

Quickly Avoiding a Random Catastrophe

Stav Ashur

Sariel Har-Peled*

March 7, 2025

Abstract

We study the problem of constructing simulations of a given randomized search algorithm `alg` with expected running time $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$, where \mathcal{O} is the optimal expected running time of any such simulation. Counterintuitively, these simulators can be dramatically faster than the original algorithm in getting `alg` to perform a single successful run, and this is done without any knowledge about `alg`, its running time distribution, etc.

For example, consider an algorithm that randomly picks some integer t according to some distribution over the integers, and runs for t seconds. then with probability $1/2$ it stops, or else runs forever (i.e., a catastrophe). The simulators described here, for this case, all terminate in constant expected time, with exponentially decaying distribution on the running time of the simulation.

Luby *et al.* [LSZ93] studied this problem before – and our main contribution is in offering several additional simulation strategies to the one they describe. In particular, one of our (optimal) simulation strategies is strikingly simple: Randomly pick an integer $t > 0$ with probability c/t^2 (with $c = 6/\pi^2$). Run the algorithm for t seconds. If the run of `alg` terminates before this threshold is met, the simulation succeeded and it exits. Otherwise, the simulator repeat the process till success.

1. Introduction

Consider a randomized algorithm `alg`, with running time X (in seconds), where X is a random variable. If the algorithm stops naturally, it had completed a *successful* run. Such randomized algorithms that always succeed but their running time is a random variable are known as *Las Vegas* algorithms. Consider the worst case scenario – all we know is that the probability `alg` is successful is bounded a way from zero. In practice, a failure might be a case where the algorithm just takes longer than what is acceptable (e.g., days instead of seconds).

Example 1.1. Consider an algorithm `alg` with its running time X , such that $\mathbb{P}[X = 1] = 0.01$ (i.e., `alg` terminates after one second with probability $1/100$). Otherwise, it runs forever.

Our purpose is to simulate `alg` such that the simulation has a small (expected) running time, and has a “lighter” tail (i.e., one can prove a concentration bound on the running time of the simulation).

*Department of Computer Science; University of Illinois; 201 N. Goodwin Avenue; Urbana, IL, 61801, USA; sariel@illinois.edu; <http://sarielhp.org/>. Work on this paper was partially supported by NSF AF award CCF-2317241.

The stop and restart model. We assume, that initializing the algorithm is “free”, and we can stop the algorithm’s execution if the runtime exceeds a certain prespecified threshold known as **TTL** (*time to live*). In the simplest settings, all we can do is restart the algorithm and run it from scratch (using fresh randomization, thus the new run is independent of earlier runs) once the TTL is exceeded.

Example 1.2. Consider the `alg` described in [Example 1.1](#), with $\mathbb{P}[X = 1] = 1/100$, and otherwise it runs forever. The optimal simulation strategy here is self evident – run `alg` for a TTL of one second, if it terminates, viola, a successful run was found. Otherwise, terminate it and start a fresh run with the same TTL. Clearly, the running time of this simulation has geometric distribution $\text{Geom}(1/100)$, with expected running time of a 100 seconds. A dramatic improvement over the original algorithm, which most likely would have never terminated.

Of course, in most cases the distribution \mathcal{D} of the running time of `alg` is unknown. The challenge is thus to perform efficient simulation of `alg` without knowing \mathcal{D} . This problem was studied by Luby *et al.* [[LSZ93](#)], who presented an elegant simulation scheme that runs in (expected) $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$ time, where \mathcal{O} is the expected running time of the optimal simulation scheme for the given algorithm. They also prove that no faster simulation is possible.

Time scale. For concreteness, we use seconds as our “atomic” time units, but the discussion implies interchangeability with other units of time. In particular, we consider one second as the minimal running time of `alg`.

Simulation. Here, we consider various simulation schemes of `alg`, where the purpose is to minimize the total running time till one gets a successful run. We consider several different simulation models, starting with a simple “stop and restart” model, and reaching more involved schemes where the simulation creates several copies of the original algorithm and run them in parallel, or dovetail their execution by pausing and resuming their execution.

Relevant literature. The work of Luby *et al.* [[LSZ93](#)] (mentioned above) studied the problem we revisit here. It was inspired in turn by the work¹ of Alt *et al.* [[AGM+96](#)], which provided a simulation strategy to minimize the tail of the distribution of the simulator running time.

Luby and Ertel [[LE94](#)] studied the parallel version of Luby *et al.* [[LSZ93](#)]. They point out that computing the optimal strategy in this case seems to be difficult, but they prove that under certain assumptions a fixed threshold strategy is still optimal. Furthermore, they show that running the strategy of Luby *et al.* on each CPU/thread yields theoretically optimal threshold. Truchet *et al.* [[TRC13](#)] studied the running time in practice and in theory of the algorithm if one simply run the algorithm in parallel. They seems to be unaware of previous relevant work.

The simulation techniques of Luby *et al.* are used in solvers for satisfiability [[GKSS08](#)], and constraint programming [[RBW06](#)]. They are also used in more general search problems, such as path planning [[MAQ23](#)].

More widely, such simulations are related to stochastic resetting [[EMS20](#)], first passage under restart [[PR17](#)], and diffusion with resetting [[TPS+20](#)]. Over simplifying, these can be described as random processes when one restart the process till the system reaches a desired state.

¹Earlier, despite the years in the two references.

The pause and resume model. An alternative, more flexible, model allows us to pause an algorithm’s execution if its running time exceeds a certain threshold, resume its execution for a prespecified time, and repeat this process for as many times as necessary. Thus, one can run several (independent) copies of the original algorithm in “parallel” by dovetailing the iterations between them (for example, by round-robin scheduling the different copies of the algorithm one by one). One can show that any scheme for this model, can be simulated (with a loss of constant factor). by the stop and restart model.

Simulation is for free. We ignore the overhead of running the simulation, as this seems to be negligible compared to the total running time of the algorithm being simulated.

Our contribution. We first describe several known simulation strategies and their performance. This is done to familiarize the reader with the settings, and get some intuition on the problem at hand. These strategies include (a \star indicates optimal strategy):

- (I) **TTL:** If full information about the running time distribution of `alg` is provided, then the optimal strategy is always to rerun the algorithm with the same TTL. This was shown by Luby *et al.* and we rederive it in [Section 2.1](#), for the sake of completeness.

In particular, the optimal threshold t induces a *profile* $(k, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that fully describes the behavior of `alg` with respect to the TTL simulation – specifically, k is the (expected) number of times one has to run `alg` with the optimal threshold t before a successful run is achieved. Importantly, any simulation of `alg` under any strategy must take (in expectation) $\Theta(k t)$ time. The concept of a profile and its properties are presented in [Section 2.2](#), and it provides us with a clean way to think about simulation strategies for `alg`.

- (II) **Exponential search.** In [Section 2.3.1](#) we explore maybe the most natural strategy – exponential search for the optimal threshold TTL. It turns out to be a terrible, horrible, no good strategy in the worst case (but we describe cases where it is decent, and it is maybe the first strategy to try out in practice).
- (III) **Parallel search.** The most lazy approach in practice is to run as many copies of `alg` as there are threads in the system, and stop as soon as one of the copies succeeds. if one runs k copies of `alg`, the expected running time of the simulation behaves like the k th order statistic of the original distribution. While this “bending” of the running time of `alg` does result in a speedup, it is easy to verify that it is not competitive in the worst case.
- (IV) **Counter search (\star).** We next present the optimal simulation strategy of Luby *et al.* [[LSZ93](#)], and prove it indeed takes $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$ expected time. Its name is due to the TTLs to use at every step being fully specified by tracking the bits that change when increasing the value of a binary counter by 1. See [Section 2.3.2](#) for details.
- (V) **$\zeta(2)$ search (\star).** In [Section 3.1.1](#) we describe a random strategy that is strikingly simple: Randomly pick an integer $t > 0$ with probability c/t^2 (with $c = 6/\pi^2$). Use this as the TTL for a run, and repeat the process till success. With high probability this strategy is optimal, see [Lemma 3.1](#).
- (VI) **Random search (\star).** In [Section 3.1.2](#) we describe another random strategy that tries to simulate the “distribution” over the integers formed by the counter search. Informally, the algorithm generates a random binary string of length 2^k (with most significant bit 1) with probability $1/2^k$. All strings of length k have the same probability to be output. We then use the number encoded by the string as the TTL threshold for the run. As usual, this repeats till a successful run is found. This strategy is also optimal, see [Lemma 3.3](#).

- (VII) **Wide search** (\star). In [Section 3.2](#), we suggest another optimal simulation strategy. The basic idea is to run many copies of `alg`, but in different “speeds”, where the i th copy is run at speed $1/i$. This can be achieved by suspending/resuming a run of `alg` as needed.
- (VIII) **X+Cache search** (\star). Maybe the most interesting idea to come out of the wide search strategy is the notion of suspending a process. A natural strategy then is to run any of the other optimal strategies, but whenever a run exceeds its TTL, instead of killing it, we suspend it. Next time a run is needed with a higher TTL, we resume the suspended processes and run it for the remaining desired time. One needs to specify here the size of the cache – i.e., how many suspended processes can one have (as too many suspended processes in practice seems to lead to a degradation in performance, as happens with the wide search). If the cache is full a process is killed as in the original scheme. This is described in detail in [Section 3.3](#). This strategy is optimal if X is one of the above optimal strategies.

2. Basic simulation schemes

Settings and basic definitions. Let $\mathbb{R}^{+\infty}$ denote the set of all real non-negative numbers including $+\infty$. Let `alg` denote the given randomized algorithm — we assume its running time is distributed according to an (unknown) distribution \mathcal{D} over $\mathbb{R}^{+\infty}$. Given a threshold α , and a random variable $X \sim \mathcal{D}$, the **α -median** of \mathcal{D} , denoted by $m_\alpha(X) = m_\alpha(\mathcal{D})$, is the minimum (formally, infimum) of t such that $\mathbb{P}[X < t] \leq \alpha$ and $\mathbb{P}[X > t] \leq 1 - \alpha$. The **median** of \mathcal{D} , denoted by $m(\mathcal{D})$, is the 1/2-median of \mathcal{D} .

Definition 2.1. TTL simulation. We are given a prespecified threshold Δ , `alg` is run with Δ as TTL threshold. Once the running time of this execution exceeds the provided TTL Δ without succeeding, this copy of `alg` is killed and a new copy is started using the same TTL Δ . This continues until a copy of `alg` stops naturally before its execution time exceeds its TTL.

Specifying a simulation strategy. The basic idea is to generate a sequence (potentially implicit and infinite) of TTLs $\mathcal{T} = t_1, t_2, \dots$, and run `alg` using these TTLs one after the other, till a run ends successfully, or its time exceeds its TTL, and then it is killed and a new run starts. The question is, of course, how to generate a sequence that minimizes the expected time till success is encountered. Thus, the strategy of the TTL simulation with threshold Δ , is the sequence $\mathcal{T} = \Delta, \Delta, \dots$

2.1. The optimal strategy is always TTL simulation

Assume we are explicitly given the distribution of the running time of the algorithm `alg`. For concreteness (and simplicity), assume we are given a discrete distribution — with times $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_n$, and corresponding probabilities p_1, \dots, p_n , where p_i is the probability the algorithm stops after exactly s_i seconds.

Let $F_i = \sum_{j=1}^i p_j$. Clearly, an optimal strategy would always set the time threshold to be one of the values of $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$. If the algorithm selects threshold s_i then if this iteration was successful the expected time this final iteration took is $\mu_i = \frac{1}{F_i} \sum_{\ell=1}^i p_\ell s_\ell$. For the strategy that always picks t_i as a threshold, its expected number of iterations till success is $1/F_i$, where the last one is a success iteration for which in expectation we have to only pay μ_i (instead of s_i).

Let \mathcal{O} denotes the expected running time till success under the optimal strategy. As before, if we decide the first threshold should be s_i , then we have

$$\mathcal{O} = F_i \mu_i + (1 - F_i)(s_i + \mathcal{O}) \implies F_i \mathcal{O} = F_i \mu_i + (1 - F_i) s_i \implies \mathcal{O} = \mu_i + \frac{1 - F_i}{F_i} s_i.$$

Lemma 2.2 (Full information settings [LSZ93]). *Let \mathbf{alg} be a randomized algorithm with running time being a random variable $X \in \mathbb{R}^{+\infty}$. The expected running time of \mathbf{alg} using TTL simulation with threshold t is*

$$f(t) = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \leq t] + \frac{\mathbb{P}[X > t]}{\mathbb{P}[X \leq t]} t \leq R(t) \quad \text{where} \quad R(t) = \frac{t}{\mathbb{P}[X \leq t]}.$$

The **optimal threshold** of \mathbf{alg} is $\Delta = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{alg}} = \arg \min_{t \geq 0} f(t)$. The optimal simulation of \mathbf{alg} , minimizing the expected running time, is the TTL simulation of \mathbf{alg} using threshold Δ , and its expected running time is $\mathcal{O} = f(\Delta)$.

Proof: The above readily implies the stated bounds. What might be less clear is why applying the same threshold repeatedly is the optimal strategy. To this end, observe that the process is memoryless – the failure of the first round (which is independent of later rounds) does not change the optimal strategy to be used in the remaining rounds². Thus, the threshold to be used in the second round should also be used in the first round, and vice versa. Thus, all rounds should use the same threshold. \blacksquare

Example 2.3 (Useful). The Riemann zeta function is $\zeta(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 1/i^s$. In particular, $\zeta(2) = \pi^2/6$ (i.e., Basel problem). In particular, consider the scenario that the running time of \mathbf{alg} is a random variable $X \sim \zeta(2)$. That is, $\mathbb{P}[X = i] = c/i^2$, where $c = 6/\pi^2$. This is a special case of the **Zeta distribution**, specifically **$\zeta(2)$ distribution**. The expected running time of \mathbf{alg} is unbounded as $\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ic/i^2 = +\infty$. It is not hard to verify that the minimum of f is realized at $\Delta = 1$, and the expected running time of this TTL simulation is $O(1)$.

Example 2.4 (Not useful). Consider the scenario that the running time is a random variable X that is uniformly distributed in an interval $I = [\alpha, \beta]$, for $\beta \geq \alpha \geq 0$. It is not hard, but tedious, to verify that the optimal threshold is β , which is the same as running the original algorithm till termination.

2.2. Algorithms and their profile

If \mathbf{alg} has optimal threshold $\Delta = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{alg}}$, and $\beta = \mathbb{P}[X \leq \Delta]$. The optimal strategy would rerun \mathbf{alg} (in expectation) $1/\beta$ times, and overall would have expected running time bounded by Δ/β . Since the functions $f(t)$ and $R(t)$ of **Lemma 2.2** are not the same, we need to be more careful.

Definition 2.5. For the algorithm \mathbf{alg} , let X be its running time. The **proxy running time** of \mathbf{alg} with threshold α is the quantity $R(\alpha) = \alpha/\mathbb{P}[X \leq \alpha]$. Let $t = \arg \min_{\alpha > 0} R(\alpha)$ be the optimal choice for the proxy running time. The **profile** of \mathbf{alg} , is the point

$$\text{profile}(\mathbf{alg}) = (1/\rho, t), \quad \text{where} \quad \rho = \mathbb{P}[X \leq t].$$

The total expected **work** associated with \mathbf{alg} is $w_{\mathbf{alg}} = R(t) = t/\rho$.

²This is where we use the full information assumption – we gain no new information from knowing that the first run had failed.

We show below that the optimal simulation strategy, up a constant, for `alg` with profile $(1/\rho, t)$ is to run the TTL simulation with threshold t . In expectation, this requires running `alg` $1/\rho$ times, each for t time. Thus, the work associated with `alg` is the area of the axis aligned rectangle with corners at the origin and $\text{profile}(\text{alg})$. Thus, all the algorithms with the same amount of work α have their profile points on the hyperbola $\mathfrak{h}(\alpha) \equiv (y = \alpha/x)$.

If `alg` has profile $(1/\rho, \Delta)$ then the expected running time of the simulation is determined (roughly) by the minimum k , such that t_1, \dots, t_k contains at least $1/\rho$ numbers at least as large as Δ . In particular, the expected simulation running time is (roughly) $O(\sum_{i=1}^k t_i)$.

Intuitively (but somewhat incorrectly) $f(x)$ and $R(x)$ are roughly the same quantity, and one can thus consider $R(x)$ to be the expected running time of the TTL simulation with threshold x . The following lemma shows that this is indeed the case for the minimums of the two functions, which is what we care about. The proof of this lemma is a bit of a sideshow, and is delegated to the appendix.

Lemma 2.6 (Proof in Appendix B.1). *If `alg` has profile $(1/\rho, t)$, then the optimal simulation of `alg` takes in expectation $\Theta(R(t)) = \Theta(t/\rho)$ time.*

2.3. Simulations using TTL sequences

We now get back to task of designing good simulation strategies. A natural way to figure out all the profiles of algorithms for which the prefix t_1, \dots, t_k (of a sequence \mathcal{T}) suffices in expectation, i.e., `alg` should have a successful run using only these TTLs, is to sort them in decreasing order and interpret the resulting numbers $t'_1 \geq t'_2, \dots, t'_k$ as a bar graph (each bar having width 1). All the profiles under this graph, are “satisfied” in expectation using this prefix. We refer to the function formed by the top of this histogram, as the k -*front* of \mathcal{T} . see Figure 2.1.




Figure 2.1: The work hyperbola for 8 (left) and 16 (right), and their associated sequences S_3 and S_4 .

A key insight is that even if we knew that the profile of `alg` lies on the hyperbola $\mathfrak{h}(\alpha) \equiv (y = \alpha/x)$ (as mentioned above, all these algorithms have the same expected work α), we do not know where it lies on this hyperbola. Thus, an optimal sequence front should sweep over the α -*work hyperbola*

$$\mathfrak{h}(\alpha) = \left\{ (1/\rho, t) \mid t/\rho = \alpha \text{ and } 1 \leq 1/\rho \leq \alpha \right\}$$

more or less in the same time. The question of how to come up with such a strategy is not obvious, and we start with the natural, but wrong, solution.

2.3.1. Exponential search: Simple but not optimal

Consider the situation where the distribution \mathcal{D} of the running time of `alg` is unknown. One can try to estimate the optimal threshold Δ , but the challenge is to simulate `alg` directly, without “wasting” time on learning \mathcal{D} first. Given a parameters $s, \delta \geq 1$, the (s, δ) -*exponential simulation*, uses the TTL sequence $\mathcal{T} = r_1, r_2, \dots$, where $r_i = (1 + \delta)^{i-1} s$ for all $i \geq 1$. The proof of the following is straightforward and is delegated to the appendix.

Lemma 2.7 (Proof in Appendix B.2). (A) Let $m = \mathbb{M}[\mathcal{D}]$ be the median running time of `alg`. The (s, δ) -*exponential simulation*, assuming $s \leq m$ and $\delta \leq 1/2$, has expected running time $O(m(1 + 1/\delta))$.
 (B) *Exponential search can be arbitrarily slower than the optimal simulation.*

2.3.2. Counter search

Here we describe a strategy due to Luby *et al.* [LSZ93] – our exposition is different and is included here for the sake completeness.

In the following, let $\{x\}^y$ be the sequence made out of y copies of x . Fix a value 2^i . We are trying to “approximate” the hyperbola $\hbar(2^i)$ with a sequence whose front roughly coincides with this hyperbola. One way to do so, is to consider a sequence S_i containing the numbers

$$S_i \equiv \{2^i\}^{2^0}, \{2^{i-1}\}^{2^1} \dots \{2^0\}^{2^i} = \{2^i\}^1, \{2^{i-1}\}^2, \{2^{i-2}\}^4, \dots, \{2\}^{2^{i-1}}, \{1\}^{2^i}$$

(not necessarily in this order!). See Figure 2.1.

The intuition for this choice is the following – we might as well round the optimal threshold of the algorithm to the closest (bigger) power of 2, and let ∇ denote this number. Unfortunately, even if we knew that the work of the optimal simulation is $\alpha = 2^i$, we do not know which value of ∇ to use, so we try all possible choices for this value. It is not hard to verify that S_i dominates the work hyperbola $\hbar 2^i$ (for all integral points).

What is not clear is how to generate an infinite sequence that its prefix is S_i if one reads the first $|S_i|$ elements of this sequence, for all i . As Luby *et al.* [LSZ93] suggest, ignoring the internal ordering of S_i , we have that $S_{i+1} = S_i, S_i, 2^{i+1}$, where $S_0 = 1$. Indeed, every number in S_i appears twice as many times in S_{i+1} except for the largest value, which is unique. We have $S_1 = 1, 1, 2$, $S_2 = 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 2, 4$, and so on.

Algorithmically, there is a neat way to generate this *counter simulation* TTL sequence. Let c be an integer counter initialized to 0. To generate the next elements in the sequence, at any point in time, we increase the value of c by one, and add all the numbers 2^i , for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$, that divide c into the sequence. Interpreting c as being represented in base 2, this is equivalent to outputting all the bits have changed by the increment. Thus, the sequence T is the following.

$T \equiv$	1,	1, 2,	1,	1, 2, 4,	1	...
c	1	2	3	4	5	...
c in base 2	00 <u>1</u>	01 <u>0</u>	01 <u>1</u>	<u>1</u> 00	10 <u>1</u>	...

Lemma 2.8 ([LSZ93]). *Running the stop and restart simulation on an algorithm `alg` using the sequence T above results in expected running time $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$, where \mathcal{O} is the expected running time of the optimal simulation for `alg`.*

Proof: Let $S(i, k)$ be the sum of all the appearances of 2^i in first k elements of T_k . For $2^i > 2^j$ (both appearing in the first k elements), we have $S(i, k) \leq S(j, k) \leq 2S(i, k)$, as one can easily verify.

Let $(1/\beta, \Delta)$ be the profile of `alg`, see [Definition 2.5](#). The optimal simulation takes in expectation $\mathcal{O} = \Theta(\Delta/\beta)$ time. Let k be the number of elements of T that were used by the simulation before it stopped. Let B be the number of elements in t_1, \dots, t_k that are at least as large as Δ . Clearly, $B \sim \text{Geom}(\beta)$ (to be more precise it is stochastically dominated by it). Thus, we have $\mathbb{E}[B] \leq 1/\beta$. Furthermore, the quantity $\ell = 1 + \lceil \log_2(B\Delta) \rceil$ is an upper bound on the largest index ℓ such that 2^ℓ appears in t_1, \dots, t_k . An easy calculation shows that $\mathbb{E}[\ell] = O(1 + \log(\Delta/\beta)) = O(\log w_{\text{alg}})$. The total work of the simulation thus is $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell} S(i, k) = O(\ell B \Delta)$, which in expectation is $O(w_{\text{alg}} \log w_{\text{alg}}) = O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$. \blacksquare

3. New strategies

3.1. The random search

A natural approach is to generate the sequence of TTLs using some prespecified distribution, repeatedly picking a value t_i before starting the i th run. This generates a strategy that can easily be implemented in a distributed parallel fashion without synchronization, with the additional benefit of being shockingly simple to describe.

3.1.1. The Zeta 2 distribution

Lemma 3.1. *With probability $\geq 1 - 1/\mathcal{O}^{O(1)}$, the expected running time of a simulation of `alg`, using a TTL sequence sampled from the $\zeta(2)$ distribution of [Example 2.3](#), is $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$, where \mathcal{O} is the minimal expected running time of any simulation of `alg`.*

Proof: Let $(1/\beta, \Delta)$ be the profile of `alg`, and let $L = c \cdot \mathcal{O}^c$, where $\mathcal{O} = \Theta(\Delta/\beta)$ and c is some sufficiently large constant, and let $\mathcal{T}_L = t_1, t_2, \dots, t_L \sim \zeta(2)$ be the random sequence of TTLs used by the simulation. In the following, let $X \sim \zeta(2)$. Clearly, the probability that any of the values in \mathcal{T}_L exceed L^2 is at most $L\mathbb{P}[X \geq L^2] = O(1/L)$ since for $i > 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}[X \geq i] = \sum_{\ell=i}^{\infty} \frac{6/\pi^2}{\ell^2} \leq \frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{\ell=i}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\ell(\ell-1)} = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{\ell=i}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\ell-1} - \frac{1}{\ell} \right) = \frac{6}{\pi^2(i-1)}.$$

A similar argument shows that $\mathbb{P}[X \geq i] \geq \frac{6}{\pi^2 i}$. The event that all the values of \mathcal{T}_L are smaller than L^2 is denoted by \mathcal{G} . Observe that

$$\tau = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \leq L^2] = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}[X \leq L^2]} \sum_{i=1}^{L^2} \frac{6i}{\pi^2 i^2} = O(\log L) = O(\log \mathcal{O}).$$

Since $\mathbb{P}[t_i \geq \Delta] \geq 6/(\pi^2 \Delta)$, the probability that the algorithm terminates in the i th run (using TTL t_i) is at least $\alpha = 6\beta/(\pi^2 \Delta)$. It follows that the simulation in expectation has to perform $M = 1/\alpha = (6/\pi^2)\mathcal{O}$ rounds. Thus, the expected running time of the simulation is $\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{E}[t_i \mid \mathcal{G}] = M\tau = O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$. \blacksquare

3.1.2. Simulating the counter search distribution

Consider a generated threshold as a binary string $b_1 b_2 \dots, b_k$, where the numerical value of this string, is the value it encodes in base two: $t = \sum_{i=1}^k b_i 2^{k-i}$.

Definition 3.2. For a natural number $t > 0$, the number of bits in its binary representation is its *length* – that is, $\ell(t) = 1 + \lfloor \log_2 t \rfloor$.

We generate a random string as follows. Let $s_1 = 1$. Next, in each step the string is finalized with probability $1/2$. Otherwise, a random bit is appended to the binary string, where the bit is randomly chosen between 0 or 1 with equal probability. Let **BIN** the resulting distribution on the natural numbers. Observe that for $R \sim \mathbf{BIN}$, the probability that R length is k (i.e., $\ell(R) = k$) is $1/2^k$, for $k \geq 1$. Also, observe that R has uniform distribution over all the numbers of the same length.

We refer to the random simulation strategy using **BIN** to sampling the TTLs as the *Random Counter* simulation.

Lemma 3.3. *With probability $\geq 1 - 1/\mathcal{O}^{O(1)}$, the expected running time of the Random Counter simulation is $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$.*

Proof: Let $(1/\beta, \Delta)$ be the profile of **alg**, $L = c \cdot \mathcal{O}^c$, where $\mathcal{O} = \Delta/\beta$ and c is some sufficiently large constant, and let $T_L = t_1, t_2, \dots, t_L$ be the random sequence used by the simulation. A value t_i of T_L is *bad* if $t_i \geq L^2$. The probability of T_L containing any bad value is at most L/L^2 , which is polynomially small in $1/\mathcal{O}$. From this point on, we assume all the values of T_L are good, and let \mathcal{G} denote this event.

For $R \sim \mathbf{BIN}$, and any integer number t , we have

$$\frac{2}{t} \geq \frac{1}{2^{\ell(t)-1}} = \mathbb{P}[\ell(R) \geq \ell(t)] \geq \mathbb{P}[R \geq t] \geq \mathbb{P}[\ell(R) > \ell(t)] = \frac{1}{2^{\ell(t)}} \geq \frac{1}{t}. \quad (3.1)$$

Observe that $\mathbb{E}[R \mid \ell(R) = j] = (2^j + 2^{j+1} - 1)/2 \leq 3 \cdot 2^{j-1}$. Furthermore, $\mathbb{P}[R \geq 2^i] = 1/2^{i-1}$, and for $i > j$, we have $\mathbb{P}[\ell(R) = j \mid R < 2^i] = 2^{-j}/(1 - 1/2^{i-1})$. Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[R \mid R < 2^i] = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathbb{E}[R \mid \ell(R) = j] \mathbb{P}[\ell(R) = j \mid R < 2^i] \leq \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{3 \cdot 2^{j-1}}{2^j(1 - 1/2^{i-1})} \leq 3i.$$

In particular, for $i = 1, \dots, L$, we have $\mathbb{E}[t_i] = O(\log \mathcal{O})$ conditioned on \mathcal{G} .

A value t_i of T_L is *final* if $t_i \geq \Delta$, and the running of the i th copy of the algorithm with TTL t_i succeeded. Let X_i be an indicator variable for t_i being final. Observe that

$$p = \mathbb{P}[X_i = 1] = \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{alg} \text{ successful run with TTL } t_i \mid t_i \geq \Delta] \mathbb{P}[t_i \geq \Delta] \geq \beta \cdot \frac{1}{\Delta} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{O}},$$

by Eq. (3.1). The number of values of T_L the simulation needs to use till it hits a success is a geometric variable $\sim \text{Geom}(1/\mathcal{O})$. (Clearly, the probability the algorithm reads all the values of T_L is diminishingly small, and can be ignored.) Thus, the algorithm in expectation reads $1/p = O(\mathcal{O})$ values of T_L , and each such value has expectation $O(\log \mathcal{O})$. Thus, conditioned on \mathcal{G} , the expected running of the simulation is $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$. \blacksquare

3.2. The wide search

Consider running many copies of the algorithm in parallel, but in different speeds. Specifically, the i th copy of **alg**, denoted by A_i , is run in speed $\alpha_i = 1/i$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. So, consider the simulation immediately after it ran A_1 for t seconds so far — here t is the *current time* of the simulation. Thus, at time t the i th algorithm A_i run so far $n_i(t) = \lfloor t/i \rfloor$ seconds. Naturally, the simulation instantiates an algorithm A_i at time i since $n_i(i) = 1$, and then runs it for one second. More generally, the simulation

allocates a running time of one second to a copy of the algorithm A_j at time t such that $n_j(t)$ had increased to a new integral value. Then, A_j is being ran for one second. This simulation scheme can easily be implemented using a heap, and we skip the low-level details.

It is not hard to simulate different speeds of algorithms in the pause/resume model by using a scheduler that allocates time slots for the copies of the algorithm according to their speed.

The wide search starts to be effective as soon as the running time of the first algorithm exceeds a threshold ∇ that already provides a significant probability that the original algorithm would stop with a success, as testified by the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *The wide search simulation described above, executed on \mathbf{alg} with profile $(1/p, \Delta)$, has the expected running time $O\left(\frac{\nabla}{\beta} \log \frac{\nabla}{\beta}\right) = O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$, where \mathcal{O} is the optimal expected running time of any simulation of \mathbf{alg} (here, the i th algorithm is being ran with speed $\alpha_i = 1/i$).*

Proof: Let $T_j = \nabla \lceil j/\beta \rceil$. If we run the first algorithm for T_j time, then the first $\lceil j/\beta \rceil$ algorithms in the wide search are going each to be run at least $T_j/\lceil j/\beta \rceil = \nabla$ time. The probability that all these algorithms failed to terminate successfully is at most $p_j = (1 - \beta)^{\lceil j/\beta \rceil} \leq \exp(-j)$. The total running time of the simulation until this point in time is bounded by

$$S_j = \sum_{i=1}^{T_j} \frac{T_j}{i} = O(T_j \log T_j) = O\left(\frac{\nabla j}{\beta} \log \frac{\nabla j}{\beta}\right).$$

Thus, the expected running time of the simulation is asymptotically bounded by

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} p_j O(S_{j+1}) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} O\left(\exp(-j) \frac{(j+1)\nabla}{\beta} \log \frac{(j+1)\nabla}{\beta}\right) = O\left(\frac{\nabla}{\beta} \log \frac{\nabla}{\beta}\right) = O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O}),$$

as $\mathcal{O} = O(\nabla/\beta)$. ■

For additional results on the wide search, see [Appendix A](#).

3.3. Caching runs

A natural approach suggested by the wide simulation, is to run any of the other simulations based on a sequence of TTLs, but instead of terminating a running algorithm when its TTL is met, we suspended it instead. Now, whenever the algorithm needs to be run for a certain time t_i , we first check if there is a suspended run that can be resumed to achieve the desired threshold. To avoid spamming the system with suspended runs (as the wide search does), we limit the cache of suspended jobs, and kill jobs if there is no space for them in the cache.

This recycling loses some randomness that the original scheme has, but it has the advantage of being faster, as long runs of \mathbf{alg} are not started from scratch.

4. Conclusions

We revisited a paper of Luby *et al.* [LSZ93] studying the problem of how to simulate a Las Vegas algorithm optimally. We described in details their results, and presented several new strategies and proved that they are also optimal. In a companion paper, we carried out extensive testing of these various strategies. This problem is quite interesting from both theoretical and practical points of view, and it surprising that it is not better known in the randomized algorithms literature/community

The benefit of parallelism. A major consideration in practice that one can use many threads/processes in parallel (i.e., we used a computer with 128 threads in our experimental study).

References

- [AGM+96] H. Alt, L. J. Guibas, K. Mehlhorn, R. M. Karp, and A. Wigderson. A method for obtaining randomized algorithms with small tail probabilities. *Algorithmica*, 16(4/5): 543–547, 1996.
- [EMS20] M. R. Evans, S. N. Majumdar, and G. Schehr. Stochastic resetting and applications. *J. Physics A*, 53(19): 193001, 2020.
- [GKSS08] C. P. Gomes, H. Kautz, A. Sabharwal, and B. Selman. Chapter 2 satisfiability solvers. *Handbook of Knowledge Representation*. Ed. by F. van Harmelen, V. Lifschitz, and B. Porter. Vol. 3. Found. Artif. Intel. Elsevier, 2008, pp. 89–134.
- [LE94] M. Luby and W. Ertel. Optimal parallelization of Las Vegas algorithms. *STACS 94, 11th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, Caen, France, February 24-26, 1994, Proceedings*, vol. 775. 463–474, 1994.
- [LSZ93] M. Luby, A. Sinclair, and D. Zuckerman. Optimal speedup of Las Vegas algorithms. *Inform. Process. Lett.*, 47(4): 173–180, 1993.
- [MAQ23] M. Morin, I. Abi-Zeid, and C.-G. Quimper. Ant colony optimization for path planning in search and rescue operations. *Euro. J. Opt. Res.*, 305(1): 53–63, 2023.
- [PR17] A. Pal and S. Reuveni. First passage under restart. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 118(3): 030603, 2017.
- [RBW06] F. Rossi, P. van Beek, and T. Walsh, eds. *Handbook of Constraint Programming*. Vol. 2. Foundations of Artificial Intelligence. Elsevier, 2006.
- [TPS+20] O. Tal-Friedman, A. Pal, A. Sekhon, S. Reuveni, and Y. Roichman. Experimental realization of diffusion with stochastic resetting. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, 11(17). PMID: 32787296: 7350–7355, 2020. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcllett.0c02122>.
- [TRC13] C. Truchet, F. Richoux, and P. Codognet. Prediction of parallel speed-ups for Las Vegas algorithms. *42nd International Conference on Parallel Processing, ICPP 2013, Lyon, France, October 1-4, 2013*, 160–169, 2013.

A. More on the wide search

Here, we present some additional results on the wide search, in particular showing how it leads to an optimal strategy in the stop/restart model (i.e., similar to the counter search). We show that in some cases one can get better expected running time using a different strategy by choosing different “speeds” for the simulation.

A.1. Simulation in the restart model

One can convert a wide-search simulation to a stop/restart simulation. Indeed, consider the pause/resume wide-search simulation – and consider how it handles the i th copy of the algorithm A_i . Every once in a while, the simulator resumes this algorithm and runs it for one second. Assume that the simulator already ran algorithm A_i for t seconds, and wants to resume it. The simulator can simply start from

scratch and run a new copy of the algorithm for $2t$ seconds, where the new copy replaces A_i , and it is dormant till the simulation tries to run A_i pass $2t$ seconds. (This is the standard idea used in implementing $O(1)$ time insertion into an array.) Since the runs performed for a single algorithm A_i are a geometric series, the running time is dominated by the last execution for it, which implies that the total running time of the simulation is proportional to its overall running time. We thus get the following result.

Theorem A.1. *Let alg be a randomized algorithm, and assume that an optimal simulation for alg is able to run alg successfully in expected \mathcal{O} time. Then, the simulation described above, in the stop and restart model, takes $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$ expected time.*

A.2. Improving the expected running time in some cases

Here, we show that in some cases one can do better than $O(\mathcal{O} \log \mathcal{O})$ expected running time.

Assumption A.2. One can choose other sequences of α_s (i.e., specify different speeds for the algorithms being simulated). The natural requirement is that the sequence of α_s is monotonically decreasing, and furthermore, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\alpha_{2i} \geq c\alpha_i$, for some absolute constant c . This implies that the α_s decrease polynomially with i (not exponentially). Specifically, there exists some constant d , such that $\alpha_i = \Omega(1/i^d)$.

Given such a sequence of α_s , let $\alpha^{-1}(t) = \min \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid 1/\alpha_i > t\}$. The total work done by the simulation by time t is

$$W(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha^{-1}(t)} \lfloor t\alpha_i \rfloor.$$

We emphasize that if any of these algorithms succeeds, then the simulation stops³.

The first time when the simulation ran at least k algorithms for t time, is when $n_k(\tau) = t$, which happens when $\tau = t/\alpha_k$ (as A_1, \dots, A_{k-1} all ran for longer by this time). The total work done by the simulation by this time is $W(\tau) = W(t/\alpha_k)$.

Lemma A.3. *Let μ be the expected running time of alg . Then, the expected running time of the simulation is $O(W(\mu))$, and furthermore, for $\psi \geq 1$, the probability that the simulation runs for more than $\Omega(W(2\mu/\alpha_\psi))$ time, is at most $2^{-\psi}$.*

Proof: The time when the simulation run (at least) i algorithms (each) for more than 2μ time, is $\tau_i = 2\mu/\alpha_i$. By Markov's inequality, the probability of A_j to run for more than $\alpha_j\tau_i = 2\mu(\alpha_j/\alpha_i)$ time, before stopping is at most

$$\frac{\mu}{2\mu(\alpha_j/\alpha_i)} = \frac{\alpha_i}{2\alpha_j} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus, the probability the simulation did not stop by time τ_i is at most

$$p_i = \prod_{k=1}^i \frac{\alpha_i}{2\alpha_k} \leq \frac{1}{2^i}.$$

³And declares victory, hmm, success.

Thus, since $\alpha_i \geq c/i^d$, for some constants $c > 0$ and $d > 1$, the expected running time of the simulation is asymptotically bounded by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p_{i-1} W(2\mu/\alpha_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2\mu/\alpha_i} \alpha_{\ell} \frac{2\mu}{\alpha_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2\mu/\alpha_i} \frac{2\mu i^d}{c} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} O(\mu i^d / 2^i) = O(\mu). \quad \blacksquare$$

Thus, for any “reasonable” polynomially decaying sequence $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots$, the expected running time of the resulting simulation is $O(\mu)$. By choosing the sequence more carefully, one can make the tail probability smaller.

Lemma A.4. *Consider an instantiation of the above simulation, where the i th algorithm runs at speed $\alpha_i = 1/(i \log^2 i)$, for $i > 2$, and $\alpha_1 = 1$, $\alpha_2 = 1/2$. Then the expected running time of the simulation is $O(\mu)$. Furthermore, the probability simulation runs for more than $O(u\mu)$ time, for any $u \geq 10$, is at most $1/\exp(\Omega(u/\log^2 u))$.*

Proof: It is easy to verify that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i = O(1)$, and thus, for any $x > 1$, we have $W(x) = O(x)$. Setting $\psi = u/\log^2 u$, we have by [Lemma A.3](#), that the algorithm takes more than $\Omega(W(2\mu/\alpha_{\psi})) = \Omega(u\mu)$ is at most $1/2^{\psi}$, which implies the claim. \blacksquare

B. Proofs

B.1. Proof of [Lemma 2.6](#)

Proof: Let X be the running time of `alg`. The proof is mathematically neat, but the reader might benefit from skipping it on a first read.

Using the notations of [Lemma 2.2](#), let $\Delta = \mathcal{T}_{\text{alg}}$, and let $O(f(\Delta))$ be the expected running time of the optimal simulation of `alg`. Let $\beta = \mathbb{P}[X \leq \Delta]$. [Lemma 2.2](#) implies that the expected running time of the TTL simulation of `alg` with TTL Δ is

$$f(\Delta) = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \leq \Delta] + \frac{1-\beta}{\beta} \Delta \leq \frac{\Delta}{\beta},$$

and $f(\Delta) \leq f(t) \leq R(t) = t/\rho$. So $O(R(t))$ is an upper bound on the expected running time of the optimal simulation of `alg`.

If $\beta \leq \frac{7}{8}$, then $f(\Delta) \geq \frac{1}{8} \Delta / \beta = \frac{1}{8} R(\Delta) \geq \frac{1}{8} R(t) = \Omega(t/\rho)$.

So assume $\beta > \frac{7}{8}$. Let $\mathbf{m} = \mathbb{M}[X \mid X \leq \Delta]$ and $\xi = \mathbb{E}[X \mid X \leq \Delta]$. By Markov’s inequality, we have that $\mathbf{m} \leq 2\xi$. Namely, $f(\Delta) \geq \mathbf{m}/2$. Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}[X \leq \mathbf{m}] = \mathbb{P}[(X \leq \mathbf{m}) \cap (X \leq \Delta)] = \mathbb{P}[X \leq \mathbf{m} \mid X \leq \Delta] \mathbb{P}[X \leq \Delta] \geq \frac{\beta}{2} > \frac{7}{16}.$$

Thus, we have $R(t) \leq R(\mathbf{m}) = \frac{\mathbf{m}}{\mathbb{P}[X \leq \mathbf{m}]} \leq \frac{16}{7} \mathbf{m} \leq 5f(\Delta)$. \blacksquare

B.2. Proof of [Lemma 2.7](#)

Proof: (A) Let $r_i = (1 + \delta)^{i-1} s$, for $i \geq 1$. Let α be the first index such that $r_{\alpha} \geq \mathbf{m}$, and observe that for $i \geq \alpha$, we have that the probability the i th run of the algorithm exceeds its time quota, is at most

$1/2$ (as the running time in this iteration has probability $1/2$ to be below the median). For R being the expected running time of this simulation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[R] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha-1} s(1+\delta)^{i-1} + \sum_{i=\alpha}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{i-\alpha-1}} s(1+\delta)^{i-1} \leq \frac{2m}{\delta} + \frac{2m}{1-(1+\delta)/2} \leq 8m + \frac{2m}{\delta}.$$

(B) Unfortunately, the exponential search simulation can be arbitrarily bad compared to the optimal. Let `alg` be an algorithm that with probability α stops after one second, and otherwise runs forever, where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is some (small) parameter. The optimal strategy here is the fixed search, with $\Delta = 1$ (i.e., rerun `alg` for one second till success) — and it has expected running time $1/\alpha$. Now, consider the $(1, \delta)$ -exponential simulation. Since α is not known to the simulation, we can set to any value such that (say) $\alpha \leq \min(\delta/2, 1/4)$. Observe that $(1 - \alpha)(1 + 2\alpha) = 1 + \alpha - 2\alpha^2 \geq 1 + \alpha/2$. Thus, the expected running time of the $(1, \delta)$ -exponential simulation is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - \alpha)^{i-1} (1 + \delta)^{i-1} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ((1 - \alpha)(1 + 2\alpha))^{i-1} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + \alpha/2) = \infty.$$

Namely, the optimal simulation has finite expected running time, while the exponential simulation running time is unbounded. ■