

## Lecture 9

Lecturer: Mohsen Ghaffari

Scribe:

In this lecture, we discuss a rather general method for solving various a wide range of *local* problems. The key concept in our discussion will be *network decompositions* first introduced by [ALGP89], also known as *low-diameter graph decomposition* [LS91].

### 0.1 Definition and Applications

Let us start with defining this concept.

**Definition 1.** (*Weak Diameter Network Decomposition*) Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , a  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$  weak diameter network decomposition of  $G$  is a partition of  $G$  into vertex-disjoint graphs  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{\mathcal{C}}$  such that for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{C}\}$ , we have the following property: the graph  $G_i$  is made of a number of vertex-disjoint and mutually non-adjacent clusters  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{\ell}$ , where each two vertices  $v, u \in X_j$  have distance at most  $D$  in graph  $G$ . We note that we do not bound the number  $\ell$ . We refer to each subgraph  $G_i$  as one block of this network decomposition.

**Definition 2.** (*Strong Diameter Network Decomposition*) Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , a  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$  strong diameter network decomposition of  $G$  is a partition of  $G$  into vertex-disjoint graphs  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{\mathcal{C}}$  such that for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{C}\}$ , we have the following property: each connected component of  $G_i$  has diameter at most  $D$ .

Notice that a strong diameter network decomposition is also a weak diameter network decomposition.

Network decompositions can be used to solve a wide range of *local* problems. To see the general method in a concrete manner, let us go back to our beloved  $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring problem.

**Theorem 3.** *Provided an  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$  weak-diameter network decomposition of a graph  $G$ , we can compute a  $\Delta + 1$  coloring of  $G$  in  $O(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D})$  rounds.*

*Proof.* We will color graphs  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{\mathcal{C}}$  one by one, each time considering the coloring assigned to the previous subgraphs. Suppose that vertices of graphs  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_i$  are already colored using colors in  $\{1, 2, \dots, \Delta + 1\}$ . We explain how to color  $G_{i+1}$  in  $O(D)$  rounds. Consider the clusters  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{\ell}$  of  $G_{i+1}$  and notice their two properties: (1) they are mutually non-adjacent, (2) for each cluster  $X_j$ , its vertices are within distance  $D$  of each other (where distances are according to the base graph  $G$ ). For each cluster  $X_j$ , let node  $v_j \in X_j$  who has the maximum identifier among nodes of  $X_j$  be the leader of  $X_j$ . Notice that leaders of clusters  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{\ell}$  can be identified in  $O(D)$  rounds (why?). Then, let  $v_j$  aggregate the topology of the subgraph induced by  $X_j$  as well as the colors assigned to nodes adjacent to  $X_j$  in the previous graphs  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_i$ . This again can be done in  $O(D)$  rounds, thanks to the fact that all the relevant information is within distance  $D + 1$  of  $v_j$ . Once this information is gathered, node  $v_j$  can compute a  $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring for vertices of  $X_j$ , while taking into account the colors of neighboring nodes of previous graphs, using a simple greedy procedure. Then, node  $v_j$  can report back these colors to nodes of  $X_j$ . This will happen for all the clusters  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{\ell}$  in parallel, thanks to the fact that they are non-adjacent and thus, their coloring choices does not interfere with each other.  $\square$

## 0.2 Randomized Algorithm for Network Decomposition

**Theorem 4.** *There is a randomized LOCAL algorithm that computes a  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$  weak-diameter network decomposition of any  $n$ -node graph  $G$ , for  $\mathcal{C} = O(\log n)$  and  $\mathcal{D} = O(\log n)$ , in  $O(\log^2 n)$  rounds, with high probability<sup>1</sup>.*

As we see in the exercises of this class, the two key parameters  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are nearly optimal and one cannot improve them simultaneously and significantly.

**Network Decomposition Algorithm:** Suppose that we have already computed subgraphs  $G_1, \dots, G_i$  so far. We now explain how to compute a subgraph  $G_{i+1} \subseteq G \setminus (\cup_{j=1}^i G_j)$ , in  $O(\log n)$  rounds, which would satisfy the properties of one block of a weak diameter network decomposition.

Let each node  $v$  pick a random radius  $r_u$  from an geometric distribution with parameter  $\varepsilon$ , for a desired (free parameter) constant  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ . That is, for each integer  $y \geq 1$ , we have  $\Pr[r_u = y] = \varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)^{y-1}$ . We will think of the vertices within distance  $r_u$  of  $u$  as the *ball of node  $u$* . Now for each node  $v$ , let  $Center(v)$  be the node  $u^*$  among nodes  $u$  such that  $dist_G(u, v) \leq r_u$  that has the smallest identifier. That is,  $Center(v) = u^*$  is the smallest-identifier node whose ball contains  $v$ . Define the clusters of  $G_i$  by letting all nodes with the same center define one cluster, and then discarding nodes who are at the boundary of their cluster. That is, any node  $v$  for which  $dist_G(v, u) = r_u$  where  $u = Center(v)$  remains unclustered.

There are two properties to prove: one that the clusters have low diameter, and second, that after  $\mathcal{C}$  iterations, all nodes are clustered. In the following two lemmas, we argue that with high probability, each cluster has diameter  $O(\log n/\varepsilon)$  and after  $\mathcal{C} = O(\log_{1/\varepsilon} n)$  iterations, all nodes are clustered.

**Lemma 5.** *With high probability, the maximum cluster diameter is at most  $O(\log n/\varepsilon)$ . Hence, this clustering can be computed in  $O(\log n/\varepsilon)$  rounds, with high probability.*

*Proof.* The proof is simple and is left as an exercise. □

**Lemma 6.** *For each node  $v$ , the probability that  $v$  is not clustered — that  $v$  is on the boundary of its supposed cluster and thus it gets discarded — is at most  $\varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Notice that

$$\Pr [v \text{ is not clustered}] = \sum_{u \in V} \Pr [v \text{ is not clustered} \mid Center(v) = u] \cdot \Pr[Center(v) = u]$$

For each vertex  $u$ , let  $before(u)$  denote the set of all vertices whose identifier is less than that of  $u$ . Define the following events

- $\mathcal{E}_1 = (r_u = dist_G(v, u))$ .
- $\mathcal{E}_2 = (r_u \geq dist_G(v, u))$ .
- $\mathcal{E}_3 = (\forall u' \in before(u), r_{u'} < dist_G(v, u'))$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout, we will use the phrase *with high probability* to indicate that an event happens with probability at least  $1 - \frac{1}{n^c}$ , for a desirably large but fixed constant  $c \geq 2$ .

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr [v \text{ is not clustered} \mid \text{Center}(v) = u] \\
&= \Pr[\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_3 \mid \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3] \\
&= \frac{\Pr[\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3]}{\Pr[\mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3]} \\
&= \frac{\Pr[\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_3]}{\Pr[\mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3]} \\
&= \frac{\Pr[\mathcal{E}_3] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{E}_1 \mid \mathcal{E}_3]}{\Pr[\mathcal{E}_3] \cdot \Pr[\mathcal{E}_2 \mid \mathcal{E}_3]} \\
&= \frac{\Pr[\mathcal{E}_1]}{\Pr[\mathcal{E}_2]} = \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the penultimate equality, we used the property that the event  $\mathcal{E}_3$  is independent of events  $\mathcal{E}_1$  and  $\mathcal{E}_2$ , and the last equality follows from the probability distribution function of the exponential distribution (recall that this is exactly the *memoryless property* of the exponential distribution). Hence, we can now go back and say that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr [v \text{ is not clustered} ] \\
&= \sum_{u \in V} \Pr[v \text{ is not clustered} \mid \text{Center}(v) = u] \cdot \Pr[\text{Center}(v) = u] \\
&= \sum_{u \in V} \varepsilon \cdot \Pr[\text{Center}(v) = u] = \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 7.** *After  $\mathcal{C} = O(\log_{1/\varepsilon} n)$  iterations, all nodes are clustered, with high probability.*

## References

- [ALGP89] Baruch Awerbuch, M Luby, AV Goldberg, and Serge A Plotkin. Network decomposition and locality in distributed computation. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1989., 30th Annual Symposium on*, pages 364–369. IEEE, 1989.
- [LS91] Nathan Linial and Michael Saks. Decomposing graphs into regions of small diameter. In *Proceedings of the Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '91*, pages 320–330, 1991.