

Approximating Min-Diameter: Standard and Bichromatic

Aaron Berger* Jenny Kaufmann† Virginia Vassilevska Williams‡

August 16, 2023

Abstract

The *min-diameter* of a directed graph G is a measure of the largest distance between nodes. It is equal to the maximum min-distance $d_{\min}(u, v)$ across all pairs $u, v \in V(G)$, where $d_{\min}(u, v) = \min(d(u, v), d(v, u))$. Min-diameter approximation in directed graphs has attracted attention recently as an offshoot of the classical and well-studied diameter approximation problem.

Our work provides a $O(m^{1.426}n^{0.288})$ -time $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation algorithm for min-diameter in DAGs, and a faster $O(m^{0.713}n)$ -time almost- $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation variant. (An almost- α -approximation algorithm determines the min-diameter to within a multiplicative factor of α plus constant additive error.) This is the first known algorithm to solve $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation for min-diameter in sparse DAGs in *truly subquadratic* time $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ for $\epsilon > 0$; previously only a 2-approximation was known. By a conditional lower bound result of [Abboud et al, SODA 2016], a better than $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation can't be achieved in truly subquadratic time under the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH), so our result is conditionally tight. We additionally obtain a new conditional lower bound for min-diameter approximation in general directed graphs, showing that under SETH, one cannot achieve an approximation factor below 2 in truly subquadratic time.

Our work also presents the first study of approximating bichromatic min-diameter, which is the maximum min-distance between oppositely colored vertices in a 2-colored graph. We show that SETH implies that in DAGs, a better than 2 approximation cannot be achieved in truly subquadratic time, and that in general graphs, an approximation within a factor below $\frac{5}{2}$ is similarly out of reach. We then obtain an $O(m)$ -time algorithm which determines if bichromatic min-diameter is finite, and an almost-2-approximation algorithm for bichromatic min-diameter with runtime $\tilde{O}(\min(m^{4/3}n^{1/3}, m^{1/2}n^{3/2}))$.

1 Introduction

The *min-distance* between two vertices x, y in a directed graph G is the minimum of the one-way distances $d(x, y)$ and $d(y, x)$, and is written $d_{\min}(x, y)$. This notion of distance was introduced by Abboud, Vassilevska W., and Wang [2] in their study of diameter in directed graphs. Since the standard notion of distance in directed graphs is not symmetric, [2] considered a number of symmetric distance functions: roundtrip distance, max-distance, and min-distance. The min-distance in particular has since then been studied in a series of papers [12, 14, 10].

The min-distance is arguably the most natural notion of distance in directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), in which for every two vertices x, y , at most one of $d(x, y), d(y, x)$ is finite. Min-distance is also applicable in

*bergera@mit.edu. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

†jkaufmann@math.harvard.edu. Harvard University. Supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE 2140743.

‡virgi@mit.edu. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Supported by NSF Grant CCF-2129139 and a Sloan Research Fellowship.

potential real-world contexts: for example, if a patient needs to see a doctor as soon as possible, the doctor can visit the patient or vice versa.

The *min-diameter* of a directed graph G is the maximum min-distance between any two vertices, or $\max_{x,y \in V(G)} d_{\min}(x, y)$. One can additionally define the *bichromatic min-diameter* in a graph G with vertex set $V = A \sqcup B$ partitioned into “red” and “blue” vertices: the bichromatic min-diameter is the maximum min-distance between oppositely-colored vertices, or $\max_{a \in A, b \in B} d_{\min}(a, b)$. These are variants on the standard notions of diameter [1, 3, 6, 9, 11, 16, 25] and bichromatic diameter [5, 13], respectively.

One can compute min-diameter or bichromatic min-diameter – and for that matter All Pairs Shortest Paths (APSP), the shortest path distances $d(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in V$ – in an n -vertex m -edge graph in $O(mn + n^2 \log n)$ time, simply by running Dijkstra’s algorithm from every vertex. In unweighted graphs, one can instead use BFS, giving an $O(mn)$ runtime.

One might ask whether, for either min-diameter or bichromatic min-diameter, a faster algorithm exists. However, just as for standard diameter and other diameter variants that have been studied [2, 13, 20], the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) [18, 8] suggests exact computation cannot be done in run-times that are *truly subquadratic*, meaning $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ for $\epsilon > 0$. SETH is one of the main hypotheses in Fine-Grained Complexity [22], and is among the most well-established hardness hypotheses for showing conditional lower bounds. It states that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is an integer $k \geq 3$ so that k -SAT on n variables cannot be solved in $O(2^{(1-\epsilon)n})$ time.

Since exact computation is conditionally hard, we resort to finding approximations. Since min-distance does not obey the triangle inequality, approximating min-diameter is especially challenging, in comparison to standard diameter or even roundtrip diameter or max-diameter. For this reason, much of the work on min-diameter has focused on DAGs.

Min-Diameter

Aboud, Vassilevska W., and Wang [2] gave a 2-approximation for min-diameter in DAGs, running in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time.¹ Meanwhile, they showed that if one can obtain a $(\frac{3}{2} - \delta)$ approximation in $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time for min-diameter in DAGs (for $\epsilon, \delta > 0$), then SETH is false. The results of [2] left a gap between the conditional lower bound of $3/2$ and the upper bound of 2 for $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time algorithms for DAGs. (The lower bound is for $O((mn)^{1-\epsilon})$ time algorithms but since the instances are sparse, this is the same as $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time.)

Later work by Dalirrooyfard and Kaufmann [12] showed that in *dense* DAGs, one can beat the mn barrier by obtaining an almost- $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation algorithm running in $O(n^{2.35})$ time. The conditional lower bound of [2] is for sparse DAGs, however, and the gap between upper and lower bounds has remained.

Our main result is to close this gap for sparse DAGs:

Theorem 1. *There is an $O(m^{0.713}n)$ time algorithm that achieves a $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ -approximation for min-diameter in any m -edge, n -node unweighted DAG.*

Furthermore, there is an $O(m^{1.426}n^{0.288})$ time algorithm that achieves a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation for min-diameter in any m -edge, n -node unweighted DAG.

A (c, a) -approximation for a quantity D is a quantity D' such that $D \leq D' \leq cD + a$.

Similar to [12], we use hitting set and set intersection methods to certify distances. Our main new technique is to iteratively grow a central interval of vertices with convenient distance properties by checking that at least one of two neighboring vertex subsets, to its left and right, has the desired properties.

¹The tilde hides polylogarithmic factors.

The algorithms use fast matrix multiplication. There are also combinatorial versions of the algorithms, with runtimes $O(m^{3/4}n)$ for the $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ -approximation and $O(m^{5/4}n^{1/2})$ for the $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation.² These runtimes are still subquadratic for sparse graphs.

Our paper also considers the case of general directed graphs. Abboud, Vassilevska W., and Wang [2] showed that under SETH, any $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time algorithm for $\epsilon > 0$ for min-diameter can achieve at best a 2-approximation. This result only held for weighted graphs.

We give the first hardness result for unweighted graphs, extending the hardness of [2]:

Theorem 2. *Under SETH, there can be no $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time $(2 - \delta)$ -approximation algorithm for the min-diameter of an unweighted directed graph with n vertices and $m = n^{1+o(1)}$ edges, for $\epsilon, \delta > 0$.*

Because our min-diameter approximation algorithms for DAGs obtain an approximation factor better than 2 in truly subquadratic time, this gives the first separation of hardness results for min-diameter approximation in the sparse cyclic versus acyclic cases.

This result, along with all other hardness results from SETH in this work, are via Orthogonal Vectors (OV) reductions. The OV problem is as follows: Given two sets A, B each containing n d -dimensional Boolean vectors, determine whether there are vectors $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ that are *orthogonal*, meaning $a \cdot b = 0$.

OV Hypothesis ([24]). *There is no constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any constant c and $d = c \log n$, the OV problem can be solved by a randomized algorithm in time $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$.*

The OV Hypothesis is implied by SETH [24]. OV-based sparse graph constructions have been commonly used to provide hardness results for diameter variants for the past decade, after having been first introduced by Roditty and Vassilevska W. in [20]. However, unlike previous OV-based constructions known to us, our construction is of a graph shaped as a cycle. If there are no orthogonal vectors then all vertices can reach one another via a single loop around the cycle, whereas if there are orthogonal vectors a path between them must loop nearly twice around the cycle, giving a min-diameter nearly twice as large.

As for upper bounds for general directed graphs, Dalirrooyfard et al. [14] gave for every integer $k \geq 2$, an $\tilde{O}(mn^{1/k})$ time $(4k - 5)$ -approximation algorithm for min-diameter. Most recently, Chechik and Zhang [10] achieved a 4-approximation in near-linear time. There is still a gap between the best approximation known in $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time (3 by [14]) and the best hardness result for such algorithms (2 by this work for unweighted, and by [2] for weighted).

Bichromatic Min-Diameter

A *bichromatic* version of diameter was considered by Dalirrooyfard et al. [13]. In a graph whose nodes are colored red and blue, the *bichromatic diameter* is the largest distance between two nodes of different colors. Dalirrooyfard et al. [13] gave algorithms and hardness for bichromatic diameter under the usual notion of distance.

Our work presents the first study of the notion of bichromatic min-diameter. As the min-diameter is the most natural diameter notion for DAGs, the bichromatic min-diameter is likewise a natural way to consider distances in DAGs whose vertices are two-colored.

We first give hardness for general directed graphs, suggesting that bichromatic min-diameter may be harder than regular min-diameter:

²Combinatorial is here used to refer to an algorithm that does not rely on fast matrix multiplication.

Theorem 3. *Under SETH, there can be no $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time $(\frac{5}{2} - \delta)$ -approximation algorithm for bichromatic min-diameter in unweighted n -node, $m = n^{1+o(1)}$ -edge graphs for $\epsilon, \delta > 0$.*

Furthermore, under SETH, there can be no $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time $(3 - \delta)$ -approximation algorithm for bichromatic min-diameter in graphs with $O(\log n)$ bit integer edge weights.

It would be interesting if the $\tilde{O}(m\sqrt{n})$ 3-approximation algorithm for min-diameter of [14] can be extended to work for bichromatic min-diameter, as then one could get a tight result in the weighted case.

We next turn to bichromatic min-diameter in DAGs. We give an almost-2-approximation algorithm and show that it is essentially tight (up to the additive error) under SETH:

Theorem 4. *Under SETH, there can be no $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ time $(2 - \delta)$ -approximation algorithm for bichromatic min-diameter in unweighted n -node, $m = n^{1+o(1)}$ -edge DAGs, for $\epsilon, \delta > 0$.*

Theorem 5. *There is an $\tilde{O}(m^{4/3}n^{1/3})$ -time algorithm, which, given a DAG and maximum red-blue edge weight M , outputs a $(2, M)$ -approximation of the bichromatic min-diameter.*

Finally, we present a linear-time algorithm which determines whether a directed graph has finite bichromatic min-diameter.

Theorem 6. *There is an $O(m)$ time algorithm which checks, for any weighted directed graph G , whether the bichromatic min-diameter is finite.*

1.1 Preliminaries

We assume the word-RAM model of computation with $O(\log n)$ bit words. All of our algorithms and reductions fall within this model.

Graphs are directed and weakly connected.³ Edge weights are polynomial in n .

The min-eccentricity of a vertex, $\epsilon(v)$, is given by $\max_{u \in V} d_{\min}(u, v)$.

For $v \in V$, the *distance- D out-neighborhood* of v is $N_D^{\text{out}}(v) = \{w \in V \setminus \{v\} \mid d(v, w) \leq D\}$. We define $N_D^{\text{in}}(v)$ correspondingly.

Given a DAG G with topological ordering π and vertex sets $S, T \subseteq V = V(G)$, we write $S <_{\pi} T$ if all vertices in S appear to the left of all vertices in T . When S or T is equal to $\{x\}$ for some vertex x , we may omit the brackets. For vertices s, t , we write $s \leq_{\pi} t$ if $s <_{\pi} t$ or $s = t$. We define a closed subset (with respect to π) to be a subset S such that for all $v \in V$, either $v \in S$, $v >_{\pi} S$, or $v <_{\pi} S$.

Given a DAG G with topological ordering π , a vertex $v \in V$ and a set $S \subseteq V$, let $s_v \in S$ be the left-most vertex in S such that $d(v, s) \leq D$, if such an s_v exists. Then we define $N_{D,S}^{\text{out}}(v)$ to be the set of vertices w such that $d(v, w) \leq D$ and, if s_v exists, $w \leq_{\pi} s_v$. One can intuitively think of $N_{D,S}^{\text{out}}(v)$ as the set $N_D^{\text{out}}(v)$ of vertices at distance at most D from v , but cut off after the first (left-most) time we hit S . We define $N_{D,S}^{\text{in}}(v)$ symmetrically. A set S such that for all v , $|N_{d,S}^{\text{out}}(v)|, |N_{d',S}^{\text{in}}(v)| \leq k$, will be called a $(k, (d, d'))$ -neighborhood cover. If $d = d'$ we refer to it as a (k, d) -neighborhood cover.

A *bichromatic DAG* G is a DAG whose vertices are two-colored. An (A, B) -separated DAG, which we may also simply call a *separated DAG* is a DAG ordered according to some topological ordering π with color sets A, B such that $A <_{\pi} B$.

We sometimes omit π when the choice of π is clear.

Let $\omega(1, r, 1)$ be the exponent of the runtime of multiplying $n \times n^r$ by $n^r \times n$ matrices. The square matrix multiplication exponent is $\omega = \omega(1, 1, 1) > 2.3715$ [23, 15].

³If a graph is not weakly connected (which can be checked in $O(m + n)$ time), then it has infinite min-diameter, as well as infinite bichromatic min-diameter if its vertices are 2-colored.

1.2 Techniques

In this section, we review two useful techniques. The first of these is the greedy set cover lemma. This lemma, and a related randomized version, have been commonly used in prior work on diameter variants ([3], [20], [7], [2], [12]). See [21] for a proof of the lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let $p = O(n)$, and let $X_1, \dots, X_p \subseteq V$ have size $|X_i| \geq n^\epsilon$ for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. In time $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ one can construct a set $S \subseteq V$ of size $O(n^{1-\epsilon} \log n)$ such that $S \cap X_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in [p]$.*

The following technique, previously used in [12], constructs a set cover of all sufficiently large balls of radius d .

Lemma 8. *Given a topologically ordered DAG G and parameters d, d' and $k = n^\epsilon$ for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, one can in time $O(nk^2)$ construct a $(k, (d, d'))$ -neighborhood cover S of size $O(\frac{n}{k} \log n)$, and also construct the sets $N_{d,S}^{out}(v)$, $N_{d',S}^{in}(v)$ for all $v \in V$.*

Proof. For each vertex v , if $|N_d^{out}(v)| < k$, we define $X_d^k(v) = N_d^{out}(v)$. Otherwise let $X_d^k(v)$ be the k left-most vertices in $N_d^{out}(v)$. Similarly, we define the set $Y_{d'}^k(v)$: if $|N_{d'}^{in}(v)| < k$, then $Y_{d'}^k(v) = N_{d'}^{in}(v)$, and otherwise $Y_{d'}^k(v)$ is the k right-most vertices in $N_{d'}^{in}(v)$.

We can compute $X_d^k(v)$ as follows: We initialize a set $S_0 = \emptyset$. While $|S_t| < k$, at step t , we consider the set $W = N_d^{out}(S_t \cup \{v\}) \cap N_d^{out}(v)$ of out-neighbors of $S_t \cup \{v\}$ that are at distance at most d from v . If W is nonempty, we let w be its left-most element, and we construct $S_{t+1} = S_t \cup \{w\}$. If W is empty, then $S_t = N_d^{out}(v) = X_d^k(v)$. If $|S_t| = k$, then S_t contains the left-most k vertices in $N_d^{out}(v)$. Thus, in either case, we will eventually construct $S_t = X_d^k(v)$. The key step in this construction process, namely finding w , can be done by maintaining a list containing the left-most neighbor of each vertex in S_t such that the neighbor is of distance at most d from v , and choosing the left-most vertex in the list at each step. At step t , this list has length at most $|S_t| < k$, and the total number of steps is at most k , so the construction can be done in $O(k^2)$ time.

We can construct $Y_{d'}^k(v)$ in $O(k^2)$ time similarly. Doing this for all $v \in V$ takes time $O(nk^2)$.

Lemma 7 gives us a set cover S of size $O(\frac{n}{k} \log n)$ which intersects all sets $X_d^k(v), Y_{d'}^k(v)$ of size at least k . This takes time $O(nk)$. Then for each vertex v , we construct $N_{d,S}^{out}(v)$ as the set obtained from $X_d^k(v)$ by removing all vertices to the right of the left-most $s \in S \cap X_d^k(v)$. We construct $N_{d,S}^{in}(v)$ in a symmetric fashion. Since the sets $X_d^k(v), Y_{d'}^k(v)$ were of size at most k , the sets $N_{d,S}^{out}(v), N_{d',S}^{in}(v)$ are also of size at most k . \square

2 Min-diameter approximation

In Section 2.1 we present a conditional lower bound showing that the OV Hypothesis implies that no $(2 - \delta)$ -approximation algorithm for min-diameter in unweighted graphs can run in truly subquadratic time. Subsequently, in Section 2.2, we give an almost- $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation algorithm for min-diameter in unweighted DAGs which runs in truly subquadratic time.

2.1 Conditional lower bound in general graphs

We first present a conditional lower bound for approximating min-diameter in general graphs.

Theorem 9. *If there are $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ such that there is an $O(m^{2-\epsilon})$ -time $(2 - \delta)$ -approximation algorithm for min-diameter, then the OV Hypothesis is false.*

Proof. Given $\delta > 0$, choose $t = \lceil \frac{2}{\delta} \rceil$ so that $2 - \delta < \frac{2t}{t+1}$. Let A be an instance of single-set OV⁴, that is, a set of $n \geq 2^t$ vectors in $\{0, 1\}^{c_0 \log n}$ for a constant $c_0 > 0$. We will construct a graph G_t with $O(tn)$ vertices, $\tilde{O}(tn)$ edges such that the min-diameter is $2t + 1$ if A contains a pair of orthogonal vectors, and $t + 1$ otherwise. For each $i \in [t]$, we construct a set A_i of n vertices corresponding bijectively to the vectors in A . For each vector $a \in A$, let a_i be the vertex in set A_i corresponding to a . We also construct a set I of “index” vertices $x_1, \dots, x_{c \log n}$. In total we have $O(tn)$ vertices. We add an edge $a_1 \rightarrow x_j$ and an edge $x_j \rightarrow a_t$ whenever $a[j] = 1$. We also add edges $a_i \rightarrow a_{i-1}$ for each $i \in \{2, \dots, t\}$. Finally, we add all possible edges $A_2 \rightarrow I$. In total we have $\tilde{O}(tn)$ edges. This graph G_t may be constructed in $\tilde{O}(tn) = \tilde{O}(n)$ time.

We now check that if the OV instance is a YES instance, G_t has at least min-diameter $2t + 1$, and in the NO case, G_t has min-diameter $t + 1$.




Figure 1: The graph G_t . The thick edge denotes that all possible edges $A_2 \rightarrow I$ exist.

YES case Let $a, b \in A$ be orthogonal. Without loss of generality, $d_{\min}(a_1, b_1) = d(a_1, b_1)$. There is no j such that $a[j] = b[j] = 1$, so there is no length-2 path from a_1 to b_t via I . Since all edges between A_i and A_{i-1} are of the form $a_i \rightarrow a_{i-1}$, the first t vertices on any $a_1 \rightarrow b_1$ path must be of the form $a_1 \rightarrow x_j \rightarrow c_t \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow c_2$ for some $j \in I, c \in A$ such that $a[j] = c[j] = 1$. We note that any path from c_2 to b_1 must traverse all sets of the cycle with the possible exception of A_1 , so must be of length at least t . Then if k is an index such that $b[k] = 1$, the path $c_2 \rightarrow x_k \rightarrow b_t \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_1$ gives $d(c_2, b_1) = t + 1$. Thus, $d(a_1, b_1) = d_{\min}(a_1, b_1) \geq 2t + 1$. So G_t has min-diameter at least $2t + 1$.

NO case Suppose that A contains no pair of orthogonal vectors. For any a_1, b_i , there is some j such that $a[j] = b[j] = 1$, so there is a path $a_1 \rightarrow x_j \rightarrow b_t \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_i$ of length at most $t + 1$. Now, consider any vertices $a_i, b_{i'}$ with $2 \leq i \leq i'$. Let j be an index such that $b[j] = 1$. There is a path $a_i \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow a_2 \rightarrow x_j \rightarrow b_t \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_{i'}$ which has length at most t . Furthermore, for any $a_1 \in A_1, x_j \in I, d(a_1, x_j) \leq t + 1$, since there is a path $a_1 \rightarrow x_k \rightarrow a_t \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow a_2 \rightarrow x_j$ for some k with $a[k] = 1$. Lastly, for any $a_i \in A_i$ with $i \geq 2$, and for any $x_j \in I$, there is a path $a_i \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow a_2 \rightarrow x_j$ of length at most t . Hence, all pairs of vertices are at min-distance at most $t + 1$. \square

⁴The OV Hypothesis can be equivalently stated in terms of single-set OV (OV where $A = B$). Informally, the reduction is to construct A' from A by appending 10 to all vectors, and B' from B by appending 01 to all vectors. If $v_1, v_2 \in A' \cup B'$ are orthogonal, then we must have $v_1 \in A', v_2 \in B'$ or vice versa.

2.2 A $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ -approximation algorithm in unweighted DAGs

Unlike in general directed graphs, where $(2 - \delta)$ -approximating min-diameter seems to be hard, in DAGs one can achieve an efficient $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ -approximation and a (slightly less) efficient $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation. The $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and the exact $\frac{3}{2}$ approximations have very similar proofs; we present the proof of the $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ -approximation result here because the algorithm is faster and marginally simpler than in the exact $\frac{3}{2}$ case, whose proof can be found in Appendix A.

Our algorithm uses fast sparse matrix multiplication to compute set intersections. Its runtime involves the constants $\alpha = \max\{0 \leq r \leq 1 \mid \omega(1, r, 1) = 2\}$ and $\beta = \frac{\omega-2}{1-\alpha}$.

Theorem 10. *There is an $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{4\beta+2-2\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n)$ -time algorithm achieving a $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ -approximation for min-diameter in unweighted DAGs.*

Since $\alpha > 0.32133$ and $\omega < 2.37156$ [23], we can use $\beta \simeq 0.5475$, giving the runtime $O(m^{0.713}n)$.

The algorithm starts by topologically sorting the DAG and fixing a neighborhood-size parameter k (whose value will be determined later). It then performs two layers of recursion. The outer layer is a binary search over min-diameter estimates D : for each estimate D , it will either determine that D is low or high, i.e. that $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$ or $\text{min-diameter}(G) \leq \lceil \frac{3}{2}D \rceil$. The inner layer, in which the estimate D is fixed, involves recursively splitting the graph in half according to the topological ordering. Then, in the core body of the algorithm, one of the following will occur:

- We find a pair of vertices with min-distance larger than D , in which case we end the recursion and report that $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$.
- We verify that every min-distance between a vertex in the left half and a vertex in the right half is at most $\lceil 3D/2 \rceil$, and we recurse on the left and right halves of the graph.

The core body of the algorithm – which will be repeated recursively as the graph is repeatedly cut in half – is as follows:

First, using Lemma 8, we compute a $(k, (D/2, \lceil D/2 \rceil))$ -neighborhood cover S of size $O(\frac{n}{k} \log n)$ along with neighborhoods $N_{D/2, S}^{\text{out}}(v), N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{\text{in}}(v)$ all of which have size at most k . Using BFS, we check that $d_{\text{min}}(s, v) \leq D$ for all $s \in S, v \in V$. This step ensures that, for every vertex with a “sufficiently large” (meaning, size- k) distance- $D/2$ out-neighborhood or distance- $\lceil D/2 \rceil$ in-neighborhood, some vertex in S lies in that out- or in-neighborhood. In this sense, S covers all of the large neighborhoods, which will be useful later.

We partition V into $2\theta = n/k^2$ closed intervals, $V_1, \dots, V_{2\theta}$. We let $L = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_\theta$ and $R = V_{\theta+1} \cup \dots \cup V_{2\theta}$ be the left and right halves of V . We start in the middle and work outwards verifying that min-distances between vertices in L and R are at most $\lceil 3D/2 \rceil$.

At each inductive step, we consider two subsets of vertices $A = V_i$ and $B = V_j$ to the left and right of the “middle interval,” which consists of the intervening subsets $V_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup V_{j-1}$. Intuitively, one might picture the middle interval as a growing amoeba, which at each step engulfs one of A or B . We will only add vertices to the middle interval once they have been “checked,” so vertices from A that are added to the middle interval have distance at most $3D/2$ to everything in B , and vice-versa. Eventually, either the algorithm will detect a min-distance greater than D and report that $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$, or the amoeba will have engulfed enough of the graph that it contains the entirety of one of the halves L or R , meaning that all distances from vertices in L to vertices in R are at most $\lceil \frac{3}{2}D \rceil$.

In order to expand the middle interval we have to confirm that one of our two candidate subsets A and B has small distances to the opposite half of the graph. Performing a BFS from each vertex in A or B to confirm this directly would be too slow, so instead we present two subroutines to achieve this goal faster. Algorithm 2 checks that all min-distances between vertices $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ are at most $\lceil 3D/2 \rceil$. Algorithm 3 checks that either all vertices in A have min-distance at most $\frac{3}{2}D$ to all vertices to the right of B , or that a symmetric property holds for all vertices in B . These algorithms will either detect that the min-diameter is more than D or allow us to add one of A or B to the middle interval.

We first give a pseudocode description of the main algorithm, Algorithm 1, which will give context for the two subroutines, Algorithms 2 and 3, whose descriptions follow afterwards.

Algorithm 1: Full graph min-distance tester

Input: DAG $G = (V, E)$, diameter guess D , parameters $k = m^{\frac{\beta+1}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}}$ and $\theta = n/2k^2$.

Output: One of the following. Each output verifies a corresponding property of G .

PASS \Rightarrow $\text{min-diameter}(G) \leq \lceil \frac{3}{2}D \rceil$
FAIL \Rightarrow $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$

- 1 Topologically sort G ;
 - 2 Using Lemma 8 compute a $(k, (D/2, \lceil D/2 \rceil))$ -neighborhood cover $S \subseteq V$. Run BFS to and from each vertex in S ;
 - 3 **if** $\exists s \in S$ such that $\epsilon(s) > D$ **then**
 - 4 **FAIL**
 - 5 Partition V into consecutive closed intervals, $V_1, \dots, V_{2\theta}$, with $|V_i| = k^2$ for each i ;
 - 6 Initialize $i = \theta$ and $j = \theta + 1$;
 - 7 **while** $i \geq 1$ **and** $j \leq 2\theta$ **do**
 - 8 Run Algorithm 2 (all-pairs) on the pair (V_i, V_j) . If this fails, then **FAIL**;
 - 9 Run Algorithm 3 (directional tester) on the pair (V_i, V_j) . If this fails, then **FAIL**;
 - 10 **else if** Algorithm 3 passes and returns V_i **then**
 - 11 | $i = i - 1$;
 - 12 **else**
 - 13 | $/*$ Otherwise, Algorithm 3 passes and returns V_j . */
 - | $j = j + 1$;
 - | $/*$ If this line is reached, all distances from L to R are at most $\lceil \frac{3}{2}D \rceil$. */
 - 14 Recursively call this algorithm on $G[L]$ and $G[R]$. If either fails, **FAIL**. Else **PASS**;
-

We will present the correctness and runtime analyses for the two subroutines, and then present the correctness proof and runtime analysis for the overall algorithm.

The first subroutine, Algorithm 2, checks distances between pairs of vertices in subsets A, B by using the cover S to hit large neighborhoods and using fast sparse rectangular matrix multiplication to efficiently check set intersections between small neighborhoods.

Theorem 11 ([19]). *If M, M' are $p \times l$ matrices having at most l nonzero entries, where $p^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq l \leq p^{\frac{\omega+1}{2}}$, then in time $O(l^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta+1}} p^{\frac{2-\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}})$ one can compute the product $M^T M'$.⁵*

⁵To be precise, if we have $\alpha \geq a, \omega \leq c$, we can define $b = \frac{c-2}{1-a}$, and then the theorem holds for any such pair a, b , used in

Algorithm 2: All-pairs min-distance tester

Input: DAG $G = (V, E)$, topological ordering π , subsets $A <_{\pi} B \subseteq V$ with $|A| = |B| = p = O(k^2)$, diameter guess D , $(k, (D/2, \lceil D/2 \rceil))$ -neighborhood cover $S \subseteq V$ such that $\epsilon(s) \leq D$ for all $s \in S$, and $N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a)$, $N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b)$ for $a \in A, b \in B$.
Output: One of the following. Each output verifies a corresponding property of G .

PASS $\Rightarrow d_{\min}(a, b) \leq \lceil \frac{3}{2}D \rceil$ for all $a \in A$ and $b \in B$
FAIL $\Rightarrow \text{min-diameter}(G) > D$

```
1 Compute  $M_A$ , the matrix with columns given by indicator vectors of  $N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a)$  for  $a \in A$ ;  
2 Compute  $M_B$ , the matrix with columns given by indicator vectors  $N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b)$  for  $b \in B$ ;  
3 Compute  $M = M_A^T M_B$ ;  
4 foreach  $a \in A, b \in B$  do  
5   if  $M_{ab} \geq 1$  then  
6     continue;  
7   else if  $a <_{\pi} N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b)$  and  $N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b) \cap S \neq \emptyset$  then  
8     continue;  
9   else if  $b >_{\pi} N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a)$  and  $N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a) \cap S \neq \emptyset$  then  
10    continue;  
11  else  
12    FAIL;  
13 PASS;
```

Lemma 12. Algorithm 2 produces the correct output in runtime $O(k^{4 + \frac{2\beta - 2\alpha\beta}{\beta + 1}})$.

Proof. We first show correctness. Assume the algorithm fails; then it fails inside the **foreach** loop at some pair a, b . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $d_{\min}(a, b) \leq D$. Let x be a midpoint of the shortest path from a to b , so $d(a, x) \leq D/2$, $d(x, b) \leq \lceil D/2 \rceil$. If $x \notin N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a)$ despite being distance $\leq D/2$ from a , then x must lie after the out-neighborhood of a reaches the $(k, (D/2, \lceil D/2 \rceil))$ -neighborhood cover S and is cut off. That is, there is some $s \in N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a) \cap S$ to the left of x , and hence to the left of b . Thus the condition in line 9 holds, and we **continue** rather than **FAIL**, which is a contradiction. Similarly, if $x \notin N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b)$ then the condition in line 7 holds, which is a contradiction. We conclude that $x \in N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a) \cap N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b)$, in which case $M_{ab} \geq 1$, completing the contradiction. Thus, $d_{\min}(a, b) > D$, and so $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$.

Conversely, assume the algorithm passes. Then for each pair of vertices $a \in A, b \in B$, one of the conditions in lines 5, 7, or 9 must hold. If $M_{ab} \geq 1$, then there is some $x \in N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a) \cap N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b)$, giving $d(a, b) \leq d(a, x) + d(x, b) \leq D/2 + \lceil D/2 \rceil \leq D + 1$. Otherwise if $a <_{\pi} N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b)$ and $N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b) \cap S$ is nonempty, then there is some $s \in N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil, S}^{in}(b) \cap S$ with $s \geq_{\pi} a$. Thus $d(a, b) \leq d(a, s) + d(s, b) \leq D + \lceil D/2 \rceil \leq \lceil 3D/2 \rceil$. Similarly, if $b >_{\pi} N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a)$ and $N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a) \cap S$ is nonempty, then there is some $s \in N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a) \cap S$ with $s \leq_{\pi} b$. So $d(a, b) \leq d(a, s) + d(s, b) \leq D/2 + D \leq 3D/2$. We conclude that if the algorithm passes, then every pair $a \in A, b \in B$ satisfies $d(a, b) \leq \lceil 3D/2 \rceil$.

We conclude with runtime analysis. M_a and M_b are sparse $p \times n$ matrices with $O(pk) = O(k^3)$ entries,

place of α, β .

so may be treated as $p \times pk$ matrices. Using Theorem 11, the matrix multiplication takes time at most $O((pk)^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta+1}} p^{\frac{2-\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}}) = O(k^{4+\frac{2\beta-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}})$. The **foreach** loop takes $O(|A||B|) = O(k^4)$ time. \square

Remark. One can modify Algorithm 2 by computing set intersections of the sets $N_{D/2,S}^{out}(a)$, $N_{\lceil D/2 \rceil,S}^{in}(b)$ for $a \in A, b \in B$, by brute force in lieu of matrix multiplication. This gives a combinatorial version of Algorithm 2 which runs in time $\tilde{O}(p^2k) = \tilde{O}(k^5)$.

Next we give the directional min-distance tester. A call to this subroutine will prove a min-distance bound of $3D/2$ from A to everything past B , prove a bound of $\lceil 3D/2 \rceil$ from B to everything before A , or find a pair of vertices with min-distance greater than D . The idea is to iterate over vertices a in A ; those with large $D/2$ -neighborhoods get hit by S , and if some a has a small $D/2$ -neighborhood it can be used as a jumping-off set to show B is close to everything past A .

Algorithm 3: Directional min-distance tester

Input: DAG $G = (V, E)$, topological ordering π , closed subsets $A <_{\pi} B \subseteq V$, diameter guess D , parameter k , $(k, (D/2, \lceil D/2 \rceil))$ -neighborhood cover $S \subseteq V$ with $\epsilon(s) \leq D$ for all $s \in S$, and neighborhoods $N_{D/2,S}^{out}(a)$ for all $a \in A$.

Output: One of the following. Each output verifies a corresponding property of G .

PASS and return $A \Rightarrow d(a, v) \leq \frac{3}{2}D$ for all $a \in A$ and $v >_{\pi} B$
PASS and return $B \Rightarrow d(v, b) \leq \lceil \frac{3}{2}D \rceil$ for all $b \in B$ and $v <_{\pi} A$
FAIL $\Rightarrow \text{min-diameter}(G) > D$

```

1 foreach  $a \in A$  do
2   if  $N_{D/2,S}^{out}(a) \cap S = \emptyset$  or  $N_{D/2,S}^{out}(a) \cap S >_{\pi} B$  then
3     foreach  $v \in \{a\} \cup N_{D/2,S}^{out}(a)$  do
4       BFS to and from  $v$ ;
5       if  $\epsilon(v) > D$  then
6         FAIL;
7     PASS and return  $B$ ;
8 PASS and return  $A$ ;

```

Lemma 13. Algorithm 3 produces the correct output in runtime $O(mk)$.

Proof. We first show correctness. If the algorithm fails, we must have found a vertex u with $\epsilon(u) > D$, and thus $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$.

If the algorithm returns A , then for each $a \in A$, there is some $s \in S \cap N_{D/2,S}^{out}(a)$ with s appearing in B or to its left. Thus for all $u >_{\pi} B$, we have $d(a, u) \leq d(a, s) + d(s, u) \leq D/2 + D = 3D/2$.

Otherwise, the algorithm returns B . Then the condition in line 2 must hold for some $a \in A$. Let $u <_{\pi} A$ and $b \in B$. Since we do not fail in line 5, we must have $d(a, b) \leq D$. Let x be a midpoint of the shortest path from a to b , so $d(a, x) \leq D/2$ and $d(x, b) \leq \lceil D/2 \rceil$. Since $N_{D/2,S}^{out}(a)$ is either not cut off by hitting S or is cut off after B , we have $x \in N_{D/2,S}^{out}(a)$. Finally, since we do not fail in line 5, we must have $d(u, x) \leq D$. Concluding, $d(u, b) \leq d(u, x) + d(x, b) \leq D + \lceil D/2 \rceil \leq \lceil 3D/2 \rceil$. As u, b were arbitrary, this completes the case.

We conclude with runtime analysis. The outer **foreach** loop repeats until we have covered every vertex in A or the condition in line 2 is satisfied. Checking this condition takes time at most $O(k)$ for a total of $O(|A|k) = O(mk)$. If the condition is satisfied, we perform $1 + |N_{D/2, S}^{out}(a)|$ calls to BFS, for a total of $O(mk)$. The algorithm concludes before returning to the outer loop, so we may add these contributions for a total time of $O(mk)$. \square

We can now complete the analysis of the overall algorithm.

Lemma 14. *Algorithm 1 produces the correct output in runtime $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{4\beta+2-2\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n)$.*

Proof. This algorithm fails only when some $s \in S$ has $\epsilon(s) > D$, when Algorithm 2 fails, or Algorithm 3 fails, all of which imply $\min\text{-diameter}(G) > D$. We now show that in the event of a pass, $\min\text{-diameter}(G) \leq \lceil 3D/2 \rceil$. It suffices to prove that if the algorithm reaches line 13 then all min-distances between vertices in L and R are at most $\lceil 3D/2 \rceil$.

Assume we are at the beginning of iteration t of the **while** loop. Let $I_t = \bigcup_{i < \ell < j} V_\ell$ be the interval strictly between V_i and V_j . We will show inductively that for all $x \in L$ and $y \in R$, where at least one of x or y is in the interval I_t , $d_{\min}(x, y) \leq \lceil 3D/2 \rceil$. When the loop terminates, I_t must entirely contain either L or R , which will prove that all min-distance between vertices in L and R are at most $\lceil 3D/2 \rceil$.

The base case is trivial, as I_1 is empty. Assume the claim holds for t . Without loss of generality, assume Algorithm 3 returns V_i , so that $I_{t+1} = I_t \cup V_i$. Let $x \in L, y \in R$ with at least one of x or y in I_{t+1} . If x or y is in I_t , then $d(x, y) \leq \lceil 3D/2 \rceil$ by induction. Otherwise, one must lie in $I_{t+1} \setminus I_t = V_i$, and since $V_i \subset L$, this vertex must be x . Then we have $y \in V_j$ or $y >_\pi V_j$. If $y \in V_j$, then since Algorithm 2 did not fail, we have $d(x, y) \leq 3D/2$. If $y >_\pi V_j$, then because Algorithm 3 returned V_i we have $d(x, y) \leq \lceil 3D/2 \rceil$. This completes the induction and the proof of correctness.

G can be topologically sorted in time $\tilde{O}(n)$. Lemma 8 constructs the set S in time $O(nk^2)$. Running BFS to and from each vertex in S takes time $\tilde{O}(mn/k)$. We run Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 each up to $2\theta = n/2k^2$ times. Since Algorithm 2 takes time $O(k^{4 + \frac{2\beta-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}})$ and Algorithm 3 takes time $O(mk)$, the total runtime of a recursive step is therefore:

$$\tilde{O}(mn/k + nk^{2 + \frac{2\beta-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}})$$

Setting $k = m^{\frac{\beta+1}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}}$, we obtain $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{4\beta+2-2\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n)$ for each recursive step. The recursion over the left and right halves of the graph then adds a logarithmic factor. \square

Proof of Theorem 10. Binary searching over $D \in [n]$ using Algorithm 1 gives the desired algorithm. The additive $+1/2$ follows from the fact that $\lceil 3D/2 \rceil$ may equal $3D/2 + 1/2$. \square

Remark. *Using the combinatorial version of Algorithm 2, one can obtain a combinatorial $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ -approximation algorithm for min-diameter which runs in time $\tilde{O}(m^{3/4}n)$.*

Theorem 15. *There is a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation algorithm for min-diameter in unweighted DAGs that runs in time $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{8\beta+4-4\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{\beta+1}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}})$.*

This runtime is at most $O(m^{1.426} n^{0.288})$. We note that there is also a combinatorial version of this algorithm which runs in time $\tilde{O}(m^{5/4} n^{1/2})$, and a version which runs in $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{7\beta+3-3\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{2\beta+2-\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}})$ time, which is $O(m^{1.171} n^{0.543})$, when $m \leq n^{1.283}$. A proof of the theorem may be found in Appendix A.

3 Bichromatic min-diameter

We first present OV-based conditional lower bounds for bichromatic min-diameter approximations, both for general graphs and for DAGs. Then in Section 3.2, we give an almost-2-approximation algorithm for bichromatic min-diameter in DAGs.

3.1 Conditional lower bounds for bichromatic min-diameter

We present, in order of increasing strength of the bound, three conditional lower bounds for approximating bichromatic min-diameter: one for DAGs, one for unweighted directed graphs, and one of weighted directed graphs. The constructions proceed analogously to Theorem 9.

Theorem 16. *For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ if there is an $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$ -time algorithm giving a $(2 - \delta)$ -approximation for bichromatic min-diameter in unweighted DAGs with $O(n)$ vertices and $O(n^{1+o(1)})$ edges, then the OV Hypothesis is false.*

Proof. Given an OV instance with vector sets A, B , for each integer $t > 0$, we will construct a bichromatic DAG G_t whose bichromatic min-diameter D is $2t + 1$ if there are a pair of orthogonal vectors $a \in A, b \in B$ and at most $t + 1$ otherwise.

G_t has red vertex set A and blue vertex sets B_1, \dots, B_t , where each B_i has vertices corresponding to the vertices of B . Note $|A| = |B_i| = n$ for all $i \in [t]$. G also has blue vertex sets I_1, \dots, I_t of size $O(\log n)$, where each vertex $v_{i,j}$ in I_i corresponds to an index j of a vector.

The edges of G_t are as follows: A is complete to I_1 . For $i \in [t-1]$, there are perfect matchings between I_i, I_{i+1} and $B_i \rightarrow B_{i+1}$, consisting respectively of edges $(v_{i,j} \rightarrow v_{i+1,j})$ and of edges (b_i, b_{i+1}) where $b_i \in B_i, b_{i+1} \in B_{i+1}$ correspond to the same vector $b \in B$. Lastly, there are edges $(a, v_{t,j})$ for each index j such that $a[j] = 1$ and edges $(v_{t,j}, b_1)$ for each index j such that $b[j] = 1$.




Figure 2: The graph G_t . The thick edge denotes that all possible edges $A \rightarrow I_1$ exist.

YES case: Suppose $a \in A, b \in B$ are orthogonal vectors. Since the edges between sets B_i are matchings, any path P from a to b_t must pass through b_0 . The vertex prior to b_0 in P must be $v_{t,j}$ for some index j such that $b[j] = 1$. Then we must have $a[j] = 0$, since the vectors are orthogonal, so there is no edge from a to $v_{t,j}$. Thus, the path from p to $v_{t,j}$ must pass through the sets I_i . Hence, we have $d(a, b_t) = 2t + 1$, giving a bichromatic min-diameter of at least $2t + 1$.

NO case: Suppose that there is no pair of orthogonal vectors. Then for every pair $a \in A, b \in B$, there is some index j such that $a[j] = b[j] = 1$. Hence for all $i \in [t]$, there is a path $a \rightarrow v_{t,j} \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow b_i$, which has length at most $t + 1$. Thus, for all $a \in A$ and $b_i \in B_i$ for any $i \in [t]$, $d(a, b_i) \leq t + 1$. Since A is complete to I_1 , for all $a \in A$ and $v_{1,j} \in I_1$, there is a path $a \rightarrow v_{1,j} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_{i,j}$, which has length

at most t . Hence, every red vertex is at distance at most $t + 1$ from every blue vertex, giving a bichromatic min-diameter of at most $t + 1$.

For constant t , constructing $V(G_t)$ takes $O(tn) = O(n)$ time, and constructing $E(G_t)$ takes $O(tn \log n)$ which is $O(n \log n)$ time. So if we can obtain a better than $\frac{2t}{t+1}$ -approximation for the bichromatic min-diameter of G_t in $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$ time, we have also solved the OV instance in $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$ time. \square

Theorem 17. *For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, if there is an $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$ -time algorithm giving a $(5/2 - \delta)$ -approximation for bichromatic min-diameter in unweighted graphs with $O(n)$ vertices and $O(n^{1+o(1)})$ edges, then the OV Hypothesis is false.*

Proof. Given an OV instance with vector sets A, B , for each integer $t > 0$, we will construct a graph G whose bichromatic min-diameter D is at least 5 if there are a pair of orthogonal vectors $a \in A, b \in B$ and at most 2 otherwise.

G has red vertex set A and blue vertex set B corresponding to the vector sets A, B , a blue vertex set I corresponding to the set of indices I of vectors in A, B , and an auxiliary blue vertex x .

For $i \in I$ and $a \in A$, we add an edge (a, i) iff $a[i] = 1$. For $i \in I$ and $b \in B$, we add an edge (i, b) iff $b[i] = 1$. Finally, we add all edges from I to x and from x to A .

We now compute the bichromatic min-diameter of G . The only red vertices are in A , so we examine their distances. Each red vertex is adjacent to x and therefore is distance at most 2 from every vertex in I . Fix $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. As b has outdegree 0, any path connecting them must start at a . The only outneighbors of a are vertices $i \in I$ such that $a[i] = 1$; if a and b are not orthogonal then at least one such i satisfies $b[i] = 1$ and therefore contains an edge to b . So when no a, b are orthogonal the min-diameter is indeed 2. On the other hand, for a, b orthogonal, there is no such i , so any path from a to b must begin $a \rightarrow i \rightarrow x$ (and continue $x \rightarrow a' \rightarrow i'$) so we cannot reach b in four or fewer edges, and the min-diameter is at least 5. \square

Theorem 18. *For any $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, if there is an $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$ -time algorithm giving a $(3 - \delta)$ -approximation for bichromatic min-diameter in weighted graphs with $O(n)$ vertices and $O(n^{1+o(1)})$ edges, then the OV Hypothesis is false.*

Proof. Given an OV instance with vector sets A, B , for each integer $t > 0$, we will construct a graph G whose bichromatic min-diameter D is at least $3t + 2$ if there are a pair of orthogonal vectors $a \in A, b \in B$ and at most $t + 1$ otherwise.

G has red vertex set A and blue vertex set B corresponding to the vector sets A, B , as well as blue vertex set I corresponding to the set of indices I of vectors in A, B .

For $i \in I$ and $a \in A$, we add a weight- t edge (a, i) iff $a[i] = 1$. For $i \in I$ and $b \in B$, we add a weight-1 edge (i, b) iff $b[i] = 1$. Lastly, we add all possible edges (i, a) and give these “backwards” edges weight $t + 1$.

For any $a \in A, i \in I$, $d_{\min}(a, i) \leq t + 1$ since the edge (i, a) exists and has weight 1. If $b \in B$ is not orthogonal to $a \in A$, then there exists $i \in I$ such that $a[i] = b[i] = 1$, so there is a path from a to b via i . Thus $d_{\min}(a, b) \leq t + 1$. So if there is no pair of orthogonal vectors, the bichromatic min-diameter is at most $t + 1$.

Suppose that a, b are orthogonal vectors. Consider a shortest $a \rightarrow b$ path; since all edges out of a are into I and all edges into b are out of I , the path must contain some $i, i' \in I$ such that $a[i] = 1$ and $b[i'] = 1$. We have $i \neq i'$ since a, b are orthogonal. The shortest path between distinct i, i' is a path of the form $i \rightarrow a' \rightarrow i'$ where $a' \in A$ is some vertex such that $a'[i'] = 1$. Thus, a shortest $a \rightarrow b$ path must be of the

form a, i, a', i', b and must therefore have weight $3t + 2$, since $w(a, i) = w(a', i') = t$, $w(i, a') = t + 1$, and $w(i', b) = 1$. So in this case the bichromatic min-diameter is at least $3t + 2$. \square

3.2 Almost-2-approximation for bichromatic min-diameter in DAGs

We conclude by turning to upper bounds for bichromatic min-diameter.

Theorem 19. *There is an $\tilde{O}(\min(m^{4/3}n^{1/3}, m^{1/2}n^{3/2}))$ -time algorithm, which, given a DAG G with maximum red-blue edge weight M_0 , outputs an approximation D_0 such that $D \leq D_0 < 2D + M_0 \leq 3D$.*

We first show how to efficiently achieve a 2-approximation in the case of separated DAGs. Recall that these are topologically ordered DAGs with color sets A, B such that $A <_{\pi} B$.

The following subroutine will allow us to identify vertices with relatively few out-neighbors of the same color, and verify that the rest of the vertices of that color have small distances to vertices of the opposite color.

Lemma 20. *Let G be an (A, B) -separated DAG. Given parameters D and $k = n^{\epsilon}$ for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, one can in time $O(\frac{mn}{k} \log^2 n)$ either determine that $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) > D$ or compute a set $A' \subseteq A$ such that for all $a \in A'$, there are at most k vertices $v \in A$ such that $d(a, v) \leq D$, and for all $a \notin A', b \in B$, $d_{\min}(a, b) \leq 2D$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume A is red and B is blue.

Using Lemma 8, we find a (k, D) -neighborhood cover S of size $O(\frac{n}{k} \log n)$ along with the sets $N_{D,S}^{\text{out}}(v)$. This takes time $O(nk^2)$. Note that $|N_{D,S}^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A| \leq k$ for all $a \in A$.

We run BFS to and from all vertices in S , which takes time $O(\frac{mn}{k} \log^2 n)$. If we find an $s \in S, v \in V$ of different colors such that $d_{\min}(s, v) > D$, then $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) > D$. Otherwise, we iterate over vertices $a \in A$. Suppose that $N_{D,S}^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ does not intersect S ; this can be checked in $O(k)$ time for each $a \in A$. Since $N_{D,S}^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ is the set of red vertices at distance at most D from a cut off after the first time this set intersects S , this means that $N_{D,S}^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ contains all red vertices at distance at most D from a . In this case, we add a to the set A' . Otherwise, $N_{D,S}^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ intersects S at some vertex s , which must be red. Then we have $d(a, s) \leq D$ and $d(s, b) \leq D$ for all blue vertices b . So $d(a, b) \leq 2D$ for all $b \in B$. \square

We can now present a 2-approximation algorithm for the special case of separated DAGs.

Lemma 21. *Algorithm 4 provides an $O(m^{4/3}n^{1/3} \log^2 n)$ -time algorithm which, given an (A, B) -separated DAG G , together with a parameter D , determines either that $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) > D$ or that $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) \leq 2D$.*

Proof. We assume A is red and B is blue. If the algorithm returns **FAIL**, then it found a red-blue pair of vertices a, b such that $d_{\min}(a, b) > D$, so $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) > D$.

Otherwise, suppose the algorithm returns **PASS**. Then the application of Lemma 20 successfully found a set A' with the desired properties. In particular, for all $a \in A \setminus A'$ and all $b \in B$, $d_{\min}(a, b) \leq 2D$.

If the algorithm returns **PASS** at line 11, then we have for all $a \in A'$ that $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ intersects T at some vertex t , which is necessarily red. Then $d(a, t) \leq D$ and $d(t, b) \leq D$ for all $a \in A'$ and $b \in B$, so (combined with the fact that this already holds for $a \in A \setminus A'$), we have that $d(a, b) \leq 2D$ for all red-blue pairs a, b , so $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) \leq 2D$.

Algorithm 4: Bichromatic min-distance tester for sparse separated DAGs

Input: (A, B) separated DAG $G = (A \sqcup B, E)$, where (without loss of generality) A is red and B is blue. Diameter guess D and parameters k, Δ .

Output: One of the following. Each output verifies a corresponding property of G .

PASS \Rightarrow $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) \leq 2D$

FAIL \Rightarrow $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) > D$

- 1 Using Lemma 20, either determine that $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) > D$ and **FAIL**, or compute a set $A' \subseteq A$ such that for all $a \in A'$, there are at most k red vertices at distance D from a , and for all $a \in A \setminus A'$, $d_{\min}(a, b) \leq 2D$ for all $b \in B$;
 - 2 Let T be the set of red vertices with out-degree at least Δ . Run Dijkstra's algorithm out of every vertex in T . If we find a $t \in T, b \in B$ such that $d(t, b) > D$, then **FAIL**;
 - 3 **foreach** a in A' **do**
 - 4 Compute the set $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$;
 - 5 **if** $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap T = \emptyset$ **then**
 - 6 Run Dijkstra's algorithm from a . If $d(a, b) > D$ for some $b \in B$, then **FAIL**;
 - 7 Run Dijkstra's algorithm into each blue vertex adjacent to a vertex in $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$; i.e., each blue vertex in $N(N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A)$. If we find a red-blue distance greater than D , then **FAIL**;
 - 8 **PASS**;
 - 9 **else**
 - 10 **continue**;
 - 11 **PASS**;
-

Otherwise, the algorithm returns **PASS** at line 8. So there is some $a \in A'$ such that $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ does not intersect T . In this case we run Dijkstra's algorithm from all blue vertices in $N(N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A)$, and from a itself. Let $b \in B$ be any blue vertex. We note that on the shortest path P between a and b , there is a left-most blue vertex, t . Then since $d(a, t) \leq D$, the vertex t' appearing before t on the path P is red, and $d(a, t') \leq D$. Therefore $t' \in N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$, so $t \in N(N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A)$. Then via Dijkstra, we have that for all $a' \in A$, $d(a', t) \leq D$, and so $d(a', b) \leq 2D$. Since this holds for all $b \in B$, we again have $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) \leq 2D$, and have completed the proof of correctness.

We note that Lemma 20 has runtime $O(\frac{mn}{k} \log^2 n)$. We further note that T has size $O(m/\Delta)$, so running Dijkstra from all vertices in T takes time $O(\frac{m^2}{\Delta} \log n)$. Moreover, we note that for $a \in A'$, the set $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ has size at most k , so computing it takes time at most $O(k^2)$. Thus, computing these sets takes time at most $O(|A'|k^2) \leq O(nk^2)$. Finally, note that if $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap T = \emptyset$, then all vertices in $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ have degree less than Δ . So computing $N(N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A)$ takes time at most $O(\Delta |N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A|) \leq O(\Delta k)$, and its size is also bounded by Δk . Running Dijkstra from a and from all blue vertices in $N(N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A)$ therefore takes time $O(m\Delta k \log n)$. Fix $k = n^{2/3}m^{-1/3}$ and $\Delta = m^{2/3}n^{-1/3}$. Our total runtime is $O(\frac{m^2}{\Delta} \log n + nk^2 + m\Delta k \log n + \frac{mn}{k} \log^2 n) = O(m^{4/3}n^{1/3} \log^2 n)$ as claimed. \square

A similar algorithm gives a better runtime in the case where the graph is dense ($m > n^{7/5}$):

Lemma 22. *Algorithm 5 provides an $O(m^{1/2}n^{3/2} \log^2 n)$ -time algorithm which, given an (A, B) -separated DAG G , together with a parameter D , determines either that $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) > D$ or that $\text{bichromatic-min-diameter}(G) \leq 2D$.*

Algorithm 5: Bichromatic min-distance tester for dense separated DAGs

Input: DAG $G = (A \sqcup B, E)$, where (without loss of generality) A is the set of red vertices, B is the set of blue vertices, and $A <_{\pi} B$. Diameter guess D and parameter k .

Output: One of the following. Each output verifies a corresponding property of G .

PASS \Rightarrow `bichromatic-min-diameter`(G) $\leq 2D$

FAIL \Rightarrow `bichromatic-min-diameter`(G) $> D$

- 1 Using Lemma 20, either determine that `bichromatic-min-diameter`(G) $> D$ and **FAIL**, or compute a set $A' \subseteq A$ such that for all $a \in A'$, there are at most k red vertices at distance D from a , and for all $a \in A \setminus A'$, $d_{\min}(a, b) \leq 2D$ for all $b \in B$;
 - 2 Using Lemma 20, either determine that `bichromatic-min-diameter`(G) $> D$ and **FAIL**, or compute a set $B' \subseteq B$ such that for all $b \in B'$, there are at most k blue vertices at distance D from b , and for all $b \in B \setminus B'$, $d_{\min}(a, b) \leq 2D$ for all $a \in A$;
 - 3 **foreach** a in A' **do**
 - 4 Compute the *red out-neighborhood* $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ using Dijkstra's algorithm. Store all computed distances $d(a, v)$ for $v \in N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$. Initialize $BB(a) = \emptyset$;
 - 5 **foreach** *edge* (v, b) where $v \in N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A, b \in B$ **do**
 - 6 Check if $d(a, b) = d(a, v) + w(v, b) \leq D$. If so, add b to $BB(a)$.
 /* $BB(a) = \{b \in B \mid b \in N(N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A), d(a, b) \leq D\}$ is the *blue boundary* of the red out-neighborhood */
 - 7 Run set intersection on the collections $\{BB(a) : a \in A'\}$ and $\{N_D^{\text{in}}(b) \cap B : b \in B'\}$. If $BB(a) \cap (N_D^{\text{in}}(b) \cap B) = \emptyset$ for some $a \in A'$ and $b \in B'$, then **FAIL**. Otherwise **PASS**;
-

Proof. We assume A is red and B is blue. Applying Lemma 20 twice takes time $O(\frac{mn}{k} \log^2 n)$. If the algorithm fails at this step, we have `bichromatic-min-diameter`(G) $> D$. Otherwise, it remains to check distances $d_{\min}(a, b)$ where $a \in A'$ and $b \in B'$. Computing $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$ for all $a \in A'$ and $N_D^{\text{in}}(b) \cap B$ for all $b \in B'$ takes time $O(nk^2)$, since these sets each have size at most k . Computing $BB(a)$ requires iterating through every edge leaving $N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$. Since each vertex has $O(n)$ incident edges, this takes time $O(n|N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A|) \leq O(nk)$. Repeating this for all $a \in A'$ therefore contributes $O(n^2k)$ to the runtime.

Once we have computed $BB(a)$, we iterate through the vertices $b \in B'$. If $BB(a) \cap (N_D^{\text{in}}(b) \cap B) = \emptyset$ for some $a \in A'$ and $b \in B'$, then we claim $d_{\min}(a, b) > D$. Suppose otherwise; let y be the last red vertex on the shortest path from a to b , and let x be the first blue vertex. Clearly $d_{\min}(a, x) \leq D$ and so $x \in N_D^{\text{out}}(a) \cap A$. Then $y \in BB(a)$. However $d_{\min}(y, b) \leq D$ as well, so $y \in N_D^{\text{in}}(b) \cap B$, which is a contradiction. Thus if the algorithm fails, $d_{\min}(a, b) > D$.

Otherwise, for all $a \in A'$ and $B \in B'$ there is an $x \in BB(a) \cap (N_D^{\text{in}}(b) \cap B)$. Then by definition $d(a, x) \leq D$ and $d(x, b) \leq D$, so we have verified that $d(a, b) \leq 2D$ and can progress to checking the next blue vertex $b \in B'$. This completes the proof of correctness.

For the runtime, we have a contribution of $O(\frac{mn}{k} \log^2 n)$ from Lemma 20 and a contribution of $O(n^2k)$ from the **foreach** loop. For set intersection it suffices to compute it combinatorially which takes time $O(n^2k \log k)$ as well. Taking $k = m^{1/2}n^{-1/2}$ we have a total runtime of $O(m^{1/2}n^{3/2} \log^2 n)$. \square

We can now describe our algorithm for arbitrary bichromatic DAGs.

Theorem 23. *There is an $\tilde{O}(\min(m^{4/3}n^{1/3}, m^{1/2}n^{3/2}))$ -time algorithm which, given a bichromatic DAG G and a parameter D , determines whether G has bichromatic min-diameter greater than D or at most $2D + M$, where M is the maximum edge weight in G .*

The idea is to look at two overlapping closed subgraphs H_0, H_1 in the middle of the graph, where H_0 is (A, B) -separated and H_1 is (B, C) -separated for some $A, B, C \subseteq V$. Depending on the sparsity of the graph, we will use the algorithm of either Lemma 21 or 22 to gain information about the distances within each H_i . We then run a constant number of Dijkstras, which will allow us to either find that G has a bichromatic min-diameter greater than D , or find a partition $V = V_0 \cup V_1$ such that for all $v \in V_0, w \in V_1$ of different colors, $d(v, w) \leq 2D + M$. In the latter case, we recurse on $G[V_0]$ and $G[V_1]$.

Proof. We begin by topologically sorting the graph; let v_1, \dots, v_n be the vertices of the graph in topologically sorted order π . We will choose a middle vertex v_j as follows: If $m > n^{7/5}$ (so $m^{1/2}n^{3/2} > m^{4/3}n^{1/3}$), i.e. if the graph is dense, let $j = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. Otherwise, in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time we can find a vertex v_j such that there are most $m/2$ edges with endpoints both to the right of v_j and at most $m/2$ edges with endpoints both to the left of v_j . This can be done by iterating through vertices in sorted order and keeping a running count of how many edges are incident to those vertices, stopping when the count reaches $m/2$.

We will assume without loss of generality that v_j is blue. Let B be a maximal closed set of blue vertices containing v_j . Let A and C be maximal closed sets of red vertices such that $A <_\pi B <_\pi C$ and $A \cup B \cup C$ is closed. Let $H_0 = G[A \cup B]$, and let $H_1 = G[B \cup C]$.

Via Lemmas 21 and 22, we can in $\tilde{O}(\min(m^{4/3}n^{1/3}, m^{1/2}n^{3/2}))$ time check for each H_i either that H_i has bichromatic min-diameter greater than D , in which case we are done, or that for all differently colored pairs $(v, w) \in V(H_i)$, $d(v, w) \leq 2D$. We may assume the latter case holds for $i \in \{0, 1\}$.

Let l be the right-most vertex to the left of A , and let r be the left-most vertex to the right of A . Then l and r are blue, since A and C are maximal closed sets of red vertices. Let a_0 be the left-most vertex in A , and let a_1 be the right-most vertex in A ; define b_0, b_1, c_0, c_1 correspondingly for B and C . See Figure 3.⁶




Figure 3

Each pair $(l, a_0), (a_1, b_0), (b_1, c_0), (c_1, r)$ contains a red and a blue vertex which are consecutive under π . Check for each such pair that there is an edge between the vertices in the pair. If any such edge does not exist, we report that the bichromatic min-diameter is infinite.

We now run Dijkstra's algorithm into and out of each vertex $l, a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1, c_0, c_1, r$. If some red-blue distance found is larger than D , we report that the bichromatic min-diameter is greater than D . Otherwise, we will show that for any vertex x in the set V_0 of vertices to the left of B , and any vertex $y \in V \setminus V_0$ having a different color than x , $d(x, y) \leq 2D + M$. The cases are as follows:

1. Let $x <_\pi A$ be any red vertex, and let $y >_\pi A$ be any blue vertex. Then by assumption, we have checked that $d(x, l) \leq D, d(l, a_0) \leq M$, and $d(a_0, y) \leq D$, so we have verified that $d(x, y) \leq 2D + M$.

⁶Not all of these vertices need exist; if they do not, this implies there are no vertices beyond them in the relevant direction, so all of the distance checks that would have involved that vertex are unnecessary.

2. Let $x <_\pi A$ be any blue vertex, and let $y >_\pi A$ be any red vertex. Then by assumption, we have checked that $d(x, a_1) \leq D$, $d(a_1, b_0) \leq M$, and $d(b_0, y) \leq D$, so again we have verified that $d(x, y) \leq 2D + M$.
3. Let $x \in A$ be any vertex; note x must be red. Let $y >_\pi A$ be any blue vertex. If $y \in B$, then we have $d(x, y) \leq 2D$, since $A \cup B = V(H_1)$ and H_1 was already checked. Otherwise, $y >_\pi C$. Then by assumption, we have checked that $d(x, b_1) \leq D$, $d(b_1, c_0) \leq M$, and $d(c_0, y) \leq D$, so we have verified that $d(x, y) \leq 2D + M$.

By a symmetric argument, if V_1 is the set of vertices to the right of B , for any vertex $y \in V_1$ and any vertex $x \in V \setminus V_1$ having a different color than y , we have verified that $d(x, y) \leq 2D + M$.

Let $G_0 = G[V_0]$ and let $G_1 = G[V_1]$. We have verified that if v, w are two differently colored vertices in V which do not lie in the same G_i , then $d_{\min}(v, w) \leq 2D + M$. We can then run the algorithm recursively on G_0 and G_1 . We now split our analysis into the sparse case in which $m^{4/3}n^{1/3} < m^{1/2}n^{3/2}$ and the dense case in which the reverse inequality holds; in each case, the recursion adds a factor of $\log n$ to the runtime.

Sparse case: We note $V_0 <_\pi B$ and in particular $V_0 <_\pi \{v_j\}$, so by our choice of v_j there are at most $m/2$ edges in G_0 . Likewise, $V_1 >_\pi \{v_j\}$, so there are at most $m/2$ edges in G_1 . Then we have:

$$|E(G_0)|^{4/3}|V(G_0)|^{1/3} + |E(G_1)|^{4/3}|V(G_1)|^{1/3} \leq 2(m/2)^{4/3}n^{1/3} \leq m^{4/3}n^{1/3}$$

Hence, the recursive runtime is $\tilde{O}(m^{4/3}n^{2/3})$.

Dense case: In this case, $V_0 <_\pi \{v_j\}$ and $V_1 >_\pi \{v_j\}$ where $j = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$, so there are at most $n/2$ edges in each of G_0 and G_1 . We have:

$$|E(G_0)|^{1/2}|V(G_0)|^{3/2} + |E(G_1)|^{1/2}|V(G_1)|^{3/2} \leq 2m^{1/2}(n/2)^{3/2} \leq m^{1/2}n^{3/2}$$

So the recursive runtime is $\tilde{O}(m^{1/2}n^{3/2})$. □

This yields the final min-diameter approximation algorithm by a standard binary search.

Proof of Theorem 19. Using Theorem 23, binary search over $D \in [0, M_1n]$ where M_1 is the maximum edge weight. This multiplies the runtime by $O(\log(M_1n))$. Since M_1 is polynomial in n , the overall runtime remains $\tilde{O}(\min(m^{4/3}n^{1/3}, m^{1/2}n^{3/2}))$. □

4 Linear time detection of infinite bichromatic min-diameter

In this section, we give a linear-time algorithm which determines whether the bichromatic min-diameter of a (possibly weighted) directed graph is finite.

We first prove the claim in the case of DAGs.

Proposition 24. *There is an $O(m)$ time algorithm which can determine whether an input DAG G has finite bichromatic min-diameter.*

Proof. Note that proving the claim for unweighted graphs is sufficient, since a weighted graph has finite bichromatic min-diameter only if the underlying unweighted graph also does.

We topologically sort the graph and let v_1, \dots, v_n be its edges in sorted order π . We then partition the vertices into disjoint sets $A^1 <_\pi A^2 <_\pi \dots <_\pi A^r$ each of which is a maximal monochromatic closed set of vertices. The sets will necessarily alternate colors, so that A^i is red for even indices i and blue for




Figure 4: The graph G , with the k th ‘sliding window’ G^k circled with a dashed line.

odd i , or vice versa. Let y^{k-1} be the left-most vertex in A^k , and let x^k be the right-most vertex in A^k , for $k \in [r]$. Thus x^k and y^k are always consecutive vertices of different colors. Let G^k be the subgraph induced by $\{x^{k-1}\} \cup A^k \cup A^{k+1} \cup \{y^{k+1}\}$. See Figure 4.

Our algorithm will take a ‘sliding window’ approach. We will check finiteness of red-blue min-distances between within the sliding window, and then show that if the check holds, all red-blue min-distances between vertices that have passed under the sliding window are finite.

Our inductive assumption will be that any min-distance between a red-blue pair of vertices in the set $L^k = A^1 \cup \dots \cup A^k \cup \{y_k\}$ is finite. In the base case, $L^0 = \{y_1\}$, so the inductive assumption holds.

We will assume without loss of generality that in step k , x^{k-1} and A^{k+1} are blue, and A^k is red; then for $i < k$, any red $v \in A^i$ can reach x^{k-1} and any blue $v \in A^i$ can reach y^{k-1} .

To simplify notation, we will write $B = A^{k+1}$.

Let $B_0 = \{b \in B \mid N^{in}(b) \cap B = \emptyset\}$ be the set of vertices in B having no in-neighbors in B . Since G is acyclic, for all $b \in B$ there is some $b_0 \in B_0$ such that $d(b_0, b)$ is finite. We can compute B_0 in time $O(|E(B)| + |V(B)|)$, which is $O(|E(G^k)| + |V(G^k)|)$.

Now, we compute a set $A' \subseteq A^k$ as follows: for each $a \in A^k$, we check whether a is adjacent to all of B_0 . If so, we add a to A' . We remark that any $a' \in A'$ can reach all vertices in B .

Next, we construct an auxiliary vertex z^k with edges (a', z^k) for all $a' \in A^k$, and we run BFS into z^k within the graph $G[A^k]$. Suppose this BFS tree $BFS^{in}(z^k)$ hits some vertex $a \in A^k$. Then there is a path $a \rightarrow z^k$, and therefore since $N^{in}(z^k) = A'$, there is a path $a \rightarrow a'$ for some $a' \in A'$. So in particular, if $a \in BFS^{in}(z^k)$, then all vertices in B are reachable from a . Hence, if $BFS^{in}(z^k) = A^k$, all vertices in B are reachable from all vertices in A^k .

Otherwise, let $a \in A^k$ be the right-most vertex in A^k not in $BFS^{in}(z^k)$. Then in particular, a has no out-neighbors in A^k . Furthermore, since $a \notin A'$, there is some $b_0 \in B_0$ such that a is not adjacent to b_0 . Since b_0 has no in-neighbors in B , there can be no path from a to b_0 , and the graph therefore has infinite bichromatic min-diameter. In this case we halt the algorithm and report this result.

Determining if $a \in A'$ takes time $O(\deg(a))$ for each a , via checking the adjacency list to see if it includes all of B_0 . So altogether the runtime needed to check all vertices in A^k is at most $O(\sum_{a \in A^k} \deg(a))$. This runtime is at most $O(|E(G^k)|)$. Likewise, running a BFS from the auxiliary vertex z^k within $G[A^k]$ takes time at most $O(|E(G^k)| + |V(G^k)|)$.

We have now verified that all vertices in $B = A^{k+1}$ are reachable from all vertices in A^k . We will furthermore run BFS from x^{k-1} and y^{k+1} within the subgraph G^k . This takes time at most $O(|E(G^k)| + |V(G^k)|)$. If any red vertex in G^k is not reachable from x^{k-1} , or if y^{k+1} is not reachable from some blue vertex in G^k , we halt and report that the bichromatic min-diameter of G is infinite.

Otherwise, we have that all red-blue min-distances between vertices in $\{x^{k-1}\} \cup A^k \cup A^{k+1} \cup \{y^{k+1}\}$ are finite. We furthermore have inductively that all red-blue min-distances within $L^k = A^1 \cup \dots \cup A^k \cup \{y_k\}$ are finite. Let $i < k$ and let $v \in A^i$ be any blue vertex. Then there is a path $v \rightarrow x^k \rightarrow y^k \rightarrow y^{k+1}$. Likewise, let $w \in A^i$ be any red vertex. Then for any $b \in B = A^{k+1}$, there is a path $w \rightarrow x^{k-1} \rightarrow y^{k-1} \rightarrow b$. Thus, all red-blue min-distances between vertices in A^i for $i < k$ and vertices in $A^{k+1} \cup \{y^{k+1}\}$ are finite.

Thus all red-blue min-distances within $L^{k+1} = A^1 \cup \dots \cup A^{k+1} \cup \{y^{k+1}\}$ are finite, completing the inductive step k .

Since every edge appears in at most three subgraphs G^k , the total runtime is at most:

$$O\left(\sum_k |E(G^k)| + |V(G^k)|\right) = O(m).$$

□

We can now prove the theorem for general directed graphs.

Reminder of Theorem 6 *There is an $O(m)$ time algorithm which checks, for any weighted directed graph G , whether the bichromatic min-diameter is finite.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the claim for unweighted G .

Using Kosaraju’s algorithm, one can in $O(m)$ time compute the strongly connected components C_1, C_2, \dots, C_t of G . We then construct a DAG G' whose vertices, singly or in pairs, correspond to the strongly connected components of G , as follows: For each SCC C_i , construct a vertex x_i . For $i \neq j$, add an edge $x_i \rightarrow x_j$ if there is at least one edge $C_i \rightarrow C_j$. If C_i consists entirely of red (blue) vertices, color x_i red (blue). Otherwise, C_i contains both red and blue vertices; in this case, we split x_i into two vertices, x_i^R and x_i^B , where x_i^R retains all edges incoming into x_i , x_i^B retains all edges outgoing from x_i , and there is an edge $x_i^R \rightarrow x_i^B$. Informally, there are edges $N^{in}(C_i) \rightarrow x_i^R \rightarrow x_i^B \rightarrow N^{out}(C_i)$.

Using Proposition 24, we can in time $O(m)$ check whether G' has finite bichromatic min-diameter. If not, then there are some SCCs C_i, C_j of G , one of which contains a red vertex and the other containing a blue vertex, such that there is no path from any vertex in C_i to any vertex in C_j or vice versa. So in this case we report that G likewise has infinite bichromatic min-diameter.

Otherwise, we have that for all SCCs C_i, C_j of G , one of which contains a red vertex a and the other of which contains a blue vertex, b , that there is some path from C_i to C_j or vice versa. Since C_i and C_j are strongly connected, this implies the existence of a path from a to b or vice versa. Moreover, for any red-blue pair a, b within the same SCC, there is a path from a to b , by the definition of strongly connectedness. Thus, in this case we report that G has finite bichromatic min-diameter. □

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to our reviewers for many helpful suggestions.

References

- [1] Amir Abboud, Fabrizio Grandoni, and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Subcubic equivalences between graph centrality problems, APSP and diameter. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, January 4-6, 2015*, pages 1681–1697, 2015.
- [2] Amir Abboud, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, and Joshua R. Wang. Approximation and fixed parameter subquadratic algorithms for radius and diameter in sparse graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*, pages 377–391, 2016.

- [3] D. Aingworth, C. Chekuri, P. Indyk, and R. Motwani. Fast estimation of diameter and shortest paths (without matrix multiplication). *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(4):1167–1181, 1999.
- [4] Josh Alman and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. A refined laser method and faster matrix multiplication. In Dániel Marx, editor, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 522–539. SIAM, 2021.
- [5] Arturs Backurs, Liam Roditty, Gilad Segal, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, and Nicole Wein. Towards tight approximation bounds for graph diameter and eccentricities. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2018, Los Angeles, CA, USA, June 25-29, 2018*, pages 267–280, 2018.
- [6] J. Basch, S. Khanna, and R. Motwani. On diameter verification and boolean matrix multiplication. *Report No. STAN-CS-95-1544, Department of Computer Science, Stanford University (1995)*, 1995.
- [7] Massimo Cairo, Roberto Grossi, and Romeo Rizzi. New bounds for approximating extremal distances in undirected graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*, pages 363–376, 2016.
- [8] Chris Calabro, Russell Impagliazzo, and Ramamohan Paturi. On the exact complexity of evaluating quantified k -cnf. In Venkatesh Raman and Saket Saurabh, editors, *Parameterized and Exact Computation - 5th International Symposium, IPEC 2010, Chennai, India, December 13-15, 2010. Proceedings*, volume 6478 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 50–59. Springer, 2010.
- [9] Shiri Chechik, Daniel H. Larkin, Liam Roditty, Grant Schoenebeck, Robert Endre Tarjan, and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Better approximation algorithms for the graph diameter. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 1041–1052, 2014.
- [10] Shiri Chechik and Tianyi Zhang. Constant approximation of min-distances in near-linear time. In *Proceedings - 2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022, Proceedings - Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS*, pages 896–906. IEEE Computer Society, 2022. doi:10.1109/FOCS54457.2022.00089.
- [11] F. R. K. Chung. Diameters of graphs: Old problems and new results. *Congr. Numer.*, 60:295–317, 1987.
- [12] Mina Dalirrooyfard and Jenny Kaufmann. Approximation Algorithms for Min-Distance Problems in DAGs. In *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2021)*, volume 198 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 60:1–60:17, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2021. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. URL: <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2021/14129>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2021.60.
- [13] Mina Dalirrooyfard, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, Nikhil Vyas, and Nicole Wein. Tight approximation algorithms for bichromatic graph diameter and related problems. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2019, July 9-12, 2019, Patras, Greece*, volume 132 of *LIPIcs*, pages 47:1–47:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.

- [14] Mina Dalirrooyfard, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, Nikhil Vyas, Nicole Wein, Yinzhan Xu, and Yuancheng Yu. Approximation algorithms for min-distance problems. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [15] Ran Duan, Hongxun Wu, and Renfei Zhou. Faster matrix multiplication via asymmetric hashing. In *Proceedings of the 64th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, page to appear, 2023.
- [16] Silvio Frischknecht, Stephan Holzer, and Roger Wattenhofer. Networks cannot compute their diameter in sublinear time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1150–1162. SIAM, 2012.
- [17] François Le Gall and Florent Urrutia. Improved rectangular matrix multiplication using powers of the coppersmith-winograd tensor. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1029–1046. SIAM, 2018.
- [18] R. Impagliazzo and R. Paturi. On the complexity of k-SAT. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
- [19] Haim Kaplan, Micha Sharir, and Elad Verbin. Colored intersection searching via sparse rectangular matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, SCG '06, page 52–60, New York, NY, USA, 2006. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/1137856.1137866.
- [20] Liam Roditty and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Fast approximation algorithms for the diameter and radius of sparse graphs. In *Proceedings of the Forty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 515–524, 2013.
- [21] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Lecture notes in graph algorithms cs267 (hitting sets, APSP), October 2016. URL: <http://theory.stanford.edu/~virgi/cs267/lecture5.pdf>.
- [22] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. On some fine-grained questions in algorithms and complexity. In *Proceedings of the ICM*, volume 3, pages 3431–3472. World Scientific, 2018.
- [23] Virginia Vassilevska Williams, Yinzhan Xu, Zixuan Xu, and Renfei Zhou. New bounds for matrix multiplication: from alpha to omega, 2023. [arXiv:2307.07970](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.07970).
- [24] Ryan Williams. A new algorithm for optimal 2-constraint satisfaction and its implications. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 348(2-3):357–365, 2005.
- [25] Raphael Yuster. Computing the diameter polynomially faster than APSP. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.6181*, 2010.

A $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation for min-diameter in DAGs

In this appendix we describe how to modify the algorithm of Theorem 10 in order to achieve an exact $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation. We additionally give two variations of the algorithm. The first is a combinatorial version which avoids the use of fast matrix multiplication and has a slightly slower runtime. The second is a version

which partitions the vertex set into subsets of size $O(nk^2/m)$ rather than $O(k^2)$ as in the main algorithm, which runs slightly faster when $m \leq n^{1.283}$.

Reminder of Theorem 15 *There is an $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{8\beta+4-4\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{\beta+1}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}})$ -time algorithm achieving a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation for min-diameter in unweighted DAGs.*

Given a DAG G with n vertices and m edges, the first step in the algorithm involves constructing an auxiliary graph G' by subdividing every edge of G . Then all vertices in $V' = V(G')$ are of the form $v \in V = V(G)$ or $v = v_{x,y}$ for some $x, y \in V$, where the latter is the vertex in the subdivided edge (x, y) , with $x \rightarrow v_{x,y} \rightarrow y$. Then G' has $m + n = O(m)$ vertices and $2m = O(m)$ edges. We scale down all edge weights by a factor of 2, so that all distances between vertices in $V \subset V'$ remain the same. A topological ordering π_0 of G can be extended to a topological ordering π of G . We note that for a vertex v , $\epsilon(v)$ refers to the eccentricity of v within the original graph G , and $N_{d,S;G'}^{out}(v)$ (or any sets or quantities marked with a $'$ symbol) are considered within the auxiliary graph G' . Since $d(u, v) = d'(u, v)$ whenever $u, v \in V$, we use the notation $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ to refer to distance in either G or G' .

From here, the algorithm and its proof follow that of Theorem 10, with two key differences. One is that we eliminate the ceiling function everywhere it appears. The other is we construct a $(k, D/2)$ -neighborhood cover of *edges* in G instead of vertices, by way of covering the auxiliary vertices $v_{x,y}$ inside of subdivided edges in the graph G' .

This set S' then functions in just the same way as a usual neighborhood cover for purposes of set intersections throughout the proof; the ceiling function is no longer necessary because every path of length $\leq D$ between vertices $a \in A, b \in B$ now has an *exact* midpoint which is at most $D/2$ from each end.

The set S' functions slightly differently for cases where we use vertices $s \in S$ as jumping-off points, because we cannot assume that an auxiliary vertex $v_{x,y}$ has min-eccentricity at most D if the original graph G has min-diameter less than D . So instead, for each $s = v_{x,y} \in S$ corresponding to an edge, we BFS to and from the endpoints x, y of the edge, and we report that the min-diameter is greater than D if $\epsilon(x)$ or $\epsilon(y)$ is greater than D . Otherwise, we can use x or y as a jumping-off point anywhere where we would have used $v_{x,y}$: If $d(a, v_{x,y}) \leq D/2$ (without loss of generality), then since the $a \rightarrow v_{x,y}$ path must pass through x , we have $d(a, x) \leq D/2$ as well. A symmetric argument holds for paths outgoing from $v_{x,y}$; these must all pass through y . Therefore, at any point in the argument where we would originally have used the fact that $\epsilon(v_{x,y}) \leq D$, we can instead rely on the fact that $\epsilon(x) \leq D$ and $\epsilon(y) \leq D$.

Lemma 25. *Algorithm 6 produces the correct output in runtime $O(k^{4 + \frac{2\beta - 2\alpha\beta}{\beta + 1}})$.*

Proof. The proof follows that of Lemma 12. If the algorithm fails, it fails inside the **foreach** loop at some pair a, b . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $d_{\min}(a, b) \leq D$. Then because we have subdivided the edges, there is some x such that $d(a, x), d(x, b) \leq D/2$. We then arrive at a contradiction by the same arguments given in the proof of Lemma 12.

Now, assume the algorithm passes. Then for each pair $a \in A, b \in B$, one of the conditions in lines 5, 7, or 9 must hold. If $M_{ab} \geq 1$, then there is some $x \in N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a) \cap N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{in}(b)$, giving $d(a, b) \leq d(a, x) + d(x, b) \leq D/2 + D/2 \leq D$. Otherwise if $a <_{\pi} N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{in}(b)$ and $N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{in}(b) \cap S' \neq \emptyset$, then there is some $s \in N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{in}(b) \cap S'$ with $s \geq_{\pi} a$. If $s \in V$, $\epsilon(s) \leq D$, and $d(a, b) \leq d(a, s) + d(s, b) \leq D + D/2 \leq 3D/2$. If $s = v_{xy} \in S' \setminus V$, then $d(y, b) < d(s, b) \leq D/2$, and then since $\epsilon(y) \leq D$, we have $d(a, b) \leq d(a, y) + d(y, b) \leq D + D/2 = 3D/2$. A symmetric argument holds in the case that $b >_{\pi} N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a)$ and $N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a) \cap S' \neq \emptyset$. We conclude that if the algorithm passes, then every pair $a \in A, b \in B$ satisfies $d(a, b) \leq 3D/2$.

Runtime analysis is as in the proof of Lemma 12. □

Algorithm 6: All-pairs exact min-distance tester

Input: DAG $G = (V, E)$ and corresponding auxiliary DAG $G' = (V', E')$, topological ordering π' of G' , subsets $A <_{\pi} B \subseteq V \subset V'$ with $|A| = |B| = p = O(nk^2/m)$, diameter guess D , $(k, D/2)$ -neighborhood cover $S' \subseteq V'$ such that $\epsilon(s) \leq D$ for all $s \in S' \cap V$ and $\epsilon(x), \epsilon(y) \leq D$ for all $v_{x,y} \in S' \setminus V$, and $N_{D/2,S;G'}^{out}(a), N_{D/2,S;G'}^{in}(b)$ for $a \in A, b \in B$.

Output: One of the following. Each output verifies a corresponding property of G .

PASS $\Rightarrow d_{\min}(a, b) \leq \frac{3}{2}D$ for all in $a \in A$ and $b \in B$
FAIL $\Rightarrow \text{min-diameter}(G) > D$

- 1 Compute M_A , the matrix with columns given by indicator vectors of $N_{D/2,S;G'}^{out}(a)$ for $a \in A$;
 - 2 Compute M_B , the matrix with columns given by indicator vectors $N_{D/2,S;G'}^{in}(b)$ for $b \in B$;
 - 3 Compute $M = M_A^T M_B$;
 - 4 **foreach** $a \in A, b \in B$ **do**
 - 5 **if** $M_{ab} \geq 1$ **then**
 - 6 **continue**;
 - 7 **else if** $a <_{\pi} N_{D/2,S;G'}^{in}(b)$ **and** $N_{D/2,S;G'}^{in}(b) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ **then**
 - 8 **continue**;
 - 9 **else if** $b >_{\pi} N_{D/2,S;G'}^{out}(a)$ **and** $N_{D/2,S;G'}^{out}(a) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ **then**
 - 10 **continue**;
 - 11 **else**
 - 12 **FAIL**;
 - 13 **PASS**;
-

Lemma 26. For $k \geq (m/n)^{\frac{\omega-1}{2(\omega-2)}}$, Algorithm 6 can be modified to produce the specified output in time $O((n/m)^{\frac{2\beta+2-\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}} k^{\frac{6\beta+4-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}})$.

Proof. It is not necessary to fix the size p of the sets $|A_i|, |B_i|$ to be $O(k^2)$. The runtime is in general $O((pk)^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta+1}} p^{\frac{2-\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}} + p^2) = O(p^{\frac{2\beta+2-\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}} k^{\frac{2\beta}{\beta+1}} + p^2)$.

We will now set $p = nk^2/m$, which we can do since $k \geq \sqrt{m/n}$. In order to apply Lemma 11, as is needed for the fast matrix multiplication, we require that $p^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq pk \leq p^{\frac{\omega+1}{2}}$, for current bounds on α, ω . The former inequality holds as $p^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} = (nk^2/m)^{\alpha/2} < k$ since $\alpha < 1$. The latter inequality holds for $k \leq (nk^2/m)^{\frac{\omega-1}{2}}$, which is true for $k \geq (m/n)^{\frac{\omega-1}{2(\omega-2)}}$.

This runtime then becomes:

$$O((n/m)^{\frac{2\beta+2-\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}} k^{\frac{6\beta+4-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}} + n^2 m^{-2} k^4) = O((n/m)^{\frac{2\beta+2-\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}} k^{\frac{6\beta+4-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}}).$$

□

Remark. Algorithm 6 can also be modified into a combinatorial algorithm, which produces the same output without use of fast matrix multiplication. We instead check set intersections in $\tilde{O}(p^2 k)$ time by brute force; the runtime is then $\tilde{O}(p^2 k)$. If $k \geq \sqrt{m/n}$, we can set $p = nk^2/m$ to obtain a runtime of $\tilde{O}(n^2 k^5 / m^2)$.

Lemma 27. Algorithm 7 produces the correct output in runtime $\tilde{O}(mk)$.

Algorithm 7: Directional exact min-distance tester

Input: DAG $G = (V, E)$ and corresponding auxiliary DAG $G' = (V', E')$, topological ordering π' of G' , subsets $A <_{\pi} B \subseteq V \subset V'$ with $|A| = |B| = p = O(k^2)$, diameter guess D , $(k, D/2)$ -neighborhood cover $S' \subseteq V'$ such that $\epsilon(s) \leq D$ for all $s \in S' \cap V$ and $\epsilon(x), \epsilon(y) \leq D$ for all $v_{x,y} \in S' \setminus V$, and neighborhoods $N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a)$ for all $a \in A$.

Output: One of the following. Each output verifies a corresponding property of G .

PASS and return $A \Rightarrow d(a, v) \leq \frac{3}{2}D$ for all $a \in A$ and $v >_{\pi} B$
PASS and return $B \Rightarrow d(v, b) \leq \frac{3}{2}D$ for all $b \in B$ and $v <_{\pi} A$
FAIL $\Rightarrow \text{min-diameter}(G) > D$

```
1 foreach  $a \in A$  do
2   if  $N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a) \cap S' = \emptyset$  or  $N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a) \cap S' >_{\pi} B$  then
3     foreach  $v \in \{a\} \cup N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a)$  do
4       if  $v \in V$  then
5         BFS to and from  $v$ ;
6         if  $\epsilon(v) > D$  then
7           FAIL;
8       else
9         Must have  $v = v_{xy} \in V' \setminus V$ ;
10        BFS to and from  $y$ ;
11        if  $\epsilon(y) > D$  then
12          FAIL;
13      PASS and return  $B$ ;
14 PASS and return  $A$ ;
```

Proof. We first show correctness. If the algorithm fails, we must have found a vertex v with $\epsilon(v) > D$, and thus $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$.

If the algorithm returns A , then for each $A \in a$, there is some $s \in S' \cap N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a)$ with s appearing in B or to its left. The argument proceeds as above: if $s \in V$, then $\epsilon(s) \leq D$, and so for each $b >_{\pi} B$ we have $d(a, b) \leq d(a, s) + d(s, b) \leq D + D/2 \leq 3D/2$. If $s = v_{xy} \in S' \setminus V$, then $d(y, b) < d(s, b) \leq D/2$, and then since $\epsilon(y) \leq D$, we have $d(a, b) \leq d(a, y) + d(y, b) \leq D + D/2 = 3D/2$.

Otherwise, the algorithm returns B . Then the condition in line 2 must hold for some $a \in A$. Let $c <_{\pi} A$ and $b \in B$. Since we do not fail in line 6, we must have $d(a, b) \leq D$. Let v be a midpoint of the shortest path from a to b , so $d(a, v), d(v, b) \leq D/2$. Since $N_{D/2, S'; G'}^{out}(a)$ is either not cut off by hitting S or is cut off after B , we have $v \in N_{D/2}^{out}(a)$. If $v \in V$, since we do not fail in line 6, we must have $d(c, v) \leq D$. Concluding, $d(c, b) \leq d(c, v) + d(v, b) \leq D + \lceil D/2 \rceil \leq \lceil 3D/2 \rceil$. Alternatively, if $v = v_{xy} \in V' \setminus V$, since we do not fail in line 11, we have $d(c, y) \leq D$. Then $d(c, b) \leq d(c, y) + d(y, b) \leq D + D/2 \leq 3D/2$. As c, b were arbitrary, this completes the case.

We conclude with runtime analysis. The outer **foreach** loop repeats until we have covered every vertex in A or the condition in line 2 is satisfied. Checking this condition takes time at most $O(k)$ for a total of $\tilde{O}(|A|k) = O(mk)$. If the condition is satisfied, we perform $1 + |N_{D/2, S'}^{out}(a)|$ calls to BFS, for a total of $\tilde{O}(mk)$. The algorithm concludes before returning to the outer loop, so we may add these contributions for

a total time of $\tilde{O}(mk)$. □

Algorithm 8: Full graph min-distance tester

Input: DAG $G = (V, E)$, diameter guess D . Parameters k and $\theta = n/2k^2$

Output: One of the following. Each output verifies a corresponding property of G .

PASS \Rightarrow $\text{min-diameter}(G) \leq \frac{3}{2}D$
FAIL \Rightarrow $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$

- 1 Construct auxiliary graph G' by subdividing edges of G ;
 - 2 Topologically sort G and extend this ordering to G' ;
 - 3 Using Lemma 8 compute a $(k, D/2)$ -neighborhood cover $S' \subseteq V'$. Run BFS within G to and from each vertex in the set $T = (S' \cap V) \cup N^{in;G'}(S' \setminus V) \cup N^{out;G'}(S' \setminus V)$;
 - 4 **if** $\exists t \in T$ such that $\epsilon(t) > D$ **then**
 - 5 | **FAIL**
 - 6 Partition V into consecutive closed intervals, $V_0, \dots, V_{2\theta}$, with $|V_i| = n/(2\theta) = k^2$ for each i ;
/* Let L, R be the left and right halves of V , so $L = V_0 \cup \dots \cup V_\theta$ and
 $R = V_{\theta+1} \cup \dots \cup V_{2\theta}$. We first check all min-distances between L
and R . */
 - 7 Initialize $i = \theta$ and $j = \theta + 1$;
 - 8 **while** $i \geq 1$ **and** $j \leq 2\theta$ **do**
 - 9 | Run Algorithm 6 (all-pairs) on the pair (V_i, V_j) . If this fails, then **FAIL**;
 - 10 | Run Algorithm 7 (directional tester) on the pair (V_i, V_j) . If this fails, then **FAIL**;
 - 11 | **else if** Algorithm 7 passes and returns V_i **then**
 - 12 | | $i = i - 1$;
 - 13 | **else**
 - 14 | | /* Otherwise, it must be that Algorithm 7 passes and returns V_j */
 - 14 | | $j = j + 1$;
 - 14 | | /* If this line is reached then all distances from L to R are at most $\frac{3}{2}D$. */
 - 15 Recursively call this algorithm on $G[L]$ and $G[R]$. If either fails, then **FAIL**. Else **PASS**;
-

Lemma 28. Algorithm 8 produces the correct output in runtime $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{8\beta+4-4\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{\beta+1}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}})$.

Proof. We note that $T \subseteq V$, since all neighbors of vertices in $V' \setminus V$ lie in V .

The algorithm fails only when some $t \in T$ has $\epsilon(t) > D$, when Algorithm 6 fails, or Algorithm 7 fails, all of which imply $\text{min-diameter}(G) > D$. In the event of a pass, $\text{min-diameter}(G) \leq 3D/2$; the proof of this claim is the same as in Lemma 1.

G' can be constructed in $O(m)$ time, and the topological sorting takes time $O(m)$. Lemma 8 constructs the set S' in time $O(nk^2)$, as it suffices to cover neighborhoods of V . Running BFS to and from each vertex in T , which has size $|T| \leq 2|S'| = O(m/k)$, takes time $\tilde{O}(m^2/k)$. We run Algorithm 6 and Algorithm 7 each up to $2\theta = n/2k^2$ times. Since Algorithm 6 takes time $O(k^{4+\frac{2\beta-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}})$ and Algorithm 7 takes time

$\tilde{O}(mk)$, the total runtime of a recursive step is therefore:

$$\tilde{O}(m^2/k + nk^{2+\frac{2\beta-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}})$$

Setting $k = (m^2/n)^{\frac{\beta+1}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}}$, we obtain $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{8\beta+4-4\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{\beta+1}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}})$ for each recursive step. The recursion then adds a logarithmic factor. \square

Lemma 29. *Algorithm 8 can be modified to produce the specified output in runtime $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{7\beta+3-3\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{2\beta+2-\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}})$ if $m \leq n^{1.283}$.*

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Lemma 28, except that we set $p = nk^2/m$ and $\theta = n/2p = m/2k^2$, and we use the modified version of Algorithm 6 given in Lemma 26. We assume for now that k satisfies the conditions of Lemma 26.

The runtime analysis then changes as follows: Running BFS to and from vertices in T still takes time $\tilde{O}(m^2/k)$. Running Algorithm 7 $n/p = m/2k^2$ times likewise takes time $\tilde{O}(m^2/k)$. Running the modified version of Algorithm 6 $m/2k^2$ times takes time $O\left(n^{\frac{2\beta+2-\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}} m^{\frac{-\beta-1+\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}} k^{\frac{4\beta+2-2\alpha\beta}{\beta+1}}\right)$. Setting $k = m^{\frac{3\beta+3-\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{-\beta-2+\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}}$ gives a runtime of $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{7\beta+3-3\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{2\beta+2-\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}})$.

It remains to check that k satisfies the conditions of Lemma 26. Substituting $\alpha > 0.31389$ [17], $\omega < 2.37286$ [4], and $\beta \simeq 0.5435$, we can verify that $k = m^{\frac{3\beta+3-\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}} n^{\frac{-\beta-2+\alpha\beta}{5\beta+3-2\alpha\beta}}$ is greater than $(m/n)^{\frac{\omega-1}{2(\omega-2)}}$ when $m \leq n^{1.283}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 15. Binary searching over $D \in [n]$ using Algorithm 8 gives the desired $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation algorithm. \square

Remark. When $m \leq n^{1.283}$, Lemma 29 gives a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation algorithm for min-diameter in DAGs running in time $O(m^{1.171} n^{0.543})$.

Remark. As mentioned above, the brute-force set-intersection version of Algorithm 6 runs in time $\tilde{O}(p^2k) = \tilde{O}(n^2k^5/m^2)$. Taking $\theta = m/2k^2$ and $k = m^{3/4}/n^{1/2}$ yields a combinatorial version of Algorithm 8 which runs in time $\tilde{O}(m^{5/4}n^{1/2})$.