

# An Improved Approximation Algorithm for the Max-3-Section Problem

**Dor Katzelnick** ✉ 

The Henry and Marilyn Taub Faculty of Computer Science, Technion, Israel

**Aditya Pillai** ✉ 

H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA

**Roy Schwartz** ✉

The Henry and Marilyn Taub Faculty of Computer Science, Technion, Israel

**Mohit Singh** ✉ 

H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA

---

## Abstract

We consider the MAX-3-SECTION problem, where we are given an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  equipped with non-negative edge weights  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and the goal is to find a partition of  $V$  into three equisized parts while maximizing the total weight of edges crossing between different parts. MAX-3-SECTION is closely related to other well-studied graph partitioning problems, *e.g.*, MAX-CUT, MAX-3-CUT, and MAX-BISECTION. We present a polynomial time algorithm achieving an approximation of 0.795, that improves upon the previous best known approximation of 0.673. The requirement of multiple parts that have equal sizes renders MAX-3-SECTION much harder to cope with compared to, *e.g.*, MAX-BISECTION. We show a new algorithm that combines the existing approach of Lassere hierarchy along with a random cut strategy that suffices to give our result.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Approximation algorithms analysis; Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Semidefinite programming

**Keywords and phrases** Approximation Algorithms, Semidefinite Programming, Max-Cut, Max-Bisection

**Funding** Mohit Singh and Aditya Pillai were supported in part by NSF CCF-2106444 and NSF CCF-1910423. Dor Katzelnick and Roy Schwartz receive funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement no. 852870-ERC-SUBMODULAR.

**Acknowledgements** The authors would like to thank Uri Zwick for insightful discussions.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we study the MAX-3-SECTION problem: given an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  equipped with non-negative edge weights  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  the goal is to partition the vertex set  $V$  into three equisized parts while maximizing the total weight of edges that cross between different parts. MAX-3-SECTION is closely related to other classic graph partitioning problems, where given the same input as in MAX-3-SECTION the goal is to output a partition of the vertex set  $V$  (possibly given some problem specific constraint) while maximizing the total weight of edges that cross between different parts. Perhaps the most famous of these problems is MAX-CUT, whose constraint is that the partition contains only two parts with no restriction on the size of these parts. MAX-CUT is one of Karp’s 21 NP-hard problems [12] and in their seminal work Goemans and Williamson [10] presented an approximation of 0.8786 using semi-definite programming and random hyperplane rounding. It is known that the latter result is tight, assuming the unique games conjecture, as proved by Khot, Kindler, Mossel, and O’Donnell [13].

A natural problem that generalizes MAX-CUT is MAX- $k$ -CUT, whose constraint is that the partition contains  $k$  parts with no restriction on the size of these parts. A simple algorithm that returns a uniform random solution, *i.e.*, every vertex is assigned independently and uniformly to one of the  $k$  parts, achieves an approximation of  $1 - 1/k$ . Several works aimed at improving the guarantee of this simple algorithm, *e.g.*, [7, 9, 4, 15]. For example, a notable case that attracted much attention is the MAX-3-CUT problem [7, 9, 4, 15], whose best approximation is 0.836 and was given by Goemans and Williamson [9]. Interestingly, the latter guarantee is worse than the approximation known for MAX-CUT. For general values of  $k$ , it was shown by Frieze and Jerrum [7] that an approximation of  $1 - 1/k + \Theta(\ln k/k^2)$  can be achieved. Further improvements for the approximation guarantee were presented by de Klerk, Pasechnik and Warners [4].

Adding a single global constraint to MAX-CUT that requires both parts to be of equal size leads to the classic problem of MAX-BISECTION. MAX-BISECTION was extensively studied throughout the years, *e.g.*, [7, 17, 11, 6, 16, 2]. This sequence of works currently culminates with the works of Raghavendra and Tan [16], who present an approximation of 0.85 that is based on rounding a Lasserre hierarchy semi-definite program, which was subsequently improved to 0.877 by Austrin, Benabbas, and Georgiou [2] who improved the former rounding. The question whether one can obtain for MAX-BISECTION the same approximation guarantee that is known for MAX-CUT remains a tantalizing open problem.

Both MAX-3-SECTION and MAX-BISECTION are captured by the MAX- $k$ -SECTION problem [1, 8, 14, 3], which falls in the above broad family of graph partitioning problems and whose constraint is that the partition contains  $k$  equisized parts. Similarly to MAX- $k$ -CUT, it is known that the simple algorithm that returns a uniform random solution achieves an approximation of  $1 - 1/k$ . Thus, it is no surprise that the goal of past research, *e.g.*, [1, 8, 14], was to improve upon this guarantee. For the special case of MAX-3-SECTION, Ling [14] presented an approximation of 0.6733 that is based on rounding a semi-definite programming relaxation similarly to MAX-3-CUT [9]. For general values of  $k$ , Andersson [1] presented an approximation of  $1 - 1/k + \Theta(1/k^3)$ , again by rounding a suitable semi-definite program relaxation. Additionally, Gaur, Krishnamurti, and Kohli [8] presented a local search algorithm for a more general problem in which each part has a (possibly different) limit on its size.

The main focus of this work is the MAX-3-SECTION problem. For  $k = 2$ , the best known approximation for MAX-BISECTION (which is essentially MAX-CUT with a single global constraint on the size of the first part in the partition) equals 0.877 and is (almost) identical to the best possible approximation of 0.878 for MAX-CUT. However, when  $k = 3$ , the best known approximation for MAX-3-SECTION (which is essentially MAX-3-CUT with two global constraints on the size of the first two pieces in the partition) equals 0.6733 and is far from the best known approximation of 0.836 for MAX-3-CUT. Moreover, the former approximation guarantee of 0.6733 for MAX-3-SECTION only slightly improves upon the  $2/3$  approximation guarantee of the trivial algorithm that simply returns a uniform random solution. Thus, we aim to understand and minimize the gap that exists for  $k = 3$ .

## 1.1 Our Results and Techniques

We present the following main algorithmic result for the MAX-3-SECTION problem:

► **Theorem 1.** *There is a polynomial time algorithm for MAX-3-SECTION that achieves an approximation guarantee of at least 0.795.*

It is important to note that the approximation guarantee of the above theorem improves upon the previous best known algorithm for MAX-3-SECTION [14] that achieves an approximation

of 0.6773. As proving the exact approximation guarantee of our algorithm is an involved task (for reasons that will be clear soon), we also present the following conjecture that is based on numerical evidence:

► **Conjecture 2.** *The algorithm presented to prove Theorem 1 achieves an approximation of 0.8192 for MAX-3-SECTION.*

We further show how the algorithm we present for proving Theorem 1 can be extended to general values of  $k$ . First, we prove that the algorithm, alongside its analysis, cannot provide an improved approximation as  $k$  increases (when compared to its approximation for the case of  $k = 3$ ). Second, using numeric evidence we conjecture that the approximation of the algorithm remains 0.8192 for  $k$  ranging from 3 up to 6. Hence, the above gives rise to the following extended conjecture:

► **Conjecture 3.** *There is a polynomial time algorithm achieving an approximation of 0.8192 for MAX- $k$ -SECTION for  $k = 3, 4, 5$ .*

The above conjecture provides, for  $k = 4, 5$ , an improved approximation when compared to the previous best known result. The current best is a small improvement over the trivial randomized approximation algorithm by Andersson [1] which achieves an approximation of  $1 - 1/k + \Theta(k^{-3})$ .

When considering our approach to MAX-3-SECTION we focus on two of its closely related problems: MAX-3-CUT and MAX-BISECTION and examine the approaches used to design and analyze algorithms for both. Let us start with MAX-3-CUT. The approach used to obtain the current best known algorithms for MAX-3-CUT, *e.g.*, [9, 4, 15], is based on the random hyperplane rounding method due to Goemans and Williamson [10] (as well as extensions of this method) of a semi-definite programming relaxation. This approach, when applied to MAX-3-SECTION, suffers a significant drawback since it does not preserve marginal values (a marginal value is the likelihood the relaxation assigns to the event that vertex  $u$  belongs to part  $i$ ). Specifically, the expected number of vertices assigned to every part by the rounding algorithm might be incomparable to  $n/3$  and therefore applying these ideas as was done by Ling [14] leads only to a minor improvement over the random solution algorithm. It is worth noting that this drawback is already present when considering MAX-BISECTION.

Let us now consider MAX-BISECTION, and specifically we focus on the approach of Raghavendra and Tan [16] (as well as Austrin, Benabbas, and Georgiou [2] who build upon [16]). First, a Lasserre hierarchy of a natural semi-definite programming relaxation for MAX-BISECTION is solved. Second, a rounding procedure that preserves the marginal values is applied to obtain a subset  $C_1 \subseteq V$  of vertices such that: (1) there are sufficiently many edges crossing the cut  $C_1$  defines; and (2)  $C_1$  contains (roughly)  $n/2$  vertices. Third, the solution is re-balanced to obtain a perfect bisection, *i.e.*, ensuring that  $|C_1| = n/2$  without a significant loss in the number of edges crossing between  $C_1$  and  $C_2 = V \setminus C_1$ .

There are two main difficulties when considering this approach in the context of MAX-3-SECTION. The first difficulty stems from the fact that we have three parts in MAX-3-SECTION, whereas in MAX-BISECTION there are only two parts. Therefore, if we use the above rounding procedure to find  $C_1 \subseteq V$  of size (roughly)  $n/3$  with sufficiently many edges crossing the cut  $C_1$  defines, it is not clear how to recurse and further partition  $V \setminus C_1$ . We note that in MAX-BISECTION no recursion is needed since  $C_2$  is chosen to be  $V \setminus C_1$ . However, in MAX-3-SECTION  $V \setminus C_1$  still needs to be partitioned into  $C_2$  and  $C_3$ . Our solution to this difficulty is to *condition* the marginal values of vertices remaining in  $V \setminus C_1$  on the fact that each remaining vertex was not chosen to  $C_1$ . Such a conditioning, intuitively, ensures that we preserve marginal values overall while recursing on  $V \setminus C_1$ .

The second difficulty in applying this approach arises from the following observation: we can show that if one first creates part  $C_1$ , and then creates part  $C_2$  (and part  $C_3$  is all remaining vertices), then if the analysis is performed edge-by-edge (as is the case in both [16, 2]) no approximation better than 0.7192 can be achieved. Specifically, we present a configuration of the vectors that correspond to the endpoints of an edge that satisfy: (1) the vectors are feasible for the semi-definite programming relaxation; and (2) the ratio between the probability of this edge being separated by the rounding algorithm and the contribution of its vectors to the objective function of the relaxation is at most 0.7192 (refer to Section 4 for a formal definition of a configuration and to Observation 35 in Appendix D for the specific configuration). An approximation of 0.7192, if possible given the above approach, improves the current best known approximation of 0.6733 [14]. However, we aim for a much larger improvement. Our solution to this difficulty is to *uniformly permute* the order in which the parts are generated. Since the approach based on [16, 2] preserves marginals, this permutation allows us to better cope with problematic configurations. It is important to note that a permutation is meaningless for MAX-BISECTION, since whether a vertex belongs to  $C_1$  immediately implies whether it belongs to  $C_2$  and vice versa. In MAX-3-SECTION this is obviously not the case.

Thus, following the above discussion, our approach builds upon the approach for MAX-BISECTION with two added ingredients. The first is altering the marginal values the semi-definite programming relaxation provides via appropriate conditioning when recursing. The second is uniformly permuting the order in which the rounding algorithm generates the parts. We note that these two added ingredients introduce two main additional obstacles. The first obstacle relates to the last re-balancing step. In both [16, 2] the re-balancing succeeds since it is proved that with a high probability each part by itself is close to being the desired size. The method this is proved is by bounding the variance of the size of each part alone. However, in our approach for MAX-3-SECTION the bound on the variance of the size of a given part depends on the other parts as well. This introduces technical issues and hence bounding of the variance requires much care. The second obstacle relates to the computer assisted proof via *branch and bound* method we employ in order to lower bound the performance ratio of our algorithm. The expression of the separation probability of an edge by the rounding algorithm is involved, as both marginal values are altered when recursing and we employ a random permutation over the order in which the parts are generated. Moreover, a configuration describing how the semi-definite programming relaxation encodes an edge involves 7 different vectors (see Sections 3 and 4). Thus, we had to incorporate many technical ingredients, *e.g.*, analytically bounding the gradient of the separation probability and restricting the search to specific type of configurations while analytically bounding the error this incurs, to make the computer assisted proof terminate faster. This results in about 150,000 hours of CPU, which is roughly 20 CPU years, to prove Theorem 1.

## 1.2 Additional Related Work

The MAX-BISECTION problem has a long and rich history. Frieze and Jerrum [7] presented an approximation of 0.6514 based on rounding a semi-definite program. Later on, Ye [17], Halperin and Zwick [11], and Feige and Langberg [6] further improved the approximation guarantee to 0.699, 0.7016, and 0.7027, respectively. They achieved the above by strengthening the semi-definite programming relaxation, *e.g.*, by adding triangle inequality constraints, and presenting better rounding methods. The next leap in approximating MAX-BISECTION came with the work of Raghavendra and Tan [16]. They utilized a higher-level Lasserre hierarchy semi-definite program, together with an elegant rounding algorithm, and obtained

a 0.85-approximation. Later on, Austrin, Benabbas, and Georgiou [2] showed an improved rounding algorithm, pushing the approximation guarantee up to 0.877. It should be noted that the latter is very close to the best possible approximation of 0.878 for MAX-CUT.

Focusing on MAX- $k$ -CUT, Frieze and Jerrum [7] presented an approximation algorithm with better guarantee than the naive random algorithm. They utilized a semi-definite program relaxation alongside an elegant rounding algorithm that samples  $k$  random vectors and assigns every vertex  $v \in V$  to the cluster of the random vector that is closest to  $v$ 's vector in the relaxation. Goemans and Williamson [9] presented an improved approximation of 0.836 for MAX-3-CUT by using a complex semi-definite program. In [4], de Klerk, Pasechnik, and Warners presented further improved bounds for MAX- $k$ -CUT. Please refer to Table 1 by Newman [15] for a summary of approximation guarantees.

### 1.3 Paper Organization

We start by presenting preliminary definitions in Section 2. Next, in Section 3 we present our semi-definite program for MAX-3-SECTION and show that it can be strengthened to obtain a solution which is globally uncorrelated. In Section 4 we present our rounding algorithm and its analysis. To obtain a bound on the approximation guarantee of our rounding algorithm, we present an analysis which is based on a computer-assisted proof in Section 5. Furthermore, we discuss the generalization of our algorithm, and its numerical estimation, in Section 6. Missing proofs appear in the appendix.

## 2 Preliminaries

We denote by  $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  the cumulative distribution function of the normal gaussian distribution and by  $\Phi^{-1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  its inverse. Specifically, if  $R \sim N[0, 1]$  then: (1)  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ :  $\Pr[R \leq x] = \Phi(x)$  (or equivalently  $\Pr[R \geq x] = 1 - \Phi(x)$ ); and (2)  $\forall x \in [0, 1]$ :  $\Pr[R \leq \Phi^{-1}(x)] = x$  (or equivalently  $\Pr[R \geq \Phi^{-1}(x)] = 1 - x$ ). Moreover, we say that a vector  $\mathbf{g}$  is a *random gaussian vector* if its coordinates are i.i.d standard gaussian  $N(0, 1)$  random variables.

We denote by  $\Gamma_t : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$  the probability that a standard bi-variate gaussian distribution with correlation  $t$  has both its coordinates at most the given quantiles, *i.e.*,

$$\forall q_1, q_2 \in [0, 1] : \Gamma_t(q_1, q_2) \triangleq \Pr[X \leq \Phi^{-1}(q_1), Y \leq \Phi^{-1}(q_2)], \begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t \\ t & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

We define the mutual information between two random variables.

► **Definition 4.** Let  $X, Y$  be jointly distributed random variables taking values in  $[q]$ . The mutual information of  $X$  and  $Y$  is defined as

$$I(X, Y) \triangleq \sum_{i, j \in [q]} \Pr(X = i, Y = j) \log \left( \frac{\Pr(X = i, Y = j)}{\Pr(X = i) \Pr(Y = j)} \right).$$

For any two disjoint subsets of vertices  $A, B \subseteq V$ , we denote by  $\delta(A, B)$  the collection of edges having one endpoint in  $A$  and another endpoint in  $B$ . Hence,  $|\delta(A, B)|$  denotes the number of edges crossing between  $A$  and  $B$ .<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For simplicity of presentation, we assume from this point onward that the graph is unweighted. All of our results apply to graphs equipped with non-negative edge weights, in which case one should substitute  $|\delta(A, B)|$  with the total weight of edges crossing between  $A$  and  $B$ .

### 3 The SDP Relaxation for Max-3-Section

In this section, we present a semi-definite programming (SDP) formulation and prove that it is a relaxation for the MAX-3-SECTION problem. Similarly to previous works on MAX-BISECTION, *e.g.*, [2, 16], we strengthen this formulation and obtain additional properties that will be useful to our rounding algorithm. We define the following SDP formulation for MAX-3-SECTION:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(SDP)} \quad & \text{maximize} && \sum_{e=(u,v) \in E} \left( 1 - \sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^i \right) && (1) \\
& \text{s.t.} && \|\mathbf{y}_\emptyset\|^2 = 1 && (2) \\
& && \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|^2 = \mathbf{y}_\emptyset \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^i && \forall v \in V, \forall i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (3) \\
& && \|\mathbf{y}_v^1\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_v^2\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}_v^3\|^2 = 1 && \forall v \in V \quad (4) \\
& && \mathbf{y}_v^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^j = 0 && \forall v \in V, i \neq j \quad (5) \\
& && \mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^j \geq 0 && \forall u, v \in V, \forall i, j = 1, 2, 3 \quad (6) \\
& && \sum_{v \in V} \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|^2 = n/3 && \forall i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

We note that in the above and what follows, for every vector  $\mathbf{y}$  a square norm of a vector  $\|\mathbf{y}\|^2$  is with respect to the  $\ell_2$  (Euclidean) norm and equals  $\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{y}$ . Next, we prove that the formulation is a relaxation for our problem. Intuitively, for every vertex  $v \in V$  the formulation SDP assigns a distribution over the three clusters via the vectors  $\mathbf{y}_v^1$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_v^2$ , and  $\mathbf{y}_v^3$ . Specifically,  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  is a unit vectors (Constraint (2)) that denotes *true* whereas the zero vector (that does not appear explicitly in SDP) denotes *false*. Each vector  $\mathbf{y}_v^i$  indicates how much vertex  $v$  is likely to be assigned to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cluster by SDP. Hence,  $\|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|^2$ , or equivalently  $\mathbf{y}_v^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  (see Constraint (3)), denotes the marginal probability of assigning vertex  $v$  to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cluster by SDP. For every vertex  $v \in V$ , the sum of these marginal probabilities needs to sum up to one (Constraint 4). Since every vertex  $v \in V$  can be assigned to a single cluster in any integral solution, SDP enforces that the vectors  $\mathbf{y}_v^i$  and  $\mathbf{y}_v^j$  for  $i \neq j$  are orthogonal (Constraint (5)). Intuitively, the joint probability SDP assigns for vertices  $u$  and  $v$  to belong to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  clusters, respectively, is non-negative (Constraint (6)). Finally, since the three clusters are required to be of size  $n/3$  each Constraint (7) is added to SDP. When focusing on the objective of SDP (see (1)), for every edge  $(u, v) \in E$  the inner product  $\mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^i$  intuitively indicates the joint probability of both  $u$  and  $v$  to be assigned to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cluster by SDP. Therefore, intuitively  $1 - \mathbf{y}_u^1 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^1 - \mathbf{y}_u^2 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^2 - \mathbf{y}_u^3 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^3$  indicates the likelihood of separating an edge  $(u, v)$  by SDP. Thus, this is the objective of SDP.

The following lemma proves that SDP is a relaxation to the MAX-3-SECTION problem, *i.e.*, the value of an optimal solution  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}}$  to SDP is an upper bound on the value of an integral optimal solution  $\text{OPT}$ .

► **Lemma 5.** *Given an instance of MAX-3-SECTION let  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}}$  be the value of an optimal solution of SDP (1) and  $\text{OPT}$  be the value of an optimal integral solution. Then,  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}} \geq \text{OPT}$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\{C_1^*, C_2^*, C_3^*\}$  be an optimal solution for the given instance of MAX-3-SECTION whose value is  $\text{OPT}$ . Construct the following vector solution to SDP. First, fix an arbitrary unit vector  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$ . Second, for every  $v \in V$  define  $\mathbf{y}_v^i$  to be the zero vector if  $v \notin C_i^*$  and  $\mathbf{y}_v^i = \mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  if  $v \in C_i^*$ . One may notice that all the constraints hold for this solution and the

value of the objective of SDP equals the value of the optimal solution  $\{C_1^*, C_2^*, C_3^*\}$ . Hence,  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}} \geq \text{OPT}$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

For simplicity of presentation, we denote by  $Y$  a solution to SDP. Thus,  $Y$  consists of  $\{\mathbf{y}_u^i\}_{u \in V, i=1,2,3}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$ . A useful property that any feasible solution  $Y$  to SDP satisfies is that  $\mathbf{y}_u^1 + \mathbf{y}_u^2 + \mathbf{y}_u^3$  always equals the vector  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$ . This is summarized in the following lemma.

► **Lemma 6.** *Let  $Y$  be a feasible solution to SDP. Then, for every vertex  $u \in V$ :  $\mathbf{y}_u^1 + \mathbf{y}_u^2 + \mathbf{y}_u^3 = \mathbf{y}_\emptyset$ .*

An immediate corollary of the above lemma is that for every pair of vertices  $u, v \in V$ :  $\mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot (\mathbf{y}_v^1 + \mathbf{y}_v^2 + \mathbf{y}_v^3) = \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2$  (via Constraint (3)).

### 3.1 Globally Uncorrelated Solution

Next we define when a solution  $Y$  to SDP is globally uncorrelated following the framework of [16]. Global uncorrelation implies that our rounding algorithm returns a solution that has close to  $\frac{n}{3}$  vertices in each part with high probability (see Lemma 15). The sizes then can be corrected with a minor loss in approximation ratio by randomly shifting the imbalanced vertices (see Lemma 16).

A simple fact about any SDP solution is the following: given any two vertices  $u, v$ , there exists a *local* probability distribution  $\mu_{u,v}$  on  $\{1, 2, 3\}^2$  such that  $\Pr_{\mu_{u,v}}[X_u = i, X_v = j] = \langle \mathbf{y}_u^i, \mathbf{y}_v^j \rangle$  for every  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $\Pr_{\mu_{u,v}}[X_u = i] = \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2$  for every  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . The distribution implies that, at least, locally the semi-definite program is a distribution over integral solutions that satisfy correct correlations. The last property states that the distributions are consistent on their intersection which can be at most one vertex.

► **Definition 7.** *A solution  $Y$  to SDP is  $\varepsilon$ -independent if  $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{u,v}}[I_{\mu_{u,v}}(X_u, X_v)] \leq \varepsilon$  where  $\mu_{u,v}$  is the local probability distribution associated with vertices  $u$  and  $v$ .*

The following lemma is an application of Theorem 4.6 from [16] to our SDP for MAX-3-SECTION and it shows how to obtain a  $\varepsilon$ -independent solution. The algorithm proving Lemma 8 follows from solving the  $\Theta(t^2)$ -level Lasserre hierarchy semi-definite program for SDP and then inductively conditioning on variables.

► **Lemma 8.** *There is an algorithm which, given an integer  $t > 0$  and an instance of MAX-3-SECTION, runs in time  $n^{O(\text{poly}(t))}$  and outputs a set of vectors  $Y$  consisting of  $\{\mathbf{y}_v^i\}_{v \in V, i=1,2,3}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  such that:*

1.  $Y$  is a feasible solution to SDP.
2. The objective value of SDP (1) when plugging in  $Y$  is at least  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}} - \frac{1}{t}$ .
3.  $Y$  is  $\frac{1}{t}$ -independent.

## 4 The Rounding Algorithm

In this section we present our rounding algorithm for SDP, which appears in Algorithm 1. The algorithm receives as input a solution to SDP and outputs a partition  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  of  $V$  that: (1) has high value compared to the SDP value of the input solution; and (2) is (nearly) balanced, *i.e.*, for every  $i = 1, 2, 3$ :  $|C_i|$  is close to  $n/3$ . We will conclude the analysis by proving that one can re-balance the partition without a significant loss in the value of the solution.

In order to state the algorithm, we require the following definition. For every vertex  $u \in V$  and  $i = 1, 2, 3$  we denote by  $\mathbf{z}_u^i$  the normalized component of  $\mathbf{y}_u^i$  that is orthogonal to  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$ , *i.e.*,  $\mathbf{y}_u^i = \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2 \mathbf{y}_\emptyset + \sqrt{\|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^4} \mathbf{z}_u^i$ . Equivalently,

$$\mathbf{z}_u^i \triangleq \frac{\mathbf{y}_u^i - \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2 \mathbf{y}_\emptyset}{\sqrt{\|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^4}}. \quad (8)$$

Clearly,  $\mathbf{z}_u^i$  is a unit vector that is orthogonal to  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$ . We note that if the marginal of vertex  $u$  and cluster  $i$  is integral, *i.e.*,  $\|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2 \in \{0, 1\}$ , then  $\mathbf{z}_u^i$  is not defined. In this case one can simply choose an arbitrary unit vector in the space orthogonal to  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  to be  $\mathbf{z}_u^i$ .

■ **Algorithm 1** Max-3-Section Rounding Algorithm

---

**Input:** solution  $\{\mathbf{y}_u^i\}_{u \in V, i=1,2,3}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  to SDP.

**Output:** a partition of  $V$  into three parts.

- 1 Draw uniformly at random a permutation  $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_3$ .
- 2 Draw independently two random Gaussian vectors  $\mathbf{g}_1$  and  $\mathbf{g}_2$ .
- 3 Define the following sets:

$$S_{\pi(1)} \triangleq \left\{ u \in V : \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(1)} \cdot \mathbf{g}_1 \geq \Phi^{-1} \left( 1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2 \right) \right\},$$

$$S_{\pi(2)} \triangleq \left\{ u \in V : \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(2)} \cdot \mathbf{g}_2 \geq \Phi^{-1} \left( 1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(2)}\|^2 / (1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2) \right) \right\}.$$

- 4 Return  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  where:  $C_{\pi(1)} \triangleq S_{\pi(1)}$ ,  $C_{\pi(2)} \triangleq S_{\pi(2)} \setminus S_{\pi(1)}$ ,  
 $C_{\pi(3)} \triangleq V \setminus (S_{\pi(1)} \cup S_{\pi(2)})$ .
- 

We first prove that Algorithm 1 preserves the marginal probabilities of SDP, *i.e.*,  $\|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2$  is the probability vertex  $u$  is assigned to cluster  $C_i$ . This is summarized in the following lemma.

► **Lemma 9.** *For every  $u \in V$  and  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , it holds that  $\Pr[u \in C_i] = \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2$ .*

**Proof.** Fix a permutation  $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_3$ , and let us calculate the probability that  $u \in C_i$  conditioned on the event that  $\pi$  was chosen in the first step of Algorithm 1. Hence, the following holds for  $C_{\pi(1)}$ :

$$\Pr[u \in C_{\pi(1)} | \pi] = \Pr[u \in S_{\pi(1)} | \pi] = \Pr\left[\mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(1)} \cdot \mathbf{g}_1 \geq \left(1 - \Phi^{-1} \left(1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2\right)\right) \mid \pi\right] = \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2.$$

We observe that the sets  $S_{\pi(1)}$  and  $S_{\pi(2)}$  are constructed with independent vectors  $\mathbf{g}_1$  and  $\mathbf{g}_2$ . Therefore, similarly to the above, the following holds for  $C_{\pi(2)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[u \in C_{\pi(2)} | \pi] &= \Pr[u \notin S_{\pi(1)} \wedge u \in S_{\pi(2)} | \pi] \\ &= \Pr[u \notin S_{\pi(1)} | \pi] \cdot \Pr[u \in S_{\pi(2)} | \pi] \\ &= \left(1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2\right) \cdot \Pr\left[\mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(2)} \cdot \mathbf{g}_2 \geq \left(1 - \Phi^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(2)}\|^2}{(1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2)}\right)\right) \mid \pi\right] \\ &= \left(1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2\right) \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(2)}\|^2}{(1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2)} \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(2)}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since the events  $\{u \in C_{\pi(1)} | \pi\}$ ,  $\{u \in C_{\pi(2)} | \pi\}$ , and  $\{u \in C_{\pi(3)} | \pi\}$  are disjoint and exactly one of them occurs, *i.e.*, every vertex  $u \in V$  belongs to exactly one cluster in the output, we can conclude that:

$$\Pr[u \in C_{\pi(3)} | \pi] = 1 - \Pr[u \in C_{\pi(1)} | \pi] - \Pr[u \in C_{\pi(2)} | \pi] = 1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(2)}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(3)}\|^2.$$



In the above the last equality follows from Constraint (4). Unfixing the conditioning on  $\pi$  by using the law of total probability concludes the proof.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Our goal is to write an expression for the probability that an edge crosses between two different parts in the partition that Algorithm 1 outputs. Given a fixed pair of vertices  $u, v \in V$  and  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , we denote by  $t_i$  the inner product between  $\mathbf{z}_u^i$  and  $\mathbf{z}_v^i$ . One should note that Constraint 3 in SDP 1 implies:

$$t_i = \frac{(\mathbf{y}_u^i - x_i \cdot \mathbf{y}_\emptyset) \cdot (\mathbf{y}_v^i - w_i \cdot \mathbf{y}_\emptyset)}{\sqrt{(x_i - x_i^2) \cdot (w_i - w_i^2)}} = \frac{\alpha_i - x_i w_i}{\sqrt{(x_i - x_i^2) \cdot (w_i - w_i^2)}}, \quad (9)$$

where  $x_i \triangleq \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2$  and  $w_i \triangleq \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|^2$  are the marginal values the SDP assigns to vertices  $u$  and  $v$ , respectively, with respect to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cluster, and  $\alpha_i \triangleq \mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^i$  is the correlation the SDP assigns for both  $u$  and  $v$  being assigned to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cluster. The following lemma gives the desired expression. We require the following claim for its proof:

$\triangleright$  **Claim 10.** Let  $(X, Y)$  be a standard bi-variate Gaussian with correlation  $t$ . Then for every  $q_1, q_2 \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $\Pr[X \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - q_1), Y \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - q_2)] = \Gamma_t(q_1, q_2)$ .

$\blacktriangleright$  **Lemma 11.** For every  $u, v \in V$ , let  $\mathcal{A}_{u,v}$  be the event that Algorithm 1 separates  $u$  and  $v$ :

$$\Pr[\mathcal{A}_{u,v}] = 1 - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_3} \left[ \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}}(x_{\pi(1)}, w_{\pi(1)}) + \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}}(1 - x_{\pi(1)}, 1 - w_{\pi(1)}) \cdot \left( \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}}\left(1 - \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, 1 - \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}}\right) + \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}}\left(\frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}}\right) \right) \right].$$

**Proof of Lemma 11.** Fix a permutation  $\pi$ . For this fixed permutation  $\pi$ , vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are *not* separated by Algorithm 1 if both vertices are in  $C_{\pi(1)}$ , or  $C_{\pi(2)}$ , or  $C_{\pi(3)}$ . Let us write the probability of these three events. First,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[u \in C_{\pi(1)}, v \in C_{\pi(1)} | \pi] &= \Pr[u \in S_{\pi(1)}, v \in S_{\pi(1)} | \pi] \\ &= \Pr[\mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(1)} \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - x_{\pi(1)}), \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_v^{\pi(1)} \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - w_{\pi(1)}) | \pi] \\ &= \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}}(x_{\pi(1)}, w_{\pi(1)}). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from Claim 10, since  $(\mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(1)}, \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_v^{\pi(1)})$  is a standard bi-variate gaussian with correlation  $t_{\pi(1)}$ .

Second, both  $u$  and  $v$  are in  $C_{\pi(2)}$  if both are not in  $S_{\pi(1)}$  and both are in  $S_{\pi(2)}$ . The former and latter events are independent since  $\mathbf{g}_1$  and  $\mathbf{g}_2$  are chosen independently in Algorithm 1. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[u \in C_{\pi(2)}, v \in C_{\pi(2)} | \pi] &= \Pr[u \notin S_{\pi(1)}, v \notin S_{\pi(1)}, u \in S_{\pi(2)}, v \in S_{\pi(2)} | \pi] \\ &= \Pr[u \notin S_{\pi(1)}, v \notin S_{\pi(1)} | \pi] \cdot \Pr[u \in S_{\pi(2)}, v \in S_{\pi(2)} | \pi]. \end{aligned}$$

The probability of the former event equals:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[u \notin S_{\pi(1)}, v \notin S_{\pi(1)} | \pi] &= \Pr[\mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(1)} \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - x_{\pi(1)}), \mathbf{g}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_v^{\pi(1)} \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - w_{\pi(1)}) | \pi] \\ &= \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}}(1 - x_{\pi(1)}, 1 - w_{\pi(1)}), \end{aligned}$$

whereas the probability of the latter event equals:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [u \in S_{\pi(2)}, v \in S_{\pi(2)} | \pi] &= \Pr \left[ \mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(2)} \geq \Phi^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}} \right), \mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_v^{\pi(2)} \geq \Phi^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}} \right) \mid \pi \right] \\ &= \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}} \left( \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As before, last equality follows from Claim 10, since  $(\mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(2)}, \mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_v^{\pi(2)})$  is a standard bi-variate gaussian with correlation  $t_{\pi(2)}$ . Thus, we can conclude that:

$$\Pr [u \in C_{\pi(2)}, v \in C_{\pi(2)} | \pi] = \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}} (1 - x_{\pi(1)}, 1 - w_{\pi(1)}) \cdot \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}} \left( \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}} \right).$$

Third, both  $u$  and  $v$  are in  $C_{\pi(3)}$  if both are not in  $S_{\pi(1)}$  and both are not in  $S_{\pi(2)}$ . The former and latter events are independent since  $\mathbf{g}_1$  and  $\mathbf{g}_2$  are chosen independently in Algorithm 1. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [u \in C_{\pi(3)}, v \in C_{\pi(3)} | \pi] &= \Pr [u \notin S_{\pi(1)}, v \notin S_{\pi(1)}, u \notin S_{\pi(2)}, v \notin S_{\pi(2)} | \pi] \\ &= \Pr [u \notin S_{\pi(1)}, v \notin S_{\pi(1)} | \pi] \cdot \Pr [u \notin S_{\pi(2)}, v \notin S_{\pi(2)} | \pi]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall, as proved above, that the probability of the former event equals:

$$\Pr [u \notin S_{\pi(1)}, v \notin S_{\pi(1)} | \pi] = \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}} (1 - x_{\pi(1)}, 1 - w_{\pi(1)}),$$

whereas the probability of the latter event equals:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [u \notin S_{\pi(2)}, v \notin S_{\pi(2)} | \pi] &= \Pr \left[ \mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(2)} \leq \Phi^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}} \right), \mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \mathbf{z}_v^{\pi(2)} \leq \Phi^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}} \right) \mid \pi \right] \\ &= \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}} \left( 1 - \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, 1 - \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can conclude that:

$$\Pr [u \in C_{\pi(3)}, v \in C_{\pi(3)} | \pi] = \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}} (1 - x_{\pi(1)}, 1 - w_{\pi(1)}) \cdot \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}} \left( 1 - \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, 1 - \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}} \right).$$

The proof is concluded since:

$$\Pr [\text{Algorithm 1 separates } u \text{ and } v] = 1 - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\pi \in S_3} \sum_{j=1}^3 \Pr [u \in C_{\pi(j)}, v \in C_{\pi(j)} | \pi].$$

◀

Our goal now is to lower bound the expected value of the output of Algorithm 1, before it is re-balanced (with a negligible loss) to ensure the size of each cluster is exactly  $n/3$ . As our analysis is performed edge-by-edge, *i.e.*, for every edge we lower bound the ratio of the probability Algorithm 1 separates the edge to the contribution of this edge to the objective of SDP (1), we introduce the notions of a configuration and a feasible configuration.

A *configuration* is a vector  $\mathbf{c} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, t_1, t_2, t_3) \in \mathbb{R}^{12}$ , such that for every  $i = 1, 2, 3$ :  $x_i, w_i, \alpha_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $t_i \in [-1, 1]$ . We say that a configuration  $\mathbf{c}$  is a *feasible configuration* if it can be realized by vectors in a feasible solution to SDP (as the following definition states).

► **Definition 12.** A configuration  $\mathbf{c} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, t_1, t_2, t_3) \in [0, 1]^9 \times [-1, 1]^3$  is called a feasible configuration if there are vectors  $\mathbf{y}_u^1, \mathbf{y}_u^2, \mathbf{y}_u^3, \mathbf{y}_v^1, \mathbf{y}_v^2, \mathbf{y}_v^3$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  satisfying:

1. The vectors  $\mathbf{y}_u^1, \mathbf{y}_u^2, \mathbf{y}_u^3, \mathbf{y}_v^1, \mathbf{y}_v^2, \mathbf{y}_v^3$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  satisfy Constraints (2) to (6) in SDP.
2.  $x_i = \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2$ ,  $w_i = \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|^2$  and  $\alpha_i = \mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^i$ ,  $\forall i = 1, 2, 3$ .
3.  $t_i = (\alpha_i - x_i w_i) / ((x_i - x_i^2)(w_i - w_i^2))^{1/2}$ ,  $\forall i = 1, 2, 3$ .

The vectors  $\mathbf{y}_u^1, \mathbf{y}_u^2, \mathbf{y}_u^3, \mathbf{y}_v^1, \mathbf{y}_v^2, \mathbf{y}_v^3$  and  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  are called a realization of  $\mathbf{c}$ . The set of all feasible configuration is denoted by  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We note that there is some redundancy in the above definition. First, we can reduce the dimension of the configuration by two simply by substituting  $x_3$  with  $1 - x_1 - x_2$  and  $w_3$  with  $1 - w_1 - w_2$ . Second, we can remove  $t_1, t_2$  and  $t_3$  (or  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  and  $\alpha_3$ ) since each  $t_i$  (or  $\alpha_i$ ) can be derived from all the parameters excluding  $t_1, t_2$ , and  $t_3$  (or excluding  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ , and  $\alpha_3$ ). In Lemma 21, we give a characterization of  $\mathcal{C}$  after projecting out  $t_1, t_2, t_3$ . This description consists of linear constraints and we utilize the description for our computer-assisted proof. For simplicity of the analysis, we will keep all the parameters.

Let us now define two functions over  $\mathcal{C}$ . The first function  $f$ , given a feasible configuration  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ , returns the probability that Algorithm 1 cuts an edge whose associated vectors are a realization of  $\mathbf{c}$ . Formally, following Lemma 11:

$$f(\mathbf{c}) \triangleq 1 - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_3} \left[ \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}}(x_{\pi(1)}, w_{\pi(1)}) + \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}}(1 - x_{\pi(1)}, 1 - w_{\pi(1)}) \cdot \left( \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}}\left(1 - \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, 1 - \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}}\right) + \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}}\left(\frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}}\right) \right) \right].$$

The second function  $g$ , given a feasible configuration  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ , returns the contribution to the objective of SDP of an edge whose associated vectors are a realization of  $\mathbf{c}$ . Formally, following (1):

$$g(\mathbf{c}) \triangleq 1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3.$$

It is important to note that both  $f$  and  $g$  can be evaluated for every configuration  $\mathbf{c} \in [0, 1]^9 \times [-1, 1]^3$  which might not be necessarily feasible. However, for such a (non feasible) configuration  $\mathbf{c}$ ,  $f(\mathbf{c})$  and  $g(\mathbf{c})$  lose their “meaning”.

To lower bound the value of the solution  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  Algorithm 1 outputs, we introduce the following:

$$\mu \triangleq \inf_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}} \left\{ \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} \right\}. \quad (10)$$

Clearly, from the above definition of  $\mu$ , the value of the output  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  of Algorithm 1 is at least:  $\mu \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}} \geq \mu \cdot \text{OPT}$  (where the inequality follows from Lemma 5 which states that SDP is a relaxation). Hence, if the output  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  of Algorithm 1 was perfectly balanced, *i.e.*,  $|C_1| = |C_2| = |C_3| = n/3$ , Algorithm 1 would achieve an approximation of  $\mu$  to the MAX-3-SECTION problem. In what follows we show that one can re-balance  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  without a significant loss in the value of the solution. Thus, our goal is to lower bound  $\mu$ . For now, as formally proving the exact value of  $\mu$  is a challenging task, we state the following conjecture that follows from numeric estimation of  $\mu$ .

► **Conjecture 13.**  $\mu \geq 0.8192$ .

Assuming the above conjecture regarding  $\mu$  (Conjecture 13), there are two things that are left in order to conclude the analysis of our algorithm. First, we show that if the solution  $Y$  to SDP is independent (as in Definition 7 and Lemma 8) then with a sufficiently high probability every cluster  $C_i$  is close to the desired size of  $n/3$ . This gives rise to the following Definition 14 and Lemma 15. Second, we show that a solution  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  that is close to being perfectly balanced can be efficiently re-balanced without a significant loss in its value. The latter is summarized in Lemma 16.

► **Definition 14.** A partition  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  of a graph on  $n$  nodes is  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced if for every  $i = 1, 2, 3$ :

$$\frac{n}{3}(1 - \varepsilon) \leq |C_i| \leq \frac{n}{3}(1 + \varepsilon).$$

► **Lemma 15.** Let  $Y$  be a  $\frac{1}{t}$ -independent solution to SDP where  $t = \Omega(\varepsilon^{-18})$ , and  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  be the partition that Algorithm 1 outputs on  $Y$ . Then for every  $i = 1, 2, 3$  it holds that:

$$\Pr \left[ \left| |C_i| - n/3 \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon n}{3} \right] \leq \varepsilon.$$

Next, we show that such unbalanced partition can be balanced without a large loss in the objective. That is, we present an algorithm that given a  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced partition, finds in polynomial time a balanced partition with small loss in the objective, in expectation.

► **Lemma 16.** There is a polynomial-time algorithm that given a  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced partition  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  with value  $\Delta = |\delta(C_1, C_2)| + |\delta(C_2, C_3)| + |\delta(C_1, C_3)|$  finds a balanced partition  $\{C'_1, C'_2, C'_3\}$  with expected value  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta'] \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon)\Delta$ .

The proofs of Lemma 15 and Lemma 16 appear in Appendix B. We combine these lemmas and prove the following result.

► **Theorem 17.** For every constant  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a polynomial-time approximation algorithm for MAX-3-SECTION, that runs in time  $n^{O(\text{poly}(\varepsilon^{-1}))}$ , achieving an approximation of  $(1 - 2\varepsilon)(\mu - O(\varepsilon))$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be a constant, and  $t$  an integer satisfying  $t = \Omega(\varepsilon^{-18})$ . Lemma 8 shows that we can compute in polynomial time a solution  $Y$  to SDP that is  $\frac{1}{t}$ -independent with only an additive loss of  $1/t$  in the objective. We repeatedly apply Algorithm 1 to round the above  $Y$  until we obtain a solution  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  that is  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced, and then apply Lemma 16 to re-balance it and obtain our final output.

Let us now analyze the approximation guarantee of the above algorithm. First, It follows from Lemma 15 and a simple union bound over the three clusters that with a probability of at least  $1 - 3\varepsilon$ , applying Algorithm 1 to round the above solution  $Y$  yields a clustering  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  that is  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced (as in Definition 14). Let us denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the event that  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  is  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced. Hence,  $\Pr[\mathcal{A}] \geq 1 - 3\varepsilon$  and  $\Pr[\bar{\mathcal{A}}] \leq 3\varepsilon$ . Moreover, as before, let us denote by  $\Delta$  the value of the solution  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ . Thus, the expected value of this solution *conditioned* on it being  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced is at least:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta|\mathcal{A}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Delta] - \Pr[\bar{\mathcal{A}}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\Delta|\bar{\mathcal{A}}]}{\Pr[\mathcal{A}]} \geq \mu \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{SDP-H}} - \frac{9\varepsilon}{2} \text{OPT}.$$

The inequality follows from the facts that: (1)  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta|\bar{\mathcal{A}}] \leq (3/2) \cdot \text{OPT}$  (since  $\Delta \leq m$  and  $\text{OPT} \geq (2/3)m$ ); (2)  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta] \geq \mu \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{SDP-H}}$  (definition of  $\mu$  (10)); and (3)  $\Pr[\mathcal{A}] \leq 1, \Pr[\bar{\mathcal{A}}] \leq 3\varepsilon$ . We note that  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP-H}} \geq \text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}} - \varepsilon^{18} \geq \text{OPT} - \varepsilon^{18}$ . Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta|\mathcal{A}] \geq \text{OPT}(\mu - O(\varepsilon)).$$

Applying Lemma 16 concludes the proof. ◀

Moreover, in Observation 34 in the appendix we present a configuration  $\mathbf{c}$  that has a ratio of  $\frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} = 0.8192$ , hence that is an upper bound on  $\mu$ .

#### 4.1 Towards Estimating $\mu$ via a Computer Assisted Proof

For our computer assisted proof, we consider a slightly different version of  $\mu$  which speeds up our code. Consider the following, for some fixed  $\delta' > 0$ :

$$\mu' \triangleq \inf_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}, g(\mathbf{c}) \geq \delta'} \left\{ \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} \right\}. \quad (11)$$

The following lemma shows the loss we incur when using  $\mu'$  rather than  $\mu$  is bounded.

► **Lemma 18.** *Let  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  be the output of Algorithm 1 when run on a solution  $Y$  to SDP 1 with objective value  $\text{SDP}_{\text{VAL}}$ . Then we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\delta(C_1, C_2)| + |\delta(C_1, C_3)| + |\delta(C_2, C_3)|] \geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta'}{2(1 - \delta')}\right) \mu' \cdot \text{SDP}_{\text{VAL}}.$$

The following theorem summarizes the approximation guarantee when  $\mu'$  is used instead of  $\mu$ .

► **Theorem 19.** *For any constant  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is an algorithm that outputs a partition of the vertex set  $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$  with  $|C_1| = |C_2| = |C_3|$  satisfying,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\delta(C_1, C_2)| + |\delta(C_1, C_3)| + |\delta(C_2, C_3)|] \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon) \left(1 - \frac{\delta'}{2(1 - \delta')}\right) \mu' (\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}} - O(\varepsilon^{3/2}))$$

with an expected run-time of  $n^{O(1/\varepsilon)}$ .

**Proof.** First we use Lemma 8 to get a  $\frac{1}{t}$ -independent solution  $Y$  for  $t = \Omega(\varepsilon^{-18})$ . Let  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP-H}}$  denote the objective value of this solution. Next we run Algorithm 1 on  $Y$  and repeat until it outputs sets  $C'_1, C'_2, C'_3$  that are  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced. We note that by Lemma 15  $(C'_1, C'_2, C'_3)$  is *not*  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced with probability at most  $3\varepsilon$ , so we run Algorithm 1 at most  $1/3\varepsilon$  times in expectation. Since  $C'_1, C'_2, C'_3$  are  $\varepsilon$ -unbalanced, applying the random shifting of Lemma 16 to  $C'_1, C'_2, C'_3$  we get  $C_1, C_2, C_3$  satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[|\delta(C_1, C_2)| + |\delta(C_1, C_3)| + |\delta(C_2, C_3)|] \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon) \mathbb{E}[|\delta(C'_1, C'_2)| + |\delta(C'_1, C'_3)| + |\delta(C'_2, C'_3)|],$$

From Lemma 18 we have,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\delta(C_1, C_2)| + |\delta(C_1, C_3)| + |\delta(C_2, C_3)|] \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon) \left(1 - \frac{\delta'}{2(1 - \delta')}\right) \mu' \text{OPT}_{\text{SDP-H}}.$$

Then applying second item of Lemma 8 gives us that  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SDP-H}} \geq \text{OPT}_{\text{SDP}} - O(\varepsilon^{3/2})$  since we set  $t = \Omega(\varepsilon^{-18})$ . ◀

## 5 Computer Assisted Proof

The goal of this section is to lower bound  $\mu'$ . We use a branch and bound procedure to lower  $\mu'$  and which gives a guarantee for the approximation factor of our algorithm (Theorem 19). We recall the definition of  $\mu'$

$$\mu' \triangleq \inf_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}, g(\mathbf{c}) \geq \delta'} \left\{ \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} \right\}. \quad (12)$$

The following claim gives a simple, yet useful, bound on the probability that our rounding algorithm will separate two vertices in the graph.

▷ **Claim 20.** Let  $u, v \in V$ , let  $x_i = \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2$  and  $w_i = \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|^2$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  be a configuration corresponding to this pair. Then it holds that

$$f(\mathbf{c}) \geq \frac{|x_1 - w_1| + |x_2 - w_2| + |x_3 - w_3|}{2}.$$

We characterize the configuration space  $\mathcal{C}$  which we will consider in the computer assisted proof.

► **Lemma 21.** Let  $\mathbf{c} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, t_1, t_2, t_3) \in \mathcal{C}$ . Then  $\mathbf{c}$  satisfies the following:

1.  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1$ .
2.  $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq \min\{x_i, w_i\}$  for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .
3.  $\max\{0, x_3 - \alpha_3 + \alpha_1 - w_1, w_2 - \alpha_2 + \alpha_1 - x_1\} \leq \min\{w_2 - \alpha_2, x_3 - \alpha_3, x_2 + x_3 - w_1 + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3\}$ .
4.  $t_i = \frac{\alpha_i - x_i w_i}{\sqrt{(x_i - x_i^2)(w_i - w_i^2)}}$  for  $i \in [3]$ .

We define the following two polytopes which we will consider when verifying bounding  $\mu'$ . These polytopes help us to speed up the branch and bound procedure.

1.  $\mathcal{S} \triangleq \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, t_1, t_2, t_3) \mid x_1 \leq \min(x_2, w_1, w_2, w_3, x_3), x_2 \leq x_3\}$ .
2.  $\mathcal{E} \triangleq \{\mathbf{c} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, t_1, t_2, t_3)\}$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{|x_i - w_i|}{2} \leq \rho g(\mathbf{c}), g(\mathbf{c}) \geq \delta'\}.$$

The following claim shows why we can restrict to configurations in  $\mathcal{S}$  and follows from the symmetry of  $f, g$ .

▷ **Claim 22.** Let  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{S}$ . Then there exists  $\mathbf{c}' \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{S}$  such that  $f(\mathbf{c}) = f(\mathbf{c}')$  and  $g(\mathbf{c}) = g(\mathbf{c}')$ .

Then Claim 22 and Claim 20 imply the following.

▷ **Claim 23.** If  $\inf_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}} \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} \geq \rho$  then  $\mu' \geq \rho$ .

**Proof.** By Claim 22 we get the following:  $\mu' = \inf_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}, g(\mathbf{c}) \geq \delta'} \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} = \inf_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{S}, g(\mathbf{c}) \geq \delta'} \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})}$ .

Assume for contradiction that  $\mu' = \min_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{S}, g(\mathbf{c}) \geq \delta'} \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} < \rho$ . Then  $\exists \mathbf{c}' \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{S}$  with  $g(\mathbf{c}') \geq \delta'$  and  $\frac{f(\mathbf{c}')}{g(\mathbf{c}')} < \rho$ . We have that  $\mathbf{c}' \notin \mathcal{E}$  otherwise  $g(\mathbf{c}') \geq \rho$  by the assumption of the lemma. Then by definition of  $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{|x_i - w_i|}{2} > \rho g(\mathbf{c}')$ , but this is a contradiction by Claim 20 since  $f(\mathbf{c}') > \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{|x_i - w_i|}{2} > \rho g(\mathbf{c}')$ . ◀

Thus our goal for the computed assisted proof is to show  $\inf_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}} \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} \geq \rho$  for some value of  $\rho$ . Given 12 intervals  $(I_1, \dots, I_{12})$  we define the following polytopes to divide our feasible region into hypercubes. Consider the following polytope,

$$\mathcal{P}(I_1, \dots, I_{12}) = (I_1 \times I_2 \dots \times I_{12}) \cap \mathcal{C}.$$

Note that intervals  $I_j$  correspond to possible values of  $x_j$  for  $j \in [3]$ , intervals  $I_3, I_4, I_5$  correspond to values of  $w_1, w_2, w_3$ , intervals  $I_7, I_8, I_9$  correspond to values of  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ , and intervals  $I_{10}, I_{11}, I_{12}$  correspond to  $t_1, t_2, t_3$ . Our computer assisted proof enumerates  $I_1, \dots, I_{12}$  so that the union of all  $\mathcal{P}(I_1, \dots, I_{12}) \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}$  covers  $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}$ . For each  $I_1, \dots, I_{12}$  we show one of the following three:

1.  $\mathcal{P}(I_1, \dots, I_{12}) \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E} = \emptyset$ .
2.  $\inf_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{P}(I_1, \dots, I_{12}) \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}} \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} \geq \rho$ .
3. Divide  $(I_1, \dots, I_{12})$  into a collection  $\mathcal{U}$  whose union equals  $(I_1, \dots, I_{12})$  so that each  $(I'_1, \dots, I'_{12}) \in \mathcal{U}$  satisfies one of the first two items.

which implies the hypothesis of Claim 23. The third item is the branching step and the first two items are how we eliminate branches. For our computer assisted proof we will only consider  $x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2, t_1, t_2, t_3$  as independent variables. The remaining variables  $w_3, x_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$  will always take values  $w_3 = 1 - w_1 - w_2, x_3 = 1 - x_1 - x_2, \alpha_i = x_i w_i + t_i \sqrt{(x_i - x_i^2)(w_i - w_i^2)}$  for  $i \in [3]$ . Our algorithm runs in stages. In the first stage we use an LP to eliminate hypercubes. The first stage works as follows,

1. Enumerate all  $\mathcal{I} = (I_1, \dots, I_{12})$  such that  $|I_j| = \eta_1$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$  and  $|I_j| = \eta_2$  for  $j = 10, 11, 12$  that the union of all  $(I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4, I_{10}, I_{11}, I_{12})$  covers the region  $[0, 1]^4 \times [-1, 1]^3$ . Note that intervals  $I_5, I_6, I_7$  can be determined by the bounds on the other intervals,  $I_j$  such that  $j \notin \{5, 6, 7\}$ . This follows since bounds on  $x_i, w_i, t_i$  imply bounds on  $\alpha_i$  because  $\alpha_i = t_i \sqrt{(x_i - x_i^2)(w_i - w_i^2)} + x_i w_i$ . Similarly,  $I_3, I_6$  are determined by  $I_1, I_2$  and  $I_4, I_5$  respectively since  $x_3 = 1 - x_1 - x_2$  and  $w_3 = 1 - w_1 - w_2$ .
2. For each hypercube  $\mathcal{I}$  enumerated in the previous step, check that  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{I}) \cap \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{S}$  contains a feasible point by solving an LP. If yes, save  $\mathcal{I}$  for further processing.

### Partial Derivatives

A crucial ingredient of the branch and bound procedure is to obtain a lower bound on the function  $f(\mathbf{c})$  for any configuration  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{I}$  in any cube. This we do by computing  $f(\mathbf{c}^*)$  for some well chosen  $\mathbf{c}^* \in \mathcal{I}$  and then using bounds on the partial derivatives to infer a bound  $f(\mathbf{c})$  for all other  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{I}$ . A tight bound on partial derivatives ensures a smaller branch and bound tree. We detail the partial derivatives and bounds thus obtained now. Previously, we defined the notion of configuration and the function  $f$  as a function of 12 variables. Since we only consider  $(x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2, t_1, t_2, t_3)$  as variables we have  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_3} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial w_3} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha_i} = 0$  and  $f, g$  are functions of 7 independent variables. We recall the definition of  $f$

$$f(x, w, \alpha, t) = 1 - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_3} \left[ \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}}(x_{\pi(1)}, w_{\pi(1)}) + \Gamma_{t_{\pi(1)}}(1 - x_{\pi(1)}, 1 - w_{\pi(1)}) \cdot \left( \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}} \left( 1 - \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, 1 - \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}} \right) + \Gamma_{t_{\pi(2)}} \left( \frac{x_{\pi(2)}}{1 - x_{\pi(1)}}, \frac{w_{\pi(2)}}{1 - w_{\pi(1)}} \right) \right) \right].$$

Moreover, for our use we can assume that the domain of  $f$  is  $0 \leq x_1 + x_2 \leq 1, 0 \leq w_1 + w_2 \leq 1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in [0, 1]$  and  $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in [-1, 1]$ . In the following, we are going to prove bounds on the partial derivatives of  $f(x, w, \alpha, t)$  with respect to  $x_i, w_i$  and  $t_i$ .

► **Lemma 24.** *For each  $(x, w, \alpha, t)$  in the domain of configuration, the following bounds on the partial derivatives of  $f$  hold:*

1.  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} f(x, w, \alpha, t) < 0$ , for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .
2.  $|\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} f(x, w, \alpha, t)| \leq \frac{5}{3} - \frac{1}{3}(1 - x_{3-i})$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ .
3.  $|\frac{\partial}{\partial w_i} f(x, w, \alpha, t)| \leq \frac{5}{3} - \frac{1}{3}(1 - w_{3-i})$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ .

The proof of the lemma is technical and appears in appendix C. We now have the following claim that gives a lower bound on all configurations in the hypercube as compared to the point  $\mathbf{m}$  in it.

▷ **Claim 25.** Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a hypercube and  $\mathcal{Q} \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{I}) \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^{12}$  be a point where the coordinates corresponding to  $x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2$  are the midpoints  $I_1, I_2, I_4, I_5$  respectively and the last 3 coordinates corresponding are  $\bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_3$  which are the upper bounds of  $I_{10}, I_{11}, I_{12}$ . Then the following holds,

$$\min_{\mathbf{c}=(x_1, \dots, t_1, t_2, t_3) \in \mathcal{Q}} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, \bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_3) \geq f(\mathbf{m}) - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{z \in \{x, w\}} \sum_{i=1}^2 (5 - (1 - \overline{z_{3-i}})) (\overline{z_i} - \underline{z_i}).$$

► **Lemma 26.** Let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathbf{m}, \mathcal{Q}$  be defined as in Claim 25. Then  $\min_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{Q}} \frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} \geq \rho$  if,

$$f(\mathbf{m}) - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{z \in \{x, w\}} \sum_{i=1}^2 (5 - (1 - \overline{z_{3-i}})) (\overline{z_i} - \underline{z_i}) \geq \rho \max_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{Q}} g(\mathbf{c})$$

where  $\overline{z_i}, \underline{z_i}$  for  $z \in \{w, x\}$  are the upper and lower bounds given by their corresponding interval in  $\mathcal{I}$ .

**Proof.** We use the fact that  $f$  is non-increasing in  $t_i$  and Claim 25 to get,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{Q}} f(\mathbf{c}) &\geq \min_{\mathbf{c}=(x_1, x_2, \dots, t_1, t_2, t_3) \in \mathcal{Q}} f(x_1, x_2, \dots, \bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_3) \\ &\geq f(\mathbf{m}) - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{z \in \{x, w\}} \sum_{i=1}^2 (5 - (1 - \overline{z_{3-i}})) (\overline{z_i} - \underline{z_i}) \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows since  $f$  is non-increasing in  $t, \alpha$  by Lemma 24. The third inequality follows by Claim 25. Thus by the inequality in the lemma and the relation above, we have shown:  $\min_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{Q}} f(\mathbf{c}) \geq \rho \max_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{Q}} g(\mathbf{c})$ . ◀

Now we describe the final stage of the experiment which eliminates all remaining cubes from the first stage.

1. For all remaining hyper cubes  $\mathcal{I}$  from stage 1 run the following steps until all cubes are eliminated.
2. Split the intervals  $I_1, I_2, I_4, I_5$  corresponding to  $x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2$  into halves to get 16 smaller sub-hypercubes  $(I'_1, \dots, I'_9, I_{10}, I_{11}, I_{12})$ . We note that this also tightens the intervals corresponding to  $x_3, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ . Check if each smaller hypercube has a feasible point in  $\mathcal{P}(I'_1, \dots, I'_9, I_{10}, I_{11}, I_{12}) \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}$ . If yes, then the sub-hypercube can be eliminated.
3. Otherwise, verify if the inequality in 26 holds. If yes, the sub-hypercube can be eliminated.
4. Otherwise, split the  $t_1, t_2, t_3$  intervals into halves to get 8 sub-hypercubes  $\mathcal{I}' = (I'_1, \dots, I'_9, I''_{10}, I''_{11}, I''_{12})$ . This also tightens the intervals for  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ . Check if each smaller hypercube  $\mathcal{I}'$  has a feasible point in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{I}') \cap \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}$ . If yes, then the sub-hypercube can be eliminated.
5. Otherwise, split the sub-hyper cube into 16 smaller hyper-cubes using Step 2. Repeat Steps 2-5 until all sub cubes are eliminated.

We ran this branch and bound procedure with  $\rho = 0.80, \delta' = 0.01$  giving a final approximation of 0.795.

## 6 Max-k-Section

Our algorithm for Max-3-Section can be generalized for larger number of sections in the following way. For a natural number  $k \geq 4$ , one can write a similar SDP formulation, where



each node  $v \in V$  has  $k$  vectors  $\mathbf{y}_v^1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_v^k$ , with similar constraints and objective for the SDP for Max-3-Section: maximize  $\sum_{\{u,v\} \in E} (1 - \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^i)$ . The rounding algorithm will work in a similar way. For example, we consider  $k = 4$ . We draw a random permutation  $\pi$  in  $\mathcal{S}^4$  and three random gaussian vectors  $\mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2, \mathbf{g}_3$  with coordinates independently distributed by  $N(0, 1)$ . Then, we define  $S_{\pi(1)}$  and  $S_{\pi(2)}$  in the same way like in the algorithm for MAX-3-SECTION. Next, we define

$$S_{\pi(3)} \triangleq \left\{ u \in V : \mathbf{z}_u^{\pi(3)} \cdot \mathbf{g}_3 \geq \Phi^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(3)}\|^2}{1 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(1)}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^{\pi(2)}\|^2} \right) \right\}$$

and the four clusters in the output will be  $C_{\pi(1)} = S_{\pi(1)}$ ,  $C_{\pi(2)} = S_{\pi(2)} \setminus S_{\pi(1)}$ ,  $C_{\pi(3)} = S_{\pi(3)} \setminus (S_{\pi(2)} \cup S_{\pi(1)})$  and  $C_{\pi(4)} = V \setminus (S_{\pi(1)} \cup S_{\pi(2)} \cup S_{\pi(3)})$ . Then, for any constant  $k$ , we can claim that with high probability the solution is concentrated and can be re-balanced, similarly to Lemma 15 and Lemma 16.

Our goal now is to bound the approximation factors that these algorithms achieve, for each  $k$ . As we discussed in the previous sections, computing the worst approximation guarantee, or even bounding it analytically is not an easy task. For  $k = 3$ , we used the branch and bound algorithm and presented a lower bound on the approximation ratio. For larger values of  $k$ , the computer-assisted proof method becomes computationally harder. However, one possible approach is to try and give a numerical estimation for the approximation factor. We will do that in the following way: for each  $k$ , one can write an optimization problem over  $k^2$  variables that represent the inner products  $\mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^j$ , for each  $i, j \in [k]$ , or as we denoted before, a feasible configuration. Then, we wish to minimize the ratio of the probability that  $u, v$  are separated and the contribution of the edge  $\{u, v\}$  to the SDP, which is  $1 - \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^i$ . To solve that optimization problem, we use Matlab and the *fmincon* functionality which can find a local minimum for this optimization problem, but only a local minimum. Therefore, we repeat the experiment for numerous random starting points in the feasible region. The results of the numerical estimations of the approximation for  $k = 3, 4, 5$  are presented in Conjecture 3.

We note that given a configuration of vectors  $\mathbf{y}_u^1, \mathbf{y}_u^2, \mathbf{y}_u^3, \mathbf{y}_v^1, \mathbf{y}_v^2, \mathbf{y}_v^3$  that has a ratio of  $\rho$  between the separation probability and the contribution of the edge  $(u, v)$  to the SDP solution for Max-3-section, one can construct a configuration for max-4-section by adding two zero vectors  $\mathbf{y}_u^4, \mathbf{y}_v^4$ . That configuration will have the same contribution for the SDP for max-4-section, and the separation probability will also be the same, even though the algorithm admits four sections. Therefore, in that way of analysis, the approximation ratio of our algorithm can only decrease as  $k$  increases. However, our numerical estimations show that for  $k \leq 5$ , the approximation is not worse than 0.8192. In addition, we note that the simple algorithm that returns a random balanced  $k$ -partition achieves a  $1 - \frac{1}{k}$  approximation, hence for  $k = 3, 4, 5$  our algorithm surpasses it.

---

## References

- 1 Gunnar Andersson. An approximation algorithm for max p-section. In *STACS 99: 16th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science Trier, Germany, March 4–6, 1999 Proceedings*, pages 237–247. Springer, 2002.
- 2 Per Austrin, Siavosh Benabbas, and Konstantinos Georgiou. Better balance by being biased: A 0.8776-approximation for max bisection. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 13(1):2:1–2:27, 2016.
- 3 Etienne De Klerk, Dmitrii Pasechnik, Renata Sotirov, and Cristian Dobre. On semidefinite programming relaxations of maximum k-section. *Mathematical programming*, 136(2):253–278, 2012.

- 4 Etienne de Klerk, Dmitrii V Pasechnik, and Joost P Warners. On approximate graph colouring and max-k-cut algorithms based on the  $\theta$ -function. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 8:267–294, 2004.
- 5 Zvi Drezner and G. O. Wesolowsky. On the computation of the bivariate normal integral. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 35(1-2):101–107, 1990.
- 6 Uriel Feige and Michael Langberg. The rpr2 rounding technique for semidefinite programs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 60(1):1–23, 2006.
- 7 Alan Frieze and Mark Jerrum. Improved approximation algorithms for max k-cut and max bisection. *Algorithmica*, 18(1):67–81, 1997.
- 8 Daya Ram Gaur, Ramesh Krishnamurti, and Rajeev Kohli. The capacitated max k-cut problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 115:65–72, 2008.
- 9 Michel X Goemans and David Williamson. Approximation algorithms for max-3-cut and other problems via complex semidefinite programming. In *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 443–452, 2001.
- 10 Michel X Goemans and David P Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 42(6):1115–1145, 1995.
- 11 Eran Halperin and Uri Zwick. A unified framework for obtaining improved approximation algorithms for maximum graph bisection problems. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 20(3):382–402, 2002.
- 12 Richard M Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. *Complexity of Computer Computations*, 1972.
- 13 Subhash Khot, Guy Kindler, Elchanan Mossel, and Ryan O’Donnell. Optimal inapproximability results for MAX-CUT and other 2-variable csps? *SIAM J. Comput.*, 37(1):319–357, 2007.
- 14 Ai-fan Ling. Approximation algorithms for max 3-section using complex semidefinite programming relaxation. In *Combinatorial Optimization and Applications: Third International Conference, COCOA 2009, Huangshan, China, June 10-12, 2009. Proceedings 3*, pages 219–230. Springer, 2009.
- 15 Alantha Newman. Complex semidefinite programming and max-k-cut. In *SIAM Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms*, 2018.
- 16 Prasad Raghavendra and Ning Tan. Approximating csps with global cardinality constraints using SDP hierarchies. In *SODA*, pages 373–387. SIAM, 2012.
- 17 Yinyu Ye. A .699-approximation algorithm for max-bisection. *Mathematical Programming*, 90(1):101–111, Mar 2001.

### A Missing Proofs from Section 3

**Proof of Lemma 6.** Consider the product  $(\mathbf{y}_u^1 + \mathbf{y}_u^2 + \mathbf{y}_u^3) \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u^1 + \mathbf{y}_u^2 + \mathbf{y}_u^3)$ . It follows from Constraints 4 and 5 that this product equals 1. Thus,  $\mathbf{y}_u^1 + \mathbf{y}_u^2 + \mathbf{y}_u^3$  is a unit vector. Moreover, Constraints 3 and 4 give that  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u^1 + \mathbf{y}_u^2 + \mathbf{y}_u^3) = 1$ . Since  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$  is also a unit vector (Constraint 2), they must be the same vector. ◀

### B Missing Proofs from Section 4

**Proof of Claim 10.** We observe that  $\Pr[X \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - q_1), Y \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - q_2)] = \Pr[X \leq -\Phi^{-1}(1 - q_1), Y \leq -\Phi^{-1}(1 - q_2)]$  since  $(X, Y)$  has the same distribution as  $(-X, -Y)$ . The fact that  $-\Phi^{-1}(x) = \Phi^{-1}(1 - x)$ ,  $\forall x \in [0, 1]$ , concludes the proof. ◀

**Proof of Lemma 18.** For each edge  $e = \{u, v\}$  in the graph let  $\mathbf{c}_e$  denote the configuration corresponding to that edge determined by the SDP solution  $Y$ . Let  $E_s = \{e \in E | g(\mathbf{c}_e) \geq \delta'\}$ .

For a set  $S \subseteq E$  we denote  $g(S) = \sum_{e \in S} g(\mathbf{c}_e)$  and  $f(S) = \sum_{e \in S} f(\mathbf{c}_e)$ . Then  $g(E) = \text{SDP}_{\text{VAL}}$  and  $f(E) = \mathbb{E}[|\delta(C_1, C_2)| + |\delta(C_1, C_3)| + |\delta(C_2, C_3)|]$ .

Now we show that  $|\overline{E_s}| \leq \frac{|E|}{3(1-\delta')}$ . This follows since  $g(E) \geq \frac{2}{3}|E|$  so we have,

$$\frac{2}{3}|E| \leq g(E) = g(E_s) + g(\overline{E_s}) \leq |E_s| + \delta'|\overline{E_s}| = |E| - (1 - \delta')|\overline{E_s}|.$$

The second inequality follows since  $g(\mathbf{c}_e) \leq 1$  for all  $e \in E$  and  $g(\mathbf{c}_e) < \delta'$  for  $e \notin E_s$ . Now we conclude the proof using this fact since

$$\begin{aligned} f(E) &\geq f(E_s) \\ &\geq \mu'g(E_s) = \mu'(g(E) - g(\overline{E_s})) \\ &\geq \mu'(g(E) - \delta'|\overline{E_s}|) \geq \mu' \left( g(E) - \delta' \frac{|E|}{3(1-\delta')} \right) \\ &\geq \mu' \left( g(E) - \delta' \frac{g(E)}{2(1-\delta')} \right) = \mu' \left( 1 - \frac{\delta'}{2(1-\delta')} \right) \text{SDP}_{\text{VAL}}. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows by the definition of  $\mu'$ , the fourth inequality follows from the upper bound on the size of  $\overline{E_s}$ , and the last inequality follows since  $\frac{2}{3}|E| \leq g(E)$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Proof of Lemma 15.** Fix  $i$  and let  $R_u^i$  denote the random variable that indicates that vertex  $u$  is assigned to part  $i$ . Let  $P^i \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u \in V} R_u^i$ . We have  $|C_i| = nP^i$  where  $C_i$  is the set of vertices assigned to part  $i$  by Algorithm 1.

For every  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $v \in V$ , it follows from Lemma 9 that  $\Pr[v \in C_i] = \Pr[R_v^i = 1] = \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|_2^2$ . Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[P^i] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V} \mathbb{E}[R_v^i] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v \in V} \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{3},$$

where the last equality follows from Constraint (7) of SDP. Let us now bound the variance of  $P^i$ :

$$\text{Var}[P^i] = \frac{1}{n^2} \left( \sum_{u \in V} \text{Var}[R_u^i] + 2 \sum_{u \neq v} \text{Cov}(R_u^i, R_v^i) \right) \leq \frac{1}{3n} + \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{u \neq v} \text{Cov}(R_u^i, R_v^i). \quad (13)$$

The inequality in (13) follows since:

$$\sum_{u \in V} \text{Var}[R_u^i] = \sum_{u \in V} \mathbb{E}[R_u^i] - \sum_{u \in V} \mathbb{E}[R_u^i]^2 \leq \sum_{u \in V} \mathbb{E}[R_u^i] = \sum_{u \in V} \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|_2^2 = \frac{n}{3},$$

where the last equality above follows again from Constraint (7) of SDP. Let us now focus on the second term in (13):

$$\text{Cov}(R_v^i, R_u^i) = \Pr[R_v^i = 1, R_u^i = 1] - \Pr[R_v^i = 1] \cdot \Pr[R_u^i = 1].$$

We require the following claim which follows from [2].

$\triangleright$  **Claim 27.** Let  $(X, Y)$  be a standard bi-variate gaussian with correlation  $\rho$ . Then for every  $q_1, q_2 \in [0, 1]$ :

$$\Gamma_\rho(1 - q_1, 1 - q_2) \leq (1 - q_1)(1 - q_2) + \min\{2|\rho|, q_1(1 - q_2), q_2(1 - q_1)\}.$$

**Proof.** We have that  $\Gamma_\rho(1 - q_1, 1 - q_2) \leq (1 - q_1)(1 - q_2) + 2|\rho|$  which is shown in Lemma 2.7 of [2]. Next we have  $\Gamma_\rho(1 - q_1, 1 - q_2) \leq \min\{1 - q_1, 1 - q_2\}$ . Then the claim follows from the fact that  $1 - q_2 = (1 - q_1)(1 - q_2) + q_1(1 - q_2)$  and  $1 - q_1 = (1 - q_1)(1 - q_2) + q_2(1 - q_1)$ . ◀

We also require the following claim for our proof. Recall that for every vertex  $u \in V$  and  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , the vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i$  is the unscaled component of  $\mathbf{y}_u^i$  in the direction orthogonal to  $\mathbf{y}_\emptyset$ , i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i = \sqrt{\|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^2 - \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|^4} \mathbf{z}_u^i$ .

▷ **Claim 28.** For every  $u, v \in V$  and any  $i \in [3]$ ,  $\Pr[R_u^i = 1, R_v^i = 1] \leq x_1 w_1 + \frac{7}{3} \sum_{i=j}^3 |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^j \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^j|^{1/3}$ .

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, we show the inequality for  $i = 1$  and by symmetry the proof follows for  $i = 2, 3$ . First we condition the permutation  $\pi$  and look the following three cases:  $\pi(1) = 1, \pi(2) = 1, \pi(3) = 1$ . For each case the probability contribution is,

1.  $\frac{1}{3} \Gamma_{t_1}(x_1, w_1)$
2.  $\frac{1}{6} \Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2) \Gamma_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) + \frac{1}{6} \Gamma_{t_3}(1 - x_3, 1 - w_3) \Gamma_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_1}{1 - x_3}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_3}\right)$
3.  $\frac{1}{6} \Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2) \Gamma_{t_3}\left(1 - \frac{x_3}{1 - x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_3}{1 - w_2}\right) + \frac{1}{6} \Gamma_{t_3}(1 - x_3, 1 - w_3) \Gamma_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_3}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_3}\right)$   
 $= \frac{1}{6} \Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2) \Gamma_{t_3}\left(\frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) + \frac{1}{6} \Gamma_{t_3}(1 - x_3, 1 - w_3) \Gamma_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_1}{1 - x_3}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_3}\right)$

Let  $R_i, Y_i \sim N(0, 1)$  with  $Cov(R_i, Y_i) = t_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . The first case follows since  $\pi(1) = 1$  with probability  $1/3$  and  $u, v$  go in  $C_1$  if  $R_1 \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - x_1), Y_1 \geq \Phi^{-1}(1 - w_1)$ . For case two, with  $1/6$  probability the  $\pi(1) = 2, \pi(2) = 1$ . Then for both  $u, v$  to go in  $C_1$  they cannot go to  $S_{\pi(1)} = S_2$  and must go to  $S_{\pi(2)} = S_1$  (which are independent events). The vertices  $u, v$  do not go to  $S_{\pi(1)} = S_2$  if  $R_2 \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - x_2), Y_2 \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - w_1)$  which occurs with probability  $\Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2)$ . Then,  $u, v$  go to  $C_1$  if  $X_1 \geq 1 - \frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, Y_1 \geq 1 - \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}$ . A similar calculation gives the probability for when  $\pi(1) = 3, \pi(2) = 1$ . For the third, case, with  $1/6$  probability  $\pi(1) = 2, \pi(2) = 3$  and  $u, v$  go to  $C_1$  if they do not go to both  $S_{\pi(1)}, S_{\pi(2)}$  which are independent events. The vertices  $u, v$  do not go to  $S_{\pi(1)} = S_2$  with probability  $\Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2)$  and do not go to  $S_{\pi(2)} = S_3$  with probability  $\Gamma_{t_3}\left(1 - \frac{x_3}{1 - x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_3}{1 - w_2}\right)$ . A similar calculation follows for when  $\pi(1) = 3, \pi(2) = 2$ . Let  $m_i = \min\{2|t_i|, x_i(1 - w_i), w_i(1 - x_i)\}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $m_4 = \min\{2|t_1|, \frac{x_1}{1 - x_2} \frac{w_3}{1 - w_2}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2} \frac{x_3}{1 - x_2}\}$ ,  $m_5 = \min\{2|t_3|, \frac{x_1}{1 - x_2} \frac{w_3}{1 - w_2}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2} \frac{x_3}{1 - x_2}\}$ ,  $m_6 = \min\{2|t_2|, \frac{x_1}{1 - x_3} \frac{w_2}{1 - w_3}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_3} \frac{x_2}{1 - x_3}\}$ , and  $m_7 = \min\{2|t_1|, \frac{x_1}{1 - x_3} \frac{w_2}{1 - w_3}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_3} \frac{x_2}{1 - x_3}\}$ . Applying the upper bounds from Claim 27 on  $\Gamma$  each term is at most

1.  $\frac{1}{3}(x_1 w_1 + m_1)$
2.  $\frac{1}{6} \left( ((1 - x_2)(1 - w_2) + m_2) \left( \frac{x_1 w_1}{(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2)} + m_4 \right) + \frac{1}{6} \left( ((1 - x_3)(1 - w_3) + m_3) \left( \frac{x_1 w_1}{(1 - x_3)(1 - w_3)} + m_7 \right) \right) \right)$
3.  $\frac{1}{6} \left( ((1 - x_2)(1 - w_2) + m_2) \left( \frac{x_1 w_1}{(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2)} + m_5 \right) + \frac{1}{6} \left( ((1 - x_3)(1 - w_3) + m_3) \left( \frac{x_1 w_1}{(1 - x_3)(1 - w_3)} + m_6 \right) \right) \right)$ .

We show the following four bounds which we use to simplify the above expression,

1.  $(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2)m_4 \leq m_1$
2.  $(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2)m_5 \leq m_3$
3.  $(1 - x_3)(1 - w_3)m_6 \leq m_2$
4.  $(1 - x_3)(1 - w_3)m_7 \leq m_1$ .

We observe that  $(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2)m_4 = \min\{2|t_1|(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2), x_1 w_3, w_1 x_3\} \leq \min\{2|t_1|, x_1(1 - w_1), w_1(1 - x_1)\} = m_1$  which follows since  $(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2) \leq 1, w_3 \leq 1 - w_1$ , and  $x_3 \leq 1 - x_1$ . A similar calculation can be used to show the remaining three items. Applying these upper bounds and summing the three cases we get

$$\begin{aligned} & x_1 w_1 + \frac{m_1}{2} + \frac{m_2}{6} \frac{x_1 w_1}{(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2)} + \frac{m_2 m_4}{6} + \frac{m_1}{6} + \frac{m_3}{6} \frac{x_1 w_1}{(1 - x_3)(1 - w_3)} + \\ & \frac{m_3 m_7}{6} + \frac{m_3}{6} + \frac{m_2}{6} \frac{x_1 w_1}{(1 - x_2)(1 - w_2)} + \frac{m_2 m_5}{6} + \frac{m_2}{6} + \frac{m_3}{6} \frac{x_1 w_1}{(1 - x_3)(1 - w_3)} + \frac{m_3 m_6}{6}. \end{aligned}$$

Then using the fact that  $x_i/(1-x_j) \leq 1$  and  $w_i/(1-w_j) \leq 1$  for  $i \neq j$  and simplifying we get that the last expression is at most

$$x_1 w_1 + \frac{2m_1}{3} + \frac{m_2}{2} + \frac{m_3}{2} + \frac{m_2 m_4}{6} + \frac{m_3 m_7}{6} + \frac{m_2 m_5}{6} + \frac{m_3 m_6}{6} \leq x_1 w_1 + \frac{2m_1}{3} + \frac{7}{6} m_2 + \frac{7}{6} m_3.$$

The last inequality follows since  $m_4 \leq 2|t_1| \leq 2$ ,  $m_7 \leq 2$ ,  $m_5 \leq 2$ , and  $m_6 \leq 2$ . We now show that for  $i \in [3]$ ,  $m_i \leq 2|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i|^{1/3}$  which will finish the proof. We use the fact that  $|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i| = |t_i| \sqrt{x_i(1-w_i)} \sqrt{w_i(1-x_i)}$  which implies that at least one of the following holds

1.  $|t_i| \leq |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i|^{1/3}$
2.  $x_i(1-w_i) \leq |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i|^{2/3}$
3.  $w_i(1-x_i) \leq |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i|^{2/3}$ .

Since one of these holds and  $m_i = \min\{2|t_i|, x_i(1-w_i), w_i(1-x_i)\}$  we get that

$$m_i \leq \max\{2|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i|^{1/3}, |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i|^{2/3}\} = 2|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i|^{1/3}$$

where the last inequality follows since  $0 \leq |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i| \leq 1$ . ◀

Using the above we prove the following:

Now Claim 28 implies that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(R_v^i, R_u^i) &= \mathbb{E}[R_v^i, R_u^i] - \mathbb{E}[R_v^i] \cdot \mathbb{E}[R_u^i] \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|_2^2 + \frac{7}{3} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i \rangle|^{1/3} - \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{7}{3} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i \rangle|^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, Lemma 5.5 [16] implies the following claim in our notation.

▷ Claim 29. For all  $u \neq v \in V$ , we have that  $\text{Cov}(R_u^i, R_v^i) \leq 8I_{\mu_{u,v}}(X_u, X_v)^{1/6}$ .

**Proof.** By Fact 4.3 in [16] we have that for any  $i \in [3]$ ,

$$I_{\mu_{u,v}}(X_u, X_v) \geq \frac{1}{2} (\Pr[X_u = i, X_v = i] - \Pr[X_u = i] \Pr[X_v = i])^2 = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^i - \|\mathbf{y}_u^i\| \|\mathbf{y}_v^i\|)^2 = \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i)^2.$$

Then by raising each side to the the power  $1/6$  and taking the average over  $i = 1, 2, 3$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mu_{u,v}}(X_u, X_v)^{1/6} &\geq \frac{1}{3 \times 2^{1/6}} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_u^i, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_v^i \rangle|^{1/3} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{7 \times 2^{1/6}} \text{Cov}(R_v^i, R_u^i). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows by Claim 28. ◀

Now, using the fact that  $Y$  is  $\frac{1}{t}$ -independent we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_{u,v}[I_{\mu_{u,v}}(X_u, X_v)] \leq \frac{1}{t},$$

where  $\mu_{u,v}$  is the local distribution as given by the SDP solution.

Now, as in [16], we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[P^i] &\leq \frac{1}{3n} + \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{u \neq v} \text{Cov}(R_u^i, R_v^i) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{3n} + \frac{16}{n^2} \sum_{u \neq v} I_{\mu_{u,v}}(X_u, X_v)^{1/6} \\
&= \frac{1}{3n} + 16 \mathbb{E}_{u,v}[I_{\mu_{u,v}}(X_u, X_v)^{1/6}] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{3n} + 16 \mathbb{E}_{u,v}[I_{\mu_{u,v}}(X_u, X_v)]^{1/6} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{3n} + 16 \frac{1}{t^{1/6}} = O(\varepsilon^3)
\end{aligned}$$

The third inequality follows since  $x^{1/6}$  is concave and the last inequality follows since  $t = \Omega(\varepsilon^{-18})$ . Thus by applying Chebyshev's Inequality we have that  $\Pr[|C_i| - \frac{n}{3}| \geq \frac{\varepsilon n}{3}] = \Pr[|P^i - \frac{1}{3}| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}] \leq \frac{\text{Var}[P^i]}{\varepsilon^2/9} \leq \varepsilon$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Proof of Lemma 16.** Without loss of generality we will assume  $|C_1| < |C_2| \leq |C_3|$ . We split the analysis into two cases and in the first case both  $C_2, C_3$  will have excess vertices. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_1| &= \frac{n}{3} - m_1 & 0 \leq m_1 \leq n\varepsilon/3 \\
|C_2| &= \frac{n}{3} + e_2 & 0 \leq e_2 \leq n\varepsilon/3 \\
|C_3| &= \frac{n}{3} + e_3 & 0 \leq e_3 \leq n\varepsilon/3 \\
m_1 &= e_2 + e_3.
\end{aligned}$$

In this case we will sample a uniformly random set  $S_2 \subseteq C_2$  with  $|S_2| = e_2$  and a uniformly random set  $S_3 \subseteq C_3$  with  $|S_3| = e_3$ . Our new cut will be  $C'_1 = C_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$ ,  $C'_2 = C_2 - S_2$ ,  $C'_3 = C_3 - S_3$  which clearly satisfies  $|C'_1| = |C'_2| = |C'_3| = \frac{n}{3}$ . We observe that the amount of edges lost in the objective value is  $|\delta(S_2, C_1)|, |\delta(S_3, C_1)|, |\delta(S_2, S_3)|$ . Next we have that  $\mathbb{E}[|\delta(S_2, C_1)|] = |\delta(C_2, C_1)| \frac{e_2}{|C_2|}$  and  $\mathbb{E}[|\delta(S_3, C_1)|] = |\delta(C_3, C_1)| \frac{e_3}{|C_3|}$  which follows since  $S_2, S_3$  are uniformly random sets. To bound the third term we use,  $|\delta(S_2, S_3)| \leq |\delta(S_2, C_3)|$  and so  $\mathbb{E}[|\delta(S_2, S_3)|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\delta(S_2, C_3)|] = |\delta(C_2, C_3)| \frac{e_2}{|C_2|}$ . Thus the total expected loss is at most

$$|\delta(C_3, C_1)| \frac{e_3}{|C_3|} + \frac{e_2}{|C_2|} (|\delta(C_2, C_3)| + |\delta(C_2, C_1)|) \leq \Delta \left( \frac{e_3}{|C_3|} + \frac{e_2}{|C_2|} \right)$$

which follows since  $|\delta(C_3, C_1)| \leq \Delta$  and  $|\delta(C_2, C_3)| + |\delta(C_2, C_1)| \leq \Delta$ . Then we need to maximize,

$$\frac{e_3}{|C_3|} + \frac{e_2}{|C_2|} = \frac{|C_3| - n/3}{|C_3|} + \frac{|C_2| - n/3}{|C_2|} = 2 - \frac{n}{3} \left( \frac{1}{|C_1|} + \frac{1}{|C_2|} \right).$$

Using Jensen's inequality and  $m_1 \leq n\varepsilon/3$  we conclude this case since  $\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{|C_2|} + \frac{1}{|C_3|} \right) \geq \frac{2}{|C_2| + |C_3|} = \frac{2}{\frac{2n}{3} + m_1} \geq \frac{6}{n(2+\varepsilon)}$  implying that the loss is at most  $\Delta(2 - \frac{4}{2+\varepsilon}) = \frac{2\Delta\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon} \leq 2\Delta\varepsilon$ .

In the second case both  $C_1, C_2$  will have missing vertices and  $C_3$  will have all the excess.

We have,

$$\begin{aligned} |C_1| &= \frac{n}{3} - m_1 & 0 \leq m_1 \leq n\epsilon/3 \\ |C_2| &= \frac{n}{3} - m_2 & 0 \leq m_2 \leq n\epsilon/3 \\ |C_3| &= \frac{n}{3} + e_3 & 0 \leq e_3 \leq n\epsilon/3 \\ e_3 &= m_1 + m_2. \end{aligned}$$

In this case we first sample a set  $S \subseteq C_3$  of size  $e_3$  then we sample a uniformly random set  $S_2 \subseteq S$  of size  $m_2$ . We set  $C'_1 = C_1 - (S - S_2)$ ,  $C'_2 = C_2 \cup S_2$ ,  $C'_3 = C_3 - S$ . The loss of edges in the solution is given by  $\delta(S_2, C_2), \delta(S - S_2, C_1)$ . We observe that  $|\delta(S_2, C_2)| \leq |\delta(S, C_2)|$  and  $|\delta(S - S_2, C_1)| \leq |\delta(S, C_1)|$  so we can bound the expected loss by

$$\mathbb{E}[|\delta(S_2, C_2)|] + \mathbb{E}[|\delta(S - S_2, C_1)|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\delta(S, C_2)|] + \mathbb{E}[|\delta(S, C_1)|] = |\delta(C_3, C_2)| \frac{e_3}{|C_3|} + |\delta(C_3, C_1)| \frac{e_3}{|C_3|}$$

and continue with

$$|\delta(C_3, C_2)| \frac{e_3}{|C_3|} + |\delta(C_3, C_1)| \frac{e_3}{|C_3|} \leq \Delta \left( \frac{e_3}{|C_3|} \right) = \Delta \left( 1 - \frac{n}{3|C_3|} \right) \leq \Delta \left( 1 - \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} \right) = \Delta \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \leq \Delta\epsilon.$$

The first inequality follows since  $|\delta(C_3, C_1)| + |\delta(C_3, C_2)| \leq \Delta$ , the second inequality follows since  $|C_3| \leq \frac{n}{3}(1+\epsilon)$ , and the third inequality follows since  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . ◀

## C Proofs of Partial Derivatives from Section 5

The following derivative is shown by [5].

► **Lemma 30.** For  $q_1, q_2 \in [0, 1]$  and  $\rho \in [-1, 1]$  we have,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \Gamma_\rho(q_1, q_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} e^{-\frac{\Phi^{-1}(q_2)^2 + \Phi^{-1}(q_1)^2 - 2\Phi^{-1}(q_2)\Phi^{-1}(q_1)\rho}{2(1-\rho^2)}}.$$

► **Lemma 31.** For any  $(x, w, \alpha, t)$  in the domain of  $f$ , we have that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} f(x, w, \alpha, t) < 0$$

for each  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .

**Proof.** Lemma 30 shows  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} \Gamma_{t_i}(q_1, q_2)$  is non-negative. In addition, we have that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} \Gamma_{t_i}(q_1, q_2) = 0$  for  $j \neq i$ . We notice that  $f(x, w, \alpha, t)$  has the following three types of terms: (1)  $\Gamma$  terms with a negative sign, (2) products of two  $\Gamma$  terms with negative sign and (3) a constant. Since  $\Gamma$  terms are positive (they are probabilities) and have non-negative derivatives with respect to  $t_i$ , the claim follows. ◀

Now we compute the partial derivative of the cut probability with respect to  $x_i$  and  $w_i$ . We need the following lemma from [2].

► **Lemma 32.** Let  $\Gamma_\rho(q_1, q_2) = \Pr[X \leq \Phi^{-1}(q_1), Y \leq \Phi^{-1}(q_2)]$  where  $\text{Cov}(X, Y) = \rho$  and  $q_1, q_2 \in [0, 1]$   $\rho \in [-1, 1]$ . Then we have,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q_1} \Gamma_\rho(q_1, q_2) = \Phi \left( \frac{\Phi^{-1}(q_2) - \rho\Phi^{-1}(q_1)}{\sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \right).$$

Note that it follows from Lemma 32 that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial q_1}\Gamma_\rho(q_1, q_2) \in [0, 1]$ .

► **Lemma 33.** *For any  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , we have the following bounds on the partial derivatives:*

1.  $|\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}f(x, w, \alpha, t)| \leq \frac{5}{3} - \frac{1}{3}(1 - x_{3-i})$ .
2.  $|\frac{\partial}{\partial w_i}f(x, w, \alpha, t)| \leq \frac{5}{3} - \frac{1}{3}(1 - w_{3-i})$ .

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, we will take the partial derivative with respect to  $x_1$ . We will consider all possible permutations  $\pi \in \mathcal{S}^3$  separately. We denote  $D_\rho(q_1, q_2) := \frac{\partial}{\partial q_1}\Gamma_\rho(q_1, q_2)$  whose expression is given in Lemma 32 and we will only use the fact that  $0 \leq D_\rho(q_1, q_2) \leq 1$  since it is a probability. First, we assume that  $\pi = (1, 2, 3)$ . That is,  $\pi(1) = 1, \pi(2) = 2, \pi(3) = 3$ . Then the expression in  $f(x, w, \alpha, t)$  that corresponds to  $\pi$  is

$$\Gamma_{t_1}(x_1, w_1) + \Gamma_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1) \left( \Gamma_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) + \Gamma_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \right).$$

and its derivative is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{t_1}(x_1, w_1) - D_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1) \left( \Gamma_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) + \Gamma_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \right) + \\ \frac{x_2 \Gamma_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1)}{(1 - x_1)^2} \left( D_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) - D_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We have that the expression in 14 is in the range  $[-2 + x_3, 2 - x_3]$ . These bounds follows since

1.  $0 \leq D_{t_1}(x_1, w_1) \leq 1$ .
2.  $0 \leq D_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1) \left( \Gamma_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) + \Gamma_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \right) \leq 1$ .
3.  $-1 + x_3 \leq \frac{x_2 \Gamma_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1)}{(1 - x_1)^2} \left( D_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) - D_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \right) \leq 1 - x_3$ .

The first item follows since  $D$  is a probability. The second item follows since  $\Gamma_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) + \Gamma_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \in [0, 1]$  since by definition of  $\Gamma$  these are the sums of disjoint probability events and therefore are also probabilities. For upper bound of the third item we have  $\frac{x_2}{(1 - x_1)^2} \Gamma_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1) \leq \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1} \leq 1 - x_3$  where the first inequality follows since  $\Gamma_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1) \leq 1 - x_1$  and the second inequality follows since  $\frac{x_2}{x_2 + x_3} = 1 - \frac{x_3}{x_2 + x_3} \leq 1 - x_3$ . The lower bound in the third item follows since  $D_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) - D_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \geq -1$  and  $0 \leq \frac{x_2 \Gamma_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1)}{(1 - x_1)^2} \leq 1 - x_3$ .

Next, we consider the permutation  $\pi = (1, 3, 2)$ . Since  $x_3$  and  $w_3$  are not in the configuration, we use  $x_3 = 1 - x_1 - x_2$  and  $w_3 = 1 - w_1 - w_2$ . Hence the expression that corresponds to  $\pi$  is

$$\Gamma_{t_1}(x_1, w_1) + \Gamma_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1) \left( \Gamma_{t_3}\left(\frac{1 - x_1 - x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{1 - w_1 - w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) + \Gamma_{t_3}\left(1 - \frac{1 - x_1 - x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{1 - w_1 - w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \right)$$

which equals to

$$\Gamma_{t_1}(x_1, w_1) + \Gamma_{t_1}(1 - x_1, 1 - w_1) \left( \Gamma_{t_3}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) + \Gamma_{t_3}\left(\frac{x_2}{1 - x_1}, \frac{w_2}{1 - w_1}\right) \right).$$

We observe that this expression is the same as the expression for  $\pi = (1, 2, 3)$  except  $t_2$  is replaced with  $t_3$ . Since  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  are independent constants in our configuration, the same bounds for expression 14 hold for the derivative in this case.



Next, we consider  $\pi = (2, 1, 3)$ . The expression in  $f$  that corresponds to  $\pi$  is

$$\Gamma_{t_2}(x_2, w_2) + \Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2) \left( \Gamma_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) + \Gamma_{t_1}\left(1 - \frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) \right).$$

and its partial derivative with respect to  $x_1$  is given by

$$\frac{\Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2)}{1 - x_2} \left( D_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) - D_{t_1}\left(1 - \frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) \right).$$

This derivative is the interval  $[-1, 1]$  since  $0 \leq \Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2) \leq 1 - x_2 \leq 1$  and  $-1 \leq D_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) - D_{t_1}\left(1 - \frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) \leq 1$  since this is the difference of two probabilities. The same bounds hold for  $\pi = (2, 3, 1)$  since the corresponding expression will be

$$\Gamma_{t_2}(x_2, w_2) + \Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2) \left( \Gamma_{t_3}\left(\frac{x_3}{1 - x_2}, \frac{w_3}{1 - w_2}\right) + \Gamma_{t_3}\left(1 - \frac{x_3}{1 - x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_3}{1 - w_2}\right) \right)$$

which equals

$$\Gamma_{t_2}(x_2, w_2) + \Gamma_{t_2}(1 - x_2, 1 - w_2) \left( \Gamma_{t_3}\left(1 - \frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) + \Gamma_{t_3}\left(\frac{x_1}{1 - x_2}, \frac{w_1}{1 - w_2}\right) \right)$$

and its derivative is the same as  $(2, 1, 3)$  except  $t_1$  is replaced with  $t_3$ .

Next we consider the permutation  $\pi = (3, 2, 1)$ . The expression for  $\pi$  is given by

$$\Gamma_{t_3}(1 - x_1 - x_2, 1 - w_1 - w_2) + \Gamma_{t_3}(x_1 + x_2, w_1 + w_2) \left( \Gamma_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) + \Gamma_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) \right)$$

and the derivative is

$$\begin{aligned} & -D_{t_3}(x_3, w_3) + D_{t_3}(1 - x_3, 1 - w_3) \left( \Gamma_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) + \Gamma_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) \right) + \\ & \frac{x_2}{(x_1 + x_2)^2} \Gamma_{t_3}(x_1 + x_2, w_1 + w_2) \left( D_{t_2}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) - D_{t_2}\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

This derivative is in the range  $[-2 + x_1, 2 - x_1]$ . This is true since the following three bounds hold:

1.  $0 \leq D_{t_3}(x_3, w_3) \leq 1$ .
2.  $0 \leq D_{t_3}(1 - x_3, 1 - w_3) \left( \Gamma_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) + \Gamma_{t_1}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) \right) \leq 1$ .
3.  $-1 + x_1 \leq \frac{x_2}{(x_1 + x_2)^2} \Gamma_{t_3}(x_1 + x_2, w_1 + w_2) \left( D_{t_1}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) - D_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) \right) \leq 1 - x_1$ .

The proof of these are similar to the three items proven earlier, except  $\frac{x_2}{(x_1 + x_2)^2} \Gamma_{t_3}(x_1 + x_2, w_1 + w_2) \leq \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2} = 1 - \frac{x_1}{x_1 + x_2} \leq 1 - x_1$ . Finally, we consider the permutation  $\pi = (3, 1, 2)$ .

Its expression is

$$\Gamma_{t_3}(1 - x_1 - x_2, 1 - w_1 - w_2) + \Gamma_{t_3}(x_1 + x_2, w_1 + w_2) \left( \Gamma_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_1}{x_1 + x_2}, \frac{w_1}{w_1 + w_2}\right) + \Gamma_{t_1}\left(1 - \frac{x_1}{x_1 + x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_1}{w_1 + w_2}\right) \right)$$

which equals to

$$\Gamma_{t_3}(1 - x_1 - x_2, 1 - w_1 - w_2) + \Gamma_{t_3}(x_1 + x_2, w_1 + w_2) \left( \Gamma_{t_1}\left(1 - \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, 1 - \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) + \Gamma_{t_1}\left(\frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, \frac{w_2}{w_1 + w_2}\right) \right)$$

Hence the derivative will be the same as  $(3, 2, 1)$  except  $t_2$  is replaced with  $t_1$ . Let  $D(\pi)$  be the derivative of the expression that corresponds to the permutation  $\pi = (i, j, k) \in \mathcal{S}^3$ . We

sum all bounds and get  $\sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}^3} D(\pi) \leq 10 - 2x_1 - 2x_3$  and  $\sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}^3} D(\pi) \geq -10 + 2x_1 + 2x_3$ . Finally, since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} f(x, w, \alpha, t) = -\frac{1}{6} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}^3} D(\pi),$$

it holds that

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} f(x, w, \alpha, t) \right| \leq \frac{5}{3} - \frac{1}{3}(1 - x_2).$$

The rest of the partial derivatives follow from symmetry between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  and symmetry between  $x_1, x_2$  and  $w_1, w_2$ . ◀

## D Missing Proofs from Section 5

**Proof of Claim 20.** It follows from Lemma 9 that our algorithm preserves marginals. That is, the probability that  $u$  goes to cluster  $C_i$  is  $x_i$ . Hence the probability that both  $u$  and  $v$  go to cluster  $C_i$  is at most  $\min\{x_i, w_i\}$ . Therefore,

$$\Pr[\text{Algorithm 1 separates } u \text{ and } v] \geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^3 \min\{x_i, w_i\}.$$

Since  $\sum_i x_i = \sum_i w_i = 1$ , it holds that  $1 - \sum_i \min\{x_i, w_i\} = \sum_i \max\{x_i, w_i\} - 1$ . Note that  $|x_i - w_i| = \max\{x_i, w_i\} - \min\{x_i, w_i\}$ , hence  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_i |x_i - w_i|$  is the average between  $1 - \sum_i \min\{x_i, w_i\}$  and  $\sum_i \max\{x_i, w_i\} - 1$ , and that concludes the proof. ◀

**Proof of Claim 25.** By the Mean Value Theorem, we have for any differentiable function  $g : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and points  $a, b \in S$  there exists  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$g(b) \geq g(a) - |\nabla g(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b) \cdot (b - a)|.$$

We use this fact and set  $g$  to  $f$ ,  $b$  to the optimizer of the LHS in the lemma,  $S$  to  $\mathcal{I}$ , and  $a = \mathbf{m}$ . Let  $\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b = (x_1^\lambda, x_2^\lambda, x_3^\lambda, w_1^\lambda, w_2^\lambda, w_3^\lambda, \alpha_1^\lambda, \alpha_2^\lambda, \alpha_3^\lambda, \bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_3)$ . Then we have

$$\min_{\mathbf{c}=(x_1, \dots, t_1, t_2, t_3) \in \mathcal{Q}} f(x_1, \dots, \bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_3) \geq f(\mathbf{m}) - \sum_{z \in \{x, w\}} \sum_{i=1}^2 \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i}(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b) \right| \frac{|\bar{z}_i - z_i|}{2}$$

which follows  $a$  is the midpoint of variables  $x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2$  in  $\mathcal{I}$  so the distance between  $a, b$  in the marginal variables is at most half the length of their respective intervals in  $\mathcal{I}$ . We note that the partial derivatives with respect to  $x_3, w_3$  are 0 since their values are determined by  $x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2$ . By Lemma 33 we have that,

$$\left| \frac{\partial f(x_1^\lambda, x_2^\lambda, x_3^\lambda, w_1^\lambda, w_2^\lambda, w_3^\lambda, \alpha_1^\lambda, \alpha_2^\lambda, \alpha_3^\lambda, \bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2, \bar{t}_3)}{\partial z_i} \right| \leq \frac{5}{3} - \frac{(1 - z_{3-i}^\lambda)}{3} \leq \frac{5}{3} - \frac{(1 - \bar{z}_{3-i})}{3}.$$

The last inequality follows since  $\mathcal{I}$  is convex so  $a + (1 - \lambda)b \in \mathcal{I}$  and the marginal variables lie in their corresponding intervals of  $\mathcal{I}$ . ◀

**Proof of Lemma 21.** The last item of the Lemma follows immediately from the last item of Definition 12. Given  $\mathbf{c}$  our goal is to see if there exist vectors  $\mathbf{y}_u^1, \mathbf{y}_u^2, \mathbf{y}_u^3, \mathbf{y}_v^1, \mathbf{y}_v^2, \mathbf{y}_v^3$  satisfying the first two conditions of Definition 12. We define  $\beta_1 \dots \beta_6$  which will represent the inner products of  $\mathbf{y}_u^i \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^j$  for  $i \neq j$ . We note that these variables do not appear in  $\mathbf{c}$  since we will

project these variables out (in this Lemma) since they do not contribute  $f$  or  $g$  and only affect feasibility of  $\mathbf{c}$ . Let  $\beta_1 \triangleq \mathbf{y}_u^1 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^2$ ,  $\beta_2 \triangleq \mathbf{y}_u^1 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^3$ ,  $\beta_3 \triangleq \mathbf{y}_u^2 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^1$ ,  $\beta_4 = \mathbf{y}_u^2 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^3$ ,  $\beta_5 \triangleq \mathbf{y}_u^3 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^2$ ,  $\beta_6 \triangleq \mathbf{y}_u^3 \cdot \mathbf{y}_v^1$ . Constraint (4) of SDP 1 and the corollary of Lemma 6 give us constraints on the  $x, w, \alpha, \beta$  variables. Consider  $Q = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6)\}$  the set of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^{15}$  that satisfy the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \alpha_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_5 & x_1 &= \alpha_1 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 \\ w_2 &= \beta_1 + \alpha_2 + \beta_6 & x_2 &= \beta_3 + \alpha_2 + \beta_4 \\ w_3 &= \beta_2 + \beta_4 + \alpha_3 & x_3 &= \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \alpha_3 \\ \sum_{i=1}^3 x_i &= \sum_{i=1}^3 w_i = 1 & \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6 &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We define  $P$  to be the projection of  $Q$  on the first 9 coordinates. That is, a vector  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in P$  if and only if there exists  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_6 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6) \in Q$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}[9]$  be the projection of the first 9 coordinates of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{C}[9] \subseteq P$ , since  $Q$  corresponds to the constraints in the SDP relaxation. We present the necessary constraints of  $P$  by eliminating  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_6$ . We start by eliminating  $\beta_1$  using  $\beta_1 = w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6$  and get

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \alpha_1 + \beta_3 + \beta_5 & x_1 &= \alpha_1 + (w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6) + \beta_2 \\ w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6 &\geq 0 & x_2 &= \beta_3 + \alpha_2 + \beta_4 \\ w_3 &= \beta_2 + \beta_4 + \alpha_3 & x_3 &= \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \alpha_3 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_3 &= w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1 & \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6 &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we eliminate  $\beta_3$  using  $\beta_3 = w_1 - \alpha_1 - \beta_5$  and get

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 - \alpha_1 - \beta_5 &\geq 0 & x_1 &= \alpha_1 + (w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6) + \beta_2 \\ w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6 &\geq 0 & x_2 &= (w_1 - \alpha_1 - \beta_5) + \alpha_2 + \beta_4 \\ w_3 &= \beta_2 + \beta_4 + \alpha_3 & x_3 &= \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \alpha_3 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_3 &= w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1 & \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_2, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6 &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we eliminate  $\beta_2$  using  $\beta_2 = x_1 - \alpha_1 - (w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6)$

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 - \alpha_1 - \beta_5 &\geq 0 & x_1 - \alpha_1 - (w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6) &\geq 0 \\ w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6 &\geq 0 & x_2 &= (w_1 - \alpha_1 - \beta_5) + \alpha_2 + \beta_4 \\ w_3 &= x_1 - \alpha_1 - (w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6) + \beta_4 + \alpha_3 & x_3 &= \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \alpha_3 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_3 &= w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1 & \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6 &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We eliminate  $\beta_4$  using  $\beta_4 = x_2 - \alpha_2 - (w_1 - \alpha_1 - \beta_5)$

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 - \alpha_1 - \beta_5 &\geq 0 & x_1 - \alpha_1 - (w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6) &\geq 0 \\ w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6 &\geq 0 & x_2 - \alpha_2 - (w_1 - \alpha_1 - \beta_5) &\geq 0 \\ w_3 &= x_1 - w_2 + \beta_6 + x_2 - w_1 + \beta_5 + \alpha_3 & x_3 &= \beta_5 + \beta_6 + \alpha_3 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_3 &= w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1 & \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_5, \beta_6 &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we eliminate  $\beta_5$  using  $\beta_5 = x_3 - \beta_6 - \alpha_3$  and get

$$\begin{array}{ll} w_1 - \alpha_1 - (x_3 - \beta_6 - \alpha_3) \geq 0 & x_1 - \alpha_1 - (w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6) \geq 0 \\ w_2 - \alpha_2 - \beta_6 \geq 0 & x_2 - \alpha_2 - (w_1 - \alpha_1 - (x_3 - \beta_6 - \alpha_3)) \geq 0 \\ w_3 = x_1 - w_2 + x_2 - w_1 + x_3 & x_3 - \beta_6 - \alpha_3 \geq 0 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1 & \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_6 \geq 0. \end{array}$$

To sum up, the conditions that we get are:

1.  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = 1$ .
2.  $0 \leq a_i \leq \min\{x_i, w_i\}$  for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .
3.  $\max\{0, x_3 - \alpha_3 + \alpha_1 - w_1, w_2 - \alpha_2 + \alpha_1 - x_1\} \leq \min\{w_2 - \alpha_2, x_3 - \alpha_3, x_2 + x_3 - w_1 + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3\}$ .

◀

► **Observation 34.** *The configuration  $\mathbf{c} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, w_1, w_2, w_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$  where*

$$\begin{array}{l} x_1 = 0.4146, x_2 = 0.0657, x_3 = 0.5197, \\ w_1 = 0.0657, w_2 = 0.4146, w_3 = 0.5197, \\ \alpha_1 = 0, \alpha_2 = 0, \alpha_3 = 0.0393 \end{array}$$

*admits a ratio of  $\frac{f(\mathbf{c})}{g(\mathbf{c})} \approx 0.8192$ .*

► **Observation 35.** *The following configuration admits a ratio of  $\approx 0.7192$  between the probability of separation without taking a random permutation on the clusters, and the contribution to the SDP.*

$$\begin{array}{l} x_1 = 0.25, x_2 = 0.25, x_3 = 0.5, \\ w_1 = 0.25, w_2 = 0.25, w_3 = 0.5, \\ \alpha_1 = 0, \alpha_2 = 0, \alpha_3 = 0. \end{array}$$