

Graph Reconstruction via MIS Queries

Christian Konrad*

Conor O’Sullivan†

Victor Traistaru ‡

Abstract

We consider the Graph Reconstruction problem given only query access to the input graph via a Maximal Independent Set oracle. In this setting, in each round, the player submits a query consisting of a subset of vertices to the oracle, and the oracle returns any maximal independent set in the subgraph induced by the queried vertices. The goal for the player is to learn all the edges of the input graph.

In this paper, we give tight (up to poly-logarithmic factors) upper and lower bounds for this problem:

1. We give a randomized query algorithm that uses $O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ non-adaptive queries and succeeds with high probability to reconstruct an n -vertex graph with maximum degree Δ . We also show that there is a non-adaptive deterministic algorithm that executes $O(\Delta^3 \log n)$ queries.
2. We show that every non-adaptive deterministic algorithm requires $\Omega(\Delta^3 / \log^2 \Delta)$ rounds, which renders our deterministic algorithm optimal, up to poly-logarithmic factors.
3. We also give two lower bounds that apply to arbitrary adaptive randomized algorithms that succeed with probability strictly greater than $\frac{1}{2}$. We show that, for such algorithms, $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ rounds are necessary in graphs of maximum degree Δ , and that $\Omega(\log n)$ rounds are necessary even when the input graph is an n -vertex cycle.

1 Introduction

Query algorithms for graph problems have recently received significant attention. In this setting, algorithms are granted access to the input graph solely via a (usually easy-to-compute) subroutine, which is also often referred to as the oracle, and the complexity of an algorithm is measured by the number of subroutine/oracle calls.

In the literature, a large number of different query models have been considered. Queries can either be *local* or *global*, depending on whether they reveal only local information, e.g., vertex degree queries [6] or queries that, for any i , reveal the i th neighbour of a vertex [8], or global information, e.g., (bipartite) independent set queries [3, 4, 1, 2] or maximal matching queries [5, 10]. Depending on the application, it is generally desirable to obtain *non-adaptive* query algorithms, i.e., algorithms where the different queries do not depend on each other’s outcomes, since such queries can be executed simultaneously and therefore admit straightforward parallel implementations.

In this work, we consider the Graph Reconstruction (GR) problem given only query access to the input graph via a Maximal Independent Set (MIS) oracle. In the GR problem, an algorithm

*School of Computer Science, University of Bristol, christian.konrad@bristol.ac.uk, supported by EPSRC New Investigator Award EP/V010611/1

†School of Physics, University of Bristol, je20344@bristol.ac.uk

‡School of Computer Science, University of Bristol, victoryt2001@gmail.com

	Algorithm	Lower Bound
Randomized	$O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ (Theorem 1)	$\Omega(\Delta^2 + \log n)$ (Theorems 2 and 3)
Deterministic	$O(\Delta^3 \log n)$ (Corollary 1)	$\Omega(\Delta^3 / \log^2 \Delta)$ (Corollary 2)

Table 1: Overview of our results. Both our algorithms are non-adaptive. The lower bounds for randomized algorithms hold for adaptive algorithms. The lower bound for deterministic algorithms holds for non-adaptive algorithms.

initially only knows the set of vertices of an input graph and is required to learn all of the graph’s edges. Our aim is to solve GR using MIS queries, where, in each round, an algorithm submits a subset of vertices to the oracle, and the oracle responds with any, potentially adversarially chosen, maximal independent set in the subgraph induced by the queried vertices.

Our work is the first to consider MIS queries. MIS queries are global queries and are very similar to the Maximal Matching queries considered in [5, 10], where the oracle returns a maximal matching in the subgraph induced by the query vertices [5], or in the subgraph spanned by the queried edges that are also contained in the input graph [10]. They should also be regarded as more powerful variants of the Independent Set and Bipartite Independent Set queries [3, 4, 1, 2], where a boolean is returned that indicates whether a queried subset of vertices is independent or, in the bipartite case, whether there exists an edge connecting two disjoint queried subsets of vertices. In particular, we are interested in whether MIS queries are significantly stronger than (Bipartite) Independent Set queries.

1.1 Our Results

In this work, we resolve the MIS-query complexity of GR up to poly-logarithmic factors, both for the class of adaptive randomized query algorithms and for the class of non-adaptive deterministic query algorithms.

Algorithms. We give a randomized algorithm for reconstructing an n -vertex graph with maximum degree Δ that uses $O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ non-adaptive queries and succeeds with high probability (**Theorem 1**). This result shows that, for GR, MIS queries are stronger than Independent Set or Bipartite Independent Set queries since an information-theoretic lower bound similar to the one given in [3] shows that $\Omega(\Delta n \log(\frac{n}{\Delta}))$ queries are needed to reconstruct a graph with maximum degree Δ using these queries. For completeness, we give a proof of this statement in Appendix A.

We also investigate whether randomization is necessary to obtain algorithms with low query complexity. Using the probabilistic method, we show that there exists a non-adaptive deterministic query algorithm that executes $O(\Delta^3 \log n)$ queries (**Corollary 1**).

Lower Bounds. We give lower bounds on the number of queries required by both non-adaptive deterministic query algorithms and adaptive randomized algorithms.

First, we show that every non-adaptive deterministic query algorithm requires $\Omega(\Delta^3 / \log^2 \Delta)$ queries (**Corollary 2**), which renders our deterministic algorithm optimal, up to poly-logarithmic factors. This result together with our non-adaptive randomized algorithm (**Theorem 1**) establishes a separation result between non-adaptive randomized and deterministic algorithms since our randomized algorithm only requires $O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ queries.

Next, we show that every adaptive randomized query algorithm requires $\Omega(\log n)$ queries,

even if the input graph is guaranteed to be an n -vertex cycle (**Theorem 2**). Furthermore, we show that randomized query algorithms require $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ queries, for any Δ (**Theorem 3**). These lower bounds show that the number of queries executed by our randomized algorithm is optimal, up to a logarithmic factor, and that the logarithmic dependency on n cannot be avoided entirely. We leave it as an open question as to whether a randomized algorithm that executes only $O(\Delta^2 + \log n)$ queries exists.

For an overview of our results, see Table 1.

1.2 Techniques

Algorithms. The key idea behind our randomized algorithm is to learn all the non-edges rather than all the edges of the input graph. To this end, we sample sufficiently many random vertex-induced subgraphs $G[V_i] \subseteq G$, for integers i , such that, for every non-edge $uv \in E(G)$, the probability that both u and v are contained in V_i and are isolated in $G[V_i]$ is $\Theta(\frac{1}{\Delta^2})$. This is achieved by including every vertex in V_i with probability $\frac{1}{\Delta+1}$. Observe that when u and v are isolated in $G[V_i]$ then the oracle necessarily needs to include both u and v in the returned maximal independent set. The returned maximal independent set therefore serves as a witness that proves that the potential edge uv is not contained in the input graph. We show that, after repeating this process $O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ times, we have learnt all non-edges with high probability, which allows us to identify the edges of the input graph by complementing the set of non-edges.

Our deterministic algorithm is built on a similar idea. We show that, when taking $\ell = \Theta(\Delta^3 \log n)$ random subsets $V_1, \dots, V_\ell \subseteq V$ as above, i.e., by inserting every vertex $v \in V$ into any subset V_i with probability $\frac{1}{\Delta+1}$, then, for any tuple $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$ of $2\Delta + 2$ disjoint vertices, which we also refer to as a *witness*, there exists a set V_i such that $u, v \in V_i$ but $w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta} \notin V_i$ with positive probability. Since this event happens with non-zero probability, such a family of subsets V_1, \dots, V_ℓ exists. Our deterministic algorithm then queries all of these subsets $(V_i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$. We now claim that our algorithm learns every non-edge $uv \in (V \times V) \setminus E$: We know that there exists a set V_i such that $u, v \in V_i$ but $(\Gamma(v) \cup \Gamma(u)) \cap V_i = \emptyset$ since $|\Gamma(v) \cup \Gamma(u)| \leq 2\Delta$ holds. The vertices u and v are thus isolated in $G[V_i]$ and therefore necessarily reported in the oracle answer, which provides a proof to the algorithm that the edge uv is not contained in the input graph.

Lower Bounds. We first discuss our $\Omega(\Delta^3 / \log^2 \Delta)$ lower bound for deterministic non-adaptive algorithms. Witnesses, i.e., tuples $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$ of $2\Delta + 2$ disjoint vertices, play a key role in our lower bound argument. We argue that any deterministic non-adaptive query algorithm must be such that, for every witness $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$ of disjoint $2\Delta + 2$ vertices, there exists a query Q_i such that $u, v \in Q_i$ and $\{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\} \cap Q_i = \emptyset$. We call a set of ℓ queries that fulfills this property a Δ -Query-Scheme of size ℓ . To see that the previous property is true, for the sake of a contradiction, suppose that this is not the case and there exists a witness $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$ that does not fulfill these properties, i.e., whenever u, v is included in a query then at least one of the vertices $w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}$ is included in this query as well. We claim that the two graphs G_1 and G_2 , where, in both graphs, w_1, \dots, w_Δ are incident on u and $w_{\Delta+1}, \dots, w_{2\Delta}$ are incident on v , and uv is an edge in G_1 but not in G_2 cannot be distinguished¹. Indeed, we claim that, for any query executed, the oracle can always report an independent set that contains at most one of the two vertices u, v , even on graph G_2 . This is because whenever u, v is included in a query then at least one of the vertices $(w_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2\Delta}$ is also included in this

¹This construction generates a maximum degree of $\Delta + 1$ in G_1 , which is technically not allowed since we consider algorithms that run on graphs of maximum degree Δ . To circumvent this issue, in our actual proof we therefore relate algorithms that operate on maximum degree Δ graphs to $(\Delta - 1)$ -Query-Schemes.

query. The oracle can therefore include w_i in the oracle answer, which implies that at most one of u and v will also be included. Both graphs G_1 and G_2 are therefore consistent with all oracle answers and are thus indistinguishable, a contradiction.

Our task, therefore, is to prove that any Δ -Query-Scheme must be of size at least $\Omega(\Delta^3 / \log^2 \Delta)$. We achieve this by combining two separate arguments that address small queries, i.e., queries $V_i \subseteq V$ of size at most $|V_i| \leq t := C \cdot \frac{n \ln(\Delta)}{\Delta}$ and large queries of size larger than t , respectively: For any pair of vertices $\{u, v\}$, small queries are such that they cover many witnesses $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$, for many different vertices $(w_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2\Delta}$, since the vertices $(w_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2\Delta}$ are chosen from $V \setminus V_i$, however, on average, vertex pairs $\{u, v\}$ cannot be included in many small queries (at most $\binom{t}{2}$). In contrast, vertex pairs $\{u, v\}$ can be included in many large queries, however, those queries do not cover many witnesses $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$, for vertices $(w_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2\Delta}$. We obtain our result by combining these observations, see the proof of Lemma 3.

Next, we discuss our $\Omega(\log n)$ queries lower bound for adaptive randomized algorithms on n -vertex cycles. Observe that, in an n -vertex cycle $G = (V, E)$, every pair of vertices $u, v \in V$ is such that $\Gamma(u) \neq \Gamma(v)$. Hence, for a query algorithm to be able to distinguish any two vertices of the input graph, the algorithm is required to obtain oracle answer maximal independent sets such that u and v do not behave the same in all returned independent sets. We show that $\Omega(\log n)$ queries are needed to distinguish between all the vertices. Our argument is based on the observation that, given a set of vertices $U \subseteq V$ that are so far indistinguishable and a query set $V_i \subseteq V$, the returned maximal independent set I_i only allows us to differentiate between the vertices of U that are not queried, queried and contained in I_i , and queried and not contained in I_i . Every query thus allows us to partition any set of vertices that is still indistinguishable into only three subsets, which implies that $\Omega(\log_3 n) = \Omega(\log n)$ queries are needed to distinguish between all the vertices.

Last, we discuss our $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ queries lower bound for graphs of maximum degree Δ . We work with the family of graphs \mathcal{G} obtained from the family of all balanced bipartite graphs $G = (A, B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = \Theta(\Delta)$ vertices where the two bipartitions A and B are turned into two separate cliques. Observe that each such graph has a maximum independent set size of 2. We now claim that, for every non-edge $ab \in (V \times V) \setminus E(G)$ in the input graph G , there must exist an independent set I_i returned by the oracle such that $I_i = \{a, b\}$. This needs to be the case since otherwise the algorithm cannot distinguish between G and the graph $G' = G \cup \{ab\}$, i.e., G with the edge ab added, since all query responses are then consistent with both G and G' . However, since at most one non-edge can be learnt per query, and \mathcal{G} contains many graphs with $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ non-edges, the result follows.

1.3 Query Algorithms for Graph Reconstruction

Query algorithms for the GR problem have been extensively studied under distance queries, where pairs of vertices in a connected input graph are queried and the oracle returns their distance [13, 9, 11, 14]. In this setting, it is known that general graphs cannot be reconstructed with $o(n^2)$ queries [13], but bounded-degree graphs can be reconstructed with $O(n^{1.5})$ queries [9] and chordal graphs with $O(\Delta^2 n \log n)$ queries [14], where Δ denotes the maximum degree of the input graph.

Angluin and Chen consider the GR problem using an Independent Set oracle, where a subset of vertices is submitted to the oracle and the oracle responds with a boolean indicating whether the set is an independent set. They show that, a graph with m edges can be reconstructed using $O(m \log n)$ queries, which is optimal (see also [1] for a follow-up work).

The GR problem has also very recently been studied when the algorithm is provided with either random vertex-induced subgraphs or submatrices of the adjacency matrix, see [12].

1.4 Outline

We give our algorithms in Section 2 and our lower bounds in Section 3. We conclude with open problems in Section 4.

2 Algorithms

We give our randomized algorithm that executes $O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ queries in Subsection 2.1, and our deterministic algorithm that executes $O(\Delta^3 \log n)$ queries in Subsection 2.2.

2.1 Randomized Algorithm

Our algorithm, Algorithm 1, executes $\Theta(\Delta^2 \log n)$ queries on random subsets $V_i \subseteq V$, where each vertex is included in V_i with probability $\frac{1}{\Delta+1}$, and outputs every pair $uv \in V \times V$ as an edge of the input graph if $\{u, v\}$ is not contained in any maximal independent set I_i , for all i , returned by the oracle.

Algorithm 1 Graph reconstruction algorithm using a Maximal Independent Set oracle

Require: Vertex set V , maximum degree Δ , large enough constant C

for $i = 1 \dots C \cdot (\Delta + 1)^2 \cdot \log n$ **do**

$V_i \subseteq V$ random sample such that every $v \in V$ is included in V_i with probability $\frac{1}{\Delta+1}$

$I_i \leftarrow \text{query}(V_i)$

end for

$E \leftarrow \{uv \in V \times V : \nexists i \text{ such that } \{u, v\} \subseteq I_i\}$

return (V, E)

In the analysis, we prove that, for every non-edge $uv \in (V \times V) \setminus E(G)$ in the input graph G , both u and v are reported in any independent set I_i with probability $\Theta(\frac{1}{\Delta^2})$. Since $\Theta(\Delta^2 \log n)$ independent sets are computed, by a Chernoff bound, any non-edge will be detected with high probability, and by the union bound, this then applies to all non-edges.

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 1 executes $O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ Maximal Independent Set queries and correctly reconstructs a graph of maximum degree Δ with high probability.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ denote the input graph, Δ the maximum degree, and let $\overline{E} = (V \times V) \setminus E$ denote the set of non-edges. We will prove that, with high probability, every non-edge can be identified by the algorithm in that, for a non-edge $uv \in \overline{E}$, there exists an independent set I_i such that $\{u, v\} \in I_i$ with high probability.

Consider thus any non-edge $uv \in \overline{E}$. Then, for every i , the probability that both u and v are reported in independent set I_i is at least:

$$\Pr[u, v \in I_i] \geq \Pr[u, v \in V_i \text{ and } (\Gamma(u) \cup \Gamma(v)) \cap V_i = \emptyset],$$

since both u and v need to be included in a maximal independent set if they are isolated vertices in $G[V_i]$.

Next, observe that the events “ $u, v \in V_i$ ” and “ $(\Gamma(u) \cup \Gamma(v)) \cap V_i = \emptyset$ ” are independent since u and v are not adjacent and are thus not contained in $\Gamma(u) \cup \Gamma(v)$. Furthermore, observe that $|\Gamma(u) \cup \Gamma(v)| \leq 2\Delta$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[u, v \in V_i \text{ and } (\Gamma(u) \cup \Gamma(v)) \cap V_i = \emptyset] &= \Pr[u, v \in V_i] \cdot \Pr[(\Gamma(u) \cup \Gamma(v)) \cap V_i = \emptyset] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(\Delta + 1)^2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Delta + 1}\right)^{2\Delta} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(\Delta + 1)^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\Delta + 1}} \cdot 2\Delta} = \frac{1}{(\Delta + 1)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{e^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where we used the bound $1 - x \geq e^{-\frac{x}{1-x}}$, which holds for every $x < 1$.

Next, over the course of the $C(\Delta + 1)^2 \log n$ iterations executed by the algorithm, we expect both endpoints of the non-edge uv to be reported $C \log(n)/e^2$ times, and by Chernoff bounds, the probability that the endpoints u, v are reported at least once is at least $1 - \frac{1}{n^3}$, when C is large enough. By the union bound, the probability that the endpoints of at least one of the $O(n^2)$ non-edges are not reported in any independent set I_i is therefore at most $\frac{1}{n}$, which completes the proof. \square

2.2 Deterministic Algorithm

Central to our deterministic algorithm is the notion of a Δ -Query-Scheme and a *Witness*:

Definition 1 (Witness). *Let V be a set of n vertices and let $2 \leq \Delta \leq n/2 - 1$ be an integer. Then, the tuple $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$ with $u, v, w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta} \in V$ being distinct vertices is called a Witness, and we denote by \mathcal{W} the set of all witnesses.*

Definition 2 (Δ -Query-Scheme). *Let V be a set of n vertices and let $2 \leq \Delta \leq n/2 - 1$ be an integer. The set $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ is denoted a Δ -Query-Scheme of size ℓ if, for every witness $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\}) \in \mathcal{W}$, there exists a query $Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that:*

1. $u, v \in Q_i$, and
2. $\{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\} \cap Q_i = \emptyset$.

In the following, we say that a query Q_i considers a witness $W \in \mathcal{W}$ if Items 1 and 2 holds for Q_i and W .

We show in Lemma 1 that a Δ -Query-Scheme of size ℓ immediately yields a non-adaptive deterministic query algorithm for GR for graphs of maximum degree Δ that executes ℓ queries. Our task is thus to design a Δ -Query-Scheme of small size, which we do in the proof of Lemma 2.

Lemma 1. *Let \mathcal{Q} be a Δ -Query-Scheme of size ℓ . Then, there exists a non-adaptive deterministic algorithm for GR that executes ℓ queries on graphs of maximum degree Δ .*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be the input graph, and let \mathcal{Q} be a Δ -Query-Scheme of size ℓ . The algorithm executes every query $Q_i \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let I_i denote the query answer to Q_i .

We now claim that, for every non-edge $uv \in (V \times V) \setminus E$ in the input graph, there exists an independent set I_i such that $u, v \in I_i$. To see this, denote by $w_1, \dots, w_{\deg(u)}$ the neighbours of u in G and by $w_{\Delta+1}, \dots, w_{\Delta+\deg(v)}$ the neighbours of v in G . Then, since \mathcal{Q} is a Δ -Query-Scheme,

there exists a query Q_i such that $u, v \in I_i$, but none of u 's and v 's neighbours are included. Hence, both u and v are necessarily included in I_i and the algorithm therefore observes a witness that proves that the edge uv does not exist in the input graph.

Since the argument applies to every non-edge, the algorithm learns all non-edges of the input graph and thus also learns all of the input graph's edges by complementing the set of non-edges. \square

Lemma 2. *There exists a Δ -Query-Scheme of size $O(\Delta^3 \log \Delta)$.*

Proof. For an integer ℓ whose value we will determine later, let $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ be such that, for every i , $Q_i \subseteq V$ is the subset of V obtained by including every vertex with probability $\frac{1}{\Delta+1}$. We use the probabilistic method and prove that \mathcal{Q} is a Δ -Query-Scheme with positive probability, which in turn implies that such a scheme exists.

To this end, let $u, v, w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta} \in V$ be distinct vertices. Then, for any i , we obtain (the derivation is identical to Inequality 1 and therefore not repeated here)

$$\Pr[u, v \in I_i \text{ and } w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta} \notin I_i] = \frac{1}{(\Delta+1)^2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Delta+1}\right)^{2\Delta} \geq \frac{1}{(\Delta+1)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{e^2}.$$

Furthermore, the probability that there does not exist a query response I_i , for any $i \in [\ell]$, such that $u, v \in I_i$ and $w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta} \notin I_i$ is at most:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\nexists i \text{ such that } u, v \in I_i \text{ and } w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta} \notin I_i] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{(\Delta+1)^2 e^2}\right)^\ell \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\ell}{(\Delta+1)^2 e^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the union bound over all possible distinct sets of vertices $u, v, w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}$, the probability that there exists such a set of vertices that would violate the properties of a Δ -Query-Scheme is at most:

$$n^{2\Delta+2} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\ell}{(\Delta+1)^2 e^2}\right).$$

For this quantity to be strictly below 1, it is enough to set

$$\ell > 2e^2(\Delta+1)^3 \ln(\Delta),$$

which in turn implies that such a scheme exists. \square

Combining Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we obtain the main result of this section.

Corollary 1. *There exists a deterministic algorithm for GR that executes $O(\Delta^3 \log \Delta)$ non-adaptive Maximal Independent Set queries for graphs with maximum degree Δ .*

3 Lower Bounds

In this section, we give three lower bound results. First, in Subsection 3.1, we consider the class of non-adaptive deterministic query algorithms and we prove that such algorithms require $\Omega(\Delta^3 / \log^2 \Delta)$ queries. This result renders our deterministic query algorithm optimal, up to poly-logarithmic factors, and it also establishes a separation result between deterministic

and randomized query algorithms, since, as demonstrated by our randomized query algorithm, $O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ randomized queries are sufficient.

Next, in Subsection 3.2, we show that $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ queries are needed for query algorithms that may be adaptive and randomized, and that $\Omega(\log n)$ queries are needed for such algorithms, even if the input graph is an n -vertex cycle.

3.1 Lower Bound for Non-adaptive Deterministic Algorithms

We will first show in Lemma 3 that any Δ -Query-Scheme must be of size at least $\Omega(\frac{\Delta^3}{\log^2 \Delta})$. Then, we argue in Lemma 4 that the queries executed by any non-adaptive deterministic query algorithm must constitute a $(\Delta - 1)$ -Query-Scheme. These two lemmas together then imply our main result of this section as stated in Corollary 2, i.e., that non-adaptive deterministic query algorithms require $\Omega(\frac{\Delta^3}{\log^2 \Delta})$ queries.

Lemma 3. *For every $\Delta = O(n^{2/3} \log^{2/3}(\Delta))$, every Δ -Query-Scheme is of size $\Omega(\frac{\Delta^3}{\log^2(\Delta)})$.*

Proof. Let C be a suitably large constant, and let \mathcal{Q} be a Δ -Query-Scheme of size $\ell = \frac{1}{6 \cdot C^2} \cdot \frac{\Delta^3}{\ln^2(\Delta)}$. We will show by contradiction that a Δ -Query-Scheme of this size does not exist. Furthermore, we define a relevant query size threshold t by $t := C \cdot \frac{n \ln(\Delta)}{\Delta}$.

Denote by \mathcal{X} the set of subsets of V of size 2, i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \{\{u, v\} : u, v \in V\}$, where V denotes the set of n vertices of the input graph, and observe that $|\mathcal{X}| = \binom{n}{2}$.

First, observe that at most ℓ queries in \mathcal{Q} are of size exactly 2. Hence, as long as $\ell \leq \binom{n}{2}/5 = n^2/10 - o(n^2)$, fewer than a $1/4$ fraction of \mathcal{X} is part of queries of size 2. Observe that a query $Q = \{u, v\}$ of size 2 immediately considers all witnesses of the form $(\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$, for any vertices $(w_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2\Delta}$. Observe also that the condition $\ell \leq n^2/10 - o(n^2)$ implies $\Delta = O(n^{2/3} \ln^{2/3}(\Delta))$, which is the assumption taken in the statement of this theorem.

Next, we argue that at least half of the pairs $\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{X}$ are such that $\{u, v\}$ is a subset of at most $\frac{1}{2}\Delta$ queries of size at most t in \mathcal{Q} . To this end, observe that any query of size at most t contains at most $\binom{t}{2} \leq t^2$ distinct pairs $\{u, v\}$, and since there are overall ℓ queries, at most

$$\ell \cdot t^2 = \frac{1}{6C^2} \cdot \frac{\Delta^3}{\ln^2(\Delta)} \cdot \left(C \cdot \frac{n \ln(\Delta)}{\Delta} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{6} \cdot n^2 \cdot \Delta$$

pairs appear overall in all queries of size at most t . Since there are overall $\binom{n}{2} = n^2/2 - o(n^2)$ pairs, the claim follows.

Consider thus a pair $\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{X}$ that is included in at most $\Delta/2$ queries of size at most t , and that is not included in a query of size 2. The arguments above ensure that such a pair exists. Denote by Q_1, \dots, Q_k the set of queries that contain u, v and suppose that Q_1, \dots, Q_j are the queries of size at most t (which implies $j \leq \Delta/2$). We now claim that there is a randomly produced witness $W = (\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$, for some vertices $(w_i)_{1 \leq i \leq 2\Delta}$, that is not considered by the queries Q_1, \dots, Q_k with positive probability. This implies that such a witness exists, contradicting the assumption that \mathcal{Q} is a Δ -Query-Scheme, which then completes the proof.

The witness is constructed as follows. Let $W = (\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta}\})$, where, for all $i \leq j$, $w_i \in Q_i \setminus \{u, v\}$ is any element, which is possible since $|Q_i| \geq 3$. Hence, by construction, the queries Q_1, \dots, Q_j each contain at least one element of witness W , which implies that W is not considered by these queries. The remaining elements $w_{j+1}, \dots, w_{2\Delta}$ are randomly picked. We

denote by R the randomly chosen elements $w_{j+1}, \dots, w_{2\Delta}$ in the following. Then, consider any query Q_i , with $i > j$, which implies that $|Q_i| \geq t$. Then:

$$\Pr[|R \cap Q_i| = \emptyset] \leq \left(1 - \frac{t}{n}\right)^{1.5\Delta} = \left(1 - \frac{C \ln \Delta}{\Delta}\right)^{1.5\Delta} \leq e^{-\frac{C \ln \Delta}{\Delta} \cdot 1.5\Delta} = \frac{1}{e^{1.5C \ln \Delta}} = \frac{1}{\Delta^{1.5C}}.$$

Since C is a large enough constant, by the union bound, the probability that every query Q_{t+1}, \dots, Q_k contains at least one element from R is strictly above 0 (recall that there are at most $\ell = O(\Delta^3)$ queries). Hence, the witness W is not considered by these queries, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4. *Let \mathcal{A} be a non-adaptive deterministic query algorithm for GR on graphs of maximum degree Δ . Then, the queries executed by \mathcal{A} form a $(\Delta - 1)$ -Query-Scheme.*

Proof. For the sake of a contradiction, suppose that there exists a sequence of queries Q_1, \dots, Q_k that does not form a $(\Delta - 1)$ -Query-Scheme but still allows the algorithm \mathcal{A} to learn the input graph exactly. Since the queries do not form a $(\Delta - 1)$ -Query-Scheme, there exists a witness $W = (\{u, v\}, \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta-2}\})$ that is not considered by the queries. Consider now any two input graphs G_1 and G_2 that have the following properties: u 's neighbours are $w_1, \dots, w_{\Delta-1}$, and v 's neighbours are $w_{\Delta}, \dots, w_{2\Delta-2}$. In G_1 , there is also an edge between u and v , and in G_2 there is no edge between u and v . Observe that the maximum degree in G_1 is Δ .

Now, we claim that, for every query Q_i , the oracle can respond with an independent set I_i that does not include both vertices u and v . Observe that the algorithm therefore cannot learn whether the edge uv exists since both G_1 and G_2 are consistent with all query answers. The algorithm therefore cannot distinguish between the two graphs G_1, G_2 , which then completes the argument.

Since Q_i does not consider W , there exists a vertex $w \in \{w_1, \dots, w_{2\Delta-2}\}$ such that $w \in Q_i$. Hence, the oracle can construct an independent set starting with vertex w (e.g., by running the Greedy maximal independent set algorithm where w is the first vertex picked), which implies that either u or v cannot be included in the independent set. This completes the proof. \square

Remark: The proof of the previous lemma assumes that the oracle can identify a witness not considered by the queries submitted by the algorithm. This is only possible if all queries are submitted simultaneously to the oracle. Observe that this is a valid assumption since we consider the class of non-adaptive algorithms, and such algorithms equally work when all queries are submitted simultaneously.

Combining Lemma 3 with Lemma 4, we obtain the main lower bound result of this section as a corollary:

Corollary 2. *Every deterministic non-adaptive query algorithm for GR requires $\Omega(\Delta^3 / \log^2(\Delta))$ queries.*

3.2 Lower Bounds for Adaptive Randomized Algorithms

We first prove that, even on an n -vertex cycle, $\Omega(\log n)$ queries are needed to solve GR. Our proof is based on an indistinguishability argument: At least $\Omega(\log n)$ queries are needed so that, for each pair of vertices $u, v \in V$, different outcomes from the oracle are observed.

Theorem 2. *Every possibly randomized query algorithm with success probability strictly greater than $1/2$ for Graph Reconstruction using a Maximal Independent Set oracle on an n -vertex cycle requires $\Omega(\log n)$ queries.*

Proof. Let \mathbf{A} be a randomized query algorithm that reconstructs an n -vertex cycle in ℓ rounds and succeeds with probability strictly above $\frac{1}{2}$. Denote by V_1, \dots, V_ℓ the query vertices and by I_1, \dots, I_ℓ the query responses. We associate the following complete ternary tree \mathcal{T} with $\ell + 1$ layers to the query vertices and responses in an execution of \mathbf{A} :

- The root (layer 1) is labelled with $V = [n]$.
- For an internal node in layer $i \leq \ell$ with label $U \subseteq V$, the node has three children with labels U_1, U_2, U_3 such that $U = U_1 \dot{\cup} U_2 \dot{\cup} U_3$, and

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= (U \cap V_i) \cap I_i, && \text{queried and reported} \\ U_2 &= (U \cap V_i) \setminus I_i, && \text{queried and not reported} \\ U_3 &= U \setminus V_i. && \text{not queried} \end{aligned}$$

We now claim that the label of every node in the last layer $\ell + 1$ (the leaves of \mathcal{T}) consists of at most one vertex. For contradiction, suppose that this is not the case and there exists a node in layer $\ell + 1$ with a label that contains two distinct vertices u, v . Consider the input cycle P and let P' be the cycle obtained from P where the position of vertices u and v are swapped. Then, \mathbf{A} cannot distinguish between P and P' since the two vertices behaved in exactly the same way in all oracle responses, or, in other words, the queries and query responses are equally valid if the input cycle was P' instead of P .

We thus conclude that \mathcal{T} has at least n leaves, which implies that \mathcal{T} has at least $\log_3(n)$ levels, using the fact that \mathcal{T} is ternary. Since \mathcal{T} has $\ell + 1$ layers, we obtain that $\ell \geq \log_3(n) - 1$ queries are needed, which completes the proof. \square

Last, we give our $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ queries lower bound for graphs of maximum degree Δ . The key observation in our proof is that, for every non-edge uv in the input graph G , there must exist an oracle response maximal independent set that contains both vertices u and v , since, if the opposite was true then the algorithm could not distinguish between the input graph G and the graph $G \cup \{uv\}$.

Theorem 3. *For any $\Delta > 0$, every possibly randomized query algorithm with success probability strictly greater than $1/2$ for Graph Reconstruction using a Maximal Independent Set oracle requires $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ queries on graphs of maximum degree Δ .*

Proof. For integers $N > 0$, let \mathcal{H}_N denote the set of all bipartite graphs $H = (A, B, E)$ with $|A| = |B| = N$. Then, let \mathcal{G}_N be the family of graphs obtained from \mathcal{H}_N by turning the bipartitions A and B of each of its graphs $H = (A, B, E) \in \mathcal{H}_N$ into (disjoint) cliques.

Let \mathbf{A} denote a randomized query algorithm with error strictly less than $1/2$. We will prove that \mathbf{A} requires $\Omega(N^2)$ queries on average over \mathcal{G}_N , which implies the result.

First, observe that $\alpha(G) \leq 2$, for every $G \in \mathcal{G}_N$ since at most one vertex from A and at most one vertex from B can be included in any independent set. Hence, every independent set reported by \mathbf{A} on any of the input graphs $G \in \mathcal{G}_N$ is of size at most 2.

Next, we argue that, for every non-edge $f = ab$ in the input graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_N$, i.e., $f \notin E(G)$, there is an independent set I_i reported by the oracle such that $\{a, b\} \subseteq I_i$. For contradiction, suppose that this is not the case. Consider then the graph $G' = G \cup \{ab\}$, i.e., the graph G with the edge ab added. Then, any sequence of queries V_1, V_2, \dots and query responses I_1, I_2, \dots that are valid for graph G are also valid for G' . The algorithm \mathbf{A} therefore cannot distinguish

between these two and thus has an error probability of at least $\frac{1}{2}$, contradicting the assumption that \mathbf{A} errs with probability strictly less than $\frac{1}{2}$.

Observe that, since $\alpha(G) \leq 2$, any query response reveals at most one non-edge. Since most (at least a large linear fraction) graphs in \mathcal{G}_N have $\Omega(N^2)$ non-edges, \mathbf{A} requires $\Omega(N^2)$ queries in average over \mathcal{G} . The result follows by observing that the maximum degree Δ of any graph in \mathcal{G}_N is $2N - 1$. \square

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we initiated the study of the GR problem using an MIS oracle. We gave a non-adaptive randomized algorithm that reconstructs a graph with maximum degree Δ using $O(\Delta^2 \log n)$ queries, and a non-adaptive deterministic query algorithm that uses $O(\Delta^3 \log n)$ queries. We also proved that, for adaptive randomized algorithms, $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ queries are necessary, and that such algorithms require $\Omega(\log n)$ queries even if the input graph is an n -vertex cycle. Furthermore, we showed that non-adaptive deterministic query algorithms require $\Omega(\Delta^3 / \log^2(\Delta))$ queries, which renders our deterministic algorithm optimal up to poly-log factors.

We conclude with two open problems:

1. Is there a randomized algorithm that requires only $O(\Delta^2 + \log n)$ queries or can we prove a stronger lower bound than $\Omega(\Delta^2)$?
2. Is there an adaptive deterministic query algorithm that requires fewer than $O(\Delta^3 \log n)$ queries?

References

- [1] Hasan Abasi and Nader H. Bshouty. On learning graphs with edge-detecting queries. In Aurélien Garivier and Satyen Kale, editors, *Algorithmic Learning Theory, ALT 2019, 22-24 March 2019, Chicago, Illinois, USA*, volume 98 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3–30. PMLR, 2019.
- [2] Raghavendra Addanki, Andrew McGregor, and Cameron Musco. Non-adaptive edge counting and sampling via bipartite independent set queries. In Shiri Chechik, Gonzalo Navarro, Eva Rotenberg, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *30th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2022, September 5-9, 2022, Berlin/Potsdam, Germany*, volume 244 of *LIPICs*, pages 2:1–2:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [3] Dana Angluin and Jiang Chen. Learning a hidden graph using $o(\log n)$ queries per edge. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 74(4):546–556, 2008.
- [4] Paul Beame, Sariel Har-Peled, Sivaramakrishnan Natarajan Ramamoorthy, Cyrus Rashtchian, and Makrand Sinha. Edge estimation with independent set oracles. In Anna R. Karlin, editor, *9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2018, January 11-14, 2018, Cambridge, MA, USA*, volume 94 of *LIPICs*, pages 38:1–38:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [5] Lidiya Khalidah binti Khalil and Christian Konrad. Constructing large matchings via query access to a maximal matching oracle. In Nitin Saxena and Sunil Simon, editors,

- 40th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2020, December 14-18, 2020, BITS Pilani, K K Birla Goa Campus, Goa, India (Virtual Conference)*, volume 182 of *LIPICs*, pages 26:1–26:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [6] Uriel Feige. On sums of independent random variables with unbounded variance and estimating the average degree in a graph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 35(4):964–984, 2006.
- [7] David Galvin. Three tutorial lectures on entropy and counting, 2014.
- [8] Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. In Josep Díaz, Klaus Jansen, José D. P. Rolim, and Uri Zwick, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 363–374, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [9] Sampath Kannan, Claire Mathieu, and Hang Zhou. Graph reconstruction and verification. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(4):40:1–40:30, 2018.
- [10] Christian Konrad, Kheeran K. Naidu, and Arun Steward. Maximum matching via maximal matching queries. In Petra Berenbrink, Patricia Bouyer, Anuj Dawar, and Mamadou Moustapha Kanté, editors, *40th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2023, March 7-9, 2023, Hamburg, Germany*, volume 254 of *LIPICs*, pages 41:1–41:22. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [11] Claire Mathieu and Hang Zhou. A simple algorithm for graph reconstruction. In Petra Mutzel, Rasmus Pagh, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *29th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2021, September 6-8, 2021, Lisbon, Portugal (Virtual Conference)*, volume 204 of *LIPICs*, pages 68:1–68:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [12] Andrew McGregor and Rik Sengupta. Graph reconstruction from random subgraphs. In Mikolaj Bojanczyk, Emanuela Merelli, and David P. Woodruff, editors, *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2022, July 4-8, 2022, Paris, France*, volume 229 of *LIPICs*, pages 96:1–96:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [13] Lev Reyzin and Nikhil Srivastava. Learning and verifying graphs using queries with a focus on edge counting. In Marcus Hutter, Rocco A. Servedio, and Eiji Takimoto, editors, *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 285–297, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [14] Guozhen Rong, Wenjun Li, Yongjie Yang, and Jianxin Wang. Reconstruction and verification of chordal graphs with a distance oracle. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 859:48–56, 2021.

A Independent Set Queries for Graph Reconstruction

For completeness, we will now prove that the number of Independent Set queries (or, in fact, any type of query that yields a binary answer) needed for GR on graphs of maximum degree $\Delta \in \Omega(\log n)$ is $\Omega(n\Delta \log(\frac{n}{\Delta}))$.

Angluin and Chen [3] observe that, since an independent set query has a binary output, at least $\log |\mathcal{G}|$ queries are needed to distinguish any two graphs in a graph family \mathcal{G} .

We will now prove that the number of n -vertex graphs with maximum degree Δ is $2^{\Omega(n\Delta \log(n/\Delta))}$, which, by the previous argument, implies that $\Omega(n\Delta \log(n/\Delta))$ Independent Set queries are needed to distinguish these graphs.

Our proof uses entropy-based arguments. We refer the reader to [7] for an excellent overview of how entropy is connected to counting problems.

Lemma 5. *The number of bipartite $2n$ -vertex graphs with bipartitions A and B each of size n and with maximum degree $\Delta = \Omega(\log n)$ is at least:*

$$2^{\frac{1}{2}n\Delta \log(\frac{n}{\Delta}) - 2} .$$

Proof. We consider the following probabilistic process: Let $G = (A, B, E)$ be a bipartite $2n$ -vertex graph with $|A| = |B| = n$ obtained by inserting every potential edge $ab \in A \times B$ into G with probability $\frac{\Delta}{2n}$. Denote by E the indicator random variable of the event that G does not contain a vertex of degree larger than Δ .

We will now bound the quantity $|\text{range}(G|E = 1)|$ from below, which constitutes a set of bipartite graphs with maximum degree Δ .

To this end, first, observe that:

$$\log(|\text{range}(X|E = 1)|) \geq H(X|E = 1) ,$$

which implies that it is enough to bound $H(X|E = 1)$. To bound this quantity, we apply the chain rule for entropy twice on the expression $H(XE)$:

$$H(XE) = H(X) + H(E|X) , \text{ and}$$

$$H(XE) = H(E) + H(X|E) = H(E) + \Pr[E = 0]H(X|E = 0) + \Pr[E = 1]H(X|E = 1) ,$$

which implies:

$$\begin{aligned} H(X|E = 1) &= \frac{H(X) + H(E|X) - H(E) - \Pr[E = 0]H(X|E = 0)}{\Pr[E = 1]} \\ &\geq H(X) + H(E|X) - H(E) - \Pr[E = 0]H(X|E = 0) \\ &\geq H(X) - 1 - \Pr[E = 0]H(X|E = 0) , \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

using the fact that entropy is non-negative, and that the inequality $H(E|X) \leq H(E) \leq 1$ holds.

Before bounding Inequality 2 further, we first prove that $\Pr[E = 0]$ is small and we give a bound on $H(X)$.

To see that $\Pr[E = 0]$ is small, consider any vertex $v \in A \cup B$. Then, the expected degree of v in G is $\Delta/2$, and, by a Chernoff bound, the probability that the degree of v is larger than Δ is at most $\frac{1}{2n^4}$ (using the assumption that $\Delta = \Omega(\log n)$). By the union bound, the probability that there exists a vertex of degree larger than Δ is thus at most $\frac{1}{n^3}$, or, equivalently, $\Pr[E = 0] \leq \frac{1}{n^3}$.

Next, we bound $H(X)$. Since each of the n^2 potential edges is included in G independently of all other edges, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} H(X) &= n^2 \cdot H_2\left(\frac{\Delta}{2n}\right) \\ &\geq n^2 \log\left(\frac{2n}{\Delta}\right) \frac{\Delta}{2n} \geq \frac{1}{2}n\Delta \log\left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) , \end{aligned}$$

where we bounded the binary entropy function by considering only one of its the two terms.

We are now ready to further simplify Inequality 2, which then yields the result:

$$\begin{aligned}
H(X|E = 1) &\geq H(X) - 1 - \Pr[E = 0]H(X|E = 0) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}n\Delta \log\left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) - 1 - \frac{1}{n^3} \cdot \log(\text{range}(X|E = 0)) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}n\Delta \log\left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) - 1 - \frac{1}{n^3} \cdot n^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}n\Delta \log\left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) - 1 - \frac{1}{n} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}n\Delta \log\left(\frac{n}{\Delta}\right) - 2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3. *The number of Independent Set queries needed for GR on n -vertex graphs of maximum degree $\Delta = \Omega(\log n)$ is $\Omega(n\Delta \log(\frac{n}{\Delta}))$.*