

# Maximum Defective Clique Computation: Improved Time Complexities and Practical Performance

Lijun Chang  
The University of Sydney  
Sydney, Australia  
Lijun.Chang@sydney.edu.au

## ABSTRACT

The concept of  $k$ -defective clique, a relaxation of clique by allowing up-to  $k$  missing edges, has been receiving increasing interests recently. Although the problem of finding the maximum  $k$ -defective clique is NP-hard, several practical algorithms have been recently proposed in the literature, with kDC being the state of the art. kDC not only runs the fastest in practice, but also achieves the best time complexity. Specifically, it runs in  $\mathcal{O}^*(\gamma_k^n)$  time when ignoring polynomial factors; here,  $\gamma_k$  is a constant that is smaller than two and only depends on  $k$ , and  $n$  is the number of vertices in the input graph  $G$ . In this paper, we propose the kDC-two algorithm to improve the time complexity as well as practical performance. kDC-two runs in  $\mathcal{O}^*((\alpha\Delta)^{k+2}\gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$  time when the maximum  $k$ -defective clique size  $\omega_k(G)$  is at least  $k+2$ , and in  $\mathcal{O}^*(\gamma_{k-1}^n)$  time otherwise, where  $\alpha$  and  $\Delta$  are the degeneracy and maximum degree of  $G$ , respectively. Note that, most real graphs satisfy  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ , and for these graphs, we not only improve the base (i.e.,  $\gamma_{k-1} < \gamma_k$ ), but also the exponent, of the exponential time complexity. In addition, with slight modification, kDC-two also runs in  $\mathcal{O}^*((\alpha\Delta)^{k+2}(k+1)^{\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)})$  time by using the degeneracy gap  $\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)$  parameterization; this is better than  $\mathcal{O}^*((\alpha\Delta)^{k+2}\gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$  when  $\omega_k(G)$  is close to the degeneracy-based upper bound  $\alpha+k+1$ . Finally, to further improve the practical performance, we propose a new degree-sequence-based reduction rule that can be efficiently applied, and theoretically demonstrate its effectiveness compared with those proposed in the literature. Extensive empirical studies on three benchmark graph collections, containing 290 graphs in total, show that our kDC-two algorithm outperforms the existing fastest algorithm kDC by several orders of magnitude.

## PVLDB Reference Format:

Lijun Chang. Maximum Defective Clique Computation: Improved Time Complexities and Practical Performance. PVLDB, 14(1): XXX-XXX, 2020. doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

## PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at URL\_TO\_YOUR\_ARTIFACTS.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing [info@vldb.org](mailto:info@vldb.org). Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment. Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 14, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097. doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Graphs have been widely used to capture the relationship between entities in applications such as social media, communication network, e-commerce, and cybersecurity. Identifying dense subgraphs from those real-world graphs, which are usually globally sparse (e.g., have a small average degree), is a fundamental problem and has received a lot of attention [9, 24]. Dense subgraphs may correspond to communities in social networks [4], protein complexes in biological networks [40], and anomalies in financial networks [2]. The clique model, requiring every pair of vertices to be directly connected by an edge, represents the densest structure that a subgraph can be. As a result, clique related problems have been extensively studied, e.g., theoretical aspect of maximum clique computation [22, 33, 34, 41], practical aspect of maximum clique computation [6, 7, 25, 26, 30, 31, 35, 37, 42, 43, 45], maximal clique enumeration [11, 13], and  $k$ -clique counting and enumeration [20, 27].

Requiring every pair of vertices to be explicitly connected by an edge however is often too restrictive in practice, by noticing that data may be noisy or incomplete and/or the data collection process may introduce errors [32]. In view of this, various clique relaxation models have been formulated and studied in the literature, such as quasi-clique [1], plex [3], club [5], and defective clique [47]. In this paper, we focus on the defective clique model, where defective cliques have been used for predicting missing interactions between proteins in biological networks [47], cluster detection [12, 39], transportation science [38], and social network analysis [17, 21]. A subgraph with  $a$  vertices is a  $k$ -defective clique if it has at least  $\binom{a}{2} - k$  edges, i.e., it misses at most  $k$  edges from being a clique. A  $k$ -defective clique is usually referred to by its vertices, since maximal  $k$ -defective cliques are vertex-induced subgraphs. Consider the graph in Figure 1,  $\{v_1, \dots, v_4\}$  is a maximum clique,  $\{v_1, \dots, v_4, v_7\}$  is a *maximal* 2-defective clique, and  $\{v_1, \dots, v_6\}$  is a *maximum* 2-defective clique that maximizes the number of vertices.




Figure 1: Defective clique

The state-of-the-art time complexity for maximum  $k$ -defective computation is achieved by the kDC algorithm proposed in [8], which runs in  $\mathcal{O}^*(\gamma_k^n)$  time where  $\gamma_k < 2$  is the largest real root

of the equation  $x^{k+3} - 2x^{k+2} + 1 = 0$  and  $n$  is the number of vertices in the input graph. The main ideas of achieving the time complexity are ① deterministically processing vertices that have up-to one non-neighbor (by reduction rule **RR2** of [8]), and ② greedily ordering vertices (by branching rule **BR** of [8]) such that the length- $(k+2)$  prefix of the ordering induces more than  $k$  missing edges. ② ensures the time complexity since we only need to consider up-to  $k+2$  prefixes when enumerating the prefixes that can be added to the solution, while ① makes ② possible. Observing that ② is impossible when each vertex has exactly one non-neighbor, it is natural to wonder whether the time complexity will be reduced if there are techniques to make each vertex have more (than two) non-neighbors. Unfortunately, the answer is negative. An alternative way is to design a different strategy (i.e., branching rule) for finding a subset of  $k+1$  or fewer vertices that induce more than  $k$  missing edges. However, this most likely cannot be conducted efficiently. Details of these negative results will be discussed in Section 3.3.

In this paper, we propose the kDC-two algorithm to improve both the time complexity and the practical performance for exact maximum  $k$ -defective clique computation. Firstly, kDC-two uses the same branching rule **BR** and reduction rules **RR1** and **RR2** as kDC, but we prove a *reduced base* (i.e.,  $\gamma_{k-1}$ ) for the time complexity by using different analysis techniques for different backtracking instances. Specifically, let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the backtracking search tree (see Figure 3) where each node represents a backtracking instance  $(g, S)$  with  $g$  being a subgraph of the input graph  $G$  and  $S \subseteq V(g)$  a  $k$ -defective clique, it is sufficient to bound the number of leaf nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Our general idea is that if at least one branching vertex (i.e., previously selected by **BR**) has been added to  $S$ , then **BR** computes an ordering of  $V(g) \setminus S$  such that the union of  $S$  and a length- $(k+1)$  prefix of the ordering induce more than  $k$  missing edges (Lemma 4.3); consequently, the number of leaf nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  rooted at  $(g, S)$  can be shown *by induction* to be at most  $\gamma_{k-1}^{|V(g) \setminus S|}$  (Lemma 4.4). Otherwise, we prove *non-inductively* that the number of leaf nodes is at most  $2 \cdot \gamma_{k-1}^{|V(g) \setminus S|}$  by introducing the coefficient 2 (Lemma 4.5).

Secondly, kDC-two also makes use of the diameter-two property of large  $k$ -defective cliques (i.e., any  $k$ -defective clique of size  $\geq k+2$  has a diameter at most two) to *reduce the exponent* of the time complexity when  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ . That is, once a vertex  $u$  is added to  $S$ , we can remove from  $g$  those vertices whose shortest distances (computed in  $g$ ) to  $u$  are larger than two. Let  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$  be a degeneracy ordering of  $V(G)$ . We process each vertex  $v_i$  by assuming that it is the first vertex of the degeneracy ordering that is in the maximum  $k$ -defective clique; note that, at least one of these  $n$  assumptions will be true, and thus we can find the maximum  $k$ -defective clique. The search tree of processing  $v_i$  has at most  $2 \cdot \gamma_{k-1}^{\alpha \Delta}$  leaf nodes since we only need to consider  $v_i$ 's neighbors and two-hop neighbors that come later than  $v_i$  in the degeneracy ordering; here  $\alpha$  and  $\Delta$  are the degeneracy and maximum degree of  $G$ , respectively. Through a more refined analysis, we show that the number of leaf nodes is also bounded by  $O((\alpha \Delta)^k \gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$ . Consequently, kDC-two runs in  $O(n \times (\alpha \Delta)^{k+2} \times \gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$  time when  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ ; note that,  $\alpha \leq \sqrt{m}$  and is small in practice [13], where  $m$  is the number of edges in  $G$ . Furthermore, we show that kDC-two, with

slight modification, runs in  $O^*((\alpha \Delta)^{k+2} \times (k+1)^{\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)})$  time when using the degeneracy gap  $\alpha + k + 1 - \omega_k(G)$  parameterization; this is better than  $O^*(\gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$  when  $\omega_k(G)$  is close to its upper bound  $\alpha + k + 1$ .

Thirdly, we propose a new reduction rule **RR3** to further improve the practical performance of kDC-two. **RR3** is designed based on the degree-sequence-based upper bound **UB** proposed in [16]. However, instead of using **UB** to prune instances after generating them as done in the existing works [8, 16], we propose to remove vertex  $u \in V(g) \setminus S$  from  $g$  if an upper bound of  $(g, S \cup u)$  is no larger than  $lb$ . Note that, rather than computing the exact upper bound for  $(g, S \cup u)$ , we test whether the upper bound is larger than  $lb$  or not. The latter can be conducted more efficiently and without generating  $(g, S \cup u)$ ; moreover, computation can be shared between the testing for different vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S$ . We show that with linear time preprocessing, the upper bound testing for all vertices  $u \in V(g) \setminus S$  can be conducted in totally linear time. In addition, we theoretically demonstrate the effectiveness of **RR3** compared with the existing reduction rules, e.g., the degree-sequence-based reduction rule and second-order reduction rule proposed in [8].

**Contributions.** Our main contributions are as follows.

- We propose the kDC-two algorithm for exact maximum  $k$ -defective clique computation, and prove that it runs in  $O^*((\alpha \Delta)^{k+2} \times \gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$  time on graphs with  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$  and in  $O^*(\gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$  time otherwise. This improves the state-of-the-art time complexity  $O^*(\gamma_k^n)$  by noting that  $\gamma_{k-1} < \gamma_k$ .
- We prove that kDC-two, with slight modification, runs in  $O^*((\alpha \Delta)^{k+2} \times (k+1)^{\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)})$  time when using the degeneracy gap  $\alpha + k + 1 - \omega_k(G)$  parameterization.
- We propose a new degree-sequence-based reduction rule **RR3** that can be conducted in linear time, and theoretically demonstrate its effectiveness compared with the existing reduction rules.

We conduct extensive empirical studies on three benchmark collections with 290 graphs in total to evaluate our techniques. The results show that (1) our algorithm kDC-two solves 16, 11 and 7 more graph instances than the fastest existing algorithm kDC on the three graph collections, respectively, for a time limit of 3 hours and  $k = 15$ ; (2) our algorithm kDC-two solves all 114 Facebook graphs with a time limit of 30 seconds for  $k = 1, 3$  and 5; (3) on the 39 Facebook graphs that have more than 15,000 vertices, kDC-two is on average two orders of magnitude faster than kDC for  $k = 15$ .

**Organizations.** The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines the problem, and Section 3 reviews the state-of-the-art algorithm kDC and its time complexity analysis. We present our algorithm kDC-two and its time complexity analysis in Section 4, and our new reduction rule **RR3** in Section 5. Experimental results are discussed in Section 6, followed by related works in Section 7. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

## 2 PROBLEM DEFINITION

We consider a large *unweighted, undirected* and *simple* graph  $G = (V, E)$  and refer to it simply as a graph; here,  $V$  is the vertex set and  $E$  is the edge set. The numbers of vertices and edges of  $G$  are

denoted by  $n = |V|$  and  $m = |E|$ , respectively. An undirected edge between  $u$  and  $v$  is denoted by  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, u)$ . The set of edges that are missing from  $G$  is called the set of **non-edges** (or missing edges) of  $G$  and denoted by  $\bar{E}$ , i.e.,  $(u, v) \in \bar{E}$  if  $u \neq v$  and  $(u, v) \notin E$ . The set of  $u$ 's neighbors in  $G$  is denoted  $N_G(u) = \{v \in V \mid (u, v) \in E\}$ , and the *degree* of  $u$  in  $G$  is  $d_G(u) = |N_G(u)|$ ; similarly, the set of  $u$ 's **non-neighbors** in  $G$  is denoted  $\bar{N}_G(u) = \{v \in V \mid (u, v) \in \bar{E}\}$ . Note that **a vertex is neither a neighbor nor a non-neighbor of itself**. Given a vertex subset  $S \subseteq V$ , the set of edges *induced* by  $S$  is  $E_G(S) = \{(u, v) \in E \mid u, v \in S\}$ , the set of non-edges induced by  $S$  is  $\bar{E}_G(S) = \{(u, v) \in \bar{E} \mid u, v \in S\}$ , and the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $S$  is  $G[S] = (S, E(S))$ . We denote the union of a set  $S$  and a vertex  $u$  by  $S \cup u$ , and the subtraction of  $u$  from  $S$  by  $S \setminus u$ . For presentation simplicity, we omit the subscript  $G$  from the notations when the context is clear, and abbreviate  $N_{G[S \cup u]}(u) = N(u) \cap S$  as  $N_S(u)$  and  $\bar{N}_{G[S \cup u]}(u) = \bar{N}(u) \cap S$  as  $\bar{N}_S(u)$ . For an arbitrary graph  $g$ , we denote its sets of vertices, edges and non-edges by  $V(g)$ ,  $E(g)$  and  $\bar{E}(g)$ , respectively.

**Definition 2.1 ( $k$ -Defective Clique).** A graph  $g$  is a  $k$ -defective clique if it misses at most  $k$  edges from being a clique, i.e.,  $|E(g)| \geq \frac{|V(g)|(|V(g)|-1)}{2} - k$  or equivalently,  $|\bar{E}(g)| \leq k$ .

Obviously, if a subgraph  $g$  of  $G$  is a  $k$ -defective clique, then the subgraph of  $G$  induced by vertices  $V(g)$  is also a  $k$ -defective clique. Thus, we refer to a  $k$ -defective clique simply by its set of vertices, and measure the size of a  $k$ -defective clique  $S \subseteq V$  by its number of vertices, i.e.,  $|S|$ . The property of  $k$ -defective clique is *hereditary*, i.e., any subset of a  $k$ -defective clique is also a  $k$ -defective clique. A  $k$ -defective clique  $S$  of  $G$  is a *maximal  $k$ -defective clique* if every proper superset of  $S$  in  $G$  is not a  $k$ -defective clique, and is a *maximum  $k$ -defective clique* if its size is the largest among all  $k$ -defective cliques of  $G$ ; denote the size of the maximum  $k$ -defective clique of  $G$  by  $\omega_k(G)$ . Consider the graph in Figure 2, both  $\{v_1, v_7, \dots, v_8\}$  and  $\{v_2, v_{11}, \dots, v_{14}\}$  are maximum 2-defective cliques with  $\omega_2(G) = 5$ ; that is, the maximum  $k$ -defective clique is not unique.




Figure 2: An example graph

**Problem Statement.** Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and an integer  $k \geq 1$ , we study the problem of maximum  $k$ -defective clique computation, which aims to find the largest  $k$ -defective clique in  $G$ .

Frequently used notations are summarized in Table 1.

### 3 THE STATE-OF-THE-ART TIME COMPLEXITY

In this section, we first review the state-of-the-art algorithm kDC [8] in Section 3.1, then briefly describe its time complexity analysis in Section 3.2, and finally discuss challenges of improving the time complexity in Section 3.3.

Table 1: Frequently used notations

Notation	Meaning
$G = (V, E)$	an unweighted, undirected and simple graph with vertex set $V$ and edge set $E$
$\omega_k(G)$	the size of the maximum $k$ -defective clique of $G$
$g = (V(g), E(g))$	a subgraph of $G$
$S \subseteq V$	a $k$ -defective clique
$(g, S)$	a backtracking instance with $S \subseteq V(g)$
$N_S(u)$	the set of $u$ 's neighbors that are in $S$
$\bar{N}_S(u)$	the set of $u$ 's non-neighbors that are in $S$
$d_S(u)$	the number of $u$ 's neighbors that are in $S$
$E(S)$	the set of edges induced by $S$
$\bar{E}(S)$	the set of non-edges induced by $S$
$\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'$	search tree of backtracking algorithms
$I, I', I_0, I_1, \dots$	nodes of the search tree $\mathcal{T}$ or $\mathcal{T}'$
$ I $	the size of $I$ , i.e., $ V(I, g) \setminus I, S $
$\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I)$	number of leaf nodes in the subtree of $\mathcal{T}$ rooted at $I$

#### 3.1 The Existing Algorithm kDC

The problem of maximum  $k$ -defective clique computation is NP-hard [46]. The existing exact algorithms compute the maximum  $k$ -defective clique via *branch-and-bound* search (aka. *backtracking*). Let  $(g, S)$  denote a backtracking instance, where  $g$  is a (sub-)graph (of the input graph  $G$ ) and  $S \subseteq V(g)$  is a  $k$ -defective clique in  $g$ . The goal of solving the instance  $(g, S)$  is to find the largest  $k$ -defective clique in the instance (i.e., in  $g$  and containing  $S$ ); thus, solving the instance  $(G, \emptyset)$  finds the maximum  $k$ -defective clique in  $G$ . To solve an instance  $(g, S)$ , a backtracking algorithm selects a branching vertex  $b \in V(g) \setminus S$ , and then recursively solves two newly generated instances: one includes  $b$  into  $S$ , and the other removes  $b$  from  $g$ . For the base case that  $S = V(g)$ ,  $S$  is the maximum  $k$ -defective clique in the instance. For example, Figure 3 shows a snippet of the backtracking search tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , where each node corresponds to a backtracking instance  $(g, S)$ . The two newly generated instances are represented as the two children of the node, and the branching vertex is illustrated on the edge; for the sake of simplicity, Figure 3 only shows the branching vertices for the first two levels.




Figure 3: A snippet of the (binary) search tree  $\mathcal{T}$  of a backtracking algorithm

The state-of-the-art time complexity is achieved by kDC [8] which proposes a new branching rule and two reduction rules to achieve the time complexity. Specifically, kDC proposes the non-fully-adjacent-first branching rule **BR** preferring branching on a vertex that is not fully adjacent to  $S$ , and the excess-removal reduction rule **RR1** and the high-degree reduction rule **RR2**.

**BR [8].** Given an instance  $(g, S)$ , the branching vertex is selected as the vertex of  $V(g) \setminus S$  that has at least one non-neighbor in  $S$ ; if no such vertices exist, an arbitrary vertex of  $V(g) \setminus S$  is chosen as the branching vertex.

**RR1 [8].** Given an instance  $(g, S)$ , if a vertex  $u \in V(g) \setminus S$  satisfies  $|\overline{E}(S \cup u)| > k$ , we can remove  $u$  from  $g$ .

**RR2 [8].** Given an instance  $(g, S)$ , if a vertex  $u \in V(g) \setminus S$  satisfies  $|\overline{E}(S \cup u)| \leq k$  and  $d_g(u) \geq |V(g)| - 2$ , we can greedily add  $u$  to  $S$ .

### 3.2 Time Complexity Analysis of kDC

The general idea of time complexity analysis is as follows. As polynomial factors are usually ignored in the time complexity analysis of exponential time algorithms, it is sufficient to bound the number of leaf nodes of the search tree (in Figure 3) inductively in a bottom-up fashion [15]. One way of bounding the number of leaf nodes of the subtree rooted at the node corresponding to instance  $(g, S)$  is to order  $V(g) \setminus S$  in such a way that the longest prefix of the ordering that can be added to  $S$  without violating the  $k$ -defective clique definition is short and bounded. Specifically, let  $(v_1, \dots, v_l, v_{l+1}, \dots)$  be an ordering of  $V(g) \setminus S$  such that the longest prefix that can be added to  $S$  without violating the  $k$ -defective clique definition is  $(v_1, \dots, v_l)$ ; that is,  $\{v_1, \dots, v_l, v_{l+1}\} \cup S$  induces more than  $k$  non-edges. Then, we only need to generate  $l+1$  new instances/branches, corresponding to the first  $l+1$  prefixes, as shown in Figure 4: for the  $i$ -th (starting from 0) branch, we include  $(v_1, \dots, v_i)$  to  $S$  and remove  $v_{i+1}$  from  $g$ . Denote the  $i$ -th branch by  $(g_i, S_i)$ . It holds that

- $|V(g_i) \setminus S_i| \leq |V(g) \setminus S| - (i+1), \forall 0 \leq i \leq l$ .

It can be shown by the techniques of [15] that the number of leaf nodes of the search tree is at most  $\gamma^n$  where  $\gamma < 2$  is the largest real root of the equation  $x^{l_{\max}+2} - 2x^{l_{\max}+1} + 1 = 0$  and  $l_{\max}$  is the largest  $l$  among all non-leaf nodes. Thus, the smaller the value of  $l_{\max}$ , the better the time complexity.




Figure 4: General idea of time complexity analysis

For kDC,  $l_{\max} = k + 1$  and thus its time complexity is  $O^*(\gamma_k^n)$  where  $\gamma_k < 2$  is the largest real root of the equation  $x^{k+3} - 2x^{k+2} + 1 = 0$  [8]; here, the  $O^*$  notation hides polynomial factors. Specifically, kDC orders  $V(g) \setminus S$  by iteratively applying **BR**. That is, each time it appends to the ordering a vertex that has at least one non-neighbor in either  $S$  or the vertices already in the ordering; if no such vertices exist, an arbitrary vertex of  $V(g) \setminus S$  is appended. It is proved in [8] that after exhaustively applying reduction rules **RR1** and **RR2**, the resulting instance  $(g, S)$  satisfies the condition:

- $|\overline{E}(S \cup u)| \leq k$  and  $d_g(u) < |V(g)| - 2, \forall u \in V(g) \setminus S$ .

i.e., **every vertex of  $V(g) \setminus S$  has at least two non-neighbors in  $g$** . Then, the worst-case scenario (for time complexity) is that the non-edges of  $g[V(g) \setminus S]$  form a set of vertex-disjoint cycles; a

length- $(k+1)$  prefix of the ordering induces exactly  $k$  non-edges, and a length- $(k+2)$  prefix induces more than  $k$  non-edges.

One may notice that Figure 3 illustrates a *binary* search tree while Figure 4 shows a *multi-way* search tree. Nevertheless, the above techniques can be used to analyze Figure 3 since a binary search tree can be (virtually) converted into an equivalent multi-way search tree, which is the way the time complexity of kDC was analyzed in [8]. That is, we could collapse a length- $l$  path in Figure 3 to make it have  $l+1$  children. This will be more clear when we conduct our time complexity analysis in Lemma 4.4.

### 3.3 Challenges of Improving the Time Complexity

As discussed in Section 3.2, the smaller the value of  $l_{\max}$ , the better the time complexity. kDC [8] proves that  $l_{\max} \leq k + 1$  by making all vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S$  have at least two non-neighbors in  $g$ , which is achieved by **RR2**. In contrast, if all vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S$  have exactly one non-neighbor in  $g$ , then  $l_{\max}$  becomes  $2k + 1$  and the time complexity is  $O^*(\gamma_{2k}^n)$ , which is the case of MADEC<sup>+</sup> [10].

It is natural to wonder whether the value of  $l_{\max}$  can be reduced if we have techniques to make each vertex of  $V(g) \setminus S$  have more (than two) non-neighbors in  $g$ . Specifically, let's consider the complement graph  $\overline{g}$  of  $g$ : each edge of  $\overline{g}$  corresponds to a non-edge of  $g$ . The question is whether the **BR** of kDC can guarantee  $l_{\max} < k + 1$  when  $\overline{g}[V(g) \setminus S]$  has a minimum degree larger than two. Unfortunately, the answer is negative. It is shown in [36] that for any  $r \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 3$ , there exists a graph in which each vertex has exactly  $r$  neighbors and the shortest cycle has length exactly  $s$ ; these graphs are called  $(r, s)$ -graphs. Thus, when  $\overline{g}[V(g) \setminus S]$  is an  $(r, s)$ -graph for  $s \geq k + 2$ , iteratively applying the branching rule **BR** may first identify vertices of the shortest cycle and it then needs a prefix of length  $k + 2$  to cover  $k + 1$  edges of  $\overline{g}[V(g) \setminus S]$  (corresponding to  $k + 1$  non-edges of  $g$ ). Alternatively, one may tempt to design a different branching rule than **BR** for finding a subset of  $k + 1$  or fewer vertices  $C \subseteq V(g) \setminus S$  such that  $\overline{g}[C]$  has at least  $k + 1$  edges. This most likely cannot be conducted efficiently, by noting that it is NP-hard to find a densest  $k$ -subgraph (i.e., a subgraph with exactly  $k$  vertices and the most number of edges) when  $k$  is a part of the input [14].

## 4 OUR ALGORITHM WITH IMPROVED TIME COMPLEXITY

Despite the challenges and negative results mentioned in Section 3.3, we in this section show that we can reduce both the base and the exponent of the time complexity. In the following, we first present our algorithm in Section 4.1, then analyze its time complexity in Section 4.2, and finally analyze the time complexity again but using the degeneracy gap parameterization in Section 4.3.

### 4.1 Our Algorithm kDC-two

Our algorithm uses the same branching rule **BR** and reduction rules **RR1** and **RR2** as kDC. But we will show in Section 4.2 that the base of the time complexity is reduced by using different analysis techniques for different nodes of the search tree. Furthermore, we make use of the diameter-two property of large  $k$ -defective

cliques to reduce the exponent of the time complexity, by observing that most real graphs have  $\omega_k(G) \geq k + 2$ .

LEMMA 4.1 (DIAMETER-TWO PROPERTY OF LARGE  $k$ -DEFECTIVE CLIQUE [10]). *For any  $k$ -defective clique, if it contains at least  $k + 2$  vertices, its diameter is at most two (i.e., any two non-adjacent vertices must have common neighbors in the defective clique).*

Following Lemma 4.1, if we know that  $\omega_k(G) \geq k + 2$ , then for a backtracking instance  $(g, S)$  with  $S \neq \emptyset$ , we can remove from  $g$  the vertices whose shortest distance (computed in  $g$ ) to any vertex of  $S$  is greater than two. This could significantly reduce the search space, as real graphs usually have a small average degree. However, it is difficult to utilize the diameter-two property reliably, since we do not know before-hand whether  $\omega_k(G) \geq k + 2$  or not and a  $k$ -defective clique of size smaller than  $k + 2$  may have a diameter larger than two. To resolve this, we propose to compute the maximum  $k$ -defective clique in two stages, where Stage-I utilizes the diameter-two property for pruning by assuming  $\omega_k(G) \geq k + 2$ . If Stage-I fails (to find a  $k$ -defective clique of size at least  $k + 2$ ), then we go to Stage-II searching the graph again without utilizing the diameter-two property. This guarantees that the maximum  $k$ -defective clique is found regardless of its size.

---

**Algorithm 1:**  $kDC\text{-two}(G, k)$

---

**Input:** A graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$


**Output:** A maximum  $k$ -defective clique in  $G$

- 1  $C^* \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
  - 2 Let  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  be a degeneracy ordering of the vertices of  $G$ ;
  - 3 **for each**  $v_i \in V(G)$  **do**
  - 4      $A \leftarrow N(v_i) \cap \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ ;
  - 5     Let  $g_{v_i}$  be the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $N[A] \cap \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ ;
  - 6     Branch&Bound( $g_{v_i}, \{v_i\}$ );
  - 7 **if**  $|C^*| < k + 1$  **then** Branch&Bound( $G, \emptyset$ );
  - 8 **return**  $C^*$ ;
- Procedure** Branch&Bound( $g, S$ )
- 9  $(g', S') \leftarrow$  apply reduction rules **RR1** and **RR2** to  $(g, S)$ ;
  - 10 **if**  $g'$  is a  $k$ -defective clique **then** update  $C^*$  by  $V(g')$  and **return**;
  - 11  $b \leftarrow$  choose a branching vertex from  $V(g') \setminus S'$  based on **BR**;
  - 12 Branch&Bound( $g', S' \cup b$ );     /\* Left branch includes  $b$  \*/;
  - 13 Branch&Bound( $g' \setminus b, S'$ );     /\* Right branch excludes  $b$  \*/;
- 

The pseudocode of our algorithm  $kDC\text{-two}$  is shown in Algorithm 1 which takes a graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$  as input and outputs a maximum  $k$ -defective clique of  $G$ ; here, two refers to both “two”-stage and diameter-“two”. Let  $C^*$  store the currently found largest  $k$ -defective clique, which is initialized as  $\emptyset$  (Line 1). We first compute a degeneracy ordering of the vertices of  $G$  (Line 2). Without loss of generality, let  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  be the degeneracy ordering, i.e., for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $v_i$  is the vertex with the smallest degree in the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $\{v_i, \dots, v_n\}$ ; the degeneracy ordering can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  time by the peeling algorithm [28]. Then, for each vertex  $v_i \in V(G)$ , we compute the largest diameter-two  $k$ -defective clique in which the first vertex, according to the degeneracy ordering, is  $v_i$ , by invoking the procedure Branch&Bound with input  $(g_{v_i}, \{v_i\})$  (Lines 4–6); that is, the diameter-two  $k$ -defective clique contains  $v_i$  and is a subset of  $\{v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ . Here,  $g_{v_i}$  is the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $v_i$  and its neighbors and two-hop

neighbors that come later than  $v_i$  according to the degeneracy ordering. After that, we check whether the currently found largest  $k$ -defective clique  $C^*$  is of size at least  $k + 1$ : if  $|C^*| \geq k + 1$ , then  $C^*$  is guaranteed to be a maximum  $k$ -defective clique of  $G$ ; otherwise,  $\omega_k(G) \leq k + 1$  and the maximum  $k$ -defective clique of  $G$  may have a diameter larger than two. For the latter, we invoke Branch&Bound again with input  $(G, \emptyset)$  (Line 7). Note that, we do not make use of the diameter-two property for pruning within the procedure Branch&Bound, and thus ensure the correctness of our algorithm.

The pseudocode of the procedure Branch&Bound is shown at Lines 9–13 of Algorithm 1. Given an input  $(g, S)$ , we first apply reduction rules **RR1** and **RR2** to reduce the instance  $(g, S)$  to a potentially smaller instance  $(g', S')$  such that  $V(g') \setminus S' \subseteq V(g) \setminus S$  (Line 9). If  $g'$  itself is a  $k$ -defective clique, then we update  $C^*$  by  $V(g')$  and backtrack (Line 10). Otherwise, we pick a branching vertex  $b$  based on the branching rule **BR** (Line 11), and generate two Branch&Bound instances and go into recursion (Lines 12–13).



**Figure 5:** Running example

*Example 4.2.* Consider the graph  $G$  in Figure 2.  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{14})$  is a degeneracy ordering of  $G$ ; for example,  $v_1$  has the smallest degree in  $G$ , and after removing  $v_1, v_2$  then has the smallest degree, so on so forth. When processing  $v_1$ , we only need to consider its neighbors  $\{v_7, v_8\}$  and two-hop neighbors  $\{v_3, v_9, v_{10}\}$ ; that is, we only need to consider the subgraph  $g_{v_1}$  that is induced by  $\{v_1, v_3, v_7, \dots, v_{10}\}$ . The backtracking search tree for Branch&Bound( $g_{v_1}, \{v_1\}$ ) is shown in Figure 5, where vertices of  $S$  for each instance  $(g, S)$  are in the shaded area. For the root node  $I_0$ , applying reduction rule **RR2** adds  $v_7$  and  $v_8$  into  $S$  since each of them has at most one non-neighbor in the subgraph; this results into the instance  $I'_0$ . Suppose the branching rule **BR** selects  $v_9$  for  $I'_0$  as  $v_9$  is not adjacent to  $v_1$ . Then, two new instances  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are generated as the two children of  $I'_0$ . For  $I_1$ , applying the reduction rule **RR1** removes  $v_3$  from the graph and then applying **RR2** adds  $v_{10}$  into  $S$ ; consequently we reach a leaf node. Similarly,  $v_{10}$  is selected as the branching vertex for  $I_2$ , which then generates two leaf nodes  $I'_3$  and  $I'_4$ .


## 4.2 Time Complexity Analysis of $kDC\text{-two}$

To analyze the time complexity of  $kDC\text{-two}$ , we use the same terminologies and notations as [8] and consider the search tree  $\mathcal{T}$  of (recursively) invoking Branch&Bound at either Line 6 or Line 7 of Algorithm 1, as shown in Figure 3. To avoid confusion, nodes of

the search tree are referred to by *nodes*, and vertices of a graph by *vertices*. Nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  are denoted by  $I, I', I_0, I_1, \dots$ , and the graph  $g$  and the partial solution  $S$  of the Branch&Bound instance to which  $I$  corresponds are, respectively, denoted by  $I.g$  and  $I.S$ . Note that  $I.g$  and  $I.S$  denote the ones obtained after applying the reduction rules at Lines 9–10 of Algorithm 1, where Line 10 is regarded as applying the reduction rule that if  $g'$  is a  $k$ -defective clique, then all vertices of  $V(g') \setminus S'$  are added to  $S'$ ; that is,  $I_0, I_1, I_3, I_4$  in Figure 5 are instances before applying the reduction rules and could be discarded from the search tree. The size of  $I$  is measured by the number of vertices of  $I.g$  that are not in  $I.S$ , i.e.,  $|I| = |V(I.g)| - |I.S| = |V(I.g) \setminus I.S|$ . It is worth mentioning that

- $|I'| \leq |I| - 1$  whenever  $I'$  is a child of  $I$ , e.g., the branching vertex  $b$  of  $I$  is in  $V(I.g) \setminus I.S$  but not in  $V(I'.g) \setminus I'.S$ .
- $|I| = 0$  whenever  $I$  is a leaf node

For a non-leaf node  $I_0$ , we consider the path  $(I_0, I_1, \dots, I_q)$  that starts from  $I_0$ , always visits the left child, and stops at  $I_q$  once  $q \geq 1$  and  $|V(g_q)| < |V(g_{q-1})|$ ; see Figure 6 for an example. Note that, the path is well defined since  $I_0$  is a non-leaf node and thus  $I_0.g$  is not a  $k$ -defective clique. For presentation simplicity, we abbreviate  $I_i.g$  and  $I_i.S$  as  $g_i$  and  $S_i$ , respectively, and denote the branching vertex selected for  $I_i$  by  $b_i$ . Let  $u$  be an arbitrary vertex of  $V(g_{q-1}) \setminus V(g_q)$ . Then,  $(b_0, \dots, b_{q-1}, u, \dots)$  is an ordering of  $V(g_0) \setminus S_0$  such that adding  $(b_0, \dots, b_{q-1}, u)$  to  $S_0$  violates the  $k$ -defective clique definition. In the lemma below, we prove that  $q \leq k$  if  $I_0$  has at least one branching vertex being added.



**Figure 6: A left-deep walk in the search tree  $\mathcal{T}$  starting from  $I_0$ ;  $I_q$  is the first node such that  $q \geq 1$  and  $|V(g_q)| < |V(g_{q-1})|$**

**LEMMA 4.3.** *If the non-leaf node  $I_0$  has at least one branching vertex being added, then  $q \leq k$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $I_x$  be the last node, on the path  $(I_0, I_1, \dots, I_x, \dots, I_{q-1})$ , satisfying the condition that all vertices of  $V(g_x) \setminus S_x$  are adjacent to all vertices of  $S_x$ , i.e., the branching vertex  $b_x$  selected for  $I_x$  has no non-neighbors in  $S_x$ . If such an  $I_x$  does not exist, then we have  $|\overline{E}(S_{i+1})| \geq |\overline{E}(S_i)| + 1$  for all  $0 \leq i < q$  (because the branching vertex added to  $S_{i+1}$  must bring at least one non-edge to  $\overline{E}(S_{i+1})$ ), and consequently  $q \leq |\overline{E}(S_q)| \leq k$ . In the following, we assume that such an  $I_x$  exists, and prove that  $|\overline{E}(S_x)| > x$  by considering two cases. Note that, each of the branching vertices  $b_i \in \{b_0, \dots, b_{x-1}\}$  that are added to  $S_x$  must have at least two non-neighbors in  $g_i$  (because of **RR2**) and all these non-neighbors are in  $S_x$  (according to the definitions of  $I_x$  and  $I_q$ ).

- **Case-I:**  $|\overline{E}(S_0)| \neq 0$ . Then, the number of unique non-edges associated with  $\{b_0, \dots, b_{x-1}\}$  is at least  $x$ , and  $|\overline{E}(S_x)| \geq |\overline{E}(S_0)| + x > x$ .

- **Case-II:**  $|\overline{E}(S_0)| = 0$ . Let  $b_{-1}$  be the branching vertex added to  $S_0$  from its parent (which exists according to the lemma statement). Then,  $b_{-1}$  has at least two non-neighbors in  $g_0$ ; note that these non-neighbors will not be removed from  $g_0$  by **RR1** since  $|\overline{E}(S_0)| = 0$  and all vertices of  $V(g_0) \setminus S_0$  are fully adjacent to vertices of  $S_0 \setminus b_{-1}$ . Thus, the number of non-edges between  $\{b_{-1}, b_0, \dots, b_{x-1}\}$  is at least  $x + 1$ , and hence  $|\overline{E}(S_x)| > x$ .

Then, according to the definition of  $I_x$  and our branching rule, for each  $i$  with  $x + 1 \leq i < q$ , the branching vertex  $b_i$  selected for  $I_i$  has at least one non-neighbor in  $S_i$ , and consequently,

$$|\overline{E}(S_q)| \geq |\overline{E}(S_x)| + (q - x - 1) > q - 1$$

Thus, the lemma follows from the fact that  $|\overline{E}(S_q)| \leq k$ .  $\square$

Let  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I)$  denote the number of leaf nodes in the subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$  rooted at  $I$ . We prove in the lemma below that  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I) \leq \beta_k^{|I|}$  when at least one branching vertex has been added to  $I$ . Note that  $\beta_k = \gamma_{k-1}$ .

**LEMMA 4.4.** *For any node  $I$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  that has at least one branching vertex being added, it holds that  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I) \leq \beta_k^{|I|}$  where  $1 < \beta_k < 2$  is the largest real root of the equation  $x^{k+2} - 2x^{k+1} + 1 = 0$ .*

**PROOF.** We prove the lemma by induction. For the base case that  $I$  is a leaf node, it is trivial that  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I) = 1 \leq \beta_k^{|I|}$  since  $\beta_k > 1$  and  $|I| = 0$ . For a non-leaf node  $I_0$ , let's consider the path  $(I_0, I_1, \dots, I_{q'})$  that starts from  $I_0$ , always visits the left child in the search tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , and stops at  $I_{q'}$  once  $q' \geq 1$  and  $|I_{q'}| \leq |I_{q'-1}| - 2$ . Note that  $(I_0, \dots, I_{q'})$  is a prefix of  $(I_0, \dots, I_q)$  since  $I_q$  satisfies the condition that  $q \geq 1$  and  $|I_q| \leq |I_{q-1}| - 2$ . It is trivial that

$$\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_0) = \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{q'}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{q'+1}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{q'+2}) + \dots + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{2q'})$$

where  $I_{q'+1}, I_{q'+2}, \dots, I_{2q'}$  are the right child of  $I_0, I_1, \dots, I_{q'-1}$ , respectively, as illustrated in Figure 6 (by replacing  $q$  with  $q'$ ); this is equivalent to converting a binary search tree to a multi-way search tree by collapsing the path  $(I_0, \dots, I_{q'-1})$  into a super-node that has  $I_{q'}, I_{q'+1}, \dots, I_{2q'}$  as its children. To bound  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_0)$ , we need to bound  $q'$  and  $|I_i|$  for  $q' \leq i \leq 2q'$ . Following from Lemma 4.3, we have

**Fact 1.**  $q' \leq q \leq k$ .

Also, according to the definition of the path, it holds that

$$\forall i \in [1, q' - 1], \quad S_i = S_{i-1} \cup b_{i-1}, \quad V(g_i) = V(g_{i-1}) \quad (1)$$

That is, the reduction rules at Line 9 of Algorithm 1 have no effect on  $I_i$  for  $1 \leq i < q'$ . Then, the following two facts hold.

**Fact 2.**  $\forall i \in [q' + 1, 2q'], |I_i| \leq |I_{i-q'-1}| - 1 \leq |I_0| + q' - i$ .


**Fact 3.**  $|I_{q'}| \leq |I_{q'-1}| - 2 \leq |I_0| - q' - 1$ .

Based on Facts 1, 2 and 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_0) &= \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{q'+1}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{q'+2}) + \dots + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{2q'}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{q'}) \\ &\leq \beta_k^{|I_{q'+1}|} + \beta_k^{|I_{q'+2}|} + \dots + \beta_k^{|I_{2q'}|} + \beta_k^{|I_{q'}|} \\ &\leq \beta_k^{|I_0|-1} + \beta_k^{|I_0|-2} + \dots + \beta_k^{|I_0|-q'} + \beta_k^{|I_0|-q'-1} \\ &\leq \beta_k^{|I_0|-1} + \beta_k^{|I_0|-2} + \dots + \beta_k^{|I_0|-k} + \beta_k^{|I_0|-k-1} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta_k^{|I_0|-1} + \beta_k^{|I_0|-2} + \dots + \beta_k^{|I_0|-k} + \beta_k^{|I_0|-k-1} \leq \beta_k^{|I_0|}$  if  $\beta_k$  is no smaller than the largest real root of the equation  $x^{k+1} - x^k - \dots - x -$

$1 = 0$  which is equivalent to the equation  $x^{k+2} - 2x^{k+1} + 1 = 0$  [15]. The first few solutions to the equation are  $\beta_1 = 1.619$ ,  $\beta_2 = 1.840$ ,  $\beta_3 = 1.928$ ,  $\beta_4 = 1.966$ , and  $\beta_5 = 1.984$ .  $\square$



**Figure 7: A right-deep walk in the search tree  $\mathcal{T}$  starting from  $I_0$  and stopping at a leaf node  $I_h$**

In Lemma 4.4, we cannot bound  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I)$  by  $\beta_k^{|I|}$  if no branching vertices have been added to  $I$ . Nevertheless, we prove in the lemma below that  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I) < 2 \cdot \beta_k^{|I|}$  holds for every node  $I$  of  $\mathcal{T}$ , by using a non-inductive proving technique.

LEMMA 4.5. *For any node  $I$  of  $\mathcal{T}$ , it holds that  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I) < 2 \cdot \beta_k^{|I|}$ .*

PROOF. If  $I$  is a leaf node, the lemma is trivial. For a non-leaf node  $I_0$ , let's consider the path  $(I_0, I_1, \dots, I_h)$  that starts from  $I_0$ , always visits the right child in the search tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , and stops at a leaf node  $I_h$ ; see Figure 7 for an example. Then, it holds that

$$\forall i \in [h+1, 2h], |I_i| \leq |I_{i-h-1}| - 1 \leq |I_0| + h - i$$

and  $|I_h| = 0$ . Moreover, for each  $i \in [h+1, 2h]$ ,  $I_i$  has at least one branching vertex (e.g.,  $b_{i-h-1}$ ) being added, and thus according to Lemma 4.4, it satisfies  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_i) \leq \beta_k^{|I_i|}$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_0) &= \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{h+1}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{h+2}) + \dots + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_{2h}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_h) \\ &\leq \beta_k^{|I_{h+1}|} + \beta_k^{|I_{h+2}|} + \dots + \beta_k^{|I_{2h}|} + \beta_k^{|I_h|} \\ &\leq \beta_k^{|I_0|-1} + \beta_k^{|I_0|-2} + \dots + \beta_k^{|I_0|-h} + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_k^{|I_0|-1}}{\beta_k - 1} + 1 < 2 \cdot \beta_k^{|I_0|} \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that  $\beta_k > 1.5, \forall k \geq 1$ .  $\square$

Following Lemma 4.5, Line 7 of Algorithm 1 runs in  $O^*(\beta_k^n)$  time. What remains is to bound  $|I|$  for Line 6 of Algorithm 1. Let  $f$  denote the vertex obtained at Line 3 of Algorithm 1,  $g$  be the subgraph extracted at Line 5, and  $t$  be the number of  $f$ 's non-neighbors in  $g$ . It holds that  $d_g(f) = |A| \leq \alpha$  since a degeneracy ordering is used for extracting  $g$ ,  $t \leq \alpha(\Delta - 1)$ , and  $|V(g)| \leq d_g(f) + t + 1 \leq \alpha\Delta + 1$ ; here,  $\alpha$  is the degeneracy of  $G$  and  $\Delta$  is the maximum degree of  $G$ . We prove the time complexity of kDC-two in the theorem below.

THEOREM 4.6. *Given a graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , kDC-two runs in  $O(n \times (\alpha\Delta)^2 \times \beta_k^{\alpha\Delta})$  time when  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ , and in  $O(m \times \beta_k^n)$  time otherwise.*

PROOF. Each invocation of Branch&Bound at Line 6 of Algorithm 1 takes  $O((\alpha\Delta)^2 \times \beta_k^{\alpha\Delta})$  time, since the root node  $I$  of the search tree satisfies  $|I| \leq \alpha\Delta$  and each node of the search tree (i.e., Lines 9–11 of Algorithm 1) takes  $O(|E(g)|) = O((\alpha\Delta)^2)$  time. When  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ , the condition of Line 7 is not satisfied and

thus Algorithm 1 runs in  $O(n \times (\alpha\Delta)^2 \times \beta_k^{\alpha\Delta})$  time. Otherwise, Line 7 takes  $O(m \times \beta_k^n)$  time and Algorithm 1 runs in  $O(n \times (\alpha\Delta)^2 \times \beta_k^{\alpha\Delta} + m \times \beta_k^n)$ ; for simplicity, we abbreviate this time complexity as  $O(m \times \beta_k^n)$  since it is usually the dominating term.  $\square$

4.2.1 *Further Reduce the Exponent.* In the following, we show that when  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ , the exponent of the time complexity can be further reduced by a more refined analysis. Let  $I_0 = (g_0, S_0)$  be the root of  $\mathcal{T}$  for Line 6 of Algorithm 1; recall that,  $f \in S_0$ ,  $d_{g_0}(f) \leq d_g(f) \leq \alpha$  and  $|I_0| \leq \alpha + t$ , where  $f$  is the vertex obtained at Line 3 of Algorithm 1 and  $t$  is number of  $f$ 's non-neighbors in the subgraph  $g$  extracted for  $f$ . Let's consider the subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$  formed by starting a depth-first-search from  $I_0$  and backtracking once the path from  $I_0$  to it has either  $t$  total edges or  $k$  positive edges (i.e., labeled as “+”); see the shaded subtree in Figure 3 for an illustration of  $t = 4$  and  $k = 2$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of leaf nodes of this subtree. Then, the number of leaf nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies

$$\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I_0) \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{L}} \ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I)$$

We bound  $|\mathcal{L}|$  and  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}}(I)$  for  $I \in \mathcal{L}$  in the following two lemmas.

LEMMA 4.7.  *$|\mathcal{L}| = O(t^k)$  where  $t$  is the number of  $f$ 's non-neighbors in  $g$ .*

PROOF. To bound  $|\mathcal{L}|$ , we observe that the search tree  $\mathcal{T}$  is a full binary tree with each node having a positive edge to its left child and a negative edge to its right child. Thus, we can label every edge by its level in the tree (see Figure 3), and for each node  $I \in \mathcal{L}$ , we associate with it a set of numbers corresponding to the levels of the positive edges from  $I_0$  to  $I$ . Then, it is easy to see that each node of  $\mathcal{L}$  is associated with a distinct subset, of size at most  $k$ , of  $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ . Consequently,  $|\mathcal{L}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{t}{i} = O(t^k)$  [29].  $\square$

LEMMA 4.8. *For all  $I \in \mathcal{L}$ , it holds that  $|I| \leq \alpha$  and  $|V(I.g)| \leq \alpha + k + 1$ .*

PROOF. Let's consider the path  $(I_0, I_1, \dots, I_{p-1}, I_p = I)$  from  $I_0$  to  $I$ . If there are  $k$  positive edges on the path, then all vertices of  $V(g_p) \setminus S_p$  must be adjacent to  $f$ , and thus  $|I_p| \leq \alpha$  and  $|V(g_p)| \leq \alpha + k + 1$ . The latter holds since all of  $f$ 's non-neighbors in  $g$  are in  $S$  and thus of quantity at most  $k$ . The former can be shown by contradiction. Suppose  $V(g_p) \setminus S_p$  contains a non-neighbor of  $f$ , then adding each of the  $k$  branching vertices (on the positive edges of the path) must bring at least one non-edge to  $S_p$ , due to the branching rule **BR**; then **RR1** will remove all non-neighbors of  $f$  from  $V(g_p) \setminus S_p$ , contradiction.

Otherwise, there are at most  $k-1$  positive edges on the path and  $p = t$ . Then,  $|I_p| \leq |I_0| - t \leq \alpha$ . Also, there are at least  $t - k + 1$  negative edges on the path and thus  $|V(g_p)| \leq |V(g_0)| - (t - k + 1) \leq t + \alpha + 1 - (t - k + 1) = \alpha + k$ .  $\square$

Consequently, the number of leaf nodes of  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $O((\alpha\Delta)^k \beta_k^\alpha)$  and the time complexity of kDC-two follows.

THEOREM 4.9. *Given a graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , kDC-two runs in  $O(n \times (\alpha\Delta)^{k+2} \times \beta_k^\alpha)$  time when  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ .*

**4.2.2 Compared with kDC.** Our algorithm kDC-two improves the time complexity of kDC [8] from two aspects. Firstly, we improve the base of the exponential time complexity from  $\gamma_k$  to  $\beta_k = \gamma_{k-1}$ . This is achieved by using different analysis techniques for the nodes that already have branching vertices being added (i.e., Lemma 4.4) and for those that do not (i.e., Lemma 4.5). Without this separation, we can only bound the length  $q$  of the path  $(I_0, \dots, I_q)$  by  $k+1$  instead of  $k$  that is proved in Lemma 4.3. Also note that, Lemma 4.5 is non-inductive and has a coefficient 2 in the bound; if we use induction in the proof of Lemma 4.5, then the coefficient will become bigger and bigger and become exponential when going up the tree. Secondly, we improve the exponent of the time complexity from  $n$  to  $\alpha$  when  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ ; note that, most real graphs have  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ . This is achieved by our two-stage algorithm that utilizes the diameter-two property for pruning in Stage-I, as well as our refined analysis in Section 4.2.1.

### 4.3 Parameterize by the Degeneracy Gap

In this subsection, we prove that kDC-two, with slight modification, runs in  $O^*((\alpha\Delta)^{k+2} (k+1)^{\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)})$  time by using the degeneracy gap  $\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)$  parameterization; this is better than  $O^*((\alpha\Delta)^{k+2} \beta_k^\alpha)$  when  $\omega_k(G)$  is close to  $\alpha+k+1$ , the degeneracy-based upper bound of  $\omega_k(G)$ . Specifically, let's consider the problem of testing whether  $G$  has a  $k$ -defective clique of size  $\tau$ . To do so, we truncate the search tree  $\mathcal{T}$  by cutting the entire subtree rooted at node  $I$  if  $|V(I.g)| \leq \tau$ ; that is, we terminate Branch&Bound once  $|V(g')| \leq \tau$  after Line 10 of Algorithm 1. Let  $\mathcal{T}'$  be the truncated version of  $\mathcal{T}$ . We first bound the number of leaf nodes of  $\mathcal{T}'$  in the following two lemmas, in a similar fashion as Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5.

**LEMMA 4.10.** *For any node  $I$  of  $\mathcal{T}'$  that has at least one branching vertex being added, it holds that  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I) \leq (k+1)^{|V(I.g)|-\tau}$ .*

**PROOF.** We prove the lemma by induction. For the base case that  $I$  is a leaf node, we have  $|V(I.g)| = \tau$  and thus  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I) = (k+1)^0 = (k+1)^{|V(I.g)|-\tau}$ . For a non-leaf node  $I_0$  that has at least one branching vertex being added, let's consider the path  $(I_0, I_1, \dots, I_q)$  that starts from  $I_0$ , always visits the left child in the search tree  $\mathcal{T}'$ , and stops at  $I_q$  once  $q \geq 1$  and  $|V(g_q)| < |V(g_{q-1})|$ ; this is the same one as studied at the beginning of Section 4.2, see Figure 6. According to Lemma 4.3, we have  $q \leq k$ . It is trivial that

$$\forall i \in [q, 2q], \quad |V(g_i)| < |V(g_0)|$$

where  $I_{q+1}, I_{q+2}, \dots, I_{2q}$  are the right child of  $I_0, I_1, \dots, I_{q-1}$ , respectively, as illustrated in Figure 6. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_0) &= \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_q) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_{q+1}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_{q+2}) + \dots + \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_{2q}) \\ &\leq (q+1) \cdot (k+1)^{|V(g_0)|-1-\tau} \leq (k+1)^{|V(g_0)|-\tau} \end{aligned}$$

□

**LEMMA 4.11.** *For any node  $I$  of  $\mathcal{T}'$ , it holds that  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I) < 2 \cdot (k+1)^{|V(I.g)|-\tau}$ .*

**PROOF.** If  $I$  is a leaf node, the lemma is trivial. For a non-leaf node  $I_0$ , let's consider the path  $(I_0, I_1, \dots, I_h)$  that starts from  $I_0$ ,

always visits the right child in the search tree  $\mathcal{T}'$ , and stops at a leaf node  $I_h$ ; see Figure 7 for an example. Then, it holds that

$$\forall i \in [h+1, 2h], |V(g_i)| \leq |V(g_{i-h-1})| \leq |V(g_0)| + h + 1 - i$$

and  $|V(g_h)| \leq |V(g_0)| - h \leq \tau$ . Moreover, for each  $i \in [h+1, 2h]$ ,  $I_i$  has at least one branching vertex (e.g.,  $b_{i-h-1}$ ) being added, and thus according to Lemma 4.10, it satisfies  $\ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_i) \leq (k+1)^{|V(g_i)|-\tau} \leq (k+1)^{|V(g_0)|+h+1-i-\tau}$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_0) &= \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_{h+1}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_{h+2}) + \dots + \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_{2h}) + \ell_{\mathcal{T}'}(I_h) \\ &\leq (k+1)^{|V(g_0)|-\tau} + (k+1)^{|V(g_0)|-1-\tau} + \dots + (k+1)^1 + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{(k+1)^{|V(g_0)|+1-\tau}-1}{k+1-1} < 2 \cdot (k+1)^{|V(g_0)|-\tau} \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that  $k \geq 1$ . □

Then, the following time complexity can be proved in a similar way to Theorem 4.9 but using Lemma 4.11 and Lemma 4.8.

**LEMMA 4.12.** *Testing whether  $G$  has a  $k$ -defective clique of size  $\tau$  for  $\tau \geq k+2$  takes  $O(n \times (\alpha\Delta)^{k+2} \times (k+1)^{\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)})$  time.*

Finally, we can find the maximum  $k$ -defective clique by iteratively testing whether  $G$  has a  $k$ -defective clique of size  $\tau$  for  $\tau = \{\alpha+k+1, \alpha+k, \dots\}$ . This will find the maximum  $k$ -defective clique and terminate after testing  $\tau = \omega_k(G)$ . Consequently, the following time complexity follows.

**THEOREM 4.13.** *The maximum  $k$ -defective clique in  $G$  can be found in  $O((\alpha+k+2-\omega_k(G)) \times n \times (\alpha\Delta)^{k+2} \times (k+1)^{\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)})$  time when  $\omega_k(G) \geq k+2$ .*

## 5 A NEW REDUCTION RULE

In this section, we propose a new reduction rule based on the degree-sequence-based upper bound **UB** that is proposed in [16], to further improve the practical performance of kDC-two.

**UB [16].** Given an instance  $(g, S)$ , let  $v_1, v_2, \dots$  be an ordering of  $V(g) \setminus S$  in non-decreasing order regarding their numbers of non-neighbors in  $S$ , i.e.  $|\overline{N}_S(\cdot)|$ . The maximum  $k$ -defective clique in the instance  $(g, S)$  is of size at most  $|S|$  plus the largest  $i$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^i |\overline{N}_S(v_j)| \leq k - |\overline{E}(S)|$ .

Note that, different tie-breaking techniques for ordering the vertices lead to the same upper bound. Thus, an arbitrary tie-breaking technique can be used in **UB**.

Let  $lb$  be the size of the currently found best solution. If an upper bound computed by **UB** for an instance  $(g, S)$  is no larger than  $lb$ , then we can prune the instance. However, this way of first generating an instance and then try to prune it based on a computed upper bound is inefficient. To improve efficiency, we propose to remove  $u \in V(g) \setminus S$  from  $g$  if an upper bound of  $(g, S \cup u)$  is no larger than  $lb$ . Note that, rather than computing the exact upper bound for  $(g, S \cup u)$ , we only need to test whether the upper bound is larger than  $lb$  or not. The latter can be conducted more efficiently and without generating  $(g, S \cup u)$ ; moreover, computation can be shared between the testing for different vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S$ .

Let  $v_1, v_2, \dots$  be an ordering of  $V(g) \setminus (S \cup u)$  in non-decreasing order regarding  $|\overline{N}_S(\cdot)|$ , and  $C$  be the set of vertices that have the same number of non-neighbors in  $S$  as  $v_{|b-|S|}$ , i.e.,  $C = \{v_i \in V(g) \setminus (S \cup u) \mid |\overline{N}_S(v_i)| = |\overline{N}_S(v_{|b-|S|})|\}$ . Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be a



partitioning of  $C$  according to their positions in the ordering, i.e.,  $C_1 = C \cap \{v_1, \dots, v_{lb-|S|}\}$  and  $C_2 = C \setminus C_1$ . Note that, both  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  contain consecutive vertices in the ordering, and  $C_2$  could be empty. A visualization of the ordering and vertex sets is shown below, where  $S \cup u$  and  $lb - |S|$  are denoted by  $R$  and  $r$  for brevity.

$$C = \{v_i \in V(g) \setminus R \mid |\overline{N}_S(v_i)| = |\overline{N}_S(v_r)|\}$$

$$\underbrace{S, u, v_1, \dots, v_{r-|C_1|}}_R, \underbrace{v_{r-|C_1|+1}, \dots, v_r, v_{r+1}, \dots, v_{r+|C_2|}}_{\substack{C_1 \\ C_2}}, \dots$$

We prove in the lemma below that the upper bound computed by **UB** for the instance  $(g, S \cup u)$  is at most  $lb$  if and only if

$$|\overline{E}(S)| + \sum_{j=1}^r |\overline{N}_S(v_j)| + |\overline{N}_{S \cup D}(u)| + \max\{|\overline{N}_{C_1}(u)| - |\overline{N}_{C_2}(u)|, 0\} > k \quad (2)$$

**LEMMA 5.1.** *The upper bound computed by **UB** for the instance  $(g, S \cup u)$  is at most  $lb$  if and only if Equation (2) is satisfied.*

**PROOF.** Let's firstly simply the left-hand side (LHS) of Equation (2). Note that,  $|\overline{N}_{S \cup D}(u)| = |\overline{N}_S(u)| + |\overline{N}_D(u)|$ ,  $|\overline{E}(S)| + |\overline{N}_S(u)| = |\overline{E}(R)|$ , and  $\sum_{j=1}^{r-|C_1|} |\overline{N}_S(v_j)| + |\overline{N}_D(u)| = \sum_{j=1}^{r-|C_1|} |\overline{N}_R(v_j)|$ . Let  $a = |\overline{N}_{C_1}(u)|$  and  $b = |\overline{N}_{C_2}(u)|$ . Then, Equation (2) is equivalent to

$$|\overline{E}(R)| + \sum_{j=1}^{r-|C_1|} |\overline{N}_R(v_j)| + \sum_{v_j \in C_1} |\overline{N}_S(v_j)| + \max\{a - b, 0\} > k \quad (3)$$

Let  $w_1, w_2, \dots$  be an ordering of  $V(g) \setminus R$  in non-decreasing order regarding  $|\overline{N}_R(\cdot)|$ . Then, the upper bound computed by **UB** for the instance  $(g, R)$  is at most  $lb$  if and only if

$$|\overline{E}(R)| + \sum_{j=1}^r |\overline{N}_R(w_j)| > k \quad (4)$$

For every  $v \in V(g) \setminus R$ , if  $(u, v) \in E$ , then  $|\overline{N}_R(v)| = |\overline{N}_S(v)|$ ; otherwise,  $|\overline{N}_R(v)| = |\overline{N}_S(v)| + 1$ . According to the definition of  $C$ , for every  $v \in D$ , it holds that  $|\overline{N}_S(v)| < |\overline{N}_S(v_{r-|C_1|+1})|$  and thus  $|\overline{N}_R(v)| \leq |\overline{N}_S(v_{r-|C_1|+1})| \leq |\overline{N}_R(w_{r-|C_1|+1})|$ . Consequently, we can assume  $\{w_1, \dots, w_{r-|C_1|}\} = D$ ; note however that, the ordering may be different. Similarly, we can assume  $\{w_{r-|C_1|+1}, \dots, w_r\} \subseteq C_1 \cup C_2$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{LHS of Equation (3)} - \text{LHS of Equation (4)} \\ &= \sum_{j=r-|C_1|+1}^r |\overline{N}_S(v_j)| + \max\{a - b, 0\} - \sum_{j=r-|C_1|+1}^r |\overline{N}_R(w_j)| \\ &= |C_1| \cdot |\overline{N}_S(v_r)| + \max\{a - b, 0\} - \sum_{j=r-|C_1|+1}^r |\overline{N}_R(w_j)| \end{aligned}$$

There are exactly  $|C_1| - a + b$  vertices of  $C_1 \cup C_2$  satisfying  $|\overline{N}_R(\cdot)| = |\overline{N}_S(v_r)|$ . Thus, if  $a \leq b$ , then there are  $|C_1| - a + b \geq |C_1|$  vertices of  $C_1 \cup C_2$  with  $|\overline{N}_R(\cdot)| = |\overline{N}_S(v_r)|$  and  $\sum_{j=r-|C_1|+1}^r |\overline{N}_R(w_j)| = |C_1| \cdot |\overline{N}_S(v_r)|$ ; otherwise,  $\sum_{j=r-|C_1|+1}^r |\overline{N}_R(w_j)| = |C_1| \cdot |\overline{N}_S(v_r)| + a - b$ . Therefore, the lemma holds.  $\square$

Based on the above discussions, we propose the following degree-sequence-based reduction rule **RR3**.

**RR3 (degree-sequence-based reduction rule).** Given an instance  $(g, S)$  with  $|S| < lb < |V(g)|$  and a vertex  $u \in V(g) \setminus S$ , we remove  $u$  from  $g$  if Equation (2) is satisfied.

**Algorithm 2:** ApplyRR3( $g, S, lb$ )

---

```

1 Obtain  $|\overline{E}(S)|$  and  $|\overline{N}_S(v)|$  for each  $v \in V(g) \setminus S$ ;
2 Let  $u_1, u_2, \dots$  be an ordering of  $V(g) \setminus S$  in non-decreasing order
   regarding  $|\overline{N}_S(\cdot)|$ ;
3  $X \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
4 for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $|V(g) \setminus S|$  do
5   if  $|X| + |V(g) \setminus S| - i < lb - |S|$  then return  $(g[S], S)$ ;
6   Let  $v_1, v_2, \dots$  be the vertices of  $X \cup \{u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \dots\}$  in
   non-decreasing order regarding  $|\overline{N}_S(\cdot)|$ ;
7   Obtain  $|\overline{N}_D(u_i)|$ ,  $|\overline{N}_{C_1}(u_i)|$  and  $|\overline{N}_{C_2}(u_i)|$ ;
8   if Equation (2) is not satisfied then Append  $u_i$  to the end of  $X$ ;
9 return  $(g[X], S)$ ;
```

---

Given an instance  $(g, S)$ , our pseudocode of efficiently applying **RR3** for all vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S$  is shown in Algorithm 2, which returns a reduced instance at either Line 5 or Line 9. We first obtain  $|\overline{E}(S)|$  and  $|\overline{N}_S(v)$  for each  $v \in V(g) \setminus S$  (Line 1), and then order vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S$  in non-decreasing order regarding  $|\overline{N}_S(\cdot)|$  (Line 2). Let  $u_1, u_2, \dots$  be the ordered vertices. We then process the vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S$  one-by-one according to the sorted order (Line 4). When processing  $u_i$ , the vertices that we need to consider are the vertices that have not been processed yet (i.e.,  $\{u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \dots\}$ ) and the subset of  $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{i-1}\}$  that passed (i.e., not pruned) by the reduction rule; denote the latter subset by  $X$ . This means that  $\{u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}\} \setminus X$  have already been removed from  $g$  by the reduction rule. If the number of remaining vertices (i.e.,  $|X| + |V(g) \setminus S| - i$ ) is less than  $r = lb - |S|$ , then we remove all vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S$  from  $g$  by returning  $(g[S], S)$  (Line 5). Otherwise, let  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r, \dots$  be the vertices of  $X \cup \{u_{i+1}, u_{i+2}, \dots\}$  in non-decreasing order regarding  $|\overline{N}_S(\cdot)|$  (Line 6). We obtain  $|\overline{N}_D(u_i)|$ ,  $|\overline{N}_{C_1}(u_i)|$  and  $|\overline{N}_{C_2}(u_i)|$  (Line 7), and remove  $u_i$  from  $g$  if Equation (2) is satisfied; otherwise,  $u_i$  is not pruned and is appended to the end of  $X$  (Line 8). Finally, Line 9 returns the reduced instance  $(g[X], S)$ .

**LEMMA 5.2.** *Algorithm 2 runs in  $O(|E(g)| + k)$  time.*

**PROOF.** Firstly, Lines 1–2 run in  $O(|E(g)| + k)$  time, where the sorting is conducted by counting sort. Secondly, Line 6 does not do anything; it is just a syntax sugar for relabeling the vertices. Thirdly, Line 7 can be conducted in  $O(|N_g(u_i)|)$  time since  $|\overline{N}_D(u_i)| = |D| - |\overline{N}_D(u_i)|$  and  $|\overline{N}_{C_1}(u_i)| = |C_1| - |\overline{N}_{C_1}(u_i)|$ ; note that, as each of  $D, C_1, C_2$  spans at most two arrays (i.e.,  $X$  and  $\{u_{i+1}, \dots\}$ ), we can easily get its size and boundary. Lastly, Line 8 can be checked in constant time by noting that  $\sum_{j=1}^r |\overline{N}_S(v_j)|$  can be obtained in constant time after storing the suffix sums of  $|\overline{N}_S(u_1)|, |\overline{N}_S(u_2)|, \dots, |\overline{N}_S(u_{i+1})|, |\overline{N}_S(u_{i+2})|, \dots$ .  $\square$

*Example 5.3.* Consider the instance  $(g, S)$  in Figure 8 for  $k = 3$  and  $lb = 5$ , where  $g$  is the entire graph and  $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ ; thus  $r = 2$ . The values of  $|\overline{N}_S(\cdot)|$  for the vertices of  $V(g) \setminus S = \{u_1, \dots, u_5\}$  are  $\{u_1 : 0, u_2 : 0, u_3 : 1, u_4 : 1, u_5 : 1\}$ . As  $|\overline{E}(S)| = 2$ , the upper bound of  $(g, S)$  computed by **UB** is 6; thus, the instance is not pruned.




Figure 8: Example instance for applying reduction rule RR3

Let's apply **RR3** for  $u_1$ . As  $X = \emptyset$ , we have  $v_i = u_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ . Then  $D = \{u_2\}$ ,  $C_1 = \{u_3\}$ ,  $C_2 = \{u_4, u_5\}$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^r |\overline{N}_S(v_j)| = 1$ ,  $|\overline{N}_{S \cup D}(u_1)| = 0$ ,  $|\overline{N}_{C_1}(u_1)| = 1$  and  $|\overline{N}_{C_2}(u_1)| = 1$ . Thus, Equation (2) is not satisfied;  $u_1$  is not pruned and is appended to  $X$ .

Now let's apply **RR3** for  $u_2$ . As  $X = \{u_1\}$ , we have  $v_1 = u_1$  and  $v_i = u_{i+1}$  for  $2 \leq i \leq 4$ . Then  $D = \{u_1\}$ ,  $C_1 = \{u_3\}$ ,  $C_2 = \{u_4, u_5\}$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^r |\overline{N}_S(v_j)| = 1$ ,  $|\overline{N}_{S \cup D}(u_2)| = 0$ ,  $|\overline{N}_{C_1}(u_2)| = 1$  and  $|\overline{N}_{C_2}(u_2)| = 0$ . Consequently, Equation (2) is satisfied and  $u_2$  is removed from  $g$ . It can be verified that  $u_3, u_4, u_5$  will all subsequently be removed.

**Effectiveness of RR3.** kDC [8] also proposed a reduction rule based on **UB**; let's denote it as **RR3'**. We remark that our **RR3** is more effective (i.e., prunes more vertices) than **RR3'** since the latter ignores the non-edges between  $u$  and  $V(g) \setminus (S \cup u)$  that are considered by **RR3**; specifically, **RR3'** removes  $u$  from  $g$  if  $|\overline{E}(S)| + \sum_{j=1}^r |\overline{N}_S(v_j)| + |\overline{N}_S(u)| > k$ . More generally, the effectiveness of our **RR3** is characterized by the lemma below.

LEMMA 5.4. **RR3** is more effective than any other reduction rule that is designed based on an upper bound of  $(g, S \cup u)$  that ignores all the non-edges between vertices of  $V(g) \setminus (S \cup u)$ .

PROOF. Firstly, we have proved in Lemma 5.1 that applying **RR3** is equivalent to computing **UB** for  $(g, S \cup u)$ . Secondly, it can be shown that **UB** computes the tightest upper bound for  $(g, S \cup u)$  among all upper bounds that ignore all the non-edges between vertices of  $V(g) \setminus (S \cup u)$ . Thus, the lemma holds.  $\square$

In particular, the second-order reduction rule proposed in [8] is designed based on an upper bound of  $(g, S \cup u)$  that does not consider the non-edges between vertices of  $V(g) \setminus (S \cup u)$ . Thus, **RR3** is more effective than the second-order reduction rule of [8].

## 6 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we evaluate the practical performance of kDC-two, by comparing it against the following two existing algorithms.

- kDC: the state-of-the-art algorithm proposed in [8].
- KDBB: the existing algorithm proposed in [16].

We implemented our algorithm kDC-two based on the code-base of kDC that is downloaded from <https://lijunchang.github.io/Maximum-kDC/>; thus, all optimizations/techniques that are implemented in kDC, except the second-order reduction rule, are used in kDC-two. In addition, we also implemented the following variant of kDC-two to evaluate the effectiveness of our new reduction rule **RR3**.

- -RR3: kDC-two without the reduction rule **RR3**.

All algorithms are implemented in C++ and compiled with the -O3 flag. All experiments are conducted in single-thread modes on a machine with an Intel Core i7-8700 CPU and 64GB main memory.

We run the algorithms on the following three graph collections, which are the same ones tested in [8, 16].

- The **real-world graphs** collection<sup>1</sup> contains 139 real-world graphs from the Network Data Repository with up to  $5.87 \times 10^7$  vertices and  $1.06 \times 10^8$  edges.
- The **Facebook graphs** collection<sup>2</sup> contains 114 Facebook social networks from the Network Data Repository with up to  $5.92 \times 10^7$  vertices and  $9.25 \times 10^7$  edges.
- The **DIMACS10&SNAP graphs** collection contains 37 graphs with up to  $1.04 \times 10^6$  vertices and  $6.89 \times 10^6$  edges. 27 of them are from DIMACS10<sup>3</sup> and 10 graphs are from SNAP<sup>4</sup>.

Same as [8, 16], we choose  $k$  from  $\{1, 3, 5, 10, 15, 20\}$ , and set a time limit of 3 hours for each testing (i.e., running a particular algorithm on a specific graph with a chosen  $k$  value).

### 6.1 Against the Existing Algorithms

In this subsection, we evaluate the efficiency of our algorithm kDC-two against the existing algorithms kDC and KDBB. Note that, (1) kDC is the fastest existing algorithm, and (2) as the code of KDBB is not available, the results of KDBB reported in this subsection are obtained from the original paper of KDBB [16].

Table 2: Number of instances solved by the algorithms kDC-two, kDC and KDBB with a time limit of 3 hours (best performers are highlighted in bold)

	Real-world graphs			Facebook graphs			DIMACS10&SNAP		
	kDC-two	kDC	KDBB	kDC-two	kDC	KDBB	kDC-two	kDC	KDBB
$k = 1$	137	133	117	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	110	37	37	36
$k = 3$	<b>136</b>	130	107	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	110	37	37	35
$k = 5$	<b>136</b>	127	104	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	108	37	37	34
$k = 10$	<b>128</b>	119	85	<b>112</b>	111	109	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	30
$k = 15$	<b>126</b>	110	68	<b>112</b>	101	103	<b>36</b>	29	25
$k = 20$	<b>113</b>	104	56	<b>111</b>	88	80	<b>34</b>	27	22

We first report in Table 2 the total number of graph instances that are solved by each algorithm with a time limit of 3 hours. We can see that for all three algorithms, the number of solved instances decreases when  $k$  increases; this indicates that when  $k$  increases, the problem becomes more difficult to solve. Nevertheless, our algorithm kDC-two consistently outperforms the two existing algorithms by solving more instances within the time limit. The improvement is more profound when  $k$  becomes large. For example, for  $k = 15$ , kDC-two solves 16, 11 and 7 more instances than the fastest existing algorithm kDC on the three graph collections, respectively; for  $k = 20$ , the numbers are 9, 23, and 7.

Secondly, we compare the number of instances solved by the algorithms when varying the time limit from 1 second to 3 hours. The results on the real-world graphs and Facebook graphs for different  $k$  values are shown in Figures 9 and 10, respectively. We can see that our algorithm kDC-two consistently outperforms kDC across all the time limits. Also notice that, on the real-world graphs

<sup>1</sup><http://lcs.ios.ac.cn/~caisw/Resource/realworld%20graphs.tar.gz>

<sup>2</sup><https://networkrepository.com/socfb.php>

<sup>3</sup><https://www.cc.gatech.edu/dimacs10/downloads.shtml>

<sup>4</sup><http://snap.stanford.edu/data/>




Figure 9: Number of solved instances by varying time limit for real-world graphs (best viewed in color)

collection, our algorithm kDC-two with a time limit of 1 second solves even more instances than KDBB with a time limit of 3 hours. We also remark that our algorithm kDC-two solves all 114 Facebook graphs with a time limit of 30 seconds for  $k = 1, 3$  and  $5$ , while the time limits needed by kDC are 125, 393 and 1353 seconds, respectively; on the other hand, KDBB is not able to solve all instances with a time limit of 3 hours.

Thirdly, we report the actual processing time of kDC-two, kDC and KDBB on a subset of Facebook graphs that have more than 15,000 vertices for  $k = 10$  and  $15$  in Table 3, where ‘-’ indicates that the processing time is longer than the 3-hour limit. There are totally 41 such graphs. But none of the tested algorithms can finish within the time limit of 3 hours on graphs *konect* and *uci-uni*; thus, these two graphs are omitted from Table 3. Also, the results of KDBB for  $k = 15$  are omitted, as they are not available. The number of vertices and edges for each graph are illustrated in the second and third columns of Table 3, respectively. From Table 3, we can observe that our algorithm kDC-two consistently and significantly outperforms kDC, which in turn runs significantly faster than KDBB, across all these graphs. In particular, kDC-two is on average 45 $\times$  and 102 $\times$  faster than kDC for  $k = 10$  and  $15$ , respectively.




Figure 10: Number of solved instances by varying time limit for Facebook graphs (best viewed in color)

In summary, our algorithm kDC-two consistently solves more graph instances than the fastest existing algorithm kDC when varying the time limit from 1 second to 3 hours, and also consistently runs faster than kDC across the different graphs with an average speed up up-to two orders of magnitude.

## 6.2 Ablation Studies

In this subsection, we first evaluate the effectiveness of our new reduction rule **RR3** by comparing kDC-two with -RR3 which is the variant of kDC-two without **RR3**. The results of -RR3 are also shown in Figures 9 and 10 and Table 3. We can observe from Figures 9 and 10 that the reduction rule **RR3** enables kDC-two to solve more graph instances across the different time limits. In particular, kDC-two solves 3, 5 and 3 more instances than -RR3 for  $k = 10, 15$  and  $20$ , respectively, on the real-world graphs collection with the time limit of 3 hours. From Table 3, we can see that kDC-two consistently runs faster than -RR3 across the different Facebook graphs with an average speed up of 2 times for  $k = 15$ . This demonstrates the practical effectiveness of our new reduction rule **RR3**.

Secondly, we compare -RR3 with kDC. Note that, -RR3 uses the same branching rule, reduction rules, and upper bounds as kDC; the only difference between them is that -RR3 conducts the

**Table 3: Processing time (in seconds) of -RR3, kDC-two, kDC, and KDBB on the 39 Facebook graphs with more than 15,000 vertices. Best performers are highlighted in bold: specifically, if the running time is slower than the fastest running time by only less than 10%, it is considered as the best.**

		$k = 10$				$k = 15$		
$n$	$m$	-RR3	kDC-two	kDC	KDBB	-RR3	kDC-two	kDC
A-anon	3M 23M	66	<b>31</b>	73	-	627	<b>239</b>	1062
Auburn71	18K 973K	4.7	2.7	956	1195	148	<b>53</b>	-
B-anon	2M 20M	79	51	<b>44</b>	-	2780	<b>1447</b>	2129
Berkeley13	22K 852K	0.24	<b>0.22</b>	0.34	630	0.77	<b>0.54</b>	70
BU10	19K 637K	0.66	<b>0.34</b>	4.0	370	3.6	<b>1.8</b>	156
Cornell5	18K 790K	0.98	<b>0.76</b>	17	2636	7.4	2.7	228
FSU53	27K 1M	1.4	<b>1.0</b>	248	1400	54	<b>34</b>	-
Harvard1	15K 824K	2.3	<b>1.6</b>	11	1354	13	<b>4.0</b>	341
Indiana	29K 1M	1.9	<b>1.1</b>	19	1421	16	<b>6.5</b>	861
Indiana69	29K 1M	1.9	<b>1.1</b>	19	1321	16	<b>6.5</b>	858
Maryland58	20K 744K	0.25	<b>0.13</b>	0.60	239	0.24	<b>0.15</b>	0.98
Michigan23	30K 1M	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.79</b>	2.2	1384	5.9	2.2	211
MSU24	32K 1M	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.38</b>	0.47	879	0.84	<b>0.56</b>	4.8
MU78	15K 649K	1.5	<b>0.63</b>	67	306	7.5	<b>3.4</b>	2437
NYU9	21K 715K	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.12	466	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.13</b>	0.58
Oklahoma97	17K 892K	1.9	<b>1.5</b>	379	6926	76	<b>50</b>	-
OR	63K 816K	4.1	<b>1.3</b>	55	1486	31	<b>10.0</b>	400
Penn94	41K 1M	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.25</b>	0.29	1972	0.39	<b>0.35</b>	0.61
Rutgers89	24K 784K	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.10</b>	0.20	386	0.23	<b>0.13</b>	4.2
Tennessee95	16K 770K	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.94</b>	1.8	554	1.5	<b>1.1</b>	20
Texas80	31K 1M	3.0	<b>2.0</b>	80	753	13	<b>6.7</b>	912
Texas84	36K 1M	12	<b>3.6</b>	1321	10253	364	<b>85</b>	-
UC33	16K 522K	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.08</b>	0.14	263	0.21	<b>0.17</b>	1.1
UCLA	20K 747K	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.11</b>	0.14	290	0.20	<b>0.17</b>	0.58
UCLA26	20K 747K	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.11</b>	0.14	288	0.20	<b>0.17</b>	0.55
UConn	17K 604K	0.09	<b>0.08</b>	0.13	194	0.34	<b>0.20</b>	2.1
UConn91	17K 604K	0.09	<b>0.08</b>	0.13	208	0.34	<b>0.20</b>	2.2
UF	35K 1M	1.6	<b>1.3</b>	27	2579	34	<b>16</b>	10778
UF21	35K 1M	1.6	<b>1.3</b>	27	2571	34	<b>16</b>	10765
UGA50	24K 1M	49	<b>26</b>	3318	6794	1874	<b>671</b>	-
Ullinois	30K 1M	2.0	<b>1.5</b>	3.6	1245	6.5	<b>3.5</b>	85
Ullinois20	30K 1M	2.0	<b>1.6</b>	3.6	1217	6.5	<b>3.5</b>	86
UMass92	16K 519K	0.21	<b>0.19</b>	0.30	318	0.65	<b>0.43</b>	5.1
UNC28	18K 766K	1.1	<b>0.67</b>	2.1	380	4.8	<b>2.1</b>	12
USC35	17K 801K	<b>0.41</b>	<b>0.38</b>	0.52	409	1.3	<b>0.89</b>	10
UVA16	17K 789K	2.4	<b>1.4</b>	14	552	25	<b>10</b>	394
Virginia63	21K 698K	0.30	<b>0.27</b>	1.1	215	0.46	<b>0.39</b>	5.6
Wisconsin87	23K 835K	2.0	<b>1.0</b>	47	924	21	<b>8.3</b>	1604
wosn-friends	63K 817K	4.1	<b>1.3</b>	54	1260	31	<b>10.0</b>	401

**Table 4: Number of graphs with small maximum  $k$ -defective clique (i.e.,  $\omega_k(G) \leq k + 1$ ) and number of graphs with large maximum  $k$ -defective clique (i.e.,  $\omega_k(G) \geq k + 2$ )**

	Real-world graphs		Facebook graphs		DIMACS10&SNAP	
	#small	#large	#small	#large	#small	#large
$k = 1$	2	137	0	114	0	37
$k = 3$	13	126	0	114	0	37
$k = 5$	22	117	1	113	1	36
$k = 10$	40	98	1	111	8	29
$k = 15$	47	91	1	111	12	25
$k = 20$	53	83	1	111	16	21

computation in two stages and exploits the diameter-two property for pruning in Stage-I. From Figures 9 and 10 and Table 3, we can see that -RR3 consistently outperforms kDC. This demonstrates the practical effectiveness of diameter-two-based pruning. To gain more insights, we report in Table 4 the number of graphs with small maximum  $k$ -defective clique (i.e.,  $\omega_k(G) \leq k + 1$ ) and the number of graphs with large maximum  $k$ -defective clique (i.e.,  $\omega_k(G) \geq k + 2$ ) for each graph collection and  $k$  value. We can see that when  $k$  increases, the proportion of graphs with  $\omega_k(G) \geq$

$k + 2$  decreases. Nevertheless, even for  $k = 20$ , there are still a lot of graphs with  $\omega_k(G) \geq k + 2$  such that kDC-two runs in  $O^*((\alpha\Delta)^{k+2}\gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$  time; this is especially true for Facebook graphs.

## 7 RELATED WORK

The concept of defective clique was firstly studied in [47] for predicting missing interactions between proteins in biological networks. Since then, designing exact algorithms for efficiently finding the maximum defective clique has been investigated due to its importance, despite being an NP-hard problem. Early algorithms, such as those proposed in [17, 18, 44], are inefficient and can only deal with small graphs. The MADEC<sup>+</sup> algorithm proposed by Chen et al. [10] is the first algorithm that can handle large graphs, due to the incorporating of a graph coloring-based upper bound and other pruning techniques. The KDBB algorithm proposed by Gao et al. [16] improves the practical performance by proposing preprocessing as well as multiple pruning techniques. The kDC algorithm proposed by Chang [8] is the state-of-the-art algorithm which incorporates an improved graph-coloring-based upper bound, a better initialization method, as well as multiple new reduction rules. From the theoretical perspective, among the existing algorithms, only MADEC<sup>+</sup> [10] and kDC [8] beats the trivial time complexity of  $O^*(2^n)$ . Specifically, MADEC<sup>+</sup> runs in  $O^*(\gamma_{2k}^n)$  time while kDC improves the time complexity to  $O^*(\gamma_k^n)$ , where  $\gamma_k < 2$  is the largest real root of the equation  $x^{k+3} - 2x^{k+2} + 1 = 0$  and  $k$  is the number of allowed missing edges. In this paper, we proposed the kDC-two algorithm to further improve both the time complexity and practical performance for maximum defective clique computation.

The problem of enumerating all maximal  $k$ -defective cliques was also studied recently where the Pivot+ algorithm proposed in [12] runs in  $O^*(\gamma_k^n)$  time, the same as the time complexity of kDC. However, we remark that (1) Pivot+ is inefficient for finding the maximum  $k$ -defective clique in practice due to lack of pruning techniques; (2) Pivot+ achieves the time complexity via using a different branching technique from kDC and it is unclear how to improve the base of its time complexity without changing the branching rule. The problem of approximately counting  $k$ -defective cliques of a particular size, for the special case of  $k = 1$  and 2, was studied in [21]; however, the techniques of [21] cannot be used for finding the maximum  $k$ -defective clique and for a general  $k$ .

Another related problem is maximum clique computation, as clique is a special case of  $k$ -defective clique for  $k = 0$ . The maximum clique is not only NP-hard to compute exactly [23], but also NP-hard to approximate within a factor of  $n^{1-\epsilon}$  for any constant  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  [19]. Nevertheless, extensive efforts have been spent on reducing the time complexity from the trivial  $O^*(2^n)$  to  $O^*(1.4422^n)$ ,  $O^*(1.2599^n)$  [41],  $O^*(1.2346^n)$  [22], and  $O^*(1.2108^n)$  [33], with the state of the art being  $O^*(1.1888^n)$  [34]. On the other hand, extensive efforts have also been spent on improving the practical efficiency, while ignoring theoretical time complexity, e.g., [6, 7, 25, 26, 30, 31, 35, 37, 42, 43, 45]. However, it is non-trivial to extend these techniques to  $k$ -defective computation for a general  $k$ .

## 8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed the kDC-two algorithm for exact maximum  $k$ -defective clique computation that runs in  $O^*((\alpha\Delta)^{k+2} \times \gamma_{k-1}^\alpha)$  time for graphs with  $\omega_k(G) \geq k + 2$ , and in  $O^*(\gamma_{k-1}^n)$  time otherwise. This improves the state-of-the-art time complexity  $O^*(\gamma_k^n)$ . We also proved that kDC-two, with slight modification, runs in  $O^*((\alpha\Delta)^{k+2} \times (k+1)^{\alpha+k+1-\omega_k(G)})$  time when using the degeneracy gap  $\alpha + k + 1 - \omega_k(G)$  parameterization. In addition, from the practical side, we designed a new degree-sequence-based reduction rule that can be conducted in linear time, and theoretically demonstrated its effectiveness compared with other reduction rules. Extensive empirical studies on three benchmark collections with 290 graphs in total showed that kDC-two outperforms the existing fastest algorithm by several orders of magnitude in practice.

## REFERENCES

- [1] James Abello, Mauricio G. C. Resende, and Sandra Sudarsky. 2002. Massive Quasi-Clique Detection. In *Proc. of LATIN'02 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 2286)*. Springer, 598–612.
- [2] Mohiuddin Ahmed, Abdun Naser Mahmood, and Md Rafiqul Islam. 2016. A survey of anomaly detection techniques in financial domain. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 55 (2016), 278–288.
- [3] Balabhaskar Balasundaram, Sergiy Butenko, and Illya V. Hicks. 2011. Clique Relaxations in Social Network Analysis: The Maximum  $k$ -Plex Problem. *Operations Research* 59, 1 (2011), 133–142.
- [4] Punam Bedi and Chhavi Sharma. 2016. Community detection in social networks. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 6, 3 (2016), 115–135.
- [5] Jean-Marie Bourjolly, Gilbert Laporte, and Gilles Pesant. 2002. An exact algorithm for the maximum  $k$ -club problem in an undirected graph. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 138, 1 (2002), 21–28.
- [6] Randy Carraghan and Panos M. Pardalos. 1990. An Exact Algorithm for the Maximum Clique Problem. *Oper. Res. Lett.* 9, 6 (Nov. 1990), 375–382.
- [7] Lijun Chang. 2019. Efficient Maximum Clique Computation over Large Sparse Graphs. In *Proc. of KDD '19*. 529–538.
- [8] Lijun Chang. 2023. Efficient Maximum  $K$ -Defective Clique Computation with Improved Time Complexity. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 1, 3, Article 209 (nov 2023), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3617313>
- [9] Lijun Chang and Lu Qin. 2018. *Cohesive Subgraph Computation over Large Sparse Graphs*. Springer Series in the Data Sciences.
- [10] Xiaoyu Chen, Yi Zhou, Jin-Kao Hao, and Mingyu Xiao. 2021. Computing maximum  $k$ -defective cliques in massive graphs. *Comput. Oper. Res.* 127 (2021), 105131.
- [11] James Cheng, Yiping Ke, Ada Wai-Chee Fu, Jeffrey Xu Yu, and Linhong Zhu. 2011. Finding maximal cliques in massive networks. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 36, 4 (2011), 21:1–21:34.
- [12] Qiangqiang Dai, Rong-Hua Li, Meihao Liao, and Guoren Wang. 2023. Maximal Defective Clique Enumeration. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 1, 1 (2023), 77:1–77:26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3588931>
- [13] David Eppstein, Maarten Löffler, and Darren Strash. 2013. Listing All Maximal Cliques in Large Sparse Real-World Graphs. *ACM Journal of Experimental Algorithmics* 18 (2013).
- [14] Uriel Feige, Guy Kortsarz, and David Peleg. 2001. The Dense  $k$ -Subgraph Problem. *Algorithmica* 29, 3 (2001), 410–421. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S004530010050>
- [15] Fedor V. Fomin and Dieter Kratsch. 2010. *Exact Exponential Algorithms*. Springer.
- [16] Jian Gao, Zhenghang Xu, Ruizhi Li, and Minghao Yin. 2022. An Exact Algorithm with New Upper Bounds for the Maximum  $k$ -Defective Clique Problem in Massive Sparse Graphs. In *Proc. of AAAI'22*. 10174–10183.
- [17] Timo Gschwind, Stefan Irnich, Fabio Furini, and Roberto Wolfler Calvo. 2021. A Branch-and-Price Framework for Decomposing Graphs into Relaxed Cliques. *INFORMS J. Comput.* 33, 3 (2021), 1070–1090.
- [18] Timo Gschwind, Stefan Irnich, and Isabel Podlinski. 2018. Maximum weight relaxed cliques and Russian Doll Search revisited. *Discret. Appl. Math.* 234 (2018), 131–138.
- [19] Johan Håstad. 1996. Clique is Hard to Approximate Within  $n^{1-\epsilon}$ . In *Proc. of FOCS'96*. 627–636.
- [20] Shweta Jain and C. Seshadhri. 2020. The Power of Pivoting for Exact Clique Counting. In *Proc. WSDM'20*. ACM, 268–276.
- [21] Shweta Jain and C. Seshadhri. 2020. Provably and Efficiently Approximating Near-cliques using the Turán Shadow: PEANUTS. In *Proc. of WWW'20*. ACM / IW3C2, 1966–1976.
- [22] Tang Jian. 1986. An  $O(2^{0.304n})$  Algorithm for Solving Maximum Independent Set Problem. *IEEE Trans. Computers* 35, 9 (1986), 847–851.
- [23] Richard M. Karp. 1972. Reducibility Among Combinatorial Problems. In *Proc. of CCC'72*. 85–103.
- [24] Victor E. Lee, Ning Ruan, Ruoming Jin, and Charu C. Aggarwal. 2010. A Survey of Algorithms for Dense Subgraph Discovery. In *Managing and Mining Graph Data*. Advances in Database Systems, Vol. 40. Springer, 303–336.
- [25] Chu-Min Li, Zhiwen Fang, and Ke Xu. 2013. Combining MaxSAT Reasoning and Incremental Upper Bound for the Maximum Clique Problem. In *Proc. of ICTAI'13*.
- [26] Chu-Min Li, Hua Jiang, and Felip Manyà. 2017. On minimization of the number of branches in branch-and-bound algorithms for the maximum clique problem. *Computers & OR* 84 (2017), 1–15.
- [27] Ronghua Li, Sen Gao, Lu Qin, Guoren Wang, Weihua Yang, and Jeffrey Xu Yu. 2020. Ordering Heuristics for  $k$ -clique Listing. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 11 (2020), 2536–2548.
- [28] David W. Matula and Leland L. Beck. 1983. Smallest-Last Ordering and clustering and Graph Coloring Algorithms. *J. ACM* 30, 3 (1983), 417–427.
- [29] Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. 2012. *Foundations of Machine Learning*. MIT Press.
- [30] Panos M. Pardalos and Jue Xue. 1994. The maximum clique problem. *J. global Optimization* 4, 3 (1994), 301–328.
- [31] Bharath Pattabiraman, Md. Mostofa Ali Patwary, Assefaw Hadish Gebremedhin, Wei-keng Liao, and Alok N. Choudhary. 2015. Fast Algorithms for the Maximum Clique Problem on Massive Graphs with Applications to Overlapping Community Detection. *Internet Mathematics* 11, 4-5 (2015), 421–448.
- [32] Jeffrey Pattillo, Nataly Youssef, and Sergiy Butenko. 2013. On clique relaxation models in network analysis. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* 226, 1 (2013), 9–18.
- [33] J. M. Robson. 1986. Algorithms for Maximum Independent Sets. *J. Algorithms* 7, 3 (1986), 425–440.
- [34] J. M. Robson. 2001. Finding a maximum independent set in time  $O(2^{n/4})$ . <https://www.labri.fr/perso/robson/mis/techrep.html>.
- [35] Ryan A. Rossi, David F. Gleich, and Assefaw Hadish Gebremedhin. 2015. Parallel Maximum Clique Algorithms with Applications to Network Analysis. *SIAM J. Scientific Computing* 37, 5 (2015).
- [36] H. Sachs. 1963. Regular Graphs with Given Girth and Restricted Circuits. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* s1-38, 1 (1963), 423–429.
- [37] Pablo San Segundo, Alvaro Lopez, and Panos M. Pardalos. 2016. A new exact maximum clique algorithm for large and massive sparse graphs. *Computers & Operations Research* 66 (2016), 81–94.
- [38] Hanif D. Sherali, J. Cole Smith, and Antonio A. Trani. 2002. An Airspace Planning Model for Selecting Flight-plans Under Workload, Safety, and Equity Considerations. *Transp. Sci.* 36, 4 (2002), 378–397.
- [39] Vladimir Stozhkov, Austin Buchanan, Sergiy Butenko, and Vladimir Boginski. 2022. Continuous cubic formulations for cluster detection problems in networks. *Math. Program.* 196, 1 (2022), 279–307.
- [40] Apichat Suratane, Martin H Schaefer, Matthew J Betts, Zita Soons, Heiko Mannsperger, Nathalie Harder, Marcus Oswald, Markus Gipp, Ellen Ramminger, Guillermo Marcus, et al. 2014. Characterizing protein interactions employing a genome-wide siRNA cellular phenotyping screen. *PLoS computational biology* 10, 9 (2014), e1003814.
- [41] Robert Endre Tarjan and Anthony E. Trojanowski. 1977. Finding a Maximum Independent Set. *SIAM J. Comput.* 6, 3 (1977), 537–546.
- [42] Etsuji Tomita. 2017. Efficient Algorithms for Finding Maximum and Maximal Cliques and Their Applications. In *Proc. of WALCOM'17*. 3–15.
- [43] Etsuji Tomita, Yoichi Sutani, Takanori Higashi, Shinya Takahashi, and Mitsuo Wakatsuki. 2010. A simple and faster branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique. In *Proc. of WALCOM'10*. 191–203.
- [44] Svyatoslav Trukhanov, Chitra Balasubramaniam, Balabhaskar Balasundaram, and Sergiy Butenko. 2013. Algorithms for detecting optimal hereditary structures in graphs, with application to clique relaxations. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 56, 1 (2013), 113–130.
- [45] Jingen Xiang, Cong Guo, and Ashraf Aboulmaga. 2013. Scalable maximum clique computation using mapreduce. In *Proc. of ICDE'13*. 74–85.

[46] Mihalis Yannakakis. 1978. Node- and Edge-Deletion NP-Complete Problems. In *Proc. of STOC'78*. ACM, 253–264.

[47] Haiyuan Yu, Alberto Paccanaro, Valery Trifonov, and Mark Gerstein. 2006. Predicting interactions in protein networks by completing defective cliques. *Bioinform.* 22, 7 (2006), 823–829.