

On Triangle Estimation using Tripartite Independent Set Queries ^{*}

Anup Bhattacharya [†] Arijit Bishnu [†] Arijit Ghosh [†] Gopinath Mishra [†]

Abstract

Estimating the number of triangles in a graph is one of the most fundamental problems in sublinear algorithms. In this work, we provide an algorithm that approximately counts the number of triangles in a graph using only polylogarithmic queries when *the number of triangles on any edge in the graph is polylogarithmically bounded*. Our query oracle *Tripartite Independent Set* (TIS) takes three disjoint sets of vertices A , B and C as inputs, and answers whether there exists a triangle having one endpoint in each of these three sets. Our query model generally belongs to the class of *group queries* (Ron and Tsur, ACM ToCT, 2016; Dell and Lapinskas, STOC 2018) and in particular is inspired by the *Bipartite Independent Set* (BIS) query oracle of Beame *et al.* (ITCS 2018). We extend the algorithmic framework of Beame *et al.*, with TIS replacing BIS, for approximately counting triangles in graphs.

Keywords. Triangle estimation, query complexity, and sublinear algorithm.

^{*}A preliminary version of this paper has been accepted in ISAAC'19

[†]Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

1 Introduction

Counting the number of triangles in a graph is a fundamental algorithmic problem in the RAM model [AYZ97, BPWZ14, IR78], streaming [ADNK14, AGM12, BYKS02, BFL⁺06, CJ17, JSP13, JG05, KP17, KMSS12, PTTW13, TPT13] and the query model [ELRS17, GRS11]. In this work, we provide the first approximate triangle counting algorithm using only polylogarithmic queries to a query oracle named *Tripartite Independent Set* (TIS).

1.1 Notations, the query model, the problem and the result

We denote the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$. Let $V(G)$, $E(G)$ and $T(G)$ denote the set of vertices, edges and triangles in the input graph G , respectively. When the graph G is explicit, we may write only V , E and T for the set of vertices, edges and triangles. Let $t(G) = |T(G)|$. The statement A, B, C are disjoint, means A, B, C are pairwise disjoint. For three non-empty disjoint sets $A, B, C \subseteq V(G)$, $G(A, B, C)$, termed as a *tripartite subgraph* of G , denotes the induced subgraph of $A \cup B \cup C$ in G minus the edges having both endpoints in A or B or C . $t(A, B, C)$ denotes the number of triangles in $G(A, B, C)$. We use the triplet (a, b, c) to denote the triangle having a, b, c as its vertices. Let Δ_u denote the number of triangles having u as one of its vertices. Let $\Delta_{(u,v)}$ be the number of triangles having (u, v) as one of its edges and $\Delta_E = \max_{(u,v) \in E(G)} \Delta_{(u,v)}$. For a set \mathcal{U} , “ \mathcal{U} is COLORED with $[n]$ ”, means that each member of \mathcal{U} is assigned a color out of $[n]$ colors independently and uniformly at random. Let $\mathbb{E}[X]$ and $\mathbb{V}[X]$ denote the expectation and variance of a random variable X . For an event \mathcal{E} , \mathcal{E}^c denotes the complement of \mathcal{E} . The statement “ a is an $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -multiplicative approximation of b ” means $|b - a| \leq \epsilon \cdot b$. Next, we describe the query oracle.

Definition 1 (Tripartite independent set oracle (TIS)). Given three non-empty disjoint subsets $V_1, V_2, V_3 \subseteq V(G)$ of a graph G , TIS query oracle answers ‘YES’ if and only if $t(V_1, V_2, V_3) \neq 0$.

Notice that the query oracle looks at only those triangles that have vertices in all of these sets V_1, V_2, V_3 . The TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION problem is to report an $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -multiplicative approximation of $t(G)$ where the input is $V(G)$, TIS oracle for graph G and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Theorem 2 (Main result). *Let G be a graph with $\Delta_E \leq d$, $|V(G)| = n \geq 64$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION can be solved using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d^2 \log^{18} n}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ many TIS queries with probability at least $1 - \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{n^2}$.*

Note that the query complexity stated in Theorem 2 is $\text{poly}(\log n, \frac{1}{\epsilon})$, even if d is $\mathcal{O}(\log^c n)$, where c is a positive constant. We reiterate that the only bound we require is on the number of triangles on an edge; neither do we require any bound on the maximum degree of the graph, nor do we require any bound on the number of triangles incident on a vertex.

1.2 Query models and TIS

Query models for graphs are essentially of two types: Local Queries, and Group (and related) queries.

Local Queries. This query model was initiated by Feige [Fei06] and Goldreich and Ron [GR08] and used even recently by [ELRS17, ERS18]. The queries on the graphs are

- (i) Degree query: the oracle reports the degree of a vertex;
- (ii) Neighbor query: the oracle reports the i^{th} neighbor of v , if it exists; and
- (iii) Edge existence query: the oracle reports whether there exists an edge between a given pair of vertices.

Group Queries or Subset queries and Subset samples. These queries were implicitly initiated in the works of Stockmeyer [Sto83, Sto85] and formalized by Ron and Tsur [RT16]. *Group queries* can be viewed as a generalization of membership queries in sets. The essential idea of the group queries is to estimate the size of an unknown set $S \subseteq U$ by using a YES/NO answer from the oracle to the existence of an intersection between sets S and $T \subseteq U$; and give a uniformly selected item of $S \cap T$, if $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$ in the *subset sample* query. Subset sample queries are at least as powerful as group queries. The *cut query* by Rubinfeld et al. [RSW18], though motivated by submodular function minimization problem, can also be seen in the light of group queries — we seek the number of edges that intersect both the vertex sets that form a cut. Choi and Kim [CK10] used a variation of group queries for *graph reconstruction*. Dell and Lapinskas [DL18] essentially used this class of queries for estimating the number of edges in a bipartite graph. *Bipartite independent set* (BIS) queries for a graph, initiated by Beame et al. [BHR⁺18], can also be seen in the light of group queries. It provides a YES/NO answer to the existence of an edge in $E(G)$ that intersects with both $V_1, V_2 \subset V(G)$ of G , where V_1 and V_2 are disjoint. A subset sample version of BIS oracle was used in [BGK⁺18].

In TIS, we seek a YES/NO answer about the existence of an intersection between the set of triangles, that we want to estimate, and three disjoint sets of vertices. Thus TIS belongs to the class of group queries, as does BIS. A bone of contention for any newly introduced query oracle is its worth¹. Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18] had given a subjective justification in favor of BIS to establish it as a query oracle. It is easy to verify that TIS, being in the same class of group queries, have the interesting connections to group testing and computational geometry as BIS. We provide justifications in favor of considering $\Delta_E \leq d$ in Appendix A. Intuitively, TIS is to triangle counting what BIS is to edge estimation.

1.3 Prior works

Eden et al. [ELRS17] showed that query complexity of estimating the number of triangles in a graph G using local queries is $\tilde{\Theta} \left(\frac{|V(G)|}{t(G)^{1/3}} + \min \left\{ \frac{|E(G)|^{3/2}}{t(G)}, |E(G)| \right\} \right)^2$. Matching upper and lower bounds on k -clique counting in G using local query model have also been reported [ERS18]. These results have almost closed the k -clique counting problem in graphs using local queries. A precursor to triangle estimation in graphs is edge estimation. The number of edges in a graph G can be estimated by using $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \left(\frac{|V(G)|}{\sqrt{|E(G)|}} \right)$ many degree and neighbor queries, and $\Omega \left(\frac{|V(G)|}{\sqrt{|E(G)|}} \right)$ queries are necessary to estimate the number of edges even if we allow all the three local queries [GR08]. This result would almost have closed the edge estimation problem but for having a relook at the problem with stronger query models and hoping for polylogarithmic number of queries. Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18] precisely

¹See <http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~oded/MC/237.html> for a comment on BIS.

² $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\cdot)$ hides a polynomial factor of $\log n$ and $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$, where $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ is such that $(1 - \epsilon)t \leq \hat{t} \leq (1 + \epsilon)t$; \hat{t} and t denote the estimated and actual number of triangles in G , respectively.

did that by estimating the number of edges in a graph using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log^{14} n}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ *bipartite independent set* (BIS) queries. Motivated by this result, we explore whether triangle estimation can be solved using only polylogarithmic TIS queries.

Note that the TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION can also be thought of as HYPEREDGE ESTIMATION problem in a 3-uniform hypergraph. As a follow up to this paper, Dell et al. [DLM20] and Bhattacharya et al. [BBGM19], independently, generalized our result to c -uniform hypergraphs, where $c \in \mathbb{N}$ is a constant. Their result showed that the bound on Δ_E is not necessary to solve TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION by using polylogarithmic many TIS queries.

Organization of the paper

We give a broad overview of the algorithm in Section 2. Section 3 gives the details of sparsification. In Section 4, we give exact/approximate estimation algorithm with respect to a threshold. Section 5 discusses about the algorithm for *coarse* estimation of the number of triangles. The final algorithm is given in Section 6. Section 7 concludes the paper with some discussions about future improvements. Appendix A provides justifications in favor of TIS. Appendix B has the probabilistic results used in this paper.

2 Overview of the algorithm

Our algorithmic framework is inspired by [BHR⁺18] but the detailed analysis is markedly different, like the use of a relatively new concentration inequality, due to Janson [Jan04], for handling sums of random variables with bounded dependency. Apart from Lemmas 6 and 9, all other proofs require different ideas.

In Figure 2, we give a *flowchart* of the algorithm and show the corresponding lemmas that support the steps of the algorithm. The main idea of our algorithm is as follows. We can figure out for a given G , if the number of triangles $t(G)$ is greater than a threshold τ ((Lemma 4)). If $t(G) \leq \tau$, i.e., G is sparse in triangles, we compute an $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of $t(G)$ (Lemma 4). Otherwise, we sparsify G to get a disjoint union of tripartite subgraphs of G that maintain $t(G)$ up to a scaling factor (Lemma 3). For each tripartite subgraph, if the subgraph is sparse (decided by Lemma 5), we count the number of triangles exactly (Lemma 6). Otherwise, we again sparsify (Lemma 7). This repeated process of sparsification may create a huge number of tripartite subgraphs. Counting the number of triangles in them is managed by doing a coarse estimation (Lemma 8) and taking a sample of the subgraph that maintains the number of triangles *approximately*. Each time we sparsify, we ensure that the sum of the number of triangles in the subgraphs generated by sparsification is a constant fraction of the number of triangles in the graph before sparsification, making the number of iterations $O(\log n)$.

We sparsify G by considering the partition obtained when $V(G)$ is COLORED with $[3k]$. This sparsification is done such that: (i) the sparsified graph is a union of a set of vertex disjoint tripartite subgraphs and (ii) a proper scaling of the number of triangles in the sparsified graph is a *good* estimate of $t(G)$ with high probability³. The proof of the sparsification result stated next uses the *method of averaged bounded differences* and *Chernoff-Hoeffding type* inequality in bounded dependency setting by Janson [Jan04]. The detailed proof is in Section 3. Recall that Δ_E is the maximum number of triangles on a particular edge.

³High probability means that the probability of success is at least $1 - \frac{1}{n^c}$ for some constant c .




Figure 1: Flow chart of the algorithm. The highlighted texts indicate the basic building blocks of the algorithm. We also indicate the corresponding lemmas that support the building blocks.

Lemma 3 (General Sparsification). *Let $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists a constant κ_1 such that for any graph G with $\Delta_E \leq d$, if V_1, \dots, V_{3k} is a random partition of $V(G)$ obtained by $V(G)$ being COLORED with $[3k]$, then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{9k^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k t(V_i, V_{k+i}, V_{2k+i}) - t(G) \right| > \kappa_1 dk^2 \sqrt{t(G) \log n} \right) \leq \frac{2}{n^4}.$$

We apply the sparsification corresponding to Lemma 3 only when $t(G)$ is above a threshold⁴ to ensure that the relative error is bounded. We can decide whether $t(G)$ is at most the threshold and if it is so, we *estimate* the value of $t(G)$, using the following lemma, whose proof is given in Section 4.

Lemma 4 (Estimation with respect to a threshold). *There exists an algorithm that for any graph G , a threshold parameter $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, determines whether $t(G) > \tau$. If $t(G) \leq \tau$, the algorithm gives a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation to $t(G)$ by using $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\tau \log^2 n}{\epsilon^2})$ many TIS queries with probability at least $1 - n^{-10}$.*

Assume that $t(G)$ is *large*⁵ and G has undergone sparsification. We initialize a data structure with a set of vertex disjoint tripartite graphs that are obtained after the sparsification step. For each tripartite graph $G(A, B, C)$ in the data structure, we check whether $t(A, B, C)$ is less than a threshold using the algorithm corresponding to Lemma 5. If it is less than a threshold, we compute the exact value of $t(A, B, C)$ using Lemma 6 and remove $G(A, B, C)$ from the data structure. The proofs of Lemmas 5 and 6 are given in Section 4.

Lemma 5 (Threshold for Tripartite Graph). *There exists a deterministic algorithm that given any disjoint subsets $A, B, C \subset V(G)$ of any graph G and a threshold parameter $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, can decide whether $t(A, B, C) \leq \tau$ using $\mathcal{O}(\tau \log n)$ TIS queries.*

Lemma 6 (Exact Counting in Tripartite Graphs). *There exists a deterministic algorithm that given any disjoint subsets $A, B, C \subset V(G)$ of any graph G , can determine the exact value of $t(A, B, C)$ using $\mathcal{O}(t(A, B, C) \log n)$ TIS queries.*

Now we are left with some tripartite graphs such that the number of triangles in each graph is more than a threshold. If the number of such graphs is not large, then we sparsify each tripartite graph $G(A, B, C)$ in a fashion almost similar to the earlier sparsification. This sparsification result formally stated in the following Lemma, has a proof similar to Lemma 3. We replace $G(A, B, C)$ by a constant (say, k)⁶ many tripartite subgraphs formed after sparsification.

Lemma 7 (Sparsification for Tripartite Graphs). *Let $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists a constant κ_2 such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| k^2 \sum_{i=1}^k t(A_i, B_i, C_i) - t(A, B, C) \right| > \kappa_2 d k^2 \sqrt{t(G) \log n} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n^8}$$

where A, B and C are disjoint subsets of $V(G)$ for any graph G with $\Delta_E \leq d$, and $A_1, \dots, A_k, B_1, \dots, B_k$ and C_1, \dots, C_k are the partitions of A, B, C formed uniformly at random, respectively.

If we have a large number of vertex disjoint tripartite subgraphs of G and each subgraph contains a large number of triangles, then we *coarsely* estimate the number of triangles in each subgraph which is correct up to $\mathcal{O}(\log^3 n)$ factor by using the algorithm corresponding to the following Lemma, whose proof is in Section 5. Our COARSE-ESTIMATE algorithm is similar in structure to the coarse estimation algorithm for edge estimation, but requires a more careful analysis.

⁴The threshold is a fixed polynomial in $d, \log n$ and $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$.

⁵Large refers to a fixed polynomial in $d, \log n$ and $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$.

⁶In our algorithm, k is a constant. However, Lemma 7 holds for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 8 (Coarse Estimation). *There exists an algorithm that given disjoint subsets $A, B, C \subset V(G)$ of any graph G , returns an estimate \tilde{t} satisfying*

$$\frac{t(A, B, C)}{64 \log^2 n} \leq \tilde{t} \leq 64t(A, B, C) \log^2 n$$

with probability at least $1 - n^{-9}$. Moreover, the query complexity of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(\log^4 n)$.

After estimating the number of triangles in each subgraph coarsely, we approximately maintain the triangle count using the following sampling result which is a direct consequence of the *Importance Sampling Lemma* of [BHR⁺18].⁷

Lemma 9 ([BHR⁺18]). *Let $(A_1, B_1, C_1, w_1), \dots, (A_r, B_r, C_r, w_r)$ be the tuples present in the data structure and e_i be the corresponding coarse estimation for $t(A_i, B_i, C_i)$, $i \in [r]$, such that*

- (i) $\forall i \in [r]$, we have $w_i, e_i \geq 1$;
- (ii) $\forall i \in [r]$, we have $\frac{e_i}{\rho} \leq t(A_i, B_i, C_i) \leq e_i \rho$ for some $\rho > 0$; and
- (iii) $\sum_{i=1}^r w_i \cdot t(A_i, B_i, C_i) \leq M$.

Note that the exact values $t(A_i, B_i, C_i)$'s are not known to us. Then there exists an algorithm that finds $(A'_1, B'_1, C'_1, w'_1), \dots, (A'_s, B'_s, C'_s, w'_s)$ such that all of the above three conditions hold and

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^s w'_i \cdot t(A'_i, B'_i, C'_i) - \sum_{i=1}^r w_i \cdot t(A_i, B_i, C_i) \right| \leq \lambda S,$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where $S = \sum_{i=1}^r w_i \cdot t(A_i, B_i, C_i)$ and $\lambda, \delta > 0$. Also,

$$s = \mathcal{O} \left(\lambda^{-2} \rho^4 \log M \left(\log \log M + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \right).$$

Now again, for each tripartite graph $G(A, B, C)$, we check whether $t(A, B, C)$ is less than a threshold using the algorithm corresponding to Lemma 5. If yes, then we can compute the exact value of $t(A, B, C)$ using Lemma 6 and remove $G(A, B, C)$ from the data structure. Otherwise, we iterate on all the required steps discussed above as shown in Figure 2. Observe that each iteration uses polylogarithmic⁸ many queries. Now, note that the number of triangles reduces by a constant factor after each sparsification step. So, the number of iterations is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. Hence, the query complexity of our algorithm is polylogarithmic. This completes the high level description of our algorithm.

3 Sparsification step

In this Section, we prove Lemma 3. The proof of Lemma 7 is similar.

⁷For the exact statement of the Importance Sampling Lemma see Lemma 29 in Appendix B.

⁸Polylogarithmic refers to a polynomial in $d, \log n$ and $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$

Lemma 10 (Lemma 3 restated). *Let $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists a constant κ_1 such that for any graph G with $\Delta_E \leq d$, if V_1, \dots, V_{3k} is a random partition of $V(G)$ obtained by $V(G)$ being COLORED with $[3k]$, then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{9k^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k t(V_i, V_{k+i}, V_{2k+i}) - t(G) \right| > \kappa_1 dk^2 \sqrt{t(G) \log n} \right) \leq \frac{2}{n^4}.$$

Proof. $V(G)$ is COLORED with $[3k]$. Let V_1, \dots, V_{3k} be the resulting partition of $V(G)$. Let Z_i be the random variable that denotes the color assigned to the i^{th} vertex. For $i \in [3k]$, $\pi(i)$ is a set of three colors defined as follows: $\pi(i) = \{i, (1 + (i + k - 1) \bmod 3k), (1 + (i + 2k - 1) \bmod 3k)\}$.

Definition 11. A triangle (a, b, c) is said to be *properly colored* if there exists a bijection in terms of coloring from $\{a, b, c\}$ to $\pi(i)$.

Let $f(Z_1, \dots, Z_n) = \sum_{i=1}^k t(V_i, V_{k+i}, V_{2k+i})$. Note that f is the number of triangles that are properly colored. The probability that a triangle is properly colored is $\frac{2}{9k^2}$. So, $\mathbb{E}[f] = \frac{2t(G)}{9k^2}$.

Let us focus on the instance when vertices $1, \dots, t-1$ are already colored and we are going to color vertex t . Let S_ℓ (S_r) be the set of triangles in G having t as one of the vertices and other two vertices are from $[t-1]$ ($[n] \setminus [t]$). $S_{\ell r}$ be the set of triangles in G such that t is a vertex and the second and third vertices are from $[t-1]$ and $[n] \setminus [t]$, respectively.

Given that the vertex t is colored with color $c \in [3k]$, let $N_\ell^c, N_r^c, N_{\ell r}^c$ be the random variables that denote the number of triangles in S_ℓ, S_r and $S_{\ell r}$ that are properly colored, respectively. Also, let \mathbb{E}_f^t denote the absolute difference in the conditional expectation of the number of triangles that are properly colored whose t^{th} -vertex is (possibly) differently colored. By considering the vertices in S_ℓ, S_r and $S_{\ell r}$ separately, we can bound \mathbb{E}_f^t

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_f^t &= \left| \mathbb{E}[f \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_{t-1}, Z_t = a_t] - \mathbb{E}[f \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_{t-1}, Z_t = a'_t] \right| \\ &= \left| N_\ell^{a_t} - N_\ell^{a'_t} + \mathbb{E} \left[N_r^{a_t} - N_r^{a'_t} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[N_{\ell r}^{a_t} - N_{\ell r}^{a'_t} \right] \right| \\ &\leq \left| N_\ell^{a_t} - N_\ell^{a'_t} \right| + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| N_r^{a_t} - N_r^{a'_t} \right| \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| N_{\ell r}^{a_t} - N_{\ell r}^{a'_t} \right| \right] \end{aligned}$$

Now, consider the following claim, which we prove later.

Claim 12. (a) $\mathbb{P}(|N_\ell^{a_t} - N_\ell^{a'_t}| < 8\sqrt{d\Delta_t \log n}) \geq 1 - 4n^{-8}$;

(b) $\mathbb{E}[|N_r^{a_t} - N_r^{a'_t}|] \leq \sqrt{d\Delta_t}/k$;

(c) $\mathbb{E}[|N_{\ell r}^{a_t} - N_{\ell r}^{a'_t}|] < 6d\sqrt{\Delta_t \log n}$.⁹

Let $c_t = 15d\sqrt{\Delta_t \log n}$. From the above claim, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_f^t < 8\sqrt{d\Delta_t \log n} + \frac{\sqrt{d\Delta_t}}{k} + 6d\sqrt{\Delta_t \log n} \leq 15d\sqrt{\Delta_t \log n} = c_t$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{4}{n^8}$. Let \mathcal{B} be the event that there exists $t \in [n]$ such that $\mathbb{E}_f^t > c_t$. By the union bound over all $t \in [n]$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \frac{4}{n^7}$.

⁹Note that Δ_t is the number of triangles having t as one of its vertices and we are not assuming any bound on Δ_t . We assume Δ_E , that is number of triangles on any edge, is bounded.

Using the method of *averaged bounded difference* [DP09] (See Lemma 24 in Appendix B), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|f - \mathbb{E}[f]| > \delta + t(G)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B})) \leq e^{-\delta^2 / \sum_{t=1}^n c_t^2} + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}).$$

We set $\delta = 60d\sqrt{t(G)} \log n$. Observe that $\sum_{t=1}^n c_t^2 = 225d^2 \log n \sum_{t=1}^n \Delta_t = 675d^2 t(G) \log n$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|f - \frac{2t(G)}{9k^2}\right| > 60d\sqrt{t(G)} \log n + t(G)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B})\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^4} + \frac{1}{n^7},$$

that is,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{9k^2}{2}f - t(G)\right| > 270dk^2\sqrt{t(G)} \log n + \frac{9k^2}{2} \cdot \frac{t(G)}{n^7}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^4} + \frac{1}{n^7}.$$

Since, $\frac{9k^2}{2} \cdot \frac{t(G)}{n^7} < dk^2\sqrt{t(G)} \log n$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{9k^2}{2}f - t(G)\right| > 271dk^2\sqrt{t(G)} \log n\right) \leq \frac{2}{n^4}.$$

□

To finish the proof of Lemma 3, we need to prove Claim 12. For that, we need the following definition and intermediate result (Lemma 14) that is stated in terms of objects, which in the current context can be thought of as vertices.

Definition 13. Let \mathcal{X} be a set of u objects COLORED with $[3k]$. Let $\alpha, \beta \in [3k]$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$. A pair of objects $\{a, b\}$ is said to be colored with $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ if there is a bijection in terms of coloring from $\{a, b\}$ to $\{\alpha, \beta\}$. An object $o \in \mathcal{X}$ is colored with $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ if o is colored with α or β .

Recall Definition 11. A triangle incident on t is properly colored if the pair of vertices in the triangle other than t , is colored with $\pi(Z_t) \setminus \{Z_t\}$. Note that, Claim 12 bounds the difference in the number of properly colored triangles incident on t when $Z_t = a_t$ and when $Z_t = a'_t$, that is, the difference in the number of triangles whose pair of vertices other than t is colored with $\pi(a_t) \setminus \{a_t\}$ and that is colored with $\pi(a'_t) \setminus \{a'_t\}$. As, a vertex can be present in many pairs, proper coloring of one triangle, incident on t , is dependent on the proper coloring of another triangle. However, this dependency is bounded due to our assumption $\Delta_E \leq d$. Now, let us consider the following Lemma.

Lemma 14. Let \mathcal{X} be a set of u objects COLORED with $[3k]$. \mathcal{F} be a set of v pairs of objects such that an object is present in at most d ($d \leq v$) many pairs and $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a set of w objects. $\mathcal{F}_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a set of pairs of objects that are colored with $\{\alpha, \beta\}$. $M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} = |\mathcal{F}_{\{\alpha, \beta\}}|$. $\mathcal{P}_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be the set of objects that are colored with $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ and $N_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} = |\mathcal{P}_{\{\alpha, \beta\}}|$. Then, we have

- (i) $\mathbb{P}(|M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}}| \geq 8\sqrt{dv \log u}) \leq \frac{4}{u^8},$
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}[|M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}}|] \leq \frac{\sqrt{dv}}{k},$ and
- (iii) $\mathbb{P}(|N_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - N_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}}| \geq 4\sqrt{w \log u}) \leq \frac{4}{u^8}.$

Proof. (i) Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\{a_1, b_1\}, \dots, \{a_v, b_v\}\}$. Let X_i be the indicator random variable such that $X_i = 1$ if and only if $\{a_i, b_i\}$ is colored with $\{\alpha, \beta\}$, where $i \in [v]$. Note that $M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} = \sum_{i=1}^v X_i$. Also, $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \frac{2}{9k^2}$, hence $\mathbb{E}[M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}}] = \frac{2v}{9k^2}$.

X_i and X_j are dependent if and only if $\{a_i, b_i\} \cap \{a_j, b_j\} \neq \emptyset$. As each object can be present in at most d many pairs of objects, there are at most $2d$ many X_j 's on which an X_i depends. Now using *Chernoff-Hoeffding's type bound in the bounded dependent setting* [DP09] (see Lemma 28 in Appendix B), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - \frac{2v}{9k^2}\right| \geq 4\sqrt{dv \log u}\right) \leq \frac{2}{u^8}.$$

Similarly, one can also show that $\mathbb{P}\left(\left|M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}} - \frac{2v}{9k^2}\right| \geq 4\sqrt{dv \log u}\right) \leq \frac{2}{u^8}$. Note that

$$\left|M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}}\right| \leq \left|M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - \frac{2v}{9k^2}\right| + \left|M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}} - \frac{2v}{9k^2}\right|.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left|M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}}\right| \geq 8\sqrt{dv \log u}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - \frac{2v}{9k^2}\right| + \left|M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}} - \frac{2v}{9k^2}\right| \geq 8\sqrt{dv \log u}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - \frac{2v}{9k^2}\right| \geq 4\sqrt{dv \log u}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}} - \frac{2v}{9k^2}\right| \geq 4\sqrt{dv \log u}\right) \\ & \leq 4u^{-8}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Let $X_i, i \in [v]$, be the random variable such that $X_i = 1$ if $\{a_i, b_i\}$ is colored with $\{\alpha, \beta\}$; $X_i = -1$ if $\{a_i, b_i\}$ is colored with $\{\alpha', \beta'\}$; $X_i = 0$, otherwise. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^v X_i$. Note that

$$M_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - M_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}} = X = \sum_{i=1}^v X_i.$$

So, we need to bound $\mathbb{E}[|X|]$ to prove the claim.

The random variables X_i and X_j are dependent if and only if $\{a_i, b_i\} \cap \{a_j, b_j\} \neq \emptyset$. As each object can be present in at most d many pairs of objects, there are at most $2d$ many X_j 's on which an X_i depends. Observe that $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X_i = -1) = \frac{2}{9k^2}$. So, $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] = \frac{4}{9k^2}$. If X_i and X_j are independent, then $\mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] = \mathbb{E}[X_i] \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j] = 0$. If X_i and X_j are dependent, then $\mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] \leq \mathbb{P}(X_i X_j = 1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_i X_j = 1) &= \mathbb{P}(X_i = 1, X_j = 1) + \mathbb{P}(X_i = -1, X_j = -1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_j = 1 \mid X_i = 1) + \mathbb{P}(X_i = -1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_j = -1 \mid X_i = -1) \\ &= \frac{2}{9k^2} \cdot \frac{1}{3k} + \frac{2}{9k^2} \cdot \frac{1}{3k} \\ &= \frac{4}{27k^3} \end{aligned}$$

Using the expression $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \sum_{i=1}^v \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] + 2 \cdot \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j]$ and recalling the fact that each X_i depends on at most $2d$ many other X_j 's, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] \leq v \cdot \frac{4}{9k^2} + 2dv \cdot \frac{4}{27k^3} \leq \frac{8dv}{9k^2}.$$

Now, using $\mathbb{E}[|X|] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X^2]}$, we get $\mathbb{E}[|X|] < \frac{\sqrt{dv}}{k}$.

- (iii) Let $\mathcal{P} = \{o_1, \dots, o_w\}$ be the set of w objects. Let $X_i, i \in [w]$, be the indicator random variable such that $X_i = 1$ if and only if o_i is colored with $\{\alpha, \beta\}$. Note that $N_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} = \sum_{i=1}^w X_i$. Observe that $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \frac{2}{3k}$ and hence, $\mathbb{E}[N_{\{\alpha, \beta\}}] = \frac{2w}{3k}$. Note that X_i and X_j are independent. Applying Hoeffding's inequality (See Lemma 25 in Appendix B), we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|N_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - \frac{2w}{3k}\right| \geq 2\sqrt{w \log u}\right) \leq \frac{2}{u^8}.$$

Similarly, we can also show that $\mathbb{P}\left(\left|N_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}} - \frac{2w}{3k}\right| \geq 2\sqrt{w \log u}\right) \leq \frac{2}{u^8}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left|N_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - N_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}}\right| \geq 4\sqrt{w \log u}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|N_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - \frac{2w}{3k}\right| + \left|N_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}} - \frac{2w}{3k}\right| \geq 4\sqrt{w \log u}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|N_{\{\alpha, \beta\}} - \frac{2w}{3k}\right| \geq 2\sqrt{w \log u}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|N_{\{\alpha', \beta'\}} - \frac{2w}{3k}\right| \geq 2\sqrt{w \log u}\right) \\ & \leq \frac{4}{u^8}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We will now give the proof of Claim 12.

Proof of Claim 12. (a) Let $S_\ell = \{(a_1, b_1, t), \dots, (a_v, b_v, t)\}$. Note that $v \leq \Delta_t$. As $\Delta_E \leq d$, each vertex in $[n]$ can be present in at most d many pairs of S_ℓ . Now we apply Lemma 14. Set $\mathcal{X} = [n]$ and $\mathcal{F} = S_\ell$ in Lemma 14. Observe that $N_\ell^{a_t} = M_{\pi(a_t) \setminus \{a_t\}}$ and $N_\ell^{a'_t} = M_{\pi(a'_t) \setminus \{a'_t\}}$. So, by of Lemma 14 (i),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|N_\ell^{a_t} - N_\ell^{a'_t}\right| \geq 8\sqrt{dv \log n}\right) \leq \frac{4}{n^8}.$$

This implies $\mathbb{P}\left(\left|N_\ell^{a_t} - N_\ell^{a'_t}\right| \geq 8\sqrt{d\Delta_t \log n}\right) \leq \frac{4}{n^8}$.

- (b) Let $S_r = \{(t, a_1, b_1), \dots, (t, a_v, b_v)\}$. Note that $v \leq \Delta_t$, the number of triangles incident on vertex t . As $\Delta_E \leq d$, each vertex in $[n]$ can be present in at most d many pairs of S_r . Now we apply Lemma 14. Set $\mathcal{X} = [n]$ and $\mathcal{F} = S_r$ in Lemma 14. Observe that $N_r^{a_t} = M_{\pi(a_t) \setminus \{a_t\}}$ and $N_r^{a'_t} = M_{\pi(a'_t) \setminus \{a'_t\}}$. By Lemma 14 (ii), we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|N_r^{a_t} - N_r^{a'_t}\right|\right] \leq \frac{\sqrt{dv}}{k} \leq \frac{\sqrt{d\Delta_t}}{k}.$$

- (c) Let $S_{\ell_r} = \{(a_1, t, b_1), \dots, (a_w, t, b_w)\}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $a_i \in [t-1]$ and $b_i \in [n] \setminus [t]$. Note that $w \leq \Delta_t$. Given that the vertex t is colored with color c and we know Z_1, \dots, Z_{t-1} , define the set P_c as

$$P_c := \{(a, t, b) \in S_{\ell_r} : t \text{ is colored with } c \text{ and } \mathbb{P}((a, t, b) \text{ is properly colored}) > 0\}.$$

Let $Q_c = |P_c|$. Observe that for $(a, t, b) \in S_{\ell_r}$, $\mathbb{P}((a, t, b) \text{ is properly colored}) > 0$ if and only if a is colored with some color in $\pi(c) \setminus \{c\}$. Now we apply Lemma 14. Set $\mathcal{X} = [n]$, $\mathcal{P} = \{a_1, \dots, a_w\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{P}_{\pi(a_t) \setminus a_t} = P_{a_t}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\pi(a'_t) \setminus a'_t} = P_{a'_t}$. By (iii) of Lemma 14,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|Q_{a_t} - Q_{a'_t}\right| \geq 4\sqrt{w \log n}\right) \leq \frac{4}{n^8}.$$

Let \mathcal{E} be the event that $\left|Q_{a_t} - Q_{a'_t}\right| \geq 4\sqrt{w \log n}$. So, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{4}{n^8}$. Assume that \mathcal{E} has not occurred. Let $P = P_{a_t} \cap P_{a'_t} = \{(x_1, t, y_1), \dots, (x_q, t, y_q)\}$. Note that $q \leq w \leq \Delta_t$. Recall that Z_x is the random variable that denotes the color assigned to vertex $x \in [n]$. Let $X_i, i \in [q]$, be the random variable such that $X_i = 1$ if y_i is colored with $\pi(a_t) \setminus \{Z_{x_i}, a_t\}$; $X_i = -1$ if y_i is colored with $\pi(a'_t) \setminus \{Z_{x_i}, a'_t\}$; $X_i = 0$, otherwise. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^q X_i$. Observe that X_i and X_j are dependent if and only if $y_i = y_j$. As $\Delta_E \leq d$, there can be at most d many y_j 's such that $y_i = y_j$. So, an X_i depends on at most d many other X_j 's.

Observe that $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X_i = -1) = \frac{1}{3k}$. So, $\mathbb{E}[X_i = 0]$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_i^2] = \frac{2}{3k}$. If X_i and X_j are independent, then $\mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] = 0$. If X_i and X_j are dependent, then

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] \leq \mathbb{P}(X_i = 1, X_j = 1) + \mathbb{P}(X_i = -1, X_j = -1) \leq \mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) + \mathbb{P}(X_j = -1) = \frac{2}{3k}.$$

Using the expression $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \sum_{i=1}^v \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] + 2 \cdot \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq v} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j]$ and the fact that each X_i depends on at most d many other X_j 's, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] \leq v \cdot \frac{2}{3k} + dv \cdot \frac{2}{3k} \leq \frac{dv}{k} \leq \frac{d\Delta_t}{k}.$$

Since, $\mathbb{E}[|X|] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X^2]}$, we get $\mathbb{E}[|X|] \leq \sqrt{\frac{d\Delta_t}{k}}$. Using $\Delta_E \leq d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|N_{\ell_r}^{a_t} - N_{\ell_r}^{a'_t}| \mid \mathcal{E}^c] &= d \cdot |Q_{a_t} - Q_{a'_t}| + \mathbb{E}[|X|] \\ &< 4d\sqrt{\Delta_t \log n} + \sqrt{\frac{d\Delta_t}{k}} < 5d\sqrt{\Delta_t \log n}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\mathbb{E}[|N_{\ell_r}^{a_t} - N_{\ell_r}^{a'_t}| \mid \mathcal{E}] \leq w \leq \Delta_t$. Putting everything together,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[|N_{\ell_r}^{a_t} - N_{\ell_r}^{a'_t}|\right] &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[|N_{\ell_r}^{a_t} - N_{\ell_r}^{a'_t}| \mid \mathcal{E}\right] + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}^c) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[|N_{\ell_r}^{a_t} - N_{\ell_r}^{a'_t}| \mid \mathcal{E}^c\right] \\ &< \frac{4}{n^8} \cdot \Delta_t + 1 \cdot 5d\sqrt{\Delta_t \log n} \leq 6d\sqrt{\Delta_t \log n} \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Estimation: Exact and Approximate

In this Section, we prove Lemmas 4 (restated as Lemma 17), 5 (restated as Lemma 16) and 6 (restated as Lemma 15). We first prove Lemmas 5 and 6, whose proofs are very similar. Then we prove Lemma 4 that in turn uses Lemma 5.

Lemma 15 (Lemma 6 restated). *There exists a deterministic algorithm that given any disjoint subsets $A, B, C \subset V(G)$ of any graph G , can determine the exact value of $t(A, B, C)$ using $\mathcal{O}(t(A, B, C) \log n)$ TIS queries.*

Proof. We initialize a tree \mathcal{T} with (A, B, C) as the root. We build the tree such that each node is labeled with either 0 or 1. If $t(A, B, C) = 0$, we label the root with 0 and terminate. Otherwise, we label the root with 1 and do the following as long as there is a leaf node (U, V, W) labeled with 1.

- (i) If $t(U, V, W) = 0$, then we label (U, V, W) with 0 and go to other leaf node labeled as 1 if any. Otherwise, we label (U, V, W) as 1 and do the following.
- (ii) If $|U| = |V| = |W| = 1$, then we add one node (U, V, W) as a child of (U, V, W) and label the new node as 0. Then we go to other leaf node labeled as 1 if any.
- (iii) If $|U| = 1, |V| = 1$ and $|W| > 1$, then we partition the set W into W_1 and W_2 such that $|W_1| = \lceil \frac{|W|}{2} \rceil$ and $|W_2| = \lfloor \frac{|W|}{2} \rfloor$; and we add (U, V, W_1) and (U, V, W_2) as two children of (U, V, W) . The case $|U| = 1, |V| > 1, |W| = 1$ and $|U| > 1, |V| = 1, |W| = 1$ are handled similarly.
- (iv) If $|U| = 1, |V| > 1$ and $|W| > 1$, then we partition the set V into V_1 and V_2 (similarly, W into W_1 and W_2) such that $|V_1| = \lceil \frac{|V|}{2} \rceil$ and $|V_2| = \lfloor \frac{|V|}{2} \rfloor$ ($|W_1| = \lceil \frac{|W|}{2} \rceil$ and $|W_2| = \lfloor \frac{|W|}{2} \rfloor$); and we add $(U, V_1, W_1), (U, V_1, W_2), (U, V_2, W_1)$ and (U, V_2, W_2) as four children of (U, V, W) . The case $|U| > 1, |V| > 1, |W| = 1$ and $|U| > 1, |V| = 1, |W| > 1$ are handled similarly.
- (v) If $|U| > 1, |V| > 1$ and $|W| > 1$, then we partition the sets U, V, W into U_1 and $U_2; V_1$ and $V_2; W_1$ and W_2 , respectively, such that $|U_1| = \lceil \frac{|U|}{2} \rceil$ and $|U_2| = \lfloor \frac{|U|}{2} \rfloor; |V_1| = \lceil \frac{|V|}{2} \rceil$ and $|V_2| = \lfloor \frac{|V|}{2} \rfloor; |W_1| = \lceil \frac{|W|}{2} \rceil$ and $|W_2| = \lfloor \frac{|W|}{2} \rfloor$. We add $(U_1, V_1, W_1), (U_1, V_1, W_2), (U_1, V_2, W_1), (U_1, V_2, W_2), (U_2, V_1, W_1), (U_2, V_1, W_2), (U_2, V_2, W_1)$ and (U_2, V_2, W_2) as eight children of (U, V, W) .

Let \mathcal{T}' be the tree after deleting all the leaf nodes in \mathcal{T} . Observe that $t(A, B, C)$ is the number of leaf nodes in \mathcal{T}' ; and

- the height of \mathcal{T} is bounded by $\max\{\log |A|, \log |B|, \log |C|\} + 1 \leq 2 \log n$,
- the query complexity of the above procedure is bounded by the number of nodes in \mathcal{T} as we make at most one query per node of \mathcal{T} .

The number of nodes in \mathcal{T}' , the number of internal nodes of \mathcal{T} , is bounded by $2t(A, B, C) \log n$. So, the number of leaf nodes in \mathcal{T} is at most $16t(A, B, C) \log n$ and hence the total number of nodes in \mathcal{T} is at most $16t(U, V, W) \log n$. Putting everything together, the required query complexity is $\mathcal{O}(t(A, B, C) \log n)$. \square

Lemma 16 (Lemma 5 restated). *There exists a deterministic algorithm that given any disjoint subsets $A, B, C \subset V(G)$ of any graph G and a threshold parameter $\tau \in cN$, can decide whether $t(A, B, C) \leq \tau$ using $\mathcal{O}(\tau \log n)$ TIS queries.*

Proof. The algorithm proceeds similar to the one presented in the Proof of Lemma 6 by initializing a tree \mathcal{T} with (A, B, C) as the root. If $t(A, B, C) \leq \tau$, then we can find $t(A, B, C)$ by using $16t(A, B, C) \log n$ many queries and the number of nodes in \mathcal{T} is bounded by $16t(A, B, C) \log n$. So, if the number of nodes in \mathcal{T} is more than $16\tau \log n$ at any instance during the execution of the algorithm, we report $t(G) > \tau$ and terminate. Hence, the query complexity is bounded by the number of nodes in \mathcal{T} , which is $\mathcal{O}(\tau \log n)$. \square

Algorithm 1: THRESHOLD-APPROX-ESTIMATE(G, τ, ϵ)

Input: A parameter τ and an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Output: Either report $t(G) > \tau$ or find an $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of $t(G)$.

- 1 **for** ($i = 1$ to $\mathcal{N} = \frac{18 \log n}{\epsilon^2}$) **do**
 - 2 Partition $V(G)$ into three parts such that each vertex is present in one of A_i, B_i, C_i with probability $1/3$ independent of the other vertices.
 - 3 Run the algorithm corresponding to Lemma 5 to determine if $t(A_i, B_i, C_i) > \tau$. If yes, we report $t(G) > \tau$ and QUIT. Otherwise, we have the exact value of $t(A_i, B_i, C_i)$
 - 4 Report $\hat{t} = \frac{9 \sum_i^{\mathcal{N}} t(A_i, B_i, C_i)}{2\mathcal{N}}$ as the output.
-

Lemma 17 (Lemma 4 restated). *There exists an algorithm that for any graph G , a threshold parameter $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, determines whether $t(G) > \tau$. If $t(G) \leq \tau$, the algorithm gives a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation to $t(G)$ by using $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\tau \log^2 n}{\epsilon^2})$ many TIS queries with probability at least $1 - n^{-10}$.*

Proof. We show that Algorithm 1 satisfies the given condition in the statement of Lemma 5. Note that THRESHOLD-APPROX-ESTIMATE calls the algorithm corresponding to Lemma 5 at most $\mathcal{N} = \frac{18 \log n}{\epsilon^2}$ times, where each call can be executed by $\mathcal{O}(\tau \log n)$ TIS queries. So, the total query complexity of THRESHOLD-APPROX-ESTIMATE is $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{N} \cdot \tau \log n) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\tau \log^2 n}{\epsilon^2}\right)$.

Now, we show the correctness of THRESHOLD-APPROX-ESTIMATE. If there exists an $i \in [\mathcal{N}]$, such that $t(A_i, B_i, C_i) > \tau$, then we report $t(G) > \tau$ and QUIT. Otherwise, by Lemma 5, we have the exact values of $t(A_i, B_i, C_i)$'s. We will be done by showing that \hat{t} is an $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation to $t(G)$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-10}$. From the description of the algorithm, each triangle in G will be counted in $t(A_i, B_i, C_i)$ with probability $\frac{2}{9}$. We have $\mathbb{E}[t(A_i, B_i, C_i)] = \frac{2}{9} t(G)$, and the expectation of the sum and the estimate \hat{t} is

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} t(A_i, B_i, C_i)\right] = \frac{2}{9} \mathcal{N} \cdot t(G) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\hat{t}] = t(G).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{t} - t(G)| \geq \epsilon \cdot t(G)\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}} t(A_i, B_i, C_i) - \frac{2}{9} \mathcal{N} \cdot t(G)\right| \geq \frac{2\epsilon}{9} \mathcal{N} \cdot t(G)\right)$$

To bound the above probability, we apply Hoeffding's inequality (See Lemma 25 in Appendix B) along with the fact that $0 \leq t(A_i, B_i, C_i) \leq \tau$ for all $i \in [\mathcal{N}]$, and we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{t} - t(G)| \geq \epsilon \cdot t(G)\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^{10}}.$$

□

5 Coarse estimation

We now prove Lemma 8. Algorithm 3 corresponds to Lemma 8. Algorithm 2 is a subroutine in Algorithm 3. Algorithm 2 determines whether a given estimate \hat{t} is correct upto a $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ factor. Lemmas 18 and 19 are intermediate results needed to prove Lemma 8.

Algorithm 2: VERIFY-ESTIMATE (A, B, C, \hat{t})

Input: Three pairwise disjoint set $A, B, C \subseteq V(G)$ and \hat{t} .
Output: If \hat{t} is a good estimate, then ACCEPT. Otherwise, REJECT.

```

1 begin
2   for ( $i = 2 \log n$  to 0) do
3     for ( $j = \log n$  to 0) do
4       Find  $A_{ij} \subseteq A, B_{ij} \subseteq B, C_{ij} \subseteq C$  by sampling each element of  $A, B$  and  $C$ ,
5         respectively with probability  $\min\{\frac{2^i}{\hat{t}}, 1\}, \min\{\frac{2^j}{2^i} \log n, 1\}, \frac{1}{2^j}$ , respectively.
6       if ( $t(A_{ij}, B_{ij}, C_{ij}) \neq 0$ ) then
7         ACCEPT
8     REJECT
9   REJECT

```

Lemma 18. *If $\hat{t} \geq 64t(A, B, C) \log^3 n$, $\mathbb{P}(\text{VERIFY-ESTIMATE}(A, B, C, \hat{t}) \text{ accepts}) \leq \frac{1}{20}$.*

Proof. Let $T(A, B, C)$ denote the set of triangles having vertices $a \in A, b \in B$ and $c \in C$, where A, B and C are disjoint subsets of $V(G)$. For $(a, b, c) \in T(A, B, C)$ such that $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$, let $X_{(a,b,c)}^{ij}$ denote the indicator random variable such that $X_{(a,b,c)}^{ij} = 1$ if and only if $(a, b, c) \in T(A_{ij}, B_{ij}, C_{ij})$ and $X_{ij} = \sum_{(a,b,c) \in T(A,B,C)} X_{(a,b,c)}^{ij}$. Note that $t(A_{ij}, B_{ij}, C_{ij}) = X_{ij}$. (a, b, c) is present in $T(A_{ij}, B_{ij}, C_{ij})$ if $a \in A_{ij}, b \in B_{ij}$ and $c \in C_{ij}$. So,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{(a,b,c)}^{ij} = 1\right) \leq \frac{2^i}{\hat{t}} \cdot \frac{2^j}{2^i} \log n \cdot \frac{1}{2^j} = \frac{\log n}{\hat{t}} \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[X_{ij}] \leq \frac{t(A, B, C)}{\hat{t}} \log n.$$

As $X_{ij} \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{ij} \neq 0) = \mathbb{P}(X_{ij} \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}[X_{ij}] \leq \frac{t(A, B, C)}{\hat{t}} \log n.$$

Now using the fact that $\hat{t} \geq 64t(A, B, C) \log^3 n$, we have $\mathbb{P}(X_{ij} \neq 0) \leq \frac{1}{64 \log^2 n}$. Observe that VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts if and only if there exists $i, j \in \{0, \dots, \log n\}$ such that $X_{ij} \neq 0$. Using the union bound, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts}) &\leq \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2 \log n} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq \log n} \mathbb{P}(X_{ij} \neq 0) \\ &\leq \frac{(2 \log n + 1)(\log n + 1)}{32 \log^2 n} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{20}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 19. *If $\hat{t} \leq \frac{t(A,B,C)}{32 \log n}$, $\mathbb{P}(\text{VERIFY-ESTIMATE}(A, B, C, \hat{t}) \text{ accepts}) \geq \frac{1}{5}$.*

Proof. For $p \in \{0, \dots, 2 \log n\}$, let $A^p \subseteq A$ be the set of vertices such that for each $a \in A^p$, the number of triangles of the form (a, b, c) with $(b, c) \in B \times C$, lies between 2^p and $2^{p+1} - 1$.

For $a \in A^p$ and $q \in \{0, \dots, \log n\}$, let $B^{pq}(a) \subseteq B$ be the set of vertices such that for each $b \in B$, the number of triangles of the form (a, b, c) with $c \in C$ lies between 2^q and $2^{q+1} - 1$. We need the following Claim to proceed further.

Claim 20. (i) *There exists $p \in \{0, \dots, 2 \log n\}$ such that $|A^p| > \frac{t(A,B,C)}{2^{p+1}(2 \log n + 1)}$.*

(ii) *For each $a \in A^p$, there exists $q \in \{0, \dots, \log n\}$ such that $|B^{pq}(a)| > \frac{2^p}{2^{q+1}(\log n + 1)}$.*

Proof. (i) Observe that $t(A, B, C) = \sum_{p=0}^{2 \log n} t(A^p, B, C)$ as the sum takes into account all incidences of vertices in A . So, there exists $p \in \{0, \dots, 2 \log n\}$ such that $t(A^p, B, C) \geq \frac{t(A,B,C)}{2 \log n + 1}$. From the definition of A^p , $t(A^p, B, C) < |A^p| \cdot 2^{p+1}$. Hence, there exists $p \in \{0, \dots, 2 \log n\}$ such that

$$|A^p| > \frac{t(A^p, B, C)}{2^{p+1}} \geq \frac{t(A, B, C)}{2^{p+1}(2 \log n + 1)}.$$

(ii) Observe that $\sum_{q=0}^{\log n} t(\{a\}, B^{pq}(a), C) = t(\{a\}, B, C)$. So, there exists $q \in \{0, \dots, \log n\}$ such that $t(\{a\}, B^{pq}(a), C) \geq \frac{t(\{a\}, B, C)}{\log n + 1}$. From the definition of $B^{pq}(a)$, $t(\{a\}, B^{pq}(a), C) < |B^{pq}(a)| \cdot 2^{q+1}$. Hence, there exists $q \in \{0, \dots, \log n\}$ such that

$$|B^{pq}(a)| > \frac{t(\{a\}, B^{pq}(a), C)}{2^{q+1}} \geq \frac{t(\{a\}, B, C)}{2^{q+1}(\log n + 1)} \geq \frac{2^p}{2^{q+1}(\log n + 1)}.$$

□

We come back to the proof of Lemma 19. We will show that **VERIFY-ESTIMATE** accepts with probability at least $\frac{1}{5}$ when loop executes for $i = p$, where p is such that $|A^p| > \frac{t(A,B,C)}{2^{p+1}(2 \log n + 1)}$. The existence of such a p is evident from Claim 20 (i).

Recall that $A_{pq} \subseteq A$, $B_{pq} \subseteq B$ and $C_{pq} \subseteq C$ are the samples obtained when the loop variables i and j in Algorithm 2 attain values p and q , respectively. Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{pq} \cap A^p = \emptyset) \leq \left(1 - \frac{2^p}{\hat{t}}\right)^{|A^p|} \leq e^{-\frac{2^p}{\hat{t}}|A^p|} \leq e^{-\frac{2^p}{\hat{t}} \frac{t(A,B,C)}{2^{p+1} \log n}} = e^{-\frac{t(A,B,C)}{2\hat{t}(2 \log n + 1)}}.$$

Now using the fact that $\hat{t} \leq \frac{t(A,B,C)}{32 \log n}$ and $n \geq 64$,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{pq} \cap A^p = \emptyset) \leq \frac{1}{e^6}.$$

Assume that $A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset$ and $a \in A_{pq} \cap A^p$. By Claim 20 (ii), there exists $q \in \{0, \dots, \log n\}$, such that $|B^{pq}(a)| \geq \frac{2^p}{2^{q+1}(\log n + 1)}$. Note that q depends on a . Observe that we will be done, if we can show that **VERIFY-ESTIMATE** accepts when loop executes for $i = p$ and $j = q$. Now,

$$\mathbb{P}(B_{pq} \cap B^{pq}(a) = \emptyset \mid A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset) \leq \left(1 - \frac{2^q}{2^p \log n}\right)^{|B^{pq}(a)|} \leq \frac{1}{e^{3/7}}.$$

Assume that $A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset$, $B_{pq} \cap B^{pq}(a) \neq \emptyset$ and $b \in B_{pq} \cap B^{pq}(a)$. Let S be the set such that (a, b, s) is a triangle in G for each $s \in S$. Note that $|S| \geq 2^q$. So,

$$\mathbb{P}(C_{pq} \cap S = \emptyset \mid A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset \text{ and } B_{pq} \cap B^{pq}(a) \neq \emptyset) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^q}\right)^{2^q} \leq \frac{1}{e}.$$

Observe that VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts if $t(A_{pq}, B_{pq}, C_{pq}) \neq 0$. Also, $t(A_{pq}, B_{pq}, C_{pq}) \neq 0$ if $A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset$, $B_{pq} \cap B^{pq}(a) \neq \emptyset$ and $C_{pq} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts}) &\geq \mathbb{P}(A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset, B_{pq} \cap B^{pq}(a) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } C_{pq} \cap S \neq \emptyset) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset) \cdot \mathbb{P}(B_{pq} \cap B^{pq}(a) \neq \emptyset \mid A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset) \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{P}(C_{pq} \cap S \neq \emptyset \mid A_{pq} \cap A^p \neq \emptyset \text{ and } B_{pq} \cap B^{pq}(a) \neq \emptyset) \\ &> \left(1 - \frac{1}{e^6}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{e^{3/7}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) > \frac{1}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Algorithm 3: COARSE-ESTIMATE (A, B, C)

Input: Three pairwise disjoint sets $A, B, C \subset V(G)$.

Output: An estimate \hat{t} for $t(A, B, C)$.

1 **begin**

2 **for** ($\hat{t} = n^3, n^3/2, \dots, 1$) **do**

3 | Repeat VERIFY-ESTIMATE (A, B, C, \hat{t}) for $\Gamma = 2000 \log n$ times. If at least $\frac{\Gamma}{10}$ many
 | VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts, then output $\tilde{t} = \frac{\hat{t}}{\log n}$.

Lemma 21 (Lemma 8 restated). *There exists an algorithm that given disjoint subsets $A, B, C \subset V(G)$ of any graph G , returns an estimate \hat{t} satisfying*

$$\frac{t(A, B, C)}{64 \log^2 n} \leq \hat{t} \leq 64t(A, B, C) \log^2 n$$

with probability at least $1 - n^{-9}$. Moreover, the query complexity of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(\log^4 n)$.

Proof. Note that an execution of COARSE-ESTIMATE for a particular \hat{t} , repeats VERIFY-ESTIMATE for $\Gamma = 2000 \log n$ times and gives output \hat{t} if at least $\frac{\Gamma}{10}$ many VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts. For a particular \hat{t} , let X_i be the indicator random variable such that $X_i = 1$ if and only if the i^{th} execution of VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts. Also take $X = \sum_{i=1}^{\Gamma} X_i$. COARSE-ESTIMATE gives output \hat{t} if $X > \frac{\Gamma}{10}$.

Consider the execution of COARSE-ESTIMATE for a particular \hat{t} . If $\hat{t} \geq 32t(A, B, C) \log^3 n$, we first show that COARSE-ESTIMATE accepts with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{n^5}$. Recall Lemma 18. If $\hat{t} \geq 64t(A, B, C) \log^3 n$, $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) \leq \frac{1}{20}$ and hence $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq \frac{\Gamma}{20}$. By using Chernoff-Hoeffding's inequality (See Lemma 26 (i) in Appendix B),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X > \frac{\Gamma}{10}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(X > \frac{\Gamma}{20} + \frac{\Gamma}{20}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^{10}}.$$

By using the union bound for all \hat{t} , the probability that COARSE-ESTIMATE outputs some $\tilde{t} = \frac{\hat{t}}{\log n} \geq 16t(A, B, C) \log^2 n$, is at most $\frac{3 \log n}{n^{10}}$.

Now consider the instance when the for loop in COARSE-ESTIMATE executes for a \hat{t} such that $\hat{t} \leq \frac{t(A, B, C)}{32 \log^2 n}$. In this situation, $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) \geq \frac{1}{5}$. So, $\mathbb{E}[X] \geq \frac{\Gamma}{5}$. By using Chernoff-Hoeffding's inequality (Lemma 26 (ii) in Appendix B),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X \leq \frac{\Gamma}{10}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(X < \frac{3\Gamma}{20}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(X < \frac{\Gamma}{5} - \frac{\Gamma}{20}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^{10}}.$$

By using the union bound for all \hat{t} , the probability that COARSE-ESTIMATE outputs some $\tilde{t} = \frac{\hat{t}}{\log n} \leq \frac{t(A, B, C)}{16 \log^2 n}$, is at most $\frac{3 \log n}{n^{10}}$.

Observe that, COARSE-ESTIMATE gives output \tilde{t} that satisfies either $\tilde{t} \geq 64t(A, B, C) \log^2 n$ or $\tilde{t} \leq \frac{t(A, B, C)}{32 \log^2 n}$ is at most $\frac{3 \log n}{n^{10}} + \frac{3 \log n}{n^{10}} \leq \frac{1}{n^9}$.

Putting everything together, COARSE-ESTIMATE gives some \tilde{t} as output with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{n^9}$ satisfying

$$\frac{t(A, B, C)}{64 \log^2 n} \leq \tilde{t} \leq 64t(A, B, C) \log^2 n.$$

From the description of VERIFY-ESTIMATE and COARSE-ESTIMATE, the query complexity of VERIFY-ESTIMATE is $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ and COARSE-ESTIMATE calls VERIFY-ESTIMATE $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$ times. Hence, COARSE-ESTIMATE makes $\mathcal{O}(\log^4 n)$ many queries. \square

6 The final triangle estimation algorithm: Proof of Theorem 1

Now we design an algorithm for $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -multiplicative approximation of $t(G)$. If $\epsilon \leq \frac{\sqrt{d} \log^{9/2} n}{n^{3/4}}$, we query for $t(\{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\})$ for all distinct $a, b, c \in V(G)$ and compute the exact value of $t(G)$. So, we assume that $\epsilon > \frac{\sqrt{d} \log^{9/2} n}{n^{3/4}}$.

We build a data structure such that it maintains two things at any point of time.

- (i) An accumulator ψ for the number of triangles. We initialize $\psi = 0$.
- (ii) A set of tuples $(A_1, B_1, C_1, w_1), \dots, (A_\zeta, B_\zeta, C_\zeta, w_\zeta)$, where tuple (A_i, B_i, C_i) corresponds to the tripartite subgraph $G(A_i, B_i, C_i)$ and w_i is the weight associated to $G(A_i, B_i, C_i)$. Initially, there is no tuple in our data structure.

Before discussing the steps of our algorithm, some remarks about our sparsification lemmas (Lemmas 3 and 7) are in order.

Remark 1. (i) In Lemma 3, $\frac{9k^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k t(V_i, V_{k+i}, V_{2k+i})$ is an $(1 \pm \lambda)$ -approximation of $t(G)$ when

$$\kappa_1 dk^2 \sqrt{t(G)} \log n \leq \lambda t(G) \Leftrightarrow t(G) \geq \frac{\kappa_1^2 d^2 k^4 \log^2 n}{\lambda^2}.$$

In our algorithm, we apply Lemma 3 for $k = 1$. Also, we require $\lambda = \frac{\epsilon}{6 \log n}$. So, Lemma 3 gives useful result in our algorithm when $t(G) \geq \frac{36 \kappa_1^2 d^2 \log^4 n}{\epsilon^2}$.

(ii) In Lemma 7, $k^2 \sum_{i=1}^k t(V_i, V_{k+i}, V_{2k+i})$ is an $(1 \pm \lambda)$ -approximation of $t(A, B, C)$ when

$$\kappa_2 dk^2 \sqrt{t(G)} \log n \leq \lambda t(G) \Leftrightarrow t(G) \geq \frac{\kappa_2^2 d^2 k^4 \log^2 n}{\lambda^2}.$$

In our algorithm, we apply Lemma 7 for $k = 3$. Also, we will require $\theta = \frac{\epsilon}{6 \log n}$. So, the above sparsification lemma gives useful result in our algorithm when $t(A, B, C) \geq \frac{324 \kappa_2^2 d^2 \log^4 n}{\epsilon^2}$.

The algorithm sets a threshold $\tau = \max \left\{ \frac{36 \kappa_1^2 d^2 \log^4 n}{\epsilon^2}, \frac{324 \kappa_2^2 d^2 \log^4 n}{\epsilon^2} \right\}$ and will proceed as follows:

Step 1: (Threshold-Approx-Estimation) Run the algorithm THRESHOLD-APPROX-ESTIMATION, presented in Section 4 with parameters τ and ϵ . By Lemma 4, we either decide $t(G) > \tau$ or we have \hat{t} which is an $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation to $t(G)$. If $t(G) > \tau$, we go to Step 2. Otherwise, we terminate by reporting an estimate \hat{t} . The query complexity of Step 1 is $\mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\tau \log^2 n}{\epsilon^2} \right)$.

Step 2: (General Sparsification) $V(G)$ is COLORED with $[3k]$ for $k = 1$. Let A, B, C be the partition generated by the coloring of $V(G)$. We initialize the data structure by setting $\psi = 0$ and adding the tuple $(A, B, C, 9/2)$ to the data structure. Note that no query is required in this step. The constant $9/2$ is obtained by putting $k = 1$ in Lemma 3.

Step 3: We repeat Steps 4 to 7 until there is no tuple left in the data structure. We maintain an invariant that the number of tuples stored in the data structure, is $\mathcal{O}(N)$, where $N = \frac{\kappa_3 \log^{12} n}{\epsilon^2}$. Note that κ_3 is a constant to be fixed later.

Step 4: (Threshold for Tripartite Graph and Exact Counting in Tripartite Graphs) For each tuple (A, B, C, w) in the data structure, we determine whether $t(A, B, C) \leq \tau$, the threshold, by using the deterministic algorithm corresponding to Lemma 5 with $\mathcal{O}(\tau \log n)$ many queries. If yes, we find the exact value of $t(A, B, C)$ by using the deterministic algorithm corresponding to Lemma 6 with $\mathcal{O}(\tau \log n)$ many queries. Then the algorithm adds $w \cdot t(A, B, C)$ to ψ . We remove all (A, B, C) 's for which the algorithm found that $t(A, B, C)$ is below the threshold. As there are $\mathcal{O}(N)$ many triples at any time, the number of queries made in each iteration of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(\tau \log n \cdot N) = \mathcal{O}(\tau N \log n)$.

Step 5: Note that each tuple (A, B, C, w) in this step is such that $t(A, B, C) > \tau$. Let $(A_1, B_1, C_1, w_1), \dots, (A_r, B_r, C_r, w_r)$ be the set of tuples stored at the current instant. If $r > 10N$ ¹⁰, we go to Step 6. Otherwise, we go to Step 7.

Step 6 (Coarse Estimation and Sampling) For each tuple (A, B, C, w) in the data structure, we find an estimate \tilde{t} such that $\frac{t(A, B, C)}{64 \log^2 n} < \tilde{t} < 64 t(A, B, C) \log^2 n$. This can be done due to Lemma 8 and the number of queries is $\mathcal{O}(\log^4 n)$ per tuple. As the algorithm executes the current step, the number of tuples in our data structure is more than $10N$. We take a sample from the set of tuples such that the sample maintains the required estimate *approximately* by using Lemma 9. We use the algorithm corresponding to Lemma 9 with $\lambda = \frac{\epsilon}{6 \log n}$,

¹⁰The constant 10 is arbitrary. Any absolute constant more than 1 would have been good enough.

$\rho = 64 \log^2 n$ and $\delta = \frac{1}{n^{10}}$ to find a new set of tuples $(A'_1, B'_1, C'_1, w'_1), \dots, (A'_s, B'_s, C'_s, w'_s)$ such that

$$\left| S - \sum_{i=1}^s w'_i t(A', B', C') \right| \leq \lambda S$$

with probability $1 - \frac{1}{n^{10}}$, where $S = \sum_{i=1}^r w_i t(A_i, B_i, C_i)$ and $s = \frac{\kappa_3 \log^{12} n}{\epsilon^2}$ for some constant $\kappa_3 > 0$. This κ_3 is same as the one mentioned in Step 3. Also, note that, $N = s = \frac{\kappa_3 \log^{12} n}{\epsilon^2}$. No query is required to execute the algorithm of Lemma 9. Recall that the number of tuples present at any time is $\mathcal{O}(N)$. Also, the coarse estimation for each tuple can be done by using $\mathcal{O}(\log^4 n)$ many queries (Lemma 8). Hence, the number of queries in this step in each iteration, is $\mathcal{O}(N \cdot \log^4 n)$.

Step 7: (Sparsification for Tripartite Graphs) We partition each of A, B and C into 3 parts uniformly at random. Let $A = U_1 \uplus U_2 \uplus U_3$; $V = V_1 \uplus V_2 \uplus V_3$ and $W = W_1 \uplus W_2 \uplus W_3$. We delete (A, B, C, w) from the data structure and add $(U_i, V_i, W_i, 9w)$ for each $i \in [3]$ to our data structure. Note that no query is made in this step.

Step 8: Report ψ as the estimate for the number of triangles in G , when no tuples are left.

First, we prove that the above algorithm produces a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ multiplicative approximation to $t(G)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ with high probability. Recall the description of Step 1 of the algorithm. If the algorithm terminates in Step 1, then we have a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ approximation to $t(G)$ by Lemma 4. Otherwise, we decide that $t(G) > \tau$ and proceed to Step 2. In Step 2, the algorithm colors $V(G)$ using three colors and incurs a multiplicative error of $1 \pm \epsilon_0$ to $t(G)$, where $\epsilon_0 = \frac{\kappa_1 d \log n}{\sqrt{t(G)}}$. This is because of Remark 1 and our choice of τ . As $t(G) > \tau$ and $n \geq 64$, $\epsilon_0 \leq \lambda = \frac{\epsilon}{6 \log n}$. Note that the algorithm possibly performs Step 4 to Step 7 multiple times, but not more than $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ times, as explained below.

Let $(A_1, B_1, C_1, w_1), \dots, (A_\zeta, B_\zeta, C_\zeta, w_\zeta)$ are the set of tuples present in the data structure currently. We define $\sum_{i=1}^\zeta t(A_i, B_i, C_i)$ as the number of *active* triangles. Let $Active_i$ be the number of triangles that are active in the i^{th} iteration. Note that $Active_1 \leq t(G) \leq n^3$. By Lemma 7 and Step 7, observe that $Active_{i+1} \leq \frac{Active_i}{2}$. So, after $3 \log n$ many iterations there will be at most constant number of active triangles and then we can compute the exact number of active triangles and add it to ψ . In each iteration, there can be a multiplicative error of $1 \pm \lambda$ in Step 5 and $1 \pm \epsilon_0$ due to Step 4. So, using the fact that $\epsilon_0 \leq \lambda$, the multiplicative approximation factor lies between $(1 - \lambda)^{3 \log n + 1}$ and $(1 + \lambda)^{3 \log n + 1}$. As $\lambda = \frac{\epsilon}{6 \log n}$, the required approximation factor is $1 \pm \epsilon$.

The query complexity of Step 1 is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\tau \log n}{\epsilon^2}\right)$. Steps 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 do not make any query to the oracle. The query complexity of Step 4 is $\mathcal{O}(\tau N \log n)$ in each iteration and that of Step 6 is $\mathcal{O}(N \log^4 n)$ in each iteration. The total number of iterations is $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$. Hence, the total query complexity of the algorithm is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon^{-2} \tau \log n + (\tau \log n + \tau N \log n + N \log^4 n) \log n\right) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4} d^2 \log^{18} n).$$

In the above expression, we have put $\tau = \max\left\{\frac{36\kappa_1^2 d^2 \log^4 n}{\epsilon^2}, \frac{324\kappa_3^2 d^2 \log^4 n}{\epsilon^2}\right\}$ and $N = \frac{\kappa_3 \log^{12} n}{\epsilon^2}$.

Now, we bound the failure probability of the algorithm. The algorithm can fail in Step 1 with probability at most $\frac{1}{n^{10}}$, Step 2 with probability at most $\frac{2}{n^4}$, Step 6 with probability at most

$\frac{10\kappa_3 \log^{12} n}{\epsilon^4} \cdot \frac{1}{n^9} + \frac{1}{n^{10}}$, and Step 7 with probability at most $\frac{10\kappa_3 \log^{12} n}{\epsilon^4} \cdot \frac{1}{n^8}$. As the algorithm might execute Steps 4 to 6 for $3 \log n$ times, the total failure probability is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{n^{10}} + \frac{2}{n^4} + 3 \log n \left(\frac{10\kappa_3 \log^{12} n}{\epsilon^4} \cdot \frac{1}{n^8} + \frac{10\kappa_3 \log^{12} n}{\epsilon^4} \cdot \frac{1}{n^9} + \frac{1}{n^{10}} \right) \leq \frac{c}{n^2}.$$

Note that the above inequality holds because $\epsilon > \frac{\sqrt{d} \log^{9/2} n}{n^{3/4}}$ and $n \geq 64$.

We end this Section by restating our main result.

Theorem 22 (Restatement of Theorem 2). *Let G be a graph with $\Delta_E \leq d$, $|V(G)| = n \geq 64$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION can be solved using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{d^2 \log^{18} n}{\epsilon^4}\right)$ many TIS queries with probability at least $1 - \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{n^2}$.*

7 Discussions

In this work, we generalize the framework of Beame et al [BHR⁺18] of EDGE ESTIMATION to solve TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION by using TIS queries. Our algorithm makes $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4} d^2 \log^{18} n)$ many TIS queries and returns a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation to the number of triangles with high probability, where d is the upper bound on Δ_E . The downside of our work is the assumption $\Delta_E \leq d$. Note that Beame et al. [BHR⁺18] had no such assumption. Removing the assumption is non-trivial mainly due to the fact that, unlike the case for edges where two edges can share a common vertex, two triangles can share an edge. Our sparsification algorithm crucially uses the assumption on Δ_E and that remains the main barrier to cross. Recall our sparsification lemma (Lemma 3) and the definition of properly colored triangles (Definition 11). Roughly speaking, our sparsification algorithm first colors the vertices of the graph, then counts the number of properly colored triangles, and finally scales it to have an estimation of the total number of triangles in the graph. Consider the situation when all the triangles in the graph have a common edge e . If e is not properly colored, then we can not keep track of any triangle in G . As a follow up to this paper, Dell et al. [DLM20] and Bhattacharya et al. [BBGM19], independently, generalized our result to c -uniform hypergraphs, where $c \in \mathbb{N}$ is a constant. In Section 1, we already noted that TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION can also be thought of as HYPEREDGE ESTIMATION problem in a 3-uniform hypergraph. Their results showed that the bound on Δ_E is not necessary to solve TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION by using polylogarithmic many TIS queries. The main technical result in both the papers is to come up with a sparsification algorithm that can take care of the case when Δ_E is not necessarily bounded. Note the sparsification algorithms in both the papers are completely different and give different insights.

Bhattacharya et al. [BBGM19] and Dell et al. [DLM20] refer the generalized oracle as GENERALISED PARTITE INDEPENDENT SET (GPIS) oracle and COLORFUL DECISION (CD) oracle, respectively. Bhattacharya et al. [BBGM19] showed that HYPEREDGE ESTIMATION can be solved by using $\mathcal{O}_c(\epsilon^{-4} \log^{5c+5} n)$ many GPIS queries and Dell et al. [DLM20] showed that it can be solved by using $\mathcal{O}_c(\epsilon^{-2} \log^{4c+8} n)$ many CD queries¹¹, with high probability. Substituting $c = 3$ in their algorithm, we can have two different algorithms for TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION. Let us compare our result (stated in Theorem 22) with the results of [BBGM19] and Dell et al. [DLM20] in the context of TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION. If $\Delta_E = o(\log n)$, our algorithm for TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION have less

¹¹The constant in $\mathcal{O}_c(\cdot)$ is a function of c . The result of Bhattacharya et al. is a high probability result. The exact bound in the paper of Dell et al. is $\mathcal{O}_c(\epsilon^{-2} \log^{4c+7} n \log \frac{1}{\delta})$, where the probability of success of their algorithm is $1 - \delta$.

query complexity than that of Bhattacharya et al. [BBGM19] for any given $\epsilon > 0$. Also, when $\Delta_E = o(\log n)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is a fixed constant, our algorithm for TRIANGLE-ESTIMATION have less query complexity than that of Dell et al. [DLM20].

Acknowledgment

Anup Bhattacharya is supported by NPDF fellowship (No. PDF/2018/002072), Government of India. Arijit Ghosh is supported by Ramanujan Fellowship (No. SB/S2/RJN-064/2015), India. We thank the anonymous reviewers of ISAAC 2019 and TOCS to improve the results and presentation of the paper.

A Scenario where Δ_E is bounded

In this Section, we discuss some scenarios where the number of triangles sharing an edge is bounded. An obvious example for such graphs are graphs with bounded degree. We explore some other scenarios.

- (i) Consider a graph $G(P, E)$ such that the vertex set P corresponds to a subset of \mathbb{R}^2 and $(u, v) \in E$ if and only if the distance between u and v is exactly 1. The objective is to compute the number of triples of points from P forming an equilateral triangle having side length 1, that is, the number of triangles in G . Observe that there can be at most two triangles sharing an edge in G , that is, $\Delta_E \leq 2$.
- (ii) Consider a graph $G(P, E)$ such that the vertex set P corresponds to a set of points inside an $N \times N$ square in \mathbb{R}^2 and $(u, v) \in E$ if and only if the distance between u and v is at most 1. The objective is to compute the number of triples of points from P forming a triangle having each side length at most 1, that is, the number of triangles in G . For *large* enough N there can be bounded number of triangles sharing an edge in G with high probability.
- (iii) Consider a graph $G(V, E)$ representing a community sharing information. Each node has some information and two nodes are connected if and only if there exists an edge between the nodes. Nodes increase their information by sharing information among their neighbors in G . Observe that the information of a node is derived by the set of neighbors. So, if two nodes have *large* number of common neighbors in G , then there is no need of an edge between the two nodes. So, the number of triangles on any edge in the graph is bounded. The objective is to compute the number of triangles in G , that is, the number of triples of nodes in G such that each pair of vertices are connected.

In (i) and (ii), TIS oracle can be implemented very efficiently. We can report a TIS query by just running a standard plane sweep algorithm in Computational Geometry that takes $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ running time.

B Some probability results

Proposition 23. *Let X be a random variable. Then $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X^2]}$.*

Lemma 24. ([DP09, Theorem 7.1]). *Let f be a function of n random variables X_1, \dots, X_n such that*

- (i) *Each X_i takes values from a set A_i ,*
- (ii) *$\mathbb{E}[f]$ is bounded, i.e., $0 \leq \mathbb{E}[f] \leq M$,*
- (iii) *\mathcal{B} be any event satisfying the following for each $i \in [n]$.*

$$|\mathbb{E}[f \mid X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_i = a_i, \mathcal{B}^c] - \mathbb{E}[f \mid X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_i = a'_i, \mathcal{B}^c]| \leq c_i.$$

Then for any $\delta \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|f - \mathbb{E}[f]| > \delta + M\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B})) \leq e^{-\delta^2 / \sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2} + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}).$$

Lemma 25 (Hoeffding's inequality [DP09]). Let X_1, \dots, X_n be n independent random variables such that $X_i \in [a_i, b_i]$. Then for $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, the following is true for any $\delta > 0$.

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \delta) \leq 2 \cdot e^{-2\delta^2 / \sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2}.$$

Lemma 26 (Chernoff-Hoeffding bound [DP09]). Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables such that $X_i \in [0, 1]$. For $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $\mu_l \leq \mathbb{E}[X] \leq \mu_h$, the followings hold for any $\delta > 0$.

$$(i) \mathbb{P}(X > \mu_h + \delta) \leq e^{-2\delta^2/n}.$$

$$(ii) \mathbb{P}(X < \mu_l - \delta) \leq e^{-2\delta^2/n}.$$

Lemma 27. ([DP09, Theorem 3.2]). Let X_1, \dots, X_n be random variables such that $a_i \leq X_i \leq b_i$ and $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Let \mathcal{D} be the dependent graph, where $V(\mathcal{D}) = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ and $E(\mathcal{D}) = \{(X_i, X_j) : X_i \text{ and } X_j \text{ are dependent}\}$. Then for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \delta) \leq 2e^{-2\delta^2 / \chi^*(\mathcal{D}) \sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)^2},$$

where $\chi^*(\mathcal{D})$ denotes the fractional chromatic number of \mathcal{D} .

The following lemma directly follows from Lemma 27.

Lemma 28. Let X_1, \dots, X_n be indicator random variables such that there are at most d many X_j 's on which an X_i depends and $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq \delta) \leq 2e^{-2\delta^2 / (d+1)^n}.$$

Lemma 29 (Importance sampling [BHR⁺18]). Let $(D_1, w_1, e_1), \dots, (D_r, w_r, e_r)$ are the given structures and each D_i has an associated weight $c(D_i)$ satisfying

$$(i) w_i, e_i \geq 1, \forall i \in [r];$$

$$(ii) \frac{e_i}{\rho} \leq c(D_i) \leq e_i \rho \text{ for some } \rho > 0 \text{ and all } i \in [r]; \text{ and}$$

$$(iii) \sum_{i=1}^r w_i \cdot c(D_i) \leq M.$$

Note that the exact values $c(D_i)$'s are not known to us. Then there exists an algorithm that finds $(D'_1, w'_1, e'_1), \dots, (D'_s, w'_s, e'_s)$ such that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, all of the above three conditions hold and

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^t w'_i \cdot c(D'_i) - \sum_{i=1}^r w_i \cdot c(D_i) \right| \leq \lambda S,$$

where $S = \sum_{i=1}^r w_i \cdot c(D_i)$ and $\lambda, \delta > 0$. The time complexity of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(r)$ and $s = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\rho^4 \log M (\log \log M + \log \frac{1}{\delta})}{\lambda^2}\right)$.

References

- [ADNK14] Nesreen K Ahmed, Nick Duffield, Jennifer Neville, and Ramana Kompella. Graph Sample and Hold: A Framework for Big-Graph Analytics. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD*, pages 1446–1455, 2014.
- [AGM12] Kook Jin Ahn, Sudipto Guha, and Andrew McGregor. Graph Sketches: Sparsification, Spanners, and Subgraphs. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS*, pages 5–14, 2012.
- [AYZ97] Noga Alon, Raphael Yuster, and Uri Zwick. Finding and Counting Given Length Cycles. *Algorithmica*, 17(3):209–223, 1997.
- [BBGM19] Anup Bhattacharya, Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, and Gopinath Mishra. Hyperedge Estimation using Polylogarithmic Subset Queries. *CoRR*, abs/1908.04196, 2019.
- [BFL⁺06] Luciana S. Buriol, Gereon Frahling, Stefano Leonardi, Alberto Marchetti-Spaccamela, and Christian Sohler. Counting Triangles in Data Streams. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS*, pages 253–262, 2006.
- [BGK⁺18] Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, Sudeshna Kolay, Gopinath Mishra, and Saket Saurabh. Parameterized Query Complexity of Hitting Set Using Stability of Sunflowers. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC*, pages 25:1–25:12, 2018.
- [BHR⁺18] Paul Beame, Sariel Har-Peled, Sivaramakrishnan Natarajan Ramamoorthy, Cyrus Rashtchian, and Makrand Sinha. Edge Estimation with Independent Set Oracles. In *Proceedings of the 9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS*, pages 38:1–38:21, 2018.
- [BPWZ14] Andreas Björklund, Rasmus Pagh, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, and Uri Zwick. Listing Triangles. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming, ICALP*, pages 223–234, 2014.
- [BYKS02] Ziv Bar-Yossef, Ravi Kumar, and D Sivakumar. Reductions in Streaming Algorithms, with an Application to Counting Triangles in Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete algorithms, SODA*, pages 623–632, 2002.
- [CJ17] Graham Cormode and Hossein Jowhari. A second look at counting triangles in graph streams (corrected). *Theoretical Computer Science*, 683:22–30, 2017.
- [CK10] Sung-Soon Choi and Jeong Han Kim. Optimal Query Complexity bounds for Finding Graphs. *Artificial Intelligence*, 174(9-10):551–569, 2010.
- [DL18] Holger Dell and John Lapinskas. Fine-Grained Reductions from Approximate Counting to Decision. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC*, pages 281–288, 2018.

- [DLM20] Holger Dell, John Lapinskas, and Kitty Meeks. Approximately counting and sampling small witnesses using a colourful decision oracle. In Shuchi Chawla, editor, *Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 2201–2211, 2020.
- [DP09] Devdatt P Dubhashi and Alessandro Panconesi. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [ELRS17] Talya Eden, Amit Levi, Dana Ron, and C Seshadhri. Approximately counting triangles in sublinear time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 46(5):1603–1646, 2017.
- [ERS18] Talya Eden, Dana Ron, and C Seshadhri. On Approximating the Number of k -Cliques in Sublinear Time. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC*, pages 722–734, 2018.
- [Fei06] Uriel Feige. On Sums of Independent Random Variables with Unbounded Variance and Estimating the Average Degree in a Graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 35(4):964–984, 2006.
- [GR08] Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008.
- [GRS11] Mira Gonen, Dana Ron, and Yuval Shavitt. Counting Stars and Other Small Subgraphs in Sublinear-Time. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 25(3):1365–1411, 2011.
- [IR78] Alon Itai and Michael Rodeh. Finding a Minimum Circuit in a Graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 7(4):413–423, 1978.
- [Jan04] Svante Janson. Large Deviations for Sums of Partly Dependent Random Variables. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 24(3):234–248, 2004.
- [JG05] Hossein Jowhari and Mohammad Ghodsi. New Streaming Algorithms for Counting Triangles in Graphs. In *Proceedings of the International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, pages 710–716, 2005.
- [JSP13] Madhav Jha, Comandur Seshadhri, and Ali Pinar. A Space Efficient Streaming Algorithm for Triangle Counting using the Birthday Paradox. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD*, pages 589–597, 2013.
- [KMSS12] Daniel M Kane, Kurt Mehlhorn, Thomas Sauerwald, and He Sun. Counting Arbitrary Subgraphs in Data Streams. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming, ICALP*, pages 598–609, 2012.
- [KP17] John Kallaugher and Eric Price. A Hybrid Sampling Scheme for Triangle Counting. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 1778–1797, 2017.
- [PTTW13] A. Pavan, Kanat Tangwongsan, Srikanta Tirthapura, and Kun-Lung Wu. Counting and Sampling Triangles from a Graph Stream. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 6(14):1870–1881, 2013.

- [RSW18] Aviad Rubinfeld, Tselil Schramm, and S. Matthew Weinberg. Computing Exact Minimum Cuts Without Knowing the Graph. In *Proceedings of the 9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS*, pages 39:1–39:16, 2018.
- [RT16] Dana Ron and Gilad Tsur. The Power of an Example: Hidden Set Size Approximation Using Group Queries and Conditional Sampling. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory*, 8(4):15, 2016.
- [Sto83] Larry Stockmeyer. The Complexity of Approximate Counting. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC*, pages 118–126, 1983.
- [Sto85] Larry Stockmeyer. On Approximation Algorithms for #P. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 14(4):849–861, 1985.
- [TPT13] Kanat Tangwongsan, Aduri Pavan, and Srikanta Tirthapura. Parallel Triangle Counting in Massive Streaming Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM*, pages 781–786, 2013.