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Abstract

The Lovász Local Lemma (LLL) is a probabilistic tool which shows that, if a collection of “bad” events $B$ in a probability space are not too likely and not too interdependent, then there is a positive probability that no bad-events in $B$ occur. Moser & Tardos (2010) gave sequential and parallel algorithms which transformed most applications of the variable-assignment LLL into efficient algorithms. A framework of Harvey & Vondrák (2015) based on “resampling oracles” extended this give very general sequential algorithms for other probability spaces satisfying the Lopsided Lovász Local Lemma (LLLL).

We describe a new structural property of resampling oracles which holds for all known resampling oracles, which we call “obliviousness.” Essentially, it means that the interaction between two bad-events $B, B'$ depends only on the randomness used to resample $B$, and not on the precise state within $B$ itself.

This property has two major consequences. First, it is the key to achieving a unified parallel LLLL algorithm, which is faster than previous, problem-specific algorithms of Harris (2016) for the variable-assignment LLLL algorithm and of Harris & Srinivasan (2014) for permutations. This new algorithm extends a framework of Kolmogorov (2016), and gives the first RNC algorithms for rainbow perfect matchings and rainbow hamiltonian cycles of $K_n$.

Second, this property allows us to build LLLL probability spaces out of a relatively simple “atomic” set of events. It was intuitively clear that existing LLLL spaces were built in this way; but the obliviousness property formalizes this and gives a way of automatically turning a resampling oracle for atomic events into a resampling oracle for conjunctions of them. Using this framework, we get the first sequential resampling oracle for rainbow perfect matchings on the complete $s$-uniform hypergraph $K_{n}^{(s)}$, and the first commutative resampling oracle for hamiltonian cycles of $K_n$.
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1 The Lovász Local Lemma and its algorithms

The Lovász Local Lemma (LLL) is a probabilistic tool, first introduced in [9], which shows that for a probability space \( \Omega \) with a finite set \( B \) of \( m \) “bad” events, then as long as the bad-events are not too interdependent (in a certain technical sense which is not relevant for this work) and are not too likely, then there is a positive probability no events in \( B \) occur. This principle has become a cornerstone of the probabilistic method of combinatorics, as this establishes that a configuration avoiding \( B \) exists. This does not directly lead to efficient algorithms, as the probability of avoiding all the bad-events is typically exponentially small.

The simplest formulation of the LLL, known as the symmetric LLL, can be stated as follows: if every bad-event \( B \) has \( P_\Omega(B) \leq p \) and is dependent with at most \( d \) others, where \( epd < 1 \), then there is a positive probability that none of the bad-events occur.

Most applications of the LLL in combinatorics use a relatively simple probability space, which we refer to as the variable-assignment LLL. This setting has \( n \) independent variables \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \), wherein each bad-event \( B \) is a boolean function of a subset of these variables denoted \( \text{Var}(B) \). Bad-events \( B, B' \) are dependent (written \( B \sim B' \)) iff \( \text{Var}(B) \cap \text{Var}(B') \neq \emptyset \). In [33], Moser & Tardos introduced a remarkably simple algorithm for the variable-assignment LLL, which we refer to as the MT algorithm:

\begin{algorithm}
1: Draw each variable independently from the distribution \( \Omega \).
2: while there is a true bad-event on \( X \) do
3: Choose a true bad-event \( B \) arbitrarily.
4: Resample \( \text{Var}(B) \) according to the distribution \( \Omega \).
\end{algorithm}

Moser & Tardos showed that this algorithm terminates quickly whenever the symmetric LLL criterion (or, more generally, the asymmetric LLL criterion) is satisfied. Later work of [34] and [26] showed that it terminates under more general LLL criteria, including the most powerful of these, the Shearer criterion [35]. See Appendix A for background on the LLL and MT algorithm.

In order to implement the MT algorithm, we need a subroutine to find a bad-event \( B \) which is true on the current configuration \( X \) (if any). We refer to this as a Bad-Event Checker (BEC). The simplest way to implement this is to loop over all bad-events and test them one by one, which would have a run-time on the order of \( m \). The run-time of the MT algorithm can often be polynomial in \( n \) and independent of \( m \) if a more-efficient BEC is used [17] [20].

1.1 The Lopsided Lovász Local Lemma

In [10], Erdős & Spencer noted that positive correlation among bad-events (again, in a certain technical sense) is as good as independence for the LLL. This generalization has been referred to as the Lopsided Lovász Local Lemma (LLLL). We say \( B, B' \) are lopsidedependent and write \( B \sim B' \) if \( B, B' \) are not positively correlated in this sense. All of the usual LLL criteria extend to the lopsidedependent setting; for example, if each bad-event \( B \) is lopsidedependent with at most \( d \) others and \( epd < 1 \), then again a configuration avoiding \( B \) exists.

Although the variable-assignment LLL covers the vast majority of application to combinatorics, other forms of the LLLL see occasional applications. The original paper [10] introducing the LLLL, for example, used a probability space based on random permutations to construct Latin transversals for certain types of arrays. Other applications include hamiltonian cycles on \( K_n \), [2],
perfect matchings of $K_n$ \cite{30}, perfect matchings of the complete $s$-uniform hypergraph $K_n^{(s)}$ \cite{28}, and spanning trees of $K_n$ \cite{28}.

The variable-assignment setting provides one of the simplest forms of the LLLL, and the original algorithm of Moser & Tardos applies to it. In \cite{21}, Harris & Srinivasan developed an algorithm similar to the MT algorithm for the probability space of random permutations, which includes the Latin transversal application of \cite{10}. This algorithm was very problem-specific; a more recent line of research has been developing generic LLLL algorithms, which can cover most of the probabilistic forms of the LLLL.

Harvey & Vondrák \cite{23} developed a general framework based on a “resampling oracle” $\mathcal{R}$ for the probability space. This is a randomized algorithm which, given some state $u$ with some bad-event $B$ true on $u$, attempts to “rerandomize” the configuration in a minimal way to fix $B$. This is similar to the way that the MT algorithm rerandomizes the variables involved in a bad-event. Given this resampling oracle, the following Algorithm 2 (which is a generalization of the MT algorithm) can be used to find a configuration avoiding the bad-events:

\begin{algorithm}
\textbf{Algorithm 2 A general resampling algorithm}
1: Draw the state $u$ from the distribution $\Omega$.
2: \textbf{while} some bad-event $B$ is true on $u$ \textbf{do}
3: \hspace{1em} Select, according to some specified rule, some $B$ true on $u$.
4: \hspace{1em} Update $u \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_B(u)$.
\end{algorithm}

Achlioptas & Iliopoulos \cite{1} further extended this framework to include similar resampling procedures that do not directly correspond to the LLLL itself. These results have led to constructive counterparts to combinatorial results involving spanning trees, matchings of $K_n$ (both discussed in \cite{23}) and hamiltonian cycles of $K_n$ (subsequently developed in \cite{22}).

We note that the choice of which bad-event to select in line (3) of Algorithm 2 is much more constrained than for the MT algorithm. Only a limited number of possibilities (such as selecting the bad-event of smallest index) work, whereas for the MT algorithm one has nearly complete freedom. In \cite{27}, Kolmogorov showed that a number of resampling oracles (including variable-assignment LLL, permutations, and perfect matchings of $K_n$) satisfy an additional property known as \textit{commutativity}. In such cases, Algorithm 2 also allows an arbitrary choice of which bad-event to select. Kolmogorov \cite{27} and Iliopoulos \cite{25} further showed that this property has powerful algorithmic and combinatorial consequences, including parallel algorithms, efficient BEC’s, and bounds on the output distribution at the termination of Algorithm 2.

1.2 Parallel algorithms for the LLL

The sequential MT algorithm terminates in polynomial time whenever the LLL criterion is satisfied, thus turning nearly all applications of the LLL in combinatorics into efficient algorithms. Moser & Tardos also gave a simple parallel algorithm:

\begin{algorithm}
\textbf{Algorithm 3 The parallel MT algorithm}
1: Draw each variable independently from the distribution $\Omega$.
2: \textbf{while} there is a true bad-event on $X$ \textbf{do}
3: \hspace{1em} Select a maximal independent set (MIS) $I$ of true bad-events.
4: \hspace{1em} Resample, in parallel, $\bigcup_{B \in I} \text{Var}(B)$.
\end{algorithm}
This parallel algorithm requires a slightly stronger criterion, which we refer to as $\epsilon$-slack; for instance, the symmetric LLL requires $ep(1 + \epsilon)d \leq 1$; if this satisfied, then it terminates after $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log m)$ rounds with high probability.\(^1\) If the BEC runs in parallel time $T$, then the overall run-time is $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log m(\log^2 m + T))$ on an EREW PRAM.\(^2\)

In [16], Haeupler & Harris showed that the parallel MT algorithm could be implemented in time $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log n(\log^2 n + T))$ (avoiding the dependence on $m$) and gave an alternative parallel algorithm running in time $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^2 m)$. As shown in [26], this parallel algorithm can usually be implemented even for more general LLL criteria, including the asymmetric LLL and Shearer’s LLL criterion.

Many graph problems, such as various forms of vertex coloring, can be solved via the LLL. The parallel MT algorithm typically leads in a straightforward way into distributed coloring algorithms in $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^2 m)$ communication rounds. There has been extensive research into obtaining faster distributed and parallel LLL algorithms. In [7], Chung, Pettie & Su gave a distributed algorithm running in $O(\log m)$ rounds if an alternate LLL criterion is satisfied, and running in $O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log^2 d) \log m)$ rounds for the symmetric LLL with $\epsilon$-slack. The latter result was subsequently improved by Ghaffari [14] to $O(\epsilon^{-1} (\log d) (\log m))$ rounds. Other distributed algorithm (requiring more stringent conditions than the LLL) are given in [11, 15] with faster runtimes (depending on the size of $d$.) On the other side, Brandt et al. [5] showed that generic distributed LLL algorithms must require time $\Omega(\log \log n)$.

### 1.3 Parallel algorithms for the LLLL

Much less progress has been made for parallel LLLL algorithms. Frustratingly, although the sequential MT algorithm works for the variable-assignment LLLL just as it does for the variable-assignment LLL, this is not true of the parallel MT algorithm. There have been only a handful of parallel algorithms for the LLLL, such as the variable-assignment LLLL algorithm of Harris [18] and the permutation LLL algorithm of Harris & Srinivasan [21].

In [27] Kolmogorov proposed a general framework for constructing parallel LLLL algorithms via resampling oracles, which can be summarized as follows:

\begin{algorithm}
\caption{Kolmogorov's framework for parallel resampling algorithms}
\begin{algorithmic}
\State Draw the state $u$ from the distribution $\Omega$
\While {there is a true bad-event on $u$}
\State Set $V$ to be the set of currently-true bad-events
\While {$V \neq \emptyset$}
\State Select, arbitrarily, some bad-event $B \in V$.
\State Update $u \leftarrow R_B(u)$.
\State Remove from $V$ all bad-events $B'$ such that either (i) $B'$ is no longer true; or (ii) $B' \sim B$
\EndWhile
\EndWhile
\end{algorithmic}
\end{algorithm}

We emphasize that this is a \textit{sequential} algorithm, which is in fact an implementation of Algorithm [2] (with an unusual choice of which bad-event to resample). We define a \textit{round} to be an iteration of the loop (lines (3) $-$ (7)). Roughly speaking, Kolmogorov showed that for a commutative resampling oracle $R$ this procedure terminates whp after $O(\log n)$ rounds. Thus, if a single round can be simulated in polylogarithmic time, then this yields an RNC algorithm.

---

\(^1\)We say that an event occurs with high probability (abbreviated whp), if it has probability at least $1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}$.

\(^2\)The factor of $\log^2 m$ here is the cost of an MIS computation. A CRCW PRAM (in which multiple processors can write to a memory cell simultaneously) can typically save a factor of $\log m$ in runtime. In order to simplify the discussion, we will be conservative and use only the EREW PRAM model throughout this paper.
The Kolmogorov framework thus makes partial progress to a parallel LLLL algorithm; however, there remain two significant hurdles. The most straightforward hurdle is a parallel implementation of \( \mathfrak{R} \). For the variable-assignment LLL, this is trivial: if bad-events \( B, B' \) are both selected for resampling, then necessarily \( \text{Var}(B) \) and \( \text{Var}(B') \) are disjoint and so the resamplings can be executed simultaneously. For other probability spaces, it is not clear how to do this step without “locking” the full state.

There is a much more fundamental hurdle, which is that the LLLL resampling process is inherently sequential in a way that the LLL is not. For the LLLL (but not the LLL) it possible that there are two bad-events \( B, B' \) which are currently true, and \( B \not\sim B' \), and resampling \( B \) makes \( B' \) false. We say in this case that \( B \) fixes \( B' \). Because of this possibility, \( B \) and \( B' \) cannot be resampled simultaneously; one must select (arbitrarily) one of the two bad-events to resample first, and then only resample the second one if it remains still true. One critical challenge for LLLL algorithms is to simulate in parallel the process of selecting an ordering of the bad-events and resampling them in sequence.

The parallel LLLL algorithms of Harris [18] and Harris & Srinivasan [21] overcome these hurdles to a limited extent. However they still suffer from a number of shortcomings. Although they run in polylogarithmic time, the exponent is quite high (and is not computed explicitly). They also require additional special structure in the bad-events, such as having the variable probabilities bounded away from one or that having bad-events involving a polylogarithmic number of variables.

Finally, and perhaps most seriously, these algorithms are highly tailored to a single probability space. They are reminiscent of the situation for LLL algorithms before the framework of Harvey & Vondrák [23]: specialized algorithms with ad-hoc analysis.

1.4 Our contribution and overview

We identify a crucial property of resampling oracles that we refer to as obliviousness. To summarize, suppose that we have two bad-events \( B, B' \) with \( B \not\sim B' \), and a configuration \( u \in B \cap B' \). The obliviousness property states that whether \( B \) fixes \( B' \) depends solely on the randomness used to resample \( B \), and not on the state \( u \) itself. This framework is developed in Section 2.

We find it remarkable that every known LLLL probability space has an oblivious resampling oracle: this includes the variable-assignment LLLL, permutations, perfect matchings of \( K_n \), perfect matchings of the hypergraph \( K^{(s)}_n \), hamiltonian cycles of \( K_n \), and spanning trees of \( K_n \).

A unified parallel algorithm. Obliviousness directly addresses the second major hurdle to a parallel LLLL algorithm. Due to obliviousness, the possibility of \( B \) fixing \( B' \) reduces to a pairwise phenomenon: we only need to know the resampling action chosen for \( B \), not the present state (which may be changing during other resampling actions). This allows us to enumerate and describe all the potential cancellations in terms of a simple graph structure. A consistent sequential resampling of the bad-events then corresponds to a structure which is similar to a lexicographically-first maximal-independent-set (LFMIS) of this graph. We show that this object can be computed efficiently in the parallel and distributed settings, generalizing analysis of [4] for undirected graphs. This LFMIS plays a similar role to the MIS in the parallel MT algorithm; the key difference is that it is able to respect the necessary sequential ordering of the bad-events.

This stage of the algorithm gives a sequence of resampling actions, which are guaranteed to be sequentially compatible. To implement them in parallel, we take advantage of combinatorial or algebraic structure in the underlying probability spaces. One especially powerful technique is to encode \( \mathfrak{R} \) as a group action. Specifically, \( \mathfrak{R}_B \) can be interpreted as a randomly-chosen group element \( g_B \) acting on the current state \( u \). In this way, resampling multiple bad-events \( B_1, \ldots, B_s \) can be interpreted as \( g_{B_s} \cdots g_{B_1} u \). This is trivially parallelized by the associativity of group multiplication.
In Section 3, we describe a generic parallel LLLL algorithm, which we summarize as follows:

**Theorem 1.1** (Informal). Suppose that epd$(1+\epsilon) \leq 1$ holds for any LLLL probability space with an appropriate parallelizable resampling oracle. Then there is a parallel algorithm in time $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^4 n)$ to find a state avoiding $\mathcal{B}$.

In Sections 6 and 7 we give a number of applications of these results. We summarize some of the more notable ones here.

**Proposition 1.2.** Suppose we have a $k$-SAT instance on $n$ variables and $m$ clauses, in which each variable appears in at most $L \leq 2^{k+1}(1-1/k)^k - 2$ clauses. Then there is a parallel algorithm to find a satisfying assignment in $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^4 (mn))$ time and poly$(m,n)$ processors whp.

**Proposition 1.3.** Let $H$ be a hypergraph in which each edge has cardinality $k$ and each vertex appears in at most $L$ edges. There is an algorithm in the LOCAL distributed computing model running in $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^3 n)$ rounds to find a proper vertex $c$-coloring of $H$ when $L = \frac{c^k(1-1/k)^{k-1}}{k(c-1)(1+\epsilon)}$.

**Proposition 1.4.** Suppose $A$ is an $n \times n$ matrix whose entries are labeled by colors, and each color appears at most $\Delta \leq 0.105$ times in $A$. Then there is a parallel algorithm to find a Latin transversal $\pi$ of $A$ in $O(\log^4 n)$ time whp. We can find an transversal $\pi$ for which every color appears at most $s$ times, in $O\left(\frac{\log^4 n}{\epsilon}\right)$ time and poly$(n)$ processors for $\Delta \leq n\left(\frac{(s-1)!}{2^{s-1}(1+\epsilon)^s}\right)^{1/(s-1)}$.

**Proposition 1.5.** Consider an edge-coloring of $K_n$ in which every color appears on at most $\Delta$ edges. If $\Delta \leq 0.105n$ and $n$ is even, then we can find a rainbow perfect matching in $O(\log^4 n)$ time and poly$(n)$ processors. If $\Delta \leq 0.026n$, then we can find a rainbow hamiltonian cycle in $O(\log^4 n)$ time and poly$(n)$ processors.

Note that it is possible to derive versions of Propositions 1.2 and 1.3 with slightly worse parameters from the variable-assignment LLL, for which the parallel MT algorithm could be used. Previous RNC algorithms are known for Proposition 1.4; this result thus answers open problems posed by Kolmogorov [27] and Harvey & Liaw [22].

**A new resampling framework.** Beyond its direct algorithmic impact, obliviousness allows us to simplify a number of resampling oracle constructions. Most probability spaces considered for the LLLL have a set of relatively simple “atomic events” which generate the bad-events. For example, in the space of uniform permutations, these are events of the form $\pi(x) = y$. A bad-event $B$ is then taken to be a conjunction of some of these atomic events.

It has been intuitively clear that the resampling oracle for the atomic events in some sense “generates” the resampling oracle for $\mathcal{B}$. A formal description of this has been elusive. To illustrate the difficulty, consider a bad-event of the form $B = A_1 \cap A_2$ and a configuration $u \in B$, where $A_1, A_2$ are atomic events. We would like to resample $B$ by resampling $A_1$ and then resampling $A_2$. In order to obtain the correct probability distribution, we must condition on $A_2$ remaining true after resampling $A_1$. For a general resampling oracle, this conditioning step might distort the probability distribution in an unmanageable way. But for an oblivious resampling oracle, this conditioning step is harmless — we are guaranteed that conditioning on $A_2$ remaining true retains an independent, uniform distribution for $u$ itself.

In Section 2, we give a simple list of axioms required for an oblivious resampling oracle for the atomic events only; these automatically lead to a resampling oracle for $\mathcal{B}$. Beyond the fact that this gives new algorithmic and distributional results, this greatly simplifies many of the proofs and constructions for existing resampling oracles. We highlight a few results:
1. We get a commutative resampling oracle for the space of hamiltonian cycles of $K_n$. As shown by [25], such commutative resampling oracles lead to powerful results on the distributional properties of the resulting LLLL configurations.

2. We get a (sequential) resampling oracle for the space of perfect matchings of the complete hypergraph $K_n^{(s)}$. This leads to efficient algorithms corresponding to non-constructive results on rainbow hypergraph matchings shown by Lu, Mohr, & Székely [28].

1.5 Notation
Throughout, we let $[n]$ denote the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. For a probability space $\Omega$ over a ground set $\mathfrak{U}$, we say that $U \approx \Omega$ if $U$ is a random variable drawn according to the distribution $\Omega$. We also define $\Omega[u]$ to be the probability mass of $u$ under $\Omega$, i.e. $\Omega[u] = P_{U \approx \Omega}(U = u)$.

For any $V \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$, we define $\Omega[V] = P_{U \approx \Omega}(U \in V) = \sum_{u \in V} \Omega[u]$. We also define $\Omega^V$ to be the distribution of $U \approx \Omega$ conditioned on $U \in B$, i.e. $\Omega^V[u] = \Omega[u]/\Omega[V]$ for $u \in V$.

For two random variables $X, Y$, we say $X \approx Y$ if $X, Y$ follow the same distribution. For any set $X$, we define $\text{Unif}(X)$ to be the uniform distribution on $X$.

We let $K_n$ denote the complete graph on vertex set $[n]$. Similarly, for $s \geq 2$, $K_n^{(s)}$ is the complete $s$-uniform hypergraph on vertex set $[n]$. We say that $M$ is a perfect matching of $K_n^{(s)}$ if it is a partition of $[n]$ into exactly $n/s$ classes of size $s$. Whenever we refer to the set of perfect matchings of $K_n^{(s)}$, we will assume implicitly that $s$ divides $n$.

We will frequently analyze the symmetric group $S_n$, the set of $n$-letter permutations; we view such permutations also as bijections on the set $[n]$. We use $(a \ b)$ to refer to the permutation which swaps $a$ and $b$ (and leaves other elements unchanged). We use the multiplication convention that $\sigma_1 \sigma_2$ is the functional composition $\sigma_1 \circ \sigma_2$, that is, the function sending $x$ to $\sigma_1(\sigma_2(x))$. Finally, for subsets $A, A' \subseteq S_n$, we let $AA'$ denote the product set $AA' = \{\pi \pi' | \pi \in A, \pi' \in A'\}$.

2 Resampling oracles
We consider the LLLL for some probability space $\Omega$ over a finite ground set $\mathfrak{U}$. Our plan is to introduce a high-level, generic algorithm for the LLLL. It only uses a few black-box properties of the underlying resampling oracle; in particular, the new property referred as obliviousness. We will then show a number of diverse probability spaces which fit neatly into this framework: this will include the variable-assignment LLLL, as well as permutations, perfect matchings of $K_n^{(s)}$, and hamiltonian cycles of $K_n$.

2.1 Oblivious resampling oracles
In Harvey & Vondrák [23], the resampling oracle is presented as a randomized subroutine mapping states $u \in B$ to states $u' = \mathcal{R}_B(u)$. In order to define the obliviousness property, we must separate the randomness from the resampling. We define, for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$, a probability space $Y_B$ over some finite set (which we also refer to as $Y_B$). We define a resampling map $r_B$ which is a deterministic function taking as input a state $u \in B$ as well as some $y \in Y_B$, and returning $r_B(u, y)$. The intent is to define the resampling oracle $\mathcal{R}_B$ as $\mathcal{R}_B(u) = r_B(u, y)$ where $y \approx Y_B$. For any state $u \in B$ and $y \in Y_B$, we will use the notational shorthand $yu = r_B(u, y)$.

As a starting point, we will require that $r$ gives rise to a commutative resampling oracle with respect to a given dependence relation $\sim$. Before we define the new property required of the
resampling function, let us reiterate the conditions of Harvey & Vondrák [23] and Kolmogorov [27], in terms of our notation.

(C1) (Probability regeneration) For any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and any fixed $u \in \mathcal{U}$, we have

$$P_{(V,y) \approx \Omega_x \times Y_x}(yU = u) = \Omega [u]$$

(C2) (Locality) If $B \not\sim B'$, and $u \in B - B'$, then for all $y \in Y_B$ we have $yu \not\in B'$.

(C3) (Commutativity) Let $B \not\sim B'$. For any states $u \in B \cap B'$ and $w \in \mathcal{U}$, the following holds

$$P_{(y,y') \approx Y_B \times Y_{B'}}(y'u = w | yu \in B') = P_{(y,y') \approx Y_B \times Y_{B'}}(y'y' = w | y'u \in B)$$

**Observation 2.1.** Suppose that $r$ satisfies Properties (C1)—(C2). Then the randomized function $\mathcal{R}_B(u)$ defined by choosing $y \approx Y_B$ and outputting $\mathcal{R}_B(u) = r_B(u,y)$, gives a resampling oracle in the sense of Harvey & Vondrák [23]. If $r$ also satisfies (C3), then the resampling oracle $\mathcal{R}_B$ is commutative in the sense of Kolmogorov [27].

We are now ready to introduce the new structural property required of the resampling map:

(C4) (Obliviousness) For all $B, B'$ with $B \not\sim B'$, and all $y \in Y_B$, we have

$$P_{U \approx \Omega \cap \pi'}(yu \in B') \in \{0, 1\}$$

Another way of stating this is that $yu \in B'$ depends solely on the resampling action $y$, and not on the state $u$. This state-independence is why we refer to this property as obliviousness. In light of (C4), let us define, for each pair $B, B'$, the set

$$Y_{B;B'} = \{y \in Y_B | yu \in B' \text{ for all } u \in B\}$$

For an oblivious resampling oracle we can thus rephrase property (C3) as:

(C3') Let $B_1 \not\sim B_2$. Let $y_1, y_2, y'_1, y'_2$ be random variables independently drawn from $Y_{B_1;B_2}, Y_{B_2}, Y_{B_1}, Y_{B_2;B_1}$ respectively. Then for any state $u \in B_1 \cap B_2$ it holds that $y_2y_1u \approx y'_1y'_2u$.

### 2.2 Atomically-generated probability spaces

For most LLLL resampling oracles, the underlying probability space $\Omega$ has a nicer form: the bad-events $B$ all are expressed as conjunctions of some "atomic" events. For example, in the variable-assignment LLLL setting, an atomic event is $X_i = j$; in the space of uniform permutations, an atomic event is $\pi(i) = j$. While this description has been intuitively clear, it has not been clear how to formalize it. The obliviousness property is the key: we are able to define a resampling oracle and a simple set of axioms applying to the atomic events alone, and then we automatically get a resampling oracle for the larger set of conjunctions of atomic events. This will vastly simplify the proofs and constructions for a number of diverse LLLL spaces.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a collection of events in a probability space $\Omega$ equipped with a dependency relation $\sim$ and a resampling oracle $r$. Note that it possible that some events $A \in \mathcal{A}$ have $A \sim A$. Given any set $E \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, we say that $E$ is independent if $A \not\sim A'$ for all distinct $A, A' \in E$. We define

$$\langle E \rangle = \bigcap_{A \in E} A.$$  

For $A_1, \ldots, A_k \in A$, we abuse notation to write $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_k \rangle$ as shorthand for $\langle \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\} \rangle = A_1 \cap \cdots \cap A_k$. Also, for $E \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we say that $A \sim E$ if there is $A' \in E$ with $A \sim A'$. We use the notation

$$Y_{A:E} = \bigcap_{A' \in E} Y_{A:A'}.$$
We define $\mathcal{A}$ to be the set of conjunctions of events of $\mathcal{A}$,

$$\mathcal{A} = \{ \langle E \rangle \mid E \text{ an independent subset of } \mathcal{A} \}$$

We will extend the dependence relation $\sim$ from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ by setting $\langle E \rangle \sim \langle E' \rangle$ if there exist $A \in E, A' \in E'$ with $A \sim A'$. The key to the construction is to extend the resampling oracle $r$ defined on $\mathcal{A}$ to a resampling oracle $\overline{r}$ on the full set of events $\mathcal{A}$; we will then take $\mathcal{B}$ to be some arbitrary subset of $\mathcal{A}$. For example, in the case of permutations, the space $\mathcal{A}$ would consist of events of the form $\pi(i_1) = j_1 \land \cdots \land \pi(i_k) = j_k$.

To define $r$, consider an event $C = \langle E \rangle$. We select some fixed, but arbitrary, ordering of $E$ as $E = \{ A_1, \ldots, A_k \}$, and we then define the set $Y_C$ as

$$Y_C = Y_{A_1;\{A_2,\ldots,A_k\}} \times Y_{A_2;\{A_3,\ldots,A_k\}} \times \cdots \times Y_{A_k;}$$

in general, the $i$th term in this cartesian product is given by $Y_{A_i;\{A_{i+1},\ldots,A_k\}} = \bigcap_{j=i+1}^{k} Y_{A_i;A_j}$.

The resampling action is defined very simply by

$$\overline{r}(u, (y_1, \ldots, y_k)) = y_k y_{k-1} \cdots y_1 u$$

**Theorem 2.2.** If the resampling oracle $r$ satisfies properties (C1), (C2), (C4) for the events $\mathcal{A}$ on the space $\Omega$, then $\overline{r}$ satisfies (C1), (C2), (C4) for the events $\mathcal{A}$ on the space $\Omega$.

If, in addition, $r$ satisfies property (C3) for the events $\mathcal{A}$, then $\overline{r}$ also does so for the events $\mathcal{A}$.

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is technical, so we defer it to Appendix B.

In later sections, we will construct a number of probability spaces satisfying these conditions. Notably, these include hamiltonian cycles of $K_n$ and perfect matchings of $K_{s,n}$. Our construction for hamiltonian cycles of $K_n$ is commutative, in contrast to a previous resampling oracle for this space of Harvey & Liaw [22]. No resampling oracle of any kind was known for the space of perfect matchings of $K_{s,n}$ for any $s > 2$. We also remark here that the space of spanning trees of $K_n$ satisfies these conditions; since the proof is straightforward, we omit it from the present paper.

### 3 A generic parallel resampling algorithm

In this section we describe a parallel algorithm for a probability space possessing an appropriate resampling oracle. Throughout, the parameter $n$ represents the description size of a configuration, such that a state $u$ is encoded in $\text{poly}(n)$ bits. Correspondingly, our goal for an RNC algorithm is to achieve $\text{polylog}(n)$ runtime, $\text{poly}(n)$ processors, and success probability $1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}$.

#### 3.1 Computational requirements for the resampling oracle

In addition to the structural properties of the resampling oracle $r$, the parallel algorithm requires a few simple computational properties as well. The runtime bounds here are chosen so that $r$ does not become the computational bottleneck for the overall algorithm.

(D1) **(Efficiency)** For any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we can draw $y \approx Y_B$ using $O(\log^3 n)$ time and $\text{poly}(n)$ processors.

(D2) **(Composability)** Suppose we are given a sequence $B_1, \ldots, B_s$, where $B_i \not\sim B_j$ for $i \neq j$, and $y_1, \ldots, y_s \in Y_{B_1}, \ldots, Y_{B_s}$ respectively, as well as a state $u \in \Omega$. Then the composition $y_s \ldots y_1 u$ can be computed using $O(\log^3(sn))$ time and $\text{poly}(n, s)$ processors.
For atomically-generated probability spaces, these two properties can themselves be simplified:

**Proposition 3.1.** Suppose that every bad-event \( B \in \mathcal{B} \) is a conjunction of at most \( \text{poly}(n) \) atomic events, and that (D2) as well as the following property (D1') holds for \( r \):

\[(D1') \text{ For any } A \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and independent set } E \subseteq \mathcal{A} \text{ with } A \not\sim E \text{ and } |E| \leq \text{poly}(n), \text{ we can efficiently sample from } Y_{A:E} \text{ in } O(\log^3 n) \text{ time and poly}(n) \text{ processors.} \]

Then (D1), (D2) hold for \( \pi \) when resampling \( \mathcal{B} \).

**Proof.** Let \( B = \langle A_1, \ldots, A_k \rangle \) with \( k \leq \text{poly}(n) \). By definition of \( \overline{\mathcal{A}} \), \{\( A_1, \ldots, A_k \)\} must be an independent set. In order to draw \( y = (y_1, \ldots, y_k) \in Y_C \), we use (D1') to sample each \( y_i \) independently from \( Y_{A_i:U(A_i+1, \ldots, A_k)} \). This shows (D1).

To show (D2), consider a sequence of bad-events \( B_1, \ldots, B_s \in \mathcal{B} \) and corresponding \( y_i \in Y_{B_i} \); we want to compute the composition \( y_s \cdots y_1 u \). Each \( y_i \) can be written as \( y_i = (y_i,1, \ldots, y_i,k_i) \), and so the composition can be written \( y_s,k_s \cdots y_{s,1} \cdots y_{1,k_1} \cdots y_{1,1} u \), wherein each \( y_{i,j} \) is in \( Y_{A_i,j} \) for some \( A_i,j \). By definition of \( \sim \) on \( \overline{\mathcal{A}} \), the events \( A_i,j \) are all independent. This sequence has length \( s \times \text{poly}(n) \) and so Property (D1') allows us to compute the composition in \( O(\log^3 (sn)) \) time and \( \text{poly}(s,n) \) processors. \( \square \)

**3.2 The algorithm**

Given a resampling oracle \( r \) satisfying (C1)–(C4), (D1), (D2), we use the following generic parallel Algorithm 5. This algorithm requires a key subroutine to find the LFMIS of a directed graph. We give a more precise definition and a parallel algorithm later in Section 4, but to summarize, the LFMIS \( I \) with respect to a permutation \( \pi \) is produced by iterating through \( i = 1, \ldots, |V| \); we add \( \pi(i) \) to \( I \), unless there is already some \( u \in I \) with an edge from \( w \) to \( \pi(i) \).

**Algorithm 5** The parallel LLLL algorithm

1. Draw \( u \) from the distribution \( \Omega \).
2. **while** there are true bad-events **do**:
   3. Let \( V \) denote the set of bad-events which are currently true.
   4. For each \( B \in V \), independently draw a random variable \( y_B \approx Y_B \).
   5. Construct the directed graph \( G \), whose vertex set is \( V \), and whose directed edge set is
      \[ E(G) = \{(B, B') \mid B \sim B' \text{ or } y_B \not\in Y_{B:B'}\} \]
   6. Find the LFMIS \( I \) of \( G \) with respect to a random permutation \( \pi \).
   7. Sort \( I = \{B_{i_1}, B_{i_2}, \ldots, B_{i_s}\} \), where \( \pi(B_{i_1}) < \pi(B_{i_2}) < \cdots < \pi(B_{i_s}) \).
   8. Update the state as \( u \leftarrow y_{B_{i_s}} y_{B_{i_{s-1}}} \cdots y_{B_{i_1}} u \)

For maximum generality, we analyze Algorithm 5 in terms of two parameters \( W, \epsilon \) from the Shearer LLLL criterion. Please see Appendix for a precise definition. Theorem 3.2 gives a few simpler LLL criteria, including the symmetric, asymmetric, and cluster-expansion criteria. For most applications, \( W \leq \text{poly}(n) \) and \( \epsilon \geq \Omega(1) \). Our main result will be the following:

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \( \mathcal{B} \) be a set of bad-events which has the following properties:

1. There is a resampling oracle satisfying (C1)—(C4), (D1), (D2).
2. There is a BEC running in time \( T \) and \( \text{poly}(n) \) processors.
3. The Shearer criterion is satisfied with parameters $\epsilon, W$.

Then there is a parallel algorithm to find a state $u \in \mathcal{U}$ avoiding $\mathcal{B}$, running in $O\left(\frac{\log(n+W\epsilon)(T+\log^3(n+W\epsilon))}{\epsilon}\right)$ time and $\text{poly}(n, W)$ processors whp.

For most applications, we can use one of the two simplified formulations of Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.3. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a set of bad-events which satisfies properties (C1)–(C4), (D1), (D2), and has a BEC running in $O(\log^3 n)$ time and $\text{poly}(n)$ processors, and which satisfies the Shearer criterion with slack $\epsilon$ and $W \leq \text{poly}(n)$.

Then there is a parallel algorithm to find a state $u \in \mathcal{U}$ avoiding $\mathcal{B}$, running in $O\left(\frac{\log^4 n}{\epsilon}\right)$ time and $\text{poly}(n)$ processors whp.

Theorem 3.4. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a set of bad-events which has a resampling oracle satisfying (C1)–(C4), (D1), (D2), and for which we can check if any given bad-event $B$ is true in $O(\log^3 n)$ time and $\text{poly}(n)$ processors, and which satisfies the symmetric LLL criterion $\epsilon_{\text{pd}}(1 + \epsilon) < 1$.

Then there is a parallel algorithm to find a state $u \in \mathcal{U}$ avoiding $\mathcal{B}$, running in $O\left(\frac{\log^4 (mn)}{\epsilon}\right)$ time and $\text{poly}(m, n)$ processors whp.

3.3 Algorithm analysis

This section is devoted to proving Theorem 3.2. We refer to each iteration of the main loop of Algorithm 5 (lines (3) – (8)) as a round. We use $V_t, I_t, \pi_t$, etc to denote the quantities corresponding to round $t$. We first observe that a single round can be implemented efficiently in parallel.

Proposition 3.5. If we have a BEC running in time $T$, then each round of Algorithm 5 can be implemented using $\text{poly}(|V_t| n)$ processors and $O(\log^3(|V_t| n))$ time whp.

Proof. We can determine the set $V_t$ in time $T$. By (D1), we can draw the random variables $y_B$ in time $O(\log |V_t| + \log^3 n)$. By Theorem 3.4, we can find $I_t$ in time $O(\log^3(|V_t| n))$ whp. Finally, using (D2), we can compute the composition $y_{B_{t,n}} y_{B_{t,n-1}} \cdots y_{B_{t,1}} u$ in time $O(\log^3(|V_t| n))$. In light of (C4), we can efficiently check if $y_B \in Y_{B,B'}$ by computing $y_{Bu}$ and testing if $y_{Bu} \in Y_{B'}$.

Thus, our main task is to show that Algorithm 5 terminates a small number of rounds. We do so by coupling it to a sequential resampling algorithm, Algorithm 6. (The variable $I'_t$, which is maintained during that algorithm, is not used — it will appear in our analysis.)

Algorithm 6 A sequential resampling algorithm

1: Draw $u$ from the distribution $\Omega$.
2: while there are true bad-events do for $t = 1, 2, \ldots$:
3: Let $V_t$ denote the set of bad-events which are currently true.
4: Mark every element of $V_t$ as “alive”
5: For each $B \in V_t$, draw a random variable $y_B \approx Y_B$.
6: Select a random ordering $\pi$ of $V_t$.
7: Set $I'_t = \emptyset$
8: for $k = 1, \ldots, |V_t|$ do
9: if $\pi(k)$ is currently marked alive then
10: Update $u \leftarrow y_{\pi(k)u}$
11: Update $I'_t \leftarrow I'_t \cup \{\pi(k)\}$
12: for any $B \in V_t$ with either (i) $B$ is false on $u$ or (ii) $B \sim \pi(k)$ do
13: Mark $B$ as dead.
By the principle of deferred decisions, there is no difference in selecting the random variable $y_B$ in a “preprocessed” way (as in line (5) of Algorithm 6), as opposed to in “online” way; thus, line (10) of Algorithm 6 is equivalent to executing the resampling oracle $R_B(u)$. Thus, Algorithm 6 is a version of Algorithm 2 with an unusual choice of which bad-event to resample; specifically, it is a version of Kolmogorov’s algorithm (Algorithm 4).

The equivalence between Algorithm 6 and Algorithm 5 follows from the following result:

**Proposition 3.6.** If the random variables $\pi, u, y$ are all fixed at the beginning of round $t$ and $I, I'$ are the LFMIS produced for Algorithms 5 and 6 respectively for round $t$, then $I = I'$.

**Proof.** Let $u_j$ denote the state after iteration $j$ of round $t$ (and $u_0$ is the state at the beginning of round $t$). Enumerate $V_t$ in sorted order as $\{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_k\}$ where $\pi(B_1) < \pi(B_2) < \cdots < \pi(B_k)$. Let us write $y_i$ as shorthand for $y_{B_i}$ and $Y_i$ as shorthand for $Y_{B_i}$.

With this notation, observe that $B_j \in I$ iff there is no $i < j$ with $B_i \in I$ and either (a) $B_i \sim B_j$ or (b) $y_i \in Y_{B_i \cup B_j}$. Similarly, $B_j \in I'$ iff there is no $i < j$ with $B_i \in I'$ and either (a) $B_i \sim B_j$ or (b) $B_j$ is false on $u_i$.

We show by induction on $j$ that $B_j \in I$ iff $B_j \in I'$.

Suppose first that $B_j \in I' - I$. Since $B_j \notin I$, there must be some $i < j$ with $B_i \in I$ such that $B_i \sim B_j$ or $y_i \notin Y_{B_i \cup B_j}$. In the former case, by our induction hypothesis $B_i \in I'$ and this would contradict that $B_j \in I'$. In the latter case, note that since $B_j \in I'$, it must be that $B_j$ is true on $u_i$ and $u_{i-1}$ and $B_i$ is true on $u_{i-1}$. Thus, $u_{i-1} \in B_i \cap B_j$ and $u_i = y_i u_{i-1} \in B_j$. So it must be that $y_i \in Y_{B_i \cup B_j}$.

Next, suppose that $B_j \in I - I'$. Since $B_j \notin I'$, there must be some $i < j$ with $B_i \in I'$ such that $B_i \sim B_j$ or $B_j$ is false on $u_i$. Let $i$ be minimal subject to these conditions. In the former case, by our induction hypothesis $B_i \in I$ and this would contradict that $B_j \in I$. Otherwise, by minimality of $i$, it must be that $B_j$ becomes false after resampling $B_i$. Thus, $u_{i-1} \in B_i \cap B_j$ and $u_i = y_i u_{i-1} \notin B_j$. Thus $y_i \in Y_{B_i} - Y_{B_i \cup B_j}$. By induction hypothesis, $B_i \in I$. Since there is an edge $(B_i, B_j)$, it cannot be that $B_j \in I$.

The analysis of [27] can be used to show that Algorithm 5 terminates in a small (typically polylogarithmic) number of rounds. We will additionally take advantage of the “random-like” distribution of the states during intermediate stages of the parallel LLLL algorithm; this phenomenon was exploited by Harris & Srinivasan [20] and Haeppler & Harris [16] for the standard MT algorithms. The main result we need to analyze Algorithm 5 is the following:

**Lemma 3.7.** If $A \in V_t$ for $t \geq 2$, then $A \in I_{t-1}'$ or $A \sim B$ for some $B \in I'_{t-1}$.

**Proof.** As we execute Algorithm 5, we let $T_i$ denote the total number of resamplings before round $i$ (so $T_1 = 0$), and we let $u_{i}^{(i)} = u_{T_i}$ denote the state immediately at the beginning of round $i$.

By definition, $A$ must be true on $u_{0}$. Observe that either $A$ is true at time $T_{i-1}$ or $A \sim B \in I'_{t-1}$; otherwise, by property (C4), $A$ would remain false after all the resamplings in round $t - 1$.

If $A \sim B \in I'_{t-1}$ or $A \in I'_{t-1}$ we are done. Otherwise, suppose $A \in V_{t-1} - I'_{t-1}$. This can only be the case if $A$ was marked as dead in round $t - 1$. Suppose that this first occurs at time $i$, during the resampling of some $B \in I'_{t-1}$. If $A \sim B$, we are done; otherwise, $A$ must be false on $u_i$.

However, $A$ is true at the beginning of round $t - 1$. By (C4), the only way it can later become false during round $t - 1$ is if there is some $B'$ resampled between times $T_{t-1}$ and $i$ with $B' \sim A$. Thus $B' \in I'_{t-1}$, $B' \sim A$ as desired.

Lemma 3.7 in combination with some general results and definitions concerning analysis of the LLLL, gives the following key bound:
Lemma 3.8. Whp, Algorithm 5 terminates after \(O\left(\frac{\log(n + W \epsilon)}{\epsilon}\right)\) rounds and \(\sum_t |V_t| \leq O(W \text{poly}(n))\).

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Lemma 3.8 ensures that Algorithm 5 terminates after \(s = O\left(\frac{\log(n + W \epsilon)}{\epsilon}\right)\) rounds whp. Proposition 3.5 shows that each round \(t\) can be executed in \(O\left(\log^3(|V_t| n)\right)\) time and \(\text{poly}(|V_t|)\) processors whp. Thus the overall runtime is at most \(s(T + \log^3 n) + \sum_{t=1}^s \log^3(|V_t|)\). By concavity, we have

\[
\sum_{t=1}^s \log^3|V_t| \leq s \log^3(1 + \sum_{t=1}^s |V_t|/s)
\]

By Lemma 3.8, \(\sum_t |V_t| \leq O(W \text{poly}(n))\) whp. Thus, this quantity is as most \(O(s \log^3(n + W \epsilon))\).

The processor count will be bounded by \(\text{poly}(n, \max_t |V_t|)\). Since \(\sum_t |V_t| \leq W \text{poly}(n)\), this is at most \(\text{poly}(n, W)\).

Theorem 3.3 is an immediate corollary. To show Theorem 3.3 note that in that case we have \(T \leq O(\log^3(mn))\) and \(W \leq O(m)\).

Although we have stated our results for general probability spaces in terms of the Shearer criterion, we also note that some probability spaces have convergence and distributional properties which go beyond these generic bounds [18, 19, 25]. Since Algorithm 5 can be viewed as a simulation of the sequential algorithm, all such bounds apply equally to it. We will later see a few examples of how these bounds can be used to analyze, for instance, the variable-assignment LLLL.

4 LFMIS for directed graphs

In this section, we describe a key subroutine in our parallel LLLL algorithm, the LFMIS for directed graphs. This plays a similar role for our LLLL algorithm as the MIS does for the parallel MT algorithm. By itself, the LFMIS has little connection to the LLLL, and may be of independent combinatorial and algorithmic interest.

For an undirected graph \(G = (V, E)\), an independent set of \(G\) is a set \(S \subseteq V\) where no two vertices in \(S\) are adjacent in \(G\). A maximal independent set (MIS) has the additional property that no \(T \supseteq S\) is an independent set of \(G\). There is a trivial sequential algorithm to find an MIS of \(G\) by adding vertices one-by-one to \(S\). The MIS produced by this sequential algorithm is referred to as the lexicographically first MIS (LFMIS). It is P-complete to find the LFMIS of a graph \(G\) [8].

More generally, given any permutation \(\pi : V \to [n]\), we define LFMIS of \(G\) with respect to \(\pi\), as the LFMIS of \(G\) when the vertices are re-ordered in increasing order of \(\pi\). If \(\pi\) is selected uniformly at random from \(S_n\), then an algorithm of Blelloch, Fineman, Shun [4] can find the LFMIS in \(O(\log^2 n)\) rounds. This was later strengthened by Fischer & Noever [12] to \(O(\log n)\) rounds.

Abusing terminology somewhat, we define the LFMIS of a directed graph \(G\) to be the set \(I\) produced by the following sequential process:

Algorithm 7 The sequential FIND-LFMIS algorithm for an directed graph \(G\).

1: Initialize \(I \leftarrow \emptyset\).
2: Mark all the vertices of \(G\) as alive
3: for \(i = 1, \ldots, n\) do
4: if vertex \(i\) is alive then
5: Add \(i\) to \(I\)
6: For any directed edge \((i, j) \in E\) mark \(j\) as dead.
Note that any undirected graph \( G \) can be viewed as a directed graph \( G' \), where every edge \((u, v) \in G\) corresponds to two directed edges \((u, v), (v, u) \in G'\). The LFMIS (in the usual sense) of \( G \) is then identical to the directed LFMIS of \( G' \).

There is a simple parallel greedy algorithm to find the LFMIS of a directed graph \( G \):

**Algorithm 8** The parallel greedy algorithm to find the LFMIS of a directed graph \( G \)

1: Initialize \( I \leftarrow \emptyset \).
2: while \( G \) is non-empty do
3: Let \( J \) denote the set of nodes \( v \in G \) such that \( G \) has no residual edge \((u, v) \) with \( u < v \).
4: Add \( J \) to \( I \).
5: For each edge \((v, u) \in E \) for \( v \in J \), remove \( v \) and \( u \) from \( G \).

This can be viewed as a parallel algorithm — each individual step, of identifying the source nodes and adding them to \( I \), can be done in \( O(\log n) \) time and \( O(m + n) \) processors. Alternatively, it can be viewed as a distributed algorithm, where the graph \( G \) itself corresponds to the communication network (in which case they can be executed in \( O(1) \) distributed communication rounds).

We will need to bound the number of steps of the greedy algorithm for a random vertex ordering. The analysis is very similar to the proof given in [4]. The main difference is that we show that the in-degrees of the vertices are rapidly reduced during the greedy algorithm; [4] showed that the (undirected) degrees are rapidly reduced when \( G \) is an undirected graph.

**Theorem 4.1.** When the vertices of \( G \) are reordered according to a permutation \( \pi \) selected uniformly at random, then Algorithm 8 terminates in \( O(\log^2 n) \) rounds whp.

We defer the proof of Theorem 4.1 to Appendix C, which shows a slightly stronger result. We also note that this corresponds to \( O(\log^3 n) \) time on an EREW PRAM, as it would require this time to find the source nodes. Note that [12] shows a run-time of \( O(\log n) \) rounds when \( G \) is undirected; we conjecture that Algorithm 8 should also run in \( O(\log n) \) rounds for directed graphs.

5 Examples of resampling oracles

Now that we have described a generic framework for atomically-generated LLLL spaces, we can give some examples. We describe three simple examples here: the variable-assignment LLLL, the uniform distribution on permutations, and cartesian products. Two other examples, perfect matchings and hamiltonian cycles of \( K_n \), are deferred to Appendices D and E.

5.1 The variable-assignment LLLL

This resampling action is very simple. For any \( i \in [n] \) and value \( j \), we define the atomic event \( A \equiv X_i = j \). The probability distribution \( Y_A \) is simply the distribution of variable \( i \) under \( \Omega \). The resampling actions can be stated very simply as setting \( r_A(X, y) = X' \), where \( X' = X \) for \( \ell \neq i \) and \( X'_i = y \).

We define \( \sim \) by setting \( (X_i = j) \sim (X'_i = j') \) if \( i = i' \) but \( j \neq j' \). We can easily check that the resulting resampling action \( \tau \) is precisely the same resampling oracle used in the Moser-Tardos algorithm. All of the properties (C1)—(C4) are trivial to verify, but we will still show a few of them in order to explain the definitions.

**Proposition 5.1.** The resampling action satisfies property (D2).
Proof. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ be given as well as associated $y_1, \ldots, y_n$, and consider some state $X$; we want to compute $X' = y_s \ldots y_1 X$. Each event $A_\ell$ has the form $X_{i_\ell} = j_\ell$. For any variable $k \in [n]$, let $\ell(k)$ be the maximal index such that $i_{\ell(k)} = k$. We observe that $X'_k = y_{\ell(k)}$. Each $\ell_k$ can be found in $O(\log s)$ rounds by binary search, and the different values $k \in [n]$ can be handled in parallel. \qed

**Proposition 5.2.** The resampling action satisfies property (C4).

Proof. Consider $A \equiv X_i = j$ and $A' \equiv X_{i'} = j'$. Let $y \in Y_A$. If $i \neq i'$, then observe that any state $X \in A \cap A'$ will have $yX$ satisfy $A'$. If $i = i'$, then $yX$ will satisfy $A'$ iff $y_i = j$. In either case, the condition on $y$ does not depend upon $X$. \qed

**Proposition 5.3.** The resampling action satisfies property (C3).

Proof. Consider $A \equiv X_i = j$ and $A' \equiv X_{i'} = j'$. If $A = A'$, then commutativity is vacuous. Otherwise, $Y_{A; A'} = Y_A$. For any fixed $X$, the distribution of $X' = y' yX$ is the following: $X'_\ell = X_\ell$ for $\ell \neq i, i'$ and $X'_{i'}$ is drawn from $\Omega$ for coordinate $\ell \in \{i, i'\}$. This is obviously independent of the ordering of $A, A'$. \qed

### 5.2 Uniform distribution on $S_n$

In this setting, we use $\pi$ instead of $u$ to represent the system state. The atomic sets here have the form

$$A = \{\pi \in S_n \mid \pi(x) = y\}$$

for some $(x, y) \in [n] \times [n]$; we write this as $A = \langle (x, y) \rangle$. We define $\sim$ on $A$ by setting $A \sim A'$ iff $P_{\Omega}(A \cap A') = 0$. This occurs if one of the following two conditions holds: (i) there are parameters $x, y, y'$ with $y \neq y'$ such that $A = \langle (x, y) \rangle$ and $A' = \langle (x, y') \rangle$, or (ii) there are parameters $x, x', y$ with $x \neq x'$ such that $A = \langle (x, y) \rangle$ and $A' = \langle (x', y) \rangle$.

For any $A = \langle (x, y) \rangle$, we define $Y_A$ to be the set of permutations of the form $\sigma = (y z)$, where $z$ is drawn uniformly from $[n]$. We define the resampling action as left-multiplication, i.e. $r_A(\pi, \sigma) = \pi \sigma$. Note that this notation agrees nicely with our shorthand notation for resampling oracles, where $yu$ stands for $r_A(u, y)$.

**Proposition 5.4.** Property (D2) holds.

Proof. For a state $\pi$ and $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s \in Y_{A_1}, \ldots, Y_{A_s}$, we want to compute the composition $\sigma_s \ldots \sigma_1 \pi$. We can do this efficiently in parallel since group multiplication is associative. \qed

**Proposition 5.5.** Property (C1) holds.

Proof. Consider $A = \langle (x, y) \rangle$. We want to show that if $\pi$ is drawn uniformly from $A$ and $z$ uniformly from $[n]$, then $(y z) \pi$ has the uniform distribution on $S_n$. This will follow from the fact that for every $\tau \in S_n$, there is exactly one $\pi \in A$ and one value $z \in [n]$ such that $(y z) \pi = \tau$.

Since $|A \times [n]| = (n - 1)! \times n = n! = |S_n|$, it suffices to show that for every such $\tau$ there is at most one such $z, \pi$. For, suppose that $\tau = (y z) \pi$. So $\tau x = (y z) \pi x = (y z) y = z$. This uniquely determines $z$. $\pi$ is then determined as $\pi = (y z) \pi$. \qed

**Proposition 5.6.** Property (C2) holds.

Proof. Consider $A = \langle (x, y) \rangle$ and $A' = \langle (x', y') \rangle$ and $\pi \in A \cap A'$. We cannot have $A = A'$ since $A - A'$ is non-empty, and so $x' \neq x, y' \neq y$. Suppose for contradiction that $(y z) \pi x' = y'$. So $\pi x' = (y z) y'$. If $z \neq y'$, then this states that $\pi x' = y'$, which contradicts $\pi \notin A'$. If $z = y'$, then this states that $\pi x' = y$, which is impossible as $\pi x = y$. \qed
Proposition 5.7. Let \( A = \langle (x, y) \rangle \) and \( A' = \langle (x', y') \rangle \) with \( A \not\sim A' \). Let \( \sigma = (y \ z) \in Y_A \) and \( \pi \in A \cap A' \). Then:

1. If \( (x, y) = (x', y') \), then we have \( \sigma \pi \in A' \) iff \( z = y \);
2. If \( (x, y) \neq (x', y') \), then we have \( \sigma \pi \in A' \) iff \( z \neq y' \)

Proof. In case (1), if \( z = y \), then \( \sigma \pi = \pi \), which is in \( A = A' \) by hypothesis. If \( z \neq y \), then \( \sigma \pi x = (y \ z)y = z \neq y \), and so \( \sigma \pi \notin A \).

In case (2), since \( A \not\sim A' \) we have \( y \neq y' \). If \( z \neq y' \), then \( \sigma \pi x' = (y \ z)y' = y' \) and so \( \sigma \pi \in A' \). If \( z = y' \), then \( \sigma \pi x' = (y \ y')y' = y \neq y' \), and so \( \sigma \pi \notin A' \).

\( \square \)

Proposition 5.8. Property (C4) holds.

Proof. Proposition 5.7 gives an explicit condition on when \( \sigma \pi \in A' \) for \( A \not\sim A' \). This condition depends solely on \( A, A', \sigma \) and not on \( \pi \) itself; thus, for any fixed \( \sigma \), it holds for all such \( \pi \) or none of them.

\( \square \)

Proposition 5.9. Property (C3) holds.

Proof. Let \( A_1 = \langle (x_1, y_1) \rangle \) and \( A_2 = \langle (x_2, y_2) \rangle \) where \( A_1 \not\sim A_2 \). If \( A_1 = A_2 \), then (C3) is trivial, so let us assume \( x_1 \neq x_2, y_1 \neq y_2 \).

We need to show that for any fixed \( \pi \), we have

\[
(y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1)\pi \approx (y_1 z'_1)(y_2 z'_2)\pi
\]

where \( (y_1 z_1) \approx Y_{A_1 \cup A_2}, (y_2 z_2) \approx Y_{A_1 \cup A_2}, (y_1 z_1) \approx Y_{A_1} \).

By Proposition 5.7 we know that \( z_1 \in [n] - \{y_2\} \) and \( z'_2 \in [n] - \{y_1\} \). We will first show that

\[
\left\{(y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1) \mid z_1 \in [n] - \{y_2\}, z_2 \in [n] \right\} \subseteq \left\{(y_1 z'_1)(y_2 z'_2) \mid z'_1 \in [n], z'_2 \in [n] - \{y_1\} \right\}
\]

(1)

So, we want to show that \( (y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1) = (y_1 z'_1)(y_2 z'_2) \) for some choice of \( z'_1, z'_2 \). If \( z_1, z_2 \) are distinct from each other and \( y_1, y_2 \), then we can simply take \( z'_1 = z_1, z'_2 = z_2 \). Otherwise, there are a number of cases depending on which of the terms \( z_1, z_2, y_1, y_2 \) are equal to each other.

**Case I: \( z_1 = z_2 = y_2 \).** Let \( z = z_1 = z_2 \). If \( z = y_1 \), then \( (y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1) = (y_2 y_1)(y_1 y_1) = (y_1 y_2)(y_2 y_2) \), and so setting \( z'_1 = y_2, z'_2 = y_2 \) works. Otherwise, if \( z \neq y_1 \), then

\[
(y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1) = (y_2 z)(y_1 z) = (y_1 y_2)(y_2 z)
\]

So setting \( z'_2 = z, z'_1 = y_2 \) works. Our hypothesis \( z \neq y_1 \) ensures that \( z'_2 \neq y_1 \).

**Case II: \( z_2 = y_2 \).** Then \( (y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1) = (y_1 z_1) = (y_1 z_1)(y_2 y_2) \), so take \( z'_1 = y_1, z'_2 = y_2 \).

**Case III: \( z_2 = y_1 \).** We may assume that \( z_2 \neq z_1, y_2 \), as we have already covered these cases. Then \( (y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1) = (y_1 z_1)(y_2 z_1) \), so taking \( z'_2 = z'_1 = z_1 \) works. Note that \( z'_2 \neq y_1 \), as otherwise we would have \( z_1 = z_2 \).

**Case IV: \( z_1 = y_1 \).** Then \( (y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1) = (y_1 y_1)(y_2 z_2) \), so take \( z'_1 = y_1, z'_2 = y_2 \). Note that we cannot have \( z'_2 = y_1 \) as this would imply \( y_1 = y_2 \).

Having shown (1), we now claim that every pair \( z_1 \in [n] - \{y_2\}, z_2 \in [n] \) gives rise to a distinct permutation \( (y_1 z_1)(y_2 z_2) \), and similarly for \( z'_1, z'_2 \). In order to show this, consider some permutation \( \tau = (y_1 z_1)(y_2 z_2) \). We must have \( \tau y_1 = z_1 \), and so \( z_1 \) is determined from \( \tau \). Likewise, \( (y_1 z_1)\tau y_2 = (y_2 z_2)\tau y_2 = z_2 \), and so \( z_2 \) is determined from \( \tau \).

This implies that there are precisely \( n(n-1) \) elements on the LHS of (1), and similarly precisely \( n(n-1) \) elements on the RHS. This implies that for a uniform distribution on \( z_1, z_2 \), the permutations \( (y_2 z_2)(y_1 z_1)\pi \) have the same distribution as the permutations \( (y_1 z_1)(y_2 z_2)\pi \).  

\( \square \)
5.3 Cartesian products

Consider probability spaces $\Omega_1, \Omega_2$, each equipped with a set of events $C_1, C_2$ (these are not necessarily bad-events), a dependency graph structure $\sim_1, \sim_2$, and resampling oracles $r_1, r_2$. We construct a new LLLL space, as follows. The underlying probability space is the cartesian product $\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. The event set $C$ consists of events of the form $C \equiv C_1 \times C_2$ for $C_1 \in C_1, C_2 \in C_2$. The relation $\sim$ on $C$ is defined by

$$C_1 \times C_2 \sim C_1' \times C_2' \iff C_1 \sim_1 C_1' \text{ or } C_2 \sim_2 C_2'$$

For such an event $C \in C$, let $Y_C = Y_{C_1} \times Y_{C_2}$, and define the resampling action by

$$r_C((u_1, u_2), (y_1, y_2)) = (r_{1,C_1}(u_1, y_1), r_{2,C_2}(u_2, y_2))$$

We can likewise define $\Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_s$ for any number $s$ of probability spaces.

**Observation 5.10.** Suppose that $\Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_s$ are all probability spaces satisfying (C1) — (C4), (D1), (D2) and $s \leq \text{poly}(n)$. Then $\Omega_1 \times \cdots \times \Omega_s$ also satisfies (C1) — (C4), (D1), (D2).

These cartesian product constructions come up in a variety of settings. For example, the permutation LLL as defined in [21] allows selection of $k$ permutations $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k$, wherein each $\pi_i$ is drawn independently and uniformly from some $S_{n_i}$ (or a subset thereof); this can be modeled as the cartesian product of the uniform distributions on $S_{n_1}, \ldots, S_{n_k}$. Therefore, the resampling action defined in Section 5.2 immediately gives a corresponding resampling action on $S_{n_1} \times \cdots \times S_{n_k}$.

In fact, the variable-assignment LLLL itself can be modeled as a cartesian product of $n$ copies of the probability space involving a single variable.

6 Applications and extensions of the variable-assignment LLLL

Harris gave in [18] a number of applications of the LLLL, which translate almost immediately into parallel algorithms. We note that one can use an alternative LLLL criterion, defined in [18] as orderability, which can be stronger than the Shearer LLLL criterion. Since the parallel LLLL algorithm is a simulation of the sequential algorithm, this criterion applies to it as well.

A full explanation of [18] requires a significant amount of notation, and is not directly relevant to the present work. For our purposes, we note that the criterion of [18] also has two parameters $\tilde{W}, \tilde{\epsilon}$ which play the same role for the variable-assignment LLLL as the parameters $W, \epsilon$ play in the Shearer LLLL criterion. In particular, Theorem 3.2 holds (with $\tilde{W}, \tilde{\epsilon}$ replacing $W, \epsilon$ respectively).

**Proposition 6.1.** Suppose we have a $k$-SAT instance with $m$ clauses, in which each variable appears in at most

$$L = \frac{2^{k+1}(1 - 1/k)^k}{(k - 1)(1 + \epsilon)} - \frac{2}{k}$$

clauses, where $\epsilon > 0$. Then there is a parallel algorithm to find a satisfying assignment using $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^4(mn))$ time and $\text{poly}(m, n)$ processors whp.

**Proof.** Using arguments from [18] paper (specifically, Theorem 4.1), the variable-assignment LLLL can be satisfied with slack $\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon$ satisfied under these conditions using the weighting function

$$\mu(B) = \frac{1 + \epsilon}{(2 - 2/k)^k} \quad \text{for all } B \in B$$

Furthermore, in this case, we have $\tilde{W} \leq m$ and we can implement a BEC by running through every clause.
6.1 Distributed algorithms

A common task in distributed communication problems is to solve a graph problem (e.g. vertex coloring) on a graph $G$, in which there are limited communication pathways among the nodes in a graph. One popular model is LOCAL, in which there are synchronous communication rounds, and each node may only communicate with its neighbors in a given round.

Since the LLL is a basic method for combinatorics, it is natural to use the LLL or its variants to solve the resulting distributed communication problem. We typically need to implement a variable-assignment LLLL algorithm as a distributed process, in which each vertex corresponds to a variable and each violated constraint (e.g. a monochromatic edge) corresponds to a bad-event. Typically in such cases, bad-events corresponding to edges or vertices of $G$ are dependent iff the distance between them in $G$ is bounded by $O(1)$. In these cases, it is convenient to translate the distributed computation on $G$ onto a new graph $H$, whose vertices are the bad-events $B$, and where there is an edge from $B$ to $B'$ on $H$ if $B, B'$ overlap on some variable. Each vertex $B$ of $H$ will keep track of the value of $\text{Var}(B)$; we can view the distributed computation on $G$ as a computation on $H$, with the goal to find a globally consistent variable assignment.

Vertices in $H$ are joined by an edge if their corresponding vertices of $G$ have distance $O(1)$; thus, a distributed round of computation in $H$ can be simulated by $O(1)$ distributed rounds of computation in $G$. Thus, it suffices to bound the running time of a distributed algorithm on $H$ (up to constant factors). See [7] for a thorough discussion of this model of computation and applications to a number of graph-coloring problems.

We can transform our parallel algorithm into a distributed algorithm for $H$, in the obvious way.

**Proposition 6.2.** Suppose that the variable-assignment LLLL criterion is satisfied with parameters $\tilde{W}, \tilde{\epsilon}$. Then there is a distributed algorithm in the LOCAL model for the variable-assignment LLLL running in $O(\tilde{\epsilon}^{-1} \log^3(\tilde{W}n))$ time whp. In particular, if $\text{epd}(1 + \epsilon) \leq 1$, then the algorithm runs in $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^3(nm))$ rounds.

*Proof.* All of the steps in a round $t$ (except the computation of the LFMIS) can be implemented in $O(1)$ communication steps in the LOCAL model. The greedy LFMIS can be implemented in $O(\log^2(\tilde{W}n))$ rounds whp. Observe that Algorithm 5 only creates an edge between $B, B'$ if $B, B'$ overlap on a variable. Thus, each individual round of the greedy LFMIS algorithm can be implemented in $O(1)$ communication steps in LOCAL. 

**Proposition 6.3.** Let $H$ be a $k$-uniform hypergraph in which each vertex appears in at most $L$ edges. Then there is a LOCAL algorithm in $O(\epsilon^{-1} \log^3 n)$ rounds to construct a non-monochromatic $c$-coloring of $H$ for $L \leq \frac{c^k(1-1/k)^{k-1}}{k(c-1)(1+\epsilon)}$.

*Proof.* Harris [18] shows that the LLLL variable-assignment criterion is satisfied here with $\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon$ and $\tilde{W} \leq \text{poly}(n)$. 

7 Applications to other probability spaces

We illustrate with the classic applications of the permutation LLL to Latin transversals. Suppose we have an $n \times n$ matrix $A$, whose entries come from a set $C$ referred to as the color set. An $s$-bounded transversal of this matrix is a permutation $\pi \in S_n$, such that no color appears at least $s$ times among the entries $A(i, \pi(i))$. The case $s = 2$ is known as a Latin transversal, and in this case the permutation is said to be rainbow in that no color is repeated among the entries of $A(i, \pi(i))$. 
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Proposition 7.1. Suppose that each color appears at most $\Delta$ times in $A$. Then, we can find a Latin transversal $\pi \in S_n$ in $O(\log^4 n)$ time and $\text{poly}(n)$ processors for $\Delta \leq 0.105n$. We can find an $s$-bounded transversal $\pi \in S_n$ in $O\left(\frac{\log^4 n}{\epsilon}\right)$ time and $\text{poly}(n)$ processors for $\Delta \leq s$.

Proof. We use the probability space of the uniform distribution over $S_n$. For the first result, simply observe that the cluster-expansion LLL criterion is satisfied here with slack of $\epsilon = \Omega(1)$ and $W \leq \text{poly}(n)$.

For the second result, for each tuple $t = \{(i_1, j_1), \ldots, (i_s, j_s)\}$ with $A(i_1, j_1) = \cdots = A(i_s, j_s)$, we have a separate bad-event $B_t$, that $\pi(i_1) = j_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \pi(i_s) = j_s$. Each $B_t$ has probability $p \leq \frac{(n-s)!}{n!}$, and has at most $d = 2sn\left(\frac{\Delta-1}{s-1}\right)$ neighboring bad-events $B_t$.

Thus, in order to satisfy the symmetric LLL criterion with $\epsilon$-slack, we need

$$e(1+\epsilon)\frac{(n-s)!}{n!}2s\left(\frac{s}{s-1}\right)^{\Delta-1} \leq 1$$

We note that

$$e(1+\epsilon)\frac{(n-s)!}{n!}2s\left(\frac{s}{s-1}\right)^{\Delta-1} \leq 2e(1+\epsilon)s\Delta \cdots \Delta \frac{(n-s)!}{(s-1)!n \times \cdots \times n} = 2e(1+\epsilon)s\Delta^{s-1}\frac{1}{(s-1)!n^{s-1}}$$

So $epd(1+\epsilon) \leq 1$ holds under the stated hypothesis. One can easily construct a BEC in $O(\log n)$ time: for each color class, simply enumerate all of the current entries of $\pi$ with that color.

We note that the runtime in Proposition 7.1 does not depend upon $s$. By contrast, the permutation LLL algorithm of [21] would only give a parallel algorithm for constant $s$. There are two main reasons it has poor scaling as a function of $s$: first, the number of bad-events could be $n^s$, which is super-polynomial for unbounded $s$; second, each bad-event spans $s$ entries, whereas [21] only allows bad-events to use polylogarithmic entries. We also note that a sequential algorithm (based on partial resampling) of [21] can achieve better bounds on $\Delta$ for large $s$, but our parallelization strategy does not extend to that case.

We next illustrate with rainbow subgraphs of $K_n$. In this case, we are given an edge-coloring of $K_n$, and our goal is to find a copy of a subgraph $H$ in $K_n$ where all the edges of the copy of $H$ receive distinct colors (i.e. a rainbow copy of $H$).

Proposition 7.2. Consider an edge-coloring of $K_n$ in which every color appears on at most $\Delta$ edges.

1. If $\Delta \leq 0.105n$ and $n$ is even, then we can find a rainbow perfect matching in $O(\log^4 n)$ time and $\text{poly}(n)$ processors.

2. If $\Delta \leq 0.026n$, then we can find a rainbow hamiltonian cycle in $O(\log^4 n)$ time and $\text{poly}(n)$ processors.

Proof. We encode these problems via the probability spaces of the uniform distribution of perfect matchings of $K_n$ and hamiltonian cycles of $K_n$, respectively. It is shown in [27] and [22], respectively, that that cluster-expansion LLL criterion is satisfied with slack $\epsilon = O(1)$ and $W \leq \text{poly}(n)$.

We get a sequential algorithm to find a rainbow perfect matching of $K_n^{(s)}$ under a similar criterion.
Proposition 7.3. For an edge-coloring of $K_n^{(s)}$ in which every color appears on at most $\Delta \leq \frac{(n-s^{-1})(1-\frac{1}{s})2s}{2s-1}$, there is a sequential algorithm to find a rainbow perfect matching.

Proof. We select a matching $M$ uniformly at random. For each pair of edges $e, e'$ of the same color, we have a bad-event $B$ that $e, e'$ are both in $M$. This event has probability $p = \frac{(n/s)(n/s-1)}{(n)(n-s)}$.

In Appendix [3] we show a resampling oracle for this probability space. In order to apply the cluster-expansion criterion, we use a slightly denser dependency graph: two events $B, B'$ are dependent if the corresponding edges overlap. With this dependency graph, we can describe the independent sets of neighbors of $B$ as follows. For each of the $2s$ vertices involved in $B$, we may select another edge $f$ $\binom{n-1}{s}$ choices and another edge of the same color as $f$ $\binom{\Delta - 1}{s}$ choices.

We set $\mu(B) = \alpha$ for every bad-event, where $\alpha \geq 0$ is a parameter to be determined. In order for the cluster-expansion criterion to hold, we will then need

$$\alpha \geq \frac{(n/s)(n/s-1)}{\binom{n}{s} \binom{n-s}{s}} \times (1 + \binom{n-1}{s})(\Delta - 1)\alpha^{2s}$$

Simple calculus shows that this has a non-negative root under the stated hypothesis. The resampling oracle in Appendix [3] is efficient, and hence Algorithm [2] efficiently finds a configuration avoiding $B$.

As another application of our algorithm, consider the strong chromatic number: given a graph $G$ with a partition of the vertices into $k$ blocks each of size $b$ (i.e., $V = V_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup V_k$), we would like to find a proper $b$-coloring such that every block has exactly $b$ colors. If this is possible for any such partition of the vertices into blocks of size $b$, then we say that the graph $G$ has a strong chromatic number $b$.

A series of papers have studied the strong chromatic number of graphs, typically in terms of their maximum degree $\Delta$. In [24], Haxell showed that such a coloring exists when $b \geq (11/4 + \epsilon)\Delta$ and $\Delta$ is sufficiently large; this is the best bound currently known. Furthermore, the constant $11/4$ cannot be improved to any number strictly less than 2. In [24], a variety of algorithms are given for constructing the colorings. These algorithms require $b \geq c\Delta$, where $c$ is a constant; however, the constant $c$ does not match those given by [24]. Two algorithms in particular are noteworthy: the first is a sequential algorithm requiring $b \geq 5\Delta$, and the second is an RNC algorithm requiring $b \geq \frac{256}{27}(1+\epsilon)\Delta$ (precise running time not stated). Our new LLLL algorithms gives a crisper version of this, which is perhaps the first parallel algorithm for strong-coloring with reasonable bounds on both the number of colors and the run-time:

Proposition 7.4. Given an partition of $G$ into blocks of size $b \geq \frac{256}{27}(1+\epsilon)\Delta$, a coloring of $G$ can be found in $O(\epsilon^{-1}\log^4 n)$ time.

Finally, we consider a hypergraph packing problem of Lu & Székely [29]. We are given two $s$-uniform hypergraphs $H_1, H_2$ and an integer $n$, and we want to find a pair of injective maps

$$\phi_1 : V(H_1) \to [n], \phi_2 : V(H_2) \to [n]$$

with the property that $\phi(H_1)$ is edge-disjoint to $\phi(H_2)$. That is, there are not edges $f_1, f_2$ of $H_1, H_2$ respectively with $\{\phi_1(v) \mid v \in f_1\} = \{\phi_2(v) \mid v \in f_2\}$.

Proposition 7.5. Suppose $H_i$ has $m_i$ edges and each edge intersects with at most $d_i$ other edges of $H_i$, for $i = 1, 2$. Also suppose that $(d_1 + 1)m_2 + (d_2 + 1)m_1 < \frac{n}{e(1+\epsilon)}$. Then there is an algorithm to find injective maps $\phi_1, \phi_2$ such that $\phi(H_1)$ is edge-disjoint to $\phi(H_2)$ in $O(\epsilon^{-1}\log^4 n)$ time whp.
Proof. We briefly review a construction of \cite{29} applying the permutation LLL to this setting. Assume without loss of generality that $V(H_1) = [n]$ and $|V(H_2)| = n$ and that $\phi_1$ is the identity permutation. Thus, we need to select the bijection $\phi_2 : H_2 \to [n]$. We use the Swapping Algorithm to construct this permutation $\phi_2$.

Given a pair of edges $f_1 = \{u_1, \ldots, u_s\} \in E(H_1), f_2 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_s\} \in E(H_2)$, form $s!$ separate bad-events: for each permutation $\sigma \in S_r$ we have the bad-event

$$\phi_2(v_1) = u_{\sigma 1} \land \cdots \land \phi_2(v_r) = u_{\sigma s}$$

The stated hypothesis ensures that the LLL criterion is satisfied for this collection of bad-events.

The number of bad-events is $m_1 m_2 s!$, which could potentially be exponentially large. However, there is a simple BEC here which can be implemented in $O(\log n)$ time; namely, for each pair of edges $f_1, f_2$, we sort $f_1$ and $\phi(f_2)$ and see if they are the same set. \qed

Note that Harris & Srinivasan \cite{21} only gives an RNC algorithm if the hypergraphs $H_i$ have rank polylog($n$); this condition is not required for Proposition \cite{7.3}.
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A Background on the LLLL

The simplest criterion for the LLL or the LLLL is the symmetric criterion $\text{epd} \leq 1$. This depends on only two properties of the collection $\mathcal{B}$: namely, the dependency structure among the bad-events, and their probabilities. A number of other criteria can be stated in these terms, and are frequently used in combinatorial constructions, including the asymmetric LLL criterion and the cluster-expansion criterion. The strongest criterion of this form is the Shearer criterion [35].

We will describe the Shearer criterion in terms of stable-set sequences, which is more useful for analyzing the MT algorithms. The connection between stable-set sequences and the original form of Shearer’s criterion was developed by Kolipaka & Szegedy [26].

Define the dependency graph to be a graph $G$ whose vertex set is $\mathcal{B}$, and in which there is an undirected edge $(B, B')$ if $B \sim B'$. For any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we define the inclusive neighborhood of $B$ as $N(B) = \{B\} \cup \{B' \in \mathcal{B} \mid B' \sim B\}$. We say that a set $J \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is independent if it is an independent set of $G$; that is, there are not distinct elements $B, B' \in J$ with $B \sim B'$.

We define a stable-set sequence to be a sequence $S = (S_0, S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_N)$, where each $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is independent, and such that $S_i \subseteq \bigcup_{B \in S_{i-1}} N(B)$ for $i \geq 2$. We say that the $S$ is rooted at $S_0$, and is singleton if $|S_0| = 1$; we sometime abuse notation and say that $S$ is rooted at $B$ if it is rooted in the singleton set $\{B\}$. We define the depth of $S$ to be $N$, the size of $S$ to be $\sum_{i=0}^{N} |S_i|$ and the weight of $S$ to be $w(S) = \prod_{i=0}^{N} \prod_{B \in S_i} P_{\Omega}(B)$. We define $\Gamma$ to be the set of all singleton stable-set sequences.

Many parallel algorithms need a slightly stronger criterion which we refer to as $\epsilon$-slack; this means that the vector of probabilities $(1 + \epsilon)P_{\Omega}(B)$ satisfies Shearer’s criterion. We always assume here that $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.
Theorem A.1 ([20]). If Shearer’s criterion is satisfied, then \( \sum_{S \in \Gamma} w(S) < \infty \). If Shearer’s criterion is satisfied with \( \varepsilon \)-slack, then \( \sum_{S \in \Gamma} w(S)(1 + \varepsilon)^{|S|} < \infty \).

Let us define a key parameter for analyzing Shearer’s criterion, the work factor \( W \):

\[
W = \sum_{S \in \Gamma} (1 + \varepsilon/3)^{|S|} w(S)
\]

This parameter allows us to state bounds on the algorithm that apply to the widest class of problem instances. However, Shearer’s criterion is difficult to work with in practice, so there are a number of simpler LLL criteria which can be related to Shearer’s criterion.

Theorem A.2. 1. (The asymmetric LLL criterion) Suppose some function \( x : \mathcal{B} \to [0, 1] \) has the property that for all \( B \in \mathcal{B} \)

\[
P_\Omega(B)(1 + \varepsilon) \leq x(B) \prod_{B' \in \mathcal{B}, B' \sim B, B' \neq B} (1 - x(B'))
\]

Then Shearer’s criterion is satisfied with \( \varepsilon \)-slack and \( W \leq \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} x(B)/(1 - x(B)) \).

2. (The cluster-expansion LLL criterion [3]) Suppose that some function \( \tilde{\mu} : \mathcal{B} \to [0, \infty) \) has the property that for all \( B \in \mathcal{B} \)

\[
\tilde{\mu}(B) \geq P_\Omega(B)(1 + \varepsilon) \prod_{I \subseteq N(B)} \prod_{B' \in I} \tilde{\mu}(I)
\]

Then Shearer’s criterion is satisfied with \( \varepsilon \)-slack and \( W \leq \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \tilde{\mu}(B) \).

3. (The symmetric LLL criterion) Suppose that \( P_\Omega(B) \leq \mu \) and \( |N(B)| \leq d \) for every \( B \in \mathcal{B} \), and suppose that

\[
\text{epd}(1 + \varepsilon) \leq 1
\]

Then Shearer’s criterion is satisfied with \( \varepsilon \)-slack and \( W \leq \text{emp} \).

For each bad-event \( A \in V_i \) during Algorithm 3 one may define a corresponding depth-\( i \) stable-set sequence \( \hat{S}(A, i) = (S_1, \ldots, S_i) \) as follows. We first set \( S_1 = \{A\} \). Next, for each \( j = i-1, \ldots, 1 \), we let \( S_j \subseteq I_j \) denote the set of bad-events \( B \in I_j \) such that \( B \sim B' \) for some \( B' \in S_{j+1} \).

Given any depth-\( i \) stable-set sequence \( S \) rooted at \( B \), we say that \( S \) appears if \( \hat{S}(B, i) = S \).

Proposition A.3. For \( A \in V_i \), the sequence \( \hat{S}(A, i) \) is a singleton stable-set sequence of depth \( i \) rooted at \( A \).

Proof. Clearly \( \hat{S}(A, i) \) has depth \( i \) and also \( S_i = \{A\} \) is a singleton set. Since \( I_j \) is independent, so is each \( S_j \) for \( j < i \). To show that \( \hat{S}(A, i) \) is a stable-set sequence, we must show that every \( B \in S_j \) has some \( B' \in S_{j+1} \) with \( B \in N(B') \) for \( j > j' \).

Lemma 3.7 ensures that every \( B \in I_j \) has either \( B \in I_j \) or \( B \sim B' \in I_{j+1} \) for some \( B \sim B' \). Thus \( B' \in N(B) \). Since \( B \in S_j \), the definition of \( S_{j-1} \) will place \( B' \) into \( S_{j-1} \) as well. Thus \( B \in S_j \) has a neighbor \( B' \in S_{j-1} \).

\[ \square \]

In [25], Iliopoulos showed how bounds on stable-set sequences gave corresponding bounds on the probabilities of bad-events becoming true during the execution of Algorithm 2 for a commutative resampling oracle; these bounds also apply to Algorithm 6 since it is a version of Algorithm 2. We summarize key results here; please see [23, 27, 25] for further technical details.
Proposition A.4. For a commutative resampling oracle, any stable-set sequence $S$ appears with probability at most $w(S)$.}

Using our bounds on stable-set sequences and arguments from [16], we now prove Lemma 3.8.

Proof of Lemma 3.8. Note that each $B \in V_i$ corresponds to an appearing depth-$i$ stable-set sequence $\hat{S}(B, i)$. All such stable-set sequences are distinct: if $i \neq i'$, then the depths of $\hat{S}(B, i)$ and $\hat{S}(B, i')$ are distinct, while if $B \neq B'$ then the roots of $\hat{S}(B, i)$ and $\hat{S}(B', i)$ are distinct.

Thus, $\sum_i |V_i|$ is at most the number of appearing stable-set sequences. Summing over $S \in \Gamma$, Proposition A.4 shows that $E[|V_i|] \leq \sum_{S \in \Gamma} w(S) \leq W$. By Markov’s inequality, therefore, $P(\sum_i |V_i| > n^\phi W) \leq n^{-\phi}$ for an arbitrary constant $\phi > 0$. Equivalently, $\sum_i |V_i| \leq \text{poly}(n)W$ whp.

Now suppose that Algorithm 6 runs for $t$ rounds. Thus each $V_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, t - 1$ is non-empty. So, for each $i = 1, \ldots, t - 1$, there is at least one appearing depth-$i$ stable set sequence (namely $\hat{S}(B, i)$ for an arbitrary $B \in V_i$).

Thus, a necessary condition for Algorithm 6 to run for $t$ rounds is that at least $t/2$ distinct singleton stable-set sequences of depth at least $t/2$ appear. By Proposition A.4, the expected number of such sequences is given by

$$\sum_{S \in \Gamma } w(S) \leq \sum_{S \in \Gamma, |S| \geq t/2} w(S) = (1 + \epsilon/3)^{-t/2} \sum_{S \in \Gamma, |S| \geq t/2} w(S)(1 + \epsilon/3)^{t/2} \leq (1 + \epsilon/3)^{-t/2} W (1 + \epsilon/3)^{|S|} = (1 + \epsilon/3)^{-t/2} W$$

By Markov’s inequality, the probability that the actual number exceeds $t/2$, is therefore at most $(1+\epsilon/3)^{-t/2} W$. This is below $n^{-\phi}$ for any constant $\phi > 0$ and $t = c \log(n + W\epsilon)/\epsilon$ and $c$ a sufficiently large constant.

B Proof of Theorem 2.2

We suppose here we are given some resampling oracle $r$ on $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying conditions (C1), (C2), (C4). At later stages in the proof we may also assume it satisfies conditions (C3).

Whenever we discuss resampling an event $C = \langle E \rangle$, we write $E = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$; in this case, we tacitly assume that we have chosen to order the elements of $E$ as $A_1, \ldots, A_k$. Note that each event $C$ must select some fixed ordering of $E$, but there is no further restriction on these orderings. When property (C3) holds, then every ordering of $C$ gives rise to the same resampling action.

Proposition B.1. The resampling oracle $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies (C1).

Proof. Consider $C = \langle A_1, \ldots, A_k \rangle$. Let $y_1, \ldots, y_k$ be independent variables, wherein $y_i$ is drawn from $Y_{A_i \cap \{A_{i+1}, \ldots, A_k\}}$. We need to show that when $U \approx \Omega^C$, then $y_k \ldots y_1 U \approx \Omega$.

For each $i = 1, \ldots, k + 1$ let us define $Q_i = A_i \cap \cdots \cap A_k$ and $U_i = y_1 \cdots y_{i-1} U$. We will show by induction that $U_i \approx \Omega^{Q_i}$. The base case $i = 1$ is given to us by hypothesis (since $C = A_1 \cap \cdots \cap A_k$), and the case $i = k + 1$ is what we are trying to prove. We also observe that $U_i \in Q_i$ with probability one, since each $y_i$ is chosen from $Y_{A_i \cap Q_{i+1}}$.

Consider a state $\tilde{U} \approx \Omega^{Q_i}$ and $\tilde{y} \approx Y_{A_i}$. For any $u \in Q_{i+1}$, property (C1), gives $P(\tilde{y} \tilde{U} = u) = \Omega[u]$. If $\tilde{y} \tilde{U} = u$, then we claim that $\tilde{U} \in Q_{i+1}$; for, if $\tilde{U} \notin A_j$ for some $j > i$, then by property (C2)
\[ \Omega[u] = P(\tilde{y}U = u) = P(\tilde{y}U = u \land \tilde{U} \in Q_{i+1} \land \tilde{y} \in Y_{A_{i};\{A_{i+1},\ldots,A_k\}}) \\
= P(\tilde{y}U = u \mid \tilde{U} \in Q_{i+1} \land \tilde{y} \in Y_{A_{i};\{A_{i+1},\ldots,A_k\}})P(\tilde{U} \in Q_{i+1} \land \tilde{y} \in Y_{A_{i};\{A_{i+1},\ldots,A_k\}}) \\
= P(y_iU_i = u)P(\tilde{U} \in Q_{i+1})P(\tilde{y} \in Y_{A_{i};\{A_{i+1},\ldots,A_k\}}). \]

In the last line, we use the fact \( U_i \) and \( \tilde{U} \mid \tilde{U} \in Q_{i+1} \) both have the distribution \( \Omega^{Q_{i+1}} \); likewise, \( y_i \) and \( \tilde{y} \mid \tilde{y} \in Y_{A_{i};Q_{i+1}} \) both have the same distribution \( Y_{A_{i};Q_{i+1}} \), and they are independent.

This shows that \( P(y_iU_i = u) \) is proportional to \( \Omega[u] \) for any \( u \in Q_{i+1} \). Since \( y_iU_i \in Q_{i+1} \) with probability one, this implies that \( U_{i+1} = y_iU_i \approx \Omega^{Q_{i+1}} \). \( \square \)

**Proposition B.2.** The resampling oracle \( \tau \) satisfies (C2).

**Proof.** Consider \( C = \langle A_1,\ldots,A_k \rangle \) and \( C' = \langle E' \rangle \) with \( C \not\sim C' \), and let \( u \in C - C' \). Consider \( y = (y_1,\ldots,y_k) \in Y_C \). There must exist some \( A' \in E' \) such that \( u \not\in A' \); we will show that \( yu \not\in A' \), and therefore \( yu \notin C \).

Define \( u_i = y_1 \cdots y_{i-1}u \). We claim that \( u_i \notin A' \) by induction on \( i \). The base case \( i = 0 \) holds since \( u \notin A' \), and we want to show the case \( i = k \). For the induction step, we use property (C2) applied to the event \( A_i \) with respect to \( A' \). \( \square \)

**Proposition B.3.** Let \( C = \langle A_1,\ldots,A_k \rangle \) and \( C' = \langle E' \rangle \) be events in \( \overline{A} \). For any state \( u \in C \cap C' \) and \( (y_1,\ldots,y_k) \in Y_C \), the following are equivalent:

1. \( yu \in C' \)
2. \( y_i \in Y_{A_i;E'} \) for all \( i = 1,\ldots,k \)

**Proof.** Define \( u_i = y_1 \cdots y_{i-1}u \). If \( y_i \in Y_{A_i;E'} \) for \( i = 1,\ldots,k \), then a simple induction on \( i \) shows that \( u_i \in C' \) for \( i = 0,\ldots,k \). Otherwise, let \( i \) be minimal such that \( y_i \not\in Y_{A_i;A'} \) for some \( A' \in E' \). We claim that \( u_j \notin A' \) for \( j > i \). The base case holds by definition of \( Y_{A_i;A'} \) and property (C4). For each \( j > i \), it holds by property (C2). \( \square \)

**Corollary B.4.** The resampling oracle \( \tau \) satisfies (C4).

**Proof.** For any events \( C, C' \) with \( C \not\sim C' \), Proposition B.3 gives an explicit condition on \( y \in Y_C \) in order to ensure that \( yu \in C' \) for \( u \in C \cap C' \). This condition depends solely on \( y \), and not \( u \) itself; thus, for any fixed \( y \in Y_C \), we are guaranteed that either \( yu \in C' \) for all \( u \in C \cap C' \) or \( yu \notin C' \) for all \( u \in C \cap C' \). \( \square \)

We next show that if \( r \) satisfies (C3) then so does \( \tau \). To show this, let us define the following random process. Given any sequence of events \( (A_1,\ldots,A_k) \in \mathcal{A} \), we draw random variables \( y_i \in Y_{A_i;\{A_{i+1},\ldots,A_k\}} \) and we compute \( F(A_1,\ldots,A_k, u) = y_k \cdots y_1u \). Note that that events \( A_1,\ldots,A_k \) are not necessarily distinct.

**Proposition B.5.** Suppose \( r \) satisfies (C3). Let \( A_1,\ldots,A_k \) be any sequence of events in \( \mathcal{A} \) and let \( u \in A_1 \cap \cdots \cap A_k \). Then for any permutation \( \pi \) on \( [k] \), we have

\[
F((A_1,\ldots,A_k), u) \approx F((A_{\pi 1},\ldots,A_{\pi k}), u)
\]
Proof. Since we can generate any permutation $\pi$ by swapping adjacent elements, it suffices to show this holds when $\pi = (j \quad j + 1)$ for some $j < k$. That is, it will suffice to show that

$$F((A_1, \ldots, A_{j-1}A_j, A_{j+1}, A_{j+2}, \ldots, A_k), u) \approx F(A_1, \ldots, A_{j-1}, A_j, A_{j+1}, A_{j+2}, \ldots, A_k, u)$$

Consider drawing $y_1, \ldots, y_{j+2}$ wherein $y_i \approx Y_{A_i;\{A_{i+1},\ldots,A_k\}}$ and also drawing random variables

$$y_j' \approx Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}}, y_j'_{j+1} \approx Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_j, A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}}.$$ We first claim that

$$y_{j+1}y_jy_{j-1} \ldots y_1u \approx y_j'y_{j+1}y_jy_{j-1} \ldots y_1u \quad (2)$$

We show that (2) holds even after conditioning on $y_1, \ldots, y_{j-1}$. Specifically, we claim that for fixed $y_1, \ldots, y_{j-1}$ and $t = y_{j-1} \ldots y_1u$, we have

$$y_{j+1}y_jt \approx y_j'y_{j+1}t \quad (3)$$

Define $Q = A_{j+2} \cap \cdots \cap A_k$ and note that $t \in A_j \cap A_{j+1} \cap Q$. Let us consider drawing random variables $\tilde{y}_j \approx Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}}$, $\tilde{y}_j' \approx Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}}$. For any $t' \in Q$, let us define the events $\tilde{y}_{j+1}\tilde{y}_jt = t'$ and $\tilde{y}_j'\tilde{y}_{j+1}t = t'$, respectively. By Property (C4), we are guaranteed that $P(\mathcal{E}) = P(\mathcal{E}')$.

We claim that a necessary condition for $\mathcal{E}$ is to have $\tilde{y}_j \in Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}}$ and $\tilde{y}_j+1 \in Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}}$. For suppose that $\tilde{y}_j \notin Y_{A_j;A_\ell}$ for $\ell \geq j + 2$. Then $\tilde{y}_j't \notin A_\ell$. Since $A_{j+1} \neq A_\ell$, also $\tilde{y}_{j+1}\tilde{y}_jt \notin A_\ell$ by (C4); but $t' \in A_\ell$. A similar argument applies to $\tilde{y}_j+1$. Therefore,

$$P(\mathcal{E}) = P(\tilde{y}_{j+1}\tilde{y}_jt = t' \land \tilde{y}_j \in Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}} \land \tilde{y}_j+1 \in Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})$$

$$= P(\tilde{y}_{j+1}\tilde{y}_jt = t' \mid \tilde{y}_j \in Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}} \land \tilde{y}_j+1 \in Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}}) \times P(\tilde{y}_j \in Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}} \land \tilde{y}_j+1 \in Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})$$

$$= P(\tilde{y}_{j+1}\tilde{y}_jt = t')P(\tilde{y}_j \in Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})P(\tilde{y}_j+1 \in Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})$$

A symmetric argument applied to $\tilde{y}_j', \tilde{y}_j'$ shows that

$$P(\mathcal{E}') = P(\tilde{y}_j'\tilde{y}_{j+1}t = t')P(\tilde{y}_j' \in Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})P(\tilde{y}_{j+1}' \in Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})$$

Since $P(\mathcal{E}) = P(\mathcal{E}')$, we have therefore shown that

$$P(y_{j+1}y_jt = t') \quad \frac{P(y_{j+1}y_jt = t')}{P(y_j'y_{j+1}t = t')} = \frac{P(\tilde{y}_j' \in Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})P(\tilde{y}_{j+1}' \in Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})}{P(\tilde{y}_j \in Y_{A_j;\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})P(\tilde{y}_{j+1} \in Y_{A_{j+1};\{A_{j+2},\ldots,A_k\}})} \quad (4)$$

This holds for every $t' \in Q$. However, note that the RHS in (4) does not depend on $t'$. Since the probabilities $P(y_{j+1}y_jt = t')$ and $P(y_j'y_{j+1}t = t')$ both sum to 1 over $t' \in Q$, it must be that $P(y_{j+1}y_jt = t') = P(y_j'y_{j+1}t = t')$ for every $t' \in Q$. So $y_{j+1}y_jt \approx y_j'y_{j+1}t$ for any fixed $t$. Integrating over $t$ yields equation (2), so

$$y_k \ldots y_{j+2}y_{j+1}y_j \ldots y_1u \approx y_k \ldots y_{j+2}y_j'y_{j+1} \ldots y_1u$$

The LHS here has the distribution $F((A_1, \ldots, A_{j-1}A_j, A_{j+1}, A_{j+2}, \ldots, A_k), u)$ and the RHS has the distribution $F((A_1, \ldots, A_{j-1}, A_{j+1}, A_{j+2}, A_k), u)$.  

Proposition B.6. If (C3) holds for $r$ then it also holds $\tau$. 
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Proof. We will show (C3'). Consider events \( C = \langle A_1, \ldots, A_k \rangle \) and \( C' = \langle A'_1, \ldots, A'_k \rangle \) and any \( v \in C \cap C' \). Let \( y = (y_1, \ldots, y_k) \in Y_C \) and \( y' = (y'_1, \ldots, y'_k) \). By Proposition 3.3 we have \( y \in Y_{C,C'} \) iff \( y_i = Y_{A_i \{A'_1, \ldots, A'_k \}} \). Therefore, we see that \( y_i \) is distributed from \( Y_{A_i \{A_{i+1} \ldots A_k, A'_1, \ldots, A'_k \}} \) and \( y'_i \) is distributed from \( Y_{A_i \{A'_1, \ldots, A'_k \}} \).

When \( y \approx Y_{C,C'} \) and \( y' \approx Y_{C'} \), then \( y'y = y'_1 \ldots y'_k y \ldots y_1 w \); this follows the distribution \( F((A_1, \ldots, A_k, A'_1, \ldots, A'_k), u) \). By Proposition 3.5 this follows the same distribution as \( F((A_1, \ldots, A'_k), A_1, \ldots, A_k, u) \); by a similar argument, this in turn follows the same distribution as \( y'y'u \) where \( y' \approx Y_{C',C} \) and \( y \approx Y_C \).

C Proof of Theorem 4.1

We use the following notation for directed graphs. For any vertex \( v \), we refer to an edge \((v, w)\) (respectively \((w, v)\)) as an an out-edge (respectively in-edge) of \( v \). The set of vertices \( \{ w \mid (v, w) \in E \} \) are the out-neighbors of \( v \), and the out-degree of \( v \) is the cardinality of this set. Similarly the set of vertices \( \{ w \mid (v, w) \in E \} \) are the in-neighbors of \( v \), and the in-degree of \( v \) is the cardinality of this set.

Let \( G = (V, E) \) be the input directed graph and let \( \pi \) be a permutation mapping \( V \) to \([n]\). We assume throughout that \( \pi \) is a random variable drawn uniformly from \( S_n \) and define the graph \( G' \) with vertex set \( V \) and edge set \( E' = \{ (u, v) \mid (u, v) \in E, \pi(u) < \pi(v) \} \). For any vertex \( v \), we define \( N^{in}(v) \) to be the set of vertices \( u \in V \) with \((u, v) \in E \); likewise, define \( N^{out}(v) \) to be the set of vertices \( u \in V \) with \((v, u) \in E \).

For any integers \( 1 \leq j \leq n \), define \( V_{[0,j]} \) to be vertex set \( V_{[0,j]} = \{ v \mid \pi(v) \leq j \} \), and define \( I_j = \{ v \in I \mid \pi(v) \leq j \} = I \cap V_{[0,j]} \) where \( I \) is the LFMIS of \( G \) with respect to \( \pi \). Likewise, for integers \( 0 \leq i \leq j \leq n \), define the vertex set \( V_{[i,j]} = V_{[0,j]} - I_i - \cup_{v \in I_i} N^{out}(v) \).

As in [4], instead of analyzing the greedy algorithm directly, we consider an alternative, slowed-down version referred to as SLOW-GREEDY. Given non-negative integers \( n_0, n_1, \ldots, n_k \) with \( 1 = n_0 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \cdots \leq n_k = n \), it is defined as follows:

Algorithm 9 The SLOW-GREEDY algorithm

1. Initialize \( I \leftarrow \emptyset \).
2. for \( i = 1, \ldots, k \) do
3. Form \( H_i \) as the induced subgraph \( H_i = G'[V_{(n_i-1,n_i)}] \).
4. Using the greedy algorithm, find the LFMIS \( J_i \) of \( H_i \) with respect to the ordering \( \pi \)
5. Add \( J_i \) to \( I \).

As shown in [4], this produces the LFMIS of \( G \) with respect to \( \pi \) and its run-time is at most that of the greedy algorithm. Thus, it suffices to bound the run-time of SLOW-GREEDY. More specifically, we will set \( k = O(\log n) \) and select integers \( n_0 \leq n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_k \) such that the greedy algorithm on each \( H_i \) takes time \( O(\log n) \). To do this, we will show that every directed path in \( H_i \) has length \( O(\log n) \).

Proposition C.1. The following property holds with probability at least \( 1 - n^{-100} \): for any integers \( 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n \) and any \( v \in V_{[i,j]} \), we have \( |N^{in}(v) \cap V_{[i,j]}| \leq O\left(\frac{n \log n}{i}\right) \).

Proof. Consider the sequential process to generate \( I \), in which we successively select a random vertex \( w \), add it to \( I \), and remove \( w \) and its out-neighbors from \( G \).

1. Initialize \( I \leftarrow \emptyset \).
2. Mark all the vertices of \( G \) as alive.
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3: for $k = 1, \ldots, n$ do
4: Select $\pi(k)$ uniformly at random from $V - \{\pi(1), \ldots, \pi(k-1)\}$.
5: if vertex $\pi(k)$ is alive then
6: Add $\pi(k)$ to $I$
7: Mark $\pi(k)$ and all vertices $u \in N^\text{out}(\pi(k))$ as dead.

Let us fix some vertex $v$ and a parameter $d$. For each $k = 0, \ldots, n$ define $E_k$ to be the event that $v$ has at least $d$ live in-neighbors after step $k$, and none of the in-neighbors of $v$ is in $I_k$.

We compute the probability of $E_k$ conditional on $E_1, \ldots, E_{k-1}$. As $E_1, \ldots, E_{k-1}$ are determined by $\pi(1), \ldots, \pi(k-1)$, it suffices to compute the probability of $E_k$ conditional on $\pi(1), \ldots, \pi(k-1)$; this allows us to compute the set of live in-neighbors after step $k-1$. If this number is less than $d$, then $E_k$ holds with probability zero. Otherwise, there is a probability of at least $\frac{d}{n-k+1}$ that $\pi(k)$ is a live in-neighbor of $v$, in which case $E_k$ fails. Thus,

$$P(E_k \mid E_1, \ldots, E_{k-1}) \leq 1 - \frac{d}{n-k+1}$$

This implies that

$$P(E_i) \leq (1 - \frac{d}{n})(1 - \frac{d}{n-1}) \cdots (1 - \frac{d}{n-i+1}) \leq (1 - \frac{d}{n})^i \leq e^{-di/n}$$

This is at most $O(n^{-200})$ for $d = \Omega(\frac{n \log n}{i})$. Taking a union bound over all $n^3$ possibilities for $v, i, j$, we see that the overall probability it fails to hold is at most $n^{-107}$ as desired. We finally note that $E_{i-1}$ is a necessary condition for the in-degree of $v$ in $G[V_{i,j}]$ to exceed $d$.

**Proposition C.2.** Suppose that $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$. Then whp all paths in $G'[V_{i,j}]$ have length $O((j/i) \log n)$.

**Proof.** We first condition on $\pi(1), \ldots, \pi(i)$. At this point, $I_i$ is fixed. Consider $H = G[V_{i,n}]$; this is the graph induced on the vertices which are are not in $I_i$ or out-neighbors of $I_i$. Clearly $G[V_{i,j}]$ is a subgraph of $H$; note that $H$ depends only on the values $\pi(1), \ldots, \pi(i)$.

Barring low-probability events, the graph $H$ has maximum in-degree $\frac{cn \log n}{i}$, for some constant $c \geq 0$. Thus, the number of length $k$-paths in $H$ is at most $n \times (\frac{cn \log n}{i})^{k-1}$. A necessary condition for a path $P = v_1, \ldots, v_k$ to survive in $G[V_{i,j}]$ is that $\pi(v_1) < \pi(v_2) < \cdots < \pi(v_k) \leq j$. Having conditioned on $\pi(1), \ldots, \pi(i)$, this event has probability

$$\frac{j-i}{n-i} \times \frac{j-i-1}{n-i-1} \times \cdots \times \frac{j-i-k+1}{n-i-k+1} \leq (j/n)^k/k!$$

Taking a union bound over all such paths $P$,

$$P(G'[V_{i,j}]) \text{ has some length-$k$ path} \leq n \left(\frac{cn \log n}{i}\right)^{k-1}(j/n)^k/k! \leq n(c(j/i) \log n)^k/k!$$

For $k \geq \Omega((j/i) \log n)$, this is $n^{-\Omega(1)}$.

**Theorem C.3.** Suppose that $|N^{in}(v)| \leq d$ for every vertex $v \in G$. Let $x = \frac{d}{\log n}$. If $\pi \approx \text{Unif}(S_n)$, then Algorithm 4 takes $O\left(\frac{\log(1+x)}{\log(2+1/x)} \log n\right) \leq O(\log d \log n) \leq O(\log^2 n)$ rounds whp.

**Proof.** First consider the case when $d \leq \frac{\log n}{2}$. In this case, observe that there are at most $nd^k$ paths in $G[V]$ of length $k$. Each such path survives to $G'$ with probability $1/k!$; thus, the expected number of length-$k$ paths in $G'$ is at most $nd^k/k!$. This is negligible for $k = \Omega(\frac{\log n}{\log(\frac{2 \log n}{d})})$. 28
Next, suppose \( d \geq \frac{1}{2} \log n \). Consider the algorithm SLOW-GREEDY, with \( n_1 = \frac{n \log n}{d} \) and \( n_j = \min(n, n_1 2^{j-1}) \) for \( j = 2, \ldots, k = \lceil \log_2(\frac{d}{\log n}) \rceil \).

There are at most \( nd^k \) length-\( k \) paths in \( G[V] \); each survives to \( G' \) with probability \( 1/k! \) and survives to \( H_1 = G'[V_{(0:n_1)}] \) with probability \( (n_1/n)^{k+1} \). Hence the probability that \( H_1 \) contains a \( k \)-long path is at most \( n(\log n)^k/k! \). This is negligible for \( k \geq \Omega(\log n) \).

By Proposition \( \ref{C.2} \) for \( i > 1 \) each graph \( H_i \) has maximum path length \( O(\frac{n}{n_1-1} \log n) = O(\log n) \).

Thus, overall, the SLOW-GREEDY algorithm takes \( O(1 + \log_2(\frac{d}{\log n})) \times O(\log n) \leq O(\log(x+1)(\log n)) \) rounds whp.

\[ \square \]

D Hamiltonian cycles of \( K_n \)

In order to define the resampling action algebraically, it is convenient to encode a hamiltonian cycle \((x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_1)\) of \( K_n \) with the permutation \( \pi = (x_1 x_2 x_3 \ldots x_n) \). With this encoding, we can view the set \( \Omega \) as the set of permutations \( \pi \) whose cycle structure contains exactly one cycle of length \( n \).

There are a number of preliminary definitions before describing the resampling oracle. First, define \( Q \) be the set of paths \((x_1, \ldots, x_k)\) where \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \) are distinct elements of \([n]\). For any such \( q = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \), define an atomic event

\[ (q) = \{ \pi \in \Omega \mid \pi(x_1) = x_2, \ldots, \pi(x_{k-1}) = x_k \} \]

We define the support of a path \( q \) by \( \text{sup}(q) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \). We define the final segment by \( \text{fin}(q) = \{x_2, \ldots, x_k\} \). For any \( q, q' \in Q \), we say \( q \sim q' \) if \( \text{sup}(v) \cap \text{sup}(v') \neq \emptyset \).

For any set \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \subseteq [n] \), let us define the set of permutations

\[ T(\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}) = \{(x_k z_k) \ldots (x_1 z_1) \mid z_i \in [n] - \{x_i, \ldots, x_k\} \} \]

Although this definition seems to depend on a fixed ordering \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \), the following result shows that this is not the case:

Proposition D.1. The definition of \( T \) does not depend on the ordering of \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \).

Proof. It suffices to show that we can swap adjacent elements. Suppose that \( \sigma = (x_k z_k) \ldots (x_1 z_1) \) where \( z_i \in [n] - \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \). Suppose we swap the \( j \) and \( j+1 \) entry; we will show that there exist \( w_j, w_{j+1} \) such that \((x_j w_j)(x_{j+1} w_{j+1}) = (x_{j+1} z_{j+1})(x_j z_j)\) with \( w_j \not\in \{x_j, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_k\}, w_{j+1} \not\in \{x_j, x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_k\}\). In this case, replacing the terms \((x_{j+1} z_{j+1})(x_j z_j)\) with \((x_j w_j)(x_{j+1} w_{j+1})\) allows us to swap \( x_j, x_{j+1} \). There are a few cases.

1. If \( z_j, z_{j+1} \) are both distinct from \( x_j, x_{j+1} \) and each other, then \((x_{j+1} z_{j+1})(x_j z_j) = (x_{j+1} z_{j+1})(x_j z_j)\) and so \( w_j = z_j, w_{j+1} = z_{j+1} \) works.

2. If \( z_j = z_{j+1} = z \), then \((x_{j+1} z_{j+1})(x_j z_j) = (x_j x_{j+1} z) = (x_j x_{j+1})(x_{j+1} z)\). Thus taking \( w_j = x_{j+1} \) and \( w_{j+1} = z \) works.

3. If \( z_{j+1} = x_j \), then \((x_{j+1} z_{j+1})(x_j z_j) = (x_j z_j x_{j+1}) = (x_j z_j)(x_{j+1} z_j)\). Thus taking \( w_j = z_j, w_{j+1} = z_j \) works.

\[ \square \]

Proposition D.2. For any \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \) and any \( \sigma \in T(\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}) \), there is exactly one choice of indices \( z_1, \ldots, z_k \) such that \( \sigma = (x_k z_k) \ldots (x_1 z_1) \) and \( z_i \in [n] - \{x_i, \ldots, x_k\} \).
Proof. We can uniquely determine \( z_k \) as \( \sigma(x_k) = (x_k \ z_k) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) x_k = z_k \); this follows since \( z_1, \ldots, z_k \) and \( x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1} \) are distinct from \( x_k \). Once we determine \( z_k \), we can determine \( (x_k \ z_k) \sigma = (x_{k-1} \ z_k) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) \) and continue to pull off \( z_{k-1}, \ldots, z_1 \) in this manner. \( \square \)

**Proposition D.3.** We have \( |T(\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\})| = \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-k-1)!} \).

**Proof.** There are \( n - k + i - 1 \) choices for each \( z_i \), and by Proposition [D.2] they all lead to distinct permutations \( \sigma \). Hence the size of \( T(\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}) \) is exactly \( \prod_{i=1}^{k} n - k + i - 1 = \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-k-1)!} \). \( \square \)

For a path \( q = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \), there is an important permutation which "normalizes" the set \( \langle q \rangle \), which we define as

\[
\lambda^q = (x_k \ x_{k-1} \ldots x_1)
\]

We are now ready to define the resampling action. Let \( A = \langle q \rangle \) be an atomic event for a path \( q = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \). We define \( Y_A \) to be the uniform distribution on \( T(\{x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}) \), and we define the resampling action by

\[
r_A(\pi, \sigma) = \sigma \lambda^q \pi
\]

**Proposition D.4.** Let \( A = \langle (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \rangle \) for. For \( \pi \in A \) and \( \sigma \in Y_A \), we have \( r_A(\pi, \sigma) \in \mathcal{A} \).

**Proof.** Let \( \sigma = (x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) \) where \( z_i \in [n] - \{x_i, \ldots, x_{k-1}\} \), and \( \tau_i = (x_i \ z_i) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) \lambda^q \pi \) for \( i = 0, \ldots, k-1 \).

We will by induction on \( i \) that each \( \tau_i \) is a full-cycle permutation on the index set \([n] - \{x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}\). At \( i = k-1 \), this is the result we are trying to prove.

To show the base case \( i = 0 \), note that \( \pi \in \langle q \rangle \) so it contains a sublist \((\ldots b \ x_1 \ x_2 \ldots x_b' \ldots)\). Multiplying by \( \lambda^q \) deletes the elements \( x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1} \), giving

\[
\lambda^q \pi = (\ldots b \ x_k \ x_{k-1} \ldots)
\]

which is a full cycle permutation on the index set \([n] - \{x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}\) as claimed.

For the induction step, observe that \( \tau_i = (x_i \ z_i) \tau_{i-1} \). The point \( x_i \) does not appear in the cycle of \( \tau_{i-1} \) by induction hypothesis. However, since \( z_i \in [n] - \{x_i, \ldots, x_{k-1}\} \), the point \( z_i \) does so. Thus \( \tau_i \) has \( x_i \) inserted just before \( z_i \) in its cycle, moving \( x_i \) from a fixed point to part of its cycle. \( \square \)

We now show that the necessary properties are satisfied.

**Proposition D.5.** Property (D2) holds.

**Proof.** For a state \( \pi \) and atomic events \( \langle q_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle q_s \rangle \), along with associated resampling actions \( \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s \in Y_{A_1}, \ldots, Y_{A_s} \), we want to compute the composition \( \sigma_s \lambda^{q_s} \ldots \lambda^{q_1} \sigma_1 \pi \). We can do this efficiently in parallel since group multiplication is associative. \( \square \)

**Proposition D.6.** Property (C1) holds.

**Proof.** Let \( A = \langle q \rangle \) for a path \( q = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \). We claim

\[
|Y_A \times \lambda^q \times \langle q \rangle| = (n - 1)! = |\mathcal{A}|
\]

(5)

By Proposition [D.4] we have \( Y_A \times \langle q \rangle \subseteq \mathcal{A} \). Thus, by a counting argument, this shows that when \( \sigma \approx Y_A \) and \( \pi \approx \langle q \rangle \), the resulting value \( r_A(\pi, \sigma) = \sigma \lambda^q \pi \) has the uniform distribution on \( \mathcal{A} \) as desired.

By Proposition [D.3] we have \( |Y_A| = \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-k)!} \). Since there is a bijective correspondence between \( \langle q \rangle \) and full-cycle permutations on the ground set \([n] - \{x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}\), we have \( |\langle q \rangle| = (n - k)! \).
Thus, if we show that the permutations $\sigma \lambda^q \pi$ are all distinct, for $\sigma \in Y_A$ and $\pi \in \langle q \rangle$, this will show that

$$|Y_A \times \lambda^q \times \langle q \rangle| = |Y_A| |\langle q \rangle| = \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-k)!} \times (n-k)! = (n-1)!$$

thus showing (5).

Consider $\pi \in A$ and $\sigma \in Y_A$ of the form $\sigma = (x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1)$, where $z_i \in [n] - \{x_i, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}$ and let $\tau = \sigma \pi$. We claim that $z_{k-1}$ is uniquely determined from $\tau$. For, the permutation $\lambda^q \pi$ has a fixed point at $x_{k-1}$. So $\tau x_{k-1} = (x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) x_k = z_{k-1}$; the latter holds as $z_i \neq x_{k-1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

So we determine $z_{k-1}$ and peel off $(x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1})$. Continuing in this way, we can determine $z_{k-1}, \ldots, z_1$ and finally $\pi$. 

**Proposition D.7.** Property (C2) holds.

**Proof.** Consider $A = \langle q \rangle$ for $q = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ and $A' = \langle q' \rangle$ for $q' = (y_1, \ldots, y_j)$ with $A \not\sim A'$ and $\pi \in A - A'$. There must exist some index $\ell < i$ with $\tau(y_\ell) \neq y_{\ell+1}$.

Let $z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1}$ be chosen so that $z_i \in [n] - \{x_i, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}$. We claim that $\sigma \lambda^q \pi y_\ell \neq y_{\ell+1}$ so that $\sigma \lambda^q \pi \not\sim A'$.

For each $i = 0, \ldots, k-1$ define $\tau_i = (x_i \ z_i) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) \lambda^q \pi$. Suppose that $i$ is minimal such that $\sigma_i y_\ell = y_{\ell+1}$. It cannot be $i = 0$, as $\lambda^q y_{\ell+1} = y_{\ell+1}$ (since $y_{\ell+1} \notin \sup(q)$).

For this value of $i > 0$, it must be either that (a) $x_i = \tau_{i-1} y_\ell, z_i = y_{\ell+1} + 1$ or (b) $z_i = \tau_{i-1} y_\ell, x_i = y_{\ell+1}$. The former cannot occur as $\tau_{i-1} x_i = x_i$ and the latter cannot occur as $x_i \neq y_{\ell+1}$.

**Proposition D.8.** Let $q = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ and $b \in [n] - \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$. Let $\sigma = (x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1)$ where $z_i \in [n] - \{x_i, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}$. Then $\sigma b = b$ iff $z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1}$ are all distinct from $b$.

**Proof.** The reverse direction is immediate.

To show the forward direction, define $\sigma_j = (x_j \ z_j) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1)$ for $j = 0, \ldots, k-1$. Let $i \leq k-1$ be minimal such that $z_i = b$. Then $\sigma_i b = (x_i \ b)(x_i-1 \ z_{i-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) b = x_i$. We claim now that for all $j \geq i$ we have $\sigma_j b \in \{x_i, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}$. We show this by induction on $j$. The base case $j = i$ is already shown. To show the induction step, suppose that $\sigma_{j-1} b = x_r$. If $z_i \neq x_r$ we have $\sigma_j b = \sigma_{j-1} b = x_r$ as desired. If $z_j = x_r$, then $\sigma_j b = (x_j \ x_r) \sigma_{j-1} x_r = x_j$, again as desired.

Thus, if some of the $z_i$ are equal to $b$ then $\sigma b \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}$, and in particular $\sigma b \neq b$.

**Corollary D.9.** Property (C4) holds.

**Proof.** Let $A = \langle q \rangle$ and $A' = \langle \langle y_1, \ldots, y_j \rangle \rangle$ where $q = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ and $A \not\sim A'$. Let $\ell < j$. Consider $\sigma = (x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1)$ in $Y_A$. For $\pi \in A'$, we have $\sigma \lambda^q \pi y_{\ell+1} = \sigma \lambda^q y_{\ell+1} = y_{\ell+1}$; this is equal to $y_{\ell+1}$ iff $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{k-1}$ are distinct from $y_{\ell+1}$.

Thus, $\sigma \lambda^q \pi \in A'$ iff $z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1}$ are distinct from $y_2, \ldots, y_j$. This criterion does not depend on $\pi$, so it either holds for all $\pi \in A \cap A'$ or none of them.

**Corollary D.10.** Let $A = \langle \langle x_1, \ldots, x_k \rangle \rangle$ and consider some independent set $E$ with $E \not\sim A$. Let $H = \cup_{q \in E} \fin(q)$. Then $Y_{A;E}$ is given by the set

$$Y_{A;E} = \left\{ (x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) \mid z_i \in [n] - H - \{x_i, \ldots, x_{k-1}\} \right\}$$

Furthermore, property (D1') holds.
Proof. We showed in the proof of Corollary D.9 that a necessary and sufficient condition to have \( \sigma \in Y_{A,A'} \) for any \( A' = (q') \in E \), is to have all \( z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1} \) disjoint from \( \text{fin}(q') \). Thus, \( \sigma \in Y_{A,E} \) iff \( z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1} \) are disjoint for \( B \).

To show (D1'), we can select corresponding \( z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1} \) to generate in parallel. Note that these do not depend upon each other, and by Proposition D.2 each value of \( z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1} \) leads to a distinct permutation. Since group multiplication is associative, the composition \( (x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) \) can be computed in parallel.

**Proposition D.11.** Property (C3) holds.

Proof. Let \( A = (q) \) where \( q = (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \) and let \( A' = (q') \) where \( q' = (b_1, \ldots, b_\ell) \) and \( A \not\sim A' \). Let us define \( H = \{ x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}, b_1, \ldots, b_\ell \} \). We will show that when \( \sigma \approx Y_{A,A'}, \sigma' \approx Y_{A'} \), then we have \( \sigma'\lambda'^q \sigma \lambda^q \approx \text{Unif}(T(H)\lambda^q\lambda'^q) \). This will in turn show (C3), since this is obviously symmetric with respect to \( A, A' \) (note that \( \lambda^q, \lambda'^q \) commute as \( A \not\sim A' \)).

Since \( A \not\sim A' \), the values \( b_1, \ldots, b_\ell \) must be distinct from \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \). Therefore, by Corollary D.10 we have \( |Y_{A,A'}| \leq \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-\ell-1)!} \). By Proposition D.3 we have \( |Y_{A'}| = \frac{(n-\ell)!}{(n-k)!} \) and \( |T(H)| = \frac{(n-\ell)!}{(n-k)!} \). Thus,

\[
|Y_{A'}| \times |Y_{A,A'}| \leq \frac{(n-\ell)!}{(n-\ell-k+1)!} \times \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-k)!} = \frac{(n-1)!}{(n-k)!} = |T(H)|
\]

In light of (6), we will show that \( T(H)\lambda^q\lambda'^q \subseteq Y_{A'}\lambda'^q \times Y_{A,A'}\lambda^q \); a simple counting argument then shows that when \( \sigma \approx Y_{A,A'}, \sigma' \approx Y_{A'} \) the permutation \( \sigma'\lambda'^q \sigma \lambda^q \) must have the uniform distribution on \( T(H)\lambda^q\lambda'^q \).

By Proposition D.11 any \( \tau \in T(H) \) can be written as \( \tau = (b_\ell \ldots c_{\ell-1})(b_1 c_1)(x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1) \), where \( z_i \notin \{x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}, b_1, \ldots, b_\ell\} \) and \( c_i \notin \{b_1, \ldots, b_\ell\} \).

If \( z_i \neq b_1 \), then \( \lambda'^q(x_i \ z_i) = (x_i \ z_i)\lambda'^q \). Otherwise, for \( z_1 = b_1 \), we have \( \lambda'^q(x_i \ z_1) = \lambda'^q(x_i b_1) = (x_i b_1)\lambda'^q \). This shows that \( \lambda'^q(x_{k-1} \ z'_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z'_1) = (x_{k-1} \ z_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z_1)\lambda'^q \), where \( z'_1 \) is defined as

\[
z'_i = \begin{cases} b_1 & \text{if } z_i = b_\ell \\ z_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

So we have shown that \( \tau \lambda^q\lambda'^q = (b_\ell \ldots c_{\ell-1})(b_1 c_1)\lambda'^q(x_{k-1} \ z'_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z'_1)\lambda^q \).

We claim that \( z'_i \notin \{x_i, \ldots, x_{k-1}, b_2, \ldots, b_\ell\} \). For, suppose \( z'_i = x_j \) for \( j \geq i \). Since \( A \not\sim A' \), \( x_j \neq b_1 \), therefore, \( z'_i = z_i = x_j \), which is forbidden.

Next suppose \( z'_i = b_j \) for \( j \geq 2 \). So \( z'_i \neq b_1 \) and hence \( z'_i = z_i = b_j \). We have already seen that \( z_i \notin \{b_1, \ldots, b_\ell\} \), so we it must be that \( j = \ell \). But in that case, we would have \( z_i = b_\ell \) and so \( z'_i = b_1 \), which cannot occur.

So, \( (x_{k-1} \ z'_{k-1}) \ldots (x_1 \ z'_1) \in Y_{A,A'} \). Clearly, \( (b_\ell \ldots c_{\ell-1})(b_1 c_1) \in Y_A \). So \( \tau \) can indeed be written as \( \tau = \sigma'\lambda'^q \sigma \lambda^q \) for \( \sigma \in Y_{A,A'}, \sigma' \in Y_{A'} \).

**E** Perfect matchings of \( K_n^s \)

Let us fix \( s \geq 2 \) throughout this section and let \( n \) be a multiple of \( s \) and define \( \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{M} \) to be the set of perfect matchings of \( K_n^s \). Note that the case \( s = 2 \) is the space of perfect matchings of \( K_n \), which has been studied more extensively, with a commutative resampling oracle given by Kolmogorov [27]. In [28], Lu, Székely & Mohr showed non-constructively that the LLLL applied to this space for all \( s \geq 2 \).
We will construct an oblivious resampling oracle for the uniform distribution on \( \mathcal{M} \). This gives efficient sequential algorithms. We also show that when \( s = 2 \), the oracle is commutative and is compatible with our parallel algorithm.

The probability space \( \Omega \) is the uniform distribution on \( \mathcal{M} \). For every size-\( s \) subset \( e \) of \([n]\), we define the atomic event

\[
\langle e \rangle = \{ M \in \mathcal{M} \mid e \in M \}
\]

The dependency relation \( \sim \) is defined by setting \( A \sim A' \) if \( P(A \cap A') = 0 \); equivalently, \( \langle e \rangle \sim \langle e' \rangle \) iff \( e \neq e' \) and \( e \cap e' \neq \emptyset \).

Whenever we write an edge \( e \) as \( e = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s\} \), we always assume implicitly that these are sorted so that \( x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_s \). With this notation in mind, for an event \( A = \langle \{x_1, \ldots, x_s\} \rangle \) we define \( Y_A \) to be the set of permutations of the form

\[
(x_2 z_2) \cdots (x_s z_s)
\]

wherein \( z_i \) is chosen uniformly from \([n] - \{x_1, \ldots, x_i\}\).

There is a natural group action of \( S_n \) on \( \mathcal{M} \), given by

\[
\sigma M = \{ \{\sigma x_1, \ldots, \sigma x_s\} \mid \{x_1, \ldots, x_s\} \in M \}
\]

We define the resampling action by the group action \( r_A(M, \sigma) = \sigma M \).

**Proposition E.1.** Property (C1) holds.

**Proof.** Consider \( A = \langle e \rangle \) for some edge \( e = \{x_1, \ldots, x_s\} \). We want to show that if we sample \( M \) uniformly from \( A \) and \( z_2, \ldots, z_k \) uniformly with \( z_i \in [n] - \{x_1, \ldots, x_i\} \), then \( (x_2 z_2) \cdots (x_s z_s) M \) has the uniform distribution on \( \mathcal{M} \).

Let us define \( D \) to be the set of all permutations on ground set \( n \), whose cycle structure consists of \( n/s \) cycles of length \( s \). Let us define \( C \subseteq D \) to be set of permutations which contains the cycle \((x_1 x_2 \ldots x_s)\). There is an obvious correspondence between the set of matching \( M \in A \) and the set of permutations \( \rho \in C \); namely, for every edge \( f \neq e \) in \( M \), there are \((s - 1)!\) possible ways to create a cycle in the structure of \( \rho \).

For any \( \rho \in D \), there is a unique matching \( G_\rho \), wherein for every cycle \((x_1, \ldots, x_s) \in \rho \) we create an edge \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_s\} \). If \( \sigma M = N \) for \( \sigma \in Y_A \) and \( M \in A \), then for any permutation \( \rho \in C \), one can verify that \( G_\sigma G_\rho^{-1} = N \).

We now claim that \( \sigma \rho \sigma^{-1} \), where \( \sigma \) ranges over \( Y_A \) and \( \rho \) ranges over \( C \), generates the uniform distribution on \( D \). The will imply that \( G_{\sigma \rho \sigma^{-1}} \approx \text{Unif}(\mathcal{V}) \), and correspondingly so does \( \sigma M = N \).

In order to show that \( \sigma \rho \sigma^{-1} \approx \text{Unif}(D) \), we observe that \( |Y_A| = (n - 1) \ldots (n - s + 1) = \frac{(n - 1)!}{(n - s)!} \). Also, \( |C| = \prod_{i=1}^{n/s-1} \frac{(si - 1)!}{(si - s)!} \) and \( |D| = \prod_{i=1}^{n/s} \frac{(si - 1)!}{(si - s)!} \). Thus,

\[
|Y_A| \times |C| = \frac{(n - 1)!}{(n - s)!} \prod_{i=1}^{n/s-1} \frac{(si - 1)!}{(si - s)!} = \frac{(s - 1)!}{(n - s)!} \prod_{i=1}^{n/s} \frac{(si - 1)!}{(si - s)!} = |D|
\]

Therefore, by a counting argument, the permutations \( \sigma \rho \sigma^{-1} \) will generate the uniform distribution on \( D \) if we can show that for every \( \tau \in D \) there is at most one choice \( \rho \in C \) and \( z_2, \ldots, z_k \) such that \( \tau = \sigma \rho \sigma^{-1} \), for \( \sigma = (x_2 z_2) \cdots (x_k z_k) \).

We can evaluate \( \tau x_1 = \sigma \rho x_1 = \sigma x_2 = z_2 \), since \( z_2, \ldots, z_k \) are distinct from \( x_1 \) and \( x_3, \ldots, x_k \) are distinct from \( x_2 \). This allows us to determine \( z_2 \). Continuing in this way, we can peel of \( z_2, \ldots, z_k \) in turn and finally determine \( \rho \). \qed
**Proposition E.2.** Property (C2) holds.

*Proof.* Consider $A = \langle e \rangle$ where $e = \{x_1, \ldots, x_s\}$ and $A' = \langle e' \rangle$ and $M \in A - A'$. We cannot have $A = A'$ since $A - A'$ is non-empty, and so $e, e'$ are disjoint.

Suppose for contradiction that $e' \in \sigma M$ for $\sigma \in Y_A$. Then let $i \geq 2$ be maximal such that $e' \in (x_i z_i) \ldots (x_k z_k)M$. We must have $i \leq k$, since $e' \notin M$. It must be the case that $z_i \in e'$. Let $N = (x_{i+1} z_{i+1}) \ldots (x_k z_k)M$. We see that $N$ must contain an edge $e' - z_i \cup \{x_i\}$. Thus, $x_i$ is matched to the vertices $e' - z_i$ in $N$.

On the other hand, the entries $z_{i+1}, \ldots, z_k$ are all distinct from $x_1, \ldots, x_{i+1}$; therefore, in the matching $N$, the entries $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ are not affected, and so $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ are matched to each other.

Thus, in $N$, $x_i$ is matched to $s - 1$ vertices in $e'$ as well as $i - 1$ vertices in $e$. So $x_i$ is matched to $s - 1 + i - 1 \geq s$ other vertices in $N$, which is impossible. 

**Proposition E.3.** Let $A = \langle e \rangle$ where $e = \{x_1, \ldots, x_s\}$ and $A' = \langle e' \rangle$ and $M \in A \cap A'$ for $A \neq A'$. Consider $\sigma \in Y_A$ of the form $\sigma = (x_2 z_2) \ldots (x_k z_k)$ where $z_i \in [n] - \{x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}\}$.

1. If $A = A'$, then $\sigma M \in A'$ iff $z_i \in e$ for $i = 2, \ldots, k$.

2. If $A \neq A'$, then $\sigma M \in A'$ iff $z_i \in [n] - e'$ for $i = 2, \ldots, k$.

*Proof.* Let us first consider case (1). Suppose $z_i \in e$ for $i = 2, \ldots, k$. So $(x_k z_k)$ only permutes two elements in $e$, and thus $(x_k z_k)M = M$. A simple induction shows that $(x_i z_i) \ldots (x_k z_k)M = M$ for all $i = k + 1, \ldots, 2$. On the other hand, let $i$ be maximal such that $z_i \notin e$. Then $(x_{i+1} z_{i+1}) \ldots (x_k z_k)M = M$. This $z_i$ will remain matched to $x_1$ in $(x_2 z_1) \ldots (x_k z_k)M$, and in particular $e \notin (x_2 z_2) \ldots (x_k z_k)M$.

Next consider case (2). In this case, $e \cap e' = \emptyset$. If $z_i \in [n] - e'$, then the edge $e'$ will be unaffected in $(x_1 z_1) \ldots (x_k z_k)M$, and so $e' \in M$. On the other hand, let $i$ be maximal such that $z_i \in e'$. This $z_i$ will remain matched to $x_1$ in $(x_1 z_1) \ldots (x_k z_k)M$, and in particular the edge $e'$ cannot remain in $(x_1 z_1) \ldots (x_k z_k)M$.

**Proposition E.4.** Property (C4) holds.

*Proof.* Proposition E.3 gives an explicit condition on when $\sigma M \in A'$ for $A \neq A'$, $M \in A \cap A'$, $\sigma \in Y_A$. This condition depends solely on $A, A', \sigma$ and not on $M$ itself; thus, for any fixed $\sigma$, it holds for all such $M$ or none of them.

**Proposition E.5.** Property (D1') holds.

*Proof.* Consider $E = \{\langle e_1 \rangle, \ldots, \langle e_k \rangle\}$ and $A = \langle e \rangle$ where $e = \{x_1, \ldots, x_s\}$. If $e \in E$, then we generate $Y_{A;E}$ by selecting $z_2, \ldots, z_k$ from the sets $H - \{x_1\}, \ldots, H - \{x_1, \ldots, x_{s-1}\}$ respectively; here the set $H \subseteq [n]$ is defined by the following rule. If $e = e_i$ for some $i$, then $H = e_i$; otherwise $H = [n] - (e_1 \cup \cdots \cup e_k)$. This set $H$ can be generated efficiently and the corresponding $z_i$ can be sampled efficiently.

**Proposition E.6.** For $s = 2$, Property (C3) holds.

*Proof.* Consider $A_1 = \langle (x_1, y_1) \rangle, A_2 = \langle (x_2, y_2) \rangle$ and some matching $M \supseteq \{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)\}$. We want to show that $(y_1 z_1) (y_2 z_2) M \approx (y_2 z_2') (y_1 z_1') M$

where $(y_2 z_2) \approx Y_{A_2;A_1}$ and $(y_1 z_1) \approx Y_{A_1}$ and $(y_1 z_1) \approx Y_{A_1;A_2}$ and $(y_2 z_2) \approx Y_{A_2}$.
By Proposition [E.3] we know that \(z_2 \in [n] - \{x_1, y_1, y_2\}\) and \(z'_2 \in [n] - \{x_2, y_2, y_1\}\). We will first show that
\[
\left\{(y_1 \ z_1)(y_2 \ z_2)M\right\} = \left\{(y_2 \ z'_2)(y_1 \ z'_1)M\right\},
\tag{7}
\]
where the parameters \(z_1, z_2, z'_1, z'_2\) satisfy \(z_2 \in [n] - \{x_1, y_1, x_2\}\), \(z_1 \in [n] - \{x_1\}\), \(z'_2 \in [n] - \{x_2\}\), \(z'_1 \in [n] - \{x_2, y_2, x_1\}\). By symmetry, it suffices to show that the LHS of (7) is contained in the RHS; that is, given \(z_1, z_2\), we want to find \(z'_2 \in [n] - \{x_2\}\) and \(z'_1 \in [n] - \{x_2, y_2, x_1\}\) such that
\[
(y_1 \ z_1)(y_2 \ z_2)M = (y_2 \ z'_2)(y_1 \ z'_1)M.
\tag{8}
\]
By relabeling, we can assume without loss of generality that \(x_1 = 1, y_1 = 3, x_2 = 2, y_2 = 4\) and that \(z_1, z_2 \in [6]\). Without loss of generality, we may take \(M = \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}, \{5, 6\}\}\) or \(M = \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}, \{5, 7\}, \{6, 8\}\}\). We have exhaustively tested all choices \(z_1, z_2\) in both cases, verifying that there is always a choice of \(z'_1, z'_2 \in [8]\) satisfying (8).

This shows (7). We now claim that every pair \(z_2 \in [n] - \{x_1, y_1, x_2\}, z_1 \in [n] - \{x_1\}\) gives rise to a distinct matching \((y_1 \ z_1)(y_2 \ z_2)M\), and similarly for \(z'_1, z'_2\). In order to show this, consider some matching \(N = (y_1 \ z_1)(y_2 \ z_2)M\). Note that \(\{x_1, y_1\} \in (y_2 \ z_2)M\), and so \(x_1\) is matched to \(z_1\) in \(N\). Thus, we can uniquely determine \(z_1\). So we can determine \((y_2 \ z_2)M = (y_1 \ z_1)N\). In \((y_2 \ z_2)M\), \(x_2\) is matched to \(z_2\). So we can uniquely determine \(z_2\).

This implies that there are precisely \((n - 3)(n - 1)\) elements on the LHS of (7), and similarly precisely \((n - 3)(n - 1)\) elements on the RHS. This implies that for a uniform distribution on \(z_1, z_2\), the matching \((y_1 \ z_1)(y_2 \ z_2)M\) have the same distribution as the matchings \((y_2 \ z'_2)(y_1 \ z'_1)M\).

\[\square\]

**Proposition E.7.** Property (D2) holds.

**Proof.** For a state \(M\) and \(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_k \in Y_{\Lambda_1}, \ldots, Y_{\Lambda_k}\), we want to compute the composition \(\sigma_k \ldots \sigma_1 M\). We can do this efficiently in parallel since group multiplication is associative. \[\square\]