### 3.1 Bar-yossef, Jayram, Kumar, Sivakumar, Trevisan Algorithm

For a better estimator of $F_{0}(\sigma)$ (determining the number of unique elements in our stream $\sigma$ ) we look to an algorithm from [BJKST02] that improves upon the Flajolet-Martin Counter.

For the Flajolet-Martin Counter, we only kept the smallest element produced by our 2-universal hash family $H:[m] \rightarrow[0,1]$ and expected that after $d$ distinct elements were processed we would have gaps of equal spacing roughly equal to $\frac{1}{d+1}$. Using the smallest element we approximated $d$.

Instead of keeping track of the smallest element, we keep track of the $t$ smallest hash values seen so far (this can be done using a heap). Using a similar analysis as above; for a 2 -universal hash family $H:[m] \rightarrow[0,1]$ we expect that the number of hashed values that are less than $\frac{t}{d}$ should be $t$. Thus we expect largest of these $t$ elements to be $\frac{t}{d}$. To achieve a $(1+\epsilon)$-approximation we must choose $t$ large enough. Specifically we will consider $t=\frac{c}{\epsilon^{2}}$ for some constant $c$.

## BJKST Algorithm

1. Choose a 2-universal hash family $H:[m] \rightarrow\left[M=m^{3}\right]$
2. $t \leftarrow \frac{c}{\epsilon^{2}}$
3. While there is another $a_{i}$ from $\sigma$ do:

- Update the smallest $t$ hash values with $h\left(a_{i}\right)$

4. Let $v$ be the largest of the $t$ smallest hash values
5. Return $\tilde{d}=\frac{t M}{v}$ (Since we expect $v \approx \frac{t M}{d}$ )

Since the hash function from our 2-universal hash family is mapping $m$ things to $m^{3}$ spots we expect that the probability that there are any collisions is at most $\frac{m^{2}}{m^{3}}=\frac{1}{m}$. Since $m$ is large, we will assume that there are no collisions.

### 3.1.1 Analysis

This algorithm uses $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{2}} \log m\right)$ space (for storing the $t$ smallest elements and $\log m$ bits) which can even be improved to roughly $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{2}}+\log m\right)$ (see [BJKST02]). We will now prove with the following two lemmas that this is a $(1+\epsilon, 1-\delta)$-estimator. For the following proofs, assume our distinct values are $b_{1}, \ldots, b_{d}$.

Lemma $1 \operatorname{Pr}[\tilde{d}>(1+\epsilon) d] \leq \frac{16}{c}$.

Proof. Suppose $\frac{t M}{v}=\tilde{d}>(1+\epsilon) d$. So $v<\frac{t M}{(1+\epsilon) d}$ which implies from the definition of $v$ that at least $t$ of the hash values $h\left(b_{1}\right), \ldots, h\left(b_{d}\right)$ are less than $\frac{t M}{(1+\epsilon) d} \leq \frac{\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) t M}{d}$ (for small values of $\epsilon$ ). For each $h\left(b_{i}\right)$, the probability of being smaller than $\frac{\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) t M}{d}$ is at most $\frac{\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) t}{d}+\frac{1}{M}<\frac{\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{d}\right) t}{d}$, where the $\frac{1}{M}$ comes from scaling.

Let $X_{i}$ be the 0-1 random variable for $h\left(b_{i}\right)<\frac{\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) t M}{d}$ and let $Y=\sum_{i=1}^{m} X_{i}$. From above, $\mathrm{E}\left[X_{i}\right] \leq \frac{\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) t}{d}$. Thus from Lemma 1 from Lecture 2 we have that:
$\operatorname{Var}[Y] \leq \mathrm{E}[Y]=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathrm{E}\left[X_{i}\right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) t}{d}=\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) t$
So by relating the probability of our estimate to the variable $Y$ and using Chebyshev we get the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}[\tilde{d}>(1+\epsilon) d] & \leq \operatorname{Pr}[Y>t] \\
& \leq \operatorname{Pr}\left[|Y-\mathrm{E}[Y]|>\frac{\epsilon t}{4}\right] \\
& \leq \frac{16 \operatorname{Var}[Y]}{e^{2} t^{2}} \\
& \leq \frac{16\left(1-\frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) t}{e^{2} t^{2}} \\
& =\frac{16-4 \epsilon}{c} \\
& \leq \frac{16}{c}
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma $2 \operatorname{Pr}[\tilde{d}<(1-\epsilon) d] \leq \frac{1}{c}$.

Proof. We note that for a constant $\alpha>1, \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \leq(1+\alpha \epsilon)$ for a small enough $\epsilon$.
Suppose now that $\tilde{d}=\frac{t M}{v}<(1-\epsilon) d$. Which implies $v<\frac{t M}{(1-\epsilon) d}$. Again this means that less than $t$ of the hash values $h\left(b_{1}\right), \ldots, h\left(b_{d}\right)$ are smaller than $\frac{t M}{(1-\epsilon) d} \leq \frac{\left(1+\frac{3}{2} \epsilon\right) t M}{d}$. For each $h\left(b_{i}\right)$, the probability of being smaller than $\frac{\left(1+\frac{3}{2} \epsilon\right) t M}{d}$ is at most $\frac{\left(1+\frac{3}{2} \epsilon\right) t}{d}+\frac{1}{M}<\frac{(1+2 \epsilon) t}{d}$.
Let $X_{i}$ be the 0-1 random variable for $h\left(b_{i}\right)<\frac{(1+2 \epsilon) t M}{d}$ and let $Y=\sum_{i=1}^{m} X_{i}$. From above, $\mathrm{E}\left[X_{i}\right] \leq \frac{(1+2 \epsilon) t}{d}$. Thus from Lemma 1 from Lecture 2 we have that:
$\operatorname{Var}[Y] \leq \mathrm{E}[Y]=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathrm{E}\left[X_{i}\right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{(1+2 \epsilon) t}{d}=(1+2 \epsilon) t$.
Similar to the previous lemma we get the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}[\tilde{d}<(1-\epsilon) d] & \leq \operatorname{Pr}[Y<t] \\
& \leq \operatorname{Pr}[|Y-\mathrm{E}[Y]|>2 \epsilon] \\
& \leq \frac{\operatorname{Var}[Y]}{4 e^{2} t^{2}} \\
& \leq \frac{(1+2 \epsilon) t}{4 e^{2} t^{2}} \\
& =\frac{1+2 \epsilon}{4 c} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{c}
\end{aligned}
$$

As an example, if we choose $c=96$ we get a $\left(1+\epsilon, 1-\frac{1}{3}\right)$-estimator.

### 3.2 AMS $F_{k}(\sigma)$ Estimator

So far we have only looked at $F_{0}(\sigma)$ and $F_{1}(\sigma)$ estimators. The first general $F_{k}(\sigma)$ estimator we will consider is the following algorithm which was presented in [AMS99] alongside their $F_{0}(\sigma)$ estimator.

## AMS $F_{k}(\sigma)$ Algorithm

1. $m \leftarrow 0, r \leftarrow 0, a \leftarrow 0$
2. While there is another item do:

- $m \leftarrow m+1$
- $\beta \leftarrow$ random boolean with $\operatorname{Pr}[\beta=1]=\frac{1}{m}$
- If $\beta=1 ; a \leftarrow a_{m}, r \leftarrow 1$
- Else if $a_{m}=a ; r \leftarrow r+1$

3. Return $m\left(r^{k}-(r-1)^{k}\right)$

The probability of the $j$-th item being selected as the last token is exactly equal to $\frac{1}{j} \times \frac{j}{j+1} \times \ldots \times \frac{m-1}{m}=\frac{1}{m}$. Thus this algorithm will randomly select one of the $m$ items. After the stream has been processed (with, say the $J$-th item being randomly selected), then $r=\left|\left\{j: a_{j}=a_{J}, J \leq j \leq m\right\}\right|$ (the number of items in the suffix of the stream past the $J$-th element that are the same as $\left.a_{J}\right)$.

It may not be immediately clear why we choose the specific return value. To understand this choice we will consider the analysis of this algorithm.

### 3.2.1 Analysis

Clearly we have that $\operatorname{Pr}[J=j]=\frac{f_{J}}{m}$. To understand the analysis of this algorithm, we will instead use the following equivalent process of selecting $a$ :

1. Pick a random $a \in[d]$.
2. Uniformly at random select one of the occurrences of $a$ from $\sigma$.

Let $X$ be the random variable for the output of the algorithm and $A$ and $R$ the random variables for $a$ and $r$ respectively.
$\mathrm{E}[X]=\sum_{j \in[d]} \operatorname{Pr}[A=j] \mathrm{E}[X \mid A=j]=\sum_{j \in[d]} \frac{f_{j}}{m} \mathrm{E}\left[m\left(R^{k}-(R-1)^{k}\right) \mid A=j\right]$
Once we are given that $A=j$, we have that $R$ is equally likely to be any of the values $\left\{1, \ldots, f_{j}\right\}$. If $R=i \in$ $\left\{1, \ldots, f_{j}\right\}$ then $\operatorname{Pr}[R=i \mid A=j]=\frac{1}{f_{j}}$ and $X=m\left(i^{k}-(i-1)^{k}\right)$. Using this we get:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[X] & =\sum_{j \in[d]} \frac{f_{j}}{m} \mathrm{E}\left[m\left(R^{k}-(R-1)^{k}\right) \mid A=j\right] \\
& =\sum_{j \in[d]} \frac{f_{j}}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{f_{j}} \frac{1}{f_{j}} m\left(i^{k}-(i-1)^{k}\right) \\
& =\sum_{j \in[d]} \sum_{i=1}^{f_{j}} i^{k}-(i-1)^{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since this is a telescoping sum we finally get $\mathrm{E}[X]=\sum_{j \in[d]} f_{j}^{k}$ as desired. We will use similar techniques to compute the variance of $X$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Var}[X] & \leq \mathrm{E}\left[X^{2}\right] \\
& =\sum_{j \in[d]} \operatorname{Pr}[A=j] \mathrm{E}\left[X^{2} \mid A=j\right] \\
& =\sum_{j \in[d]} \frac{f_{j}}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{f_{j}} \frac{1}{f_{j}}\left(m\left(i^{k}-(i-1)^{k}\right)\right)^{2} \\
& =m \sum_{j \in[d]} \sum_{i=1}^{f_{j}}\left(i^{k}-(i-1)^{k}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

If we consider the polynomial $x^{k}-(x-1)^{k}$ we can say, using Mean Value Theorem, that $\exists g(x) \in(x-1, x)$ such that $x^{k}-(x-1)^{k}=k g(x)^{k-1} \leq k x^{k-1}$. Thus if we apply this once to the above equation we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Var}[X] & \leq m \sum_{j \in[d]} \sum_{i=1}^{f_{j}}\left(i^{k}-(i-1)^{k}\right)^{2} \\
& \leq m \sum_{j \in[d]} \sum_{i=1}^{f_{j}} k i^{k-1}\left(i^{k}-(i-1)^{k}\right) \\
& \leq m k \sum_{j \in[d]} f_{j}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{f_{j}}\left(i^{k}-(i-1)^{k}\right) \\
& =m k \sum_{j \in[d]} f_{j}^{k-1} f_{j}^{k} \\
& =m k \sum_{j \in[d]} f_{j}^{2 k-1} \\
& =k F_{1} F_{2 k-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

So we can see that this algorithm gives us a desirable expected value but the variance can potentially be very large. To finish this bound we will consider the following Lemma.

Lemma $3 \quad F_{1} F_{2 k-1} \leq n^{1-\frac{1}{k}}\left(F_{k}\right)^{2}$.
The proof will be presented in the next lecture.
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