

Wasserstein barycenters are NP-hard to compute

Jason M. Altschuler

Enric Boix-Adserà

Abstract

The problem of computing Wasserstein barycenters (a.k.a. Optimal Transport barycenters) has attracted considerable recent attention due to many applications in data science. While there exist polynomial-time algorithms in any fixed dimension, all known runtimes suffer exponentially in the dimension. It is an open question whether this exponential dependence is improvable to a polynomial dependence. This paper proves that unless $P = NP$, the answer is no. This uncovers a “curse of dimensionality” for Wasserstein barycenter computation which does not occur for Optimal Transport computation. Moreover, our hardness results for computing Wasserstein barycenters extend to approximate computation, to seemingly simple cases of the problem, and to averaging probability distributions in other Optimal Transport metrics.

1 Introduction

Wasserstein barycenters provide a natural approach for averaging probability distributions in a way that respects their geometry. Given probability distributions μ_1, \dots, μ_k over \mathbb{R}^d and non-negative weights $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ summing to 1, the corresponding Wasserstein barycenters are the probability distributions ν over \mathbb{R}^d that minimize

$$\min_{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathcal{W}_2^2(\nu, \mu_i), \quad (1.1)$$

where \mathcal{W}_2 denotes the 2-Wasserstein distance (a.k.a. the standard Optimal Transport distance) [1]. In other words, Wasserstein barycenters are precisely the Riemannian centers of mass (a.k.a. Fréchet means) with respect to the Optimal Transport distance.

Wasserstein barycenters have received considerable research attention over the past decade due to their elegant mathematical properties (see e.g., [1]) and many data-science applications (see e.g., the surveys [24, 25]). For example, popular applications include improving Bayesian learning by averaging posterior distributions [30], improving sensors by averaging their measurements [15], and interpolating between shapes by averaging them (viewed as point clouds in Euclidean space) [29]. For further applications in machine learning, statistics, and computer graphics, see e.g., [14, 17, 26] and the aforementioned surveys.

However, a key issue that determines how useful Wasserstein barycenters are in applications is whether they can be computed efficiently. Note that in nearly all computational applications, including all of the aforementioned applications, each measure μ_i is a discrete distribution: it is a “point cloud” over data points. This motivates the following fundamental question, which has remained open despite considerable research attention (see the previous work section).

Can Wasserstein barycenters of discrete distributions be computed in polynomial time?

JA and EB are with the Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems (LIDS), Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA 02139. Work partially supported by NSF Graduate Research Fellowship 1122374, a Siebel PhD Fellowship, and a TwoSigma PhD fellowship.

That is, can the optimization problem (1.1) be solved in time that is polynomial in the number of distributions k , the dimension d , the maximum support size n of the input distributions μ_i , and the bit complexity $\log U$ of each entry in the input measures and weights?

Recent work has shown that Wasserstein barycenters can in fact be computed in polynomial time in any *fixed* dimension d [4]. However, the dependence of this algorithm is exponential in d —prohibiting scalability to high-dimensional settings often encountered in statistics and machine learning applications—and it is unclear whether this can be improved.

1.1 Contributions

The main result of this paper is a resolution of the above question: unless $P = NP$, the answer is no. This result uncovers a “curse of dimensionality” for computing Wasserstein barycenters in light of the aforementioned result that they are polynomial-time computable in any fixed dimension [4]. This is perhaps surprising because there is no curse of dimensionality for Optimal Transport computation (that problem is well-known to be polynomial-time computable, see e.g., [27]). This curse of dimensionality we uncover for Wasserstein barycenter computation explains why there has been a lack of progress towards developing non-heuristic algorithms for high-dimensional settings despite a rapidly growing literature (see the previous work section).

Theorem 1.1 (NP-hardness). *Assuming $P \neq NP$, there is no algorithm that given distributions μ_1, \dots, μ_k and weights $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$, computes the value of the Wasserstein barycenter problem (1.1) in $\text{poly}(n, k, d, \log U)$ time.*

Moreover, this hardness extends even to computation of *approximate* Wasserstein barycenters. This extension requires the slightly stronger yet standard complexity-theoretic assumption $NP \not\subseteq BPP$, which in words is the statement that NP-hard problems do not admit polynomial-time randomized algorithms. This result is formally stated as follows. Below, let R be a squared diameter upper bound on the supports of the μ_i ; any runtime must depend on R and the accuracy ε through the scale-invariant ratio R/ε .

Theorem 1.2 (Inapproximability). *Assuming $NP \not\subseteq BPP$, there is no randomized algorithm that given distributions μ_1, \dots, μ_k and weights $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$, computes the value of the Wasserstein barycenter problem (1.1) to ε additive accuracy with probability at least $2/3$ in $\text{poly}(n, k, d, \log U, R/\varepsilon)$ time.*

We make three remarks about our results. First, since Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 establish hardness for (approximately) computing the optimal *value* of the barycenter problem, as an immediate corollary they preclude finding an (approximately) optimal *solution*. Specifically, since $\mathcal{W}(\nu, \mu_i)$ is computable in polynomial time (e.g., via linear programming [27]) whenever ν has polynomial-size support, these results imply that: unless $P = NP$, there is no polynomial-time algorithm for computing a barycenter ν with polynomial-size support.¹

Second, these hardness results hold even in the “simple” setting where all weights $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_k = 1/k$ are uniform, all measures μ_1, \dots, μ_k are supported on n points each, and all these support points have $\{0, 1\}$ -valued coordinates. The “hard problem instances” we construct in §3 have all these properties. In §4, we remark that the hardness further applies if μ_1, \dots, μ_k are uniform distributions, and if the dimension d is somewhat low—namely, $d = \lfloor k^\alpha \log n \rfloor$ for exact computation or $d = \lfloor (kn)^\alpha \rfloor$ for approximate computation, where $\alpha > 0$ is an arbitrarily small real number.

Third, this hardness extends to averaging probability distributions in other Optimal Transport metrics. Specifically, recall that the standard barycenter problem (1.1) is the M -estimator for the

¹Note that there always *exists* a barycenter with support of size $O(nk)$, see, e.g. [6] for a proof. Our result shows that if $P \neq NP$, then such a barycenter cannot be efficiently computed.

squared 2-Wasserstein distance \mathcal{W}_2^2 over the metric space (\mathbb{R}^d, ℓ_2) . One can analogously define the problem for \mathcal{W}_p^p (the p -Wasserstein distance raised to the p -th power) over the metric space (\mathbb{R}^d, ℓ_q) , for arbitrary $p, q \geq 1$ not necessarily equal to 2. The parameter q enables extending to non-Euclidean geometries; and the parameter p enables targeting different M -estimators, notable examples including Wasserstein barycenters when $p = 2$, and Wasserstein geometric medians when $p = 1$. In the Appendix, we show the analogs of our results for this generalized problem.

1.2 Previous work

Previous work has primarily attacked the computational complexity of Wasserstein barycenters from the algorithmic side. However, while many algorithms have been proposed, all of them have runtime which scales exponentially in at least one of the input parameters, and/or they are heuristic (e.g., [13, 14]).

Algorithms with exponential dependence in d . A popular approach is to use “fixed-support approximations”; that is, assume that the barycenter is supported on a guessed set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of points, and then optimize over the corresponding weights, see e.g., [7, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21, 29, 31] among many others. The point of this fixed-support approximation is that it reduces the barycenter problem to a polynomial-size LP—which can then be solved efficiently using out-of-the-box LP solvers or specially-tailored approaches such as entropic regularization—if the set S has polynomial size. However, this “if” is the key issue: obtaining a barycenter that is ε -additively approximate for the objective (1.1) requires taking S to be an ε -cover of the space. In particular this means that all fixed-support methods require $\Omega(R/\varepsilon)^d$ time. Such runtimes have two issues. First is the exponential scaling in the dimension d . Second is that they only compute to “low precision” ε due to the $1/\varepsilon$ dependence. While not fixed-support approaches, the Frank-Wolfe algorithm of [22] and the Functional Gradient Descent algorithm of [28] also suffer from the same two issues.²

Recent work has shown that in any fixed dimension d , Wasserstein barycenters can in fact be computed exactly in $\text{poly}(n, k, \log U)$ time [4]. However, the runtime dependence on dimension is still exponential: for non-constant d , the runtime is $(nk)^d \cdot \text{poly}(n, k, \log U)$. Theorem 1.1 of this paper shows that this is optimal in the sense that unless $\text{P} = \text{NP}$, the exponential dependence on d cannot be improved to polynomial.

Algorithms with exponential dependence in k . A well-known approach that avoids exponential dependence on the dimension d is to reformulate the Wasserstein barycenter as a linear program (LP) and then solve it. However, this LP has n^k variables (see, e.g. [1, 6, 7]), and thus applying a standard LP solver out-of-the-box requires $\Omega(n^k)$ time which is exponential in k .

Other related work. We briefly mention two tangentially related pieces of work. First, it is known that finding the sparsest Wasserstein barycenter is NP-hard [8]. However, this result only applies to the sparsest barycenter and therefore does not provide any guidance on the complexity of finding a polynomially sparse barycenter. In fact, finding such a barycenter can be done in polynomial time in any fixed dimension [4]. Second, while this paper and much of the literature focuses on computing Wasserstein barycenters of discrete distributions, there is also an interesting line of work on computing barycenters of continuous distributions. In order to ensure that μ_i and ν

²In fact, these two algorithms also suffer exponentially in other parameters besides d : their runtime incurs dependencies of order $n^{\Omega(1/\varepsilon)}$. This is because these algorithms are tailored to an entropically regularized problem and have runtime factors of order e^γ , where γ is an entropic regularization parameter that must be set to $\gamma = \Omega((\log n)/\varepsilon)$ in order to obtain an ε -approximate (unregularized) Wasserstein barycenter.

have concise representations for computational purposes, the distributions are typically restricted to Gaussians, in which case specialized algorithms can be designed; see e.g., [5, 12].

1.3 Outline

In §2 we establish preliminaries and notation. In §3 we prove our main results (Theorems 1.1 and 1.2). In §4 we mention how these hardness results extend to seemingly simple settings. In §5 we conclude with several directions for future work. Extensions to averaging probability distributions in other Optimal Transport metrics are proved in a similar way but are more involved and thus deferred to the Appendix. Readers who are interested only in the standard barycenter problem can entirely skip this technical Appendix without any loss of understanding.

2 Preliminaries and notation

Barycenters. The optimal value of the barycenter problem (1.1) is denoted by OPT_{BARY} . We show the claimed hardness results hold even in the special case that the weights $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_k = 1/k$ are uniform, and thus henceforth specialize solely to this case. The atoms in the support of distribution μ_i are denoted by $x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We abuse notation slightly by writing μ_i to denote this discrete distribution as well as the vector of probability masses in the simplex $\Delta_n = \{p \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1\}$ over the n atoms $\{x_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^n$ in any fixed ordering. The Euclidean norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|$. Recall that the squared 2-Wasserstein distance $\mathcal{W}(\mu, \nu)$ between two distributions μ and ν on \mathbb{R}^d is the minimum, over all joint distributions P on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with first marginal μ and second marginal ν , of $\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \pi} \|X - Y\|^2$; for further background, see e.g., [32].

Tensors. We denote the k -fold product space $\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$ by $(\mathbb{R}^n)^{\otimes k}$, and similarly for $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n)^{\otimes k}$. The i -th marginal of a tensor $P \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{\otimes k}$ is the vector $m_i(P) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with j -th entry $[m_i(P)]_j = \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_k} P_{j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_k}$. The set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is denoted by $[n]$, and the k -fold product space $[n] \times \dots \times [n]$ is denoted by $[n]^k$. For shorthand, we often denote an element of $[n]^k$ by $\vec{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k)$. We denote the maximum modulus entry of a tensor C by $C_{\max} = \max_{\vec{j}} |C_{\vec{j}}|$.

Multimarginal Optimal Transport. This paper is purposely written in such a way that background on Multimarginal Optimal Transport (MOT) is not necessary for understanding the proofs. We recall briefly just the problem statement: MOT is the problem of linear programming over joint distributions with fixed marginals. More precisely, given measures $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k \in \Delta_n$ and a cost tensor $C \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{\otimes k}$, the corresponding MOT problem is

$$\min_{P \in \mathcal{M}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)} \langle C, P \rangle \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathcal{M}(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ denotes the “transportation polytope” $\{P \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n)^{\otimes k} : m_i(P) = \mu_i, \forall i \in [k]\}$. For further discussion about the algorithmic complexity of MOT, see the recent papers [2, 3] and the references within.

Graphs. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and vertices $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V$ (not necessarily distinct), we denote the number of edges (counted with multiplicity) in the induced subgraph of G with these vertices by $|E(v_1, \dots, v_k)| = \sum_{i < i' \in [k]} \mathbb{1}[(v_i, v_{i'}) \in E]$. We make use of the NP-hardness of the CLIQUE decision problem [16, 19]. Recall that a k -clique in an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ is a subset of vertices $S \subseteq V$ of size $|S| = k$ such that $|E(S)| = \binom{k}{2}$. The CLIQUE decision problem is: given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k > 0$, decide whether G contains a k -clique.

3 Proofs

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. The proofs are similar and thus parallelized. At a high-level, there are three steps in the proofs, based on reducing to/from the following four problems: (1) high-dimensional Wasserstein barycenters; (2) a certain Multimarginal Optimal Transport problem; (3) the problem of finding k maximally-correlated vectors, one from the support of each μ_i ; and (4) the NP-hard CLIQUE decision problem. Below, §3.1 reduces (2) to (1); §3.2 reduces (3) to (2); and §3.3 reduces (4) to (3). Together, these three ingredients imply a reduction from the NP-hard problem (4) to the high-dimensional Wasserstein barycenter problem (1); §3.4 uses this to conclude the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

For simplicity, below we ignore discussion of bit-complexity since the constructed “hard” instances of Wasserstein barycenters are such that all support points $x_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ have all $\{0, 1\}$ -valued entries, and thus clearly have polynomial bit complexity.

3.1 Step 1: Reducing Multimarginal Optimal Transport to barycenters

The starting point of our reduction is a well-known equivalent reformulation of the barycenter problem (1.1) as a Multimarginal Optimal Transport (MOT) problem. The reason we use such a reformulation is that it lets us use the recently developed machinery of [2] for proving hardness of structured MOT problems. The precise MOT reformulation we state below is a slightly non-standard variant that is convenient in the sequel.

Proposition 3.1 (Reduction to MOT). *Let $C \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{\otimes k}$ be the tensor with entries*

$$C_{\vec{j}} = - \sum_{i \neq i' \in [k]} \langle x_{i,j_i}, x_{i',j_{i'}} \rangle \quad (3.1)$$

for $\vec{j} \in [n]^k$, and let OPT_{MOT} denote the optimal value of the corresponding MOT problem (2.1) with cost C . Then

$$\text{OPT}_{\text{BARY}} = \frac{\text{OPT}_{\text{MOT}}}{k^2} + \Delta, \quad (3.2)$$

where Δ is a number that can be computed in $\text{poly}(n, k, d)$ time.

Proof. It is well-known (see, e.g., [1, 6, 7]) that OPT_{BARY} is equal to the value of the MOT problem (2.1) that has cost tensor $C' \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{\otimes k}$ given by

$$C'_{\vec{j}} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \left\| x_{i,j_i} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i'=1}^k x_{i',j_{i'}} \right\|^2. \quad \forall \vec{j} \in [n]^k.$$

By expanding the squared norm in the definition of $C'_{\vec{j}}$ and simplifying, we obtain the relation

$$C'_{\vec{j}} = \frac{1}{k^2} C_{\vec{j}} + \frac{k-1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_{i,j_i}\|^2.$$

Therefore by appealing to the following observation, we conclude that the desired relation (3.2) holds with $\Delta = \frac{k-1}{k^2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^n [\mu_i]_j \cdot \|x_{i,j}\|^2$. \square

Observation 3.2 (MOT on separable functions). *Consider vectors $h^{(1)}, \dots, h^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and scalars $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $F = \alpha G + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i H^{(i)}$ for some tensors $G, H^{(1)}, \dots, H^{(k)} \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^{\otimes k}$ satisfying $H_{\vec{j}}^{(i)} = h_{j_i}^{(i)}$ for each $i \in [k]$ and $\vec{j} \in [n]^k$. Then*

$$\min_{P \in \mathcal{M}} \langle P, F \rangle = \alpha \min_{P \in \mathcal{M}} \langle P, G \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i \langle \mu_i, h^{(i)} \rangle.$$

Proof. By linearity, $\langle P, F \rangle = \alpha \langle P, G \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i \langle P, H^{(i)} \rangle$. The separability of $H^{(i)}$ along its slices implies $\langle P, H^{(i)} \rangle = \langle m_i(P), h^{(i)} \rangle$, which for $P \in \mathcal{M}$ is simply $\langle \mu_i, h^{(i)} \rangle$. \square

3.2 Step 2: Reducing finding k maximally-correlated vectors to Multimarginal Optimal Transport

Here, we leverage the recent results of [2] to reduce (approximately) computing the minimum entry $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ of the cost tensor C , to (approximately) computing the optimal value OPT_{MOT} of the MOT problem with cost tensor C . The upshot is that $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ is a combinatorial optimization problem that is phrased in a more amenable way for proving NP-hardness. This in large part due to the following simple geometric interpretation of $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$: find k points, one from the support of each μ_i , such that their variance is minimized.

The specializations of the exact and approximate reductions in of [2] to the present setting are formally stated as follows. Below, the MOT_{BARY} problem is: given measures μ_1, \dots, μ_k , compute the optimal value OPT_{MOT} of the MOT problem (2.1) for the corresponding cost C given by (3.1). The MIN_{BARY} problem is: given points $\{x_{i,j}\}_{i \in [k], j \in [n]}$, compute the optimal value of $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ for the corresponding cost C given by (3.1). The subscripts on the MOT_{BARY} and MIN_{BARY} problems serve to emphasize that here we specialize to cost tensors C of the form (3.1), whereas the results of [2] hold more generally for arbitrary costs C .

Proposition 3.3. *There is a deterministic algorithm that, given access to an oracle solving MOT_{BARY} , solves MIN_{BARY} in $\text{poly}(n, k)$ oracle queries and additional time.*

Proposition 3.4. *There exists a constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and a randomized algorithm that, given $\tau > 0$ and access to an oracle solving MOT_{BARY} to additive accuracy τ , solves MIN_{BARY} up to $\tau(nk)^\alpha$ additive accuracy with probability $2/3$ in $\text{poly}(n, k, C_{\max}/\varepsilon)$ oracle queries and additional time.*

3.3 Step 3: NP-hardness of finding k maximally-correlated vectors

Here, we show that the MIN_{BARY} problem is NP-hard.³

Proposition 3.5 (Inapproximability of $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$). *Assuming $\text{P} \neq \text{NP}$, there does not exist an algorithm that given vectors $\{x_{i,j}\}_{i \in [k], j \in [n]} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$, computes the value of $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ to additive error 0.99 in $\text{poly}(n, k, d)$ time for the cost tensor C given by (3.1).*

The key ingredient in the proof is the following embedding, which enables us to encode the NP-hard CLIQUE decision problem as an instance of $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ in sufficiently high dimension d . For simplicity of exposition, we make no attempt to optimize d here; that is done in §4.

³Note that the algorithm of [4] solves MIN_{BARY} (exactly) in polynomial time, but only for fixed dimension d .

Lemma 3.6 (Embedding for CLIQUE). *Given an n -vertex graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k > 0$, there exists a function $\phi : [k] \times [n] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\binom{k}{2}n^2}$ that can be evaluated in $\text{poly}(n, k)$ time and satisfies*

$$\langle \phi(i, v), \phi(i', v') \rangle = \mathbf{1}[(v, v') \in E] \quad (3.3)$$

for all $i \neq i' \in [k]$ and $v, v' \in V$.

Proof. Define the embedding ϕ as follows. Index the $\binom{k}{2}n^2$ coordinates by tuples (ℓ, u, ℓ', u') where $\ell < \ell' \in [k]$ and $u, u' \in [n] \cong V$. Set

$$[\phi(i, v)]_{(\ell, u, \ell', u')} = \mathbf{1}[(u, u') \in E] \cdot \mathbf{1}[(\ell, u) = (i, v) \text{ or } (\ell', u') = (i, v)]. \quad (3.4)$$

Clearly ϕ is computable in $\text{poly}(n, k)$ time. To show (3.3), note that for any $i < i' \in [k]$ and $v, v' \in V$, the vectors $\phi(i, v)$ and $\phi(i', v')$ have disjoint support if $(v, v') \notin E$, and otherwise share exactly one non-zero entry at the coordinate $(\ell, u, \ell', u') = (i, v, i', v')$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.5. We reduce CLIQUE to approximately solving $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$. Given an n -vertex graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k > 0$, let ϕ be the corresponding embedding in Lemma 3.6, and set $x_{i,j} = \phi(i, j) \in \{0, 1\}^{\binom{k}{2}n^2}$ for each $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [n] \cong V$. Observe that for each $\vec{j} \in [n]^k$,

$$C_{\vec{j}} = -2 \sum_{i < i' \in [k]} \langle x_{i,j_i}, x_{i',j_{i'}} \rangle = -2 \sum_{i < i' \in [k]} \langle \phi(i, j_i), \phi(i', j_{i'}) \rangle = -2 \sum_{i < i' \in [k]} \mathbf{1}[(j_i, j_{i'}) \in E] = -2|E(j_1, \dots, j_k)|.$$

Recall $|E(j_1, \dots, j_k)|$ denotes the number of edges in the induced subgraph of G with vertices j_1, \dots, j_k where we count the edges with multiplicity if j_1, \dots, j_k are not disjoint. Thus in particular

$$\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}} = -2 \max_{S \in V^k} |E(S)|,$$

and so $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ has value $-2\binom{k}{2}$ if G contains a clique of size k , and value at least $-2\binom{k}{2} + 2$ if not. Therefore computing $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ to any additive error less than 1 enables one to decide whether G contains a clique of size k . But the latter problem is NP-hard [19]. \square

3.4 Concluding the proofs

With Propositions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 in hand, we are now ready to conclude the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. If there is a $\text{poly}(n, k, d)$ -time algorithm for computing OPT_{BARY} , then by Proposition 3.1 there is a $\text{poly}(n, k, d)$ -time algorithm for computing OPT_{MOT} , and thus by Proposition 3.3 there is a $\text{poly}(n, k, d)$ -time algorithm for computing $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$. But assuming $\text{P} \neq \text{NP}$, this contradicts the NP-hardness of $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ proven in Proposition 3.5. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. If there is a $\text{poly}(n, k, d, R/\varepsilon)$ -time randomized algorithm for ε -approximating OPT_{BARY} with probability $2/3$, then by Proposition 3.1 there is a $\text{poly}(n, k, d, R/\varepsilon)$ -time randomized algorithm for (εk^2) -approximating OPT_{MOT} with probability $2/3$. By a standard boosting argument—namely repeat this algorithm $\log 1/\delta$ times, taking the median, and applying a Chernoff bound—this implies a $\text{poly}(n, k, d, R/\varepsilon, \log 1/\delta)$ -time randomized algorithm for (εk^2) -approximating OPT_{MOT} with probability $1 - \delta$. Therefore by setting δ sufficiently high, we conclude by Proposition 3.4 and a union bound that there exists a $\text{poly}(n, k, d, R/\varepsilon)$ -time randomized algorithm for $(\varepsilon n^\alpha k^{\alpha+2})$ -approximating $\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}}$ with probability 0.51 , say. But assuming $\text{NP} \notin \text{BPP}$, this contradicts the NP-hardness shown in Proposition 3.5. \square

4 Hardness in seemingly simple cases

The NP-hardness reduction in §3 holds even in the seemingly simple setting where all weights $\lambda_i = 1/k$ are uniform, all measures μ_i are supported on n points each, and all these support points have $\{0, 1\}$ -valued coordinates. Here, we briefly mention that the hardness also applies (i) even if the dimension is somewhat “low”, and (ii) even if μ_i are all uniform distributions.

Optimizing the dimension. Our construction in §3 is in dimension $d = \Theta(k^2 n^2)$. While this is sufficient to prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, the dimension d in the exhibited hard instances can be lowered if desired. For example, since the barycenter problem depends on $\{x_{i,j}\}_{i \in [k], j \in [n]} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ only through their pairwise inner products, d can be lowered to the number of vectors kn . In fact, d can be further lowered to $\lfloor (nk)^\alpha \rfloor$ for arbitrarily small $\alpha > 0$ by a “trivial” argument: given an instance of the barycenter problem, artificially increase n by adding polynomially many atoms with no mass, and artificially increase k by adding polynomially many Dirac measures μ_i —then the enlarged problem can be made to have dimension $d \leq \lfloor (nk)^\alpha \rfloor$, yet is hard because solving the original problem is hard.

One can further improve the dependence of d on n to be logarithmic. Indeed, since computing $\min_{\bar{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\bar{j}}$ is NP-hard to approximate to constant additive error by Proposition 3.3, and since $C_{\bar{j}}$ is the sum of $O(k^2)$ inner products by (3.5), one can use the Johnson–Lindenstrauss lemma to reduce d so long as each inner product is preserved to additive $O(1/k^2)$ error. Since each inner product is either 0 or 1 in our construction (3.4), it suffices to preserve each inner product to multiplicative $(1 + O(1/k^2))$ error which can be done by embedding in dimension $d = O(k^4 \log(nk))$ —and thus also in dimension $\lfloor k^\alpha \log n \rfloor$ for any constant $\alpha > 0$ by artificially increasing k as described above.

Hardness for uniform distributions. Theorem 1.2 extends to the case where μ_1, \dots, μ_k are uniform distributions over the same number of atoms. This follows from combining the theorem with the observation that if μ_1, \dots, μ_k are arbitrary discrete measures over n points, then there exist discrete measures μ'_1, \dots, μ'_k that (i) are each uniform over N points where N is of polynomial size, (ii) are polynomial-time computable, and (iii) preserve the barycenter functional pointwise to ε additive error in the sense that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu_i, \nu) - \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu'_i, \nu) \right| \leq \varepsilon. \quad (4.1)$$

for any measure ν supported on the convex hull of the supports of the μ_i .⁴

Such measures μ'_i can be explicitly constructed as follows in two steps. Denote the atoms of μ_i by $x_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let $\mu_{i,j} \in [0, 1]$ denote the corresponding masses. First, quantize $\mu_{i,j}$ by rounding it down to the nearest multiple $q \lfloor \mu_{i,j}/q \rfloor$ of $q \in [0, 1]$, and adding the overflow mass on an atom at $\vec{0}$, say. Second, split any atom with $m q$ mass into m close atoms each with q mass. Then $N \leq 1/q$.

We sketch the proof of correctness. We argue this just for the first quantization step; the argument for the second splitting step is similar and omitted for brevity. Without loss of generality, assume μ_i are supported on $[0, 1]^d$; then ν can be similarly restricted. By considering the trivial coupling between μ_i and μ'_i that is the rounding transformation, $\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu_i, \mu'_i)$ is at most the moved mass $1 - \sum_{j=1}^n q \lfloor \mu_{i,j}/q \rfloor \leq n q$ times the squared diameter d of $[0, 1]^d$. Thus by the triangle inequality,

$$|\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_i, \nu) - \mathcal{W}_2(\mu'_i, \nu)| \leq \mathcal{W}_2(\mu_i, \mu'_i) \leq \sqrt{n q d}.$$

⁴I.e., for any ν that could be a candidate barycenter.

Since ν is supported on $[0, 1]^d$, it follows that $\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_i, \nu), \mathcal{W}_2(\mu'_i, \nu) \in [0, d]$, thus

$$|\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu_i, \nu) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu'_i, \nu)| \leq 2d |\mathcal{W}_2(\mu_i, \nu) - \mathcal{W}_2(\mu'_i, \nu)| \leq 2d\sqrt{nd}.$$

Taking $q = O(\varepsilon^2/(nd^3))$ therefore ensures (4.1).

5 Discussion

The problem of computing Wasserstein barycenters has attracted significant research attention due to many data-science applications. However, fundamental questions about the computational complexity of Wasserstein barycenters have remained unresolved—in particular, whether they can be computed in polynomial time. The vast majority of the literature has tried to tackle this problem by developing faster algorithms. The purpose of this paper is to show that this rapidly growing line of work cannot hope to succeed: computing Wasserstein barycenters is NP-hard. Furthermore, we show that this hardness extends to approximate computation, to seemingly simple cases of the problem, and to averaging probability distributions in other Optimal Transport metrics.

Now, it should be emphasized that although (or perhaps because) our results rule out polynomial-time algorithms with provable guarantees, it is an important research direction to develop better practical heuristics for computing Wasserstein barycenters due to the many motivating applications. Also potentially interesting is investigating whether polynomial-time algorithms are possible in special cases of the problem—e.g., if the input distributions μ_i are drawn from some generative process, or if the points in their supports lie in certain structured geometric configurations. This second direction is of course mostly interesting if these structural assumptions are motivated by real-world applications.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Victor-Emmanuel Brunel and Pablo Parrilo for stimulating conversations.

References

- [1] M. Agueh and G. Carlier. Barycenters in the Wasserstein space. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 43(2):904–924, 2011.
- [2] J. M. Altschuler and E. Boix-Adserà. Hardness results for Multimarginal Optimal Transport problems. *arXiv pre-print*, 2020.
- [3] J. M. Altschuler and E. Boix-Adserà. Polynomial-time algorithms for Multimarginal Optimal Transport problems with decomposable structure. *arXiv pre-print arXiv:2008.03006*, 2020.
- [4] J. M. Altschuler and E. Boix-Adserà. Wasserstein barycenters can be computed in polynomial time in fixed dimension. *Journal of Machine Learning*, to appear.
- [5] P. C. Álvarez-Esteban, E. Del Barrio, J. Cuesta-Albertos, and C. Matrán. A fixed-point approach to barycenters in Wasserstein space. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 441(2):744–762, 2016.
- [6] E. Anderes, S. Borgwardt, and J. Miller. Discrete Wasserstein barycenters: Optimal transport for discrete data. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 84(2):389–409, 2016.
- [7] J.-D. Benamou, G. Carlier, M. Cuturi, L. Nenna, and G. Peyré. Iterative Bregman projections for regularized transportation problems. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 37(2):A1111–A1138, 2015.
- [8] S. Borgwardt and S. Patterson. On the computational complexity of finding a sparse Wasserstein barycenter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07568*, 2019.

- [9] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [10] G. Carlier and I. Ekeland. Matching for teams. *Economic theory*, 42(2):397–418, 2010.
- [11] G. Carlier, A. Oberman, and E. Oudet. Numerical methods for matching for teams and Wasserstein barycenters. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 49(6):1621–1642, 2015.
- [12] S. Chewi, T. Maunu, P. Rigollet, and A. J. Stromme. Gradient descent algorithms for Bures-Wasserstein barycenters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.01700*, 2020.
- [13] S. Cohen, M. Arbel, and M. P. Deisenroth. Estimating barycenters of measures in high dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07105*, 2020.
- [14] M. Cuturi and A. Doucet. Fast computation of Wasserstein barycenters. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 685–693, 2014.
- [15] F. Elvander, I. Haasler, A. Jakobsson, and J. Karlsson. Multi-marginal optimal transport using partial information with applications in robust localization and sensor fusion. *Signal Processing*, 171:107474, 2020.
- [16] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and intractability*, volume 174.
- [17] N. Ho, X. L. Nguyen, M. Yurochkin, H. H. Bui, V. Huynh, and D. Phung. Multilevel clustering via Wasserstein means. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1501–1509, 2017.
- [18] H. Janati, M. Cuturi, and A. Gramfort. Debiased Sinkhorn barycenters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.02575*, 2020.
- [19] R. M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Complexity of computer computations*, pages 85–103. Springer, 1972.
- [20] A. Kroshnin, D. Dvinskikh, P. Dvurechensky, A. Gasnikov, N. Tupitsa, and C. Uribe. On the complexity of approximating Wasserstein barycenter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08686*, 2019.
- [21] T. Lin, N. Ho, X. Chen, M. Cuturi, and M. Jordan. Fixed-support Wasserstein barycenters: Computational hardness and fast algorithm. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- [22] G. Luise, S. Salzo, M. Pontil, and C. Ciliberto. Sinkhorn barycenters with free support via Frank-Wolfe algorithm. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 9322–9333, 2019.
- [23] B. Mohar. Face covers and the genus problem for apex graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 82(1):102–117, 2001.
- [24] V. M. Panaretos and Y. Zemel. Statistical aspects of Wasserstein distances. *Annual review of statistics and its application*, 6:405–431, 2019.
- [25] G. Peyré and M. Cuturi. Computational optimal transport. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 2017.
- [26] J. Rabin, G. Peyré, J. Delon, and M. Berton. Wasserstein barycenter and its application to texture mixing. In *International Conference on Scale Space and Variational Methods in Computer Vision*, pages 435–446. Springer, 2011.
- [27] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [28] Z. Shen, Z. Wang, A. Ribeiro, and H. Hassani. Sinkhorn barycenter via functional gradient descent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- [29] J. Solomon, F. De Goes, G. Peyré, M. Cuturi, A. Butscher, A. Nguyen, T. Du, and L. Guibas. Convolutional Wasserstein distances: Efficient optimal transportation on geometric domains. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 34(4):1–11, 2015.
- [30] S. Srivastava, C. Li, and D. B. Dunson. Scalable Bayes via barycenter in Wasserstein space. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):312–346, 2018.
- [31] M. Staib, S. Claiici, J. M. Solomon, and S. Jegelka. Parallel streaming Wasserstein barycenters. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2647–2658, 2017.
- [32] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*. Number 58. American Mathematical Society, 2003.

A Extension to W_p^p barycenters over (\mathbb{R}^d, ℓ_q)

In this Appendix, we extend our hardness-of-computation results to averaging probability distributions with respect to other Optimal Transport metrics. Readers interested only in the standard Wasserstein barycenter problem can entirely skip this Appendix without any loss of understanding.

Specifically, here we average distributions with respect to the p -th powered p -Wasserstein distance over the metric space (\mathbb{R}^d, ℓ_q) , for arbitrary $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$. That is, we study the generalization of the barycenter problem (1.1) that is

$$\min_{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \mathcal{W}_{p,q}^p(\nu, \mu_i), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{p,q}$ denotes the p -Wasserstein distance over the ℓ_q -norm, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{W}_{p,q}(\mu, \nu) = \left[\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{M}(\mu, \nu)} \int \int \|x - y\|_q^p d\mu(x) d\nu(y) \right]^{1/p}.$$

This generalizes the standard Wasserstein barycenter problem (1.1), in which one averages distributions with respect to the squared 2-Wasserstein distance over the metric space (\mathbb{R}^d, ℓ_2) .

Below we extend Theorem 1.2 by proving hardness of approximate computation for this generalized problem (A.1). Note that hardness of exact computation is ill-stated here because for general $p, q \neq 2$, the bit complexity of the optimal value (A.1) might not be polynomially bounded in the input size (e.g., it could be the case that the inputs are rational but the optimal value is irrational).

In what follows, the measures μ_1, \dots, μ_k are still each over n atoms in \mathbb{R}^d . However, now the appropriate quantity for R is the p -th power of the ℓ_q norm diameter of these supports; this ensures that R/ε is scale-invariant.

Theorem A.1 (Generalization of Theorem 1.2). *Fix $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$. Assuming $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{BPP}$, there does not exist a randomized algorithm that given distributions μ_1, \dots, μ_k and weights $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$, computes the value of the (p, q) -Wasserstein barycenter problem (A.1) to ε additive accuracy with probability at least $2/3$ in $\text{poly}(n, k, d, \log U, R/\varepsilon)$ time.*

At a high-level, the 3-step proof strategy of Theorem A.1 is similar to that of the main $p = q = 2$ case shown in §3. However, the third step is more technically involved here. Note that as in the main case, the hardness we show holds even in the case of uniform weights and thus we henceforth assume for simplicity that $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_k = 1/k$.

For step one, the cost of the generalized barycenter problem (A.1) is still given by the optimal value of a corresponding MOT problem. This is well-known; for a proof see e.g., [10]. The cost tensor C for this MOT problem has entries

$$C_{\vec{j}} = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_{i,j_i} - y\|_q^p. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Note that in contrast to the main case $p = q = 2$ in §3, there is *not* a closed form for the optimal $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in this variational expression (A.2) for the cost tensor entries. This is the root of the additional complexity in the generalized (p, q) setting. For step two, we again use the reduction of [2] stated in Proposition 3.4. Therefore, by an identical argument as in Theorem 1.2, it suffices to show that approximating the minimum entry of this cost tensor C is NP-hard. This is the analog of step three and is stated formally below.

Proposition A.2 (Generalization of Proposition 3.5). *Fix $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$. Assuming $\text{P} \neq \text{NP}$, there does not exist an algorithm that given vectors $\{x_{i,j}\}_{i \in [k], j \in [n]} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^d$, computes $\min_{\bar{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\bar{j}}$ to additive error ε for the cost C in (A.2) in time $\text{poly}(n, k, d, 1/\varepsilon)$.*

It therefore remains to prove this proposition. Our high-level approach is similar to the proof for the case of $p = q = 2$ in §3.3. Specifically, we show that given an n -node graph G and an integer $k > 0$, we construct vectors $x_{i,j}$ such that computing $\min_{\bar{j}} C_{\bar{j}}$ for the corresponding cost C enables one to decide whether G has a k -clique. However, the proof is significantly more involved here because, as mentioned above, the entries $C_{\bar{j}}$ do not have explicit forms.

The rest of the Appendix is organized as follows. In A.1, we provide helper lemmas that are useful for the proof of Proposition 3.4. Then in A.2, A.3, and A.4, we prove Proposition 3.4 for the cases $q = 1$, $q \in (1, \infty)$, and $q = \infty$ respectively. These three cases can be read separately.

A.1 Helper lemmas

For shorthand, we express the entries of the cost tensor C in (A.2) as $C_{\bar{j}} = \frac{1}{k} F(x_{1,j_1}, \dots, x_{k,j_k})$, where the function $F = F_{p,q} : (\mathbb{R}^d)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y\|_q^p. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Lemma A.3. *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$, $q \in [1, \infty]$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The function $y \mapsto \|x - y\|_q^p$ is convex on \mathbb{R}^d .*

Proof. Express this function as the composition $f \circ g \circ h$ of the powering function $f(t) = t^p$ from $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the q -norm function $g(z) = \|z\|_q$ from $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the translation function $h(y) = x - y$ from $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and appeal to standard results on convexity-preserving transformations (see e.g., [9]). Specifically, since g is convex and h is linear, their composition $g \circ h$ is convex. Thus, since also f is convex and monotonic, it follows that $f \circ (g \circ h) = f \circ g \circ h$ is convex. \square

Recall that in the proof of the main results in §3 we reduce from the NP-hard CLIQUE decision problem. For technical reasons, it is convenient in the extensions below to use the fact that this CLIQUE problem is NP-hard even in certain special cases.

Lemma A.4 (Hardness of CLIQUE in special cases). *Assuming $\text{P} \neq \text{NP}$, there does not exist an algorithm that given an integer $k > 0$ and a graph G on n vertices, decides whether there G contains a clique of size k in $\text{poly}(n, k)$ time. This is unchanged if G is assumed regular, or if k is even.*

Proof. NP-hardness of the standard CLIQUE problem is shown in [19]. For the case of regular graphs, [23] shows that it is NP-hard to find a maximum independent set in regular graphs. The claim then follows since a (maximum) independent set in G is a (maximum) clique in the complement graph. For the case of k with fixed parity, consider the graph G' that is G with an extra vertex v that is connected to all vertices in G . Note that S is a k -clique in G if and only if $S \cup \{v\}$ is a $(k+1)$ -clique in G' . The claim then follows from hardness of the standard CLIQUE problem [19]: take G is k is even, or G' if k is odd. \square

A.2 Case $q = 1$

Here, we prove Proposition A.2 in the case $q = 1$. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with $V = [n]$ and let $k > 0$ be an even integer. We define the following embedding $\phi : [k] \times [n] \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}^d$, $d = 2\binom{k}{2}n^2$. Each entry is indexed by an element of

$$\Sigma = \{(\ell, u, \ell', u', s) : \ell < \ell' \in [k], \text{ and } u, u' \in [n] \cong V, \text{ and } s \in \{+1, -1\}\}.$$

For shorthand, we denote an element $(\ell, u, \ell', u', s) \in \Sigma$ by σ . For $\sigma \in \Sigma$, set

$$[\phi(i, v)]_\sigma = \begin{cases} \tau(\ell, \ell', i), & i \notin \{\ell, \ell'\} \\ s, & (i, v) = (\ell, u) \\ s, & (i, v) = (\ell', u') \text{ and } (u, u') \in E \\ -s, & (i, v) = (\ell', u') \text{ and } (u, u') \notin E \\ 0, & i \in \{\ell, \ell'\} \text{ and } (i, v) \notin \{(\ell, u), (\ell', u')\} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where we define $\tau(\ell, \ell', i) = (-1)^{|[i] \setminus \{\ell, \ell'\}|}$.

Lemma A.5. *For any $\ell < \ell' \in [k]$, we have $\sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{\ell, \ell'\}} \tau(\ell, \ell', i) = 0$.*

Proof. The sum over $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell-1\}$ equals $-1 \mathbf{1}[\ell \text{ is even}]$. The sum over $i \in \{\ell+1, \dots, \ell'-1\}$ equals $(-1)^\ell \mathbf{1}[\ell' - \ell \text{ is even}]$. The sum over $i \in \{\ell'+1, \dots, k\}$ equals $\mathbf{1}[\ell' \text{ is odd}]$ since k is even. There are four cases arising from whether ℓ, ℓ' are even. In all cases, the total is readily checked to be 0. \square

Lemma A.6. *Let $j_1, \dots, j_k \in V$ not necessarily distinct, and let t denote $|E(j_1, \dots, j_k)|$. Then*

$$F(\phi(1, j_1), \dots, \phi(k, j_k)) \geq k^{1-p} (nk(k-1)(nk-2n+2) - 4t)^p.$$

Furthermore, the bound holds with equality if $t = \binom{k}{2}$.

Proof. For shorthand, let $x_i = \phi(i, j_i) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^d$ for $i \in [k]$. By Jensen's inequality on the convex function $t \mapsto t^p$ and separability of the ℓ_1 norm, we have

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y\|_1^p \geq \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} k \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y\|_1 \right)^p = k^{1-p} \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \min_{y_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^k |[x_i]_\sigma - y_\sigma| \right)^p \quad (\text{A.5})$$

We explicitly solve the latter univariate minimization over each coordinate y_σ in closed form. To this end, let $T = \{(i, j_i)\}_{i \in [k]}$ and partition the index set $\Sigma = \cup_{(a,b,c,s) \in \{0,1\}^3 \times \{-1,1\}} A_{a,b,c,s}$ where

$$A_{a,b,c,s} = \{\sigma = (u, \ell, u', \ell', s) \in \Sigma : |\{(\ell, u)\} \cap T| = a, |\{(\ell', u')\} \cap T| = b, |\{(u, u')\} \cap E| = c\}.$$

Note that if $\sigma = (\ell, u, \ell', u', s) \in A_{a,b,c,s}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k |[x_i]_\sigma - y_\sigma| &= \sum_{i \in \{\ell, \ell'\}} |[x_i]_\sigma - y_\sigma| + \sum_{i \notin \{\ell, \ell'\}} |\tau(\ell, \ell', i) - y_\sigma| \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{\ell, \ell'\}} |[x_i]_\sigma - y_\sigma| + (k/2 - 1)|1 - y_\sigma| + (k/2 - 1)|1 + y_\sigma| \\ &= (a + bc)|s - y_\sigma| + b(1 - c)|s + y_\sigma| + (2 - a - b)|y_\sigma| + (k/2 - 1)(|1 - y_\sigma| + |1 + y_\sigma|). \end{aligned}$$

where above the second equality is by Lemma A.5. Thus, by a direct calculation,

$$\min_{y_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^k |[x_i]_\sigma - y_\sigma| = \begin{cases} k-2, & a+b=0 \quad (\text{achieved by } y_\sigma=0) \\ k-1, & a+b=1 \quad (\text{achieved by } y_\sigma=0) \\ k, & a+b=2, c=0 \quad (\text{achieved by } y_\sigma=0) \\ k-2, & a+b=2, c=1 \quad (\text{achieved by } y_\sigma=s) \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Further, since $t = |E(j_1, \dots, j_k)|$, we have

$$|A_{a,b,c,s}| = \begin{cases} \binom{k}{2}(n-1)^2, & a+b=0 \\ 2\binom{k}{2}(n-1), & a+b=1 \\ \binom{k}{2}-t, & a+b=2, c=0 \\ t, & a+b=2, c=1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Therefore by combining (A.5), (A.6), and (A.7), and simplifying, we conclude the desired bound

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_1, \dots, x_k) &\geq k^{1-p} \left(\sum_{(a,b,c,s) \in \{0,1\}^3 \times \{-1,1\}} \sum_{\sigma \in A_{a,b,c,s}} \min_{y_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}} |[x_i]_\sigma - y_\sigma| \right)^p \\ &= k^{1-p} 2^p \left(\binom{k}{2}(n-1)^2(k-2) + 2\binom{k}{2}(n-1)(k-1) + \left(\binom{k}{2} - t \right)k + t(k-2) \right)^p \\ &= k^{1-p} (nk(k-1)(nk-2n+2) - 4t)^p. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that this bound holds with equality when $t = \binom{k}{2}$. To do this, note that it suffices to explicitly construct $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$$\|x_i - y^*\|_1 = n(k-1)(nk-2n+2) - 2(k-1) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

for each $i \in [k]$, since then plugging in $F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y\|_1^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y^*\|_1^p$ finishes the proof. To this end, construct $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by setting $y_\sigma^* = s$ for all $\sigma \in A_{1,1,1,s}$ and $s \in \{+1, -1\}$, and 0 elsewhere. We now verify (A.8). The sparsity pattern of y_σ^* implies

$$\|x_i - y^*\|_1 = \|x_i\|_1 + \sum_{s \in \{-1,1\}} \sum_{\sigma \in A_{1,1,1,s}} (|[x_i]_\sigma - s| - |[x_i]_\sigma). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The first term in (A.9) is

$$\|x_i\|_1 = 2\binom{k}{2}n^2 - 2(k-1)n(n-1) = n(k-1)(nk-2n+2) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

by direct computation. To compute the second term in (A.9), observe that because (j_1, \dots, j_k) forms a clique in G , the sum over $\sigma \in A_{1,1,1,s}$ is a sum over $\sigma = (\ell, j_\ell, \ell', j_{\ell'}, s)$ for $\ell < \ell' \in [k]$. Consider two cases:

- If $i \in \{\ell, \ell'\}$, then $[x_i]_\sigma = s$, hence $|[x_i]_\sigma - s| - |[x_i]_\sigma| = |s - s| - |s| = -1$. Therefore the contribution of this case to the second term in (A.9) is

$$\sum_{s \in \{-1,1\}} \sum_{\substack{\ell < \ell' \in [k] \\ \text{s.t. } i \in \{\ell, \ell'\}}} (|[x_i]_\sigma - s| - |[x_i]_\sigma) = -2(k-1). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

- Else if $i \notin \{\ell, \ell'\}$, then $[x_i]_\sigma = \tau(\ell, \ell', i)$, hence $|[x_i]_\sigma - s| - |[x_i]_\sigma| = |\tau(\ell, \ell', i) - s| - 1$. Therefore the contribution of this case to the second term in (A.9) is

$$\sum_{s \in \{-1,1\}} \sum_{\substack{\ell < \ell' \in [k] \\ \text{s.t. } i \notin \{\ell, \ell'\}}} (|[x_i]_\sigma - s| - |[x_i]_\sigma) = \sum_{\substack{\ell < \ell' \in [k] \\ \text{s.t. } i \notin \{\ell, \ell'\}}} (|\tau(\ell, \ell', i) + 1| + |\tau(\ell, \ell', i) - 1| - 2) = 0 \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where the last step is because $|1+z| + |1-z| = 2$ for $z \in \{-1, 1\}$.

Combining (A.9), (A.10), (A.11), and (A.12) now yields the desired identity (A.8). \square

Proof of Proposition A.2 for $q = 1$. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph on n vertices and $k > 0$ be an even integer. Let $\phi : [k] \times [n] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^d$, $d = 2\binom{k}{2}n^2$, be the embedding in (A.4). Let $x_{i,j} = \phi(i, j)$ for $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [n] \cong V$, and let C denote the corresponding tensor (A.2). By Lemma A.6, there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on p such that $\min_j C_j$ differs by at least $\alpha(nk)^{-\beta}$ depending on whether G contains a clique of size k . Thus, if one could compute $\min_j C_j$ to ε error in $\text{poly}(n, k, d, 1/\varepsilon)$ time, then one could determine if G contains a clique of size k in $\text{poly}(n, k)$ time. But the latter problem is NP-hard by Lemma A.4. \square

A.3 Case $q \in (1, \infty)$

Here, we prove Proposition A.2 in the case $1 < q < \infty$. As in §3.3, we reduce from the CLIQUE problem and use the same embedding ϕ . However, this construction requires a new analysis for the present purposes and it is helpful to view it through the lens of the following technical definition.

Definition A.7. A (k, s, t) -collection is a collection of vectors $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \{0, 1\}^d$, for some dimension d , such that:

- (i) Each vector is non-zero on s entries, i.e., $\|x_1\|_1 = \dots = \|x_k\|_1 = s$.
- (ii) Exactly t pairs of vectors share one non-zero entry, i.e., $|\{(i, i') : \langle x_i, x_{i'} \rangle = 1, i < i'\}| = t$.
- (iii) The other $\binom{k}{2} - t$ pairs of vectors are disjoint, i.e., $|\{(i, i') : \langle x_i, x_{i'} \rangle = 0, i < i'\}| = \binom{k}{2} - t$.
- (iv) For each entry $j \in [d]$, at most two vectors are non-zero, i.e., $|\{i : [x_i]_j = 1\}| \leq 2$.

We prove several technical lemmas regarding the value of F applied to a (k, s, t) -collection.

Lemma A.8. Let $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty)$. There exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ that depend only on p and q satisfying the following. If $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \subset \{0, 1\}^d$ is a (k, s, t) -collection and at least one vector x_i has a non-zero j -th coordinate, then any solution $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to (A.3) satisfies

$$y_j \geq \alpha(kd)^{-\beta}.$$

Proof. After possibly permuting the k vectors, we may assume without loss of generality that $[x_i]_j = \mathbb{1}[i \leq m]$ for some $m \geq 1$. Note also that $y \in [0, 1]^d$ else projecting y to $[0, 1]^d$ would improve the objective. Thus

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^m ((1 - y_j)^q + c_i)^{\frac{p}{q}} + \sum_{i=m+1}^k (y_j^q + c_i)^{\frac{p}{q}},$$

where $c_i = \sum_{\ell \neq j}^d |[x_i]_\ell - y_\ell|^q \in [0, d - 1]$ for $i \in [k]$. By the first-order optimality condition on y_j ,

$$(1 - y_j)^{q-1} \sum_{i=1}^m ((1 - y_j)^q + c_i)^{p/q-1} = y_j^{q-1} \sum_{i=m+1}^k (y_j^q + c_i)^{p/q-1}.$$

Re-arranging yields $y_j = a/(a + b)$, where

$$a = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m ((1 - y_j)^q + c_i)^{(p/q-1)} \right)^{1/(q-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \left(\sum_{i=m+1}^k (y_j^q + c_i)^{(p/q-1)} \right)^{1/(q-1)}.$$

Assume without loss of generality that $y_j \leq 1/2$; the other case $y_j \geq 1/2$ is handled by adjusting the constants α and β . Then $a \geq 2^{(q-p)/(q-1)}$, and $b \leq (kd^{(p/q-1)})^{1/(q-1)}$ since $y_i^q + c_j \leq d$. The claim follows by suitably choosing the constants α and β . \square

Lemma A.9. Let $0 \leq t' \leq t \leq T$ for $T \geq 1$.

- If $\gamma \geq 1$, then $t^\gamma - t'^\gamma \geq (t - t')^\gamma$.
- If $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, then $t^\gamma - t'^\gamma \geq \frac{\gamma}{T}(t - t')$.

Proof. The first is by convexity of $t \mapsto t^\gamma$ on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ for $\gamma \geq 1$. The second is because $t^\gamma - (t')^\gamma \geq \gamma(t - t')t^{\gamma-1}$ by concavity of $t \mapsto t^\gamma$ on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ for $\gamma \leq 1$, and then bounding $t^{\gamma-1} \geq T^{\gamma-1} \geq T^{-1}$. \square

Lemma A.10. Let $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty)$. There exist constants $\alpha', \beta' > 0$ that depend only on p and q and satisfy the following. If $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \subset \{0, 1\}^d$ is a (k, s, t) -collection with $s \geq k - 1$ and $t < \binom{k}{2}$, then there exists a $(k, s, t + 1)$ -collection $(x'_1, \dots, x'_k) \subset \{0, 1\}^d$ such that

$$F(x'_1, \dots, x'_k) \leq F(x_1, \dots, x_k) - \Delta,$$

where $\Delta = \alpha'(kd)^{-\beta'}$.

Proof. By $t < \binom{k}{2}$ and item (iii) of Definition A.7, there is a pair of vectors that is supported on disjoint entries. Without loss of generality, these two vectors are x_1 and x_2 . Note that x_1 and x_2 can each share one non-zero entry with at most $k - 2$ other vectors. Since $s \geq k - 1$, item (i) of Definition A.7 implies that each of the vectors x_1, x_2 has a non-zero entry that is zero for every other vector. Thus, after a possible permutation of the d coordinates, we may assume without loss of generality that $[x_1]_i = \mathbb{1}[i = 1]$ and $[x_2]_i = \mathbb{1}[i = 2]$ for all $i \in [k]$.

We construct a $(k, s, t + 1)$ -collection (x'_1, \dots, x'_k) by letting $x'_i = x_i$ for all $j \geq 2$, and setting x'_1 to be x_1 where the first two entries are modified: $[x'_1]_1 = 0$ and $[x'_1]_2 = 1$. It is straightforward to verify that this is a $(k, s, t + 1)$ -collection: (i) each vector x'_i has s non-zeros, (ii) and (iii) the only pairwise correlation that has changed is that now $\langle x'_1, x'_2 \rangle = 1$, whereas before $\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle = 0$, and (iv) only x'_1 and x'_2 are non-zero on coordinate 2.

We now prove that $F(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is larger than $F(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)$ by at least Δ . Let $y \in [0, 1]^d$ be such that $F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y\|_q^p$, and construct $y' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by setting $y'_1 = 0$, $y'_2 = \min(1, ((y_1)^q + (y_2)^q)^{1/q}) \in [0, 1]$, and $y'_i = y_i$ for all $j \geq 3$. Then on one hand,

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y\|_q^p = \underbrace{((1 - y_1)^q + (y_2)^q + c_1)^{\frac{p}{q}}}_{h_1} + \underbrace{((y_1)^q + (1 - y_2)^q + c_2)^{\frac{p}{q}}}_{h_2} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=3}^k ((y_1)^q + (y_2)^q + c_j)^{\frac{p}{q}}}_{h_3}$$

where $c_i = \sum_{j=3}^d |[x_i]_j - y_j|^q \in [0, d - 2]$ for $i \in [k]$. And on the other hand,

$$F(x'_1, \dots, x'_k) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \|x'_i - y'\|_q^p = \underbrace{((1 - y'_2)^q + c_1)^{\frac{p}{q}}}_{h'_1} + \underbrace{((1 - y'_2)^q + c_2)^{\frac{p}{q}}}_{h'_2} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=3}^k ((y'_2)^q + c_i)^{\frac{p}{q}}}_{h'_3}.$$

Therefore it suffices to show that $h'_2 \leq h_2$, $h'_3 \leq h_3$, and $h'_1 \leq h_1 - \Delta$.

To show $h'_2 \leq h_2$, note that $(1 - y'_2)^q \leq (1 - y_2)^q \leq y_1^q + (1 - y_2)^q$ since $y_2 \leq y'_2 \leq 1$. To show $h'_3 \leq h_3$, note that the construction of y' implies $(y'_2)^q \leq (y_1)^q + (y_2)^q$. Finally, to show $h'_1 \leq h_1 - \Delta$, note that $h_1 = t^{p/q}$ and $h'_1 = (t')^{p/q}$ where $t = (1 - y_1)^q + y_2^q + c_1$ and $t' = (1 - y'_2)^q + c_1$. Observe that $0 \leq t' \leq t \leq d$ and in fact $t - t' = (1 - y_1)^q + y_2^q - (1 - y'_2)^q$ because $y_1 \leq y'_2 \leq 1$. Thus by Lemma A.9, we have that $h_1 - h'_1 = t^{p/q} - t'^{p/q}$ is at least y_2^p if $p \geq q$, and at least $(p/qd)y_2^q$ if $p < q$. In either case, this gap is at least inverse polynomially large in k and d by the analogous inverse polynomial lower bound on y_2 in Lemma A.8. Choosing suitable constants α' and β' completes the proof. \square

Lemma A.11. *If (x_1, \dots, x_k) and (x'_1, \dots, x'_k) are both $(k, s, \binom{k}{2})$ -collections, then $F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = F(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)$.*

Proof. By adding padding zeros, we may assume that $x_1, \dots, x_k, x'_1, \dots, x'_k \in \{0, 1\}^d$ for some common dimension d . Observe that to be an $(k, s, \binom{k}{2})$ collection, the k vectors are such that each pair of vectors shares exactly one non-zero entry (on which all other vectors are zero) and otherwise has disjoint support. Thus (x_1, \dots, x_k) equals (x'_1, \dots, x'_k) up to a permutation of the d coordinates and the k vectors. The claim follows since $F(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is invariant with respect to padding zeros, permuting the vectors, and permuting coordinates. \square

With these lemmas in hand, we can prove Proposition A.2 in the case $q \in (1, \infty)$.

Proof of Proposition A.2 for $q \in (1, \infty)$. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a regular graph with n vertices and degree ∂ . Let $\phi : [k] \times [n] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^d$, $d = \binom{k}{2}n^2$ be the embedding in (3.4). Let $x_{i,j} = \phi(i, j)$ for $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [n] \cong V$, and let C denote the corresponding tensor (A.2). Observe that for any $\vec{j} \in [n]^k$, the set $\{x_{i,j_i}\}_{i \in [k]}$ is a $(k, s, t_{\vec{j}})$ -collection for $s = (k-1)\partial$ and $t_{\vec{j}} = |E(j_1, \dots, j_k)|$. Let V^* denote $1/k$ times the value of F applied to a $(k, s, \binom{k}{2})$ collection for $s = (k-1)\partial$; note that V^* is well-defined since it is independent of the specific collection by Lemma A.11.

We claim that depending on whether G contains a k -clique, $\min_{\vec{j}} C_{\vec{j}}$ changes by at least the quantity Δ in Lemma A.10. Indeed, on one hand, if G contains a k -clique, then

$$\min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} C_{\vec{j}} = \frac{1}{k} \min_{\vec{j} \in [n]^k} F\left(\{x_{i,j_i}\}_{i \in [k]}\right) \leq V^*$$

where the first step is by definition of C , and the second is by specializing the minimization to $\vec{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_k)$ which contains the vertices in a k -clique of G (in any order). On the other hand, if G does not have a k -clique, then for all $\vec{j} \in [n]^k$ we have

$$C_{\vec{j}} = \frac{1}{k} F\left(\{x_{i,j_i}\}_{i \in [k]}\right) \geq V^* + \frac{\left(\binom{k}{2} - t_{\vec{j}}\right) \Delta}{k} \geq V^* + \frac{\Delta}{k}$$

by $\binom{k}{2} - t_{\vec{j}} \geq 1$ applications of Lemma A.10 and the definition of V^* .

Therefore, given a regular graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer $k > 0$, we can detect whether G has a k -clique by approximating both $\min_{\vec{j}} C_{\vec{j}}$ and V^* to additive accuracy of $\Delta/(10k)$, say. Since V^* can be approximated in polynomial time via standard convex optimization algorithms, and since $\Delta/(10k)$ scales inverse polynomially in n , k , and d for any fixed p and q , this implies that if one could compute $\min_{\vec{j}} C_{\vec{j}}$ to ε error in $\text{poly}(n, k, d, 1/\varepsilon)$ time, then one could determine if G contains a clique of size k in $\text{poly}(n, k)$ time. But the latter problem is NP-hard by Lemma A.4. \square

A.4 Case $q = \infty$

Here, we prove Proposition A.2 in the case $q = \infty$. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an n -vertex graph and $k > 0$. Consider the following embedding $\phi : [k] \times [n] \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}^d$, where $d = \binom{k}{2}n^2$. The entries of ϕ are indexed by tuples of the form (ℓ, u, ℓ', u') where $\ell < \ell' \in [k]$ and $u, u' \in [n] \cong V$. Set

$$[\phi(i, v)]_{(\ell, u, \ell', u')} = \begin{cases} 0, & (i, v) \notin \{(\ell, u), (\ell', u')\} \\ 1, & (i, v) = (\ell', u') \\ 1, & (i, v) = (\ell, u) \text{ and } (u, u') \in E \\ -1, & (i, v) = (\ell, u) \text{ and } (u, u') \notin E \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

In the following two lemmas, let v_1, \dots, v_k be vertices in V , not necessarily distinct, and denote $x_i = \phi(i, v_i)$ for $i \in [k]$.

Lemma A.12. *If v_1, \dots, v_k form a clique of size k , then*

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_k) \leq k/2^p.$$

Proof. Define $y^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as follows. For $\ell < \ell' \in [k]$ and $u, u' \in [n]$, set

$$[y^*]_{(\ell, u, \ell', u')} = \begin{cases} -1/2, & \text{if } \exists i \in [k] \text{ such that } [x_i]_{(\ell, u, \ell', u')} = -1 \\ 1/2, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Observe that in the first case, $[x'_i]_{(\ell, u, \ell', u')} \in \{-1, 0\}$ for all $i' \in [k]$. Indeed, otherwise $(i', v_{i'}) = (\ell', u')$, which implies that $(v_i, v_{i'}) \notin E$ and thus contradicts the assumption that (v_1, \dots, v_k) is a clique. Observe also that in the second case, $[x_i]_{(j, u, j', u')} \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $i \in [k]$. Thus $\|x_i - y^*\|_\infty \leq 1/2$ for all $i \in [k]$, hence $F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y\|_\infty^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y^*\|_\infty^p \leq k/2^p$. \square

Lemma A.13. *Suppose $n \geq 3$. If v_1, \dots, v_k do not form a clique of size k , then*

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_k) \geq 2 + (k-2)/2^p.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality $(v_1, v_2) \notin E$. We make two observations that hold for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

First, note that $\|x_1 - x_2\|_\infty = 2$ because $[x_1]_{(1, v_1, 2, v_2)} = -1$ and $[x_2]_{(1, v_1, 2, v_2)} = 1$. Thus by Jensen's inequality on the convex function $y \mapsto \|x - y\|_\infty^p$ (Lemma A.3), we have

$$\frac{\|x_1 - y\|_\infty^p + \|x_2 - y\|_\infty^p}{2} \geq \left\| \frac{x_1 - x_2}{2} \right\|_\infty^p = 1^p = 1. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Second, note that $\|x_i - x'_i\|_\infty \geq 1$ for all $i \neq i' \in [k]$ because for $u \in V \setminus \{v_i, v_{i'}\}$, it holds that $[x_i]_{(i, u, i', v_{i'})} = 0$ and $[x'_i]_{(i, u, i', v_{i'})} = 1$. Thus by Jensen's inequality on the convex function $y \mapsto \|x - y\|_\infty^p$ (Lemma A.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=3}^k \|x_i - y\|_\infty^p &= \frac{1}{2(k-3)} \sum_{i \neq i'=3}^k (\|x_i - y\|_\infty^p + \|x'_i - y\|_\infty^p) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{k-3} \sum_{i \neq i'=3}^k \left\| \frac{x_i - x'_i}{2} \right\|_\infty^p \\ &\geq \frac{1}{k-3} \cdot (k-2)(k-3) \cdot \frac{1}{2^p} \\ &= \frac{k-2}{2^p}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Therefore, since (A.14) and (A.15) hold for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we conclude that $F(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \min_y \sum_{i=1}^k \|x_i - y\|_\infty^p \geq 2 + (k-2)/2^p$. \square

Proof of Proposition A.2 for $q = \infty$. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph on n vertices, and let $\phi: [k] \times [n] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^d$, $d = \binom{k}{2} n^2$, be the embedding in (A.13). Let $x_{i,j} = \phi(i, j)$ for $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [n] \cong V$, and let C denote the corresponding tensor (A.2). By Lemmas A.12 and A.13, $\min_j C_j$ differs by at least $(2 - 2^{1-p})/k \geq 1/k$ depending on whether G contains a clique of size k . Thus if one could compute $\min_j C_j$ to additive error $\varepsilon < 1/(2k)$ in $\text{poly}(n, k, d, 1/\varepsilon)$ time, then one could determine if G contains a clique of size k in $\text{poly}(n, k)$ time. But the latter problem is NP-hard [19]. \square