Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity, Revision 1 of Report No. 104 (2020)

On Counting t-Cliques Mod 2

Oded Goldreich*

July 12, 2020

Abstract

For a constant $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the problem of counting the number of t-cliques *mod 2* in a given graph. We show that this problem is not easier than determining whether a given graph contains a t-clique, and present a simple worst-case to average-case reduction for it. The reduction runs in linear time when graphs are presented by their adjacency matrices, and average-case is with respect to the uniform distribution over graphs with a given number of vertices.

1 Informal description

For a constant integer $t \geq 3$, finding t-cliques in graphs and determining their mere existence are archetypical computational problems within the frameworks of parameterized complexity and fine grained complexity (see, e.g., [FG] and [W], resp.). The complexity of counting the number of t-cliques has also been studied (see, e.g., [GR, BBB]). In this work, we consider a variant of the latter problem; specifically, the problem of counting the number of t-cliques mod 2.

Determining the number of t-cliques *mod 2* in a given graph is potentially easier than determining the number of t-cliques in the same graph. On the other hand, as shown in Theorem 1, determining the said number mod 2 is not easier (in the worst-case sense) than determining whether or not a graph contains a t-clique. Hence, the worst-case complexity of *counting t-cliques mod 2* lies between the worst-case complexity of *counting t-cliques* and the worst-case complexity of *determining the existence of t-cliques*. Consequently, as far as worst-case complexity is concerned, using the "counting mod 2 problem" as proxy for the "existence problem" is at least as justified as using the "counting problem" as such a proxy.

Our main result (presented in Theorem 2) is an efficient worst-case to average-case reduction for *counting t-cliques mod 2*. The reduction in efficient in the sense that it runs in linear time when graphs are presented by their adjacency matrices. Average-case is with respect to the uniform distribution over graphs with a given number of vertices, and it yields the correct answer (with high probability) whenever the average-case solver is correct on at least a $1 - 2^{-t^2}$ fraction of the instances. In other words, the average-case solver has error rate at most 2^{-t^2}. The question of whether the same result holds with respect to significantly higher error rates, and ultimately with error rate 0.49, is left open.

*Department of Computer Science, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel. E-mail: oded.goldreich@weizmann.ac.il

ISSN 1433-8092

Relation and comparison to prior work. Efficient worst-case to average-case reductions were presented before for the related problem of *counting t-cliques* (over the integers). Specifically, Goldreich and Rothblum provided such a reduction with respect to a relatively simple distribution over graphs with a given number of vertices, alas not the uniform distribution [GR]. On the other hand, their reduction works even when the average-case solver has error rate that approaches 1; specifically, its error rate on n-vertex graphs may be as large as $1 - \frac{1}{\mathrm{poly}(\log n)} = 1 - o(1)$. In contrast, Boix-Adsera, Brennan, and Bresler provided an efficient worst-case to average-case reduction with respect to the uniform distribution, but their reduction can only tolerate a vanishing error rate [BBB]; specifically, its error rate on n-vertex graphs is required to be $1/\mathrm{poly}(\log n) = o(1)$.

Hence, our worst-case to average-case reduction, which is for a related (but different) problem, matches the better aspects of the prior works (see Table 1): It refers to the uniform distribution (as [BBB]), and tolerates a constant error rate (which is better than [BBB] but worse than [GR]).

problem	distribution	error rate	where
counting	relatively simple	$1 - 1/\mathrm{poly}(\log n) = 1 - o(1)$	[GR]
counting	uniform	$1/\mathrm{poly}(\log n) = o(1)$	[BBB]
counting mod 2	uniform	$\exp(-t^2) = \Omega(1)$	here

Table 1: *Comparison of different worst-case to average-case reductions for variants of the t-*`CLIQUE` *problem, for the constant t, where n denotes the number of vertices. The first column indicates the version being treated, the second indicates the distribution for which average-case is considered, and the third indicates the error rate allowed for the average-case solver.*

Techniques. In contrast to [GR, BBB], which relate the t-clique counting problem to the evaluation of lower degree polynomials over large and medium sized fields, we related the counting *mod 2* problem to low degree polynomials over GF(2). This relation allows us to present reductions that are much simpler than those presented in [GR, BBB].

As noted above, we leave open the problem of improving the error rate that can be tolerated by a worst-case to average-case reduction (for counting t-cliques mod 2). We note that tolerating an error rate that approaches 0.5 presupposes that approximately half of the n-vertex graphs have an odd number of t-cliques (unless finding t-cliques can be done in $\widetilde{O}(n^2)$-time). This is indeed the case, as can be seen from a general result of Kolaitis and Kopparty [KK, Thm. 3.2].

2 Formal statements and proofs

For a fixed integer $t \geq 3$ and a graph G, we denote by $\mathtt{CC}^{(t)}(G)$ the number of t-cliques in G, and let $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(G) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} (\mathtt{CC}^{(t)}(G) \bmod 2)$ denote the parity of this number. We often represent n-vertex graphs by their adjacency matrices; hence, $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(A) = \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(G)$, where A is the adjacency matrix of G, and it follows that

$$\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(A) = \sum_{i_1 < \cdots < i_t \in [n]} \prod_{j < k \in [t]} A_{i_j, i_k} \bmod 2, \tag{1}$$

where $A_{u,v}$ is the $(u, v)^{\mathrm{th}}$ entry of A (indicating whether or not $\{u, v\}$ is an edge in G).

Theorem 1 (deciding the existence of t-cliques reduces to computing $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$): *For every integer $t \geq 3$, there is a randomized reduction of determining whether a given n-vertex graph contains a t-clique to computing $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ on n-vertex graphs such that the reduction runs in time $O(n^2)$, makes* $\exp(t^2)$ *queries, and has error probability at most* $1/3$.

Proof: Consider a randomized reduction that, on input $G = ([n], E)$, flips each edge to a non-edge with probability 0.5, leaves non-edges intact, and returns the value of $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ on the resulting graph; that is, the reduction generates a random subgraph of G, denoted G', and returns $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(G')$.

To analyze the output of this procedure (on input G), consider a (symmetric) n-by-n matrix X such that $x_{i,j}$ is a variable if $\{i,j\} \in E$ and $x_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise. We view $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(X)$, which is defined as in Eq. (1), as a multivariate polynomial over GF(2), and observe that it has degree at most $\binom{t}{2}$. The key observation is that $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(X)$ *is a non-zero polynomial if and only if the graph G contains a t-clique* (i.e.,$\mathtt{CC}^{(t)}(G) > 0$). Hence, the foregoing reduction can be viewed as returning the value of $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(X)$ on a random (symmetric) assignment to the variables in X. It follows that the reduction always returns 0 if $\mathtt{CC}^{(t)}(G) = 0$, and returns 1 with probability at least $2^{-\binom{t}{2}}$ otherwise (i.e., when $\mathtt{CC}^{(t)}(G) > 0$). The latter assertion is due to the Schwartz–Zippel for small fields (i.e., for GF(2)).[1] Applying the foregoing reduction for $\exp(t^2)$ times, the claim follows. ■

Theorem 2 (worst-case to average-case reduction for $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$): *For every integer $t \geq 3$, there is a randomized reduction of computing $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ on the worst-case n-vertex graph to correctly computing $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ on at least a $1 - \exp(-t^2)$ fraction of the n-vertex graphs such that the reduction runs in time $O(n^2)$, makes $\exp(t^2)$ queries, and has error probability at most* $1/3$.

Proof: Setting $d = \binom{t}{2}$, consider the following random self-reduction of $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$. On input a symmetric and non-reflective n-by-n matrix, A:

1. Select uniformly d random (symmetric and non-reflective) n-by-n matrices, denoted $R^{(1)}, ..., R^{(d)}$, and let $R^{(0)} = A$.
2. Making adequate queries to $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$, return $\sum_{I \subseteq \{0,1,...,d\}: I \neq \{0\}} \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(I)}) \bmod 2$, where $R^{(I)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in I} R^{(i)} \bmod 2$ and $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(\emptyset)}) = 0$.

Hence, the foregoing reduction performs $2^{d+1} - 2$ queries, and each of these queries (i.e., each $R^{(I)}$ for $I \notin \{\emptyset, \{0\}\}$) is uniformly distributed over the set of all symmetric and non-reflective n-by-n matrices.

We claim that, for any fixed $R^{(0)}, R^{(1)}, ..., R^{(d)}$, it holds that $\sum_{I \subseteq \{0,1,...,d\}: I \neq \{0\}} \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(I)})$ equals $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(0)}) \bmod 2$. This claim is proved by considering the multivariate polynomial $P(x_0, x_1, ..., x_d)$ over GF(2) that is defined to equal $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(\sum_{i=0}^{d} x_i R^{(i)})$. Specifically, we use the following facts:

- $P(b_0, b_1, ..., b_d) = \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(\{i: b_i = 1\})})$; in particular, $P(0, 0, ..., 0) = 0$ and $P(1, 0, ..., 0) = \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(0)})$.
- P has degree $\binom{t}{2} = d$, since $P(x_0, x_1, ..., x_d) = \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(L(x_0, x_1, ..., x_d))$ such that $L(x_0, ..., x_d)$ is a matrix of linear functions (i.e., the $(u,v)^{\text{th}}$ entry of $L(x_0, ..., x_d)$ equals $\sum_{i=0}^{d} R_{u,v}^{(i)} x_i$).

  (Indeed, using Eq. (1), it follows that $P = \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(L)$ has degree $\binom{t}{2}$.)

[1] See [G, Exer. 5.1].

- for any $(d+1)$-variate polynomial of degree at most d over GF(2) it holds that the sum of its evaluation over all 2^{d+1} points is 0.

  This general fact can be seen by considering an arbitrary monomial $M(x_0,x_1,...,x_d) = \prod_{i\in I} x_i$, where $I \subset \{0,1,..,d\}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{(b_0,b_1,...,b_d)\in\mathrm{GF}(2)^{d+1}} M(b_0,b_1,...,b_d) &= \sum_{(b_0,b_1,...,b_d)\in\mathrm{GF}(2)^{d+1}} \prod_{i\in I} b_i \\ &= 2^{d+1-|I|}\cdot \prod_{i\in I} \sum_{b_i\in\mathrm{GF}(2)} b_i\end{aligned}$$

  which equals 0 (mod 2), since $|I| \le d$.

Combining the foregoing facts, it follows that $\sum_{I\subseteq\{0,1,...,d\}:I\neq\{0\}} \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(I)})$ equals $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R_0)$ (mod 2).

Thus, given oracle access to a program Π such that $\Pr_R[\Pi(R) = \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R)] \ge 1-\epsilon$, when making queries to Π rather than to $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$, the foregoing reduction returns the correct value with probability at least $1-(2^{d+1}-2)\cdot\epsilon$ (i.e., whenever all queries are answered correctly). Using $\epsilon = 2^{-t^2}$, we obtain a worst-case to average-case reduction that fails with probability less than $2^{d+1-t^2} = 2^{-(t^2+t-2)/2} < 1/3$ when given access to a procedure that is correct on at least a $1-2^{-t^2}$ fraction of the instances.[2] ■

Remark 3 (the distribution of $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R)$ for random R): *The proof of Theorem 2 implies that* $2^{-t^2} < \Pr_R[\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R)=1] < 1-2^{-t^2}$. *To see this, using notation as in the proof, suppose towards the contradiction that* $\Pr_R[\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R)=b] \ge 1-2^{-t^2}$ *for some* b. *Then, for every* R_0, *it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pr_{R_1,...,R_d}\left[\sum_{I\subseteq\{0,1,...,d\}:I\neq\{0\}} \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(I)}) \equiv 0 \pmod 2\right] \\ &\ge \Pr_{R_1,...,R_d}\left[(\forall I\subseteq\{0,1,...,d\}\setminus\{\{0\},\emptyset\})\, \mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R^{(I)})=b\right] \\ &\ge 1-(2^{d+1}-2)\cdot 2^{-t^2} > 0\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses $2^{d+1-t^2} = 2^{-(t^2+t-2)/2} < 1$. *But this is impossible when* $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R_0) = 1$ (e.g., if $\mathtt{CC}^{(t)}(R_0) = 1$).

While Remark 3 only asserts that $\mathrm{E}_R[\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R)]$ is bounded away from both 0 and 1, it is known to be approximately 1/2. The latter fact follows as a special case of a general result of Kolaitis and Kopparty [KK, Thm. 3.2].[3]

Open Problem 4 (stronger worst-case to average-case reduction for $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$): *For every integer* $t \ge 3$ *and* $\gamma > 0.5$, *is there a randomized reduction of computing* $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ *on the worst-case* n*-vertex graph to correctly computing* $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ *on at least a* γ *fraction of the* n*-vertex graphs such that the reduction runs in time* $\widetilde{O}(n^2)$, *and has error probability at most* $1/3$.

[2] Indeed, we can slightly improve the bound by using any constant $\epsilon < 2^{-d-2} = 2^{-(t^2-t+4)/2}$.

[3] Proofs of the cases of $t \in \{3,4\}$ were presented in a prior version of this work. At that time, I was unaware of the results of Kolaitis and Kopparty [KK].

This strengthens Theorem 2 by requiring the reduction to tolerate error rate that is arbitrary close to 0.5 rather than error rate $\exp(-t^2)$. The fact that $\mathrm{E}_R[\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R)] \approx 0.5$ may be viewed as a sanity check for Problem 4, since $|\mathrm{E}_R[\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}(R)] - 0.5| > \delta$ would have implied that $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ can be computed correctly with probability $0.5 + \delta$ in constant time.

3 Conclusion

Theorem 2 asserts an efficient worst-case to average-case reduction for *counting t-cliques mod 2*, where average-case is with respect to the uniform distribution over graphs with the given number of vertices. Specifically, for any integer $t \geq 3$, computing $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ on the worst-case n-vertex graph is reducible (in $O(n^2)$-time) to computing $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ correctly on a $1 - \exp(-t^2)$ fraction of all n-verterx graphs.

We believe that Theorem 2, which has a very simple proof, is as interesting as an analogous result that refers to counting t-cliques (i.e., computing $\mathtt{CC}^{(t)}$), because (as shown in Theorem 1) computing $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ is not easier than determining whether a given graph contains a t-clique. The point is that the decisional problem (i.e., t-CLIQUE) is the one that has received most attention in prior work, and results regarding either $\mathtt{CC}^{(t)}$ or $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ are mostly proxies for it (i.e., for results regarding t-CLIQUE). In particular, combining Theorems 1 and 2, it follows that deciding t-CLIQUE on the worst-case n-vertex graph is reducible (in $O(n^2)$-time) to computing $\mathtt{CC}_2^{(t)}$ correctly on a $1 - \exp(-t^2)$ fraction of all n-verterx graphs.

We note that prior works fall short of establishing results analogous to Theorem 2: The results of [GR] are not for the uniform distribution (but rather for a relatively simple but different distribution), where the results of [BBB] hold for a notion of average-case that allows only a vanishing error rate (i.e., the "average-case algorithm" is required to be correct on at least a $1 - \frac{1}{\mathrm{poly}(\log n)}$ fraction of the n-vertex graphs).

As stated in Problem 4, we leave open the problem of obtaining a result analogous to Theorem 2 for "average-case algorithms" that are correct on a γ fraction of the instances, for every $\gamma > 1/2$.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Dana Ron and to Guy Rothblum for useful discussions. I am most grateful to Swastik Kopparty for calling my attention to the results in [KK].

References

[BBB] Enric Boix-Adsera, Matthew Brennan, and Guy Bresler. The Average-Case Complexity of Counting Cliques in Erdos-Renyi Hypergraphs. In *60th FOCS*, 2019.

[FG] Jorg Flum and Martin Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory.* Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series, Springer, 2006.

[G] Oded Goldreich. *Introduction to Property Testing.* Cambridge University Press, 2017.

[GR] Oded Goldreich and Guy Rothblum. Counting t-Cliques: Worst-Case to Average-Case Reductions and Direct Interactive Proof Systems. In *59th FOCS*, 2018.

[KK] Phokion Kolaitis and Swastik Kopparty. Random graphs and the parity quantifier. *Journal of the ACM*, Vol. 60 (5), pages 1–34, 2013.

[W] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Hardness of Easy Problems: Basing Hardness on Popular Conjectures such as the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis. In *10th Int. Sym. on Parameterized and Exact Computation*, pages 17–29, 2015.

ECCC ISSN 1433-8092

https://eccc.weizmann.ac.il