

A Polynomial Time Algorithm for Almost Optimal Vertex Fault Tolerant Spanners

Udit Agarwal
 udit@utexas.edu
 University of Texas at Austin
 Austin, Texas

February 27, 2020

Abstract

We present the first polynomial time algorithm for the f vertex fault tolerant spanner problem, which achieves almost optimal spanner size. Our algorithm for constructing f vertex fault tolerant spanner takes $O(k \cdot n \cdot m^2 \cdot W)$ time, where W is the maximum edge weight, and constructs a spanner of size $O(n^{1+1/k} f^{1-1/k} \cdot (\log n)^{1-1/k})$. Our spanner has almost optimal size and is at most a $\log n$ factor away from the upper bound on the worst-case size. Prior to this work, no other polynomial time algorithm was known for constructing f vertex fault tolerant spanner with optimal size.

Our algorithm is based on first greedily constructing a hitting set for the collection of paths of weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$ between the endpoints u and v of an edge (u, v) and then using this set to decide whether the edge (u, v) needs to be added to the growing spanner.

1 Introduction

In this paper we study an efficient construction of f vertex fault tolerant vertex spanners in the sequential model. A *spanner* H is a subgraph of a graph $G = (V, E)$ such that it preserves distances between all pairs (u, v) by a factor of at most k , i.e. $d_H(u, v) \leq k \cdot d_G(u, v)$. However a subgraph H is called a *f vertex fault tolerant spanner* of G if for any set of at most f vertices, $F \subset V$, the resulting subgraph $H \setminus F$ is a k -spanner of $G \setminus F$.

Spanners were first introduced by Peleg and Schäffer [13] and Peleg and Ullman [14], and has been extensively studied over the years (e.g. [1, 3, 6, 10, 11, 15]). In practice, spanners are mostly used in applications in the area of distributed computing. However distributed systems are prone to failures, and thus we would like a spanner for such a system to be robust to these failures, giving rise to the need for constructing *fault-tolerant spanners*.

This notion of fault-tolerant spanners was first introduced by Levcopoulos, Narasimhan, and Smid [12] and has been intensively studied over the years as well [5, 7–9]. A naive way for constructing an f -fault tolerant spanner is to construct it greedily by going over the edges in increasing order of their weight. Recently Bodwin and Patel [5] showed that such an approach gives an optimal bound on the worst-case size of such spanners. This improves on the bound achieved in [4] which was the first such result based on the greedy algorithm and all prior work on fault tolerant spanners uses more involved constructions with comparatively simpler analysis (e.g. [2, 7, 8]).

However the running time of the above described greedy approach is exponential in f (also mentioned in [5]) and in [5] the authors also mentions that *it would be interesting to improve this exponential dependence on f , or perhaps to find a different fast algorithm achieving the existential bounds shown in the paper.* In this paper we partly solve the problem by providing a polynomial time algorithm for constructing f vertex fault tolerant spanners, with runtime polynomially dependent on the maximum edge weight, W .

2 Overview of the Algorithm

We first start with a brief overview of the naive greedy algorithm for constructing f vertex fault tolerant spanners, which is described below.

Algorithm 1 GREEDY-VFT

Input: $G = (V, E)$; k ; f

```

1:  $H \leftarrow \phi$ 
2: for each  $(u, v) \in E$  in order of non-decreasing edge weights do
3:   if there exists  $F \subset V$  of size at most  $f$  such that  $\text{dist}_{H \setminus F}(u, v) > k \cdot w(u, v)$  then
4:     add  $(u, v)$  to  $H$ 
5:   end if
6: end for
```

The correctness of the above described algorithm is quite straightforward. However its running time is exponential in the parameter f since a naive implementation of the if loop in Steps 3-5, by going over all possible subsets F of V of size at most f and then checking the weight of the shortest path from u to v in the resulting graph $H \setminus F$, takes $\Omega(n^f)$ time (also noted in [5]). In this paper we present an alternate greedy algorithm for constructing f vertex fault tolerant vertex spanners with polynomial running time. The running time of our algorithm is independent of the parameter f .

Our algorithm is still based on the greedy approach and it goes over the edges in non-decreasing order of weights. However we use an entirely different method than the one described in Algorithm 1 to decide whether the edge (u, v) needs to be added to the growing spanner H . Our method constructs a greedy hitting set for the collection of paths from u to v in H of weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$ and then decide whether to add (u, v) to H or not based on the size of this hitting set. Note that we do not list all paths from u to v in H since it will require exponential time. Instead for each vertex x , our algorithm computes a count of the number of paths from u to v that passes through x and has weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$. This allows us to compute a desired hitting set for the collection of paths from u to v without explicitly listing these paths. This is described in detail in Section 4.

3 Main Contributions

Polynomial Time Greedy Algorithm for Computing f vertex fault tolerant Spanner. Prior to this work, all greedy approaches for constructing f vertex fault tolerant spanners require exponential time [4,5]. This is the first work that presents a polynomial time algorithm for constructing f vertex fault tolerant spanners for integer edge weights.

Construction of Hitting Set for a collection of paths without explicitly listing the paths. Our algorithm for constructing f vertex fault tolerant spanners requires constructing a hitting set for the collection of paths from u to v of weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$ in the growing spanner H before deciding whether to add the edge (u, v) to H . However since explicitly listing all paths from u to v may require exponential time, we present an alternate way for constructing the hitting set by computing for each node x , the number of paths from u to v that passes through x .

4 Description of the Algorithm

In this Section we give a detailed description of our algorithm for constructing f vertex fault tolerant spanners. As noted in Section 2, our algorithm is also based on the greedy approach and it goes over the edges (u, v) in non-decreasing order of weight. Algorithm 2 gives the pseudocode of our algorithm.

Algorithm 2 POLY-VFT

Input: $G = (V, E)$; k ; f

```

1:  $H \leftarrow \phi$ 
2: for each  $(u, v) \in E$  in order of non-decreasing edge weights do
3:   Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the collection of paths from  $u$  to  $v$  of weight at most  $k \cdot w(u, v)$  (we do not explicitly
   compute  $\mathcal{C}$ ).
4:   Construct hitting set  $Q$  for the collection  $\mathcal{C}$  using Algorithm 3 described in Section 5.
5:   if  $|Q| \leq f \cdot \log n$  then
6:     add  $(u, v)$  to  $H$ 
7:   end if
8: end for

```

We now give a step by step description of Algorithm 2. The algorithm goes over all the edges (u, v) in the non-decreasing order of weights in the for loop in Steps 2-8. In each iteration of the for loop, the algorithm first construct a hitting set Q for the collection of paths from u to v of weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$ using the greedy hitting set algorithm described in Section 5. Then in Steps 5-7, the algorithm adds the edge (u, v) to the growing spanner H if the size of the hitting set Q is at most $f \cdot \log n$.

4.1 Correctness

We now establish the correctness of Algorithm 2. We start with establishing that H is indeed a f vertex fault tolerant spanner (Lemma 4.1). We then establish the polynomial running time of Algorithm 2 (Lemma 4.2). We conclude with establishing a bound on the size of H (Lemmas 4.4-4.7).

Lemma 4.1. *The subgraph H constructed by Algorithm 2 is a f vertex fault tolerant spanner.*

Proof. Let H' be a f vertex fault tolerant spanner for the graph G and let H be the subgraph constructed by Algorithm 2. Let (u, v) be a minimum weight edge that belongs to the set $H' \setminus H$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the collection of paths from u to v in H of weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$. Since (u, v) was

not added to H in Steps 5-7, it implies that Q has size more than $f \cdot \log n$. From Lemma 5.1, any optimal set F that hits every path in the collection $\mathcal{C}$ should have size greater than $\frac{|Q|}{\log n} > f$. Thus there will always exist at least one path from u to v in H of weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$, irrespective of the set F of nodes that is removed from the graph such that $|F| \leq f$.

In a similar fashion, we can argue about the rest of the edges in the set $H' \setminus H$. Thus H is a f vertex fault tolerant spanner. $\square$

We now establish the polynomial runtime of Algorithm 2.

Lemma 4.2. *Algorithm 2 constructs the spanner H in $O(k \cdot n \cdot m^2 \cdot W)$ time, where W is the maximum integer edge weight.*

Proof. The for loop in Steps 2-8 runs for total m iterations. And each iteration of the for loop takes $O(k \cdot n \cdot m \cdot W)$ running time, since Step 4 takes $O(k \cdot n \cdot m \cdot W)$ time by Lemma 5.2 and Steps 5-7 takes $O(1)$ time. $\square$

We finally conclude that Algorithm 2 constructs an almost optimal size f vertex fault tolerant spanner by establishing that H has almost optimal size. Our proof is based on the proof given in [5] to establish the upper bound on the worst-case size of a f vertex fault tolerant spanner. We describe the complete proof here for completeness.

4.1.1 Bound on size of H

We start with the following definition of a blocking set, described in [5].

Definition 4.3 (BLOCKING SET [5]). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a k -blocking set for G is a set $B \subseteq V \times E$ such that:*

- (a) *every $(v, e) \in B$ has $v \notin e$, and*
- (b) *for every cycle C in G on $\leq k$ edges, there exists $(v, e) \in B$ such that $v, e \in C$.*

We now give an upper bound on the size of the blocking set B of the spanner H constructed by Algorithm 2. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 3 in [5].

Lemma 4.4. *The spanner H returned by Algorithm 2 with parameters k, f has a $(k + 1)$ -blocking set of size at most $(f \log n) \cdot |E(H)|$.*

Proof. For each edge $e = (u, v) \in H$, let Q_e be the hitting set constructed in Step 4 for the collection of paths from u to v of weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$, when (u, v) was added to H . Let $B = \{(x, e) | e \in E(H), x \in Q_e\}$. Clearly $|B| \leq f \cdot \log n \cdot |E(H)|$ since an edge e is added to H in Steps 5-7 only if $|Q_e| \leq f \cdot \log n$.

We now show that B is a $(k + 1)$ -blocking set. Let C be a cycle in H with at most $k + 1$ edges and let (u, v) be the edge which was added the last to the spanner H among all the edges in C . Since the path from u to v through the cycle C has length at most k , the weight of this path is at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$ (since (u, v) has the largest weight in C) and thus this path must be in the collection $\mathcal{C}$. Since Q_e is a hitting set for the paths in $\mathcal{C}$, there exists $x \in Q$ that also belongs to $C \setminus \{u, v\}$ and by construction of B , $(x, e) \in B$. This shows that B is indeed a $(k + 1)$ -blocking set. $\square$

We adapt the following lemma from [5] (Lemma 4) to establish an upper bound on the size of spanner H (Theorem 4.6).

Lemma 4.5 ([5]). *Let H be any graph on n nodes and m edges, let $f = o(n)$ be a parameter and let $f' = f \cdot \log n$, and suppose H has a $(k+1)$ -blocking set B of size $|B| \leq f' \cdot |E(H)|$. Then H has a subgraph on $O(n/f')$ nodes, $\Omega(m/f'^2)$ edges, and girth $> k+1$.*

The following theorem along with Corollary 4.7 from [5] establishes an upper bound on the worst-case size of H .

Theorem 4.6 ([5]). *Let $b(n, k)$ be the maximum possible number of edges in a graph on n nodes and girth $> k$. Then any graph H on n nodes returned by Algorithm 2 with parameters f', k satisfies*

$$|E(H)| = O\left(f'^2 \cdot b\left(\frac{n}{f'}, k+1\right)\right)$$

Corollary 4.7 ([5]). *For any graph H on n nodes returned by Algorithm 2 with parameters $f', 2k-1$, we have*

$$|E(H)| = O(n^{1+1/k} f'^{1-1/k})$$

And since $f' = f \cdot \log n$, we have $|E(H)| = O(n^{1+1/k} \cdot f'^{1-1/k} \cdot (\log n)^{1-1/k})$.

5 Hitting Set Algorithm

In this section we describe an algorithm to implement Step 4 of Algorithm 2. The goal is to construct a small hitting set for the collection $\mathcal{C}$ of paths from vertex u to v of weight at most $k \cdot w(u, v)$. Note that we do not explicitly construct this collection $\mathcal{C}$ since it may require exponential time.

Our algorithm follows a greedy approach to construct the hitting set Q . It proceeds in iterations: in each iteration, it first uses a dynamic programming procedure to compute, for each vertex x , the number of paths from u to v that passes through x in $\mathcal{C}$ (call this value $count_x$). It then picks the vertex y , that has the maximum count value, in set Q (paths through y are not considered in the collection $\mathcal{C}$ in future iterations). Algorithm 3 gives the pseudocode of our hitting set algorithm.

Algorithm 3 HITTING-SET CONSTRUCTION

Input: $G = (V, E)$; k, u, v

- 1: $Q \leftarrow \emptyset$
 - 2: Compute $count_x$ values for each $x \in V$ using the algorithm described in Section 5.1.
 - 3: **while** there exists $x \in V$ with $count_x > 0$ **do**
 - 4: Let y be the node with max $count$ value.
 - 5: add y to Q .
 - 6: Re-compute $count_x$ values for each $x \in V$ using the algorithm described in Section 5.1.
 - 7: **end while**
-

The correctness of Algorithm 3 is quite straightforward. Lemma 5.1 establishes a relationship between the size of an optimal hitting set and the constructed set Q and Lemma 5.2 establishes the running time of the algorithm.

Lemma 5.1 ((Folklore)). *A hitting set Q constructed by a greedy algorithm has size at most $\log n \cdot OPT$, where OPT is the size of an optimal solution.*

Lemma 5.2. *Algorithm 3 runs in $O(k \cdot n \cdot m \cdot W)$ time.*

Proof. Step 2 takes $O(k \cdot m \cdot W)$ time (Corollary 5.6). Each iteration of the while loop in Steps 3-7 takes $O(k \cdot m \cdot W)$ time since Step 5 takes $O(1)$ time and Step 6 takes $O(k \cdot m \cdot W)$ time. The lemma follows since the while loop runs for at most n iterations. $\square$

5.1 Computing $count_x$ values

In this section we describe a dynamic programming algorithm to compute $count_x$ values for each vertex x , where $count_x$ is the number of paths in the collection $\mathcal{C}$ that passes through x (excluding the paths that are already covered by the already computed hitting set Q). Here we are given the endpoints u and v of all the paths in this collection $\mathcal{C}$.

Our algorithm follows a three-phase strategy: first for each $x \in V$, we compute the number of paths starting from u and ending at x of weight wt , where $1 \leq wt \leq k \cdot w(u, v)$ and then similarly we compute for each $x \in V$, the number of paths starting at x and ending at v of weight wt for $1 \leq wt \leq k \cdot w(u, v)$. We then combine these values to obtain the $count_x$ values for each $x \in V$.

Let $count_{u,x,wt}$ refers to the number of paths in the collection $\mathcal{C}$ (excluding the paths covered by the already computed vertices in Q) that starts from u and ends at x and has weight wt . Similarly let $count_{x,v,wt}$ refers to the number of paths in the collection $\mathcal{C}$ (excluding the paths covered by the already computed vertices in Q) that starts from x and ends at v and has weight wt .

5.1.1 Computing $count_{u,x,wt}$ values

We follow a dynamic programming approach to compute $count_{u,x,wt}$ values for each $x \in V$ and $1 \leq wt \leq k \cdot w(u, v)$. Algorithm 4 describes the pseudocode of our algorithm.

Algorithm 4 COMPUTE- $count_{u,x,wt}$

Input: $G = (V, E)$; k, u, v, Q : current vertices in hitting set

```

1: for each  $(u, x) \in E$  do
2:    $count_{u,x,w(u,x)} \leftarrow 1$ 
3: end for
4: for  $1 \leq wt \leq k \cdot w(u, v)$  do
5:   for each  $(x, y) \in E$  do
6:     if  $count_{u,x,wt} > 0$  then
7:        $count_{u,y,wt+w(x,y)} \leftarrow count_{u,x,wt} + count_{u,y,wt+w(x,y)}$ 
8:     end if
9:   end for
10: end for

```

The correctness of the above algorithm is quite straightforward. We now establish the running time of the above algorithm.

Lemma 5.3. *Algorithm 4 computes $\text{count}_{u,x,wt}$ values for each $x \in V$, $1 \leq wt \leq k \cdot w(u,v)$ in $O(k \cdot m \cdot W)$ time.*

Proof. The inner for loop in Steps 5-9 takes $O(m)$ time per iteration of the outer for loop. The lemma follows since the outer for loop runs for $k \cdot W$ iterations. $\square$

5.1.2 Computing $\text{count}_{x,v,wt}$ values

Similar to the algorithm described in the previous section, we can compute $\text{count}_{x,v,wt}$ values using a dynamic programming approach in $O(k \cdot m \cdot W)$ time. This leads to the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *For each $x \in V$, $1 \leq wt \leq k \cdot w(u,v)$, the $\text{count}_{x,v,wt}$ values can be computed in $O(k \cdot m \cdot W)$ time.*

5.1.3 Computing count_x values

In this section we describe a simple algorithm to combine the count_x values using the $\text{count}_{u,x,wt}$ and $\text{count}_{x,v,wt}$ values computed in the previous sections.

Let $\text{sum}_{u,x,wt}$ denote the sum of $\text{count}_{u,x,wt'}$ values for $1 \leq wt' \leq wt$. We can compute these values for each $x \in V$, $1 \leq wt \leq k \cdot w(u,v)$, in $O(k \cdot n \cdot W)$ time. Then for each $x \in V$, count_x is the sum of $\text{sum}_{u,x,wt}$ and $\text{count}_{x,v,k \cdot w(u,v) - wt}$ for each $1 \leq wt \leq k \cdot w(u,v) - 1$. This can be done in additional $O(k \cdot W)$ time per $x \in V$. This leads to the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *Given $\text{count}_{u,x,wt}$ and $\text{count}_{x,v,wt}$ values, for each $x \in V$ count_x values can be computed in additional $O(k \cdot n \cdot W)$ time.*

The following corollary follows from Lemmas 5.3-5.5.

Corollary 5.6. *For given endpoints u and v , the count_x values for each $x \in V$ can be computed in $O(k \cdot m \cdot W)$ time.*

6 Conclusion

In this paper we present a first polynomial time algorithm for computing f vertex fault tolerant spanners of almost optimal size. The size of our spanner is at most a $\log n$ factor away from the known optimal bound [5].

References

- [1] I. Althöfer, G. Das, D. Dobkin, D. Joseph, and J. Soares. On sparse spanners of weighted graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 9(1):81–100, 1993.
- [2] G. Ausiello, A. Ribichini, P. G. Franciosa, and G. F. Italiano. Computing graph spanners in small memory: fault-tolerance and streaming. *Discrete Mathematics, Algorithms and Applications*, 2(04):591–605, 2010.

- [3] S. Baswana, T. Kavitha, K. Mehlhorn, and S. Pettie. Additive spanners and (α, β) -spanners. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 7(1):1–26, 2010.
- [4] G. Bodwin, M. Dinitz, M. Parter, and V. V. Williams. Optimal vertex fault tolerant spanners (for fixed stretch). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1884–1900. SIAM, 2018.
- [5] G. Bodwin and S. Patel. A trivial yet optimal solution to vertex fault tolerant spanners. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 541–543, 2019.
- [6] S. Chechik. New additive spanners. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 498–512. SIAM, 2013.
- [7] S. Chechik, M. Langberg, D. Peleg, and L. Roditty. Fault tolerant spanners for general graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(7):3403–3423, 2010.
- [8] A. Czumaj and H. Zhao. Fault-tolerant geometric spanners. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 32(2):207–230, 2004.
- [9] M. Dinitz and R. Krauthgamer. Fault-tolerant spanners: better and simpler. In *Proceedings of the 30th annual ACM SIGACT-SIGOPS symposium on Principles of distributed computing*, pages 169–178, 2011.
- [10] M. Elkin and D. Peleg. $(1+\epsilon, \beta)$ -spanner constructions for general graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 33(3):608–631, 2004.
- [11] A. Filtser and S. Solomon. The greedy spanner is existentially optimal. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 9–17, 2016.
- [12] C. Levcopoulos, G. Narasimhan, and M. Smid. Efficient algorithms for constructing fault-tolerant geometric spanners. In *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 186–195, 1998.
- [13] D. Peleg and A. A. Schäffer. Graph spanners. *Journal of graph theory*, 13(1):99–116, 1989.
- [14] D. Peleg and J. D. Ullman. An optimal synchronizer for the hypercube. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 18(4):740–747, 1989.
- [15] M. Thorup and U. Zwick. Spanners and emulators with sublinear distance errors. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithm*, pages 802–809, 2006.