arXiv:1111.6698v1 [cs.DS] 29 Nov 2011

On the Integrality Gap of the Directed-Component Relaxation for Steiner Tree

MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi
Computer Science Department
University of Maryland,
College Park, MD 20742

Shi Li
Department of Computer Science
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08540

March 19, 2014

Abstract

In this note, we show that the integrality gap of the k-Directed-Component- Relaxation(k-DCR) LP for the Steiner tree problem, introduced by Byrka, Grandoni, Rothvob and Sanita (STOC 2010), is at most $\ln(4) < 1.39$. The proof is constructive: we can efficiently find a Steiner tree whose cost is at most $\ln(4)$ times the cost of the optimal fractional k-restricted Steiner tree given by the k-DCR LP.

1 Introduction

Given a n-node graph $G = (V, E)$, with edge cost $c : E \to \mathbb{R}_+$, and a subset $R \subseteq V$ of nodes, which we call *terminals*, the goal of the *Steiner Tree* problem is to find a minimum cost tree S spanning R. Note that S might contain nodes outside R (called *Steiner nodes*). The decision version of this problem is one of the Karp's 21 NP-complete problems. Thus, the Steiner tree problem is NP-hard. In fact, it is NP-hard to give a solution with cost less than 96/95 times the optimal cost([2, 4]).

It is well known that the minimum cost *terminal spanning tree* is a 2-approximation for the Steiner tree problem, if we replace the weighted graph by its metric closure. The first improvement over the naive 2-approximation was the 11/6-approximation given by Zelikovsky in 1992([10]), after which a sequence of improvements came out. Berman and Ramaiyer improved the bound to 1.746 in 1992([1]). Then, Zelikovsky himself improved it to 1.693 in 1996 [11], which was followed by Pro mel and Stegers improvement to 1.667 in 1997 [8], by Karpinski and Zelikovsky to 1.644 in 1997 [6], and by Hougardy and Pro mel to 1.598 in [5]. Then, Robins and Zelikovsky, in 2005 [9] gave a $1 + \ln(3)/2 < 1.55$-approximation. The best approximation ratio is $\ln(4) + \epsilon < 1.39 + \epsilon$, given by Byrka et al. in 2010([3]).

The $\ln(4) + \epsilon$ approximation is given by an iterative rounding to the *directed component relaxation (DCR)* introduced in [3], of the *k-restricted Steiner tree* problem (see [7]). Given a Steiner tree S, a *component* of S is a maximal sub-tree of S whose all internal nodes are Steiner nodes. A component is k-restricted if it contains at most k terminals. Then, a k-restricted Steiner tree is a tree spanning R whose all components are k-restricted. Without loss of generality, we can assume the cost function c form a metric. Then, it is known that

$$\mathsf{opt}_k \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lfloor \log_2 k \rfloor}\right) \mathsf{opt},$$

where opt and opt_k are the costs of the optimal Steiner tree and k-restricted Steiner tree, respectively.

The rounding procedure in [3] gives a Steiner tree whose cost is at most $\ln(4)\mathsf{opt}_k$. Since the $\ln(4)$ ratio is with respect to the cost of the optimal (k-restricted) Steiner tree, the rounding procedure does not give an $\ln(4)$ upper bound on the integrality gap of the k-DCR. The authors of [3] left an open problem in their discussion section: whether the integrality gap of the k-DCR LP is at most $\ln(4)$.

In this note, we answer the question positively, by proving the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *We can efficiently find a random Steiner tree whose expected cost is at most* $\ln(4)\mathsf{opt}_k^{\mathsf{f}}$*, where* $\mathsf{opt}_k^{\mathsf{f}}$ *is the cost of optimal fractional k-restricted Steiner tree given by the k-DCR.*

Unlike the iterative rounding in [3], our algorithm solves the LP only once, at the beginning of the algorithm. The remaining part of this note is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the k-DCR LP introduced in [3]. Then, we give our rounding algorithm in Section 3 and prove Theorem 1 in Section 4.

2 k-DCR LP

In this section, we review the k-DCR LP introduced in [3]. We say a component is k-restricted if it contains at most k terminals. Then, a k-restricted Steiner tree is a Steiner tree whose all components are k-restricted. We think of k as a constant. Then, given a subset R' of terminals of size at most k, we can easily compute the optimal component spanning R', by enumerating all Steiner nodes in the component. Given a Steiner tree S, we choose an arbitrary root $r \in R$, and direct all edges in S towards r. Then, each component C has a root in S (which is called the *sink* of the component). We call a component with a specified sink a *directed component*. Let $C_1, C_2, \cdots, C_h$ for $h = O(kn^k)$ be the set of all directed components. Let $c(C_j)$ be the cost of C_j, $R(C_j)$ be the set of terminals contained in C_j, $\mathsf{sink}(C_j)$ be the sink of C_j and $\mathsf{sources}(C_j) = R(C_j) \setminus \{\mathsf{sink}(C_j)\}$ be the *sources* of C_j. We say a component C_j *crosses* a subset $U \subseteq R$ if $\mathsf{sources}(C_j) \cap U \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathsf{sink}(C_j) \notin U$. Let $\delta_k^+(U)$ be the set of directed components that cross U. The k-DCR LP is as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min \sum_j c(C_j) x_j & & & & & (k-\mathrm{DCR}) \\
\sum_{C_j \in \delta_k^+(U)} x_j & \geq & 1, & & \forall U \subseteq R \setminus \{r\}, U \neq \emptyset & \\
\sum_j |\mathsf{sources}(C_j)|\, x_j & = & |R| - 1 & & & \\
x_j & \geq & 0, & & \forall j = 1, 2, \cdots, h &
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that the second constraint does not appear in [3]. However, it is easy to check its validity. All the arguments will go through without the constraint; we add the constraint so that we can use Lemma 15 in [3] as a black-box.

3 Rounding Algorithm

We obtain $\{x_j : j \in [h]\}$ by solving the above LP. Without loss of generality, we assume each x_j is a multiply of $1/m$, for some large integer m. Then, let $\mathcal{C}$ be the multi-set of components, in which C_j appears mx_j times. By abusing the notation, we assume $\mathcal{C} = \{C_j : j \in [N]\}$ and $x_j = 1/m$ for every $j \in [N]$. We shall keep using x_j's throughout the note, to emphasize that they are obtained by solving the LP; we shall use only once the fact that all x-values are $1/m$.

We make multiple copies of a Steiner node v such that each Steiner node appears in at most 1 component in $\mathcal{C}$. By adding co-located Steiner nodes, we can think of each component C_j as a full binary-tree, with leaves being terminals and internal nodes being Steiner nodes.

Constructing witness trees We shall construct a *witness tree* Y_j on $R(C_j)$ for every $j \in [N]$. For each Steiner vertex v in the tree C_j, we randomly color one of the two edges to its children black and the other white. For two distinct terminals $s, s' \in R(C_j)$, $(s, s') \in Y_j$ if and only if the unique path connecting s and s' in C_j contains exactly one black edge. Notice that Y_j is indeed a tree on $R(C_j)$. For an edge $e' \in C_j$, define

$$W(e') = \left\{e \in Y_j : \text{the unique path in } C_j \text{ connecting the two end points of } e \text{ contains } e'\right\}.$$

For an edge $e \in Y_j$, let $W^{-1}(e) = \{e' \in C_j : e \in W(e')\}$ be the set of edges in the unique path in C_j connecting the two end points of e.

Lemma 2. *$Y = \bigcup_{j\in[N]} x_j Y_j$ is a convex combination of trees in R, where $x_j Y_j$ denotes the tree Y_j with edge capacities scaled by x_j, and the $\bigcup$ notion denotes union of graphs.*

Proof. For each $j \in [N]$, we direct the edges of Y_j towards $\mathsf{sink}(C_j)$. We show that for every $s \in R \setminus \{r\}$, we can send 1 unit flow from s to r in the directed Y.

Suppose not. Then we can find a cut $(U, R \setminus U)$ of R such $s \in U, r \notin U$ and the total capacity from U to $R \setminus U$ is less than 1. $C_j \in \delta^+(U)$ only if some edge in $x_j Y_j$ goes from U to $R \setminus U$. This edge has capacity x_j. Since the total capacity of the directed cut is smaller than 1, we have $\sum_{j:C_j\in\delta^+(U)} x_j < 1$, contradicting the fact that $\{x_j, j \in [N]\}$ is a valid LP solution.

By the second constraint of the k-DCR LP, the total capacity of Y is exactly $|R| - 1$. Thus, it is enough to show that Y dominates a linear combination of trees. By standard matroid theory, it suffices to check that for every partitioning $R_1, R_2, \cdots, R_\ell$ of R into ℓ partitions, the total capacity of edges across different partitions is at least $\ell - 1$. Without loss of generality, assume $r \in R_1$. Consider each directed cut $(R_i, R \setminus R_i)$ for $i = 2, 3, \cdots \ell$. The total capacity of edges from R_i to $R \setminus R_i$ is at least 1, since we can send 1 unit from from some terminal in R_i to r. Summing up the inequalities over $i = 2, 3, \cdots, \ell$, we get that the total capacity is at least $\ell - 1$. Notice that every edge across two different partitions is counted at most once, since we directed the edges. Thus, the total capacity of edges across different partitions in $R_1, R_2, \cdots R_\ell$ is at least $\ell - 1$. □

The following lemma will be useful later.

Lemma 3. *Let Y_j be the witness tree of C_j and L be a subset of edges in Y_j. Let L' be the set of edges e' in C_j such that $W(e') \subseteq L$. Suppose the removal of L from Y_j breaks Y_j into $\ell = |L| + 1$ connected components $Y_{j,1}, Y_{j,2}, \cdots, Y_{j,\ell}$.*

Then, the removal of L' from C_j breaks C_j into ℓ connected components $C_{j,1}, C_{j,2}, \cdots, C_{j,\ell}$ which contain terminals (we ignore the connected components containing only Steiner nodes). Moreover, for ever $i \in [\ell]$, the set of terminals in $C_{j,i}$ is exactly the set of terminals in $Y_{j,i}$.

Proof. We show that two terminals $s, s' \in R(C_j)$ are connected in $C_j \setminus L'$ if and only if they are connected in $Y_j \setminus L$.

Consider an edge $e \in Y_j \setminus L$. Then, no edge in $W^{-1}(e)$ will be in L'. Notice that $W^{-1}(e)$ form a path in C_j connecting the two end points of e. Thus, if s and s' are connected in $Y_j \setminus L$, we can connect them in $C_j \setminus L'$ using edges in $W^{-1}(P_{s,s'}) := \bigcup_{e \in P_{s,s'}} W^{-1}(e)$, where $P_{s,s'}$ denotes the unique path in $Y_j \setminus L$ connecting s and s'.

Then, suppose s and s' are connected in $C_j \setminus L'$ by a path $P_{s,s'} = (v_0 = s, v_1, v_2, \cdots v_\ell = s')$. Consider a black edge (v_i, v_{i+1}) in the path. If v_{i+1} is the parent, the witness terminal for (v_i, v_{i+1}) is defined as the unique terminal whose path to v_{i+1} contains only white edges. This terminal can be located by starting from v_{i+1} and following the white children. If v_i is the parent, the witness terminal is defined as the unique terminal whose path to v_i contains only white edges. Then, for two adjacent black edges e_1 and e_2 in the path $P_{s,s'}$, the witness terminals for e_1 and e_2 are connected by an edge in $e \in Y_j$. Moreover, $W(e_1) = \{e\}$, assuming e_1 is higher than e_2 in the tree. Since e_1 is not in L', e is not in L. Thus, two witness terminals for two adjacent black edges are connected in $Y_j \setminus L$. Similarly, s (resp.,s') is connected with the witness terminal for the first (resp. last) black edge in $P_{s,s'}$ in $Y_j \setminus L$. Thus, s and s' are connected in $Y_j \setminus L$. □

Rounding fractional solution in iterations We process the algorithm in iterations. After t iterations, we obtain a set $\mathcal{Y}^{(t)} = \left\{Y_j^{(t)} : j \in \left[N^{(t)}\right]\right\}$, where each $Y_j^{(t)}$ is a tree spanning some subset $R\left(Y_j^{(t)}\right) \subseteq R$, a set $\left\{x_j^{(t)} : j \in \left[N^{(t)}\right]\right\}$, a set $\tilde{Y}^{(t)}$ of edges in $R \times R$, and a set $\tilde{S}^{(t)}$ of edges in $V \times V$. Define

$$Y^{(t)} = \bigcup_{j \in \left[N^{(t)}\right]} x_j^{(t)} Y_j^{(t)}.$$

For every t, we make sure that

(P1). $Y^{(t)} \cup \tilde{Y}^{(t)}$ is a convex combination of trees on R.

(P2). If two terminals s and s' are connected in $\tilde{Y}^{(t)}$, then they are connected in $\tilde{S}^{(t)}$.

Initially $N^{(0)} = N, Y_j^{(0)} = Y_j$ and $x_j^{(0)} = x_j$ for every $j \in [N]$. $\tilde{Y}^{(0)}$ and $\tilde{S}^{(0)}$ are empty. When the algorithm terminates after T iterations, $\tilde{Y}^{(T)}$ is a terminal spanning tree and $\tilde{S}^{(T)}$ is the Steiner tree we output. Notice that Properties (P1) and (P2) hold for $t = 0$.

Now we show how to update the objects we maintain in the $t+1$-th iteration. For the sake of simplicity, we omit the superscript (t) in the description and simply use $N, \mathcal{Y}, Y_j, Y, x_j$ and $\tilde{Y}$. We randomly select a $j \in [N]$ according to the values x_j. That is, the probability that j is selected is x_j/Σ where $\Sigma = \sum_{j \in [N]} x_j$. We add all edges in Y_j to $\tilde{Y}$ and the set $W^{-1}(Y_j) := \bigcup_{e \in Y_j} W^{-1}(e)$ of edges to $\tilde{S}$. Notice that $W^{-1}(e)$ forms a path connecting the two endpoints of e; thus, after adding edges to $\tilde{Y}$ and $\tilde{S}$, Property (P2) still holds.

Since we added $|R(Y_j)| - 1$ edges to $\tilde{Y}$, we can remove edges of total capacity $|R(Y_j)| - 1$ from Y to maintain (P1) (in particular, edges in $x_j Y_j$ themselves will be removed from Y). We remove edges randomly such that the probability that each edge $e \in Y$ is removed, over the choices of all j's, is $1/\Sigma$. This is possible due to the following lemma in [3].

Lemma 4 (Lemma 15 in [3])**.** *Let Y' be a convex combination of trees on the set R of terminals and T be a tree on R. Suppose $Y' = \bigcup_{j' \in [N']} x'_{j'} Y'_{j'}$, where $x'_{j'} \in [0,1]$ and each $Y'_{j'}$ is tree on a subset $R'_{j'} \subseteq R$ of terminals. We can find a set of distributions $\left\{\mathcal{B}_{j'} : j' \in [N']\right\}$ such that*

1. *Every distribution $\mathcal{B}_{j'}, j' \in [N']$ is over subsets of edges in T, such that for every subset B in the support of $\mathcal{B}_{j'}$, $(T \setminus B) \cup Y'_{j'}$ is a tree spanning R.*

2. *For every edge $e \in T$, $\sum_{j' \in [N']} x'_{j'} \Pr_{B \sim \mathcal{B}_{j'}}[e \in B] = 1$.*

We show how to apply Lemma 4 to remove edges from Y. Because $x_j = 1/m$ for every $j \in [N]$ (notice that this is true for $t = 0$, and we make sure that this is true for every t), each edge in Y has capacity $1/m$. We can find a decomposition of $Y \cup \tilde{Y}$ into m trees $T_1, T_2, \cdots, T_m$ such that every edge in Y appears in exactly one tree. That is, $Y \cup \tilde{Y} = \frac{1}{m}\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} T_i$. Let $Y'_j = Y_j, x'_j = x_j$ for $j \in [N]$; let $Y'_{N+1}, Y'_{N+2}, \cdots, Y'_{N+|\tilde{Y}|}$ be the $\left|\tilde{Y}\right|$ singular sets, each containing one element in $\tilde{Y}$. Let $N' = N + \left|\tilde{Y}\right|$ and $x'_j = 1$ for $j \in [N'] \setminus [N]$. We then apply Lemma 4 with $Y' = Y \cup \tilde{Y} = \bigcup_{j' \in [N']} x'_{j'} Y'_{j'}$ and $T = T_i$ for each $i \in [m]$.

Then, for each T_i, we randomly select a subset $B \in \mathcal{B}_j$ and remove B from T. Notice that T_i contains all edges in $\tilde{Y}$; also, when $Y'_{j'} = \{e\}$ for some $e \in \tilde{Y}$, the only possible choice for $B \in \mathcal{B}_{j'}$ is $\{e\}$. Thus, by the second property of Lemma 4, $e \in \tilde{Y}$ will not be in $\mathcal{B}_{j'}$ for any $j' \le N$; also, no edges in Y will be in $\mathcal{B}_{j'}$ for $j' > N$. Then, the probability that some edge $e \in Y$ is removed, over all choices of j, is

$$\sum_{j \in [N]} \frac{x_j}{\Sigma} \Pr_{B \sim \mathcal{B}_j}[e \in B] = \frac{1}{\Sigma}.$$

Since for each $i \in [m]$, $T_i \setminus B \cup Y_j$ is a tree, the new Y and $\tilde{Y}$ satisfy Property (P1).

Removing edges from $Y_{j'}$ will break $Y_{j'}$ into ℓ connected components $Y_{j',1}, Y_{j',2}, \cdots, Y_{j',\ell}$. Then, we remove $Y_{j'}$ from $\mathcal{Y}$ and add the ℓ connected components to $\mathcal{Y}$. The correspondent x values of these components will be $x_{j'}$. Notice that N and Σ may increase.

This finishes the description of an iteration. The algorithm terminates when $Y = \bigcup_{j \in [N]} x_j Y_j$ becomes empty.

4 Proof of the $\ln(4)$-Integrality Gap

For the sake of analysis, we can assume Σ never changes by the following trick. Let Σ' be the upper bound of Σ at any time. We add dummy components of total x-value $\Sigma' - \Sigma$ so that the sum of x values become Σ'. If we sampled a dummy component, we do nothing in the iteration.

For any edge $e' \in G$ that is used by the fractional solution(that is, $e' \in C_j$ for some $j \in \left[N^{(0)}\right]$), let $D_{e'}$ be the index t of the iteration after which edges in $W(e')$ are all removed from Y.

Lemma 5. $\mathbb{E}[D_{e'}] \le \ln(4)\Sigma$.

Proof. In [3], it is shown that $\Pr[|W(e')| \ge i] \le 2^{-i+1}$. Also, since each $e \in W(e')$ will be removed from Y with probability $1/\Sigma$ in each iteration, by Lemma 18 of [3], $\mathbb{E}[D_e \,|\, |W(e)| = i] \le H_i \cdot \Sigma$, where $H_i = 1 + 1/2 + 1/3 + \cdots 1/i$ is the i-th harmonic number. Thus,

$$E[D(e)] \le \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i+1}(H_i - H_{i-1})\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i2^{i-1}}\Sigma = \ln(4) \cdot \Sigma.$$

□

Consider a component $C_j, j \in N^{(0)}$ and its witness tree $Y_j^{(0)}$. After t iterations, we removed a subset L of edges from $Y_j^{(0)}$ and break $Y_j^{(0)}$ into $\ell = |L| + 1$ connected components. Let L' be the set of edges e' in C_j such that $W(e') \subseteq L$. Then, by Lemma 3, the removal of L' from C_j breaks C_j into ℓ connected components that contain terminals. Also, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the ℓ connected components of $Y_j^{(0)} \setminus L$ and those of $C_j \setminus L'$. If we sampled some connected component of $Y_j^{(0)} \setminus L$ at the some iteration, we shall add the correspondent connected component of $C_j \setminus L'$ into $\tilde{S}$. Thus, each edge in $C_j \setminus L'$ will be added to $\tilde{S}$ with probability at most $x_j^{(0)}/\Sigma$ at the iteration; the edges in L' will not be added to $\tilde{S}$. Since L' contains the edges e' such that all edges in $W(e')$ are removed from $Y^{(t)}$, the expected contribution of an edge $e' \in C_j$ to the final cost is at most

$$\mathbb{E}(D_{e'})\frac{x_j}{\Sigma}c(e') \leq \ln(4)\Sigma\frac{x_j}{\Sigma}c(e') = \ln(4)x_j c(e').$$

Since the contribution of $e' \in C_j$ to $\mathsf{opt}_k^{\mathsf{f}}$ is $x_j c(e')$, the expected cost of the Steiner tree we constructed is at most $\ln(4)\mathsf{opt}_k^{\mathsf{f}}$.

References

[1] Piotr Berman and Viswanathan Ramaiyer. Improved approximations for the Steiner tree problem. In *Proceedings of the third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, SODA '92, pages 325–334, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1992. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.

[2] Marshall Bern and Paul Plassmann. The Steiner problem with edge lengths 1 and 2,. *Information Processing Letters*, 32:171–176, September 1989.

[3] Jaroslaw Byrka, Fabrizio Grandoni, Thomas Rothvoß, and Laura Sanità. An improved lp-based approximation for Steiner tree. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '10, pages 583–592, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.

[4] Miroslav Chlebík and Janka Chlebíková. The Steiner tree problem on graphs: Inapproximability results. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 406:207–214, October 2008.

[5] Stefan Hougardy and Hans Jrgen Prmel. A 1.598 approximation algorithm for the Steiner problem in graphs. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 448–453, 1999.

[6] Marek Karpinski and Alexander Zelikovsky. New approximation algorithms for the Steiner tree problems. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 1:47–65, 1995.

[7] Tobias Polzin and Siavash Vahdati Daneshmand. On Steiner trees and minimum spanning trees in hypergraphs. *Operations Research Letters*, 31(1):12 – 20, 2003.

[8] Hans Jrgen Prmel and Angelika Steger. RNC-approximation algorithms for the Steiner problem. In *Proceeding of STACS'97*, pages 559–570. Springer-Verlag, 1997.

[9] Gabriel Robins and Alexander Zelikovsky. Tighter bounds for graph Steiner tree approximation. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 19:122–134, May 2005.

[10] Alexander Zelikovsky. An 11/6-approximation algorithm for the network Steiner problem. *Algorithmica*, 9(5):463–470, 1993.

[11] Alexander Zelikovsky. Better approximation bounds for the network and Euclidean Steiner tree problems. Technical report, 1995.