Computational Lower Bounds for Community Detection on Random Graphs

Bruce Hajek, Yihong Wu, Jiaming Xu

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

COLT, July 3-6, 2015

Community detection in networks

Networks with community structures arise in many applications



Collaboration network: 118 scientists [Girvan-Newman '02]

Community detection in networks

Networks with community structures arise in many applications



Collaboration network: 118 scientists [Girvan-Newman '02]

• Task: Find underlying communities based on the network topology

Community detection in networks

Networks with community structures arise in many applications



Collaboration network: 118 scientists [Girvan-Newman '02]

- Task: Find underlying communities based on the network topology
- Applications: Friend or movie recommendation in online social networks











- One cluster of size K plus 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

Planted clique hardness hypothesis



[Alon et al. '98] [Dekel et al. '10] [Deshpande-Montanari '13]... Intermediate regime: $\log n \ll K \ll \sqrt{n}$, $\gamma = \Theta(1)$

 detection is possible but believed to have high computational complexity: [Alon et al. '11] [Feldman et al. '13]...

Planted clique hardness hypothesis



[Alon et al. '98] [Dekel et al. '10] [Deshpande-Montanari '13]... Intermediate regime: $\log n \ll K \ll \sqrt{n}$, $\gamma = \Theta(1)$

- 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 $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$
 - detecting sparse principal component [Berthet-Rigollet '13]
 - detecting sparse submatrix [Ma-Wu '13]
 - cryptography [Applebaum et al. '10]: $\gamma = 2^{-\log^{0.99} n}$

Main result: Hardness for detecting a single cluster

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



Main result: Hardness for detecting a single cluster

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



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

Corollary: Hardness for recovering a single cluster

Can show: Hardness of detection implies hardness or recovery, so: Assuming Planted Clique hardness for any constant $\gamma > 0$



Corollary: Hardness for *recovering* a single cluster

Can show: Hardness of detection implies hardness or recovery, so: Assuming Planted Clique hardness for any constant $\gamma > 0$



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

Proof requires a polynomial time reduction

$$h: A_{n \times n} \mapsto \widetilde{A}_{N \times N}$$

$$H_0: \operatorname{Bern}(\gamma) \qquad \operatorname{Bern}(q)$$

$$vs \qquad vs$$

$$H_1: k \operatorname{clique}_k \qquad K \operatorname{Bern}(p)$$

$$K$$

Proof requires a polynomial time reduction



 $h: A \mapsto \widetilde{A}$ is agnostic to the clique and can be computed in P-time





Split each node into ℓ new nodes $N = n\ell, K = k\ell$

Assign edges with distributions *P*, *Q*



Split each node into ℓ new nodes $N = n\ell, K = k\ell$

Assign edges with distributions *P*, *Q*





How to choose *P*, *Q*?

Matching H_0 : $(1 - \gamma)Q + \gamma P = \text{Binom}(\ell^2, q)$ Matching H_1 approximately: $P \approx \text{Binom}(\ell^2, p)$ in total variation distance

Please see paper for more information and references

Thanks!