

Faster Counting and Sampling Algorithms using Colorful Decision Oracle

Anup Bhattacharya^{*} Arijit Bishnu[†] Arijit Ghosh[‡] Gopinath Mishra[§]

Abstract

In this work, we consider d -HYPEREDGE ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE SAMPLE problem in a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(U(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}))$ in the query complexity framework, where $U(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of vertices and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of hyperedges. The oracle access to the hypergraph is called COLORFUL INDEPENDENCE ORACLE (CID), which takes d (non-empty) pairwise disjoint subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq U(\mathcal{H})$ as input, and answers whether there exists a hyperedge in \mathcal{H} having (exactly) one vertex in each $A_i, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. The problem of d -HYPEREDGE ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE SAMPLE with CID oracle access is important in its own right as a combinatorial problem. Also, Dell *et al.* [SODA '20] established that *decision vs counting* complexities of a number of combinatorial optimization problems can be abstracted out as d -HYPEREDGE ESTIMATION problems with a CID oracle access.

The main technical contribution of the paper is an algorithm that estimates $m = |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})|$ with \hat{m} such that

$$\frac{1}{C_d \log^{d-1} n} \leq \frac{\hat{m}}{m} \leq C_d \log^{d-1} n.$$

by using at most $C_d \log^{d+2} n$ many CID queries, where n denotes the number of vertices in the hypergraph \mathcal{H} and C_d is a constant that depends only on d . Our result coupled with the framework of Dell *et al.* [SODA '21] implies improved bounds for the following fundamental problems:

Edge Estimation using the BIPARTITE INDEPENDENT SET (BIS). We improve the bound obtained by Beame *et al.* [ITCS '18, TALG '20].

Triangle Estimation using the TRIPARTITE INDEPENDENT SET (TIS). The previous best bound for the case of graphs with low *co-degree* (Co-degree for an edge in the graph is the number of triangles incident to that edge in the graph) was due to Bhattacharya *et al.* [ISAAC '19, TOCS '21], and Dell *et al.*'s result gives the best bound for the case of general graphs [SODA '21]. We improve both of these bounds.

^{*}National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India

[†]Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

[‡]Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

[§]University of Warwick, UK

Hyperedge Estimation & Sampling using COLORFUL INDEPENDENCE ORACLE (CID). We give an improvement over the bounds obtained by Dell *et al.* [SODA '21].

1 Introduction

Estimating different combinatorial structures like edges, triangles and cliques in an unknown graph that can be accessed only through *query oracles* is a fundamental area of research in *sublinear algorithms* [Fei06, GR08, ELRS17, ERS20]. Different query oracles provide unique ways of looking at the same graph. Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18] introduced an independent set based subset query oracle, named BIPARTITE INDEPENDENT SET (BIS) query, to estimate the number of edges in a graph using polylogarithmic queries. The BIS query answers a YES/NO question on the existence of an edge between two disjoint subsets of vertices of a graph G . The next natural questions in this line of research were problems of estimation and uniform sampling of hyperedges in hypergraphs [DLM20, BBGM19, BBGM21]. In this paper, we will be focusing on these two fundamental questions, and in doing so, we will improve all the previous results [BHR⁺20, DLM20, BBGM19, BBGM21].

1.1 Our query oracle, results and the context

A hypergraph \mathcal{H} is a *set system* $(U(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}))$, where $U(\mathcal{H})$ denotes a set of n vertices and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$, a set of subsets of $U(\mathcal{H})$, denotes the set of hyperedges. A hypergraph \mathcal{H} is said to be *d -uniform* if every hyperedge in \mathcal{H} consists of exactly d vertices. The cardinality of the hyperedge set is denoted as $m(\mathcal{H}) = |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})|$. We will access the hypergraph using the following oracle* [BGK⁺18].

Definition 1.1 (Colorful Independent Set (CID)). Given d pairwise disjoint subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq U(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} as input, CID query answers YES if and only if $m(A_1, \dots, A_d) \neq 0$, where $m(A_1, \dots, A_d)$ denotes the number of hyperedges in \mathcal{H} having exactly one vertex in each A_i , where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$.

Note that the earlier mentioned BIS is a special case of CID when $d = 2$. With this query oracle access, we solve the following two problems.

d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION

Input: Vertex set $U(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} with n vertices, a CID oracle access to \mathcal{H} , and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Output: A $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -approximation \hat{m} to $m(\mathcal{H})$ with probability $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$.

Note that EDGE ESTIMATION problem is a special case of d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION when $d = 2$.

*In [BGK⁺18], the oracle is named as GENERALIZED PARTITE INDEPENDENT SET oracle. Here, we follow the same suit as Dell *et al.* [DLM20] with respect to the name of the oracle.

d-HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE

Input: Vertex set $U(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} with n vertices, a CID oracle access to \mathcal{H} , and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Output: With probability $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$, report a sample from a distribution of hyperedges in \mathcal{H} such that the probability that any particular hyperedge is sampled lies in the interval $[(1 - \varepsilon)\frac{1}{m}, (1 + \varepsilon)\frac{1}{m}]$.

This area started with the investigation of EDGE ESTIMATION problem by Dell and Lapinskas [DL18, DL21] and Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18], then Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] studied *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION for $d = 3$, and more recently Dell *et al.* [DLM20] gave algorithms for *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and *d*-HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE for general d . Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18] showed that EDGE ESTIMATION problem can be solved using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log^{14} n}{\varepsilon^4}\right)$ BIS queries. Having estimated the number of edges in a graph using BIS queries, a very natural question was to estimate the number of hyperedges in a hypergraph using an appropriate query oracle. This extension is nontrivial as two edges in a graph can intersect in at most one vertex but the intersection pattern between two hyperedges in a hypergraph is more complicated. As a first step towards resolving this question, Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] considered *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION in 3-uniform hypergraphs using CID queries. They showed that when *co-degree* of any pair of vertices in a 3-uniform hypergraph is bounded above by Δ , then one can solve *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Delta^2 \log^{18} n}{\varepsilon^4}\right)$ CID queries. Recall that co-degree of two vertices in a hypergraph is the number of hyperedges that contain both vertices. Dell *et al.* [DLM20] generalized the results of Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18] and Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21], and obtained a similar (with an improved dependency in terms of ε) result for the *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION problem for general d . Apart from *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION problem, they also considered the problem of *d*-HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE. The results of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] are formally stated in the following proposition:

Proposition 1.2 (Dell et al. [DLM20]). *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and *d*-HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE can be solved by using $\mathcal{O}_d\left(\frac{\log^{4d+8} n}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}_d\left(\frac{\log^{4d+12} n}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ CID queries, respectively. [†]

Currently, the best known bound (prior to this work) for solving *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION problem, for general d , is due to Dell *et al.* [DLM20], but note that for constant $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18, BHR⁺20] still have the best bound for the EDGE ESTIMATION problem.

[†]Dell *et al.* [DLM20] studied *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and *d*-HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE where the probability of success is $1 - \delta$ for some given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and have showed that *d*-HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and *d*-HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE can be solved by using $\mathcal{O}_d\left(\frac{\log^{4d+7} n}{\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}_d\left(\frac{\log^{4d+11} n}{\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$ CID queries, respectively. In Proposition 1.2, we have taken $\delta = n^{\mathcal{O}(d)}$. But both the results of Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18, BHR⁺20] and Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] are in the high probability regime.

In this paper, we work with success probability to be $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$ for simplicity of presentation and compare our results with all previous results in a high probability regime.

Our main result is an improved *coarse estimation* technique, named ROUGH ESTIMATION, and is stated in the following theorem. The significance of the coarse estimation technique will be discussed in Section 1.2.

Theorem 1.3 (Main result). *There exists an algorithm ROUGH ESTIMATION that has CID query access to a d -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$ and returns \hat{m} as an estimate for $m = |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})|$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_d \log^{d-1} n} \leq \frac{\hat{m}}{m} \leq C_d \log^{d-1} n$$

with probability at least $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$ using at most $C_d \log^{d+2} n$ CID queries, where C_d is a constant that depends only on d and n denotes the number of vertices in \mathcal{H} .

Coarse estimation gives a crude polylogarithmic approximation for m , the number of hyperedges in \mathcal{H} . This improvement in the coarse estimation algorithm coupled with *importance sampling* and the algorithmic framework of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] gives an improved algorithm for both d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE problems.

Theorem 1.4 (Improved bounds for estimating and sampling). *d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE problems can be solved by using $\mathcal{O}_d\left(\frac{\log^{3d+5} n}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}_d\left(\frac{\log^{3d+9} n}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ CID queries, respectively.*

The details regarding how Theorem 1.3 can be used together with the framework of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] to prove Theorem 1.4 will be discussed in Section 5.

Using Theorem 1.4, we directly get the following improved bounds for EDGE ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION in 3-uniform hypergraph by substituting $d = 2$ and $d = 3$, respectively.

Corollary 1.5. (a) *EDGE ESTIMATION can be solved using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log^{11} n}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ queries to BIPARTITE INDEPENDENT SET (BIS) oracle.*

(b) *d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION in a 3-uniform hypergraph can be solved using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log^{14} n}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ CID queries.*

The above corollary gives the best bound (till now) for the EDGE ESTIMATION. Recall that Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] proved that when the co-degree of a 3-uniform graph is bounded by Δ then d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION in that hypergraph can be solved using $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Delta^2 \log^{18} n}{\varepsilon^4}\right)$ CID queries. For fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\Delta = o(\log n)$ the bound obtained by Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] is asymptotically better than the bound we get from Dell *et al.* [DLM20], see Proposition 1.2. Note that Corollary 1.5 (b) improves the bounds obtained by Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] and Dell *et al.* [DLM20] for all values of Δ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

1.2 Fundamental role of coarse estimation

The framework of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] is inspired by the following observation. Let us consider $t = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$ independent subhypergraphs each induced by $n/2$ uniform random vertices. The probability, that a particular hyperedge is present in a subhypergraph induced by $n/2$ many uniform random vertices, is $\frac{1}{2^d}$. Denoting X as the sum of the numbers of the hyperedges present in the t subhypergraphs, observe that $\frac{2^d}{t}X$ is a $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -approximation of m . If we repeat the procedure recursively $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ times, then all the subhypergraphs will have a bounded number of vertices in terms of d , at which point the number of hyperedges can be determined exactly by using $\mathcal{O}_d(1)$ CID queries. However, the number of induced subhypergraphs in the worst case can become as *large* as $\Omega((\log n)^{\log n})$.

To have the number of subhypergraphs bounded at all point of time, they use *importance sampling*. It is about maintaining the weighted sum of some variables whose approximate value is known to us. The output will be a bounded number of variables and some weight parameters such that the weighted sum of the variables estimates the required sum. The objective of the importance sampling procedure in Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18, BHR⁺20] and Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21], are also the same [‡]. However, Dell *et al.* improved the importance sampling result by the use of a particular form of Bernstein inequality and by a very careful analysis.

To apply importance sampling, it is required to have a rough estimate (possibly with a polylogarithmic approximation factor) of the number of hyperedges in each subhypergraph that are currently present for processing – this is what exactly coarse estimation does. The objective of coarse estimation in Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18, BHR⁺20] and Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] are also the same [§]. But all these frameworks have a commonality. The approximation guarantee and the query complexity of the coarse estimation has a direct bearing on the query complexity of the final algorithm.

Therefore, any improvement in the coarse estimation algorithm will directly improve the query complexities of d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE. In this paper, we focus on improving the coarse estimation algorithm.

1.3 Setup and notations

We denote the sets $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\{0, \dots, n\}$ by $[n]$ and $[n^*]$, respectively. A hypergraph \mathcal{H} is a *set system* $(U(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}))$, where $U(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of vertices and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of hyperedges. The set of vertices present in a hyperedge $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is denoted by $U(F)$ or simply

[‡]In fact, Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] directly use the importance sampling developed by Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18, BHR⁺20]

[§]Note that the main merit of the framework of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] over Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18, BHR⁺20] and Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21] is not only that it generalized to hypergraph, but also the dependence on ε is $1/\varepsilon^2$ in Dell *et al.* [DLM20]'s work as opposed to $\frac{1}{\varepsilon^4}$ in Beame *et al.* [BHR⁺18, BHR⁺20] and Bhattacharya *et al.* [BBGM19, BBGM21].

F. A hypergraph \mathcal{H} is said to be d -uniform if all the hyperedges in \mathcal{H} consist of exactly d vertices. The cardinality of the hyperedge set is $m(\mathcal{H}) = |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})|$. For $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq U(\mathcal{H})$ (not necessarily pairwise disjoint), $\mathcal{F}(A_1, \dots, A_d) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of hyperedges having a vertex in each A_i , and $m(A_1, \dots, A_d)$ is the number of hyperedges in $|\mathcal{F}(A_1, \dots, A_d)|$.

Let $\mathbb{E}[X]$ and $\mathbb{V}[X]$ denote the expectation and variance of the random variable X . For an event \mathcal{E} , the complement of \mathcal{E} is denoted by $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$. The statement “ a is a $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -approximation of b ” means $|b - a| \leq \varepsilon \cdot b$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\exp(x)$ denotes the standard exponential function e^x . In this paper, d is a constant, and $\mathcal{O}_d(\cdot)$ and $\Omega_d(\cdot)$ denote the standard $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ and $\Omega(\cdot)$, where the constant depends only on d . We use $\log^k n$ to denote $(\log n)^k$. By polylogarithmic, we mean $\mathcal{O}_d\left(\frac{\log^{\mathcal{O}(d)} n}{\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)}}\right)$ in this paper.

1.4 Paper organization

In Section 2, we describe the notion of an *ordered hyperedge*, and define three other query oracles that can be simulated by using $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ CID queries. The role of ordered hyperedges and these oracles are mostly expository purposes, i.e., they help us to describe our algorithms and the calculations more neatly. Section 3 gives a brief overview of the proof of our main technical result. In Section 4 we give the proof of our main result (Theorem 1.3). We describe in Section 5 implications of our main result and how Theorem 1.3 can be used to prove Theorem 1.4. The equivalence proofs of the CID oracle and its variants are discussed in Section 2. Some useful probability results are given in Appendix A. Since we use different types of oracles in the calculations, we have recalled all their definitions in Appendix B for the ease of reference.

2 Preliminaries: Ordered hyperedges, CID oracle, and its variants

Ordered hyperedges We will use the subscript “ o ” to denote the set of ordered hyperedges. For example, $\mathcal{H}_o(U, \mathcal{F}_o)$ denotes the ordered hypergraph corresponding to $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$. Here $\mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of ordered hyperedges that contains $d!$ ordered d -tuples for each hyperedge in $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$. Let $m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)$ denotes $|\mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}_o)|$. Note that $m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) = d!m(\mathcal{H})$. Also, let $\mathcal{F}_o(A_1, \dots, A_d)$ denotes the set $\{F_o \in \mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}) : \text{the } i\text{-th vertex of } F_o \text{ is in } A_i, \forall i \in [d]\}$. The corresponding number for ordered hyperedges is $m_o(A_1, \dots, A_d)$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_o(U(\mathcal{H}), \dots, U(\mathcal{H})) = \mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H})$.

CID oracle and its variants Note that the CID query takes as input d pairwise disjoint subsets of vertices. We now define two related query oracles CID₁ and CID₂ that remove the disjointness requirements for the input. Then we extend CID₂ to the ordered setting. We show that both query oracles can be simulated, with high probability, by making $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ queries to the CID oracle. The oracles CID₁ and CID₂ will be used in the description of the algorithm for ease of exposition.

CID₁: Given s pairwise disjoint subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_s \subseteq U(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} and

$a_1, \dots, a_s \in [d]$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^s a_i = d$, CID₁ query on input $A_1^{[a_1]}, A_2^{[a_2]}, \dots, A_s^{[a_s]}$ answers YES if and only if $m(A_1^{[a_1]}, \dots, A_s^{[a_s]}) \neq 0$. Here $A^{[a]}$ denotes the set A repeated a times.

CID₂: Given any d subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq U(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} , CID₂ query on input A_1, \dots, A_d answers YES if and only if $m(A_1, \dots, A_d) \neq 0$.

CID₂^o: Given any d subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq U(\mathcal{H}_o)$ of an ordered hypergraph \mathcal{H}_o , CID₂^o query on input A_1, \dots, A_d answers YES if and only if $m_o(A_1, \dots, A_d) \neq 0$.

Observe that the CID₂ query is the same as the CID query without the requirement that the input sets are disjoint. For the CID₁ query, multiple repetitions of the same set is allowed in the input. It is obvious that a CID query can be simulated by a CID₁ or CID₂ query. Also, CID₂^o is the ordered analogue of CID₂. Using the following observation, we show how a CID₂^o, CID₁, or a CID₂ query can be simulated by a polylogarithmic number of CID queries.

Observation 2.1 (Connection between query oracles). Let $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$ denote a hypergraph and $\mathcal{H}_o(U, \mathcal{F}_o)$ denote the corresponding ordered hypergraph.

- (i) A CID₁ query to $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$ can be simulated using $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ CID queries with probability $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$.
- (ii) A CID₂ query $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$ can be simulated using $\mathcal{O}_d(1)$ CID₁ queries.
- (iii) A CID₂ query $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$ can be simulated using $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ CID queries with probability $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$.
- (iv) A CID₂^o query to $\mathcal{H}_o(U, \mathcal{F}_o)$ can be simulated using a CID₂ query to $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$.

Proof. (i) Let the input of CID₁ query be $A_1^{[a_1]}, \dots, A_s^{[a_s]}$ such that $a_i \in [d] \forall i \in [s]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^s a_i = d$.

We partition each A_i randomly into a_i parts B_i^j for $j \in [a_i]$. We make a CID query with input $B_1^1, \dots, B_1^{a_1}, \dots, B_s^1, \dots, B_s^{a_s}$. Note that

$$\mathcal{F}(B_1^1, \dots, B_1^{a_1}, \dots, B_s^1, \dots, B_s^{a_s}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(A_1^{[a_1]}, \dots, A_s^{[a_s]}).$$

So, if CID₁ outputs ‘No’ to query $A_1^{[a_1]}, \dots, A_s^{[a_s]}$, then the above CID query will also report ‘No’ as its answer. If CID₁ answers ‘YES’, then consider a particular hyperedge

$F \in \mathcal{F}(A_1^{[a_1]}, \dots, A_s^{[a_s]})$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\text{CID oracle answers 'YES'}) \\
& \geq \mathbb{P}(F \text{ is present in } \mathcal{F}(B_1^1, \dots, B_1^{a_1}, \dots, B_s^1, \dots, B_s^{a_s})) \\
& \geq \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{1}{a_i^{a_i}} \\
& \geq \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{1}{d^{a_i}} \quad (\because a_i \leq d \text{ for all } i \in [d]) \\
& = \frac{1}{d^d} \quad (\because \sum_{i=1}^s a_i = d)
\end{aligned}$$

We can boost up the success probability arbitrarily by repeating the above procedure polylogarithmic times.

- (ii) Let the input to CID_2 query be A_1, \dots, A_d . Let us partition each set A_i into at most $2^{d-1} - 1$ subsets depending on A_i 's intersection with A_j 's for $j \neq i$. Let \mathcal{P}_i denote the corresponding partition of A_i , $i \in [d]$. Observe that for any $i \neq j$, if we take any $B_i \in \mathcal{P}_i$ and $B_j \in \mathcal{P}_j$, then either $B_i = B_j$ or $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$.

For each $(B_1, \dots, B_d) \in \mathcal{P}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_d$, we make a CID_1 query with input (B_1, \dots, B_d) . Total number of such CID_1 queries is at most $2^{\mathcal{O}(d^2)}$, and we report 'YES' to the CID_2 query if and only if at least one CID_1 query, out of the $2^{\mathcal{O}(d^2)}$ queries, reports 'YES'.

- (iii) It follows from (i) and (ii). □

3 Overview of the main structural result

To prove Theorem 1.3, we first consider Lemma 3.1, which is the central result of the paper and is the ordered hypergraph analogue of Theorem 1.3. The main theorem (Theorem 1.3) follows from Lemma 3.1 along with Observation 2.1.

Lemma 3.1 (Main Lemma). *There exists an algorithm `ROUGH ESTIMATION` that has CID_2^o query access to a d -uniform ordered hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_o(U, \mathcal{F}_o)$ corresponding to hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$ and returns \widehat{m}_o as an estimate for $m_o = |\mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}_o)|$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_d \log^{d-1} n} \leq \frac{\widehat{m}}{m} \leq C_d \log^{d-1} n$$

with probability at least $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$ using at most $C_d \log^{d+1} n$ CID_2^o queries, where C_d is a constant that depends only on d .

At a high level, the idea for an improved coarse estimation involves a recursive bucketing technique and careful analysis of the intersection pattern of hypergraphs.

To build up towards the final proof, we need to prove Lemma 3.1. Towards this end, we first define some quantities and prove Claim 3.2. For that, let us think of partitioning the vertex set in $U_1 = U(\mathcal{H})$ into buckets such that the vertices in each bucket appear as the first vertex in approximately the same number of hyperedges. So, there will be at most $d \log n + 1$ buckets. It can be shown that there is a bucket $Z_1 \subseteq U_1$ such that the number of hyperedges, having the vertices in the bucket as the first vertex, is at least $\frac{m_o}{d \log n + 1}$. For each vertex $z_1 \in Z_1$, let the number of hyperedges in \mathcal{H}_o , having z_1 as the first vertex, lie between 2^{q_1} and $2^{q_1+1} - 1$ for some suitable q_1 . Then we can argue that

$$|Z_1| \geq \frac{m_o}{2^{q_1+1}(d \log n + 1)}.$$

Similarly, we extend the bucketing idea to tuples as follows. Consider a vertex a_1 in a particular bucket of U_1 and consider all the ordered hyperedges in $\mathcal{F}_o(a_1)$ containing a_1 as the first vertex. We can bucket the vertices in $U_2 = U(\mathcal{H})$ such that the vertices in each bucket of U_2 are present in approximately the same number of hyperedges in $\mathcal{F}_o(a_1)$ as the second vertex. We generalize the above bucketing strategy with the vertices in U_i 's, which is formally described below. Notice that this way of bucketing will allow us to use conditionals on sampling vertices from the desired buckets of U_i 's.

For $q_1 \in [(d \log n)^*]$, let $U_1(q_1) \subseteq U_1$ be the set of vertices in $a_1 \in U_1$ such that for each $a_1 \in U_1(q_1)$, the number of hyperedges in $\mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}_o)$, containing a_1 as the first vertex, lies between 2^{q_1} and $2^{q_1+1} - 1$. For $2 \leq i \leq d - 1$, and $q_j \in [(d \log n)^*]$ for each $j \in [i - 1]$, consider $a_1 \in U_1(q_1), a_2 \in U_2((q_1, a_1), q_2), \dots, a_{i-1} \in U_{i-1}((q_1, a_1), \dots, (q_{i-2}, a_{i-2}), q_{i-1})$. Let $U_i((q_1, a_1), \dots, (q_{i-1}, a_{i-1}), q_i)$ be the set of vertices in U_i such that for each $u_i \in U_i((q_1, a_1), \dots, (q_{i-1}, a_{i-1}), q_i)$, the number of ordered hyperedges in $\mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}_o)$, containing u_j as the j -th vertex for all $j \in [i]$, lies between 2^{q_i} and $2^{q_i+1} - 1$. We need the following result to proceed further. For ease of presentation, we use (Q_i, A_i) to denote $(q_1, a_1), \dots, (q_{i-1}, a_{i-1})$ for $2 \leq i \leq d - 1$. Informally, Claim 3.2 says that for each $i \in [d - 1]$, there exists a bucket in U_i having a *large* number of vertices contributing approximately the same number of hyperedges..

Claim 3.2. (i) *There exists $q_1 \in [(d \log n)^*]$ such that*

$$|U_1(q_1)| > \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{2^{q_1+1}(d \log n + 1)}.$$

(ii) *Let $2 \leq i \leq d - 1$ and $q_j \in [(d \log n)^*] \forall j \in [i - 1]$. Let $a_1 \in U_1(q_1), a_j \in U_j((Q_{j-1}, A_{j-1}), q_j) \forall j \neq 1$ and $j < i$. There exists $q_i \in [(d \log n)^*]$ such that*

$$|U_i((Q_i, A_i), q_i)| > \frac{2^{q_{i-1}}}{2^{q_i+1}(d \log n + 1)}.$$

Proof. (i) Observe that $m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) = \sum_{q_1=0}^{d \log n} m_o(U_1(q_1), U_2, \dots, U_d)$. So, there exists $q_1 \in [(d \log n)^*]$ such that $m_o(U_1(q_1), U_2, \dots, U_d) \geq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{d \log n + 1}$. From the definition of $U_1(q_1)$, $m_o(U_1(q_1), U_2, \dots, U_d) < |U_1(q_1)| \cdot 2^{q_1+1}$. Hence, there exists $q_1 \in [(d \log n)^*]$ such that

$$|U_1(q_1)| > \frac{m_o(U_1(q_1), U_2, \dots, U_d)}{2^{q_1+1}} \geq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{2^{q_1+1}(d \log n + 1)}.$$

(ii) Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & m_o(\{a_1\}, \dots, \{a_{i-1}\}, U_i, \dots, U_d) \\ = & \sum_{q_i=0}^{d \log n} m_o(\{a_1\}, \dots, \{a_{i-1}\}, U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_{i-1}), q_i), \dots, U_d). \end{aligned}$$

So, there exists $q_i \in [(d \log n)^*]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & m_o(\{a_1\}, \dots, \{a_{i-1}\}, U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_{i-1}), q_i), \dots, U_d) \\ & \geq \frac{m_o(\{a_1\}, \dots, \{a_{i-1}\}, U_i, \dots, U_d)}{d \log n + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of $U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_{i-1}), q_i)$, we have

$$m_o(\{a_1\}, \dots, \{a_{i-1}\}, U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_{i-1}), q_i), \dots, U_d) < |U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_i), q_i)| \cdot 2^{q_i+1}$$

Hence, there exists $q_i \in [(d \log n)^*]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_i), q_i)| & > \frac{m_o(\{a_1\}, \dots, \{a_{i-1}\}, U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_{i-1}), q_i), \dots, U_d)}{2^{q_i+1}} \\ & \geq \frac{m_o(\{a_1\}, \dots, \{a_{i-1}\}, U_i, \dots, U_d)}{2^{q_i+1}(d \log n + 1)} \\ & \geq \frac{2^{q_i-1}}{2^{q_i+1}(d \log n + 1)} \end{aligned}$$

□

From Claim 3.2, it follows that there exists $(q_1, \dots, q_{d-1}) \in [(d \log n)^*]^{d-1}$ such that $|U_1(q_1)| > \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{2^{q_1+1}(d \log n + 1)}$ and $|U_i((Q_i, A_i), q_i)| > \frac{2^{q_i-1}}{2^{q_i+1}(d \log n + 1)}$. So, if we sample each vertex in U_1 with probability $p_1 = \min\{\frac{2^{q_1}}{m_o}, 1\}$ independently to generate B_1 , each vertex of U_i ($2 \leq i \leq d-1$) with probability $p_i = \min\{2^{q_i-j_i-1} \cdot d \log n, 1\}$ independently to generate B_i , and each vertex in U_d with probability $\min\{2^{-q_d-1}, 1\}$ to generate B_d , then we can show that $\mathcal{F}_o(B_1, \dots, B_d)$ is nonempty with probability at least $\prod_{i=1}^d p_i \geq \frac{1}{2^d}$. The success probability $\frac{1}{2^d}$ can be amplified by repeating the procedure suitable number of times. So, if we consider all possible $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d-1} n)$ guesses for (q_1, \dots, q_{d-1}) , we have that there exists a guess for which $\mathcal{F}_o(B_1, \dots, B_d)$ is nonempty,

that is $m_o(B_1, \dots, B_d) \neq 0$, and that can be determined by a CID_2^o query. In total, there will be $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d-1} n)$ CID_2^o queries.

However, the sampling probability p_1 to sample the vertices from U_1 depends on m_o . But we do not know m_o . Observe that the above procedure works even if we know any lower bound on m_o . So, the idea is to consider geometrically decreasing guesses for m_o starting from $m_o = n^d$, and call the above procedure for the guesses until the CID_2^o query corresponding to the guess $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ for m_o reports that $m_o(B_1, \dots, B_d) \neq 0$. We will be able to achieve the desired result by showing that, for any guess at least a polylogarithmic factor more than the correct m_o , the corresponding CID_2^o queries over the samples report $m_o(B_1, \dots, B_d) \neq 0$ with probability at most $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{2^d})$. The success probability of $1 - \Omega(\frac{1}{2^d})$ can be amplified by repeating the procedure suitable number of times for each guess. In the next section, we formalize the discussion in this section.

4 Proof of Lemma 3.1

We now prove Lemma 3.1 formally. The algorithm corresponding to Lemma 3.1 is Algorithm 2 (named `ROUGH ESTIMATION`). Algorithm 1 (named `VERIFY-ESTIMATE`) is a subroutine of Algorithm 2. Algorithm 1 determines whether a given estimate $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ of the number of ordered hyperedges is correct up to $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{2d-3} n)$ factor. Lemma 4.1 and 4.2 are intermediate results needed to prove Lemma 3.1; they bound the probability from above and below, respectively of `VERIFY-ESTIMATE` accepting the estimate $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$.

Lemma 4.1. *If $\widehat{\mathcal{R}} \geq 20d^{2d-3}4^d m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) \log^{2d-3} n$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{VERIFY-ESTIMATE}(\mathcal{H}_o, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}) \text{ accepts the estimate } \widehat{\mathcal{R}}) \leq \frac{1}{20 \cdot 2^d}.$$

Algorithm 1: VERIFY-ESTIMATE ($\mathcal{H}_o, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}$)

Input: CID query access to a d -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_o(U, \mathcal{F})$ and a guess $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ for the number of hyperedges in \mathcal{H}_o .

Output: ACCEPT $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ or REJECT $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$.

```
1 Let
2    $U_1 = \dots = U_d = U(\mathcal{H})$  for ( $j_1 = d \log n$  to 0) do
3   | find  $B_1 \subseteq U_1$  by sampling every element of  $U_1$  with probability  $p_1 = \min \left\{ \frac{2^{j_1}}{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}}, 1 \right\}$ 
   | independently of other elements.
4   | for ( $j_2 = d \log n$  to 0) do
5   | | find  $B_2 \subseteq U_2$  by sampling every element of  $U_2$  with probability
   | |  $p_2 = \min \{ 2^{j_2 - j_1} \cdot d \log n, 1 \}$  independently of other elements.
6   | |  $\vdots$ 
7   | | for ( $j_{d-1} = d \log n$  to 0) do
8   | | | find  $B_{d-1} \subseteq U_{d-1}$  by sampling every element of  $U_{d-1}$  with probability
   | | |  $p_{d-1} = \min \{ 2^{j_{d-1} - j_{d-2}} \cdot d \log n, 1 \}$  independently of other elements.
9   | | | Let  $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{d-1}) \in [(d \log n)^*]^{d-1}$ 
10  | | | Let  $p(i, \mathbf{j}) = p_i$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ 
11  | | | Let  $B(i, \mathbf{j}) = B_i$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ 
12  | | | find  $B(d, \mathbf{j}) = B_d \subseteq U_d$  by sampling every element of  $U_d$  with probability
   | | |  $p_d = \min \{ 2^{-j_{d-1}}, 1 \}$  independently of other elements.
13  | | | if ( $m_o(B_{1,\mathbf{j}}, \dots, B_{d,\mathbf{j}}) \neq 0$ ) then
14  | | | | ACCEPT /*[Note that CID2o query is called in the above line.]*/
15  | | | end
16  | | end
17  | end
18 end
19 REJECT
```

Proof. Consider the set of ordered hyperedges $\mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}_o)$ in \mathcal{H}_o . Algorithm VERIFY-ESTIMATE taking parameters \mathcal{H}_o , and $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ and described in Algorithm 1, loops over all possible $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{d-1}) \in [(d \log n)^*]^{d-1}$ [¶]. For each $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_{d-1}) \in [(d \log n)^*]^{d-1}$, VERIFY-ESTIMATE ($\mathcal{H}_o, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}$) samples vertices in each U_i with suitable probability values $p(i, \mathbf{j})$, depending on \mathbf{j} , $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$, d and $\log n$, to generate the sets $B_{i,\mathbf{j}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. See Algorithm 1 for the exact values of $p(i, \mathbf{j})$'s. VERIFY-ESTIMATE ($\mathcal{H}_o, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}$) reports ACCEPT if there exists one $\mathbf{j} \in [(d \log n)^*]^{d-1}$ such that $m_o(B_{1,\mathbf{j}}, \dots, B_{d,\mathbf{j}}) \neq 0$. Otherwise, REJECT is reported by VERIFY-ESTIMATE ($\mathcal{H}_o, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}$).

[¶]Recall that $[n]^*$ denotes the set $\{0, \dots, n\}$.

For an ordered hyperedge $F_o \in \mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}_o) = \mathcal{F}_o(U_1, \dots, U_d)$ and $\mathbf{j} \in [(d \log n)^*]^{d-1}$. Note that

$$U_1 = \dots = U_d = U(\mathcal{H}).$$

Let $X_{F_o}^{\mathbf{j}}$ denote the indicator random variable such that $X_{F_o}^{\mathbf{j}} = 1$ if and only if $F_o \in \mathcal{F}_o(B_{1,\mathbf{j}}, \dots, B_{d,\mathbf{j}})$.

Let

$$X_{\mathbf{j}} = \sum_{F_o \in \mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}_o)} X_{F_o}^{\mathbf{j}}.$$

Note that $m_o(B_{1,\mathbf{j}}, \dots, B_{d,\mathbf{j}}) = X_{\mathbf{j}}$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_{F_o}^{\mathbf{j}} = 1) &= \prod_{i=1}^d (p(i, \mathbf{j})) \\ &\leq \frac{2^{j_1}}{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}} \cdot \frac{2^{j_2}}{2^{j_1}} d \log n \times \dots \times \frac{2^{j_{d-1}}}{2^{j_{d-2}}} d \log n \times \frac{1}{2^{j_{d-1}}} \\ &= \frac{d^{d-2} \log^{d-2} n}{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}} \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{\mathbf{j}}] \leq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}} d^{d-2} \log^{d-2} n,$$

and since $X_{\mathbf{j}} \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{\mathbf{j}} \neq 0) = \mathbb{P}(X_{\mathbf{j}} \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}[X_{\mathbf{j}}] \leq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}} d^{d-2} \log^{d-2} n.$$

Now, using the fact that $\widehat{\mathcal{R}} \geq 20d^{2d-3} \cdot 4^d \cdot m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) \log^{2d-3} n$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{\mathbf{j}} \neq 0) \leq \frac{1}{20d^{d-1} \cdot 4^d \cdot \log^{d-1} n}.$$

Recall that VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts if and only if there exists \mathbf{j} such that $X_{\mathbf{j}} \neq 0$ [‡]. Using the union bound, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\text{VERIFY-ESTIMATE}(\mathcal{H}_o, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}) \text{ accepts the estimate } \widehat{R}\right) &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in [(d \log n)^*]^{d-1}} \mathbb{P}(X_{\mathbf{j}} \neq 0) \\ &\leq \frac{(d \log n + 1)^{d-1}}{20 \cdot 4^d \cdot (d \log n)^{d-1}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{20 \cdot 2^d}. \end{aligned}$$

□

[‡]Note that \mathbf{j} is a vector but $X_{\mathbf{j}}$ is a scalar.

Lemma 4.2. *If $\widehat{\mathcal{R}} \leq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{4d \log n}$, $\mathbb{P}(\text{VERIFY-ESTIMATE}(\mathcal{H}_o, \widehat{\mathcal{R}})$ accepts the estimate $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}) \geq \frac{1}{2^d}$.*

Proof. We will be done by showing the following. VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts with probability at least $1/5$ when the loop variables j_1, \dots, j_{d-1} respectively attain values q_1, \dots, q_{d-1} such that

$$|U_1(q_1)| > \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{2^{q_1+1}(d \log n + 1)}$$

and

$$|U_i((Q_i, A_i), q_i)| > \frac{2^{q_i-1}}{2^{q_i+1}(d \log n + 1)}$$

for all $i \in [d-1] \setminus \{1\}$. The existence of such j_i s is evident from Claim 3.2. Let $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_{d-1})$. Recall that $B_{i,\mathbf{q}} \subseteq U_i$ is the sample obtained when the loop variables j_1, \dots, j_{d-1} attain values q_1, \dots, q_{d-1} , respectively. Let $\mathcal{E}_i, i \in [d-1]$, be the events defined as follows.

- $\mathcal{E}_1 : U_1(q_1) \cap B_{1,\mathbf{q}} \neq \emptyset$.
- $\mathcal{E}_i : U_j((Q_{j-1}, A_{j-1}), q_j) \cap B_{j,\mathbf{q}} \neq \emptyset$, where $2 \leq i \leq d-1$.

As noted earlier, Claim 3.2 says that for each $i \in [d-1]$, there exists a bucket in U_i having a *large* number of vertices contributing approximately the same number of hyperedges. The above events correspond to the nonempty intersection of vertices in heavy buckets corresponding to U_i and the sampled vertices $B_{i,\mathbf{j}}$, where $i \in [d-1]$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{E}}_1) &\leq \left(1 - \frac{2^{q_1}}{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}}\right)^{|U_1(q_1)|} \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{2^{q_1}}{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}} |U_1(q_1)|\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{2^{q_1}}{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}} \cdot \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{2^{q_1+1}(d \log n + 1)}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-1). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality uses the fact that $\widehat{\mathcal{R}} \leq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{4d \log n}$, from the condition of the lemma. Assume that \mathcal{E}_1 occurs and $a_1 \in U_1(q_1) \cap B_{1,\mathbf{q}}$. We will bound the probability that $U_2(Q_1, A_1), q_2) \cap B_{2,\mathbf{q}} = \emptyset$, that is $\overline{\mathcal{E}}_2$. Note that, by Claim 3.2 (ii),

$$|U_2(Q_1, A_1), q_2)| \geq \frac{2^{q_1}}{2^{q_2+1}(d \log n + 1)}.$$

So,

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{E}}_2 \mid \mathcal{E}_1) \leq \left(1 - \frac{2^{q_2}}{2^{q_1}} \log n\right)^{|U_2(Q_1, A_1), q_2)|} \leq \exp(-1)$$

Assume that $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{i-1}$ hold, where $3 \leq i \in [d-1]$. Let $a_1 \in U_1(q_1)$ and $a_{i-1} \in A_{i-1}((Q_{i-2}, U_{i-2}), q_{i-1})$.

We will bound the probability that $U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_{i-1}), q_i) \cap B_{i,\mathbf{q}} = \emptyset$, that is $\overline{\mathcal{E}_i}$. Note that

$$|U_i((Q_{i-1}, A_{i-1}), q_i)| \geq \frac{2^{q_{i-1}}}{2^{q_i+1}(d \log n + 1)}.$$

So, for $3 \leq i \in [d-1]$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{E}_i} \mid \mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{i-1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{2^{q_i}}{2^{q_{i-1}}} \log n\right)^{|U_i(Q_{i-1}, A_{i-1}), q_i|} \leq \exp(-1)$$

Assume that $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{d-1}$ hold. Let $a_1 \in U_1(q_1)$ and $a_{i-1} \in A_{i-1}((Q_{i-2}, A_{i-2}), q_{i-1})$ for all $i \in [d] \setminus \{1\}$. Let $S \subseteq U_d$ be the set of d -th vertex of the ordered hyperedges in $\mathcal{F}_o(\mathcal{H}_o)$ having u_j as the j -th vertex for all $j \in [d-1]$. Note that $|S| \geq 2^{q_{d-1}}$. Let \mathcal{E}_d be the event that represents the fact $S \cap B_{d,\mathbf{q}} \neq \emptyset$. So,

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{E}_d} \mid \mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{d-1}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{q_{d-1}}}\right)^{q_{d-1}} \leq \exp(-1)$$

Observe that VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts if $m(B_{1,\mathbf{q}}, \dots, B_{d,\mathbf{q}}) \neq 0$. Also,

$$m_o(B_{1,\mathbf{q}}, \dots, B_{d,\mathbf{q}}) \neq 0 \text{ if } \bigcap_{i=1}^d \mathcal{E}_i \text{ occurs.}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{VERIFY-ESTIMATE}(\mathcal{H}_o, \widehat{\mathcal{R}}) \text{ accepts}) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^d \mathcal{E}_i\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_1) \prod_{i=2}^d \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{E}_i \mid \bigcap_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{E}_j\right) \\ &> \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right)^d \\ &> \frac{1}{2^d}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we will prove Lemma 3.1 that will be based on Algorithm 2.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Note that an execution of ROUGH ESTIMATION for a particular $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ repeats VERIFY-ESTIMATE for $\Gamma = d \cdot 4^d \cdot 2000 \log n$ times and gives output $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ if more than $\frac{\Gamma}{10 \cdot 2^d}$ VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts. For a particular $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$, let X_i be the indicator random variable such that $X_i = 1$ if and only if the i -th execution of VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts. Also take $X = \sum_{i=1}^{\Gamma} X_i$. ROUGH ESTIMATION gives output $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ if $X > \frac{\Gamma}{10 \cdot 2^d}$.

Algorithm 2: ROUGH ESTIMATION($\mathcal{H}_o(U, \mathcal{F}_o)$)

Input: CID₂^o query access to a d -uniform hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_o(U, \mathcal{F}_o)$.
Output: An estimate \hat{m}_o for $m_o = m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)$.
1 for ($\hat{\mathcal{R}} = n^d, n^d/2, \dots, 1$) **do**
2 | Repeat VERIFY-ESTIMATE ($\mathcal{H}_o, \hat{\mathcal{R}}$) for $\Gamma = d \cdot 4^d \cdot 2000 \log n$ times. If more than $\frac{\Gamma}{10 \cdot 2^d}$
| VERIFY-ESTIMATE accepts, then output $\hat{m}_o = \frac{\hat{\mathcal{R}}}{d^{d-2} \cdot 2^d \cdot (\log n)^{d-2}}$.
3 end

Consider the execution of ROUGH ESTIMATION for a particular $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$. If $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \geq 20d^{2d-3}4^d \cdot m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) \cdot \log^{2d-3} n$, then we first show that ROUGH ESTIMATION does not accept with high probability. Recall Lemma 4.1. If $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \geq 20d^{2d-3}4^d \cdot m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) \log^{2d-3} n$, $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) \leq \frac{1}{20 \cdot 2^d}$ and hence $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq \frac{\Gamma}{20 \cdot 2^d}$. By using Chernoff-Hoeffding's inequality (See Lemma A.2 (i) in Section A),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X > \frac{\Gamma}{10 \cdot 2^d}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(X > \frac{\Gamma}{20 \cdot 2^d} + \frac{\Gamma}{20 \cdot 2^d}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^{10d}}$$

Using the union bound for all $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$, the probability that ROUGH ESTIMATION outputs some $\hat{m}_o = \frac{\hat{\mathcal{R}}}{d^{d-2} \cdot 2^d}$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \geq 20d^{2d-3}4^d \cdot m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) \log^{2d-3} n$, is at most $\frac{d \log n}{n^{10}}$. Now consider the instance when the for loop in the algorithm ROUGH ESTIMATION executes for a $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \leq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{4d \log n}$. In this situation, $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) \geq \frac{1}{2^d}$. So, $\mathbb{E}[X] \geq \frac{\Gamma}{2^d}$. By using Chernoff-Hoeffding's inequality (See Lemma A.2 (ii) in Section A),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X \leq \frac{\Gamma}{10 \cdot 2^d}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(X < \frac{\Gamma}{2^d} - \frac{4}{5} \cdot \frac{\Gamma}{2^d}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^{100d}}$$

By using the union bound for all $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$, the probability that ROUGH ESTIMATION outputs some $\hat{m}_o = \frac{\hat{\mathcal{R}}}{d^{d-2} \cdot 2^d}$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \leq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{4d \log n}$, is at most $\frac{d \log n}{n^{100d}}$. Observe that, the probability that ROUGH ESTIMATION outputs some $\hat{m}_o = \frac{\hat{\mathcal{R}}}{d^{d-2} \cdot 2^d}$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \geq 20d^{2d-3}4^d m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) \log^{2d-3} n$ or $\hat{\mathcal{R}} \leq \frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{4d \log n}$, is at most

$$\frac{d \log n}{n^{10d}} + \frac{d \log n}{n^{100d}} \leq \frac{1}{n^{8d}}.$$

Putting everything together, ROUGH ESTIMATION gives some $\hat{m}_o = \frac{\hat{\mathcal{R}}}{d^{d-2} \cdot 2^d \cdot (\log n)^{d-2}}$ as the output with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{n^{8d}}$ satisfying

$$\frac{m_o(\mathcal{H}_o)}{8d^{d-1}2^d \log^{d-1} n} \leq \hat{m}_o \leq 20d^{d-1}2^d \cdot m_o(\mathcal{H}_o) \log^{d-1} n$$

From the pseudocode of VERIFY-ESTIMATE (Algorithm 1), we call for CID₂ queries only at line number 12. In the worst case, VERIFY-ESTIMATE executes line number 12 for each $\mathbf{j} \in [(d \log n)^*]$. That is, the query complexity of VERIFY-ESTIMATE is $\mathcal{O}(\log^{d-1} n)$. From the description of ROUGH ESTIMATION, ROUGH ESTIMATION calls VERIFY-ESTIMATE $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ times for each choice

of \widehat{R} . Hence, ROUGH ESTIMATION makes $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d+1} n)$ CID₂ queries. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Before getting into the reasons *why Theorem 1.4 follows from Theorem 1.3*, let us first review the algorithms for d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE by Dell *et al.* [DLM20].

Overview of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] Dell *et al.*'s algorithm for d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE make repeated calls to d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION. Their algorithm for d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION calls mainly three subroutines over $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ iterations: COARSE, HALVING, and TRIM. HALVING and TRIM calls COARSE repeatedly. So, COARSE is the main building block for their algorithms for d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE.

COARSE algorithm It estimates the number of hyperedges in the hypergraph up to polylog factors by using polylog queries. The result is formally stated as follows, see [DLM20, Sec. 4].

Lemma 5.1 (COARSE ALGORITHM by Dell *et al.* [DLM20]). *There exists an algorithm COARSE, that has CID query access to a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$, makes $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{2d+3} n)$ CID queries, and finds \widehat{m} satisfying*

$$\Omega_d\left(\frac{1}{\log^d n}\right) \leq \frac{\widehat{m}}{m} \leq \mathcal{O}_d\left(\log^d n\right)$$

with probability at least $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$.

Remark 1. The objective of COARSE algorithm by Dell *et al.* is essentially same as that our ROUGH ESTIMATION algorithm. Both of them can estimate the number of hyperedges in any induced subhypergraph. However, note that ROUGH ESTIMATION (as stated in Theorem 1.3) has better approximation guarantee and better query complexity than that of COARSE algorithm of Dell *et al.* (as stated in Lemma 5.1).

The framework of Dell *et al.* implies that the query complexity of d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE can be expressed by the approximation guarantee and the query complexity of the COARSE algorithm. This is formally stated as follows:

Lemma 5.2 (d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION and d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE in terms of quality of COARSE algorithm [DLM20]). *Let there exists an algorithm COARSE, that has CID query access to a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(U, \mathcal{F})$, makes q CID queries, and finds \widehat{m} satisfying $\frac{1}{b} \leq \frac{\widehat{m}}{m} \leq b$ with probability at least $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$. Then*

(i) d -HYPEREDGE-ESTIMATION can be solved by using

$$\mathcal{O}_d\left(\log^2 n \left(\log nb + \frac{b^2 \log^2 n}{\varepsilon^2}\right) q\right)$$

CID queries.

(ii) d -HYPEREDGE-SAMPLE can be solved by using

$$\mathcal{O}_d \left(\log^6 n \left(\log nb + \frac{b^2 \log^2 n}{\varepsilon^2} \right) q \right)$$

CID queries.

Why Theorem 1.4 follows from Theorem 1.3? Observe that we get Proposition 1.2 (the result of Dell *et al.*) from Lemma 5.1 by substituting $b = \mathcal{O}_d(\log^d n)$ and $q = \mathcal{O}_d(\log^{2d+3} n)$ in Lemma 5.2. In Theorem 1.4 we improve on the Proposition 1.2 by using our main result (Theorem 1.3), and substituting $b = \mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d-1} n)$ and $q = \mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d+2} n)$ in Lemma 5.2.

The main reason we get an improved query complexity for hyperedge estimation in Theorem 1.4 as compared to Dell *et al.* (Proposition 5.2) is our ROUGH ESTIMATION algorithm is an improvement over the COARSE algorithm of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] in terms of approximation guarantee as well as query complexity.

How our ROUGH ESTIMATION improves over COARSE of Dell *et al.* [DLM20]? At a very high level, the frameworks of our ROUGH ESTIMATION algorithm and that of Dell *et al.*'s COARSE algorithm might look similar, but the main ideas involved are different. Our ROUGH ESTIMATION (as stated in Lemma 3.1) directly deals with the hypergraph (though the ordered one) and makes use of CID_2^o queries. Note that each CID_2^o query can be simulated by using $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ CID queries. However, COARSE algorithm of Dell *et al.* considers $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ independent random d -partite hypergraphs by partitioning the vertex set into d parts uniformly at random, works on the d -partite hypergraphs, and reports the median, of the $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ outputs corresponding to random d -partite subhypergraphs, as the final output. So, there is $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ blowup in both our ROUGH ESTIMATION algorithm and Dell *et al.*'s COARSE algorithm, though the reasons behind the blowups are different.

Our ROUGH ESTIMATION calls repeatedly ($\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ times) VERIFY ESTIMATE for each guess, where the total number of guesses is $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$. In the COARSE algorithm, Dell *et al.* uses repeated calls ($\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d+1} n)$) times to an analogous routine of our VERIFY ESTIMATE, which they name VERIFY GUESS, $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ times. Their VERIFY GUESS has the following criteria for any guess M :

- If $M \geq \frac{d^d \log^{2d} n}{2^{3d-1}} m$, VERIFY GUESS accepts M with probability at most p ;
- If $M \leq m$, VERIFY GUESS accepts M with probability at least $2p$;
- It makes $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^d n)$ CID queries.

Recall that the number of CID_2 queries made by each call to VERIFY ESTIMATE is $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d-1} n)$, that is, $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^d n)$ CID queries. So, in terms of the number of CID queries, both our ROUGH ESTIMATION and COARSE of Dell *et al.* have the same complexity.

The probability p in VERIFY GUESS of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] satisfies $p \approx_d \frac{1}{\log^d n}$, where \approx_d is used to suppress the terms involving d . So, for each guess M , their COARSE algorithm has to call $\mathcal{O}_d\left(\frac{1}{p} \log n\right) = \mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d+1} n)$ times to distinguish whether it is the case $M \leq m$ or $M \geq \frac{d^d \log^{2d} n}{2^{3d-1}} m$, with a probability at least $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$. So, the total number of queries made by the COARSE algorithm of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] is

$$\mathcal{O}_d(\log n) \cdot \mathcal{O}_d(\log n) \cdot \mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d+1} n) \cdot \mathcal{O}_d(\log^d n) = \mathcal{O}_d(\log^{2d+3} n).$$

The first $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ term is due to the blow up incurred to convert original hypergraph to d -partite hypergraph, the second $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ term is due to the number of guesses for m , the third $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d+1} n)$ term is the number of times COARSE calls VERIFY GUESS, and the last term $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^d n)$ is the number of CID queries made by each call to VERIFY GUESS.

As it can be observed from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, p in our case (VERIFY ESTIMATE) is $\Omega_d(1)$. So, it is enough for ROUGH ESTIMATION to call VERIFY ESTIMATE only $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ times. Therefore, the number of CID queries made by our ROUGH ESTIMATION is

$$\mathcal{O}_d(\log n) \cdot \mathcal{O}_d(\log n) \cdot \mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d-1} n) \cdot \mathcal{O}_d(\log n) = \mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d+2} n).$$

In the above expression, the first $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ term is due to the number of guesses for m , the second $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ term is the number of times ROUGH ESTIMATION calls VERIFY ESTIMATE, the third $\mathcal{O}_d(\log^{d-1} n)$ term is the number of CID₂ queries made by each call to VERIFY ESTIMATE, and the last $\mathcal{O}_d(\log n)$ term is the number of CID queries needed to simulate a CID₂ query with probability at least $1 - 1/n^{\Omega(d)}$.

We do the improvement in approximation guarantee as well as query complexity in ROUGH ESTIMATION algorithm (as stated in Theorem 1.3), as compared to COARSE algorithm of Dell *et al.* [DLM20] (as stated in Lemma 5.1), by a careful analysis of the intersection pattern of the hypergraphs and setting the sampling probability parameters in VERIFY ESTIMATE (Algorithm 1) algorithm in a nontrivial way, which is evident from the description of Algorithm 1 and its analysis.

References

- [BBGM19] Anup Bhattacharya, Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, and Gopinath Mishra. Triangle Estimation Using Tripartite Independent Set Queries. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC*, volume 149, pages 19:1–19:17, 2019.
- [BBGM21] Anup Bhattacharya, Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, and Gopinath Mishra. On Triangle Estimation Using Tripartite Independent Set Queries. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 65(8):1165–1192, 2021.
- [BGK⁺18] Arijit Bishnu, Arijit Ghosh, Sudeshna Kolay, Gopinath Mishra, and Saket Saurabh. Parameterized Query Complexity of Hitting Set Using Stability of Sunflowers. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC*, volume 123, pages 25:1–25:12, 2018.
- [BHR⁺18] Paul Beame, Sarel Har-Peled, Sivaramakrishnan Natarajan Ramamoorthy, Cyrus Rashtchian, and Makrand Sinha. Edge Estimation with Independent Set Oracles. In *Proceedings of the 9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS*, volume 94, pages 38:1–38:21, 2018.
- [BHR⁺20] Paul Beame, Sarel Har-Peled, Sivaramakrishnan Natarajan Ramamoorthy, Cyrus Rashtchian, and Makrand Sinha. Edge Estimation with Independent Set Oracles. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(4):52:1–52:27, 2020.
- [DL18] Holger Dell and John Lapinskas. Fine-Grained Reductions from Approximate Counting to Decision. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC*, pages 281–288, 2018.
- [DL21] Holger Dell and John Lapinskas. Fine-Grained Reductions from Approximate Counting to Decision. *ACM Trans. Comput. Theory*, 13(2):8:1–8:24, 2021.
- [DLM20] Holger Dell, John Lapinskas, and Kitty Meeks. Approximately counting and sampling small witnesses using a colourful decision oracle. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 2201–2211, 2020.
- [DP09] Devdatt P. Dubhashi and Alessandro Panconesi. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [ELRS17] Talya Eden, Amit Levi, Dana Ron, and C. Seshadhri. Approximately counting triangles in sublinear time. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 46(5):1603–1646, 2017.

- [ERS20] Talya Eden, Dana Ron, and C. Seshadhri. On Approximating the Number of k -Cliques in Sublinear Time. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 49(4):747–771, 2020.
- [Fei06] Uriel Feige. On Sums of Independent Random Variables with Unbounded Variance and Estimating the Average Degree in a Graph. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 35(4):964–984, 2006.
- [GR08] Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. Approximating Average Parameters of Graphs. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008.

A Some probability results

Lemma A.1 (Chernoff-Hoeffding bound [DP09]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables such that $X_i \in [0, 1]$. For $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X]$, the followings hold for any $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$.*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mu| \geq \delta\mu) \leq 2 \exp(-\mu\delta^2/3)$$

Lemma A.2 (Chernoff-Hoeffding bound [DP09]). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables such that $X_i \in [0, 1]$. For $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $\mu_l \leq \mathbb{E}[X] \leq \mu_h$, the followings hold for any $\delta > 0$.*

(i) $\mathbb{P}(X > \mu_h + \delta) \leq \exp(-2\delta^2/n)$.

(ii) $\mathbb{P}(X < \mu_l - \delta) \leq \exp(-2\delta^2/n)$.

B Oracle definitions

Definition B.1 (Independent set query (IS) [BHR⁺18]). Given a subset A of the vertex set V of a graph $G(V, E)$, IS query answers whether A is an independent set.

Definition B.2 (Bipartite independent set oracle (BIS) [BHR⁺18]). Given two disjoint subsets A, B of the vertex set V of a graph $G(V, E)$, BIS query reports whether there exists an edge having endpoints in both A and B .

Definition B.3 (Tripartite independent set oracle (TIS) [BBGM19]). Given three disjoint subsets A, B, C of the vertex set V of a graph $G(V, E)$, the TIS oracle reports whether there exists a triangle having endpoints in A, B and C .

Definition B.4 (Generalized d -partite independent set oracle (CID) [BGK⁺18]). Given d pairwise disjoint subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq U(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} as input, CID query answers whether $m(A_1, \dots, A_d) \neq 0$, where $m(A_1, \dots, A_d)$ denotes the number of hyperedges in \mathcal{H} having exactly one vertex in each $A_i, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$.

Definition B.5 (CID₁ oracle). Given s pairwise disjoint subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_s \subseteq U(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} and $a_1, \dots, a_s \in [d]$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^s a_i = d$, CID₁ query on input $A_1^{[a_1]}, A_2^{[a_2]}, \dots, A_s^{[a_s]}$ answers whether $m(A_1^{[a_1]}, \dots, A_s^{[a_s]}) \neq 0$.

Definition B.6 (CID₂ oracle). Given any d subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq U(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypergraph \mathcal{H} , CID₂ query on input A_1, \dots, A_d answers whether $m(A_1, \dots, A_d) \neq 0$.

Definition B.7 (CID₂^o oracle). Given any d subsets of vertices $A_1, \dots, A_d \subseteq U(\mathcal{H}_o)$ of an ordered hypergraph \mathcal{H}_o , CID₂^o query on input A_1, \dots, A_d answers YES if and only if $m_o(A_1, \dots, A_d) \neq 0$.