

Statistical and computational thresholds for the planted k -densest sub-hypergraph problem

Luca Corinzia¹, Paolo Penna¹, Wojciech Szpankowski², and Joachim M. Buhmann¹

¹Department of Computer Science, ETH Zurich, Switzerland
 {jbuhmann, luca.corinzia, paolo.penna}@inf.ethz.ch

²Department of Computer Science, Purdue University, USA
 szpan@purdue.edu

November 24, 2020

Abstract

Recovery a planted *signal* perturbed by *noise* is a fundamental problem in machine learning. In this work, we consider the problem of recovery a planted k -densest sub-hypergraph on h -uniform hypergraphs over n nodes. This fundamental problem appears in different contexts, e.g., community detection, average case complexity, and neuroscience applications. We first observe that it can be viewed as a *structural* variant of *tensor PCA* in which the hypergraph parameters k and h determine the structure of the signal to be recovered when the observations are contaminated by Gaussian noise. In this work, we provide tight *information-theoretic* upper and lower bounds for the recovery problem, as well as the first non-trivial *algorithmic* bounds based on approximate message passing algorithms. The problem exhibits a typical information-to-computational-gap observed in analogous settings, that widens with increasing sparsity of the problem. Interestingly, the bounds show that the structure of the signal does have an impact on the existing bounds of tensor PCA that the unstructured planted signal does not capture.

1 Introduction

High dimensional inference problems play a key role in recent machine learning and data analysis applications. Typical scenarios exhibit problem dimensions that are comparable to the sample size, hence precluding effective estimation with no further structure imposed on the underlying signal, such as low rank or

sparsity. Examples of such problems include sparse mean estimation, compressive sensing, sparse phase retrieval, low-rank matrix estimation, community detection, planted clique and densest subgraph recovery problems.

In this work we study the problem of recovery a *planted k -densest sub-hypergraph* on h -uniform hypergraphs over n nodes recently introduced in [22]. This is the *planted* version of the classical k -densest subgraph [21], informally defined as follows. The *planted* solution consists of a set of k randomly chosen nodes among the total of n nodes. The weights of all $\binom{n}{h}$ hyperedges ¹ *inside the planted solution* have some initial *bias*, the others have zero bias. After some Gaussian *noise* is added to these initial weights, we would like to recover the planted solution given only these noisy observations.

Under what conditions is it possible to recover the planted solution?

What about computationally efficient algorithms for this task?

In the simpler *graph* setting the problem is closely related to detecting a core structure in community detection, it resembles the well-known planted clique problem, and other community detection models such as the stochastic block model (SBM). Recent work also suggest that the k -densest subgraph problem is related to long term memory mechanism in the brain [45]. The more general *hypergraph* version is

¹Recall that in an h -uniform hypergraph we have one hyper-edge for each subset of h nodes, with $h = 2$ being the standard undirect graph.

closely related to the so-called *tensor* Principal Component Analysis (tensor PCA). Higher order interactions among nodes is also rather natural in several applications, including modeling brain regions [35, 58, 61] and in computer vision applications [40].

Our goal is to understand the *information-theoretic* and *computational* algorithmic limits for this class of recovery problems, thereby establishing the regimes for which algorithms have the ability to recover a hidden structure or signal from noisy measurements and partial information. In particular, we are interested in the existence of the so called *computational-to-statistical gaps* and whether the *hypergraph parameter* h plays a role. For a start, consider the two extremes $h = 1$ and $h = k$, where the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) is *computationally efficient* though for *different* reasons:

- For $h = k$ the solutions are statistically *independent* (like in the Random Energy Model [24]). The maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) can be implemented by searching exhaustively through all $\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n}{h}$ solutions, which is computationally efficient since $\binom{n}{h}$ is the input size.
- For $h = 1$ exhaustive search through all $\binom{n}{k}$ solutions is clearly inefficient, unless k is constant. Nonetheless simply selecting greedily the k nodes with highest weights implements efficiently the MLE. Unlike the previous case, the solutions are statistically *dependent*.

Therefore, in both these extreme cases there is *no computational-to-statistical gap*, while their information-theoretic nature is very different. The case $h = 1$ can be considered *easier* from the pure information-theoretic point of view, since the analysis of recoverability conditions (whether the MLE succeeds) boils down to analyzing $N = \binom{n}{h}$ *independent* Gaussian random variables. The presence of *dependencies* between solutions makes the analysis of the information-theoretic boundary conditions significantly more complex, even for $h = k$.

We are interested in the *non-extreme* cases (the spectrum $1 < h \leq k \leq n$), where most of the practical and theoretical applications arise. These are also the most challenging cases since they present both challenges: information-theoretical due to *dependencies* and algorithmic since the MLE is *not* computationally efficient in general. In particular, we shall focus on the *sparse* regime $k \ll n$ which, in several recovery problems, seems to be the major source of

computational-to-statistical gaps. We mainly consider $k \approx n^\alpha$ with arbitrary $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ constant (though some of our results extend to the full spectrum).

1.1 Our contribution

We study the problem of recovery a *planted* k -densest sub-hypergraph on h -uniform hypergraphs over n nodes. We consider the version in which the planted solution (“signal”) is perturbed by *Gaussian* noise, as in the closely related tensor PCA problem (see below). For this natural problem above, we provide novel information-theoretic and algorithmic recovery thresholds on the *signal-to-noise ratio* (SNR) necessary and sufficient to recover the planted solution in the sparse regime $k \approx n^\alpha$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ constant. The signal-to-noise ratio is intuitively defined as follows. All $\binom{k}{h}$ hyperedges inside the planted part have an initial positive *bias* β , and therefore the “total signal” given by the planted solution is $\beta \binom{k}{h}$. Since the noise added to each hyperedge is normally distributed $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, it is convenient to define the “total noise” as $\sqrt{\binom{k}{h}} 2k \log n \sim \sqrt{\binom{k}{h}} 2 \log \binom{n}{k}$, which intuitively incorporates the fact that we have $\binom{n}{k}$ solutions each of them with variance (noise) $\sqrt{\binom{k}{h}}$ – for more intuition on the logarithm see Remark 1.1 below. This leads to the *scale-normalized* SNR defined as “total signal/total noise”:

$$\gamma \equiv \beta \sqrt{\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k}} \cdot \frac{1}{2 \log n}. \quad (1)$$

The above normalization is introduced in order to incorporate the problem parameters n, k, h so that the *information-theoretic recoverability* thresholds corresponds to a *finite* γ (see next paragraph and Remark 1.1 below). Note that both k and h may depend on n , that is, we consider $k = k(n)$ and $h(n)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. We should also emphasize that for constant γ , the signal β depends on n, k and h and, in particular, $\beta = \beta(n) = \Theta \left(\sqrt{\frac{2k \log n}{\binom{k}{h}}} \right)$.

Tight information theoretic bounds for recovery. We show that recoverability using (computationally-unbounded) estimators is impossible or possible, when the scale-normalized SNR γ in

eq. (1) is below or above the following two constants:

$$\gamma_{LB} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{1-\alpha} & \text{for any } h = \omega(1) \\ \sqrt{1-\alpha}/2 & \text{in general} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$\gamma_{UB} = \sqrt{1+2\alpha} + \sqrt{\alpha},$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a constant satisfying $k \approx n^\alpha$. Specifically, we prove the following:

Theorem (informal) *For $\gamma < \gamma_{LB}$, exact recovery is impossible regardless of which estimator (algorithm) we use, while for $\gamma > \gamma_{UB}$ the exact recovery is possible via the (computationally intractable) maximum likelihood estimator.*

We stress that the bounds are essentially tight since they refer to a *scale-normalized* SNR γ which contains the leading factors (see eq. (1)). We indeed observe that, if we cast the problem in the tensor PCA formulation, the bounds that can be obtained from the literature are far from optimal for our problem. Our bounds also improve drastically over the known bounds for this problem [22] (see Section A.2 for a detailed comparison). The upper bound is based on a (relatively standard) union bound analysis, which actually provides thresholds for *partial recovery* as well. For example, a threshold $1 + \sqrt{\alpha}$ is enough to recover any constant fraction of the planted solution (see Theorem 2.2 and Remark 2.3 for the exact bounds). The lower bound is a major technical contribution as it requires to deal with non-trivial *dependencies* between solutions (partial overlaps). For this we provide different proofs which employ the following arguments. The first proof uses a generalized Fano’s inequality and packing/covering suitably adapted to our problem; The second proof uses recent tail bounds for maximum of Gaussian r.v. with bounded correlation, also combined with the packing/covering argument.

New algorithmic results based on approximate message passing (AMP) For many high dimensional statistical estimation problems this class of algorithms represent the best known technique, e.g., planted clique [26], dense and sparse PCA on both matrix and higher order tensors [55, 46, 47]. Recent work [59] suggest that a hierarchy of such AMP algorithms may actually match the performance of the best known efficient algorithms.

We provide an heuristic derivation of AMP together with a state evolution analysis for our problem as a generalization of the tensor PCA AMP

algorithm with non-factorizable prior distribution and obtain the following non-trivial *computationally-efficient* threshold:

$$\gamma_c^{AMP} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2e} \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^{h-1} \frac{1}{h(h-1) \log n}}.$$

Intuitively, for $k \approx n^\alpha$ and by ignoring low order terms, the above bound corresponds to $\gamma_c^{AMP} \approx \sqrt{n^{(1-\alpha)(h-1)}/(h(h-1) \log n)}$.

Implications and comparison with tensor PCA

Tensor PCA is a very closely related problem to ours, and the new results also suggest an interesting comparison with the known bounds [55, 55, 36, 50, 38, 5, 54]: 1) Applying the tensor PCA bounds “black-box” to our problem yields bounds that are far from optimal in most of the cases (see for example the upper and lower bounds given in Section A.1). The reason is that our problem imposes a “combinatorial” structure on the planted vector (a restricted prior) which tensor PCA does not have. The bounds must take into account this structure in the form of both parameters k and h . 2) While approximate message passing does not have a provable guarantee for “generic” tensor PCA, in our problem we are able to obtain a provable (algorithmic) SNR threshold; Moreover, this algorithm can be also experimentally tested to verify some ‘robustness’ property when it is initialized with the (correct) planted solution: Below our information-theoretic threshold, even with this initialization, it fails to return the planted solution (while above the information-theoretic threshold) it succeeds (when provided with this side-information).

Finally, we noticed that tensor PCA has yet a subtle difference. In tensor PCA, the estimator has more observations available in the form of “diagonal entries/self-loops” (for the simple matrix case $h = 2$, in tensor PCA we can also observe the “diagonal” elements W_{ii}). This means that algorithms for tensor PCA may not work for our problem (our experiments of AMP in this regard confirm that for some range of values these extra information is indeed important).

Further Related Work Our problem is closely related to the well studied *tensor PCA* and variants of the stochastic block model (SBM) studied in community detection. Here one seeks to recover some “dense” community hidden in a random graph. Notable examples include the *planted clique problem* [8, 56], its “relaxed” version known as the *k-densest*

subgraph [18], and extensions to uniform *hypergraphs* [41]. All these works deal with *unweighted* (Bernulli) random *graph* models.

The problem considered here, instead, deals with the *weighted* (Gaussian) model, where edges can assume different (continuous) weights. These formulations are notoriously more powerful in many applications, and they are sometimes referred to as weighted stochastic block model (WSBM) in community detection [3, 4, 53]. Moreover, we consider the case of *hypergraphs*, which strictly generalizes the graph setting ($h = 2$) to higher order interactions [16, 34, 42]. This results in a tensor PCA with a restricted prior to encode the solutions (k -densest sub-hypergraphs). Restricted priors are also studied in [54], where the authors provide tight threshold for (weak) recoverability for different problems and for “generic” (spherical) prior. Unlike ours, their restricted priors result in a moderate change in the information-theoretic threshold.

Different statistical and computational thresholds have been observed also in the problem of *sparse* PCA [25, 17] and in *some* versions of the stochastic block model (SBM) [1, 51, 2, 19]. Statistical and computational thresholds are still unknown for various SBM generalizations, including the *weighted* SBM (WSBM) [3, 4, 53] and the SBM on h -uniform hypergraph (hSBM) [20, 32]. For the WSBM, information-theoretic results are only known for *dense* regimes *and* by adding some additional restrictions ($h = 2$ [39] and $h = 4$ [43], where in both works the planted part consists two or more communities of equal size $k = \Theta(n)$). Spectral algorithms have been studied on *unweighted* hypergraphs [32, 33].

Recent developments focused on recovery conditions for the spike Wigner model [44, 10, 11, 14, 6, 54], SBM [60, 9], generalized linear models [12]. These approaches have been mainly applied to dense scenarios – roughly speaking, the case $k = \rho n$ for constant ρ . The extension to sparse scenarios have been developed recently in [13] (see also [7] for a survey). Further work relate the computationally hard regimes to the so-called overlap gap property (OGP) [30, 29, 31]. A recent work on tensor PCA [52] considers the minimum mean square error (MMSE) estimator. Their work shows that, under rather general conditions, there is a sharp critical threshold for the MMSE estimator in the sparse regimes; for our problem, after a proper rescaling, this yields a sharp threshold $\gamma^{MMSE} = \sqrt{(1 - \alpha)}$ for this estimator which corresponds a *weak* recovery condition (positive correlation).

tion).

1.2 Model and formal definitions

We study the problem of recovery a *planted* k -densest sub-hypergraph on h -uniform hypergraphs over n nodes. Every subset of h nodes $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_h\}$ is an (*hyper*)*edge* whose weight W_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_h} is a Gaussian random variable, defined according to the following process. Choose a subset x of k nodes uniformly at random (planted solution). The resulting weights are given by the h -order tensor $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}(x)$ in which all edges inside x have an initial *bias* $\beta \geq 0$, and these initial weights are perturbed by adding some Gaussian *noise* across all hyperedges $(i_1 i_2 \dots i_h)$ with $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_h$:

$$W_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \beta \mathbb{1}_{\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_h \in x\}} + Z_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{\{P\}} = 1$ if predicate P is true, and $\mathbb{1}_{\{P\}} = 0$ otherwise, and $Z_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. For any subset x of k nodes (a feasible solution), we also consider the sum of all $\binom{k}{h}$ weights of the hyperedges inside x ,

$$S = S(x) \equiv \sum_{\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_h\} \subseteq x} W_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_h}. \quad (4)$$

We say that *exact recovery* is achieved if there exists an estimator or algorithm $\hat{v}()$ that, on input the weight tensor $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}(x)$ given by (3) and planted x chosen uniformly at random, returns $\hat{v} = \hat{v}(\mathbf{W})$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\hat{v} = x) = 1 - o(1)$. Similarly k' -*partial recovery* is achieved if $\mathbb{P}(|\hat{v} \cap x| = k') = 1 - o(1)$. In these cases, we write $P_{\text{recover}} \rightarrow 1$ and $P_{\text{recover}}^{(k')} \rightarrow 1$, respectively. Our bounds depend on the *scale-normalized SNR* in eq. (1): $\gamma \equiv \beta \sqrt{\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k}} \cdot \frac{1}{2 \log n}$. This scaling incorporates the parameters k and h of the problem and it will result in information-theoretic thresholds located at finite values.

Remark 1.1 (rescaled SNR γ). The above rescaled SNR γ has also a natural interpretation for our problem. If we stipulate that the planted solution is sharply concentrated around its mean, and all $M = \binom{n-k}{k} \approx \binom{n}{k}$ *unbiased* solutions were *independent*, then their maximum would satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{planted} &\sim \mu_X = \beta \binom{k}{h} \\ \text{max unbiased} &\sim \sigma_X \sqrt{2 \log M} \end{aligned}$$

where *max unbiased* is the maximum (best) among all unbiased solutions (solutions that have no overlap

with the planted one). Recoverability would require a bias β such that ‘planted’ is bigger than the ‘max unbiased’ (best contender). Since every solution is a Gaussian r.v. given by the sum of $\binom{k}{h}$ Gaussians with variance 1, we have $\sigma_X = \sqrt{\binom{k}{h}}$, and by approximating $\log M \approx \log \binom{n}{k} \approx \log n^k = k \log n$, the condition above on β is exactly $\gamma \geq 1$.

The (information-theoretic) recoverability thresholds correspond to the performance of the MLE, which can be easily identified as the k -densest sub-hypergraph; that is, by the solution minimizing the quantity in eq. (4) (see [22, Theorem 4]).

Note that all these parameters may depend on n , that is, we consider $k = k(n)$ and $h(n)$. Throughout the paper we hide the dependency on n for the sake of readability. In most of the analysis, the following rescaling of the involved quantities will appear naturally:

$$\alpha_q \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q}{\log n} \quad (5)$$

which intuitively means that $q \approx n^\delta$ for $\delta = \alpha_q$. We call α_q the *rate* of a generic $q = q(n)$. We shall sometimes represent solutions as binary (0-1) vectors of length n and, to cast the problem into the tensor PCA framework, rescale them into unitary vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} Sol_k &\equiv \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_i x_i = k\}, \\ UnSol_k &\equiv \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_i x_i = 1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

(The 0-1 formulation is mostly convenient for our proofs, while the rescaling to unitary vectors is necessary to compare the bounds for tensor PCA in the literature.)

2 Information Theoretic Bounds

2.1 Main Intuition (for both upper and lower bounds)

In both the upper and lower bounds, it is natural to consider the weight S_{planted} of the planted solution compared to the maximum (best) among all other solutions (contenders). Moreover, for the purpose of the analysis, it is useful to partition the latter (contenders) according to their overlap with the planted solution.

Further notation. Throughout this section, we shall identify each solution simply by its total weight S as defined in eq. (3). The weight of the planted solution is denoted by S_{planted} , while S_m denotes the set of (weights of) solutions sharing exactly m nodes with the planted solution. With slight abuse of notation we write $S \in S_m$ to denote the weight S of a particular solution in that set S_m , when this is clear from the context. Finally, for any set S , $\max(S) \equiv \max_{S \in S} S$.

To study the recoverability thresholds we analyze the behaviour of the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) which can be easily identified as the k -densest sub-hypergraph (see Theorem 4 in [22] for a proof). We consider k' -partial recover for the MLE estimator. Exact recovery corresponds to the case $k' = k$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $P_{\text{recover}}^{(k')}$ be the probability that the MLE recovers at least k' nodes from the planted solution, and $P_{\text{failrecover}}^{(k')} = 1 - P_{\text{recover}}^{(k')}$ the probability that it fails in doing so. For any m let S_m denote the set of all solutions that share exactly m nodes with the planted solution S_{planted} . Then the following holds for all $k' \in \{0, \dots, k\}$:*

$$P_{\text{failrecover}}^{(k')} \leq \sum_{m=0}^{k'-1} \mathbb{P}(S_{\text{planted}} \leq \max(S_m)) ; \quad (7)$$

$$P_{\text{failrecover}} \equiv P_{\text{failrecover}}^{(k)} \geq \mathbb{P}(S_{\text{planted}} < \max(S_m)), \quad (8)$$

where (8) holds for every $m < k$.

The proof of this lemma is a simple union bound and the definition that S_m corresponds to the solutions with overlap m with the planted one.

Intuitively speaking, our goal is to distinguish between the case in which recovery is possible from the one in which it is impossible, i.e., whether γ is in the regime such that

$$\mathbb{P}(P_{\text{failrecover}}^{(k')} \rightarrow 0) \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbb{P}(P_{\text{failrecover}}^{(k')} \rightarrow 1).$$

We shall reduce this question to the study of the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(S_{\text{planted}} < \max(S_m))$, so to determine the values of γ for which

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S_{\text{planted}} \leq \max(S_m)) &\rightarrow 0 & \text{or} \\ \mathbb{P}(S_{\text{planted}} \leq \max(S_m)) &\rightarrow 1 \end{aligned}$$

where in the first scenario (recovery possible) we need these probabilities to go to zero *sufficiently fast* to apply the union bound (eq. (7)) over all different m .

2.2 Upper bound (possibility of approximate or exact recovery)

Recall that we consider the problem of recovering $k' \leq k$ nodes inside the planted solution. The upper bounds for exact or partial recovery depend on the parameters k' and k and how close they are to each other (e.g., for $k' = k$ we have exact recovery). The main result proved in Section B.6 follows:

Theorem 2.2 (upper bound). *For any k and any $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ it holds that $P_{\text{recover}}^{(k')} \rightarrow 1$ for any $\gamma > \gamma_{UB}^{(k')}$, where $\gamma_{UB}^{(k')} \equiv \sqrt{1 + \alpha_k - 2\alpha_{k-k'} + \alpha_{k'}} + \sqrt{\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-k'} + \alpha_{k'}}$ and $\alpha_k, \alpha_{k'}$ and $\alpha_{k-k'}$ are defined according to eq. (10).*

Remark 2.3. For the regime $k \approx n^\alpha$ (more generally for $\alpha_k = \alpha$) we get the following trade offs: (1) *Exact recovery* ($k' = k$), corresponds to $\gamma_{UB} = \sqrt{1 + 2\alpha} + \sqrt{2\alpha}$. (2) *Recovery a constant fraction* ($k' = \lambda k$), corresponds to $\gamma_{UB}^{(\lambda k)} = 1 + \sqrt{\alpha}$. (3) *Recovery a root* ($k' = k^\beta$), corresponds to $\gamma_{UB}^{(k^\beta)} = \sqrt{1 - \alpha + \alpha\beta} + \sqrt{\alpha\beta}$.

2.3 Lower bounds (impossibility of recovery)

We shall present two proofs leading to optimal bounds in different regimes. The proofs use different arguments (tail bounds on maximum of *dependent* Gaussians and the generalized Fano's inequality, respectively). Both proofs start by considering a *sufficiently large* set of *weakly overlapping* solutions (whose existence is given by Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 below). Intuitively, recovery in the original problem is at least as difficult as recovery restricted to this set of weakly dependent solutions.

Lemma 2.4. *For any $r \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ there exists a subset $Cover_r$ of solutions satisfying the following conditions: (1) Any two solutions in $Cover_r$ share less than r nodes. (2) For any solution $x \notin Cover_r$ there exists a solution $y \in Cover_r$ such that x and y have at least r nodes in common. (3) The total number of solutions in $Cover_r$ is at least*

$$C(r) \gtrsim \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{B(r)} \quad \text{for} \quad B(r) = \sum_{d=r}^k \binom{k}{d} \binom{n-k}{k-d}. \quad (9)$$

As we shall prove below, the lower bounds can be characterized via the following *rate* that comes from

the set $Cover_r$ above:

$$\alpha_{C(r)} \stackrel{(9)}{=} \frac{\log C(r)}{\log n}. \quad (10)$$

Lemma 2.5 (lower bound on the rate). *For any $k = n^\alpha$ and $r \leq \lambda k$, with constant $\alpha, \lambda \in (0, 1)$, and for $r = \omega(\frac{k}{\log n})$ it holds that $\alpha_{C(r)} \gtrsim r(1 - \alpha)$.*

2.3.1 Lower bound via concentration of the maximum of dependent Gaussians

This proof of the lower bound is based result on tail bounds on the *maximum* of Gaussians with *bounded* correlation [48] (Lemma B.4 below). The resulting bound proved in Section B.6 is as follows:

Theorem 2.6 (lower bound). *For $k \approx n^\alpha$ for constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and for $h = \omega(1)$ the following holds. For any arbitrarily small constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ it holds that*

$$\gamma \leq \begin{cases} (1 - \epsilon_0) \cdot \sqrt{1 - \alpha} & \text{for } h = o(\sqrt{k}) \\ (1 - \epsilon_0) \cdot \sqrt{1 - \alpha} / \sqrt{e} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

implies $P_{\text{recover}} \rightarrow 0$.

Intuitively, we use the above mentioned result (Lemma B.4) to show that the maximum among solutions in $Cover_r$ (contenders of the planted solution) concentrates tightly around

$$\sigma_k \sqrt{\alpha_{C(r)} \cdot 2 \log n} \quad (12)$$

where $\sigma_k = \sqrt{\binom{k}{h}}$, while the planted solution concentrates around its expectation $\beta_k = \beta(\frac{k}{h})$. Then, the condition for recovery translates into μ_k being larger than (12) which corresponds to (essentially) $\gamma < \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{C(r)}}{k}}$. A crucial point is that, in order to arrive to (12), we need r such that the maximum correlation between solutions vanishes, which gives the conditions on h in Theorem 2.6 and the corresponding bound on $\alpha_{C(r)}$.

2.3.2 Lower bound via generalized Fano's inequality

In this section, we prove a lower bound based on Fano's inequality and a tensor-based formulation of the problem. This proof follows the same ideas in [55], though it contains a couple of additional ingredients (a different estimate due to the absence of "diagonal" elements and an estimate of certain binomial

summations stemming from the ‘‘combinatorial’’ nature of our problem). The following is proven in Section B.7:

Theorem 2.7. *For $k \approx n^\alpha$ for constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and for any small constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ we have*

$$\gamma < (1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\frac{1 - \alpha}{2}} \implies P_{\text{recover}} \not\rightarrow 1. \quad (13)$$

Intuitively, by restricting to the solutions in $Cover_r$, we use the generalized Fano’s inequality [57] to show that $P_{\text{failrecover}} = 1 - P_{\text{recover}}$ satisfies

$$P_{\text{failrecover}} \gtrsim 1 - \frac{I(x; \mathbf{W})}{\log |Cover_r|} \quad (14)$$

where $I(x; \mathbf{W})$ is the mutual information between x and $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}(x)$. By using [57] and the combinatorial structure of x , we can show an upper bound $\binom{k}{h} \beta^2$ on the mutual information. We do this by considering the (KL-divergence between) the laws of $\mathbf{W}(x)$ and $\mathbf{W}(x')$ for different x and x' . Simple rescaling according to γ yields $\frac{I(x; \mathbf{W})}{\log |Cover_r|} \lesssim \frac{2\gamma^2 k}{\alpha_{C(r)}}$ which immediately implies $P_{\text{recover}} \lesssim \frac{2\gamma^2 k}{\alpha_{C(r)}}$. This corresponds to (essentially) $\gamma < \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{C(r)}}{2k}}$ and the theorem follows by applying the bound on $\alpha_{C(r)}$ in Lemma 2.5 with $r = \lambda k$ and constant $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.

3 Computational Thresholds via Approximate Message Passing

Approximate message passing algorithms are a class of algorithms for high dimensional statistical estimation that approximate belief propagation in the large system limit [27]. This class of algorithms has been proposed for the related problem of tensor PCA estimation. Intuitively, it iteratively estimates the mean $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ and the variance $\mathbf{a}^{(t)}$ of the classic belief propagation messages in the factor graph of the estimation problem, discarding low order terms that depend on the target factor node of the messages. The algorithm results in a slight modification of a general spectral algorithm for tensor PCA. In the following we use the operator ‘ \circ ’ to denote an operation that is performed elementwise on a vector or tensor.

Prior distribution and threshold function For $p(\mathbf{y})$ being the prior distribution of the model (in our case, this is the uniform distribution over the vectors

corresponding to the possible subsets of k nodes, i.e., the vectors $\mathbf{y} \in UnSol_k$ as defined in eq. (6)), Let us first introduce the following probability distribution

$$g(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{y}) \exp(\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} - (\mathbf{y} \circ \mathbf{y}) \cdot \mathbf{a})/2}{Z(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})}$$

where $Z(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})$ is the normalizing constant. Then, we define the following threshold function which will be used in the definition of AMP algorithm below:

$$f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}_{g(\cdot|\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x})}[\mathbf{y}]. \quad (15)$$

Further tensor notation Let us now introduce for convenience the following notation. Given a h -th order tensor $\mathbf{W} \in \bigotimes^h \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the map $\mathbf{W} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$\mathbf{W}\{\mathbf{x}\}_i = \sum_{j_2, \dots, j_h} W_{i, j_2, \dots, j_h} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_h} \quad (16)$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The outer product of two tensors $\mathbf{W} \in \bigotimes^{h_1} \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \bigotimes^{h_2} \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $\mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{Y}$, i.e., $(\mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{Y})_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h j_1 j_2 \dots j_\ell} = \mathbf{W}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_\ell} \mathbf{Y}_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_\ell}$. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define $\mathbf{x}^{\otimes h} = \mathbf{x} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{x} \in \bigotimes^h \mathbb{R}^n$ as the h -th outer power of \mathbf{x} . The inner product of the two tensors $\mathbf{W} \in \bigotimes^{h_1} \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \bigotimes^{h_2} \mathbb{R}^n$ with $h_2 \leq h_1$ is defined as $\langle \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y} \rangle = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_{h_2}} \mathbf{W}_{i_1, \dots, i_{h_2-h_1}, j_1, \dots, j_{h_2}} \mathbf{Y}_{j_1, \dots, j_{h_2}}$.

The AMP procedure The iterative AMP procedure reads (derivation given in Section C):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}^{(t)} &= \beta^2 (h-1) \langle \mathbf{W}^{\circ 2}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(t)} \rangle \otimes (\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t-1)})^{\otimes h-2} \\ \mathbf{x}^{(t)} &= \beta \mathbf{W}\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\} - \mathbf{b}^{(t)} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t-1)} \\ \mathbf{a}^{(t)} &= \beta^2 \mathbf{W}^{\circ 2} \{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)})^{\circ 2}\} \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(t+1)} &= \text{diag}(\mathbf{J}_x f(\mathbf{a}^{(t)}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)})) \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t+1)} &= f(\mathbf{a}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{J}_x f$ is the Jacobian w.r.t variable x of the function f and $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ extracts its diagonal entries.

Approximate the threshold function The threshold function f becomes tractable when the prior distribution p factorizes, that is, when $p(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_i p(y_i)$. In this case, the threshold function f factorizes into independent components, and the AMP equations proposed here are equivalent to those in [47] (more details in section C).

In our problem, however, the prior distribution does *not* factorize since p is the uniform distribution over all binary vectors with *exactly* k components set to 1 eq. (6). A similar issue arises in the

planted clique problem studied in [26], where the authors propose to approximate the prior distribution with a factorized Bernoulli distribution with parameter $\delta = k/n$. With this approximation the threshold function reads $f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = (f_i(a_i, x_i))_{i=1}^n$ where

$$f_i(a_i, x_i) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-x_i + a_i/2 + \log(1/\delta - 1))}.$$

While this Bernoulli approximation is effective for large k – like the regime $k = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ studied in [26] – it may be inaccurate for small k . We indeed observe experimentally (see Section 4) that at small values of k , the above approximation is no longer negligible. Hence, we propose a *finer* approximation of the threshold function, that is still tractable. Our parametrization is inspired by the independent Bernoulli approximation:

$$f(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-x_i + a_i/2 + \lambda(\mathbf{x}))} \right)_{i=1}^n \quad (18)$$

with $\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ being a scalar used to enforce f to select k components equals to 1 as in (6), hence given by $\sum_i f_i(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) = k$. The experiments described in section 4 below show that our finer approximation outperforms the Bernoulli i.i.d. approximation.

State Evolution The evolution of the approximated message passing algorithms in the special case of Bayesian-optimal inference can be tracked by a one dimensional iterative equation of the overlap order parameter. In our setting, with generic (even non-factorizable) prior distribution $p(x)$ and threshold function f we can define the multidimensional overlap order parameter

$$\mathbf{m}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{z}} [\mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{x}^0 \circ \mathbf{x}^{(t)}\}]$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the tensor with components $\mathbf{1}_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_h} = 1$ if $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_h$ and 0 otherwise, and the resulting mapping $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ is the one defined according to eq. (16). The multidimensional state evolution (SE) (generalizing [47]) reads then (see Section C for a heuristic derivation):

$$\mathbf{m}^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{z}} [\mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{x}^0 \circ f(\hat{\mathbf{m}}^{(t)}, \hat{\mathbf{m}}^{(t)} \circ \mathbf{x} + \sqrt{\hat{\mathbf{m}}^{(t)}} \circ \mathbf{z})\}]$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{m}}^{(t)} = \beta^2 \binom{n-1}{h-1} \mathbf{m}^{(t)}$, \mathbf{z} is a vector with i.i.d. standard Gaussian entries and the square root is applied elementwise. Note again that assuming a factorized i.i.d. prior distribution $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_i \tilde{p}(x_i)$ the

SE is equivalent to the single letter evolution of the *scalar* overlap $m_t = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{x}^0 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}$ described in [47]

$$m_{t+1} = \mathbb{E}_{x, z} [x \cdot f(\hat{m}_t, \hat{m}_t x + \sqrt{\hat{m}_t} z)] \quad (19)$$

where $x \sim \tilde{p}$, $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and $\hat{m}_t = \beta^2 \binom{n-1}{h-1} m_t$. In the following we derive an analytical threshold for the AMP algorithm to succeed, approximating the true prior distribution with factorized Bernoulli prior with parameter $\delta = \frac{k}{n}$ and using the simplified SE in eq. (19). A simple heuristic argument based on the study of the fixed points of the SE is given in section C.

Claim 3.1. *The critical γ for recovery for the AMP algorithm described in eq. (17) reads*

$$\gamma_c^{AMP} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2e} \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^{h-1} \frac{1}{h(h-1) \log n}}. \quad (20)$$

4 Experiments and Discussion

In Figure 1 we report both the empirical performance and the factorized SE (eq. (19)) fixed point for uninformative initialization (no better than random overlap with planted solution) and informative initialization (respectively UI and II) for different values of k . We can observe that for high value of k the Bernoulli i.i.d. approximation of the prior function and factorized thresholding function well matches the SE fixed point, with the UI empirical performance slightly worse than the SE prediction due to finite-size effects (as already observed for the planted clique detection problem in graph [26]). At smaller values of k ($k = 5$ and $k = 10$) the statistical dependency between signal components increases and the AMP empirical performance heavily mismatch the SE prediction. In this setting the proposed multivariate threshold function significantly outperform the naive factorized AMP, matching correctly the SE in the II setting. Interestingly the dynamic phase transition of the AMP indicated by the critical signal at which the SE with II fails is close to the conjectured information-theoretic threshold $\gamma_{IT} = 1$ (see [22]). This finding suggests a possibility of analysis of the IT thresholds with statistical physics inspired techniques (e.g. interpolation methods) that so far have never been applied rigorously to the case of structured priors (e.g. densest sub-hypergraph and planted clique problems). In Figure 2 we also report the factorized SE fixed point for $h = 3$ and $h = 4$ for both UI and II. We can




Figure 1: Empirical performance of the AMP algorithm for fixed $n = 500$ and different values of k (respectively, from left to right, $k = 20, 10, 5$). The experiment is repeated 20 times, and we report the median overlap achieved. The AMP and AMP VECT refer respectively to the use of a scalar and a vectorial thresholding function as in eq. (18)

observe the good agreement between the analytical computational threshold given by eq. (20) and the empirical fixed point obtained by the SE. The dynamical phase transition indicated by the m^* transition for II (bottom row) is close to the information theoretic lower bound (as shown already for the tensor PCA problem [47]).

References

- [1] Emmanuel Abbe, Afonso S Bandeira, and Georgina Hall. Exact recovery in the stochastic block model. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(1):471–487, 2016.
- [2] Emmanuel Abbe and Colin Sandon. Community detection in general stochastic block models: Fundamental limits and efficient algorithms for recovery. In *56th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 670–688. IEEE, 2015.
- [3] Christopher Aicher, Abigail Z Jacobs, and Aaron Clauset. Adapting the stochastic block model to edge-weighted networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1305.5782*, 2013.
- [4] Christopher Aicher, Abigail Z Jacobs, and Aaron Clauset. Learning latent block structure in weighted networks. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 3(2):221–248, 2014.
- [5] Gerard Ben Arous, Reza Gheissari, and Aukosh Jagannath. Algorithmic thresholds for tensor PCA. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.00921*, 2018.
- [6] Benjamin Aubin, Bruno Loureiro, Antoine Mailhard, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. The spiked matrix model with generative priors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12385*, 2019.
- [7] Afonso S Bandeira, Amelia Perry, and Alexander S Wein. Notes on computational-to-statistical gaps: predictions using statistical physics. *Portugaliae Mathematica*, 75(2):159–186, 2018.
- [8] Boaz Barak, Samuel B Hopkins, Jonathan Kerner, Pravesh Kothari, Ankur Moitra, and Aaron Potechin. A nearly tight sum-of-squares lower bound for the planted clique problem. In *57th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 428–437. IEEE, 2016.
- [9] Jean Barbier, Chun Lam Chan, and Nicolas Macris. Mutual information for the stochastic block model by the adaptive interpolation method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.07273*, 2019.
- [10] Jean Barbier, Mohamad Dia, Nicolas Macris, Florent Krzakala, Thibault Lesieur, and Lenka Zdeborová. Mutual information for symmetric rank-one matrix estimation: A proof of the replica formula. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 424–432, 2016.
- [11] Jean Barbier, Mohamad Dia, Nicolas Macris, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. Rank-one matrix estimation: analysis of algorithmic and information theoretic limits by the spatial coupling method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.02537*, 2018.




Figure 2: State evolution fixed point overlap m^* reached by the factorized equation in eq. (19). The first row reports the overlap obtain with uninformative initialization (UI, $m_0 \approx 0$), while the bottom row report the overlap with informative initialization $m_0 = 1$. The empirical fixed point with UI, well matches the analytical AMP threshold given by eq. (20) (brown line, expressed in terms of the β parameter). Upper and lower bound are also reported for reference.

- [12] Jean Barbier, Florent Krzakala, Nicolas Macris, Léo Miolane, and Lenka Zdeborová. Optimal errors and phase transitions in high-dimensional generalized linear models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(12):5451–5460, 2019.
- [13] Jean Barbier and Nicolas Macris. 0-1 phase transitions in sparse spiked matrix estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05030*, 2019.
- [14] Jean Barbier and Nicolas Macris. The adaptive interpolation method for proving replica formulas. Applications to the Curie–Weiss and Wigner spike models. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 52(29):294002, 2019.
- [15] Jean Barbier, Nicolas Macris, and Cynthia Rush. All-or-nothing statistical and computational phase transitions in sparse spiked matrix estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07971*, 2020.
- [16] Austin R. Benson, David F. Gleich, and Jure Leskovec. Higher-order organization of complex networks. *Science*, 353(6295):163–166, 2016.
- [17] Quentin Berthet and Philippe Rigollet. Complexity theoretic lower bounds for sparse principal component detection. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 1046–1066, 2013.
- [18] Matthew Brennan, Guy Bresler, and Wasim Huleihel. Reducibility and computational lower bounds for problems with planted sparse structure. In *31st Conference On Learning Theory (COLT)*, volume 75 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 48–166, 2018.
- [19] Yudong Chen and Jiaming Xu. Statistical-computational phase transitions in planted models: The high-dimensional setting. In *31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, PMLR, pages 244–252, 2014.
- [20] I Chien, Chung-Yi Lin, and I-Hsiang Wang. Community detection in hypergraphs: Optimal

- statistical limit and efficient algorithms. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, PMLR, pages 871–879, 2018.
- [21] Eden Chlamtac, Michael Dinitz, Christian Konrad, Guy Kortsarz, and George Rabanca. The Densest k-Subhypergraph Problem. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM)*, volume 60 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:19, 2016.
- [22] Luca Corinzia, Paolo Penna, Luca Mondada, and Joachim M. Buhmann. Exact recovery for a family of community-detection generative models. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 415–419. IEEE, 2019.
- [23] Thomas M Cover. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [24] Bernard Derrida. Random-energy model: An exactly solvable model of disordered systems. *Physical Review B*, 24(5):2613, 1981.
- [25] Yash Deshpande and Andrea Montanari. Information-theoretically optimal sparse pca. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2197–2201. IEEE, 2014.
- [26] Yash Deshpande and Andrea Montanari. Finding hidden cliques of size $\sqrt{N/e}$ in nearly linear time. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 15(4):1069–1128, 2015.
- [27] David L Donoho, Arian Maleki, and Andrea Montanari. Message-passing algorithms for compressed sensing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(45):18914–18919, 2009.
- [28] William Feller. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications*, volume 2. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- [29] David Gamarnik and Aukosh Jagannath. The overlap gap property and approximate message passing algorithms for p -spin models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.06943*, 2019.
- [30] David Gamarnik, Aukosh Jagannath, and Subhabrata Sen. The overlap gap property in principal submatrix recovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09959*, 2019.
- [31] David Gamarnik and Ilias Zadik. The landscape of the planted clique problem: Dense subgraphs and the overlap gap property. *arXiv 1904.07174*, 2019.
- [32] Debarghya Ghoshdastidar and Ambedkar Dukkipati. Consistency of spectral partitioning of uniform hypergraphs under planted partition model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 397–405, 2014.
- [33] Debarghya Ghoshdastidar and Ambedkar Dukkipati. Consistency of spectral hypergraph partitioning under planted partition model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(1):289–315, 2017.
- [34] Jacopo Grilli, György Barabás, Matthew J Michalska-Smith, and Stefano Allesina. Higher-order interactions stabilize dynamics in competitive network models. *Nature*, 548(7666):210–213, 2017.
- [35] Shi Gu, Muzhi Yang, John D Medaglia, Ruben C Gur, Raquel E Gur, Theodore D Satterthwaite, and Danielle S Bassett. Functional hypergraph uncovers novel covariant structures over neurodevelopment. *Human brain mapping*, 38(8):3823–3835, 2017.
- [36] Samuel B Hopkins, Jonathan Shi, and David Steurer. Tensor principal component analysis via sum-of-square proofs. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 956–1006, 2015.
- [37] Yukito Iba. The Nishimori line and Bayesian statistics. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 32(21):3875, 1999.
- [38] Aukosh Jagannath, Patrick Lopatto, and Leo Miolane. Statistical thresholds for tensor PCA. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.03403*, 2018.
- [39] Varun Jog and Po-Ling Loh. Information-theoretic bounds for exact recovery in weighted stochastic block models using the Renyi divergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.06418*, 2015.
- [40] Jean-Michel Jolion and Walter Kropatsch. *Graph based representations in pattern recognition*, volume 12. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [41] Chuyang Ke and Jean Honorio. Exact partitioning of high-order planted models with a

- tensor nuclear norm constraint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.11666*, 2020.
- [42] Zheng Tracy Ke, Feng Shi, and Dong Xia. Community detection for hypergraph networks via regularized tensor power iteration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.06503*, 2019.
- [43] Chiheon Kim, Afonso S Bandeira, and Michel X Goemans. Community detection in hypergraphs, spiked tensor models, and sum-of-squares. In *International Conference on Sampling Theory and Applications (SampTA)*, pages 124–128. IEEE, 2017.
- [44] Florent Krzakala, Jiaming Xu, and Lenka Zdeborová. Mutual information in rank-one matrix estimation. In *IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pages 71–75. IEEE, 2016.
- [45] Robert Legenstein, Wolfgang Maass, Christos H. Papadimitriou, and Santosh S. Vempala. Long Term Memory and the Densest K-Subgraph Problem. In *9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS)*, volume 94 of *LIPIcs*, pages 57:1–57:15, 2018.
- [46] Thibault Lesieur, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. Constrained low-rank matrix estimation: Phase transitions, approximate message passing and applications. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2017(7):073403, 2017.
- [47] Thibault Lesieur, Léo Miolane, Marc Lelarge, Florent Krzakala, and Lenka Zdeborová. Statistical and computational phase transitions in spiked tensor estimation. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 511–515. IEEE, 2017.
- [48] Miles E Lopes. On the maximum of dependent gaussian random variables: A sharp bound for the lower tail. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.08539*, 2018.
- [49] Andrea Montanari. Statistical estimation: from denoising to sparse regression and hidden cliques. *Statistical Physics, Optimization, Inference, and Message-Passing Algorithms: Lecture Notes of the Les Houches School of Physics: Special Issue*, 2013.
- [50] Andrea Montanari, Daniel Reichman, and Ofer Zeitouni. On the limitation of spectral methods: From the gaussian hidden clique problem to rank-one perturbations of gaussian tensors. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 217–225. 2015.
- [51] Elchanan Mossel, Joe Neeman, and Allan Sly. Consistency thresholds for the planted bisection model. In *47th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 69–75. ACM, 2015.
- [52] Jonathan Niles-Weed and Ilias Zadik. The All-or-Nothing Phenomenon in Sparse Tensor PCA. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.00921 2007.11138*, 2020.
- [53] Tiago P Peixoto. Nonparametric weighted stochastic block models. *Physical Review E*, 97(1):012306, 2018.
- [54] Amelia Perry, Alexander S. Wein, and Afonso S. Bandeira. Statistical limits of spiked tensor models. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 56(1):230–264, 02 2020.
- [55] Emile Richard and Andrea Montanari. A statistical model for tensor pca. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2897–2905, 2014.
- [56] Jacob Steinhardt. Does robustness imply tractability? A lower bound for planted clique in the semi-random model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05120*, 2017.
- [57] Sergio Verdú et al. Generalizing the fano inequality. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 40(4):1247–1251, 1994.
- [58] Zhijiang Wang, Jiming Liu, Ning Zhong, Yulin Qin, Haiyan Zhou, Jian Yang, and Kuncheng Li. A naive hypergraph model of brain networks. In *International Conference on Brain Informatics*, pages 119–129. Springer, 2012.
- [59] A. S. Wein, A. El Alaoui, and C. Moore. The kikuchi hierarchy and tensor pca. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1446–1468, 2019.
- [60] Lenka Zdeborová and Florent Krzakala. Statistical physics of inference: Thresholds and algorithms. *Advances in Physics*, 65(5):453–552, 2016.

- [61] Chen Zu, Yue Gao, Brent Munsell, Minjeong Kim, Ziwen Peng, Yingying Zhu, Wei Gao, Daoqiang Zhang, Dinggang Shen, and Guorong Wu. Identifying high order brain connectome biomarkers via learning on hypergraph. In *International Workshop on Machine Learning in Medical Imaging*, pages 1–9. Springer, 2016.

Appendices

A Bounds in the literature

A.1 Tensor PCA formulations

We follow the terminology of [36] to explain the similarities/differences between tensor PCA and our problem.

Problem A.1 (Symmetric Tensor PCA). *Given an input tensor $\mathbf{T} = \tau \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A}$, where $v \in R^n$ is an arbitrary unit vector, $\tau \geq 0$ is the signal-to-noise ratio, and \mathbf{A} is a random noise tensor with iid standard Gaussian entries, recover the signal v approximately. Moreover, the noise tensor is symmetric and thus so is the input tensor as well, that is, $\mathbf{A}_{\pi(i_1)\pi(i_2)\dots\pi(i_h)} = \mathbf{A}_{i_1i_2\dots i_h}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{\pi(i_1)\pi(i_2)\dots\pi(i_h)} = \mathbf{T}_{i_1i_2\dots i_h}$ for any permutation π .*

Problem A.2 (Planted k -Densest Sub-Hypergraph). *This problem is a variant of symmetric tensor PCA in which we impose the following additional structure:*

1. *We consider only the $\binom{n}{h}$ entries with distinct indices, that is, $\mathbf{T}_{i_1i_2\dots i_h} = 0$ whenever $i_a = i_b$ for some a and b .*
2. *The vector v encodes a planted k -Subgraph and thus has exactly k entries equal to $1/\sqrt{k}$, and all other entries are equal to 0.*

Remark A.3 (Impact of diagonal entries – Item 1). Dropping Condition 1 leads to the variant in which we make the substitution $\binom{n}{h} \mapsto n^h$ in Item 1 above.

Remark A.4 (Rescalings). Different papers consider different rescaling of the signal-to-noise ratio, that are here reported for convenience in Table 1. In general, consider a tensor

$$\mathbf{T} = \mu \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{A} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \qquad (21)$$

where v is a vector of unit length, and μ and σ^2 (signal and noise, respectively) determine the SNR. By simply rescaling so that we have normally distributed Gaussian noise, this is the same

$$\mathbf{T} = \mu/\sigma \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A} \qquad \mathbf{A} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \qquad (22)$$

and since in our formulation (SNR in eq. (1)) we consider the planted solution as a 0-1 vector x consisting of k ones and $n - k$ zeros, we are effectively considering a planted signal $\beta \cdot x^{\otimes h} = \beta\sqrt{k^h} \cdot v^{\otimes h}$ where $v = x/\sqrt{k}$ is a unitary vector. Therefore, the tensor PCA formulation in eq. (21) corresponds to

$$\beta\sqrt{k^h} = (\mu/\sigma) \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad \gamma = (\mu/\sigma)\sqrt{\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k^{h+1}} \cdot \frac{1}{2 \log n}} \qquad (23)$$

We use this relation to convert the existing bounds for tensor PCA in the literature in our SNR γ as shown in Table 1. In [★] we ignore the diagonal entries (see Remark A.3). As we are implicitly considering the easier problem with the additional entries, the bounds that one obtains are in a sense “optimistic” for our original problem.

The information-theoretic bounds translated in our scale read as follows:

$$\text{lower bound [55]:} \qquad \beta \leq \sqrt{\frac{h}{10}} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad \gamma \leq \sqrt{\frac{n \cdot h! \binom{k}{h}}{k^{h+1}} \frac{1}{20 \log n}} \qquad (24)$$

$$\text{upper bound [55]:} \qquad \beta \geq \sqrt{h \log h} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad \gamma \geq \sqrt{\frac{n \cdot h! \binom{k}{h}}{k^{h+1}} \frac{\log h}{2 \log n}} \qquad (25)$$

Table 1: Signal to noise ratio scaling in the literature

| Tensor | Noise | SNR (\star =ours) |
|--|--|---|
| $\mathbf{T} = \beta \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/(n(h-1)!))$ | β [55] |
| $\mathbf{T} = \beta' \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2/(n \cdot h!))$ | β' [50] |
| $\mathbf{T} = \beta'' \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2/(n \cdot h!))$ | β'' [54] |
| $\mathbf{T} = \tau \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ | τ [36] |
| $\mathbf{T} = \lambda \sqrt{n} \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ | λ [38, 5] |
| $\mathbf{T} = \sqrt{\lambda_n} \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ | λ_n [52] |
| $\mathbf{T} = \beta \sqrt{k^h} \cdot v^{\otimes h} + \mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ | $\gamma = \beta \sqrt{\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{2 \log n}}$ [\star] |

Sharper bounds have been obtained for detection and (weak) recoverability:

$$\text{generic (spherical) prior [54]:} \quad \beta'' = \sqrt{2 \log h} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \gamma = \sqrt{\frac{n \cdot h! \binom{k}{h} \log h}{k^{h+1} 2 \log n}} \quad (26)$$

$$\text{iid } \{\pm 1\}^{\rho n} \text{ (Radamacher) prior [54]:} \quad \beta'' = 2\sqrt{H(\rho) + \rho \log 2} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \gamma = \sqrt{\frac{n \cdot h! \binom{k}{h} \log h}{k^{h+1} 4 \log n}} \quad (27)$$

where the Radamacher prior bounds apply to one of the following restrictions: (i) the dense regimes with any constant $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and $h \rightarrow \infty$ or (2) the sparse regime $\rho \rightarrow 0$ but with constant h .

Sharp bounds on the (still intractable) MMSE estimator have been also obtained [52]. A direct (naive) use of their result on what they call Bernulli prior (our problem but with the diagonal entries) would lead to the following bound:

$$\text{MMSE [52]:} \quad \lambda_n = 2 \log \binom{n}{k} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \gamma^{MMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k^{h+1}} \cdot \frac{2 \log \binom{n}{k}}{2 \log n}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k^h} \cdot (1 - \alpha)} \quad (28)$$

The above bound is in fact not correct as it makes a wrong use of the general result in [52]. A more careful application of their general result in fact yields a sharp threshold for the MMSE in our problem (without diagonal entries)

$$\gamma^{MMSE} = \sqrt{1 - \alpha}$$

which can be obtained by a proper rescale of the planted vector \mathbf{v} so that the resulting tensor (without diagonal entries) has unit length. Note that these bounds on the MMSE regard the problem of finding a vector with a positive (non vanishing) correlation with the planted vector (weak recovery).

Algorithmic upper bounds provided by sum-of-squares (SOS) algorithms [36] are:

$$\tau^{SOS} \geq n^{h/4} \log(n)^{1/4} / \epsilon \quad \gamma^{SOS} \geq \sqrt{\frac{n^{h/2} \binom{k}{h}}{k^{h+1}} \frac{1}{2\epsilon^2 \log(n)^{1/2}}} \quad (29)$$

for any $h \geq 3$ and where $\epsilon = \frac{\text{loss}}{k}$ due to the normalized (unitary) vector x ; In our setting, where we require perfect recovery, we have $\text{loss} < 1$ which corresponds to set $\epsilon = 1/k$ in the bound above. Note that for $k \approx n^\alpha$ this bound can be worse than the AMP threshold $\gamma_c^{AMP} \approx \sqrt{n^{(1-\alpha)(h-1)}}$.

Further papers provide general bounds whose thresholds do *not* have a closed form and apply to the

(easier) problem of detection (distinguish between a tensor with planted signal from the pure random noise):

$$\beta_h^{2nd} \equiv \inf_{q \in (0,1)} \sqrt{-\frac{1}{q^h} \log(1-q^2)} \quad \text{detection with eigenvalues} \quad [50] \quad (30)$$

$$\lambda_c \equiv \sup \left\{ \lambda \geq 0 \mid \sup_{t \in [0,1]} f_\lambda(t) \leq 0 \right\} \quad \text{detection = positive correlation} \quad [38] \quad (31)$$

$$f_\lambda(t) = \lambda^2 t^h + \log(1-t) + t$$

A.2 Prior information-theoretic bounds

We report the prior upper and lower bounds on the very same problem in [22, Theorem 5]. For the sake of comparison, we rewrite the upper and lower bound there according to our scaled-normalized SNR γ , and denote these bounds as γ_{lb} and γ_{ub} , respectively. As we can see below, these bounds are very loose in most of the cases, $\gamma_{lb} \ll \gamma_{LB} \leq \gamma_{UB} \ll \gamma_{ub}$:

$$\gamma_{lb} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{h}} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{ub} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2} & \frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k} \frac{1}{\log n} \rightarrow 0 \\ 2\sqrt{1+c(1+\log 2)} & \frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k} \frac{1}{\log n} \rightarrow c \in (0, +\infty) \\ 2\sqrt{\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k \log n} \cdot \frac{1+\log 2}{1-\alpha}} & k \lesssim n^\alpha, \alpha \in (0, 1) \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

For instance, when $1 \ll h \ll k$ we have $\gamma_{lb} \rightarrow 0$ and $\gamma_{ub} \rightarrow +\infty$.

B Postponed proofs

B.1 Probability tools

We shall use the well-known inequalities on *tail distribution of Gaussians*: For any $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ and any $c > 0$, it holds that (see [28, Section 7.1])

$$\left(\frac{1}{c} - \frac{1}{c^2}\right) \cdot \frac{e^{-c^2/2\sigma^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \leq \mathbb{P}(X > \mu + c) \leq \frac{1}{c} \cdot \frac{e^{-c^2/2\sigma^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}. \quad (33)$$

B.2 Proof of Lemma 2.1

The upper bound in (7) follows since $S_{\text{planted}} > S$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_m$. Then the MLE must return S_{planted} or some solution in $\mathcal{S}_{m+1} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{S}_k$, and the inequality follow from the union bound on the probability $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{m=0}^{k'-1} \{S_{\text{planted}} \leq \max(\mathcal{S}_m)\}\right)$. For the lower bound in (8) we can observe that if $S_{\text{planted}} < \max(\mathcal{S}_m)$ for some $m < k$, then the MLE cannot return S_{planted} , and thus it fails to exactly recover the planted solution.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 2.2

For the purpose of the analysis, we define the following quantities depending on $k' \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$:

$$d(k') \equiv \binom{k}{h} - \binom{k'}{h} = \binom{k}{h} (1 - \rho(k')), \quad Q_{k'} \equiv \binom{n-k}{k-k'},$$

$$M_{k'} \equiv \binom{k}{k'} \binom{n-k}{k-k'} = \binom{k}{k-k'} \binom{n-k}{k-k'}$$

Note that, for each *fixed* subset of k' nodes of the planted solution, there are $Q_{k'}$ solutions that share these k' nodes with the planted solution. Moreover, there are exactly $M_{k'}$ solutions that share k' nodes with the

planted solution. Each such solution sharing k' nodes with the planted solution differs in $d(k')$ edges with the planted solution. Finally, we let

$$t_\Delta \equiv \sqrt{\Delta 2 \log n} . \quad (34)$$

Lemma B.1. *Fix an arbitrary subset F of k' nodes of the planted solution, with $k' \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, and let $\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(F)}$ be the set of all solutions that share exactly this set of k' nodes with the planted solution. For any $S \in \mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(F)}$ let $S^{(-F)}$ denote the sum of the weights in the non-common part, that is the sum of $d(k') = \binom{k}{h} - \binom{k'}{h}$ edge weights in S and with none of their nodes contained in F . Denote by $\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}$ the set of all the $S^{(-F)}$. For any $\Delta > 0$ and any $S^{(-F)}$ as above, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(S^{(-F)} > t_\Delta \right) \leq p_{k', \Delta} \equiv \left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\Delta}{d(k')}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta} \cdot \sqrt{2 \log n}} . \quad (35)$$

Moreover, the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > t_\Delta \right) \leq Q_{k'} \cdot p_{k', \Delta} \quad (36)$$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)} < d(k')\beta - t_\Delta \right) \leq p_{k', \Delta} \quad (37)$$

where $|\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}| = \binom{n-k}{k-k'} = Q_{k'}$.

Proof. Observe that each $S^{(-F)}$ consists of $d(k') = \binom{k}{h} - \binom{k'}{h}$ non-biased edges, and therefore $S^{(-F)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, d(k'))$. Hence, by applying eq. (33) with $t = t_\Delta = \sqrt{\Delta 2 \log n}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(S^{(-F)} > t_\Delta \right) \stackrel{(33)}{\leq} \frac{1}{t_\Delta} \cdot \frac{e^{-t_\Delta^2/2d(k')}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = \frac{e^{-(\Delta \log n)/d(k')}}{t_\Delta \sqrt{2\pi}} = \frac{n^{-\Delta/d(k')}}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta} \cdot \sqrt{2 \log n}} , \quad (38)$$

which proves eq. (35). By the union bound and eq. (35) we obtain eq. (36):

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > t \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{S^{(-F)} \in \mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}} S > t \right) \leq Q_{k'} \cdot p_{k', \Delta} .$$

Finally, eq. (37) holds by observing that, since all $d(k')$ edges of $S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)}$ are biased, we have $S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)} \sim \mathcal{N}(d(k')\beta, d(k'))$. Therefore, by applying eq. (33) with $t = d(k')\beta + t_\Delta$ we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)} < d(k')\beta - t_\Delta \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)} > d(k')\beta + t_\Delta \right) \stackrel{(33)}{\leq} \frac{1}{t_\Delta} \cdot \frac{e^{-t_\Delta^2/2d(k')}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$$

and the remaining of the proof is as above in eq. (38). \square

Theorem B.2. *For every $\eta \geq 0$ and for every $k' \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, let $\gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(k')} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{k}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{d(k')}} \cdot UB_\eta(k')$ where*

$$UB_\eta(k') \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\log M_{k'}}{\log n}} + \eta + \sqrt{\frac{\log \binom{k}{k'}}{\log n}} + \eta . \quad (39)$$

Then, for any $\gamma > \gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(k')}$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}) > S_{\text{planted}} \right) \in O \left(\frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{n^\eta} \right) .$$

Proof Idea. By the union bound over the $\binom{k}{k'}$ possible fixed subsets F of k' nodes, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}) > S_{\text{planted}}) \leq \binom{k}{k'} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)}).$$

Moreover, for any t , we have $\mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > t) + \mathbb{P}(t \geq S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)})$. Calculations show that, since $\gamma > \gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(k')}$, there exists a particular t such that Lemma B.1 implies that both these two probabilities go to 0 sufficiently fast. See Section B.3.1 for the full proof. \square

The rates α_k and $\alpha_{k-k'}$ defined by eq. (10) provide upper bounds for the fractions in eq. (39). Using the union bound over all $m \in \{0, \dots, k' - 1\}$ we can set $\eta = \alpha_{k'}$ so that the right hand side of eq. (7) goes to 0. This leads to the upper bound in Theorem 2.2.

B.3.1 Proof of Theorem B.2

Proof. For any $k' \in \{0, \dots, k - 1\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}) > S_{\text{planted}}) &\leq \binom{k}{k'} \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(F)}) > S_{\text{planted}}) \\ &= \binom{k}{k'} \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)}) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

We show below that $\gamma > \gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(k')}$ implies that there exists t such that

$$t_{\Delta'} < t < d(k')\beta - t_{\Delta''} \quad (41)$$

with

$$\frac{\Delta'}{d(k')} \geq \frac{\log M_{k'}}{\log N} + \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Delta''}{d(k')} \geq \frac{\log \binom{k}{k'}}{\log n} + \eta. \quad (42)$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(X > Y) \leq \mathbb{P}(X > t) + \mathbb{P}(t \geq Y)$ for every t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > t) + \mathbb{P}(t \geq S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}^{(-F)}) > t_{\Delta'}) + \mathbb{P}(d(k')\beta - t_{\Delta''} > S_{\text{planted}}^{(-F)}) \\ &\leq Q_m \cdot p_{k', \Delta'} + p_{k', \Delta''} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where the latter inequality follows from eq. (37) and eq. (36). Combining eq. (40) and eq. (43), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}) > S_{\text{planted}}) &\leq \binom{k}{k'} (Q_m \cdot p_{k', \Delta'} + p_{k', \Delta''}) = \\ &\binom{k}{k'} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\Delta'}{d(k')}} \frac{Q_m}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta'} \cdot \sqrt{2\log n}} \right) + \binom{k}{k'} \left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\Delta''}{d(k')}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta''} \cdot \sqrt{2\log n}} \right) = \\ &\left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\Delta'}{d(k')} - \frac{\log M_{k'}}{\log n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta'} \cdot \sqrt{2\log n}} \right) + \left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{\Delta''}{d(k')} - \frac{\log \binom{k}{k'}}{\log n}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta''} \cdot \sqrt{2\log n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used in the first equality eq. (35) and in the last equality the identity $z = n^{\frac{\log z}{\log n}}$ and the fact that $\binom{k}{h}Q_{k'} = \binom{k}{h}\binom{n-k}{k-k'} = M_{k'}$. Then, by eq. (42) we get the next two inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_{k'}) > S_{\text{planted}}) &\leq \frac{1}{n^\eta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \cdot \sqrt{2\log n}} \left(\frac{1}{\Delta'} + \frac{1}{\Delta''} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^\eta} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sqrt{2\log n} \cdot d(k')} \left(\frac{\log n}{\log M_{k'}} + \frac{\log n}{\log \binom{k}{k'}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^\eta} \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used $d(k') \geq 1$, for $k' \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, and $M_{k'} \geq \binom{k}{h} \geq k$.

To conclude the proof we show that $\gamma > \gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(k')}$ implies that there exists t such that eq. (41) and eq. (42) hold. We set $\Delta' = d(k') \left(\frac{\log M_{k'}}{\log n} + \eta \right)$ and $\Delta'' = d(k') \left(\frac{\log \binom{k}{k'}}{\log n} + \eta \right)$ so that eq. (42) holds. By plugging this into eq. (41), we can rewrite the inequality $t_{\Delta'} < d(k')\beta - t_{\Delta''}$ as follows:

$$d(k')\beta > t_{\Delta'} + t_{\Delta''} \stackrel{(34)}{>} \sqrt{2\log n}(\sqrt{\Delta'} + \sqrt{\Delta''})$$

hence by the rescaling in eq. (1) we get the condition for the SNR:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2\log n}} &> \frac{1}{d(k')}(\sqrt{\Delta'} + \sqrt{\Delta''}) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{d(k')}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log M_{k'}}{\log n} + \eta} + \sqrt{\frac{\log \binom{k}{k'}}{\log n} + \eta} \right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{d(k')}} \cdot UB_\eta(k') \end{aligned}$$

and the theorem follows from the identity definition of γ in eq. (1). \square

B.3.2 Bounds on $\gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(k')}$ in Theorem B.2

We show the following result:

Lemma B.3. *For every k and $k' \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, it holds that*

$$\gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(k')} \leq \left(\sqrt{1 + \alpha_k - 2\alpha'_k + \eta} + \sqrt{\alpha_k - \alpha'_k + \eta} \right) \sqrt{\frac{(k-k')\binom{k}{h}}{\left(\binom{k}{h} - \binom{k'}{h}\right)k}} \quad (44)$$

$$\leq \left(\sqrt{1 + \alpha_k - 2\alpha'_k + \eta} + \sqrt{\alpha_k - \alpha'_k + \eta} \right). \quad (45)$$

Proof. Using the standard inequalities on binomial coefficients in eq. (49) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log \binom{k}{k'}}{\log n} &\leq (k-k') \frac{1 + \log k - \log(k-k')}{\log n} \stackrel{(10)}{\approx} (k-k')(\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-k'}), \\ \frac{\log \binom{n-k}{k-k'}}{\log n} &\leq (k-k') \frac{1 + \log(n-k) - \log(k-k')}{\log n} \stackrel{(10)}{\approx} (k-k')(1 - \alpha_{k-k'}), \end{aligned}$$

thus implying

$$\frac{\log M_{k'}}{\log n} = \frac{\log \binom{k}{k'} \binom{n-k}{k-k'}}{\log n} \lesssim (k-k')(1 + \alpha_k - 2\alpha_{k-k'}) .$$

By plugging this into the definition of $UB_\eta(k')$ in eq. (39), we get

$$UB_\eta(k') = \sqrt{\frac{\log M_{k'}}{\log n} + \eta} + \sqrt{\frac{\log \binom{k}{k'}}{\log n} + \eta} \lesssim \sqrt{1 + \alpha_k - 2\alpha_{k-k'} + \eta} + \sqrt{\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-k'} + \eta} .$$

Hence, using the definition of $\gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(k')}$ given in Theorem B.2, we obtain eq. (44). To conclude the proof we show that

$$\frac{k-k'}{\binom{k}{h} - \binom{k'}{h}} \leq \frac{k}{\binom{k}{h}} .$$

Simply observe that this inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{k-k'}{k} \leq \frac{\binom{k}{h} - \binom{k'}{h}}{\binom{k}{h}} \Leftrightarrow \frac{\binom{k'}{h}}{\binom{k}{h}} \leq \frac{k'}{k} . \quad (46)$$

For $k' < h$ this inequality is trivially satisfied since $\binom{k'}{h} = 0$. Otherwise we can write the previous inequality as

$$\frac{\binom{k'}{h}}{\binom{k}{h}} = \frac{k'!}{h!(k'-h)!} \frac{h!(k-h)!}{k!} = \frac{k'(k'-1)\cdots(k'-h+1)}{k(k-1)\cdots(k-h+1)} \leq \frac{k'}{k}$$

which is satisfied for any $k' \leq k$ since all these terms satisfy $\frac{k'-i}{k-i} \leq 1$, for $1 \leq i \leq h-1$.

B.3.3 Getting the Main Result (Theorem B.2 + Lemma B.3 \Rightarrow Theorem 2.2)

The idea is that by taking $\eta = \alpha_{k'} + \epsilon_0$, we can apply the union bound over all $m \leq k'$ to get the right hand side of eq. (7) going to 0, hence $P_{\text{failrecover}}^{(k')} \rightarrow 0$ and $P_{\text{recover}}^{(k')} \rightarrow 1$. Specifically, for γ satisfying $\gamma > \gamma_{UB_\eta}^{(m)}$ for all $m = \{0, \dots, k'\}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\max(\mathbf{S}_m) > S_{\text{planted}}) \in O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{n^\eta}\right)$ thus implying

$$P_{\text{failrecover}}^{(k')} \in O\left(\frac{k' \sqrt{\log n}}{n^\eta}\right) .$$

For $\eta = \alpha_{k'} + \epsilon_0$ we have

$$\frac{k' \sqrt{\log n}}{n^\eta} = \frac{k'}{n^{\alpha_{k'}}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{n^{\epsilon_0}} \approx \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{n^{\epsilon_0}}$$

where the asymptotics is due to $\frac{k'}{n^{\alpha_{k'}}} \rightarrow 1$, by definition of $\alpha_{k'}$ in eq. (10). Hence, $\frac{k'}{n^\eta} = o(1)$ and the probability $P_{\text{failrecover}}^{(k')}$ tends to 0. \square

B.4 Proof of Lemma 2.4

Proof. We construct $Cover_r$ by a simple iterative greedy procedure. Starting from an arbitrary $x \in Sol_k$, include x into $Cover_r$ and remove all solutions in Sol_k which intersect x in at least r nodes. Iterate this step with the remaining solutions in Sol_k not considered before. Every time we include one new solution in $Cover_r$, we remove (at most) $B(r)$ solutions from Sol_k . So, in total we can collect in $Cover_r$ at least $\lceil |Sol_k|/B(r) \rceil = \lceil \binom{n}{k}/B(r) \rceil$ many solutions. This proves part (3). Part (1) holds by construction, and part (2) is because otherwise $x \notin Cover_r$ would have been included by this procedure. \square

B.5 Proof of Lemma 2.5

Proof. Since $\binom{k}{d} \leq 2^k$ and $\binom{n-k}{k-d} \leq \binom{n}{k-r}$, we get the following upper bound

$$B(r) \leq 2^k \binom{n}{k-r} (k-r). \quad (47)$$

Therefore

$$R(r) = \log \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{B(r)} \geq \log \binom{n}{k} - \left[k + \log \binom{n}{k-r} + \log(k-r) \right]. \quad (48)$$

Using standard inequalities on the binomial coefficients,

$$a(\log b - \log a) \leq \log \binom{b}{a} \leq a(1 + \log b - \log a), \quad (49)$$

we get

$$\log \binom{n}{k} \geq k(\log n - \log k) = k(1 - \alpha) \log n \quad (50)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \log \binom{n}{k-r} &\leq (k-r)(1 + \log n - \log(k-r)) \\ &\lesssim (k-r)(1 - \alpha) \log n, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where the last inequality follows from $r \leq \lambda k$ and, in particular, $\log(k-r) \geq \log(k - \lambda k) = \log k + \log(1 - \lambda) \approx \log k - \alpha \log n$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{C(r)} &\stackrel{(10)}{=} \frac{R(r)}{\log n} \gtrsim k(1 - \alpha) - (k-r)(1 - \alpha) - \frac{k + \log(k-r)}{\log n} \\ &= r(1 - \alpha) - o(r) \approx r(1 - \alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where the last equality is due to $r = \omega\left(\frac{k}{\log n}\right)$. \square

B.6 Proof of Theorem 2.6

This proof of this lower bound is based on the following result on tail bounds on the *maximum* of Gaussians with *bounded* correlation [48].

Lemma B.4 (Theorem 2.2 in [48]). *For any constant $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$, the maximum of N possibly dependent Gaussian random variables $X_1, \dots, X_N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_X^2)$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max(X_1, \dots, X_N) \leq \sigma_X \cdot \delta_0 \sqrt{2(1 - \rho_0) \log N} \right) \leq C \cdot \frac{\log^\alpha N}{N^\beta} \quad (53)$$

where $C = C(\delta_0, \rho_0)$ is a constant depending only on δ_0 and ρ_0 ,

$$\alpha = \frac{1 - \rho_0}{\rho_0} (1 - \delta_0), \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{1 - \rho_0}{\rho_0} (1 - \delta_0)^2. \quad (54)$$

We here outline a road map of the proof: i) analyze conditions for vanishing correlation between solutions ($\rho(r) \rightarrow 0$), ii) using Lemma B.4 we show that vanishing correlation implies the concentration of the maximum of a given cover of solutions (via rate the cover rate $\alpha_{C(r)}$), iii) using a lower bound on the rate of the cover, we provide a respective lower bound of the recovery threshold.

Lemma B.5 (vanishing correlation). *The correlation between any two solutions sharing r nodes is $\rho = \frac{\binom{r}{h}}{\binom{k}{h}}$ and it vanishes in each of the following two regimes:*

1. For $h = \omega(1)$ and $r \leq \lambda k$ for any constant λ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \lambda < 1 & \text{for } h = o(\sqrt{k}) \\ \lambda < 1/e & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

2. For $h = O(1)$ and for any $r = o(k)$.

Proof. Observe that,

$$k(k-1)\cdots(k-h+1) \geq (k-h)^h = \left(1 - \frac{h}{k}\right)^h k^h \geq \left(1 - \frac{h^2}{k}\right) k^h$$

and therefore

$$\frac{\binom{r}{h}}{\binom{k}{h}} = \frac{r!}{h!(r-h)!} \frac{h!(k-h)!}{r!} = \frac{r(r-1)\cdots(r-h+1)}{k(k-1)\cdots(k-h+1)} \leq \left(\frac{r}{k}\right)^h \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{h^2}{k}\right)} \leq \frac{\lambda^h}{\left(1 - \frac{h^2}{k}\right)}.$$

For $h = o(\sqrt{k})$ and $h = \omega(1)$ the latter quantity converges to 0 for any constant $\lambda < 1$. As for the other case in (55), we have

$$\frac{\binom{r}{h}}{\binom{k}{h}} \leq \frac{e^h r^h}{h^h} \cdot \frac{h^h}{k^h} = \left(\frac{e \cdot r}{k}\right)^h \leq (e\lambda)^h \rightarrow 0$$

where the asymptotics follows from $e < c_0$ and $h \rightarrow \infty$. As for the second case, since $h = \Theta(1)$ we have $\binom{r}{h} = \Theta(r^h)$ and $\binom{k}{h} = \Theta(k^h)$, and thus $r \ll k$ implies $\binom{r}{h} \ll \binom{k}{h}$. \square

Lemma B.6 (concentration of the maximum). *For r such that the correlation $\rho(r)$ vanishes, i.e. $\rho(r) \rightarrow 0$, and for any constant $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max(\text{Cover}_r) \leq (1 - \epsilon_0) \cdot \sigma_k \sqrt{\alpha_{C(r)} \cdot 2 \log n}\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad (56)$$

where $\sigma_k = \sqrt{\binom{k}{h}}$.

Proof. We apply the tail bound on the maximum of Gaussians [48] (Lemma B.4 above) with $N = C(r) = |\text{Cover}_r|$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max(\text{Cover}_r) \leq (1 - \epsilon_0) \cdot \sigma_k \sqrt{2 \log C(r)}\right) \rightarrow 0. \quad (57)$$

In particular, since in our problem the correlation vanishes, we can choose any $\rho_0 < 1$ and, for sufficiently large n , satisfy $\delta_0 \sqrt{1 - \rho_0} \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$ and $\rho(r) \leq \rho_0$. Then, (57) follows from (53) as both α and β in (54) are constants and $C(r) = |\text{Cover}_r| \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, recall that $\alpha_{C(r)} = \log C(r) / \log n$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma B.7 (concentration of planted solution). *For any $\Delta = \Omega\left(\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{\log n}\right)$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_{\text{planted}} > \beta_k + \sqrt{\Delta \cdot 2 \log n}\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad (58)$$

where $\beta_k = \binom{k}{h} \beta$.

Proof. Simply observe that $S_{\text{planted}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\binom{k}{h}\beta, \binom{k}{h})$. Hence, by applying eq. (33) with $\mu = \binom{k}{h}\beta = \beta_k$, $\sigma^2 = \binom{k}{h}$, and $c = t_\Delta = \sqrt{\Delta 2 \log n}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{\text{planted}} > \beta_k + t_\Delta) \stackrel{(33)}{\leq} \frac{1}{t_\Delta} \cdot \frac{e^{-t_\Delta^2/2\binom{k}{h}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = \frac{e^{-(\Delta \log n)/\binom{k}{h}}}{t_\Delta \sqrt{2\pi}} = \frac{n^{-\Delta/\binom{k}{h}}}{\sqrt{2\pi\Delta} \cdot \sqrt{2 \log n}}, \quad (59)$$

and the latter quantity goes to 0 for $\Delta = \Omega\left(\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{\log n}\right)$. \square

Theorem B.8. *For any r such that the correlation $\rho(r)$ vanishes and $\alpha_{C(r)} = \Omega(1)$, and for any small constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ we have*

$$\gamma < (1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{C(r)}}{k}} \implies P_{\text{recover}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (60)$$

Proof. We show that the condition on γ implies that there exists a t such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\max(\text{Cover}_r) > t) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(S_{\text{planted}} \leq t) \rightarrow 1 \quad (61)$$

thus implying

$$P_{\text{recover}} \leq \mathbb{P}(\max(\text{Cover}_r) \leq S_{\text{planted}}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\max(\text{Cover}_r) \leq t) + \mathbb{P}(t < S_{\text{planted}}) \rightarrow 0.$$

To this end, as we want to apply Lemma B.6 and Lemma B.7 to get (61), we impose that

$$(1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\binom{k}{h}} \sqrt{\alpha_{C(r)} \cdot 2 \log n} > \binom{k}{h} \beta + \sqrt{\Delta \cdot 2 \log n}$$

for $\Delta = \delta_0 \cdot \frac{\binom{k}{h}}{\log n}$ with $\delta_0 > 0$ constant (we need $\Delta = \Omega\left(\frac{\binom{k}{h}}{\log n}\right)$ to apply Lemma B.7). The inequality above is equivalent to the following inequalities (since $\beta = \gamma \sqrt{\frac{k}{\binom{k}{h}} \cdot 2 \log n}$):

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\binom{k}{h}} \sqrt{\alpha_{C(r)} \cdot 2 \log n} &> \sqrt{\binom{k}{h}} \gamma \sqrt{k \cdot 2 \log n} + \sqrt{2\delta_0 \binom{k}{h}} && \Leftrightarrow \\ (1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\alpha_{C(r)}} &> \gamma \sqrt{k} + \sqrt{\delta_0 / \log n} && \Leftrightarrow \\ (1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{C(r)}}{k}} - \sqrt{\frac{\delta_0}{k \log n}} &> \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

From the hypothesis that $\alpha_{C(r)} = \Omega(1)$, the condition above is implied by the hypothesis $\gamma < (1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{C(r)}}{k}}$, for any constant $\epsilon_0 < \epsilon_0$ (e.g., $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0/2$). \square

Combining the bound on $\alpha_{C(r)}$ in Lemma 2.5 with Theorem B.8 we get Theorem 2.6.

B.6.1 Getting the Main Result (Lemma 2.5 + Theorem B.8 \Rightarrow Theorem 2.6)

Consider any $r = \lambda k$ with λ being any constant satisfying (55), according to the regime of h vs k . By Lemma B.5, the correlation $\rho(r)$ vanishes since $h = \omega(1)$. We can thus apply Theorem B.8 and Lemma 2.5 with $r = \lambda k$ and obtain the desired result as follows:

$$(1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{C(r)}}{k}} \stackrel{\text{(Lemma 2.5)}}{\geq} (1 - \epsilon_0) \sqrt{\lambda(1 - \alpha)} > \gamma$$

where the last inequality follows from the condition on γ in (11) and the hypothesis that λ satisfies (55). The above inequality and Theorem B.8 implies the result.

B.7 Proof of Theorem 2.7

Proof. For any $x \in \text{Sol}_k$, let $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}(x)$ be the corresponding tensor according to our problem (3). We give a lower bound on the probability of exact recovery, and on the expected loss, of the MLE (and thus on any estimator as well). Let $\text{flat}(\mathbf{W})$ denote the $\binom{n}{h}$ -dimensional vector obtained by flattening the symmetric h -tensor \mathbf{W} into a vector containing its independent components (all $\mathbf{W}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h}$ for distinct h -tuples $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_h$). Since each component of vector $\text{flat}(\mathbf{W})$ is a Gaussian r.v. according to (3), the whole vector $\text{flat}(\mathbf{W})$ is also distributed as a Gaussian,

$$\text{flat}(\mathbf{W}(x)) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\beta \text{flat}(x^{\otimes h}), \mathbf{I}_{\binom{n}{h}}\right) \equiv P_x \quad (62)$$

where $\mathbf{I}_{\binom{n}{h}}$ is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{h}}$.

Lemma B.9. *For any two vectors $x, x' \in \text{Sol}_k$ we have*

$$D(P_x \| P_{x'}) \leq \binom{k}{h} \beta^2,$$

where $D(\cdot \| \cdot)$ denotes the Kullback-Leiber divergence.

Proof. Since P_x and $P_{x'}$ are a Gaussian probability distributions (62), we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_x \| P_{x'}) &= \frac{1}{2} \beta^2 \|\text{flat}(x^{\otimes h}) - \text{flat}(x'^{\otimes h})\|_2^2 \\ &= \beta^2 (\|\text{flat}(x^{\otimes h})\|_2^2 - \langle \text{flat}(x^{\otimes h}), \text{flat}(x'^{\otimes h}) \rangle) \\ &\leq \beta^2 \|\text{flat}(x^{\otimes h})\|_2^2 = \beta^2 \binom{k}{h}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

For any $l \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and for $r = k - l$, let Cover_r be the subset of solutions defined according to Lemma 2.4. For any $y \in \text{Sol}_k$ (possibly $y \notin \text{Cover}_r$) we consider its ‘‘closest’’ solution in Cover_r ,

$$\text{closest}(y) \equiv \arg \min_{y' \in \text{Cover}_r} \text{Loss}(y', y).$$

Let x be chosen uniformly at random in $\text{Cover}_r \subseteq \text{Sol}_k$, and let $\tilde{x} = \text{closest}(\text{MLE}(\mathbf{W}))$. By Fano’s inequality [23] we have that, for x chosen uniformly at random in $\text{Cover}_r \subseteq \text{Sol}_k$,

$$P_{\text{failrecovery}} \geq \mathbb{P}(\text{closest}(\text{MLE}(\mathbf{W})) \neq x) \geq 1 - \frac{\mathbf{I}(x; \mathbf{W}) + \log 2}{\log |\text{Cover}_r|} \quad (63)$$

where $\mathbf{I}(\cdot; \cdot)$ denotes the mutual information; using the generalized Fano’s inequality [57]

$$\mathbf{I}(x; \mathbf{W}) \leq \frac{1}{|\text{Cover}_r|^2} \sum_{x \neq x' \in \text{Cover}_r} D(P_x \| P_{x'}) \leq \binom{k}{h} \beta^2, \quad (64)$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma B.9. Hence, since $\beta^2 = \gamma^2 \frac{k}{\binom{k}{h}} \cdot 2 \log n$, we get

$$P_{\text{failrecovery}} \geq 1 - \frac{\binom{k}{h} \beta^2 + \log 2}{\log |\text{Cover}_r|} \approx 1 - \frac{2\gamma^2 k \cdot \log n}{\log |\text{Cover}_r|} = 1 - \frac{2\gamma^2 k}{\alpha_{C(r)}} \quad (65)$$

where last equality is just the definition of $\alpha_{C(r)}$ in (10) and the previous approximation comes from $|\text{Cover}_r| \rightarrow \infty$. The bound $\alpha_{C(r)} \gtrsim r(1 - \alpha)$ in Lemma 2.5, with $r = \lambda k$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ constant, yield

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{closest}(\text{MLE}(\mathbf{W})) \neq x) \gtrsim 1 - 2\gamma^2 \frac{1}{\lambda(1 - \alpha)}. \quad (66)$$

We next provide a lower bound on the expected loss of the MLE (and thus of any estimator). For any $x \in \text{Cover}_r$ and for $\tilde{x} = \text{closest}(\text{MLE}(\mathbf{W}))$, by definition of $\text{closest}()$, the event $\{\tilde{x} \neq x\}$ implies $\text{Loss}(\tilde{x}, x) \geq l/2$, where $\text{Loss}(\tilde{x}, x) \equiv k - |\langle \tilde{x}, x \rangle|$. This and Markov inequality imply that

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{closest}(\text{MLE}(\mathbf{W})) \neq x) \leq \mathbb{P}(\text{Loss}(\tilde{x}, x) \geq l/2) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \text{Loss}(\tilde{x}, x)}{l/2}. \quad (67)$$

Finally, since $l = k - r = (1 - \lambda)k$

$$\mathbb{E} \text{Loss}(\tilde{x}, x) \gtrsim \frac{l}{2} \left(1 - 2\gamma^2 \frac{1}{\lambda(1 - \alpha)}\right) = \frac{(1 - \lambda)k}{2} \left(1 - 2\gamma^2 \frac{1}{\lambda(1 - \alpha)}\right), \quad (68)$$

and the condition for impossibility of exact recovery, $\mathbb{E} \text{Loss}(\tilde{x}, x) \geq 1$, translates into

$$\gamma \leq \sqrt{\frac{\lambda(1 - \alpha)}{2} - \frac{\lambda(1 - \alpha)}{(1 - \lambda)k} \lambda(1 - \alpha)}. \quad (69)$$

Since this holds for any constant $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and for $k \rightarrow +\infty$ the theorem follows. \square

C Derivations for Section 3 (AMP algorithm)

C.1 Derivation of the AMP iterative equations

In the following we adopt conveniently the notation used in [47], denoting as

$$\mathbf{S} = \beta \sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \mathbf{W}.$$

Throughout this section, we shall make the following assumption on the above ‘rescaled’ tensor, i.e., on how β scales with respect to the entries of \mathbf{W} .

Assumption C.1. *For every h -tuple $i_1 i_2 \dots i_h$ of distinct indices, it holds that $S_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} \leq 1$, that is, $\beta \leq 1/\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} W_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h}$.*

A somewhat stronger assumption is the following one:

Assumption C.2. *For every h -tuple $i_1 i_2 \dots i_h$ of distinct indices, it holds that $S_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_h} = o(1)$.*

Message passing algorithm. We next present a message passing algorithm which is a simple generalization of the algorithm for matrices in [46]. The algorithm is described by the following iterative equations:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i \rightarrow i i_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}} \sum_{\substack{k_2 < \dots < k_h \\ (k_2, \dots, k_h) \neq (i_2, \dots, i_h)}} S_{i k_2 \dots k_h} \cdot \hat{x}_{k_2 \rightarrow i k_2 \dots k_h}^{(t)} \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{x}_{k_h \rightarrow i k_2 \dots k_h}^{(t)} \\ A_{i \rightarrow i i_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \sum_{\substack{k_2 < \dots < k_h \\ (k_2, \dots, k_h) \neq (i_2, \dots, i_h)}} S_{i k_2 \dots k_h}^2 \cdot (\hat{x}_{k_2 \rightarrow i k_2 \dots k_h}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (\hat{x}_{k_h \rightarrow i k_2 \dots k_h}^{(t)})^2 \\ (\hat{x}_{i \rightarrow i i_2 \dots i_h}^{(t+1)})_i &= f\left((A_{i \rightarrow i i_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})_i, (x_{i \rightarrow i i_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})_i\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the multidimensional threshold function defined in eq. (15) and $(\hat{x}_{i \rightarrow i i_2 \dots i_h}^{(t+1)})_i$ denotes the n -dimensional indexed by i . Note that the function f is applied element-wise on all indices other than i ,

that is, on i_2, \dots, i_h . Since the messages depend weakly on the target factor we can compute the messages including the factor (i_2, \dots, i_h) in the sums above, and dropping the factor node dependency as:

$$x_i^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}} \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h} \cdot \hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} \quad (70)$$

$$A_i^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2 \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \quad (71)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t+1)} = f(\mathbf{A}^t, \mathbf{x}^t).$$

We can now analyze the error obtained by this simplification as:

$$x_i^{(t)} - x_{i \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h} \cdot \hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} \quad (72)$$

$$A_i^{(t)} - A_{i \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2 \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2. \quad (73)$$

Observation C.3. By Assumption C.1, the error in A is of lower order than the one in x .

Hence we can estimate the error in $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}$ by focusing on the quantity in eq. (72):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_{i \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} - \hat{x}_i^{(t)} &= f\left(\left(A_{i \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t-1)}\right)_i, \left(x_{i \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t-1)}\right)_i\right) - f\left(\mathbf{A}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t-1)}\right)_i \\ &= -\partial_{x_i} f\left(\mathbf{A}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t-1)}\right)_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h} x_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t-1)} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t-1)} + o\left(\frac{S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}}\right) \\ &= -\partial_{x_i} f\left(\mathbf{A}^{(t-1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(t-1)}\right)_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h} x_{i_2}^{(t-1)} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{i_h}^{(t-1)} + o\left(\frac{S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Plugging this last expansion into eq. (70), and by recalling the definition of $\sigma^{(t)}$ in eq. (17), we get to leading order:

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}} \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h} \hat{x}_{i_2}^{(t)} \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{x}_{i_h}^{(t)} + \\ &\quad - \frac{h-1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \sum_{i_2} \sigma_{i_2}^{(t)} \sum_{i_3 < \dots < i_h} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2 \hat{x}_{i_3}^{(t)} \hat{x}_{i_3}^{(t-1)} \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{x}_{i_h}^{(t)} \hat{x}_{i_h}^{(t-1)} + o\left(\frac{S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where the factor $h-1$ comes from the symmetry of choosing the index (i_2 in our case) for the lower order term in the product. Note that all the other terms are of lower order and are hence discarded. Plugging instead eq. (74) into eq. (71) we obtain:

$$A_i^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2 \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_2}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_h}^{(t)})^2 + o\left(\frac{S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}\right).$$

C.2 Derivation of the state evolution

We assume here a typical condition for belief propagation algorithm, that is the statistical independence between the observation \mathbf{S} and the estimates $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ (see for reference [49, 46]). Given the independence, the central limit theorem applies for the right hand side of both eq. (70) and eq. (71), so that the messages

behave in the large n limit as Gaussian random variables. We can hence describe the evolution of the AMP algorithm tracking only average and variance of such messages (in the sequel \mathbf{Z} denotes the Gaussian noise in eq. (3)):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}}[x_i^{(t)}] &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}} \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}}[S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}] \cdot \hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} \\
&= \beta^2 \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} x_i^0 \cdot x_{i_2}^0 \cdot \dots \cdot x_{i_h}^0 \cdot \hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)} \\
&= \beta^2 \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} x_i^0 \cdot x_{i_2}^0 \cdot \dots \cdot x_{i_h}^0 \cdot \hat{x}_{i_2}^{(t)} \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{x}_{i_h}^{(t)} + o(\beta^2) \\
&= \beta^2 x_i^0 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{x}^0 \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\}_i + o(\beta^2) .
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

Analogously

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{Z}}[x_i^{(t)}] &= \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{Z}}[S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}] \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \\
&= \beta^2 \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} (\hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \\
&= \beta^2 \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} (x_{i_2}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (x_{i_h}^{(t)})^2 + o(\beta^2) \\
&= \beta^2 \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^t \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^t\}_i + o(\beta^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}}[A_i^{(t)}] &= \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}}[S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2] \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_2 \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_h \rightarrow ii_2 \dots i_h}^{(t)})^2 \\
&= \beta^2 \sum_{i_2 < \dots < i_h} (\beta^2 (x_i^0)^2 \cdot (x_{i_2}^0)^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (x_{i_h}^0)^2 + 1) \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_2}^{(t)})^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (\hat{x}_{i_h}^{(t)})^2 + o(\beta^2) \\
&= \beta^4 x_i^0 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{x}^0 \circ \mathbf{x}^0 \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^t \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^t\}_i + \beta^2 \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^t \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^t\}_i + o(\beta^2) = \beta^2 \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^t \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^t\}_i + o(\beta^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

where in the second equality we used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}}[S_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2] &= \beta^2 (x_i^0)^2 \cdot (x_{i_2}^0)^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (x_{i_h}^0)^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}}[Z_{ii_2 \dots i_h}^2] + \beta x_i^0 \cdot x_{i_2}^0 \cdot \dots \cdot x_{i_h}^0 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}}[Z_{ii_2 \dots i_h}] \\
&= \beta^2 (x_i^0)^2 \cdot (x_{i_2}^0)^2 \cdot \dots \cdot (x_{i_h}^0)^2 + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

We now assume that the signal estimates $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^t$ are drawn from the true intractable posterior distribution $p(\cdot | \mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{Z})$. Given this assumption and using the Nishimori condition (see [37, 47]) we obtain easily from eq. (76) and eq. (77):

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{Z}}[\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{Z}}[\mathbf{A}^{(t)}] = \beta^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^0} \mathbf{1}\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)} \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\} + o(\beta^2) = \beta^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^0} \mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{x}^0 \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(t)}\} + o(\beta^2) = \hat{\mathbf{m}}^{(t)} + o(\beta^2).$$

It can be easily seen that the *variance* of the messages A is of lower order, hence $\mathbf{A}^{(t)}$ can be approximated by only its mean. With the assumed gaussianity of messages we can hence write using eq. (75) and eq. (76) $\mathbf{x}^{(t)} = \hat{\mathbf{m}}^{(t)} \circ \mathbf{x}^0 + \sqrt{\hat{\mathbf{m}}^{(t)}} \circ \mathbf{z}$. The state evolution finally reads:

$$\mathbf{m}^{t+1} = \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{z}}[\mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{x}^0 \circ \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{t+1}\}] = \frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{Z}}[\mathbf{1}\{\mathbf{x}^0 \circ f(\hat{\mathbf{m}}^t, \hat{\mathbf{m}}^t \circ \mathbf{x}^0 + \sqrt{\hat{\mathbf{m}}^t} \circ \mathbf{z})\}] .$$

C.3 Analytical threshold for AMP recovery

To get an analytical threshold we start from the SE for factorizable prior as in eq. (19) and we study the fixed point of the recursive equation for the parameter of the Bernulli distribution $\delta = k/n \rightarrow 0$ in the large system limit. In particular the threshold function reads in the limit $f(a, x) = \delta e^{x-a/2} + O(\delta^2)$, hence the factorized SE becomes $m_{t+1} = \delta^2 \mathbb{E}_z[e^{\hat{m}_t/2 + \sqrt{\hat{m}_t} z}] = \delta^2 e^{\hat{m}_t}$ with $\hat{m}_t = \beta^2 \binom{n-1}{h-1} m_t$. It is easy to see that the critical bias β to have a perfect overlap with the planted signal is

$$\beta_c = \sqrt{\frac{1}{e(h-1)} \frac{n^{2(h-1)}}{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} \frac{1}{k^{2(h-1)}}}.$$

Using the definition of normalized SNR γ in eq. (1), we obtain the threshold γ_c^{AMP} in eq. (20).

Remark C.4 (Validity of the AMP approximations). We can observe from the derivations above that the AMP equations and state evolution are carried out assuming the quantity

$$\frac{S_{i_1, \dots, i_h}}{\sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}}} = \beta \sqrt{\binom{n-1}{h-1}} W_{i_1, \dots, i_h}$$

being small (which corresponds to Assumption C.2 above). This is the case for the classic tensor PCA for both dense and sparse signal with linear sparsity as in [47]. However in the scenario here considered the effective sparsity of the problem defined by the parameter $\delta = k/n$ can be sub-linear, and hence non-trivial estimation requires a β (hence a SNR) such that the quantity above is not $o(1)$. For this reason the derivations have to be considered non-rigorous in the regime used in this analysis. The rigorous presentation of AMP-like algorithms in effectively sub-linear sparse estimation problem, also in line of the approach proposed very recently in [15], is left for future developments.