

Testing bounded arboricity

Talya Eden*

Reut Levi†

Dana Ron‡

April 28, 2021

Abstract

In this paper we consider the problem of testing whether a graph has bounded arboricity. The class of graphs with bounded arboricity includes many important graph families (e.g., planar graphs and randomly generated preferential attachment graphs). Graphs with bounded arboricity have been studied extensively in the past, in particular, since for many problems they allow for much more efficient algorithms and/or better approximation ratios.

We present a tolerant tester in the general-graphs model. The general-graphs model allows access to degree and neighbor queries, and the distance is defined with respect to the actual number of edges. Namely, we say that a graph G is ϵ -close to having arboricity α , if by removing at most an ϵ -fraction of its edges we can obtain a graph G' that has arboricity α , and otherwise we say that G is ϵ -far. Our algorithm distinguishes between graphs that are ϵ -close to having arboricity α and graphs that are $c \cdot \epsilon$ -far from having arboricity 3α , where c is an absolute small constant. The query complexity and running time of the algorithm are $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon\sqrt{m}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$ where n denotes the number of vertices and m denotes the number of edges (we use the notation \tilde{O} to hide poly-logarithmic factors in n). In terms of the dependence on n and m this bound is optimal up to poly-logarithmic factors since $\Omega\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{m}}\right)$ queries are necessary.

1 Introduction

The arboricity of a graph is defined as the minimum number of forests into which its edges can be partitioned. This measure is equivalent (up to a factor of 2) to the maximum average degree in any subgraph [26, 32, 27] and to the degeneracy of the graph.¹ Hence, the arboricity of a graph can be viewed as a measure of its density “everywhere”. The class of graphs with bounded arboricity includes many important families of graphs, e.g., all minor-closed graph classes such as planar graphs, graphs of bounded treewidth and graphs of bounded genus. Furthermore, graphs in this class are not restricted to being minor-free (for some fixed minor). In fact, graphs over n vertices with arboricity 2 may have a $K_{\sqrt{n}}$ -minor. In the context of social networks, graphs that are generated according to evolving graph models such as the Barabási-Albert Preferential Attachment model [4] have bounded arboricity. For various graph optimization problems, it is known that better approximation ratios and faster algorithms exist for graphs with bounded arboricity (e.g., [8, 18, 15, 3] and [5, 24] in the distributed setting), and several NP-hard problems such as CLIQUE, INDEPENDENT-SET and DOMINATING-SET become fixed-parameter tractable [1, 15].

*CSAIL at MIT. Email: talyaa01@gmail.com.

†Efi Arazi School of Computer Science, The Interdisciplinary Center, Israel. Email: reut.levi@idc.ac.il.

‡School of Electrical Engineering, Tel Aviv University. Email: danaron@tau.ac.il.

¹The degeneracy of a graph G is the smallest integer k such that in every subgraph of G there is vertex of degree at most k . The arboricity of G is upper bounded by its degeneracy and the degeneracy is less than twice the arboricity.

In this work we address the problem of testing whether a graph has bounded arboricity. That is, we are interested in an algorithm that with high constant probability accepts graphs that have arboricity bounded by a given α , and rejects graphs that are relatively far from having slightly larger arboricity (in the sense that relatively many edges should be removed so that the graph will have such arboricity). In fact, as explained precisely next, we solve a *tolerant* [30] version of this problem in which we accept graphs that are only close to having arboricity α . Furthermore, our result is in what is known as the *general-graphs model* [29], where there is no upper bound on the maximum degree in the graph, and distance to having a property is measured with respect to the number of edges in the graph. As we discuss in more detail in Section 1.4, almost all previous results on testing related bounded graph measures assumed the graph has bounded degree.

1.1 Our result

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with n vertices and m edges. We assume that for any given vertex $v \in V$, it is possible to query for its degree, $d(v)$, as well as query for its i^{th} neighbor for any $1 \leq i \leq d(v)$.^{2,3} We say that G is ϵ -close to having arboricity α if at most $\epsilon \cdot m$ edges should be removed from G so that the resulting graph will have arboricity at most α . Otherwise, G is ϵ -far from having arboricity α .

We present an algorithm that, given query access to G together with parameters n , α and ϵ distinguishes with high constant probability between the case that G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α , and the case that G is $c \cdot \epsilon$ -far from having arboricity 3α for an absolute constant⁴ c . The query complexity and running time of the algorithm are

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon\sqrt{m}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$$

in expectation.

1.2 Discussion of the result

In this subsection we discuss several aspects of our result, as well as some variants. The variants are summarized in Table 1.

The tightness of the complexity bound. If we consider the complexity of the algorithm as a function of n and m (ignoring the dependence on ϵ), we get that it is $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{m}}\right)$. We observe that this complexity is essentially tight, even for non-tolerant algorithms (i.e., that distinguish between the case that G has arboricity at most α , and the case that G is far from having arboricity 3α). To be precise, for constant ϵ , $\Omega\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{m}}\right)$ queries are necessary for any algorithm that is not provided with any information regarding m , or even when it is provided with a constant factor estimate of m (e.g., a factor-2 estimate). The lower-bound construction is based on two families of graphs, where graphs in one family have arboricity at most α and graphs in the other family are far from having arboricity at most 3α . The graphs in the second family have a slightly larger number of

²We note that the ordering of the neighbors of vertices is arbitrary and that a neighbor query to vertex v with $i > d(v)$ is answered by a special symbol. Observe that a degree query to v can be replaced by $O(\log d(v))$ neighbor queries.

³Usually the general-graphs model also allows for pair queries, however our algorithm does not require them, and the lower bounds holds also when allowing them.

⁴The constant we achieve is 20. For the sake of simplicity and clarity of the algorithm and its analysis, we did not make an effort to minimize this constant.

edges, where, roughly speaking, these edges are the source of the distance to bounded arboricity, and they belong to a relatively small “hidden” subgraph (over $O(\sqrt{m})$ vertices). Other than this small subgraph, graphs in the two families have identical structure.

If the algorithm is provided with m (or a very precise estimate, i.e., within $(1 \pm \epsilon/c)$ for $c > 1$), then we cannot use this lower-bound construction, as graphs in both families must have the same (or almost the same) number of edges. However, in such a case we can modify the construction (so that graphs in both families have exactly the same number of edges) and obtain a lower bound of $\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{m}\right)$ (graphs in the two families now differ on subgraphs of size $O(m/\alpha)$). Furthermore, we show that this number of queries is sufficient (when the algorithm is provided with a precise estimate of m). Note that by [26, 27], $\alpha \leq \sqrt{m}$, so that $\frac{n\alpha}{m} \leq \frac{n}{\sqrt{m}}$.

Bounded-degree graphs. Suppose first that we are given an upper bound d on the maximum degree in G , and let $\bar{d} = 2m/n$ denote the average degree. Then we can slightly modify the algorithm so that the term $\tilde{O}(n/\sqrt{m})$ in the complexity of the algorithm is replaced by d/\bar{d} .

The above statement is for the case that distance to having the property is measured (as defined in the general-graphs model), with respect to m (and we only assume that the algorithm is provided with additional information regarding the maximum degree in the graph). If we consider the bounded-degree model [16], in which not only do we get d as input, but in addition distance is measured with respect to $d \cdot n$ (which is an upper bound on m), then our algorithm can be slightly modified so that its complexity depends *only on* $1/\epsilon$ (and the dependence is quasi-polynomial).

Access to random edges. In the case that the algorithm is given access to uniformly (or almost uniformly) distributed random edges, it can again be slightly modified to run in time quasi-polynomial in $1/\epsilon$. This is true since the term $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon\sqrt{m}}\right)$ in the running time arises from sampling edges almost uniformly at random when the number of edges is unknown.

Expected complexity. The reason that the query complexity and running time are in expectation is due to the need of the edge sampling procedure to obtain an estimate for the number of edges. If such a (constant factor) estimate is provided to the algorithm, then the upper bound on the complexity of the algorithm always holds.

α vs. 3α . Our algorithm distinguishes between the case that the graph is close to having arboricity at most α and the case that it is far from having arboricity at most 3α . The constant 3 can be reduced to $2 + \eta$ at a cost that depends (exponentially) on $1/\eta$, but we do not know how to avoid this cost and possibly go below a factor of 2. However, in some cases this constant may not be significant. For example, suppose we want to know whether, after removing a small fraction of the edges, we can obtain a graph G' with bounded arboricity so that we can run an optimization algorithm on G' (or possibly on G itself), whose complexity depends polynomially on the arboricity of G' . In such a case, the difference between α and 3α is inconsequential.

Two-sided error vs. one-sided error. Our algorithm has two-sided error, and we observe that for $\alpha \geq 2$ every one-sided error algorithm must perform $\Omega(n)$ queries. We note that for $\alpha = 1$, there exists a one-sided error algorithm for testing cycle-freeness [9] that performs $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ queries (and these many queries are necessary [16]).

Summary of our result and variants		
General-graphs model, two-sided error, unknown m , distance w.r.t. m	$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon\sqrt{m}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$	Theorem 7
	$\Omega\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\epsilon m}}\right)$	Claim 8
Known m (or $(1 \pm \epsilon/c)$ -estimate)	$O\left(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon^3 m}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$	Theorem 18
	$\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon m}\right)$	Claim 9
Upper bound d on max-degree	$O\left(\frac{d}{\epsilon d}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$	Section ??
Upper bound d on max-degree and distance w.r.t. $n \cdot d$	$\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$	Section ??
Access to random edges	$\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$	Section ??
One-sided error, $\alpha \geq 2$	$\Omega(n)$	Claim 10

Table 1: Unless explicitly specified otherwise, all results refer to two-sided error algorithms in the general-graphs model (so that the distance is with respect to the number of edges m , and m is unknown). For each variant we specify the difference(s) in terms of the model (or error type).

Dependence on ϵ . In the second term of the complexity of our algorithm there is a quasi-polynomial dependence on $1/\epsilon$. It is an open problem whether this dependence can be reduced to polynomial.

1.3 The algorithm

Challenges of designing algorithms in the general-graphs models and our approach

The general-graphs model presents several challenges. Indeed, relatively few properties were studied in this model. These include bounded diameter and connectivity [29], bipartiteness [23] ([10] for planar graphs), triangle-freeness [2, 19, 31], cycle-freeness [9] (with one-sided error) and k -path-freeness [22] (when random edge queries are also allowed). Since this model allows for unbounded degrees, it could be the case that the large distance to having the property is due to a relatively dense subgraph that resides on a small set of vertices. As a consequence, observing this subgraph might be costly. Furthermore, since the degrees are unbounded, it is not clear how to efficiently explore the graph. Previous techniques in this model include bounded-size BFS [29] (that is, performing a BFS until a predetermined fixed number of vertices is discovered), random walks [10, 22] and analysis based on color coding [22].

We apply a different technique to meet the above challenges. In our analysis, we characterize a “special” set of edges, S , such that if the graph is ϵ -close to having bounded arboricity, then $|S|$ is small, and if the graph is far from having bounded arboricity, then $|S|$ is large. The question now is how to decide whether an edge belongs to S or not. We show that given an edge in the graph, we can perform a certain “approximate decision” regarding membership in S , which suffices for our purposes. In order to do so, we use a procedure that recursively samples a subset of the neighbors

of a given vertex, until it reaches the maximal depth of the recursion. At this point it returns a deterministic answer based on the degree of the vertex, which propagates up the recursion tree. The resulting queries of this process can also be viewed as a randomized BFS of bounded degree and depth. We next provide some more details on the algorithm.

The algorithm. Our starting point is a simple (non-sublinear and deterministic) algorithm that is similar to the distributed forest decomposition algorithm of Barenboim and Elkin [5]. This algorithm works in $\ell = O(\log(1/\epsilon))$ iterations, where in each iteration it assigns edges to a subset of the vertices, and the vertices that are assigned edges become “inactive”. We show that if the graph has arboricity at most α , then, when the algorithm terminates, the number of edges between remaining active vertices, whose set we denote here by A_ℓ , is relatively small. On the other hand, if the graph is sufficiently far from having arboricity at most 3α , then the number of edges between vertices in A_ℓ is relatively large.

Given this statement regarding the number of remaining edges between vertices in A_ℓ , our algorithm estimates the number of such remaining edges. To this end we devise a procedure for deciding whether a given vertex v belongs to A_ℓ . This can be done by emulating the deterministic algorithm on the distance- ℓ neighborhood of v . However, such an emulation may require a very large number of queries (as the maximum degree in the graph is not necessarily bounded). Instead, we perform a certain approximate randomized emulation of the deterministic algorithm, which is much more query efficient. While this emulation does not exactly answer whether or not $v \in A_\ell$, it gives an approximate answer that suffices for our purposes (see Lemma 5 for the precise statement).

The high-level idea is that given a vertex v , we select a random subset of its neighbors. We then recursively run the procedure to decide for each of these neighbors whether it belongs to $A_{\ell-1}$ (the vertices that remain active after $\ell - 1$ iterations). This recursive process defines a (random) tree with ℓ levels. For each vertex in the tree we decide if it is active or not according to the fraction of active children it has in the tree, and for the leaf vertices we simply decide according to their degree.

When analyzing the correctness of this procedure for a vertex v we need to take into account two sources of error. The first is due to a possible bias in the selection of its sample of neighbors. That is, even if we had an oracle that always answered correctly for a vertex u whether it belongs to $A_{\ell-1}$, we might still err in our decision regarding whether or not v belongs to A_ℓ . The second source of error is due to incorrect answers on v 's neighbors. In other words, we need to analyze how errors propagate (and accumulate) up the recursion tree.

In addition, we upper bound the total size of the tree (which determines the query complexity and running time of the procedure).

1.4 Related Work

In what follows, when we say “testing” we mean “property testing”, as defined earlier. That is, distinguishing between objects that have a property and objects that are far from having the property.

Most of the property testing results related to this work are in the bounded-degree model [16]. Recall that in this model the algorithm has the same query access to the graph as we consider, but it is also given an upper bound, d , on the maximum degree in the graph, and distance is measured with respect to $d \cdot n$ (rather than the actual number of edges, m), so that it is less stringent. As noted in Section 1.2, an adaptation of our algorithm to the (“easier”) bounded-degree model achieves complexity that is quasi-polynomial in $1/\epsilon$ (and independent of n). As we discuss next, in the bounded-degree model there are several results on testing whether a graph excludes specific

fixed minors as well as results on testing minor-closed properties in general. In what follows we assume that d is a constant, since in some of these works this assumption is made (so that no explicit dependence on d is stated).

Goldreich and Ron [16] provide an algorithm for testing if a graph is cycle-free, namely, excludes C_3 -minors, where the complexity of the algorithm is $O(1/\epsilon^3)$. Yoshida and Ito [33] test outerplanarity (excluding K_4 -minors and $K_{2,3}$ -minors) and if a graph is a cactus (excluding a diamond-minor) in time that is polynomial in $1/\epsilon$. Benjamini, Schramm, and Shapira [6] showed that any minor-closed property can be tested in time that depends only on $1/\epsilon$ (where the dependence may be triply-exponential). Hassidim et al. [20] introduced a general tool, a partition oracle, for locally partitioning graphs that belong to certain families of graphs, into small parts with relatively few edges between the parts. A partition oracle for a family of graphs implies a corresponding (two-sided error) tester for membership in this family. Hassidim et al. [20] designed partition oracles for hyperfinite classes of graphs and minor-closed classes of graphs. One of the implications of their work is improving the running time of testing minor-closed properties from triply-exponential in $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ to singly exponential in $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$. Levi and Ron later improved the running time of the partition oracle for minor-closed classes of graphs to quasi-polynomial in $1/\epsilon$ [25]. Edelman et al. designed a partition oracle for graphs with bounded treewidth [11] whose query and time complexity are polynomial in $1/\epsilon$. Newman and Sohler [28] extended the result of [20] and showed that every hyperfinite property (i.e., property of hyperfinite graphs) is testable in time that is independent of the size of the graph.

All the aforementioned testing algorithms have two-sided error (and this is also true of our algorithm). Czumaj et al. [9] study the problem of one-sided error testing of C_k -minor freeness and tree-minor freeness. For cycle-freeness (C_3 -minor freeness) they give a one-sided error testing algorithm whose complexity is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ (for $k > 3$ there is an exponential dependence on k). They show that the dependence on \sqrt{n} is tight for any minor that contains a cycle. On the other hand, for tree-minors they give an algorithm whose complexity is $\exp((1/\epsilon)^{O(k)})$, where k is the size of the tree (so that the complexity is independent of n).

Finally we discuss results in the general-graphs model that are related to our result. Czumaj et al. [9] show that their result for cycle-freeness extends to the general-graphs model, where the complexity of the algorithm is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$. Iwama and Yoshida [22] consider an augmented model that allows random edge sampling. In this augmented model they provide several testers for parameterized properties including k -path freeness whose complexity is independent of the size of the graph.

1.5 Organization

Following some basic preliminaries in Section 2, we give the aforementioned “Edge-assignment algorithm” in Section 3. In Section 4 we present our testing algorithm. The lower bounds mentioned in Section 1.2 are provided in Section 5 and the variants of our algorithm (e.g., in the bounded-degree model) appear in Section ???. A procedure for estimating what we refer to as the ϵ -corrected arboricity of a given graph (see Definition 12) appears in Section 6. In the appendix we describe an improved variant of our algorithm for the case that a precise estimate of the number of edges is given to the algorithm.

2 Preliminaries

For an integer k , let $[k] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \dots, k\}$. For an undirected simple graph $G = (V, E)$ let $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$. For each vertex $v \in V$, let $d(v)$ denote its degree.

We assume there is query access to the graph in the form of *degree* queries and *neighbor* queries. That is, for any vertex $v \in V$, it is possible to perform a query to obtain $d(v)$, and for any v and $i \in [d(v)]$, it is possible to perform a query to obtain the i^{th} neighbor of v (where the order over neighbors is arbitrary). If $i > d(v)$, then a special symbol is returned.

Definition 1 (Distance). *For a property \mathcal{P} of graphs, and a parameter $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, we say that a graph G is ϵ -far from (having) the property \mathcal{P} , if more than $\epsilon \cdot m$ edge modifications on G are required so as to obtain a graph that has the property \mathcal{P} .*

Definition 2 (Arboricity). *The arboricity of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is the minimum number of forests into which its edges can be partitioned. We denote the arboricity of G by $\alpha(G)$.*

By the work of Nash-Williams [26, 27], for every graph $G = (V, E)$,

$$\alpha(G) = \max_{S \subseteq V} \left\lceil \frac{|E(S)|}{|S| - 1} \right\rceil, \quad (1)$$

where $E(S)$ denotes the set of edges in the subgraph induced by S .

Let $\exp(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^x$, and for a random variable χ , we use $\mathbb{E}[\chi]$ to denote its expected value.

We make use of Hoeffding's inequality [21], stated next. For $i = 1, \dots, s$, let χ_i be a 0/1-valued random variable, such that $\Pr[\chi_i = 1] = \mu$. Then for any $\gamma \in (0, 1]$,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i > \mu + \gamma \right] < \exp(-2\gamma^2 s)$$

and

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i < \mu - \gamma \right] < \exp(-2\gamma^2 s).$$

We also apply the following version of the multiplicative Chernoff bound [7]. For $i = 1, \dots, s$, let χ_i be a random variables taking values in $[0, B]$, such that $\mathbb{E}[\chi_i] = \mu$. Then for any $\gamma \in (0, 1]$,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i > (1 + \gamma)\mu \right] < \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 \mu s}{3B}\right)$$

and

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i < (1 - \gamma)\mu \right] < \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2 \mu s}{2B}\right).$$

3 A Deterministic Edge-Assignment Algorithm

In this section we describe a deterministic algorithm that, given as input a graph $G = (V, E)$, assigns edges to vertices. The algorithm works iteratively, where in each iteration it assigns edges to a new subset of vertices. The algorithm is provided with parameters that determine an upper bound on the number of edges that are assigned to each vertex (where an edge may be assigned to both of its endpoints). The number of edges assigned to each vertex is at most 3α plus a small fraction of its original degree. This fraction is determined by one of the parameters (γ). When the algorithm terminates, some edges may remain unassigned (and some vertices may not have been assigned any edges). This algorithm (when viewed as a distributed algorithm) is a variant of the

Algorithm 1 Assign-Edges($G, \alpha, \epsilon, \gamma$)

- 1: $G_0(\gamma) = G, A_0(\gamma) = V$.
 - 2: **for** $i = 1$ to $\ell \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lceil \log_{6/5}(1/\epsilon) \rceil$ **do**
 - 3: Let $B_i(\gamma)$ be the set of vertices $v \in V$ whose degree in $G_{i-1}(\gamma)$ is at most $3\alpha + \gamma \cdot d(v)$.
 - 4: Assign each vertex $v \in B_i(\gamma)$ the edges incident to it in $G_{i-1}(\gamma)$.
 - 5: Let $A_i(\gamma) = A_{i-1}(\gamma) \setminus B_i(\gamma)$, and let $G_i(\gamma)$ be the graph induced by $A_i(\gamma)$.
 - 6: **end for**
-

algorithm by Barenboim and Elkin [5] for finding a forest decomposition in graphs with bounded arboricity.

The algorithm **Assign-Edges** is provided with 3 parameters: α, ϵ and γ . It might be useful to first consider its execution with $\gamma = 0$. The role of γ will become clear subsequently (when we describe our testing algorithm and its relation to **Assign-Edges**). In the case of $\gamma = 0$, in every iteration, each vertex with degree at most 3α in the current graph is assigned all its incident edges in this graph. The initial graph is G , and at the end of iteration i , the vertices that are assigned edges, denoted $B_i(\gamma)$ in the algorithm⁵, together with the edges assigned to them, are removed from the graph. Once vertices are assigned edges, we view them as becoming *inactive*. We use the notation $A_i(\gamma)$ for the vertices that are still *active* at the end of iteration i . Observe that by the definition of the algorithm, for $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2$, we have that $A_i(\gamma_2) \subseteq A_i(\gamma_1)$ for every iteration i , and hence $G_i(\gamma_2)$ is a subgraph of $G_i(\gamma_1)$.

In the next two lemmas we upper bound the number of edges in $G_\ell(0)$ when G is close to having arboricity α , and we lower bound the number of edges in $G_\ell(\gamma)$ (which is a subgraph of $G_\ell(0)$), when G is far from having arboricity 3α .⁶

Lemma 3. *If G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α , then $|E(G_\ell(0))| \leq 5\epsilon m$.*

Proof. By the premise of the lemma, G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α . This implies that for each of its subgraphs, G' , there is a subset of at most ϵm edges whose removal makes G' have arboricity at most α . In particular this is true for the subgraphs $G_i(0)$ defined by the algorithm, for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Denoting by m_i the number of edges in $G_i(0)$, we have that for every $i \in [\ell]$,

$$m_i \leq \alpha \cdot |A_i(0)| + \epsilon m. \quad (2)$$

By the definition of $A_i(0)$, each vertex $v \in A_i(0)$ has degree greater than 3α in $G_{i-1}(0)$. It follows that

$$m_{i-1} \geq 3\alpha |A_i(0)|/2. \quad (3)$$

Suppose that $|A_i(0)| > 4\epsilon m/\alpha$ (so that $\epsilon m < \alpha |A_i(0)|/4$). The upper bound on m_i in Equation (2) implies that $m_i \leq 5\alpha |A_i(0)|/4$. combining this with the lower bound on m_{i-1} in Equation (3) we get that $\frac{m_i}{m_{i-1}} \leq 5/6$.

Therefore, in every iteration of **Assign-Edges** in which $|A_i(0)| > 4\epsilon m/\alpha$, the number of edges in the graph decreases by a multiplicative factor of $5/6$. On the other hand, if $|A_i(0)| \leq 4\epsilon m/\alpha$, then, applying Equation (2) with this upper bound on $|A_i(0)|$, we get that $m_i \leq 5\epsilon m$. Hence, after at most $\lceil \log_{6/5}(1/\epsilon) \rceil$ iterations, there are at most $5\epsilon m$ edges between active vertices. \square

Lemma 4. *If G is ϵ' -far from having arboricity 3α , then $|E(G_\ell(\gamma))| > (\epsilon' - 2\gamma)m$.*

⁵While $B_i(\gamma)$ depends also on α , we shall want to refer to these sets when the algorithm is invoked with the same value of α but with different values of γ . Hence, only γ appears explicitly in the notation.

⁶The term 3α can be improved to $(2 + \eta)\alpha$ for any $\eta > 0$ by increasing the number of iterations by a factor of $1/\eta$.

Proof. Assume, contrary to the claim, that $|E(G_\ell(\gamma))| \leq (\epsilon' - 2\gamma)m$. We shall show that by removing at most $\epsilon' \cdot m$ edges from G we can obtain a graph that has arboricity at most 3α , thus reaching a contradiction to the premise of the lemma that G is ϵ' -far from having arboricity 3α . First we remove all edges in $G_\ell(\gamma)$, that is, all edges in which both endpoints belong to $A_\ell(\gamma)$. We are left with edges that are incident to vertices in the set $V \setminus A_\ell(\gamma)$. For each vertex $v \in V \setminus A_\ell(\gamma)$, let $a(v)$ be the number of edges it is assigned (by Algorithm 1), and recall that $a(v) \leq 3\alpha + \gamma d(v)$. For each vertex v such that $a(v) > 3\alpha$, we remove $a(v) - 3\alpha$ of the edges it is assigned (these edges can be selected arbitrarily), thus leaving it with at most 3α assigned edges (recall that some edges may be assigned to both their endpoints). Let E_R denote the subset of edges that were removed. We have:

$$|E_R| \leq |E(G_\ell(\gamma))| + \sum_{\substack{v \in V \setminus A_\ell(\gamma): \\ a(v) > 3\alpha}} (a(v) - 3\alpha) \leq (\epsilon' - 2\gamma)m + \sum_{v \in V} \gamma d(v) = \epsilon' \cdot m. \quad (4)$$

It remains to show that the set of edges that were not removed, i.e., $E \setminus E_R$, can be decomposed into at most 3α forests. This is argued in a manner similar to [5]. Namely, we define an acyclic orientation, where for each vertex u , the number of edges in $E \setminus E_R$ that are oriented from u to another vertex v , is at most 3α (thus defining the at most 3α forests). Consider an edge (u, v) such that $u \in B_i$ and $v \in B_{i'}$. If $i \neq i'$, then we orient (u, v) from the vertex that became inactive first to the vertex that became inactive second. That is, if (without loss of generality) $i < i'$, then (u, v) is oriented from u to v . If both vertices became inactive at the same iteration, that is $i = i'$, then we orient (u, v) from the vertex with the smaller id to the vertex with the larger id. Observe that by the definition of the orientation, for every vertex u , the set of edges oriented out of u is a subset of the edges assigned to u . Furthermore, the orientation is acyclic. Since after the removal of E_R , each vertex is left with at most 3α assigned edges, we obtain an orientation as desired. Combing this with Equation (4) we reach a contradiction. \square

4 The Testing Algorithm

In this section we present and analyze our algorithm **Is-Bounded-Arboricity**. We assume that the distance parameter, ϵ , is at most $1/20$ (since otherwise the algorithm can simply accept, as it is required to reject graphs that are 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α).

We start with a central procedure used by **Is-Bounded-Arboricity**.

4.1 Deciding whether a vertex is active

In this subsection we present a procedure that, roughly speaking, decides whether a given vertex v belongs to the set of active vertices $A_i(0)$ (as defined in the algorithm **Assign-Edges** from Section 3). This procedure is then used to estimate the number of edges remaining in $G_\ell(0)$ (the subgraph induced by $A_\ell(0)$).

Observe that by the description of the algorithm **Assign-Edges**, for any vertex v , the decision whether $v \in A_i(0)$ can be made by considering the distance- i neighborhood of v . However, the size of this neighborhood may be very large, since the maximum degree in the graph is not bounded. Hence, rather than querying for the entire distance- i neighborhood, we query (in a randomized manner), for only a small part of the neighborhood, as detailed in the procedure **Is-Active**. As stated in Lemma 5, the procedure ensures (with high probability), that its output is correct on $v \in A_\ell(\gamma) \subseteq A_\ell(0)$ and on $v \notin A_\ell(0)$. If $v \in A_\ell(0) \setminus A_\ell(\gamma)$, then the procedure may return any output, and as we shall see subsequently, this suffices for our purposes.

Procedure 2 Is-Active $(v, \ell, \alpha, \gamma, \delta)$

- 1: Set the confidence parameter $\rho = \left(\frac{\delta \cdot \gamma}{\ell}\right)^{4\ell}$.
 - 2: Return **Recursive-Is-Active** $(v, \ell, \alpha, \gamma, \rho)$.
-

Procedure 3 Recursive-Is-Active $(v, i, \alpha, \gamma, \rho)$

- 1: If $d(v) \leq 3\alpha$, then return **No**.
 - 2: If $i = 1$ and $d(v) > 3\alpha$, then return **Yes**.
 - 3: Sample a random multiset, $S_{v,i}$, of $t = \left\lceil \frac{4\ell \log(1/\rho)}{\gamma^2} \right\rceil$ neighbors of v .
 - 4: For every $u \in S_{v,i}$, invoke **Recursive-Is-Active** $(u, i-1, \alpha, \gamma, \rho)$ and let $\eta(v, i)$ be the fraction of vertices in $S_{v,i}$ that returned **Yes**.
 - 5: If $\eta(v, i) \cdot d(v) > 3\alpha + (\gamma/2) \cdot d(v)$, then return **Yes**, otherwise return **No**.
-

Lemma 5. For $\delta < \frac{1}{3}$ and $\gamma < 1$, the procedure **Is-Active** $(v, \ell, \alpha, \gamma, \delta)$ returns a value in $\{\text{Yes}, \text{No}\}$ such that the following holds.

1. If $v \notin A_\ell(0)$, then the procedure returns **No** with probability at least $1 - \delta$.
2. If $v \in A_\ell(\gamma)$, then the procedure returns **Yes** with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

The query complexity and running time of **Is-Active** $(v, \ell, \alpha, \gamma, \delta)$ are $O\left(\left(\frac{6\ell \cdot \log\left(\frac{\ell}{\gamma \cdot \delta}\right)}{\gamma^2}\right)^\ell\right)$.

Proof. For a vertex $v \in V$, consider the execution of **Is-Active** $(v, \ell, \alpha, \gamma, \delta)$.

For $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, define S_i to be the multiset of vertices on which **Recursive-Is-Active** is invoked with the parameter i . In particular, $S_\ell = \{v\}$, and for $i < \ell$, the vertices in S_i were selected in invocations of **Recursive-Is-Active** with $i+1$. For a vertex u , let $\hat{\eta}(u, i, \gamma)$ be the fraction of vertices in $S_{u,i}$ that belong to $A_{i-1}(\gamma)$, and let $\hat{\eta}(u, i, 0)$ be the fraction of vertices in $S_{u,i}$ that belong to $A_{i-1}(0)$ (which is a superset of $A_{i-1}(\gamma)$). Recall that $A_0(0) = A_0(\gamma) = V$.

For $2 \leq i \leq \ell$ we say that a vertex $u \in S_i$ is *i-successful* if one of the following holds:

1. $u \in A_i(\gamma)$ and $\hat{\eta}(u, i, \gamma) \cdot d(u) > 3\alpha + (\gamma/2)d(u)$.
2. $u \notin A_i(0)$ and $\hat{\eta}(u, i, 0) \cdot d(u) \leq 3\alpha + (\gamma/2)d(u)$.
3. $u \in A_i(0) \setminus A_i(\gamma)$.

Otherwise, it is *i-unsuccessful*. For $i = 1$, every vertex is 1-successful.

Consider a recursive call to **Recursive-Is-Active** $(u, i, \alpha, \gamma, \rho)$ on a vertex $u \in A_i(\gamma)$ for $2 \leq i \leq \ell$. Since $u \in A_i(\gamma)$, we have that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\eta}(u, i, \gamma) \cdot d(u)] > 3\alpha + \gamma d(u)$. By Hoeffding's inequality, the probability that u is *i-unsuccessful* is upper bounded by

$$\Pr\left[\hat{\eta}(u, i, \gamma) \leq \mathbb{E}[\hat{\eta}(u, i, \gamma)] - \gamma/2\right] < \exp(-2(\gamma/2)^2 \cdot t) \leq \rho/2.$$

Now consider a vertex $u \notin A_i(0)$. That is, $u \in \bigcup_{i' < i} B_{i'}(0)$ (where $B_{i'}(\cdot)$ is as defined in the algorithm **Assign-Edges**). In this case we claim that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\eta}(u, i, 0) \cdot d(u)] \leq 3\alpha$. To verify this claim observe that since $u \in B_{i'}(0)$ (for some $i' \leq i$), the number of neighbors that u has in $A_{i'-1}(0)$ is at most 3α . The claim follows since $A_{i-1}(0) \subseteq A_{i'-1}(0)$ (for $i' \leq i$), and by the definition of $\hat{\eta}(u, i, 0)$

(the fraction of vertices in $S_{u,i}$ that belong to $A_{i-1}(0)$). By Hoeffding's inequality, the probability that u is i -unsuccessful is upper bounded by

$$\Pr\left[\widehat{\eta}(u, i, 0) > \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\eta}(u, i, 0)] + \gamma/2\right] < \exp(-2(\gamma/2)^2 \cdot t) \leq \rho/2.$$

For $2 \leq i \leq \ell$ we say that a vertex $u \in S_i$ is *recursively i -successful* if u is i -successful and all the vertices in $S_{u,i}$ are recursively $(i-1)$ -successful. For $i=1$ every vertex is defined to be recursively 1-successful. By this definition, if for every $2 \leq i \leq \ell$, every $u \in S_i$ is i -successful, then we also have that for every $2 \leq i \leq \ell$, every $u \in S_i$ is recursively i -successful. By taking a union bound over all $2 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $u \in S_i$, we get that the probability that for some i there exists $u \in S_i$ that is not i -successful is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} t^i \cdot \frac{\rho}{2} &\leq t^\ell \cdot \rho = \left\lceil \frac{4\ell \log(1/\rho)}{\gamma^2} \right\rceil^\ell \cdot \rho \\ &\leq \frac{6^\ell \ell^\ell \cdot \log^\ell\left(\frac{\ell}{\delta\gamma}\right) \cdot \delta^{4\ell} \cdot \gamma^{4\ell}}{\gamma^{2\ell}} \cdot \frac{\delta^{4\ell} \cdot \gamma^{4\ell}}{\ell^{4\ell}} < \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by the assumption that $\delta < \frac{1}{3}$ and $\gamma < 1$.

We next claim that if $u \in S_i$ is recursively i -successful, then the following holds: if $u \in A_i(\gamma)$, then **Recursive-Is-Active** $(u, i, \alpha, \gamma, \rho)$ returns **Yes** and if $u \notin A_i(0)$, then **Recursive-Is-Active** $(u, i, \alpha, \gamma, \rho)$ returns **No**. We establish this claim as well by induction on i .

For $i=1$ (the leaves of the recursion tree), the claim follows by Steps 1 and 2 of the algorithm. For the induction step, assume the claim holds for $i-1 \geq 1$, and we prove it for i . If $u \in A_i(\gamma)$, then (since u is i -successful), $\widehat{\eta}(u, i, \gamma) \cdot d(u) > 3\alpha + (\gamma/2)d(u)$, and since all the vertices in $S_{u,i}$ are recursively $(i-1)$ -successful, then by induction, the algorithm returns **Yes** in Step 5. If $u \notin A_i(0)$, then (again since u is i -successful), $\widehat{\eta}(u, i, 0) \cdot d(u) \leq 3\alpha + (\gamma/2)d(u)$, and since all the vertices in $S_{u,i}$ are recursively $(i-1)$ -successful, by induction the algorithm returns **No** in Step 5.

It remains to bound the complexity of the algorithm. Consider the recursion tree corresponding to the complete execution of **Is-Active** $(v, \ell, \alpha, \gamma, \rho)$ for any vertex v . Since the size of the recursion tree is $O(t^\ell) = O\left(\left(\frac{6\ell \cdot \log(\ell/(\gamma\delta))}{\gamma^2}\right)^\ell\right)$, the upper bound on the complexity of the procedure follows. \square

4.2 The algorithm for testing bounded arboricity

In order to distinguish between the case that G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α and the case that it is 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α , our algorithm samples edges and applies the procedure **Is-Active** to their endpoints. Sampling edges (almost uniformly) is done by making use of the following theorem.

Theorem 6 (Eden & Rosenbaum [14], rephrased). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with n vertices and m edges. There exists an algorithm named **Sample-Edge-Almost-Uniformly**, that is given query access to G and parameters n, β and δ . The algorithm returns an edge $e \in E$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, and conditioned on an edge being returned, each edge in the graph is returned with probability in $\left[\frac{(1-\beta)}{m}, \frac{(1+\beta)}{m}\right]$. The expected query complexity and running time of the algorithm are $O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\beta m}}\right) \cdot \log^2(n/\delta)$.*

We note that it can be shown that the dependence on $\text{poly}(\log n)$ in the complexity of **Sample-Edge-Almost-Uniformly** can be reduced to a dependence on $\text{poly}(\log(n/\sqrt{m}))$ (this dependence stems from estimating the average degree up to a constant factor).⁷

Algorithm 4 Is-Bounded-Arboricity(G, n, α, ϵ)

- 1: Invoke **Sample-Edge-Almost-Uniformly**($n, 1/4, 1/4$) for $t = \frac{600}{\epsilon}$ times, and let S be the (multi-)set of returned edges.
 - 2: Let s be the number of (not necessarily different) edges in S . If $s < \frac{300}{\epsilon}$, then return **Yes**.
 - 3: Set $\ell = \lceil \log_{6/5}(1/\epsilon) \rceil$.
 - 4: **for** each edge $(u_i, v_i) \in S$ **do**
 - 5: Invoke **Is-Active**($v_i, \ell, \alpha, \epsilon, \epsilon/2$) and **Is-Active**($u_i, \ell, \alpha, \epsilon, \epsilon/2$).
 - 6: If **Is-Active** returned **Yes** on both invocations, then set $\chi_i = 1$. Otherwise, set $\chi_i = 0$.
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Set $\chi = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i$.
 - 9: If $\chi < 10\epsilon$, then return **Yes**. Otherwise, return **No**.
-

Theorem 7. *Let G be a graph over n vertices and m edges. If G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α , then **Is-bounded-arboricity** returns **Yes** with probability at least $2/3$, and if G is 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α , then **Is-bounded-arboricity** returns **No** with probability at least $2/3$.*

*The query complexity and running time of **Is-Bounded-Arboricity** are*

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon\sqrt{m}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$$

in expectation.

Proof. By Theorem 6, each invocation of **Sample-Edge-Almost-Uniformly**($n, 1/4, 1/4$) succeeds with probability at least $3/4$. By the multiplicative Chernoff bound and by the setting of $t = \frac{600}{\epsilon}$, it follows that with probability at least $5/6$, at least $1/2$ of the invocations return an edge. Hence, $s \geq \frac{300}{\epsilon}$ with probability at least $5/6$ and the algorithm continues to the following steps. We henceforth condition on this event.

We say that the procedure **Is-Active** is correct when invoked with a vertex v in Step 5 of the algorithm if $v \in A_\ell(\epsilon)$ and **Is-Active** returns **Yes**, or if $v \notin A_\ell(0)$ and **Is-Active** returns **No**. For a subgraph G' of G we let $m(G')$ denote the number of edges in G' .

We first consider the case that G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α . By Lemma 3, in this case $m(G_\ell(0)) \leq 5\epsilon m$. For each $i \in [s]$ such that the edge (u_i, v_i) does not belong to $G_\ell(0)$, it holds that either u_i or v_i is not in $A_\ell(0)$. Hence, by Lemma 5, **Is-Active** returns **Yes** on both vertices with probability at most $\epsilon/2$ (recall that **Is-Active** is called in Step 5 with the confidence parameter δ set to $\epsilon/2$). For each edge $(u_i, v_i) \in G_\ell(0)$, we upper bound the probability that **Is-Active** returns **Yes** on both vertices by 1. By Theorem 6, when **Sample-Edge-Almost-Uniformly** is invoked with parameters $\beta = 1/4$ and $\delta = 1/4$, if the algorithm returns an edge, then each edge in the graph is returned with probability in $[(3/4)/m, (5/4)/m]$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\chi_i] \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot \frac{(5/4) \cdot m}{m} + \frac{(5/4) \cdot m(G_\ell(0))}{m} \leq \frac{5 \cdot m(G_\ell(0))/4 + \epsilon m}{m}.$$

⁷This can be done by applying the algorithm of [12] for estimating the number of edges and slightly modifying their geometric search procedure.

Since $m(G_\ell(0)) \leq 5\epsilon m$, we get that $\mathbb{E}[\chi_i] \leq 8\epsilon$ for every $i \in [s]$.

By the multiplicative Chernoff bound and since $s \geq \frac{300}{\epsilon}$,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i > \left(1 + \frac{1}{20}\right) \cdot 8\epsilon \right] < \exp \left(-\frac{(1/20)^2 \cdot 8\epsilon \cdot s}{3} \right) < 1/6.$$

It follows that if G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α , then either the algorithm returns **Yes** in Step 2, or with probability at least $5/6$, $\chi \leq 9\epsilon$, which causes the algorithm to return **Yes** in Step 9.

Now consider the case that G is 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α . By Lemma 4, setting $\epsilon' = 20\epsilon$ and $\gamma = \epsilon$, in this case we get that $m(G_\ell(\epsilon)) > 18\epsilon m$.

For each $i \in [s]$ such that the edge (u_i, v_i) belongs to $G_\ell(\epsilon)$, we get that $\chi_i = 1$ if the invocations of **Is-Active** on both u_i and v_i return **Yes**. Since for (u_i, v_i) in $G_\ell(\epsilon)$ both u_i and v_i belong to $A_\ell(\epsilon)$, by Lemma 5 and the union bound, **Is-Active** returns **Yes** on both vertices with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Hence (using our assumption that $\epsilon \leq 1/20$),

$$\mathbb{E}[\chi_i] \geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon) \cdot (3/4) \cdot m(G_\ell(\epsilon))}{m} \geq 12\epsilon.$$

By the multiplicative Chernoff bound and since $s \geq \frac{300}{\epsilon}$,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i < \left(1 - \frac{1}{20}\right) \cdot 12\epsilon \right] < \exp \left(-\frac{(1/20)^2 \cdot 12\epsilon \cdot s}{2} \right) < 1/6.$$

It follows that (conditioned on $s \geq \frac{300}{\epsilon}$), with probability at least $5/6$, $\chi \geq 10\epsilon$, which causes the algorithm to return **No** in Step 9. Since the probability that $s < \frac{300}{\epsilon}$ is at most $1/6$, if G is 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α , then the algorithm returns **No** with probability at least $2/3$.

It remains to bound the complexity of the algorithm. By Theorem 6, the $t = \frac{600}{\epsilon}$ invocations of **Sample-Edge-Almost-Uniformly** with parameters $\beta = 1/4$ and $\delta = 1/4$ take $O\left(\frac{n \cdot \log^2 n}{\epsilon \sqrt{m}}\right)$ time. In each step of the for loop there are at most two invocations of the procedure **Is-Active** with parameters $\gamma = \epsilon$ and $\delta = \epsilon/2$. By Lemma 5, the query complexity and running time resulting from each of these invocations are $O\left(\left(\frac{6\ell \log(\ell/\epsilon^2)}{\epsilon^2}\right)^\ell\right)$. Since $\ell = \lceil \log_{6/5}(1/\epsilon) \rceil$, the total query complexity and running time are $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon \sqrt{m}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$, as claimed. \square

5 Lower bounds

The following lower bounds are quite simple and are proved here for the sake of completeness.

Claim 8. *For a graph G let n denote the number of vertices in G and let \bar{m} be a constant factor approximation of the number of edges, m , in G . Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm that is given query access to a graph G as well as parameters n , \bar{m} , $\epsilon < 1/100$, and $\alpha < \sqrt{\epsilon \bar{m}}$. The algorithm \mathcal{A} is required to distinguish with probability at least $2/3$ between the case that G has arboricity at most α and the case that G is 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α . Then \mathcal{A} must perform $\Omega\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\epsilon m}}\right)$ queries.*

Proof. Consider the following two families of graphs \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 . Every graph in \mathcal{G}_1 consists of three disjoint subgraphs G_1^1, G_2^1 and G_3^1 as described next. G_1^1 is an independent set of size $n - 2\bar{m}/\alpha -$

$2\sqrt{100\epsilon\overline{m}}$; G_2^1 is a bipartite graph with \overline{m}/α vertices on each side and α perfect matchings between the two sides; G_3^1 is an independent set of size $2\sqrt{100\epsilon\overline{m}}$; The graphs within the family differ from one another only by the labeling of the vertices. The graphs in the second family \mathcal{G}_2 also consists of three disjoint subgraphs G_1^2, G_2^2, G_3^2 . Here we have $G_1^2 = G_1^1, G_2^2 = G_2^1$ and G_3^2 is a complete bipartite graph with $\sqrt{100\epsilon\overline{m}}$ vertices on each side. As before, the graphs within the family differ only by the labeling of the vertices.

All graphs in \mathcal{G}_1 have \overline{m} edges, and all graphs in \mathcal{G}_2 have $\overline{m} + 100\epsilon\overline{m} < 2\overline{m}$ edges. Furthermore, all graphs in \mathcal{G}_1 have arboricity α , while in \mathcal{G}_2 all graphs are 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α . To verify the latter claim, observe that after removing $20\epsilon m < 40\epsilon\overline{m}$ edges from any graph in \mathcal{G}_2 , the number of edges remaining in the subgraph G_3^2 is greater than $100\epsilon\overline{m} - 40\epsilon\overline{m} = 60\epsilon\overline{m}$. Since the number of vertices in G_3^2 is $2\sqrt{100\epsilon\overline{m}} = 20\sqrt{\epsilon\overline{m}}$, the arboricity of G_3^2 (after the removal of the aforementioned edges) is greater than $3\sqrt{\epsilon\overline{m}} > 3\alpha$.

In order to distinguish between a graph drawn uniformly from the first family and a graph drawn uniformly from the second family, an algorithm must witness a vertex in G_3^i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Since the probability of witnessing such a vertex for both $i = 1$ and $i = 2$ is $\frac{|V(G_3^i)|}{n} = \frac{2\sqrt{100\epsilon\overline{m}}}{n}$, at least $\Omega\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{\epsilon m}}\right)$ queries are required in order to distinguish between the two families with probability at least $2/3$. \square

The proof of Claim 8 relies on the ability to construct a lower bound instance where we “hide” a small set of vertices with very high density. When the algorithm is also given the exact number of edges in the graph this is no longer possible, and the above lower bound does not hold. Instead, for the case where m is known, we prove a weaker lower bound of $\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon m}\right)$.

Claim 9. *For a graph G let n denote the number of vertices in G and let m denote the number of edges. Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm that is given query access to a graph G as well as parameters $n, m, \epsilon < 1/100$ and $\alpha \leq \sqrt{\epsilon m}$. The algorithm \mathcal{A} is required to distinguish with probability at least $2/3$ between the case that G has arboricity at most α and the case that G is 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α . Then \mathcal{A} must perform $\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon m}\right)$ queries.*

Proof. We describe two families of graphs \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 . Each graph in the first family \mathcal{G}_1 consists of four disjoint subgraphs, G_1^1, G_2^1, G_3^1 and G_4^1 , which are defined as follows: G_1^1 is an independent set over $n - 2m/\alpha - 2\sqrt{100\epsilon m}$ vertices; G_2^1 is a bipartite graph with $(1 - 100\epsilon)m/\alpha$ vertices on each side, and α perfect matchings between the sides; G_3^1 is a bipartite graph with $100\epsilon m/\alpha$ vertices on each side, and α perfect matchings between the sides; G_4^1 is an independent set over $2\sqrt{100\epsilon m}$ vertices. The graphs in the second family \mathcal{G}_2 also consists of four disjoint subgraphs G_1^2, G_2^2, G_3^2 and G_4^2 . Here we have $G_1^2 = G_1^1$ and $G_2^2 = G_2^1$, G_3^2 is an independent set over $200\epsilon m/\alpha$ vertices and G_4^2 is a complete bipartite graph with $\sqrt{100\epsilon m}$ vertices on each side. Within each family, the graphs differ only by the labeling of the vertices. By the above description we get that graphs in both families have exactly m edges. Furthermore, the graphs in \mathcal{G}_1 have arboricity α , and the graphs in \mathcal{G}_2 are 20ϵ -far from having arboricity 3α (this follows similarly to what was shown in the proof of Claim 8).

We assume without loss of generality that every neighbor query (u, i) or pair query (u, v) is preceded by one or two degree queries $d(u)$ or $d(u), d(v)$, respectively. Furthermore, assume that whenever the algorithm queries for the degree of some vertex u , it also gets an index $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ indicating to which of the subgraphs $G_1^i, G_2^i, G_3^i, G_4^i$ it belongs (without revealing the value of i). Since $G_1^1 = G_1^2$ and $G_2^1 = G_2^2$, it is clear that in order to distinguish between a graph drawn from \mathcal{G}_1 to a graph drawn from \mathcal{G}_2 any algorithm must hit either G_3^i or G_4^i for the corresponding i value. Since for both $i = 1$ and $i = 2$, $|G_3^i| + |G_4^i| = O\left(\frac{\epsilon m}{\alpha}\right)$ (recall that we assume that $\alpha \leq \sqrt{\epsilon m}$), we have

that hitting either G_3^i or G_4^i occurs with probability $O\left(\frac{\epsilon m}{n\alpha}\right)$, so that $\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon m}\right)$ queries are required in order to distinguish the two families with probability at least $2/3$. \square

Finally we establish that there is no one-sided error algorithm for bounded arboricity that performs a number of queries that is sublinear in n .

Claim 10. *Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm that is given query access to a graph G as well as parameters n , $\alpha \geq 2$ and $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}$ (where n is the number of vertices in G). It is required to accept G with probability 1 if G has arboricity at most α and reject G with probability at least $2/3$ if G is ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α . Then \mathcal{A} must perform $\Omega(n)$ queries.*

Proof. We shall prove that for any $\alpha \geq 2$, sufficiently large n and $\epsilon \leq 1/4$, there exists a graph G over n vertices for which the following two conditions hold. On one hand, G is ϵ -far from having arboricity 3α . On the other hand, for any $k \leq n/c$, where c is a sufficiently large constant, every induced subgraph of G over k vertices has arboricity at most α . Therefore, for this graph, any one-sided error algorithm must perform $\Omega(n)$ queries.

Consider selecting G according to the distribution $G(n, p)$ where $p = \frac{10\alpha}{n}$. That is, for each pair of vertices, the probability that we have an edge between these two vertices is p (and the corresponding events for different pairs of vertices are independent). The expected number of edges in G is $\binom{n}{2} \cdot p = 5\alpha(n-1)$. By applying the multiplicative Chernoff bound, with very high probability, the number of edges in G is at least $4\alpha(n-1)$ (i.e., at least $4/5$ of the expected value), so that by Equation (1), G is at least $1/4$ -far from having arboricity 3α .

Let k be an integer such that $4 < k \leq n/c$, and let K be a subset of k vertices. We next upper bound the probability that the number of edges in the subgraph induced by K , denoted $m(K)$, is more than $\alpha(k-1)$. For any fixed set B of $\alpha(k-1)$ pairs of vertices, the probability that we get an edge between every pair in B is $p^{\alpha(k-1)}$. Taking a union bound over all such subsets B , and using the inequality $\binom{y}{x} \leq \left(\frac{e \cdot y}{x}\right)^x$, the probability that $m(K) > \alpha(k-1)$ is upper bounded by

$$\binom{\binom{k}{2}}{\alpha(k-1)} \cdot p^{\alpha(k-1)} \leq \left(\frac{e \cdot k \cdot p}{2\alpha}\right)^{\alpha(k-1)} = \left(\frac{5e \cdot k}{n}\right)^{\alpha(k-1)}.$$

By taking a union bound over all $\binom{n}{k}$ subsets of size k we get that the probability that there exists any such subset of size k is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{k} \cdot \left(\frac{5e \cdot k}{n}\right)^{\alpha(k-1)} &\leq \left(\frac{e \cdot n}{k}\right)^k \cdot \left(\frac{5e \cdot k}{n}\right)^{\alpha(k-1)} \leq (5e^2)^{\alpha(k-1)} \cdot \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\alpha(k-1)-k} \\ &\leq \left((5e^2)^3 \cdot \frac{k}{n}\right)^{\alpha(k-1)-k} \leq \left((5e^2)^3 \cdot \frac{k}{n}\right)^{k-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\frac{\alpha(k-1)}{\alpha(k-1)-k} \leq 3$ for $\alpha \geq 2$ and $k \geq 4$, and that $\alpha(k-1) - k \geq k-2$ for $\alpha \geq 2$. By setting $c = 2(5e^2)^3$, this probability is upper bounded by $2^{-(k-2)}$, and by summing over all $k > 4$ we get that the probability is bounded away from 1. \square

As mentioned in the introduction, for the case of $\alpha = 1$ (cycle-freeness), there is a one-sided error testing algorithm [9] that performs $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ queries (and these many queries are necessary [16]).

6 Estimating the corrected arboricity

In this section we present a procedure for estimating what we refer to as the ϵ -corrected-arboricity of a graph G . The ϵ -corrected-arboricity of a graph G is the minimal arboricity of a graph that G can be “corrected into”. That is, it is the minimal arboricity over all the graphs that are ϵ -close to G (See Definition 12). The procedure performs a standard geometric search on the value of the “corrected arboricity” using the testing algorithm **Is-Bounded-Arboricity**, and we provide the procedure here for the sake of completeness. More precisely, the procedure first obtains an estimate \overline{m} of m . Then it starts with a guess value $\tilde{\alpha} = 1$, and for each guess value $\tilde{\alpha}$ it invokes **Is-Bounded-Arboricity** with $\tilde{\alpha}$ for $O(\log \log \overline{m})$ times. If the majority of votes return **Yes**, then the algorithm returns $\tilde{\alpha}$, and otherwise it continues with $\tilde{\alpha} = 2\tilde{\alpha}$. The search ends when $\tilde{\alpha}$ exceeds $\sqrt{\overline{m}}$, at which point, the algorithm simply returns $\sqrt{\overline{m}}$. (Recall that for every graph G , $\alpha \leq \sqrt{m}$.) We note that the overhead of this procedure, compared to the testing algorithm, is a factor of $\text{poly}(\log n)$.

Theorem 11 (Goldreich & Ron [17], rephrased). *There exists a procedure that when invoked with a graph G and a confidence parameter δ , returns a value \overline{m} such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $\overline{m} \in [m, 2m]$, where m is the number of edges in G . The expected running time of the procedure is $O(n \log(n/\delta)/\sqrt{\overline{m}})$.*

Algorithm 5 Estimate-Corrected-Arboricity(G, n, ϵ)

- 1: Invoke [17] with parameters G and $1/9$ to obtain an estimate \overline{m} of the number of edges in G .
 - 2: Let $\tilde{\alpha} = 1$ and $\delta = 1/(9 \log \overline{m})$.
 - 3: **while** $\tilde{\alpha} \leq \sqrt{\overline{m}}$ **do**
 - 4: Invoke **Is-Bounded-Arboricity**($G, n, \tilde{\alpha}, \epsilon$) for $10 \log(1/\delta)$ times.
 - 5: If more than half of the invocations returned **Yes**, then return $\overline{\alpha} = \tilde{\alpha}$.
 - 6: Let $\tilde{\alpha} = 2\tilde{\alpha}$.
 - 7: **end while**
 - 8: **return** $\sqrt{\overline{m}}$.
-

Definition 12 (ϵ -Corrected Arboricity). *Let \mathcal{G}_n denote the family of graphs over n vertices. For a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$ let $\alpha^*(G, \epsilon)$ denote the minimal value α' such that G is ϵ -close to a graph G' with arboricity at most α' . That is, $\alpha^*(G, \epsilon) = \min_{G' \in \mathcal{G}_n} \{\alpha(G') \mid \text{dist}(G, G') \leq \epsilon \cdot m(G)\}$. We refer to the value α^* as the ϵ -corrected arboricity of the graph G .*

Claim 13. *The algorithm **Estimate-Corrected-Arboricity** when invoked with a graph G over n vertices and parameter ϵ returns a value $\overline{\alpha}$ such that with probability at least $2/3$, $\alpha^*(G, 20\epsilon)/3 \leq \overline{\alpha} \leq 2\alpha^*(G, \epsilon)$. The expected query complexity and running time of the algorithm are*

$$\tilde{O} \left(\frac{n}{\epsilon \sqrt{\overline{m}}} + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))} \right).$$

Proof. By Theorem 11, with probability at least $8/9$, the value \overline{m} is such that $\overline{m} \in [m, 2m]$. We henceforth condition on this event.

For every value $\tilde{\alpha}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha} < \alpha^*(G, 20\epsilon)/3$, it holds that G is at least 20ϵ -far from every graph with arboricity at most $3\tilde{\alpha}$. Hence, by Theorem 7, every invocation of **Is-Bounded-Arboricity**($G, n, \tilde{\alpha}, \epsilon$) returns **No** with probability at least $2/3$, and by a simple amplification argument, the probability

that more than half of the invocations return **Yes** in Step 5 is at most δ . Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, **Estimate-Corrected-Arboricity** will continue to run with a value $2\tilde{\alpha}$. Since there are at most $\log(\sqrt{m})$ invocations with a value $\tilde{\alpha} < \alpha^*(G, 20\epsilon)/3$, by a union bound, the probability that **Estimate-Corrected-Arboricity** will return a value $\tilde{\alpha} < \alpha^*(G, 20\epsilon)/3$ is at most $1/9$.

Once we reach a value $\tilde{\alpha}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha} \geq \alpha^*(G, \epsilon)$, then by the definition of α^* , G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most $\tilde{\alpha}$, and therefore, by Theorem 7, every invocation of **Is-Bounded-Arboricity**($G, \tilde{\alpha}, \epsilon$) returns **Yes** with probability at least $2/3$. Hence, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, more than half of the invocations of **Is-Bounded-Arboricity** return **Yes** and the algorithm returns $\tilde{\alpha}$. Since we increase $\tilde{\alpha}$ by a factor 2 at every step it holds that we will reach a value $\tilde{\alpha}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha} \in [\alpha^*(G, \epsilon), 2\alpha^*(G, \epsilon)]$, and by the above, once we reach such a value **Estimate-Corrected-Arboricity** will return $\tilde{\alpha}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta > 8/9$.

By a union bound, with probability at least $2/3$, **Estimate-Corrected-Arboricity** returns a value $\bar{\alpha}$ such that $\alpha^*(G, 20\epsilon)/3 \leq \bar{\alpha} \leq 2\alpha^*(G, \epsilon)$.

By Theorem 11, estimating the number of edges in Step 1, takes $O\left(\frac{n \cdot \log^2 n}{\sqrt{m}}\right)$ time in expectation. By Theorem 7, every invocation of the while loop in Step 3 takes $\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon\sqrt{m}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}$ time in expectation. Since the number of iterations is at most $\log(\bar{m})$ (and $\bar{m} \leq n^2$), the query complexity and running time are

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon\sqrt{m}} + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}\right)$$

in expectation. □

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the reviewers of the ACM Transactions on Algorithms journal for their helpful comments.

References

- [1] Noga Alon and Shai Gutner. Linear time algorithms for finding a dominating set of fixed size in degenerated graphs. *Algorithmica*, 54(4):544–556, 2009.
- [2] Noga Alon, Tali Kaufman, Michael Krivelevich, and Dana Ron. Testing triangle-freeness in general graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Math*, 22(2):786–819, 2008.
- [3] Nikhil Bansal and Seeun William Umboh. Tight approximation bounds for dominating set on graphs of bounded arboricity. *Information Processing Letters*, 122:21–24, 2017.
- [4] Albert-László Barabási and Reka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
- [5] Leonid Barenboim and Michael Elkin. Sublogarithmic distributed MIS algorithm for sparse graphs using Nash-Williams decomposition. *Distributed Computing*, 22(5-6):363–379, 2010.
- [6] Itai Benjamini, Oded Schramm, and Asaf Shapira. Every minor-closed property of sparse graphs is testable. *Advances in Mathematics*, 223:2200–2218, 2010.
- [7] Herman Chernoff. A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 23, 12 1952.

- [8] Norishige Chiba and Takao Nishizeki. Arboricity and subgraph listing algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 14(1):210–223, 1985.
- [9] Artur Czumaj, Oded Goldreich, Dana Ron, C. Seshadhri, Asaf Shapira, and Christian Sohler. Finding cycles and trees in sublinear time. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 45(2):139–184, 2014.
- [10] Artur Czumaj, Morteza Monemizadeh, Krzysztof Onak, and Christian Sohler. Planar graphs: Random walks and bipartiteness testing. In *IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2011, Palm Springs, CA, USA, October 22–25, 2011*, pages 423–432, 2011.
- [11] Alan Edelman, Avinatan Hassidim, Huy N. Nguyen, and Krzysztof Onak. An efficient partitioning oracle for bounded-treewidth graphs. In *Proceedings of 15th International Workshop on Randomization and Approximation Techniques in Computer Science (RANDOM)*, pages 530–541. Springer, 2011.
- [12] Talya Eden, Dana Ron, and C. Seshadhri. Sublinear time estimation of degree distribution moments: The degeneracy connection. In *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 7:1–7:13, 2017.
- [13] Talya Eden and Will Rosenbaum. On sampling edges almost uniformly. *CoRR*, abs/1706.09748, 2017.
- [14] Talya Eden and Will Rosenbaum. On sampling edges almost uniformly. In *1st Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA) 2018*, pages 7:1–7:9, 2018.
- [15] David Eppstein, Maarten Löffler, and Darren Strash. Listing all maximal cliques in large sparse real-world graphs. *ACM Journal of Experimental Algorithms*, 18(3):364–375, 2013.
- [16] Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. Property testing in bounded degree graphs. *Algorithmica*, 32(2):302–343, 2002.
- [17] Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008.
- [18] Petr A. Golovach and Yngve Villanger. Parameterized complexity for domination problems on degenerate graphs. In *Proceedings of 34th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, pages 195–205, 2008.
- [19] Luca Gugelmann. Testing triangle-freeness in general graphs: Lower bounds. BSc thesis, Dept. of Mathematics, ETH, Zurich, 2006.
- [20] Avinatan Hassidim, Jonathan A. Kelner, Huy N. Nguyen, and Krzysztof Onak. Local graph partitions for approximation and testing. In *Proceedings of 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 22–31, 2009.
- [21] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 58(301):13–30, 1963.
- [22] Kazuo Iwama and Yuichi Yoshida. Parameterized testability. In *Proceedings of the 5th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, pages 507–516, 2014.

- [23] Tali Kaufman, Michael Krivelevich, and Dana Ron. Tight bounds for testing bipartiteness in general graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 33(6):1441–1483, 2004.
- [24] Christoph Lenzen, Yvonne-Anne Pigolet, and Roger Wattenhofer. Distributed minimum dominating set approximations in restricted families of graphs. *Distributed Computing*, 26(2):119–137, 2013.
- [25] Reut Levi and Dana Ron. A quasi-polynomial time partition oracle for graphs with an excluded minor. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 11(3):24:1–24:13, 2015.
- [26] C. St. JA. Nash-Williams. Edge-disjoint spanning trees of finite graphs. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 1(1):445–450, 1961.
- [27] C. St. JA. Nash-Williams. Decomposition of finite graphs into forests. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 1(1):12–12, 1964.
- [28] Ilan Newman and Christian Sohler. Every property of hyperfinite graphs is testable. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42(3):1095–1112, 2013.
- [29] Michal Parnas and Dana Ron. Testing the diameter of graphs. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 20(2):165–183, 2002.
- [30] Michal Parnas, Dana Ron, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Tolerant property testing and distance approximation. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 72(6):1012–1042, 2006.
- [31] Thomas Ras. Testing triangle-freeness in general graphs: Upper bound. BSc thesis, Dept. of Mathematics, ETH, Zurich, 2006.
- [32] William Thomas Tutte. On the problem of decomposing a graph into n connected factors. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 36(1):221–230, 1961.
- [33] Yuichi Yoshida and Hiro Ito. Testing outerplanarity of bounded degree graphs. *Algorithmica*, 73(1):1–20, 2015.

A Adaptation of the algorithm when given a $(1 \pm \epsilon/c)$ estimate of m

In this section we describe an adaption of the algorithm for the case where it is given a $(1 \pm \epsilon/c)$ estimate of m . It will be easier to think of every edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ as two distinct directed edges (u, v) and (v, u) . We take advantage of the following definitions and simple claim.

Definition 14. *We say that a vertex v is **high** if $d(v) > 2\alpha/\epsilon$. Otherwise, we say it is **low**.*

*For an edge (u, v) , if u is low then we say it is a **directed low edge**, and otherwise we say that it is a **directed high edge**.*

Claim 15. *If a graph G has arboricity at most α , then it has at most $2\epsilon m$ directed high edges.*

Proof. Let H denote the set of high degree vertices in the graph. Then $|H| < 2m/(2\alpha/\epsilon) = \epsilon m/\alpha$, and it follows that $|E(H)| < \alpha|H| = \epsilon m$, implying that the number of directed high edges is at most $2\epsilon m$. □

We shall also make use of Lemma 3.1 of Eden and Rosenbaum [13] for sampling directed light edges.⁸

For a degree threshold θ let $E_{\leq\theta}$ denote the set of directed edges $(u, v) \in E$ such that $d(u) \leq \theta$.

Lemma 16 (Eden & Rosenbaum [13]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with n vertices and m edges. There exists a procedure named **Sample-Light-Edge** that given θ , returns a directed edge in $E_{\leq\theta}$ with probability $\frac{|E_{\leq\theta}|}{n \cdot \theta}$. Furthermore, the procedure performs a constant number of queries and each directed edge in $E_{\leq\theta}$ is returned with equal probability.*

Procedure 6 Estimate-High-Edges($n, \alpha, \epsilon, \delta, \bar{m}$)

- 1: Set $r = \frac{n\alpha}{\bar{m}} \cdot \frac{200 \ln(1/\delta)}{\epsilon^3}$.
 - 2: Invoke the procedure **Sample-Light-Edge** for r times with $\theta = 2\alpha/\epsilon$ and let $\chi_i = 1$ if the i^{th} invocation returned an edge, and otherwise let $\chi_i = 0$.
 - 3: Let $\chi = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \chi_i$.
 - 4: Let $\bar{m}_{low} = \frac{2n\alpha}{\epsilon} \cdot \chi$ and let $\bar{m}_{high} = \bar{m} - \bar{m}_{low}$.
 - 5: If $\bar{m}_{high} > 5\epsilon\bar{m}/2$, then return Many. Otherwise, return Few.
-

Claim 17. *Assume that $\bar{m} \in (1 \pm \epsilon/4)m$. If there are more than $3\epsilon m$ directed high edges in the graph, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, **Estimate-High-Edges** returns Many, and if there are at most $2\epsilon m$ directed high edges in the graph, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, **Estimate-High-Edges** returns Few. The query complexity and running time of the procedure are $O\left(\frac{n\alpha \cdot \log(1/\delta)}{\epsilon^3 \cdot m}\right)$.*

Proof. Let m_{low} and m_{high} denote the number of directed low and high edges in the graph, respectively. We first consider the case that G has more than $3\epsilon m$ high edges, so that $m_{low} \leq (1 - 3\epsilon)m$. By the above and Lemma 16, $\mathbb{E}[\chi] = \frac{m_{low}}{(2n\alpha/\epsilon)} \leq \frac{(1-3\epsilon)m}{(2n\alpha/\epsilon)}$. Therefore, by the multiplicative Chernoff bound, the setting of $r = \frac{n\alpha}{\bar{m}} \cdot \frac{200 \ln(1/\delta)}{\epsilon^3}$ in the algorithm, the assumption that $\bar{m} \leq (1 + \epsilon/4)m$, and the assumption that $\epsilon \leq 1/20$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\chi > \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) \cdot \frac{(1-3\epsilon)m}{(2n\alpha/\epsilon)} \right] &< \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 \cdot \frac{(1-3\epsilon)m}{(2n\alpha/\epsilon)} \cdot r}{16 \cdot 3} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{\epsilon^3(1-3\epsilon)m}{96n\alpha} \cdot \frac{n\alpha}{\bar{m}} \cdot \frac{200 \ln(1/\delta)}{\epsilon^3} \right) < \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Hence, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\chi \leq \frac{(1 + \epsilon/4) \cdot (1 - 3\epsilon)\epsilon m}{2n \cdot \alpha} < \frac{(1 - 5\epsilon/2) \cdot \epsilon \bar{m}}{2n \cdot \alpha}$$

and $\bar{m}_{low} < (1 - 5\epsilon/2) \cdot \bar{m}$. It follows that $\bar{m}_{high} > 5\epsilon\bar{m}/2$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$, so that the algorithm will return Many.

We now consider the case that G has less than $2\epsilon m$ high edges, so that $m_{low} > (1 - 2\epsilon)m$. Hence, by Lemma 16, $\mathbb{E}[\chi] > \frac{(1-2\epsilon)m}{(2n\alpha/\epsilon)}$. By the multiplicative Chernoff bound, the setting of r , the assumption that $\bar{m} \leq (1 + \epsilon/4)m$ and the assumption that $\epsilon \leq 1/20$,

$$\Pr \left[\chi < \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) \cdot \frac{(1-2\epsilon)m}{(2n\alpha/\epsilon)} \right] < \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 \cdot \frac{(1-2\epsilon)m}{(2n\alpha/\epsilon)} \cdot r}{16 \cdot 2} \right) < \delta. \quad (6)$$

⁸This theorem appears only in version [13], and not in the final version of the same paper [14].

It follows that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\chi \geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon/4)(1 - 2\epsilon)\epsilon m}{2n \cdot \alpha} > \frac{(1 - 5\epsilon/2) \cdot \epsilon \bar{m}}{2n \cdot \alpha}.$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $\bar{m}_{high} < 5\epsilon\bar{m}/2$ and the procedure returns **Few**.

By Lemma 16, the query complexity and running time of each invocation of the procedure **Sample-Light-Edge** (with $\theta = 2\alpha/\epsilon$) are $O(1)$. Hence, the query complexity and running time of the procedure are $O(r) = O\left(\frac{n\alpha \cdot \log(1/\delta)}{\epsilon^3 \cdot m}\right)$. \square

Consider modifying the algorithm **Is-Bounded-Arboricity** (from Section 4) as follows. We first check if there are many high edges in the graph, and if so we reply that the graph is far from having arboricity at most 3α . Otherwise, we sample light edges and check if their endpoints are active.

Algorithm 7 Is-Bounded-Arboricity-Given-Edges-Estimate($G, n, \alpha, \epsilon, \bar{m}$)

- 1: Invoke **Estimate-High-Edges**($n, \alpha, \epsilon, 1/12, \bar{m}$), and if the procedure returns **Many** then return **No**.
 - 2: Invoke **Sample-Light-Edge** with $\theta = 2\alpha/\epsilon$ for $t = \frac{1000n\alpha}{\epsilon^2\bar{m}}$ times, and let S be the (multi-)set of returned directed edges. Let s be the number of (not necessarily different) edges in S .
 - 3: If $s < \frac{800}{\epsilon}$ then return **No**.
 - 4: Set $\ell = \lceil \log_{6/5}(1/\epsilon) \rceil$.
 - 5: **for** every directed edge $(u_i, v_i) \in S$ **do**
 - 6: Invoke **Is-Active**($u_i, \ell, \alpha, \epsilon, \epsilon/2$) and **Is-Active**($v_i, \ell, \alpha, \epsilon, \epsilon/2$). If the procedure returned **Yes** on both invocations, then set $\chi_i = 1$. Otherwise, set $\chi_i = 0$.
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Set $\chi = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i$.
 - 9: If $\chi < 12\epsilon$, then return **Yes**. Otherwise, return **No**.
-

Theorem 18. *Assume that $\bar{m} \in (1 \pm \epsilon/4)m$. If G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α , then **Is-Bounded-Arboricity-Given-Edges-Estimate** returns **Yes** with probability at least $2/3$, and if G is 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α , then **Is-Bounded-Arboricity-Given-Edges-Estimate** returns **No** with probability at least $2/3$.*

The query complexity and running time of the algorithm are

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon^3 m} + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}\right)$$

in expectation.

Proof. We first consider the case that G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α , and prove that the algorithm returns **Yes** with probability at least $2/3$. If G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α , then it follows from Claim 15 that G has less than $2\epsilon m$ directed high edges. Therefore, by Claim 17, the procedure **Estimate-High-Edges** returns **Few** with probability at least $11/12$. We henceforth condition on this event.

By Lemma 16 each invocation of **Sample-Light-Edge** with $\theta = 2\alpha/\epsilon$ returns a directed light edge with probability at least $\frac{(1-2\epsilon)m}{(2n\alpha/\epsilon)}$. Let us denote this probability by p_{succ} and let x_i be a

random variable that indicates if the i^{th} invocation of **Sample-Light-Edge** returns an edge. By the multiplicative Chernoff bound,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t x_i < 0.9p_{succ} \right] < \exp \left(-\frac{0.1^2 \cdot p_{succ} \cdot t}{2} \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{1}{200} \cdot \frac{(1-2\epsilon) \cdot \epsilon m}{2n\alpha} \cdot \frac{1000n\alpha}{\epsilon^2 \bar{m}} \right) < \frac{1}{12},$$

where the last inequality is by the assumption that $\bar{m} \leq (1 + \epsilon/4)m$ and that $\epsilon \leq 1/20$. Therefore, with probability at least $11/12$, $s > 0.9 \cdot p_{succ} \cdot t > \frac{800}{\epsilon}$. Condition on this event as well.

By Lemma 3, if G is ϵ -close to having arboricity at most α , then $m(G_\ell(0)) \leq 5\epsilon m$, so that $m_{low}(G_\ell(0)) \leq 10\epsilon m$, where for a subgraph G' , we let $m_{low}(G')$ denote the number of directed low edges in G' . For every i such that (u_i, v_i) is not in $G_\ell(0)$, it holds that either u_i or v_i is not in $A_\ell(0)$. Hence, by Lemma 5, **Is-Active** returns **Yes** on both vertices with probability at most $\epsilon/2$. For every i such that (u_i, v_i) is in $G_\ell(0)$, we bound the probability that **Is-Active** returns **Yes** on both vertices by 1. Since by Lemma 16, each directed light edge in the graph is returned with equal probability, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\chi_i] \leq \frac{(\epsilon/2) \cdot (m_{low}(G) - m_{low}(G_\ell(0)))}{m_{low}} + \frac{m_{low}(G_\ell(0))}{m_{low}(G)} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{10\epsilon m}{m_{low}(G)} \leq 11.7\epsilon,$$

where the last inequality is by the fact that $m_{low} \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)m$ and the assumption that $\epsilon < 1/20$. Therefore, by the multiplicative Chernoff bound, and since $s > \frac{800}{\epsilon}$,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i > \left(1 + \frac{1}{40}\right) \cdot 11.7\epsilon \right] < \exp \left(-\frac{(1/40)^2 \cdot 11.7\epsilon \cdot s}{3} \right) < 1/6.$$

Therefore with probability at least $5/6$, $\chi < 12\epsilon$. By taking a union bound over all “bad” events, it holds that the procedure returns **Yes** with probability at least $2/3$.

Now we consider the case that G is at least 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α , and prove that with probability at least $2/3$, the algorithm returns **No**. If G has more than $3\epsilon m$ high edges, then by Claim 17, with probability at least $11/12$ the procedure **Estimate-High-Edges** will return **Many** in step 1, and therefore the algorithm will return **No** and we are done. Also, if $s < \frac{800}{\epsilon}$, then the procedure returns **No** in Step 3, and we are done. Therefore, assume that G has at most $3\epsilon m$ high edges and that $s \geq \frac{800}{\epsilon}$.

By Lemma 4, since G is at least 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α , it holds that $m(G_\ell(\epsilon)) > 16\epsilon m$, implying that $m_{low}(G_\ell(\epsilon)) > 13\epsilon m$. For every i such that (u_i, v_i) is in $G_\ell(\epsilon)$, both u_i and v_i are in $A_\ell(\epsilon)$, and by Lemma 5 and the union bound, **Is-Active** returns **Yes** on both vertices with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Also, it follows from Lemma 16 that every directed light edge in the graph is returned with equal probability. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\chi_i] \geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon) \cdot m_{low}(G_\ell(\epsilon))}{m} \geq 12.35\epsilon.$$

By the multiplicative Chernoff bound and since $s > \frac{800}{\epsilon}$,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=1}^s \chi_i < \left(1 - \frac{1}{40}\right) \cdot 12.35\epsilon \right] < \exp \left(-\frac{(1/40)^2 \cdot 12.35\epsilon \cdot s}{2} \right) < 1/6.$$

Therefore, if G is 20ϵ -far from having arboricity at most 3α , then with probability at least $2/3$, $\chi > 12\epsilon$ and the algorithm returns **No**.

By Claim 17, the query complexity and running time resulting from the invocation of the procedure **Estimate-High-Edges** in Step 1 are $O(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon^3 m})$. By Lemma 16, the running time and query complexity of the procedure **Sample-Light-Edge** are constant, and therefore the query complexity and running time of Step 2 are $O(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon^2 m})$. In each step of the for loop there are two invocations of the procedure **Is-Active** with parameters $\gamma = \epsilon$ and $\delta = \epsilon/2$. By Lemma 5, the query complexity and running time resulting from these invocations are $O\left(\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}\right)$. Therefore, the total query complexity and running time are $O\left(\frac{n\alpha}{\epsilon^3 m} + \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{O(\log(1/\epsilon))}\right)$. \square