

# Simple Parallel Algorithms for Single-Site Dynamics

Hongyang Liu \*

Yitong Yin\*

## Abstract

The single-site dynamics are a canonical class of Markov chains for sampling from high-dimensional probability distributions, e.g. the ones represented by graphical models.

We give a simple and generic parallel algorithm that can faithfully simulate single-site dynamics. When the chain asymptotically satisfies the  $\ell_p$ -Dobrushin's condition, specifically, when the Dobrushin's influence matrix has constantly bounded  $\ell_p$ -induced operator norm for an arbitrary  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , the parallel simulation of  $N$  steps of single-site updates succeeds within  $O(N/n + \log n)$  depth of parallel computing using  $\tilde{O}(m)$  processors, where  $n$  is the number of sites and  $m$  is the size of graphical model. Since the Dobrushin's condition is almost always satisfied asymptotically by mixing chains, this parallel simulation algorithm essentially transforms single-site dynamics with optimal  $O(n \log n)$  mixing time to RNC algorithms for sampling. In particular we obtain RNC samplers, for the Ising models on general graphs in the uniqueness regime, and for satisfying solutions of CNF formulas in a local lemma regime. With non-adaptive simulated annealing, these RNC samplers can be transformed routinely to RNC algorithms for approximate counting.

A key step in our parallel simulation algorithm, is a so-called "universal coupling" procedure, which tries to simultaneously couple all distributions over the same sample space. We construct such a universal coupling, that for every pair of distributions the coupled probability is at least their Jaccard similarity. We also prove that this is optimal in the worst case. The universal coupling and its applications are of independent interests.

arXiv:2111.04044v1 [cs.DS] 7 Nov 2021

---

\*State Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, 163 Xianlin Avenue, Nanjing, Jiangsu Province, China. E-mails: liuhongyang@smail.nju.edu.cn, yinyt@nju.edu.cn

# 1 Introduction

Drawing random samples according to a prescribed probability distribution is a basic computational problem. Historically, Monte Carlo calculations using random samples were among the earliests being programmed on electronic computers [M<sup>+</sup>87]. Today, sampling from high-dimensional distributions is one of the central problems in various fields of modern computer science.

The Monte Carlo Markov chain (MCMC) method is one of the main methods for sampling. A large fraction of Markov chains for sampling from high-dimensional distributions, fall into the class of *single-site dynamics*. Let  $V$  be a set of  $n$  sites, and  $Q$  a set of  $q = |Q|$  spins. Let  $\mu$  be a distribution defined over all configurations  $\sigma \in Q^V$ . A canonical Markov chain for sampling from  $\mu$  is the following single-site dynamics, known as the *Glauber dynamics* (or *Gibbs sampler*, *heat-bath dynamics*):

- On configuration  $\sigma \in Q^V$ , a  $v \in V$  is picked uniformly at random and its spin  $\sigma_v$  is replaced by a random spin drawn independently according to the correct marginal distribution  $\mu_v^{\sigma_{V \setminus \{v\}}}$ .

It is well known that the chain has stationary distribution  $\mu$ . Furthermore, when  $\mu$  is a Gibbs distribution defined by local constraints, there is an underlying graph  $G = (V, E)$  such that the marginal distributions  $\mu_v^{\sigma_{V \setminus \{v\}}}$  depend only on  $\sigma_{N_v}$ , the values of  $\sigma$  at  $v$ 's neighbors.

Abstractly, a single-site dynamics on graph  $G = (V, E)$  can be defined by a class of local update distributions  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  where each  $P_v^\tau$  is a distribution over  $Q$ , that is determined by the site  $v \in V$  to be updated and the current configuration  $\tau = \sigma_{N_v^+}$  on  $v$ 's inclusive neighborhood  $N_v^+$ .<sup>1</sup>

**Parallel MCMC sampling.** The samples produced by single-site dynamics are crucial for the Monte Carlo calculations of partition functions [SVV09], e.g. Ising model [JS93] and number of satisfying solutions [FGYZ21], whose computation in turn is crucial for statistical inference, a task that is more and more frequently asked to be resolved by parallel computing.

Markov chains as the single-site dynamics are defined sequentially. Whether such sequentiality is inevitable, raised intriguing questions in theory. In a seminal work [MVV87], Mulmuley, Vazirani and Vazirani asked whether there is an efficient (RNC) parallel algorithm for sampling bipartite perfect matchings so that permanent can be approximately computed in parallel. This was partially answered negatively by Teng [Ten95], who pointed out a barrier to parallelize the chains for bipartite perfect matching, which are slightly beyond the scope of single-site dynamics.

On the other hand, in the past decade, increasing attention has drawn to parallel-efficient algorithms for MCMC sampling and related tasks [FHY21, FVY21, AHSS20, BRY20, TSD20, GJL19, DDJ18, FY18, FG18, JLY18, FSY17, DSZOR15, DSOR16, AAG<sup>+</sup>12, GLGG11, NRRW11].

For single-site dynamics, an idealized parallelization is given by its continuous-time variant.

## *The Continuous-Time Single-Site Dynamics*

The continuous-time process  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  on space  $Q^V$  evolves as:

1. each site  $v \in V$  holds an independent rate-1 Poisson clock;
2. when a clock at a site  $v \in V$  rings, the spin  $X_t(v)$  is redrawn according to  $P_v^{X_t(N_v^+)}$ .

This continuous-time process “parallelizes” the single-site dynamics with  $n = |V|$  speedup, because a continuous time  $T \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  corresponds to  $N$  discrete steps for a random  $N \sim \text{Pois}(nT)$ .

<sup>1</sup>We use the inclusive neighborhood  $N_v^+ = \{u \mid \{u, v\} \in E\} \cup \{v\}$  in this abstraction of single-site dynamics because for some single-site dynamics the rule for updating a site  $v$  may depend on  $v$ 's current spin, e.g. the Metropolis chains.

Although this idealized parallel process has been discovered for over half a century [Gla63], little has been known about how we can implement it correctly and efficiently in a parallel computer. A major obstacle for this is a classical conundrum in concurrency: If two adjacent sites concurrently read each other's current spin and then use that information to update themselves, then it will cause incorrect simulation of the process, because such concurrent update and especially the dependency relation it causes, do not exist in the continuous-time process. But if we avoid the concurrent adjacent updates, then we have to pay an extra factor of degree  $\Delta$  (in fact, chromatic number  $\chi$ ) in the time complexity for simulating the process, which can be very large for general graph  $G$ .

We are concerned with the following fundamental question: Can we simulate the continuous-time single-site dynamics both faithfully and efficiently by a parallel computer?

This was addressed in a recent work [FHY21] for a subclass of single-site dynamics, called the Metropolis chains. When a Lipschitz condition is satisfied by the Metropolis filters, a single-site Metropolis chains can be simulated faithfully and efficiently by a parallel algorithm. The approach was tailored for Metropolis filters, whose evaluation is reducible to a coin flipping. For general single-site dynamics where an update is beyond Boolean decision, especially the Glauber dynamics, the problem of efficient and faithful parallel simulation requires new techniques.

## 1.1 Our results

We give a simple and generic parallel algorithm that can faithfully simulate a single-site dynamics.

**Condition for efficient parallel simulation.** The parallel simulation is efficient under a condition that is formulated in the same way as the Dobrushin's conditions, but is a lot weaker in scale.

**Definition 1.1** (Dobrushin's influence matrix [Dob70]). The *Dobrushin's influence matrix*  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{V \times V}$  for the single-site dynamics on graph  $G = (V, E)$  specified by  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  is defined as:

$$\forall u, v \in V: \quad \rho(u, v) \triangleq \max_{\tau, \tau': \tau \oplus \tau' \subseteq \{u\}} d_{\text{TV}}(P_v^\tau, P_v^{\tau'}), \quad (1)$$

where  $d_{\text{TV}}(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the total variation distance, and the maximum is taken over all pairs of configurations  $\tau, \tau' \in Q^{N_v^+}$  on the inclusive neighborhood  $N_v^+ = N_v \cup \{v\}$  of  $v$ , such that  $\tau$  and  $\tau'$  agree with each other everywhere except at  $u$ . In particular, for distinct non-adjacent  $u, v \in V$ , the maximum is in fact taken over all  $(\tau, \tau')$  that  $\tau = \tau'$ , and hence  $\rho(u, v) = 0$  for such pair of  $u, v$ .

The operator norm  $\|\rho\|_p$  of the Dobrushin's influence matrix contains crucial information regarding the mixing of the chain. The  $\ell_p$ -induced operator norm is:

$$\|\rho\|_p \triangleq \sup_{v \neq 0} \frac{\|\rho v\|_p}{\|v\|_p}.$$

Specifically,  $\|\rho\|_1 = \max_v \sum_u \rho(u, v) < 1$  corresponds to the Dobrushin's condition [Dob70], and  $\|\rho\|_\infty = \max_u \sum_v \rho(u, v) < 1$  the Dobrushin-Shlosman's condition [DS85a, DS85b].

In a seminal work of Hayes [Hay06], the  $\ell_2$ -Dobrushin's condition  $\|\rho\|_2 < 1$  was proposed, which has implications for several main approaches for mixing, e.g. coupling [Hay06], spectral gap [EKZ21], log-Sobolev [Mar19] and modified log-Sobolev inequalities [BCC<sup>+</sup>21]. This condition was further generalized by Dyer, Goldberg, and Jerrum in [DGJ09] to arbitrary matrix norms.

Our sufficient condition for efficient faithful parallel simulation of single-site dynamics is given by the following asymptotic variant of the  $\ell_p$ -Dobrushin's condition.

**Condition 1.** There is a  $p \in [1, \infty]$  such that  $\|\rho\|_p \leq C$  for some constant  $C = O(1)$ .

**Main theorems.** Let  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  on space  $Q^V$  be a continuous-time single-site dynamics on graph  $G = (V, E)$  defined by local update distributions  $\{P_v^\tau\}$ . The single-site dynamics is presented to the algorithm as oracles for evaluating the distributions  $P_v^\tau$ , such that given any  $v \in V$ ,  $\tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$  and  $x \in Q$ , the oracle returns the value of the probability  $P_v^\tau(x)$ .

We give a parallel algorithm in CRCW-PRAM for simulating single-site dynamics.

**Theorem 1.2** (informal). *For single-site dynamics on graph  $G = (V, E)$  satisfying Condition 1, from any initial state  $X_0 \in Q^V$ , the state  $X_T$  at any time  $0 < T < \text{poly}(|V|)$  in the continuous-time chain can be produced by a parallel algorithm with  $O(T + \log |V|)$  depth using  $\tilde{O}(|E| + |V||Q|^2)$  processors.*

The  $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$  hides poly-logarithmic factors. The algorithm is a Las Vegas algorithm that guarantees to return a *faithful* copy of  $X_T$  upon its termination, while the complexity upper bounds hold with high probability  $(1 - |V|^{-O(1)})$ . Without concurrent writes, the algorithm becomes Monte Carlo with high success probability, with an extra  $(\log \log |V| + \log |Q|)$  factor in the depth.

This parallel algorithm can be turned into a distributed algorithm in the CONGEST model.

**Theorem 1.3** (informal). *For single-site dynamics on graph  $G = (V, E)$  satisfying Condition 1, from any initial state  $X_0 \in Q^V$ , the state  $X_T$  at any time  $0 < T < \text{poly}(|V|)$  in the continuous-time chain can be produced with high probability by a distributed algorithm on network  $G$  within  $O(T + \log |V|)$  rounds, using messages each of  $O(\log |V| \cdot \log |Q|)$  bits.*

The distributed algorithm runs on the same network  $G$  as the underlying graph of the single-site dynamics. Given the unlimited computation power and local memory in the CONGEST model, the update distributions  $P_v^\tau$  can be explicitly given to each node  $v$  as local input. The algorithm is a Monte Carlo algorithm that terminates in fixed rounds and succeeds with high probability.

**Useful consequences.** Note that the  $T$  in above theorems is the continuous time duration, which corresponds to  $N$  discrete update steps for an  $N \sim \text{Pois}(nT)$ , where  $n = |V|$ . By the lower bound [HS07], single-site dynamics mixes in  $\Omega(n \log n)$  discrete steps. Therefore, when applied on mixed chains, the above algorithms achieve  $\Theta(n)$  parallel speedup.

For example, for any reversible and convergent (irreducible and aperiodic) single-site dynamics, if the Dobrushin-Shlosman's condition  $\|\rho\|_\infty < 1$  (which implies contraction of path coupling) holds, the chain mixes within  $n^{-O(1)}$  total variation distance to the stationary distribution  $\pi$  in  $O(n \log n)$  steps or  $O(\log n)$  continuous time. Combined with Theorem 1.2, this gives the following straightforward corollary for MCMC sampling in the RNC class (problems solvable by randomized parallel algorithms with poly-logarithmic depth and polynomial processors).

**Corollary 1.4.** *For reversible and convergent single-site dynamics with RNC-computable initial state and local update distributions, if the Dobrushin's influence matrix has  $\|\rho\|_\infty < 1$ , there is an RNC algorithm for drawing approximate sample (within  $n^{-O(1)}$  total variation distance) from the stationary distribution  $\pi$ .*

One can replace the above condition  $\|\rho\|_\infty < 1$  in Corollary 1.4 with any sufficient condition that implies both Condition 1 and  $O(n \log n)$ -step mixing, the corollary persists.

Condition 1 is much weaker than sufficient conditions for mixing. For example, it holds if an asymptotic version of the Dobrushin-Shlosman's condition  $\|\rho\|_\infty = O(1)$  holds, which basically says that the path coupling [BD97] can increase the discrepancy by at most  $O(1)$  factor, that is: "disagreements do not propagate super-exponentially". On various graphical models, e.g. Ising model, hardcore model, and proper coloring, this condition is no stronger or even much weaker than the necessary conditions for the chain to mix. It also subsumes the Lipschitz condition for the Metropolis filters given in [FHY21] for the Metropolis chains.

An Ising model on graph  $G = (V, E)$  is defined as follows. Let  $Q = \{0, 1\}$ . Let  $\beta > 0$  be an edge activity and  $\lambda = (\lambda_v)_{v \in V} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^V$  be local fields. The Gibbs distribution  $\mu$  is defined by:

$$\forall \sigma \in \{0, 1\}^V, \quad \mu(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z} \beta^{m(\sigma)} \prod_{v \in V} \lambda_v^{\sigma_v},$$

where  $m(\sigma) \triangleq \sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} I[\sigma_u = \sigma_v]$  denotes the number of monochromatic edges in  $\sigma$ , and the normalizing factor  $Z_G(\beta) \triangleq \sum_{\sigma \in Q^V} \beta^{m(\sigma)} \prod_{v \in V} \lambda_v^{\sigma_v}$  is the partition function.

The uniqueness condition for the Ising model is given by  $\beta \in (\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta}, \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2})$ , where  $\Delta = \Delta_G \geq 3$  is the maximum degree of  $G$ . When  $\beta > \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}$  or  $\beta < \frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta}$ , either the single-site dynamics is slow mixing or the sampling problem itself is intractable [GM07, SS12].

Assuming uniqueness condition, an optimal  $O(n \log n)$ -step discrete mixing time was proved for the Glauber dynamics on graphs with bounded maximum degree [CLV21, MS13], and very recently on all graphs [CFYZ21]. Furthermore, Condition 1 holds easily for the Ising model for any  $1 - O(\frac{1}{\Delta}) \leq \beta \leq 1 + O(\frac{1}{\Delta})$ . Consequently, we have the following parallel Ising sampler.

**Corollary 1.5** (Ising sampler). *For Ising models on  $n$ -vertex graph  $G = (V, E)$  with maximum degree  $\Delta = \Delta_G \geq 3$  and edge activity  $\beta \in (\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta}, \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2})$ , approximate sample within any  $\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$  total variation distance can be produced by a parallel algorithm with  $O(\log n \cdot \log \Delta)$  depth using  $\tilde{O}(|E|)$  processors.*

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first RNC algorithm for sampling from graphical models with unbounded maximum degree up to the critical threshold. The extra  $(\log \Delta)$  factor to the depth is contributed by realizing the oracles for evaluating local update distributions.

The parallel algorithm can be implemented as an  $O(\log n)$ -round CONGEST( $\log n$ ) algorithm on network  $G$ , where the local update distributions can be evaluated using 1-round communication.

Our parallel algorithm for sampling can be applied for more complicated distributions.

Consider conjunctive normal form (CNF) formulas on  $n$  Boolean variables. We call a CNF formula  $\Phi$  a  $(k, d)$ -CNF formula if all of its clauses have size  $k$  and each variable appears in at most  $d$  clauses. In [FGYZ21, Moi19], an  $\text{poly}(d, k) \cdot n^{1+2^{-20}}$ -time algorithm is given for sampling almost uniform satisfying solutions under a local lemma condition  $k \geq 20 \log k + 20 \log d + 60$ .

Here we show that this algorithm can be parallelized in the RNC class.

**Corollary 1.6** (SAT sampler). *For  $(k, d)$ -CNF formulas  $\Phi$  with  $n$  variables where*

$$k \geq 20 \log k + 20 \log d + 60, \tag{2}$$

*an almost uniform satisfying assignment of  $\Phi$  within  $\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}$  total variation distance can be produced by a parallel algorithm with  $\text{polylog}(n)$  depth using  $\text{poly}(d, n)$  processors.*

The single-site dynamics is run on a much complicated distribution  $\mu_M$ , which is projected from the uniform distribution  $\mu$  over all SAT solutions of  $\Phi$  on a carefully constructed subset  $M \subset V$ . This is because the original  $\mu$  may not be connected through single-site update.

Both above parallel samplers can be turned into parallel approximate counting algorithms, via the *non-adaptive* simulated annealing. For the Ising model, using the a Chebyshev's cooling schedule in [DFK91] and [ŠVV09, Corollary 2.4], we can routinely turn the Ising sampler in Corollary 1.5 to an  $O(\log n \cdot \log \Delta)$ -depth  $\tilde{O}(mn^2/\epsilon^2)$ -processor algorithm for  $\epsilon$ -approximation of the Ising partition function, under the same uniqueness condition. And by the non-adaptive annealing provided in [FGYZ21, Algorithm 7], we also have an  $\text{polylog}(n)$ -depth  $\text{poly}(d, n)$ -processor for approximately counting the number of satisfying solutions of any  $(k, d)$ -CNF satisfying (2).

Corollary 1.5 and Corollary 1.6 are proved in Section 6.

## 2 Preliminaries

**Single-site dynamics.** Let  $V$  be a set of  $n$  sites. Let  $Q = \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$  be a finite set of  $q \geq 2$  spins. A configuration on  $S \subseteq V$  is an assignment  $\sigma \in Q^S$  of spins to the sites in  $S$ . Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an undirected graph on vertex set  $V$ . For each vertex  $v \in V$ , let  $N_v \triangleq \{u \in V \mid \{u, v\} \in E\}$  denote the neighborhood of  $v$  in  $G$ , and let  $N_v^+ \triangleq N_v \cup \{v\}$  denote the *inclusive neighborhood* of  $v$  in  $G$ .

We use the term *single-site dynamics* on graph  $G$  to refer to the following type of Markov chains on space  $Q^V$ . Let  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  be a collection of *local update distributions*, such that for every site  $v \in V$  and every configuration  $\tau \in N_v^+$  on  $v$ 's inclusive neighborhood,  $P_v^\tau$  is a distribution over all spins in  $Q$ . A Markov chain on space  $Q^V$  is specified by  $\{P_v^\tau\}$ . On configuration  $\sigma \in Q^V$ , it does the following:

1. pick  $v \in V$  uniformly at random;
2. replace the spin  $\sigma(v)$  of  $v$  by a spin drawn independently according to  $P_v^\tau$ , where  $\tau = \sigma(N_v^+)$ .

The  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  is also called the *local transition rule* for the chain.

**Examples.** Given a distribution  $\mu$  over  $Q^V$ , for any  $v \in V$  and any possible  $\tau \in Q^S$  on  $S \subseteq V \setminus \{v\}$ , let  $\mu_v^\tau$  denote the marginal distribution at  $v$  induced by  $\mu$  conditional on the configuration on  $S$  being fixed as  $\tau$ , that is,

$$\forall x \in Q, \quad \mu_v^\tau(x) = \Pr_{\sigma \sim \mu}[\sigma_v = x \mid \sigma_S = \tau].$$

Consider a *Gibbs distribution*  $\mu$  defined on graph  $G$  over sample space  $Q^V$ . That is, for any  $v \in V$  and any possible  $\sigma \in Q^V$ , the marginal distribution  $\mu_v^{\sigma_{V \setminus \{v\}}}$  depends only on the values of  $\sigma$  at  $v$ 's neighbors, i.e.  $\mu_v^{\sigma_{V \setminus \{v\}}} = \mu_v^{\sigma_{N_v}}$ . For examples:

- **Ising/Potts/coloring models:** Let  $\beta \geq 0$  be an *edge activity*. A Gibbs distribution  $\mu$  is defined on graph  $G = (V, E)$ , such that  $\mu(\sigma) \propto \beta^{m(\sigma)}$  for  $\sigma \in Q^V$ , where  $m(\sigma) \triangleq \sum_{\{u, v\} \in E} I[\sigma_u = \sigma_v]$  denotes the number of monochromatic edges in  $\sigma$ . For  $q = |Q| = 2$  the model becomes the (field-less) Ising model, and for general  $q > 2$  the Potts model. For  $\beta = 0$ ,  $\mu$  gives the uniform distribution over all proper  $q$ -colorings of  $G$ .

Two basic classes of single-site dynamics are:

- *Glauber dynamics* (a.k.a. *Gibbs sampler*, *heat-bath*): The local update distributions are  $P_v^\tau = \mu_v^{\tau_{N_v}}$ .
- *Metropolis chain*: To update  $v$ 's spin in  $\sigma \in Q^V$ , first “propose” to replace  $\sigma(v)$  with a spin  $x \in Q$  chosen uniformly at random, and then “accept” it with probability  $\min \left\{ 1, \mu_v^{\sigma_{N_v}}(x) / \mu_v^{\sigma_{N_v}}(\sigma_v) \right\}$ .

Formally,  $P_v^\tau(x) = \frac{1}{|Q|} \min \left\{ 1, \mu_v^{\tau_{N_v}}(x) / \mu_v^{\tau_{N_v}}(\tau_v) \right\}$  for  $x \neq \tau_v$  and  $P_v^\tau(\tau_v) = 1 - \sum_{x \neq \tau_v} P_v^\tau(x)$ .

It is well known that both chains are reversible with respect to  $\mu$  [LPW17]. Both chains can be defined for general (not necessarily Gibbs) distributions  $\mu$  over  $Q^V$ , by setting  $G$  as the complete graph and hence the marginal distributions  $\mu_v^{\tau_{N_v}} = \mu_v^{\tau_{V \setminus \{v\}}}$ .

For the Gibbs distributions  $\mu$  defined by hard constraints, where infeasible configurations are of 0 probability, one can usually extend the definition of  $\mu_v^\tau$  to infeasible conditions  $\tau$  by ignoring the constraints violated locally by  $\tau$ . For example, for uniform distribution  $\mu$  over proper  $q$ -colorings of  $G$ , for such  $\tau \in Q^{N_v}$  that is already improper,  $\mu_v^\tau$  can still be defined as the uniform distribution over all available colors in  $Q \setminus \{\tau_u \mid u \in N_v\}$ , which is well-defined as long as  $q > \Delta$  for the maximum degree  $\Delta$  of  $G$ . In this way, the above single-site dynamics may become absorb to feasible states even if it starts from an infeasible one.

In this paper we assume that for a single-site dynamics the local update distributions  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  have definitions for all sites  $v \in V$  and neighborhood configurations  $\tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$ .

**Continuous-time chain.** The continuous-time version of the single-site dynamics is defined as follows. The time runs continuously with a uniform rate starting from 0.

1. each site  $v \in V$  is associated with an independent rate-1 Poisson clock: let  $S_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq i} T_j$ , where  $T_1, T_2, \dots$  are independent and identically distributed exponential random variables of rate 1, and the Poisson clock rings at time  $S_1, S_2, \dots$ ;
2. whenever the clock at a site  $v \in V$  rings, the spin of  $v$  is updated according to  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  as in the discrete-time chain.

Let  $(X_t^C)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  denote this continuous-time process, and let  $(X_t^D)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}}$  denote its discrete-time counterpart. The two processes are equivalent up to a speedup factor  $n$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** *Conditioning on the same initial configuration  $X_0^C = X_0^D \in Q^V$ , for any  $T > 0$ ,  $X_T^C$  is identically distributed as  $X_N^D$ , where  $N$  follows the Poisson distribution  $\text{Pois}(nT)$ , where  $n = |V|$ .*

**Mixing time.** According to Markov chain convergence theorem [LPW17], an irreducible and aperiodic Markov chain on finite state space converges to a unique stationary distribution  $\pi$ . The *mixing time* or *mixing rate* measures the rate at which the chain converges. For two distributions  $\mu, \nu$  over the same sample space  $\Omega$ , the *total variation distance* between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is defined as

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \Omega} |\mu(x) - \nu(x)|.$$

For a chain  $X_t$  on space  $Q^V$  that converges to stationary distribution  $\pi$ , for any  $\sigma \in Q^V$ , let  $p_t^\sigma$  denote the distribution of  $X_t$  conditioning on  $X_0 = \sigma$ , and let

$$t_{\text{mix}}(\sigma, \epsilon) \triangleq \min \{t > 0 \mid d_{\text{TV}}(p_t^\sigma, \pi) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

And the *mixing time* is defined as  $t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) \triangleq \max_{\sigma \in Q^V} t_{\text{mix}}(\sigma, \epsilon)$ .

Let  $t_{\text{mix}}^C(\epsilon)$  and  $t_{\text{mix}}^D(\epsilon)$  denote respectively the mixing times of the continuous-time and discrete-time single-site dynamics  $(X_t^C)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  and  $(X_t^D)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}}$ , defined by the same local transition rule  $\{P_v^\tau\}$ . The following relation between the two mixing times follows immediately from Proposition 2.1:

$$n \cdot t_{\text{mix}}^C(\epsilon) = O\left(t_{\text{mix}}^D(\epsilon/2) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right), \quad (3)$$

where  $n = |V|$  is the number of sites.

In particular, an  $O(n \log n)$  mixing time for the discrete-time chain implies an  $O(\log n)$  mixing time for the continuous-time chain. And due to a general lower bound for single-site dynamics [HS07], these are also the optimal mixing time bounds.

**Computation models.** In this paper we use the concurrent-read concurrent-write (CRCW) parallel random access machine model (PRAM) with arbitrary write, where an arbitrary value written concurrently is stored. The *depth* of an algorithm is equal to the number of time steps required.

We use NC to refer to both the class of parallel algorithms with poly-logarithmic depth and polynomial processors and the class of problems solvable by such algorithms. We use RNC for the randomized counterpart of NC.

The CONGEST model is defined on an undirected network  $G = (V, E)$ , where the nodes represent processors. Initially, each node receives its local input and private random bits. The communications are synchronized and proceed in rounds. In each round, each node may perform arbitrary local computation and send a  $B$ -bit message to each of its neighbors. The messages are received by the end of the round. The model is denoted as CONGEST( $B$ ).

### 3 Belief Propagation for Simulating Markov Chain

In this section, we introduce an iterative algorithm that simulates single-site dynamics. The algorithm falls into the general framework of *belief propagation (BP)*: each site maintains an internal state, which is updated iteratively according to the current internal states of adjacent sites until a fixpoint is reached. The classic sum-product BP algorithms were known for calculating marginal probabilities [Pea82, MM09]. Here we give a BP style algorithm for simulating the chain itself.

Let  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  be a continuous-time single-site dynamics on graph  $G = (V, E)$ , defined by local update distributions  $\{P_v^\tau\}$ . We want to simulate the chain up to a fixed time  $T > 0$ . On each site  $v \in V$ , a rate-1 Poisson clock runs independently up to time  $T$ , generating a time sequence:

$$0 = t_0^v < t_1^v < \dots < t_{m_v}^v < T,$$

where  $m_v \sim \text{Pois}(T)$ . With probability 1, all  $t_i^v$ 's with  $i \geq 1$  are distinct. We call such a collection of time sequences for all sites  $\mathfrak{T} = (t_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v}$  an *update schedule* up to time  $T$ .

Given an update schedule  $\mathfrak{T}$ , we identify the  $i$ -th update at site  $v$  (which occurs at time  $t = t_i^v$ ) by a pair  $(v, i)$ . To resolve this update, the current spin  $X_t(v)$  of site  $v$  is replaced by a random spin generated independently according to  $P_v^\tau$ , where  $\tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$  is constructed as: for each  $u \in N_v^+$ ,  $\tau_u = X_{t_{j_u}^u}$  is the spin generated in the  $j_u$ -th update at site  $u$ , where  $j_u = \max\{j \geq 0 \mid t_j^u < t_i^v\}$ .

More precisely, such generation of the random spin for update  $(v, i)$  can be expressed as:

$$X_t(v) \leftarrow \text{Sample} \left( P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)}$  stands for the random seed, and the *deterministic* subroutine  $\text{Sample}(\mu, \mathcal{R})$  guarantees to return a spin distributed as  $\mu$  using random bits  $\mathcal{R}$ , for any distribution  $\mu$  over  $Q$ .

Knowing the initial configuration  $X_0 \in Q^V$ , once the update schedule  $\mathfrak{T} = (t_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v}$  up to time  $T$  and the assignment  $\mathfrak{R} = (\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)})_{v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq m_v}$  of random bits for resolving updates fixed, the entire evolution of the chain  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  is uniquely determined by sequentially executing (4).

A parallel procedure that faithfully simulates the process is given in Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1: An iterative algorithm for simulating single-site dynamics

---

**Input:** initial configuration  $X_0 \in Q^V$ ; update schedule  $\mathfrak{T} = (t_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v}$ ;  
assignment  $\mathfrak{R} = (\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)})_{v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq m_v}$  of random bits for resolving updates.

```

1 initialize  $\ell \leftarrow 0$  and  $\widehat{X}_v^{(0)}[i] \leftarrow X_0(v)$  for all  $v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v$ ;
2 repeat
3    $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$ ;
4   for all  $v \in V$  in parallel do  $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[0] \leftarrow X_0(v)$ ;
5   for all updates  $(v, i)$ , where  $v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq m_v$ , in parallel do
6     let  $\tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$  be constructed as:
7        $\forall u \in N_v^+, \tau_u \leftarrow \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j_u]$  for  $j_u = \max\{j \geq 0 \mid t_j^u < t_i^v\}$ ;
8      $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \leftarrow \text{Sample} \left( P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} \right)$ ;
9   end
9 until  $\widehat{X}^{(\ell)} = \widehat{X}^{(\ell-1)}$ ;
```

---

**Remark 3.1 (consistent iterative updating).** The algorithm maintains an array  $\widehat{X}$  where each entry  $\widehat{X}_v[i]$  corresponds to an update  $(v, i)$  in the chain. In every iteration,  $\widehat{X}_v[i]$  is updated according to the rule (4), using the same assignment of random bits  $\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)}$  regardless which iteration it is in.



Unlike the BP for calculating the marginal probabilities, whose correctness is guaranteed mostly on trees [MM09], Algorithm 1 always converges to the correct chain within finite steps.

**Lemma 3.2 (convergence & correctness).** *Fix any initial configuration  $X_0 \in Q^V$ , any update schedule  $\mathfrak{T} = (t_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v}$  up to time  $T$ , and any assignment of random bits  $\mathfrak{R} = (\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)})_{v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq m_v}$  for resolving updates. Let  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  be the continuous-time chain fully determined by  $X_0$ ,  $\mathfrak{T}$  and  $\mathfrak{R}$ .*

1. *Algorithm 1 terminates within  $m + 1$  iterations (of the **repeat** loop), where  $m = \sum_{v \in V} m_v$ .*
2. *Upon termination,  $\widehat{X}$  correctly gives all transitions of  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ , such that  $\widehat{X}_v[i] = X_{t_i^v}(v)$  for every update  $(v, i)$ . In particular,  $(\widehat{X}_v[m_v])_{v \in V} = X_T$  gives the configuration at time  $T$ .*

The BP in Algorithm 1 guarantees to converge to the correct answer because there is a partial order relation which captures the dependency between updates, formally defined in (6). Both the convergence in finite steps and correctness of the BP rely on the partial order.

For random choices  $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R})$  generated as in a continuous-time chain  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  up to time  $T$ , by calculations in [FHY21, HS07], with high probability the longest monotone path generated by independent Poisson clocks on graph  $G$  is bounded by  $O(\Delta T + \log n)$ , where  $\Delta$  is the maximum degree. Consequently, Algorithm 1 converges within these many steps with high probability.

**Fast convergence.** Indeed, Algorithm 1 can reach its fixpoint substantially faster than a chain of dependency has reached initial values. In Line 7 the algorithm does:

$$\widehat{X}_v[i] \leftarrow \text{Sample} \left( P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} \right).$$

Here, the entry  $\widehat{X}_v[i]$  (which corresponds to the update  $(v, i)$ ) can locally stabilize (i.e. has the same value in two consecutive iterations) even before its neighborhood configuration  $\tau$  has stabilized, if:

1. the distributions  $P_v^\tau, P_v^{\tau'}$  with similar boundary conditions  $\tau, \tau' \in Q^{N_v^+}$  are close to each other;
2. for  $P_v^\tau, P_v^{\tau'}$  that are close to each other, it is likely that  $\text{Sample}(P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)}) = \text{Sample}(P_v^{\tau'}, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)})$ .

The first property is captured by Condition 1. And the second is formalized by a new notion:

**Definition 3.3 ( $\alpha$ -competitiveness).** Let  $\alpha \geq 1$ . A procedure  $\text{Sample}(\mu, \mathcal{R})$  that returns a sample from distribution  $\mu$  arbitrarily specified over  $Q$ , is said to be  $\alpha$ -competitive, if for any  $\mu, \nu$  over  $Q$ ,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{R}} [\text{Sample}(\mu, \mathcal{R}) \neq \text{Sample}(\nu, \mathcal{R})] \leq \alpha \cdot d_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu). \quad (5)$$

The following convergence bound for Algorithm 1 on random input justifies the above intuition. On random choices  $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R})$  generated as in the continuous-time chain  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  up to time  $T$ , Algorithm 1 faithfully simulates the chain using  $O(T + \log n)$  iterations with high probability, assuming Condition 1 with constant  $C = O(1)$  and an  $O(1)$ -competitive  $\text{Sample}$  subroutine.

**Lemma 3.4 (fast convergence).** *If Condition 1 holds with parameter  $C$  and the  $\text{Sample}$  subroutine is  $\alpha$ -competitive, then for every  $T > 0$  and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , Algorithm 1 on any initial configuration  $X_0 \in Q^V$  and random  $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R})$  up to time  $T$  terminates within  $O(\alpha C \cdot T + \log(\frac{n}{\epsilon}))$  iterations with probability  $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ .*

It remains to show that there is indeed a  $\text{Sample}$  procedure with small competitiveness. Such a procedure provides a *universal coupling*, which simultaneously couples all distributions  $\mu$  over sample space  $Q$ . Surprisingly, there is such a universal coupling procedure that can always perform within twice the optimal coupling between any pair of distributions  $\mu, \nu$  over  $Q$ .

**Theorem 3.5 (twice-optimal universal coupling).** *There is a 2-competitive  $\text{Sample}(\mu, \mathcal{R})$  procedure.*

The rest of this section is dedicated to proving Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.4. The proof of Theorem 3.5 is postponed to Section 4, where we explore the concept of universal coupling.

### 3.1 Worst-case convergence of the BP

Fix an update schedule  $\mathfrak{T} = (t_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v}$ . For any updates  $(u, j)$  and  $(v, i)$  where  $i, j \geq 1$ , define

$$(u, j) \preceq (v, i) \iff u \in N_v^+ \wedge t_j^u \leq t_i^v. \quad (6)$$

This gives a well-defined partial order relation on updates since all  $t_i^v$ 's with  $i \geq 1$  are distinct. Intuitively,  $(u, j) \prec (v, i)$  (that is,  $(u, j) \preceq (v, i)$  but  $(u, j) \neq (v, i)$ ) means that the resolution of update  $(v, i)$  may be dependent on the outcome of update  $(u, j)$ .

The partial order relation in (6) gives rise to a notion of depth for updates. For each update  $(v, i)$  where  $v \in V$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m_v$ , its *depth*, denoted by  $\text{depth}(v, i)$ , is recursively defined as:

$$\text{depth}(v, i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \neg \exists (u, j) \text{ s.t. } (u, j) \prec (v, i), \\ 1 + \max_{(u, j) \prec (v, i)} \text{depth}(u, j) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\text{depth}(v, i)$  gives the length of the longest chain that ends at  $(v, i)$  in the partial order.

Now consider the  $\widehat{X}$  maintained by Algorithm 1. Note that for every update  $(v, i)$  and any possible iteration number  $\ell \geq 0$ , the entry  $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i]$  is assigned only once in Line 7 of Algorithm 1. For all those  $\ell \geq 1$  that the algorithm has terminated before the  $\ell$ -th iteration, we simply assume that  $\widehat{X}^{(\ell)} = \widehat{X}^{(\ell-1)}$ . Therefore,  $\widehat{X}^{(\ell)}$  is well-defined for all  $\ell \geq 0$ , given the input  $X_0, \mathfrak{T}$  and  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

The next lemma shows that for every update  $(v, i)$ , the corresponding entry  $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i]$  stops changing (i.e. locally terminates) beyond  $\text{depth}(v, i)$  iterations.

**Lemma 3.6.** *For each update  $(v, i)$  where  $v \in V$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m_v$ , for any  $\ell > \text{depth}(v, i)$ ,*

$$\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] = \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell-1)}[i].$$

This immediately proves Item 1 of Lemma 3.2, the convergence of Algorithm 1 within  $m + 1$  steps, since the size  $m = \sum_{v \in V} m_v$  of the poset is a trivial upper bound on the length of any chain, and hence by Lemma 3.6 the entire  $\widehat{X}$  must have stopped changing after at most  $m + 1$  steps.

*Proof of Lemma 3.6.* A key observation is that, in the  $r$ -th iteration, the neighborhood configuration  $\tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$  constructed in Line 6 for resolving an update  $(v, i)$  satisfies that for every  $u \in N_v^+$ ,  $\tau_u = \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j_u]$ , where either  $(u, j_u) \prec (v, i)$  (and hence  $\text{depth}(u, j_u) \leq \text{depth}(v, i)$ ) or  $j_u = 0$ . Intuitively, this observation simply says that every spin in the neighborhood configuration  $\tau$  for resolving an update  $(v, i)$  either results from a previous update or is part of the initial configuration.

We now prove the lemma by an induction on depth. For the induction basis: for the updates  $(v, i)$  with depth  $\text{depth}(v, i) = 1$ , there is no  $(u, j)$  such that  $(u, j) \prec (v, i)$ . Therefore, by the above observation, the  $\tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$  constructed in Line 6 for resolving update  $(v, i)$  always satisfies that  $\tau_u = \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[0] = X_0(u)$  for every  $u \in N_v^+$ , which implies that  $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \leftarrow \text{Sample}(P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v, i)})$  stops changing after the first iteration. This verifies the lemma when  $\text{depth}(v, i) = 1$ .

Now we are going to verify the lemma for the updates  $(v, i)$  with depth  $\text{depth}(v, i) > 1$ , assuming that the lemma has been established for all updates with  $\text{depth}(u, j) < \text{depth}(v, i)$ . By the same observation, and due to the induction hypothesis, the  $\tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$  constructed in Line 6 for resolving update  $(v, i)$  stops changing after  $\text{depth}(v, i) - 1$  iterations, which implies that  $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \leftarrow \text{Sample}(P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v, i)})$  stops changing after  $\text{depth}(v, i)$  iterations. This completes the induction and proves the lemma.  $\square$

### 3.2 Fast average-case convergence of the BP

In a continuous-time chain  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ , the update schedule  $\mathfrak{T}$  is randomly generated by independent Poisson clocks. On such randomly generated update schedule  $\mathfrak{T}$ , Algorithm 1 runs much faster.

**Lemma 3.7** ([FHY21, HS07]). *For a random update schedule  $\mathfrak{T} = (T_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v}$  generated up to time  $T$  by the  $n$  independent rate-1 Poisson clocks on graph  $G$  of maximum degree  $\Delta$ , for any  $\ell \geq 1$ , the probability that there is an update  $(v, i)$  with  $\text{depth}(v, i) \geq \ell$  is bounded by  $n \cdot \left(\frac{e(\Delta+1)T}{\ell}\right)^\ell$ .*

*Proof.* Fix any path  $(v_1, \dots, v_\ell) \in V^\ell$  such that  $v_{i+1} \in N_{v_i}^+$ . Consider the event that there exist  $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_\ell < T$  such that the Poisson clock at  $v_i$  rings at time  $t_i$ , which occurs with probability  $\leq \left(\frac{eT}{\ell}\right)^\ell$  due to [HS07, Observation 3.2]. Apply union bound over  $\leq n(\Delta+1)^\ell$  paths.  $\square$

Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7 together shows that on a random update schedule  $\mathfrak{T}$  up to time  $T$ , Algorithm 1 terminates within  $\lceil 2e(\Delta+1)T + \log_2\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon}\right) \rceil$  iterations with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ .

We now prove Lemma 3.4, the  $O(T + \log n)$ -step convergence under Condition 1. Fix an update schedule  $\mathfrak{T} = (t_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v}$ . It defines a partial order relation  $\prec$  as in (6). For a chain  $\pi$  of size  $\ell$ :

$$\pi : (v_1, i_1) \prec (v_2, i_2) \prec \dots \prec (v_\ell, i_\ell),$$

define the *weight* of this chain as that  $w(\pi) \triangleq 1$  if  $\ell = 1$  and for  $\ell > 1$ ,

$$w(\pi) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} (\alpha \cdot \rho(v_i, v_{i+1})), \quad (7)$$

where  $\rho(u, v)$  is the influence of site  $u$  on site  $v$  in the Dobrushin's influence matrix  $\rho$  defined in Definition 1.1; and  $\alpha$  represents the competitive ratio of  $\text{Sample}(\cdot, \cdot)$  defined in Definition 3.3.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Fix an arbitrary update schedule  $\mathfrak{T} = (t_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq m_v}$ . For any update  $(v, i)$ , for any  $\ell \geq 1$ ,*

$$\Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \neq \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell-1)}[i] \right] \leq \sum_{\substack{\text{chain } \pi \text{ of size } \ell \\ \text{that ends at } (v, i)}} w(\pi), \quad (8)$$

where the probability is taken over the random bits  $\mathfrak{R} = (\mathcal{R}_i^v)_{v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq m_v}$ .

*Proof.* We prove the following inequality: for  $\ell \geq 2$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \neq \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell-1)}[i] \right] \leq \sum_{(u, j): (u, j) \prec (v, i)} \alpha \cdot \rho(u, v) \cdot \Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j] \neq \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-2)}[j] \right], \quad (9)$$

where the sum is over all updates  $(u, j)$  in  $\mathfrak{T}$ , where  $u \in V$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m_u$  such that  $(u, j) \prec (v, i)$ .

The lemma follows from (9) by an induction. For the induction basis, when  $\ell = 1$ , the right hand side of (8) becomes  $w((v, i)) = 1$ , and hence (8) holds since  $\Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_v^{(1)}[i] \neq \widehat{X}_v^{(0)}[i] \right] \leq 1$ . Assuming (8) for  $\ell - 1$ , due to (9),

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \neq \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell-1)}[i] \right] &\leq \sum_{(u, j): (u, j) \prec (v, i)} \alpha \cdot \rho(u, v) \sum_{\substack{\text{chain } \pi \text{ of size } \ell-1 \\ \text{that ends at } (u, j)}} w(\pi) \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{\text{chain } \pi \text{ of size } \ell \\ \text{that ends at } (v, i)}} w(\pi). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. The rest of the proof is dedicated to proving (9).

For any  $\ell \geq 1$ , the variable  $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i]$  is assigned in Line 7 of Algorithm 1, as

$$\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \leftarrow \text{Sample} \left( P_v^{\tau^{(\ell)}}, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} \right),$$

where  $\tau^{(\ell)} \in Q^{N_v^+}$  is constructed as that

$$\forall u \in N_v^+ : \tau_u^{(\ell)} = \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j_u] \text{ where } j_u = \max\{j \geq 0 \mid t_j^u < t_i^v\}. \quad (10)$$

We use  $\mathfrak{R}_{<t}$  to denote the random bits used for resolving updates before time  $t$ . Formally:

$$\mathfrak{R}_{<t} \triangleq (\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)})_{v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq m_v, t_i^v < t}.$$

Observe that for any  $\ell \geq 0$ , the value of  $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i]$  is fully determined given  $\mathfrak{R}_{<t}$  if  $t_i^v < t$ .

By Definition 3.3, with  $\alpha$ -competitive  $\text{Sample}(\cdot, \cdot)$ , for  $\ell \geq 2$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \neq \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell-1)}[i] \mid \mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v} \right] &= \Pr \left[ \text{Sample} \left( P_v^{\tau^{(\ell)}}, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} \right) \neq \text{Sample} \left( P_v^{\tau^{(\ell-1)}}, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} \right) \mid \mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v} \right] \\ &\leq \alpha \cdot d_{\text{TV}} \left( P_v^{\tau^{(\ell)}}, P_v^{\tau^{(\ell-1)}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $\tau^{(\ell)}$  and  $\tau^{(\ell-1)}$  as constructed in (10) are determined by  $\mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v}$ , and the random choice of  $\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)}$  is independent of  $\mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v}$ .

We construct a sequence  $\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_k \in N_v^+$  where  $k = |\tau^{(\ell)} \oplus \tau^{(\ell-1)}|$  is the number of sites on which  $\tau^{(\ell)}$  and  $\tau^{(\ell-1)}$  disagree with each other, such that the sequence  $\tau^{(\ell-1)} = \tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_k = \tau^{(\ell)}$  transforms  $\tau^{(\ell-1)}$  to  $\tau^{(\ell)}$  by fixing one spin at a time, that is, every pair of consecutive  $\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}$  differ only at one site. By triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{TV}} \left( P_v^{\tau^{(\ell)}}, P_v^{\tau^{(\ell-1)}} \right) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k d_{\text{TV}} \left( P_v^{\tau_{i-1}}, P_v^{\tau_i} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{u \in N_v^+} I \left[ \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j_u] \neq \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-2)}[j_u] \right] \cdot \rho(u, v), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the second inequality is due to the constructions of  $\tau^{(\ell)}$  and  $\tau^{(\ell-1)}$  in (10) and the fact that  $d_{\text{TV}} \left( P_v^{\tau_{i-1}}, P_v^{\tau_i} \right) \leq \rho(u, v)$  for any pair of  $\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i$  that disagree with each other only at site  $u$ .

Note that given the assignment of  $\mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v}$ , for any update  $(u, j)$  with  $t_j^u < t_i^v$ , we can write

$$I \left[ \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j] \neq \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-2)}[j] \right] = \Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j] \neq \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j] \mid \mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v} \right].$$

Observe that in (12),  $\widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j_u] \neq \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-2)}[j_u]$  occurs only if  $(u, j_u)$  is an update (with  $j_u \geq 1$ , otherwise  $\widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[0] = \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-2)}[0] = X_0(u)$ ) that  $(u, j_u) \prec (v, i)$ . Equation (12) can be further upper bounded as:

$$d_{\text{TV}} \left( P_v^{\tau^{(\ell)}}, P_v^{\tau^{(\ell-1)}} \right) \leq \sum_{(u,j):(u,j) \prec (v,i)} \Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j] \neq \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j] \mid \mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v} \right] \cdot \rho(u, v) \quad (13)$$

Combine (13) with (11). We have

$$\Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \neq \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell-1)}[i] \mid \mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v} \right] \leq \sum_{(u,j):(u,j) \prec (v,i)} \alpha \cdot \rho(u, v) \cdot \Pr \left[ \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j] \neq \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j] \mid \mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v} \right].$$

Then (9) follows by averaging over all assignments of  $\mathfrak{R}_{<t_i^v}$  through the law of total probability, which proves the lemma.  $\square$

With Lemma 3.8, we can prove Lemma 3.4, the  $O(T + \log n)$ -step convergence of Algorithm 1 under Condition 1, by upper bounding the expected total weights for all chains of fixed size.

*Proof of Lemma 3.4 (fast convergence).* Let  $\mathfrak{T} = (T_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq M_v}$  be the random update schedule generated by the  $n$  independent rate-1 Poisson clocks up to time  $T$ . A random poset of updates is induced by  $\mathfrak{T}$ . Due to Lemma 3.8, by a union bound over all updates  $(v, i)$  and averaging over  $\mathfrak{T}$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ \widehat{X}^{(\ell)} \neq \widehat{X}^{(\ell-1)} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{T}} \left[ \sum_{\text{chain } \pi \text{ of size } \ell} w(\pi) \right], \quad (14)$$

where the weight function  $w(\cdot)$  is defined in (7). It remains to calculate this expected total weight.

Let  $M = \sum_{v \in V} M_v$  denote the total number of updates in  $\mathfrak{T} = (T_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq M_v}$ , which follows the Poisson distribution with mean  $nT$ :

$$\forall m \geq 0, \quad \Pr[M = m] = e^{-nT} \frac{(nT)^m}{m!}.$$

Conditioning on  $M = m$  for a fixed integer  $m \geq 1$ , we sort all  $m$  updates according to their times:  $0 < T_{I_1}^{U_1} < T_{I_2}^{U_2} < \dots < T_{I_m}^{U_m} < T$ , which gives us a random sequence of sites:

$$U_1, U_2, \dots, U_m \in V,$$

such that  $U_i$  is the  $i$ -th (ranked globally in time) updated site. By independence and symmetry between Poisson clocks, the sequence  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_m) \in V^m$  is uniformly distributed.

Given a sequence  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_m) \in V^m$  of fixed length  $m$ , for any increasing sub-sequence  $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_\ell \leq m$  of length  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ , define:

$$W(j_1, \dots, j_\ell) = W_{\mathbf{U}}(j_1, \dots, j_\ell) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (\alpha \cdot \rho(U_{j_i}, U_{j_{i+1}})) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} A(U_{j_i}, U_{j_{i+1}}),$$

where  $A \triangleq \alpha \rho$ .

For random  $\mathfrak{T} = (T_i^v)_{v \in V, 0 \leq i \leq M_v}$  conditional on  $M = m$ , and the sequence  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_m)$  of updated sites determined by  $\mathfrak{T}$ , it is easy to verify that for every  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ ,

$$\sum_{\text{chain } \pi \text{ of size } \ell} w(\pi) \leq \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_\ell \leq m} W_{\mathbf{U}}(j_1, \dots, j_\ell). \quad (15)$$

For uniform random  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, U_2, \dots, U_m) \in V^m$ , for any  $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_\ell \leq m$ , any  $v_1, \dots, v_\ell \in V$ , it holds that  $(U_{j_1}, \dots, U_{j_\ell}) = (v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$  with probability  $\frac{1}{n^\ell}$ . For any  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [W_{\mathbf{U}}(j_1, \dots, j_\ell)] &= \frac{1}{n^\ell} \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_\ell \in V} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} A(v_i, v_{i+1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^\ell} \left\| A^{\ell-1} \mathbf{1} \right\|_1 \\ \text{(Hölder's inequality)} \quad &\leq \frac{n^{1/q}}{n^\ell} \left\| A^{\ell-1} \mathbf{1} \right\|_p \\ &\leq \frac{n^{1/q}}{n^\ell} \|A\|_p^{\ell-1} \|\mathbf{1}\|_p \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{\ell-1}} \|\alpha \rho\|_p^{\ell-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Condition 1 with parameter  $C$ , it holds that  $\|\rho\|_p \leq C$  for some suitable  $p \in [1, \infty]$ . Hence  $\mathbb{E}[W_U(j_1, \dots, j_\ell)] \leq \left(\frac{\alpha C}{n}\right)^{\ell-1}$ . Combining with (15), for every  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{X}} \left[ \sum_{\text{chain } \pi \text{ of size } \ell} w(\pi) \mid M = m \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \in V^m} \left[ \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_\ell \leq m} W_U(j_1, \dots, j_\ell) \right] \\ &\leq \binom{m}{\ell} \left(\frac{\alpha C}{n}\right)^{\ell-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (14), for every  $\ell \geq 1$ , the probability that Algorithm 1 does not terminate within  $\ell \geq 1$  iterations is bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ \widehat{X}^{(\ell)} \neq \widehat{X}^{(\ell-1)} \right] &\leq \sum_{m \geq 0} \Pr[M = m] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathfrak{X}} \left[ \sum_{\text{chain } \pi \text{ of size } \ell} w(\pi) \mid M = m \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{m \geq \ell} e^{-nT} \frac{(nT)^m}{m!} \binom{m}{\ell} \left(\frac{\alpha C}{n}\right)^{\ell-1} \\ \text{(take } k = m - \ell) &= \frac{nT}{\ell!} (\alpha CT)^{\ell-1} \sum_{k \geq 0} e^{-nT} \frac{(nT)^k}{k!} \\ ((\ell-1)! \geq \left(\frac{\ell-1}{e}\right)^{\ell-1}) &\leq \frac{nT}{\ell} \left(\frac{e\alpha CT}{\ell-1}\right)^{\ell-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This probability is bounded by  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  for  $\ell = O(\alpha CT + \log(\frac{n}{\epsilon}))$  set as follows:

$$\ell = \left\lceil (2e\alpha C + 1)T + \log_2 \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon}\right) + 1 \right\rceil.$$

□

### 3.3 Correctness of the BP

We now prove Item 2 of Lemma 3.2, the correctness of Algorithm 1. Let  $\widehat{X}$  denote the  $\widehat{X}^{(\ell)}$  in Algorithm 1 when the algorithm terminates. Recall that  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  denotes the continuous-time chain fully determined by  $X_0$ ,  $\mathfrak{X}$  and  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Item 2 of Lemma 3.2 is restated as follows.

**Lemma 3.9.** *For each update  $(v, i)$  where  $v \in V$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m_v$ ,*

$$\widehat{X}_v[i] = X_{t_i^v}(v).$$

*Proof.* As the fixpoint for the BP in Algorithm 1, the  $\widehat{X}$  satisfies that for every update  $(v, i)$  where  $v \in V$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m_v$ ,

$$\widehat{X}_v[i] = \text{Sample} \left( P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} \right),$$

where  $\tau \in Q_v^{N_v^+}$  satisfies that for every  $u \in N_v^+$ ,  $\tau_u = \widehat{X}_u[j_u]$  for  $j_u = \max\{j \geq 0 \mid t_j^u < t_i^v\}$ .

By definition of the continuous-time chain  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ , for every update  $(v, i)$  where  $v \in V$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m_v$ ,

$$X_{t_i^v}(v) = \text{Sample} \left( P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} \right),$$

where  $\tau \in Q_v^{N_v^+}$  satisfies that for every  $u \in N_v^+$ ,  $\tau_u = X_{t_{j_u}^u}(u)$  for  $j_u = \max\{j \geq 0 \mid t_j^u < t_i^v\}$ .

Besides,  $\widehat{X}_v[0] = X_0(v)$  for all  $v \in V$ . The lemma follows by inductively verifying the equality  $\widehat{X}_v[i] = X_{t_i^v}(v)$  through the partial order defined in (6). □

## 4 Universal Coupling

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.5 by exploring a new concept called universal coupling<sup>2</sup>.

Let  $\Omega$  be a finite sample space and  $\Delta(\Omega)$  the *probability simplex* on sample space  $\Omega$ , formally,

$$\Delta(\Omega) \triangleq \left\{ p \in [0, 1]^\Omega \mid \sum_{x \in \Omega} p(x) = 1 \right\}.$$

Every  $p \in \Delta(\Omega)$  corresponds to a distribution over  $\Omega$  such that the probability of  $x \in \Omega$  is  $p(x)$ .

**Definition 4.1 (universal coupling).** An  $f : \Delta(\Omega) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$  is said to be a *universal coupling* on sample space  $\Omega$ , if for every  $p \in \Delta(\Omega)$  and every  $x \in \Omega$ , for  $\mathcal{R} \in [0, 1]$  chosen uniformly at random,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{R}} [f(p, \mathcal{R}) = x] = p(x).$$

A coupling of a pair of distributions  $p, q \in \Delta(\Omega)$  is a distribution  $\mathcal{D} \in \Delta(\Omega^2)$  satisfying that  $\sum_{y \in \Omega} \mathcal{D}(\cdot, y) = p$  and  $\sum_{x \in \Omega} \mathcal{D}(x, \cdot) = q$ . By the coupling lemma [MU17], for any  $p, q \in \Delta(\Omega)$ ,

$$\forall \text{ coupling } \mathcal{D} \text{ of } p \text{ and } q : \Pr_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [X \neq Y] \geq d_{\text{TV}}(p, q).$$

And the equality is achieved by the optimal coupling  $\mathcal{D}_{p, q}^*$  of  $p$  and  $q$ .

A universal coupling simultaneously couples all distributions over  $\Omega$ . It obviously cannot outperform the optimal coupling  $\mathcal{D}_{p, q}^*$  on any pair of  $p, q \in \Delta(\Omega)$ . The following theorem shows that a universal coupling can perform within twice-optimal on any pair of distributions.

**Theorem 4.2.** *There is a universal coupling  $f : \Delta(\Omega) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$  such that for any  $p, q \in \Delta(\Omega)$ , for  $\mathcal{R} \in [0, 1]$  chosen uniformly at random,*


$$\Pr [f(p, \mathcal{R}) = f(q, \mathcal{R})] \geq \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}. \quad (16)$$

This proves Theorem 3.5, because  $\Pr [f(p, \mathcal{R}) \neq f(q, \mathcal{R})] \leq \frac{2d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)} \leq 2d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)$ .

The coupled probability in (16) is in fact the *Jaccard similarity* between two naturally constructed point sets:

$$\frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)} = \frac{\sum_{x \in \Omega} \min(p(x), q(x))}{\sum_{x \in \Omega} \max(p(x), q(x))} = \frac{|P \cap Q|}{|P \cup Q|},$$

where  $P \triangleq \{(x, y) \mid x \in \Omega \wedge y < p(x)\}$  and  $Q \triangleq \{(x, y) \mid x \in \Omega \wedge y < q(x)\}$ . The following gives an illustration of the point sets  $P$  and  $Q$ .



Later in Theorem 4.5 we will show that the bound in Theorem 4.2 is optimal in the worst case.

<sup>2</sup>The concept of universal coupling should not be confused with the *grand coupling* which is used in e.g. coupling from the past (CFTP) for Markov chains [LPW17].

## 4.1 A universal coupling achieving the Jaccard similarity

We now describe a universal coupling that achieves the bound in Theorem 4.2. In Definition 4.1, the random seed  $\mathcal{R}$  for the universal coupling is assumed to be chosen uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$ . Here, we interpret this uniform  $\mathcal{R} \in [0, 1]$  as an infinite sequence  $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots$ , where each  $(X_i, Y_i) \in \Omega \times [0, 1]$  is chosen uniformly and independently. Such a mapping from uniform  $\mathcal{R} \in [0, 1]$  to a sequence of uniform and independent  $(X_i, Y_i) \in \Omega \times [0, 1]$  can be routinely constructed.<sup>3</sup> And we abuse the notation: We use  $\mathcal{R}$  to represent the sequence  $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots$ .

Our construction of universal coupling is described in Algorithm 2.

---

### Algorithm 2: Sample( $p, \mathcal{R}$ )

---

**Input** :  $p \in \Delta(\Omega)$ ;  $\mathcal{R} = ((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots)$ , where each  $(X_i, Y_i) \in \Omega \times [0, 1]$ .

**Output**: a sample in  $\Omega$ .

- 1 let  $i^*$  be the smallest  $i \geq 1$  such that  $Y_i < p(X_i)$ ;
  - 2 return  $X_{i^*}$ ;
- 

The procedure defined in Algorithm 2 is a universal coupling on sample space  $\Omega$  and is efficient.

**Lemma 4.3 (correctness and efficiency).** *For any  $p \in \Delta(\Omega)$ , for random  $\mathcal{R} = ((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots)$ , each  $(X_i, Y_i) \in \Omega \times [0, 1]$  chosen uniformly and independently at random:*

1.  $\forall x \in \Omega : \Pr[\text{Sample}(p, \mathcal{R}) = x] = p(x)$ ;
2. the  $i^*$  constructed in Algorithm 2 follows the geometric distribution with success probability  $1/|\Omega|$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(X, Y) \in \Omega \times [0, 1]$  be chosen uniformly at random. For any function  $w : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,

$$\Pr[Y < w(X)] = \sum_{x \in \Omega} \Pr[X = x \wedge Y < w(x)] = \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{x \in \Omega} w(x). \quad (17)$$

In particular, for  $p \in \Delta(\Omega)$ , we have  $\Pr[Y < p(X)] = 1/|\Omega|$  since  $\sum_{x \in \Omega} p(x) = 1$ . Since the  $(X_i, Y_i)$  pairs are independent of each others, this proves Item 2 of the lemma:  $i^*$  follows the geometric distribution with success probability  $1/|\Omega|$ .

For any  $p \in \Delta(\Omega)$  and  $x \in \Omega$ ,

$$\Pr[X = x \mid Y < p(X)] = \frac{\Pr[X = x \wedge Y < p(x)]}{\Pr[Y < p(X)]} = \frac{p(x)/|\Omega|}{1/|\Omega|} = p(x),$$

where the second to the last equation is due to that  $\Pr[Y < p(X)] = 1/|\Omega|$ . Since the output of  $\text{Sample}(p, \mathcal{R})$  follows the distribution of  $X$  conditioning on  $Y < p(X)$ , this proves Item 1 of the lemma:  $\text{Sample}(p, \mathcal{R})$  always returns a correct sample of  $p$  for every distribution  $p \in \Delta(\Omega)$ .  $\square$

The following lemma shows that the  $\text{Sample}(\cdot, \cdot)$  procedure defined in Algorithm 2 satisfies the coupling guarantee in (16). Together with Lemma 4.3, this proves Theorem 4.2.

**Lemma 4.4 (coupling performance).** *For any  $p, q \in \Delta(\Omega)$ , for random  $\mathcal{R} = ((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots)$ , each  $(X_i, Y_i) \in \Omega \times [0, 1]$  chosen uniformly and independently at random:*

$$\Pr[\text{Sample}(p, \mathcal{R}) = \text{Sample}(q, \mathcal{R})] \geq \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}.$$

---

<sup>3</sup>For example, the bits in  $\mathcal{R}$  with odd indices are used for generating uniform  $X_1, X_2, \dots \in \Omega$  by rejection sampling, and the bits in  $\mathcal{R}$  with even indices are used as the bits of uniform  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots \in [0, 1]$  in a zig-zag order.



*Proof.* Let  $p \cap q : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and  $p \cup q : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be two functions defined as:

$$\forall x \in \Omega : \quad p \cap q(x) = \min(p(x), q(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad p \cup q(x) = \max(p(x), q(x)).$$

Clearly,  $p \cap q(x) \leq p \cup q(x)$ , and it is easy to verify that

$$\sum_{x \in \Omega} p \cap q(x) = 1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{x \in \Omega} p \cup q(x) = 1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q).$$

Due to (17), for  $(X, Y)$  chosen uniformly at random from  $\Omega \times [0, 1]$ ,

$$\Pr[Y < p \cap q(X)] = \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{|\Omega|} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[Y < p \cup q(X)] = \frac{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{|\Omega|},$$

and hence

$$\Pr[Y < p \cap q(X) \mid Y < p \cup q(X)] = \frac{\Pr[Y < p \cap q(X)]}{\Pr[Y < p \cup q(X)]} = \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}. \quad (18)$$

Let  $\mathcal{R} = ((X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots)$  be an infinite sequence, where each  $(X_i, Y_i)$  is chosen uniformly and independently from  $\Omega \times [0, 1]$ . Define:

$$I_p^* = \min\{i \mid Y_i < p(X_i)\} \quad \text{and} \quad I_q^* = \min\{i \mid Y_i < q(X_i)\}.$$

Observe that  $\max(I_p^*, I_q^*) = \min\{i \mid Y_i < p \cap q(X_i)\}$ ,  $\min(I_p^*, I_q^*) = \min\{i \mid Y_i < p \cup q(X_i)\}$ , and

$$I_p^* = I_q^* \implies \text{Sample}(p, \mathcal{R}) = \text{Sample}(q, \mathcal{R}). \quad (19)$$

Then, for every  $i \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[ \max(I_p^*, I_q^*) = i \mid \min(I_p^*, I_q^*) = i \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[ Y_i < p \cap q(X_i) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{j < i} Y_j \geq p \cap q(X_j) \right) \mid Y_i < p \cup q(X_i) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{j < i} Y_j \geq p \cup q(X_j) \right) \right] \\ &= \Pr [Y_i < p \cap q(X_i) \mid Y_i < p \cup q(X_i)] \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$= \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}, \quad (21)$$

where Equation (20) is due to the independence between different  $(X_i, Y_i)$  pairs and that

$$Y_j \geq p \cup q(X_j) \implies Y_j \geq p \cap q(X_j),$$

and Equation (21) is due to (18). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [I_p^* = I_q^*] &= \Pr \left[ \max(I_p^*, I_q^*) = \min(I_p^*, I_q^*) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i \geq 1} \Pr \left[ \min(I_p^*, I_q^*) = i \right] \cdot \Pr \left[ \max(I_p^*, I_q^*) = i \mid \min(I_p^*, I_q^*) = i \right] \\ &= \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)} \cdot \sum_{i \geq 1} \Pr \left[ \min(I_p^*, I_q^*) = i \right] \\ &= \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where Equation (22) is due to (21). Finally, by the observation (19),

$$\Pr [\text{Sample}(p, \mathcal{R}) = \text{Sample}(q, \mathcal{R})] \geq \Pr [I_p^* = I_q^*] = \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}.$$

□

## 4.2 A tight lower bound for universal coupling

We now prove a lower bound that shows that the universal coupling described in Algorithm 2 may be optimal. This lower bound is an existential one, which verifies the tightness of Theorem 4.2 for certain types of total variation distance values.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $f : \Delta(\Omega) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Omega$  be a universal coupling on sample space  $\Omega$ . For any  $1 \leq k < |\Omega|$ , there exist  $p, q \in \Delta(\Omega)$  with  $d_{\text{TV}}(p, q) = 1/k$ , such that for  $\mathcal{R} \in [0, 1]$  chosen uniformly at random,*

$$\Pr [f(p, \mathcal{R}) = f(q, \mathcal{R})] \leq \frac{k-1}{k+1} = \frac{1 - d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}{1 + d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)}.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, let  $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|\}$  be the sample space.

We prove by construction. Let  $S_1, \dots, S_{k+1} \subseteq \Omega$  be constructed as follows:

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq k+1 : \quad S_i = \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\} \setminus \{i\}.$$

For  $1 \leq i \leq k+1$ , let  $\mu_i$  be the uniform distribution over  $S_i$ . Clearly,  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{k+1} \in \Delta(\Omega)$ . Furthermore, for every  $1 \leq i < j \leq k+1$ ,

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_i, \mu_j) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}} |I[x \neq i] - I[x \neq j]| \frac{1}{k} = \frac{1}{k}.$$

**Claim 4.6.** *For any  $(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}) \in S_1 \times \dots \times S_{k+1}$ ,*

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k+1} I[x_i \neq x_j] \geq k.$$

To formally verify this claim, observe that  $x_i \neq i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k+1$  since  $i \notin S_i$ . In particular,  $x_{x_1} \neq x_1$  since also  $1 \leq x_1 \leq k+1$  (and hence we can treat  $i = x_1$ ). And for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, k+1\} \setminus \{1, x_1\}$ , it must hold that  $I[x_j \neq x_1] + I[x_j \neq x_{x_1}] \geq 1$  since  $x_{x_1} \neq x_1$  (and hence  $x_j$  cannot be equal to two distinct elements). Thus we can rewrite the summation in Claim 4.6 as:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k+1} I[x_i \neq x_j] &\geq I[x_1 \neq x_{x_1}] + \sum_{j \in \{1, \dots, k+1\} \setminus \{1, x_1\}} (I[x_j \neq x_1] + I[x_j \neq x_{x_1}]) \\ &\geq 1 + (k+1 - 2) \\ &= k. \end{aligned}$$

Claim 4.6 is now proved. Then on any fixed  $\mathcal{R} \in [0, 1]$ , the universal coupling  $f(\mu_i, \mathcal{R})$  returns an  $x_i \in S_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq k+1$ , such that by Claim 4.6:

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k+1} I[f(\mu_i, \mathcal{R}) \neq f(\mu_j, \mathcal{R})] \geq k.$$

For  $\mathcal{R} \in [0, 1]$  chosen uniformly at random, by linearity of expectation:

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k+1} \Pr [f(\mu_i, \mathcal{R}) \neq f(\mu_j, \mathcal{R})] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k+1} I[f(\mu_i, \mathcal{R}) \neq f(\mu_j, \mathcal{R})] \right] \geq k.$$

There are  $\binom{k+1}{2}$  such  $(i, j)$  pairs satisfying  $1 \leq i < j \leq k+1$ . By averaging principle, there exist  $1 \leq i < j \leq k+1$  such that

$$\Pr [f(\mu_i, \mathcal{R}) \neq f(\mu_j, \mathcal{R})] \geq \frac{2}{k+1}.$$

□

## 5 Parallel and Distributed Implementations

In this section, we discuss implementations of the algorithm for simulating single-site dynamics. We use Algorithm 2 on sample space  $Q$  as the  $\text{Sample}(\cdot, \cdot)$  subroutine used in Line 7 of Algorithm 1.

Note that Algorithm 2 can be parallelized in a straightforward way. Now the sample space is the set  $Q$  of all spins. In each round, for some *width*  $w \geq 1$ , the algorithm checks out in parallel the next  $w$  pairs of  $(X_i, Y_i) \in Q \times [0, 1]$  in the sequence  $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots$ , finds the  $(X_i, Y_i)$  with smallest  $i$  satisfying  $Y_i < p(X_i)$  (which can be implemented by a comparison network of  $O(\log w)$  depth) and returns such  $X_i$ . The algorithm enters the next round if it fails to find such  $(X_i, Y_i)$ .

To avoid actually generating infinite sequence of random numbers at the beginning of the algorithm, we may apply the *principle of deferred decisions* in the implementation: A random number is drawn only when it is accessed by the algorithm. But beware, as stressed in Remark 3.1, the randomness used by the algorithm should be *consistent*: The resolution of the same update  $(v, i)$  in Line 7 of Algorithm 1 should use the same random bits  $\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)}$  every time. The  $\text{Sample}$  subroutine is then implemented as a dynamic data structure described in Algorithm 3, which generates the random bits the first time they are used and memorizes the random bits once they are generated.

---

### Algorithm 3: Dynamic data structure ConsistSampler

---

**Data:** integers  $k \geq 0, w \geq 1; \mathcal{R} = ((X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_{kw}, Y_{kw}))$ , where  $(X_i, Y_i) \in Q \times [0, 1]$ .

- 1 **Function** Initialize ( $W$ ):
  - Input** : an integer  $W \geq 1$
  - 2  $k \leftarrow 0, w \leftarrow W$ , and  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow ()$  is initialized to an empty sequence;
- 3 **Function** Draw ( $p$ ):
  - Input** : a distribution  $p$  over  $Q$ .
  - Output:** a random spin in  $Q$  distributed as  $p$ .
  - 4  $\ell \leftarrow 0$ ;
  - 5 **while** true **do**
  - 6     **if**  $\ell = k$  **then**
  - 7         generate  $((X_{\ell \cdot w + 1}, Y_{\ell \cdot w + 1}), \dots, (X_{(\ell+1) \cdot w}, Y_{(\ell+1) \cdot w}))$ , each  $(X_i, Y_i) \in Q \times [0, 1]$
  - 8         chosen uniformly and independently at random, and append it to the end of  $\mathcal{R}$ ;
  - 9          $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ;
  - 10     **end**
  - 11     compute  $i^* = \min \{i \mid \ell \cdot q + 1 \leq i \leq (\ell + 1) \cdot q \wedge Y_i < p(X_i)\} \cup \{\infty\}$ ;
  - 12     /\* uses  $O(1)$  depth and  $O(w^2)$  processors in the CRCW PRAM \*/
  - 13     **if**  $i^* < \infty$  **then return**  $X_{i^*}$ ;
  - 14      $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$ ;
  - 15 **end**

---

It is easy to see that Algorithm 3 satisfies the correctness and coupling performance stated in Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4. Moreover, by (17) and the independence between  $(X_i, Y_i)$  pairs, the number of iterations (of the **while** loop) used by Algorithm 3 before termination follows the geometric distribution with success probability  $1 - (1 - 1/q)^w \geq 1 - e^{-w/q}$ , where  $q = |Q|$ .

We now describe our parallel implementation of the algorithm that faithfully simulates a continuous-time single-site dynamics  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  up to an arbitrarily specified time  $T > 0$  given the initial configuration  $X_0 \in Q^V$ . It is just Algorithm 1 using Algorithm 3 as the  $\text{Sample}$  subroutine, and the random choices  $(\mathfrak{I}, \mathfrak{R})$  used by the chain are generated and accessed internally by the algorithm. The implementation is formally described in Algorithm 4.

---

**Algorithm 4:** Simulation  $(X_0, T)$ 

---

**Input** : initial configuration  $X_0 \in Q^V$  and time  $T > 0$ .

**Output**: a random  $X \in Q^V$  identically distributed as the  $X_T$  in the continuous-time single-site dynamics  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  specified by  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  conditioning on  $X_0$ .

```
1 forall  $v \in V$  in parallel do
2    $T_0^v \leftarrow 0$ ;
3   generate  $0 < T_1^v < \dots < T_{M_v}^v < T$  by independently simulating a rate-1 Poisson process;
4 end
5 forall updates  $(v, i)$  (where  $v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq M_v$ ) and  $u \in N_v^+$  in parallel do
6   compute  $\text{pred}_u(v, i) \triangleq \max\{j \geq 0 \mid T_j^u < T_i^v\}$ ;
7 end
8 forall updates  $(v, i)$  (where  $v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq M_v$ ) in parallel do
9    $\widehat{X}_v^{(0)}[i] \leftarrow X_0(v)$ ;
10  create a new instance of ConsistSampler  $\mathcal{S}_{(v,i)}$  and call  $\mathcal{S}_{(v,i)}.Initialize(\lceil |Q| \ln |V| \rceil)$ ;
11 end
12  $\ell \leftarrow 0$ ;
13 repeat
14    $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$ ;
15   forall  $v \in V$  in parallel do  $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[0] \leftarrow X_0(v)$ ;
16   forall updates  $(v, i)$  (where  $v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq M_v$ ) in parallel do
17     let  $\tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$  be constructed as:  $\forall u \in N_v^+, \tau_u \leftarrow \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[\text{pred}_u(v, i)]$ ;
18      $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_{(v,i)}.Draw(P_v^\tau)$ ;
19   end
20 until  $\widehat{X}^{(\ell)} = \widehat{X}^{(\ell-1)}$ ;
21 return  $X = \left( X_v^{(\ell)}[M_v] \right)_{v \in V}$ ;
```

---

## 5.1 Reducing processor and communication costs

The number of processors used by Algorithm 4 grows at least linearly in  $T$ . To further reduce this cost, we apply a simple idea: divide the time interval  $[0, T]$  into smaller time intervals each of length  $O(\log n)$  and simulate the chain for each time interval one after another. Using this trick, we can effectively treat  $T$  as  $O(\log n)$  when dealing with the processor/communication cost of the algorithm, meanwhile do not increase the parallel rounds of the algorithm. The final algorithm uses Algorithm 4 as subroutine, and is described in Algorithm 5.

The following theorem is a formal restatement of Theorem 1.2.

**Theorem 5.1** (Theorem 1.2, formally stated). *Assume oracles for evaluating  $\{P_v^\tau\}$ , such that given any  $v \in V, \tau \in Q^{N_v^+}$  and  $x \in Q$ , the oracle returns the probability  $P_v^\tau(x)$ . There is a CRCW-PRAM algorithm such that given any  $X_0 \in Q^V$  on graph  $G = (V, E)$  and  $0 < T \leq n^{c_0}$ , it does the followings:*

1. *The algorithm returns a random configuration  $X \in Q^V$  that is identically distributed as the  $X_T$  in the continuous-time single-site dynamics  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  specified by  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  on  $G$  conditioning on  $X_0$ .*
2. *Assume Condition 1. With probability  $1 - n^{-c_1}$ , the algorithm has  $O_{c_0, c_1}(T + \log n)$  depth and uses  $O_{c_1}\left(\left(m + nq^2 \log^2 n\right) \log n\right)$  processors, where  $n = |V|, m = |E|, q = |Q|$ .*

---

**Algorithm 5:** Parallel simulation of single-site dynamics with improved work efficiency
 

---

**Input** : initial configuration  $X_0 \in Q^V$  and time  $T > 0$ .

**Output**: a random  $X \in Q^V$  identically distributed as the  $X_T$  in the continuous-time single-site dynamics  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  specified by  $\{P_v^T\}$  conditioning on  $X_0$ .

```

1 while  $T > \ln(n)$  do
2   |  $X_0 \leftarrow \text{Simulation}(X_0, \ln(n));$ 
3   |  $T \leftarrow T - \ln(n);$ 
4 end
5 return  $\text{Simulation}(X_0, T);$ 

```

---

*Proof.* The parallel algorithm claimed in the theorem is Algorithm 5. It is easy to verify that the output of Algorithm 4 is just the output of Algorithm 1 on the same initial configuration  $X_0$  and random  $(\mathfrak{X}, \mathfrak{N})$  generated as in the chain  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ . By Lemma 3.2, Algorithm 1 returns the correct sample of  $X_T$  upon termination, so does Algorithm 4. And the correctness of Algorithm 5 follows from the Markov property. This proves Item 1.

It is also easy to verify that the output of Algorithm 3 is the same as Algorithm 2 if on the same input distribution and random bits, therefore Algorithm 3 is 2-competitive. Assume Condition 1. Consider  $T_0 \leq \ln(n)$ . By Lemma 3.4,  $\text{Simulation}(X_0, T_0)$  terminates within  $O(T_0 + \log \frac{n}{\epsilon}) = O(\log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$  iterations of the **repeat** loop in Line 13 of Algorithm 4 with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ . Within each iteration, the algorithm makes parallel calls to Algorithm 3. With probability at least  $1 - \exp(-n)$  there are  $O(nT_0) = O(n \ln(n))$  parallel calls to Algorithm 3 in every iteration because the total number of updates follows the Poisson distribution with mean  $nT_0 \leq n \ln(n)$ . And for each individual call to Algorithm 3, the number of rounds it takes follows the geometric distribution with success probability  $\geq 1 - e^{-\ln(n)} = 1 - 1/n$ , which is bounded by  $O(1 + \log_n \frac{1}{\epsilon})$  with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ , while each round takes  $O(1)$  depth to compute. Apart from the **repeat** loop, the depth of  $\text{Simulation}(X_0, T_0)$  is dominated by the sequential computations in Line 3 and Line 6, which are both bounded by  $\max_{v \in V} M_v$ , the maximum number that a Poisson clock rings at a site, which is  $O(\log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$  with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$  due to the concentration of Poisson distribution with mean  $T_0 \leq \ln(n)$ . Overall the depth of  $\text{Simulation}(X_0, T_0)$  for a  $T_0 \leq \ln(n)$  is bounded by  $O(\log \frac{n}{\epsilon} (1 + \log_n \frac{1}{\epsilon}))$  with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon - \exp(-\Omega(n))$ . Now consider Algorithm 5 that runs with  $\ln(n) < T \leq n^{c_0}$ . It divides  $T$  into  $T/\ln(n)$  parts. Choosing the error as  $\epsilon = n^{-c_1}/T$ , by union bound, with probability at least  $1 - n^{-c_1}$  the depth of Algorithm 5 is bounded by  $O_{c_1}(\frac{T}{\ln(n)} \log(nT) \log_n(nT)) = O_{c_0, c_1}(T)$  because  $T \leq n^{c_0}$ . Taking the maximum of the  $0 < T \leq \ln(n)$  and  $T > \ln(n)$  cases, it gives  $O_{c_0, c_1}(T + \log n)$  bound with probability at least  $1 - n^{-c_1}$ .

Algorithm 5 uses the same number of processors as the  $\text{Simulation}(X_0, T_0)$  in Algorithm 4 for a  $T_0 \leq \ln(n)$ . It is sufficient to bound the processor usage for the latter. The number of processors used by such  $\text{Simulation}(X_0, T_0)$  is dominated by Line 6 and the calls to Algorithm 3 in Line 18. The former takes  $\sum_{v \in V} M_v \deg(v) = \sum_{\{u, v\} \in E} (M_u + M_v)$  processors, where  $M_v$  that stands for the number of times the Poisson clocks at site  $v$  rings, follows the Poisson distribution with mean  $T_0 \leq \ln(n)$ . Hence the number of processors used in Line 6 is bounded by  $O_{c_1}(m \log n)$  with probability  $\geq 1 - n^{-c_1-1}$ , where  $m = |E|$ . In each iteration, the number of parallel calls to Algorithm 3 in Line 18 is given by the number of updates  $M = \sum_{v \in V} M_v$  which follows the Poisson distribution with mean  $nT_0 \leq n \ln(n)$ , thus is bounded by  $O(nT_0) = O(n \log n)$  with probability  $1 - \exp(-\Omega(n))$ . And each call to Algorithm 3 takes  $(q \ln(n))^2$  processors for a  $O(1)$  depth computation of min index in the CRCW-PRAM model. Overall, the total number of processors is bounded by  $O_{c_1}((m + nq^2 \log^2 n) \log n)$  with probability  $\geq 1 - n^{-c_1}$ . This proves Item 2.  $\square$

**Remark 5.2 (bounded precision).** The random choices in our algorithms, more precisely the times generated by the Poisson clocks and the real number drawn uniformly from  $[0, 1]$  in the sampling subroutines Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3, are assumed to be real numbers of unbounded precisions. This is mainly due to expository purposes and can be circumvented in implementations.

First, the random update times  $T_i^{v'}$ 's generated by Poisson clocks do not have to be real numbers, because they are only used for determining the partial order relation  $\preceq$  between updates defined in (6). The partial order  $\preceq$  is uniquely determined once all times generated by the Poisson clocks are distinct. And this is guaranteed with high probability when we only generate the first  $O(\log n)$  bits for the times through the standard routines for simulating Poisson point processes [SKM95].

Moreover, suppose that all probabilities in the local update distributions  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  of the single-site dynamics are of  $k$  bits (i.e. they are rational numbers with denominator  $2^k$ ). Then we can define the universal coupling only for those distributions  $p \in \Delta(Q)$  with  $k$ -bit precision. And in Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3, we can replace the real numbers drawn uniformly from  $[0, 1]$  by uniform  $k$ -bit rational numbers from  $[0, 1)$ . All analyses in Section 4.1 of such sampling approach still follow because (17) holds for any function with values of  $k$ -bit precision.

## 5.2 Distributed implementation

The following theorem is a formal restatement of Theorem 1.3.

**Theorem 5.3** (Theorem 1.3, formally stated). *Assume Condition 1. There is a CONGEST algorithm on network  $G = (V, E)$  such that given any  $X_0 \in Q^V$  and  $0 < T \leq n^{c_0}$ , it does the followings:*

1. *The algorithm terminates within  $O_{c_0, c_1}(T + \log n)$  rounds of communications, with each message of  $O_{c_1}(\log n \log q)$  bits, where  $n = |V|$  and  $q = |Q|$ .*
2. *The algorithm returns an  $X \in Q^V$  that is within  $n^{-c_1}$  total variation distance from the  $X_T$  in the continuous-time single site dynamics  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$  specified by  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  conditioning on  $X_0$ .*

*Proof.* A CONGEST algorithm on network  $G = (V, E)$  is described in Algorithm 6. It consists of two phases. In **Phase I**, each site  $v \in V$  locally generates all its update times  $0 < T_1^v < \dots < T_{M_v}^v < T$  up to time  $T$  and exchange them with all its neighbors. After receiving all updates times from all its neighbors,  $v$  can locally figure out the “predecessors” of all its updates  $(v, i)$  in the partial order determined by the update times within the neighborhood  $N_v^+$ . This phase can take  $O(T + \log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$  rounds with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$  since the number of updates  $M_v$  for every site  $v$  follows the Poisson distributions with mean  $T$ . And each message contains an update time  $T_j^u$ , which does not need to be a real number of infinite precision, because as long as the predecessors  $\text{pred}_u(v, i)$  in Line 4 are correctly computed, the algorithm will behave the same, which happens with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$  with a message size of  $O(\log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$  bits. In **Phase II**, Algorithm 6 simulates what Algorithm 1 does, with each round in Algorithm 6 in the CONGEST model corresponding to an iteration of the **repeat** loop in Algorithm 1. The only communication needed here is to retrieve the current neighborhood configuration in Line 11, which takes  $O(T + \log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$  spins (and hence  $O((T + \log \frac{n}{\epsilon}) \log q)$  bits) to communicate between every pair of neighbors with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ , due to the same concentration of Poisson random variable. By Lemma 3.4, with probability  $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ , **Phase II** takes at most  $O(T + \log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$  rounds before reaching a fixpoint. At this point, we already achieve with probability  $\geq 1 - n^{-c_1}$  the  $O_{c_1}(T + \log n)$  round complexity stated in the theorem, only each message consists of  $O_{c_1}((T + \log n) \log q)$  bits.

To further reduce the message size to  $O(\log n \log q)$  bits, we apply the same trick as in Algorithm 5. For a  $\ln(n) < T \leq n^{c_0}$ , divide  $T$  into  $T / \ln(n)$  many subintervals of length  $T_0 \leq \ln(n)$  and run Algorithm 6 consecutively for these time subintervals, such that Algorithm 6 runs within each time

---

**Algorithm 6: A CONGEST algorithm for simulating single-site dynamics**


---

**Input** at  $v \in V$  : initial spin  $X_0(v)$  of site  $v \in V$  and  $T > 0$ .

**Output** at  $v \in V$ : the spin  $X(v)$  of site  $v$ .

```

1 Phase I:
2   generate  $0 < T_1^v < \dots < T_{M_v}^v < T$  by independently simulating a rate-1 Poisson process;
3   forall neighbors  $u \in N_v$  do send  $(T_i^v)_{1 \leq i \leq M_v}$  to  $u$  and receive  $(T_i^u)_{1 \leq i \leq M_u}$  from  $u$ ;
   /* in  $O(T + \log n)$  rounds of communications, succeeds w.h.p. */
4   forall  $1 \leq i \leq M_v$  and  $u \in N_v^+$  do compute  $\text{pred}_u(v, i) \leftarrow \max\{j \mid T_j^u < T_i^v\} \cup \{0\}$ ;
   /* only needs the first  $O(\log n)$  bits of every  $T_j^u$  w.h.p. */
5 end-of-phase
6 Phase II:
7   generate independent random seeds  $\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq M_v$ ,
   where  $\mathcal{R}_{(v,i)} = \left( (X_1^{(v,i)}, Y_1^{(v,i)}), (X_2^{(v,i)}, Y_2^{(v,i)}), \dots \right)$ , each  $(X_j^{(v,i)}, Y_j^{(v,i)}) \in \mathcal{Q} \times [0, 1]$ 
   chosen uniformly and independently at random;
8    $\widehat{X}_v^{(0)}[i] \leftarrow X_0(v)$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq M_v$ ;
9   for rounds  $\ell = 1$  to  $L$  do
   /* for a properly fixed round complexity  $L = O(T + \log n)$  */
10   $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[0] \leftarrow X_0(v)$ ;
11  retrieve  $\widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[j]$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq M_u$  from all neighbors  $u \in N_v$ ;
   /*  $O((T + \log n) \log q)$ -bits message from each neighbor w.h.p. */
12  forall  $1 \leq i \leq M_v$  do
13  |   let  $\tau \in \mathcal{Q}^{N_v^+}$  be constructed as:  $\forall u \in N_v^+, \tau_u \leftarrow \widehat{X}_u^{(\ell-1)}[\text{pred}_u(v, i)]$ ;
14  |    $\widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[i] \leftarrow \text{Sample}(P_v^\tau, \mathcal{R}_{(v,i)})$ ;
   /* use the  $\text{Sample}(\cdot, \cdot)$  defined in Algorithm 2 */
15  |   end
16  end
17  return  $X(v) = \widehat{X}_v^{(\ell)}[M_v]$ ;
18 end-of-phase

```

---

subinterval for a properly fixed number of rounds without global coordination. This can be done if none of the above errors ever occur. Taking all above error probabilities as  $\epsilon = n^{-c_1}/T$ , by union bound, with probability  $n^{-c_1}$  an error ever occurs, in which case the output is treated as arbitrary, which introduce a  $n^{-c_1}$  total variation distance error to the final output. And with probability  $\geq 1 - n^{-c_1}$ , the algorithm that divides  $T$  into subintervals and runs Algorithm 6 as subroutines terminates in  $O_{c_1}(\frac{T}{\ln n} \log(nT)) = O_{c_0, c_1}(T)$  rounds since  $T \leq n^{c_0}$ , where each message consists of  $O_{c_1}(\log n \log q)$  bits. And for the case when  $T < \ln(n)$ , with probability  $\geq 1 - n^{-c_1}$ , Algorithm 6 itself terminates in  $O_{c_1}(T + \log n) = O_{c_1}(\log n)$  rounds and each messages consists of  $O_{c_1}((T + \log n) \log q) = O_{c_1}(\log n \log q)$  bits.

Overall, with probability  $\geq 1 - n^{-c_1}$ , the final algorithm (Algorithm 6 applied with the trick as in Algorithm 5) terminates in  $O_{c_0, c_1}(T + \log n)$  rounds, and each messages consists of  $O_{c_1}(\log n \log q)$  bits. The algorithm faithfully simulates Algorithm 1 except for an  $n^{-c_1}$  error.  $\square$

## 6 Applications for Ising Model and SAT Solutions

*Proof of Corollary 1.5.* When  $\beta \in (\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta}, \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2})$ , due to [CFYZ21], the discrete mixing time of the Glauber dynamics for Ising model is  $t_{\text{mix}}^D(\epsilon) = O(n \log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$ , thus by (3), the continuous mixing time is  $t_{\text{mix}}^C(\epsilon) = O(\log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$ ; and it is easy to verify that Condition 1 holds with constant  $C = 1$  in  $\ell_\infty$  norm. Applying Theorem 5.1 with  $T = t_{\text{mix}}^C(1/\text{poly}(n)) = O(\log n)$ , with high probability Algorithm 5 returns an approximate sample within  $1/\text{poly}(n)$  total variation distance within  $O(\log n)$  depth using  $\tilde{O}(m + nq^2) = \tilde{O}(m)$  processors, assuming oracles for evaluating marginal probabilities:

$$\forall \tau \in \{0, 1\}^{N_v}, \forall x \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \mu_v^\tau(x) = \frac{\lambda_v^x \beta^{-x(d_v-2\|\tau\|_1)}}{1 + \lambda_v \beta^{\|\tau\|_1/(d_v-\|\tau\|_1)'}}$$

where  $d_v \triangleq |N_v|$  and  $\|\tau\|_1 \triangleq \sum_{u \in N_v} \tau(u)$ . An oracle costs  $O(\log d_v) = O(\log \Delta)$  depth and  $O(d_v)$  processors, where the overhead on processors contributes only to  $(nq^2)$  branch in the  $\tilde{O}(m + nq^2)$  bound. This gives the overall  $O(\log n \log \Delta)$  depth and  $\tilde{O}(m + \sum_{v \in V} d_v) = \tilde{O}(m)$  processors.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.6.* Let  $\mu$  be the uniform distribution over all satisfying solutions of  $\Phi$ .

The sampling algorithm in [FGYZ21] consists of three building blocks:

1. Construct a set  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq V$  satisfying [FGYZ21, Condition 3.1] by using the Moser-Tardos algorithm. This can be parallelized by the parallel Moser-Tardos algorithm [MT10]. The local lemma condition (2) is strong enough to be compatible with the parallel Moser-Tardos algorithm in constructing  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq V$  satisfying [FGYZ21, Condition 3.1].
2. Simulate the Glauber dynamics for the distribution  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}$  projected from  $\mu$  onto  $\mathcal{M}$ . This is a single-site dynamics on the complete graph on  $\mathcal{M}$ , with local update distributions  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  specified as  $P_v^\tau = \mu_v^{\tau_{\mathcal{M} \setminus \{v\}}}$ , where  $\tau$  is the current assignment on  $\mathcal{M}$ . By [FGYZ21, Lemma 4.2], all assignments on  $\mathcal{M}$  having positive measure in  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}$ ,  $\{P_v^\tau\}$  are well-defined. By [FGYZ21, Lemma 4.1], this chain mixes in  $t_{\text{mix}}^D(\epsilon) = O(n \log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$  steps (which translates to  $t_{\text{mix}}^C(\epsilon) = O(\log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$  continuous time by (3)), since it satisfies a path coupling condition [FGYZ21, Equation (11)], which also implies Condition 1 with  $C = 1$  in  $\ell_\infty$  norm. Applying Theorem 5.1 with  $T = t_{\text{mix}}^C(1/\text{poly}(n)) = O(\log n)$ , Algorithm 5 simulates this chain within  $O(\log n)$  depth and  $\tilde{O}(|\mathcal{M}|^2) = \tilde{O}(n^2)$  processors, assuming oracles for evaluating  $\mu_v^{\tau_{\mathcal{M} \setminus \{v\}}}$ .

Drawing from  $\mu_v^{\tau_{\mathcal{M} \setminus \{v\}}}$  is done by [FGYZ21, Algorithm 3]. At each update of the chain, with high probability, the clauses satisfied already by the current assignment on  $\mathcal{M} \setminus \{v\}$  disconnect the CNF into components of small sizes. A rejection sampling can be applied to the component containing  $v$ , with each trial succeeding with probability  $\geq n^{-2-20}$ .

3. At last, after the Glauber dynamics on  $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}$  mixes, the random assignment on  $\mathcal{M}$  is extended to all variables. This is also done by [FGYZ21, Algorithm 3] that draws from  $\mu_{V \setminus \mathcal{M}}^{\tau_{\mathcal{M}}}$ .

It remains to guarantee that: (1) [FGYZ21, Algorithm 3] can be parallelized, and (2) the marginal probabilities  $\mu_v^{\tau_{\mathcal{M} \setminus \{v\}}}$  can be calculated in parallel. For (1), generally [FGYZ21, Algorithm 3] samples from a  $\mu_{S \setminus T}^{\tau_T}$ , where  $S, T \subseteq V$  are disjoint, by: first constructing the connected components that intersect  $S$  in the formula of clauses not yet satisfied by  $\tau_T$ , and then a rejection samplings through independent trials applied on these components, where the former can be parallelized by a connected component algorithm such as [SV80] and the latter is trivially parallelizable. For (2), due to Chernoff-Hoeffding, the marginal probabilities  $\mu_v^{\tau_{\mathcal{M} \setminus \{v\}}}$  can be estimated within  $1/\text{poly}(n)$  additive error with  $1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$  confidence, by independently (thus parallel) repeating [FGYZ21, Algorithm 3] for  $\text{poly}(n)$  times. Overall, it only introduces  $1/\text{poly}(n)$  total variation error into the final output.  $\square$



## 7 Conclusion and Open Problems

We give a simple and generic parallel algorithm for faithful simulation of single-site dynamics. Assume an asymptotic variant of  $\ell_p$ -Dobrushin's condition. The algorithm parallelizes single-site dynamics with linear in  $n$  speedup, where  $n$  is the number of sites.

The asymptotic Dobrushin's condition is fairly generous. It basically asks that the discrepancy in the system does not propagate at a super-exponential rate. To see how humble this is, recall that to obtain fast mixing we usually expect the discrepancy to decay.

Under this mild condition, our parallel simulation algorithm transforms single-site dynamics with optimal  $O(n \log n)$  mixing time to RNC algorithms for sampling, as long as the marginal distributions for single-site updates are RNC-computable. With non-adaptive simulated annealing, this also gives RNC algorithms for approximately computing the partition functions.

In the heart of our algorithm, there is a universal coupling protocol, which universally couples all distributions over the same finite sample space. For every pair of distributions, simultaneously it provides a coupling between them that performs twice the optimal coupling tailored for that pair, in terms of discrepancy. More applications of this randomization approach will be interesting.

**Open problems.** In general, the studies of efficient parallel algorithms for sampling and counting are well motivated and are still very open. In this paper, we choose to solve these problems through the faithful parallel simulation of single-site dynamics and non-adaptive simulated annealing. This approach is generic and has the advantage in directly applying the existing results for the single-site Markov chains whose mixing has been extensively studied. Besides the current approach, it is generally open and interesting to have RNC counterparts of well-known sampling and counting algorithms. Next, we give a list of concrete open problems:

- We apply our result to the chain in [FGYZ20], which gives a parallel sampler for satisfying solutions of the CNFs in the local lemma regime. But the total work of this sampler is a large polynomial. A question is to give a parallel sampler of polylog depth with total work as the sequential sampler in [FGYZ20], which is close to linear in  $n$ , the number of variables.
- The current counting approach based on non-adaptive annealing is not work efficient. The total work is in square of that of the adaptive annealing [ŠVV09]. A question is how much useful the polylog depth of adaptivity can be for counting via sampling. Is it possible to achieve the work efficiency as the adaptive annealing by parallel computing of polylog depth?
- In this paper, we give a universal coupling that can couple every pair of distributions up to their Jaccard similarity. We show that this is optimal in the worst case. A question is whether this lower bound holds to all possible values of total variation.
- A major challenge: an RNC algorithm for sampling almost uniform (not necessarily perfect) matchings in graphs of unbounded maximum degree. It basically asks for an RNC counterpart for the Jerrum-Sinclair algorithm [Jer03], which is highly unknown whether should exist.
- An even bigger challenge: an NC algorithm (with no randomness) for approximate counting in graphs of unbounded degree. This is even open for the poly-time sequential computation.

**Acknowledgement.** We want to thank Weiming Feng for patiently answering to our inquiries. Yitong Yin wants to thank Tom Hayes for the helpful discussions.

## References

- [AAG<sup>+</sup>12] Amr Ahmed, Moahmed Aly, Joseph Gonzalez, Shравan Narayanamurthy, and Alexander J Smola. Scalable inference in latent variable models. In *Proceedings of the fifth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, pages 123–132, 2012.
- [AHSS20] Nima Anari, Nathan Hu, Amin Saberi, and Aaron Schild. Sampling arborescences in parallel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.09502*, 2020.
- [BCC<sup>+</sup>21] Antonio Blanca, Pietro Caputo, Zongchen Chen, Daniel Parisi, Daniel Štefankovič, and Eric Vigoda. On mixing of markov chains: Coupling, spectral independence, and entropy factorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.07459*, 2021.
- [BD97] Russ Bubley and Martin Dyer. Path coupling: A technique for proving rapid mixing in markov chains. In *FOCS*, pages 223–231, 1997.
- [BRY20] Amartya Shankha Biswas, Ronitt Rubinfeld, and Anak Yodpinyanee. Local access to huge random objects through partial sampling. In *11th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [CFYZ21] Xiaoyu Chen, Weiming Feng, Yitong Yin, and Xinyuan Zhang. Optimal mixing time for the Ising model in the uniqueness regime. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.03034*, 2021.
- [CLV21] Zongchen Chen, Kuikui Liu, and Eric Vigoda. Optimal mixing of Glauber dynamics: Entropy factorization via high-dimensional expansion. In *STOC*, 2021. arXiv:2011.02075.
- [DDJ18] Constantinos Daskalakis, Nishanth Dikkala, and Siddhartha Jayanti. Hogwild!-Gibbs can be panaccurate. In *Proceedings of the 31st Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 32–41, 2018.
- [DFK91] Martin Dyer, Alan Frieze, and Ravi Kannan. A random polynomial-time algorithm for approximating the volume of convex bodies. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 38(1):1–17, 1991.
- [DGJ09] Martin Dyer, Leslie Ann Goldberg, and Mark Jerrum. Matrix norms and rapid mixing for spin systems. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 19(1):71–107, 2009.
- [Dob70] Roland L Dobrushin. Prescribing a system of random variables by conditional distributions. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 15(3):458–486, 1970.
- [DS85a] Roland L Dobrushin and Senya B Shlosman. Completely analytical gibbs fields. In *Statistical physics and dynamical systems*, pages 371–403. Springer, 1985.
- [DS85b] Roland Lvovich Dobrushin and Senya B Shlosman. Constructive criterion for the uniqueness of gibbs field. In *Statistical physics and dynamical systems*, pages 347–370. Springer, 1985.
- [DSOR16] Christopher De Sa, Kunle Olukotun, and Christopher Ré. Ensuring rapid mixing and low bias for asynchronous Gibbs sampling. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1567–1576, 2016.
- [DSZOR15] Christopher De Sa, Ce Zhang, Kunle Olukotun, and Christopher Ré. Rapidly mixing Gibbs sampling for a class of factor graphs using hierarchy width. In *Proceedings of the 28th Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 3097–3105, 2015.

- [EKZ21] Ronen Eldan, Frederic Koehler, and Ofer Zeitouni. A spectral condition for spectral gap: fast mixing in high-temperature ising models. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–17, 2021.
- [FG18] Manuela Fischer and Mohsen Ghaffari. A simple parallel and distributed sampling technique: Local glauber dynamics. In *32nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2018)*, volume 121, pages 26–1. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [FGYZ20] Weiming Feng, Heng Guo, Yitong Yin, and Chihao Zhang. Fast sampling and counting  $k$ -SAT solutions in the local lemma regime. In *STOC*, pages 854–867. ACM, 2020.
- [FGYZ21] Weiming Feng, Heng Guo, Yitong Yin, and Chihao Zhang. Fast sampling and counting  $k$ -sat solutions in the local lemma regime. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 68(6):1–42, 2021.
- [FHY21] Weiming Feng, Thomas P Hayes, and Yitong Yin. Distributed metropolis sampler with optimal parallelism. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2121–2140. SIAM, 2021.
- [FSY17] Weiming Feng, Yuxin Sun, and Yitong Yin. What can be sampled locally? In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 121–130, 2017.
- [FVY21] Weiming Feng, Nisheeth K Vishnoi, and Yitong Yin. Dynamic sampling from graphical models. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 50(2):350–381, 2021.
- [FY18] Weiming Feng and Yitong Yin. On local distributed sampling and counting. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, 2018.
- [GJL19] Heng Guo, Mark Jerrum, and Jingcheng Liu. Uniform sampling through the lovász local lemma. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 66(3):1–31, 2019.
- [Gla63] Roy J. Glauber. Time-dependent statistics of the Ising model. *Journal of mathematical physics*, 4(2):294–307, 1963.
- [GLGG11] Joseph E Gonzalez, Yucheng Low, Arthur Gretton, and Carlos Guestrin. Parallel Gibbs sampling: From colored fields to thin junction trees. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, volume 15, pages 324–332, 2011.
- [GM07] A Gerschenfeld and A Monianari. Reconstruction for models on random graphs. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2007.
- [Hay06] Thomas P. Hayes. A simple condition implying rapid mixing of single-site dynamics on spin systems. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 39–46, 2006.
- [HS07] Thomas P. Hayes and Alistair Sinclair. A general lower bound for mixing of single-site dynamics on graphs. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 931–952, 2007.
- [Jer03] Mark Jerrum. *Counting, sampling and integrating: algorithms and complexity*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.

- [JLY18] Michael I Jordan, Jason D Lee, and Yun Yang. Communication-efficient distributed statistical inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2018.
- [JS93] Mark Jerrum and Alistair Sinclair. Polynomial-time approximation algorithms for the Ising model. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 22(5):1087–1116, 1993.
- [LPW17] David A. Levin, Yuval Peres, and Elizabeth L. Wilmer. *Markov chains and mixing times*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017.
- [M<sup>+</sup>87] Nicholas Metropolis et al. The beginning of the monte carlo method. *Los Alamos Science*, 15(584):125–130, 1987.
- [Mar19] Katalin Marton. Logarithmic sobolev inequalities in discrete product spaces. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 28(6):919–935, 2019.
- [MM09] Marc Mezard and Andrea Montanari. *Information, physics, and computation*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [Moi19] Ankur Moitra. Approximate counting, the lovász local lemma, and inference in graphical models. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 66(2):1–25, 2019.
- [MS13] Elchanan Mossel and Allan Sly. Exact thresholds for Ising–Gibbs samplers on general graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, 41(1):294–328, 2013.
- [MT10] Robin A Moser and Gábor Tardos. A constructive proof of the general Lovász local lemma. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 57(2):11, 2010.
- [MU17] M. Mitzenmacher and E. Upfal. *Probability and Computing: Randomization and Probabilistic Techniques in Algorithms and Data Analysis*. Probability and Computing: Randomization and Probabilistic Techniques in Algorithms and Data Analysis. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [MVV87] Ketan Mulmuley, Umesh V Vazirani, and Vijay V Vazirani. Matching is as easy as matrix inversion. In *Proceedings of the 19th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 345–354, 1987.
- [NRRW11] Feng Niu, Benjamin Recht, Christopher Ré, and Stephen J Wright. Hogwild!: A lock-free approach to parallelizing stochastic gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1106.5730*, 2011.
- [Pea82] Judea Pearl. *Reverend Bayes on inference engines: A distributed hierarchical approach*. Cognitive Systems Laboratory, School of Engineering and Applied Science . . . , 1982.
- [SKM95] D. Stoyan, W.S. Kendall, and J. Mecke. *Stochastic Geometry and Its Applications*. Inorganic Chemistry. Wiley, 1995.
- [SS12] Allan Sly and Nike Sun. The computational hardness of counting in two-spin models on  $d$ -regular graphs. In *FOCS*, pages 361–369, 2012.
- [SV80] Yossi Shiloach and Uzi Vishkin. An  $o(\log n)$  parallel connectivity algorithm. Technical report, Computer Science Department, Technion, 1980.
- [ŠVV09] Daniel Štefankovič, Santosh Vempala, and Eric Vigoda. Adaptive simulated annealing: A near-optimal connection between sampling and counting. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 56(3):1–36, 2009.

- [Ten95] Shang-Hua Teng. Independent sets versus perfect matchings. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 145(1-2):381–390, 1995.
- [TSD20] Alexander Terenin, Daniel Simpson, and David Draper. Asynchronous gibbs sampling. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 144–154. PMLR, 2020.