

Uniform Reliability for Unbounded Homomorphism-Closed Graph Queries

Antoine Amarilli 

LTCI, Télécom Paris, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, France

Abstract

We study the uniform query reliability problem, which asks, for a fixed Boolean query Q , given an instance I , how many subinstances of I satisfy Q . Equivalently, this is a restricted case of Boolean query evaluation on tuple-independent probabilistic databases where all facts must have probability $1/2$. We focus on graph signatures, and on queries closed under homomorphisms. We show that for any such query that is *unbounded*, i.e., not equivalent to a union of conjunctive queries, the uniform reliability problem is $\#P$ -hard. This recaptures the hardness, e.g., of s - t connectedness, which counts how many subgraphs of an input graph have a path between a source and a sink.

This new hardness result on uniform reliability strengthens our earlier hardness result on probabilistic query evaluation for unbounded homomorphism-closed queries [1]. Indeed, our earlier proof crucially used facts with probability 1, so it did not apply to the unweighted case. The new proof presented in this paper avoids this; it uses our recent hardness result on uniform reliability for non-hierarchical conjunctive queries without self-joins [2], along with new techniques.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Database query processing and optimization (theory)

Keywords and phrases Uniform reliability, $\#P$ -hardness, probabilistic databases

1 Introduction

A long line of research [13] has investigated how to extend relational databases with probability values. The most common probabilistic model, called *tuple-independent databases* (TID), annotates each fact of the input database with an independent probability of existence. The *probabilistic query evaluation* (PQE) problem then asks for the probability that a fixed Boolean query is true in the resulting product distribution on possible worlds. The PQE problem has been historically studied for conjunctive queries (CQs) and unions of conjunctive queries (UCQs). This study led to the dichotomy result of Dalvi and Suciu [4], which identifies a class of *safe UCQs* for which the problem can be solved in PTIME:

► **Theorem 1.1** ([4]). *Let Q be a UCQ. The PQE problem for Q of computing, given a TID I , the probability that Q holds on I , is in PTIME if Q is safe, and $\#P$ -hard otherwise.*

This result has been extended in several ways, to apply to some queries featuring negation [5], disequality (\neq) joins [9], or inequality ($<$) joins [10]. More recently, two new directions have been explored. First, our work with Ceylan [1] extended the study from UCQs to the broader class of *homomorphism-closed* queries. This class captures recursive queries such as regular path queries (RPQs) or Datalog (without inequalities or negation). In [1], we focused on homomorphism-closed queries that were *unbounded*, i.e., not equivalent to a UCQ. We showed that PQE is $\#P$ -hard for *any* such query, though for technical reasons the result only applies to graphs, i.e., arity-two signatures. This extended the above dichotomy to the full class of homomorphism-closed queries (on graph signatures).

Second, the dichotomy has been extended from PQE to restricted problems which do not allow arbitrary probabilities on the TID. Kenig and Suciu [7] have shown that the dichotomy of [4] still held for the so-called *generalized model counting* problem, where the allowed probabilities on tuples are only 0 (the tuple is missing), $1/2$, or 1; this is in contrast with the

original proof of the dichotomy, which uses arbitrary probabilities. Our result in [1] already held for the generalized model counting problem. What is more, for a subclass of the unsafe queries, they showed that hardness still held for the *model counting problem*, where the probabilities are either 0 or 1/2. Independently, with Kimelfeld [2], we have shown hardness of the same problem for the incomparable class of non-hierarchical CQs without self-joins. Rather than model counting, we called this the *uniform reliability* (UR) problem, following the terminology in the work of Grädel, Gurevich, and Hirsch [6].

In our opinion, this uniform reliability problem is interesting even outside of the context of probabilistic databases: we simply ask, for a fixed query Q , given a database instance I , *how many* subinstances of I satisfy Q . The UR problem also relates to computing the *causal effect* and *Shapley values* in databases [12, 8, 2]. What is more, UR for homomorphism-closed queries captures existing counting problems on graphs, such as *st-connectedness* [14] which asks how many subgraphs of an input graph contain a path between a source and a sink.

The ultimate goal of these two lines of work would be to classify the complexity of *uniform reliability*, across *all homomorphism-closed queries*. Specifically, one can conjecture:

► **Conjecture 1.2.** *Let Q be a homomorphism-closed query on an arbitrary signature. The uniform reliability problem for Q is in PTIME if Q is a safe UCQ, and #P-hard otherwise.*

To establish this, there are three obstacles to overcome. First, in the case where Q is a UCQ, one would need to establish the hardness of UR for all unsafe UCQs, extending the work of Kenig and Suciu [7]. Second, when Q is unbounded, one would need to adapt the methods of [1] to apply to UR rather than PQE. Third, the methods of [1] would need to be extended from graph signatures to arbitrary arity signatures.

Result statement. In this paper, we address the second difficulty and show the following, which extends the main result of [1] from PQE to UR, and brings us closer to Conjecture 1.2:

► **Theorem 1.3 (Main result).** *Let Q be an unbounded homomorphism-closed query on an arity-two signature. The uniform reliability problem for Q is #P-hard.*

The proof of this result has the same high-level structure as in [1], but there are significant new technical challenges to overcome. In particular, we now reduce from different problems, whose hardness rely (among other things) on the hardness of uniform reliability for the query $R(x), S(x, y), T(y)$, shown in [2]. The impossibility to assign a probability of 1 to facts also makes reductions much more challenging: intuitively, as all facts can now be missing, there is no longer a clear connection between the possible worlds of the source problem and the possible worlds of the database built in the reduction. We use multiple tools to work around this, for instance a *saturation* technique that creates a large but polynomial number of copies of some facts and argues that their absence is sufficiently unlikely to be negligible. As saturation cannot apply to unary facts, we also need to identify so-called *critical models*, a more elaborate variant of a notion in [1], minimizing carefully-chosen weight criteria.

We give a high-level structure of the proof below as it is presented in the rest of the paper, and comment in more detail on how the techniques relate to our earlier work [1].

Paper structure. We give preliminaries and the formal definition of UR in Section 2, along with the two problems from which we reduce: one problem on bipartite graphs from [2], and one variant of a connectivity problem of [14]. We show that they are #P-hard (Appendix A).

We then review notions from [1] in Section 3: the *dissociation* operation on instances, and the notion of a *tight edge*, which makes the query false when we apply dissociation to it. We

invoke a result from [1] showing that tight edges always exist for unbounded queries. This is the only place where we use the unboundedness of the query, and is unfortunately the only result from [1] that can be used as-is. Some other notions are reused and extended from [1] but they are always re-defined and re-proved in a self-contained way in the present paper.

We then present in Section 4 the notion of a *critical model*, as a model of the query which is *subinstance-minimal* and features a tight edge which is minimal by optimizing three successive quantities: *weight*, *extra weight*, and *lexicographic weight*. The notion of *weight* is from [1], the two other notions relate to *side weight* from [1] but significantly extend it. We show in this section that a query having a model with a tight edge also has a critical model.

We then move on to the hardness proof. As in [1], there are two cases: a *non-iterable* case where we reduce from the problem on bipartite graphs, and an *iterable* case where we reduce from the connectivity problem. In Section 5, we formally define the notion of iteration (essentially identical to the notion in [1]) and show hardness when there is a non-iterable critical model. The coding used in the reduction extends that of [1] with the *saturation* technique of creating a large number of copies of some elements. There are many new technical challenges, e.g., proving that a polynomial number of copies suffices to make the absence of the facts sufficiently unlikely, and justifying that all the other facts are “necessary” for a query match, using in particular subinstance-minimality and the notion of extra weight.

Last, in Section 6, we show hardness in the case where all critical models are iterable. We first show that such models can be repeatedly iterated, and that the measure of *extra weight* must be zero in this case, allowing us to focus on the more precise criterion of lexicographic weight. Then we define the coding, which is similar to [1] up to technical modifications. The reduction does not use saturation but argues that all facts are “necessary” using the notion of lexicographic weight and a new *explosion* structure.

We then conclude in Section 7. To save space, most proofs are deferred to the appendix.

2 Preliminaries and Problem Statement

Instances. We consider a *relational signature* σ consisting of relations of maximal arity 2. A σ -*instance* (or just *instance*) is a set of *facts*, i.e., expressions of the form $R(a, b)$ where a and b are constants and $R \in \sigma$. We assume without loss of generality that all relations in σ are binary; if there are unary relations U we can simply code them with a binary relation U' , replacing facts $U(a)$ by $U'(a, a)$ in instances, and modifying the query to interpret $U'(a, a)$ as $U(a)$ and to ignore facts $U'(a, b)$ with $a \neq b$: this is similar to Theorem 8.4 of [1]. Accordingly, a fact $R(a, b)$ is *unary* if $a = b$, otherwise it is *binary*.

The *domain* $\text{dom}(I)$ of an instance I is the set of constants occurring in I . A *homomorphism* from I to an instance I' is a function $h: \text{dom}(I) \rightarrow \text{dom}(I')$ such that, for each fact $R(a, b)$ of I , the fact $R(h(a), h(b))$ is in I' . We write $I' \subseteq I$ if I' is a *subinstance* of I , i.e., I' is simply a subset of the facts of I ; in particular we then have $\text{dom}(I') \subseteq \text{dom}(I)$.

Queries. A *query* Q over σ is a Boolean function over σ -instances which we always assume to be *homomorphism-closed*, i.e., if Q returns true on I and I has a homomorphism to an instance I' then Q also returns true on I' . When Q returns true on I we call I a *model* of Q , or say that I *satisfies* Q (written $I \models Q$); otherwise I *violates* Q . Any homomorphism-closed query Q is *monotone*, i.e., if I satisfies Q and $I \subseteq I'$ then I' satisfies Q . A *subinstance-minimal model* of Q is a model I of Q such that no strict subinstance of I satisfies Q .

We focus on *unbounded queries*, i.e., queries having an infinite number of subinstance-minimal models. Examples of well-studied homomorphism-closed query languages include

conjunctive queries (CQs), *unions of CQs* (UCQs), *regular path queries* (RPQs), and *Datalog* without inequalities or negations. The queries defined by Datalog or RPQs are unbounded unless they are equivalent to a UCQ (i.e., non-recursive Datalog); more generally a query is either unbounded or equivalent to a UCQ.

UR and PQE problems. In this paper, we study *uniform reliability* (UR). The problem $\text{UR}(Q)$ for a fixed query Q is the following: we are given as input an instance I , and we must return how many subinstances of I satisfy Q , i.e., the number $|\{I' \subseteq I \mid I' \models Q\}|$. Note that we have no general upper bound on the complexity of this problem, as we allow queries to be arbitrarily complex or even undecidable to evaluate, e.g., “there is a path $R(x_1), S(x_1, x_2), \dots, S(x_{n-1}, x_n), T(x_n)$ where n is the index of a Turing machine that halts”.

We will sometimes consider the generalization of UR called *probabilistic query evaluation* (PQE). The $\text{PQE}(Q)$ problem for a fixed query Q asks, given an instance I and a probability distribution $\pi: I \rightarrow [0, 1]$ mapping each fact of I to a rational in $[0, 1]$, to determine the total probability of the subinstances of I satisfying Q , when each fact $F \in I$ is drawn independently from the others with the probability $\pi(F)$. Formally, we must compute: $\sum_{I' \subseteq I \text{ s.t. } I' \models Q} \prod_{F \in I'} \pi(F) \times \prod_{F' \in I \setminus I'} (1 - \pi(F'))$.

The UR problem is a special case of PQE where the function π maps all facts to $1/2$, up to renormalization, i.e., multiplying by $2^{|I|}$. We will sometimes abusively talk about UR as the problem of computing that probability, because this probabilistic phrasing makes it more convenient, e.g., to reason about conditional probabilities, or about negligible probabilities.

Hard problems. The goal of this paper is to show Theorem 1.3. We will establish $\#P$ -hardness using *polynomial-time Turing reductions* [3] (see [1] for details). Specifically, we reduce from one of two $\#P$ -hard problems, depending on the query. In [1], we reduce from the problems $\#PP2DNF$ and $U\text{-}ST\text{-}CON$ (undirected source-to-target connectivity), which are shown to be $\#P$ -hard in [11]. In this paper, given our focus on UR, we reduce from variants of these problems: the λ, μ, ν -*variable-clause-variable probabilistic $\#PP2DNF$ problem* and the ϕ, η -*vertex-edge probabilistic $U\text{-}ST\text{-}CON$ problem*. We first define the first problem:

► **Definition 2.1.** *Let $0 < \lambda, \nu < 1$ and $0 < \mu \leq 1$ be fixed probabilities. The λ, μ, ν -variable-clause-variable probabilistic $\#PP2DNF$ problem (or for brevity λ, μ, ν - $\#PP2DNF$) is the following: given a bipartite graph $(U \cup V, E)$ with $E \subseteq U \times V$, we ask for the probability that we keep an edge and its two incident vertices, where vertices of U have probability λ to be kept, vertices of V have probability μ to be kept, and edges of E have probability ν to be kept, all these choices being independent. Formally, we must compute:*

$$\sum_{\substack{(U', E', V') \subseteq U \times E \times V \\ E' \cap (U' \times V') \neq \emptyset}} \lambda^{|U'|} \times (1 - \lambda)^{|U| - |U'|} \times \mu^{|E'|} \times (1 - \mu)^{|E| - |E'|} \times \nu^{|V'|} \times (1 - \nu)^{|V| - |V'|}$$

The name $\#PP2DNF$ is because of the link to positive partitioned 2-DNF formulas, which we do not need here. We can show that λ, μ, ν - $\#PP2DNF$ is $\#P$ -hard, because it amounts to uniform reliability for the query $R(x), S(x, y), T(y)$ for which hardness is shown in [2]:

► **Proposition 2.2** ([2]). *For any fixed $0 < \lambda, \nu < 1$ and $0 < \mu \leq 1$, the problem λ, μ, ν - $\#PP2DNF$ is $\#P$ -hard.*

We now define the second problem:

► **Definition 2.3.** *Let $0 < \phi \leq 1$ and $0 < \eta < 1$ be fixed probabilities. The ϕ, η -vertex-edge-probabilistic $U\text{-}ST\text{-}CON$ problem (or for brevity ϕ, η - $U\text{-}ST\text{-}CON$) is the following: given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and source and sink vertices $r, s \in V$ with $r \neq s$, we ask for the*




Figure 1 Examples of Section 3 and 4

probability that we keep a subset of edges and vertices containing a path that connects r and s (in particular keeping r and s), where vertices have probability ϕ to be kept and edges have probability η to be kept, all these choices being independent. Formally, we must compute:

$$\sum_{\substack{V' \subseteq V, E' \subseteq E \\ r \text{ and } s \text{ connected in } (V', E'_{|V'})}} \phi^{|V'|} \times (1 - \phi)^{|V| - |V'|} \times \eta^{|E'|} \times (1 - \eta)^{|E| - |E'|}$$

This intuitively combines features of the undirected source-to-target edge-connectedness and node-connectedness problems of [14]. With standard techniques and some effort, we can show that ϕ, η -U-ST-CON is #P-hard (see Appendix A):

► **Proposition 2.4.** For any fixed $0 < \phi \leq 1$ and $0 < \eta < 1$, the problem ϕ, η -U-ST-CON is #P-hard.

3 Basic Techniques: Dissociation, Tight Edges

Having presented the hard problems, we now recall the notion of *edges* and how we *copy* them, and the *dissociation* operation introduced in [1]. We also present *tight edges* and re-state the result of [1] showing that unbounded queries have models with tight edges.

Edges and copies. An *edge* e in an instance I is a couple (u, v) of distinct elements of $\text{dom}(I)$ such that there is at least one fact of I using both u and v , i.e., of the form $R(u, v)$ or $R(v, u)$, hence non-unary. The *covering facts* of e in I is the non-empty set of these facts. Note that (u, v) is an edge iff (v, u) is, and they have the same covering facts.

We call $e = (u, v)$ a *non-leaf edge* if I contains facts using u but not v (called *left-incident facts*) and facts using v but not u (called *right-incident facts*). An example is shown in Figure 1a (with no unary facts). The left-incident and right-incident facts are called together the *incident facts*; note that they may include unary facts.

In this paper we will often modify instances I by *copying* an edge $e = (u, v)$ of I to some other couple (u', v') of elements. This means that we modify I to add, for each covering fact F of e , the fact obtained by replacing u by u' and v by v' . Note that, if u' and v' are both fresh, or if $u' = u$ and v' is fresh or $v' = v$ and u' is fresh, then the result of this process has a homomorphism back to I . Clearly, copying (u, v) on (u', v') is equivalent to copying (v, u) on (v', u') (but different from copying, say, (u, v) on (v', u')). Note that copying an edge does *not* copy its incident facts, though our constructions will often separately copy some of them.

► **Example 3.1.** In the instance $I = \{R(a), S(a, b), S'(b, a), T(b)\}$, copying (a, b) on (a, b') for a fresh element b' means adding the facts $S(a, b'), S'(b', a)$.

Dissociation. One basic operation on instances is *dissociation*, which replaces one edge by two copies connected to each endpoint:

► **Definition 3.2.** Let I be an instance and $e = (u, v)$ be a non-leaf edge of I . The dissociation of e in I is obtained by modifying I to add two fresh elements u' and v' , copying e to (u', v) and to (u, v') , and then removing the covering facts of e .

The process is illustrated in Figures 1a and 1b. Note the following immediate observation:

► **Claim 3.3.** The dissociation of an edge in I has a homomorphism back to I .

Tight edges. We can then define a *tight edge* as one whose dissociation breaks the query:

► **Definition 3.4.** A non-leaf edge (u, v) in an instance I is tight for the query Q if I satisfies Q but the dissociation of (u, v) in I does not.

We use a result of [1] (but sketch the proof to be self-contained): unbounded queries must have a model with a tight edge. This is the only point where we use the unboundedness of the query.

► **Theorem 3.5** (Theorem 6.6 in [1]). Any unbounded query has a model with a tight edge.

Proof sketch. As the query Q is unbounded, it has infinitely many minimal models: let I be a sufficiently large one. Iteratively dissociate the non-leaf edges of I until none remain (this always terminates), and let I' be the result. If I' violates Q , then some dissociation broke Q , i.e., was applied to a tight edge in a model of Q . Otherwise, I' has no non-leaf edges and satisfies Q . We can then show thanks to the simple structure of I' that it has a constant-sized subset that satisfies Q , and deduce that Q already holds on a constant-sized subinstance of I . As I is large, this contradicts the minimality of I . See [1] for details. ◀

Thus, in the sequel, we fix the query Q and assume that it has a model with a tight edge. Note that some bounded queries may also have a tight edge, e.g., the prototypical unsafe CQ $R(x), S(x, y), T(y)$; our results in this paper thus also apply to some bounded queries.

4 Minimality and Critical Models

In this section, we refine the notion of a tight edge to impose minimality criteria and get to the notion of *critical models*. We define three successive minimality criteria. The first is called *weight* and counts the covering facts; the *critical weight* Θ is the minimal weight of a tight edge. Having defined Θ , we restrict our attention to *clean* tight edges e , whose incident facts do not include so-called *garbage facts*, i.e., strict subsets of the covering facts of e . The second criterion is *extra weight* and counts the incident facts that are not isomorphic to the covering facts; the *critical extra weight* Ξ is the minimal extra weight of a tight edge of weight Θ . The third is *lexicographic weight* and counts the other left-incident and right-incident facts, ordered lexicographically: the *critical lexicographic weight* Λ is the minimal lexicographic weight of a tight edge of weight Λ and extra weight Ξ .

We then define a *critical model* as a *subinstance-minimal* model with a clean tight edge that optimizes these three weights in order, and show that such models exist.

Weight. The *weight* was defined in [1], but unlike in [1] we do not count unary facts:

► **Definition 4.1.** The weight of an edge $e = (u, v)$ in an instance I is the number of covering facts of e (it is necessarily greater than 0).

► **Example 4.2.** The weight of (a, b) in $I = \{R(b), T(b, c), S(b, a), S'(b, a), U(a, b)\}$ is 3.

The minimal weight of a tight edge across all models is an intrinsic characteristic of Q , called the *critical weight*:

► **Definition 4.3.** *The critical weight of the query Q , written $\Theta \geq 1$, is the minimum, across all models I of Q and tight edges e of I , of the weight of e in I .*

The point of the critical weight is that edges with weight less than Θ can never be tight:

► **Claim 4.4.** *Let I be a model of Q and $e = (u, v)$ be a non-leaf edge of I . If the weight of e is less than Θ , then the dissociation of e in I is also a model of Q .*

► **Example 4.5.** The bounded CQ $Q' : R(x), S(x, y), S'(x, y), T(y)$ has critical weight 2, as witnessed by the model $I' = \{R(a), S(a, b), S'(a, b), T(b)\}$ with a tight non-leaf edge (a, b) of weight 2 and the inexistence of a model with a tight non-leaf edge of weight 1.

As Q' has critical weight 2, in any model I of Q' , if we have an edge $e = (u, v)$ with only one covering fact using both u and v , we know that dissociating e cannot make Q false.

Having defined Θ , to simplify further definitions, we define the notion of a *clean* edge as one that does not have incident facts achieving strict subsets of its covering facts:

► **Definition 4.6.** *Let I be a model of Q , let $e = (u, v)$ be an edge of I , and let C be its covering facts. For any edge (u, t) , if its covering facts are isomorphic to a strict subset of C when renaming t to v , then we call these left incident facts left garbage facts. Likewise, the right garbage facts are the right incident facts that are covering facts of edges (w, v) that are isomorphic to a subset of C when renaming w to u .*

We call e clean if it has no left or right garbage facts (called collectively garbage facts).

► **Example 4.7.** In $I = \{S(a, b'), U(a), S(a, b), S'(b, a), T(c, b), S(c, b), S'(e, b), S'(b, f)\}$, the left garbage facts of (a, b) are $\{S(a, b')\}$ and the right garbage facts are $\{S'(b, f)\}$.

We will always be able to ensure that tight edges with critical weight are clean, justifying that we restrict our attention to clean tight edges in the sequel:

► **Claim 4.8.** *If Q has a model with a tight edge, then it has a model with a clean tight edge of weight Θ .*

Proof sketch. We find a model with a tight edge of weight Θ by definition of Θ . Then, any edges with garbage facts have weight $< \Theta$, so they can be dissociated using Claim 4.4 and homomorphically merged to e . At the end of this process, e is clean and is still tight. ◀

Extra weight. We further restrict tight edges e by limiting their number of incident facts, similarly to the notion of *side weight* in [1]. However, in this paper, we additionally partition the incident facts between so-called *extra facts* and *copy facts*. Intuitively, our reductions will use codings that introduce copies of the edge e , and the *extra facts* are those that can be “distinguished” from incident copies of e added in codings; by contrast copy facts are non-unary facts in edges that are isomorphic copies of e and therefore “indistinguishable”.

We want to minimize the number of extra facts, to intuitively ensure that they are all “necessary”, in the sense that a copy of e missing an incident extra fact can be dissociated. Let us formally define the extra facts: they are those that are part of a so-called *triangle*, i.e., involve an element occurring both in a left-incident in a right-incident fact, or they are a covering fact of an edge whose covering facts are not isomorphic to the covering facts of e .

► **Definition 4.9.** Let I be an instance with an edge $e = (u, v)$, and let $C \subseteq I$ be the covering facts of e . An element $w \in \text{dom}(I)$ forms a triangle with e if both (u, w) and (v, w) are edges.

Let (u', v') be some edge of I . We call (u', v') a copy of (u, v) if the covering facts of (u', v') are isomorphic to C by the isomorphism mapping u' to u and v' to v .

We partition the non-garbage left-incident facts of (u, v) between:

- The left copy facts, i.e., the binary facts involving u and an element v' such that (u, v') is a copy of (u, v) and v' does not form a triangle with e : we call v' a left copy element of e .
- The left extra facts, which comprise all other non-garbage left-incident facts, namely:
 - The unary facts on u .
 - The non-garbage binary facts involving u and some element x such that:
 - * the element x forms a triangle with e ; or
 - * the covering facts of the edge (u, x) are not isomorphic to C .

We partition the non-garbage right-incident facts into right extra facts and right copy facts with right copy elements in a similar way. Note that, as we prohibit triangles, the left copy elements and right copy elements are disjoint. We talk of the copy elements, copy facts, extra facts of e to denote both the left and right kinds.

► **Example 4.10.** Consider the instance of Figure 1c and the edge $e = (u, v)$ with covering facts C in orange. The left and right copy elements are respectively t_1 and t_2 and w_1 and w_2 . The dashed orange edges are strict subsets of C , i.e., garbage facts. The extra facts include unary facts (not pictured), facts with x_1 (the black edge (u, x_1) represents non-garbage facts not isomorphic to C), and facts with x_2, x_3 , and x_4 (which form triangles).

Note that garbage facts are neither extra facts nor copy facts, and are ignored in the definition above except in that they may help form triangles. This does not matter: thanks to Claim 4.8, garbage facts will only appear in intermediate steps of some proofs. We can now define the *critical extra weight* as the minimal extra weight of a tight edge with weight Θ :

► **Definition 4.11.** The critical extra weight of Q , written $\Xi \geq 0$, is the minimum across all models I of Q and tight edges e of I of weight Θ , of the number of extra facts of e in I .


► **Example 4.12.** Continuing Example 4.5, the query Q' had critical extra weight 2, as witnessed by I' . The query $Q'' : R(x), S(x, y), S(x', y), S(x', y'), T(y')$, has critical weight 1 and critical extra weight 0, as witnessed by the model $I'' = \{R(a), S(a, b), S(a', b), S(a', b'), T(b')\}$ where the edge (a', b) is tight (and clean) and has weight 1 and extra weight 0.

Again, the definition of critical extra weight clearly ensures:

► **Claim 4.13.** Let I be a model of Q and $e = (u, v)$ be a non-leaf edge. If e has weight Θ and extra weight $< \Xi$, then the dissociation of e in I is also a model of Q .

Lexicographic weight. We then impose a third minimality requirement on a tight edges e , which is needed in Section 6 (but unused in Section 5). The intuition is that we want to limit the number of copy elements. Specifically, we minimize first the number τ of left copy elements, then the number ω of right copy elements, hence the name *lexicographic weight*. This is why we need to order edges (e.g., (u, v) instead of $\{u, v\}$) and break the symmetry:

► **Definition 4.14.** Let I be an instance with an edge $e = (u, v)$. Let τ be the number of left copy elements and ω be the number of right copy elements of e . The lexicographic weight of e is the couple (τ, ω) . We order these couples lexicographically, i.e., $(\tau, \omega) < (\tau', \omega')$ with $\tau, \tau', \omega, \omega' \in \mathbb{N}$ iff $\tau < \tau'$ or $\tau = \tau'$ and $\omega < \omega'$.



■ **Figure 2** Examples of Section 5

The critical lexicographic weight $\Lambda \geq 0$ of Q is the minimum, over all models I of Q and all tight edges of e with weight Θ and extra weight Ξ , of the lexicographic weight of e .

Note that minimizing the lexicographic weight does not always minimize the total number of copy facts, e.g., $(1, 3) < (2, 1)$ but $1 + 3 > 2 + 1$. However, it is always the case that removing a copy fact of an edge e causes the lexicographic weight of e to decrease (and does not cause the extra weight to increase, as the remaining covering facts of the edge are garbage facts). Using this weaker “componentwise” requirement instead of the lexicographic weight would suffice almost everywhere except in part of Section 6. Again, we have:

► **Claim 4.15.** *Let I be a model of Q and $e = (u, v)$ be a non-leaf edge with weight Θ , extra weight Ξ , and lexicographic weight $< \Lambda$. Then, the dissociation of e in I is also a model of Q .*

Critical models. We now define *critical models* (significantly refining the so-called *minimal tight patterns* of [1]). A critical model I is intuitively a model of Q with a clean tight edge e that achieves the minimum of the weight criteria, and where we additionally impose that I is subinstance-minimal. For convenience we also specify a choice of incident facts in the critical model, but this choice is arbitrary, i.e., we can pick any pair of a left and right incident fact.

► **Definition 4.16.** *A critical model (I, e, F_L, F_R) is a model I of Q which is subinstance-minimal, a clean tight edge e of I having weight Θ , extra weight Ξ , and lexicographic weight Λ , and a left incident fact F_L and a right incident fact F_R of e .*

We can now claim that critical models exist:

► **Proposition 4.17.** *If a query Q has a model with a tight edge, then it has a critical model.*

Proof sketch. The existence of models with tight edges achieving the critical weights is by definition, cleanliness can be imposed by Claim 4.8, and subinstance-minimality can easily be imposed by picking some minimal subset of facts of the model that satisfy the query. ◀

5 Hardness with a Non-Iterable Critical Model

Having defined critical models, we now start our hardness proof. As in [1], we will distinguish two cases, based on whether we can break Q with an *iteration* process on a critical model.

► **Definition 5.1.** *Let $M = (I, e, F_L, F_R)$ be a critical model, write $e = (u, v)$, and write C the covering facts of e . Let A and B be the set of the left-incident and right-incident facts of e in I , respectively. The iteration of M is obtained by modifying I in the following way:*

- Add fresh elements u' and v' , copy e on (u, v') , (u', v') , (u', v) , and remove the facts of C .
- Create a copy of the facts of $A \setminus \{F_L\}$ where we replace u by u' .

■ Create a copy of the facts of $B \setminus \{F_R\}$ where we replace v by v' .

► **Example 5.2.** Consider the critical model in Figure 2a, with edge (u, v) and where F_L and F_R are binary facts respectively using u and x_1 and u and x_2 . Its iteration is shown in Figure 2b, with dashed edges representing edges where F_L and F_R are missing.

A *non-iterable* critical model M is one whose iteration no longer satisfies the query; otherwise M is *iterable*. In this section, we show hardness when there is a non-iterable model:

► **Proposition 5.3.** *Assume that Q has a non-iterable critical model. Then the uniform reliability problem for Q is #P-hard.*

We prove this result in the rest of this section.

Fixing notation. Fix the critical model $M = (I, e, F_L, F_R)$ and write $e = (u, v)$ the tight clean edge. We must introduce some notation to talk about the incident facts of e in I , which is summarized in Figure 2a. As e is clean, we know that its incident facts are either extra facts or copy facts — there are no garbage facts.

Write $C \subseteq I$ the covering facts of e in I (in orange on the picture), with $|C| = \Theta$. Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ be the elements different from u and v with which one of u or v has a (non-unary) extra fact or has one of the two facts F_L and F_R . Note that some of the elements in X may have facts with both u and v (i.e., triangles), like x_2 in the picture. We may have $k = 0$, specifically when F_L and F_R are unary facts and any other extra facts are unary.

Further write $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_\tau\}$ the left copy elements of e not in X and $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_\omega\}$ the right copy elements of e not in X , with T and W disjoint. We exclude elements of X because, if F_L (resp., F_R) is a copy fact, then X contains exactly one left copy element (resp., exactly one right copy element). We may have $\tau = \omega = 0$, i.e., if there are no copy facts except possibly those of the edges of F_L and of F_R .

To recapitulate, the incident facts of e in I only involve elements from $X \sqcup T \sqcup W$. Specifically, they are the unary facts on u , the unary facts on v , the extra facts (which involve one of $\{u, v\}$ and one element of X), the facts F_L and F_R which respectively involve u and v and (if they are non unary) one element of X , and the other left and right copy facts forming isomorphic copies of e as edges (u, t_j) with $1 \leq j \leq \tau$ and (w_i, v) with $1 \leq i \leq \omega$. Notice again how, if F_L or F_R are copy facts, then these notations handle them as extra facts along with any other covering facts of their edge. Note that our description of the incident facts of e does not constrain the facts that may exist between elements of $X \sqcup T \sqcup W$.

Coding bipartite graphs. We will reduce from our variant of #PP2DNF (Definition 2.1) by using M to code a bipartite graph $G = (U \sqcup V, E)$. Intuitively, we will create one copy u_i of u for each vertex i of U , one copy v_j of v for each vertex j of V , and copy the edge e on (u_i, v_j) for each edge (i, j) of E . The reason why we distinguish X and T and W is because we will handle them differently. For the incident facts of e that are unary or involve elements of X , we will create one single copy of them for each u_i and each v_j . Indeed, we will show that edges (u_i, v_j) that are missing one such incident fact can be dissociated (if an extra fact is missing, using Claim 4.13) or mapped in a specific way in the iteration (if one F_L or F_R is a copy fact and is missing a fact on its edge). For the (copy) facts involving $T \sqcup W$, we will copy them (using the fact that they are binary) by creating a large number q of copies of $T \sqcup W$. This *saturation* process will in fact create a large number of copies of all facts involving some element of $T \sqcup W$, which we call the *saturated facts*.

Let us accordingly define the *saturated coding* of a bipartite graph using M :

► **Definition 5.4.** Let $G = (U \sqcup V, E)$ be a non-empty bipartite graph, and assume without loss of generality that $U = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $V = \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Let $q > 0$ be some integer. The q -saturated coding of G in M , written $I_{G,q}$, is the instance defined by modifying I in the following way:

- For all $1 \leq p \leq q$, create fresh elements $T_p = \{t_{1,p}, \dots, t_{\tau,p}\}$ and $W_p = \{w_{1,p}, \dots, w_{\omega,p}\}$. Identify $t_j = t_{j,1}$ for $1 \leq j \leq \tau$ and $w_i = w_{i,1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \omega$.
- Letting Φ be the set of the saturated facts, for each $1 \leq p \leq q$, create a copy of Φ where each element t_j is replaced by $t_{j,p}$ and each element w_i is replaced by $w_{i,p}$.
- Create elements u_1, \dots, u_n and v_1, \dots, v_m , where we identify $u = u_1$ and $v = v_1$.
- Create a copy of all incident facts of e for all u_i and v_j . Formally, let A and B be the set of the left-incident and right-incident facts of e in the current model (i.e., involving the $t_{j,p}$ and $w_{i,p}$): note that A (resp., B) contains in particular F_L (resp., F_R) and any unary facts on u (resp., on v). For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, create a copy of the facts of A replacing u by u_i , and for each $1 \leq j \leq m$ create a copy of the facts of B replacing v by v_j .
- Copy e (i.e., C) on (u_i, v_j) for each $(i, j) \in E$, and remove the facts of C if $(u_1, v_1) \notin E$.

The saturated coding process is illustrated in Figure 2c. Note that the process is in polynomial time if the value q is polynomial in the size $|G|$ of the input bipartite graph.

Understanding the coding. Letting $G = (U \sqcup V, E)$ be a non-empty bipartite graph and writing $U = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $V = \{1, \dots, m\}$, we study the coding $I_{G,q}$ to relate subsets of $I_{G,q}$ to subsets of $U \times E \times V$. For this, we partition the facts of $I_{G,q}$ in five kinds (see Figure 2c):

- The *base facts* (pictured in black), which are the facts that do not involve any of the elements $u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_m$ or any of the T_p or W_p with $1 \leq p \leq q$ (but they may involve elements of X): these facts are precisely the facts of I that do not involve the elements u or v or any of the $T \sqcup W$, and were unchanged in the coding.
- The *saturated facts* (in purple), i.e., the facts involving some element of $T_p \sqcup W_p$ for some $1 \leq p \leq q$. These facts exist in q copies, and some (corresponding to facts of I between u or v and an element of $T \sqcup W$) have been further copied n times (if they involve u) or m times (if they involve v).
- The *non-saturated left-incident facts* (in blue) of each vertex $i \in U$, which are the facts which involve u_i and do not involve the $T_p \sqcup W_p$, i.e., are unary or involve an element of X . These facts include in particular a copy of F_L .
- The *non-saturated right-incident facts* (in green) of each vertex $j \in V$, that involve v_j and not the $T_p \sqcup W_p$, i.e., are unary or involve an element of X ; they include a copy of F_R .
- The *copy of e* (in orange) for each edge $(i, j) \in E$, which is on the edge (u_i, v_j) of $I_{G,q}$.

The last three kinds are what we are interested in for the reduction, but the first two kinds need to be dealt with. We will show that the base facts must all be present to satisfy the query, and that each edge has some copy of the saturated facts with high probability.

Base facts. We say that a subinstance of $I_{G,q}$ is *well-formed* if all base facts are present, and *ill-formed* if one is missing. The following is easy to see by subinstance-minimality of I :

► **Proposition 5.5.** *The ill-formed subinstances do not satisfy the query.*

Hence, the number of subinstances of $G_{I,q}$ satisfying the query is the number of well-formed subinstances that do. Thus, in the sequel, we only consider well-formed subinstances.

Saturated facts. For the saturated facts, we will intuitively define *valid* subinstances where, for each couple of vertices $(i, j) \in U \times V$, considering the copies u_i and v_j of u and v , there is a complete copy of the saturated facts that are “relevant” to them. More precisely, looking back at the original instance I , and considering the facts of I involving an element of $T \sqcup W$, there are of two types. The first type are the facts that do not involve u or v , i.e., they only involve elements of $T \sqcup W$ and possibly of $\text{dom}(I) \setminus \{u, v\}$. Each such fact has been copied q times in $I_{G,q}$, and the copy numbered $1 \leq p \leq q$ uses one or two elements of $T_p \sqcup W_p$. The second type are the facts involving u or v in I (they cannot involve both). These facts have been copied $n \times q$ or $m \times q$ times in $I_{G,q}$, each copy using one element of $T_p \sqcup W_p$ for some $1 \leq p \leq q$ and one u_i for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ or one v_j for some $1 \leq j \leq m$. What we require of a valid subinstance J is that, for each couple $(i, j) \in U \times V$, we have in J some copy $1 \leq p \leq q$ containing all facts of the first type and all facts of the second type involving u_i and v_j :

► **Definition 5.6.** *We partition the saturated facts of $I_{G,q}$ in q copies: formally, the p -th saturated copy for $1 \leq p \leq q$ is the subset of the saturated facts of $I_{G,q}$ that involve some element of $T_p \sqcup W_p$. A saturation index for $I_{G,q}$ is a function $\iota: U \times V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, q\}$.*

For $J \subseteq I_{G,q}$, we say that J is valid for ι if, for each $(i, j) \in U \times V$, letting $p := \iota(i, j)$, considering the facts of the p -th saturated copy, J contains all such facts that are:

- *of the first type, i.e., J contains all facts of $I_{G,q}$ that involve some element of $T_p \sqcup W_p$ and do not involve any elements of $\{u_{i'} \mid 1 \leq i' \leq n\} \sqcup \{v_{j'} \mid 1 \leq j' \leq m\}$;*
- *of the second type and involve u_i or v_j , i.e., J contains all facts of $I_{G,q}$ that involve some element of $T_p \sqcup W_p$ and involve either u_i or v_j .*

We call J valid if there is a saturation index for which it is valid; otherwise J is invalid.

Note that, for each choice of couple $(i, j) \in U \times V$, the required facts can be found in a different saturated copy $\iota(i, j)$, i.e., we do not require that J contains all facts of the p -th saturated copy for some p . Indeed this stronger requirement would be too hard to ensure: intuitively, the number of facts required for each (i, j) is constant (it only depends on I), but the number of facts in the p -th saturated copy depends on G (it is linear in $|U| \times |V|$).


We now show that we can pick a number q of copies which is polynomial in the input G , but makes it very unlikely that a random subinstance is invalid. Thus, even without understanding which invalid subinstances satisfy Q , the proportion of subinstances of $I_{G,q}$ that satisfy Q will be the proportion of valid subinstances that do, up to an error which is much less than the probability of any valid subinstance and can be eliminated by rounding:

► **Lemma 5.7.** *There is a polynomial P_M such that, for any non-empty bipartite graph $G = (U \sqcup V, E)$, letting $\chi := |U| + |V| + |E|$ be the size of G and defining $q := P_M(\chi)$, the proportion of subinstances of $I_{G,q}$ that are invalid is strictly less than $2^{-(\chi|I|+1)}$.*

Thanks to this, we focus on the well-formed subinstances J where we keep some subset of the saturated facts making J valid. We now fix q to the value of Lemma 5.7, and build $I_{G,q}$.

Good and bad subinstances. Let us now study the status of the last three kinds of facts:

► **Definition 5.8.** *Let $J \subseteq I_{G,q}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ (resp., $1 \leq j \leq m$), the vertex $i \in U$ (resp., $j \in V$) is complete in J if all its non-saturated left-incident facts (resp., non-saturated right-incident facts) are present in J , and incomplete otherwise. The edge $(i, j) \in E$ is complete in J if all covering facts of (u_i, v_j) in $I_{G,q}$ are present in J , and incomplete otherwise. We call J good if there is an edge $(i, j) \in E$ with (i, j) , i , and j complete, and bad otherwise.*



■ **Figure 3** Examples of Section 6

We now claim that, among the well-formed valid subinstances, the good ones satisfy the query, and the bad ones do not. This is easy to see for good subinstances:

► **Proposition 5.9.** *For any good valid well-formed subinstance $J \subseteq I_{G,q}$, there is a homomorphism from I to J .*

Proof sketch. As J is well-formed all base facts are present, and J is valid for some saturation index ι . Let $(i, j) \in E$ be an edge witnessing that J is good. The homomorphism maps $T \sqcup W$ to $T_{\iota(i,j)} \sqcup W_{\iota(i,j)}$, maps u to u_i and v to v_j , and is the identity otherwise. ◀

For bad subinstances, we show with much more effort that they do not satisfy the query:

► **Proposition 5.10.** *Any bad subinstance $J \subseteq I_{G,q}$ does not satisfy the query.*

Proof sketch. We dissociate incomplete edges with Claim 4.4, and dissociate complete edges missing at least one incident extra fact with Claim 4.13, which does not break Q . Then we show how to map this homomorphically to the iteration I' of M , by mapping complete vertices to u and v in the dissociation, mapping vertices missing facts of the edges of F_L or F_R to u' and v' respectively (after dissociating these edges if F_L or F_R are copy facts). This contradicts the assumption that M was non-iterable, i.e., that I' violates Q . ◀

This establishes that the status of Q on a valid well-formed subinstance J depends on whether J are good or bad, i.e., depends on which of the last three kinds of facts were kept in J . Now, the subsets of these facts are clearly in correspondence with the subsets of $U \times E \times V$ for the λ, μ, ν -#PP2DNF problem, (see Definition 2.1) for well-chosen constant probabilities λ, μ, ν . Further, a subset of $U \times E \times V$ is counted in λ, μ, ν -#PP2DNF if the corresponding subset of the last three kinds of facts yields a good subinstance. As the ill-formed subinstances are easy to count, and the invalid ones are negligible, we can conclude the reduction and establish Proposition 5.3. The full proof is in the appendix.

6 Hardness when all Critical Models are Iterable

In this last section, we show hardness in the case where all critical models are iterable:

► **Proposition 6.1.** *Assume that Q has a critical model and that all critical models of Q are iterable. Then the uniform reliability problem for Q is #P-hard.*

A first observation is that, in this case, we have $\Xi = 0$, by contraposition of the following:

► **Claim 6.2.** *If the critical extra weight is > 0 , then Q has a non-iterable critical model.*

Proof sketch. Take a critical model $M = (I, e, F_L, F_R)$ with $e = (u, v)$ and one of F_L, F_R an extra fact. The edge (u', v') in the iteration of M has extra weight $< \Xi$, so we can dissociate it without breaking Q and merge the two resulting copies. This yields the so-called *fine dissociation* (see Figure 3c, and Definition E.1 in the appendix), which violates Q . ◀

Hence, in the rest of the section, we assume $\Xi = 0$, and fix an iterable critical model $M = (I, e, F_L, F_R)$. All incident facts of $e = (u, v)$ in I are copy facts, so we write $t, t_1, \dots, t_{\tau-1}$ the left copy elements and $w, w_1, \dots, w_{\omega-1}$ the right copy elements, where t and w are the elements that occur in F_L and F_R respectively (the choice of F_L and F_R from now on only matters in that it distinguishes two copy elements t and w). The lexicographic weight of e in I is thus $\Lambda = (\tau, \omega)$ with $\tau, \omega \geq 1$. We write C the covering facts of e in I . See Figure 3a.

n -step iteration. Let us now define the n -step iteration of M . It is related to iteration in [1], but specialized to the case where $\Xi = 0$, i.e., all incident facts are copy facts.

- **Definition 6.3.** For $n > 0$, the n -step iteration of M is obtained by modifying I :
- Create elements u_1, \dots, u_n and v_1, \dots, v_n , where we identify u and u_1 and v_n and v .
 - For all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, copy e on $(u_i, t_{j'})$ and $(w_{i'}, v_j)$ for all $1 \leq j' < \tau$ and $1 \leq i' < \omega$.
 - For all $1 \leq i \leq n$, copy e on (u_i, v_i) for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and on (u_{i+1}, v_i) for all $1 \leq i < n$.
 - Remove the facts of C , except in the trivial case where $n = 1$.

The iteration is illustrated in Figure 3a. Note that the 1-step iteration is exactly I . Further, the 2-step iteration resembles the iteration in Section 5, but omits some incomplete copies of (u, t) and (w, v) (i.e., the dashed edges in Figure 2b): as t and w are copy elements (as $\Xi = 0$) these facts would be garbage facts so the difference is inessential.

We now show that, if the iteration process of Section 5 cannot break Q on any critical model, then the n -step iteration of any critical model M for any $n > 0$ must satisfy Q . This proposition summarizes how we use the hypothesis that all critical models are iterable:

- **Proposition 6.4.** Let Q be a query that has a critical model and that all critical models for Q are iterable. Then $\Xi = 0$ and, for any critical model M of Q , for any $n > 0$, the n -iteration of M satisfies Q ; further it is even a subinstance-minimal model of Q .

Proof sketch. Intuitively, the n -step iteration can be achieved by repeatedly performing the iteration from Section 5. A tedious point is that we must show that iteration is performed on critical models, i.e., that all intermediate models are subinstance-minimal. ◀

Coding. We explain how to code an undirected graph to reduce from ϕ, η -U-ST-CON for some $0 < \phi \leq 1$ and $0 < \eta < 1$ (see Definition 2.3): this time no saturation is needed. Proposition 6.4 will then intuitively show that some paths in the coding make Q true.

- **Definition 6.5.** Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with source r and sink s , with $r \neq s$. The coding I_G of G in M is the instance defined by modifying I in the following way:
- For all $a \in V$, create a fresh element u_a , and copy $(u, t_{j'})$ on $(u_a, t_{j'})$ for all $1 \leq j' < \tau$.
 - We identify u to u_r , so u_r also occurs in another copy of e , namely the edge (u_r, t) .
 - For each edge $\pi = \{a, b\} \in E$, create fresh elements $u_\pi, v_{\pi,a}, v_{\pi,b}$, copy $(u, t_{j'})$ on $(u_\pi, t_{j'})$ for all $1 \leq j' < \tau$, copy $(w_{i'}, v)$ on $(w_{i'}, v_{\pi,\beta})$ for all $1 \leq i' < \omega$ and $\beta \in \{a, b\}$, and copy (u, v) on $(u_a, v_{\pi,a}), (u_\pi, v_{\pi,a}), (u_\pi, v_{\pi,b}),$ and $(u_b, v_{\pi,b})$.
 - Copy (u, v) on (u_s, v) , and then remove the facts of C .

An example is given in Figure 3b, shortening the vertex names for readability. The coding I_G can clearly be built in polynomial time in G . We partition the facts of I_G in four kinds:

- The *base facts* (not pictured), i.e., the facts involving no element of $\{u_a \mid a \in V\} \cup \{v_{\pi,\beta} \mid \pi \in E, \beta \in \pi\} \cup \{v\}$.
- The *supplementary base facts* (in black), i.e., the covering facts of (u_r, t) and $(u_r, t_{j'})$ for $1 \leq j' < \tau$, and the covering facts of (u_s, v) and (w, v) and $(w_{i'}, v)$ for $1 \leq i' < \omega$.
- The *vertex facts* (in purple) of each vertex $a \in V \setminus \{r\}$, i.e., the covering facts of $(u_a, t_{j'})$ for $1 \leq j' < \tau$.
- The *edge facts* (in orange) of each edge $\pi = \{a, b\}$ of E , i.e., all covering facts and incident facts of $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,a})$ and $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,b})$, including the covering facts of $(u_a, v_{\pi,a})$ and $(u_b, v_{\pi,b})$.

As in Section 5, the base facts of I_G are the facts of I not involving u and v . A subinstance $J \subseteq I_G$ is *well-formed* if it contains all base facts and supplementary base facts. Then:

► **Claim 6.6.** *The ill-formed (i.e., not well-formed) subinstances do not satisfy the query.*

Now, consider a well-formed subinstance $J \subseteq I_G$. A vertex $a \in V$ is *complete* in J if all vertex facts of a are present, and *incomplete* otherwise; and an edge $\pi \in E$ is *complete* in J if all its edge facts of π are present, and *incomplete* otherwise. A *complete path* in J is a path connecting r and s in G such that all traversed edges and vertices are complete in J (except r , for which completeness was not defined). We say that J is *good* if it has a complete path, and *bad* otherwise. We can easily see that good subinstances satisfy the query, because they contain an iterate of M and we can use Proposition 6.4:

► **Claim 6.7.** *For any good well-formed subinstance $J \subseteq I_G$, there is a homomorphism from the $(2n + 1)$ -step iteration of M to J , where n is the length of a complete path in J .*

It is again far more challenging to show the other claim:

► **Claim 6.8.** *Any bad subinstance $J \subseteq I_G$ does not satisfy the query.*

Proof sketch. We dissociate all copies of e that are missing a fact or are of the form $(u_\beta, v_{\pi,\beta})$ and are missing an incident fact with some element $w_{i'}$. Then, we map the result by a homomorphism h to a structure called the *explosion* (pictured in Figure 3c, see Definition E.3 in the appendix), which intuitively reflects all maximal strict subsets of the $\{t_1, \dots, t_{\tau-1}\}$, and violates Q (by considering the lexicographic weight of its edges). We define h along the cut of G defined by considering the vertices reachable from r via a complete path. ◀

We then show hardness by reducing from ϕ, η -U-ST-CON for well-chosen constant probabilities ϕ and η (up to assuming that the source vertex r is always kept) and thus conclude the reduction, establishing Proposition 6.1. Together with Proposition 5.3, as Q has a critical model by Proposition 4.17 and Theorem 3.5, we have shown our main result (Theorem 1.3).

7 Conclusion

We have proved the intractability of uniform reliability for unbounded homomorphism-closed queries on graph signatures. A natural direction for future work is to extend this intractability result towards Conjecture 1.2. The two remaining obstacles are the case of unbounded queries on arbitrary signatures, which we intend to study in future work; and the case of bounded queries, i.e., UCQs, where the general case is left open by Kenig and Suciu [7]. Other natural extensions include the study of queries satisfying weaker requirements than homomorphism-closure; or other notions of possible worlds, e.g., induced subinstances; or other notions of intractability, e.g., the inexistence of lineages in tractable circuit classes from knowledge compilation. A more general question is whether the techniques developed here have any connection to other areas of research, e.g., constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs).

References

- 1 Antoine Amarilli and İsmail İlkan Ceylan. The dichotomy of evaluating homomorphism-closed queries on probabilistic graphs. *LMCS*, 2021. doi:10.46298/lmcs-18(1:2)2022.
- 2 Antoine Amarilli and Benny Kimelfeld. Uniform reliability of self-join-free conjunctive queries. *LMCS*, 2022. To appear.
- 3 Stephen A. Cook. The complexity of theorem-proving procedures. In *Proc. STOC*, 1971.
- 4 Nilesh N. Dalvi and Dan Suciu. The dichotomy of probabilistic inference for unions of conjunctive queries. *Journal of the ACM*, 59(6):30, 2012.
- 5 Robert Fink and Dan Olteanu. Dichotomies for queries with negation in probabilistic databases. *TODS*, 41(1), 2016.
- 6 Erich Grädel, Yuri Gurevich, and Colin Hirsch. The complexity of query reliability. In *Proc. PODS*, 1998.
- 7 Batya Kenig and Dan Suciu. A dichotomy for the generalized model counting problem for unions of conjunctive queries. In *Proc. PODS*, 2021.
- 8 Ester Livshits, Leopoldo E. Bertossi, Benny Kimelfeld, and Moshe Sebag. The Shapley value of tuples in query answering. In *Proc. ICDT*, volume 155, 2020.
- 9 Dan Olteanu and Jiewen Huang. Using OBDDs for efficient query evaluation on probabilistic databases. In *Proc. SUM*, volume 5291, 2008.
- 10 Dan Olteanu and Jiewen Huang. Secondary-storage confidence computation for conjunctive queries with inequalities. In *Proc. SIGMOD*, 2009.
- 11 J. Scott Provan and Michael O. Ball. The complexity of counting cuts and of computing the probability that a graph is connected. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 12(4), 1983.
- 12 Babak Salimi, Leopoldo E. Bertossi, Dan Suciu, and Guy Van den Broeck. Quantifying causal effects on query answering in databases. In *TAPP*, 2016.
- 13 Dan Suciu, Dan Olteanu, Christopher Ré, and Christoph Koch. *Probabilistic databases*. Synthesis Lectures on Data Management. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2011.
- 14 Leslie Gabriel Valiant. The complexity of computing the permanent. *TCS*, 8(2):189–201, 1979.

A Proofs for Section 2 (Preliminaries and Problem Statement)

In this appendix, we give the formal details to show that the two problems from which we reduce are #P-hard.

We first explain more carefully why the first problem is intractable, as for inessential reasons this actually requires some inspection of the proof of [2]:

► **Proposition 2.2** ([2]). *For any fixed $0 < \lambda, \nu < 1$ and $0 < \mu \leq 1$, the problem λ, μ, ν -#PP2DNF is #P-hard.*

Proof. We can see the input bipartite graph as an instance over the signature with unary relations R and T and binary relation S , but the instances thus obtained must obey the following restrictions (*): the domains of R and T are disjoint, and the domain of S is a subset of the products of that of R and T . The probability of the R -facts is then λ , that of the T -facts is then ν , and that of the S -facts is then μ , and we ask for the probability of drawing a possible world where the query $Q_0 : R(x), S(x, y), T(y)$ holds.

This is an instance of probabilistic query evaluation for the query Q_0 with fixed probabilities λ, μ, ν for the facts of the relations R, S, T respectively. This PQE problem is shown #P-hard on arbitrary instances by Theorem 4.3 of [2]. By inspection of the proof (see Section 5, “Defining the gadgets” and “Defining the reduction”), one can check the instances used in the hardness proof in fact obey the restrictions (*), so that the problem is still #P-hard even when restricted to input instances obeying (*). Thus, the λ, μ, ν -#PP2DNF problem is also #P-hard, which concludes the proof. ◀

We now show hardness of the second problem in the rest of this appendix:

► **Proposition 2.4.** *For any fixed $0 < \phi \leq 1$ and $0 < \eta < 1$, the problem ϕ, η -U-ST-CON is #P-hard.*

In the process of proving Proposition 2.4, we will need to consider the ϕ, η -vertex-edge-probabilistic U-ST-CON problem in cases where $\eta = 1$, even though the statement of the proposition does not mention it.

So we actually show the following stronger statement:

► **Proposition A.1.** *For any fixed $0 < \phi \leq 1$ and $0 < \eta \leq 1$ such that $\phi < 1$ or $\eta < 1$, the problem ϕ, η -U-ST-CON is #P-hard.*

To do so, we first distinguish the cases where one of the probabilities is 1. When the vertex probability is $\phi = 1$, the problem is already known to be hard:

► **Proposition A.2** ([11]). *For any fixed probability $0 < \eta < 1$, the problem $1, \eta$ -U-ST-CON is #P-hard.*

Proof. This is simply the standard U-ST-CON problem with probability η on the edges, which is #P-hard [11]. ◀

When the edge probability is $\eta = 1$, we can show hardness by reducing from the undirected S-T NODE CONNECTEDNESS problem. That problem is shown to be #P-hard in [14] but unfortunately only for the vertex probability $\phi = 1/2$. We can show that hardness also applies to any arbitrary choice of ϕ using a standard interpolation argument:

► **Proposition A.3.** *For any fixed probability $0 < \phi < 1$, the problem $\phi, 1$ -U-ST-CON is #P-hard.*

Proof. We reduce from the undirected S–T NODE CONNECTEDNESS problem, which is shown to be #P-hard in [14]. This is the $\frac{1}{2}$, 1-U-ST-CON problem, i.e., where we count the number of vertex subsets such that there is a path connecting the source r and sink s .

First note that, given that there is no path in the cases where r and s are not kept, up to multiplying by a factor of $1/4$ we can assume that the vertices r and s are always present. The same holds for our problem ϕ , 1-U-ST-CON, multiplying by a factor of ϕ^2 . So we will work with these slightly modified problems where we only consider subsets of vertices where the vertices r and s are kept. In this case the answer to the problem is clearly 1 if r and s are adjacent, so we further assume that r and s are not adjacent.

Given an instance of the S–T NODE CONNECTEDNESS PROBLEM, namely, an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and source and sink vertices r and s , our goal is to compute the number of *good* vertex subsets, where we call a subset $V' \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\}$ *good* if there is an undirected path between r and s in the induced subgraph on V' in G . We define quantities $X_0, \dots, X_{|V|-2}$ where X_i for $0 \leq i \leq |V| - 2$ denotes the number of good subsets of cardinality i . Note that, for instance, $X_0 = 0$ as r and s are not adjacent. The quantity that we must compute is $\sum_i X_i$. We will explain how the computation of the vector \vec{X} of these quantities reduces in polynomial time to the our problem ϕ , 1-U-ST-CON problem, which suffices to conclude.

For any positive integer $1 \leq q \leq |V| - 1$, let G_q denote the undirected graph obtained from G where each vertex v of $V \setminus \{s, t\}$ is replaced by copies v_1, \dots, v_q , where every edge $\{u, v\}$ with $u, v \notin \{s, t\}$ is replaced by the q^2 edges $\{u_i, v_j\}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq q$, and where every edge $\{u, s\}$ or $\{u, t\}$ is replaced by the q edges $\{u_i, s\}$ or $\{u_i, t\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$ respectively. (Remember that there are no edges between r and s .) Remark that after this transformation two copies u_i and u_j of a vertex u are *not* adjacent. The construction of G_q from G is in polynomial time because the value q is polynomial in the size of q .

We now invoke our oracle for the problem ϕ , 1-U-ST-CON on the graph G_q for each $1 \leq q \leq |V| - 1$, returning probabilities $P_1, \dots, P_{|V|-1}$. Let us examine these probabilities in more detail and show that they are connected to the quantities $X_0, \dots, X_{|V|-2}$ that we must compute, by showing the following equation:

$$P_q = (1 - \phi^q)^{|V|-2} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq |V|-2} X_i \times \left(\frac{1}{1 - \phi^q} - 1 \right)^i \quad (1)$$

To show Equation 1, notice that we can choose a subset of vertices of G_q by selecting vertices in $V \setminus \{s, t\}$ and choosing whether they are *kept* (i.e., one of their copies in G_q is kept) or *not kept* (i.e., none of the copies are kept). Note that the probability that a vertex is not kept is $(1 - \phi)^q$ and the probability that it is kept is $1 - (1 - \phi)^q$. Now, note that a subset of vertices of G_q has a path connecting r and s iff the kept vertices in G have a path connecting r and s , i.e., the kept vertices in G are a good subset. Indeed, in one direction, if there is a path of kept vertices connecting r and s in G_q , modifying the path by replacing each vertex copy v_i by the vertex v , we obtain a path connecting r and s in G , each vertex of which was kept. Conversely, if there is a path of kept vertices connecting r and s in G , we obtain a path connecting r and s in G_q by replacing each kept vertex by some copy witnessing that it is kept.

For this reason, the value P_q returned by the oracle on G_q can be expressed as:

$$P_q = \sum_{\substack{V' \subseteq V \setminus \{s, t\} \\ V' \text{ good in } G}} (1 - \phi^q)^{|V|-2-|V'|} \times (1 - (1 - \phi^q))^{|V'|}$$

As the summand only depends on the cardinality of V' , we can split the sum according to this cardinality and regroup the factors, making the quantities X_i appear, to obtain:

$$P_q = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq |V|-2} X_i \times (1 - \phi^q)^{|V|-2-i} \times (1 - (1 - \phi^q))^i$$

Taking out the common factors, and rewriting, we get:

$$P_q = (1 - \phi^q)^{|V|-2} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq |V|-2} X_i \times \left(\frac{1 - (1 - \phi^q)}{1 - \phi^q} \right)^i$$

Rewriting the contents of the parenthesis, we have obtained Equation 1.

Now, Equation 1 means that, from the oracle answers $P_1, \dots, P_{|V|-1}$, by dividing by $(1 - \phi^q)^{|V|-2}$, we can recover the vector \vec{Q} of the following quantities, for $1 \leq q \leq |V| - 1$:

$$Q_q = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq |V|-2} X_i \times \alpha_\phi(q)^i \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha_\phi(q) = \frac{1}{1 - \phi^q} - 1$, which is incidentally well-defined because $0 < \phi < 1$ and $q > 0$. Further observe that the function α_ϕ is in fact bijective (strictly decreasing) over the positive reals.

Now, Equation 2 can be seen as a matrix equation

$$\vec{Q} = M\vec{X}$$

where the matrix M is a square matrix whose q -th row and i -th column contains $\alpha_\phi(q)^i$. We recognize a Vandermonde matrix. Further, as α_ϕ is bijective, the values $\alpha_\phi(q)$ are pairwise distinct, so M is invertible.

This concludes the presentation of our reduction: given the input graph G , we build the graph G_q for each $1 \leq q \leq |V| - 1$ in polynomial time, we obtain the values P_q from the oracle, deduce the vector \vec{Q} by dividing by $(1 - \phi^q)^{|V|-2}$, build the matrix M , invert it in polynomial time, compute $\vec{X} = M^{-1}\vec{Q}$, and compute the sum $\sum_i X_i$ which is the answer to the undirected S-T NODE CONNECTEDNESS problem instance from which we were reducing. This concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

We will conclude the proof of Proposition A.1, hence of Proposition 2.4, using Propositions A.2 and A.3, by a saturation and rounding argument. To do this, we need a general-purpose lemma about probabilistic computation, which we will actually reuse when proving Lemma 5.7 in Appendix D:

► **Lemma A.4.** *Fix some probability $0 < \zeta < 1$. We are given $0 < \epsilon < 1$ be a probability, and let $\chi > 0$ be an integer. Then for any integer $q > \frac{\ln(\chi) - \ln(\epsilon)}{-\ln(1 - \zeta)}$, we have:*

$$1 - (1 - (1 - \zeta)^q)^\chi < \epsilon$$

Note that $\ln(\epsilon) < 0$, $\ln(\chi) \geq 0$, and $\ln(1 - \zeta) < 0$.

The intuition of the lemma is the following. We are considering a process where we want to have all of χ draws succeed. Each draw consists of performing some number q of attempts, and each attempt succeeds with probability ζ to succeed one attempt. The probability ζ is fixed, but the number of draws χ is part of the input, and we must choose the value of q . The lemma tells us how large we need to make q so as to guarantee that the probability that some attempt succeeds in each of the χ draws is sufficiently high, i.e, the probability that there is a draw where we fail all the attempts is at most some target probability ϵ .

Proof of Lemma A.4. The equation to show can be equivalently rephrased to:

$$(1 - (1 - \zeta)^q)^\chi > 1 - \epsilon$$

Or, as $\chi > 0$:

$$1 - (1 - \zeta)^q > (1 - \epsilon)^{1/\chi}$$

Equivalently:

$$(1 - \zeta)^q < 1 - (1 - \epsilon)^{1/\chi} \tag{3}$$

Thus, establishing Equation 3 suffices to conclude.

Let us first show that we have:

$$(1 - \zeta)^q < \frac{\epsilon}{\chi} \tag{4}$$

To see why this holds, recall that we have defined:

$$q > \frac{\ln(\chi) - \ln(\epsilon)}{-\ln(1 - \zeta)}$$

As $0 < \zeta < 1$, we have $\ln(1 - \zeta) < 0$, so we deduce:

$$q \ln(1 - \zeta) < \ln(\epsilon) - \ln(\chi)$$

Exponentiating, we get Equation 4.

Now let us conclude. We use Bernoulli's inequality, which states that for every real number $0 \leq r \leq 1$ and $x \geq -1$ we have:

$$(1 + x)^r \leq 1 + rx$$

In particular, for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ and $\chi > 0$, we have:

$$(1 - x)^{1/\chi} \leq 1 - \frac{x}{\chi}$$

Equivalently:

$$\frac{x}{\chi} \leq 1 - (1 - x)^{1/\chi} \tag{5}$$

Thus from Equation 4 and Equation 5, taking $x = \epsilon$, we get Equation 3, which concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

We can now show Proposition A.1:

Proof of Proposition A.1. Let ζ and η be the fixed vertex and edge probabilities. If the vertex probability ζ is 1, we conclude by Proposition A.2. If the edge probability η is 1, we conclude by Proposition A.3. Otherwise, we show the hardness of ζ, η -U-ST-CON in the rest of the proof, by reducing from the case $\zeta, 1$ -U-ST-CON where edges have probability 1. We use a saturation and rounding argument where we intuitively replace each edge by a large number of parallel paths.

Specifically, let us consider an instance to the problem $\phi, 1$ -U-ST-CON, consisting of an undirected graph G with distinguished source and sink vertices r and s . Let n be the number of vertices of G , and let m be its number of edges. We assume without loss of

generality that $n, m > 0$ as the answer is trivial otherwise. For any integer $q > 0$, we denote by $G_q = (V_q, E_q)$ the graph obtained from G by keeping the same source and sink vertex and replacing each edge by q parallel paths of length 2, i.e., every edge $\{u, v\}$ is replaced by $2q$ edges $\{u, w_{u,v,1}\}, \dots, \{u, w_{u,v,q}\}$ and $\{w_{u,v,1}, v\}, \dots, \{w_{u,v,q}, v\}$ where the intermediate vertices $w_{u,v,1}, \dots, w_{u,v,q}$ are fresh.

A *possible world* of G_q is a subset (V', E') of $V_q \times E_q$; remember that we have an oracle that can tell us the total probability of the possible worlds of G_q that are *good*, i.e., contain a path connecting r and s where all vertices and edges are kept. By contrast, what we want to compute is the probability of vertex subsets V' of V that are *good*, i.e., the induced subgraph of G on V' contains a path connecting r and s .

We will argue that for sufficiently large q it is very likely that each edge of G is reflected by one of the paths of length 2 that codes it. Formally, we say that a possible world is *valid* if, for each of the m edges $\{u, v\}$ of G , there is some choice of $1 \leq p \leq q$ such that the vertex $w_{u,v,p}$ and the edges $\{u, w_{u,v,p}\}$ and $\{v, w_{u,v,p}\}$ were kept; otherwise the possible world is *invalid*. We claim that, if we consider the possible worlds of G_q where we condition the choices of the vertices $w_{u,v,i}$ for $\{u, v\} \in E$ and $1 \leq i \leq q$ and of all edges to ensure that V' is valid, then there is a path connecting r and s (under draws of the other vertices i.e., those of G) with same probability as in G . Indeed, there is an immediate probability-preserving bijection between the subsets, and there is a length-2 path connecting two vertices u and v in G_q precisely for the vertex pairs u and v connected by an edge in G .

So let us investigate the probability ϵ' of getting an invalid possible world of G_q , and show that it can be made sufficiently small with a polynomial value of q , so that the answer of our oracle on G_q is sufficiently close to the probability of the subsets of V containing a path connecting r and s . Let us write the rational ϕ as a/b where a and b are integers, so that $1 - \phi = (b - a)/b$. Define $\epsilon := \frac{(1/b)^n}{2}$: this ensures that the probability of any subset of vertices of G is at most 2ϵ . We want to show that the probability of invalid subsets is negligible, i.e., that we have $\epsilon' < \epsilon$. Now, the probability of an invalid subset is by definition the following:

$$\epsilon' = 1 - (1 - (1 - \phi\eta^2)^q)^m$$

because a subset is invalid if there is an edge for which for all q paths of length 2 coding it we did not keep the two edges and the intermediate vertex in the path of length 2 that codes it. For an explanation of this expression, see the details below the statement of Lemma A.4. By Lemma A.4, taking $\zeta := \phi\eta^2$ and $\chi := m$, we have $\epsilon' < \epsilon$ if we take $q := 1 + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(n) - \ln(\epsilon)}{-\ln(1 - \zeta)} \right\rceil$. Remembering that $\ln(1 - \zeta)$ is a constant, and noting that by definition of ϵ we have $\ln(\epsilon) = n \ln(1/b) - \ln 2$ where b is a constant, this value q is polynomial in n , hence in the size of the input graph G .

This allows us to conclude the reduction. Given the graph G and vertices r and s , we build G_q for this value of q , which is in polynomial time in G . We then call our oracle for the ϕ, η -vertex-edge-probabilistic problem on G_q . It returns the value:

$$O = \epsilon'X + (1 - \epsilon')Y$$

Where $\epsilon' < \epsilon$ is the probability of getting an invalid possible world, where X is the probability that an invalid possible world is good (which is unknown); and Y is the probability that a valid possible world is good (which as we argued is the answer to the $\phi, 1$ -U-ST-CON instance G , i.e., what we need to compute). Equivalently, we obtain:

$$O = Y + \epsilon'(X - Y) + Y$$

Recall that $\phi = a/b$, so the answer that we wish to compute is of the form $Y = Z/b^n$ for some integer Z , and it is sufficient to determine the integer Z . We can multiply the oracle result O by b^n and obtain:

$$Ob^n = Z + b^n \epsilon'(X - Y)$$

Now, let us argue that we can recover Z from Ob^n , hence recover Y from O and conclude. As X and Y are probabilities we have $-1 \leq X - Y \leq 1$, and as $0 \geq \epsilon' < \epsilon = \frac{b^{-n}}{2}$, we conclude that $-1/2 < b^n \epsilon'(X - Y) < 1/2$, so we recover Z from the oracle answer by rounding the rational Ob^n to the nearest integer, concluding the reduction. ◀

B Proofs for Section 3 (Basic Techniques: Dissociation, Tight Edges)

In the appendix, to simplify some of the technical proofs that use the dissociation process, we explain how we can extend the definition of this process so that it also applies (in a vacuous way) to non-leaf edges and non-edges. This will make it easier to deal with several different cases in a unified fashion in proofs:

► **Definition B.1.** *Let I be an instance and let (u, v) be a non-edge, i.e., a couple of distinct elements of $\text{dom}(I)$ such that no fact of I uses both u and v . The dissociation of (u, v) in I is simply I , i.e., we do not do anything.*

Let I be an instance. A leaf edge is a couple $e = (u, v)$ of distinct elements of $\text{dom}(I)$ which is an edge but not a non-leaf edge. Hence, one of u and v (or both) is such that the only facts of I where this element appears are the covering facts of e . We call such elements the leaf elements of e . (Specifically, if both u and v are leaf elements then the only facts of I using u or v are the covering facts of e .) Then the dissociation of e in I is obtained by replacing the leaf elements by fresh constants. For instance, if u occurs in other facts of I than the covering facts of e but v does not, then we rename v to be a fresh element. Likewise, if both u and v are leaf elements, then we rename them both, i.e., the covering facts of e are replaced by an isomorphic copy on two fresh elements.

Note that, for any instance I , if we take $e = (u, v)$ to be a non-edge or a leaf edge of I , then the dissociation of e in I is isomorphic to I , in particular it satisfies the query iff I does. Specifically, dissociating a non-edge or a leaf edge never makes the query false.

Further note that, for any couple $e = (u, v)$ of distinct elements of $\text{dom}(I)$ (whether non-edge, leaf edge, or non-leaf edge) then the dissociation of e in I is an instance in which e is no longer an edge.


C Proofs for Section 4 (Minimality and Critical Models)

► **Claim 4.4.** *Let I be a model of Q and $e = (u, v)$ be a non-leaf edge of I . If the weight of e is less than Θ , then the dissociation of e in I is also a model of Q .*

Proof. If the dissociation did not satisfy Q , then e would be tight, which would contradict the minimality of Θ . ◀

► **Claim 4.8.** *If Q has a model with a tight edge, then it has a model with a clean tight edge of weight Θ .*

Proof. In this proof, we use the conventions on dissociation introduced in Appendix B. The process of the proof is illustrated in Figure 4.



■ **Figure 4** Illustration of the proof of Claim 4.8: an instance I with a tight edge e with incident garbage facts (dashed orange edges), copy facts (orange edges), and extra facts (black edges); the dissociation I_1 of the edges containing garbage facts; the result I_2 of merging the dangling copies on (u, v) ; the dissociation of e in I .

By definition of Θ , we know that Q has a model I with a tight edge e of weight Θ . Let us modify I to obtain a model I' where e is a tight edge of weight Θ which is clean. To do so, consider all the elements x_1, \dots, x_n with which e has left garbage facts, and the elements y_1, \dots, y_m with which e has right garbage facts; note that these sets may not be disjoint (though they are on Figure 4).

The edges $(x_1, v), \dots, (x_n, v)$ and $(u, y_1), \dots, (u, y_m)$ have weight $< \Theta$, so they can be dissociated without breaking the query (using Claim 4.4 if they are non-leaf, or trivially if they are leaf using the conventions of Appendix B). Let I_1 be the result of performing all these dissociations: we know that I_1 satisfies the query. In I_1 , the edge e still has garbage facts because of the edge copies created in the dissociations (called *dangling copies*), but all the elements with which it has garbage facts are now leaf elements. Also note that in I_1 relative to I we have created other dangling edges (on the elements x_1, \dots, x_n and y_1, \dots, y_m).

Now, let I_2 be the result of homomorphically mapping the dangling copies into e , which is possible because their covering facts are (up to renaming) a subset of those of e . We know that I_2 satisfies the query. Further, by construction the edge e does not have any garbage facts in I_2 , and obviously it still has weight Θ .

The only remaining point is to show that e is still tight in I_2 . To see why, let I'_2 be the result of dissociating e in I_2 (i.e., isomorphic to I_2 if e is a leaf edge, though this case can in fact never happen), and let I' be the result of dissociating e in I : we know that I' violates Q because e is tight in I . Now, we claim that I'_2 has a homomorphism to I' , defined by mapping the two copies of the edge (u, v) dissociated in I_2 to the two copies of that edge in I' , and mapping the other dangling edges created when going from I to I_1 to the incident edges of (u, v) that were dissociated to create them. Thus, as I' does not satisfy the query, neither does I'_2 . Thus e is indeed tight in I_2 , in particular it must be non-leaf. This concludes the proof. ◀

► **Proposition 4.17.** *If a query Q has a model with a tight edge, then it has a critical model.*

To prove the proposition, we first prove a lemma:

► **Lemma C.1.** *Let I be a model of Q and let e be a non-leaf clean edge of I . Let J be a subinstance of I . Then:*

- *If we removed in J a covering fact of e in I , then the weight of e in J is less than the weight of e in I .*
- *Otherwise, the weight of e in J is the same as the weight of e in I . Now, if we removed in J an extra fact of e in I , then the extra weight of e in J is less than the extra weight of e in I .*

- *Otherwise, the extra weight of e in J is the same as the extra weight of e in I . Now, if we removed in J a copy fact of e in I , then the lexicographic weight of e in J is less than the lexicographic weight of e in I .*
- *Otherwise, the lexicographic weight of e in J is the same as the lexicographic weight of e in I , and in fact we did not remove any incident fact of e in I .*

Proof. It is clear that removing facts cannot increase the weight, and that the weight decreases strictly iff some covering fact is removed, so the first bullet point and the first part of the second bullet point are immediate. (Note that removing an extra fact may create a new copy element, and increase the lexicographic weight while the extra weight is decreased, but this does not contradict the statement.) From now on, we assume that no covering fact was removed.

For the extra weight, we claim that the extra facts of e in J are also extra facts of e in I . This implies that removing facts did not cause the extra weight to increase and removing an extra fact of e in I must have strictly decreased the extra weight. We consider the possible extra facts of e in J :

- The unary facts on u or v in J are also unary facts on u or v in I .
- For the facts involving one of u or v in J along with some element x achieving a triangle with e in J , the element x must also achieve a triangle with e in I , so they are also extra facts of e in I . In other words, removing facts can never cause new triangles to appear.
- For the facts involving one of u or v in J along with an element x such that the set C' of covering facts of the edge are not isomorphic to the set C of covering facts of e in I , we know that in I the covering facts of the edge are some (not necessarily strict) superset of C' . Here it is important that we excluded garbage facts in the definition of extra facts: as C' is in fact not isomorphic to a subset of C , a superset of C' cannot be isomorphic to C .

Thus we have established the second part of the second bullet point and the first part of the third bullet point. From now on, we assume that no extra fact was removed.

For the lexicographic weight, it is now clear that, if no covering fact or extra fact of e is removed, then the lexicographic weight decreases iff we remove a copy fact of e (this may create garbage facts, which are not accounted in the extra weight or lexicographic weight). This establishes the second part of the third bullet point, and the first part of the fourth bullet point.

The second part of the fourth bullet point is because we assumed that e was clean, so all its incident facts are extra facts or copy facts. ◀

We are now ready to prove Proposition 4.17:

Proof. We know by hypothesis that Q has a model with a tight edge $e = (u, v)$, and by definition of Θ and Ξ and Λ there is such a model I with a tight edge e having weight Θ and extra weight Ξ and lexicographic weight Λ . We use in this proof the conventions introduced in Appendix B.

Up to modifying I with the process of Claim 4.8, we can ensure that e is clean in I . The only additional point to verify is that the process in the proof does not change the extra weight or lexicographic weight of e . Indeed, as e is still a tight non-leaf edge after the process, we know that the extra weight did not decrease (otherwise Claim 4.13 would apply, contradicting tightness), and dissociating edges involving incident garbage facts and merging them in e cannot have caused the extra weight to increase. Thus, the extra weight is still Ξ . Further, the lexicographic weight did not decrease (otherwise Claim 4.15 would

apply, contradicting tightness), and again the process cannot have caused the lexicographic weight to increase. Hence, we can additionally ensure that e is clean.

To achieve subinstance-minimality, let J be a minimal subset of I which still satisfies the query. By definition, J is subinstance-minimal. Consider the dissociation J' of e in J , in which (u, v) is no longer an edge, and which can add dangling copies of e as (u, v') or (u', v) with u' and v' leaf elements. (Specifically, unless (u, v) in J is an edge which is non-leaf, then the dissociation does nothing except renaming elements, following our conventions). We can map J' to the dissociation I' of e in I , with the identity homomorphism extended to map the dangling copies on the dangling copies added in I' relative to I by the dissociation. Thus, J' does not satisfy the query, whereas J does. Hence, (u, v) is still a leaf in I , and it is a non-leaf edge which is tight.

We now claim that the covering facts of e in J are the same as in I . Indeed, assuming the contrary, the covering facts of e in J would be a strict subset of the covering facts of e in I , so the weight of e in J would be strictly less than Θ . Thus, as e is non-leaf, by Claim 4.4, we could dissociate e in J and obtain a model J' of Q , contradicting the fact that it is tight.

Last, we claim that the incident facts of e in J are the same as in I . Indeed, assuming otherwise, the incident facts of e in J would be a strict subset of those of e in I . By Lemma C.1, as e is clean, removing incident facts of e without removing covering facts of e must reduce the extra weight, or keep the extra weight unchanged and reduce the lexicographic weight. Thus, as e is a non-leaf edge in J , by Claim 4.13 or by Claim 4.15, we could dissociate the edge without breaking the query, contradicting the fact that e is tight in J .

Thus, in particular the extra weight (resp., lexicographic weight) of e in J is the same as the extra weight (resp., lexicographic weight) of e in I . Thus we have established that I is a subinstance-minimal model of Q with a tight clean edge e having the right weight, extra weight, and lexicographic weight, which concludes the proof. ◀

D Proofs for Section 5 (Hardness with a Non-Iterable Critical Model)

► **Proposition 5.5.** *The ill-formed subinstances do not satisfy the query.*

Proof. Let F be some missing base fact in the ill-formed subinstance I' . Consider the function from $I_{G,q}$ to I that identifies all copies of u , and all copies of each t_j and w_i . This is a homomorphism, and the preimage of F is the single fact F . Hence, I' , as a subinstance of $I_{G,q} \setminus \{F\}$, has a homomorphism to $I \setminus \{F\}$. As I is subinstance-minimal, we conclude that $I \setminus \{F\}$ does not satisfy the query, hence I' also does not. ◀

► **Lemma 5.7.** *There is a polynomial P_M such that, for any non-empty bipartite graph $G = (U \sqcup V, E)$, letting $\chi := |U| + |V| + |E|$ be the size of G and defining $q := P_M(\chi)$, the proportion of subinstances of $I_{G,q}$ that are invalid is strictly less than $2^{-(\chi|I|+1)}$.*

Proof. We write $n = |U|$ and $m = |V|$. The first step in our proof is to change slightly the notion of valid subinstances to the more stringent requirement of a *routine* subinstance, where we partition the copies of saturated facts among the pairs of vertices of $U \times V$. The intuition is that each pair of $U \times V$ will look for witnessing facts in a different subset of the copies, which will simplify the analysis.

Formally, let us first define $q = n \times m \times q'$, with q' to be defined later. From this definition of q , we will label the saturated copies by talking about the (i, j, p) -th saturated copy with $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, and $1 \leq p \leq q'$. Further, the copies of the elements t_1, \dots, t_τ of T will be indexed as $t_{j',i,j,k}$ with $1 \leq j' \leq \tau$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, and $1 \leq p \leq q'$, and likewise

the copies of the w_1, \dots, w_ω of W will be indexed as $w_{i',i,j,k}$ with $1 \leq i' \leq \omega$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, and $1 \leq p \leq q'$. The intuition is that, when we consider one pair (u_i, v_j) with $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, we will only consider the (i, j, p) -th saturated copies for $1 \leq p \leq q'$. In other words, we will only consider saturation indexes $\iota: U \times V \rightarrow \{1, \dots, q\}$ which, seeing them by abuse of notation as functions of type $\iota: U \times V \rightarrow U \times V \times \{1, \dots, q'\}$, ensure that for all $(i, j) \in U \times V$ we have $\iota(i, j) = (i, j, p)$ for some $1 \leq p \leq q'$. We say that $J \subseteq I_{G,q}$ is *routine* if there is a saturation index of this restricted form for which it is valid.

Given that routine subinstances are in particular valid, to show our lower bound on the probability of valid subinstances, it suffices to show it on the routine subinstances. Thus, we only study routine subinstances in the rest of this proof. (The only reason why we define valid subinstances rather than routine subinstances in the main text is that the definition of valid is somewhat easier to present.)

We will adopt the probabilistic perspective in which facts of $I_{G,q}$ have probability q , and will talk of the *probability* that a subinstance is routine instead of the proportion of routine subinstances. The probability that $J \subseteq I_{G,q}$ is routine is the probability that it admits a saturation index of the restricted form above for which it is valid, i.e., for each $(i, j) \in U \times V$ there is a choice of $1 \leq p \leq q'$ such the (i, j, p) -th saturated copy contains all facts that involve u_i or involve v_j or involve no element of the form u_i or v_j . The definition of routine subinstances (unlike valid subinstances) ensures that these events across the $(i, j) \in U \times V$ are independent, because they talk about facts in disjoint subsets of the saturated copies, i.e., disjoint subsets of facts. Hence, the probability that a subinstance is routine is an independent conjunction requiring, for all $(i, j) \in U \times V$, that there is a choice of p for this i and j .

Further, for a choice of $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, the existence of a suitable $1 \leq p \leq q'$ is a disjunction across q' disjoint saturated copies, i.e., disjoint subsets of facts again. So, the probability that a suitable $1 \leq p \leq q'$ exists for some $(i, j) \in U \times V$ is a disjunction of independent probabilistic events, each of which for $1 \leq p \leq q'$ states that in the (i, j, p) -th saturated copy all necessary facts are present.

Last, for a choice of $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $1 \leq p \leq q'$, the probabilistic event in question is the conjunction of the presence of all the required facts, i.e., again a conjunction of independent probabilistic events. Each fact has probability $1/2$, and the number of such facts is at most $|I|$, because the facts of a saturated copy that either involve u_i or involve v_j or involve no copy of u and v are in bijection with the facts of I involving some element of $T \sqcup W$, i.e., a subset of I , thus having cardinality at most $|I|$.

Thus, the probability of getting a non-routine subinstance is the conjunction of $n \times m$ independent events, each of which is the disjunction of q' independent events, each of which is the conjunction of at most $|I|$ events having probability $1/2$. Thus, the probability of non-routine subinstances is at most:

$$1 - (1 - (1 - 2^{-|I|})^{q'})^{|U| \times |V|}$$

We can now use Lemma A.4, which is specifically intended for this purpose (see Appendix A), with $\zeta := 2^{-|I|}$, and $q := q'$ and $\chi := |U| \times |V|$. The lemma shows that, for the above quantity to be less than $2^{-(\chi|I|+1)}$, or more stringently less than $\epsilon := (2^{-(|I|+1)})^\chi$, we can take:

$$q' := 1 + \left\lceil \frac{\ln(\chi) - \chi \ln(2^{-(|I|+1)})}{-\ln(1 - 2^{-|I|})} \right\rceil.$$

Remembering that $|I|$ is a constant, this value is bounded by a polynomial in χ , thus the same is true of q . So indeed we can define a polynomial P_M giving us a suitable q as a

function of $\chi = |U| \times |V|$, and for this q the probability of non-routine subinstances, hence of invalid subinstances, is less than ϵ , which concludes. \blacktriangleleft

► **Proposition 5.9.** *For any good valid well-formed subinstance $J \subseteq I_{G,q}$, there is a homomorphism from I to J .*

Proof. Let $(i, j) \in E$ be an edge witnessing that J is good, i.e., i and j are complete and (i, j) is complete, let ι be a saturation index for which J is valid, and let $p := \iota(i, j)$.

Define a homomorphism h to map u and v to u_i and v_j , to map $T \sqcup W$ to $T_p \sqcup W_p$, and to be the identity otherwise. Let us consider all facts of I :

- The facts that do not involve u , v , or $T \sqcup W$ are unchanged by the homomorphism and are mapped to base facts, which are all present because J is well-formed.
- For the facts that involve $T \sqcup W$, we know by definition of a saturation index that all facts of the p -th saturated copy that either involve u_i or involve v_j or involve no copy of u and v are present in J , and these are in one-to-one correspondence with the facts of $T \sqcup W$ involving u and v in I , i.e., they define suitable images for these facts.
- For the facts that involve u and not v and possibly elements of X , they are mapped by h to the non-saturated left-incident facts of u_i , which are present because i is complete. The same applies to the facts involving v and not u because j is complete.
- For the facts of I that involve u and v , i.e., the covering facts of u and v , they are mapped by h to the copy of e on (u_i, v_j) , which contains all these facts because (i, j) is complete. \blacktriangleleft

► **Proposition 5.10.** *Any bad subinstance $J \subseteq I_{G,q}$ does not satisfy the query.*

Proof. The definition of the q -saturated coding clearly ensures that for any $q > 0$ the instance $I_{G,q}$ has a homomorphism h to $I_{G,1}$, obtained by mapping the elements of $T_p \sqcup W_p$ to $T_1 \sqcup W_1$. Note now that if a subinstance of $I_{G,q}$ is bad then its image by h is also a bad subinstance of $I_{G,1}$, because the homomorphism only merges saturated facts. So it suffices to consider the case $q = 1$, i.e., show that any bad subinstance $J \subseteq I_{G,1}$ does not satisfy the query, which we do in the sequel. For convenience we identify $T_1 \sqcup W_1$ with $T \sqcup W$ in the notation.

[While not necessary for the proof, it may help the reader to assume that all the saturated facts are present in the subinstances that we consider in the proof. The intuitive reason why the presence or absence of the saturated does not matter is that they are copy facts of the edges (u_i, v_j) , so they only contribute to the lexicographic weight (or, if they are incomplete, consist of garbage facts that do not contribute to the weight at all); but the notion of the lexicographic weight will not intervene in this proof at all.]

We adopt in this proof the convention explained in Appendix B. Assume by contradiction that J satisfies the query. Our goal in the proof will be to modify J without breaking the query, intuitively by dissociating edges; and then map the result to the iteration, which was assumed to violate the query.

Recall the notion of vertices of U and V and edges of E being *complete*.

In the case where F_L is a copy fact of e in I and not an extra fact of e in I , we must distinguish two kinds of incomplete vertices of U : the *extra incomplete* and the *F_L -incomplete*. In this case, letting x_L be the other element than u used in F_L , we call $i \in U$ *extra incomplete* if it is missing a non-saturated left-incident fact corresponding to a left extra fact of e in I , i.e., a unary fact on u or a binary fact between u and some element of $X \setminus \{x_L\}$. We call $i \in U$ *F_L -incomplete* if it is only missing non-saturated left-incident facts that are binary

facts between u and x_L . When F_L is an extra fact of e in I , we consider that all incomplete $i \in U$ are extra-incomplete.

Likewise, we distinguish the incomplete $j \in V$ between the *extra incomplete* and F_R -*incomplete*: if F_R is a copy fact of e in I , letting x_R be the other element than v that it uses, then the F_R -*incomplete* $j \in V$ are the incomplete $j \in V$ missing only facts between x_R and v , and the *extra-incomplete* $j \in V$ are the other ones; if F_R is an extra fact of e in I then all incomplete $j \in V$ are extra-incomplete.

[It may help the reader to understand that there are really four cases in the proof, depending on whether F_L is an extra fact or a copy fact, and whether F_R is an extra fact or a copy fact. The presentation of the definitions and of the proof is designed so that, in the interest of brevity, all four cases are handled at once. Intuitively, the easiest case of the proof is when both F_L and F_R are extra facts, in which case all incomplete vertices are extra-incomplete, and all edges (u_i, v_j) where one of the vertices i and j is incomplete can be dissociated because they have extra weight $< \Xi$. This makes it easy to define the homomorphism to the iteration. By contrast, if F_L and F_R are copy facts, in particular when $\Xi = 0$ so that all incident facts of e in I are copy facts, then the incomplete left vertices i and right vertices j must be missing some facts involving the same elements as F_L and F_R respectively. Then the argument is that their edge with x_L and x_R has weight $< \Theta$ and can be dissociated, and this dissociation allows us to map the elements u_i and v_j corresponding to incomplete left vertices i and right vertices j to the elements u' and v' of the iteration.]

The first step is to dissociate incomplete copies of e on couples (u_i, v_j) for $(i, j) \in E$ because they have weight $< \Theta$. For any incomplete edge $(i, j) \in E$, consider the couple (u_i, v_j) . It is either a non-edge or leaf edge and can be dissociated without breaking the query, or it has weight $< \Theta$ and can be dissociated by Claim 4.4 without breaking the query. Let J_1 be the result of performing these dissociations on J : it still satisfies the query. In J_1 , each couple (u_i, v_j) is either an edge of weight Θ (if (i, j) is complete) or a non-edge (otherwise), i.e., relative to J , the covering facts of the couples (u_i, v_j) for incomplete edges (i, j) have been removed. In exchange, we have added leaf edges involving some of the u_i and v_j together with a fresh vertex, whose covering facts are (up to renaming) a (strict) subset of C (i.e., they will intuitively be garbage facts). We call these *dangling edges*, and we say that a dangling edge is *attached* to the element of $\{u_i \mid i \in U\} \sqcup \{v_j \mid j \in V\}$ that occurs in its covering facts.

The second step is to get dissociate complete copies of e relating vertices u_i and v_j such that one of i and j is extra-incomplete, because they have extra weight $< \Xi$. For any complete edge $(i, j) \in E$ where one of i and j is extra-incomplete, consider the edge (u_i, v_j) . It has weight Θ . Its incident facts are the following:

- Covering facts of other edges of the form $(u_i, v_{j'})$ or $(u_{i'}, v_j)$, whose covering facts are an isomorphic copy of some (not necessarily strict) subset of C , so they are accounted for in the extra weight or not at all. Note that by construction they do not achieve triangles, so they are not reflected in the extra weight of e .
- Dangling edges created in the first step, but these consist of a strict subset of C (up to renaming), so they are garbage facts and are not reflected in the weight at all.
- Covering facts of edges of the form $(u_i, t_{j'})$ or $(w_{i'}, v_j)$ with elements of $T_1 \sqcup W_1$, which are a subset of the covering facts of the same edges in I , i.e., copies of the edge e that do not achieve triangles. Hence, these facts are either accounted in the lexicographic weight (if all facts are present) or not at all (if they are garbage facts), and in all cases they are not reflected in the extra weight of e .

- The non-saturated left-incident facts of u_i and the non-saturated right-incident facts of v_j ; as one of i and j is extra incomplete, one of them is missing which corresponds to an extra fact of e in I . So these are the only facts that define the extra weight of (u_i, v_j) , and we can therefore see that the extra weight is strictly less than Ξ .

Thus, the edge (u_i, v_j) is either non-leaf and can vacuously be dissociated without breaking the query, or it has weight Θ and extra weight $< \Xi$ and can be dissociated without breaking the query by Claim 4.13. Let J_2 be the result of performing these dissociations: J_2 satisfies the query, and in J_2 compared to J_1 all edges where one of the endpoints is extra-incomplete have been dissociated.

The third step is only necessary in the case where F_L is a copy fact of e in I , and letting x_L be the other element than u used in F_L , it consists of dissociating the edges (u_i, x_L) where i is F_L -incomplete, because they have weight $< \Theta$. Formally, let us consider all F_L -incomplete $i \in U$, and consider the couple (u_i, x_L) . Either it is a non-edge or leaf edge and can be vacuously dissociated without breaking the query, or as $i \in U$ is F_L -incomplete its weight is $< \Theta$, so by Claim 4.4 again it can be dissociated without breaking the query. Let J_3 be the result of performing these dissociations: in J_3 compared to J_2 for all F_L -incomplete $i \in U$ there is no edge (u_i, x_L) . If F_L is an extra fact of e in I , we simply let $J_3 = J_2$ and the latter requirement is vacuously true as there are no F_L -incomplete $i \in U$ at all. In both cases, J_3 satisfies the query.

The fourth step is the symmetric of the third step: if F_R is a copy fact of e in I , letting x_R be the other element than v that it uses, for each F_R -incomplete $j \in V$, we dissociate the edge (x_R, v_j) without breaking the query because it has weight $< \Theta$, and let J_4 be the result; otherwise if F_R is an extra fact of e in I we let $J_4 := J_3$. In both cases, J_4 satisfies the query.

We are now ready to define a homomorphism h from J_4 to the iteration I' of the critical model M , which by assumption does not satisfy the query, giving us the desired contradiction. Define h in the following way:

- We define h to be the identity on the elements not in $T \sqcup W \sqcup \{u_i \mid i \in I\} \sqcup \{v_j \mid j \in I\}$ that are in $\text{dom}(I)$, i.e., are not leaf elements of dangling edges created in one of the four steps. The facts in the induced subinstance on these elements is exactly the induced subinstance of I on the same elements, i.e., $\text{dom}(I) \setminus (T \sqcup W \sqcup \{u, v\})$, so this correctly maps the facts (intuitively these correspond to the base facts).
- We define h to be the identity on $T \sqcup W$, as we know that the facts of J_4 involving $T \sqcup W$ but not the u_i and v_j are a subset of the facts of I involving $T \sqcup W$ but not u and v (intuitively these correspond to the saturated facts of the first type, i.e., those that do not use the u_i and v_j)
- We map the u_i and v_j in the following way:
 - If i is complete or extra-incomplete, we map u_i to u .
 - If i is F_L -incomplete, we map u_i to u' .
 - If j is complete or extra-incomplete, we map v_j to v .
 - If j is F_R -incomplete, we map v_j to v' .
- We map the dangling edges in the following way:
 - For dangling edges created in the first step, their covering edges are a (strict) subset of C up to renaming, so if they are attached to an element v_j then if $h(v_j) = v$ we map the leaf element to u' otherwise $h(v_j) = v'$ and we map it to u ; and if they are attached to an element u_i then if $h(u_i) = u$ we map the leaf element to v' otherwise $h(u_i) = u'$ and we map it to v .

- For dangling edges created in the second step, their covering edges are an isomorphic copy of C up to renaming, and they are again attached to the u_i and v_j so we proceed in the same way as the previous bullet point.
- For dangling edges created in the third step, their covering edges are a (strict) subset of C again. The copy attached to an u_i is dealt with as above, and for the copy attached to x_L we map the leaf element to u .
- For the fourth step, we proceed in the same way, mapping the leaf element of the copy attached to x_R to v .

We must show that h is indeed a homomorphism. Clearly the only important point is to show that the copies of e and their incident facts are correctly mapped. It is easy that the dangling edges are correctly mapped, so we do not consider them in what follows.

Consider a couple (u_i, v_j) . For the left incident facts which are not edges of the form (u_i, v_j) , if $h(u_i) = u$ then correctness is easy to see: the left incident facts in J_4 are with the elements of $T \sqcup W$ and the elements of X which are reflected in I' on u . Otherwise, we know that i was F_L -incomplete meaning that in the third step we ensured that there was no edge (u_i, x_L) in J_4 so that we can indeed map all incident facts: relative to I , the edge (u', v') in I' is only missing the left incident fact corresponding to F_L up to renaming, i.e., between u' and x_L but in fact we have no fact to map to this edge. The reasoning for right incident facts is symmetric.

Now, consider the copies of e themselves. From the definition of I' , the only point to verify is that we have no copy (u_i, v_j) of e left in J_4 where $h(u_i) = u$ and $h(v_j) = v$, i.e., each of i and j is complete or extra-incomplete. Remember that the copies of e on couples (u_i, v_j) left after the first step only correspond to edges (i, j) which are complete, and that those left after the second step only correspond to vertices i and j for which none are extra-incomplete. Hence, if (u_i, v_j) is a copy of e in J then i and j are both complete and so is the edge (i, j) . Together with (i, j) being complete, this would witness the fact that J was a good subinstance of $I_{G,1}$, which is impossible because J was defined to be bad.

Thus, we have shown a homomorphism from J_4 , which satisfies the query, to I' , which does not, so we have reached a contradiction and the proof is finished. ◀

Proof of Proposition 5.3. We reduce from the problem λ, μ, ν -#PP2DNF, with constant probabilities λ and μ and ν to be defined later.

We are given as input a bipartite graph $G = (U \sqcup V, E)$, and let $\chi := |U| + |V| + |E|$. We assume without loss of generality that G is non-empty, otherwise the answer on this input instance is trivial. We let $n := |U| + |V| + |E|$, which is polynomial in the input. Let q be the value given in Lemma 5.7, which is again polynomial in the input. Construct the coding $I_{G,q}$ of G in I using the fixed critical model $M = (I, e, F_L, F_R)$, writing $e = (u, v)$. We want to show that the value computed by our oracle, i.e., the number of subinstances of $I_{G,q}$ satisfying Q , reveals what we wanted to compute about G , namely, the total probability of subsets $U' \times E' \times V'$ of $U \times E \times V$ where $U' \times V' \cap E'$ is nonempty. Note that what our oracle returns is, up to renormalization, the probability of getting a subinstance of $I_{G,q}$ that satisfies Q .

Remember that in the main text we partitioned the facts of $I_{G,q}$ in five kinds. Let Ψ_L (resp, Ψ_R) be the number of non-saturated left-incident facts (resp., non-saturated right-incident facts) of a vertex of U (resp., of a vertex of V) in $I_{G,q}$; equivalently, these are respectively the number of left-incident and right-incident facts of e in I not involving $T \sqcup W$. Further remember that, by Proposition 5.5, the subinstances where some base fact is missing, i.e., the ill-formed subinstances, do not satisfy the query; so we can assume that the

base facts are present and restrict our attention to these subinstances, i.e., the well-formed subinstances.

For the saturated facts, we have partitioned the subinstances between those that are valid and those that are invalid. So, restricting our attention to the well-formed subinstances, the probability returned by the oracle is:

$$O = \epsilon X + (1 - \epsilon)Y \quad (6)$$

where ϵ is the probability that a subinstance is invalid conditioned on the fact of being well-formed, X is the probability that a subinstance satisfies the query conditioned on the fact of being well-formed and invalid, and Y is the probability that a subinstance satisfies the query conditioned on the fact of being well-formed and valid. Note that, because the base facts and saturated facts are disjoint, the probabilistic events “the subinstance is valid” and “the subinstance is well-formed” are independent, so in fact ϵ is also the probability that a subinstance is invalid without conditioning. Thus, we know by Lemma 5.7 that:

$$\epsilon < 2^{-(\chi|I|+1)} \quad (7)$$

Now, we have $\Theta + \Psi_L + \Psi_R \leq |I|$ because, considering I , the facts of Θ are the covering facts of e , the facts of Ψ_L are a subset of the left-incident facts of e , and the facts of Ψ_R are a subset of the right-incident facts of e . So we have:

$$\epsilon < 2^{-(\chi(\Theta+\Psi_L+\Psi_R)+1)} \quad (8)$$

Now, for the value Y , by Propositions 5.9 and 5.10, we know that the probability that a valid and well-formed subinstance satisfies the query is precisely the probability that it is good, i.e., the probability that it has a complete edge connecting two complete vertices. The probability that $i \in U$ is complete is $\lambda := 2^{-\Psi_L}$, the probability that $(i, j) \in E$ is complete is $\mu := 2^{-\Theta}$, and the probability that $j \in V$ is complete is $\nu := 2^{-\Psi_R}$, and there is a clear probability-preserving correspondence between the choices of subsets $(U', E', V') \subseteq U \times E \times V$ and the choice of which left vertices, edges, and right vertices will be complete in a valid well-formed subinstance of $I_{G,q}$. So the probability that a valid and well-formed subinstance satisfies Q is exactly the probability of obtaining a good triple $(U', E', V') \subseteq U \times E \times V$ in the problem λ, μ, ν -#PP2DNF, i.e., the answer that we wish to compute to conclude the reduction. Now, there are $Y' := 2^{(|U|+|V|+|E|) \times (\Theta+\Psi_L+\Psi_R)}$ possible triples overall in that problem, so the value Y is of the form $\frac{Y''}{Y'}$ with $0 \leq Y'' \leq Y'$, with Y'' being the answer to the problem on G , i.e., the value that we wish to recover to conclude the reduction.

We now claim that we can recover Y from the oracle answer O . To see why, note that we can rewrite Equation 6 to:

$$O = Y + \epsilon(X - Y)$$

where Y and X are conditional probabilities, so:

$$-1 \leq X - Y \leq 1 \quad (9)$$

We can multiply by Y' and get:

$$Y'O = Y'' + \epsilon Y'(X - Y)$$

We know that Y'' is a number of subinstances, i.e., an integer. Now, remembering that $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$ because it is a probability, we have by Equation 8 that as $Y' = 2^{\chi(\Theta+\Psi_L+\Psi_R)}$ we have $0 \leq \epsilon Y' < 1/2$ and by Equation 8 we have $-1/2 < \epsilon Y'(X - Y) < 1/2$. This means that we can recover from $Y'O$ the value Y'' by rounding, hence we can recover Y from O , which concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

E

 Proofs for Section 6 (Hardness when all Critical Models are Iterable)

► **Proposition 6.1.** *Assume that Q has a critical model and that all critical models of Q are iterable. Then the uniform reliability problem for Q is $\#P$ -hard.*

In the proofs of this section, we will use the *fine dissociation*:

► **Definition E.1.** *Let $M = (I, e, F_L, F_R)$ be a critical model, where we write $e = (u, v)$. The fine dissociation of M is the instance obtained by modifying I in the following way:*

- *Create fresh elements u' and v' .*
- *For each left incident fact F'_L of e in I except F_L , create the fact obtained from F'_L by replacing u by u' .*
- *For each right incident fact F'_R of e in I except F_R , create the fact obtained from F'_R by replacing v by v' .*
- *Copy the edge e on (u, v') and (u', v) , and remove the covering facts of e .*

We gave an illustration of the fine dissociation in Figure 3c in the main text, but specialized to the case where $\Xi = 0$ (i.e., all incident facts are copy facts) because this is the setting of most of this section; but the fine dissociation can also be defined without this assumption, and we will use it in this general sense here.

Notice that the definition of the fine dissociation is closely related to the notion of the same name in [1] but with a slight difference, e.g., we do not create incomplete copies of e on the edges (u, v) and (u', v') . This difference is inessential, because these edges would be garbage facts of the edges (u, v') and (u', v) .

Equivalently, the fine dissociation is the iteration of M but without the copy of e on (u', v') ; or it is like the dissociation but the two copies of e are created not with leaf elements but with elements respectively involved in all the left incident facts of e except F_L and all the right incident facts of e except F_R .

We make the following claim, which relies on the notion of lexicographic weight (but, for now, only in the componentwise sense). The claim holds no matter whether the critical model is iterable or not. The proof method is the same as that of Lemma 7.6 of [1] (see in particular Figure 8 of [1]), but skipping the first two steps thanks to the omission of the incomplete edges (u, v) and (u', v') , and reasoning about extra weight and (componentwise) lexicographic weight instead of side weight.

► **Claim E.2.** *The fine dissociation of a critical model does not satisfy the query.*

Proof. Letting $M = (I, e, F_L, F_R)$ and writing $e = (u, v)$, consider the copy of e on (u, v') in the fine dissociation I' of M . If (u, v') is a leaf edge in I' , i.e., F_R was the only right-incident fact of e in I , then we can vacuously dissociate (u, v') , using the convention introduced in Appendix B. Otherwise, let us show that we can dissociate the non-leaf edge (u, v') without breaking the query. The incident facts of (u, v') are the same as those of e in I , except it is missing the right-incident fact F_R on v' . As M is a critical model, e is clean, so F_R is either an extra fact or a copy fact of e in I (not a garbage fact). We know by similar reasoning to Lemma C.1 that either the extra weight of (u, v') in I' is less than that of e in I , i.e., is $< \Xi$ (if F_R is an extra fact of e in I); or that the extra weight of (u, v') in I' is Ξ but the lexicographic weight of (u, v') in I' is less than that of e in I , i.e., it is $< \Lambda$. Thus, by applying Claim 4.13 in the first case and Claim 4.15 in the second case, we know that we can dissociate (u, v') in I without breaking the query. Let I'_1 be the result of this dissociation.



■ **Figure 5** Illustration of the proof of Proposition 6.4. The left picture represents the 2-step iteration of the model M of Figure 3a (top), and the right picture represents its iteration in the sense of Section 5. The only difference are the two dashed edges which are copies of the edge (u, t) and (w, v) respectively, missing the facts F_L and F_R respectively. They have weight $< \Theta$, so can be dissociated, and merged in (u, v') and (u', v) , so indeed the difference between the two processes is inessential. (However, the 2-step iteration, unlike the iteration, is a subinstance-minimal model of Q , as we show.)

Considering I'_1 and the edge (u', v) , but noticing that the incident facts of (u', v) in I'_1 are the same as in I' , the symmetric argument (but noticing the absence of F_L instead of F_R), shows that we can dissociate (u', v) in I'_1 without breaking the query. We do so, obtaining I'_2 which satisfies the query.

Now, we can homomorphically merge u and u' , merge v and v' , and merge the leaf copies of e involving u and u' (respectively in steps 1 and 2) and v and v' (respectively in steps 2 and 1). This maps I'_2 to the dissociation of e in I , which does not satisfy the query because e is tight. We have reached a contradiction, so the proof is concluded. ◀

Thanks to this observation, in the case where the iteration cannot break the query, we will be able to simplify critical models by noticing that the critical extra weight is 0. Namely:


▶ **Claim 6.2.** *If the critical extra weight is > 0 , then Q has a non-iterable critical model.*

Proof. Let (I, e, F'_L, F'_R) be a critical model of the query, and write $e = (u, v)$. As the critical extra weight is > 0 , we know that one of u and v has an extra fact. Let us replace the choice of incident facts F'_L and F'_R to use extra facts if possible, i.e., pick incident facts F_L and F_R where at least one of them is an extra fact of e . This yields another critical model $M = (I, e, F_L, F_R)$, with the same weight and extra weight and lexicographic weight. Let us show that M is non-iterable.

Consider the iteration I' of M . Consider first the copy of e of C on (u', v') . This edge has weight Θ , and has extra weight $< \Xi$. Indeed, it is missing the copies of F_L and F_R and its other incident facts are copies of the other incident facts of e in I (i.e., copy facts and extra facts) and the covering facts of the copies of e on (u', v') and (u, v') but these are copy facts of (u', v') in I' (note in particular that neither u nor v forms a triangle with (u', v')). Thus, indeed the edge (u', v') in I' can be dissociated without breaking the query (by Claim 4.13). Next, we can homomorphically map the leaf element of the two leaf edges thus created into u and v , merging the two leaf edges into (u, v) and (u', v') , i.e., removing them without breaking the query. We have obtained as a result of this process the fine dissociation of M , and shown that it satisfies the query, which contradicts the result of Claim E.2, concluding the proof. ◀

▶ **Proposition 6.4.** *Let Q be a query that has a critical model and that all critical models for Q are iterable. Then $\Xi = 0$ and, for any critical model M of Q , for any $n > 0$, the n -iteration of M satisfies Q ; further it is even a subinstance-minimal model of Q .*

Proof. The fact that $\Xi = 0$ is directly given by the contrapositive of Claim 6.2.



■ **Figure 6** Illustration of the proof of Proposition 6.4. The left picture illustrates the 3-step iteration of the model M of Figure 3a (top). Here we have $\Lambda = (3, 3)$. Observe how removing a fact in any of the edges (u_i, v_i) or (u_{i+1}, v_i) allows us to dissociate it (because its weight is now $< \Theta$) and merge to the fine dissociation (Figure 3c, top). Further, removing a fact in any other orange edge (involving u_i or v_i) allows us to dissociate it (because its weight is now Θ), merge the dangling copy on u_i or v_i on the edge of the form (u_i, v_i) , and then the edge (u_i, v_i) now has lexicographic weight $(3, 2)$ or $(2, 3)$ and can also be dissociated. The right picture illustrates the result of performing the 2-step iteration of (u_3, v_2) in the left picture with some choice of left-incident fact in the edge (u_2, v_2) and a choice of right-incident fact in the edge (u_3, v_3) : one can see that the result is isomorphic to the 4-step iteration of M (Figure 3a, bottom).

Let us show that the n -iteration of any critical model M is a subinstance-minimal model of Q , by induction on n .

The base case of $n = 1$ is vacuous because the 1-iteration of any critical model M is M itself, which is by definition a subinstance-minimal model of Q .

For the case $n = 2$, we first show that the 2-step iteration I_2 satisfies the query, and then that it is subinstance-minimal. We assume that the iteration of M satisfied the query, now the 2-step iteration I_2 of M is identical to the iteration of M up to a minor difference, illustrated in Figure 5. Specifically, letting t and w be the other elements of F_L and F_R respectively (which are copy facts as $\Xi = 0$), if $\Theta > 1$ then I_2 has no edge (u_2, t) and (w, v_1) whereas the iteration has edges (u', t) and (w, v') containing a copy of the covering facts of e except F_L and F_R respectively. But these facts are garbage facts; given the iteration, we can dissociate these two edges (they have weight $< \Theta$, so we can use Claim 4.4 if they are non-leaf edges) without breaking the query, homomorphically merge the incident leaf edge on u' and v' with (u', v) and (u, v') , merge the other incident leaf edges to (u, t) and (w, v) , and this establishes that I_2 satisfies the query.

Now, let us show subinstance-minimality. Consider a strict subset J of I_2 . By monotonicity, it suffices to consider the case of a single missing fact F , i.e., $J = I_2 \setminus \{F\}$. The argument is sketched on an example for the 3-step iteration on Figure 6 (left).

If F is one of the facts of I_2 that does not involve u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 , then considering the homomorphism h mapping J to I by mapping u_1 and u_2 to u and v_1 and v_2 to v and being the identity otherwise, then the only preimage of F by h would be F , so h is in fact a homomorphism from J to $I \setminus \{F\}$. As I is a subinstance-minimal model of Q , we know that $I \setminus \{F\}$ does not satisfy Q , and neither does J .

If F is a fact of the edge $(u_1, t_{j'})$ for some $1 \leq j' < \tau$ (first case), or a fact of the edge (u_1, t) , i.e., F_L or another fact on the same elements (second case), then it J that edge has weight $< \Theta$ and can be dissociated without breaking the query. Consider now the edge (u_1, v_1) : its weight is Θ , its extra weight is $\Xi = 0$, its left copy elements are t and the $t_{j''}$ for $j'' \in \{1, \dots, \tau - 1\} \setminus \{j'\}$ (in the first case) or the $t_{j''}$ for $1 \leq j'' < \tau$ (second case), i.e., $\tau - 1$ left copy elements, so its lexicographic weight is less than $\Lambda = (\tau, \omega)$ and we can dissociate it without breaking the query by Claim 4.15. We can now map the result homomorphically to the fine dissociation of M (Definition E.1) by mapping u_1 to u , mapping u_2 to u' , mapping

v_1 and v_2 to v , mapping the dangling copies of e on u_1 to (u, v') and on v_1 to (u', v) , and the dangling copy of e on $t_{j''}$ to $(u, t_{j''})$ (in the first case) or the dangling copy of e on t to (u, t) (in the second case). We know by Claim E.2 that the fine dissociation does not satisfy the query, which concludes.

If F is a fact of the edge $(w_{i'}, v_2)$ for some $1 \leq i' < \omega$ (first case), or a fact of the edge (w, v_2) , i.e., F_R or a fact on the same elements (second case), then we reason in the same way: we dissociate this edge, and then the edge (u_2, v_2) has left copy elements v_1 and the $t_{j''}$ for $1 \leq j'' < \tau$, i.e., τ left copy elements, and it has $\omega - 1$ right copy elements, so it has strictly smaller lexicographic weight, and we can dissociate it and conclude in the symmetric way as above.

If F is a fact of the edge $(u_2, t_{j'})$ for some $1 \leq j' < \tau$, then in J that edge has weight $< \Theta$ and can be dissociated. We now consider the edge (u_2, v_1) : its weight is Θ , its extra weight is $\Xi = 0$, its left copy elements are v_2 and the $t_{j''}$ for $j'' \in \{1, \dots, \tau - 1\} \setminus \{j'\}$ (note that the dangling edge created on the previous dissociation consists of garbage facts), and its right copy elements are u_1 and the $w_{i'}$ for $1 \leq i' < \omega$. So there are $\tau - 1$ left-incident elements, so the lexicographic weight of the edge is less than Λ . So we can dissociate the edge without breaking the query by Claim 4.15. We can now map the result to the fine dissociation as the identity except that the dangling edges on u_2 and v_1 and $t_{j'}$ are mapped to (u_1, u_2) and (v_1, v_2) and $(u_1, t_{j'})$ respectively. We conclude again by Claim E.2.

If F is a fact of the edge $(w_{i'}, v_1)$ for some $1 \leq i' < \omega$, the reasoning is symmetric: we dissociate the edge $(w_{i'}, v_1)$, we notice that the edge (u_2, v_1) now has τ left-incident elements and $\omega - 1$ right-incident elements, so we dissociate again by Claim 4.15, and map to the fine dissociation and conclude by Claim E.2.

Last, if F is a fact of a copy of e , we distinguish the three cases. If F is a fact of (u_1, v_1) , then we dissociate this edge in J as it has weight $< \Theta$, and we can map to the fine dissociation of M mapping u_1 to u and u_2 to u' and v_1 and v_2 to v and mapping the dangling edges on u_1 and v_1 to (u, v') and (u', v') . If F is a fact of (u_2, v_2) , the reasoning is similar. If F is a fact of (u_2, v_1) , we dissociate it, and we map to the fine dissociation in the same way as in the previous paragraph.

Thus, no matter the missing fact F , we know that $I_2 \setminus \{F\}$ does not satisfy the query, which shows that it is subinstance minimal.

We now take care of the induction step of the induction. Now, let $n > 2$, let M be a critical model assume that the $(n - 1)$ iteration I_{n-1} of M is a subinstance-minimal model of the query, and let us show that the same is true for the n -iteration I_n . We first show that it satisfies the query, and then that it is subinstance-minimal.

Consider the copy of e on (u_n, v_{n-1}) . We claim that this edge is tight in I_{n-1} . Indeed, it is a non-leaf edge, as witnessed by the covering facts of the edge (u_n, v_n) and (u_{n-1}, v_{n-1}) . Further, it is tight because if we dissociate it then the result has a homomorphism to the fine dissociation which by Claim E.2 does not satisfy the query. Specifically, the homomorphism maps u_1, \dots, u_{n-1} to u , maps u_n to u' , maps v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} to v' , maps v_n to v , and maps the dangling edge on u_{n-1} and on v_{n-1} to (u, v') and (u', v) respectively.

Let us now consider this tight edge $e' = (u_n, v_{n-1})$ and pick arbitrary facts F'_L and F'_R respectively in the copies (u_{n-1}, v_{n-1}) and (u_n, v_n) of e . We claim that $M' = (I_{n-1}, e, F'_L, F'_R)$ is a critical instance. For this, we first notice that e has weight Θ . As $\Xi = 0$, there is nothing to check. As for the lexicographic weight, we know that (u_2, v_1) is missing the copy of the edge with t and with w , but has in exchange the edge (u_1, v_1) incident to v_1 and the edge (u_2, v_2) incident to u_2 , so it is indeed unchanged.

Now, consider the 2-iteration of M' : as M' is a critical instance, it is iterable, and by applying the base case of $n = 2$ we know that its 2-iteration satisfies the query. One can see that the result (see Figure 6, right) that the result is isomorphic to I_n (shown in Figure 3a, bottom). Thus, the n -iteration I_n satisfies the query. We name the elements accordingly in what follows.

We last show that I_n is subinstance-minimal. The argument is similar to the subinstance-minimality of I_2 : see again Figure 6 (left) and the explanation in the caption. If a fact F is missing that does not involve any of the u_i and v_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$, we can map back to $I \setminus \{F\}$ by mapping all u_i to u and all v_i to v and we conclude by subinstance-minimality of I . If a fact is missing in one of the copies (u_i, v_i) of e , then we can dissociate it because it has weight $< \Theta$ and map homomorphically to the fine dissociation by mapping u_1, \dots, u_i to u , mapping u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n to u' , mapping v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} to v' , mapping v_i, \dots, v_n to v , and mapping the dangling leaf edge on u_i to (u, v') and the dangling leaf edge on v_i to (u', v) . If a fact is missing on one of the copies (u_{i+1}, v_i) of e , then we map u_1, \dots, u_i to u , map u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n to u' , map v_1, \dots, v_i to v' , map v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n to v , and map the dangling leaf edge on u_{i+1} to (u', v') and the dangling leaf edge on v_i to (u, v') . Last, if one of the other facts is missing, it is a fact involving some u_i or involving some v_j , i.e., an incident fact to some edge (u_i, v_i) , and we can dissociate the edge of the fact because it has weight $< \Theta$ then argue as before that the edge (u_i, v_i) now has lexicographic weight $< \Lambda$ and can be dissociated, and then we map to the fine dissociation as explained in what precedes. This concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

► **Claim 6.6.** *The ill-formed (i.e., not well-formed) subinstances do not satisfy the query.*

Proof. By monotonicity, it suffices to consider the case of a single missing fact F .

We first focus on the case of a missing base fact F . In this case, we can map J homomorphically to $I \setminus \{F\}$, and conclude by subinstance-minimality.

Second, let us study the case where a supplementary base fact F involving $u = u_r$ is missing. We define a homomorphism h to a strict subset of the 2-step iteration by mapping all u_x with $x \neq r$ to u' , mapping u_r to u , mapping all $v_{\pi,r}$ adjacent to u_r to v' , and mapping all other $v_{\pi,\beta}$ to v . To check that h is indeed a homomorphism, the important points are that there are no edges (u_x, t) with $x \neq s$, there are no edges $(w, v_{\pi,r})$, and there are no edges $(u_r, v_{\pi,\beta})$ with $\beta \neq r$. Further, the left-incident fact F' of e in I corresponding to the missing fact F has no image because the only vertex mapped to u by h is u_r which is missing F . Thus, h is a homomorphism to the strict subset of the 2-step iteration where we removed F' , and we conclude by Proposition 6.4.

Last, we consider the case of a missing supplementary base fact F that involves v . We again define a homomorphism h to a strict subset of the 2-step iteration. We map all u_x with $x \neq t$ to u , map u_s to u' , map v to v and map all other copies of v to v' . Again, to see that h is a homomorphism, the important points is that (u_s, t) is not an edge of I_G , that there are no edges of I_G of the form $(w, v_{\pi,\beta})$, and that there are no edges of the form (u_x, v) with $v \neq t$. Further, again the fact corresponding to F in the 2-step iteration has no image, so we have a homomorphism to a strict subset of the 2-step iteration and conclude by Proposition 6.4. \blacktriangleleft

► **Claim 6.7.** *For any good well-formed subinstance $J \subseteq I_G$, there is a homomorphism from the $(2n + 1)$ -step iteration of M to J , where n is the length of a complete path in J .*

Proof. The argument may be easier to follow graphically on an example by considering the coding shown in Figure 3b and the iteration shown in Figure 3a (bottom).

Consider the subinstance J and the witnessing complete path in G , which we assume to be simple: $r = a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n = s$. This means that the following edges have all of their covering facts in J and all their incident facts in J except possibly for the left incident facts of the first edge: $(u_{a_0}, v_{\pi_0, a_0}), (u_{\pi_0}, v_{\pi_0, a_0}), (u_{\pi_0}, v_{\pi_0, a_1}), (u_{a_1}, v_{\pi_0, a_1}), \dots, (u_{a_{n-1}}, v_{\pi_{n-1}, a_{n-1}}), (u_{\pi_{n-1}}, v_{\pi_{n-1}, a_{n-1}}), (u_{\pi_{n-1}}, v_{\pi_{n-1}, a_n}), (u_{a_n}, v_{\pi_{n-1}, a_n})$, where we write $\pi_0 = \{a_0, a_1\}, \dots, \pi_{n-1} = \{a_{n-1}, a_n\}$.

Further, as J is well-formed, all supplementary base facts are present. Thus, we know that the edge (u_s, v_{π_0, u_s}) in fact has all its left-incident facts, hence all its incident facts by considering the right-incident facts of the second edge in the sequence above, and that we can extend the sequence above with the edge (u_s, v) which has all its covering facts and all its right-incident facts, hence all its incident facts by considering the left-incident facts of the last edge in the sequence above.

The facts mentioned so far correspond to the facts involving the elements u_i and v_i in the $(2n + 1)$ -iteration I' of M , which satisfies the query because M is iterable and by Proposition 6.4. As for the other facts of I' , they correspond to base facts of I_G , which are all present because J is well-formed. Thus, indeed J contains a subinstance which is isomorphic to I' , concluding the proof. \blacktriangleleft

► **Claim 6.8.** *Any bad subinstance $J \subseteq I_G$ does not satisfy the query.*

To show this claim, we will need to consider a new structure defined from the non-iterable critical model M , which we call the *explosion*. Note that this structure is not symmetric, intuitively to account for the asymmetry in the definition of the lexicographic weight.

► **Definition E.3.** *The explosion of M is defined in the following way:*


- Create a copy v' of v and u' of u
- For each $1 \leq j' < \tau$, copy the edges $(u, t_{j'})$ on $(u', t_{j'})$, and for each $1 \leq i' < \omega$, copy the edges $(w_{i'}, v)$ on $(w_{i'}, v')$.
- For every strict subset Σ of $\{t_1, \dots, t_\tau\}$ (there may be none, in case $\tau = 0$), create a copy u_Σ of u , and for each $t_j \in \Sigma$ copy the edge (u, t_j) on (u_Σ, t_j) .
- Copy e on (u, v') and (u', v) and on (u_Σ, v) and (u_Σ, v') for each subset above Σ (i.e., none if $\tau = 0$).
- Remove the covering facts C of (u, v) .

See Figure 3c (bottom) for an illustration.

Note that when $\tau = 1$, i.e., t is the only left copy element of e in I , then the explosion is almost the same as the fine dissociation, except that the incomplete copies of the edges containing the facts F_L and F_R are not created – but intuitively these do not matter because they are garbage facts. (The reason why the fine dissociation create these edges, like iteration, but unlike n -step iteration and the explosion, is because the fine dissociation is used to show that $\Xi = 0$, i.e., before we know that $\Xi = 0$, and in the case where $\Xi > 0$ these edges could make a difference.)

When $\tau = 2$, an example is shown on Figure 7a (top and middle). When $\tau = 3$, an example is shown on Figure 3a (top) and Figure 3c (bottom) in the main text. When $\tau = 4$, an example is shown on Figure 3a (bottom) and Figure 7b. Remember that $\tau \leq \omega$ by definition of the critical lexicographic weight. Note how, as τ increases, the edges of the form (u_Σ, v) and (u_Σ, v') have a arbitrarily high number of right copy elements, but always $\tau - 1$ left copy elements, so that they can be dissociated thanks to our definition of the lexicographic weight.

We claim the following, which is the only place where we use the full power of lexicographic minimality:



■ **Figure 7** Examples for the explosion (see also Figure 3c, bottom)

► **Lemma E.4.** *The explosion of a critical model does not satisfy the query.*

Proof. Let us assume that it does and show a contradiction. If $\tau = 0$ as we argued the explosion is a subset of the fine dissociation which does not satisfy the query by Claim E.2, so we assume $\tau > 0$.

Consider each edge of the form (u_Σ, v) . The edge has weight Θ , the extra weight Ξ is clearly zero, so let us compute the lexicographic weight by considering the left copy elements. (The reader may want to refer to examples, e.g., Figure 7.) There are $\tau - 2$ copy elements in the strict subset Σ , plus the element v' . Hence, the number of left copy elements is $\tau - 1$, but $\Lambda = (\tau, \omega)$, so the lexicographic weight is strictly smaller. (Note that the number of right copy elements may be greater than ω .)

Hence, by Claim 4.15, we can dissociate these edges without breaking the query. The same argument shows that we can dissociate all edges (u_Σ, v) .

Now, we can homomorphically map the result to the fine dissociation, by mapping the u_Σ to u , mapping u to u and v to v and u' to u' and v' to v' , and mapping the dangling edges on v' to (u, v') and on v to (u', v) and on the u_Σ to (u, v) . We know by Claim E.2 that the fine dissociation does not satisfy the query, so we have reached a contradiction, which concludes the proof. ◀

We can now show:

Proof of Claim 6.8. Consider a bad subinstance J . Let us reason by contradiction, assume that J satisfies the query, and rewrite it to an instance satisfying the query and having a homomorphism to the explosion, which is a contradiction by Lemma E.4.

We will use the conventions of Appendix B. The proof is in several steps. It may be helpful to informally comment on why the definition introduces the intermediate vertices u_π , which were not present in the coding of Section 7 of [1]. The reason is that these intermediate vertices have precisely two incident copies of e of the form $(u_\pi, v_{\pi, \beta})$ with $\beta \in \pi$, so their number of left copy elements is precisely τ and we can dissociate them if their number of right copy elements become $< \omega$, i.e., if some right-incident fact is missing. By contrast, the

vertices u_a have more left copy elements, e.g., $\tau + 1$ if all vertices of the input undirected graph have degree 3.

The first step is to notice that copies (up to renaming) of the set C of facts which are incomplete can be dissociated, because either they are empty or leaf and this is vacuous, or they are non-leaf and their weight is $< \Theta$ so we can use Claim 4.4. We call *dangling edges* the edges created after these dissociations, and say they are *attached* to the element which is non-leaf in them, if there is one. (The reason why there may be none is that some of the incomplete copies considered in this step may be such that both their elements are leaves, i.e., a copy up to renaming of C where both elements involved do not occur in any other fact. Then the “dissociation” of this edge (following the conventions in Appendix B) is isomorphic to it and is not attached to any element. However, these edges are not connected to anything else in the instance and can be mapped homomorphically to any copy of e in the explosion at the end of the process; so we simply ignore these copies in what follows.) Thus, letting J_2 be the result of this process, in J_2 relative to J all incomplete copies of C have been removed and replaced by dangling edges attached to some of the endpoints.

The second step is to notice that whenever an element of the form $v_{\pi,\beta}$ is missing some right copy element in J_1 which is not u_β (i.e., an edge of the form $(w_{i'}, v_{\pi,\beta})$, which has been dissociated in the first step), then the edge $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,\beta})$ can be dissociated. This is vacuous if it is not an edge or a leaf edge, and otherwise this is because its weight is Θ , its extra weight is 0 (note that there are no triangles in the coding except possibly in the base facts), and its lexicographic weight can be accounted as follows: the element u_π has at most $\tau - 1$ left copy elements (namely, the $t_1, \dots, t_{j'}$) and there is another left copy element namely $v_{\pi,\beta'}$ for β' the element such that $\pi = \{\beta, \beta'\}$, so τ left copy elements in total; and the element $v_{\pi,\beta}$ is missing some right copy element so is connected to at most $\omega - 2$ elements, plus u_β because of the edge $(u_\beta, v_{\pi,\beta})$, so it is connected to at most $\omega - 1$ elements. Thus, as $\Lambda = (\tau, \omega)$, we see that the lexicographic weight of $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,\beta})$ is less than Λ , and by Claim 4.15 we can indeed dissociate the edge $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,\beta})$. We let J_3 be the result of dissociating all edges that can be dissociated in this fashion. In J_3 relative to J_2 , in any sequence $u_a, v_{\pi,a}, u_\pi, v_{\pi,b}, u_b$ with $\pi = \{a, b\}$, if one of $v_{\pi,a}$ or $v_{\pi,b}$ is missing a right-incident fact with one of the $w_{i'}$, then the corresponding edge $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,a})$, or $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,b})$, has been dissociated.

Now we can define the homomorphism h from J_3 to the explosion. We initialize it to be the identity on $u_r = u$ and on v , and on all elements except the elements u_a with $a \in V$ or u_π with $\pi \in E$ or $v_{\pi,\beta}$ with $\pi \in E$ and $\beta \in \pi$.

Next, we let R be the set of nodes v of the graph G such that there is a path in G from r to v which is complete in J . For each $v \in R$, we map u_v to u , in particular we map u_r to u as we said before. Note that, as J is bad, then $s \notin R$, as this would otherwise witness the existence of a complete path from r to s in J , i.e., that J is good. Further, for each edge $\pi \in E$ between vertices of R , i.e., $\pi \subseteq R$, we map u_π to u and $v_{\pi,\beta}$ to v' for each $\beta \in \pi$. All facts between these elements are clearly correctly mapped, because we have mapped copies of u to u and copies of v different from v to v' , and in the explosion there is a copy (u, v') of e and all needed incident facts.

Now, we consider the set R' of nodes of G that are adjacent to a node in R but which are not in R . Note that $u_r \notin R'$, but potentially $u_s \in R'$. There are several kinds of such nodes:

- The incomplete nodes, i.e., the vertices a with some vertex facts missing. For such a node a , remembering that in the first step we dissociate all edges that were incomplete copies of e , we let Σ be some maximal strict subset of $\{t_1, \dots, t_{\tau-1}\}$ containing all the elements of this form which are left copy elements of u_a . We map u_a to u_Σ in the

explosion, and for every edge $\pi = \{b, a\}$ with b in R we map u_π to u and $v_{\pi,a}$ and $v_{\pi,b}$ to v' .

- The complete nodes $a \in V$. We map these to u' . For these, as they were not added to R , we know that all edges $\pi = \{b, a\}$ with $b \in R$ were incomplete. There are four subcases for each such edge:
 - u_π is missing some left copy elements with one of the $t_1, \dots, t_{\tau-1}$. In this case, remembering that incomplete edges were dissociated in step 1, letting Σ be a maximal strict subset of $\{t_1, \dots, t_{\tau-1}\}$ containing all the elements of this from that are left copy elements of u_π in J_3 , we map u_π to u_Σ in the explosion, and map $v_{\pi,b}$ to v' and $v_{\pi,a}$ to v .
 - $v_{\pi,a}$ is missing some right copy elements with one of the $w_1, \dots, w_{\omega-1}$. In this case, in the second step we dissociated the edge $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,a})$, so we can map u_π to u and $v_{\pi,b}$ to v' and $v_{\pi,a}$ to v . Note that there is no edge (u, v') in the explosion, so we really use the fact that the second step dissociated the edge.
 - $v_{\pi,b}$ is missing some right copy elements. In this case, similarly to the previous case, we map u_π to u' and $v_{\pi,b}$ to v' and $v_{\pi,a}$ to v .
 - Some fact in the edges $(u_b, v_{\pi,b})$ or $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,a})$ or $(u_\pi, v_{\pi,a})$ or $(u_a, v_{\pi,a})$ is missing, so these edges were dissociated in the first step. In the case of an edge incident to u_π , we conclude like in the two previous bullet points. If it is the edge $(u_b, v_{\pi,b})$, we map $v_{\pi,b}$ and $v_{\pi,a}$ to v and u_π to u' . If it is the edge $(u_a, v_{\pi,a})$, we map $v_{\pi,b}$ and $v_{\pi,a}$ to v' and u_π to u .

The homomorphism that we define correctly maps all facts of J_3 that correspond in the coding to edges $\{b, a\}$ with $b \in R$ and $a \in R'$. Further, for edges $\pi = \{a, a'\}$ with $a, a' \in R'$, we know that u_a and $u_{a'}$ were mapped either to u' or to u_Σ , so we can map u_π to u' and $v_{\pi,a}$ and $v_{\pi,b}$ to v .

Then, for the vertices a in $V \setminus (R \cup R')$ and the edges π involving them, we simply map u_a and u_π to u' and $v_{\pi,\beta}$ for $\beta \in \pi$ to v in this case, which is correct because these edges do not involve any vertex b whose element u_b was mapped to u by h .

Last, the dangling edges are mapped without difficulty, as they are copies of subsets of the covering facts of e (up to renaming), and the vertices to which they are attached are mapped to vertices having such an incident copy of e oriented in the right way.

The important points to check for the correctness of the homomorphism are the following:

- The source u_r was mapped to u .
- The sink u_s was mapped to u' or some u_Σ , so the edge (u_s, v) is correctly mapped.
- Whenever a vertex is mapped to some u_Σ then its left-adjacent copy facts are contained in the subset Σ
- No two elements u_a and $u_{\{a,b\}}$ are mapped one to u and the other one to u' unless one of the edges $(u_a, v_{\{a,b\},a})$ and $(u_{\{a,b\}}, v_{\{a,b\},b})$ has been dissociated.

So we have defined a homomorphism to the explosion and shown that the explosion satisfies the query, which is a contradiction by Lemma E.4. This concludes. ◀

This allows us to complete our reduction.

Proof of Proposition 6.1. We have fixed the critical model M . We reduce from the problem ϕ, η -U-ST-CON with $\phi = 2^{-\Theta \times (\tau-1)}$, and $\eta = 2^{-\Theta(4+(\tau-1)+2\omega)}$, with Θ the critical weight and $\Lambda = (\tau, \omega)$ the critical side weight. Note that we can have $\phi = 1$ if $\tau = 1$, but that we always have $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \eta < 1$. We assume without loss of generality that the source vertex r is kept.

Given G , we code it to the instance I_G , which is in linear time in G (remember that I is fixed). We know by Claim 6.6 that the subinstances missing a base fact or supplementary base fact do not satisfy the query, so we can simply study the well-formed subinstances.

Now, the probability that a vertex u_a with $a \neq r$ is complete is ϕ , the probability that an edge is complete is η , and these events are independent and in correspondence with the vertices of $V \setminus \{r\}$ and edges of E by a probability-preserving bijection, such that a subset (V', E') containing r features a path of kept vertices and edges connecting r and s in G iff the corresponding subinstance is good. We know by Claim 6.7 and 6.8 that, on the well-formed subinstances, the query holds precisely on the good ones, so the result of uniform reliability for Q on I_G is precisely the answer to ϕ, η -U-ST-CON. This establishes the correctness of the reduction and concludes. ◀