

Minimum Cost Flow in the CONGEST Model

Tijn de Vos*

Abstract

We consider the CONGEST model on a network with n nodes, m edges, diameter D , and integer costs and capacities bounded by poly n . In this paper, we show how to find an exact solution to the minimum cost flow problem in $n^{1/2+o(1)}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds, improving the state of the art algorithm with running time $m^{3/7+o(1)}(\sqrt{n}D^{1/4} + D)$ [FGL⁺21], which only holds for the special case of unit capacity graphs. For certain graphs, we achieve even better results. In particular, for planar graphs, expander graphs, $n^{o(1)}$ -genus graphs, $n^{o(1)}$ -treewidth graphs, and excluded-minor graphs our algorithm takes $n^{1/2+o(1)}D$ rounds. We obtain this result by combining recent results on Laplacian solvers in the CONGEST model [FGL⁺21, ALH⁺22] with a CONGEST implementation of the LP solver of Lee and Sidford [LS14], and finally show that we can round the approximate solution to an exact solution. Our algorithm solves certain linear programs, that generalize minimum cost flow, up to additive error ϵ in $n^{1/2+o(1)}(\sqrt{n} + D) \log^3(1/\epsilon)$ rounds.

1 Introduction

The CONGEST model [Pel00] is one of the most widely studied distributed models. It consists of a network of n nodes that communicate in synchronous rounds, where each node can exchange a message of size $O(\log n)$ with each of its neighbors. The minimum cost flow problem is considered one of the harder problems in the CONGEST model. Although the highest lower bound is $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n} + D)$, which is the same as for ‘easier’ problems such as shortest path, minimum spanning trees, bipartiteness, s - t connectivity [PR00, Elk06, SHK⁺12], it was only recently that the first distributed algorithm was presented [FGL⁺21]. For the approximate version there exists some further, also quite recent, results [GKK⁺18, BFKL21]. These results use the powerful *Laplacian paradigm* to obtain their results.

The Laplacian paradigm encompasses a series of algorithms that combine numerical and combinatorial techniques. The *Laplacian matrix* of a weighted graph G is defined as $L(G) := \text{Deg}(G) - A(G)$, where $\text{Deg}(G)$ is the diagonal weighted degree matrix: $\text{Deg}(G)_{uu} := \sum_{(u,v) \in E} w(u,v)$ and $\text{Deg}(G)_{uv} := 0$ for $u \neq v$, and $A(G)$ is the adjacency matrix: $A(G)_{uv} := w(u,v)$. This line of research was initiated by Spielman and Teng [ST04], who showed that linear equations in the Laplacian matrix of a graph can be solved in near-linear time. More efficient sequential and parallel Laplacian solvers have been presented since [KOSZ13, KMP14, KMP11, CKM⁺14, KS16, PS14, KLP⁺16]. The Laplacian paradigm has booked many successes, including but not limited to flow problems [M13, She13, KLOS14, M16, Pen16, CMSV17, LS20a, LS20b, AMV20], bipartite matching [vdBLN⁺20], and (parallel) shortest paths [Li20, ASZ20].

Recently, these developments have also made their way to the distributed world [GKK⁺18, BFKL21, FGL⁺21, ALH⁺22, FdV22]. In particular, Forster, Goranci, Liu, Peng, Sun, and Ye [FGL⁺21] provide a Laplacian solver that takes $n^{o(1)}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds, which is near-optimal: they provide a $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ lower bound. Furthermore, they show that their Laplacian solver leads to an implementation of (minimum cost) maximum flow algorithms [M16, CMSV17] in the CONGEST

*University of Salzburg, Austria. This work is supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P 32863-N. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 947702).

model. In this paper, we significantly improve the round complexity of the algorithms solving the exact variants of these flow problems.

1.1 Our Results

Our main result is an algorithm that solves the minimum cost flow problem, so in particular also the maximum flow problem.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists an algorithm that, given a directed graph $G = (V, E, w)$ with integer costs $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^m$ and capacities $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^m$ satisfying $\|q\|_\infty, \|c\|_\infty \leq M$, computes a minimum cost maximum s - t flow in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G)\log^3 M)$ rounds in the CONGEST model, where $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G)$ is the number of rounds needed to solve a Laplacian system on G .*

We know that $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G) = n^{o(1)}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ for general graphs [FGL⁺21], which is near-optimal. However, for certain graphs we can get better results. This is based on the concept of *universally optimal* algorithms, which takes the topology of the input graph into account. The details regarding this can be found in section 1.2. In particular, we have $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G) = n^{o(1)}D$ for planar graphs, expander graphs, $n^{o(1)}$ -genus graphs, $n^{o(1)}$ -treewidth graphs, and excluded-minor graphs.

Further we remark that Cohen, Mądry, Sankowski, and Vladu [CMSV17] show that the negative weight single source shortest path problem can be reduced to minimum cost flow and a non-negative weight shortest path computation. Using [CM22] for the latter in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}D^{1/4} + D)$ rounds, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2. *There exists an algorithm that, given a directed graph $G = (V, E, w)$ with integer weights $w \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ satisfying $\|w\|_\infty \leq M$, and source $s \in V$, computes shortest paths from s in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G)\log^3 M)$ rounds in the CONGEST model, where $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G)$ is the number of rounds needed to solve a Laplacian system on G .*

We obtain Theorem 1.1 by writing the problem as an LP, solving this LP up to high precision and rounding the result. Hereto we present an LP solver for certain linear programs in the CONGEST model.

Formally, the setting is as follows. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $l_i \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, and $u_i \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for all $i \in [m]$, where we assume $l_i \neq -\infty$ or $u_i \neq +\infty$. The linear program we want to solve is as follows

$$\text{OPT} := \min_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^m: A^T x = b \\ \forall i \in [m]: l_i \leq x_i \leq u_i}} c^T x.$$

We assume that the set of feasible solutions to the LP $\Omega^\circ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : A^T x = b, l_i \leq x_i \leq u_i\}$ is non-empty.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a constraint matrix with $\text{rank}(A) = n$, let $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a demand vector, and let $c \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be a cost vector. Moreover, let $x_0 \in \Omega^\circ$ be a given initial point. Suppose a CONGEST network consists of n nodes, where each node i knows both every entire j -th row of A for which $A_{ji} \neq 0$ and knows $(x_0)_j$ if $A_{ji} \neq 0$. Moreover, suppose that for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and positive diagonal $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ we can compute $(A^T W A)^{-1} y$ up to precision $\text{poly}(1/m)$ in $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G)$ rounds. Let $U := \max\{\|1/(u - x_0)\|_\infty, \|1/(x_0 - l)\|_\infty, \|u - l\|_\infty, \|c\|_\infty\}$. Then with high probability the CONGEST algorithm `LPSolve` outputs a vector $x \in \Omega^\circ$ with $c^T x \leq \text{OPT} + \epsilon$ in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \log^3(U/\epsilon) T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$ rounds.*

Intuitively, U is a bound on the size of any constants or variables appearing in the LP. For graph problems, this is usually bounded by a polynomial in n and M .

The formal statement of this theorem might seem somewhat convoluted; essentially it means that we can solve linear programs whose constraint matrix can be expressed in terms of the

adjacency matrix, where each node knows the entries in the constraint matrix corresponding to its incident edges. Analogously, a node has to output the variables corresponding to its incident edges. This includes flow problems, see Appendix A. It also includes approximate fractional maximal matching. However, here the running time does not come close to the $O(\log(nM)/\epsilon^2)$ running time of Ahmadi, Kuhn, and Oshman [AKO18] (at least for $\epsilon = \Omega(1/n^{1/4})$).

1.2 Related Work

Distributed Flow Algorithms Our main point of reference is Forster, Goranci, Liu, Peng, Sun, and Ye [FGL⁺21]. They provide the previous best minimum cost flow solver, which takes $m^{3/7+o(1)}(\sqrt{n}D^{1/4} + D)$ rounds¹. Their approach uses the framework from Cohen, Mądry, Sankowski, and Vladu [CMSV17], which uses $\tilde{O}(m^{3/7})$ iterations of another interior point method to solve a (different) LP representing the problem. We bring this number of iterations down to $\tilde{O}(n^{1/2})$. Moreover, this approach leads to an approximate solution that has to be made into an exact solution by running $\tilde{O}(m^{3/7})$ shortest path computations. Currently, the state of the art for algorithm for shortest path computations takes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}D^{1/4} + D)$ rounds [CM22], which is already (slightly) worse than the global (near optimal) round complexity for solving Laplacian systems. Moreover, this means that their set-up cannot benefit from the recent progress of (almost) universally optimal Laplacian solvers. Our approach solves the LP up to a higher precision, such that an internal rounding procedure gives the exact solution, and no further shortest path computations are necessary. A further improvement is that [FGL⁺21] only solves minimum cost flow in graphs with *unit capacities*, where we solve it for arbitrary capacities. Further, [FGL⁺21] provides a maximum flow algorithm for graphs with arbitrary capacities, which takes $\tilde{O}(m^{3/7}U^{1/7}(n^{o(1)}(\sqrt{n} + D) + \sqrt{n}D^{1/4}) + \sqrt{m})$ rounds. This is the previous best result for maximum flow in the CONGEST model.

For approximate versions, there exist some further results that only hold for undirected graphs. Ghaffari et al. [GKK⁺18] give a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum flow in weighted undirected graphs in $n^{o(1)}(\sqrt{n} + D)/\epsilon^3$ rounds. Further, Becker et al. [BFKL21] gave a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation to unit capacity minimum cost flow in undirected graphs in $\tilde{O}(n/\epsilon^2)$ rounds.

Interior Point Methods for Flow Problems The line of work giving solutions for flow problems through interior point methods is initiated by Daich and Spielman [DS08], who leverage the Laplacian solver of Spielman and Teng [ST04] in an $\tilde{O}(m^{3/2})$ time algorithm. The most recent development is the near-linear time algorithm of Chen et al. [CKL⁺22]. However, their algorithm uses $\Omega(m)$ iterations, which seems to render it hard to implement it efficiently in a distributed setting, as any intuitive implementation uses at least one round per iteration. The algorithms with lowest iteration counts have either $\Theta(m^{3/7})$ iterations [M16, CMSV17], or $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ iterations [LS14]. In our work, we show how to implement the latter efficiently in the CONGEST model.

Distributed Laplacian Solvers and Shortcut Quality Forster et al. [FGL⁺21] provide a CONGEST model algorithm with $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G) = n^{o(1)}(\sqrt{n} + D)$, and show that this is existentially optimal. For any graph, we know that $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G) = \Omega(D)$, however it turns out that the \sqrt{n} -term is not necessary for every instance. To make this precise, we define the *shortcut quality* of a graph, as introduced by Ghaffari and Haeupler [GH16]. Intuitively, the shortcut quality tells us how easy it is, given some partition of the nodes, to compute some simple function (e.g., a minimum over the values held by nodes) on each part separately. Since distributed algorithm design often has such functions at its core, the shortcut quality can be used both for better upper and lower bounds.

¹For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to graphs with weights bounded by $\text{poly}(m)$ when discussing related work.

Definition 1.4. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph whose node set V is partitioned into k disjoint subsets $V = P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \dots \cup P_k$, such that each induced subgraph $G[P_i]$ is connected. A collection of k subgraphs H_1, \dots, H_k is called a shortcut of G with congestion c and dilation d if

1. the (hop) diameter of $G[P_i] \cup H_i$ is at most d ;
2. every edge is included in at most c graphs H_i .

The quality of the shortcut is defined as $c + d$. The shortcut quality of G , denoted by $SQ(G)$, is defined as the smallest shortcut quality of the worst-case partition of V into connected parts.

Anagnostides et al. [ALH⁺22] provide efficient algorithms for Laplacian solving in terms of the shortcut quality. Moreover, they provide an $\tilde{\Omega}(SQ(G))$ lower bound.

Theorem 1.5 ([ALH⁺22]). *There exists a Laplacian solver with error $\epsilon > 0$ in the CONGEST model that, given a graph G , takes $n^{o(1)} \text{poly}(SQ(G)) \log(1/\epsilon)$ rounds. In graphs with minor density δ and hop-diameter D , it takes $n^{o(1)} \delta D \log(1/\epsilon)$.*

Note that on graphs with minor density $n^{o(1)}$ the algorithm takes $n^{o(1)} D \log(1/\epsilon)$ rounds, matching the lower bound up to $n^{o(1)}$ factors. This includes planar graphs, $n^{o(1)}$ -genus graphs, $n^{o(1)}$ -treewidth graphs, and excluded-minor graphs.

Further note that in particular on graphs G with $SQ(G) = n^{o(1)}$ the algorithm takes $n^{o(1)} \log(1/\epsilon)$ rounds. This includes expanders, hop-constrained expanders, and the classes mentioned above with restricted diameter $D = n^{o(1)}$.

2 Overview and Techniques

2.1 LP Solver

For our LP solver, we give an implementation of Lee and Sidford's [LS14] LP solver in the CONGEST model. For correctness, we refer to [LS14]. In a similar fashion, Forster and de Vos [FdV22] gave an implementation of this algorithm in the Broadcast Congested Clique. In this distributed model, each round each node can send *the same* $O(\log n)$ -bit message to every other node in the network. This is in contrast to the CONGEST model, where nodes can send different messages, but only to its neighbors. Forster and de Vos essentially show that this LP framework uses \sqrt{n} iterations, where each iteration involves:

- (1) Matrix-vector multiplication involving some matrix with entries corresponding to edges;
- (2) Approximately solving a Laplacian system;
- (3) Computing leverage scores;
- (4) Projecting on a mixed norm ball.

For this section (and the formulation of Theorem 1.3), we assume that matrix-vector multiplication can be done efficiently. In practice, this means that we have to be able to write the constraint matrix in terms of the adjacency matrix. In other words, there should only be constraints that correspond to edges.

For (2), we can use [FGL⁺21, ALH⁺22], as mentioned in section 1.2.

Concerning (3); the leverage score of a matrix M is defined by $\sigma(M) := \text{diag}(M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T)$, where $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ returns the diagonal vector. We remark (similar to [LS14, FdV22]) that, using the Johnson-Lindenstrauss Lemma, we can compute a sufficient approximation by some local sampling and a small number of matrix-vector multiplications and Laplacian solves. Details can be found in section 3.

It remains to show that we can ‘project on a mixed norm ball’. The objective here is to project a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ onto a ball of mixed norm. In particular, given $l \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we consider the ball of mixed norm 1: $\mathcal{B} := \{x : \|x\|_2 + \|l^{-1}x\|_\infty \leq 1\}$. Now we need to compute $x \in \mathcal{B}$ closest to a , more formally we need to compute

$$\arg \max_{\|x\|_2 + \|l^{-1}x\|_\infty \leq 1} a^T x.$$

We do this by borrowing ideas from [LS14, FdV22]. Details can be found in section 3.

2.2 Minimum Cost Flow

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a directed graph, with integer capacities $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, integer costs $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$, and source and target nodes s and t respectively. The *minimum cost (maximum) flow* problem is to find an s - t flow of minimum cost, among all such flows of maximum value. More formally, we say that $f \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E$ is a s - t flow if $f_e \leq c_e$ for all $e \in E$ and $\sum_{e \in E: v \in e} f_e = 0$. The *value* of the flow is $\sum_{v \in V: (s,v) \in E} f_{(s,v)}$. The *maximum flow*, is the flow of maximum value and the *minimum cost (maximum) flow* is the flow of minimum cost $\sum_{e \in E} f_e q_e$ among all flows of maximum value.

The minimum cost flow problem has a natural corresponding linear program. However, the state-of-the-art LP solvers only provide an approximate solution. To turn this efficiently into an exact solution, we do not consider the textbook LP formulation, but one that is closely related. After solving this up to high precision (additive error $\epsilon = O(1/\text{poly}(m))$), we use the well-known fact that a minimum cost flow problem with integer input admits an optimal solution with integer values [KT06], and we (internally) round the approximate fractional solution to an optimal integer solution.

The technical contribution is to show that this particular LP formulation satisfies the demands of Theorem 1.3. This is done in Appendix A.

3 A Distributed LP Solver

In this section, we present our algorithm to solve a linear program, given a Laplacian solver. First, we reiterate the formal description of the problem. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $l_i \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, and $u_i \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ for all $i \in [m]$, where we assume $l_i \neq -\infty$ or $u_i \neq +\infty$. The linear program we try to solve is as follows

$$\text{OPT} := \min_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^m: A^T x = b \\ \forall i \in [m]: l_i \leq x_i \leq u_i}} c^T x.$$

We assume that the set of feasible solutions to the LP $\Omega^\circ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : A^T x = b, l_i \leq x_i \leq u_i\}$ is non-empty.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a constraint matrix with $\text{rank}(A) = n$, let $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a demand vector, and let $c \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be a cost vector. Moreover, let $x_0 \in \Omega^\circ$ be a given initial point. Suppose a CONGEST network consists of n nodes, where each node i knows both every entire j -th row of A for which $A_{ji} \neq 0$ and knows $(x_0)_j$ if $A_{ji} \neq 0$. Moreover, suppose that for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and positive diagonal $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ we can compute $(A^T W A)^{-1} y$ up to precision $\text{poly}(1/m)$ in $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G)$ rounds. Let $U := \max\{\|1/(u - x_0)\|_\infty, \|1/(x_0 - l)\|_\infty, \|u - l\|_\infty, \|c\|_\infty\}$. Then with high probability the CONGEST algorithm `LPSolve` outputs a vector $x \in \Omega^\circ$ with $c^T x \leq \text{OPT} + \epsilon$ in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \log^3(U/\epsilon) T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$ rounds.*

The algorithm we provide in this section is an implementation of Lee and Sidford’s [LS14] in the CONGEST model. We refer to them for the proof of correctness. For the two subroutines that we change, computing leverage scores and projecting on a mixed norm ball, we provide a correctness analysis. The remainder of this section consists of presenting the algorithm and

proving the bound on the number of rounds. In both we follow notation of Forster and de Vos [FdV22], who provide the equivalent for the Broadcast Congested Clique.

Lee and Sidford [LS19]² show that it is sufficient to solve equations involving $A^T D A$ up to precision $\text{poly}(1/m)$. We use this fact for our running time, and simplify our presentation by writing as if we solve such equations exactly. Similarly, we need to perform matrix-vector multiplication with the adjacency matrix and diagonal matrices only up to precision $\text{poly}(\epsilon/(mU))$. Further we can assume all values are upper bounded by $\text{poly}(mU/\epsilon)$. Due to the bandwidth constraint of the CONGEST model, these multiplications take $\tilde{O}(\log(U/\epsilon))$ rounds. At the end of the computation both incident nodes to an edge know its value.

Further, we use throughout in runtime bounds that $D = \tilde{O}(T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$, which holds since $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G) = \tilde{\Omega}(SQ(G)) = \tilde{\Omega}(D)$ [ALH⁺22].

Definitions and Set-Up On a high level, we perform a weighted path following interior point method. This means that throughout a number of iterations, given a current point $x^{(i)} \in \Omega^\circ$, we find a point $x^{(i+1)} \in \Omega^\circ$ closer to the optimal solution. To control that a point $x^{(i)}$ stays away from the boundary, we need to control $l_j \leq x_j^{(i)} \leq u_j$ for $j \in [n]$. This is done using a *barrier function* $\phi_i(x_i)$, which goes to ∞ when x_i goes to the boundary, i.e., to l_j or u_j . The path then looks as follows:

$$x^{(i)} = \arg \min_{A^T x = b} \left(i \cdot c^T x + \sum_{j \in [m]} \phi_j(x_j) \right). \quad (1)$$

To make this work, we need some more properties on ϕ , leading to the definition of a self-concordant barrier function.

Definition 3.1. *A convex, thrice continuously differentiable function $\phi: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a ν -self-concordant barrier function for open convex set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ if the following three conditions are satisfied*

1. $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \phi(x_i) = \infty$ for all sequences $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $x_i \in K$ converging to the boundary of K .
2. $|\phi'''(x)[h, h, h]| \leq 2|\phi''(x)[h, h]|^{3/2}$ for all $x \in K$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
3. $|\phi'(x)[h]| \leq \sqrt{\nu}|\phi''(x)[h, h]|^{1/2}$ for all $x \in K$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

In our case, we choose ϕ as follows.

- If l_i is finite and $u_i = +\infty$, we use a log barrier: $\phi_i(x) := -\log(x - l_i)$.
- If $l_i = -\infty$ and u_i is finite, we use a log barrier: $\phi_i(x) := -\log(u_i - x)$.
- If l_i and u_i are finite, we use a trigonometric barrier: $\phi_i(x) := -\log \cos(a_i x + b_i)$, where $a_i := \frac{\pi}{u_i - l_i}$ and $b_i := -\frac{\pi}{2} \frac{u_i + l_i}{u_i - l_i}$.

This ϕ is a 1-concordant barrier function [LS19]. It can be computed internally in the CONGEST model, since we only require local knowledge of the constraints. By using this function in Equation 1, we obtain a $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{m} \log(1/\epsilon))$ iteration method [Ren88].

We can generalize Equation 1 to

$$x^{(i)} = \arg \min_{A^T x = b} \left(i \cdot c^T x + \sum_{j \in [m]} g_j(x) \phi_j(x_j) \right), \quad (2)$$

²In this section, we refer to the arXiv version [LS19] rather than the conference version [LS14], whenever the technical details can only be found there.

for some *weight functions* $g_j: \Omega^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$. Lee and Sidford [LS14] show that using *regularized Lewis weights* we only need $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \log(1/\epsilon))$ iterations.

To give the formal definition of the regularized Lewis weight function, we first introduce some general notation.

- For any matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we let $\text{diag}(M) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the diagonal of M , i.e., $\text{diag}(M)_i := M_{ii}$.
- For any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write upper case $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ for the diagonal matrix associated to x , i.e., $X_{ii} := x_i$ and $X_{ij} := 0$ if $i \neq j$.
- For $x \in \Omega^\circ$, we write $A_x := (\Phi''(x))^{-1/2} A$.
- For $h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write $J_h(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ for the Jacobian of h at x , i.e., $[J_h(x)]_{ij} := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} h(x)_i$.
- For positive $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, we let $\|\cdot\|_w$ the norm defined by $\|x\|_w^2 = \sum_{i \in [n]} w_i x_i^2$, and we let $\|\cdot\|_{w+\infty}$ the *mixed norm* defined by $\|x\|_{w+\infty} = \|x\|_\infty + C_{\text{norm}} \|x\|_w$ for some constant $C_{\text{norm}} > 0$ to be defined later.
- Whenever we apply scalar operation to vectors, these operations are applied coordinate-wise, e.g., for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $[x/y]_i := x_i/y_i$, and $[x^{-1}]_i := x_i^{-1}$.

Definition 3.2. A differentiable function $g: \Omega^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ is a (c_1, c_s, c_k) -weight function if the following bounds holds for all $x \in \Omega^\circ$ and $i \in [m]$:

- *size bound:* $\max\{1, \|g(x)\|_1\} \leq c_1$;
- *sensitivity bound:* $e_i^T G(x)^{-1} A_x (A_x^T G(x)^{-1} A_x)^{-1} A_x^T G(x)^{-1} e_i \leq c_s$;
- *consistency bound:* $\|G(x)^{-1} J_g(x) (\Phi''(x))^{-1/2}\|_{g(x)+\infty} \leq 1 - c_k < 1$.

We denote $C_{\text{norm}} := 24\sqrt{c_s c_k}$.

Following Lee and Sidford [LS14], we use the *regularized Lewis weights*. The ℓ_p -Lewis weights generalize a ℓ_2 measure of row importance called leverage scores. They are a key tool in approximating matrix ℓ_p -norms.

Definition 3.3. For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(M) = n$, we let

$$\sigma(M) := \text{diag}(M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T)$$

denote the leverage scores of M . For all $p > 0$, we define the ℓ_p -Lewis weights $w_p(M)$ as the unique vector $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ such that $w = \sigma(W^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} M)$, where $w = \text{diag}(W)$. We define the regularized Lewis weights as $g(x) := w_p(M_x) + c_0$, for $p = 1 - \frac{1}{\log(4m)}$ and $c_0 := \frac{n}{2m}$.

The regularized Lewis weight function g is a (c_1, c_s, c_k) -weight function with $c_1 \leq \frac{3}{2}n$, $c_s \leq 4$, and $c_k \leq 2 \log(4m)$ [LS19].

As said before, Lee and Sidford show that using Equation 2 with this weight function for $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \log(1/\epsilon))$ iterations gives an ϵ -approximate solution to our LP.

Computing Leverage Scores Existing techniques for computing regularized Lewis weights compute leverage scores $\sigma(M) := \text{diag}(M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T)$ as an intermediate step. As shown later, by repeatedly computing leverage scores, we can approximate the Lewis weights. Unfortunately, there are no known efficient algorithms for computing leverage scores exactly. However, obtaining a sufficiently close approximation is feasible [SS11, DMMW12, Mah11, LMP13, Woo14, CLM⁺15]. We observe that $\sigma(M)_i = \|M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T e_i\|_2^2$, and note that by the Johnson-Lindenstrauss lemma [JL84] this norm can be approximately preserved under projections onto a low dimensional subspace. In particular Achlioptas [Ach03] gives an explicit (randomized) construction.

Theorem 3.4 ([Ach03]). *Let $m > 0$ be an integer, let $\eta, \beta > 0$ be parameters, let $k = \Omega(\beta \log m / \eta^2)$ be an integer, and let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times m}$ be a random matrix, where $R_{ij} = \pm 1/\sqrt{k}$, each with probability $1/2$. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}[(1 - \eta)\|x\|_2 \leq \|Rx\|_2 \leq (1 + \eta)\|x\|_2] \geq 1 - m^{-\beta}.$$

Now we are ready to give an algorithm to compute σ^{apx} such that $(1 - \eta)\sigma(M)_i \leq \sigma_i^{\text{apx}} \leq (1 + \eta)\sigma(M)_i$, for all $i \in [m]$.

Algorithm 1: COMPUTELEVAGESCORES(M, η)

- 1 Set $k = \Theta(\log(m)/\eta^2)$.
 - 2 Let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times m}$ be a matrix where $R_{ij} = \pm 1/\sqrt{k}$, each with probability $1/2$.
 - 3 Compute $p^{(j)} = M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T R^{(j)}$ for $j \in [k]$.
 - 4 **return** $\sum_{j=1}^k (p^{(j)})^2$.
-

Lemma 3.5. *For any $\eta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 1/m^{O(1)}$ the CONGEST model algorithm ComputeLeverageScores(M, η) computes $\sigma^{\text{apx}}(M)$ such that*

$$(1 - \eta)\sigma(M)_i \leq \sigma^{\text{apx}}(M)_i \leq (1 + \eta)\sigma(M)_i$$

for all $i \in [m]$. If $M = WA$, for some diagonal $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, then it terminates in $\tilde{O}((\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))/\eta^2)$ rounds.

Proof. ComputeLeverageScores(M, η) returns $\sigma^{\text{apx}}(M)_i$. Using that the matrix $M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T$ is symmetric, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{\text{apx}}(M)_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^k (M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T R^{(j)})_i^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k (R M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T)_{ji}^2 \\ &= \|R M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T e_i\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since we also have $\sigma(M)_i = \|M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T e_i\|_2^2$, Theorem 3.4 gives us that

$$(1 - \eta)\sigma(M)_i \leq \sigma^{\text{apx}}(M)_i \leq (1 + \eta)\sigma(M)_i,$$

with probability at least $1 - 1/m^{O(1)}$. Using a union bound, we can get the same guarantee for all $i \in [m]$ simultaneously.

In the CONGEST model, we construct the required random matrix R as follows. For each edge, the node with higher ID flips k coins to determine the values $\pm 1/\sqrt{k}$ and sends the result over the edge. This takes $O(k/\log n) = O(1/\eta^2)$ rounds.

For the computation in line 3, we note that we can view this as k times

- a matrix-vector multiplication $M^T R^{(j)}$, followed by
- a Laplacian system solve $(M^T M)^{-1} M^T R^{(j)}$, as $M^T M = A^T W^2 A$, followed by
- a matrix-vector multiplication $M(M^T M)^{-1} M^T R^{(j)}$.

The first and last step can be done in $\tilde{O}(\log(U/\epsilon))$ rounds, and the Laplacian solve can be done in $T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G)$ rounds. Finally, line 4 can be done internally. Hence we have total running time $\tilde{O}((\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))/\eta^2)$. \square

Computing the Weight Function We continue by providing the algorithms for computing the initial weights, and for updating the weights throughout the path finding algorithm. As we use the latter for the former, we give the latter first.

Algorithm 2: COMPUTEAPXWEIGHTS($M, p, w^{(0)}, \eta$)

```

1  $L = \max\{4, \frac{8}{p}\}$ ,  $r = \frac{p^2(4-p)}{2^{20}}$ , and  $\delta = \frac{(4-p)\eta}{256}$ .
2  $T = \left\lceil 80 \left( \frac{p}{2} + \frac{2}{p} \right) \log \left( \frac{pn}{32\eta} \right) \right\rceil$ .
3 for  $j = 1, \dots, T - 1$  do
4    $\sigma^{(j)} = \text{ComputeLeverageScores}(W_{(j)}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} M, \delta/2)$ .
5   for  $i \in [m]$  do
6     Let  $w_i^{(j+1)}$  be the median of  $(1-r)w_i^{(0)}$ ,  $w_i^{(j)} - \frac{1}{L} \left( w_i^{(0)} - \frac{w_i^{(0)}}{w_i^{(j)}} \sigma_i^{(j)} \right)$ , and
        $(1+r)w_i^{(0)}$ .
7 return  $w^{(T)}$ .
```

Lemma 3.6. *Let $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be some diagonal matrix, let $w^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ be a vector, and let $\eta \in (0, 1]$ and $p \in [1 - 1/\log(4m), 2]$ be parameters. Set $M = WA$. Then COMPUTEAPXWEIGHTS($M, p, w^{(0)}, \eta$) returns approximate weights in*

$$\tilde{O}\left(\frac{\log(1/\eta)}{\eta^2}(\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))\right)$$

rounds.

Proof. The algorithm consists of $T = \tilde{O}\left((p + \frac{1}{p})\log(p/\eta)\right)$ iterations. Using the assumption that $p \in [1 - 1/\log(4m), 2]$, we get $T = \tilde{O}(\log(1/\eta))$. In each iteration, we call the procedure $\text{ComputeLeverageScores}(W_{(j)}^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} M, \delta/2)$ and compute some medians, the latter of which can be done internally. The call to $\text{ComputeLeverageScores}$ takes $\tilde{O}((\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))/(\delta/2)^2) = \tilde{O}((\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))/\eta^2)$ rounds, giving us the total running time as stated. \square

For the properties and correctness of the approximate weights we refer to [LS19]. Using the following algorithm, we compute the initial weights. We do this by iteratively bringing the

all-ones vector closer to the initial weight vector.

Algorithm 3: COMPUTEINITIALWEIGHTS($A, p_{\text{target}}, \eta$)

```

1  $p = 2$ .
2  $w = 12c_k \mathbf{1}$ .
3 while  $p \neq p_{\text{target}}$  do
4    $h = \frac{\min\{2, p\}}{\sqrt{n} \log \frac{me^2}{n}} \cdot r$ .
5   Let  $p^{(\text{new})}$  be the median of  $p - h$ ,  $p_{\text{target}}$ , and  $p + h$ .
6    $w = \text{ComputeApxWeights}(A, p^{(\text{new})}, w^{p^{(\text{new})}/p}, \frac{p^2(4-p)}{2^{22}})$ .
7    $p = p^{(\text{new})}$ .
8 return  $\text{ComputeApxWeights}(A, p_{\text{target}}, w, \eta)$ .
```

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\eta \in (0, 1]$ and $p_{\text{target}} \in [1 - 1/\log(4m), 2]$ be parameters, then the CONGEST model algorithm $\text{COMPUTEINITIALWEIGHTS}(A, p_{\text{target}}, \eta)$ returns initial weights in $\tilde{O}((\sqrt{n} + \frac{\log(1/\eta)}{\eta^2})(\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}(G)}))$ rounds.*

Proof. The while loop of line 3 finishes in $O(\sqrt{n}(p_{\text{target}} + \frac{1}{p_{\text{target}}}) \log(m/n))$ iterations. Using that $p_{\text{target}} \in [1 - 1/\log(4m), 2]$, this simplifies to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ iterations. Each iteration consists of internally computing h and some medians, and a call to ComputeApxWeights . This call requires precision $\frac{p^2(4-p)}{2^{22}}$, which is $\Omega(1)$ for our range of p . So the while loop takes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}(\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}(G)}))$ rounds in total.

Then in line 8 we call ComputeApxWeights with precision η , which takes $\tilde{O}(\frac{\log(1/\eta)}{\eta^2}(\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}(G)}))$ rounds. Together this gives the stated running time. \square

For the properties and correctness of the initial weights we refer to [LS19].

Algorithm In this section, we give the formal algorithm for solving the LP, together with a series of lemmas proving the running time of each subroutine.

Algorithm 4: LPSOLVE(x_0, ϵ)

```

Input: an initial point  $x_0$  such that  $A^T x_0 = b$ .
1  $w = \text{ComputeInitialWeights}(A, 1 - 1/\log(4m), \frac{1}{2^{16} \log^3 m}) + \frac{n}{2m}$ ,  $d = -w\phi'(x_0)$ .
2  $t_1 = (2^{27} m^{3/2} U^2 \log^4 m)^{-1}$ ,  $t_2 = \frac{2m}{\eta}$ ,  $\eta_1 = \frac{1}{2^{18} \log^3 m}$ , and  $\eta_2 = \frac{\epsilon}{8U^2}$ .
3  $(x^{(\text{new})}, w^{(\text{new})}) = \text{PathFollowing}(x_0, w, 1, t_1, \eta_1, d)$ .
4  $(x^{(\text{final})}, w^{(\text{final})}) = \text{PathFollowing}(x^{(\text{new})}, w^{(\text{new})}, t_1, t_2, \eta_2, c)$ .
5 return  $x^{(\text{final})}$ .
```

After computing the initial weights, this algorithm calls PathFollowing twice, first to move the given initial point towards a central starting point with respect to the cost vector c , and second to move the path along from there. The algorithm PathFollowing is as follows.

Algorithm 5: PATHFOLLOWING($x, w, t_{\text{start}}, t_{\text{end}}, \eta, c$)

```

1  $t = t_{\text{start}}$ ,  $R = \frac{1}{768c_k^2 \log(36c_1 c_s c_k m)}$ , and  $\alpha = \frac{R}{1600\sqrt{n} \log^2 m}$ .
2 while  $t \neq t_{\text{end}}$  do
3    $(x, w) = \text{CenteringInexact}(x, w, t, c)$ .
4   Let  $t$  be the median of  $(1 - \alpha)t$ ,  $t_{\text{end}}$ , and  $(1 + \alpha)t$ .
5 for  $i = 1, \dots, 4c_k \log(\frac{1}{\eta})$  do
6    $(x, w) = \text{CenteringInexact}(x, w, t_{\text{end}}, c)$ .
7 return  $(x, w)$ .
```

The progress steps in `PathFollowing` are made by `CenteringInexact`, which is as follows.

Algorithm 6: `CENTERINGINEXACT`(x, w, t, c)

- 1 $R = \frac{1}{768c_k^2 \log(36c_1 c_s c_k m)}$, and $\eta = \frac{1}{2c_k}$.
 - 2 $\delta = \left\| P_{x,w} \left(\frac{tc+w\phi'(x)}{w\sqrt{\phi''(x)}} \right) \right\|_{w+\infty}$ // where $P_{x,w} := I - W^{-1}A_x(A_x^T W^{-1}A_x)^{-1}A_x^T$.
 - 3 $x^{(\text{new})} = x - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\phi''(x)}} P_{x,w} \left(\frac{tc-w\phi'(x)}{w\sqrt{\phi''(x)}} \right)$.
 - 4 $z = \log(\text{ComputeApWeights}(A_{x^{(\text{new})}}, 1 - 1/\log(4m), w, e^R - 1))$.
 - 5 $u = \left(1 - \frac{6}{7c_k}\right) \delta \cdot \text{ProjectMixedBall}(-\nabla\Phi \frac{\eta}{12R}(z - \log(w)), C_{\text{norm}}\sqrt{w})$.
 - 6 $w^{(\text{new})} = \exp(\log(w) + u)$.
 - 7 **return** $(x^{(\text{new})}, w^{(\text{new})})$.
-

We present the subroutine `ProjectMixedBall` in section 4. We prove the running times of these three algorithms in reverse order.

Lemma 3.8. *The CONGEST model algorithm `CenteringInexact`(x, w, t, c) terminates in*

$$\tilde{O}(\log^2(U/\epsilon)T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$$

rounds.

Proof. Computing $P_{x,w} \left(\frac{tc+w\phi'(x)}{w\sqrt{\phi''(x)}} \right)$ takes $\tilde{O}(T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$ rounds, using internal computation for multiplying with diagonal matrices and a Laplacian solve. To compute δ and make it known to every node, we use $\tilde{O}(D \log(U/\epsilon))$ rounds.

Next, we call `ComputeApWeights` with precision $\eta = \tilde{\Omega}(1)$, so this takes $\tilde{O}(\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$ rounds by Lemma 3.6. Finally we call the algorithm `ProjectMixedBall`, which takes

$$\tilde{O}(D \log^2(U/\epsilon)) = \tilde{O}(\log^2(U/\epsilon)T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$$

rounds by Lemma 4.1. □

We use this result to prove the running time of `PathFollowing`.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $t_{\text{start}}, t_{\text{end}} \geq 1$, and $\eta \in (0, 1]$ be parameters. The CONGEST model algorithm `PathFollowing`($x, w, t_{\text{start}}, t_{\text{end}}, \eta, c$) terminates in*

$$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}(|\log(t_{\text{end}}/t_{\text{start}})| + \log(1/\eta)) \log^2(U/\epsilon)T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$$

rounds.

Proof. First, we note that the while loop of line 2 uses $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}(|\log(t_{\text{end}}/t_{\text{start}})| + \log(1/\eta)))$ iterations [LS19]. Each such iteration consists of a call to `CenteringInexact` and internal computations. Then the for loop of line 5 takes $O(c_k \log(1/\eta))$ iterations, each consisting of a call to `CenteringInexact`. Clearly this is dominated by the running time of the while loop.

Since `CenteringInexact` takes $\tilde{O}(\log^2(U/\epsilon)T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$ rounds by Lemma 3.8, we obtain the stated running time. □

Finally, we give the running time of the complete algorithm.

Lemma 3.10. *Given $\epsilon > 0$, the CONGEST model algorithm `LPSolve`(x_0, ϵ) terminates in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \log^3(U/\epsilon)T_{\text{Laplacian}}(G))$ rounds.*

Proof. Apart from some internal computation, this algorithm consists of three different parts: computing initial weight and two calls to `PathFollowing` with different parameters.

The call to `ComputeInitialWeights` takes

$$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n}(\log(U/\epsilon) + T_{\text{Laplacian}(G)}))$$

rounds, since we call it with precision $\frac{1}{2^{16} \log^3 m}$.

The execution of `PathFollowing` $(x_0, w, 1, t_1, \eta_1, d)$ takes

$$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \log(U) \log^2(U/\epsilon) T_{\text{Laplacian}(G)})$$

rounds, by Lemma 3.9 and plugging in t_1 and η_1 .

The execution of `PathFollowing` $(x^{(\text{new})}, w^{(\text{new})}, t_1, t_2, \eta_2, c)$ takes

$$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \log^3(U/\epsilon) T_{\text{Laplacian}(G)})$$

rounds, by Lemma 3.9 and plugging in t_1, t_2 and η_2 .

The last running time dominates the first two and gives the stated result. \square

4 Projecting on a Mixed Norm Ball

In this section, we present a CONGEST algorithm for projecting on a mixed norm ball. This problem is defined as follows. Given $a, l \in \mathbb{R}^m$, find

$$\arg \max_{\|x\|_2 + \|l^{-1}x\|_\infty \leq 1} a^T x.$$

In the original work, Lee and Sidford [LS19] initially sort m values and precompute m functions on a and l . In the CONGEST model, these are expensive routines. We borrow ideas from Forster and de Vos [FdV22], who overcame the same problem for the Broadcast Congested Clique. The rough idea is to only sort implicitly, and perform a binary search to reduce the number of functions that we have to compute to a manageable amount. We provide pseudocode in algorithm 7, with more details in the proof of Lemma 4.1. The pseudocode has a rather complicated binary search and some daunting equations in it. Both are probably best understood by examining the proof.

Note that this problem has little to do with the graph structure in the CONGEST model, and as expected the algorithm actually does not make use of the graph structure other than establishing a shortest path tree for communication.

Algorithm 7: PROJECTMIXEDBALL(a, l)

- 1 Determine the minimum value, maximum value, and step size of $\{|a_i|/l_i : i \in [m]\}$, denote this space of possible values S .
- 2 For $s \in S$, let i be the index of the value $|a_i|/l_i$ closest to s .
- 3 Perform a binary search on S w.r.t. g_i :
- 4 Compute $\sum_{k \in [j]} |a_k| l_k$, $\sum_{k \in [j]} a_k^2$, and $\sum_{k \in [j]} l_k^2$ for $j \in \{i-1, i\}$.
- 5 Internally compute

$$g_i := \max_{t: i_t = i} t \sum_{k \in [i]} |a_k| l_k + \sqrt{(1-t)^2 - t^2 \sum_{k \in [i]} l_k^2} \sqrt{\|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{k \in [i]} a_k^2}.$$

- 6 Let t be the index corresponding to the maximal g_i .

$$7 \quad x_j^i := \begin{cases} \frac{t}{1-t} \text{sign}(a_j) l_j & \text{if } j \in [i] \\ \sqrt{\frac{1 - \left(\frac{t}{1-t}\right)^2 \sum_{k \in [i]} l_k^2}{\|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{k \in [i]} a_k^2}} a_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- 8 return x
-

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose the vectors $a, l \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are distributed over the network such that: 1) for each $i \in [m]$, a_i and l_i are known by exactly one node, 2) a node knows a_i if and only if it knows l_i . Moreover, suppose that $\|a\|_\infty, \|l\|_\infty \leq O(\text{poly}(m)U)$. Then the algorithm `ProjectMixedBall`(a, l) finds*

$$\arg \max_{\|x\|_2 + \|l^{-1}x\|_\infty \leq 1} a^T x$$

up to precision $O(1/(\text{poly}(mU/\epsilon)))$ in $\tilde{O}(D \log^2(U/\epsilon))$ rounds in the `CONGEST` model.

Proof. We rewrite the problem into maximizing over some concave function, which has a unique maximum that can be found using a binary search over the domain. We start by parameterizing the ℓ_2 -norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\|x\|_2 + \|l^{-1}x\|_\infty \leq 1} a^T x &= \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \left[\max_{\|x\|_2 \leq 1-t, -tl_i \leq x_i \leq tl_i} a^T x \right] \\ &= \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} (1-t) \left[\max_{\|x\|_2 \leq 1, -\frac{t}{1-t}l_i \leq x_i \leq \frac{t}{1-t}l_i} a^T x \right] \\ &= \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} g(t), \end{aligned}$$

where we define $g(t)$ as

$$g(t) := (1-t) \left[\max_{\|x\|_2 \leq 1, -\frac{t}{1-t}l_i \leq x_i \leq \frac{t}{1-t}l_i} a^T x \right].$$

We *conceptually* sort the values of a and l with $|a_i|/l_i$ monotonically decreasing, i.e., we only sort them for this notation in the proof, the algorithm does not sort the values. Next, we write i_t for the first coordinate $i \in [m]$ such that

$$\frac{1 - \left(\frac{t}{1-t}\right)^2 \sum_{k \in [i_t]} l_k^2}{\|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{k \in [i_t]} a_k^2} \leq \frac{\left(\frac{t}{1-t}\right)^2 l_i^2}{a_i^2}.$$

Now it can be shown (see e.g. [LS19]) that the vector that attains the maximum in $g(t)$ is $x^{i_t} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, defined by

$$x_j^{i_t} := \begin{cases} \frac{t}{1-t} \text{sign}(a_j) l_j & \text{if } j \in [i_t] \\ \sqrt{\frac{1 - \left(\frac{t}{1-t}\right)^2 \sum_{k \in [i_t]} l_k^2}{\|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{k \in [i_t]} a_k^2}} a_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We substitute this into the definition of $g(t)$:

$$g(t) = t \sum_{k \in [i_t]} |a_k| l_k + \sqrt{(1-t)^2 - t^2 \sum_{k \in [i_t]} l_k^2} \sqrt{\|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{k \in [i_t]} a_k^2}.$$

We note that $g(t)$ is a concave function (its second derivative is non-positive), hence it has a unique maximum. We find this maximum by searching over the domain. To do this, we rewrite g in terms of the index i_t :

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} g(t) &= \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \max_{i \in [m]} g_i(t) \\ &= \max_{i \in [m]} \max_{t: i_t=i} g_i(t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g_i(t) := t \sum_{k \in [i]} |a_k| l_k + \sqrt{(1-t)^2 - t^2 \sum_{k \in [i]} l_k^2} \sqrt{\|a\|_2^2 - \sum_{k \in [i]} a_k^2}.$$

Now fix a index i , and suppose a node knows $\sum_{k \in [j]} |a_k| l_k$, $\sum_{k \in [j]} a_k^2$, and $\sum_{k \in [j]} l_k^2$ for $j \in \{i-1, i\}$. Then we can internally compute $g_i := \max_{t: i_t = i} g_i(t)$, because we can internally find the range of t where $i_t = i$, since we have that $i_t \geq i_s$ if $t \leq s$, hence the set of t such that $i_t = j$ is an interval.

Next, we describe how to compute the sums $\sum_{k \in [j]}$. We do this by constructing a shortest path tree of diameter D from the node holding the values a_j, l_j . Along the tree, we aggregate the values of $|a_k| l_k$, a_k^2 , or l_k^2 respectively, for all $k \leq j$. The result can be broadcasted to all nodes without incurring extra costs. Note that if the indices are not known explicitly, the node holding a_j and l_j , can first broadcast $|a_j|/l_j$, and then other nodes only add their values $|a_i|/l_i$ (and others respectively) if $|a_i|/l_i \leq |a_j|/l_j$. Since the values need to be maintained with precision $\text{poly}(mU/\epsilon)$, sending one message needs at most $\tilde{O}(\log(U/\epsilon))$ rounds, so the whole procedure takes at most $\tilde{O}(D \log(U/\epsilon))$ rounds.

Naively, we would now be done by a simple binary search over $i \in [m]$, however we have the complication that we have only conceptually sorted the indices and hence nodes do not know which indices belong to the values they are holding. Instead we do a binary search over the possible values of $|a_i|/l_i$. Again using a communication tree from an arbitrary leader, we can find the global minimum, global maximum, and step size (least common multiple of denominators l_i) for the $|a_i|/l_i$ values. As not all values in the search space appear, we take the closest appearing value for a given value in the binary search. This gives a total search space of size $O(\text{poly}(mU/\epsilon))$, so we need $\tilde{O}(\log(U/\epsilon))$ iterations, each taking $\tilde{O}(D \log(U/\epsilon))$ rounds. \square

References

- [Ach03] Dimitris Achlioptas. Database-friendly random projections: Johnson-lindenstrauss with binary coins. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 66(4):671–687, 2003. Announced at PODS 2001.
- [AKO18] Mohamad Ahmadi, Fabian Kuhn, and Rotem Oshman. Distributed approximate maximum matching in the CONGEST model. In *Proc. of the 32nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2018*, volume 121 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [ALH⁺22] Ioannis Anagnostides, Christoph Lenzen, Bernhard Haeupler, Goran Zuzic, and Themis Gouleakis. Almost universally optimal distributed laplacian solvers via low-congestion shortcuts. In *Proc. of the 36th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2022*, volume 246 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. Announced at PODC 2022.
- [AMV20] Kyriakos Axiotis, Aleksander Mądry, and Adrian Vladu. Circulation control for faster minimum cost flow in unit-capacity graphs. In *Proc. of the 61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*, pages 93–104. IEEE, 2020.
- [ASZ20] Alexandr Andoni, Clifford Stein, and Peilin Zhong. Parallel approximate undirected shortest paths via low hop emulators. In *Proc. of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020*, pages 322–335. ACM, 2020.
- [BFKL21] Ruben Becker, Sebastian Forster, Andreas Karrenbauer, and Christoph Lenzen. Near-optimal approximate shortest paths and transshipment in distributed and

- streaming models. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(3):815–856, 2021. Announced at DISC 2017.
- [CKL⁺22] Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. Maximum flow and minimum-cost flow in almost-linear time. *CoRR*, abs/2203.00671, 2022.
- [CKM⁺14] Michael B. Cohen, Rasmus Kyng, Gary L. Miller, Jakub W. Pachocki, Richard Peng, Anup B. Rao, and Shen Chen Xu. Solving SDD linear systems in nearly $m \log^{1/2} n$ time. In *Proc. of the Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2014*, pages 343–352. ACM, 2014.
- [CLM⁺15] Michael B. Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, Richard Peng, and Aaron Sidford. Uniform sampling for matrix approximation. In *Proc. of the Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS 2015)*, pages 181–190, 2015.
- [CM22] Shiri Chechik and Doron Mukhtar. Single-source shortest paths in the CONGEST model with improved bounds. *Distributed Comput.*, 35(4):357–374, 2022. Announced at PODC 2020.
- [CMSV17] Michael B. Cohen, Aleksander Mądry, Piotr Sankowski, and Adrian Vladu. Negative-weight shortest paths and unit capacity minimum cost flow in $\tilde{o}(m^{10/7} \log w)$ time (extended abstract). In *Proc. of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017*, pages 752–771. SIAM, 2017.
- [DMMW12] Petros Drineas, Malik Magdon-Ismael, Michael W. Mahoney, and David P. Woodruff. Fast approximation of matrix coherence and statistical leverage. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):3475–3506, 2012. Announced at ICML 2012.
- [DS08] Samuel I. Daitch and Daniel A. Spielman. Faster approximate lossy generalized flow via interior point algorithms. In *Proc. of the 40th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2008)*, pages 451–460, 2008.
- [Elk06] Michael Elkin. An unconditional lower bound on the time-approximation trade-off for the distributed minimum spanning tree problem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(2):433–456, 2006.
- [FdV22] Sebastian Forster and Tijn de Vos. The laplacian paradigm in the broadcast congested clique. In *Proc. of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2022*, pages 335–344. ACM, 2022.
- [FGL⁺21] Sebastian Forster, Gramoz Goranci, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Xiaorui Sun, and Mingquan Ye. Minor sparsifiers and the distributed laplacian paradigm. In *Proc. of the 62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021*, pages 989–999. IEEE, 2021.
- [GH16] Mohsen Ghaffari and Bernhard Haeupler. Distributed algorithms for planar networks II: low-congestion shortcuts, mst, and min-cut. In Robert Krauthgamer, editor, *Proc. of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016*, pages 202–219. SIAM, 2016.

- [GKK⁺18] Mohsen Ghaffari, Andreas Karrenbauer, Fabian Kuhn, Christoph Lenzen, and Boaz Patt-Shamir. Near-optimal distributed maximum flow. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 47(6):2078–2117, 2018. Announced at PODC 2015.
- [Gre96] Keith D. Gremban. *Combinatorial preconditioners for sparse, symmetric, diagonally dominant linear systems*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, 1996.
- [JL84] William B Johnson and Joram Lindenstrauss. Extensions of lipschitz mappings into a hilbert space. *Contemp. Math.*, 26:189–206, 1984.
- [KLOS14] Jonathan A. Kelner, Yin Tat Lee, Lorenzo Orecchia, and Aaron Sidford. An almost-linear-time algorithm for approximate max flow in undirected graphs, and its multicommodity generalizations. In *Proc. of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014*, pages 217–226. SIAM, 2014.
- [KLP⁺16] Rasmus Kyng, Yin Tat Lee, Richard Peng, Sushant Sachdeva, and Daniel A. Spielman. Sparsified cholesky and multigrid solvers for connection laplacians. In *Proc. of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016*, pages 842–850. ACM, 2016.
- [KMP11] Ioannis Koutis, Gary L. Miller, and Richard Peng. A nearly- $m \log n$ time solver for SDD linear systems. In *Proc. of the IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2011*, pages 590–598. IEEE Computer Society, 2011.
- [KMP14] Ioannis Koutis, Gary L. Miller, and Richard Peng. Approaching optimality for solving SDD linear systems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(1):337–354, 2014. Announced at FOCS 2010.
- [KOSZ13] Jonathan A. Kelner, Lorenzo Orecchia, Aaron Sidford, and Zeyuan Allen Zhu. A simple, combinatorial algorithm for solving sdd systems in nearly-linear time. In *Proc. of the 45th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2013)*, pages 911–920, 2013.
- [KS16] Rasmus Kyng and Sushant Sachdeva. Approximate gaussian elimination for laplacians - fast, sparse, and simple. In *Proc. of the IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2016*, pages 573–582. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [KT06] Jon M. Kleinberg and Éva Tardos. *Algorithm design*. Addison-Wesley, 2006.
- [Li20] Jason Li. Faster parallel algorithm for approximate shortest path. In *Proc. of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020*, pages 308–321. ACM, 2020.
- [LMP13] Mu Li, Gary L. Miller, and Richard Peng. Iterative row sampling. In *Proc. of the 54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2013)*, pages 127–136, 2013.
- [LS14] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Path finding methods for linear programming: Solving linear programs in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\text{rank}})$ iterations and faster algorithms for maximum flow. In *Proc. of the 55th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2014)*, pages 424–433. IEEE Computer Society, 2014.
- [LS19] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Solving linear programs with $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\text{rank}})$ linear system solves. *CoRR*, abs/1910.08033, 2019.

- [LS20a] Yang P. Liu and Aaron Sidford. Faster divergence maximization for faster maximum flow. *CoRR*, abs/2003.08929, 2020.
- [LS20b] Yang P. Liu and Aaron Sidford. Faster energy maximization for faster maximum flow. In *Proc. of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020*, pages 803–814. ACM, 2020.
- [Mah11] Michael W. Mahoney. Randomized algorithms for matrices and data. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 3(2):123–224, 2011.
- [M13] Aleksander Mądry. Navigating central path with electrical flows: From flows to matchings, and back. In *Proc. of the 54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2013*, pages 253–262. IEEE Computer Society, 2013.
- [M16] Aleksander Mądry. Computing maximum flow with augmenting electrical flows. In *Proc. of the IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2016*, pages 593–602. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [Pel00] David Peleg. *Distributed computing: a locality-sensitive approach*. SIAM, 2000.
- [Pen16] Richard Peng. Approximate undirected maximum flows in $O(m\text{polylog}(n))$ time. In *Proc. of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016*, pages 1862–1867. SIAM, 2016.
- [PR00] David Peleg and Vitaly Rubinfeld. A near-tight lower bound on the time complexity of distributed minimum-weight spanning tree construction. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 30(5):1427–1442, 2000. Announced at FOCS 1999.
- [PS14] Richard Peng and Daniel A. Spielman. An efficient parallel solver for SDD linear systems. In *Proc. of the Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2014*, pages 333–342. ACM, 2014.
- [Ren88] James Renegar. A polynomial-time algorithm, based on newton’s method, for linear programming. *Mathematical programming*, 40(1-3):59–93, 1988.
- [She13] Jonah Sherman. Nearly maximum flows in nearly linear time. In *Proc. of the 54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2013*, pages 263–269. IEEE Computer Society, 2013.
- [SHK⁺12] 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. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 41(5):1235–1265, 2012. Announced at STOC 2011.
- [SS11] Daniel A. Spielman and Nikhil Srivastava. Graph sparsification by effective resistances. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(6):1913–1926, 2011. Announced at STOC 2008.
- [ST04] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Nearly-linear time algorithms for graph partitioning, graph sparsification, and solving linear systems. In *Proc. of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2004)*, pages 81–90. ACM, 2004.
- [vdBLN⁺20] Jan van den Brand, Yin Tat Lee, Danupon Nanongkai, Richard Peng, Thatchaphol Saranurak, Aaron Sidford, Zhao Song, and Di Wang. Bipartite matching in nearly-linear time on moderately dense graphs. In *Proc. of the 61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*, pages 919–930. IEEE, 2020.

A Minimum Cost Flow

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1 by applying Theorem 1.3 to a suitable linear program and rounding the result to an exact solution accordingly. This particular LP formulation of minimum cost flow has first been presented by Daitch and Spielman [DS08], and is used by Lee and Sidford [LS19], and Forster and de Vos [FdV22]. As opposed to the formulation of Theorem 1.1, we use $|V|$ and $|E|$ in this section to indicate the size of the node and edge set. We reserve n and m for the dimensions of the linear program, in line with section 3. We write M for the maximal edge capacity and cost.

Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{(|V|-1) \times |E|}$ be the edge-node incidence matrix with the row for the source s omitted. The variables of the LP consist of $x \in \mathbb{R}^{|E|}$, $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}$ and $F \in \mathbb{R}$. The linear program is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \tilde{q}^T x + \lambda(1^T y + 1^T z) - 2n\tilde{M}F \\ & \text{subject to } Bx + y - z = Fe_t, \\ & \quad 0 \leq x_i \leq c_i, \\ & \quad 0 \leq y_i \leq 4|V|M, \\ & \quad 0 \leq z_i \leq 4|V|M, \\ & \quad 0 \leq F \leq 2|V|M, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{M} := 8|E|^2 M^3$, $\lambda := 28160|E|^8 2M^9$, and $\tilde{q} = c + r$, where for each edge r_e is a uniformly random number from $\left\{ \frac{1}{4|E|^2 M^2}, \frac{2}{4|E|^2 M^2}, \dots, \frac{2|E|M}{4|E|^2 M^2} \right\}$. Daitch and Spielman [DS08] show that with probability at least $1/2$ this problem has a unique solution, which is also a valid solution to the original problem. After applying this reduction we (conceptually) scale everything by $4|E|^2 M^2$ to ensure the cost vector is integral again.

We set the variables as follows to obtain an initial interior point: $F = |V|M$, $x = \frac{c}{2}$, $y = 2|V|M\mathbf{1} - (B\frac{c}{2})^- + Fe_t$, $z = 2|V|M\mathbf{1} + (B\frac{c}{2})^+$, where we denote a^+ and a^- for the vectors defined by

$$(a^+)_i := \begin{cases} a_i & \text{if } a_i \geq 0; \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad (a^-)_i := \begin{cases} a_i & \text{if } a_i \leq 0 \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

respectively.

Next, we describe how we transform an ϵ -approximate solution x to this LP into an exact solution for the minimum cost flow problem. By introducing extra variables y and z , we might have overshoot the flow by at most $1^T y + 1^T z \leq \epsilon$. To correct for this we set $\tilde{x} = (1 - \epsilon)x$. We set $\epsilon := \frac{1}{320|E|^4 M^5}$, and then the error with respect to the unique solution is at most $1/6$ [LS19], so we have we can simply round the flow on each edge to the closest integer. Clearly both these steps can be done internally in the CONGEST model.

To solve the above LP, we use Theorem 1.3 with $A = [B \ I \ -I \ -e_t]^T$. Actually, this does not use the entire network, but only $n = |V| - 1$ nodes, since the source does not need to participate in the computation. Since the knowledge of the node-incident matrix B is distributed as required, the knowledge of A is distributed as required. The last step is to show that we can solve equations in $A^T W A$ in $T_{\text{Laplacian}}$. This follows from [Gre96] and is made explicit in [KOSZ13, FdV22], who show that $A^T W A$ is symmetric and diagonally dominant, hence equations in $A^T W A$ can be solved by solving two Laplacian equations. We get $U/\epsilon = M \text{poly}(|V|)$, so $\log^3(U/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(\log^3 M)$.