

Distributed Treewidth Computation

Jason Li¹

¹ Carnegie Mellon University, jmli@cs.cmu.edu

Abstract

Of all the restricted graph families out there, the family of low treewidth graphs has continuously proven to admit many algorithmic applications. For example, many NP-hard algorithms can be solved in polynomial time on graphs of constant treewidth. Other algorithmic techniques, such as Baker’s technique, partition the graph into components of low treewidth. Therefore, computing the treewidth of a graph remains an important problem in algorithm design. For graphs of constant treewidth, linear-time algorithms are known in the classical setting, and well as polylog(n)-time parallel algorithms for computing an $O(1)$ -approximation to treewidth. However, nothing is yet known in the distributed setting.

In this paper, we give near-optimal algorithms for computing the treewidth on a distributed network. We show that for graphs of constant treewidth, an $O(1)$ -approximation to the treewidth can be computed in near-optimal $\tilde{O}(D)$ time, where D is the diameter of the network graph. In addition, we show that many NP-hard problems that are tractable on constant treewidth graphs can also be solved in $\tilde{O}(D)$ time on a distributed network of constant treewidth.

Our algorithms make use of the shortcuts framework of Ghaffari and Haeupler [SODA’16], which has proven to be a powerful tool in designing near-optimal distributed algorithms for restricted graph networks, such as planar graphs, low-treewidth graphs, and excluded minor graphs.

1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in fast distributed algorithms on restricted graph families. Part of this recent action stemmed from the widespread lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n}+D)$ for distributed algorithms on general graphs [5], which holds for many basic graph optimization problems. By restricting the graph networks to exclude the pathological lower bound instances in [5], researchers have found success in beating the lower bound on nontrivial families of graph networks. For example, there are now distributed MST algorithms running in near-optimal $O(D \cdot n^{o(1)})$ time on planar graphs, bounded treewidth graphs, and graphs with small mixing time [7, 10, 11, 8]. Adding onto this line of work, this paper investigates many algorithmic problems on graphs networks of bounded treewidth and gives efficient distributed algorithms running in near-optimal $\tilde{O}(D)$ ¹ rounds on these networks, where D is the diameter of the network graph.

The concept of treewidth, which dates back to the study of graph minors of Robertson and Seymour [18], has proven fruitful in the quest for efficient classical algorithms for computationally intractable problems. For problems of bounded treewidth, many difficult, NP-hard problems can be solved in polynomial time. Then, with the increasing popularity of the parallel PRAM model, the classical bounded treewidth algorithms were adapted to run in parallel [15, 16]. However, until this paper, nothing was yet known in the distributed setting.

1.1 Results

Our main result is a distributed $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm to compute the treewidth of a network graph in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(k)}D)$ rounds of the CONGEST model, where k is the treewidth of the

¹ We use $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ notation to hide polylogarithmic factors in n .



network graph G . To state this result in an approximation setting, we say that the algorithm *distinguishes* the instances where $\text{tw}(G) > k$ and the instances $\text{tw}(G) \leq O(k)$.

► **Theorem 1.** *Given a network graph G and integer k , there is a distributed algorithm running in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(k)}D)$ rounds and either correctly concludes that $\text{tw}(G) > k$, or correctly concludes that $\text{tw}(G) \leq 7k + 4$. Every node in the network should know the conclusion of the algorithm.*

Of course, to approximate the treewidth of a network graph G , we simply run the above algorithm with increasing values of $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ until the algorithm outputs “ $\text{tw}(G) \leq 7k + 4$ ”; the running time will be dominated by the last, successful k . Also, observe that the diameter factor, D , is necessary in the running time. Intuitively, this is because treewidth is a global property of a graph; in other words, one cannot say anything about the treewidth by only looking at a local neighborhood around a vertex. For example, given any approximation factor α , consider the network graph consisting of a path of length $\Omega(n)$ with a clique of size 2α attached to one end. For the information of the 2α -clique to reach the node v on the other end of the path, the number of rounds required is at least the length of the path, which is $\Omega(n)$. Before the 2α -clique reaches node v , the only nodes that v can possibly learn in the network form a path, which has treewidth 1. Therefore, for node v to distinguish between treewidth 1 (the path without the clique) and treewidth $2\alpha - 1$ (the path with the clique attached), $\Omega(n)$ rounds are needed. Hence, to obtain an α -approximation, $\Omega(n) = \Omega(D)$ rounds are necessary.

Our distributed algorithm follows the outline of the parallel algorithm of Lagergren [15], which approximates the treewidth in $k^{O(k)}$ polylog(n) parallel time. The algorithm of [15] makes repeated calls to an algorithm that finds *vertex disjoint paths* between two given vertices. Our main technical contribution is a distributed algorithm solving this vertex disjoint paths problem on a graph network of treewidth k in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ time. This algorithm resembles the parallel vertex disjoint paths problem [14], but new ideas are required to construct a distributed algorithm. Our main insight is in viewing the algorithm of [14] in a *graph contraction*-based setting, and then applying the recent technology of *partwise aggregation* in distributed computing [7, 9, 14]. Outside of this subroutine, we adapt the framework of [15], which computes a treewidth decomposition given this subroutine, to the distributed setting.

► **Lemma 2.** *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ of treewidth at most k and two vertices $s, t \subseteq V$, we can either find k vertex-disjoint s – t paths, or output an s – t node cut of size less than k , in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ rounds. In the former case, every node knows whether it is on a path, and if so, its predecessor and successor on that path. In the latter case, every node knows the fact that k vertex-disjoint paths do not exist, as well as whether it is in the node cut.*

Perhaps more importantly, the algorithm of Theorem 1 also outputs a distributed version of a *treewidth decomposition*. Using this decomposition, we can solve many computationally difficult problems on bounded treewidth graph networks like in the classical setting.

► **Theorem 3.** *Let G be a graph network with treewidth k . The problems maximum independent set, minimum vertex cover, chromatic number, and minimum dominating set can be solved in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(k)}D)$ rounds on network G .*

We remark that we can extend Theorem 3 to solve many other optimization problems that are tractable on bounded-treewidth graphs.

1.2 Related Work

The shortcuts framework was introduced by Ghaffari and Haeupler [7], who used it to solve MST and $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate minimum cut on planar graphs in near-optimal $\tilde{O}(D)$ time. This framework was expanded on in [10, 11], generalizing these algorithms to run on bounded-genus

and bounded-treewidth graphs in $\tilde{O}(D)$ time. Lately, [13] studied the shortcuts framework on minor-free graphs, leading to $\tilde{O}(D^2)$ -round distributed algorithms for these problems on graphs excluded a fixed minor.

Efficient algorithms that do not use the shortcuts framework also exist. Recently, Ghaffari et al. [8] give a distributed algorithm for MST in time proportional to the *mixing time* of the network graph. For well-mixing graphs, such as expanders and random graphs, the algorithm runs in $2^{O(\sqrt{\log n \log \log n})}$ time.

The graph-theoretic property treewidth was introduced in Robertson and Seymour's study of graph minors [18]. Since then, it has seen many algorithmic applications in solving NP-hard problems, such as maximum independent set and chromatic number, efficiently on bounded treewidth graphs; for an extensive study, see [17].

The algorithmic problem of computing or approximating the treewidth of a graph has also been studied extensively. Computing the treewidth exactly is NP-hard [2], but admits an $O(\sqrt{\log k})$ approximation in polynomial time [1, 6], where k is the treewidth of the input graph. For small values of k , faster algorithms were known since the work of Robertson and Seymour [18]. Bodlaender [3] gave the first linear-time algorithm for fixed k , running in $2^{O(k^3)}n$ time. In the parallel setting, computing an $O(1)$ -approximation of the treewidth can be done in $k^{O(k)}$ polylog(n) time using $O(n)$ processors [15, 16].

2 Preliminaries

All of our algorithms work under the CONGEST model of distributed computing. There is a network $G = (V, E)$ of n nodes and diameter D . On each synchronous round, every node can send an $O(\log n)$ -bit message to each of its neighbors in G , possibly a different message to each neighbor. We assume that between synchronous rounds, every node can perform unbounded local computation.

Throughout the paper, G will always represent the graph network, and D its diameter. Given any graph H , let $V(H)$ and $E(H)$ denote the vertices and edges of H . For a vertex $v \in V$, denote $N(v)$ as the neighbors of v in G . For a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, denote $N(S)$ as the neighbor of set S in G , i.e., the vertices in $V - S$ with a neighbor in S , and define $N[S] := N(S) \cup S$. A path in H is a sequence of vertices such that adjacent vertices are neighbors in H . A path is simple if no vertex appears twice on the path. For vertices $s, t \in V$, an $s-t$ path is a (not necessarily simple) path connecting s and t , and a vertex set S is called a vertex cut if it intersects every $s-t$ path in G .

Lastly, for a positive integer r , let $[r]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ of positive integers from 1 to r .

2.1 Partwise and Subgraph Aggregation

The shortcuts framework of Ghaffari and Haeupler [7] has proved fruitful in designing distributed algorithms on restricted graph families. The inner workings of shortcuts is not necessary for the scope of this paper. Rather, we abstract out the primary task that is accomplished through the shortcuts framework, which we define as Partwise Aggregation (PA), following [9].

► **Definition 4** (Partwise Aggregation [9]). Let $G = (V, E)$ be a network graph, and let $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_{|\mathcal{P}|})$ be a collection of pairwise disjoint and connected subsets $P_i \subseteq V$, called **parts**. For each part P_i , every node $v \in P_i$ knows the set $N(v) \cap P_i$, i.e., which of its neighbors belong to its part. Suppose that every node $v \in \bigcup_i P_i$ has an integer x_v of $O(\log n)$ bits, and let \oplus be an associative function operating on integers of length $O(\log n)$. Every node in P_i wants to learn the value $\bigoplus_{v \in P_i} x_v$, i.e., the aggregate \oplus of all of the values x_v in P_i . We call such a task **partwise aggregation** with operator \oplus .

The power of the shortcuts framework is that it allows us to solve this partwise aggregation (PA) problem quickly, especially if the network graph G has special structure. We provide an intuitive description below, referring the reader to [7] for more details. In an ideal case, if for every part P_i , the diameter of $G[P_i]$ is $O(D)$, then every part P_i can simply aggregate inside $G[P_i]$ in $O(D)$ rounds. The trouble is when the diameter of $G[P_i]$ is much larger than D , the diameter of G . The shortcuts framework resolves this issue by allowing these “long and skinny” parts to borrow edges from the rest of the network G to aid in their partwise aggregation. For a part P_i , the borrowed edges H_i should satisfy the property that the diameter of $G[P_i] \cup H_i$ is now comparable to the diameter of G . On the other hand, it is not ideal for a single edge in G to be borrowed by too many parts, since it would induce “congestion” along the edge. The shortcuts framework computes an appropriate set H_i of borrowed edges for each part P_i while satisfying two conditions: (i) the diameter of $G[P_i] \cap H_i$ is small for each P_i , and (ii) no edge in G appears in too many H_i . Each part P_i then executes its aggregation on the graph $G[P_i] \cap H_i$.

A recent line of work [10, 11, 13] has built on the initial shortcuts framework of [7], leading to near-optimal PA algorithms for many special classes of graphs.

► **Theorem 5** ([7, 10, 11, 13]). *For any associative operator \oplus , we can solve the partwise aggregation problem in $\tilde{O}(Q_G)$ rounds, where Q_G is a parameter that depends on the graph G and its diameter D , as follows:*

1. For all graphs G , $Q_G = O(\sqrt{n} + D)$.
2. If G has genus g , $Q_G = O(\sqrt{g} + \mathbb{1}D)$.
3. If G has treewidth k , $Q_G = \tilde{O}(kD)$.
4. If G excludes a fixed minor H , $Q_G = \tilde{O}(f(H) \cdot D^2)$, where f is a function depending only on H .

We will define a **PA round** to be one iteration of PA, where every node participating in PA initially knows its part ID, its value x_v , and the common operator \oplus , and at the end, every node learns the aggregate \oplus of its part. Observe that the well-studied *broadcast* procedure can be formulated as a PA problem: if a leader node v in a part P_i wants to broadcast its value x , then we set $x_v \leftarrow x$, $x_u \leftarrow -\infty$ (more precisely, some $O(\log n)$ -bit encoding of $-\infty$) for all $u \in P_i - v$, and \oplus to be the max function.

The PA round assumes that every node knows the ID of its part. Often, we will not have this luxury: each node does not know its part ID, but only which of its neighbors also belong to its part, and in some cases, only a subset of this. Below, we formulate an aggregation task with this weaker assumption, and show that it can be solved using $O(\log n)$ iterations of PA as defined in Definition 4.

► **Definition 6** (Subgraph Aggregation). Let $G = (V, E)$ be a network graph, let $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_{|\mathcal{P}|})$ be a collection of parts, and for each $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$, let H_i be a connected subgraph of G on the nodes in P_i , not necessarily the induced graph $G[P_i]$. Suppose that for each subgraph H_i , every node in $V(H_i)$ knows its neighbors in the subgraph H_i and nothing else. Suppose that every node $v \in \bigcup_i P_i$ has an integer x_v of $O(\log n)$ bits, and let \oplus be an associative function operating on integers of length $O(\log n)$. Every node in P_i wants to learn the value $\bigoplus_{v \in P_i} x_v$, i.e., the aggregate \oplus of all of the values x_v in P_i . We call such a task **subgraph aggregation** with operator \oplus .

Likewise, we define **SA round** to be one iteration of subgraph aggregation (SA), where every node $v \in P_i$ knows its neighbors in H_i , its value x_v , and the common operator \oplus , and at the end, learns the aggregate \oplus of its part. The following lemma shows that while SA has a weaker assumption, it is no harder than partwise aggregation modulo an $O(\log n)$ factor. While this result has been implied in the literature, e.g., in [12], this is the first time it has been stated explicitly. We defer the proof of the following lemma to Appendix A.

► **Lemma 7.** *One SA round can be solved in $O(\log n)$ PA rounds.*

Combining Lemma 7 with Theorem 5 gives the following corollary for treewidth k graphs, which is the result we will use in this paper. Since SA solves a stronger problem than PA or broadcast, we will only use the term SA for the rest of the paper. In fact, the following corollary will be the only result in this section that is used for the rest of the paper.

► **Corollary 8.** *On a graph network of treewidth k , one SA round can be solved in $\tilde{O}(kD)$ rounds.*

2.2 SA Helper Routines

Our main algorithms will use the following routines, all of which reduce to computing $O(\log n)$ rounds of SA. The proof of the statement below is deferred to Appendix A.

► **Lemma 9** (Spanning Tree). *Given a connected subgraph $H \subseteq G$ of the network graph, we can compute a spanning tree of G in $O(\log n)$ SA rounds. Every node knows its neighbors of the spanning tree.*

► **Lemma 10** (Rooted Tree Aggregation). *Consider a tree T in G . Given a root $v_r \in V(T)$, we can compute the tree T rooted at v_r in $O(\log n)$ SA rounds, so that every node in $V(T) - v_r$ knows its parent in the tree T rooted at v_r . Moreover, if each node v_i knows an integer x_i , and a common associative operator \oplus , then we can let each node v_i learn the subtree aggregate $\bigoplus_{j \in T(v_i)} x_j$, where $T(v_i)$ is the subtree rooted at v_i , i.e., all nodes in T whose path to the root contains v_i .*

► **Lemma 11** (Path Aggregation). *Consider a directed path $P = \{v_1, \dots, v_\ell\}$ in G , where each node v_i knows its predecessor and successor on the path. In $O(\log n)$ SA rounds, each node v_i can learn the value of i , its index in the path. Moreover, if each node v_i knows an integer x_i and a common associative operator \oplus , we can let each node v_i learn the prefix aggregate $\bigoplus_{j \leq i} x_j$ and suffix aggregate $\bigoplus_{j \geq i} x_j$.*

► **Lemma 12** (s — t Path). *Given a connected subgraph $H \subseteq G$ and two vertices $s, t \in V$, we can compute a directed s — t path in G in $O(\log n)$ SA rounds. Every node knows whether it is on the path, and if so, its predecessor and successor nodes on that path.*

3 The Vertex-disjoint Paths Algorithm

This section is devoted to proving the following lemma. It is the most technical section of the paper, as well as our main technical contribution.

► **Lemma 13.** *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ of treewidth at most k and two vertices $s, t \subseteq V$, we can either find k vertex-disjoint s — t paths, or output an s — t node cut of size less than k , in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ rounds. In the former case, every node knows whether it is on a path, and if so, its predecessor and successor on that path. In the latter case, every node knows the fact that k vertex-disjoint paths do not exist, as well as whether it is in the node cut.*

When we are talking about graph algorithms in general, not necessarily in the distributed setting, we will use the term **vertices**. When talking about actual nodes in a distributed network, we will use the term **nodes**. This is to distinguish between graphs (in the graph-theoretic sense) and the physical graph network. Often times, it is simpler to first explain an algorithm in a classical setting, and then adapt it to run on a distributed network. For most of this section, we will take this approach, explaining our distributed implementation in gray boxes.

Before introducing our distributed algorithm, we first make one important transformation of the network graph that will be useful later on. Define G^ℓ to be the following graph: for each node $v \in G$, we add r corresponding nodes v^1, \dots, v^ℓ in G^ℓ . For each $v \in G$, we connect the nodes v^1, \dots, v^ℓ in a clique K_r , and for each edge (u, v) in G , we connect the node set u^1, \dots, u^ℓ and the node set v^1, \dots, v^ℓ with a complete bipartite graph $K_{r,r}$.

We would like to *simulate* the network G^ℓ using the network G . In particular, we show how to simulate a T -round algorithm on the network G^ℓ in $O(\ell^2 T)$ rounds on the original network G .

We let every node $v \in V(G)$ in the original network *simulate* the nodes v^1, \dots, v^ℓ in G^ℓ . That is, node v performs the computations that nodes v^1, \dots, v^ℓ perform in the algorithm on G^ℓ . Observe that two nodes $u^i, v^j \in V(G^\ell)$ can communicate in G^ℓ iff either $u = v$, or the nodes $u, v \in V(G)$ that simulate them can communicate in G . If $u = v$, then since the same node u simulates u^i and v^j , no communication between nodes in G is needed. If $u \neq v$, then the edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$ in the original network is responsible for ℓ^2 communicating edges in G^ℓ , namely the edges (u^i, v^j) for $i, j \in [\ell]$. Therefore, for each round of the algorithm on G^ℓ , we can take ℓ^2 rounds to pass the at most ℓ^2 messages in G^ℓ through the edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$.

It is easy to see that the diameter of G^ℓ is also D . The claim below, whose proof is deferred to Appendix B, bounds the treewidth of G^ℓ . By Corollary 8, one SA round on G^ℓ can be solved in $\tilde{O}(k\ell D)$ rounds on $\tilde{O}(k\ell D)$, and the above argument shows that it can be simulated in $\tilde{O}(k\ell^3 D)$ rounds on G .

► **Claim 14.** *If G has treewidth k , then G^ℓ has treewidth $O(k\ell)$.*

For the rest of this section, we will always either run our distributed algorithm directly on G , or run it first on G^ℓ for some ℓ and then simulate it on G . In the latter case, we will simply state that the algorithm is run on G^ℓ ; simulating it on G is implied.

The algorithm models off of the one of [14] for approximating the treewidth in a parallel model. However, new ideas are required to adapt the algorithm in a distributed model. In particular, as we will see, we need to adopt a *graph contraction-based approach* to support the use of SA.

The algorithm is iterative and represents the original Ford-Fulkerson algorithm for maximum flow. It maintains a set of disjoint s – t paths, and, on each iteration, either increases the number of disjoint paths by one through an **augmenting path** step, or certifies that it is not possible to reach k disjoint paths.

On the first iteration, the algorithm simply needs to find a single s – t path. This can be done by Lemma 12. On a general iteration, for the rest of this section, we assume that the algorithm knows r vertex-disjoint paths for $1 \leq r < k$, and needs to find $r + 1$ vertex-disjoint paths.

In the distributed setting, we assume that each node in a path knows its neighbor(s) on the path. We now make each node on a path learn its index on the path; this can be accomplished with Lemma 11 (on network G). In addition, we would like to assign each of the r paths a unique path ID in $[r]$, known to all nodes in the path. This can be accomplished on network G as follows: first, each node sets $x_v \leftarrow ID(v)$ if v belongs in a path, or $-\infty$ otherwise. Then, we compute the maximum x_v inside G using SA. The (unique) node u with $x_u = \max_v x_v$ notifies this event to all nodes in its path P using SA. We assign path P the ID r , known to all its nodes. Then, all nodes in path P drop out of the future path ID computations (i.e., they set $x_v \leftarrow -\infty$ from now on). There are $r - 1$ paths left; we iterate with $r \leftarrow r - 1$ until we are done.

3.1 The Residual Graph

Recall the setting: the algorithm knows r vertex-disjoint paths and tries to find $r + 1$ vertex-disjoint paths. Our algorithm maintains a **reachability graph**, a directed graph with a source s and sink t , such that there is an augmenting path in G iff t is reachable from s in this directed graph. Its construction is directly modeled off of the *residual graph* from the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm and is similar to the “graph decomposition into bridges” in [14]. In general, directed reachability is a hard problem in distributed models and even parallel models, but we will exploit the special structure of the residual graph in the k -vertex disjoint paths problem in order to compute $s \rightarrow t$ reachability efficiently.

Construction of the reachability graph. The steps in our construction are illustrated in Figure 1. First, we construct a directed graph G'_{res} which represents the *residual graph* in the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm following the standard reduction from the vertex-disjoint paths problem to the (directed) edge-disjoint paths problem: for each vertex $v \in V - \{s, t\}$, create two vertices v_{in} and v_{out} with a directed edge (arc) (v_{in}, v_{out}) , and for each (undirected) edge $(u, v) \in E$, add the two arcs (u_{out}, v_{in}) and (v_{out}, u_{in}) . The following fact follows from standard analysis of the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm.

► **Fact 15.** *There is an augmenting path in G iff there is a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path in G'_{res} .*

We now modify the Ford-Fulkerson residual graph G'_{res} as follows: for each vertex $v \in V$ not on one of the r vertex-disjoint paths, we contract the vertices $\{v_{in}, v_{out}\}$ into a single vertex v . The resulting graph is our residual graph G_{res} .

► **Corollary 16.** *There is an augmenting path in G iff there is a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path in G_{res} .*

Proof. Observe that this contraction does not create new, simple $s \rightarrow t$ paths, since given any simple directed $s \rightarrow t$ path P in G_{res} , for each vertex $v \in P$ not on one of the r vertex-disjoint paths, replace the occurrence of v with v_{in}, v_{out} in that order; the resulting path is a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path P in G'_{res} . Clearly, since we only contract vertices, we do not destroy any $s \rightarrow t$ paths. Therefore, there is a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path in G_{res} iff there is one in G'_{res} , and the statement follows from the equivalence in Fact 15. ◀


In fact, since there is always a $t \rightarrow s$ path in G_{res} , we can translate this statement in terms of strong connectivity.

► **Corollary 17.** *There is an augmenting path in G iff s and t are strongly connected in G_{res} .*

The notion of strongly connected components forms the basis of our distributed algorithm. Throughout the algorithm, such as in the next step, we will modify the reachability graph in ways such that s and t are strongly connected after the contraction iff they were strongly connected before.

Let $\overline{G_{res}}$ denote the graph G_{res} with its arcs replaced by undirected edges (with parallel edges removed). Observe that we can “embed” $\overline{G_{res}}$ as a subgraph of G^2 as follows: the nodes $v_{in}, v_{out} \in V(\overline{G_{res}})$ map to $v^1, v^2 \in V(G^2)$, and the nodes s, t map to s^1, t^1 . Therefore, we can simulate the network $\overline{G_{res}}$ using G^2 . From now on, every time we say the distributed algorithm runs on the network $\overline{G_{res}}$, we mean that it runs on G^2 with this embedding.

For each connected component B in $G - \bigcup_j V(P_j)$, we also have $B \subseteq V(G_{res})$; we call B a **bridge** in G_{res} , following the terminology of [14]. Suppose we number the bridges B_1, B_2, \dots . We claim that B_i is strongly connected in the G_{res} . Indeed, for each edge (u, v) in the graph $G - \bigcup_j V(P_j)$, the two arcs $(u_{out}, v_{in}), (v_{out}, u_{in})$ are present in G'_{res} , so the contracted vertices



■ **Figure 1** Top left: the graph G with source s and sink t . The black vertices mark the one existing path found so far. Top right: The residual graph G'_{res} from the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm. Bottom left: The reachability graph G_R vertices only. The two ellipses are the bridges. Bottom right: The same reachability graph G_R . The red arcs mark a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path, which corresponds to a valid augmenting path.

u, v in G_{res} are connected by both arcs (u, v) and (v, u) . Since B_i is connected by such bi-directed arcs, it is strongly connected in G_{res} .

We now proceed to construct a reachability graph G_R . First, for each bridge B_i , contract it into a single vertex β_i , since B_i is strongly connected, this does not change whether or not s and t are strongly connected. For each edge (u, v) in one of the r current paths where u is to the left of v , we remove the arc (v_{out}, u_{in}) . This does not affect the SCCs, since u_{in} is still reachable from v_{out} along the path $v_{out} \rightarrow v_{in} \rightarrow u_{out} \rightarrow u_{in}$. For each of the r existing vertex-disjoint paths P in G , the set of vertices $\{v_{in}, v_{out}\}$ in the reachability graph now form a directed path from t to s ; see Figure 1. We number these directed paths P_1, \dots, P_r . For each such directed path P_i and two vertices $u, v \in V(P_i)$, we say that u is to the **left** of v if v can reach u on the directed path P_j . Equivalently, we say that v is to the **right** of u . We also form a linear ordering of $V(P_j) \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$, where $u < v$ iff u is to the left of v , and $v > -\infty$ and $v < +\infty$ for all $v \in V(P_j)$. Also, for each $j \in [r]$, arrange P_j in rightward order as $v_1, \dots, v_{|P_j|}$ (so that v_1 is adjacent to s), and for each $i \in [|P_j|]$, define $\pi(v_i) := i$, the *index* of v_i on the path P_j .

The resulting directed graph, whose vertices are $(\bigcup_j P_j) \cup \{\beta_i : \text{bridge } B_i\}$, constitutes our reachability graph G_R .

For the distributed setting, the motivation for viewing the bridges B_i as single vertices β_i is that we can communicate within each bridge B_i using SA. Initially, every node in $\bigcup_j V(P_j)$ broadcasts to its neighbors the fact that it belongs to some P_j . Then, for each bridge B_i , each node in V_{B_i} knows that its neighbors in B_i are precisely the neighbors from which it did not receive a broadcast. This knowledge is exactly what is needed for a single SA round.

Construction of the bridge graph.

We next construct the **bridge graph** similarly to [14].

For a bridge B_i and a path P_j , let l_i^j be the leftmost ingoing neighbor of β_i on P_j in G_R , or $-\infty$ if such a neighbor does not exist. In other words, $l_i^j = \min(N_{G_R}^-(\beta_i) \cap P_j)$ according to the linear ordering of P_j , or $-\infty$ if the set $N(B_i) \cap P_j$ is empty. Similarly, let r_i^j be the rightmost outgoing neighbor of B_i on P_j , or ∞ if such a neighbor does not exist. In other words, $r_i^j = \max(N_{G_R}^+(\beta_i) \cap P_j)$. Observe that, by the construction of G_R , we always have $r_i^j \geq l_i^j - 1$; see Figure 1.

By Lemma 11, we can assume that each node $v \in P_j$ knows its index on the path. Then, in $2k$ SA rounds, every node in every bridge B_i can learn the values l_i^j and r_i^j . First, every node on P_j broadcasts its index to all its neighbors in $\overline{G_{res}}$. Then, for each bridge B_i , every node $v \in B_i$ sets x_v^l as the minimum index received from an in-neighbor of P_j in G_{res} , and sets x_v^r as the maximum index received from an out-neighbor of P_j in G_{res} . Then, in two SA rounds, every node learns the minimum x_v^l and maximum x_v^r within its bridge, which are the values l_i^j and r_i^j .

We now construct the bridge graph G_B .

1. The vertices of G_B is the set $\{\beta_i : B_i \text{ is a bridge}\}$.
2. For two bridges B_i, B_x and $j \in [r]$, add an arc (β_i, β_x) to a set D_j if:
 - a. For some path P_y , $l_x^y \leq r_i^y$. Intuitively, this means that we can reach B_x from B_i in G_R by traveling leftward from r_i^y to l_x^y along path P_y .
 - b. We have $r_x^j > r_i^j$. Intuitively, this means that we make “progress” along path P_j , in that we can now reach a vertex in P_j further to the right.
 - c. There is no β_z such that β_z satisfies the above two conditions, and either $r_z^j > r_x^j$, or $r_z^j = r_x^j$ and $ID(B_z) > ID(B_x)$. In other words, ties are broken by ID (assume that each bridge has a unique ID).

For each D_j , we add all arc in D_j to G_B .

We say that a node β_i is **s-reachable** if there is a node in B_i with s as an in-neighbor. Likewise, we say that a node β_i is **t-reachable** if there is a node in B_i with t as an out-neighbor.

We can compute the arc set D_j in a distributed fashion, such that for each β_i , every node in B_i knows the arc $(\beta_i, \beta_x) \in D_j$, if any. We assume that every bridge B_x has computed the values l_x^j and r_x^j for all $j \in [k]$. First, each node $v \in B_x$ broadcasts the value $(\pi(r_x^j), ID(B_x))$ to each in-neighbor in G_{res} on a path P_y . Then, every path P_y computes a prefix maximum of the values $(\pi(r_x^j), ID(B_x))$ sent on the previous step. By maximum, we mean lexicographic, so ties are broken by highest $ID(B_x)$; if nothing is sent over a given prefix, then the maximum is $-\infty$ with an arbitrary ID . By Lemma 11, this maximum can be computed in parallel for each P_j in $O(\log n)$ SA rounds.

At this point, for each $y \in [k]$ and node $v \in P_y$, we have computed the maximum r_x^j over all nodes β_x with $l_x^y \leq v$. We now have every node $v \in P_y$ broadcast this maximum $(\pi(r_x^j), ID(B_x))$ to its in-neighbors in G_{res} . Finally, every bridge B_i computes the maximum $(\pi(r_x^j), ID(B_x))$ received by one of its nodes through a SA round. If the maximum value r_x^j satisfies $r_x^j > r_i^j$, then every node in B_i now knows the arc (β_i, β_x) in D_j .

We remark that our bridge graph construction is slightly different from the one in [14], in order to make it more amenable to distributed computing. We have a statement similar to Theorem 4.1 from [14], stating an equivalence between the residual graph and the bridge graph. By Fact 15, this equivalence also extends to augmenting paths in G . Because the proof resembles the one in [14], we defer it to Appendix B.

► **Lemma 18.** *There is an augmenting path between s and t in G iff there exists s -reachable β_i and t -reachable β_x and a directed $\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_x$ path in G_B .*

Like in [14], our next goal is to determine whether there is an $s \rightarrow t$ path in G_B . Of course, since directed reachability is a difficult problem in general, we need to exploit the special structure of G_B . [14] proceeds by iteratively *shortcutting* the graph, while we proceed using contraction. This deviation from [14] is the main technical contribution of the paper.

From now on, we abuse notation, sometimes referring to D_j as the directed graph whose arcs are precisely D_j . Observe that for each $j \in [r]$, every vertex has out-degree at most 1 in D_j . Also, the directed graph D_j is acyclic, since an arc $\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_x$ implies that $r_x^j > r_i^j$. It follows that D_j is composed of rooted trees, where the arcs point from away from the leaves towards the root. We now show that every rooted tree in D_j is in fact *strongly connected* in G_R .

► **Claim 19.** *Suppose β_i and β_x belong in the same rooted tree in D_j . Then, β_i and β_x are strongly connected in G_{res} .*

Proof. It suffices to prove the statement for pairs β_i, β_x where arc (β_i, β_x) exists in D_j . By condition 2(a) in the construction of G_B , there is a path P_y with $l_x^y \leq r_i^y$. Therefore, from β_i , we move to r_i^y , then (left) along P_y to l_x^y , and then to β_x . From β_x , we can move to r_x^j , then along P_j to l_i^j (since $r_x^j > r_i^j \geq l_i^j - 1$), and finally back to β_i , showing strong connectivity. ◀

With the bridge graph G_B computed, our two remaining steps are: (i) determine if there exists s -reachable β_i and t -reachable β_x and a directed $\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_x$ path in G_B , and (ii) return an augmenting path or a node separator of size r , depending on the outcome of (i).

For the rest of this section, we will shift our main focus from the classical setting to the distributed setting. That is, we will explain our algorithm from a distributed point of view, rather than commenting on distributed implementations in gray boxes.

3.2 Solving the Bridge Graph

Our distributed algorithm differs from the one in [14] by using a *contraction*-based approach, rather than a *shortcutting*-based one. A high-level outline of our algorithm is as follows. First, we contract every rooted tree of D_1 , or equivalently, every connected component in $\overline{D_1}$, the underlying undirected graph of D_1 . We now *recompute* the bridge graph with the corresponding bridges of each connected component merged into a single *super-bridge* in G_{res} . We repeat this process for the remaining $j \in [r]$: contract every connected component in $\overline{D_j}$, recompute the bridge graph, and repeat. The lemma below states the desired property of the contraction algorithm. The proof is deferred to Appendix B due to its length.

► **Lemma 20.** *At the end of the contraction algorithm, there exists s -reachable β_i and t -reachable β_x that contract to the same vertex iff s and t are strongly connected in G_{res} .*

First, for each $j \in [r]$, in the distributed computation of the bridge graph G_B , we can augment the computation of the arc (β_i, β_x) in D_j (if any) so that for each B_i , not only do the nodes know β_x , but also (i) $ID(B_x)$, (ii) the *minimum*² value $y \in [r]$ for which $l_x^y \leq r_i^y$, and (iii) the value $\pi(l_x^y)$; this simply requires broadcasting the auxiliary information on each step, and breaking ties by value of y . Observe that since β_i and β_x belong in the same SCC in G_{res} , so do all nodes $v \in P_y$ with $l_x^y \leq v \leq r_i^y$.

We now describe our algorithm for contracting the connected components in $\overline{D_1}$. Our next goal is to find, for each connected component C in $\overline{D_1}$, a subgraph H_C^1 in G_{res} spanning the

² It is not important that this is minimum and not maximum or even arbitrary. However, we assume minimum because uniqueness will make our analysis easier to present.

bridges B_i whose nodes β_i are in that component. Every node in the subgraph should know its neighbors in the subgraph. Moreover, this subgraph should be a tree, a property that will be useful later for recovery.

For each arc (β_i, β_x) in C , consider the corresponding pair (l_x^y, r_i^y) as mentioned above. We want to connect together all nodes $v \in P_y$ with $l_x^y \leq v \leq r_i^y$ into H_C^1 . In other words, each node $v \in P_y$ should know whether there exists an (l_x^y, r_i^y) pair such that $l_x^y < v \leq r_i^y$; if so, the node v connects to its leftward adjacent node on P_j . We accomplish this task as follows: first, every bridge B_i with an arc (β_i, β_x) in D_1 and corresponding pair (l_x^y, r_i^y) sends the value $\pi(l_x^y)$ to node r_i^y , which is necessarily adjacent to B_i in $\overline{G_{res}}$. Then, for each $y \in [r]$, the nodes on P_y compute a suffix minimum of the sent $\pi(l_x^y)$ values. It is clear that for each node $v \in P_y$, there exists (l_x^y, r_i^y) with $l_x^y < v \leq r_i^y$ iff the suffix minimum at v is strictly less than $\pi(v)$. Therefore, v joins its leftward neighbor iff its suffix minimum is less than $\pi(v)$.

Observe that if node v has suffix minimum exactly $\pi(v)$, then node v is at the left endpoint of some (l_x^y, r_i^y) pair. We claim that the converse is true.

► **Claim 21.** *Suppose the arc (β_i, β_x) exists in D_1 , and consider the minimum $y \in [r]$ such that $l_x^y \leq r_i^y$. Then, the suffix minimum at l_x^y is exactly $\pi(l_x^y)$. Moreover, there does not exist an arc $(\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x'})$ in D_1 such that $x \neq x'$ and $l_x^y = l_{x'}^y$.*

Proof. Suppose the first statement is false. Then, there is some other arc $(\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x'})$ in D_j such that $l_{x'}^y \leq l_x^y \leq r_i^y$. Assume that either $r_{x'}^1 > r_x^1$, or $r_{x'}^1 = r_x^1$ and $ID(B_{x'}) > ID(B_x)$. Then, since $l_{x'}^y \leq l_x^y \leq r_i^y$ and $r_{x'}^1 \geq r_x^1 > r_i^1$, $\beta_{x'}$ violates condition 2(c) for (β_i, β_x) in the definition of the bridge graph, contradiction. The other case, assuming that either $r_x^1 > r_{x'}^1$, or $r_x^1 = r_{x'}^1$ and $ID(B_x) > ID(B_{x'})$ is symmetric: we have β_x violating condition 2(c) for $(\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x'})$. For the second statement, if such an arc $(\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x'})$ exists, then without loss of generality, assume that either $r_{x'}^1 > r_x^1$, or $r_{x'}^1 = r_x^1$ and $ID(B_{x'}) > ID(B_x)$ (we swap x and x' otherwise). Then, since $l_{x'}^y \leq l_x^y$, we can apply the proof of the first statement to get a contradiction. ◀


This finishes the edges of H_C^1 within each P_j . Of course, we can repeat the above in parallel for each connected component C in $\overline{D_1}$. We now augment the above computation so that when computing suffix minimum, the value $ID(B_x)$ is recovered along with the minimum $\pi(l_x^y)$. Then, if a node $v \in P_y$ has suffix minimum exactly $\pi(v)$, then v connects to its neighbor(s) in B_x in H_C^1 , where C is the component containing β_x . Then, for each arc (β_i, β_x) in D_1 and minimum y for which $l_x^y \leq r_i^y$, the bridge B_i connects to r_i^y in H_C^1 , where C is the component containing β_i . Finally, within each bridge B_i , add a spanning tree of B_i into the corresponding subgraph H_C^1 using Lemma 9. This concludes our construction of the subgraph for each connected component in D_1 .

We now prove some properties of the subgraphs H_C^1 . The tree property below does not help us in the contraction phase, but it will help in recovering paths in the recovery phase.

► **Claim 22.** *The subgraphs H_C^1 satisfy the following properties:*

1. *For every connected component C in $\overline{D_1}$, there is a subgraph spanning (precisely) the bridges in C .*
2. *Any two subgraphs are disjoint.*
3. *Every subgraph is a tree.*

Proof. Claim 21 implies the following statement: for any two arcs $(\beta_i, \beta_x), (\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x'})$ in D_1 , either the path $r_i^y \rightarrow l_x^y$ on P_y and the path $r_{i'}^y \rightarrow l_{x'}^y$ on P_y are disjoint, or $x = x'$. If $x = x'$, then the arcs $(\beta_i, \beta_x), (\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x'})$ belong to the same connected component in $\overline{D_1}$. Therefore, if $(\beta_i, \beta_x), (\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x'})$ belong to different connected components, then the segments $r_i^y \rightarrow l_x^y$ and $r_{i'}^y \rightarrow l_{x'}^y$ do not intersect. It is easy to see by the algorithm that each constructed H_C^1 is disjoint. This proves (1) and (2).



■ **Figure 2** Top: the bridges B_i with their relevant edges l_j^i, r_i^j in green and blue. The dotted red edges mark the arcs in D_1 connecting the β_i . Bottom: the subgraph H_C^1 for the connected component $\{\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5\}$ in $\overline{D_1}$.

For property (3), fix a subgraph H_C^1 . For each $\beta_i \in C$, the corresponding bridge B_i induces a tree in H_C^1 by construction. Therefore, the subgraph H_C^1 is acyclic iff the graph obtained by contracting each bridge B_i in H_C^1 is acyclic. Suppose we take H_C^1 and contract each B_i into a vertex β_i , so that the new graph, called H , is now a subgraph of G_R . To prove that H is acyclic, we start with $\overline{D_1}$ and transform it into H while preserving the acyclicity of $\overline{D_1}$. For each $\beta_x \in C$ with positive in-degree in D_1 , let $\beta_{x_1}, \dots, \beta_{x_\ell}$ be the in-neighbors of β_x . In H_C^1 , the algorithm adds the union of the (now undirected) paths $r_{x_i}^y \rightarrow l_x^y$ to H_C^1 ; in addition, for each β_{x_i} , the algorithm adds an edge connecting B_{x_i} to $r_{x_i}^y$. The set of edges added is a tree connecting the vertices $\beta_x, \beta_{x_1}, \dots, \beta_{x_\ell}$ of H ; call this tree T_x . For each β_x in $\overline{D_1}$, we delete the edges (β_x, β_{x_i}) in $\overline{D_1}$ and add T_x (as well as any extra vertices). Since we always delete a tree and add back a tree, the graph remains acyclic. At the end, we have added exactly the edges in H_C^1 , proving that H_C^1 is acyclic. Lastly, H_C^1 is connected by property (1), so it is a tree. ◀

Since the subgraphs H_C^1 are disjoint, they serve as the nodes after contracting every connected component of $\overline{D_1}$ in the classical algorithm, and we can communicate within each contracted component in one SA round. We would like to continue this algorithm for $j = 2, \dots, r$, always maintaining subgraphs H_C^j that are trees spanning the super-bridges in the connected components of $\overline{D_j}$, but we run into the following obstacle: when constructing the subgraph on the next iteration, we might reuse edges in $E(H_C^1) \cap E(\bigcup_j P_j)$, i.e., the edges in H_C^1 inside the paths P_j . Reusing these edges may destroy the tree property of H_C^j .

We fix this problem as follows. Our goal is to construct a graph G^+ that “embeds” into G^{2r} (the same way $\overline{G_{res}}$ embeds into G^2). Replace each node in $v \in \bigcup_j P_j$ with r copies v^1, \dots, v^r , connected together in a clique, with each node v^j sharing the same neighbors as v . Let us call this network G^+ . Observe that G^+ embeds into $(G_{res})^r$ and G_{res} embeds into G , which means that G^+ embeds into G^{2r} .

We run the algorithm on G^+ instead, which we then simulate on G . For the first iteration $j = 1$, every node v^1 now takes the role of node $v \in \bigcup_i P_i$. This way, in future iteration $j = 2, \dots, r$, we always have a fresh set of nodes, namely the nodes v^j , to use in iteration j . For

iteration $j = 2 \dots, r$, we repeat the algorithm for $j = 1$ with three main differences: (i) before the iteration, every super-bridge is now the nodes in some H_C^{j-1} , (ii) we do not add a spanning tree inside each bridge, since we already have one from iteration $j - 1$, and (iii) every node v^j now takes the role of node $v \in \bigcup_i P_i$. Since our algorithm emulates the classical algorithm, we know by Lemma 20 that after all r iterations, there is a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path iff there is an s -reachable bridge and a t -reachable bridge in the same subgraph H_C^r . Our next goal is to, depending on this outcome, either find an augmenting path in G_{res} or find an $s-t$ node cut of size at most r .

3.3 Finding an Augmenting Path

First of all, it is easy to test if there exists a subgraph H_C^r with both an s -reachable and t -reachable bridge: in two SA rounds, the s -reachable bridges and the t -reachable bridges broadcast in their subgraphs H_C^r . If there exists a subgraph H_C^r with both s -reachable and t -reachable bridges, then we show how find an augmenting path in G_{res} . Note that this task is not trivial, since while there exists a (unique) path from the s -reachable and t -reachable bridges in H_C^r , this path may go rightward along a path P_j , which is not allowed.


For illustration, suppose first that in some H_C^1 , there already exist an s -reachable bridge B_s and a t -reachable bridge B_t . Let β_x be the “root” of the component (tree) C in D_1 , i.e., the unique β_x with no out-arc in D_1 . The unique path from B_s to B_x in H_C^1 only goes left along the paths P_j , since every time we travel along an arc in D_1 from B_s to B_x , we traverse leftward along one path P_j from one bridge to another. Moreover, we can compute this path in $O(\log n)$ SA rounds using Lemma 12. Next, we “trim” the path by removing all edges completely inside B_s or B_x .

If $B_x = B_t$, then we skip the next step; otherwise, since there is a path from B_t to B_x in D_1 , we have $r_x^1 > r_t^1$. Combining this with $r_t^1 \geq l_t^1 - 1$ gives $r_x^1 \geq l_t^1$. Therefore, we can extend this path from B_x to travel left from r_x^1 to l_t^1 , and then enter B_t . Again, by using Lemma 12, we can establish this path in $O(\log n)$ SA rounds, and then trim it by removing all edges completely inside B_x or B_t . Finally, we connect the ends of the B_s-B_x and B_x-B_t paths inside B_x , which can be done in $O(\log n)$ SA rounds.

Lastly, it remains to connect node s to the B_s -end of the path, and to connect the B_t -end of the path to t . Again, these take $O(\log n)$ SA rounds.

In general, we process the graphs in reverse order $H_C^r, H_C^{r-1}, \dots, H_C^1$. For a graph H_C^j , we first repeat the algorithm for the H_C^1 case above, treating the connected components of H_C^{j-1} as the contracted bridges. Observe that all edges outside any component H_C^{j-1} must travel leftward along the paths P_j . We now erase all edges inside each traversed component H_C^{j-1} and connect the two broken endpoints in H_C^{j-1} on the next iteration. At the end, we have constructed a path P^+ that only travels left along paths P_j .

The last issue is that unlike the H_C^1 case, this path P^+ may not be simple. Indeed, since there are r copies of each node in $\bigcup_j P_j$, a single arc in some P_j can be traversed left up to r times, once in each copy. We can fix this issue with the following “shortcutting” step: first, number the nodes on P^+ from 1 to $|P^+|$ using Lemma 11, and suppose every other node gets value $x_v := 0$. Then, for each node $v \in \bigcup_j P_j$, every node $\{v^1, \dots, v^r\}$ updates $x_{v^i} \leftarrow \max_h x_{v^h}$, which can be done in one round since the nodes v^1, \dots, v^r are connected by a clique. Then, every node $v \in P^+$ computes a prefix maximum of the x_u values in the path. For each $v \in P^+$, if this maximum is greater than x_v , then the path P^+ can be pruned before x_v is reached; see Figure 3. Therefore, node $v \in P^+$ drops out of the path P^+ . Finally, we collapse the graph G^+ back into G , giving our desired simple augmenting path in G_{res} . Lastly, translating the augmenting path in G_{res} to $r + 1$ vertex-disjoint paths in G can be done as in the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm.



■ **Figure 3** Left: the path P^+ . Right: collapsing the path P^+ ; the numbers are the updated x_v values.

3.4 Finding a Node Cut

If there is no subgraph H_C^r with both an s -reachable and t -reachable bridge, then there is no augmenting path, so the algorithm needs to find an s – t node cut S of size at most k .

Let \mathcal{B}_s denote all bridges B_i inside some subgraph H_C^r containing an s -reachable bridge. For each bridge B_i to learn whether or not $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_s$, we have every node inside a bridge that is adjacent to s broadcast to its subgraph H_C^r ; the bridges $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_s$ are precisely the ones that receive such a broadcast.

We now present a set of k nodes, one from each P_k , that form an s – t node cut; a similar construction is presented in the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [14]. For path P_j , let w'_j be the rightmost r_j^i over all bridges $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$. Necessarily, $w'_j = v_{in}$ for some v on the vertex-disjoint path in G_{res} corresponding to P_j ; let w_j be this node v . If this node does not exist, i.e., $r_j^i = -\infty$ for all bridges $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$, then let w_j be the first node on P_j (the one adjacent to s).

We now show how to compute the nodes w_j for each $j \in [r]$. First, every bridge $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_s$ notifies node r_j^i ; then, every node in $v \in P_j$ sets x_v to be its index on P_j if it is notified, and 1 otherwise. The nodes in P_j then compute aggregate maximum of the values x_v . Finally, the node $v \in P_j$ whose index is exactly its value x_v becomes w_j .

► **Lemma 23.** *The set $\{w_1, \dots, w_r\}$ is a node cut of G .*

Proof. First, we would like to extend Lemma 20 to the following statement: at the end of the contraction algorithm, an s -reachable β_i and a (not necessarily t -reachable) vertex β_x contract to the same vertex iff s and B_i are strongly connected in G_{res} . To do so, imagine changing the graph G_{res} as follows: remove all arcs from any bridge to t and add a single arc from a vertex in B_x to t . With this modification, the graphs G_R and G_B do not change, but now, only β_x is t -reachable; applying Lemma 20 proves the statement. From now on, we forget this modification, i.e., we stick with the original G_{res} .

Observe that the distributed algorithm follows the contraction algorithm of Lemma 20; in particular, every subgraph H_C^r contains the bridges B_i whose vertices β_i get contracted to a single vertex in the contraction algorithm. Therefore, the bridges $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$ are precisely the β_i that get contracted to the same vertex as some s -reachable bridge. By the statement at the beginning of this proof, these bridges B_i are precisely those strongly connected to s .

The rest of our proof resembles the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [14]. Suppose for contradiction that there is a simple s – t path P in $G - \{w_1, \dots, w_r\}$. Consider the subsequence of vertices in P that are also in $\bigcup_j P_j$. At some point, we must have two vertices $v, v' \in \bigcup_j P_j$ adjacent on this subsequence such that for the paths $P_j, P_{j'}$ containing v and v' respectively, we have $v < w_j$ and $v' > w_{j'}$. The vertices v, v' cannot be adjacent in P , so there must be vertices inside a single bridge B_i in between the occurrences of v and v' on P . This bridge B_i satisfies $l_i^j < w_j$ and $r_i^{j'} > w_{j'}$. Since $w_j = r_{i'}^j$ for some $B_{i'} \in \mathcal{B}$, vertex w_j is reachable

from s . Therefore, vertex l_i^j is also reachable from s , and so is B_i , which means that s and B_i are strongly connected in G_{res} . In particular, $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$, so $w_{j'} \geq r_i^{j'}$ by definition of $w_{j'}$, contradicting the assumption that $r_i^{j'} > w_{j'}$. ◀

This finishes the k -vertex disjoint paths algorithm and Lemma 2.

3.5 Running on Multiple Subgraphs

We have proved our main result of this section, Lemma 2, restated below for reference. Below, we state some modifications of this result that are more directly useful in the next section.

► **Lemma 2.** *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ of treewidth at most k and two vertices $s, t \subseteq V$, we can either find k vertex-disjoint s – t paths, or output an s – t node cut of size less than k , in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ rounds. In the former case, every node knows whether it is on a path, and if so, its predecessor and successor on that path. In the latter case, every node knows the fact that k vertex-disjoint paths do not exist, as well as whether it is in the node cut.*

First, we obtain a generalization where we want to find vertex-disjoint paths between two sets of nodes, not just s, t , within a connected subgraph of G , not G itself. Moreover, this formulation includes *forbidden* nodes, those which cannot appear in any vertex-disjoint path.

► **Corollary 24.** *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ of treewidth k , a set $U \subseteq V$ such that $G[U]$ is connected, and three disjoint vertex sets $A, B \subseteq V - U$ and $X \subseteq U$, we can either find k vertex-disjoint A – B paths whose internal nodes belong in $G[U] - X$, or conclude that k vertex-disjoint paths do not exist, in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ rounds. In the positive case, every vertex knows whether it is on a path, and if so, its predecessor and successor on that path. In the negative case, every vertex knows the fact that k vertex-disjoint paths do not exist.*

Proof. The subgraph is not an issue, because any simulated network $G[U]^\ell$ in the algorithm is a subgraph of G^ℓ , so we can simulate network $G[U]^\ell$ on G^ℓ first, and then on G .

To address the A – B paths modification, imagine adding a node s whose neighbors are precisely A , and a node t whose neighbors are precisely B . The *virtual* nodes s, t do not exist in the network, but observe that through the algorithm of Lemma 2, the only times when nodes s and t are active are (i) when we compute prefix/suffix aggregates on at most k paths, and (ii) when we compute a path with s and/or t as an endpoint, in an attempt to find an augmenting path. In case (i), for each path P_y , the node $v \in P_y$ with $\pi(v) = 2$ (i.e., the node to the immediate right of s) can take the role of s in prefix computations; likewise, the node with $\pi(v) = |P_y| - 1$ can take the role of t in suffix computations.³ In case (ii), the nodes in A and B , which are in the network, can take the role of nodes s and t . For example, if we have an s -reachable bridge and we want a path from s to a specific node v in the bridge B_i , then we instead compute a path from a node in $N(s) \cap B_i$ to v .

Lastly, the *forbidden* node set X is also not a problem: when computing the bridges B_i , these nodes purposefully do not join any bridge. ◀

The next generalization really emphasizes the power of the shortcuts framework: suppose, instead, that we want to solve k vertex-disjoint paths on a subgraph $H \subseteq G$. Actually, we want to solve multiple instances of the problem on vertex-disjoint subgraphs H_1, \dots, H_ℓ . Then, we can solve them all simultaneously in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ rounds!

³ The corner case $|P_y| = 2$ can be ignored, since we can greedily choose the single edge from s to t as a path. Likewise, if any nodes in A and B are adjacent, we can greedily choose them as vertex-disjoint paths.

► **Corollary 25.** *Given multiple instances (U_i, A_i, B_i, X_i) in Corollary 24 such that the node sets U_i are disjoint, we can, simultaneously for each (U_i, A_i, B_i, X_i) , either find k vertex-disjoint A_i – B_i paths whose internal nodes belong in $G[U_i] - X_i$, or conclude that k vertex-disjoint paths do not exist, in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ total rounds.*

Proof. For each instance (U_i, A_i, B_i, X_i) , every step of the algorithm either runs on network $G[U_i]$, or on $G[U_i]^{\ell_i}$ for some $\ell_i \leq k$. Since the networks $G[U_i]^{\ell_i}$ are disjoint subgraphs of G^k for different U_i , we simulate every network $G[U_i]$ or $G[U_i]^{\ell_i}$ on G^k . Therefore, on each step, the SA tasks of the different instances can be simultaneously solved on G^k in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ rounds, which is then simulated on G in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$ rounds. ◀

4 Algorithm Outside Disjoint Paths

In this section, we provide the rest of the algorithm for approximating treewidth, which uses the k -vertex disjoint paths problem as a subroutine. It is a combination of the efficient sequential and parallel algorithms in [16, 15]. It will make repeated calls to the algorithm of Corollary 25, the corollary of Lemma 2 in the previous section.

The treewidth approximation algorithm, which is recursive, uses the concept of graph separators, defined below.

► **Definition 26** (Separation). Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $A, B, S \subseteq V$. We say that S **separates** G into A and B if A, B, S partition V and $N(A) \subseteq S$ and $N(B) \subseteq S$. Note that A and B are not necessarily connected, which means that there could be multiple choices for A and B . In addition, for disjoint $X, Y \subseteq S$, we say that S is an X – Y **separator** if there exist $A, B \subseteq V$ with $X \subseteq A, Y \subseteq B$ such that S separates G into A and B .

► **Definition 27** (Balanced Separation). Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $X \subseteq V$. A set $S \subseteq V$ is an (X, α) -**balanced separator** of G if there exist $A, B \subseteq V$ such that S separates G into A and B and $|A \cap X|, |B \cap X| \leq \alpha|X|$. When $X = V$, we omit the X , using the term α -**balanced separator** instead.

The following well-known fact states that if G has bounded treewidth, then it admits constant-sized balanced separators for any $X \subseteq V$.

► **Lemma 28** (Lemma 7.20 of [4]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph of treewidth k . For any set $X \subseteq V$, there exists an $(X, 2/3)$ -balanced separator of G of size $k + 1$.*

The algorithm is recursive, always running on an instance (U, X) with $U \subseteq V, X \subseteq N[U]$, and $|X| \leq 7k + 4$. It starts with $(U, X) = (V, \emptyset)$. The algorithm has two cases, depending on whether the current recursion depth is odd or even (the initial instance (V, \emptyset) has recursion depth 0). The even case finds a balanced separator S of size $\leq k + 1$ in the graph $G[U]$,⁴ separating the current graph into components whose sizes are a constant fraction smaller, and for each component U' of vertices, recursively calls $(U', N[U'] \cap (X \cup S))$. This guarantees the algorithm $O(\log n)$ recursion depth, but comes at a cost: the size of X increases by $\leq k + 1$ upon the next recursion call (to the odd case). This increase is remedied in the odd case below, which on input (U, X) finds a set S that separates $G[U]$ into components, each with $\leq \frac{2}{3}|X|$ vertices in X , and for each component U' of vertices, recursively calls $(U', N[U'] \cap (X \cup S))$. If $|X| \geq 6k + 4$, then

$$(U', N[U'] \cap (X \cup S)) \leq \frac{2}{3}|X| + |S| = |X| - \frac{1}{3}|X| + |S| \leq |X| - \frac{1}{3}(6k + 4) + (k + 1) = |X| - k - \frac{1}{3},$$

⁴ Of course, if no such balanced separator S is found, the algorithm can immediately exit and conclude that $\text{tw}(G) > k$.

so the size of X is reduced by $k + 1$. Thus, by alternating the recursion between odd and even depth, we can maintain the invariant $|X| \leq 6k + 4$ while reducing the size of U by a constant on every two iterations.

The distributed implementation runs through the recursion tree in parallel. Namely, it proceeds in T super-rounds, where T is the maximum recursion depth of the recursive algorithm. On super-round $t \in [T]$, the distributed algorithm processes all instances (U, X) at recursion depth t . Here, we will use the crucial property that the sets U in this recursion layer are connected and pairwise disjoint.

4.1 Odd Recursion Depth

In this case, our goal is to reduce the size of X sufficiently. We know by Lemma 28, there exists an $(X, 2/3)$ -balanced separator in G . Suppose S is this separator, which separates G into A and B such that $|A \cap X|, |B \cap X| \leq (2/3)|X|$. If we let $Y := A \cap X$ and $Z := B \cap X$, then this means that $|Y|, |Z| \leq \frac{2}{3}|X|$ and the set S contains $X - (Y \cup Z)$ and is an Y - Z separator. The algorithm proceeds by trying all possible values of Y and Z and finding such a set S .

The algorithm for odd recursion depth proceeds as follows. For all partitions X', Y, Z of X with $|Y|, |Z| \leq \frac{2}{3}|X|$, try to find an Y - Z separator in the graph $G[U] - X'$ of size $\leq (k+1) - |X'|$, which is an instance of $(k+1 - |X'|)$ -VERTEX DISJOINT PATHS. If no such separator is found over all Y, Z , terminate the algorithm and output the conclusion that $\text{tw}(G) > k$. Else, for partition X', Y, Z and Y - Z separator S' , let $S := X' \cup S'$, and for each component U' of vertices in $G[U] - S$, recursively call $(U', N[U'] \cap (X \cup S))$. If the graph $G[U] - S$ is empty, then this recursion branch terminates.

Like the above algorithm, the distributed algorithm iterates over all $O(3^k)$ partitions X', Y, Z . We can elect a leader in U to decide which partition X', Y, Z to try next, and broadcast it to the other nodes in U using SA. For $(k+1 - |X'|)$ -VERTEX DISJOINT PATHS, one difficulty is that we want our computation to depend on $X \not\subseteq U$ and yet run only on nodes in U , since only the sets U are disjoint over instances, not X . This is the reason for the specifications of Corollary 25. In fact, we simply solve $(k+1 - |X'|)$ -VERTEX DISJOINT PATHS using Corollary 25 with parameters $(A, B, X) := (Y, Z, X')$, taking time $\tilde{O}(k^{O(1)}D)$.

4.2 Even Recursion Depth

In this case, our goal is to separate the current graph into components a constant factor smaller, in order to bound the recursion depth by $O(\log n)$. We first introduce the concept of splitters from [15].

► **Definition 29** (B -splitter). For a rooted, spanning tree $T \subseteq G[U]$, a set of vertices $R \subseteq U$ is a B -splitter if $|R| \leq n/B$ and every connected component in $T - R$ has less than B vertices.

For a vertex $v \in U$, define $\text{desc}(v)$ and $\text{children}(v)$ as the children and descendants of v , respectively. Define $\text{sub_size}(v)$ as the number of vertices in the subtree rooted at v . Let R be all the vertices $v \in U$ satisfying the following condition:

$$1 + \sum_{u \in \text{children}(v)} (\text{sub_size}(u) \bmod B) > k.$$

► **Theorem 30** (Theorem 9.2 in [15]). *The set R defined above is an R -splitter.*

The distributed algorithm first computes an arbitrary spanning tree T of $G[U]$, e.g., by computing an MST with arbitrary weights following [7], and roots it at an arbitrary vertex. At this point, every node knows its parent and children in the rooted tree. To compute the set R , each node $v \in U$ first computes the size of its subtree in T ; this can be done in $O(\log n)$ SA rounds using tree aggregation techniques in [12]. Then, each node broadcasts $\text{sub_size}(v)$ to its parent node in a single round, so that each node can determine whether it joins R .

The rest of this even recursion section is based on [16]. For each vertex $r \in R$, we define

$$w_r := \text{sub_size}(r) - \sum_{r' \in \text{desc}(r) \cap R} \text{sub_size}(r'),$$

and for $R' \subseteq R$, $w_{R'} := \sum_{r \in R'} w_r$. In other words, w_r is the number of vertices v for which r is the first vertex in R encountered on the path from v to the root. Also, observe that $\sum_{r \in R} w_r = |U|$. The following lemma states that if a separator X does not intersect R , then the values w_r approximately determine the size of a separated component.

► **Lemma 31** (Lemma 2 in [16]). *Consider a set $X \subseteq U$ with $|X| \leq k$ and $X \cap R = \emptyset$ which separates G into A and B . Then,*

$$||A| - w(A \cap R)| \leq kB,$$

and the same holds for B .

We compute an R -splitter with $B := n/(12k)$, so that $|R| \leq 12k$. By Lemma 28, there exists an $(X, 2/3)$ -balanced separator of G into A and B . If $X \cap R = \emptyset$, then by Lemma 31,

$$w(A \cap R) \leq |A| + kB \leq (2/3)|U| + (1/12)|U| = (9/12)|U|,$$

and the same holds for B . Therefore, letting $Y := A \cap R$ and $Z := B \cap R$, we conclude that there exists a partition Y, Z of R with $w(Y), w(Z) \leq (9/12)|U|$ that admits a Y – Z separator in $G[U] - R$ of size $\leq k + 1$. The algorithm tries all possible such Y, Z and tries to find a separator for each. If a separator S is found, then by Lemma 31,

$$|A| \leq w(A \cap R) + kB \leq (9/12)|U| + (1/12)|U| = (10/12)|U|,$$

so S is an $(X, 10/12)$ -balanced separator, giving us the necessary constant factor decrease.

Otherwise, if no S is found, we must have $X \cap R \neq \emptyset$. In this case, we brute-force over which one of the $|R| \leq 12k$ vertices belongs in X . If we guess $r \in R$, then we would like to solve the instance $(U - r, X)$, except we look for a separator of size k instead of $k + 1$.

It is possible for $U - r$ to be disconnected, in which case only the largest component still needs to be separated, since the other components have size $\leq (1/2)|U|$. Therefore, if U' is the largest component of $G[U] - r$, then we solve the instance $(U', N[U'] \cap X)$ with k decreased by 1. This is a recursion that is completely contained inside the (U, X) instance; it has nothing to do with the main recursion, so it does not distinguish between even and odd recursion levels.

Overall, an instance with value k results in $\leq 12k$ recursive instances of value $k - 1$. A straightforward induction shows that this recursion tree has size $\leq k^{O(k)}$.

The values w_r can be computed in a distributed setting as follows: every node $r \in R$ sets $x_r := w_r$ and every other node $v \in V - R$ sets $x_v := 0$. Then, every node computes $\sum_{u \in \text{desc}(v)} x_u$ in $O(\log n)$ shortcut rounds using tree aggregation techniques in [12]. Since every node $r \in R$ already knows $\text{sub_size}(r)$, it can locally compute $w_r = \text{sub_size}(r) - \sum_{u \in \text{desc}(r)} x_u$.

The recursion within each (U, X) instance is done sequentially, which results in $k^{O(k)}$ se-

quential calls to s -VERTEX DISJOINT PATHS for $s \leq k + 1$, taking total time $\tilde{O}(k^{O(k)})$.

5 Applications

This section proves Theorem 3, restated below.

► **Theorem 3.** *Let G be a graph network with treewidth k . The problems maximum independent set, minimum vertex cover, chromatic number, and minimum dominating set can be solved in $\tilde{O}(k^{O(k)}D)$ rounds on network G .*

For conciseness, we only provide a distributed algorithm for maximum independent set; the algorithms for the other problems are straightforward modifications.

We first introduce our notation for treewidth decompositions. A *treewidth decomposition* of a graph G is a tree \mathcal{T} whose vertices, called *bags*, are subsets of $V(G)$. The tree \mathcal{T} satisfies three properties: (i) the union of vertices over all bags equals $V(G)$; (ii) for each $v \in V$, the set of bags containing v is connected in \mathcal{T} ; (iii) for each edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$, there is a bag containing both u and v . The *treewidth* of a graph G is the minimum k such that there exists a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of G whose bag sizes are at most $k + 1$.

5.1 The Classical Algorithm

Let us now sketch the traditional algorithm for maximum independent set on bounded treewidth graphs. For an input graph G of treewidth k , the algorithm first computes a treewidth decomposition of the graph with bag sizes bounded by $O(k)$. Then, the algorithm applies dynamic programming on this treewidth decomposition; we sketch this dynamic program below. This presentation of the dynamic programming algorithm is not the most standard or the most efficient, but it will translate more smoothly when we adapt it to the distributed setting.

The dynamic program. Root the tree \mathcal{T} at a root vertex $r \in V(\mathcal{T})$. For each vertex $v \in V(\mathcal{T})$, let its bag be B_v . For each bag B_v and subset $I \subseteq B_v$, we will define dynamic programming states $\text{Join}(B_v, I)$. For each vertex $v \in V(\mathcal{T}) - \{r\}$ and its parent $p \in V(\mathcal{T})$ in the rooted tree \mathcal{T} , for subsets $I_v \subseteq B_v$ and $I_p \subseteq B_p$, we will define dynamic programming states $\text{Extend}(B_v, I_v, B_p, I_p)$. These are defined as follows:

1. For each vertex $v \in V(\mathcal{T})$ that is a leaf in the rooted tree \mathcal{T} and each $I_v \subseteq B_v$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Join}(B_v, I_v) &:= |I_v| \text{ if } I_v \text{ is an independent set in } G[B_v], \\ &- \infty \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Our goal is for the optimal size of the independent set to be the best value of $\text{Join}(B_r, I_r)$, i.e., $\max_{B_r \subseteq I_r} \text{Join}(B_r, I_r)$. Clearly, if r is a leaf (i.e., the tree \mathcal{T} is a single vertex), then this is true. Otherwise, we will define Join for non-leaf vertices later.

2. For each vertex $v \in V(\mathcal{T}) - \{r\}$ and its parent p , and each $I_v \subseteq B_v, I_p \subseteq B_p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Extend}(B_v, I_v, B_p, I_p) &:= \text{Join}(B_v, I_v) + |I_p - I_v| \text{ if } I_v \cap (B_v \cap B_p) = I_p \cap (B_v \cap B_p) \\ &\text{ and } I_v, I_p \text{ are independent sets in } G[B_v], G[B_p], \\ &- \infty \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In other words, we try to *extend* the state I_v in B_p to the state I_p in B_p , but this is only valid if the sets I_v, I_p agree on the vertices shared by B_v and B_p , namely $B_v \cap B_p$.

3. For each non-leaf vertex p , let $\text{children}(p)$ denote the children of p in \mathcal{T} . For each $I_p \subseteq B_p$,

$$\text{Join}(B_p, I_p) := |I_p| + \sum_{v \in \text{children}(p)} \max_{I_v \subseteq B_v} (\text{Extend}(B_v, I_v, B_p, I_p) - |I_p|) \quad (3)$$

if I_p is an independent set in $G[B_p]$,
 – ∞ otherwise

It is a routine exercise in algorithm design on bounded treewidth graphs to argue that this algorithm is correct. The main observation is that in the dynamic program, once $\text{Join}(B_p, I_p)$ “forgets” the vertices in $B_v - B_p$ for some $v \in \text{children}(p)$, these vertices never appear again on any $\text{Join}(B_{p'}, I_{p'})$ for any p' on the path from p to the root r , due to property (ii) of the treewidth decomposition.

Recovering the solution. Thus, $\max_{I_r \subseteq B_r} \text{Join}(B_r, I_r) =: \text{OPT}$ is the size of the maximum independent set in G . To compute the actual maximum independent set, we follow the traditional procedure of “reversing” the dynamic program, starting from the root r :

1. For I_r^* , pick an arbitrary set $I_r \subseteq B_r$ that satisfies $\text{Join}(B_r, I_r) = \text{OPT}$, i.e.,

$$I_r^* := \arg \max_{I_r \subseteq B_r} \text{Join}(B_r, I_r). \quad (4)$$

2. For each non-leaf vertex p and each $v \in \text{children}(p)$, define

$$I_v^* := \arg \max_{I_v \subseteq B_v} (\text{Extend}(B_v, I_v, B_p^*, I_p^*) - |I_v^*|). \quad (5)$$

3. At the end, the returned maximum independent set is $\bigcup_{v \in V(\mathcal{T})} I_v^*$.

5.2 Distributed Implementation

Suppose the input (and network) graph G has treewidth t . We first run the treewidth algorithm of Theorem 1, computing a treewidth decomposition with maximum bag size $O(k)$. However, one immediate issue is that the nodes in each bag

The first attempt is to adapt the treewidth algorithm of Theorem 1 into computing an actual treewidth decomposition. However, one caveat is that the nodes in each bag of the treewidth decomposition may not be connected in the network G . Therefore, when performing the standard dynamic programming over a treewidth decomposition, the nodes in a bag cannot directly communicate with each other.

We resolve this issue by exploiting the special structure of the treewidth algorithm of Section 4. Recall that the algorithm is recursive: on each recursive instance (U, X) , it either terminates prematurely, concluding that $\text{tw}(G) > k$, or finds a node set S of size $\leq k + 1$ and, for each connected component U' in $G[U] - S$, recursively calls $(U', N[U'] \cap (X \cup S))$. In Section 4, we observed several properties of the algorithm that will be helpful, listed below.

1. For each layer of the recursion depth, the sets U in the instances (U, X) are connected and node-disjoint.
2. For each instance (U, X) in the algorithm, $X \subseteq N[U]$.
3. If instance (U, X) computes separator $S \subseteq U$, then every recursive instance (U', X') called by this instance has $N[U'] \cap S \neq \emptyset$.
4. The tree in the treewidth decomposition has depth $O(\log n)$.
5. Every leaf instance (U, X) in the recursion tree has $|U| \leq k + 1$, since the computed separator S satisfies $|S| \leq k + 1$, and $G[U] - S$ must be empty to end this recursion branch.

We now specify a tree decomposition \mathcal{T} “implicitly” produced by the algorithm of Section 4. For each instance (U, X) that produces separator S , create a bag $B_{U,X}$ in \mathcal{T} with vertices $X \cup S$.

The children of this bag are the bags produced by all recursive instances (U', X') called by (U, X) . It is clear by the algorithm of Section 4 that \mathcal{T} is a treewidth decomposition with maximum bag size $O(k)$. We would like to apply dynamic programming on this treewidth decomposition \mathcal{T} in a distributed fashion.

Modifications. We first augment the algorithm of Theorem 1, so that for each layer of the recursion, for each (U, X) in that layer, all nodes $v \in V$ know: (i) the depth of that layer, (ii) the ID of U , set to be the smallest ID of a node in U , and (iii) the set X of size $O(k)$. Moreover, if S is the separator computed at instance (U, X) , then for each instance (U', X') called recursively at this instance, *exactly* one of the nodes in $N[U'] \cap S$ knows the ID of U' and its neighbors in U' ; we say that node v is *in charge* of U' . It is clear that all of this can be done in $k^{O(1)}$ polylog(n) SA rounds.

The dynamic program. With this, we implement the dynamic program of Section 5.1 “bottom-up”, from layer $T := \Theta(\log n)$ to (the single instance in) layer 0 in that order. For layer $t \in [T]$, for each instance (U, X) in that layer, perform the following:

1. If no nodes in U have received anything so far, then instance (U, X) is a leaf in the recursion tree. In this case, the computed separator S in instance (U, X) is exactly U , so the bag corresponding to (U, X) has node set $X \cup S = X \cup U$. The nodes in U first learn each other’s IDs as well as the IDs in X ; this can be achieved because (i) $|U| \leq k + 1$, (ii) U is connected, (iii) $X \subseteq N[U]$, and (iv) $|X| = O(t)$. The bag $B_{U,X}$ for this instance is a leaf in \mathcal{T} and has node set $X \cup U$, so for each $I_{U,X} \subseteq B_{U,X}$, we compute $\text{Join}(B_{U,X}, I_{U,X})$ according to (1). This is $2^{O(k)}$ values, one for each $I_{U,X} \subseteq B_{U,X}$; we then broadcast all of the $\text{Join}(B_{U,X}, I_{U,X})$ pairs to $N[U]$. In total, this takes $2^{O(k)}$ distributed rounds.
2. Otherwise, (U, X) must have called some recursive instances after computing its separator S . Any such instance (U', X') satisfies $N[U'] \cap S \neq \emptyset$, and instance (U', X') has already broadcasted all $\text{Join}(B_{U',X'}, I_{U',X'})$ pairs to the *unique* node in U in charge of U' . For each node $v \in U$ and recursive instance (U', X') such that v is in charge of U' , node v locally computes, according to (2),

$$\text{Extend}(B_{U',X'}, I_{U',X'}, B_{U,X}, I_{U,X}) \text{ for each } X \subseteq B_{U,X}, X' \subseteq B_{U',X'}.$$

Note that a node can receive from multiple (U', X') , but it can locally compute all such states simultaneously. Then, for each $I_{U,X} \subseteq B_{U,X}$, each node v locally computes the sum

$$\sum_{I_{U',X'} \subseteq B_{U',X'}} \max_{I_{U',X'} \subseteq B_{U',X'}} (\text{Extend}(B_{U',X'}, I_{U',X'}, B_{U,X}, I_{U,X}) - |I_{U,X}|),$$

where the sum is taken over all instances (U', X') such that v is in charge of U' , and then the nodes in U compute an aggregate sum of all these values. Finally, each node can locally compute $\text{Join}(B_{U,X}, I_{U,X})$ for each $I_{U,X} \subseteq B_{U,X}$ using (3). In total, this step takes $2^{O(k)}$ SA rounds.

Recovering the solution. To recover the actual maximum independent set, we again follow the process in Section 5.1. This time, we process the layers from layer 0 to layer T .

1. For the initial depth 0 with instance (U, X) , recall that all nodes in U have learned $\text{Join}(B_{U,X}, I_{U,X})$ for all $I_{U,X} \subseteq B_{U,X}$. All nodes in U compute $I_{U,X}^*$ according to (4), where the arg max breaks ties lexicographically (so that all nodes in U can agree upon the same $I_{U,X}^*$), and then broadcast the set $I_{U,X}^*$ to their neighbors. Since $X \cup S \subseteq N[U]$, each node in $X \cup S$ can learn whether it belongs to $I_{U,X}^*$. Then, for each node $v \in U$ in charge of a recursive instance (U', X') , node v locally computes $I_{U',X'}^*$ according to (5), and sends the set $I_{U',X'}^*$ to its neighbors in U' . All of this can be done in $O(k)$ distributed rounds.

2. For each instance (U', X') called by instance (U, X) , the nodes in U' adjacent to the node in charge of (U', X') have received $I_{U', X'}^*$. These nodes broadcast the set $I_{U', X'}^*$ to all nodes in U' , taking $O(k)$ SA rounds. Then each node in U' in charge of a recursive instance performs the same as above.

At the end, every node in V knows whether it belongs to the maximum independent set $\bigcup_{U, X} I_{U, X}^*$. This completes the distributed implementation, which runs in $2^{O(k)} \log n$ SA rounds. This concludes Theorem 3.

References

- 1 Eyal Amir. Efficient approximation for triangulation of minimum treewidth. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth conference on Uncertainty in artificial intelligence*, pages 7–15. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 2001.
- 2 Stefan Arnborg, Derek G Corneil, and Andrzej Proskurowski. Complexity of finding embeddings in k -tree. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 8(2):277–284, 1987.
- 3 Hans L Bodlaender. A linear-time algorithm for finding tree-decompositions of small treewidth. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 25(6):1305–1317, 1996.
- 4 Marek Cygan, Fedor V Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshantov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized algorithms*, volume 3. Springer, 2015.
- 5 Atish Das Sarma, Stephan Holzer, Liah Kor, Amos Korman, Danupon Nanongkai, Gopal Pandurangan, David Peleg, and Roger Wattenhofer. Distributed verification and hardness of distributed approximation. In *STOC*, pages 363–372, 2011.
- 6 Uriel Feige, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, and James R Lee. Improved approximation algorithms for minimum weight vertex separators. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 38(2):629–657, 2008.
- 7 Mohsen Ghaffari and Bernhard Haeupler. Distributed algorithms for planar networks ii: Low-congestion shortcuts, mst, and min-cut. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 202–219. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2016.
- 8 Mohsen Ghaffari, Fabian Kuhn, and Hsin-Hao Su. Distributed mst and routing in almost mixing time. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 131–140. ACM, 2017.
- 9 Bernhard Haeupler, D Ellis Hershkowitz, and David Wajc. Round-and message-optimal distributed part-wise aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.05127*, 2018.
- 10 Bernhard Haeupler, Taisuke Izumi, and Goran Zuzic. Low-congestion shortcuts without embedding. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 451–460. ACM, 2016.
- 11 Bernhard Haeupler, Taisuke Izumi, and Goran Zuzic. Near-optimal low-congestion shortcuts on bounded parameter graphs. In *International Symposium on Distributed Computing*, pages 158–172. Springer, 2016.
- 12 Bernhard Haeupler and Jason Li. Faster distributed shortest path approximations via shortcuts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03671*, 2018.
- 13 Bernhard Haeupler, Jason Li, and Goran Zuzic. Minor excluded network families admit fast distributed algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.06237*, 2018.
- 14 Samir Khuller and Baruch Schieber. Efficient parallel algorithms for testing k and finding disjoint s - t paths in graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 20(2):352–375, 1991.
- 15 Jens Lagergren. Efficient parallel algorithms for graphs of bounded tree-width. *Journal of Algorithms*, 20(1):20–44, 1996.

- 16 Bruce A Reed. Finding approximate separators and computing tree width quickly. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 221–228. ACM, 1992.
- 17 Bruce A Reed. Algorithmic aspects of tree width. In *Recent advances in algorithms and combinatorics*, pages 85–107. Springer, 2003.
- 18 Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. ii. algorithmic aspects of tree-width. *Journal of algorithms*, 7(3):309–322, 1986.

A Omitted Proofs in Section 2

Proof (Lemma 7). Let H_1, \dots, H_ℓ be the connected, disjoint subgraphs in an SA instance. The reduction from SA to PA uses the Heads/Tails clustering technique from parallel graph contraction algorithms. We sketch the Heads/Tails clustering algorithm below, which, given a graph, contracts each connected component into a single vertex. For $O(\log n)$ rounds, each vertex flips Heads/Tails with probability $1/2$ each and broadcasts the flip to its neighbors. If a vertex flips Heads and has a neighbor with Heads, it notifies one of its Heads neighbors. Afterwards, every Heads vertex and its Tails neighbors who notified it contract into a single vertex. Following the standard analysis, w.h.p., every connected component contracts to a single vertex after $O(\log n)$ iterations.

Now we describe the distributed SA algorithm. As input, each node in each subgraph H_i knows its neighbors in that subgraph. Our goal is for the nodes in each H_i to agree on a common ID, unique to each H_i . Then, a single round of PA solves the desired aggregation task.

At a high level, we want to run a distributed version of the Heads/Tails algorithm on the graph $H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_\ell$. On each iteration, for each vertex v in the contracted graph, the nodes in the original graph that contracted to v form a part for a PA round. In particular, every node in a part should know its (unique) part ID. At the beginning, each node is its own part, and it can set its part ID to be its node ID.

We now describe each of $O(\log n)$ steps of the clustering algorithm. In $O(1)$ PA rounds, each part collectively decides on a Heads/Tails flip for that part. Then, every node broadcasts its part ID and its flip to all its neighbors in its own subgraph. Then, in $O(1)$ PA rounds, any node that received a Heads flip from a neighbor, and whose own part flipped Tails, notifies its part of the part ID received by such a neighbor. Then, each part that flipped Tails collectively decides on a common part ID (e.g., the minimum one) and sets its own part ID to be that one. The new parts are the nodes with a common part ID; clearly, every part is still connected. Finally, after $O(\log n)$ iterations, each taking $O(1)$ PA rounds, all nodes within each subgraph H_i contracted to a single vertex in the Heads/Tails algorithm, which means that they have agreed on a common part ID. ◀

Proof (Lemma 9). We can assign arbitrary weights to the edges of H use the MST algorithm of [7], which runs a modified Boruvka’s algorithm with the current contracted components as the parts; for details, see [7, 12]. ◀

Proof (Lemma 10). Computing subtree aggregation in the tree rooted at v_r is covered in [12]. To determine the parent of each node except the root, we can set $x_i \leftarrow 1$ for each node v_i with sum as the aggregate. For each node $v_i \in V(T) - v_r$, its parent is precisely the unique neighbor u whose aggregate $\bigoplus_{j \in T(u)} x_j$ is larger than the aggregate $\bigoplus_{j \in T(v_i)} x_j$ at v_i . ◀

Proof (Lemma 11). For prefix aggregation, let v_ℓ be the root of the tree P . Then, subtree aggregate $\bigoplus_{j \in T(v_i)} x_j$ is exactly the prefix aggregate $\bigoplus_{j \leq i} x_j$, so we can apply Lemma 10. For each node v_i to learn the index i , we set $x_i \leftarrow 1$ for all i so that value i is exactly the prefix

aggregate $\bigoplus_{j \leq i} x_j$. Finally, for suffix aggregation, we compute subtree aggregates with v_1 as the root instead. \blacktriangleleft

Proof (Lemma 12). First, compute a spanning tree $T \subseteq H$ using Lemma 9. Root the tree T at t , and set $x_s \leftarrow 1$ and $x_v \leftarrow 0$ for all other nodes $v \in V(H) - s$. Now compute subtree aggregates with sum as the operator. Observe that a node has nonzero subtree sum iff it is on the path from s to t . Finally, each node v with $\sum_{j \in T_v} \neq 0$ sends a message to its parent in the rooted tree, so that every node on the path learns its predecessor and successor. \blacktriangleleft

B Omitted Proofs in Section 3

Proof (Claim 14). Since G has treewidth k , there exists a treewidth decomposition with maximum bag size $k + 1$. We now construct a treewidth decomposition⁵ \mathcal{T} of G^ℓ with maximum bag size $(k + 1)\ell$, which is sufficient to prove the claim. Starting from \mathcal{T} , for each $v \in G$, we replace all occurrences of v in bags in \mathcal{T} with the vertices v^1, \dots, v^ℓ . Clearly, the maximum bag size is now at most $(k + 1)\ell$. We now claim that the new decomposition \mathcal{T}' is a treewidth decomposition of G^ℓ . Property (i) is clearly satisfied. For property (1), for each vertex $v^r \in V(G^\ell)$, the set of bags containing it is precisely the set of bags containing v in \mathcal{T} , which is connected, proving property (2). Finally, for property (3), for vertices $u^i, v^j \in V(G^\ell)$ adjacent in G^ℓ , either (i) $u = v$, in which case any bag containing u in \mathcal{T} contains both u^i and v^j , or (ii) $u \neq v$, in which case there must be a bag in \mathcal{T} containing both u and v , and this bag in \mathcal{T}' contains both u^i and v^j . \blacktriangleleft

Proof (Lemma 18). By Corollary 17, the existence of an augmenting path is equivalent to s and t being strongly connected in G_{res} . Since the transformation from G_{res} to G_R preserves SCCs, this is also equivalent to s and t being strongly connected in G_R . Also, there is always a $t \rightarrow s$ path in G_R , so strong connectivity of s and t is equivalent to the existence of a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path in G_R . Therefore, we prove the following statement instead: there is a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path in G_R iff there exists s -reachable β_i and t -reachable β_x and a directed $\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_x$ path in G_B . The rest of the proof resembles the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [14].

For the *if* direction, suppose there is a directed $\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_x$ path in G_B from s -reachable β_i to t -reachable β_x ; we will transform this path into an $s \rightarrow t$ path in G_R . We replace each arc $(\beta_j, \beta_{j'})$ with a directed path from β_j to $\beta_{j'}$ in G_R as follows. By definition of G_B , there is $y \in [r]$ satisfying $r_j^y \geq l_{j'}^y$. We replace arc $(\beta_j, \beta_{j'})$ with the path composed of the arc (β_j, r_j^y) , the left path along P_y from r_j^y to $l_{j'}^y$, and finally the arc $(l_{j'}^y, \beta_{j'})$. Finally, add the arcs (s, β_i) and (β_x, t) to the path, completing the $s \rightarrow t$ path.

For the *only if* direction, suppose there is a directed $s \rightarrow t$ path P in G_R ; without loss of generality, assume that P is simple. A simple path in G_R consists of vertices β_i with a leftward path along some P_j in between every two consecutive β_i . Let the β_i vertices on P be $\beta_{x_1}, \dots, \beta_{x_\ell}$ from left to right; by definition, β_{x_1} is s -reachable and β_{x_ℓ} is t -reachable. We now construct a (not necessarily simple) path from β_{x_1} to possibly a different t -reachable vertex in G_B .

For $i \in [\ell - 1]$, let y_i be such that the path P travels along P_{y_i} from β_{x_i} to $\beta_{x_{i+1}}$, and let y_ℓ be an arbitrary integer in $[r]$. First, set $x'_1 \leftarrow x_1$. Then, one by one, for i from 2 to ℓ , we will replace the vertex β_{x_i} with a vertex $\beta_{x'_i}$ such that (i) either $\beta_{x'_{i-1}} = \beta_{x'_i}$ or the arc $(\beta_{x'_{i-1}}, \beta_{x'_i})$ exists in G_B , and (ii) we have $r_{x'_i}^{y_i} \geq r_{x_i}^{y_i}$. Note that condition (ii) is satisfied by definition for $i = 1$.

Fix an $i \in [2, \ell - 1]$; we assume that the invariant is satisfied at i . Since $r_{x'_i}^{y_i} \geq r_{x_i}^{y_i}$, we can travel from $\beta_{x'_i}$ to $\beta_{x_{i+1}}$ along path P_{y_i} . Consider the arc $(x_i, x') \in D_{y_{i+1}}$; we first assume that it exists. By condition 2(c) of the construction of the bridge graph with $\beta_{x_{i+1}}$ as β_z , we have

⁵ For our definition of treewidth and treewidth decomposition, we refer the reader to Section 5.

$r_{x'}^{y_{i+1}} \geq r_{x_{i+1}}^{y_{i+1}}$; otherwise, we contradict condition 2(c). Therefore, setting $\beta_{x'_{i+1}} \leftarrow \beta_{x'}$ maintains the two properties for index $i + 1$.

Now suppose arc (x_i, x') does not exist in $D_{y_{i+1}}$. Then, we must have $r_{x'}^{y_{i+1}} \geq r_{x_{i+1}}^{y_{i+1}}$; otherwise, $\beta_{x_{i+1}}$ satisfies conditions 2(a) and 2(b) of the bridge graph, so an arc in $D_{y_{i+1}}$ must exist. Therefore, setting $\beta_{x'_{i+1}} \leftarrow \beta_{x'_i}$ maintains the two properties for index $i + 1$.

Since β_{x_ℓ} is t -reachable, we have $r_{x_\ell}^y = |P_y|$ for all $y \in [r]$, i.e., the rightmost out-neighbor of vertex β_x is t on each path P_y . Since $r_{x'_\ell}^{y_\ell} \geq r_{x_\ell}^{y_\ell} = |P_{y_\ell}|$, vertex $\beta_{x'_\ell}$ is also t -reachable. We remove duplicates from the sequence $\beta_{x'_1}, \beta_{x'_2}, \dots, \beta_{x'_{\ell-1}}$, obtaining our desired path in G_B from s -reachable β_{x_1} to some t -reachable vertex. \blacktriangleleft

Proof (Lemma 20). We define iteration i of the contraction algorithm as the iteration where the components of $\overline{D_j}$ are contracted. Also, let G_B^i be the bridge graph after iteration $i \in [r]$, and $G_B^0 := G_B$, and let D_j^i be the edge set D_j in G_B^i .

For the *only if* direction, we first show that if two vertices β_i, β_x contract to the same vertex, then the bridges B_i, B_x are strongly connected in G_{res} . Before the contraction algorithm begins (i.e., before iteration 1), this is clearly true. On iteration i , suppose the statement holds for the bridge graph right before iteration i . Iteration i contracts the bridges inside each connected component of D_j^{i-1} , which, by Claim 19, is strongly connected. Therefore, the statement holds after iteration i as well. Applying induction on i proves the statement at the end of the algorithm. Finally, taking β_i and β_x to be an s -reachable and t -reachable vertex finishes the *only if* direction.

For the *if* direction, we temporarily abuse notation, referring to vertices β_i in G_R and G_B^j as (super-) bridges as well as B_i . For bridge β_i , consider all directed simple paths in G_R that start from β_i and end at some t -reachable bridge. Define $\text{dist}(\beta_i)$ to be the minimum possible number of bridges β_x on such a path, minus 1. In particular, $\text{dist}(\beta_i) = \infty$ iff there is no such path, and $\text{dist}(\beta_i) = 0$ iff β_i is t -reachable. Also, for bridges β_i, β_x , we say that β_i can *directly reach* β_x in G_R if there is a directed $\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_x$ path in G_R with no other bridges inside. We now prove, by induction on $d \geq 0$, that all bridges β_i with $\text{dist}(\beta_i) = d$ contract to the a vertex containing an t -reachable bridge. Since s and t are strongly connected in G_{res} , there is an s -reachable bridge β_i with finite $\text{dist}(\beta_i)$, proving the *if* direction.

The base case $d = 0$ is trivial; we now consider the case $d = 1$. Suppose a bridge β_i satisfies $\text{dist}(\beta_i) = 1$. Then, exiting from bridge β_i , we can move left along some path P_y and then enter an t -reachable bridge β_x . Note that a t -reachable bridge necessarily satisfies $r_x^j = |P_j|$ for all $j \in [r]$, i.e., the rightmost out-neighbor of bridge β_x is t on each path P_j . By definition of G_B , this means that for all j , there is an arc in D_j from β_i to β_x , or possibly a different t -reachable bridge due to tie-breaking. In particular, this arc is in D_1 , so on iteration 1 of the algorithm, β_i and β_x already contract to the same vertex.

Now suppose $\text{dist}(\beta_i) = d + 1$ for $d \geq 1$. First, if β_i contracts to the same component as some other β_x with $\text{dist}(\beta_x) \leq d$, then by induction, β_x contracts to a component containing a t -reachable bridge. β_i contracts to this same component, completing the inductive step.

Otherwise, consider the directed path P from β_i to t in G_R achieving $\text{dist}(\beta_i) = d + 1$, and suppose $\beta_i, \beta_{x_0}, \beta_y$ are the first three bridges on P . Suppose that, from β_{x_0} to β_y , the path P walks left along path P_j in G_R ; in particular, this means that $r_{x_0}^j \geq l_y^j$. Furthermore, either the arc (β_i, β_{x_0}) is in D_j , or some arc (β_i, β_x) exists in D_j such that $r_x^j \geq r_{x_0}^j$ and β_i can directly reach β_x in G_R ; in the former case, we set $x := x_0$. The inequalities $r_x^j \geq r_{x_0}^j \geq l_y^j$ imply that β_x can directly reach β_y , and since $\text{dist}(\beta_y) = d - 1$, we have $\text{dist}(\beta_x) \leq d$. Now consider iteration j of the algorithm, which contracts all connected components in $\overline{D_j}$ in G_B^{j-1} . Before iteration j , let $\beta_{i'}$ and $\beta_{x'}$ in G_B^{j-1} denote the super-bridges that β_i and β_x have contracted to; we assume $\beta_{i'} \neq \beta_{x'}$, since otherwise we are in the first case. Observe that the corresponding super-bridge $B_{i'}$ can still directly reach $B_{x'}$. In particular, if $\beta_{x''}$ is the super-bridge for which $(\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x''})$ is an arc in D_j^{j-1} , then $r_{x''}^j \geq r_{x'}^j \geq r_x^j \geq l_y^j$. In particular, some original bridge β_{x_1} that contracts to the super-bridge $\beta_{x''}$ satisfies $r_{x_1}^j = r_{x''}^j \geq l_y^j$, which again implies that $\text{dist}(\beta_{x_1}) \leq d$. Then,

23:26 Distributed Treewidth Computation with Applications

on iteration j , super-bridges $\beta_{i'}, \beta_{x'}$ contract together, so bridges β_i, β_{x_1} contract to the same super-bridge. The fact that $\text{dist}(\beta_{x_1}) \leq d$ completes the inductive step. ◀