

Maximum Bipartite vs. Triangle-Free Subgraph*

Tamio-Vesa Nakajima
University of Oxford
tamio-vesa.nakajima@cs.ox.ac.uk

Stanislav Živný
University of Oxford
standa.zivny@cs.ox.ac.uk

24th October 2024

Abstract

Given a (multi)graph G which contains a bipartite subgraph with ρ edges, what is the largest triangle-free subgraph of G that can be found efficiently? We present an SDP-based algorithm that finds one with at least 0.8823ρ edges, thus improving on the subgraph with 0.878ρ edges obtained by the classic Max-Cut algorithm of Goemans and Williamson. On the other hand, by a reduction from Håstad’s 3-bit PCP we show that it is NP-hard to find a triangle-free subgraph with $(25/26 + \varepsilon)\rho \approx (0.961 + \varepsilon)\rho$ edges.

As an application, we classify the *Maximum Promise Constraint Satisfaction Problem* $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ for all bipartite G : Given an input (multi)graph X which admits a G -colouring satisfying ρ edges, find an H -colouring of X that satisfies ρ edges. This problem is solvable in polynomial time, apart from trivial cases, if H contains a triangle, and is NP-hard otherwise.

1 Introduction

Given an undirected (multi)graph G , what is the bipartite subgraph of G with the most edges? This problem, known as the maximum cut problem — or Max-Cut for short — is one of the most fundamental problems in computer science. Max-Cut was among the 21 problems shown to be NP-hard by Karp [Kar72]. Papadimitriou and Yannakakis showed that Max-Cut is APX-hard [PY91] and thus does not admit a polynomial-time approximation scheme, unless $P = NP$. However, there are several simple 0.5-approximation algorithms. Goemans and Williamson used semidefinite programming and randomised rounding to design a 0.878-approximation algorithm [GW95]. Khot, Kindler, Mossel, O’Donnell, and Oleszkiewicz established the optimality of this algorithm [KKMO07, MOO10] under Khot’s Unique Games Conjecture [Kho02].

What if the task is merely finding a large triangle-free subgraph (rather than a bipartite one)?

While the Goemans-Williamson algorithm can still be used, as our main result we design an algorithm with a better approximation guarantee: If G contains a bipartite subgraph with ρ edges, our algorithm efficiently finds a triangle-free subgraph of G with 0.8823ρ edges. Our algorithm is a randomised combination of the Goemans-Williamson original “random hyperplane algorithm”, and an algorithm that first selects “long edges” (meaning edges for which the angle between the corresponding

*This work was supported by UKRI EP/X024431/1. For the purpose of Open Access, the authors have applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission. All data is provided in full in the results section of this paper.

vectors from the SDP solution is above a certain threshold) and then applies a random hyperplane rounding, selecting “shorter edges” (still longer than some other threshold). The probability of the biased coin that selects one of the two algorithms depends on certain geometric quantities which guarantee that the resulting subgraph is indeed triangle-free. We complement our tractability result by showing that it is NP-hard to find a triangle-free subgraph with $(25/26 + \varepsilon)\rho \approx (0.961 + \varepsilon)\rho$ edges. This result is obtained by a reduction from Håstad’s 3-bit PCP [Hås01].

Our work falls within the broad framework of *constraint satisfaction problems*. A constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) is a problem like Max-Cut, i.e., a problem about finding an assignment of values to the given variables subject to the given constraints. In Max-Cut, the variables correspond to the vertices of the input graph, the values are just 0 and 1 (corresponding to the two sides of a cut), and the constraints are binary disequalities associated with the edges of the graph. Given a CSP, the computational task could be to find a solution maximising the number of satisfied constraints as in Max-Cut, or finding a (perfect) solution satisfying all constraints as in (hyper)graph colouring problems. A *promise* CSP (PCSP) is a CSP in which each constraint comes in two forms, a strong one and a weak one. The promise is that a solution exists using the strong versions of the constraints, while the (possibly easier) task is to find a solution using the weak constraints. A recent line of work by Austrin, Guruswami, and Håstad [AGH17], Brakensiek and Guruswami [BG21], and Barto, Bulín, Krokhin, and Opršal [BBKO21] initiated a systematic study of PCSPs with perfect completeness, i.e., finding a solution satisfying all weak constraints given the promise that a solution satisfying all strong constraints exists. Canonical examples include approximate graph [GJ76] and hypergraph [DRS05, ABP20] colouring problems, e.g., finding a 6-colouring of a given 3-colourable graph.

The *approximation* of promise CSPs includes interesting computational problems, as discussed in the recent work of Barto, Butti, Kazda, Viola, and Živný [BBK⁺24]. One example is the following. Given a graph G that admits a 2-colouring of the vertices with a ρ -fraction of the edges coloured properly, find a 3-colouring of G with an $\alpha\rho$ -fraction of the edges coloured properly, where $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ is the approximation factor. As a side result, we show that there is a 1-approximation algorithm; i.e., given a graph with a 2-colouring with ρ -fraction of non-monochromatic edges, one can efficiently find a 3-colouring of the graph with the same fraction of non-monochromatic edges. Our algorithm solves the Goemans-Williamson SDP for Max-Cut [GW95] and then rounds like Frieze and Jerrum for Max-3-Cut [FJ97], cf. [Appendix A](#) for details.

As can be easily shown (cf. [Section 3](#)), this implies that the following problem is also solvable efficiently. Fix a bipartite graph G with at least one edge and another graph H that *contains a triangle* and has a homomorphism from G .¹ Then, given an input graph X , finding a partial homomorphism from X to H ² is solvable efficiently given the promise that such a partial homomorphism exists from X to G . Our hardness result immediately implies that this problem is NP-hard if H is *triangle-free*.

In other words, we obtain a computational complexity dichotomy for the problem $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ with a bipartite G (cf. [Section 3](#) for all formal definitions and the precise statement of our result). This should be compared with the conjecture of Brakensiek and Guruswami [BG21] on the decision version of the approximate graph homomorphism problem; in their conjecture the “bipartite G ” case is (trivially) tractable but the maximisation version, which we settle in the present paper, was open. (The precise statement of their conjecture and the relationship with our work can be found in [Section 3](#).)

¹I.e. there is an edge preserving map from $V(G)$ to $V(H)$.

²I.e. a map from $V(X)$ to $V(H)$ preserving ρ of the edges of X . When $\rho = |E(X)|$, such a map is known as an H -colouring [HN90].

Related work Bhangale and Khot gave an optimal inapproximability result for Max-3-LIN over non-Abelian groups [BK21]. The series of works by Bhangale, Khot, and Minzer [BKM22, BKM23a, BKM23b, BKM24] established, among other things, hardness of approximation of certain perfectly satisfiable CSPs. We already mentioned in passing the very recent work of Barto et al. [BBK⁺24], which extends the algebraic approach from [BBKO21] to approximability of PCSPs.

The notion of Max-PCSPs is a natural generalisation of the well-studied notion of Max-CSPs. For finite-domain Max-CSPs, it is known that a certain rounding of the basic SDP relaxation gives, up to some ε , the UGC-optimal approximation ratio (in time doubly exponential in ε) [Rag08, RS09]. Recent work of Brakensiek et al. [BGS23] states that parts of this hardness result are verbatim applicable to approximating certain Max-PCSPs. However, the Raghavendra-Steurer algorithm does not immediately give a 1-approximation algorithm due to the above-mentioned ε , even for Max-CSPs. Moreover, that result is established only for finite-domain Max-CSPs. Furthermore, the hardness results are conditional on the UGC. Our results (i) give approximation ratio 1, for MaxPCSP(K_2, K_3), (ii) give algorithms for infinite-domain structures, for MaxPCSP(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3), and (iii) involve unconditional NP-hardness, for the hardness of MaxPCSP(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3).

2 Preliminaries

For two nonzero vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we denote by $\angle(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ the angle between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} in radians; i.e., $\angle(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \arccos\left(\frac{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{y}\|}\right)$. The following useful fact is well-known, cf. [Euc26, Book XI, Proposition 21].

Lemma 1. *For any three nonzero vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have $\angle(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) + \angle(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) + \angle(\mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_1) \leq 2\pi$.*

Graphs and (partial) homomorphisms. All graphs will be undirected but with possibly multiple edges. Fix two graphs $G = (V, E)$, $H = (U, F)$, and $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that there exists a *partial homomorphism* of weight ρ from G to H , and write $G \xrightarrow{\rho} H$, if there exists a mapping $h : V \rightarrow U$ such that for ρ edges $(x, y) \in E$ we have $(h(x), h(y)) \in F$. If $G \xrightarrow{|E|} H$, we say that there exists a homomorphism from G to H and write $G \rightarrow H$. (Note that for any G, H, I , if $G \xrightarrow{\rho} H \rightarrow I$ then $G \xrightarrow{\rho} I$.)

We denote by K_2 a clique on two vertices. A partial homomorphism $h : G \xrightarrow{\rho} K_2$ represents a cut of weight ρ , namely the edges (x, y) with $h(x) \neq h(y)$. Equivalently, it represents a bipartite subgraph of G with weight ρ . We now introduce a graph that similarly captures triangle-free subgraphs. Let \mathfrak{G}_3 be the direct sum of all finite triangle-free graphs. In other words, for every finite triangle-free graph $G = (V, E)$, the graph \mathfrak{G}_3 contains vertices x_G for $x \in V$, and edges (x_G, y_G) for $(x, y) \in E$. Then, for finite G , a partial homomorphism $h : G \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathfrak{G}_3$ represents a triangle-free subgraph of G with weight ρ : all the edges that connect vertices that are mapped by h to neighbouring vertices in \mathfrak{G}_3 form a triangle-free subgraph of G .

Maximum PCSPs. Fix two (possibly infinite) graphs $G \rightarrow H$. Then the *maximum promise constraint satisfaction problem* (MaxPCSP) for undirected graphs, denoted by $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$, is defined as follows. In the search version of the problem, we are given a (multi)graph X such that $X \xrightarrow{\rho} G$, and must find $h : X \xrightarrow{\rho} H$; this problem can be approximated with approximation ratio α if we can

find $h : X \xrightarrow{\alpha\rho} H$. In the decision version, we are given a (multi)graph X and a number $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$ and must output **Yes** if $X \xrightarrow{\rho} G$, and **No** if not even $X \xrightarrow{\rho} H$. This problem can be approximated with approximation ratio α if we can decide between $X \xrightarrow{\rho} G$ and not even $X \xrightarrow{\alpha\rho} H$.

In particular, approximating the problem $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ with approximation ratio α means the following. In the search version: given a graph G that contains a cut of weight ρ , find a triangle-free subgraph of weight $\alpha\rho$. In the decision version: given a graph G and a number $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$, output **Yes** if it has a cut of weight ρ , and **No** if it has no triangle-free subgraph of weight $\alpha\rho$.

We define the problem $\text{PCSP}(G, H)$ identically to $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$, except that it is guaranteed that $\rho = 1$. Thus observe that $\text{PCSP}(G, H)$ reduces to $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ trivially, in the sense that there is a polynomial-time reduction from $\text{PCSP}(G, H)$ to $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ that does not change the input.

Suppose $G \rightarrow G' \rightarrow H' \rightarrow H$. Then, $\text{PCSP}(G, H)$ polynomial-time reduces to $\text{PCSP}(G', H')$ and $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ polynomial-time reduces to $\text{MaxPCSP}(G', H')$ (and the same holds for α -approximation). Furthermore, the decision version of $\text{PCSP}(G, H)$ and $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ polynomial-time reduces to the search version of $\text{PCSP}(G, H)$ and $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$, respectively. In other words, the decision version is no harder than the search version. Hence by proving our tractability results for the search version, and our hardness results for the decision version, we prove them for both versions of the problems.

SDP. For the Max-Cut problem, which is just $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, K_2)$, the *basic SDP relaxation* for a graph $G = (V, E)$ with n vertices, which can be solved within additive error ε in polynomial time with respect to the size of G and $\log(1/\varepsilon)$,³ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \frac{1 - \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v}{2} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_u = 1, \\ & \mathbf{x}_u \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Goemans and Williamson [GW95] gave a rounding algorithm for the SDP (1) with approximation ratio

$$\alpha_{GW} = \left(\max_{0 \leq \tau \leq \pi} \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{1 - \cos \tau}{\tau} \right)^{-1} \approx 0.878,$$

thus beating the trivial approximation ratio of $1/2$ obtained by, e.g., a random cut. Their algorithm solves the SDP (1), selects a uniformly random hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^n , and returns the cut induced by the hyperplane.

3 Results

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 2. $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ is 0.8823-approximable (in the search version) in polynomial time, and it is NP-hard to $(25/26 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate (even in the decision version) for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$.

³Throughout we will ignore issues of real precision.

Note that crucially $0.8823 > 0.878\dots$, thus our algorithm beats the Goemans-Williamson algorithm.

We prove this result in two parts: the tractability side in [Section 4](#) and the hardness side in [Section 5](#). We quickly give an intuitive explanation of why such an algorithm is possible. Define

$$\tau_{GW} = \arg \max_{0 \leq \tau \leq \pi} \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{1 - \cos \tau}{\tau} \approx 0.742\pi.$$

The function $\tau \mapsto (\pi/2)(1 - \cos \tau)/\tau$, depicted in [Figure 1](#), is increasing up to τ_{GW} , then decreasing. Why would $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ be easier to approximate than $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, K_2)$? Consider the




Figure 1: Function giving rise to α_{GW} , τ_{GW} .

Goemans-Williamson algorithm for $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, K_2)$; the worst-case performance of this algorithm appears in a graph where the embedding into \mathbb{R}^N given by solving the SDP (1) gives all edges an angle of approximately τ_{GW} . Observe that $\tau_{GW} > 2\pi/3$ — so immediately (cf. [Lemma 1](#)) this instance is triangle-free. So, for this instance an algorithm for $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ could just return the entire graph! Indeed, in order to create an instance that contains triangles one needs to introduce shorter edges. This suggests that a hybrid algorithm, that either selects “long edges” or some appropriate selection of “shorter edges” (still longer than some threshold), should have better performance.

Our next result is a combination of the Goemans-Williamson SDP for Max-Cut [[GW95](#)] and a rounding scheme due to Frieze and Jerrum for Max-3-Cut [[FJ97](#)], cf. [Appendix A](#) for details.

Theorem 3. *MaxPCSP(K_2, K_3) is solvable in polynomial time (in the search version).*

This algorithm is somewhat similar to the Goemans-Williams algorithm, except that rather than selecting a uniformly random hyperplane, it selects three normally distributed vectors, and partitions the vertices according to which vector they are closest to (where closeness is measured in terms of inner products). Thus, while this algorithm solves the same SDP as the algorithm from [Theorem 2](#), it rounds the solution differently.

Combining [Theorem 3](#) with (the hardness part of) [Theorem 2](#), we obtain a complexity classification:

Corollary 4. *Let G be bipartite graph with at least one edge. Then, $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ is solvable in polynomial time if H has a loop or contains a triangle (in the search version), and is NP-hard to solve if H is triangle-free (in the decision version).⁴*

Proof. If H contains a triangle then $G \rightarrow K_2 \rightarrow K_3 \rightarrow H$, so $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ reduces to $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, K_3)$, which can be solved in polynomial time by [Theorem 3](#). Conversely, if H is triangle-free then $K_2 \rightarrow G \rightarrow H \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}_3$, so $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ reduces to $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$. Hence, by [Theorem 2](#), it is NP-hard even to approximate $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ with approximation ratio $25/26 + \varepsilon$ (in the decision version), and thus in particular $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ is NP-hard (in the decision version). \square

Brakensiek and Guruswami conjectured the tractability boundary of promise CSPs on undirected graphs.

Conjecture 5 ([\[BG21\]](#)). *If G, H are undirected graphs, then $\text{PCSP}(G, H)$ is tractable if G is bipartite or H has a loop; and is NP-hard otherwise.*

As $\text{PCSP}(G, H)$ reduces to $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$, it follows from [Conjecture 5](#) that $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ is NP-hard whenever G is non-bipartite and H is loopless. Since we already classified the case when G is bipartite but not edgeless, we conjecture that the tractability boundary for maximum PCSPs on undirected graphs is the following:

Conjecture 6. *If G, H are undirected graphs, then $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ is tractable if (i) G has no edges, or (ii) H has a loop, or (iii) G is bipartite and H contains a triangle; and is NP-hard otherwise.*

Resolving [Conjecture 6](#) should be easier than resolving [Conjecture 5](#), similarly to how the complexity of finite-valued CSPs [\[TŽ16\]](#) was resolved before the complexity of decision CSPs [\[Bul17, Zhu20\]](#)

We note that our hardness result depends in an essential way on the fact that the input graph can have multiple edges; we equivalently could have allowed non-negative integer weights on the edges. This variant of the problem is most natural when looking at it as a constraint satisfaction problem. It is interesting to ask what the complexity of $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ is if the input graph is both weightless and without multiple edges.

4 Tractability

Our tractability result is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *There exist $\alpha, P, Q, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ with $P + Q = 1, P \geq 0, Q \geq 0, \tau \in [2\pi/3, \tau_{GW}]$, such that the following hold*

$$P \frac{\theta}{\pi} + Q \geq \alpha \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{2} \quad \theta \in [\tau, \pi] \quad (2)$$

$$P \frac{\varphi}{\pi} + Q \frac{\varphi}{\pi} \geq \alpha \frac{1 - \cos \varphi}{2} \quad \varphi \in [\pi - \tau/2, \tau] \quad (3)$$

$$P \frac{\psi}{\pi} \geq \alpha \frac{1 - \cos \psi}{2} \quad \psi \in [0, \pi - \tau/2]. \quad (4)$$

⁴Note that if G has no edges or H has a loop then $\text{MaxPCSP}(G, H)$ is trivially tractable.

In particular, we can take $\alpha \geq 0.88232$, $\tau = 2.18746$,

$$P = \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} \left(\frac{1 - \cos(\pi - \tau/2)}{\pi - \tau/2} \right) \approx 0.987535,$$

and $Q = 1 - P$.

Proof. Firstly (4) is most tight when $\psi = \pi - \tau/2$, so it reduces to

$$P \geq \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} \underbrace{\left(\frac{1 - \cos(\pi - \tau/2)}{\pi - \tau/2} \right)}_{X(\tau)}.$$

Next, (3) is actually independent of P, Q , since $P + Q = 1$ and thus the left-hand side is just φ/π . Since we will take $\tau \leq \tau_{GW}$, it is also most tight when $\varphi = \tau$ (cf. [Figure 1](#)), so it becomes

$$\alpha \leq \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\tau}{1 - \cos \tau}.$$

For (2) we see that it becomes easier to satisfy if P is smaller and Q is larger, so we will choose P to be the minimum value it could have vis-à-vis (3) and (4), namely

$$P = \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} X(\tau).$$

Hence, as $P + Q = 1$, the first constraint becomes

$$\frac{\alpha\theta}{2} X(\tau) + 1 - \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} X(\tau) \geq \alpha \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{2}.$$

Simplifying, we get

$$\alpha \frac{\theta - \pi}{2} X(\tau) + 1 \geq \alpha \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{2}.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\alpha \leq \frac{2}{(\pi - \theta)X(\tau) - \cos \theta + 1}$$

Separating out α , we have

$$\alpha \leq \min_{\theta} \frac{2}{(\pi - \theta)X(\tau) - \cos \theta + 1} = 2 \left(\max_{\theta} (\pi - \theta)X(\tau) - \cos \theta + 1 \right)^{-1}$$

Now we can observe that $0.75 > X(\tau) > 0.6$ for $2\pi/3 \leq \tau \leq \pi$ numerically. The derivative of the function we are maximising is $-X(\tau) + \sin \theta$ — this is necessarily positive at $\theta = 2\pi/3$ and negative for $\theta = \pi$, because of the approximation of $X(\tau)$ above. So the maximum is hit at $\pi - \arcsin X(\tau)$, as this is the solution to the equation within the bound for θ . Hence the bound is

$$\alpha \leq \frac{2}{X(\tau) \arcsin X(\tau) + \cos \arcsin X(\tau) + 1}$$

So we now want to find τ that maximises α such that

$$\alpha \leq \frac{2}{X(\tau) \arcsin X(\tau) + \cos \arcsin X(\tau) + 1} \tag{5}$$

$$\alpha \leq \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\tau}{1 - \cos \tau} \tag{6}$$

We can see this situation in [Figure 2](#). Numerically we compute that if we choose $\tau = 2.18746$, then we get $\alpha \geq 0.88232$. \square




Figure 2: Bounds from Lemma 7

We now prove our tractability result.⁵

Theorem 8. *There exists a polynomial-time algorithm to 0.8823-approximate $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$.*

Proof. Take α, P, Q, τ as in Lemma 7. Consider the following randomised algorithm.

1. Input: a graph $G = (V, E)$, which admits a cut of weight $\rho \geq |E|/2$.
2. Solve SDP (1) to within error ε . Thus we get a set of vectors \mathbf{x}_v for $v \in V$, with $\|\mathbf{x}_v\|^2 = 1$ and

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in E} \frac{1 - \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v}{2} \geq \rho - \varepsilon.$$

3. Flip a biased coin, randomly choosing from the following two cases.
 - (i) With probability P , sample a uniformly random hyperplane H , and compute the set of edges (u, v) with \mathbf{x}_u on the opposite side of H as \mathbf{x}_v . Return this set of edges.
 - (ii) With probability Q , return all the edges (u, v) with $\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v) > \tau$, then sample a uniformly random hyperplane H and additionally return all the edges (u, v) with $\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v) \geq \pi - \tau/2$ and with $\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v$ on opposite sides of H .

First, let us verify that our algorithm returns a triangle-free subgraph. First, in Case (i), we return a bipartite subgraph, so we certainly return a triangle-free subgraph. The reasoning for Case (ii) is more geometric. Consider any three edges returned in this case. If the three edges are of angle between $\pi - \tau/2$ and τ , then they cannot form a triangle, since the edges of this kind that we return form a

⁵We remark in passing that *no* SDP-based algorithm can have performance greater than $8/9 = 0.888\dots$, since for the triangle K_3 the SDP value is $9/4$, yet the largest triangle-free subgraph has weight 2 (and $2/(9/4) = 8/9$).

bipartite graph (determined by H). Conversely, suppose that at least one edge has angle greater than τ , and the other two have angle at least $\pi - \tau/2$. Then the sum of the angles of the edges are $> 2\pi$, and hence by [Lemma 1](#), they cannot form a triangle.

Now, let us compute the expected performance of our algorithm. Recall that for a uniformly random hyperplane H , two unit vectors \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} are on opposite sides of H with probability $\angle(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})/\pi$ [[GW95](#)]. Consider any edge (u, v) in our graph. We will show that the probability that the edge is included in the cut is at least $\alpha(1 - \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v)/2 = \alpha(1 - \cos \angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v))/2$; there are three cases depending on $\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)$.

$\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v) \in (\tau, \pi]$. In this case, the edge is included with probability $\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)/\pi$ in [Case \(i\)](#), and with probability 1 in [Case \(ii\)](#). Thus, and by applying (2) from [Lemma 7](#), we find that the edge is included with probability

$$P \frac{\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)}{\pi} + Q \geq \alpha \frac{1 - \cos \angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)}{2}.$$

$\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v) \in [\pi - \tau/2, \tau]$. In this case, the edge is included with probability $\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)/\pi$ both in [Case \(i\)](#) and in [Case \(ii\)](#). Thus, by (3) from [Lemma 7](#), the edge is included with probability

$$P \frac{\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)}{\pi} + Q \frac{\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)}{\pi} \geq \alpha \frac{1 - \cos \angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)}{2}.$$

$\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v) \in [0, \pi - \tau/2)$. In this case, the edge is included with probability $\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)/\pi$ in [Case \(i\)](#) and never included in [Case \(ii\)](#). Thus, by (4) from [Lemma 7](#), the edge is included with probability

$$P \frac{\angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)}{\pi} \geq \alpha \frac{1 - \cos \angle(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)}{2}.$$

Hence overall we include an edge (u, v) with probability at least $\alpha(1 - \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v)/2$. Since

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in E} \frac{1 - \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v}{2} \geq \rho - \varepsilon,$$

it follows that we return a triangle-free subgraph with expected weight $\alpha(\rho - \varepsilon)$.

Now, we derandomise our algorithm. First, note that rather than randomly choosing between [Case \(i\)](#) and [Case \(ii\)](#), we can just run both cases and return the better of the two solutions. Secondly, using the techniques of [[MR99](#)] (or, more efficiently [[BK05](#)]), we can derandomise the choice of random hyperplane in polynomial time, at the cost of losing ε' potential value, in polynomial time in $\log(1/\varepsilon')$. Hence, in polynomial time in the size of the graph and $\varepsilon, \varepsilon'$ we return a triangle-free subgraph with weight $\alpha(\rho - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon' \geq \alpha\rho - (\varepsilon + \varepsilon')$.

To complete the proof, note that we take $\alpha \geq 0.88232$, but we only advertise an approximation ratio of 0.8823. Hence, the subgraph we return has weight $0.8823\rho + 2 \cdot 10^{-5}\rho - (\varepsilon + \varepsilon')$, and since $\rho \geq |E|/2 \geq 1/2$ (since if $|E| = 0$ the problem is trivial), this is at least $0.8823\rho + (10^{-5} - \varepsilon - \varepsilon')$. Hence it is sufficient to choose $\varepsilon + \varepsilon' = 10^{-5}$. The algorithm then runs in polynomial time in the size of G , and finds a triangle-free subgraph with weight 0.8823ρ , as required. \square

5 Hardness results

Our general strategy will be to gadget reduce from the 3-bit PCP of Håstad [Hås01], similarly to [TSSW00] or [BGS98]. The main difficulty comes in from the fact that it is not possible to “negate” variables in an obvious way, since “negation” is not globally preserved by the property of being triangle-free, as opposed to that of being bipartite. Some mild complications will be forced by this. Recall first the definition of exactly-3 linear equations.

Definition 9. In the problem E3Lin_δ , one is given a system of mod-2 linear equations with exactly 3 variables per equation; i.e. $x+y+z \equiv 0 \pmod 2$ or $x+y+z \equiv 1 \pmod 2$. If it is possible to simultaneously solve a $1 - \delta$ fraction of all the equations, one must answer YES; otherwise, if it is not even possible to simultaneously solve a $\frac{1}{2} + \delta$ fraction of the equations, one must answer No.

Theorem 10 ([Hås01]). *For every small enough δ , the problem E3Lin_δ is NP-hard.*

To deal with our negation problems, we will need a “balanced” version of this problem.

Definition 11. In the problem $\text{BalancedE3Lin}_\delta$, one is given a system of mod-2 linear equations with exactly 3 variables per equation; i.e. $x + y + z \equiv 0 \pmod 2$ or $x + y + z \equiv 1 \pmod 2$. Furthermore, the number of equations of the two types is equal. A *balanced solution* to such a system of equations is one that satisfies exactly as many equations of form $x+y+z \equiv 0 \pmod 2$ as those of form $x+y+z \equiv 1 \pmod 2$.

If it is possible to find a balanced solution that satisfies a $1 - \delta$ fraction of all the equations, one must answer YES; otherwise, if it is not even possible to find any (*possibly even unbalanced*) solution that satisfies a $\frac{1}{2} + \delta$ fraction of the equations, one must answer No.

We believe that [Hås01] proves, without being explicit about it, NP-hardness of $\text{BalancedE3Lin}_\delta$, although it is not straightforward to see it from the proof in [Hås01]. For completeness, we provide a simple, self-contained reduction.

Lemma 12. *For every small enough δ , the problem $\text{BalancedE3Lin}_\delta$ is NP-hard.*

Proof. We reduce from E3Lin_δ to $\text{BalancedE3Lin}_\delta$.

Reduction. Given a system of m equations \mathcal{E} on n variables, which contains the equations $x_i + y_i + z_i \equiv p_i \pmod 2$ for $i \in [m]$,⁶ we define the system of equations \mathcal{E}' on n variables, which contains the equations $x'_i + y'_i + z'_i \equiv 1 - p_i \pmod 2$ for $i \in [m]$. We then return the system of equations $\mathcal{E} \sqcup \mathcal{E}'$ i.e. the disjoint union of the two systems.

Completeness. Suppose that \mathcal{E} has a solution $x_i \mapsto c(x_i)$ that satisfies a $1 - \delta$ fraction of the equations. Then the system $\mathcal{E} \sqcup \mathcal{E}'$ has a balanced solution that also satisfies a $1 - \delta$ fraction of its equations, namely the one that sends x_i to $c(x_i)$ and x'_i to $1 - c(x_i)$. This solution is balanced since every equation $x_i + y_i + z_i \equiv p_i \pmod 2$ that it solves within \mathcal{E} can be paired up with an equation $x'_i + y'_i + z'_i \equiv 1 - p_i \pmod 2$ which is solved in \mathcal{E}' .

⁶As usual, we denote by $[m]$ the set $\{1, \dots, m\}$.

Soundness. Suppose $\mathcal{E} \sqcup \mathcal{E}'$ has a solution $x_i \mapsto c(x_i), x'_i \mapsto d(x'_i)$, which satisfies a $\frac{1}{2} + \delta$ fraction of the equations. Such a solution must either satisfy a $\frac{1}{2} + \delta$ fraction of the equations within \mathcal{E} , or a $\frac{1}{2} + \delta$ fraction of the equations within \mathcal{E}' . In the first case, c is the required solution for the original problem; in the second, $x_i \mapsto 1 - d(x'_i)$ is the required solution. \square

We now define the notion of “gadget” that we will need for this particular reduction. This is along the same lines as [BGS98, TSSW00], but (i) generalised to deal with promise problems and (ii) specialised to our particular promise problem.

For the following, if $G = (V, E)$ is any bipartite graph, and $V' \subseteq V$, then we say that a function $c : V' \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is compatible with G if it is possible to extend c into a 2-colouring of G .

Definition 13. A gadget with performance $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and parity $p \in \{0, 1\}$ is a graph $G = (V, E)$, with $0, x, y, z \in V$, where the following hold.

1. For any function $c : \{0, x, y, z\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $c(0) + c(x) + c(y) + c(z) \equiv p \pmod{2}$, there exists a bipartite subgraph H of G with α edges, such that c is compatible with H .
2. Any triangle-free subgraph of G has at most α edges.
3. Every triangle-free subgraph H of G with strictly more than $\alpha - 1$ edges puts $0, x, y, z$ in the same connected component C , and the distance from 0 to x, y, z respectively is at most 2. Furthermore C is bipartite, and for any $c : \{0, x, y, z\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that is compatible with C , we have that $c(0) + c(x) + c(y) + c(z) \equiv p \pmod{2}$.

Lemma 14. Suppose we have n containers with capacities $c_1, \dots, c_n \geq 0$. Suppose we distribute a volume of $c_1 + \dots + c_n - n + a$ among the containers, distributing $v_i \leq c_i$ volume to container i . Then the number of containers i for which $v_i > c_i - 1$ is at least a .

Proof. If we want to minimise the number of containers with $v_i > c_i - 1$, it is optimal first to distribute $c_i - 1$ volume to each container i , and then for those containers where we are forced to distribute more to distribute up to c_i . The first step uses up $c_1 + \dots + c_n - n$ volume, leaving us with a volume to distribute. This volume of a cannot push fewer than $\lceil a \rceil$ of the containers above $c_i - 1$, since once pushed above this one can then add only 1 further unit to that container. \square

The following theorem encodes our reduction from the 3-bit PCP of [Hås01] to $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$. This reduction is standard, needing only some care to deal with the fact that the triangle-free graph selected in the soundness case must be “connected enough”.

Theorem 15. Suppose that for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ there exist gadgets G_i with performance α_i and parity i . Then it is NP-hard to approximate $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ with approximation ratio $1 - 1/(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1) + \varepsilon$.

Proof. We reduce $\text{BalancedE3Lin}_\delta$ to approximate $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ with approximation ratio $1 - 1/(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1) + \varepsilon$. Our choice of δ will be bounded above by a value that depends on ε . We now describe our gadget reduction.

Reduction. Suppose we are given an instance of $\text{BalancedE3Lin}_\delta$, with $2m$ constraints and n variables V . Suppose that the constraints are $x_i^0 + y_i^0 + z_i^0 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ and $x_i^1 + y_i^1 + z_i^1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ for $i \in [m]$. Our reduction first creates $n + 1$ vertices, one for every variable, plus a special vertex denoted by $0'$. For every constraint $x_i^p + y_i^p + z_i^p = p \pmod{2}$ we create a copy of G_p , identifying vertices $0, x, y, z$ with $0', x_i^p, y_i^p, z_i^p$.

Completeness. Suppose that our `BalancedE3Lin` instance has a balanced solution that satisfies at least a $1 - \delta$ fraction of the constraints. We claim that the graph outputted by our algorithm has a cut with at least $m(1 - \delta)(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1)$ edges. Indeed, this cut is guaranteed by [Item 1 in Definition 13](#): place the vertices corresponding to variables in the original problem in the cut according to their value; then the vertices in the gadgets are placed according to the cut guaranteed by this assumption. The cut then has at least $m(1 - \delta)(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1)$ edges because the solution is guaranteed to be balanced.

Soundness. Suppose that the graph outputted by our reduction has a triangle-free subgraph S with $m(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 - 1 + \delta) = m(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1) - 2m + m + 2m\delta$ edges. We call a constraint with parity i “good” if the intersection of S with the gadget corresponding to that constraint has weight greater than $\alpha_i - 1$. Observe that at least $m + 2m\delta$ constraints must be good by [Lemma 14](#): the gadgets for the $2m$ constraints are the containers; by [Item 2 from Definition 13](#), m of the capacities are α_0 , and m are α_1 ; finally, a constraint is “good” if its container is allocated strictly more volume than its capacity minus one. We now show how to create a solution to the original `BalancedE3Lin` instance that satisfies all the good constraints: this solution then satisfies a $(m + 2m\delta)/2m = 1/2 + \delta$ fraction of the constraints.

To create our solution, consider the subgraph S . Find the shortest path from $0'$ to every variable, then set the variable to the parity of the length of that path. (If there is no path, then we can set that variable arbitrarily.) Consider now any good constraint: suppose it is $x + y + z \equiv p \pmod{2}$. Suppose S' is the intersection of S with the gadget for this constraint. Since S is triangle-free, S' must be triangle-free; since the constraint is good, the weight of S' is strictly greater than $\alpha_i - 1$. By [Item 3 of Definition 13](#), S' is bipartite; furthermore and also S' connects $0'$ to x, y, z by paths of length at most 2. Thus the shortest path from $0'$ to x, y, z in S (as well as S') is also of length at most 2 as well. Since S is triangle-free, the parity of the length of the shortest path from $0'$ to x, y, z in S matches the parity of any path from $0'$ to x, y, z in S' . (To see why: if this were not the case, then for one of x, y, z , there are two paths from $0'$ of different parities, both of length at most 2. The first path is the one that exists in S by assumption, the second one is the one that exists in S' by [Item 3 of Definition 13](#). This implies a triangle in S , a contradiction.) Colouring according to the sides of the bipartite graph S' satisfies the constraint according to [Item 3 of Definition 13](#), and our colouring is the same as this. So all good constraints are satisfied.

Hardness factor. Thus we have shown that given a `BalancedE3Lin` instance with a balanced solution that satisfies a $1 - \delta$ fraction of the equations, our reduction yields a graph with a cut with $m(1 - \delta)(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1)$ edges; and if the graph we output has a triangle-free subgraph with at least $m(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 - 1 + \delta)$ edges the original instance must have had a solution that satisfies at least a $1/2 + \delta$ fraction of equations. It follows that $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, \mathfrak{G}_3)$ is NP-hard to approximate with approximation ratio

$$\frac{m(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 - 1 + \delta)}{m(1 - \delta)(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1)} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1} + O(\delta)\right) (1 + O(\delta)) = 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1} + O(\delta).$$

This can be made to be less than $1 - \frac{1}{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1} + \varepsilon$ by setting δ small enough. \square

We now exhibit the gadgets. The first gadget is identical to a gadget of Bellare, Goldreich and Sudan [[BGS98](#)] (although our analysis is slightly more complicated). In [[BGS98](#)], this gadget is called “PC-CUT”, defined immediately before [[BGS98](#), Claim 4.17]. The second gadget is a generalisation of the first. Recall that the gadgets of [[BGS98](#)] were improved in [[TSSW00](#)], and indeed the results of [[TSSW00](#)] indicate a generic method to find optimal gadgets for finite-domain CSPs. We do not believe this approach directly applies to our case because the property of being triangle-free is

not captured by any finite CSP template (indeed, \mathfrak{G}_3 is infinite, and any homomorphism-equivalent structure must also be).

We will write our gadgets as graphs with non-negative integer weights for simplicity of presentation. These gadgets can then be implemented by adding edges multiple times.

Lemma 16. *There exists a gadget with performance 9 and parity 1.*

Proof. Consider the complete graph on $\{0, a, x, y, z\}$. Suppose $w(a) = 2, w(0) = w(x) = w(y) = w(z) = 1$, and give an edge (i, j) weight $w(i, j) = w(i)w(j)$. We now show that this satisfies the conditions from [Definition 13](#).

1. Without loss of generality suppose $c(0) = 0$. We have two cases. First, suppose that $c(x) = c(y) = c(z) = 1$. Then our cut is $(\{x, y, z\}, \{a, 0\})$ which has weight 9. Conversely, suppose without loss of generality that $c(x) = c(y) = 0, c(z) = 1$. Then our cut is $(\{0, x, y\}, \{a, z\})$, which also has weight 9.
2. Consider any triangle-free subgraph of the gadget. This graph is either bipartite or it is C_5 . If it is bipartite, suppose it has parts (A, B) . Then

$$\sum_{i \in A, j \in B} w(i, j) = \left(\sum_{i \in A} w(i) \right) \left(\sum_{j \in B} w(j) \right),$$


and the optimal cut puts a (with weight 2) and one other vertex on one side, and the other three vertices on the other side — this cut has weight 9, as required (all other cuts have weight at most 8). On the other hand, if the triangle-free subgraph is C_5 it has weight at most $2+2+1+1+1 = 7 \leq 9$.

3. Consider any triangle-free subgraph of the gadget. By the analysis in the previous item, the only triangle-free subgraphs with weight greater than 8 are isomorphic to $K_{2,3}$, which put a and one of $0, x, y, z$ on one side, and the other three vertices on the other side. It is not difficult to check that all of these graphs connect 0 to x, y, z with paths of length at most 2, and that the sides of the cut exhibit the correct parity requirements. \square

Lemma 17. *There exists a gadget with performance 17 and parity 0.*

Proof. Consider the complete graph on $\{0, 1, a, x, y, z\}$. Let $w(a) = w(1) = 2, w(0) = w(x) = w(y) = w(z) = 1, \delta(0, 1) = \delta(1, 0) = 1$, whereas otherwise $\delta(i, j) = 0$. Then define $w(i, j) = w(i)w(j) + \delta(i, j)$.

1. Without loss of generality suppose $c(0) = 0$. There are two cases. First suppose $c(x) = c(y) = c(z) = 0$. Then our cut is $(\{x, y, z, 0\}, \{a, 1\})$ with weight 17. Otherwise, suppose without loss of generality that $c(x) = 0, c(y) = c(z) = 1$. Then our cut is $(\{1, y, z\}, \{0, a, x\})$, with weight 17.
2. Consider all the triangle-free subgraphs of the gadget. This subgraph is either bipartite, or it is a subgraph of the following graph



First we deal with the bipartite case. The weight of a complete bipartite graph with parts (A, B) is

$$\left(\sum_{i \in A, j \in B} \delta(i, j) \right) + \left(\sum_{i \in A} w(i) \right) \left(\sum_{j \in B} w(j) \right).$$

The first part of the sum is 1 if and only if 0 and 1 are in different sides of the cut, and the second is maximised exactly when the two sides of the cut are as even as possible i.e. have weight 4 and 4 respectively — cuts that satisfy both of these conditions weight at most $17 = 4 \times 4 + 1$ edges, while all other cuts have weight at most 16.

Now consider a non-bipartite triangle-free subgraph. The largest this could be is the graph pictured above. First consider the contribution of $w(i)w(j)$ to the total weight. Suppose for contradiction that the contribution is > 14 ; since there are 7 edges, there must exist one edge whose contribution is > 2 . Since $w(i)w(j) \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, and $w(i)w(j) = 4$ only for $\{i, j\} = \{a, 1\}$, a and 1 are adjacent within the subgraph. Since any way of placing $a, 1$ adjacently within the subgraph leads to them having at most 3 other neighbours, the contribution of $w(i)w(j)$ is at most $4 + 3 \times 2 + 3 \times 1 = 13 \not> 14$, a contradiction. So the contribution of $w(i)w(j)$ is at most 14, and the total weight is at most 15.

3. Consider now any triangle-free subgraph of the gadget with weight greater than 16. By the analysis in the previous item, this subgraph must be a complete bipartite subgraph where the two parts both have weight 4, and 0 and 1 are put on opposite sides of the cut. Consider the side of a : if it is on the same side as 1, then x, y, z are all on the opposite side i.e. together with 0. Conversely, if a is on the same side as 0, then two of x, y, z must be on the same side as 1, and the remaining vertex among x, y, z must be on the same side as 0. It is not difficult to check that these bipartite subgraphs satisfy the desired connectivity and parity conditions. \square

Acknowledgement

We thank Jakub Opršal, who asked us about the complexity of maximisation PCSPs for graphs beyond cliques, and for useful discussions.

A Proof of Theorem 3

We first introduce some useful notation. For any predicate φ , we let $[\varphi] = 1$ if φ is true, and 0 otherwise.

For an event φ we let $\Pr[\varphi]$ be the probability that φ is true. For a random variable X , we let $\mathbb{E}[X]$ denote its expected value. Note that $\mathbb{E}[[\varphi]] = \Pr[\varphi]$. For any two distributions $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$ with domains A, A' , we let $\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}'$ denote the product distribution, whose domain is $A \times A'$. For any distribution \mathcal{D} over \mathbb{R} and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, the distribution $a\mathcal{D} + b$ is the distribution of $aX + b$ when $X \sim \mathcal{D}$. We use the standard probability theory abbreviations i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) and p.m.f. (probability mass function).

We introduce a few classic distributions we will need. The uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(D)$ over a discrete set D is the distribution with p.m.f. $f : D \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by $f(x) = 1/|D|$. Note that $\mathcal{U}(D^n)$ is the same as $\mathcal{U}(D)^n$, a fact which we will use implicitly. We let $\text{NBin}(n)$ denote a normalised binomial distribution: it is the distribution of $X_1 + \dots + X_n$, where $X_i \sim \mathcal{U}(\{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}\})$. The domain of this distribution is $\{(-n + 2k)/\sqrt{n} \mid 0 \leq k \leq n\}$, the probability mass function is $(-n + 2k)/\sqrt{n} \mapsto \binom{n}{k}/2^n$,

the expectation is 0, and the variance is 1. If $\mu, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, then we let $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ denote the normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 . Fixing d , if $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d, \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, then we let $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ denote the multivariate normal distribution with mean μ and covariance matrix Σ . We let \mathbf{I}_d denote the $d \times d$ identity matrix. Observe that if $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then for any matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d' \times d}$ we have that $A\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(A\mu, A\Sigma A^T)$. Furthermore if $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ with Σ positive semidefinite, then by finding the Cholesky decomposition $\Sigma = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T$, where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we find that \mathbf{x} is identically distributed to $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}' + \mu$, where $\mathbf{x}' \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$.

Our goal is to prove the following result.

Theorem 3. $\text{MaxPCSP}(K_2, K_3)$ is solvable in polynomial time (in the search version).

Our proof will be split into three parts: First we prove some technical bounds which we will need. Next, we provide a randomised algorithm. Finally, we derandomise the algorithm.

Technical bounds. For the proof, we will need a technical lemma, stated as [Lemma 19](#) below. The proof of [Lemma 19](#) is an application of the following result of Cheng.

Theorem 18 ([\[Che68\]](#)[\[Che69, Equation \(2.18\)\]](#)). Suppose $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ are drawn from a quadrivariate normal distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a & b & ab \\ a & 1 & ab & b \\ b & ab & 1 & a \\ ab & b & a & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a, b \in [-1, 1]$. Then $\Pr_{\mathbf{u}}[u_1 \geq 0, u_2 \geq 0, u_3 \geq 0, u_4 \geq 0]$ is

$$\frac{1}{16} + \frac{\arcsin a + \arcsin b + \arcsin ab}{4\pi} + \frac{(\arcsin a)^2 + (\arcsin b)^2 - (\arcsin ab)^2}{4\pi^2}.$$

Lemma 19. Fix $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$. Suppose $x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ i.e. they are i.i.d. standard normal variables. The probability that

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &\geq x_2 \\ x_1 &\geq x_3 \\ \alpha x_1 + \beta y_1 &\geq \alpha x_2 + \beta y_2 \\ \alpha x_1 + \beta y_1 &\geq \alpha x_3 + \beta y_3 \end{aligned}$$

is precisely

$$P(\alpha) = \frac{1}{9} + \frac{\arcsin \alpha + \arcsin \frac{\alpha}{2}}{4\pi} + \frac{(\arcsin \alpha)^2 - (\arcsin \frac{\alpha}{2})^2}{4\pi^2}.$$

Proof. Define the following normally distributed random variables:

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= (x_1 - x_2)/\sqrt{2}, \\ u_2 &= (x_1 - x_3)/\sqrt{2}, \\ u_3 &= (\alpha x_1 + \beta y_1 - \alpha x_2 - \beta y_2)/\sqrt{2}, \\ u_4 &= (\alpha x_1 + \beta y_1 - \alpha x_3 - \beta y_3)/\sqrt{2}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: Plot of expressions from Lemma 20.

Observe that, by simple computation, and since $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$, we have that $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, where

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2} & \alpha & \frac{\alpha}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & 1 & \frac{\alpha}{2} & \alpha \\ \alpha & \frac{\alpha}{2} & 1 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{\alpha}{2} & \alpha & \frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The probability we want is just $\Pr_{\mathbf{u}}[u_1 \geq 0, u_2 \geq 0, u_3 \geq 0, u_4 \geq 0]$. Apply Theorem 18 with $a = \frac{1}{2}$ and $b = \alpha$ to find that the required probability is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{16} + \frac{\arcsin \frac{1}{2} + \arcsin \alpha + \arcsin \frac{\alpha}{2}}{4\pi} + \frac{(\arcsin \frac{1}{2})^2 + (\arcsin \alpha)^2 - (\arcsin \frac{\alpha}{2})^2}{4\pi^2} = \\ \frac{1}{9} + \frac{\arcsin \alpha + \arcsin \frac{\alpha}{2}}{4\pi} + \frac{(\arcsin \alpha)^2 - (\arcsin \frac{\alpha}{2})^2}{4\pi^2}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

We will need a bound on the $P(\alpha)$ function from Lemma 19.

Lemma 20. For $-1 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, $1 - 3P(\alpha) \geq \frac{1-\alpha}{2}$.

The functions involved are shown in Figure 3.

Proof. Define

$$f(\alpha) = 1 - 3P(\alpha) - \frac{1-\alpha}{2} = \frac{1}{6} + \frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{3}{4\pi} \left(\arcsin \alpha + \arcsin \frac{\alpha}{2} \right) - \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \left((\arcsin \alpha)^2 - \left(\arcsin \frac{\alpha}{2} \right)^2 \right).$$

We want to show that $f(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$. First we show that $f(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in [-1, 0]$. Numerically, we can find that

$$\max_{-1 < x < 1} f'''(x) \approx -0.1454 < 0,$$

at $x \approx -0.5681$. Thus $f''(x)$ is decreasing, and $f'(x)$ is concave. Thus, by Jensen's inequality, for $x \in (-1, 0)$,

$$f'(x) \geq -x \lim_{t \rightarrow -1^+} f'(t) + (1+x)f'(0),$$

(as f' is not defined at -1). But $f'(0) \approx 0.1419 > 0$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow -1^+} f'(t) \approx 0.1642 > 0$, so $f'(x) > 0$ for $x \in (-1, 0)$. It follows that f is increasing on $[-1, 0]$, which is sufficient to show that $f(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in [-1, 0]$, as $f(-1) = 0$.

Now, we consider $x \in [0, 1]$. Observe again that we know that $f''(x)$ is decreasing. But since $f''(0) \approx -0.1139 < 0$, it follows that $f''(x) < 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$; so f is concave on $[0, 1]$. Now, again applying Jensen's inequality, we find that for $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$f(x) \geq xf(0) + (1-x)f(1).$$

Now, $f(0) = 1/6 > 0$, and $f(1) = 0$, so $f(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$.

Thus our conclusion follows in all cases. \square

Randomised algorithm. We first provide a randomised version of our algorithm, accurate up to some ε .

Theorem 21 (Randomised version of [Theorem 3](#)). *There exists a randomised algorithm which, given a graph $G = (V, E)$ that has a cut with ρ edges and an accuracy parameter ε , finds a 3-colouring of G that satisfies $\rho - \varepsilon$ edges in expectation, in polynomial time with respect to the size of G and $\log(1/\varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Our algorithm is as follows. In essence, it solves the SDP of Goemans and Williamson [[GW95](#)] i.e. (1), then randomly rounds as the 3-colouring algorithm of Frieze and Jerrum [[FJ97](#)].

1. Input: a graph $G = (V, E)$, which admits a cut of weight ρ . Suppose $n = |V|$.
2. Solve SDP (1) to within error ε . Thus we get a set of vectors $\mathbf{x}_v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $v \in V$, with $\|\mathbf{x}_v\|^2 = 1$ and

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in E} \frac{1 - \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v}{2} \geq \rho - \varepsilon.$$
3. Sample three i.i.d. normally distributed n -dimensional vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$.
4. Set the colour of node u to $\arg \max_i \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{a}_i$. (Break ties arbitrarily.)

Let us compute the expected number of edges which are satisfied by this 3-colouring. Consider an edge $(u, v) \in E$; in terms of $\frac{1 - \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v}{2}$, what is the probability that (u, v) is properly coloured? This is the same as the probability that $\arg \max_i \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{a}_i \neq \arg \max_u \mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{a}_i$, which, by symmetry, is equal to

$$1 - 3 \Pr_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3} [\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{a}_1 \geq \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{a}_1 \geq \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{a}_3, \mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{a}_1 \geq \mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{a}_1 \geq \mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{a}_3]. \quad (7)$$

Since $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3$ are selected from a rotationally symmetric distribution, we can rotate everything to be in a 2-dimensional plane without affecting the probability in (7). Furthermore, we can rotate so that \mathbf{x}_u is moved to $(1, 0)$, and \mathbf{x}_v is at (α, β) , where $\alpha = \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v$ and $\beta = \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2}$ (note that this rotation is possible since it preserves the angle between \mathbf{x}_u and \mathbf{x}_v , and their lengths). Since (the projection to this plane of) the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3$ are bivariate standard normal variables, we can see them as pairs

$(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2), (a_3, b_3)$, where $a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ are i.i.d. standard normal variables. Then, we can rewrite (7) as

$$1 - 3 \Pr_{\substack{a_1, a_2, a_3 \\ b_1, b_2, b_3}} [a_1 \geq a_2, a_1 \geq a_3, \alpha a_1 + \beta b_1 \geq \alpha a_2 + \beta b_2, \alpha a_1 + \beta b_1 \geq \alpha a_3 + \beta b_3]. \quad (8)$$

By Lemma 19, the expression in (8) is $1 - 3P(\alpha)$, which is, by Lemma 20, at least $\frac{1-\alpha}{2} = \frac{1-\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v}{2}$. Thus, by linearity of expectation, the expected number of edges we satisfy is at least $\sum_{(u,v) \in E} \frac{1-\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v}{2} \geq \rho - \varepsilon$, as required. \square

Derandomised algorithm. We will now show how to derandomise our algorithm, using the method of conditional expectations, which was also used by Mahajan and Ramesh [MR99]. The approach of Bhargava and Kosaraju [BK05] derandomises conditional probabilities by an approximation of normal distributions via polynomials; we approximate simply just with a scaled binomial distribution. Our goal will be the following general derandomisation theorem.

Theorem 22. *Fix a constant d . There exists an algorithm that does the following. Suppose we are given $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{x}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y_{ij}, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $i \in [m], j \in [d]$. Suppose $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ and that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \Pr_{\mathbf{a}} \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a} > y_{ij} \right] \geq \rho$$

for some $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the algorithm computes some particular $\mathbf{a}^* = (a_1^*, \dots, a_d^*) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a}^* > y_{ij} \right] \geq \rho - \varepsilon,$$

in polynomial time with respect to $n, m, 1/\varepsilon$.

To facilitate the proof of Theorem 22, we will need a multidimensional version of the Berry-Esseen theorem. We will use the following version with explicit constants, due to Raič [Rai19].

Theorem 23 ([Rai19, Theorem 1.1]). *Suppose $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are independent random variables with mean zero, such that the sum of their covariance matrices is \mathbf{I}_d . Let $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{t}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{t}_N$. Suppose $\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$, and let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be convex and measurable. Then*

$$|\Pr_{\mathbf{s}}[\mathbf{s} \in C] - \Pr_{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{a} \in C]| \leq \left(42\sqrt[4]{d} + 16\right) \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{E} [\|\mathbf{t}_i\|^3].$$

The following is an easy and well-known corollary of Theorem 23: We can approximate a multivariate normal distribution with binomial distributions. For completeness, we provide a proof.

Corollary 24. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be a constant and take $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Take*

$$N = N_\varepsilon \geq \left(\frac{42d^{7/4} + 16d^{3/2}}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 = \frac{\xi_d}{\varepsilon^2}, \quad (9)$$

where $\xi_d = O(d^{7/2})$ depends only on d . Suppose $s_1, \dots, s_N \sim \text{NBin}(N)$ are i.i.d., and let $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_d)$. Let $\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. Then for all convex measurable sets $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$|\Pr_{\mathbf{s}}[\mathbf{s} \in C] - \Pr_{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{a} \in C]| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Note that each component of \mathbf{s} is i.i.d. and distributed as the sum of N independent trials that take value $\pm 1/\sqrt{N}$ equiprobably. In other words, we can see \mathbf{s} as the sum $\mathbf{t}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{t}_N$, where $\mathbf{t}_1, \dots, \mathbf{t}_N \sim \mathcal{U}(\{-1/\sqrt{N}, 1/\sqrt{N}\}^d)$ are i.i.d. Observe that the covariance matrix of \mathbf{t}_i is \mathbf{I}_d/N , so the sum of these covariance matrices for all i is \mathbf{I}_d . Furthermore $\|\mathbf{t}_i\| = \sqrt{(\pm 1/\sqrt{N})^2 + \dots + (\pm 1/\sqrt{N})^2} = \sqrt{d/N}$ with probability 1. Now, apply [Theorem 23](#) to $\mathbf{s} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{t}_i$. We find that

$$|\Pr_{\mathbf{s}}[\mathbf{s} \in C] - \Pr_{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{a} \in C]| \leq (42\sqrt[4]{d} + 16) \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{t}_i\|^3] = (42\sqrt[4]{d} + 16) N \sqrt{\frac{d}{N}} = \frac{42d^{7/4} + 16d^{3/2}}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Substituting [\(9\)](#), it follows that $|\Pr_{\mathbf{s}}[\mathbf{s} \in C] - \Pr_{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{a} \in C]| \leq \varepsilon$, as required. \square

Theorem 25. Fix a constant d , and take $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d \in \mathbb{R}^n, y_1, \dots, y_d \in \mathbb{R}, z_1, \dots, z_d \in \mathbb{R}, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider the function

$$p(t) = \Pr_{\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)} \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{a} + z_i t > y_i \right].$$

There exists a step function \widehat{p} with $\text{poly}(1/\varepsilon)$ steps, where the steps and the values at those steps are computable in polynomial time with respect to $1/\varepsilon$ and n , such that $|\widehat{p}(t) - p(t)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Observe that the tuple $(\mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d \cdot \mathbf{a})$ (interpreted as a column vector) is a d -variate normally distributed vector; namely, if we let

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^T \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_d^T \end{pmatrix}$$

be a block matrix whose rows are $\mathbf{x}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d^T$, then $(\mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d \cdot \mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{X}\mathbf{I}_n\mathbf{X}^T) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T)$.

We can compute the covariance matrix, namely $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T$, in polynomial time with respect to n . Now, by computing the Cholesky decomposition of this positive semidefinite matrix, we can find $\mathbf{X}' \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}'^T = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T$. Thus $(\mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d \cdot \mathbf{a}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}'^T)$. Letting $\mathbf{x}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_d$ be the rows of \mathbf{X}' , we find that $(\mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d \cdot \mathbf{a})$ is identically distributed to $(\mathbf{x}'_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}', \dots, \mathbf{x}'_d \cdot \mathbf{a}')$, when $\mathbf{a} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ and $\mathbf{a}' \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$, since both follow the distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}'^T)$. Thus,

$$p(t) = \Pr_{\mathbf{a}' \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)} \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{a}' + z_i t > y_i \right].$$

In other words, we have reduced the dimensionality of our problem from n to d , a constant.

Note that the set defined by $\bigwedge_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{a}' + z_i t > y_i$ is necessarily convex and measurable, being the intersection of finitely many half-spaces. Thus we can apply [Corollary 24](#). Let $N = N_\varepsilon$ and $s_1, \dots, s_N \sim \text{NBin}(N)$, and suppose $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_d)$. Then, we know that

$$\left| p(t) - \Pr_{\mathbf{s}} \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{s} + z_i t > y_i \right] \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

This suggests using the following definition:

$$\widehat{p}(t) = \Pr_{\mathbf{s}} \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{s} + z_i t > y_i \right],$$

as this must satisfy the condition $|\widehat{p}(t) - p(t)| \leq \varepsilon$. What remains is to show that \widehat{p} is a step function, and that these steps can be efficiently computed.

Intuitively, this is the case since the probability distribution we define \widehat{p} over is discrete. More precisely, letting $D = \{-N/\sqrt{N}, (-N+2)/\sqrt{N}, \dots, (N-2)/\sqrt{N}, N/\sqrt{N}\}^d$ be the domain of \mathbf{s} , and letting q be the p.m.f. of \mathbf{s} (note that it can be efficiently computed, since \mathbf{s} is essentially distributed according to a product distribution of normalised binomials), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{p}(t) &= \Pr_{\mathbf{s}} \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{s} + z_i t > y_i \right] = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in D} q(\mathbf{u}) \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{u} + z_i t > y_i \right] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in D} q(\mathbf{u}) \left[z_i t > \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} y_i - \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{u} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that, for each $\mathbf{u} \in D$, the function

$$t \mapsto q(\mathbf{u}) \left[z_i t > \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} y_i - \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{u} \right]$$

is a step function with at most one step: if $z_i = 0$ then the function is a constant (whose value is easy to compute); otherwise the step is at $(1/z_i) \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} y_i - \mathbf{x}'_i \cdot \mathbf{u}$, where the step being increasing or decreasing is determined by the sign of z_i (and again the values of the function are easy to compute). It therefore follows that \widehat{p} is a step function that has at most $|D| = N^d_\varepsilon = \text{poly}(1/\varepsilon)$ steps, and that each of the values that the function takes can be computed in polynomial time with respect to $1/\varepsilon$ and n . \square

Proof of Theorem 22. We give a recursive algorithm. If $n = 0$ then there is nothing to output, so assume $n \geq 1$. Let $\mathbf{a} = (t, \mathbf{a}')$, and $\mathbf{x}_{ij} = (z_{ij}, \mathbf{x}'_{ij})$ — in other words, separate out the first variable. We are given that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \Pr_{\mathbf{a}', t} \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a}' + z_{ij} t > y_{ij} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^m \Pr_{\mathbf{a}} \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a} > y_{ij} \right] \geq \rho,$$

when $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{a}', t) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$. But then this must be true for some particular value of t , say t^* , i.e.

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \Pr_{\mathbf{a}'} \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a}' + z_{ij} t^* > y_{ij} \right] \geq \rho. \quad (10)$$

Apply Theorem 25 to each of the probabilities above viewed as functions of t , with $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon/2nm$; we thus build step functions p_1, \dots, p_m in polynomial time with respect to n and $1/\varepsilon' = 2nm/\varepsilon$, such that

$$\left| p_i(t) - \Pr_{\mathbf{a}'} \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a}' + z_{ij} t > y_{ij} \right] \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2nm}$$

for all t . Add these equations for $i = 1, \dots, m$ to find

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^m p_i(t) - \sum_{i=1}^m \Pr_{\mathbf{a}'} \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a}' + z_{ij} t > y_{ij} \right] \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2n}. \quad (11)$$

Observe that $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i$ is a step function with polynomially many steps with respect to n, m , whose values are also computable in polynomial time. Thus it is easy to find some value \hat{t} that maximises the expression $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i(\hat{t})$. By (10) and (11) we have that $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i(\hat{t}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m p_i(t^*) \geq \rho - \frac{\varepsilon}{2n}$, and by (11) again we find that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \Pr_{\mathbf{a}'} \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a}' + z_{ij} \hat{t} > y_{ij} \right] \geq \rho - \frac{\varepsilon}{n}.$$

Equivalently,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \Pr_{\mathbf{a}'} \left[\bigwedge_{j=1}^d \mathbf{x}'_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{a}' > y_{ij} - z_{ij} \hat{t} \right] \geq \rho - \frac{\varepsilon}{n},$$

and we can recursively find optimal values for the remaining random variables in \mathbf{a}' . Observe that our recursive depth is n , that at each level we use polynomial time with respect to $n, m, 1/\varepsilon$, and that, finally, at each step we lose ε/n from the sum of our probabilities. These facts together imply the correctness of our general derandomisation procedure.

We note in passing that the total time complexity of our method is exponential in d ; however this does not matter, as we consider d a constant. \square

This is enough to derandomise our algorithm.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $G = (V, E)$, where $V = [n]$ (without loss of generality) and $m = |E|$. Suppose this graph has a cut of size ρ . By the analysis of our randomised algorithm from Theorem 2 with $\varepsilon = 1/3$, using SDP we can find, in polynomial time with respect to G , a set of vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ such that $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 = 1$ and, if $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ are normally distributed variables, then

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in E} \Pr_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3} \left[\arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_k \cdot \mathbf{x}_u \neq \arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_v \right] \geq \rho - \frac{1}{3}.$$

Now, let $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{3n})$, and define \mathbf{x}_{ui} such that $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{ui} = \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_u$; in other words, pad out \mathbf{x}_u with $2n$ zeroes. In what follows, let \oplus denote addition mod 3 over $[3]$. We first claim that the event

$$\arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_u \neq \arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_v,$$

can be seen as the disjoint union of 6 intersections of 4 half spaces in the space of \mathbf{a} . To express it in this way, first fix the value of the respective sides to $c \neq c'$, where $c, c' \in [3]$. Observe that the event that $\arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_u = c$ is the same as $\mathbf{a}_c \cdot \mathbf{x}_u > \mathbf{a}_{c \oplus 1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{a}_c \cdot \mathbf{x}_u > \mathbf{a}_{c \oplus 2} \cdot \mathbf{x}_u$. Now, using the notation from before, this is equivalent to $\mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{uc} - \mathbf{x}_{u, c \oplus 1}) > 0 \wedge \mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{uc} - \mathbf{x}_{u, c \oplus 2}) > 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho - \frac{1}{3} &\leq \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \Pr_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \mathbf{a}_3} \left[\arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_u \neq \arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_v \right] \\ &= \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \sum_{c \neq c'} \Pr_{\mathbf{a}} \left[\mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{uc} - \mathbf{x}_{u, c \oplus 1}) > 0 \wedge \mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{uc} - \mathbf{x}_{u, c \oplus 2}) > 0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \wedge \mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{vc'} - \mathbf{x}_{v, c' \oplus 1}) > 0 \wedge \mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{vc'} - \mathbf{x}_{v, c' \oplus 2}) > 0 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By [Theorem 22](#) with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{3}$, we can find particular values \mathbf{a}^* such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(u,v) \in E} \sum_{c \neq c'} [\mathbf{a}^* \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{uc} - \mathbf{x}_{u,c \oplus 1}) > 0 \wedge \mathbf{a}^* \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{uc} - \mathbf{x}_{u,c \oplus 2}) > 0 \\ \wedge \mathbf{a}^* \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{vc'} - \mathbf{x}_{v,c' \oplus 1}) > 0 \wedge \mathbf{a}^* \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{vc'} - \mathbf{x}_{v,c' \oplus 2}) > 0] \geq \\ \geq \rho - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3} = \rho - \frac{2}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining $(\mathbf{a}_1^*, \mathbf{a}_2^*, \mathbf{a}_3^*) = \mathbf{a}^*$, this is equivalent to

$$\sum_{(u,v) \in E} [\arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{x}_u \neq \arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{x}_v] \geq \rho - \frac{2}{3}.$$

In other words, if we set the colour of vertex u to $\arg \max_i \mathbf{a}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{x}_u$, then we will correctly colour at least $\rho - 2/3$ edges. Now, note that $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the number of correctly coloured edges must also be an integer, and it is at least $\rho - 2/3$, it follows that it is at least ρ . Thus our algorithm returns a 3-colouring of value ρ , as required. \square

References

- [ABP20] Per Austrin, Amey Bhangale, and Aditya Potukuchi. Improved inapproximability of rainbow coloring. In *Proc. 31st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA'20)*, pages 1479–1495, 2020. [arXiv:1810.02784](#), [doi:10.1137/1.9781611975994.90](#).
- [AGH17] Per Austrin, Venkatesan Guruswami, and Johan Håstad. $(2+\varepsilon)$ -Sat is NP-hard. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 46(5):1554–1573, 2017. [doi:10.1137/15M1006507](#).
- [BBK⁺24] Libor Barto, Silvia Butti, Alexandr Kazda, Caterina Viola, and Stanislav Živný. Algebraic approach to approximation. In *39th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS'24)*, pages 10:1–10:14. ACM, 2024. [arXiv:2401.15186](#), [doi:10.1145/3661814.3662076](#).
- [BBKO21] Libor Barto, Jakub Bulín, Andrei A. Krokhin, and Jakub Opršal. Algebraic approach to promise constraint satisfaction. *J. ACM*, 68(4):28:1–28:66, 2021. [arXiv:1811.00970](#), [doi:10.1145/3457606](#).
- [BG21] Joshua Brakensiek and Venkatesan Guruswami. Promise Constraint Satisfaction: Algebraic Structure and a Symmetric Boolean Dichotomy. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(6):1663–1700, 2021. [arXiv:1704.01937](#), [doi:10.1137/19M128212X](#).
- [BGS98] Mihir Bellare, Oded Goldreich, and Madhu Sudan. Free Bits, PCPs, and Nonapproximability — Towards Tight Results. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 27(3):804–915, 1998. [doi:10.1137/S0097539796302531](#).
- [BGS23] Joshua Brakensiek, Venkatesan Guruswami, and Sai Sandeep. SDPs and Robust Satisfiability of Promise CSP. In *Proc. Annual 55th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'23)*, pages 609–622. ACM, 2023. [arXiv:2211.08373](#), [doi:10.1145/3564246.3585180](#).

- [BK05] Ankur Bhargava and S. Rao Kosaraju. Derandomization of dimensionality reduction and SDP based algorithms. In *Proc. 8th International Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures (WADS'05)*, pages 396–408. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005. doi:10.1007/11534273_35.
- [BK21] Amey Bhangale and Subhash Khot. Optimal Inapproximability of Satisfiable k -LIN over Non-Abelian Groups. In *Proc. 53rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'21)*, pages 1615–1628. ACM, 2021. arXiv:2009.02815, doi:10.1145/3406325.3451003.
- [BKM22] Amey Bhangale, Subhash Khot, and Dor Minzer. On Approximability of Satisfiable k -CSPs: I. In *Proc. 54th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'22)*, pages 976–988. ACM, 2022. doi:10.1145/3519935.3520028.
- [BKM23a] Amey Bhangale, Subhash Khot, and Dor Minzer. On Approximability of Satisfiable k -CSPs: II. In *Proc. 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'23)*, pages 632–642. ACM, 2023. doi:10.1145/3564246.3585120.
- [BKM23b] Amey Bhangale, Subhash Khot, and Dor Minzer. On Approximability of Satisfiable k -CSPs: III. In *Proc. 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'23)*, pages 643–655. ACM, 2023. doi:10.1145/3564246.3585121.
- [BKM24] Amey Bhangale, Subhash Khot, and Dor Minzer. On Approximability of Satisfiable k -CSPs: IV. In *Proc. 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'24)*, pages 1423–1434. ACM, 2024. doi:10.1145/3618260.3649610.
- [Bul17] Andrei A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform CSPs. In *Proc. 58th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'17)*, pages 319–330, USA, 2017. IEEE. arXiv:1703.03021, doi:10.1109/FOCS.2017.37.
- [Che68] M. Cheng. The clipping loss in correlation detectors for arbitrary input signal-to-noise ratios. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 14(3):382–389, 1968. doi:10.1109/TIT.1968.1054159.
- [Che69] M. C. Cheng. The orthant probabilities of four gaussian variates. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 40(1):152–161, 1969. doi:10.1214/aoms/1177697812.
- [DRS05] Irit Dinur, Oded Regev, and Clifford Smyth. The hardness of 3-uniform hypergraph coloring. *Comb.*, 25(5):519–535, September 2005. doi:10.1007/s00493-005-0032-4.
- [Euc26] Euclid. *The Thirteen Books of Euclid's Elements*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1926. Trans. Sir Thomas Little Heath.
- [FJ97] Alan M. Frieze and Mark Jerrum. Improved Approximation Algorithms for MAX k -CUT and MAX BISECTION. *Algorithmica*, 18(1):67–81, 1997. doi:10.1007/BF02523688.
- [GJ76] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. The complexity of near-optimal graph coloring. *J. ACM*, 23(1):43–49, 1976. doi:10.1145/321921.321926.
- [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. doi:10.1145/227683.227684.

- [Hås01] Johan Håstad. Some optimal inapproximability results. *J. ACM*, 48(4):798–859, 7 2001. doi:[10.1145/502090.502098](https://doi.org/10.1145/502090.502098).
- [HN90] Pavol Hell and Jaroslav Nešetřil. On the Complexity of H -coloring. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 48(1):92–110, 1990. doi:[10.1016/0095-8956\(90\)90132-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0095-8956(90)90132-J).
- [Kar72] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Complexity of Computer Computations: Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–103. Springer US, 1972. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9).
- [Kho02] Subhash Khot. On the power of unique 2-prover 1-round games. In *Proc. 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'02)*, pages 767–775. ACM, 2002. doi:[10.1145/509907.510017](https://doi.org/10.1145/509907.510017).
- [KKMO07] Subhash Khot, Guy Kindler, Elchanan Mossel, and Ryan O’Donnell. Optimal Inapproximability Results for MAX-CUT and Other 2-Variable CSPs? *SIAM J. Comput.*, 37(1):319–357, 2007. doi:[10.1137/S0097539705447372](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539705447372).
- [MOO10] Elchanan Mossel, Ryan O’Donnell, and Krzysztof Oleszkiewicz. Noise stability of functions with low influences: invariance and optimality. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171(1):295–341, 2010. doi:[10.4007/annals.2010.171.295](https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2010.171.295).
- [MR99] Sanjeev Mahajan and H. Ramesh. Derandomizing approximation algorithms based on semidefinite programming. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 28(5):1641–1663, 1999. doi:[10.1137/S0097539796309326](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539796309326).
- [PY91] Christos H. Papadimitriou and Mihalis Yannakakis. Optimization, approximation, and complexity classes. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 43(3):425–440, 1991. doi:[10.1016/0022-0000\(91\)90023-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(91)90023-X).
- [Rag08] Prasad Raghavendra. Optimal algorithms and inapproximability results for every CSP? In *Proc. 40th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'08)*, pages 245–254, 2008. doi:[10.1145/1374376.1374414](https://doi.org/10.1145/1374376.1374414).
- [Rai19] Martin Raič. A multivariate Berry–Esseen theorem with explicit constants. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):2824 – 2853, 2019. arXiv:[1802.06475](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.06475), doi:[10.3150/18-BEJ1072](https://doi.org/10.3150/18-BEJ1072).
- [RS09] Prasad Raghavendra and David Steurer. How to round any CSP. In *Proc. 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'09)*, pages 586–594. IEEE Computer Society, 2009. doi:[10.1109/FOCS.2009.74](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2009.74).
- [TSSW00] Luca Trevisan, Gregory B. Sorkin, Madhu Sudan, and David P. Williamson. Gadgets, approximation, and linear programming. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 29(6):2074–2097, 2000. doi:[10.1137/S0097539797328847](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539797328847).
- [TŽ16] Johan Thapper and Stanislav Živný. The Complexity of Finite-Valued CSPs. *J. ACM*, 63(4):37:1–37:33, 2016. doi:[10.1145/2974019](https://doi.org/10.1145/2974019).
- [Zhu20] Dmitriy Zhuk. A proof of the CSP dichotomy conjecture. *J. ACM*, 67(5):30:1–30:78, 2020. arXiv:[1704.01914](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.01914), doi:[10.1145/3402029](https://doi.org/10.1145/3402029).