

Testing Distribution Identity Efficiently

Krzysztof Onak
MIT
konak@mit.edu

Abstract

We consider the problem of testing distribution identity. Given a sequence of independent samples from an unknown distribution on a domain of size n , the goal is to check if the unknown distribution approximately equals a known distribution on the same domain. While Batu, Fortnow, Fischer, Kumar, Rubinfeld, and White (FOCS 2001) proved that the sample complexity of the problem is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$, the running time of their tester is much higher: $O(n) + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$. We modify their tester to achieve a running time of $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$.

Let p and q be two probability distributions on $[n]^1$, and let $\|p - q\|_1$ denote the ℓ_1 -distance between p and q . In this paper, algorithms have access to two distributions q and p .

- The distribution p is *known*: for each $i \in [n]$, the algorithm can query the probability p_i of i in constant time.
- The distribution q is *unknown*: the algorithm can only obtain an independent *sample* from q in constant time.

An *identity tester* is an algorithm such that:

- if $p = q$, then it accepts with probability $2/3$,
- if $\|p - q\|_1 \geq \epsilon$, then it rejects with probability $2/3$.

Batu, Fortnow, Fischer, Kumar, Rubinfeld, and White [BFF⁺01] proved that there is an identity tester that uses only $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ samples from q . A shortcoming of their algorithm is a running time of $O(n) + \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$. In this note, we show that their tester can be modified to achieve a running time of $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$. It is also well known that $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$ samples are required to tell the uniform distribution on $[n]$ from a distribution that is uniform on a random subset of $[n]$ of size $n/2$.

1 The Original Tester

We now describe the tester of Batu *et al.* [BFF⁺01], which is outlined as Algorithm 1. Let $\epsilon' = \epsilon/C$, where C is a sufficiently large positive constant. The tester starts by partitioning the set $[n]$ into $k + 1 = \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon'} \frac{2n}{\epsilon} \rceil + 1 = O(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \cdot \log(n/\epsilon))$ sets R_0, R_1, \dots, R_k in Step 1, where

$$R_j = \left\{ i \in [n] : \frac{\epsilon}{2n} \cdot (1 + \epsilon')^{j-1} < p_i \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2n} \cdot (1 + \epsilon')^j \right\}$$

¹We write $[k]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, for any positive integer k .

Algorithm 1: Outline of the tester of Batu *et al.* [BFF⁺01]

- 1 Partition $[n]$ into R_0, R_1, \dots, R_k
 - 2 Compute P_j , for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$
 - 3 Use $O((k/\varepsilon)^2 \cdot \log k)$ samples from q to get an estimate Q'_j of each Q_j up to $\varepsilon/(4k+4)$
 - 4 **if** $\|(P_0, \dots, P_k) - (Q'_0, \dots, Q'_k)\|_1 > \varepsilon/4$ **then REJECT**
 - 5 Let $s_i, i \in [n]$, be the number of occurrences of i in a sample of size $S = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\varepsilon))$
 - 6 **for** $j > 0$ *s.t.* $P_j > \varepsilon/(4k+4)$ **do**
 - 7 **if** $\sum_{i \in R_j} \binom{s_i}{2} > (1 + \varepsilon/4) \cdot \binom{Q_j}{2} \cdot P_j \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{2n} (1 + \varepsilon')^j$ **then REJECT**
 - 8 **ACCEPT**
-

for $j > 0$, and

$$R_0 = \left\{ i \in [n] : p_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2n} \right\}.$$

We then define probabilities of each set according to p and q : $P_j = \sum_{i \in R_j} p_i$ and $Q_j = \sum_{i \in R_j} q_i$. The tester computes and estimates those probabilities in Steps 2 and 3. In Step 4, the tester verifies that the probabilities of sets R_j in both the distributions are close. Finally, in Steps 5–7, the tester verifies that q restricted to each R_j is approximately uniform, by comparing second moments of p and q over each R_j . If q passes the test with probability greater than $1/3$, it must be close to p . On the other hand, if $p = q$, then the parameters can be set so that q passes with probability $2/3$.

Note that the additive linear term in the complexity of the tester comes from explicitly computing each R_j and each P_j in Steps 1–2.

2 Our Improvement

Note that the partition of $[n]$ into sets R_j need not be computed explicitly, since for each sample i from q , one can check which R_j it belongs to by querying p_i .

We observe that one can verify that $\|(P_0, \dots, P_k) - (Q_0, \dots, Q_k)\|_1$ is small without explicitly computing each P_i . We use Algorithm 2 for this purpose. Let j^* be an index such that an element of probability $1/\sqrt{n}$ would belong to R_{j^*} . The algorithm is based on the following facts:

- For $j < j^*$, if P_j is not negligible, R_j must be large, and a good additive estimate to P_j can be obtained by uniformly sampling $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\varepsilon))$ elements of $[n]$, and computing the weight of those that belong to R_j .
- If $p = q$, we are likely to learn all elements in $R_j, j \geq j^*$, by sampling only $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ elements of q . This gives the exact value of each $P_j, j > j^*$. If $p \neq q$, this method still gives lower bounds for each P_j .

If $\|(P_0, \dots, P_k) - (Q'_0, \dots, Q'_k)\|_1 \geq \delta$, our estimates for P_j and Q_j are likely to be sufficiently different. A detailed proof follows.

Lemma 1 *Algorithm 2 with appropriately chosen constants tells $p = q$ (Case 1) from $\|(P_0, \dots, P_k) - (Q_0, \dots, Q_k)\|_1 \geq \delta$ (Case 2) with probability $9/10$.*

Proof The multiplicative constant in the sample size of Step 1 is such that Step 1 succeeds with probability $99/100$. The size of S_1 is chosen such that with probability $99/100$, S_1 contains all elements i of probability

Algorithm 2: Telling $p = q$ (Case 1) from $\|(P_0, \dots, P_k) - (Q_0, \dots, Q_k)\|_1 \geq \delta$ (Case 2)

- 1 Use $O((k/\delta)^2 \cdot \log k)$ samples from q to get an estimate Q'_j of each Q_j up to $\delta/(8k+8)$
 - 2 Let j^* be an index such that an element of probability $1/\sqrt{n}$ would belong to R_{j^*}
 - 3 Let S_1 be a set of $O(\sqrt{n} \cdot \log n)$ samples from q
 - 4 **for** j s.t. $j^* \leq j \leq k$ **do**
 - 5 Let $T_j = S_1 \cap R_j$ (with no repetitions)
 - 6 **if** $|Q'_j - \sum_{i \in T_j} p_i| > \frac{\delta}{8k+8}$ **then return** “Case 2”
 - 7 Let S_2 be a set of $O\left(\left(\frac{k}{\delta}\right)^3 \sqrt{n} \cdot \log k\right)$ independent samples from $[n]$ with replacement
 - 8 **for** j s.t. $j < j^*$ **do**
 - 9 Let $U_j = S_2 \cap R_j$ (with repetitions)
 - 10 **if** $|Q'_j - \frac{\sum_{i \in U_j} p_i}{|S_2|}| > \frac{\delta}{4k+4}$ **then return** “Case 2”
 - 11 **return** “Case 1”
-

$q_i \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}$ by the coupons collector’s problem. Finally, the size of S_2 is chosen such that with probability 99/100, for each $j < j^*$, $\left|\frac{\sum_{i \in U_j} p_i}{|S_2|} - P_j\right| \leq \frac{\delta}{8k+8}$. To see this, let us first focus on $j < j^*$ such that $P_j \geq \frac{\delta}{16(k+1)}$. Note that each $i \in S_2$ contributes with a value in $[0, 1/\sqrt{n}]$ to $\sum_{i \in U_j} p_i$. By the Chernoff bound, $O\left(\left(\frac{k}{\delta}\right)^3 \sqrt{n} \cdot \log k\right)$ samples suffice to estimate P_j with multiplicative error $1 + \frac{\delta}{8k+8}$ with probability $1 - \frac{1}{200k}$, which implies additive error at most $\frac{\delta}{8k+8}$ as well. For $j < j^*$ such that $P_j < \frac{\delta}{16(k+1)}$, the Chernoff bound still guarantees with the same probability that the estimate is less than $\frac{\delta}{8k+8}$.

If $p = q$, then Algorithm 2 discovers this with probability 97/100 due to the following facts. Firstly, $T_j = R_j$, for $j \geq j^*$, so $\sum_{i \in T_j} p_i = P_j$. Therefore, provided all Q'_j are good approximations to the corresponding Q_j , q always passes Step 6. Secondly, if all $\frac{\sum_{i \in U_j} p_i}{|S_2|}$, $0 \leq j < j^*$, are good approximations of the corresponding P_j , q always passes Step 10 as well.

If $\|(P_0, \dots, P_k) - (Q_0, \dots, Q_k)\|_1 \geq \delta$, there is j' such that $Q_{j'} > P_{j'} + \frac{\delta}{2k}$. If $j' \geq j^*$, then because P_j is always greater than or equal to $\sum_{i \in T_j} p_i$, the tester concludes in Step 6 for $j = j'$ that Case 2 occurs, provided $Q'_{j'}$ is a good approximation to $Q_{j'}$, which happens with probability at least 99/100. If $j' < j^*$, then because we have good approximations to both $Q_{j'}$ and $P_{j'}$ with probability 98/100, and their distance is at least $\frac{\delta}{2k} - 2\frac{\delta}{8k+8} > \frac{\delta}{4k+4}$, the algorithm concludes in Step 10 for $j = j'$ that Case 2 occurs. ■

To get an efficient tester, we replace Steps 2–4 of Algorithm 1 with Algorithm 2, where we set δ to ε/C for a sufficiently large constant C . If Algorithm 2 concludes that Case 2 occurs, the new algorithm immediately rejects. Furthermore, if it is not the case that $\|(P_0, \dots, P_k) - (Q_0, \dots, Q_k)\|_1 \geq \delta$, Steps 6 and 7 work with estimates Q'_j instead of the exact values P_j up to a modification of constants.

Acknowledgment

The author thanks Ronitt Rubinfeld for asking the question.

References

- [BFF⁺01] Tugkan Batu, Lance Fortnow, Eldar Fischer, Ravi Kumar, Ronitt Rubinfeld, and Patrick White. Testing random variables for independence and identity. In *FOCS*, pages 442–451, 2001.