Practical aspects of $\ell_0$-sampling algorithms
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Abstract. The $\ell_0$-sampling problem plays an important role in streaming graph algorithms. In this paper, we revisit a near-optimal $\ell_0$-sampling algorithm, proposing a variant that allows proving a tighter upper bound for the probability of failure. We compare experimental results of both variants, providing empirical evidence of their applicability in real-case scenarios.

1. Introduction

The $\ell_0$-sampling problem consists in sampling a nonzero coordinate from a dynamic vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ with uniform probability. This vector is defined in a turnstile model, which consists of a stream of updates $S = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_t)$ on $\mathbf{a}$ (initially 0), where $s_i = (u_i, \Delta_i) \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \times \mathbb{R}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$, meaning an increment of $\Delta_i$ units to $a_{u_i}$. It is desirable that such sample be produced in a single pass through the stream with sublinear space complexity. The challenge arises from the fact that, since $\Delta_i$ can be negative and hence some updates in the stream may cancel others, directly sampling the stream may lead to incorrect results.

The research on $\ell_0$-sampling algorithms has recently gained some traction, in part due to results showing that these algorithms can be used as building blocks in many other algorithms [Cormode and Firmani 2014]. For example, the sampling of nonzero coordinates from rows of the incidence matrix of a graph can be used to compute connected components, $k$-connectivity, bipartiteness, and approximate minimum spanning trees in dynamic graphs using $O(n \log^c n)$ bits, for some constant $c$ [Ahn et al. 2012, McGregor 2014].

In order to achieve sublinear space complexity in a single pass, an $\ell_0$-sampling algorithm must represent $\mathbf{a}$ through a lower-dimensional projection. This representation is known as a sketch. Sketch-based algorithms are common in streaming scenarios, by virtue of allowing compact representations of the original data, whilst retaining some useful information about them.

In [Cormode et al. 2005], a seminal sketch-based algorithm for the $\ell_0$-sampling problem is introduced. The algorithm uses a universal family of hash functions to partition the vector $\mathbf{a}$ into $O(\log n)$ subvectors with exponentially decreasing probabilities of representing each element of $\mathbf{a}$. It is proven that there is a constant lower bound on the probability that at least one of those subvectors has exactly one nonzero coordinate. Through a procedure called 1-sparse recovery (Section 2), which requires $O(\log n)$ bits for each subvector, it is possible to recover such coordinate. Considering that the probability of failure has a constant upper bound, running $O(\log(1/\delta))$ independent instances of the algorithm
can ensure a success probability of at least $1 - \delta$. The total space complexity of this algorithm is $O(\log^2 n \log(1/\delta))$. Further studies show stronger results by relaxing assumptions on the hash functions used [Monemizadeh and Woodruff 2010, Jowhari et al. 2011]. Nevertheless, they keep the same worst-case space complexity. In fact, any algorithm that performs $\ell_0$-sampling in a single pass should require $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ bits in the worst case [Jowhari et al. 2011]. This holds even if the algorithm allows a relative error of $\epsilon$ and a failure probability of $\delta$, for constants $\epsilon$ and $\delta$.

2. 1-sparse recovery procedure

A vector is 1-sparse when it has a single nonzero coordinate. A 1-sparse recovery procedure allows deciding whether a vector $a$ is 1-sparse, and possibly recover the only nonzero coordinate from it. Note that while $a$ is expected to be 1-sparse at the time of a successful recovery, it may have any number of nonzero coordinates before that. This procedure is a building block for many $\ell_0$-sampling algorithms. Here we present a false-biased randomized variant that handles cases where $a$ has negative values [Cormode and Firmani 2014]. It begins by choosing a sufficiently large prime $p \in \Theta(n^c)$, with $c > 1$, and random integer $z \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Then, iterating through all $s_i = (u_i, \Delta_i) \in S$, three sums are computed:

$$b_0 = \sum_{i=1}^t \Delta_i, \quad b_1 = \sum_{i=1}^t \Delta_i u_i, \quad b_2 = \sum_{i=1}^t \Delta_i z^{u_i} \mod p.$$ 

If $a$ is 1-sparse, it is easy to see that the nonzero coordinate can be recovered as $i = b_1/b_0$, with $a_i = b_0$. However, verifying that $a$ is 1-sparse requires more effort.

**Theorem 1.** If $a$ is 1-sparse, then $b_2 \equiv b_0 z^{b_1/b_0} \mod p$. Otherwise, $b_2 \not\equiv b_0 z^{b_1/b_0} \mod p$ with probability at least $1 - n/p$.

**Proof (sketch).** If $a$ is 1-sparse, with a nonzero coordinate $i$, it is trivial to see that $b_2 \equiv a_i z^i \mod p$. Otherwise, $b_2 \equiv b_0 z^{b_1/b_0} \mod p$ may still hold if $z$ is a root in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ of the polynomial $p(z) = b_0 z^{b_1/b_0} - \sum \Delta_i z^{u_i}$. As $p(z)$ is an degree-$n$ polynomial, it has at most $n$ roots in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Therefore, given that $z$ is chosen at random, the probability of a false recovery is at most $n/p$. $\blacksquare$

This 1-sparse recovery procedure stores $z$, and the sums $b_0$, $b_1$, and $b_2$. Assuming that every $a_i$ is limited by a polynomial in $n$, the total space required is $O(\log n)$ bits.

3. $\ell_0$-sampling algorithm

In this work, two variants of the same $\ell_0$-sampling algorithm are presented. Both variants define $a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}, \ldots, a^{(m)}$ subvectors of $a$. For all $1 \leq j \leq m$, each $a_i \not= 0$ has a $1/2^j$ probability of being present at $a^{(j)}$, that is, $a_i^{(j)} = a_i$ with probability $1/2^j$, otherwise $a_i^{(j)} = 0$. To decide whether $a_i^{(j)}$ is present, we draw a hash function $h_j : \{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow \{0, \ldots, 2^m - 1\}$ from a universal family, and observe whether $m - \lceil \log_2 h_j(i) \rceil = j$, which happens with probability $1/2^j$. An independent 1-sparse recovery is then computed for each $a^{(j)}$. The variants differ only in the number of functions used. Variant (a) uses a single hash function for every $a^{(j)}$ (Algorithm 1), while Variant (b) uses a different function for each subvector (Algorithm 2). While (a) is more useful in practice, the error analysis in (b) is more straightforward. We provide empirical evidence in Section 4 that the error in either variant converges quickly as a function of $n$. 
Every variant either succeeds in returning a single nonzero coordinate of $\alpha$, or reports a failure. The probability of failure is given by the joint probability of failure of all $m$ 1-sparse recoveries. In Variant (b), those are independent events. Moreover, the probability that a single recovery $M[j]$ fails is the complement of the probability that $\alpha^{(j)}$ is 1-sparse, that is, assuming $\alpha$ has $r \gg 1$ nonzero coordinates:

$$\Pr[\text{Failure}] = \prod_{j=1}^{m} \left( 1 - r 2^{-j} (1 - 2^{-j}) r^{-1} \right) \approx \prod_{j=1}^{m} \left( 1 - r 2^{-j} e^{-r 2^{-j}} \right).$$

**Theorem 2.** If $5 \leq \log_2 r \leq m - 5$, then $\Pr[\text{Failure}] \leq 0.31$, for Variant (b).

**Proof (sketch).** It is easy to see that the lowest probabilities of failure concentrate around $j$ such that $2^j \leq r < 2^{j+1}$. Letting $q = r/2^{\lfloor \log_2 r \rfloor}$, it holds that

$$\Pr[\text{Failure}] \leq \prod_{k=-5}^{5} \left( 1 - q 2^k e^{-q 2^k} \right).$$

Note that $1 \leq q < 2$. In this interval, all factors $1 - q 2^k e^{-q 2^k}$ are either monotonically increasing or decreasing. Analyzing their global maxima, we arrive at a maximum product of approximately 0.3071, therefore $\Pr[\text{Failure}] \leq 0.31$. 

This result shows that, as $n$ grows, choosing $m = 5 + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ is enough to ensure a constant upper bound on the probability of failure. Furthermore, to ensure a success probability of at least $1 - \delta$, it is sufficient to run $\lceil \log_{0.31} \delta \rceil$ instances of the algorithm.

**4. Empirical evaluation and outlook**

In order to assess the algorithms behavior in a real implementation, an experiment was set up. Both variants were implemented and tested with a vector of size $n = 4096$ and increasing values of $r$. We tested both a correctly sized (i.e., for $m = 17$) and an undersized instance of the $\ell_0$-sampling algorithm. The empirical cumulative distribution was also recorded. The experiment was run 100,000 times and the mean value for each data point is reported in Figure 1.
This experiment suggests that in a correctly sized $\ell_0$-sampling, the failure probability stays almost constant under 20%. There is little difference between Variants (a) and (b). Furthermore, in an undersized setup, the failure rate rapidly reaches critical levels.

In conclusion, we have introduced a variant of the $\ell_0$-sampling algorithm and proved its failure probability to be bounded by a constant value, provided a certain structure-size condition is met. Research is ongoing on the proof of exact probabilities of failure for both algorithm variants. Future research may also include novel graph algorithms that use $\ell_0$-sampling as a primitive.
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