Algorithm 38 Synchronous Algorithm: Canonical Form
1: In r rounds: **send** complete initial state to nodes at distance at most r
2:      // do all the communication first
3: Compute output based on complete information about r-neighborhood
4:      // do all the computation in the end

8.1 Locality

Let us for a moment look at distributed algorithms more generally (i.e., not only at coloring and not only at rings). Assume that initially, all nodes only know their own label (identifier) and potentially some additional input. As information needs at least r rounds to travel r hops, after r rounds, a node v can only learn about other nodes at distance at most r. If message size and local computations are not restricted, it is in fact not hard to see, that in r rounds, a node v can exactly learn all the node labels and inputs up to distance r. As shown by the following lemma, this allows to transform every deterministic r-round synchronous algorithm into a simple canonical form.

Lemma 8.1. *If message size and local computations are not bounded, every deterministic, synchronous r-round algorithm can be transformed into an algorithm of the form given by Algorithm 38 (i.e., it is possible to first communicate for r rounds and then do all the computations in the end).*

Proof. Consider some r-round algorithm $\mathcal{A}$. We want to show that $\mathcal{A}$ can be brought to the canonical form given by Algorithm 38. First, we let the nodes communicate for r rounds. Assume that in every round, every node sends its complete state to all of its neighbors (remember that there is no restriction on the maximal message size). By induction, after i rounds, every node knows the initial state of all other nodes at distance at most i. Hence, after r rounds, a node v has the combined initial knowledge of all the nodes in its r-neighborhood. We want to show that this suffices to locally (at node v) simulate enough of Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ to compute all the messages that v receives in the r communication rounds of a regular execution of Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$.

Concretely, we prove the following statement by induction on i. For all nodes at distance at most $r - i + 1$ from v, node v can compute all messages of the first i rounds of a regular execution of $\mathcal{A}$. Note that this implies that v can compute all the messages it receives from its neighbors during all r rounds. Because v knows the initial state of all nodes in the r-neighborhood, v can clearly compute all messages of the first round (i.e., the statement is true for $i = 1$). Let us now consider the induction step from i to $i+1$. By the induction hypothesis, v can compute the messages of the first i rounds of all nodes in its $(r - i + 1)$-neighborhood. It can therefore compute all messages that are received by nodes in the $(r - i)$-neighborhood in the first i rounds. This is of course exactly what is needed to compute the messages of round $i + 1$ of nodes in the $(r - i)$-neighborhood. □

Chapter 8

Locality Lower Bounds

In Chapter 1, we looked at distributed algorithms for coloring. In particular, we saw that rings and rooted trees can be colored with 3 colors in $\log^* n + O(1)$ rounds. In this chapter, we will reconsider the distributed coloring problem. We will look at a classic lower bound that shows that the result of Chapter 1 is tight: Coloring rings (and rooted trees) indeed requires $\Omega(\log^* n)$ rounds. In particular, we will prove a lower bound for coloring in the following setting:

- We consider deterministic, synchronous algorithms.

- Message size and local computations are unbounded.

- We assume that the network is a directed ring with n nodes.

- Nodes have unique labels (identifiers) from 1 to n.

Remarks:

- A generalization of the lower bound to randomized algorithms is possible.

- Except for restricting to deterministic algorithms, all the conditions above make a lower bound stronger: Any lower bound for synchronous algorithms certainly also holds for asynchronous ones. A lower bound that is true if message size and local computations are not restricted is clearly also valid if we require a bound on the maximal message size or the amount of local computations. Similarly also assuming that the ring is directed and that node labels are from 1 to n (instead of choosing IDs from a more general domain) strengthen the lower bound.

- Instead of directly proving that 3-coloring a ring needs $\Omega(\log^* n)$ rounds, we will prove a slightly more general statement. We will consider deterministic algorithms with time complexity r (for arbitrary r) and derive a lower bound on the number of colors that are needed if we want to properly color an n-node ring with an r-round algorithm. A 3-coloring lower bound can then be derived by taking the smallest r for which an r-round algorithm needs 3 or fewer colors.

Remarks:

- It is straightforward to generalize the canonical form to randomized algorithms: Every node first computes all the random bits it needs throughout the algorithm. The random bits are then part of the initial state of a node.

Definition 8.2 (r-hop view). *We call the collection of the initial states of all nodes in the r-neighborhood of a node v, the r-hop view of v.*

Remarks:

- Assume that initially, every node knows its degree, its label (identifier) and potentially some additional input. The r-hop view of a node v then includes the complete topology of the r-neighborhood (excluding edges between nodes at distance r) and the labels and additional inputs of all nodes in the r-neighborhood.

Based on the definition of an r-hop view, we can state the following corollary of Lemma 8.1.

Corollary 8.3. *A deterministic r-round algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ is a function that maps every possible r-hop view to the set of possible outputs.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.1, we know that we can transform Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ to the canonical form given by Algorithm 38. After r communication rounds, every node v knows exactly its r-hop view. This information suffices to compute the output of node v. □

Remarks:

- Note that the above corollary implies that two nodes with equal r-hop views have to compute the same output in every r-round algorithm.

- For coloring algorithms, the only input of a node v is its label. The r-hop view of a node therefore is its labeled r-neighborhood.

- If we only consider rings, r-hop neighborhoods are particularly simple. The labeled r-neighborhood of a node v (and hence its r-hop view) in an oriented ring is simply a $(2r+1)$-tuple $(\ell_{-r}, \ell_{-r+1}, \ldots, \ell_0, \ldots, \ell_r)$ of distinct node labels where ℓ_0 is the label of v. Assume that for $i > 0$, ℓ_i is the label of the ith clockwise neighbor of v and ℓ_{-i} is the label of the ith counterclockwise neighbor of v. A deterministic coloring algorithm for oriented rings therefore is a function that maps $(2r+1)$-tuples of node labels to colors.

- Consider two r-hop views $\mathcal{V}_r = (\ell_{-r}, \ldots, \ell_r)$ and $\mathcal{V}'_r = (\ell'_{-r}, \ldots, \ell'_r)$. If $\ell'_i = \ell_{i+1}$ for $-r \leq i \leq r-1$ and if $\ell'_r \neq \ell_i$ for $-r \leq i \leq r$, the r-hop view $\mathcal{V}'_r$ can be the r-hop view of a clockwise neighbor of a node with r-hop view $\mathcal{V}_r$. Therefore, every algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that computes a valid coloring needs to assign different colors to $\mathcal{V}_r$ and $\mathcal{V}'_r$. Otherwise, there is a ring labeling for which $\mathcal{A}$ assigns the same color to two adjacent nodes.

8.2   The Neighborhood Graph

We will now make the above observations concerning colorings of rings a bit more formal. Instead of thinking of an r-round coloring algorithm as a function from all possible r-hop views to colors, we will use a slightly different perspective. Interestingly, the problem of understanding distributed coloring algorithms can itself be seen as a classical graph coloring problem.

Definition 8.4 (Neighborhood Graph). *For a given family of network graphs $\mathcal{G}$, the r-neighborhood graph $\mathcal{N}_r(\mathcal{G})$ is defined as follows. The node set of $\mathcal{N}_r(\mathcal{G})$ is the set of all possible labeled r-neighborhoods (i.e., all possible r-hop views). There is an edge between two labeled r-neighborhoods $\mathcal{V}_r$ and $\mathcal{V}'_r$ if $\mathcal{V}_r$ and $\mathcal{V}'_r$ can be the r-hop views of two adjacent nodes.*

Lemma 8.5. *For a given family of network graphs $\mathcal{G}$, there is an r-round algorithm that colors graphs of $\mathcal{G}$ with c colors iff the chromatic number of the neighborhood graph is $\chi(\mathcal{N}_r(\mathcal{G})) \leq c$.*

Proof. We have seen that a coloring algorithm is a function that maps every possible r-hop view to a color. Hence, a coloring algorithm assigns a color to every node of the neighborhood graph $\mathcal{N}_r(\mathcal{G})$. If two r-hop views $\mathcal{V}_r$ and $\mathcal{V}'_r$ can be the r-hop views of two adjacent nodes u and v (for some labeled graph in $\mathcal{G}$), every correct coloring algorithm must assign different colors to $\mathcal{V}_r$ and $\mathcal{V}'_r$. Thus, specifying an r-round coloring algorithm for a family of network graphs $\mathcal{G}$ is equivalent to coloring the respective neighborhood graph $\mathcal{N}_r(\mathcal{G})$. □

Instead of directly defining the neighborhood graph for directed rings, we define directed graphs $B_{k,n}$ that are closely related to the neighborhood graph. Let k and n be two positive integers and assume that $n \geq k$. The node set of $B_{k,n}$ contains all k-tuples of increasing node labels $([n] = \{1, \ldots, n\})$:

$$V[B_{k,n}] = \{(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k) : \alpha_i \in [n], i < j \rightarrow \alpha_i < \alpha_j\} \qquad (8.1)$$

For $\underline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ and $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)$ there is a directed edge from $\underline{\alpha}$ to $\underline{\beta}$ iff

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\} : \beta_i = \alpha_{i+1}. \qquad (8.2)$$

Lemma 8.6. *Viewed as an undirected graph, the graph $B_{2r+1,n}$ is a subgraph of the r-neighborhood graph of directed n-node rings with node labels from [n].*

Proof. The claim follows directly from the observations regarding r-hop views of nodes in a directed ring from Section 8.1. The set of k-tuples of increasing node labels is a subset of the set of k-tuples of distinct node labels. Two nodes of $B_{2r+1,n}$ are connected by a directed edge iff the two corresponding r-hop views are connected by a directed edge in the neighborhood graph. Note that if there is an edge between $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\underline{\beta}$ in $B_{k,n}$, $\alpha_1 \neq \beta_k$ because the node labels in $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\underline{\beta}$ are increasing. □

To determine a lower bound on the number of colors an r-round algorithm needs for directed n-node rings, it therefore suffices to determine a lower bound on the chromatic number of $B_{2r+1,n}$. To obtain such a lower bound, we need the following definition.

Definition 8.7 (Diline Graph). *The directed line graph (diline graph) $\mathcal{DL}(G)$ of a directed graph $G = (V,E)$ is defined as follows. The node set of $\mathcal{DL}(G)$ is $V[\mathcal{DL}(G)] = E$. There is a directed edge $((w,x),(y,z))$ between $(w,x) \in E$ and $(y,z) \in E$ iff $x = y$, i.e., if the first edge ends where the second one starts.*

Lemma 8.8. *If $n > k$, the graph $\mathcal{B}_{k+1,n}$ can be defined recursively as follows:*

$$\mathcal{B}_{k+1,n} = \mathcal{DL}(\mathcal{B}_{k,n}).$$

Proof. The edges of $\mathcal{B}_{k,n}$ are pairs of k-tuples $\underline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_k)$ and $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_k)$ that satisfy Conditions (8.1) and (8.2). Because the last $k-1$ labels in $\underline{\alpha}$ are equal to the first $k-1$ labels in $\underline{\beta}$, the pair $(\underline{\alpha},\underline{\beta})$ can be represented by a $(k+1)$-tuple $\underline{\gamma} = (\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_{k+1})$ with $\gamma_1 = \alpha_1$, $\gamma_i = \beta_{i-1} = \alpha_i$ for $2 \le i \le k$, and $\gamma_{k+1} = \beta_k$. Because the labels in $\underline{\alpha}$ and the labels in $\underline{\beta}$ are increasing, the labels in $\underline{\gamma}$ are increasing as well. The two graphs $\mathcal{B}_{k+1,n}$ and $\mathcal{DL}(\mathcal{B}_{k,n})$ therefore have the same node sets. There is an edge between two nodes $(\underline{\alpha}_1,\underline{\beta}_1)$ and $(\underline{\alpha}_2,\underline{\beta}_2)$ of $\mathcal{DL}(\mathcal{B}_{k,n})$ if $\underline{\beta}_1 = \underline{\alpha}_2$. This is equivalent to requiring that the two corresponding $(k+1)$-tuples $\underline{\gamma}_1$ and $\underline{\gamma}_2$ are neighbors in $\mathcal{B}_{k+1,n}$, i.e., that the last k labels of $\underline{\gamma}_1$ are equal to the first k labels of $\underline{\gamma}_2$. □

The following lemma establishes a useful connection between the chromatic numbers of a directed graph G and its diline graph $\mathcal{DL}(G)$.

Lemma 8.9. *For the chromatic numbers $\chi(G)$ and $\chi(\mathcal{DL}(G))$ of a directed graph G and its diline graph, it holds that*

$$\chi(\mathcal{DL}(G)) \ge \log_2(\chi(G)).$$

Proof. Given a c-coloring of $\mathcal{DL}(G)$, we show how to construct a 2^c coloring of G. The claim of the lemma then follows because this implies that $\chi(G) \le 2^{\chi(\mathcal{DL}(G))}$.

Assume that we are given a c-coloring of $\mathcal{DL}(G)$. A c-coloring of the diline graph $\mathcal{DL}(G)$ can be seen as a coloring of the edges of G such that no two adjacent edges have the same color. For a node v of G, let S_v be the set of colors of its outgoing edges. Let u and v be two nodes such that G contains a directed edge (u,v) from u to v and let x be the color of (u,v). Clearly, $x \in S_u$ because (u,v) is an outgoing edge of u. Because adjacent edges have different colors, no outgoing edge (v,w) of v can have color x. Therefore $x \notin S_v$. This implies that $S_u \ne S_v$. We can therefore use these color sets to obtain a vertex coloring of G, i.e., the color of u is S_u and the color of v is S_v. Because the number of possible subsets of $[c]$ is 2^c, this yields a 2^c-coloring of G. □

Let $\log^{(i)} x$ be the i-fold application of the base-2 logarithm to x:

$$\log^{(1)} x = \log_2 x, \quad \log^{(i+1)} x = \log_2(\log^{(i)} x).$$

Remember from Chapter 1 that

$$\log^* x = 1 \text{ if } x \le 2, \quad \log^* x = 1 + \min\{i : \log^{(i)} x \le 2\}.$$

For the chromatic number of $\mathcal{B}_{k,n}$, we obtain

Lemma 8.10. *For all $n \ge 1$, $\chi(\mathcal{B}_{1,n}) = n$. Further, for $n \ge k \ge 2$, $\chi(\mathcal{B}_{k,n}) \ge \log^{(k-1)} n$.*

Proof. For $k = 1$, $\mathcal{B}_{k,n}$ is the complete graph on n nodes with a directed edge from node i to node j iff $i < j$. Therefore, $\chi(\mathcal{B}_{1,n}) = n$. For $k > 2$, the claim follows by induction and Lemmas 8.8 and 8.9. □

This finally allows us to state a lower bound on the number of rounds needed to color a directed ring with 3 colors.

Theorem 8.11. *Every deterministic, distributed algorithm to color a directed ring with 3 or less colors needs at least $(\log^* n)/2 - 1$ rounds.*

Proof. Using the connection between $\mathcal{B}_{k,n}$ and the neighborhood graph for directed rings, it suffices to show that $\chi(\mathcal{B}_{2r+1,n}) > 3$ for all $r < (\log^* n)/2 - 1$. From Lemma 8.10, we know that $\chi(\mathcal{B}_{2r+1,n}) \ge \log^{(2r)} n$. To obtain $\log^{(2r)} n \le 2$, we need $r \ge (\log^* n)/2 - 1$. Because $\log_2 3 < 2$, we therefore have $\log^{(2r)} n > 3$ if $r < \log^* n/2 - 1$. □

Corollary 8.12. *Every deterministic, distributed algorithm to compute an MIS of a directed ring needs at least $\log^* n/2 - O(1)$ rounds.*

Remarks:

• It is straightforward to see that also for a constant $c > 3$, the number of rounds needed to color a ring with c or less colors is $\log^* n/2 - O(1)$.

• There basically (up to additive constants) is a gap of a factor of 2 between the $\log^* n + O(1)$ upper bound of Chapter 1 and the $\log^* n/2 - O(1)$ lower bound of this chapter. It is possible to show that the lower bound is tight, even for undirected rings (for directed rings, this will be part of the exercises).

• Alternatively, the lower bound can also be presented as an application of Ramsey's theory. Ramsey's theory is best introduced with an example: Assume you host a party, and you want to invite people such that there are no three people who mutually know each other, and no three people which are mutual strangers. How many people can you invite? This is an example of Ramsey's theorem, which says that for any given integer c, and any given integers $n_1,\ldots,n_c$, there is a Ramsey number $R(n_1,\ldots,n_c)$, such that if the edges of a complete graph with $R(n_1,\ldots,n_c)$ nodes are colored with c different colors, then for some color i the graph contains some complete subgraph of color i of size n_i. The special case in the party example is looking for $R(3,3)$.

• Ramsey theory is more general, as it deals with hyperedges. A normal edge is essentially a subset of two nodes; a hyperedge is a subset of k nodes. The party example can be explained in this context: We have (hyper)edges of the form $\{i,j\}$, with $1 \le i,j \le n$. Choosing n sufficiently large, coloring the edges with two colors must exhibit a set S of 3 edges $\{i,j\} \subseteq \{v_1,v_2,v_3\}$, such that all edges in S have the same color. To prove our coloring lower bound using Ramsey theory, we form all hyperedges of size $k = 2r+1$, and color them with 3 colors. Choosing n sufficiently large, there must be a set $S = \{v_1,\ldots,v_{k+1}\}$ of $k+1$ identifiers, such that all $k+1$ hyperedges consisting of k nodes from S have the same color. Note

that both $\{v_1,\ldots,v_k\}$ and $\{v_2,\ldots,v_{k+1}\}$ are in the set S, hence there will be two neighboring views with the same color. Ramsey theory shows that in this case n will grow as a power tower (tetration) in k. Thus, if n is so large that k is smaller than some function growing like $\log^* n$, the coloring algorithm cannot be correct.

- The neighborhood graph concept can be used more generally to study distributed graph coloring. It can for instance be used to show that with a single round (every node sends its identifier to all neighbors) it is possible to color a graph with $(1 + o(1))\Delta^2 \ln n$ colors, and that every one-round algorithm needs at least $\Omega(\Delta^2/\log^2 \Delta + \log\log n)$ colors.

- One may also extend the proof to other problems, for instance one may show that a constant approximation of the minimum dominating set problem on unit disk graphs costs at least log-star time.

- Using r-hop views and the fact that nodes with equal r-hop views have to make the same decisions is the basic principle behind almost all locality lower bounds (in fact, we are not aware of a locality lower bound that does not use this principle). Using this basic technique (but a completely different proof otherwise), it is for instance possible to show that computing an MIS (and many other problems) in a general graph requires at least $\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$ and $\Omega(\log \Delta)$ rounds.

Chapter Notes

The lower bound proof in this chapter is by Linial [Lin92], proving asymptotic optimality of the technique of Chapter 1. This proof can also be found in Chapter 7.5 of [Pel00]. The lower bound is also true for randomized algorithms [Nao91]. Recently, this lower bound technique was adapted to other problems [CHW08, LW08]. In some sense, Linial's seminal work raised the question of what can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time [NS93], essentially starting distributed complexity theory.

More recently, using a different argument, Kuhn et al. [KMW04] managed to show more substantial lower bounds for a number of combinatorial problems including minimum vertex cover (MVC), minimum dominating set (MDS), maximal matching, or maximal independent set (MIS). More concretely, Kuhn et al. showed that all these problems need polylogarithmic time (for a polylogarithmic approximation, in case of approximation problems such as MVC and MDS). For recent surveys regarding locality lower bounds we refer to e.g. [KMW10, Suo12]. Ramsey theory was started by Frank P. Ramsey with his 1930 article called "On a problem of formal logic" [Ram30]. For an introduction to Ramsey theory we refer to e.g. [NR90, LR03].

Bibliography

[CHW08] A. Czygrinow, M. Hańćkowiak, and W. Wawrzyniak. Fast Distributed Approximations in Planar Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, 2008.

[KMW04] F. Kuhn, T. Moscibroda, and R. Wattenhofer. What Cannot Be Computed Locally! In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, July 2004.

[KMW10] Fabian Kuhn, Thomas Moscibroda, and Roger Wattenhofer. Local Computation: Lower and Upper Bounds. *CoRR*, abs/1011.5470, 2010.

[Lin92] N. Linial. Locality in Distributed Graph Algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 21(1):193–201, February 1992.

[LR03] Bruce M. Landman and Aaron Robertson. *Ramsey Theory on the Integers*. American Mathematical Society, 2003.

[LW08] Christoph Lenzen and Roger Wattenhofer. Leveraging Linial's Locality Limit. In *22nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*, Arcachon, France, September 2008.

[Nao91] Moni Naor. A Lower Bound on Probabilistic Algorithms for Distributive Ring Coloring. *SIAM J. Discrete Math*, 4(3):409–412, 1991.

[NR90] Jaroslav Nesetril and Vojtech Rodl, editors. *Mathematics of Ramsey Theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1990.

[NS93] Moni Naor and Larry Stockmeyer. What can be computed locally? In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, STOC '93, pages 184–193, New York, NY, USA, 1993. ACM.

[Pel00] David Peleg. *Distributed computing: a locality-sensitive approach.* Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2000.

[Ram30] F. P. Ramsey. On a problem in formal logic. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 30:264–286, 1930.

[Suo12] Jukka Suomela. Survey of Local Algorithms. http://www.cs.helsinki.fi/local-survey/, 2012.