

Uniform Linked Lists Contraction

Yijie Han

School of Computing and Engineering
University of Missouri at Kansas City
Kansas City, MO 64110, USA
hanyij@umkc.edu,

Abstract. We present a parallel algorithm (EREW PRAM algorithm) for linked lists contraction. We show that when we contract a linked list from size n to size n/c for a suitable constant c we can pack the linked list into an array of size n/d for a constant $1 < d \leq c$ in the time of 3 coloring the list. Thus for a set of linked lists with a total of n elements and the longest list has l elements our algorithm contracts them in $O(n \log i/p + (\log^{(i)} n + \log i) \log \log l + \log l)$ time, for an arbitrary constructible integer i , with p processors on the EREW PRAM, where $\log^{(1)} n = \log n$ and $\log^{(t)} n = \log \log^{(t-1)} n$ and $\log^* n = \min\{i \mid \log^{(i)} n < 10\}$. When i is a constant we get time $O(n/p + \log^{(i)} n \log \log l + \log l)$. Thus when $l = \Omega(\log^{(c)} n)$ for any constant c we achieve $O(n/p + \log l)$ time. The previous best deterministic EREW PRAM algorithm has time $O(n/p + \log n)$ and best CRCW PRAM algorithm has time $O(n/p + \log n / \log \log n + \log l)$.

Keywords: Parallel algorithms, linked list, linked list contraction, uniform linked list contraction, EREW PRAM.

1 Introduction

Linked list contraction refers to the pairing of neighboring nodes on the linked list and replacing the two nodes with a newly created node in order to have the linked list contracted. In parallel computation we need to do this pairing-off for many pairs of nodes concurrently such that in one round the size of the linked list shrinks from n to n/c for a constant $c > 1$. Linked list contraction requires this process repeated such that the original linked list is finally contracted to a single node (actually because of parallel algorithm design we need the initial input n nodes linked list to be contracted to $n/\log n$ nodes as pointer jumping [13] can be applied after the linked list has been contracted to $n/\log n$ nodes). Linked list contraction can be used to rank the nodes in the linked list such that nodes along the linked list receiving numbers $1, 2, 3, \dots, n$. Linked list contraction and/or ranking can then be used for many other computations for linked lists, trees, and graphs. Thus linked list contraction is regarded as a basic or fundamental computation in parallel computation.

The model we use is the EREW (Exclusive Read Exclusive Write) PRAM (Parallel Random Access Machine) [9,10]. PRAM is a machine where memory is shared among all processors. In one step on the EREW (CREW (Concurrent Read Exclusive Write), CRCW (Concurrent Read Concurrent Write)) PRAM multiple processors cannot (can, can) read the same memory cell and cannot (cannot, can) write the same memory cell. When concurrent write happens on the CRCW PRAM an arbitration rule needs to be used to determine what content is written into the memory cell. On the ARBITRARY CRCW PRAM an arbitrary processor will succeed in writing when concurrent write happens. On the COMMON

CRCW PRAM processors write into the same memory cell in a step have to write the same value and this value is written into the memory cell.

Early work on linked list contraction include the work of Wyllie [13] and Kruskal et al. [11]. Han achieved $O(n/p + \log n)$ time for linked list contraction of n nodes on the CRCW PRAM with p processors [5]. At the time it was difficult to achieve $O(n/p + \log n)$ time on the EREW PRAM because it was not known how to do uniform linked list contraction and dynamically balancing the load is difficult. In 1991 Anderson and Miller came up with a very clever accounting scheme to calculate the dynamic load and obtained an EREW PRAM algorithm [1] for linked list ranking (contraction) with time $O(n/p + \log n)$ (conference version of their paper was published in 1988). The existence of the $\log n$ additive factor in the complexity of their algorithm comes from two causes. One is the pointer jumping [13] and the other reason is the dynamic load balancing scheme of their algorithm because their algorithm requires the contracted linked list be packed before the final pointer jumping stage [13]. We are unable to reduce the time complexity for pointer jumping and therefore in the case of contracting a single linked list of size n we cannot improve on the $O(n/p + \log n)$ time complexity of Anderson and Miller's algorithm. However, if we are contracting many linked lists stored in an array of size n and the longest linked list has size l then the only application of pointer jumping [13] will rank the linked lists in $O(n \log l/p + \log l)$ time. Therefore, the open question is that in the case of contracting or ranking multiple linked lists can we do better. The ideal case here is to achieve $O(n/p + \log l)$ time. Anderson and Miller's algorithm cannot achieve this because their load balancing scheme cannot guarantee uniform contraction. Here we use uniform contraction to mean when linked lists are contracted they can be stored in a packed array using the same time for 3 coloring a linked list so that processors can be used efficiently to the contracted lists.

In [5,8] we showed that by resorting to the sublogarithmic CRCW array prefix sum algorithm [12] we can contract linked lists in $O(n/p + \log n/\log^{(3)} n + \log l)$ time. In [2] it is improved to $O(n/p + \log n/\log \log n + \log l)$ time due to the fact that array prefix sum can be done in $O(n/p + \log n/\log \log n)$ time [2].

Previously we gave an $O(n \log i/p + \log^{(i)} n + \log i)$ time EREW PRAM algorithm [6] for finding a maximal independent set or a maximal matching for linked lists or a 3-coloring of the linked lists, where i can be any constructible integer. Here we use this algorithm and we apply some new ideas of ours and reach deterministic time $O(n \log i/p + (\log^{(i)} n + \log i) \log \log l + \log l)$ for linked lists contraction on the EREW PRAM, where n is the total number of nodes in all linked lists, p is the number of processors used, i is any constructible integer, l is the length of the longest linked list.

In particular if $l = \Omega(\log^{(c)} n)$ for a constant c we can reach $O(n/p + \log l)$ time.

Our uniform linked list contraction algorithm will pack the linked list of size n/c for a constant c , after linked list 3 coloring and pairing-off nodes, into an array of size n/d for a constant $1 < d \leq c$, using the same time for linked list 3 coloring. Thus, if linked list 3 coloring can be done in constant time then the above linked lists contraction can be accomplished in $O(n/p + \log l)$ time for any values of l .


The result, that is uniform linked list contraction, has been envisioned before but was thought probably unachievable. The result we have achieved here is a surprise. We thought before that this is unachievable and are amazed of the result achieved here.

2 Preliminary


Linked list contraction is done by first finding a maximal independent set of the linked list nodes and then let nodes in the maximal independent set pair-off their neighboring node(s) with themselves (combine one's neighboring node and itself into one node and thus the name of contraction). An independent set is a set of nodes such that there is no edge between any two nodes in the set. A maximal independent set is an independent set such that it cannot be enlarged and remains to be an independent set. If two nodes v_1 and v_2 in the maximal independent set intend to pair-off the same (non)maximal independent set node w then an arbitrary one of v_1 or v_2 wins and succeeds in the pairing-off with w . A maximal independent set can be found after linked lists nodes have been 3 colored. (Here 2 colored is OK also but 2 coloring is much slower than 3 coloring, use a maximum independent set is also OK but finding a maximum independent set is much slower than finding a maximal independent set).

The problem in parallel computing for linked list contraction is where to place the contracted node. As in Anderson and Miller [1], initially we can imagine that the n nodes linked list is placed in a two dimensional array of n/p rows and p columns such that each of the p processors can be assigned to one column. Say processors initially working on the first row of the array and proceeds downward the array. After the first pair-off step in the worst case there are $n/2$ nodes in the first row after pairing-off because every pair of nodes before pairing-off are on the first row. Thus we need to keep $p/2$ processors on the first row in the next step and move the other $p/2$ processors to second row in the next step. Thus in the worst case, nodes in some columns depletes faster than other columns. This situation is shown in Fig. 1. Before Anderson and Miller's work we do not even know that n nodes will eventually be contracted to $n/\log n$ nodes as nodes in some columns may be all depleted and leave processors in these columns idling. Anderson and Miller showed a dynamic load balancing strategy and a clever accounting scheme to guarantee that the number of node be reduced to $n/\log n$ (actually in their paper they showed that the number of nodes can be reduced to $n/\log^{(c)} n$ for a constant c , but this has the some effects as reducing to $n/\log n$ nodes and therefore here we talk about the situation of reducing to $n/\log n$ nodes). However, the remaining $n/\log n$ nodes are in the array with some columns have more nodes than other columns. Anderson and Miller's algorithm cannot guarantee that the $n/\log n$ nodes are placed in the remaining array of $n/(p \log n)$ rows and p columns without using extra $\log n$ time (resorting to packing). In Anderson and Miller's algorithm we need to spend $\log n$ time to pack the remaining nodes to the array of $n/(p \log n)$ rows and p columns. Packing takes at least $\log n$ time on the EREW PRAM. On the CRCW PRAM it can be done in $O(\log n / \log \log n)$ time [2]. Actually approximate packing (i.e. pack the remaining $n/\log n$ nodes to an array of size $cn/\log n$ for some small values of c , e.g. $c = \log \log n$, is ok also) and there are algorithms for achieving approximate packing in $O(\log \log n)$ time [4] on the CRCW model.

What we are actually demonstrate here is that after finding a maximal independent set a constant times and pairing-off a constant number of passes (therefore there are n/c contracted nodes) we can expending $O(n/p + 1)$ time with p processors to place these n/c nodes into an array of size n/d with $c \geq d > 1$. This is what we call uniform linked list contraction. Thus for multiple linked lists of total n nodes and longest linked list has l nodes. We can use $n/\log l$ processors and contract n nodes to $n/\log l$



(a) 0-1 pairs in the linked list(s).



(b) Orient the linked list(s).

Fig. 2. Uniform linked list contraction by orienting the linked list(s).

linked lists can be “contracted” by pointer jumping [13] in $\log l$ time with n processors. If Anderson and Miller algorithm [1] is used to contract these linked lists it can be done in $O(n/p + \log n)$ time, but it cannot be done in $O(n/p + \log l)$ time. And this $O(n/p + \log l)$ time is what we are aiming for in this paper. Basically, we show that we can pack the remaining contracted nodes of the linked lists in the same time for computing a 3 coloring, and this is what we call uniform linked list contraction.

The strategy of our algorithm is to place the contracted nodes in the right position. Note that we can use repeated pairing-off to purposely remove some nodes and create vacant spots. Our strategy uses the colors created in finding a maximal independent set to orient the linked list(s).

Initially we may assume that linked lists are stored in a two dimensional array A of 2 rows and $n/2$ columns. Our algorithm will first make every 0-1 pair in the linked lists (nodes colored with 2 will be contracted into the linked lists) on the same row. Secondly for every 0-1 on the bottom row (top row) and in columns c_0 and c_1 we enforce that the two nodes in top row (bottom row) and columns c_0 and c_1 be colored with the same color (i.e. both be colored with 0’s or both be colored with 1’s). This is shown in Fig. 3. As shown in Fig. 3. Such configuration results in an orientation of the linked lists because it creates the periodic pattern of $\begin{matrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{matrix}$ along the orientation.

Thus, using the same time for 3 coloring a linked list, we can contract the linked list in A and pack remaining nodes of the linked list to the bottom row of A .

The performance of our uniform linked list contraction algorithm is limited by the time for 3 coloring a linked list. If 3 coloring can be done in T time, then we can pack the contracted linked lists into an array of size n/d for a constant $d > 1$ in T time.


3 The Algorithm

3.1 Localization


We use the localization technique. Localization basically says that we can separate linked lists into two or more (constant number of) parts such that we can view that there are no links between any two of these parts (each part is localized). Here we show how to store linked lists in two rows with each row containing $n/2$ nodes and then localize linked lists to each row (such that all links between two rows are deleted). In principle we can divide linked lists into any two parts and then localize them, i.e. we need not assume that any one part of the two parts are stored in a continuous block of memory.

Algorithm **Localize**

1. Store linked lists of n nodes in a $2 \times n/2$ array A such that each column has 2 nodes of the linked list. Call the 0th row as the upper level and 1st row as the lower level. We are going to localized the upper row as well as the lower row.
2. Our first goal is to let a sufficient long (at least 100 nodes but no more than 300 nodes) of a sublist to run at the same level (either upper level or lower level). In order to achieve this we do (a): first contract sublist runs at the lower level and if a sublist has less than 100 nodes running at the lower level before it connects nodes at the upper level then we contract all these nodes and eliminate them



- (a) 0-1 pairs in the linked list(s). Every 0-1 pair is in the same row.
 The other two cells in the same columns of a 0-1 pair are both colored with 0's or 1's.



- (b) Orientation of the linked lists induced by such configuration.

Fig. 3. Create orientation for linked lists.

by having them contracted to the nodes at the upper level. If the sublist running at lower level has at least 100 nodes then we uncontract them and let this sublist run at the lower level. Then we do (b): contract sublist runs at upper level and if a sublist has less than 100 nodes running at the upper level before it connects nodes at the lower level then we contract all these nodes and eliminate them by having them contracted to the nodes at the lower level. If the sublist running at upper level has at least 100 nodes then we uncontract them and let this sublist run at the upper level but “delete” the links that connecting a node at lower level to an end node of this sublist at upper level (there are 2 such links for each sublist). In this way we now have many (sub)lists running either at the upper level or at the lower level.

The “deletion” of links connecting between upper level and lower level is for the purpose of viewing that the linked lists are localized. It does not mean that we will really cut any input linked list to multiple lists. The localization is mainly to prevent linked list to alternatively going up and down between the upper level and the lower level, i.e. prevent sublist of the form $a_1, b_2, a_3, b_4, \dots$, where a_i 's are at the upper level and b_i 's are at the lower level.

We can repeatedly apply this localizing algorithm to localize linked lists to a constant number of parts. For example, we can localize linked lists to 4 rows.

3.2 Uniform Contraction

We first localize the input linked list to two rows of A . Then we will 3 coloring the linked list on the bottom row. If a node is colored 2 instead of 0 or 1 then we will contract this node into one of its neighboring node. Thus now linked list on the bottom row is 0-1 colored. We then form 0-1 pairs. This is done by letting each node colored with 1 arbitrarily pairs with one of its neighboring node colored with 0. If two nodes colored with 1 both try to pair with the same 0 colored node then we let the 1 node with larger address wins the pair. Nodes colored with 0 or 1 did not form pairs will be contracted into the neighboring nodes that formed pairs. Thus now we have the linked list at the bottom row of A having nodes paired into 0-1 pairs.

We now do the same for the linked list at the top row of A and form 0-1 pairs for nodes in the linked list on the top row of A .

Now comes the key step. If two nodes at the bottom row $A[1, i]$ and $A[1, j]$ form a 0-1 pair we want to enforce that $A[0, i]$ and $A[0, j]$ at the top row be colored with the same color (i.e. both be colored with 0's or both be colored with 1's). We call this the uniformity step. Note that, in general, $A[0, i]$ and $A[0, j]$ do not form 0-1 pair, for if $A[0, i]$ and $A[0, j]$ form a 0-1 pair then we contract $A[0, i]$ and $A[0, j]$ into one node and place it at $A[1, i]$, and we contract $A[1, i]$ and $A[1, j]$ into one node and place it at $A[1, j]$.

To achieve the uniformity step, let us look at case here: $A[1, j_0]$ and $A[1, j_1]$ form a 0-1 pair and $A[0, j_0]$ and $A[0, j_1]$ are of different color. Say $A[0, j_0]$ is colored with 0 and $A[0, j_1]$ is colored with 1. Now look at the pair of $A[0, j_1]$ and say this node is $A[0, j_2]$. Let $A[1, j_2]$ and $A[1, j_3]$ form a 0-1 pair. $A[0, j_2]$ is colored with 0 as it is the pair of $A[0, j_1]$. Now look at the color of $A[0, j_3]$. If $A[0, j_3]$ is colored with 0 then let $A[0, j_4]$ be the pair of $A[0, j_3]$ that is colored with 1. Let $A[1, j_4]$ and $A[1, j_5]$ form a 0-1 pair. If $A[0, j_5]$ is colored with 0 then we swap the position of $A[0, j_5]$ and $A[0, j_1]$ and thus accomplishing the

uniformity step. If $A[0, j_5]$ is colored with 1 then we contract $A[0, j_1]$ and $A[0, j_2]$ into one node and place it at $A[0, j_2]$ and we move $A[0, j_3]$ to $A[0, j_1]$ and thus accomplish the uniformity step.

If $A[0, j_3]$ is colored with 1 then we form a chain (directed linked list) of $A[0, j_0], A[0, j_1], A[0, j_2], A[0, j_3], \dots$, where $A[0, j_{2i}]$'s are colored with 0 and $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$'s are colored with 1. $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+2}]$ form a 0-1 pair. We group $A[0, j_{2i}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$ into one node because $A[1, j_{2i}]$ and $A[1, j_{2i+1}]$ is a pair. Thus, we get a directed linked list L of nodes a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots , where a_0 represents $A[0, j_0]$ and $A[0, j_1]$, a_1 represents $A[0, j_2]$ and $A[0, j_3], \dots$. We 3 color the nodes of L . If $A[0, j_{2i}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$ is colored 0, $A[0, j_{2i+2}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+3}]$ is colored with 1, $A[0, j_{2i+4}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+5}]$ is colored with 2, then we swap $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+2}]$, contract $A[0, j_{2i+3}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+4}]$ into one node and place it at $A[0, j_{2i+4}]$, move $A[0, j_{2i+5}]$ to $A[0, j_{2i+3}]$. Thus accomplishing the uniformity step. If $A[0, j_{2i}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$ is colored 0, $A[0, j_{2i+2}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+3}]$ is colored with 1, $A[0, j_{2i+4}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+5}]$ is colored with 0, then we swap $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+2}]$ and thus accomplishing the uniformity step.

Note some pairs at the top row have been contracted into one node but this node is the only node at the top row for the pairs at the same column and bottom row. That is, if $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+2}]$ are contracted into one node and placed at $A[0, j_{2k}]$ then $A[0, j_{2k+1}]$ is vacant. Thus, we can form 0-1 pairs for these contracted nodes (here $A[0, j_{2k}]$ and $A[0, j_{2k+1}]$) and need not worry about the uniformity requirement.

Now we enforce the uniformity requirement for the bottom row. That is for each 0-1 pair at the top row $A[0, i]$ and $A[0, j]$ we require that $A[1, i]$ and $A[1, j]$ be colored with the same color (both be colored with 0's or both be colored with 1's). The approach is the same as we did for the uniformity of the top row.

After we enforced uniformity step, the colors of $2 * color(A[0, j]) + color(A[1, j])$ along the linked list form periodic pattern of 0, 1, 3, 2 and thus it provides an orientation of the linked list $A[*, j], A[*, j + 1], A[*, j + 2], \dots$, with links running alternatively at the top and bottom rows. This linked list orientation then allow us to contract the nodes at $A[0, j_{2i+1}]$ and $A[0, j_{2i+2}]$ into one node and place it at $A[1, j_{2i+2}]$ and contract nodes at $A[1, j_{2i}]$ and $A[1, j_{2i+1}]$ into one node and place it at $A[1, j_{2i+1}]$.

Main Theorem: Linked lists can be uniformly contracted. \square

Because we can 3 color linked lists in $O(n \log i/p + \log^{(i)} n + \log i)$ time and therefore if the longest linked list has length $l = \Omega(\log^{(c)} n)$ for a constant c then we can 3 color linked lists in $O(n/p + \log^{(c)} n)$ time. We can place input linked lists on a two dimensional array of $\log^{(c+1)} n$ rows and $n/\log^{(c+1)} n$ columns. If we use $p = n/\log^{(c)} n$ processors then each row can be 3 colored in $O(n/(p \log^{(c+1)} n))$ time and be contracted into the rows below. Thus, we eliminate one row in $O(n/(p \log^{(c+1)} n))$ time. When the last row remains we can use pointer jumping to finish the linked lists contraction. Thus, it takes $O(n/p + \log l)$ time to do the linked lists contraction.

Corollary 1: If multiple linked lists are placed into an array of size n and the longest linked list has length $l = \Omega(\log^{(c)} n)$ for a constant c then linked lists contraction can be done in $O(n/p + \log l)$ time

using p processors on the EREW PRAM. \square

In general because we compute 3 coloring in $O(n \log i/p + \log^{(i)} n + \log i)$ time with p processors, thus if we use $n/\log l$ processors then after $O(\log l \log i + (\log^{(i)} n + \log i) \log \log l)$ steps the size of the array containing all unfinished (contraction) linked lists has size $n/\log l$ and we can use pointer jumping to finish the linked lists contraction in $O(\log l)$ time. Thus we have

Corollary 2: If multiple linked lists are placed into an array of size n and the longest linked list has length l then linked lists contraction can be done in $O(n \log i/p + (\log^{(i)} n + \log i) \log \log l + \log l)$ time using p processors on the EREW PRAM, where i is a constructible integer. \square

4 Conclusion

We presented a deterministic algorithm for uniform linked list contraction. Because it is uniform and thus it brings some advantages such as for linked lists contraction.

References

1. R. J. Anderson, G. L. Miller. Deterministic parallel list ranking. *Algorithmica*, Vol. 6, 859-868(1991).
2. R. Cole, U. Vishkin. Approximate and exact parallel scheduling with applications to list, tree and graph problems. *27th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comput. Sci.*, IEEE, 478-491(1986).
3. A.V. Goldberg, S. A. Plotkin, G. E. Shannon. Parallel symmetry-breaking in sparse graphs, *SIAM J. on Discrete Math.*, Vol 1, No. 4, 447-471(Nov., 1988).
4. T. Goldberg, U. Zwick. Optimal deterministic approximate parallel prefix sums. *Proc. 3rd Israel Symposium on Theory and Computing Systems*, 220-228(1995).
5. Y. Han. Designing fast and efficient parallel algorithms. Ph.D. Thesis. Duke University, 1987.
6. Y. Han. Matching partition a linked list and its optimization. *Proc. 1989 ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA'89)*, 246-253(June 1989).
7. Y. Han. An optimal linked list prefix algorithm on a local memory computer. *Proc. 1989 Computer Science Conference (CSC'89)*, 278-286(Feb., 1989).
8. Y. Han. Parallel algorithms for computing linked list prefix. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing* **6**, 537-557(1989).
9. J. Ja'Ja. An Introduction to Parallel Algorithms, Addison-Wesley, 1992.
10. R. Karp, V. Ramachandran. Parallel algorithms for shared-memory machines. *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science*, Edited by J. van Leeuwen. Elsevier Science Publishers B.V. 1990.
11. C. P. Kruskal, L. Rudolph, M. Snir. The power of parallel prefix. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, Volume: C-34 , Issue: 10, 965-968(1985).
12. J. H. Reif. Probabilistic parallel prefix computation. *Proc. 1984 International Conf. on Parallel Processing*, 433-443(August 1984).
13. J. C. Wyllie. The complexity of parallel computation. Tech. Rep. 79-387. Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 1979.