

# Revisit the Partial Coloring Method: Prefix Spencer and Sampling

Dongrun Cai\* Xue Chen† Wenxuan Shu‡ Haoyu Wang§ Guangyi Zou¶  
 University of Science and Technology of China

## Abstract

As the most powerful tool in discrepancy theory, the partial coloring method has wide applications in many problems including the Beck-Fiala problem [BF81] and Spencer’s celebrated result [Spe85, Ban10, LM12, Rot17]. Currently, there are two major algorithmic approaches for the partial coloring method: the first approach uses linear algebraic tools to update the partial coloring for many rounds [Ban10, LM12, BG17, LRR17, BDGL19]; and the second one, called Gaussian measure algorithm [Rot17, RR23], projects a random Gaussian vector to the feasible region that satisfies all discrepancy constraints in  $[-1, 1]^n$ .

In this work, we explore the advantages of these two approaches and show the following results for them separately.

1. Spencer [Spe86] conjectured that the prefix discrepancy of any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$  is  $O(\sqrt{m})$ , i.e.,  $\exists \mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $\max_{t \leq n} \|\sum_{i \leq t} \mathbf{A}(\cdot, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i)\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{m})$  where  $\mathbf{A}(\cdot, i)$  denotes column  $i$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Combining small deviations bounds of the Gaussian processes and the Gaussian measure algorithm [Rot17], we show how to find a partial coloring with prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m})$  and  $\Omega(n)$  entries in  $\{\pm 1\}$  efficiently. To the best of our knowledge, this provides the first partial coloring whose prefix discrepancy is almost optimal [Spe85, Spe86] (up to constants).

However, unlike the classical discrepancy problem [Bec81, Spe85], there is no reduction on the number of variables  $n$  for the prefix problem. By recursively applying partial coloring, we obtain a full coloring with prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \log \frac{O(n)}{m})$ . Prior to this work, the best bounds of the prefix Spencer conjecture for arbitrarily large  $n$  were  $2m$  [BG81] and  $O(\sqrt{m \log n})$  [Ban12, BG17].

2. Our second result extends the first linear algebraic approach to a sampling algorithm in Spencer’s classical setting. On the first hand, besides the six deviation bound [Spe85], Spencer also proved that there are  $1.99^m$  good colorings with discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m})$  for any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times m}$ . Hence a natural question is to design efficient random sampling algorithms in Spencer’s setting. On the other hand, some applications of discrepancy theory, such as experimental design, prefer a random solution instead of a fixed one [Fis25, Stu38, HSSZ24]. Our second result is an efficient sampling algorithm whose random output has min-entropy  $\Omega(n)$  and discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m})$ . Moreover, our technique extends the linear algebraic framework by incorporating leverage scores of randomized matrix algorithms.

---

\*cdr@mail.ustc.edu.cn

†xuechen1989@ustc.edu.cn, College of Computer Science, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026 & Hefei National Laboratory, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230088, China. Supported by Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology 2021ZD0302901, NSFC 62372424, and CCF-HuaweiLK2023006.

‡wxshu@mail.ustc.edu.cn

§why666@mail.ustc.edu.cn

¶zouguangyi2001@gmail.com

# 1 Introduction

The partial coloring method, as one of the most powerful techniques in discrepancy theory, has been applied to obtain the best known bounds for various problems. This method was first introduced by Beck [Bec81]. Later on, Spencer [Spe85] successfully applied it to prove the discrepancy of any set system of  $m$  subsets is at most  $6\sqrt{m}$ . Formally, given  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , we call  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \|\mathbf{Ax}\|_\infty$  the discrepancy of  $\mathbf{A}$  where  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  is a bi-coloring on the columns of  $A$ . In this work, we use  $\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)$  to denote row  $i$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A}(\cdot, j)$  to denote its column  $j$ . For convenience, we consider each row  $\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)$  as a constraint on  $\mathbf{x}$  and call  $\langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{x} \rangle$  the discrepancy of this row. A partial coloring is a relaxation of  $\mathbf{x}$  from the discrete Boolean cube to  $[-1, 1]^n$  with  $\Omega(n)$  entries in  $\{\pm 1\}$ .

In particular, Spencer’s classical result [Spe85] shows that for any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times m}$ ,  $\exists$  a partial coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^m$  with 99% entries in  $\{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{m})$ . Via a reduction from  $n$  variables to  $m$  variables [Bec81, BF81], the discrepancy of any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$  is  $O(\sqrt{m})$  by recursively applying Spencer’s partial coloring. A celebrated line of research provides efficient algorithms to find such a partial coloring, to name a few [Ban10, LM12, Rot17, LRR17, ES18, BLV22, PV23]. Recently, the partial coloring method has been successfully applied to many other problems, such as the *prefix* Spencer conjecture [Spe86, BG17], the vector balancing problem [BDG19, BDGL19, BRR23], matrix sparsification [RR20], and matrix discrepancy theory [HRS22, DJR22, BJM23].

There are two major algorithmic approaches for the partial coloring method. The first one keeps updating the partial coloring via linear-algebraic tools, called linear-algebraic framework in this work. In [LM12, LRR17, PV23], the algorithms find a safe subspace  $H_t$  and pick a (random) vector  $\mathbf{v}_t \in H_t$  to update the coloring. Other works [Ban10, BDG19, BDGL19, BG17] have used semi-definite programs to find the subspace and provide the update vector. The second approach measures the feasible region by the (standard) Gaussian distribution, called Gaussian measure algorithm [Rot17, RR23]. Here the feasible region is the convex body  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  of all  $x$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_\infty \leq L$  for some discrepancy bound  $L$ . Then a partial coloring is a point  $\mathbf{x} \in K \cap [-1, 1]^n$  with  $\Omega(n)$  entries in  $\{\pm 1\}$ . The key idea in the 2nd approach is to use the (standard) Gaussian measure to lower bound the size of  $K$  [Glu89]. Then Rothvoss [Rot17] proved that the projection of a random Gaussian vector to  $K \cap [-1, 1]^n$  would be a good partial coloring (w.h.p.).

While both approaches obtain the same algorithmic results for Spencer’s bound, they are quite different. On the first hand, the linear-algebraic framework is more flexible that admits the algorithm to impose various linear constraints and pick any vector in the safe subspace  $H_t$ . On the second hand, the Gaussian measure approach could comply many more discrepancy constraints than the linear-algebraic framework, since it only needs a lower bound on the Gaussian measure of the feasible region  $K$ . In this work, we continue the study of the partial coloring method and explore the advantages of these two methods separately.

## 1.1 Our Results

For ease of exposition, we focus on Spencer’s setting in this section, whose input matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$  satisfies  $n \geq m$ . Our first result is an application of the Gaussian measure algorithm [Rot17] to the prefix Spencer conjecture. Instead of bounding  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_\infty$ , the prefix discrepancy bounds  $\max_{t \leq n} \|\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{A}(\cdot, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i)\|_\infty$  where  $\mathbf{A}(\cdot, i)$  denotes column  $i$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{A}(\cdot, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i)$  is a prefix vector summation of  $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ . While Spencer [Spe86] conjectured that the prefix discrepancy is  $O(\sqrt{m})$  in the same order of his six deviation bound [Spe85], the best known bounds were  $2m$  [BG81] and  $O(\sqrt{m \log n})$  [Ban12, BG17] for *arbitrarily large*  $n$ .

For the prefix Spencer conjecture, we show how to find a partial coloring  $\mathbf{x}$  such that (1) it has  $\Omega(n)$  entries in  $\{\pm 1\}$  and (2) its prefix discrepancy is  $O(\sqrt{m})$ . We remark that this upper bound

on the prefix discrepancy is *optimal* up to constants [Spe85, Spe86]. Previously, such a optimal partial coloring were known only for the special case  $n = m$  [Spe86].

However, different from the classical Spencer problem, there is no reduction from  $n$  variables to  $m$  variables in prefix discrepancy theory. Thus repeating this partial coloring leads to a *full* coloring of prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \log \frac{O(n)}{m})$ . For  $n = m^{1+o(1)}$ , this also improves the previous bounds  $2m$  and  $O(\sqrt{m \log n})$  mentioned earlier.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Given any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$  with  $n \geq m$ , the Gaussian measure algorithm finds a partial coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in [-1, 1]^n$  such that*

1. *its prefix discrepancy is  $O(\sqrt{m})$ ;*
2.  *$\mathbf{x}$  has  $\Omega(n)$  entries in  $\{\pm 1\}$ .*

*Moreover, there exists an efficient algorithm to find a full coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  whose prefix discrepancy is  $O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \log \frac{O(n)}{m})$ .*

Theorem 1.1 uses the crucial fact that to apply the Gaussian measure algorithm, we only need to lower bound the Gaussian measure of the convex body of feasible  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . While the number of prefix constraints is  $nm$  larger than the number of variables  $n$ , these constraints are highly correlated. For example,  $|\sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{A}(1, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i)| \leq L$  implies that the same bound would hold for the next prefix summation  $\sum_{i=1}^{t+1} \mathbf{A}(1, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i)$  very likely. The key step in Theorem 1.1 is to turn this intuition into a small-deviation bound for (sub-)Gaussian processes:

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{x} \sim N(0, 1)^n} \left[ \forall t \leq n, \left| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{x}(i) \right| = O(\sqrt{m}) \right] \geq 2^{-c \cdot n/m} \text{ for some small constant } c. \quad (1)$$

While inequality (1) holds for  $x \sim \{\pm 1\}^n$  also, it is unclear how to satisfy  $m$  constraints simultaneously for  $x \sim \{\pm 1\}^n$ . When  $x \sim N(0, 1)^n$ , we apply the classical Šidák-Khatri inequality [Šid67, Kha67, Roy14] to lower bound the probability of satisfying all prefix constraints in  $\mathbf{A}$ . This allows us to apply the classical Gaussian measure algorithm by Rothvoss [Rot17].

Our second result studies the sampling question in Spencer's setting via the linear-algebraic framework. In his original paper [Spe85], Spencer had shown that there are exponentially many colorings satisfying  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq 10\sqrt{m}$  for any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times m}$ . Hence a natural question is to sample from these good colorings  $\mathbf{x}$  (satisfying  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq 10\sqrt{m}$ ). Moreover, some applications of discrepancy theory, such as experimental design [Fis25, Fis26], seek a random balanced coloring rather than a fixed one. Specifically, experimental design requires the coloring to be both balanced and robust. While there are several ways to define robustness, randomized solutions are considered as the most reliable way [Stu38]. For example, Harshaw et al. [HSSZ24] considered how to generate a random coloring whose covariance matrix is balanced. In this work, we use the *min-entropy* of the coloring as an alternative way to measure its randomness and robustness. Equivalently, we bound the probability that the sampling algorithm outputs a single fixed string.

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exists a sampling algorithm such that given any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$  with  $n \geq m$ ,*

1. *its output  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  always satisfies  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq O(\sqrt{m})$ ;*
2. *for any good coloring  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ , the probability that the output equals  $\epsilon$  is  $O(1.9^{-0.9n})$ .*

Our algorithm extends the linear-algebraic framework by incorporating leverage scores of randomized matrix algorithms [Woo14]. Although previous algorithms [Ban10, LM12, Rot17] for

Spencer’s problem use a large amount of randomness to generate a partial coloring, it is unclear how to measure the *min-entropy* of the full coloring obtained by these partial coloring methods. Our main idea is to use leverage scores of the safe subspace to find an entry  $k_t$  such that every update  $t$  could either fix  $\mathbf{x}(k_t) = 1$  or  $\mathbf{x}(k_t) = -1$  arbitrarily. This guarantees that different partial colorings would lead to different colorings. In fact, in every update, our algorithm could fix 99% uncolored entries in this way. Compared to previous algorithms in this framework [Ban10, LM12, BG17, LRR17, BLV22, PV23], this provides an alternate way to control the partial coloring; and our algorithm can be viewed as an application of this idea to sampling.

Specifically, we generalize the definition of the leverage scores on rows of a matrix [Woo14] to coordinates of a subspace  $H$ . In particular, the leverage score  $\tau_i(H)$  of coordinate  $i$  indicates the closeness of the indicator vector  $e_i$  to  $H$ . While indicator vectors  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  are not in the safe subspace for many settings, we use leverage scores of  $H$  to find an approximation  $\mathbf{v} \in H$  for indicator vectors such that updating along  $\mathbf{v}$  or  $-\mathbf{v}$  could set an entry to be 1 or  $-1$  arbitrarily.

Finally, we extend the sampling algorithm to the Beck-Fiala problem [BF81] and the vector-balancing problem [Ban98]. Analogue to Theorem 1.2 in the Spencer setting, our algorithm outputs a good coloring  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfying the Beck-Fiala bound with a sufficiently large min-entropy. For the vector-balancing problem, we extend the online algorithm by Liu et al. [LSS22] which uses a random walk with a Gaussian stationary distribution. Our contribution here is several new ingredients about the properties of this random walk. We describe the details of these two algorithms in Section 6.

## 1.2 Related Works

**Algorithms in the linear-algebraic framework.** For general  $\{0, 1\}$ -matrices, Spencer’s discrepancy bound  $O(\sqrt{m})$  is tight for the Hadamard matrix. In a breakthrough, Bansal [Ban10] used a SDP-based random walk to find a partial coloring efficiently and provided the first algorithmic method of the Spencer problem. Lovett and Meka [LM12] simplified Bansal’s algorithm via walking on the edge of convex bodies. Very recently, Pesenti and Vladu [PV23] used a regularized random walk to improve the big-O constant in Spencer’s bound.

Several works have extended the linear algebraic framework to obtain efficient algorithms for Banaszczyk’s bound [Ban98] about the vector balancing problem. The vector balancing problem assumes each column  $\mathbf{A}(\cdot, j)$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  is a unit vector such that the discrepancy minimization becomes balancing  $\|\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{x}(j) \cdot \mathbf{A}(\cdot, j)\|_\infty$ . The seminal works by Bansal et al. [BDG19, BDGL19] showed efficient algorithms to generate  $\mathbf{x}$  with discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{\log n})$  via guaranteeing that  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$  is a random sub-Gaussian vector. Subsequent works [LRR17, BLV22] provided unified approaches to obtain both Banaszczyk’s result and Spencer’s result. In particular, Levy et al. [LRR17] gave the first deterministic algorithms by derandomizing these random walk algorithms via a carefully selected multiplicative weight update method.

Recent work by Harrow et al. [HSSZ24] improved the sub-Gaussian constant of [BDGL19] to 1. Moreover, they consider balancing the covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{x}$  as a way to measure its randomness since randomization is the major method to guarantee the robustness in experimental design [Stu38].

**Prefix Discrepancy Theory.** Bárány and Grinberg [BG81] proved that the prefix discrepancy of any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$  is at most  $2m$  independent with  $n$ . Later on, Spencer [Spe86] conjectured the prefix discrepancy is  $O(\sqrt{m})$  and proved this for the special case  $n = m$ . In fact, prior to our algorithm, there is no algorithm (to the best of our knowledge) to find such a coloring even for the special case  $n = m$ . Banaszczyk [Ban12] used deep techniques from convex geometry to prove the existence of  $\mathbf{x}$  with prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m \log n})$  for Spencer’s prefix conjecture.

In [BG17], Bansal and Garg provided an elegant prefix discrepancy algorithm in the linear-algebraic framework that matches Banaszczyk’s bound. Technically, they showed how to find an update vector in a high dimensional subspace such that  $\sum_{j \leq t} \mathbf{A}(\cdot, j) \mathbf{x}(j)$  satisfies certain sub-Gaussian properties. While our work is *inspired* by this elegant algorithm [BG17], our results and techniques are incomparable. First of all, while Bansal and Garg’s algorithm produces a full coloring with discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m \log n})$ , it leaves a gap  $O(\sqrt{\log n})$  to Spencer’s conjecture. On the other hand, our prefix algorithm finds a *partial* coloring whose prefix discrepancy matches the bound in Spencer’s conjecture. Secondly, the technique of our sampling algorithm is to find a vector in subspace  $H_t$  that is very close to indicator vectors  $e_1, \dots, e_n$ . But Bansal and Garg’s algorithm looks for a “well-spread” random vector with certain sub-Gaussian properties.

Recent work by Bansal et al. [BRS22] conjectured that the prefix discrepancy of the Beck-Fiala problem (where each column of  $\mathbf{A}$  has  $O(1)$  ones) is  $O(1)$  and provided an beautiful application to approximation algorithms in scheduling theory.

**The Gaussian measure algorithm.** Gluskin [Glu89] used the Gaussian measure to show the existence of a good partial coloring. Rothvoss [Rot17] designed an elegant algorithm to find a partial coloring directly based on the Gaussian measure of convex bodies. While this framework is less flexible than the first linear-algebraic framework, it could comply more discrepancy constraints. For example, this partial coloring method has been used in matrix sparsification [RR20] and matrix Spencer’s conjecture [BJM23]. Furthermore, Reis and Rothvoss [RR23] has shown the Gaussian measure could be exponentially small for any constant. Our technical contribution here is a connection between Gaussian processes and the Gaussian measure algorithm. We believe it would be interesting to see more Gaussian measure algorithms based on Gaussian processes.

**Online Discrepancy Theory.** Online problems require the algorithm to output  $\mathbf{x}(i)$  after reading column  $\mathbf{A}(\cdot, i)$  whose goal is still to bound every prefix summation. Alweiss et al. [ALS21] provided an elegant algorithm with online discrepancy  $O(\log m)$  for the vector balancing problem where each column is of length  $\leq 1$ . Later on, Liu et al. [LSS22] used random walks with Gaussian stationary distributions to obtain a *partial* coloring with online discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ . Very recent work by Kulkarni et al. [KRR24] have shown optimal online algorithms whose online discrepancy is  $O(\sqrt{\log m})$ , despite their running time is not a polynomial. One remark is that [KRR24] only implies a coloring with prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m \cdot \log n})$  for the prefix Spencer conjecture. Other online settings have been studied in [Spe77, BJM<sup>+</sup>21].

Finally, there are many other settings and applications of discrepancy theory including hereditary discrepancy [MNT20], discrepancy of permutations [NNN12], differential privacy [NTZ13]. We refer to textbooks [Cha02, Mat09] for an overview.

### 1.3 Discussion

In this work, we explore the advantages of the two algorithmic frameworks for the partial coloring method and apply them to two problems in Spencer’s setting separately.

For the prefix Spencer conjecture, our algorithm finds a partial coloring whose prefix discrepancy is almost-optimal. This leads to a full coloring of discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \log \frac{O(n)}{m})$ . While it is well known how to reduce  $n$  in classical discrepancy problems, much less is known about prefix problems. It would be interesting to investigate the reduction of variables for the prefix discrepancy problem.

Technically, we apply the small deviation bounds of Gaussian processes to the Gaussian measure algorithm. Inspired by the chaining argument in Gaussian processes, we use the correlation of those prefix constraints to reduce the loss of applying the Šidák-Khatri inequality directly. Similar ideas

have been studied in other works about matrix sparsification [RR20, DJR22]. It is interesting to investigate the application of this idea to other problems in discrepancy theory including the Kadison-Singer problem [MSS15] and  $\ell_1$  subspace embedding (a.k.a. sparsification of zonotopes) [Tal90, BRR23].

There are many more open questions in prefix discrepancy theory. While the prefix discrepancy of the Beck-Fiala problem is conjectured to be  $O(1)$  [BRS22], the best known upper bound is  $O(\sqrt{\log n})$  from Banaszczyk’s existence proof [Ban12]. In fact, there is no *efficient* algorithm to output a coloring with prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{\log n})$  in this setting yet [KRR24]. This is in contrast with the prefix Spencer conjecture where Bansal and Garg [BG17] provided an efficient algorithm matching Banaszczyk’s bound  $O(\sqrt{m \log n})$ . Furthermore, an intriguing direction is to design *efficient* online algorithm for the vector balancing problem with a prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ .

For the linear-algebraic framework, our algorithm admits the partial coloring to fix an entry  $\mathbf{x}(k_t)$  to 1 or  $-1$  arbitrarily in every update  $t$ . While we state it as a sampling algorithm, one could apply it to control those  $\{\pm 1\}$ -entries in the partial coloring method. For example, in the Beck-Fiala setting, given the partial coloring  $\mathbf{x}_t$  at step  $t$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_t$  be the set of fixed  $\{\pm 1\}$ -entries in  $\mathbf{x}_t$ . For unfixed entries in  $\mathbf{x}_t([n] \setminus \mathcal{F}_t)$ , our algorithm guarantees that  $0.99 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{F}_t|)$  entries could be chosen to get fixed (to  $\pm 1$ ) in this update. In another word, at each step, it could set *almost* any unfixed entry to either 1 or  $-1$ . This provides a way to strengthen the standard partial coloring method. One open question would be to use stronger partial coloring methods to obtain a bound like  $O(\sqrt{d \log d})$  for the Beck-Fiala problem of degree- $d$ .

**Organization.** The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide basic notations and definitions. In Section 3, we provide an overview of our algorithms and techniques. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1 about the prefix discrepancy conjecture. In Section 5, we provide a random sampling algorithm in Spencer’s setting and prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 6, we discuss random sampling algorithms in Beck-Fiala’s and Banaszczyk’s settings.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $\|\cdot\|_p$  denote the  $\ell_p$  norm of a vector  $\mathbf{v}$ , i.e.,  $\|\mathbf{v}\|_p = (\sum_i |\mathbf{v}(i)|^p)^{1/p}$ . For convenience, we use  $\exp(x)$  to denote the function  $e^x$  of a real variable (number)  $x$  and  $[n]$  to denote  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .

We use bold letters like  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  to denote matrices and vectors. For a vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v})$  denote the set of non-zero entries in  $\mathbf{v}$  as the support of  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $\mathbf{v}(S)$  for a subset  $S \subseteq [n]$  denote the punctured-vector in  $\mathbb{R}^S$  such that  $\mathbf{v}(i)$  denotes its entry  $i$ . For two vectors  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^S$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^T$  with disjoint supports  $S \cap T = \emptyset$ , let  $\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{v}$  denote their concatenation on  $S \cup T$ .

For convenience, let  $\vec{0}$  and  $\vec{1}$  denote the all-0 and all-1 vectors separately. Moreover, we use  $\mathbf{e}_i$  to denote the indicator vector for coordinate  $i$ .

For a symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , we use  $\mathbf{G} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j \cdot \phi_j \phi_j^\top$  to denote its eigen-decomposition where  $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_n$ . For any matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  whose dimension is  $m \times n$ , we use  $\mathbf{A}(S, T)$  to denote the submatrix on  $S \times T$  for any  $S \subseteq [m]$  and  $T \subseteq [n]$ . In this work,  $\mathbf{A}(\cdot, i)$  denotes column  $i$  of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{A}(j, \cdot)$  denotes its row  $j$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{A}(\cdot, [t])$  will denote the submatrix of the first  $t$  columns.

**Discrepancy theory.** Through this work, we always use  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  to denote the input matrix for various settings such that discrepancy theory looks for a  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  minimizing  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty$ . Since  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{i \in [m]} |\langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{x} \rangle|$ , we consider each row  $\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)$  as a constraint in the discrepancy problem. Moreover, we call  $\mathbf{x} \in [-1, 1]^n$  a partial coloring and  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  a coloring.

We generalize Spencer’s setting to matrices whose entries are in  $[-1, 1]$ . For convenience, we focus on the setting where  $n \geq m$  in this work.

We summarize the classical bounds by Spencer [Spe85] and its algorithmic results by [Ban10, LM12, Rot17, LRR17]. We state the following version whose starting point  $\mathbf{x}_0$  could be arbitrary.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Given any  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  with  $n \geq m$ , there exist exponentially many  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{m})$ . Moreover, there exist efficient algorithms that given any starting point  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , they find  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  with  $\mathbf{x}(i) = \mathbf{x}_0(i)$  for each  $\mathbf{x}_0(i) \in \{\pm 1\}$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{m})$ .*

**Prefix discrepancy.** In the prefix problem, the goal is to bound the prefix summation of any  $\ell$  terms

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \max_{\ell \leq n} \left\| \sum_{i \leq \ell} \mathbf{A}(\cdot, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i) \right\|_\infty, \quad (2)$$

instead of the total summation  $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i \leq n} \mathbf{A}(\cdot, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i)$ . Since  $\mathbf{A}(\cdot, [\ell])$  denotes the submatrix of the first  $\ell$  columns and  $\mathbf{x}([\ell])$  denotes the subvector of the first  $\ell$  entries, we simplify the prefix summation as

$$\sum_{i \leq \ell} \mathbf{A}(\cdot, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i) = \mathbf{A}(\cdot, [\ell]) \cdot \mathbf{x}([\ell]).$$

One remark is that the prefix discrepancy in (2) provides an upper bound on the discrepancy of any consecutive subset of indices (up to factor 2) [BRS22].

Spencer [Spe86] conjectured that when  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$ , no matter how large is  $n$ , there always exists  $\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  such that the prefix discrepancy defined in (2) is  $O(\sqrt{m})$ .

### 3 Overview

In this section, we provide an overview of our algorithms in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2.

**Prefix Discrepancy Theory.** The starting point of the prefix discrepancy algorithm is Lévy’s inequality [Lév38] which bounds the deviation of the prefix summations of symmetric random variables like  $X_i \sim \{\pm 1\}$ .

**Lemma 3.1** (Lévy’s inequality). *Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be independent symmetric random variables and  $\mathbf{S}_k = \sum_{i=1}^k X_i$  be their partial summations of  $k \in [n]$ . For any  $\theta > 0$  we have*

1.  $\Pr[\max_{k \in [n]} \{\mathbf{S}_k\} \geq \theta] \leq 2 \cdot \Pr[\mathbf{S}_n \geq \theta]$ ,
2.  $\Pr[\max_{k \in [n]} \{|\mathbf{S}_k|\} \geq \theta] \leq 2 \cdot \Pr[|\mathbf{S}_n| \geq \theta]$ .

While Lévy’s inequality has been used for the special case  $n = m$  [Spe86], this is not stronger enough to bound the prefix discrepancy by  $O(\sqrt{m})$  for arbitrarily large  $n$ . Even for a single constraint  $\mathbf{A}(j, \cdot)$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{A}(j, i)\mathbf{x}(i)$  could have variance  $\Theta(n)$ ; and  $\Pr[|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{A}(j, i)\mathbf{x}(i)| = \omega(\sqrt{m})]$  is close to 1 when  $n = \omega(m)$ .

The main technical tool is to prove a small-deviation bound directly: for  $\mathbf{x} \sim \{\pm 1\}^n$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ \forall t \leq n, \left| \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{A}(j, i) \cdot \mathbf{x}(i) \right| = O(\sqrt{m}) \right] \geq 2^{-n/m}. \quad (3)$$

The intuition behind (3) is that Lemma 3.1 implies that the prefix discrepancy of  $2m$  variables is  $O(\sqrt{m})$  with a constant probability. Hence we could partition  $n$  entries into  $n/2m$  intervals and apply Lemma 3.1 to each interval. Conditioned on that each interval satisfies the prefix constraint, then we need to consider the summation of every interval. While these  $n/2m$  interval summations may no longer be sub-Gaussian conditioned on the prefix constraint on each interval, they are still symmetric. This turns out to be enough for a lower bound like  $2^{-n/m}$ .

Back to the prefix discrepancy algorithm, although (3) implies a probability  $2^{-n/m}$  for any single constraint, it is unclear how to turn this into a probability  $2^{-n}$  for all  $m$  constraints. Hence we consider the Gaussian measure instead of the discrete Boolean cube and apply the Šidák-Khatri inequality for  $m$  constraints. However, by the Gaussian measure algorithm [Rot17, RR23], we could only obtain a *partial* coloring with a prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m})$ . The last point here is that to obtain a full coloring of prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \log \frac{n}{m})$  instead of  $O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \log n)$ , we will adjust the deviation from  $O(\sqrt{m})$  to  $O(\sqrt{n \cdot \log \frac{O(m)}{n}})$  when  $n = O(m)$  and apply Levy's inequality for the new deviation.

**Sampling.** Next we consider the sampling algorithm in Spencer's setting. For ease of exposition, we consider the case  $n = \omega(m)$  and use  $\mathbf{x}_t$  to denote the partial coloring at step  $t$ . The sampling algorithm for  $n = O(m)$  is more involved whose discussion will be deferred to the end of this section.

The classical reduction [Bec81] considers the dual space  $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  of all rows in  $\mathbf{A}$  such that any update vector  $\mathbf{v}_t \in H$  has  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_t\|_\infty = 0$ . Back to the sampling question, even though there are exponentially many choices of  $\mathbf{v}_t$  in  $H$ , one needs to guarantee that these updates will generate exponentially many colorings eventually. Our first idea circumvents this by requiring that each update sets an fixed entry  $\mathbf{x}(k_t)$  to be either 1 or  $-1$ . In another word, our algorithm finds a coordinate  $k_t$  instead of a direction  $\mathbf{v}_t$ . Even though this reduces the number of choices, it guarantees that all partial colorings generated in this process are distinct. Then our second idea of finding the coordinate  $k_t$  relies on the properties of leverage scores of  $H$ . We recall a few properties of the leverage score here.

**Leverage Scores.** The standard leverage score is defined for every row of a full-rank matrix  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  with  $n \geq d$ :

$$\tau_i = \mathbf{G}(i, \cdot)^\top (\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G})^{-1} \mathbf{G}(i, \cdot) \text{ for row } i \text{ in } \mathbf{G}. \quad (4)$$

One could generalize it for every coordinate of a subspace by basic properties of leverage scores [Woo14, CP19]. We summarize two properties of  $\tau_i$  here and provide a self-contained proof.

**Claim 3.2.** *Given a linear subspace  $H \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , for each coordinate  $i \in [n]$ , let  $\tau_i(H) := \max_{\mathbf{u} \in H \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{|\mathbf{u}(i)|^2}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2}$ .*

*Then  $\sum_{i \in [n]} \tau_i(H) = \dim(H)$ .*

*Moreover, given  $H$  and  $i$ , Algorithm 1 computes the corresponding vector  $\mathbf{u}$  such that  $\frac{\mathbf{u}(i)^2}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2} = \tau_i(H)$  (and  $\mathbf{u}(i) = 1$ ).*

In fact, any matrix  $\mathbf{G}$  generating  $H$  will have the same sequence of leverage scores. Thus one could put a basis of  $H$  into  $\mathbf{G}$  and compute  $\tau_i$  via (4). Then we describe Algorithm 1 here. For ease of exposition, we require that the output vector has  $\mathbf{u}(i) = 1$  instead of  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 = 1$ .



---

**Algorithm 1** Compute a vector with a large entry

---

**Input:** a linear subspace  $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and an index  $i \in [n]$ .

**Output:**  $\mathbf{u} \in H$ .

- 1: **procedure** FINDVECTOR( $H, i$ )
  - 2:   Find an orthonormal basis  $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_d$  of  $H$ .
  - 3:   Let  $\mathbf{u} \leftarrow \psi_1(i) \cdot \psi_1 + \dots + \psi_d(i) \cdot \psi_d$ .
  - 4:   **return**  $\mathbf{u} := \mathbf{u}/\mathbf{u}(i)$ .
  - 5: **end procedure**
- 

*Proof of Claim 3.2.* Let  $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_d$  be an orthonormal basis of  $H$ . Then for any  $\mathbf{u} \in H$ , we rewrite  $\mathbf{u} = \alpha_1 \psi_1 + \dots + \alpha_d \psi_d$  and obtain

$$\frac{|\mathbf{u}(i)|^2}{\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2} = \frac{(\sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j \psi_j(i))^2}{\sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j^2} \leq \frac{(\sum_j \alpha_j^2) \cdot (\sum_j \psi_j(i)^2)}{\sum_j \alpha_j^2} = \sum_j \psi_j(i)^2$$

where we use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in the 2nd step. Since the inequality is tight when  $\alpha_1 = \psi_1(i), \dots, \alpha_d = \psi_d(i)$ , we know  $\tau_i(H)$  equals  $\sum_j \psi_j(i)^2$ . Thus  $\sum_i \tau_i(H) = d$ . Also, the correctness of Algorithm 1 follows the above analysis.  $\square$

In our sampling algorithm, we choose  $k_t$  as the coordinate with the largest leverages score in the safe subspace  $H_t$ . The reason is as follows. Since updating  $\mathbf{x}_t$  by an indicator vector  $\mathbf{e}_k$  (like  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{x}_t + \alpha_t \cdot \mathbf{e}_k$  for a scalar  $\alpha_t$ ) could set  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(k)$  to be either 1 or  $-1$ , the intuition is to find a vector  $\mathbf{v}_t$  in  $H$  as close to indicator vectors as possible. By Claim 3.2, the closest vector to  $\mathbf{e}_k$  in  $H$  is determined by the leverage score of coordinate  $k$  in  $H$  (because  $\max_{\mathbf{u} \in H: \|\mathbf{u}\|_2=1} \langle \mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{u} \rangle^2 = \max_{\mathbf{u} \in H: \|\mathbf{u}\|_2=1} |\mathbf{u}(k)|^2 = \tau_k(H)$ ). Thus we pick the coordinate  $k_t$  with the largest leverage score.

However,  $\mathbf{v}_t \neq \mathbf{e}_{k_t}$ . To guarantee the update  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_t + \alpha_t \cdot \mathbf{v}_t$  is in  $[-1, 1]^n$  after setting  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(k_t) \in \{\pm 1\}$ , we require  $\mathbf{x}_t$  to be almost  $\vec{0}$  except those fixed entries. One way to prove this is to show  $\|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \approx t$ , which is achieved by a strong martingale concentration (and further requiring  $H$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  to be orthogonal to  $\mathbf{x}_t$ ).

For the case  $n = O(m)$ , many partial-coloring algorithms set a polynomial (or logarithmic) small scalar  $\alpha_t$  in each update. However, we need the scalar  $\alpha_t$  to be at least 1 such that each update could fix an entry to either  $+1$  or  $-1$ . We notice that the deterministic discrepancy algorithm of Levy, Ramadas, and Rothvoss [LRR17] could work for constant scalars in each update. Thus we apply our techniques to the deterministic discrepancy algorithm in [LRR17], which provides the sampling algorithm for  $n = O(m)$  with discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m})$ .

## 4 Prefix Spencer Problem

We show how to find an optimal partial coloring for the prefix Spencer conjecture in this section. In this section,  $\epsilon$  is a small constant to be fixed later (in Lemma 4.3). Since we will run the partial coloring algorithm recursively to obtain a full coloring, we state the general form with an arbitrary starting point  $\mathbf{x} \in (-1, 1)^n$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for any  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  with  $n \geq m$ , function PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING in Algorithm 2 takes any  $\mathbf{x} \in (-1, 1)^n$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  as inputs to return a partial coloring  $\mathbf{x}'$  such that with high probability,*

1.  $\epsilon/4$  fraction of entries in  $\mathbf{x}'$  are  $\pm 1$ .
2. The prefix discrepancy of  $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'$  is  $O(\sqrt{m})$ :

$$\sup_{\ell \leq n} \|\mathbf{A}(\cdot, [\ell]) \cdot (\mathbf{x}'([\ell]) - \mathbf{x}([\ell]))\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{m}).$$

We have the following corollary by applying Theorem 4.1 recursively to obtaining a full coloring whose proof is deferred to Section 4.1.

**Corollary 4.2.** *For any  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  with  $n \geq m$ , there is a polynomial time algorithm that generates a coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  satisfying*

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq n} \|\mathbf{A}(\cdot, [t]) \cdot \mathbf{x}([t])\|_\infty \leq O\left(\sqrt{m} \cdot \ln \frac{O(n)}{m}\right)$$

with high probability.

We describe function PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING of Theorem 4.1 in Algorithm 2. Basically, function PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING rounds  $\Omega(n)$  entries of non-negative entries in  $\mathbf{x}$  (defined as  $I$ ) to  $\pm 1$ . For the first time reader, it might be more convenient to assume  $\mathbf{x} = \vec{0}$  such that  $I = [n]$  and  $T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}$  is the identity map of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For general  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q)$  denotes the convex body of  $Q$  after applying the linear transformation  $T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}$ . In the rest of this section, we finish the proof of Theorem 4.1.

---

**Algorithm 2** partial coloring with optimal prefix discrepancy

---

- 1: **function** GAUSSIAN\_SAMPLING( $Q$  and  $S$  such that  $Q$  is a symmetric convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^S$ )
  - 2:   Sample a Gaussian vector  $\mathbf{y}^* \sim N(0, 1)^S$
  - 3:   Compute  $\mathbf{x}^* = \arg \min_{z \in Q \cap [-1, 1]^S} \{\|\mathbf{y}^* - z\|_2\}$
  - 4:   Return  $\mathbf{x}^*$
  - 5: **end function**
  - 6: **function** PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING( $\mathbf{x} \in (-1, 1)^n, \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ )
  - 7:   W.l.o.g. we assume half entries in  $\mathbf{x}$  are non-negative — otherwise consider its flip  $-\mathbf{x}$
  - 8:   Let  $I$  be the sequence of indices  $i \in [n]$  with  $\mathbf{x}(i) \geq 0$
  - 9:    $Q \leftarrow \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^I : \max_{j \in [m]} \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I|} \left| \sum_{i=I(1)}^{I(k)} \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \leq 112\sqrt{m} \right\}$
  - 10:   Define a linear operator  $T_{\mathbf{x}(I)} : \mathbb{R}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^I$  such that  $T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(\mathbf{y}) \leftarrow \frac{1}{1-\mathbf{x}(i)} \cdot \mathbf{y}(i)$  for every  $i \in I$
  - 11:    $\mathbf{x}^* \leftarrow \text{GAUSSIAN\_SAMPLING}(T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q), I)$
  - 12:   Flip  $\mathbf{x}^*$  if the number of 1-entries in  $\mathbf{x}^*$  are less than  $\frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot |I|$
  - 13:   For every  $i \in I$ ,  $\mathbf{x}'(i) \leftarrow \mathbf{x}(i) + (1 - \mathbf{x}(i)) \cdot \mathbf{x}^*(i)$ ; otherwise  $\mathbf{x}'(i) \leftarrow \mathbf{x}(i)$  for  $i \notin I$
  - 14:   **return**  $\mathbf{x}'$
  - 15: **end function**
- 

The key of Function PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING is the Gaussian measure algorithm [Rot17, RR23], which is reformulated as Function GAUSSIAN\_SAMPLING. The main property of Function GAUSSIAN\_SAMPLING is that when  $Q$  is large enough, its output  $\mathbf{x}^*$  has  $\left| \left\{ i : \mathbf{x}^*(i) \in \{\pm 1\} \right\} \right| = \Omega(n)$ . In particular, we use the Gaussian measure  $\gamma(\cdot)$  to measure the size of  $Q$ . For convenience, we provide a general definition:

$$\gamma_S(K) := \Pr_{\mathbf{g} \sim N(0, 1)^S} [\mathbf{g} \in K] \text{ for any measurable set } K \subset \mathbb{R}^S$$

where  $N(0, 1)^S$  denotes a random vector in  $\mathbb{R}^S$  whose entries are sampled from  $N(0, 1)$  independently. The correctness of function GAUSSIAN\_SAMPLING follows from Theorem 7 of [Rot17].

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\epsilon := 10^{-4}$  and  $\delta := \frac{9}{5000}$ . Suppose that  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^S$  is a symmetric convex body with  $\gamma_S(K) \geq e^{-\delta n}$ . Then the output  $x^*$  of function GAUSSIAN\_SAMPLING( $K, S$ ) has at least  $\epsilon \cdot |S|$  many coordinates in  $\{-1, 1\}$  with probability  $1 - e^{-\Omega(|S|)}$ .*

In this section, we fix  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta$  as defined in Lemma 4.3. The proof of Theorem 4.1 relies on several properties of the Gaussian measure.

**Gaussian random variables.** We recall several useful facts about the Gaussian random variables. The first one is Lévy's inequality stated as Lemma 3.1. The second one is the Šidák-Khatri inequality about the correlation of two bodies in Gaussian measures [Šid67, Kha67, Roy14].

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $T_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $T_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be any two symmetric convex bodies. Then  $\gamma_n(T_1 \cap T_2) \geq \gamma_n(T_1) \cdot \gamma_n(T_2)$ .*

The new ingredient is a lower bound on the probability of a sequence of Gaussian random variables (a.k.a. a Gaussian process) with small deviations. While we only state the lower bound, this estimation is tight up to constants in the exponent. [Chu48, Sha93].

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in [n]}$  be i.i.d Gaussian random variables, with  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0, \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] = 1$ . Let  $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  and  $S_n^* = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i|$ . Then for any  $\ell$ , we have*

$$\Pr[S_n^* < 4\sqrt{\ell}] \geq 4^{-\frac{n}{\ell}}.$$

In fact, this lower bound also holds for i.i.d symmetric sub-Gaussian random variables such as  $X_i \sim \{\pm 1\}$ . We use the deviation bound of Lemma 4.5 for  $\ell < \sqrt{n}$ . For completeness, we provide an elementary proof in Appendix A.

While Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5 together provide a lower bound on  $\gamma_I(Q)$ , Function GAUSSIAN\_SAMPLING takes  $T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q)$  as the convex body given the starting point  $\mathbf{x}$ . Hence we need the following lemma to lower bound  $\gamma_I(T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q))$  by  $\gamma_I(Q)$ .

**Lemma 4.6** (Corollary 14 of [Rot17]). *Let  $K \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be a symmetry convex body and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then*

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{g} \in N(0,1)^n} [(\lambda(1)\mathbf{g}(1), \dots, \lambda(n)\mathbf{g}(n)) \in K] \geq \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^n \max\{1, |\lambda(i)|\}} \Pr_{\mathbf{g} \in N(0,1)^n} [\mathbf{g} \in K].$$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Define the convex body satisfying the prefix constraint of row  $j$  as

$$Q_j := \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^I : \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I|} \left| \sum_{i=I(1)}^{I(k)} \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \leq 112\sqrt{m} \right\}.$$

Then  $Q = \cap_{j=1}^m Q_j$  and  $T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q) = \cap_{j=1}^m T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q_j)$ . It is obvious that  $Q$  and  $Q_j$  are symmetric convex bodies. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_I(T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q_j)) &= \Pr_{\mathbf{g} \in N(0,1)^I} \left[ \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I|} \left| \sum_{i=I(1)}^{I(k)} (1 - \mathbf{x}(i)) \cdot \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \leq 112\sqrt{m} \right] \\ &\geq \Pr_{\mathbf{g} \in N(0,1)^I} \left[ \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I|} \left| \sum_{i=I(1)}^{I(k)} \mathbf{g}(i) \right| \leq 112\sqrt{m} \right] \\ &\quad \text{(By Lemma 4.6, } \mathbf{A}(j, i) \in [-1, 1] \text{ and } 1 - \mathbf{x}(i) \in [-1, 1]) \\ &\geq e^{-\frac{|I|}{28^2 m}}. \quad \text{(By Lemma 4.5)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\gamma_I (T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q_j)) \geq e^{-\frac{9}{5000} \cdot |I|/m}. \quad (5)$$

Then we apply Lemma 4.4:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_I (T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q)) &\geq \prod_{j=1}^m \gamma_I (T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q_j)) && \text{(By Lemma 4.4)} \\ &\geq (e^{-\frac{9}{5000} |I|/m})^m && \text{(By Equation(5))} \\ &= e^{-\frac{9}{5000} |I|}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 4.3, GAUSSIAN SAMPLING can find a partial coloring  $\mathbf{x}^* \in T_{\mathbf{x}(I)}(Q) \cap [-1, 1]^{|I|}$  so that  $\mathbf{x}^*$  has at least  $\epsilon \cdot |I|$  many entries in  $\{\pm 1\}$  with probability  $1 - e^{-\Omega(|I|)}$ .

Line 12 and Line 13 of Algorithm 2 guarantees that the number of  $i \in I$  with  $\mathbf{x}^*(i) = 1$  is at least  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}|I|$  and  $\mathbf{x}'(i) = 1$  for all the  $i \in I$  with  $\mathbf{x}^*(i) = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{x}'(i) \in [-1, 1]$  for  $i \in I$ . Thus we have  $|\{i \in [n] \mid \mathbf{x}'(i) \in \{\pm 1\}\}| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{4} \cdot n$ , i.e.,  $\epsilon/4$  fraction of entries in  $\mathbf{x}'$  are  $\pm 1$ .

Observe that the update  $\mathbf{x}'(i) - \mathbf{x}(i) = (1 - \mathbf{x}(i)) \cdot \mathbf{x}^*(i)$  for  $i \in I$  guarantees that  $\mathbf{x}'(I) - \mathbf{x}(I) \in Q \cap [-1, 1]^I$  and the update  $\mathbf{x}'(i) - \mathbf{x}(i) = 0$  for  $i \in [n] \setminus I$  shows  $\mathbf{x}'([n]/I) - \mathbf{x}([n]/I) = 0$ . Thus, the prefix discrepancy of  $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'$  is  $O(\sqrt{m})$ . □

#### 4.1 Proof of Corollary 4.2

We have the following standard bound for the Gaussian random variable [Ver20].

**Claim 4.7.** *Given the Gaussian random variable  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ , for any deviation  $\delta \cdot \sigma$  with  $\delta > 1$ ,*

$$\Pr[|N(0, \sigma^2)| \geq \delta \cdot \sigma] \leq \frac{e^{-\delta^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \cdot \delta}.$$

We use Algorithm 3 to prove Corollary 4.2. It contains two phases. In the first phase, we iteratively apply function PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING to entries in  $(-1, 1)$  until there are  $O(m)$  entries left in  $(-1, 1)$ . Then in the second phase, we apply function PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING with a different definition of  $Q$  whose upper bound becomes  $\sqrt{2|I| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I|}}$  instead of  $112\sqrt{m}$  in every iteration.

---

**Algorithm 3** prefix spencer constructive upper bound

---

- 1: **function** PREFIXSPENCER( $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ )
- 2:    $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \vec{0}, I' \leftarrow [n]$
- 3:   **repeat**
- 4:      $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow \text{PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING}(\mathbf{x}(I'), \mathbf{A}(\cdot, I'))$
- 5:     Let  $I'$  be the sequence of indices  $i \in [n]$  with  $\mathbf{x}(i) \notin \{\pm 1\}$
- 6:   **until**  $|I'| = 50m$
- 7:   Modify function PREFIXPARTIALCOLORING by changing line 9 into

$$Q \leftarrow \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^I : \max_{j \in [m]} \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I|} \left| \sum_{i=I(1)}^{I(k)} \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \leq \sqrt{2|I| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I|}} \right\}$$

and we call the new function as PREFIXPARTIALCOLORINGMODIFIED

8:  $t \leftarrow 0$  and  $\mathbf{x}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{x}, \tilde{I}_0 = I'$   
9: **repeat**  
10:  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{PREFIXPARTIALCOLORINGMODEFIED}(\mathbf{x}_t(\tilde{I}_t), \mathbf{A}(\cdot, \tilde{I}_t))$   
11: Let  $\tilde{I}_{t+1}$  be the sequence of indices  $i \in [n]$  with  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(i) \notin \{\pm 1\}$   
12: **until**  $|\tilde{I}_{t+1}| = O(\sqrt{m})$   
13: Color the entries of  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$  not in  $\{\pm 1\}$  arbitrarily and denote it as  $\mathbf{x}$   
14: **return**  $\mathbf{x}$   
15: **end function**

---

In the first phase, by Theorem 4.1, we color at least  $\frac{\epsilon}{4}$  fraction of uncolored entries in each iteration. Thus we need  $O(\frac{\ln \frac{n}{m}}{\ln \frac{1}{1-\epsilon/4}})$  iterations to reduce  $|I'|$  from  $n$  into  $O(m)$ . The success probability is at least  $(1 - e^{-\Omega(m)})$ . After the first phase, we get a partial coloring  $\mathbf{x}_0$  with prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \ln \frac{n}{m})$  and at most  $O(m)$  entries in  $(-1, 1)$ .

Then we consider the second phase. Denote  $I_t \subseteq \tilde{I}_t$  as the sequence of indices  $j \in [n]$  with  $0 \leq \mathbf{x}_t(j) < 1$  at the  $t$ -th iteration of the second phase. Similarly we define the convex body  $Q_j^t$  and  $Q^t$  as follows:

$$Q_j^t := \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_t} : \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I_t|} \left| \sum_{i=I_t(1)}^{I_t(k)} \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \leq \sqrt{2|I_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}} \right\}.$$

$$Q^t := \left\{ \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_t} : \max_{j \in [m]} \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I_t|} \left| \sum_{i=I_t(1)}^{I_t(k)} \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \leq \sqrt{2|I_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}} \right\}.$$

Then we compute,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{\mathbf{g} \in N(0,1)^{I_t}} \left[ \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I_t|} \left| \sum_{i=I_t(1)}^{I_t(k)} (1 - \mathbf{x}(i)) \cdot \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \geq \sqrt{2|I_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}} \right] \\ & \leq 2 \Pr_{\mathbf{g} \in N(0,1)^{I_t}} \left[ \left| \sum_{i=I_t(1)}^{I_t(k)} (1 - \mathbf{x}(i)) \cdot \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \geq \sqrt{2|I_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}} \right] \quad (\text{By Lemma 3.1}) \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}} \leq \frac{|I_t|}{2000m}. \quad (\text{By Claim 4.7, } \mathbf{A}(j, i) \in [-1, 1] \text{ and } 1 - \mathbf{x}(i) \in [-1, 1]) \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\gamma_{I_t}(T_{\mathbf{x}(I_t)}(Q_j^t)) = \Pr_{\mathbf{g} \in N(0,1)^{I_t}} \left[ \max_{1 \leq k \leq |I_t|} \left| \sum_{i=I_t(1)}^{I_t(k)} (1 - \mathbf{x}(i)) \cdot \mathbf{g}(i) \cdot \mathbf{A}(j, i) \right| \leq \sqrt{2|I_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}} \right] \geq 1 - \frac{|I_t|}{2000m}. \quad (6)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{I_t}(T_{\mathbf{x}(I_t)}(Q^t)) & \geq \prod_{j=1}^m \gamma_{I_t}(T_{\mathbf{x}(I_t)}(Q_j^t)) \quad (\text{By Lemma 4.4}) \\ & \geq \left(1 - \frac{|I_t|}{2000m}\right)^m \quad (\text{By Equation 6}) \\ & \geq e^{-2m \cdot \frac{|I_t|}{2000m}} \quad (\text{For } 0 < x < \frac{1}{2}, \text{ we have } 1 - x \geq e^{-2x}) \\ & \geq e^{-\frac{9}{5000} \cdot |I_t|}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1, we color at least  $\frac{\epsilon}{4}$  fraction of uncolored entries for each iteration. Thus we need another  $O(\frac{\ln m}{4-\epsilon})$  iterations to make  $|\tilde{I}_t| = O(\sqrt{m})$ . Besides,  $\mathbf{x}_t(I_t) - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}(I_t) \in Q^t \cap [-1, 1]$ . Thus, the prefix discrepancy of  $\mathbf{x}_t - \mathbf{x}_{t+1}$  is  $\sqrt{2|I_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}}$  for each iteration.

Since in the  $t$ -th iteration, we turn at least  $\frac{\epsilon}{4}|\tilde{I}_t|$  entries of  $\tilde{I}_t$  into 1, we obtain  $|\tilde{I}_{t+1}| \leq (1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4})|\tilde{I}_t|$ . Thus  $|\tilde{I}_t| \leq (1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4})^t |\tilde{I}_0|$ . Besides,  $I_t \subset \tilde{I}_t$ .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2|I_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}} &\leq \sqrt{2|\tilde{I}_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|\tilde{I}_t|}} && (x \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{x} \text{ increases on } x \text{ for } 0 < x < 100m) \\ &= \sqrt{2|\tilde{I}_0| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|\tilde{I}_0|}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{|\tilde{I}_t|}{|\tilde{I}_0|}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\ln \frac{2000m}{|\tilde{I}_t|}}{\ln \frac{2000m}{|\tilde{I}_0|}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice for  $0 < |\tilde{I}_t| \leq |\tilde{I}_0| < 100m$ , we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{\ln \frac{2000m}{|\tilde{I}_t|}}{\ln \frac{2000m}{|\tilde{I}_0|}}} \leq \left( \frac{|\tilde{I}_0|}{|\tilde{I}_t|} \right)^{\frac{1}{6}}.$$

Thus we have

$$\sqrt{2|I_t| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_t|}} \leq \sqrt{2|\tilde{I}_0| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|\tilde{I}_0|}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4}\right)^{\frac{t}{3}}. \quad (7)$$

Suppose we stop at time  $T = O(\ln \frac{n}{m} + \ln m) = O(\ln n)$ , the prefix discrepancy of  $\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_T$  should be

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\ell \leq n} \|\mathbf{A}(\cdot, [\ell]) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_T)\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \sup_{\ell \leq n} \|\mathbf{A}(\cdot, [\ell]) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i+1})\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{2|I_i| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|I_i|}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2|\tilde{I}_0| \cdot \ln \frac{2000m}{|\tilde{I}_0|}} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4}\right)^{\frac{i}{3}} = O(\sqrt{m}). \end{aligned}$$

(Notice  $|\tilde{I}_0| = O(m)$  and Equation (7).)

Then we color the left  $\sqrt{m}$  entries to get a full coloring. The prefix discrepancy will only increase by  $O(\sqrt{m})$ .

Combine the whole analysis, we shall obtain a coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  with prefix discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \ln \frac{n}{m}) + O(\sqrt{m}) + O(\sqrt{m}) = O(\sqrt{m} \cdot \ln \frac{n}{m})$ .

## 5 Random Sampling in Spencer's Setting

In this section, we provide a random sampling algorithm in Spencer's setting. This extends the classical linear algebraic framework by incorporating leverage scores such that the min-entropy of the output is  $\Omega(n)$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** For any  $n \geq m$ , there exist a constant  $C$  and an efficient randomized algorithm such that for any input  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$ ,

1. its output  $\mathbf{x}$  always satisfies  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_\infty \leq C\sqrt{m}$ .
2. for any  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ , the probability of  $\mathbf{x} = \epsilon$  is  $O(1.9^{-0.9n})$ .

**Remark 5.2.** Spencer [Spe85] has shown that  $\forall K \geq 6, \exists \beta_K < 1$  such that there are  $(2 - \beta_K)^n$  solutions satisfying  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_\infty \leq K\sqrt{n}$  for any  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ . We could generalize Theorem 5.1 to guarantee that the probability of outputting any  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  is  $\leq (2 - \beta)^{-n}$  for any  $\beta > 0$ . This is done by relaxing the discrepancy to  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_\infty \leq C_\beta \cdot \sqrt{n}$  for some constant  $C_\beta$  and resetting parameters  $\delta = \beta/4, T = n \cdot (1 - \beta/4), \gamma = O(\beta^3)$ , and  $\theta = O(\beta^4)$ .

On the other side, Spencer [Spe85] also showed that for any  $C = O(1), \exists \mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$  such that the number of  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  with  $\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_\infty \leq C\sqrt{m}$  is exponentially small compared to  $2^n$ .

Finally, there are weaker sampling algorithms whose output has the Shannon entropy  $0.5n$  instead of the min-entropy<sup>1</sup>. However, for the Shannon entropy, it is possible that this sampling algorithm will output a fixed coloring with probability 0.9; but its output still has the Shannon entropy  $\geq 0.5n$ .

Our algorithm has two parts. When  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$  for a fixed constant  $C^* \geq 10^6$  in this section, we apply Algorithm 4 directly to sample a random coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ . Otherwise we apply Algorithm 5 (with  $\binom{\mathbf{A}}{-\mathbf{A}}$  instead of  $\mathbf{A}$ ) to sample  $\mathbf{x}$ . We state the correctness of Algorithm 4 for  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$  as follows.

**Lemma 5.3.** Given  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  where  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$ , with probability 0.99 over  $\mathbf{r}$ , Function COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING in Algorithm 4 returns  $\mathbf{x}_T \in [-1, 1]^n$  with  $|\{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}(i)| = 1\}| = 0.9n$  and  $\|\mathbf{Ax}_T\|_\infty = 0$ .

Moreover, for different seeds  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $\mathbf{r}'$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_T \leftarrow \text{COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{x}'_T \leftarrow \text{COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING}(\mathbf{r}')$  have a different  $\{\pm 1\}$ -entry.

While Algorithm 4 is still in the classical linear-algebraic framework of the partial coloring method, the key difference compared to previous works [Ban10, LM12, BG17] is to find an safe entry  $k_t$  such that it could fix  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(x_t)$  to  $+1$  or  $-1$  arbitrarily. We obtain this entry by considering its leverage scores in the safe subspace  $H_t$ . Recall that the key properties of the leverage scores are stated in Claim 3.2.

Then we state the correctness of Algorithm 5 for  $n < C^* \cdot m$ . This algorithm combines the deterministic discrepancy algorithm in [LRR17] with our leverage score sampling technique. One particular reason of choosing this algorithm in [LRR17] is because its update vector  $\alpha_t \mathbf{u}_t$  could have length  $\geq 1$  in [LRR17] such that  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(x_t)$  could be either 1 or  $-1$  after the update.

**Lemma 5.4.** Given  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  where  $n \leq C \cdot m$  for any constant  $C = O(1)$ , with probability 0.99 over  $\mathbf{r}$ , Function SAMPLINGSPENCER in Algorithm 5 returns  $\mathbf{x}_T \in [-1, 1]^n$  with  $|\{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}(i)| = 1\}| = 0.9n$  and  $\langle \mathbf{A}(j, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_T \rangle = O(\sqrt{m})$  for any  $j \in [m]$ .

Moreover, for different seeds  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $\mathbf{r}'$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_T \leftarrow \text{SAMPLINGSPENCER}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{x}'_T \leftarrow \text{SAMPLINGSPENCER}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{r}')$  have a different  $\{\pm 1\}$ -entry.

Both proofs are in the same framework — the key step is to show the existence of  $k_t$  for  $T = 0.9n$  steps, which is proved by a strong martingale concentration bound on  $\|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2$ . For ease of exposition, we present the proof of Lemma 5.3 in Section 5.1 before the proof of Lemma 5.4 in Section 5.2. Finally we finish the proof of Theorem 5.1 in as follows.

<sup>1</sup>We provide a description in Appendix B and thank the anonymous referee to suggest it.

---

**Algorithm 4** Reduction Sampling in Spencer's Setting when  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$ 


---

**Input:**  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$ ,  $\eta = 0.1$ ,  $T = 0.9n$ ,  $\gamma = 0.0001$ ,  $\delta = 0.05$ .

**Random seed**  $\mathbf{r} \in \{\pm 1\}^T$  will be generated on the fly.

**Output:**  $\mathbf{x}_T \in [-1, 1]^n$ .

```

1: function COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING( $\mathbf{r}$ )
2:    $\mathbf{x}_0 = \vec{0}$ .
3:   for  $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$  do
4:      $\mathcal{F}_t \leftarrow \{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}_t(i)| = 1\}$ .
5:      $\mathcal{D}_t \leftarrow \{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}_t(i)| \geq 1 - \eta\}$ .
6:      $H_t :=$  the subspace in  $\mathbb{R}^{[n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t}$  orthogonal to  $\mathbf{x}_t([n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t)$  and  $\{\mathbf{A}(j, [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t) : j \in [m]\}$ .
7:     Compute the leverage scores of  $\tau_i(H_t)$  for each  $i \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$ .
8:     Find the first coordinate  $k_t \notin \mathcal{D}_t$  such that  $\tau_{k_t}(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma$  and  $|\mathbf{x}_t(k_t)| \leq \delta$  — return  $\perp$ 
       if such a coordinate does not exist.
9:     Let  $\mathbf{u}_t$  be the vector  $\mathbf{u}_t(k_t) = 1$  and  $\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_2^2 = 1/\tau_i$  (see Algorithm 1 for details).
10:    For  $\delta_t := \mathbf{x}_t(k_t)$ , set  $\mathbf{r}(t+1) = 1$  with probability  $\frac{1+\delta_t}{2}$ ; otherwise  $\mathbf{r}(t+1) = -1$ .
11:    Choose  $\alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_t + \alpha_t \cdot \mathbf{u}_t$  satisfies  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(k_t) = \mathbf{r}(t+1)$ .
12:  end for
13:  return  $\mathbf{x}_T$ 
14: end function

```

---

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* While both functions could fail and output  $\perp$ , one could repeat Function COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING (when  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$ ) or Function SAMPLINGSPENCER (when  $n \leq C^* \cdot m$ )  $n$  times. Thus with probability at least  $1 - 0.01^n$  we could get a partial coloring  $\mathbf{x}_T \in [-1, 1]^n$ . Otherwise, if all the  $n$  repeats fail and return  $\perp$ , we apply Theorem 2.1 directly to output  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  with  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq O(\sqrt{m})$ .

Then we bound the discrepancy for the two cases  $n < C^* \cdot m$  and  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$  separately. When  $n \leq C^* \cdot m$ , note that we run Function COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING on  $\mathbf{A}' := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} \\ -\mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix}$  instead of  $\mathbf{A}$ . By Lemma 5.4,  $\max_{j \in [2m]} \langle \mathbf{A}'(j, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_T \rangle = O(\sqrt{m})$ . Then we apply Theorem 2.1 on  $\mathbf{x}_T$  and  $\mathbf{A}'$  to get the full coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  with  $\|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_T)\|_\infty \leq O(\sqrt{m})$ . So the discrepancy is

$$\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{j \in [2m]} \langle \mathbf{A}'(j, \cdot), \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \max_{j \in [2m]} \langle \mathbf{A}'(j, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_T \rangle + \|\mathbf{A}'(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_T)\|_\infty \leq O(\sqrt{m}).$$

When  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$ , we apply Theorem 2.1 on  $\mathbf{x}_T$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  to get full coloring  $\mathbf{x}$  as well. By Lemma 5.3, it's clear that  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_T\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_T)\|_\infty \leq O(\sqrt{m})$ .

Next, we discuss the probability  $\Pr[\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}]$ . Let us consider the case  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$ . Lemma 5.3 guarantees that for any two different random seeds  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $\mathbf{r}'$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_T \neq \mathbf{x}'_T$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}'$  be the full colorings obtained by applying Theorem 2.1 on  $\mathbf{x}_T$  and  $\mathbf{x}'_T$  respectively. By the guarantee of Theorem 2.1,  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}'$  for different seeds  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $\mathbf{r}'$ . Hence we bound the probability of generating any  $\mathbf{r} \in \{\pm 1\}^T$ . Recall that for any  $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$ ,  $\delta_t := \mathbf{x}_t(k_t)$  is  $\leq \delta := 0.05$ . From Line 10 of Algorithm 4,

$$\mathbf{r}(t+1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } \frac{1+\delta_t}{2}, \\ -1 & \text{with probability } \frac{1-\delta_t}{2}. \end{cases}$$



---

**Algorithm 5** Sampling in Spencer's Setting when  $n \leq C \cdot m$ 


---

**Input:**  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$ ,  $\rho = 1/\sqrt{2n}$ ,  $\theta = 5 \cdot 10^{-7}$ ,  $\eta = 0.1$ ,  $\gamma = 0.0001$ ,  $\delta = 0.05$  and  $T = 0.9n$ .

**Random seed**  $\mathbf{r} \in \{\pm 1\}^T$  will be generated on the fly.

**Output:**  $\mathbf{x}_T \in [-1, 1]^n$ .

```

1: function SAMPLINGSPENCER( $\mathbf{r}$ )
2:    $\mathbf{x}_0 = \vec{0}$ .
3:    $w_i^{(0)} \leftarrow n/m$  for  $i \in [m]$ .
4:   for  $t = 0$  to  $T - 1$  do
5:      $\mathcal{F}_t \leftarrow \{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}_t(i)| = 1\}$ .
6:      $\mathcal{D}_t \leftarrow \{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}_t(i)| > 1 - \eta\}$ .
7:     Let  $I^{(t)} \subset [m]$  be the set of heavy constraints whose weights  $w_i^{(t)}$  are the largest  $\theta \cdot n$ 
      ones.
8:      $U_1^{(t)} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{[n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t} : \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{A}(i, [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t) \rangle = 0 \text{ for } i \in I^{(t)}\}$ 
9:      $U_2^{(t)} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{[n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t}$  be the linear subspace of  $\text{span}\{\phi_j : \theta n \leq j \leq n\}$  where  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$  are
      eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{M}^{(t)} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \mathbf{A}(i, [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t) \cdot \mathbf{A}(i, [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t)^\top$  whose eigen-decomposition is
       $\sum_j \mu_j \cdot \phi_j \cdot \phi_j^\top$  with  $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_n$ .
10:     $U_3^{(t)} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{[n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t} \mid \langle \mathbf{u}, \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \mathbf{A}(i, [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t) \rangle = 0\}$ .
11:     $H_t \leftarrow U_1^{(t)} \cap U_2^{(t)} \cap U_3^{(t)} \cap (\text{dual space of } \mathbf{x}_t \text{ in } R^{[n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t})$ .
12:    Compute the leverage scores  $\tau_i(H_t)$  for each  $i \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$ .
13:    Find the first coordinate  $k_t \notin \mathcal{D}_t$  such that  $\tau_{k_t}(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma$  and  $|\mathbf{x}_t(k_t)| \leq \delta$  — return  $\perp$ 
      if such a coordinate does not exist
14:    Let  $\mathbf{u}_t$  be the vector  $\mathbf{u}_t(k_t) = 1$  and  $\|\mathbf{u}_t\|_2^2 = 1/\tau_i$  (see Algorithm 1 for details).
15:    For  $\delta_t := \mathbf{x}_t(k_t)$ , randomly set  $\mathbf{r}(t+1) = 1$  with probability  $\frac{1+\delta_t}{2}$  and  $\mathbf{r}(t+1) = -1$  with
      probability  $\frac{1-\delta_t}{2}$ .
16:    Choose  $\alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_t + \alpha_t \mathbf{u}_t$  satisfies  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(k_t) = \mathbf{r}(t+1)$ .
17:     $w_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_i^{(t)} \cdot \exp[\rho \cdot \langle \alpha_t \mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \rangle] \cdot \exp[-2/(\theta n)]$ .
18:  end for
19:  return  $\mathbf{x}_T$ .
20: end function

```

---

So for any  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ ,  $\Pr[\mathbf{x} = \epsilon] \leq (\frac{1+\delta}{2})^T \leq 0.525^{0.9n}$ . When  $n \geq C^* \cdot m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[\mathbf{x} = \epsilon] &= \Pr[\mathbf{x} = \epsilon \wedge \exists \text{ one call of COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING succeeds}] \\
&\quad + \Pr[\mathbf{x} = \epsilon \wedge \text{All calls of COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING} = \perp] \\
&\leq 0.525^{0.9n} / (1 - 0.01) + 0.01^n \\
&\leq O(1.9^{-0.9n}).
\end{aligned}$$

When  $n \leq C^* \cdot m$ , we run Function SAMPLINGSPENCER. By the same argument above,  $\Pr[\mathbf{x} = \epsilon] \leq O(1.9^{-0.9n})$  holds as well. □

### 5.1 Proof of Lemma 5.3

Before proving Lemma 5.3, we state some basic properties of COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING. The proof of Lemma 5.5 is deferred to the end of this section.

**Lemma 5.5.** *The  $t$ -loop in Function COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING satisfies that with probability  $1 - e^{-\Omega(n^{0.4})}$  over  $\mathbf{r}$ , for each  $t \in [0, T - 1]$ ,*

1.  $\exists k_t \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$  satisfying  $|\mathbf{x}_t(k_t)| \leq \delta$  and  $\tau_{k_t}(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma$ .
2. After updating  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \in [-1, 1]^n$  and  $|\mathcal{F}_{t+1}| = t + 1$ .
3. After updating  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ ,  $\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_t(i)|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}$ .
4. After updating  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ ,  $|\mathcal{D}_{t+1}| \leq 1.000124(t + 1) + O(n^{0.7})$ .

In fact, one could show that 99% coordinates in  $[n] \setminus \mathcal{F}_t$  could be chosen as the coordinate  $k_t$  after rescaling those parameters. To show this, we reset  $C^*$  to be large enough and  $\gamma$  to be small enough such that  $1 - 10^{-3}$  fraction of coordinates has  $\tau_j(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma$ . Lemma 5.5 implies that the main term of  $\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_t(i)|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}$  is  $\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot t$  independent with  $\delta$ . It means that  $1 - 10^{-3}$  fraction of coordinates also satisfy  $|\mathbf{x}_t(i)| \leq \delta$ . A union bound shows 99% coordinates in  $[n] \setminus \mathcal{F}_t$  could be chosen as the entry  $k_t$ .

Then we can finish the proof of Lemma 5.3.

*Proof of Lemma 5.3.* By a union bound over Lemma 5.5, Function COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING outputs  $\perp$  with probability less than  $T \cdot e^{-\Omega(n^{0.4})} < 0.01$ . Assuming Function COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING doesn't output  $\perp$  in the following argument. Lemma 5.5 shows that the partial coloring  $\mathbf{x}_T \in [-1, 1]^n$ . Denote  $\{\mathbf{A}(j, [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t) : j \in [m]\}$  by  $G_t$ . Because in COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING the update  $\mathbf{u}_t$  is orthogonal to  $G_t$  for any  $t \in [T - 1]$ , we have  $\|\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}_T\|_\infty = 0$

For two different random seeds  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $\mathbf{r}'$ , we only need to show that there is an entry  $i \in [n]$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_T := \text{COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{x}'_T := \text{COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING}(\mathbf{r}')$  are in  $\{\pm 1\}$  different on entry  $i$ . We consider the first entry  $j \in [T]$  such that  $\mathbf{r}(j) \neq \mathbf{r}'(j)$ . Since  $\mathbf{r}([j - 1]) = \mathbf{r}'([j - 1])$ , the first  $j$  indices chosen in  $\text{COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\text{COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING}(\mathbf{r}')$  are the same, say  $k_0, \dots, k_{j-1}$ . From Algorithm 4,  $\mathbf{x}_T(k_{j-1}) = \mathbf{r}(j)$  and  $\mathbf{x}'_T(k_{j-1}) = \mathbf{r}'(j)$ . Moreover, those entries are fixed after moment  $j$ . Thus  $\mathbf{x}_T \neq \mathbf{x}'_T$ .  $\square$

In the rest of this section, we finish the proof of Lemma 5.5. The plan is to apply induction on  $t$ . The most technical part is a martingale concentration for Property 3 of Lemma 5.5, whose proof is deferred to the end of this section.

**Lemma 5.6** (Martingale). *If Lemma 5.5 holds up to  $(t - 1)$ -loop, then  $\|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \cdot t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}$  holds with probability  $1 - e^{-\Omega(n^{0.4})}$ . Since  $|\mathcal{F}_t| = t$ , this is equivalent to*

$$\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_t(i)|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}. \quad (8)$$

Then we apply induction to prove the rest 3 properties.

**Base case:** For  $t = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \vec{0}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_0 = \emptyset$ . The existence of such  $k_0$  and  $\mathbf{u}_0$  is direct.

**Hypothesis:** Lemma 5.5 holds up to  $(t - 1)$ , where  $0 \leq t - 1 \leq T - 1$ .

**Induction step:** Consider the  $t$ -loop. We prove Property 1 by showing the following fact: let  $\mathcal{E} := \{j \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t : \tau_j(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma\}$  and  $\mathcal{Q} := \{\ell \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{F}_t : |\mathbf{x}_t(\ell)| \leq \delta\}$ , and we have  $|\mathcal{E}|/(n - |\mathcal{D}_t|) \geq 0.51$  and  $|\mathcal{Q}|/(n - |\mathcal{F}_t|) \geq 0.51$  respectively.

We show  $|\mathcal{E}|/(n - |\mathcal{D}_t|) \geq 0.51$  by contradiction. Notice that

$$\frac{\sum_{j \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t} \tau_j}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} = \frac{\dim(H_t)}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} = \frac{n - |\mathcal{D}_t| - 1 - |G_t|}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} \geq 1 - \frac{m+1}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} \geq 1 - 0.49 \cdot \gamma. \quad (9)$$

Assume  $|\mathcal{E}| < 0.51 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{D}_t|)$ , we have

$$\sum_{j \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t} \tau_j < 0.51 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{D}_t|) + 0.49 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{D}_t|)(1 - \gamma) < (1 - 0.49 \cdot \gamma) \cdot (n - |\mathcal{D}_t|).$$

Since  $\tau_j(H_t)$  is always  $\in [0, 1]$ . It's contradicted with inequality (9).

Then we show  $|\mathcal{Q}|/(n - |\mathcal{F}_t|) \geq 0.51$  by contradiction as well. We could verify the following inequality by chosen parameters.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7} &\leq 0.49 \cdot \delta^2 \cdot (n - t) & (10) \\ \iff \left( \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} + 0.49 \cdot \delta^2 \right) \cdot t &\leq 0.49 \cdot \delta^2 \cdot n - 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}, \\ \iff 0.00133 \cdot t &\leq 0.00125 \cdot n - 0.4 \cdot n^{0.7}, & (\text{plug } \delta = 0.05 \text{ and } \gamma = 0.0001.) \\ \iff 0 &\leq 2.5 \cdot 10^{-5} \cdot n - 0.4 \cdot n^{0.7}. & (n \text{ is large enough and } t < 0.9n.) \end{aligned}$$

Combining inequality (8) and (10), we have

$$\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_t(i)|^2 \leq 0.49 \cdot \delta^2 \cdot (n - t). \quad (11)$$

Assume  $|\mathcal{Q}| < 0.51 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{F}_t|)$ . For  $|\mathcal{F}_t| = t$  and  $|\mathbf{x}_t(i)| \geq 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_t(i)|^2 > 0 \cdot 0.51 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{F}_t|) + \delta^2 \cdot 0.49 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{F}_t|) = \delta^2 \cdot 0.49 \cdot (n - t),$$

which is contradicted with inequality (11). For  $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{D}_t$ , we have  $|\mathcal{Q}|/(n - |\mathcal{D}_t|) \geq |\mathcal{Q}|/(n - |\mathcal{F}_t|) \geq 0.51$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{Q}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$ , both of them belong to  $[n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$ . Since  $|\mathcal{Q}|/(n - |\mathcal{D}_t|) \geq 0.51$  and  $|\mathcal{E}|/(n - |\mathcal{D}_t|) \geq 0.51$ , there must exist some coordinate  $k_t \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$  satisfying  $k_t \in \mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{E}$ .

Next, we show that Property 2 holds for the induction hypothesis on  $t$ . For any  $j \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$  and  $j \neq k_t$ ,  $\frac{|\alpha_t \cdot \mathbf{u}_t(j)|}{|\alpha_t \cdot \mathbf{u}_t(k_t)|} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}}$  which implies

$$|\alpha_t \cdot \mathbf{u}_t(j)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}} \cdot (1 + \delta) \leq 0.01 < \eta.$$

Because  $|\mathbf{x}_t(j)| < 1 - \eta$ ,  $|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(j)| < 1$ . By the definition of  $\alpha_t$ ,  $|\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(k_t)| = 1$ . For any  $h \in \mathcal{D}_t$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_t(h)$  will not be changed after time  $t$ . So  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \in [-1, 1]^n$  and  $|\mathcal{F}_{t+1}| = t + 1$ .

Finally we show Property 4 for the induction hypothesis of  $t$ . By lemma 5.6, with probability  $1 - e^{-\Omega(n^{0.4})}$ ,

$$\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_{t+1}} |\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(i)|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot (t+1) + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}.$$

Therefore we have

$$|\mathcal{D}_{t+1}| \leq t + 1 + \frac{\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_{t+1}} |\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(i)|^2}{(1 - \eta)^2} \leq 1.000124 \cdot (t + 1) + O(n^{0.7}).$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.6.* For any  $0 \leq j \leq t$ , let  $A_j = \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_j} |\mathbf{x}_j(i)|^2$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_j$  denote the filtration that consists of  $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_j\}$ . Notice that

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{j+1} | \mathcal{Y}_j] = A_j + \mathbb{E}[A_{j+1} - A_j | \mathcal{Y}_j] \quad (12)$$

$$= A_j + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_{j+1}} |\mathbf{x}_{j+1}(i)|^2 - \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_j} |\mathbf{x}_j(i)|^2 \middle| \mathcal{Y}_j \right] \quad (13)$$

$$= A_j + \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}_{j+1}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{x}_j\|_2^2 - 1 | \mathcal{Y}_j] \quad (14)$$

$$= A_j + \mathbb{E} [\alpha_{j+1}^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_{j+1}\|_2^2 - 1 | \mathcal{Y}_j] \quad (15)$$

$$= A_j + \sum_{s=1}^{j+1} \mathbb{E} [\alpha_s^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_s\|_2^2 - 1 | \mathcal{Y}_{s-1}] - \sum_{s=1}^j \mathbb{E} [\alpha_s^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_s\|_2^2 - 1 | \mathcal{Y}_{s-1}]. \quad (16)$$

Let  $M_j = A_j - \sum_{s=1}^j \mathbb{E} [\alpha_s^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_s\|_2^2 - 1 | \mathcal{Y}_{s-1}]$ , by equation (16) we have

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{j+1} | \mathcal{Y}_j] = M_j,$$

which means  $\{M_j\}_{j \geq 0}$  is a martingale. By the definition of  $\mathbf{r}(j+1)$  and  $\alpha_{j+1}$ ,  $\alpha_{j+1} \leq 1 + |\delta_{j+1}|$  and

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha_{j+1}^2 | \mathcal{Y}_j] = (1 - \delta_{j+1})^2 \cdot \frac{1 + \delta_{j+1}}{2} + (1 + \delta_{j+1})^2 \cdot \frac{1 - \delta_{j+1}}{2} = 1 - \delta_{j+1}^2.$$

Besides,  $\|\mathbf{u}_{j+1}\|_2^2 \leq 1 + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{j+1}$  is determined by  $\mathcal{Y}_j$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |M_{j+1} - M_j| &= \left| \alpha_{j+1}^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_{j+1}\|_2^2 - 1 - \mathbb{E} [\alpha_{j+1}^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_{j+1}\|_2^2 - 1 | \mathcal{Y}_j] \right| \\ &\leq (1 + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}) ((1 + |\delta_{j+1}|)^2 - (1 - \delta_{j+1}^2)), \\ &\leq 8\delta. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds for  $\gamma < 0.1$  and  $|\delta_{t+1}| \leq \delta < 1$ . Therefore by the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality [MU17], we have

$$\Pr[|M_t| \geq \mu] \leq 2 \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-\mu^2}{(8\delta)^2 \cdot t}\right).$$

Setting  $\mu = 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}$ , we can conclude that for any  $0 \leq t \leq 0.9n - 1$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \cdot e^{-n^{0.4}}$ ,

$$|M_t| \leq 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}. \quad (17)$$

Besides, for any  $1 \leq s \leq 0.9n - 1$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_s^2 | \mathcal{Y}_{s-1}] = (1 - \delta_s^2) \leq 1$  and  $\|\mathbf{u}_s\|_2^2 \leq 1 + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}$ ,

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E} [\alpha_s^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_s\|_2^2 - 1 | \mathcal{Y}_{s-1}] \leq (1 + \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}) \cdot t - t = \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} t. \quad (18)$$

Because  $\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_j(i)|^2 \geq 0$ , we only care about the upper bound. Combining inequality (17) and (18), we can conclude that with probability at least  $1 - 2 \cdot e^{-n^{0.4}}$ ,

$$\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_j(i)|^2 = A_t = M_t + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E} [\alpha_s^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_s\|_2^2 - 1 | \mathcal{Y}_{s-1}] \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}. \quad (19)$$

Because  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_t(i)|^2 = t$ ,  $\|\mathbf{x}_t\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} \cdot t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}$ . □

## 5.2 Proof of Lemma 5.4

The proof of Lemma 5.4 contains two parts. First we show that Algorithm 5 could find  $k_t$  with high probability for all the  $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ . Thus we could get the partial coloring  $\mathbf{x}_T$  with  $|\{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}_T(i)| = 1\}| = 0.9n$ . By the same argument in Lemma 5.3, for different random seeds  $\mathbf{r}$  and  $\mathbf{r}'$ , there is an entry  $i \in [n]$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_T := \text{SAMPLINGSPENCER}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\mathbf{x}'_T := \text{SAMPLINGSPENCER}(\mathbf{r}')$  are in  $\{\pm 1\}$  different on entry  $i$ . Secondly, we bound  $\langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_T \rangle$  for all the  $i \in [m]$ .

To prove the existence of  $k_t$ , analogue to the role of Lemma 5.5 in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we have Lemma 5.7 for the proof of Lemma 5.4.

**Lemma 5.7.** *The  $t$ -loop in Function SAMPLINGSPENCER satisfies that with probability  $1 - e^{-\Omega(n^{0.4})}$  over  $\mathbf{r}$ , for each  $t \in [0, T-1]$ ,*

1.  $\exists k_t \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$  satisfying  $|\mathbf{x}_t(k_t)| \leq \delta$  and  $\tau_{k_t}(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma$ .
2. After updating  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \in [-1, 1]^n$ .  $|\mathcal{F}_{t+1}| = t + 1$
3. After updating  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ ,  $\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_t(i)|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}$ .
4. After updating  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}$ ,  $|\mathcal{D}_{t+1}| \leq 1.000124(t+1) + O(n^{0.7})$ .

*Proof.* The main difference between SAMPLINGSPENCER and COLUMNREDUCTIONSAMPLING is the definition of  $H_t$ . The proof is partially omitted here since it is the same as that in Lemma 5.5. We apply induction on  $t$ .

**Base case:** When  $t = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_0 = \vec{0}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_0 = \emptyset$ , the existence of  $k_0$  and  $\mathbf{u}_0$  is straightforward.

**Hypothesis:** Lemma 5.7 holds up to  $t-1$  for  $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ .

**Induction step:** For the  $t$ -th loop, we prove Property 1 first. Let  $\mathcal{Q} = \{\ell \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t : |\mathbf{x}_t(\ell)| \leq \delta\}$  and  $\mathcal{E} = \{j \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t : \tau_j(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma\}$ . By the same argument in Lemma 5.5,  $|\mathcal{Q}| \geq 0.51 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{D}_t|)$ . To prove  $|\mathcal{E}| \geq 0.51 \cdot (n - |\mathcal{D}_t|)$ , we only need to show the following inequality:

$$\frac{\dim(H_t)}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} \geq 1 - 0.49\gamma. \quad (20)$$

By the definition of  $H_t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(H_t) &\geq n - |\mathcal{D}_t| - |I^{(t)}| - |\text{span}\{\phi_j : 1 \leq j < \theta n\}| - 2 \\ &\geq n - |\mathcal{D}_t| - 2\theta \cdot n - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\dim(H_t)}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} = \frac{n - |\mathcal{D}_t| - 2\theta \cdot n - 2}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} \geq 1 - \frac{2\theta \cdot n + 2}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|}.$$

By the induction hypothesis on  $t - 1$ ,

$$|\mathcal{D}_t| \leq 1.000124 \cdot t + O(n^{0.7}) \leq 0.91 \cdot n.$$

By the chosen parameters  $T = 0.9n$ ,  $\theta = 5 \cdot 10^{-7}$  and  $\gamma = 0.0001$ , we have

$$1 - \frac{2\theta \cdot n + 2}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} \geq 1 - 0.49\gamma$$

so that Inequality (20) holds. Consequently,  $|\mathcal{E}| \geq 0.51(n - |\mathcal{D}_t|)$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{E} \neq \emptyset$ , which infers the existence of  $k_{t+1}$ .

The proofs of other properties are the same as that of Lemma 5.5 and we omit them.  $\square$

By Lemma 5.7 and a union bound on  $T$  loops, we have proved that (1) Function SAMPLINGSPENCER can find the key coordinate  $k_t \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$  for all the  $T$  loops with probability  $1 - Te^{-\Omega(n^{0.4})} > 0.99$ . (2) When the  $T$ -th loop is over, we get  $\mathbf{x}_T \in [-1, 1]^n$  with  $|\{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}_T(i)| = 1\}| = 0.9n$ .

To finish the proof of Lemma 5.4, we bound  $\langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_T \rangle$  similar to the analysis in [LRR17]. For completeness, we provide the full proof here. Define

$$\Phi^{(t)} := \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)}$$

and let  $\mathbf{y}_t := \alpha_t \mathbf{u}_t$  in the rest of this section. We show that  $\Phi^t$  is non-increasing in the following claim.

**Claim 5.8.** For any  $t \in [0, T - 1]$ ,  $\Phi^{(t+1)} \leq \Phi^{(t)}$ .

*Proof.* By the line 17 of Algorithm 5,

$$\Phi^{(t+1)} = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t+1)} = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \exp[\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \rangle] \cdot \exp[-2/(\theta n)].$$

To control the factor  $\exp[\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \rangle]$ , we show that  $\langle \mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \rangle$  is bounded in the following. In our setting,  $|\mathbf{y}_t(k_t)| \leq 1 + \delta$  and  $|\mathbf{y}_t(k_t)|^2 / \|\mathbf{y}_t\|_2^2 \geq 1 - \gamma$ . Hence,  $\|\mathbf{y}_t\|_2 \leq \sqrt{(1 + \delta)^2 / (1 - \gamma)} \leq \sqrt{2}$ . Given  $\rho = 1/\sqrt{2n}$  and  $\|\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n}$ ,

$$\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \rangle \leq \rho \cdot \|\mathbf{y}_t\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)\|_2 \leq 1.$$

Because  $e^x \leq 1 + x + x^2$  for any  $x \in [-1, 1]$ , we have

$$\Phi^{(t+1)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \left[ 1 + \rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{y}_t \rangle + \rho^2 \cdot \langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{y}_t \rangle^2 \right] \cdot \exp[-2/(\theta n)].$$

Since  $\mathbf{y}_t \in U_3^{(t)}$  guarantees  $\left\langle \mathbf{y}_t, \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \right\rangle = 0$ ,

$$\Phi^{(t+1)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \exp[-2/(\theta n)] + \rho^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{y}_t \rangle^2. \quad (21)$$

In the Inequality (21),

$$\sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{y}_t \rangle^2 = \mathbf{y}_t^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)^\top \right) \mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{y}_t^T \mathbf{M}^{(t)} \mathbf{y}_t, \quad (22)$$

where  $\mathbf{M}^{(t)} := \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)^\top$ . Notice that the sum of eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{M}^{(t)}$  is at most  $\sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \|\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)\|_2^2$ . For  $\mathbf{y}_t \in U_2^{(t)}$ , the largest  $\theta n$  eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{M}^{(t)}$  are excluded so that none of the remaining eigenvalues is greater than  $\frac{1}{\theta n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \|\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)\|_2^2$ . Consequently,

$$\mathbf{y}_t^\top \mathbf{M}^{(t)} \mathbf{y}_t \leq \frac{1}{\theta n} \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)\|_2^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{y}_t\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{\theta} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \quad (23)$$

for  $\|\mathbf{y}_t\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2}$  and  $\|\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)\|_2^2 \leq n$ . And for sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $\exp[-2/(\theta n)] \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\theta n}$ . Combining Inequality (21), (22) and (23), we have

$$\Phi^{(t+1)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m w_i^{(t)} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\theta n} + \frac{1}{\theta n} \right) = \Phi^{(t)}.$$

□

**Claim 5.9.** For any  $i \in [m]$  and  $n \leq C \cdot m$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_T \rangle \leq \rho^{-1} [\ln(em/\theta n) + 2T/(\theta n)] = O(\sqrt{m})$ .

*Proof.* By the definition of  $w_i^{(t)}$ ,

$$w_i^{(t)} = \frac{n}{m} \cdot \exp[\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_t \rangle] \cdot \exp[-2t/(\theta n)].$$

After rearrangement,

$$\langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_T \rangle = \rho^{-1} \left[ \ln w_i^{(T)} + \ln \left( \frac{m}{n} \right) + 2T/(\theta n) \right]. \quad (24)$$

So we aim to bound  $\ln w_i^{(T)}$  next. Recall that  $I^{(t)}$  denotes the set of heavy constraints whose weights are the largest  $\theta \cdot n$  ones at iteration  $t$ . It's sufficient to bound  $w_i^{(T)}$  for all the  $i \in I^{(T)}$ . Let  $t^*$  be the last iteration when  $i \notin I^{(t^*)}$ . (Since initially all weights are equal, we can assume that  $i \notin I^{(0)}$ .) At the beginning of Algorithm 5,  $\Phi^{(0)} = m \cdot \frac{n}{m} = n$ . Markov's inequality and Claim 5.8 infer that  $w_i^{(t^*)} \leq \frac{1}{\theta n} \Phi^{(t^*)} \leq \frac{1}{\theta n} \Phi^{(0)} = \frac{1}{\theta}$ .

By the definition of  $U_1^{(t)}$ , for any  $t \geq t^* + 1$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_t$  is orthogonal to  $\mathbf{A}(i, \cdot)$  and  $\exp[\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \rangle] = 1$ . So after the  $(t^* + 1)$ -th iteration,  $w_i^{(t)}$  keeps decreasing. Because  $\exp(\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{y}_{t^*}, \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \rangle) \leq \exp(1/\sqrt{2n} \cdot \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{n}) \leq e$  and  $\exp[-2/(\theta n)] \leq 1$ , we have

$$w_i^{(t^*+1)} = w_i^{(t^*)} \cdot \exp[\rho \cdot \langle \mathbf{y}_{t^*}, \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot) \rangle] \cdot \exp[-2/(\theta n)] \leq e \cdot w_i^{(t^*)}.$$

Hence

$$w_i^{(T)} \leq w_i^{(t^*+1)} \leq e \cdot w_i^{(t^*)} \leq e/\theta. \quad (25)$$

By plugging Inequality (25) into Equation (24), we get the desired upper bound on  $\langle \mathbf{A}(i, \cdot), \mathbf{x}_T \rangle$ . □

## 6 Random sampling in Beck-Fiala's and Banaszczyk's settings

In this section, we discuss random sampling algorithms in Beck-Fiala's and Banaszczyk's settings. It is folklore that there are exponentially many good colorings satisfying these the Beck-Fiala bound and Banaszczyk's bound (see Appendix B). Hence it is natural to ask the same question of sampling as Spencer's setting.

**Beck-Fiala's setting.** In this setting, given the sparsity  $d$ , the input matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  will have each column of at most  $d$  non-zero entries. For simplicity, we refer to such a matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  as having degree  $d$ . Beck and Fiala [BF81] proved  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = O(d)$ , which is independent of  $n$  and  $m$ . Moreover, they conjectured the best bound is  $O(\sqrt{d})$ . However, the best known bounds for the Beck-Fiala problem are still  $O(d)$  [BF81] and  $O(\sqrt{d \log n})$  [Ban98]. We defer the discussion of  $O(\sqrt{d \log n})$  to the second half of this section. We summarize Beck and Fiala's bound as follows.

**Theorem 6.1** (Beck-Fiala [BF81]). *Given any  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  of degree  $d$  and any starting point  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in [-1, 1]^n$ , there exists an efficient algorithm to find  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $\mathbf{x}(i) = \mathbf{x}_0(i)$  for each  $\mathbf{x}_0(i) \in \{\pm 1\}$  and  $\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)\|_\infty = O(d)$ .*

Our main result here is a sampling algorithm whose output has discrepancy  $O(d)$  and min-entropy  $\Omega(n)$ . We present our random sampling algorithm in Algorithm 6.

**Theorem 6.2.** *For some constant  $C = O(1)$ , there exists an efficient sampling algorithm that satisfies the following two properties: for any input  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  of degree  $d$ ,*

1. *Its output  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  always satisfies  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq C \cdot d$ .*
2. *For any  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ ,  $\Pr[\text{SAMPLINGBECKFIALA} = \epsilon] = O(1.9^{-0.9n})$ .*

*Proof.* To control the probability of failing, we repeat Algorithm 6  $n$  times. If all the  $n$  repeats fail and output  $\perp$ , we directly apply Theorem 6.1 to get a coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ .

The primary distinction between Algorithm 6 and Algorithm 4 is the definition of  $H_t$ . We only need to ensure that

$$\frac{\sum_{j \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t} \tau_j}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} = \frac{\dim(H_t)}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} = 1 - \frac{1 + |G_t|}{n - |\mathcal{D}_t|} \geq 1 - 0.49 \cdot \gamma. \quad (26)$$

By the definition of  $G_t$ , we have  $|G_t| \leq \frac{d \cdot (n-t)}{C \cdot d/2}$ . By the chosen parameters of  $C$  and  $\gamma$ , we could verify Inequality (26) directly, like Inequality (9). The rest proof is the same as that of Lemma 5.3 and we omit it.

In fact, in every update  $t$ , we could pick 99% entries in  $[n] \setminus \mathcal{F}_t$  as the entry  $k_t$ . To show this, we reset  $C$  to be large enough and  $\gamma$  to be small enough such that  $1 - 10^{-3}$  fraction of coordinates has  $\tau_j(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma$ . Lemma 5.5 implies that the main term of  $\sum_{i \notin \mathcal{F}_t} |\mathbf{x}_t(i)|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot t + 8 \cdot \delta \cdot n^{0.7}$  is  $\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \cdot t$  independent with  $\delta$ . It means that  $1 - 10^{-3}$  fraction of coordinates also satisfy  $|\mathbf{x}_t(i)| \leq \delta$ . A union bound shows 99% coordinates in  $[n] \setminus \mathcal{F}_t$  could be chosen as the entry  $k_t$ .  $\square$

**Banaszczyk's setting** In Banaszczyk's setting, we investigate the discrepancy of  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$ , each column of which has  $\ell_2$ -norm at most 1. Rewrite the  $n$  columns of  $\mathbf{A}$  as vectors  $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in$



---

**Algorithm 6** Sampling Procedure for the Beck-Fiala setting
 

---

**Input:**  $\mathbf{A} \in [-1, 1]^{m \times n}$  of degree  $d$ ,  $\eta = 0.1$ ,  $T = 0.9n$ ,  $C = 41000$ ,  $\gamma = 0.0001$ ,  $\delta = 0.05$ .

**Random seed**  $\mathbf{r} \in \{\pm 1\}^T$  will be generated on the fly.

**Output:**  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ .

```

1: function SAMPLINGBECKFIALA
2:    $\mathbf{x}_0 = \vec{0}$ .
3:   for  $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$  do
4:      $\mathcal{F}_t \leftarrow \{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}_t(i)| = 1\}$ .
5:      $\mathcal{D}_t \leftarrow \{i \in [n] : |\mathbf{x}_t(i)| \geq 1 - \eta\}$ .
6:     Let  $G_t \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{[n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t}$  denote  $\left\{ \mathbf{A}(i, [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t) : i \in [m] \text{ with } \|\mathbf{A}(i, [n] \setminus \mathcal{F}_t)\|_0 > \frac{C \cdot d}{2} \right\}$  as the
       set of heavy constraints at moment  $t$ .
7:     Let  $H_t$  be the subspace in  $\mathbb{R}^{[n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t}$  orthogonal to  $\mathbf{x}_t([n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t)$  and  $G_t$ .
8:     Compute the leverage score  $\tau_i(H_t)$  of each  $i \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$ .
9:     Find the first coordinate  $k_t \notin \mathcal{D}_t$  such that  $\tau_{k_t}(H_t) \geq 1 - \gamma$  and  $|\mathbf{x}_t(k_t)| \leq \delta$  — return  $\perp$ 
       if such a coordinate does not exist.
10:     $\mathbf{u}_t \leftarrow \text{FINDVECTOR}(H_t, k_t)$  in Algorithm 1.
11:    For  $\delta_t := \mathbf{x}_t(k_t)$ , randomly set  $\mathbf{r}(t+1) = 1$  with probability  $\frac{1+\delta_t}{2}$  and  $\mathbf{r}(t+1) = -1$  with
       probability  $\frac{1-\delta_t}{2}$ .
12:    Choose  $\alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_t + \alpha_t \cdot \mathbf{u}_t$  satisfies  $\mathbf{x}_{t+1}(k_t) = \mathbf{r}(t+1)$ .
13:  end for
14:  Get  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  by applying Theorem 6.1 to color all entries of  $\mathbf{x}_T$  not in  $\{\pm 1\}$ .
15:  return  $\mathbf{x}$ .
16: end function

```

---

$\mathcal{R}^m$  with  $\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 \leq 1$  for all the  $i \in [n]$ . Our objective is to find a coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  to minimize  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty$ . The best bound to date is

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_\infty \leq O\left(\sqrt{\log \min\{n, m\}}\right),$$

established by Banaszczyk [Ban98]. A celebrated line of research has provided efficient algorithms for this bound including [BDG19, BDGL19, LRR17, BLV22].

We introduce a random sampling algorithm for Banaszczyk's setting in Algorithm 7. It is based on the random walk with Gaussian stationary distribution from [LSS22]. Our technical contribution is several monotone properties about this random walk whose stationary distribution is Gaussian. For completeness, we provide its full proof in Appendix D.

**Theorem 6.3.** *Given any  $\gamma > 0$ , for any  $n \geq \gamma \cdot m$ , vectors  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $\ell_2$ -norm at most 1, there exist  $e^{\Omega(n)}$  many colorings  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{\log m})$ . Algorithm 7 is an efficient algorithm and satisfies the following properties:*

1. Its output  $\mathbf{x}$  always has discrepancy  $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{\log m})$ .
2. The probability of outputting any string in  $\{\pm 1\}^n$  is at most  $\delta^n$  for some  $\delta < 1$ .

**Remark 6.4.** *While we did attempt to optimize those constants, there are a few remarks.*

1. There are sets of vectors whose number of colorings  $\mathbf{x}$  with  $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\log m}$  is at most  $2^{-\Omega(\frac{n}{\log n})} \cdot 2^n$ . For example, consider  $\frac{n}{\log n}$  groups of same vectors like  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \dots = \mathbf{v}_{\log n} = \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\frac{n}{\log n} - \log n + 1} = \dots = \mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{e}_{\frac{n}{\log n}}$ .

2. The argument in [BJM<sup>+</sup>22] provides another random sampling algorithm with a similar guarantee<sup>2</sup>. For completeness, we include it in Appendix C.
3. Theorem 6.3 provides an alternative random sampling algorithm with discrepancy  $O(\sqrt{d \log m})$  for the Beck-Fiala setting, if we scale the degree  $d$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  by a factor  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$ .

---

**Algorithm 7** Randomly Sample  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^m$  for Banaszczyk’s bound

---

**Input:**  $\gamma, \{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  where  $0 < \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 \leq 1 \forall i \in [n]$ .

**Output:**  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\{\pm 1\}^n$  and its discrepancy vector  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ .

- 1: **procedure** SAMPLINGBANASZCZYK
  - 2:   Resort  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$  such that  $\|\mathbf{v}_1\|_2 \geq \|\mathbf{v}_2\|_2 \geq \dots \geq \|\mathbf{v}_n\|_2$ .
  - 3:   Set  $\sigma \geq 1$  such that  $r_\sigma(\ell) < \frac{1}{6}e^{-\frac{24}{\gamma}}$  for all  $\ell \in [-0.5, 0.5]$  — see Section D.1 for the definition of  $r_\sigma(\ell)$  and its properties.
  - 4:   Sample  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \cdot I_m)$ .
  - 5:   **for**  $1 \leq i \leq n$  **do**
  - 6:      $\sigma' \leftarrow \sigma / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2$ .
  - 7:      $\ell_i \leftarrow \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2$ .
  - 8:      $\mathbf{y}(i) \leftarrow J_{\ell_i}^{\sigma'}$  (see Section D.1 for the definition).
  - 9:      $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1} + \mathbf{y}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$ .
  - 10:   **end for**
  - 11:   Let  $E = \{i | \mathbf{y}(i) = 0\}$  denote those empty entries in  $\mathbf{y}$ .
  - 12:   Apply Theorem C.1 to obtain  $\mathbf{z} \in \{\pm 1\}^E$  for vectors  $\{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i \in E}$ .
  - 13:   Output  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}(\overline{E}) \circ \mathbf{z}(E)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$ .
  - 14: **end procedure**
- 

## Acknowledgement

We thank the anonymous referee for the helpful comments on the previous version.

## References

- [ALS21] Ryan Alweiss, Yang P. Liu, and Mehtaab Sawhney. Discrepancy minimization via a self-balancing walk. In *STOC '21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 14–20. ACM, 2021.
- [And65] George E Andrews. A simple proof of jacobi’s triple product identity. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 16(2):333–334, 1965.
- [Ban98] Wojciech Banaszczyk. Balancing vectors and gaussian measures of n-dimensional convex bodies. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 12(4):351–360, jul 1998.
- [Ban10] Nikhil Bansal. Constructive algorithms for discrepancy minimization. In *51th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2010*, pages 3–10. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.

---

<sup>2</sup>Thanks the anonymous referee to suggest it.

- [Ban12] Wojciech Banaszczyk. On series of signed vectors and their rearrangements. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 40(3):301–316, 2012.
- [BDG19] Nikhil Bansal, Daniel Dadush, and Shashwat Garg. An algorithm for komlós conjecture matching banaszczyk’s bound. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 48(2):534–553, 2019.
- [BDGL19] Nikhil Bansal, Daniel Dadush, Shashwat Garg, and Shachar Lovett. The gram-schmidt walk: A cure for the banaszczyk blues. *Theory Comput.*, 15:1–27, 2019.
- [Bec81] József Beck. Roth’s estimate of the discrepancy of integer sequences is nearly sharp. *Combinatorica*, (1):319–325, 1981.
- [BF81] József Beck and Tibor Fiala. “integer-making” theorems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 3(1):1–8, 1981.
- [BG81] I. Bárány and V.S. Grinberg. On some combinatorial questions in finite-dimensional spaces. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 41:1–9, 1981.
- [BG17] Nikhil Bansal and Shashwat Garg. Algorithmic discrepancy beyond partial coloring. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017*, pages 914–926. ACM, 2017.
- [BJM<sup>+</sup>21] Nikhil Bansal, Haotian Jiang, Raghu Meka, Sahil Singla, and Makrand Sinha. Online discrepancy minimization for stochastic arrivals. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2842–2861. SIAM, 2021.
- [BJM<sup>+</sup>22] Nikhil Bansal, Haotian Jiang, Raghu Meka, Sahil Singla, and Makrand Sinha. Smoothed analysis of the komlós conjecture. In *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2022)*, 2022.
- [BJM23] Nikhil Bansal, Haotian Jiang, and Raghu Meka. Resolving matrix spencer conjecture up to poly-logarithmic rank. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023*, page 1814–1819. ACM, 2023.
- [BLV22] Nikhil Bansal, Aditi Laddha, and Santosh S. Vempala. A unified approach to discrepancy minimization. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2022*, volume 245 of *LIPICs*, pages 1:1–1:22. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [BRR23] Rainie Bozzai, Victor Reis, and Thomas Rothvoss. The vector balancing constant for zonotopes. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2023*, pages 1292–1300. IEEE, 2023.
- [BRS22] Nikhil Bansal, Lars Rohwedder, and Ola Svensson. Flow time scheduling and prefix beck-fiala. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 331–342, 2022.
- [Cha02] Bernard Chazelle. *The Discrepancy Method (Randomness and Complexity)*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [Chu48] Kai Lai Chung. On the maximum partial sums of sequences of independent random variables. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 64(2):205–233, 1948.

- [CP19] Xue Chen and Eric Price. Active regression via linear-sample sparsification. In *Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2019, 25-28 June 2019*, volume 99 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 663–695. PMLR, 2019.
- [DJR22] Daniel Dadush, Haotian Jiang, and Victor Reis. A new framework for matrix discrepancy: partial coloring bounds via mirror descent. In *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 649–658. ACM, 2022.
- [ES18] Ronen Eldan and Mohit Singh. Efficient algorithms for discrepancy minimization in convex sets. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 53(2):289–307, 2018.
- [Fis25] R.A. Fisher. *Statistical Methods for Research Workers*. Biological monographs and manuals. Oliver and Boyd, 1925.
- [Fis26] R. A. Fisher. The arrangement of field experiments. *Journal of the Ministry of Agriculture*, 33:503–515, 1926.
- [Glu89] E. D. Gluskin. Extremal Properties of Orthogonal Parallelepipeds and Their Applications to the Geometry of Banach Spaces. *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 64(1):85–96, February 1989.
- [HRS22] Samuel B. Hopkins, Prasad Raghavendra, and Abhishek Shetty. Matrix discrepancy from quantum communication. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2022, page 637–648. ACM, 2022.
- [HSSZ24] Christopher Harshaw, Fredrik Sävje, Daniel A. Spielman, and Peng Zhang. Balancing covariates in randomized experiments with the gram–schmidt walk design. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 0(0):1–13, 2024.
- [Kha67] C. G. Khatri. On certain inequalities for normal distributions and their applications to simultaneous confidence bounds. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 1853–1867, 1967.
- [KMV05] Jeong Han Kim, Jir’ Matousek, and Van H Vu. Discrepancy after adding a single set. *Combinatorica*, 25(4):499, 2005.
- [KRR24] Janardhan Kulkarni, Victor Reis, and Thomas Rothvoss. Optimal online discrepancy minimization. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2024, page 1832–1840. ACM, 2024.
- [Lév38] P Lévy. Théorie de l’addition des variables aléatoires. *Gauthier-Villars, Paris*, 1938.
- [LM12] Shachar Lovett and Raghu Meka. Constructive discrepancy minimization by walking on the edges. In *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012*, pages 61–67. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.
- [LRR17] Avi Levy, Harishchandra Ramadas, and Thomas Rothvoss. Deterministic discrepancy minimization via the multiplicative weight update method. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization - 19th International Conference, IPCO 2017, Proceedings*, volume 10328 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 380–391. Springer, 2017.
- [LSS22] Yang P. Liu, Ashwin Sah, and Mehtaab Sawhney. A gaussian fixed point random walk. In *13th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2022*, volume 215 of *LIPICs*, pages 101:1–101:10, 2022.

- [Mat09] Jiri Matousek. *Geometric Discrepancy: An Illustrated Guide*. Springer Science, 2009.
- [MNT20] Jiri Matousek, Aleksandar Nikolov, and Kunal Talwar. Factorization norms and hereditary discrepancy. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2020(10):751–780, 2020.
- [MSS15] Adam W. Marcus, Daniel A. Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. Interlacing families ii: Mixed characteristic polynomials and the kadison—singer problem. *Annals of Mathematics*, 182(1):327–350, 2015.
- [MU17] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and computing: Randomization and probabilistic techniques in algorithms and data analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2017.
- [NNN12] Alantha Newman, Ofer Neiman, and Aleksandar Nikolov. Beck’s three permutations conjecture: A counterexample and some consequences. In *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2012*, pages 253–262. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.
- [NTZ13] Aleksandar Nikolov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. The geometry of differential privacy: the sparse and approximate cases. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC’13*, pages 351–360. ACM, 2013.
- [PV23] Lucas Pesenti and Adrian Vladu. Discrepancy minimization via regularization. In Nikhil Bansal and Viswanath Nagarajan, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023*, pages 1734–1758. SIAM, 2023.
- [Rot17] Thomas Rothvoss. Constructive discrepancy minimization for convex sets. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 46(1):224–234, 2017.
- [Roy14] Thomas Royen. A simple proof of the gaussian correlation conjecture extended to multivariate gamma distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.1028*, 2014.
- [RR20] Victor Reis and Thomas Rothvoss. Linear size sparsifier and the geometry of the operator norm ball. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2020*, pages 2337–2348. SIAM, 2020.
- [RR23] Victor Reis and Thomas Rothvoss. Vector balancing in lebesgue spaces. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 62(3):667–688, 2023.
- [Sha93] Qi-Man Shao. A note on small ball probability of a gaussian process with stationary increments. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 6:595–602, 1993.
- [Šid67] Zbyněk Šidák. Rectangular confidence regions for the means of multivariate normal distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 62(318):626–633, 1967.
- [Spe77] Joel Spencer. Balancing games. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 23(1):68–74, 1977.
- [Spe85] Joel Spencer. Six standard deviations suffice. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 289(2):679–706, 1985.
- [Spe86] Joel Spencer. Balancing vectors in the max norm. *Combinatorica*, 6:55–65, 1986.

- [Stu38] Student. Comparison between balanced and random arrangements of field plots. *Biometrika*, 29(3/4):363–378, 1938.
- [Tal90] Michel Talagrand. Embedding subspaces of  $l_1$  into  $l_n$ . *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 108(2):363–369, 1990.
- [Ver20] Roman Vershynin. High-dimensional probability. *University of California, Irvine*, 10:11, 2020.
- [Woo14] David P. Woodruff. Sketching as a tool for numerical linear algebra. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 10(1–2):1–157, 2014.

## A Proof of Lemma 4.5

Actually, the proof still holds for the symmetric sub-Gaussian random variables (i.e. Bernoulli random variables supported on  $\{\pm 1\}$ ). But for simplicity, we consider the standard Gaussian random variable here.

For the case that  $n < \ell$ , we apply Lemma 3.1 directly.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[S_n^* \geq 4\sqrt{\ell}] &\leq 2 \Pr[S_n \geq 4\sqrt{\ell}] \\ &\leq 2 \frac{e^{-8\frac{\ell}{n}}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \cdot 4 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\ell}{n}}} \\ &\leq e^{-8\frac{\ell}{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[S_n^* < 4\sqrt{\ell}] &= 1 - \Pr[S_n^* \geq 4\sqrt{\ell}] \\ &\geq 1 - e^{-8\frac{\ell}{n}} \\ &\geq e^{-2 \ln 2 \cdot \frac{n}{\ell}}. \end{aligned} \quad (n < \ell)$$

For  $n \geq \ell$ , without loss of generality, assume  $n$  divide  $l$ . Then we divide  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  into  $\frac{n}{l}$  intervals. Interval  $i$  contains  $l$  random variables  $X_{(i-1)l+1}, \dots, X_{i \cdot l}$ . Let  $Z_i^* = \max_{1 \leq j \leq l} |\sum_{k=1}^j X_{(i-1)l+k}|$  denote the largest deviation of the prefix sum in interval  $i$ . Let  $Z_i = \sum_{j=1}^l X_{(i-1)l+j}$ . Thus  $Z_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{n}{l}$  are i.i.d. Gaussian random variables with distribution  $N(0, l)$ . Recall that  $S_l^* = \max_{1 \leq i \leq l} |\sum_{j=1}^i X_j|$  and  $S_l = \sum_{i=1}^l X_i$ . Thus  $Z_1^* = S_l^*$ .

For the  $i$ -interval, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Z_i^* \geq 2\sqrt{\ell}] &\leq 2 \Pr[|Z_i| \geq 2\sqrt{\ell}] && \text{(By Lemma 3.1)} \\ &\leq \frac{e^{-2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}. && \text{(By Claim 4.7)} \end{aligned}$$

This means  $\Pr[Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell}] \geq (1 - \frac{e^{-2}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}) > \frac{1}{2}$ . In the conditional distribution of  $Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell}$ , one useful property is that  $Z_i \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 2\sqrt{\ell})$  is symmetric such that

$$\Pr[0 \leq Z_i < 2\sqrt{\ell} | Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell}] = \Pr[-2\sqrt{\ell} < Z_i \leq 0 | Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell}] \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (27)$$

Similarly, in the conditional distribution of  $|S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} < 2\sqrt{\ell}|$ ,  $S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 2\sqrt{\ell})$  is symmetric such that

$$\Pr \left[ 0 \leq S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} < 2\sqrt{\ell} \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] = \Pr \left[ -2\sqrt{\ell} < S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \leq 0 \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (28)$$

Moreover,  $Z_i$  and  $Z_i^*$  are independent with  $S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}$ .

Then we consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[ |S_{i\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell} \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[ |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} + Z_i| < 2\sqrt{\ell} \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[ -2\sqrt{\ell} < S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} + Z_i < 2\sqrt{\ell} \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[ S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} + Z_i \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 2\sqrt{\ell}), S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 0] \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \\ &+ \Pr \left[ S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} + Z_i \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 2\sqrt{\ell}), S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \in (0, 2\sqrt{\ell}) \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the case  $-2\sqrt{\ell} < S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \leq 0$ ,  $[0, 2\sqrt{\ell}) \subset (-2\sqrt{\ell} - S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}, 2\sqrt{\ell} + S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell})$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[ S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} + Z_i \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 2\sqrt{\ell}), S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 0] \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \\ & \geq \Pr \left[ Z_i \in [0, 2\sqrt{\ell}), S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 0] \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[ Z_i \in [0, 2\sqrt{\ell}) \mid Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \cdot \Pr \left[ -2\sqrt{\ell} \leq S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \leq 0 \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \\ & \hspace{15em} (Z_i \text{ and } Z_i^* \text{ are independent with } S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}. \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}. \hspace{10em} (\text{By Equations(27) and (28)}) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\Pr \left[ S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} + Z_i \in (-2\sqrt{\ell}, 2\sqrt{\ell}), S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} \in (0, 2\sqrt{\ell}) \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Thus

$$\Pr \left[ |S_{i\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell} \mid |S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}, Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell} \right] \geq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (29)$$

Denote the event  $E_i = \{Z_i^* < 2\sqrt{\ell}\}$ ,  $F_i = \{|S_{i\cdot\ell}| < 2\sqrt{\ell}\}$ . Since  $Z_1 \leq Z_1^* = S_\ell^*$ , we have  $E_1 \subset F_1$ . Besides,  $E_i$  is independent with  $F_j$  for  $j < i$  and is independent with  $E_k$  for  $k \neq i$ . Notice that  $S_{i\cdot\ell} = S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell} + Z_i$ , which means  $S_{i\cdot\ell}$  only depends on  $S_{(i-1)\cdot\ell}, Z_i$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{\frac{n}{\ell}}, E_1, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{\ell}}] &= \left( \prod_{i=2}^{\frac{n}{\ell}} \Pr[F_i \mid F_{i-1}, E_i] \cdot \Pr[E_i] \right) \cdot \Pr[F_1, E_1] \\ &\geq \left( \frac{1}{4} \right)^{\frac{n}{\ell}-1} \Pr[E_1] \hspace{5em} (\text{Use Equation(29) and } E_1 \subset F_1) \\ &\geq \left( \frac{1}{4} \right)^{\frac{n}{\ell}}. \end{aligned}$$

If events  $\{E_i\}_{i \in [\frac{n}{\ell}]}$  and  $\{F_i\}_{i \in [\frac{n}{\ell}]}$  all happen, for any  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |S_t| &= |S_{\lfloor \frac{t}{\ell} \rfloor \cdot \ell} + \sum_{i=1}^{t - \lfloor \frac{t}{\ell} \rfloor \cdot \ell} X_{\lfloor \frac{t}{\ell} \rfloor \cdot \ell + i}| \\ &< |S_{\lfloor \frac{t}{\ell} \rfloor \cdot \ell}| + Z_{\lfloor \frac{t}{\ell} \rfloor \cdot \ell}^* \\ &< 2\sqrt{\ell} + 2\sqrt{\ell} = 4\sqrt{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\Pr[S_n^* < 4\sqrt{\ell}] \geq \Pr[F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{\frac{n}{\ell}}, E_1, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{\ell}}] \geq (\frac{1}{4})^{\frac{n}{\ell}} = e^{-2 \ln 2 \cdot \frac{n}{\ell}}$ .

## B Counting Argument from [KMV05]

We show that there are exponentially many solutions in the Beck-Fiala setting and the Banaszczyk setting based on a Shannon-entropy argument of [KMV05].

**Theorem B.1.** *Given any matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , if its any submatrix  $\mathbf{A}'$  constituted by a subset of columns in  $\mathbf{A}$  has discrepancy at most  $h$ , then there are at least  $2^{0.5n}$  colorings  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq 2h$ .*

In particular, this implies that there are exponentially many solutions in the Spencer's setting, the Beck-Fiala setting, and the Banaszczyk's setting.

*Proof.* Consider a random set  $E \subset [n]$  and split the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  into two submatrices by partition its columns into  $\mathbf{A}_E$  and  $\mathbf{A}_{[n] \setminus E}$ . Let  $\mathbf{y}_E$  be the coloring of  $E$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{A}_E \cdot \mathbf{y}_E\|_\infty \leq h$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{[n] \setminus E}$  be the counterpart of  $\mathbf{A}_{[n] \setminus E}$  with discrepancy at most  $h$ . Now we define two colorings based on the two sub-colorings  $\mathbf{y}_E$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{[n] \setminus E}$  as

$$\mathbf{x}'_E(i) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{y}_E(i) & i \in E \\ \mathbf{y}_{[n] \setminus E}(i) & i \in [n] \setminus E \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}''_E(i) = \begin{cases} -\mathbf{y}_E(i) & i \in E \\ \mathbf{y}_{[n] \setminus E}(i) & i \in [n] \setminus E \end{cases}$$

Thus both  $\mathbf{x}'_E$  and  $\mathbf{x}''_E$  have discrepancy at most  $2h$ . Given a subset  $E \in [n]$ , we call  $(\mathbf{x}'_E, \mathbf{x}''_E)$  a pair of colors encoded by  $E$ .

We first prove all the pairs are different. For any two different subsets  $E \in 2^{[n]}$  and  $Q \in 2^{[n]}$ , we have  $E \cap ([n] \setminus Q) \neq \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\exists i \in E \cap ([n] \setminus Q)$  so that  $\mathbf{x}'_Q(i) = \mathbf{x}''_Q(i)$  but  $\mathbf{x}'_E(i) \neq \mathbf{x}''_E(i)$ . Because there are  $2^n$  different choices of  $E$ , we get  $2^n$  different pairs.

Since these pairs are distinct, the Shannon entropy of the pair  $(\mathbf{x}'_E, \mathbf{x}''_E)$  for a uniform random subset  $E$  in  $[n]$  is  $n$ . By the sub-additivity of Shannon entropy either the entropy of  $\mathbf{x}'_E$  or the entropy of  $\mathbf{x}''_E$  is at least  $0.5n$ . If  $H(\mathbf{x}'_E) \geq 0.5n$ , this implies that there are  $2^{0.5n}$  colorings with discrepancy  $2h$ . □

**Remark B.2.** *This argument also provides a random sampling algorithm whose output has the Shannon entropy at least  $0.5n$  by outputting one of  $\{\mathbf{x}'_E, \mathbf{x}''_E\}$  with probability half for a uniformly random  $E \subset [n]$ .*

*However, our algorithm has a stronger guarantee of a min-entropy  $0.9n$  such that each coloring will appear with an exponential small probability. On the other hand, for the Shannon entropy, it is possible that this sampling algorithm will output a fixed coloring with probability  $0.9$ ; but its output still has the Shannon-entropy  $\geq 0.5n$ .*



## C Random Sampling in Banaszczyk's setting via sub-Gaussian argument

In this section, we show a random sampling algorithm for Banaszczyk's bound based on the discrepancy algorithm of [BDGL19] and the idea of matrix stacking from [BJM<sup>+</sup>22]. To simplify the presentation, we always use  $\mathbf{v}_j$  for  $j \in [n]$  to denote column  $j$  in  $\mathbf{A}$  such that the goal is equivalent to  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \|\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{x}(j) \cdot \mathbf{v}_j\|_\infty$  for the Komlós problem.

For convenience, we call a random vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$   $\lambda$ -subgaussian, if it satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle)] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\lambda^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2}{2}\right)$  for every  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . One useful property of  $\lambda$ -subgaussian vectors is that for any *unit vector*  $\mathbf{v}$  and any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\Pr[\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq t] \leq 2 \cdot e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\lambda^2}}. \quad (30)$$

This is obtained by setting  $\mathbf{u} = \frac{t}{\lambda^2} \cdot \mathbf{v}$  and apply Markov's inequality to  $\Pr[\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq t^2/\lambda^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \rangle)]/e^{t^2/\lambda^2}$  and vice versa for  $\mathbf{u} = -\frac{t}{\lambda^2} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ .

We restate the guarantee of the Gram-Schmidt walk algorithm [BDGL19]. We remark that the original subgaussian constant is  $\sqrt{40}$  in [BDGL19] but a tighter constant 1 is obtained in Theorem 6.6 of [HSSZ24].

**Theorem C.1.** *Given a matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  whose columns have  $\ell_2$  norm at most 1, the Gram-Schmidt walk algorithm outputs a random coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}$  is 1-subgaussian.*

*In particular, its output  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  satisfies  $\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{\log \min\{m, n\}})$  with high probability.*

The sampling algorithm applies the matrix stacking technique [BJM<sup>+</sup>22] as follows: Let  $\mathbf{A}' = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{I}_n \end{pmatrix}$  be the stack matrix of the input  $\mathbf{A}$  with the identity matrix  $\mathbf{I}_n$ . Then let the output be the output of the Gram-Schmidt walk algorithm with input  $\mathbf{A}'$ .

Now we prove its correctness.

**Theorem C.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  be the output of the Gram-Schmidt walk algorithm on the stacked matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{I}_n \end{pmatrix}$ . For any vector  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ , we have*

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{x}}[\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2 \cdot e^{-n/8}.$$

and with probability  $1 - m^{-\Omega(1)}$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq O\left(\sqrt{\log m}\right).$$

*Proof.* Because the column of the stacked matrix has  $\ell_2$  norm at most  $\sqrt{2}$ , by Lemma C.1 the discrepancy vector  $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{I}_n \end{pmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}$  is  $\sqrt{2}$ -subgaussian. By the definition of sub-Gaussian, the two subvectors  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}$  are  $\sqrt{2}$ -subgaussian. So for any unit vector  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{R}^n$ ,

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{x}}[|\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle| \geq t] \leq 2 \cdot e^{-t^2/8},$$

and for any unit vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{R}^m$ ,

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{x}}[|\langle \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} \rangle| \geq t] \leq 2 \cdot e^{-t^2/8}.$$

Then,  $\Pr_{\mathbf{x}}[\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = \mathbf{x}] \leq \Pr_{\mathbf{x}}[|\langle \mathbf{x}, \frac{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_2} \rangle| \geq \sqrt{n}] \leq 2 \cdot e^{-n/8}$ . The second conclusion holds by a union bound over the canonical basis with  $t = O(\sqrt{\log m})$ .  $\square$

## D Random Sampling in Banaszczyk's setting

We prove Theorem 6.3 in this section. It extends the fixed point Gaussian random walk algorithm in [LSS22] to show (1) the existence of exponentially many vectors satisfying Banaszczyk's bound and (2) an efficient algorithm to sample a random good vector when  $n = \Omega(m)$ . For ease of reading, we restate the theorem and algorithm in Theorem D.1 and Algorithm 8.

**Theorem D.1.** *Given any  $\gamma > 0$ , for any  $n \geq \gamma \cdot m$  vectors  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $\ell_2$ -norm at most 1, there exist  $e^{\Omega(n)}$  many colorings  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that  $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{\log m})$ . Moreover, there exists an efficient algorithm that guarantees:*

1. Its output  $\mathbf{x}$  always has discrepancy  $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{\log m})$ .
2. The probability of outputting any string in  $\{\pm 1\}^n$  is at most  $\delta^n$  for some  $\delta < 1$ .

Algorithm 8 uses  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$  to denote the discrepancy vector of the first  $i$  vectors, i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i = \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbf{x}(j) \mathbf{v}_j$ . The key ingredient of Algorithm 8 is the random walk  $J_\ell^\sigma$  over  $\mathbb{R}$  introduced in [LSS22], whose steps are  $\{\pm 1\}$  mostly and stationary distribution is  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ . We give a full description in Section D.1. Our main technical contribution here is to prove several monotonicity of this random walk on its parameters  $\sigma$  and  $\ell$  — see Lemma D.6 in Section D.1.

---

**Algorithm 8** Randomly Sample  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^m$  for Banaszczyk's bound

---

**Input:**  $\gamma, \{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  where  $0 < \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 \leq 1 \forall i \in [n]$ .

**Output:**  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\{\pm 1\}^n$  and its discrepancy vector  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ .

- 1: **procedure** SAMPLINGBANASZCZYK
  - 2:   Resort  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$  such that  $\|\mathbf{v}_1\|_2 \geq \|\mathbf{v}_2\|_2 \geq \dots \geq \|\mathbf{v}_n\|_2$ .
  - 3:   Set  $\sigma \geq 1$  such that  $r_\sigma(\ell) < \frac{1}{6}e^{-\frac{24}{\gamma}}$  for all  $\ell \in [-0.5, 0.5]$  — see Section D.1 for the definition of  $r_\sigma(\ell)$  and its properties.
  - 4:   Sample  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \cdot I_m)$ .
  - 5:   **for**  $1 \leq i \leq n$  **do**
  - 6:      $\sigma' \leftarrow \sigma / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2$ .
  - 7:      $\ell_i \leftarrow \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2$ .
  - 8:      $\mathbf{y}(i) \leftarrow J_{\ell_i}^{\sigma'}$  (see Section D.1 for the definition).
  - 9:      $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1} + \mathbf{y}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$ .
  - 10:   **end for**
  - 11:   Let  $E = \{i | \mathbf{y}(i) = 0\}$  denote those empty entries in  $\mathbf{y}$ .
  - 12:   Apply Theorem C.1 to obtain  $\mathbf{z} \in \{\pm 1\}^E$  for vectors  $\{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i \in E}$ .
  - 13:   Output  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}(\overline{E}) \circ \mathbf{z}(E)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$ .
  - 14: **end procedure**
- 

In the rest of this section, we analyze Algorithm 8 and finish the proof of Theorem D.1. Let  $\boldsymbol{\omega}' := \boldsymbol{\omega}_n - \boldsymbol{\omega}_0$  denote the discrepancy vector generated by  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}'' := \sum_{i \in E} \mathbf{z}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$  such that the discrepancy  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_\infty \leq \|\boldsymbol{\omega}'\|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{\omega}''\|_\infty$ . Then we only need to bound  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}'\|_\infty$  and  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}''\|_\infty$  separately. We state the main result in [LSS22] to bound  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}'\|_\infty$ .

**Theorem D.2** ([LSS22]). *In Algorithm 8,  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \cdot I_m)$  for all  $i \in [n]$ .*

Theorem D.2 implies that  $\boldsymbol{\omega}' = \sum_i \mathbf{y}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i = \boldsymbol{\omega}_n - \boldsymbol{\omega}_0$  fails to satisfy  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}'\|_\infty = O(\sigma \cdot \sqrt{\log m})$  with probability  $m^{-1}$ . To control the failing probability, the algorithm of Theorem D.1 will repeat

Procedure SAMPLINGBANASZCZYK for  $n$  times and verify  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}'\|_\infty = O(\sigma \cdot \sqrt{\log m})$  each time until it succeeds. If all  $n$  calls failed, the algorithm returns a fixed solution from Theorem C.1.

To show that there are exponentially many good colorings, we use the following lemma to prove that the for-loop in Algorithm 8 outputs any fixed string in  $\{0, \pm 1\}^n$  with an exponentially small probability. Since the success probability is  $1 - m^{-1}$ , after proving Algorithm 8 outputting any coloring with exponentially small probability  $c^n$  for some  $c < 1$ , we have the number of good colorings is at least  $(1 - m^{-1})c^{-n}$ .

**Lemma D.3.** *For any  $\gamma > 0$ , let  $\sigma$  be defined in Line 3 of Algorithm 8. Then there exist  $\alpha < 1$  and  $\beta < 1$  such that for any  $t \leq n$  and any sequence  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \in \{0, \pm 1\}^t$ ,  $(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_t)$  generated by Algorithm 8 satisfies*

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{y}}[\mathbf{y}(1) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(t) | \boldsymbol{\omega}_0] \leq \alpha^{t-t_0} \cdot r_\sigma^{t_0} \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_t\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0\|_2^2}, \quad (31)$$

where  $t_0$  denotes the number of zeros in  $(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(1), \dots, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(t))$  and  $r_\sigma = \max_{\ell \in [-0.5, 0.5]} r_\sigma(\ell)$ ; more importantly,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  satisfy  $\gamma > 2 \frac{\ln(1+2\sigma^2 \ln \beta)}{\ln(\alpha+r_\sigma)}$  where both  $\alpha + r_\sigma$  and  $1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta$  are in  $(0.9, 1)$ .

Here we finish the proof of Theorem D.1 and defer the proof of Lemma D.3 to Section D.2.

*Proof of Theorem D.1.* First, we bound the discrepancy of Procedure SAMPLINGBANASZCZYK. We rewrite  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_\infty \leq \|\boldsymbol{\omega}'\|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{\omega}''\|_\infty$ . Then  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}'\|_\infty = O(\sigma \cdot \sqrt{\log m})$  with probability  $1 - m^{-1}$  from Theorem D.2 (in fact  $\sigma = O(\sqrt{1/\gamma})$  from the proof of Lemma D.6). And  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}''\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{\log m})$  from Theorem C.1.

Then we show the probability of outputting any coloring is exponentially small. By Lemma D.3 and  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$ , Procedure SAMPLINGBANASZCZYK has

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr[\mathbf{y}(1) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(n) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(n)] \\ &= \int_x \Pr[\mathbf{y}(1) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(n) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(n) | \boldsymbol{\omega}_0 = \mathbf{g}] \cdot \Pr[\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 = \mathbf{g}] \, d\mathbf{g} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \Pr[\mathbf{y}(1) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(n) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(n) | \boldsymbol{\omega}_0 = \mathbf{g}] \cdot (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \cdot e^{-\|\mathbf{g}\|_2^2/(2\sigma^2)} \, d\mathbf{g} \\ & \hspace{20em} (\text{since } \boldsymbol{\omega}_0 \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_m)) \\ &\leq (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \cdot \alpha^{n-t_0} \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_n\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_n\|_2^2} \cdot r_\sigma^{t_0} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} e^{-\|\mathbf{g}\|_2^2 \cdot (1/(2\sigma^2) + \ln \beta)} \cdot d\mathbf{g} \\ & \hspace{10em} (\text{apply Lemma D.3 and rewrite } \beta^{-\|\mathbf{g}\|_2^2} \text{ as } e^{-\|\mathbf{g}\|_2^2 \cdot \ln \beta}) \\ &\leq (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \cdot \alpha^{n-t_0} \cdot r_\sigma^{t_0} \cdot \left( \pi \cdot \frac{1}{1/(2\sigma^2) + \ln \beta} \right)^{\frac{m}{2}} \hspace{5em} (\text{note that } \beta < 1) \\ &= \alpha^n \cdot (r_\sigma/\alpha)^{t_0} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta} \right)^{m/2}. \hspace{5em} (32) \end{aligned}$$

Now we show that the final output is sufficiently random. The loop of Algorithm 8 generates a partial coloring  $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, \pm 1\}^n$ . Let  $\mathbf{z} \in \{\pm 1\}^E$  be the partial coloring generated in line 13 on the empty set  $E$ , and the final output be  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}(\overline{E}) \circ \mathbf{z}(E)$ . After replacing all 0s of  $\mathbf{y}$  in Line 13, there are at most  $\binom{n}{t_0}$  possible  $\mathbf{y}$ s that could result in the same full coloring  $\mathbf{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ . By the upper

bound of  $\Pr[\mathbf{y}]$  in (32), we bound  $\Pr[\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}]$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{E \subseteq [n]} \Pr[\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = \mathbf{y}(E) \circ \mathbf{z}(E)] &\leq \sum_{t_0=0}^n \binom{n}{t_0} \alpha^n \cdot (r_\sigma/\alpha)^{t_0} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta} \right)^{m/2} \\
&= \alpha^n \left(1 + \frac{r_\sigma}{\alpha}\right)^n \cdot \left( \frac{1}{1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta} \right)^{m/2} \\
&= (\alpha + r_\sigma)^n \cdot \left( \frac{1}{1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta} \right)^{m/2} \\
&= \left( \frac{\alpha + r_\sigma}{(1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta)^{\frac{m}{2n}}} \right)^n \leq \left( \frac{\alpha + r_\sigma}{(1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}} \right)^n.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

In the last step, we use the property  $n \geq \gamma m$ .

After repeating Procedure SAMPLINGBANASZKZYK for  $n$  times, this probability becomes

$$\left( \frac{\alpha + r_\sigma}{(1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}} \right)^n / (1 - m^{-1}) + m^{-n}$$

where  $m^{-n}$  is the probability that each call fails to generate  $\|\boldsymbol{\omega}'\|_\infty = O(\sqrt{\log m})$ .

By the last property of Lemma D.3,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  gives a constant  $\frac{\alpha + r_\sigma}{(1 + 2\sigma^2 \ln \beta)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}}}$  that is strictly less than 1. So each coloring is output with an exponentially small probability. And there are exponentially many good colorings.  $\square$

## D.1 $0, \pm 1$ Random Walk in [LSS22]

We review the Gaussian fix-point random walk  $J_x^\sigma$  introduced in [LSS22] and discuss its properties here.

**Definition D.4** ( $0, \pm 1$  walk). *Given  $\sigma \geq 1$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , consider two transition probability functions,*

$$p_\sigma(x) = \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \exp\left(\frac{-j \cdot (2x + j)}{2\sigma^2}\right) \text{ and} \tag{34}$$

$$r_\sigma(x) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^j \exp\left(\frac{-j \cdot (2x + j)}{2\sigma^2}\right). \tag{35}$$

Define the random variable  $J_x^\sigma$  as

$$J_x^\sigma = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with prob. } r_\sigma(x), \text{ for } x \in [-0.5, 0.5] \\ 1 & \text{with prob. } p_\sigma(x), \text{ for } x \in [-0.5, 0.5] \\ -1 & \text{with prob. } p_\sigma(-x), \text{ for } x \in [-0.5, 0.5] \\ 1 & \text{with prob. } p_\sigma(x), \text{ for } x > 0.5 \\ -1 & \text{with prob. } 1 - p_\sigma(x), \text{ for } x > 0.5 \\ -1 & \text{with prob. } p_\sigma(-x), \text{ for } x < -0.5 \\ 1 & \text{with prob. } 1 - p_\sigma(-x), \text{ for } x < -0.5. \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

Liu, Sah, and Sawhney [LSS22] showed that  $p_\sigma(x) + p_\sigma(-x) + r_\sigma(x) = 1$  and  $J_x^\sigma$  defines a random walk on  $\mathbb{R}$  whose stationary distribution is Gaussian.

**Lemma D.5** (Lemma 2.3 of [LSS22]). *If  $Z \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ , then  $Z + J_Z^\sigma$  is distributed as  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ .*

To prove that this random walk is sufficiently random, we prove the following properties for  $p_\sigma$  and  $r_\sigma$ , which may be of independent interest.

**Lemma D.6.** *The transition probabilities of  $J_x^\sigma$  satisfy the following monotonicity properties:*

1. For any fixed  $\sigma \geq 1$ ,  $p_\sigma(x)$  is strictly monotonically decreasing on  $x \in [-0.5, +\infty)$ .
2. For any  $x \in [0.5, +\infty)$ ,  $p_\sigma(x)$  is strictly monotonically increasing on  $\sigma \in [1, +\infty)$ .
3. For  $x = -0.5$ ,  $p_\sigma(-0.5)$  is strictly monotonically decreasing on  $\sigma \in [1, +\infty)$ .
4. For any  $x \in [-0.5, 0.5]$ ,  $r_\sigma(x)$  is strictly monotonically decreasing on  $\sigma \in [1, +\infty)$ . And  $\max_{x \in [-0.5, 0.5]} r_\sigma(x) = r_\sigma(0)$  approaches to 0 as  $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$ .

The proof of Lemma D.6 is deferred to Section D.3. We will use these properties in the following way:

**Corollary D.7.** 1. For any  $x \geq -0.5$  and any  $\sigma' \geq \sigma \geq 1$ ,  $p_{\sigma'}(x) \leq p_{\sigma'}(-0.5) \leq p_\sigma(-0.5)$ .

2. For a fixed  $\sigma$ , let  $r_\sigma = r_\sigma(0)$ . For any  $x \in [-0.5, 0.5]$  and any  $\sigma' \geq \sigma$ ,  $r_{\sigma'}(x) \leq r_\sigma$ .

## D.2 Proof of Lemma D.3

In this section, we assume  $\sigma \geq 1$  taken in Line 3 of Algorithm 8 satisfying  $r_\sigma < \frac{1}{6}e^{-\frac{24}{\gamma}}$  and  $\gamma < 0.5$  without loss of generality. We fix  $B = \frac{24\sigma^2}{\gamma}$  as a quite large constant and choose  $\beta = 1 - \frac{1}{4B}e^{-\frac{B}{\sigma^2}} = 1 - \frac{\gamma}{96\sigma^2}e^{-\frac{24}{\gamma}}$  and  $\alpha = 1 - \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{B}{\sigma^2}} = 1 - \frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{24}{\gamma}}$  such that the following condition holds in this section.

**Condition D.8.** *We assume that  $\alpha, \beta, B$ , and  $\sigma$  satisfy the following properties (which will be verified in the end of this section):*

1.  $\alpha\beta^{-2B+1} \geq 1$ .
2.  $\alpha\beta^2 \geq p_\sigma(-0.5)$ .
3.  $\alpha\beta^{1+2B} \geq p_\sigma(-0.5)$ .
4.  $\alpha\beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^3} > 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) + \exp\left(\frac{-2B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{2\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{\sigma^2}\right)$ .
5.  $\exp\left(\frac{-\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \leq \alpha \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 \cdot (2\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle + \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2)}$  for any  $\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \geq B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2$ .

We verify that  $\alpha = 1 - \frac{1}{3}e^{-B/\sigma^2}$ ,  $\beta = 1 - \frac{1}{4B}e^{-B/\sigma^2}$ ,  $B = \frac{24\sigma^2}{\gamma}$  and  $\sigma$  with  $r_\sigma < \frac{1}{6}e^{-24/\gamma}$  satisfy Condition D.8 in the end of this section. Now we finish the proof of Lemma D.3 by rewriting

$$\Pr[\mathbf{y}(1) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0] = \Pr[\mathbf{y}(1)|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0] \cdot \Pr[\mathbf{y}(2)|\mathbf{y}(1), \boldsymbol{\omega}_0] \cdots \Pr[\mathbf{y}(t)|\mathbf{y}(t-1), \dots, \boldsymbol{\omega}_0]. \quad (37)$$

Notice that  $\Pr[\mathbf{y}(i)|\mathbf{y}(i-1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(1), \boldsymbol{\omega}_0] = \Pr[J_{\ell_i}^{\sigma'} = \mathbf{y}(i)]$  for  $\ell_i = \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2$  and  $\sigma' = \sigma / \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2$ . Since  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$  are fixed in Algorithm 8,  $\Pr[\mathbf{y}(i)|\mathbf{y}(i-1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(1), \boldsymbol{\omega}_0] = \Pr[J_{\ell_i}^{\sigma'} = \mathbf{y}(i)]$  depends only on  $\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle$  and we simplify the notation as  $\Pr[\mathbf{y}(i)|\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle]$ . We use a potential function  $f(\mathbf{y}, i)$  to dominate  $\Pr[\mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(i+1)|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0]$ .

**Definition D.9** (Potential function). *Assuming  $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$  satisfying Condition D.8, for any  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_i$  and  $\mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(i)$ , let  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i = \mathbf{y}(1) \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{y}(i) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$ . For each  $i$  we define  $f(\mathbf{y}, i)$  by induction. If  $\mathbf{y}(i) = \pm 1$ , let*

$$f(\mathbf{y}, i) = f(\mathbf{y}, i-1) \cdot \alpha \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 \cdot (\|\boldsymbol{\omega}_i\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1}\|_2^2)}, \quad (38)$$

and if  $\mathbf{y}(i) = 0$ , let

$$f(\mathbf{y}, i) = f(\mathbf{y}, i-1) \cdot r_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2}(\ell_i). \quad (39)$$

First of all, We show  $f(\mathbf{y}, t) \leq \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_t\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0\|_2^2} \cdot r_\sigma^{t_0}$ . By the definition,

$$f(\mathbf{y}, t) = \alpha^{t-t_0} \beta^{\sum_{i \in [t], \mathbf{y}(i) \neq 0} \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 \cdot (\|\boldsymbol{\omega}_i\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1}\|_2^2)} \prod_{\mathbf{y}(i)=0} r_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2}(\ell_i). \quad (40)$$

Let  $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$  be coordinates such that  $\mathbf{y}(i_j) \neq 0$  for any  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1, \mathbf{y}(i) \neq 0}^t \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 \cdot (\|\boldsymbol{\omega}_i\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i-1}\|_2^2) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^k \|\mathbf{v}_{i_s}\|_2 \cdot (\|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_s}\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_{s-1}}\|_2^2) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^k \|\mathbf{v}_{i_s}\|_2 \cdot (\|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_s}\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_{s-1}}\|_2^2) \quad (\text{use } \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_{s-1}} = \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_{s-1}}) \\ &= \sum_{s=2}^{k-1} \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_s}\|_2^2 \cdot (\|\mathbf{v}_{i_s}\|_2 - \|\mathbf{v}_{i_{s+1}}\|_2) + \|\mathbf{v}_{i_k}\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_k}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{v}_{i_1}\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{v}_{i_k}\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i_k}\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{v}_{i_1}\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0\|_2^2 \quad (\text{use } \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2 \geq \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2) \\ &= \|\mathbf{v}_{i_k}\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_t\|_2^2 - \|\mathbf{v}_{i_1}\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0\|_2^2 \quad (\text{use } \|\mathbf{v}_{i_1}\|_2 \leq 1 \text{ and } \|\mathbf{v}_{i_k}\|_2 \geq \|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2) \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_t\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary D.7,  $r_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2}(\ell_i) \leq r_\sigma$ . We have

$$f(\mathbf{y}, t) \leq \alpha^{t-t_0} \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_t\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0\|_2^2} \cdot r_\sigma^{t_0}. \quad (41)$$

For  $\sigma, B$  and  $\alpha, \beta$  satisfying Condition D.8 we apply induction on  $t$  to prove

$$\text{hypothesis: for any } t, \quad f(\mathbf{y}, t) \geq \Pr[\mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(t) | \boldsymbol{\omega}_0]. \quad (42)$$

From (41), this shows the probability bound in Lemma D.3. In the end of this section, we verify the last property of Lemma D.3 and Condition D.8.

**Base case:** For convenience, assume  $\|\mathbf{v}_0\|_2 = 1$  such that (42) is true for the base case  $t = 0$ .

**Induction step:** From  $i$  to  $i+1$ , it suffices to show

$$f(\mathbf{y}, i+1)/f(\mathbf{y}, i) \geq \Pr[\mathbf{y}(i+1) | \mathbf{y}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(i), \boldsymbol{\omega}_0] = \Pr[\mathbf{y}(i+1) | \boldsymbol{\omega}_i], \quad (43)$$

We consider 5 cases depending on  $\mathbf{y}(i+1) = 1$  or  $-1$  and whether  $|\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}(i+1) \rangle| \geq B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2$  or not. Recalling that  $\ell_{i+1} = \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}$  is the location of the  $i$ -th step in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

- (i)  $\mathbf{y}(i+1) = 1$  and  $-0.5 \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 \leq \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \leq B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2$ : In this case,  $\ell_{i+1} \geq -0.5$  and Corollary D.7 shows

$$\Pr \left[ \mathbf{y}(i+1) = 1 \mid \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \right] = p_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}(\ell_{i+1}) \leq p_{\sigma}(-0.5). \quad (44)$$

And by Property 3 of Condition D.8,

$$f(\mathbf{y}, i+1)/f(\mathbf{y}, i) = \alpha \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 \cdot (2\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle + \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2)} \geq \alpha \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^3 + 2B} \geq p_{\sigma}(-0.5). \quad (45)$$

- (ii)  $\mathbf{y}(i+1) = -1$  and  $0.5 \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 < \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \leq B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2$ : In this case  $\ell_{i+1} = \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2} > 0.5$ , by Property 4 of Lemma D.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ \mathbf{y}(i+1) = -1 \mid \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \right] &= 1 - p_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}(\ell_{i+1}) \\ &\leq 1 - p_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}(B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2). \end{aligned}$$

We simplify  $p_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}(B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}(B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2) &= \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \exp \left( \frac{-j \cdot B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{j^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \\ &\geq \exp \left( \frac{-B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) - \exp \left( \frac{-2B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{2\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{\sigma^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

And we can verify the following inequality by Property 4 of Condition D.8.

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{y}, i+1)/f(\mathbf{y}, i) &= \alpha \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 \cdot (-2\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle + \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2)} \\ &\geq \alpha \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^3} \\ &> 1 - \exp \left( \frac{-B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) + \exp \left( \frac{-2B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{2\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{\sigma^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

$$\geq 1 - p_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}(B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2) \quad (48)$$

$$\geq \Pr \left[ \mathbf{y}(i+1) = -1 \mid \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \right].$$

- (iii)  $\mathbf{y}(i+1) = -1$  and  $-0.5 \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 \leq \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \leq 0.5 \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2$ . In this case

$$\ell_{i+1} = \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2} \in [-0.5, 0.5]. \quad (49)$$

By monotonicity of  $p_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}(\ell_{i+1})$  in Corollary D.7, we have

$$\Pr[\mathbf{y}(i+1) = -1 \mid \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle] = p_{\sigma/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}(-\ell_{i+1}) \leq p_{\sigma}(-0.5). \quad (50)$$

And by Property 2 of Condition D.8

$$f(\mathbf{y}, i+1)/f(\mathbf{y}, i) = \alpha \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 \cdot (-2\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle + \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2)} \geq \alpha \beta^{1 + \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^3} \geq p_{\sigma}(-0.5). \quad (51)$$

(iv)  $\mathbf{y}(i+1) = 1$  and  $\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \geq B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ \mathbf{y}(i+1) = 1 \mid \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \right] &= \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \exp \left( \frac{-j \cdot \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{j^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left( \frac{-\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

And by Property 2 of Condition D.8 we have  $f(\mathbf{y}, i+1)/f(\mathbf{y}, i) = \alpha \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 \cdot (2\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle + \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2)} \geq \Pr[\mathbf{y}(i+1) \mid \langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle]$ .

(v)  $\mathbf{y}(i+1) = -1$  and  $\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle \geq B/\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2$  We bound  $\Pr[\mathbf{y}(i+1) = -1 \mid \boldsymbol{\omega}_i] \leq 1$ . And by Property 1 of Condition D.8,

$$f(\mathbf{y}, i+1)/f(\mathbf{y}, i) = \alpha \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2 \cdot (-2\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle + \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2)} \geq \alpha \cdot \beta^{-2B + \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2} \geq 1. \quad (53)$$

Hence by equation (41) we have

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{y}} [\mathbf{y}(1) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(1), \dots, \mathbf{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(t) \mid \boldsymbol{\omega}_0] \leq f(\mathbf{y}, t) \leq \alpha^{t-t_0} \cdot \beta^{\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_t\|_2^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_0\|_2^2} \cdot r_\sigma^{t_0} \quad (54)$$

as desired.

Finally we show that our choices of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  satisfy both Condition D.8 and the last property of Lemma D.3. For  $\sigma$  satisfying  $r_\sigma < \frac{1}{6} e^{-\frac{24}{\gamma}}$  defined in Line 3 of Algorithm 8, recall that  $B = \frac{24\sigma^2}{\gamma}$ ,  $\beta = 1 - \frac{1}{4B} e^{-\frac{B}{\sigma^2}}$  and  $\alpha = 1 - \frac{1}{3} e^{-\frac{B}{\sigma^2}}$ . We show Condition D.8 holds before verifying  $\gamma > 2 \frac{\ln(1+2\sigma^2 \ln \beta)}{\ln(\alpha+r_\sigma)}$ .

To show this we add some auxiliary restrictions to simplify those properties in Condition D.8.

1.  $\alpha \geq \beta^{2B-1}$  from Property 1.
2. If  $\beta \geq e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}}$ , then  $\alpha\beta^{2B+1} \geq e^{-B/\sigma^2}$  implies that Property 5 holds for any  $|\langle \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \rangle| \geq B$ . To satisfy  $\alpha\beta^{2B+1} \geq e^{-B/\sigma^2}$ , given  $\alpha \geq \beta^{2B-1}$ , we only need  $\beta \geq e^{-\frac{1}{4\sigma^2}}$ .
3. Property 3 needs  $\beta \geq p_\sigma(-0.5)^{1/4B}$  and Property 2 is satisfied if Property 1 and Property 3 are satisfied.

So Condition D.8 are fulfilled if the following restrictions are satisfied: (1)  $\alpha \geq \beta^{2B-1}$ ; (2)  $\beta \geq 0.68^{1/4B} \geq p_\sigma(-0.5)^{1/4B}$ ; (3)  $\beta \geq e^{-\frac{1}{4\sigma^2}}$ ; (4)  $\beta^{2B} > 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) + \exp\left(\frac{-2B}{\sigma^2} - \frac{2\|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2^2}{\sigma^2}\right)$ .

For  $\sigma \geq 1$  and  $\frac{B}{\sigma^2} \geq 10$ , these restrictions are satisfied by  $\beta = 1 - \frac{1}{4B} e^{-\frac{B}{\sigma^2}}$  and  $\alpha = 1 - \frac{1}{3} e^{-\frac{B}{\sigma^2}}$ . After plugging  $B = \frac{24\sigma^2}{\gamma}$ , they become  $\beta = 1 - \frac{\gamma}{96\sigma^2} e^{-\frac{24}{\gamma}}$  and  $\alpha = 1 - \frac{1}{3} e^{-\frac{24}{\gamma}}$ . Given  $r_\sigma < \frac{1}{6} e^{-24/\gamma}$ , we have  $\alpha + r_\sigma < 1 - \frac{1}{6} e^{-24/\gamma}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \cdot \frac{\ln(1+2\sigma^2 \ln \beta)}{\ln(\alpha+r_\sigma)} &\leq 2 \cdot 1.5 \cdot \frac{-2\sigma^2 \ln \beta}{1-\alpha-r_\sigma} \\ &\leq \frac{6 \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{2B} e^{-\frac{B}{\sigma^2}}}{\frac{1}{6} e^{-\frac{B}{\sigma^2}}} \\ &\leq \frac{18\sigma^2}{B} = \frac{3}{4} \gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Hence we have proven the last property of Lemma D.3.



### D.3 Proof of Lemma D.6

To study the monotonicity of  $p_\sigma(x)$ , we define two functions

$$A_\sigma(x) = \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad (56)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B_\sigma(x) &= \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i \cdot A_\sigma(x+i) \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot j \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Then we have

$$p_\sigma(x) = \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot A_\sigma(x). \quad (58)$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial p_\sigma(x)}{\partial x} = \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot \frac{-j}{\sigma^2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-j \cdot (2x+j)}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (59)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot B_\sigma(x) \quad (60)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i \cdot A_\sigma(x+i) \quad \text{by (57)}. \quad (61)$$

We show  $p_\sigma(x)$  is monotonically decreasing on  $x$  in  $[-1/2, \infty]$  for all  $\sigma > 0$  first.

*Proof of Lemma D.6 (1).*

To show  $p_\sigma(x)$  is decreasing when  $x \geq -1/2$ , by equation (60) we just need to show  $B_\sigma(x) > 0$  for all  $x \geq -1/2$ .

Fixing  $\sigma \neq 0$ ,  $B_\sigma(x) = \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot j \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$ , there exists an  $x_\sigma$  large enough such that for all  $x > x_\sigma$ ,  $B_\sigma(x) > 0$  due to the exponentially decay of  $\exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$  and only the first term becoming significant. Now  $B_\sigma(x)$  is an alternative sum of  $A_\sigma(x+i)$ . Hence by alternating series test the sign of  $B_\sigma(x)$  is determined by monotonicity of  $A_\sigma(x)$ .

$$\frac{\partial A_\sigma(x)}{\partial x} = -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot (x \cdot A_\sigma(x) + B_\sigma(x)). \quad (62)$$

For  $x > \max\{x_\sigma, 0\}$  we have  $A_\sigma(x) > 0$ ,  $B_\sigma(x) > 0$ , hence  $\frac{\partial A_\sigma(x)}{\partial x} < 0$ . So  $A_\sigma(x)$  is monotonically decreasing on  $x \geq x_\sigma$ . Moreover, if there exists  $x$  such that  $A_\sigma(x) - A_\sigma(x+1) \leq 0$ , saying the largest one is  $x_0$ , i.e.,  $x_0 \triangleq \max\{x : A_\sigma(x+1) \geq A_\sigma(x)\}$ .

First we show that  $x_0 < \max(x_0, 0)$  and hence  $x_0 < 0$ .

$$-\sigma^2 \cdot \frac{\partial A_\sigma(x)}{\partial x} = x \cdot A_\sigma(x) + \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i \cdot A_\sigma(x+i) > x \cdot A_\sigma(x) + A_\sigma(x) - A_\sigma(x+1). \quad (63)$$

For  $s \geq \max(x_0, 0)$ , since  $A_\sigma(s) > 0$ , we simplify (63) to

$$-\sigma^2 \cdot \frac{\partial A_\sigma(s)}{\partial s} > A_\sigma(s) - A_\sigma(s+1) \geq 0. \quad (64)$$

Hence  $\frac{\partial A_\sigma(s)}{\partial s} < 0$  for  $s \geq \max(x_0, 0)$ , which implies  $A_\sigma(s) - A_\sigma(s+1) > 0$  for  $s \geq \max(x_0, 0)$ . Therefore  $x_0 < \max(x_0, 0)$  which means  $x_0 < 0$  and  $A_\sigma(s)$  decreases on  $s \geq 0$ .

Now we show  $x_0 < \max(x_0, -1/2)$ . For  $0 \geq s \geq \max(x_0, -1/2)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& A_\sigma(s) - A_\sigma(s+1) \\
&= - \int_s^{s+1} \frac{\partial A_\sigma(x)}{\partial x} \cdot dx \\
&> \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_s^{s+1} ((1+x) \cdot A_\sigma(x) - A_\sigma(x+1)) \cdot dx && \text{(by Equation 63)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_s^0 ((1+x) \cdot A_\sigma(x) - A_\sigma(x+1)) \cdot dx + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_0^{s+1} ((1+x) \cdot A_\sigma(x) - A_\sigma(x+1)) \cdot dx \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_s^0 ((1+x) \cdot A_\sigma(x+1) - A_\sigma(x+1)) \cdot dx + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_0^{s+1} ((1+x) \cdot A_\sigma(s+1) - A_\sigma(s+1)) \cdot dx \\
&\quad \text{(first term uses } A_\sigma(x) \geq A_\sigma(x+1) \text{ for } x \geq s \text{ and second term uses } A(x) \text{ decreasing for } x \geq 0) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_s^0 x \cdot A_\sigma(x+1) \cdot dx + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_0^{s+1} x \cdot A_\sigma(s+1) \cdot dx \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_s^0 x \cdot A_\sigma(s+1) \cdot dx + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_0^{s+1} x \cdot A_\sigma(s+1) \cdot dx \\
&\hspace{15em} \text{(use } A_\sigma(x+1) \text{ decreasing for } x \geq -1) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot (s+1/2) \cdot A_\sigma(s+1) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

So if  $s \geq \max(-1/2, x_0)$  we have  $A_\sigma(s) > A_\sigma(s+1)$ . This means  $x_0 < \max(-1/2, x_0)$  by the definition of  $x_0$ . So we must have  $x_0 < -1/2$ . Hence  $A_\sigma(x)$  is monotonically decreasing when  $x \geq -1/2$  which implies  $B_\sigma(x) > 0$  and  $p_\sigma(x)$  decreasing on  $x \geq -1/2$ .  $\square$

Then we show  $p_\sigma(-1/2)$  is strictly increasing on  $\sigma > 0$ .

*Proof of Lemma D.6 (2).* First we express  $\frac{\partial p_\sigma(x)}{\partial \sigma}$  by  $B_\sigma(x)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial p_\sigma(x)}{\partial \sigma} &= \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot \frac{2j \cdot (2x+j)}{2\sigma^3} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-j \cdot (2x+j)}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot (2x \cdot j + j^2) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot (2x \cdot B_\sigma(x) + \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot j^2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)).
\end{aligned}$$

Also, we can express the last term as alternative summation of  $B_\sigma(x+i)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot j^2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j} (2i-1) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \quad (\text{use } j^2 = \sum_{i=1}^j 2i-1) \\
&= \sum_{i \geq 1} \sum_{k=j-i \geq 0} (-1)^{k+i-1} \cdot 2i \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+k+i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) + \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j} (-1) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= 2 \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^{k+i-1} \cdot i \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+k+i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) - B_\sigma(x) \\
&= 2 \sum_{k \geq 0} (-1)^k \cdot B_\sigma(x+k) - B_\sigma(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\frac{\partial p_\sigma(x)}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{1}{\sigma^3} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot (2x \cdot B_\sigma(x) + B_\sigma(x) + 2 \cdot \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^i \cdot B_\sigma(x+i)). \quad (65)$$

Now we consider the monotonicity of  $B_\sigma(x)$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial B_\sigma(x)}{\partial x} &= -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{j \geq 1} (-1)^{j-1} \cdot (x+j) \cdot j \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x+j)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left( x \cdot B_\sigma(x) + B_\sigma(x) + 2 \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^i \cdot B_\sigma(x+i) \right). \quad (66)
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma D.6 (1) that  $A_\sigma(x)$  is monotonically decreasing on  $[0, +\infty)$ , we have  $\frac{\partial B_\sigma(x)}{\partial x} < 0$  for  $x \geq 1$ .

Let  $x_0$  be the largest  $x$  so that  $B_\sigma(x) - B_\sigma(x+1) \leq 0$  as well. We will show that  $x_0 < \max(x_0, 1)$ . For  $s \geq \max(x_0, 1)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial B_\sigma(s)}{\partial s} &= -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \left( x \cdot B_\sigma(x) + B_\sigma(x) + 2 \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^i \cdot B_\sigma(x+i) \right) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \left( 2B_\sigma(s) + 2 \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^i \cdot B_\sigma(s+i) \right) \quad (\text{use } B_\sigma(s) > 0 \text{ for } s > -1/2) \\
&= -\frac{2}{\sigma^2} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i \cdot B_\sigma(s+i) < 0. \quad (\text{by the definition of } x_0 \text{ and the alternative criterion})
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have  $\frac{\partial B_\sigma(s)}{\partial s} < 0$  for  $s \geq \max(x_0, 1)$  which implies  $B_\sigma(s) - B_\sigma(s+1) > 0$  and  $x_0 < \max(x_0, 1)$ . And therefore we have  $x_0 < 1$ .

And then we show  $x_0 < \max(x_0, 1/2)$ . For  $1 \geq s \geq \max(x_0, 1/2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
& B_\sigma(s) - B_\sigma(s+1) \\
&= - \int_s^{s+1} \frac{\partial B_\sigma(x)}{\partial x} \cdot dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_s^{s+1} (x \cdot B_\sigma(x) + B_\sigma(x) + 2 \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^i \cdot B_\sigma(x+i)) \cdot dx \\
&> \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \left( \int_s^1 (1+x) \cdot B_\sigma(x) - 2B_\sigma(x+1) \cdot dx + \int_1^{s+1} (1+x) \cdot B_\sigma(x) - 2B_\sigma(x+1) \cdot dx \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \left( \int_s^1 (x-1) \cdot B_\sigma(x+1) \cdot dx + \int_1^{s+1} (1+x) \cdot B_\sigma(s+1) - 2B_\sigma(s+1) \cdot dx \right) \\
&\quad \text{(use } B_\sigma(x) \geq B_\sigma(x+1) \text{ for } x \geq s \text{ and } B_\sigma(x) \text{ decreasing for } x \geq 1.) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot \int_s^{s+1} (x-1) \cdot B_\sigma(s+1) \cdot dx \quad (B_\sigma(x+1) \text{ is decreasing for } x \geq 0.) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \cdot (s-1/2) \cdot B_\sigma(s+1) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument we have  $B_\sigma(x) - B_\sigma(x+1) > 0$  for  $x \geq 1/2$ .

And if  $x \geq 1/2$  we have

$$\frac{\partial p_\sigma(x)}{\partial \sigma} \geq \frac{3}{2\sigma^3} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \left(2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot B_\sigma(x) + B_\sigma(x) + 2 \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^i \cdot B_\sigma(x+i)\right) > 0, \quad (67)$$

which means  $p_\sigma(x)$  is monotonically increasing strictly on  $\sigma > 0$  for any fixed  $x \geq 1/2$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma D.6(3).* Plugging  $x = -1/2$  into Equation (65) we have

$$\frac{\partial p_\sigma(-1/2)}{\partial \sigma} = \frac{3}{2\sigma^3} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot 2 \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^i \cdot B_\sigma(x+i). \quad (68)$$

And by the monotonicity of  $B_\sigma(x+1)$  for  $x \geq -1/2$  proved above, we have  $\frac{\partial p_\sigma(-1/2)}{\partial \sigma} < 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma D.6(4).* As mentioned in [LSS22], let  $u = \exp\left(\frac{-1}{2\sigma^2}\right)$  and  $v = \sqrt{-1} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-x}{2\sigma^2}\right)$  which means  $|u| < 1$  and  $v \neq 0$ . By Jacobi triple product identity (reference e.g. [And65]) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
r_\sigma(x) &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} u^{j^2} \cdot v^{2j} \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - u^{2j}) \cdot (1 + u^{2j-1}v^2) \cdot (1 + u^{2j-1}v^{-2}) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-j/\sigma^2}) \cdot (1 - e^{-(2j+2x-1)/(2\sigma^2)}) \cdot (1 - e^{-(2j-2x-1)/(2\sigma^2)}).
\end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Besides,

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - e^{-(2j+2x-1)/(2\sigma^2)}) \cdot (1 - e^{-(2j-2x-1)/(2\sigma^2)}) &= 1 + e^{-2 \cdot (2j-1)/(2\sigma^2)} - e^{-(2j-1)/(2\sigma^2)} \left( e^{-\frac{x}{\sigma^2}} + e^{\frac{x}{\sigma^2}} \right) \\
&\leq 1 + e^{-2 \cdot (2j-1)/(2\sigma^2)} - 2e^{-(2j-1)/(2\sigma^2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $r_\sigma(x) \leq r_\sigma(0)$  for  $x \in [-0.5, 0.5]$ . And it is easy to verify

$$\ln r_\sigma(0) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \ln(1 - e^{-j/\sigma^2}) \leq -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-j/\sigma^2} = -\Theta(\sigma^2). \quad (70)$$

Hence for  $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$  we have  $r_\sigma(0) \leq e^{-\Omega(\sigma^2)} \rightarrow 0$ . □