## COS 423 Lecture 11 Finding Minimum Spanning Trees Faster

© Robert E. Tarjan 2011

## Concurrent greedy with cleanup

For certain families of graphs, concurrent greedy with cleanup runs in O(n) time

#### **Requirements:**

(i) All graphs in the family are sparse: m = O(n)

(ii) The family is closed under *edge contraction*: combine both ends of the edge into a single vertex, with an edge to any vertex that was adjacent to either end If  $m \le cn$ , concurrent greedy with cleanup takes O(c(n + n/2 + n/4 + ...)) = O(n) time

**Trees**: *m* < *n*, closed under contraction, no cleanups needed

**Planar graphs**: *m* < 3*n*, closed under contraction

For concurrent greedy (with or without cleanups) to run in O(m) time on a arbitrary graph, we need a way to "thin" a graph: using red rule, color red all but O(n) edges, in O(m) time.

## Faster algorithms for general graphs

#### O(mlglgn) Yao 1975, packets

Run concurrent greedy algorithm, but with only *m*/lg*n* edges. To do this, group edges incident to each vertex into packets, each of size lg*n* (with at most one small packet per vertex). Give the main algorithm only the minimumweight edge in each packet.

Time to find packet minima is O(*m*lglg*n*).

#### O(mlg\*n) Fredman & Tarjan 1984, F-heaps

Store the set of edges incident to each blue tree in an F-heap (or rank-pairing heap). Run single-source greedy until blue tree is big enough; then choose an unconnected source and run single-source from it. Repeat until all blue trees are big enough. Clean up. Repeat. Algorithm is a hybrid of single-source and concurrent greedy with cleanup. Each round takes O(m) time. If blue trees have size at least k before a round, they have size at least  $2^k$  after  $\rightarrow \lg^* n$  rounds.

O(*m*lglg\**n*) Gabow et al. 1986, F-heaps + packets

O(*m*) Karger et al. 1995, thinning + random sampling

 $O(m\alpha(n))$  Chazelle 1998, soft heaps + complicated hybrid algorithm

O(minimum) Pettie & Ramachandran 2002, Chazelle's algorithm with fixed-depth recursion + brute force for small subproblems

## The power of random sampling

#### **Concurrent greedy + thinning**

How to thin?

A related question: MST verification

Given a spanning tree T, is it an MST?

**Yes**, if and only if every non-tree edge (*v*, *w*) has maximum weight on the cycle formed with the path in *T* joining *v* and *w* 

Proof: Red rule

Use the same idea to thin: given any forest (set of vertex-disjoint trees), can color red any non-tree edge whose ends are in the same tree and whose weight is maximum on the cycle formed with tree edges

## Thinning using a forest



## Thinning using a forest



#### How to find maxima on tree paths?

For now, assume O(m)

# How to find a good forest? Best is an MST, but too expensive to compute

**Good enough**: an MSF (minimum spanning forest) of a random sample of the edges. (The sample subgraph may not be connected)

Randomized minimum spanning tree algorithm Concurrent greedy with occasional thinning

Let *b* = #blue trees, initially *n*,

- e = #uncolored edges, initially m
- c = a constant to be chosen later

while b > 1 do
if e < cb then one pass of concurrent greedy
 else thinning step</pre>

### Thinning step

Sample the uncolored edges by adding each edge with probability ½, independently

- Find an MSF of the sample by applying the MST algorithm recursively to each connected component of the sample
- Color red all sampled edges not in the MSF and all non-sampled edges maximum on a cycle with MSF edges

After thinning, expected #uncolored edges  $\leq 2b$ 

### **Expected running time**

$$R(e) \le O(e) + R(e - b/2) \text{ if sparse}$$
$$\le O(e) + R(e/2) + T(2b) \text{ if dense}$$

Sparse: 
$$e < cb \rightarrow b/2 > e/(2c)$$
  
 $\rightarrow e - b/2 < e(1 - 1/(2c))$   
Dense:  $e \ge cb \rightarrow 2b \le 2e/c$   
 $\rightarrow e/2 + 2b \le e(1/2 + 4e/c)$   
 $c = 5 \rightarrow R(e) \le O(e) + R(9e/10) = O(e)$ 

After thinning, expected #uncolored edges  $\leq 2b$ 

**Proof**: Think of building the MSF *F* of the sample in the following way: Process the edges in increasing order by weight. To process (*v*, *w*), flip coin. If heads, put (*v*, *w*) in sample: if ends in same tree, color red; otherwise, add to *F*. If tails, not in sample: if ends in same tree, color red; otherwise, not in sample, not colored.

- **Proof** (cont.): Do coin flip after testing whether ends are in same tree: if ends in same tree, color red; otherwise, flip coin, add to *F* if heads. This change has no effect on the outcome: *F* is the same, as is the set of red edges. (The outcomes of the coin flips on the red edges have no effect.)
- Expected #uncolored edges = expected #coin flips = expected #flips until b - 1 heads. Each flip increases expected #heads by  $\frac{1}{2} \rightarrow$ expected #flips = 2(b - 1).

Finding maxima on tree paths *Convert to a problem on a shallow tree* Given tree T with edge weights, the Borůvka tree B(T) is formed from T by running the concurrent greedy algorithm on T. Tree B contains one node for each blue tree formed. Each leaf of B is a vertex of T; each non-leaf is a blue tree containing >1 vertex; the root is the final blue tree. Node x is the parent of node y in B if y is a blue tree before some pass k and x is the blue tree containing the vertices of y after pass k. The weight of edge (x, y) is the weight of the edge incident to y selected during pass k.

## Minimum spanning tree



## Borůvka tree



# If T has n vertices, B has <2n nodes, $\leq n/2^k$ of depth k

The concurrent greedy algorithm can build the Borůvka tree of the MST as it builds the MST

T(v, w) = path joining vertices v and w in TB(v, w) = path joining nodes v and w in Bp(v) = parent of v in B For any v, w in T,  $\max\{c(x, y) | (x, y) \text{ on } T(v, w)\} = \max\{c(x, y) | (x, y) \text{ on } B(v, w)\}$ 

#### **Proof**:

- (≤): Let (x, y) have maximum weight on T(v, w). Let U be a blue tree that selects (x, y). Deleting (x, y) from T forms a cut X, Y with one of v and w in X and the other in Y. Let x and v be in X, so y and w are in Y. Since (x, y) has maximum weight on T(x, y), v but not w is in U. The edge (U, p(U)) has weight c(x, y), and this edge is on B(v, w).
- ( $\geq$ ): Let (U, p(U)) be any edge on B(v, w). Let v be in U, so w is not in U. Let (x, y) be the edge on T(v, w)with exactly one end in U. Then  $c(x, y) \geq c(U, p(U))$ .