

Perfect Simulation of Las Vegas Algorithms via Local Computation

Xinyu Fu*

Yonggang Jiang[†]

Yitong Yin*

Abstract

The notion of Las Vegas algorithm was introduced by Babai (1979) and may be defined in two ways:

- In Babai’s original definition, a randomized algorithm is called Las Vegas if it has finitely bounded running time and certifiable random failure.
- Alternatively, in a widely accepted definition today, Las Vegas algorithms mean the zero-error randomized algorithms with random running time.

The equivalence between the two definitions is straightforward. In particular, by repeatedly running the algorithm until no failure encountered, one can simulate the correct output of a successful running.

We show that this can also be achieved for distributed local computation. Specifically, we show that in the LOCAL model, any Las Vegas algorithm that terminates in finite time with *locally* certifiable failures, can be converted to a zero-error Las Vegas algorithm, at a polylogarithmic cost in the time complexity, such that the resulting algorithm perfectly simulates the output of the original algorithm on the same instance conditioned on that the algorithm successfully returns without failure.

*State Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University. Emails: xyfu@smail.nju.edu.cn, yinyt@nju.edu.cn.

[†]MPI-INF and Saarland University, Germany, yjiang@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | A LOCAL Sampling Lemma and Proof of Main Theorem | 3 |
| 2.1 | Sampling satisfying solution of Lovász local lemma | 3 |
| 2.2 | Formal statement and proof of the main theorem | 4 |
| 3 | Algorithm and Outline of Proof | 5 |
| 3.1 | Decay of correlation in LLL | 6 |
| 3.2 | Las Vegas SLOCAL algorithm | 7 |
| 3.3 | Algorithm: <i>Initialization</i> and <i>Clustering</i> | 8 |
| 3.4 | Algorithm: <i>Resampling</i> | 11 |
| 3.5 | Wrapping up (Proof of Theorem 2.1) | 15 |
| 4 | Related Work and Discussions | 16 |
| 5 | Analysis of Correlation Decay | 17 |
| 5.1 | Construction of the bad event A_λ | 17 |
| 5.2 | Correlation decay in the augmented LLL instance | 18 |
| 6 | Analysis of Initialization and Clustering | 25 |
| 6.1 | Analysis of <i>Initialization</i> (Proof of Lemma 3.5) | 25 |
| 6.2 | Analysis of <i>Clustering</i> (Proof of Lemma 3.7) | 25 |
| 7 | Analysis of Resampling | 29 |
| 7.1 | Correctness of <i>RecursiveSampling</i> (Proof of Item 1 in Lemma 3.11) | 29 |
| 7.2 | Efficiency of <i>RecursiveSampling</i> (Proof of Item 2 in Lemma 3.11) | 33 |
| 7.3 | Accuracy of estimation (Proof of Lemma 3.10) | 37 |
| 7.4 | Analysis of <i>Substituting</i> (Proof of Lemma 3.12) | 40 |
| 7.5 | Wrapping up the analysis of <i>Resampling</i> (Proof of Lemma 3.13) | 42 |
| A | Simulation of SLOCAL-LV in LOCAL Model | 48 |

1 Introduction

The Las Vegas algorithm introduced by Babai [Bab79] is a fundamental concept in the theory of computing. It defines the important complexity class **ZPP**, which is the class of decision problems solvable by efficient Las Vegas algorithms. Other than decision problems, Las Vegas algorithms also play key roles in solving optimization [Kal92, Cla95], searching [MSL92, MT10], or sampling [PW96, GJL19] problems.

Las Vegas algorithms can be defined in two ways. In Babai's original definition [Bab79], Las Vegas algorithms are defined as the randomized algorithms whose failures are *certifiable*:

- A Las Vegas algorithm produces the correct output or reports failure after finitely bounded time.

An alternative definition of Las Vegas algorithm is also used variously, e.g. in [LSZ93, MR95, MU05], there Las Vegas algorithms are defined as *zero-error* randomized algorithms:

- A Las Vegas algorithm may have random running time but always produces the correct output.

The equivalence between these two definitions is obvious. By truncation, one can convert a zero-error Las Vegas algorithm with random running time to a Las Vegas algorithm with bounded running time and certifiable failure. Conversely, by restarting the algorithm once a failure is reported, one can convert a Las Vegas algorithm with certifiable failure to a zero-error Las Vegas algorithm. This strategy of retrying with independent random choice until success, defines a *rejection sampling* procedure, which perfectly simulates the random output of the Las Vegas algorithms conditioned on that it successfully returns without failure.

This strategy for perfect simulation of Las Vegas algorithm relies on a global coordination machinery: all parts of the algorithm need to be informed whether a failure is encountered somewhere. In contrast, we are interested in how this could be achieved by local computations, in the absence of global coordination.

The LOCAL model. Local computations are formally characterized by the LOCAL model [Lin92, Pel00]. An instance consists of a network $G = (V, E)$, which is an undirected graph, and a vector $x = (x_v)_{v \in V}$ of local inputs. Each node $v \in V$ receives x_v and $n = |V|$ as its input, and can access to private random bits. Communications are synchronized and proceed in rounds. In each round, each node may perform arbitrary local computation based on all information collected so far and send messages of arbitrary sizes to all its neighbors. This gives a LOCAL algorithm. The time complexity is measured by the number of rounds spent by the algorithm until all nodes terminate. A LOCAL algorithm is said to be a $t(n)$ -round LOCAL algorithm on a class of instances, if it always terminates within $t(n)$ rounds on every instance from that class, where n represents the number of nodes of the instance.

The (Babai's) Las Vegas algorithm can be defined in the LOCAL mode with *locally certifiable failures*. A $t(n)$ -round LOCAL algorithm is called *Las Vegas* if each node $v \in V$ returns a pair (Y_v, F_v) , where Y_v stands for the local output at v , and $F_v \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether the algorithm failed locally at v . The algorithm successfully returns if none of the node fails. Furthermore, it is guaranteed that $\sum_{v \in V} \mathbb{E}[F_v] < 1$. This notion of Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm was formulated in [GHK18].

In this paper, we try to answer the following fundamental question:

Can we faithfully simulate the correct output avoiding all local failures via local computation?

Specifically, we wonder whether a fixed-round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm with locally certifiable failures, can be converted into a zero-error Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm that produces the correct output $(Y_v)_{v \in V}$ conditioned on $\sum_{v \in V} F_v = 0$, where the distribution of the correct output is faithfully preserved. This asks for what used to be achieved by the rejection sampling in the absence of global coordination.

In this paper, for the first time, we answer this question affirmatively. We prove the following result for the perfect simulation of Las Vegas algorithms via local computation.

Theorem 1.1 (main theorem, informal). *Any $t(n)$ -round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm can be converted to a zero-error Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm, which terminates within $t(n) \cdot \text{polylog}(n)$ rounds with probability $1 - n^{-O(1)}$, and returns the output of the $t(n)$ -round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm conditioned on no failure.*

In above theorem, the output of the zero-error Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm is identically distributed as the output of the $t(n)$ -round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm conditioned on that none of the nodes fails, i.e. the zero-error algorithm perfectly simulates a successful running of the algorithm that may locally fail.

To see how nontrivial this is, consider a weakened task: to generate an assignment of random bits so that under this random choice the algorithm terminates without failure. One may think of this as “solving” the random bits under which the algorithm successfully returns, which is weaker than our goal, where the generated random bits are further required to follow the correct distribution. However, for local computation, just solving the feasible random bits without bothering their distribution is already highly nontrivial.

In a seminal work [GHK18], Ghaffari, Harris and Kuhn gave a systematic approach for solving the good random bits under which a Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm successfully returns. Their derandomization based approach preserves the *support* of distribution, hence was more suitable for the *distributed graph problems* for constructing feasible solutions on graphs. Specifically, $\text{polylog}(n)$ -round reductions were established between the two types of the Las Vegas LOCAL algorithms for such problems.

In contrast, the perfect simulation guaranteed in Theorem 1.1 preserves the distribution, therefore, the result can apply to the problems beyond constructing feasible solutions, for example, the sampling problems.

Consider the *Gibbs distributions* defined on the network $G = (V, E)$. Each node v corresponds to a variable with finite domain Σ . Let \mathcal{F} be a class of *constraints*, where each $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is a nonnegative-valued function $f : \Sigma^{\text{vbl}(f)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined on the variables in $\text{vbl}(f) \subseteq V$. This defines a Gibbs distribution μ over all assignments $\sigma \in \Sigma^V$ by:

$$\mu(\sigma) \propto \prod_{f \in \mathcal{F}} f(\sigma_{\text{vbl}(f)}).$$

Such Gibbs distribution μ is said to be *local*, if: (1) for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the diameter of $\text{vbl}(f)$ in graph G is bounded by a constant; and (2) for any partial assignment $\sigma \in \Sigma^\Lambda$ specified on $\Lambda \subseteq V$, if σ is locally feasible, i.e. if $f(\sigma_{\text{vbl}(f)}) > 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\text{vbl}(f) \subseteq \Lambda$, then σ is (globally) feasible, which means that σ can be extended to a feasible full assignment $\tau \in \Sigma^V$ such that $\tau_\Lambda = \sigma$ and $\mu(\tau) > 0$.¹

A Gibbs distribution μ is said to have *strong spatial mixing with exponential decay* if the discrepancy (measured in total variation distance) between the marginal distributions μ_v^σ, μ_v^τ at any $v \in V$ given the respective feasible boundary conditions $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma^\Lambda$ on $\Lambda \subseteq V$ that differ over an arbitrary $\Delta \subseteq \Lambda$, satisfies:

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_v^\sigma, \mu_v^\tau) \leq |V|^{O(1)} \cdot \exp(\Omega(\text{dist}_G(v, \Delta))).$$

The strong spatial mixing is a key property for sampling algorithms. Its implication to efficient sampling from general Gibbs distributions is a major open problem. In [FY18, Corollary 5.3], a $\text{polylog}(n)$ -round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm with bounded local failures was given, for perfect sampling from local Gibbs distributions that have the strong spatial mixing with exponential decay. By Theorem 1.1, this immediately implies the following result for perfect simulation of Gibbs distributions via local computation.

Corollary 1.2. *For any class of local Gibbs distributions that have the strong spatial mixing with exponential decay, there is a LOCAL algorithm for perfect sampling from the Gibbs distribution, which terminates within $\text{polylog}(n)$ rounds with probability $1 - n^{-O(1)}$.*

¹In [FY18], this property of local feasibility implying global feasibility in Gibbs distribution was called “locally admissible”.

2 A LOCAL Sampling Lemma and Proof of Main Theorem

The perfect simulation of Las Vegas LOCAL algorithms stated in Theorem 1.1 is achieved by resolving a more general problem, namely, generating a random sample avoiding all bad events. This problem is formulated as a natural sampling problem in the variable-framework of the Lovász local lemma.

2.1 Sampling satisfying solution of Lovász local lemma

An instance for the variable-framework Lovász local lemma (LLL) is given by $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$, where $\{X_i\}_{i \in U}$ is a set of mutually independent random variables, such that each X_i follows a distribution ν_i over a finite domain Σ_i ; and $\{A_v\}_{v \in V}$ is a set of *bad events*, such that for each $v \in V$, the occurrence of A_v is determined by the evaluation of $X_{\text{vbl}(v)} = (X_i)_{i \in \text{vbl}(v)}$, where $\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq U$ denotes the subset of variables on which A_v is defined. The LLL instance I defines a *dependency graph* $D = D_I = (V, E)$, such that each vertex $v \in V$ represents a bad event A_v and each $\{u, v\} \in E$ iff $\text{vbl}(v) \cap \text{vbl}(u) \neq \emptyset$.

An LLL instance I is said to be γ -satisfiable, if the probability avoiding all bad events is bounded as:

$$\Pr \left(\bigcap_{v \in V} \overline{A_v} \right) \geq \gamma. \quad (1)$$

The Lovász local lemma [EL75] states a sufficient condition on the dependency graph for γ to be positive.

A satisfiable LLL instance I gives rise to a natural probability distribution over satisfying assignments. Let $\mu = \mu_I$ denote the distribution of the random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_i)_{i \in U}$ conditioning on that none of the bad events $\{A_v\}_{v \in V}$ occur. Formally, denote by $\Omega = \Omega_I \triangleq \{\sigma \in \bigotimes_{i \in U} \Sigma_i \mid \sigma \text{ avoids } A_v \text{ for all } v \in V\}$ the space of all satisfying assignments, and $\nu = \nu_I \triangleq \prod_{i \in U} \nu_i$ the product measure. Then

$$\forall \sigma \in \Omega, \quad \mu(\sigma) \triangleq \Pr(\mathbf{X} = \sigma \mid \mathbf{X} \in \Omega) = \frac{\nu(\sigma)}{\nu(\Omega)}. \quad (2)$$

This distribution $\mu = \mu_I$ of random satisfying assignment was referred as the *LLL distribution* in [Har20]. It is a Gibbs distribution defined by hard constraints.

The following defines a computational problem for generating a sample according to the distribution μ .

| | |
|---|--|
| <u>Sampling Satisfying Solution of Lovász Local Lemma</u> | |
| Input : | a γ -satisfiable LLL instance I with dependency graph $D_I = (V, E)$; |
| Output: | a random satisfying assignment $\mathbf{X}^* = (X_i^*)_{i \in U}$ distributed as μ_I . |

When the problem is solved in the LOCAL model, the input is presented to the algorithm as follows:

1. The network G of the LOCAL model is just the dependency graph D_I .
2. Each node $v \in V$ receives as input the values of $n = |V|$ and γ , along with the definition of the bad event A_v , and the distributions ν_i of the random variables $\{X_i \mid i \in \text{vbl}(v)\}$ on which A_v is defined, so that it can locally draw independent evaluations of the random variables $\{X_i \mid i \in \text{vbl}(v)\}$ or check the occurrence of A_v on such evaluation.

Our main technical result is an efficient LOCAL algorithm for sampling satisfying solution according to the LLL distribution, for any LLL instance that is not prohibitively scarce to satisfy. We call this result a “LOCAL sampling lemma” since it uses the local lemma framework to give a LOCAL sampling algorithm.

Theorem 2.1 (LOCAL sampling lemma). *There is a randomized LOCAL algorithm such that for any LLL instance I with n bad events, if I is γ -satisfiable, then the algorithm returns a random satisfying assignment drawn from μ_I , within $\tilde{O}\left(\log^6 n \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\gamma}\right)$ rounds in expectation, and within $\tilde{O}\left(\log^6 n \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^6 \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ rounds with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$.*

In the classical algorithmic Lovász Local Lemma, the main goal is to construct a satisfying assignment. Here, our goal is more challenging: to generate a random satisfying assignment according to the LLL distribution μ . This sampling problem has been proved to require polynomially stronger condition than the conventional algorithmic LLL [BGG⁺19, GJL19, Har20]. And only recently, polynomial-time centralized algorithms were discovered for sampling uniform satisfying assignment for general LLL instances [HWY22, JPV21, FGYZ21, Moi19]. In order for perfectly simulating Las Vegas LOCAL algorithms, we do not impose any local lemma type of condition on the dependency graph. Instead, we show that the sampling problem is tractable via local computation, as long as the chance for a random assignment to be satisfying is non-negligible. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first result of the kind.

As a byproduct, the algorithm in Theorem 2.1 gives a uniform sampler for LCLs in the LOCAL model. The *locally checkable labelings* (LCLs) (see [NS95] for formal definitions) are vertex labelings satisfying local constraints in the network. Suppose that each label is drawn uniformly and independently at random, and violating the locally checkable constraint at each node $v \in V$ defines a bad event A_v . Then the LLL distribution corresponds to the uniform distribution over LCLs, and Theorem 2.1 has the following corollary.

Corollary 2.2. *For any locally checkable labeling (LCL) problem, if uniform random labeling can always generate a correct LCL with probability at least $n^{-\text{polylog}(n)}$, then there is a randomized LOCAL algorithm that outputs a uniform random LCL within $\text{polylog}(n)$ rounds with high probability.*

2.2 Formal statement and proof of the main theorem

Recall that for LOCAL algorithms, an instance $\mathcal{I} = (G, \mathbf{x})$ consists of a network $G = (V, E)$ and a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_v)_{v \in V}$ specifying the local input x_v to each node $v \in V$. Let \mathfrak{C} be a class of instances. A $t(n)$ -round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm with success probability $\gamma(n)$ on instance class \mathfrak{C} , is a randomized LOCAL algorithm such that on every instance $\mathcal{I} = (G, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathfrak{C}$, where G is a network with $n = |V|$ nodes, at every node $v \in V$ the algorithm terminates within $t(n)$ rounds and outputs a pair (Y_v, F_v) where $F_v \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether the algorithm failed locally at v , and the probability that the algorithm succeeds is

$$\Pr(\forall v \in V : F_v = 0) \geq \gamma(n).$$

Denote by $(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{I}}) = \langle (Y_v)_{v \in V}, (F_v)_{v \in V} \rangle$ the output of the Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm on instance $\mathcal{I} = (G, \mathbf{x})$ with network $G = (V, E)$. The following theorem is a formal restatement of Theorem 1.1, which gives a zero-erro Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm that perfectly simulates the good output $(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}} \mid \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{0})$ when there is no failure everywhere in the network.

Theorem 2.3 (main theorem, formal). *Let $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be two functions. Let \mathcal{A} be a $t(n)$ -round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm with success probability $\gamma(n)$ on instance class \mathfrak{C} . There is a LOCAL algorithm \mathcal{B} such that on every instance $\mathcal{I} \in \mathfrak{C}$ of n nodes, for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$,*

- \mathcal{B} terminates within $t(n) \cdot \tilde{O}\left(\log^6 n \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\gamma(n)} \cdot \log^6 \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ rounds with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$;
- upon termination, \mathcal{B} returns an output $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{B}}$ that is identically distributed as $(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{A}} \mid \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbf{0})$, which stands for the output of \mathcal{A} on the same instance \mathcal{I} conditioned on that none of the nodes fails.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} = (G, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathfrak{C}$ be the instance of the LOCAL algorithm, where $G = (V, E)$ is a network with $n = |V|$ nodes and the vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_v)_{v \in V}$ specifies the local inputs. For each $v \in V$, let X_v denote the local random bits at node v used by algorithm \mathcal{A} .

Since \mathcal{A} is a $t(n)$ -round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm, at any $v \in V$, the algorithm \mathcal{A} deterministically maps the inputs $\mathbf{x}_B = (x_v)_{v \in B}$ and the random bits $\mathbf{X}_B = (X_v)_{v \in B}$ within the $t(n)$ -ball $B = B_{t(n)}(v)$, to the local output $(Y_v^{\mathcal{A}}, F_v^{\mathcal{A}})$, where $F_v^{\mathcal{A}} \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates the failure at v . This defines a bad event A_v for every $v \in V$, on the random variables X_u for $u \in B_{t(n)}(v)$, i.e. $\text{vbl}(v) = B_{t(n)}(v)$, by

$$A_v : F_v^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{vbl}(v)}) = 1.$$

Together, this defines an LLL instance $I = (\{X_v\}_{v \in V}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$, which is $\gamma(n)$ -satisfiable because the probability that \mathcal{A} has no failure everywhere is at least $\gamma(n)$.

We simulate the sampling algorithm in Theorem 2.1 (which we call the *LLL sampler*) on this LLL instance I . Rather than executing it on the dependency graph D_I as in Theorem 2.1, here we simulate the LLL sampler on the network $G = (V, E)$, where each node $v \in V$ holds an independent random variable X_v and a bad event A_v . Note that any 1-round communication in the dependency graph D_I can be simulated by $O(t(n))$ -round communications in this network $G = (V, E)$. Also note that at each $v \in V$, the values of $t(n)$ and $\gamma(n)$ can be computed locally by knowing $n = |V|$ and enumerating all network instances $\mathcal{I} \in \mathfrak{C}$ with n nodes. The LLL sampler can thus be simulated with $O(t(n))$ -multiplicative overhead. In the end it outputs an $\mathbf{X}^* = (X_v^*)_{v \in V} \sim \mu_I$, which is identically distributed as $(\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbf{0})$, i.e. the random bits used in the algorithm \mathcal{A} conditioned on no failure. The final output $\mathbf{Y}^* = (Y_v^*)_{v \in V}$ is computed by simulating \mathcal{A} within $t(n)$ locality deterministically using $\mathbf{X}^* = (X_v^*)_{v \in V}$ as random bits.

The LLL sampler in Theorem 2.1 is a Las Vegas algorithm with random terminations. Each node $v \in V$ can continue updating Y_v^* using the current random bits \mathbf{X}_B^* it has collected within its $t(n)$ -local neighborhood $B = B_{t(n)}(v)$. Once the LLL sampler for generating \mathbf{X}^* terminates at all nodes, the updating of \mathbf{Y}^* will stabilize within additional $t(n)$ rounds. And this final \mathbf{Y}^* is identically distributed as $(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{A}} \mid \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbf{0})$. This gives us the zero-error Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm \mathcal{B} as claimed in Theorem 2.3. \square

3 Algorithm and Outline of Proof

In this section, we describe the main sampling algorithm and outline the proof of Theorem 2.1, the LOCAL sampling lemma. The proof consists of the following main parts.

- We define a notion of correlation decay that is useful for sampling. We introduce an “augmentation” of the LLL instance, which creates correlation decay by introducing a new local bad event. (Section 3.1)
- The zero-error Las Vegas algorithm for sampling, is presented in a sequential local paradigm, called SLOCAL-LV algorithms, which can be simulated by LOCAL algorithms. (Section 3.2)
- After the first two phases of the sampling algorithm, namely, *Initialization* and *Clustering*, a random assignment \mathbf{Y} is generated, and the violated bad events are clustered into balls. (Section 3.3)
- In the last phase of the sampling algorithm, namely *Resampling*, the random assignment \mathbf{Y} is locally fixed, where the variables involved in the violated bad events are resampled. In the end, the updated assignment \mathbf{Y} is guaranteed to follow the correct LLL distribution. (Section 3.4)

At last, we wrap up the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Section 3.5.

In our proof, the step of the augmentation of LLL to get correlation, and the *Resampling* phase of the sampling algorithm, are technically innovative, while the rests are more routine in technique.

Graph notation. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph. The following notations are used throughout.

- **Neighborhoods:** $N_G(v) \triangleq \{u \in V \mid \{u, v\} \in E\}$ and inclusive neighborhood $N_G^+(v) \triangleq N(v) \cup \{v\}$.
- **Distances:** $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$ represents the shortest path distance between u and v in G , and $\text{dist}_G(S, T) \triangleq \min_{u \in S, v \in T} \text{dist}_G(u, v)$. The diameter of $S \subseteq V$ in G is given by $\text{diam}_G(S) \triangleq \text{dist}_G(S, S)$.
- **Balls:** $B_r^G(v) \triangleq \{u \in V \mid \text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq r\}$ and $B_r^G(S) \triangleq \{u \in V \mid \text{dist}_G(u, S) \leq r\}$ for $S \subseteq V$.
- **Spheres:** $S_{[\ell, r]}^G(v) \triangleq B_r^G(v) \setminus B_{\ell-1}^G(v)$ and $S_{[\ell, r]}^G(T) \triangleq B_r^G(T) \setminus B_{\ell-1}^G(T)$ for $T \subseteq V$.

In all above notations, we omit the underlying graph G if it is clear in the context.

3.1 Decay of correlation in LLL

Let $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$ be a LLL instance, where each random variable X_i follows the distribution ν_i over domain Σ_i . For $\Lambda \subseteq U$, define $\Sigma_\Lambda \triangleq \prod_{i \in \Lambda} \Sigma_i$ and $\nu_\Lambda \triangleq \prod_{i \in \Lambda} \nu_i$, and write $\nu = \nu_U$ and $\Sigma = \Sigma_U$.

For nonempty $\Lambda \subset U$ and $\tau \in \Sigma_\Lambda$, define

$$\Omega^\tau = \Omega_I^\tau \triangleq \{\sigma \in \Sigma \mid \sigma_\Lambda = \tau \text{ and } \sigma \text{ avoids bad events } A_v \text{ for all } v \in V \text{ s.t. } \text{vbl}(v) \not\subseteq \Lambda\}. \quad (3)$$

For disjoint $S, T \subseteq U$, for $\sigma \in \Sigma_S$ and $\tau \in \Sigma_T$, denote by $\sigma \wedge \tau$ the direct concatenation of σ and τ , that is, $\sigma \wedge \tau \in \Sigma_{S \cup T}$ satisfying $(\sigma \wedge \tau)_i = \sigma(i)$ for $i \in S$ and $(\sigma \wedge \tau)_i = \tau(i)$ for $i \in T$.

The following defines a notion of correlation decay in the LLL instance.

Definition 3.1 (ϵ -correlated sets). A pair of disjoint $S, T \subset U$ with $S \cup T \neq U$, is said to be ϵ -correlated, if one of S, T is empty, or for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_S$ and $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Sigma_T$,

$$\nu(\Omega^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_1}) \cdot \nu(\Omega^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_2}) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \nu(\Omega^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_2}) \cdot \nu(\Omega^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_1}).$$

To see that this indeed defines a decay of correlation, note that it is equivalent to the following property: For \mathbf{X} drawn according to the product distribution ν that avoids all bad events A_v satisfying $\text{vbl}(v) \not\subseteq S \cup T$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(X_S = \sigma_1 \wedge X_T = \tau_1) \cdot \Pr(X_S = \sigma_2 \wedge X_T = \tau_2) \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \Pr(X_S = \sigma_1 \wedge X_T = \tau_2) \cdot \Pr(X_S = \sigma_2 \wedge X_T = \tau_1). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that we want to bound the correlation between X_S and X_T in a random satisfying assignment \mathbf{X} distributed as $\mu = \mu_I$, which is drawn according to the product distribution ν that avoids all bad events A_v . Here, Definition 3.1 is slightly different by ignoring the bad events A_v defined on the variables within $S \cup T$.

The decay of correlation is crucial for sampling from joint distributions. However, such property is not taken for granted for all γ -satisfiable LLL instances. A key idea is then to properly ‘‘augment’’ the LLL instance by introducing new bad events to enforce desirable correlation decay. This must be done carefully because this would inevitably bias the LLL distribution, which needs to be taken care of later.

The following is a key lemma which guarantees that in a LLL instance, if a local neighborhood S is separated from a far enough region T by a well-satisfiable boundary, then S and T can be made enough ϵ -correlated by introducing a new bad event which is locally defined and can scarcely occur.

Given a LLL instance $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$, for any $\Lambda \subseteq V$, we denote

$$\text{vbl}(\Lambda) \triangleq \bigcup_{v \in \Lambda} \text{vbl}(v) \quad \text{and} \quad I(\Lambda) \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in \text{vbl}(\Lambda)}, \{A_v\}_{v \in \Lambda}),$$

where $I(\Lambda)$ is the LLL sub-instance induced by the bad events $\{A_v\}_{v \in \Lambda}$.

Lemma 3.1 (LLL augmentation). *There is a universal constant $C_0 > 0$ such that the followings hold for any $\epsilon, \gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{\gamma}{2})$, and for all $\ell \geq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, where*

$$\ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) \triangleq \left\lceil C_0 \cdot \log \frac{2}{\epsilon} \cdot \log \frac{2}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \log \left(2 \log \frac{2}{\epsilon} \cdot \log \frac{2}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right\rceil. \quad (4)$$

Let $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$ be a LLL instance whose dependency graph is D_I . For any nonempty $\Lambda \subseteq V$, if the sub-instance $I(B_\ell(\Lambda) \setminus \Lambda)$ is γ -satisfiable, then there exists a new bad event A_λ with $\lambda \notin V$ such that:

1. A_λ is an event defined on the random variables in $\text{vbl}(\lambda) = \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda)) \setminus \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$, and the construction of A_λ depends only on the specifications of Λ , $\{A_v\}_{v \in B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda)}$, $\{X_i\}_{i \in \text{vbl}(B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda))}$ and $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$;
2. A_λ occurs with probability at most δ on independent random variables $\{X_i\}_{i \in U}$, i.e. $\nu(A_\lambda) \leq \delta$;
3. the variable sets $S = \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$ and $T = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))$ are ϵ -correlated in the augmented LLL instance

$$\hat{I} = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_\lambda\}).$$

All balls $B_\ell(\cdot)$ and spheres $S_{[\cdot, \cdot]}(\cdot)$ in above are defined in the dependency graph D_I of the LLL instance I .

Notation for the new bad event. For $\epsilon, \gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{\gamma}{2})$, and $\ell = \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, for $\Lambda \subseteq V$ satisfying that $I(B_\ell(\Lambda) \setminus \Lambda)$ is γ -satisfiable, we use $A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}^I$ to denote the bad event A_λ constructed in Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.1 is a novel and critical part of our approach. Its proof is technical, and is exposed in Section 5.

3.2 Las Vegas SLOCAL algorithm

Our main sampling algorithm is described in a sequential local (SLOCAL) paradigm. The SLOCAL model introduced by Ghaffari, Kuhn, and Maus [GKM17] captures the local computations where symmetry breaking is not concerned. We extend this notion to the algorithms with random locality of computation.

SLOCAL-LV algorithms An N -scan SLOCAL-LV algorithm runs on a network $G = (V, E)$ with a subset $A \subseteq V$ of active nodes. Each node $v \in V$ maintains a local memory state M_v , which initially stores v 's local input, random bits, unique ID and also a list of neighbors' IDs, and a bit that indicates whether $v \in A$. An arbitrary static total order is assumed on nodes in V , such that the relative order between any pair $u, v \in V$ can be deduced from the contents of M_u and M_v .

The algorithm operates in $N \geq 1$ scans. Within each scan, the active nodes in A are processed one after another in the ordering. Upon each node $v \in A$ being processed, for $\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, the node v tries to grow an ℓ -ball $B_\ell(v)$ and update the memory states M_u for all $u \in B_\ell(v)$ based on the information observed so far by v , until some stopping condition has been met by the information within the current ball $B_\ell(v)$. Finally, each $v \in V$ outputs a value based on its memory state M_v .

Compared to the standard (Monte Carlo) SLOCAL algorithm, whose locality is upper bounded by a fixed value, in SLOCAL-LV algorithm, the local neighborhoods are randomly constructed in a sequential and local fashion. The next theorem gives a simulation of SLOCAL-LV algorithms in the LOCAL model.

Proposition 3.2 (simulation of SLOCAL-LV in LOCAL). *Let \mathcal{A} be an N -scan SLOCAL-LV algorithm that assumes an arbitrary ordering of nodes. Then there is a randomized LOCAL algorithm \mathcal{B} , such that starting from the same initial memory states $\mathbf{M} = (M_v)_{v \in V}$, the algorithm \mathcal{B} terminates and returns the same output as \mathcal{A} within $O(|A| \cdot \max_{v \in A, j \in [N]} \ell_{v,j})$ rounds, where A is the set of active nodes and $\ell_{v,j}$ is the radius of the ball accessed by the active node v in the j th scan of algorithm \mathcal{A} , both fully determined by \mathbf{M} .*

Compared to the simulation of SLOCAL Monte Carlo algorithm in the LOCAL model proved in [GKM17], which relies on the network decomposition to parallelize the SLOCAL procedure, Proposition 3.2 provides a rather straightforward simulation which does not parallelize the local computations. An advantage of such easy simulation is that it does not require a worst-case complexity upper bound for all scan orders of nodes. And this translation from SLOCAL-LV to LOCAL algorithm makes it more convenient to describe LOCAL algorithms where there are multiple randomly growing local neighborhoods interfering each other.

A formal proof of Proposition 3.2 is given in Appendix A for completeness.

3.3 Algorithm: Initialization and Clustering

Now we can describe the sampling algorithm in Theorem 2.1. The input instance is a γ -satisfiable LLL instance $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$ with $n = |V|$ bad events. The network $G = D_I$ is its dependency graph. Our goal is to output a random satisfying assignment $\mathbf{X}^* = (X_i^*)_{i \in U}$ drawn from the LLL distribution μ_I .

The algorithm consists of three phase: *initialization*, *clustering*, and *resampling*. The first phase is described in the LOCAL model.

- **Initialization:** produces a random assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ and a random set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq V$, satisfying certain desirable property, within fixed $\tilde{O}(\log^3 n)$ rounds on the LOCAL model.

Then this random $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{R})$ is passed to a 2-scan SLOCAL-LV algorithm that runs on the same network, where the two scans corresponds to the two phases of the algorithm, respectively.

- **Clustering:** cluster the bad event that are not avoided by \mathbf{Y} in to balls that are reasonably far apart.
- **Resampling:** properly fix the assignments on the balls to obtain the correct $\mathbf{X}^* \sim \mu_I$.

Due to Proposition 3.2, the 2-scan SLOCAL-LV algorithm can be transformed to a LOCAL algorithm, which altogether with the initialization phase, give us the LOCAL algorithm claimed in Theorem 2.1.

Initialization. The goal of this phase is to generate a random assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ and a random node set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq V$ satisfying the following condition.

Condition 3.3. *The followings hold for $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ and $\mathcal{R} \subseteq V$:*

1. \mathbf{Y} follows the product distribution ν .
2. For any $v \in V$, if A_v occurs on \mathbf{Y} , then there is $u \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\text{dist}(u, v) \leq d \cdot \log n \cdot \log \log \log n$, for some large enough universal constant d to be specified later.
3. For any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we have $|\mathcal{R}| = O\left(\log n \cdot \log \log n \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$.

Intuitively, Condition 3.3 guarantees that the random vector $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ is generated according to the product distribution ν , and $\mathcal{R} \subseteq V$ is a small set of “centers”, such that all bad events made occur by \mathbf{Y} are not far from some center. In the LOCAL model, this can be achieved rather straightforwardly with the help of network decomposition, which is a major building block for distributed algorithms.

Definition 3.2 (network decomposition). A weak (c, d) -network decomposition of $G = (V, E)$ is a pair $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C})$, where $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots\}$ is a partition of V into vertex subsets, each with diameter at most d ; and $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [c]$ is a proper coloring of \mathcal{S} such that $\mathcal{C}(S_1) \neq \mathcal{C}(S_2)$ for any $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\text{dist}_G(S_1, S_2) = 1$.

We adopt the recent bound for deterministic network decomposition from [GGH⁺23].

Lemma 3.4 ([GGH⁺23]). *There is a deterministic LOCAL algorithm that, on any network G with n nodes, computes a weak $(O(\log n), O(\log n \cdot \log \log \log n))$ -network decomposition of G in $\tilde{O}(\log^3 n)$ rounds.*

Note that each node $v \in V$ corresponds to a bad event A_v defined on the variables in $\text{vbl}(v)$, and one variable may appear in the $\text{vbl}(v)$ for multiple v 's. Alternatively, one can assign each variable to a unique node through the following partition:

$$\forall v \in V, \quad U_v \triangleq \{i \in \text{vbl}(v) \mid v \text{ has the smallest ID among all } v' \in V \text{ with } i \in \text{vbl}(v')\}.$$

It is obvious that $\{U_v \mid v \in V\}$ is a partition of U , assuming that $U = \text{vbl}(V)$ is the set of variables ever appearing in any bad events. Also, each node $v \in V$ can compute U_v within one round.

The algorithm for producing the desirable $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{R})$ is as follows. At first, each node $v \in V$ locally draws $Y_i \sim \nu_i$ independently for all $i \in U_v$. This gives the random assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ that follows the product distributions ν . Next, $\mathcal{R} \subseteq V$ is constructed in three steps. First, each node $v \in V$ checks if A_v is avoided by \mathbf{Y} , which costs one round since $\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq \bigcup_{w \in N^+(v)} U_w$. Second, construct a weak $(c \cdot \log n, d \cdot \log n \cdot \log \log \log n)$ -network decomposition $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C})$ for some suitable constant $c, d \in \mathbb{N}$, which according to Lemma 3.4, can be achieved within $\tilde{O}(\log^3 n)$ rounds. At last, within each cluster $S \in \mathcal{S}$, each node $v \in S$ checks whether the union bad event $A_S \triangleq \bigcup_{v \in S} A_v$ is avoided by \mathbf{Y} , and marks v in \mathcal{R} iff A_S occurs and v has the smallest ID within the cluster S . This guarantees that for any bad event A_v that occurs on \mathbf{Y} , the node $v \in V$ must be $d \cdot \log n \cdot \log \log \log n$ -close to a node in \mathcal{R} , and the construction of such \mathcal{R} takes $\tilde{O}(\log n)$ rounds given the network decomposition $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C})$, because the diameter of each cluster $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is at most $d \cdot \log n \cdot \log \log \log n$. Altogether, we have the following.

Lemma 3.5. *The initialization phase outputs $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{R})$ satisfying Condition 3.3 within $\tilde{O}(\log^3 n)$ rounds.*

It only remains to verify that $|\mathcal{R}| = O\left(\log n \cdot \log \log n \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, which follows from the Chernoff bound. A formal proof is included in Section 6.1 for completeness.

Clustering. The random assignment \mathbf{Y} and node set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq V$ constructed in the initialization phase, is passed to a SLOCAL-LV algorithm, which runs on the same network $G = D_I$ and takes \mathcal{R} as the set of active nodes. The SLOCAL-LV algorithm runs in two scans, where the first scan is the *Clustering* phase.

Each node $v \in V$ maintains a local memory M_v , which initially stores its UID $\text{id}(v)$, the private random bits, the part of the random assignment $(Y_i)_{i \in U_v}$ and the indicator of whether $v \in \mathcal{R}$. The total order assumed on V is a natural one: $u < v$ iff $\text{id}(u) < \text{id}(v)$ for any $u, v \in V$.

The SLOCAL-LV algorithm scans the active nodes $v \in \mathcal{R}$ in order, and computes two parameters $p_v \in V \cup \{\perp\}$ and $r_v \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\perp\}$ for each $v \in \mathcal{R}$, which defines a collection of balls in the network G :

$$\mathcal{B} \triangleq \{B_{r_v}(p_v) \mid v \in \mathcal{R} \wedge p_v \neq \perp \wedge r_v \neq \perp\}. \quad (5)$$

The goal is to construct a collection \mathcal{B} of far-apart and reasonably small balls, which together with the random assignment \mathbf{Y} , satisfy some desirable property which we will formulate soon.

Definition 3.3 (marginal distribution). For $\Lambda \subseteq U$, a $\tau \in \Sigma_\Lambda$ is said to be a *feasible boundary condition* if $\Omega^\tau \neq \emptyset$, where Ω^τ is defined in (3). Given $\Lambda \subset U$ and feasible boundary condition $\tau \in \Sigma_\Lambda$, for any nonempty $S \subseteq U \setminus \Lambda$, the *marginal distribution* on S induced by $\mu = \mu_I$ conditioned on τ , denoted by $\mu_S^\tau = \mu_{I,S}^\tau$, is defined as:

$$\forall \sigma \in \Sigma_S, \quad \mu_S^\tau(\sigma) \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} (X_S = \sigma \mid \mathbf{X} \in \Omega^\tau).$$

The following notion of *clustered conditional Gibbs property*, is inspired by the “conditional Gibbs” property introduced in [FVY21, FGY22]. Here we refine the definition to adapt to a structure of clustering.

Definition 3.4 (clustered conditional Gibbs). Let $\epsilon, \gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{\gamma}{2})$, and $\ell = \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, where $\ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$ is defined in (4). Let $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$ be a LLL instance. A random pair $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{B})$, where $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ is an assignment and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$ is a collection of node sets, is said to satisfy the *clustered conditional Gibbs property* on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, if for any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$ with $\Pr(\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}) > 0$:

1. the sub-instance $I(B_\ell(\Lambda) \setminus \Lambda)$ is γ -satisfiable for every $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}$;
2. for $S \triangleq \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}} \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$, $T \triangleq U \setminus \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}} \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))$, for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_S$ with $\Pr(\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B} \wedge Y_S = \sigma) > 0$, conditioned on that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B} \wedge Y_S = \sigma$, the assignment Y_T follows the marginal distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}, T}^\sigma$, i.e.

$$\forall \tau \in \Sigma_T, \quad \Pr(Y_T = \tau \mid \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B} \wedge Y_S = \sigma) = \mu_{\hat{I}, T}^\sigma(\tau),$$

where \hat{I} stands for the LLL instance defined by $\hat{I} = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}^I \mid \Lambda \in \mathcal{B}\})$ and recall that $A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}^I$ represents the bad event constructed in Lemma 3.1.

All above balls $B_\ell(\cdot)$ are defined in the dependency graph D_I of the LLL instance I .

Let $0 < \zeta_0 < 1$ be a sufficient small constant. We define the choice of parameter

$$(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0) \triangleq \left(\frac{1}{2n}, \frac{\gamma}{8}, \frac{\zeta_0 \cdot \gamma}{24n^3} \right) \quad (6)$$

and let $\ell = \ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$. Our goal is to construct \mathcal{B} so that $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ satisfies the following condition.

Condition 3.6. The random assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ and random collection of node sets $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$, satisfy

1. $\text{dist}_G(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2) \geq 2(\ell + 2)$ for any distinct $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \in \mathcal{B}$;
2. $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$.

The following is the SLOCAL-LV algorithm for constructing such $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$. Each node $v \in \mathcal{R}$ maintains a variable $b_v \in V \cup \{\perp\}$ in its local memory M_v , which is initialized to \perp . The SLOCAL-LV algorithm sequentially processes each active node $v \in \mathcal{R}$ in order. The pseudocode is given in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: The SLOCAL-LV algorithm for Clustering at node $v \in \mathcal{R}$

```

1 set  $p_v \leftarrow v$  and  $r_v \leftarrow 1 + d \cdot \log n \cdot \log \log \log n$ ;
2 while true do
3   if there exist  $u \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{v\}$  and  $w \in B_{2(\ell+2)+r_v}(p_u)$  such that  $b_w = u$  then
4     let  $c \in V$  be the node with the smallest  $\text{id}(c)$  satisfying
        $\text{dist}(p_u, c) \leq r_u + \ell + 2$  and  $\text{dist}(p_u, c) \leq r_v + \ell + 2$ ;
       // Such  $c \in V$  must exist since  $\text{dist}(p_u, p_v) \leq r_u + r_v + 2(\ell + 2)$ .
5     set  $p_v \leftarrow c$  and  $r_v \leftarrow r_u + r_v + 2 \cdot (\ell + 2)$ ;
6      $\forall w \in B_{r_u}(p_u)$ : set  $b_w \leftarrow \perp$ ;
7     set  $p_u \leftarrow \perp$  and  $r_u \leftarrow \perp$ ;
8   else if  $\mathbf{Y}$  makes the bad event  $A_{\lambda(B_{r_v}(p_v), \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}^I$  occur then
9     update the radius of the ball responsible for node  $v$  to  $r_v \leftarrow r_v + \ell$ ;
10  else
11     $\forall u \in B_{r_v}(p_v)$ : set  $b_u \leftarrow v$ ;
12  return;
```

After all active nodes $v \in \mathcal{R}$ have been processed, the 1st scan of the SLOCAL-LV algorithm terminates, and the collection \mathcal{B} of balls are constructed as in (5) from the centers p_v and radius r_v computed for $v \in \mathcal{R}$. Formally, the followings are guaranteed for the clustering \mathcal{B} and the random assignment \mathbf{Y} .

Lemma 3.7. *Assume Condition 3.3. The followings hold after Algorithm 1 is sequentially executed on all node $v \in \mathcal{R}$ in the ascending order of $\text{id}(v)$, which computes the values of $p_v \in V \cup \{\perp\}$ and $r_v \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\perp\}$ for each $v \in \mathcal{R}$ and thereby constructs $\mathcal{B} \triangleq \{B_{r_v}(p_v) \mid v \in \mathcal{R} \wedge p_v \neq \perp \wedge r_v \neq \perp\}$.*

1. *For any distinct $u, v \in \mathcal{R}$, if $p_u, p_v, r_u, r_v \notin \{\perp\}$ then $B_{r_u}(p_u) \cap B_{r_v}(p_v) = \emptyset$, which guarantees that each ball $B = B_{r_v}(p_v) \in \mathcal{B}$ is uniquely identified by some node $v \in \mathcal{R}$ with $p_v, r_v \notin \{\perp\}$.*
2. *$(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ satisfies Condition 3.6.*
3. *For any $0 < \eta < 1$, with probability at least $1 - \eta$, the sum of radii of all balls in \mathcal{B} is bounded as*

$$\mathcal{D} \triangleq \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{R} \\ p_v \neq \perp, r_v \neq \perp}} r_v = \tilde{O} \left(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\eta} \right).$$

Lemma 3.7 is formally proved in Section 6.2.

The following corollary follows easily from Lemma 3.7, since \mathcal{D} is monotonically increasing during the scan, and upper bounds the radii of the local neighborhoods of the SLOCAL-LV algorithm.

Corollary 3.8. *For any $0 < \eta < 1$, with probability at least $1 - \eta$, Algorithm 1 returns at every node $v \in \mathcal{R}$ within radius $\tilde{O} \left(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\eta} \right)$.*

3.4 Algorithm: Resampling

The second scan of the SLOCAL-LV algorithm corresponds to the *Resampling* phase. The algorithm scans the active nodes $v \in \mathcal{R}$ sequentially in the ascending order of their ID's, and properly fix the random assignment \mathbf{Y} generated in the *Initialization* phase, over the balls in \mathcal{B} constructed in the *Clustering* phase, to finally obtain the random satisfying assignment \mathbf{X}^* distributed correctly as the LLL distribution μ_I .

Ideal case (one ball to fix). First, we consider an ideal case for the *Resampling* phase. Suppose after the *Clustering* phase, there is only one node $v \in \mathcal{R}$ with $p_v \neq \perp$ and $r_v \neq \perp$, which means \mathcal{B} contains only one ball $\Lambda = B_{r_v}(p_v)$. Our goal is to locally fix the assignment \mathbf{Y} around Λ to make it follow the correct distribution μ_I . How to resolve with this ideal one-ball case is the technical crux of this phase.

Recall the choice of parameters $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$ in (6). It can be routinely verified that the LLL instance I , the random assignment \mathbf{Y} , the ball $\Lambda = B_{r_v}(p_v) \in \mathcal{B}$ of bad events, together with the parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha) = (\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0, \gamma_0)$ satisfy the following condition.

Condition 3.9. *Given the LLL instance $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$, the random assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$, and the subset $\Lambda \subseteq V$ of bad events, along with the parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ satisfy that*

- $0 < \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \alpha \leq \gamma < 1$ and $0 < \delta < \zeta_0 \cdot \alpha$;
- the LLL instance I is α -satisfiable and the sub-instance $I(V \setminus \Lambda)$ is γ -satisfiable;
- $(\mathbf{Y}, \{\Lambda\})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$.

Our goal is to locally modify the random assignment \mathbf{Y} to follow the correct distribution μ_I , as long as Condition 3.9 is satisfied initially. To achieve this, we recall the new bad event A_λ constructed in Lemma 3.1, and also consider its complementary event $A_{\bar{\lambda}}$:

$$A_\lambda \triangleq A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}^I, \text{ where } \lambda \notin V, \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\bar{\lambda}} \triangleq \overline{A_\lambda}, \text{ where } \bar{\lambda} \notin V. \quad (7)$$

And define the following two augmented LLL instances:

$$\hat{I} = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V \cup \{\lambda\}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{I}' = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V \cup \{\bar{\lambda}\}}). \quad (8)$$

There is an idealized sampling procedure: with probability $P = \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda]$, update \mathbf{Y} to follow the distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}}$; otherwise, update \mathbf{Y} to follow the distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}'}$. Altogether, this generates a random assignment $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_I$. A challenge is that P is hard to compute, which can be remedied by an estimation within a small interval $[L, R]$. This is stated by the following lemma, which is proved in Section 7.3.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$ be a LLL instance. Let $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $0 < \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 < 1$ and $\ell = \ell_0(\epsilon^k, \alpha_2, \alpha_1 \cdot \epsilon^k)$. For any nonempty $\Lambda \subseteq V$ and an arbitrary event A_λ defined on the random variables in $\text{vbl}(\Lambda)$, assuming that I is α_1 -satisfiable and $I(V \setminus \Lambda)$ is α_2 -satisfiable, there is a $\hat{P} \in (0, 1)$ determined only by Λ , A_λ , and $I(B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda))$, such that*

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda] \in [\hat{P} - 2\epsilon^k, \hat{P} + 2\epsilon^k].$$

The ball $B(\cdot)$ on above is defined in the dependency graph D_I .

To apply the aforementioned strategy, we draw a uniform random $\rho \in [0, 1)$ beforehand. If $\rho \in [0, L)$, we enter the zone for generating $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}}$; if $\rho \in [R, 1)$, we enter the zone for generating $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}'}$; and otherwise $\rho \in [L, R)$, we enter the “zone of indecision”, in which case we increase the radius ℓ in Lemma 3.10 to get a more accurate estimation of P . Similar idea was used in [AJ22, HWY22].

To locally update \mathbf{Y} to get $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}}$, we use the approach of *Bayes filter* in [FGY22]. Let $S = \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$ and $T = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}(\Lambda))$. By Condition 3.9, $Y_T \sim \mu_{\hat{I}, T}^{Y_S}$. The Bayes filter $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Y}, S, T)$ satisfies

$$\Pr[\mathcal{F} \text{ succeeds}] \propto \frac{\mu_{\hat{I}, T}(Y_T)}{\mu_{\hat{I}, T}^{Y_S}(Y_T)} = \frac{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_T}) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_S})}{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_S \wedge Y_T})} \propto \frac{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_T})}{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_S \wedge Y_T})} \triangleq f(Y_T), \quad (9)$$

where \propto are taken over all $Y_T \in \Sigma_T$ with $\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_S \wedge Y_T}) > 0$. The function $f(Y_T) \triangleq \nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_T}) / \nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_S \wedge Y_T})$ is defined for all such Y_T . Note that $\Pr[\mathcal{F} \text{ succeeds}] = \frac{f(Y_T)}{\max f}$, and this probability can be computed locally from $B_{\ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)+1}(\Lambda)$. If \mathcal{F} succeeds, we resamples $Y_{U \setminus T} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}, U \setminus T}^{Y_T}$. This gives $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}}$ by the Bayes law. Furthermore, the Bayes filter \mathcal{F} succeeds with large chance due to the correlation decay in \hat{I} .

For all other branches (\mathcal{F} failed or generate $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}'}$), we recursively apply the sampling algorithm on properly grown balls in the respective instances \hat{I} or \hat{I}' to satisfy the invariant Condition 3.9. This recursive procedure *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) is described in Algorithm 2, where the argument \mathbf{Y} is passed-by-pointer, so that it can be updated in the recursion, while all other arguments are passed-by-value.

The correctness and efficiency of Algorithm 2 are stated by the following lemma, proved in Section 7.

Lemma 3.11. *Assume that Condition 3.9 is satisfied by the input of *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$).*

1. *After *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) returns, \mathbf{Y} follows the distribution μ_I .*
2. *For any $0 < \eta < 1$, with probability $1 - \eta$, *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) accesses $I(B_r(\Lambda))$ and updates $Y_{\text{vbl}(B_r(\Lambda))}$, where $r = \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) + \tilde{O}\left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\eta} + \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\eta} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$.*

Algorithm 2: *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$)

Input: LLL instance $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$, subset $\Lambda \subseteq V$, parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$;
Data : assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ stored globally that can be updated by the algorithm;
// Throughout the algorithm, $A_\lambda, A_{\bar{\lambda}}, \hat{I}, \hat{I}'$ are defined as in (7) and (8).

- 1 initialize $i \leftarrow 1$, and define $\ell_0 \triangleq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$;
- 2 draw $\rho \in [0, 1)$ uniformly at random;
- 3 **while true do**
- 4 $\ell_i \leftarrow \ell_0(\zeta_0^i, \gamma, \alpha \cdot \zeta_0^i)$;
- 5 compute the smallest interval $[L, R]$ containing $P \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda]$ based on $\Lambda, A_\lambda, I(B_{\ell_0 + \ell_i + 1}(\Lambda))$, assuming that I is α -satisfiable and $I(V \setminus B_{\ell_0 + \ell_i + 1}(\Lambda))$ is γ -satisfiable;
 // By Lemma 3.10, such interval $[L, R]$ exists and satisfies $R - L \leq 4\zeta_0^i$.
- 6 **if** $\rho < L$ **then**
- 7 // Enters the zone $[0, L) \subseteq [0, P)$ for generating $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}}$.
- 8 define $T \triangleq U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0}(\Lambda))$;
- 9 **with probability** $\frac{f(Y_T)}{\max f}$, where f is defined as in (9), **do**
- 10 update \mathbf{Y} by redrawing $Y_{U \setminus T} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}, U \setminus T}^{Y_T}$;
- 11 // $\frac{f(Y_T)}{\max f}$ and $\mu_{\hat{I}, U \setminus T}^{Y_T}$ can be evaluated locally within $B_{\ell_0 + 1}(\Lambda)$.
- 12 **else**
- 13 initialize $r \leftarrow \ell_0 + 1$;
- 14 **while** \mathbf{Y} does not avoid the bad event $A_{\lambda(B_r(\Lambda), 1/2, \gamma, \zeta_0 \alpha/2)}^{\hat{I}}$ **do**
- 15 grow the ball: $r \leftarrow r + \ell_0\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}\right)$;
- 16 $\text{RecursiveSampling}\left(\mathbf{Y}; \hat{I}, B_r(\Lambda) \cup \{\lambda\}, \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{2}\right)$;
- 17 **return**;
- 18 **else if** $\rho \geq R$ **then**
- 19 // Enters the zone $[R, 1) \subseteq [P, 1)$ for generating $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}'}$.
- 20 initialize $s \leftarrow \ell_0 + 1$;
- 21 **while** \mathbf{Y} does not avoid the bad event $A_{\lambda(B_s(\Lambda), 1/2, \gamma, \zeta_0 \alpha(1-R)/2)}^{\hat{I}'}$ **do**
- 22 grow the ball: $s \leftarrow s + \ell_0\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha(1-R)}{2}\right)$;
- 23 $\text{RecursiveSampling}\left(\mathbf{Y}; \hat{I}', B_s(\Lambda) \cup \{\bar{\lambda}\}, \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha(1-R)}{2}, \alpha(1-R)\right)$;
- 24 **return**;
- 25 **else**
- 26 // Enters the zone $[L, R)$ of indecision.
- 27 enter the next iteration (and refine the estimation of P): $i \leftarrow i + 1$;

Resampling (general case). Finally, we deal with the general case for the *Resampling* phase. In this case, there may be multiple nodes $v \in \mathcal{R}$ with $p_v \neq \perp$ and $r_v \neq \perp$. Our goal is still to locally fix the assignments \mathbf{Y} to correctly follow the LLL distribution μ_I , only there may be multiple balls $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}$ to fix.

To maintain the invariant Condition 3.9 while sequentially and locally running the *RecursiveSampling* procedure, we introduce the following abstraction called the *Substituting* trick, which is formally described by the following technical lemma, whose proof is in Section 7.4.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $\epsilon, \gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, \gamma]$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{\gamma}{2})$, and $\ell = \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$ which is defined as in (4). Let $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$ be a LLL instance. For any nonempty set $\Lambda \subseteq V$ of bad events, any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(\Lambda)}$, if I is α -satisfiable and $I(B_\ell(\Lambda) \setminus \Lambda)$ is γ -satisfiable, then we can construct a new random variable X_β (with domain Σ_β and distribution ν_β) with $\beta \notin U$ and a new bad event A_κ with $\kappa \notin V$ satisfying the followings:*

1. *The constructions of X_β and A_κ depend only on the specifications of Λ , σ , $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$ and $I(B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda))$. The event A_κ is defined on the random variables in $\text{vbl}(\kappa) = \text{vbl}(B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda)) \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda)) \cup \{\beta\}$.*
2. *Let $T = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))$. For any $W \subseteq T$, any $\omega \in \Sigma_W$ and $\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma_{\bar{W}}$, where $\bar{W} = T \setminus W$, we have*

$$\mu_{\hat{I}, \bar{W}}^{\omega \wedge \sigma}(\bar{\omega}) = \mu_{I_\sigma, \bar{W}}^\omega(\bar{\omega}),$$

where \hat{I} stands for the LLL instance defined by $\hat{I} = \left(\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \left\{ A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}^I \right\} \right)$, where $A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}^I$ represents the bad event constructed in Lemma 3.1, and I_σ stands for the LLL instance defined by $I_\sigma = \left(\{X_i\}_{i \in (U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))) \cup \{\beta\}}, \{A_v\}_{v \in (V \setminus B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda)) \cup \{\kappa\}} \right)$.

3. *The LLL instance I_σ is $(1 - \epsilon) \cdot (\alpha - \delta)$ -satisfiable.*

All balls $B(\cdot)$ in above are defined in the dependency graph D_I of the original LLL instance I .

With this abstraction, the SLOCAL-LV algorithm for the *Resampling* phase can be described as follow. For exposition, we write $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$, where the nodes are sorted in ascending order according to their IDs. The SLOCAL-LV algorithm scans the nodes in \mathcal{R} in this order. Suppose that a node $v = v_k$ with $p_v, r_v \notin \{\perp\}$ is being processed, while the local algorithm is oblivious to its rank k . We are going to define the substituted instance I' and \mathbf{Y}' on which the *RecursiveSampling* procedure is actually applied.

First, define

$$N_k \triangleq \{j \mid v_j \in \mathcal{R} \wedge j > i \wedge p_{v_j} \neq \perp \wedge r_{v_j} \neq \perp\}.$$

For $j \in N_k$, let X_{β_j} and A_{λ_j} denote the respective random variable and bad event constructed in Lemma 3.12 under parameter $\Lambda_j \triangleq B_{r_{v_j}}(p_{v_j}), Y_{\text{vbl}(\Lambda_j)}, (\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0), I(B_{\ell(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)+1}(\Lambda_j))$. Define

$$U' \triangleq U \setminus \bigcup_{j \in N_k} \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}(\Lambda_j)) \quad \text{and} \quad V' \triangleq V \setminus \bigcup_{j \in N_k} B_{\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)+1}(\Lambda_j).$$

Then the substituted instance I' is defined as follows:

$$I' \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U'} \cup \{X_{\beta_j}\}_{j \in N_k}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V'} \cup \{A_{\lambda_j}\}_{j \in N_k}). \quad (10)$$

Let \mathbf{Y} be the current assignment right before the SLOCAL-LV algorithm starts at $v = v_k$. For each $j \in N_k$, let Y_{β_j} be drawn independently from the marginal distribution $\mu_{I', \beta_j}^{Y_{\text{vbl}(\lambda_j) \setminus \{\beta_j\}}}$. This is well-defined because $Y_{\text{vbl}(\lambda_j) \setminus \{\beta_j\}} \subseteq U'$. Then the substituted assignment \mathbf{Y}' is the concatenation of $Y_{U'}$ and $(Y_{\beta_j})_{j \in N_k}$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{Y}' \triangleq Y_{U'} \wedge (Y_{\beta_j})_{j \in N_k}. \quad (11)$$

The SLOCAL-LV algorithm at v just calls $\text{RecursiveSampling}(\mathbf{Y}'; I', B_{r_v}(p_v), \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0, \gamma_0)$. Observe that although the definitions of I' and \mathbf{Y}' involve the global rank k of the node v , the actual constructions of I' and \mathbf{Y}' can be implicit during the recursion of RecursiveSampling , so that the substituted parts of I and \mathbf{Y} are locally constructed when being accessed. This can be realized by local computation on the original I and \mathbf{Y} , after extending the radius of the local algorithm by an additional $2(\mathcal{D} + |\mathcal{R}| \cdot \ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0) + 1)$. This implementation is formally explained in Section 7.

Algorithm 3: The SLOCAL-LV algorithm for Resampling at node $v \in \mathcal{R}$

```

1  $\text{RecursiveSampling}(\mathbf{Y}'; I', B_{r_v}(p_v), \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0, \gamma_0)$ ;
   // The  $I'$  and  $\mathbf{Y}'$  respectively defined in (10), (11) are implicitly given,
   // where the substituted parts are realized at the time being accessed.
2 update  $Y_{U'} \leftarrow Y'_{U'}$ ;
   // Only the updated variables need to be copied.
```

The following lemma states the correctness and efficiency of this algorithm, and is proved in Section 7.5.

Lemma 3.13. *The followings hold after Algorithm 3 is sequentially executed on all node $v \in \mathcal{R}$, assuming that the input \mathbf{Y} and p_v, r_v for $v \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfy the properties asserted by Lemma 3.7.*

1. \mathbf{Y} follows the distribution μ_I .
2. For any $0 < \eta < 1$, with probability $1 - \eta$, Algorithm 3 returns at every node $v \in \mathcal{R}$ within radius

$$\tilde{O}\left(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\log^4 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\eta}\right).$$

3.5 Wrapping up (Proof of Theorem 2.1)

First, we prove the correctness of sampling, i.e. the output random assignment \mathbf{Y} follows the distribution μ_I . By Lemma 3.5, the *Initialization* phase outputs $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{R})$ that satisfies Condition 3.3. Then, they are passed to a 2-scan SLOCAL algorithm on the set \mathcal{R} of active nodes. Since $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{R})$ satisfies Condition 3.3, by Lemma 3.7, after the 1st scan, the assignment \mathbf{Y} , along with the values of $p_v \in V \cup \{\perp\}$ and $r_v \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\perp\}$ for $v \in \mathcal{R}$ computed in this scan, satisfy the condition of Lemma 3.13. Then by Lemma 3.13, after the 2nd scan, the SLOCAL-LV algorithm terminates and computes a random assignment $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_I$. By Proposition 3.2, the SLOCAL-LV algorithm is faithfully simulated by a LOCAL algorithm.

Then, we bound the round complexity of the algorithm. By Lemma 3.5, the *Initialization* phase takes fixed $\tilde{O}(\log^3 n)$ rounds in the LOCAL model. By Proposition 3.2, the round complexity of the LOCAL algorithm that simulates a SLOCAL-LV algorithm is the product of the number of active nodes and the maximum radius of the SLOCAL algorithm. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let R_i be the random variable that represents the maximum radius of the i -th scan of the SLOCAL-LV algorithm. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ be arbitrary. By Lemma 3.5, we have $|\mathcal{R}| = \tilde{O}\left(\log n \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\epsilon}{3}$; by Corollary 3.8, we have $R_1 = \tilde{O}\left(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\epsilon}{3}$; and by Lemma 3.13, we have $R_2 = \tilde{O}\left(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^4 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\epsilon}{3}$. Altogether, by union bound, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, the round complexity of the LOCAL algorithm is bounded by

$$|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \max(R_1, R_2) = \tilde{O}\left(\log^6 n \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^6 \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right).$$

4 Related Work and Discussions

The perfect simulation of Las Vegas algorithms is a fundamental problem. In the celebrated work of Luby, Sinclair and Zuckerman [LSZ93], an optimal strategy was given for speeding up Las Vegas algorithms. Their approach was based on stochastic resetting, which requires global coordination and works for the Las Vegas algorithms with deterministic outputs, or the interruptible random outputs.

The distribution of satisfying solutions of the Lovász local lemma (LLL) has drawn much attention, e.g. in [GJL19, Har20]. Its perfect simulation was studied in [GJL19, HWY22, HSW21, FGW⁺23], where several key approaches for perfect sampling were applied, including: partial rejection sampling (PRS) [GJL19], “lazy depth-first” method of Anand and Jerrum (a.k.a. the AJ algorithm) [AJ22], coupling from the past (CFTP) [PW96], and coupling towards the past (CTTP) [FGW⁺23].

In the LOCAL model, Ghaffari, Harris and Kuhn [GHK18] showed that for distributed graph problems, where the goal is to construct feasible graph configurations, the fixed-round Las Vegas algorithms and the zero-error Las Vegas algorithms are equivalent up to polylogarithmic rounds. Their approach was based on a derandomization by conditional expectations, and hence was especially suitable for the tasks where the support of the output distribution, instead of the output distribution itself, is concerned, such as the searching problems for constructing feasible solutions.

The LOCAL algorithms and Gibbs distributions are intrinsically related. For example, the distributions of the random bits on which a fixed-round Las Vegas LOCAL algorithm successfully returns are Gibbs distributions, where the certifiers of local failures are the local constraints defining the Gibbs distribution. In [FY18], Feng and Yin gave a LOCAL sampler with local failures for the Gibbs distributions with strong spatial mixing by parallelizing the JVV sampler [JVV86] using the network decomposition [LS93].

Discussion of the current result. In this paper, we show that for local computation, the successful output of any fixed-round Las Vegas computation, where failures are reported locally, can be perfectly simulated with polylogarithmic overheads.

As by-products, this gives perfect simulations, via efficient (polylogarithmic-round) local computation, for several fundamental classes of high-dimensional joint distributions, including:

- random satisfying solutions of Lovász local lemma with non-negligible satisfiability;
- uniform locally checkable labelings (LCLs) with non-negligible feasibility;
- Gibbs distributions satisfying the strong spatial mixing with exponential decay.

We develop a novel approach for augmenting Lovász local lemma (LLL) instances by introducing locally-defined new bad events, to create the desirable decay of correlation. We also give a recursive local sampling procedure, which utilizes the correlation decay to accelerate the sampling process, and meanwhile still keeps the sampling result correct, without being biased by the change to the LLL instance.

At first glance, it almost looks like we are creating mixing conditions out of nothing. In particular, the approach seems to bypass the local-lemma-type conditions for sampling (e.g. the one assumed in [HWY22]). But indeed, our augmentation of LLL instances relies on that the LLL instances are fairly satisfiable (or at least the separator between the regions that we want to de-correlate should be enough satisfiable). Sampling in such instances might already be tractable in conventional computation models, e.g. in polynomial-time Turing machine, but the problem remains highly nontrivial for local computation.

This new approach for perfect simulation works especially well in the models where the locality is the sole concern. A fundamental question is how this could be extended to the models where the computation and/or communication costs are also concerned, e.g. CONGEST model or PRAM model.

5 Analysis of Correlation Decay

In this section, we prove Lemma 3.1, which augments the LLL instance to create correlation decay.

Let $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$ be a LLL instance with dependency graph D_I . Let $\Lambda \subseteq V$ be a nonempty subset of bad events. For integer $r \geq 0$, define the following ‘‘rings’’ of variables:

$$R_r^I(\Lambda) \triangleq \begin{cases} \text{vbl}(\Lambda) & \text{if } r = 0; \\ \text{vbl}(B_r^{D_I}(\Lambda)) \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{r-1}^{D_I}(\Lambda)) & \text{if } r > 0; \end{cases}$$

and $R_{[i,j]}^I(\Lambda) \triangleq \bigcup_{i \leq r \leq j} R_r^I(\Lambda)$.

We further define the corresponding subsets of bad events:

$$V_{[i,j]}^I(\Lambda) \triangleq \left\{ v \in V \mid \text{vbl}(v) \cap R_{[i,j]}^I(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset \right\},$$

$$V_{(i,j)}^I(\Lambda) \triangleq \left\{ v \in V \mid \text{vbl}(v) \subseteq R_{[i,j]}^I(\Lambda) \right\}.$$

Let \mathbf{X} be drawn from the product distribution ν . For $0 \leq i < j$, for $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_i^I(\Lambda)}$ and $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_j^I(\Lambda)}$, define the probability that \mathbf{X} avoids all the bad events who ever use the variables sandwiched between the two rings $R_i^I(\Lambda)$ and $R_j^I(\Lambda)$, given the boundary condition σ and τ , as:

$$P_\Lambda^I(i, \sigma; j, \tau) \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids all bad events } A_v \text{ s.t. } v \in V_{[i+1, j-1]}^I(\Lambda) \mid X_{R_i^I(\Lambda)} = \sigma \wedge X_{R_j^I(\Lambda)} = \tau \right).$$

We further define the average $P_\Lambda^I(i, \sigma; j, \tau)$ over τ :

$$P_\Lambda^I(i, \sigma; j, *) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \nu_{\text{vbl}(\lambda_j)}} [P_\Lambda^I(i, \sigma; j, \tau)]$$

$$= \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids all bad events } A_v \text{ s.t. } v \in V_{[i+1, j-1]}^I(\Lambda) \mid X_{R_i^I(\Lambda)} = \sigma \right),$$

and $P_\Lambda^I(i, *, j, \tau)$ is symmetrically defined.

5.1 Construction of the bad event A_λ

Let $\epsilon, \gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{\gamma}{2})$, and $\ell \geq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$. Let $\Lambda \subseteq V$ and suppose that the sub-instance $I(B_\ell(\Lambda) \setminus \Lambda)$ is γ -satisfiable. The new bad event A_λ claimed in Lemma 3.1 is constructed as follows.

For $0 \leq i \leq \ell + 1$, initialize A_{λ_i} to be the trivial event defined on the variables in $\text{vbl}(\lambda_i) \triangleq R_i^I(\Lambda)$ that never occurs. Let $J \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{0 \leq i \leq \ell+1})$ denote the LLL instance further including the bad events $\{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{0 \leq i \leq \ell+1}$. Next, the definitions of the bad events in $\{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ are updated iteratively, which modify the definitions of the bad events A_{λ_i} on the same sets $\text{vbl}(\lambda_i) = R_i^I(\Lambda)$ of variables. It is easy to see that throughout the process $\text{vbl}(\lambda_i) = R_i^I(\Lambda) = R_i^J(\Lambda)$. The procedure for updating $\{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ is described in Algorithm 4, with the parameter $D \triangleq \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} \log \frac{\ell}{\delta}$, where ϵ_0 is a constant to be fixed later.

After the procedure reaches a fixed point and stops, the solution $\{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ is used to construct the bad event A_λ . Let $\text{vbl}(\lambda) \triangleq \text{vbl}(B_\ell^{D_I}(\Lambda)) \setminus \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$. Note that $\text{vbl}(\lambda_1), \dots, \text{vbl}(\lambda_\ell)$ form a partition of $\text{vbl}(\lambda)$. Then A_λ is defined as: for every $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(\lambda)}$, event A_λ occurs on σ iff σ avoids all the bad events A_v with $v \in V_{(1, \ell)}^I(\Lambda)$ and does not avoid A_{λ_i} for some $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. The construction is described in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4: Construction of the bad event A_λ .

- 1 **for** $0 \leq i \leq \ell + 1$ **do**
- 2 \lfloor initialize $A_{\lambda_i} \leftarrow$ the trivial event defined on the variables in $\text{vbl}(\lambda_i) \triangleq R_i^I(\Lambda)$ that never occurs;
- 3 define $J \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{0 \leq i \leq \ell+1})$ and $D \triangleq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} \log \frac{\ell}{\delta}$;
- 4 **repeat**
- 5 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{if there exist } 1 \leq i < i + D < j \leq \ell \text{ and } \sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(\lambda_i)} \text{ s.t.} \\ \sigma \text{ avoids } A_{\lambda_i}, \text{ and } P_\Lambda^J(i, \sigma; j, *) < \frac{\delta}{2\ell} \text{ then} \\ \lfloor \text{update the definition of } A_{\lambda_i} \text{ so that } A_{\lambda_i} \text{ occurs on } \sigma \text{ (and remains the same otherwise);} \end{array} \right.$
- 6 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{if there exist } 1 \leq i < i + D < j \leq \ell \text{ and } \tau \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(\lambda_j)} \text{ s.t.} \\ \tau \text{ avoids } A_{\lambda_j}, \text{ and } P_\Lambda^J(i, *, j, \tau) < \frac{\delta}{2\ell} \text{ then} \\ \lfloor \text{update the definition of } A_{\lambda_j} \text{ so that } A_{\lambda_j} \text{ occurs on } \tau \text{ (and remains the same otherwise);} \end{array} \right.$
- 7
- 8
- 9 **until** nothing has changed to $\{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$;
- 10 let A_λ be the event defined on the variables in $\text{vbl}(\lambda) \triangleq \text{vbl}(\lambda_1) \uplus \text{vbl}(\lambda_2) \uplus \dots \uplus \text{vbl}(\lambda_\ell)$ such that

$$A_\lambda = \left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^I(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} A_{\lambda_i} \right);$$

5.2 Correlation decay in the augmented LLL instance

Lemma 5.1. A_λ occurs with probability at most δ .

Proof. For $k \geq 0$, let $J^{(k)}$ denote the LLL instance J after k iterations of the **repeat** loop in Algorithm 4. Let $\{A_{\lambda_i}^{(k)}\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ denote the $\{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ after k iterations. Further suppose that in the k -th iteration, the bad event $A_{\lambda_{i_k}}$ is picked to update and is made occur on the $\tau^{(k)} \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(\lambda_{i_k})}$.

For \mathbf{X} drawn from the product distribution ν , the probability of A_λ can be calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu}(A_\lambda) &= \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^I(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} A_{\lambda_i} \right) \right) \\ &= \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^I(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \right) \cap \left(\exists k \geq 1 : X_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)} = \tau^{(k)} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^I(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \right) \cap \left(\forall 1 \leq j < k : X_{R_{i_j}^J(\Lambda)} \neq \tau^{(j)} \right) \cap \left(X_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)} = \tau^{(k)} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^I(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \overline{A_{\lambda_i}^{(k-1)}} \right) \cap \left(X_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)} = \tau^{(k)} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Due to the definition of $J^{(k)}$, we have

$$\left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^I(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \overline{A_{\lambda_i}^{(k-1)}} \right) = \bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^{J^{(k-1)}}(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v}.$$

And in Algorithm 4, for each iteration $k \geq 1$, there exists a $1 \leq j_k \leq \ell$ with $|i_k - j_k| > D$ such that

- if $i_k < j_k$, then $P_{\Lambda}^{J^{(k-1)}}(i_k, \tau^{(k)}; j_k, *) = \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{[i_k+1, j_k-1]}^{J^{(k-1)}}(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \mid X_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)} = \tau^{(k)} \right) < \frac{\delta}{2\ell}$;
- if $i_k > j_k$, then $P_{\Lambda}^{J^{(k-1)}}(j_k, *; i_k, \tau^{(k)}) = \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{[j_k+1, i_k-1]}^{J^{(k-1)}}(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \mid X_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)} = \tau^{(k)} \right) < \frac{\delta}{2\ell}$.

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu}(A_{\lambda}) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^{J^{(k-1)}}(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \right) \cap \left(X_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)} = \tau^{(k)} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{(1,\ell)}^{J^{(k-1)}}(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \mid X_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)} = \tau^{(k)} \right) \cdot \nu_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)}(\tau^{(k)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \nu} \left(\bigcap_{v \in V_{[\min(i_k, j_k)+1, \max(i_k, j_k)-1]}^{J^{(k-1)}}(\Lambda)} \overline{A_v} \mid X_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)} = \tau^{(k)} \right) \cdot \nu_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)}(\tau^{(k)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\delta}{2\ell} \cdot \nu_{R_{i_k}^J(\Lambda)}(\tau^{(k)}) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2\ell} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_i^J(\Lambda)}} \nu_{R_i^J(\Lambda)}(\sigma) \\ &\leq \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where the second to the last inequality is due to the fact that for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and every $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_i^J(\Lambda)}$, the bad event A_{λ_i} is updated to occur on σ at most once. \square

Let J^* denote the LLL instance J after Algorithm 4. Let $\hat{I} \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_{\lambda}\})$. The followings can be verified for the S and T defined in the statement of Lemma 3.1:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \text{vbl}(\Lambda) = R_0^{J^*}(\Lambda) = R_0^{\hat{I}}(\Lambda), \\ T &= U \setminus \text{vbl}\left(B_{\ell}^{D_I}(\Lambda)\right) = U \setminus \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq \ell} R_i^{J^*}(\Lambda) = U \setminus \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq \ell} R_i^{\hat{I}}(\Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it can be verified that for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_S$ and $\tau \in \Sigma_T$, we have $\nu(\Omega_{J^*}^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) = \nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma \wedge \tau})$. This means: to guarantee that S and T are ϵ -correlated in \hat{I} , it is sufficient to prove that they are ϵ -correlated in J^* . The rest of this section is devoted to proving that S and T are ϵ -correlated in J^* .

Next, we will state a series of technical lemmas (Lemmas 5.2 to 5.4), which we use to prove Lemma 3.1. From now on in this section, we omit J^* and Λ in the notations and write:

$$P(i, \sigma; j, \tau) \triangleq P_{\Lambda}^{J^*}(i, \sigma; j, \tau), \quad R_r \triangleq R_r^{J^*}(\Lambda), \quad V_{(i,j)} \triangleq V_{(i,j)}^{J^*}(\Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad V_{[i,j]} \triangleq V_{[i,j]}^{J^*}(\Lambda).$$

When we say ϵ -correlated, it always means the ϵ -correlated in J^* . Furthermore, we use V^* to denote the set of the bad events in the LLL instance J^* , that is, $V^* \triangleq V \cup \{\lambda_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq \ell + 1\}$.

Definition 5.1. For $0 \leq i < j \leq \ell + 1$, the *density matrix* of R_i and R_j is defined as $M \triangleq (M_{\sigma, \tau})_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_i}, \tau \in \Sigma_{R_j}}$, where $M_{\sigma, \tau} = P(i, \sigma; j, \tau)$. The variable sets R_i and R_j are said to be *partial ϵ -correlated* if for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in R_i$ that avoid bad event A_{λ_i} and any $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in R_j$ that avoid bad event A_{λ_j} , it holds that

$$M_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M_{\sigma_2, \tau_2} \leq (1 + \epsilon) M_{\sigma_1, \tau_2} \cdot M_{\sigma_2, \tau_1}.$$

Definition 5.2. For $i \geq 0$, the R_i is called a *good ring*, if $\bigcup_{v \in V_{[i,i]}} A_v$ occurs with probability at most ϵ_0 .

Lemma 5.2. For any $0 \leq i' \leq i < j \leq j' \leq \ell + 1$, any $\epsilon > 0$, if R_i and R_j are partial ϵ -correlated, then $R_{i'}$ and $R_{j'}$ are partial ϵ -correlated.

Lemma 5.3. For any $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 3D$, if $R_i, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{i+3D}$ are good rings, then R_i and R_{i+3D} are partial $\frac{1}{\epsilon_0}$ -correlated.

Lemma 5.4. For any $1 < i < i + D < j \leq \ell - 2D$, any $\epsilon > 0$, if R_i and R_j are partial ϵ -correlated and $R_i, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{j+2D}$ are good rings, then R_i and R_{j+2D} are partial $(1 - \epsilon_0)\epsilon$ -correlated.

We further remark that Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 hold in particular for the J^* produced by Algorithm 4, whereas Lemma 5.2 holds generally.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. By Lemma 5.1, we have A_{λ} occurs with probability at most δ . Recall that $\delta < \frac{\gamma}{2}$. Thus, the instances J^* and instance \hat{I} are $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ -satisfiable. With respect to the product distribution ν , for any $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$ satisfying $j - i > 1$, the events $\bigcup_{v \in V_{[i,i]}} A_v$ and $\bigcup_{v \in V_{[j,j]}} A_v$ are mutually independent. Thus, there are at most $4 \cdot \log_{1-\epsilon_0} \frac{\gamma}{2}$ non-good rings among $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{\ell}$.

According to Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.4, if there are $3D + 2D \cdot \log_{1-\epsilon_0}(\epsilon_0 \epsilon)$ consecutive good rings then the first and the last good rings must be partial ϵ -correlated. If

$$\ell > 2 \cdot \left(4 \cdot \log_{1-\epsilon_0} \frac{\gamma}{2}\right) \cdot (3D + 2D \cdot \log_{1-\epsilon_0}(\epsilon_0 \epsilon)), \quad (12)$$

then there must exist a sequence of good rings R_i, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_j such that $1 \leq i \leq j \leq \ell$ and $j - i \geq 3D + 2D \cdot \log_{1-\epsilon_0}(\epsilon_0 \epsilon)$. Recall that $D = \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} \log \frac{\ell}{\delta}$. There is a sufficiently large constant C_0 , such that all $\ell \geq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) = \left\lceil C_0 \cdot \log \frac{2}{\epsilon} \cdot \log \frac{2}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \log \left(2 \log \frac{2}{\epsilon} \log \frac{2}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right) \right\rceil$ satisfies (12).

By Lemma 5.2, R_0 and $R_{\ell+1}$ are partial ϵ -correlated. Recall that A_{λ_0} never occurs on any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_0}$, and $A_{\lambda_{\ell+1}}$ never occurs on any $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_{\ell+1}}$. For any $\sigma \in \Sigma_S$ and $\tau \in \Sigma_T$, we have

$$\nu(\Omega^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) = P(0, \sigma; \ell + 1, \tau_{R_{\ell+1}}) \cdot \nu_S(\sigma) \cdot \nu_T(\tau).$$

Thus, for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_S, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Sigma_T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu(\Omega^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_1}) \cdot \nu(\Omega^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_2}) \\ &= P(0, \sigma_1; \ell + 1, (\tau_1)_{R_{\ell+1}}) \cdot \nu_S(\sigma_1) \cdot \nu_T(\tau_1) \cdot P(0, \sigma_2; \ell + 1, (\tau_2)_{R_{\ell+1}}) \cdot \nu_S(\sigma_2) \cdot \nu_T(\tau_2) \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot P(0, \sigma_1; \ell + 1, (\tau_2)_{R_{\ell+1}}) \cdot \nu_S(\sigma_1) \cdot \nu_T(\tau_2) \cdot P(0, \sigma_2; \ell + 1, (\tau_1)_{R_{\ell+1}}) \cdot \nu_S(\sigma_2) \cdot \nu_T(\tau_1) \\ &= (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \nu(\Omega^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_2}) \cdot \nu(\Omega^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_1}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, S and T are ϵ -correlated in J^* , which means that they are ϵ -correlated in the instance \hat{I} . \square

Inspired by the definitions of $P(i, \sigma; j, *)$ and $P(i, *; j, \tau)$, we extend these definitions to any sub-classes $C_i \subseteq \Sigma_{R_i}$ and $C_j \subseteq \Sigma_{R_j}$ of assignments on the rings R_i and R_j as:

$$P(i, C_i; j, \tau) \triangleq \sum_{\sigma \in C_i} \nu_{R_i}(\sigma) \cdot P(i, \sigma; j, \tau),$$

$$P(i, \sigma; j, C_j) \triangleq \sum_{\tau \in C_j} \nu_{R_j}(\tau) \cdot P(i, \sigma; j, \tau).$$

Definition 5.3. Let $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$. For any $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_j}$, we say that R_i is *well-distributed based on* (j, τ) , if τ avoids A_{λ_j} and for any $C \subseteq \Sigma_{R_i}$ satisfying $\nu_{R_i}(C) > \frac{1}{4}$, we have $\frac{P(i, C; j, \tau)}{P(i, *; j, \tau)} > \frac{\nu_{R_i}(C)}{2}$.

And symmetrically, for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_i}$ we say that R_j is *well-distributed based on* (i, σ) if σ avoids A_{λ_i} and for any $C \subseteq \Sigma_{R_j}$ satisfying $\nu_{R_j}(C) > \frac{1}{4}$, we have $\frac{P(i, \sigma; j, C)}{P(i, \sigma; j, *)} > \frac{\nu_{R_j}(C)}{2}$.

The following lemma states the good properties for being well-distributed and holds generally.

Lemma 5.5. Let $1 < i < j \leq \ell$. For any $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_j}$, if R_i is well-distributed based on (j, τ) and R_i is a good ring, then the followings hold:

1. R_{i-1} is well-distributed based on (j, τ) ;
2. for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_{i-1}}$: $P(i-1, \sigma; j, \tau) \leq 3\nu_{R_{i-1}}(\sigma) \cdot P(i-1, *; j, \tau)$;
3. $\nu_{R_i}(S) \geq \frac{3}{4}$ for $S = \left\{ \pi \in \Sigma_{R_i} \mid \frac{P(i, \pi; j, \tau)}{P(i, *; j, \tau)} \geq \frac{1}{8} \right\}$.

And the symmetric holds for the good ring R_j that is well-distributed based on (i, σ) for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_i}$:

1. R_{j+1} is well-distributed based on (i, σ) ;
2. for any $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_{j+1}}$: $P(i, \sigma; j+1, \tau) \leq 3\nu_{R_{j+1}}(\tau) \cdot P(i, \sigma; j+1, *)$;
3. $\nu_{R_j}(S) \geq \frac{3}{4}$ for $S = \left\{ \pi \in \Sigma_{R_j} \mid \frac{P(i, \sigma; j, \pi)}{P(i, \sigma; j, *)} \geq \frac{1}{8} \right\}$.

Proof. We prove these properties one by one.

1. Note that for any $v \in V_{[i, i]} \setminus V_{[i+1, i+1]}$, we have $\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq R_{i-1} \cup R_i$. For any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_{i-1}}$, define

$$K_\sigma \triangleq \left\{ \rho \in \Sigma_{R_i} \mid \sigma \wedge \rho \text{ avoids all bad events } A_v \text{ for } v \in V_{[i, i]} \setminus V_{[i+1, i+1]} \right\}.$$

For any $C \subseteq \Sigma_{R_{i-1}}$ with $\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C) > \frac{1}{4}$, we define $C' \triangleq \{ \sigma \in C \mid \nu_{R_i}(K_\sigma) > 1 - \frac{1}{9} \}$. Then, for any $\sigma' \in C \setminus C'$, and \mathbf{X} drawn from product distribution ν , we have

$$\Pr(\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids all bad events } A_v \text{ for } v \in V_{[i, i]} \setminus V_{[i+1, i+1]} \mid X_{R_{i-1}} = \sigma') \leq \frac{8}{9}.$$

Since R_i is a good ring, $\bigcup_{v \in V_{[i, i]} \setminus V_{[i+1, i+1]}} A_v$ occurs with probability at most ε_0 . We have $\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C \setminus C') \leq 9\varepsilon_0$, which means $\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C') \geq \nu_{R_{i-1}}(C) - 9\varepsilon_0$. Since R_i is well-distributed based on (j, τ) , for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_{i-1}}$ with $\nu_{R_i}(K_\sigma) \geq \frac{8}{9}$, we have

$$P(i, K_\sigma; j, \tau) = \frac{P(i, K_\sigma; j, \tau)}{P(i, *; j, \tau)} \cdot P(i, *; j, \tau) > \frac{\nu_{R_i}(K_\sigma)}{2} \cdot P(i, *; j, \tau) \geq \frac{4}{9} \cdot P(i, *; j, \tau).$$

Thus, for any $C \subseteq \Sigma_{R_{i-1}}$ with $\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C) > \frac{1}{4}$, we have

$$P(i-1, C; j, \tau) \geq \sum_{\sigma \in C'} \nu_{R_{i-1}}(\sigma) P(i, K_\sigma; j, \tau) > \frac{4}{9} (\nu_{R_{i-1}}(S) - 9\varepsilon_0) P(i, *, j, \tau).$$

Note that $P(i-1, \Sigma_{R_{i-1}} \setminus C; j, \tau) \leq (1 - \nu_{R_{i-1}}(C)) \cdot P(i, \Sigma_{R_i}; j, \tau) = (1 - \nu_{R_{i-1}}(C)) \cdot P(i, *, j, \tau)$, hence

$$\frac{P(i-1, C; j, \tau)}{P(i-1, \Sigma_{R_{i-1}} \setminus C; j, \tau)} > \frac{4}{9} \cdot \frac{\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C) - 9\varepsilon_0}{1 - \nu_{R_{i-1}}(C)} \geq \frac{\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C)/2}{1 - \nu_{R_{i-1}}(C)/2}.$$

The last inequality holds for $\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C) \geq \frac{1}{4}$ and sufficiently small ε_0 . Thus, we obtain that

$$\frac{P(i-1, C; j, \tau)}{P(i-1, *, j, \tau)} = \frac{P(i-1, C; j, \tau)}{P(i-1, \Sigma_{R_{i-1}} \setminus C; j, \tau) + P(i-1, C; j, \tau)} > \frac{\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C)}{2}.$$

2. We define $C'' \triangleq \{\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_{i-1}} \mid \nu_{R_i}(K_\sigma) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4}\}$. By the same argument as before, we have $\nu_{R_{i-1}}(C'') \geq 1 - 4\varepsilon_0$ and

$$P(i-1, *, j, \tau) \geq P(i-1, C''; j, \tau) \geq \frac{3}{8} (1 - 4\varepsilon_0) \cdot P(i, *, j, \tau).$$

Since $P(i-1, \sigma; j, \tau) \leq \nu_{R_{i-1}}(\sigma) \cdot P(i, *, j, \tau)$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_{i-1}}$. For sufficient small ε_0 , we have

$$P(i-1, \sigma; j, \tau) \leq 3\nu_{R_{i-1}}(\sigma) \cdot P(i-1, *, j, \tau).$$

3. Sort $\Sigma_{R_i} = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{|\Sigma_{R_i}|}\}$ in the non-decreasing order according to the value of $P(i, \sigma; j, \tau)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be the smallest number such that $\sum_{l \leq k} \nu_{R_i}(\sigma_l) > \frac{1}{4}$. Then, we have $\frac{P(i, \{\sigma_k\}; j, \tau)}{P(i, *, j, \tau)} = \frac{1}{\nu_{R_i}(\sigma_k)}$. $\frac{P(i, \{\sigma_k\}; j, \tau)}{P(i, *, j, \tau)} \geq \frac{1}{8}$, because otherwise $\frac{P(i, \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k\}; j, \tau)}{P(i, *, j, \tau)} < \sum_{l \leq k} \frac{1}{8} \nu_{R_i}(\sigma_l) \leq \frac{1}{8}$, contradicting that R_i is well-distributed based on (j, τ) . Therefore, we have $\{\sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots, \sigma_{|\Sigma_{R_i}|}\} \subseteq S$ and

$$\nu_{R_i}(S) \geq \nu_{R_i}(\{\sigma_k, \sigma_{k+1}, \dots, \sigma_{|\Sigma_{R_i}|}\}) \geq \frac{3}{4}.$$

The symmetric case that R_j is well-distributed based on (i, σ) follows by symmetry. \square

The next lemma guarantees the existence of well-distributed ring in the J^* produced by Algorithm 4.

Lemma 5.6. *In the J^* produced by Algorithm 4, for $1 \leq i, j \leq \ell$ with $|i - j| > D$, if R_k is a good ring for all $\min(i, j) \leq k \leq \max(i, j)$, then R_i is well-distributed based on (j, τ) for every $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_j}$ avoiding A_{λ_j} .*

Proof. We prove for the case that $i < j$. The case with $i > j$ follows by symmetry.

By contradiction, assume that there is some $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_j}$ avoiding A_{λ_j} such that R_i is not well-distributed based on (j, τ) . By Lemma 5.5, R_k is not well-distributed based on (j, τ) for all $i \leq k < j$. Thus, for all such k , there exists a $C \subseteq \Sigma_{R_k}$ such that $\nu_{R_k}(C) > \frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{P(k, C; j, \tau)}{P(k, *, j, \tau)} \leq \frac{\nu_{R_k}(C)}{2}$. When $k = j - 1$, we have $P(k, *, j, \tau) = 1$. For $i \leq k < j - 1$, it can be verified by the law of total probability that $P(k, \Sigma_{R_k} \setminus C; j, \tau) \leq (1 - \nu_{R_k}(C)) \cdot P(k + 1, *, j, \tau)$, hence

$$P(k, *, j, \tau) = \frac{P(k, \Sigma_{R_k} \setminus C; j, \tau)}{1 - \frac{P(k, C; j, \tau)}{P(k, *, j, \tau)}} \leq \frac{(1 - \nu_{R_k}(C)) \cdot P(k + 1, *, j, \tau)}{1 - \nu_{R_k}(C)/2} \leq \frac{6}{7} \cdot P(k + 1, *, j, \tau),$$

which implies that $P(i, *, j, \tau) \leq (\frac{6}{7})^D$. Thus, we have $P(i, *, j, \tau) < \frac{\delta}{2\ell}$ for sufficiently small constant ε_0 , contradicting the termination condition of the **repeat** loop in Algorithm 4. \square

Now we are ready to prove the technical Lemmas 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. For convenience, we define functions ϕ_v for all $v \in V$ as follow. For any partial assignment σ where the variables in $\text{vbl}(v)$ are assigned, define:

$$\phi_v(\sigma) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma \text{ avoids } A_v, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Denote by M the density matrix of R_i and R_j , and by M' that of R_j and $R_{j'}$. Then the matrix $M'' = M \cdot W \cdot M'$ is the density matrix of R_i and $R_{j'}$, where $W \triangleq (W_{\sigma,\tau})_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_j}, \tau \in \Sigma_{R_j}}$ is the diagonal weight matrix such that $W_{\sigma,\sigma} = \nu_{R_j}(\sigma) \cdot \left(\prod_{v \in V_{(j,j)}} \phi_v(\sigma) \right)$ for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_j}$.

For $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_{R_i}$ avoiding A_{λ_i} and $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Sigma_{R_{j'}}$ avoiding $A_{\lambda_{j'}}$, consider the following two cases:

- Case I: $M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2} = 0$. Then, $M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2} \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_2} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_1}$ is immediate.
- Case II: $M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2} \neq 0$. Let $S_j \triangleq \{\rho \in \Sigma_{R_j} \mid \rho \text{ avoids bad event } A_{\lambda_j}\}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2} &= \sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Sigma_{R_j}} (M_{\sigma_1, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_2}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2} \\ &= \sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_j} M_{\sigma_1, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_2} W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_2} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_1} = \sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_j} (M_{\sigma_1, \rho_2} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_1}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}.$$

Recall that R_i and R_j are partial ϵ -correlated. According to Definition 5.1, for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_{R_i}$ avoiding A_{λ_i} and $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \Sigma_{R_j}$ avoiding A_{λ_j} , we have $M_{\sigma_1, \rho_1} \cdot M_{\sigma_2, \rho_2} \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot M_{\sigma_1, \rho_2} \cdot M_{\sigma_2, \rho_1}$. Then, we have $M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_2} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_1} \neq 0$ and

$$\frac{M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2}}{M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_2} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_1}} = \frac{\sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_j} (M_{\sigma_1, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_2}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}}{\sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_j} (M_{\sigma_2, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_1, \rho_2}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}} \leq 1 + \epsilon.$$

This proves that R_i and $R_{j'}$ are partial ϵ -correlated. By symmetric argument, it also follows that $R_{i'}$ and R_j are partial ϵ -correlated. Now treating i and j' as our new “ i ” and “ j ”, applying the old result with $R_{i'}$ and R_j on this new instance, gives us that the partial ϵ -correlation between $R_{i'}$ and $R_{j'}$ in the original instance. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Let $j \triangleq i + 3D$ and $k \triangleq \lfloor \frac{i+j}{2} \rfloor$. By Lemma 5.6, R_{k-1}, R_k, R_{k+1} are well-distributed based on both (i, σ) and (j, τ) for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_i}$ avoiding A_{λ_i} and any $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_j}$ avoiding A_{λ_j} . Let M be the density matrix of R_i and R_j . According to Lemma 5.5, for any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{R_i}$ avoiding A_{λ_i} and any $\tau \in \Sigma_{R_j}$ avoiding A_{λ_j} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\sigma, \tau} &= \sum_{\rho \in \Sigma_{R_k}} \nu_{R_k}(\rho) \cdot \prod_{v \in V_{(k,k)}} \phi_v(\rho) \cdot P(i, \sigma; k, \rho) \cdot P(k, \rho; j, \tau) \\ &> \left(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon_0 \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{8} \right)^2 \cdot P(i, \sigma; k, *) \cdot P(k, *; j, \tau); \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\sigma, \tau} &= \sum_{\rho \in \Sigma_{R_k}} \nu_{R_k}(\rho) \cdot \prod_{v \in V_{(k,k)}} \phi_v(\rho) \cdot P(i, \sigma; k, \rho) \cdot P(k, \rho; j, \tau) \\ &\leq 3^2 \cdot P(i, \sigma; k, *) \cdot P(k, *; j, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_{R_i}$ avoiding A_{λ_i} and $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Sigma_{R_j}$ avoiding A_{λ_j} , we have

$$\frac{M_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M_{\sigma_2, \tau_2}}{M_{\sigma_2, \tau_1} \cdot M_{\sigma_1, \tau_2}} \leq \frac{3^4}{\left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_0\right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^2\right)^2} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0},$$

for sufficiently small constant ε_0 . \square

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Let $j' \triangleq j + 2D$. We reuse the definitions of the M, M', W, M'' , and S_j in the proof of Lemma 5.2.

For $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_{R_i}$ avoiding A_{λ_i} and $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Sigma_{R_{j'}}$ avoiding $A_{\lambda_{j'}}$, we consider following two cases:

- Case I: $M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2} = 0$. Then, $M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2} \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_2} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_1}$ is immediate.
- Case II: $M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2} \neq 0$. Then, by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.2, we have $M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_2} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_1} \neq 0$. Define $S_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \triangleq \{(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in S_j \times S_j \mid M_{\sigma_1, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_2} \leq M_{\sigma_1, \rho_2} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_1}\}$. Then, for any $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_j$, it holds that $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}$ or $(\rho_2, \rho_1) \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &\triangleq \sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}} (M_{\sigma_1, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_2}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}, \\ P_2 &\triangleq \sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \notin S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}} (M_{\sigma_1, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_2}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}, \\ Q_1 &\triangleq \sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}} (M_{\sigma_1, \rho_2} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_1}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}, \\ Q_2 &\triangleq \sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \notin S_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}} (M_{\sigma_1, \rho_2} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_1}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}. \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.5, R_{j-1}, R_j, R_{j+1} are well-distributed based on $(i, \sigma_1), (i, \sigma_2), (j', \tau_1)$ and (j', τ_2) , and it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 + Q_2 &\leq 3^4 \cdot P(i, \sigma_1; j, *) \cdot P(i, \sigma_2; j, *) \cdot P(j, *; j', \tau_1) \cdot P(j, *; j', \tau_2), \\ Q_1 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_0\right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^4 \cdot P(i, \sigma_1; j, *) \cdot P(i, \sigma_2; j, *) \cdot P(j, *; j', \tau_1) \cdot P(j, *; j', \tau_2). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_2}}{M''_{\sigma_1, \tau_2} \cdot M''_{\sigma_2, \tau_1}} &= \frac{\sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_j} (M_{\sigma_1, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_2, \rho_2}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}}{\sum_{\rho_1, \rho_2 \in S_j} (M_{\sigma_2, \rho_1} M_{\sigma_1, \rho_2}) W_{\rho_1, \rho_1} W_{\rho_2, \rho_2} M'_{\rho_1, \tau_1} M'_{\rho_2, \tau_2}} \\ &= \frac{P_1 + P_2}{Q_1 + Q_2} \leq \frac{Q_1 + (1 + \epsilon) \cdot Q_2}{Q_1 + Q_2} \leq 1 + \epsilon \cdot \left(1 - \frac{Q_1}{Q_1 + Q_2}\right) \\ &\leq 1 + \epsilon \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon_0\right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{8}\right)^4 \cdot 3^{-4}\right) \leq 1 + (1 - \varepsilon_0) \cdot \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small constant ε_0 .

Altogether, this proves that R_i and $R_{j'}$ are partial $(1 - \varepsilon_0) \cdot \epsilon$ correlated. \square

6 Analysis of Initialization and Clustering

In this section, we first prove the correctness and efficiency of the *Initialization* phase (Lemma 3.5), and then we prove the correctness and efficiency of the *Clustering* phase (Lemma 3.7).

6.1 Analysis of Initialization (Proof of Lemma 3.5)

It is sufficient to show that for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the event $|\mathcal{R}| = O\left(\log n \cdot \log \log n \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ holds with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. This can be proved by the Chernoff bound.

For each $S \in \mathcal{S}$, let $Y_S \in \{0, 1\}$ be the random variable that indicates whether A_S occurs on \mathbf{Y} . Then $|\mathcal{R}| = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} Y_S = \sum_{k=1}^{c \log n} \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}(S)=k} Y_S \right)$. For $1 \leq k \leq c \cdot \log n$, let $n_k = |\{S \in \mathcal{S} | \mathcal{C}(S) = k\}|$, which is the number of clusters with color k . Then, for each $1 \leq k \leq c \cdot \log n$, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}(S)=k} Y_S \right] = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}(S)=k} (1 - \Pr[Y_S = 0]) \leq n_k - n_k \cdot \left(\prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}(S)=k} \Pr[Y_S = 0] \right)^{\frac{1}{n_k}}.$$

Since \mathcal{C} is a proper coloring of \mathcal{S} , $\{Y_S\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}(S)=k}$ are mutually independent random variables. Recall that the distributed LLL instance I is γ -satisfiable. We have $\prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}(S)=k} \Pr[Y_S = 0] \geq \gamma$, which implies

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}(S)=k} Y_S \right] \leq n_k \cdot \left(1 - \gamma^{\frac{1}{n_k}} \right) = n_k \cdot \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{n_k} \ln \frac{1}{\gamma}} \right) = O\left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma}\right).$$

Suppose that c_1 is a sufficiently large constant. By Chernoff bound, for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we have

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}(S)=k} Y_S \geq c_1 \cdot (\log \log n) \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right] \leq \frac{\epsilon}{c \log n}.$$

By the union bound, we have

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} Y_S \geq (c \log n) \cdot c_1 \cdot (\log \log n) \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right] \leq \frac{\epsilon}{c \log n} \cdot c \log n = \epsilon.$$

Thus, for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we have $|\mathcal{R}| = O\left(\log n \cdot \log \log n \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$.

6.2 Analysis of Clustering (Proof of Lemma 3.7)

Balls are uniquely identified and far-apart. According to the definition of \mathcal{B} , if for any distinct $u, v \in \mathcal{R}$ with $r_v, p_v, r_u, p_u \notin \{\perp\}$ we have $\text{dist}_G(B_{r_v}(p_v), B_{r_u}(p_u)) \geq 2(\ell + 2)$, then the followings hold:

1. for any distinct $u, v \in \mathcal{R}$, if $p_u, p_v, r_u, r_v \notin \{\perp\}$ then $B_{r_u}(p_u) \cap B_{r_v}(p_v) = \emptyset$.
2. $\text{dist}_G(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2) \geq 2(\ell + 2)$ for any distinct $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \in \mathcal{B}$.

It then remains to show that we indeed have $\text{dist}_G(B_{r_v}(p_v), B_{r_u}(p_u)) \geq 2(\ell + 2)$ for any distinct $u, v \in \mathcal{R}$ with $r_v, p_v, r_u, p_u \notin \{\perp\}$. We prove this by induction. Suppose that the sequence $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|\mathcal{R}|}\}$ is obtained by sorting \mathcal{R} in ascending order of IDs. Algorithm 1 is applied on the nodes in \mathcal{R} in this order.

For the induction basis: initially all $v \in \mathcal{R}$ set p_v and r_v to \perp , which satisfies the hypothesis trivially.

Now, suppose the induction hypothesis holds before the execution of Algorithm 1 on node v_i for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. After Algorithm 1 terminates on v_i , it holds that, it holds that $\text{dist}_G(B_{r_{v_i}}(p_{v_i}), B_{r_{v_j}}(p_{v_j})) \geq 2(\ell + 2)$ for any $1 \leq j \leq i$, if $p_{v_j}, r_{v_j} \notin \{\perp\}$. Otherwise, the **while** loop in Algorithm 1 would not terminate. According to Algorithm 1, for $1 \leq j < i$, the only possible modification can be made to p_{v_j} and r_{v_j} during the execution of the algorithm at node v_i is to set them to \perp . Thus, by the induction hypothesis, it still holds that for any distinct $1 \leq j, k < i$ such that $p_{v_j}, r_{v_j}, p_{v_k}, r_{v_k} \notin \{\perp\}$, we have $\text{dist}_G(B_{r_{v_j}}(p_{v_j}), B_{r_{v_k}}(p_{v_k})) \geq 2(\ell + 2)$. And for $j > i$, it holds that $p_{v_j} = r_{v_j} = \perp$. Altogether, it holds that after Algorithm 1 terminates on node v_i , for any distinct $1 \leq j, k \leq |\mathcal{R}|$ such that $p_{v_j}, r_{v_j}, p_{v_k}, r_{v_k} \notin \{\perp\}$, we have $\text{dist}_G(B_{r_{v_j}}(p_{v_j}), B_{r_{v_k}}(p_{v_k})) \geq 2(\ell + 2)$.

Thus, after Algorithm 1 has been sequentially executed on all node $v \in \mathcal{R}$, for any distinct $u, v \in \mathcal{R}$ with $r_v, p_v, r_u, p_u \notin \{\perp\}$, it holds that $\text{dist}_G(B_{r_v}(p_v), B_{r_u}(p_u)) \geq 2(\ell + 2)$.

Clustered Conditional Gibbs Property. Then, we prove that $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property (as defined in Definition 3.4) on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$.

For any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$, define

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{B}) &\triangleq \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}} \text{vbl}(\Lambda), & T(\mathcal{B}) &\triangleq U \setminus \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}} \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda)), \\ \Phi(\mathcal{B}) &\triangleq \left\{ A_v \mid v \in V \setminus \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}} \Lambda \right\}, & \Phi'(\mathcal{B}) &\triangleq \{A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}^I \mid \Lambda \in \mathcal{B}\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_{S(\mathcal{B})}$ with $\Pr[\mathcal{B} = B \wedge Y_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \sigma] > 0$, we define following three events:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) &: Y_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \sigma, \\ \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) &: \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}, \\ \mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) &: \mathbf{Y} \text{ avoids all bad events in } \Phi(\mathcal{B}) \cup \Phi'(\mathcal{B}). \end{aligned}$$

For any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_{S(\mathcal{B})}$ with $\Pr[\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B} \wedge Y_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \sigma] > 0$, we will prove the equivalence between $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$ and $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$.

First, we show $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \implies \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$ and $\mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$ happen together. If a bad events in $\Phi(\mathcal{B})$ occurs on \mathbf{Y} , according to Condition 3.3, it must be included in at least one ball, centered on a node in \mathcal{R} with radius $2d \cdot \log n \log \log n + 1$. And Algorithm 1 will only combine balls into bigger balls. Thus, it must hold that $v \in \Lambda$ for some $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}$, a contradiction. If a bad events in $\Phi'(\mathcal{B})$ occurs on \mathbf{Y} , then according to Algorithm 1, the algorithm will not terminate with $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}$, a contradiction. Therefore, we have the occurrence of $\mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$.

Next, we show $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \implies \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$. This is proved by induction. Define

$$\mathcal{Z} \triangleq \{Z \in \Sigma \mid Z_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \sigma \text{ and } Z \text{ avoids all bad events in } \Phi(\mathcal{B}) \cup \Phi'(\mathcal{B})\}.$$

Since $\Pr[\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B} \wedge Y_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \sigma] > 0$, there exists at least one assignment $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that \mathcal{B} is output by Algorithm 1 after running on Z . Next, we will prove that for any $\hat{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}$, Algorithm 1 will output the same \mathcal{B} after running on \hat{Z} , which implies $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \implies \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$.

Consider a fixed $\hat{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}$. Define

$$D \triangleq \{v \in V \mid A_v \text{ occurs on } Z\} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{D} \triangleq \{v \in V \mid A_v \text{ occurs on } \hat{D}\}.$$

Recall that Z avoids all the bad events in $\Phi(\mathcal{B})$. Thus, for any $v \in D$, it holds that $v \in \bigcup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}} \Lambda$, which means $\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq S(\mathcal{B})$. The same argument also holds for \hat{Z} , which gives $\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq S(\mathcal{B})$. Assuming $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$, it holds that $Z_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \hat{Z}_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \sigma$. Thus, we have $D = \hat{D}$.

A random set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq V$ is computed in the *Initialization* phase from the random assignment \mathbf{Y} generated according to the product distribution ν . Denote by $R, \hat{R} \subseteq V$ the respective \mathcal{R} sets computed in *Initialization* phase from Z, \hat{Z} . It can be verified that $R = \hat{R}$ since $D = \hat{D}$.

Let the nodes in $R = \hat{R}$ be sorted in the ascending order of IDs as $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|R|}\}$. Let $1 \leq i \leq |R|$. Suppose that Algorithm 1 is executed at node $v_i \in R$ on the assignment $\mathbf{Y} = Z$. Denote by N_i the total number of iterations of the **while** loop, and for $0 \leq j \leq N_i$ and $1 \leq k \leq |R|$, let $p_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ respectively denote the p_{v_k} and r_{v_k} computed right after the j -th iteration. Let $\hat{N}_i, \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ and $\hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ be similarly defined for $1 \leq i \leq |\hat{R}| = |R|$ and $0 \leq j \leq \hat{N}_i$ when Algorithm 1 is executed at node $v_i \in \hat{R} = R$ on the assignment $\mathbf{Y} = \hat{Z}$. By convention, let $N_0 = \hat{N}_0 = 0$ and $p_{v_i}^{(0,0)} = r_{v_i}^{(0,0)} = \hat{p}_{v_i}^{(0,0)} = \hat{r}_{v_i}^{(0,0)} = \perp$.

Next, we prove by induction that, for any $0 \leq i \leq |R| = |\hat{R}|$, it holds that $N_i = \hat{N}_i$, and furthermore, for any $0 \leq j \leq N_i = \hat{N}_i$, any $1 \leq k \leq |R| = |\hat{R}|$ it always holds that $p_{v_k}^{(i,j)} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i,j)} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$.

The induction basis holds trivially as $N_0 = \hat{N}_0 = 0$ and $p_{v_i}^{(0,0)} = r_{v_i}^{(0,0)} = \hat{p}_{v_i}^{(0,0)} = \hat{r}_{v_i}^{(0,0)} = \perp$.

Suppose $p_{v_k}^{(i,j)} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i,j)} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ for some $0 \leq i \leq |R|$, $0 \leq j \leq N_i$, $1 \leq k \leq |R|$, and further suppose $N_i = \hat{N}_i$ if $j = N_i$. Then, we prove that the same holds for the next iteration. If $j = N_i$, by the same initialization in Algorithm 1, we have $p_{v_k}^{(i+1,0)} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i+1,0)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i+1,0)} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i+1,0)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq |R|$. If $j < N_i$, consider the following three cases for the j -th iteration in Algorithm 1 at node v_i :

- **Case 1: the If condition in Line 3 is satisfied.** In this case, there exists $v_{i'} \in R = \hat{R}$ with $i' \neq i$ such that $\text{dist}(B_{r_{v_i}^{(i,j)}}(p_{v_i}^{(i,j)}), B_{\hat{r}_{v_{i'}}^{(i,j)}}(\hat{p}_{v_{i'}}^{(i,j)})) \leq (2\ell + 2)$. By I.H.: $p_{v_k}^{(i,j)} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i,j)} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq |R|$. Then the same **If** condition must be satisfied by the same $v_{i'}$ when $\mathbf{Y} = \hat{Z}$. Thus, $p_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq |R|$.
- **Case 2: the If condition in Line 8 is satisfied.** In this case, the new bad event A_λ defined on variables outside the ball $B_{r_{v_i}^{(i,j)}}(p_{v_i}^{(i,j)})$ occurs on Z and the radius grows as $r_{v_i}^{(i,j+1)} = r_{v_i}^{(i,j)} + \ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$. Since on $\mathbf{Y} = Z$, \mathcal{B} is eventually output, A_λ must be defined over $S(\mathcal{B})$. Hence the same **If** condition must be satisfied when $\mathbf{Y} = \hat{Z}$. We have $p_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq |R|$.
- **Case 3: otherwise.** In this case, it can be verified that the above two **If** conditions are not satisfied on $\mathbf{Y} = \hat{Z}$ either. It is obvious to see this for the **If** condition in Line 3, since $p_{v_k}^{(i,j)} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i,j)} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i,j)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq |R|$ by I.H.. For the **If** condition in Line 8, we consider the two subcases: (a) if $B_{r_{v_i}^{(i,j)}}(p_{v_i}^{(i,j)}) \in \mathcal{B}$, by the occurrence of $\mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$, the condition will not be triggered on \hat{Z} ; (b) if $B_{r_{v_i}^{(i,j)}}(p_{v_i}^{(i,j)}) \notin \mathcal{B}$, in Algorithm 1, the bad event A_λ must be defined on $S(\mathcal{B})$. Thus, the condition will not be triggered on \hat{Z} . Thus, we have $p_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(i,j+1)}$ for $1 \leq k \leq |R|$, and further have $N_i = \hat{N}_i$.

Thus, $p_{v_k}^{(|R|, N_{|R|})} = \hat{p}_{v_k}^{(|R|, N_{|R|})}$ and $r_{v_k}^{(|R|, N_{|R|})} = \hat{r}_{v_k}^{(|R|, N_{|R|})}$ for $1 \leq k \leq |R|$. Since \mathcal{B} is output by Algorithm 1 after running on Z , this shows that \mathcal{B} is also output by Algorithm 1 after running on \hat{Z} .

This proves the equivalence between $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$ and $\mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)$. Now we are ready to prove the clustered conditional Gibbs property of $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{B})$. For any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_{S(\mathcal{B})}$ with $\Pr[\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B} \wedge Y_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \sigma] > 0$, and any $\tau \in \Sigma_{T(\mathcal{B})}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Y_{T(\mathcal{B})} = \tau \mid \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B} \wedge Y_{S(\mathcal{B})} = \sigma] &= \Pr[Y_{T(\mathcal{B})} = \tau \mid \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_2(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)] \\ &= \Pr[Y_{T(\mathcal{B})} = \tau \mid \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)]. \end{aligned}$$

Due to Condition 3.3, \mathbf{Y} follows the product distribution ν . Thus, the above conditional probability is precisely $\mu_{\hat{I}, T(\mathcal{B})}^\sigma(\tau) = \Pr[Y_{T(\mathcal{B})} = \tau \mid \mathcal{A}_1(\mathcal{B}, \sigma) \wedge \mathcal{A}_3(\mathcal{B}, \sigma)]$, where

$$\hat{I} = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \Phi'(\mathcal{B})) = \left(\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}^I \mid \Lambda \in \mathcal{B} \} \right).$$

Thus, after Algorithm 1 has been sequentially executed on all nodes $v \in \mathcal{R}$, it holds that $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{B})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$.

Balls are reasonably small. During the execution of Algorithm 1 on some node $v \in \mathcal{R}$, the value of $\mathcal{D} \triangleq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}: p_v \neq \perp, r_v \neq \perp} r_v$ may be increased in the following cases:

- **Case 1: at initialization.** For a node $v \in V$, it increases \mathcal{D} by $1 + d \cdot \log n \cdot \log \log \log n$ while initializes its radius r_v from \perp to $1 + d \cdot \log n \cdot \log \log \log n$. In the *Clustering* phase, when Algorithm 1 is sequentially applied to all $v \in \mathcal{R}$, such initialization can happen at most $|\mathcal{R}|$ times. Thus, the total contribution to \mathcal{D} of this case is bounded by $|\mathcal{R}| \cdot (1 + d \cdot \log n \cdot \log \log \log n) = \tilde{O}(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log n)$.
- **Case 2: when the If condition in Line 3 is triggered.** In Algorithm 1, once the **if** condition in Line 3 is triggered, \mathcal{D} will increase by $2\ell + 1$, and meanwhile, at least one node $u \in \mathcal{R}$ with $p_u \neq \perp$ will becomes $p_u = \perp$. Thus, in the *Clustering* phase this condition can be triggered at most $|\mathcal{R}|$ times. The total contribution to \mathcal{D} of this case is bounded by $|\mathcal{R}| \cdot (2\ell + 1) = \tilde{O}(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma})$.
- **Case 3: when the If condition in Line 8 is triggered.** For $v \in V$, and $1 \leq r \leq n$, define the event

$$\mathcal{F}_{v,r} : A_{\lambda(B_r(v), \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}^I \text{ occurs on } \mathbf{Y}.$$

We define $\mathcal{F} \triangleq \{\mathcal{F}_{v,r} \mid v \in V, 1 \leq r \leq n\}$. For any $v \in V$ and $1 \leq r \leq n$, according to Lemma 3.1, the probability of $\mathcal{F}_{v,r}$ is at most $\frac{1}{n^3}$. And it can be observed that the **if** condition in Line 8 is triggered k times for some $k \geq 1$, only if at least k events in \mathcal{F} happen. Moreover, these k events must be mutually independent. This is because once the **if** condition is triggered and the constructed augmenting event occurs, the involved random variable will be included in a ball and will not be used by any other constructed augmenting event who triggers **if** condition next time.

Thus, it is sufficient to bound the probability that there exists a subset of k mutually independent events in \mathcal{F} such that all of them happen together, which is

$$\sum_{\substack{F \subseteq \mathcal{F}, |F|=k, \\ \text{the events in } F \\ \text{are independent}}} \prod_{f \in F} \Pr[f \text{ happens}] \leq \sum_{\substack{F \subseteq \mathcal{F}, |F|=k, \\ \text{the events in } F \\ \text{are independent}}} \prod_{f \in F} \frac{1}{n^3} \leq n^{2k} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{3k}} = \frac{1}{n^k}.$$

For any $0 < \eta < 1$, the probability that the **if** condition in Line 8 is triggered at least $k = \log_n \frac{1}{\eta}$ times is at most $n^{-k} \leq \eta$. Note that each time the **if** condition is triggered, the value of \mathcal{D} will increase by ℓ . Thus, with probability $1 - \eta$, the contribution \mathcal{D} of this case is bounded by $\tilde{O}(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\eta})$.

Overall, for any $0 < \eta < 1$, we have $\mathcal{D} = \tilde{O}(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\eta})$ with probability $1 - \eta$.

7 Analysis of Resampling

In this section, we analyze the *Resampling* phase of the algorithm. The correctness and efficiency of the *RecursiveSampling* procedure (Items 1 and 2 in Lemma 3.11) are respectively proved in Sections 7.1 and 7.2. The accuracy of the estimation (Lemma 3.10) in the augmented instance is proved in Section 7.3. The correctness of substituting (Lemma 3.12) is proved in Section 7.4. Finally, the analysis of the *Resampling* phase (Lemma 3.11) is wrapped up in Section 7.5.

7.1 Correctness of *RecursiveSampling* (Proof of Item 1 in Lemma 3.11)

First, we prove Item 1 of Lemma 3.11, which guarantees the correctness of Algorithm 2.

Assume that Condition 3.9 is satisfied by the input of *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$). Our goal is to show that $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_I$ when the procedure returns. This is proved by a structural induction. For the induction basis $\Lambda = V$, Line 9 is executed with probability 1 and the resampled \mathbf{Y} follows the distribution μ_I .

For the general case, assume that all recursive calls made within *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) return with the correct sampling results as long as Condition 3.9 is satisfied by the input arguments to these recursive calls. We then prove $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_I$ when *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) returns.

In Algorithm 2, a $\rho \in [0, 1)$ is drawn uniformly at random beforehand. Then an estimation $[L, R]$ of the probability $P = \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda]$ is dynamically improved based on local information, to determine whether $\rho < P$ (in which case Line 6 is satisfied, and the algorithm enters the zone for generating $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}}$) or $\rho \geq P$ (in which case Line 16 is satisfied, and the algorithm enters the zone for generating $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}'}$). This inspires us to define the following events:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_1 &: \text{ Line 6 is satisfied, and the algorithm enters the zone for generating } \mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}} \\ \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1 &: \text{ Line 16 is satisfied, and the algorithm enters the zone for generating } \mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}'}. \end{aligned}$$

Once the algorithm enters one of these two zones, it will not leave the zone until the algorithm returns. Thus, the above two events are mutually exclusive. Furthermore, at least one of them must occur eventually. Indeed, for $P \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda]$, we have the following claim.

Claim 7.1. $\Pr[\mathcal{F}_1] = P$ and $\Pr[\overline{\mathcal{F}}_1] = 1 - P$.

Proof. Let $\ell_0 = \ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$. By Lemma 3.1, A_λ is defined on the random variables in $\text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0}(\Lambda))$. For $i \geq 1$, let $\ell_i \triangleq \ell_0(\zeta_0^i, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \cdot \zeta_0^i)$. For $i \geq 1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{J}_i &\triangleq \{J = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U_J}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V_J}) \mid J \text{ is } \alpha\text{-satisfiable} \\ &\quad \text{and } J(V_J \setminus B_{\ell_0 + \ell_i}^{D_J}(\Lambda)) \text{ is } \gamma\text{-satisfiable} \\ &\quad \text{and } J(B_{\ell_0 + \ell_i + 1}^{D_J}(\Lambda)) = I(B_{\ell_0 + \ell_i + 1}^{D_I}(\Lambda))\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $i \geq 1$, let

$$L_i \triangleq \inf_{J \in \mathfrak{J}_i} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_J}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_{\bar{\lambda}}] \quad \text{and} \quad R_i \triangleq \sup_{J \in \mathfrak{J}_i} \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_J}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_{\bar{\lambda}}].$$

Since $I \in \mathfrak{J}_i$ for all $i \geq 1$, it always holds that $P \in [L_i, R_i]$. In particular, $P = L_i = R_i$ when $L_1 = R_1$. And by Lemma 3.10, we have $R_i - L_i \leq 4\zeta_0^i$ for all $i \geq 1$.

Let i_{\max} denote the smallest integer $i \geq 1$ with $B_{\ell_0 + \ell_i}(\Lambda) = V$. Let j_{\max} denote the smallest integer $i \geq 1$ with $L_i = R_i$. Observe that $j_{\max} \leq i_{\max}$. Then, the **while** loop stops within at most j_{\max} iterations. Moreover, for $1 \leq i \leq j_{\max}$, the values of L_i and R_i are computed in Line 5 in the i -th iteration.

The probability of \mathcal{F}_1 is then calculated. By convention, assume $L_0 = 0$ and $R_0 = 1$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{F}_1] &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq i_{\max}} \Pr \left[\left(\rho < \max_{0 \leq j \leq i} L_j \right) \wedge \left(\max_{0 \leq j < i} L_j \leq \rho < \min_{0 \leq j < i} R_j \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq i_{\max}} \frac{\max_{0 \leq j \leq i} L_j - \max_{0 \leq j < i} L_j}{\min_{0 \leq j < i} R_j - \max_{0 \leq j < i} L_j} \cdot \left(\min_{0 \leq j < i} R_j - \max_{0 \leq j < i} L_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq i_{\max}} \left(\max_{0 \leq j \leq i} L_j - \max_{0 \leq j < i} L_j \right) = \max_{0 \leq i \leq i_{\max}} L_i = P. \end{aligned}$$

As for the probability of $\overline{\mathcal{F}_1}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\overline{\mathcal{F}_1}] &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq i_{\max}} \Pr \left[\left(\rho \geq \min_{0 \leq j \leq i} R_j \right) \wedge \left(\max_{0 \leq j < i} L_j \leq \rho < \min_{0 \leq j < i} R_j \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq i_{\max}} \frac{\min_{0 \leq j < i} R_j - \min_{0 \leq j \leq i} R_j}{\min_{0 \leq j < i} R_j - \max_{0 \leq j < i} L_j} \cdot \left(\min_{0 \leq j < i} R_j - \max_{0 \leq j < i} L_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq i_{\max}} \left(\min_{0 \leq j < i} R_j - \min_{0 \leq j \leq i} R_j \right) = 1 - \min_{0 \leq i \leq i_{\max}} R_i = 1 - P. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The following claim guarantees the soundness of Line 8 in Algorithm 2.

Claim 7.2. *With probability 1, $\max f > 0$ and $\nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{Y_S \wedge Y_T} \right) > 0$, where f is defined in (9).*

Proof. Let $S = \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$ and $T = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}(\Lambda))$. We show that for any $\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_S$ and $\tau_1 \in \Sigma_T$ with $\Pr[Y_S = \sigma_1 \wedge Y_T = \tau_1] > 0$, it always holds that $\nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_1} \right) > 0$, and furthermore, it holds that $\max f > 0$ conditioned on $Y_S = \sigma_1$, which will prove the claim. Fix any $\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_S$ and $\tau_1 \in \Sigma_T$ with $\Pr[Y_S = \sigma_1 \wedge Y_T = \tau_1] > 0$. Since the input to *RecursiveSampling* satisfies Condition 3.9, it holds that $(\mathbf{Y}, \{\Lambda\})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, which means $\mu_{\hat{I}, T}^{\sigma_1}(\tau_1) > 0$, and hence $\nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_1} \right) > 0$, for the LLL instance \hat{I} defined as in (8).

For $\nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}} \right) \geq \alpha - \delta > 0$, there exist $\sigma_2 \in \Sigma_S$ and $\tau_2 \in \Sigma_T$ such that $\nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\tau_2} \right) > 0$ and $\nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_2} \right) > 0$. According to Lemma 3.1, we have that S and T are ϵ -correlated in instance \hat{I} , i.e.:

$$\nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_1} \right) \cdot \nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_2} \right) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_2} \right) \cdot \nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_1} \right).$$

Thus, it holds that $\nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_2} \right) > 0$ and $\max f \geq f(\tau_2) = \nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\tau_2} \right) / \nu \left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_2} \right) > 0$. \square

Claim 7.3. *Conditioned on \mathcal{F}_1 , when *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) returns, \mathbf{Y} follows $\mu_{\hat{I}}$.*

Proof. By Claim 7.2, the Bayes filter constructed in Line 8 is well-defined. Let \mathcal{F}_2 denote the event that the Bayes filter defined in Line 8 succeeds. Depending on whether \mathcal{F}_2 happens, we proceed in two cases.

First, assume that \mathcal{F}_2 does not happen. In this case, we only need to verify that the input of the recursive call $\text{RecursiveSampling}\left(\mathbf{Y}; \hat{I}, B_r(\Lambda) \cup \{\lambda\}, \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{2}\right)$ in Line 14 satisfies Condition 3.9. For any fixed $x \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with $\Pr[\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \neg \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge r = x] > 0$, conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \neg \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge r = x$, the properties asserted in Condition 3.9 are verified one by one on the input to this recursive call as follow.

1. By our assumption, the original input $(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ satisfies Condition 3.9, which means $0 < \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \alpha \leq \gamma < 1$ and $0 < \delta < \zeta_0 \cdot \alpha$. The same can be easily verified for $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{2}\right)$.
2. Since $(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ satisfies Condition 3.9, the LLL instance $I(V \setminus \Lambda)$ is γ -satisfiable. For $x > \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, we have $\hat{I}((V \cup \{\lambda\}) \setminus (B_x(\Lambda) \cup \{\lambda\})) = I(V \setminus B_x(\Lambda))$, which must also be γ -satisfiable since $V \setminus B_x(\Lambda) \subseteq V \setminus \Lambda$. Furthermore, it holds that $\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}) \geq \alpha - \delta \geq (1 - \zeta_0)\alpha$. By choosing $\zeta_0 > 0$ to be a sufficient small constant, the LLL instance \hat{I} is at least $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ -satisfiable.
3. Let $\hat{S} = \text{vbl}(B_x(\Lambda))$ and $\hat{T} = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{x+\ell_0(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2})}(\Lambda))$. Let A_κ and \hat{I}_κ , where $\kappa \notin V$, respectively denote the bad event and the augmented LLL instance constructed in Lemma 3.1, where

$$A_\kappa \triangleq A_{\lambda(B_x(\Lambda), \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2})}^{\hat{I}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{I}_\kappa \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_\lambda\} \cup \{A_\kappa\}).$$

Let \mathcal{A} denote the event that \mathbf{Y} avoids the bad event A_κ . For any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\hat{S}}$ with $\Pr[\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \neg \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge r = x \wedge Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma] > 0$, since $Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma$ already ensures $r_1 \geq x$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \neg \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge r = x \wedge Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma \iff \mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \neg \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge \mathcal{A} \wedge Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma.$$

Moreover, given \mathcal{A} and $Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma$, the event $\neg \mathcal{F}_2$ is conditionally independent of $Y_{\hat{T}}$. Recall that $(\mathbf{Y}, \{\Lambda\})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$. Thus, conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \neg \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge r = x \wedge Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma$, it holds that $Y_{\hat{T}}$ follows the distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}_1, \hat{T}}^\sigma$.

Thus, $(\mathbf{Y}, \{B_x(\Lambda) \cup \{\lambda\}\})$ is clustered conditional Gibbs on instance \hat{I} with parameter $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}\right)$.

Altogether, conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \neg \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge r = x$, the input to the recursive call in Line 14 satisfies Condition 3.9. By the induction hypothesis, right after the recursive call in Line 14 returns, \mathbf{Y} follows the distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}}$. Since this holds for all possible $x \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we have that the output $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}}$ conditioned on \mathcal{F}_1 and $\neg \mathcal{F}_2$.

The remaining case is that \mathcal{F}_2 happens. Let $S = \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$ and $T = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}(\Lambda))$. Fix any $\sigma \in \Sigma_S$ with $\Pr[\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge Y_S = \sigma] > 0$. We prove that, conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge Y_S = \sigma$, the \mathbf{Y} follows the distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}}$ after Line 9 being executed. In the following analysis, let $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ denote the original input random assignment and let $\mathbf{Y}' = (Y'_i)_{i \in U}$ denote the \mathbf{Y} after Line 9 being executed.

Recall that S and T are ϵ -correlated in instance \hat{I} . For any $\pi \in \Sigma$ with $\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\pi_T \wedge \sigma}) = 0$, it holds that $\mu_{\hat{I}, T}(\pi_T) = 0$. Thus, for any $\pi \in \Sigma$ with $\mu_{\hat{I}, T}(\pi_T) > 0$, it holds that $\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\pi_T \wedge \sigma}) > 0$. For any $\pi \in \Sigma$ with $\mu_{\hat{I}}(\pi) > 0$, conditioned on \mathcal{F}_1 and $Y_S = \sigma$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{Y}' = \pi \wedge \mathcal{F}_2] &= \Pr[Y'_T = \pi_T] \cdot \Pr[Y'_{U \setminus T} = \pi_{U \setminus T} \mid Y'_T = \pi_T] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{F}_2 \mid \mathbf{Y}' = \pi] \\ &= \mu_{\hat{I}, T}^\sigma(\pi_T) \cdot \mu_{\hat{I}, U \setminus T}^{\pi_T}(\pi_{U \setminus T}) \cdot \frac{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\pi_T})}{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma \wedge \pi_T})} \cdot \frac{1}{\max f} = \mu_{\hat{I}}(\pi) \cdot \frac{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}})}{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^\sigma)} \cdot \frac{1}{\max f}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, conditioned on \mathcal{F}_1 and $Y_S = \sigma$, it holds that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{F}_2] = \sum_{\pi \in \Sigma} \Pr[\mathbf{Y}' = \pi \wedge \mathcal{F}_2] = \sum_{\pi \in \Sigma} \mu_{\hat{I}}(\pi) \cdot \frac{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}})}{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^\sigma)} \cdot \frac{1}{\max f} = \frac{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}})}{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^\sigma)} \cdot \frac{1}{\max f}.$$

Thus, conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_1 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge Y_S = \sigma$, the output \mathbf{Y}' follows $\mu_{\hat{I}}$. By the law of total probability, conditioned on \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 , after *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) returns, \mathbf{Y} follows $\mu_{\hat{I}}$. \square

Claim 7.4. *Conditioned on $\overline{\mathcal{F}_1}$, when *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) returns, \mathbf{Y} follows $\mu_{\hat{I}}$.*

Proof. In this case, we only need verify that the input $(\mathbf{Y}; \hat{I}', B_s(\Lambda) \cup \{\bar{\lambda}\}, \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha (1-R)}{2}, \alpha(1-R))$ of the recursive call to *RecursiveSampling* in Line 20 satisfies Condition 3.9. For any fixed $x \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with $\Pr(\overline{\mathcal{F}_1} \wedge s = x) > 0$, conditioned on $\overline{\mathcal{F}_1}$ and $s = x$, the properties asserted in Condition 3.9 are verified one by one on the input to this recursive call as follow.

1. By our assumption, the original input $(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ satisfies Condition 3.9, which means $0 < \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \alpha \leq \gamma < 1$ and $0 < \delta < \zeta_0 \cdot \alpha$. The same can be verified on $(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha (1-R)}{2}, \alpha(1-R))$.
2. Since $(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ satisfies Condition 3.9, the LLL instance $I(V \setminus \Lambda)$ is γ -satisfiable. For $x > \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, we have $\hat{I}'((V \cup \{\bar{\lambda}\}) \setminus (B_x(\Lambda) \cup \{\bar{\lambda}\})) = I(V \setminus B_x(\Lambda))$, which must also be γ -satisfiable since $V \setminus B_x(\Lambda) \subseteq V \setminus \Lambda$. Furthermore, it holds that $\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}'} \geq \nu(\Omega_I) \cdot (1-P) \geq \alpha \cdot (1-R)$.
3. Let $\hat{S} = \text{vbl}(B_x(\Lambda))$ and $\hat{T} = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{x+\ell_0}(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2})(\Lambda))$. Let A_κ and \hat{I}_κ , where $\kappa \notin V$, respectively denote the bad event and the augmented LLL instance constructed in Lemma 3.1, where

$$A_\kappa \triangleq A_{\lambda(B_x(\Lambda), \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha (1-R)}{2})}^{\hat{I}'}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{I}'_1 \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_{\bar{\lambda}}\} \cup \{A_\kappa\}).$$

Let \mathcal{A} denote the event that \mathbf{Y} avoids the bad event A_κ . For any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\hat{S}}$ with $\Pr(\overline{\mathcal{F}_1} \wedge s = x \wedge Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma) > 0$, since $Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma$ already ensures $s \geq x$, we have

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}_1} \wedge s = x \wedge Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma \iff \neg \overline{\mathcal{F}_1} \wedge \mathcal{A} \wedge Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma.$$

Recall that by our assumption, $(\mathbf{Y}, \{\Lambda\})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$. Thus, conditioned on $\overline{\mathcal{F}_1} \wedge s = x \wedge Y_{\hat{S}} = \sigma$, it holds that $Y_{\hat{T}}$ follows the distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}'_1, \hat{T}}^\sigma$, i.e. $(\mathbf{Y}, \{B_x(\Lambda) \cup \{\bar{\lambda}\}\})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance \hat{I}' with parameter $(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha (1-R)}{2})$.

Altogether, conditioned on $\overline{\mathcal{F}_1}$ and $r = x$, the input to the recursive call in Line 20 satisfies Condition 3.9. By the induction hypothesis, right after the recursive call in Line 20 returns, \mathbf{Y} follows the distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}}$. Since this holds for all possible $x \in \mathbb{N}^+$, by the law of total probability, we have that the output $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}}$ conditioned on $\overline{\mathcal{F}_1}$. \square

Now we are ready to finalize the proof of the correctness of *RecursiveSampling*. Denote by \mathbf{Y}^* the random assignment \mathbf{Y} when *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) returns. By Claim 7.1 and Claim 7.3, for any $\pi \in \Sigma_V$ avoiding A_λ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{Y}^* = \pi] &= \Pr[\mathbf{Y}^* = \pi \mid \mathcal{F}_1] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{F}_1] + \Pr[\mathbf{Y}^* = \pi \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}_1}] \cdot \Pr[\overline{\mathcal{F}_1}] \\ &= \mu_{\hat{I}}(\pi) \cdot P = \mu_I(\pi). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Claim 7.1 and Claim 7.4, for any $\pi \in \Sigma_V$ not avoiding A_λ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{Y}^* = \pi] &= \Pr[\mathbf{Y}^* = \pi \mid \mathcal{F}_1] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{F}_1] + \Pr[\mathbf{Y}^* = \pi \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}_1}] \cdot \Pr[\overline{\mathcal{F}_1}] \\ &= \mu_{\hat{I}}(\pi) \cdot (1 - P) = \mu_I(\pi). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mu_I$ when $\text{RecursiveSampling}(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ returns, assuming Condition 3.9 satisfied initially by the input, which finishes the inductive proof of the correctness of RecursiveSampling .

7.2 Efficiency of RecursiveSampling (Proof of Item 2 in Lemma 3.11)

We now prove Item 2 of Lemma 3.11, which bounds the efficiency of Algorithm 2.

Assume that Condition 3.9 is satisfied by the input of $\text{RecursiveSampling}(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$. To upper bound the complexity of the recursive algorithm, we construct a potential $\mathcal{P} \geq 0$, which is computed during the execution of RecursiveSampling according to the following rules which are added into Algorithm 2:

- \mathcal{P} is initialized to 0, and the current value of \mathcal{P} is returned whenever the algorithm returns;
- when the recursive call in Line 14 returns with some value \mathcal{P}_1 , the value of \mathcal{P} is increased by \mathcal{P}_1 ;
- when the recursive call in Line 20 returns with some value \mathcal{P}_2 , the current value of \mathcal{P} is increased by $\mathcal{P}_2 + \lceil \log \frac{1}{1-R} \rceil + 1$, where R is the current estimation upper bound calculated in Line 5;
- whenever Line 23 is executed, the value of \mathcal{P} is increased by 1.

This procedure for computing the potential \mathcal{P} is explicitly described in Algorithm 5. Note that other than the part for computing the value of \mathcal{P} , Algorithm 5 is exactly the same as Algorithm 2. Therefore, we refer to them both by the same name $\text{RecursiveSampling}(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$.

Next, we prove Claim 7.5 and Claim 7.6, where Claim 7.5 says that the potential \mathcal{P} computed as above can be used to bound the radius r of $\text{RecursiveSampling}(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ stated in Item 2 of Lemma 3.11, and Claim 7.6 gives an upper bound on the potential \mathcal{P} .

Claim 7.5. *Suppose that Condition 3.9 is satisfied by the input of $\text{RecursiveSampling}(\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$, who accesses $I(B_r(\Lambda))$, updates $Y_{\text{vl}(B_r(\Lambda))}$, and returns a $\mathcal{P} \geq 0$. It holds that*

$$r \leq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) + O\left(\mathcal{P} \cdot \left(\mathcal{P} + \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \left(\mathcal{P} \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\right).$$

Proof. Let $c > 1$ be a sufficient large constant. For $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, define

$$g(\mathcal{P}, \gamma, \alpha) = c \cdot \mathcal{P} \cdot \left(\mathcal{P} + \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \left(\mathcal{P} \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right).$$

Claim 7.5 is proved by showing that $r \leq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) + g(\mathcal{P}, \gamma, \alpha)$. This is proved by a structural induction. Suppose that the input is the LLL instance $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$, the random assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$, and the subset $\Lambda \subseteq V$ of bad events, along with the parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ satisfying Condition 3.9.

First, for the induction basis, when $\Lambda = V$, the induction hypothesis holds as $r = 0$ and $\mathcal{P} = 0$.

Algorithm 5: *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) that computes \mathcal{P} during execution

Input : LLL instance $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$, subset $\Lambda \subseteq V$, parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$;
Data : assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$ stored globally that can be updated by the algorithm;
Output: integer $\mathcal{P} \geq 0$;
// An integer $\mathcal{P} \geq 0$ is computed and returned (which are highlighted);
otherwise, the algorithm is the same as Algorithm 2.

- 1 initialize $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow 0$, $i \leftarrow 1$, and define $\ell_0 \triangleq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$;
// The value of \mathcal{P} is initialized to 0.
- 2 draw $\rho \in [0, 1)$ uniformly at random;
- 3 **while true do**
- 4 $\ell_i \leftarrow \ell_0(\zeta_0^i, \gamma, \alpha \cdot \zeta_0^i)$;
- 5 compute the smallest interval $[L, R]$ containing $P \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda]$ based on Λ, A_λ ,
 $I(B_{\ell_0+\ell_i+1}(\Lambda))$, assuming that I is α -satisfiable and $I(V \setminus B_{\ell_0+\ell_i+1}(\Lambda))$ is γ -satisfiable;
- 6 **if** $\rho < L$ **then**
- 7 define $T \triangleq U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0}(\Lambda))$;
- 8 **with probability** $\frac{f(Y_T)}{\max f}$, where f is defined as in (9), **do**
- 9 update \mathbf{Y} by redrawing $Y_{U \setminus T} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}, U \setminus T}^{Y_T}$;
- 10 **else**
- 11 initialize $r \leftarrow \ell_0 + 1$;
- 12 **while** \mathbf{Y} does not avoid the bad event $A_{\lambda(B_r(\Lambda), 1/2, \gamma, \zeta_0 \alpha/2)}^{\hat{I}}$ **do**
- 13 grow the ball: $r \leftarrow r + \ell_0\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}\right)$ and $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} + 1$;
 // The value of \mathcal{P} is increased by 1.
- 14 $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} + \text{RecursiveSampling}\left(\mathbf{Y}; \hat{I}, B_r(\Lambda) \cup \{\lambda\}, \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha}{2}\right)$;
 // The value of \mathcal{P} is increased by the amount returned by the
 recursive call.
- 15 **return** \mathcal{P} ;
- 16 **else if** $\rho \geq R$ **then**
- 17 initialize $s \leftarrow \ell_0 + 1$;
- 18 **while** \mathbf{Y} does not avoid the bad event $A_{\lambda(B_s(\Lambda), 1/2, \gamma, \zeta_0 \alpha(1-R)/2)}^{\hat{I}'}$ **do**
- 19 grow the ball: $s \leftarrow s + \ell_0\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha(1-R)}{2}\right)$ and $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} + 1$;
 // The value of \mathcal{P} is increased by 1.
- 20 $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} + \lceil \log \frac{1}{1-R} \rceil + \text{RecursiveSampling}\left(\mathbf{Y}; \hat{I}', B_s(\Lambda) \cup \{\bar{\lambda}\}, \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha(1-R)}{2}, \alpha(1-R)\right)$;
 // The value of \mathcal{P} is increased by the amount returned by the
 recursive call.
- 21 **return** \mathcal{P} ;
- 22 **else**
- 23 enter the next iteration (and refine the estimation of P): $i \leftarrow i + 1$ and $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} + 1$;
 // The value of \mathcal{P} is increased by 1.

Now, consider the general case. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\ell &\triangleq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) = O\left(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \log \left(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\right), \\ \ell_1 &\triangleq \ell_0\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}\right) = O\left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\right), \\ \ell_2 &\triangleq \ell_0\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha(1-R)}{2}\right) = O\left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\alpha(1-R)} \log \left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\alpha(1-R)}\right)\right), \\ \ell_3 &\triangleq \ell_0(\zeta_0^K, \gamma, \alpha \cdot \zeta_0^K) = O\left(K \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\log \frac{1}{\alpha} + K\right) \log \left(K \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\log \frac{1}{\alpha} + K\right)\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where K stands for the number of times that Line 23 is executed.

The induction then proceeds in the following three cases:

- **Case 1: Line 14 is executed.** Let K_1 denote the number of times that Line 13 is executed. Let \mathcal{P}_1 denote the value returned by the recursive call in Line 14. In this case, we have $\mathcal{P} = K + \mathcal{P}_1 + K_1$. By the induction hypothesis, it holds that

$$r \leq \ell + (K_1 + 1) \cdot \ell_1 + g\left(\mathcal{P}_1, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}\right) + \ell_3.$$

- **Case 2: Line 20 is executed.** Let K_2 denote the number of times that Line 19 is executed. Let \mathcal{P}_2 denote the value returned by the recursive call in Line 20. In this case we have $\mathcal{P} = K + \mathcal{P}_2 + K_2 + \lceil \log \frac{1}{1-R} \rceil$. By the induction hypothesis, it holds that

$$r \leq \ell + (K_2 + 1) \cdot \ell_2 + g\left(\mathcal{P}_2, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha(1-R)}{2}\right) + \ell_3.$$

- **Case 3: otherwise.** In this case, we have $\mathcal{P} = K$. It holds that

$$r \leq \ell + \ell_3 + 1.$$

By choosing c to be a large enough constant, one can verify that $r \leq \ell_0 + g(\mathcal{P}, \gamma, \alpha)$ in all cases. \square

Claim 7.6. *Suppose that Condition 3.9 is satisfied by the input of `RecursiveSampling`($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$), who returns a $\mathcal{P} \geq 0$. For any $\eta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \eta$, it holds that $\mathcal{P} = O\left(\log^2 \frac{1}{\eta}\right)$.*

Proof. We prove that, for some constant d_1 , it holds that $\Pr[\mathcal{P} > d_1 \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\eta}] < \eta$ for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$.

This is proved by induction. Suppose that the input is the LLL instance $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$, the random assignment $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_i)_{i \in U}$, and the subset $\Lambda \subseteq V$ of bad events, along with the parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha)$ satisfying Condition 3.9.

For the induction basis, when $\Lambda = V$, the induction hypothesis holds trivially since $\mathcal{P} = 0$.

For the general case. by induction hypothesis, all recursive calls return the correctly bounded values of \mathcal{P} 's as long as Condition 3.9 is satisfied by the input. We prove that `RecursiveSampling`($\mathbf{Y}; I, \Lambda, \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \alpha$) returns a correctly bounded \mathcal{P} .

Let K denote the number of times that Line 23 is executed. Let K_1 denote the number of times that Line 13 is executed. Let K_2 denote the number of times that Line 19 is executed. If Line 14 is executed, let

\mathcal{P}_1 denote the value returned by the recursive call in Line 14. If Line 20 is executed, let \mathcal{P}_2 denote the value returned by the recursive call in Line 20.

For $\eta \in (0, 1)$, let $k \triangleq 10 \log \frac{1}{\eta} + d_2$ for sufficient large constant d_2 . One can verify that if $\mathcal{P} > d_1 \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\eta}$, then necessarily at least one of the following events must have happened.

- **Event \mathcal{E}_1 :** $K > k$. The probability that Line 23 is executed more than k times is $R - L$, where R and L respectively take values of these variables in the k -th iteration of the **while** loop. By Lemma 3.10, we have $R - L \leq 4\zeta_0^k$. By choosing ζ_0 to be a small enough constant, we have

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_1) = \Pr(K > k) \leq 4\zeta_0^k \leq 0.01\eta.$$

- **Event \mathcal{E}_2 :** **Line 14 is executed and $K_1 \geq k$.** We have $\Pr(\mathcal{E}_2) \leq \Pr(\forall A \in \Phi : A \text{ occurs on } \mathbf{Y})$, where

$$\Phi \triangleq \left\{ A_{\lambda(B_r(\Lambda), \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2})}^{\hat{I}} \mid r = \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) + 1 + i \cdot \ell_0\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha}{2}\right), \text{ for } 0 \leq i < k \right\}.$$

Let X_β and A_κ denote the respective random variable and bad event constructed in Lemma 3.12 under parameter Λ , $Y_{\text{vbl}(\Lambda)}$, $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, $I(B_{\ell(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)+1}(\Lambda))$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} U' &\triangleq U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)}(\Lambda)), \\ V' &\triangleq V \setminus B_{\ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)+1}(\Lambda), \\ I' &\triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U'} \cup \{X_\beta\}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V'} \cup \{A_\kappa\}). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Let Y_β be drawn independent according to the marginal distribution $\mu_{I', \beta}^{Y_{\text{vbl}(\kappa)} \setminus \{\beta\}}$. This is well-defined because $Y_{\text{vbl}(\kappa)} \setminus \{\beta\} \subseteq U'$. Then, define assignment \mathbf{Y}' as

$$\mathbf{Y}' \triangleq Y_{U'} \wedge Y_\beta. \tag{14}$$

Since (\mathbf{Y}, Λ) satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on I with parameter $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$, we have $Y_{U'} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}, U'}^{Y_{\text{vbl}(\Lambda)}}$, where \hat{I} is defined as in (8). By Lemma 3.12, we have $Y_{U'} \sim \mu_{I', U'}$, which means $\mathbf{Y}' \sim \mu_{I'}$, i.e. for any $A \in \Phi$, we have that A occurs on \mathbf{Y} if and only if A occurs on \mathbf{Y}' . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_2) &\leq \Pr(\forall A \in \Phi : A \text{ occurs on } \mathbf{Y}) = \Pr(\forall A \in \Phi : A \text{ occurs on } \mathbf{Y}') \\ &\leq \frac{(\zeta_0 \alpha)^k}{(1 - \epsilon)(\alpha - \delta)} \leq 4\zeta_0^k \leq 0.01\eta, \end{aligned}$$

by choosing ζ_0 to be sufficiently small constant.

- **Event \mathcal{E}_3 :** **Line 14 is executed and $\mathcal{P}_1 \geq d_1 \log^2 \frac{1}{1.1\eta}$.** We first bound the probability that Line 14 is executed. Recall that S and T are ϵ -correlated in instance \hat{I} , where \hat{I} is defined as in (8). According to Definition 3.1, it holds with probability 1 that

$$\frac{f(Y_T)}{f_{\max}} \geq \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus, the probability that Line 14 is executed is at most $\frac{1}{2}$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\Pr(\mathcal{P}_1 > d_1 \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{1.1\eta} \mid \text{Line 14 is executed}) < 1.1\eta$. Overall, we have

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_3) \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot 1.1\eta \leq 0.55\eta.$$

- **Event \mathcal{E}_4 : Line 20 is executed and $K_2 \geq k$.** The probability of \mathcal{E}_4 can be bounded similarly as \mathcal{E}_2 . Let I', Y' be defined as in (13) and (14) respectively. Let \hat{I}' defined as in (8). Define

$$\Phi' \triangleq \left\{ A_{\lambda(B_r(\Lambda), \frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha (1-R)}{2})}^{\hat{I}'} \mid r = \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) + 1 + i \cdot \ell_0\left(\frac{1}{2}, \gamma, \frac{\zeta_0 \alpha (1-R)}{2}\right), \text{ for } 0 \leq i < k \right\}$$

For any $A \in \Phi'$, we have that A occurs on \mathbf{Y} if and only if A occurs on \mathbf{Y}' , and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_4) &\leq \Pr(\forall A \in \Phi' : A \text{ occurs on } \mathbf{Y}) = \Pr(\forall A \in \Phi' : A \text{ occurs on } \mathbf{Y}') \\ &\leq \frac{(\zeta_0 \alpha)^k}{(1-\epsilon)(\alpha-\delta)} \leq 4\zeta_0^k \leq 0.01\eta. \end{aligned}$$

- **Event \mathcal{E}_5 : Line 20 is executed and $\log \frac{1}{1-R} \geq k$.** The probability that Line 20 is executed given R , is precisely $1 - R$. Thus, we have

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_5) = \Pr\left(\text{Line 20 is executed} \mid \log \frac{1}{1-R} \geq k\right) \cdot \Pr\left(\log \frac{1}{1-R} \geq k\right) \leq 2^{-k} \leq 0.01\epsilon.$$

- **Event \mathcal{E}_6 : Line 20 is executed and $\mathcal{P}_2 > d_1 \log^2 \frac{1}{1.1\eta}$.** The probability that Line 20 is executed is bounded by $1 - R$. Recall that $1 - R$ is the lower bound of $P \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I}(\mathbf{X} \text{ does not avoid } A_\lambda)$. Assuming Condition 3.9, this probability P is at most $\frac{\delta}{\alpha} \leq \zeta_0$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\Pr(\mathcal{P}_2 > d_1 \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{1.1\eta}) < 1.1\eta$. And by choosing ζ_0 to be sufficiently small constant, we have

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_6) \leq \zeta_0 \cdot 1.1\eta \leq 0.01\eta.$$

By the union bound applied on all above cases, we have

$$\Pr\left(\mathcal{P} > d_1 \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\eta}\right) < \eta,$$

for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$. This proves Claim 7.6. \square

Combine Claim 7.5 and Claim 7.6. For any $0 < \eta < 1$, with probability at least $1 - \eta$, the following upper bound holds for the radius r of Algorithm 2, assuming that its input satisfies Condition 3.9:

$$r \leq \ell_0(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) + O\left(\left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\eta} + \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\eta} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \cdot \log\left(\log \frac{1}{\eta} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\right).$$

This proves Item 2 in Lemma 3.11.

7.3 Accuracy of estimation (Proof of Lemma 3.10)

We prove Lemma 3.10, which guarantees the accuracy of the estimation of the probability

$$P \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I}[\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda]$$

from the local information.

We first prove the following technical lemma, which follows directly from Definition 3.1.

Lemma 7.7. Let $I = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V})$ be a LLL instance. For any $\epsilon > 0$, any disjoint $S, T \subset U$ with $S \cup T \neq U$, any real functions:

$$p_1, p_2 : \Sigma_S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad q_1, q_2 : \Sigma_T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0},$$

if S and T are ϵ -correlated in I , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The lemma follows by verifying:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \\ & = \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_S, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma_1) \cdot q_1(\tau_1) \cdot p_2(\sigma_2) \cdot q_2(\tau_2) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_1}) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_2}) \\ & \leq \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_S, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma_1) \cdot q_1(\tau_1) \cdot p_2(\sigma_2) \cdot q_2(\tau_2) \cdot (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma_1 \wedge \tau_2}) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma_2 \wedge \tau_1}) \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Now we can prove Lemma 3.10.

Proof of Lemma 3.10. For any $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(\Lambda)}$, define

$$\phi(\sigma) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \sigma \text{ avoids the bad event } A_\lambda, \\ 0 & \sigma \text{ does not avoid the bad event } A_\lambda. \end{cases}$$

For any $v \in V$, $\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq W \subseteq V$, $\sigma \in \Sigma_W$, define

$$\phi_v(\sigma) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \sigma \text{ avoids the bad event } A_v, \\ 0 & \sigma \text{ does not avoid the bad event } A_v. \end{cases}$$

Let $S = \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$ and $T = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))$. For any $\sigma \in \Sigma_S$, define

$$p_1(\sigma) \triangleq \prod_{\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq S} \phi_v(\sigma), \quad p_2(\sigma) \triangleq p_1(\sigma) \cdot \phi(\sigma).$$

For any $\tau \in \Sigma_T$, define

$$q_1(\tau) \triangleq \prod_{\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq T} \phi_v(\tau), \quad q_2(\tau) \triangleq 1.$$

We considered a new bad event A_w constructed by Lemma 3.1 and a augmented LLL instance I_w :

$$A_w \triangleq A_{\lambda(\Lambda, \epsilon^k, \alpha_2, \alpha_1 \cdot \epsilon^k)}^I, \quad \text{where } w \notin V, \quad \text{and} \quad I_w = (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V \cup \{w\}}).$$

According to Lemma 3.1, we have S and T are ϵ^k -correlated in LLL instance I_w . By Lemma 7.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \\ & \leq (1 + \epsilon^k) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau}). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Let

$$P \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_I} [\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda], \quad \text{and} \quad P_w \triangleq \Pr_{\mathbf{X} \sim \mu_{I_w}} [\mathbf{X} \text{ avoids } A_\lambda].$$

It holds that

$$P_w = \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau})}{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau})}.$$

Then, define

$$\hat{P} \triangleq \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau})}{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau})}.$$

The above P_w and \hat{P} are well-defined, since their denominators are non-zero, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_2(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) & \geq \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(\sigma) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^{\sigma \wedge \tau}) \\ & = \nu(\Omega_{I_w}) \geq \alpha_2 - \alpha_1 \cdot \epsilon^k > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the value of \hat{P} can be determined by Λ , A_λ and $I(B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda))$. By Equation (15) and simply swap the definition of q_1 with q_2 , we directly have

$$\hat{P} \leq (1 + \epsilon^k) \cdot P_w \leq (1 + \epsilon^k)^2 \cdot \hat{P}. \quad (16)$$

Now we try to estimate the difference between P and P_w . First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P & = \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S} p_2(\sigma) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^\sigma)}{\nu(\Omega_I)} \leq \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S} p_2(\sigma) \cdot (\nu(\Omega_{I_w}^\sigma) + \nu(A_w) \cdot \nu_S(\sigma))}{\nu(\Omega_I)} \\ & \leq \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S} p_2(\sigma) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^\sigma)}{\nu(\Omega_{I_w})} + \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S} p_2(\sigma) \cdot \nu(A_w) \cdot \nu_S(\sigma)}{\nu(\Omega_I)} \leq P_w + \frac{\alpha_1 \cdot \epsilon^k}{\alpha_1} = P_w + \epsilon^k. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P & = \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S} p_2(\sigma) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^\sigma)}{\nu(\Omega_I)} \geq \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S} p_2(\sigma) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^\sigma)}{\nu(\Omega_{I_w})} \cdot \frac{\nu(\Omega_{I_w})}{\nu(\Omega_I)} \\ & \geq \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S} p_2(\sigma) \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I_w}^\sigma)}{\nu(\Omega_{I_w})} \cdot \frac{\nu(\Omega_I) - \nu(A_w)}{\nu(\Omega_I)} \geq P_w \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_1 \cdot \epsilon^k}{\alpha_1}\right) = P_w \cdot (1 - \epsilon^k). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

By combining (16) (17) (18), we have

$$\hat{P} - 2\epsilon^k \leq P \leq \hat{P} + 2\epsilon^k. \quad \square$$

7.4 Analysis of *Substituting* (Proof of Lemma 3.12)

We prove Lemma 3.12, which guarantees the soundness of the substituting trick. We first construct the new random variable X_β and bad event A_κ , and then prove the identity stated in Lemma 3.12.

The construction of X_β . We construct a new random variable X_β follows a distribution ν_β over a domain Σ_β . Here is the construction of Σ_β and ν_β .

- The domain Σ_β . Let $R = \text{vbl}(B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda)) \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))$. We set $\Sigma_\beta = \Sigma_R$.
- The distribution ν_β . Let $S = \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$ and $T = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))$. Let $\omega \in \Sigma_{T \setminus R}$ be an arbitrary configuration. For any $\pi \in \Sigma_\beta$, define

$$P(\pi) \triangleq \frac{\nu\left(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\omega \wedge \pi \wedge \sigma}\right)}{\nu_T(\omega \wedge \pi) \cdot \nu_S(\sigma)}.$$

Note that $P(\pi)$ does not depend on ω . Order all the configurations $\pi \in \Sigma_\beta$ increasingly by $P(\pi)$ as $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_{|\Sigma_\beta|}$. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq |\Sigma_\beta|$, we set

$$\nu_\beta(\pi_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{P(\pi_1)}{P(\pi_{|\Sigma_\beta|})} & i = 1, \\ \frac{P(\pi_i) - P(\pi_{i-1})}{P(\pi_{|\Sigma_\beta|})} & 1 < i \leq |\Sigma_\beta|. \end{cases}$$

The construction of A_κ . We construct the new bad event A_κ as follow. The event A_κ is defined on the variables in $\text{vbl}(\kappa) \triangleq R \cup \{\beta\}$ such that for any $\tau \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(\kappa)}$,

$$A_\kappa \text{ occurs if and only if } P(\tau_R) < P(\tau_\beta).$$

Proof of Lemma 3.12. We prove the claimed properties one by one.

To prove Item 1 in Lemma 3.12, it is easy to verify that the constructions of X_β and A_κ depend only on the specifications of Λ , σ , $(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta)$ and $I(B_{\ell+1}(\Lambda))$.

Next, we prove Item 2 in Lemma 3.12. Fix any $W \subseteq T$ and its complement $\overline{W} = T \setminus W$. Define the following set of assignments:

$$\Sigma'_{\overline{W}} \triangleq \{\overline{w} \in \Sigma_{\overline{W}} \mid \overline{w} \wedge \omega \text{ avoids all the bad events } A_v \text{ such that } \text{vbl}(v) \subseteq T \text{ and } \text{vbl}(v) \not\subseteq W\}.$$

Let $U_\sigma \triangleq (U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))) \cup \{\beta\}$. For any $\omega \in \Sigma_W$ and $\overline{w} \in \Sigma'_{\overline{W}}$, it holds that

$$\mu_{\hat{I}, \overline{W}}^{\omega \wedge \sigma}(\overline{w}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma \wedge \omega \wedge \overline{w}})}{\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma \wedge \omega})} & \text{if } \nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}^{\sigma \wedge \omega}) > 0 \text{ and } \overline{w} \in \Sigma'_{\overline{W}}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mu_{I_\sigma, \overline{W}}^\omega(\overline{w}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^{\omega \wedge \overline{w}})}{\nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^\omega)} & \text{if } \nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^\omega) > 0 \text{ and } \overline{w} \in \Sigma'_{\overline{W}}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We consider following cases:

• **Case 1:** $\bar{\omega} \notin \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}$. In this case, it holds that $\mu_{I, \bar{W}}^{\omega \wedge \sigma}(\bar{\omega}) = \mu_{I_\sigma, \bar{W}}^\omega(\bar{\omega}) = 0$.

• **Case 2:** $\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}$ and $\nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega}) = 0$. In this case, we have

$$\nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^\omega) = \sum_{\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}} \nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^{\omega \wedge \bar{\omega}}) = \sum_{\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}} \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega \wedge \bar{\omega}}) = \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega}) = 0.$$

Therefore, it holds that $\mu_{I, \bar{W}}^{\omega \wedge \sigma}(\bar{\omega}) = \mu_{I_\sigma, \bar{W}}^\omega(\bar{\omega}) = 0$.

• **Case 3:** $\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}$ and $\nu(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^\omega) > 0$. In this case, it holds that

$$\mu_{I, \bar{W}}^{\omega \wedge \sigma}(\bar{\omega}) = \frac{\nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega \wedge \bar{\omega}})}{\nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega})} = \frac{\nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega \wedge \bar{\omega}})}{\sum_{\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}} \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega \wedge \bar{\omega}})}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{I_\sigma, \bar{W}}^\omega(\bar{\omega}) &= \frac{\nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^{\omega \wedge \bar{\omega}})}{\nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^\omega)} = \frac{\nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^{\omega \wedge \bar{\omega}})}{\sum_{\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}} \nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}^{\omega \wedge \bar{\omega}})} = \frac{\nu_T(\omega \wedge \bar{\omega}) \cdot \nu_\beta((\omega \wedge \bar{\omega})_R)}{\sum_{\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}} \nu_T(\omega \wedge \bar{\omega}) \cdot \nu_\beta((\omega \wedge \bar{\omega})_R)} \\ &= \frac{\nu_T(\omega \wedge \bar{\omega}) \cdot P((\omega \wedge \bar{\omega})_R)}{\sum_{\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}} \nu_T(\omega \wedge \bar{\omega}) \cdot P((\omega \wedge \bar{\omega})_R)} = \frac{\nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega \wedge \bar{\omega}})}{\sum_{\bar{\omega} \in \Sigma'_{\bar{W}}} \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \omega \wedge \bar{\omega}})} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\mu_{I, \bar{W}}^{\omega \wedge \sigma}(\bar{\omega}) = \mu_{I_\sigma, \bar{W}}^\omega(\bar{\omega})$.

Combing three cases, we prove that

$$\forall \omega \in \Sigma_W, \bar{\omega} \in \Sigma_{\bar{W}} : \mu_{I, \bar{W}}^{\omega \wedge \sigma}(\bar{\omega}) = \mu_{I_\sigma, \bar{W}}^\omega(\bar{\omega}).$$

At last, we prove Item 3 in Lemma 3.12. As before, for any $v \in V$, $\omega \in \Sigma_W$, where $\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq W \subseteq V$, let $\phi_v(\omega)$ indicate whether ω avoids A_v . Let $S = \text{vbl}(\Lambda)$ and $T = U \setminus \text{vbl}(B_\ell(\Lambda))$. For any $x \in \Sigma_S$, define

$$p_1(x) \triangleq \prod_{\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq S} \phi_v(x) \quad \text{and} \quad p_2(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\nu_S(x)} & x = \sigma, \\ 0 & x \neq \sigma. \end{cases}$$

For any $y \in \Sigma_T$, define

$$q_1(y) \triangleq \prod_{\text{vbl}(v) \subseteq T} \phi_v(y) \quad \text{and} \quad q_2(y) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\nu_T(y)} & y_R = \pi_{|\Sigma_\beta|}, \\ 0 & y_R \neq \pi_{|\Sigma_\beta|}. \end{cases}$$

It holds that

$$\nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}) = \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma_T} \nu_T(\tau) \cdot q_1(\tau) \cdot \frac{P(\tau_R)}{P(\pi_{|\Sigma_\beta|})} = \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(x) \cdot q_1(y) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau})}{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_2(x) \cdot q_2(y) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau})}.$$

and

$$\nu(\Omega_{\hat{I}}) \leq \frac{\nu_U(\Omega_{\hat{I}})}{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(x) \cdot q_2(y) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau})} = \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(x) \cdot q_1(y) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau})}{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_S, \tau \in \Sigma_T} p_1(x) \cdot q_2(y) \cdot \nu(\Omega_I^{\sigma \wedge \tau})}.$$

By Lemma 7.7, we have $\nu_U(\Omega_{\hat{I}}) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma})$, which implies $\nu_{U_\sigma}(\Omega_{I_\sigma}) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \nu_U(\Omega_{\hat{I}})$. Recall that the original LLL instance I is α -satisfiable and the additional bad event occurs with probability no more than δ . Therefore, the LLL instance I_σ is at least $(1 - \epsilon)(\alpha - \delta)$ -satisfiable. \square

7.5 Wrapping up the analysis of *Resampling* (Proof of Lemma 3.13)

At last, we wrap up the analysis of the *Resampling* phase, and prove Lemma 3.13.

Proof of Item 1 of Lemma 3.13. Denote by v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n the sequence of nodes obtained by sorting V in ascending order according to IDs. For $1 \leq k \leq n$, denote by \mathcal{B}_k the ball associated to node v_k , i.e.

$$\mathcal{B}_k \triangleq \begin{cases} B_{r_{v_k}}(p_{v_k}) & \text{if } v_k \in \mathcal{R} \text{ and } p_{v_k}, r_{v_k} \notin \{\perp\}, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Fix arbitrary $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n \subseteq V$ and assignments $\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(B_1)}, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(B_2)}, \dots, \sigma_n \in \Sigma_{\text{vbl}(B_n)}$ satisfying

$$\Pr \left[\left(\bigwedge_{k=1}^n \mathcal{B}_k = B_k \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{k=1}^n Y_{\text{vbl}(B_k)} = \sigma_k \right) \right] > 0.$$

Assume that the input \mathbf{Y} and p_v, r_v for $v \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfy the properties guaranteed by Lemma 3.7. Our goal is to show that conditioned on $\mathcal{B}_k = B_k$ and $Y_{\text{vbl}(B_k)} = \sigma_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$, right after Algorithm 3 being sequentially executed on all nodes in \mathcal{R} , the output assignment \mathbf{Y} follows the distribution μ_I .

For $0 \leq k \leq n$, let $\mathbf{Y}^{(k)}$ denote the random assignment \mathbf{Y} right after Algorithm 3 terminates on all the active nodes v_j with $j \leq k$. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, define

$$N_k \triangleq \{j \mid k < j \leq n \wedge B_j \neq \emptyset\}.$$

In the rest of the proof, we show that $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k)}, \{B_i\}_{i \in N_k})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on I with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$ for any $0 \leq k \leq n$. In particular, this guarantees that $(\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}, \emptyset)$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property, which implies that the final output $\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}$ follows the distribution μ_I .

For $k \in N_0$, let $A_{\lambda_k} \triangleq A_{\lambda(B_k, \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}^I$. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, define

$$\overline{U}^{(k)} \triangleq U \setminus \bigcup_{j \in N_k} \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}(B_j)), \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{T}^{(k)} \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V} \cup \{A_{\lambda_j}\}_{j \in N_k}).$$

The goal is to prove that $Y_{\overline{U}^{(k)}}^{(k)}$ follows the distribution $\mu_{\overline{T}^{(k)}, \overline{U}^{(k)}}^{\bigwedge_{j \in N_k} \sigma_j}$ for every $0 \leq k \leq n$.

We prove this by induction on k . As guaranteed by Lemma 3.7, $(\mathbf{Y}^{(0)}, \{B_i\}_{i \in N_0})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on I with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$. This becomes the basis of the induction.

Then, we consider the general case. By induction hypothesis, assume that $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k-1)}, \{B_i\}_{i \in N_{k-1}})$ satisfy the clustered conditional Gibbs property on I with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. This implies

$$Y_{\overline{U}^{(k-1)}}^{(k-1)} \sim \mu_{\overline{T}^{(k-1)}, \overline{U}^{(k-1)}}^{\bigwedge_{j \in N_{k-1}} \sigma_j} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq k \leq n. \quad (19)$$

If $B_k = \emptyset$, then $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k)}, \{B_i\}_{i \in N_k}) = (\mathbf{Y}^{(k-1)}, \{B_i\}_{i \in N_{k-1}})$ and the induction follows directly. If $B_k \neq \emptyset$, then v_k must be an active node in \mathcal{R} on which Algorithm 3 is executed. We first verify that the input to Line 1 of Algorithm 3 executed on v_k , denoted by $(\mathbf{Y}'; I', B_k, \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0, \gamma_0)$, satisfies Condition 3.9.

For $j \in N_0$, let X_{β_j} and A_{κ_j} denote the respective random variable and bad event constructed in Lemma 3.12 under parameter $B_j, \sigma_j, (\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0), I(B_{\ell(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)+1}(B_j))$.

For $0 \leq s \leq t \leq n$, define

$$U^{(s,t)} \triangleq U \setminus \bigcup_{i \in N_s \setminus N_t} \text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}(B_i)),$$

$$V^{(s,t)} \triangleq V \setminus \bigcup_{i \in N_s \setminus N_t} B_{\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)+1}(B_i),$$

$$I^{(s,t)} \triangleq (\{X_i\}_{i \in U^{(s,t)}} \cup \{X_{\beta_i}\}_{i \in N_s \setminus N_t}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V^{(s,t)}} \cup \{A_{\kappa_i}\}_{i \in N_s \setminus N_t}).$$

Observe that $I^{(s,s)} = I$ for all $0 \leq s \leq n$. Observe that, for $0 \leq s < t \leq n$, if $B_t = \emptyset$, then $I^{(s,t)} = I^{(s,t-1)}$. And if $B_t \neq \emptyset$, then $I^{(s,t)}$ is obtained from $I^{(s,t-1)}$ by substituting the ball $B_{\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)+1}(B_t)$ with A_{λ_t} and substituting $\text{vbl}(B_{\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)}(B_t))$ with X_{β_t} . According to Lemma 3.7, for any distinct $i, j \in N_0$, the distance between B_i and B_j is at least $2(\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0) + 2)$. One can verify that $I^{(k,n)} = I'$.

For $k \leq j \leq n$, define

$$\mathbf{Y}^{(k,j)} \triangleq Y_{U^{(k,j)}}^{(k-1)} \wedge (Y'_{\beta_j})_{j \in N_k \setminus N_j}.$$

One can verify that $\mathbf{Y}^{(k,n)} = \mathbf{Y}'$.

Then, we verify that the input of *RecursiveSampling*($\mathbf{Y}'; I', B_k, \epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0, \gamma_0$) satisfies Condition 3.9. The first property can be verified easily. For the second property, according to Lemma 3.12, it holds that $\nu(\Omega_{I^{(k,j)}}) \geq (1 - \epsilon_0)(\nu(\Omega_{I^{(k,j-1)}}) - \delta_0)$ for all $k < j \leq n$. Note that the LLL instance $I^{(k,k)}$ is the original LLL instance I , which is γ -satisfiable. Thus, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\Omega_{I^{(k,n)}}) &\geq (1 - \epsilon_0)^n \cdot \nu(\Omega_{I^{(k,k)}}) - n \cdot \delta_0 \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2n}\right)^n \nu(\Omega_{I^{(k,k)}}) - n \cdot \frac{\zeta_0 \cdot \gamma}{24n^3} \geq \frac{\gamma}{8} \geq \gamma_0, \end{aligned}$$

which means that $I^{(k,n)}(V \setminus B_k)$ is also γ_0 -satisfiable. It remains to verify the third property, which states that the $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k,n)}, \{B_k\})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance $I^{(k,n)}$ with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$. This is proved by the following claim.

Claim 7.8. *For $k \leq j \leq n$, it holds that $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k,j)}, \{B_k\} \cup \{B_i\}_{i \in N_j})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on $I^{(k,j)}$ with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$.*

Proof. For $k \leq j \leq n$, define

$$\hat{U}^{(k,j)} \triangleq U^{(k-1,n)} \cup \{\beta_i\}_{i \in N_k \setminus N_j},$$

$$\hat{I}^{(k,j)} \triangleq \left(\{X_i\}_{i \in \hat{U}^{(k,j)}} \cup \{X_{\beta_i}\}_{i \in N_k \setminus N_j}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V^{(k,j)}} \cup \{A_{\kappa_i}\}_{i \in N_k \setminus N_j} \cup \{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{i \in \{k\} \cup N_j} \right).$$

The goal is to prove that $Y_{\hat{U}^{(k,j)}}^{(k,j)}$ follows the distribution $\mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j)}, \hat{U}^{(k,j)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_j} \sigma_i}$ for $k \leq j \leq n$.

This is proved by induction on j . For the induction basis, assuming $j = k$, in this case we have $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k,k)}, \{B_k\} \cup \{B_i\}_{i \in N_k}) = (\mathbf{Y}^{(k-1)}, \{B_i\}_{i \in N_{k-1}})$ and $I^{(k,k)} = I$. By (19), we have

$$Y_{\hat{U}^{(k-1)}}^{(k,k)} \sim \mu_{\bar{I}^{(k-1)}, \hat{U}^{(k-1)}}^{\bigwedge_{i \in N_{k-1}} \sigma_i}.$$

Observe that $U^{(k-1,n)} = \hat{U}^{(k,k)}$, $(\bigwedge_{i \in N_{k-1}} \sigma_i) = (\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_k} \sigma_i)$ and $\bar{I}^{(k-1)} = \hat{I}^{(k,k)}$. It holds that

$$Y_{\hat{U}^{(k,k)}}^{(k,k)} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,k)}, \hat{U}^{(k,k)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in N_k} \sigma_j}.$$

Next, consider the general case. By induction hypothesis, for $j - 1$ for $k < j \leq n$, the clustered conditional Gibbs property is satisfied by $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k,j-1)}, \{B_k\} \cup \{B_i\}_{i \in N_{j-1}})$ on $I^{(k,j-1)}$ with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$, which means

$$Y_{\hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{(k,j-1)} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j-1)}, \hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_{j-1}} \sigma_i}. \quad (20)$$

Depending on whether $B_j = \emptyset$, there are two cases. First, if B_j is \emptyset , then $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k,j)}, \{B_k\} \cup \{B_i\}_{i \in N_j}) = (\mathbf{Y}^{(k,j-1)}, \{B_k\} \cup \{B_i\}_{i \in N_{j-1}})$ and $I^{(k,j)} = I^{(k,j-1)}$. By (20), it holds that

$$Y_{\hat{U}^{(k,j)}}^{(k,j)} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j)}, \hat{U}^{(k,j)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_j} \sigma_i}.$$

Next, assume $B_j \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.12, for any $\tau \in \Sigma_{\hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}$,

$$\mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j-1)}, \hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_{j-1}} \sigma_i}(\tau) = \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j)}, \hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_j} \sigma_i}(\tau).$$

Note that $Y_{\hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{(k,j-1)} = Y_{\hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{(k,j)}$. By (20), we have

$$Y_{\hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{(k,j)} \sim \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j)}, \hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_j} \sigma_i}.$$

Recall that each $Y_{\beta_j}^{(k,j)}$ is drawn independent from the distribution $\mu_{I^{(k,n)}, \beta_j}^{Y_{\text{vbl}(\kappa_j) \setminus \{\beta_j\}}^{(k-1)}}$. By Lemma 3.7, for any distinct $i, j \in N_0$, the distance between B_i and B_j is at least $2(\ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0) + 2)$. Thus, we have $Y_{\text{vbl}(\kappa_j) \setminus \{\beta_j\}}^{(k-1)} = Y_{\text{vbl}(\kappa_j) \setminus \{\beta_j\}}^{(k,j)}$ and for any $c \in \Sigma_{\beta_j}$,

$$\mu_{I^{(k,n)}, \beta_j}^{Y_{\text{vbl}(\kappa_j) \setminus \{\beta_j\}}^{(k-1)}}(c) = \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j)}, \beta_j}^{Y_{\text{vbl}(\kappa_j) \setminus \{\beta_j\}}^{(k,j)}}(c).$$

It then holds that for any $\tau \in \Sigma_{\hat{U}^{(k,j)}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left(Y_{\hat{U}^{(k,j)}}^{(k,j)} = \tau \right) &= \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j)}, \hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_j} \sigma_i}(\tau_{\hat{U}^{(k,j-1)}}) \cdot \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j)}, \beta_j}^{\tau_{\text{vbl}(\kappa_j) \setminus \{\beta_j\}}}(\tau_{\beta_j}) \\ &= \mu_{\hat{I}^{(k,j)}, \hat{U}^{(k,j)}}^{\sigma_k \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in N_j} \sigma_i}(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k,j)}, \{B_k\} \cup \{B_i\}_{i \in N_j})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance $I^{(k,j)}$ with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \delta_0, \gamma_0)$. \square

By Claim 7.8, we have that $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k,n)}, \{B_k\})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on $I^{(k,n)}$ with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$. Thus, upon the execution of Algorithm 3 on v_k , the input to Line 1 satisfies Condition 3.9. By Lemma 3.11, after the execution of Line 1 of Algorithm 3, $\mathbf{Y}^{(k,n)}$ follows the distribution $\mu_{I^{(k,n)}}$. Thus, it holds that $Y_{U^{(k,n)}}^{(k,n)}$ is identical to $Y_{U^{(k,n)}}^{(k)}$ and follows the distribution $\mu_{I^{(k,n)}, U^{(k,n)}}$.

For $k \leq j \leq n$, define

$$\bar{I}^{(k,j)} \triangleq \left(\{X_i\}_{i \in U^{(k,j)}} \cup \{X_{\beta_i}\}_{i \in N_k \setminus N_j}, \{A_v\}_{v \in V^{(k,j)}} \cup \{A_{\lambda_i}\}_{i \in N_k \setminus N_j} \cup \{A_{\kappa_i}\}_{i \in N_j} \right).$$

By Lemma 3.12, for any $\pi \in \Sigma_{U^{(k,n)}}$, it holds that

$$\mu_{I^{(k,n)}, U^{(k,n)}}(\pi) = \mu_{\bar{I}^{(k,n-1)}, U^{(k,n)}}(\pi) = \mu_{\bar{I}^{(k,n-2)}, U^{(k,n)}}(\pi) = \dots = \mu_{\bar{I}^{(k,k)}, U^{(k,n)}}(\pi).$$

Thus, it holds that

$$Y_{U^{(k,n)}}^{(k)} \sim \mu_{\bar{I}^{(k,k)}, U^{(k,n)}}(\pi).$$

Recall that $U^{(k,n)} = \bar{U}^{(k)}$ and $\bar{I}^{(k,k)} = \bar{I}^{(k)}$. It holds that $Y_{\bar{U}^{(k)}}^{(k)}$ follows the distribution $\mu_{\bar{I}^{(k)}, \bar{U}^{(k)}}^{\bigwedge_{j \in N_k} \sigma_j}$. Thus, after executing Line 2 of Algorithm 3, we have that $(\mathbf{Y}^{(k)}, \{B_i\}_{i \in N_k})$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$. This completes the induction.

Therefore, $(\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}, \emptyset)$ satisfies the clustered conditional Gibbs property on instance I with parameter $(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)$. As argued before, this guarantees that After Algorithm 3 being sequentially executed on all node $v \in \mathcal{R}$, the final output assignment $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}^{(n)}$ follows the distribution μ_I . \square

Proof of Item 2 of Lemma 3.13. Fix any $0 < \eta < 1$, the follows hold.

- According to Item 2 of Lemma 3.11, with probability $1 - \frac{\eta}{2}$, at every node $v \in \mathcal{R}$, the call to the *RecursiveSampling* procedure in Algorithm 3 returns within radius

$$r_1 = r_v + \ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0) + \tilde{O}\left(\log^4 n \cdot \left(\log \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\eta} + \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$$

from the center p_v in the LLL instance I' . And $I'(B_{r_1}(p_v))$ can be locally constructed within $I(B_{r_2}(v))$, where

$$r_2 = r_1 + O(\mathcal{D} + |\mathcal{R}| \cdot \ell_0(\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \delta_0)).$$

- According to Item 3 of Lemma 3.7, with probability $1 - \frac{\eta}{2}$, we have $\mathcal{D} = \tilde{O}(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\eta})$, which implies $r_v = \tilde{O}(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \frac{1}{\eta})$.

Overall, with probability at least $1 - \eta$, Algorithm 3 returns at every node $v \in \mathcal{R}$ with radius bounded by

$$\tilde{O}\left(|\mathcal{R}| \cdot \log^2 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right) + \tilde{O}\left(\log^4 n \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \log^4 \frac{1}{\eta}\right). \quad \square$$

References

- [AJ22] Konrad Anand and Mark Jerrum. Perfect sampling in infinite spin systems via strong spatial mixing. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 51(4):1280–1295, 2022.
- [Bab79] László Babai. Monte-carlo algorithms in graph isomorphism testing. *Université tde Montréal Technical Report, DMS*, (79-10), 1979.
- [BGG⁺19] Ivona Bezáková, Andreas Galanis, Leslie Ann Goldberg, Heng Guo, and Daniel Stefankovic. Approximation via correlation decay when strong spatial mixing fails. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 48(2):279–349, 2019.
- [Cla95] Kenneth L Clarkson. Las vegas algorithms for linear and integer programming when the dimension is small. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 42(2):488–499, 1995.

- [EL75] Paul Erdos and László Lovász. Problems and results on 3-chromatic hypergraphs and some related questions. *Infinite and finite sets*, 10(2):609–627, 1975.
- [FGW⁺23] Weiming Feng, Heng Guo, Chunyang Wang, Jiaheng Wang, and Yitong Yin. Towards derandomising markov chain monte carlo. In *IEEE 2023 Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2023.
- [FGY22] Weiming Feng, Heng Guo, and Yitong Yin. Perfect sampling from spatial mixing. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 61(4):678–709, 2022.
- [FGYZ21] Weiming Feng, Heng Guo, Yitong Yin, and Chihao Zhang. Fast sampling and counting k-sat solutions in the local lemma regime. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 68(6):1–42, 2021.
- [FVY21] Weiming Feng, Nisheeth K Vishnoi, and Yitong Yin. Dynamic sampling from graphical models. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 50(2):350–381, 2021.
- [FY18] Weiming Feng and Yitong Yin. On local distributed sampling and counting. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 189–198, 2018.
- [GGH⁺23] Mohsen Ghaffari, Christoph Grunau, Bernhard Haeupler, Saeed Ilchi, and Václav Rozhoň. Improved distributed network decomposition, hitting sets, and spanners, via derandomization. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2532–2566. SIAM, 2023.
- [GHK18] Mohsen Ghaffari, David G Harris, and Fabian Kuhn. On derandomizing local distributed algorithms. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 662–673. IEEE, 2018.
- [GJL19] Heng Guo, Mark Jerrum, and Jingcheng Liu. Uniform sampling through the Lovász local lemma. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 66(3):18:1–18:31, 2019.
- [GKM17] Mohsen Ghaffari, Fabian Kuhn, and Yannic Maus. On the complexity of local distributed graph problems. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 784–797. ACM, 2017.
- [Har20] David G Harris. New bounds for the moser-tardos distribution. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 57(1):97–131, 2020.
- [HSW21] Kun He, Xiaoming Sun, and Kewen Wu. Perfect sampling for (atomic) lovász local lemma. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03932*, 2021.
- [HWY22] Kun He, Chunyang Wang, and Yitong Yin. Sampling lovász local lemma for general constraint satisfaction solutions in near-linear time. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 147–158. IEEE, 2022.
- [JPV21] Vishesh Jain, Huy Tuan Pham, and Thuy Duong Vuong. Towards the sampling lovász local lemma. In *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 173–183. IEEE, 2021.

- [JVV86] Mark R. Jerrum, Leslie G. Valiant, and Vijay V. Vazirani. Random generation of combinatorial structures from a uniform distribution. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 43:169–188, 1986.
- [Kal92] Gil Kalai. A subexponential randomized simplex algorithm. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 475–482, 1992.
- [Lin92] Nathan Linial. Locality in distributed graph algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 21(1):193–201, 1992.
- [LS93] Nathan Linial and Michael Saks. Low diameter graph decompositions. *Combinatorica*, 13(4):441–454, 1993.
- [LSZ93] Michael Luby, Alistair Sinclair, and David Zuckerman. Optimal speedup of las vegas algorithms. *Information Processing Letters*, 47(4):173–180, 1993.
- [Moi19] Ankur Moitra. Approximate counting, the lovász local lemma, and inference in graphical models. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 66(2):1–25, 2019.
- [MR95] Rajeev Motwani and Prabhakar Raghavan. *Randomized algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 1995.
- [MSL92] D Mitchell, B Selman, and H Leveque. A new method for solving hard satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of the tenth national conference on artificial intelligence (AAAI-92)*, pages 440–446, 1992.
- [MT10] Robin A Moser and Gábor Tardos. A constructive proof of the general Lovász local lemma. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 57(2):11, 2010.
- [MU05] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and Computing: Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [NS95] Moni Naor and Larry Stockmeyer. What can be computed locally? *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 24(6):1259–1277, 1995.
- [Pel00] David Peleg. *Distributed computing: a locality-sensitive approach*. SIAM, 2000.
- [PW96] James G. Propp and David B. Wilson. Exact sampling with coupled Markov chains and applications to statistical mechanics. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 9(1-2):223–252, 1996.

A Simulation of SLOCAL-LV in LOCAL Model

We prove Proposition 3.2. The LOCAL algorithm for simulating the SLOCAL-LV algorithm is described in Algorithm 6. Recall that whether a node $v \in V$ is an active node (which means that $v \in A$) is indicated in the local memory M_v . For each active node $v \in A$, Algorithm 6 is executed on v , with the initial M_v presented to the LOCAL algorithm as v 's input. Also recall that we define G^t to be the t -th power graph with an edge between any pair of u, v where $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq t$.

Algorithm 6: The LOCAL algorithm for simulating SLOCAL-LV at active node $v \in A$

```

1 initialize  $A_v \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2 for  $i = 1$  to  $\lceil \log n \rceil$  do
3   in the induced subgraph  $G^{(2^{i+1})}[A]$ , find the maximal connected component containing  $v$ ,
   denoted by  $A'$ ;
4   simulate the SLOCAL-LV algorithm with set  $A'$  of active nodes, where the simulation fails if
   the maximum radius accessed by the SLOCAL-LV algorithm exceeds  $2^i$ ;
5   if the simulation does not fail then
6     let  $A_v \leftarrow A'$  and update the output states according to the simulation of  $v$ ;
7     break;
8 if there exists  $u \in A$  with  $A_u \subseteq A_v$  then
9   cancel all the updates to output made by  $u$ ;
   // In this case, we say that  $u$  is canceled by  $v$ .
10 if there exists  $u \in A$  with  $A_v \subseteq A_u$  then
11  cancel all the updates to output made by  $v$ ;
   // In this case, we say that  $v$  is canceled by  $u$ .

```

It is easy to see that Algorithm 6 terminates, and when it terminates, a set $A_v \subseteq A$ is constructed for each $v \in A$. The following lemma follows from the property of $G^{(2^{i+1})}$.

Lemma A.1. *For distinct $u, v \in A$, one of the followings must be true:*

1. $A_u \cap A_v = \emptyset$.
2. $A_u \subseteq A_v$.
3. $A_v \subseteq A_u$.

Proof. Assume A_u is a maximum connected component of G^{t_u} and A_v is a maximum connected component of G^{t_v} , for some integers t_u and t_v . Suppose $t_u \leq t_v$. If $A_u \cap A_v \neq \emptyset$, then in G^{t_v} , A_u and A_v must be in the same connected components, since every edge in G^{t_u} is also an edge in G^{t_v} . Thus, $A_u \subseteq A_v$. Similarly, if $t_u \geq t_v$, then $A_v \subseteq A_u$. \square

The following lemma is because of the condition of canceling a vertex.

Lemma A.2. *For any $v \in A$, there exists $u \in A$ such that $v \in A_u$ and u is not canceled.*

Proof. Consider the last time v appears in some A_u . If v is not in any A_u in the end, u must be canceled by some other vertex u' , in which case we have $A_u \subseteq A_{u'}$, and hence $v \in A_{u'}$, a contradiction. \square

For any $v \in A$, note that the simulation must succeed if $i = \lceil \log n \rceil$. Thus, there exists an i for v such that the simulation in the i -th iteration does not fail. Denote such i as I_v . Suppose that this successful simulation has the radius $\ell'_{v,j}$ for $v \in A'$ in the j -th scan. Define $T_v = \cup_{v \in A', j \in [N]} B_{\ell'_{v,j}}(v)$, i.e., the set of all vertices whose outputs are supposed to be updated by v . The following lemmas guarantee the correctness of the simulation.

Lemma A.3. *If $u, v \in A$ and both u, v are not canceled, then $T_u \cap T_v = \emptyset$.*

Proof. According to Lemma A.1, we have $A_u \cap A_v = \emptyset$. If $T_u \cap T_v \neq \emptyset$, there must exist $u' \in A_u, v' \in A_v$ such that $B_x(u') \cap B_y(v') \neq \emptyset$, where x, y are the radii accessed by u' and v' and satisfy $x \leq 2^{I_u}, y \leq 2^{I_v}$. w.o.l.g, we assume $I_u \leq I_v$. Then we have $\text{dist}_G(u', v') \leq x + y \leq 2^{I_v+1}$. That is to say, u' and v' has an edge in $G^{(2^{I_v+1})}$, which causes a contradiction since A_v is a maximum connected components. \square

Lemma A.4 (correctness of simulation). *For any $u \in A$, if u is not canceled, then Algorithm 6 at u produces the same outputs for the nodes in A_u as in the SLOCAL-LV algorithm.*

Proof. We will prove by induction on k that, the first k vertices accessed by the SLOCAL-LV algorithm is simulated exactly the same in our LOCAL algorithm by some $u \in A$. For $k = 1$, According to Lemma A.2, there exists A_u containing the first vertex accessed in the SLOCAL-LV algorithm, which is simulated correctly by u . Assume that the first k vertices are simulated correctly. For the $k+1$ -th vertex accessed, suppose it is vertex v in the j -th phase. By Lemma A.2, there exists A_u containing the $k+1$ -th vertex accessed in the SLOCAL-LV algorithm, and it will only access $B_{\ell_{v,j}}(v) \in T_u$, which only contains the information updated by the vertices in A_u according to Lemma A.3. Thus, the simulation is correct. \square

The following lemma bounds the round complexity of Algorithm 6. Recall that $\ell_{v,j}$ is the radius of the ball accessed by the SLOCAL-LV algorithm at node $v \in A$ in the j -th phase.

Lemma A.5. *For any $v \in A$, we have $I_v \leq \lceil \log \max_{v \in A, j \in [N]} \ell_{v,j} \rceil$.*

Proof. Consider the $\lceil \log \max_{v \in A, j \in [N]} \ell_{v,j} \rceil$ -th iteration for vertex v . We claim that for any $u \in A \setminus A_v$, and $k \in [N]$, we have $B_{\ell_{u,k}} \cap (\cup_{v \in A', j \in [N]} B_{\ell_{v,j}}(v)) = \emptyset$. Otherwise, u has distance at most $2 \cdot \max_{v \in A, j \in [N]} \ell_{v,j}$ to a vertex in A_v , contradicting the fact that A_v is a maximal connected components of G^x for $x \geq 2 \cdot \max_{v \in A, j \in [N]} \ell_{v,j}$. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma A.4, the simulation on A_v will produce the same output as in the SLOCAL-LV algorithm, in which case the simulation must not fail. \square

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.2.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. The correctness of Algorithm 6 follows from Lemmas A.2 and A.4.

Then we bound the complexity of Algorithm 6. Let $M = \max_{v \in A, j \in [N]} \ell_{v,j}$. For a vertex $v \in A$, to run the i -th loop, v need to find the maximal connected component in $G^{2^i+1}[A]$, and grow a ball of radius at most 2^i from each vertex in the connected component. According to Lemma A.5, we have $2^i + 1 = O(M)$ since $i < I_v$. The maximal connected components in $G^{O(M)}[A]$ has diameter at most $O(|A| \cdot M)$ in G . Thus, u only needs to collect the information in $B_\ell(u)$ for some $\ell = O(|A| \cdot M)$. The only problem is that u do not know ℓ initially. This can be solved by guessing ℓ by scanning $\ell' = 2^i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$, collecting information in $B_{\ell'}(u)$ and determining whether stops. \square