


Methods

Why Is Maximum Clique Often Easy in Practice?

Jose L. Walteros,^a Austin Buchanan^b

^aDepartment of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York 14260; ^bSchool of Industrial Engineering and Management, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078

Contact: josewalt@buffalo.edu,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8258-7532> (JLW); buchanan@okstate.edu,

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2999-9666> (AB)

Received: July 12, 2018

Revised: August 21, 2019

Accepted: November 9, 2019

Published Online in Articles in Advance:

June 16, 2020

OR/MS Subject Classification: networks/ graphs; analysis of algorithms: computational complexity

Area of Review: Optimization

<https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2019.1970>

Copyright: © 2020 INFORMS

Abstract. To this day, the maximum clique problem remains a computationally challenging problem. Indeed, despite researchers' best efforts, there exist unsolved benchmark instances with 1,000 vertices. However, relatively simple algorithms solve real-life instances with millions of vertices in a few seconds. Why is this the case? Why is the problem apparently so easy in many naturally occurring networks? In this paper, we provide an explanation. First, we observe that the graph's clique number ω is very near to the graph's degeneracy d in most real-life instances. This observation motivates a main contribution of this paper, which is an algorithm for the maximum clique problem that runs in time polynomial in the size of the graph, but exponential in the gap $g := (d + 1) - \omega$ between the clique number ω and its degeneracy-based upper bound $d + 1$. When this gap g can be treated as a constant, as is often the case for real-life graphs, the proposed algorithm runs in time $O(dm) = O(m^{1.5})$. This provides a rigorous explanation for the apparent easiness of these instances despite the intractability of the problem in the worst case. Further, our implementation of the proposed algorithm is actually practical—competitive with the best approaches from the literature.

Funding: This work was supported by the National Science Foundation, Division of Civil, Mechanical and Manufacturing Innovation [Awards CMMI-1635611, "Operational Decision-Making for Reach Maximization of Incentive Programs that Influence Consumer Energy-Saving Behavior" and CMMI-1662757, "Imposing Connectivity Constraints in Large-Scale Network Problems"].

Keywords: maximum clique • fixed-parameter tractable • fpt • vertex cover • degeneracy • k -core • parameterized below degeneracy • kernelization • parameterized complexity

1. Introduction

To this day, the maximum clique problem remains a computationally challenging problem. Indeed, despite researchers' best efforts, there exist unsolved benchmark instances with $n = 1,000$ vertices. Examples from the 2nd DIMACS Implementation Challenge (DIMACS_2) are given in Table 1, none of which were solved in a four-hour time limit in the expository paper of Prosser (2012). Another set of notoriously hard instances arise from error-correcting codes (Sloane 2017). For example, the instance 2dc.2048 took 300 CPU days (in 2015) to solve with a branch-and-bound algorithm, and the instance 1dc.1024 took 200 CPU days (in 2005) to solve using Lovász theta semidefinite program (SDP) bounds.

In contrast, relatively simple algorithms, which do not rely on sophisticated SDP bounds or supercomputers, often solve real-life instances with millions of vertices in seconds. Examples from the DIMACS_10 and the Stanford Large Network Dataset Collection (SNAP) are given in Table 2. Here, we report the time (in seconds) to solve them using the single-threaded version of our implementation. As we will see, these

times are competitive with recent exact approaches, such as Buchanan et al. (2014), Rossi et al. (2015), and Verma et al. (2015).

Why? Why is it that such small instances, like the 700-vertex graph p_hat700-3 and the 1,024-vertex graph 1dc.2014, are left unsolved even after hours of computation, using carefully designed exact algorithms that exploit decades of theory? At the same time, why are we able to solve very large real-life graphs, like the 18,520,486-vertex graph uk-2002, in a matter of seconds?

To answer these questions, consider the instances in Table 2. Empirically, these large, real-life instances have a small *clique-core gap*, which we define as $g := (d + 1) - \omega$. (Here, ω is the graph's clique number, and d is the graph's degeneracy, also known as the k -core number.) Indeed, the clique-core gap is *at most two* on all but one of these easy instances. Similarly, Rossi et al. (2015) plot the ratio $\omega/(d + 1)$ for many real-life graphs and note that it is often close to 1, particularly for collaboration and web graphs. In contrast, the challenging instances given in Table 1 have large clique-core gaps—never less than 365.

Table 1. Instances from DIMACS_2 that Are Not Solved in a Four Hour Time Limit, by the Algorithms MCQ1, MCSa1, and MCSb1, per Prosser (2012)

| Graph | n | m | ω | $d + 1$ | g | Time |
|---------------|-------|-----------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| brock800_1 | 800 | 207,505 | 23 | 488 | 465 | >14,400 |
| brock800_2 | 800 | 208,166 | 24 | 487 | 463 | >14,400 |
| brock800_3 | 800 | 207,333 | 25 | 484 | 459 | >14,400 |
| hamming10-4 | 1,024 | 434,176 | 40 | 849 | 809 | >14,400 |
| johnson32-2-4 | 496 | 107,880 | 16 | 436 | 420 | >14,400 |
| keller5 | 776 | 225,990 | 27 | 561 | 534 | >14,400 |
| keller6 | 3,361 | 4,619,898 | ≥ 59 | 2,691 | $\leq 2,632$ | >14,400 |
| MANN_a81 | 3,321 | 5,506,380 | $\geq 1,100$ | 3,281 | $\leq 2,181$ | >14,400 |
| p_hat700-3 | 700 | 183,010 | ≥ 62 | 427 | ≤ 365 | >14,400 |
| p_hat1000-3 | 1,000 | 371,746 | ≥ 68 | 610 | ≤ 542 | >14,400 |
| p_hat1500-2 | 1,500 | 568,960 | ≥ 65 | 505 | ≤ 440 | >14,400 |
| p_hat1500-3 | 1,500 | 847,244 | ≥ 94 | 930 | ≤ 836 | >14,400 |

Is this pattern more than just a coincidence? Must hard instances have a large clique-core gap? Put differently, are instances with small clique-core gap always easy to solve? In this paper, we answer these questions in the affirmative.

To prove this, we provide an algorithm for the maximum clique problem whose running time is bounded by $1.28^g n^{O(1)}$, where the polynomial function of the number n of vertices does not depend on the clique-core gap g . When the clique-core gap can be treated as a constant, as is often the case for real-life graphs, the proposed algorithm runs in time $O(dm) = O(m^{1.5})$, where m refers to the number of edges. Furthermore, the largest instance in Table 2, called uk-2002, falls into a class of instances that are solved by our algorithm in linear time. This provides a rigorous explanation for the apparent easiness of these instances despite the intractability of the maximum clique problem in the worst case. As a bonus, our implementation is actually practical and competitive with state-of-the-art approaches for large, real-life graphs, like those of Verma et al. (2015) and Rossi et al. (2015), which run quickly in practice but lack worst-case time bounds. Our implementation is publicly available at <https://github.com/jwalteros/dOmega>.

1.1. Our Contributions

In Section 2, we review previous work on the maximum clique problem and discuss concepts that will be employed in our approach, such as graph degeneracy, minimum degree orderings, and the parameterized complexity of the minimum vertex cover problem. In Section 3, we provide an algorithm that, when given a graph G and a nonnegative integer p , answers the question: “Does G have a clique of size $d + 1 - p$?” We analyze its running time when applied to this decision problem and also when used as a subroutine for solving the maximum clique problem. In Section 4, we present computational results over 60 instances

Table 2. Some Real-Life Graphs from DIMACS_10 and SNAP

| Graph | n | m | ω | $d + 1$ | g | Time |
|------------------|------------|-------------|----------|---------|-----|-------|
| coAuthorsDBLP | 299,067 | 977,676 | 115 | 115 | 0 | 0.04 |
| web-NotreDame | 325,729 | 1,090,108 | 155 | 156 | 1 | 0.07 |
| coPapersCiteseer | 434,102 | 16,036,720 | 845 | 845 | 0 | 0.17 |
| coPapersDBLP | 540,486 | 15,245,729 | 337 | 337 | 0 | 0.20 |
| web-BerkStan | 685,230 | 6,649,470 | 201 | 202 | 1 | 0.25 |
| eu-2005 | 862,664 | 16,138,468 | 387 | 389 | 2 | 0.50 |
| in-2004 | 1,382,908 | 13,591,473 | 489 | 489 | 0 | 0.47 |
| wiki-Talk | 2,394,385 | 4,659,565 | 26 | 132 | 106 | 36.92 |
| uk-2002 | 18,520,486 | 261,787,258 | 944 | 944 | 0 | 15.72 |

Note. Solve times are reported for our implementation using one thread.

arising from different real-world applications that are often used to test graph algorithms. Fifty of these 60 instances were also considered by Verma et al. (2015) to test their own approach for maximum clique. We show that 14 of these instances can be solved by our approach in linear time, allowing us to exclude them in further tests. We also compare our running times with those of Verma et al. (2015), Rossi et al. (2015), and Buchanan et al. (2014) and demonstrate that our approach is practical and competitive. In Section 5, we provide further insights into why our approach can run relatively quickly even when g is moderately large. In Section 6, we conclude and offer insights and roadblocks for other possible parameterizations for the maximum clique problem and for the minimum vertex coloring problem.

2. Background

In this section, we set the stage by reviewing concepts like graph degeneracy and k -cores. We discuss how they have been used to solve the maximum clique problem, particularly when the input is a large, sparse graph. Then, we review topics from parameterized complexity used in our approach, including kernelization and fixed-parameter tractable (fpt) algorithms for vertex cover.

We consider a simple graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set V and edge set $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$. The number of vertices and edges of G are denoted by $n := |V|$ and $m := |E|$, respectively. The subgraph of G induced by the vertex subset $S \subseteq V$ is denoted by $G[S] := (S, \binom{S}{2} \cap E)$. The complement of G is denoted $\bar{G} = (V, \bar{E})$, where $\bar{E} = \binom{V}{2} \setminus E$. The neighborhood of a vertex $v \in V$ in G is denoted $N_G(v) := \{w \in V \mid \{v, w\} \in E\}$, and the degree of v is $\deg_G(v) := |N_G(v)|$. The minimum and maximum degrees of G are denoted by $\delta(G)$ and $\Delta(G)$, respectively. A graph G is r -regular if $r = \delta(G) = \Delta(G)$. A clique $C \subseteq V$ is a subset of pairwise adjacent vertices, that is, every $\{i, j\} \in \binom{C}{2}$ belongs to E . The size of a largest clique in G is denoted $\omega(G)$. A clique of

largest possible size is called a maximum clique. When the graph G in question is clear, the subscript or argument G is often dropped from the aforementioned notations. When k is a positive integer, we let $[k] := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

2.1. Caveman Graphs

Figure 1 provides a connected *caveman* graph, which will be used for illustrative purposes throughout this paper. The class of connected caveman graphs was introduced by Watts (1999) in the context of social network analysis. They are generated by taking a disjoint collection of cliques (“caves”) and rewiring one edge within each clique to a nearby clique (e.g., replacing $\{6, 7\}$ by $\{6, 1\}$), creating a cycle. There are 10 maximum cliques in this graph, including the set $\{2, 3, 4, 5\}$.

2.2. Degeneracy, k -Cores, and MD Orderings

A common preprocessing procedure for the maximum clique problem is based on k -cores (see the peeling procedure of Abello et al. (1999)). The idea is as follows. Suppose there is a known lower bound L on the clique number. Then, a vertex in a *maximum* clique will neighbor (at least) $L - 1$ vertices in said clique, and so its degree in the original graph will also be at least $L - 1$. Importantly, a vertex with degree less than $L - 1$ cannot belong to a maximum clique and can be safely deleted from the instance. This deletion lowers the degrees of its neighbors, making them candidates for deletion, and so this degree check can

be performed iteratively. At the end, what remains is the k -core of the graph, where $k = L - 1$. The name k -core comes from Seidman (1983). For many real-life graphs, this preprocessing is especially helpful given the large numbers of low-degree vertices and the fact that it can be implemented to run in linear time (Matula and Beck 1983).

Definition 1 (k -Core). For an integer k , the k -core of a graph G is the maximum subgraph G' of G satisfying $\delta(G') \geq k$ (if one exists).

As an example, the connected caveman graph depicted in Figure 1 is itself the graph’s 3-core, since every vertex has degree at least three. The graph itself is also the 1-core and the 2-core.

Similar ideas can also be used to find an *upper bound* on the clique number. Specifically, suppose that the graph has *no* k -core, then there can be no clique of $k + 1$ vertices. For example, it can be observed that our caveman graph has no 4-core, and so it has no clique of five vertices; thus, $\omega \leq 4$.

The largest integer k for which there exists a k -core is sometimes called the (highest) k -core number of the graph (Bader and Hogue 2003), which we will denote by d . The reason for using the notation d is that the k -core number is equivalent to the graph invariant called degeneracy, as defined by Lick and White (1970).¹


Definition 2 (Degeneracy). A graph is said to be d -degenerate if every subgraph (with at least one vertex) has a vertex of degree at most d . The degeneracy of a graph is the smallest value of d such that it is d -degenerate.

As we have just argued, a degeneracy-based upper bound on the clique number is $\omega \leq d + 1$, and Table 2 given in the introduction illustrates that this bound is often very strong on real-life graphs. Fortunately, computing this bound is an easy task. Indeed, an algorithm of Matula and Beck (1983) finds it in linear time by computing a vertex ordering satisfying Lemma 1.

Lemma 1 (Lick and White 1970). A graph is d -degenerate if and only if it admits a vertex ordering (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) in which each vertex v_i has at most d neighbors after it in the ordering, that is, $|N(v_i) \cap \{v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}| \leq d$, for every $i \in [n]$.

The algorithm by Matula and Beck (1983) works by iteratively removing a vertex of minimum degree (in the remaining graph) and appending it to the ordering. The ordering that results is not only a degeneracy ordering, but also a *minimum degree ordering*, which is the name given by Nagamochi (2010). In our proposed algorithm, we employ a minimum degree ordering.²

Figure 1. (Color online) An Example of a Connected Caveman Graph



Definition 3 (MD Ordering). A minimum degree (MD) ordering of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a vertex ordering (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) such that

$$\deg_{G[S_i]}(v_i) = \delta(G[S_i]),$$

for every $i \in [n]$, where $S_i := \{v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$.

As an example, Figure 2 gives an MD ordering of the connected caveman graph from Figure 1. Here, each vertex has at most three neighbors after it in the ordering, and so the graph is 3-degenerate (and 4-degenerate and 5-degenerate and so on), and the graph's degeneracy is $d = 3$. So, by our upper bound $\omega \leq d + 1$ we can argue that the clique number of our connected caveman graph is *at most* four. Since the clique number is indeed four, the clique-core gap $g := (d + 1) - \omega$ here is zero. It can be observed that *all* caveman graphs constructed by the procedure of Watts (1999) have $g = 0$.

The idea behind k -core preprocessing for the maximum clique problem is to remove low-degree vertices that cannot be part of an optimal solution. A similar procedure can be used to remove “low-degree” edges. Namely, when given a lower bound L on the clique number, one can safely and iteratively remove edges $\{i, j\}$ whose endpoints have fewer than $L - 2$ common neighbors. This leads to the essentially equivalent notions of k -truss (Cohen 2008), k -community (Verma et al. 2015), and triangle-core (Rossi 2014).³ By iteratively removing an edge $\{i, j\}$ whose endpoints have a *minimum* number $|N(i) \cap N(j)|$ of common neighbors, one can compute the k -truss of a graph, for any k , in time $O(m^{1.5})$, as first described by Wang and Cheng (2012). This gives rise to the notion of community degeneracy c , which is the largest value c for which there exists a subgraph in which the endpoints of each edge have at least c neighbors in common. The associated upper bound on the maximum clique number is $\omega \leq c + 2$. Conceivably, one could extend the approach that we propose in this paper to develop an algorithm whose running time is polynomial in the size of the graph, but exponential in the gap

between ω and $c + 2$. However, the polynomial part of its running time, $O(m^2)$, would become too much of a hindrance when attempting to solve very large instances (with hundreds of millions of edges), so we will not take that route in this paper.

As a final remark, the k -core and k -truss preprocessing procedures for solving the maximum clique problem can be thought of as quick and specialized variants of probing (Savelsbergh 1994).


2.3. Maximum Clique in Graphs with Millions of Vertices

In this section, we review previous approaches for solving the maximum clique problem, particularly for sparse graphs with millions of vertices. The interested reader is directed to the survey of Bomze et al. (1999) for more information about the maximum clique problem more generally and to the expository computer implementation paper of Prosser (2012).

Abello et al. (1999) were perhaps the first to try to solve the maximum clique problem in a graph with millions of vertices. They considered a multigraph (allowing parallel edges) with > 53 million vertices and > 170 million edges obtained from AT&T call data. In its largest (connected) component of 45 million vertices, they found a clique of size 30 using the Greedy Randomized Adaptive Search Procedure (GRASP) metaheuristic, but were unable to prove its optimality. A key step in their approach is the k -core procedure, which they called “peeling.” No running times were given, and the AT&T call data multigraph was never made publicly available.

Years later, Verma et al. (2015) and Rossi et al. (2015) independently worked on this problem and gave detailed computational experiments for publicly available instances.⁴ Like Abello et al. (1999), both Verma et al. (2015) and Rossi et al. (2015) first use a heuristic to find an initial lower bound and then apply the k -core peeling procedure. At this point, Verma et al. (2015) may apply k -community peeling as well and, if necessary, send the remaining (small) graph to the maximum clique solver of Östergård (2002).

Figure 2. (Color online) An MD Ordering of the Connected Caveman Graph from Figure 1, Which Is Obtained by Iteratively Removing a Vertex of Minimum Degree and Appending It to the Ordering



Note. Here, $d = 3$ and so $\omega \leq 4$.

In contrast, Rossi et al. (2015) implement their own branch-and-bound algorithm which, among other things, prunes the search tree based on colorings.

The approaches of Verma et al. (2015) and Rossi et al. (2015) work rather well given the sizes of the graphs. Indeed, the largest instance considered by Verma et al. (2015) has 18.5 million vertices and was solved in 2.5 minutes. Rossi et al. (2015) report solving an instance having 66 million vertices in 20 minutes. Despite their success for solving large instances, these two approaches lack nontrivial worst-case running times, but the easiness of their instances can be partially attributed to their sparsity. Indeed, Eppstein et al. (2013) show that all maximal cliques can be enumerated in time $O(d(n-d)3^{d/3})$, implying that a maximum clique can be found in the same time. Later, Buchanan et al. (2014) exploit the same idea to solve the maximum clique problem in time $O(nm + n2^{d/4})$ relying on a subroutine of Robson (2001).⁵ With slight modifications, Manoussakis (2014) improves the time bound to $O((n-d)2^{d/4})$.

Most previous algorithms from the maximum clique literature are designed to solve small benchmark instances, like those from DIMACS_2. Since these graphs tend to be small and dense, most approaches use an adjacency matrix to store the graph and thus require $\Omega(n^2)$ space. Indeed, this is true for challenge solvers like Cliquer (Östergård 2002), MCR (Tomita and Kameda 2007), MCS (Tomita et al. 2010), MAXCLQ (Li and Quan 2010), and BBMCX (San Segundo et al. 2015). Thus, they would quickly exceed available memory when applied to the large, real-life graphs coming from DIMACS_10 or the SNAP database. Moreover, these challenge solvers do not bother to reduce the size of the instance through peeling, because peeling is ineffective on DIMACS_2 instances. Another important difference is that challenge solvers tend to use sophisticated pruning strategies that can be quite time consuming, especially when applied to large, real-life graphs. For these reasons, challenge solvers are ill-suited for the real-life instances that we consider (Verma et al. 2015).

Another notable class of approaches is based on variants of the Lovász theta bound (Lovász 1979, Knuth 1994). The conventional approach for computing this bound is to solve a SDP with an $n \times n$ matrix variable X , as well as constraints $X(i, j) = 0$ for edges $\{i, j\} \in E$ and another constraint $\text{trace}(X) = 1$. Solving this SDP would require $\Omega(n^2 + m^2)$ space using a solver like CSDP (Borchers 1999, 2017). More recent developments, like those of Lieder et al. (2015), would still require $\Omega(n^2)$ space to store the dual variable. For these reasons, SDP-based bounding mechanisms have been limited to instances with a few thousand vertices (Wilson 2009, Lieder et al. 2015,

Sloane 2017) and are ill-suited for the instances that we consider.

2.4. The Connection to Vertex Cover

The approach that we propose in this paper takes advantage of the well-known relationship between the maximum clique problem and the minimum vertex cover problem:

$$\omega(G) = \alpha(\overline{G}) = n - \tau(\overline{G}), \quad (1)$$

where α and τ denote the independence and vertex cover numbers, respectively. That is, to compute $\omega(G)$, one can simply subtract $\tau(\overline{G})$ from n .

However, it is not computationally viable to use this relationship directly. First, most very large, real-life graphs are incredibly sparse, meaning that \overline{G} would be too large to store in computer memory. For example, the complement of the graph wiki-Talk has nearly three trillion edges. Second, even if one could construct and store \overline{G} , there is no reason to think that solving for $\tau(\overline{G})$ would be any easier than computing $\omega(G)$ directly.

Instead, we will: (1) solve a (parameterized) vertex cover problem, not on \overline{G} directly, but on specially constructed *small* graphs $\overline{G}[S]$; and (2) exploit the fact that the vertex cover problem is fpt with respect to solution size. Below, we review existing kernelization and fpt algorithms that will be used as subroutines in our approach.

2.4.1. Kernelization Algorithms for Vertex Cover.

Kernelization is a key tool in our approach. In the context of parameterized complexity, *kernelization* refers to a certain type of preprocessing. When given an input (G, k) to a parameterized decision problem (with parameter k), it runs in polynomial time and returns another instance (G', k') such that

- (G, k) is a “yes” instance if and only if (G', k') is a “yes” instance;
- the size of the instance (G', k') is bounded by some computable function of k .

Note that the second condition ensures that the instance’s size is bounded as a function of the parameter k only; it does not depend on the size of G .

Below, we discuss two popular kernels for vertex cover. For more on kernelization, we refer the reader to textbooks by Cygan et al. (2015) and Downey and Fellows (1999) and to the computational experiments—specifically for vertex cover—by Abu-Khzam et al. (2004).

Buss Kernel. The kernelization given by Sam Buss (Buss and Goldsmith 1993) relies on the observation that vertices of sufficiently high degree must belong

to every k -vertex cover. Namely, if a vertex $v \in V$ has degree greater than k , then v belongs to every k -vertex cover. (Otherwise, all of its $> k$ neighbors must be chosen to cover the edges incident to v .) This leads to the Buss kernel (following the presentation of Balasubramanian et al. (1998)):

1. let $S := \{v \in V(G) \mid \deg_G(v) > k\}$;
2. if $|S| > k$, return “no”; otherwise let $k' := k - |S|$;
3. $G' \leftarrow G - S \cup I$, where I is the set of isolated vertices in $G - S$;
4. if $|E(G')| > kk'$, return “no”;
5. else return the kernel (G', k') .

The graph G' from the kernel has at most $2kk'$ vertices, since G' has at most kk' edges and no isolated vertices. The rule used in step 4 is safe, as follows. We are interested in k' -vertex covers of G' , and each vertex of G' has degree at most k . Hence, these k' vertices can cover at most kk' edges. This entire kernelization can be implemented to run in time $O(kn)$ when G is represented via adjacency lists (Buss and Goldsmith 1993, Chen et al. 2001), making it very useful in practice (Akiba and Iwata 2016).

Nemhauser-Trotter Kernel. Another notable kernel for vertex cover that we will use follows by results of Nemhauser and Trotter (1975). As they observed, the natural linear programming (LP) relaxation for vertex cover gives half-integral (basic) solutions:

$$\min \sum_{v \in V} x_v \quad (2)$$

$$x_i + x_j \geq 1, \quad \{i, j\} \in E, \quad (3)$$

$$0 \leq x_v \leq 1, \quad v \in V. \quad (4)$$

That is, there always exists an optimal solution $x^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to this LP such that $x^* \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}^n$. Moreover, there is a minimum vertex cover S of G such that

$$V_1 \subseteq S \subseteq V_1 \cup V_{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $V_i = \{v \in V \mid x_v^* = i\}$ for $i \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$.

Chen et al. (2001) observed that this leads to the following kernelization procedure. If the optimal objective of the LP is greater than k , then obviously (G, k) is a “no” instance. Otherwise, the Nemhauser-Trotter kernel (G', k') has $G' = G - V_0 - V_1$ and $k' = k - |V_1|$. It can be seen that G' has at most $2k$ vertices, beating the $2k^2$ bound given by the Buss kernel.⁶ We note that the Nemhauser-Trotter kernel need not use LP algorithms. Indeed, such an x^* can be found in time $O(m\sqrt{n})$ using the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm (after a suitable transformation to an instance of bipartite matching (Bar-Yehuda and Even 1985)). By applying the Buss kernel before finding x^* , we get a runtime of $O(kn + k^3)$, as was observed by Chen et al. (2001). Further, Iwata et al. (2014) give a linear-time postprocessing procedure

that, when applied after the Hopcroft-Karp algorithm, finds an optimal LP solution x^* that maximizes the number of coordinates x_i^* that are integral. In our implementation, we will employ all of these kernelization techniques.

Pulleyblank (1979) gives characterizations of those graphs for which the all-half vector is the unique optimal LP solution, as well as a proof that this occurs for “almost all graphs.” Indeed, more than 93% of graphs on 50 vertices admit the all-half vector as the unique optimal LP solution. For graphs on 100 vertices, it is more than 99.9999986%, meaning that the postprocessing procedure described by Iwata et al. (2014) can be helpful only for relatively small graphs. Nevertheless, due to its low overhead and the frequent occurrence of small graphs in the subproblems of our approach, our implementation includes this procedure.

Other Preprocessing Rules. There are a number of other reduction rules for vertex cover (Chen et al. 2001, Downey and Fellows 2012, Cygan et al. 2015). For example, crown reduction gives a kernel of at most $3k$ vertices (cf. the recent development of Li and Zhu (2018) ensuring a $2k$ kernel based on crown decomposition). Some other reduction rules have no worst-case guarantees but can be helpful. For example, one can safely select the neighbor of a leaf vertex to be part of a minimum vertex cover. Or, consider a degree-two vertex v with neighbors u and w . If u neighbors w , one can safely select u and w but not v . If u does not neighbor w , the *vertex folding* operation can be applied to reduce the parameter k by one without branching (Chen et al. 2001), which is also employed in our implementation.

2.4.2. FPT Algorithms for Vertex Cover. An algorithm is said to be fpt if its runtime is bounded by $f(k)n^{O(1)}$, where n is the input size, k is the parameter of choice, and f is a function that depends only on k (Downey and Fellows 2012). A parameterized problem is fpt if it admits an fpt algorithm. The k -vertex cover problem is the classical fpt problem. For example, a simple bounded search tree algorithm solves k -vertex cover in time $2^kn^{O(1)}$ (Cygan et al. 2015). Simple arguments reduce the exponential term to 1.4656^k . We describe both of these approaches here. There is also a more complex approach due to Chen et al. (2010) that reduces the runtime to $O(1.2738^k + kn)$, but we do not describe it in detail here.

Bounded Search Tree. A simple fpt Algorithm **vc1** for k -vertex cover is as follows, where the input is a graph G and an integer k . It operates on the fact that, in any vertex cover, a vertex v —or all of its neighbors $N(v)$ —must belong to it.

Algorithm vc1(G, k)

1. if $k < 0$, return “no”;
2. if $|E(G)| = 0$, return “yes”;
3. pick a vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $|N_G(v)| \geq 1$;
4. return $\mathbf{vc1}(G - v, k - 1) \vee \mathbf{vc1}(G - N[v], k - |N_G(v)|)$.

Notice that in the last step, the parameter in the recursive calls has decreased by at least one. Thus, the depth of the recursion is (at most) $k + 1$. Since there are two recursive calls, the number of vertices in the search tree is fewer than 2^{k+2} . The time spent in steps 1, 2, and 3 is $O(n)$. The subproblems in step 4 can be created in linear time. This gives a total runtime of $O(2^k(n + m))$. This can be reduced to $O(kn + 2^k k^2)$ by applying the Buss kernel beforehand (Balasubramanian et al. 1998). Another improvement can be gained by *interleaving* kernelization within the search tree. For example, if we added the step “if $|E(G)| > ck^2$, then replace (G, k) by its Buss kernel” just prior to step 3, this would reduce the time to $O(kn + 2^k)$, where $c \geq 1$ is a user-specified constant (Niedermeier and Rossmanith 2000).

Branching on Vertices of Degree ≥ 3 . To improve the runtime even further, we must tackle the base of the exponential term, which can be done through the following insight. If a graph G has maximum degree $\Delta(G)$ at most two, then it is the disjoint union of cycle and path graphs. In this case, we can compute a minimum vertex cover in time $O(n)$ and return the appropriate yes/no response. Otherwise, we can branch on a vertex of degree *at least three*. This drastically reduces the search space.

Algorithm vc2(G, k)

1. if $k < 0$, return “no”;
2. if $|E(G)| > ck^2$, replace (G, k) by its Buss kernel (possibly returning “no”);
3. if $\Delta(G) \leq 2$, run the polynomial-time algorithm for vertex cover, and return appropriate yes/no;
4. pick a vertex $v \in V(G)$ with $|N_G(v)| \geq 3$;
5. return $\mathbf{vc2}(G - v, k - 1) \vee \mathbf{vc2}(G - N[v], k - |N_G(v)|)$.

This improves the running time to $O(kn + 1.4656^k)$. The term 1.4656 comes from solving the recurrence $T(k) = T(k - 1) + T(k - 3)$. In practice, it is natural to branch on vertices of degree larger than three (say, on a vertex of maximum degree), since this reduces the parameter more quickly. Indeed, this has performed well in experiments (Akiba and Iwata 2016), so we will do this as well.

2.4.3. Limitations of FPT. While these fpt algorithms for vertex cover are important subroutines in our approach, we emphasize that it is *not* computationally viable to apply them to \bar{G} directly. For example, consider the graph wiki-Talk, which has degeneracy $d = 131$. Suppose that we wanted to test whether this 2,394,385-vertex graph has a clique of size $d + 1 = 132$.

By using the relationship $\tau(\bar{G}) = n - \omega(G)$, this would be equivalent to testing whether the complement of wiki-Talk (which has nearly 3 trillion edges) has a vertex cover of size $k = n - 132 = 2,394,253$. The kernelization and fpt algorithms that we just reviewed would be no match for this instance.

3. A New Algorithm for Maximum Clique

In this section, we provide an Algorithm **main** that, when given a graph G and a nonnegative integer p , determines whether G has a clique of size $d + 1 - p$. In other words, it determines whether the clique-core gap is at most p . In the pseudocode, we use the concepts of right-neighborhood and right-degree, which are defined below.

Definition 4 (Right-Degree, Right-Neighborhood). If the vertices of a graph $G = (V, E)$ are ordered (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) , then the right-neighborhood of a vertex v_i is defined as the set $N(v_i) \cap \{v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ and the right-degree of v_i , denoted $\text{rdeg}(v_i)$, is the size of its right-neighborhood.

To illustrate these definitions, consider Figure 2 in which the first vertex in the ordering is $v_1 = 2$, its right-degree is $\text{rdeg}(2) = 3$, and its right-neighborhood is $\{3, 4, 5\}$.

The pseudocode for our proposed algorithm is as follows.

Algorithm main(G, p)

1. compute an MD ordering (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) and degeneracy d of G ;
2. let $D = \{v_i \in V \mid i \leq n - d, \text{rdeg}(v_i) \geq d - p\}$;
3. for $v_i \in D$ do
 - a. construct $\bar{G}[V_i]$, where V_i is the right-neighborhood of v_i ;
 - b. if $\bar{G}[V_i]$ has a vertex cover of size $q_i := |V_i| + p - d$, return “yes”;
4. construct $\bar{G}[V_f]$, where $V_f = \{v_f, \dots, v_n\}$ and $f := n - d + 1$;
5. if $\bar{G}[V_f]$ has a vertex cover of size $q_f := p - 1$, return “yes”;
6. return “no.”

3.1. Illustration of the Algorithm

To illustrate the algorithm, let G be the connected caveman graph given in Figure 1, and suppose that the task is to determine whether it has a clique of size $d + 1 - p$, where $p = 0$. The MD ordering to be computed in step 1 is not unique, but suppose that the one depicted in Figure 2 is identified. The set D defined in step 2 will be given by all vertices v_i whose right-degree is at least $d - p = 3 - 0 = 3$, which is the set

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_{10}, v_{14}, v_{18}, v_{22}\} \\ &= \{2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 3, 8, 13, 18, 23\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the for-loop in step 3 is reached and entered with, say, $v_i = v_1 = 2$. In this case, $V_i = \{3, 4, 5\}$ and the graph $\bar{G}[V_i]$ is constructed. This graph is the edgeless graph on three vertices, and so it *does* have a vertex cover of size $q_i = |V_i| + p - d = 3 + 0 - 3 = 0$ (i.e., the empty set), and so the algorithm returns “yes.” And, indeed the vertex cover \emptyset of $\bar{G}[V_i]$ corresponds to the independent set $\{3, 4, 5\}$ of $\bar{G}[V_i]$, which corresponds to the clique $\{3, 4, 5\}$ of $G[V_i]$, which corresponds to the four-vertex clique $\{2, 3, 4, 5\}$ of G . It can be observed that the algorithm runs in linear time for this graph. The same can be said for *all* caveman graphs constructed as per Watts (1999).

3.2. Analysis of the Algorithm

To analyze the algorithm’s running time, we will use the following lemma, which is essentially due to Manoussakis (2016), although he considers the graphs $G[V_i]$ instead of their complements $\bar{G}[V_i]$.

Lemma 2 (Manoussakis 2016). *The graphs $\bar{G}[V_1], \bar{G}[V_2], \dots, \bar{G}[V_f]$ can be constructed in time and space $O((n - d + 1)d^2)$ using an adjacency list representation of G .*

Though not explicitly mentioned by Manoussakis (2016), his procedure can generate each graph $\bar{G}[V_i]$ on the fly in time $O(d^2)$, and the additional space requirement for our purposes is $O(d^2)$. Note that $d^2 = O(m)$ since $2m \geq d(d + 1)$.

Theorem 1. *The Algorithm main correctly determines whether a graph G with degeneracy d has a clique of size $d + 1 - p$ in time $O((n - d)(1.28^p + d^2))$ and space $O(m + \text{poly}(d))$.*

Proof. First we analyze the running time and space. Steps 1 and 2 take $O(m + n)$ time and space by the MD ordering algorithm of Matula and Beck (1983), and each graph $\bar{G}[V_i]$ can be constructed in time $O(d^2)$, essentially by Manoussakis (2016). Finally, the remaining nontrivial steps are 3(b) and 5 in which we ask if $\bar{G}[V_i]$ has a vertex cover of size q_i . Denote by $T(n, k)$ the time to check whether an n -vertex graph has a vertex cover of size k . Then the total time is

$$O\left((m + n) + (|D| + 1)d^2 + \sum_{v_i \in D} T(|V_i|, q_i)\right). \quad (5)$$

Chen et al. (2010) show that $T(n, k) = O(1.2738^k + kn)$ using space polynomial in n . Since the MD ordering is also a degeneracy ordering, we have $|V_i| \leq d$. Then, since $q_i := |V_i| + p - d \leq p$, we have

$$T(|V_i|, q_i) = O(1.2738^{q_i} + q_i|V_i|) = O(1.2738^p + pd),$$

using space polynomial in d . Thus, since $|D| \leq n - d$ and $1 \leq n - d$ and

$$m = \sum_{i=1}^{n-d} |V_i| + |E(G_f)| \leq (n - d)d + \binom{d}{2} \leq (n - d + 1)d^2,$$

the running time (5) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & O((n - d + 1)d^2 + (n - d + 1)(1.2738^p + pd)) \\ & = O((n - d)(d^2 + 1.2738^p)). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove correctness. Suppose G has a clique $C \subseteq V$ of size $d + 1 - p$, and let v_i be its earliest vertex in the MD ordering. If $i \leq n - d$, then the graph $G[V_i]$ has a clique $C \setminus \{v_i\}$ of size $d - p$, implying $\bar{G}[V_i]$ has an independent set of size $d - p$, meaning $\bar{G}[V_i]$ has a vertex cover of size $|V_i| + p - d = q_i$. Thus, the algorithm will return “yes.” And, if $i > n - d$, then the graph $G[V_f]$ has a clique of size $d + 1 - p$ implying $\bar{G}[V_f]$ has an independent set of size $d + 1 - p$, meaning that $\bar{G}[V_f]$ has a vertex cover of size $|V_f| - (d + 1 - p) = p - 1 = q_f$, in which case the algorithm will return “yes.”

Now, if the algorithm returns “yes,” then it encountered a graph $\bar{G}[V_j]$ with a vertex cover C^* of size q_j . If $j \leq n - d$, then $\{v_j\} \cup V_j \setminus C^*$ is a clique in G of size

$$1 + |V_j| - |C^*| = 1 + (q_j + d - p) - q_j = d + 1 - p.$$

And, if $j > n - d$, then $V_f \setminus C^*$ is a clique in G of size $|V_f| - |C^*| = d - q_f = d + 1 - p$. \square

Theorem 2. *When p is a constant, Algorithm main runs in time $O(dm) = O(m^{1.5})$.*

Proof. Let $G' = (V', E')$ be the $(d - p)$ -core of G . Denote by $n' = |V'|$ and $m' = |E'|$ the number of vertices and edges of G' , respectively. By the sum of vertex degrees in G' , we have $2m' \geq (d - p)n'$, so $dn' \leq 2m' + pn'$. Note that $|D| \leq n'$, so $|D| \leq (2m' + pn')/d$. Thus, when p is a constant, the running time (5) of Algorithm main is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & O\left((m + n) + (|D| + 1)d^2 + \sum_{v_i \in D} T(|V_i|, q_i)\right) \\ & = O\left((m + n) + \left(\frac{2m' + pn' + d}{d}\right)d^2\right. \\ & \quad \left.+ |D|(1.2738^p + pd)\right) \\ & = O((m + n) + (2m' + pn' + d)d + n'(d)) \\ & = O(m + m'd + n'd) = O(dm) = O(m^{1.5}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1 (The Running Time Analysis Is Tight). There exists an infinite class of graphs for which Algorithm main runs in time $\Omega(m^{1.5})$, even when $p = 0$.

The remark holds by the complete bipartite graphs $K_{d,2d}$ which have $n = 3d$ vertices, $m = 2d^2$ edges, and degeneracy d . In an MD ordering, at least d vertices from the larger partition will appear first, and each will have right-degree d . This implies that the set D will have

at least d vertices. And, each of these first d subproblems's graphs $\bar{G}[V_1], \dots, \bar{G}[V_d]$ are complete, requiring the algorithm to create d edge sets of size $\binom{d}{2}$. This shows a running time of at least $|D|\binom{d}{2} \geq \Omega(d^3) = \Omega(m^{1.5})$.

Remark 2 (A Linear-Time Special Case). If $p = 0$ and the d -core of G is d -regular, then **main** runs in linear time.⁷

Proof. Denote by $G' = (V', E')$ the d -core of G with $n' := |V'|$ vertices and $m' := |E'|$ edges. Let G'_1, \dots, G'_k be the (connected) components of G' . For each component G'_i let $w_i \in V(G'_i)$ be its earliest vertex in the MD ordering. Observe that, when w_i is removed from the graph, there will exist a vertex in its component G'_i having degree less than d until all vertices of G'_i have been placed in the MD ordering. As a result, w_i is the only vertex of G'_i that belongs to D . Thus,

$$D = \{w_i \mid i \in [k]\},$$

so $|D| = k$. And, each G'_i has at least $d + 1$ vertices. So, $n' = \sum_{i=1}^k |V(G'_i)| \geq k(d + 1)$, implying that $|D| < n'/d$. Thus, by time bound (5), the running time in this situation is

$$\begin{aligned} & O\left((m + n) + (|D| + 1)d^2 + \sum_{v_i \in D} T(|V_i|, q_i)\right) \\ &= O\left((m + n) + \left(\frac{n' + d}{d}\right)d^2 + |D|(1.2738^p + pd)\right) \\ &= O((m + n) + (n' + d)d + n'(d)) \\ &= O(m + n'd) = O(m). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the last equation follows by $n'd = 2m' \leq 2m$, which holds by the d -regularity of G' . \square

We can solve the maximum clique problem in time $O(dm) = O(m^{1.5})$ when $(d + 1) - \omega$ is a constant using the following approach. Start with $p = 0$. Apply the Algorithm **main** from above. If it returns “yes,” then return $\omega = d + 1 - p$. Else, increase p by 1 and repeat until getting a “yes.” This proves the following corollary.

Corollary 1. Let $g := (d + 1) - \omega$ be the clique-core gap, that is, the difference between the clique number ω and its degeneracy-based upper bound $d + 1$. We can compute ω

1. in time $1.28^g \text{poly}(n)$;
2. in time $O(dm) = O(m^{1.5})$ when g is a constant; and
3. in polynomial time when $g = O(\log n)$.

As we have seen, many real-life graphs have small clique-core gaps, making Corollary 1 practically relevant. Is there a reasonable explanation for why these graphs have small g ? To help answer this question, we can turn to generative graph models, such as those proposed by Barabási and Albert (1999) and Bonato et al. (2009). As noted by Eppstein et al. (2013), graphs produced under the preferential attachment model of

Barabási and Albert (1999) have bounded degeneracy. Thus, these graphs also have bounded clique-core gap, and so Corollary 1 applies. In another example, consider the iterated local transitivity (ITL) model of Bonato et al. (2009), which is motivated by properties of online social networks, specifically the idea that if $\{u, v\}$ are friends and $\{v, w\}$ are friends, then $\{u, w\}$ are friends. The ITL model begins with an arbitrary initial graph G_0 and constructs a sequence of graphs $(G_t : t \geq 0)$ by “cloning” vertices. That is, G_{t+1} is constructed from G_t as follows. For every vertex v in G_t , a clone v' is added and connected to every vertex from $N_{G_t}(v) \cup \{v\}$. (Note that each iteration's clones form an independent set.) It can be observed that the clique number and degeneracy increase by one in each iteration, $\omega(G_{t+1}) = \omega(G_t) + 1$ and $d(G_{t+1}) = d(G_t) + 1$, so the clique-core gap does not change, $g(G_t) = g(G_0)$ for all $t \geq 1$. Thus, graphs constructed under the ITL model have increasing degeneracy but constant clique-core gap.

3.3. Algorithm Implementation

The interested reader can refer to Appendix A for more details about our implementation. This discussion covers the generation of the MD ordering, the construction of the subgraphs $\bar{G}[V_i]$, and the use of parallelization. Although these implementation choices do not improve the worst-case bounds given in Section 3.2, they can have a discernible effect on the algorithm's practical performance.

4. Computational Experiments

The computational experiments reported in this section were conducted on a computing cluster running Linux x86_64, CentOS 7.2. Each node in the cluster was equipped with a 12-core Intel Xeon® E5-2620 v3 2.4GHz processor and 128 GB of RAM. Our algorithm was implemented in C++ and compiled with GCC 6.3.0. Each instance was solved by a single node of the cluster under a time limit of one hour.

We compare the results of our implementations with those obtained using the algorithms proposed by Buchanan et al. (2014), Rossi et al. (2015), and Verma et al. (2015), which we refer to as BWBP, RGG, and VBB, respectively.⁸ These three algorithms were also coded in C++ and were compiled with GCC 6.3.0 according to the specifications provided by the authors. We note that the implementation of Rossi et al. (2015) was shown to dominate those of Csardi et al. (2006), Konc and Janežič (2007), and Pattabiraman et al. (2013), so we exclude them from our experiments.

In addition to the aforementioned algorithms, there is also a recent series of papers (San Segundo et al. 2016, 2017a,b) that report algorithms with fast computational times over some of the instances

considered in this paper. In essence, these three papers describe minor variations of a “peeling” algorithm implemented in a bit-string encoding that, like in Rossi et al. (2015), combines an upper bound from vertex coloring with a branch-and-bound type of search. The computational experiments presented in these papers report solution times that are often significantly faster than those obtained with RGG and VBB. Our initial intention was to include their algorithms in our computational experiments as well. However, the website provided by the authors, which reportedly hosted their code, was down at the time this research was conducted.⁹ We contacted the corresponding author who confirmed at the time of our inquiry that the code was indeed not available to share and provided instead the computer logs of their computational experiments. An examination of these logs reveals that the times reported in these papers do not account for the full execution of the algorithms. Instead, they only reflected the search time for a maximum clique over the subgraphs that resulted from the peeling process, omitting the time it takes to produce the k -core. Surprisingly, the times they report for the approach by Rossi et al. (2015)—the algorithm they compare their results against—include the preprocessing times.¹⁰ It should be noted that the time to generate the k -core often represents a large portion of the overall running time for these algorithms and as such should not be ignored. For this reason *all* other approaches include these preprocessing times in their reports. Given the absence of an implementation to provide a fair comparison, we omit the algorithms from these papers from our computational experiments.

For the computational experiments, we use the 50 instances considered by Verma et al. (2015) and 10 additional large instances. They were added to complement the test bed with extra instances from different domains with clique-core gaps ranging from small to large to better analyze the performance of our approach. All graphs were obtained from SNAP and DIMACS_10. These databases have a collection of large networks of sizes ranging from thousands to millions of vertices. They include social networks, web graphs, road networks, Internet networks, citation networks, collaboration networks, randomly generated graphs, and communication networks. The multitude of domains from which these networks originate, the very large sizes of them, and the fact that most real-life solvers commonly use them in their experiments make them suitable candidates for our computational experiments.

Different versions of graphs we used for the computational experiments are also available in other databases such as the Network Repository (Rossi and Ahmed 2015). We notice, however, that the sizes of

some of these graphs vary slightly from source to source. Therefore, some degeneracy values and maximum clique sizes reported in this paper may differ from those reported by Rossi et al. (2015), for they gathered the instances from the latter database. An example of these differences is the instance wiki-Talk, which is reported in this paper to have 2,394,385 vertices and 4,659,565 edges, whereas in Rossi et al. (2015) the graph is reported to have 92,117 vertices and 360,767 edges. Similar differences occur for the instances com-Orkut, soc-LiveJournal1, soc-Epinions, and others.

For consistency, our experiments use the instances collected directly from both the SNAP and DIMACS_10 websites. Therefore, all algorithms were executed over the same computer architecture and with the same data sets as input. All directed graphs were converted to undirected graphs by replacing each directed edge with an undirected edge. Parallel edges and loops were removed.

Table 3 describes the graphs from the two datasets that were used for this study. The graphs were classified into nine categories based on their specific domain: (1) graphs from citation networks, (2) synthetic graphs created by different graph generators, (3) graphs derived from peer-to-peer Internet networks and graphs generated by crawling IP addresses, (4) portions of online social networks, (5) graphs generated by crawling websites, (6) graphs generated from sparse matrices collected from different domains, (7) road networks, (8) communication networks, and (9) graphs that associate products from the website of the e-commerce company Amazon based on the likelihood of being purchased in the same order. Table 3 also reports, for each graph, the number of vertices n , the number of edges m , the largest degree Δ , the degeneracy d , the size of a maximum clique ω , and the clique-core gap g .

The large graphs considered for the computational experiments typically consumed several gigabytes of hard drive space as text files. Since input/output operations with current hard drive technology are several orders of magnitude slower than most operations performed in RAM, reading the input files of real-life instances often takes much longer than solving for a maximum clique. For this reason, we do not report the reading times and start the clock after the algorithm loads the input graph into memory. This is a common practice (Verma et al. 2015, Rossi et al. 2015).

To reduce the variability of the running times caused by the hardware, we solve all instances five times and report the average. The variability between runs is generally small and has no significant impact on the overall running times. On average, it represents less than 3% of the total running time for all the runs and less than 1% for the instances whose

Table 3. Description of the Graphs Used in the Computational Experiments

| Type | Source | Name | n | m | Δ | d | ω | g |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------|-------------|----------|-----|----------|-----|
| Citation | SNAP | Cit-HepTh | 27,770 | 352,285 | 2,468 | 37 | 23 | 15 |
| | SNAP | Cit-HepPh | 34,546 | 420,877 | 846 | 30 | 19 | 12 |
| | DIMACS_10 | coAuthorsCiteseer | 227,320 | 814,134 | 1,372 | 86 | 87 | 0 |
| | DIMACS_10 | citationCiteseer | 268,495 | 1,156,647 | 1,318 | 15 | 13 | 3 |
| | DIMACS_10 | coAuthorsDBLP | 299,067 | 977,676 | 336 | 114 | 115 | 0 |
| | DIMACS_10 | coPapersCiteseer | 434,102 | 16,036,720 | 1,188 | 844 | 845 | 0 |
| | DIMACS_10 | coPapersDBLP | 540,486 | 15,245,729 | 3,299 | 336 | 337 | 0 |
| | DIMACS_10 | er-fact1.5-scale20 | 1,048,576 | 10,904,496 | 45 | 14 | 3 | 12 |
| | SNAP | cit-Patents | 3,774,768 | 16,518,947 | 793 | 64 | 11 | 54 |
| Synthetic | DIMACS_10 | delaunay_n16 | 65,536 | 196,575 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| | DIMACS_10 | kron_g500-simple-logn16 | 65,536 | 2,456,071 | 17,997 | 432 | 136 | 297 |
| | DIMACS_10 | preferentialAttachment | 100,000 | 499,985 | 983 | 5 | 6 | 0 |
| | DIMACS_10 | G_n_pin_pout | 100,000 | 501,198 | 25 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| | DIMACS_10 | smallworld | 100,000 | 499,998 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 2 |
| | DIMACS_10 | delaunay_n17 | 131,072 | 393,176 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| | DIMACS_10 | delaunay_n18 | 262,144 | 786,396 | 21 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| | DIMACS_10 | rgg_n.2.21_s0 | 2,097,152 | 14,487,995 | 37 | 18 | 19 | 0 |
| | DIMACS_10 | rgg_n.2.22_s0 | 4,194,304 | 30,359,198 | 36 | 19 | 20 | 0 |
| | DIMACS_10 | rgg_n.2.23_s0 | 8,388,608 | 63,501,393 | 40 | 20 | 21 | 0 |
| Internet topology and peer-to-peer | DIMACS_10 | rgg_n.2.24_s0 | 16,777,216 | 89,345,197 | 40 | 20 | 21 | 0 |
| | SNAP | p2p-Gnutella04 | 10,876 | 39,994 | 103 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| | SNAP | p2p-Gnutella25 | 22,687 | 54,705 | 66 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| | DIMACS_10 | as-22july06 | 22,963 | 48,436 | 2,390 | 25 | 17 | 9 |
| | SNAP | p2p-Gnutella24 | 26,518 | 65,369 | 355 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| | SNAP | p2p-Gnutella30 | 36,682 | 88,328 | 55 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| | SNAP | p2p-Gnutella31 | 62,586 | 147,892 | 95 | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| | DIMACS_10 | caidaRouterLevel | 192,244 | 609,066 | 1,071 | 32 | 17 | 16 |
| Social | SNAP | as-skitter | 1,696,415 | 11,095,298 | 35,455 | 111 | 67 | 45 |
| | SNAP | wiki-Vote | 7,115 | 100,762 | 1,065 | 53 | 17 | 37 |
| | SNAP | soc-Epinions1 | 75,879 | 405,740 | 3,044 | 67 | 23 | 45 |
| | SNAP | soc-Slashdot0811 | 77,360 | 469,180 | 2,539 | 54 | 26 | 29 |
| | SNAP | soc-Slashdot0922 | 82,168 | 504,230 | 2,552 | 55 | 27 | 29 |
| | SNAP | soc-pokec | 1,632,803 | 22,301,964 | 14,854 | 47 | 29 | 19 |
| Web | SNAP | soc-LiveJournal1 | 4,847,571 | 42,851,237 | 20,333 | 372 | 321 | 52 |
| | SNAP | web-Stanford | 281,903 | 1,992,636 | 38,625 | 71 | 61 | 11 |
| | DIMACS_10 | cnr-2000 | 325,557 | 2,738,969 | 18,236 | 83 | 84 | 0 |
| | SNAP | web-NotreDame | 325,729 | 1,090,108 | 10,721 | 155 | 155 | 1 |
| | SNAP | web-BerkStan | 685,230 | 6,649,470 | 84,230 | 201 | 201 | 1 |
| | DIMACS_10 | eu-2005 | 862,664 | 16,138,468 | 68,963 | 388 | 387 | 2 |
| | SNAP | web-Google | 875,713 | 4,322,051 | 6,332 | 44 | 44 | 1 |
| | DIMACS_10 | in-2004 | 1,382,908 | 13,591,473 | 21,869 | 488 | 489 | 0 |
| | SNAP | wiki-topcats | 1,791,489 | 25,444,207 | 238,342 | 99 | 39 | 61 |
| | DIMACS_10 | uk-2002 | 18,520,486 | 261,787,258 | 194,955 | 943 | 944 | 0 |
| Sparse matrices | DIMACS_10 | wave | 156,317 | 1,059,331 | 44 | 8 | 6 | 3 |
| | DIMACS_10 | audikw1 | 943,695 | 38,354,076 | 344 | 47 | 36 | 12 |
| | DIMACS_10 | ldoor | 952,203 | 22,785,136 | 76 | 34 | 21 | 14 |
| | DIMACS_10 | ecology1 | 1,000,000 | 1,998,000 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | DIMACS_10 | 333SP | 3,712,815 | 11,108,633 | 28 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| | DIMACS_10 | cage15 | 5,154,859 | 47,022,346 | 46 | 25 | 6 | 20 |
| Road | DIMACS_10 | luxembourg.osm | 114,599 | 119,666 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | DIMACS_10 | belgium.osm | 1,441,295 | 1,549,970 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Communication | SNAP | email-Enron | 36,692 | 183,831 | 1,383 | 43 | 20 | 24 |
| | DIMACS_10 | cond-mat-2005 | 40,421 | 175,691 | 278 | 29 | 30 | 0 |
| | SNAP | email-EuAll | 265,214 | 364,481 | 7,636 | 37 | 16 | 22 |
| | SNAP | wiki-Talk | 2,394,385 | 4,659,565 | 100,029 | 131 | 26 | 106 |
| | SNAP | com-Orkut | 3,072,441 | 117,185,083 | 33,313 | 253 | 51 | 203 |

Table 3. (Continued)

| Type | Source | Name | n | m | Δ | d | ω | g |
|----------------------|--------|------------|---------|-----------|----------|-----|----------|-----|
| Product copurchasing | SNAP | Amazon0302 | 262,111 | 899,792 | 420 | 6 | 7 | 0 |
| | SNAP | Amazon0312 | 400,727 | 2,349,869 | 2,747 | 10 | 11 | 0 |
| | SNAP | Amazon0601 | 403,394 | 2,443,408 | 2,752 | 10 | 11 | 0 |
| | SNAP | Amazon0505 | 410,236 | 2,439,437 | 2,760 | 10 | 11 | 0 |

overall execution lasts more than one second. However, using the average times provides for a better comparison between algorithms, particularly for instances that are solved rather quickly and when the running times of the algorithms differ only so slightly.

4.1. Instances Solved in Linear Time

We observe that 14 of the 60 instances in our testbed are solved in linear time. We report the times in seconds to solve these instances in Table 4. We consider these 14 instances to be too easy and exclude them in subsequent experiments as they would yield little insight.

Eight of these instances have d -regular d -cores and satisfy the property $d + 1 = \omega$. Thus, they are solved in linear time by **main** (see Remark 2). Interestingly, uk-2002, which is the largest graph in our testbed with more than 18 million vertices and 260 million edges, is one of them. Four of the nine citation networks share this property too.

Six other instances are solved “for free” by the MD ordering, because it provides matching lower and upper bounds on ω . We have already seen the upper bound $\omega \leq d + 1$. Meanwhile, for the lower bound L , observe that if the right-degree of a vertex v_i is equal to the number of vertices to its right in the ordering (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) , that is, if $\text{rdeg}(v_i) = |\{v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n\}|$, then $\{v_i, \dots, v_n\}$ is a clique of size $n - i + 1$, as v_i has the smallest degree in subgraph $G[\{v_i, \dots, v_n\}]$. The largest clique found using this idea comes by picking the smallest i satisfying this property. If this yields a

clique of size $d + 1$, then $\omega = d + 1$ and **main** can halt as soon as the MD ordering algorithm finishes.

4.2. Results for the New Algorithm

In this section, we discuss the performance of our approach on the remaining 46 instances. We begin by presenting the results of our algorithm when executed over a single thread. Table 5 presents the maximum clique size ω , the clique-core gap g , the lower bound L produced by the MD ordering, and the time in seconds taken by our algorithm. We also report the time spent computing the MD ordering (step 1 in **main**), generating the subgraphs $\bar{G}[v_i]$ (steps 3(a) and 4 in **main**), and solving the corresponding vertex cover subproblems (steps 3(b) and 5 in **main**).

A glance at Table 5 shows that our approach is able to solve most instances quite rapidly, with 33 out of the 46 instances solved in less than one second and five of the remaining 13 instances taking between 1 and 10 seconds. All but two graphs are solved in less than 40 seconds. The nine instances for which our approach took more than five seconds are highlighted in bold, as we will focus our discussion on them.

There are several observations that can be drawn from these results. First, as one might expect, the size of the instance is an important factor to consider when it comes to the difficulty of finding maximum cliques. With two notable exceptions (kron_g500-simple-logn16 and Wiki-Talk), graphs having fewer than 10 million edges are solved by our approach in less than one second, whereas larger instances naturally take longer.

Table 4. Instances Solved in Linear Time by the Proposed Algorithm

| Property | Name | n | m | d | ω | g | Time |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|-----|----------|-----|-------|
| d -regular d -core | cond-mat-2005 | 40,421 | 175,691 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 0.00 |
| | coAuthorsCiteseer | 227,320 | 814,134 | 86 | 87 | 0 | 0.03 |
| | coAuthorsDBLP | 299,067 | 977,676 | 114 | 115 | 0 | 0.04 |
| | coPapersCiteseer | 434,102 | 16,036,720 | 844 | 845 | 0 | 0.17 |
| | coPapersDBLP | 540,486 | 15,245,729 | 336 | 337 | 0 | 0.20 |
| | rgg_n_2_21_s0 | 2,097,152 | 14,487,995 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0.55 |
| | rgg_n_2_22_s0 | 4,194,304 | 30,359,198 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 1.33 |
| | uk-2002 | 18,520,486 | 261,787,258 | 943 | 944 | 0 | 15.72 |
| $L = d + 1$ | preferentialAttachment | 100,000 | 499,985 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0.03 |
| | cnr-2000 | 325,557 | 2,738,969 | 488 | 489 | 0 | 0.08 |
| | Amazon0312 | 400,727 | 2,349,869 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.17 |
| | in-2004 | 1,382,908 | 13,591,473 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0.47 |
| | rgg_n_2_23_s0 | 8,388,608 | 63,501,393 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 6.13 |
| | rgg_n_2_24_s0 | 16,777,216 | 89,345,197 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 9.30 |

Table 5. Computational Results for the Remaining 46 Instances

| Instance | n | m | L | d | ω | g | Time | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | MD ordering | Subgraph generation | V.C. | Total |
| Cit-HepPh | 34,546 | 420,877 | 18 | 30 | 19 | 12 | 0.01 | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.18 |
| Cit-HepTh | 27,770 | 352,285 | 20 | 37 | 23 | 15 | 0.01 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.20 |
| citationCiteseer | 268,495 | 1,156,647 | 10 | 15 | 13 | 3 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.11 |
| er-fact1.5-scale20 | 1,048,576 | 10,904,496 | 2 | 14 | 3 | 12 | 1.64 | 5.90 | 1.26 | 9.12 |
| cit-Patents | 3,774,768 | 16,518,947 | 10 | 64 | 11 | 54 | 2.25 | 0.86 | 1.32 | 4.52 |
| delaunay_n16 | 65,536 | 196,575 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
| kron_g500-simple-logn16 | 65,536 | 2,456,071 | 135 | 432 | 136 | 297 | 0.04 | 7.17 | 2,651.29 | 2,663.15 |
| G_n_pin_pout | 100,000 | 501,198 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.03 | 0.18 | 0.04 | 0.27 |
| smallworld | 100,000 | 499,998 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.10 |
| delaunay_n17 | 131,072 | 393,176 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.11 |
| delaunay_n18 | 262,144 | 786,396 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.23 |
| p2p-Gnutella04 | 10,876 | 39,994 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| p2p-Gnutella25 | 22,687 | 54,705 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| as-22july06 | 22,963 | 48,436 | 14 | 25 | 17 | 9 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| p2p-Gnutella24 | 26,518 | 65,369 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| p2p-Gnutella30 | 36,682 | 88,328 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| p2p-Gnutella31 | 62,586 | 147,892 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| caidaRouterLevel | 192,244 | 609,066 | 6 | 32 | 17 | 16 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.09 |
| as-skitter | 1,696,415 | 11,095,298 | 57 | 111 | 67 | 45 | 0.94 | 0.61 | 0.10 | 1.68 |
| Wiki-Vote | 7,115 | 100,762 | 16 | 53 | 17 | 37 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.27 |
| soc-Epinions1 | 75,879 | 405,740 | 21 | 67 | 23 | 45 | 0.01 | 0.29 | 0.26 | 0.60 |
| soc-Slashdot0811 | 77,360 | 469,180 | 25 | 54 | 26 | 29 | 0.02 | 0.21 | 0.05 | 0.29 |
| soc-Slashdot0922 | 82,168 | 504,230 | 26 | 55 | 27 | 29 | 0.02 | 0.21 | 0.05 | 0.30 |
| soc-pokec | 1,632,803 | 22,301,964 | 15 | 47 | 29 | 19 | 2.52 | 10.04 | 0.22 | 12.93 |
| soc-LiveJournal1 | 4,847,571 | 42,851,237 | 320 | 372 | 321 | 52 | 4.39 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 4.95 |
| web-Stanford | 281,903 | 1,992,636 | 13 | 71 | 61 | 11 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.15 |
| web-NotreDame | 325,729 | 1,090,108 | 154 | 155 | 155 | 1 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 |
| web-BerkStan | 685,230 | 6,649,470 | 201 | 201 | 201 | 1 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 |
| eu-2005 | 862,664 | 16,138,468 | 387 | 388 | 387 | 2 | 0.47 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.50 |
| web-Google | 875,713 | 4,322,051 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 1 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 |
| wiki-topcats | 1,791,489 | 25,444,207 | 5 | 99 | 39 | 61 | 2.54 | 9.58 | 0.28 | 12.58 |
| wave | 156,317 | 1,059,331 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0.04 | 0.23 | 0.04 | 0.33 |
| audikw1 | 943,695 | 38,354,076 | 30 | 47 | 36 | 12 | 0.72 | 31.84 | 1.14 | 34.30 |
| ldoor | 952,203 | 22,785,136 | 21 | 34 | 21 | 14 | 0.42 | 8.94 | 7.19 | 19.04 |
| ecology1 | 1,000,000 | 1,998,000 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0.09 | 0.55 |
| 333SP | 3,712,815 | 11,108,633 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1.10 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 1.49 |
| cake15 | 5,154,859 | 47,022,346 | 5 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 2.58 | 24.34 | 3.71 | 32.77 |
| luxembourg.osm | 114,599 | 119,666 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| belgium.osm | 1,441,295 | 1,549,970 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 |
| Email-Enron | 36,692 | 183,831 | 17 | 43 | 20 | 24 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.12 |
| Email-EuAll | 265,214 | 364,481 | 14 | 37 | 16 | 22 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.09 |
| Wiki-Talk | 2,394,385 | 4,659,565 | 25 | 131 | 26 | 106 | 0.29 | 1.34 | 34.82 | 36.92 |
| com-Orkut | 3,072,441 | 117,185,083 | 14 | 253 | 51 | 203 | 13.10 | 150.95 | 132.91 | 302.99 |
| Amazon0302 | 262,111 | 899,792 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 |
| Amazon0505 | 410,236 | 2,439,437 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 |
| Amazon0601 | 403,394 | 2,443,408 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 |

Notes. We highlight in bold the instances for which the proposed approach takes more than five seconds to solve. V.C. refers to the time needed to solve vertex cover subproblems.

Second, as discussed in previous sections, it is clear that the clique-core gap plays a significant role in the efficacy of our algorithm. As evidenced by the

times presented in Table 5, all instances but one that have a clique-core gap less than 10 are solved within one second. Moreover, the synthetic instance

kron_g500-simple-logn16, which has the largest clique-core gap $g = 297$ is by far the instance that takes the longest to solve despite having significantly fewer vertices than other instances. Also, the instances that take the second and third most time to solve are communication networks com-Orkut and Wiki-Talk, which have the second and third largest clique-core gaps of 203 and 106, respectively. Interestingly, as will be shown in Section 4.3, the instances for which the clique-core gap exceeds 200 (kron_g500-simple-logn16 and com-Orkut) are challenging, not only for our algorithm, but also for other approaches with which we compare. Another observation is that it is quite common for the graphs to have a small clique-core gaps compared with their degeneracy d . On average, this difference is roughly 26, which is about 39% the value of d . These averages fall to 19 and 30% if all 60 instances are considered.

Third, the results in Table 5 also highlight the fact that the worst-case analysis of our algorithm can be pessimistic in the sense that instances with moderate clique-core gaps are sometimes easy to solve. Indeed, there are several cases, including citation network cit-Patents, peer-to-peer network as-skitter, and social networks soc-Epinions1 and soc-LiveJournal1, that have moderate clique-core gaps (at least 45), but our algorithm is able to solve them quite rapidly (less than five seconds). In contrast, other instances with significantly smaller clique-core gaps (20 or less), like social network soc-pokec and graphs from sparse matrices audikw, ldoor, and cage15, take significantly longer to be solved. We provide explanations for this behavior in Section 5. In particular, we will see that the times are also highly correlated with the number of subgraphs that **main** must process, as well as the difficulty of the resulting vertex cover subproblems.

Fourth, the times presented in Table 5 show that, for the majority of instances, the algorithm's bottleneck is generating the subgraphs. Indeed, for the instances which Algorithm **main** takes more than one second to solve, generating the subgraphs takes on average 43% of the total time, whereas solving the resulting vertex cover subproblems takes on average only 27%. Four notable examples are the instances soc-pokec, wiki-topcats, audikw1, and cage15, for which the subgraph generation takes more than 74% of the total time. As one may expect, the results also show that for the three instances with a clique-core gap greater than 100, the algorithm spends a considerable amount of time solving the vertex cover subproblems. The two most extreme cases are kron_g500-simple-logn16 and wiki-Talk in which **main** spends more than 94% of its time in the vertex cover subroutine. The case of graph com-Orkut is also noteworthy as **main** spends similar amounts of time generating the subgraphs and solving vertex cover subproblems. Additionally,

among the 46 instances, com-Orkut is also the one for which generating the MD ordering takes the longest, which makes sense given that it is one of the largest graphs in our test bed, having more than three million vertices and 100 million edges.

4.3. Performance Comparison with Other Approaches

In this section, we compare our running times with those of BWBP, VBB, and RGG. Table 6 presents the times in seconds of the four approaches. We highlight in bold the fastest times to solve each instance and mark with an asterisk (*) the cases where an algorithm fails to identify ω within the time limit. This only occurs a few times for algorithms BWBP and VBB when solving three of the largest instances in our test bed. We observed that the exact solver by Östergård (2002), which is used by both BWBP and VBB as a subroutine, appears to have difficulties solving maximum clique in some of the subgraphs produced by these two algorithms.

The results suggest that all four algorithms are fairly competitive across all instances. Our approach seems to outperform the others when the clique-core gap is relatively small, but tends to take longer for instances with large clique-core gaps, as one might expect. Interestingly, with the exception of communications network wiki-Talk (which is solved by BWBP, VBB, and RGG rather quickly), each instance for which our algorithm takes more than five seconds to solve is also challenging for the other algorithms. For these nine instances, the two algorithms that use a peeling procedure as the key component (VBB and RGG) seem to perform slightly better than the other two. Furthermore, for the two instances that have clique-core gaps exceeding 200, that is, kron_g500-simple-logn16 and com-Orkut—which we recall are the graphs our algorithm takes the longest to solve—RGG is clearly the fastest of the four algorithms.

The case of the synthetic graph kron_g500-simple-logn16 is worth highlighting, as it is an instance where all algorithms (except for RGG) struggle. Given that BWBP and **main** can take time exponential in d and g , respectively, and because this instance has both a large degeneracy and a large clique-core gap, it is understandable why they struggle here. The strong performance exhibited by RGG for this instance appears to be a result of its aggressive pruning strategies.

To summarize the performance of the algorithms, we report the *shifted geometric mean* (SGM), both for the test set as a whole (all 60 instances), and also for insightful subgroups (e.g., real-life graphs). The use of the SGM to compare algorithms originates with Achterberg (2007) and has since been adopted by many others, for example, Mittelmann (2018).

Table 6. Comparison of Algorithms **main**, BWBP, VBB, and RGG

| Instance | n | m | d | ω | g | Time | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----|----------|-----|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | main | BWBP | VBB | RGG |
| Cit-HepTh | 34,546 | 420,877 | 30 | 19 | 12 | 0.18 | 0.34 | 0.12 | 0.19 |
| Cit-HepPh | 27,770 | 352,285 | 37 | 23 | 15 | 0.20 | 0.37 | 0.12 | 0.20 |
| citationCiteseer | 268,495 | 1,156,647 | 15 | 13 | 3 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.53 | 0.26 |
| er-fact1.5-scale20 | 1,048,576 | 10,904,496 | 14 | 3 | 12 | 9.12 | 13.64 | 17.15 | 6.87 |
| cit-Patents | 3,774,768 | 16,518,947 | 64 | 11 | 54 | 4.52 | 5.29 | 12.79 | 5.89 |
| delaunay_n16 | 65,536 | 196,575 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.09 |
| kron_g500-simple-logn16 | 65,536 | 2,456,071 | 432 | 136 | 297 | 2,663.15 | 815.16 | 335.94 | 13.31 |
| G_n_pin_pout | 100,000 | 501,198 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.27 | 0.50 | 0.42 | 0.23 |
| smallworld | 100,000 | 499,998 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 0.10 | 0.27 | 0.41 | 0.22 |
| delaunay_n17 | 131,072 | 393,176 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.22 | 0.18 |
| delaunay_n18 | 262,144 | 786,396 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.23 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 0.36 |
| p2p-Gnutella04 | 10,876 | 39,994 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| p2p-Gnutella25 | 22,687 | 54,705 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.44 | 0.02 |
| as-22july06 | 22,963 | 48,436 | 25 | 17 | 9 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| p2p-Gnutella24 | 26,518 | 65,369 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.02 |
| p2p-Gnutella30 | 36,682 | 88,328 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.03 |
| p2p-Gnutella31 | 62,586 | 147,892 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.05 |
| caidaRouterLevel | 192,244 | 609,066 | 32 | 17 | 16 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.15 |
| as-skitter | 1,696,415 | 11,095,298 | 111 | 67 | 45 | 1.68 | 2.57 | 6.21 | 2.74 |
| wiki-Vote | 7,115 | 100,762 | 53 | 17 | 37 | 0.27 | 0.21 | 0.10 | 0.09 |
| soc-Epinions1 | 75,879 | 405,740 | 67 | 23 | 45 | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.26 | 0.31 |
| soc-Slashdot0811 | 77,360 | 469,180 | 54 | 26 | 29 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.20 |
| soc-Slashdot0922 | 82,168 | 504,230 | 55 | 27 | 29 | 0.30 | 0.34 | 0.16 | 0.22 |
| soc-pokec | 1,632,803 | 22,301,964 | 47 | 29 | 19 | 13.50 | 12.93 | 19.45 | 11.20 |
| soc-LiveJournal1 | 4,847,571 | 42,851,237 | 372 | 321 | 52 | 4.95 | * | * | 9.07 |
| web-Stanford | 281,903 | 1,992,636 | 71 | 61 | 11 | 0.15 | 0.25 | 2.96 | 0.53 |
| web-NotreDame | 325,729 | 1,090,108 | 155 | 155 | 1 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.23 |
| web-BerkStan | 685,230 | 6,649,470 | 201 | 201 | 1 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 6.96 | 1.33 |
| eu-2005 | 862,664 | 16,138,468 | 388 | 387 | 2 | 0.50 | 0.72 | 26.29 | 3.06 |
| web-Google | 875,713 | 4,322,051 | 44 | 44 | 1 | 0.33 | 0.35 | 1.15 | 0.82 |
| wiki-topcats | 1,791,489 | 25,444,207 | 99 | 39 | 61 | 12.58 | 14.94 | * | 20.04 |
| wave | 156,317 | 1,059,331 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0.33 | 1.39 | 0.63 | 0.49 |
| audikw1 | 943,695 | 38,354,076 | 47 | 36 | 12 | 34.30 | 92.87 | 14.10 | 32.12 |
| ldoor | 952,203 | 22,785,136 | 34 | 21 | 14 | 19.04 | 36.58 | 10.79 | 14.36 |
| ecology1 | 1,000,000 | 1,998,000 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0.55 | 2.76 | 1.05 | 1.04 |
| 333SP | 3,712,815 | 11,108,633 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1.49 | 1.86 | 50.24 | 5.79 |
| cake15 | 5,154,859 | 47,022,346 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 32.77 | 56.83 | 23.38 | 27.49 |
| luxembourg.osm | 114,599 | 119,666 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 0.01 |
| belgium.osm | 1,441,295 | 1,549,970 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.89 | 0.28 |
| email-Enron | 36,692 | 183,831 | 43 | 20 | 24 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.09 |
| email-EuAll | 265,214 | 364,481 | 37 | 16 | 22 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| wiki-Talk | 2,394,385 | 4,659,565 | 131 | 26 | 106 | 36.92 | 3.89 | 5.82 | 5.25 |
| com-Orkut | 3,072,441 | 117,185,083 | 253 | 51 | 203 | 302.99 | 275.67 | * | 241.00 |
| Amazon0302 | 262,111 | 899,792 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.32 | 0.17 |
| Amazon0601 | 410,236 | 2,439,437 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 1.95 | 0.13 |
| Amazon0505 | 403,394 | 2,443,408 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 2.19 | 0.13 |

Notes. For each instance, the best times are highlighted in bold. The asterisk (*) indicates an inability to find ω within the time limit of one hour.

Given solution times t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k of a given algorithm and a time shift $s > 0$, the SGM is defined as

$$\gamma_s(t_1, \dots, t_k) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^k \max\{t_i + s, 1\} \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} - s.$$

Since most instances are solved by all algorithms in less than one second, we set the time shift s as one second. The times taken by BWBP, VBB, and RGG on the linear-time solvable instances were not reported in our previous tables, but they are needed for our SGM

Table 7. Comparison of the Shifted Geometric Means (Unscaled and Scaled) of the Times for Algorithms **main**, BWBP, VBB, and RGG for Runs Executed on a Single Thread

| Instance group | Graphs | main | | BWBP | | VBB | | RGG | |
|---------------------|--------|-------------|-------------|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|
| | | Unscaled | Scaled | Unscaled | Scaled | Unscaled | Scaled | Unscaled | Scaled |
| $g \in [0, 1)$ | 18 | 0.73 | 1.00 | 1.55 | 2.11 | 3.06 | 4.17 | 0.96 | 1.31 |
| $g \in [1, 10)$ | 20 | 0.21 | 1.00 | 0.36 | 1.75 | 1.12 | 5.37 | 0.47 | 2.25 |
| $g \in [10, 100)$ | 19 | 2.55 | 1.00 | 5.09 | 1.99 | 3.36 | 2.49 | 2.65 | 1.04 |
| $g \in [100, 1000)$ | 3 | 312.15 | 11.62 | 102.36 | 3.81 | 201.30 | 7.49 | 26.87 | 1.00 |
| Real-life | 49 | 1.30 | 1.00 | 2.06 | 1.58 | 4.29 | 3.30 | 1.43 | 1.10 |
| All | 60 | 1.50 | 1.02 | 2.28 | 1.55 | 3.80 | 2.58 | 1.48 | 1.00 |

Note. The time shift s was set to one second.

calculations, so we provide them in Appendix B. On some instances, algorithms BWBP and VBB are unable to finish in a time limit of one hour, in which case 3,600 seconds is used in the SGM calculations.

We further classify the 60 graphs into four different groups based on their clique-core gap and calculate the SGM for each algorithm on each of these groups. We also compare the solution times for the 49 instances that arise from real-life applications (i.e., excluding the 11 synthetic graphs). Table 7 presents both the unscaled and scaled SGMs of the solution times. The scaled values are calculated with respect to the best performance in each group, so that 1.00 indicates the fastest approach and larger values indicate slower performance.

The results from Table 7 indicate that Algorithms **main** and RGG are undoubtedly the top performers on this test bed, obtaining similar average times on all the 60 instances and improving upon the averages of BWBP and VBB by about 50% and 250%, respectively. Algorithm VBB seems to be the one with the worst average; however, the large difference in performance can be partially explained by the fact that VBB failed to solve two instances that the top performers solve rather quickly.

The SGMs also corroborate the intuition that our approach should be fastest when the clique-core gap is small ($g < 10$). Interestingly, Algorithm **main** also seems to fare quite well on instances with moderate clique-core gaps (i.e., within the $[10, 100)$ interval), performing slightly better than RGG and better than BWBP and VBB. In contrast, on the instances with large clique-core gaps ($g > 100$), **main** is significantly slower than the other three algorithms, especially RGG. This notable performance gap can be directly attributed to the large amount of time it takes **main** to solve the synthetic instance *kron_g500-simple-log16*.

Another observation is that **main** performs better than the other algorithms on graphs arising from real-life applications. This supports the idea that our approach, which was developed and analyzed using *worst-case* analysis, is actually competitive with the best approaches from the literature on *real-life* graphs.

5. Further Observations

As observed in Section 4.2, our approach performs relatively well even in several cases where the clique-core gap g is somewhat large. For example, graphs *cit-Patents*, *as-skitter*, *soc-Epinions1*, and *soc-LiveJournal1* are solved in less than five seconds despite having moderate clique-core gaps (not less than 45). Why is this the case? Where in the worst-case runtime analysis of Algorithm **main** are we being overly pessimistic?

We make two observations that help to explain this phenomenon. For some instances G ,

1. very few of the graphs $\overline{G}[V_i]$ need to be generated;
2. very few branches are generated.

In cases where the first observation applies, the time to generate the subgraphs $O(|D|d^2)$ may be significantly less than the worst-case bound $O((n-d)d^2)$ that appears in Theorem 1. For example, consider the graphs *soc-LiveJournal1* and *cage15* in Table 8. They are similarly sized, each having roughly five million vertices and 45 million edges. Perhaps surprisingly, *soc-LiveJournal1* is solved more quickly than is *cage15* (5 seconds vs. 33 seconds), despite having a clique-core gap that is *larger* by 32. Our best explanation for this phenomenon is the number of subgraphs $\overline{G}[V_i]$ that have to be generated by **main**. For *soc-LiveJournal1* this number is only 152, which is a tiny fraction of the $n-d+1 = 4,847,200$ subgraphs possible. In contrast, for the graph *cage15*, roughly 90% of the more than 5 million subgraphs $\overline{G}[V_i]$ are generated by our approach. As can be seen in Table 8, it is common for **main** to generate only a small fraction of the possible subgraphs; in 31 out of the 60 instances, fewer than 2% of the subgraphs have to be generated.

In cases where the second observation applies, the time to explore the search trees is considerably less than the exponential term from Corollary 1 would suggest. A first explanation for the small number of branches is that the preprocessing provided by the Buss kernel, Nemhauser-Trotter kernel, and degree-two reduction rules is very powerful, often solving the k -vertex cover problems at the root node of the search tree. For example, consider the graphs *er-fact1*.

Table 8. More Details from the Experiments


| Instance | n | d | ω | g | Time | Subgraphs generated | % out of $n - d + 1$ | Avg. $ V_i $ | Calls to V.C. | Avg. q_i | #B |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|
| Cit-HepPh | 34,546 | 30 | 19 | 12 | 0.18 | 7,618 | 22 | 23 | 42,887 | 3 | 0 |
| Cit-HepTh | 27,770 | 37 | 23 | 15 | 0.20 | 6,043 | 22 | 29 | 41,336 | 4 | 0 |
| citationCiteseer | 268,495 | 15 | 13 | 3 | 0.11 | 2,435 | 1 | 13 | 3,767 | 0 | 0 |
| er-fact1.5-scale20 | 1,048,576 | 14 | 3 | 12 | 9.12 | 1,034,648 | 99 | 11 | 8,810,258 | 4 | 0 |
| cit-Patents | 3,774,768 | 64 | 11 | 54 | 4.52 | 117,982 | 3 | 13 | 505,845 | 4 | 290,504 |
| delaunay_n16 | 65,536 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.05 | 13,347 | 20 | 4 | 26,693 | 0 | 0 |
| kron_g500 | 65,536 | 432 | 136 | 297 | 2,663.15 | 6,747 | 10 | 220 | 575,752 | 75 | 46,650,543 |
| G_n_pin_pout | 100,000 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.27 | 86,671 | 87 | 5 | 288,314 | 1 | 0 |
| smallworld | 100,000 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 0.10 | 30,896 | 31 | 6 | 36,668 | 0 | 0 |
| delaunay_n17 | 131,072 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.11 | 26,831 | 20 | 4 | 53,656 | 0 | 0 |
| delaunay_n18 | 262,144 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.23 | 53,648 | 20 | 4 | 107,163 | 0 | 0 |
| p2p-Gnutella04 | 10,876 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.01 | 6,048 | 56 | 5 | 14,957 | 1 | 0 |
| p2p-Gnutella25 | 22,687 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0.01 | 6,927 | 31 | 4 | 10,079 | 0 | 0 |
| as-22july06 | 22,963 | 25 | 17 | 9 | 0.01 | 110 | 0 | 21 | 600 | 3 | 0 |
| p2p-Gnutella24 | 26,518 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0.01 | 8,420 | 32 | 4 | 13,190 | 0 | 0 |
| p2p-Gnutella30 | 36,682 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.02 | 11,668 | 32 | 4 | 18,418 | 0 | 0 |
| p2p-Gnutella31 | 62,586 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 0.04 | 19,087 | 30 | 4 | 29,922 | 0 | 0 |
| caidaRouterLevel | 192,244 | 32 | 17 | 16 | 0.09 | 2,491 | 1 | 21 | 11,751 | 4 | 0 |
| as-skitter | 1,696,415 | 111 | 67 | 45 | 1.68 | 3,490 | 0 | 77 | 38,333 | 10 | 8 |
| Wiki-Vote | 7,115 | 53 | 17 | 37 | 0.27 | 2,243 | 32 | 37 | 47,869 | 13 | 9,035 |
| soc-Epinions1 | 75,879 | 67 | 23 | 45 | 0.60 | 4,736 | 6 | 43 | 101,433 | 15 | 13,206 |
| soc-Slashdot0811 | 77,360 | 54 | 26 | 29 | 0.29 | 4,706 | 6 | 35 | 45,319 | 6 | 1,093 |
| soc-Slashdot0922 | 82,168 | 55 | 27 | 29 | 0.30 | 4,677 | 6 | 36 | 44,989 | 6 | 1,046 |
| soc-pokec | 1,632,803 | 47 | 29 | 19 | 12.93 | 244,868 | 15 | 32 | 1,218,334 | 3 | 0 |
| soc-LiveJournal1 | 4,847,571 | 372 | 321 | 52 | 4.95 | 152 | 0 | 355 | 5,338 | 20 | 0 |
| web-Stanford | 281,903 | 71 | 61 | 11 | 0.15 | 918 | 0 | 64 | 4,359 | 4 | 0 |
| web-NotreDame | 325,729 | 155 | 155 | 1 | 0.07 | 8 | 0 | 154 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| web-BerkStan | 685,230 | 201 | 201 | 1 | 0.25 | 1 | 0 | 201 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| eu-2005 | 862,664 | 388 | 387 | 2 | 0.50 | 15 | 0 | 388 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| web-Google | 875,713 | 44 | 44 | 1 | 0.33 | 3 | 0 | 44 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| wiki-topcats | 1,791,489 | 99 | 39 | 61 | 12.58 | 98,095 | 5 | 50 | 1,248,588 | 9 | 304 |
| wave | 156,317 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0.33 | 152,919 | 98 | 7 | 280,717 | 1 | 0 |
| audikw1 | 943,695 | 47 | 36 | 12 | 34.30 | 906,531 | 96 | 41 | 5,413,233 | 3 | 0 |
| ldoor | 952,203 | 34 | 21 | 14 | 19.04 | 728,774 | 77 | 26 | 4,431,069 | 4 | 0 |
| ecology1 | 1,000,000 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0.55 | 998,001 | 100 | 2 | 998,001 | 0 | 0 |
| 333SP | 3,712,815 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1.49 | 137,606 | 4 | 4 | 274,283 | 0 | 0 |
| cage15 | 5,154,859 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 32.77 | 4,625,580 | 90 | 10 | 21,574,632 | 3 | 39 |
| luxembourg.osm | 114,599 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0.02 | 248 | 0 | 2 | 248 | 0 | 0 |
| belgium.osm | 1,441,295 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0.29 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Email-Enron | 36,692 | 43 | 20 | 24 | 0.12 | 2,238 | 6 | 30 | 25,803 | 7 | 110 |
| Email-EuAll | 265,214 | 37 | 16 | 22 | 0.09 | 1,534 | 1 | 26 | 17,006 | 7 | 94 |
| Wiki-Talk | 2,394,385 | 131 | 26 | 106 | 36.92 | 14,787 | 1 | 52 | 401,229 | 29 | 2,142,798 |
| com-Orkut | 3,072,441 | 253 | 51 | 203 | 302.99 | 704,585 | 23 | 79 | 20,635,158 | 44 | 925,580 |
| Amazon0302 | 262,111 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0.09 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Amazon0505 | 410,236 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.19 | 148 | 0 | 10 | 148 | 0 | 0 |
| Amazon0601 | 403,394 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.19 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Notes. We report the number of subgraphs $\overline{G}[V_i]$ generated, the percentage of subgraphs generated out of $n - d + 1$, the average number of vertices $|V_i|$ in these subgraphs, the number of times the vertex cover subroutine is called, the average value of q_i of the q_i -vertex cover subproblems that are solved, and the total number of branches (#B) generated by search trees of all the q_i -vertex cover subproblems. Averages are rounded to integers. The name of the instance kron_g500-simple-logn16 was shortened to reduce the width of the table. V.C., vertex cover.

5-scale20, soc-pokec, audikw1, and ldoor. Even though **main** solves over a million k -vertex cover subproblems for each of these graphs, it does not branch once. This explains why the 1.2 million k -vertex cover

subproblems for soc-pokec are solved in just 0.22 seconds (see Table 5). The ability to entirely avoid branching is quite common, occurring on 33 of the 46 instances, including all graphs that have clique-core

Figure 3. (Color online) Right-Degree Distribution of a Selection of Instances



Notes. The horizontal axis represents the right-degree, and the vertical axis represents the percentage of vertices having such a right-degree. The dashed line marks ω . The dashed line for $p_hat1500-2$ marks the best known solution.

gaps less than 20 (see Table 8). A second explanation for the small number of branches relates to the values of k in the k -vertex cover subproblems. Although **main**'s running time is expressed with respect to the worst case where $k = g$, most of the subproblems are solved for smaller values of k . These small- k subproblems are easier in worst-case terms and may also be more amenable to preprocessing (recalling that all instances with $g < 20$ were solved without branching).

For further analysis, we introduce the right-degree distribution.

Definition 5 (Right-Degree Distribution). Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$, we

define the right-degree distribution of pair (G, σ) to be a function that indicates the fraction of vertices with right-degree equal to k , for each $k \geq 0$.

Figure 3 presents the right-degree distributions for 12 graphs from our test bed and for four others from DIMACS_2. In each case, we use our MD ordering as the vertex ordering σ . Here, the horizontal axis represents the right-degree, and the vertical axis represents the percentage of vertices having such a right-degree. The right-degree distributions for all 60 graphs from our test bed can be found in Figure B.1 of Appendix B.

In these distributions, the position of ω (indicated by the dashed line) is important for the following reason.

The mass of the distribution's tail to the *right* of this dashed line (essentially) indicates the fraction of the possible subgraphs $\overline{G}[V_i]$ that will be generated by **main**. For most of the real-life graphs, we see something like as-skitter or web-Stanford, where this right-tail has small mass, meaning that very few subgraphs will be generated. This happens quite often on the real-life graphs, which can be observed by looking in Figure B.1 of Appendix B. In contrast, for the graphs er-fact1.5-scale20, cage15, and the four DIMACS_2 graphs, the right-tail is nearly the entire mass, meaning that a large fraction of the subgraphs will be generated.

The *width* of the right-tail also has a meaningful interpretation. It is (essentially) equivalent to the clique-core gap g , which is important given the (possibly) exponential dependence of **main** on g . However, not all width- g right-tails are created equal.

The *shape* of the right-tail also influences the performance of Algorithm **main**. A good example of this is cit-Patents. This graph has a moderate clique-core gap of $g = 54$, as can be observed by the moderate width of the right-tail. However, this tail is usually very thin, especially at its rightmost end, meaning that only for very few subgraphs $\overline{G}[V_i]$ will **main** need to solve for a k -vertex cover with k being moderately large. Indeed, so many of them will be solved for tiny values of k that the average value of k is only four (see Table 8). Similarly, cage15 has a clique-core gap of 20, and our approach solves more than 21 million instances of the k -vertex cover problem (!); however, so much of the right-tail is concentrated near to ω that the average value of k is only three, and **main** is able to finish in only 33 seconds.

In a quite different example, consider the DIMACS_2 graph named p_hat1500-2. This instance is known to be challenging, and to our knowledge, its clique number is still unknown. (So, the dashed line marks the best existing lower bound.) Given this difficulty, it makes sense that it has an awful right-degree distribution. Its right-tail contains nearly all of the mass, meaning that **main** would generate nearly all of the subgraphs. Its right-tail is quite long, meaning that **main** would need to solve the k -vertex cover for a large value of k (perhaps $k \approx 440$). Finally, the shape of the right-tail is no good either, being concentrated to its rightmost end, meaning that **main** would need to solve *many* k -vertex cover instances with k being large. These three properties make p_hat1500-2 quite unlike the real-life instances from the DIMACS_10 and SNAP testbeds and quite a challenge for Algorithm **main**.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we aim to answer the questions: Why is the maximum clique problem often easy in practice? Is there a rigorous, worst-case explanation for this phenomenon? In this pursuit, we first observe that

real-life instances often have a small clique-core gap $g := (d + 1) - \omega$, which we define to be the difference between the clique number ω and its degeneracy-based upper bound $d + 1$. Indeed, more than half of the large, real-life instances considered in this paper have clique-core gaps of 0, 1, or 2, and these instances are solved in mere seconds by the approaches of Verma et al. (2015) and Rossi et al. (2015). In contrast, synthetic benchmark instances often have clique-core gaps of 365 or more and remain unsolved after hours of computation (Prosser 2012).

We show that these observations are not just a coincidence. Hard instances must have large clique-core gaps, and instances with small clique-core gaps are easy. This is shown via an algorithm for the maximum clique problem that is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to g . In the particular case that g is a constant, our approach runs in time $O(dm) = O(m^{1.5})$. This provides the first rigorous, worst-case explanation for why instances like uk-2002 are easy to solve despite having more than 260 million edges and a degeneracy of nearly 1,000. Detailed computational experiments show that our algorithm is competitive with the best approaches from the literature, particularly on real-life graphs and other graphs that have clique-core gaps less than 100. Even when g is 100 or more, our approach can still be practical, which we explain by the shape of the right-degree distribution and the clique number's position in it. Our implementation is publicly available for others to improve upon, extend, or compare with it.

6.1. Open Problems and Alternative Parameterizations

One might wonder if there are better parameterizations for the maximum clique problem. For example, if given a k -coloring of the graph, is it fpt with respect to the parameter p to check whether $\omega \geq k - p$? If so, this would generalize our approach, since one can find a coloring with $k = d + 1$ colors in linear time (Matula and Beck 1983). This turns out to be a bad parameterization with respect to p , since the case $p = 0$ is NP hard, say, by the usual reduction from 3-SAT to CLIQUE. Essentially the same result was stated by Akiba and Iwata (2016) in the context of parameterizations above the clique cover number for the minimum vertex cover problem.

In a related question, one might ask if the maximum clique problem is fpt with respect to the parameter k when given a k -coloring. If so, this would generalize the approaches of Eppstein et al. (2013), Buchanan et al. (2014), and Manoussakis (2014). But, this is another bad parameterization, as this amounts to the multicolored clique problem, which is widely believed not to be fpt (see theorem 13.7 of Cygan et al. 2015).

We leave with a few open problems. Our Algorithm **main** checks if $\omega = d + 1$ in linear time provided that

the d -core of the graph is d -regular. However, it can take time $\Omega(m^{1.5})$ when d -regularity is not assumed. This motivates our first open question.

Open Problem 1. Is there a linear-time algorithm to test if $\omega = d + 1$?

If this first question is answered in the affirmative a natural next question is as follows. Recall that our approach runs in time $O(dm) = O(m^{1.5})$ when p is a constant.

Open Problem 2. Is there an algorithm that, for any constant p , tests if $\omega \geq d + 1 - p$ in linear time?

Finally, we discuss possible parameterizations for the minimum vertex coloring problem. It is natural to parameterize below degeneracy, that is, to see if the chromatic number χ satisfies $\chi \leq d + 1 - p$. However, this is a bad parameterization as coloring is NP hard on four-regular planar graphs (Garey et al. 1976, Dailey 1980). Namely, the case $d = 4$ and $p = 2$ is NP hard. For the same reason, parameterizing above the clique number ω is fruitless.

Open Problem 3. Are there good parameterizations for coloring real-life graphs?

A possibly exploitable fact is that checking whether an n -vertex graph has $\chi \leq n - k$ is fpt with respect to k . Indeed, the running time is bounded by $O^*(8^k)$ by the size $3k - 3$ kernel of Chor et al. (2004) and the $O^*(2^n)$ algorithm for coloring due to Björklund et al. (2009). However, χ is typically orders of magnitude smaller

than n on real-life graphs, meaning that k would end up being rather large and an alternative parameterization is needed. Verma et al. (2015) found coloring to be more difficult than maximum clique in practice, so finding a good parameterization for vertex coloring is perhaps a more onerous task than ours.

Acknowledgments

The first author dedicates this work to Myriam Silva J. and Jose Luis Walteros M. for their unconditional support and love. The authors also thank the Center for computational Research (CCR) at the University at Buffalo for their support towards the execution of the computational experiments.


Appendix A. Algorithm Implementation

In this appendix, we discuss the implementation of several key components of Algorithm [main](#). We also present further enhancements that can be incorporated to speed up its performance in practice and analyze the results obtained by our algorithm when equipped with these enhancements.

A.1. Computing MD Orderings

To compute an MD ordering in linear time, the algorithm by Matula and Beck (1983) stores the vertices in a bucket-sort type structure using $\Delta + 1$ buckets labeled from 0 to Δ . The algorithm initializes each bucket i so that it contains the vertices whose degree is equal to i . At each iteration, to identify the vertex that will be appended to the ordering (i.e., the one with the smallest degree), the algorithm selects a vertex from the first nonempty bucket. Then, since removing such a vertex reduces the degree of its neighbors

Figure A.1. The Benefits of Parallelization for the Nine Instances that Took [main](#) More than Five Seconds to Solve on a Single Thread.



Notes. The total times are reported above the bars. The names er-fact1.5-scale20 and kron_g500-simple-logn16 were shortened to reduce the width of the chart.

exactly by one, the algorithm proceeds to relocate them into their corresponding new buckets based on their updated degree, that is, decreases their bucket by one.

In their original paper, Matula and Beck (1983) proposed an implementation that utilizes doubly-linked lists to represent the degree buckets. Since both the insertion and removal operations take constant time on doubly linked lists, relocating the vertices between buckets to maintain the sorted structure is done quite efficiently. This type of implementation was also adopted by Eppstein et al. (2013) and Verma et al. (2015) in their respective codes.

A related linear-time algorithm was later given by Batagelj and Zaversnik (2003). This algorithm does not produce an MD ordering, but does solve a similar problem of generating k -cores. We employ one of its key ideas. It encodes the bucket structure using *arrays* instead of doubly linked lists. For practical reasons, arrays tend to outperform doubly linked lists mainly because most modern programming languages store arrays contiguously in memory unlike doubly linked lists which, given their pointer-based nature, are generally stored scattered across memory. Arrays tend to reduce the number of cache misses during the execution of the algorithm, resulting in an overall better performance despite the array and doubly linked list implementations having the same worst-case complexity.

Here, we provide a minor modification of the algorithm proposed by Batagelj and Zaversnik (2003), which we adapt to compute MD orderings. Algorithm A.1 preserves the linear-time complexity of the one by Matula and Beck (1983), but encodes the bucket structure using the following arrays:

- **buckets:** An array of size n that stores the $\Delta + 1$ buckets in consecutive order starting from 0 and ending in Δ . Each bucket i is represented by a subarray that contains the vertices with degree i . The number of contiguous positions allocated to each bucket in this array changes as the algorithm progresses given that the vertices get swapped from bucket to bucket when their degree decreases. Therefore, the algorithm requires us to keep track of the position of the first element of each bucket in this array. These positions are maintained in the following array:

- **ind:** An array of size $\Delta + 1$ that contains the position where each bucket begins in the buckets array. During execution it is possible for a bucket to become empty. In this case, the position stored by array **ind** for that bucket will be equal to the value for the subsequent bucket.

- **ord:** An array of size n containing the MD ordering.
- **rdeg:** An array of size n containing the right-degree of each vertex.

- **pos:** An array of size n indicating the position of each vertex in the buckets array. Upon termination, this array yields the position of each vertex in the MD ordering.

The main difference with the original version proposed by Batagelj and Zaversnik (2003) resides in the way in which the algorithm updates the buckets of the neighbors of a vertex v that is being appended to the MD ordering (i.e., steps 26–31). To compute an MD ordering, it is required to consider the specific case in which both v and at least one of its neighbors u are in the same bucket. This extra step can be omitted when generating k -cores. Algorithm A.1 also uses steps 16–18 to identify a lower bound L on ω , which is explained in Section 4.1.

A.2. Generating and Processing the Subgraphs

We now discuss the procedure for constructing the subgraphs $\bar{G}[V_i]$ in **main**, that is, steps 3(a) and 5. First, since it is reasonable to expect larger graphs to contain larger cliques, we do not construct and process the subgraphs following the sequence given by the MD ordering. Instead, we begin by sorting the first $n - d$ vertices of the MD ordering in decreasing order with respect to their right-degree and then proceed to run the fpt vertex cover algorithms starting with subgraph $\bar{G}[V_f]$, followed by the subgraphs given by this new ordered sequence (i.e., step 3(b) in **main**). Since the $\text{rdeg}(i) \leq d$ for all $i \in V$, sorting the vertices can be done in time $O(n)$ via bucket sort, which preserves the worst case complexity of the algorithm as stated in Theorem 1.

Sorting the vertices by their right-degree has a crucial effect on the running time of the algorithm in practice, because it directly yields set D of step 2 in **main** for any value of p (i.e., the algorithm halts returning “no” as soon as the first vertex with right-degree less than $d - p$ appears in the sequence). Furthermore, in most of the instances we tested (see Section 5), maximum cliques are often found in the largest subgraphs, and given that a large proportion of the subgraphs tend to be quite small (often much smaller than ω), several subgraphs do not even need to be generated in **main**. In fact, among the instances we tested, on average only 23% of the subgraphs need to be generated in our implementation (see Table 8).

To construct a graph $\bar{G}[V_i]$ in time $O(d^2)$ (i.e., step 3(a) in **main**), we first generate the right-neighborhoods of the first $n - d$ vertices (i.e., V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{n-d}). Manoussakis (2016) provides an $O(m)$ time algorithm to construct these vertex subsets using as input the MD ordering. We notice, however, that these sets can be immediately generated while computing the MD ordering as follows. Whenever a vertex v is appended to the MD ordering, the algorithm proceeds to decrease the degree of the neighbors of v that have not yet been added to the MD ordering. These neighbors are in fact the members of right-neighborhood V_i and as such can be stored directly. Once the MD ordering is computed and all sets V_1, V_2, \dots, V_f are generated, the algorithm proceeds to construct each $\bar{G}[V_i]$ on the fly, following the subsequent steps of the algorithm by Manoussakis (2016).

Furthermore, given that Algorithm **main** is executed iteratively for several values of p starting from $p = 0$ until $p = d + 1 - \omega$ is reached, during each call of **main** the algorithm is only required to process the subgraphs $\bar{G}[V_i]$ for which $|V_i| \geq d - p$. Once graph $\bar{G}[V_i]$ is generated during some call of **main**, we keep it in memory and reuse it for subsequent values of p .

Generating the vertex sets V_1, V_2, \dots, V_f while computing the MD ordering avoids traversing the adjacency lists an extra time, thus reducing the running time of the algorithm in practice. However, we notice that this minor variation does not improve upon the worst-case time complexity given by Manoussakis (2016), because the largest contributor to the complexity of constructing the graphs $\bar{G}[V_i]$ is the time spent generating the edge sets and not the vertex sets.

A.3. Algorithm Parallelization

The proposed algorithm can directly benefit from a parallelized implementation over multiple threads without requiring major modifications to its design. The key observation

for the parallelized version of **main** comes from the fact that the **fpt** procedure for vertex cover that is executed over each of the generated subgraphs (steps 3(b) and 5) can be run independently in parallel by different threads without the need to exchange large amounts of information between such processes. The task of generating subgraphs $\overline{G}[V_i]$ and running the vertex cover algorithm on them can then be evenly distributed among independent threads, while maintaining a global atomic flag that stops the execution of all the threads in the event that any of those threads finds a vertex cover of the desired size.

We now proceed to discuss the results of the parallelized version of our algorithm using two, four, and eight threads

and analyze the performance improvements obtained. We compare the multithreaded implementation with RGG exclusively, as the other algorithms were not coded to run in parallel. Table A.1 presents the times in seconds of both approaches. We left the times obtained with a single processor to allow for a full comparison and highlight in bold the fastest times to solve each instance. As with previous tables, mark with an asterisk (*) the cases where an algorithm fails to identify ω within the time limit. Unsurprisingly, parallelization results in notable speedups on instances for which the clique-core gap is large. We notice however that for some easy instances with small clique-core gaps, the overhead of creating and managing the

Algorithm A.1 (Algorithm for Computing an MD Ordering of a Graph)

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$

Output: The degeneracy d of G , a lower bound L on ω , an MD ordering (v_1, \dots, v_n) of G , and the right-degree of the vertices in V .

```

1: procedure MDOORDERING( $G$ )
2:   Initialize the buckets and ind arrays according to the degree of the vertices. Ties are broken
     lexicographically.
3:   Initialize the pos array based on the position of the vertices in the buckets array.
4:    $d \leftarrow 0$ 
5:    $L \leftarrow 0$ 
6:   for all  $i \in V$  do
7:      $\text{rdeg}[i] \leftarrow |N(i)|$ 
8:   end for
9:   for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
10:     $v \leftarrow \text{buckets}[i]$ 
11:     $\text{ord}[i] \leftarrow v$  ▷  $v$  becomes part of the MD ordering
12:     $\text{ind}[\text{rdeg}[v]] \leftarrow \text{ind}[\text{rdeg}[v]] + 1$  ▷ the index for the bucket where  $v$  was is updated to the position
     right after  $v$ 
13:    if  $d < \text{rdeg}[v]$  then
14:       $d \leftarrow \text{rdeg}[v]$  ▷ the degeneracy is updated
15:    end if
16:    if  $L = 0$  and  $\text{rdeg}[v] = n - i$  then ▷ a lower bound is found
17:       $L \leftarrow n - i + 1$ 
18:    end if
19:    for all  $u \in N(v)$  do ▷ This loop updates buckets of the neighbors of  $v$ 
20:      if  $\text{pos}[u] > \text{pos}[v]$  then
21:        let  $w$  be the first vertex in  $u$ 's current bucket
22:        if  $u \neq w$  then
23:          Swap  $u$  and  $w$  in the buckets array and update pos accordingly
24:        end if
25:         $\text{rdeg}[u] \leftarrow \text{rdeg}[u] - 1$ 
26:        if  $\text{rdeg}[u] = \text{rdeg}[v]$  then ▷  $u$  and  $v$  are in the same bucket
27:           $\text{ind}[\text{rdeg}[u]] \leftarrow \text{pos}[v] + 1$  ▷ the index of the new bucket of  $u$  is set to begin right after  $\text{pos}[v]$ 
28:           $\text{ind}[\text{rdeg}[u]] \leftarrow \text{ind}[\text{rdeg}[v]] + 1$  ▷ the index of the bucket that contained  $v$  is set to begin
     right after  $\text{pos}[u]$ 
29:        else
30:           $\text{ind}[\text{rdeg}[u]] \leftarrow \text{pos}[u] + 1$  ▷ the index of the new bucket of  $u$  is set to begin right after  $\text{pos}[u]$ 
31:        end if
32:      end if
33:    end for
34:  end for
35:  return  $d, L, \text{ord}$ , and  $\text{rdeg}$ 
36: end procedure

```

Table A.1. Comparison of Algorithms **main**, BWBP, VBB, and RGG

| Instance | d | ω | g | Time | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|----------|-----|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | | | 1 thread | | | | 2 threads | | 4 threads | | 8 threads | |
| | | | | main | BWBP | VBB | RGG | main | RGG | main | RGG | main | RGG |
| Cit-HepTh | 30 | 19 | 12 | 0.18 | 0.34 | 0.12 | 0.19 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.24 |
| Cit-HepPh | 37 | 23 | 15 | 0.20 | 0.37 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.24 |
| citationCiteseer | 15 | 13 | 3 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.53 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.12 | 0.38 | 0.10 | 0.42 |
| er-fact1.5-scale20 | 14 | 3 | 12 | 9.12 | 13.64 | 17.15 | 6.87 | 6.80 | 6.30 | 4.40 | 5.34 | 3.70 | 5.69 |
| cit-Patents | 64 | 11 | 54 | 4.52 | 5.29 | 12.79 | 5.89 | 4.29 | 7.12 | 4.09 | 6.96 | 3.80 | 7.11 |
| delaunay_n16 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.11 |
| kron_g500 | 432 | 136 | 297 | 2,663.15 | 815.16 | 335.94 | 13.31 | 1,431.80 | 7.85 | 1,151.30 | 6.08 | 959.51 | 4.42 |
| G_n_pin_pout | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.27 | 0.50 | 0.42 | 0.23 | 0.16 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.09 | 0.27 |
| smallworld | 7 | 6 | 2 | 0.10 | 0.27 | 0.41 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.05 | 0.25 |
| delaunay_n17 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.21 |
| delaunay_n18 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0.23 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 0.36 | 0.16 | 0.41 | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.42 |
| p2p-Gnutella04 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| p2p-Gnutella25 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.44 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| as-22july06 | 25 | 17 | 9 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
| p2p-Gnutella24 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.69 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| p2p-Gnutella30 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| p2p-Gnutella31 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.08 |
| caidaRouterLevel | 32 | 17 | 16 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 0.29 |
| as-skitter | 111 | 67 | 45 | 1.68 | 2.57 | 6.21 | 2.74 | 1.36 | 3.71 | 1.31 | 3.72 | 1.15 | 4.64 |
| wiki-Vote | 53 | 17 | 37 | 0.27 | 0.21 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.11 |
| soc-Epinions1 | 67 | 23 | 45 | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.26 | 0.31 | 0.35 | 0.28 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.18 | 0.25 |
| soc-Slashdot0811 | 54 | 26 | 29 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.15 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.24 |
| soc-Slashdot0922 | 55 | 27 | 29 | 0.30 | 0.34 | 0.16 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.24 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0.12 | 0.24 |
| soc-pokec | 47 | 29 | 19 | 13.50 | 12.93 | 19.45 | 11.20 | 9.02 | 10.31 | 6.13 | 8.98 | 5.31 | 10.22 |
| soc-LiveJournal1 | 372 | 321 | 52 | 4.95 | * | * | 9.07 | 4.73 | 13.24 | 4.46 | 13.16 | 4.15 | 13.84 |
| web-Stanford | 71 | 61 | 11 | 0.15 | 0.25 | 2.96 | 0.53 | 0.12 | 0.71 | 0.12 | 0.71 | 0.10 | 0.74 |
| web-NotreDame | 155 | 155 | 1 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.07 | 0.37 | 0.07 | 0.36 | 0.07 | 0.49 |
| web-BerkStan | 201 | 201 | 1 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 6.96 | 1.33 | 0.26 | 2.01 | 0.27 | 2.04 | 0.26 | 2.17 |
| eu-2005 | 388 | 387 | 2 | 0.50 | 0.72 | 26.29 | 3.06 | 0.48 | 4.69 | 0.51 | 4.69 | 0.50 | 6.25 |
| web-Google | 44 | 44 | 1 | 0.33 | 0.35 | 1.15 | 0.82 | 0.34 | 1.29 | 0.35 | 1.31 | 0.34 | 1.44 |
| wiki-topcats | 99 | 39 | 61 | 12.58 | 14.94 | * | 20.04 | 7.66 | 11.41 | 5.36 | 8.44 | 4.58 | 6.70 |
| wave | 8 | 6 | 3 | 0.33 | 1.39 | 0.63 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 0.53 | 0.13 | 0.48 | 0.12 | 0.55 |
| audiokw1 | 47 | 36 | 12 | 34.30 | 92.87 | 14.10 | 32.12 | 18.49 | 24.28 | 11.05 | 19.97 | 8.73 | 19.58 |
| ldoor | 34 | 21 | 14 | 19.04 | 36.58 | 10.79 | 14.36 | 10.37 | 12.29 | 5.85 | 9.90 | 5.40 | 10.91 |
| ecology1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0.55 | 2.76 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 0.41 | 1.16 | 0.33 | 1.01 | 0.31 | 1.05 |
| 333SP | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1.49 | 1.86 | 50.24 | 5.79 | 1.25 | 5.94 | 1.31 | 5.02 | 1.43 | 5.06 |
| cage15 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 32.77 | 56.83 | 23.38 | 27.49 | 18.18 | 24.56 | 11.96 | 20.00 | 9.74 | 18.44 |
| luxembourg.osm | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| belgium.osm | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.89 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.45 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 0.29 | 0.50 |
| email-Enron | 43 | 20 | 24 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.12 |
| email-EuAll | 37 | 16 | 22 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.16 | 0.05 | 0.22 |
| wiki-Talk | 131 | 26 | 106 | 36.92 | 3.89 | 5.82 | 5.25 | 20.47 | 3.76 | 13.55 | 2.97 | 12.48 | 2.78 |
| com-Orkut | 253 | 51 | 203 | 302.99 | 275.67 | * | 241.00 | 166.96 | 146.02 | 146.13 | 105.30 | 112.08 | 78.54 |
| Amazon0302 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.32 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 0.27 | 0.10 | 0.28 | 0.09 | 0.38 |
| Amazon0601 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 1.95 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.29 |
| Amazon0505 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 2.19 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.20 | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.29 |

Notes. For each instance, the best times are highlighted in bold. The asterisk (*) indicates an inability to find ω within the time limit of one hour. The name kron_g500-simple-logn16 was shortened to reduce the width of the table.

additional threads may undermine the benefit of the parallelization, producing no substantial improvements. Additionally, the algorithm for computing an MD ordering is sequential, and so parallelization is not particularly

helpful when the instance is solved soon after the MD ordering is found.

Results indicate Algorithm **main** solves nearly all instances more quickly than does RGG. It seems that **main** is

Table A.2. Comparison of the Times for Algorithm **main** Using Linear Search (LS) and Binary Search (BS)

| Instance | L | d | ω | g | Time | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-----|----------|-----|--------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| | | | | | 1 thread | | 2 threads | | 4 threads | | 8 threads | |
| | | | | | LS | BS | LS | BS | LS | BS | LS | BS |
| er-fact1.5 | 2 | 14 | 3 | 12 | 9.12 | 8.01 | 6.80 | 5.98 | 4.40 | 3.89 | 3.70 | 3.52 |
| audikw1 | 30 | 47 | 36 | 12 | 34.30 | 32.63 | 18.49 | 17.37 | 11.05 | 10.06 | 8.73 | 8.55 |
| ldoor | 21 | 34 | 21 | 14 | 19.04 | 13.44 | 10.37 | 7.27 | 5.85 | 4.05 | 5.40 | 3.85 |
| soc-pokec | 15 | 47 | 29 | 19 | 12.93 | 13.37 | 9.02 | 9.24 | 6.13 | 7.10 | 5.31 | 6.63 |
| cage15 | 5 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 32.77 | 29.00 | 18.18 | 16.59 | 11.96 | 10.07 | 9.74 | 9.22 |
| wiki-topcats | 5 | 99 | 39 | 61 | 12.58 | 12.46 | 7.66 | 7.59 | 5.36 | 5.32 | 4.58 | 4.57 |
| wiki-Talk | 25 | 131 | 26 | 106 | 36.92 | 16.42 | 20.47 | 9.01 | 13.55 | 5.47 | 12.48 | 5.49 |
| com-Orkut | 14 | 253 | 51 | 203 | 302.99 | 256.53 | 166.96 | 146.26 | 146.13 | 105.53 | 112.08 | 90.78 |
| kron-g500 | 135 | 432 | 136 | 297 | 2,663.15 | 469.01 | 1,431.80 | 247.60 | 1,151.30 | 157.85 | 959.51 | 163.46 |

Notes. For each instance, the best times are highlighted in bold. The name of the instance er-fact1.5scale20 and kron_g500-simplelogn16 were shortened to reduce the width of the table.

able to exploit the parallelized execution, reducing the solution times in most cases, whereas RGG is only able to do so for the largest instances. In fact, the running times of RGG sometimes slightly deteriorate on some small instances when using multiple threads. A possible explanation of this slight deterioration is that, for instances that are solved rather fast, RGG spends most of the execution in parts of the algorithms that are not parallelized, like generating the k -cores, and so the overhead paid for parallelization is not worth it.

To further understand the benefits of parallelization, we visualize in Figure A.1 the times for the nine most challenging instances for **main**, that is, those instances taking longer than five seconds with the single-thread implementation. The bars are scaled by the single-thread time (1x), and a lower value indicates a performance improvement. As can be observed, when ran on two, four, and eight threads, **main** finishes on average 43%, 61% and, 67% faster than on a single thread, respectively. Since Algorithm **main** spends most of its time generating subgraphs and solving vertex cover subproblems (see Table 8), which are straightforward tasks to parallelize, the multithreaded implementation results in noticeable improvements. For comparison purposes, we also report the average performance on the other 37 instances. As might be expected, the benefits of parallelization are less pronounced on them.

A.4. Further Implementation Enhancements

There are several enhancements that can be easily incorporated into our approach to potentially reduce its running time. We briefly discuss a few of them in this section and provide details of their performance.

First, as described in Section 3, Algorithm **main** is executed sequentially for several values of p starting from $p = 0$ until $p = d + 1 - \omega$ is reached. This linear-search type of execution may become expensive whenever the clique-core gap is expected to be large. In that case, the proposed algorithm may benefit from a different type of search to reduce the number of times **main** is called. In the presence of a good lower bound L , the algorithm could run in a binary search fashion instead of the linear search. The algorithm can use as the initial L the lower bound produced by the MD

ordering procedure described in Section 4.1 or the result of any other heuristic.

A drawback of this variation is that it depends heavily on the quality of the lower bound L , and since clique is hard to approximate (Håstad 1999, Zuckerman 2006), $d + 1 - L$ can be as bad as $\Omega(d)$. Thus, the worst-case bound of $1.28^{\text{poly}(n)}$ given in Corollary 1 cannot be maintained and is drastically affected, becoming $1.28^d \text{poly}(n)$. We have observed in practice that the binary search variation often reduces the computational times to solve some of the instances we consider in our experiments. However, given its negative effect on the worst-case complexity of our approach, we do not expand on this variation other than a brief discussion about some computational experiments.

A second possible enhancement takes advantage of the way in which our approach divides the search across many smaller subgraphs. This allows for one to execute several heuristics and other algorithms over each of these subgraphs to identify upper and lower bounds on the maximum cliques of subgraphs $G[V_1], G[V_2], \dots, G[V_f]$, thus potentially refining the bounds on ω . This could also be used to identify subgraphs that are not worth exploring (i.e., subgraphs whose clique upper bound is smaller than the best lower bound of G). However, in an effort to stay true to the proposed algorithm, we do not employ these ideas in our implementation.

We focus our attention on the variation that runs **main** in a binary search fashion for values of p within interval $[0, d + 1 - L)$, until $p = d + 1 - \omega$ is reached. Here, we use as L the lower bound produced by the MD ordering. We compare the performance of this variant with the linear search version described in Section 3. Table A.2 presents the times obtained by both variants on the nine instances for which the linear search takes more than five seconds to solve (see Section 4).

It can be observed that binary search outperforms linear search for all instances but one (soc-pokec). The results also suggest that the speedups obtained by the binary search depend significantly on the clique-core gaps. As one might expect, for instances with clique-core gap less than 100, the times of both variants are quite similar with the binary search only achieving speedups of a few seconds.

In contrast, in the cases in which the clique-core gaps exceed 100 (wiki-Talk, com-Orkut, and kron_g500-simple-logn16), the binary search is able to find ω significantly faster than

the linear search. The most notable example is the case of kron_g500-simple-logn16 for which the single-thread binary search implementation finds ω more than 2,000 seconds faster.

Appendix B. Additional Tables and Figures

Figure B.1. (Color online) Right-Degree Distribution of the Different Instances




Figure B.1. (Continued)





Figure B.1. (Continued)



Notes. The horizontal axis represents the right-degree, and the vertical axis represents the percentage of vertices having such a right-degree. The dashed line marks ω .

Table B.1. Comparison of the Times for Algorithms **main**, BWBP, VBB, and RGG for the Instances Solved in Linear Time by Our Approach

| Property | Name | n | m | d | ω | g | main | BWBP | VBB | RGG |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|-----|----------|-----|--------------|-------|-------------|-------------|
| d -regular d -core | cond-mat-2005 | 40,421 | 175,691 | 29 | 30 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| | coAuthorsCiteseer | 227,320 | 814,134 | 86 | 87 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.04 |
| | coAuthorsDBLP | 299,067 | 977,676 | 114 | 115 | 0 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.05 |
| | coPapersCiteseer | 434,102 | 16,036,720 | 844 | 845 | 0 | 0.17 | 1.86 | 2.23 | 0.50 |
| | coPapersDBLP | 540,486 | 15,245,729 | 336 | 337 | 0 | 0.20 | 1.94 | 1.31 | 0.52 |
| | rgg_n_2_21_s0 | 2,097,152 | 14,487,995 | 18 | 19 | 0 | 0.55 | 2.35 | 0.71 | 1.24 |
| | rgg_n_2_22_s0 | 4,194,304 | 30,359,198 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 1.33 | 5.55 | 1.48 | 3.31 |
| | uk-2002 | 18,520,486 | 261,787,258 | 943 | 944 | 0 | 15.72 | 39.73 | 70.11 | 16.34 |
| $L = d + 1$ | preferentialAttachment | 100,000 | 499,985 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.31 |
| | cnr-2000 | 325,557 | 2,738,969 | 488 | 489 | 0 | 0.08 | 0.32 | 2.75 | 0.09 |
| | Amazon0312 | 400,727 | 2,349,869 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0.17 | 0.50 | 1.84 | 0.14 |
| | in-2004 | 1,382,908 | 13,591,473 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0.47 | 1.46 | 7.67 | 0.47 |
| | rgg_n_2_23_s0 | 8,388,608 | 63,501,393 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 6.13 | 12.14 | 2.74 | 7.98 |
| | rgg_n_2_24_s0 | 16,777,216 | 89,345,197 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 9.30 | 17.44 | 8.21 | 12.18 |

Note. For each instance, the best times are highlighted in bold.

Endnotes

¹ Also see the equivalent or nearly equivalent notions of coloring number (Erdős and Hajnal 1966) (not to be confused with chromatic number), the Szekeres-Wilf number (Szekeres and Wilf 1968), width (Freuder 1982), and linkage (Kirousis and Thilikos 1996).

² MD orderings are closely related to degeneracy orderings, width orderings (Freuder 1982), and smallest-last orderings (Matula and Beck 1983), and they have been used in many clique algorithms, with explicit worst-case guarantees on their running time (Eppstein et al. 2013, Buchanan et al. 2014, Manoussakis 2014) and without guarantees (Carraghan and Pardalos 1990, Prosser 2012).

³ A subgraph G' of G is called a k -community if the endpoints of every edge $e \in E(G')$ have at least k common neighbors in G' .

⁴ Anurag Verma presented preliminary results as early as the INFORMS Annual Meeting in Charlotte, NC in November 2011. The resulting paper was submitted to a journal in July 2012, but was never posted to a preprint website. Ryan Rossi posted his group's preprint to arXiv in October 2012.

⁵ Buchanan et al. (2014) also give an algorithm whose running time is polynomial in the number of vertices, but exponential in the " k -truss number" or "community degeneracy."

⁶ In some sense, both kernels are "optimal" in that there is no (polytime) kernel for vertex cover with $O(k^{2-\epsilon})$ edges, unless $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$ (Dell and Van Melkebeek 2014). However, the Nemhauser-Trotter kernel is also believed to be optimal with respect to the number of vertices. Namely, corollary 3.13 of Chen et al. (2007) states that if there exists a polytime algorithm for constructing a kernel that is a subgraph of the original graph with $(2 - \epsilon)k$ vertices, then $\text{P} = \text{NP}$.

⁷ In an alternative linear-time approach, first compute the d -core G' of G via Matula and Beck (1983) and suppose G' is d -regular. Then, $\omega = d + 1$ if and only if some connected component of G' contains exactly $d + 1$ vertices.

⁸ The algorithm in Buchanan et al. (2014) was implemented for this comparison using the clique solver by Östergård (2002) as a sub-routine; the implementation of Rossi et al. (2015) was made available by the authors at <http://ryanrossi.com/pmc/> (accessed January 2020); and the implementation of Verma et al. (2015) was kindly provided by the authors.

⁹ The website <https://www.biicode.com/pablodev/copt> that according to San Segundo et al. (2016) hosted the code was not available during the period from March 2017 to January 2020.

¹⁰ For instance, the computational log provided by the authors for solving the instance soc-pokec with two processors using the parallelized algorithm described in San Segundo et al. (2017b) reports a reading time of 10.68 seconds, a so-called setup time of 13.24 seconds that includes the calculation of the graph's k -core and the peeling process, and the search time over the reduced subgraph of 5.83 seconds. The authors report as the execution time the 5.83 seconds exclusively. This type of inconsistency was observed for all the instances they solved.

References

- Abello J, Pardalos PM, Resende MGC (1999) On maximum clique problems in very large graphs. Abello JM, Vitter JS, ed. *External Memory Algorithms* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI), 119–130.
- Abu-Khzam FN, Collins RL, Fellows MR, Langston MA, Sutner WH, Symons CT (2004) Kernelization algorithms for the vertex cover problem: Theory and experiments. Arge L, Italiano GF, Sedgwick R, eds. *Proc. 6th Workshop Algorithm Engrg. Experiments (ALENEX)* (SIAM, Philadelphia), 62–69.
- Achterberg T (2007) Constraint integer programming. PhD thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin.
- Akiba T, Iwata Y (2016) Branch-and-reduce exponential/FPT algorithms in practice: A case study of vertex cover. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 609(1):211–225.
- Bader GD, Hogue CW (2003) An automated method for finding molecular complexes in large protein interaction networks. *BMC Bioinformatics* 4:Article 2.
- Balasubramanian R, Fellows M, Raman V (1998) An improved fixed-parameter algorithm for vertex cover. *Inform. Processing Lett.* 65(3):163–168.
- Barabási AL, Albert R (1999) Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* 286(5439):509–512.
- Bar-Yehuda R, Even S (1985) A local-ratio theorem for approximating the weighted vertex cover problem. Ausiello G, Lucertini M, eds. *Analysis and Design of Algorithms for Combinatorial Problems* (North Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam), 27–45.

- Batagelj V, Zaversnik M (2003) An $O(m)$ algorithm for cores decomposition of networks. Preprint, submitted October 25, <https://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0310049>.
- Björklund A, Husfeldt T, Koivisto M (2009) Set partitioning via inclusion-exclusion. *SIAM J. Comput.* 39(2):546–563.
- Bomze IM, Budinich M, Pardalos PM, Pelillo M (1999) The maximum clique problem. Du DZ, Pardalos PM, eds. *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization* (Springer-Verlag, Boston), 1–74.
- Bonato A, Hadi N, Horn P, Pralat P, Wang C (2009) Models of online social networks. *Internet Math.* 6(3):285–313.
- Borchers B (1999) CSDP, a C library for semidefinite programming. *Optim. Methods Software* 11(1-4):613–623.
- Borchers B (2017) CSDP 6.2 user's guide. Accessed January 20, 2020, <https://github.com/coin-or/Csdp/blob/master/doc/csdpuser.pdf>.
- Buchanan A, Walteros JL, Butenko S, Pardalos PM (2014) Solving maximum clique in sparse graphs: an $O(nm + n2^{d/4})$ algorithm for d -degenerate graphs. *Optim. Lett.* 8(5):1611–1617.
- Buss JF, Goldsmith J (1993) Nondeterminism within P. *SIAM J. Comput.* 22(3):560–572.
- Carraghan R, Pardalos PM (1990) An exact algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Oper. Res. Lett.* 9(6):375–382.
- Chen J, Kanj IA, Jia W (2001) Vertex cover: Further observations and further improvements. *J. Algorithms* 41(2):280–301.
- Chen J, Kanj IA, Xia G (2010) Improved upper bounds for vertex cover. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 411(40):3736–3756.
- Chen J, Fernau H, Kanj IA, Xia G (2007) Parametric duality and kernelization: Lower bounds and upper bounds on kernel size. *SIAM J. Comput.* 37(4):1077–1106.
- Chor B, Fellows M, Juedes D (2004) Linear kernels in linear time, or how to save k colors in $O(n^2)$ steps. Hromkovič J, Nagl M, eds. *Proc. 30th Internat. Conf. Graph-Theoretic Concepts Comput. Sci.* (Springer Berlin, Heidelberg), 257–269.
- Cohen J (2008) Trusses: Cohesive subgraphs for social network analysis. Technical Report 16 (National Security Agency, Fort Meade, MD).
- Csardi G, Nepusz T (2006) The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal Complex Systems* 1695(5):1–9.
- Cygan M, Fomin FV, Kowalik L, Lokshtanov D, Marx D, Pilipczuk M, Pilipczuk M, Saurabh S (2015) *Parameterized Algorithms* (Springer, New York).
- Dailey DP (1980) Uniqueness of colorability and colorability of planar 4-regular graphs are NP-complete. *Discrete Math.* 30(3):289–293.
- Dell H, Van Melkebeek D (2014) Satisfiability allows no nontrivial sparsification unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses. *J. ACM* 61(4):Article 23.
- Downey RG, Fellows MR (1999) *Parameterized Complexity* (Springer-Verlag, New York).
- Eppstein D, Löffler M, Strash D (2013) Listing all maximal cliques in large sparse real-world graphs. *ACM J. Experiment. Algorithmics* 18(3):3.1.
- Erdős P, Hajnal A (1966) On chromatic number of graphs and set-systems. *Acta Math. Hungar.* 17(1-2):61–99.
- Freuder EC (1982) A sufficient condition for backtrack-free search. *J. ACM* 29(1):24–32.
- Garey MR, Johnson DS, Stockmeyer L (1976) Some simplified NP-complete graph problems. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 1(3):237–267.
- Håstad J (1999) Clique is hard to approximate within $O(n^{1-\epsilon})$. *Acta Math.* 182(1):105–142.
- Iwata Y, Oka K, Yoshida Y (2014) Linear-time FPT algorithms via network flow. *Proc. 25th Annual ACM-SIAM Sympos. Discrete Algorithms* (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia), 1749–1761.
- Kirousis LM, Thilikos DM (1996) The linkage of a graph. *SIAM J. Comput.* 25(3):626–647.
- Knuth DE (1994) The sandwich theorem. *Electron. J. Combin.* 1(1):1.
- Konc J, Janežič D (2007) An improved branch and bound algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* 58(3):569–590.
- Li CM, Quan Z (2010) An efficient branch-and-bound algorithm based on MaxSAT for the maximum clique problem. *Proc. 24th AAAI Conf. Artificial Intelligence* (AAAI Press, Palo Alto, CA), 128–133.
- Li W, Zhu B (2018) A $2k$ -kernelization algorithm for vertex cover based on crown decomposition. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 739:80–85.
- Lick DR, White AT (1970) k -degenerate graphs. *Canadian J. Math.* 22(5):1082–1096.
- Lieder F, Rad FBA, Jarre F (2015) Unifying semidefinite and set-copositive relaxations of binary problems and randomization techniques. *Comput. Optim. Appl.* 61(3):669–688.
- Lovász L (1979) On the Shannon capacity of a graph. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 25(1):1–7.
- Manoussakis G (2014) The clique problem on inductive k -independent graphs. Preprint, submitted October 13, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.3302>.
- Manoussakis G (2016) New algorithms for cliques and related structures in k -degenerate graphs. Preprint, submitted April 4, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.01819v4>.
- Matula DW, Beck LL (1983) Smallest-last ordering and clustering and graph coloring algorithms. *J. ACM* 30(3):417–427.
- Mittelmann H (2018) Benchmarks for optimization software. Accessed January 20, 2020, <http://plato.asu.edu/bench.html>.
- Nagamochi H (2010) Minimum degree orderings. *Algorithmica* 56(1):17–34.
- Nemhauser GL, Trotter LE Jr (1975) Vertex packings: structural properties and algorithms. *Math. Programming* 8(1):232–248.
- Niedermeyer R, Rossmanith P (2000) A general method to speed up fixed-parameter-tractable algorithms. *Inform. Processing Lett.* 73(3):125–129.
- Östergård PRJ (2002) A fast algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 120(1):197–207.
- Pattabiraman B, Patwary MMA, Gebremedhin AH, Liao WK, Choudhary A (2013) Fast algorithms for the maximum clique problem on massive sparse graphs. Bonato A, Mitzenmacher M, Pralat P, eds. *International Workshop on Algorithms and Models for the Web-Graph* (Springer, Heidelberg), 156–169.
- Prosser P (2012) Exact algorithms for maximum clique: A computational study. *Algorithms (Basel)* 5(4):545–587.
- Pulleyblank WR (1979) Minimum node covers and 2-bicritical graphs. *Math. Programming* 17(1):91–103.
- Robson JM (2001) Finding a maximum independent set in time $O(2^{n/4})$. Technical report, LaBRI, Université de Bordeaux I.
- Rossi RA (2014) Fast triangle core decomposition for mining large graphs. Tseng VS, Ho TB, Zhou Z-H, Chen ALP, Kao H-Y, eds. *Pacific-Asia Conf. Knowledge Discovery Data Mining* (Springer, Heidelberg), 310–322.
- Rossi RA, Ahmed NK (2015) The network data repository with interactive graph analytics and visualization. *Proc. 29th AAAI Conf. Artificial Intelligence* (AAAI Press, Palo Alto, CA), 4292–4293.
- Rossi RA, Gleich DF, Gebremedhin AH (2015) Parallel maximum clique algorithms with applications to network analysis. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 37(5):C589–C616.
- San Segundo P, Lopez A, Pardalos PM (2016) A new exact maximum clique algorithm for large and massive sparse graphs. *Comput. Oper. Res.* 66:81–94.
- San Segundo P, Nikolaev A, Batsyn M (2015) Infra-chromatic bound for exact maximum clique search. *Comput. Oper. Res.* 64:293–303.
- San Segundo P, Artieda J, Batsyn M, Pardalos PM (2017a) An enhanced bitstring encoding for exact maximum clique search in sparse graphs. *Optim. Methods Software* 32(2):312–335.
- San Segundo P, Lopez A, Artieda J, Pardalos PM (2017b) A parallel maximum clique algorithm for large and massive sparse graphs. *Optim. Lett.* 11(2):343–358.
- Savelsbergh MWP (1994) Preprocessing and probing techniques for mixed integer programming problems. *ORSA J. Comput.* 6(4):445–454.

- Seidman SB (1983) Network structure and minimum degree. *Soc. Networks* 5(3):269–287.
- Sloane NJA (2017) Challenge problems: Independent sets in graphs. Accessed Janary 20, 2020, <https://oeis.org/A265032/a265032.html>.
- Szekeres G, Wilf HS (1968) An inequality for the chromatic number of a graph. *J. Combin. Theory* 4(1):1–3.
- Tomita E, Kameda T (2007) An efficient branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique with computational experiments. *J. Global Optim.* 37(1):95–111.
- Tomita E, Sutani Y, Higashi T, Takahashi S, Wakatsuki M (2010) A simple and faster branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique. Rahman MS, Fujita S, eds. *WALCOM: Algorithms and Computation* (Springer, Berlin), 191–203.
- Verma A, Buchanan A, Butenko S (2015) Solving the maximum clique and vertex coloring problems on very large sparse networks. *INFORMS J. Comput.* 27(1):164–177.
- Wang J, Cheng J (2012) Truss decomposition in massive networks. *Proc. VLDB Endowment* 5(9):812–823.
- Watts DJ (1999) Networks, dynamics, and the small-world phenomenon. *Amer. J. Sociol.* 105(2):493–527.
- Wilson AT (2009) Applying the boundary point method to an SDP relaxation of the maximum independent set problem for a branch and bound algorithm. Master’s thesis, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, NM.
- Zuckerman D (2006) Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number. *Proc. 38th Annual ACM Sympos. Theory Comput.* (ACM, New York), 681–690.

Jose L. Walteros is an assistant professor of industrial and systems engineering at the University at Buffalo. His research interests primarily focus on solving problems in the areas of combinatorial optimization, network interdiction, graph theory, logistics, and network flows. He currently serves as Vice Chair for Network Optimization in the INFORMS Optimization Society. Previously, he served as president of the INFORMS Junior Faculty Interest Group.

Austin Buchanan is an assistant professor of industrial engineering and management at Oklahoma State University. His research focuses on solving combinatorial optimization problems in networks, particularly those having connectivity or distance constraints. He currently serves as an associate editor for the journal *Networks* and has served in various leadership roles in the INFORMS Optimization Society and the INFORMS Section on Telecommunications and Network Analytics.