

Completing the Node-Averaged Complexity Landscape of LCLs on Trees

Alkida Balliu · alkida.balliu@gssi.it · Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila, Italy

Sebastian Brandt · brandt@cispa.de · CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Saarbrücken, Germany

Fabian Kuhn · kuhn@cs.uni-freiburg.de · University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany

Dennis Olivetti · dennis.olivetti@gssi.it · Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila, Italy

Gustav Schmid · schmidg@informatik.uni-freiburg.de · University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany

The node-averaged complexity of a problem captures the number of rounds nodes of a graph have to spend *on average* to solve the problem in the LOCAL model. A challenging line of research with regards to this new complexity measure is to understand the complexity landscape of locally checkable labelings (LCLs) on families of bounded-degree graphs. Particularly interesting in this context is the family of bounded-degree trees as there, for the worst-case complexity, we know a complete characterization of the possible complexities and structures of LCL problems. A first step for the node-averaged complexity case has been achieved recently [DISC '23], where the authors in particular showed that in bounded-degree trees, there is a large complexity gap: There are no LCL problems with a deterministic node-averaged complexity between $\omega(\log^* n)$ and $n^{o(1)}$. For randomized algorithms, they even showed that the node-averaged complexity is either $O(1)$ or $n^{\Omega(1)}$. In this work we fill in the remaining gaps and give a complete description of the node-averaged complexity landscape of LCLs on bounded-degree trees. Our contributions are threefold.

- On bounded-degree trees, there is no LCL with a node-averaged complexity between $\omega(1)$ and $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$.
- For any constants $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant c and an LCL problem with node-averaged complexity between $\Omega((\log^* n)^c)$ and $O((\log^* n)^{c+\varepsilon})$.
- For any constants $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an LCL problem with node-averaged complexity $\Theta(n^x)$ for some $x \in [\alpha, \alpha + \varepsilon]$.

This work has been partially funded by the PNRR MIUR research project GAMING “Graph Algorithms and MinING for Green agents” (PE0000013, CUP D13C24000430001), and by the research project RASTA “Realtà Aumentata e Story-Telling Automatizzato per la valorizzazione di Beni Culturali ed Itinerari” (Italian MUR PON Project ARS01 00540).

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Our Contribution	4
1.2	High-level Ideas and Techniques	5
2	Preliminaries and Definitions	7
3	Road Map	8
4	k-hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$-coloring	9
4.1	A Generic Algorithm for $2\frac{1}{2}$ - or $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring	11
4.2	Lower Bounds For $3\frac{1}{2}$ -Coloring	12
5	Weighted Problems	15
6	Weighted Lower Bounds	17
6.1	The Polynomial Regime	20
6.2	The $\log^* n$ regime	23
7	Algorithm for Weighted $2\frac{1}{2}$-Coloring	26
7.1	The Upper Bound	29
8	Solving Weighted $3\frac{1}{2}$-coloring	31
8.1	Using the algorithm from [BBK ⁺ 23a]	32
8.2	Generic algorithm for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3,5}$	37
9	Density Results	41
10	More efficient weight	44
11	The $\omega(1) - (\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ Gap	48
11.1	LCLs in the Black-White Formalism	50
11.2	A Tree Decomposition	50
11.3	The Generic Algorithm	51
11.4	Classes and Label-Sets	52
11.5	From Worst-Case to Node-Averaged Case	54
11.6	Finding a Function	54
11.7	The Plan for Saving the $O(\log^* n)$ Term	56
11.8	The New Way of Handling Compress Paths	57
11.9	From a $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ Node-Averaged Algorithm to a Constant-Good Function	58

1 Introduction

Distributed computation theory has witnessed remarkable progress since the 1980s. Researchers have not only been able to determine tight complexities of many fundamental distributed graph problems, but they have also been able to develop frameworks that can determine the complexity of entire classes of problems at once. Many known results establish lower bounds on the amount of rounds of communication that are required to solve certain problems. These results are proved for ad-hoc, worst-case networks, suffering from notable limitations: in particular, such lower bounds do not provide any information about the time it takes for a randomly selected node to terminate, and they only state that at least one node of the network has to spend a lot of time. For this reason, the last yearst have seen several attempts to go beyond worst-case complexity.

One recent successful line of research studies the node-averaged complexity of distributed graph problems, which measures the average runtime of a node in the worst-case graph. The study of node-averaged complexity of graph problems is not only interesting per se, but it can also be a powerful tool for developing algorithms with better worst-case complexity. A notable example is the recent algorithm for computing a $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring in $O(\log n \log^2 \Delta)$ deterministic worst-case rounds [GK21], which is built on top of a subroutine for a variant of coloring (called list-coloring) that has $O(\log^2 \Delta)$ deterministic node-averaged complexity. Any improvement on the node-averaged complexity of this problem would lead to an algorithm for $(\Delta + 1)$ -coloring with better deterministic worst-case complexity.

Locally Checkable Labelings. A rich and successful line of research has studied a class of problems called Locally Checkable Labelings (LCLs), that have been introduced in the seminal work of Naor and Stockmeyer [NS95]. Informally, these problems satisfy that a given solution is correct if and only if the constant-radius neighborhood of each node satisfies some given constraints. LCLs include many classical problems, such as coloring, maximal matching, and maximal independent set. The worst-case complexity of LCLs has been extensively studied in the context of bounded-degree graphs. In such a setting, we now have an almost complete characterization of what the possible deterministic and randomized worst-case complexities of LCLs are, and sometimes we even have decidability results: in many cases, given an LCL defined in some formal language, it is possible to automatically compute its distributed time complexity, and synthesize an algorithm for it with optimal runtime. These works studied different graph topologies, such as paths and cycles [CSS21, BBC⁺19], trees [BBC⁺22, BBOS21, BHOS19, CP19, BBO⁺21, BBE⁺20, GRB22, BCM⁺21, BBF⁺22, Cha20], grids [BHK⁺17], and general graphs [BBOS21, BBOS20, BCM⁺21, BHK⁺18, CKP19].

Node-averaged complexity of LCLs. A notable line of research regards the worst-case complexity of LCLs on trees of bounded degree. There, we know that LCLs can only have the following deterministic worst-case complexities: $O(1)$, $\Theta(\log^* n)$, $\Theta(\log n)$, and $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ for any fixed integer $k > 0$. Moreover, randomization can only help for problems with deterministic complexity $\Theta(\log n)$, making their randomized complexity $\Theta(\log \log n)$. Building on such remarkable results, a first attempt to generalize our knowledge to the case of node-averaged complexity has been done by Feuilloley in [Feu17], who showed that on cycles, the deterministic node-averaged complexity of an LCL is asymptotically the same as its worst-case complexity. Then, [BBK⁺23b] considered LCLs on trees and proved the following results. Any LCL on trees either has node-averaged complexity $O(\log^* n)$, or it has polynomial node-averaged complexity. Thus, differently from the landscape of worst-case complexities, there are no LCLs with node-averaged complexity $\Theta(\log n)$ or $\Theta(\log \log n)$. A concrete and surprising application of this generic result is that a 3-coloring can be computed in just $O(\log^* n)$ node-averaged rounds in bounded-degree trees. For this problem, it is known




Figure 1: Everything that was known about the Node-Averaged Complexity Landscape before the results in this paper.

that $\Omega(\log n)$ worst-case rounds are required. Another result shown in [BBK⁺23b] states that, if a problem has worst-case complexity $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ for some k , then it has $\Omega(n^{1/(2^k-1)})$ deterministic node-averaged complexity and $\Omega(n^{1/(2^k-1)}/\log n)$ randomized node-averaged complexity. Hence, a problem that has polynomial worst-case complexity also has polynomial node-averaged complexity. Finally, the authors show that any LCL on trees that can be solved in subpolynomial worst-case time can be solved in $O(1)$ randomized node-averaged complexity.

Node-averaged complexity of graph problems. Apart from LCLs, the node-averaged complexity has been studied for several other specific problems. For example, Barenboim and Tzur [BT19] considered the problem of vertex-coloring in graphs of small arboricity, showing that the node-averaged complexity can be significantly smaller than what we currently know for worst-case. While the node-averaged complexity of some problems is strictly better than their worst-case complexity, in [BGKO23] it has been shown that the currently best known randomized worst-case lower bound for the MIS problem, which is $\Omega(\sqrt{\log n / \log \log n})$, holds in the case of node-averaged complexity as well. On the other hand, the paper also showed that, for a slight relaxation of MIS, called $(2, 2)$ -ruling set, it is possible to provide an algorithm with a node-averaged complexity that is significantly better than the known worst-case lower bound for this problem.

1.1 Our Contribution

In our work, we complete the characterization of the possible node-averaged complexities of LCLs on trees of bounded degree. We show that, perhaps surprisingly, the landscape of possible node-averaged complexities is significantly different from the one of possible worst-case complexities. Fig. 1 gives an overview of everything that was known so far about the node-averaged complexity landscape of LCLs on bounded degree trees. We will later see that with our results we get a complete characterization of the landscape.

Polynomial regime. As already mentioned, in the case of worst-case complexities, the only possible complexities in the polynomial regime are $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ for any constant integer k . Prototypical problems exhibiting these worst-case complexities are so-called k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problems. In our work, we show that the landscape of possible polynomial node-averaged complexities is substantially different, that is, that the region $n^{\Omega(1)} - O(\sqrt{n})$ is infinitely dense. More in detail, we show that, for any rational $0 < a/b \leq 1/2$, there exists an LCL with (deterministic and randomized) node-averaged complexity $\Theta(n^{a/b})$, implying the following.

Theorem 1. *For any two real numbers $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ there exists a constant $r_1 < c < r_2$ and an LCL Π such that Π has node-averaged complexity $\Theta(n^c)$*

We achieve this by creating a weighted version of k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ coloring that depends on two more parameters Δ, d . We call it $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{2.5}$ and we prove matching upper and lower bounds for it.

Theorem 2. For any D, d, k such that $D \geq d + 3$, the node-averaged complexity of $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{2.5}$ is $O(n^{\alpha_1})$, where $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.

Theorem 3. For any constants D, d, k , such that $D \geq d + 3$ the LCL $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{2.5}$ has node-averaged complexity $\Omega(n^{\alpha_1})$, where $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.

New complexities in the $O(\log^* n)$ regime. In the case of worst-case complexities, it is known that there are no LCLs that have a complexity that lies in the region $\omega(1)-o(\log^* n)$. Moreover, it is known that, for randomized algorithms, there are no LCLs that have a node-averaged complexity that lies in the region $\omega(1)-n^{o(1)}$. We show that, in the case of deterministic node-averaged complexities, this is false. We first introduce a new class of problems we call k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, which already gives an infinite amount of nonempty complexity classes between $(\log^* n)^{\Omega(1)}-O(\log^* n)$. We repeat a similar process as in the polynomial regime to obtain a new class of LCLs $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$. We again obtain a strong lower bound.

Theorem 4. For any constants D, d, k , such that $D \geq d + 3$ the LCL $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ has node-averaged complexity $\Omega((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x)})$, where $\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{1+(1-x)\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.

However due to the fact that an algorithm for this problem can not even afford to have a linear number of nodes run for $\log^* n$ many rounds, proving a matching upper bound proves quite challenging. We instead get an algorithm that almost matches the lower bound.

Theorem 5. For any D, d, k such that $d \geq 3, D \geq d + 3$, the node-averaged complexity of $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ is $O((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')})$, where $\alpha_1(x') = \frac{1}{1+(1-x')\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x')^j}$ and $x' = \frac{\log(\Delta-d+1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.

We overcome these complications, by showing that through clever choice of parameters Δ and d , we can get our upper and lower bound to become arbitrarily close, giving us the same kind of guarantee as in the polynomial regime.

Theorem 6. For any two real numbers $0 < r_1 < r_2 < 1$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist constants Δ, d, k, c such that $r_1 \leq c \leq r_2$ and LCL $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ has node-averaged complexity between $\Omega((\log^* n)^c)$ and $O((\log^* n)^{c+\varepsilon})$.

New gaps in the $O(\log^* n)$ regime. We complete the results about the $O(\log^* n)$ regime by proving a gap in the possible complexities.

Theorem 7. There are no LCLs with a deterministic complexity that lies in the range $\omega(1)-(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$. Moreover, given an LCL, it is decidable whether it can be solved in $O(1)$ deterministic node-averaged rounds.

The new node-averaged complexity landscape of LCLs on trees By including all of our new results, we get a complete picture about the node-averaged complexity landscape of LCLs on bounded-degree trees. We provide a complete overview in Fig. 2.

1.2 High-level Ideas and Techniques

In the following, we outline the main ideas that we use to prove our results.




Figure 2: Everything that is known about the node-averaged complexity landscape after including the results in this paper. The gap between constant and $\log^*(n)^{o(1)}$ is due to [Theorem 7](#). The regions of infinite density, represented by red bars, are a result of [Theorems 1 and 6](#). The gap between $\omega(\sqrt{n})$ and $o(n)$ is due to [Corollary 60](#).

LCLs with weighted node-averaged complexity Intuitively the idea is the following: Start with a problem like 2-hierarchical $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -coloring, which has worst case complexity $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ [[CP19](#)] and node-averaged complexity $\Theta(n^{1/(2^k-1)})$ [[BBK+23b](#)]. Because the problem has worst case complexity $\Theta(n^{1/2})$, there must exist an instance of the problem with a node v which runs for $T_v \in \Omega(n^{1/k})$ rounds. Now assume we could give some nodes more weight during the node-averaged analysis. Then we could give a linear amount of weight $w(v) = \frac{n}{2}$ to this node v and as a result the node-averaged complexity would be at least

$$\bar{T} \geq \frac{1}{n} \cdot T_v \cdot w(v) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \Omega(n^{1/2}) \cdot \frac{n}{2} \in \Omega(n^{1/2}).$$

So the node-averaged complexity would match the worst-case complexity. We achieve such a weighted behavior simply by designing an LCL in a clever way.

Assume we have marked some neighbor u of v as a weight node, by giving it an input label **Weight**. Then such a weight node u must copy the output of its adjacent non-weight node v . Essentially u has to wait for v to terminate, so it can then output the same thing. However to put a lot of weight on v , we also have to attach a lot of nodes to v , but since the maximum degree is constant this is not so simple. We solve this by having the output label of v propagate through weight nodes. For example we could require weight nodes that are adjacent to other weight nodes to also copy the same output label. We leverage this by attaching a path of $\frac{n}{2}$ nodes to v . Then all of the nodes in that path have to copy the output of v and therefore all of the $\frac{n}{2}$ nodes have to wait for v to terminate. However, we have made a grave error here, because the propagation along this long path takes $\Omega(n)$ time. As a result we have increased the worst case complexity of this new LCL to $\Theta(n)$.

Luckily we have a complete understanding of what determines the worst case complexity of LCLs on trees. The problems with worst case complexity $\Theta(n)$ are exactly the problems for which, in long paths, it takes a linear amount of rounds to terminate, like, e.g., 2-coloring. So we include a way to let nodes terminate earlier, by allowing some weight nodes to output **Decline** and immediately terminate without copying any other output label.

So the resulting LCL could roughly be described like this: Weight nodes that are adjacent to non weight nodes have to copy the output of one such non weight node. For any weight node that did copy the output, at most d neighboring weight nodes may decline to also copy the output, but the remaining nodes do have to copy the output.

As a consequence of allowing some nodes to **Decline**, not all weight nodes have to actually copy the output and we run into efficiency problems. We will see that there is now some efficiency factor x that determines how many of the weight nodes actually have to wait for our node v to terminate. By scaling this efficiency factor between $(0, 1)$, we are able to obtain all intermediate complexities between the worst case complexity of $\Theta(n^{1/2})$ and the node-averaged complexity $\Theta(n^{1/2^k-1})$.

New complexities in the $O(\log^* n)$ regime. We want to get the same kind of density result that we get by introducing weight nodes to the family of k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problems, but with complexities in $O(\log^* n)$. Similarly to the polynomial regime, where we can scale between worst case complexity $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ and node-averaged complexity $\Theta(n^{1/(2^k-1)})$, we introduce a new infinite family of problems we call k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. These problems have worst case complexity $\Theta(\log^* n)$ and node-averaged complexity $\Theta((\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}})$. This allows us to again apply the same tricks with weighted nodes, to scale between the worst case and the node-averaged complexities. However, since an algorithm is only allowed $o(\log^* n)$ rounds *on average*, it becomes highly non-trivial to actually achieve a fast node-averaged complexity. Using the algorithm of [BBK⁺23b] we are able to still achieve a node-averaged complexity that is close to the lower bound. By applying some tricks in the choice of parameters, we can get this upper bound arbitrarily close to the lowerbound (but never actually have them match). Still this will be enough to also prove the same kind of infinite density result also for the $O(\log^* n)$ regime.

New gaps in the $O(\log^* n)$ regime. In order to show that there are no LCLs in the range $\omega(1)-(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$, we operate as follows. As already mentioned, in [BBK⁺23b] it is shown that there are no LCLs with node-averaged complexity that lies in $\omega(\log^* n)-n^{o(1)}$. This result is shown by providing a unified way to solve all problems that have (worst-case or node-averaged) complexity $n^{o(1)}$, and the provided normal-form algorithm has node-averaged complexity $O(\log^* n)$. On a high level, this normal-form algorithm computes a decomposition of the tree that satisfies some desirable properties, and in parallel exploits the decomposition that is being computed in order to let many nodes terminate early. The resulting $O(\log^* n)$ complexity is only needed for splitting some long paths, obtained during the decomposition, into shorter paths. Moreover, as already noted in [BBK⁺23b], if such splitting can be avoided, then the node-averaged runtime could be directly improved to $O(1)$. In our work, we provide two main ingredients:

- Given an LCL, it is possible to automatically determine whether it is needed to split long paths into shorter paths when computing the decomposition.
- If an LCL can be solved in $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ deterministic node-averaged rounds, then it is not needed to split paths.

The importance of the above results is twofold. On the one hand, we get that, if a problem can be solved in $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ deterministic node-averaged rounds, then it has $O(1)$ deterministic node-averaged complexity. On the other hand, we also obtain that we can automatically decide whether a given problem has $O(1)$ node-averaged complexity. We highlight that, in the worst-case setting, determining whether a problem can be solved in $O(1)$ rounds is a long-standing open question.

2 Preliminaries and Definitions

Locally Checkable Labeling Problems. As already mentioned, on a high level, the class of Locally Checkable Labeling (LCL) problems contains all those problems defined on bounded-degree graphs such that: (i) nodes may have inputs that come from a finite set, (ii) nodes must output labels from a finite set, (iii) the produced solution must be correct in any r -radius neighborhood, where r is some constant. More precisely, an LCL problem Π is defined as a tuple $(\Sigma_{\text{in}}, \Sigma_{\text{out}}, C, r)$, where: (i) Σ_{in} is a finite set of possible input labels for Π ; (ii) Σ_{out} is a finite set of possible output labels for Π ; (iii) $r \geq 1$ is an integer called *the checkability radius* of Π ; (iv) C (that stands for “constraint”) is a finite set containing the labeled graphs that represent all radius- r neighborhoods

that are valid for Π . More in detail C is a finite set of pairs (H, v) , where $H = (V_H, E_H)$ is a graph and $v \in V_H$, satisfying the following: (1) v has eccentricity at most r in H ; (2) To each pair $(v, e) \in V_H \times E_H$ is assigned a label $\ell_{\text{in}} \in \Sigma_{\text{in}}$ and a label $\ell_{\text{out}} \in \Sigma_{\text{out}}$. Then, solving an LCL $\Pi = (\Sigma_{\text{in}}, \Sigma_{\text{out}}, C, r)$ on a graph $G = (V, E)$ (where all node-edge pairs are labeled with a label in Σ_{in}) requires to label each pair $(v, e) \in V \times E$ with a label in Σ_{out} satisfying that, for each node $v \in V$, the labeled graph induced by the nodes in the radius- r neighborhood of v is isomorphic to some (labeled) graph in C .

Node-averaged complexity. In this paper, we use the notion of node-averaged complexity as in [BGKO23, BBK⁺23b]. Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm solving an LCL Π . Let \mathcal{G} be a family of graphs, and let $G = (V, E) \in \mathcal{G}$ be a graph where we run \mathcal{A} . Let $v \in V$ and let $T_v^G(\mathcal{A})$ be the number of rounds after which v terminates when running \mathcal{A} on G . Then, the node-averaged complexity of \mathcal{A} on the family of graphs \mathcal{G} is defined as follows.

$$\text{AVG}_V(\mathcal{A}) := \max_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{|V|} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{v \in V(G)} T_v^G(\mathcal{A}) \right] = \max_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{|V|} \cdot \sum_{v \in V(G)} \mathbb{E} [T_v^G(\mathcal{A})]$$

3 Road Map

We now provide a summary of the structure of the paper.

The k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problems. We start, in Section 4, by formally defining the k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problems. These problems are defined by slightly modifying the definition of the k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problems of [CP19]. In Section 4, we show that the k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problems have complexity $\Theta((\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}})$.

Weighted problems. While the results of Section 4 provide LCLs with some node-averaged complexities in the range $\omega(1) - o(\log^* n)$, in our work we also show that the complexity landscape is in fact infinitely dense in that region, and in the polynomial region. For this purpose, we start, in Section 5, by introducing weighted versions of the problems of $2\frac{1}{2}$ - and $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring.

Weighted lower bounds. We provide lower bounds for the weighted variants of $2\frac{1}{2}$ - and $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring in Section 6.

Weighted upper bounds. In Sections 7 and 8 we provide upper bounds for the weighted variants of $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, and $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, respectively.

Density results. In Section 9, we combine the results of Sections 6 to 8 to show that the node-averaged complexity landscape of LCLs is dense in the regions $(\log^* n)^{\Omega(1)} - o(\log^* n)$ and $n^{\Omega(1)} - o(\sqrt{n})$. Since to our knowledge this has not been stated anywhere else so far, we also give a proof for the $\omega(\sqrt{n}) - o(n)$ gap as a direct consequence of a nice lemma by [Feu17].

More efficient weight. What is left out from the results of the previous sections is showing that there are LCL problems in the polynomial regime that have the same worst-case and node-averaged complexity. We do this in Section 10, by defining the weighted version of $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring differently.

The $\omega(1)-(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ gap We conclude, in [Section 11](#), by proving that there are no LCLs with a node-averaged complexity that lies in the range $\omega(1)-(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$.

4 k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring

We first do a warm up by answering one of the open questions in [\[BBK⁺23b\]](#), namely the question if there exist LCLs with node-averaged complexity in the range $\omega(1)-o(\log^* n)$. To give a positive answer to this question, we define a new infinite family of LCLs called k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. These problems are really just a small twist on the family of the k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problems introduced by Chang and Pettie [\[CP19\]](#), that we now report.

Definition 8 (k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring). There are no input labels. Instead, each node has a level in $\{1, \dots, k+1\}$, that can be computed in constant time, and the constraints of the nodes depend on the level that they have. The level of a node is computed as follows.

1. Let $i \leftarrow 1$.
2. Let V_i be the set of nodes of degree at most 2 in the remaining tree. Nodes in V_i are of level i . Nodes in V_i are removed from the tree.
3. Let $i \leftarrow i + 1$. If $i \leq k$, continue from step 2.
4. Remaining nodes are of level $k + 1$.

Each node must output a single label in $\Sigma_{\text{out}} := \{W, B, E, D\}$, where W stands for White, B for Black, E for Exempt, and D for Decline, and based on their level, they must satisfy the following local constraints.

- No node of level 1 can be labeled E .
- All nodes of level $k + 1$ must be labeled E .
- Any node of level $2 \leq i \leq k$ is labeled E iff it is adjacent to a lower level node labeled W , B , or E .
- Any node of level $1 \leq i \leq k$ that is labeled W (resp. B) has no neighbors of level i labeled W (resp. B) or D . In other words, W and B are colors, and nodes of the same color cannot be neighbors in the same level.
- Nodes of level k cannot be labeled D . As a result they must be properly 2-colored with colors W, B . They may output E only if their lower level neighbours did not output D .

The problem of k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring has worst case complexity $\Theta(n^{1/k})$ [\[CP19\]](#). However, in [\[BBK⁺23b\]](#), it is shown that the node-averaged complexity of this problem is $\Theta(n^{1/(2^k-1)})$.

In order to better understand this family of problems, let us consider the case $k = 2$, which gives an LCL with worst-case complexity $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$. In a worst-case instance for this problem, there are only nodes of level 1 and 2: nodes of level 2 form a path P of length $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$, and to each node v of P there is a path Q_v of length $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ of nodes of level 1 connected to it. Let us call these paths “ Q -paths”. The constraints of the problem require that each Q -path is either all 2-colored with labels W and B , or all labeled D . Then, the subpaths of P induced by nodes that are not connected to a 2-colored Q -path must be properly 2-colored, while the other nodes of P can output E . This implies that either some Q -path is 2-colored, or P is 2-colored, and it is possible to prove

that this implies a worst-case complexity of $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$. In the case of node-averaged complexity, a worst-case instance looks different: Q -paths have length $\Theta(n^{1/3})$ and P has length $\Theta(n^{2/3})$, and it is possible to prove that the node-averaged complexity is $\Theta(n^{1/3})$. Intuitively, this happens because the nodes of P are less, so they can spend more time while keeping the average runtime low.

In the following, we will slightly modify the definition of these problems to obtain the family of k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problems. While our new problems will not be interesting from a worst case perspective, we will prove that these problems result in an infinite amount of intermediate complexities in the range $\omega(1)-o(\log^* n)$. The rules are almost the same as in k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, except that level k nodes must either output E , or output a valid 3-coloring using the colors $\{R, G, Y\}$. For completeness, we restate all of the rules.

Definition 9 (k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring). Nodes are assigned a level in $\{1, \dots, k+1\}$, in the same way as for k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. However the set of possible labels is now $\Sigma_{\text{out}} = \{R, G, Y, W, B, E, D\}$, which now also contains the colors red, green and yellow. Nodes must satisfy the following rules based on their level:

- No node of level 1 can be labeled E .
- All nodes of level $k+1$ must be labeled E .
- Any node of level $2 \leq i \leq k$ is labeled E iff it is adjacent to a lower level node labeled W , B , or E .
- Any node of level $1 \leq i < k$ that is labeled W (resp. B) has no neighbors of level i labeled W (resp. B) or D . In other words, W and B are colors, and nodes of the same color cannot be neighbors in the same level. Also, nodes in these levels must not output any label in $\{R, G, Y\}$.
- Nodes of level k cannot be labeled D, W, B . Also, adjacent nodes must not both have the same label among R, G, Y , that is, nodes of level k not labeled E must be properly 3-colored with colors in $\{R, G, Y\}$. Nodes of level k may output E only if their lower level neighbours did not output D .

This problem can be expressed as a standard LCL by setting the checkability radius r to be $O(k)$ since, in $O(k)$ rounds, a node can determine its level, and hence which constraints apply. Furthermore, by simply having all nodes of level $1, \dots, k-1$ output D , and having the nodes in level k compute a valid 3-coloring, we can solve the problem in worst case time $O(\log^* n)$, due to the fact that 3-coloring a path can be done in $O(\log^* n)$ worst-case rounds by, e.g., using the algorithm by Linial [Lin92]. In the rest of the section, we will prove that the node-averaged complexity of k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring lies strictly in the range $\omega(1)-o(\log^* n)$, which in particular implies $\Omega(\log^* n)$ worst-case complexity, due to the fact that, on trees, there are no LCLs in the range $\omega(1)-o(\log^* n)$ [GRB22]. Hence, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 10. k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring has worst case complexity $\Theta(\log^* n)$.

The rest of the section is dedicated to proving tight upper and lower bounds for this infinite family of problems, and thereby establishing an infinite amount of complexity classes in the node-averaged landscape. We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 11. *The deterministic node-averaged complexity of computing a k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring is $\Theta((\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}})$.*

This result, however, tells us nothing about the spaces between these complexities. In later sections, we will build upon these problems to show that, not only are there an infinite amount of intermediate complexities in the range $\omega(1)-o(\log^* n)$, but also that the complexity landscape is in fact infinitely dense in that region.

4.1 A Generic Algorithm for $2\frac{1}{2}$ - or $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring

We first give a generic algorithm that consists of k phases and depends on parameters $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}$. Phase $i < k - 1$ proceeds as follows.

- **Fixing paths of level i :** Consider the subgraph of nodes that did not yet output any label. Then, nodes of level i check if they are in a path P , induced by level i nodes, of length at least γ_i . Every node can have this information after at most $2\gamma_i$ rounds. If P has length at least γ_i , then all nodes in P output D . Otherwise P must have length strictly less than γ_i . As a result, all nodes in P have seen the entire path and can output a consistent 2-coloring using the labels W, B .
- **Higher level nodes choose E :** Since some paths got consistently 2-colored, some higher-level nodes are allowed to output E . Consider some path P of nodes of level i that just decided their output labels. According to the rules of $2\frac{1}{2}$ - and $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring the endpoints of P might be adjacent to higher level nodes u, v (there can only be two, because each endpoint had degree 2 when it was assigned a level). If P did output a proper 2-coloring, then u, v can output E . Then again u and v might be adjacent to higher level nodes which can then also output E . We iterate this until there are no more nodes that can output E , this takes at most k rounds, because there are only k levels.

In phase k , all remaining level k nodes (the ones that did not yet output E) either compute a consistent 2-coloring in linear time (in the case of $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring), or compute a consistent 3-coloring in $O(\log^* n)$ time (in the case of $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring). This finishes the description of our algorithm.

We note some properties of the provided algorithm. All paths of level i nodes either output a consistent coloring, or D . Furthermore, nodes only output E if they have a lower level neighbor that did not output D . Finally, nodes of level 1 do not output E , and nodes of level k do not output D . Therefore, the algorithm satisfies all constraints, and we get the following corollary.

Corollary 12. *The generic algorithm computes a valid solution to the k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, or, respectively, the k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problem.*

We will first prove a generic statement that will be useful in many places of the paper.

Lemma 13. *Given any instance of either k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, or k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, consider the execution of the generic algorithm. Let i be between 1 and $k - 1$, and let n' be an upper bound on the number of nodes of level $\geq i$ that did not yet output a label. Then, after executing phase i of the generic algorithm with parameter γ_i , the number of remaining nodes (which all have level $> i$) is at most $O(\frac{n'}{\gamma_i})$.*

Proof. We argue that for each node of level $i + 1$ that remains, there must be at least $\frac{\gamma_i}{2}$ nodes of level i that did already terminate. Consider some remaining node v of level $i + 1$, it must have at least one neighbor u of level i that did output D . Otherwise v would have output E already. Since u did output D , the path of level i nodes containing u must have length at least γ_i , so charge half of all nodes in this path towards v (the other half might be charged to the node at the other end of the path). So each remaining level $i + 1$ node has at least $\frac{\gamma_i}{2}$ nodes that already terminated charged

to it (and the sets of charged nodes are disjoint). As a result there can be at most $\frac{2n'}{\gamma_i} \in O(\frac{n'}{\gamma_i})$ such nodes of level $i + 1$ remaining. Any path of level $i + 1$ nodes has at most 2 level $i + 2$ nodes adjacent to the endpoints. So for any two nodes of level $i + 2$ that still remain, there must exist at least one node of level $i + 1$ that did not terminate yet. By repeating this reasoning we get that for every 2^{j-i-1} nodes of level $j > i + 1$ there exists at least one node of level $i + 1$ that did not terminate yet. Or conversely, for every level $i + 1$ node that remains, there remain at most

$$\sum_{i+1 < j \leq k} 2^{j-i-1} \in O(1)$$

nodes of higher levels. If such a level i node did not exist, all of these higher level nodes could simply output E . So since there exist at most $O(\frac{n'}{\gamma_i})$ level $i + 1$ nodes, there also remain at most $O(\frac{n'}{\gamma_i})$ nodes in total. \square

Now, equipped with [Lemma 13](#), getting our upper bound on the node-averaged complexity of k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring is just a matter of choosing the parameters $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}$ correctly. Define $t := (\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}}$ as the target complexity. For $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ define $\gamma_i := t^{2^{i-1}}$. We run the generic algorithm with value γ_i for phase i .

Lemma 14. *Let $t := (\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}}$. The algorithm solves k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring in $O(t)$ node-averaged complexity.*

Proof. By repeatedly applying [Lemma 13](#), and since k is a constant, we get that after phase $i < k$ only $r_i = O\left(\frac{n}{t^{2^i-1}}\right)$ nodes remain. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} r_i &= n \cdot O\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_1}\right) \cdot O\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_2}\right) \cdot \dots \cdot O\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_i}\right) = O\left(\frac{n}{\prod_{j \leq i} \gamma_j}\right) = O\left(\frac{n}{\prod_{j \leq i} t^{2^{j-1}}}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{n}{t^{\sum_{j \leq i} 2^{j-1}}}\right) = O\left(\frac{n}{t^{2^i-1}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Nodes spend $2\gamma_i = 2t^{2^{i-1}}$ rounds in phase $i < k$, and $O(\log^* n) = O(((\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}})^{2^{k-1}}) = O(t^{2^{k-1}})$ rounds in phase k . Combining this with the above result of how many nodes remain for a given phase, we get the following upper bound on the node-averaged complexity.

$$\bar{T} = \frac{1}{n} \left(r_{k-1} \cdot O(t^{2^{k-1}}) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} r_{i-1} \cdot O(\gamma_i) \right) = O\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{n}{t^{2^{i-1}-1}} \cdot t^{2^{i-1}}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{n}{t^{-1}}\right) = O(t) \quad \square$$

4.2 Lower Bounds For $3\frac{1}{2}$ -Coloring

In this section, we prove the following result.

Lemma 15. *The deterministic node-averaged complexity of k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring is $\Omega((\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}})$.*

Before proving a lower bound for k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, we state few important results about node-averaged complexity. We use this very nice characterisation of the node-averaged complexity of LCLs on paths and cycles by Feuilloley [\[Feu17\]](#).

Lemma 16 ([\[Feu17\]](#)). *For any LCL problem Π defined on paths, the following holds:*

- Π has randomised and deterministic node-averaged complexity $\Theta(n)$ if and only if it has randomised and deterministic worst case complexity $\Theta(n)$;
- Π has deterministic node-averaged complexity $\Theta(\log^* n)$ if and only if it has deterministic worst case complexity $\Theta(\log^* n)$.

This lemma immediately gives us bounds on the deterministic node-averaged complexity of 2-coloring and 3-coloring paths, since these problems, on paths, are known to require $\Omega(n)$ and $\Omega(\log^* n)$ worst-case rounds, respectively.

Corollary 17. *The 3-coloring problem, on paths, has deterministic node-averaged complexity $\Omega(\log^* n)$.*

We now define the family of graphs that we use to prove our lower bounds.

Definition 18 (*k-hierarchical lower bound graph*). For some parameters ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k , consider the following recursive construction. Start from a path of length ℓ_k , which is called *path of level k*, and its nodes are called *nodes of level k*. Then, recursively, for $i = k - 1, \dots, 1$ do the following. For each path P of level $i + 1$, for each node v of P , create a path P' of length ℓ_i and connect one endpoint of P' to v . The path P' is a *path of level i* and its nodes are *nodes of level i*. This graph is called *k-hierarchical lower bound graph*.

An example of this construction, for $k = 2$, is depicted in [Figure 3](#). We note a small corollary about this construction, that will be useful in later sections. It is just an immediate consequence of the definition.

Corollary 19. *Consider the computation of levels as in [Definition 8](#). For all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let L_i be the set of level i nodes. Then, $|L_i| \in \Omega(\prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell_j)$.*

We now prove the following lemma.

Lemma 20. *Let n be the size of the k -hierarchical lower bound graph, as a function of ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k . Let $\mathcal{S} = \{1, \dots, n^c\}$ be the ID space. Let \mathcal{G}_k be the family of k -hierarchical lower bound graphs obtained by assigning IDs from \mathcal{S} . Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm for k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. Then, one of the following holds:*

- either there exists an instance in $G \in \mathcal{G}_k$ and a value $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$ such that at least half of the nodes of level i spend at least $\ell_i/10$, or
- there exist $n^{c-1}/4^k$ graphs in \mathcal{G}_k , using disjoint sets of IDs, such that, for each of them, for all i in $\{1, \dots, k - 1\}$, all nodes of level i output D .

Proof. We split the ID space into n^{c-1} sets of size n , and for each set S we construct an instance by using an arbitrary ID assignment over the IDs from S . Let I_0 be the set of resulting instances. We will prove by induction that, either we can construct an instance in which the first condition of the lemma is satisfied, or we can construct a sequence of sets I_1, \dots, I_k satisfying that, for all i , for all instances in I_i , by running \mathcal{A} , all nodes at level at most i output D , where the size of I_i is at least $|I_0|/4^i$. Note that for $i = 0$ the claim trivially holds.

Hence, in the following, assume that, for all instances in I_{i-1} , by running \mathcal{A} , all nodes at level at most $i - 1$ output D . Then, construct I_i as follows. We run \mathcal{A} on all instances in I_{i-1} , and:

- either there exists an instance $I \in I_{i-1}$ in which at least half of the nodes of level i spend at least $\ell_i/10$, or

- in all instances $I \in I_{i-1}$, at least half of the nodes of level i spend at most $\ell_i/10$.

Note that, if the first case applies, then the claimed statement holds. Hence, in the following assume that the second condition holds.

We now prove that all nodes that run in at most $\ell_i/10$ must output D . Since $n \geq \ell_i$, for each node u that runs in at most $\ell_i/10$, we can find some other node v that also runs in at most $\ell_i/10$, and such that u and v have disjoint views (that is, their radius- $\ell_i/10$ neighborhood is disjoint). Note that, by inductive hypothesis, all nodes in level i cannot output E , and hence they either output B, W , or D . If both u and v output B or W , then by adjusting the parity accordingly, we can create a single path containing both u and v in which their outputs cannot be completed into a proper 2-coloring, which is a contradiction. If at least one node outputs B or W , and the other outputs D , we can create a single path that directly gives a contradiction. Hence, all nodes that run in at most $\ell_i/10$ rounds output D .

We now lower bound the number of paths containing at least one node u that satisfies the following properties:

- Node u terminates in at most $\ell_i/10$ rounds (and hence it outputs D).
- Node u is at distance at least $\ell_i/10 + 1$ from the endpoints of the path containing u (and hence u does not see outside the path).

Let x be the total number of paths of level i , and let p the number of paths satisfying the desired properties. We have $x\ell_i/2$ nodes that output D and terminate in at most $\ell_i/10$ rounds. At most $2x\ell_i/10$ of them can be too close to the endpoints of their paths. In the worst case, the remaining ones are in the same paths. Hence, we can lower bound p as follows.

$$p \geq \left(\frac{x\ell_i}{2} - \frac{2x\ell_i}{10}\right) \cdot \frac{10}{8\ell_i} = \frac{3x}{8} > x/4$$

We thus get that, for every 4 instances in I_{i-1} (recall that they use disjoint sets of IDs), we can construct a single instance in which all nodes of level i output D . Such instances are added to I_i . \square

We are now ready to prove [Lemma 15](#). Assume for a contradiction that, for some k , the k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring can be solved in $o((\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}})$ rounds. Let $t := (\log^* n)^{1/2^{k-1}}$, and for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, let $\ell_i := t^{2^{i-1}}$. Then, let $\ell_k := \lfloor n / (\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \ell_i) \rfloor$. We consider the k -hierarchical lower bound graphs for these parameters. Observe that, by construction, the total number of nodes is $\Theta(n)$.

We apply [Lemma 20](#). If the first case of the lemma applies, we obtain that there exists an instance and a value of i in which at least half of the nodes of level i spend at least $\ell_i/10$. In this case, we get that the node-averaged complexity is at least

$$\frac{1}{2n} \cdot \prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell_j \cdot \frac{\ell_i}{10} \geq \frac{1}{2n} \cdot \frac{n}{2(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \ell_i)} \cdot \prod_{i \leq j \leq k-1} \ell_j \cdot \frac{\ell_i}{10} = \frac{\prod_{i \leq j \leq k-1} \ell_j}{4(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} \ell_i)} \cdot \frac{\ell_i}{10} = \frac{\ell_i}{40 \prod_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} \ell_j}.$$

Note that $\ell_i = t^{2^{i-1}}$, and that $\prod_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} \ell_j = t^{2^i - 1}$. Hence, the node-averaged complexity is at least $t/40$, which is a contradiction.

Hence, the second case of the lemma applies. We obtain that there are many instances in which all nodes, except the ones at level k , output D , which implies that the nodes at level k need to properly 3-color the path at level k . We now prove that the nodes in the path at level k need to spend $\Omega(\log^* n)$ rounds on average, by a reduction from the hardness of 3-coloring given by [Corollary 17](#).




Figure 3: The figure illustrates the lower bound graph for 2-hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. All nodes of level 1 are colored green and all nodes of level 2 are colored red. The nodes in level 1 form paths of length $\sqrt{\log^* n}$ (and $\sqrt{\log^* n} + 1$ for the left and rightmost). The level 2 nodes are just one long path of length $\frac{n}{\sqrt{\log^* n}} - 2$

Lemma 21. *Assume all nodes at levels strictly smaller than k output D . Then, the nodes in the path at level k need to spend $\Omega(\log^* \ell_k)$ rounds on average.*

Proof. Assume the ID space in which \mathcal{A} runs is $\{1, \dots, n^c\}$. Let f be an injective function that maps the IDs from $\{1, \dots, n^{c-1}\}$ into instances given by Lemma 20. For c large enough, the 3-coloring problem on paths has still $\Omega(\log^* n)$ deterministic node-averaged complexity even if the IDs are in the range $\{1, \dots, n^{c-1}\}$. We now show that we can use \mathcal{A} to solve 3-coloring on paths, assuming the IDs are in $\{1, \dots, n^{c-1}\}$, by using a standard simulation argument. Given a 3-coloring instance of size ℓ_k , nodes create a virtual instance of k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring as follows. Each node v takes an arbitrary node u of degree 2 in the path of level k in $f(v)$, and takes the tree T_v induced by all nodes of lower layers reachable from u . Each node v pretends to be connected not only with its neighbors in the path, but also to T_v . By simulating \mathcal{A} on this instance, we obtain that all nodes in the virtual trees output D , and hence we get a 3-coloring in the path. Since the nodes in the path are ℓ_k , and since by Corollary 17 the 3-coloring problem on a path of length ℓ_k requires $\Omega(\log^* \ell_k)$, the claim follows. \square

Since $\log^* \ell_k \in \Omega(\log^* n)$, for some large-enough constant c we obtain the following lower bound on the node-averaged complexity of \mathcal{A} :

$$\frac{1}{n} \cdot \ell_k \cdot c \log^* n \geq \frac{1}{2c} \frac{\log^* n}{t^{2^{k-1}-1}} = \frac{1}{2c} t,$$

which is a contradiction.

This, together with Lemma 14, concludes the proof of Theorem 11. In the next section, we will see a way of extending $2\frac{1}{2}$ - and $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring in a way that turns them into something like a weighted version of original problems. Here weighted means weighted in terms of the node-averaged complexity. The idea is to attach some special *weight* nodes to every normal node that has to wait until the normal node terminates. We start with doing this for $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, as there the analysis is easier.

5 Weighted Problems

In this section, we introduce weighted versions of the problems of $2\frac{1}{2}$ - and $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. These problems will be instrumental in showing the density of non-empty complexity classes in the polynomial and the sub- $\log^* n$ regimes.

Formally, we will denote the weighted versions of k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ - and $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring by $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^Z$, where $Z \in \{2\frac{1}{2}, 3\frac{1}{2}\}$ indicates whether the problem is a weighted version of $2\frac{1}{2}$ - or $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, and the other three parameters Δ , d , and k indicate an upper bound for the maximum degree of the considered graphs, a parameter for tuning the complexity of the problem, and the parameter k from the definition of k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ - or $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, respectively.

Definition 22. Let Δ , d , and k be positive integers satisfying $\Delta \geq d + 3$, and let $Z \in \{2\frac{1}{2}, 3\frac{1}{2}\}$.

The LCL $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^Z$ has input label set $\Sigma_{\text{in}} := \{\text{Active}, \text{Weight}\}$, i.e., each node is labeled with either **Active** or **Weight**. In the former case, we call the node an *active node*, in the latter we call the node a *weight node*.

Each active node has to output a label from $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}}$, where $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}}$ is the output label set of k -hierarchical Z -coloring. Each weight node v has to output a label from the set $\{\text{Decline}, \text{Connect}, \text{Copy}\}$. If v outputs **Copy**, then it has to additionally output a label from $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}}$. We will call this additional output label from $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}}$ the *secondary output* of v .

The output is correct if it satisfies the following properties.

1. The connected components induced by active nodes satisfy the constraints of k -hierarchical Z -coloring provided in [Definition 8](#) and [Definition 9](#).
2. Each weight node that is adjacent to at least one active node must output **Connect** or **Copy**.
3. For each weight node v that outputs **Connect**, at least two neighbors of v are active or output **Connect** as well. (To be clear, if v has one active neighbor and one weight neighbor that outputs **Connect**, then this property is satisfied.)
4. For each node v that outputs **Copy**, at most d neighbors of v output **Decline**.
5. If a weight node v that outputs **Copy** has an active neighbor, then the secondary output of v is identical to the output of at least one active neighbor of v . Moreover, for any two adjacent weight nodes v, w that both output **Copy**, the secondary output of v is identical to the secondary output of w .

As the constraints of k -hierarchical Z -coloring mentioned in [Property 1](#) as well as all other properties mentioned in the problem description only depend on a constant-radius neighborhood of the respectively considered nodes, the problem $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^Z$ is an LCL problem.

We start with some intuition on these problems. We use inputs to decide which nodes are weight nodes and which nodes have to solve $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring (resp. $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring). [Property 2](#) and [5](#) ensure that weight nodes don't simply all output **Decline**. Notice that in a disconnected component consisting of just weight nodes, they can all simply output **Decline**. However, if there is at least one active node adjacent, then [Property 2](#) creates at least one weight node with **Connect** or **Copy**.

We first ignore **Connect** labels and just think about a component of weight nodes C with just a single active node v adjacent to C . As a result of [Property 2](#), the weight nodes adjacent to v all have to output **Copy**, and by [Property 5](#) they must have as secondary output the same output as v . Furthermore, this output *spreads* through C because nodes adjacent to a **Copy** node also have to output **Copy**. As a result all of the nodes in C must wait for v to decide on its output label and can only then propagate this output throughout C . This will cause very long dependency chains and make this propagation take very long. To avoid very long dependency chains we allow some nodes to output **Decline** in [Property 4](#) and exclude **Decline** nodes from the need to propagate the labels further. To understand [Property 3](#) and the **Connect** label we have to consider components of weight nodes with multiple active neighbors, for example a path of 4 nodes with both endpoints

being active nodes and the two middle nodes being weight nodes. If we didn't have the `Connect` label, both the middle nodes would have to output `Copy` and have as secondary output the labels that the endpoints chose. However, if these two labels are different we would get a contradiction to Property 5. So if we consider a larger component of weight nodes with multiple active nodes adjacent to it, we can use the `Connect` label to *connect* different active nodes that are too close together. By Property 3 the nodes that output `Connect` are paths between active nodes and nothing else, so this is the only use case for this `Connect` label. We will later see, in the upper bound, that if these active nodes are sufficiently far apart we don't need to use `Connect`, and in our lower bound constructions weight components will only ever be adjacent to one active node, so the label `Connect` can never be used.

Tour of the lower bound. In order to show the effectiveness of our construction, we start by showing that if we attach W weight nodes in a balanced Δ -regular tree to a single active node v , then W^x of these weight nodes have to actually output v 's output as secondary output (Lemma 23). Here x denotes some efficiency factor that is based on the parameters chosen. We then elaborate on this by showing that if we instead spread these W nodes evenly in weight trees attached to ℓ different active nodes, we have that $\ell(\frac{W}{\ell})^x$ many nodes must copy an output from an active node (Corollary 24). We use these insights to extend the classical lower bound constructions for these problems by putting a linear amount of weight evenly distributed on nodes of each level (Definition 25). Then, in order to actually prove our lower bounds, we first find ID assignments for these problem instances such that the algorithm behaves in a predictable way, such that it either completely colors all nodes of a level, or none (Lemma 26). We then calculate how much time it would cost to color each level as a function of the length of the paths given by parameters n^{α_i} for level i (Corollary 30). We get an optimisation problem that makes it so that no matter which level the algorithm decides to color, it should take as long as possible (Corollary 31). We obtain an analytic solution that gives us the length of the paths as a function of the efficiency factor x , and obtain a lower bound for every choice of parameters Δ, d, k (Lemma 33).

Tour of the upper bound. We start by restating the problem of outputting the correct weight labels as its own problem, and then develop an algorithm that only takes care of solving this weight problem. The guarantees that this algorithm is able to achieve matches the efficiency factor from the lower bound section (Lemma 40). We then use the generic algorithm from Section 4 to allow the active nodes to compute a correct solution to the $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problem (resp. $3\frac{1}{2}$). To upper bound the node-averaged complexity, we calculate how much time would be spent coloring each level based on the parameters of the generic algorithm and assuming a worst case distribution of weight. We then see that, with the choice of parameters given by the lower bound section, we obtain a tight upper bound (Proof of Theorem 2).

6 Weighted Lower Bounds

For the rest of this section, fix k, Δ, d to be some integer constants, such that $\Delta \geq d + 3$. Since not necessarily all of the weight nodes need to copy a label from an active node, the efficiency of the weight decreases. The next lemma gives a lower bound on how many nodes have to wait for active nodes.

Lemma 23. *Let $\Delta, k, d \geq 2$ be constant such that $\Delta \geq d + 3$. Consider the LCL $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^Z$ for any Z . Consider an active node v with a balanced Δ regular tree T_w of w weight nodes attached to it,*

then at least $w^{\log(\Delta-1-d)/\log(\Delta-1)}$ of these weight nodes have to output Copy and have as secondary output the same output as v .

Proof. Let r be the weight node that is directly adjacent to v , think of the tree of weight nodes as rooted at r . Since v is the only active node attached to T_w , none of the nodes in T_w can output Connect. Consider some non-leaf node u in this tree of weight nodes. It has to have one edge towards its parent (or for r one edge towards v) and then $\Delta - 1$ children. As a result this tree has height $\log_{\Delta-1}(w)$. Now if u does not output Decline, then $\Delta - 1 - d$ of u 's children have to copy the output of u . Since r is directly adjacent to an active node it has to output Copy and use v 's output as secondary output. Then at least $\Delta - d - 1$ of r 's children have to also copy the output, then $\Delta - 1 - d$ of the childrens children have to do the same and so on. As a result the number of nodes copying the output of v is at least:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta - 1 - d)^{\log_{\Delta-1}(w)} &= (\Delta - 1)^{\log_{\Delta-1}(\Delta-1-d) \cdot \log_{\Delta-1}(w)} = \\ &= w^{\log_{\Delta-1}(\Delta-1-d)} = w^{\log(\Delta-1-d)/\log(\Delta-1)} \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

From now on, let $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$. Notice that the more weight we put on a tree, the less efficient it becomes, so to maximize the efficiency of our weight it makes sense to distribute it as evenly as possible. Consider if we attach a tree of w/ℓ weight nodes to ℓ active nodes. By Lemma 23 for each of these trees $(w/\ell)^x$ nodes have to copy the output of their respective active node. Now clearly the total amount of copying nodes is:

$$(w/\ell)^x \ell = w^x \ell^{1-x} > w^x$$

Corollary 24. *Let $x = \log(\Delta - 1 - d)/\log(\Delta - 1)$. By distributing w weight nodes evenly among ℓ Δ -regular trees, each attached to an active node the amount of nodes that have to output Copy is $w^x \ell^{1-x}$. Additionally such an even distribution results in the maximum amount of nodes copying.*

Notice that the additionally part is a direct consequence of Jensen's Inequality for the concave function $\phi(a) = a^x$ (for $x \leq 1$), if we split the weight into ℓ parts w_1, \dots, w_ℓ :

$$\phi\left(\frac{\sum w_i}{\ell}\right) \geq \frac{\sum \phi(w_i)}{\ell}. \text{ So, we get that: } \ell \phi\left(\frac{w}{\ell}\right) \geq \sum \phi(w_i)$$

Equipped with the knowledge from these last two results, we now know how to extend the lower bound construction Definition 18. We define a new weighted version of it, illustrated in Fig. 4. The idea is to use $\frac{n}{k}$ nodes to create the lower bound graph from Definition 18. In that construction the number of nodes of level 1 is already linear in n , so we do not need additional weight there. For the rest of the levels, we balance things out, by putting $\frac{n}{k}$ weight nodes on the nodes of level 2, \dots , k . As a result every layer has a linear amount of weight. Note that since the number of nodes in lower levels is significantly larger, this also means that the weight is more efficient. We distribute this weight evenly in balanced Δ -regular trees, so we get the bounds from Corollary 24. This gives us our new construction.

Definition 25 (Weighted Construction). Given a target size of n and parameters ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k such that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k} \ell_i = n$, define $n' = n/k$, then start with the counterexample graph G' from Definition 18 with n' nodes, by setting $\ell'_i = \ell_i \cdot \frac{1}{k^{1/k}}$ (Then $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k} \ell'_i = n'$). Define L_1, \dots, L_k to be sets of nodes such that L_i is exactly the set of level i nodes in G' ($V(G') = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} L_i$). For each of L_2, \dots, L_k distribute $\frac{n}{k}$ nodes evenly in balanced Δ -regular trees, each attached to one of the nodes in L_i . This is our weighted construction G , with a total of




Figure 4: Showing the construction for $k = 3$. The red nodes have level 3, the green nodes level 2 and the purple nodes have level 1 (Some purple paths from the green nodes in the middle are omitted). No trees are attached to level 1 nodes, but every level 2, or 3 node has a tree attached to it. The trees attached to level 3 nodes are larger, as the same number of $\frac{n}{k}$ nodes is evenly distributed among less nodes.

n nodes, $\frac{n}{k}$ for G' and then $k - 1$ times $\frac{n}{k}$ for the weight nodes.

The Problem Instance: To obtain an instance of $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^Z$, we have to assign input labels Active, Weight. All nodes in G' get input label Active, all of the other nodes in the trees get input label Weight. As a result we have a valid instance for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^Z$.

Crucially, our lower bound construction contains the original lower bound graph from [Definition 18](#). As a result any algorithm that correctly solves $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^Z$ inside any graph from [Definition 25](#) also solves either k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, or k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring in G' . So for any algorithm that correctly solves $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$, we can apply [Lemma 20](#).

Lemma 26. *Consider any correct deterministic algorithm that solves $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$, given any parameters ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k and an instance of the Weighted Construction. Then one of the following is true:*

- *There exists an assignment of IDs to the Weighted Construction and a value $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$, such that at least half of the nodes of level i run for at least $\ell'_i/10$ rounds.*
- *There exists an assignment of IDs to the Weighted Construction, such that for all of $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$ all nodes of level i output D .*

Instead consider a randomised algorithm trying to solve $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2.5}$ in the weighted lower bound construction, then nodes cannot distinguish based on IDs, so the argumentation becomes a lot easier than the proof of [Lemma 20](#).

Lemma 27. *Consider any correct randomised algorithm that solves $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2.5}$, given any parameters ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k and an instance of the Weighted Construction. Then one of the following is true:*

- *There exists a value $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$, such that at least a third of the nodes of level i run for at least $\ell'_i/4$ rounds*
- *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$ all nodes of level i output D .*

Proof. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, k - 1\}$ and let P be an arbitrary path of level i nodes. Then by construction P has length ℓ'_i and furthermore the middle third of all of the nodes in P have an indistinguishable $\frac{\ell'_i}{4}$ hop neighbourhood. As a result they all have to behave the same in the first $\frac{\ell'_i}{4}$ rounds. If they terminate in strictly less than $\frac{\ell'_i}{4}$ rounds, it means that they all have to follow the same output distribution. As a result, they cannot output a consistent 2-coloring and so for the algorithm to be correct, they have to output D . If instead they terminate after at least $\frac{\ell'_i}{4} \in \Omega(\ell'_i)$ time we are in exactly the other case. \square

We can now use these results to obtain lower bounds on the total time an algorithm would spend on nodes of level i , regardless of whether or not we are solving $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2.5}$, or $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$. Notice that regardless of whether we invoke [Lemma 26](#), or [Lemma 27](#), at least a third of the level i nodes spend $\Omega(\ell')$ time. So in either case we can prove the following.

Lemma 28. *Consider the nodes of some level $1 \leq i < k$. If at least a third of all level i nodes spend $\Omega(\ell'_i)$ time, then the total amount of time used is $\Omega\left(n^x \cdot \left(\prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell_j\right)^{1-x} \cdot \ell_i\right)$*

Proof. By [Corollary 19](#) $|L_i| \in \Omega\left(\prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell'_j\right)$. Since we distribute $\frac{n}{k}$ many nodes in balanced Δ -regular trees of weight nodes, by [Corollary 24](#) the amount of nodes that have to wait for nodes in L_i to terminate is at least $\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^x |L_i|^{1-x}$. So if a third of the nodes in $|L_i|$ spend at least $\Omega(\ell'_i)$ time, then since the weight is distributed evenly, also a third of the $\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^x |L_i|^{1-x}$ nodes have to spend $\Omega(\ell'_i)$ time. So for the total amount of time spent, we get at least

$$\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^x |L_i|^{1-x} \cdot \Omega(\ell'_i) = \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^x \left(\Omega\left(\prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell'_j\right)\right)^{1-x} \cdot \Omega\left(\frac{\ell_i}{k^{1/k}}\right) = \Omega\left(n^x \cdot \left(\prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell_j\right)^{1-x} \cdot \ell_i\right)$$

The last inequality just comes from hiding a bunch of constants in the Ω notation. $\frac{1}{k^x}$ is a constant, because k and x are constants, the same goes for the $k - i + 1$ factors of $\frac{1}{k^{1/k}}$ from transforming the ℓ'_j into ℓ_j . \square

We still need something to argue about the level k path, since [Lemma 28](#) only holds for $i < k$.

Lemma 29. *Computing a 2-coloring of the level k path takes $\Omega(n^x \cdot \ell_k^{1-x} \cdot \ell_k)$ total time for any randomised algorithm and if we are in the second case of [Lemma 26](#) then deterministically computing a 3-coloring takes $\Omega(n^x \cdot \ell_k^{1-x} \cdot \log^* \ell_k)$ total time.*

Proof. Again, because of [Corollary 19](#), $|L_k| \in \Omega(\ell'_k) = \Omega(\ell_k)$, so since we distribute $\frac{n}{k}$ many nodes in balanced Δ -regular trees of weight nodes, by [Corollary 24](#) the amount of nodes that have to wait for nodes in L_k to terminate is at least $\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^x |L_k|^{1-x}$.

If we want to 3-color the level k path, then by [Lemma 21](#) this takes node-averaged time $\Omega(\log^* \ell'_k)$. This then immediately gives the desired bound.

Now consider the case where we want to 2-color the path. By construction the middle third of the nodes in the level k path have an indistinguishable $\frac{\ell'_k}{4}$ hop neighborhood (that is, they cannot see the ends). If they spend less than $\frac{\ell'_k}{4}$ rounds, then they have to follow the same output distribution, so they cannot output a consistent 2-coloring. So the total time to 2-color the path is lower bounded by

$$\Omega\left(\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^x \frac{(\ell'_k)^{1-x}}{3} \cdot \frac{\ell'_k}{4}\right) \in \Omega(n^x \cdot \ell_k^{1-x} \cdot \ell_k) \quad \square$$

In the next section we will choose explicit ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k and prove a lower bound for weighted $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. For weighted $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring the lower bound proof is very similar with different choices of ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k .

6.1 The Polynomial Regime

Since the lemmas are very generic, we will work with some more concrete values. Let $\ell_1 = n^{\alpha_1}$, $\ell_2 = n^{\alpha_2}$, \dots , $\ell_{k-1} = n^{\alpha_{k-1}}$. Lastly to get $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k} \ell_i = n$, we choose $\ell_k = n^{1 - \sum_{j < k} \alpha_j}$. We will deduce an

optimisation problem, that will give us the exact values for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}$.

We now just plug these values in the lemmas from before and immediately get lower bounds on the total amount of time spent. By normalising with $\frac{1}{n}$ we immediately get lower bounds on the node-averaged complexity.

Corollary 30. *Let ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k be as above. Then, if an algorithm computes a 2-coloring of the level k nodes, the node-averaged complexity is*

$$\Omega\left(n^{1+(x-2)\sum_{j<k}\alpha_j}\right) =: A_k$$

For any $1 \leq i < k$ if a third of all of the level i nodes spend $\Omega(\ell_i)$ rounds, then the node-averaged complexity is

$$\Omega\left(n^{(x-1)\sum_{j<i}\alpha_j+\alpha_i}\right) =: A_i$$

Proof. According to [Lemma 29](#), the total amount of time spent for the 2-coloring of the level k nodes is lower bounded by:

$$\Omega(n^x \cdot \ell_k^{1-x} \cdot \ell_k) = \Omega\left(n^x \cdot \left(n^{1-\sum_{j<k}\alpha_j}\right)^{1-x} \cdot n^{1-\sum_{j<k}\alpha_j}\right) = \Omega\left(n^{2+(x-2)\sum_{j<k}\alpha_j}\right).$$

So the node-averaged time is at least

$$\Omega\left(\frac{1}{n} \cdot n^{2+(x-2)\sum_{j<k}\alpha_j}\right) = \Omega\left(n^{1+(x-2)\sum_{j<k}\alpha_j}\right).$$

For any $1 \leq i < k$, if we are in the case of [Lemma 28](#) the total amount of time spent by level i nodes is at least:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega\left(n^x \cdot \left(\prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell_j\right)^{1-x} \cdot \ell_i\right) &= \Omega\left(n^x \cdot \left(n^{\sum_{i \leq j \leq k} \alpha_j}\right)^{1-x} \cdot n^{\alpha_i}\right) = \Omega\left(n^{x+(1-x)(1-\sum_{j<i}\alpha_j)+\alpha_i}\right) \\ &= \Omega\left(n^{1+(x-1)\sum_{j<i}\alpha_j+\alpha_i}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\sum_{i \leq j \leq k} \alpha_j = 1 - \sum_{j<i} \alpha_j$, since $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k} \ell_i = n$. Again we normalize by $\frac{1}{n}$ to obtain a lower bound on the node-averaged complexity.

$$\frac{1}{n} \cdot \Omega\left(n^{1+(x-1)\sum_{j<i}\alpha_j+\alpha_i}\right) = \Omega\left(n^{(x-1)\sum_{j<i}\alpha_j+\alpha_i}\right) \quad \square$$

Because of [Lemma 27](#), the paths in level i , either all decline, or nodes of level i spend a lot of time. If the level i nodes spend a lot of time, then by [Corollary 30](#) the node-averaged complexity is at least A_i . But if all of them decline, then the nodes in level k must output a 2-coloring, so according to [Corollary 30](#) the node-averaged complexity is A_k . Since one of the two cases must happen because of [Lemma 27](#), we always get a lower bound on the node-averaged complexity.

Corollary 31. *Let A_1, \dots, A_k be as in [Corollary 30](#), then any algorithm that correctly solves the weighted $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problem has node-averaged complexity*

$$\Omega\left(\min_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A_1 := n^{\alpha_1}, \\ A_2 := n^{(x-1)\alpha_1+\alpha_2}, \\ A_3 := n^{(x-1)(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)+\alpha_3}, \\ \dots, \\ A_i := n^{(x-1)(\sum_{j<i}\alpha_j)+\alpha_i}, \\ \dots, \\ A_k := n^{1+(x-2)\sum_{j<k}\alpha_j} \end{array} \right\}\right)$$

As a result our lower bound is the strongest when we choose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}$ such that the smallest of the A_i terms is maximised.

$$\max_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A_1 := n^{\alpha_1}, \\ A_2 := n^{(x-1)\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}, \\ A_3 := n^{(x-1)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \alpha_3}, \\ \dots, \\ A_i := n^{(x-1)(\sum_{j < i} \alpha_j) + \alpha_i}, \\ \dots, \\ A_k := n^{1 + (x-2)\sum_{j < k} \alpha_j} \end{array} \right\}$$

Since all terms have the same base, we can instead optimise just the exponents. As long as the exponents are all positive, an optimal solution to this new problem is also an optimal solution the original problem.

$$\max_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} B_1 := \alpha_1, \\ B_2 := (x-1)\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \\ B_3 := (x-1)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \alpha_3, \\ \dots, \\ B_i := (x-1)(\sum_{j < i} \alpha_j) + \alpha_i, \\ \dots, \\ B_k := 1 + (x-2)\sum_{j < k} \alpha_j \end{array} \right\}$$

Lemma 32. *The optimal solution is achieved when setting all terms equal.*

Proof. By interpreting each B_i as a function and noticing that B_1 only depends on α_1 , while all other terms have a negative dependence on α_1 , we can eliminate variables. Since $\frac{\partial B_1}{\partial \alpha_1} = 1$ and $\frac{\partial B_i}{\partial \alpha_1} \leq 0$ for all $1 < i \leq k$ the optimal value of

$$\max_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \min\{B_1, \min\{B_2, B_3, \dots, B_k\}\}$$

is achieved by setting $B_1 = \min\{B_2, B_3, \dots, B_k\}$. We then iteratively apply this same argument on $\min\{B_2, \dots, B_k\}$ while treating α_1 as a constant. \square

As a result we can obtain a formula for the optimal solutions depending only on x , by setting the terms equal.

Lemma 33. *The optimal solution is given by*

$$\alpha_i = (2-x)\alpha_{i-1}, \text{ and} \tag{1}$$

$$\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j} \tag{2}$$

Furthermore $\alpha_1(x) = B_1 = B_2 = \dots = B_k$ holds for the optimal solution.

Proof. For $1 < i < k$

$$\begin{aligned} B_i = B_{i-1} &\Rightarrow (x-1)\left(\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j\right) + \alpha_i = (x-1)\left(\sum_{j<i-1} \alpha_j\right) + \alpha_{i-1} \\ &\Rightarrow (x-1)\alpha_{i-1} + \alpha_i = \alpha_{i-1} \Rightarrow \alpha_i = (2-x)\alpha_{i-1} \end{aligned}$$

and using the above

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 = B_k &\Rightarrow \alpha_1 = 1 + (x-2)\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_j = 1 - (2-x)\alpha_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (2-x)^{j-1} \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha_1 = 1 - \alpha_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (2-x)^j \\ &\Rightarrow 1 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (2-x)^j = \alpha_1 (2-x)^0 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (2-x)^j = \alpha_1 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j} \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Now, because of [Corollary 31](#), we immediately get [Theorem 3](#).

6.2 The $\log^* n$ regime

We prove a lower bound on the weighted version of k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, so fix parameters d, Δ, k and let $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$ be the efficiency factor from [Lemma 23](#). We follow the exact same procedure as in [Section 6.1](#), but for $\ell_1 = (\log^* n)^{\alpha_1}, \ell_2 = (\log^* n)^{\alpha_2}, \dots, \ell_{k-1} = (\log^* n)^{\alpha_{k-1}}$. Lastly to get $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k} \ell_i = n$, we choose $\ell_k = n \cdot (\log^* n)^{-\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j}$. Again we will deduce an optimisation problem, that will give us the exact values for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}$.

First we prove that any algorithm must spend a lot of time if it wants to color paths.

Corollary 34. *Let ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k be as above, then if an algorithm computes a 3-coloring of the level k nodes the node-averaged complexity is*

$$\Omega\left((\log^* n)^{1+(x-1)\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j}\right) =: A_k$$

For any $1 \leq i < k$ if half of all of the level i nodes, spend at least $\frac{\ell'_i}{10}$ time, then the node-averaged complexity is at least

$$\Omega\left((\log^* n)^{(x-1)\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j + \alpha_i}\right) =: A_i$$

Proof. According to [Lemma 29](#) the total amount of time spent for the 3-coloring of the level k nodes is lower bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(n^x \cdot \ell_k^{1-x} \cdot (\log^* \ell_k)) &= \Omega\left(n^x \cdot \left(n \cdot (\log^* n)^{-\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j}\right)^{1-x} \cdot \log^*\left(n \cdot (\log^* n)^{-\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j}\right)\right) \\ &= \Omega\left(n^1 \cdot (\log^* n)^{1+(x-1)\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j}\right). \end{aligned}$$

So the node-averaged time is at least

$$\Omega\left(\frac{1}{n} \cdot n^1 \cdot (\log^* n)^{1+(x-1)\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j}\right) = \Omega\left((\log^* n)^{1+(x-1)\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j}\right).$$

For any $1 \leq i < k$, if half of all of the level i nodes spend at least $\frac{\ell'_i}{10}$ time, then according to [Lemma 28](#) the total amount of time spent for the 2-coloring of the level i nodes is lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega\left(n^x \cdot \left(\prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell_j\right)^{1-x} \cdot \ell_i\right) &= \Omega\left(n^x \cdot \left(n \cdot (\log^* n)^{-\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j}\right)^{1-x} \cdot (\log^* n)^{\alpha_i}\right) \\ &= \Omega\left(n^1 \cdot (\log^* n)^{(x-1)\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j + \alpha_i}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\prod_{i \leq j \leq k} \ell_j = n \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{-\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j}\right)$, since $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k} \ell_i = n$. Again we normalize by $\frac{1}{n}$ to obtain a lower bound on the node-averaged complexity.

$$\frac{1}{n} \cdot \Omega\left(n^1 \cdot (\log^* n)^{(x-1)\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j + \alpha_i}\right) = \Omega\left((\log^* n)^{(x-1)\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j + \alpha_i}\right)$$

□

Because of [Lemma 26](#), the paths in level i , either all decline, or nodes in i spend at least A_i node-averaged time, according to [Corollary 34](#). But if all of them decline, then the nodes in level k must output a 3-coloring, which by [Corollary 34](#) also implies node-averaged complexity at least A_k . Now because [Lemma 26](#) states that one of these cases must happen, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 35. *Let A_1, \dots, A_k be as in [Corollary 34](#), then any algorithm that correctly solves the weighted $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problem has node-averaged complexity*

$$\Omega\left(\min_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A_1 := (\log^* n)^{\alpha_1}, \\ A_2 := (\log^* n)^{(x-1)\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}, \\ A_3 := (\log^* n)^{(x-1)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \alpha_3}, \\ \dots, \\ A_i := (\log^* n)^{(x-1)(\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j) + \alpha_i}, \\ \dots, \\ A_k := (\log^* n)^{1+(x-1)\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j} \end{array} \right\}\right)$$

As a result, our lower bound is the strongest when we choose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}$ such that the smallest of the A_i terms is maximised.

$$\max_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A_1 := (\log^* n)^{\alpha_1}, \\ A_2 := (\log^* n)^{(x-1)\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}, \\ A_3 := (\log^* n)^{(x-1)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \alpha_3}, \\ \dots, \\ A_i := (\log^* n)^{(x-1)(\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j) + \alpha_i}, \\ \dots, \\ A_k := (\log^* n)^{1+(x-1)\sum_{j<k} \alpha_j} \end{array} \right\}$$

Since all terms have the same base, we can instead optimise just the exponents. As long as the exponents are all positive, an optimal solution to this new problem is also an optimal solution the the original problem.

$$\max_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}} \min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} B_1 := \alpha_1, \\ B_2 := (x-1)\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \\ B_3 := (x-1)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \alpha_3, \\ \dots, \\ B_i := (x-1)(\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j) + \alpha_i, \\ \dots, \\ B_k := 1 + (x-1) \sum_{j<k} \alpha_j \end{array} \right\}$$

Exactly in the same way as was proven in [Lemma 32](#), we also get that in this optimisation problem it is enough to set all the terms equal, so we do it to obtain a formula for the optimal solutions depending only on x .

Lemma 36. *The optimal solution is given by*

$$\alpha_i = (2-x)\alpha_{i-1} \tag{3}$$

and

$$\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{1 + (1-x) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x)^j} \tag{4}$$

Furthermore $\alpha_1(x) = B_1 = B_2 = \dots = B_k$ holds for the optimal solution.

Proof. For $1 < i < k$

$$\begin{aligned} B_i = B_{i-1} &\Rightarrow (x-1) \left(\sum_{j<i} \alpha_j \right) + \alpha_i = (x-1) \left(\sum_{j<i-1} \alpha_j \right) + \alpha_{i-1} \\ &\Rightarrow (x-1)\alpha_{i-1} + \alpha_i = \alpha_{i-1} \Rightarrow \alpha_i = (2-x)\alpha_{i-1} \end{aligned}$$

and using the above

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 = B_k &\Rightarrow \alpha_1 = 1 + (x-1) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_j = 1 - (1-x)\alpha_1 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (2-x)^{j-1} \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha_1 = 1 - (1-x)\alpha_1 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x)^j \\ &\Rightarrow 1 = \alpha_1 + (1-x)\alpha_1 \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x)^j = \alpha_1 (1 + (1-x) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x)^j) \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha_1 = \frac{1}{1 + (1-x) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x)^j} \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, because of [Corollary 35](#), we immediately get [Theorem 4](#).

Theorem 4. *For any constants D, d, k , such that $D \geq d + 3$ the LCL $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ has node-averaged complexity $\Omega((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x)})$, where $\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{1 + (1-x) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.*

7 Algorithm for Weighted $2\frac{1}{2}$ -Coloring

In this section, we provide an algorithm that solves problem $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2\frac{1}{2}}$ with node-averaged complexity $O(n^{\alpha_1})$, where $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-1-d)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$. To this end, we introduce a new problem, called the d -free weight problem. The d -free weight problem essentially constitutes a subproblem of $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2\frac{1}{2}}$ (and simultaneously $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3\frac{1}{2}}$) that has to be solved to solve $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2\frac{1}{2}}$ (and $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3\frac{1}{2}}$). After stating the problem, we will design an algorithm that solves the problem, which will become an essential part of our algorithm for solving $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2\frac{1}{2}}$. In Section 8, we will make use of the d -free weight problem in a similar manner (using a different algorithm for solving it) to design an algorithm for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3\frac{1}{2}}$.

The d -free weight problem. Let Δ and d be positive integers satisfying $d < \Delta$ and $\Delta \geq 3$. The d -free weight problem is an LCL on trees with input label set $\Sigma_{\text{in}} = \{A, W\}$ and output label set $\Sigma_{\text{out}} = \{\text{Decline}, \text{Connect}, \text{Copy}\}$. Each node v has one input label from Σ_{in} and must output one output label from Σ_{out} . We call nodes that have input label A *adjacent* nodes and nodes with input label W *weight* nodes. The (global) output is correct if it satisfies the following (local) properties:

1. If a node v with input label A outputs **Connect**, at least one neighbor of v outputs **Connect** as well. If a node v with input label W outputs **Connect**, at least two neighbors of v output **Connect** as well.
2. For each node v that outputs **Copy**, at most d neighbors of v output **Decline**.
3. Each node with input label A outputs **Connect** or **Copy**.

In the following, we provide an algorithm \mathcal{A} for solving the d -free weight problem with worst-case complexity $O(\log n)$ rounds. We will later show that the output produced by \mathcal{A} does not only produce a correct output but additionally has useful properties that we will make use of in the analysis of the algorithm we design for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2\frac{1}{2}}$.

The algorithm. Algorithm \mathcal{A} proceeds as follows. First, each node collects its $(3\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 3)$ -hop neighborhood. Then, based on the collected information each node chooses its output according to the following rules.

Any node that lies on a path of length at most $(2\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 2)$ between two nodes with input A outputs **Connect**. All other nodes output **Decline** or **Copy** (as specified in the following).

Let v be a node with input A that does not output **Connect**, and denote the set of nodes in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil)$ -hop neighborhood of v by U_v and the set of nodes in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 1)$ -hop neighborhood of v by \hat{U}_v . Let $\varphi: \hat{U}_v \rightarrow \{\text{Decline}, \text{Copy}\}$ be a function with the following properties.

1. For each $u \in \hat{U}_v \setminus U_v$, we have $\varphi(u) = \text{Decline}$.
2. For each $u \in U_v$, we have $\varphi(u) \in \{\text{Decline}, \text{Copy}\}$.
3. $\varphi(v) = \text{Copy}$.
4. For each node u that outputs **Copy**, at most d neighbors of u output **Decline**.
5. Among all function satisfying Properties (1) to (4), φ is one that assigns **Copy** to the minimum amount of nodes in \hat{U}_v possible.

Now, each node u that is contained in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 1)$ -hop neighborhood of a node v as described above outputs $\varphi(u)$ (where φ is the function defined on the respective \hat{U}_v). (Note that a node u cannot be contained in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 1)$ -hop neighborhood of two such nodes v as otherwise those two nodes would output **Connect**.) All nodes for which the above rules do not uniquely specify the output output **Decline**. This concludes the description of \mathcal{A} .

Note that the information contained in the $(2\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 2)$ -hop view of a node v suffices to determine whether v lies on a path of length at most $(2\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 2)$ between two nodes with input A . Consequently, the information contained in the $(3\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 3)$ -hop neighborhood of a node u suffices to determine whether u is contained in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 1)$ -hop neighborhood of a node v with input A that does not output **Connect**. Hence, the information contained in the $(3\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 3)$ -hop neighborhood collected by each node at the beginning of \mathcal{A} indeed suffices for each node to perform all step specified in the description of \mathcal{A} .

However, from the description of \mathcal{A} , it is not obvious that \mathcal{A} is well-defined, which we take care of with the following lemma.

Lemma 37. *Algorithm \mathcal{A} is well-defined.*

Proof. To show well-definedness, it suffices to prove that for any node v with input A that does not output **Connect** there exists a function $\psi: \hat{U}_v \rightarrow \{\text{Decline}, \text{Copy}\}$ that satisfies Properties (1) to (4), which we do in the following.

Let v be a node with input A that does not output **Connect**. Consider the following (sequential) algorithm \mathcal{A}^* for defining ψ , where, abusing notation, we consider \hat{U}_v as a rooted tree with root v . Set $\psi(v) := \text{Copy}$. Select the $\min\{d, \deg(v)\}$ children of v for which the subtrees hanging from the children have the largest numbers of nodes (breaking ties arbitrarily). Set $\psi(u) := \text{Decline}$ for any node u in any of those $\min\{d, \deg(v)\}$ subtrees (including their roots). Set $\psi(u) := \text{Copy}$ for any child of v that is not in any of these subtrees. Then iterate on each subtree hanging from such a child u with $\psi(u) = \text{Copy}$ where, for the min expression, we use $\min\{d, \deg(u) - 1\}$ (where, as before, $\deg(u)$ denotes the degree of u in \hat{U}_v). This concludes the description of \mathcal{A}^* .

We argue that the function ψ produced by \mathcal{A}^* satisfies Properties (1) to (4). From the description of \mathcal{A}^* , it is immediate that Properties (2) to (4) are satisfied. To show that also Property (1) is satisfied, consider the following claim: if a node $u \in \hat{U}_v$ with $\psi(u) = \text{Copy}$ has distance i from v , then the number of nodes in the subtree hanging from u is at most $|\hat{U}_v| / ((d+1)^i)$. This claim implies that Property (1) is satisfied, as any node $u \in \hat{U}_v \setminus U_v$ has distance $\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 1$ from v and $|\hat{U}_v| / ((d+1)^i) < 1$ for $i = \lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 1 \geq \lceil \log_{d+1} |\hat{U}_v| \rceil + 1$, which implies that such a node u cannot output **Copy**.

In the following, we prove the claim by induction in i . For $i = 0$, the claim is trivially true. Now assume that the claim holds for some i , and consider some node $u \in \hat{U}_v$ with $\psi(u) = \text{Copy}$ that has distance $i + 1$ from v . Let w denote the parent of u , which implies that w has distance i from v . Moreover, by the design of \mathcal{A}^* , we know that $\psi(w) = \text{Copy}$. By applying the induction hypothesis to w , we know that the subtree hanging from w has at most $|\hat{U}_v| / ((d+1)^i)$ nodes. Since, by the design of \mathcal{A}^* , the subtree hanging from u contains at most as many nodes as any of the d “heaviest” subtrees hanging from children of w , it follows that the subtree hanging from u has at most $\left(|\hat{U}_v| / ((d+1)^i) \right) / (d+1) = |\hat{U}_v| / ((d+1)^{i+1})$ nodes, as desired. \square

As it immediately follows from the algorithm description that \mathcal{A} has a runtime of $O(\log n)$, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 38. *Algorithm \mathcal{A} solves the d -free weight problem in $O(\log n)$ rounds.*

Next, we collect some useful properties of the output that \mathcal{A} produces in [Observation 39](#) and [Lemma 40](#).

Observation 39. Each maximal connected component C of nodes that output `Copy` contains exactly one node with input A . Moreover, for each node v with input A that outputs `Copy`, exactly one such maximal connected component C contains nodes that are also contained in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 1)$ -hop neighborhood of v , and this connected component C is a subgraph of the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil)$ -hop neighborhood of v .

Proof. From the description of \mathcal{A} , it follows that any two nodes with input A that output `Copy` are at distance at least $2\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 3$ from each other. Moreover, all nodes that output `Copy` are contained in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil)$ -hop neighborhood of such a node v . Hence, each maximal connected component of nodes outputting `Copy` must be entirely contained in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil)$ -hop neighborhood of such a node v . Observe further that, by the design of \mathcal{A} , the nodes in the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil + 1)$ -hop neighborhood of such a node v that output `Copy` form a connected component and contain v . All statements made in the observation follow. \square

Lemma 40. Let v be a node with input A that outputs `Copy`, and let \hat{U} denote the set of nodes of the $(\lceil \log_{d+1} n \rceil)$ -hop neighborhood of v . Let $\hat{U}_{\text{Copy}} \subseteq \hat{U}$ denote the subset of nodes in \hat{U} that output `Copy`. Then $|\hat{U}_{\text{Copy}}| \leq 6|\hat{U}|^{\frac{\log(\Delta-1-d)}{\log(\Delta-1)}}$.

Proof. We upper bound the number of nodes in \hat{U}_{Copy} by upper bounding the number of nodes that output `copy` under the function ψ obtained by executing the sequential algorithm \mathcal{A}^* from the proof of [Lemma 37](#) on \hat{U} . Let K denote the number of nodes $u \in \hat{U}$ with $\psi(u) = \text{Copy}$. Furthermore, let K_1 denote the number of nodes $u \in \hat{U}$ with $\psi(u) = \text{Copy}$ that are at distance at most $\lfloor \log_{\Delta-1} |\hat{U}| \rfloor$ from v , and K_2 the number of nodes $u \in \hat{U}$ with $\psi(u) = \text{Copy}$ that are at distance at least $\lfloor \log_{\Delta-1} |\hat{U}| \rfloor + 1$ from v . In particular, we have $k = K_1 + K_2$.

We first bound K_1 . By the description of \mathcal{A}^* , the nodes in \hat{U} that output `Copy` induce a subtree (which we can assume to be rooted at v) in which each node has at most $\Delta - 1 - d$ children, possibly except for v , which has at most $\Delta - d$ children. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &\leq \frac{\Delta - d}{\Delta - 1 - d} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \log_{\Delta-1} |\hat{U}| \rfloor} (\Delta - 1 - d)^i \leq 2 \cdot 2(\Delta - 1 - d)^{\lfloor \log_{\Delta-1} |\hat{U}| \rfloor} \\ &\leq 4 \cdot 2^{\log(\Delta-1-d) \frac{\log |\hat{U}|}{\log(\Delta-1)}} \leq 4|\hat{U}|^{\frac{\log(\Delta-1-d)}{\log(\Delta-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound K_2 . Let L_i denote the number of nodes in \hat{U}_{Copy} that are contained in trees hanging from nodes in \hat{U} that are at distance i from v . Observe that the design of \mathcal{A}^* ensures that $L_{i+1} \leq \frac{\Delta-1-d}{\Delta-1} L_i$ for any $i \geq 1$, and $L_1 \leq \frac{\Delta-d}{\Delta} L_0 = \frac{\Delta-d}{\Delta} |\hat{U}|$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &\leq \frac{\Delta - d}{\Delta} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta - 1 - d}{\Delta - 1} \right)^{\lfloor \log_{\Delta-1} |\hat{U}| \rfloor} \cdot |\hat{U}| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta - 1 - d}{\Delta - 1} \right)^{\log_{\Delta-1} |\hat{U}|} \cdot |\hat{U}| = 2(\Delta - 1 - d)^{\log_{\Delta-1} |\hat{U}|} = 2|\hat{U}|^{\frac{\log(\Delta-1-d)}{\log(\Delta-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the bounds on K_1 and K_2 , we obtain

$$K = K_1 + K_2 \leq 6|\hat{U}|^{\frac{\log(\Delta-1-d)}{\log(\Delta-1)}}.$$

Observe that Property 5 in the definition of Algorithm \mathcal{A} ensures that the number of nodes in \hat{U}_{Copy} is upper bounded by K . Hence, we obtain

$$|\hat{U}_{\text{Copy}}| \leq 6|\hat{U}|^{\frac{\log(\Delta-1-d)}{\log(\Delta-1)}},$$

as desired. \square

7.1 The Upper Bound

Now we are set to describe the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2\frac{1}{2}}$ that will achieve the desired upper bound.

The algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ Let $x := \frac{\log(\Delta-1-d)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$, and set

$$\alpha_i := (2-x)\alpha_{i-1}, \quad (5)$$

for all $2 \leq i \leq k-1$, and

$$\alpha_1 := \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j}, \quad (6)$$

as in Lemma 33. Moreover, set $\gamma_i := n^{\alpha_i}$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$.

In $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$, each *active* node v executes the generic algorithm for solving k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring from Section 4.1 on the maximal connected component of active nodes containing v with parameters γ_i as specified above.

Each *weight* node w starts by solving the d -free weight problem on the subgraph induced by the maximal connected component of weight nodes containing w , using Algorithm \mathcal{A} . For this, each weight node that is adjacent to an active node assumes that it has input A , while any other weight node assumes that it has input W . After $3\lceil\log_{d+1} n\rceil + 3$ rounds, each weight node has finished executing \mathcal{A} . If a weight node outputs **Connect** or **Decline** in the execution of \mathcal{A} , then it also outputs the respective label in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ and terminates. If a weight node outputs **Copy** in the execution of \mathcal{A} , then it will also output **Copy** in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ but it also has to compute its secondary output, so it will not terminate yet. Instead it will wait until $3\lceil\log_{d+1} n\rceil + 3$ rounds have passed (counted from the beginning of the algorithm), and then proceed to the next phase, described in the following.

After round $3\lceil\log_{d+1} n\rceil + 3$, as soon as an active neighbor of a weight node w with input label A decides on its output label in the k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problem, w will flood this output label through the connected component of weight nodes outputting **Copy** that contains w (breaking ties arbitrarily in case w has two or more active neighbors that decide on their output label simultaneously). If immediately after round $3\lceil\log_{d+1} n\rceil + 3$, a weight node w with input label A already knows about a neighbor that has decided on its output label in the k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring problem, then w will use this output label for flooding through the connected component of weight nodes outputting **Copy** that contains w (again, breaking ties arbitrarily.) As soon as a node in the connected component learns this output label ℓ , it will output ℓ as its secondary output (and **Copy** as its primary output). This concludes the description of Algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$.

Algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ is well-defined, by Observation 39 and the fact that the design of \mathcal{A} ensures that any two weight nodes with input label A outputting **Copy** are at distance at least $2\lceil\log_{d+1} n\rceil + 3$ from each other.

In the following, we will prove the correctness of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ and bound its node-averaged complexity.

Lemma 41. *Algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ computes a correct output for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2\frac{1}{2}}$.*

Proof. To show correctness of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$, it suffices to show that the five properties of a correct output for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2\frac{1}{2}}$ specified in [Definition 22](#) are satisfied. Property (1) (with $Z = 2\frac{1}{2}$) follows from [Corollary 12](#). Properties (2), (3), and (4) follow from Properties (3), (1), and (2) in the definition of the d -free weight problem, respectively. Property (5) follows from the way in which weight nodes that output **Copy** determine their secondary output in $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ and [Observation 39](#). \square

Theorem 2. *For any D, d, k such that $D \geq d + 3$, the node-averaged complexity of $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{2.5}$ is $O(n^{\alpha_1})$, where $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.*

Proof. We start by observing that the weight nodes that output **Copy** form connected components containing exactly one node u that has at least one active neighbor and that all nodes in such a component output the same secondary label that furthermore is the output label of an active neighbor of u . (This follows from the design of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ and [Observation 39](#).) Let v be an active neighbor of such a node u such that u (and therefore all nodes in the connected component $C(u)$ of **Copy** nodes containing u) “copied” the output of v and returned it as secondary output during the execution of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$. Then we say that each node in $C(u)$ is *assigned* to v (where we break ties arbitrarily so that each weight node outputting **Copy** is assigned to exactly one active node). For each active node v , let $D(v)$ denote the set of all weight nodes assigned to v . Note that the design of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ ensures that all nodes in $D(v)$ terminate at most $O(\log n)$ rounds after v , by [Corollary 38](#). Hence, for our calculations we can (and will) assume that all nodes in $D(v)$ terminate at the same time as node v as the $O(\log n)$ additive overhead per node does not exceed the targeted node-averaged complexity. Furthermore, observe that the weight nodes that output **Connect** or **Decline** terminate in $O(\log n)$ rounds (by [Corollary 38](#)) and can therefore be ignored for the calculations of the node-averaged complexity as, again, their contribution does not exceed the targeted node-averaged complexity.

We proceed by bounding the sum of the individual termination times of all other nodes. As a first step, we compute, for each phase $1 \leq i \leq k$ of the generic algorithm applied on the active nodes (described in [Section 4.1](#)), the number of nodes that have still not terminated at the *start* of the phase. By [Lemma 13](#), at the beginning of phase i , there are at most still $n \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{\gamma_j}$ active nodes remaining (where we assume an empty product to evaluate to 1). Moreover, the argument used for proving the second part of [Corollary 24](#), combined with [Lemma 40](#), implies that the number of weight nodes that have not terminated at the beginning of phase i is at most

$$6 \cdot n \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{\gamma_j} \cdot \left(n / \left(n \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{\gamma_j} \right) \right)^x = 6n \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \gamma_j \right)^{x-1}.$$

Hence, the total number of nodes that have not terminated at the beginning of phase i is at most

$$n \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{\gamma_j} + 6n \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \gamma_j \right)^{x-1} \leq 7n \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \gamma_j \right)^{x-1}.$$

Multiplying with the runtime of the respective phase and summing up over all k phases, we obtain that the aforementioned sum of individual termination times is upper bounded by

$$7n \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(\gamma_i \left(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \gamma_j \right)^{x-1} \right) + \left(\frac{n}{\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \gamma_j} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \gamma_j \right)^{x-1} \right).$$

By using the fact that $\gamma_i = n^{\alpha_i}$, for each $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, our upper bound can be written as

$$7n \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(n^{\alpha_i + (x-1) \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \alpha_j} \right) + n^{1 + (x-2) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_j} \right).$$

Observe that the exponents of the k summands are precisely those that also appeared in [Section 6](#). In particular, [Lemma 33](#) ensures that all k exponents are equal to α_1 , enabling us to rewrite our upper bound as

$$7n(k \cdot n^{\alpha_1}).$$

As k is a constant, we obtain that the aforementioned sum of individual termination times is in $O(n \cdot n^{\alpha_1})$, implying a node-averaged complexity of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{poly}}$ of

$$O(n^{\alpha_1}) = O\left(n^{1/(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j)}\right),$$

where $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-1-d)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$, as desired. □

8 Solving Weighted $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring

When trying to solve the weighted versions of $2\frac{1}{2}$ - and $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring, the new challenge is to deal with the weight nodes. This challenge is significantly harder in the lower regime, where we often have only $o(\log^* n)$ node-averaged time to work with. We formalised the problem that the weight nodes want to solve as the d -free Weight Problem in [Section 7](#). We restate it here for completeness.

The d -free weight problem Let Δ and d be positive integers satisfying $d < \Delta$ and $\Delta \geq 3$. The d -free weight problem is an LCL on trees with input label set $\Sigma_{\text{in}} = \{A, W\}$ and output label set $\Sigma_{\text{out}} = \{\text{Decline}, \text{Connect}, \text{Copy}\}$. Each node v has one input label from Σ_{in} and must output one output label from Σ_{out} . We call nodes that have input label A *adjacent* nodes and nodes with input label W *weight* nodes. The (global) output is correct if it satisfies the following (local) properties:

1. If a node v with input label A outputs **Connect**, at least one neighbor of v outputs **Connect** as well. If a node v with input label W outputs **Connect**, at least two neighbors of v output **Connect** as well.
2. For each node v that outputs **Copy**, at most d neighbors of v output **Decline**.
3. Each node with input label A outputs **Connect** or **Copy**.

We are interested in solutions where not too many nodes must output the label **Copy**. The ultimate goal would be to match [Lemma 23](#) and show that if a component of w weight nodes is attached to an adjacent node v , at most w^x many nodes have to output **Copy**, where $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$. In the polynomial regime we were able to give an algorithm that achieves such a behaviour, but this algorithm was allowed to spend $O(\log n)$ rounds. In the \log^* regime we can not afford such luxuries. We will instead show that we can achieve something similar, but with a slightly worse efficiency factor of $x' = \frac{\Delta-d+1}{\Delta-1}$.

8.1 Using the algorithm from [BBK+23a]

To achieve the goal of an efficiency factor $x' = \frac{\Delta-d+1}{\Delta-1}$ we use the algorithm of [BBK+23a] which computes a $(\gamma, \ell, O(\log n))$ -decomposition (Definition 71) with a node-averaged complexity of just $O(\log^* n)$. We will call it the *Fast Decomposition Algorithm*. This decomposition can then be used to obtain a good solution for the weight problem. The full description and analysis of their algorithm is quite lengthy and we encourage the reader to look up the details in the original paper. To keep this work at a reasonable length, we will only restate the relevant details.

The layers of such a decomposition implicitly define an ordering and the main point of interest in [BBK+23a] are local maximums with regards to the partial order of layers defined in Definition 75.

We adapt the naming convention and call nodes that already have a layer assigned *assigned nodes* and all other nodes *free nodes*.

Definition 42 (local maximum [BBK+23a]). A *local maximum* is an assigned node $v \in V(G)$ with the following two properties:

1. Node v and all of its neighbors are assigned.
2. For each neighbor w of v , the layer of w is strictly smaller than the layer of v .

However the algorithm of [BBK+23a] requires $\Theta(\log^* n)$ rounds of precomputation, which is not fast enough for us. The bottleneck of their algorithm is the *Compress With Slack* procedure, which requires us to be able to split paths into short subpaths of length in $[\ell, 2\ell]$ for some constant ℓ . This is required to satisfy the definition of a proper (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition. We define a relaxed version of a (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition that does not need to split paths into small subpaths. We emphasise that this is the only difference to the partial (γ, ℓ, i) -decomposition in [BBK+23a].

Definition 43 (relaxed (γ, ℓ, i) -decomposition). Given three integers γ, ℓ, i , a (γ, ℓ, i) -decomposition is a partition of a subset $V' \subset V(G)$ into $2i-1$ layers $V_1^R = (V_{1,1}^R, \dots, V_{1,\gamma}^R), \dots, V_i^R = (V_{i,1}^R, \dots, V_{i,\gamma}^R), V_1^C, \dots, V_{i-1}^C$ such that the following hold for all layer numbers $1 \leq \ell \leq i$.

1. Compress layers: The connected components of each $G[V_\ell^C]$ are paths of length at least ℓ , the endpoints have exactly one neighbor in a higher layer, and all other nodes do not have any neighbor in a higher layer, or that is not yet assigned a layer.
2. Rake layers: The diameter of the connected components in $G[V_\ell^R]$ is $O(\gamma)$, and for each connected component at most one node has a neighbor in a higher layer, or that is not yet assigned a layer.
3. The connected components of each sublayer $G[V_{\ell,j}^R]$ consist of isolated nodes. Each node in a sublayer $V_{\ell,j}^R$ has at most one neighbor in a higher layer, or that is not yet assigned a layer.

The following is implicit in Section 5.4 of [BBK+23a].

Corollary 44 ([BBK+23a] Section 5.4). *For any constant ℓ , the Fast Decomposition Algorithm computes a relaxed $(\gamma, \ell, O(\log n))$ -decomposition with node-averaged complexity $O(1)$ and worst case complexity $O(\log n)$.*

Similar to the algorithm presented in Section 11.2, the Fast Decomposition Algorithm consists of iteratively performing Rakes and Compresses. The key idea to obtain a fast node-averaged complexity is to insert additional compress paths, to create more local maximums. As a result, they




Figure 5: This figure from [BBK⁺23a] illustrates the way edges are oriented in the Fast Decomposition Algorithm. The two black nodes at the top are nodes that are not yet assigned a layer. The arrows in the tree show how edges are oriented when such a tree is raked away and the bold path in the middle represents a compress path. In such a compress path, only the first and last ℓ edges are oriented.

will mess with the ordering of the layers. To still be able to argue about which nodes were assigned first, they introduce an orientation of the edges in the following way. When a node v is raked, the node orients its unique remaining edge (if it exists) towards itself. When a path is compressed, the first and last ℓ edges are oriented inwards. Refer to Fig. 5 for an illustration.

During the analysis the authors mark nodes when they are able to terminate. For any iteration i , this is only done in the following two cases (refer to [BBK⁺23a] Lemmas 34-36 for details):

1. Whenever a node v becomes a local maximum it becomes *marked*. Furthermore all nodes that can be reached from v through a consistently oriented path also become *marked* in $O(i)$ rounds.
2. For all compress layers V_{i-1}^C ⁰ in the relaxed decomposition, all nodes u that are at distance at least ℓ from any endpoint of a path become *marked*. Furthermore all nodes that can be reached from u through a consistently oriented path also become *marked* in $O(i)$ rounds.

They then use these marks to obtain a fast node-averaged complexity with the following lemma.

Lemma 45 ([BBK⁺23a] Lemma 36). *There exists a constant $0 < \sigma < 1$, such that for every iteration $i > 5$ of the Fast Decomposition Algorithm at most $2\Delta^b n \sigma^i$ nodes are not marked.*

We will not cover more details of the original algorithm, as we believe this would only cause more confusion. The original analysis is quite long and complicated, so instead we will state the following observations from the original paper which we will need to solve the d -free weight problem efficiently:

Observation 46.

1. If $\ell \geq 2$ any assigned node has at most one incoming edge. This holds because edges are only ever oriented from unassigned nodes to newly assigned nodes. (If ℓ is too small, a node in a compress path might have two incoming edges.)
2. If $\ell > 2$ then two local maxima must have distance at least 3. Consider a path between two local maxima, there must necessarily be a compress path, as otherwise the layers on this path must be strictly decreasing in both directions.
3. The only case in which the endpoint of a compress path v gets marked, is when there is a consistently oriented path from another node u towards it and u got marked.

⁰In iteration i , compress layer $i - 1$ is assigned.

4. Unoriented edges between assigned nodes are only in compress layers, at distance at least ℓ from the endpoints.
5. In iteration i of the algorithm, the connected components induced by consistently oriented edges have diameter at most $O(i)$. This is a direct result of each Rake or Compress only extending such a component by only a constant length.

We use these observations to find a good solution to the weight problem. To be more explicit, we change the algorithm in the following ways.

Adapted Algorithm: Each node v with input label A checks its 5-hop neighborhood. If there is at least one other node with input label A , then the unique path between u and v all output **Connect**. As a result all remaining nodes with input label A have distance at least 5. We then proceed to start to run the Fast Decomposition Algorithm with parameter $\ell = 3$ (so all of the observations hold) in the remaining graph (so ignoring all nodes with output **Connect**). In each iteration we apply these additional rules whenever they come up:

1. If a node v with input label A gets assigned a layer in iteration i , it immediately does the following based on the type of layer:
 - **Case 1 Rake Layer:** Then by the properties of a relaxed (γ, ℓ, i) decomposition, v has at most a single edge towards an active node u . If such a u exists, we label it **Decline** and call it a *border node*. Furthermore v outputs **Copy** and all nodes that can be reached from v through a consistently oriented path (that did not already output **Decline**) also output **Copy** in $O(i)$ rounds.
 - **Case 2 Compress Layer:** Then by the properties of a relaxed (γ, ℓ, i) decomposition, v has at most 2 neighbors u, w that are in the same layer, or that are not yet assigned. Both of these nodes immediately output **Decline** and are now *border nodes*. Furthermore v outputs **Copy** and all nodes that can be reached from v through a consistently oriented path (that did not already output **Decline**) also output **Copy** in $O(i)$ rounds. If either u, w , or both were already an assigned node all nodes that can be reached from them through a consistently oriented path also output **Decline** in $O(i)$ rounds.
2. If a *border node* v becomes assigned a layer all nodes (that did not already output **Decline**) that can be reached from v through a consistently oriented path also output **Decline** in $O(i)$ rounds.
3. If a node v becomes a local maximum, it immediately adapts label **Decline**. Furthermore all nodes (that did not already output **Decline**) that can be reached from v through a consistently oriented path also output **Decline** in $O(i)$ rounds.
4. For all compress layers V_{i-1}^C in the relaxed decomposition, all nodes u , that are at distance at least ℓ from any endpoint of a path, adapt label **Decline**. Furthermore all nodes (that did not already output **Decline**) that can be reached from u through a consistently oriented path also output **Decline** in $O(i)$ rounds.

All nodes that become marked in the original Fast Decomposition Algorithm fix their output label in our adapted version, in fact we are more aggressive with having nodes terminate than the base algorithm. As a consequence we obtain the following result.

Corollary 47. *Let $R(i) = \{v \in V \mid v \text{ did not output Copy or Decline after iteration } i\}$. Then there exists a constant $0 < \sigma < 1$, such that for every iteration $i > 5$ of the adapted Fast Decomposition Algorithm the number of nodes in R is at most $2\Delta^b n \sigma^i$.*

To prove that we actually compute a solution to the d -free Weight Problem, we have to make sure that any node with output Copy has at most d neighbors with output Decline. The following lemma will be enough to prove correctness. Note also that, by ignoring the precomputation, we do not actually use the Connect label at all. Furthermore, since the rest of the algorithm runs on the graph without the nodes that did output Connect in the beginning, we never actually encounter a node that has output Connect for the rest of the algorithm.

Lemma 48. *Assuming nodes with input label A have distance at least 5 and $\ell > 2$, then for all iterations i , any node v that did not output Decline has at most 2 neighbors that do. Furthermore, at most one of them is not a border node.*

Proof. There are only three different reasons why nodes output Decline. As the result of a local maximum, in the middle of compress paths, or because of border nodes. If a node v does not have input label A , then it has at most one neighboring border node. This is true because, if there were at least two such border nodes, then the respective nodes with input A would have distance exactly $4 < 5$ a contradiction.

If instead v has input label A itself, it can only have border nodes when v itself is assigned a layer. We distinguish whether or not v is a rake or compress node.

- If v is a rake node, it has exactly one border node and can not have more because of the distance to other nodes that have input A .
- If v is in a compress layer, then it has two border nodes. Furthermore if v is an endpoint of the compress layer, the two border nodes are the unique higher layer neighbor and its unique neighbor inside its compress layer. If instead v is not an endpoint of the compress layer, then the two border nodes are its two unique neighbors inside the layer.

Next we consider how many neighbors with output Decline a node v has without considering border nodes. We consider the three cases unassigned, assigned to a rake layer, and assigned to a compress layer. Since we already took care of border nodes, we only consider local maximums and the nodes in compress paths.

- **Case 1 v is unassigned:** Since local maximums must be surrounded by assigned nodes, none of the neighbors of v can be local maximums. Furthermore for any already assigned neighbor u of v , v must be the unique unassigned neighbor of u . As a result the edge between them is oriented from v to u , because of [Observation 46](#). So u must either be a rake node itself, or the endpoint of a compress path, so u did not output Decline.
- **Case 2 v is in a rake layer:** If v is in a rake layer, then the edge to its unique higher layer (or unassigned) neighbor u must be oriented from u to v . So if u had output Decline, then also v would have output Decline. Clearly no other neighbor w of v can be a local maximum and again, cannot have output Decline because of some other local maximum because of [Observation 46](#). If u was the endpoint of a path, it also would not have output Decline because of [Observation 46](#).
- **Case 3 v is in a compress layer:** If v is in a compress layer, then it can have at most one neighbor u in the same layer that did output Decline. This would be the case only if u is at

distance exactly ℓ from an endpoint of the path and v is at distance exactly $\ell - 1$ from an endpoint of the path. This holds because otherwise they either both output Decline (when they are deep enough in the path), or both do not (because both are not and the edge is oriented from v to u). The other possibility is that v is an endpoint of the path and the unique higher layer neighbor u is a local maximum. Then the edge between them must be oriented from v to u , since otherwise v would have also output Decline. Because $\ell > 2$ these two cases cannot happen simultaneously.

Whichever one of the two possibilities for compress nodes is true (either v is the endpoint, or v is exactly at distance ℓ from an endpoint), if v also has input A , it still will have at most 2 neighbors that do output Decline, since there is an overlap.

□

As a result of [Lemma 48](#), we immediately get that at the end we will have a valid solution to the d -free weight problem, as long as $d \geq 2$. Additionally, because of [Corollary 47](#), we get that we will be done after $O(\log n)$ rounds and that the node-averaged complexity is $O(1)$.

Corollary 49. *The adapted Fast Decomposition Algorithm computes a valid solution to the d -free weight problem, for $d \geq 2$. Furthermore the node-averaged complexity is $O(1)$ and all nodes have decided on an output after $O(\log n)$ rounds.*

Assume some node v that has input label A gets assigned a layer in iteration i and as a consequence immediately outputs Copy. Then all of the nodes that have not yet chosen an output label and can be reached from v over a consistently oriented path also output Copy. Let us denote by $\mathcal{C}(v)$ all of the nodes that do output Copy as a consequence of v being assigned a layer.

Lemma 50. *For any node v with input label A , the set $\mathcal{C}(v)$ is a tree rooted at v with diameter in $O(i)$, where i is the iteration in which v is assigned a layer. Assuming nodes with input label A have distance at least 5, then for any v , if $u \notin \mathcal{C}(v)$ is adjacent to $\mathcal{C}(v)$, then u has output Decline. Furthermore for two nodes $u \neq v$, both with input label A , $\mathcal{C}(v)$ and $\mathcal{C}(u)$ are disjoint.*

Proof. By [Observation 46](#), we get the claim on the diameter and that no node has more than one incoming edge. The incoming edge of v is exactly its edge to its unique unassigned neighbor. But that neighbor does output Decline. So all other edges of v are oriented away from v . Since also all other nodes in $\mathcal{C}(v)$ have only one incoming edge and only nodes reachable by a consistently oriented path output Copy, the subtree $\mathcal{C}(v)$ is rooted at v .

Consider the orientation of an edge between a node $w \in \mathcal{C}(v)$ and a node $u \notin \mathcal{C}(v)$.

- **Oriented from w to u :** either u did already output Decline previously, or u would have to also output Copy. Furthermore u cannot have Copy as the result of some other propagation of Copy labels, since its unique incoming edge comes from w .
- **Oriented from u to w :** w would have two incoming edges, since w must have a consistently oriented path from v to w , a contradiction.
- **The edge $\{u, w\}$ is not oriented:** by [Observation 46](#), u must be a node inside a compress layer that is at distance at least ℓ from the endpoints, so u did output Decline. If u also has input A , then w cant also have input A and so w would be a border node and output Decline.

To see the furthermore part, assume this is not the case. So take a node $w \in \mathcal{C}(u) \cup \mathcal{C}(v)$. Because of the distance between two nodes that have input A , we have that $v \neq w \neq u$. So w can be reached over a consistently oriented path from u and another such path from v . But nodes only have one incoming edge, a contradiction. □

As a result, the components that output **Copy** are completely separated by **Decline**. This will be enough for the rest of our analysis.

8.2 Generic algorithm for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$

We are ready to give an algorithm for the LCL $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$ from [Definition 22](#). So assume Δ, d, k to be fixed constants satisfying $\Delta \geq d + 3$ and $d \geq 3$, and let $x' = \frac{\log(\Delta-d+1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$. We will give an algorithm that achieves node-averaged complexity $\Theta((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')})$, where the function $\alpha_1(x') = \frac{1}{1+(1-x') \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x')^j}$ is the one from [Theorem 4](#). Note that this is not tight because $x' > x$, however we will see in the proof of [Theorem 6](#) that with some tricks we will get $x' < x + \varepsilon$ for any arbitrarily small constant ε . Our generic algorithm will be a mixture of the generic algorithm for k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring from [Section 4.1](#) and the algorithm for the d -free weight problem that we just discussed.

Algorithm Description Each node has input either **Active** or **Weight**, let V^A be the set of nodes that have input **Active** and V^W be the set of nodes that have input **Weight**. We call V^A the set of active nodes and V^W the set of weight nodes, we further note that $V = V^A \cup V^W$. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}$ be the values obtained in [Lemma 36](#) by using $x' = \frac{\log(\Delta-d+1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$. We set $\gamma_1 = (\log^* n)^{\alpha_1}, \dots, \gamma_{k-1} = (\log^* n)^{\alpha_{k-1}}$ and run the generic algorithm with these parameters on the graph induced by V^A . We note that computing these γ_i values is just local computation.

On the other hand, nodes in V^W run the adapted Fast Decomposition Algorithm to compute a solution to the d -free Weight Problem. Each node in V^W that is adjacent to an active node $v \in V^A$ gets input label A , while all other nodes in V^W adopt input label W . The graph induced by V^W is now a valid instance for the d -free weight problem (the parameter d is the same as in $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$). When running the adapted Fast Decomposition Algorithm in V^W , every node that chooses output label **Decline** as its solution for the d -free weight problem, also immediately outputs **Decline** as its output for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$.

Some nodes will be assigned **Connect** right at the beginning, these nodes also immediately output **Connect** as their output for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$.

Any node v with input label A waits for the adapted fast decomposition algorithm to assign it the label **Copy**, let the iteration in which that happens be iteration i . Then v does the following with the set $\mathcal{C}(v)$ from [Lemma 50](#).

- **Case 1 v has an active neighbor that already terminated with output o :** Then all nodes in $\mathcal{C}(v)$ output label **Copy** with secondary output o in $O(i)$ rounds.
- **Case 2 all of v 's active neighbors still did not terminate yet:** Then it first collects the entire topology of the rooted subtree induced by $\mathcal{C}(v)$ in $O(i)$ time. By [Lemma 48](#) any node in $\mathcal{C}(v)$ has at most 2 neighbors with output label **Decline**. v changes some labels in $\mathcal{C}(v)$ to **Decline** in a way that minimises the number of nodes that have label **Copy**, while still maintaining a valid solution to the d -free weight problem. We note that we do not change nodes that previously had output **Decline**. Then, all nodes that are newly assigned **Decline** immediately output **Decline** as their output for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$.

When an active node $v \in V^A$ terminates with output o and an adjacent active node $u \in V^W$ already was assigned a set $\mathcal{C}(u)$ in iteration i , in $O(i)$ rounds all nodes in $\mathcal{C}(u)$, that still have label **Copy** as their solution for the d -free weight problem, output **Copy** with secondary output o as their output for $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$.

This finishes the description of the algorithm. We will first argue that the algorithm is correct.

Lemma 51. *The algorithm computes a correct solution to $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$.*

Proof. Because of the correctness of the generic algorithm from [Section 4.1](#) the nodes in V^A output a correct solution to k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. So we only need to show that the nodes in V^W output correct solutions.

First notice that all of the nodes that output **Connect** at the beginning of the fast decomposition algorithm are paths between active nodes. So they satisfy the constraints. All other nodes with input A do output **Copy** so we also get that all nodes u adjacent to an active node $v \in V^A$ output either **Copy** or **Connect**.

So the last thing we need to show is that for each node $u \in V^W$ that does output **Copy** at most d neighbors output **Decline**. The only nodes that output **Copy** are ones that were in a set $\mathcal{C}(v)$ for some node v adjacent to an active node. By [Lemma 48](#) we get that when v is first assigned a layer in some iteration i each node in $\mathcal{C}(v)$ has at most 2 neighbors that output **Decline**. Note that these nodes did output **Decline** for both the d -free weight problem and $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$. This only changes if v computes a reassignment of output labels and changes some nodes from **Copy** to **Decline**. However when v does so, it knows the entire topology of $\mathcal{C}(v)$, and does so such that these labels are a valid solution to the d -free weight problem. So as a result all nodes that still output **Copy** have at most d neighbors that do output **Decline**, satisfying the constraints of $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^{3.5}$. \square

Next we consider some node $v \in V^W$ that gets input label A for the d -free weight problem. Assume it gets assigned a label by the adapted Fast Decomposition Algorithm in iteration i and the active node adjacent to v has not yet terminated.

Lemma 52. *If a node $v \in V^W$ with input label A for the d -free weight problem reassigns some labels in $\mathcal{C}(v)$, the number of nodes that still have label **Copy** is at most $2|\mathcal{C}(v)|^{x'}$, where $x' = \frac{\log(\Delta-d+1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.*

Proof. By [Lemma 50](#) the set $\mathcal{C}(v)$ is a tree rooted at v with diameter at most $O(i)$. By [Lemma 48](#) any node in $\mathcal{C}(v)$ initially has at most 2 neighbors that output **Decline**. Since the maximum degree is Δ , the fan-out of the tree $\mathcal{C}(v)$ is at most $\Delta - 1$, and as a result the diameter is at least $\log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)$. We start at v and for every one of the layers $0 \leq j \leq \log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)$ (layer 0 is v) of the rooted tree $\mathcal{C}(v)$ we do the following. Each node u in layer j has at most 2 neighbors that already have output **Decline**, so it can assign at least $d - 2$ of its at most $\Delta - 1$ children the output **Decline**. We always assign **Decline** to the children with the heaviest subtrees and then also change all of the **Copy** outputs in that subtree to **Decline**. As a result with every layer we lose at least $\frac{d-2}{\Delta-1}$ nodes. Let $\mathcal{C}'(v) \subset \mathcal{C}(v)$ be all nodes that still have output **Copy** after the reassignment. In the first $\log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)$ layers, the tree $\mathcal{C}'(v)$ now has fan-out $\Delta - d - 1$, so the number of nodes in these first layers is at most

$$(\Delta - d - 1)^{\log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)} = (\Delta - 1)^{\log_{\Delta-1}(\Delta-d-1) \cdot \log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)} = |\mathcal{C}(v)|^{\log_{\Delta-1}(\Delta-d-1)} = |\mathcal{C}(v)|^x.$$

Since we lose a $\frac{d-2}{\Delta-1}$ fraction of the nodes every layer until $\log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)$, the number of remaining nodes after that layer is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{C}(v)| \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta - d + 1}{\Delta - 1}\right)^{\log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)} &= |\mathcal{C}(v)| \cdot \frac{(\Delta - d + 1)^{\log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)}}{|\mathcal{C}(v)|} \\ &= (\Delta - 1)^{\log_{\Delta-1}(\Delta-d+1) \cdot \log_{\Delta-1}(|\mathcal{C}(v)|)} \\ &= |\mathcal{C}(v)|^{\log_{\Delta-1}(\Delta-d+1)} = |\mathcal{C}(v)|^{x'}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two, the size of $\mathcal{C}'(v)$ is upper bounded by

$$|\mathcal{C}'(v)| \leq |\mathcal{C}(v)|^x + |\mathcal{C}(v)|^{x'} \leq 2|\mathcal{C}(v)|^{x'}.$$

\square

Next we analyse the guarantees that we get from the generic algorithm for k -hierarchical $3\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring. By the description and [Lemma 13](#) we get the following results.

Corollary 53. *Phase $i < k$ of the generic algorithm that runs on V^A takes $O((\log^* n)^{\alpha_i})$ rounds and after it all nodes of level i have terminated. Furthermore the number of remaining nodes in V^A is upper bounded by*

$$O\left(\frac{n}{\prod_{j \leq i} (\log^* n)^{\alpha_j}}\right).$$

Let $L_i \subset V^A$ be all nodes that terminate in phase $1 \leq i \leq k$ of the generic algorithm. Let A_i be all weight nodes adjacent to a node in L_i that did already get assigned a layer by the adapted Fast Decomposition Algorithm at the end of phase i of the generic algorithm. Then we also define $W_i = L_i \cup_{v \in A_i} \mathcal{C}'(v)$ as the set that includes all weight nodes that were in $\mathcal{C}'(v)$ components for any v adjacent to a node in L_i (We ignore nodes adjacent nodes that don't have a $\mathcal{C}'(v)$ yet, as we will deal with them later.) Note that we refer to the sets $\mathcal{C}'(v)$ from [Lemma 52](#).

Lemma 54. *For all $i < k$, the total time spent by nodes in W_i is upper bounded by*

$$O\left(n^1 \cdot \left(\log^*(n)^{\alpha_i + (x'-1) \sum_{j < i} \alpha_j}\right)\right).$$

Proof. By [Corollary 53](#), we get

$$|L_i| \in O\left(\frac{n}{\prod_{j < i} (\log^* n)^{\alpha_j}}\right) = O\left(\frac{n}{(\log^* n)^{\sum_{j < i} \alpha_j}}\right).$$

Because of [Lemma 52](#), the size of W_i is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |W_i| &= |L_i| + \sum_{v \in A_i} |\mathcal{C}'(v)| \leq |L_i| + \sum_{v \in A_i} 2|\mathcal{C}(v)|^{x'} \leq 2|L_i| \left(\frac{\sum_{v \in A_i} |\mathcal{C}(v)|}{|A_i|}\right)^{x'} \\ &\leq 2|L_i| \left(\frac{\sum_{v \in A_i} |\mathcal{C}(v)|}{\Delta|L_i|}\right)^{x'} \leq \frac{2}{\Delta^{x'}} |L_i| \left(\frac{n}{|L_i|}\right)^{x'} \in O\left(n^{x'} \cdot \left(\frac{n}{(\log^* n)^{\sum_{j < i} \alpha_j}}\right)^{1-x'}\right) \\ &= O\left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{-\sum_{j < i} \alpha_j}\right)^{1-x'}\right) = O\left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{(x'-1) \sum_{j < i} \alpha_j}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

All of the nodes in L_i terminate after $t \in O(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \dots + \gamma_i) = O(\gamma_i)$ rounds, where the equality comes from the fact that $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_{k-1}$. The diameter of the $\mathcal{C}'(v)$ components can clearly also be at most t (since only t rounds happened so far). So after at most an additional t rounds all nodes in $|W_i|$ have terminated. As a result, the total time spent by nodes in W_i is upper bounded by

$$O\left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{(x'-1) \sum_{j < i} \alpha_j}\right)\right) \cdot O(\gamma_i) = O\left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{\alpha_i + (x'-1) \sum_{j < i} \alpha_j}\right)\right).$$

□

For $i = k$ the calculation is a bit different

Lemma 55. *The total time spent by nodes in W_k is upper bounded by $O\left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{1+(x'-1) \sum_{j < k} \alpha_j}\right)\right)$.*

Proof. In the same way as before we get

$$|W_k| = O\left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{(x'-1) \sum_{j \leq k} \alpha_j}\right)\right).$$

All of the nodes in L_k terminate after $t \in O(\log^* n)$ rounds. The diameter of the $\mathcal{C}'(v)$ components can clearly also be at most t (since only t rounds happened so far). So after at most an additional t rounds all nodes in $|W_k|$ have terminated. As a result, the total time spent by nodes in W_k is upper bounded by

$$O\left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{(x'-1) \sum_{j < i} \alpha_j}\right)\right) \cdot O(\log^* n) = O\left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{1+(x'-1) \sum_{j < k} \alpha_j}\right)\right).$$

□

Now we take care of the nodes in V^W which are not yet accounted for, that is, all those that are immediately assigned **Decline**, or those that when reaching an adjacent node v with input A can all immediately terminate. Remember that the second case happens only when a neighbor $u \in V^A$ of v had already terminated with some output o , when v was assigned.

Lemma 56. *All nodes in $W := V^W \setminus \left(\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} W_i\right)$ terminate in a constant number of rounds on average.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of **Corollary 47**. Let

$$R(i) = \{v \in V^W \mid v \text{ did not output Copy or Decline after iteration } i\}$$

be the set as in **Corollary 47**. We argue that all of these nodes have already terminated, or are in one of the sets W_1, \dots, W_k . All nodes that get assigned output label **Decline** for the d -free weight problem all immediately terminate with output **Decline** for $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$. If instead the nodes did output C , then they are in one of the $\mathcal{C}(v)$ for some v . If this v has a neighbor that did already terminate, then also all of the nodes in $\mathcal{C}(v)$ can terminate $O(i)$ iterations later. If they don't have such a neighbor, then they are necessarily part of one of the W_i .

So the remaining nodes in W after iteration i are exactly the set $R(i)$. By **Corollary 47**, for constant $b \in O(1)$, $0 < \sigma < 1$, the following holds after iteration $i \geq 5$:

$$|R(i)| \leq 2\Delta^b n \sigma^i.$$

Since by **Corollary 49** the algorithm terminates after $c \log n \in O(\log n)$ rounds for some constant c , we get for the node-averaged complexity of the nodes in W ,

$$\bar{T} \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(5n + \sum_{5 < i \leq c \log(n)} |R(i)|\right) \leq 5 + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{5 < i \leq c \log(n)} 2\Delta^b n \sigma^i = 5 + 2\Delta^b \sum_{5 < i \leq c \log(n)} \sigma^i \in O(1).$$

□

Now we can bound the total node-averaged complexity by differentiating between the nodes in W and nodes in W_1, \dots, W_k . So we finally give a proof for **Theorem 5**.

Theorem 5. *For any D, d, k such that $d \geq 3, D \geq d + 3$, the node-averaged complexity of $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ is $O((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')})$, where $\alpha_1(x') = \frac{1}{1+(1-x') \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x')^j}$ and $x' = \frac{\log(\Delta-d+1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.*

Proof. We can write down the node-averaged runtime using W and W_1, \dots, W_k . We denote the termination time of a node v by T_v .

$$\bar{T} = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{v \in G} T_v = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\sum_{v \in W} T_v + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{v \in W_i} T_v \right)$$

By [Lemma 56](#) we get that the contribution of the nodes in W is a constant. We can use [Lemma 55](#) to bound the total time of nodes in W_k and [Lemma 54](#) to bound the total time for nodes in W_i for $i < k$. We get:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{T} &= O(1) + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < k} O \left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{\alpha_i + (x'-1) \sum_{j < i} \alpha_j} \right) \right) + O \left(n^1 \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{1 + (x'-1) \sum_{j < k} \alpha_j} \right) \right) \right) \\ &= O \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < k} \left((\log^* n)^{\alpha_i + (x'-1) \sum_{j < i} \alpha_j} \right) + \left((\log^* n)^{1 + (x'-1) \sum_{j < k} \alpha_j} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

These exponents are exactly the terms as in [Lemma 36](#), and we choose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}$ as the optimal solutions given there. Furthermore, all of these exponents equal each other and are $\alpha_1(x')$. Hence, we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{T} &= O \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < k} \left((\log^* n)^{\alpha_i + (x'-1) \sum_{j < i} \alpha_j} \right) + \left((\log^* n)^{1 + (x'-1) \sum_{j < k} \alpha_j} \right) \right) \\ &= O \left(\sum_{1 \leq i < k} \left((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')} \right) + \left((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')} \right) \right) = O \left(k \cdot \left((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')} \right) \right) \\ &= O \left(\left((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. □

9 Density Results

We will now show that the node-averaged complexity landscape of LCLs on bounded degree trees is dense in the region $n^{\Omega(1)} - o(n^{1/2})$. To do this, we will use [Theorem 3](#) and [Theorem 2](#), that we restate here for ease of reading.

Theorem 3. *For any constants D, d, k , such that $D \geq d + 3$ the LCL $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{2.5}$ has node-averaged complexity $\Omega(n^{\alpha_1})$, where $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.*

Theorem 2. *For any D, d, k such that $D \geq d + 3$, the node-averaged complexity of $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{2.5}$ is $O(n^{\alpha_1})$, where $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.*

We first need to show that $\alpha_1(x)$ is well behaved.

Lemma 57. $\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j}$ is a continuous monotonically increasing function over the interval $[0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Notice that $P(x) := \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j$ is just a polynomial with real coefficients and therefore continuous. Clearly $\frac{\partial P}{\partial x}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} -j(2-x)^{j-1}$, which, for $x \in [0, 1]$, is always a negative number. Therefore, $P(x)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, 1]$, and as a result $\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{P(x)}$ is strictly increasing and continuous on $[0, 1]$, as long as we do not divide by 0. But since $\alpha_1(0) = \frac{1}{2^k-1}$, and as just discussed $\alpha_1(x)$ is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$, this also means that $\alpha_1(x)$ is well behaved on our interval. \square

Lemma 58. *For any integer k and any two real numbers $\frac{1}{2^k-1} \leq r_1 < r_2 < \frac{1}{k}$, there exist constants Δ, d, c such that $r_1 \leq c \leq r_2$ and $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{2.5}$ has node-averaged complexity n^c .*

Proof. The complexities with $\frac{1}{2^k-1}$ are simply given by the original k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring [BBK⁺23b]. So in the following assume $\frac{1}{2^k-1} < r_1$. Notice that the complexity induced by **Theorems 2** and **3** is exactly

$$n^{\alpha_1(x)},$$

so if we find some constants Δ, d , such that

$$\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (2-x)^j} = c,$$

we are done. Since according to **Lemma 57** we have that $\alpha_1(x)$ is continuous and strictly increasing, we can obtain $x_1 = \alpha_1^{-1}(r_1)$ and $x_2 = \alpha_1^{-1}(r_2)$. Furthermore, for any $x_1 \leq a \leq x_2$, it holds that $r_1 = \alpha_1(x_1) \leq \alpha_1(a) \leq \alpha_1(x_2) = r_2$, again because α_1 is a continuous strictly increasing function. We also note that since $\alpha_1(0) = \frac{1}{2^k-1}$ and $\alpha_1(1) = \frac{1}{k}$, we get that $0 < x_1 < x_2 < 1$.

Now the only thing left to do is to choose a appropriately. Notice that we may only choose a value from among the set

$$X := \{\log(\Delta d - 1) / \log(\Delta - 1) \mid s, \Delta \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } \Delta \geq d + 3\}.$$

However, given any rational number p/q with $p < q$ we can choose $\Delta := 2^q + 1$ and then solve for d in

$$\Delta - d - 1 = 2^p \Rightarrow 2^q + 1 - d - 1 = 2^p \Rightarrow d = 2^q - 2^p > 0$$

and therefore $p/q \in X$. Now since between any two real numbers $0 < x_1 < x_2 < 1$ there exists a rational number $0 < a < 1 \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying $r_1 \leq a \leq r_2$ and as just discussed also $a \in X$, we simply choose $c = \alpha_1(a)$ and get that $r_1 \leq c \leq r_2$. \square

Observe that **Lemma 58** does not actually allow us to reach a node-averaged complexity of $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$. We will take care of such a complexity in **Lemma 69** of **Section 10**. By combining **Lemma 69** and **Lemma 58**, we obtain the following.

Theorem 1. *For any two real numbers $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ there exists a constant $r_1 < c < r_2$ and an LCL Π such that Π has node-averaged complexity $\Theta(n^c)$*

Proof. If we want an LCL with complexity $\Theta(n^{1/k})$, then we invoke **Lemma 69**. Otherwise, since there exists k such that $r_1 < \frac{1}{2^k-1} < r_2$, we just invoke **Lemma 58** with $r'_1 = \frac{1}{2^k-1}, r_2$ and get the desired result. \square

We conclude the discussion about the polynomial regime by showing that there is a gap between $\Theta(n)$ and $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ in the node-averaged complexity landscape. This is a simple consequence of a result by Feuilloley.

Lemma 59 ([Feu17]). *Let A be an algorithm that solves an LCL problem Π with node-averaged complexity T . Then, if a node v runs for t rounds, either there exist at least $t/2 - 1$ nodes in the $t/2$ -radius neighborhood of v that run for at least $t/2$ rounds, or v could terminate earlier.*

When we apply this lemma to a node that runs for linear in n many rounds we immediately get that we spend too much total time to have a fast node-averaged complexity.

Corollary 60. *Any LCL with worst case complexity $\Omega(n)$ has node-averaged-complexity $\Omega(n)$.*

Proof. Since the LCL has worst case complexity $\Omega(n)$, there must exist an instance I and a node v in this instance, such that v runs for at least cn rounds for some constant c . By [Lemma 59](#) this means that there are at least $\frac{cn}{2}$ nodes that run for at least $\frac{cn}{2}$ rounds which already results in a node-averaged complexity of at least

$$\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{cn}{2} \cdot \frac{cn}{2} = c'n,$$

for an adequate constant c' . □

Next we will show that the node-averaged complexity landscape of LCLs on bounded degree trees is dense in the region $(\log^* n)^{\Omega(1)-o(\log^* n)}$. Things will be a bit more tricky, but [Theorem 4](#) together with [Theorem 5](#), which we restate here for ease of reading, will be enough.

Theorem 4. *For any constants D, d, k , such that $D \geq d + 3$ the LCL $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ has node-averaged complexity $\Omega((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x)})$, where $\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{1+(1-x)\sum_{j=0}^{k-2}(2-x)^j}$ and $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.*

Theorem 5. *For any D, d, k such that $d \geq 3, D \geq d + 3$, the node-averaged complexity of $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ is $O((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')})$, where $\alpha_1(x') = \frac{1}{1+(1-x')\sum_{j=0}^{k-2}(2-x')^j}$ and $x' = \frac{\log(\Delta-d+1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$.*

Again we start by showing that $\alpha_1(x)$ is well behaved.

Lemma 61. $\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{1+(1-x)\sum_{j=0}^{k-2}(2-x)^j}$ is a continuous monotonically increasing function over the interval $[0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Notice that $P(x) := 1 + (1-x)\sum_{j=0}^{k-2}(2-x)^j$ is just a polynomial with real coefficients and therefore continuous. By the product rule,

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial x}(x) = (1-x) \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} -j(2-x)^{j-1} - \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (2-x)^j,$$

which for $x \in [0, 1]$ is always a negative number. Therefore $P(x)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, 1]$ and as a result $\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{P(x)}$ is strictly increasing and continuous on $[0, 1]$ as long as we do not divide by 0. But since $\alpha_1(0) = \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}$ and as just discussed $\alpha_1(x)$ is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$, this also means that $\alpha_1(x)$ is well behaved on our interval. □

Since there is a gap between the results in [Theorems 4](#) and [5](#), we have to make sure that this gap gets arbitrarily small.

Lemma 62. *For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $x = \frac{a}{b} \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$, there exists Δ, d such that $x = \frac{\log(\Delta-d-1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$ and $x' = \frac{\log(\Delta-d+1)}{\log(\Delta-1)}$ and $|x - x'| < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Fix ε, a, b , we will show that proper Δ, d exist. It suffices to show that, for any constant c , we can pick Δ, d such that $\Delta - d - 1 = 2^{ca}$ and $\Delta - 1 = 2^{cb}$, because then $x = \frac{ca}{cb} = \frac{a}{b}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= \frac{\log(\Delta - d + 1)}{\Delta - 1} = \frac{\log(\Delta - d - 1 + 2)}{cb} = \frac{\log(2^{ac} + 2)}{cb} \leq \frac{1}{cb} \cdot (\log(2^{ac}) + \frac{2}{2^{ac}}) \\ &= x + \frac{2}{2^{ac}} < x + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that the Taylor Expansion of $\log(z)$ at $z = 2^{ac}$ is a proper upper bound, because the logarithm is a concave function and the fact that we can choose c such that $\frac{2}{2^{ac}} < \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Now, to prove that for any constant c we can pick Δ, d such that $\Delta - d - 1 = 2^{ca}$ and $\Delta - 1 = 2^{cb}$, we first set

$$\Delta - 1 = 2^{cb} \Rightarrow \Delta = 2^{cb} + 1,$$

and then we use that in

$$\Delta - d - 1 = 2^{ca} \Rightarrow \Delta - d - 1 = 2^{cb} + 1 - d - 1 = 2^{cb} - d = 2^{ca} \Rightarrow d = 2^{cb} - 2^{ca} > 0.$$

□

Since we can now make the gap between the upper and the lower bound arbitrarily small, the rest follows in the same way as it did in the polynomial regime.

Theorem 6. *For any two real numbers $0 < r_1 < r_2 < 1$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist constants Δ, d, k, c such that $r_1 \leq c \leq r_2$ and LCL $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ has node-averaged complexity between $\Omega((\log^* n)^c)$ and $O((\log^* n)^{c+\varepsilon})$.*

Proof. We first start by fixing k such that $\frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \leq r_1 < 1/k$, which is possible, since $r_1 > 0$. As a result of this choice of k the function $\alpha_1(x)$ actually outputs values from $\frac{1}{2^{k-1}}$ to $\frac{1}{k}$. Now since by [Lemma 61](#) the function $\alpha_1(x) = \frac{1}{1+(1-x)\sum_{j=0}^{k-2}(2-x)^j}$ is continuous and strictly increasing on the real interval $[0, 1]$, we obtain $x_1 = \alpha_1^{-1}(r_1), x_2 = \alpha_1^{-1}(r_2)$, and we choose $\frac{a}{b} \in \mathbb{Q}$, such that $0 < x_1 < \frac{a}{b} < x_2 < 1$. As a result it holds that $r_1 = \alpha_1(x_1) < \alpha_1(\frac{a}{b}) < \alpha_1(x_2) = r_2$, again because α_1 is a continuous strictly increasing function. Choose $\varepsilon' := \min\{\varepsilon, (r_2 - \alpha_1(\frac{a}{b}))/2\}$ to ensure that everything fits in the gap between $\alpha_1(\frac{a}{b})$ and r_2 . Now since $\alpha_1(x)$ is continuous, for every $\varepsilon' > 0$ there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for all values $\tau \in (\alpha_1(\frac{a}{b}) - \delta, \alpha_1(\frac{a}{b}) + \delta)$ it holds that $\alpha_1(\frac{a}{b}) - \varepsilon' < \alpha_1(\tau) < \alpha_1(\frac{a}{b}) + \varepsilon'$. So now given ε' we get a δ that we can use in [Lemma 62](#) and obtain values Δ, d such that $x = \frac{a}{b}$ and $|x - x'| < \delta$. As a result $|\alpha_1(x) - \alpha_1(x')| < \varepsilon'$ because of our choice of δ .

Now by [Theorems 4](#) and [5](#) the complexity of $\Pi_{\Delta, d, k}^{3.5}$ is between $\Omega((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x)})$ and $O((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x')}) \subset O((\log^* n)^{\alpha_1(x)+\varepsilon'})$. □

10 More efficient weight

Observe that [Lemma 58](#) allows us to only get arbitrarily close to the worst case complexity, but it does not give us LCLs that have worst-case and node-averaged complexities that are the same. For example, choose $k = 2$. Then, the worst case complexity is $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$, but [Lemma 58](#) only gives us LCLs with node-averaged complexity $o(\sqrt{n})$. As it turns out, if we design our LCLs differently, we can also obtain a problem with node-averaged complexity $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$. According to the analysis of the previous sections, this happens exactly if the efficiency factor x is 1. However, with the way

we defined our weight augmented LCLs, we can only push x arbitrarily close to 1. What we really need is a nice twist on the rules that weight nodes need to follow, that allows us to reach $x = 1$. However, at the same time, we have to ensure that our worst case complexity does not become $\Theta(n)$. The way the LCLs $\Pi_{\Delta,d,k}^Z$ are defined results in a complexity $O(\log n)$ for the problem on weight nodes. To solve this issue and achieve $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$ node-averaged complexity, we will require weight nodes to solve a problem with worst case complexity $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$. This way we keep the same worst case complexity, but as we will soon see, make much more efficient use of weight nodes.

To get the desired worst case runtime we must create a problem that only allows k compresses. The problem we use is essentially the problem of computing a (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition (Definition 71, but modified to be an LCL). Instead of outputting the exact layer number in the decomposition, we require nodes to only choose an output label that represents how many compresses have been used so far. To enforce an actual decomposition, we require the nodes to output the orientation implied by a rake and compress decomposition.

Definition 63 (k -hierarchical labeling). For any integer k , the k -hierarchical labeling problem consists of the input set $\Sigma_{\text{in}} = \emptyset$ and the output set $\Sigma_{\text{out}} = \{R_0, R_1, \dots, R_k, C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$. We call the labels R_1, \dots, R_k *rake labels* and C_1, \dots, C_{k-1} *compress labels*. Furthermore, there is an ordering of the labels $R_1 < C_1 < R_2 < C_2 < R_3 < \dots < C_{k-1} < R_k$. Any legal labeling must satisfy the following rules:

1. All edges adjacent to a rake label must be oriented.
2. Each node v has at most one edge $e = (v, u)$ oriented away from itself, except for compress nodes that have two compress neighbors, who must not have any outgoing edge.
3. For all oriented edges (u, v) the label of v is larger than or equal to the label of u .
4. For all compress labels, the subgraph induced by the nodes of that label consists only of disjoint paths.
5. Two nodes that have a different compress label must not be adjacent.
6. Any node v with a rake label has at most one compress label neighbor pointing towards it. Furthermore if there is such a neighbor, then all neighbors that point towards v have a strictly lower label.

Some intuition on this rules.

- **Items 1 and 2** force us to consistently orient all of the rake label components towards some component specific root node.
- **Items 4 and 5** force us to use compress labels only in paths and to ensure that two different compress paths are separated by at least one rake label.
- **Item 3** ensures that we have to keep track of how many compresses we have used so far. Basically the way we will be handling a long path P is, to have every node but the endpoints take compress label C_i and have both endpoints pick rake label R_i . Then we orient the edges connecting the endpoints towards the endpoints. Clearly this works only if we have used only R_1, \dots, R_{i-1} so far.
- **Item 6** will help us argue about how many nodes have to wait when we use this formulation to augment other LCLs.

Clearly all of the rules can be checked by just looking at the immediate neighbors of a node.

Corollary 64. *For any constant k , the k -hierarchical labeling is an LCL.*

Lemma 65. *The k -hierarchical labeling problem has worst case complexity $O(n^{\frac{1}{k}})$.*

Proof. We will first use [Lemma 72](#) with $L = k$ and $\ell = 4$ to obtain a $(O(n^{\frac{1}{k}}), 4, k)$ -decomposition in $O(n^{\frac{1}{k}})$ rounds. We will now describe how every node v can compute its output label for the k -hierarchical labeling problems using only the information from its direct neighbors. Every node v is either assigned to a Rake Layer, or to a Compress Layer. We will handle both cases separately.

- Rake Layer: Let v be in Rake Layer $V_{i,j}^R$ with $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $j \in O(n^{\frac{1}{k}})$. We now have v choose output label R_i . By [Property 3](#) of the decomposition there exists at most one neighbor with a higher layer than v . If such a neighbor u exists, then orient the edge between v and u from v to u .
- Compress Layer: Let v be in Compress Layer V_i^C with $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. then by [Property 1](#) of the decomposition v is in path P of length in $[4, 8]$, in which all of the nodes have the same layer. If v is not an endpoint of the path, then v will output C_i . If instead v is an endpoint of the path v will output R_{i+1} . Since v is an endpoint it has exactly one neighbor u in P , we will orient the edge from u to v . Furthermore by [Property 1](#) of the decomposition v has exactly one neighbor w in a higher layer. We will orient the edge from v to w .

Now we argue that all rules of the k -hierarchical labeling problem are satisfied.

1. Consider a node v that did output a rake label. Consider any neighbor u of v , if in the initial decomposition u was assigned a lower layer than v , then u did orient the edge towards v . If v had a higher layer, then v oriented the edge towards u . Lastly the only possible way for u and v to be in the same layer in the decomposition is if both were in the same compress layer. But then v must be an endpoint of that layer, since it did output a rake label. Furthermore since compress layers have at least 4 nodes, u cannot be an endpoint of the path and so the edge was oriented from u to v . Also no inner node of the compress path has to orient both edges.
2. Whenever we orient edges above, we only orient edges away from the current node and if we do that we only do it once per node.
3. Again whenever we orient an edge (u, v) , the decomposition layer of u is smaller than v . Also notice that when we assign output labels the ordering on the layers of the decomposition will directly translate to the ordering we need for our problem.
4. The compress labels will form paths of length $[2, 6]$ since both endpoints adopt a rake label.
5. Different compress layers are disjoint in the decomposition and the endpoints of the original compress layer use a rake label. As a consequence, any two nodes that use different compress labels will be separated by these rake label nodes.
6. The only case when compress nodes orient towards a rake label is at the endpoints. Since compress layers are disjoint paths, no node can be the endpoint of more than one compress path. Furthermore if we consider such an endpoint, then by [Property 1](#) of the decomposition none of its neighbors are in a higher layer. So the nodes that might output an equal label are only the ones inside its own compress layer, but these all output a smaller compress label.

□

The definition of a (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition immediately gives that the rake layers have diameter at most γ . Now because only nodes that are in rake layer V_i^R are assigned rake label R_i , the nodes that output rake labels also form components of diameter at most γ .

Corollary 66. *Using the construction above, rake labels induce components of size at most $O(n^{\frac{1}{k}})$.*

Now we also add the weight functionality into the ruleset.

Definition 67 (k -hierarchical weight augmented $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -coloring). For any k , the k -hierarchical weight augmented $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -coloring LCL has input label set $\Sigma_{\text{in}} = \{\text{Weight}, \text{Active}\}$. We call nodes with input Active active nodes and nodes with input Weight weight nodes. Each active node has to output a label from $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}}$, where $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}}$ is the output label set of k -hierarchical $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -coloring. Each weight node has to output a label from the set $\{R_1, \dots, R_k, C_1, \dots, C_{k-1}\}$.

Further all weight nodes must output a secondary output from $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}} \cup \{\text{Decline}\}$. The following rules must be satisfied.

1. The active nodes have to compute a valid solution to k -hierarchical $2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ -coloring on the subgraph induced by active nodes and output only labels from $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}}$.
2. The weight nodes have to output a valid solution to the k -hierarchical labeling problem on the subgraph induced by weight nodes.
3. Any weight node w adjacent to at least one active node v has to orient the edge (w, v) towards exactly one of these active nodes v . Furthermore w must have as secondary output exactly the output of v . (v must output from $\Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\text{Active}}$ according to **Item 1**)
4. All weight nodes pointing towards other weight nodes must output the same secondary output, unless they also point towards an active node and copy that output.
5. Only compress label nodes may output Decline as their secondary output and they do so if and only if they are not also adjacent to an active node. If they are adjacent to an active node, then they must have that nodes output as their secondary output.

Now we prove the effectiveness of this construction.

Lemma 68. *For any integer $k \in O(1)$, consider any k -hierarchical weight augmented LCL Π' . Consider an active node v with a balanced Δ -regular tree of w weight nodes attached to it. Let v output $x \in \Sigma_{\text{out}}^{\Pi'}$, then $\Omega(w)$ of these weight nodes must have x as their secondary output.*

Proof. Let r be the weight node that is attached to v and consider it as the root of the attached tree. Now because of **Item 2** of the k -hierarchical weight augmented definition, r must have x as secondary output and point towards v . Since the tree is Δ -regular, the fan-out of the tree is $\Delta - 1$ and so as a result a subtree of height h has exactly $(\Delta - 1)^h - 1$ many nodes. Now r can have either a rake label or a compress label.

- If r has a rake label, according to **Item 2** of the k -hierarchical labeling problem, r is pointing to at most one other node. So it has at least $\Delta - 2$ incoming edges.
- If instead r has a compress label, then according to the rules of the k -hierarchical labeling problem r has at most 2 compress neighbors and if it has only one compress neighbor, then it has just one outgoing edge. As a result, r has at least $\Delta - 3$ incoming edges.

We call nodes adjacent to r that have an edge oriented towards r , children of r . Consider one such child u .

1. u has a rake label: Then by [Item 4](#) of the k -hierarchical weight augmented problem, u must also have x as its secondary output.
2. u has a compress label: Then u must output Decline as its secondary output. So all of the nodes in the subtree of u must also have Decline as their secondary output. But because the tree is balanced, this is at most an $\frac{1}{\Delta-1}$ fraction of nodes. Furthermore if this is the case, then by [Item 6](#) all of the other children of r must output a rake label that is at least one smaller than that of r .

If r is a rake node, then we have that $\Delta - 2$ children have to also output x , if instead r is a compress node at least $\Delta - 3$ children have to also output x . For each one of these children that have to copy, they must be rake nodes, and therefore have $\Delta - 1$ children. For each of them we make the same argument that all rake children have to copy x . It is only in the second case, where one such child is a compress child, that there are actually nodes that do not have to have x as their secondary output. However since then all other children must have a strictly smaller rake label and since there are only k different rake labels, this can happen only $k - 1$ times. In the worst case this happens in the first k levels of the tree, so we lose $(\Delta - 1)^{h-i} - 1$ many nodes in the i -th level. Therefore, the number of weight nodes that must have x as their secondary output is upper bounded by

$$w - (\Delta - 1)^{h-1} - 1 - (\Delta - 1)^{h-2} - 1 - \dots - (\Delta - 1)^{h-(k-1)} - 1 = w - (k - 1) - \sum_{1 \leq i < k} \frac{w}{(\Delta - 1)^i}$$

Which is in $\Omega(w)$ when Δ and k are constant. □

This basically means that we can attach trees with efficiency factor $x = 1$. So by following the same lower bound argumentation as in [Section 6](#), we get that the node-averaged complexity of k -hierarchical weight augmented $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring is in $\Theta(n^{1/k})$. (The upper bound follows from the fact that both k -hierarchical $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring is worst case $O(n^{1/k})$ and also k -hierarchical labeling problem is in $O(n^{1/k})$).

Lemma 69. *The node-averaged complexity of k -hierarchical weight augmented $2\frac{1}{2}$ -coloring is in $\Theta(n^{1/k})$.*

11 The $\omega(1) - (\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ Gap

In this section, we prove that there is no LCL with deterministic node-averaged complexity that lies between $\omega(1)$ and $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$. Before diving into this proof, we summarize some notions and high-level ideas from previous work, that will be useful in our proofs.

It is known that there are no LCLs with a worst-case complexity (neither deterministic nor randomized) that lies between $\omega(\log n)$ and $n^{o(1)}$ [[CP19](#)], and that there are no LCLs with a worst-case complexity (neither deterministic nor randomized) that lies between $\omega(n^{1/(k+1)})$ and $o(n^{1/k})$ for any integer $k > 0$ [[Cha20](#)]. These results have been shown as follows.

- It is shown that there exists a generic algorithm for solving all problems Π that have $O(\log n)$ worst-case complexity. This generic algorithm requires the existence of a suitable function called $f_{\Pi, \infty}$.
- It is shown that an algorithm with $n^{o(1)}$ worst-case (deterministic or randomized) complexity implies the existence of a function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$.

- It is shown that there exists a generic algorithm for solving all problems Π that have $O(n^{1/(k+1)})$ worst-case complexity. This generic algorithm requires the existence of a suitable function called $f_{\Pi,k+1}$.
- It is shown that an algorithm with $o(n^{1/k})$ worst-case (deterministic or randomized) complexity implies the existence of a function $f_{\Pi,k+1}$.

Moreover, it is shown that the existence of a function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ or a function $f_{\Pi,k}$, for a given integer $k > 0$, is decidable (i.e., there exists a centralized algorithm that takes as input a problem Π and always terminates, outputting the function if it exists, or an error message otherwise).

In [BBK+23a] it is shown that there is no LCL with node-averaged complexity that lies between $\omega(\log^* n)$ and $n^{o(1)}$, and that if a problem cannot be solved in $n^{o(1)}$ worst-case complexity, then it cannot be solved in $n^{o(1)}$ node-averaged complexity. These results are proved by showing the following.

- If a suitable function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ exists, then Π can be solved in $O(\log^* n)$ node-averaged complexity.
- If a problem has (deterministic or randomized) worst-case complexity $\Omega(n^{1/k})$, then it has randomized node-averaged complexity $\Omega(n^{1/(2^k-1)}/\log n)$ and deterministic node-averaged complexity $\Omega(n^{1/(2^k-1)})$. This is shown by using a randomized algorithm with node-averaged complexity $o(n^{1/(2^k-1)}/\log n)$, or a deterministic algorithm with node-averaged complexity $o(n^{1/(2^k-1)})$, to construct a function $f_{\Pi,k+1}$.

In this section, we prove the following.

- Recall that the existence of a suitable function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ implies that the problem Π has node-averaged complexity $O(\log^* n)$, and that it is possible to use an algorithm with $O(\log^* n)$ node-averaged complexity to construct a suitable function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$. We show that, if the function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ satisfies some additional properties, then Π can be solved in $O(1)$ rounds. Moreover, we show that it is decidable whether such function exists.
- If there exists an algorithm with deterministic node-averaged complexity $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$, then a function with such properties exists.

Hence, by showing the above, we obtain that the existence of an algorithm with deterministic node-averaged complexity $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ implies the existence of an algorithm with deterministic node-averaged complexity $O(1)$, and hence that there are no LCLs with a deterministic node-averaged complexity that lies in the range $\omega(1) - (\log^* n)^{o(1)}$. Moreover, we also obtain that, whether a problem can be solved in $O(1)$ node-averaged rounds, is decidable. Hence, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 7. *There are no LCLs with a deterministic complexity that lies in the range $\omega(1) - (\log^* n)^{o(1)}$. Moreover, given an LCL, it is decidable whether it can be solved in $O(1)$ deterministic node-averaged rounds.*

In the remainder of the section, we start by giving a recap of some notions presented in [BBK+23a], and then we prove our statements. More precisely, the section is structured as follows.

- In [BBK+23a], it is first shown that all LCLs on trees can be converted into problems described in a specific formalism, called the *black-white formalism*, while preserving the node-averaged complexity of the problem under consideration. In Section 11.1 we present this formalism.

- In [BBK⁺23a] it is shown that, every LCL in the black-white formalism can be solved in a specific generic way, that starts by decomposing the tree in some way. This result is an adaptation, to the black-white formalism, of results already presented in [CP19, Cha20], We give a high-level overview of this decomposition, and of the generic algorithm, in Section 11.2, and Section 11.3, respectively.
- Fundamental ingredients of the generic algorithm are the concepts of *classes* and *label-sets*, that we present in Section 11.4.
- In Section 11.5, we provide a high-level overview of how the described ingredients are used in [BBK⁺23a] to obtain an algorithm with $O(\log^* n)$ node-averaged complexity.
- As already mentioned, the generic algorithm relies on the existence of a function with special properties. In Section 11.6, we show how the existence of this function is determined.
- Finally, in the remainder of the section, we show that, if this function satisfies some additional properties, then the problem can be solved in $O(1)$ deterministic node-averaged complexity.

11.1 LCLs in the Black-White Formalism

Definition 70 ([BBK⁺23a]). A problem Π described in the black-white formalism is a tuple $(\Sigma_{\text{in}}, \Sigma_{\text{out}}, C_W, C_B)$, where:

- Σ_{in} and Σ_{out} are finite sets of labels.
- C_W and C_B are both sets of multisets of pairs, where each pair $(\ell_{\text{in}}, \ell_{\text{out}})$ is in $\Sigma_{\text{in}} \times \Sigma_{\text{out}}$.

Solving a problem Π on a graph G means that:

- $G = (W \cup B, E)$ is a graph that is properly 2-colored, and in particular each node $v \in W$ is labeled $c(v) = W$, and each node $v \in B$ is labeled $c(v) = B$.
- To each edge $e \in E$ is assigned a label $i(e) \in \Sigma_{\text{in}}$.
- The task is to assign a label $o(e) \in \Sigma_{\text{out}}$ to each edge $e \in E$ such that, for each node $v \in W$ (resp. $v \in B$) it holds that the multiset of incident input-output pairs is in C_W (resp. in C_B).

In [BBK⁺23a], it is shown how, by starting from an LCL Π on trees, one can define an LCL Π' in the black-white formalism that has the same asymptotic node-averaged complexity as Π . Observe that, when considering a problem in the black-white formalism, it is assumed that the tree is 2-colored.

11.2 A Tree Decomposition

The generic algorithms used in [CP19, Cha20] are based on the idea of decomposing the tree into layers. More in detail, the first step is running a procedure called *rake-and-compress*, that takes as input a parameter γ and works as follows. For $i = 1, \dots$ perform the following.

- For $j = 1, \dots, \gamma$ remove nodes of degree 1. Call the removed nodes at step (i, j) *rake nodes of layer (i, j)* , and let $V_{i,j}^R$ be the set of these nodes. Call all the nodes removed at step i *rake nodes of layer i* and let V_i^R be the set of these nodes.
- Remove nodes of degree 2 and call the removed nodes *compress nodes of layer i* , and let V_i^C be the set of these nodes.

- Repeat until the tree becomes empty.

The choice of γ affects the number of obtained layers: if $\gamma = 1$, then it is possible to prove that the obtained layers are at most $O(\log n)$, while if $\gamma = \Theta(n^{1/k})$ then it is possible to prove that rake layers are bounded by k and compress layers are bounded by $k - 1$. This decomposition algorithm can be slightly tweaked to obtain additional properties, summarized in [Definition 71](#). The worst-case time required to compute such a decomposition is summarized in [Lemma 72](#).

Definition 71 ((γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition [[BBK⁺23a](#)]). Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a tree. Let $G[V']$, where $V' \subseteq V(G)$, be the subgraph induced by the nodes in V' . Given three integers γ, ℓ, L , a (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition is a partition of the nodes in $V(G)$ into $2L - 1$ layers $V_1^R = (V_{1,1}^R, \dots, V_{1,\gamma}^R), \dots, V_L^R = (V_{L,1}^R, \dots, V_{L,\gamma}^R), V_1^C, \dots, V_{L-1}^C$ such that the following hold.

1. **Compress layers.** The connected components of each $G[V_i^C]$ are paths of length in $[\ell, 2\ell]$, the endpoints have exactly one neighbor in a higher layer, and all other nodes do not have any neighbor in a higher layer.
2. **Rake layers.** The diameter of the connected components in $G[V_i^R]$ is $O(\gamma)$, and for each connected component at most one node has a neighbor in a higher layer.
3. The connected components of each sublayer $G[V_{i,j}^R]$ consist of isolated nodes. Each node in a sublayer $V_{i,j}^R$ has at most one neighbor in a higher layer or sublayer.

Lemma 72 ([[CP19](#), [Cha20](#)]). Assume $\ell = O(1)$. Then the following hold.

- For any positive integer k and $\gamma = n^{1/k}(\ell/2)^{1-1/k}$, a (γ, ℓ, k) -decomposition can be computed in $O(k \cdot n^{1/k})$ rounds.
- For $\gamma = 1$ and $L = O(\log n)$, a (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition can be computed in $O(\log n)$ rounds.

11.3 The Generic Algorithm

The rake-and-compress procedure produces a useful layering on the tree, that is used as follows. Consider, for simplicity, the case in which there are no nodes in compress layers: according to the ordering $(i, j) < (i', j')$ if $i < i'$ or $i = i' \wedge j < j'$, we get that each node has at most one neighbor in a higher rake layer. We call the edge connecting a node u to its unique higher-layer neighbor v the *outgoing edge* of u , and all the other edges incident to u are called *incoming edges* of u .

Recall that, solving a problem Π in the black-white formalism means assigning one label for each edge such that the constraints of the problem are satisfied. We now process the tree to assign a set of labels to each edge. We process nodes from lower to higher layers. To each node u , we assign a set of labels to its outgoing edge, such that, for any choice in such a set, there exists a choice in the sets assigned to the incoming edges of u , such that the constraints of the problem are satisfied on u . Note that such a set is always non-empty, as long as the problem is solvable in any tree. In other words, we compute what labels we could put on the outgoing edge of u such that we can pick a valid labeling on the whole subtree rooted at u . This set of labels, informally, is called *class* of the subtree rooted at u . Observe that, once a set has been assigned to each edge, we can process the nodes in reverse order to assign a label to each edge and make the constraints of the problem satisfied on all nodes.

While we discussed how to handle rake layers, handling compress layers is more complicated. In fact, if we define incoming and outgoing edges analogously as in the case of rake nodes, we get that compress paths have *two* outgoing edges, one for each endpoint. The issue in having two outgoing

edges is that, fixing a label on the edge of one endpoint of a compress path may affect what are the valid labelings on the edge of the other endpoint, and hence there is no straightforward way to assign sets of labels to the two endpoints such that this labeling is completable into a valid solution in the path.

This issue is handled in [CP19, Cha20] by first using a decomposition that gives only paths of constant size, and by then using some function that maps the sets of the incoming edges of a path into two sets for the two outgoing edges of the path. This function must satisfy a special property: we want the whole process to never compute empty sets (since otherwise we cannot then assign labels to the edges), and in [CP19, Cha20] is proved that such a function always exists (conditioned on the problem being solvable in the target runtime). We now provide a formal definition of class, also extended to the case of compress paths.

11.4 Classes and Label-Sets

While the generic algorithms are provided already in [CP19, Cha20], in [BBK⁺23a] the same algorithms are provided in a more accessible form, thanks to the fact that they are restricted to LCLs in the black-white formalism. We now present some of the ingredients provided in [BBK⁺23a]. The first ingredient is the definition of label-sets and classes.

Definition 73 ([BCM⁺21, BBK⁺23a]). Assume we are given an LCL $\Pi = (\Sigma_{\text{in}}, \Sigma_{\text{out}}, C_W, C_B)$ in the black-white formalism. Consider a tree $G = (V, E)$, and a connected subtree $H = (V_H, E_H)$ of G . Assume that the edges connecting nodes in V_H to nodes in $V \setminus V_H$ are split into two parts, F_{incoming} and F_{outgoing} , that are called, respectively, the set of incoming and outgoing edges. Assume also that for each edge $e \in F_{\text{incoming}}$ is assigned a set $L_e \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{out}}$. This set is called *the label-set of e* . Let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}} = (L_e)_{e \in F_{\text{incoming}}}$. A *feasible labeling* of H w.r.t. F_{incoming} , F_{outgoing} , and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$ is a tuple $(L_{\text{outgoing}}, L_{\text{incoming}}, L_H)$ where:

- L_{incoming} is a labeling $(l_e)_{e \in F_{\text{incoming}}}$ of F_{incoming} satisfying $l_e \in (\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}})_e$ for all $e \in F_{\text{incoming}}$,
- L_{outgoing} is a labeling $(l_e)_{e \in F_{\text{outgoing}}}$ of F_{outgoing} satisfying $l_e \in \Sigma_{\text{out}}$ for all $e \in F_{\text{outgoing}}$,
- L_H is a labeling $(l_e)_{e \in E_H}$ of E_H satisfying $l_e \in \Sigma_{\text{out}}$ for all $e \in E_H$,
- the output labeling of the edges incident to nodes of H given by L_{outgoing} , L_{incoming} , and L_H is such that all node constraints of each node $v \in V_H$ are satisfied.

Also, we define the following:

- a *class* is a set of feasible labelings,
- a *maximal class* is the unique inclusion maximal class, that is, it is the set of all feasible labelings,
- an *independent class* is a class A such that for any $(L_{\text{outgoing}}, L_{\text{incoming}}, L_H) \in A$, and for any $(L'_{\text{outgoing}}, L'_{\text{incoming}}, L'_H) \in A$ the following holds. Let L''_{outgoing} be an arbitrary combination of L_{outgoing} and L'_{outgoing} , that is, $L''_{\text{outgoing}} = (l_e)_{e \in F_{\text{outgoing}}}$ where $l_e \in \{(L_{\text{outgoing}})_e, (L'_{\text{outgoing}})_e\}$. There must exist some L''_{incoming} and L''_H satisfying $(L''_{\text{outgoing}}, L''_{\text{incoming}}, L''_H) \in A$.

Note that the maximal class with regard to some given $\Pi, H, F_{\text{incoming}}, F_{\text{outgoing}}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$, is unique. In contrast, there may be different ways (or none) to restrict a maximal class to a (nonempty) independent class.

As discussed, the generic algorithm needs to assign label-sets to edges in two specific types of subgraphs H , that are the following.




Figure 6: The figure illustrates the two cases of the label-set computation, where it is assumed that the incoming edges have already a label-set assigned and the goal is to assign a label-set to the outgoing edges; the left side depicts the case of a single node, the right side shows the case of a short path.

- The graph H consists of a single rake node. By construction, H has only one outgoing edge.
- The graph H consists of a short compress path. By construction, H has only two outgoing edges.

Hence, [Definition 73](#) is used only for the two specific types of graphs H : either single nodes, or short paths. In each of these cases we need to compute a label-set for each outgoing edge. We now report the way to compute label-sets in these two cases as presented in [\[BBK⁺23a\]](#). The cases are illustrated in [Figure 6](#), which comes from [\[BBK⁺23a\]](#).

Definition 74 (label-set computation [\[BBK⁺23a\]](#)). Assume we are given some function $f_{\Pi,k}$ (to be specified later). We define a function $g(v)$ that can be used to compute label-sets for the outgoing edges as a function of H , Π , F_{incoming} , F_{outgoing} , $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$, and $f_{\Pi,k}$, for two specific types of graphs H .

- **Single nodes:** the graph H consists of a single node v that has a single outgoing edge e , and hence $F_{\text{outgoing}} = \{e\}$. All the other edges (which might be 0) are incoming, and for each of them we are given a label-set (where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$ represents this assignment). We assign, to the outgoing edge, the label-set $g(v)$, that consists of the set of labels that we can assign to the outgoing edge, such that we can pick a label for each incoming edge in a valid manner. More in detail, let B be the maximal class of H w.r.t. Π , F_{incoming} , F_{outgoing} , and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$. Then, we denote $g(v) = \bigcup_{(L_{\text{outgoing}}, L_{\text{incoming}}, L_H) \in B} \{(L_{\text{outgoing}})_e\}$. We have $g(v) \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{out}}$. Observe that each node v can compute $g(v)$ if it is given the value of $g(u)$ (that is, the label-set of the edge $\{u, v\}$) for each incoming edge $\{v, u\}$.
- **Short paths:** the graph H is a path of length between ℓ and 2ℓ , for some $\ell = O(1)$ that depends solely on Π and the target running time. The endpoints of the path are v_1 and v_2 . The outgoing edges are $F_{\text{outgoing}} = \{e_1, e_2\}$, where e_1 (resp. e_2) is the outgoing edge incident to v_1 (resp. v_2). Let B be the maximal class of H . We assume to be given a function $f_{\Pi,k}$, that depends solely on Π and some parameter k (that, in turn, depends on the target running time), that maps a class B into an independent class $B' = f_{\Pi,k}(B)$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $g(v_i) = \bigcup_{(L_{\text{outgoing}}, L_{\text{incoming}}, L_H) \in B'} \{(L_{\text{outgoing}})_{e_i}\}$. We have $g(v_i) \subseteq \Sigma_{\text{out}}$. The label-set of e_1 (resp. e_2) is $g(v_1)$ (resp. $g(v_2)$). Observe that the values of $g(v_i)$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, can be computed given H and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$.

Observe that, by the definition of independent class, we get that, for any choice of labels in the two label-sets assigned to the outgoing edges of a compress path, there exists a valid labeling for the compress path that is compatible with the label-sets of the incoming edges.

11.5 From Worst-Case to Node-Averaged Case

Definition 74 provides a way to process the layers of a rake-and-compress decomposition to assign label-sets to all edges, such that then nodes can be processed in reverse order to assign a label to each edge. In fact, consider the following ordering.

Definition 75 (Layer ordering [BBK⁺23a]). We define the following total order on the (sub)layers of a (γ, ℓ, L) -decomposition.

- $V_{i,j}^R < V_{i',j'}^R$, iff $i < i' \vee (i = i' \wedge j < j')$
- $V_{i,j}^R < V_i^C$
- $V_i^C < V_{i+1,j}^R$

We can first process the nodes according to the ordering of **Definition 75** to assign label-sets to all edges by using **Definition 74**. Then, we can process the nodes in reverse order and assign a label to each edge such that the constraints of the problem are satisfied. For more details, see [BBK⁺23a, Section 4].

In [CP19, Cha20] it is shown that the parameter ℓ required by the decomposition can be computed solely as a function of Π , and that ℓ is $O(1)$. Given a function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$, by using a $(1, O(1), O(\log n))$ -decomposition, we obtain an algorithm that solves Π in $O(\log n)$ worst-case deterministic rounds, while by using a $(O(n^{1/k}), O(1), k)$ -decomposition, for $k = O(1)$, we obtain an algorithm that solves Π in $O(n^{1/k})$ worst-case deterministic rounds. We call these generic algorithms *solvers*.

In order to obtain $O(\log^* n)$ node-averaged complexity, in [BBK⁺23a] it is shown how to compute a tree decomposition with $O(\log^* n)$ node-averaged complexity, and how to additionally tweak it so that the label-set computation, and the following label picking phase, can be computed in $O(1)$ node-averaged complexity. For more details, see [BBK⁺23a, Section 5]. The $O(\log^* n)$ time is actually only spent for splitting compress paths into shorter paths (of length between ℓ and 2ℓ), and the whole algorithm of [BBK⁺23a] would actually require $O(1)$ rounds if splitting long paths into short ones is not needed. What we show in the rest of the section is that, if there exists an algorithm with $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ deterministic node-averaged complexity, then this splitting is not needed, implying an algorithm with $O(1)$ deterministic node-averaged complexity.

11.6 Finding a Function

Recall that, in the described solver procedure, it is required to use a function $f_{\Pi,k}$ for solving a problem in $O(n^{1/k})$ worst-case deterministic rounds, or a function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ for solving a problem in $O(\log n)$ worst-case deterministic rounds. Moreover, recall that the function used in the solver needs to satisfy the condition that the solver never creates empty label-sets. We call *good* a function that satisfies this condition.

In [CP19, Cha20], it is argued that there is a *finite* amount of possible (good or bad) functions $f_{\Pi,\infty}$, and for a given k , there is a *finite* amount of possible functions $f_{\Pi,k}$. Moreover, it is shown that it is *decidable* whether a given function is good, implying that it is decidable whether a good function exists, and if it exists it is possible to compute it.

We now present the algorithm, shown in [BBK⁺23a], that tests whether a given function is good. This function is called *testing procedure*. The procedure depends not only on the function to be tested, but also on a parameter ℓ that, in [CP19, Cha20], it is shown that it can be determined solely as a function of Π . The testing procedure is well-defined for any integer $k > 0$, but also for $k = \infty$. The idea of the testing procedure is to keep track of all possible label-sets that one could

possibly obtain while running the solver. For each of these label-sets L , the procedure also keeps track of a subtree (where nodes are also marked with the layers of a decomposition) where, if we run the solver by using the function that we are testing, we would obtain an edge with label-set L . These trees, called *representative trees*, will be used later.

Algorithm 1: The testing procedure of [BBK⁺23a]

1. Initialize S with all the possible values of the label-set $g(v)$ of v (as defined in Definition 74) that could be obtained when v is a leaf. Note that the possible values are a finite amount that only depends on the amount of input labels of Π . Initialize \mathcal{R}_1 by inserting one pair $((\tilde{T}, u), L)$ for each element L in S , where \tilde{T} is a tree composed of 2 nodes $\{u, v\}$ and 1 edge $\{u, v\}$, and $L = g(v)$. Node v is marked as a rake node of layer 1, while u is marked as a temporary node.
2. For $i = 1, \dots, k$ do the following. If, at any step, an empty label-set is obtained, then the tested function is not good.
 - (a) Do the following in all possible ways. Consider x arbitrary elements $((\tilde{T}_j, v_j), L_j)$ of \mathcal{R}_i , where $1 \leq j \leq x$ and $1 \leq x \leq \Delta$. Construct the tree T as the union of all trees \tilde{T}_j , where all the nodes v_j (note that each node v_j has degree 1) are identified as a single node, call it v , which, after this process, has degree x in T . Let F_{incoming} be the set of edges connected to v , and let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$ be the label-set assignment given by the sets L_j . The node v is marked as a rake node of layer i . If v has an empty maximal class w.r.t. F_{incoming} , $F_{\text{outgoing}} = \{\}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$, then the tested function is not good.
 - (b) Do the following in all possible ways. Consider x arbitrary elements $((\tilde{T}_j, v_j), L_j)$ of \mathcal{R}_i , where $1 \leq j \leq x$ and $1 \leq x \leq \Delta - 1$. Construct the tree T as the union of all trees \tilde{T}_j , where all the nodes v_j are identified as a single node, call it v . Attach an additional neighbor u to v . Let $F_{\text{outgoing}} = \{\{u, v\}\}$. Let F_{incoming} be the set of edges connected to v , excluding $\{u, v\}$, and let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}}$ be the label-set assignment given by the sets L_j . The node v is marked as a rake node of layer i , while u is marked as a temporary node. Let $L = g(v)$ (as defined in Definition 74). If L is empty, then the function is not good. Add $((T, u), L)$ to \mathcal{R}_i if no pair with second element L is already present.
 - (c) Repeat the previous two step until nothing new is added to \mathcal{R}_i . This must happen, since there are a finite amount of possible label-sets.
 - (d) If $i = k$, stop.
 - (e) Initialize $\mathcal{C}_i = \emptyset$.
 - (f) Do the following in all possible ways. Construct a graph starting from a path H of length between ℓ and 2ℓ where we connect nodes of degree 1 to the nodes of H satisfying: (i) all nodes in H have degree at most Δ ; (ii) the two endpoints of H have an outgoing edge that connects respectively to nodes u_1 and u_2 that are nodes of degree 1; (iii) all the other edges connecting degree-1 nodes to the nodes of H are incoming for H . Next, replace each incoming edge e and the node of degree 1 connected to it with a tree \tilde{T} of a pair $((\tilde{T}, u), L)$ in \mathcal{R}_i , by identifying u with the node of the path connected to e . Different trees can be used for different edges. The nodes u_1 and u_2 are marked as temporary nodes, while the nodes of the path are marked as compress nodes of layer i . Use the function as described in Definition 74 to compute the label-sets L_1 and L_2 of the two endpoints. If L_1 or L_2 is empty, then the function is not good. Otherwise, add

the pair $((H, u_1), L_1)$ (resp. $((H, u_2), L_2)$) to \mathcal{C}_i if no pair with second element L_1 (resp. L_2) is already present. The *representative tree* of $P = (H, F_{\text{incoming}}, F_{\text{outgoing}}, \mathcal{L}_{\text{incoming}})$ is defined as $r(P) = T$.

(g) Set $\mathcal{R}_{i+1} = \mathcal{R}_i \cup \mathcal{C}_i$. If $\mathcal{R}_{i+1} = \mathcal{R}_i$, stop.

For more details about this procedure, we refer the reader to [BBK⁺23a, Section 7]. As discussed in [BBK⁺23a], it is possible to prove that the testing procedure generates exactly those label-sets that could possibly be obtained by running the solver [CP19, Cha20]. Hence, if empty label-sets are never obtained, then the function can indeed be used to solve a problem. We now prove a useful property of this testing procedure.

Lemma 76. *Let Π be an LCL in the black-white formalism. Let F be the (finite) set of all possible functions $f_{\Pi, \infty}$. Let k_{\max} be the largest value of i reached when testing all the function in F . If a good function $f_{\Pi, k_{\max}+1}$ exists, then a good function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ exists.*

Proof. Define $f_{\Pi, \infty} := f_{\Pi, k_{\max}+1}$. The proof follows from the fact that all functions $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ that are not good fail the testing procedure within the first k_{\max} steps, while $f_{\Pi, k_{\max}+1}$ does not fail in the first $k_{\max}+1$ steps. \square

11.7 The Plan for Saving the $O(\log^* n)$ Term

We now discuss how the $O(\log^* n)$ term in the node-averaged complexity of the solver procedure of [BBK⁺23a] can be avoided. The solver procedure, as shown in [BBK⁺23a], precomputes a distance- $O(1)$ $O(1)$ -coloring (for some suitable constants), which can be done in $O(\log^* n)$ deterministic worst-case rounds. Then, throughout its execution, the solver handles each compress path P in the compress layer V_i^C as follows.

- First, compute a set S of nodes of the compress path P such that the subpaths induced by the nodes in $P \setminus S$ form paths of length in $[\ell, 2\ell]$, and such that endpoints of P are not in S . The nodes in S are moved to $V_{i+1,1}^R$. This is done in $O(1)$ deterministic worst-case rounds by exploiting the precomputed coloring.
- The function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ is used to assign label-sets to the edges connecting nodes of the subpaths to their higher-layer neighbors.
- Nodes in S now have all incoming edges with label-sets assigned, and no outgoing edges. This means that they can pick a valid labeling for all their incident edges and terminate.
- Nodes in the subpaths, except for the first and the last subpath, can now pick a valid labeling for their incident edges and terminate, since such subpaths are connected to nodes in S on both sides, and since the subpaths have constant length.

This whole procedure allows to fully label the nodes of a path (except for the first and last subpath) in $O(1)$ worst-case rounds, by exploiting the precomputed coloring. We now provide an alternative way for handling compress paths in $O(1)$ worst-case rounds, that, on the one hand, it does not require to precompute a coloring, but on the other hand, it requires the function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ to satisfy some additional properties. We thus get that, if there exists a function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ that satisfies these additional properties, then the algorithm with deterministic node-averaged complexity $O(\log^* n)$ of [BBK⁺23a] can be turned into an algorithm with $O(1)$ deterministic node-averaged complexity. Finally, we will show that if a problem can be solved in $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ deterministic node-averaged complexity, then a function with the required properties exists.

11.8 The New Way of Handling Compress Paths

We modify the algorithm of [BBK⁺23a], and in particular the handling of compress paths, as follows. In the original algorithm, all compress paths have length in $[\ell, 2\ell]$, due to the fact that they have been split by exploiting the precomputed coloring. Since we cannot precompute this coloring anymore, we now need to be able to handle paths of arbitrary length (still at least ℓ). Observe that if a path P has length at most $3\ell + 4$, a coloring in P can be computed in constant time, and hence the original algorithm can be used. Hence, in the following, we assume the path to be of length at least $3\ell + 4$. We now show how to handle a path P in compress layer i , that is, all nodes of P are in V_i^C .

Consider the two nodes at distance exactly $\ell + 1$ from an endpoint of P . We split P into three subpaths by promoting these two nodes to $V_{i+1,1}^R$ (that is, the next layer). We call (according to some arbitrary ordering) the first and last promoted node s_1 and s_2 , the first and last subpath P_1 and P_2 , and the middle path P_m . Observe that P_1 and P_2 have length exactly ℓ , and P_m has length at least ℓ . We use the function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ to assign label-sets to the edges connecting the endpoints of P_1 and P_2 to their higher-layer neighbors (that include s_1 and s_2).

What remains to be done is assigning labels to the edges of P_m , and this must be done in constant time even if P_m is of superconstant length. On a high-level, we have discussed why this is sufficient in order to obtain an algorithm with $O(1)$ deterministic node-averaged complexity, and this is also shown more formally in [BBK⁺23a, Lemma 40, arXiv version].

We define a new LCL problem Π' , as a function of $\Pi = (\Sigma_{\text{in}}, \Sigma_{\text{out}}, C_W, C_B)$, $f_{\Pi, \infty}$, a set of label-sets \mathcal{C} , and the original maximum degree Δ , that captures exactly what we need (that is, to assign labels to the edges of P_m).

Definition 77 (Compress Problem Π'). We define an LCL problem Π' (not in the black-white formalism) that has checkability-radius $O(\ell)$, where inputs are provided to nodes, and outputs are on edges. The problem Π' is defined on paths, that is, it is assumed that all nodes have degree at most 2. If the path is shorter than ℓ (recall that $\ell = O(1)$), then the problem Π' is defined such that any output is allowed. Hence, in the following we assume that the path has length at least ℓ . The problem $\Pi' = (\Sigma'_{\text{in}}, \Sigma'_{\text{out}}, C')$ is defined as follows. Let $\Sigma'_{\text{in}} := \bigcup_{j=0}^{\Delta-1} \mathcal{C}^j$, that is, a node receives as input a tuple of size at most $\Delta - 1$, where each element of the tuple is a label-set in \mathcal{C} . Let $\Sigma'_{\text{out}} := \Sigma_{\text{out}}$, that is, the possible outputs of Π and Π' are the same. We now define the constraint C' , by consider three possible cases.

- **Nodes of degree 2.** The constraint C' , on an arbitrary node v of degree 2, is defined as follows. If the tuple that v received as input is of size $\Delta - 1$, then v is unconstrained (any output is allowed). Let o_1, o_2 be the labels outputted by v on its incident edges, and let (L_1, \dots, L_k) be the input of v . It must hold that there exists a choice $\ell_1 \in L_1, \dots, \ell_k \in L_k$ such that the multiset $\{o_1, o_2\} \cup \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k\}$ is in the constraint of v of the original problem Π .
- **Nodes of degree 1.** For a node v of degree 1, the constraint C' is defined as follows. Let (L_1, \dots, L_k) be the input of v . If $k = 0$, then v is unconstrained (that is, any output is allowed). If L_1 is not in the codomain of the function g (that is defined as a function of $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ in Definition 74), then v is unconstrained. Otherwise, the constraint of v is defined in the same way as in the case of nodes of degree 2.

Before proving that a constant-time algorithm for Π' implies that we can assign labels to the edges of P_m in constant time, we report a useful property about LCLs on paths.

Observation 78 ([BBC⁺19]). Let Π be an LCL defined on paths. Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm that solves Π in $O(1)$ worst-case rounds, when given as input the size n of the path. Then, there exists a

value $n_0 = O(1)$ such that \mathcal{A} solves Π in constant time on instances of size $n \geq n_0$ when given as input n_0 instead of n .

We observe the following.

Observation 79. If Π' can be solved in worst-case $O(1)$ rounds, then the edges incident to the nodes of P_m can be labeled in worst-case $O(1)$ rounds such that the following hold.

- The constraints of Π are satisfied.
- On edges that have an assigned label-set, the output is from that set.

Proof. The claim follows directly from the definition of Π' . In fact, the path P_m is of length at least ℓ , and the edges connecting the endpoints of P_m to neighbors of higher layers have a label-set that is in the codomain of g . Under these conditions, the constraint of Π' is defined in such a way that it satisfies the requirements of the observation. Hence, by running an algorithm for Π' we obtain the required labeling. However, in the LOCAL model, it typically is assumed that, when running an algorithm, the size n of the graph is provided to the nodes, but in our case nodes do not know the size of P_m . Though, by [Observation 78](#), such a knowledge of n is not required on instances of size at least some constant n_0 . On instances smaller than n_0 we can anyways compute the size of the path in constant time. \square

We are now ready to define the additional property that we require on a function.

Definition 80 (Constant-good function). A function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ is called constant-good if its associated problem Π' has worst-case complexity $O(1)$.

Observe that, by combining [Observation 79](#) with a constant-good function, we can handle compress paths in constant time without precomputing a coloring. We exploit the following lemma.

Lemma 81 ([\[BBC⁺19\]](#)). *Given an LCL problem Π defined on paths, it is possible to decide whether it can be solved in $O(1)$ worst-case rounds.*

It is easy to modify the testing procedure to additionally check if a tested function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ is constant-good: first, run the normal testing procedure, then, if a function passes the test, additionally check, by using [Lemma 81](#), whether the problem Π' defined as a function of $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ can be solved in worst-case $O(1)$ rounds.

11.9 From a $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ Node-Averaged Algorithm to a Constant-Good Function

We now prove that, if there exists an algorithm \mathcal{A} solving Π with deterministic node-averaged complexity $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$, then there exists a function $f_{\Pi, \infty}$ that is constant-good. We start by reporting a useful lemma shown in [\[BBK⁺23a\]](#).

Lemma 82 (Lemma 60 in the arXiv version of [\[BBK⁺23a\]](#), rephrased). *Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm with deterministic node-averaged complexity $o(w^{1/(2^k-1)})$, where $w = w(n)$ is in $O(n)$. Let $\{1, \dots, n^c\}$ be the range of IDs for which the algorithm is defined, and assume that c is a large-enough constant. Moreover, let n be an integer that is at least a large-enough constant. Then, it is possible to construct a good function $f_{\Pi, k+1}$, as a function of \mathcal{A} and n , satisfying the following properties. Let $((T, v), L)$ be a pair obtained by the testing procedure by using the function $f_{\Pi, k+1}$. Then, there exists a tree T' satisfying the following properties.*

- T' contains a node v' of degree one.

- T' has at most N nodes, where $N = \Theta(w(n))$, and
- there exists a set \mathcal{X} containing $O(n^{c-4})$ disjoint sets of IDs

satisfying that, for each $X \in \mathcal{X}$, it is possible to assign IDs to the nodes of T' , such that:

- All the IDs are from X .
- There exists a set of nodes D in T' that, by running \mathcal{A} on any supertree of T' of size n , they do not see outside T' .
- Any labeling of T' that agrees with the outputs of the nodes of D restricts the labels on the edge incident to v' to a subset of L .

Since \mathcal{A} runs in $(\log^* n)^{o(1)} \subseteq n^{o(1)}$, we get that a good function $f_{\Pi,k}$ exists for any arbitrary k [BBK⁺23a]. By Lemma 76, this implies that a good function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ exists. In the rest of the section, we prove that some constant-good function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ exists (but not necessarily the one given by Lemma 76). Observe that we only need to prove that there exists a function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ for which its associated problem Π' has worst-case $O(1)$ complexity.

For this purpose, we first define a different LCL problem Π'' , and, by exploiting Lemma 82, we prove that Π'' has $O(1)$ worst-case complexity, by showing that we can use \mathcal{A} to solve it. We will later show that this implies that there exists a function $f_{\Pi,\infty}$ for which its associated problem Π' has worst-case $O(1)$ complexity.

Definition 83 (The Problem Π''). The problem Π'' is a problem on paths defined as follows. Let $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_h\}$ be the set of possible good functions for Π (recall that $h = O(1)$), and let Π'_i be the problem Π' defined as a function of f_i . Each node receives an input for Π'_i for each i . Each node has to output a value $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ and an output for Π'_h . If two nodes are neighbors, they are required to output the same index i . The output for Π'_h needs to satisfy the constraints of Π'_h .

Observe that the definition of Π'' does not depend on a specific function, but it solely depends on the original problem Π .

Lemma 84. *The problem Π'' has worst-case complexity $O(1)$.*

Proof. We start by showing how to use \mathcal{A} to solve Π'' . For this purpose, we show how, nodes of a path, can simulate \mathcal{A} on a virtual graph constructed as a function of their input.

Let n be the length of the path. If n is smaller than some large enough constant, we solve the problem by brute force. A solution exists because Π'' is constructed by using good functions. Let $w(n) = \sqrt{\log^* n}$. Observe that $(\log^* n)^{o(1)}$ is in $o(w(n)^{1/(2^k-1)})$ for any k , and hence we can use Lemma 82. Let $n' = c \cdot n \cdot \sqrt{\log^* n}$, for some large enough constant c . We apply Lemma 82 to construct a good function $f = f_{\Pi, k_{\max}+1}$ with parameters n' and w . Let i be the index of f in the definition of the problem Π'' (which exists since the definition of Π'' considers all the good functions). Let $P = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ be a path, where the input of node v_j at index i is $\mathcal{L} = (L_1^j, \dots, L_{d_j}^j)$. We show that we can use \mathcal{A} to solve Π'' with index i , by constructing a virtual graph where we run \mathcal{A} .

The virtual graph is obtained by connecting to each node v_j , d_j trees, one for each label-set in \mathcal{L} , as given by Lemma 82, where the node v' of each tree is identified with v_j . It is known that the complexity of an LCL problem on paths does not depend on the range of the IDs [BBC⁺19], and thus, for our purpose, we assume that the IDs on the path are in the range $\{1, \dots, n^{c-5}\}$. We get that, for large enough n , there exists an injective function from the IDs on the path to $\{1, \dots, O(n^{c-4})\}$. Hence, by Lemma 82, we can label the whole virtual graph with unique IDs that

satisfy the following. By running \mathcal{A} (and telling it that there are n' nodes, which, by [Lemma 82](#), is an upper bound on the nodes of the virtual graph), we obtain that, by [Lemma 82](#), for each node v_j of the path, the labeling produced by \mathcal{A} satisfies that the virtual h th edge of v_j has a label present in L_h^j . Moreover, \mathcal{A} also assigns a solution to the edges of the path. Thus, we get a solution for Π'_i , and hence a solution for Π'' .

We now prove that the deterministic node-averaged runtime is bounded by $o(\log^* n)$, and by [\[Feu17\]](#), $o(\log^* n)$ deterministic node-averaged complexity on paths implies $O(1)$ worst-case complexity. The sum of the runtimes on the virtual instance is bounded by $S' \leq n' \cdot (\log^* n')^{o(1)} = n' \cdot (\log^* n)^{o(1)}$. Let S be the sum of the running times of the nodes in the path. We obtain that the node-averaged complexity is bounded by the following.

$$\frac{1}{n}S \leq \frac{1}{n}S' \leq \frac{c \cdot \sqrt{\log^* n}}{n'}S' \leq \frac{c \cdot \sqrt{\log^* n}}{n'} \cdot n' \cdot (\log^* n)^{o(1)} \leq c \cdot (\log^* n)^{\frac{1}{2}+o(1)} \in o(\log^* n)$$

□

Note that the deterministic algorithm that we constructed for solving Π'' in $O(1)$ may solve, for different values of n , different subproblems Π'_i , which by itself is not sufficient to show that there is a problem Π'_i with deterministic worst-case complexity $O(1)$. However, we now show that, the fact that Π'' has worst-case complexity $O(1)$, implies that Π'_i has worst-case complexity $O(1)$ for some i , implying that a constant-good function exists.

Lemma 85. *There exists an i for which Π'_i has worst-case complexity $O(1)$.*

Proof. By [Observation 78](#), any large-enough instance of Π'' can be solved by running an algorithm \mathcal{A} for Π'' by providing it always the same value of n , call it n_0 .

We start by proving that, given two large enough instances I_1 and I_2 for Π'' , even of different sizes, the solution produced by \mathcal{A} in I_1 and I_2 must satisfy that all nodes, in both instances, output a solution that uses the same index i . For a contradiction, suppose that there are two different large enough instances I_1 and I_2 where nodes use different indices. Then, we can create a single instance I_3 where there is at least one node that has the same view as in I_1 within its runtime, and at least one node that has the same view as in I_2 within its runtime. Since \mathcal{A} is run by telling it that there are n_0 nodes, we get that these two nodes, in I_3 , produce the same output as in the instances I_1 and I_2 . This contradicts the correctness of the algorithm, since the constraints of Π'' require that all nodes output the same index i .

Since, for large enough instances, \mathcal{A} always solves Π'' with the same index i , and for all small enough instances we can find a solution by brute force, we get that an algorithm that solves Π'_i in $O(1)$ rounds exists. □

References

- [BBC⁺19] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Yi-Jun Chang, Dennis Olivetti, Mikaël Rabie, and Jukka Suomela. The distributed complexity of locally checkable problems on paths is decidable. In *Proc. 38th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC 2019)*, pages 262–271. ACM Press, 2019.
- [BBC⁺22] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Yi-Jun Chang, Dennis Olivetti, Jan Studený, and Jukka Suomela. Efficient classification of locally checkable problems in regular trees. In *Proc. 36th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, (DISC 2022)*, pages 8:1–8:19, 2022.

- [BBE⁺20] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Yuval Efron, Juho Hirvonen, Yannic Maus, Dennis Olivetti, and Jukka Suomela. Classification of distributed binary labeling problems. In *Proc. 34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2020)*, volume 179 of *LIPICs*, pages 17:1–17:17. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [BBF⁺22] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Manuela Fischer, Rustam Latypov, Yannic Maus, Dennis Olivetti, and Jara Uitto. Exponential speedup over locality in MPC with optimal memory. In *36th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, (DISC 2022)*, pages 9:1–9:21, 2022.
- [BBK⁺23a] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Fabian Kuhn, Dennis Olivetti, and Gustav Schmid. On the node-averaged complexity of locally checkable problems on trees. *CoRR*, abs/2308.04251, 2023.
- [BBK⁺23b] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Fabian Kuhn, Dennis Olivetti, and Gustav Schmid. On the node-averaged complexity of locally checkable problems on trees. In Rotem Oshman, editor, *37th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2023, October 10-12, 2023, L’Aquila, Italy*, volume 281 of *LIPICs*, pages 7:1–7:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [BBO⁺21] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Dennis Olivetti, Jan Studený, Jukka Suomela, and Aleksandr Tereshchenko. Locally checkable problems in rooted trees. In *Proc. 40th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC 2021)*, pages 263–272, 2021.
- [BBOS20] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Dennis Olivetti, and Jukka Suomela. How much does randomness help with locally checkable problems? In *Proc. 39th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC 2020)*, pages 299–308. ACM Press, 2020.
- [BBOS21] Alkida Balliu, Sebastian Brandt, Dennis Olivetti, and Jukka Suomela. Almost global problems in the LOCAL model. *Distributed Comput.*, 34(4):259–281, 2021.
- [BCM⁺21] Alkida Balliu, Keren Censor-Hillel, Yannic Maus, Dennis Olivetti, and Jukka Suomela. Locally checkable labelings with small messages. In *35th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2021*, pages 8:1–8:18, 2021.
- [BGKO23] Alkida Balliu, Mohsen Ghaffari, Fabian Kuhn, and Dennis Olivetti. Node and edge averaged complexities of local graph problems. *Distributed Comput.*, 36(4):451–473, 2023.
- [BHK⁺17] Sebastian Brandt, Juho Hirvonen, Janne H. Korhonen, Tuomo Lempiäinen, Patric R. J. Östergård, Christopher Purcell, Joel Rybicki, Jukka Suomela, and Przemyslaw Uznanski. LCL problems on grids. In *Proc. 36th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC 2017)*, pages 101–110, 2017.
- [BHK⁺18] Alkida Balliu, Juho Hirvonen, Janne H. Korhonen, Tuomo Lempiäinen, Dennis Olivetti, and Jukka Suomela. New classes of distributed time complexity. In *Proc. 50th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2018)*, pages 1307–1318. ACM Press, 2018.
- [BHOS19] Alkida Balliu, Juho Hirvonen, Dennis Olivetti, and Jukka Suomela. Hardness of minimal symmetry breaking in distributed computing. In *Proc. 38th ACM Symposium*

- on *Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC 2019)*, pages 369–378. ACM Press, 2019.
- [BT19] Leonid Barenboim and Yaniv Tzur. Distributed symmetry-breaking with improved vertex-averaged complexity. In *Proc. 20th Int. Conf. on Distributed Computing and Networking (ICDCN)*, pages 31–40, 2019.
- [Cha20] Yi-Jun Chang. The complexity landscape of distributed locally checkable problems on trees. In *Proc. 34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2020)*, volume 179 of *LIPICs*, pages 18:1–18:17. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [CKP19] Yi-Jun Chang, Tsvi Kopelowitz, and Seth Pettie. An exponential separation between randomized and deterministic complexity in the LOCAL model. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 48(1):122–143, 2019.
- [CP19] Yi-Jun Chang and Seth Pettie. A time hierarchy theorem for the LOCAL model. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 48(1):33–69, 2019.
- [CSS21] Yi-Jun Chang, Jan Studený, and Jukka Suomela. Distributed graph problems through an automata-theoretic lens. In *Proc. 28th International Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity (SIROCCO 2021)*, LNCS. Springer, 2021.
- [Feu17] Laurent Feuilloley. How long it takes for an ordinary node with an ordinary ID to output? In *Proc. 24th Int. Coll. on Structural Information and Communication Complexity (SIROCCO)*, volume 10641, pages 263–282, 2017.
- [GK21] Mohsen Ghaffari and Fabian Kuhn. Deterministic distributed vertex coloring: Simpler, faster, and without network decomposition. In *62nd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2021, Denver, CO, USA, February 7-10, 2022*, pages 1009–1020. IEEE, 2021.
- [GRB22] Christoph Grunau, Václav Rozhon, and Sebastian Brandt. The landscape of distributed complexities on trees and beyond. In *Proc. 41st ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC 2022)*, pages 37–47, 2022.
- [Lin92] Nathan Linial. Locality in distributed graph algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 21(1):193–201, 1992.
- [NS95] Moni Naor and Larry J. Stockmeyer. What can be computed locally? *SIAM J. Comput.*, 24(6):1259–1277, 1995.