

## Lecture 16: CS 880: Complexity of Counting Problems

Instructor: Jin-Yi Cai

Scribe: Chen Zeng

For a symmetric, bipartite matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$ , we want to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *If  $\text{EVAL}(\mathbf{A})$  is not  $\#P$ -hard, then there exists an  $m \times m$  purified bipartite matrix  $\mathbf{A}'$  such that  $\text{EVAL}(\mathbf{A}) \equiv \text{EVAL}(\mathbf{A}')$ .*

Recall the definition of the *purified bipartite matrix*:

**Definition 1.** *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  be a symmetric, connected and bipartite matrix.  $\mathbf{A}$  is called a purified bipartite matrix if there exists positive rational numbers  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m$ , and an integer  $1 \leq k < m$  such that*

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $\mathbf{B}$  is  $k \times (m - k)$ , and of the following form:

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 & & & & \\ & \mu_2 & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \mu_k & \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_{1,1} & \zeta_{1,2} & \cdots & \zeta_{1,m-k} \\ \zeta_{2,1} & \zeta_{2,2} & \cdots & \zeta_{2,m-k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \zeta_{k,1} & \zeta_{k,2} & \cdots & \zeta_{k,m-k} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{k+1} & & & & \\ & \mu_{k+2} & & & \\ & & \ddots & & \\ & & & \mu_m & \end{pmatrix}$$

where every  $\zeta_{i,j}$  is a root of unity.

We shall prove Theorem 1 by constructing the matrix  $\mathbf{B}$ . First, we need to define the notion of a *generating set*.

**Definition 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  be a set of  $n$  non-zero algebraic numbers, for some  $n \geq 1$ . Then we say  $\{g_1, \dots, g_d\}$ , for some integer  $d \geq 0$ , is a generating set of  $\mathcal{A}$  if*

1. Every  $g_i$  is a non-zero algebraic number in  $\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ .
2. For all  $(k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  such that  $(k_1, \dots, k_d) \neq \mathbf{0}$ , then  $g_1^{k_1} \cdots g_d^{k_d}$  is not a root of unity.
3. For every  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , there exists a unique  $(k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  such that  $a/g_1^{k_1} \cdots g_d^{k_d}$  is a root of unity.

We shall utilize the following lemma to construct the matrix  $\mathbf{B}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of non-zero algebraic numbers, then it has a generating set.*

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the set of all non-zero entries  $A_{i,j}$  from  $\mathbf{A}$ , by Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{A}$  has a generating set  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_d\}$ . By Definition 2, for each  $A_{i,j}$  there exists a unique tuple  $(k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  such that  $A_{i,j}/g_1^{k_1} \cdots g_d^{k_d}$  is a root of unity, and we shall denote it by  $\zeta_{i,j}$ . Next, we construct the matrix  $\mathbf{B} = (B_{i,j})^{m \times m} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  as follows: Let  $p_1 < \dots < p_d$  denote the  $d$  smallest primes. Then,

$$B_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A_{i,j} = 0 \\ p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_d^{k_d} \cdot \zeta_{i,j} & \text{if } A_{i,j} = g_1^{k_1} \cdots g_d^{k_d} \cdot \zeta_{i,j} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Note that this construction is in 1-to-1 correspondence:  $B_{i,j}$  is well-defined by the uniqueness of  $(k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and conversely by taking the prime factorization of  $|B_{i,j}|$ , and then recover  $A_{i,j}$ . We will prove that  $\text{EVAL}(\mathbf{A}) \equiv \text{EVAL}(\mathbf{B})$ . By the last lemma from our last lecture, it suffices to prove  $\text{COUNT}(\mathbf{A}) \equiv \text{COUNT}(\mathbf{B})$ . Recall the problem  $\text{COUNT}(\mathbf{A})$  is defined as follows:

**Definition 3.** Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$  be a fixed symmetric matrix with algebraic entries, then the input of the problem  $\text{COUNT}(\mathbf{A})$  is a pair  $(G, x)$  where  $G = (V, E)$  is an undirected graph, and  $x$  is a complex number. The output is:

$$\#\mathbf{A}(G, x) = |\{\text{assignment } \xi : V \rightarrow [m] \mid \text{wt}_{\mathbf{A}}(\xi) = x\}|$$

**Lemma 2.**  $\text{COUNT}(\mathbf{A}) \equiv \text{COUNT}(\mathbf{B})$

*Proof.* We will only prove  $\text{COUNT}(\mathbf{A}) \leq \text{COUNT}(\mathbf{B})$  as the other direction is proved similarly. Let  $(G, x)$  be an input of  $\text{COUNT}(\mathbf{A})$  where  $G = (V, E)$ , and  $n = |E|$ . Let

$$X = \left\{ \prod_{i,j \in [m]} A_{i,j}^{k_{i,j}} \mid k_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N}^1 \text{ and } \sum_{i,j \in [m]} k_{i,j} = n \right\}$$

Recall that  $X$  is polynomial in  $n$ , and for any  $x \notin X$ ,  $\#\mathbf{A}(G, x) = 0$ . For any  $x \in X$ , we can find a sequence of non-negative integers  $\{k_{i,j}^*\}_{i,j \in [m]}$  in polynomial time such that  $\sum_{i,j} k_{i,j}^* = n$  and

$$x = \prod_{i,j \in [m]} A_{i,j}^{k_{i,j}^*} \quad (2)$$

We define  $y$  by

$$y = \prod_{i,j \in [m]} B_{i,j}^{k_{i,j}^*} \quad (3)$$

Thus,  $x = 0$  iff  $y = 0$ , which happens iff when some  $k_{i,j}^* > 0$  for some entry  $A_{i,j} = 0$ . To prove  $\text{COUNT}(\mathbf{A}) \leq \text{COUNT}(\mathbf{B})$ , it suffices to prove the claim  $\#\mathbf{A}(G, x) = \#\mathbf{B}(G, y)$ . To prove that claim, we only need to show that for any assignment  $\xi : V \rightarrow [m]$ ,

$$\text{wt}_{\mathbf{A}}(\xi) = x \Leftrightarrow \text{wt}_{\mathbf{B}}(\xi) = y$$

---

<sup>1</sup>In this write-up,  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of non-negative integers.

We shall only prove  $wt_{\mathbf{A}}(\xi) = x \Rightarrow wt_{\mathbf{B}}(\xi) = y$  as the other direction is proved similarly.

Let  $\xi : V \rightarrow [m]$  be an assignment, for every  $i, j \in [m]$ , let  $k_{i,j}$  be the number of edges  $(u, v) \in E$  such that  $(\xi(u), \xi(v)) = (i, j)$  or  $(j, i)$ , then

$$wt_{\mathbf{A}}(\xi) = \prod_{i,j \in [m]} A_{i,j}^{k_{i,j}} \quad (4)$$

and

$$wt_{\mathbf{B}}(\xi) = \prod_{i,j \in [m]} B_{i,j}^{k_{i,j}} \quad (5)$$

For  $x = 0$ ,  $wt_{\mathbf{A}}(\xi) = 0$  iff for some zero entry  $A_{i,j} = 0$ ,  $k_{i,j} > 0$ . By our construction of  $\mathbf{B}$ ,  $A_{i,j} = 0$  iff  $B_{i,j} = 0$ , and thus,  $wt_{\mathbf{B}}(\xi) = 0$ . Next, we assume both  $x, y \neq 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_d\}$  be the generating set of the set of all non-zero entries in  $\mathbf{A}$ . By Definition 2, there exists integers  $e_{1,(ij)}, \dots, e_{d,(ij)}$  such that:

$$A_{i,j} = \prod_{\ell=1}^d g_{\ell}^{e_{\ell,(ij)}} \cdot \zeta_{i,j} \quad (6)$$

and

$$B_{i,j} = \prod_{\ell=1}^d p_{\ell}^{e_{\ell,(ij)}} \cdot \zeta_{i,j} \quad (7)$$

for  $A_{i,j} \neq 0$  where  $\zeta_{i,j}$  is a root of unity. By (4) and (6),

$$wt_{\mathbf{A}}(\xi) = x \Rightarrow \prod_{\ell=1}^d g_{\ell}^{\sum_{i,j} (k_{i,j} - k_{i,j}^*) e_{\ell,(ij)}} \text{ is a root of unity}$$

By the second requirement of a generating set in Definition 2, for any  $\ell \in [d]$

$$\sum_{i,j} (k_{i,j} - k_{i,j}^*) e_{\ell,(ij)} = 0$$

which implies that

$$\prod_{i,j} (\zeta_{i,j})^{k_{i,j}} = \prod_{i,j} (\zeta_{i,j})^{k_{i,j}^*}$$

By (3), (5) and (7), it follows that  $wt_{\mathbf{B}}(\xi) = y$ . □

Next, we construct the matrix  $\mathbf{B}'$  by  $B'_{i,j} = |B_{i,j}|$ , and we will show:

**Lemma 3.**  $EVAL(\mathbf{B}') \leq EVAL(\mathbf{B})$

*Proof.* It suffices to show  $COUNT(\mathbf{B}') \leq COUNT(\mathbf{B})$ . Let

$$Y = \left\{ \prod_{i,j \in [m]} B_{i,j}^{k_{i,j}} \mid k_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \sum_{i,j \in [m]} k_{i,j} = n \right\}$$

$Y_x = \{y | y \in Y \text{ and } |y| = x\}$ . Thus,

$$\#_{\mathbf{B}'}(G, x) = \sum_{y \in Y_x} \#_{\mathbf{B}}(G, y)$$

the lemma then follows. □

Next, we will prove Theorem 1.

*Proof.* As both  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{B}'$  are connected and bipartite, there is always a permutation  $\Pi$  of  $[m]$  such that  $\mathbf{B}_{\Pi, \Pi}$  is the bipartisation of a  $k \times (m - k)$  matrix  $\mathbf{F}$  for some  $k \in [m]$ :  $\mathbf{B}_{\Pi, \Pi} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{F} \\ \mathbf{F}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\mathbf{B}'_{\Pi, \Pi}$  is the bipartisation of  $\mathbf{F}'$  where  $F'_{i,j} = |F_{i,j}|$ . Since permuting  $\mathbf{B}$  does not affect the complexity of  $\text{EVAL}(\mathbf{B})$ , then

$$\text{EVAL}(\mathbf{B}'_{\Pi, \Pi}) \leq \text{EVAL}(\mathbf{B}_{\Pi, \Pi}) \equiv \text{EVAL}(\mathbf{B}) \equiv \text{EVAL}(\mathbf{A})$$

If  $\text{EVAL}(\mathbf{B}'_{\Pi, \Pi})$  is #P-hard, then  $\text{EVAL}(\mathbf{A})$  is also #P-hard. If  $\text{EVAL}(\mathbf{B}'_{\Pi, \Pi})$  is not #P-hard, then since every entry in  $\mathbf{B}'_{\Pi, \Pi}$  is non-negative, by Bulatov and Grohe's theorem, the rank of  $\mathbf{F}'$  must be 1. Therefore, there exists non-negative rational numbers  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k, \dots, \mu_m$  such that  $F'_{i,j} = \mu_i \mu_{j+k}$  for all  $i \in [k]$  and  $j \in [m - k]$ . Furthermore, for all  $i \in [m]$ ,  $\mu_i$  can not be 0 or else  $\mathbf{B}'_{\Pi, \Pi}$  is not connected. Since every entry in  $\mathbf{B}_{\Pi, \Pi}$  is the product of the corresponding entry in  $\mathbf{B}'_{\Pi, \Pi}$  and some root of unity,  $\mathbf{B}_{\Pi, \Pi}$  is also a purified bipartite matrix. The theorem then follows. □