

Testing whether the Uniform Distribution is a Stationary Distribution

Sourav Chakraborty^a, Akshay Kamath^a, Rameshwar Pratap^{1a}

^a *Chennai Mathematical Institute,
Chennai, India.*
e-mail: {sourav, adkamath, rameshwar}@cmi.ac.in

Abstract

A random walk on a directed graph generates a Markov chain on the vertices of the graph. An important question that often arises in the context of Markov chains is, whether the uniform distribution on the vertices of the graph is a stationary distribution. A stationary distribution of a Markov chain is a global property of the graph. This leads to the belief that whether a particular distribution is a stationary distribution of a Markov chain depends on the global property of that Markov chain. In this paper for a directed graph whose underlying undirected graph is regular, we prove that whether the uniform distribution on the vertices of the graph is a stationary distribution, depends on a local property of the graph, namely if (u, v) is a directed edge, then $\text{out-degree}(u)$ is equal to $\text{in-degree}(v)$.

This result also has an application to the problem of testing whether a given distribution is uniform or “far” from being uniform. If the distribution is the stationary distribution of the lazy random walk on a directed graph and the graph is given as an input, then how many bits (orientations) of the input graph does one need to query in order to decide whether the distribution is uniform or “far”¹ from it? This is a problem of graph property testing, and we consider this problem in the orientation model. We reduce this problem to testing Eulerianity in the orientation model.

Keywords: Markov Chain; Property Testing; Orientation Model; Stationary Distribution.

1. Introduction

Spectral properties of undirected graphs have been well studied and well understood [2]. However, there has been less success in the study of the same in the case of directed graphs, possibly due the non-symmetric structure associated with its adjacency matrix. In this work, we attempt to understand the spectral properties of Markov chains obtained by a random walk on a directed graph. Markov chains are one of the most important structures in Theoretical Computer Science. The most significant characteristics of a Markov chain are its stationary distribution and mixing time. It is an

¹Corresponding author:

This work done when the author was pursuing his PhD from Chennai Mathematical Institute.
Present/corresponding address: 122/7 PAC Colony, Naini, Allahabad, UP, India.
Contact Number: +91 9953842289

¹Here, farness does not imply any statistical distance between the distributions. Rather, it specifies the distance between the orientations - i.e. the minimum number of edges that need to be reoriented such that the stationary distribution obtained by a random walk on the resulting graph (obtained after reorientation of edges) is uniform.

interesting problem to test if a particular distribution is a stationary distribution of a given Markov chain. Since a stationary distribution of a Markov chain is a global property of the graph, this leads to the belief that whether a particular distribution is a stationary distribution of a Markov chain depends on its global structure.

In this paper, we focus on the Markov chain obtained by a random walk on a directed graph. We prove contrary to aforementioned belief that if the graph is regular, then whether the uniform distribution is a stationary distribution depends on a local property of the graph. The following theorem, which is the main result of this paper, is a statement about that local property.

Theorem 1. *Let $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$ be a directed graph such that the total degree (i.e., $\text{Indegree}(v) + \text{Outdegree}(v)$) for every vertex $v \in V$ is the same. Then the uniform distribution on the vertices of \vec{G} is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain (generated by a random walk on \vec{G}) if and only if the graph has the following properties:*

1. for all $v \in V$, $\text{Indegree}(v) \neq 0$ and $\text{Outdegree}(v) \neq 0$,
2. for all $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$, $\text{Outdegree}(u) = \text{Indegree}(v)$.

As an application of this result, we design a testing algorithm to test whether the uniform distribution is the stationary distribution of the Markov chain generated by a *lazy random walk*² on \vec{G} .

1.1. Application to Property Testing of Distributions

In property testing, the goal is to look at a very small fraction of the input and decide whether the input has a certain property, or it is “far” from satisfying the property. For a given distance parameter $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we say that the input is an ϵ -far from satisfying the property if one has to change at least ϵ fraction of the input to make the input satisfy the property. Theorem 1 also has an application to the problem of testing whether a given distribution is uniform or “far” from being uniform. More precisely, if the distribution is the stationary distribution of the lazy random walk on a directed graph and the graph is given as an input, then how many bits of the input graph do one need to query in order to decide whether the distribution is uniform or “far” from it? We consider this problem in the **orientation model** (see [5]). In this model, the underlying undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ is known in advance, and the orientation of the edges has to be queried. The graph is said to be “ ϵ -far” from satisfying the property P if one has to reorient at least an ϵ fraction of the edges to make the graph satisfy the property. We reduced this problem to testing Eulerianity in the orientation model. We use the results of [4] to obtain an algorithm that incurs sublinear cost for the above problem. We present this part of our result in Section 4.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Graph Notations

Throughout the paper, we will be dealing with directed graphs (possibly with multiple edges between any two vertices) in which each edge is directed only in one direction. To avoid confusion,

² A lazy random walk (starting from a particular vertex) on a directed graph is a random walk in which at each time step, the walk stays where it is with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ or moves according to the usual random walk. Moreover, it converges to a unique stationary distribution.

we will call them **oriented graphs** because each edge is oriented and is not bidirectional. We will denote the oriented graph by $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$, and the underlying undirected graph (that is, when the directions on the edges are removed) by $G = (V, E)$. For a vertex $v \in V$, the in-degree and the out-degree of v in \vec{G} are denoted by $d^-(v)$ and $d^+(v)$ respectively. An oriented graph $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$ is called a *degree- Δ* oriented graph if for all $v \in V$, $d^-(v) + d^+(v) = \Delta$. In this paper, we will be focusing on *degree- Δ* oriented graphs.

2.2. Markov Chains Preliminaries

Fact 2. A Markov chain is a stochastic process on a set of states given by a transition matrix. Let S be the set of states with $|S| = n$. Then, the transition matrix T is an $n \times n$ matrix with entries from the positive reals; the rows and columns are indexed by the states; the (u, v) -th entry $T_{u,v}$ of the matrix denotes the probability of transition from state u to state v . Since T is stochastic, $\sum_v T_{u,v}$ must be 1. A distribution $\mu : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ on the vertices is said to be stationary if for all vertices v ,

$$\sum_v \mu(u)T_{u,v} = \mu(v).$$

Fact 3. If \vec{G} is an oriented graph then a random walk on \vec{G} defines a Markov chain, where, the states are the vertices of the graph; the probability to traverse an edge (u, v) is given by the quantity $p_{u,v} = \frac{1}{d^+(u)}$; and hence, the transition probability $T_{u,v}$ from vertex u to vertex v is $p_{u,v}$ times the number of edges between u and v . The uniform distribution on the vertices of \vec{G} is a stationary distribution for this Markov chain if and only if for all $v \in V$,

$$\sum_{u:(u,v) \in \vec{E}} p_{u,v} = 1 = \sum_{w:(v,w) \in \vec{E}} p_{v,w}.$$

Note 4. In this paper, we will only consider Markov chains that arise from random walks on \vec{G} , where \vec{G} is an oriented graph.

3. Structure of Graphs with Uniform Stationary Distribution

The following theorem is a rephrasing of Theorem 1.

Theorem 5. Let $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$ be a degree- Δ oriented graph, then the uniform distribution on the vertices of \vec{G} is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain if and only if for all $v \in V$, both $d^-(v), d^+(v) \neq 0$ and for all $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$,

$$d^+(u) = d^-(v).$$

PROOF. First of all, recall that the uniform distribution is a stationary distribution for \vec{G} , if and only if for all $v \in V$,

$$\sum_{u:(u,v) \in \vec{E}} p_{u,v} = 1 = \sum_{w:(v,w) \in \vec{E}} p_{v,w},$$

where $p_{u,v}$ is the transition probability from vertex u to vertex v , and $p_{u,v} = \frac{1}{d^+(u)}$.

Thus, if the graph \vec{G} has the property that for all $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$, $d^+(u) = d^-(v)$, then

$$\sum_{u:(u,v) \in \vec{E}} p_{u,v} = \sum_{u:(u,v) \in \vec{E}} \frac{1}{d^+(u)} = \sum_{u:(u,v) \in \vec{E}} \frac{1}{d^-(v)} = 1.$$

The last equality holds because the summation is over all the edges entering v (which is non-empty), and thus there are $d^-(v)$ number of items in the summation. Similarly,

$$\sum_{w:(v,w) \in \vec{E}} p_{v,w} = \sum_{w:(v,w) \in \vec{E}} \frac{1}{d^+(v)} = 1.$$

Therefore, if the graph \vec{G} has the property that for all $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$, $d^+(u) = d^-(v)$, then the uniform distribution is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain.

Now, let us prove the other direction, that is, let us assume that the uniform distribution is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain. We prove this direction by contradiction. The central idea of the proof is the notion of “degree-alternating” path (see Definition 7). Now, if there is an edge (u, v) such that $d^+(u) \neq d^-(v)$, then we show that there is a degree-alternating path with infinitely many unbalanced edges (see Definition 8). Further, by Lemma 9, if there is a degree-alternating path with infinitely many unbalanced edges, then there is a vertex having negative in-degree or out-degree, which is not possible, and we get a contradiction.

We start the proof with a couple of easy observations.

Observation 6. *If the uniform distribution is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain then:*

1. *Every connected component in the underlying graph is strongly connected.*
2. *For a vertex v , there exists an edge (u, v) such that $d^+(u) < d^-(v)$ if and only if there exists an edge (w, v) such that $d^+(w) > d^-(v)$.*

Using the above observations, we prove our theorem by contradiction.

Definition 7. *A path $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^t$ is called a “degree-alternating” path if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- *For all $i \geq 0$, $(v_{i+1}, v_i) \in \vec{E}$,*
- *For all $i \geq 0$, $d^+(v_{2i+1}) = \min \{d^+(w) : (w, v_{2i}) \in \vec{E}\}$,*
- *For all $i > 0$, $d^+(v_{2i}) = \max \{d^+(w) : (w, v_{2i-1}) \in \vec{E}\}$.*

Note that the above degree-alternating path can have repeated vertices (or edges).

Definition 8. *We call an edge (u, v) “unbalanced” if $d^+(u) \neq d^-(v)$. Also, we call a vertex w “unbalanced” if there is an edge (w', w) such that $d^+(w') \neq d^-(w)$.*

Now, we will show that if a strongly connected graph has one “unbalanced” edge, then there must be a “degree-alternating” path with infinitely many unbalanced edges. And this along with the Lemma 9 will give a contradiction.

If the graph does not have any degree-alternating path with infinitely many unbalanced edges, then there must be a degree-alternating path ending at an unbalanced edge (u, v) such that the path cannot be extended to a longer path with more unbalanced edges. We show that this is not possible by showing that we can extend a given degree-alternating path to a longer degree-alternating path, with at least one more unbalanced edge.

Note that if u is an unbalanced vertex, then by Observation 6, we can extend the degree-alternating path ending at (u, v) by one more unbalanced edge (v, w) such that $d^-(v) \neq d^+(w)$. Similarly, if there is a path from an unbalanced vertex to u , then we can extend the degree-alternating path with an edge (u, w') such that $d^-(u) \neq d^+(w')$. Further by Observation 6, since underlying graph is strongly connected, there is a path from v to u , then using above arguments we can surely extend the degree-alternating path. As a consequence, we get a degree-alternating path with infinitely many unbalanced edges.

Now if we apply to Lemma 9 on the degree-alternating path with infinitely many unbalanced edges, and from the fact that the in-degree or out-degree of a vertex cannot be negative, we get a contradiction. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Lemma 9. *Let $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^t$ be a “degree-alternating” path. Suppose we define we define a new sequence $\{s_i\}_{i=0}^t$ of positive integers as following:*

- For all $k \geq 0$, $s_{2k} = d^-(v_{2k})$, and for all $k \geq 0$, $s_{2k+1} = d^+(v_{2k+1})$.

Then this sequence of positive integers is a non-increasing sequence. Moreover, if v_i and v_{i+1} are two consecutive vertices in the sequence such that $d^-(v_{i+1}) \neq d^+(v_i)$, then $s_{i+1} < s_i$.

PROOF. Since we have assumed that the uniform distribution is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain, then for all vertices v ,

$$\sum_{u:(u,v) \in \vec{E}} \frac{1}{d^+(u)} = 1 = \sum_{w:(v,w) \in \vec{E}} \frac{1}{d^+(v)}.$$

Let us first prove that in the sequence $\{s_i\}_{i=0}^t$, $s_{2i} \geq s_{2i+1}$.

Since $d^+(v_{2i+1}) = \min \left\{ d^+(w) : (w, v_{2i}) \in \vec{E} \right\}$,

$$1 = \sum_{(u, v_{2i}) \in \vec{E}} \frac{1}{d^+(u)} \leq \frac{d^-(v_{2i})}{d^+(v_{2i+1})}, \quad (1)$$

and hence, we have $d^-(v_{2i}) \geq d^+(v_{2i+1})$ which by definition gives $s_{2i} \geq s_{2i+1}$.

Now, let us also prove that in the sequence $\{s_i\}_{i=0}^t$, $s_{2i-1} \geq s_{2i}$. By definition, this is the same as proving $d^+(v_{2i-1}) \geq d^-(v_{2i})$. Since we have assumed that the graph \vec{G} is a degree- Δ graph, proving that $s_{2i-1} \geq s_{2i}$ is same as proving $d^-(v_{2i-1}) \leq d^+(v_{2i})$.

Similar to previous case, since

$$d^+(v_{2i}) = \max \left\{ d^+(w) : (w, v_{2i-1}) \in \vec{E} \right\}$$

and

$$1 = \sum_{(u, v_{2i-1}) \in \vec{E}} \frac{1}{d^+(u)} \geq \frac{d^-(v_{2i-1})}{d^+(v_{2i})}. \quad (2)$$

Thus, we have $s_{2i-1} \geq s_{2i}$.

Note that the inequalities in Equations 1 and 2 are strict inequalities if $d^+(v_{2i+1}) \neq d^-(v_{2i})$ and $d^+(v_{2i-1}) \neq d^-(v_{2i})$ respectively. Thus, if for any i , $d^+(v_{i+1}) \neq d^-(v_i)$, then $s_{i+1} < s_i$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

From Theorem 5, we can also obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 10. *Let $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$ be a connected degree- Δ oriented graph. Then, the uniform distribution on the vertices of \vec{G} is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain, if and only if the following conditions apply:*

1. *If the underlying undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ is non-bipartite, then the graph \vec{G} is Eulerian.*
2. *If G is bipartite with bipartition $V_1 \cup V_2 = V$, then $|V_1| = |V_2|$ and the in-degree of all vertices in one part will be same, and it will be equal to out-degree of all vertices in the other part.*

PROOF. From Theorem 5, it follows that the uniform distribution on the vertices of \vec{G} is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain if and only if for all $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$, we have

$$d^+(u) = d^-(v). \quad (3)$$

Suppose G has a path of length 2 between vertices u and w through v (that is (u, v) and (v, w) are edges in G). Then it is easy to verify that in all four possible cases (depending on the orientation of the edges (u, v) and (v, w)), we have $d^+(u) = d^+(w)$ (by Equation 3). Similarly, it is also easy to see that if there a path of even length between u and w in G (a path from u to w using even number of edges), then we have $d^+(u) = d^+(w)$.

From this we can prove both parts of the corollary.

Let v be a vertex of any odd cycle in G , and (u, v) be an edge belong to that cycle, then $d^+(v) = d^+(u) = d^-(v)$ (the last equality follows from Equation 3). And now note that, if there exist a vertex having in-degree equal to out-degree and Equation 3 holds, then all the vertices in the strongly-connected component have in-degree equal to out-degree. Further, since G is connected, \vec{G} must be Eulerian. Also note that if \vec{G} is Eulerian, then the uniform distribution is a stationary distribution.

For the case of bipartite graphs, if V_1 and V_2 is the bi-partition, then any two vertices in V_1 are connected by an even length path, and hence all the vertices in V_1 has the same out-degree, and since all the vertices have the same total degree so all the vertices in V_1 must have same in-degree also. Similarly, all the vertices in V_2 have the same out-degree and the same in-degree. And if there is a directed edge from a vertex in V_1 to vertex in V_2 (or vice versa), then from Equation 3, we have the out-degree of vertices in V_1 equals the in-degree of the vertices in V_2 .

Theorem 5 and Corollary 10 have an application to property testing. We present this application in the next section.

4. Application to Property Testing

A property of a graph that is invariant under graph isomorphism is called a graph property. Testing of graph properties has been a very active topic in the area of property testing (see [3], [6]),

and have been studied under various query models, for example: dense-graph models, sparse-graph models, orientation model etc. Note that, whether the uniform distribution on the vertices of \vec{G} is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain, is a graph property. Thus, the problem of distinguishing between whether the stationary distribution of the Markov chain is the uniform distribution, or is “far” from it, is a question of testing graph properties. Here, this question has been framed in the *orientation model* (defined in the next subsection). Some interesting graph properties like connectivity [1] and Eulerianity [4] have been studied in this model. Using Theorem 1, we show that for both bipartite and non-bipartite graphs, testing (in the orientation model) whether the uniform distribution on vertices of \vec{G} is the stationary distribution of the Markov chain (generated by a *lazy random walk* on \vec{G}), can be reduced to testing if the graph is Eulerian. Using algorithms from [4] of testing Eulerianity in the orientation model, we obtain various bounds on the query complexity for testing uniformity of the stationary distribution.

In [4] it is shown that if G is an α -expander, then it is possible to test, in the orientation model, whether G is Eulerian by performing $O(\Delta/\alpha)$ queries. From our result, it implies that if G is an α -expander, then testing uniformity of the stationary distribution can be done with $O(\Delta/\alpha)$ queries. Since $1/\alpha$ is also a measure of the mixing time of the random walk, it implies that the query complexity for testing uniformity of the stationary distribution is directly proportional to the mixing time of the Markov chain.

4.1. Property Testing in the Orientation Model

Given an oriented graph $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$ and a property \mathcal{P} , we want to test whether \vec{G} satisfies the property or it is “ ϵ -far” from satisfying the property. In the orientation model, the underlying graph $G = (V, E)$ is known in advance. Each edge in E is oriented (that is directed in exactly one direction), and the orientation of the edges has to be queried. The graph is said to be “ ϵ -far” from satisfying the property \mathcal{P} if one has to reorient at least an ϵ fraction of the edges to make the graph satisfy the property. Here, the goal is to design a randomized algorithm that queries the orientation of the edges, and does the following:

- the algorithm ACCEPTS with probability at least $2/3$, if \vec{G} satisfies the property \mathcal{P} ,
- the algorithm REJECTS with probability at least $2/3$, if \vec{G} is “ ϵ -far” from satisfying the property \mathcal{P} .

The query complexity of the algorithm is defined by the number of edges it queries. The natural goal is to design a tester for \mathcal{P} with minimum query complexity. If the graph satisfies the property and the tester accepts with probability 1, then the tester is called a *1-sided error tester*. The standard tester (as defined above) is called a *2-sided error tester*.

The orientation model for testing graph properties was introduced by Halevy *et al.* [5]. Fischer *et al.* studied the problem of testing whether an oriented graph \vec{G} is Eulerian [4]. They derived various upper and lower bounds for both 1-sided and 2-sided error testers. Here, we use their algorithms for testing whether the uniform distribution is the stationary distribution of the Markov chain.

4.2. Testing whether the Uniform Distribution is a Stationary Distribution in the Orientation Model

Given a degree- Δ oriented graph $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$, we say that the graph has the property \mathcal{P}' if for all $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$, we have $d^+(u) = d^-(v)$. Since the underlying undirected graph is known in

advance, we know its connected components. If the graph \vec{G} is “ ϵ -close” to satisfy the property \mathcal{P}' , then by “*pigeonhole principle*” there is at least one connected component of \vec{G} that is also “ ϵ -close” to satisfy the property \mathcal{P}' . Thus, if all connected components are “ ϵ -far” from satisfying the property \mathcal{P}' , then we can conclude that \vec{G} is “ ϵ -far” from satisfying the property \mathcal{P}' (contrapositive of the previous statement). Thus, we perform testing on every connected-component of \vec{G} , and we reject if all connected components are “ ϵ -far” from satisfying the property \mathcal{P}' . Now, *w.l.o.g.*, we will assume that the graph \vec{G} is connected.

From Corollary 10, if \vec{G} is non-bipartite then we have to test whether \vec{G} is Eulerian. Since we can determine whether a graph is bipartite or not just by looking at the underlying undirected graph, if \vec{G} is non-bipartite then we use the Eulerianity testing algorithm from [4].

Now, let \vec{G} be bipartite. Let the bipartition be V_L and V_R . If $|V_L| \neq |V_R|$ then the graph surely does not satisfy the property \mathcal{P}' . From Corollary 10, if $|V_L| = |V_R|$ then the graph must have the property that the out-degree of all vertices in V_L must be equal to the in-degree of all vertices in V_R and vice versa. Let v be a vertex in V_L and $d^-(v) = k_1$ and $d^+(v) = k_2$. Now, consider any bipartite directed graph $\vec{G}^* = (V, \vec{E}^*)$ with bipartition V_L and V_R that satisfies the following conditions:

- The underlying undirected graphs of \vec{G} and \vec{G}^* are exactly the same,
- $\forall u \in V_L, d_{\vec{G}^*}^-(u) = k_2, d_{\vec{G}^*}^+(u) = k_1$, and $\forall v \in V_R, d_{\vec{G}^*}^-(v) = k_1, d_{\vec{G}^*}^+(v) = k_2$.

Now consider the graph $\vec{G}^{\cup} = (V, \vec{E} \cup \vec{E}^*)$ obtained by superimposing \vec{G} and \vec{G}^* - an edge $e \in \vec{E}^{\cup}$ if either $e \in \vec{E}$, or $e \in \vec{E}^*$. Clearly, if \vec{G} has the property \mathcal{P}' , then \vec{G}^{\cup} is Eulerian, and fairness from having property \mathcal{P}' is also true by the following lemma:

Lemma 11. *If \vec{G} is “ ϵ -far” from having property \mathcal{P}' , then \vec{G}^{\cup} is “ $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -far” from being Eulerian.*

PROOF. Let \vec{H} be an Eulerian graph which is the closest to \vec{G}^{\cup} . Since the underlying undirected graph for \vec{G} and \vec{G}^* are exactly the same, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the edges in \vec{E} and \vec{E}^* . Now, look at edges of \vec{G}^{\cup} that were flipped in order to obtain \vec{H} . Suppose a flipped edge (say e) belonging to \vec{E}^* . Then, we can re-flip this edge e and flip the corresponding edge in \vec{E} . Thus, we have effectively flipped the same number of edges. By performing these operations on the flipped edges of \vec{E}^* , we have obtained a new graph which has the same number of flipped edges as \vec{G}^{\cup} , and all the flipped edges in \vec{G}^{\cup} belongs to \vec{E} .

Thus, if the graph \vec{G}^{\cup} is not “ $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -far” from being Eulerian, then \vec{G} is not “ ϵ -far” from having property \mathcal{P}' , which is a contradiction.

Now, all we have to test is whether the new graph \vec{G}^{\cup} is Eulerian or “ $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -far” from being Eulerian. Note that every query to \vec{G}^{\cup} can be simulated by a single query to G . Thus, we can now use the Eulerian testing algorithm from [4]. The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 1, and the various

	1-sided test	2-sided test
Graphs with large Δ	$\Delta + O\left(\frac{m}{\epsilon^2 \Delta}\right)$	$\Delta + \min \left\{ \tilde{O} \left(\frac{m^3}{\epsilon^6 \Delta^6} \right), \tilde{O} \left(\frac{m}{\epsilon^2 \Delta^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right) \right\}$
Bounded-degree graphs *	$\Omega \left(m^{\frac{1}{4}} \right)$	$\Omega \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{\log \log m}} \right)$
α -expander	$O \left(\frac{\Delta \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})}{\alpha \epsilon} \right)$	$\min \left\{ \tilde{O} \left(\left(\frac{\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})}{\alpha \epsilon} \right)^3 \right), \tilde{O} \left(\left(\frac{\sqrt{\Delta} \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})}{\alpha \epsilon} \right) \right) \right\}$

* Lower bound holds for 4-regular graph.

Δ is the maximum degree of the underlying undirected graph and m is the number of edges in the graph.

Table 1: Bounds on the query complexity (in the orientation model) for testing uniformity of stationary distribution of the Markov chain obtained by the random walk on a directed graph.

bounds on the query complexity that can be obtained is summarized in Table 1.

<p>Data: Degree-Δ Oriented Graph $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$</p> <p>Result: Whether \vec{G} has the property \mathcal{P}' or is “ϵ-far” from having it.</p> <p>1 if G is non-bipartite then</p> <p>2 Test if \vec{G} is Eulerian (see [4]) and give the corresponding output.</p> <p>3 else</p> <p>4 Let V_L and V_R be the bipartition for the graph G.</p> <p>5 Sample a vertex from V_L and query all edges incident to it. Let $d^-(v) = k_1$ and $d^+(v) = k_2$.</p> <p>6 Construct any bipartite graph $\vec{G}^* = (V, \vec{E}^*)$ with bipartition (V_L, V_R) such that</p> <p>7 (a) For all $v \in V_L$, $d_{\vec{G}^*}^-(v) = k_2$ and $d_{\vec{G}^*}^+(v) = k_1$, and for all $v \in V_R$, $d_{\vec{G}^*}^-(v) = k_1$ and $d_{\vec{G}^*}^+(v) = k_2$.</p> <p>8 (b) The underlying graph of \vec{G}^* is exactly same as $G = (V, E)$.</p> <p>9 Superimpose \vec{G}^* and the graph G (say $\vec{G}^{\cup} = (V, E \cup \vec{E}^*)$).</p> <p>10 Test if \vec{G}^{\cup} is Eulerian (see [4]) and give the corresponding output.</p> <p>11 end</p>
--

Algorithm 1: Algorithm for testing property \mathcal{P}'

5. Conclusion and Open Problems

We have shown that, for a given *degree- Δ* oriented graph $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$, whether the uniform distribution on vertices of \vec{G} is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain, depends on a local property of graph. If \vec{G} satisfies this local property, then it has some particular kind of structure (see Corollary 10). Finally, as an application of this result, we showed that testing this local property in orientation model, can be reduced to testing Eulerianity [4].

It is an interesting problem to test whether the stationary distribution of a Markov chain is equal to some fixed distribution D . In this paper, we have considered D to be uniform distribution, but the same problem is also interesting for other distributions. Moreover, finding a relationship between the distance of the stationary distribution from the uniform distribution, and the number of edges that needs to be reoriented, is an interesting open problem. Also, this result holds only for graphs where the in-degree plus out-degree of all the vertices are same. A major open problem of this work is to come up with a similar statement for more general graphs.

References

- [1] Sourav Chakraborty, Eldar Fischer, Oded Lachish, Arie Matsliah, and Ilan Newman. Testing st -connectivity. In *APPROX-RANDOM*, pages 380–394, 2007.
- [2] F.R.K. Chung. *Spectral Graph Theory*. Number no. 92 in CBMS Regional Conference Series. Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences.
- [3] Eldar Fischer. The art of uninformed decisions: A primer to property testing. *Current Trends in Theoretical Computer Science: The Challenge of the New Century*, G. Paun, G. Rozenberg and A. Salomaa (editors), World Scientific Publishing, I:229–264, 2004.
- [4] Eldar Fischer, Oded Lachish, Ilan Newman, Arie Matsliah, and Orly Yahalom. On the query complexity of testing orientations for being eulerian. In *APPROX-RANDOM*, pages 402–415, 2008.
- [5] Shirley Halevy, Oded Lachish, Ilan Newman, and Dekel Tsur. Testing properties of constraint-graphs. In *IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 264–277, 2007.
- [6] Dana Ron. Property testing (foundations and trends in machine learning). *Publishers: Now Publishers Inc.*