

Faster algorithms for sampling connected induced subgraphs

Marco Bressan
Sapienza University of Rome
bressan@di.uniroma1.it

July 24, 2020

Abstract

We consider the following problem: given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k , sample a connected induced k -node subgraph of G (also called k -graphlet) uniformly at random. The best algorithms known achieve ε -uniformity and are based on random walks or color coding. The random walk approach is elegant, but has a worst-case running time of $\Delta^{\Theta(k)} \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon}$ where $n = |V|$ and Δ is the maximum degree of G . Color coding is more efficient, but requires a preprocessing phase with running time and space $2^{\Theta(k)} \mathcal{O}(m \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ where $m = |E|$.

Our main result is an algorithm for ε -uniform sampling with the following guarantees. The preprocessing runs in time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} n \log n)$ and space $\mathcal{O}(n)$. This implies a sublinear preprocessing when G is dense enough. After, the algorithm yields independent ε -uniform k -graphlets in $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}((\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{10} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ expected time per sample. The preprocessing phase computes in one pass an approximate ordering of G that makes rejection sampling efficient in the sampling phase, and the ε -uniformity is based on estimating cuts and coupling arguments. In fact, the algorithm derives from a much simpler algorithm which has $\mathcal{O}(m \log \Delta)$ preprocessing time and returns *perfectly uniform* k -graphlets from G in $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ expected time per sample. To the best of our knowledge this is the first efficient algorithm for perfectly uniform graphlet sampling. In addition, we give an almost-tight bound for the random walk technique. More precisely, we show that the most commonly used random walk has mixing time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(t(G) (\frac{\Delta}{\delta})^{k-1} \log n)$ where $t(G)$ is the mixing time of G and δ is its minimum degree. This improves on recent results and is tight up to a factor $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \delta \log n$.

1 Introduction

We address the following problem. Given an undirected graph G , sample uniformly at random a connected and induced k -node subgraph of G , where $k \geq 2$ is a fixed integer. This is a fundamental primitive in graph mining, since it gives a way to analyse the low-level structure of graphs and obtain insights about their nature. This kind of subgraph analysis has a plethora of applications, including social network analysis [6, 16, 21], clustering [14, 20], and bioinformatics [3, 10, 18]. As a result, subgraph sampling has been extensively studied in computer science, statistics, and related fields [1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 23]. Naturally, sampling *some* subgraph on k nodes uniformly at random can be done by sampling a random subset of k nodes from G . As [15] notes, however, guaranteeing that the subgraph is connected and induced is a challenge by itself. These connected induced subgraphs are usually called k -graphlets, and we follow this convention. Although graphlet sampling is a natural and relevant problem, a tight characterization of its complexity is missing.

Currently, all graphlet sampling algorithms with formal guarantees are based on one of two unrelated techniques. The first technique is Markov chain Monte Carlo, and is based on running a random walk over the space of all k -graphlets of G until a stationary distribution is reached. The graphlets are sampled from this stationary distribution, and rejection sampling is then applied to obtain a uniform distribution. This technique is widely used [1, 5, 11, 12, 15, 19, 23]. The fundamental issue with this technique is in the mixing time of the chain. Knowing the mixing time is crucial, since it bounds the running time of the algorithm and in fact it is even necessary for running it (as it tells us when to stop the walk). Yet the best upper bound on the mixing time has a gap of $(\frac{\Delta}{\delta})^{k-1}$ against the lower bound, where Δ and δ are the maximum and minimum degrees of G . Thus in the worst case the walk takes $\Delta^{\Theta(k)}$ steps, and moreover a tight bound is unknown. The second technique is based on color coding [4]. As shown in [7], color coding yields a two-phase algorithm for sampling graphlets. The algorithm has preprocessing time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(m)$ and space $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(n)$, and sampling time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(\Delta)$; by increasing the space to $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(m)$, one can sample in $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$. The algorithm does in fact much more than just sampling, as it counts the number of colorful treelets rooted at every node of G of any possible shape, size, and subset of colors. This is for sampling from a small sub-population of all graphlets in G , but can be extended to all graphlets with a multiplicative time and space overhead of $\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. Whether faster or simpler algorithms exist remains unknown. Moreover, both techniques yield only *approximately* uniform samples.

Our contribution. In this work we give two contributions. The first one consists in two algorithms for sampling k -graphlets uniformly and ε -uniformly. These algorithms do not use random walks or color coding. The first algorithm, U-SAMPLER, yields:

Theorem 1. *The preprocessing of U-SAMPLER(G) uses time $\mathcal{O}(m \log \Delta)$ and space $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Afterwards, U-SAMPLER(G) draws k -graphlets independently and uniformly at random from G in $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ expected time per sample.*

U-SAMPLER is simple, and is mainly intended as entry point for the second algorithm. Yet, it guarantees perfectly *uniform* samples; to the best of our knowledge it is the first efficient algorithm to do so. The idea behind the algorithm is to make rejection sampling efficient. Indeed, rejection sampling becomes inefficient because of the gap between the largest and the smallest probability of the sampling distribution. We show that we can bypass this obstacle by sorting the nodes of G greedily, in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$, by iteratively removing the node of maximum degree. This implicitly partitions the graphlets of G into n buckets, so that the max-to-min probability ratio is bounded by $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, both in the distribution of bucket sizes and in the distribution of graphlet samples inside each bucket. We obtain a two-stage sampling (first the bucket, then the graphlet) where each sample is

accepted with probability at least $k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$, so we need $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ trials per sample. To sample a single graphlet efficiently, in the preprocessing we sort the adjacency lists of G with the mentioned order, in time $\mathcal{O}(m \log \Delta)$. We can then use binary search to locate the neighbors of a node during the sampling, which explains the $\mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ factor in the sampling.

Starting from U-SAMPLER we derive our second algorithm EPS-U-SAMPLER, which yields:

Theorem 2. *The preprocessing of $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$ uses time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{2}{(k-1)}} n \log n\right)$ and space $\mathcal{O}(n)$. With high probability, thereafter $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$ draws k -graphlets independently and ε -uniformly at random from G in $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{8+\frac{4}{(k-1)}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)$ expected time per sample.*

Note that the preprocessing time is independent of m , and the sampling time is independent of G . EPS-U-SAMPLER is fairly more complex than U-SAMPLER. Loosely speaking, it sketches the graph ordering of U-SAMPLER, and then simulates its sampling phase over it. The obstacle with the sketching is that we need to guarantee a bounded ratio between the degree of a node v and that of all the nodes following it in the order, both in G and in the subgraph induced by these nodes (this is necessary for efficient sampling). In fact, the sketch guarantees this boundedness only for a fraction of the nodes, but we can prove that the remaining fraction is irrelevant since it corresponds to a fraction $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ of all graphlets, and thus can be ignored. The difficulty in the sampling phase is that just doing as in U-SAMPLER fails because we do not have the sorted adjacency lists anymore. Thus, we have to approximate the behaviour of U-SAMPLER by approximating the distribution of the choices it makes. Unfortunately, U-SAMPLER samples edges from potentially very sparse cuts (with only one “good” edge out of Δ , for instance), so we cannot approximate such distributions *point-wise* up to an ε multiplicative error. We resort to a coarser approximation of the cuts, and by a coupling argument we show that the output of the two algorithms is identical with probability $1 - \varepsilon$, implying that EPS-U-SAMPLER is ε -uniform.

Our second result is related to the “classic” graphlet random walk mentioned above and widely employed in the literature [5, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 23]. In this technique, one defines a graph \mathcal{G}_k where the nodes are the graphlets of G and two graphlets are adjacent if their intersection has size $k - 1$. Then, one runs a lazy random walk over \mathcal{G}_k until reaching the stationary distribution, or more precisely, until the walk is within variation distance ε from it. Assuming G is connected, the walk can be made ergodic via standard techniques. Finally, this ε -approximate distribution is turned into ε -uniform via rejection sampling. As said, the fundamental question with this approach is the mixing time $t_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k)$, that is, the number of steps for the walk to be within variation distance ε of the stationary distribution. The best bound known so far is from [1], $t(\mathcal{G}_k) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(t(G) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{2(k-1)}\right)$. This still gives a mixing time of $t(G) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^2$ for sampling 2-graphlets, i.e., edges. In this work we prove the following bound:

Theorem 3. *For all graphs G and all $k \geq 2$ the ε -mixing time of the lazy random walk over \mathcal{G}_k satisfies $t_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(t(G) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{k-1} \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)$.*

Ignoring $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ factors, this result improves the upper bound of [1] by a factor $\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{k-1}$, and is only a factor $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \delta \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon}$ away from their $k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} \Omega\left(t(G) \frac{\Delta^{k-1}}{\delta^k}\right)$ lower bound. As a consequence, we obtain an algorithm MC-SAMPLER yielding:

Theorem 4. *MC-SAMPLER(G, ε) returns an ε -uniform k -graphlet from G in expected running time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(t(G) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{k-2} \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon}\right)$.*

Note that this bound depends on $\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{k-2}$, less than the $\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{k-1}$ in the mixing bound. The reason is that, as observed in [15, 23], we can sample k -graphlets indirectly by sampling edges in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} ;

each edge is a pair of $(k-1)$ -graphlets whose union is a k -graphlet. By standard results, to achieve ε -uniformity over the edges of \mathcal{G}_{k-1} , we just need to run the walk over it until mixing time. We note that recently [15] showed an ε -sampling algorithm with running time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}((\Delta \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{k-3})$, assuming sampling edges uniformly at random from G in time $\mathcal{O}(1)$, which requires a $\mathcal{O}(n)$ preprocessing of the graph (which we do not need). Our mixing time bound is obtained using a technique completely different from [1]. We recursively relate the relaxation times of \mathcal{G}_k and \mathcal{G}_{k-1} via spectral gaps, Dirichlet forms, and Markov chain comparison theorems. In this way we avoid Cheeger's inequality which in [1] leaves a quadratic factor on the ground. As part of the proof, we relate the relaxation time of the walk on an arbitrary graph G and that on its line graph $L(G)$, that is, the graph of adjacencies between the edges of G , proving:

Lemma 1. *If $|E(G)| \geq 1$, then $\tau(L(G)) \leq \frac{20\Delta}{\delta}\tau(G)$ where $L(G)$ is the line graph of G and $\tau(\cdot)$ denotes the relaxation time of the lazy walk.*

Comparison with existing bounds. The table below puts our bounds in perspective. The uniform sampling bound for [7] is obtained by running the whole color-coding algorithm, including the preprocessing phase, for each single sample. The bound of [15] has preprocessing time $\mathcal{O}(n)$ since the authors assume sampling edges uniformly at random in $\mathcal{O}(1)$. The bounds for ε -uniform sampling for [7] are explained in Appendix A.

	preprocessing time	pr. space	time per sample	output
[7]	-	-	$2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(m) + k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$	uniform
U-SAMPLER	$\mathcal{O}(m \log n)$	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(\log n)$	uniform
[15]	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	-	$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(\Delta^{k-3}(\log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{k-3})$	ε -uniform
[7]	$2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(m \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + f(\varepsilon, k)$	$2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(n \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(\Delta(\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})^2)$	ε -uniform
[7]	$2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(m \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + f(\varepsilon, k)$	$2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(m \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}((\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})^2)$	ε -uniform
MC-SAMPLER	-	-	$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(t(G)(\frac{\Delta}{\delta})^{k-2} \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})$	ε -uniform
EPS-U-SAMPLER	$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}((\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{2}{(k-1)}} n \log n)$	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}((\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{8+\frac{4}{(k-1)}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$	ε -uniform

Table 1: Summary of results. Here $f(\varepsilon, k) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$, see Appendix A.

Preliminaries. For each $v \in V$ we let d_v be the degree of v . We let $\Delta = \max_{v \in V} d_v$ and $\delta = \max_{v \in V} d_v$. We assume the following graph access model: for every $v \in V$ in constant time we can check d_v , check the i -th neighbor of v , and check if $\{u, v\} \in E$. For the random walks we assume G is connected (this is standard and necessary for ergodicity). A k -graphlet $g = (V_g, E_g)$ is a subgraph of G that is connected and induced (that is, $E_g = G[V_g]$). We consider graphlets as unlabelled; therefore $g = (V_g, E_g)$ is identified by its nodes V_g and we use g and V_g interchangeably. We denote by \mathcal{V}_k the set of all k -graphlets of G . To measure the distance between two distributions π, σ over a finite domain \mathcal{X} (e.g., $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{V}_k$), we use the total variation distance, $\text{tvd}(\pi, \sigma) = \max_{A \subseteq \mathcal{V}} \{\pi(A) - \sigma(A)\}$. If π is the uniform distribution and $\text{tvd}(\pi, \sigma) \leq \varepsilon$, then we say σ is ε -uniform. In this paper, ‘‘high probability’’ means that for any $a > 0$ we can make the probability larger than $1 - 1/n^a$ by increasing the cost by a multiplicative factor $\mathcal{O}(a)$. A weighted graph is denoted as $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, w)$ where $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. For every $u \in \mathcal{V}$ the weight of u is $w(u) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}: u \in e} w(e)$. The random walk on \mathcal{G} is defined as follows. Consider the Markov chain

with transition matrix P_0 given by $P_0(u, v) = \frac{w(u, v)}{w(u)}$. The walk is given by the *lazy* version of this chain, with an added loop of weight $w(u)$ at each node, whose transition matrix is $P = \frac{1}{2}(P_0 + I)$. By standard Markov chain theory, this chain is ergodic and converges to the limit distribution π given by $\pi(u) = \frac{w(u)}{\sum_{v \in V} w(v)}$. Given an ergodic Markov chain $X = \{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ with limit distribution π , if π_t is the distribution of X_t , the ε -mixing time of X is $t_\varepsilon(X) = \min\{t_0 : \forall X_0 \in \mathcal{X} : \forall t \geq t_0 : \text{tvd}(\pi_t, \pi) \leq \varepsilon\}$. We write $t_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G})$ for the mixing time of the random walk on \mathcal{G} as defined above. All our walks are time-reversible. Therefore, if $\pi^* = \min_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \pi(u)$, then $(\tau - 1) \log(1/2\varepsilon) \leq t_\varepsilon(X) \leq \tau \log(1/\varepsilon\pi^*)$ where $\tau = 1/\gamma$ the relaxation time of the chain, where γ being the spectral gap of the transition matrix (see [13], Theorems 12.3 and 12.4). Appendix E gives the necessary background on Markov chains. The other appendices give the full proofs of all our theorems and the pseudocode of our algorithms.

2 Overview of the uniform and ε -uniform algorithm

This section gives a walk-through of the ideas and proofs behind U-SAMPLER and EPS-U-SAMPLER. We start with U-SAMPLER which helps setting the stage. The pseudocode and the proof of its guarantees (Theorem 1) are given in Appendix B.1 and B.2.

Warm-up: rejection sampling. To begin, consider a generic rejection sampling technique. First, we draw a random k -graphlet g from G according to some known distribution p . Second, with probability $\frac{p^*}{p(g)}$ we accept g and output it. Here, p^* is (a lower bound on) the smallest probability of any graphlet. For any fixed g , in any given trial, the probability that g is returned is $p(g) \frac{p^*}{p(g)} = p^*$, which is constant i.e. independent of g . Thus, the distribution of returned graphlets is uniform. The problem is that the expected number of trials before some g is accepted is potentially order of $\frac{1}{p^*}$. However, $\frac{1}{p^*}$ is at least the number of graphlets in G , which in turn is at least $k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} \Delta^{k-1}$. Thus, we could end up with doing $k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} \Delta^{k-1}$ trials. (This is effectively the obstacle in the random walk approach, where the Δ^{k-1} is paid by the mixing time). To avoid this situation we shall construct a distribution p that is already close to uniform, that is, where $\frac{p^*}{p(g)} \geq k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}$ for all g , so that the expected number of trials is at most $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$.

Two-step sampling with $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ rejection trials. Suppose we can partition the k -graphlets into n buckets, $B(1), \dots, B(n)$ associated to the nodes of G , such that for every $B(v)$ we can:

1. obtain an estimate a_v such that $k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} |B(v)| \leq a_v \leq k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} |B(v)|$
2. sample efficiently from a distribution p_v over $B(v)$ such that $\frac{k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}}{|B(v)|} \leq p_v(g) \leq \frac{k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}{|B(v)|}$ for all g
3. compute $p_v(g)$ efficiently for any g

Then we can achieve uniform sampling with a two-stage rejection sampling. First, we choose a bucket $B(v)$ with probability $a_v / \sum a_u$, then we draw a graphlet g from $B(v)$ according to p_v , and finally we accept g with probability $\frac{k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}}{a_v p_v(g)}$. The acceptance probability is constant over $B(v)$, and since $k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} \leq a_v p_v(g) \leq k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, it is well defined and in $k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}$. Thus, with $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ rejection trials in expectation we can return a uniform sample.

Bucketing by sorting G . The aforementioned bucketing can be obtained by sorting G in one pass. Consider indeed the order \prec given by repeatedly removing the highest degree node. A standard greedy algorithm does this in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$ and space $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Denote by $G(v)$ the graph induced by all $u \succeq v$ (the transitive closure of v in \prec). We define the bucket $B(v)$ as the set of all graphlets of $G(v)$ containing v . Clearly, this bucketing is a partition of all graphlets. Now let $d(v|G(v))$ be the degree of v in $G(v)$. By construction, $d(v|G(v))$ is the maximum degree of $G(v)$

as well. Therefore, by standard counting arguments, if $B(v) \neq \emptyset$:

$$\frac{d(v|G(v))^{k-1}}{(k-1)^{k-1}} \leq |B(v)| \leq (k-1)! d(v|G(v))^{k-1} \quad (1)$$

Therefore $a_v = d(v|G(v))^{k-1}$ is our desired estimate of $|B(v)|$. (The case $B(v) = \emptyset$ can be checked quickly with a graph search). We then let $a = \sum_{v \in V: B(v) \neq \emptyset} a_v$, and $p(v) = \frac{a_v}{a}$ for each $v \in V$. Note that the crucial point here is that $d(v|G(v))$, the degree of v in $G(v)$, is also the maximum degree of $G(v)$. In EPS-U-SAMPLER we lose this property and we need to guarantee it approximately. Finally we sort the adjacency lists of G according to \prec in time $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{v \in V} d_v \log d_v) = \mathcal{O}(m \log \Delta)$.

Sampling from $B(v)$. Now we want to sample a graphlet in $B(v)$ from a distribution p_v that guarantees $k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} \frac{1}{|B(v)|} \leq p_v(g) \leq k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \frac{1}{|B(v)|}$ for all g . Thanks again to the fact that $d(v|G(v))$ is the maximum degree of $G(v)$, a straightforward random subset growing procedure does the trick. We start with $S_1 = \{v\}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, we expand S_i into S_{i+1} by choosing an edge uniformly at random in the cut between S_i and $G(v) \setminus S_i$. Since $B \neq \emptyset$ and every node in $G(v)$ has degree at most $d(v|G(v))$, the size $\varphi_i(u)$ of the cut between S_i and $G(v) \setminus S_i$ satisfies $\frac{1}{i} d(v|G(v)) \leq \varphi_i(u) \leq i d(v|G(v))$. Thus, the probability of any specific sequence S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k is:

$$k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} d(v|G(v))^{k-1} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\varphi_i} \leq k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} d(v|G(v))^{k-1} \quad (2)$$

This is also, up to $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ factors, the probability of obtaining any specific graphlet g . Therefore this procedure yields the desired sampling distribution p_v . The crucial point is once again the bound given by $d(v|G(v))$, which we lose in EPS-U-SAMPLER.

Computing $p_v(g)$ and the role of sorted lists. Finally, we have to compute the probability $p_v(g)$, which we need in the rejection step. The procedure is essentially the same as for sampling, so we describe it. To select the random edge in the cut of S_i , for each $u \in S_i$ we compute the size $\varphi_i(u)$ of the cut between u and $G(v) \setminus S_i$. We can do this in time $\mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ using the sorted the adjacency lists of G , since the sub-list containing the neighbors of u in $G(v)$ starts where v would sit in the list, which we can find with a binary search. Then, we select u with probability proportional to $\varphi_i(u)$ and select an edge in its cut uniformly at random. This takes again time $\mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ via binary search. Thus we have our desired efficient procedure to compute $p_v(g)$ for every g . However, in EPS-U-SAMPLER the lists are not sorted (we do not have enough time), so we have to find another way for the sampling and the computation of $p_v(g)$.

2.1 The ε -uniform algorithm

In this section we describe EPS-U-SAMPLER and sketch the proof of:

Theorem 2. *The preprocessing of EPS-U-SAMPLER(G, ε) uses time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{2}{k-1}} n \log n\right)$ and space $\mathcal{O}(n)$. With high probability, thereafter EPS-U-SAMPLER(G, ε) draws k -graphlets independently and ε -uniformly at random from G in $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{8+\frac{4}{k-1}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)$ expected time per sample.*

Appendix C gives the full proof and pseudocode. The algorithm has two main technical ingredients:

1. a sketching routine that computes an ordering of G such that every $G(v)$ has degrees balanced within $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{k-1}} k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}$ factors and “loses” only a fraction $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ of graphlets (Lemma 2 below)
2. a sampling routine that, exploiting the approximate degree balance, estimates the cut sizes well enough to behave ε -closely to U-SAMPLER conditional on accepting the graphlet

Algorithm 1 EPS-U-SAMPLER(G, ε) (informal version)

```

1: function PREPROCESS()
2:   compute  $\prec$  and  $\{a_v\}_{v \in V}$  using BUCKET-SKETCH( $G, \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ )
3:   let  $p(v) = \frac{a_v}{\sum_{u \in V} a_u}$  for each  $v \in V$ 
4: function SAMPLE()
5:   while true do
6:     draw a bucket  $B(v)$  from the distribution  $p$ 
7:      $g = \text{EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(\text{seed} = v, \text{tolerance} = \varepsilon^3)$ 
8:      $\widehat{p}_v(g) = \text{EPS-COMPUTE-P}(\text{graphlet} = g, \text{tolerance} = \varepsilon^3)$ 
9:     with probability  $\frac{\varepsilon}{p(v) \widehat{p}_v(g) \sum_{u \in V} a_u}$  return  $g$ 

```

Note that this is not simply a matter of estimating some quantities (e.g., the cut sizes) by sampling. Consider for example the random cut-edge sampling described above. If for all $u \in S_i$ we had a multiplicative $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ estimate of the cut of u , then EPS-U-SAMPLER would behave essentially as U-SAMPLER and we would be done. It is not hard to see that doing so requires examining $\Omega(\Delta)$ edges, since u might have degree Δ but only one edge in the cut. A similar obstacle holds for the ordering of G and for computing $p_v(g)$. Thus, we need a more refined approach.

Sketching the graph order. Let us start with the graph ordering. Recall that we want an order \prec over V such that $d(v|G(v))$ is *approximately* the maximum degree in $G(v)$. The trivial degree ordering does not work. This can be seen when G is the union of a complete bipartite graph $K_{\Delta, \delta}$ and a clique on δ nodes. The degree ordering sets, in order, the left nodes L of $K_{\Delta, \delta}$, the right nodes R of $K_{\Delta, \delta}$, and the clique nodes C . Thus, $R \prec L \prec C$. Now for any $v \in L$ we have $d(v|G(v)) = 0$, yet the first node $u \in C$ has $d(u|G(v)) = \delta > d(v|G(v))$. As a second try, we could estimate $d(v|G(v))$ for each v by sampling the edges of v and checking how many of them fall after v in the order. If $d(v|G(v))$ is relatively large, say $d(v|G(v)) \geq \varepsilon d_v$, then we keep bucket $B(v)$, else we completely ignore it. This guarantees $d(v|G(v)) \geq \varepsilon \max_{u \succ v} d(u|G(v))$ whenever $B(v)$ is kept. At the same time, by a counting argument, $(\varepsilon d_v) d_v^{k-2} = \varepsilon d_v^{k-1}$ if $B(v)$ is ignored, yet v in G is part of roughly d_v^{k-1} graphlets (the stars centered in it). Thus, the ignored buckets hold only a fraction ε of all graphlets and we are still fine. The problem is that now the cuts of different S_i can differ by a factor ε depending on the nodes of $G(v)$ they contain. By equation (2), this means for two different graphlets g, g' in $B(v)$ we can have $\frac{p_v(g)}{p_v(g')} \simeq \varepsilon^k$. This makes the rejection trials grow to $(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^k$.

We prove that we can do better as follows. We take each node $v \in V$ in descending degree order and test how many edges v has towards the nodes below it in the current order; in other words we estimate $d(v|G(v))$. To this end we draw roughly $(\frac{k}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{2}{k-1}} \log n$ neighbors of v uniformly at random. If enough neighbors are below v , then we estimate $d(v|G(v)) = d_v$ and v is not moved. Else, we estimate $d(v|G(v)) \simeq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{k-1}} d_v$ and v is accordingly moved down to its “correct” position, updating the order. This is our sketching routine, BUCKET-SKETCH, see below. We prove:

Lemma 2 (simplified version). BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε) runs in time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}((1/\varepsilon)^{\frac{2}{k-1}} n \log n)$, and with high probability returns an order \prec over V and estimates $\{a_v\}_{v \in V}$ such that:

1. if $a_v > 0$, then $d(v|G(v)) \geq k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{k-1}} d(u|G(v))$ for all $u \succ v$
2. if $a_v > 0$, then $\varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} |B(v)| \leq a_v \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} |B(v)|$
3. $\sum_{v: a_v=0} |B(v)| \leq \varepsilon \sum_{v \in V} |B(v)|$

Algorithm 2 BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε)

- 1: let $\eta = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \frac{1}{3(k-1)^2}$ and $h = \Theta(\eta^{-2} \log n)$
 - 2: init $s_v = d_v$ for all $v \in V$ ▷ any-time upper bound on $d(v|G(v))$
 - 3: init $\prec =$ the order over V by nonincreasing s_v ▷ \prec will respect s_v at any time
 - 4: **for** each v in V in nonincreasing order of degree **do** ▷ each v is processed only once
 - 5: sample h neighbors x_1, \dots, x_h of v u.a.r.
 - 6: let $X = \sum_{j=1}^h \mathbb{I}\{x_j \succ v\}$
 - 7: **if** $X \geq 2\eta h$ **then** ▷ $d(v|G(v)) \gtrsim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{k-1}} d_v$
 - 8: let $a_v = (d_v)^{k-1}$
 - 9: **else** ▷ $d(v|G(v)) \ll \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{k-1}} d_v$
 - 10: let $a_v = 0$ and $s_v = 3\eta d_v$
 - 11: update \prec according to s_v ▷ mode v to its correct position
 - 12: **for** each $v : d_v \leq k/\eta, a_v = 0$ **do**
 - 13: check if $B(v) \neq \emptyset$ via BFS in $G(v)$
 - 14: if so then compute $d(v|G(v))$ and let $a_v = d(v|G(v))^{k-1}$
 - 15: **return** the order \prec and the estimates $\{a_v\}_{v \in V}$
-

where $B(\cdot), G(\cdot)$ are meant as induced by the returned order \prec .

Properties (1.) and (2.) guarantee the desired balance in the degrees of $G(v)$ and in the bucket size estimates (we lose only a factor ε against U-SAMPLER). These two properties hold for buckets with $a_v > 0$ only. The buckets with $a_v = 0$ do not guarantee them, because $d(v|G(v)) \ll \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{k-1}} d_v$ so we could not estimate $d(v|G(v))$ accurately. Property (3.) however says we can ignore these buckets since they account for an ε fraction of the whole graphlet distribution. Note that we can precompute the distribution p over V using time and space $\mathcal{O}(n)$ by the alias method, so that drawing a bucket takes constant time [22].

Coupling with the uniform sampling. We now move to sampling, with the following strategy. First, we imagine running the sampling phase of U-SAMPLER on our sketched preprocessing output $(\prec, \{a_v\}_{v \in V})$. So for simplicity we can imagine the adjacency lists of G are sorted. First, we choose a bucket $B(v)$ with probability $p(v)$. Now, starting with $S_1 = \{v\}$ we run the random edge sampling procedure of U-SAMPLER above. Suppose we are drawing a random edge in the cut of S_i . Property (1.) of Lemma 2 ensures that the cut of S_i is between $d(v|G(v))$ and $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{k-1}} d(v|G(v))$. This implies that for any two graphlets g, g' we have $p_v(g) \leq \varepsilon p_v(g')$. Therefore we have lost only a factor ε compared to the distribution used by U-SAMPLER. Moreover, by property (2.) we lose another ε in the distribution of the a_v . It can be shown that this has the following consequence:

Claim 1. *If we replace the sampling phase of EPS-U-SAMPLER with that of U-SAMPLER, then the output graphlets are uniform over $\cup_{v:a_v>0} B(v)$, and the probability of accepting a graphlet is at least $\varepsilon^2 k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}$ in any given trial.*

Therefore, in terms of rejection trials, the loss of efficiency due to the sketched preprocessing is essentially ε^2 . It remains to (i) achieve ε -distance of the output from the uniform distribution over $\cup_{v:a_v>0} B(v)$, and (ii) bound the time spent in a single trial.

Achieving ε -uniformity. Recall the two key steps of sampling in U-SAMPLER: sampling a graphlet g from $B(v)$ according to p_v , and computing the probability $p_v(g)$ (and then accepting

g with probability $\propto \frac{1}{p_v(g)}$). For the first step, we cannot achieve p_v anymore, or more precisely, without sorted adjacency lists we would need to examine all edges of S_i , which could be Δ . We can however draw from a distribution δ -close to p_v , for some small δ (unrelated to the minimum degree of G), by estimating the cut size $\varphi_i(u)$ of each $u \in S_i$. The reason why we use a new parameter δ will be clear soon. We claim:

Claim 2. *By sampling $\simeq k^4(\frac{1}{\delta})^2(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{4}{k-1}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ edges of $u \in S_i$ we obtain an approximation of $\varphi_i(u)$ within an additive factor $\frac{\delta}{k^2}\varphi_i$ where $\varphi_i = \sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)$.*

To see why this holds, recall property (1.) of Lemma 2. The cut φ_i of S_i satisfies $d(v|G(v)) \leq \varphi_i \leq (\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{1}{k-1}} d(v|G(v))$. In addition, we can prove $d_u \leq (\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{1}{k-1}} d_v$ (this is shown in the full version of Lemma 2). Hence $\varphi_i \geq \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{k-1}} d_u$. Thus every sampled edge of u has probability at least $\mu = \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{k-1}}$ of being in the cut. For an $(1 \pm \frac{\delta}{k^2})$ -approximation we therefore need $(\frac{k^2}{\delta\mu})^2 = k^4(\frac{1}{\delta})^2(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{4}{k-1}}$ samples, as the claim says. (The additional factor $\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ is to guarantee this happens with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$, so we can absorb the approximation failure in our ε -uniformity bound). Now, since we have at most k nodes in S_i , and for each of them we have a $\frac{\delta}{k^2}\varphi_i$ -additive approximation, it follows that we can draw an edge $\frac{\delta}{k}$ -uniformly from the cut of S_i . This implies a coupling. That is, we can assume U-SAMPLER and EPS-U-SAMPLER choose the same edge in the cut of S_i with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{k}$. By a union bound over all i , they choose the same graphlet with probability $1 - \delta$. Thus:

Lemma 3 (simplified version). *After the preprocessing of EPS-U-SAMPLER, the distributions of the subgraphs sampled by EPS-U-SAMPLER and U-SAMPLER before rejection are δ -close.*

This gives a bound on the statistical distance between EPS-U-SAMPLER and U-SAMPLER up to the sampling step. We still have to perform the rejection and ensure the distribution *conditional on accepting the graphlet* is ε -uniform. To this end recall from Claim 1 that the probability of acceptance is $\simeq \varepsilon^2$. Thus, to ensure ε -uniformity of the *accepted* graphlets, we shall ensure ε^3 -uniformity of the sampled graphlets (before the rejection trial happens). Hence, we run the approximate sampling above with $\delta = \varepsilon^3$. This brings the number of samples to $\simeq (\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^6(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{4}{k-1}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$.

This essentially completes the running time of a single round of sampling. It remains to compute the probability $p_v(g)$ that the algorithm samples g . Note that this probability is not the same of U-SAMPLER. However, we can show that we can obtain a $(1 \pm \delta)$ -multiplicative estimate:

Lemma 4 (simplified version). *In time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}((\frac{1}{\delta})^2(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{4}{k-1}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ we can compute with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$ an estimate $\hat{p}_v(g) \in (1 \pm \varepsilon) p_v(g)$ of $p_v(g)$.*

Now, we accept the graphlet with probability $\propto \frac{1}{p_v(g)}$. By the lemma, this is δ -close to the probability that U-SAMPLER accepts it. Once again we can couple the two algorithms so that (conditionally on having sampled the same graphlet) they agree on acceptance with probability $1 - \delta$. Finally, we set $\delta = \varepsilon^3$. We get the same running time as for the sampling, $(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^6(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{4}{k-1}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$.

We can now conclude the sampling. As said, each trial accepts the sampled graphlet with probability at least $\varepsilon^2 k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}$. Thus, we need $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^2$ trials in expectation. Each trial has (expected) running time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}((\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^6(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\frac{4}{k-1}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. This gives a total expected sampling time of:

$$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 \cdot k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^6 \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{4}{k-1}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^8 \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{4}{k-1}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \quad (3)$$

This completes the overview of EPS-U-SAMPLER. For complete formal proofs of our claims see Appendix C.

3 Overview of the MCMC results

We sketch the proofs of our results for the random walk graphlet sampling technique (full proofs in Appendix D). Recall that our input graph G is assumed to be connected (otherwise the walk is not ergodic). For all $k \geq 2$, the graph $\mathcal{G}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$, usually called the k -state graph or k -graphlet graph of G , is defined as follows. \mathcal{V}_k is the set of all k -node induced connected subgraphs of G , and \mathcal{E}_k contains an edge for every pair $g, g' \in \mathcal{V}_k$ such that $g \cap g' \in \mathcal{V}_{k-1}$. It is not hard to see that \mathcal{G}_k is connected. Recall that t_ε denotes the mixing time of the lazy walk on a graph, and recall:

Theorem 3 (shortened version). $t_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(t(G) (\frac{\Delta}{\delta})^{k-1} \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})$.

To prove the theorem, first recall that $t_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k)$ is within $\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})$ factors of the relaxation time $\tau(\mathcal{G}_k)$ of the walk (see the preliminaries). Therefore the heart of the proof deals with bounding $\tau(\mathcal{G}_k)$, and in particular proving:

Lemma 5. $\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) = \mathcal{O}(\tau(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}) \text{poly}(k) \frac{\Delta}{\delta})$.

The main difficulty in proving Lemma 5 is comparing random walks over completely different graphs; for example, a coupling does not work. In [1], this is done by relating directly the conductance of \mathcal{G}_k and G via an analysis of the cuts. Instead, here we use the line graph $L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, that is, the graph of adjacencies between the edges of \mathcal{G}_{k-1} , for simplicity denoted L_{k-1} . Consider indeed any two $(k-1)$ -graphlets $h, h' \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1}$ that are adjacent. Clearly, $g = h \cup h'$ is a k -graphlet of G and thus a node of \mathcal{G}_k . On the other hand, $\{h, h'\}$ is an edge in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} and thus a node of L_{k-1} . In fact, \mathcal{G}_k can be obtained from L_{k-1} by collapsing together all states corresponding to the same graphlet g in \mathcal{G}_k , and rescaling edge weights by $\text{poly}(k)$ factors. By standard Markov chain comparison results, this implies $\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) = \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(k)\tau(L_{k-1}))$. This is the first step of the proof. To obtain Lemma 5, it remains to show that $\tau(L_{k-1}) = \mathcal{O}(\tau(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}) \frac{\Delta}{\delta})$. This is the second step of the proof. More precisely, in two steps we prove:

$$\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) \leq \text{poly}(k) \cdot \tau(L_{k-1}) \leq \text{poly}(k) \cdot \frac{20\Delta}{\delta} \tau(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}) \quad (4)$$

Intermediate result: relaxation time of the line graph. For the second step of the proof, as anticipated we show the following result which might be of independent interest:

Lemma 1 (shortened version). *Any \mathcal{G} with $|V(\mathcal{G})| \geq 2$ satisfies $\tau(L(\mathcal{G})) \leq \frac{20\Delta}{\delta} \tau(\mathcal{G})$.*

The idea is to simulate the walk on $L(\mathcal{G})$ over the 1-subdivision of \mathcal{G} . This is the graph \mathcal{S} obtained by replacing each edge of \mathcal{G} with two consecutive edges, where the middle node represents the original edge. The relaxation time of \mathcal{S} is essentially the same of \mathcal{G} . We then alter the weights of the edges of \mathcal{S} (originally unweighted, that is with unitary weights) by factors in $[\delta, \Delta]$. We can show that the resulting random walk, observed over the states representing the original edges, is exactly the random walk on $L(\mathcal{G})$. Since the weights are in $[1, \Delta/\delta]$, by standard Markov chain comparison results $\tau(L(\mathcal{G})) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \tau(\mathcal{S}))$, and the hidden constant is at most 20.

References

- [1] Matteo Agostini, Marco Bressan, and Shahrzad Haddadan. Mixing time bounds for graphlet random walks. *Information Processing Letters*, 152:105851, 2019.
- [2] David Aldous and James Fill. *Reversible Markov chains and random walks on graphs*. 1995.
- [3] N. Alon, P. Dao, I. Hajirasouliha, F. Hormozdiari, and S. C. Sahinalp. Biomolecular network motif counting and discovery by color coding. *Bioinformatics*, 24(13):i241–249, Jul 2008.
- [4] Noga Alon, Raphael Yuster, and Uri Zwick. Color-coding. *J. ACM*, 42(4):844–856, 1995.
- [5] Mansurul A. Bhuiyan, Mahmudur Rahman, Mahmuda Rahman, and Mohammad Al Hasan. Guise: Uniform sampling of graphlets for large graph analysis. In *Proc. of IEEE ICDM 2012*, pages 91–100, 2012.
- [6] Anthony Bonato, David F Gleich, Myunghwan Kim, Dieter Mitsche, Paweł Prałat, Yanhua Tian, and Stephen J Young. Dimensionality of social networks using motifs and eigenvalues. *PloS one*, 9(9):e106052, 2014.
- [7] Marco Bressan, Flavio Chierichetti, Ravi Kumar, Stefano Leucci, and Alessandro Panconesi. Counting graphlets: Space vs time. In *Proc. of ACM WSDM*, pages 557–566, 2017.
- [8] Marco Bressan, Flavio Chierichetti, Ravi Kumar, Stefano Leucci, and Alessandro Panconesi. Motif counting beyond five nodes. *ACM TKDD*, 12(4), 2018.
- [9] Marco Bressan, Stefano Leucci, and Alessandro Panconesi. Motivo: Fast motif counting via succinct color coding and adaptive sampling. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 12(11):16511663, July 2019.
- [10] Jin Chen, Wynne Hsu, Mong Li Lee, and See-Kiong Ng. Nemofinder: Dissecting genome-wide protein-protein interactions with meso-scale network motifs. In *Proc. of ACM KDD*, KDD 06, page 106115, 2006.
- [11] Xiaowei Chen, Yongkun Li, Pinghui Wang, and John C. S. Lui. A general framework for estimating graphlet statistics via random walk. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 10(3):253–264, November 2016.
- [12] Guyue Han and Harish Sethu. Waddling random walk: Fast and accurate mining of motif statistics in large graphs. In *Proc. of IEEE ICDM*, pages 181–190, 2016.
- [13] David A. Levin, Yuval Peres, and Elizabeth L. Wilmer. *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*. American Mathematical Society, 2009.
- [14] Pan Li, Hoang Dau, Gregory Puleo, and Olgica Milenkovic. Motif clustering and overlapping clustering for social network analysis. In *Proc. of IEEE INFOCOM*, pages 1–9, 2017.
- [15] Ryuta Matsuno and Aristides Gionis. Improved mixing time for k-subgraph sampling. In *Proc. of SIAM SDM*, pages 568–576, 2020.
- [16] R. Milo, S. Shen-Orr, S. Itzkovitz, N. Kashtan, D. Chklovskii, and U. Alon. Network motifs: Simple building blocks of complex networks. *Science*, 298(5594):824–827, 2002.

- [17] Kirill Paramonov, Dmitry Shemetov, and James Sharpnack. Estimating graphlet statistics via lifting. In *Proc. of ACM KDD*, page 587595, 2019.
- [18] Nataša Pržulj. Biological network comparison using graphlet degree distribution. *Bioinformatics*, 23(2):e177–e183, 2007.
- [19] Tanay Kumar Saha and Mohammad Al Hasan. Finding network motifs using mcmc sampling. In *Proc. of CompleNet*, pages 13–24. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [20] Charalampos E. Tsourakakis, Jakub Pachocki, and Michael Mitzenmacher. Scalable motif-aware graph clustering. In *Proc. of WWW*, page 14511460, 2017.
- [21] Johan Ugander, Lars Backstrom, and Jon Kleinberg. Subgraph frequencies: Mapping the empirical and extremal geography of large graph collections. In *Proc. of WWW*, pages 1307–1318, 2013.
- [22] M. D. Vose. A linear algorithm for generating random numbers with a given distribution. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 17(9):972–975, Sep 1991.
- [23] Pinghui Wang, John C. S. Lui, Bruno Ribeiro, Don Towsley, Junzhou Zhao, and Xiaohong Guan. Efficiently estimating motif statistics of large networks. *ACM TKDD*, 9(2):8:1–8:27, 2014.

A ε -uniform sampling via color coding

We show how to use the color coding algorithm of [7] in a black-box fashion to perform ε -uniform sampling from G . The overhead in the running time and space is $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$, and the overhead in the sampling time is $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}\mathcal{O}((\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})^2)$.

First, we perform $\ell = \mathcal{O}(e^k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ independent colorings of G and run the preprocessing phase of the algorithm of [7] on each of them, storing the resulting count table (this is a table produced by the dynamic program of the algorithm). This gives a $\mathcal{O}(e^k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ overhead for the preprocessing phase in terms of both time and space. In a single run, any given graphlet g has probability $\frac{k^k}{k!} \geq e^{-k}$ of becoming colorful, i.e., of being colored with k distinct colors. Thus, with $\mathcal{O}(e^k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ independent runs, graphlet of G is colorful with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$ in at least one run and thus appears in the respective count table. Now, as shown in [7], for each run $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, with $\mathcal{O}(\frac{k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}{\varepsilon^2})$ samples one can estimate the total number of graphlets N_i detected in that run within a multiplicative $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ factor. (This requires estimating the average number of spanning trees per-graphlet in that run, and multiply by the number of detected trees, which is known). In time $\mathcal{O}(\frac{k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}{\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$, we do so for all runs with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$. Now, we choose randomly a run $i \in [\ell]$ with probability proportional to (the estimate of) N_i . Then, we draw a graphlet from that run uniformly at random using the algorithm. This yields a graphlet uniformly at random from the union of all runs. Thus, the probability that a specific graphlet g is sampled is proportional to the number of runs where g appears. This is just the number of colorings $\ell(g)$ in which g is colorful, which we can compute by looking at the colors assigned to g by each one of the ℓ runs, in $\ell = \mathcal{O}(e^k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ time. Then, we accept g with probability $\frac{1}{\ell}$. Therefore we need at most $\ell = \mathcal{O}(e^k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ trials in expectation before a graphlet is accepted. This gives an overhead of $(e^k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})^2$ in the sampling phase. This construction can be derandomized using an (n, k) -family of perfect hash functions of size $\ell = 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \log n$, see [4]. This derandomization would increase the time and space of the preprocessing by a factor $\log n$, but we would still need to estimate the number of graphlets in each run, so the final distribution would still be non-uniform.

B Appendix for Section 2

Lemma 6. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be any graph, and for any $v \in V$ let N_v be the number of k -graphlets of G containing v . If $N_v > 0$, then:*

$$N_v \geq \frac{(d_v)^{k-1}}{(k-1)^{k-1}} = (d_v)^{k-1} k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)} \quad (5)$$

Moreover, if $d_u \leq \Delta$ for all $u \in G$, then:

$$N_v \leq (k-1)! (\Delta)^{k-1} = (\Delta)^{k-1} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \quad (6)$$

Proof. For the lower bound, if $d_v \leq k-1$ then $\frac{(d_v)^{k-1}}{(k-1)^{k-1}} \leq 1$, so if $N_v \geq 1$ then $N_v \geq \frac{(d_v)^{k-1}}{(k-1)^{k-1}}$. If instead $d_v > k-1$, then $N_v \geq \binom{d_v}{k-1}$ since any set of nodes formed by v and $k-1$ of its neighbors is connected. However $N_v \geq \binom{d_v}{k-1} \geq \frac{(d_v)^{k-1}}{(k-1)^{k-1}}$ since $\binom{a}{b} \geq \frac{a^b}{b^b}$ for all $a \geq 1$ and all $b \in [a]$.

For the upper bound, note that we can construct a connected subgraph on k nodes containing v by starting with $S_1 = \{v\}$ and at every step $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ choosing a neighbor of S_i in $G \setminus S_i$. Since each $u \in G$ has degree at most Δ , then S_i has at most $i\Delta$ neighbors. Thus the total number of choices is at most $\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} i\Delta = (k-1)! (\Delta)^{k-1}$. \square

B.1 Pseudocode

We give our uniform algorithm U-SAMPLER(G) and the routines used by it.

Algorithm 3 U-SAMPLER(G)

```

1:  $(\prec, \{a_v\}_{v \in V}) = \text{PREPROCESS}(G)$ 
2: let  $a = \sum_{v \in V} a_v$ 
3: let  $p(v) = \frac{a_v}{a}$  for each  $v \in V$ 
4: let  $\beta_k(G) = \frac{1}{k!a}$ 
5:
6: function SAMPLE()
7:   while true do
8:     draw  $v$  from the distribution  $p$ 
9:      $S = \text{SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v)$ 
10:     $p(S) = \text{COMPUTE-P}(G, S)$ 
11:    with probability  $\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)}$  return  $S$ 

```

Algorithm 4 PREPROCESS(G)

```

1: compute  $\prec$  by repeatedly removing the highest-degree node from  $G$ 
2: for each  $v \in V$  do
3:   sort the adjacency list of  $v$  according to  $\prec$ 
4:   compute  $d(v|G(v))$ 
5:   check if  $B(v) \neq \emptyset$  via BFS in  $G(v)$ 
6:   if  $B(v) \neq \emptyset$  then let  $a_v = d(v|G(v))^{k-1}$  else let  $a_v = 0$ 
7: return the order  $\prec$  and the estimates  $\{a_v\}_{v \in V}$ 

```

Algorithm 5 SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v)

```
1:  $S_1 = \{v\}$ 
2: for  $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$  do
3:   for  $u \in S_i$  do
4:      $\varphi_i(u) = d(u|G(v)) - (\text{degree of } u \text{ in } G[S_i])$  ▷ cut between  $u$  and  $G(v) \setminus S_i$ 
5:     draw  $u$  with probability  $\frac{\varphi_i(u)}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)}$ 
6:     draw  $u'$  u.a.r. from the neighbors of  $u$  in  $G(v) \setminus S_i$ 
7:      $S_{i+1} = S_i \cup \{u'\}$ 
8: return  $S_k$ 
```

Algorithm 6 COMPUTE-P($G, S = \{v, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$)

```
1:  $p = 0$ 
2: for each permutation  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$  of  $v, u_2, \dots, u_k$  such that  $\sigma_1 = v$  do
3:    $p_\sigma = 1$ 
4:   for each  $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$  do
5:      $S_i = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i\}$ 
6:      $d(\sigma_{i+1}|S_i \cup \sigma_{i+1}) = \text{number of neighbors of } \sigma_{i+1} \text{ in } S_i$ 
7:      $\varphi_i(u) = d(u|G(v)) - (\text{degree of } u \text{ in } G[S_i])$  ▷ cut between  $u$  and  $G(v) \setminus S_i$ 
8:      $p_\sigma = p_\sigma \cdot \frac{d(\sigma_{i+1}|S_i \cup \sigma_{i+1})}{\varphi_i}$ 
9:    $p = p + p_\sigma$ 
10: return  $p$ 
```

B.2 Proof of Theorem 1

We go through a series of lemmas.

Lemma 7. PREPROCESS(G) runs in time $\mathcal{O}(m \log \Delta)$. The output order \prec satisfies $d(v|G(v)) \geq d(u|G(v))$ for all $v \prec u$. The output estimates $a_v > 0$ satisfy $\frac{a_v}{|B(v)|} \in [k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}, k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}]$.

Proof. For the running time, the greedy removal can be implemented in time $\mathcal{O}(m)$ by bucketing the nodes by degree. For each bucket we process each node in turn by updating its neighbors (moving them to the bucket ahead) if they have not been processed yet. This takes time $\mathcal{O}(m)$ in total. Sorting the adjacency lists takes time $\sum_{v \in V} \mathcal{O}(d_v \log(d_v)) = \mathcal{O}(m \log \Delta)$. The BFS takes time $\mathcal{O}(k \log \Delta)$ since, for a generic node u , its adjacency list for G_v is just the tail of the adjacency list of u formed by the positions $\succeq v$, which can be found in time $\mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$. The claim on the a_v follows by Lemma 6, since in $G(v)$ node v has degree $d(v|G(v))$ and as noted above this the maximum of $G(v)$ as well. \square

Lemma 8. SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v) runs in time $\mathcal{O}(k^3 \log \Delta)$. For any $g = G[S] \in B(v)$, the probability $p(S)$ that SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v) returns S is in $[k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}, k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}] \cdot d(v|G(v))^{-(k-1)}$.

Proof. Running time. We show that one run of the outer cycle takes time $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \Delta)$. Computing $\varphi_i(u)$ takes time $\mathcal{O}(k \log \Delta)$. This holds since in $\mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ we locate the position of v in the adjacency list of u , which subtracted from d_u yields $d(u|G(v))$; and for each $u' \in S_i$ in $\mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ we check whether $u' \sim u$. Thus the cycle over $u \in S_i$ takes $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log \Delta)$ in total. Drawing u takes $\mathcal{O}(k)$. Finally, drawing u' takes $\mathcal{O}(k)$ as well. To see this, note that if u had no neighbors in S_i then we could just draw a node from the last $d(u|G(v))$ elements of the adjacency list of u . If u has

neighbors in S_i , we still know the (at most k) disjoint sublists of the adjacency lists containing the neighbors in the cut. Thus we can draw a uniform integer $j \in [\varphi_i(u)]$ and select the j -th neighbor of u in $G_v \setminus S_i$ in time $\mathcal{O}(k)$.

Probability. Consider any S such that $g = G[S] \in B(v)$. By construction S is a k -node subset such that $v \in S$ and $G[S]$ is connected. We compute an upper bound and a lower bound on the probability $p(S)$ that the algorithm returns S . For the upper bound, there are at most $(k-1)!$ sequences of nodes through which the algorithm can produce S . Let v, u_2, \dots, u_k be any such sequence and consider the generic subset S_i . Let $\varphi_i(u)$ be the size of the cut between $u \in S_i$ and $G_v \setminus S_i$, and let $\varphi_i = \sum_{u \in S_i} \varphi_i(u)$. By construction, S_{i+1} is obtained by adding to S_i the endpoint u_{i+1} of an edge chosen uniformly at random in the cut between S_i and $G_v \setminus S_i$. Thus, for any $u' \in G_v \setminus S_i$, $\mathbb{P}(u_{i+1} = u') = \frac{d(u'|S_i \cup u')}{\varphi_i}$ where $d(u'|S_i \cup u')$ is the number of neighbors of u' in S_i . Now, on the one hand $d(u'|S_i \cup u') \leq i$. On the other hand:

$$\varphi_i \geq \frac{d(v|G(v))}{i} \tag{7}$$

To see this, note that $\varphi_i \geq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ since $G[S_k]$ is connected. Also, $\varphi_1 = d(v|G(v))$ since $S_1 = \{v\}$. Now, if $\varphi_1 \leq i$ then $\frac{\varphi_1}{i} \leq 1$ and therefore $\varphi_i \geq \frac{\varphi_1}{i}$. If instead $\varphi_1 \geq i$, since the degree of v in S_i is at most $i-1$, then the cut of S_i still contains at least $\varphi_1 - |S_i| + 1 \geq \varphi_1 - (i-1)$ edges. Therefore $\varphi_i \geq \varphi_1 - (i-1) \geq \varphi_1 - (i-1)\frac{\varphi_1}{i} = \frac{\varphi_1}{i}$. It follows that $\mathbb{P}(u_{i+1} = u') = \frac{d(u'|S_i \cup u')}{\varphi_i} \leq \frac{i^2}{d(v|G(v))}$. Thus the probability that $\text{SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v)$ follows the particular sequence v, u_2, \dots, u_k is at most $\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{i^2}{d(v|G(v))} = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} d(v|G(v))^{-(k-1)}$. Since there are at most $(k-1)!$ sequences over S , then $p(S) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} d(v|G(v))^{-(k-1)}$. For the lower bound, since $G[S]$ is connected then at least one sequence v, u_2, \dots, u_k exists such that $\varphi_i \geq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. However, $\varphi_i \leq i d(v|G(v))$ since $d(v|G(v))$ is the maximum degree of $G(v)$. So the sequence has probability at least $\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{i} d(v|G(v))^{-1} = k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} d(v|G(v))^{-(k-1)}$. \square

Lemma 9. $\text{COMPUTE-P}(G, S = \{v, u_2, \dots, u_k\})$ runs in time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ and outputs the probability $p(S)$ that $\text{SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v)$ returns S .

Proof. The proof is essentially the same of Lemma 8. \square

Lemma 10. $\text{SAMPLE}()$ has expected running time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ and returns graphlets uniformly at random from G .

Proof. First, let us check that $\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)} \leq 1$ for all v and all S , so that the probability of rejection in $\text{U-SAMPLER}(G)$ is well-defined. We have:

$$\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)} = \frac{1}{k!} \frac{a}{a_v} \frac{1}{p(S)} = \frac{1}{k!} \frac{1}{a_v} \frac{1}{p(S)} \tag{8}$$

By Lemma 9, $p(S) \geq \frac{1}{k!} (d(v|G(v)))^{-(k-1)} = \frac{1}{k! a_v}$, hence the expression is bounded by 1 as desired.

Conditioned on drawing S , the probability that the algorithm stops is $\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)}$. By Lemma 8, $p(S) = k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} \frac{1}{a_v}$ so $\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)} = k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}$. Therefore each invocation of $\text{SAMPLE}()$ terminates within $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ rounds in expectation. Finally, by Lemma 8 and Lemma 9 each round takes $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$, thus the expected total running time is $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(\log \Delta)$ too. The uniformity of the samples follows by construction: the algorithm draws S from $B(v)$ with probability $p(v)p(S)$ and conditioned on this event it outputs S with probability $\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)}$. Thus, for any given execution of the loop, the probability that S is returned is $\beta_k(G)$ which is constant over $B(v)$. \square

C Appendix for Section 2.1

C.1 Pseudocode

We give the pseudocode of our ε -uniform algorithm $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$. The routines invoked by the algorithm are provided below. Finally we provide $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL}(G, \varepsilon)$ which we use in the analysis by coupling it with $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$.

Algorithm 7 $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$

```

1: let  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \frac{\varepsilon^3}{32(k!)^4(3k^2)^{2k}}$ 
2: let  $\eta$  as in  $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon/2)$ 
3:  $(\prec, \{a_v\}_{v \in V}) = \text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon/2)$ 
4: let  $a = \sum_{v \in V} a_v$ 
5: let  $p(v) = \frac{a_v}{a}$  for each  $v \in V$ 
6: let  $\beta_k(G) = \frac{\varepsilon/2}{a k!(3k^2)^k}$ 
7:
8: function  $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}()$ 
9:   while true do
10:     draw  $v$  from the distribution  $p$ 
11:      $S = \text{EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v, \varepsilon_1, \eta)$ 
12:      $\hat{p}(S) = \text{EPS-COMPUTE-P}(S, G, \varepsilon_2, \eta)$ 
13:     with probability  $\min(1, \frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)\hat{p}(S)})$  return  $S$ 

```

Algorithm 8 $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon)$

```

1: let  $\eta = (\frac{\varepsilon}{k})^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \frac{1}{3(k-1)^2}$  and  $h = \Theta(\eta^{-2} \log n)$ 
2: init  $s_v = d_v$  for all  $v \in V$ 
3: init  $\prec$  the order over  $V$  by nonincreasing  $s_v$ 
4: for each  $v$  in  $V$  in nonincreasing order of degree do
5:   sample  $h$  neighbors  $x_1, \dots, x_h$  of  $v$  u.a.r.
6:   let  $X = \sum_{j=1}^h \mathbb{I}\{x_j \succ v\}$ 
7:   if  $X \geq 2\eta h$  then
8:     let  $a_v = (d_v)^{k-1}$ 
9:   else
10:    let  $a_v = 0$  and  $s_v = 3\eta d_v$ 
11:    move  $v$  to its position in  $\prec$  according to  $s_v$ 
12: for each  $v : d_v \leq k/\eta, a_v = 0$  do
13:   check if  $B(v) \neq \emptyset$  via BFS in  $G(v)$ 
14:   if so then compute  $d(v|G(v))$  and let  $a_v = d(v|G(v))^{k-1}$ 
15: return the order  $\prec$  and the estimates  $\{a_v\}_{v \in V}$ 

```

\triangleright any-time upper bound on $d(v|G(v))$
 $\triangleright s_v > s_u \implies v \prec u$
 \triangleright each v is processed only once
 $\triangleright s_v > s_u \implies v \prec u$

Algorithm 9 EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v, ε, η)

- 1: let $h = \Theta\left(\frac{k^8 \log 1/\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 \eta^4}\right)$
- 2: $S_1 = \{v\}$
- 3: **for** $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$ **do**
- 4: **for** each $u \in S_i$ **do**
- 5: sample h neighbors x_1, \dots, x_h of u i.i.d. u.a.r.
- 6: let $X = \sum_{j=1}^h \mathbb{I}\{x_j \succ v \wedge x_j \notin S_i\}$
- 7: **if** $X \geq h \frac{\varepsilon \eta^2}{8k^4}$ **then** let $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) = \frac{d_u}{h} X$ **else** let $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) = 0$
- 8: draw u with probability $\frac{\widehat{\varphi}_i(u)}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \widehat{\varphi}_i(z)}$ (if all $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) = 0$ then FAIL)
- 9: **repeat**
- 10: draw u' u.a.r. from the adjacency list of u
- 11: **until** $u' \succ v \wedge u' \notin S_i$
- 12: let $S_{i+1} = S_i \cup \{u'\}$
- 13: **return** S_k

Algorithm 10 EPS-COMPUTE-P($G, S = \{v, u_2, \dots, u_k\}, \varepsilon, \eta$)

- 1: **for** each $u \in S$ **do**
- 2: sample $h = \Theta\left(\frac{k^9}{\varepsilon^2 \eta^4} \log 1/\varepsilon\right)$ neighbors $x_{u,1}, \dots, x_{u,h}$ of u i.i.d. u.a.r.
- 3: $\widehat{p} = 0$
- 4: **for** each permutation $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$ of v, u_2, \dots, u_k such that $\sigma_1 = v$ **do**
- 5: $\widehat{p}_\sigma = 1$
- 6: **for** each $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$ **do**
- 7: $S_i = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_i\}$
- 8: $c_i =$ number of neighbors of σ_{i+1} in S_i
- 9: $\widehat{\varphi}_i = \sum_{u \in S_i} \frac{d_u}{h} \sum_{j=1}^h \mathbb{I}\{x_{u,j} \succ v \wedge x_{u,j} \notin S_i\}$ ▷ cut size estimate
- 10: $\widehat{p}_\sigma = \widehat{p}_\sigma \cdot \frac{c_i}{\widehat{\varphi}_i}$
- 11: $\widehat{p} = \widehat{p} + \widehat{p}_\sigma$
- 12: **return** \widehat{p}

Algorithm 11 EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL(G, ε)

- 1: let η as in BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε)
- 2: $(\prec, \{a_v\}_{v \in V}) =$ BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε)
- 3: let $a = \sum_{v \in V} a_v$
- 4: let $p(v) = \frac{a_v}{a}$ for each $v \in V$
- 5: let $\beta_k(G) = \frac{\varepsilon}{a k! (3k^2)^k}$
- 6: sort the adjacency lists of G according to \prec
- 7:
- 8: **function** SAMPLE()
 - 9: **while** true **do**
 - 10: draw v from the distribution p
 - 11: $S =$ SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v)
 - 12: $p(S) =$ COMPUTE-P(G, S)
 - 13: with probability $\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)}$ **return** S else continue

C.2 Proofs for bucket-sketch(G, ε)

In what follows, $\eta = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \frac{1}{3(k-1)^2}$ as defined in BUCKET-SKETCH.

Lemma 11. *With high probability the output of BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε) satisfies:*

1. if $v \prec u$, then $d_v \geq 3\eta d_u$
2. if $a_v > 0$, then $d(v|G(v)) \geq \frac{\eta}{k} d_v \geq \frac{\eta}{k} \cdot d(u|G(v))$ for all $u \succ v$
3. if $a_v > 0$ then $\frac{a_v}{|B(v)|} \in \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}, \frac{k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}{\varepsilon}\right]$
4. $\sum_{v:a_v=0} |B(v)| \leq \varepsilon \sum_{v \in V} |B(v)|$

Proof. First, we prove a set of observations that are used repeatedly in the proof. We also need to establish some notation to describe the algorithm along the rounds. We denote by:

- $t = 1, \dots, n$ the generic round of the first loop
- \prec_t the order \prec at the start of round t
- $G_t(v) = G[\{u \succeq_t v\}]$ the subgraph induced by v and the nodes below it at time t
- $d(u|G_t(v))$ the degree of u in $G_t(v)$
- t_v the round where v is processed
- s_v^* the final value of s_v (note that $3\eta d_v \leq s_v^* \leq s_v = d_v$)
- $X_j = \mathbb{I}\{x_j \succ v\}$ and $X = \sum_{j=1}^h X_j$, in a generic round

We denote by \prec_n the output order (formally it would be \prec_{n+1} but clearly this equals \prec_n), and by $G_n(\cdot)$ the subgraphs induced in G under the order \prec_n . By a_v we always mean the value at output time unless otherwise specified.

Observation 1. *If $u \prec_{t_u} v$ then $G_n(v) \subseteq G_{t_u}(u)$ and $d(u|G_n(v)) \leq d(u|G_{t_u}(u))$.*

Proof. Note that no node preceding u at t_u is ever moved past v after round t_u . Therefore $G_n(v)$ contains a subset of the nodes $\{z \succeq_{t_u} u\}$. But by definition $G_{t_u}(u) = G[\{z \succeq_{t_u} u\}]$. Thus $G_n(v) \subseteq G_{t_u}(u)$. By monotonicity of $d(u|\cdot)$ it follows that $d(u|G_n(v)) \leq d(u|G_{t_u}(u))$. \square

Observation 2. *For all v and all $t \geq t_v$ we have $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) \geq d(v|G_t(v))$, with equality if $a_v > 0$.*

Proof. By definition, $G_{t_v}(v) = G[\{u \succeq_{t_v} v\}]$. Thus, every $u \prec_{t_v} v$ is not in $G_{t_v}(v)$. Any such u however has been processed before v , and cannot be moved past v after round t_v . Hence $G_{t_v}(v) \supseteq G_t(v)$ for all $t \geq t_v$. The claim then follows by monotonicity of $d(v|\cdot)$, and by noting that if $a_v > 0$ then v is not moved by the algorithm and thus $G_t(v) = G_{t_v}(v)$ for all $t \geq t_v$. \square

Observation 3. *At each round, conditioned on past events, with high probability $|X - \mathbb{E}X| \leq \eta h$.*

Proof. Consider round t_v . Conditioned on past events, the X_j are independent binary random variables. Therefore by Hoeffding's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}X| > \eta h) < 2e^{-2h\eta^2} = e^{-\Theta(\log n)} \quad (9)$$

regardless of $\mathbb{E}X$ and since $h = \Theta(\eta^{-2} \log n)$. \square

Observation 4. *With high probability, $d(v|G_t(v)) \leq s_v^*$ for every v at any time in any round t .*

Proof. If s_v is never updated, then by definition $s_v^* = s_v = d_v$ and obviously $d_v \geq d(v|G_t(v))$. Suppose instead s_v is updated at round t_v , so $s_v^* = 3\eta d_v$. By Observation 2, $d(v|G_t(v)) \leq d(v|G_{t_v}(v))$. Now we show that with high probability $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) \leq 3\eta d_v$. Suppose indeed $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) > 3\eta d_v$. Note that $\mathbb{E}X_j = \frac{d(v|G_{t_v}(v))}{d_v}$ for all j . Therefore, if $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) > 3\eta d_v$, then $\mathbb{E}X > 3\eta h$. Now, the algorithm updates s_v only if $X < 2\eta h$. This implies the event $X < \mathbb{E}X - \eta h$, which by Observation 3 fails with high probability. Thus with high probability $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) \leq 3\eta d_v$. \square

Observation 5. *If round t_v of the first loop sets $a_v > 0$ then w.h.p. $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) \geq \eta d_v$, else w.h.p. $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) \leq 3\eta d_v$. If the second loop sets $a_v > 0$ then $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) > \frac{\eta}{k} d_v$ deterministically.*

Proof. The first claim has the same proof of Observation 4: if $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) < \eta d_v$ then $\mathbb{E}X < \eta h$, so $a_v > 0$ implies $X \geq 2\eta h$ and thus $X > \mathbb{E}X + \eta h$. Similarly, if $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) > 3\eta d_v$ then $\mathbb{E}X > 3\eta h$, so letting $a_v = 0$ implies $X < 2\eta h$ which means $X < \mathbb{E}X - \eta h$. Both events fail with high probability by Observation 3. The second claim holds deterministically since, in the second loop, $d_v < \frac{k}{\eta}$ and if $a_v > 0$ then $B(v) \neq \emptyset$ which implies $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) \geq 1$. \square

Observation 6. *With high probability, for all v , for all $u \succ_n v$ we have $d(u|G_n(v)) \leq s_v^*$.*

Proof. When u is processed in round t_u , either $v \prec_{t_u} u$ or $u \prec_{t_u} v$. If $v \prec_{t_u} u$, then v was processed before u . Thus at the beginning of the round $s_v^* \geq s_u$, since we assumed $v \prec_{t_u} u$. But at the beginning of the round $s_u = d_u$ since s_u has not been updated yet. Thus $s_v^* \geq d_u$, and clearly $d_u \geq d(u|G_t(v))$ for all t and in particular for $t = n$. Therefore $s_v^* \geq d(u|G_n(v))$. Suppose instead $u \prec_{t_u} v$. Then by Observation 1 $d(u|G_n(v)) \leq d(u|G_{t_u}(u))$, and by Observation 4 w.h.p. $d(u|G_{t_u}(u)) \leq s_u^*$. But since by hypothesis $u \succ_n v$, then $s_u^* \leq s_v^*$. Therefore $d(u|G_n(v)) \leq s_v^*$. \square

We can finally prove Lemma 2.

Proof of 1 (if $v \prec_n u$, then $d_v \geq 3\eta d_u$)

Simply note that $d_v \geq s_v^* \geq s_u^* \geq 3\eta d_u$, where $s_v^* \geq s_u^*$ holds by construction of the order \prec_n .

Proof of 2 (if $a_v > 0$, then $d(v|G_n(v)) \geq \frac{\eta}{k} d_v \geq \frac{\eta}{k} \cdot d(u|G_n(v))$ for all $u \succ_n v$)

Since $a_v > 0$, by Observation 2 $d(v|G_n(v)) = d(v|G_{t_v}(v))$ and by Observation 5 $d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) \geq \frac{\eta}{k} d_v$. Thus $d(v|G_n(v)) \geq \frac{\eta}{k} d_v$ and the first claim is proven. The second claim follows from the first one by proving that $d_v \geq d(u|G_n(v))$. If $d_v \geq d_u$ then obviously $d_v \geq d(u|G_n(v))$ as well. Suppose instead $d_v < d_u$. Then u is processed before v and so $u \prec_{t_u} v$, so by Observation 4 w.h.p. $s_v^* \geq d(u|G_n(v))$. But $d_v \geq s_v^*$, so $d_v \geq d(u|G_n(v))$.

Proof of 3 (if $a_v > 0$ then $\frac{a_v}{|B(v)|} \in \left[\frac{\varepsilon}{k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}, \frac{k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}}{\varepsilon} \right]$)

First, we observe that if $a_v > 0$ then w.h.p. $|B(v)| \geq 1$. Indeed, if $d_v < k/\eta$ then v is processed in the second loop, which deterministically sets $a_v > 0$ only when $|B(v)| \geq 1$. If instead $d_v \geq k/\eta$, then v is processed only in the first loop, and:

$$d(v|G_n(v)) = d(v|G_{t_v}(v)) \geq \eta d_v \geq \eta \frac{k}{\eta} = k \quad (10)$$

where since $a_v > 0$ the first equality holds by Observation 2 and the first inequality by Observation 5. But if $d(v|G_n(v)) \geq k$ then $G_n(v)$ contains a k -star centered in v and so $|B(v)| \geq 1$.

Thus we continue assuming $|B(v)| \geq 1$. To lighten the notation define $d_v^* = d(v|G_n(v))$ and $\Delta_v^* = \max_{u \in G(v)} d(u|G_n(v))$. Lemma 6 applied to $G_n(v)$ yields:

$$k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)} (d_v^*)^{k-1} \leq |B(v)| \leq k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} (\Delta_v^*)^{k-1} \quad (11)$$

We now show that w.h.p.:

$$\varepsilon k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)} (\Delta_v^*)^{k-1} \leq a_v \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} (d_v^*)^{k-1} \quad (12)$$

which implies our claim. For the upper bound, note that by construction $a_v \leq (d_v)^{k-1}$ and that by point (2) of this lemma $d_v \leq (\frac{k}{\eta}) d_v^*$. Substituting η we obtain:

$$a_v \leq (d_v)^{k-1} \leq (d_v^*)^{k-1} \left(\frac{k}{\eta}\right)^{k-1} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} (d_v^*)^{k-1} \quad (13)$$

For the lower bound, note that since $a_v > 0$ then $a_v \geq (d_v^*)^{k-1}$ regardless of where a_v is set. But point (2) of this lemma gives $d_v^* \geq d(v|G_n(v)) \geq \frac{\eta}{k} \cdot d(u|G_n(v))$ for all $u \succ_n v$. Thus $\Delta_v^* = \max_{u \in G(v)} d(u|G_n(v)) \leq \frac{k}{\eta} d_v^*$. Therefore:

$$(\Delta_v^*)^{k-1} \leq \left(\frac{k}{\eta} d_v^*\right)^{k-1} = \varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} (d_v^*)^{k-1} \leq \varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} a_v \quad (14)$$

which completes the claim.

Proof of 4 ($\sum_{v:a_v=0} |B(v)| \leq \varepsilon \sum_{v \in V} |B(v)|$)

Consider any v such that $a_v = 0$. First, observe that the only nonzero terms in the left summation have $d_v \geq \frac{k}{\eta}$. Indeed, if $|B(v)| > 0$ and $d_v < \frac{k}{\eta}$, then the second loop of the algorithm would detect $|B(v)| > 0$ and set $a_v > 0$; thus v does not appear in the summation.

Now we prove the bound by charging every graphlet in G to at most ε graphlets in $\cup_{v:a_v=0} B(v)$. On the one hand, if $d_v \geq \frac{k}{\eta}$ then $d_v > k-1$, so in G there are at least $\binom{d_v}{k-1}$ stars formed by v and $k-1$ of its neighbors. We charge $1/k$ -th of each star to v (each star can be charged to at most k nodes). Therefore v contributes at least $\frac{1}{k} \binom{d_v}{k-1}$ to the right summation. On the other hand, by Observation 4 and Observation 6, the maximum degree of G_v is at most s_v^* , which equals $3\eta d_v$ since we know $a_v = 0$ was set in the first loop. Lemma 6 then gives $|B(v)| \leq (k-1)! (s_v^*)^{k-1} = (k-1)! (3\eta)^{k-1} (d_v)^{k-1}$. Thus, v contributes at most $(k-1)! (3\eta)^{k-1} (d_v)^{k-1}$ to the left summation. By taking the ratio, using the fact that $\binom{d_v}{k-1} \geq \frac{(d_v)^{k-1}}{(k-1)^{k-1}}$, and substituting η , we obtain:

$$\frac{\sum_{v:a_v=0} |B(v)|}{\sum_v |B(v)|} \leq \frac{(k-1)! (3\eta)^{k-1} (d_v)^{k-1}}{\frac{1}{k} \frac{(d_v)^{k-1}}{(k-1)^{k-1}}} < (3\eta)^{k-1} k (k-1)^{2(k-1)} = \varepsilon \quad (15)$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma 11. $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon)$ runs in time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{2}{(1/\varepsilon)^{\frac{2}{k-1}}} n \log n\right)$.

Proof. The initialisation takes time $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ because of the sorting. In the first loop, each iteration takes time $\mathcal{O}(h) = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2} \log n)$ for the sampling and the summation. In the second loop, each iteration takes time $\mathcal{O}(k^2/\eta^2)$. To see this, note that the BFS visits the edges of at most $k-1$ nodes, all of them in $G_n(v)$. Now, if $u \in G_n(v)$ then $s_u^* \leq s_v^* \leq d_v < k/\eta$. On the other hand $s_u^* \geq 3\eta d_u$. It follows that $3\eta d_u < k/3\eta^2$, that is, $d_u \leq k/\eta^2$. Therefore the total cost is at most $\mathcal{O}(k^2/\eta^2)$. The total running time is therefore dominated by $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{-2} n \log n)$. Replacing $\eta = (\varepsilon/k)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} \frac{1}{3(k-1)^2}$ yields the bound of the lemma. □

C.3 Proofs for eps-sample-subgraph(G, v, ε, η)

Lemma 3. *Suppose after running BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε_0) the high-probability claims of Lemma 2 hold. If we run SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v) and EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v, ε, η) with $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, the two output distributions are ε -close.*

Proof. Consider first the execution of BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε_0). We let $\eta_0 = (1/\varepsilon_0)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$ be the variable defined in there, and similarly η be the one defined in a hypothetical execution of BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε). Since $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ then obviously $\eta \leq \eta_0$.

Now we consider SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v) and EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v, ε, η), on the same G and with the same preprocessing output ($\prec, \{a_v\}_{v \in V}$) of BUCKET-SKETCH(G, ε_0). Let $q(\cdot)$ be the distribution of the output of EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v, ε, η) and $p(\cdot)$ the distribution of the output of SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH(G, v). In the same way we denote by q and p the distributions over the nodes and edges used by the two algorithm (which one applies is clear from the context). The proof has two parts. First we show that, at each step i , the distribution q of the edge chosen by the algorithm is $\frac{\varepsilon}{k-1}$ -close to p . Then, by a coupling argument and a union bound we show p and q are ε -close over S_k . To obtain ε -closeness, we show $\varepsilon/2$ -closeness conditioned on some event that has probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$. Instead of $\varepsilon/2$ we use just ε , and one can compensate by increasing h by constant factors.

Let us start with the distribution of the edges. Suppose EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH is processing node $u \in S_i$ at line 4. We denote by $\varphi_i(u)$ the cut size of u , and by $\varphi_i = \sum_{u \in S_i} \varphi_i(u)$ the total cut size of S_i (both cuts meant towards $G(v) \setminus S_i$). Recall from the proof of Lemma 8 that:

$$\varphi_i \geq \frac{\varphi_1}{i} \tag{16}$$

Let us go back to the algorithm and the generic round when $u \in S_i$ is processed. For each j let $X_j = \mathbb{I}\{x_j \succ v \wedge x_j \notin S_i\}$, so that $X = \sum_{j=1}^h X_j$. Clearly, $\mathbb{E}[\frac{d_u}{h} X] = \varphi_i(u)$. By Hoeffding's inequality, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{d_u}{h} X - \mathbb{E}\frac{d_u}{h} X\right| \geq \delta\varphi_1\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(|X - \mathbb{E}X| \geq \frac{\delta\varphi_1 h}{d_u}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-2 \frac{\delta^2 \varphi_1^2 h}{d_u^2}\right) \tag{17}$$

Now recall points (1) and (2) of Lemma 2, and note that $\varphi_1 = d(v|G(v))$. The lemma then says that $\varphi_1 \geq \frac{\eta_0}{k} d_v$ and $d_v \geq \frac{\eta_0}{k} d_u$ for all $u \in G(v)$. Therefore $d_u \leq (k/\eta_0)^2 \varphi_1$, and since $\eta \leq \eta_0$, also $d_u \leq (k/\eta)^2 \varphi_1$. Now we set:

$$\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{4k^2} \tag{18}$$

which gives:

$$2 \exp\left(-2 \frac{\delta^2 \varphi_1^2 h}{d_u^2}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-2 \frac{(\varepsilon/4k^2)^2 \varphi_1^2 h}{(k/\eta)^4 \varphi_1^2}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2 \eta^4 h}{8k^8}\right) \tag{19}$$

Since $h = \Theta\left(\frac{k^8}{\varepsilon^2 \eta^4} \log 1/\varepsilon\right)$, we obtain $\exp(-\Theta(\log 1/\varepsilon)) = (1/\varepsilon)^{\Theta(1)}$. Therefore $|\frac{d_u}{h} X - \mathbb{E}\frac{d_u}{h} X| < \delta\varphi_1$ for all $u \in S_i$ with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$.

Now, we want to bound the deviation of the estimate $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u)$. If EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH sets $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) = \frac{d_u}{h} X$, then the concentration result above automatically implies $|\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) - \varphi_i(u)| \leq \delta\varphi_1$. Suppose instead EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH sets $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) = 0$. If $\varphi_i(u) \leq \delta\varphi_1$ then obviously $|\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) -$

$|\varphi_i(u)| \leq \delta\varphi_1$ and we are again fine. Thus, the only remaining bad event is that $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) = 0$ when $\varphi_i(u) > \delta\varphi_1$ and. Recall from above that $\mathbb{E}X = h\frac{\varphi_i(u)}{d_u}$ and $d_u \leq (k/\eta)^2\varphi_1$. We have:

$$\mathbb{E}X = h\frac{\varphi_i(u)}{d_u} > h\frac{\delta\varphi_1}{d_u} \geq h\frac{\delta(\eta/k)^2 d_u}{d_u} = h\frac{\varepsilon}{4k^2} \frac{\eta^2}{k^2} = h\frac{\varepsilon\eta^2}{4k^4} \quad (20)$$

Now $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) = 0$ only if $X < h\frac{\varepsilon\eta^2}{8k^4}$, i.e., $X < \mathbb{E}X - t$ with $t = h\frac{\varepsilon\eta^2}{8k^4}$. By Hoeffding's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X < \mathbb{E}X - h\frac{\varepsilon\eta^2}{8k^4}\right) < \exp\left(-\frac{2(h\frac{\varepsilon\eta^2}{8k^4})^2}{h}\right) = \exp\left(-h\frac{\varepsilon^2\eta^4}{32k^8}\right) \quad (21)$$

Since $h = \Theta\left(\frac{k^8}{\varepsilon^2\eta^4} \log 1/\varepsilon\right)$, the probability drops again to $\text{poly}(\varepsilon)$. Hence with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$ we have $|\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) - \varphi_i(u)| \leq \delta\varphi_1$ for all $u \in S_i$.

Let us now analyse the distribution of the edges. Suppose the algorithm is going to expand S_i . Let $q(\{u, u'\})$ be the probability that edge $\{u, u'\}$ is selected. We show that $q(\{\cdot, \cdot\})$ is ε/k -uniform over the cut between S_i and $G_v \setminus S_i$. Let $q(u)$ denote the probability that the algorithm selects $u \in S_i$ at line 8, and let $q(u'|u) = q(\{u, u'\}|u)$ be the probability that u' is chosen at line 10 given that u is chosen at line 8. Note that $q(u'|u) = \frac{1}{\varphi_i(u)}$, since once u is selected the algorithm keeps drawing edges incident to u uniformly until one in the cut is found. Let C be any subset of the cut between S_i and $G_v \setminus S_i$. Note that $\text{tvd}(p, q) \leq \max_C (q(C) - p(C))$, since the family of all possible C is exactly the space of events. Let C_u be the subset of edges of C containing u . Then:

$$q(C) - p(C) = \sum_{u \in S_i} (q(C_u) - p(C_u)) \quad (22)$$

$$= \sum_{u \in S_i} \left(\sum_{\{u, u'\} \in C_u} q(u)q(\{u, u'\}|u) - \sum_{\{u, u'\} \in C_u} p(u)p(\{u, u'\}|u) \right) \quad (23)$$

$$= \sum_{u \in S_i} \left(\sum_{\{u, u'\} \in C_u} q(u) \frac{1}{\varphi_i(u)} - \sum_{\{u, u'\} \in C_u} p(u) \frac{1}{\varphi_i(u)} \right) \quad (24)$$

$$= \sum_{u \in S_i} \frac{1}{\varphi_i(u)} \sum_{\{u, u'\} \in C_u} (q(u) - p(u)) \quad (25)$$

$$= \sum_{u \in S_i} \frac{|C_u|}{\varphi_i(u)} (q(u) - p(u)) \quad (26)$$

$$= \sum_{u \in S_i} \frac{|C_u|}{\varphi_i(u)} \left(\frac{\widehat{\varphi}_i(u)}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \widehat{\varphi}_i(z)} - \frac{\varphi_i(u)}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)} \right) \quad (27)$$

$$\leq \sum_{u \in S_i} \left(\frac{\widehat{\varphi}_i(u)}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \widehat{\varphi}_i(z)} - \frac{\varphi_i(u)}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)} \right) \quad (28)$$

Now recall that $|\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) - \varphi_i(u)| \leq \delta\varphi_1$ for all $u \in S_i$. Therefore $\sum_{z \in S_i} \widehat{\varphi}_i(z) \geq (\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)) - k\delta\varphi_1 \geq$

$(1 - k\delta) \sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)$. Moreover, $k\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ thus $\frac{1}{1-k\delta} \leq 2$. This gives:

$$q(C) - p(C) \leq \sum_{u \in S_i} \left(\frac{\varphi_i(u) + \delta\varphi_1}{(1 - k\delta) \sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)} - \frac{\varphi_i(u)}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)} \right) \quad (29)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)} \sum_{u \in S_i} \left((1 + 2k\delta)(\varphi_i(u) + \delta\varphi_1) - \varphi_i(u) \right) \quad (30)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)} \sum_{u \in S_i} \left(2k\delta\varphi_i(u) + \delta(1 + 2k\delta)\varphi_1 \right) \quad (31)$$

$$= 2k\delta \frac{\sum_{u \in S_i} \varphi_i(u)}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)} + \delta(1 + 2k\delta) \frac{i}{k} \frac{\varphi_1}{\sum_{z \in S_i} \varphi_i(z)} \quad (32)$$

$$\leq 4k\delta \quad (33)$$

$$\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{k} \quad (34)$$

Therefore for each i with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$ the distributions of the two algorithms for the choice of the edge in the cut of S_i satisfy $\text{tvd}(q, p) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$. By increasing h by a $\mathcal{O}(\log k)$ factor we can take a union bound on all i so that with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$ the claim holds simultaneously for all i .

We can now show that the distributions of the two algorithms over their outputs satisfy $\text{tvd}(p, q) \leq \varepsilon$. To this end we couple the two processes. Let S_i and R_i the random sets held respectively by $\text{EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v, \varepsilon, \eta)$ and $\text{SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v)$ at step i . For every $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ let e_{S_i} and e_{R_i} be the edges selected by the two processes at step i , so that $S_{i+1} = S_i \cup e_{S_i}$ and $R_{i+1} = R_i \cup e_{R_i}$. Clearly, at the beginning $S_1 = R_1 = \{v\}$. Now suppose $S_i = R_i$ for some $i \geq 1$. Then, as shown above, the distribution of S_{i+1} and R_{i+1} are $\frac{\varepsilon}{k}$ -close. Thus there exists a coupling of the two processes such that $\mathbb{P}(e_{S_i} \neq e_{R_i}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$ for all i . This implies that $\mathbb{P}(e_{S_k} \neq e_{R_k}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{P}(e_{S_i} \neq e_{R_i}) \leq \varepsilon$. Thus the output distributions satisfy $\text{tvd}(q, p) \leq \varepsilon$. \square

Lemma 12. $\text{EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v, \varepsilon, \eta)$ has expected running time $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 \eta^4}\right) \log 1/\varepsilon$.

Proof. At the beginning, the algorithm deterministically takes h samples for $\leq k^2$ times, spending in total time $\mathcal{O}(h \text{poly}(k))$. We show this dominates the expected time of the trials at lines 9–11 as well. Let T be the number of trials (the number of times lines 9–11 are executed). If u is the node chosen at line 8, then the algorithm returns after $\frac{d_u}{\varphi_i(u)}$ trials in expectation. Clearly if u has nonzero probability of being chosen then $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) > 0$. Taking the expectation over the $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u)$ yields:

$$\mathbb{E}T = \sum_{u \in S_i} \mathbb{P}(u \text{ chosen}) \mathbb{E}[T | u \text{ chosen}] \leq \sum_{u \in S_i} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) > 0) \frac{d_u}{\varphi_i(u)} \quad (35)$$

Now, $\mathbb{E}X = h \frac{\varphi_i(u)}{d_u}$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) > 0$ only if $X > h \frac{\varepsilon \eta^2}{8k^4}$. By Markov's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}(X > 0) < \frac{h \frac{\varphi_i(u)}{d_u}}{h \frac{\varepsilon \eta^2}{8k^4}} = \frac{\varphi_i(u)}{d_u} \frac{8k^4}{\varepsilon \eta^2} \quad (36)$$

Therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\varphi}_i(u) > 0) \frac{d_u}{\varphi_i(u)} \leq \frac{8k^4}{\varepsilon \eta^2} = \mathcal{O}(h) \quad (37)$$

Summing over all terms in $\mathbb{E}T$ and over all rounds shows that the expected number of trials over the whole algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(h \text{poly}(k))$. Finally, note that each single trial takes time $\mathcal{O}(k)$; just check if u' satisfies $u' \succ v$ and has no neighbors in S_i . Substituting $h = \Theta\left(\frac{k^8 \log 1/\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^2 \eta^4}\right)$ yields the bound. \square

C.4 Proofs for eps-compute-p(G, S, ε, η)

Lemma 13. $\text{EPS-COMPUTE-P}(G, S, \varepsilon, \eta)$ runs in deterministic time $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)}\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2\eta^4} \log 1/\varepsilon)$.

Proof. The running time is dominated by line 9, where we sum over at most kh terms. This is repeated a total of at most $k!$ times (for each permutation on $k-1$ nodes we make $k-1$ iterations). Substituting $h = \Theta(\frac{k^9}{\varepsilon^2\eta^4} \log 1/\varepsilon)$ yields the bound. \square

Lemma 4. Suppose after running $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon_0)$ the high-probability claims of Lemma 2 hold. Consider any k -node set S reachable from v in $G(v)$. Then, for any $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$ the output $\hat{p}(S)$ of $\text{EPS-COMPUTE-P}(G, S, \varepsilon, \eta)$ and the output $p(S)$ of $\text{COMPUTE-P}(G, S)$ satisfy $\hat{p}(S) \in (1 \pm \varepsilon)p(S)$ where η is the value $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon)$ would use.

Proof. We compare $\text{EPS-COMPUTE-P}(G, S, \varepsilon, \eta)$ against $\text{COMPUTE-P}(G, S)$ (Algorithm 6). We let $\eta_0 = (1/\varepsilon_0)^{\frac{1}{k-1}}k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$ be the value used by $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon_0)$. Clearly $\eta \leq \eta_0$. Consider any single iteration at line 4. Let φ_i denote the size of the cut between S_i and $G_v \setminus S_i$, and let p_σ be the value computed by $\text{COMPUTE-P}(S, G)$. This is the value \hat{p}_σ would take if we had $\hat{\varphi}_i = \varphi_i$ for all i . We now show that $\hat{\varphi}_i \in (1 \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2k})\varphi_i$ for all i with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$. If this is the case, then:

$$\frac{\hat{p}_\sigma}{p_\sigma} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i / \hat{\varphi}_i}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i / \varphi_i} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \varphi_i}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \hat{\varphi}_i} = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\varphi_i}{\hat{\varphi}_i} \in \left(1 \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}\right)^{k-1} \quad (38)$$

This implies that $\hat{p}_\sigma \in (1 \pm \varepsilon)p_\sigma$. Indeed, on one side, $(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2k})^{k-1} \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}(k-1) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. On the other side, for all $r > 1$ and $0 < x < \frac{1}{k-1}$ we have $(1-x)^r \leq 1 + \frac{rx}{1-(r-1)x}$; plugging in $r = k-1$ and $x = \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}$ yields $(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2k})^{k-1} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$.

Thus, we show that w.h.p. $\hat{\varphi}_i \in (1 \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2k})\varphi_i$. Consider again any single execution of line 4 and let $X_{u,j} = \mathbb{I}\{x_{u,j} \succ v \wedge x_{u,j} \notin S_i\}$. Clearly $\mathbb{E}[X_{u,j}] = \frac{\varphi_i(u)}{d_u}$, so $\mathbb{E}\hat{\varphi}_i = \varphi_i$. Now let $X = \frac{h}{d_v}\hat{\varphi}_i$. Recall from the proof of Lemma 3 that $\varphi_i \geq \frac{\varphi_1}{k-1}$ and $d_u \leq (k/\eta_0)^2\varphi_1 \leq (k/\eta)^2\varphi_1$. This yields:

$$\mathbb{E}X = \frac{h}{d_v}\varphi_i \geq \frac{h}{d_v}\frac{\varphi_1}{k-1} > \frac{h}{d_v}\frac{\eta^2}{k^3}d_v = \frac{h\eta^2}{k^3} \quad (39)$$

Therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{\varphi}_i - \mathbb{E}\hat{\varphi}_i| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}\mathbb{E}\hat{\varphi}_i\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(|X - \mathbb{E}X| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2k}\mathbb{E}X\right) < \mathbb{P}\left(|X - \mathbb{E}X| > \frac{\varepsilon h\eta^2}{2k^4}\right) \quad (40)$$

By Hoeffding's inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|X - \mathbb{E}X| > \frac{\varepsilon h\eta^2}{2k^4}\right) \leq \exp\left(-2\frac{(\frac{\varepsilon h\eta^2}{2k^4})^2}{h}\right) = \exp\left(-h\frac{\varepsilon^2\eta^4}{2k^8}\right) \quad (41)$$

Since the algorithm uses $h = \Theta(\frac{k^9}{\varepsilon^2\eta^4} \log 1/\varepsilon)$, the probability drops below $2^{-k}/\text{poly}(\varepsilon)$. The algorithm uses the same random variables to estimate the cuts of at most 2^k subsets; a union bound on those subsets completes the proof. \square

C.5 Proofs for $\text{eps-u-sampler}(G, \varepsilon)$

Lemma 14. *The preprocessing phase of $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$ runs deterministically in time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}((1/\varepsilon)^2 n \log n)$.*

Proof. The runtime of the preprocessing is dominated by $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon/2)$ and the bound follows from Lemma 2. \square

Lemma 15. *In $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$, suppose after running $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon/2)$ the high-probability claims of Lemma 2 hold. Then each invocation of $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}()$ returns a graphlet independently and ε -uniformly at random from G .*

Proof. We will couple $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$ and $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL}(G, \varepsilon'/2)$. With these inputs, the preprocessing phases of the two algorithms are identical (except that $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL}$ also sorts the adjacency lists), thus we can couple them to behave identically. In particular we assume they obtain the same order \prec , the same bucket distribution $p : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$, and the same normalization parameter $\beta_k(G)$. Now let $H = v \in V : a_v > 0$ (H for heavy buckets). If the high-probability claims of Lemma 2 hold, then H contains a fraction $(1 - \varepsilon/2)$ of all graphlets of G . By Lemma 17, SAMPLE of $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL}$ returns graphlets uniformly at random from H . Thus to prove the ε -uniformity of $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}$, we show the distribution of its returned graphlets is $\varepsilon/2$ -close to that of SAMPLE in $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL}$. By the triangle inequality this implies the claim. Formally, if \mathcal{U}_V and \mathcal{U}_H are the uniform distributions respectively over $\cup_{v \in V} B(v)$ and $\sum_{v \in H} B(v)$, and q is the distribution given by $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}$, then:

$$\text{tvd}(q, \mathcal{U}_V) \leq \text{tvd}(q, \mathcal{U}_H) + \text{tvd}(\mathcal{U}_H, \mathcal{U}_V) \leq \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 \quad (42)$$

where the bound on the first term is the one we will prove, and the bound on the second term follows as said from Lemma 2 and Lemma 17.

Let us then consider one single iteration of SAMPLE and $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}$. We couple the two algorithms along the way. First, since the bucket distribution p is identical, we can couple them so they choose the same bucket $B(v)$ (lines 10 of SAMPLE and 10 of $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}$). From now on we consider v as fixed and all probability distributions are meant as conditioned on v being the chosen node. We denote by S_P the random set of nodes drawn by SAMPLE at line 11, and by S_Q the one drawn by $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}$ at line 11. Now, the two algorithms invoke respectively $\text{SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v)$ and $\text{EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v, \varepsilon_1, \eta)$. Since $\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon$, by Lemma 3 we have $\text{tvd}(S_P, S_Q) \leq \varepsilon_1$. Hence we can couple the two algorithms so that $\mathbb{P}(S_Q \neq S_P) \leq \varepsilon_1$. Now let X_P be the indicator random variable of the event that SAMPLE accepts S_P and returns it (see line 13) and by X_Q the indicator random variable of the event that $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}$ accepts S_Q and returns it (see line 13). We define the outcome of SAMPLE as the pair (S_P, X_P) , and that of $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}$ as the pair (S_Q, X_Q) . Let \mathcal{D}_P and \mathcal{D}_Q be the distributions of (S_P, X_P) and (S_Q, X_Q) respectively. We want to show that the two distributions are $\varepsilon/2$ -close conditioned on the graphlets being accepted, that is, we want:

$$\text{tvd}(\mathcal{D}_P(\cdot | X_P = 1), \mathcal{D}_Q(\cdot | X_Q = 1)) \leq \varepsilon \quad (43)$$

Ignoring for a moment the $k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}$ factors, the strategy is the following. The probability that the algorithms accept the sampled graphlet is $\Omega(\varepsilon^2)$. Therefore, to make the conditional distributions $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ -close, we can make the unconditional distributions $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3)$ -close. Obviously we have to take care of the fact that the two algorithms can disagree on both the sampled graphlet and its acceptance.

Before continuing let $X_V = \max(X_P, X_Q)$. This indicates the event that at least one of the algorithms accepted its graphlet. Clearly $P(X_V = 1) \geq P(X_P = 1)$. By Lemma 17, since $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL}$ is invoked with $\varepsilon/2$, at any given iteration we have $P(X_P = 1) \geq \varepsilon^2 k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$. Now, by

the triangle inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tvd}(\mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_P = 1), \mathcal{D}_Q(\cdot|X_Q = 1)) &\leq \text{tvd}(\mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_P = 1), \mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_V = 1)) \\ &\quad + \text{tvd}(\mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_V = 1), \mathcal{D}_Q(\cdot|X_V = 1)) \\ &\quad + \text{tvd}(\mathcal{D}_Q(\cdot|X_Q = 1), \mathcal{D}_Q(\cdot|X_V = 1)) \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

By the coupling, the middle term satisfies:

$$\text{tvd}(\mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_V = 1), \mathcal{D}_Q(\cdot|X_V = 1)) \leq \mathbb{P}(S_Q \neq S_P | X_V = 1) \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_Q \neq S_P)}{\mathbb{P}(X_V = 1)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon^2} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \quad (45)$$

where we used the bounds on $\mathbb{P}(S_Q \neq S_P)$ and $\mathbb{P}(X_V = 1)$ from above.

We bound similarly the sum of the other two terms. For the first term note that:

$$\text{tvd}(\mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_P = 1), \mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_V = 1)) \leq \mathbb{P}(X_P = 0 | X_V = 1) \quad (46)$$

This is true since $\mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_P = 1)$ is just $\mathcal{D}_P(\cdot|X_V = 1)$ conditioned on $X_P = 1$, an event which has probability $1 - \mathbb{P}(X_P = 0 | X_V = 1)$. Symmetrically, for the last term $\text{tvd}(\mathcal{D}_Q(\cdot|X_Q = 1), \mathcal{D}_Q(\cdot|X_V = 1)) \leq \mathbb{P}(X_Q = 0 | X_V = 1)$. The sum of the two terms is therefore bounded by:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_P = 0 | X_V = 1) + \mathbb{P}(X_Q = 0 | X_V = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X_P \neq X_Q | X_V = 1) \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_P \neq X_Q)}{\mathbb{P}(X_V = 1)} \quad (47)$$

The denominator is at least $\varepsilon^2 k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$, see above. For the numerator,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_Q \neq X_P) \leq \mathbb{P}(S_Q \neq S_P) + \mathbb{P}(X_Q \neq X_P | S_Q = S_P) \quad (48)$$

As said, $\mathbb{P}(S_Q \neq S_P) \leq \varepsilon_1$. For the second term, we again couple X_Q and X_P so that:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_Q \neq X_P | S_Q = S_P) = |\mathbb{P}(X_P = 1 | S_Q = S_P) - \mathbb{P}(X_Q = 1 | S_Q = S_P)| \quad (49)$$

$$\leq \left| 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_Q = 1 | S_Q = S_P)}{\mathbb{P}(X_P = 1 | S_Q = S_P)} \right| \quad (50)$$

Now, $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$ and $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL}(G, \varepsilon'/2)$ by construction have respectively $\mathbb{P}(X_P = 1 | S_Q = S_P) = \frac{\beta_k(G)}{p^{(v)} p(S)}$ and $\mathbb{P}(X_Q = 1 | S_Q = S_P) = \min(1, \frac{\beta_k(G)}{p^{(v)} \widehat{p}(S)})$. Note that the min can only bring the ratio above closer to 1, since $\mathbb{P}(X_P = 1 | S_Q = S_P) \leq 1$. Therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_Q \neq X_P | S_Q = S_P) \leq \left| 1 - \frac{\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p^{(v)} p(S)}}{\min(1, \frac{\beta_k(G)}{p^{(v)} \widehat{p}(S)})} \right| \leq \left| 1 - \frac{p(S)}{\widehat{p}(S)} \right| \quad (51)$$

Now, by Lemma 4, with probability $1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon_2)$ we have $\widehat{p}(S) \in [1 \pm \varepsilon_2]p(S)$. Conditioning on this event, we have $|1 - \frac{p(S)}{\widehat{p}(S)}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_2}{1 - \varepsilon_2} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_2)$. Otherwise, $\mathbb{P}(X_Q \neq X_P | S_Q = S_P) \leq 1$. Thus:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_Q \neq X_P | S_Q = S_P) \leq (1 - \text{poly}(\varepsilon_2))\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_2) + \text{poly}(\varepsilon_2) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_2) \quad (52)$$

which drops below ε_2 by adjusting the constants. Applying these two bounds to the right-hand side of (48), we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_Q \neq X_P) \leq \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \quad (53)$$

Therefore the sum of the first and third term of (44) is at most:

$$\frac{\varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon^2} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} + (\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2) \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} = \frac{\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon^2} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \quad (54)$$

Since $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$ defines $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon^3 k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$, the bound drops below $\varepsilon/2$, as desired. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 16. In $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER}(G, \varepsilon)$, suppose after running $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon/2)$ the high-probability claims of Lemma 2 hold. Then every invocation of $\varepsilon\text{-SAMPLE}()$ has expected running time $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left((1/\varepsilon)^{8+\frac{4}{k-1}} \log 1/\varepsilon\right)$.

Proof. As shown above, $\mathbb{P}(X_Q \neq X_P) \leq \varepsilon_1 + 2\varepsilon_2$ which implies $\mathbb{P}(X_Q = 1) \geq \mathbb{P}(X_P = 1) - (\varepsilon_1 + 2\varepsilon_2)$. Recall however that $\mathbb{P}(X_P = 1) = \varepsilon^2 k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$, while $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon^3 k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$. Thus, scaling $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$ by $k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$ factors if needed, we can ensure that $\mathbb{P}(X_Q = 1) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}(X_P = 1)$. The expected number of rounds is then at most $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}(1/\varepsilon)^2$. Each round is dominated by $\text{EPS-SAMPLE-SUBGRAPH}(G, v, \varepsilon_1, \eta)$ and $\text{EPS-COMPUTE-P}(S, G, \varepsilon_2, \eta)$, which by Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 have expected running time $k^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1^2 \eta^4} \log 1/\varepsilon\right)$. Note that these bounds holds even conditioned on past events. Recall that $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon^3 k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$ and $\eta = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{k-1}} k^{-\mathcal{O}(k)}$, since this is the η defined by $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon/2)$. Multiplying the expected rounds bound by the per-round time, the total expected running time is at most

$$k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} (1/\varepsilon)^2 \cdot k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left((1/\varepsilon)^{6+\frac{4}{k-1}} \log 1/\varepsilon\right) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}\left((1/\varepsilon)^{8+\frac{4}{k-1}} \log 1/\varepsilon\right) \quad (55)$$

This concludes the proof. \square

C.6 Proofs for $\text{eps-u-sampler-full}(G, \varepsilon)$

Lemma 17. In $\text{EPS-U-SAMPLER-FULL}(G, \varepsilon)$, suppose after running $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon)$ the high-probability claims of Lemma 2 hold. Then the following holds. First, at any given iteration $\text{SAMPLE}()$ accepts the sampled graphlet with probability $\varepsilon^2 k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}$. Second, $\text{SAMPLE}()$ returns graphlets uniformly at random from $\cup_{a_v > 0} B(v)$.

Proof. First, note that $\text{SAMPLE}()$ is the same of U-SAMPLER . Therefore Lemma 10 implies the claim on the distribution of the returned graphlets, provided that the rejection probability is well-defined, that is, $\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)} \leq 1$ for all $p(v) > 0, p(S) > 0$. By substituting $\beta_k(G)$ and $p(v)$:

$$\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)} = \frac{\varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}}{a_v p(S)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} d(v|G(v))^{-(k-1)}}{p(S)} \quad (56)$$

where we used the fact that when $p(v) > 0$, i.e. $a_v > 0$, then $a_v \geq d(v|G(v))^{k-1}$ by construction of $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon)$. Thus we need $p(S) \geq \varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} d(v|G(v))^{-(k-1)}$. To this end we adapt the lower bound on $p(S)$ of Lemma 8. In particular, since $G[S]$ is connected then at least one sequence v, u_2, \dots, u_k exists such that $\varphi_i \geq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. Now, by Lemma 2, all $u \succ v$ satisfy $d(u|G(v)) \geq \frac{k}{\eta} \cdot d(v|G(v))$, i.e., the degree of $G(v)$ is bounded by $\frac{k}{\eta} d(v|G(v))$. It follows that $\varphi_i \leq i \frac{k}{\eta} d(v|G(v))$ for all i , so as desired the sequence probability is at least

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{i} (k/\eta)^{k-1} d(v|G(v))^{-1} = \varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} d(v|G(v))^{-(k-1)} \quad (57)$$

Now we bound the acceptance probability from below. To this end recall the upper bound on $p(S)$ of Lemma 8, which gives $p(S) \leq k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} d(v|G(v))^{-(k-1)}$ regardless of the degrees of the other nodes in $G(v)$. Now, since $a_v > 0$ by Lemma 2 we have $d(v|G(v))^{k-1} \geq \varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} (d_v)^{k-1}$, so $p(S) \leq k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} d_v^{-(k-1)}$. On the other hand $a_v \leq d(v)^{k-1}$ by construction of $\text{BUCKET-SKETCH}(G, \varepsilon)$. Therefore:

$$\frac{\beta_k(G)}{p(v)p(S)} = \frac{\varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}}{a_v p(S)} \geq \frac{\varepsilon k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)}}{d(v)^{k-1} k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} d_v^{-(k-1)}} = \varepsilon^2 k^{\mathcal{O}(-k)} \quad (58)$$

as claimed. \square

D Proofs of the MCMC results

In this section we prove the results of Section 3: Theorem 3, Lemma 5, Lemma 1 (Appendix D.1) and Theorem 2 (Appendix D.4). We employ standard Markov chain results reported in Appendix E.

D.1 Proof of Theorem 3, Lemma 5, Lemma 1

As anticipated, Theorem 3 derives from Lemma 5. The derivation is as follows. First, a recursive application of Lemma 5 yields

$$\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O} \left(\tau(G) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right)^{k-1} \right) \quad (59)$$

Now recall (93) from Appendix E. On the one hand we have $\tau(G) = \mathcal{O}(t(G))$. On the other hand, we have $t_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k) = \mathcal{O}(\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\pi^*}))$ where $\pi^* = \min_{g \in \mathcal{V}_k} \pi(g)$ is the smallest mass of any k -graphlet in \mathcal{G}_k in the stationary distribution π . Therefore,

$$t_\varepsilon(\mathcal{G}_k) = k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \left(t(G) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right)^{k-1} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon\pi^*} \right) \quad (60)$$

Now $\pi(g) = \frac{d_g}{\sum_{g' \in \mathcal{V}_k} d_{g'}}$ where d_g is the degree of g in \mathcal{G}_k . Since $|\mathcal{V}_k| \leq \binom{n}{k}$ and each $g \in \mathcal{G}_k$ has degree at most $\text{poly}(n)$, then $\pi^* = \Omega(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)})$ and $\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon\pi^*} = \mathcal{O}(\log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})$. The bound of Theorem 3 follows.

In the rest of the section we prove Lemma 5, that is,

$$\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) = \mathcal{O} \left(\text{poly}(k) \cdot \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \cdot \tau(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}) \right) \quad (61)$$

We denote a generic node of \mathcal{G}_k as g , and a generic node of \mathcal{G}_{k-1} as u, v , or z (no confusion with the nodes of G should arise). We always denote by d_u the degree of u in the original simple graph (without self-loops or weights), and the same for d_g . We let $L = L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ denote the line graph of \mathcal{G}_{k-1} . The node set of L is $V(L) = \{x_{uv} : \{u, v\} \in E(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})\}$, and its edges are all the pairs in the form $\{x_{uv}, x_{uz}\}$ with $u \neq z$, representing edges $\{u, v\}$ and $\{u, z\}$ adjacent in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} . The lazy walk on L is defined by the following weighting:

$$w_0(x_{uv}, x_{uz}) = 1 \quad u \neq z \quad (62)$$

$$w_0(x_{uv}, x_{uv}) = d_u + d_v - 2 \quad (63)$$

where d_u is as usual the degree of u in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} . See Figure 1 below.




Figure 1: A path of 3 graphlets in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} , and how it appears in $L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Both graphs are weighted so to yield a lazy random walk.

D.2 From \mathcal{G}_{k-1} to $L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$

The first step in the proof of Lemma 5 is proving Lemma 1, here recalled:

Lemma 1 (reformulated with $G = \mathcal{G}_k$). *If $|\mathcal{E}_k| \geq 1$, then:*

$$\tau(L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})) \leq 20 \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \tau(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}) \quad (64)$$

where $\tau(\cdot)$ is the relaxation time of the lazy walk.

To prove the result we build an auxiliary weighted graph \mathcal{S}' and show that $\tau(\mathcal{S}') \leq \frac{4\Delta}{\delta} \tau(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $\tau(L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})) \leq 5\tau(\mathcal{S}')$. To begin, let \mathcal{S} be the 1-subdivision of \mathcal{G}_{k-1} . This is the graph obtained by replacing each edge $\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1}$ with two consecutive edges $\{u, x_{uv}\}, \{x_{uv}, v\}$ where x_{uv} is a new node representing $\{u, v\}$. We make \mathcal{S} lazy by adding loops and assigning the following weights:

$$w_{\mathcal{S}}(u, u) = d_u \quad u \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} \quad (65)$$

$$w_{\mathcal{S}}(u, x_{uv}) = 1 \quad \{u, v\} \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} \quad (66)$$

$$w_{\mathcal{S}}(x_{uv}, x_{uv}) = 2 \quad \{u, v\} \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} \quad (67)$$

The graph \mathcal{S}' is the same as \mathcal{S} but with the following weights:

$$w_{\mathcal{S}'}(u, u) = d_u^2 \quad u \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} \quad (68)$$

$$w_{\mathcal{S}'}(u, x_{uv}) = d_u \quad \{u, v\} \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} \quad (69)$$

$$w_{\mathcal{S}'}(x_{uv}, x_{uv}) = d_u + d_v \quad \{u, v\} \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} \quad (70)$$

The reader may refer to Figure 2 below.




Figure 2: Left: a pair of $(k-1)$ -graphlets u, v forming an edge in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} . Middle: how $\{u, v\}$ appears in \mathcal{S} , the 1-subdivision of G . Right: the reweighting given by \mathcal{S}' .

We now show:

Lemma 18. $\tau(\mathcal{S}') \leq \frac{4\Delta}{\delta} \tau(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$.

Proof. First, note that $\min_{x,y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{w_{\mathcal{S}}(x,y)}{w_{\mathcal{S}'}(x,y)} \geq 1/\Delta$ and $\max_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{w_{\mathcal{S}}(x)}{w_{\mathcal{S}'}(x)} \leq 1/\delta$. By Lemma 26 this implies $\gamma(\mathcal{S}') \geq \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \gamma(\mathcal{S})$, or equivalently $\tau(\mathcal{S}') \leq \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \tau(\mathcal{S})$. Thus, we need only to show that $\tau(\mathcal{S}) \leq 4\tau(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$, or equivalently, $\gamma(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}) \leq 4\gamma(\mathcal{S})$. We do so by comparing the numerators and denominators of (95) in Lemma 25 for \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{G}_{k-1} .

In the remainder of the proof we write \mathcal{G} for \mathcal{G}_{k-1} and uv for x_{uv} . Consider the walk on \mathcal{S} and let $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ be its stationary distribution. Let $f_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{V(\mathcal{S})}$ be the choice of f that attains the minimum in (95) under $\pi = \pi_{\mathcal{S}}$. We will show that there exists $f_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{V(\mathcal{G})}$ such that:

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{G}}, \pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}})}{\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}})} \leq 4 \frac{\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{S}}, \pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}})}{\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}})} \quad (71)$$

By Lemma 25 this implies our claim, since the left-hand side of (71) bounds $\gamma(\mathcal{G})$ from above and the right-hand side equals $4\gamma(\mathcal{S})$. Now, first, note that for all $u \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(u) = \frac{2}{3}\pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{G}$ (the weight of u is the same in \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{S} , but the total sum of weights in \mathcal{S} is $3/2$ that of \mathcal{G}). Similar calculations show that for all $uv \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) = \frac{4}{3d_u}\pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u)$, where d_u continues to denote the original degree of u in \mathcal{G} . Third, observe that since $f_{\mathcal{S}}$ attains the minimum in (95) then necessarily $f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) = \frac{f_{\mathcal{S}}(u)+f_{\mathcal{S}}(v)}{2}$ for all $uv \in \mathcal{G}$. We define $f_{\mathcal{G}}$ as the restriction of $f_{\mathcal{S}}$ on $V(\mathcal{G})$.

Now we relate the numerator of (71) for \mathcal{S} and for \mathcal{G} . To begin, note that:

$$\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{S}}, \pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}}) = \sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \left((f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv))^2 Q_{\mathcal{S}}(u, uv) + (f_{\mathcal{S}}(v) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv))^2 Q_{\mathcal{S}}(u, uv) \right) \quad (72)$$

Observe that $Q_{\mathcal{S}}(u, uv) = Q_{\mathcal{S}}(v, uv) = \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(u)\frac{1}{2d_u}$, and as noted above, $f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) = \frac{f_{\mathcal{S}}(u)+f_{\mathcal{S}}(v)}{2}$, thus $(f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv)) = (f_{\mathcal{S}}(v) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv)) = \frac{1}{2}(f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(v))$. Recalling that $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(u) = \frac{2}{3}\pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u)$, we have:

$$\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{S}}, \pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \left(f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(v) \right)^2 \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(u) \frac{1}{2d_u} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \left(f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(v) \right)^2 \pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u) \frac{1}{2d_u} \quad (73)$$

On the other hand, since by construction $f_{\mathcal{G}}(u) = f_{\mathcal{S}}(u)$ and since $Q_{\mathcal{G}}(u, v) = \pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u)\frac{1}{2d_u}$:

$$\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{G}}, \pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}}) = \sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \left(f_{\mathcal{G}}(u) - f_{\mathcal{G}}(v) \right)^2 Q_{\mathcal{G}}(u, v) = \sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \left(f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) - f_{\mathcal{S}}(v) \right)^2 \pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u) \frac{1}{2d_u} \quad (74)$$

Comparing (73) and (74) shows that $\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{G}}, \pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}}) = 3\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{S}}, \pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}})$.

We turn to the denominator of (71). First, we have:

$$\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}}) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{G}} \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(u) f_{\mathcal{S}}(u)^2 + \sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv)^2 \quad (75)$$

Since $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(u) = \frac{2}{3}\pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u)$ and $f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) = f_{\mathcal{G}}(u)$, the first term equals $\frac{2}{3}\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}})$. We now show that the second term equals $\frac{2}{3}\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}})$ as well. By convexity of the square, we have:

$$\sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv)^2 = \sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) \left(\frac{f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) + f_{\mathcal{S}}(v)}{2} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) \frac{1}{2} (f_{\mathcal{S}}(u)^2 + f_{\mathcal{S}}(v)^2) \quad (76)$$

Each summand in the right-hand side charges $\frac{1}{2}\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv)f_{\mathcal{S}}(u)^2$ to u . Therefore,

$$\sum_{uv \in \mathcal{G}} \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) f_{\mathcal{S}}(uv)^2 = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{G}} \pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) d_u \frac{1}{2} f_{\mathcal{S}}(u)^2 = \frac{2}{3} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{G}} \pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u) f_{\mathcal{S}}(u)^2 \quad (77)$$

where the last equality comes from $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}(uv) = \frac{4}{3d_u}\pi_{\mathcal{G}}(u)$. Since $f_{\mathcal{S}}(u) = f_{\mathcal{G}}(u)$, the last term equals again $\frac{2}{3}\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}})$. Therefore $\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}}) \geq \frac{3}{4}\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}})$. By combining our two bounds, we obtain:

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{G}}, \pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}})}{\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{G}}}(f_{\mathcal{G}})} \leq \frac{3\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{S}}, \pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}})}{\frac{3}{4}\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}})} = 4 \frac{\mathcal{E}_{P_{\mathcal{S}}, \pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}})}{\text{Var}_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f_{\mathcal{S}})} \quad (78)$$

which shows that $\gamma(\mathcal{G}) \leq 4\gamma(\mathcal{S})$, completing the proof. \square

We conclude by relating the relaxation time of \mathcal{S}' to that of $L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Formally:

Lemma 19. *If $|V(\mathcal{G}_k)| > 1$ then $\tau(L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})) \leq 5\tau(\mathcal{S}')$.*

Proof. Let $X = \{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the walk on \mathcal{S}' , and let $Y = X[A]$ be the chain induced by X on the subset of states $A = \{x_{uv} : \{u, v\} \in E(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})\}$ (Definition 5). By Lemma 28, $\tau(Y) \leq \tau(\mathcal{S}')$. Now we want to prove that $\tau(L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})) \leq 5\tau(Y)$. To this end, we show that Y is exactly the random walk on L if we just alter the weights of L as follows:

$$w'_L(x_{uv}, x_{uz}) = 1 \quad u \neq z \quad (79)$$

$$w'_L(x_{uv}, x_{uv}) = d_u + d_v + 2 \quad (80)$$

To see this, let us compute the transition probabilities of Y from the generic state x_{uv} of \mathcal{S}' . The reader may refer to Figure 3 below. First, if $Y_t = x_{uv}$ then we can assume $X_s = x_{uv}$ for some $s = s(t)$. From x_{uv} , the two possible transitions are $Y_{t+1} = x_{uv}$ and $Y_{t+1} = x_{uz}$ for some $z \neq v$. The first transition, $Y_{t+1} = x_{uv}$, requires exactly one of these three disjoint events occurs:

1. $X_{s+1} = x_{uv}$
2. $X_{s+1} = \dots = X_{s'-1} = u$ and $X_{s'} = x_{uv}$ for some $s' \geq s + 2$
3. the same as (2) but with v in place of u .

The probability of (1) is $\frac{1}{2}$ by construction of the loop weights. The probability of (2) is the product of $\mathbb{P}(X_{s+1} = u | X_s = x_{uv}) = \frac{d_u}{2(d_u+d_v)}$ times $\mathbb{P}(X_{s'} = x_{uv} | X_{s'-1} = u) = \frac{1}{d_u}$, since X leaves u with probability 1, in which case it moves to x_{uv} with probability $\frac{1}{d_u}$. Thus, the probability of (2) is $\frac{1}{2(d_u+d_v)}$, and by symmetry the same is for (3). Therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} = x_{uv} | Y_t = x_{uv}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{d_u + d_v} = \frac{d_u + d_v + 2}{2(d_u + d_v)} \quad (81)$$

The second transition, $Y_{t+1} = x_{uz}$, is the same as event (2) above, only with $X_{s'} = x_{uz}$ instead of $X_{s'} = x_{uv}$. But conditioned on $X_{s'-1} = u$ the two events have the same probability, therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} = x_{uz} | Y_t = x_{uv}) = \frac{1}{2(d_u + d_v)} \quad (82)$$

Thus the probabilities are proportional to 1 and $d_u + d_v + 2$, as the weighting w'_L says.

We can now conclude the proof. Consider the generic node x_{uv} . If $d_u + d_v = 2$, then \mathcal{G}_{k-1} is a single edge, and $|V(\mathcal{G}_k)| = 1$. Thus if $|V(\mathcal{G}_k)| > 1$ we must have $d_u + d_v \geq 3$. But then $\frac{d_u+d_v+2}{d_u+d_v-2} \leq \frac{3+2}{3-2} = 5$. Therefore $w_S \leq w'_L \leq 5w_S$, and Lemma 26 yields $\tau(L) \leq 5\tau(\mathcal{S}')$. \square




Figure 3: Left: the graph \mathcal{S}' described above. Right: the reweighted line graph L' obtained by weighting the loops of $L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ with $(d_u + d_v + 2)$ instead of $(d_u + d_v - 2)$. If we observe the random walk on \mathcal{S}' only on the states x_{\cdot} , we see exactly the walk over L' .

D.3 From $L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ to \mathcal{G}_k

We now prove that $\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) \leq \mathcal{O}_k(\tau(L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})))$. To this end, we first obtain from $L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ a new weighted graph L_N by repeatedly collapsing subsets of nodes. Standard results guarantee that $\tau(L_N) \leq \tau(L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}))$, and we will be left with proving that $\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) \leq \mathcal{O}_k(\tau(L_N))$.

Let us begin the construction. For any $g \in V(\mathcal{G}_k)$ let $H(g) = \{x_{uv} \in V(L) : g = u \cup v\}$. Note that $\{H(g)\}_{g \in V(\mathcal{G}_k)}$ is a partition of $V(L)$ into equivalence classes. Now let $V(\mathcal{G}_k) = \{g_1, \dots, g_N\}$, and let $L_0 = L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. For each $i = 1, \dots, N$ we define L_i by taking L_{i-1} and collapsing $H(g_i)$. Formally, we let $L_i = (V(L_i), E(L_i), w_i)$, where $V(L_i) = V(L_{i-1}) \setminus H(g_i) \cup \{a_i\}$ with a_i being a new state representing $H(g_i)$, and:

$$w_i(x, x') = w_{i-1}(x, y) \quad x \neq a_i, x' \neq a_i \quad (83)$$

$$w_i(x, a_i) = \sum_{x' \in a_i} w_{i-1}(x, x') \quad x \neq a_i \quad (84)$$

$$w_i(a_i, a_i) = \sum_{x \in a_i} \sum_{x' \in a_i} w_{i-1}(x, x') \quad (85)$$

Now consider the walk on L_i . This is the collapsed version of the walk L_{i-1} with respect to the set of states $A^C = H(g_i)$, see Definition 4. Therefore by Lemma 27 the spectral gaps of the two walks satisfy $\gamma(L_i) \geq \gamma(L_{i-1})$, and the relaxation times satisfy $\tau(L_i) \leq \tau(L_{i-1})$. Thus $\tau(L_N) \leq \tau(L_0) = \tau(L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}))$. Now we prove:

Lemma 20. $\tau(\mathcal{G}_k) \leq \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(k)\tau(L_N))$.

Proof. We show that the walk on L_N is the lazy walk on \mathcal{G}_k up to a reweighting of the edges by multiplicative factors $\mathcal{O}_k(1)$. By Lemma 26 this implies the thesis. In particular we show that, if \mathcal{G}_k is taken in its lazy version (with loops accounting for half of the node weight), then (1) $V(L_N) = V(\mathcal{G}_k)$, (2) $E(L_N) = E(\mathcal{G}_k)$, (3) $w_N/w_{\mathcal{G}_k} = \Theta_k(1)$. We denote the generic state $a_i \in L_N$ simply as g , meaning that a_i represents $H(g)$.

Proof that $V(L_N) = V(\mathcal{G}_k)$. Suppose $g \in V(L_N)$. Then by construction $g = u \cup v$ for some two u, v that form an edge in \mathcal{G}_{k-1} . This implies that g has k nodes and is connected, hence g is a k -graphlet and $g \in V(\mathcal{G}_k)$. Conversely, suppose $g \in V(\mathcal{G}_k)$. Since g is connected it has a spanning tree T (a subgraph of G). Let a, b be two distinct leaves of T and let $g' = g \setminus \{a\}$ and $g'' = g \setminus \{b\}$. Then g', g'' are connected and have $k-1$ nodes, so are in $V(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Moreover $|g' \cap g''| = k-2$, so $\{g', g''\} \in E(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Thus $\{g', g''\} \in L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and as a consequence $g \in V(L_N)$. Therefore $V(L_N) = V(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$.

Proof that $E(L_N) = E(\mathcal{G}_k)$. First, both L_N and the lazy version of \mathcal{G}_k have a loop at each node (L_N inherits from L_0 a positive self-transition probability at each node). Consider then a non-loop edge $\{g', g''\} \in E(L_N)$. By construction of L_N we must have $g' = u \cup v$ and $g'' = u \cup z$, with $\{u, v\}, \{u, z\} \in E(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $u, v, z \in V(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ all distinct. This implies $g' \cap g'' = u$ and so $\{g', g''\} \in E(\mathcal{G}_k)$. It follows that $E(L_N) \subseteq E(\mathcal{G}_k)$. Consider now a non-loop edge $\{g', g''\} \in E(\mathcal{G}_k)$. First, let $u = g' \cap g''$; note that by hypothesis u is connected and $|u| = k-1$, so $u \in V(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. Now let $\{a'\} = g' \setminus g''$ and let b' be any neighbor of a' in u . Choose any spanning tree T' of u rooted at b' , and let $c' \neq b'$ be any leaf of T' (such a leaf must exist since $|g| \geq 3$ and thus $|u| \geq 2$). We define $v = g' \setminus \{c'\}$. Note that by construction (1) v is connected and has size $k-1$, (2) $u \cap v$ is connected and has size $k-2$, and (3) $u \cup v = g'$. Therefore $v \in V(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $\{u, v\} \in E(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$. A symmetric construction using g'' and u yields z such that $z \in V(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $\{u, z\} \in E(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ and $u \cup z = g''$. Now, by construction, $\{u, z\}$ and $\{u, v\}$ give two adjacent states $x_{uv}, x_{uz} \in V(L_0)$. But since $u \cup v = g'$ and $u \cup z = g''$, then $x_{uv} \in H(g)$ and $x_{uz} \in H(g'')$. This implies that $\{g', g''\}$ appears as an edge in $E(L_N)$. Therefore $E(\mathcal{G}_k) \subseteq E(L_N)$. We conclude that $E(\mathcal{G}_k) = E(L_N)$.

Proof that $\frac{w_N}{w_{\mathcal{G}_k}} = \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(k))$. Recall that every state $a \in L_N$ corresponds to a subset $H(g)$ in the partition of L_0 . The weight $w_N(a, a')$ of a non-loop edge in L_N is exactly the size of the cut between the corresponding sets $H(g), H(g')$ in L_0 , where we know from above that $a \sim a'$ if and only if $g \sim g'$. Consider then a non-loop edge $\{g, g'\} \in \mathcal{G}_k$. By construction $w_{\mathcal{G}_k}(g, g') = 1$. Now, there are at most $\binom{k}{2}$ distinct pairs of $(k-1)$ -graphlets $u, v \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1}$ such that $u \cup v = g$. Thus, $H(g) \leq \binom{k}{2}$. The same holds for g' . Therefore the cut between $H(g)$ and $H(g')$ in $L(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ has size between 1 and $\binom{k}{2}^2$. It follows that $1 \leq \frac{w_N(a, a')}{w_{\mathcal{G}_k}(g, g')} \leq \binom{k}{2}^2$ where a, a' represent g, g' .

A similar argument holds for the loops. First, recall that $w_{\mathcal{G}_k}(g) = d_g$ by the lazy weighting. Consider then any non-loop edge $\{g, g'\} \in \mathcal{G}_k$. Note that $\{g, g'\}$ determines $u = g \cap g' \in V(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ univocally. Moreover, there exist some $v, z \in \mathcal{G}_{k-1}$ such that $u \cup v = g$ and $u \cup z = g'$ and that $\{x_{uv}, x_{uz}\}$ is an edge in L_0 ; and note that there are at most k distinct v and at most k distinct z satisfying these properties. Therefore, every $\{g, g'\}$ can be mapped to a set of between 1 to k^2 edges in L_0 , such that every edge in the set is in the cut between $H(g)$ and $H(g')$. Furthermore, note that different g' are mapped to disjoint sets, since any edge $\{x_{uv}, x_{uz}\}$ identifies univocally $g = u \cup v$ and $g' = u \cup z$. It follows that the cut of $H(g)$ is at least d_g and at most $k^2 d_g$. Since the cut has at least one edge, and $H(g)$ has at most $\binom{k}{2}^2$ internal edges, then the total weight of $H(g)$ is between 1 and $\text{poly}(k)$ times the cut. This is also $w_N(a)$, the weight of the state a representing g in L_N . The claim follows by noting that by construction $w_N(a) \leq w_N(a, a) \leq 2w_N(a)$. \square

D.4 ε -uniform sampling via random walks

We give the proof behind MC-SAMPLER, showing:

Theorem 4 (alternative version). *For any graph G , any $k \geq 2$, and any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can sample k -graphlets independently and ε -uniformly from \mathcal{V}_k in $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)} \mathcal{O}(t_\varepsilon(G) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{k-2} \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})$ expected time per sample.*

Proof of Theorem 4. Consider $\mathcal{G}_{k-1} = (\mathcal{V}_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}_{k-1})$. By construction, every edge yields a k -graphlet $g = u \cup v$. Recall from Lemma 22 the set $T(g)$ and that $T(g) \leq k^2$. Now suppose we draw from a $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\varepsilon}{k^2})$ -uniform distribution over \mathcal{E}_{k-1} and accept the sampled edge $\{u, v\}$ with probability $\frac{1}{T(g)}$. Since the acceptance probability is $> \frac{1}{k^2}$, we obtain an ε -uniform distribution of accepted graphlets. Now, By Lemma 21, we can achieve the $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\varepsilon}{k^2})$ -uniform distribution over \mathcal{E}_{k-1} if we achieve an $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\varepsilon}{k^2})$ -uniform distribution over \mathcal{V}_{k-1} . Thus we just need run the walk over \mathcal{G}_{k-1} for $t_{\varepsilon_k}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1})$ steps where $\varepsilon_k = \Theta(\frac{\varepsilon}{k^2})$. By Theorem 3, we have $t_{\varepsilon_k}(\mathcal{G}_{k-1}) = k \circ k \mathcal{O}(t_\varepsilon(G) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{k-2} \log \frac{n}{\varepsilon})$. (The $\frac{1}{k^2}$ factor of ε_k is absorbed by $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$). Finally, by Lemma 23, each step takes $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(k))$ time in expectation. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 21. *Consider the lazy random walk $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ over $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and let $Y_t = \{X_t, X_{t+1}\}$ be the random (unordered) edge crossed the walk traverses between t and $t+1$. Let π_t be the distribution of X_t over \mathcal{V} and σ_t the distribution of Y_t over \mathcal{E} , and let π be the stationary distribution of X . If π_t is ε -close to π , then σ_t is ε -uniform.*

Proof. Recall that $\pi(x) \propto d_x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{V}$. Let X^* be a random variable with distribution π , and let $Y^* = \{X^*, Z\}$ where Z is a neighbor of X^* chosen uniformly at random. Clearly Y^* has uniform distribution by construction. Since $\text{tvd}(\pi_t, \pi) \leq \varepsilon$, we can couple X_t and X^* so that $\mathbb{P}(X_t \neq X^*) \leq \varepsilon$. If $X_t = X^*$, we can then couple Y_t and Y_π by letting $Y_t = Y$. This shows that $\mathbb{P}(Y^* \neq Y_t) \leq \varepsilon$, thus Y_t is ε -uniform. \square

Lemma 22. Consider the graphs $\mathcal{G}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$ and $\mathcal{G}_{k-1} = (\mathcal{V}_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}_{k-1})$. For every $g \in \mathcal{G}_k$ define $T(g) = \{\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{E}_{k-1} : u \cup v = g\}$. Then $|T(g)| \leq \binom{k}{2}$, and given g we can compute $|T(g)|$ in time $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(k))$.

Proof. Every $\{u, v\} \in T(g)$ satisfies: (i) $u = g \setminus \{x\}$ and $v = g \setminus \{y\}$ for some $x, y \in g$, and (ii) u, v , and $u \cap v$ are connected. Thus given g we can just enumerate all $\binom{k}{2}$ pairs of nodes in g and count which ones have u, v , and $u \cap v$ connected. This gives the bound on $|T(g)|$ too. \square

Lemma 23. Any single step of the lazy walk over \mathcal{G}_k can be simulated in $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(k))$ expected time.

Proof. To decide whether to follow the loop we just toss a fair coin. Let us now see how to transition to a neighbouring graphlet uniformly at random. Let $g = (V_g, E_g) \in \mathcal{V}_k$ be the current node of the walk and let $N(g)$ be the neighbourhood of g . Note that $N(g)$ can be partitioned as $N(g) = \cup_{x \in V_g} N_x(g)$ where $N_x(g) = \{g' \sim g : x \notin g'\}$. Thus we first select x and then draw from $N_x(g)$. For each $x \in V_g$, if $g \setminus x$ is connected we proceed (otherwise $N_x(g) = \emptyset$ by definition of the chain). For every $y \in g \setminus x$ let $\varphi_g(y)$ be the degree of y in g , which we can compute in $\mathcal{O}(k)$. Now, each neighbor y' of y in $V \setminus g$ gives a graphlet $g' = g \cup y' \setminus x$ adjacent to g . Thus we let $\varphi(y) = d_y - \varphi_g(y)$, which is the degree of y in $V \setminus g$. Similarly let $\varphi(g \setminus x) = \sum_{y \in g \setminus x} \varphi(y)$; this is the cut size between $g \setminus x$ and $V \setminus g$. Finally, we let $\varphi(g) = \sum_{x \in g} \varphi(g \setminus x)$.

Now, we select $x \in g$ with probability $\frac{\varphi(g \setminus x)}{\varphi(g)}$. Then, we select $y \in g \setminus x$ with probability $\frac{\varphi(y)}{\varphi(g \setminus x)}$. Finally, we select one of the $\varphi(y)$ neighbors $y' \sim y$ in $V \setminus g$ uniformly at random. To do this we just sample y' uniformly at random from the neighbors of y until $y' \notin g$. This requires $\leq k$ expected trials, since y has at most $k - 1$ neighbors in g and at least 1 neighbor in $V \setminus g$.

Now consider any $g' \sim g$. Note that G' is identified univocally by the pair (x, y') where $x = g \setminus g'$ and $y' = g' \setminus g$. The probability that the process above selects (x, y') is:

$$\mathbb{P}(x, y') = \mathbb{P}(x) \sum_{\substack{y \in g \setminus x \\ \varphi_x(y) > 0}} \mathbb{P}(y|x) \mathbb{P}(y'|x, y) \quad (86)$$

$$= \frac{\varphi(g \setminus x)}{\varphi(g)} \cdot \sum_{\substack{y \in g \setminus x \\ \varphi_x(y) > 0}} \frac{\varphi(y)}{\varphi(g \setminus x)} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{I}\{y' \sim y\}}{\varphi(y)} \quad (87)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\varphi_g} |\{y \in g \setminus x : \varphi_x(y) > 0, y' \sim y\}| \quad (88)$$

Once we draw y' , we compute $\alpha(y') = |\{y \in g \setminus x : \varphi_x(y) > 0, y' \sim y\}|$. Note that $\alpha(y')$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(k))$, and that $1 \leq \alpha(y') \leq k - 1$. Finally, we apply rejection, accepting y' with probability $\frac{1}{k-1} \frac{1}{\alpha(y')} \in [\frac{1}{k^2}, 1]$. The distribution of the selected pair (x, y') is therefore uniform. The expected number of rejection trials is $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$, and so is the expected running time of the entire process. \square

E Technical background for Markov chain analysis

We recall spectral results on Markov chains used in this work. As anticipated, we consider an ergodic time-reversible Markov chain $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ over a finite state space \mathcal{V} with transition matrix P . The chain is given by the simple random walk over a weighted graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, w)$. We let π_t be the distribution of X_t , and $\pi = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \pi_t$ be the unique limit distribution. We denote by $\pi^* = \min_{g \in \mathcal{V}} \pi(g)$ the smallest mass of any state according to π .

E.1 Mixing time, conductance, spectral gap

Given two distributions π, σ over some domain \mathcal{X} , the total variation distance between π and σ is:

$$\text{tvd}(\pi, \sigma) = \max_{A \subseteq \mathcal{V}} \{\pi(A) - \sigma(A)\} \quad (89)$$

If π is the uniform distribution and $\text{tvd}(\pi, \sigma) \leq \varepsilon$, then we say σ is ε -uniform. The ε -mixing time of the chain X is:

$$t_\varepsilon(X) = \min\{t_0 : \forall X_0 \in \mathcal{V} : \forall t \geq t_0 : \text{tvd}(\pi_t, \pi) \leq \varepsilon\} \quad (90)$$

In this work we bound $t_\varepsilon(X)$ in two ways. The first is via the conductance of \mathcal{G} . For any subset of states $U \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, the volume of U is $\text{vol}(U) = \sum_{u \in U} w(u)$. The cut of U is $C(U) = \{e = \{u, u'\} \in \mathcal{E} : u \in U, u' \in \mathcal{V} \setminus U\}$, and its weight is $c(U) = \sum_{e \in C(U)} w(e)$. Then:

Definition 1 (Conductance). *The conductance of U is $\Phi(U) = c(U)/\text{vol}(U)$. The conductance of \mathcal{G} is $\Phi(\mathcal{G}) = \min\{\Phi(U) : U \subset \mathcal{V}, \text{vol}(U) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{vol}(\mathcal{V})\}$.*

A classical result (see e.g.[13]) states that:

$$\frac{1}{4\Phi} \leq t_\varepsilon(X) \leq \frac{2}{\Phi^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\pi^*}\right) \quad (91)$$

A second way to bound t_ε is via spectral gaps and relaxation times:

Definition 2 (Spectral gap). *The spectral gap of the chain X is $\gamma = 1 - \lambda_*$, where:*

$$\lambda_* = \max\left\{|\lambda| : \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of } P, \lambda \neq 1\right\} \quad (92)$$

The relaxation time of the chain is $\tau = \frac{1}{\gamma}$.

Then (see again [13]):

$$(\tau - 1) \log\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\right) \leq t_\varepsilon(X) \leq \tau \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\pi^*}\right) \quad (93)$$

E.2 Dirichlet forms

For any two states $x, y \in \mathcal{V}$ we denote the transition rate of $\{x, y\}$ by $Q(x, y) = \pi(x)P(x, y)$. For any function $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we let $\text{Var}_\pi f = \mathbb{E}_\pi(f - \mathbb{E}_\pi f)^2$.

Definition 3 (Dirichlet form; see [13], §13.2.1). *Let P be a reversible transition matrix on a state space \mathcal{V} with stationary distribution π . Let $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any function. Then the Dirichlet form associated to P, π, f is:*

$$\mathcal{E}_{P, \pi}(f) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x, y \in \mathcal{V}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 Q(x, y) \quad (94)$$

The Dirichlet form characterises the spectral gap as follows:

Lemma 24 (see [13], Lemma 13.12). *The spectral gap satisfies:*

$$\gamma = \min_{\substack{f \in \mathbb{R}^V \\ \text{Var}_\pi(f) \neq 0}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{P,\pi}(f)}{\text{Var}_\pi(f)} \quad (95)$$

E.3 Markov chain comparison theorems

We report several comparison theorems for spectral gaps of related/transformed chains.

Direct comparison.

Lemma 25 ([13], Lemma 13.18). *Let P and \tilde{P} be reversible transition matrices with stationary distributions π and $\tilde{\pi}$, respectively. If $\mathcal{E}_{\tilde{P},\tilde{\pi}}(f) \leq \alpha \mathcal{E}_{P,\pi}(f)$ for all functions f , then*

$$\tilde{\gamma} \leq \left(\max_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\pi(x)}{\tilde{\pi}(x)} \right) \alpha \gamma \quad (96)$$

Lemma 26 ([2], Lemma 3.29). *Consider an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ possibly with loops. Let w and w' be two weightings over \mathcal{E} and let γ and γ' be the spectral gaps of the corresponding random walks. Then:*

$$\gamma' \geq \gamma \cdot \frac{\min_{e \in \mathcal{E}} (w(e)/w'(e))}{\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (w(v)/w'(v))} \quad (97)$$

Collapsed chains (see [2], §2.7.3 and Corollary 3.27).

Definition 4. *Let $A \subset \mathcal{V}$ and let $A^C = \mathcal{V} \setminus A$ (note that $A^C \neq \emptyset$). The collapsed chain X^* has state space $A \cup \{a\}$ where a is a new state representing A^C , and transition matrix given by:*

$$P^*(u, v) = P(u, v) \quad u, v \in A \quad (98)$$

$$P^*(u, a) = \sum_{v \in A^C} P(u, v) \quad u \in A \quad (99)$$

$$P^*(a, v) = \frac{1}{\pi(A^C)} \sum_{u \in A^C} \pi(u) P(u, v) \quad v \in A \quad (100)$$

$$P^*(a, a) = \frac{1}{\pi(A^C)} \sum_{u \in A^C} \sum_{v \in A^C} \pi(u) P(u, v) \quad (101)$$

Lemma 27. *The collapsed chain X^* satisfies $\gamma(X^*) \geq \gamma(X)$.*

Induced chains (see [13], Theorem 13.20).

Definition 5. *Given a reversible chain $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ on a state space \mathcal{V} , consider an arbitrary nonempty $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. Let $\tau_A^+ = \min\{t \geq 1 : X_t \in A\}$ (when $X_0 \in A$ this is the first return time of A). The induced chain on A is the chain with state space A and transition probabilities:*

$$P_A(x, y) = P(X_{\tau_A^+} = y \mid X_0 = x) \quad \forall x, y \in A \quad (102)$$

Lemma 28. *Consider a reversible chain on \mathcal{V} with stationary distribution π and spectral gap γ . Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ be nonempty and let γ_A be the spectral gap for the chain induced on A . Then $\gamma_A \geq \gamma$.*