# Computational Lower Bounds for Community Detection on Random Graphs

# Bruce Hajek, Yihong Wu, and Jiaming Xu

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering Coordinated Science Laboratory University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Wharton School of Statistics University of Pennsylvannia

#### Community detection in networks

Networks with community structures arise in many applications



#### Hardness for *detecting* a single cluster

Assuming Planted Clique hardness for any constant  $\gamma > 0$ :

 $\beta \uparrow K = \Theta(n^{\beta})$ 

Formal statement of hardness of detecting a cluster

 $\gamma$ : edge probability in Planted Clique

### Theorem

Assume Planted Clique Hypothesis holds for

Collaboration network: [Girvan-Newman '02]

Task: Find underlying communities based on the network topology

Applications: Friend or movie recommendation in online social networks

# Cluster recovery under stochastic blockmodel

Vast literature on stochastic blockmodel [Holland et al. '83] and planted partition model [Condon-Karp '01]:
[Bickel-Chen '09] [Rohe et al. '10] [Jin '12] [Mossel et al. '12] [Mossel et al. '13] [Mossel et al. '14] [Cai-Li' 14] [Guédon-Vershynin '14] [Arias-Castro-Verzelen '14] [Lei-Rinaldo '14] [Le-Levina-Vershynin '15] ...



Main result: *Detecting* a single cluster in the red regime is at least as hard as detecting a clique of size  $K = o(\sqrt{n})$ 

# Hardness for *recovering* a single cluster

Can show: Hardness of detection implies hardness or recovery, so: Assuming Planted Clique hardness for any constant  $\gamma > 0$ : all  $0 < \gamma \le 1/2$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$  and  $0 < \beta < 1$  be such that

$$\alpha < \beta < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{4}.$$

Then there exists a sequence  $\{(N_{\ell}, K_{\ell}, q_{\ell})\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying  $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{-\log q_{\ell}}{\log N_{\ell}} = \alpha$  and  $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{\log K_{\ell}}{\log N_{\ell}} = \beta$  such that for any sequence of randomized polynomial-time tests  $\phi_{\ell}$  for the PDS $(N_{\ell}, K_{\ell}, 2q_{\ell}, q_{\ell})$  problem, the Type-I+II error probability is lower bounded by 1.

Proof requires a polynomial time reduction

 $\mapsto$ 

$$7: A_{n \times n}$$

VS

$$\widetilde{A}_{N \times N}$$

 $H_0$ : Bern $(\gamma)$ 



- [Karrer-Newman '11] [Decelle et al. '11]
   [Nadakuditi-Newman '12] [Krzakala et al. '13]
   [Saade et al. '15] ...
- [McSherry '01] [Coja-Oghlan '10] [Chaudhuri et al. '12] [Ames '12] [Chen-Sanghavi-Xu '12] [Heimlicher et al. '12] [Anandkumar et al. '13] [Lelarge et al. '13] [Massoulié '13] [Vinayak-Oymak-Hassibi '14] [Abbe et al. '14] [Yun-Proutiere '14] [Abbe-Sandon '15] [Chin-Rao-Vu '15] ...

This paper focuses on a single community



*n* – *K* outliers
Connectivity *p* within cluster and *q* otherwise
Also known as *Planted Dense Subgraph* model *p* = 1, *q* = γ corresponds to *Planted Clique* model

One cluster of size *K* plus

Planted clique hardness hypothesis



Corollary of main result: *Recovering* a single cluster in the red regime is at least as hard as detecting a clique of size  $K = o(\sqrt{n})$ 

About the spectral barrier [Nadakuditi-Newman '12]



 $H_1$ : clique



VS

Need  $h : A \mapsto \widetilde{A}$  agnostic to the clique and computable in polynomial time. Given an integer  $\ell$ , two probability distributions P, Q on  $\{0, 1, \dots, \ell^2\}$ 



How to choose P, Q? Matching  $H_0$ :  $(1 - \gamma)Q + \gamma P = \text{Binom}(\ell^2, q)$ Matching  $H_1$  approximately:  $P \approx \text{Binom}(\ell^2, p)$ 



[Alon et al. '98] [Dekel et al. '10]
[Deshpande-Montanari '13]...
Intermediate regime: log n ≪ K ≪ √n, γ = Θ(1)
detection is possible but believed to have high computational complexity: [Alon et al. '11] [Feldman et al. '13]...

 many (worst-case) hardness results assuming Planted Clique hardness with γ = <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>
 detecting sparse principal component [Berthet-Rigollet '13]
 detecting sparse submatrix [Ma-Wu '13]
 cryptography [Applebaum et al. '10]: γ = 2<sup>-log<sup>0.99</sup> n</sup>  $\frac{1}{\sigma_{2}} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{2}} =$ 

Conjecture [Chen-Xu '14]: no polynomial-time algorithm can recover beyond the spectral barrier. (Our corollary partially resolves this conjecture.)

#### in total variation distance

Lemma (Bound the total variation distance)

Let  $\ell, n \in \mathbb{N}, k \in [n]$  and  $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Let  $N = \ell n, K = k\ell, p = 2q$  and  $m_0 = \lfloor \log_2(1/\gamma) \rfloor$ . Assume that  $16q\ell^2 \leq 1$ and  $k \geq 6e\ell$ . If  $G \sim \mathcal{G}(n, \gamma)$ , then  $\widetilde{G} \sim \mathcal{G}(N, q)$ . If  $G \sim \mathcal{G}(n, k, 1, \gamma)$ , then  $d_{\text{TV}}(P_{\widetilde{G}}, \mathcal{G}(N, K, p, q)) \leq e^{-K} + ke^{-\ell} + k^2(q\ell^2)^{m_0+1} + \sqrt{e^{q\ell^2} - 1}$ 

Please see paper for more information and references

