Advanced Algorithmic Techniques (COMP523)

Online Algorithms 2

Recap and plan

Last lecture:

- Online Algorithms
- Competitive Ratio
- Online load balancing
- Paging
- This lecture:
 - Online algorithms for paging.
 - A Randomised online algorithm for paging.

- LRU (*Least Recently Used*): Replace the page that was requested the least recently.
- FIFO (*First-In First-Out*): Replace the page that has been in the cache the longest.
- LIFO (*Last-In First-Out*): Replace the page that has been in the cache the shortest.
- LFU (*Least Frequently Used*): Replace the page that was requested the least frequently so far.
- MIN (Offline Optimal): Replace the page whose next request happens the furthest in the future.

• Theorem: LRU and FIFO have competitive ratio k.

• Consider the following algorithm:

- Consider the following algorithm:
 - The algorithm proceeds in *phases*.

- Consider the following algorithm:
 - The algorithm proceeds in *phases*.
 - At the beginning of a phase, all the pages are unmarked.

- Consider the following algorithm:
 - The algorithm proceeds in *phases*.
 - At the beginning of a phase, all the pages are unmarked.
 - Whenever a page is requested, it is marked.

- Consider the following algorithm:
 - The algorithm proceeds in *phases*.
 - At the beginning of a phase, all the pages are unmarked.
 - Whenever a page is requested, it is marked.
 - When a "fault" occurs, the algorithm replaces an unmarked page.

- Consider the following algorithm:
 - The algorithm proceeds in *phases*.
 - At the beginning of a phase, all the pages are unmarked.
 - Whenever a page is requested, it is marked.
 - When a "fault" occurs, the algorithm replaces an unmarked page.
 - When all pages in the cache are marked, and a request for an unmarked page occurs, the phase ends.











request













































• Theorem: The marking algorithm has competitive ratio k.

- Theorem: The marking algorithm has competitive ratio k.
 - The algorithm "*faults*" at most k times in every phase.

- Theorem: The marking algorithm has competitive ratio k.
 - The algorithm "*faults*" at most k times in every phase.
 - Every time it fails, the requested page is marked.

- Theorem: The marking algorithm has competitive ratio k.
 - The algorithm "*faults*" at most k times in every phase.
 - Every time it fails, the requested page is marked.
 - If all pages in the cache are marked and a new page is requested, then the phase changes.

- Theorem: The marking algorithm has competitive ratio k.
 - The algorithm "*faults*" at most k times in every phase.
 - Every time it fails, the requested page is marked.
 - If all pages in the cache are marked and a new page is requested, then the phase changes.
 - The optimal offline algorithm "*faults*" at least once in every phase.

- Theorem: The marking algorithm has competitive ratio k.
 - The algorithm "*faults*" at most k times in every phase.
 - Every time it fails, the requested page is marked.
 - If all pages in the cache are marked and a new page is requested, then the phase changes.
 - The optimal offline algorithm "*faults*" at least once in every phase.
 - The phase ends when k+1 different pages are requested.

- Theorem: The marking algorithm has competitive ratio k.
 - The algorithm "*faults*" at most k times in every phase.
 - Every time it fails, the requested page is marked.
 - If all pages in the cache are marked and a new page is requested, then the phase changes.
 - The optimal offline algorithm "*faults*" at least once in every phase.
 - The phase ends when k+1 different pages are requested.
 - The optimal offline algorithm can only keep at most k of those in the cache.

• Theorem: LRU and FIFO have competitive ratio k.

- Theorem: LRU and FIFO have competitive ratio k.
- Proof: LRU and FIFO are marking algorithms.

- Theorem: LRU and FIFO have competitive ratio k.
- Proof: LRU and FIFO are marking algorithms.
- Corollary: LRU and FIFO are the best online algorithms for the paging problem.

• We will use randomisation to achieve a better competitive ratio.

- We will use randomisation to achieve a better competitive ratio.
- We have to make a distinction, when it come to the power of the adversary:

- We will use randomisation to achieve a better competitive ratio.
- We have to make a distinction, when it come to the power of the adversary:
 - Oblivious Adversary: The adversary fixes an input sequence in advance.

- We will use randomisation to achieve a better competitive ratio.
- We have to make a distinction, when it come to the power of the adversary:
 - Oblivious Adversary: The adversary fixes an input sequence in advance.
 - Adaptive Adversary: The adversary can change the input sequence based on the realisations of randomness of the choices of the algorithm.

- Consider the following algorithm:
 - The algorithm proceeds in *phases*.
 - At the beginning of a phase, all the pages are unmarked.
 - Whenever a page is requested, it is marked.
 - When a "fault" occurs, the algorithm replaces an unmarked page.
 - When all pages in the cache are marked, and a request for an unmarked page occurs, the phase ends.

Randomised Marking algorithm

- Consider the following algorithm:
 - The algorithm proceeds in *phases*.
 - At the beginning of a phase, all the pages are unmarked.
 - Whenever a page is requested, it is marked.
 - When a "fault" occurs, the algorithm replaces an unmarked page, selecting one uniformly at random.
 - When all pages in the cache are marked, and a request for an unmarked page occurs, the phase ends.

Randomised Marking algorithm

 Theorem: The Randomised Marking algorithm has competitive ratio 2H_k against oblivious adversaries.

• Assume without loss of generality that RMA makes a "*fault*" on the first request.

- Assume without loss of generality that RMA makes a "fault" on the first request.
- Consider phase i,

- Assume without loss of generality that RMA makes a "fault" on the first request.
- Consider phase i,
 - let m_i be the number of "new" pages in the phase, i.e., pages which were not requested in phase i-1.

- Assume without loss of generality that RMA makes a "fault" on the first request.
- Consider phase i,
 - let m_i be the number of "new" pages in the phase, i.e., pages which were not requested in phase i-1.
 - call the remaining k-mi pages "old".

- Assume without loss of generality that RMA makes a "fault" on the first request.
- Consider phase i,
 - let m_i be the number of "new" pages in the phase, i.e., pages which were not requested in phase i-1.
 - call the remaining k-m_i pages "old".
- Every time a "new" page is requested, we have a "fault".

- Assume without loss of generality that RMA makes a "fault" on the first request.
- Consider phase i,
 - let m_i be the number of "new" pages in the phase, i.e., pages which were not requested in phase i-1.
 - call the remaining k-m_i pages "old".
- Every time a "new" page is requested, we have a "fault".
- Every time an "old" page is requested, we may have "fault".

- Assume without loss of generality that RMA makes a "fault" on the first request.
- Consider phase i,
 - let m_i be the number of "new" pages in the phase, i.e., pages which were not requested in phase i-1.
 - call the remaining k-m_i pages "old".
- Every time a "new" page is requested, we have a "fault".
- Every time an "old" page is requested, we may have "fault".
 - The "*fault*" happens if we replaced the "*old*" page with a "*new*" one.







request





request









fault happens because we substituted 5.







request



request

fault does not happen because we did not substitute 5.

- Assume without loss of generality that RMA makes a "fault" on the first request.
- Consider phase i,
 - let m_i be the number of "new" pages in the phase, i.e., pages which were not requested in phase i-1.
 - call the remaining k-m_i pages "old".
- Every time a "new" page is requested, we have a "fault".
- Every time an "old" page is requested, we may have "fault".
 - The "*fault*" happens if we replaced the "*old*" page with a "*new*" one.

 Assume (wlog) that the m_i requests for "new" pages come first and the k-m_i requests for "old" pages follow.

- Assume (wlog) that the m_i requests for "new" pages come first and the k-m_i requests for "old" pages follow.
 - What is the probability that on the first "old" page request, we make a "fault"?

- Assume (wlog) that the m_i requests for "new" pages come first and the k-m_i requests for "old" pages follow.
 - What is the probability that on the first "old" page request, we make a "fault"?
 - It is the probability that the "old" page was replaced on the first request, or the second request or, ..., or the the m_i'th request.

- Assume (wlog) that the m_i requests for "new" pages come first and the k-m_i requests for "old" pages follow.
 - What is the probability that on the first "old" page request, we make a "fault"?
 - It is the probability that the "old" page was replaced on the first request, or the second request or, ..., or the the m_i'th request.
 - This is m_i/k.

- The "fault" happens if we replaced the "old" page with a "new" one.
 - What is the probability of that happening?
- Assume (wlog) that the m_i requests for "new" pages come first and the k-m_i requests for "old" pages follow.

- The "fault" happens if we replaced the "old" page with a "new" one.
 - What is the probability of that happening?
- Assume (wlog) that the m_i requests for "new" pages come first and the k-m_i requests for "old" pages follow.
 - What is the probability that on the second "old" page request, we make a "fault", given that we made a "fault" on the first "old" page request?

- The "fault" happens if we replaced the "old" page with a "new" one.
 - What is the probability of that happening?
- Assume (wlog) that the m_i requests for "new" pages come first and the k-m_i requests for "old" pages follow.
 - What is the probability that on the second "old" page request, we make a "fault", given that we made a "fault" on the first "old" page request?
 - This is m_i/(k-1).

 The expected number of "*faults*" of our algorithm in phase i is

 $m_i + m_i/k + m_i/(k-1) + ... + m_i/(k-(k-m_i)+1 \le m_i H_k)$

• Summing up over all the phases, we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{cost of RMA}] \le H_k \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$$

Arguing about the OPT

- What is the number of "*faults*" that the optimal offline algorithm makes?
- Let's look at two consecutive phases i-1 and i.
- Let n_{i-1} and n_i be the number of "*faults*" of OPT on those phases.
- By the definition of a phase, there are m_i new pages in phases i-1 and i.
 - It holds that $n_{i-1} + n_i \le m_i$

• Summing up, we get:
$$OPT \ge \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i$$

Combining

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{cost of RMA}] \le H_k \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$$

$$OPT \ge \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i$$

The competitive ratio of RMA is 2H_k