

Work-Efficient Parallel Counting via Sampling

Hongyang Liu*

Yitong Yin*

Yiyao Zhang*

August 20, 2024

Abstract

We study the problem of estimating the partition function $Z(\beta) = \sum_{x \in \Omega} \exp[-\beta \cdot H(x)]$ of a Gibbs distribution defined by a Hamiltonian $H(\cdot)$. It is well known that the partition function $Z(\beta)$ can be well approximated by the simulated annealing method, assuming a sampling oracle that can generate samples according to the Gibbs distribution of any given inverse temperature β . This method yields the most efficient reductions from counting to sampling, including:

- classic non-adaptive (parallel) algorithms with sub-optimal cost [DFK89; Bez+08];
- adaptive (sequential) algorithms with near-optimal cost [SVV09; Hub15; Kol18; HK23].

In this paper, we give an algorithm that achieves efficiency in both parallelism and total work. Specifically, it provides a reduction from counting to sampling using near-optimal total work and logarithmic depth of computation. Consequently, it gives work-efficient parallel counting algorithms for several important models, including the hardcore and Ising models in the uniqueness regime.

arXiv:2408.09719v1 [cs.DS] 19 Aug 2024

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

1 Introduction

The reductions between counting and sampling is a fundamental topic in the theory of computing. A classic result of Jerrum, Valiant and Vazirani [JV86] established that approximate counting and sampling are computationally equivalent up to polynomial time for all self-reducible problems. A large class of counting problems can be represented as calculating the partition function of a Gibbs distribution, for which much more efficient approximation algorithms were known through drawing samples from the corresponding Gibbs distributions.

1.1 Partition function of Gibbs distribution

The Gibbs distributions capture the systems consisting of locally constrained random variables. Formally, a Gibbs distribution can be defined abstractly by the Hamiltonian function as follows.

Definition 1.1. Given a finite sample space Ω and a Hamiltonian function $H : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, h\}$ for some $h \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the *Gibbs distribution* π_β on Ω at the inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$, is defined as:

$$\forall x \in \Omega, \quad \pi_\beta(x) \triangleq \frac{\exp[-\beta \cdot H(x)]}{Z(\beta)} \quad (1)$$

where the normalizing factor $Z(\beta) \triangleq \sum_{x \in \Omega} \exp[-\beta \cdot H(x)]$ is called the *partition function*.

Furthermore, let $q \triangleq \ln Z(0) = \ln |\Omega|$.

Remark 1.2. Here, we only consider integer-valued Hamiltonian functions that range from 0 to h . General integer-valued Hamiltonian functions can be dealt with by applying a normalization.

A large number of counting problems can be represented as calculating the partition functions. To estimate the value of a partition function $Z(\beta)$, a standard routine is to estimate the ratio:

$$Q \triangleq \frac{Z(\beta_{\max})}{Z(\beta_{\min})}, \quad (2)$$

where $\beta_{\max} = \beta$ and $\beta_{\min} < \beta_{\max}$ is chosen to make $Z(\beta_{\min})$ to be trivial or easy to calculate.

The value of Q in (2) can be estimated through the Monte Carlo method by drawing samples.

Definition 1.3. Fixed a Hamiltonian function $H : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, h\}$ on a sample space Ω and $0 \leq \beta_{\min} < \beta_{\max}$, a *sampling oracle* \mathcal{O} for the interval $[\beta_{\min}, \beta_{\max}]$ is such a program that, upon each query, receives as input a $\beta \in [\beta_{\min}, \beta_{\max}]$ and returns a random sample $X \sim \pi_\beta$.

Remark 1.4. The above definition assumes exact samplers, while the standard Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method produces approximate samples. Such discrepancy can be resolved by a standard coupling argument (as pointed out in [SVV09, Remark 5.9]) so that the bias of sampling will not affect our main conclusions.

The method of simulated annealing offers a systematic approach to estimate the ratio in (2) by sampling from Gibbs distributions using the sampling oracle formulated in Definition 1.3. In this method, a sequence of increasing inverse temperatures $\beta_{\min} = \beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \dots < \beta_l = \beta_{\max}$, called a *cooling schedule*, is generated (either adaptive or non-adaptive to the sampling outcomes), so that the independent samples are combined into an estimate \hat{Q} of $Q = \frac{Z(\beta_{\max})}{Z(\beta_{\min})}$. Previous work of this method [DFK89; Bez+08; SVV09; Hub15; Kol18; HK23] falls into two categories:

- non-adaptive algorithms using $O(1)$ rounds and $\tilde{O}(q^2)$ total work [DFK89; Bez+08];
- adaptive algorithms using $\Omega(\sqrt{q})$ rounds and $\tilde{O}(q)$ total work [SVV09; Hub15; Kol18; HK23].

The following open question then naturally arose:

For counting via sampling, is it possible to be efficient in both depth and total work?

In this work, we answer this question affirmatively. In particular, we propose a work-efficient parallel annealing algorithm for approximate counting via sampling, which is efficient in both the parallel complexity and total work. This is formally stated by the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5 (Main result). *Fix any Hamiltonian function $H : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, h\}$ and let $q = \ln |\Omega|$. For any given values of $0 \leq \beta_{\min} < \beta_{\max}$, assuming a sampling oracle \mathcal{O} for the interval $[\beta_{\min}, \beta_{\max}]$, there exists a parallel algorithm that given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, returns an estimate \hat{Q} of $\frac{Z(\beta_{\max})}{Z(\beta_{\min})}$ satisfying*

$$\Pr \left[(1 - \varepsilon) \frac{Z(\beta_{\max})}{Z(\beta_{\min})} \leq \hat{Q} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{Z(\beta_{\max})}{Z(\beta_{\min})} \right] \geq 3/4,$$

within total computational cost of $O(q \ln^2 h (\ln q + \ln \ln h + \varepsilon^{-2}))$ and depth of $O(\ln q + \ln \ln h + \ln \varepsilon^{-1})$, using one round of non-adaptive queries to the sampling oracle.

Remark 1.6. [Theorem 1.5](#) actually shows that there is a simple non-adaptive cooling schedule (which is a one-round protocol for drawing samples) that can produce samples which can be combined into the desired estimator \hat{Q} within the total cost and depth as stated in [Theorem 1.5](#).

As in all prior work, the success probability $3/4$ in [Theorem 1.5](#) can be boosted to any $1 - \delta$ by applying the median trick to $O(\log \delta^{-1})$ independent estimates.

A comparison with prior work is given in [Table 1](#). Note that usually $\log h \ll q$.

Results	Total work	Rounds of sampling
[DFK89; Bez+08]	$O(q^2 \varepsilon^{-2} \log^2 h)$	1
[SVV09]	$O(q \varepsilon^{-2} (\log q + \log h)^5)$	$O(\sqrt{q} \log q \log h (\log q + \log h))$
[Hub15]	$O(q \log h (\log q + \log \log h + \varepsilon^{-2}))$	$O(q)$
[Kol18; HK23]	$O(q \varepsilon^{-2} \log h)$	$O(q)$
Ours	$O(q \log^2 h (\log q + \log \log h + \varepsilon^{-2}))$	1

Table 1: Prior work and our results

In summary, our algorithm achieves a near-optimal total work $\tilde{O}(q)$ with depth of $O(\log q)$.

For the Ising model and hard-core model within the uniqueness regime, a recent work [\[LY22\]](#) gives a parallel sampler that returns an approximate sample using $\tilde{O}(m)$ total work within $O(\log n \cdot \log \Delta)$ depth. Consequently, we have the following work-efficient RNC approximation algorithms for the Ising and hard-core partition functions within the uniqueness regime.

Corollary 1.7. *There is a parallel algorithm such that given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and an Ising model on graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$ vertices, $m = |E|$ edges and max-degree $\Delta \geq 3$, with edge activity within the uniqueness regime $(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta}, \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2})$, outputs an estimate of the partition function within $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -multiplicative error with total computational cost of $\tilde{O}(nm\varepsilon^{-2})$ and depth of $O(\log n \cdot \log \Delta + \log \varepsilon^{-1})$.*

Corollary 1.8. *There is a parallel algorithm such that given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and a hardcore model on graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$ vertices, $m = |E|$ edges and max-degree $\Delta \geq 3$, with fugacity λ within the uniqueness regime $(0, \frac{(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}{(\Delta-2)^\Delta}]$, outputs an estimate of the partition function within $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -multiplicative error with total computational cost of $\tilde{O}(nm\varepsilon^{-2})$ and depth of $O(\log n \cdot \log \Delta + \log \varepsilon^{-1})$.*

The $\tilde{O}(nm\varepsilon^{-2})$ total work bounds in these applications almost match the best known bounds achieved by the sequential algorithms for approximate counting.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, the error rate $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. 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. **RNC** is used for the randomized counterpart of **NC**. The depth of a parallel algorithm is equal to the number of time steps required.

2.1 Chebyshev's inequality

For random variable X with finite variance, we denote its expectation and variance respectively as $\mathbb{E}[X]$ and $\mathbf{Var}[X]$. The relative variance of X is $\frac{\mathbf{Var}[X]}{\mathbb{E}^2[X]}$ and we use the following notation for convenience: $S[X] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[X^2]}{\mathbb{E}^2[X]} = 1 + \frac{\mathbf{Var}[X]}{\mathbb{E}^2[X]}$. Hence the well-known Chebyshev's inequality follows.

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \Pr[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}[X]] \leq \frac{\mathbf{Var}[X]}{\varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E}^2[X]} = \frac{S[X] - 1}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad (3)$$

2.2 Monotonicity and convexity of partition function

Let $z(\beta) = \ln Z(\beta)$. We have the result for its monotonicity and convexity.

Lemma 2.1. $z(\beta)$ is monotonically decreasing and convex on $\beta \geq 0$.

Proof. The result follows by simple calculations:

$$\begin{aligned} z'(\beta) &= -\frac{1}{Z(\beta)} \sum_{x \in \Omega} H(x) \cdot \exp[-\beta \cdot H(x)] = -\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\beta}[H(X)] \leq 0, \\ z''(\beta) &= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\beta}[H^2(X)] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\beta}^2[H(X)] = \mathbf{Var}_{X \sim \pi_\beta}[H(X)] \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In above, we use the observation that $z'(\beta) = -\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\beta}[H(X)] \geq -h$. □

2.3 Graphical models

The graphical model can express the Gibbs distribution on a graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$ vertices and $m = |E|$ edges, with edge activity $\gamma > 0$ and vertex activity $\lambda > 0$.

The Ising model is defined on the sample space $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^V$, such that the Gibbs distribution π^{Ising} is defined by,

$$\forall \sigma \in \Omega, \quad \pi^{\text{Ising}}(\sigma) \propto \gamma^{m(\sigma)} \lambda^{n_+(\sigma)},$$

where $m(\sigma) = \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \mathbf{1}[\sigma_u = \sigma_v]$ denotes the number of monochromatic edges in σ and $n_+(\sigma) = \sum_{v \in V} \sigma_v$ is the number of vertices occupied in σ .

The hard-core model is defined on $\Omega = \{\sigma \in \{0, 1\}^V : \sigma \text{ indicates an independent set in } G\}$, such that the Gibbs distribution $\pi^{\text{hard-core}}$ is defined by,

$$\forall \sigma \in \Omega, \quad \pi^{\text{hard-core}}(\sigma) \propto \lambda^{n_+(\sigma)}$$

The partition functions are the normalizing factor of the Gibbs distributions. On graphs with max-degree $\Delta \geq 3$, the uniqueness conditions for the Ising model and the hard-core model are given respectively by $\gamma \in (\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta}, \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2})$ and $\lambda < \frac{(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}{(\Delta-2)^\Delta}$. According to [LY22], there exists an **RNC** sampling algorithm for these models within their uniqueness regimes using $\tilde{O}(m)$ total work and $O(\log n \cdot \log \Delta)$ depth.

3 Parallel Annealing Algorithm

We present a parallel algorithm for estimating the ratio $Q = Z(\beta_{\max})/Z(\beta_{\min})$ for given inverse temperatures $\beta_{\min} < \beta_{\max}$, assuming access to a sampling oracle \mathcal{O} for the interval $[\beta_{\min}, \beta_{\max}]$.

The algorithm utilizes the simulated annealing method and consists of two key parts:

- A **cooling schedule** from β_{\min} to β_{\max} of length l is constructed by the algorithm, which is an increasing sequence of inverse temperatures $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$, where

$$\beta_{\min} = \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \dots < \beta_l = \beta_{\max}.$$

- Given the cooling schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$, independent samples for π_{β_i} , where $1 \leq i \leq l$, are generated by the sampling oracle \mathcal{O} , and combined into an **estimator** for $Q = \frac{Z(\beta_{\max})}{Z(\beta_{\min})}$.

The cooling schedule. The construction of the cooling schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$ can be *adaptive*: the choice of β_j may depend on the samples drawn according to the previous temperatures β_j for $j < i$. Such adaptivity was a key to the near-linear cost of the annealing algorithm [SVV09; Hub15; Kol18; HK23].

Alternatively, we revisit the *non-adaptive* cooling schedules, whose construction may depend on the values of $q = \ln |\Omega|$ and h , but not on the Hamiltonian $H : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, h\}$ itself. Previously, such non-adaptive cooling schedules (e.g. the Chebyshev cooling schedule) were employed in the classic works [DFK89; Bez+08], achieving sub-optimal quadratic costs.

Here, we show the existence and efficiency of the following non-adaptive cooling schedule.

Theorem 3.1. *For any Hamiltonian function $H : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, h\}$ and letting $q = \ln |\Omega|$, there exists a non-adaptive cooling schedule $0 = \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \dots < \beta_l = +\infty$ of length $l = O(q \log^2 h)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} z(\beta_{j-1}) - z(\beta_j) &\leq \frac{1}{\ln h} \quad \text{for } j \in \{2, \dots, l-1\}, \\ z(\beta_{l-1}) - z(\beta_l) &\leq 2, \end{aligned}$$

where recall that $z(\beta) = \ln Z(\beta)$ represents the log-partition function.

This theorem is formally proved in Section 4.

A key observation is that this simple non-adaptive cooling schedule is sufficient to support a good estimate of the ratio $Q = Z(\beta_{\max})/Z(\beta_{\min})$, by properly combining the known estimators.

The classic Product Estimator (PE). Given a cooling schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$ and independent samples drawn according to the corresponding Gibbs distributions π_{β_i} , a canonical estimator for the ratio $Q = Z(\beta_1)/Z(\beta_l)$ is the so-called product estimator (PE). Recall the telescopic product:

$$Q = \frac{Z(\beta_l)}{Z(\beta_1)} = \frac{Z(\beta_2)}{Z(\beta_1)} \cdot \frac{Z(\beta_3)}{Z(\beta_2)} \cdots \frac{Z(\beta_l)}{Z(\beta_{l-1})}.$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq l-1$, let X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ir} be r independent samples of π_{β_i} , where r is a parameter. The estimator is naturally defined as:

$$\hat{Q} = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \left(\frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^r W_{ij} \right), \quad \text{where } W_{ij} = \exp [(\beta_i - \beta_{i+1})H(X_{ij})].$$

Observe that $\mathbb{E}[W_{ij}] = \frac{Z(\beta_{i+1})}{Z(\beta_i)}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{Q}] = Q$. Therefore, \hat{Q} is an unbiased estimator of Q .

The parallel procedure that implements the PE is given in Algorithm 1.

This classic estimator works well for the so-called B -Chebyshev cooling schedule.

Algorithm 1: Product Estimator: $PE(\mathcal{L}, r)$

Input: a cooling schedule: $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_{\min} = \beta_1, \dots, \beta_l = \beta_{\max})$, integer $r > 0$.

Output: an estimate \hat{Q} of $Z(\beta_{\max})/Z(\beta_{\min})$.

```
1 for  $i = 1, \dots, l-1$  in parallel do
2   for  $j = 1, \dots, r$  in parallel do
3     Sample  $X_{ij} \sim \pi_{\beta_i}$ ;
4      $W_{ij} \leftarrow \exp [(\beta_i - \beta_{i+1})H(X_{ij})]$ ;
5    $W_i \leftarrow \frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^r W_{ij}$ ;
6  $\hat{Q} \leftarrow \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} W_i$ ;
7 return  $\hat{Q}$ ;
```

Definition 3.2. A cooling schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_l)$ is called a B -Chebyshev cooling schedule for a constant $B > 0$ if for any $i \in \{2, \dots, l\}$, we have $\frac{Z(\beta_{i-1}) \cdot Z(2\beta_i - \beta_{i-1})}{Z^2(\beta_i)} \leq B$.

Theorem 3.3 ([DFK89]). Given a B -Chebyshev cooling schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_l)$, the procedure $PE(\mathcal{L}, \lceil 4Bl\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1} \rceil)$ returns an estimate \hat{Q} of $Z(\beta_l)/Z(\beta_1)$ satisfying

$$\Pr \left[(1 - \varepsilon) \frac{Z(\beta_l)}{Z(\beta_1)} \leq \hat{Q} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{Z(\beta_l)}{Z(\beta_1)} \right] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

within one round of oracle calls and the total cost of $O(l^2\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1})$.

Note that the $O(l^2)$ factor in the total cost is sub-optimal. This is improved by a new estimator.

The Paired Product Estimator (PPE). The other well known estimator for $Q = Z(\beta_l)/Z(\beta_1)$ is the paired product estimator (PPE) introduced in [Hub15]. It is inspired from the identity:

$$Q = \frac{Z(\beta_l)}{Z(\beta_1)} = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \frac{Z\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{Z(\beta_i)} / \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \frac{Z\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{Z(\beta_{i+1})}.$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq l-1$, let X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ir} be r independent samples of π_{β_i} , and Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{ir} be r independent samples of $\pi_{\beta_{i+1}}$, where r is a parameter. The estimator is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q} &= W/V, \\ \text{where } W &= \frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^r \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \exp \left[\frac{\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}}{2} H(X_{ij}) \right], \\ V &= \frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^r \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \exp \left[\frac{\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i}{2} H(Y_{ij}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Such \hat{Q} is not necessarily an unbiased estimator of Q . Nevertheless, we have $\mathbb{E}[W] = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \frac{Z\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{Z(\beta_i)}$

and $\mathbb{E}[V] = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \frac{Z\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{Z(\beta_{i+1})}$.

The parallel procedure that implements the PPE is given in [Algorithm 2](#).

Algorithm 2: Paired Product Estimator: $\text{PPE}(\mathcal{L}, r)$

Input: a cooling schedule: $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_{\min} = \beta_1, \dots, \beta_l = \beta_{\max})$, integer $r > 0$.

Output: an estimate \hat{Q} of $Z(\beta_{\max})/Z(\beta_{\min})$.

```
1 for  $j = 1, \dots, r$  in parallel do
2   for  $i = 1, \dots, l-1$  in parallel do
3     Sample  $X_{ij} \sim \pi_{\beta_i}$  and  $Y_{ij} \sim \pi_{\beta_{i+1}}$ ;
4      $W_{ij} \leftarrow \exp \left[ \frac{\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}}{2} H(X_{ij}) \right]$ ,  $V_{ij} \leftarrow \exp \left[ \frac{\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i}{2} H(Y_{ij}) \right]$ ;
5    $W_j \leftarrow \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} W_{ij}$ ,  $V_j \leftarrow \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} V_{ij}$ ;
6  $W \leftarrow \frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^r W_j$ ,  $V \leftarrow \frac{1}{r} \sum_{j=1}^r V_j$ ;
7  $\hat{Q} = W/V$ ;
8 return  $\hat{Q}$ ;
```

This new estimator requires fewer samples but requires the cooling schedule to have narrower gaps between the log-partition functions of neighboring temperatures. In prior work, such cooling schedules were generated in an adaptive fashion by sequential programs.

A key observation of us is that there is a non-adaptive cooling schedule (as in [Theorem 3.1](#)) using which the PPE can also be fairly efficient.

Theorem 3.4. Given a cooling schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_l)$ satisfying that

- $z(\beta_i) - z(\beta_{i+1}) \leq \frac{1}{\ln 2}$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$,
- $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_{\beta_i}}[H(X)] \geq D$ for a constant $D > 0$,

the procedure $\text{PPE}(\mathcal{L}, \lceil 36D^{-1}\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1} \rceil)$ returns an estimate \hat{Q} of $Z(\beta_l)/Z(\beta_1)$ satisfying

$$\Pr \left[(1 - \varepsilon) \frac{Z(\beta_l)}{Z(\beta_1)} \leq \hat{Q} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{Z(\beta_l)}{Z(\beta_1)} \right] \geq 1 - \delta,$$

within one round of oracle calls and the total cost of $O(l\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-1})$.

Proof. Recall that $z(\beta) = \ln Z(\beta)$. Let $\kappa_i = z(\beta_i) + z(\beta_{i+1}) - 2z(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2})$. For $0 \leq i \leq l-1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{ij}] = \frac{Z\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{Z(\beta_i)}, \quad \mathbb{E}[V_{ij}] = \frac{Z\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{Z(\beta_{i+1})}, \quad \mathbb{S}[W_{ij}] = \mathbb{S}[V_{ij}] = \frac{Z(\beta_i)Z(\beta_{i+1})}{Z^2\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)} = e^{\kappa_i}.$$

Let $\kappa = \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \kappa_i$. Since $W_j = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} W_{ij}$ and $V_j = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} V_{ij}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_j] = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \frac{Z\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{Z(\beta_i)}, \quad \mathbb{E}[V_j] = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \frac{Z\left(\frac{\beta_i + \beta_{i+1}}{2}\right)}{Z(\beta_{i+1})}, \quad \mathbb{S}[W_j] = \mathbb{S}[V_j] = \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} e^{\kappa_i} = e^{\kappa}$$

Furthermore, taking the average over the r trials, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[W]}{\mathbb{E}[V]} = \frac{Z(\beta_l)}{Z(\beta_1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{S}[W] = \mathbb{S}[V] = 1 + \frac{1}{r}(e^{\kappa} - 1).$$

Note that κ can be bounded using the following property established in [[Hub15](#)] from the monotonicity and convexity of the log-partition function $z(\beta) = \ln Z(\beta)$.

Lemma 3.5 (Lemma 3.2 in [Hub15]). For any $0 \leq \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$, let $\tilde{\kappa} = z(\beta_1) + z(\beta_2) - 2z(\frac{\beta_1 + \beta_2}{2})$,

$$\frac{-z'(\beta_1)}{-z'(\beta_2)} \geq \exp \left[\frac{2\tilde{\kappa}}{z(\beta_1) - z(\beta_2)} \right]. \quad (4)$$

By Lemma 3.5 and the conditions for the cooling schedule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \kappa_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} [z(\beta_i) - z(\beta_{i+1})] \cdot \ln \frac{-z'(\beta_i)}{-z'(\beta_{i+1})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2 \ln h} \cdot \ln \frac{-z'(\beta_0)}{-z'(\beta_l)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2 \ln h} \cdot \ln \frac{h}{D} \leq \frac{1}{2} + \ln \frac{1}{D}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{S}[W] = \mathbb{S}[V] = 1 + \frac{1}{r} (e^\kappa - 1) \leq 1 + \frac{e^{2\delta}}{18}$ and by the Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\Pr \left[|W - \mathbb{E}[W]| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \mathbb{E}[W] \right] \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr \left[|V - \mathbb{E}[V]| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \mathbb{E}[V] \right] \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$$

Therefore, $\hat{Q} = W/V$ approximates $Q = Z(\beta_l)/Z(\beta_1) = \mathbb{E}[W]/\mathbb{E}[V]$ within $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -multiplicative error with probability at least $1 - \delta$. \square

The main algorithm. A major obstacle for applying the paired product estimator (PPE) is to satisfy the two conditions in Theorem 3.4 for the cooling schedule, where the first condition that calls for smaller gaps, is already satisfied by the non-adaptive cooling schedule in Theorem 3.1, and the second condition that calls for a lower bound of expectation of Hamiltonian function, can be satisfied by a noisy binary search given in [KK07], stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6 ([KK07]). For any cooling schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$, let $p_j = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_{\beta_j}}[H(X)]$. There exists a subroutine *NoisyFind*($\mathcal{L}, \tau, \varepsilon, \delta$) that terminates with total cost of $O(\varepsilon^{-2} \log \delta^{-1} (\log l + \log \delta^{-1}))$, $O(\varepsilon^{-2} \log \delta^{-1} (\log l + \log \delta^{-1}))$ rounds of computation where all samples are drawn at the inverse temperatures in the cooling schedule, and returns an index $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, l\}$ that satisfies one of the followings with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

- $j = 0$ and $[0, p_1] \cap [\tau - \varepsilon, \tau + \varepsilon] \neq \emptyset$,
- $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, l-1\}$ and $[p_j, p_{j+1}] \cap [\tau - \varepsilon, \tau + \varepsilon] \neq \emptyset$,
- $j = l$ and $[p_l, 1] \cap [\tau - \varepsilon, \tau + \varepsilon] \neq \emptyset$.

Observe that the event $[p_j, p_{j+1}] \cap [\tau - \varepsilon, \tau + \varepsilon] \neq \emptyset$ implies that $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_{\beta_j}}[H(X)] \geq \tau - \varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_{\beta_{j+1}}}[H(X)] \leq \tau + \varepsilon$, where the former satisfies the second condition of Theorem 3.4, and the latter implies $\Pr_{X \sim \pi_{\beta_{j+1}}}[H(X) = 0] \geq 1 - \tau - \varepsilon$, which means $Z(\beta_{j+1})/Z(+\infty) \leq 1/(1 - \tau - \varepsilon)$, leading to a B -Chebyshev cooling schedule.

Based on the above observation, we design a combined estimator which combines both PE and PPE. This gives our main algorithm, presented in Algorithm 3.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. In Algorithm 3, we first truncate the non-adaptive cooling schedule, resulting in a cooling schedule length of $l = O(q \log^2 h)$. Then, we perform the noisy binary search to find an index j with success probability at least 0.99. Notably, as discussed in Theorem 3.6, by setting $\tau = 0.5, \varepsilon = 0.25$ and $\delta = 0.01$ in *NoisyFind*($\mathcal{L}, \tau, \varepsilon, \delta$), the $O(\log q + \log \log h)$ samples

Algorithm 3: Main Algorithm

Input: inverse temperature β_{\min} and β_{\max} , error rate $\varepsilon > 0$.

Output: an estimate \hat{Q} of $Z(\beta_{\max})/Z(\beta_{\min})$.

- 1 Generate a non-adaptive cooling schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_l)$ as in [Theorem 3.1](#);
 - 2 $s \leftarrow \min\{i | \beta_i \geq \beta_{\min}\}$ and $t \leftarrow \max\{i | \beta_i \leq \beta_{\max}\}$;
 - 3 $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow (\beta_{\min}, \beta_s, \dots, \beta_t, \beta_{\max})$ and reassign indexes to $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_L)$;
 - 4 $j \leftarrow \text{NoisyFind}(\mathcal{L}, 0.5, 0.25, 0.01)$, using the $\text{NoisyFind}(\mathcal{L}, \tau, \varepsilon, \delta)$ in [Theorem 3.6](#);
 - 5 **if** $j = 0$ **then**
 - 6 $\hat{Q} \leftarrow \text{PE}((\beta_1, \beta_L), \lceil 320\varepsilon^{-2} \rceil)$;
 - 7 **else if** $j = L$ **then**
 - 8 $\hat{Q} \leftarrow \text{PPE}((\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_L), \lceil 720\varepsilon^{-2} \rceil)$;
 - 9 **else**
 - 10 $\hat{Q}_1 \leftarrow \text{PPE}((\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_j), \lceil 12960\varepsilon^{-2} \rceil)$;
 - 11 $\hat{Q}_2 \leftarrow \text{PE}((\beta_j, \beta_{j+1}, \beta_L), \lceil 4320\varepsilon^{-2} \rceil)$;
 - 12 $\hat{Q} \leftarrow \hat{Q}_1 \cdot \hat{Q}_2$;
 - 13 **return** \hat{Q}
-

are taken sequentially. However, we can consider precomputing $O(\log q + \log \log h)$ samples at each inverse temperature so that all the samples can be drawn simultaneously, then the total cost is $O(q \log^2 h (\log q + \log \log h))$.

- If $j = 0$, we have $Z(\beta_1)/Z(\beta_L) \leq Z(\beta_1)/Z(+\infty) \leq 4$ and $\text{PE}((\beta_1, \beta_L), \lceil 320\varepsilon^{-2} \rceil)$ returns an estimate of the ratio within the error rate ε with probability at least 0.9. It has total cost of $O(\varepsilon^{-2})$ and the sampling can be done simultaneously.
- If $j = L$, the schedule $\mathcal{L} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_L)$ satisfies the condition in [Theorem 3.4](#). Hence $\text{PPE}((\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_L), \lceil 720\varepsilon^{-2} \rceil)$ returns an estimate within the error rate ε with probability at least 0.9, which has total cost of $O(q\varepsilon^{-2} \log^2 h)$.
- If $2 \leq j \leq L - 1$, we divide the cooling schedule into two parts and estimate the ratio $Z(\beta_j)/Z(\beta_1)$ and $Z(\beta_L)/Z(\beta_j)$ respectively by PPE and PE, ensuring an error rate of $\varepsilon/3$ and a success probability at least 0.9. The final estimate is multiplied by the two ratios. Similarly, it has total cost of $O(q\varepsilon^{-2} \log^2 h)$.

Finally, it is easy to verify that [Algorithm 3](#) has total work of $O(q \log^2 h (\log q + \log \log h + \varepsilon^{-2}))$ and depth of $O(\log q + \log \log h + \log \varepsilon^{-1})$. \square

4 The Non-Adaptive Cooling Schedule

A key finding of us is a non-adaptive cooling schedule which saves the total work. Compared to the non-adaptive cooling schedule constructed in [\[Bez+08\]](#), our cooling schedule, as claimed in [Theorem 3.1](#), reduces the gaps between the log-partition functions of neighbouring temperatures from a constant to $\frac{1}{\ln h}$, yet only increases the length of the schedule by a factor of $O(\log h)$.

Before proving [Theorem 3.1](#), we first make a slight change to the non-adaptive cooling schedule constructed in [\[Bez+08\]](#), including a simple proof similar to the one in [\[SVV09\]](#). The schedule consists of two parts: intervals with linear growth and intervals with exponential growth.

Lemma 4.1. Consider the following cooling schedule $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = (\tilde{\beta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_{l^*})$:

$$0, \frac{1}{h \ln h}, \frac{2}{h \ln h}, \dots, \frac{k}{h \ln h}, \frac{k\gamma}{h \ln h}, \frac{k\gamma^2}{h \ln h}, \dots, \frac{k\gamma^t}{h \ln h}, +\infty \quad (5)$$

where $k = \lceil q \rceil$, $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{q}$, $t = \lceil (1+q)(\ln h + \ln \ln h) \rceil$. For any $j \in \{2, \dots, l^*\}$, we have

1. if $\tilde{\beta}_j = \tilde{\beta}_{j-1} + \frac{1}{h \ln h}$, then $z(\tilde{\beta}_{j-1}) - z(\tilde{\beta}_j) \leq \frac{1}{\ln h}$;
2. if $\tilde{\beta}_j = \gamma \tilde{\beta}_{j-1}$, then $z(\tilde{\beta}_{j-1}) - z(\tilde{\beta}_j) \leq 2$;
3. if $\tilde{\beta}_j = +\infty$, then $z(\tilde{\beta}_{j-1}) - z(\tilde{\beta}_j) \leq 2$.

For a Hamiltonian function $H : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, h\}$, for any $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, h\}$, let

$$c_i = |\{x \in \Omega \mid H(x) = i\}|.$$

The partition function $Z(\beta)$ can be re-expressed as:

$$Z(\beta) = \sum_{x \in \Omega} \exp[-\beta \cdot H(x)] = \sum_{i=0}^h c_i \cdot \exp(-i\beta).$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We verify the properties as follows.

1. If $\tilde{\beta}_j = \tilde{\beta}_{j-1} + \frac{1}{h \ln h}$, $Z(\tilde{\beta}_j) = \sum_{i=0}^h c_i \cdot \exp[-i(\tilde{\beta}_{j-1} + \frac{1}{h \ln h})] \geq e^{-\frac{1}{\ln h}} Z(\tilde{\beta}_{j-1})$.
2. This case follows directly from the proof of [SVV09, Lemma 3.2].
3. If $\tilde{\beta}_j = +\infty$, on one hand, $\tilde{\beta}_{j-1} = \frac{k\gamma^t}{h \ln h} \geq \frac{1}{h \ln h} \cdot q \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)^{(1+q)(\ln h + \ln \ln h)} \geq q$. Meanwhile, $Z(q) = c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^h c_i e^{-iq} \leq c_0 + \frac{1}{Z(0)} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^h c_i \leq c_0 + 1 \leq 2Z(+\infty)$. By the monotonicity of $Z(\beta)$, $Z(\tilde{\beta}_{j-1}) \leq 2Z(+\infty) = 2Z(\tilde{\beta}_j)$.

Recall that $z(\beta) = \ln Z(\beta)$ and the results follow by taking the logarithm of both sides. Moreover, the length of the schedule is $l^* = k + t + 2 = O(q \log h)$. \square

Finally, the non-adaptive cooling schedule $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ in Lemma 4.1 is modified to the non-adaptive cooling schedule \mathcal{L} claimed in Theorem 3.1, by applying a simple interpolation using the convexity of $z(\beta)$ so that it achieves the gap $z(\beta_{j-1}) - z(\beta_j) \leq \frac{1}{\ln h}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Based on the schedule in Lemma 4.1, we only do a little more work on the intervals with exponential growth. Let the interval $\mathcal{G}_i = \left(\frac{k\gamma^{i-1}}{h \ln h}, \frac{k\gamma^i}{h \ln h}\right) = (\eta_{i-1}, \eta_i)$ for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$. We add c_i inverse temperatures $(\alpha_1^i, \dots, \alpha_{c_i}^i)$ into \mathcal{G}_i such that $\eta_{i-1} = \alpha_0^i < \alpha_1^i < \dots < \alpha_{c_i}^i < \alpha_{c_i+1}^i = \eta_i$ and $z(\alpha_{j-1}^i) - z(\alpha_j^i) \leq \frac{1}{\ln h}$ for any $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, c_i + 1\}$.

For the first interval \mathcal{G}_1 , note that $\eta_1 - \eta_0 \leq \frac{2}{h \ln h}$, let $c_1 = 1$ and $\alpha_1^1 = \frac{\eta_0 + \eta_1}{2}$, the case follows by the proof on the intervals with linear growth. We next consider the case when $i \geq 2$. If we evenly divide the interval $\mathcal{G}_{i-1} = (\eta_{i-2}, \eta_{i-1})$ into $r = \lceil 2 \ln h \rceil$ segments each with length $\delta = r^{-1}(\eta_{i-1} - \eta_{i-2})$, it is clear that the decreasing of $z(\beta)$ for the last segment is upper bounded by $\frac{1}{\ln h}$ due to the convexity. Hence we add an inverse temperature every length δ in the interval \mathcal{G}_i , i.e. $c_i = \lceil \delta^{-1}(\eta_i - \eta_{i-1}) \rceil - 1$ and $\alpha_j^i = \eta_{i-1} + j\delta$. In this way, the condition follows.

Finally, the length of this cooling schedule is bounded as:

$$l = 2 + k + t + \sum_{i=1}^t c_i \leq 2 + k + t + t \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right) (2 \ln h + 1) \leq 25q \ln^2 h = O(q \log^2 h).$$

\square

References

- [Bez+08] Ivona Bezáková, Daniel Stefankovic, Vijay V. Vazirani, and Eric Vigoda. “Accelerating Simulated Annealing for the Permanent and Combinatorial Counting Problems”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 37.5 (2008), pp. 1429–1454.
- [DFK89] Martin E. Dyer, Alan M. Frieze, and Ravi Kannan. “A Random Polynomial Time Algorithm for Approximating the Volume of Convex Bodies”. In: *Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 1989, Seattle, Washington, USA, May 14-17, 1989*. ACM, 1989, pp. 375–381.
- [HK23] David G. Harris and Vladimir Kolmogorov. “Parameter Estimation for Gibbs Distributions”. In: *50th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2023, Paderborn, Germany, July 10-14, 2023*. Vol. 261. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023, 72:1–72:21.
- [Hub15] Mark Huber. “Approximation algorithms for the normalizing constant of Gibbs distributions”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* (2015). Publisher: JSTOR, pp. 974–985.
- [JVV86] Mark Jerrum, Leslie G. Valiant, and Vijay V. Vazirani. “Random Generation of Combinatorial Structures from a Uniform Distribution”. In: *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 43 (1986), pp. 169–188.
- [KK07] Richard M. Karp and Robert Kleinberg. “Noisy binary search and its applications”. In: *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2007, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 7-9, 2007*. SIAM, 2007, pp. 881–890.
- [Kol18] Vladimir Kolmogorov. “A Faster Approximation Algorithm for the Gibbs Partition Function”. In: *Conference On Learning Theory, COLT 2018, Stockholm, Sweden, July 6-9, 2018*. Vol. 75. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2018, pp. 228–249.
- [LY22] Hongyang Liu and Yitong Yin. “Simple parallel algorithms for single-site dynamics”. In: *54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2022, Rome, Italy, June 20-24, 2022*. ACM, 2022, pp. 1431–1444.
- [SVV09] Daniel Stefankovic, Santosh S. Vempala, and Eric Vigoda. “Adaptive simulated annealing: A near-optimal connection between sampling and counting”. In: *J. ACM* 56.3 (2009), 18:1–18:36.