Approximating the partition function of the ferromagnetic Ising model

> Mark Jerrum School of Mathematical Sciences Queen Mary, University of London

Describing joint work with Leslie Ann Goldberg (Liverpool) and Alistair Sinclair (Berkeley)

Counting, Inference and Optimization on Graphs Princeton, 2nd-5th November 2011

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

The Ising model

Let G = (V, E) be a graph, with indeterminates $\gamma = (\gamma_e : e \in E)$ associated to the edges.

Definition

The Ising partition function is

$$Z_{\mathsf{lsing}}(\mathcal{G}; \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{\sigma: \mathcal{V} \to \{0,1\}} \prod_{e \in E} (1 + \gamma_e \delta_e(\sigma)),$$

where $\delta_e(\sigma)$ is 1 if σ assigns the same value to the two endpoints of e, and 0 otherwise.

We are interested in computing the partition function in the *ferromagnetic* case, which corresponds to evaluating the polynomial $Z_{\text{lsing}}(G; \gamma)$ in the positive orthant, $\gamma \geq 0$.

- ロ ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 回 ト - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4 □ - 4

In the q-state Potts model, a configuration is a function V → {0, 1, ..., q − 1}. The Ising model is the special case q = 2. Leslie Goldberg will consider the general Potts model later. For the time being, we stick to the 2-spin situation.

- In the q-state Potts model, a configuration is a function V → {0, 1, ..., q − 1}. The Ising model is the special case q = 2. Leslie Goldberg will consider the general Potts model later. For the time being, we stick to the 2-spin situation.
- It is #P-hard to compute Z_{lsing}(G; γ) exactly, given G and an assignment to γ.

- In the q-state Potts model, a configuration is a function V → {0, 1, ..., q − 1}. The Ising model is the special case q = 2. Leslie Goldberg will consider the general Potts model later. For the time being, we stick to the 2-spin situation.
- It is #P-hard to compute Z_{lsing}(G; γ) exactly, given G and an assignment to γ.
- It is NP-hard even to approximate Z_{lsing}(G; γ) in the non-ferromagnetic case, corresponding to γ ≥ −1.

Approximate computation: FPRAS

Definition

An *FPRAS* is a randomised algorithm that produces a result that is correct to within relative error $1 \pm \varepsilon$ with high probability. It must run in time $poly(n, \varepsilon^{-1})$, where *n* is the input size.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

Approximate computation: FPRAS

Definition

An *FPRAS* is a randomised algorithm that produces a result that is correct to within relative error $1 \pm \varepsilon$ with high probability. It must run in time $poly(n, \varepsilon^{-1})$, where *n* is the input size.

Theorem (Jerrum & Sinclair 1990)

There is an FPRAS for $Z_{\text{Ising}}(G; \gamma)$ in the ferromagnetic region $(\gamma \ge 0)$.

(Alternatively: there is an FPRAS for the Tutte polynomial along the positive branch of the hyperbola defined by q = 2.)

The FPRAS for the ferromagnetic Ising partition function is an example of the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method, but a direct application, based on single-site updates clearly fails. The following simulation illustrates the point:

Demo

(Acknowledgements to Bernd Nottelmann and Peter Young.)

We can say that the Markov chain is not "rapidly mixing".

Call an edge subset A even if every vertex in (V, A) has even degree.

Then we have the following alternative "high temperature" expansion of the partition function:

$$Z_{ ext{lsing}}(G; \gamma) = 2^{|V|} \prod_{e \in E} w'_e \sum_{\substack{A \subseteq E \\ A ext{ even}}} \prod_{e \in A} w_e$$

where $w'_e = (\gamma_e + 2)/2$ and $w_e = \gamma_e/(\gamma_e + 2)$.

The Markov chain based on single-edge updates of even subsets (and defective even subsets) *is* rapidly mixing... yielding an FPRAS.

Now suppose there is a multiplicative weight $1 + \mu_v \sigma(v)$ at each vertex v. There is again a high-temperature expansion:

$$Z_{\mathsf{lsing}}(G; \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = 2^{|V|} \cdots \sum_{A \subseteq E} \prod_{e \in A} w_e \prod_{\substack{v \in V \\ \deg_A(v) \text{ odd}}} z_v$$

where $z_v = \mu_v/(\mu_v + 2)$ and w_e is as before. (An easily computable product of weights has been omitted.)

A slight modification of the earlier Markov chain with single-edge updates works here also, provided $\mu_{v} \geq 0$ (or $\mu_{v} \leq 0$) for all $v \in V$.

But what if the field is *inconsistent*, i.e., μ_v takes negative values as well as positive?

Denote by #BIS the problem of counting independent sets in a bipartite graph.

Fact (Dyer, Goldberg, Greenhill & Jerrum, 2000)

#BIS is inter-reducible — in an approximation-preserving sense — with several other counting problems (e.g., downsets in a partial order, stable matchings, Widom-Rowlinson model in statistical physics).

A class of sampling problems of intermediate computational complexity or an illusion?

A logically defined complexity class

The complexity class, $\#RH\Pi_1$, containing "Bipartite Independent Set" and its peers is characterised by syntactically restricted sentences in first order logic. In fact, #BIS is complete for this class with respect to approximation-preserving reducibility. (C.f. "restricted Krom SNP" / "Linear Datalog".)

E.g., the set of downsets in a partial order (A, \prec) may be expressed as

$$\{D: \forall x, y \in A. \neg D(x) \lor \neg(y \prec x) \lor D(y)\}.$$

A logically defined complexity class

The complexity class, $\#RH\Pi_1$, containing "Bipartite Independent Set" and its peers is characterised by syntactically restricted sentences in first order logic. In fact, #BIS is complete for this class with respect to approximation-preserving reducibility. (C.f. "restricted Krom SNP" / "Linear Datalog".)

E.g., the set of downsets in a partial order (A, \prec) may be expressed as

$$\{ D : \forall x, y \in A. \neg D(x) \lor \neg(y \prec x) \lor D(y) \}.$$

$$(\equiv \neg (D(x) \land (y \prec x) \land \neg D(y)))$$

The complexity class, $\#RH\Pi_1$, containing "Bipartite Independent Set" and its peers is characterised by syntactically restricted sentences in first order logic. In fact, #BIS is complete for this class with respect to approximation-preserving reducibility. (C.f. "restricted Krom SNP" / "Linear Datalog".)

E.g., the set of downsets in a partial order (A, \prec) may be expressed as

$$\{D: \forall x, y \in A. \neg D(x) \lor \neg(y \prec x) \lor D(y)\}.$$

First order universal quantification.

The complexity class, $\#RH\Pi_1$, containing "Bipartite Independent Set" and its peers is characterised by syntactically restricted sentences in first order logic. In fact, #BIS is complete for this class with respect to approximation-preserving reducibility. (C.f. "restricted Krom SNP" / "Linear Datalog".)

E.g., the set of downsets in a partial order (A, \prec) may be expressed as

$$\{D: \forall x, y \in A. \neg D(x) \lor \neg (y \prec x) \lor D(y)\}.$$

CNF. (Only one clause in this instance!)

The complexity class, $\#RH\Pi_1$, containing "Bipartite Independent Set" and its peers is characterised by syntactically restricted sentences in first order logic. In fact, #BIS is complete for this class with respect to approximation-preserving reducibility. (C.f. "restricted Krom SNP" / "Linear Datalog".)

E.g., the set of downsets in a partial order (A, \prec) may be expressed as

$$\{D: \forall x, y \in A. \neg D(x) \lor \neg (y \prec x) \lor D(y)\}.$$

Each clause has at most one unnegated relation symbol and at most one negated relation symbol.

Some restrictions of the Ising model

- Zero external field: $\mu_v = 0$, for all $v \in V$.
- Consistent external field: μ_ν ≥ 0, for all ν (or μ_ν ≤ 0, for all ν).

• Ferromagnetic: $\gamma_e \geq 0$, for all $e \in E$.

Ising partition function	Exact	Approximate
Zero field, planar	FP^1	-
Ferromagnetic, consistent field	#P-hard	FPRAS ²
Ferromagnetic, general field	#P-hard	?
Antiferromagnetic/spinglass	#P-hard	NP-hard ³

Notes

Ising partition function	Exact	Approximate
Zero field, planar	FP^1	-
Ferromagnetic, consistent field	#P-hard	FPRAS ²
Ferromagnetic, general field	#P-hard	?
Antiferromagnetic/spinglass	#P-hard	NP-hard ³

Notes

¹Reduction to dimer coverings (perfect matchings) [Fisher].

Ising partition function	Exact	Approximate
Zero field, planar	FP^1	-
Ferromagnetic, consistent field	#P-hard	FPRAS ²
Ferromagnetic, general field	#P-hard	?
Antiferromagnetic/spinglass	#P-hard	NP-hard ³

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで

Notes

²We saw this earlier.

Ising partition function	Exact	Approximate
Zero field, planar	FP^1	-
Ferromagnetic, consistent field	#P-hard	FPRAS ²
Ferromagnetic, general field	#P-hard	?
Antiferromagnetic/spinglass	#P-hard	NP-hard ³

Notes

³Essentially Max Cut.

It is possible to encode an instance of #BIS as an instance of the ferromagnetic Ising model with general field:

- 1 means "OUT";
- 0 means "IN";
- $1 + \mu_u = (1 + \gamma)^{\operatorname{deg}(u)}$.



- 1 means "IN";
- 0 means "OUT";

•
$$1 + \mu_{\nu} = (1 + \gamma)^{-\deg(\nu)}$$

Calculation

$\sigma(u) - \sigma(v)$	Contribution	Equals
IN – IN	$1 imes 1 imes (1+\gamma)^{-1}$	$(1 + \gamma)^{-1}$
IN – OUT	$1 imes (1 + \gamma) imes 1$	$1 + \gamma$
OUT – IN	$(1+\gamma) imes (1+\gamma) imes (1+\gamma)^{-1}$	$1 + \gamma$
OUT – OUT	$(1+\gamma) imes 1 imes 1$	$1 + \gamma$

Fleshing out the details (and also doing the reduction in the other direction) yields:

Theorem (Goldberg and Jerrum, 2007)

Computing the partition function of a ferromagnetic Ising model with a general fields is equivalent to #BIS under approximation-preserving reductions.

Ising partition function	Exact	Approximate
Zero field, planar	FP	-
Ferromagnetic, consistent field	#P-hard	FPRAS
Ferromagnetic, general field	#P-hard	#BIS-equivalent
Antiferromagnetic/spinglass	#P-hard	NP-hard

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ