

# Improved parallel derandomization via finite automata with applications

Jeff Giliberti\*, David G. Harris†

## Abstract

One main genre of algorithmic derandomization comes from the construction of probability distributions with small support that “fool” a randomized algorithm. This is especially well-suited to parallelization, i.e. NC algorithms. A significant abstraction of these methods can be formulated in terms of fooling polynomial-space statistical tests computed via finite automata (Sivakumar 2002); this encompasses  $k$ -wise independence, sums of random variables, and many other properties.

We describe new parallel algorithms to fool general finite-state automata with significantly reduced processor complexity. The analysis is also simplified because we can cleanly separate the problem-specific optimizations from the general lattice discrepancy problems at the core of the automaton-fooling construction.

We illustrate with improved applications to the Gale-Berlekamp Switching Game and to approximate MAX-CUT via SDP rounding.

## 1 Introduction

A fundamental problem in the theory of computation is to *derandomize* existing randomized algorithms. Such randomized algorithms typically use a large number of independent random bits. One main genre of derandomization is to build a probability distribution which is much smaller (of polynomial instead of exponential size), which “fools” the randomized algorithm. That is, the behavior of all relevant statistical properties should be similar when presented with fully-independent random bits vs. bits drawn from a small, carefully-constructed correlated distribution. This probability space can then be searched exhaustively to find a specific input with desired properties.

Such algorithms are especially well-suited to parallelization. In this setting, the goal is to simulate the random algorithm in NC, i.e. with a polylogarithmic runtime and polynomial processor complexity. A simple example of this technique comes from a probability space with  $k$ -wise independence, for constant  $k$  [ABI86, Jof74, KM94, Lub85]. The method of conditional expectation can be used to achieve improved efficiency [Lub93, MNN94, Rag88], pushing up to polylogarithmic  $k$  under certain circumstances [BR91]. One of the reasons behind the wide application of the  $k$ -wise independent framework is that basic statistical properties (e.g. means and variances) are preserved, thereby yielding Chernoff-like concentration bounds [BR94, SSS95].

There are many other types of probability space constructions to fool more-advanced properties, e.g., probability spaces with near- $k$ -wise independence [AGHP92, AMN98, CRS94, EGL<sup>+</sup>92, NN90],

---

\*University of Maryland, email: [jeffgiliberti@umd.edu](mailto:jeffgiliberti@umd.edu). JG gratefully acknowledges financial support by the Fulbright U.S. Graduate Student Program, sponsored by the U.S. Department of State and the Italian-American Fulbright Commission. This content does not necessarily represent the views of the Program.

†University of Maryland, email: [davidgharris29@gmail.com](mailto:davidgharris29@gmail.com)

probability spaces fooling halfspaces or polytopes [KM22, OST20, GMRZ11, GMR<sup>+</sup>12] and so on. Often, the randomized algorithm itself must be significantly modified or “slowed down” to work with these spaces [Har19a].

A significant abstraction of these methods is the construction of probability spaces fooling polynomial-space statistical tests computed via finite randomized automata [BG92, Har19b, KK97, MRS01, Nis90, Nis92, Siv02]. These types of tests are ubiquitous in randomized algorithm analysis, encompassing  $k$ -wise independence, sums of random variables, and many other properties. For example, they are used in deterministic parallel algorithms for finding balanced independent sets in graphs [HMP<sup>+</sup>16], for applications of the Lovász Local Lemma in combinatorics [Har23], for approximately solving covering and packing integer programs [BKNS12, Sri01], for undirected connectivity problems [Nis92], and more.

## 1.1 Our contribution

We describe new parallel algorithms to fool automata, with significantly reduced processor complexity. The analysis is also simplified because we can cleanly separate out problem-specific optimizations from the general lattice discrepancy problems that are at the core of the algorithm.

At a high level, there are two main improvements in our analysis. First, we take advantage of a recent work-efficient algorithm for near-optimal solutions to general lattice discrepancy problems [GG24, GGR23]. Second, we introduce a new notion of absolute weighted error, measured in terms of function Lipschitz value.

It will require several preliminary definitions to describe how these automata work and the error bounds to use. However, we can provide a summary of our algorithm performance as follows:

**Theorem 1.1** (Simplified). *Consider a probability space on  $n$  binary variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , and weighted automata  $F_1, \dots, F_z$ , each with state space of size at most  $\eta$  and Lipschitz value  $\lambda$ , that read in the input variables in the same order.*

*The algorithm FOOL produces a distribution  $D$  simultaneously fooling the automata to absolute weighted error  $\lambda\varepsilon$  using  $\tilde{O}(nz\eta\varepsilon^{-2} + nz\eta^{2.38})$  processors and polylogarithmic time.*

By way of comparison, the algorithm of [Har19b] would require roughly  $O(n^3 z^2 \eta^4 \varepsilon^{-2})$  processors. Our full results are more general, easily allowing for non-binary alphabets, automata with different state space sizes, or special computational structure in the automaton transition matrices; see [Theorem 5.3](#) for details.

We illustrate this framework through two prototypical applications: the Gale-Berlekamp Switching Game and SDP rounding for approximate MAX-CUT.

**Theorem 1.2** (Gale-Berlekamp Switching Game). *Given an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$ , there is an algorithm running in  $\tilde{O}(n^{3.5})$  processors and polylogarithmic time to find  $x, y \in \{-1, +1\}^n$  satisfying  $\sum_{i,j} A_{i,j} x_i y_j \geq (\sqrt{2/\pi} - o(1))n^{3/2}$ .*

It is interesting that the Gale-Berlekamp analysis revolves around *anti-concentration* bounds, which are precisely the opposite discrepancy-minimization. Our algorithm for this problem beats the complexity of the optimized algorithm of [Har19b] which required  $n^{5+o(1)}$  processors.

**Theorem 1.3** (MAX-CUT SDP Rounding). *Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be an arbitrary constant. Given an  $n$ -vertex  $m$ -edge graph  $G(V, E)$ , there is an algorithm running in  $\tilde{O}(mn^3)$  processors and polylogarithmic time that finds an  $\alpha(1 - \varepsilon)$  approximate MAX-CUT of  $G$ , where  $\alpha \approx 0.878$  is the Goemans-Williamson approximation constant [GW95].*

An  $(1 - \varepsilon)$  solution to the SDP relaxation of MAX-CUT for constant  $\varepsilon$  can be obtained in polylogarithmic time and near-linear work from the algorithm of [AZLO16], so we will be concerned with rounding the SDP solution via our automata framework. A rounding procedure was presented in [Siv02], which however requires a very large number of processors. Here, we drastically improve the processor complexity, getting closer to the *sequential*  $\tilde{O}(n^3)$  runtime of [BK05].

Although the new algorithms are still not fully work-efficient, this makes progress toward practical algorithms in these settings.

## 2 Preliminaries

We focus on the deterministic PRAM model. For an input of size  $N$ , our goal throughout is to develop algorithms with  $\text{poly}(N)$  processor complexity and  $\text{polylog}(N)$  runtime. We say an algorithm has *polylogarithmic time* if its time complexity is polylogarithmic in its processor and input complexity. We use the  $\tilde{O}$  notation: we say a quantity is  $\tilde{O}(g(x))$  if it has size at most  $g(x) \cdot \text{polylog}(N, g(x))$  processors, where  $N$  is the size of all algorithm inputs.

Since we are not aiming to precisely minimize the runtime, we will not be concerned with the precise details of the PRAM model (e.g. whether it uses shared or exclusive write access, etc.)

Throughout, we use  $\log$  for logarithm in base  $e$  and  $\lg$  for base 2. We always assume  $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ .

We write  $\lceil x \rceil$  for rounding to the nearest integer.

### 2.1 Notation and Automaton Fooling Basics

The underlying probability space  $\Omega$  is defined by drawing a sequence  $\vec{r} = (r_0, \dots, r_{n-1})$ , wherein each  $r_t$  is independently drawn from a probability distribution  $\Omega_t$  over an arbitrary alphabet. We consider an automaton  $F$  with a state space  $S$ . This automaton processes the input  $\vec{r}$  in order; at each timestep  $t$ , the automaton in state  $s \in S$  receives an input  $r_t$  and transitions to state  $F(r_t, s)$ .

For a pair of values  $(t, h)$ , we define  $\Omega_{t,h} = \Omega_t \times \Omega_{t+1} \times \dots \times \Omega_{t+h-1}$  to be the associated probability space on input sequences  $\vec{r} = (r_t, r_{t+1}, \dots, r_{t+h-1})$ . In this context, we denote  $h$  as the *horizon*,  $(t, h)$  as the *window*, and vector  $\vec{r}$  as a *drivestream*. We define  $F(\vec{r}, s)$  to be the result of transiting from time  $t$  to  $t + h$  under  $\vec{r}$ .

We write  $\vec{r} \in \Omega_{t,h}$  to indicate that  $r$  has non-zero probability under  $\Omega_{t,h}$ . We say a pair  $(s', t')$  is *reachable* from position  $(s, t)$  if there exists  $\vec{r} \in \Omega_{t, t'-t}$  with  $s' = F(\vec{r}, s)$ ; we denote by  $\text{Reach}(s, t)$  the set of such pairs reachable from  $(s, t)$ .

Throughout, we define  $\eta = |S|$  and  $\sigma = \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} |\Omega_t|$  where  $|\Omega_t|$  is the size of the support of  $\Omega_t$ .

**Measurement of Distribution Error:** Our goal is to find a polynomial-size distribution  $\tilde{D}$  on drivestreams that “fools” the automaton. That is, the behavior of the automaton when presented with  $\vec{r} \sim \tilde{D}$  on any starting state should be close to when  $\vec{r}$  is drawn from the fully independent distribution  $\Omega_{0,n}$ .

For a distribution  $D$  on drivestreams, we denote the *transition matrix* as  $T_D$ , i.e.  $T_D(s, s')$  is the probability of transiting from state  $s$  to  $s'$  for a drivestream  $\vec{r} \sim D$ . (We follow the convention that the window  $(t, h)$  is determined from  $D$ .) For brevity, we also write  $T_{t,h} := T_{\Omega_{t,h}}$ .

With some abuse of notation, for any weight function  $w : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we also define

$$T_D(s, w) = \sum_{s' \in S} T_D(s, s') w(s').$$

We can define the “sensitivity” of a weight function  $w$  to the underlying drivestream values over

a window  $(t, h)$ , by:

$$\alpha(s, w, t, h) := \max_{\vec{r} \in \Omega_{t,h}} w(F(\vec{r}, s)) - \min_{\vec{r} \in \Omega_{t,h}} w(F(\vec{r}, s))$$

For our purposes, we will measure error via a weight function  $W : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  over final states. Given this weight function  $W$ , we define the “expected value” weight vector at time  $t$  by

$$V_t(s) = T_{t,n-t}(s, W)$$

We define the *total sensitivity*  $\rho(u)$  of a starting state  $u \in S$  as:

$$\rho(u) := \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \max_{(s,t) \in \text{Reach}(u,0)} \alpha(s, V_{t+1}, t, 1)$$

With all these rather technical definitions, we can state the goal of our algorithms as follows: we want to find a distribution  $D$  such that, for every state  $s$ , there holds

$$|T_D(s, W) - T_\Omega(s, W)| \leq \varepsilon \rho(s)$$

The definition of  $\rho$  is similar to the definition in McDiarmid’s inequality and other concentration bounds for the Doob martingale. For example, the following definition is familiar:

**Definition 2.1** (Lipschitz expectations). *Let  $\vec{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . The weight function  $W$  is  $\vec{\lambda}$ -Lipschitz if*

$$\alpha(s, t, V_{t+1}, 1) \leq \lambda_t$$

for all  $s, t$ ; that is, the maximum change in the expected weight of the final state caused by a change in the  $t^{\text{th}}$  drivestream input is at most  $\lambda_t$ .

In this context, we say that the total Lipschitz value, denoted  $\lambda_{tot}$ , is  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$ .

We say that  $W$  is  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz, for a scalar value  $\lambda$ , if it is  $\vec{\lambda}$ -Lipschitz for the constant vector  $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda, \lambda, \dots, \lambda)$ .

**Observation 2.2.** *Suppose that, for all states  $s$  and all drivestreams  $\vec{r}_a$  and  $\vec{r}_b$  which agree on all but the  $i^{\text{th}}$  coordinate, we have  $|W(F(\vec{r}_a, s)) - W(F(\vec{r}_b, s))| \leq \lambda_i$ . Then  $W$  is  $\vec{\lambda}$ -Lipschitz and  $\rho(s) \leq \lambda_{tot}$  for all states  $s$ . This gives  $|T_D(s, W) - T_\Omega(s, W)| \leq \varepsilon \lambda_{tot}$ .*

We emphasize that our use of “weighted” error gives a *weaker* notion of automata-fooling than had been considered in prior works [Har19b, MRS01], where the goal was to fool the entire spectrum of output states; however, this notion of fooling seems to cover most known applications and leads to significantly simpler and more efficient fooling algorithms.

## 2.2 Comparison with other automaton models

Our automaton model is slightly different from some of the other models that have appeared in previous algorithms. Overall, our model is significantly more general and flexible. We should highlight a few key differences and how to handle them in our framework.

- **Nonuniform probability spaces:** In other papers (e.g. [MRS01, Siv02]), the underlying probability space was assumed to be independent unbiased bits, i.e.  $\Omega$  is the uniform distribution on  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . Via quantization, it is possible to simulate other input distributions using unbiased bits, but this can lead to much higher processor complexities. It may also require some problem-specific

arguments for measuring the quantization error. Our framework, where the independent distributions  $\Omega_t$  are not uniform and not identical, can simplify many of these constructions. For example, in our application to MAX-CUT (Section 7.2), we can directly deal with Gaussian random variables vs. simulating them through Binomial distributions as in [Siv02].

- **Multiple automata:** In typical applications, we have  $z$  separate “statistical tests” to run on the data, and we want a distribution fooling them all simultaneously. Concretely, suppose that for each  $i = 1, \dots, z$  there is a separate automaton  $F_i$  on a state space  $S_i$ , with its own weight function  $W_i$ . This automaton begins at a designated start state  $0_i$  and proceeds through the input stream. Crucially here, all these automata must read the data in the same order  $r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}$ .

We can encode the multiple automata into a single large automaton, with state space  $S = \{(i, s) : s \in S_i\}$ . Note that states  $(i, s)$  will never mix with states  $(i', s')$  for  $i' \neq i$ . This single automaton will have state space of size  $\eta = \sum_i |S_i|$ . Thus, in our framework, it will suffice throughout to consider just a *single* automaton.

- **Leveled automata:** Previous constructions of automata were often allowed to have additional clock inputs; that is, the automaton received input  $F(\vec{r}, s, t)$  at each time  $t$ . The transition rule could depend in an arbitrary way on  $t$ . This is sometimes called a “leveled automaton”.

We will use a different approach: we can allow the alphabet to also include a clock information, if desired. Thus, for instance,  $\Omega_t$  may be supported on tuples  $(t, \vec{r})$  where  $\vec{r}$  comes from some fixed alphabet. The automaton would then know the time  $t$  upon receiving an input  $(t, \vec{r}) \in \Omega_t$ . In this way, our framework can handle leveled automata with no losses.

## 2.3 Lattice Approximation

The problem of automata fooling is closely linked to lattice approximation, defined as follows:

**Definition 2.3** (Lattice Approximation Problem). *Given an  $m \times n$  matrix  $A$  and a fractional vector  $\vec{u} \in [0, 1]^n$ , the objective is to compute an integral vector  $\vec{v} \in \{0, 1\}^n$  to minimize the discrepancies  $D_k = |\sum_{j=1}^n A_{kj}(u_j - v_j)|$ .*

Intuitively, we use the lattice problem to model the process of converting each random bit (represented by the  $u_j$ 's) to a static zero or one bit according to the lattice solution (represented by the  $v_j$ 's). The work [GG24] provides a parallel algorithm for the lattice approximation problem with near-optimal discrepancy as well as complexity; we summarize it as follows:

**Theorem 2.4** (Theorem 1.3 of [GG24]). *Suppose that  $A_{kj} \in [0, 1]$  for all  $k, j$ . There is a deterministic parallel algorithm that solves the lattice approximation problem with  $D_k \leq O(\sqrt{\mu_k} \log m + \log m)$  for all  $k$ , where  $\mu_k = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kj} u_j$ . The algorithm uses  $\tilde{O}(n + m + nnz(A))$  processors and polylogarithmic time, where  $nnz(A)$  denotes the number of non-zero entries in the matrix  $A$ .*

For our purposes, it will be convenient to use a slight extension of Theorem 2.4 which allows for the discrepancy matrix  $A$  to take arbitrary real values.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $\Delta_k = \max_j |A_{kj}|$  for each row  $k$ . There is a deterministic parallel algorithm that solves the lattice approximation problem where  $D_k \leq O(\sqrt{\Delta_k \tilde{\mu}_k} \log m + \Delta_k \log m)$  for all  $k$ , where  $\tilde{\mu}_k = \sum_{j=1}^n |A_{kj}| \min\{u_j, 1 - u_j\}$ . The algorithm uses  $\tilde{O}(n + m + nnz(A))$  processors and polylogarithmic time.*

*Proof.* First, for any value  $u_j > \frac{1}{2}$ , let  $\tilde{u}_j = 1 - u_j$  and  $a'_{kj} = -A_{kj}$ ; otherwise let  $\tilde{u}_j = u_j$ ,  $a'_{kj} = A_{kj}$ . Next, construct a  $2m \times n$  matrix  $\tilde{A}$ , where for each row  $k = 0, \dots, m - 1$  of  $A$ , the matrix  $\tilde{A}$  has  $\tilde{A}_{2k,j} = \max\{0, \frac{A_{kj}}{\Delta_k}\}$  and  $\tilde{A}_{2k+1,j} = \max\{0, \frac{-A'_{kj}}{\Delta_k}\}$ . Finally apply Theorem 2.4 to  $\tilde{A}$  and  $\tilde{u}$ .  $\square$

For many cases, it suffices to use the simple inequality  $\tilde{\mu}_k \leq n\Delta_k$  to get a cruder bound.

**Corollary 2.6.** *The algorithm of Proposition 2.5 gives  $D_k \leq O(\Delta_k \sqrt{n} \log m)$  for all  $k$ .*

### 3 Automata Fooling Algorithms

The automata-fooling procedure consists of two procedures: REDUCE (Section 4) and FOOL (Section 5). The procedure FOOL solves the problem in a bottom-up fashion by relying on REDUCE.

The technical core of the automata-fooling procedure is the subroutine REDUCE: given an input distribution  $E$  of window  $(t, h)$  and a weight function  $w : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the REDUCE subroutine returns an explicitly-described distribution  $D$  which is close to  $E$  (measured in terms of  $w$ ), but has much smaller support. Importantly, the input distribution  $E$  is not necessarily presented explicitly; instead, we assume that we can compute certain marginal transition probabilities. Thus, the overall complexity may end up being much smaller than the cost of directly reading the distribution  $E$ .

#### 3.1 Definitions for representing distributions

In order to work concretely with distributions, we need to define precisely how they are represented and stored. Formally, we view a distribution  $D$  over drivestreams as an array  $D[0], \dots, D[\ell - 1]$  with associated probabilities  $p_D(0), \dots, p_D(\ell - 1)$  with  $p_D(0) + \dots + p_D(\ell - 1) = 1$ , where  $\ell$  is the size of  $D$  denoted by  $|D| = \ell$ . We always assume that  $D$  is associated with a fixed window  $(t, h)$ , and each entry  $\vec{r} = D[i]$  is a sequence in  $\Omega_{t, h}$ .

We assume without loss of generality that  $|D|$  is a power of two (adding dummy zero entries if needed). Consequently, the elements (drivestreams) of  $D$  can be indexed by a bitstring  $b$  of length  $\text{len}(D) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lg |D|$ . With some abuse of notation, we write the elements of distribution  $D$  as a multiset  $\{D[0], \dots, D[\ell - 1]\}$  and write  $p_D(b)$  instead of  $p_D(i)$  with  $b$  being the bit representation of  $i$ . (It is a multiset since the entries  $D[i]$  are not necessarily distinct.)

One important computational task is to compute  $F(\vec{r}, s)$  for a given drivestream  $\vec{r}$  and state  $s$ . We summarize this as follows:

**Observation 3.1.** *Given a drivestream  $\vec{r} = (r_t, \dots, r_{t+h-1})$ , we can compute all values  $F(\vec{r}, s) : s \in S$  using a total of  $\tilde{O}(\eta h)$  processors and polylogarithmic time.*

*Proof.* We do this recursively: we compute this table for time  $t$  and  $t + h/2$  with drivestreams  $\vec{r}_1 = (r_t, \dots, r_{t+h/2-1})$ ,  $\vec{r}_2 = (r_{t+h/2}, \dots, r_{t+h-1})$ . Then, we compute  $F(\vec{r}, s) = F(\vec{r}_2, F(\vec{r}_1, s))$  in parallel for all  $s$ .  $\square$

#### 3.2 Partial bitstrings

We say that a bitstring  $b$  of length shorter than  $\text{len}(D)$  is a *partial bitstring*. For a partial bitstring  $b$ , we denote by  $D[b^*]$  the induced distribution consisting of all the drivestreams in  $D$  whose indices start with  $b$ , so  $D[b^*] = D[b0^*] \cup D[b1^*]$ , where  $b0$  and  $b1$  refer to concatenating a 1 or 0 bit to  $b$ . Similarly, we define  $p_D(b^*)$  to be the probability of choosing a drivestream from  $D$  whose index starts with  $b$ , i.e.  $p_D(b^*) = \sum_{a \in D[b^*]} p_D(a)$ .

A crucial task for our algorithm is to compute certain conditional probabilities for distributions. We define the *Prediction Problem* for a distribution  $D$  and a weight function  $w : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows: we need to produce a data structure  $\mathcal{Q}(D, w)$ , which can answer the following two types of queries: (i) given any partial bitstring  $b$ , return the value  $p_D(b^*)$ ; (ii) given  $(b, s)$  where  $b$  is a partial bitstring and  $s$  is a state, return the value  $T_{D[b^*]}(s, w)$ . Each query should take polylogarithmic time and processors. In either case,  $b$  can take on any length  $\ell \leq \text{len}(D)$ .

**Observation 3.2.** *The Prediction Problem for a horizon- $h$  distribution  $D$  and a weight function  $w$  can be solved with  $\tilde{O}(|D|h\eta)$  processors and polylogarithmic time.*

*Proof.* To support query of type (i), for each partial bitstring  $b$ , we can look up all the corresponding distribution entries  $p_D(a)$  with  $a \in [b^*]$ . Since each distribution entry appears in  $\text{len}(D)$  partial bitstrings, this computation takes  $\tilde{O}(|D|)$  processors.

To support queries of type (ii), for each entry  $\vec{r} = D[a]$  and every state  $s$ , we use [Observation 3.1](#) to determine  $s' = F(\vec{r}, s)$  and add the contribution  $p_{D[b^*]}(a)w(s')$  for every prefix  $b$  of  $a$ .  $\square$

Critically, we can use the structure within a distribution to avoid materializing it explicitly. The most important case is for a Cartesian product. This result will be used later in [Section 5](#).

**Proposition 3.3.** *Given distributions  $D^1, D^2$  of horizons  $h$  and start times  $t_1, t_2 = t_1 + h$  respectively, the Prediction Problem for distribution  $E = D^1 \times D^2$  and any weight function  $w$  can be solved with  $\tilde{O}(\eta h(|D^1| + |D^2|))$  processors and polylogarithmic time.*

*Proof.* First, we use [Observation 3.1](#) to compute the values  $F(\vec{r}, s)$  for all states  $s$  and drivestreams  $\vec{r} \in D^1$ . This step takes  $\tilde{O}(|D^1|h\eta)$  processors. Then, we use [Observation 3.2](#) to solve the Prediction Problem for  $D^2, w$ , using  $\tilde{O}(|D^2|h\eta)$  processors. Using  $\mathcal{Q}(D^2, w)$ , we compute the weight function

$$w_2(s) = T_{D^2}(s, w).$$

and we finally apply [Observation 3.2](#) a second time to solve the Prediction Problem for  $D^1, w_2$ .

Let  $L_1 = \text{len}(D^1)$ . Now consider a bitstring  $b$  of some length  $\ell$ . If  $\ell \leq L_1$ , then we have

$$p_E(b^*) = p_{D^1}(b^*), \quad T_{E[b^*]}(s, w) = T_{D^1[b^*]}(s, w_2)$$

for any state  $s$ ; such queries can be answered using the data structure  $\mathcal{Q}(D^1, w_2)$ . Otherwise, if  $\ell > L_1$ , then let  $b = (b_1, b_2)$  where  $b_1$  has length  $L_1$  and  $b_2$  has length  $\ell - L_1$ . We have

$$p_E(b^*) = p_{D^1}(b_1) \cdot p_{D^2}(b_2^*), \quad T_{E[b^*]}(s, w) = T_{D^2[b_2^*]}(F(D^1[\vec{b}_1], s), w)$$

which can be computed by using the data structure  $\mathcal{Q}(D^2, w)$  and the values  $F(\vec{r}, s) : \vec{r} \in D^1$ .  $\square$

## 4 The REDUCE Algorithm

The goal of the REDUCE algorithm ([Algorithm 1](#)) is to take an input distribution  $E$  and weight function  $w$ , and produce a smaller distribution  $D$  which is close to it.

For intuition, consider the following randomized process. Draw  $m$  elements  $D[0], \dots, D[m-1]$  independently with replacement from the support of the distribution  $E$ , wherein  $D[i] = v$  is selected with probability proportional to  $p_E(v)$ . Then set  $p_D[i] = 1/m$ , so the process is unbiased. Via standard concentration bounds, appropriate choices of  $m$  ensure that  $T_D(s, w) \approx T_E(s, w)$ .

The algorithm REDUCE is based on derandomizing this process via a slowed-down simulation. We compute the final distribution  $D$  in  $B = \text{len}(E)$  steps. Concretely, our algorithm iteratively computes distributions  $D_0, D_1, \dots, D_B$  by fixing the  $i^{\text{th}}$  bit level of each entry in  $D_{i-1}$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** REDUCE( $E, \varepsilon, w$ )

---

- 1: Set  $B = \text{len}(E)$  and  $m = \frac{CB^2 \log \eta}{\varepsilon^2}$  for a constant  $C$ .
  - 2: Solve Prediction Problem for distribution  $E$
  - 3: Initialize  $H_0 := \{m \text{ empty bitstrings}\}$
  - 4: **for**  $i = 1, \dots, B$  **do** ▷ Fix  $i^{\text{th}}$  bit
  - 5:     Formulate Lattice Problem  $\mathcal{L}$  for  $H_{i-1}$ .
  - 6:      $\vec{v} \leftarrow$  solve  $\mathcal{L}$  via **Proposition 2.5** with sampling rate  $u_b = \frac{p_E(b1^*)}{p_E(b^*)}$  for each  $b \in H_{i-1}$
  - 7:      $H_i \leftarrow H_{i-1} \vec{v}$  ▷ Concatenate vector  $\vec{v}$  as  $i^{\text{th}}$  bit level
  - 8: **parfor**  $j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$  **do** ▷ Convert bitstring (index) to drivestream (value)
  - 9:     Set  $D[j] = E[H_B[j]]$  and set probability  $p_D[j] = 1/m$ .
  - return**  $D$
- 

In this algorithm, each  $H_i$  is a multi-set consisting of  $m$  bitstrings  $H_i[0], \dots, H_i[m-1]$  of length  $i$ . Note that, after solving the Prediction Problem for  $E$ , the sampling values  $u_b$  at Line 6 can all be determined.

The following is our main result analyzing the algorithm:

**Theorem 4.1.** *The algorithm REDUCE runs in  $\tilde{O}((h+\eta)/\varepsilon^2)$  processors and polylogarithmic time, plus the cost of solving the prediction problem for  $E$ . The final distribution  $D$  is uniform with size  $O(\varepsilon^{-2} \log \eta \log^2 |E|)$ . For large enough constant  $C$ , the distribution  $D$  satisfies*

$$|T_D(s, w) - T_E(s, w)| \leq \varepsilon \alpha(s, w, t, h) \quad \text{for each state } s$$

*Proof.* Let us fix  $E, w$ ; for brevity, we write  $\alpha_s := \alpha(s, w, t, h)$  for each state  $s$ .

For each iteration  $i$ , consider a distribution  $D_i$  derived by drawing a bitstring  $b \in H_i$  uniformly at random, and then returning a drivestream drawn from  $E[b^*]$ . In particular,  $D_0 = E$  and  $D_B = D$  is precisely the distribution returned by REDUCE. In each iteration, we aim to ensure that

$$|T_{D_i}(s, w) - T_{D_{i-1}}(s, w)| \leq \varepsilon \alpha_s / B; \tag{1}$$

at the end, this will give us  $|T_D(s, w) - T_E(s, w)| = \sum_{i=1}^B |T_{D_i}(s, w) - T_{D_{i-1}}(s, w)| \leq \varepsilon \alpha_s$  as desired.

We now proceed to analyze each step. Define  $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H_i$  and  $\tilde{H} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H_{i-1}$ , along with corresponding distributions  $D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_i$  and  $\tilde{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{i-1}$ . Here,  $\tilde{H}$  has the first  $i-1$  bit levels fixed, and  $H$  is obtained by fixing the  $i^{\text{th}}$  bit level, that is, appending one bit  $v_b$  to each bitstring  $b$  in  $\tilde{H}$ . Since  $\tilde{D}$  is uniform on  $\tilde{H}$ , we have the following equation for every state  $s$ :

$$T_{\tilde{D}}(s, w) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{b \in \tilde{H}} T_{E[b^*]}(s, w).$$

We expose the choice of the next bit in  $\tilde{D}$  and  $D$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\tilde{D}}(s, w) &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{b \in \tilde{H}} \left[ \frac{p_E(b1^*)}{p_E(b^*)} \cdot T_{E[b1^*]}(s, w) + \frac{p_E(b0^*)}{p_E(b^*)} \cdot T_{E[b0^*]}(s, w) \right] \\ T_D(s, w) &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{b \in \tilde{H}} [v_b \cdot T_{E[b1^*]}(s, w) + (1 - v_b) \cdot T_{E[b0^*]}(s, w)]. \end{aligned}$$



Thus we can calculate the difference between probabilities for  $D$  and  $\tilde{D}$  as:

$$T_{D_i}(s, w) - T_D(s, w) = \frac{1}{m} \left( \sum_{b \in \tilde{H}} \left( \frac{p_E(b1^*)}{p_E(b^*)} - v_b \right) (T_{E[b1^*]}(s, w) - T_{E[b0^*]}(s, w)) \right). \quad (2)$$

In light of the bound (2), we apply [Proposition 2.5](#), where each state  $s$  corresponds to a constraint row  $k$  with entries

$$A_{kb} = T_{E[b1^*]}(s, w) - T_{E[b0^*]}(s, w),$$

and with  $u_b = \frac{p_E(b1^*)}{p_E(b^*)}$  for all  $b$ . All these values have been computed from the Prediction Problem for  $E$ . Furthermore, since the maximum spread of the values  $w(F(\vec{r}, s))$  over all possible choices of  $\vec{r}$  is at most  $\alpha_s$ , we have

$$\Delta_k = \max_b |A_{kb}| \leq \alpha_s$$

Since the matrix has  $\eta$  rows and  $m$  columns, [Corollary 2.6](#) with our choice of  $m$  gives:

$$\frac{1}{m} |T_{D_i}(s, w) - T_D(s, w)| \leq O\left(\frac{\alpha_s \sqrt{m} \log \eta}{m}\right)$$

which is at most  $\varepsilon \alpha_s / B$  by our choice of  $m$ .

This concludes the construction of  $H$  from  $\tilde{H}$ . It is evident that, after solving the Prediction Problem for  $E$ , the Lattice Approximation Problem can be generated using  $O(\eta m)$  processors.  $\square$

## 5 The FOOL Algorithm

We build the automata-fooling distribution via the algorithm FOOL ([Algorithm 2](#)). It proceeds by fooling distributions on successively larger time horizons  $h = 1, 2, 4, 8, \dots$ , and merging them together using the REDUCE procedure from the previous section.

---

### Algorithm 2 FOOL( $\varepsilon, W$ )

---

- 1: Set parameters  $\ell = \lg n$  and  $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{20(\ell+1)}$ ,  $\triangleright$  Assume  $n$  is a power of two
  - 2: Set  $\tilde{D}_{t,0} = \Omega_t$  for each  $t = 0, \dots, n-1$
  - 3: Compute all vectors  $V_t = T_{t,n-t}(s, W) : s \in S$  for all  $t = 0, \dots, n$ .
  - 4: **for**  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  **do**
  - 5:     **parfor**  $j \in \{0, \dots, n/2^i - 1\}$  **do**
  - 6:          $\tilde{D}_{t,i} = \text{REDUCE}(\tilde{D}_{t,i-1} \times \tilde{D}_{t+h/2,i-1}, \delta, V_{t+h})$  for  $t = 2^i j, h = 2^i$
  - return** distribution  $\tilde{D}_{0,\ell}$
- 

We initialize by computing the “expected value” vectors  $V_t$ , obtained from the transition matrix of the distribution  $\Omega_{t,n-t}$  going from timestep  $t$  to the final timestep  $n$ . This may take advantage of problem-specific automaton properties on the underlying independent distribution  $\Omega$ . In [Section 5.1](#), we will also describe a few “generic” methods to calculate these probabilities.

The main loop iterates through levels  $1, \dots, \ell$  in a bottom-up fashion. At each level  $i$ , we solve in parallel the REDUCE problems for distributions  $\tilde{D}_{t,i-1}$  and  $\tilde{D}_{t+h/2,i-1}$  to obtain  $\tilde{D}_{t,i}$  for all  $t$ . It is important to note that we never materialize the Cartesian product of  $\tilde{D}_{t,i-1}$  and  $\tilde{D}_{t+h/2,i-1}$ .

Let us now proceed to analyze the error of the final distribution  $\tilde{D}_{0,\ell}$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $s \in S$ . For any window  $t, h$ , we have*

$$\alpha(s, V_{t+h}, t, h) \leq 2 \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} \max_{(s', t') \in \text{Reach}(s, t)} \alpha(s', V_{t'+1}, t', 1)$$

*Proof.* For any  $t' \geq t$ , define  $a_{t'} = \max_{(s', t') \in \text{Reach}(s, t)} \alpha(s', V_{t'+1}, t', 1)$ . We claim that, for any drivestream  $\vec{r} \in \Omega_{t, h}$ , we have

$$|V_{t+h}(F(\vec{r}, s)) - V_t(s)| \leq \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} a_{t'}$$

from which the claim will immediately follow. For, consider the sequence of states  $s_t = s, s_{t+1} = F(r_t, s_t), s_{t+2} = F(r_{t+1}, s_{t+1}), \dots, s_{t+h} = F(\vec{r}, s)$ . Consider some time  $t' \geq t$  and let  $s' = s_{t'}$ . Clearly  $s' \in \text{Reach}(s, t)$ . So  $|V_{t'+1}(F(r_{t'}, s')) - V_{t'+1}(F(r', s'))| \leq \alpha(s', V_{t'+1}, t', 1) \leq a_{t'}$  for any  $r' \in \Omega_{t'}$ . Summing over  $r'$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{t'+1}(F(r_{t'}, s')) - V_{t'}(s')| &= |V_{t'+1}(F(r_{t'}, s')) - \sum_{r'} p_{\Omega_{t'}}(r') V_{t'+1}(F(r', s'))| \\ &\leq \sum_{r'} p_{\Omega_{t'}}(r') |V_{t'+1}(F(r_{t'}, s')) - V_{t'+1}(F(r', s'))| \leq a_{t'} \end{aligned}$$

Overall, we get

$$|V_{t+h}(F(\vec{r}, s)) - V_t(s)| \leq \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} |V_{t'+1}(s_{t'+1}) - V_{t'}(s_{t'})| \leq \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} a_{t'}. \quad \square$$

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $\tilde{D}$  be the distribution returned by  $\text{FOOL}(\varepsilon, W)$ , and let  $s \in S$ . We have*

$$|T_{\tilde{D}}(s, W) - T_{\Omega}(s, W)| \leq \varepsilon \rho(s) \quad (3)$$

*Proof.* For any state  $s$  and times  $t < t'$ , let  $a_{s, t, t'} = \max_{(s', t') \in \text{Reach}(s, t)} \alpha(s', V_{t'+1}, t', 1)$ . Note that if  $(s_1, t_1) \in \text{Reach}(s_0, t_0)$  then  $a_{s_1, t_1, t'} \leq a_{s_0, t_0, t'}$  for  $t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t'$ . We will show by induction on  $i$  that for each  $s$ , each distribution  $\tilde{D}_{t, i}$  and  $h = 2^i$  satisfies

$$|T_{\tilde{D}_{t, i}}(s, V_{t+h}) - V_t(s)| \leq 2(i+1)\delta \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} a_{s, t, t'} \quad (4)$$

The base case  $i = 0$  is vacuous since  $\tilde{D}_{t, 0} = \Omega_t$ . The final case  $i = \ell, t = 0, h = n$  establishes the claimed result, since  $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{20(\ell+1)}$  and  $V_0(s) = T_{\Omega}(s, W)$  for each state  $s$ .

For the induction step, write  $\Omega^1 = \Omega_{t, h/2}, \Omega^2 = \Omega_{t+h/2, h/2}, \tilde{D}^1 = \tilde{D}_{t, i-1}, \tilde{D}^2 = \tilde{D}_{t+h/2, i-1}, \tilde{D}^{12} =$

$\tilde{D}^1 \times \tilde{D}^2$ , and  $\delta' = 2i\delta$ . For any state  $s$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{\tilde{D}^{12}}(s, V_{t+h}) &= \sum_{(k, t+h/2) \in \text{Reach}(s, t)} T_{\tilde{D}^1}(s, k) T_{\tilde{D}^2}(k, V_{t+h}) \\
&\leq \sum_{(k, t+h/2) \in \text{Reach}(s, t)} T_{\tilde{D}^1}(s, k) \left( V_{t+h/2}(k) + \delta' \sum_{t'=t+h/2}^{t+h-1} a_{k, t+h/2, t'} \right) && \text{(Induction Hypothesis)} \\
&\leq \sum_k T_{\tilde{D}^1}(s, k) \left( V_{t+h/2}(k) + \delta' \sum_{t'=t+h/2}^{t+h-1} a_{s, t, t'} \right) && \text{(since } (k, t+h/2) \in \text{Reach}(s, t)) \\
&= T_{\tilde{D}^1}(s, V_{t+h/2}) + \delta' \sum_{t'=t+h/2}^{t+h-1} a_{s, t, t'} && \text{(since } \sum_k T_{\tilde{D}^1}(s, k) = 1) \\
&\leq V_t(s) + \delta' \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h/2-1} a_{s, t, t'} + \delta' \sum_{t'=t+h/2}^{t+h-1} a_{s, t, t'} = V_t(s) + \delta' \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} a_{s, t, t'} && \text{(Induction Hypothesis)}
\end{aligned}$$

A completely analogous calculation shows  $T_{\tilde{D}^{12}}(s, V_{t+h}) \geq V_t(s) - \delta' \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} a_{s, t, t'}$ , so overall

$$|T_{\tilde{D}^{12}}(s, V_{t+h}) - V_t(s)| \leq 2i\delta \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} a_{s, t, t'} \quad (5)$$

By [Theorem 4.1](#) and [Proposition 5.1](#), the distribution  $\tilde{D}_{t,i}$  has

$$|T_{\tilde{D}_{t,i}}(s, V_{t+h}) - T_{\tilde{D}^{12}}(s, V_{t+h})| \leq \delta\alpha(s, V_{t+h}, t, h) \leq 2\delta \sum_{t'=t}^{t+h-1} a_{s, t, t'} \quad (6)$$

Combining bounds (5) and (6) establishes the desired induction bound (4).  $\square$

**Theorem 5.3.** *The cost of FOOL is  $\tilde{O}(n\eta/\varepsilon^2 + \eta\sigma)$  processors and polylogarithmic time, plus the cost of computing the vectors  $V_t : t = 0, \dots, n$ . The final distribution  $\tilde{D}$  has size  $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$ , and satisfies the bounds  $|T_D(s, W) - T_\Omega(s, W)| \leq \varepsilon\rho(s)$  for each state  $s$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $N = \max\{\eta, \sigma, n, 1/\varepsilon\}$ . We claim that each distribution  $\tilde{D}_{t,i}$  for  $i \geq 1$  has size at most  $\varepsilon^{-2} \log^5 N$  for large enough  $N$ . We show this by induction on  $i \geq 1$ . Let  $\tilde{D}^1 = \tilde{D}_{t,i-1}$ ,  $\tilde{D}^2 = \tilde{D}_{t+h/2,i-1}$  and  $\tilde{D} = \tilde{D}_{t,i}$ . By induction hypothesis (and taking into account the distribution sizes for  $i = 0$ ), the distributions  $\tilde{D}^1, \tilde{D}^2$  have size at most  $\sigma + (\log^5 N)/\varepsilon^2$ . So  $\tilde{D}^1 \times \tilde{D}^2$  has size at most  $\sigma^2(\log^{10} N)/\varepsilon^4$ . By specification of REDUCE, the distribution  $\tilde{D}$  has size

$$L \leq c\delta^{-2} \log \eta \cdot \log^2(\sigma^2(\log N)^{10}/\varepsilon^4)$$

for some constant  $c$ . For large enough  $N$ , we have  $\sigma^2(\log N)^{10}/\varepsilon^4 \leq N$  and  $\delta^{-2} \log \eta \leq \varepsilon^{-2} \log^3 N$ , and so  $L \leq c \cdot \log^3 N \cdot \log^2 N$ , completing the induction. This shows the bound on distribution size.

Now observe that each call to REDUCE at level  $i$  has processor complexity  $\tilde{O}((2^i + \eta)\delta^{-2})$  by [Theorem 4.1](#), plus the cost of solving the Prediction Problem for the distributions from the previous level  $i - 1$ . For  $i > 1$ , this is the Prediction Problem for  $\tilde{D}_{t,i-1} \times \tilde{D}_{t+h/2,i-1}$ ; by [Proposition 3.3](#), it has cost  $\tilde{O}(\delta^{-2}\eta 2^i)$  (taking into account the sizes of the distributions  $\tilde{D}_{t',i-1}$ ). For  $i = 0$ , it has cost  $\tilde{O}(\eta|\Omega_t|)$  by [Observation 3.2](#).

There are  $n/2^i$  calls to REDUCE at level  $i$ , so the overall processor complexity (aside from solving the Prediction Problem at level  $i = 0$ ), is given by  $\frac{n}{2^i} \cdot \tilde{O}((2^i \eta) \cdot \delta^{-2}) = \tilde{O}(n\eta/\varepsilon^2)$ . The Prediction Problems at level  $i = 0$  have total cost  $\sum_t \tilde{O}(\eta\sigma_t) = \tilde{O}(\eta\sigma)$ .

The error bound is a restatement of [Proposition 5.2](#). □

## 5.1 Generic algorithms to compute information about $\Omega$

As we have mentioned, the FOOL algorithm requires computing certain probabilistic information about the underlying distributions  $\Omega_{t,h}$ ; namely, their transition matrices and the expected weight of each final state when the automaton is driven by  $\Omega_{t,h}$ . There are some fairly crude methods to solve these generically, which are still often good enough for many applications.

**Proposition 5.4.** *All vectors  $V_t = T_{t,n-t}(s, W)$ , can be computed with  $\tilde{O}(n\eta^\omega)$  processors, where  $\omega$  is the exponent of any efficiently-parallelizable matrix-multiplication algorithm.*

*In particular, for the Coppersmith-Winograd algorithm [CW87], we have  $\omega \leq 2.38$ . (See [JáJ92] for further details on parallel implementation.)*

*Moreover, if we can compute all transition matrices  $T_{t,h} : h = 2^i, t = j2^i$ , then we can compute all vectors  $V_t$  (for any desired weight function  $W$ ) with  $\tilde{O}(n\eta^2)$  processors and polylogarithmic time.*

*Proof.* We begin by recursively computing all transition matrices  $T_{t,h}$ , for  $h = 2^i$  with  $i = 0, \dots, \lg n$  and  $t = j2^i$  with  $j = 0, \dots, n/2^i$ . This computation is done in  $\lg n$  rounds from  $i = 0$  to  $i = \lg n$ . At level  $i$ , assume that we have computed all matrices  $T_{t,h/2}$  for  $t$  a multiple of  $h/2$ . We can compute each  $T_{t,h}$  via the matrix product  $T_{t,h} = T_{t,h/2}T_{t+h/2,h/2}$ , using  $\tilde{O}(\eta^\omega)$  processors. Since we do this for  $n/2^i$  values of  $t$ , the overall work at the  $i^{\text{th}}$  level is  $\tilde{O}(n/2^i \cdot \eta^\omega)$ .

It remains to compute the vectors  $V_t = T_{t,n-t}W$  using transition matrices  $T_{t,h}$ . We will again do this in  $\lg n$  levels, but this time in a top-down fashion. At level  $i$ , we will compute  $T_{t,n-t}W$  for all indices  $t$  which are a multiple of  $h_i = n/2^i$ . For the initial level  $i = 0$ , we simply obtain  $T_{0,n}W$  by multiplying the computed matrix  $T_{0,n}$  by the vector  $W$ . For  $i \geq 1$ , the computation consists of two steps. First, we compute in parallel for each  $t = h_i + j \cdot h_{i-1}$  with  $j = 0, \dots, 2^{i-1} - 2$ :

$$T_{t,n-t}W = T_{t,h_i}(T_{t+h_i,n-t-h_i}W),$$

where matrix  $T_{t,h_i}$  was computed earlier since  $h_i$  is a power of two, and the vector  $T_{t+h_i,n-t-h_i}W$  was computed at level  $i - 1$  (since  $t + h_i$  is a multiple of  $h_{i-1}$ ). Second, we compute in parallel for each  $t = j \cdot h_{i-1}$  with  $j = 0, \dots, 2^{i-1} - 1$  the vector  $T_{t,n-t}W$  as described above, where  $T_{t+h_i,n-t-h_i}W$  was computed in the first step (of the same level  $i$ ). Therefore, at level  $i \geq 1$ , we execute  $2^i - 1$  matrix-vector multiplications; each taking  $\tilde{O}(\eta^2)$  processors and polylogarithmic time. At the final level  $i = \lg n$ , we have computed all the desired vectors  $V_t$ . □

As we have discussed, a number of applications involve multiple statistical tests  $i = 1, \dots, z$ , each computed by its own automaton  $F_i$  on a state space  $S_i$  of size  $|S_i| = \eta_i$ , with its own weight function  $W_i$ . We can summarize a few properties of this combined automaton:

**Proposition 5.5.** *a) The total statespace is  $\eta = \sum_i \eta_i$ .*

*b) Each starting state  $s$  for automaton  $i$  has  $\rho(s) \leq \rho_i^{\max}$ .*

*c) The vectors  $V_t$  can be calculated in  $\tilde{O}(n \sum_i \eta_i^\omega)$  processors and polylogarithmic time.*

*In particular, the FOOL algorithm has processor complexity  $\tilde{O}(n\eta/\varepsilon^2 + \sigma\eta + n \sum_i \eta_i^\omega)$  and polylogarithmic time, and the resulting distribution  $D$  has  $|T_D(s, W) - T_\Omega(s, W)| \leq \varepsilon \rho_i^{\max}$  for each state  $s$  of automaton  $i$ .*

## 6 Reducing the state space for counter automata

One of the most common types of statistical tests is based on *counters*: statistics which are based on summing some function over all the input. These are often used directly, and can also be combined together to make more complex (higher-order) statistical tests.

Consider a statistic of the form

$$W\left(\sum_t f_t(r_t)\right) \quad \text{where } f_t : \Omega_t \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

where  $W$  is an arbitrary real-value weight function.

It is easy to compute  $\sum_t f_t(r_t)$  by tracking all possible values of the running sum. However, this is often overkill: typically, the running sum is confined to a much smaller window, roughly the standard deviation around the mean. We can take advantage of this effect by constructing an automaton which only maintains the running sum within “typical” values close to the mean, along with a “reject” state for some exponentially-rare deviations.

Let us define some relevant parameters for the counter.

$$\mu_t = \mathbb{E}_{r \sim \Omega_t}[f_t(r)], \quad M_t = \max_{r \in \Omega_t} |f_t(r) - \mu_t|, \quad M = \max_{t \in [n]} M_t, \quad \kappa = \sqrt{\sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \text{Var}_{r \sim \Omega_t}[f_t(r)]}$$

Given some error parameter  $\delta > 0$ , we choose a value  $T$  with

$$T \geq \lceil 100(M + \kappa) \log(n/\delta) \rceil.$$

In this context, we refer to  $T$  as the *span* of the automaton.

**Observation 6.1.** *When drivestream  $\vec{r}$  is drawn randomly, the following bound holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ :*

$$\left| \sum_{i=t}^{t'} (f(r_i) - \mu_i) \right| < 0.15T \quad \text{for all times } t, t'$$

*Proof.* Apply Bernstein’s inequality and take a union bound over  $t, t'$ . □

In light of [Observation 6.1](#), our strategy will be to construct a truncated automaton  $\tilde{F}$ , which only stores the running sum within a window of  $\pm T$  from the running mean. Specifically, the automaton has states of the form  $\tilde{S} = \{-T, -T + 1, \dots, T - 1, T\} \cup \{\perp\}$ , and updates its state  $c$  to a new state  $c'$  as:

$$c' = \begin{cases} (c + f(r_t) - a_t + a_{t-1}, 0) & \text{if } c \neq \perp \text{ and } |c + f(r_t) - a_t + a_{t-1}| \leq T \\ \perp & \text{if } c \neq \perp \text{ and } |c + f(r_t) - a_t + a_{t-1}| > T \\ \perp & \text{if } c = \perp, \text{ irrespective of input } r_t \end{cases}$$

where we define

$$a_t = \left\lceil \sum_{i=0}^t \mu_i \right\rceil \quad \text{for each time } t$$

Overall, the state space has size  $|\tilde{S}| \leq O(T)$ . Each integer state  $c$  at time  $t$  corresponds to a running sum  $c + a_t$ . The state  $\perp$  represents a “reject” or “rare” state where the running sum has deviated too far from its mean.

We can define a potential function  $\phi : \tilde{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  as

$$\phi(c) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |c| \leq T/3 \\ (|c| - T/3)/(T/3) & \text{if } T/3 < |c| < 2T/3 \\ 1 & \text{if } |c| > 2T/3 \text{ or } c = \perp \end{cases}$$

Intuitively,  $\phi$  measures how close the current state  $c$  is to a reject state.

For purposes of analysis, it is useful to consider a second “truthful” automaton  $\bar{F}$ . This has state space  $\bar{S} = \{(\bar{c}, b)\}$ , where now  $\bar{c}$  can range over all of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $b$  is a boolean flag set to true if  $\bar{F}$  would be in state  $\perp$ . Note that  $\bar{F}$  reaches a non-reject state  $(\bar{i}, 0)$  if and only if  $\tilde{F}$  reaches the same state  $i \neq \perp$ . We likewise define a potential function  $\phi : \bar{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  as

$$\phi(\bar{c}, b) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |c| \leq T/3 \text{ and } b = 0, \\ (|c| - T/3)/(T/3) & \text{if } T/3 < |c| < 2T/3 \text{ and } b = 0. \\ 1 & \text{if } |c| > 2T/3 \text{ and } b = 0, \text{ or if } b = 1. \end{cases}$$

We can observe that for any drivestream  $\vec{r}$ , any non-reject states  $\tilde{s}, \bar{s} = (\bar{c}, b)$  reached by automata  $\tilde{F}, \bar{F}$  respectively have  $\bar{s} = (\tilde{s}, 0)$  and  $\phi(\tilde{s}) = \phi(\bar{s})$ , while the reject states  $\tilde{s} = \perp$  and  $\bar{s} = (\bar{c}, 1)$  have a common value  $\phi(\tilde{s}) = \phi(\bar{s}) = 0$ .

**Observation 6.2.** *The final state  $s$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}_\Omega[\phi(s)] < \delta$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $\phi(s) > 0$  only if the counter ever reaches value  $\pm T/3$ . By [Observation 6.1](#) this has probability at most  $\delta$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.3.** *For any inputs  $r_t^1, r_t^2$  and state  $u = (\bar{c}, b)$ , there holds*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{r} \sim \Omega_{t+1, n-t-1}} \left[ \left| \phi(F(r_t^1 \vec{r}, u)) - \phi(F(r_t^2 \vec{r}, u)) \right| \right] \leq \frac{3M_t}{T} + \delta.$$

*Proof.* Let  $s^i = F(r_t^i \vec{r}, u)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . We must argue that the expected value  $\mathbb{E}[|\phi(s^1) - \phi(s^2)|]$  is at most  $\lambda_t$ , where the expectation is taken over  $r_{t+1}, \dots, r_{n-1}$  drawn from  $\Omega$ .

This is clear if  $b = 1$  since then  $\phi(s)$  does not depend on  $r_t$ . Otherwise, there are two cases. First, suppose  $\bar{c} < 5T/6$ . After adding  $f(r_t)$ , the two automata have value at most  $5T/6 + M_t \leq 5T/6 + T/100$ . The only way to get  $|\phi(s^1) - \phi(s^2)| > 3M_t/T$  is if one of the two automata reaches a reject state, which occurs only if the remaining counter values attain a value of at least  $0.15T$ . By [Observation 6.1](#), this has probability at most  $\delta$ .

Next, suppose  $\bar{c} > 5T/6$ . After time  $t$ , both automata have counter values at least  $5T/6 - M_t \geq 0.82T$ . Again by [Observation 6.1](#), with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  both automata end in a state of value at least  $0.82T - 0.15T \geq 2T/3$ , giving  $\phi(s^1) = \phi(s^2) = 1$ .  $\square$

## 7 Applications

The framework of randomized finite automata fooling has found many applications in the derandomization of parallel algorithms. We present the derandomization of two basic problems: the Gale-Berlekamp Switching Game ([Section 7.1](#)) and approximate MAX-CUT via SDP rounding ([Section 7.2](#)). Through our new construction, we improve the best known deterministic processor complexity for both problems.

## 7.1 Gale-Berlekamp Switching Game

**Definition 7.1** (Gale-Berlekamp Switching Game). *Given an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  with entries  $A_{ij} = \pm 1$ , the problem is to find vectors  $x, y \in \{-1, +1\}^n$  to maximize the imbalance  $I = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} x_i y_j$ .*

This has attracted some interest because it revolves around *anti-concentration bounds*, in contrast to typical randomized analysis which tends to focus on concentration bounds. An elegant randomized algorithm of [AS15], using the Central Limit Theorem, gives imbalance of

$$I \geq (\sqrt{2/\pi} - o(1))n^{3/2}.$$

The automata-fooling framework can be used to get a solution of nearly this same quality, at the cost of slightly higher work and depth. The previous work bound by [Har19b] was  $n^{5+o(1)}$ . Our new construction improves this slightly.

**Theorem 7.2.** *There is an algorithm running in  $\tilde{O}(n^{3.5})$  processors and polylogarithmic time to find  $x, y \in \{-1, +1\}^n$  with imbalance  $I \geq (\sqrt{2/\pi} - o(1))n^{3/2}$ .*

In order to show **Theorem 7.2**, following [Ber97] and [AS15], we set  $x_i = 1$  if  $\sum_j A_{ij} y_j > 0$ , and  $x_i = -1$  otherwise. This gives

$$\sum_{i,j} A_{i,j} x_i y_j = \sum_i x_i \sum_j A_{i,j} y_j = \sum_i \left| \sum_j A_{i,j} y_j \right|.$$

As shown in [BS71], for  $y$  uniformly drawn from  $\Omega = \{-1, +1\}^n$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[|\sum_j A_{i,j} y_j|] \geq \sqrt{2n/\pi} - o(\sqrt{n})$  for each  $i$ . This is the statistical test we want to fool.

For each value  $i$ , we have a counter automaton to track the running  $\sum_j A_{ij} y_j$ . This uses the construction of **Section 6** with  $\delta = n^{-10}$ , where  $M = 1$  and  $\kappa = \sqrt{\sum_j A_{ij}^2} = \sqrt{n}$ . So the automaton has span  $T = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ . Correspondingly, for this automaton  $i$ , we use the weight function

$$W(c) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c = \perp \\ |c|(1 - \phi(c)) & \text{if } c \neq \perp \end{cases}$$

We make a few observations about the behavior of this automaton.

**Proposition 7.3.** *Let  $(c, b)$  be the final automaton state for a given input sequence  $y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ .*

- a) *For any  $y \in \{-1, +1\}^n$ , we have  $|\sum_j A_{ij} y_j| \geq W(c, b)$ .*
- b) *When  $y$  is drawn from  $\Omega = \{-1, +1\}^n$ , there holds  $\mathbb{E}[W(c)] \geq \sqrt{2n/\pi} - o(\sqrt{n})$ .*
- c) *The weight function  $W$  is  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz for  $\lambda = O(1)$ .*

*Proof.* In all cases, it is useful to consider the truthful automaton  $\bar{F}$  to compute the state  $\bar{s} = (\bar{c}, b)$ , where  $c$  can range over all possible values  $\{-n, \dots, n\}$ . For a given sequence  $y$ , we observe that

$$W(c) = |\bar{c}|(1 - \phi(\bar{c}, b)).$$

- a) Since  $\phi(\bar{c}, b) \geq 0$ , clearly  $W(c) \leq |c|$ .
- b) Observe that  $W(c) \geq |\bar{c}| - n\phi(\bar{c}, b)$ . So  $\mathbb{E}[W(c)] \geq \mathbb{E}[|\bar{c}|] - n\mathbb{E}[\phi(\bar{c}, b)]$ ; the first term  $\mathbb{E}[|\bar{c}|]$  is precisely the same as for the true running sum, i.e.  $\mathbb{E}[|\bar{c}|] = \mathbb{E}[|\sum_j A_{ij} y_j|] = \sqrt{2n/\pi} - o(\sqrt{n})$ , and the second term is at most  $n \cdot n^{-10} \leq o(n)$  by our choice of  $\delta$ .

- c) Since either  $|\bar{c}| \leq T$  or  $\phi(\bar{c}, b) = 1$ , the maximum change from modifying entry  $y_t$  is at most  $1 + T|\Delta\phi(\bar{c}, b)|$ . By [Proposition 6.3](#), we have  $\mathbb{E}[|\Delta\phi(\bar{c}, b)|] \leq \frac{3}{T} + n^{-10} \leq O(1)$ , where the expectation is over future entries  $y_{t+1}, \dots, y_{n-1}$ .  $\square$

The complexity follows from [Proposition 5.5](#) with  $\varepsilon = 1/\sqrt{n \log n}$ , where we have  $z = n$  automata each of state space  $\hat{\eta}_i = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ . In the resulting distribution  $D$ , for  $y \sim D$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_D\left[\sum_j A_{ij}y_j\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_\Omega[W(c)] - \rho = (\sqrt{2/\pi} - O(\varepsilon))\sqrt{n}$$

for every  $i$ . By searching the space exhaustively, we can find a specific sequence  $y$  satisfying the desired imbalance bounds.

This concludes the proof of [Theorem 7.2](#).

## 7.2 Approximate MAX-CUT

The MAX-CUT problem for a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is to find a vertex set  $S \subseteq V$  to maximize the total weight of edges with exactly one endpoint in  $S$ . The seminal work of Goemans & Williamson [[GW95](#)] showed that MAX-CUT can be approximated to a factor of  $\alpha \approx 0.878$  by rounding its semi-definite programming (SDP) formulation. Moreover, the integrality gap of the SDP is precisely  $\alpha$  [[FS02](#)], and assuming the Unique Games Conjecture no better approximation ratio is possible for polynomial-time algorithms [[KKMO07](#)].

A sequential deterministic  $\alpha$ -approximation with  $\tilde{O}(n^3)$  runtime was shown in [[BK05](#)]. This relies on the method of conditional expectation, which is hard to parallelize. The work of [[Siv02](#)] showed that an  $\alpha(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation can be obtained in parallel and deterministically with polylogarithmic time and  $\text{poly}(n)$  processors (e.g. on the order of  $n^{100}$ ) by using the automata derandomization framework. The huge polynomial complexity of this approach is its main downside. Here, we give an improved and explicit construction for the parallel derandomization of Goemans and Williamson's algorithm.

To review, observe that MAX-CUT can be formulated as the following integer program:

$$\max \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)=e \in E} w_e(1 - v_i \cdot v_j) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad v_i \in \{-1, 1\}, i \in [n].$$

This can be relaxed to the following SDP:

$$\max \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)=e \in E} w_e(1 - v_i \bullet v_j) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad v_i \in [-1, 1]^n, \|v_i\|_2 = 1, i \in [n],$$

where  $\bullet$  denotes the inner product in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Given an SDP solution  $v$ , we can round it by drawing independent standard Gaussian random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and constructing the cut  $S = \{i \mid v_i \bullet X \geq 0\}$ . The resulting (random) cutsizes  $W$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[W] = \sum_{(i,j)=e \in E} w_e \Pr[(i, j) \text{ is cut}] = \sum_{(i,j)=e \in E} w_e \frac{\arccos(v_i \bullet v_j)}{\pi} \geq \alpha \cdot \text{OPT}, \quad (7)$$

where OPT denotes the size of the maximum cut. [[Siv02](#)] noted that an  $\alpha$ -approximation can be



achieved deterministically by fooling (up to  $\pm\varepsilon$ ) the statistical test

$$\Pr[(i, j) \text{ is cut}] = \Pr[\text{sgn}(v_i \bullet X) \neq \text{sgn}(v_j \bullet X)] \quad (8)$$

for each edge  $(i, j)$ .

We follow the same approach, but using our more-efficient automata construction framework.

**Theorem 7.4.** *There is an algorithm running in  $\tilde{O}(mn^3\varepsilon^{-4} + mn^{2.88}\varepsilon^{-4.76})$  processors and polylogarithmic time that finds an  $\alpha(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate rounding of a MAX-CUT SDP solution.*

Via the algorithm of [AZLO16] to solve the SDP, this gives the following main result:

**Corollary 7.5.** *For arbitrary constant  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find an  $\alpha(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate MAX-CUT solution using  $\tilde{O}(mn^3)$  processors and polylogarithmic time.*

The remainder of the section is devoted to showing [Theorem 7.4](#). To avoid cumbersome calculations, we will show an algorithm for a  $(1 - O(\varepsilon))$ -approximation, assuming  $\varepsilon$  is smaller than any needed constants. For readability, we write  $\tilde{O}()$  throughout to suppress any polylog( $n/\varepsilon$ ) terms.

As a starting point, consider the following process. We draw  $n$  independent standard Gaussian variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . For each edge  $(i, j)$ , we have a statistical test to read these values in order and compute  $c_i = v_i \bullet X$  and  $c_j = v_j \bullet X$ . We then apply the weight function  $W_{ij}(c_i, c_j)$  as the indicator variable that  $\text{sgn}(c_i) = \text{sgn}(c_j)$ .

In order to apply our derandomization framework efficiently, we make a number of changes to this basic strategy: (i) we replace  $X$  with a discretized truncated Gaussian denoted by  $Y$ ; (ii) we further quantize each term  $v_{ik}Y_k$  in the computation of the sum  $c_i = \sum_k v_{ik}Y_k$ ; (iii) we apply the optimization of [Section 6](#) to reduce the state space for each counter automaton; (iv) we modify the weight function to a pessimistic estimator with better Lipschitz constant.

Let us fix two quantization parameters

$$\gamma = \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta\sqrt{n\log(n/\varepsilon)}}, \quad r = \beta\log(n/\varepsilon)$$

for some sufficiently large constant  $\beta > 0$ .

Concretely, each  $Y_k$  is derived by truncating a standard Gaussian to within  $\pm r$ , and rounding to the nearest multiple of  $\gamma$ . Then, each term in the product  $v_{ik}Y_k$  is rounded to the nearest multiple of  $\gamma$ . Since this comes up frequently in the analysis, let us denote this “rounded” inner product by:

$$v \star Y = \gamma \sum_k \left\lceil \frac{1}{\gamma} v_k Y_k \right\rceil$$

Given this definition, we will form our cut set by setting

$$S = \{i : v_i \star Y \geq 0\}$$

**Lemma 7.6.** *For appropriately chosen  $\beta$ , there is a coupling between random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  such that, for any unit vector  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , there holds  $\Pr(|u \bullet X - u \star Y| > \varepsilon) \leq (\varepsilon/n)^{10}$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the following process to generate  $Y_k$ : we first draw  $X_k$  from its distribution (a standard Gaussian). If  $|X_k| \leq r$ , we set  $Y_k$  to be the multiple of  $\gamma$  closest to  $X_k$ ; otherwise, we just draw  $Y_k$  independently from its distribution.

Let  $Y'_k$  be the result of rounding  $X_k$  to the nearest multiple of  $\gamma$ , and let  $Z_k$  be the result of rounding  $u_k Y_k$  to the nearest multiple of  $\gamma$ . So  $Y_k = Y'_k$  as long as  $|X_k| < r$ . Note that  $\Pr(|X_k| \geq r) \leq (\varepsilon/n)^{12}$  for large enough  $\beta$ . So by a union bound, we have  $Y'_k = Y_k$  for all  $n$  with probability at least  $1 - (\varepsilon/n)^{11}$ . If this occurs, then  $u \star Y = u \star Y' = \sum_k Z_k$ . So, we can write

$$\Pr(|u \bullet X - u \star Y| > \varepsilon) \leq (\varepsilon/n)^{11} + \Pr\left(\left|\sum_k (u_k X_k - Z_k)\right| > \varepsilon\right)$$

Consider now a term  $u_k X_k - Z_k$ . With probability one, we have

$$|u_k X_k - Z_k| \leq |u_k X_k - u_k Y_k| + \gamma/2 \leq u_k |X_k - Y_k| + \gamma/2 \leq (u_k + 1)\gamma$$

Furthermore, since we always round to the nearest value, the distribution of  $Z_k$  is symmetric around zero — if  $X_k$  is changed to  $-X_k$ , then  $Z_k$  is also changed to  $-Z_k$ . Thus  $\mathbb{E}[u_k X_k - Z_k] = 0$ . So  $\sum_k (u_k X_k - Z_k)$  is a sum of  $n$  independent random variables, each of mean zero and bounded in the range  $\pm(u_k + 1)\gamma$ . By Hoeffding's inequality, the probability of getting  $|\sum_k (u_k X_k - Z_k)| > \varepsilon$  is at most

$$\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sum_k ((u_k + 1)\gamma)^2}\right)\right) = \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\gamma^2 n}\right)\right)$$

which is at most  $(\varepsilon/n)^{11}$  by our choice of  $\gamma = \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta\sqrt{n \log(n/\varepsilon)}}$  for large enough  $\beta$ .  $\square$

Observe that the scaled sum  $\frac{1}{\gamma}(v_i \star Y)$  is an integer-valued counter. We can apply the method of [Section 6](#) to construct a “vertex” automaton  $\tilde{F}_i$  that tracks the running sum within a window. We record a few parameters and observations about this automaton.

**Proposition 7.7.** *The automaton  $\tilde{F}_i$  can be implemented with the following parameters:*

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &\leq \tilde{O}(|v_{it}|/\gamma) \text{ for each } t, & M &\leq \tilde{O}(1/\gamma), \\ \kappa &\leq \tilde{O}(1/\gamma), & \delta &= (\varepsilon/n)^{10}, & \text{span } T &\leq \tilde{O}(1/\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

The potential function  $\phi_i$  has  $\mathbb{E}[\phi_i(s)] \leq (\varepsilon/n)^{10}$ , and, when coordinate  $Y_t$  is modified, then the expectation over coordinates  $Y_{t+1}, \dots, Y_n$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[|\Delta\phi_i|] \leq \tilde{O}(v_{ik} + (\varepsilon/n)^{10})$ .

*Proof.* The bounds on  $M_t$  and  $M$  follow directly from the fact that  $|Y_k| \leq \tilde{O}(1)$  and the  $k^{\text{th}}$  summand is  $[v_{ik} Y_k]$ . For the bound on  $\kappa$ , observe that  $\kappa^2 = \text{Var}\left[\frac{1}{\gamma}(v_i \star Y)\right] = \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \mathbb{E}[(v_i \star Y)^2]$ . We now use the coupling of [Lemma 7.6](#). When  $|v_i \bullet X - v_i \star Y| \leq \varepsilon$ , we have  $(v_i \star Y)^2 \leq (|v_i \bullet X| + \varepsilon)^2$ ; otherwise, we have  $v_i \star Y \leq \tilde{O}(\sum_k v_{ik}) \leq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$  holding with probability one. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(v_i \star Y)^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}[(|v_i \bullet X| + \varepsilon)^2] + (\varepsilon/n)^{10} \cdot \tilde{O}(n) \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}[(v_i \bullet X)^2] + 2\varepsilon^2 + (\varepsilon/n)^{10} \cdot \tilde{O}(n) \leq \tilde{O}(1) \end{aligned}$$

where the last bound holds since  $v_i \bullet X$  is a standard Gaussian random variable and  $\|v_i\|_2 = 1$ .

With these parameters, we can choose  $T = \lceil 100(\kappa + M) \log(n/\delta) \rceil = \tilde{\Theta}(1/\gamma)$ . The bounds on  $\phi_i$  follow directly from [Observation 6.2](#) and [Proposition 6.3](#).  $\square$

From these vertex-automata, we construct edge-automata  $F_{ij}$ , one for each edge  $(i, j) \in E$ . Automaton  $F_{ij}$  keeps track of the joint states of  $\tilde{F}_i, \tilde{F}_j$ , i.e. the truncated running sums  $v_i \star Y$  and

$v_j \star Y$ , with the following weight function for the state  $s = (c_i, c_j)$ :

$$W_{ij}(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c_i = \perp \text{ or } c_j = \perp \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{sgn}(c_i) = \text{sgn}(c_j) \\ \min\{1, \frac{|c_i - c_j|}{\varepsilon}\}(1 - \phi_i(c_i))(1 - \phi_j(c_j)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Observe that whenever  $W_{ij}(s) > 0$ , we must have  $\text{sgn}(v_i \star Y) \neq \text{sgn}(v_j \star Y)$ , i.e. edge  $ij$  is cut. This weight function has a few other nice properties.

**Proposition 7.8.** *For automaton  $ij$ , let  $s$  be the final state obtained by stepping with inputs  $Y$ .*

- a) *For randomly drawn  $Y$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}_Y[W_{ij}(s)] \geq \frac{\arccos(v_i \bullet v_j)}{\pi} - O(\varepsilon)$ .*
- b) *The weight function  $W_{ij}$  has total Lipschitz value  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}/\varepsilon)$ .*

*Proof.* a) Let  $\mathcal{E}$  denote the event that  $\text{sgn}(v_i \star Y) \neq \text{sgn}(v_j \star Y)$  and  $|v_i \star Y| > \varepsilon$  and  $|v_j \star Y| > \varepsilon$ .

Note that, when this occurs, we have  $\min\{1, \frac{|c_i - c_j|}{\varepsilon}\} = 1$ . Also, unless the vertex-automata end in reject states, we have  $c_i = v_i \star Y, c_j = v_j \star Y$ . Overall, we have the following bound:

$$W_{ij}(s) \geq \Pr(\mathcal{E}) - \phi_i(c_i) - \phi_j(c_j)$$

Here  $\mathbb{E}[\phi_i(c_i) + \phi_j(c_j)] \leq O(\varepsilon)$  by [Proposition 7.7](#). Furthermore, we claim that

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}) \geq \frac{\arccos(v_i \bullet v_j)}{\pi} - O(\varepsilon)$$

For, we use the coupling in [Lemma 7.6](#) to calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}) &= 2\Pr(v_i \star Y > \varepsilon \wedge v_j \star Y < -\varepsilon) && \text{(by symmetry)} \\ &\geq 2\Pr(v_i \bullet X > 2\varepsilon \wedge v_j \bullet X < -2\varepsilon) - O(\varepsilon) && \text{(by Lemma 7.6)} \\ &\geq 2\Pr(v_i \bullet X > 0 \wedge v_j \bullet X < 0) - \Pr(|v_i \bullet X| < 2\varepsilon) - \Pr(|v_j \bullet X| < 2\varepsilon) - O(\varepsilon) \\ &\geq \Pr(\text{sgn}(v_i \bullet X) \neq \text{sgn}(v_j \bullet X)) - O(\varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since  $v_i \bullet X$  and  $v_j \bullet X$  are standard Gaussian variables. As in the usual MAX-CUT argument, we have  $\Pr(\text{sgn}(v_i \bullet X) \neq \text{sgn}(v_j \bullet X)) = \frac{\arccos(v_i \bullet v_j)}{\pi}$ .

- b) Consider replacing the vertex-automata for  $v_i, v_j$  with their “truthful” counterparts, calculating the exact sum  $\bar{c}_i = v_i \star Y$  and  $\bar{c}_j = v_j \star Y$  along with flag bits  $b_i, b_j$ . We can observe that then

$$W_{ij}(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{sgn}(\bar{c}_i) = \text{sgn}(\bar{c}_j) \\ \min\{1, \frac{|\bar{c}_i - \bar{c}_j|}{\varepsilon}\}(1 - \phi_i(\bar{c}_i, b_i))(1 - \phi_j(\bar{c}_j, b_j)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If we change coordinate  $Y_k$ , then  $\bar{c}_i$  and  $\bar{c}_j$  change by at most  $\tilde{O}(\gamma + v_{ik})$  and  $\tilde{O}(\gamma + v_{jk})$  respectively. Overall, we have  $|\Delta W_{ij}(s)| \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{\gamma + |v_{ik}| + |v_{jk}|}{\varepsilon}) + |\Delta \phi_i(\bar{c}_i, b_i)| + |\Delta \phi_j(\bar{c}_j, b_j)|$ . By [Proposition 7.7](#), the terms  $|\Delta \phi_i(\bar{c}_i, b_i)|$  and  $|\Delta \phi_j(\bar{c}_j, b_j)|$  have expected value at most  $\tilde{O}(|v_{ik}| + (\varepsilon/n)^{10})$  and  $\tilde{O}(|v_{jk}| + (\varepsilon/n)^{10})$  respectively. Summing over  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , the total

Lipschitz value is at most

$$\tilde{O}\left(\sum_k \frac{\gamma + |v_{ik}| + |v_{jk}|}{\varepsilon} + |v_{ik}| + |v_{jk}| + (\varepsilon/n)^{10}\right) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\gamma n}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon\right) \leq \tilde{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon}\right). \quad \square$$

Next, we discuss how to compute the transition matrices for the automata. Using the generic algorithm of [Proposition 5.4](#) would give processor complexity  $\tilde{O}(n^{\omega+1}\varepsilon^{-2\omega})$ , which is too high for us; to reduce it, we take advantage of structure in the transition matrices.

**Proposition 7.9.** *Given transition matrices  $T_{t,h}$  and  $T_{t+h,h}$  for a edge-automaton  $F_{ij}$ , we can compute the corresponding matrix  $T_{t,2h}$  in polylogarithmic time with processor complexity*

$$\tilde{O}(\gamma^{-2\omega}(\min\{1, \gamma + a_i\} \min\{1, \gamma + a_j\})^{\omega-1}) \quad \text{where } a_i = \sum_{k=t}^{t+2h-1} v_{ik}, \quad a_j = \sum_{k=t}^{t+2h-1} v_{jk}$$

*Proof.* The automaton has  $\eta_{ij} = \tilde{O}(1/\gamma^2)$  states. Consider any state  $s = (c_i, c_j)$  of the automaton at time  $t$ , where  $c_i, c_j \neq \perp$ . The counter  $c_i$  can advance by at most  $\tilde{O}(v_{ik})$  in each timestep, and is quantized in multiples of  $\gamma$ . Hence,  $c_i$  can reach at most  $\tilde{O}(1 + a_i/\gamma)$  possible states; also, because of the truncation in the automata  $\tilde{F}_i$ , it trivially can reach at most  $\tilde{O}(1/\gamma)$  states. The same phenomenon holds for  $c_j$ .

Let  $d_i = \tilde{O}(\min\{1/\gamma, 1 + a_i/\gamma\})$  and  $d_j = \tilde{O}(\min\{1/\gamma, 1 + a_j/\gamma\})$ . Overall, for a given starting state, the above reasoning shows that there are at most  $d_i d_j$  possible states reachable at times  $t+h$  and  $t+2h$ . Going further, we can divide the entire state space for the automaton  $F_{ij}$  into blocks of width  $d_i$  and  $d_j$ ; for *all* states within a given block, there are at most  $\tilde{O}(1)$  blocks that can be reached at times  $t+h, t+2h$ . (This also holds for the reject states, placing them into their own singleton blocks.)

Overall, we can decompose the matrix product  $T_{t,h}T_{t+h,h}$  into  $\frac{\eta_{ij}}{d_i d_j}$  block multiplications, each of dimension  $d_i d_j$ . Each block multiplication has cost  $(d_i d_j)^\omega$ . So the total cost is  $\eta_{ij}(d_i d_j)^{\omega-1}$ ; the result follows from substituting in the values  $d_i, d_j$  and some simplifications.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.10.** *For each automaton  $F_{ij}$ , vectors  $V_t = T_{t,n-t}(s, W) : t = 0, \dots, n-1$ , can be computed with  $\tilde{O}(n^3\varepsilon^{-4} + n^{2.88}\varepsilon^{-4.76})$  processors.*

*Proof.* The automaton has state space  $\eta = O(1/\gamma^2)$ . We show how to compute all transition matrices  $T_{t,h}$ , for  $h = 2^\ell$  with  $\ell = 0, \dots, \lg n$  and  $t = j2^\ell$  with  $j = 0, \dots, n/2^\ell$ . We can then apply [Proposition 5.4](#) to compute  $V_t$ 's in  $\tilde{O}(n\eta^2) = \tilde{O}(n^3/\varepsilon^4)$  processors.

Let us fix some level  $\ell$  and  $h = 2^\ell$ ; for each value  $t$ , define

$$b_t = \sum_{k=t}^{t+h-1} (v_{ik}^2 + v_{jk}^2)$$

Observe that  $\sum_t b_t \leq 2$ . Furthermore, by concavity, we have

$$\sum_{k=t}^{t+h-1} (v_{ik} + v_{jk}) \leq \sqrt{b_t h}. \quad (9)$$

We compute each matrix  $T_{t,h}$  via [Proposition 7.9](#); from the bound (9), this has cost

$$\begin{aligned} O(\gamma^{-2\omega} (\min\{1, \gamma + \sum_{k=t}^{h-1} v_{ik}\} \{\min\{1, \gamma + \sum_{k=t}^{h-1} v_{jk}\}\}^{\omega-1})) &\leq O(\gamma^{-2\omega} \min\{1, \gamma + \sqrt{b_t h}\}^{2(\omega-1)}) \\ &\leq O(\gamma^{-2} + \gamma^{-2\omega} \min\{1, (b_t h)^{\omega-1}\}) \leq O(\gamma^{-2} + \gamma^{-2\omega} \min\{1, b_t h\}) \end{aligned}$$

Summing over all  $n/h$  choices of  $t$ , the total processor complexity at level  $\ell$  is given by

$$\tilde{O}(\sum_t (\gamma^{-2} + \gamma^{-2\omega} \min\{b_t h, 1\})) \leq \tilde{O}(n\gamma^{-2}/h + \min\{n/h, h\}\gamma^{-2\omega})$$

These quantities are maximized at  $h = 1$  and  $h = \sqrt{n}$  respectively; overall, they are at most

$$\tilde{O}(n\gamma^{-2} + \sqrt{n}\gamma^{-2\omega}) \leq \tilde{O}(\frac{n^2}{\varepsilon^2} + n^{1/2+\omega}\varepsilon^{-2\omega}) \leq O(n^{2.88}\varepsilon^{-4.76}). \quad \square$$

**Finishing the construction:** We are now ready to compute the total processor complexity for the MAX-CUT approximation algorithm. Each probability distribution  $\Omega_t$  has size  $\tilde{O}(\gamma^{-1}) = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}/\varepsilon)$ , thus  $\sigma = \tilde{O}(n^{1.5}/\varepsilon)$ . The reduced total number of states of an edge-automaton  $F_{ij}$  is  $\tilde{O}(1/\gamma^2) = \tilde{O}(n/\varepsilon^2)$  and the weight function  $W_{ij}$  has total Lipschitz value  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}/\varepsilon)$ . So we run FOOL with parameter  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}$ , and the fooling process has cost  $\tilde{O}(m\frac{n^3}{\varepsilon^4} + m\frac{n^{2.5}}{\varepsilon^3} + m\frac{n^{2.88}}{\varepsilon^{4.76}})$ .

For each  $F_{ij}$ , the resulting distribution  $D'$  satisfies  $|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim D'}[W_{ij}(s)] - \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \Omega}[W_{ij}(s)]| \leq \varepsilon$ , with  $s$  denoting the final state. So by [Proposition 7.8](#), it gives

$$\Pr_{Y \sim D}(\text{edge } ij \text{ cut}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim D}[W_{ij}] \geq \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \Omega}[W_{ij}] - \varepsilon \geq \frac{\arccos(v_i \bullet v_j)}{\pi} - O(\varepsilon)$$

Summing over all edges, the total expected weight of the cut edges is

$$\sum_{ij \in E} w_e \frac{\arccos(v_i \bullet v_j)}{\pi} - \sum_{ij \in E} w_e O(\varepsilon)$$

The first term is at least  $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}$ . The second term is at most  $O(\varepsilon \cdot \text{OPT})$  since  $\text{OPT} \geq \sum_e w_e/2$ . By searching the distribution  $D$  exhaustively, we can find a cut satisfying these bounds.

## 8 Acknowledgements

Thanks to Mohsen Ghaffari and Christoph Grunau for explaining the works [\[GG24\]](#) and [\[GGR23\]](#).

## References

- [ABI86] Noga Alon, László Babai, and Alon Itai. A fast and simple randomized parallel algorithm for the maximal independent set problem. *Journal of Algorithms*, 7(4):567–583, 1986.
- [AGHP92] Noga Alon, Oded Goldreich, Johan Håstad, and René Peralta. Simple constructions of almost  $k$ -wise independent random variables. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 3(3):289–304, 1992.

- [AMN98] Yossi Azar, Rajeev Motwani, and Joseph Naor. Approximating probability distributions using small sample spaces. *Combinatorica*, 18(2):151–171, 1998.
- [AS15] Noga Alon and Joel H Spencer. *The probabilistic method*. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
- [AZLO16] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yin Tat Lee, and Lorenzo Orecchia. Using optimization to obtain a width-independent, parallel, simpler, and faster positive SDP solver. In *Proc. 27th annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1824–1831, 2016.
- [Ber97] Bonnie Berger. The fourth moment method. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(4):1188–1207, 1997.
- [BG92] Manuel Blum and Oded Goldreich. Towards a computational theory of statistical tests. In *Proc. 33rd annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 406–416, 1992.
- [BK05] Ankur Bhargava and S Rao Kosaraju. Derandomization of dimensionality reduction and SDP based algorithms. In *Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, pages 396–408. Springer, 2005.
- [BKNS12] Nikhil Bansal, Nitish Korula, Viswanath Nagarajan, and Aravind Srinivasan. Solving packing integer programs via randomized rounding with alterations. *Theory of Computing*, 8(24):533–565, 2012.
- [BR91] Bonnie Berger and John Rompel. Simulating  $(\log^c n)$ -wise independence in NC. *Journal of the ACM*, 38(4):1026–1046, oct 1991.
- [BR94] Mihir Bellare and John Rompel. Randomness-efficient oblivious sampling. In *Proc. 35th annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 276–287, 1994.
- [BS71] Thomas A Brown and Joel H Spencer. Minimization of  $\pm 1$  matrices under line shifts. In *Colloquium Mathematicum*, volume 1, pages 165–171, 1971.
- [CRS94] Suresh Chari, Pankaj Rohatgi, and Aravind Srinivasan. Improved algorithms via approximations of probability distributions. In *Proc. 26th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 584–592, 1994.
- [CW87] Don Coppersmith and Shmuel Winograd. Matrix multiplication via arithmetic progressions. In *Proc. 19th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1–6, 1987.
- [EGL<sup>+</sup>92] Guy Even, Oded Goldreich, Michael Luby, Noam Nisan, and Boban Veličkovic. Approximations of general independent distributions. In *Proc. 24th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 10–16, 1992.
- [FS02] Uriel Feige and Gideon Schechtman. On the optimality of the random hyperplane rounding technique for MAX CUT. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 20(3):403–440, 2002.
- [GG24] Mohsen Ghaffari and Christoph Grunau. Work-efficient parallel derandomization II: Optimal concentrations via bootstrapping. In *Proc. 56th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1889–1900, 2024.

- [GGR23] Mohsen Ghaffari, Christoph Grunau, and Václav Rozhoň. Work-efficient parallel derandomization I: Chernoff-like concentrations via pairwise independence. In *Proc. 64th annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1551–1562, 2023.
- [GMR<sup>+</sup>12] Parikshit Gopalan, Raghu Meka, Omer Reingold, Luca Trevisan, and Salil Vadhan. Better pseudorandom generators from milder pseudorandom restrictions. In *Proc. 53rd annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 120–129, 2012.
- [GMRZ11] Parikshit Gopalan, Raghu Meka, Omer Reingold, and David Zuckerman. Pseudorandom generators for combinatorial shapes. In *Proc. 43rd annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, page 253–262, 2011.
- [GW95] Michel X Goemans and David P Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 42(6):1115–1145, 1995.
- [Har19a] David G Harris. Derandomized concentration bounds for polynomials, and hypergraph maximal independent set. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 15(3):1–29, 2019.
- [Har19b] David G Harris. Deterministic parallel algorithms for bilinear objective functions. *Algorithmica*, 81:1288–1318, 2019.
- [Har23] David G Harris. Deterministic algorithms for the Lovász local lemma: simpler, more general, and more parallel. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 63(3):716–752, 2023.
- [HMP<sup>+</sup>16] David G Harris, Ehab Morsy, Gopal Pandurangan, Peter Robinson, and Aravind Srinivasan. Efficient computation of sparse structures. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 49(2):322–344, 2016.
- [JáJ92] Joseph JáJá. *An Introduction to Parallel Algorithms*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1992.
- [Jof74] Anatole Joffe. On a set of almost deterministic  $k$ -independent random variables. *the Annals of Probability*, 2(1):161–162, 1974.
- [KK97] David R Karger and Daphne Koller. (De)randomized construction of small sample spaces in NC. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(3):402–413, 1997.
- [KKMO07] Subhash Khot, Guy Kindler, Elchanan Mossel, and Ryan O’Donnell. Optimal inapproximability results for MAX-CUT and other 2-variable CSPs? *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(1):319–357, 2007.
- [KM94] Howard Karloff and Yishay Mansour. On construction of  $k$ -wise independent random variables. In *Proc. 26th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 564–573, 1994.
- [KM22] Zander Kelley and Raghu Meka. Random restrictions and PRGs for PTFs in Gaussian space. In *Proc. 37th Computational Complexity Conference (CCC)*, 2022.
- [Lub85] Michael Luby. A simple parallel algorithm for the maximal independent set problem. In *Proc. 17th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1–10, 1985.

- [Lub93] Michael Luby. Removing randomness in parallel computation without a processor penalty. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 47(2):250–286, 1993.
- [MNN94] Rajeev Motwani, Joseph Seffi Naor, and Moni Naor. The probabilistic method yields deterministic parallel algorithms. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 49(3):478–516, 1994.
- [MRS01] Sanjeev Mahajan, Edgar A Ramos, and KV Subrahmanyam. Solving some discrepancy problems in NC. *Algorithmica*, 29(3):371–395, 2001.
- [Nis90] Noam Nisan. Pseudorandom generators for space-bounded computations. In *Proc. 22nd annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 204–212, 1990.
- [Nis92] Noam Nisan.  $RL \subseteq SC$ . In *Proc. 24th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, page 619–623, 1992.
- [NN90] Joseph Naor and Moni Naor. Small-bias probability spaces: Efficient constructions and applications. In *Proc. 22nd annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 213–223, 1990.
- [OST20] Ryan O’Donnell, Rocco A Servedio, and Li-Yang Tan. Fooling Gaussian PTFs via local hyperconcentration. In *Proc. 52nd annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1170–1183, 2020.
- [Rag88] Prabhakar Raghavan. Probabilistic construction of deterministic algorithms: approximating packing integer programs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 37(2):130–143, 1988.
- [Siv02] D Sivakumar. Algorithmic derandomization via complexity theory. In *Proc. 34th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 619–626, 2002.
- [Sri01] Aravind Srinivasan. New approaches to covering and packing problems. In *Proc. 12th annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 567–576, 2001.
- [SSS95] Jeanette P Schmidt, Alan Siegel, and Aravind Srinivasan. Chernoff–Hoeffding bounds for applications with limited independence. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 8(2):223–250, 1995.