \neq (\alpha', q')$ and proceed by induction on i . The hypothesis \mathcal{H} is that the statement holds up to layer $i-1$ (included). For convenience, we drop the superscript r .

- Suppose Q^i is a layer of decision nodes. Let $q \in Q^i$ be the decision node $\text{ite}(x, q_1, q_0)$ and $q' \in Q^i$ be the decision node $\text{ite}(y, q'_1, q'_0)$ (possibly with $x = y$). By definition

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{q,t,h} &= (\mathbf{reduce}(Y_{q_0,t_0,h_0}, t/t_0) \otimes \{\neg x\}) \cup (\mathbf{reduce}(Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}, t/t_1) \otimes \{x\}) \\ Y_{q',t',h'} &= (\mathbf{reduce}(Y_{q'_0,t'_0,h'_0}, t'/t'_0) \otimes \{\neg y\}) \cup (\mathbf{reduce}(Y_{q'_1,t'_1,h'_1}, t'/t'_1) \otimes \{y\}) \end{aligned}$$

where $h = h_0 \cup h_1 \cup \{(q_0, t_0), (q_1, t_1)\}$ and $h' = h'_0 \cup h'_1 \cup \{(q'_0, t'_0), (q'_1, t'_1)\}$. Let β be the restriction of α to $\text{var}(q) \setminus \{x\}$ and β' be the restriction of α' to $\text{var}(q') \setminus \{y\}$. Let $j = \alpha(x)$, $k = \alpha'(y)$ and $q^* = \text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\beta, q_j), \text{path}(\beta', q'_k))$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h} \text{ and } \alpha' \in Y_{q',t',h'}] &= \frac{tt'}{t_j t'_k} \Pr[\beta \in Y_{q_j,t_j,h_j} \text{ and } \beta' \in Y_{q'_k,t'_k,h'_k}] \\ &\leq \frac{tt'}{t^h(q^*)} \quad (\text{by } \mathcal{H}) \end{aligned}$$

We have $q = \text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\alpha, q), \text{path}(\alpha', q'))$ only if $q = q'$ and $\alpha = \alpha'$, which goes against assumption. So $\text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\alpha, q), \text{path}(\alpha', q')) = q^*$ and $t^* = t^h(q^*)$.

- Suppose Q^i is a layer of \vee -nodes and let $q, q' \in Q^i$ be satisfiable nodes with $children_{<}(q) = (q_1, \dots, q_m)$ and $children_{<}(q') = (q'_1, \dots, q'_\ell)$. All q_j s and q'_j s are in Q^{i-1} (potentially some q_j equal to some q'_j). Let $h = h_1 \cup \dots \cup h_m \cup \{(q_1, t_1), \dots, (q_m, t_m)\}$ and $h' = h'_1 \cup \dots \cup h'_m \cup \{(q'_1, t'_1), \dots, (q'_\ell, t'_\ell)\}$. Let $t_{\min} = \min(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ and $t'_{\min} = \min(t'_1, \dots, t'_\ell)$. By definition, $Y_{q,t,h} = \text{reduce}(Z_{q,h}, t/t_{\min})$ and $Y_{q',t',h'} = \text{reduce}(Z_{q',h'}, t'/t'_{\min})$ where $t \leq t_{\min}$ and $t' \leq t'_{\min}$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{q,h} &= \text{union}(q, \text{reduce}(Y_{q_1,t_1,h_1}, t_{\min}/t_1), \text{reduce}(Y_{q_2,t_2,h_2}, t_{\min}/t_2), \dots, \text{reduce}(Y_{q_m,t_m,h_m}, t_{\min}/t_m)) \\ Z_{q',h'} &= \text{union}(q', \text{reduce}(Y_{q'_1,t'_1,h'_1}, t'_{\min}/t'_1), \text{reduce}(Y_{q'_2,t'_2,h'_2}, t'_{\min}/t'_2), \dots, \text{reduce}(Y_{q'_\ell,t'_\ell,h'_\ell}, t'_{\min}/t'_\ell)) \end{aligned}$$

There is a unique $j \in [m]$ and a unique $k \in [\ell]$ such that $\alpha \in Z_{q,h}$ only if $\alpha \in Y_{q_j,t_j,h_j}$ and $\alpha' \in Z_{q',h'}$ only if $\alpha' \in Y_{q'_k,t'_k,h'_k}$. So

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h} \text{ and } \alpha' \in Y_{q',t',h'}] \\ &= \frac{tt'}{t_{\min}t'_{\min}} \Pr[\alpha \in Z_{q,h} \text{ and } \alpha' \in Z_{q',h'}] \\ &= \frac{tt'}{t_{\min}t'_{\min}} \Pr\left[\alpha \in \text{reduce}(Y_{q_j,t_j,h_j}, t_{\min}/t_j) \text{ and } \alpha' \in \text{reduce}(Y_{q'_k,t'_k,h'_k}, t'_{\min}/t'_k)\right] \\ &= \frac{tt'}{t_j t'_k} \Pr\left[\alpha \in Y_{q_j,t_j,h_j} \text{ and } \alpha' \in Y_{q'_k,t'_k,h'_k}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{tt'}{t^h(q^*)} \tag{\mathcal{H}} \end{aligned}$$

where $p^* = \text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\alpha, q_j), \text{path}(\alpha', q'_k))$. We have $q = \text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\alpha', q), \text{path}(\alpha', q'))$ or $q' = \text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\alpha', q), \text{path}(\alpha', q'))$ only if $q = q'$ and $\alpha = \alpha'$, which goes against assumption. So $\text{lcpn}(\text{path}(\alpha', q), \text{path}(\alpha', q')) = q^*$ and $t^* = t^h(q^*)$.

This finishes the proof of statement (1). Back to the statement of the Lemma, the part on $Y_{q,t,h}^r$ follows from (1) by choosing $q = q'$, $t = t'$, $h = h'$ and using Lemma 3. For the part of $Z_{q,t}^r$ we have that

$$\Pr[\alpha \in Y_{q,t,h}^r, \alpha' \in Y_{q',t',h'}^r] = \frac{t^2}{t_{\min}} \Pr[\alpha \in Z_{q,h}^r, \alpha' \in Z_{q',h'}^r] \leq \frac{t^2}{t^*}$$

where $t_{\min} = \min(t^h(q_1), \dots, t^h(q_k))$. We conclude using Lemma 3. \square

6 Analysis of approxMC_nFBDD

We finally conduct the analysis of `approxMC_nFBDD`. The hardest part to analyze is the core algorithm `approxMC_nFBDD_core`, for which we will prove the following.

Lemma 5. *Let B be a complete alternating nFBDD over n variables. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\kappa = \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$. Let $n_s \geq \frac{16n}{\kappa^2}$, $n_t \geq 8 \ln(16|B|)$ and $\theta = 16n_s n_t (1 + \kappa)$. `approxMC_nFBDD_core`(B, n_s, n_t, θ) runs in time $O(|B|^4 n_s^2 n_t^2)$ and returns `Est` with the guarantee*

$$\Pr[\text{Est} \notin (1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(B)|] \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

The probability 1/4 is decreased down to any $\delta > 0$ with the median technique. Thus giving our main result.

Theorem 2. *Let B be an nFBDD over n variables. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. `approxMC_nFBDD`(B, ε, δ) runs in time $O(n^6 |B|^4 (1/\varepsilon)^4 \log(|B|)^2 \log(1/\delta))$ and returns `Est` with the guarantee that*

$$\Pr[\text{Est} \in (1 \pm \varepsilon)|B^{-1}(1)|] \geq 1 - \delta$$

Proof. Let $\widehat{L}_1, \dots, \widehat{L}_m$ be the estimates returned by m independent calls to `approxMC_nFBDD_core`(B, n_s, n_t, θ), with κ, n_s, n_t and θ set as in Lemma 5. Let X_i be the indicator variable that takes value 1 if and only if $\widehat{L}_i \notin (1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(B)|$. Let $\bar{X} = X_1 + \dots + X_m$. By Lemma 5, $\mathbb{E}[\bar{X}] \leq m/4$. Using Hoeffding bound, we have

$$\Pr \left[\text{Median}_{1 \leq i \leq m}(X_i) \notin (1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(B)| \right] = \Pr \left[\bar{X} > \frac{m}{2} \right] \leq \Pr \left[\bar{X} - \mathbb{E}[\bar{X}] > \frac{m}{4} \right] \leq \exp(-m/8) \leq \delta$$

For the running time, `approxMC_nFBDD_core` is actually called on an nFBDD that is complete and alternating, so B is first turned into an equivalent complete and alternating nFBDD B' , with $|B'| = O(n|B|)$. Using Lemma 5, we find that computing a single \widehat{L}_j takes time $O(n^6|B|^4(1/\varepsilon)^4 \log(|B|)^2)$. We just multiply by $m = O(\log(1/\delta))$ and we are done. \square

Algorithm `approxMC_nFBDD_core` has a feature that is not convenient for the analysis, namely, it stops whenever a sample set $S^r(q)$ has size greater than θ . This corresponds to Lines 14 and 15 in `approxMC_nFBDD_core`. Let `approxMC_nFBDD_core*` be the same algorithm without these two lines. So the same algorithm, but it does not stop when $S^r(q)$ grows big. We argue that working with `approxMC_nFBDD_core*` is enough to prove Lemma 5 without the running time requirement. In particular, it will be enough to prove the following two lemmas. For these lemmas and after, B is a complete alternating nFBDD over n variables, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\kappa = \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$, $n_s \geq \frac{16n}{\kappa^2}$, $n_t \geq 8 \ln(16|B|)$ and $\theta = 16n_s n_t(1 + \kappa)$.

Lemma 6. *The probability that `approxMC_nFBDD_core*`(B, n_s, n_t, θ) computes $p(q) \notin (1 \pm \kappa)|M(q)|^{-1}$ for some $q \in B$ is at most $1/8$.*

Lemma 7. *The probability that `approxMC_nFBDD_core*`(B, n_s, n_t, θ) constructs a set $S^r(q)$ with $|S^r(q)| \geq \theta$ for some $q \in B$ and some $r \in [n_s n_t]$ is at most $1/8$.*

Equipped with Lemmas 6 and 7, Lemma 5 follows.

Proof of Lemma 5. For convenience we do some renaming: $\mathcal{A} := \text{approxMC_nFBDD_core}(B, n_s, n_t, \theta)$ and $\mathcal{A}^* := \text{approxMC_nFBDD_core}^*(B, n_s, n_t, \theta)$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{\mathcal{A}} [\text{Est} \notin (1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(B)|] \\ &= \Pr_{\mathcal{A}^*} \left[\bigcup_r \bigcup_q |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \right] + \Pr_{\mathcal{A}^*} \left[\bigcap_r \bigcap_q |S^r(q)| < \theta \text{ and Est} \notin (1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(B)| \right] \\ &\leq \Pr_{\mathcal{A}^*} \left[\bigcup_r \bigcup_q |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \right] + \Pr_{\mathcal{A}^*} [\text{Est} \notin (1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(B)|] \\ &\leq \Pr_{\mathcal{A}^*} \left[\bigcup_r \bigcup_q |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \right] + \Pr_{\mathcal{A}^*} \left[\bigcup_q p(q) \notin \frac{1}{(1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(q)|} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where q ranges over all nodes in B and r ranges in $[n_s n_t]$. Now κ has been set so that $p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$ implies $p(q) \notin \frac{1}{(1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(q)|}$ so, using Lemmas 6 and 7:

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{A}} [\text{Est} \notin (1 \pm \varepsilon)|M(B)|] \leq \Pr_{\mathcal{A}^*} \left[\bigcup_r \bigcup_q |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \right] + \Pr_{\mathcal{A}^*} \left[\bigcup_q p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right] \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

Now we bound the running time of \mathcal{A} . The algorithm stops as soon as a sample set grows in size beyond θ . For each layer $i > 0$ —assuming the algorithm has not stopped yet—when processing $q \in Q^i$ with `DEC_estimateSample` or `OR_estimateSample`, up to $|Q^{i-1}| \theta n_s n_t = O(|Q^{i-1}| n_s^2 n_t^2)$ samples are

processed. For each sample, it is decided whether it survives the **reduce** and whether it survives the **union**. In the **union**, up to $|Q^{i-1}|$ queries of the form $\alpha \in? M(q')$, $q' \in Q^{i-1}$, are done to determine the first child of q of which α is a model. Each query takes time at most $O(|B|)$. So the total running time for processing Q^i is at most $O(|B| \cdot n_s^2 n_t^2 \cdot |Q^i| \cdot |Q^{i-1}|^2)$. So the running time for all $2n + 1$ layers is at most $O(|B|^4 n_s^2 n_t^2)$ \square

It remains to prove Lemmas 6 and 7, that is, to show that the following two probabilities

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{q \in B} p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr \left[\bigcup_{r \in [n_s n_t]} \bigcup_{q \in B} |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \right]$$

are both fewer than $1/8$ when running `approxMC_nFBDD_core*` (B, n_s, n_t, θ) . The next two sections are dedicated to the proof of these upper bounds.

6.1 Proof of Lemma 6

Here we show that, given the guarantees on n_s , n_t and θ from Lemma 6's statement, the event $\bigcup_{q \in B} p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$ occurs with probability at most $1/8$ when running `approxMC_nFBDD_core*` (B, n_s, n_t, θ) .

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{q \in B} p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right] = \Pr \left[\bigcup_i \bigcup_{q \in Q^i} p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right] \quad (2)$$

Claim 1. *The event $\left(\bigcup_i \bigcup_{q \in Q^i} p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right)$ occurs if and only if the event*

$$\left(\bigcup_{i>0} \bigcup_{q \in Q^i} p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \text{ and for all } q' \in Q^{<i}, p(q') \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q')|} \right)$$

occurs

Proof. The “if” direction is trivial. For the other direction, suppose that for a run of the algorithm, we have some q such that $p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$. Let i be the smallest integer such that there is $q \in Q^i$ and $p(q) \notin (1 \pm \kappa)/|M(q)|$. i cannot be 0 because the only nodes in Q^0 are the 1-sink and the 0-sink and $p(q) = 1/|M(q)|$ for the sinks (using that $1/0$ is ∞). So $Q^{<i}$ is defined and, by minimality of i , we have that $p(q') \in (1 \pm \kappa)/|M(q')|$. \square

So the probability (2) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[\bigcup_{i>0} \bigcup_{q \in Q^i} p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \text{ and for all } q' \in Q^{<i}, p(q') \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q')|} \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{i>0} \sum_{q \in Q^i} \Pr \left[p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \text{ and for all } q' \in Q^{<i}, p(q') \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q')|} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Let $P(q)$ be the probability $\Pr \left[p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \text{ and for all } q' \in Q^{<i}, p(q') \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q')|} \right]$. We bound this probability from above in the case where q is a \vee -node and in the case where q is a decision node. The case when $q = ite(x, q_1, q_0)$ is a decision node is easy by construction, if $p(q_0) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q_0)|}$ and $p(q_1) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q_1)|}$ then $p(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$ with probability 1. So there really is only the case q a \vee -node that is not straightforward.

Let $q = q_1 \vee \dots \vee q_k$, we can assume that $M(q_i) > 0$ for all i . First we use the total probability law to introduce the history in the probability. We consider all realizable histories before i and denote by

$H = h$ the event that the history h occurs, that is, the event that the algorithm sets $p(q')$ to $p^h(q')$ for all $q' \in Q^{<i}$.

$$P(q) = \Pr \left[\bigcup_h H = h \text{ and } p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \text{ and for all } q' \in Q^{<i}, p(q') \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q')|} \right]$$

where h ranges over all realizable global histories before layer i . Recall that $q \in Q^i$ so $p^h(q)$ is a random variable but $p^h(q')$ is constant for all $q' \in Q^{\leq i-1}$. Now the probability is the same as

$$P(q) = \Pr \left[\bigcup_h H = h \text{ and } p^h(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \text{ and for all } q' \in Q^{<i}, p^h(q') \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q')|} \right].$$

The probabilities are zero when $p^h(q')$ is not in $(1 \pm \kappa)/|M(q')|$. So let \mathcal{H} be the set of realizable global histories before layer i such that $p^h(q') \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q')|}$ holds for every $q' \in Q^{<i}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P(q) &= \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \Pr \left[H = h \text{ and } p^h(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \text{ and for all } q' \in Q^{<i}, p^h(q') \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q')|} \right] \\ &= \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \Pr \left[H = h \text{ and } p^h(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Let $\rho := \min(p^h(q_1), \dots, p^h(q_k))$. ρ is fixed because all $p^h(q_j)$ s are constant. We have that $p^h(q) = \min(\rho, \hat{\rho})$ for $\hat{\rho}^{-1} = \text{Median}_{0 \leq j < n_t} \left(\frac{1}{\rho \cdot n_s} \sum_{r=j \cdot n_s + 1}^{(j+1)n_s} |\hat{S}^{r,h}(q)| \right)$ where $\hat{S}^{r,h}(q)$ are random variables.

Claim 2. $\hat{\rho} \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$ implies that $p^h(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$.

Proof. If $p^h(q) = \hat{\rho}$ then, trivially, $\hat{\rho} \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$ implies that $p^h(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$. Otherwise if $p^h(q) = \rho$ then $\hat{\rho} \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$ implies that $p^h(q) \leq \hat{\rho} \leq \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$ and, since $h \in \mathcal{H}$ guarantees that $\rho \geq \frac{1 - \kappa}{\max_{j \in [k]} |M(q_j)|} \geq \frac{1 - \kappa}{|M(q)|}$, we have that $p^h(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$. \square

Now the key observation is that the joint distributions $(H, p^H(q), \hat{S}^{r,H}(q))$ and $(H, p^H(q), Z_{q,H}^r)$ are equal (Observation 1). So, for $h \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr \left[H = h \text{ and } p^h(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right] \\ &\leq \Pr \left[H = h \text{ and } p^h(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \text{ and } \text{Median}_{0 \leq j < n_t} \left(\frac{1}{\rho \cdot n_s} \sum_{r=j \cdot n_s + 1}^{(j+1)n_s} |Z_{q,h}^r| \right) \notin \frac{|M(q)|}{1 \pm \kappa} \right] \\ &\leq \Pr \left[\text{Median}_{0 \leq j < n_t} \left(\frac{1}{\rho \cdot n_s} \sum_{r=j \cdot n_s + 1}^{(j+1)n_s} |Z_{q,h}^r| \right) \notin \frac{|M(q)|}{1 \pm \kappa} \mid H = h \right] \Pr[H = h] \\ &= \Pr \left[\text{Median}_{0 \leq j < n_t} \left(\frac{1}{\rho \cdot n_s} \sum_{r=j \cdot n_s + 1}^{(j+1)n_s} |Z_{q,h}^r| \right) \notin \frac{|M(q)|}{1 \pm \kappa} \right] \Pr[H = h] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The last line follows because $Z_{q,h}^r$ is independent of H . So, finally, we can forget about the algorithm and work only in the random process. We bound

$$\Pr \left[\text{Median}_{0 \leq j < n_t} \left(\frac{1}{\rho \cdot n_s} \sum_{r=j \cdot n_s + 1}^{(j+1)n_s} |Z_{q,h}^r| \right) \notin \frac{|M(q)|}{1 \pm \kappa} \right] \quad (6)$$

using Chebyshev's inequality followed by Hoeffding bound. From Lemma 3 we have that $\mu := \mathbb{E}[|Z_{q,h}^r|] = \rho|M(q)|$ for every r .

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^2 &:= \text{Var}[|Z_{q,h}^r|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|Z_{q,h}^r|^2] = \mu + \sum_{\alpha, \alpha' \in M(q), \alpha \neq \alpha'} \Pr[\alpha \in Z_{q,h}^r \text{ and } \alpha' \in Z_{q,h}^r] \\
&= \mu + \sum_{\alpha, \alpha' \in M(q), \alpha \neq \alpha'} \Pr[\alpha \in Z_{q,h}^r \mid \alpha' \in Z_{q,h}^r] \Pr[\alpha' \in Z_{q,h}^r] \\
&\leq \mu + \sum_{\alpha, \alpha' \in M(q), \alpha \neq \alpha'} \frac{\rho^2}{p^h(\text{lcpn}(\text{path}(q, \alpha), \text{path}(q, \alpha')))} \quad (\text{Lemmas 3 and 4})
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{P} = \text{path}(\alpha, q) = (q_\alpha^0, q_\alpha^1, q_\alpha^2, \dots, q_\alpha^{i-1}, q)$, with q_α^0 the 1-sink. For every $\alpha' \in M(q) \setminus \{\alpha\}$, $\mathcal{P}' = \text{path}(\alpha', q)$, $\text{lcpn}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}')$ is one of the q_α^j . Recall that $I(\alpha, q, j)$ is the set of $\alpha' \in M(q)$ such that $\text{lcpn}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}') = q_\alpha^j$.

$$\sigma^2 \leq \mu + \sum_{\alpha \in M(q)} \sum_{j \in [0, i-1]} |I(\alpha, q, j)| \frac{\rho^2}{p^h(q_\alpha^j)} \leq \mu + \rho^2 \sum_{\alpha \in M(q)} \sum_{j \in [0, i-1]} \frac{|M(q)|}{|M(q_\alpha^j)| p^h(q_\alpha^j)} \quad (\text{Lemma 2})$$

Because $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $q_\alpha^j \in Q^{<i}$, we have $|M(q_\alpha^j)| p^h(q_\alpha^j) \geq 1 - \kappa$.

$$\sigma^2 \leq \mu + \frac{\rho^2}{1 - \kappa} \sum_{\alpha \in M(q)} \sum_{j \in [0, i-1]} |M(q)| \leq \mu + \frac{2n\rho^2}{1 - \kappa} \sum_{\alpha \in M(q)} |M(q)| = \mu + \frac{2n\mu^2}{1 - \kappa}$$

Let $W_j := \frac{1}{\rho n_s} \sum_{r=jn_s+1}^{(j+1)n_s} |Z_{q,h}^r|$. By independence of the $Z_{q,h}^r$ for different r we have

- $\mathbb{E}[W_j] = \mu/\rho = |M(q)|$
- $\text{Var}[W_j] = \frac{1}{\rho^2 n_s^2} \sum_{r=1}^{n_s} \text{Var}[|Z_{q,h}^r|] \leq \frac{1}{\rho^2 n_s} \left(\mu + \frac{2n\mu^2}{1 - \kappa} \right) = \frac{1}{n_s} \left(\frac{|M(q)|}{\rho} + \frac{2n|M(q)|^2}{1 - \kappa} \right)$

Now, $W_j \in \frac{|M(q)|}{1 \pm \kappa}$ occurs if and only if $\frac{-\kappa|M(q)|}{1 + \kappa} \leq W_j - |M(q)| \leq \frac{\kappa|M(q)|}{1 - \kappa}$, which is subsumed by $|W_j - |M(q)|| \leq \frac{\kappa|M(q)|}{1 + \kappa}$. So Chebyshev's inequality gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr \left[W_j \notin \frac{|M(q)|}{1 \pm \kappa} \right] &\leq \Pr \left[|W_j - |M(q)|| > \frac{\kappa|M(q)|}{1 + \kappa} \right] \leq \frac{(1 + \kappa)^2}{\kappa^2 |M(q)|^2} \text{Var}(W_j) \\
&\leq \frac{(1 + \kappa)^2}{\kappa^2 n_s} \left(\frac{1}{|M(q)|\rho} + \frac{2n}{1 - \kappa} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{(1 + \kappa)^2}{\kappa^2 n_s} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \kappa} + \frac{2n}{1 - \kappa} \right) \quad \left(\rho \geq \frac{1 - \kappa}{\max_j |M(q_j)|} \geq \frac{1 - \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{4n}{\kappa^2 n_s} \quad \left(\frac{(1 + \kappa)^2}{1 - \kappa} \text{ decreases to } 1 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \quad (n_s \geq 16n/\kappa^2)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds when κ is small enough and n is large enough.

We can now bound the probability (6) from above. Let E_j be the indicator variable taking value 1 if and only if $W_j \notin \frac{|M(q)|}{1 \pm \kappa}$ and let $\bar{E} = \sum_{j=0}^{n_t-1} E_j$. We have $\mathbb{E}[\bar{E}] \leq \frac{n_t}{4}$ so applying Hoeffding bound gives

$$\Pr \left[\text{Median}_{0 \leq j < n_t} (W_j) \notin \frac{|M(q)|}{1 \pm \kappa} \right] = \Pr \left[\bar{E} > \frac{n_t}{2} \right] \leq \Pr \left[\bar{E} - \mathbb{E}(\bar{E}) \geq \frac{n_t}{4} \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{n_t}{8} \right) \leq \frac{1}{16|B|}.$$

where the last inequality uses that $n_t \geq 8 \ln(16|B|)$. Plugging this into (5) and (4), it follows that

$$P(q) \leq \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{16|B|} \Pr[H = h] \leq \frac{1}{16|B|}$$

Finally, using this in (3) and (2) we conclude that

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_i \bigcup_{q \in Q^i} p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right] \leq \frac{1}{16} \quad (7)$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 6.

6.2 Proof of Lemma 7

In this section, the event to avoid is that of some $S^r(q)$ growing too large in size.

$$\Pr \left[\bigcup_{r \in [n_s n_t]} \bigcup_{q \in B} |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \right] \leq \underbrace{\Pr \left[\bigcup_r \bigcup_q |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \text{ and } \bigcap_q p(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right]}_{P_1} + \underbrace{\Pr \left[\bigcup_q p(q) \notin \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right]}_{P_2}$$

We have already shown how to bound P_2 in the previous section so we focus on P_1 :

$$P_1 = \sum_h \Pr \left[H = h \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_r \bigcup_q |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \right) \text{ and } \left(\bigcap_q p^h(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right) \right]$$

where h ranges over all realizable global histories for a complete run of `approxMC_nFBDD_core*`. Since all $p^h(q)$ are constant, we can restrict ourselves to the $h \in \mathcal{H}$, the set of histories such that $p^h(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}$ for all h (otherwise the probability is zero). Using again that $(H, p^H, S^{r,H}(q)) = (H, p^H, Y_{q,p^H,H}^r)$ (Observation 1), P_1 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \Pr \left[H = h \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_r \bigcup_q |Y_{q,p^h,h}^r| \geq \theta \right) \text{ and } \left(\bigcap_q p^h(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \Pr \left[H = h \text{ and } \bigcup_r \bigcup_q |Y_{q,p^h(q),h}^r| \geq \theta \right] \\ &= \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \Pr \left[\bigcup_r \bigcup_q |Y_{q,p^h(q),h}^r| \geq \theta \right] \Pr[H = h] && (Y_{q,t,h}^r \text{ independent of } H) \\ &\leq \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{r,q} \Pr \left[|Y_{q,p^h(q),h}^r| \geq \theta \right] \Pr[H = h] && (\text{union bound}) \\ &\leq \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{r,q} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[|Y_{q,p^h(q),h}^r| \right]}{\theta} \Pr[H = h] && (\text{Markov's inequality}) \\ &\leq \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{r,q} \frac{1 + \kappa}{\theta} \Pr[H = h] && (\text{Lemma 3 and } p^h(q) \in \frac{1 \pm \kappa}{|M(q)|}) \\ &\leq \frac{n_s \cdot n_t \cdot (1 + \kappa) \cdot |B|}{\theta} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{16} \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (7) gives $\Pr \left[\bigcup_{r \in [n_s n_t]} \bigcup_{q \in B} |S^r(q)| \geq \theta \right] \leq P_1 + P_2 \leq \frac{1}{8}$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 7.

References

- [ACJR21a] Marcelo Arenas, Luis Alberto Croquevielle, Rajesh Jayaram, and Cristian Riveros. #NFA admits an FPRAS: efficient enumeration, counting, and uniform generation for logspace classes. *J. ACM*, 68(6):48:1–48:40, 2021.
- [ACJR21b] Marcelo Arenas, Luis Alberto Croquevielle, Rajesh Jayaram, and Cristian Riveros. When is approximate counting for conjunctive queries tractable? In Samir Khuller and Virginia Vassilevska Williams, editors, *STOC '21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21-25, 2021*, pages 1015–1027. ACM, 2021.
- [ACMS20] Antoine Amarilli, Florent Capelli, Mikaël Monet, and Pierre Senellart. Connecting knowledge compilation classes and width parameters. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 64(5):861–914, 2020.
- [GJK⁺97] Vivek Gore, Mark Jerrum, Sampath Kannan, Z. Sweedyk, and Stephen R. Mahaney. A quasi-polynomial-time algorithm for sampling words from a context-free language. *Inf. Comput.*, 134(1):59–74, 1997.
- [KLM89] Richard M. Karp, Michael Luby, and Neal Madras. Monte-carlo approximation algorithms for enumeration problems. *J. Algorithms*, 10(3):429–448, 1989.
- [MCM24] Kuldeep S. Meel, Sourav Chakraborty, and Umang Mathur. A faster FPRAS for #NFA. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data*, 2(2), may 2024.