

On evaluation of permanents

Andreas Björklund^a, Thore Husfeldt^{a,b}, Petteri Kaski^{c,1}, Mikko Koivisto^{c,1}

^a*Lund University, Department of Computer Science,
P.O.Box 118, SE-22100 Lund, Sweden*

^b*IT University of Copenhagen,
Rued Langgaards Vej 7, 2300, København S, Denmark*

^c*Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT,
Department of Computer Science, University of Helsinki,
P.O.Box 68, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland*

Key words: Algorithms, Parameterized computation, Permanent

The *permanent* of an $m \times n$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, with $m \leq n$, is defined as

$$\text{per } A \doteq \sum_{\sigma} a_{1\sigma(1)} a_{2\sigma(2)} \cdots a_{m\sigma(m)} ,$$

where the summation is over all injections σ from $M \doteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ to $N \doteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. While studies on permanents – since their introduction in 1812 by Binet [3] and Cauchy [5] – have focused on matrices over fields and commutative rings, we generally only assume the entries are from some *semiring*, that is, multiplication need not commute and additive inverses need not exist.

In this note, we give simple algorithms to evaluate the permanent of a given matrix. In arbitrary semirings, we apply Bellman–Held–Karp type

Email addresses: andreas.bjorklund@yahoo.se (Andreas Björklund),
thore.husfeldt@cs.lu.se (Thore Husfeldt), petteri.kaski@cs.helsinki.fi (Petteri Kaski),
mikko.koivisto@cs.helsinki.fi (Mikko Koivisto)

¹This research was supported in part by the Academy of Finland, Grants 117499 (P.K.) and 125637 (M.K.).

dynamic programming [1, 2, 7] across column subsets; in commutative semirings, a “transposed” variant is shown to be considerably faster. In arbitrary rings, the starting point is Ryser’s classic algorithm [13] that we manage to expedite for rectangular matrices, but that remains the fastest known algorithm for square matrices; again, in commutative rings, a transposed variant is shown to be substantially faster for rectangular matrices.

To state our main results, we take the *time* requirement of an algorithm as the number of additions and multiplications it performs, while the *space* requirement is taken as the maximum number of semiring elements that it needs to keep simultaneously in memory at any point in the computation. Also, denote by $\binom{q}{\downarrow r}$ the sum of the binomial coefficients $\binom{q}{0} + \binom{q}{1} + \dots + \binom{q}{r}$.

Theorem 1. *The permanent of any $m \times n$ matrix, $m \leq n$, can be computed*

- (i) *in semirings in time $O\left(m\binom{n}{\downarrow m}\right)$ and space $O\left(\binom{n}{\downarrow m}\right)$;*
- (ii) *in commutative semirings in time $O(m(n - m + 1)2^m)$ and space $O((n - m + 1)2^m)$;*
- (iii) *in rings in time $O\left(m\binom{n}{\downarrow m/2}\right)$ and space $O\left(\binom{n}{\downarrow m/2}\right)$; and*
- (iv) *in commutative rings in time $O((mn - m^2 + n)2^m)$ and space $O(n)$.*

All previous works we are aware of on evaluation of permanents assume commutativity, besides perhaps what is implicit in Ryser’s formula, see (1) below. For commutative *rings*, our bounds improve upon the state-of-the-art achieved in a series of works based on arguably more involved techniques: Using the Binet–Minc formulas [12], Kawabata and Tarui [9] presented an algorithm that runs in time $O(n2^m + 3^m)$ and space $O(n2^m)$. Recently, Vassilevska and Williams [14] took a different approach and obtained improved

bounds $O(mn^32^m)$ and $O(n^22^m)$, respectively. Finally, by a yet different, algebraic approach, Koutis and Williams [11] further improved these bounds to $\text{poly}(m, n)2^m$ and $\text{poly}(m, n)$. For commutative *semirings*, Vassilevska and Williams [14] gave a Gurevich–Shelah [6] type recursive partitioning algorithm running in time $\text{poly}(m, n)4^m$ and space $\text{poly}(m, n)$. Koutis and Williams [11] presented bounds comparable to Theorem 1(ii) using a dynamic programming algorithm similar to ours but in an algebraic guise.

We begin without any further assumptions about the semiring and adopt the standard dynamic programming treatment of sequencing problems. That is, the algorithm tabulates intermediate results $\alpha(i, J)$ for sets $J \subseteq N$ of size i , given by the recurrence

$$\alpha(0, \emptyset) \doteq 1, \quad \alpha(i, J) \doteq \sum_{j \in J} \alpha(i-1, J \setminus \{j\}) a_{ij} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

Here J corresponds to the image $\sigma(\{1, 2, \dots, i\})$ of the injection σ , and it is easy to show that the permanent of A is obtained as the sum of the terms $\alpha(m, J)$ over all $J \subseteq N$ of size m . Straightforward analysis proves Theorem 1(i).

In commutative semirings, we may transpose the previous algorithm, as follows. The idea is to go through the column indices j one by one, associating j with either one row index i not already associated with some other column, or associating j with none of the rows. Formally, for all $I \subseteq M$ define recursively

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\emptyset, 0) &\doteq 1, \quad \alpha(I, 0) \doteq 0 \quad \text{for } I \neq \emptyset, \\ \alpha(I, j) &\doteq \alpha(I, j-1) + \sum_{i \in I} \alpha(I \setminus \{i\}, j-1) a_{ij} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Here I corresponds to the preimage $\sigma^{-1}(\{1, 2, \dots, j\})$ of the injection σ . One can show easily by induction that $\alpha(I, j)$ equals the permanent of the submatrix of A consisting of the rows I and columns $\{1, 2, \dots, j\}$; in particular, $\alpha(M, n) = \text{per } A$. To obtain the bounds in Theorem 1(ii), it remains to observe that $\alpha(I, j)$ needs to be computed only if $|I| \leq j \leq n - m + |I|$, and thus, the time and space requirements are $O(m(n - m + 1)2^m)$ and $O((n - m + 1)2^m)$, respectively.

In rings, we start with Ryser's inclusion–exclusion formula. Denote by a_{iX} the partial row sum of the entries a_{ij} with $j \in X$. Ryser [13] found that

$$\text{per } A = \sum_{\substack{X \subseteq N \\ |X| \leq m}} (-1)^{m-|X|} \binom{n-|X|}{m-|X|} a_{1X} a_{2X} \cdots a_{mX}. \quad (1)$$

(While Ryser's original derivation is for fields, it immediately extends to arbitrary rings.) Visiting the sets X , for instance, in the lexicographical order, the terms a_{iX} can be computed in an incremental fashion, each in constant amortized time. Thus the permanent can be evaluated in time $O\left(m \binom{n}{\downarrow m}\right)$ and space $O(m)$. For square matrices this remains the most efficient way to evaluate the permanent.

But, when m is much less than n we can, in fact, do significantly better. For any subset of rows $I \subseteq M$ and any subset of columns $J \subseteq N$, let A_{IJ} denote the corresponding submatrix of A . For simplicity, assume m is even, and denote $K \doteq \{1, 2, \dots, m/2\}$ and $L \doteq \{m/2 + 1, m/2 + 2, \dots, m\}$. Now, we may write $\text{per } A$ as the sum of the products $\text{per } A_{KP} \text{ per } A_{LQ}$ over all *disjoint* pairs of subsets $P, Q \subseteq N$ with $|P| = |Q| = m/2$. While computing the sum over the $\binom{n}{m/2} \binom{n-m/2}{m/2}$ such pairs (P, Q) may look inadvisable at first glance, the following observation changes the picture.

For a set family \mathcal{F} , denote by $\downarrow\mathcal{F}$ the family of sets in \mathcal{F} and their subsets.

Theorem 2 (Björklund et al. [4], Kennes [10]). *Let f and g be two functions from the subsets of a finite set U to a ring R . Then,*

$$\sum_{\substack{S, T \subseteq U \\ S \cap T = \emptyset}} f(S)g(T) = \sum_{X \subseteq U} (-1)^{|X|} \left(\sum_{S \supseteq X} f(S) \right) \left(\sum_{T \supseteq X} g(T) \right). \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, if \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are given families of subsets of U such that f and g vanish outside \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , respectively, then the sum (2) can be computed with $O(|U|(|\downarrow\mathcal{F}| + |\downarrow\mathcal{G}|))$ ring and set operations, and with a storage for $O(|\downarrow\mathcal{F}| + |\downarrow\mathcal{G}|)$ ring elements.

To apply this result, we first note that the cardinality of $\downarrow\{P \subseteq N : |P| = m/2\}$ is $\binom{n}{\downarrow m/2}$. Second, note that the permanent per A_{KP} , for all $P \subseteq N$ of size $m/2$, can be computed in time $O\left(m \binom{n}{\downarrow m/2}\right)$ and space $O\left(\binom{n}{\downarrow m/2}\right)$; similarly for the permanents per A_{LQ} . Combining these bounds yields Theorem 1(iii). We also note without proof that the space requirement can be reduced to $O(m)$ at the cost of an extra factor of $3^{m/2}$ in the time requirement; the idea is the same as what we have recently used to count paths and packings [4].

Finally, in commutative rings we may transpose Ryser's formula in analogue to the transposed dynamic programming algorithm for commutative semirings. To this end, denote by a_{Xj} the partial column sum of the entries a_{ij} with $i \in X$. Then we may write

$$\text{per } A = \sum_{X \subseteq M} (-1)^{m-|X|} \sum_p a_{X_1}^{p_1} a_{X_2}^{p_2} \cdots a_{X_n}^{p_n},$$

where the inner-most summation is over all binary sequences $p = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $p_1 + p_2 + \cdots + p_n = m$. To see this, consider arbitrary row

indices $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m \in M$ and column indices $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m \in N$. Note that the expanded sum contains a unique term of the form $c a_{i_1 j_1} a_{i_2 j_2} \cdots a_{i_m j_m}$ if and only if the indices j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m are distinct; the coefficient c is the sum of the terms $(-1)^{m-|X|}$ over all $X \subseteq M$ that contain the row indices i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m . If all the row indices are distinct, there is only one such set X , and the coefficient correctly equals $(-1)^{m-|M|} = 1$. Otherwise, there are equally many such subsets X of odd and even size, and the coefficient correctly vanishes.

To analyze the time and space complexity, we note that, for any fixed $X \subseteq M$, the summation over the binary sequences p can be performed using simple dynamic programming in time $O(n + m(n - m))$ and space $O(n)$.² Here we assume that the sets X are visited in a suitable order such that each partial column sum can be updated in an incremental fashion in constant amortized time. Theorem 1(iv) follows.

We end by discussing the role of commutativity. With the given definition of permanents, Theorem 1 suggests that commutativity is crucial for efficient evaluation of permanents. However, we point out that with the following transposed definition, the bounds in Theorem 1(ii, iv) actually hold without the assumption of commutativity: For an injection σ from M to N , denote by σ_i the i th largest element in the image $\sigma(M)$. Define the *transposed*

²In the field of complex numbers, where one can evaluate discrete convolution via fast Fourier transforms, the time requirement can be reduced to $O(n \log^2 m)$. We are not aware whether such improvement is possible in an arbitrary (commutative) ring.

permanent of an $m \times n$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ over any semiring as

$$\text{per}' A \doteq \sum_{\sigma} a_{\sigma^{-1}(\sigma_1)\sigma_1} a_{\sigma^{-1}(\sigma_2)\sigma_2} \cdots a_{\sigma^{-1}(\sigma_m)\sigma_m} ,$$

where the summation is over all injections σ from $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ to $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Note that in any commutative semiring, of course, $\text{per}' A = \text{per} A$.

References

- [1] R. Bellman, Combinatorial processes and dynamic programming, in: R. Bellman, M. Jr. Hall (Eds.), Combinatorial Analysis, Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics 10 American Mathematical Society, 1960, pp. 217–249.
- [2] R. Bellman, Dynamic programming treatment of the travelling salesman problem, J. Assoc. Comput. Mach. 9 (1962) 61–63.
- [3] J. Binet, Sur un Système de Formules analytiques, et leur application à des considérations géométriques, J. de l'École Polytechnique 9, Cahier 16 (1813) 280–354.
- [4] A. Björklund, T. Husfeldt, P. Kaski, M. Koivisto, Counting paths and packings in halves, Corr, abs/0904.3093 (2009).
- [5] A.L. Cauchy, Sur les Fonctions qui ne peuvent obtenir que deux valeurs égales et de signes contraires par suite des transpositions opérées entre les variables qu'elles renferment, J. de l'École Polytechnique 10, Cahier 17 (1815) 29–112.

- [6] Y. Gurevich, S. Shelah, Expected computation time for Hamiltonian path problem, *SIAM J. Comput.* 16 (1987) 486–502.
- [7] M. Held, R.M. Karp, A dynamic programming approach to sequencing Problems, *J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math.* 10 (1962) 196–210.
- [8] R.M. Karp, Dynamic programming meets the principle of inclusion and exclusion, *Oper. Res. Lett.* 1 (1982) 49–51.
- [9] T. Kawabata, J. Tarui, On complexity of computing the permanent of a rectangular matrix, *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals E82-A* (1999) 741–744.
- [10] R. Kennes, Computational aspects of the Moebius transform on a graph, *IEEE Transactions on System, Man, and Cybernetics* 22 (1991) 201–223.
- [11] I. Koutis, R. Williams, Limits and applications of group algebras for parameterized problems, *ICALP 2009*, to appear.
- [12] H. Minc, Evaluation of permanents, *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* (2) 22 (1979) 27–32.
- [13] H.J. Ryser, *Combinatorial Mathematics*, Carus Mathematical Monographs 14, The Mathematical Association of America, 1963.
- [14] V. Vassilevska, R. Williams, Finding, minimizing, and counting weighted subgraphs, *STOC 2009*, to appear.