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## Lecture 16

Lecturer: Ronitt Rubinfeld
Scribe: Anson Hu

Today: hypothesis testing, the cover method.
Previously covered: given samples of a distribution $p$ of domain size $n$, it is possible to check if

- $p=q$ for known $q$ or $\epsilon$-far in $O(\sqrt{n})$ samples
- $p$ is $\epsilon$-close to known $q$ in $L_{1}$ distance or $\epsilon$-far in $L_{2}$ distance in $O(n / \log n)$ samples
- $p=q$ for $q$ given via samples or $\epsilon$-far in $L_{2}$ in $O\left(n^{2 / 3}\right)$ samples
- $p$ is $\epsilon$-close to $q$ given via samples in $L_{1}$ distance or $\epsilon$-far in $L_{2}$ distance in $O(n / \log n)$ samples


## 1 Hypothesis testing

Tool: Given a collection of distributions $H$, of which you have complete knowledge, and samples of a distribution $p$ such that there exists $q$ in $H$ for which $\operatorname{dist}(p, q)$ is small, the goal is to output $h$ in $H$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(p, h)$ is small. Our metric is the number of samples in terms of $H$ and the domain size.

Start with the simple case with $|H|=2 . h_{1}, h_{2}$ are given explicitly and $p$ is taken via samples. The goal is to output whichever $h_{i}$ is closer to $p$. If $\left\|h_{1}-h_{2}\right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon$, either one can be output.

Theorem 1 : Given $p$ via samples, $h_{1}, h_{2}$ explicitly, an $\epsilon^{\prime}$ parameter for accuracy, and a $\delta^{\prime}$ confidence parameter, there is an algorithm "Choose" which takes $O\left(\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta^{\prime}}\right) / \epsilon^{\prime 2}\right)$ samples and outputs one of $\left\{h_{1}, h_{2}\right\}$ which satisfies that if one of $\left\{h_{1}, h_{2}\right\}$ has $\left\|h_{i}-p\right\|_{1} \leq \epsilon^{\prime}$, then with probability $\geq 1-\epsilon^{\prime}$ the output is $h_{j}$ such that $\left\|h_{j}-p\right\|_{1} \leq 12 \epsilon^{\prime}$.

We will use $\epsilon^{\prime} \approx \epsilon / 12$. ( $\delta^{\prime}$ is used because down the line it will be needed to pass all tests in a union bound.)

### 1.1 Algorithm "Choose"

First, define $A=\left\{x \mid h_{1}(x)>h_{2}(x)\right\}$. Think about a simplified example where $h_{1}$ and $h_{2}$ only cross twice:


Call these regions $R_{1}, R_{2}, R_{3}$. Let $a_{1}=h_{1}(A)$ and $a_{2}=h_{2}(A)$. We can see that $a_{1}=R_{1}+R_{2}$, $a_{2}=R_{2}$, and $R_{1}=R_{3}=a_{1}-a_{2}$. Notice that $R_{1}=R_{3}$ because the sum of probabilities is equal to 1 for $h_{1}$ and $h_{2}$, and therefore the "additional" probability $R_{1}$ gained by $h_{1}$ over $A$ must be gained by $h_{2}$ over the remainder of the domain.

The $L_{1}$ distance between $h_{1}$ and $h_{2}$ is $R_{1}+R_{3}=2 R_{1}=2\left(a_{1}-a_{2}\right)$.
The algorithm "Choose" does the following:

1. if $a_{1}-a_{2} \leq 5 \epsilon^{\prime}$, declare a tie and return $h_{1}$. (No samples are taken.)
2. draw $m=\frac{2 \log \left(1 / \delta^{\prime}\right)}{\epsilon^{\prime 2}}$ samples $S_{1} \ldots S_{m}$ from $p$.
3. let $\left.\alpha=\frac{1}{m}|i| S_{i} \in A \right\rvert\,$. (In other words $\alpha$ is the fraction of samples in A.)
4. if $\alpha>a_{1}-(3 / 2) \epsilon^{\prime}$, return $h_{1}$, else if $\alpha<a_{2}+(3 / 2) \epsilon^{\prime}$ return $h_{2}$, else there is a tie and return $h_{1}$.

We need that $a_{1}-(3 / 2) \epsilon^{\prime}>a_{2}+(3 / 2) \epsilon^{\prime}$ to make these regions exclusive, which means that $a_{1}>$ $a_{2}+3 \epsilon^{\prime}$. This is enforced by step 1 .

## Behavior

If $h_{1}$ or $h_{2}$ is $\epsilon^{\prime}$ close to $p$, then if there is a tie in step 1 , the $L_{1}$ distance between the two is at most $10 \epsilon^{\prime}$ and then $\left\|p-H_{i}\right\|_{1} \leq 11 \epsilon^{\prime}$, so we are good.
(Side note: total variation distance is used in some papers; it just means half of $L_{1}$ distance.)
Otherwise, we reach step 2, and $L_{1}$ distance between the two is $>10 \epsilon^{\prime} . E[\alpha]=\operatorname{Pr}_{x \in p}[x \in A]=p(A)$. By Chernoff bound on the number of samples, with high probability $|\alpha-E[\alpha]|<\epsilon^{\prime} / 2 . h_{1}$ assigns $a_{1}$ weight to $A$, and $h_{2}$ assigns $a_{2}$ weight to $A$. If $p$ is $\epsilon^{\prime}$-close to $h_{1}$, it assigns $\geq a_{1}-\epsilon^{\prime}$ weight to $A$, which implies $\alpha>a_{1}-\epsilon^{\prime}-\epsilon^{\prime} / 2=a_{1}-(3 / 2) \epsilon^{\prime}$. Therefore $h_{1}$ is output with high probability. The same argument holds for $h_{2}$ in the other direction. We have demonstrated that the algorithm has correct behavior.

### 1.2 A first attempt at arbitrary-size $|H|$

We will try to run this as a subroutine where we reuse samples when plugging into "Choose". The plan is to use union bound since the runs are dependent. The probability of a run being bad is at most $\delta^{\prime}$, therefore we need $k \delta^{\prime}$ to be small, where $k$ is the number of times we run it. Therefore we need $\delta^{\prime} \approx 1 / k$.

We can try a tournament method as such in the image:


However, this is not good, since at each level we gain a factor of 11 of error (for example, if $p=h_{1}$ but $h_{2}$ passes, the distance of $h_{2}$ could be up to about $11 \epsilon^{\prime}$. A similar argument holds as we advance down the tournament tree, so the final winner of the tournament could have as far as $\left\|p-h_{w i n n e r}\right\|_{1} \leq 11^{\log l} \epsilon^{\prime}$.

Now, we instead try to test all pairs. Then we can see that the distribution closest to $p$ never loses, and we want to show that things 11 apart will lose to the winner. We will modify the choose spec: if $h_{i}>12 \epsilon^{\prime}$-far from $p$, then it will likely lose, and if $h_{i}>10 \epsilon^{\prime}$-far, then it is likely to tie or lose.

## 2 The cover method

Definition $2 C$ is an $\epsilon$-cover of $D$, where both $C$ and $D$ are collections of distributions and $C$ is smaller, if $\forall p \in D, \exists q \in C$ such that $\|p-q\|_{1} \leq \epsilon$.

Theorem 3 Given a cover $C$ of $D$, there exists an algorithm, given $p \in D$, which takes $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{2}} \log |C|\right)$ samples of $p$ and outputs $h \in C$ such that $\left\|h-p_{1}\right\|_{1} \leq 12 \epsilon$ with probability $\geq 9 / 10$.

Proof Run "Choose" on $p$ with every pair $\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right) \in C$, the best $q_{o p t}$ ties or wins all matches. If $q^{\prime} \geq 12 \epsilon$-far from $p$, then it is at least $11 \epsilon$-far from $q_{o p t}$.

### 2.1 Examples


$\forall p$, use $\tilde{p} \leftarrow$ closest $i / k$, so $\|p-\tilde{p}\|_{1}<1 / k$.
$k=\Theta(1 / \epsilon) \rightarrow| | p-\tilde{p} \|_{1} \leq \epsilon,|C|=k+1=\Theta(1 / \epsilon)$, and therefore the number of samples taken by the cover method is $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{2}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$.

3-bucket distributions. $|C|=\Theta\left(1 / \epsilon^{2}\right)$, since we have to pick pairs of $(\alpha, \beta)$, and the algorithm takes $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{2}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ samples.


Monotone distributions. By Birge's theorem, $C=\left\{i_{1} / k \ldots i_{\log n / \epsilon} / k\right\}$, where the is are in $\{0 \ldots k\}$. $|C|=\Theta\left(\frac{1}{e^{\log n!\epsilon}}\right)$, so the number of samples is $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{3}} \cdot \log n \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$.

Poisson binomial distribution. $X=\sum x_{i}$, where $x_{i}$ is an indicator variable for a coin with bias $p_{i}$. The $p_{i}$ are independent but not identically distributed. For example, where $p_{1}=1 / 2, p_{2}=1, p \ldots=0$, $\operatorname{Pr}[x=0]=0, \operatorname{Pr}[x=1]=1 / 2$.

