

# Max-Cut with $\varepsilon$ -Accurate Predictions

Vincent Cohen-Addad\*   Tommaso d’Orsi†   Anupam Gupta‡   Euiwoong Lee§  
Debmalya Panigrahi¶

## Abstract

We study the approximability of the MAXCUT problem in the presence of predictions. Specifically, we consider two models: in the *noisy predictions* model, for each vertex we are given its correct label in  $\{-1, +1\}$  with some unknown probability  $1/2 + \varepsilon$ , and the other (incorrect) label otherwise. In the more-informative *partial predictions* model, for each vertex we are given its correct label with probability  $\varepsilon$  and no label otherwise. We assume only pairwise independence between vertices in both models.

We show how these predictions can be used to improve on the worst-case approximation ratios for this problem. Specifically, we give an algorithm that achieves an  $\alpha + \tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^4)$ -approximation for the noisy predictions model, where  $\alpha \approx 0.878$  is the MAXCUT threshold. While this result also holds for the partial predictions model, we can also give a  $\beta + \Omega(\varepsilon)$ -approximation, where  $\beta \approx 0.858$  is the approximation ratio for MAXBISECTION given by Raghavendra and Tan. This answers a question posed by Ola Svensson in his plenary session talk at SODA’23.

---

\*Google Research France.

†Bocconi University. Part of this work was done while the author was at ETH Zürich.

‡New York University. Supported in part by NSF awards CCF-2006953 and CCF-2224718, and by Google, Inc. Part of this work was done while the author was at Carnegie Mellon University.

§University of Michigan. Supported in part by NSF award CCF-2236669 and by Google, Inc.

¶Duke University.

# 1 Introduction

The study of graph cuts has played a central role in the evolution and success of the field of algorithm design since its early days. In particular, cut problems have served as a testbed for models and techniques in “beyond worst case” algorithm design [Bop87, Rou20], as researchers have striven to bridge the gap between observed real-world performance of algorithms and their theoretical analyses based on worst-case instances. Over the years, this has given rise to several deep lines of research, such as the study of (semi-)random instances of cut problems (e.g., [MNS14, New06, CI01, ABH15, Abb17, CKMTS20]) and the exploration of optimal cuts that are stable to random noise (introduced by Bilu and Linial [BL12], see also [MMV14]). In recent years, the abundance of data and the impact of machine learning has led to algorithmic models that seek to go beyond worst-case performance using a *noisy prediction* of an optimal solution, typically generated by a machine learning model or a human expert or even by crowdsourcing. This paradigm has been particularly successful at overcoming information-theoretic barriers in online algorithms (see the CACM article by Mitzenmacher and Vassilvitskii [MV22]) but is also a natural alternative for transcending computational barriers. Motivated by this vision, in his SODA ’23 plenary lecture, Ola Svensson posed the following question: *In the MAXCUT problem, suppose we are given a prediction for the optimal cut that is independently correct for every vertex with probability  $1/2 + \varepsilon$ . Can we exploit this information to breach the MAXCUT threshold of  $\alpha_{GW} \simeq 0.878$  and obtain an  $(\alpha_{GW} + f(\varepsilon))$ -approximate solution?*

In this paper, we give an affirmative answer to this question *for all*  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Namely, we give an algorithm that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , obtains an  $(\alpha_{GW} + \tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^4))$ -approximate MAXCUT solution. Furthermore, we relax the independence requirement to just pairwise independence of the predictions on the vertices. We further complement this result by considering another natural prediction model where instead of a noisy prediction for every vertex, we get a correct prediction but only for an  $\varepsilon$ -fraction of randomly chosen vertices. In this case, we obtain an  $(\alpha_{RT} + \Omega(\varepsilon))$ -approximate solution to MAXCUT, where  $\alpha_{RT} \simeq 0.858$  is the approximation factor obtained by Raghavendra and Tan for the MAXBISECTION problem [RT12]. Note that  $\alpha_{RT}$  is slightly smaller than  $\alpha_{GW}$ , but we get a better advantage of  $\Omega(\varepsilon)$  instead of  $\Omega(\varepsilon^4)$ .

**The MaxCut Problem.** We start by describing the MAXCUT problem. In this problem, we are given a weighted graph  $G = (V, E)$  represented by a (symmetric)  $n \times n$  adjacency matrix  $A$ , where  $A_{ij} = w_{ij}$ , the weight of edge  $\{i, j\}$  if it exists, and 0 otherwise. (We assume the graph has no self-loops, and hence  $A$  has zeroes on the diagonal.) We use  $D$  to denote the diagonal matrix  $D_{ii} = \sum_{j \in [n]} A_{ij}$  and  $L = D - A$  to denote the (unnormalized) Laplacian matrix of the graph. Note that  $x \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  denotes a cut in the graph, and the quadratic form

$$\langle x, Lx \rangle = \sum_{\{i,j\} \in E} w_{ij} (x_i - x_j)^2$$

counts (four times) the weight of edges crossing the cut between the vertices labeled 1, and those labeled  $-1$ . Hence, MAXCUT can be rephrased as follows:

$$\text{MAXCUT}(G) := \max_{x \in \{-1, 1\}^n} 1/4 \cdot \langle x, Lx \rangle.$$

## 1.1 The Noisy/Partial Predictions Framework

In this work, we initiate a study of cut problems under two different models with predictions that may be incorrect or incomplete. In defining these models, by the “correct solution”, we mean an (arbitrary) fixed optimal solution for the MAXCUT instance.

1. The *noisy predictions model*, where for each vertex we are given its correct label in  $\{-1, +1\}$  with some unknown probability  $1/2 + \varepsilon$ , and the other (incorrect) label otherwise. Here we only assume pairwise independence; for any two vertices  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $\Pr[i, j \text{ both give their correct labels}] = (1/2 + \varepsilon)^2$ .
2. The *partial predictions model*, where for each vertex we are given its correct label in  $\{-1, +1\}$  with some unknown probability  $\varepsilon$ , and no (blank) label otherwise. Again, we only assume pairwise independence; for any two vertices  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $\Pr[i, j \text{ both give their correct labels}] = \varepsilon^2$ .

These two models are very basic and aim at capturing scenarios where we are given very noisy predictions. These models can easily be extended to other cut problems (SPARSESTCUT, MINBISECTION, CORRELATIONCLUSTERING, etc.), and more generally to other CSPs. In this paper, we explore the power of such predictions to approximate MAXCUT instances: clearly we can just ignore the predictions and use Goemans-Williamson rounding [GW95] to obtain an  $\alpha_{\text{GW}} \approx 0.878$ -approximation for any instance—but *can we do better?*

## 1.2 Our Results and Techniques

We show how to answer the above question positively in both prediction models. In the more demanding model, we get noisy predictions. Here we can just output the prediction to beat the random cut bound of  $m/2$  by  $O(\varepsilon^2(\text{opt} - m/2))$ , but this is generally worse than the SDP-based cut algorithm. The following theorem shows how to outperform  $\alpha_{\text{GW}}$  by an additive  $\text{poly}(\varepsilon)$  factor:

**Theorem 1.1** (Noisy Predictions). *Given noisy predictions with a bias of  $\varepsilon$ , there is a polynomial-time randomized algorithm that obtains an approximation factor of  $\alpha_{\text{GW}} + \tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^4)$  in expectation for the MAXCUT problem.*

The intuition for this theorem comes from considering graphs with high degree: when  $x^* \in \{-1, +1\}^n$  denotes the optimal solution and a vertex  $i$  has a degree at least  $\Omega(n)$ , the celebrated PTAS of Arora, Karger, and Karpinski [AKK99] starts by obtaining a good estimate of  $(Ax^*)_i$  by sampling  $\tilde{O}(1)$  uniformly random vertices and exhaustively guessing their  $x^*$  values. We observe that under  $\varepsilon$ -noisy predictions where  $\varepsilon n$  bits of information is given, the degree of a vertex  $i$  only needs to be least  $\Omega(1/\varepsilon^2)$  to obtain a similarly good estimate on  $(Ax^*)_i$  and eventually a PTAS. For low-degree graphs, we use the algorithm by Feige, Karpinski, and Langberg [FKL02], whose analysis was recently refined by Hsieh and Kothari [HK22] to guarantee an  $(\alpha_{\text{GW}} + \tilde{O}(1/d^2))$ -approximation where  $d$  is the maximum degree. We give details of Theorem 1.1 in §2.

The AKK result applies not just to MAXCUT but to “dense” instances of all 2-CSPs. We show that this generalization extends to the noisy predictions model. In particular, for dense instances of 2-CSPs, a noisy prediction with bias  $\varepsilon$  can be leveraged to obtain a PTAS where the density threshold is a function of the prediction bias and the approximation error. This extension to general 2-CSPs is given in §4.

Our next result is for the more-informative partial predictions model. In this model, we show how to easily get an additive improvement of  $O(\varepsilon^2)$  over  $\alpha_{\text{GW}}$ , and again ask: can we do better? Our next result gives an affirmative answer:

**Theorem 1.2** (Partial Predictions). *Given partial predictions with a rate of  $\varepsilon$ , there is a polynomial-time randomized algorithm that obtains an (expected) approximation factor of  $\alpha_{\text{RT}} + (1 - \alpha_{\text{RT}} - o(1))(2\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)$  for the MAXCUT problem.*

Here  $\alpha_{\text{RT}}$  is the approximation factor for MAXBISECTION given by Raghavendra and Tan [RT12], and approximately 0.858, a quantity slightly smaller than  $\alpha_{\text{GW}}$ . The advantage of their rounding algorithm is that it preserves marginals of vertices; the probability that a vertex  $i$  becomes 1 is exactly the quantity predicted by the SDP solution.

### 1.3 Related Work

Since the early days, bringing together theory and practice has been the focus of an intense research effort. The driving observation is that the best theoretical algorithms are often designed to handle worst-case instances that rarely occur in practice (and the successful practical heuristics do not have provable guarantee in the *worst-case*). This observation has thus given birth to a line of work on the so-called *beyond worst-case* complexity of various optimization problems [Bop87], and in particular cut problems [Rou20]. One iconic example is the *Stochastic Block Model*, which provides a distribution over graphs that exhibits a “clear” ground-truth cut, and the goal is to design algorithms that on input drawn from the stochastic block model, identify the ground-truth cut. This has given rise to a deep line of work on the complexity of random instances for cut problems and has allowed to show that some heuristics used in practice perform well on such inputs [MNS14, New06, CI01, ABH15, Abb17, CKMTS20]. This work has been generalized to random Constraint Satisfaction Problems (CSP) instances, hence contributing identifying and characterizing hard CSP instances (e.g.: [GKM22]). Another celebrated line of work is provided by the stability notion introduced by Bilu and Linial [BL12] who consider MAXCUT instances (and other combinatorial optimization problems) where the optimum solution is unique and remains optimal for any graph obtained by a  $\gamma$ -perturbation of the edge weights. Makarychev, Makarychev, and Vijayaraghavan [MMV14] showed that it is possible to find an exact optimal solution if  $\gamma = \Omega(\sqrt{\log n \log \log n})$  and hard if  $\gamma = o(\alpha_{\text{SC}})$ , where  $\alpha_{\text{SC}}$  denotes the best polytime approximation ratio for the SPARSESTCUT problem.

More recently, the abundance of data and the impact of machine learning has led us to design other models to capture new emerging real-world scenarios and bridge the gap between theory and practice. For clustering inputs, Ashtiani, Kushagra and Ben-David [AKBD16] introduced a model that assumes that the algorithm can query an external oracle (representing, for example, a machine learning model) that provides the optimum cluster labels; the goal is then to limit the number of queries to the oracle. This has led to several results leading to tight bounds for various clustering objectives, from  $k$ -means [ABJK18] to correlation clustering [MS17]. In some of these and in follow-up works, e.g., Green Larsen et al. [LMT20], and Del Pia et al. [DPMT22], researchers have considered a more robust setting where the same-cluster oracle answers are noisy. Another set of works is by Ergun et al. [EFS<sup>+</sup>22], and Gamlath et al. [GLNS22], who consider  $k$ -means and related clustering problems where the node labels are noisy. E.g., [GLNS22] showed that even when the cluster labels provided by the oracles are correct with a tiny probability (say 1%), it is possible to obtain a  $(1 + o(1))$ -approximation to the  $k$ -means objective as long as the clusters are not too small. Noisy predictions similar to ours for online problems such as caching and online covering have also been considered (e.g., [GPSS22]). More generally, various online problems have been considered in the prediction model, and the dependence of algorithmic performance on a variety of noise parameters has been explored (see, e.g., Lykouris and Vassilvitskii [LV21] who formalized this setting and the many papers listed at [ALP23]).

A variant of the model considered in this paper has also been considered in an independent work by Bampis, Escoffier, and Xeferis [BEX24] where they focus on several cut problems (among them MAXCUT) in dense graphs and provide an algorithm that approximates MAXCUT within a ratio  $1 - \varepsilon - O(\varepsilon)$  factor if the number of edges is  $\Omega(n^2)$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is the probability of a vertex to be mislabeled in a sample of size of  $O(\log n / \varepsilon^3)$ .

## 1.4 Notation and Preliminaries

As mentioned in the introduction, the weighted undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  is represented by an  $n \times n$  weighted adjacency matrix  $A$ , where  $A_{ij} = w_{ij} \mathbb{1}_{\{i,j\} \in E}$ . The matrix  $A$  has zero diagonals. We let  $W_i = \sum_j w_{ij}$  denote the weighted degree of vertex  $i$ , let  $D := \text{diag}(W_1, \dots, W_n)$  be the diagonal matrix with these weighted degrees, and hence  $L := D - A$  be the weighted (unnormalized) Laplacian matrix of the graph.

In the *noisy predictions* model, we assume there is some fixed and unknown optimal solution  $x^* \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ . The algorithm has access to a *prediction vector*  $Y \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ , such that prediction  $Y_i$  is pairwise-independently *correct* with some (unknown) probability  $p$ ; namely, for each  $i$  we have

$$\Pr[Y_i = x_i^*] = p \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[Y_i = -x_i^*] = 1 - p, \quad (1)$$

and for each  $i \neq j$ ,

$$\Pr[Y_i = x_i^* \text{ and } Y_j = x_j^*] = p^2.$$

We assume that the predictions have a strictly positive bias, i.e.,  $p > 1/2$ , and we denote the *bias* of the predictions by  $\varepsilon := p - 1/2$ . For now we assume that the biases of all nodes are exactly  $\varepsilon$ : while this can be relaxed a bit, allowing arbitrarily different biases for different nodes may require new ideas. (See the discussion at the end of the paper.) Also, we can assume we know  $\varepsilon$ , since we can run our algorithm for multiple values of  $\varepsilon$  chosen from a fine grid over the interval  $(0, 1/2)$  and choose the best cut among these runs.

In the *partial predictions* model with *rate*  $\varepsilon$  we are given a *prediction vector*  $Y \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n$  where for each vertex  $i \in V$ , we have

$$\Pr[Y_i = x_i^*] = \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[Y_i = 0] = 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (2)$$

and for each  $i \neq j$ ,

$$\Pr[Y_i = x_i^* \text{ and } Y_j = x_j^*] = \varepsilon^2.$$

## 2 MaxCut in the Noisy Prediction Model

Our goal in this section is to show the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.1** (Noisy Predictions). *Given noisy predictions with a bias of  $\varepsilon$ , there is a polynomial-time randomized algorithm that obtains an approximation factor of  $\alpha_{GW} + \tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^4)$  in expectation for the MAXCUT problem.*

A basic distinction that we will use throughout this section is that of  $\Delta$ -wide and  $\Delta$ -narrow graphs; these should be thought of as weighted analogs of high-degree and low-degree graphs. We first define these and related concepts below, then we present an algorithm for the MAXCUT problem on  $\Delta$ -wide graphs in §2.1, followed by the result for  $\Delta$ -narrow graphs in §2.2. We finally wrap up with the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#).

We partition the edges incident to vertex  $i$  into two sets: the  $\Delta$ -*prefix* for  $i$  comprises the  $\Delta$  heaviest edges incident to  $i$  (breaking ties arbitrarily), while the remaining edges make up the  $\Delta$ -*suffix* for  $i$ . We fix a parameter  $\eta \in (0, 1/2)$ . We will eventually set  $\Delta = \Theta(1/\varepsilon^2)$  and  $\eta$  to be an absolute constant. Recall that  $W_i = \sum_{j \in [n]} A_{ij}$  is the weighted degree of  $i$ .

**Definition 2.1** ( $\Delta$ -Narrow/Wide Vertex). *A vertex  $i$  is  $\Delta$ -wide if the total weight of edges in its  $\Delta$ -prefix is at most  $\eta W_i$ , and so the weight of edges in its  $\Delta$ -suffix is at least  $(1 - \eta)W_i$ . Otherwise, the vertex  $i$  is  $\Delta$ -narrow.*

Intuitively, a  $\Delta$ -wide vertex is one where most of its weighted degree is preserved even if we ignore the  $\Delta$  heaviest edges incident to the vertex.

We partition the vertices  $V = [n]$  into the  $\Delta$ -wide and  $\Delta$ -narrow sets; these are respectively denoted  $V_{>\Delta}$  and  $V_{<\Delta}$ . We define  $W_{>\Delta} := \sum_{i \in V_{>\Delta}} W_i$  and  $W_{<\Delta} := \sum_{i \in V_{<\Delta}} W_i$ , and hence the sum of weighted degrees of all vertices is  $W := \sum_{i=1}^n W_i = W_{>\Delta} + W_{<\Delta}$ .

**Definition 2.2** ( $\Delta$ -Narrow/Wide Graph). *A graph is  $\Delta$ -wide if the sum of weighted degrees of  $\Delta$ -wide vertices accounts for at least  $1 - \eta$  fraction of that of all vertices; i.e., if  $W_{>\Delta} \geq (1 - \eta)W$ . Otherwise, it is  $\Delta$ -narrow.*

## 2.1 Solving MaxCut for $\Delta$ -wide graphs

Our main theorem for  $\Delta$ -wide graphs is the following.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Fix  $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1)$ . Given noisy predictions with bias  $\varepsilon$ , there is a polynomial-time randomized algorithm that, given any  $\Delta$ -wide graph, outputs a cut of value at least the maximum cut minus  $(5\eta + 2\varepsilon')W$ , where  $\Delta := O(1/(\varepsilon \cdot \varepsilon')^2)$ , with probability 0.98.*

Since the graph is  $\Delta$ -wide, most vertices have their weight spread over a large number of their neighbors. In this case, the prediction vector allows us to obtain a good estimate  $\hat{r}$  of the optimal neighborhood imbalance  $r^*$  (the difference between the number of neighbors a vertex has on its side versus the other side of the optimal cut). We can then write an LP to assign fractional labels to vertices that maximize the cut value while remaining faithful to these estimates  $\hat{r}$ ; finally rounding the LP gives the solution.

### 2.1.1 The $\Delta$ -wide Algorithm

Define an  $n \times n$  matrix  $\tilde{A}$  from the adjacency matrix  $A$  as follows: for each row corresponding to the edges incident to a vertex  $i$ , we set the entry  $\tilde{A}_{ij} = 0$  if the edge  $(i, j)$  is in the  $\Delta$ -prefix of vertex  $i$ ; otherwise,  $\tilde{A}_{ij} = A_{ij}$ . Now, define an  $n$ -dimensional vector  $\hat{r}$  as follows:

$$\hat{r}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(\tilde{A}Y)_i & \text{if } i \text{ is } \Delta\text{-wide} \\ 0 & \text{if } i \text{ is } \Delta\text{-narrow} \end{cases}$$

where  $Y$  is the prediction vector as defined in (1). Solve the linear program:

$$\min_{x \in [-1, 1]^n} \langle \hat{r}, x \rangle \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\hat{r} - Ax\|_1 \leq (\varepsilon' + 2\eta)W. \quad (3)$$

Let  $\hat{x} \in [-1, 1]^n$  be the optimal LP solution.

Finally, do the following  $O(1/\eta)$  times independently, and output the best cut  $X^*$  among them: randomly round the fractional solution  $\hat{x}$  independently for each vertex to get a cut  $X \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ ; namely,  $\Pr[X_i = 1] = (1 + \hat{x}_i)/2$  and  $\Pr[X_i = -1] = (1 - \hat{x}_i)/2$ .

### 2.1.2 The Analysis

For a labeling  $x \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ , the *neighborhood imbalance* for vertex  $i$  is defined as  $\sum_j A_{ij}x_j = (Ax)_i$ . This denotes the (signed) difference between the total weight of edges incident to  $i$  that appear and do not appear in the cut defined by the labeling  $x$ . The maximality of the optimal cut  $x^* \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  ensures that  $x_i^* \cdot \text{sign}((Ax^*)_i) \leq 0$  for all  $i$ ; else, switching  $x_i$  from 1 to  $-1$  or vice-versa increases the objective. Define  $r^* := Ax^*$  to be the vector of imbalances for the optimal cut.

**Lemma 2.4.** *The vector  $\hat{r}$  satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{r} - r^*\|_1] := \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{r}_i - r_i^*|\right] \leq O\left(\frac{W}{\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta}}\right) + 2\eta W.$$

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i] = x_i^* \cdot \Pr[Y_i = x_i^*] - x_i^* \cdot \Pr[Y_i = -x_i^*] = x_i^*(1/2 + \varepsilon) - x_i^*(1/2 - \varepsilon) = 2\varepsilon x_i^*.$$

Define  $Z := \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}Y$ . Then,  $\mathbb{E}[Z] = x^*$ , and so  $\mathbb{E}[AZ] = r^*$ .

First, we consider a  $\Delta$ -narrow vertex  $i$ . Since  $\hat{r}_i = 0$ , we have  $|\hat{r}_i - r_i^*| = |r_i^*| \leq W_i$ . So summing over all  $\Delta$ -narrow vertices gives

$$\sum_{i \in V_{<\Delta}} |\hat{r}_i - r_i^*| \leq \sum_{i \in V_{<\Delta}} W_i \leq \eta W, \quad (4)$$

since the graph is  $\Delta$ -wide.

Now, we consider a  $\Delta$ -wide vertex  $i$ . We have

$$|\hat{r}_i - r_i^*| = |(\tilde{A}Z)_i - r_i^*| \leq |\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i] - r_i^*| + |(\tilde{A}Z)_i - \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i]|. \quad (5)$$

To bound the first term in the RHS of (5), recall that  $r_i^* = \mathbb{E}[(AZ)_i]$ . Thus,

$$|\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i] - r_i^*| = |\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i] - \mathbb{E}[(AZ)_i]| = \langle (\tilde{A} - A)_i, \mathbb{E}[Z] \rangle.$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}[Z] = x^* \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ , we get

$$|\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i] - r_i^*| = (\tilde{A} - A)_i \cdot x^* \leq \|(\tilde{A} - A)_i\|_1 \|x^*\|_\infty \leq \eta W_i,$$

where in the last step, we used the fact that  $i$  is a  $\Delta$ -wide vertex.

Now, we bound the second term in the RHS of (5). Using Chebyshev's inequality on the sum  $(\tilde{A}Z)_i = \sum_j \tilde{A}_{ij} Z_j$ , we get

$$\Pr[|(\tilde{A}Z)_i - \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i]| \geq \lambda_i] \leq \frac{\text{var}((\tilde{A}Z)_i)}{\lambda_i^2}.$$

Since the variables  $Z_j$  are pairwise independent, the variance  $\text{var}((\tilde{A}Z)_i) = \sum_j \tilde{A}_{ij}^2 \text{var}(Z_j)$ . The individual variances are at most 1, hence we need to bound  $\sum_j \tilde{A}_{ij}^2$ . We know

$$\sum_{j \in [n]} \tilde{A}_{ij}^2 = \|\tilde{A}_i\|_2^2 \leq \|\tilde{A}_i\|_1 \cdot \|\tilde{A}_i\|_\infty.$$

Note that the weight of any edge in the  $\Delta$ -suffix of  $i$  is at most  $W_i/\Delta$ . Therefore, by our definition of  $\tilde{A}$ , we have  $\|\tilde{A}_i\|_\infty \leq W_i/\Delta$ . Since  $\tilde{A}_{ij} \leq A_{ij}$  for all  $j \in [n]$ , we also have  $\|\tilde{A}_i\|_1 \leq \|A_i\|_1 = W_i$ . Applying these bounds, We get:

$$\sum_{j \in [n]} \tilde{A}_{ij}^2 \leq W_i^2/\Delta.$$

Therefore,

$$\Pr[|(\tilde{A}Z)_i - \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i]| \geq \lambda_i] \leq \frac{(W_i/\varepsilon)^2}{O(\lambda_i^2) \cdot \Delta}.$$

Setting  $\lambda_i := 2^t \cdot O(W_i/(\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta}))$  makes the right hand side at most  $\frac{1}{2^{2t}}$ , say. Now, for a non-negative random variable  $Z$  and some scalar  $z$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq z + \sum_{t \geq 0} \Pr[Z \geq 2^t \cdot z] \cdot 2^{t+1}z.$$

Using this above, we get that

$$\mathbb{E}[|(\tilde{A}Z)_i - \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i]|] = O(W_i/(\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta})).$$

Summing over all  $\Delta$ -wide vertices, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \in V_{>\Delta}} |\hat{r}_i - r_i^*| \right] \leq O \left( \frac{W_{>\Delta}}{\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta}} \right) + \eta W_{>\Delta} \leq O \left( \frac{W}{\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta}} \right) + \eta W.$$

Combining with (4) for  $\Delta$ -narrow vertices, we get

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\hat{r}_i - r_i^*\|_1] \leq O \left( \frac{W}{\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta}} \right) + 2\eta W. \quad \square$$

Now using Markov's inequality with Lemma 2.4, we get that setting  $\Delta = \Omega(1/(\varepsilon\varepsilon')^2)$  for any fixed constant  $\varepsilon' > 0$  ensures that we get a vector of empirical imbalances  $\hat{r}$  satisfying

$$\|\hat{r} - r^*\|_1 \leq (\varepsilon' + 2\eta)W. \quad (6)$$

with probability at least 0.99. (Since the  $2\eta W$  losses are deterministically bounded, we can use Markov's inequality only on the random variable  $\sum_{i \in V_{>\Delta}} |(\tilde{A}Z)_i - \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}Z)_i]|$ .) Hence, when the event in (6) happens, the vector  $x^*$  is a feasible solution to LP (3).

Next, we need to analyze the quality of the cut produced by randomly rounding the solution of LP (3). Recall that for the (unnormalized) Laplacian  $L$  and some  $x \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ , the cut value is

$$f(x) := 1/4 \cdot \langle x, Lx \rangle = 1/4 \cdot (\langle x, Dx \rangle - \langle x, Ax \rangle) = 1/4 \cdot (W - \langle x, Ax \rangle). \quad (7)$$

**Lemma 2.5.** *For any  $\Delta$ -wide graph, the algorithm from §2.1.1 outputs  $X^* \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  that satisfies*

$$f(X^*) \geq f(x^*) - (2\varepsilon' + 5\eta)W$$

*with probability at least 0.98.*

*Proof.* Recall that the cut  $X^*$  is the best among  $T := O(1/\eta)$  independent roundings of cut  $\hat{x}$ . Consider one of the roundings  $X$ , and write:

$$\langle X, AX \rangle = \langle \hat{x}, \hat{r} \rangle + (\langle \hat{x}, A\hat{x} \rangle - \langle \hat{x}, \hat{r} \rangle) + (\langle X, AX \rangle - \langle \hat{x}, A\hat{x} \rangle). \quad (8)$$

Let us first bound the expectation of each of the terms in the RHS of (8) separately.

To bound the first term  $\langle \hat{x}, \hat{r} \rangle$ , note that given (6) (which happens with probability 0.99), the solution  $x^*$  is feasible for the LP in (3). This means the optimal solution  $\hat{x}$  has objective function value

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{r}, \hat{x} \rangle &\leq \langle \hat{r}, x^* \rangle = \langle r^*, x^* \rangle + \langle \hat{r} - r^*, x^* \rangle \leq \langle x^*, Ax^* \rangle + \|\hat{r} - r^*\|_1 \|x^*\|_\infty \\ &\leq \langle x^*, Ax^* \rangle + (\varepsilon' + 2\eta)W. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$



Next, we bound the second term  $(\langle \hat{x}, A\hat{x} \rangle - \langle \hat{x}, \hat{r} \rangle)$  by

$$\|\hat{x}\|_\infty \|A\hat{x} - \hat{r}\|_1 \leq (\varepsilon' + 2\eta)W, \quad (10)$$

by feasibility of  $\hat{x}$  for the LP in (3). Finally, we bound the third term  $(\langle X, AX \rangle - \langle \hat{x}, A\hat{x} \rangle)$ , this time in expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle X, AX \rangle] - \langle \hat{x}, A\hat{x} \rangle = 0. \quad (11)$$

Chaining eqs. (9) to (11) for the various parts of (8), we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle X, AX \rangle] \leq \langle x^*, Ax^* \rangle + (2\varepsilon' + 4\eta)W.$$

Moreover, using that  $\langle X, AX \rangle \in [-W, W]$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\langle X, AX \rangle \geq \mathbb{E}[\langle X, AX \rangle] + \eta W] &= \Pr[\langle X, AX \rangle + W \geq \mathbb{E}[\langle X, AX \rangle] + (1 + \eta)W] \\ &\leq \Pr[\langle X, AX \rangle + W \geq (1 + \eta/2)(\mathbb{E}[\langle X, AX \rangle] + W)] \\ &\leq 1/(1 + \eta/2). \end{aligned}$$

If  $X^*$  is the cut with the smallest value of  $\langle X, AX \rangle$  among all the independent roundings:

$$\Pr[\langle X^*, AX^* \rangle \leq \langle x^*, Ax^* \rangle + (2\varepsilon' + 5\eta)W] \geq 1 - (1/(1 + \eta/2))^T \geq 0.99.$$

Substituting into the definition of  $f(\cdot)$  completes the proof. □

This proves [Lemma 2.5](#), and hence also [Theorem 2.3](#).

*Deterministic Rounding.* We observe that we can replace the repetition by a simple pipeage rounding algorithm to round the fractional solution  $\hat{x}$  to an integer solution  $X^*$  without suffering any additional loss. Indeed, viewing  $\langle x, Ax \rangle$  as a function of some  $x_i$  keeping the remaining  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \setminus \{x_i\}$  fixed gives us a linear function of  $x_i$  (since the diagonals of  $A$  are zero). Hence we can increase or decrease the value of  $x_i$  to decrease  $\langle x, Ax \rangle$  until  $x_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ . Iterating over the variables gives the result. However, this does not change the result qualitatively.

## 2.2 Solving MaxCut for $\Delta$ -narrow graphs

Next, we consider  $\Delta$ -narrow graphs. Our main result for them is the following.

**Theorem 2.6.** *For any  $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is a randomized algorithm for the MAXCUT problem with an (expected) approximation factor of  $\alpha_{GW} + \tilde{\Omega}(\eta^5/\Delta^2)$  on any  $\Delta$ -narrow graph.*

For the case of  $\Delta$ -narrow graphs, we do not use predictions; rather, we adapt an existing algorithm for the MAXCUT problem for low-degree graphs by Feige, Karpinski, and Langberg [FKL02] and its refinement due to Hsieh and Kothari [HK22]. Note that any graph with maximum degree  $\Delta$  is clearly  $\Delta$ -narrow (even when  $\eta = 1$ ).

### 2.2.1 The $\Delta$ -narrow Algorithm

We show that [Theorem 2.6](#) holds for the Feige, Karpinski, and Langberg (FKL) MAXCUT algorithm [FKL02]. We briefly recall this algorithm first. Consider the MAXCUT SDP with triangle inequalities:

$$\max_{v_i \in S_n \ \forall i \in [n]} \sum_{i,j \in [n]: A_{ij}=1} \frac{1 - \langle v_i, v_j \rangle}{2} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad s(\langle v_j, v_k \rangle + \langle v_i, v_k \rangle) \leq \langle v_i, v_j \rangle \quad \forall i, j, k \in [n], s \in \{-1, 1\}.$$

where  $S_n$  is the unit sphere of  $n$  dimensions. Let  $\hat{v}$  be an optimal solution to this SDP.

Let  $g$  be a unit vector chosen uniformly at random from  $S_n$ . We use *random hyperplane rounding* (cf. the Goemans-Williamson MAXCUT algorithm [GW95]) to round  $\hat{v}$  to  $\hat{x} \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  as follows: if  $\langle \hat{v}_i, g \rangle > 0$ , then  $\hat{x}_i = 1$ ; else,  $\hat{x}_i = -1$ .

Now, define  $F = \{i \in [n] : \langle \hat{v}_i, g \rangle \in [-\delta, \delta]\}$  for some  $\delta = \Theta(1/((\Delta/\eta)\sqrt{\log(\Delta/\eta)}))$ . We partition  $N_i := [n] \setminus \{i\}$  as follows:  $B_i := \{j \in N_i \setminus F : \hat{x}_j = \hat{x}_i\}$ , and  $C_i := \{j \in N_i \setminus F : \hat{x}_j \neq \hat{x}_i\}$  and  $D_i := N_i \cap F$ . We define  $F' \subseteq F$  as follows:  $i \in F'$  if  $i \in F$  and  $w(B_i) > w(C_i) + w(D_i)$  where  $w(S) := \sum_{j \in S} A_{ij}$ . In the final output  $X \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ , we flip the vertices in  $F'$ , namely  $X_i = -\hat{x}_i$  if  $i \in F'$ , else  $X_i = \hat{x}_i$ .

### 2.2.2 The Analysis

The ‘‘local gain’’ for a vertex  $i \in F$  is defined as  $\Delta_i := (|B_i| - (|A_i| + |C_i|))^+$ , where  $z^+ = \max(z, 0)$ . We now state the following key lemmas:

**Lemma 2.7.** *For any vertex  $i \in [n]$ ,  $\Pr[i \in F] = \Omega(\delta)$ .*

*Proof.* This lemma immediately follows from [HK22, Fact 3].  $\square$

Let  $i$  be a  $\Delta$ -narrow vertex, and  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be its weight vector ( $w_i = A_{ij}$  for all  $j \in [n]$ ) so that  $W_i = \|w_i\|_1$ . Let  $w' \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the projection of  $w$  onto its top  $\Delta$  coordinates. The narrowness of  $i$  implies that  $\|w'\|_1 \geq \eta \|w\|_1$ , which implies that

$$\|w\|_2^2 \geq \|w'\|_2^2 \geq \frac{\|w'\|_1^2}{\Delta} \geq \frac{\eta^2 \|w\|_1^2}{\Delta}.$$

It turns out that the analysis of [HK22] still holds under the above bound between  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  norms of weight vectors. So we have the following slight generalization of their Lemma 8.

**Lemma 2.8** (extends Lemma 8 of [HK22]). *There is a large enough constant  $C$  such that for any  $d \geq 3$  and  $\delta = \frac{1}{Cd\sqrt{\log d}}$ , for any vertex  $i$  whose weight vector  $w$  satisfies  $\|w\|_1^2 \leq d\|w\|_2^2$ , it holds that the expected local gain of a vertex  $i$  satisfies:*

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i | i \in F] = \Omega\left(\frac{W_i}{d\sqrt{\log d}}\right).$$

*Proof.* In [HK22], the only place where the degree bound  $d$  is used is  $\|w\|_1^2 \leq d\|w\|_2^2$  at the end of the proof of Lemma 7.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove that the FKL algorithm establishes [Theorem 2.6](#).

*Proof of Theorem 2.6.* Note that the value of the cut  $X$  exceeds that of  $\hat{x}$  by  $\sum_{i \in F'} \Delta_i$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\langle X, LX \rangle] &= \mathbb{E}[\langle \hat{x}, L\hat{x} \rangle] + \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_i | i \in F] \cdot \Pr[i \in F] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\langle \hat{x}, L\hat{x} \rangle] + \sum_{i: \Delta\text{-narrow}} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_i | i \in F] \cdot \Pr[i \in F]. \end{aligned}$$

Let the approximation factor of the cut  $\hat{x}$  output by the Goemans-Williamson algorithm be denoted  $\alpha_{\text{GW}}$  and let  $\text{opt}$  be the size of the maximum cut. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle \hat{x}, L\hat{x} \rangle] \geq \alpha_{\text{GW}} \cdot \text{opt}.$$

From [Lemmas 2.7](#) and [2.8](#) with  $d = \Delta/\eta^2$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle X, LX \rangle] \geq \alpha_{\text{GW}} \cdot \text{opt} + \Omega \left( \frac{1}{(\Delta/\eta^2)\sqrt{\log(\Delta/\eta^2)}} \cdot \sum_{i:\Delta\text{-narrow}} \frac{W_i}{(\Delta/\eta^2)\sqrt{\log(\Delta/\eta^2)}} \right).$$

Since  $\sum_{i:\Delta\text{-narrow}} W_i \geq \eta W \geq 2\eta \cdot \text{opt}$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}[\langle X, LX \rangle] \geq (\alpha_{\text{GW}} + \tilde{\Omega}(\eta^5/\Delta^2)) \cdot \text{opt}. \quad \square$$

### 2.3 Wrapping up: Proof of [Theorem 1.1](#)

For  $\Delta$ -wide graphs, [Theorem 2.3](#) returns a cut with value at least

$$\text{opt} - (2\eta + \varepsilon')W$$

with probability 0.98. Since we can always find a cut of value  $\alpha_{\text{GW}} \cdot \text{opt}$ , and  $\text{opt} \geq W/2$ , this means the expected cut value is at least

$$[0.98 \cdot (1 - 6\eta - 2\varepsilon') + 0.02 \cdot \alpha_{\text{GW}}] \text{opt}.$$

And for  $\Delta$ -narrow graphs, [Theorem 2.6](#) finds a cut with expected value

$$[\alpha_{\text{GW}} + \tilde{\Omega}(\eta^5/\Delta^2)] \cdot \text{opt}.$$

Moreover, recall that  $\Delta = O(1/(\varepsilon\varepsilon')^2)$ . Setting  $\eta, \varepsilon'$  to be suitably small universal constants gives us that both the above approximation factors are at least  $\alpha_{\text{GW}} + \tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^4)$ , which proves [Theorem 1.1](#).

## 3 MaxCut in the Partial Prediction Model

We now consider the partial prediction model, where each vertex pairwise-independently reveals their correct label with probability  $\varepsilon$ . Since an  $\varepsilon^2$  fraction of the edges are induced by the vertices with the given labels, it is easy to get an approximation ratio of almost  $\alpha_{\text{GW}} + \Omega(\varepsilon^2)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Given noisy predictions with a rate of  $\varepsilon$ , there is a polynomial-time randomized algorithm that obtains an (expected) approximation factor of  $\alpha_{\text{GW}} + \varepsilon^2$  for the MAXCUT problem*

*Proof.* Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with the optimal cut  $(A^*, B^*)$  that cuts  $E^* = E \cap E(A^*, B^*)$ , let  $S$  be the set of vertices whose label is given, and let  $A = A^* \cup S$ ,  $B = B^* \cup S$ . Consider the following MAXCUT SDP that fixes the vertices with the revealed labels.

$$\max_{v_i \in S_n \ \forall i \in [n]} \sum_{i,j \in [n]} \frac{A_{i,j}(1 - \langle v_i, v_j \rangle)}{2} \quad \text{s.t. } v_i = v_0 \ \forall i \in A \text{ and } v_i = -v_0 \ \forall i \in B.$$

Note that this is still a valid relaxation so the optimal SDP value  $\text{sdp}$  is at least  $\text{opt}$ . For each edge  $e \in E^*$ ,  $e \in E(A, B)$  with probability  $\varepsilon^2$ ; in other words, both of its endpoints will reveal their labels. Let  $\tau$  denotes the total weight of such edges, so that  $\mathbb{E}[\tau] = \varepsilon^2 \text{opt}$ . Note that  $\text{sdp} \geq \text{opt}$  for every partial prediction.

Perform the standard hyperplane rounding. For each  $e \in E^* \cap E(A, B)$ , the rounding will always cut  $e$ . For all other edges, we have an approximation ratio of  $\alpha_{\text{GW}}$ . Therefore, the expected weight of the cut edges is at least

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau W + \alpha_{\text{GW}}(\text{sdp} - \tau W)] \geq \varepsilon^2 \text{opt} + \alpha_{\text{GW}}(1 - \varepsilon^2) \text{opt} = (\alpha_{\text{GW}} + (1 - \alpha_{\text{GW}})\varepsilon^2) \cdot \text{opt}. \quad \square$$

Is  $\Omega(\varepsilon^2)$  optimal? Ideally, we could get an  $\Omega(\varepsilon)$ -advantage if the hyperplane rounding performs better than  $\alpha_{\text{GW}}$  for the edges with only one endpoint's label revealed. One naive way to achieve this is to hope that the rounding *preserves the marginals*; i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[x_i] = \langle v_0, v_i \rangle$  for all  $i \in [n]$ . In that case, if we consider  $(i, j)$  where if  $v_i = \pm v_0$ , the probability that  $(i, j)$  is cut is exactly their contribution to the SDP  $(1 - \langle v_i, v_j \rangle)$ .

Unfortunately, the hyperplane rounding does not satisfy this property. Instead, we use the rounding scheme developed by Raghavendra and Tan [RT12] for max-bisection that has an approximation ratio  $\alpha_{\text{RT}} \approx 0.858$  while preserving the marginals.

**Theorem 1.2** (Partial Predictions). *Given partial predictions with a rate of  $\varepsilon$ , there is a polynomial-time randomized algorithm that obtains an (expected) approximation factor of  $\alpha_{\text{RT}} + (1 - \alpha_{\text{RT}} - o(1))(2\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)$  for the MAXCUT problem.*

*Proof.* Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with the optimal cut  $(A^*, B^*)$  that cuts  $E^* = E \cap E(A^*, B^*)$ , let  $S$  be the set of vertices whose label is given, and let  $A = A^* \cup S$ ,  $B = B^* \cup S$ . Let  $E'$  be the set of the edges that are incident on  $A$  or  $B$ . Each edge cut in the optimal solution will be in  $E'$  with probability  $2\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2$ . Let  $\tau$  be the total weight of the edges in  $E^* \cap E'$  so that  $\mathbb{E}[\tau] = (2\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)\text{opt}$ . Guess the value of  $\tau$  (up to a  $o(1)$  multiplicative error that we will ignore in the proof), and consider the following MAXCUT SDP that fixes the vertices with the revealed labels and requires a large SDP contribution from  $E'$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{v_i \in S_n \ \forall i \in [n]} \quad & \sum_{i, j \in [n]} \frac{A_{i, j}(1 - \langle v_i, v_j \rangle)}{2} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & v_i = v_0 && \forall i \in A \\ & v_i = -v_0 && \forall i \in B \\ & \sum_{(i, j) \in E'} \frac{A_{i, j}(1 - \langle v_i, v_j \rangle)}{2} \geq \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Given the correctly guessed value of  $\tau$ , the optimal solution is still feasible for the above SDP, so  $\text{sdp} \geq \text{opt}$ . We use Raghavendra and Tan [RT12]'s rounding algorithm, which is briefly recalled below.

- For each  $i \in [n]$ , define  $\mu_i \in [-1, +1]$  and  $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $v_i = \mu_i v_0 + w_i$  and  $w_i \perp v_0$ . Let  $\bar{w}_i = w_i / \|w_i\|$ . ( $w_i = 0$  if and only if  $v_i = \pm v_0$ . Then define  $\bar{w}_i = 0$ .)
- Pick a random Gaussian vector  $g$  orthogonal to  $v_0$ . Let  $\xi_i := \langle g, \bar{w}_i \rangle$ . Note that each  $\xi_i$  is a standard Gaussian.
- Let the threshold  $t_i := \Phi^{-1}(\mu_i/2 + 1/2)$  where  $\Phi$  is the CDF of a standard Gaussian.
- If  $\xi_i \leq t_i$ , set  $x_i = 1$  and otherwise set  $x_i = -1$ .

Raghavendra and Tan showed that this rounding achieves an  $(\alpha_{\text{RT}} \approx 0.858)$ -approximation for every edge.

Consider an edge  $(i, j) \in E'$  and without loss of generality, assume  $i \in B$ , which implies that  $v_i = -v_0$ . The contribution of this edge to the SDP objective is  $\mu_j/2 + 1/2$ . Note that  $\Pr[x_j = 1]$  is exactly  $\mu_j/2 + 1/2$  and  $\mathbb{E}[x_j] = (\mu_j/2 + 1/2) - (1/2 - \mu_j/2) = \mu_j$ . So, we get a 1-approximation from this edge. Since other edges still have an  $\alpha_{\text{RT}}$ -approximation, the total expected weight of the edges cut is at least

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau + \alpha_{\text{RT}}(\text{sdp} - \tau)] \geq (2\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)\text{opt} + \alpha_{\text{RT}}(1 - (2\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2))\text{opt} = \alpha_{\text{RT}} \cdot \text{opt} + (1 - \alpha_{\text{RT}})(2\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)\text{opt}.$$

Hence the proof of [Theorem 1.2](#).  $\square$

## 4 2-CSPs in the Noisy Prediction Model

In this section we extend [theorem 2.3](#) to general 2-CSPs.

We start by introducing some additional notation and definitions. For a multi-index  $\alpha \in [n]^2$  we denote by  $\alpha(i)$  its  $i$ -th index. For variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , we then write  $\chi_\alpha(x)$  for the monomial  $\prod_{i \in \alpha} x_i$ . Given a predicate  $P : \{-1, +1\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , an instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of the CSP(P) problem over variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  is a multi-set of triplets  $(w, c, \alpha)$  representing constraints of the form  $P(c \circ x^\alpha) = P(c_1 x_{\alpha(1)}, c_2 x_{\alpha(2)}) = 1$  where  $\alpha \in [n]^2$  is the scope,  $c \in \{\pm 1\}^2$  is the negation pattern and  $w \geq 0$  is the weight of the constraint. We let  $W = \sum_{(w, c, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}} w$ . We can represent the predicate  $P$  as the multilinear polynomial of degree 2 in indeterminates  $x_{\alpha(1)}, x_{\alpha(2)}$ ,

$$P(c \circ x^\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha' \subseteq \alpha} c^{\alpha'} \cdot \hat{p}(\alpha') \cdot \chi_{\alpha'}(x),$$

where  $\hat{p}(\alpha')$  is the coefficient in  $P$  of the monomial  $\chi_{\alpha'}(x)$ . Notice that this formulation does not rule out predicates with same multi-index but different negation pattern or multi-indices in which an index appears multiple times. Given a predicate  $P$ , an instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of CSP(P) with  $m$  constraints and  $x \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  we define

$$\text{val}_{\mathcal{I}}(x) := \frac{1}{W} \sum_{(w, c, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}} w \cdot P(c \circ x^\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{opt}_{\mathcal{I}} := \max_{x \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \text{val}_{\mathcal{I}}(x).$$

For an instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of CSP(P), in the noisy prediction model we assume there is some fixed assignment  $x^*$  with value  $\text{val}_{\mathcal{I}}(x^*) = \text{opt}_{\mathcal{I}}$ . The algorithm has access to a prediction vector  $Y \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  such that predictions  $y_i$ 's are 2-wise independently correct with probability  $\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}$  for unknown bias  $\varepsilon$ . We let  $Z = \frac{Y}{2\varepsilon}$ . With a slight abuse of notation we also write  $P(c \circ Z^\alpha)$  even though  $Z$  is a rescaled boolean vector.

For a literal  $i \in [n]$  and an instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of CSP(P) we let  $S_i := \{(w, c, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I} \mid \alpha(1) = i\}$ . As in [section 2.1.1](#), we can define  $\Delta$ -wide literals and instances. For an instance  $\mathcal{I}$ , we partition the constraints in  $S_i$  into two sets: the  $\Delta$ -prefix for  $i$  comprises the  $\Delta$  heaviest constraints in  $S_i$  (breaking ties arbitrarily), while the remaining constraints make up the  $\Delta$ -suffix for  $i$ , which we denote by  $\tilde{S}_i$ . We fix a parameter  $\eta \in (0, 1/2)$ . We let  $W_i = \sum_{(w, c, \alpha) \in S_i} w_i$ .

**Definition 4.1** ( $\Delta$ -Narrow/Wide). *A literal  $i$  is  $\Delta$ -wide if the total weight of its in its  $\Delta$ -prefix is at most  $\eta W_i$ , and so the weight of edges in its  $\Delta$ -suffix is at least  $(1 - \eta)W_i$ . Otherwise, the literal  $i$  is  $\Delta$ -narrow. An instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of CSP(P) is  $\Delta$ -wide if  $\sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} W_i \geq (1 - \eta)W$ .*

We are now ready to state the main theorem of the section.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $P : \{\pm 1\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be a predicate. Let  $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\eta \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $\Delta \geq O(1/(\varepsilon' \cdot \varepsilon)^2)$ . There exists a polynomial-time randomized algorithm that, given a  $\Delta$ -wide  $\mathcal{I}$  in CSP(P) and noisy predictions with bias  $\varepsilon$ , returns a vector  $\hat{x} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  satisfying*

$$\text{val}_{\mathcal{I}}(\hat{x}) \geq \text{opt}_{\mathcal{I}} - 5\eta - O(\varepsilon'),$$

with probability at least 0.98.

The proof of [theorem 4.2](#) follows closely that of [theorem 2.3](#). First observe that we may assume without loss of generality that each  $(w, c, \alpha)$  appears exactly twice in  $\mathcal{I}$ . This is convenient

so that for all  $x \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ ,  $\text{val}_{\mathcal{I}}(x) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i} w \cdot P(c \circ x^\alpha)$ . With a slight abuse of notation, for all  $(w, c, \alpha) \in S_i$ , we let

$$P(c \circ (x_i \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i})) := \sum_{\substack{\alpha' \subseteq \alpha \text{ s.t.} \\ \alpha'(1)=i}} \hat{p}_{\alpha'} c^{\alpha'} x_i \cdot \chi_{\alpha' \setminus \alpha'(1)}(Z) + \sum_{\substack{\alpha' \subseteq \alpha \text{ s.t.} \\ \alpha'(1) \neq i}} \hat{p}_{\alpha'} c^{\alpha'} \chi_{\alpha'}(Z),$$

and

$$P(c \circ x^{\alpha \setminus i}) := \sum_{\substack{\alpha' \subseteq \alpha \text{ s.t.} \\ \alpha'(1)=i}} \hat{p}_{\alpha'} c^{\alpha'} \chi_{\alpha' \setminus \alpha'(1)}(x) + \sum_{\substack{\alpha' \subseteq \alpha \text{ s.t.} \\ \alpha'(1) \neq i}} \hat{p}_{\alpha'} c^{\alpha'} \chi_{\alpha'}(x),$$

We further define  $\tilde{S}_i \subseteq S_i$  to be subset of constraints in  $S_i$  that are not part of the  $\Delta$ -prefix of  $i$ . We can now state the algorithm behind [theorem 4.2](#), which amounts to the following two steps.

1. Solve the linear program

$$\max_{x \in [-1, +1]^n} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} w P(c \circ (x_i \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i}))$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-narrow}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i} w P(c \circ x^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right| + \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i \setminus \tilde{S}_i} w P(c \circ x^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right| \\ & + \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} w \left( P(c \circ x^{\alpha \setminus i}) - P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \right| \leq C(\varepsilon' + 2\eta)W \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

for some large enough absolute constant  $C > 0$ . Let  $\hat{x} \in [-1, +1]^n$  be the found optimal solution.

2. Repeat  $O(1/\eta)$  times independently and output the best assignment  $X^*$ : independently for each  $i \in [n]$  set  $X_i = 1$  with probability  $(1 + \hat{x}_i)/2$  and  $X_i = -1$  otherwise.

The LP above generalize the one in [eq. \(3\)](#), which comes as a special case where  $\hat{p}_{\alpha'} = 0$  for all  $\alpha' \subset \alpha \in [n]^2$ . Indeed, since predicates contain only two literals, the program is linear. Given the resemblance between [eq. \(3\)](#) and [eq. \(12\)](#), the proof of [theorem 4.2](#) follows closely that of [theorem 2.3](#), we defer it to [appendix A](#).

## 5 Closing Remarks

Our work suggests many directions for future research. One immediate question is to quantitatively improve our results: e.g., the exponent of  $\varepsilon$  for noisy predictions, and the constants. Here are some broader questions:

1. We assume that our noisy predictions are correct with probability *equal to*  $1/2 + \varepsilon$ ; we can easily extend to the case where each node has a prediction that is correct with some probability  $1/2 + \varepsilon_i$ , and each  $\varepsilon_i \in \Theta(\varepsilon)$ . But our approach breaks down when different nodes are correct with wildly different probabilities, even when we are guaranteed  $\varepsilon_i \geq \varepsilon$  for every  $i$ . Can we extend to that case?

2. For which other problems can we improve the performance of the state-of-the-art algorithms using noisy predictions? As we showed, the ideas used for the  $\Delta$ -wide case extend to more general maximization problems on 2-CSPs with “high degree”, but can we extend the results for the “low-degree” case where each variable does not have a high-enough degree to infer a clear signal? Can we extend these to minimization versions of 2-CSPs?

3. What general lower bounds can we give for our prediction models?

We feel that  $\alpha_{GW} + O(\varepsilon)$  is a natural barrier. One “evidence” we have is the following integrality gap for the SDP used in the partial information model; starting from a gap instance and an SDP solution exhibiting  $\text{opt} \leq \alpha_{GW} \cdot \text{sdp}$  for the standard SDP (without incorporating revealed information), given labels for an  $\varepsilon n$  vertices, our new SDP simply fixes the positions of the corresponding  $\varepsilon n$  vectors, but doing that from the given SDP solution decreases the SDP value by at most  $O(\varepsilon)$  in expectation, which still yields  $\text{opt} \leq (\alpha_{GW} + O(\varepsilon))\text{sdp}$ . (Note that you can replace the SDP gap with any hypothetical gap instance for stronger relaxations.)

Given that the partial predictions model is easier than the noisy predictions model and our entire algorithm for the partial model is based on this SDP, this might be considered as a convincing lower bound, but it would be nicer to have more general lower bounds against all polynomial-time algorithms.

4. Our models only assume pairwise independence between vertices: can we extend our results to other ways of modeling correlations between the predictions? In addition to stochastic predictions, can we incorporate geometric predictions (e.g., in random graph models where the probability of edges depend on the proximity of the nodes)?

## Acknowledgments.

We thank Ola Svensson for enjoyable discussions.

## References

- [Abb17] Emmanuel Abbe. Community detection and stochastic block models: recent developments. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):6446–6531, 2017.
- [ABH15] Emmanuel Abbe, Afonso S Bandeira, and Georgina Hall. Exact recovery in the stochastic block model. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 62(1):471–487, 2015.
- [ABJK18] Nir Ailon, Anup Bhattacharya, Ragesh Jaiswal, and Amit Kumar. Approximate clustering with same-cluster queries. 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 40:1–40:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [AKBD16] Hassan Ashtiani, Shrinu Kushagra, and Shai Ben-David. Clustering with same-cluster queries. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [AKK99] Sanjeev Arora, David R. Karger, and Marek Karpinski. Polynomial time approximation schemes for dense instances of np-hard problems. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 58(1):193–210, 1999.
- [ALP23] Online index for algorithms with predictions, 2023. <https://algorithms-with-predictions.github.io/>.
- [BEX24] Evripidis Bampis, Bruno Escoffier, and Michalis Xeferis. Parsimonious learning-augmented approximations for dense instances of  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard problems, 2024.

- [BL12] Yonatan Bilu and Nathan Linial. Are stable instances easy? *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 21(5):643–660, 2012.
- [Bop87] Ravi B Boppana. Eigenvalues and graph bisection: An average-case analysis. In *28th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1987)*, pages 280–285. IEEE, 1987.
- [CI01] Ted Carson and Russell Impagliazzo. Hill-climbing finds random planted bisections. In S. Rao Kosaraju, editor, *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, January 7-9, 2001, Washington, DC, USA*, pages 903–909. ACM/SIAM, 2001.
- [CKMTS20] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Adrian Kosowski, Frederik Mallmann-Trenn, and David Saulpic. On the power of louvain in the stochastic block model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:4055–4066, 2020.
- [DPMT22] Alberto Del Pia, Mingchen Ma, and Christos Tzamos. Clustering with queries under semi-random noise. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 5278–5313. PMLR, 2022.
- [EFS<sup>+</sup>22] Jon C. Ergun, Zhili Feng, Sandeep Silwal, David P. Woodruff, and Samson Zhou. Learning-augmented  $k$ -means clustering. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [FKL02] Uriel Feige, Marek Karpinski, and Michael Langberg. Improved approximation of max-cut on graphs of bounded degree. *J. Algorithms*, 43(2):201–219, 2002.
- [GKM22] Venkatesan Guruswami, Pravesh K. Kothari, and Peter Manohar. Algorithms and certificates for boolean CSP refutation: smoothed is no harder than random. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 678–689. ACM, 2022.
- [GLNS22] Buddhima Gamlath, Silvio Lattanzi, Ashkan Norouzi-Fard, and Ola Svensson. Approximate cluster recovery from noisy labels. In Po-Ling Loh and Maxim Raginsky, editors, *Conference on Learning Theory, 2-5 July 2022, London, UK*, volume 178 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1463–1509. PMLR, 2022.
- [GPSS22] Anupam Gupta, Debmalya Panigrahi, Bernardo Subercaseaux, and Kevin Sun. Augmenting online algorithms with  $\epsilon$ -accurate predictions. In *NeurIPS*, Dec 2022.
- [GW95] Michel X. Goemans and David P. Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *J. ACM*, 42(6):1115–1145, 1995.
- [HK22] Jun-Ting Hsieh and Pravesh K. Kothari. Approximating max-cut on bounded degree graphs: Tighter analysis of the FKL algorithm. *CoRR*, abs/2206.09204, 2022.
- [LMT20] Kasper Green Larsen, Michael Mitzenmacher, and Charalampos E. Tsourakakis. Clustering with a faulty oracle. In Yennun Huang, Irwin King, Tie-Yan Liu, and Maarten van Steen, editors, *WWW '20: The Web Conference 2020, Taipei, Taiwan, April 20-24, 2020*, pages 2831–2834. ACM / IW3C2, 2020.
- [LV21] Thodoris Lykouris and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Competitive caching with machine learned advice. *J. ACM*, 68(4):24:1–24:25, 2021.
- [MMV14] Konstantin Makarychev, Yury Makarychev, and Aravindan Vijayaraghavan. Bilu–linial stable instances of max cut and minimum multiway cut. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 890–906. SIAM, 2014.
- [MNS14] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. Belief propagation, robust reconstruction and optimal recovery of block models. In Maria Florina Balcan, Vitaly Feldman, and Csaba Szepesvári, editors, *Proceedings of The 27th Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 35 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 356–370, Barcelona, Spain, 13–15 Jun 2014. PMLR.



- [MS17] Arya Mazumdar and Barna Saha. Clustering with noisy queries. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- [MV22] Michael Mitzenmacher and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Algorithms with predictions. *Commun. ACM*, 65(7):33–35, 2022.
- [New06] Mark EJ Newman. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 103(23):8577–8582, 2006.
- [O’D14] Ryan O’Donnell. *Analysis of boolean functions*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [Rou20] Tim Roughgarden, editor. *Beyond the Worst-Case Analysis of Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [RT12] Prasad Raghavendra and Ning Tan. Approximating CSPs with global cardinality constraints using sdP hierarchies. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 373–387. SIAM, 2012.

## A Missing proofs for 2-CSPs

We obtain here the proof of [theorem 4.2](#).

**Feasibility of the best assignment** As in [lemma 2.4](#), we first prove that, in expectation over the prediction  $Y$ ,  $x^*$  is a feasible solution to the program.

**Lemma A.1.** *Consider the settings of [theorem 4.2](#). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-narrow}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i} w P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) \right| + \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i \setminus \tilde{S}_i} w P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) \right| \\ & + \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} w \left( P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) - P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \right| \leq W(2\eta + O(1/\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta})). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* First, by definition of  $\Delta$ -wide instance,

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-narrow}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i} w P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) \right| \leq \eta W.$$

Second, by definition for any  $\Delta$ -wide vertex  $i$ ,

$$\left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i \setminus \tilde{S}_i} w P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) \right| \leq \eta W_i.$$

Hence it remains to show

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} w \left( P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) - P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \right| \leq O(W/(\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta})).$$

Now, recall that  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i] = 2\varepsilon x_i^*$  and thus  $\mathbb{E}[Z] = x^*$ . So for any  $(c, \alpha) \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[P(c \circ Z^\alpha)] = \mathbb{E}[P(c \circ x^{*\alpha})]$  by pair-wise independence of the predictions. Thus it suffices to study, for each

$\Delta$ -wide  $i$ ,  $\text{var} \left( \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i} w P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right)$ . To this end, notice that for any  $\alpha, \alpha' \in S_i$  with  $\alpha \cap \alpha' = \{i\}$  it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ P(c \circ Y^{\alpha \setminus i}) P(c \circ Y^{\alpha' \setminus i}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ P(c \circ Y^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ P(c \circ Y^{\alpha' \setminus i}) \right].$$

Moreover, since  $|\alpha| = 2$ , there are at most 4 distinct negation patterns. Therefore, by the AM-GM inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var} \left( \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} w P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) &\leq \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} O(w^2) \text{var} \left( P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} O\left(\frac{w^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that entries of  $Z$  are bounded by  $1/\varepsilon$  and the coefficients of a boolean predicate are bounded by 1 (by Parseval's Theorem, see [O'D14]). By construction of  $\tilde{S}_i$ , each  $(w, c, \alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i$  must satisfy  $w \leq W_i/\Delta$ . Using Holder's inequality

$$\text{var} \left( \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} w P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \leq O\left(\frac{W_i^2}{\Delta \cdot \varepsilon^2}\right).$$

We can use this bound on the variance in combination with Chebishev's inequality to obtain, for  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i} w \left( P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) - P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \right| \geq \lambda \right) \leq O\left(\frac{W_i^2}{\varepsilon^2 \cdot \Delta \cdot \lambda^2}\right).$$

Let  $\lambda := O(W_i/(\varepsilon\sqrt{\Delta}))$ . A peeling argument now completes the proof:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i} w \left( P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) - P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \right| \right] \\ &\leq \lambda + \sum_{t \geq 0} 2^{t+1} \lambda \cdot \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in S_i} w \left( P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) - P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \right| \geq 2^t \lambda \right) \leq O(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Analysis of the algorithm** We can use [lemma A.1](#) to obtain our main theorem for CSPs.

*Proof of [theorem 4.2](#).* We follow closely the proof of [lemma 2.5](#). Consider one of the assignments  $X \in \{\pm 1\}^n$  found in the second step of the algorithm. Recall  $\hat{x} \in [-1, +1]^n$  denotes the optimal fractional solution found by the algorithm. We may rewrite for each  $\Delta$ -wide  $i$  and  $(w, c, \alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} w P(c \circ X^\alpha) &= \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{S}_i} w \left[ P(c \circ (\hat{x}_i \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + P(c \circ X^\alpha) - P(c \circ \hat{x}^\alpha) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ P(c \circ \hat{x}^\alpha) - P(c \circ (\hat{x}_i \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i})) \Big]. \quad (13)$$

We bound each term in eq. (13) separately. First, notice that by Markov's inequality and lemma A.1, with probability 0.99,  $x^*$  is a feasible solution to the LP. Conditioning on this event  $\mathcal{E}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w P(c \circ (\hat{x}_i \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i})) &\geq \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w P(c \circ (x_i^* \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i})) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w P(c \circ x^{*\alpha}) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w \left( P(c \circ (x_i^* \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i})) - P(c \circ x^{*\alpha}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

By Holder's inequality and the fact that  $x^*$  is feasible, for  $\Delta$ -wide  $i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w \left( P(c \circ (x_i^* \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i})) - P(c \circ x^{*\alpha}) \right) \\ \leq \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \left| \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w \left( P(c \circ Z^{\alpha \setminus i}) - P(c \circ x^{*\alpha \setminus i}) \right) \right| \leq (O(\varepsilon') + 2\eta)W. \end{aligned}$$

Since by construction  $\hat{x}$  is feasible, another application of Holder's inequality also yields the following bound on the third term,

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w \left( P(c \circ (\hat{x}_i \cdot Z^{\alpha \setminus i})) - P(c \circ \hat{x}^\alpha) \right) \leq (O(\varepsilon') + 2\eta)W.$$

For the second term in eq. (13), by construction of  $X$  we have  $\mathbb{E}[P(c \circ X^\alpha) | \mathcal{E}] = P(c \circ \hat{x}^\alpha)$ . Combining the three bounds, we get that

$$\text{opt}_{\mathcal{I}} \geq E \left[ \frac{1}{W} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w P(c \circ X^\alpha) \Bigg| \mathcal{E} \right] \geq \text{opt}_{\mathcal{I}} - (O(\varepsilon') + 4\eta).$$

Applying Markov's inequality on the random variable  $\text{opt}_{\mathcal{I}} - \frac{1}{W} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w P(c \circ X^\alpha)$ , we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{W} \sum_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ \Delta\text{-wide}}} \sum_{(w,c,\alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i} w P(c \circ X^\alpha) \leq \text{opt}_{\mathcal{I}} - (O(\varepsilon') + 5\eta) \Bigg| \mathcal{E} \right) \leq \frac{1}{1 + \eta}$$

The theorem follows since we sample  $O(1/\eta)$  independent assignments  $X$  and pick the best.  $\square$