

Non-Adaptive Edge Counting and Sampling via Bipartite Independent Set Queries

Raghavendra Addanki*
 Adobe Research
 raddanki@adobe.com

Andrew McGregor
 University of Massachusetts Amherst
 mcgregor@cs.umass.edu

Cameron Musco
 University of Massachusetts Amherst
 cmusco@cs.umass.edu

July 7, 2022

Abstract

We study the problem of estimating the number of edges in an n -vertex graph, accessed via the *Bipartite Independent Set* query model introduced by Beame et al. (ITCS '18). In this model, each query returns a Boolean, indicating the existence of at least one edge between two specified sets of nodes. We present a *non-adaptive* algorithm that returns a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ relative error approximation to the number of edges, with query complexity $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-5} \log^5 n)$, where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ hides $\text{poly}(\log \log n)$ dependencies. This is the first non-adaptive algorithm in this setting achieving $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon, \log n)$ query complexity. Prior work requires $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ rounds of adaptivity. We avoid this by taking a fundamentally different approach, inspired by work on single-pass streaming algorithms. Moreover, for constant ϵ , our query complexity significantly improves on the best known adaptive algorithm due to Bhattacharya et al. (STACS '22), which requires $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^{11} n)$ queries. Building on our edge estimation result, we give the first non-adaptive algorithm for outputting a nearly uniformly sampled edge with query complexity $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-6} \log^6 n)$, improving on the works of Dell et al. (SODA '20) and Bhattacharya et al. (STACS '22), which require $\Omega(\log^3 n)$ rounds of adaptivity. Finally, as a consequence of our edge sampling algorithm, we obtain a $\tilde{O}(n \log^8 n)$ query algorithm for connectivity, using two rounds of adaptivity. This improves on a three-round algorithm of Assadi et al. (ESA '21) and is tight; there is no non-adaptive algorithm for connectivity making $o(n^2)$ queries.

1 Introduction

In this work, we study sub-linear query algorithms for estimating the number of edges in a simple, unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$, and for sampling uniformly random edges. Access to G is via a *Bipartite Independent Set (BIS)* oracle [BHPR⁺18]. A query to this oracle takes as input two disjoint subsets $L, R \subseteq V$ and returns

$$BIS(L, R) = \begin{cases} '1' & \text{if there is no edge between } L \text{ and } R \\ '0' & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Most of the work done while a graduate student at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Local Query Models. Prior work on sub-linear query graph algorithms has largely focused on *local* queries, in particular, (i) vertex degree queries (ii) neighbor queries (output the i th neighbor of a vertex) and (iii) edge existence queries [Fei06, GR08, Ses]. In the literature, the first two types of queries form the *adjacency list* query model, while all three types of queries form the *adjacency matrix* query model. Under these models, a variety of graph estimation problems have been well studied, including edge counting and sampling [ER18, GR08, Ses, TT22], subgraph counting [ABG⁺18, BER21, ERS20], vertex cover [Beh22, ORRR12], and beyond [Ron19].

For a graph with n nodes and m edges, given access only to degree queries, Feige [Fei06] presented an algorithm for estimating m up to $(2 \pm \epsilon)$ relative error with query complexity $O(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon, \log n))$. This work also showed that any $(2 - o(1))$ -approximation algorithm requires $\Omega(n)$ queries. In the adjacency list query model, Goldreich and Ron [GR08] gave a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm, with query complexity $O(n/\sqrt{m} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon, \log n))$. Recently, Eden and Rosenbaum [ER18] gave algorithms for near-uniform edge sampling with the same query complexity, and showed that this complexity is nearly tight.

Global Query Models. Motivated by the desire to obtain more query efficient algorithms, Beame et al. [BHPR⁺18] studied edge estimation using *global* queries that can make use of information across the graph, including the BIS queries that we will focus on, and the related Independent Set (IS) queries. IS queries were introduced in the literature on query efficient graph recovery [AN19, AC08]. They answer whether or not there exist any edges in the induced subgraph on a subset of nodes $S \subseteq V$. We refer the reader to the exposition in [BHPR⁺18], which discusses applications of these global query models in group testing [CS90, Dor43], computational geometry [AHP08, CJ15, Fis03], fine-grained complexity [DL21, DLM20], and decision versus counting complexity [DLM20, RT16, Sto83, Sto85].

In the IS query model, [BHPR⁺18, CLW20] give a $O(\min\{\sqrt{m}, n/\sqrt{m}\} \cdot \text{poly}(\log n, 1/\epsilon))$ query algorithm for $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ approximate edge counting. In the BIS model, numerous authors [BHPR⁺18, DLM20, BBGM22] achieve $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation for edge counting and near-uniform edge sampling using just $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon, \log n)$ queries. This is exponentially smaller than the query complexities in the IS and local queries models.

Extending the BIS query model to hypergraphs, Dell et al. [DLM20] introduce the *coloured independence oracle* which detects the presence of a size k hyperedge. They give algorithms for hyperedge estimation and sampling using this generalized oracle. Many other variants of global queries have been studied including LINEAR, OR and CUT queries [ACK21, CS21, RSW18]. These queries have been applied to solving maximum matching [KK20, Nis21], minimum cut [RSW18], triangle estimation [BBGM19, BBGM21, DLM20], connectivity [ACK21], hitting sets [BGK⁺18], weighted edge estimation [BGMP19], problems related to linear algebra [RWZ20], quantum algorithms [MS22], and full graph recovery [AN19, AC08].

The Role of Adaptivity. Notably, for both local and global queries, most sub-linear time graph algorithms are *adaptive*, i.e., a query may depend on the answers to previous queries. In many cases, it is desirable for queries to be *non-adaptive*. This allows them to be completed independently, and might allow for the resulting algorithm to be easily implemented in massively parallel computation frameworks [KSV10]. Non-adaptive algorithms also lead naturally to single-pass, rather than multi-pass, streaming algorithms. In fact, the BIS query model can be seen as a very restricted subset of the more general LINEAR query model, in which each query outputs the inner product of the edge indicator vector with a query vector. This model has long been studied in the graph-streaming literature [AGM12, McG14], in part due to its usefulness in giving single-pass algorithms. However,

it has remained open whether non-adaptive algorithms can be given in more restricted global query models.

For these reasons, Assadi et al. [ACK21] and Chakrabarti and Stoeckl [CS21] have recently sought to reduce query adaptivity under a variety of global query models, including LINEAR, OR, CUT and BIS queries. These works study the *single element recovery* problem, which is a weaker variant of uniform edge sampling, requiring that the algorithm return a single edge in G . Assadi et al. also study the problem of checking connectivity, presenting a BIS query algorithm making $\tilde{O}(n)$ queries and using three rounds of adaptivity. They give a two-round algorithm in the stronger OR query model, and show that even in this model, there is no non-adaptive algorithm for connectivity making $o(n^2)$ queries.

We note that reducing query adaptivity is also a well-studied direction in the closely related literature on group testing [DHH00, INR10]. IS and BIS oracles can be thought of as tests if there is a single element in a group of edges, where that group is required to be all edges incident on one node set (IS) or between two disjoint sets (BIS). Attempts to minimize query adaptivity have also been made for sparse recovery [IPW11, KP19, NSWZ18], sub-modular function maximization [BS18, CQ19], property testing [CG18] and multi-armed bandit learning [AAAK17].

1.1 Our Contributions

Our main result is the first *non-adaptive* algorithm for edge estimation up to $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ relative error, using $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon, \log n)$ BIS queries. Formally, we show:

Theorem 1 (Theorem 11 restated). *Given a graph G with n nodes and m edges, there is an algorithm that makes $O(\epsilon^{-5} \log^5 n \log^6(\log n))$ non-adaptive BIS queries to G and returns an estimate \hat{m} satisfying: $m(1 - \epsilon) \leq \hat{m} \leq m(1 + \epsilon)$, with probability at least $3/5$.**

Prior methods for $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ error edge estimation using BIS queries are based on a binary search style approach [BHPR⁺18, DLM20, BBGM22], which is inherently adaptive, and this leads to algorithms requiring $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ rounds of adaptivity. Beame et al. [BHPR⁺18] present a non-adaptive algorithm giving a $O(\log^2 n)$ approximation factor for bipartite graphs, using $O(\log^3 n)$ queries. However, no non-adaptive results for general graphs or achieving $1 \pm \epsilon$ relative error for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$ were previously known. Even with adaptivity, the best known algorithm due to [BBGM22] has a query complexity of $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^{11} n)$ and succeeds with probability $1 - 1/n^2$. Therefore, our non-adaptive result improves upon the current best known algorithms, for constant ϵ .

Our second result builds on our edge estimation approach, giving the first non-adaptive BIS query algorithm that returns a near-uniformly sampled edge. Formally:

Theorem 2 (Theorem 38 restated). *Given a graph G with n nodes, m edges, and edge set E , there is an algorithm that makes $O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^6 n \log(\epsilon^{-1} \log n) + \epsilon^{-6} \log^5 n \log^6(\log n) \log(\epsilon^{-1} \log n))$ non-adaptive BIS queries which, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, outputs an edge from a probability distribution P satisfying $(1 - \epsilon)/m \leq P(e) \leq (1 + \epsilon)/m$ for every $e \in E$.*

Prior results for near-uniform edge sampling required $\Omega(\log^3 n)$ rounds of adaptivity [BBGM22, DLM20]. Additionally, even ignoring adaptivity, our results improves on the best known query complexity of $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log^{14} n)$, due to [BBGM22], for constant ϵ .

*Note that the success probability can be boosted in the standard way, by running multiple independent instantiations of the algorithm and taking their median estimate.

By combining Theorem 2 with prior work on sublinear query graph connectivity, via edge sampling, we obtain a connectivity algorithm using two rounds for adaptivity:

Theorem 3 (Theorem 39 restated). *Given a graph G with n nodes, there is a 2-round adaptive algorithm that determines if G is connected with probability at least $1 - 1/n$ using $\tilde{O}(n \log^8 n)$ BIS queries, where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ ignores the $\log^{O(1)} \log n$ dependencies.*

Theorem 3 improves on a three-round algorithm of Assadi et al. [ACK21] and is tight: even in the stronger OR query model (which allows checking the presence of an edge within an arbitrary subset of edges) no non-adaptive algorithm can make $o(n^2)$ queries. Assadi et al. gave a two-round algorithm in this stronger OR query model. Thus, Theorem 3 closes the gap between BIS queries and OR queries for this problem. We note that there is a separation from the even stronger LINEAR query model, where non-adaptive algorithms for connectivity and cut approximation are well-known [AGM12]. Understanding if there remain interesting separations between the BIS and OR query models in terms of adaptivity would be very interesting.

2 Technical Overview

In this section, we present an overview of our non-adaptive BIS query algorithms for edge estimation (Theorem 1) and near-uniform edge sampling (Theorem 2), along with our 2-round algorithm for connectivity (Theorem 3).

2.1 Edge Estimation

A simple idea to estimate the number of edges in a graph via BIS queries is to sample small random subsets of nodes and run BIS queries to check the presence of an edge between them. The fraction of these queries that return ‘1’ (i.e., indicating the presence of no edge) can then be used to estimate the number of edges. In particular, for a graph containing m edges, if the random subgraphs have $O(n/\sqrt{m})$ nodes in them, then we expect a ‘1’ answer with constant probability. Beame et al. [BHPR⁺18] describe a non-adaptive algorithm along these lines, which gives a $O(\log^2 n)$ approximation for bipartite graphs using $O(\log^3 n)$ queries. Unfortunately, going beyond this coarse approximation factor is difficult since many dependencies due to common neighbors arise and this increases the variance of the estimators. Beame et al. handle the issue by using the coarse estimates to subdivide the graph into smaller sub-graphs, until these divided graphs only contain $O(\log^{O(1)} n)$ edges, at which point all their edges can be discovered with few queries. This strategy yields a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ approximation, however, it is inherently adaptive.

Our non-adaptive edge estimation algorithm takes a different approach. Suppose we could sample each node with probability $p_v \approx \epsilon^{-2} d(v)/m$ and compute the degree of the sampled nodes then it is straightforward to show $\sum_v \mathbb{I}[v \text{ sampled}] \cdot d(v)/p_v$ equals $2m$ in expectation. Furthermore, an application of Bernstein bound implies that it is a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ with sufficient probability. The challenge is showing that this type of approach can be approximated in the BIS query model.

Subsampling Nodes. The first idea, drawn from work on streaming algorithms, is to subsample the nodes of G at different rates of the form $1/\gamma^j$ where $\gamma > 1$ is constant and $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, O(\log n)\}$. At each rate, we will “recover” all sampled nodes (along with a corresponding degree estimate) whose degree is roughly $d(v) \approx \epsilon^2 m/\gamma^j$. In this way, each node will be recovered with probability roughly

$1/\gamma^j \approx \epsilon^{-2}d(v)/m$, as desired. We describe this subsampling procedure in Section 4.3, as part of our main algorithm EDGE-ESTIMATOR (Algorithm 3).

Recovering Heavy Nodes. The next challenge is to show that we can actually recover the appropriate nodes and degree estimates at each sampling rate. If we can approximate the degree of all nodes sampled at rate $1/\gamma^j$ up to additive error $O(\epsilon^3 \cdot m/\gamma^j)$, we will obtain a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ relative error approximation to the degree of any node we hope to recover at that sampling rate, i.e., any node with degree roughly $\epsilon^2 m/\gamma^j$. Using these approximations, we can determine which nodes should be recovered at that rate, and form our edge estimate.

Degree Estimation via Neighborhood Size Estimation. To achieve such an additive error approximation, we also use ideas from the sparse recovery and streaming literature. In particular, we implement an approach reminiscent of the Count-Min sketch algorithm [CM05]. The approach is described in detail in Section 4.2, where we present Algorithm ESTIMATE-DEGREE (Algorithm 2). First observe that when sampling at rate $1/\gamma^j$, conditioned on any node v being included in the sample, the expected total degree of the sampled nodes other than v is $O(m/\gamma^j)$. If we further subdivide these nodes into $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^3)$ random groups, the expected total degree of all nodes other than v in any group is $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^3 \cdot m/\gamma^j)$.

Now, if v is placed in group S , we can approximately upper bound its degree by the total *neighborhood size* of S . This upper bound holds approximately as long as v does not have too many neighbors in S , which it won't with good probability. The neighborhood size of S is in turn upper bounded by the degree of v plus the total degree of other nodes in S , and thus by $d(v) + \tilde{O}(\epsilon^3 \cdot m/\gamma^j)$ in expectation. So, in expectation, this approach gives an additive $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^3 \cdot m/\gamma^j)$ error approximation to the degree of each sampled node v , with constant probability. Repeating this procedure $O(\log n)$ times, and, as in the Count-Min sketch, taking the minimum degree estimate for each node sampled at rate $1/\gamma^j$, gives us high probability approximation for such nodes.

Neighborhood Size Estimation. The final step is to implement an algorithm that can estimate the neighborhood size of the random subset of nodes S , to be used in our degree estimation procedure. We do this in Section 4.1, where we present Algorithm NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE (Algorithm 1). This algorithm takes as input two disjoint subsets L, R and returns a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation for the size of the neighborhood of L in R . We highlight that this may be very different than the *number of edges connecting L to R* – the neighborhood size is the number of nodes in R with at least one edge to L . This difference is critical in removing the correlations discussed previously due to common neighbors. Such correlations lead to the adaptive nature of prior algorithms [BHPR⁺18, DLM20]. To estimate the size of the neighborhood of L in R , we sample the nodes in R at different rates and ask BIS queries on L and the sampled subset of R . Intuitively, when the sampling rate is the inverse of the size of the neighborhood, we will observe a ‘1’ response with constant probability. We can detect this and thus estimate the neighborhood size.

Non-adaptivity. The approach is inherently non-adaptive as all random sampling of nodes and random subsets can be formed ahead of time, independently of any query responses. The only catch is that to determine which nodes should be recovered at each sampling rate, i.e., those nodes with degree $d(v) \approx \epsilon^{-2} \cdot m/\gamma^j$, we need a coarse estimate to the edge count m in the first place. Fortunately, we can bootstrap such an estimate starting with a very coarse $O(\log^2 n)$ -relative error approximate estimation, due to Beame et al. [BHPR⁺18]. We then refine this estimate iteratively using Algorithm REFINE-ESTIMATE (Algorithm 4). Each refinement improves the approximation factor by ϵ , and after $O(\log_{1/\epsilon} \log n)$, refinements our estimate will result in a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation

factor. The key observation here is that each refine step does not require any additional BIS queries. Thus, our algorithm remains non-adaptive.

2.2 Uniform Edge Sampling and Connectivity

In the full version, we prove Theorem 2 by designing and analyzing a non-adaptive algorithm for returning a near-uniform sample among the edges of the graph. Our approach builds heavily on our edge estimation algorithm. If we knew the degree $d(v)$ of all vertices, then to sample a uniform edge, we could sample a vertex $v \in V$ with probability $d(v)/\sum_{w \in V} d(w)$ and return a uniform neighbor among the neighbors of v . We can observe that the probability that an edge (v, u) is sampled is $d(v)/\sum_{w \in V} d(w) \cdot 1/d(v) + d(u)/\sum_{w \in V} d(w) \cdot 1/d(u) = 1/m$, i.e., this approach yields a uniformly random edge sample.

Node Sampling. We implement the above approach approximately using BIS queries in Algorithm SAMPLING. First note that recovered vertices in our edge estimation algorithm are sampled with probabilities roughly proportional to their degrees. We argue that we can select a random vertex from this set, which overall is equal to any vertex v with probability approximately $d(v)/\sum_{w \in V} d(w)$. To do so, we leverage our degree estimates, and the fact that our edge count estimator, which is the sum of scaled degrees of recovered vertices, is well-concentrated.

Random Neighbor Sampling. It remains to show how to return a random neighbor of the sampled vertex. To do so, in the full version, we describe an algorithm that takes as input two disjoint subsets L, R and returns a uniform neighbor among the neighbors of L in R . By showing an equivalence between the substantially more powerful OR queries and BIS queries in this specific setting, we argue that an existing algorithm for OR queries can be extended to return a uniform neighbor using BIS queries. An OR query takes as input a subset of pairs of vertices and returns ‘1’ iff there is an edge in the subset queried. Building on this, in the full version, we present Algorithm UNIFORM-NEIGHBOR that takes as input the subset of nodes sampled at any rate $1/\gamma^j$ as in our edge estimation algorithm, and approximately returns a uniform neighbor for every vertex v sampled in this set. As before, we construct $\tilde{O}(1/\epsilon^4)$ random partitions of the sampled nodes. For every vertex v in a random subset S , we return a uniform neighbor (obtained using the idea just described) of S as the neighbor of v . If v has large degree compared to the total degree of nodes in the partition, which it will if it is meant to be recovered at that sampling rate, this output will most likely be a neighbor of v , and will be close to a uniformly random one.

A Two-Round Algorithm for Connectivity. Our non-adaptive edge sampling algorithm (Theorem 2) yields a two-round algorithm for graph connectivity (Theorem 3), improving on a prior three-round algorithm of [ACK21]. In particular, the algorithm of [ACK21] selects $O(\log^2 n)$ random neighbors per vertex, and contracts the connected components of this random graph into *supernodes*. This random sampling step can be performed using one round of $\tilde{O}(n)$ BIS queries. They prove that in the contracted graph on the supernodes, there are at most $O(n \log n)$ edges. Using this fact, they then show how to identify whether all the supernodes are connected using $\tilde{O}(n)$ BIS queries and two additional rounds of adaptivity.

We follow the same basic approach: using a first round of $\tilde{O}(n)$ queries to randomly sample $O(\log^2 n)$ neighbors per vertex and contract the graph into supernodes. Once this is done, we observe that we have BIS query access to the contracted graph simply by always grouping together the set of nodes in each supernode. So, we can directly apply the non-adaptive sampling algorithm of Theorem 2 to sample edges from the contracted graph. By a coupon collecting argument, drawing

$O(n \log^2 n)$ near-uniform edge samples (with replacement) from the contracted graph suffices to recover all $O(n \log n)$ edges in the graph, and thus determine connectivity of the contracted graph, and, in turn, the original graph.

3 Preliminaries

Let $G(V, E)$ denote the graph on vertex set V with edges $E \subseteq V \times V$. Let $|V| = n$ be the number of nodes and $|E| = m$ be the number of edges. For any set of nodes $S \subseteq V$, let $E[S] \subseteq E$ denote the edges in the induced subgraph on S . For any two disjoint sets of nodes $L, R \subseteq V$, let $E[L, R] = \{(u, v) \in E \mid u \in L, v \in R\}$ denote the edges between them. For any $v \in V$, let $\Gamma(v) = \{u \mid (v, u) \in E \text{ for some } v \in V\}$ be its set of neighbours. Let $d(v) = |\Gamma(v)|$ be its degree. For $S \subseteq V$, let $\Gamma(S) = \bigcup_{u \in S} \Gamma(u)$ and let $d(S) = \sum_{u \in S} d(u)$.

Definition 4 (OR query). *An OR query takes as input a collection E_q of pairs of vertices given by $E_q = \{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_k, y_k) \mid x_i, y_i \in V \forall i \in [k]\}$ and satisfies the following:*

$$\mathcal{OR}(E_q) = \begin{cases} '1' & \text{if } E_q \cap E = \phi \\ '0' & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5 (Bernstein's inequality). *Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be independent random variables. Suppose $|X_i| \leq M \forall i \in [n]$. Then:*

$$\Pr \left[\left| \sum_i X_i - \mathbf{E}[X_i] \right| \geq t \right] \leq \exp \left(- \frac{t^2}{2 \sum_i \mathbf{E}[(X_i - \mathbf{E}[X_i])^2] + \frac{2}{3} M t} \right)$$

Fact 6.

$$\left(1 + \frac{x}{n}\right)^n \geq e^x \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{n}\right) \geq e^x \quad \text{for } |x| \leq n, n \geq 1.$$

4 Non-adaptive algorithm for edge estimation

In this section, we present our non-adaptive algorithm for edge estimation using BIS queries. In Section 4.1, we describe an algorithm that takes as input two disjoint subsets L, R and returns an estimate of the size of the neighborhood $|\Gamma(L) \cap R|$. Next, in Section 4.2, we use this algorithm to give additive error approximations of degrees of all the vertices in a given subset. Finally, in Section 4.3, using the approximate degree estimates, we construct a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximate estimator for m by sampling nodes with probabilities roughly proportional to their degrees.

4.1 Estimating the size of neighborhood

Algorithm NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE takes as input two disjoint subsets $L, R \subseteq V$ and returns a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of the size of neighborhood of L in R , i.e., $|\Gamma(L) \cap R|$ using $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon, \log n)$ BIS queries. We overview the analysis of this algorithm here, before presenting the details in section 4.1.1.

The main idea is to sample subsets of vertices in R (denoted $\hat{R}_1, \hat{R}_2, \dots$) with exponentially decreasing probability values $1/2, 1/4, 1/8, \dots$. When the sampling rate $1/2^i$ falls below $1/|\Gamma(L) \cap R|$, we expect L to no longer have any neighbors in \hat{R}_i with good probability. In particular, we can

return the inverse of the smallest probability $1/2^i$ for which $\mathcal{BIS}(L, \widehat{R}_i) = '1'$, as a coarse estimate for $|\Gamma(L) \cap R|$.

To boost the accuracy of this estimate, we repeat the process $T = O(\epsilon^{-2} \log(\delta^{-1} \cdot \log n))$ times, and at each sampling rate count the number of times the BIS query $\mathcal{BIS}(L, \widehat{R}_i)$ returns '1'. This count is denoted $\text{count}(i)$ in Algorithm 1, and its expectation can be written in closed form as $\mathbf{E}[\text{count}(i)] = T \cdot (1 - 1/2^i)^{|\Gamma(L) \cap R|}$. Suppose $2^{\widehat{i}} \leq |\Gamma(L) \cap R| < 2^{\widehat{i}+1}$, then, $\mathbf{E}[\text{count}(\widehat{i})] = \Theta(T)$. Via a standard Chernoff bound, it will be approximated to $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ error with high probability by $\text{count}(\widehat{i})$. Thus, we can compute an accurate estimate of the neighborhood size by inverting our estimate of $\mathbf{E}[\text{count}(\widehat{i})]$, as $\log_{(1-1/2^{\widehat{i}})}(\text{count}(\widehat{i})/T)$. We identify the appropriate \widehat{i} in line 12 of Algorithm 1, and compute the corresponding estimate in lines 13-14. There is one edge case handled in line 13: if $|\Gamma(L) \cap R| = 1$ we will have $\widehat{i} = 0$, and $\text{count}(\widehat{i}) = 0$. The final error bound for Algorithm 1 is stated below.

Algorithm 1 NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE: Estimating the neighborhood size of L in R

Input: $L, R \subseteq V$, approximation error ϵ , failure probability δ .
Output: $\eta_{\text{est}}(L)$ as an estimate of $|\Gamma(L) \cap R|$.

- 1: Initialize $\eta_{\text{est}}(L) \leftarrow 0$.
- 2: **for** $i = 0, 1, \dots, \log_2 n$ **do**
- 3: $\text{count}(i) \leftarrow 0$.
- 4: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T = 2e^8 \ln(\log n / \delta) \cdot \epsilon^{-2}$ **do**
- 5: $\widehat{R}_i^t \leftarrow \{u \in R \mid u \text{ is included independently with probability } 1/2^i\}$.
- 6: $\text{count}(i) = \text{count}(i) + \mathcal{BIS}(L, \widehat{R}_i^t)$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: **end for**
- 9: **if** $\text{count}(0) = T$ **then**
- 10: **return** $\eta_{\text{est}}(L) = 0$.
- 11: **else**
- 12: Set $\widehat{i} \leftarrow \max \left\{ i \mid \frac{\text{count}(i)}{T} < \frac{(1-\epsilon)}{2e^2} \right\}$.
- 13: **if** $\widehat{i} = 0$ **then return** $\eta_{\text{est}}(L) = 1$.
- 14: **else return** $\eta_{\text{est}}(L) = \log_{(1-1/2^{\widehat{i}})}(\text{count}(\widehat{i})/T)$.
- 15: **end if**
- 16: **end if**

4.1.1 Approximation Guarantees of Algorithm NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE

For any $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \log_2 n\}$ let \widehat{R}_i denote a set constructed by sampling vertices of R with probability $1/2^i$. In Algorithm 1, we construct $T = O(\epsilon^{-2} \log(\delta^{-1} \cdot \log n))$ such sets, each denoted by $\widehat{R}_i^t \forall t \in [T]$. Let $\text{count}(i) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{BIS}(L, \widehat{R}_i^t)$ denotes the number of times the BIS query $\mathcal{BIS}(L, \widehat{R}_i^t)$ returns '1'. For any $t \in [T]$, we define:

$$p(i) = \Pr \left[\mathcal{BIS}(L, \widehat{R}_i^t) = '1' \right] = \Pr \left[\Gamma(L) \cap \widehat{R}_i^t = \phi \right] \text{ and } \widehat{p}(i) = \frac{\text{count}(i)}{T}.$$

Suppose L satisfies:

$$2^{i^*} \leq |\Gamma(L) \cap R| < 2^{i^*+1} \text{ for some } i^* \in \{0, 1, \dots, \log_2 n\}.$$

Claim 7. *We have the following bounds:*

$$p(i^*) \geq \frac{1}{2e^2}, \quad p(i^* - 2) > \frac{1}{2e^8}, \quad \text{and } p(i^* - 2) \leq \frac{1}{e^4}.$$

Proof.

$$p(i) = \Pr \left[\Gamma(L) \cap \widehat{R}_i^t = \phi \right] = \Pr[u \notin \widehat{R}_i^t \forall u \in R \cap \Gamma(L)] = \prod_{u \in R \cap \Gamma(L)} \Pr[u \notin \widehat{R}_i^t] = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^i}\right)^{|\Gamma(L) \cap R|}.$$

We can lower bound $p(i^*)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} p(i^*) &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{i^*}}\right)^{|\Gamma(L) \cap R|} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{i^*}}\right)^{2^{i^*+1}} \geq e^{-2} \left(1 - \frac{2^{i^*+1}}{2^{2i^*}}\right) \quad (\text{using inequality 6}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2e^2} \quad \text{for } i^* \geq 2. \\ p(i^*) &\geq \frac{1}{8} \quad \text{for } i^* = 1. \end{aligned}$$

If $i = i^* - 2$, we have:

$$p(i) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^i}\right)^{|\Gamma(L) \cap R|} \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^i}\right)^{2^{i^*}} \leq e^{-2^{i^*-i}} = \frac{1}{e^4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} p(i) &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^i}\right)^{|\Gamma(L) \cap R|} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{i^*-2}}\right)^{|\Gamma(L) \cap R|} > \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{i^*-2}}\right)^{2^{i^*+1}} \\ &\geq e^{-8} \left(1 - \frac{2^{i^*+1}}{2^{2i^*-4}}\right) \quad (\text{using inequality 6}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2e^8} \quad \text{for } i^* \geq 5. \end{aligned}$$

For $i^* \leq 4$, the inequality is satisfied. So, we have: $p(i^* - 2) > 1/2e^8$. □

Claim 8. *For sufficiently small ϵ , with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have:*

$$\text{count}(i) \geq \frac{1 - \epsilon}{2e^2} \cdot T \quad \forall i \geq i^* \quad \text{and} \quad \text{count}(i^* - 2) < \frac{1 - \epsilon}{2e^2} \cdot T.$$

Proof. As $\text{count}(i) = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{BIS}(L, \widehat{R}_i^t)$, we have: $\mathbf{E}[\text{count}(i)] = T \cdot p(i)$. Using Claim 7, we have:

$$T = 2e^8 \ln(\log n / \delta) \cdot \epsilon^{-2} \geq \frac{4 \ln(\log n / \delta) \cdot \epsilon^{-2}}{p(i^* - 2)} \geq \frac{4 \ln(\log n / \delta) \cdot \epsilon^{-2}}{p(i^*)}, \quad \text{as } p(i^*) \geq p(i^* - 2).$$

Suppose $i \in \{i^*, i^* - 2\}$. Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[|\widehat{p}(i) - p(i)| \geq \epsilon \cdot p(i)] &= \Pr[|T \cdot \widehat{p}(i) - T \cdot p(i)| \geq T \cdot \epsilon \cdot p(i)] \\ &= \Pr[|\text{count}(i) - \mathbf{E}[\text{count}(i)]| \geq \epsilon \mathbf{E}[\text{count}(i)]] \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 T p(i)}{2}\right) \leq \frac{\delta}{\log n} \quad (\text{Using Chernoff bound}). \end{aligned}$$

Using Claim 7, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{count}(i^*) &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot T \cdot p(i^*) \geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon)}{2e^2} \cdot T \\ \text{count}(i^* - 2) &< (1 + \epsilon) \cdot T \cdot p(i) \leq \frac{(1 + \epsilon)}{e^4} \cdot T \\ \implies \text{count}(i^* - 2) &< \frac{(1 + \epsilon)}{e^4} \cdot T \leq \frac{(1 - \epsilon)}{2e^2} \cdot T, \text{ when } \epsilon \leq \frac{e^2/2 - 1}{e^2/2 + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition, we can observe that $p(i) \geq p(i^*) \forall i \geq i^*$. So, the concentration around expected values for $\text{count}(i)$ obtained using Chernoff bounds will hold for all $i \geq i^*$. Using union bound on at most $\log n$ sampling levels, we have, with probability $1 - \delta$:

$$\text{count}(i^* - 2) < \frac{(1 - \epsilon)}{2e^2} \cdot T \text{ and } \text{count}(i) \geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon)}{2e^2} \cdot T \forall i \geq i^*.$$

□

Lemma 9. *Algorithm 1 uses $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log n \log(\delta^{-1} \cdot \log n))$ BIS queries and returns an estimate $\eta_{\text{est}}(L)$ of $|\Gamma(L) \cap R|$ such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$(1 - \epsilon) \cdot |\Gamma(L) \cap R| \leq \eta_{\text{est}}(L) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot |\Gamma(L) \cap R|.$$

Proof. If $|\Gamma(L) \cap R| = 0$, then, $\text{count}(i) = T$ for every $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \log n\}$. So, $\hat{i} = 0$, as none of the values $\text{count}(i)$, for any i will be below the threshold value of $(1 - \epsilon)T/2e^2$. So, the estimate $\eta_{\text{est}}(L) = 0$ returned is exact.

Suppose $|\Gamma(L) \cap R| = 1$. When we sample with probability $1/2^i$ when $i = 0$, we obtain $\hat{R}_i^t = R$, for every $t \in [T]$. As $\mathcal{BLS}(L, R) = '1'$, we have $\text{count}(i) = 0$, and our estimate $\eta_{\text{est}}(L) = 1$ is exact. For the remainder of the proof, we assume $i^* \geq 1$.

From Algorithm 1, we define $\hat{i} = \arg \max\{i \mid \text{count}(i) < (1 - \epsilon)T/2e^2\} + 1$. From Claim 8, this implies: $\hat{i} \geq i^* - 2$. Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have:

$$i^* - 2 \leq \hat{i} \leq i^* - 1.$$

Now, we argue that $\eta_{\text{est}}(L)$ defined by:

$$\eta_{\text{est}}(L) := \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})} \hat{p}(\hat{i}) \text{ obtains a } (1 \pm \epsilon) \text{ approximation for } |\Gamma(L) \cap R|.$$

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon)p(\hat{i}) &\leq \hat{p}(\hat{i}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)p(\hat{i}) \\ \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})}(1 - \epsilon) \cdot p(\hat{i}) &\leq \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})} \hat{p}(\hat{i}) \leq \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})}(1 + \epsilon) \cdot p(\hat{i}) \\ |\Gamma(L) \cap R| + \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})}(1 - \epsilon) &\leq \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})} \hat{p}(\hat{i}) \leq |\Gamma(L) \cap R| + \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})}(1 + \epsilon) \\ \implies |\Gamma(L) \cap R| - 2^{\hat{i}} \cdot \epsilon &\leq \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})} \hat{p}(\hat{i}) \leq |\Gamma(L) \cap R| + 2^{\hat{i}} \cdot \epsilon \\ \implies |\Gamma(L) \cap R| - 2^{i^*-2} \cdot \epsilon &\leq \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})} \hat{p}(\hat{i}) \leq |\Gamma(L) \cap R| + 2^{i^*-1} \cdot \epsilon \\ \implies (1 - \epsilon/4) \cdot |\Gamma(L) \cap R| &\leq \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})} \hat{p}(\hat{i}) \leq (1 + \epsilon/2) \cdot |\Gamma(L) \cap R|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\eta_{\text{est}}(L) := \log_{(1-1/2^{\hat{i}})} \hat{p}(\hat{i})$ is a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -relative error approximation of $|\Gamma(L) \cap R|$.

The total number of BIS queries used by Algorithm 1 is $O(\log n \cdot T) = O(\epsilon^{-2} \log n \log(\log n / \delta))$.

□

4.2 Finding good approximation for degrees of vertices

We now describe how to use the NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE algorithm to estimate the degrees of all vertices in a given subset $S \subseteq V$ up to additive error depending on the total degree of S . Our approach is inspired by the count-min sketch algorithm [CM05]. We randomly partition S into subsets $S^1, S^2, \dots, S^\lambda$ where $\lambda = O(\epsilon^{-3} \log^2 n)$. The choice of the parameter λ is based on the analysis in Section 4.3. For each S^i , we estimate the size of the neighborhood of S^i in $V \setminus S^i$ using NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE. We then return this neighborhood size estimate as the degree estimate for all vertices in S^i . For $v \in S^i$, $|\Gamma(S^i) \cap V \setminus S^i|$ is nearly an overestimate for $d(v)$, as long as v has few neighbors in S^i , which it will with high probability. Additionally, it is not too large an overestimate – we can observe that $|\Gamma(S^i) \cap V \setminus S^i| - d(v) \leq d(S^i \setminus v)$. I.e., the error in the overestimate is at most the total degree of the other nodes in S^i . In expectation, this error is at most $\frac{d(S)}{\lambda} = O\left(d(S) \cdot \frac{\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n}\right)$ due to our random choice of S^i .

As in the count-min sketch algorithm, to obtain high probability estimates, we repeat the process $T = O(\log n)$ times and assign the minimum among the neighborhood estimates as the degree estimate of $d(v)$. The full approach is given in Algorithm 2 (ESTIMATE-DEGREE) and the error bound in the Lemma 10 below.

Lemma 10. *Suppose $S \subseteq V$. Then, Algorithm 2 uses $O(\epsilon^{-5} \log^3 n \log^2(\log n))$ BIS queries and with probability $1 - O(1/\log n)$, returns degree estimates $\hat{d}(v)$ for every vertex $v \in S$ satisfying:*

$$d(v)(1 - \epsilon) \leq \hat{d}(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n} \cdot d(S).$$

Algorithm 2 ESTIMATE-DEGREE: Obtain additive approximate degree estimates

Input: S is a subset of V , ϵ is approximation error.

Output: Degree estimates of vertices in S .

- 1: Scale $\epsilon \leftarrow \epsilon/3$ and initialize $\hat{d}(v) \leftarrow n$ for every $v \in S$.
 - 2: **for** t in $\{1, 2, \dots, O(\log n)\}$ **do**
 - 3: Consider a random partitioning of S into $S^{t1}, S^{t2}, \dots, S^{t\lambda}$ where $\lambda = O(\epsilon^{-3} \log^2 n)$.
 - 4: **for** every partition S^{ta} where $a \in [\lambda]$ **do**
 - 5: $\eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) \leftarrow \text{NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE}(S^{ta}, V \setminus S^{ta}, \epsilon, \delta)$, where $\delta = O(1/\log^4 n)$.
 - 6: $\hat{d}(v) \leftarrow \min\{\hat{d}(v), \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta})\} \forall v \in S^{ta}$.
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: **return** $\hat{d}(v)$ for every $v \in S$.
-

4.2.1 Proof of Lemma 10

Consider a vertex $v \in S$. It is easy to observe that in any partition S^{ta} containing v , where $t \in [T]$ and $a \in [\lambda]$, the degree of v outside the partition (denoted by $d(v, V \setminus S^{ta})$) is upper bounded by the total size of the neighborhood of S^{ta} (denoted by $|\Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap V \setminus S^{ta}|$) which is upper bounded by the total degree of vertices present in the partition (denoted by $d(S^{ta})$). Similar to the analysis of count-min sketch, a simple, yet important observation is that the total degree of the partition except for vertex v , i.e., $d(S^{ta} \setminus \{v\})$ is less than $c \cdot d(S)/\lambda$ for some constant c and results in the additive approximation factor of $O(d(S)/\lambda)$. Now, we present the proof of Lemma 10:

Proof. Given $S \subseteq V$. Consider a vertex $v \in S^{ta}$ for some $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lambda\}$ and $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$. For each call to neighborhood size estimation, we set the failure probability to be $\delta = O(1/\log^4 n)$. From Lemma 9, we have with probability $1 - \delta$:

$$(1 - \epsilon)|\Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap (V \setminus S^{ta})| \leq \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)|\Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap (V \setminus S^{ta})|$$

We can observe that $d(v, V \setminus S^{ta}) = |\Gamma(v) \cap (V \setminus S^{ta})| \leq |\Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap (V \setminus S^{ta})|$. Therefore:

$$d(v, V \setminus S^{ta}) \leq \frac{\eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta})}{1 - \epsilon}.$$

Consider the following:

$$\mathbf{E}[d(v, S^{ta})] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{u \in V} \mathbb{1}\{u \in \Gamma(v) \cap S^{ta}\}\right] = \frac{d(v)}{\lambda} = \frac{d(v)\epsilon^3}{c \log^2 n} \leq \epsilon d(v), \text{ as } c > 1.$$

From Markov's inequality, with probability at least $1/2$, we have: $d(v, S^{ta}) \leq 2\epsilon d(v)$. Combining the above, with probability $1/2 - \delta$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta})}{1 - \epsilon} &\geq d(v, V \setminus S^{ta}) = d(v) - d(v, S^{ta}) \geq d(v)(1 - 2\epsilon), \\ \implies \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) &\geq (1 - 3\epsilon)d(v). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[d(S^{ta} \setminus \{v\})] &= \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{u \in S \setminus \{v\}} d(u) \mathbb{1}\{u \in S^{ta}\}\right] = \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{v\}} d(u) \Pr[u \in S^{ta}] \\ &= \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{v\}} d(u) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda} \\ &\leq d(S) \cdot \frac{\epsilon^3}{c \log^2 n}, \text{ for some constant } c > 1 \\ &\leq d(S) \cdot \frac{\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n}. \end{aligned}$$

From Markov's inequality, it follows that:

$$\Pr\left[d(S^{ta} \setminus \{v\}) \geq d(S) \cdot \frac{2\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n}\right] \leq \frac{\mathbf{E}[d(S^{ta} \setminus \{v\})]}{d(S) \cdot \frac{2\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

So, with probability at least $1/2$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d(S^{ta}) &= d(v) + d(S^{ta} \setminus \{v\}) \\ &\leq d(v) + d(S) \cdot \frac{2\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n} \\ \implies \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) &\leq |\Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap (V \setminus S^{ta})| \leq d(S^{ta}, V \setminus S^{ta}) \leq d(S^{ta}) \\ \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) &\leq d(v) + d(S) \cdot \frac{2\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n}. \end{aligned}$$

Using union bound on all possible sets S^{ta} for all $t \in [T]$ and $a \in [\lambda]$, with probability at least $1 - T \cdot \lambda \cdot \delta \geq 1 - 1/2 \log n$, the neighborhood estimates are $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -relative approximations. By taking minimum of all the $T = O(\log n)$ estimates, we argue that $\widehat{d}(v)$ is a good approximation of $d(v)$. We take minimum of all the T estimates containing v and obtain the final degree estimate, given by:

$$\widehat{d}(v) = \min_{t \in T} \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}).$$

We observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\widehat{d}(v) < (1 - 3\epsilon)d(v) \right] &= \Pr \left[\left\{ \min_{t \in T} \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) \right\} < (1 - 3\epsilon)d(v) \right] \\ &= \prod_{t \in T} \Pr \left[\eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) < (1 - 3\epsilon)d(v) \right] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^T \leq \frac{1}{2n^4}, \text{ and} \\ \Pr \left[\widehat{d}(v) > d(v) + d(S) \cdot \frac{2\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n} \right] &= \Pr \left[\left\{ \min_{t \in T} \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) \right\} > d(v) + d(S) \cdot \frac{2\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n} \right] \\ &= \prod_{t \in T} \Pr \left[\eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) > d(v) + d(S) \cdot \frac{2\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n} \right] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^T \leq \frac{1}{2n^4}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking a union bound on all the vertices in S and the event that neighborhood estimates are accurate, the total failure probability is at most $1/2 \log n + 1/n^3 \leq 1/\log n$. Therefore, for every vertex $v \in S^{ta}$, we have with probability at least $1 - 1/\log n$:

$$(1 - 3\epsilon)d(v) \leq \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) \leq d(v) + d(S) \cdot \frac{2\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n}.$$

Set $\epsilon = \epsilon/2^{1/3}$ to appropriately scale the value of ϵ for the final guarantees. Algorithm 2 uses $O(\epsilon^{-3} \log^2 n \cdot T)$ many calls to the sub-routine NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE, i.e., Algorithm 1. From Lemma 9, we know that Algorithm 1 uses $O(\epsilon^{-2} \log n \log(\delta^{-1} \log n))$ BIS queries, where we set $\delta = O(1/\log^4 n)$. Therefore, the query complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(\epsilon^{-5} \log^4 n \log(\log n))$. \square

4.3 Edge Estimation

In this section, we describe the algorithm EDGE-ESTIMATOR that obtains a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation for the number of edges m . The constants used c_1, c_2 satisfy $c_1 \leq c_2/10$ and $c_2 \geq 50$, and we do not explicitly mention them for the sake of brevity. Missing details are presented in the full version.

Our Approach. A naive strategy to estimate the number of edges (denoted by m) is to sample roughly $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2})$ nodes uniformly, and estimate m given the degrees of the sampled nodes. However, the variance of such an estimator depends on the maximum degree, which could be as high as $O(n)$. To fix this issue, we sample vertices at different rates. Our sampling rates are given by the sequence $1/\gamma^j$ where $\gamma > 1$ is a constant, $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \log n\}$. We use the term j^{th} level to refer to the

sampling rate γ^{-j} . It is easy to observe that when a vertex v is sampled at rate $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-2}d(v)/m)$, its contribution is $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^2m)$. In other words, if $d(v) \approx \epsilon^2m/\gamma^j$, for some sampling level j , we can use it in our estimator. However, there are three main challenges in implementing this approach which we detail below.

Approximate degrees. Algorithm ESTIMATE-DEGREE returns degree estimates that are *approximate* with an additive approximation error of $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^3m/\gamma^j)$ at sampling level j . To include a vertex v , we have to ensure that this error term is small and given by $O(\epsilon d(v))$. When $d(v) = \tilde{\Omega}(\epsilon^2m/\gamma^j)$, the returned degree estimate $\hat{d}(v)$ will be a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation to the actual degree $d(v)$. Observe that this corresponds to the threshold we mentioned earlier. Therefore, our goal is to identify all vertices at every level j that pass the threshold of $\tilde{\Omega}(\epsilon^2m/\gamma^j)$. When that happens, we say that the vertex v has been recovered at level j and can be safely included in our estimator.

Knowledge of m . As we do not know the value of m , we start with an $O(\log^2 n)$ -relative error approximate estimate, obtained by the Algorithm COARSEESTIMATOR in Beame et al. [BHPR⁺18]. We repeatedly refine the approximate estimate using Algorithm REFINE-ESTIMATE, until we get a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -relative error approximation of m . Each *refinement* improves the approximation factor from the previous stage by a multiplicative factor of ϵ . We note that each refinement does not require any additional BIS queries and uses the approximate degree estimates obtained previously.

Boundary Vertices. It is possible that some vertices have degrees close to the threshold values at each sampling level. We denote such vertices V_{boundary} and refer to them as *boundary vertices*. For such boundary vertices, as we use approximate degree estimates, they might be recovered at a level different from its true level (defined with respect to exact degrees). Such a scenario could potentially affect the contribution of the recovered vertex in our estimator by an additional multiplicative factor dependent on γ and the difference between recovered level and true level. As a result, our estimator might not be a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -relative error approximation anymore. We get around this limitation by dividing the region between any two consecutive levels into B buckets and shifting the boundaries of all the levels by a random shift selected uniformly from the first B buckets. We account for this by changing the sampling rates to $\gamma^{-\mu(j)}$ where $\mu(j)$ encodes the random shift.

With the random shift of the level boundaries, we ensure that every vertex will lie close to the boundary with probability at most ϵ . Moreover, we argue that every boundary vertex is recovered at its true level or level adjacent to its true level. Therefore, the total contribution of V_{boundary} to our edge estimator is $O(\epsilon m)$.

4.3.1 Overview of Algorithm EDGE-ESTIMATOR

Random Boundary Shift. Let ϵ denote the approximation parameter, $B = 2/\epsilon$ denote the total number of buckets between two consecutive levels and $\gamma = 1/(1 - \epsilon)$ the probability of sampling parameter. The region between two consecutive levels is divided into B buckets with the boundaries of buckets proportional to the values given by $\{[1/\gamma^B, 1/\gamma^{B-1}), \dots, [1/\gamma^2, 1/\gamma), [1/\gamma, 1)\}$. We select a random integer offset for shifting our levels, denoted by s , which is selected uniformly at random from $[0, B)$. Now, the level boundaries are located at values proportional to $\gamma^{-\mu(j)}$ where $\mu(j) = j \cdot B - s$ and $0 \leq j \leq L$. Observe that the number of sampling levels is given by $L = \frac{1}{B} \cdot \log_\gamma n + 1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \log n + 1$.

In Algorithm EDGE-ESTIMATOR, we construct sets $V = S_0 \supseteq S_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq S_L$ where a set S_j (for all $j \geq 2$) is obtained by sampling vertices in S_{j-1} with probability $1/\gamma^B$. The set S_1

Algorithm 3 EDGE-ESTIMATOR: Non-adaptive algorithm for estimating edges

Input: V set of n vertices and $\epsilon > 0$ error parameter.

Output: Estimate \hat{m} of number of edges in G .

- 1: Scale $\epsilon \leftarrow \frac{\epsilon}{600 \log_{1/\epsilon} \log n}$ and initialize $\gamma \leftarrow 1/(1 - \epsilon)$ and $B \leftarrow 2/\epsilon$.
- 2: Let s be an integer selected uniformly at random from the interval $[0, B]$.
- 3: Let $\mu(j) \leftarrow -s + j \cdot B$ for every integer j in the interval $[0, \frac{1}{B} \cdot \log_\gamma n + 1]$.
- 4: Initialize $S_0 \leftarrow V$ and construct S_1 by sampling vertices in S_0 with probability $1/\gamma^{\mu(1)}$.
- 5: Construct $S_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq S_L$ for $L = \frac{1}{B} \cdot \log_\gamma n$ where each S_j is obtained by sampling vertices in $S_{j-1} \forall j \geq 2$, independently with probability $1/\gamma^B$.
- 6: **for** $j = 0, 1, \dots, L$ **do**
- 7: Run ESTIMATE-DEGREE (S_j) to obtain the estimates $\hat{d}_j(v)$ for all $v \in S_j$ satisfying:

$$(1 - \epsilon)d(v) \leq \hat{d}_j(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(j)}}.$$

8: **end for**

9: Let \bar{m}_0 be the $O(\log n)$ -approximate estimate from the Algorithm COARSEESTIMATOR in Beame et al. [BHPR⁺18] on a random partition of V .

10: Set $\bar{m}_0 \leftarrow \max\{2, 16 \log n \cdot \bar{m}_0\}$, so that we have $m \leq \bar{m}_0 \leq (64 \log^2 n) \cdot m$.

11: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T = 2 \log_{1/\epsilon} \log n$ **do**

12: \bar{m}_t is assigned the output of REFINE-ESTIMATE that takes as input approximate degree values $\hat{d}_j(v) \forall v \in S_j \forall j \in [L]$, the previous estimate \bar{m}_{t-1} and the iteration t .

13: **end for**

14: **return** $\hat{m} \leftarrow \bar{m}_T$.

is obtained by sampling vertices in V with probability $1/\gamma^{-s+B}$. Our sampling scheme results in each vertex being included in a set S_j with probability $1/\gamma^{\mu(j)}$. We can easily show that with constant probability, $d(S_j) = O(m \log n / \gamma^{\mu(j)})$, for all j . Using Algorithm 2, we obtain approximate degree estimates of vertices in S_j for every sampling level $j \leq L$ with an approximation error of $O(\epsilon^3 / \log^2 n \cdot d(S_j)) = O(m \epsilon^3 / \gamma^{\mu(j)} \log n)$. By starting with a bad estimate \bar{m}_0 for the total number of edges m and initialized to a $O(\log^2 n)$ -approximate estimate, we refine it to obtain an improved estimate \bar{m}_1 . We repeat this process $T = 2 \log_{1/\epsilon} \log n$ times, such that the estimate \bar{m}_{t-1} is used to construct an improved estimate \bar{m}_t . Finally, we return the estimate \bar{m}_T as our final estimate for m .

Overview of Algorithm REFINE-ESTIMATE. Suppose we are given an initial estimate \bar{m} satisfying $m \leq \bar{m} \leq (1 + \alpha)m$ for some unknown approximation factor α satisfying $\epsilon \leq \alpha \leq \binom{n}{2}$. We set the threshold value for recovering a vertex at a level j as $\frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$ where c_2 is a constant. So, when a vertex v with degree estimate $\hat{d}_j(v)$ (obtained from Algorithm 3) satisfies $\hat{d}_j(v) \geq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$, we set the level of recovery $\hat{\ell}(v) = j$ and recovered flag $r(v) = 1$. From construction, we can observe that once a vertex is recovered at a particular level it is not available to be recovered at higher level later. Our estimator is the summation of terms $\gamma^{\mu(\hat{\ell}(v))} \cdot \hat{d}(v)$ for every v satisfying $r(v) = 1$. We normalize \hat{m} to ensure that the final estimate returned satisfies $m \leq \hat{m}$ (see the full version for additional details).

Algorithm 4 REFINES-ESTIMATE: Refines the current estimate of number of edges

Input: \bar{m} satisfying $m \leq \bar{m} \leq m(1 + \alpha)$, approximate degree values $\hat{d}_j(v) \forall v \in S_j \forall j \in [L]$ obtained using Algorithm 3, \bar{m}_0 , and iteration t .

Output: Estimate \hat{m} satisfying $m \leq \hat{m} \leq m(1 + \epsilon \cdot \alpha)$ of number of edges in G .

```

1: Initialize  $\hat{m} \leftarrow 0$ .
2: Initialize  $r(v) \leftarrow 0$  for all  $v$  (indicator if  $v$  has been recovered yet).
3: for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, L$  do
4:   for  $v \in S_j$  do
5:     if  $r(v) = 0$  and  $\hat{d}_j(v) \geq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$  then
6:        $\hat{m} \leftarrow \hat{m} + \gamma^{\mu(j)} \cdot \hat{d}(v)$ 
7:        $\hat{\ell}(v) \leftarrow j$  and  $r(v) \leftarrow 1$ .
8:     end if
9:   end for
10: end for
11: if  $t < T = 2 \log_{1/\epsilon} \log n$  then
12:    $\hat{m} = \hat{m}/2 + (\epsilon \log \log n)^t \bar{m}_0$ . ▷ We normalize  $\hat{m}$  so that we have  $\hat{m} \geq m$ .
13: else
14:    $\hat{m} = \hat{m}/2$ .
15: end if
16: return  $\hat{m}$ .

```

Using Bernstein's inequality, we argue that in iteration t , we can improve the approximation factor of the previous estimate \bar{m}_{t-1} by a multiplicative factor of ϵ in the new estimate \bar{m}_t . After $T = O(\log_{1/\epsilon} \log n)$ iterations, the edge estimate will be a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -relative error approximation satisfying:

Theorem 11. *Given a graph G with n nodes and m edges, there is an algorithm that makes $O(\epsilon^{-5} \log^5 n \log^6(\log n))$ non-adaptive BIS queries to G and returns an estimate \hat{m} satisfying: $m(1 - \epsilon) \leq \hat{m} \leq m(1 + \epsilon)$, with probability at least $3/5$.*

4.3.2 Proof of Theorem 11

First, we show that our degree estimates are calculated accurately at every level with constant probability of success.

Claim 12. *With probability $3/4$, for all levels $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$, we have:*

$$d(S_j) \leq \frac{8m \cdot L}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}}.$$

Proof. As every vertex is included in S_j with probability $1/\gamma^{\mu(j)}$, we get:

$$\mathbf{E}[d(S_j)] = \frac{\sum_{v \in V} d(v)}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} = \frac{2m}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}}$$

Therefore, by Markov's Inequality, $\Pr[d(S_j) \geq 8m \cdot L/\gamma^{\mu(j)}] \leq 1/(4L)$. Taking a union bound over all the levels, with probability at least $3/4$,

$$d(S_j) \leq 8m \cdot L/\gamma^{\mu(j)} \leq 8m \cdot \log n/\gamma^{\mu(j)} \text{ for every level } j \in [L].$$

□

Combining Claim 12 and Lemma 10, for sufficiently large n , we have:

Corollary 13. *The degree estimates returned by Algorithm 2 for each sampling level $j \in [L]$, satisfy the following with probability at least 0.70:*

$$(1 - \epsilon)d(v) \leq \widehat{d}_j(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 m}{\gamma^{\mu(j)} \log n} \quad \forall v \in S_j.$$

Proof. From Lemma 10, we have that, for every $j \in [L]$, with probability at least $1 - O(1/\log n)$, the approximate degree estimates satisfy:

$$(1 - \epsilon)d(v) \leq \widehat{d}_j(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{\epsilon^3}{\log^2 n} \cdot d(S_j) \quad \forall v \in S_j.$$

From Claim 12, we know that $d(S_j) \leq 8m \cdot \log n / \gamma^{\mu(j)}$, for every level $j \in [L]$, with probability at least 3/4. Combining both of them, we have the claim about the approximate degree estimates.

Using union bound, we have that the total failure probability is at most $1/4 + O(L \cdot 1/\log n) \leq 0.30$, as $L = O(\log n)$. Hence, the corollary. □

For each vertex $v \in S$ for some subset $S \subseteq V$, we associate a level $\ell(v)$ such that the *actual* degree of v is a large fraction of the total degree of S , i.e., $\ell(v)$ is the minimum $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, L\}$ satisfying $d(v) \geq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$. The value $\frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$ is called threshold for level $\ell(v)$, and it depends on the estimate \bar{m} for the number of edges m .

Definition 14 (Actual Level). *For every vertex $v \in V$, we associate a level $\ell(v)$ defined as*

$$\ell(v) = \arg \min_{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, L\}} d(v) \geq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}.$$

The vertices that lie close to the threshold of a level and within a γ -multiplicative factor are called the boundary vertices and are defined as below:

Definition 15 (Boundary vertices). *The vertices closer to the boundary are denoted by the set:*

$$V_{\text{boundary}} = \left\{ v \mid d(v) \in \left[\frac{\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \log n}, \frac{\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)} \log n} \right) \text{ or } d(v) \in \left(\frac{\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)+1} \log n}, \frac{\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)} \log n} \right) \right\}.$$

Claim 16. *For any vertex $v \in V$, with probability $1 - \epsilon$, there is some $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, L\}$ such that:*

$$\frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)-1}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \leq d(v) \leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j-1)+1}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}.$$

In other words, $\Pr[v \in V_{\text{boundary}}] \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. For notational convenience, let $\sigma = \frac{\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$. Note that for any $v \in V$ there is some j such that $\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \leq d(v) < \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j-1)}}$. We claim that every such vertex will not lie close to the edges of the interval $\left[\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}}, \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j-1)}} \right)$, i.e., $d(v) \notin \left[\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}}, \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j-1)}} \right)$ and $d(v) \notin \left[\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j-1)+1}}, \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j-1)}} \right)$. We will show that both events occur with probability at most $1/B$, giving the claim via a union bound.

For any v , there is a unique i such that $d(v) \in \left[\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^i}, \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{i-1}}\right)$. Thus, the claim only fails to hold if $i = \mu(j)$ for some j or $i = \mu(j-1) + 1$ for some j . For the first case, when $i = \mu(j) = j \cdot B - s$ for some j is satisfied only if $s = j \cdot B - i$, which occurs with probability $1/B$ since s is selected uniformly at random from $\{0, 1, \dots, B-1\}$. Similarly, $i = \mu(j-1) + 1 = (j-1) \cdot B + 1 - s$ only if $s = (j-1) \cdot B + 1 - i$, which again occurs with probability $1/B$. Using union bound, we have:

$$\Pr \left[d(v) \in \left[\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}}, \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j)-1}} \right) \text{ or } d(v) \in \left[\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j-1)+1}}, \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(j-1)}} \right) \right] \leq \frac{2}{B} = \epsilon.$$

Hence, the claim. \square

Definition 17 (Recovered Level). *A vertex v is recovered at level $\widehat{\ell}(v)$ iff*

$$\widehat{\ell}(v) = \arg \min_{j \in [L]} \widehat{d}_j(v) \geq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}.$$

We associate the following sets with the set of recovered vertices:

$$\mathcal{R} = \{v \in V \mid r(v) = 1\}, \mathcal{R}_{\text{bad}} = \{v \in \mathcal{R} \mid \widehat{\ell}(v) \neq \ell(v)\}, \text{ and } \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}} = \mathcal{R} \cap V_{\text{boundary}}.$$

Here, \mathcal{R}_{bad} represents set of recovered vertices v at a level $\widehat{\ell}(v)$ different from $\ell(v)$. Recall that $\ell(v)$ represents the level at which the vertex v is recovered if we knew the degree $d(v)$ exactly.

Using the next claim, we argue that if v is included in the set of sampled vertices at level $\ell(v)$, i.e., $v \in S_{\ell(v)}$, then, it will be recovered at that level, provided degree estimates satisfy Corollary 13.

Claim 18. *Suppose $v \in S_{\ell(v)}$ and $v \notin V_{\text{boundary}}$ satisfying:*

$$(1 - \epsilon)d(v) \leq \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}}, \text{ then, we have } \widehat{\ell}(v) = \ell(v).$$

Proof. As $v \notin V_{\text{boundary}}$, and $v \in S_{\ell(v)}$, from the definition of boundary vertices, we have:

$$\frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))-1}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \leq d(v) \leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)+1}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}.$$

This implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v) &\geq (1 - \epsilon)d(v) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))-1}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \\ &= (1 - \epsilon)\gamma \cdot \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \\ &= \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}, \end{aligned}$$

as $\gamma = 1/(1 - \epsilon)$, and so in Algorithm REFINE-ESTIMATE (Alg. 4), v will be recovered, and $\widehat{\ell}(v) = \ell(v)$ as long as it hasn't been recovered at a prior level.

At any prior level $j \leq \ell(v) - 1$, from Lemma 10, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{d}_j(v) &\leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(j)}} \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)+1}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(j)}} \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\gamma \cdot \gamma^{(\ell(v)-1-j) \cdot B}} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&= \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \left(1 - \epsilon + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&< \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n},
\end{aligned}$$

as long as we set $c_1 < c_2$. Thus, v will be rejected at any level $j < \ell(v)$. \square

The following corollary is immediate from the previous Claim 18, as every vertex that is not at the boundary is recovered at the actual level.

Corollary 19. *If all the degree estimates of sampled vertices at every level are good approximations, i.e., satisfy the Corollary 13, then, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{bad}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}} \subseteq V_{\text{boundary}}$.*

For a vertex v that lies in the boundary, i.e., $v \in V_{\text{boundary}}$, it is possible that v is recovered at a level far away from $\ell(v)$. Using the next claim, we argue that it will be recovered in the adjacent levels if it has not been recovered at $\ell(v)$.

Claim 20. *Suppose $v \in S_{\ell(v)+1}$ and $v \in V_{\text{boundary}}$ satisfying:*

$$(1 - \epsilon) \leq \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}}, \text{ then, we have } \widehat{\ell}(v) \in \{\ell(v) + 1, \ell(v), \ell(v) - 1\}.$$

Proof. For notational convenience, let $\sigma = \frac{\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$. As $v \in S_{\ell(v)+1}$, we have $v \in S_{\ell(v)-1}$ and $v \in S_{\ell(v)}$ from construction.

First, we observe that $\widehat{\ell}(v) \leq \ell(v) + 1$, because,

$$\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v) \geq (1 - \epsilon)d(v) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))}} \geq (1 - \epsilon) \gamma^B \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)+1)}} \geq \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)+1)}}.$$

The last inequality follows from $(1 - \epsilon) \gamma^B \geq (1 - \epsilon)(1 + \epsilon)^B \geq 3 - 3\epsilon \geq 1$, when $\epsilon \leq \frac{2}{3}$. As $v \in V_{\text{boundary}}$, we have the following cases:

(a) $d(v) \in \left(\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)+1}}, \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)}} \right)$. We use proof by contradiction. Suppose $\widehat{\ell}(v) \leq \ell(v) - 2$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v) &\leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \\
&< \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \\
&= \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^{(\ell(v)-1-\widehat{\ell}(v)) \cdot B}} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^B} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&= \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \left((1 - \epsilon)^B + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \left(e^{-2} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows because $c_1 \leq c_2(1 - e^{-2})$. Therefore, $\widehat{\ell}(v) > \ell(v) - 2$.

(b) $d(v) \in \left[\frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))}}, \frac{\sigma}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))-1}} \right)$. Using a similar argument, we obtain that $\widehat{\ell}(v) \geq \ell(v)$.

For the sake of contradiction, let $\widehat{\ell}(v) \leq \ell(v) - 1$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v) &\leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \\
&< \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \\
&= \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \cdot \left(\frac{\gamma}{\gamma^{(\ell(v)-\widehat{\ell}(v)) \cdot B}} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \left(\frac{2}{\gamma^B} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&= \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \left(2(1 - \epsilon)^B + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \left(2e^{-2} + \frac{c_1 \epsilon}{c_2} \right) \leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows because $c_1 \leq c_2(1 - 2e^{-2})$. Therefore, $\widehat{\ell}(v) > \ell(v) - 1$.

Therefore, we have $\ell(v) - 2 < \widehat{\ell}(v) \leq \ell(v) + 1$. □

Definition 21 (Random variables). Let $\widehat{X}(v)$ be the random variable with $\widehat{X}(v) = \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))} \cdot \widehat{d}(v)$ if v is recovered at level $\widehat{\ell}(v)$ and $\widehat{X}(v) = 0$ otherwise. We define $X(v)$ similarly, assuming we run Algorithm 4 with exact degrees, i.e., $X(v) = \gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \cdot d(v)$ if v is recovered at its actual level $\ell(v)$ and $X(v) = 0$ otherwise.

In the analysis that follows next, we will argue that for most of the vertices in \mathcal{R} , except for those in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}$, the $\widehat{X}(v)$ and $X(v)$ are close to each other, i.e., $1 \pm \epsilon$ approximations of each other. Separately, we show that the contribution of $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \widehat{X}(v)$ is small. As $X(v)$ values do not contain any degree approximations, they are easier to handle and we will show concentration for $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}} X(v)$. As a result, the concentration will also hold for the actual estimate $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}} \widehat{X}(v)$.

Throughout the remaining section, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we will assume that the degrees are *good* approximations. Formally stated, we define \mathcal{E}_0 as the event indicating all the degree estimates at every sampling level satisfy Corollary 13. Note that $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_0] \geq 0.70$ (from Corollary 13).

Claim 22. *With probability at least $1 - 1/11 \log \log n$, we have:*

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \widehat{X}(v) \leq 572\epsilon m \log \log n \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) \leq 44\epsilon m \log \log n.$$

Proof. For the sake of brevity, we omit that all the expected values include conditioning on the event \mathcal{E}_0 .

Consider a vertex $v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}$. We have that the probability a vertex $v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}$ is recovered at a level $\widehat{\ell}(v)$ satisfying $\widehat{\ell}(v) \in \{\ell(v) + 1, \ell(v), \ell(v) - 1\}$ (From Claim 20):

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}] &= \Pr[v \in V_{\text{boundary}}] \cdot \Pr[v \in \mathcal{R} \mid v \in V_{\text{boundary}}] \\ &= \sum_{\widehat{\ell}(v) \in \{\ell(v)+1, \ell(v), \ell(v)-1\}} \Pr[v \in V_{\text{boundary}}] \cdot \Pr[v \in S_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\widehat{X}(v)] &= \sum_{\widehat{\ell}(v) \in \{\ell(v)+1, \ell(v), \ell(v)-1\}} \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))} \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)} \Pr[v \in V_{\text{boundary}}] \cdot \Pr[v \in S_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}] \\ &\leq \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\widehat{\ell}(v) \in \{\ell(v)+1, \ell(v), \ell(v)-1\}} \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)} \\ &\leq 3\epsilon \cdot \left(d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 m}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)} \log n} \right) \quad (\text{using Corollary 13}) \\ &= 3\epsilon \cdot \left(d(v) + \left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)^B \cdot \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 m}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \log n} \right) \\ &\leq 3\epsilon \cdot (d(v) + 5\epsilon d(v)), \text{ because } d(v) \geq \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2 \bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \log n} \geq \frac{c_1 \epsilon^2 m}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \log n} \\ &\leq 18\epsilon \cdot d(v) \\ \Rightarrow \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \widehat{X}(v) \right] &\leq 18\epsilon \cdot \sum_{v \in V} d(v) \leq 36\epsilon m. \end{aligned}$$

Using Markov's inequality, we have $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \widehat{X}_v \leq 572\epsilon m \log n$, with probability $\geq 1 - 1/22 \log \log n$. Similarly, we can bound the sum:

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) \right] \leq \sum_{v \in V} \epsilon \cdot d(v) \leq 2\epsilon m.$$

Using Markov's inequality, we have, with probability $1 - 1/22 \log \log n$, $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{bad}}} X(v) \leq 44\epsilon m \log \log n$. Taking a union bound for both the events, gives us the claim. \square

Claim 23. $\mathbf{E}[X(v)] = d(v) \forall v \in V$. Also, $\mathbf{E}[\sum_{v \in V} X(v)] = 2m$.

Proof. By Claim 18, $X(v)$ is nonzero which requires that $v \in S_{\ell(v)}$. As v is included in $S_{\ell(v)}$ with probability $1/\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))}$. Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[X(v)] &= \gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \cdot d(v) \cdot 1/\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} = d(v) \\ \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{v \in V} X(v)\right] &= \sum_{j \in [L]} \sum_{v \in V \cap S_j} \mathbf{E}[X(v)] = \sum_{v \in V} d(v) = 2m. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Claim 24. $\left| \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \widehat{X}(v) - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) \right| \leq \epsilon \cdot \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v)$.

Proof. Consider a vertex $v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}$. From Claim 18, we have $\widehat{\ell}(v) = \ell(v)$ provided $v \in S_{\ell(v)}$. As we have already conditioned on the event \mathcal{E}_0 , from Corollary 13, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon)d(v) &\leq \widehat{d}_{\ell(v)}(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 m}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \log n} \\ (1 - \epsilon)\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} d(v) &\leq \gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \widehat{d}_{\ell(v)}(v) \leq \gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} d(v) + \gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \cdot \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 m}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \log n} \\ \Rightarrow (1 - \epsilon)X(v) &\leq \widehat{X}(v) \leq X(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 m}{\log n}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\bar{m} \geq m$ and $c_2 > c_1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d(v) &\geq \frac{\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \log n} \geq \frac{m \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \log n} \\ \Rightarrow \frac{m \cdot c_1 \epsilon^3}{\log n} &\leq \frac{m \cdot c_2 \epsilon^3}{\log n} \leq \gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \cdot \epsilon d(v) = \epsilon X(v). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(1 - \epsilon)X(v) \leq \widehat{X}(v) \leq (1 + \epsilon)X(v).$$

Thus, if $\widehat{X}(v)$ is nonzero, $(1 - \epsilon)\widehat{X}(v) \leq X(v) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\widehat{X}(v)$, which gives the claim after summing up over all the terms. \square

Claim 25. The variables $X(v) \forall v \in V$ are independent and bounded given by

$$X(v) \leq \frac{2\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$$

Proof. Since the vertices are included independently in the sets S_0, \dots, S_L , the independence of $X(v)$ follows immediately. Additionally, since $\ell(v)$ is the smallest $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, L\}$ for which $d(v) \geq$

$\frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\bar{j})}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$ (See the definition of $\ell(v)$ in Claim 18), we obtain $d(v) \leq \frac{\bar{m}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$. Thus, if $X(v)$ is nonzero,

$$X(v) = \gamma^{\mu(\ell(v))} \cdot d(v) \leq \frac{\gamma^B \bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \leq \frac{1}{(1-\epsilon)^B} \cdot \frac{\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \leq \frac{2\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}.$$

□

Combining Claims 23 and 25 we obtain:

Claim 26. *With probability at least $1 - 1/n$, $|\sum_v X(v) - 2m| \leq \max\{\epsilon, \epsilon \cdot \alpha\} \cdot 2m$.*

Proof. By Claims 25 and 23, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V} \mathbf{E}[(X(v) - d(v))^2] &= \sum_v \mathbf{E}[X(v)^2] - 2d(v) \mathbf{E}[X(v)] + d(v)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_v \mathbf{E}[X(v)^2] \\ &\leq \frac{2\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \cdot \sum_{v \in V} \mathbf{E}[X(v)] = \frac{2\bar{m} \cdot 2m \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha > 1$, then, $m \leq \bar{m} \leq m(1 + \alpha) \leq 2m\alpha$. From Bernstein's inequality (Lemma 5), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\left| \sum_v X(v) - 2m \right| \geq \epsilon' \alpha \cdot m \right] &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon'^2 \alpha^2 \cdot m^2}{\frac{2 \cdot 2\bar{m} \cdot 2m \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} + \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{2\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \cdot m \epsilon' \alpha} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon'^2 \alpha^2 \cdot m^2 \log n}{2 \cdot 4m\alpha \cdot 2m \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2 + \frac{2}{3} \cdot 4m\alpha \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2 \cdot m \epsilon' \alpha} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon'^2 \alpha^2 \log n}{16c_2 \epsilon^2 \alpha + \frac{8}{3} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2 \cdot \epsilon' \alpha^2} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n}, \text{ because,} \\ \frac{\epsilon'^2 \alpha^2}{16c_2 \epsilon^2 \alpha + \frac{8}{3} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2 \cdot \epsilon' \alpha^2} &\geq 1, \text{ as } 1 \geq \epsilon' \geq \epsilon \left(\frac{56c_2}{3} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha \in [\epsilon', 1]$, then, $\bar{m} \leq 2m$. From Bernstein's inequality (Lemma 5), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\left| \sum_v X(v) - 2m \right| \geq \epsilon' \cdot m \right] &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon'^2 \cdot m^2}{\frac{2 \cdot 2\bar{m} \cdot 2m \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} + \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{2\bar{m} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n} \cdot m \epsilon'} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon'^2 \cdot m^2 \log n}{2 \cdot 4m \cdot 2m \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2 + \frac{2}{3} \cdot 4m \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2 \cdot m \epsilon'} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon'^2 \log n}{64c_2 \epsilon^2 + \frac{16}{3} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n}, \text{ because,} \\ \frac{\epsilon'^2}{64c_2 \epsilon^2 + \frac{16}{3} \cdot c_2 \epsilon^2} &\geq 1, \text{ as } 1 \geq \epsilon' \geq \epsilon \left(\frac{208c_2}{3} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining both the statements, and scaling ϵ gives us the lemma. □

Note that Claim 26 basically gives us what we want, after adjusting constants on α and scaling up our estimate appropriately. We formalize this using the below lemma:

Lemma 27. *Suppose the input \bar{m} to Algorithm REFINE-ESTIMATE satisfies $m \leq \bar{m} \leq m(1 + \alpha)$ for some approximation factor $\epsilon \leq \alpha \leq \frac{\binom{n}{2}}{m}$. Then, with probability $1 - 1/11 \log \log n - 1/n$:*

$$2m(1 - \epsilon \log \log n - \epsilon \cdot \alpha) \leq \sum_{v \in V} \hat{X}(v) \leq 2m(1 + \epsilon \cdot \log \log n + \epsilon \cdot \alpha).$$

Proof. We note that for the vertices that are not recovered, i.e., $r(v) = 0$, we have $\hat{X}(v) = 0$, and therefore need to only consider vertices in \mathcal{R} . From Claim 24, we have:

$$\left| \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \hat{X}(v) - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) \right| \leq \epsilon \cdot \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v)$$

Combining it with $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \hat{X}(v) \leq 572\epsilon m \log \log n$ from Claim 22, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}} \hat{X}(v) &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \hat{X}(v) \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \sum_{v \in V} X(v) + 572\epsilon m \log \log n \\ &\leq 2m(1 + \epsilon \cdot \alpha + \epsilon \cdot \log \log n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows by scaling ϵ (with a constant) appropriately. From Claim 22, we have $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) \leq 44\epsilon m \log \log n$. Therefore, we get:

$$\sum_{v \in V} X(v) \leq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) + 44\epsilon m \log \log n.$$

Similarly, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}} \hat{X}(v) &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} \hat{X}(v) \\ &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{boundary}}} X(v) \\ &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \sum_{v \in V} X(v) - (1 - \epsilon)44\epsilon m \log \log n \\ &\geq 2m(1 - \epsilon \log \log n - \epsilon \cdot \alpha) \geq 2m(1 - \alpha \cdot \epsilon \log \log n). \end{aligned}$$

The last step follows by scaling ϵ appropriately. Using union bound, we get the final probability claim. Hence, the lemma. \square

In Algorithm REFINE-ESTIMATE, we start with an estimate \bar{m}_0 for the number of edges, due to Beame et al.[BHPR⁺18]. The estimate for the number of edges \bar{m}_0 satisfies $m \leq \bar{m}_0 \leq m(1 + \alpha_0)$, for some α_0 . As $m \leq \bar{m}_0 \leq O(m \log^2 n)$, the approximation factor α_0 could be as large as $O(\log^2 n)$. In Lemma 27, we showed that we can improve our estimator by $\epsilon \cdot (\alpha + \log \log n)$ multiplicative factor. We call this multiplicative improvement as *refinement*. In the next theorem, we argue that our Algorithm 3 which performs repeated refinements results in a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation.

Theorem 28 (Theorem 11 restated). *Given a graph G with n nodes and m edges, there is an algorithm that makes $O(\epsilon^{-5} \log^5 n \log^6(\log n))$ non-adaptive BIS queries to G and returns an estimate \widehat{m} satisfying: $m(1 - \epsilon) \leq \widehat{m} \leq m(1 + \epsilon)$, with probability at least $3/5$.*

Proof. We denote $\epsilon' = O(\epsilon \log \log n)$. As $m \leq \bar{m}_0 \leq O(m \log^2 n)$, the approximation factor α_0 could be as large as $O(\log^2 n)$. From Lemma 27, we have that each refinement improves the approximation factor to $m(1 + \epsilon \cdot \alpha + \epsilon \cdot \log n) \leq m(1 + \epsilon' \alpha_0) \leq m + \epsilon' m \alpha_0$. Therefore, after $O(\log_{1/\epsilon'} \log n)$ refinements, we expect the upper bound in the approximation to reduce from $\alpha_0 \cdot m$ to $O(\epsilon' \cdot m)$. However, each refinement worsens the lower bound from m to $m(1 - \epsilon' \cdot \alpha)$. In order to maintain the invariant that the input to Algorithm 4 always satisfies $\bar{m}_1 = \widehat{m} \geq m$, we normalize it by adding $\epsilon' m_0$. This implies that $\widehat{m} \leq m + 2\epsilon' m \alpha_0$, and the new approximation factor $\alpha_1 \leq 2\epsilon' \alpha_0$. Continuing this, after $T - 1 = 3 \log_{1/\epsilon'} \log n$ refinements, we will have $\widehat{m}_T \leq m + (2\epsilon')^T m \alpha_0$. By scaling $\epsilon = O(\epsilon' / \log \log n)$, we have, $\epsilon' \leq 1/c$ for some integer constant $c > 2$ and $\widehat{m}_T \leq m + \epsilon \cdot m$. So, the final estimate \widehat{m} returned satisfies:

$$m(1 - \epsilon) \leq \widehat{m} \leq m(1 + \epsilon)$$

For each level of sampling, we use Algorithm 2 to return degree estimates which requires $O(\epsilon^{-5} \log^4 n \log(\log n))$ BIS queries and $O(\epsilon^{-5} \log^5 n \log^2(\log n))$ in total including all the L levels (without scaling of ϵ). As we have scaled by setting $\epsilon = O(\epsilon' / \log \log n)$, the total number of BIS queries is $O(\epsilon^{-5} \log^5 n \log^6(\log n))$.

Recall that we have conditioned on the event \mathcal{E}_0 that our degree estimates are accurate. Using union bound, the total probability of failure across $O(\log \log n)$ refinements is:

$$\Pr[\neg \mathcal{E}_0] + (1/10 \log \log n + 1/n) \cdot \log \log n \leq 0.30 + 1/11 + \log \log n/n \leq 2/5 \text{ for sufficiently large } n.$$

Hence, the theorem. □

5 Non-adaptive algorithms for uniform sampling

In this section, we describe algorithms for sampling a *near*-uniform edge in the graph. In Section 5.1, we discuss connections between OR queries (Definition 4) and BIS queries, and outline an algorithm that takes as input two disjoint subsets L, R and returns a uniform vertex in $|\Gamma(L) \cap R|$. Next, in Section 5.2, we use this algorithm to return uniform neighbors for every vertex in a given subset sampled from V . Finally, in Section 5.3, we combine these neighbors obtained for each vertex, and return a *near*-uniform sample among the edges of the graph.

5.1 Identifying uniform neighbor of a subset of vertices

We will describe connections between OR queries (Definition 4) and BIS queries that give us algorithms for sampling uniformly an edge from the neighborhood of a subset of vertices L in another disjoint subset R . This is similar to Section 4, where we discussed algorithms for counting the number of edges in the neighborhood of a set L in another disjoint subset R .

In [ACK21], the authors discuss various algorithms for the well-studied single element recovery problem using OR-queries. In the single element recovery problem, we are given a boolean vector, and we want to identify a non-zero index (also called element) of the vector.

Definition 29 (Single Element Recovery [ACK21]). *Given a boolean vector $x \in \{0, 1\}^N$, return a non-zero element from the support of x , denoted by $\text{supp}(x)$.*

Lemma 30 (Lemma 4.3 from [ACK21] restated). *Suppose $x \in \{0, 1\}^N$ is a boolean vector. There is a non-adaptive randomized algorithm that recovers a uniform element $j \in \text{supp}(x)$ with probability $1 - \delta$ and uses $O(\log^2 N \log(1/\delta))$ OR queries.*

Simulating a BIS query using OR query. We start with an observation that any BIS query can be simulated using a single OR query. An OR query (Definition 4) takes as input a subset $S \subseteq V \times V$ of pairs of vertices and returns if an edge of the graph is present among the subset. Therefore, a BIS query $\mathcal{BIS}(L, R)$ is equivalent to an OR query of the subset $S = \{(u, v) \mid u \in L, v \in R\}$.

Now, we will show a connection in the other direction for the problem of single element recovery, i.e., we show that OR queries used for finding single element recovery can be simulated using appropriate BIS queries.

Suppose we are given two disjoint subsets $L, R \subseteq V$, and we want to output a neighbor of L in R , i.e., a vertex in the set $\Gamma(L) \cap R$. Intuitively, this is equivalent to finding a non-zero element (corresponds to a neighbor vertex) in the vector defined over the subset R for a given subset L .

Simulating an OR query using BIS query for finding a neighbor. Let $x_R \in \{0, 1\}^R$ denote a vector such that i th element of the vector corresponds to the i th vertex v_i in R (according to some fixed ordering of vertices). If $v_i \in \Gamma(L) \cap R$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, |R|\}$, then, $x_R[i] = 1$, otherwise it is 0. Let \mathcal{Q} denotes the set of OR queries used to recover a uniform element from x_R using the algorithm from Lemma 30. Each of the OR queries $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ is defined over a subset $R_q \subseteq \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|R|}\}$ and can be replaced with a corresponding BIS query $\mathcal{BIS}(L, R_q)$ with the same output. Therefore, we can restate Lemma 30 in terms of BIS queries as follows:

Lemma 31. *Suppose $L, R \subseteq V$ are disjoint subsets. There is a non-adaptive randomized algorithm that recovers a uniform neighbor $u \in \Gamma(L) \cap R$ with probability $1 - \delta$ and uses $O(\log^2 |R| \log(1/\delta))$ BIS queries.*

5.2 Identifying uniform neighbour for each vertex

In this section, given a subset $S \subseteq V$, we describe an algorithm that returns a uniform neighbor for every vertex in S based on the ideas from Section 5.1.

Overview of Algorithm UNIFORM-NEIGHBOR. Our algorithm extends ESTIMATE-DEGREE by also returning a uniform neighbor for every vertex in S , along with the degree estimates. Consider a vertex v contained in the partition S^{ta} . Along with the estimating the neighborhood size of the partition containing a vertex v , we also return a uniform neighbor from the set $\Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap V \setminus S^{ta}$ using Lemma 31 from Section 5.1. So, we will have a set of $T = O(\log n)$ neighbors for every vertex. By selecting the neighbor corresponding to the partition $S^{t_{\min}(v)a}$ containing v , we ensure that the neighbor is a uniform neighbor of v with high success probability. Here, the partition $S^{t_{\min}(v)a}$ where $t_{\min}(v) \in [T]$, corresponds to the random partition with the minimum neighborhood estimate size and is used for degree estimate of v , i.e., $\hat{d}(v)$.

We extend Lemma 31 and obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 32. *If $v \in S^{ta}$ for some $t \in [T], a \in [\lambda]$, then, for every neighbor $w \in \Gamma(v) \cap V \setminus S^{ta}$, we have:*

$$\Pr[w = z^{ta}] = \frac{1}{|\Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap V \setminus S_j^{ta}|}$$

Algorithm 5 UNIFORM-NEIGHBOR: Uniform neighbor for each vertex in a given subset S

Input: Subset $S \subseteq V$.
Output: Degree estimates and a uniform neighbour for each vertex $v \in S$.

- 1: Initialize $\widehat{d}(v) \leftarrow n$ for every $v \in S$.
- 2: **for** t in $\{1, 2, \dots, T = O(\log n)\}$ **do**
- 3: Consider a random partitioning of S into $S^{t1}, S^{t2}, \dots, S^{t\lambda}$ where $\lambda = O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^2 n)$.
- 4: **for** every partition S^{ta} where $a \in [\lambda]$ **do**
- 5: Let z^{ta} is sample returned using Lemma 31 where $L = S^{ta}, R = V \setminus S^{ta}$ and $\delta = O(\epsilon/\log n^4)$.
- 6: $\eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta}) \leftarrow \text{NEIGHBORHOOD-SIZE}(S^{ta}, V \setminus S^{ta})$.
- 7: **for** $v \in S^{ta}$ **do**
- 8: **if** $\widehat{d}(v) > \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta})$ **then**
- 9: $\widehat{d}(v) \leftarrow \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{ta})$.
- 10: $t_{\min}(v) \leftarrow t$.
- 11: **end if**
- 12: **end for**
- 13: **end for**
- 14: **end for**
- 15: $\mathcal{U}_j(v) = z^{t_{\min}(v)a}$ for every $v \in S$.
- 16: **return** $\widehat{d}(v), \mathcal{U}_j(v)$ for every $v \in S$.

Proof. From Lemma 31, we know that any vertex $w \in \Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap V \setminus S^{ta}$ will satisfy :

$$\Pr[w = z^{ta}] = \frac{1}{|\Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap V \setminus S_j^{ta}|}.$$

As $\Gamma(v) \cap V \setminus S^{ta} \subseteq \Gamma(S^{ta}) \cap V \setminus S^{ta}$, we have the corollary. □

Lemma 33. *Suppose $S \subseteq V$. Then, Algorithm 5 uses $O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^5 n \log(\epsilon^{-1} \log n))$ BIS queries and with probability $1 - O(\epsilon/\log n)$, returns degree estimates $\widehat{d}(v)$ for every vertex $v \in S$ satisfying:*

$$d(v)(1 - \epsilon) \leq \widehat{d}(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{\epsilon^4}{\log^2 n} \cdot d(S).$$

Proof. For every random partition, we use Lemma 31 to return a uniform neighbor. This step uses $O(\log^2 n \log(1/\delta))$ BIS queries and succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, where $\delta = O(\epsilon/T\lambda \log n)$, $T = O(\log n)$, and $\lambda = O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^2 n)$. The total number of random partitions considered is $O(T \cdot \lambda) = O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^3 n)$. Following the proof of Lemma 10, we get the lemma. □

5.3 Identifying a uniform edge in the graph

In this section, we give an algorithm that returns an edge sample from a distribution that is close to the uniform distribution. Our algorithm extends Algorithm EDGE-ESTIMATOR and is based on the following idea. Suppose we know the degrees of all the vertices, denoted by $d(v) \forall v \in V$, in the graph. In order to sample a uniform edge, we can sample a vertex v with probability $d(v)/\sum_{w \in V} d(w)$ and return a uniform neighbor among the neighbors of v . We can observe that the probability that an edge $e = (v, u)$ is sampled is $d(v)/\sum_{w \in V} d(w) \cdot 1/d(v) + d(u)/\sum_{w \in V} d(w) \cdot 1/d(u) = 1/m$.

Algorithm 6 SAMPLING: Non-adaptive algorithm for sampling uniform edges

Input: V set of n vertices and $\epsilon > 0$ error parameter.

Output: Edge of the graph sampled from a (near)-uniform distribution.

- 1: Scale $\epsilon \leftarrow \frac{\epsilon}{600 \log_{1/\epsilon} \log n}$ and initialize $\gamma \leftarrow 1/(1 - \epsilon)$ and $B \leftarrow 2/\epsilon$.
 - 2: Let s be an integer selected uniformly at random from the interval $[0, B)$.
 - 3: Let $\mu(j) \leftarrow -s + j \cdot B$ for every integer j in the interval $[0, \frac{1}{B} \cdot \log_\gamma n]$.
 - 4: Initialize $S_0 \leftarrow V$ and construct S_1 by sampling vertices in S_0 with probability $1/\gamma^{\mu(1)}$.
 - 5: Construct $S_1 \supseteq S_2 \dots \supseteq S_L$ for $L = \frac{1}{B} \cdot \log_\gamma n$ where each S_j is obtained by sampling vertices in $S_{j-1} \forall j \geq 2$, independently with probability $1/\gamma^B$.
 - 6: **for** $j = 0, 1, \dots, L$ **do**
 - 7: Run UNIFORM-NEIGHBOR (Algorithm 5) on S_j , to obtain the degree estimates $\hat{d}_j(v)$ satisfying $(1 - \epsilon)d(v) \leq \hat{d}_j(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 \cdot m}{\log n \cdot \gamma^{\mu(j)}}$ for all $v \in S_j$.
 - 8: Let $\mathcal{U}(v)$ denote the neighbor returned by Algorithm 5 for vertex $v \in S_j$.
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: Let \bar{m}_0 be the $O(\log n)$ -approximate estimate from the Algorithm COARSEESTIMATOR in Beame et al. [BHPR⁺18] on a random partition of V .
 - 11: Set $\bar{m}_0 \leftarrow \max\{2, 16 \log n \cdot \bar{m}_0\}$, so that we have $m \leq \bar{m}_0 \leq (64 \log^2 n) \cdot m$.
 - 12: **for** $t = 1, 2, \dots, T = 2 \log_{1/\epsilon} \log n$ **do**
 - 13: \bar{m}_t is assigned the output of REFINE-ESTIMATE that takes as input approximate degree values $\hat{d}_j(v) \forall v \in S_j \forall j \in [L]$, the previous estimate \bar{m}_{t-1} and the iteration t .
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: For every v recovered, let $\hat{\ell}(v)$ denote the level at which v was recovered by T th iteration of REFINE-ESTIMATE. Include all the recovered vertices in \mathcal{R} .
 - 16: Let v_{sampled} be the vertex drawn from the distribution such that a vertex v in \mathcal{R} is selected with probability proportional to $\gamma^{\mu(\hat{\ell}(v))} \cdot \hat{d}_{\hat{\ell}(v)}(v)$.
 - 17: **return** edge $(v_{\text{sampled}}, \mathcal{U}(v_{\text{sampled}}))$.
-

In order to extend the above idea to our setting, there are two challenges. First, we do not know the degrees (or approximate degrees) of all the vertices. This is because the set of recovered vertices, i.e., with $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximate degree estimates known is a subset of the sampled vertices at each level of sampling. Secondly, each vertex is recovered at a different level and is therefore sampled with different probabilities. In order to return a uniform edge based on the previously discussed idea, we must return a single vertex among the set of recovered vertices with probability proportional to its degree.

We address these two challenges by, amongst the recovered vertices, returning vertex v with probability proportional to $\gamma^{\hat{\ell}(v)} \cdot \hat{d}(v)$ where $\hat{\ell}(v)$ is the level at which it is recovered, and $\hat{d}_{\hat{\ell}(v)}(v)$ is the degree estimate at the level of recovery. From Section 4.3, we know that our estimator $\sum_{v \text{ is recovered}} \hat{X}(v) = \sum_{v \text{ is recovered}} \gamma^{\hat{\ell}(v)} \cdot \hat{d}(v)$ is concentrated around $2m$ (See Lemma 27) and we will be able to return a *near*-uniform sample.

Overview of Algorithm SAMPLING. Our algorithm is an extension of Algorithm EDGE-ESTIMATOR (Algorithm 3) and the differences are highlighted in blue. During the process of constructing the edge estimator, by repeated refinements, let $\hat{\ell}(v)$ denote the level at which a vertex v is recovered at the last, i.e., $T = O(\log_{1/\epsilon} \log n)^{\text{th}}$ refinement iteration, and the corresponding degree estimate

$\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)$. Let \mathcal{R} denote the set of all recovered vertices, i.e., $\widehat{X}(v) \neq 0$, in the last *refinement* iteration. Then, we draw a vertex v from the distribution such that it is selected with probability proportional to $\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))} \cdot \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)$. From our earlier discussion, this approach will result in a *near-uniform* sample.

5.3.1 Proof of Theorem 2

Claim 34. *With probability $1 - 2\epsilon$, for all levels $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$, we have:*

$$d(S_j) \leq \frac{m \cdot L}{\epsilon \gamma^{\mu(j)}}.$$

Proof. As every vertex is included in S_j with probability $1/\gamma^{\mu(j)}$, we get:

$$\mathbf{E}[d(S_j)] = \frac{\sum_{v \in V} d(v)}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} = \frac{2m}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}}$$

Therefore, by Markov's Inequality, $\Pr[d(S_j) \geq m \cdot L/\epsilon \gamma^{\mu(j)}] \leq 2\epsilon/L$. Taking a union bound over all the levels, with probability at least $1 - 2\epsilon$,

$$d(S_j) \leq m \cdot L/\epsilon \gamma^{\mu(j)} \leq m \cdot \log n/\epsilon \gamma^{\mu(j)} \text{ for every level } j \in [L].$$

□

By setting $\lambda = O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^2 n)$, a multiplicative factor of $1/\epsilon$ more than that in section 4, we ensure that the exact guarantees hold with probability $1 - \epsilon$. Combining Claim 34 and Lemma 33, for sufficiently large n , we have:

Corollary 35. *The degree estimates returned by Algorithm 5 for each sampling level $j \in [L]$, satisfy the following with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$:*

$$(1 - \epsilon)d(v) \leq \widehat{d}_j(v) \leq d(v) + \frac{c_1 \epsilon^3 m}{\gamma^{\mu(j)} \log n} \quad \forall v \in S_j.$$

For the remaining portion of this section, we will condition on the event that Corollary 35 is satisfied. In the proof of the main Theorem 38, we account for the failure probability of this event.

In the next lemma, we show that if a vertex is recovered at level j (recall the threshold value for recovery from Section 4.3), the neighbor returned by Algorithm 5, given by $\mathcal{U}_j(v)$ is equal to any neighbor of v with probability $1/\widehat{d}_j(v)$. From Section 4.3, we know that approximate degree of v obtained from the set S , denoted by $\widehat{d}_j(v)$, when $\ell(v) = j$ is a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of $d(v)$, therefore, we have returned a neighbor of v with probability $(1 \pm \epsilon)/d(v)$.

Lemma 36. *Suppose $v \in S_j$ satisfies the following: $\widehat{d}(v) \geq \frac{m}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}$. Then, for every $w \in \Gamma(v)$, we have with probability $1 - \epsilon$:*

$$(1 - \epsilon) \frac{1}{\widehat{d}(v)} \leq \Pr[\mathcal{U}_j(v) = w] \leq (1 + \epsilon) \frac{1}{\widehat{d}(v)}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 9, we know that:

$$(1 - \epsilon)|\Gamma(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}) \cap V \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}| \leq \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)|\Gamma(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}) \cap V \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}|.$$

Moreover, our degree estimates in Algorithm 5 are obtained by $\widehat{d}(v) = \eta_{\text{est}}(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a})$. Consider a vertex $w \in \Gamma(v)$. If $w \in \Gamma(v) \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{U}_j(v) = w] &= \frac{1}{|\Gamma(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}) \cap V \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}|} \\ (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{d}(v)} &\leq \Pr[\mathcal{U}_j(v) = w] \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{d}(v)} \end{aligned}$$

If $w \in \Gamma(v) \cap S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}$, then, it is never returned. In iteration $t_{\min}(v) \in [T]$, $w \in S$ is assigned to one of the λ random partitions, we observe that such an event happens with probability:

$$\Pr[w \in S^{t_{\min}(v)^a} \cap \Gamma(v)] = \frac{1}{\lambda} = \frac{\epsilon^4}{c \log^2 n} \leq \epsilon, \text{ for some constant } c > 1.$$

It is possible that $\mathcal{U}_j(v) \notin \Gamma(v) \cap (V \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a})$, which is a failure event for us, as no neighbor of v will be returned. We will argue that probability for such an event occurring is small.

From the analysis in Lemma 10 and Corollary 35, with probability at least $1 - 1/n^3$ and for an appropriate choice of c_2 , we have:

$$d(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a} \setminus \{v\}) \leq \frac{c_1 m \cdot \epsilon^3}{\gamma^{\mu(j)} \log n} \leq \epsilon \widehat{d}(v) \quad (\text{as we are given } \widehat{d}(v) \geq \frac{m}{\gamma^{\mu(j)}} \cdot \frac{c_2 \epsilon^2}{\log n}).$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{U}_j(v) \notin \Gamma(v) \cap (V \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a})] &\leq \frac{|\Gamma(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a} \setminus \{v\}) \cap V \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}|}{|\Gamma(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}) \cap V \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}|} \\ &\leq \frac{d(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a} \setminus \{v\})}{|\Gamma(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}) \cap V \setminus S^{t_{\min}(v)^a}|} \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \frac{d(S^{t_{\min}(v)^a} \setminus \{v\})}{\widehat{d}(v)} \leq \epsilon(1 + \epsilon) = 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

By union bound, failure probability is at most $1/n^3 + \epsilon \leq 2\epsilon$. Scaling ϵ appropriately, gives us the lemma. \square

In the next lemma, we show that if a vertex is not in V_{boundary} , then, it is recovered with the required probability of $\widehat{d}(v)/2m$ (upto $1 \pm \epsilon$ factor). Otherwise, we argue that the probability of returning it is not too large.

Lemma 37. *For any vertex v , with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, we have:*

1. $(1 - \epsilon) \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m} \leq \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v] \leq (1 + \epsilon) \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m}$ if $v \notin V_{\text{boundary}}$.
2. $\Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v] \leq \frac{15(1+\epsilon)\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m}$ if $v \in V_{\text{boundary}}$.

Proof. We condition on the event that the $(1 - \epsilon)2m \leq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}} \widehat{X}(v) \leq (1 + \epsilon)2m$, which happens with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ (follows from Corollary 35, Lemma 27, and Theorem 11).

From Claim 18, we know that a vertex not lying at the boundary will be recovered at level $\ell(v)$, i.e., $\widehat{\ell}(v) = \ell(v)$. Consider a vertex $v \in V \setminus V_{\text{boundary}}$, we have:

$$\Pr[v \in \mathcal{R}] = \Pr[v \in S_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}] = \frac{1}{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}}$$

From construction, for any vertex $v \in \mathcal{R}$, we have that

$$\Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v \mid v \in \mathcal{R}] = \frac{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))} \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}} \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))} \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(w)}(w)} \leq (1 + 2\epsilon) \frac{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))} \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m}.$$

Similarly, we get:

$$\Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v \mid v \in \mathcal{R}] \geq (1 - \epsilon) \frac{\gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))} \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m}.$$

Combining both the above statements and scaling $\epsilon = \epsilon/2$, we get:

$$(1 - \epsilon) \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m} \leq \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v] \leq (1 + \epsilon) \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m}.$$

Now, consider a vertex $v \in V_{\text{boundary}}$. From Claim 20, if included in we know that $\widehat{\ell}(v) \in \{\ell(v) - 1, \ell(v), \ell(v) + 1\}$, provided it is included in their corresponding set $S_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[v \in \mathcal{R}] &\leq \sum_{\widehat{\ell}(v) \in \{\ell(v)-1, \ell(v), \ell(v)+1\}} \Pr[v \in S_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}] \leq \frac{3}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)}} \\ \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v] &= \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v \mid v \in \mathcal{R}] \cdot \Pr[v \in \mathcal{R}] \leq \frac{3(1 + 2\epsilon) \gamma^{\mu(\widehat{\ell}(v))}}{\gamma^{\mu(\ell(v)-1)}} \cdot \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m} \\ &\leq \frac{15(1 + 2\epsilon) \widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the lemma. \square

Theorem 38. *Given a graph G with n nodes, m edges, and edge set E , there is an algorithm that makes $O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^6 n \log(\epsilon^{-1} \log n) + \epsilon^{-6} \log^5 n \log^6(\log n) \log(\epsilon^{-1} \log n))$ non-adaptive BIS queries which, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, outputs an edge from a probability distribution P satisfying $(1 - \epsilon)/m \leq P(e) \leq (1 + \epsilon)/m$ for every $e \in E$.*

Proof. Consider an edge $e = (v, u)$. Then, the edge $e = (v, u)$ can be returned by Algorithm 6 if either v or u is the vertex sampled v_{sampled} and the other vertex is the neighbor returned by

Algorithm 5. From Lemmas 36 and 37, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[e \text{ is returned by Algorithm 6}] &= \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{U}(v) = u] + \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = u] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{U}(u) = v] \\
&\Rightarrow \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v] = \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v \mid v \in V \setminus V_{\text{boundary}}] \Pr[v \in V \setminus V_{\text{boundary}}] \\
&\quad + \Pr[v_{\text{sampled}} = v \mid v \in V_{\text{boundary}}] \Pr[v \in V_{\text{boundary}}] \\
&\leq (1 + \epsilon)^2 \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m} + \epsilon \cdot \frac{15(1 + 2\epsilon)\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m} \\
&\leq (1 + O(\epsilon)) \cdot \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[e \text{ is returned by Algorithm 6}] &\leq (1 + O(\epsilon)) \cdot \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)}{2m} \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(v)}(v)} + (1 + O(\epsilon)) \cdot \frac{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(u)}(u)}{2m} \cdot \frac{1}{\widehat{d}_{\widehat{\ell}(u)}(u)} \\
&\leq (1 + O(\epsilon)) \cdot \frac{1}{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

The total number of additional (other than those used for edge estimation) BIS queries used is $O(\log n \cdot Q)$ where Q is the queries used by Algorithm 5 to return a (near) uniform sample. From Claim 33, we have that $Q = O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^5 n \log(\epsilon^{-1} \log n))$. In Algorithm 5, as we partition each sampled subset S_j , for every $j \in L$, into an additional $1/\epsilon$ factor many partitions as compared to Algorithm 2. Therefore, we use a total of $O(\epsilon^{-4} \log^6 n \log(\epsilon^{-1} \log n) + \epsilon^{-6} \log^5 n \log^6(\log n) \log(\epsilon^{-1} \log n))$ BIS queries for edge estimation.

Using union bound, we have that the failure probability in Lemma 37 and Corollary 35 is at most $O(\epsilon)$. Scaling the ϵ appropriately, gives us a failure probability of ϵ . Hence, the theorem. \square

6 Graph Connectivity

In this section, we present Algorithm CONNECTIVITY-BIS that uses 2-rounds of adaptivity to determine the connectivity of an input graph G . This improves upon on a prior three-round algorithm of [ACK21]. In particular, the algorithm of [ACK21] selects $O(\log^2 n)$ random neighbors per vertex, and contracts the connected components of this random graph into *supernodes*. This random sampling step can be performed using one round of $\widetilde{O}(n)$ BIS queries. They prove that in the contracted graph on the supernodes, there are at most $O(n \log n)$ edges. Using this fact, they then show how to identify whether all the supernodes are connected using $\widetilde{O}(n)$ BIS queries and two additional rounds of adaptivity.

We follow the same basic approach: using a first round of $\widetilde{O}(n)$ queries to randomly sample $O(\log^2 n)$ neighbors per vertex and contract the graph into supernodes. Once this is done, we observe that we have BIS query access to the contracted graph simply by always grouping together the set of nodes in each supernode. So, we can directly apply the non-adaptive sampling algorithm of Theorem 2 to sample edges from the contracted graph. By a coupon collecting argument, drawing $O(n \log^2 n)$ near-uniform edge samples (with replacement) from the contracted graph suffices to recover all $O(n \log n)$ edges in the graph, and thus determine connectivity of the contracted graph, and, in turn, the original graph.

Algorithm CONNECTIVITY-BIS:

1. For every node $v \in V$, sample $O(\log^2 n)$ edges uniformly with replacement, from the neighborhood $\Gamma(v)$, using Lemma 31. Let the resulting set of edges sampled be denoted by $E' \subseteq E$ and the connected components in the subgraph $G(V, E')$ be S_1, S_2, \dots, S_p .
2. Let $G^{\text{sup}}(V^{\text{sup}}, E^{\text{sup}})$ where $E^{\text{sup}} \subseteq V^{\text{sup}} \times V^{\text{sup}}$ denotes the supergraph obtained from $G(V, E')$ by collapsing the connected components S_1, S_2, \dots, S_p into single supernodes s_1, s_2, \dots, s_p respectively, given by:

$$V^{\text{sup}} = \{s_i \mid S_i \text{ where } i \in [p] \text{ is a connected component in } G(V, E')\}$$

$$E^{\text{sup}} = \{(s_i, s_j) \mid \exists x \in S_i, y \in S_j \text{ where } i \neq j \text{ such that } (x, y) \in E\}.$$

3. Run Algorithm 6 (with any constant value for ϵ) on G^{sup} to draw $T = O(n \log^2 n)$ uniform superedge samples with replacement, from E^{sup} . If the resulting graph G^{sup} is connected, output ‘Yes’. Otherwise, output ‘No’.

Theorem 39. *Given a graph G with n nodes, there is a 2-round adaptive algorithm that determines if G is connected with probability at least $1 - 1/n$ using $\tilde{O}(n \log^8 n)$ BIS queries, where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ ignores the $\log^{O(1)} \log n$ dependencies.*

Proof. We have: $|E^{\text{sup}}| = O(n \log n)$ (see Lemma 6.5 in [ACK21]). From Theorem 38, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[(s_i, s_j) \in E^{\text{sup}} \text{ is returned}] &\geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \frac{(1 - \epsilon)}{|E^{\text{sup}}|} \geq (1 - 2\epsilon) \cdot c \cdot \frac{1}{n \log n} \text{ for constant } \epsilon < 0.5 \\ \Rightarrow \Pr[(s_i, s_j) \text{ is not returned}] &= (1 - \Pr[(s_i, s_j) \in E^{\text{sup}} \text{ is returned}])^T \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{2c}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{n \log n} \cdot T} \leq \frac{1}{n^4}. \end{aligned}$$

By union bounding over at most $O(n \log n)$ many superedges, the total failure probability is at most $1/n^2$. Similarly, union bounding over the failure probability of recovering $O(n \log^2 n)$ edges in the first step, we have that the failure probability is at most $1/n^2$. Therefore, Algorithm CONNECTIVITY-BIS recovers all the edges in E^{sup} with probability at least $1 - 1/n$.

From Lemma 31, the total number of BIS queries required in the first round of our algorithm is $O(n \cdot \log^2 n \cdot \log^3 n) = O(n \log^5 n)$. Setting ϵ to be any constant value, from Theorem 38, the total number of BIS queries required is $O(n \log^5 n) + \tilde{O}(n \log^2 n \cdot \log^6 n) = \tilde{O}(n \log^8 n)$, where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ ignores the $\log \log n$ dependencies. Hence, the theorem. \square

7 Conclusion and Open Questions

In this paper, we presented non-adaptive algorithms for edge estimation and sampling using BIS queries. It would be interesting to see if there is a better dependence on ϵ than that obtained by our algorithms, when we consider non-adaptive algorithms for edge estimation. Using Independent Set (IS) queries, *adaptive* algorithms for edge estimation with optimal query complexity $O(\min\{\sqrt{m}, n/\sqrt{m}\} \cdot \text{poly}(\log n, 1/\epsilon))$ were obtained only recently [CLW20, BHPR⁺18]. It would be interesting to see if we can extend our techniques to study *non-adaptive* algorithms for edge estimation using IS queries or in the standard adjacency list model. We believe that adaptivity plays a role similar to that of number of passes for streaming algorithms, and optimizing for the rounds of adaptivity could be a good future direction, even for problems that might already have query optimal adaptive sub-linear time algorithms.

Acknowledgements

Part of this work was done while R. Addanki was a visiting student at the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing. This work was supported by a Dissertation Writing Fellowship awarded by the Manning College of Information and Computer Sciences, University of Massachusetts Amherst to R. Addanki. In addition, this work was supported by NSF grants CCF-1934846, CCF-1908849, and CCF-1637536, awarded to A. McGregor; and NSF grants CCF-2046235, IIS-1763618, as well as Adobe and Google Research Grants, awarded to C. Musco. We thank the anonymous reviewers of the European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA) 2022, for their helpful suggestions.

References

- [AAAK17] Arpit Agarwal, Shivani Agarwal, Sepehr Assadi, and Sanjeev Khanna. Learning with limited rounds of adaptivity: Coin tossing, multi-armed bandits, and ranking from pairwise comparisons. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 39–75, 2017. [3](#)
- [ABG⁺18] Maryam Aliakbarpour, Amartya Shankha Biswas, Themis Gouleakis, John Peebles, Ronitt Rubinfeld, and Anak Yodpinyanee. Sublinear-time algorithms for counting star subgraphs via edge sampling. *Algorithmica*, 80(2):668–697, 2018. [2](#)
- [AC08] Dana Angluin and Jiang Chen. Learning a hidden graph using $o(\log n)$ queries per edge. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 74(4):546–556, 2008. [2](#)
- [ACK21] Sepehr Assadi, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, and Sanjeev Khanna. Graph connectivity and single element recovery via linear and OR queries. In *29th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, (ESA)*, pages 7:1–7:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [25](#), [26](#), [32](#), [33](#)
- [AGM12] Kook Jin Ahn, Sudipto Guha, and Andrew McGregor. Analyzing graph structure via linear measurements. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 459–467, 2012. [2](#), [4](#)
- [AHP08] Boris Aronov and Sarel Har-Peled. On approximating the depth and related problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 38(3):899–921, 2008. [2](#)
- [AN19] Hasan Abasi and Bshouty Nader. On learning graphs with edge-detecting queries. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory (ALT)*, pages 3–30, 2019. [2](#)
- [BBGM19] Anup Bhattacharya, Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, and Gopinath Mishra. Hyperedge estimation using polylogarithmic subset queries. [arXiv:1908.04196](#), 2019. [2](#)
- [BBGM21] Anup Bhattacharya, Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, and Gopinath Mishra. On triangle estimation using tripartite independent set queries. *Theory of Computing Systems*, pages 1–28, 2021. [2](#)
- [BBGM22] Anup Bhattacharya, Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, and Gopinath Mishra. Faster counting and sampling algorithms using colorful decision oracle. In *Proceedings of the 39th*

International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS), 2022. 2, 3

- [Beh22] Soheil Behnezhad. Time-optimal sublinear algorithms for matching and vertex cover. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 873–884, 2022. 2
- [BER21] Amartya Shankha Biswas, Talya Eden, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Towards a decomposition-optimal algorithm for counting and sampling arbitrary motifs in sub-linear time. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM)*, 2021. 2
- [BGK⁺18] Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, Sudeshna Kolay, Gopinath Mishra, and Saket Saurabh. Parameterized query complexity of hitting set using stability of sunflowers. In *29th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, 2018. 2
- [BGMP19] Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, Gopinath Mishra, and Manaswi Paraashar. Efficiently sampling and estimating from substructures using linear algebraic queries. *arXiv:1906.07398*, 2019. 2
- [BHPR⁺18] Paul Beame, Sariel Har-Peled, Sivaramakrishnan Natarajan Ramamoorthy, Cyrus Rashtchian, and Makrand Sinha. Edge estimation with independent set oracles. *Proceedings of the 9th Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, 2018. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 24, 28, 33
- [BS18] Eric Balkanski and Yaron Singer. The adaptive complexity of maximizing a submodular function. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1138–1151, 2018. 3
- [CG18] Clément L Canonne and Tom Gur. An adaptivity hierarchy theorem for property testing. *Computational Complexity*, 27(4):671–716, 2018. 3
- [CJ15] Sergio Cabello and Miha Jejčič. Shortest paths in intersection graphs of unit disks. *Computational Geometry*, 48(4):360–367, 2015. 2
- [CLW20] Xi Chen, Amit Levi, and Erik Waingarten. Nearly optimal edge estimation with independent set queries. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2916–2935, 2020. 2, 33
- [CM05] Graham Cormode and Shan Muthukrishnan. An improved data stream summary: the count-min sketch and its applications. *Journal of Algorithms*, 55(1):58–75, 2005. 5, 11
- [CQ19] Chandra Chekuri and Kent Quanrud. Parallelizing greedy for submodular set function maximization in matroids and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 78–89, 2019. 3
- [CS90] Chao L Chen and William H Swallow. Using group testing to estimate a proportion, and to test the binomial model. *Biometrics*, pages 1035–1046, 1990. 2
- [CS21] Amit Chakrabarti and Manuel Stoeckl. The element extraction problem and the cost of determinism and limited adaptivity in linear queries. *arXiv:2107.05810*, 2021. 2, 3

- [DHH00] Dingzhu Du, Frank K Hwang, and Frank Hwang. *Combinatorial group testing and its applications*, volume 12. World Scientific, 2000. 3
- [DL21] Holger Dell and John Lapinskas. Fine-grained reductions from approximate counting to decision. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)*, 13(2):1–24, 2021. 2
- [DLM20] Holger Dell, John Lapinskas, and Kitty Meeks. Approximately counting and sampling small witnesses using a colourful decision oracle. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2201–2211, 2020. 2, 3, 5
- [Dor43] Robert Dorfman. The detection of defective members of large populations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 14(4):436–440, 1943. 2
- [ER18] Talya Eden and Will Rosenbaum. On sampling edges almost uniformly. In *1st Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA)*, 2018. 2
- [ERS20] Talya Eden, Dana Ron, and C Seshadhri. On approximating the number of k-cliques in sublinear time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 49(4):747–771, 2020. 2
- [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. 2
- [Fis03] Aleksei V Fishkin. Disk graphs: A short survey. In *International Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms*, pages 260–264. Springer, 2003. 2
- [GR08] Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008. 2
- [INR10] Piotr Indyk, Hung Q Ngo, and Atri Rudra. Efficiently decodable non-adaptive group testing. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1126–1142, 2010. 3
- [IPW11] Piotr Indyk, Eric Price, and David P Woodruff. On the power of adaptivity in sparse recovery. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 285–294, 2011. 3
- [KK20] Lidiya Khalidah binti Khalil and Christian Konrad. Constructing large matchings via query access to a maximal matching oracle. In *40th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS)*, 2020. 2
- [KP19] Akshay Kamath and Eric Price. Adaptive sparse recovery with limited adaptivity. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2729–2744, 2019. 3
- [KSV10] Howard Karloff, Siddharth Suri, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. A model of computation for mapreduce. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 938–948, 2010. 2

- [McG14] Andrew McGregor. Graph stream algorithms: a survey. *ACM SIGMOD Record*, 43(1):9–20, 2014. 2
- [MS22] Ashley Montanaro and Changpeng Shao. Quantum algorithms for learning a hidden graph. In *17th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. 2
- [Nis21] Noam Nisan. The demand query model for bipartite matching. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 592–599, 2021. 2
- [NSWZ18] Vasileios Nakos, Xiaofei Shi, David P Woodruff, and Hongyang Zhang. Improved algorithms for adaptive compressed sensing. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, 2018. 3
- [ORRR12] Krzysztof Onak, Dana Ron, Michal Rosen, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. A near-optimal sublinear-time algorithm for approximating the minimum vertex cover size. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1123–1131, 2012. 2
- [Ron19] Dana Ron. Sublinear-time algorithms for approximating graph parameters. In *Computing and Software Science*, pages 105–122. Springer, 2019. 2
- [RSW18] Aviad Rubinfeld, Tselil Schramm, and S. Matthew Weinberg. Computing Exact Minimum Cuts Without Knowing the Graph. In *Proceedings of the 9th Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, 2018. 2
- [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 (TOCT)*, 8(4):1–19, 2016. 2
- [RWZ20] Cyrus Rashtchian, David P Woodruff, and Hanlin Zhu. Vector-matrix-vector queries for solving linear algebra, statistics, and graph problems. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM)*, 2020. 2
- [Ses] C Seshadhri. A simpler sublinear algorithm for approximating the triangle count. [arXiv:1505.01927](https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.01927). 2
- [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. 2
- [Sto85] Larry Stockmeyer. On approximation algorithms for $\#$ p. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 14(4):849–861, 1985. 2
- [TT22] Jakub Tětek and Mikkel Thorup. Edge sampling and graph parameter estimation via vertex neighborhood accesses. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1116–1129, 2022. 2