

Fast Coloring Despite Congested Relays

Maxime Flin
Reykjavik University
maximef@ru.is

Magnús M. Halldórsson
Reykjavik University
mmh@ru.is

Alexandre Nolin
CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security
alexandre.nolin@cispa.de

Abstract

We provide a $O(\log^6 \log n)$ -round randomized algorithm for distance-2 coloring in CONGEST with Δ^2+1 colors. For $\Delta \gg \text{poly log } n$, this improves exponentially on the $O(\log \Delta + \text{poly log log } n)$ algorithm of [Halldórsson, Kuhn, Maus, Nolin, DISC'20].

Our study is motivated by the ubiquity and hardness of local reductions in CONGEST. For instance, algorithms for the Local Lovász Lemma [Moser, Tardos, JACM'10; Fischer, Ghaffari, DISC'17; Davies, SODA'23] usually assume communication on the conflict graph, which can be simulated in LOCAL with only constant overhead, while this may be prohibitively expensive in CONGEST. We hope our techniques help tackle in CONGEST other coloring problems defined by local relations.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Related Work	4
1.2	Our Techniques in a Nutshell	5
1.3	Organization of the Paper	7
2	Preliminaries & Definitions	7
2.1	Slack Generation	7
2.2	Sparse-Dense Decomposition	8
2.3	Pseudo-degrees	9
3	Detailed Overview of the Full Algorithm	10
4	Coloring Dense Nodes	12
4.1	Leader, Outliers & Colorful Matching	13
4.2	Synchronized Color Trial	14
4.3	Slack Color (with extra bandwidth)	16
4.4	Learning Small Palettes (with extra bandwidth)	19
4.5	Proof of Theorem 1	21
5	Reducing The Degree With Slack	22
6	Selecting Outliers	25
7	Overcoming Congestion	27
7.1	Color Sampling	27
7.2	Learning Palette	28
A	Concentration Inequality	32
B	Pseudo-Code	33
C	Colorful Matching	33
D	Almost-Clique Decomposition	34
E	Proof of Lemma 7.1	35
F	Low Degree Algorithm	36

1 Introduction

In the LOCAL model of distributed computing, we are given a communication network in the form of an n -node graph $G = (V, E)$, where each node has a unique $O(\log n)$ -bit identifier. Time is divided in discrete intervals called rounds, during which nodes send/receive one message to/from each of their neighbors in G . In the CONGEST model, the same holds, and additionally each message is restricted to $O(\log n)$ bits.

The usual assumption in distributed graph coloring is that the communication graph $G = (V, E)$, through which messages are sent, is the same as the conflict graph H , the graph to be colored. When this assumption is loosened, H is typically locally embedded into G , in the sense that conflicting nodes (i.e., neighbors in H) are simulated by nodes of G within distance c for some small constant $c > 0$. The unlimited bandwidth of LOCAL allows one to simulate communication on H with merely constant overhead in G . In CONGEST however, bandwidth constraints preclude such local reductions. This is a major challenge toward understanding the complexity landscape in CONGEST as such local transformations are ubiquitous in the distributed graph literature. Notable examples include reductions to MIS [BE13, Section 3.9], coloring algorithms based on the Lovász Local Lemma [PS15, CPS17, CHL+18], or subroutines working with cluster graphs [GGR21, MU21, FGG+23].

We make a step in that direction by studying the *distance-2* $\Delta^2 + 1$ -coloring problem, where Δ is the maximum degree of G . Namely, we provide a fast algorithm for coloring G^2 while communicating on G with $O(\log n)$ -bit messages. That is, each node $v \in V$, select a color in $\{1, 2, \dots, \Delta^2 + 1\}$ different from the ones chosen by nodes at distance at most 2 from v in G . The main high-level challenges of distance-2 coloring (not knowing exact degrees nor colors used by neighbors) are somewhat similar to issues occurring naturally in harder coloring problems, such as estimating c -degrees (the number of neighbors with color c in their palette) for all colors c in parallel.

Coloring problems are amongst the most intensively studied problems in the distributed graph literature for they capture the main challenges of symmetry breaking (see, e.g., [BE13]). Symmetry breaking on power graphs appears naturally in numerous settings [KMR01, BEPS16, Gha16, Gha19, EM19, FGG+23]. (See, e.g., [MPU23, Section 1.2] for a recent treatment.) For instance, it arises naturally when assigning frequencies to antennas in wireless networks.

Our Contribution. We provide a poly log log n -round randomized algorithm to find a distance-2 coloring of G . Our algorithm uses $\Delta^2 + 1$ colors, which is a natural analog to $\Delta + 1$ at distance-1.

Theorem 1. *There is a randomized algorithm for distance-2 coloring any n -node graph G with maximum degree Δ , using $\Delta^2 + 1$ colors, and running in $O(\log^6 \log n)$ rounds of CONGEST.*

This is an exponential improvement over the previous best known bound $O(\log n)$ [HKMN20], as a function of n alone. Interestingly, for more general power graphs G^k with $k \geq 3$, it is provably hard to verify an arbitrary coloring [FHN20]. Thus, any poly log log n algorithm coloring G^k when $k \geq 3$ and $\Delta \gg \text{poly log log } n$ would need a different approach.

Theorem 1 requires non-constructive pseudorandom compression techniques, so can be viewed as either existential or requiring exponential local computation. However, we give an explicit and efficient algorithm that achieves such a coloring with $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth. We emphasize that even with $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth, it is not clear that fast coloring algorithms can be implemented at distance-2. Our $O(\log^2 n)$ -bandwidth algorithm preserves the intuition behind our techniques. In fact, reducing the bandwidth to $O(\log n)$ is a technical issue which was almost entirely solved by previous work [HNT22].

1.1 Related Work

Coloring has been extensively studied in the distributed literature [SW10, BEPS16, BE13, HSS18, CLP20, HKNT22], and it was the topic of the paper of Linial [Lin92] that defined the LOCAL model. The best round complexity of randomized $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring in LOCAL (as a function of n alone) progressed from $O(\log n)$ in the 80's [Lub86, ABI86, Joh99], through $O(\log^3 \log n)$ [BEPS16, HSS18, CLP20], to the very recent $\tilde{O}(\log^2 \log n)$ [GG23]. These algorithms made heavy use of both the large bandwidth and the multiple-message transmission feature of the LOCAL model.

In CONGEST, Halldórsson, Kuhn, Maus, and Tonoyan [HKMT21] gave a $O(\log^5 \log n)$ -round CONGEST algorithm, later improved to $O(\log^3 \log n)$ in [HNT22, GK21]. Very recently, Flin, Ghaffari, Kuhn, and Nolin [FGH⁺23a] provided a $O(\log^3 \log n)$ -round algorithm in *broadcast* CONGEST, in which nodes are restricted to broadcast one $O(\log n)$ -bit message per round. While these algorithms drastically reduced the bandwidth requirements compared to their earlier LOCAL and CONGEST counterparts, they still use more bandwidth than what distance-2 coloring allows. Indeed, at distance-2 a node cannot receive a distinct message from each neighbor.

Recent years have seen several results for problems on power graphs in CONGEST [GP19, HKM20, HKMN20, MPU23, BG23]. Ghaffari and Portmann [GP19] gave the first sublogarithmic network decomposition algorithm with a mild dependency on the size of identifiers. Keeping a mild dependency on the size of identifiers is crucial in CONGEST as a common technique, called shattering, is to reduce the problem to small poly $\log n$ -size instances on which we run a deterministic algorithm, typically a network decomposition algorithm. While the instance size decreases exponentially, identifiers remain of size $O(\log n)$ bit. Hence, deterministic algorithms with linear dependency on the size of identifiers, such as [RG20], yield no sub-logarithmic algorithms. The later $O(\log^5 n)$ CONGEST algorithm by [GGR21] with mild dependency on the ID space was extended by [MU21] to work on power graphs with exponentially large IDs space in time $O(\log^7 n)$. Very recently, [MPU23] gave a $O(k^2 \log \Delta \log \log n + k^4 \log^5 \log n)$ randomized CONGEST algorithm to compute a maximal independent set in G^k . Along the way, [MPU23] extended the faster $\tilde{O}(\log^3 n)$ network decomposition of [GGH⁺23] to power graphs in CONGEST with a mild dependency on the ID space.

For vertex-coloring at distance two, when $(1 + \varepsilon)\Delta^2$ colors are available, the problem is much easier, and is known to be solvable in $O(\log^4 \log n)$ rounds [HN23]. The first poly($\log n$)-round CONGEST algorithm for distance-2 $(\Delta^2 + 1)$ -coloring was given in [HKM20], while a $O(\log \Delta) + \text{poly}(\log \log n)$ -round algorithm was given in [HKMN20]. The original publication of this last result had a higher dependence in n , later reduced by improved network decomposition results of [GGH⁺23, MPU23] and a faster deterministic algorithm by [GK21]. We state this for later use (see Appendix F for more details):

Proposition 1.1 ([HKMN20, Lemma 3.12+3.15] + [MPU23, Appendix A] + [GK21]). *Let H be a subgraph of G^2 where G is the communication network, and suppose $\Delta(H) \leq \text{poly} \log n$. Suppose each node v , of degree $d_H(v)$ in H , knows a list $L(v)$ of $d_H(v) + 1$ colors from some color space $|\mathcal{U}| \leq \text{poly}(n)$. There is a randomized algorithm coloring H in $O(\log^5 \log n)$ rounds of CONGEST such that each node receives a color from its list.*

The best bound known for a deterministic CONGEST algorithm using $\Delta^2 + 1$ colors is $O(\Delta^2 + \log^* n)$ rounds [HKM20]. Very recently, [BG23] gave a handful of deterministic coloring algorithms on power graphs, including a $O(\Delta^4)$ -coloring algorithm in $O(\log \Delta \cdot \log^* n)$ rounds (which is an adaptation of Linial's algorithm) and a $O(\Delta^2)$ -coloring algorithm in $O(\Delta \log \Delta + \log \Delta \cdot \log^* n)$

rounds (which is an adaptation of the $O(\sqrt{\Delta} \text{poly log } \Delta + \log^* n)$ algorithm of [FHK16, BEG22, MT22]).

Open Problems. Along the way we introduce various tools whose range of application extends to more general embedded coloring problems. In particular, almost all steps of our algorithm work if each $v \in V$ uses colors $\{1, 2, \dots, \tilde{d}(v) + 1\}$, for $\tilde{d}(v)$ a locally computable upper bound on degrees. It would be interesting to know if $\tilde{d}(v) + 1$ -coloring could be solved. The more difficult list variants of this problem, where nodes must adopt colors from lists of size $\Delta^2 + 1$ or $\tilde{d}(v) + 1$, are also open. Key aspects of our approach fail for list coloring and, in fact, it is not even known if $\Delta + 1$ -list-coloring of G is achievable in $\text{poly log log } n$ rounds of broadcast CONGEST. It would also be interesting to push the complexity of $\Delta^2 + 1$ -coloring of G^2 down to $O(\log^* n)$ when $\Delta \geq \text{poly log } n$, to fully match the state of the art at distance one. While we conjecture that minor modifications to our algorithm¹ might be able to reduce its complexity by one or more $\text{log log } n$ factors, achieving $O(\log^* n)$ should require a quite new approach, as many steps of our algorithm use $\Omega(\text{log log } \Delta)$ rounds. From a wider perspective, it would be very interesting to find precise characterizations of local embeddings that can be handled in CONGEST.

1.2 Our Techniques in a Nutshell

In this section, we highlight the main challenges and sketch the main ideas from our work. Precise definitions are in Section 2 and a more detailed but still high-level overview of our algorithm can be found in Section 3.

Fast Distributed Coloring. All sublogarithmic distributed coloring algorithms [HSS18, CLP20, HKMT21, HKNT22, HNT22, FGH⁺23a] follow the overall structure displayed in Figure 1.

The key concept is the one of *slack*: the slack of a node is the difference between the number of colors available to that node (i.e., not used by a colored neighbor) and its number of uncolored neighbors (see Definition 2.1). Nodes with slack proportional to their uncolored degree can be colored fast. The algorithm uses a combination of creating excess colors (by coloring two neighbors with the same color) and reducing the uncolored degree in order for all nodes to get a slack linear in their uncolored degree.

We first generate *slack* by a single-round randomized color trial. We next partition the nodes into the sparse nodes and dense clusters (called *almost-cliques*). Among the dense clusters, we separate a fraction of the nodes as *outliers*. Both the sparse nodes and the outliers can be colored fast using the *linear* slack available to them. The remaining *inliers* then go through a *synchronized color trial* (SCT), where the nodes are assigned a near-uniform random color which avoids color clashes between nodes in the same cluster. The remaining nodes now should have slack proportional to their number of uncolored neighbors. The ultra-dense clusters need a special treatment, but they induce a low-degree graph. The above structure is necessary for high-degree graphs, while for low-degree graphs




Figure 1: The structure of ultrafast coloring algorithms

¹Such as reducing the nodes' uncolored degrees to $O(\log n / \log \log n)$ instead of $O(\log n)$, or slightly reducing the number of layers produced by one of the subroutines (SliceColor).

one can afford less structured methods.

At the outset, several parts of this schema already exist for distance-2 coloring. In particular, generating slack is trivial, a $\text{poly}(\log \log n)$ -round algorithm for coloring $\text{poly}(\log n)$ -degree graphs is known from [HKMN20], and coloring with slack $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ follows from [HN23]. Almost-clique decompositions (ACD) have been well studied and need only a minor tweak here. We use a particularly simple form of SCT, introduced for the streaming and broadcast CONGEST settings [FGH⁺23b, FGH⁺23a]: permute the colors of the *clique palette* – the set of colors not used within the almost-clique – and distribute them uniformly at random among the nodes. We produce the clique palette by giving the nodes data structure access for looking up their assigned color.

Challenges. The biggest challenge in deriving efficient algorithms for the distance-2 setting is that there are no efficient methods known (and possibly not existing) to compute (or approximate) basic quantities like the distance-2 degree of a node. One can easily count the number of 2-paths from a given node, but not how many distinct endpoints they have. This seriously complicates the porting of all previous methods from the distance-1 setting, as we shall see.

A related issue is that a node cannot keep track of all the colors used by its distance-2 neighbors, since it has Δ^2 of them but only bandwidth $O(\Delta \log n)$ bits. Hence, it cannot maintain its true palette (the set of available colors), which means that the standard method of coloring with proportional slack [SW10, CLP20] (that can be achieved in $O(\log^* n)$ rounds in distance-1) is not available.

Using Multiple Sources of Slack. We use slack from four sources in our analysis. The (usual) initial slack generation step gives the dense nodes slack proportional to their external degree – their degree to outside of their almost-clique. The method of *colorful matching* [ACK19] provides slack proportional to the average anti-degree of the cluster, where anti-degree counts non-neighbors in one’s almost-clique. And finally we get two types of slack for free: the discrepancy between the node’s pseudodegree and its true degree on one hand, and the difference between Δ^2 and the pseudodegree on the other hand, where pseudodegrees are easy-to-compute estimates of distance-2 degrees. Only by combining all four sources can we ensure that the final step of coloring with proportional slack can be achieved fast.

Selecting Outliers. The outliers are nodes with exceptionally high degree parameters, either high *external degree* (to the outside of the almost-clique) or *anti-degree* (non-neighbors within the cluster). As we cannot estimate their true values, we work with *pseudodegrees*: the number of 2-paths to external neighbors, or how many additional 2-paths are necessary to reach all anti-neighbors. The selection of outliers is crucial for the success of the last step of the algorithm, where we need to ensure that nodes have true slack proportional to the number of uncolored neighbors. To select outliers, we use a sophisticated filtering technique, giving us bounds in terms of certain related parameters, that then can be linked to the slack that the nodes obtain.

Coloring Fast with Slack. With the right choice of inliers and suitable analysis of SCT, we argue that remaining uncolored nodes have slack proportional to their uncolored degree. We provide a new procedure to color these nodes, extending a method from the first fast CONGEST algorithm [HKMT21]. It needs to be adapted to biased sampling and to handle nodes with different ranges of slack. It outputs a series of low-degree graphs, which are then colored by the method of [HKMN20].

1.3 Organization of the Paper

After introducing some definitions and results from previous work in [Section 2](#), we give a detailed overview of the full algorithm in [Section 3](#). In [Section 4](#), we go over the technical details involving the coloring of dense nodes, assuming a $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth. We defer some lengthy and technical proofs to [Sections 5](#) and [6](#) to preserve the flow of the paper. We explain how we reduce the bandwidth to $O(\log n)$ in [Section 7](#). Missing details as well as some proofs can be found in appendices.

2 Preliminaries & Definitions

Distributed Graphs. For any integer $k \geq 1$, let $[k]$ represent the set $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. We denote by $G = (V, E)$ the communication network, $n = |V|$ its number of nodes, and Δ its maximum degree. The square graph G^2 has vertices V and edges between pairs $u, v \in V$ if $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq 2$. For a node $v \in V$, we denote its unique identifier by $\text{ID}(v)$. For a graph $H = (V_H, E_H)$, the neighborhood in H of v is $N_H(v) = \{u \in V_H : uv \in E_H\}$. A subgraph $K = (V_K, E_K)$ of $H = (V_H, E_H)$ with $V_K \subseteq V_H$ is an *induced* subgraph if $E_K = \{uv \in E_H : u, v \in V_K\}$, i.e., it contains all edges of E_H between nodes of V_K . We call *anti-edge* in H a pair $u, v \in V_H$ such that $uv \notin E_H$, i.e., an edge missing from H (or, equivalently, in the complement of H).

The degree of v in H is $d_H(v) = |N_H(v)|$, and we shall denote by $N^2(v) = N_{G^2}(v)$ the distance-2 neighbors of v , and the *distance-2 degree* of v by $d(v) = |N^2(v)|$. We also drop the subscript for distance-1 neighbors and write $N(v)$ for $N_G(v)$.

Distributed Coloring. A *partial c -coloring* \mathcal{C} is a function mapping vertices V to colors $[c] \cup \{\perp\}$ such that if $uv \in E$, either $\mathcal{C}(u) \neq \mathcal{C}(v)$ or $\perp \in \{\mathcal{C}(u), \mathcal{C}(v)\}$. The coloring is complete if $\mathcal{C}(v) \neq \perp$ for all $v \in V$ (i.e., all nodes have a color). A *deg+1-list-coloring* instance is an input graph $H = (V_H, E_H)$ where each node has a list $L(v)$ of $d_H(v) + 1$ colors from some color space \mathcal{U} . A valid *deg+1-list-coloring* is a proper coloring $\mathcal{C} : V_H \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathcal{C}(v) \in L(v)$ for each $v \in V_H$.

Our algorithm computes a monotone sequence of partial colorings until all nodes are colored. In particular, once a node *adopts* a color, it never changes it. The palette of v with respect to the current partial coloring \mathcal{C} is $\Psi(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\Delta^2 + 1] \setminus \mathcal{C}(N^2(v))$, i.e., the set of colors that are not used by distance-2 neighbors. For a set $S \subseteq V$, we shall denote the uncolored vertices of S by $S^\circ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v \in S : \mathcal{C}(v) = \perp\}$ and, reciprocally, the colored vertices of S by $S^\bullet \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S \setminus S^\circ$. We shall denote the uncolored (distance-2) degree with respect to \mathcal{C} by $d^\circ(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |N_{G^2}^\circ(v)|$.

2.1 Slack Generation

A key notion to all fast randomized coloring algorithm is the one of slack. It captures the number of excess colors: a node with slack s will always have s available colors, regardless of the colors tried concurrently by neighbors. For our problem, the slack is more simply captured by the following definition.

Definition 2.1 (Slack). Let H be an induced subgraph of G^2 . The slack of v in H (with respect to the current coloring of G^2) is

$$s_H(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\Psi(v)| - d_H^\circ(v) .$$

There are three ways a node can receive slack: if it has a small degree originally, if two neighbors adopt the same color, or if an uncolored neighbor is inactive (does not belong to H). We consider

the first two types of slack *permanent* because a node never increases its degree, and nodes never change their adopted color. On the other hand, the last type of slack is *temporary*: if some inactive neighbors become active, the node loses the slack which was provided by those neighbors.

The sparsity of a node counts the number of missing edges in its neighborhood. We stress that, contrary to previous work in $\Delta + 1$ -coloring [CLP20, HKMT21, FGH⁺23a], we use the *local sparsity* – defined in terms of the node’s degree $d(v)$ – as opposed to the global sparsity, instead defined in term of Δ . This is to separate the contribution to slack of same-colored neighbors from the *degree slack*, $\Delta^2 - d(v)$. While global sparsity measures both, local sparsity focuses on the former.

Definition 2.2 (Local Sparsity, [AA20, HKNT22]). The sparsity of v (in the square graph G^2) is

$$\zeta_v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{d(v)} \left(\binom{d(v)}{2} - |E(N^2(v))| \right).$$

A node v is ζ -sparse if $\zeta_v \geq \zeta$; if $\zeta_v \leq \zeta$ it is ζ -dense.

For a node v , observe that each time that both endpoints of a missing edge in $N(v)$ are colored the same, the node v gains slack as its uncolored degree decreases by 2 while its palette loses only 1 color. Therefore, when a node has many missing edges in its neighborhood, it has the potential to gain a lot of slack [Ree98, EPS15]. This potential for slack is turned into permanent slack by the following simple algorithm (GenerateSlack): each node flips a random coin (possibly with constant bias); each node whose coin flip turned heads picks a color at random and *tries* it, i.e., colors itself with it if none of its neighbors is also trying it (see Appendix B for pseudo-code). As we state the result with local sparsity (which is in terms of $d(v)$) while nodes try colors in $[\Delta^2 + 1]$, the next statement has a $d(v)/\Delta^2$ factor compared to previously published versions.

Proposition 2.3 (Slack Generation, [Ree98, EPS15, HKMT21]). *There exists a (small) universal constant $\gamma_{\text{slack}} > 0$ such that after GenerateSlack, w.p. $e^{-\Omega(\zeta_v \cdot \frac{d(v)}{\Delta^2})}$, node v received slack $\gamma_{\text{slack}} \cdot \zeta_v \cdot \frac{d(v)}{\Delta^2}$.*

2.2 Sparse-Dense Decomposition

All recent fast randomized distributed coloring algorithms [HSS18, CLP20, HKMT21, HKNT22, FHM23, FGH⁺23a] decompose the graph into a set of sparse nodes and several dense clusters. Such a decomposition was first introduced by [Ree98].

Definition 2.4. For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$, a distance-2 ε -almost-clique decomposition (ACD) is a partition of $V(G)$ in sets $V_{\text{sparse}}, K_1, \dots, K_k$ such that

1. nodes in V_{sparse} either are $\Omega(\varepsilon^2 \Delta^2)$ -sparse in G^2 or have degree $d(v) \leq \Delta^2 - \Omega(\varepsilon^2 \Delta^2)$,
2. for all $i \in [k]$, sets K_i are called *almost-cliques*, and verify
 - (a) $|K_i| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \Delta^2$,
 - (b) for each $v \in K_i$, $|N^2(v) \cap K_i| \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \Delta^2$.

There are several ways to compute this decomposition in CONGEST [HKMN20, HKMT21, HNT22, FGH⁺23b]. We refer the reader to the version of [HNT22, Section 4.2]. The existing distance-2 algorithm of [HKMN20] uses $O(\log \Delta)$ rounds and the CONGEST algorithms by [HKMT21] require too much bandwidth at distance-2. We mention that [FGH⁺23b] implements [HNT22] without representative hash functions and that it can be done here as well. We discuss the implementation of the algorithm in Appendix D.

Lemma 2.5 (Adaptation of [FGH⁺23b, Section B.1]). *There exists a CONGEST randomized algorithm partitioning the graph into $V_{\text{sparse}}, K_1, \dots, K_k$ for some integer $k \geq 0$ such as described in Definition 2.4. It runs in $O(\varepsilon^{-4})$ rounds.*

Definition 2.6 (External and Anti-Degrees). For a node $v \in K$ and some almost-clique K , we call $e_v = |N^2(v) \setminus K|$ its *external degree* and $a_v = |K \setminus N^2(v)|$ its *anti-degree*. We shall denote by $\bar{e}_K = \sum_{v \in C} e_v / |K|$ the average external degree and $\bar{a}_K = \sum_{v \in K} a_v / |K|$ the average anti-degree.

It was first observed by [HKMT21] that sparsity bounds external and anti-degrees.

Lemma 2.7 ([HKMT21, Lemmas 6.2]). *There exists two constants $C_{\text{ext}} = C_{\text{ext}}(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $C_{\text{anti}} = C_{\text{anti}}(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $v \in K$, the bounds $e_v \leq C_{\text{ext}}\zeta_v$ and $a_v \leq C_{\text{anti}}\zeta_v$ holds.*

2.3 Pseudo-degrees

Bandwidth constraints, such as that of the CONGEST model, can severely restrict nodes in their ability to learn information about their neighborhood in a power graph of G . This includes a node's palette (which colors are not yet used by its neighbors in the power graph) but also its degree and related quantities. This motivates the use of similar, but readily computable quantities.

Definition 2.8 (Distance-2 Pseudo-Degrees). In the distance-2 setting, for any node $v \in V$, let its *pseudo-degree* $\tilde{d}(v)$ and its *uncolored pseudo-degree* $\tilde{d}^\circ(v)$ be

$$\tilde{d}(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{u \in N_G(v)} |N_G(u)| \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{d}^\circ(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |N_G^\circ(v)| + \sum_{u \in N_G(v)} |N_{G \setminus \{v\}}^\circ(u)|. \quad (1)$$

For a dense node $v \in K$, its *pseudo-external degree* \tilde{e}_v and its *pseudo-anti degree* \tilde{a}_v are

$$\tilde{e}_v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{u \in N_G(v)} |N_G(u) \setminus K| \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{a}_v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |K| - \sum_{u \in N_G(v)} |N_G(u) \cap K|. \quad (2)$$

Note that pseudo-degree and pseudo-external degree are *overestimates* of a node's actual degree and external degree, while pseudo-anti degree is an *underestimate* of a dense node's actual anti-degree. The estimates are accurate for nodes with a tree-like 2-hop neighborhood.

For dense nodes, we also introduce notation for the deviations between the pseudo-degrees and actual G^2 -degrees. Such deviations result in slack, which we exploit later in the paper.

$$\theta_v^{\text{ext}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{e}_v - e_v, \quad \theta_v^{\text{anti}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_v - \tilde{a}_v, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \theta_v^{\text{ext}} + \theta_v^{\text{anti}} = \tilde{d}(v) - d(v).$$

We also write $\theta_K^{\text{ext}} = \sum_{v \in K} \theta_v^{\text{ext}} / |K|$ for the average value within a clique.

Pseudo-degrees partially allow nodes to estimate their *degree slack*, the number of colors that v is guaranteed to always have available due to the palette being larger than its degree. Intuitively, the deviations θ_v^{ext} and θ_v^{anti} capture the part of its degree slack that a dense node v does not know about.

$$\underbrace{\Delta^2 + 1 - d(v)}_{\text{degree slack}} = \underbrace{\Delta^2 + 1 - \tilde{d}(v)}_{\text{known to } v} + \underbrace{\theta_v^{\text{ext}} + \theta_v^{\text{anti}}}_{\text{unknown to } v} \quad (3)$$

3 Detailed Overview of the Full Algorithm

We now give a streamlined overview of our algorithm and describe with some details the technical ideas behind it. See [Algorithm 1](#) for a high-level description of its steps. Since there exists a $O(\log^5 \log n)$ -round algorithm when $\Delta \leq \text{poly log } n$ ([Proposition 1.1](#)), we assume $\Delta \geq \Omega(\log^{3.5} n)$. Henceforth, we assume we are given the almost-clique decomposition $V_{\text{sparse}}, K_1, \dots, K_k$ ([Lemma 2.5](#)).

Input	: Graph G with $\Delta \geq \Omega(\log^{3.5} n)$	
Output:	A distance-2 coloring \mathcal{C} of G	
1	$V_{\text{sparse}}, K_1, \dots, K_k = \text{ComputeACD}(\varepsilon)$	(Section 2.2)
2	GenerateSlack	(Proposition 2.3)
3	$\text{ColoringSparseNodes}$	(Proposition 3.1)
4	Matching	(Appendix C)
5	ComputeOutliers	(Section 6)
6	ColorOutliers	(Proposition 3.1)
7	SynchColorTrial	(Section 4.2)
8	$L_1, \dots, L_\ell = \text{SliceColor}$ for some $\ell = O(\log \log n)$	(Sections 4.3 and 5)
9	foreach $i \in [\ell]$ do	
10	LearnPalette	(Section 4.4)
11	$\text{ColorSmallDegree}(L_i)$	(Proposition 1.1)

Algorithm 1: High-Level Algorithm

Coloring Sparse Nodes (Steps 2 & 3). The coloring of sparse nodes was already handled in [\[HN23\]](#). After GenerateSlack , all sparse nodes have slack proportional to Δ^2 ([Proposition 2.3](#)). In particular, their palettes always represent a constant fraction of the color space $[\Delta^2 + 1]$. This allows them to sample colors in their palette efficiently without learning most of their distance-2 neighbors' colors. The algorithm is summarized by the following proposition:

Proposition 3.1 (Coloring Nodes with Slack Linear in Δ^2 , [\[HN23\]](#)). *Suppose $\Delta \geq \Omega(\log^{3.5} n)$. Let H be an induced subgraph of G^2 for which all nodes have slack $\gamma \cdot \Delta^2$ for some universal constant $\gamma > 0$ known to all nodes. There exists an algorithm coloring all nodes of H in $O(\log^* n)$ rounds.*

Reducing Degrees with Slack. Since coloring sparse nodes is already known, from now on, we focus our attention to dense nodes. Reducing coloring problems to low-degree instances that one then solves with an algorithm that benefits from the low degree is a common scheme in randomized algorithms for distributed coloring [\[BEPS16, CLP20\]](#). In particular, when nodes have slack linear in their degree, it was observed by [\[SW10, EPS15, CLP20\]](#) that if nodes try *multiple colors from their palette*, degrees decrease exponentially fast, resulting in a $O(\log^* n)$ -round algorithm in LOCAL. This observation motivates the structure of all ultrafast coloring algorithms: 1) generate $\Omega(e_v)$ slack with GenerateSlack , 2) reduce degrees to $O(e_v)$ with SynchColorTrial , and 3) complete the coloring with slack. Unfortunately, this approach is not feasible for us because it requires too much bandwidth. As a result, we do something intermediate that takes advantage of slack but only tries a single color at a time to accommodate our bandwidth limitations. In $O(\log \log n)$ rounds, our method creates $O(\log \log n)$ instances of the maximum degree $O(\log n)$.

Another key technical detail of these methods is that nodes try colors *from their palettes*. At distance-2, perfect sampling in one's palette is not feasible for nodes do not have sufficient bandwidth. We show that they can nevertheless sample colors from a good enough approximation of their palette, in the sense that it preserves the slack. Our involved sampling process requires our degree reduction algorithm to work with weaker guarantees than previous work [HKMT21, HKNT22]. See Section 5 for the proof.

Lemma 3.2 (Slice Color). *Let $C, \alpha, \kappa > 0$ be some universal constants. Suppose each node knows an upper bound $b(v) \geq d^\circ(v)$ on its uncolored degree. Suppose that for all nodes with $b(v) \geq C \log n$, and a value $s(v) \geq \alpha \cdot b(v)$, there exists an algorithm that samples a color $C_v \in \Psi(v) \cup \{\perp\}$ (where \perp represents failure) with the following properties:*

$$\Pr(C_v = \perp) \leq 1/\text{poly}(n) , \quad (4)$$

$$\Pr(C_v = c \mid C_v \neq \perp) \leq \frac{\kappa}{d^\circ(v) + s(v)} . \quad (5)$$

Then, there is a $O(\log \log \Delta + \kappa \cdot \log(\kappa/\alpha))$ -rounds algorithm extending the current partial coloring so that uncolored vertices are partitioned into $\ell = O(\log \log \Delta)$ layers L_1, \dots, L_ℓ such that each uncolored node knows to which layer it belongs and each $G[L_i]$ has uncolored degree $O(\log n)$.

Coloring Dense Nodes. We assume the sparse nodes are colored (Step 3) and focus on the dense nodes (Steps 4 to 11). Dense nodes receive slack proportional to their external degree (Step 2, Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.7) in all but the densest almost-cliques.

Steps 4, 5 & 6: Setting up (Section 4.1). We begin by two pre-processing steps to ensure uncolored nodes have useful properties further in the algorithm. Computing a colorful matching (Step 4, Proposition 4.6) creates $\Theta(\bar{a}_K)$ slack in the clique palette $\Psi(K)$. This is a crucial step to ensure we can approximate nodes palettes (see Step 8). We then compute a (small) fraction $O_K \subseteq K$ of atypical nodes called *outliers* (Step 5, Lemma 4.2). Outliers have $\Omega(|K|)$ slack from their inactive inlier neighbors, and can thus be colored in $O(\log^* n)$ rounds (Step 6, Proposition 3.1). *Inliers* $I_K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K \setminus O_K$ verify $\tilde{e}_v \leq O(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}})$ and $\tilde{a}_v \leq O(\bar{a}_K)$ (Equation (6)).

While the colorful matching algorithm is rather straightforward to implement even at distance-2, computing outliers is a surprisingly challenging task. The reason is that, contrary to distance-1, nodes do not know good estimates for \bar{a}_K . Fortunately, a node only overestimates its anti-degree (i.e., $\tilde{a}_v \geq a_v$) and we know that $0.9|K|$ nodes have $a_v \leq 100\bar{a}_K$. By learning approximately the distributions of anti-degrees, we can set a threshold τ such that all nodes with $\tilde{a}_v \leq \tau$ verify $\tilde{a}_v \leq 200\bar{a}_K$.

Step 7: Synchronized Color Trial (Section 4.2). This now standard step exploits the small external degree of dense nodes to color most of them. We distributively sample a permutation π of $[|I_K|]$ such that the i -th node in I_K (with respect to any arbitrary order) knows $\pi(i)$ (Lemma 4.10). Each node then learns the $\pi(i)$ -th color in $\Psi(K)$ and tries that color (Lemma 4.11). This leaves $O(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \log n)$ uncolored node in each almost-clique (Lemma 4.7). To implement these steps, we split nodes into small random groups to spread the workload. The main technical novelty here is an algorithm to aggregate the partial information of each group (Lemma 4.9).

Step 8: Slice Color (Section 4.3). In the densest almost-cliques, the synchronized color trial already leaves $O(\log n)$ nodes uncolored with uncolored degree $O(\log n)$. In other almost-cliques, nodes have slack proportional to their uncolored degree $O(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$: $\Theta(\bar{a}_K)$ slack from the

colorful matching (Step 4), $\Omega(e_v) + \theta_v^{\text{ext}} = \Omega(\tilde{e}_v)$ from slack generation and pseudo-external-degree. If these are not large enough, it must be that $\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v) \geq \Omega(\bar{e}_K)$, i.e., the node has enough slack from its small degree.

While at distance-1 we could use slack to color fast, doing the same at distance-2 requires more work because nodes do not know their palettes. The first key observation, is that *the clique-palette preserves the slack*. More precisely, for all inliers $v \in I_K$, we have $|\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)| \geq d^\circ(v) + \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$ (Lemma 4.13). The proof of this statement is very technical and requires careful balancing of all four sources of slack: the colorful matching, the sparsity slack, the pseudo-degree slack and the degree slack. We also emphasize this is why inliers need to verify $\tilde{a}_v \leq O(\bar{a}_K)$: when we use colors from the clique-palette, we lose up to a_v colors used by anti-neighbors, which we compensate using the colorful matching and pseudo-anti-degree slack $\Theta(\bar{a}_K) + \theta_K^{\text{anti}}$.

It remains to sample uniform colors in $\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)$. Based on Lemma 4.13, it can be observed that $|\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)| \geq \Omega(|\Psi(K)|)$. Hence, each node v finds a random color $C_v \in \Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)$ to try w.h.p. by sampling $\Theta(\log n)$ uniform colors in $\Psi(K)$. With $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth, this step can easily be implemented (Lemma 4.15) by sampling indices in $|\Psi(K)|$ and using the same tools as for the synchronized color trial (Step 7). With $\Theta(\log n)$ bandwidth, we use *representative hash functions* (Lemma 7.2). Intuitively, we use a poly(n)-sized family of hash functions mapping $[\Delta^2 + 1]$ to some $[\Theta(|\Psi(K)|)]$. To “sample” colors, we take a hash function at random and pick as sampled colors those hashing below $\Theta(\log n)$. Since a hash function h can be described in $O(\log n)$ bits and the hashes $h(\Psi(K)) \cap [\sigma]$ and $h(\mathcal{C}(N(v) \setminus K)) \cap [\sigma]$ can be described using a $O(\log n)$ -bitmap, the algorithm works in CONGEST.

The above allows us to apply SliceColor after SynchColorTrial. In $O(\log \log n)$ rounds, we compute $\ell = O(\log \log n)$ layers L_1, L_2, \dots, L_ℓ such that the maximum uncolored degree in each induced graph $G[L_i]$ is $O(\log n)$ (Lemma 3.2).

Steps 10 & 11: Coloring Small Degree Instances (Section 4.4). We go through each layer L_1, L_2, \dots, L_ℓ sequentially, each time coloring all nodes in L_i . Actually constructing small degree instances for solving with a deterministic algorithm requires the nodes to learn colors from their palette – a tough ordeal in the distance-2 setting. Our argument is two-fold: in not-too-dense almost-cliques, a simple sampling argument works (Lemma 4.17). In very dense almost-clique where $\bar{a}_K, \bar{e}_K, \theta_K^{\text{ext}} \leq O(\log n)$, we use a different argument exploiting the very high density of the cluster to disseminate colors fast (Lemma 4.20). We point out that at this step, it is crucial that uncolored nodes have typical degrees $a_v, e_v \leq O(\log n)$, which is ensured by our inlier selection (Step 5). Once nodes know a list of $d^\circ(v) + 1$ colors from their palettes, we can use a small-degree algorithm from [HKMN20, GGH⁺23, MPU23, GK21] to complete the coloring of L_i in $O(\log^5 \log n)$ rounds (Proposition 1.1). Overall, coloring small degree instances needs $O(\log^6 \log n)$ rounds, which dominates the complexity of our algorithm.

4 Coloring Dense Nodes

Henceforth, we assume we are given an ε -almost-clique decomposition $V_{\text{sparse}}, K_1, \dots, K_k$ (for some small² ε , e.g., $\varepsilon = 10^{-5}$) where V_{sparse} is already colored. We further assume we ran GenerateSlack and that each node v with $\zeta_v \geq \Omega(\log n)$ has slack $\Omega(\zeta_v)$ (Proposition 2.3). In this section, we describe an algorithm that colors dense nodes. More formally, we prove the following result:

²we made no attempt to optimize the constants

Proposition 4.1 (Coloring Dense Nodes). *After GenerateSlack and coloring sparse nodes, there is a $O(\log^6 \log n)$ -round randomized algorithm $\Delta^2 + 1$ -coloring dense nodes K_1, \dots, K_k with high probability.*

We find it helpful to describe the algorithm using $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth first, for it is based on the same high-level ideas. The use of extra bandwidth is very limited and explicitly stated. The reduction in bandwidth is mostly achieved through techniques from [HNT22]. Details of how this is performed can be found in Section 7.

4.1 Leader, Outliers & Colorful Matching

A useful property of almost-cliques, used by [HKMT21, HKNT22, FGH⁺23a], is their relative uniform sparsity. The first step of these algorithms is to dissociate the typical nodes, called *inliers*, from the atypical ones, called *outliers*. At distance-2, however, detecting outliers is difficult. For instance, the algorithm of [FGH⁺23a] requires to keep only nodes with anti-degree $a_v \leq O(\bar{a}_K)$. Such a trivial task at distance one requires work at distance-2 because nodes are unable to approximate their degree accurately (up to a constant factor). To circumvent this limitation of the distance-2 setting, we instead compute outliers using *pseudo-degrees* (Definition 2.8).

Lemma 4.2 (Compute Outliers). *We compute in $O(\log \log \Delta)$ rounds a set O_K in each almost-clique K such that $I_K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K \setminus O_K$ has size $0.95|K|$ and each $v \in I_K$ verifies*

$$\tilde{e}_v \leq 200(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}}), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{a}_v \leq 200\bar{a}_K. \quad (6)$$

The general idea behind Lemma 4.2 is that a large fraction of the almost-clique has a typical sparsity, external degree and anti-degree. By learning approximately the distribution of pseudo-external degrees and pseudo-anti-degrees, the leader can select a large enough fraction of K verifying Equation (6). As the proof of Lemma 4.2 is quite technical, we defer it to Section 6 to preserve the flow of the paper.

Outliers can be colored in $O(\log^* n)$ rounds, thanks to the $\Omega(\Delta^2)$ slack provided by their inactive inliers neighbors. Starting from Section 4.2, we will assume outliers are all colored, thus focus on coloring inliers.

Colorful Matching. A major issue when coloring dense nodes in G^2 is that they do not know their palette. We overcome this by using the *clique palette* as an approximation.

Definition 4.3 (Clique Palette). For an almost-clique K , define its *clique palette* as $\Psi(K) = [\Delta^2 + 1] \setminus \mathcal{C}(K)$, i.e., the set of colors in $\{1, 2, \dots, \Delta^2 + 1\}$ that are not already used by a node of K .

This idea was first (implicitly) used by [ACK19] to prove their palette sparsification theorem on almost-cliques. This was since used formally in [FGH⁺23b, FGH⁺23a]. Note that in large almost-cliques (such that $|K| = (1 + \varepsilon)\Delta^2$), the clique-palette can be empty after coloring the outliers. To remedy this issue, [ACK19] compute first a colorful-matching:

Definition 4.4 (Colorful Matching). In a clique K , a colorful matching M is a set of anti-edges in K (edges in the complement) such that both endpoints are colored the same.

In an almost-clique with a colorful matching of size $|M|$, the slack provided to the clique palette by monochromatic anti-edges ensures the following fact:

Fact 4.5. *In an almost-clique K with k uncolored nodes and a colorful matching of size \bar{a}_K , we have $|\Psi(K)| \geq k$.*

We will use a stronger variant of [Fact 4.5](#) which requires a colorful matching of size $\beta\bar{a}_K$ for some large constant $\beta > 1$ (to be defined later). [\[FGH+23a\]](#) gave a CONGEST algorithm to compute a colorful matching of size $\Theta(\bar{a}_K/\varepsilon)$ in $O(1/\varepsilon)$ rounds in cliques with a high average anti-degree. We review this algorithm and argue it can be implemented on G^2 with constant overhead in [Appendix C](#).

Proposition 4.6 (Distance-2 Colorful Matching). *Let $\beta \leq O(1/\varepsilon)$. There exists a $O(\beta)$ -round randomized algorithm **Matching** that computes a colorful matching of size $\beta\bar{a}_K$ in all almost-cliques of G^2 with $\bar{a}_K \geq \Omega(\log n)$.*

4.2 Synchronized Color Trial

Synchronizing color trials in dense components is a fundamental part of all known sub-logarithmic algorithm [\[HSS18, CLP20, HKMT21, HKNT22\]](#). We implement a variant of [\[HKNT22\]](#) where a uniform permutation determines which node tries which color. Contrary to [\[HKNT22\]](#), we use colors from the clique palette $\Psi(K)$ ([Definition 4.3](#)), which is easier to implement in our setting. This approach was also used by [\[FGH+23a\]](#) to implement the synchronized color trial in Broadcast-CONGEST. A major difference with [\[FGH+23a\]](#) is that at distance-2, nodes cannot learn the whole clique-palette $\Psi(K)$.

Lemma 4.7 (Synchronized Color Trial, [\[HKNT22\]](#)). *Let K be an almost-clique with $|I_K| \geq \Omega(|K|)$ inliers. Fix the randomness outside K arbitrarily. Let π be a uniform random permutation of $[|I_K|]$. If the i -th node in I_K (for any arbitrary order) tries the $\pi(i)$ -th color in $\Psi(K)$ (if it exists), then, with high probability, at most $O(\bar{e}_K + \bar{a}_K + \log n)$ are uncolored in K .*

Proof. Let $v \in K$ be the node of minimum anti-degree. Note that $|K| \leq \Delta^2 + a_v \leq \Delta^2 + \bar{a}_K$. Since all uncolored nodes are inliers, even if each colored node in K uses a different color, the clique palette has size $|\Psi(K)| \geq \Delta^2 - (|K| - |I_K|) \geq |I_K| - \bar{a}_K$. This means that at most \bar{a}_K nodes fail due to colors missing in $\Psi(K)$.

Partition I_K into two arbitrary disjoint sets S_1 and S_2 of size at least $\lfloor |I_K|/2 \rfloor$. Order nodes $v_1, \dots, v_{|S_1|}$ of S_1 by increasing IDs. Let X_i be the random variable indicating if v_i fails to get colored. The only way a node of S_1 fails to adopt its color is if it conflicts with an external neighbor. For any conditioning of values $\pi(v_j)$ for all $j < i \leq |I_K|/2$, the probability v_i fails to get colored is $\Pr(X_i = 1 \mid \pi(v_1), \dots, \pi(v_{i-1})) \leq \frac{e_v}{|I_K|/2} \leq O\left(\frac{e_v}{|K|}\right)$, using $|I_K|/2 \geq \Omega(|K|)$. Therefore, the expected number of uncolored nodes in S_1 is

$$\mathbb{E}[X] \leq \sum_{v \in S_1} O\left(\frac{e_v}{|K|}\right) \leq \sum_{v \in K} O\left(\frac{e_v}{|K|}\right) = O(\bar{e}_K).$$

By the martingale inequality ([Lemma A.1](#)), w.h.p., at most $O(\bar{e}_K + \log n)$ nodes are uncolored in S_1 . The same reasoning applies to S_2 and by union bound over both sets, the number of uncolored nodes in S after the synchronized color trial is at most $O(\bar{e}_K + \log n)$. \square

To implement the synchronized color trial, a node v needs only to know $\pi(v)$ and the $\pi(v)$ -th color of $\Psi(K)$. We use an approach similar to [\[FGH+23a\]](#): we randomly partition nodes into groups T_1, \dots, T_k to spread the workload. Concretely, we use the following fact, which is a straightforward consequence of Chernoff and [Definition 2.4.2b](#).

Fact 4.8. *Let K be an almost-clique and $k \leq |K|/(C \log n)$ for some large enough $C > 0$. Suppose each $v \in K$ samples $t(v) \in [k]$ uniformly at random. Then, w.h.p., each $T_i = \{v \in K : t(v) = i\}$ satisfies that any $u, w \in K$ have $|N^2(u) \cap N^2(w) \cap T_i| \geq (C/4) \log n$. We say set T_i 2-hop connects K .³*

Contrary to [FGH⁺23a], at distance-2, nodes do not have the bandwidth to learn the whole clique-palette nor the full random permutation. Fortunately, they only need to know their position in the permutation and the one corresponding color. The main technical novelty in our distance-2 implementation lies in an algorithm to compute prefix-sums $\sum_{j < i} x_j$ where each random group T_i holds a value x_i (Lemma 4.9). We first explain how to aggregate such prefix sums and then show it is enough for implementing the synchronized color trial.

Lemma 4.9 (Prefix Sums). *Let $T_1, \dots, T_k \subseteq K$ be disjoint sets that 2-hop connect K . If each T_i holds a poly log n -bit integer x_i , then there is a $O(1)$ -round algorithm such that for all $i \in [k]$, each $v \in T_i$ learns $\sum_{j < i} x_j$.*

Proof. Compute a BFS tree rooted at some arbitrary $w_K \in K$ and spanning $N^2(w_K) \cap K$. We order distance-2 neighbors of w_K with the *lexicographical order induced by the BFS tree*: distance-2 neighbors $u \in N_{G^2}(w_K)$ are ordered first by $\text{ID}(v)$, where v is the parent of u in the BFS tree, and then by $\text{ID}(u)$. Call $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{|N_{G^2}(w_K) \cap K|}$ distance-2 neighbors of w_K with respect to that ordering. For each $i \in [k]$, node u_i learns x_i . Since T_i 2-hop connects K , there must exist a node $r \in N(u_i) \cap N(T_i)$ which can relay x_i from its neighbor in T_i to u_i . For each distance-1 neighbor $v_j \in N(w_K) \cap K$ of w_K (i.e., depth-1 nodes in the BFS tree), let $u_{i_j}, u_{i_j+1}, \dots, u_{i_j+1-1}$ be its children in the BFS tree. Each v_j can learn all values $x_{i_j}, \dots, x_{i_j+1-1}$ with a broadcast. Node v_j then sends the sum $S_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k=i_j}^{i_j+1-1} x_k$ to w_K , which responds with $\sum_{k < j} S_j = \sum_{k < i_j} x_k$. For each child u_{i_j+t} with $0 \leq t \leq i_{j+1} - i_j$, the node v_j communicates

$$\sum_{k < j} S_k + \sum_{k=i_j}^{i_j+t-1} x_k = \sum_{k < i_j+t} x_k$$

to u_{i_j+t} , which is exactly the prefix sum it had to learn. Each u_i can then transmit its prefix sum to T_i using the same path it used to learn x_i . \square

We now explain how we use it to implement SynchColorTrial. Since the following algorithmic ideas are very similar to the ones of [FGH⁺23a], we only discuss them briefly, and claim no novelty beyond Lemma 4.9.

Lemma 4.10 (Permute). *There is an algorithm that samples a uniform permutation π of $[|I_K|]$ in $O(1)$ rounds with high probability. The i -th node in I_K (with respect to any ordering where v knows its index) learns $\pi(i)$.*

Proof. Each node $v \in I_K$ picks an integer $t(i) \in [\Theta(|K|/\log n)]$ at random. Let $T_i = \{v \in S : t(v) = i\}$. By Chernoff bound, w.h.p., $|T_i| = O(\log n)$ and 2-hop connects K (Fact 4.8). In particular, each T_i has hop-diameter at most 4. Let w_i be the node of minimum ID in T_i . Each T_i computes a spanning tree rooted at its w_i . This is performed in parallel for all groups, by having nodes

³Note that the 2-hops are in G^2 . In G , this means that for any pair of nodes $u_0, u_4 \in K$, there is a length-4 path u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 in G s.t. $u_2 \in T_i$.

forward the minimum ID they received from a group T_i to other members of T_i . Note that an edge only needs to send information concerning the two groups of its endpoints. Each T_i then relabels itself using small $O(\log \log n)$ -bit identifiers in the range $[|T_i|]$. w_i samples a permutation ρ_i of $|T_i|$ and broadcasts it to T_i . Since the permutation of a group needs $O(\log n) \times O(\log \log n)$ bits, after $O(\log \log n)$ rounds each $v \in T_i$ knows $\rho_i(v)$. Then, using [Lemma 4.9](#), each v learns $\sum_{j < i} |T_j|$. Finally, node v sets its position to $\pi(v) = \sum_{j < i} |T_j| + \rho_i(v)$. \square

Lemma 4.11 (Free Color). *Suppose each node in $v \in K$ holds an integer $i_v \in [\Delta^2 + 1]$. There is $O(1)$ -round algorithm at the end of which each v knows the i_v -th color of $\Psi(K)$ (with respect to any globally known total order of $\Psi(K)$). Furthermore, all nodes can learn $|\Psi(K)|$ in the process.*

Proof. Each node $v \in K$ picks an integer $t(v) \in [\Theta(\Delta^2/\log n)]$. Let $T_i = \{v \in K : t(v) = i\}$. Again, w.h.p., $|T_i| = O(\log n)$ and T_i 2-hop connects K . Each node broadcasts its color (if it adopted one) and its group number $t(v)$. Let $R_i = \{i \cdot \Theta(\log n), \dots, (i+1) \cdot \Theta(\log n) - 1\}$. Let $S_{u,i} = R_i \cap \mathcal{C}(N(u) \cap K)$ be the colors from range R_i used by neighbors of u . For each $i \in [k]$, node u can describe $S_{u,i}$ to each neighbor in T_i using a $O(\log n)$ -bitmap. Since each T_i has diameter 4 and 2-hop connects K , after $O(1)$ rounds of aggregation on bitmaps using a bitwise OR, each node in T_i knows $R_i \cap \mathcal{C}(K)$, i.e., all colors from range R_i used in K . Note that this also allows them to compute $R_i \setminus \mathcal{C}(K) = R_i \cap \Psi(K)$, i.e., the colors of R_i that are *not* used by a node of K . By [Lemma 4.9](#), nodes of T_i learn $\sum_{j < i} |R_j \cap \Psi(K)|$ in $O(1)$ rounds. Finally each v broadcasts i_v and each $u \in T_i$ broadcasts i , $\sum_{j < i} |R_j \cap \Psi(K)|$ and $R_i \setminus \mathcal{C}(K)$. Since each set T_i 2-hop connects K , if the i_v -th color of $\Psi(K)$ belongs to range R_i (i.e., $\sum_{j < i} |R_j \cap \Psi(K)| \leq i_v < \sum_{j \leq i} |R_j \cap \Psi(K)|$), then there exists a $u \in T_i$ and $w \in N(u) \cap N(v)$ which knows both i_v and the color it corresponds to. Then w can transmit that information to v .

To learn $|\Psi(K)|$, nodes aggregate the sum of all $|R_i \cap \Psi(K)|$. This can easily done with a BFS (and electing a leader in each group to avoid double counting). \square

4.3 Slack Color (with extra bandwidth)

After the synchronized color trial, uncolored nodes have degree proportional to the slack they received from `GenerateSlack` ([Proposition 2.3](#)). Contrary to [[CLP20](#), [HKMT21](#), [HKNT22](#)], nodes cannot trivially try colors from their palettes, for they lack direct knowledge of it. In this section, we give a solution that uses $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth and defer the `CONGEST` implementation to [Section 7.1](#). The idea is to sample $\Theta(\log n)$ colors from the clique palette, which is accessible by [Lemma 4.11](#). Note that this step is needed only in high-sparsity cliques: if $\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K \leq O(\log n)$, then its remaining uncolored nodes after the synchronized color trial have degree $O(\log n)$. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 4.12 (\mathcal{K}_{mod} , $\mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$). Let $C > 0$ be a large enough constant. We say that almost-clique K is *very dense* if $\bar{a}_K < C \log n$ and $\bar{e}_K, \theta_K^{\text{ext}} < 4C \log n$. Reciprocally, we say K is *moderately dense* if it is not very dense. We call \mathcal{K}_{mod} the set of moderately dense almost-cliques and $\mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$ the very dense ones.

[Lemma 4.13](#) shows that in moderately dense almost-cliques, the clique palette preserves the slack provided by early steps of the algorithm (slack generation, colorful matching and degree slack).

Lemma 4.13 (The Clique Palette Preserves Slack). *After GenerateSlack and Matching, for all inlier $v \in I_K$ with $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$, we have*

$$|\Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)| \geq d^\circ(v) + \Omega(\tilde{e}_v + \bar{e}_K + \bar{a}_K) .$$

In particular, for any such $v \in I_K$ with $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$, we have $|\Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)| \geq \Omega(|\Psi(K)|)$.

Proof. Clearly, $|K| = |N^2(v) \cap K| + a_v$. We carefully add all contributions to the degree slack of a node

$$\Delta^2 = (\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) + \tilde{d}(v) = |N^2(v) \cap K| + e_v + (\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) + \theta_v^{\text{ext}} + \theta_v^{\text{anti}} .$$

The clique palette loses one color for each colored node but saves one for each edge in the colorful matching. Recall that K° denotes the uncolored part of K . The clique palette has size at least

$$|\Psi(K)| \geq \Delta^2 - (|K| - |K^\circ|) + |M| \geq |K^\circ| + e_v + |M| - a_v + (\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) + \theta_v^{\text{ext}} + \theta_v^{\text{anti}} .$$

Let s be the slack received w.h.p. by v after GenerateSlack: if $e_v \geq C \log n$ then $s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Omega(\zeta_v) \geq \Omega(e_v)$ (Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.7), otherwise $s = 0$. The palette of v is of size at least

$$|\Psi(v)| \geq d^\circ(v) + s + (\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) + \theta_v^{\text{ext}} + \theta_v^{\text{anti}} .$$

Notice $|\Psi(v) \setminus \Psi(K)| \leq a_v$ and $|\Psi(K) \setminus \Psi(v)| \leq e_v^\bullet$ (recall e_v^\bullet is the number of *colored* external neighbors). A double counting argument bounds the number of colors in both v 's palette and the clique palette:

$$\begin{aligned} 2|\Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)| &= |\Psi(v)| + |\Psi(K)| - |\Psi(v) \setminus \Psi(K)| - |\Psi(K) \setminus \Psi(v)| \\ &\geq d^\circ(v) + |K^\circ| + (e_v - e_v^\bullet) + s + |M| - 2a_v + 2\theta_v^{\text{anti}} + 2\theta_v^{\text{ext}} + 2(\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) \\ &\geq 2d^\circ(v) + s + |M| - 2\tilde{a}_v + 2\theta_v^{\text{ext}} + 2(\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) , \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the second inequality uses $|K^\circ| + (e_v - e_v^\bullet) \geq d^\circ(v)$ and $\theta_v^{\text{anti}} - a_v = (a_v - \tilde{a}_v) - a_v = -\tilde{a}_v$.

The remaining of this proof is a careful case analysis to show that Equation (7) implies the result. Slack implicitly refers to the slack in the clique palette, i.e., node v has slack x if $|\Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)| \geq d^\circ(v) + x$. Each case of our analysis corresponds to a regime for \bar{a}_K and \bar{e}_K , since v receives slack from the coloring matching only when $\bar{a}_K > \Omega(\log n)$ (Proposition 4.6) and from slack generation when $e_v \geq \Omega(\log n)$ (Proposition 2.3). When both quantities are too small, the following fact implies nodes must have slack from a low degree.

Fact 4.14. *If $\bar{a}_K, \tilde{e}_v \leq \bar{e}_K/4$, then $\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v) > \bar{e}_K/2$.*

Proof. For all $v \in K$, we have $|K| = |N^2(v) \cap K| + a_v$ and $\Delta^2 = (\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) + |N^2(v) \cap K| + \theta_v + e_v$, Equation (8) holds:

$$\Delta^2 - |K| = (\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) + \theta_v + e_v - a_v = (\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v)) + \tilde{e}_v - \tilde{a}_v . \quad (8)$$

Since this holds for all nodes, it also holds on average:

$$\Delta^2 - |K| \geq \theta_K + \bar{e}_K - \bar{a}_K . \quad (9)$$

We conclude by replacing Equation (9) in Equation (8):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v) &\geq (\Delta^2 - |K|) - \tilde{e}_v && \text{(by Equation (8))} \\ &\geq \bar{e}_K - \bar{a}_K - \tilde{e}_v && \text{(by Equation (9))} \\ &\geq \bar{e}_K/2 . && \text{(because } \bar{a}_K, \tilde{e}_v \leq \bar{e}_K/4) \end{aligned}$$

□

Case 1: If $\bar{a}_K > C \log n$ and $\bar{e}_K < 4C \log n$. We compute a colorful matching of size $|M| \geq 402\bar{a}_K$. Thus, all nodes have slack $|M| - 2\tilde{a}_v \geq 2\bar{a}_K$, because $\tilde{a}_v \leq 200\bar{a}_K$ for all inliers (Lemma 4.2). If $e_v \geq \bar{a}_K > C \log n$, then v receives slack $\Omega(e_v)$ from slack generation; hence it has $\Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$ slack by Equation (7). Otherwise, if $\bar{a}_K > e_v$, it gets enough slack from the colorful matching.

Case 2: If $\bar{a}_K > C \log n$ and $\bar{e}_K \geq 4C \log n$. Similarly to case 1, nodes have slack \bar{a}_K . If $\bar{a}_K > \bar{e}_K/4$ or $\theta_v^{\text{ext}} \geq \bar{e}_K/8$, then it has enough slack. Finally, if $e_v > \bar{e}_K/8 > \Omega(\log n)$, then v received $\Omega(e_v)$ slack from GenerateSlack; hence has slack $\Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$. The only remaining possibility is that $\bar{a}_K, \tilde{e}_v \leq \bar{e}_K/4$. Then, Fact 4.14 shows that $\Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v) \geq \bar{e}_K/2 \geq \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$ and we are done.

Case 3: If $\bar{a}_K < C \log n$ and $\bar{e}_K > 4C \log n$. If $e_v > \bar{e}_K/8 \geq \Omega(\log n)$, then v has slack $\theta_v^{\text{ext}} + \Omega(e_v) \geq \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$ from slack generation, so we are done. If $\theta_K^{\text{ext}} > \bar{e}_K/8$, then again we are done. Otherwise, $\bar{a}_K, \tilde{e}_v \leq \bar{e}_K/4$ and by Fact 4.14 we conclude that all nodes have enough degree slack.

Case 4: If $\bar{a}_K < C \log n$ and $\bar{e}_K < 4C \log n$. Since $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$, it must be that $\theta_K^{\text{ext}} > 4C \log n$. If \tilde{e}_v is greater than $\theta_K^{\text{ext}}/8$, then v has slack $\Omega(\tilde{e}_v) \geq \Omega(\tilde{e}_v + \theta_K^{\text{ext}}) \geq \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$ and we are done. So we can assume $\bar{a}_K, \tilde{e}_v < \theta_K^{\text{ext}}/4$. We argue that the degree slack must be large. Similarly to Fact 4.14, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 - \tilde{d}(v) &\geq (\Delta^2 - |K|) - \tilde{e}_v && \text{(by Equation (8))} \\ &\geq \theta_K^{\text{ext}} - \bar{a}_K - \tilde{e}_v && \text{(by Equation (9))} \\ &\geq \theta_K^{\text{ext}}/2 \geq \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v) . && \text{(by assumption)} \end{aligned}$$

Constant density. Observe that if $|\Psi(K)| > 2e_v$ then $|\Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)| \geq |\Psi(K)| - e_v \geq |\Psi(K)|/2$. Otherwise if $e_v \geq |\Psi(K)|/2$, we use $|\Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)| \geq \Omega(e_v)$ (which we just proved) to deduce that $|\Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)| \geq \Omega(e_v) \geq \Omega(|\Psi(K)|)$. \square

Lemma 4.15 is the main implication of Lemma 4.13. It states that we can use random sampling in the clique palette, instead of nodes' palettes, to try colors in SliceColor (Lemma 3.2). In particular, after SynchColorTrial (Step Line 7 in Algorithm 1), SliceColor with the sampling process described in Lemma 4.15 reduces degrees to $O(\log n)$ in $O(\log \log n)$ rounds.

Lemma 4.15. *There is an $O(1)$ -round algorithm (using $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth) that when run after GenerateSlack and Matching, achieves the following: It samples a random color $C_v \in \Psi(v) \cup \{\perp\}$ for all uncolored dense nodes $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$ such that $\Pr(C_v = \perp) \leq 1/\text{poly}(n)$ and $\Pr(C_v = c) \leq \frac{1}{\bar{a}_v + \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)}$ for all colors $c \in \Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)$.*

Proof. Fix a node $v \in K$. Nodes of K can learn $|\Psi(K)|$ by Lemma 4.11. Then v samples $x = \Theta(\log n)$ indices in $[|\Psi(K)|]$. By Lemma 4.11, using $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth, each node can learn in $O(1)$ rounds the colors corresponding to the indices they sampled. They broadcast this list of colors (using $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth) and drop all colors used by neighbors (i.e., that are not in their palette). Finally, node v picks C_v uniformly at random among the remaining ones. Since $|\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)| \geq \Omega(|\Psi(K)|)$, by sampling $\Theta(\log n)$ colors, we sample at least one color $\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)$ with high probability (i.e., $\Pr(C_v = \perp) \leq 1/\text{poly}(n)$). To argue about the uniformity (Equation (5)), we observe that sampling $x = \Theta(\log n)$ indices in $[|\Psi(K)|]$ and then trying a random one of those is equivalent to sampling a uniform permutation π of $[|\Psi(K)|]$ (the x sampled indices are $\pi^{-1}(1), \dots, \pi^{-1}(x)$) and trying the color $c \in \Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)$ with the smallest $\pi(c)$ (if

$\min \pi(\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)) < x$). Hence, if we call $Z = \min \pi(\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathbf{C}_v = c) &= \Pr(Z < x \wedge \pi(c) = Z) \\ &\leq \Pr(\pi(c) = Z) = \frac{1}{|\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)|} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{d^\circ(v) + \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{by Lemma 4.13})$$

□

4.4 Learning Small Palettes (with extra bandwidth)

Assume we are given sets L_1, \dots, L_ℓ for some $\ell = O(\log \log n)$ such that the maximum uncolored degree in each $G[L_i]$ is at most $O(\log n)$. We explain how nodes learn a list $L(v)$ of $d^\circ(v) + 1$ colors in their palette, with respect to the current coloring of G^2 .

Lemma 4.16 (Learn Palette). *Let H be an induced subgraph of G^2 with maximum uncolored degree $O(\log n)$. There is a $O(\log \log n)$ -round algorithm at the end of which each node in H knows a set $L(v) \subseteq \Psi(v)$ of $d_H^\circ(v) + 1$ colors with high probability.*

The argument is two-fold, we deal with $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$ nodes and very dense nodes $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$ separately. Here, we assume $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth. The $O(\log n)$ bandwidth argument can be found in [Section 7.2](#).

Moderately Dense Almost-Cliques. Using the sampling algorithm from [Lemma 4.15](#), nodes can sample $C \log n$ many colors in their palette in $O(1)$ rounds, for any arbitrarily large constant $C > 0$. Since uncolored degrees in H are $O(\log n)$, this suffices for [Lemma 4.16](#).

Lemma 4.17. *Let H be an induced subgraph of G^2 with maximum uncolored degree $C' \log n$ for a large constant $C' > 0$. There is a $O(1)$ -round algorithm (using $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth) for $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$ to learn a list $L(v)$ of $d_H^\circ(v) + 1$ colors from their palettes.*

Proof. Let $\gamma > 0$ be the universal constant such that $|\Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)| \geq \gamma |\Psi(K)|$ from [Lemma 4.13](#) (which applies because $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$). Each v builds a set S_v by sampling each color $c \in \Psi(K)$ in it with probability $p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2C' \log n}{\gamma |\Psi(K)|}$. In expectation, v samples $\mathbb{E}[|S_v \cap \Psi(v)|] = p |\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)| = 2C' \log n \times \frac{|\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)|}{\gamma |\Psi(K)|} \geq 2C' \log n$ colors. By Chernoff bound, w.p. $1 - n^{-\Theta(C')}$, $|S_v \cap \Psi(v)| \geq C' \log n \geq d_H^\circ(v) + 1$. To implement the sampling of colors, each node samples indices in $[\Psi(K)]$ and learns the corresponding colors with [Lemma 4.11](#). Since $|S_v| = O(\log n)$, a node can broadcast this set to its distance-1 neighbors and remove colors used by external neighbors using $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth. Hence, each v finds a list $L(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_v \cap \Psi(v)$ of at least $d_H^\circ(v) + 1$ colors. □

Very Dense Almost-Cliques. We are now considering nodes $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$, such that [Lemma 4.13](#) does not apply. We use the following broadcast primitive: Each node forwards along each outgoing edge a (independently) random message received.

Lemma 4.18 (Distance-2 Many-to-All Broadcast). *Let K be an almost-clique in G^2 and $S \subseteq K$ be a subset of k vertices such that each $x \in S$ has a message m_x . Suppose $\Delta \geq k \log n$ and $\Delta^2 \geq k^3 \log n$. After four rounds of the broadcast primitive, every node in K received all messages $\{m_x\}_{x \in S}$, w.h.p.*

Proof. Let $u \in S$ and $v \in K$. Recall that u and v both have at least $(1 - \varepsilon)\Delta^2$ d2-neighbors in K . Since $|K| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\Delta^2$, there are at least $(1 - 3\varepsilon)\Delta^2$ common d2-neighbors of u and v in K . Let $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N^2(u) \cap N^2(v)$ be this set.

We attribute a unique “relay” to each node $w \in W$, connecting it to v . For each $w \in W$, let r_w be the common d1-neighbor of w and v of lowest ID. For each d1-neighbor r of v , let $W_r \subseteq W$ be the nodes of W for which r is the chosen relay to v . Assume $\varepsilon < 1/12$. Using that $|W_r| \leq \Delta$, and by a simple Markov-type argument, there are at least $(1 - 6\varepsilon)\Delta \geq \Delta/2$ d1-neighbors r of v for which $|W_r| \geq \Delta/2$. Let R be the set of those “heavy” relays.

After the first round, each d1-neighbor of u receives m_u . Consider some heavy relay $r \in R$. Each node $w \in W_r$ receives the message m_u from a d1-neighbor it shares with u with probability at least $1/k$, independently from other nodes. Thus, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-\Delta/(24k)) = 1 - 1/\text{poly}(n)$, $\Delta/(4k)$ or more nodes in W_r receive m_u .

Assume at least $\Delta/(4k)$ nodes in W_r received m_u . Then, in the third round of the broadcast primitive, r fails to receive m_u with probability at most:

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{\Delta/(4k)} \leq e^{-\Delta/(4k^2)}.$$

When $\Delta/(4k^2) \geq 1/2$, this probability is bounded by $e^{-1/2} \leq 2/3$. In that case, $\Delta/6$ or more nodes in R should receive m_u in expectation, and so at least $\Delta/12$ heavy relays receive m_u w.p. $1 - \exp(-\Delta/72)$. The probability that those relays all fail in sending m_u to v in the fourth round of the broadcast primitive is at most $(1 - 1/k)^{\Delta/72} \leq \exp(-\Delta/(72k)) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$.

If $\Delta/(4k^2) \leq 1/2$, then $e^{-\Delta/(4k^2)} \leq 1 - \Delta/(8k^2)$. In expectation, at least $\Delta^2/(16k^2)$ heavy relays receive m_u , and $\Delta^2/(32k^2)$ of them receive m_u w.h.p. All those relays fail to send m_u to v with probability at most $(1 - 1/k)^{\Delta^2/(32k^2)} \leq \exp(-\Delta^2/(32k^3)) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$. \square

In particular, this allows us to learn all colors remaining in the clique palette, because at this step of the algorithm, only $\text{poly log } n$ colors should remain available in $\Psi(K)$. If not, we learn nonetheless a set of $\text{poly log } n$ colors from $\Psi(K)$ which will act as a replacement.

Lemma 4.19. *Assume $\Delta \geq \Omega(\log^{3.5} n)$. There is an $O(1)$ -round algorithm (with $O(\log n)$ bandwidth) such that, in each almost-clique K , either*

1. *all nodes $v \in K$ learn all colors in $\Psi(K)$, or*
2. *all nodes learn a set $D \subseteq \Psi(K)$ of $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ colors.*

Proof. If $|\Psi(K)| \leq O(\log^2 n)$, then let $D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi(K)$. Otherwise, if $|\Psi(K)| \geq \Omega(\log^2 n)$, let D be the $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ first colors of $\Psi(K)$. Recall that all nodes can learn $|\Psi(K)|$ in $O(1)$ rounds (Lemma 4.9); hence, nodes know in which of the two case they are.

Assign indices of $|\Psi(K)|$ to arbitrary nodes $u_1, \dots, u_{|D|}$ of K (with a BFS for instance). This is feasible because $|K| \geq \Delta^2/2 > \Theta(\log^2 n) = |D|$. Then, each u_i learns the i -th color of D in $O(1)$ rounds (Lemma 4.11). Each u_i then crafts a message m_i containing that color and distributes it to all nodes of K by Many-to-All broadcast. By assumption, there are only $|D| = O(\log^2 n)$ messages, and since $|K| \geq \Delta^2/2 \geq \Theta(\log^7 n) = |D|^3 \times \Theta(\log n)$, we meet the requirements of Lemma 4.18. Thus, in $O(1)$ rounds, all the nodes in K know all colors of D . \square

For nodes of very dense almost-cliques, the clique palette $\Psi(K)$ does not approximate their palette well enough. We correct for that by adding colors used by anti-neighbors. They filter

out colors used by external neighbors with $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth, because they have $O(\log n)$ such neighbors.

Lemma 4.20. *Suppose each $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$ has $O(\log n)$ uncolored nodes (hence $d^\circ(v) \leq O(\log n)$ for all $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$). There is a $O(\log \log n)$ -round randomized algorithm (using $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth) for all uncolored nodes $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$ to learn a list $L(v)$ of $d_H^\circ(v) + 1$ colors from their palettes.*

Proof. Run the algorithm of [Lemma 4.19](#). Assume first that nodes learned all colors of $\Psi(K)$. Recall nodes have $e_v = O(\log n)$ external neighbors (because $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$ and $v \in I_K$); hence, they can learn all colors used by their external neighbors in $O(1)$ rounds by using $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth. Since each uncolored v knows $\Psi(K)$ and the colors of its external neighbors, it thereby knows $\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)$.

With a BFS, we can relabel uncolored node of K in the range $[O(\log n)]$. Since uncolored nodes are inliers, they have anti-degree $a_v \leq O(\bar{a}_K) \leq O(\log n)$ each. At most $O(\log^2 n)$ nodes in K are anti-neighbors of (at least one) uncolored node. We can run $O(\log n)$ BFS in parallel, one rooted at each uncolored node, such that each node knows to which uncolored node it is connected (at distance-2). This takes $O(\log \log n)$ rounds, even with bandwidth $O(\log n)$, because each BFS uses $O(\log \log n)$ -bit messages (thanks to the relabeling) and we run $O(\log n)$ of them. Then, the $O(\log^2 n)$ nodes with an uncolored anti-neighbor can describe their list of uncolored anti-neighbors using a $O(\log n)$ -bitmap. Using [Lemma 4.18](#), they broadcast this information as well as their color to all nodes.

Nodes use lists $L(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\Psi(K) \cup \mathcal{C}(K \setminus N^2(v))) \cap \Psi(v)$, i.e., the clique palette augmented with the colors of their anti-neighbors, minus colors used by external neighbors. Adding $\Delta^2 + 1 \geq |N^2(v) \cap K| + e_v$ and $|K| \leq |N^2(v) \cap K| + a_v$, we get $|\Psi(K)| \geq \Delta^2 + 1 - (|K| - |K^\circ|) \geq |K^\circ| + 1 + e_v - a_v$. Since each colored external neighbor removes at most one color, lists have size (recall e_v^\bullet and a_v^\bullet are the *colored* external degree and anti-degrees respectively)

$$|L(v)| \geq |\Psi(K)| - e_v^\bullet + a_v^\bullet \geq |K^\circ| + (e_v - e_v^\bullet) - (a_v - a_v^\bullet) + 1 = d^\circ(v) + 1 .$$

Suppose now that we are in the second case of [Lemma 4.19](#), i.e., nodes learn a set $D \subseteq \Psi(K)$ of $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ colors. This immediately leads to a good approximation. Since $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$, the average node has few external connections, $\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}} = O(\log n)$ ([Definition 4.12](#)). Moreover, because uncolored nodes are all inliers, $e_v = O(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}})$ ([Equation \(6\)](#)). Finally, node v loses at most one color in D per external neighbor, hence

$$|D \cap \Psi(v)| \geq |D| - e_v \geq \Theta(\log^2 n) - O(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}}) \geq \Theta(\log^2 n) \geq d^\circ(v) + 1 .$$

The last inequality holds because, at this point of the algorithm, nodes have $d^\circ(v) = O(\log n)$. \square

4.5 Proof of [Theorem 1](#)

Let $C > 0$ be some large universal constant. By [Lemma 2.5](#), computing the almost-clique decomposition $V_{\text{sparse}}, K_1, \dots, K_k$ of G^2 takes $O(1)$ rounds of CONGEST ([Step 1](#)). Generating slack ([Line 4](#)) and coloring V_{sparse} takes $O(\log^* n)$ rounds ([Propositions 3.1](#) and [2.3](#)). Putting together all results from [Section 4](#), we prove the proposition stated earlier, which implies [Theorem 1](#).

Proposition 4.1 (Coloring Dense Nodes). *After GenerateSlack and coloring sparse nodes, there is a $O(\log^6 \log n)$ -round randomized algorithm $\Delta^2 + 1$ -coloring dense nodes K_1, \dots, K_k with high probability.*

(Steps 4, 5 & 6.) By Proposition 4.6, we compute a colorful matching of size $402\bar{a}_K$ in $O(1)$ rounds, in all almost-cliques with $\bar{a}_K > C \log n$. By Lemma 4.2, we can compute sets O_K and $I_K = K \setminus O_K$ in all almost cliques, such that all $v \in I_K$ verify Equation (6) and $|I_K| > (1-5/100)|K|$. Let H_1 be the subgraph of G^2 induced by $\bigcup_K O_K$. Note that each $v \in O_K$, for some almost-clique K , has at least $(1-5/100)|K| - \varepsilon\Delta^2 > (1-5/100)(1-\varepsilon)\Delta^2 - \varepsilon\Delta^2 \geq \Delta^2/2$ neighbors in I_K , for ε small enough. Hence, each outlier has $\Delta^2/2$ slack in H_1 and can thus be colored in $O(\log^* n)$ rounds by Proposition 3.1.

(Step 7 & 8.) Order nodes of I_K with a BFS. By Lemma 4.10, w.h.p., the i -th node of I_K can learn $\pi(i)$, where π is a uniformly random permutation of $[|I_K|]$. By Lemma 4.11, each node can learn, thus try, the i -th color of $\Psi(K)$ (if it exists). With high probability, by Lemma 4.7, each almost-clique K has $O(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \log n)$ uncolored nodes. This implies, the uncolored degree of a dense node $v \in K$ is $O(e_v + \bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \log n)$. In particular, if $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$ (Definition 4.12), it has uncolored degree $d^\circ(v) \leq O(\log n)$. Since Step 8 intend to reduce the uncolored degree to $O(\log n)$, we can focus on moderately dense almost-cliques. Let $H_2 = \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}} K$. The following fact shows conditions of Lemma 3.2 are verified by the sampler of Lemma 4.15.

Fact 4.21. *There exists a universal constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $s(v) \geq \alpha \cdot b(v)$ for all $v \in H_2$, where $b(v) = \tilde{e}_v + |K^\circ|$ and $s(v) \geq \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$ from Lemma 4.15 such that $\Pr(\mathcal{C}_v = c) \leq \frac{1}{d^\circ(v) + s(v)}$.*

Proof. Let K be the almost-clique of v . The quantity $b(v)$ only requires $O(1)$ rounds to compute: To compute its pseudo-external degree \tilde{e}_v , a node only needs to receive from each of its direct neighbors $u \in N_G(v)$ the value $|(N_G(u) \cup \{u\}) \setminus K|$; for $|K^\circ|$, the number of uncolored nodes in K , a simple BFS within K suffices to count $|K^\circ|$ and broadcast it to the whole almost-clique.

We now show $b(v)$ satisfies the hypotheses. After SCT, by Lemma 4.7, at most $O(\bar{e}_K + \bar{a}_K + \log n)$ nodes are left uncolored in K , so $b(v) \in O(\tilde{e}_v + \bar{e}_K + \bar{a}_K + \log n)$. By Lemma 4.15, there exist $s(v) \in \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)$ s.t. Equation (5) holds. If $b(v) \leq C \log n$, then $d^\circ(v) < C \log n$, hence the uncolored degree is already $O(\log n)$. Otherwise, when $b(v) \geq C \log n$, it must be that $b(v) \in \Theta(\tilde{e}_v + \bar{e}_K + \bar{a}_K)$, and so, there exists a universal constant α s.t. $s(v) \geq \alpha \cdot b(v)$. \square Fact 4.21

Hence, we can use the sampling algorithm of Lemma 4.15 (and Lemma 7.2 with $O(\log n)$ bandwidth), to run SliceColor (Lemma 3.2) in H_2 . Therefore, in $O(\log \log n)$ rounds, we produce a coloring and a partition L_1, \dots, L_ℓ of uncolored nodes in H_2 such that the maximum uncolored degree of each $G[L_i]$ for $i \in [\ell]$ is $O(\log n)$. We also define $L_0 = \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}} K$ which has maximum uncolored degree $O(\log n)$ after the synchronized color trial.

(Steps 10 & 11.) We go through layers L_0, L_1, \dots, L_ℓ sequentially. In L_0 , nodes learn lists of $\text{deg}+1$ colors from their palette by Lemma 4.20 (and Lemma 7.5 with $O(\log n)$ bandwidth). In each L_i for $i \in [\ell]$, nodes are moderately dense, hence learn their palette from sampling by Lemma 4.17 (and Lemma 7.2 with $O(\log n)$ bandwidth). Solve each of these $\text{deg}+1$ -list-coloring instance of Proposition 4.1 with the small degree algorithm of Proposition 1.1. Since learning palettes takes $O(\log \log n)$ and each $\text{deg}+1$ -list-coloring instance is solved in $O(\log^5 \log n)$, the total round complexity of this step is $O(\log^6 \log n)$, which dominates the complexity of the algorithm.

\square Theorem 1

5 Reducing The Degree With Slack

In this section we prove the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2 (Slice Color). *Let $C, \alpha, \kappa > 0$ be some universal constants. Suppose each node knows an upper bound $b(v) \geq d^\circ(v)$ on its uncolored degree. Suppose that for all nodes with $b(v) \geq C \log n$, and a value $s(v) \geq \alpha \cdot b(v)$, there exists an algorithm that samples a color $C_v \in \Psi(v) \cup \{\perp\}$ (where \perp represents failure) with the following properties:*

$$\Pr(C_v = \perp) \leq 1/\text{poly}(n) , \quad (4)$$

$$\Pr(C_v = c \mid C_v \neq \perp) \leq \frac{\kappa}{d^\circ(v) + s(v)} . \quad (5)$$

Then, there is a $O(\log \log \Delta + \kappa \cdot \log(\kappa/\alpha))$ -rounds algorithm extending the current partial coloring so that uncolored vertices are partitioned into $\ell = O(\log \log \Delta)$ layers L_1, \dots, L_ℓ such that each uncolored node knows to which layer it belongs and each $G[L_i]$ has uncolored degree $O(\log n)$.

We will actually prove a slightly stronger statement: that each node v in a layer L_i has $O(\log n)$ uncolored neighbors in higher or equal layers, i.e., in $L_{\geq i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{j \geq i} L_j$. The technique is similar to an algorithm of [BEPS16], which partitioned uncolored nodes into 2 subgraphs of maximum degree $O(\log n)$.

At a high level, the efficiency of Algorithm 2 comes from a feedback loop between uncolored degree and probability of getting colored: the smaller uncolored degree is w.r.t. slack, the larger the probability of getting colored; the larger the probabilities that nodes get colored, the smaller the uncolored degree becomes. We call *skew* the factor κ in Equation (5) by which some colors are more likely to be tried. Intuitively, we compensate for the skew by having nodes only try colors with probability $O(1/\kappa)$ in the first phase of the algorithm, and adding a κ term in the ratio between slack and degree for the second phase.

Input : uncolored dense nodes with bound $b(v) \geq d^\circ(v)$ on their uncolored degree, slack $s(v) \geq \alpha \cdot b(v) \in \Omega(\log n)$, given a color sampler with skew κ .

Output: uncolored nodes partitioned into $O(\log \log \Delta)$ graphs of $O(\log n)$ degree.

- 1 For $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell = \lceil \log \log \Delta \rceil$, let $L_i \leftarrow \{v : b(v) < C \log n \cdot 2^{2^i}\} \setminus \bigcup_{j < i} L_j$.
- 2 In color tries, priority is given first to higher layers, second to higher IDs
- 3 **for** $16\kappa \cdot \ln(2\kappa/\alpha)$ rounds, for each uncolored node v in parallel **do**
- 4 W.p. $1/(4\kappa)$, v independently decides to try a color in that round.
- 5 **if** v is to try a color in that round **then**
- 6 v samples and tries a color.
- 7 **for** $2\lceil \log \log \Delta \rceil + 2$ rounds, for each uncolored node v in parallel **do**
- 8 v samples and tries a color.

Algorithm 2: SliceColor.

Proof of Lemma 3.2. For any node v in a layer L_i , let $d'^\circ(v)$ be its uncolored degree within $L_{\geq i} = \bigcup_{j \geq i} L_j$. Throughout this analysis, the uncolored degree only counts *active* neighbors of a node, i.e., uncolored nodes that are executing the SliceColor. Notably, it ignores nodes of low uncolored degree $O(\log n)$ which are not passed to SliceColor.

Fact 5.1 (Minimum slack in layers). *For all $i \geq 1$, the minimum initial slack in layer L_i and above, denoted $s(L_i)$, satisfies $s(L_i) \geq \alpha C \log n \cdot 2^{2^{i-1}}$.*

Proof. By assumption, we have $s(v) \geq \alpha \cdot b(v)$, and for all nodes in layer L_i , $b(v) \geq C \log n \cdot 2^{2^i-1}$ as they would otherwise be in a previous layer. \square

Fact 5.2 (Constant degree reduction). *After the first loop in lines 3 to 6, w.h.p., each node v has at most $s(v)/(2\kappa)$ uncolored neighbors.*

Proof. Consider a node v , uncolored at the start of some iteration of the loop in line 3. Suppose it has at most $s(v)/(2\kappa)$ (active) neighbors. Then, by union bound, if it tries a random color from the skewed color sampling algorithm, it fails to get colored with probability at most $\frac{s(v)}{2\kappa} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{d^\circ(v)+s(v)} \leq 1/2$. Suppose now the opposite, that v has more than $s(v)/(2\kappa)$ neighbors. Since $s(v) \geq \Omega(\log n)$, w.h.p., less than a $1/(2\kappa)$ fraction of its neighbors decide to try a color in line 4. Thus, when trying a random color from the skewed color sampling algorithm, v fails to get colored with probability at most $\frac{d^\circ(v)}{2\kappa} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{d^\circ(v)+s(v)} \leq 1/2$.

Consider a node v with $\Omega(\log n)$ neighbors. Conditioned on a high probability event, nodes try a random color w.p. $1/(4\kappa)$ and will each get colored with probability $1/2$ when doing so. By Lemma A.1 (Chernoff bound), at least an $1/(16\kappa)$ fraction of v 's neighbors get colored, w.h.p. Thus, after $16\kappa \cdot \ln(2\kappa/\alpha)$ rounds, only a $(1 - 1/(16\kappa))^{16\kappa \cdot \ln(2\kappa/\alpha)} \leq \alpha/(2\kappa)$ fraction of its neighbors remain uncolored. \square

Fact 5.3 (Slack increases coloring probability). *Suppose a node v satisfies $s(v) \geq x \cdot \kappa d^\circ(v)$. When trying a color in line 8, it fails to get colored with probability at most $1/x$, even conditioned on arbitrary random choices by its neighbors.*

Proof. The number of distinct colors tried by neighbors of v in equal or higher layers is at most $d^\circ(v)$. The probability that v hits one of those colors is bounded by $d^\circ(v) \cdot \kappa / (d^\circ(v) + s(v)) \leq (s(v)/(x \cdot \kappa)) \cdot \kappa / s(v) \leq 1/x$. \square

Fact 5.4 (Quadratic progress in ratio). *For some $x \geq 2$, $i \geq 2$, suppose that for all $j \geq i$, all nodes $v \in L_j$ satisfy $d^\circ(v) \leq s(v)/(x \cdot \kappa)$. For each node $v \in L_i$ and any $t \geq s(v)/(x^2 \cdot \kappa)$, after $O(1)$ iterations of the loop in line 7, v satisfies $d^\circ(v) \leq t$ w.p. $1 - \exp(-\Omega(t))$.*

Proof. Let us order uncolored nodes first by layer (giving priority to layers of higher index), second by ID, such that nodes early in the order have priority over nodes later in the order when trying colors. Consider a node $v \in L_i$, and for all its neighbors in $L_{\geq i}$, consider the random variables $X_1, \dots, X_{d^\circ(v)}$ indicating whether each of its neighbors stays uncolored after 2 rounds of trying colors. For each such variable, by Fact 5.3, $E[X_j] \leq 1/x^2 \leq 1/(2x)$, and so $E[\sum_{j=1}^{d^\circ(v)} X_j] \leq t/2$. Note that whether a node gets colored only depends on its neighbors of higher priority, so revealing the random choices of nodes in their order of priority allows us to apply Lemma A.1 (Chernoff bound), which gives:

$$\Pr\left(\sum_{j \in [d^\circ(v)]} X_j \geq t\right) \leq \exp(-t/6) . \quad \square$$

We can now prove Lemma 3.2. Initially, all nodes satisfy $s(v) \geq \alpha d^\circ(v)$. By Fact 5.2, after the first loop (lines 3 to 6), they all satisfy $s(v) \geq 2 \cdot \kappa d^\circ(v)$. We are now ready for repeated applications of Fact 5.4.

At the beginning of the first iteration of the second loop (line 7), nodes satisfy $s(v) \geq 2^{2^0} \cdot \kappa d^\circ(v)$. Suppose that for some integer k , all nodes in $L_{\geq i}$ satisfy $s(v) \geq 2^{2^k} \cdot \kappa d^\circ(v)$ and that

$s(L_i)/(2^{2^{k+1}} \cdot \kappa) \in \Omega(\log n)$. By [Fact 5.4](#), after 2 rounds, all such nodes satisfy $s(v) \geq 2^{2^{k+1}} \cdot \kappa d^{\circ}(v)$, with high probability.

Since $s(L_i)/(2^{2^i} \cdot \kappa) \in \Omega(\log n)$, for the $i \leq \lceil \log \log \Delta \rceil$ first iterations of the second loop, we can apply [Fact 5.4](#) and claim that, w.h.p., all nodes $v \in L_{\geq i}$ satisfy $s(v) \geq 2^{2^i} \cdot \kappa d^{\circ}(v)$. We cannot, however, reapply [Fact 5.4](#) in the same manner beyond this point, as $s(v)/(2^{2^{i+1}} \cdot \kappa)$ could now be below $c \log n$ for a small constant c . However, the $2^{2^i} \kappa$ ratio between $s(v)$ and $d^{\circ}(v)$ achieved by all nodes in $L_{\geq i}$ means that they all get colored w.p. at least $1 - 2^{-2^i}$ in subsequent iterations of the loop, by [Fact 5.3](#). Since each node $v \in L_i$ has less than $C \log n \cdot 2^{2^{i+1}}$ neighbors to begin with, its expected number of $L_{\geq i}$ -neighbors after 2 more iterations of the loop is some $O(\log n)$. So, applying [Fact 5.4](#), w.h.p., each node in L_i has at most $O(\log n)$ neighbors in higher layers at the end of the algorithm. \square

6 Selecting Outliers

In this section we prove the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2 (Compute Outliers). *We compute in $O(\log \log \Delta)$ rounds a set O_K in each almost-clique K such that $I_K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K \setminus O_K$ has size $0.95|K|$ and each $v \in I_K$ verifies*

$$\tilde{e}_v \leq 200(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}}), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{a}_v \leq 200\bar{a}_K. \quad (6)$$

The crux is that most nodes in K verify (stronger versions of) [Equation \(6\)](#). Indeed, for anti-degrees we have access to underestimates $\tilde{a}_v \leq a_v$. Therefore, Markov inequality directly implies that at least $(1 - 1/100)|K|$ nodes have $\tilde{a}_v \leq a_v \leq 100\bar{a}_K$. Similarly, at least $(1 - 1/50)|K|$ nodes are such that $\tilde{e}_v = e_v + \theta_v^{\text{ext}} \leq 100(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}})$.

The issue is that, although nodes know the values of \tilde{e}_v and \tilde{a}_v , they neither know \bar{e}_K nor \bar{a}_K . We begin by describing a more general *filtering algorithm* and then use it to select outliers.

A Filtering Algorithm. We focus on an almost-clique K where each node has a value $0 \leq x_v \leq U$ for some integer upper bound $U \leq \text{poly}(\Delta)$. For some density parameter $\delta \in (0, 1)$, our idea is to find a τ such that $\{v \in K : x_v \geq \tau\}$ has density at most δ (i.e., size $\delta|K|$). Since we cannot afford to learn all x_v , we approximate their distribution and learn instead the size of the sets

$$S_i = \{v \in K : (1 + \eta)^i \leq x_v < (1 + \eta)^{i+1}\} \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, \lceil \log_{1+\eta} |K| \rceil + 1,$$

where $\eta = \Theta(\delta/(1 - \delta))$ is small constant parameters to be defined precisely later.

Learning all $|S_i|$ is too expensive, so we settle for a constant factor approximation. Let v be the node of minimum ID in K and T be a BFS tree spanning K rooted at v . We shall call T_u the subtree rooted at u . Let u be an internal node and u_1, \dots, u_d its children in T . Suppose that each u_j has a value $s_i^{u_j}$ for each $i \in [\ell]$ (where $\ell \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lceil \log_{1+\eta} |K| \rceil + 1$) which is an approximate value of $|S_i \cap T_{u_j}|$. Node u computes the following approximation of $|S_i \cap T_u|$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the indicator function:

$$s_i^u = \mathbf{1}(u \in S_i) + \sum_{j=1}^d (1 + \eta)^{\lceil \log_{1+\eta} s_i^{u_j} \rceil} \leq \mathbf{1}(u \in S_i) + (1 + \eta) \sum_{j=1}^d s_i^{u_j}.$$

Let $s_i = s_i^v$ be the value computed by the root. The following fact holds because T has depth 4 in G and each node belongs to exactly one S_i .

Fact 6.1. $|S_i| \leq s_i \leq (1 + \eta)^3 |S_i|$

The next important fact is that aggregates s_i^u are easy to compute

Fact 6.2. *Node u computes each s_i^u for $i \in [\ell]$ in $O(\log \log \Delta)$ rounds.*

That is because, starting from leaves all the way to the root, each child u_j of u in T needs to send $\lceil \log_{1+\eta} s_i^{u_j} \rceil$ for each $i \in [\ell]$, which is a total of $O(\log \log \Delta) \times O(\log n)$ bits to u . Thus, after $O(\log \log \Delta)$ rounds, the root of the BFS tree knows all values s_i for $i \in [\ell]$. We state now the key lemma:

Lemma 6.3 (Filtering Lemma). *Fix some $M \geq 1$ and $\delta \in (0, 4/5)$. Suppose $A = \{v \in K : x_v \leq M\}$ has size at least $(1 - \delta)|K|$. There is an algorithm computing a set $\tilde{A} \subseteq K$ such that each $v \in \tilde{A}$ verifies $x_v \leq 2M$ and $|\tilde{A}| \geq (1 - 1.5\delta)|K|$.*

Proof. Define

$$\tau = \inf \left\{ i \in [\ell] : \sum_{j \leq i} s_j \geq (1 - \delta)|K| \right\},$$

and let $\tilde{A} = \bigcup_{j \leq \tau} S_j$. Note that the root of T knows all s_j 's and can therefore compute τ . Once the value of τ is known, each node knows if it belongs to \tilde{A} . By [Fact 6.1](#) and definition of τ ,

$$|\tilde{A}| = \sum_{j \leq \tau} |S_j| \geq \sum_{j \leq \tau} s_j / (1 + \eta)^3 \geq \frac{1 - \delta}{(1 + \eta)^3} |K| \geq (1 - 1.5\delta)|K|,$$

where the last inequality comes from setting $\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\delta}{4k(1-\delta)}$ where $k = 3$. Using $e^x \leq 1 + x + x^2$ for $x \leq 1$, we have $(1 + \eta)^k \leq e^{\eta k} \leq 1 + \eta k + (\eta k)^2 \leq 1 + 2\eta k$ because $\eta k < 1$. Hence, using $\frac{1}{1+x} \geq 1 - x$ for all $x > 0$, we have $\frac{1-\delta}{(1+\eta)^k} \geq \frac{1-\delta}{1+2\eta k} \geq (1-\delta)(1-2\eta k) \geq (1-2\delta)$, where the last inequality comes from our choice of η .

We now argue that each $u \in \tilde{A}$ has $x_u \leq (1 + \eta)M$. Let us define $v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \arg \max_{u \in A} x_u$, the node such that $x_v \leq M$ with the greatest value x_v . Let $i \in [\ell]$ be the index such that $v \in S_i$. If $i > \tau$, then all $u \in \tilde{A}$ verify $x_u \leq (1 + \eta)^{\tau+1} \leq (1 + \eta)^i \leq x_v \leq M$. On the other hand, if $i \leq \tau$, we claim that we must have $i = \tau$. This is a straightforward consequence of the maximality of x_v : using that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{j \leq i} S_j$, we get

$$\sum_{j \leq i} s_j \geq \sum_{j \leq i} |S_j| \geq |A| \geq (1 - \delta)|K|.$$

So, by minimality of τ , it must be that $\tau \leq i$, hence that $\tau = i$. The lemma follows since each $u \in S_j$ with $j < \tau$ verify $x_u < (1 + \eta)^\tau \leq x_v \leq M$ and each $u \in S_\tau$ verify $x_u \leq (1 + \eta)^{\tau+1} \leq (1 + \eta)x_v \leq (1 + \eta)M$. \square

Proof of [Lemma 4.2](#). Applying [Lemma 6.3](#) to the set $\{v \in K : \tilde{a}_v \leq \bar{a}_K/100\}$ (with $\delta = 1/100$ and $M = 100\bar{a}_K$), we compute in $O(\log \log n)$ rounds a set $A_1 \subseteq K$ of size $(1 - 3/200)|K|$ such that all $v \in A_1$ verify $\tilde{a}_v \leq 200\bar{a}_K$. By Markov, at most $|K|/100$ nodes verify $e_v > 100\bar{e}_K$, and at most $|K|/100$ other nodes verify $\theta_v^{\text{ext}} > 100\theta_K^{\text{ext}}$. So, at least $(1 - 1/50)|K|$ nodes have $\tilde{e}_v = e_v + \theta_v^{\text{ext}} \leq 100(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}})$. Applying [Lemma 6.3](#) to the set $\{v \in K : \tilde{e}_v \leq 100(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}})\}$ (with $\delta = 1/50$ and $M = 100(\bar{a}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}})$), we compute a set $A_2 \subseteq K$ of size $(1 - 3/100)|K|$ such that all $v \in A_2$ verify $e_v \leq 200(\bar{e}_K + \theta_K^{\text{ext}})$. Letting $I_K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_1 \cap A_2$, we have a set for which all nodes verify [Equation \(6\)](#) and of size $(1 - 5/100)|K|$. \square

7 Overcoming Congestion

In this section, we explain how we reduce the bandwidth to $O(\log n)$. The parts of the algorithm that need to be modified are the sampling of colors when reducing the degree ([Lemma 4.15](#)) and the learning of the palettes once the uncolored degree is $O(\log n)$ ([Lemmas 4.17](#) and [4.20](#)).

7.1 Color Sampling

We explain first how nodes sample uniform colors from their palette with $O(\log n)$ bandwidth. The intuition remains the same as in [Lemma 4.15](#): sampling $\Theta(\log n)$ colors in $\Psi(K)$ and dropping the ones used by external neighbors. The lower bandwidth cost is achieved by using pseudorandom objects (representative hash functions) to sample the colors. This technique was previously used by [\[HNT22\]](#) to implement the $\text{deg}+1$ -list-coloring algorithm of [\[HKNT22\]](#) in CONGEST. We extend [\[HNT22\]](#) to comply with our uniformity needs ([Equation \(5\)](#)). Intuitively, one can think of a representative hash function as a random function in the sense that for *any sets* T and P , the number of collisions under a random function is close to what would be expected from a truly random function. [Lemma 7.1](#) gives a formal description. Since the proof is a standard probabilistic argument, we postpone it to [Appendix E](#).

Lemma 7.1 (Representative Hash Functions, Extension of [\[HNT22\]](#)). *Let $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1/8)$ and $\lambda \geq 1$ an integer be such that $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\lambda \geq \Omega(\alpha^{-1}\beta^{-2} \log n)$. Let \mathcal{U} be a finite set. There exists a family \mathcal{H}^{rep} of $F = \Theta(\beta\lambda^2 \log |\mathcal{U}| \text{poly}(n))$ functions $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow [\lambda]$ and a $\sigma \leq \lambda$ verifying $\sigma \geq \Theta(\beta^{-2}\alpha^{-1} \log n)$ such that*

1. *For any pair $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \times [\lambda]$ and disjoint sets $T, P \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ with sizes $|T|, |P| \leq \beta\lambda$ and $|T| \geq \alpha\lambda$, when sampling a $h \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{rep}}$ such that $h(x) = y$, with high probability, [Equation \(10\)](#) holds:*

$$|(h(T) \setminus h(P)) \cap [\sigma]| \geq \frac{\sigma|T|}{\lambda}(1 - 8\beta) . \quad (10)$$

2. *For all pairs $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \times [\lambda]$ there are $\frac{1 \pm 1/2}{\lambda} F$ functions in $h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $h(x) = y$.*

Lemma 7.2. *For all nodes $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$, there is a randomized algorithm (using $O(\log n)$ bandwidth) sampling a random color $C_v \in \Psi(v) \cup \{\perp\}$ (where \perp represents failure) such that $\Pr(C_v = \perp) \leq 1/\text{poly}(n)$ and for all $c \in \Psi(v)$ we have $\Pr(C_v = c) \leq \frac{\kappa}{d^c(v) + \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \bar{e}_v)}$ for some universal constant $\kappa > 0$.*

Proof. We begin by explaining the algorithm and implementation, and we later explain why it samples colors with the right probability. Let \mathcal{H}^{rep} be a family of representative hash functions for parameters λ, α, β to be defined later. Node v samples a random $h \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{rep}}$ and broadcast it to its neighbors, which can be done in $O(1)$ rounds because $\lambda, |\mathcal{H}^{\text{rep}}| \leq \text{poly}(n)$. Similarly to [Lemma 4.11](#), we can split K randomly into groups T_1, \dots, T_k with $k = \Theta(|K|/\log n)$. Nodes of T_i learn about a range of $\Theta(\log n)$ colors from the color space. Since v has a distance-2 neighbor in each T_i ([Fact 4.8](#)), each distance-1 neighbors u knows about a set $S_u \subseteq \Psi(K)$ such that $\bigcup_{u \in N(v)} S_u = \Psi(K)$. Each $u \in N(v)$ send $\{i \in [\sigma] : i \in h(S_u)\}$ in $O(1)$ rounds using a bitmap (because $\sigma = \Theta(\log n)$). Using a bitwise OR, node v computes $A_v = \{i \in [\sigma] : i \in h(\Psi(K))\}$. Similarly, node v can learn $B_v = \{i \in [\sigma] : i \in h(\mathcal{C}(N^2(v) \setminus K))\}$ the hash values of external neighbors. Then v samples an index $i_v \in A_v \setminus B_v$ uniformly at random. At least one of its neighbors can tell v which color in

$\Psi(K)$ hashes to i_v (breaking ties arbitrarily). Note that this color must be in their palette. Let the random color C_v be that color, and $C_v = \perp$ if $A_v \setminus B_v = \emptyset$.

Letting $\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (100/\gamma_1)|\Psi(K)|$, $\beta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1/100$ and $\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\gamma_1}{100} \cdot \gamma_2$ where $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (0, 1)$ are the constants from [Lemma 4.13](#) such that 1) $|\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)| \geq \gamma_1 e_v$ and 2) $|\Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)| \geq \gamma_2 |\Psi(K)|$. (Recall nodes can compute $|\Psi(K)|$ in $O(1)$ rounds, [Lemma 4.11](#).) Let $T = \Psi(K) \cap \Psi(v)$ and $P = \mathcal{C}(N^2(v) \setminus K)$. Clearly, $T \cap P = \emptyset$ since $T \subseteq \Psi(v)$ and $P \cap \Psi(v) = \emptyset$, both by definition. By our choice of parameters, we have $|T| \leq |\Psi(K)| \leq \beta\lambda$, and $|T| \geq \alpha\lambda = \gamma_2 |\Psi(K)|$. On the other hand, $|P| \leq e_v \leq \beta\lambda$. Hence, by definition of \mathcal{H}^{rep} , with high probability,

$$|A_v \setminus B_v| = |(h(T) \setminus h(P)) \cap [\sigma]| \geq \frac{\sigma|T|}{\lambda}(1 - 8\beta) \geq \alpha(1 - 8\beta)\sigma = \Theta(\log n). \quad (11)$$

[Equation \(11\)](#) implies $C_v \neq \perp$ with high probability. We turn to the uniformity. Fix some $c \in \Psi(v) \cap \Psi(K)$ (if $c \notin \Psi(K)$ then $\Pr(C_v = c) = 0$), then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(C_v = c) &= \sum_{i \in [\sigma]} \Pr(\text{pick index } i \text{ in } A_v \setminus B_v \mid h_v(c) = i) \times \Pr(h_v(c) = i) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha(1 - 8\beta)\sigma} \times \frac{2\sigma}{\lambda} \\ &= \frac{1}{4\alpha(1 - 8\beta)|\Psi(K)|} && \text{(by definition of } \lambda) \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa}{d^\circ(v) + \Omega(\bar{a}_K + \bar{e}_K + \tilde{e}_v)} && \text{for } \kappa = \frac{1}{4\alpha(1 - 8\beta)}, \quad \text{(by } \text{Lemma 4.13}) \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds because [Equation \(11\)](#) is true for any conditioning on one pair $h(c) = i$, and there are at most $2F/\lambda$ functions $h \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{rep}}$ such that $h(c) = i$ for any pair. \square

7.2 Learning Palette

In this section, we reduce the bandwidth of the last step of our algorithm ([Section 4.4](#)). Our algorithm follows the same overall structure: nodes need to learn poly $\log n$ colors from the clique palette, colors used by their external neighbors and (in very dense almost-cliques) the colors of their anti-neighbors.

Moderately Dense Almost-Cliques. When [Lemma 4.13](#) applies, we use the same approach as [Lemma 4.17](#) but with representative hash functions. The main difference with [Lemma 7.2](#) is that nodes need to infer $\Theta(\log n)$ colors from hashes, instead of one.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{mod}}$, and $d^\circ(v) < C' \log n$ for some large enough constant $C' > 0$. There is a $O(1)$ -round algorithm (using $O(\log n)$ bandwidth) for all such v to learn at list $L(v) \subseteq \Psi(v)$ containing $d^\circ(v) + 1$ colors.*

Proof. Notice that we are considering the same nodes as in [Lemma 7.2](#). Therefore, we implement the same algorithm to sample indices in $[\sigma]$. In particular, [Equation \(11\)](#) still holds, and for a large enough constant in σ , we have $|A_v \setminus B_v| \geq \alpha(1 - 8\beta)\sigma \geq \Theta(\log n) \geq d^\circ(v) + 1$. To learn which color corresponds to which selected hash, we pick nodes $u_{v,i}$ in K , one of each pair (v, i) with $v \in K^\circ$ and $i \in A_v \setminus B_v$ selected by v . We use many-to-all broadcast ([Lemma 4.18](#)) for 1) each $v \in K^\circ$ to broadcast h_v , and 2) for each $u_{v,i}$ to broadcast message (v, i, c) where $c \in \Psi(K)$ such that $h_v(c) = i$. Since $|K^\circ| = O(\log n)$ and each $v \in K^\circ$ selects $O(\log n)$ indices, there are $O(\log^2 n)$ such pairs, which allows many-to-all broadcast to work when $\Delta \geq \Omega(\log^{3.5} n)$. Also note that $u_{v,i}$ learns such a $c \in \Psi(K)$ the same way nodes did in [Lemma 7.2](#). \square

Very Dense Almost-Cliques. For very dense almost-clique, the $O(\log^2 n)$ bandwidth was only needed when learning which colors used by external neighbors were in the clique palette. We reduce the bandwidth by reducing exponentially the number of bits needed to describe colors in $\Psi(K)$. We use pairwise independent hash functions.

Definition 7.4 (Almost Pairwise Independent Hash-Functions [Vad12, Problem 3.4]). A family of functions \mathcal{H}^{pwi} mapping elements from $[N]$ to $[M]$ is δ -almost pairwise independent if for every $x_1 \neq x_2 \in [N]$ and $y_1, y_2 \in [M]$, we have

$$\Pr(h(x_1) = y_1 \wedge h(x_2) = y_2) \leq \frac{1 + \delta}{M^2}.$$

There exists a family \mathcal{H}^{pwi} of δ -almost pairwise independent from $[N]$ to $[M]$ such that choosing a random function in \mathcal{H}^{pwi} requires $O(\log \delta^{-1} + \log \log N + \log M)$ random bits.

Lemma 7.5. *When $v \in K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{very}}$, there is a $O(\log \log n)$ -round randomized algorithm (using $O(\log n)$ bandwidth) for all uncolored nodes to learn $d^\circ(v) + 1$ colors from their palettes.*

Proof. We run first the algorithm of Lemma 4.19 to learn the clique-palette, which uses only $O(\log n)$ bandwidth. We describe the algorithm when nodes learn $\Psi(K)$. The case where nodes learn a set $D \subset \Psi(K)$ of $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ colors works the same with $L'(v) = D$ for all $v \in K^\circ$ (ignoring colors of anti-neighbors).

Following the first steps of Lemma 4.20, an uncolored node knows the set $L'(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Psi(K) \cup \mathcal{C}(K \setminus N^2(v))$ of $O(\log^2 n)$ colors constituted of $\Psi(K)$ as well as of the $O(\log n)$ colors of its anti-neighbors. Let \mathcal{H}^{pwi} be a family of δ -almost pairwise independent hash functions from $[\Delta^2 + 1]$ to $[M]$, with δ an arbitrary small constant and M to be defined later. By union bound, the probability that a random function in \mathcal{H}^{pwi} has a collision on one pair $c, c' \in L'(v)$ with $c \neq c'$ is at most $\frac{(1+\delta)|L'(v)|^2}{M^2} < 1$ where the last inequality holds if $M = \Theta(|L'(v)|) = \Theta(\log^2 n)$. Hence, for these choice of parameters, there exists a $h_v \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{pwi}}$ without collisions on the colors of $L'(v)$. We update lists to $L(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{c \in L'(v) : h_v(c) \notin h_v(\mathcal{C}(N^2(v) \setminus K))\}$ by removing colors hashing to the same value as one of the external neighbors. If an external neighbor adopted a color $c \in L'(v)$, clearly $c \notin L(v)$, i.e., $L(v) \subseteq \Psi(v)$. Since each external neighbor removes at most one color from $L'(v)$ (because h is collision free on $L(v)$), the set $L(v)$ has size at least $|\Psi(K)| + a_v^\bullet - e_v^\bullet \geq d^\circ(v) + 1$ (for the same reason as in Lemma 4.20). This algorithm uses only $O(\log n)$ bandwidth because describing the hash function h_v requires $O(\log \log n)$ bits and sending $e_v = O(\log n)$ hash values on an edge requires $O(\log n) \times O(\log \log n)$ bits, hence, $O(\log \log n)$ rounds. \square

References

- [AA20] Noga Alon and Sepehr Assadi. Palette sparsification beyond $(\Delta + 1)$ vertex coloring. In *APPROX/RANDOM*, volume 176 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:22. LZI, 2020. 8
- [ABI86] Noga Alon, László Babai, and Alon Itai. A fast and simple randomized parallel algorithm for the maximal independent set problem. *J. of Algorithms*, 7(4):567–583, 1986. 4
- [ACK19] Sepehr Assadi, Yu Chen, and Sanjeev Khanna. Sublinear algorithms for $(\Delta + 1)$ vertex coloring. In *SODA*, pages 767–786. SIAM, 2019. 6, 13, 34

- [BE13] Leonid Barenboim and Michael Elkin. *Distributed Graph Coloring: Fundamentals and Recent Developments*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2013. [3](#), [4](#)
- [BEG22] Leonid Barenboim, Michael Elkin, and Uri Goldenberg. Locally-iterative distributed $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring and applications. *J. ACM*, 69(1):5:1–5:26, 2022. [5](#)
- [BEPS16] Leonid Barenboim, Michael Elkin, Seth Pettie, and Johannes Schneider. The locality of distributed symmetry breaking. *Journal of the ACM*, 63(3):20:1–20:45, 2016. [3](#), [4](#), [10](#), [23](#), [36](#)
- [BG23] Leonid Barenboim and Uri Goldenberg. Speedup of distributed algorithms for power graphs in the CONGEST model. Technical Report 2305.04358, arXiv, 2023. [4](#)
- [CHL⁺18] Yi-Jun Chang, Qizheng He, Wenzheng Li, Seth Pettie, and Jara Uitto. The complexity of distributed edge coloring with small palettes. In *SODA*, pages 2633–2652. SIAM, 2018. [3](#)
- [CLP20] Yi-Jun Chang, Wenzheng Li, and Seth Pettie. Distributed $(\Delta+1)$ -coloring via ultrafast graph shattering. *SIAM J. Computing*, 49(3):497–539, 2020. [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [8](#), [10](#), [14](#), [16](#)
- [CPS17] Kai-Min Chung, Seth Pettie, and Hsin-Hao Su. Distributed algorithms for the Lovász local lemma and graph coloring. *Distributed Comput.*, 30(4):261–280, 2017. [3](#)
- [Doe20] Benjamin Doerr. *Probabilistic Tools for the Analysis of Randomized Optimization Heuristics*, pages 1–87. Springer International Publishing, 2020. [32](#)
- [EM19] Michael Elkin and Shaked Matar. Near-additive spanners in low polynomial deterministic CONGEST time. In *PODC*, pages 531–540. ACM, 2019. [3](#)
- [EPS15] Michael Elkin, Seth Pettie, and Hsin-Hao Su. $(2\Delta - 1)$ -edge-coloring is much easier than maximal matching in the distributed setting. In *SODA*, pages 355–370. SIAM, 2015. [8](#), [10](#)
- [FGG⁺23] Salwa Faour, Mohsen Ghaffari, Christoph Grunau, Fabian Kuhn, and Václav Rozhoň. Local distributed rounding: Generalized to MIS, matching, set cover, and beyond. In *SODA*, pages 4409–4447. SIAM, 2023. [3](#)
- [FGH⁺23a] Maxime Flin, Mohsen Ghaffari, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Fabian Kuhn, and Alexandre Nolin. Coloring fast with broadcasts. In *SPAA*, pages 455–465. ACM, 2023. [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [8](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [34](#)
- [FGH⁺23b] Maxime Flin, Mohsen Ghaffari, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Fabian Kuhn, and Alexandre Nolin. A distributed palette sparsification theorem. Technical Report 2301.06457, arXiv, 2023. [6](#), [8](#), [9](#), [13](#), [33](#)
- [FHK16] Pierre Fraigniaud, Marc Heinrich, and Adrian Kosowski. Local conflict coloring. In *FOCS*, 2016. [5](#)
- [FHM23] Manuela Fischer, Magnús M. Halldórsson, and Yannic Maus. Fast distributed Brooks’ theorem. In *SODA*, pages 2567–2588. SIAM, 2023. [8](#)

- [FHN20] Pierre Fraigniaud, Magnús M. Halldórsson, and Alexandre Nolin. Distributed testing of distance- k colorings. In *SIROCCO*, volume 12156 of *LNCS*, pages 275–290. Springer, 2020. [3](#)
- [GG23] Mohsen Ghaffari and Christoph Grunau. Faster deterministic distributed MIS and approximate matching. *to appear at STOC*, abs/2303.16043, 2023. [4](#)
- [GGH⁺23] Mohsen Ghaffari, Christoph Grunau, Bernhard Haeupler, Saeed Ilchi, and Václav Rozhoň. Improved distributed network decomposition, hitting sets, and spanners, via derandomization. In *SODA*, pages 2532–2566. SIAM, 2023. [4](#), [12](#), [37](#)
- [GGR21] Mohsen Ghaffari, Christoph Grunau, and Václav Rozhoň. Improved deterministic network decomposition. In *SODA*, 2021. [3](#), [4](#)
- [Gha16] Mohsen Ghaffari. An improved distributed algorithm for maximal independent set. In *SODA*, pages 270–277. SIAM, 2016. [3](#)
- [Gha19] Mohsen Ghaffari. Distributed maximal independent set using small messages. In *SODA*, pages 805–820. SIAM, 2019. [3](#)
- [GK21] Mohsen Ghaffari and Fabian Kuhn. Deterministic distributed vertex coloring: Simpler, faster, and without network decomposition. In *FOCS*, pages 1009–1020. IEEE Computer Society, 2021. [4](#), [12](#), [36](#), [37](#)
- [GP19] Mohsen Ghaffari and Julian Portmann. Improved network decompositions using small messages with applications on MIS, neighborhood covers, and beyond. In *DISC*, volume 146 of *LIPICs*, pages 18:1–18:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. [4](#)
- [HKM20] Magnús M. Halldórsson, Fabian Kuhn, and Yannic Maus. Distance-2 coloring in the CONGEST model. In *PODC*, pages 233–242. ACM, 2020. [4](#)
- [HKMN20] Magnús M. Halldórsson, Fabian Kuhn, Yannic Maus, and Alexandre Nolin. Coloring fast without learning your neighbors’ colors. In *DISC*, pages 39:1–39:17. LZI, 2020. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [8](#), [12](#), [34](#), [36](#), [37](#)
- [HKMT21] Magnús M. Halldórsson, Fabian Kuhn, Yannic Maus, and Tigran Tonoyan. Efficient randomized distributed coloring in CONGEST. In *STOC*, pages 1180–1193. ACM, 2021. [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [8](#), [9](#), [11](#), [13](#), [14](#), [16](#)
- [HKNT22] Magnús M. Halldórsson, Fabian Kuhn, Alexandre Nolin, and Tigran Tonoyan. Near-optimal distributed degree+1 coloring. In *STOC*, pages 450–463. ACM, 2022. [4](#), [5](#), [8](#), [11](#), [13](#), [14](#), [16](#), [27](#)
- [HN23] Magnús M. Halldórsson and Alexandre Nolin. Superfast coloring in CONGEST via efficient color sampling. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 948:113711, 2023. [4](#), [6](#), [10](#)
- [HNT22] Magnús M. Halldórsson, Alexandre Nolin, and Tigran Tonoyan. Overcoming congestion in distributed coloring. In *PODC*, pages 26–36. ACM, 2022. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [8](#), [13](#), [27](#), [34](#), [35](#)

- [HSS18] David G. Harris, Johannes Schneider, and Hsin-Hao Su. Distributed $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring in sublogarithmic rounds. *Journal of the ACM*, 65:19:1–19:21, 2018. [4](#), [5](#), [8](#), [14](#)
- [Joh99] Öjvind Johansson. Simple distributed $\Delta + 1$ -coloring of graphs. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 70(5):229–232, 1999. [4](#)
- [KMR01] Sven Oliver Krumke, Madhav V. Marathe, and S. S. Ravi. Models and approximation algorithms for channel assignment in radio networks. *Wirel. Networks*, 7(6):575–584, 2001. [3](#)
- [Lin92] Nathan Linial. Locality in distributed graph algorithms. *SIAM J. Computing*, 21(1):193–201, 1992. [4](#)
- [Lub86] M. Luby. A simple parallel algorithm for the maximal independent set problem. *SIAM J. Computing*, 15:1036–1053, 1986. [4](#)
- [MPU23] Yannic Maus, Saku Peltonen, and Jara Uitto. Distributed symmetry breaking on power graphs via sparsification. In *PODC*, pages 157–167. ACM, 2023. full version available at [arxiv:2302.06878](#). [3](#), [4](#), [12](#), [36](#), [37](#)
- [MT22] Yannic Maus and Tigran Tonoyan. Linial for lists. *Distributed Comput.*, 35(6):533–546, 2022. [5](#)
- [MU21] Yannic Maus and Jara Uitto. Efficient CONGEST algorithms for the Lovász local lemma. In *DISC*, volume 209 of *LIPICs*, pages 31:1–31:19. LZI, 2021. [3](#), [4](#)
- [PS15] Seth Pettie and Hsin-Hao Su. Distributed coloring algorithms for triangle-free graphs. *Inf. Comput.*, 243:263–280, 2015. [3](#)
- [Ree98] Bruce A. Reed. ω , Δ , and χ . *J. Graph Theory*, 27(4):177–212, 1998. [8](#)
- [RG20] Václav Rozhon and Mohsen Ghaffari. Polylogarithmic-time deterministic network decomposition and distributed derandomization. In *STOC*, pages 350–363. ACM, 2020. [4](#)
- [SW10] Johannes Schneider and Roger Wattenhofer. A new technique for distributed symmetry breaking. In *PODC*, pages 257–266. ACM, 2010. [4](#), [6](#), [10](#)
- [Vad12] Salil P. Vadhan. Pseudorandomness. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 7(1-3):1–336, 2012. [29](#)

A Concentration Inequality

We use the following variants of Chernoff bounds for dependent random variables. The first one is obtained, e.g., as a corollary of Lemma 1.8.7 and Theorems 1.10.1 and 1.10.5 in [Doe20].

Lemma A.1 (Martingales). *Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^r$ be binary random variables, and $X = \sum_i X_i$. Suppose that for all $i \in [r]$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) \in \{0, 1\}^{i-1}$ with $\Pr(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_r = x_{i-1}) > 0$, $\Pr(X_i = 1 \mid X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_{i-1} = x_{i-1}) \leq q_i \leq 1$, then for any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\Pr\left(X \geq (1 + \delta) \sum_{i=1}^r q_i\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\min(\delta, \delta^2)}{3} \sum_{i=1}^r q_i\right). \quad (12)$$

Suppose instead that $\Pr(X_i = 1 \mid X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_{i-1} = x_{i-1}) \geq q_i$, $q_i \in (0, 1)$ holds for i, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1} over the same ranges, then for any $\delta \in [0, 1]$,

$$\Pr\left(X \leq (1 - \delta) \sum_{i=1}^r q_i\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^r q_i\right). \quad (13)$$

B Pseudo-Code

In this section, we give pseudo-code for some of the basic routines of distributed coloring.

- 1 Send c_v to $N(v)$.
- 2 If there is a $u \in N^2(v)$ which has $\text{ID}(u) < \text{ID}(v)$ and $c_u = c_v$ then there is a relay $r \in N(v) \cap N(u)$ which knows about it. It informs v and u about their failure.
- 3 if v did not fail, then it adopts the color c_v , i.e. define $\mathcal{C}(v) = c_v$.

Algorithm 3: TryColor(a node v , a color c_v)

- 1 Each node chooses to be active independently with probability $p_g = 1/20$
- 2 Active nodes sample $c_v \in [\Delta^2 + 1]$ uniformly at random and call TryColor(c_v)

Algorithm 4: GenerateSlack

C Colorful Matching

Input : a clique K and a constant $0 < \beta < 1/(18\epsilon)$.

Output: a colorful matching M of size $\beta \cdot \bar{a}_K$.

- 1 **repeat**
- 2 Sample each color with probability $p = 1/(4\Delta)$. If a node sampled more than one color, it drops all its colors. If the sampled color c is used by a neighbor or by an edge of M , the node drops the color.
- 3 For each color we did not drop at the previous step, nodes keep their color if there is at least one anti-neighbor with this color. If the same color is used by two (or more) anti-edges, we keep the one with the smallest ID.
- 4 **until** $O(\beta)$ times

Algorithm 5: Matching (for a fixed clique K).

Algorithm 5 computes a colorful matching of size $\beta \bar{a}_K$ with probability $1 - e^{-\Theta(\bar{a}_K)}$. We refer the reader to [FGH⁺23b] for a proof of correctness. A node can easily check if the color is already used by a node in the colorful matching (Lemma 4.11). We argue nodes can check if an anti-neighbor sampled the same color as them in $O(1)$ rounds.

We split the color space in ranges R_1, \dots, R_k with $k = \Theta(\Delta^2/\log n)$. Observe that the set T_i of nodes sampling a color in R_i is a random group; hence, has size $\Theta(\log n)$ and 2-hop connects K . Compute a BFS tree in each T_i . Using bitmaps, each $u \in T_i$ learns which colors in R_i are sampled in each tree of $T_i \setminus u$. This is because relays of $u \in T_i$ know which color was sampled by u , so they can filter out its contribution to the bitmap (if needed). Since anti-neighbors that sample the same

color are in the same group, all nodes learn if there exists an anti-neighbor with the same color as theirs. If more than one anti-edge has color c , using aggregation on the BFS tree in T_i , we can select the one with the smallest pair of IDs.

Using the prefix-sum algorithm and random groups (Lemmas 4.9 and 4.11), an edge in M can learn how many edges M contains with a smaller color. In particular, they can adjust the size of M to be exactly $\beta\bar{a}_K$ (in a case it contains more edges than needed).

D Almost-Clique Decomposition

Almost-clique decomposition are commonly computed by classifying edges as *friendly* (or *unfriendly*) if neighbors share a $(1 - \varepsilon)$ fraction of their neighborhoods. Computing ε -friendly edges exactly is too expensive; [ACK19] showed it was enough to compute a weaker predicate distinguishing ε -friends from non- $(c \cdot \varepsilon)$ -friends where $c > 1$ is some constant. This predicate is called ε -buddy and is the one implemented by [HNT22] in CONGEST. A node with many buddies is called *popular*, and the popular predicate is what classifies nodes as either sparse or dense. We refer the reader to [HKMN20, Appendix B in full version] for more details on ε -buddies. One of the main technical contributions of [HNT22] is a distributed algorithm EstimateSimilarity:

Lemma D.1 (Estimate Similarity, [HNT22, Lemma 2]). *Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose nodes u and v know respectively sets S_u and S_v from a universe \mathcal{U} . The randomized algorithm EstimateSimilarity uses $O(1)$ rounds with messages of size $O(\log n/\varepsilon^4 + \log \log |\mathcal{U}| + \log \max(|S_u|, |S_v|))$ such that w.h.p. u and v know $|S_v \cap S_u|$ up to an error $\varepsilon \max(|S_u|, |S_v|)$.*

At distance-1, by letting $S_u = N(u)$ and $S_v = N(v)$, this algorithm computes the ε -buddy predicate, thereby the almost-clique decomposition. To compute the estimates, each node v samples a hash function h_v which can be described with $O(\log n)$ bits. It then compute T_u , the set of values $x \in S_u$ that 1) hash to a value $h(x) \leq \Theta(\log n)$ and 2) collide with no other values in $S_u \setminus x$. It then sends $h(T_u)$ to its neighbors.

For computing almost-clique decompositions, it was then remarked in [FGH⁺23a] that this algorithm could be simplified by letting each node pick a random value in $[O(\Delta/\varepsilon^4)]$ and using this value as “hash” instead of each node picking a hash function. As this process of letting each node pick a random value $h(v)$ is formally equivalent to picking a global random hash function $h : V \rightarrow [O(\Delta/\varepsilon^4)]$, the analysis of Lemma D.1 works immediately using this function instead of individually picked functions h_u, h_v . In [FGH⁺23a], this allowed for the computations of almost-clique decompositions with only broadcast communication.

The same observation essentially also allows for computing almost-clique decompositions at distance-2. The only subtlety at distance-2 is that, since v does not know its neighborhood, it can mistake two nodes hashing to the same value with having two paths to the same node. This issue is solved by being very conservative and ignoring hashes received multiple times. Note that, by doing so, we underestimate $|S_v| = d(v)$ by $\tilde{d}(v) - d(v)$ because each time some node $u \in N^2(v)$ with two distinct 2-paths to v hashes to a value below $O(\log n)$, two relays send this value to v , making v remove it from T_v . A node with $\tilde{d}(v) - d(v) \geq \varepsilon\Delta^2$ will underestimate its number of friends, note however that such a node is sparse. Underestimating the number of friends of a sparse node does not cause any harm as even without such errors, it does not have enough friends to belong to an almost-clique. On the other hand, a node with $\tilde{d}(v) - d(v) \leq \varepsilon\Delta^2$ will lose only $\varepsilon\Delta^2$ when estimating its number of friends. Fortunately, this much error can be tolerated when we implement the ε -buddy predicate. The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 6.

1 Let \mathcal{H} be a family of representative hash functions $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow [\lambda]$ with parameters

$$\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 8\Delta^2/\varepsilon, \quad \beta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon/4, \quad \alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon^2/8, \quad \sigma = \Theta(\varepsilon^{-4} \log n).$$

2 Each v samples a random value $h(v) \in [\lambda]$ and sends it to its neighbors.

3 Each relay $r \in N(v)$ of v computes $h(N_G(r)) \cap [\sigma]$

4 Let $T_v = [\sigma] \cap \bigcup_{r \in N_G(v)} \left(h(N_G(r)) \setminus h(\bigcup_{r' \neq r} N_G(r')) \right)$

5 Each v broadcasts T_v .

6 A shared relay $r \in N(v) \cap N(u)$ computes $|T_u \cap T_v|/\sigma$ and declare v and u friends if it is at least $(1 - \Theta(\varepsilon))\Delta^2$.

7 Each $r \in N_G(v)$ sends to v how many friends it detected in $N_G(r)$.

8 If v received notice of at least $(1 - \Theta(\varepsilon))\Delta^2$ friends from its relays, it declares itself popular.

Algorithm 6: Buddy and Popular

E Proof of Lemma 7.1

Lemma 7.1 (Representative Hash Functions, Extension of [HNT22]). *Let $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1/8)$ and $\lambda \geq 1$ an integer be such that $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\lambda \geq \Omega(\alpha^{-1}\beta^{-2} \log n)$. Let \mathcal{U} be a finite set. There exists a family \mathcal{H}^{rep} of $F = \Theta(\beta\lambda^2 \log |\mathcal{U}| \text{poly}(n))$ functions $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow [\lambda]$ and a $\sigma \leq \lambda$ verifying $\sigma \geq \Theta(\beta^{-2}\alpha^{-1} \log n)$ such that*

1. For any pair $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \times [\lambda]$ and disjoint sets $T, P \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ with sizes $|T|, |P| \leq \beta\lambda$ and $|T| \geq \alpha\lambda$, when sampling a $h \in \mathcal{H}^{\text{rep}}$ such that $h(x) = y$, with high probability, Equation (10) holds:

$$|(h(T) \setminus h(P)) \cap [\sigma]| \geq \frac{\sigma|T|}{\lambda}(1 - 8\beta). \quad (10)$$

2. For all pairs $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \times [\lambda]$ there are $\frac{1 \pm 1/2}{\lambda} F$ functions in $h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $h(x) = y$.

Quick Review of HNT. We begin by reviewing the work of [HNT22] (henceforth referred to as HNT) on which this part is heavily based. For some function $h : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [\lambda]$ and sets $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, they introduce sets

- $A|_h^{\leq \sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h^{-1}([\sigma]) \cap A$ the values to hash $\leq \sigma$ through h ;
- $A \wedge_h^{\leq \sigma} B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in A : h(x) \in [\sigma] \cap h(B \setminus \{x\})\}$ the values $x \in A$ which collide with some $B \setminus \{x\}$ through h ; and
- $A \neg_h^{\leq \sigma} B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (A|_h^{\leq \sigma}) \setminus (A \wedge_h^{\leq \sigma} B)$ the values $x \in A$ to hash $\leq \sigma$ without colliding with some element in $B \setminus \{x\}$.

Henceforth, we will only consider sets $A \subseteq B$, such that $|h(A \neg_h^{\leq \sigma} B)| = |A \neg_h^{\leq \sigma} B|$ (because each index in $[\sigma]$ has a unique pre-image in A). Note that $|A \neg_h^{\leq \sigma} B| \geq |A|_h^{\leq \sigma} - |A \wedge_h^{\leq \sigma} B|$. Their key lemma from HNT is the following: (we will use a $\beta' \neq \beta$ from Lemma 7.1 to be defined precisely later)

Lemma E.1 (Claim 1 from HNT). *Let $\alpha, \beta', \nu \in (0, 1)$ and λ such that $\alpha \leq \beta'$ and $\lambda \geq \Omega(\alpha^{-1}\beta'^{-2} \log(1/\nu))$. There exists a $\sigma = \Theta(\beta'^{-2}\alpha^{-1} \log(1/\nu)) \leq \lambda$ such that if $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ verify $|A|, |B| \leq \beta\lambda$ and $|A| \geq \alpha\lambda$, then a random function $h : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [\lambda]$ verify that $|A \neg_h^{\leq \sigma} B| \geq \frac{\sigma|A|}{\lambda}(1 - 3\beta')$ with probability $1 - \nu/2$.*

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Lemma E.1 states that a random function essentially verify our requirements. We now give the existential argument for the existence of the family \mathcal{H}^{rep} described in Lemma 7.1.

Sample F functions $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_F : [\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ uniformly at random. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1, \dots, h_F\}$. For each pair $(x, y) \in \mathcal{U} \times [\lambda]$, we define the set $\mathcal{H}(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{h \in \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } h(x) = y\}$. The following fact is a straightforward consequence of the uniformity of functions and Chernoff bound.

Fact E.2. For any pair $(x, y) \in [\lambda] \times \mathcal{U}$, w.p. $1 - e^{-\Theta(F/\lambda)}$, we have $|\mathcal{H}(x, y)| \in \frac{1 \pm 1/2}{\lambda} F$.

Fix a pair $(x, y) \in [\lambda] \times \mathcal{U}$ and condition on an arbitrary set $\mathcal{H}(x, y)$ of size at least $F/(2\lambda)$. Let $T, P \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ be any set such that $|T| \geq \alpha\lambda$ and $|T|, |P| \leq \beta\lambda$ (such as required by Lemma 7.1). We define $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} T$ and $B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} T \cup P$, such that $|A| \geq \alpha\lambda$ and $|B| \leq 2\beta\lambda \leq \beta'\lambda'$ where $\beta' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\beta$. The restriction $h|_{\mathcal{U} \setminus \{x\}}$ of h is a uniform function $\mathcal{U} \setminus \{x\} \rightarrow [\lambda]$; hence, Lemma E.1 applies. When adding the fixed value $h(x) = y$, we remove at most one hash value. Hence, we have the bound $|h(T) \setminus h(P) \cap [\sigma]| \geq |A - \sigma_h B| \geq \frac{\sigma|A|}{\lambda}(1 - 3\beta') - 1 \geq \frac{\sigma|A|}{\lambda}(1 - 4\beta') = \frac{\sigma|A|}{\lambda}(1 - 8\beta)$ for $\sigma = \Theta(\beta'^{-2}\alpha^{-1} \log 1/\nu)$ large enough. Since a function is bad for sets A, B with probability at most $\nu/2$ and $|\mathcal{H}(x, y)| \geq F/(2\lambda)$, the Chernoff bound gives the following:

Fact E.3. The number of functions in $\mathcal{H}(x, y)$ to verify Equation (10) is $(1 - \nu)|\mathcal{H}(x, y)|$ with probability $1 - e^{-\Theta(\nu F/\lambda)}$.

Define $\mathcal{E}_1(x, y)$ the event that Fact E.2 fails and $\mathcal{E}_2(x, y)$ the event that Fact E.3 fails. We show that with probability strictly less than 1 that no $\mathcal{E}_1(x, y)$ nor $\mathcal{E}_2(x, y)$ occurs. A simple union bound gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\exists x, y : \mathcal{E}_1(x, y) \vee \mathcal{E}_2(x, y)) &\leq \sum_{x, y} 2\Pr(\mathcal{E}_1(x, y)) + \Pr(\mathcal{E}_2(x, y) \mid \overline{\mathcal{E}_1}(x, y)) \\ &\leq \lambda|\mathcal{U}| \left(2e^{-\Theta(F/\lambda)} + |\mathcal{U}|^{\Theta(\beta\lambda)} e^{-\Theta(\nu F/\lambda)} \right) < 1 \end{aligned}$$

for some large enough $F = \Theta(\lambda^2 \nu^{-1} \log |\mathcal{U}|)$. By the probabilistic method, there exists a family \mathcal{H}^{rep} such as described in Lemma 7.1.

F Low Degree Algorithm

We explain in this section how results in [HKMN20, MPU23, GK21] are combined to obtain an $O(\log^5 \log n)$ algorithm for $\text{poly}(\log n)$ -sized instances of $\text{deg}+1$ -list-coloring on square graphs, as stated in Proposition 1.1.

Proposition 1.1 ([HKMN20, Lemma 3.12+3.15] + [MPU23, Appendix A] + [GK21]). *Let H be a subgraph of G^2 where G is the communication network, and suppose $\Delta(H) \leq \text{poly} \log n$. Suppose each node v , of degree $d_H(v)$ in H , knows a list $L(v)$ of $d_H(v) + 1$ colors from some color space $|\mathcal{U}| \leq \text{poly}(n)$. There is a randomized algorithm coloring H in $O(\log^5 \log n)$ rounds of CONGEST such that each node receives a color from its list.*

The algorithm of [HKMN20] first reduces to two instances of maximum degree $O(\log n)$, similar to [BEPS16], using $O(\log \log n)$ color tries. As the instances to solve are connected in G^2 rather than G , they then add some relay nodes (which they call Steiner nodes) to each instance to make them connected in G . These relays are few enough that they do not increase much the size of the

instances. A distance-2 network decomposition of this graph is then computed, which is where recent results on network decompositions first improve the runtime of [HKMN20].

The distance-2 network decomposition can be computed in $\tilde{O}(\log^3 \log n)$ CONGEST rounds, using a recent result of [MPU23] adapting the network decomposition of [GGH⁺23] to power graphs with a mild dependency on the ID space. At this point, we can iterate through the colors of the network decomposition, and color each cluster of it following the same method as in [HKMN20]. In each cluster, nodes reduce their color space by choosing a hash function from $[\Delta^2 + 1]$ to $\text{poly}(\log n)$ using a standard derandomization technique (method of conditional expectation). Each cluster then colors itself using a deterministic algorithm for degree+1-list-coloring. Recent improvements for this problem allow this step to run in $O(\log^4 \log n)$ within each cluster, where one $O(\log \log n)$ factor comes from simulating the algorithm of [GK21] in the distance-2 setting. More precisely, the algorithm only needs $O(\log^3 \log n)$ communication rounds on G^2 with $O(\log \log n)$ bandwidth, which can be implemented in $O(\log^4 \log n)$ with G as communication graph, with $\Theta(\log n)$ bandwidth and using that the degree is at most $O(\log n)$.

Putting everything together, the total cost of the algorithm is $O(\log^5 \log n)$. The complexity from computing the network decomposition [GGH⁺23, MPU23] is dominated by that of coloring the decomposition's clusters afterwards, decomposed as follows: one $O(\log \log n)$ from iterating through the colors of the network decomposition, $O(\log^3 \log n)$ to run [GK21] in each cluster, with an $O(\log \log n)$ overhead to run the algorithm with communication graph G instead of G^2 .