

The Complexity of Contracting Planar Tensor Networks

Ying Liu¹ ✉

State Key Laboratory of Computer Science, China
Institute of Software Chinese Academy of Sciences, China
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Abstract

Tensor networks have been an important concept and technique in many research areas, such as quantum computation and machine learning. We study the exponential complexity of contracting tensor networks on two special graph structures: planar graphs and finite element graphs.

We prove that any finite element graph has a $O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})$ size edge separator. Furthermore, we develop a $2^{O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})}$ time algorithm to contracting a tensor network consisting of N Boolean tensors, whose underlying graph is a finite element graph with maximum degree Δ and has no face with more than d boundary edges in the planar skeleton, based on the $2^{O(\sqrt{\Delta N})}$ time algorithm [21] for planar Boolean tensor network contractions.

We use two methods to accelerate the exponential algorithms by transferring high-dimensional tensors to low-dimensional tensors. We put up a $O(k)$ size planar gadget for any Boolean symmetric tensor of dimension k , where the gadget only consists of Boolean tensors with dimension no more than 5. Another method is decomposing any tensor into a series of vectors (unary functions), according to its *CP decomposition* [20].

We also prove the sub-exponential time lower bound for contracting tensor networks under the counting *Exponential Time Hypothesis* (#ETH) holds.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Computational complexity and cryptography

Keywords and phrases complexity, finite element graphs, exponential time, planar graphs, tensor network contraction, #ETH, #3SAT

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

Funding Ying Liu : Supported by NSFC61932002 and NSFC 61872340.

Acknowledgements The authors are very grateful to Prof. Jinyi Cai and Prof. Mingji Xia for their beneficial guidance and advise.

1 Introduction

Tensor network states provide an import analytic framework for high dimensional data structures among a variety of scientific disciplines, such as deep convolutional arithmetic circuits in machine learning [22], partition functions in classical statistical mechanics [14], quantum circuits in quantum theory [26, 7, 29, 15] and more. The underlying idea of tensor networks is to use the interconnection among low-dimensional tensors to represent the complex entangled data structures so people can easily manipulate them. The *vaule* of a tensor network, a scalar quantity obtained by contracting all tensors, reflects some critical characteristics of the corresponding data structure. For example, the amplitude of a quantum circuit [7]. Therefore, the complexity of tensor network computation or tensor network contraction is a worthy research topic.

¹ Corresponding author



© ; licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:16

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics



LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

The order of edges in the contraction sequence would not affect the value of a tensor network, but it decides the total time cost of the contraction process. So choosing an optimal contraction sequence is the key to efficiently computing the value of a tensor network. Markov and Shi [26] demonstrated that the optimal contraction sequence is decided by the minimum-width tree decomposition of the line graph of the underlying graph. Thus, the total contraction time is closely related to the treewidth of the line graph. Finding the tree decomposition with minimum width is an NP-hard problem, and searching for an optimal contraction sequence is also hard. People prefer constructing a sequence that makes the number of high arithmetic-intensity contractions small. A common way is searching for an appropriate cut or separator hierarchy to construct the contraction sequence [27, 1, 21, 15], which also involves the aspect of *graph partition*.

Researchers usually preprocess the tensor network to construct the contraction sequence more efficiently. A universal method to simplify a tensor network is called *tensor slicing* or *tensor decomposition*, which decomposes a tensor into some lower dimensional tensors. A series of tensor decomposition formats, presented in [20] and [8], have been introduced and exploited in practice in several works, for example, the SVD [15] and Tensor-Train decomposition [19] for the tensor network simplification.

A tensor of some dimension k is actually a function of arity k . The parameterized set of functions \mathcal{F} is a decisive factor of the complexity of a tensor network computation problem, where each tensor belongs to \mathcal{F} in the input. Tensor network contraction is exactly the class *Holant Problem* [4], and the computational complexity of the Holant problem has been widely studied in past years. Cai et al. presented a series of tractable conditions, which \mathcal{F} satisfies, such that the corresponding Holant problem is tractable in polynomial time; otherwise it is #P-hard [5, 2, 23, 28]. Dell et al. [16, 17] imported the counting version of *Exponential Time Hypothesis* to study the fine-grained complexity classification of some counting problems [12, 6, 11], which are tensor network contraction problems with special parameterized function sets. They demonstrate that such a problem is polynomial-time solvable if the parameterized set \mathcal{F} satisfies the given condition; otherwise the problem can not be computed in sub-exponential time when the counting Exponential Time Hypothesis (#ETH) holds. Besides, the excellent performance of #ETH in proving sub-exponential lower bounds of tensor network contraction problems also has been confirmed in [3, 25].

1.1 Main results

We focus on the algorithms and computational lower bounds of tensor network contraction problems on two special graph structures: planar graphs and finite element graphs. Main results are presented in Table 1.

Based on the classical planar edge separator theorem [13], we prove that we can find a $O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})$ size edge separator for a finite element graph where no face has more than d boundary edges and each vertex has no more than Δ incident edges.

Kourtis et al. [21] used the planar edge separator theorem [13] to find the contraction sequence and put up a $2^{O(\sqrt{\Delta N})}$ time algorithm for planar Boolean tensor network contractions. Inspired by it, we develop the $2^{O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})}$ time algorithm for Boolean tensor networks on finite elements graphs.

We preprocess the input tensor network to accelerate the above two algorithms. We put up an $O(k)$ -size planar gadget for any Boolean symmetric function of arity k . Only functions of small arity are applied in such a gadget. Based on this design, we preprocess any tensor network with only Boolean symmetric functions by transferring high dimensional tensors to a series of low dimensional tensors. We eliminate the factor Δ in the time cost of the contraction

■ **Table 1** Main results in this article.

(a) The upper bound of the size of edge separator in a graph with N vertices

Graph structure	Edge separator size
planar graph	$O(\sqrt{\Delta N})$ [13]
finite element graph	$O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})$ (Theorem 7)

(b) The complexity of contracting a tensor network parameterized by the set \mathcal{F} .

Graph structure	\mathcal{F}	upper bound	lower bound
planar graph	a set of Boolean functions	$2^{O(\sqrt{\Delta N})}$ [21]	$2^{o(\sqrt{N})}$ (Theorem 13)
	a set of symmetric Boolean functions	$2^{O(\sqrt{N})}$ (Theorem 9)	
	a finite set	$R^{O(\sqrt{N})}$ (Theorem 11)	
finite elements graph	a set of Boolean functions	$2^{O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})}$ (Theorem 8)	$2^{o(\sqrt{N})}$ (Theorem 14)
	a set of symmetric Boolean functions	$2^{O(\sqrt{d^3 N})}$ (Theorem 10)	
	a finite set	$R^{O(d\sqrt{N})}$ (Theorem 12)	

algorithms. Another preprocessing uses *CP decomposition* [18] to decompose a tensor into a sum of the products of some vectors. We use this tool crossing the node separator hierarchy to provide two divide-and-conquer algorithms for tensor network contraction problems on planar and finite elements graphs, respectively. Let R denote the maximum rank of the functions in \mathcal{F} . The two algorithms cost $R^{O(\sqrt{N})}$ and $R^{O(d\sqrt{N})}$ time, respectively.

Naturally, we consider the computational lower bound of tensor network contractions. We present $2^{o(N)}$ time lower bound for tensor networks defined on the set $\{=2, =3, \neq 2, OR_3\}$, even restricted on planar or finite element graphs.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Definitions and notations

Let \mathbb{N} or \mathbb{C} denote the set of natural numbers or algebraic complex numbers. $[q]$ denotes the finite domain $\{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ for some positive integer q . If $q=2$, then $[q]$ is called the Boolean domain where any variable is assigned 0 or 1. $\bar{x} = 1 - x$ denotes the negation for a Boolean variable x .

A function F of some *arity* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ defined on the domain $[q]$ maps $[q]^k$ to \mathbb{C} . If $k = 1$ or 2 , then F is a *unary* or *binary* function respectively. A function F of arity k is *symmetric* if $F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = F(x_{\pi(1)}, x_{\pi(2)}, \dots, x_{\pi(k)})$ for any input $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \in [q]$ under any permutation $\pi : [k] \rightarrow [k]$. Any Boolean symmetric function of arity k can be expressed as $[f_0, f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k]$ where f_i is the value when the assignment of variables has Hamming weight $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. For example, the binary equality function or disequality function can be written as $(=2) = [1, 0, 1]$ or $(\neq 2) = [0, 1, 0]$, respectively. A function is also called a *signature* or *constraint*.

An undirected graph G is a tuple (V, E) , where V is the vertex set and $E \subseteq \{(u, v) | u, v \in V(G)\}$ is the edge set. $N_G(v)$ (or $N(v)$) denotes the set of edges incident to v in G . And $d_v = |N(v)|$ denotes the *degree* of v . A loop is counted twice, and a k -multiple edge is counted k times when computing d_v . $\Delta = \max\{d_v : v \in V\}$ denotes the maximum degree of G . If Δ is a constant, then G is a bounded degree graph. An edge is called a *bridge*, i.e., a cut-edge, whose deletion increases the number of connected components in the graph. A set S of vertices or edges is called a *node* or *edge separator* if G is partitioned into two disconnected components A and B after removing S . S is called a *balanced* separator if A and B both have no more $\frac{2}{3}|V(G)|$ vertices.

A graph is planar if it has a planar embedding, i.e., it can be drawn on the plane in such a way that edges intersect only at the endpoints. A balanced node or edge separator for a planar graph can always be found in linear time.

► **Lemma 1** ([24]). *Let G be a planar graph with N vertices. A balanced node separator $C \subseteq V(G)$ can be found in $O(N)$ time, such that $|C| = 2\sqrt{2N}$.*

► **Lemma 2** ([13]). *Let G be a planar graph with N vertices and maximum degree Δ . A balanced edge separator $C \subseteq E(G)$ can be found in $O(N)$ time, such that $|C| = 3\sqrt{2\Delta N}$.*

Consider a class of graphs that are “almost” planar. A canonical example is *finite element graphs*. A finite element graph G is formed from a *planar embedding* G^* of a planar graph by adding all possible diagonals to each face which has more than 3 boundary edges². G^* is called the *skeleton* of G , and each faces in G^* is an *element* of G . According to the definition, G can be drawn on the planar with crossings only appearing inside the elements.

► **Lemma 3** ([24]). *Let G be a finite element graph with N vertices. Suppose each element of G has no more than d boundary edges. A balanced node separator $C \subseteq V(G)$ with $|C| = 4\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor \sqrt{N}$ can be found in polynomial time.*

A k -dimensional *tensor* $F \in (C)^{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k}$ is also a function of arity k with variables $x_1 \in [q_1], x_2 \in [q_2], \dots, x_k \in [q_k]$, for some integers q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k . Let \mathcal{F} denote a set of functions defined on the finite domain $[q]$ for some integer q . A tensor network defined on \mathcal{F} is a signature grid (G, π) , where $G(V, E \cup X)$ with two disjoint sets of edges is a graph and π maps every vertex $v \in V$ to a function $F_v \in \mathcal{F}$ together with a linear order to $N(v)$. X denotes the set of dangling edges with one endpoint in V and the other dangling. The tensor network (G, π) defines an $|X|$ -dimensional tensor (or a $|X|$ -arity function):

$$\Gamma(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k) = \sum_{\sigma: E \rightarrow [q]} \prod_{v \in V} F_v(\sigma|_{N(v)}),$$

where $k = |X|$, $(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k) \in [q]^k$ is an assignment to X , and $\sigma|_{N(v)}$ is the extension of σ on $N(v)$ by (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k) . We called the tensor network (G, π) a *gadget* or an \mathcal{F} -gate with the signature Γ .

If $X = \emptyset$, (G, π) is an input of a tensor network contraction problem or a Holant problem parameterized by \mathcal{F} .

► **Definition 4.** *Let \mathcal{F} be a set of functions on the domain $[q]$. A tensor network contraction problem defined on \mathcal{F} , denoted by $\#\mathcal{F}$, is defined as*

² A vertex v would be treated as k different vertices if k incident edges of v are the boundary edges of a face when adding all possible diagonals.

Input: (G, π) .

$$\text{Output : } Z(G) = \sum_{\sigma: E \rightarrow [q]} \prod_{v \in V} F_v(\sigma|_{N(v)}).$$

The mapping π is usually omitted, and G denotes the grid (G, π) when the context is clear. The problem $pl\text{-}\#\mathcal{F}$ denotes the sub-problem of $\#\mathcal{F}$, where all instances are restricted to be planar.


A canonical example is counting Boolean 3-Satisfiability ($\#3\text{SAT}$), which is the problem of counting the number of satisfying assignments to a given Boolean 3-CNF.

► **Definition 5.** A 3 conjunctive normal form (3CNF) formula ϕ on variables $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$ is of the form $\bigwedge_i C_i$ where each clause $C_i = \bigvee l_i^k$ with $k \leq 3$ has each literal $l_i^k = x_j$ or $l_i^k = \bar{x}_j$ for some $j \in [n]$. The problem $\#3\text{SAT}$ is defined as:

Input: A 3-CNF formula ϕ .

Output: The number of satisfying assignments to ϕ .

$\#3\text{SAT}$ is exactly a tensor network contraction problem parameterized by a set of Boolean symmetric functions $\mathcal{E} \cup \{OR_1, OR_2, OR_3, \neq_2\}$, where $\mathcal{E} = \{=1, =2, =3, \dots\}$ denotes the set of all equality functions, $OR_1 = [0, 1]$, $OR_2 = [0, 1, 1]$, and $OR_3 = [0, 1, 1, 1]$. For example, given a 3-CNF formula $\phi = (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \bar{x}_3) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee x_3) \wedge x_1$, we can construct a tensor network G , showed on Figure 1, with $Z(G) = \#3\text{SAT}(\phi)$.



■ **Figure 1** A tensor network representation for a 3CNF formula $\phi = (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \bar{x}_3) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee x_3) \wedge x_1$. The orange ellipses denote the function (\neq_2) .

2.2 Tensor rank and decomposition

A k -arity function or k -dimensional tensor $F \in \mathbb{C}^{q_1 \times q_2 \times \dots \times q_k}$ is *rank-one* if it can be written as an outer product of k vectors or unary functions, i.e., $F = a^{(1)} \otimes a^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes a^{(k)}$, where $a^{(i)}$ is a vector for any $i \in [k]$. This means each element of F is the product of corresponding vector elements, i.e., $F_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k} = a_{i_1}^{(1)} a_{i_2}^{(2)} \dots a_{i_k}^{(k)}$ for all $i_j \in [q_j]$. The CANDECOMP/PARAFAC (CP) decomposition [18] decomposes a k -dimensional tensor F into a sum of component rank-one tensors, i.e., a CP decomposition of F is $\sum_{r=1}^R a_r^{(1)} \otimes a_r^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes a_r^{(k)}$ for some integer R . The *rank* of F is defined as

$$\text{rank}(F) = \min \left\{ R : F = \sum_{r=1}^R a_r^{(1)} \otimes a_r^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes a_r^{(k)} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The expression $\sum_{r=1}^{\text{rank}(F)} a_r^{(1)} \otimes a_r^{(2)} \otimes \dots \otimes a_r^{(k)}$ denotes a minimum CP decomposition of F . More basic information about tensor rank and decomposition can be seen in [20, 8].

A tensor $F \in \mathbb{C}^{q_1 \times q_2 \times \dots \times q_k}$ is a symmetric tensor if all its dimensions are identical, i.e., $q_1 = q_2 = \dots = q_k$, and its elements are invariant under any permutation of the indices. For a symmetric tensor $F \in \mathbb{C}^{q \times q \times \dots \times q}$, the *symmetric rank* of F is defined as:

$$\text{rank}_S(F) = \min\{R : F = \sum_{r=1}^R a_r \otimes a_r \otimes \dots \otimes a_r = \sum_{r=1}^R a_r^{\otimes k}\}. \quad (2)$$

Comon et al. show that $\text{rank}_S(F) \leq \binom{q+k-1}{k}$ in [9].

2.3 Exponential time hypothesis

Impagliazzo et al. [16, 17] introduced the *Exponential Time Hypothesis* (ETH), which states SAT is not tractable in sub-exponential time. Dell et al. [12] put up the more relaxed counting version: #ETH.

#ETH[12]: *There is a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that no deterministic algorithm can compute #3SAT in $2^{\varepsilon n}$ time, where n is the number of variables of the input formula.*

The lower bound can be strengthened to $2^{\varepsilon m}$ according to the *Sparsification Lemma* [17], where m denotes the number of clauses in the input formula. Liu [25] proved such a sub-exponential time lower bound for the restriction to #3SAT that every input 3-CNF formula contains each variable in at most 3 clauses. The restriction defines the problem $\#\{=, \neq, \text{OR}_2, \text{OR}_3, \neq\}$ where $(=) = [1, 1]$ and $(\neq) = [1, 0, 0, 1]$. It can be reduced to the problem $\#\{=, \neq, \text{OR}_3, \neq\}$ since we can simulate $=$ by $(=)(x) = \sum_{y,z \in \{0,1\}} (=)(x, y, z) (=)(y, z)$, OR_1 by $\text{OR}_1(x) = \text{OR}_3(x, x, x)$, and OR_2 by $\text{OR}_2(x, w) = \sum_{y,z \in \{0,1\}} \text{OR}_3(x, y, z) (=)(y, z, w)$, where $x, w \in \{0, 1\}$.

► **Lemma 6.** [25] *There is a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the problem $\#\{=, \neq, \neq, \text{OR}_3\}$ can not be computed in $2^{\varepsilon n}$ time if #ETH holds, where n is the number of vertices in the input.*

3 Algorithms for contracting tensor networks

Kourtis et al. [21] introduced an algorithm to contract a planar Boolean tensor network in $2^{O(\sqrt{\Delta N})}$ time, where N denotes the number of vertices and Δ denotes the maximum degree. They presented a divide and conquer algorithm to find a sequence of edge separators to partition the network to N isolated tensors, according to Lemma 2. Then they contracted the isolated tensors in the reversed order of partitioning. The algorithm guaranteed that each tensor appearing in the contraction process has $O(\sqrt{\Delta N})$ dimension so that the Boolean tensor network can be contracted in $2^{O(\sqrt{\Delta N})}$ time.

Inspired by the algorithm, we consider the edge separator of a finite element graph.

► **Theorem 7.** *Let G be a finite element graph with N vertices and maximum degree Δ . Suppose each element of G has no more than d boundary edges. A balanced edge separator C of G can be found in polynomial time, with $|C| = O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})$.*

Proof. Let G^* denotes the planar skeleton of G . Suppose G^* has f faces L_1, L_2, \dots, L_f with more than 3 boundary edges. We construct a planar graph G^{**} from G^* by adding a new vertex w_i inside each face L_i and connecting it with all boundary vertices. $W = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_f\}$. The planar graph G^{**} has $N + f \leq 2N$ vertices and maximum degree $\Delta^{**} \leq \max\{\Delta, d\}$. By Lemma 3, we find a balanced edge separator C^{**} with $|C^{**}| = O(\sqrt{\Delta^{**}N})$ in $O(N)$ time.

Suppose C^{**} partitions G^{**} into two disconnected parts A^{**} and B^{**} . Let $A = A^{**} \cap V(G)$ and $B = B^{**} \cap V(G)$. For an edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$ which connects A and B , either $(u, v) \in C^{**}$ or $\{(u, w_i), (w_i, v)\} \cap C^{**} \neq \emptyset$ for some $w_i \in W$. If $(u, w_i) \in C^{**}$, we add all diagonals, which connect u with some boundary vertex of L_i , to the set C . We do the same if $(w_i, v) \in C^{**}$. Finally, we add $C^{**} \cap E(G)$ to C . C is a balanced edge separator of G and $|C| = O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})$. ◀


Then we can build an exponential algorithm similar to the algorithm in [21].

▶ **Theorem 8.** *Let G be a finite element with N vertices and maximum degree Δ . Suppose each element of G has no more than d boundary edges. Given a Boolean tensor network whose underlying graph is G , it can be contracted in $2^{O(d\sqrt{\max\{\Delta, d\}N})}$ time.*

3.1 Defined on a set of Boolean symmetric functions

We consider accelerating the above algorithms. When the tensor network is defined on a set of Boolean symmetric functions, we replace each function of some arity n by a planar bounded degree gadget with $O(n)$ vertices.

Suppose $F = [f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n]$ with $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{C}$ (w.l.o.g, n is a power of 2)³. We replace F with an equivalent planar gadget, shown in Figure 2. The general idea of the gadget is to rearrange the assignment of variables since the order of elements in the assignment is irrelevant. Treating each assignment as an n -length string over $\{0, 1\}$, we use the left part to count the number of 1 (Hamming weight) and use the right part to return an ordered n -length string where all 1 are in front of 0. Then we decide the corresponding function value according to the location of the border of 1 and 0. Next, we introduce the gadget in detail.



■ **Figure 2** Planar bounded degree structure to realize all Boolean symmetric functions.

The left part of this planar gadget uses the idea “Adder” to calculate the binary expression of Hamming weight $Hw(x)$ of the assignment $x = (w_1w_2 \dots w_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$. The functions all are simple addition operators in the left part. The left structure accepts x and adds every two adjacent bits. Each vertex denotes an addition function A or B , shown in Figure 3-(a),

³ We can use some additional edges, whose other endpoints are attached with the unary function $[1, 0]$, to refill the arity. This operator only increases the aimed gadget size to double.

23:8 The Complexity of Contracting Planar Tensor Networks



(a) In the left part

(b) In the right part

■ **Figure 3** Vertex modes of the planar gadget.

which adds two bits I_1, I_2 or three bits h_1, I_1, I_2 , sets the most significant bit u to join a higher level addition, and sets the least significant bit h or h_2 to join the operation of the horizontal adjacent vertex on the right. After $\log_2 n$ levels, the left part outputs the binary expression of $\text{Hw}(x)$ in the horizontal edges from top to bottom (information would not be lost since $\text{Hw}(x) \leq \log_2 n + 1$).

$$A(u, h, I_1, I_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u = \lfloor (I_1 + I_2)/2 \rfloor \text{ and } h = (I_1 + I_2) \bmod 2 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$B(u, h_1, h_2, I_1, I_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u = \lfloor (I_1 + I_2 + h_1)/2 \rfloor \text{ and } h_2 = (I_1 + I_2 + h_1) \bmod 2 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

The right part uses the horizontal $(\log_2 n + 1)$ bits to recover an ordered string of the form $1^{\text{Hw}(x)}0^{|x|-\text{Hw}(x)}$ before outputting the accuracy value of F . It is obvious that the top two bits would not be 1 at the same time. In the right part, the functions are a little different from those in the left part, shown in Figure 3-(b). Each of them is one of the following functions:

$$C(u, h, o_1, o_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } o_1 = u + h \text{ and } o_2 = 2u + h - o_1 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$D(u, h_1, h_2, o_1, o_2) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u = 1 \text{ \& } o_1 = o_2 = 1 \text{ and } h_2 = h_1 \\ 1 & \text{if } u = 0 \text{ \& } o_1 = h_1 \text{ and } o_2 = h_2 = 0 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

The Hamming weight is reflected by the location of the sub-string 10 in the ordered string $1^{\text{Hw}(x)}0^{|x|-\text{Hw}(x)}$. The gadget uses additional 2-arity functions $F_1, \dots, F_i, \dots, F_{n-1}$ to identify the location, where $i \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}$.

$$\begin{cases} F_1(0, 0) = f_0, \\ F_1(1, 0) = f_1, \\ F_1(1, 1) = F_1(0, 1) = 1; \end{cases}$$


$$\begin{cases} F_i(0,0) = F_i(1,1) = F_i(0,1) = 1, \\ F_i(1,0) = f_i; \\ F_{n-1}(1,1) = f_n, \\ F_{n-1}(1,0) = f_{n-1}, \\ F_{n-1}(0,0) = F_{n-1}(0,1) = 1. \end{cases}$$

The number of vertices in such a planar gadget is $2(n + \frac{n}{2} + \frac{n}{4} + \dots + 1) + n - 1 = O(n)$, and the maximum degree is 5.

For any tensor network G defined on the set of Boolean symmetric functions, we preprocess it to a bounded degree tensor network G' by the above gadgets. If G is planar, then $\sum_{v \in V(G)} d_v = 2E(G) \leq 6|V(G)| - 12$. So G' has $O(|V(G)|)$ vertices. We apply the algorithm [21] on G' .

► **Theorem 9.** *Any planar tensor network consisting of N Boolean symmetric tensors can be contracted in $2^{O(\sqrt{N})}$ time.*

If G is a finite element graph, we need more steps to preprocess G . We transfer G to a planar graph first. Suppose there are f elements L_1, L_2, \dots, L_f with more than 3 boundary edges in the planar skeleton G^* of G . d_i denotes the number of boundary edges in L_i for $i \in [f]$. There are no more than $(\sum_{i \in [f]} d_i^4)$ crossings in G , according to the definition of finite element graphs. We replace each crossing with a new vertex assigned with the function Cr , shown in Figure 4. The function Cr keeps $a = a'$ and $b = b'$ for Boolean variables a, a', b, b' .



■ **Figure 4** A planar gadget for crossing. The black circle vertices are assigned OR_2 or OR_3 ; the orange ellipses are the vertices assigned (\neq_2) .

Then we obtain a planar tensor network G' with no more than $N + \sum_{i \in [f]} d_i^4 \leq N + 2md^3 \leq N + 6Nd^3$ vertices, where $m = |E(G^*)| \leq |E(G)|$ and $d = \max\{d_1, \dots, d_f\}$. $Z(G') = Z(G)$. A gadget with the function Cr , shown in Figure 4, consists of only Boolean symmetric functions. We construct the planar G'' from G' by replacing each occurrence of Cr with such a gadget. G'' has $O(d^3 N)$ vertices and maximum degree no more than 6. $Z(G'') = Z(G') = Z(G)$. We can compute $Z(G'')$ in $2^{O(\sqrt{d^3 N})}$ time by Theorem 9. Since G'' is constructed in polynomial time, the above algorithm computes $Z(G)$ in $2^{O(\sqrt{d^3 N})}$ time.

► **Theorem 10.** *A tensor network consisting of N Boolean symmetric tensors can be contracted in $2^{O(\sqrt{d^3 N})}$ time if the underlying graph is a finite element graph whose elements all have no more than d boundary edges.*

Can we also construct a planar bounded degree gadget for any symmetric function over a larger domain, for example, the domain $[3]$? The algorithm in Theorem 11 can be extended further if we can. Unfortunately, the answer is negative, according to Appendix A.

3.2 Defined on a set of finite functions

It is trivial that a tensor network consisting of only unary functions can be contracted in polynomial time. CP decomposition provides the way to decompose a tensor to a series of unary functions.

► **Theorem 11.** *Let \mathcal{F} be a finite set of functions and $R = \max\{\text{rank}(F) | F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. A planar tensor network defined on \mathcal{F} can be contracted in $R^{O(\sqrt{N})}$ time, where N denotes the number of vertices in the input.*

Proof. We state the main idea of the divide and conquer algorithm here. Appendix A.1 shows details.

Given a planar tensor network G with N vertices, we search for a balanced node separator C with $|C| = O(\sqrt{N})$ in linear time, by Lemma 1. For each vertex $v \in C$, we replace the d_v -dimensional tensor F_v by the components of a minimum CP decomposition of F_v independently. Suppose $F_v = \sum_{i=1}^r u_i^1 \otimes u_i^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_i^{d_v}$, where $r = \text{rank}(F_v) \leq R$, then we obtain a series of new tensor networks G_1, \dots, G_r by replacing F_v with r components $u_1^1 \otimes u_1^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_1^{d_v}, \dots, u_r^1 \otimes u_r^2 \otimes \cdots \otimes u_r^{d_v}$ independently. We make a contraction between each u_i^j and its adjacent tensor in G_i , where $j \in [k]$. After the contractions, G_i is a tensor network consisting of two disconnected planar tensor networks A_i and B_i , where each has no more than $\frac{2}{3}N$ vertices. Suppose $Z(G)$ denotes the value of G . $Z(G) = \sum_{i=1}^r Z(G_i) = \sum_{i=1}^r Z(A_i)Z(B_i)$. Then we compute $Z(A_i)$ and $Z(B_i)$ for $i \in [r]$.

The value of G can be computed in $R^{O(\sqrt{N})}$ time by the above algorithm. The runtime analysis is presented in Appendix B. ◀

The above algorithm can be extended for contracting tensor networks on finite element graphs, by Lemma 3.


► **Theorem 12.** *Let \mathcal{F} be a finite set of functions and $R = \max\{\text{rank}(F) | F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. A tensor network defined by \mathcal{F} , whose underlying graph is a finite element graph having no elements with more than d boundary edges, can be contracted in $R^{O(d\sqrt{N})}$ time, where N is the number of tensors.*

4 Lower bounds of tensor network contraction problems

In this section, we prove the lower bound for contracting tensor networks, even restricting the underlying graphs to planar graphs or finite element graphs.

► **Theorem 13.** *If $\#ETH$ holds, then there is a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that a planar tensor network can not be contracted in $2^{\varepsilon\sqrt{N}}$ time, where N denotes the number of vertices in the input.*

Furthermore, the result holds for the planar tensor networks defined by the set $\{=_2, =_3, \neq_2, OR_3\}$.



■ **Figure 5** Some $\{OR_3, =_3\}$ -gates.

Proof. We reduce the problem $\#\{=2, =3, \neq_2, OR_3\}$ to $pl\text{-}\#\{=2, =3, \neq_2, OR_3\}$. Let G with N vertices be an instance of $\#\{=2, =3, \neq_2, OR_3\}$. G has at most $3N$ edges and $9N^2$ crossings.

We replace each crossing with a new vertex assigned the function Cr . The new tensor network G' is an instance of $pl\text{-}\#\{=2, =3, \neq_2, OR_3, Cr\}$. G' has at most $(N + 9N^2)$ vertices. We replace each occurrence of Cr with the gadget shown in Figure 4, then we construct a planar tensor network G'' with $O(N^2)$ vertices. G'' is an instance of $pl\text{-}\#\{=2, =3, \neq_2, OR_3, OR_2, =_5, =_6\}$. We further replace each occurrence of OR_2 , $=_5$, or $=_6$ by the gadgets shown in Figure 5. The generated tensor network G''' is an instance of $pl\text{-}\#\{=2, =3, \neq_2, OR_3\}$. G''' has $O(N^2)$ vertices. $Z(G''') = Z(G'') = Z(G') = Z(G)$.

Suppose the theorem is false, i.e., we can solve $Z(G''')$ in $2^{\varepsilon\sqrt{cN^2}}$ time for any $\varepsilon > 0$, then we can solve $Z(G)$ in $\text{poly}(N) + 2^{\varepsilon\sqrt{cN^2}} \leq 2^{\varepsilon'N}$ time for some constant ε' . It is a contradiction to Lemma 6. ◀

Now we think about the lower bound for tensor network contraction problems on finite element graphs. Given a planar graph, we use triangular partitioning to build a finite element graph.

▶ **Theorem 14.** *If $\#ETH$ holds, then there is a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that a tensor network, whose underlying graph is a finite element graph with N vertices, can not be contracted in $2^{\varepsilon\sqrt{N}}$ time.*


Furthermore, the result holds even when the parameterized set is restricted to Boolean symmetric functions of arity no more than 7.

Proof. Let G be an instance of $pl\text{-}\#\{=2, =3, \neq_2, OR_3\}$. The underlying graph has a planar embedding, which G also denotes. For the embedded planar graph G , we think about triangular partitioning every face with more than 3 boundary edges. We first deal with *bridges*. We add a new vertex w and edges $(v_1, w), (v_2, w)$ for each bridge (v_1, v_2) . Then we get a new planar graph G' with no bridge. Let L_1, L_2, \dots, L_s denote the faces with more than 3 boundary edges in G' .

Suppose the boundary vertices of a face $L \in \{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_s\}$ are labeled v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d in clockwise order⁴. We add a $(\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$ -length cycle $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil}, u_1)$ inside L , and add edges $(u_j, v_{2j-1}), (u_j, v_{2j}), (u_j, v_{2j+1})$ for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil\}$, where v_{d+1} is exact v_1 . If d is odd, we extra add the edges $(u_{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil}, v_d)$ and $(u_{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil}, v_{d_1})$. We partition L into some triangles and a face L' with $(\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$ boundary edges. We continue to partition L' in the same way.

⁴ A vertex is given different labels if more than one of its incident edges are in the boundary of L .

After no more than $\lceil \log_2 d \rceil$ rounds, we completely triangulate L . We add no more than d new vertices with degree no more than 7. For example, we show in Figure 6 the process of partitioning a face with 7 boundary edges.



■ **Figure 6** The process of triangular partitioning a face with 7 boundary edges.

We triangulate each face in G' and obtain a finite element graph G'' in $\text{poly}(N)$ time. The planar skeleton of G'' is itself. G'' has no more than $N + \sum_{L_i} d_i \leq N + 2|E(G')| \leq 6N$ vertices, where d_i is the number of boundary edges in face L_i . The maximum degree of G'' is no more than 7.

Next, we assign to every vertex $v \in V(G'')$ an appropriate Boolean symmetric function, such that $Z(G') = Z(G)$. For each vertex $v \in V(G'') - V(G)$, we assign the function $[1, 0]^{\otimes d_v}$ to v , so that the edge-variables in $E(G'') - E(G)$ must be assigned 0. For each vertex $v \in V(G'') \cap V(G)$, we assign to v the function F_v , according to the function $[f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3]$ (or $[f_0, f_1, f_2]$) which is originally assigned to v in G . F_v denotes the function $[0, \dots, 0, f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3]$ (or function $[0, \dots, 0, f_0, f_1, f_2]$), which takes value 0 when the Hamming weight of input is no more than $k - 4$ (or $k - 3$). The assignment to edges in $E(G'') - E(G)$ are fixed and make no difference to the value of G'' . The assignments to edges $E(G'') \cup E(G)$ contribute to $Z(G'')$ in the same way as they contribute to $Z(G)$. So $Z(G'') = Z(G)$.

Suppose $Z(G'')$ can be solved in $2^{\varepsilon\sqrt{6N}}$ time for any $\varepsilon > 0$, then we have an algorithm to compute $Z(G)$ in $(\text{poly}(N) + 2^{\varepsilon\sqrt{6N}}) \leq 2^{\varepsilon'\sqrt{N}}$ time for some $\varepsilon' > 0$. It is a contradiction to Theorem 13. ◀

5 conclusion

In this article, we introduce some efficient algorithms for tensor network contraction problems on two special graph structures: planar graphs and finite element graphs. We put up different methods to design the algorithms, depending on the classes of the parameterized sets.

When the parameterized sets are restricted to Boolean symmetric functions, we also utilize #ETH to prove a tight lower bound for tensor network contraction problems on the two special graph structures.

There are still gaps between the algorithms and the lower bounds.

References

- 1 Yaroslav Akhremtsev, Tobias Heuer, Peter Sanders, and Sebastian Schlag. *Engineering a direct k -way Hypergraph Partitioning Algorithm*, pages 28–42. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2017. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611974768.3>, arXiv:<https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611974768.3>, doi:10.1137/1.9781611974768.3.

- 2 Miriam Backens. A complete dichotomy for complex-valued holant^c. In *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2018)*, volume 107 of *LIPIcs*, pages 12:1–12:14. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- 3 Cornelius Brand, Holger Dell, and Marc Roth. Fine-grained dichotomies for the tutte plane and boolean $\#csp$. *Algorithmica*, 81(2):541–556, 2019.
- 4 Jin Yi Cai, Heng Guo, and Tyson Williams. *Holant Problems*, pages 918–921. Springer New York, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-2864-4_748.
- 5 Jin-Yi Cai, Pinyan Lu, and Mingji Xia. Dichotomy for holant* problems of boolean domain. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 64(8):1362–1391, 2020.
- 6 Hubie Chen, Radu Curticapean, and Holger Dell. The exponential-time complexity of counting (quantum) graph homomorphisms. In *45th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 11789, pages 364–378. Springer, 2019.
- 7 Jianxin Chen, Fang Zhang, Mingcheng Chen, Cupjin Huang, Michael Newman, and Yaoyun Shi. Classical simulation of intermediate-size quantum circuits. *arXiv:1805.01450 [quant-ph]*, 05 2018.
- 8 Andrzej Cichocki, Namgil Lee, Ivan Oseledets, Anh-Huy Phan, Qibin Zhao, and Danilo P. Mandic. Tensor networks for dimensionality reduction and large-scale optimization: Part 1 low-rank tensor decompositions. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, 9(4–5):249–429, dec 2016.
- 9 Pierre Comon, Gene Golub, Lek-Heng Lim, and Bernard Mourrain. Symmetric tensors and symmetric tensor rank. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 30(3):1254–1279, 03 2008. doi:10.1137/060661569.
- 10 Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory, 2nd Edition*, page 784. Wiley-Blackwell, 7 2006.
- 11 Radu Curticapean. Block interpolation: A framework for tight exponential-time counting complexity. *Information and Computation*, 261:265–280, 2018.
- 12 Holger Dell, Thore Husfeldt, Dániel Marx, Nina Taslaman, and Martin Wahlen. Exponential time complexity of the permanent and the tutte polynomial. *ACM Transaction on Algorithms*, 10(4):21:1–21:32, 2014.
- 13 Krzysztof Diks, Hristo N. Djidjev, Ondrej Sykora, and Imrich Vrto. Edge separators for planar graphs and their applications. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 1988*, pages 280–290. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1988.
- 14 Glen Evenbly and Guifre Vidal. Tensor network renormalization. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115:180405, Oct 2015. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.180405>, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.180405.
- 15 Johnnie Gray and Stefanos Kourtis. Hyper-optimized tensor network contraction. *Quantum*, 5:410, March 2021.
- 16 Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-sat. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
- 17 Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 63(4):512–530, 2001.
- 18 Henk Kiers. Towards a standardized notation and terminology in multiway analysis. *Journal of Chemometrics - J CHEMOMETR*, 14(3):105–122, 05 2000. doi:10.1002/1099-128X(200005/06)14:33.0.CO;2-I.
- 19 Ilya Kisil, Giuseppe G. Calvi, Kriton Konstantinidis, Yao Lei Xu, and Danilo P. Mandic. Accelerating tensor contraction products via tensor-train decomposition [tips & tricks]. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 39(5):63–70, 2022. doi:10.1109/MSP.2022.3156744.
- 20 Tamara Kolda and Brett Bader. Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM Review*, 51(3):455–500, 08 2009. doi:10.1137/07070111X.
- 21 Stefanos Kourtis, Claudio Chamon, Eduardo R. Mucciolo, and Andrei E. Ruckenstein. Fast counting with tensor networks. *SciPost Phys.*, 7:60, 2019. URL: <https://scipost.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.7.5.060>, doi:10.21468/SciPostPhys.7.5.060.

- 22 Yoav Levine, Or Sharir, Nadav Cohen, and Amnon Shashua. Quantum entanglement in deep learning architectures. *Physical Review Letters*, 122, 02 2019. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.065301.
- 23 Jiabao Lin and Hanpin Wang. The complexity of boolean holant problems with nonnegative weights. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(3):798–828, 2018.
- 24 Richard J Lipton and Robert Endre Tarjan. A separator theorem for planar graphs. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 36(2):177–189, 1979.
- 25 Ying Liu. The exponential-time complexity of the complex weighted $\#csp$. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.02782*, 2022.
- 26 Igor L. Markov and Yaoyun Shi. Simulating quantum computation by contracting tensor networks. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 38(3):963–981, 2008.
- 27 Sebastian Schlag, Vitali Henne, Tobias Heuer, Henning Meyerhenke, Peter Sanders, and Christian Schulz. k-way hypergraph partitioning via n-level recursive bisection. *ArXiv*, abs/1511.03137, 2016.
- 28 Shuai Shao and Jin-Yi Cai. A dichotomy for real boolean holant problems. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 1091–1102, 2020. doi:10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00105.
- 29 Benjamin Villalonga, Sergio Boixo, Bron Nelson, Christopher Henze, Eleanor Rieffel, Rupak Biswas, and Salvatore Mandrà. A flexible high-performance simulator for verifying and benchmarking quantum circuits implemented on real hardware. *npj Quantum Information*, 5:86, 10 2019.

A Planar bounded degree gadgets for symmetric functions over a large domain

Utilizing the planar gadget of crossing in Figure 4, we can relax the planar restriction to the gadget. We want to build a $O(n)$ -size bounded degree gadget with only $O(n)$ crossings for any n -arity symmetric functions over the domain $[q]$ with $q \geq 3$. The answer is negative. We prove this by the special case: $q = 3$.

There is $2^{\frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}}$ different symmetric functions which map $\{0, 1, 2\}^n$ to $\{0, 1\}$. According to the lower bound of Kolmogorov complexity (Thm 14.2.4 in [10]), the core-word to encode such a function is at least $\frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}$ bits in length.

Consider encoding a $c \cdot n$ -size gadget G with maximum degree Δ , where c and Δ are some constants. We use the function $C(\Delta)$ to denote the number of functions of arity no more than Δ . Since Δ is a constant, $C(\Delta)$ is also a constant. For each vertex in G , we can use a $\log_2(cn) + \log_2 C(\Delta)$ -length core-word to encode it, where the first $\log_2(cn)$ bits encode the index of the vertex and the next $\log_2 C(\Delta)$ bits indicate the function assigned to the vertex. Each edge G can be encoded as a pair of core-words of two adjacent nodes. Then the gadget has a core-word, whose length is no longer than $\Delta cn \cdot 2(\log_2(cn) + \log_2 C(\Delta))$ bits. It is impossible to compress any n -arity symmetric function, defined on $\{0, 1, 2\}$, into a $\Delta cn \cdot 2(\log_2(cn) + \log_2 C(\Delta))$ length core-word without information loss, when n is big enough.

Finding a planar bounded degree gadget for every symmetric function is impossible. Nevertheless, we can construct such gadgets for some special classes of functions. One class is $\{F : [\{0, 1, \dots, q\}]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid F(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = F_1(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \otimes F_2(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \otimes \dots \otimes F_q(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where the value of F_i is only decided by the number of i in the assignment of variables. We can still simulate F by counting the numbers of i and computing each F_i independently, similar to the one in Figure 2. The left part computes q groups of binary expressions, which indicate the number of $1, 2, \dots, q$ in the assignment. The degree of a vertex in the left part increases to $2q$ or $3q - 1$. There are q copies of the right part in Figure 2, where the i -th duplicate recovers F_i independently. The copies would bring $O(q^2n)$ crossings. The gadget has only $O(qn)$ nodes and $O(q^2n)$ crossings in total, and the maximum degree is $O(q)$.

B The algorithm to contract planar tensor networks in $R^{O(\sqrt{N})}$ time

Let \mathcal{F} be a finite set of functions and $R = \max\{rank(F) \mid F \in \mathcal{F}\}$. We compute and record a minimum CP decomposition for every function in \mathcal{F} . $TD(\mathcal{F})$ record all unary functions appearing in the decomposition. We further compute the set $\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle = \mathcal{F} \cup \{F \circ u \mid F \in \langle \mathcal{F} \rangle \text{ and } u \in TD(\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle)\}$, and record the minimum CP decomposition of each function in $\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle$. $F \circ u$ denotes any $(k-1)$ -arity function in $\{\sum_x F \cdot u(x) \mid x \text{ is a variable of } F\}$, where F is a function of some arity k and u is a unary function. Above preparation aims to determine all possible functions appearing in the algorithm process and record their minimum CP decompositions. Since \mathcal{F} are finite, we can complete the preparation in finite time.

The algorithm works as follows.

Consider the time recursive formula of Algorithm 1. Suppose the input tensor network G defined on \mathcal{F} has N vertices. We can find a balanced node separator $S \in V(G)$ with $|S| \leq 2\sqrt{2N}$ in c_1N time for some constant c_1 , by Lemma 1. S partitions G into two disconnected parts where each has no more than $\frac{2}{3}N$ vertices. We independently replace the functions in S with the corresponding components in their minimum CP decompositions.

■ **Algorithm 1** Contracting a planar tensor network defined on \mathcal{F}

```

Input:  $G$ .
Output:  $Z(G)$ .
1 if  $|V| > 1$  then
2   Find a node separator  $S$  of  $G$ .
3   foreach  $v \in S$  do
4     if  $F_v = \sum_{i=1}^{rank(F_v)} u_i^1 \otimes u_i^2 \otimes \dots \otimes u_i^{d_v}$  then
5       Replace  $F_v$  by  $\{u_1^1 \otimes \dots \otimes u_1^{d_v}\}, \dots, \{u_{rank(F_v)}^1 \otimes \dots \otimes u_{rank(F_v)}^{d_v}\}$ 
        respectively.
6     end
7   end
8   Rename every new tensor network  $G_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$ , where  $l_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, R\}$  for
     $j = 1, 2, \dots, |S|$ .
9   foreach  $G_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$  do
10    Adjust  $G_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$  by contracting every unary function, which comes from the
    functions in  $S$ . Then  $G_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$  is divided to two disconnected components
     $A_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$  and  $B_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$ .
11    Solve  $Z(A_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})$  by Algorithm 1.
12    Solve  $Z(B_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})$  by Algorithm 1.
13     $Z(G_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}) = Z(A_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})Z(B_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})$ .
14  end
15   $Z(G) = \sum_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}} Z(G_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})$ .
16 else
17   Compute  $Z(G)$  directly.
18 end
19 return  $Z(G)$ .

```

Since we have pre-recorded all possible minimum CP decompositions and the results of the possible contractions in the adjustment stage, every new tensor network $G_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$ can be constructed and adjusted in $\text{poly}(N + \Delta|S|)$ time. The algorithm generates at most $R^{|S|}$ new tensor networks, each of which consists of two disconnected sub-networks $A_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$ and $B_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$ with $|V(A_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})|, |V(B_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})| \leq \frac{2}{3}N$.

If we have the values $Z(A_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})$ and $Z(B_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}})$, we compute the value of $G_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{|S|}}$ by a multiplication. Furthermore, we obtain $Z(G)$ by $R^{|S|}$ times additions after obtaining all values of the new graphs.

The time recursive formula is:

$$T(N) = c_1 \cdot N + R^{|S|}(\text{poly}(N + \Delta|S|) + (T(aN) + T(bN))) + \text{poly}(R^{|S|}), \quad a, b \leq \frac{2}{3}.$$

By mathematical induction, the total time of Algorithm 1 is $R^{O(\sqrt{N})}$.