

On the Cryptanalysis via Approximation of Cryptographic Primitives Relying on the Planted Clique Conjecture

Aubrey Alston (ada2145@columbia.edu), Yanrong Wo (yw2513@columbia.edu)

1 Overview

The core constructive task the field of cryptography is that of creating cryptographic primitives (e.g. private-key encryption, public-key encryption, message authentication codes,...) with provable security guarantees. Where perfect (information theoretic) security is impossible, cryptographers must in practice necessarily rely on the assumption that some problem is hard to solve in nearly every case (a computational hardness assumption). Primitives in these cases generally provide guarantees of the following informal form: assuming that an enemy takes a long time to solve some problem Y , a system using X is secure.

In general, the computational hardness assumptions used in the wild are derived from problems for which many have tried and failed to provide polynomial-time solutions; some of the most common examples include integer factorization, quadratic residuosity, the discrete log problem, and on. At best, our reliance on these problems nests security in the hope that these specific, at times disparate problems will continue to elude researchers: by and large, none of these assumptions are supported by a well-founded general description of hardness as we would see in e.g. complexity theory. As such, one of the so-called ‘holy grails’ of cryptography is to instead vest the hopes for security in a single well-founded, well-known, and well-studied assumption, such as the assumption that $P \neq NP$.

While the reliable use of some NP-complete problem in tandem with the assumption that $P \neq NP$ has eluded cryptographers due to lack of results showing average-case hardness, one alternative which has been explored is reliance on assumptions that solving certain NP-hard optimization problems within some degree of accuracy is computationally difficult in specific instance classes. In this work, we explore one such example of this effort, [6], which attempts to provide cryptographic primitives by relying on the planted clique conjecture. More specifically, we (1) present [6] in summary, (2) propose a simple cryptanalytic method for the primitives in [6] using approximation algorithms, and (3) consider the feasibility of such cryptanalysis in the context of existing approximation algorithms for the maximum clique problem. We ultimately find that recent advances in the area of combinatoric approximation algorithms fatally hinders the prospect of any serious application of the suggested constructions.¹

Contents

1	Overview	1
2	Hiding Cliques for Cryptographic Security: Attempted Cryptography from the Planted Clique Conjecture	2
3	A Cryptanalytic Method using Approximation	3
4	Existing Approximation Algorithms	5
4.1	Methods for Planted Cliques in Random Graphs	5
4.1.1	The Greedy Approach	5

¹This report was produced as a final project report for the Analysis of Algorithms II course at Columbia University.

4.1.2	The Metropolis Process	6
4.1.3	Finding Cliques using Spectral Methods	8
4.1.4	A Probabilistic Combinatorial Method	10
4.1.5	Recent work: Sum-of-squares Optimization	12
4.2	Methods for General Graphs	12
4.2.1	Feige’s Algorithm: The State of the Art	12
5	Applying the Cryptanalytic Method	12
5.1	Limits of Analysis given Existing Approximation Algorithms	12
5.2	Consequences for the Suggested Primitives	12
6	Conclusion	12

2 Hiding Cliques for Cryptographic Security: Attempted Cryptography from the Planted Clique Conjecture

In “Hiding Cliques for Cryptographic Security” [6], Juels and Peinado attempt to demonstrate a manner in which the problem of finding large cliques in random graphs may be used to construct cryptographic primitives. Specifically, the authors note that it is conjectured that no probabilistic polynomial time algorithm exists which is able to find cliques of size $\geq (1 + \epsilon) \log_2 n$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ in random graphs with constant edge probability $\frac{1}{2}$ and attempt to develop cryptographic primitives on the assumption that this conjecture is true.

The authors begin with a general description of ‘hard’ graph problems from the perspective of a standard variation of the clique problem in undirected graphs: given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k < |V|$, return a complete subgraph of G a number of nodes as close as possible to k . Following a discussion of the need for average-case hardness in cryptography, the authors then introduce the context of their own contribution: where they acknowledge the previously stated conjecture regarding the ability to find ‘large’ cliques in random graphs, the authors show that the problem of finding ‘large’ cliques in random graphs with a constant number of artificially placed cliques (of size $1 + \epsilon$, $\forall \epsilon, 1 \geq \epsilon > 0$) is just as hard as the truly random case². This contribution thereby admits a probabilistic method whereby hard instances of the clique problem may be generated and then used as the basis of cryptographic primitives.

The authors do note that the actual security yielded by a naive application of this conjecture is weak. In particular, the authors note that the largest natural clique size in a random graph with edge probability $\frac{1}{2}$ is $2 \log_2 n$. As such, the brute-force approach needs only to iterate through all $\binom{n}{2 \log_2 n} \in 2^{O(\log^2 n)}$ $2 \log_2 n$ -node subsets of V and therefore takes time pseudopolynomial in n ; attacks relying on this brute-force approach may therefore be entirely practical. The authors claim that this is a non-issue by virtue of the fact the complexity of the brute-force approach may be increased by increasing edge probability p from $\frac{1}{2}$ (and thus the size of the largest clique); they justify this statement by further claiming that their main result holds for general edge probabilities.

Following a discussion of related work largely restricted to the history of what we now know as the planted clique conjecture, the authors present a proof of their main result which we summarize. In the following proof sketch, the authors denote by p the distribution $\mathcal{G}_{n,1/2}$ from the Erdos-Renyi random graph model (graphs consisting of n nodes where each edge is present with probability $\frac{1}{2}$); they denote by p'_k the distribution of graphs obtained by sampling from p and uniformly selecting a subgraph of k nodes to make complete.

²What the authors rely on is simply a restatement of the planted clique conjecture—we discuss this in greater detail in a later section.

Main theorem (T1) For $k \leq (2 - \delta) \log_2 n$ and $2 \geq \delta > 0$, if there exists an algorithm A which finds cliques of size $(1 + \epsilon) \log_2 n$ with probability $\frac{1}{q(n)}$ (where $q(n)$ is a polynomial) in graphs drawn from p'_k , A also finds cliques of size $(1 + \epsilon) \log_2 n$ with probability $\frac{1}{q'(n)}$ in graphs drawn from p for some polynomial $q'(n)$.

Proof of T1 In their proof, given graph G , the authors denote by $C_k(G)$ the number of cliques of size k in G . For G drawn from some distribution D , $C_k(G)$ is a random variable, and the authors refer to its expectation by E_k .

Because this result is not strictly crucial with respect to our analysis (our analysis will ultimately be indifferent to it), we simply provide a high-level sketch of the proof. The first logical step in the proof is to show that, when $C_k(G \sim p'_k)$ is not too far from $E_k(G \sim p'_k)$, the probability of seeing G when drawing inputs from p'_k is negligibly far from that of seeing G when drawing from p . The next logical step is to prove that the variance of $C_k(G \sim p'_k)$ is satisfactorily small, thereby yielding that only a negligible fraction of graphs from the support of p'_k will have $C_k(G \sim p'_k)$ far from $E_k(G \sim p'_k)$. This allows them to conclude that there exists only a negligible fraction Δ of the support for which $p(G)$ and $p'_k(G)$ differ non-negligibly. Thus for the non-negligible $1 - \Delta$ -fraction of inputs which are close, we would expect a non-negligible difference in correctness when running A on inputs drawn from this subset of the support according to p (and thus a non-negligible difference in correctness overall). \square .

The authors further claim (but do not prove) that T1 holds for general edge probabilities $p > \frac{1}{2}$. Stated equivalently, they claim that the following also holds: For $k \leq (2 - \delta) \log_{\frac{1}{p}} n$ and $2 \geq \delta > 0$, if there exists an algorithm A which finds cliques of size $(1 + \epsilon) \log_{\frac{1}{p}} n$ with probability $\frac{1}{q(n)}$ (where $q(n)$ is a polynomial) in graphs drawn from p'_k , A also finds cliques of size $(1 + \epsilon) \log_{\frac{1}{p}} n$ with probability $\frac{1}{q'(n)}$ in graphs drawn from p for some polynomial $q'(n)$.

After proving their primary result, the authors conclude the article by presenting a means of constructing cryptographic primitives using the assumption that there does not exist a probabilistic polynomial time algorithm able to find cliques of size $(1 + \epsilon) \log_{\frac{1}{p}} n$ in graphs drawn from $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$. Of the primitives described, we focus our attention on their design of a secure **one-way function**³. We reproduce the OWF described below:

Algorithm 1 OWF from the Planted Clique Problem

- 1: **procedure** $f_{n,p,k}(G = (V, E) \mid |V| = n \wedge G \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,p}, K \subseteq V \mid |K| = k \in [\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n, 2 \log_{\frac{1}{p}} n])$
 - 2: Connect all vertices in K , obtaining modified graph G' .
 - 3: **return** G'
 - 4: **end procedure**
-

(In the formal sense of a cryptographic one-way function, the first argument to f would technically need to be an advice string s sampling $G \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ when s is sampled uniformly. (So it may be the case that $|s| \geq n$.)

3 A Cryptanalytic Method using Approximation

In this section, we (a) qualify how and under what specific assumptions the function f proposed by Juels and Peinado is a cryptographic one-way function and (b) suggest a simple means of cryptanalysis of f using nothing more than approximation algorithms.

³All of the constructions provided by the authors are provided in passing and without complete proof, but we focus on the OWF construction because it is arguably more versatile, able to be itself applied to obtain other primitives (e.g. symmetric-key encryption using a Feistel network). (Furthermore, the other constructions they give are simply extensions of the OWF.)

Formally, a cryptographic **one-way function** is a function g which is (1) computable in polynomial time but (2) for which no probabilistic polynomial-time adversary A (modeled as a randomized algorithm with source of randomness r) is able to compute a pseudo-inverse of g except with negligible probability. In other words,

$$\forall \text{p.p.tm } A, \forall d > 0, \Pr_r[g(A(r, g(x))) = g(x)] < n^{-d}$$

In the specific case of the candidate one-way function $f_{n,p,k}$ suggested by Juels and Peinado, we see that condition (1) is satisfied in that the operation of connecting k vertices in an n -node graph may be trivially performed in polynomial time. With respect to condition (2), consider the following modification to the computational variant of the *planted clique conjecture* as given in [2]:

1. Draw an Erdos-Renyi random graph G from the distribution $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ for $p \geq \frac{1}{2}$.
2. Flip a coin to determine whether to modify G . If heads, connect a random subset of vertices of size $k \in [\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n, 2\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n]$ in G ; otherwise, leave G as-is.
3. Return G .

The problem in this setting is, as usual, to find a clique in G of size k or output \emptyset if none exists.

We claim now that $f_{n,p,k}$ satisfies condition (2) of a one-way function under the assumption that the computational planted clique problem is hard⁴ in $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ and for k in the range $k \in [\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n, 2\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n]$. To show this, say that there exists a p.p.tm adversary A which succeeds against $f_{n,p,k}$ with non-negligible probability. In the planted clique setting, say that we flip heads in the second step. Since the graph G returned in the third step and the output of $f_{n,p,k}$ are both graphs drawn from $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with a clique of size $k \in [\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n, 2\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n]$ embedded, A will with high probability be able to recover a clique of size k from the former because it is able to do so from the latter.

For A which only ever returns cliques of size k or the empty set, we thus see that A succeeds in the planted clique setting with probability greater than or equal to half the probability it does so against $f_{n,p,k}$ as a one-way function, therefore non-negligibly by our choice of A . By the contrapositive of this conclusion, we have that $f_{n,p,k}$ is a secure one-way function under the assumption that the computational planted clique problem is hard in $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ and for k in the range $k \in [\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n, 2\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n]$.

Cryptanalysis through Approximation We have so far established that the one-way function of Juels and Peinado is secure under the assumption that that the computational planted clique problem is hard in $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ and for k in the range $k \in [\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n, 2\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n]$. It follows directly, however, that the inverse of this statement is also true: namely, if the computational planted clique problem can be solved in $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ and for k in the range $k \in [\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n, 2\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n]$ with high probability, then $f_{n,p,k}$ is not secure. We use this fact as a basis for cryptanalysis of $f_{n,p,k}$.

Say that we have an algorithm B which is able to solve the computational planted clique problem in $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ for $k \in [\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n, 2\log_{\frac{1}{p}} n]$. The output of $f_{n,p,k}(\cdot)$ is a graph drawn from $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with a clique of size k embedded: since this corresponds to the heads case of the planted clique setting, $B(G)$ should will be able to output a clique C of size k with high probability. This clique C satisfies $f_{n,p,k}(G, B(G) = C) = f_{n,p,k}(\cdot)$, and so the existence of B allows us to cryptanalytically invert $f_{n,p,k}$ in a direct manner.

Extending the above analysis, we thus propose to cryptanalyze any practical implementation or use of $f_{n,p,k}$ as follows:

1. Compile a finite, fixed set of algorithms $[A]$ approximating the maximum clique problem in graphs drawn from $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$.

⁴as in it cannot be solved except with negligible probability by p.p.tm algorithms

2. On obtaining an evaluation of $f_{n,p,k}(\cdot) = G'$, attempt to invert it by running $A(G)$ for all $A \in [A]$, returning the largest clique returned over all algorithms.

This method simply hedges cryptanalysis on the capabilities of approximation algorithms for the maximum clique problem in random graphs: if there exists an approximation algorithm which finds large cliques with high probability for some parameterization of $f_{n,p,k}$, we may succeed in inverting the function (or breaking any primitive which might be based on $f_{n,p,k}$) as we previously illustrated. One might appreciate, however, that cryptanalysis frees us from being tied to relying only on algorithms which require only polynomial time; a valid cryptanalytic attack may be conducted, for example, by a practical pseudo-polynomial algorithm which runs in parallel. As such, $[A]$ may include anything from standard polynomial-time approximation algorithms to a clever variant of a brute-force approach.

In the rest of this report, we explore existing approximation algorithms to determine the extent to which such cryptanalysis is possible given our current capabilities. We then use the information we uncover during this exploration to discuss the implications on methods of constructing cryptographic primitives with planted cliques in the manner of [6].

4 Existing Approximation Algorithms

We now shift our focus to survey existing strategies for searching for cliques in graphs. We split this survey into two parts: (1) an exploration of methods constructed specifically for random graphs and (2) an exploration of the state-of-the-art with respect to approximation of the maximum clique problem.

4.1 Methods for Planted Cliques in Random Graphs

4.1.1 The Greedy Approach

One of the first formulations of the planted clique problem was given by Karp in [7]. In his exposition, Karp gave a probabilistic analysis of a natural greedy approach to searching for cliques in random graphs. This method in particular is interesting because of its simplicity and because more sophisticated methods achieve only comparable performance [5]. We reproduce the basic form of this algorithm below:

Algorithm 2 Greedy Clique Search

```

1: procedure  $f_{n,p,k}(G = (V, E) \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,p})$ 
2:   Choose a random vertex  $v \in V$ .
3:   Set  $T$  to be the subgraph induced by  $v$  and its neighborhood in  $G$ .
4:   Set  $C = \{v\}$ 
5:   while  $T$  contains nodes not in  $C$  do
6:     Choose a random vertex  $u \in T$ .
7:     Add  $u$  to  $C$ .
8:     Set  $T'$  to be the subgraph induced by  $u$  and its neighborhood in  $T$ .
9:     Set  $T = T'$ .
10:  end while
11:  return  $C$ 
12: end procedure

```

Space and Time It may be seen trivially that this algorithm requires polynomial time and space (polynomial with respect to n). There is one iteration per node in the set C returned, of size at most n , and the operation to update T may be performed naively in time $O(n)$ assuming $O(1)$ edge membership lookup, so the entire algorithm completes in time $O(n^2)$ (this is by no means tight). Similarly, the algorithm needs only to store a constant number of copies of subgraphs of G , and so space space required is linear in the size of the original input.

Analysis of Algorithms II Project Report, Spring 2017

Aubrey Alston (ada2145@columbia.edu), Yanrong Wo (yw2513@columbia.edu)

Approximation Performance Karp gives a fairly direct probabilistic analysis which reveals that the given greedy algorithm will find a clique of size $(1 + o(1)) \log_2 \frac{1}{p} n$ in expectation.

Note first in the greedy algorithm that, at any iteration C is a subset of V and that T is the subgraph of G induced by C and all nodes in G which are adjacent to all nodes in C . Note also that for each iteration in which the algorithm does not terminate C grows by 1. Since the algorithm only ever chooses nodes adjacent to all of C , C is a clique of size i during iteration i .

Draw a graph $G = (V, E)$ from $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$. Now fix an arbitrary subset $S_i \subseteq V$ of V , $|S_i| = i \leq n$; for our purposes, say S_i is C at the i th iteration of the greedy algorithm. For all $u \in V \setminus S_i$, define an indicator random variable N_u which is 1 if and only if u is adjacent to all nodes in S_i . Because edge probabilities are disjoint, we know $\mathbb{E}[N_u] = \Pr[N_u] = p^i$ for all u ; by linearity of expectation, we therefore may obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{u \in V \setminus S_i} N_u\right] = (n - i)p^i$$

As a result, the earliest iteration i such that the only nodes in T are the nodes in C (there are no more nodes adjacent to all of C) in expectation satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{u \in V \setminus S_i} N_u] = (n - i)p^i = 0$, so $i = (1 + o(1)) \log_2 \frac{1}{p} n$. During this iteration, C is a clique of size i , and so, in expectation, the algorithm will return a clique of this size.

A further note which is perhaps more useful to our analysis than a general exploration of the planted clique problem is this: the variance in the number of nodes adjacent to all of C in iteration i obeys $\text{Var}[\sum_{u \in V \setminus S_i} N_u] = (n - i)(p^i)(1 - p^i)$ because the indicators N_u are not correlated and because they obey a Bernoulli distribution. Thus, since i brings $(n - i)p^i$ close to 0, it will likewise bring $(n - i)p^i(1 - p^i)$ close to 0, meaning that there is little variance in the size of the clique returned by this greedy algorithm.

4.1.2 The Metropolis Process

In [5], Jerrum explores a method of applying a simplified form of simulated annealing called the Metropolis process to the planted clique problem. He ultimately finds that, though the method is more sophisticated, it requires super-polynomial time in order to find cliques larger than those found by greedy methods like the one discussed in the previous section.

Jerrum begins by describing what he calls the Metropolis process on cliques in a graph $G = (V, E)$:

1. At the current instant, let a clique K be the ‘state’ of our system.
2. Metropolis step:
 - (a) Choose a node v uniformly at random from V .
 - (b) If $v \notin K$ but v is adjacent to all of K , add it to K .
 - (c) If $v \in K$, remove v from K with probability λ^{-1} , where λ is the parameter of the Metropolis process.

The key difference between the Metropolis algorithm and a standard greedy algorithm is the $\lambda \geq 1$ temperature parameter: informally, it ‘tunes’ the willingness of the algorithm to backtrack from local optima. Jerrum also foreshadows properties of the method to be shown, noting the following properties of the process which make it seem like a plausible solution to the planted clique problem:

- The Metropolis process leads to an equilibrium distribution in which the probability of the current state being any particular clique K is proportional to $\lambda^{|K|}$: in this way, the algorithm prefers larger cliques to smaller ones.
- While increasing the λ parameter to emphasize this difference does not come without a time trade-off, λ doesn’t need to be excessively large.

The hope for the Metropolis process rests wholly in the desire for quick convergence; the author notes that this work dashes this hope, showing that the process takes times superpolynomial in n to reach a state corresponding to a clique of size $(1 + \epsilon) \log_2 n$ *regardless* of the choice of temperature λ .

We now summarize the core analysis given by Jerrum. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph on n nodes, and choose a temperature parameter $\lambda \geq 1$. The Metropolis process on G is discussed as a Markov chain (G, λ) in which the state space Ω is the set of all cliques within G and where there are transitions between states if and only if $|K \Delta K'| \leq 1^5$. The transition probabilities $K \Rightarrow K'$ in this chain are given by the following expression:

$$p(K, K') = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} & |K \Delta K'| \leq 1 \wedge K \subseteq K' \\ \frac{1}{\lambda n} & |K \Delta K'| \leq 1 \wedge K' \subseteq K \\ 1 - \sum_{K' \neq K} p(K, K') & K = K' \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Following this description of the process, Jerrum then delegates to elementary results in stochastic models to demonstrate that (G, λ) has a unique stationary distribution $\pi(K) = \lambda^{|K|} \frac{1}{\sum_{K \in \Omega} \lambda^{|K|}}$.

Main result: A Lower Bound Argument The main result of this work is stated formally as follows: for $G \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ and every $\lambda \geq 1$, there exists an initial state from which the expected time for the Metropolis process to reach a clique of size at least $(1 + \epsilon) \log_2 n$ exceeds $n^{\Omega(\log_2 n)}$.

In order to prove this theorem, the author first introduces the notion of a *m-gateway*, which is simply a clique from which there exists a path with non-zero transition probabilities to a clique of size m in the Metropolis process. The author then states and proves a lemma which establishes that for $k = (1 + \frac{2}{3}\epsilon) \log_2 n$, the proportion of k -cliques which are $m = (1 + \epsilon) \log_2 n$ -gateways is less than $n^{-\Omega(\log_2 n)}$. Logically, the purpose of this lemma within the proof is to show that $(1 + \epsilon)$ -cliques are generally inaccessible because m -gateway k -cliques are sparse (and, for the chosen m , the algorithm must pass through some k -clique).

The proof of the main theorem then applies this lemma in a straightforward manner. Given (G, λ) , and fixing k and m as in the lemma, we take C as the set of k -cliques which are also m gateways. Using C , we then obtain a partition (S, \bar{S}) such that S is the set of states that may be reached from the empty clique (initial state of the process) without passing through C . The proof then uses lemma 1 and the fact that any m -clique must pass through a k -clique to show that the small size of C constricts paths from S to \bar{S} according to the superpolynomial bound of $n^{-\Omega(\log_2 n)}$. The authors then demonstrate formally that the expected time (number of iterations) until the first entrance into \bar{S} is itself therefore bounded from below by $n^{-\Omega(\log_2 n)}$, thus that there must necessarily exist an initial state which takes as long (and thus at least as long to reach an $m = (1 + \epsilon) \log_2 n$ -clique located in \bar{S}).

Extensions: Larger Cliques and Varying Edge Densities Jerrum also extends his main result to encompass cases corresponding to (a) the presence of large cliques and (b) the case where the edge probability is varied. The primary argument follows the same pattern as the proof of the main theorem, and he is able to conclude in both cases that the superpolynomial bound holds. More specifically, he shows the following:

- For any $G \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ containing a clique of size n^β , $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$ and every $\lambda \geq 1$, there exists an initial state from which the expected time for the Metropolis process takes time $n^{\Omega(\log_2 n)}$ to find a clique of size $(1 + \epsilon) \log_2 n$.
- For any $G \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$, there exists an initial state from which the expected time for the Metropolis process takes time $n^{\Omega(\log \frac{1}{p} n)}$ to find a clique of size $(1 + \epsilon) \log \frac{1}{p} n$.

⁵Here, Δ means symmetric set difference.

As we have seen thus far, there seems to be a ‘hard roof’ with respect to the size of cliques found in strictly polynomial time by these methods hovering around $(1 + o(1)) \log_{1/p} n$. While the variance admitted by the greedy approach does not offer much leeway, a key observation by Jerrum is that the theorems presented say something only about the absolute worst case of the Metropolis algorithm. This point will become especially relevant in section 5.

4.1.3 Finding Cliques using Spectral Methods

In [1] authors Alon et. al. present a method of finding cliques of size $k > cn^{0.5}$ in graphs drawn from $\mathcal{G}_{n,1/2}$ for all fixed $c > 0$ using spectral methods. Beginning with a discussion of intractability results for the maximum clique problem in general graphs, the authors introduce motivation for studying large cliques planted in graphs from $\mathcal{G}_{n,1/2}$ in that Jerrum [5] and others conjecture the hardness of finding the maximum clique in graphs from $\mathcal{G}_{n,1/2}$ containing only natural cliques.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph drawn from $\mathcal{G}_{n,1/2}$. Let A be the adjacency matrix of G : $A_{u,v} = 1$ if and only if $(u, v) \in E$. Because A is symmetric, it has real-valued eigenvalues $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ and an associated orthonormal basis of eigenvectors v_1, \dots, v_n (where n is the number of nodes in G). The authors initially present their method for c fixed to 10 ($k > 10\sqrt{n}$); the key observation driving the algorithm is that, with high probability, a large portion of the hidden clique will be represented in the second eigenvector, v_2 . We reproduce the method below:

1. Compute the the second eigenvector, v_2 , of A using any standard polynomial-time method.
2. Sort V in decreasing order of absolute value in v_2 . Take W as the first k nodes in this order. Let $Q \subset V$ be the set of nodes in V adjacent to at least $3k/4$ nodes in W .
3. Return Q .

That this algorithm returns in polynomial time is immediate. There are many polynomial-time algorithms satisfactory for the first step, and the last two may be implemented as a simple sort/iterate procedure. In order to prove that the above algorithm returns a clique of size k , the authors prove some spectral properties of G ; we provide an outline of the proof method and summarize the proofs given where appropriate. The authors first prove the following:

Proposition 2.1 Let $G \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ be a random graph; embed a clique of size $k = o(n)$. Then almost surely the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix A satisfy that (i) $\lambda_1 \geq (\frac{1}{2} + o(1))n$ and (ii) $\lambda_i \leq (1 + o(1))\sqrt{n}$ for all $i \geq 3$.

To prove (i), the authors use the common method of viewing λ_1 with respect to the Rayleigh quotient: $\lambda_1 = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{x^T A x}{x^T x}$. Taking x to be the vector of all 1s, we see thus that λ_1 is at least the average degree of nodes in G . Since the degrees of G may be described by a Binomial distribution determined by edge probability, we know that the average degree in G is at least $(1/2 + o(1))n$ almost surely.

To prove (ii), the authors rely on the proven result that $\max_{i \geq 2} |\lambda_i| \leq \sqrt{m} + O(\sqrt{m}^{1/3} \log m)$ for $G' \sim \mathcal{G}_{m,1/2}$ with high probability. In order to bound the eigenvalues of G , the authors decompose A as the union of two random graphs: $G_2 \sim \mathcal{G}_{k,1/2}$ and $G_1 = G - G_2$. Trivially, G_1 now obeys $\mathcal{G}_{n,1/2}$. This then allows the authors to decompose the adjacency matrix A as a union of two adjacency matrices; taking u_1 as the largest eigenvector of one and u_2 as the largest of the other, the largest Rayleigh quotient (over the subspace of vectors orthogonal to both u_1 and u_2) will with high probability be $\leq (1 + o(1))\sqrt{n}$ by the aforementioned existing result.

The rest of the proof rests on the crucial point to be made by the analysis that the eigenvector v_2 of A has the majority of its weight on the large clique in G . To show this point, the authors define a vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $z_i = n - k$ if $i \leq k$ and $-k$ otherwise. Towards showing that the weight of v_2 rests in the clique of size k , the next step in the proof is to show the following proposition to be true:

Proposition 2.3 There exists a small vector δ (specifically having l_2 -norm less than $\frac{1}{60}$ th of that of z) such that $z - \delta$ is collinear with v_2 .

The proof of this proposition makes use of the following lemma: with high probability,

$$\|(A - (k/2)I)z\|^2 \leq (1/4 + o(1))n^3k$$

While we will not reproduce the proof of this lemma in great detail, it follows fairly directly. In order to prove it, one must simply decompose the coordinates of $(A - (k/2)I)z$ as random variables; the claim of the lemma then follows by applying standard Binomial estimates.

The truth of the proposition follows from this lemma using standard spectral decomposition. Decompose z as a linear combination of the vectors of the orthonormal eigenbasis of A : $z = c_1v_1 + \dots + c_nv_n$. Likewise, take $\delta = c_1v_1 + c_3v_3 + \dots + c_nv_n$. Note that then $(A - (k/2)I)z = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(\lambda_i - (k/2))v_i$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \|(A - (k/2)I)z\| &= \sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2(\lambda_i - (k/2))^2 \\ &\geq (1 + o(1))\left(\frac{k}{2} - \sqrt{n}\right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

(Prop 2.1) (R1)

Using this result, the authors then show that $\|\delta\|^2$ is less than $\frac{1}{60}\|z\|^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta\|^2 &= \sum_{i \neq 2}^n c_i^2 \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{n^3k}{(k - 2\sqrt{n})^2} \end{aligned}$$

(Rearranging R1; applying lemma)

$$< \frac{1}{60}kn(n - k) = \frac{1}{60}\|z\|^2$$

Within the larger scope of the analysis of this algorithm, proposition 2.3 uses proposition 2.1 to obtain that there exists a vector $z - \delta = c_2v_2$ collinear with v_2 which is ‘heavy’ in k dimensions. The authors conclude the proof of correctness by establishing the following two claims:

1. At least $\frac{5}{6}$ of the k largest coordinates of v_2 correspond to vertices of the clique. The authors argue that, because $\|\delta\|^2 \leq (1/60)\|z\|^2$, there are at most $k/6$ coordinates of δ which are greater than $n/3$ in absolute value. By the structure of z , then, the authors are able to conclude that at least $k - d_1$ of the first k coordinates have value greater than $n/2$ and at least $n - k - d_2$ of the last $(n - k)$ coordinates have value at most $n/2$, where $d_1 + d_2 \leq k/6$. The authors claim that this then implies the first statement of this item. ⁶
2. Every vertex outside of the clique is almost surely adjacent to less than $3k/4$ vertices of W . The authors establish this through a probabilistic argument: owing to edge probability $\frac{1}{2}$, vertices outside of the clique are adjacent to at most $(1 + o(1))k/2$ vertices of the clique. Since W also contains at most $1/6$ nodes not in the clique, we may bound the maximum number of neighbors in W of any non-clique node by $(1 + o(1))k/2 + k/6 < \frac{3}{4}k$.

⁶We note that this indeed follows if the first k coordinates correspond to the elements in the k clique, which the authors haven’t explicitly established. The argument certainly holds if we arbitrate that the first k nodes in the graph are the planted clique, and it should hold under permutation of vertices; the authors do not discuss this, but it is only a minor point.

Analysis of Algorithms II Project Report, Spring 2017

Aubrey Alston (ada2145@columbia.edu), Yanrong Wo (yw2513@columbia.edu)

Together, these two claims conclude the proof of correctness of the algorithm. This guarantees (with high probability) by (2) that the algorithm chooses only vertices of the clique and by (1) that the algorithm takes all vertices of the clique.

The final section of [1] gives a method of extending the original algorithm in order to find cliques of size $c\sqrt{n}$ for fixed c . The main observations leading to this improvement are the following:

- By taking the subgraph induced by the neighborhood of a subset of vertices S of size s , $G[S]$, we reduce the size of the graph to almost certainly contain only $(1 + o(1))n/2^s$ nodes.
- When the subgraph is induced by a subset of nodes S is also a subset of the largest clique in the graph, the ratio of the clique size to the number of the nodes in the graph increases.

Noting these, the authors conclude by presenting the following polynomial-time method which extends their original algorithm:

1. Calculate $s = 2 \log_2 10/c + 2$.
2. For all subsets $S \subset V$ of size s
 - (a) Calculate G' as the subgraph induced by S and nodes in the intersection of neighborhoods of all nodes in S .
 - (b) Run the original algorithm on G' , obtaining a set Q_S .
 - (c) If $Q_S \cup S$ is of size k , return $Q_S \cup S$.
3. Return \emptyset .

4.1.4 A Probabilistic Combinatorial Method

Since the publication of [1], other authors have found alternative approaches which allow for the recovery of cliques of size $c\sqrt{n}$ in random graphs. One example is [4], in which Feige describes another method achieving the same bound as [1] using semi-definite programming.

Another example which we will explore in greater detail in this section is a method given by Dekel et. al. in [3]. This method is of particular interest to us because (a) it achieves performance identical to that achieved in [1], (b) it relies on a simple randomized combinatorial strategy, and (c) it is easily extended to apply to random graphs with edge probability other than $\frac{1}{2}$.

At a high level, for a graph $G \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with a hidden clique of size k , the algorithm proposed by Dekel et. al. is parameterized by $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\beta > 0$ and proceeds in three stages:

1. Iteratively find subgraphs of the input graph G : $G = G_0 \subset G_1 \subset \dots$. In particular, given G_i , G_{i+1} is defined as follows: pick a random subset of vertices S_i from G_i which contains each vertex with probability α . Define \bar{V}_i to be the set of vertices in G_i that are not in S_i but have at least $\frac{1}{2}|S_i| + \beta \frac{\sqrt{|S_i|}}{2}$ neighbors in S_i . Intuitively, this process grows the relative size of the hidden clique with each iteration; in general, this process needs to be repeated a logarithmic number t times.
2. Search for \bar{K} , the subset of the hidden clique contained in G_t . This is done by computing an estimate of the size of \bar{K} , k_t , and taking \bar{K} as the set of vertices in G_t with degree at least $\frac{1}{2}|V(G_t)| + \frac{1}{4}k_t$.
3. Find the rest of the nodes of K using \bar{K} . This is done by taking K' as the set containing \bar{K} and all of its common neighbors. K^* is taken as the set of the k largest-degree vertices in the subgraph of G induced by K' . K^* is the set returned by the algorithm as the hidden clique.

Analysis of Algorithms II Project Report, Spring 2017

Aubrey Alston (ada2145@columbia.edu), Yanrong Wo (yw2513@columbia.edu)

The main result that the authors prove about this algorithm is the following:

Theorem For $c > c_0$, there exist parameters α and β such that, for $G \sim \mathcal{G}_{n,1/2}$ with a hidden clique of size $c\sqrt{n}$, the probability that $K^*(G, \alpha, \beta)$ is the hidden clique is at least $1 - e^{-\Theta(n^{\epsilon_0})}$ where ϵ_0 is a function of c .

We provide a sketch of the proof given by the authors in [3].

With respect to phase (1), the authors consider an iteration i of the subgraph-finding procedure to be successful if the number of nodes in G_i and the number of nodes of the hidden clique in G_i are each respectively close to their expected value; the authors show that this is the case with high probability. Specifically, the authors show that, in every iteration, the graph G_i has the same distribution as random graphs $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{n}_i, 1/2}$ with cliques of size \bar{k}_i embedded (and where \bar{n}_i and \bar{k}_i are the respective expected values). This allows the authors to conclude that the per-iteration failure probability is small enough to take a union bound over all t iterations and obtain a high success probability.

With respect to phase (2), the authors show that the set \bar{K} is with high probability a subset of the hidden clique. They do this by proving two key lemmas. The first of these lemmas states that, for random graphs with embedded cliques of a certain size, there exist natural numbers D_1 and D_2 such that all non-clique nodes have degree less than or equal to D_1 and all clique nodes have degree greater than or equal to D_2 . The second of these lemmas uses the previous to state that, if phase (1) completed without failure (which occurs with high probability due to their proof of the properties of phase (1)), the nodes of the hidden clique are distinguishable via D_1 and D_2 and thus \bar{K} is with high probability a subset of the original hidden clique.

With respect to phase (3), the authors give a more general result that the entire hidden clique may be revealed given partial information in the form of a subset of the hidden clique. In particular, the authors show that the entire hidden clique may be revealed if the size of the hidden clique k and the size of the partial clique revealed s has the following properties:

- $k \in O(\log n \log \log n)$ and $s \geq (1 + \epsilon) \log n$
- or $k \in \omega(\log n \log \log n)$ and $s \geq \log n + 1$.

by the proof of the properties of phase (2), one of the above is the case with high probability, and so K^* obtained from \bar{K} is the hidden clique.

Following their proof of the basic algorithm, the authors give multiple extensions of their algorithm, two of which are useful for our purposes.

Reducing c_0 The authors note that the basic form of their algorithm works for $c \geq c_0$ for $c_0 \geq 1.65^7$. In their conclusion, the authors note that the same technique used by Alon et. al. in [1] to reduce their c_0 of 10 applies: simply iterate through subgraphs $G[N^*(S)]$ induced by the common neighborhoods of small subsets of nodes and run the original algorithm on each subgraph.

Alternative Edge Probabilities The authors further provide a generalization of their original algorithm which works for graphs with edge probabilities $p \neq \frac{1}{2}$. We summarize the differences in this more general form of the algorithm below:

1. Run phase 1 as before, except now take \bar{V}_i as the set of vertices with at least $p|S_i| + \beta\sqrt{p(1-p)}|S_i|$ neighbors in S_i .
2. Define $\rho = (1 - \alpha)\bar{\Phi}(\beta - c\sqrt{\alpha}\frac{1-p}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}})$. After phase 1 has run for t iterations, let \bar{K} contain all of the vertices in G_t with degree at least $p|V(G_t)| + \frac{1}{2}(1 + p)\rho^t k$.

⁷The authors also introduce a more complicated method of reducing c_0 to about 1.22, but the performance gain is marginal in the face of the method of Alon in [1]

Analysis of Algorithms II Project Report, Spring 2017

Aubrey Alston (ada2145@columbia.edu), Yanrong Wo (yw2513@columbia.edu)

3. Phase 3 is as before, but instead let K' contain \bar{K} and all vertices in G having $\frac{1}{2}(1+p)|\bar{K}|$ neighbors in \bar{K} . Let K^* now be the set of vertices in G having at least $\frac{1}{2}(p+1)k$ neighbors in K' .

Note that above $\bar{\Phi}()$ refers to the complementary Gaussian cumulative distribution function. The proof of this generalized algorithm is the same as before, except the variable p is kept as a parameter rather than manipulated as a constant $\frac{1}{2}$. The authors do not offer a formal analysis of algorithm runtime, but their stated running time is $O(n^2)$ for all given algorithms. (This excludes the case for the algorithm boosted using the subset enumeration technique of Alon from [1].)

4.1.5 Recent work: Sum-of-squares Optimization

4.2 Methods for General Graphs

4.2.1 Feige's Algorithm: The State of the Art

5 Applying the Cryptanalytic Method

5.1 Limits of Analysis given Existing Approximation Algorithms

5.2 Consequences for the Suggested Primitives

6 Conclusion

References

- [1] ALON, N., KRIVELEVICH, M., AND SUDAKOV, B. Finding a large hidden clique in a random graph. *Random Structures and Algorithms* 13, 3-4 (1998), 457–466.
- [2] ARORA, S., AND BARAK, B. *Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach*, 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2009.
- [3] DEKEL, Y., GUREL-GUREVICH, O., AND PERES, Y. Finding hidden cliques in linear time with high probability. In *Proceedings of the Meeting on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics* (Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2011), ANALCO '11, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, pp. 67–75.
- [4] FEIGE, U., AND KRAUTHGAMER, R. Finding and certifying a large hidden clique in a semirandom graph. *Random Struct. Algorithms* 16, 2 (Mar. 2000), 195–208.
- [5] JERRUM, M. Large cliques elude the metropolis process. *Random Structures and Algorithms* 3, 4 (1992), 347–359.
- [6] JUELS, A., AND PEINADO, M. Hiding cliques for cryptographic security. *Des. Codes Cryptography* 20, 3 (July 2000), 269–280.
- [7] TRAUB, J. F. *Algorithms and Complexity: New Directions and Recent Results*. Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, FL, USA, 1976.