1 Streaming for Voting

Consider the following scenario. Votes are being cast for a major election, but due to a lack of resources, only one computer is available to count the votes. Furthermore, this computer only has enough space to store one vote at a time, plus a single extra integer. Each vote is a single integer 0 or 1, denoting a vote for Candidate A and Candidate B respectively.

(a) Come up with an algorithm to determine whether candidate A or B won, or if there was a tie.

(b) Consider now an election with 3 candidates. Say there is a winner only if a candidate receives more than 50 percent of the vote, otherwise there is no winner. If we’re given another integer’s worth of storage, come up with an algorithm to determine the winner if there is one. For simplicity, your algorithm can output any of the candidates in the case that there is no winner (not necessarily the one with the most votes). Votes are now numbered 0, 1, 2.

Solution:

(a) Initialize one of the integers \( i \) to 0. Use the other to store the incoming votes. For every vote for Candidate A, decrement \( i \) by one. For every vote for Candidate B, increment \( i \) by 1. If at the end \( i \) is negative, Candidate A won. If at the end \( i \) is positive, Candidate B won. If \( i \) is 0, there was a tie.

(b) Let \( m \) be a variable which will hold either 0, 1, or 2. Let \( i \) be a counter similar to in the previous part. For each element in the stream, do the following. If \( i \) is 0, set \( m \) equal to the value of the current vote, and set \( i \) to 1. Else if \( i > 0 \), and \( m \) is equal to the current vote in the stream, increment \( i \). Else decrement \( i \).

At the end, if there is a majority vote, \( m \) will contain it. However, if there is no majority vote, \( m \) will still contain some element of the stream.

We can see that this is the case with the following short inductive proof:

Base case: Our algorithm will definitely detect the majority element of a 1 element stream.

Inductive Hypothesis: Assume our algorithm works for a stream of \( n \) or fewer elements.

We have two cases. Either the first candidate’s count drops to zero at some point during the streaming, or it doesn’t. If the first candidate’s count never drops to zero, then the first candidate must be the majority candidate.

If the first candidate’s count does drop to zero (let’s say after the \( x \)th vote), then we can say the following. Suppose we have not yet encountered the true majority element. Then it must be the majority of the rest of the stream. By the inductive hypothesis we will find it by the end of the algorithm. If we have encountered the true majority element already, we can say the following. This element could have appeared only up to \( \frac{n}{2} \) times so far. Of the remaining \( n - x \) elements, at least \((\frac{n}{2} + 1 - \frac{x}{2}) = \frac{n-x}{2} + 1 \) must be the majority element. Thus the true majority element will also be the majority of the rest of the stream. We can then apply the inductive hypothesis again, completing the proof.

2 Universal Hashing

Let \([m]\) denote the set \(\{0, 1, ..., m-1\}\). For each of the following families of hash functions, determine whether or not it is pairwise-independent. If it is universal, determine how many random bits are needed to choose a function from the family.
(a) $H = \{h_{a_1,a_2} : a_1, a_2 \in [m]\}$, where $m$ is a fixed prime and 

$$h_{a_1,a_2}(x_1, x_2) = a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 \mod m$$

Notice that each of these functions has signature $h_{a_1,a_2} : [m]^2 \to [m]$, that is, it maps a pair of integers in $[m]$ to a single integer in $[m]$.

(b) $H$ is as before, except that now $m = 2^k$ is some fixed power of 2.

(c) $H$ is the set of all functions $f : [m] \to [m-1]$.

Solution:

(a) The hash function is universal. The universality proof is the same as the one in the textbook (only now we have a 2-universal family instead of 4-universal). To reiterate, assume we are given two distinct pairs of integers $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$. Without loss of generality, let’s assume that $x_1 \neq y_1$. If we chose values $a_1$ and $a_2$ that hash $x$ and $y$ to the same value, then $a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 \equiv a_1 y_1 + a_2 y_2 \mod m$. We can rewrite this as $a_1 (x_1 - y_1) \equiv a_2 (y_2 - x_2) \mod m$. Let $c \equiv a_2 (y_2 - x_2) \mod m$. Since $m$ is prime and $x_1 \neq y_1$, $(x_1 - y_1)$ must have a unique inverse. So $a_1 (x_1 - y_1) \equiv a_2 (y_2 - x_2) \mod m$ if and only if $a_1 \equiv c (x_1 - y_1)^{-1} \mod m$, which will only happen with probability $1/m$.

We need to randomly pick two integers in the range $[0, \ldots, m-1]$, so we need $2 \log m$ random bits.

(b) This family is not universal. Consider the following inputs: $(x_1, x_2) = (0, 2^{k-1})$ and $(y_1, y_2) = (2^{k-1}, 0)$. We then have $h_{a_1,a_2}(x_1, x_2) = 2^{k-1} a_2 \mod 2^k$ and $h_{a_1,a_2}(y_1, y_2) = 2^{k-1} a_1 \mod 2^k$. Now notice that if $a_2$ is even (i.e. with probability 1/2) then $h_{a_1,a_2}(x_1, x_2) = 0 \mod 2^k$ otherwise (if $a_2$ is odd) $h_{a_1,a_2}(x_1, x_2) = 2^{k-1} \mod 2^k$; likewise for $a_1$. So we get that $h_{a_1,a_2}(x_1, x_2) = h_{a_1,a_2}(y_1, y_2)$ with probability $1/2 > 1/2^k$, so the family is not universal.

(c) This family is universal. To see that, fix $x, y \in \{0, 1, \ldots, m-1\}$ with $x \neq y$. Now we need to figure out the following: how many (out of the $(m-1)^m$ in total) functions $f : [m] \to [m-1]$ will collide on $x$ and $y$, i.e. $f(x) = f(y) = k$, for some fixed $k \in [m-1]$. Well, there are $(m-1)^{m-2}$ different functions $f : [m] \to [m-1]$ that have the property $f(x) = f(y) = k$ (because I just fixed the output of 2 inputs to some fixed $k \in [m-1]$ and allow the output of $f$ for all other inputs to range over all $m-1$ possible values). Finally, ranging over all $m-1$ values of $k$, we get that there are $(m-1)^{m-1}$ functions $f : [m] \to [m-1]$ with the property $f(x) = f(y)$. So the probability of picking one such $f$ is exactly $\frac{(m-1)^{m-1}}{(m-1)^m} = \frac{1}{m-1}$.

How many bits do we need in this case? Well, there is no succinct representation in this case, so we need to write down the whole family of functions explicitly and then pick one of the $(m-1)^m$ functions of the family. To do that we can imagine indexing all functions with integers $1, \ldots, (m-1)^m$ and randomly picking one such integer $k \in \{1, \ldots, (m-1)^m\}$; this obviously requires $\log (m-1)^m = m \log (m-1)$ bits.