

Model-Agnostic Approximation of Constrained Forest Problems

Corinna Coupette^{1,2,3}, Alipasha Montaseri⁴, and Christoph Lenzen⁵

¹Aalto University

²KTH Royal Institute of Technology

³Max Planck Institute for Informatics

⁴Sharif University of Technology

⁵CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security

Abstract

Constrained Forest Problems (CFPs) as introduced by Goemans and Williamson in 1995 capture a wide range of network design problems with edge subsets as solutions, such as Minimum Spanning Tree, Steiner Forest, and Point-to-Point Connection. While individual CFPs have been studied extensively in individual computational models, a unified approach to solving general CFPs in multiple computational models has been lacking. Against this background, we present the *shell-decomposition algorithm*, a *model-agnostic meta-algorithm* that efficiently computes a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation to CFPs for a broad class of forest functions.

To demonstrate the power and flexibility of this result, we instantiate the shell-decomposition algorithm for three fundamental, NP-hard CFPs (Steiner Forest, Point-to-Point Connection, and Facility Placement and Connection) in three different computational models (CONGEST, PRAM, and Multi-Pass Streaming). For example, for constant ε , we obtain the following $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximations in the CONGEST model:

- (1) For Steiner Forest specified via input components (SF-IC), where each node knows the identifier of one of k disjoint subsets of V (the input components), we achieve a deterministic $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} + D + k)$ rounds, where D is the hop diameter of the graph.
- (2) For Steiner Forest specified via symmetric connection requests (SF-SCR), where connection requests are issued to pairs of nodes $u, v \in V$, we leverage randomized equality testing to reduce the running time to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$, succeeding with high probability.
- (3) For Point-to-Point Connection, we provide a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds.
- (4) For Facility Placement and Connection, a relative of non-metric Uncapacitated Facility Location, we obtain a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds.

We further show how to replace the $\sqrt{n} + D$ term by the complexity of solving Partwise Aggregation, achieving (near-)universal optimality in any setting in which a solution to Partwise Aggregation in near-shortcut-quality time is known.

1 Introduction

The classic approach to determining the computational complexity of a task consists in deriving upper and lower bounds that are as tight as possible in a particular model of computation. On the upper-bound side, this can result in solutions that are specifically engineered toward the chosen computational model, such that the task at hand needs to be reexamined for every relevant model. Worse still, one might end up with fragile solutions that overcome only the challenges specifically represented by the model under study. At first glance, lower bounds might appear more robust in this regard, since they highlight an obstacle that *any* algorithm needs to overcome. However, many such lower bounds are shown for very specific network topologies that have never been observed in practice. This might lead to a false sense of success in having classified the complexity of a given task—although the lower bound merely indicates that the parameters used to capture the computational complexity of the task are insufficient. In brief, traditional upper and lower bounds bear two limitations: *model specificity* and *existential optimality*.

A textbook illustration of these limitations is provided by the Steiner Forest problem (SF), which generalizes the well-known Steiner Tree problem (ST). In the classic SF formulation using input components (SF-IC), we are given a weighted graph, along with disjoint subsets of nodes $V_1, \dots, V_k \subseteq V$, and the goal is to determine a minimum-weight subgraph spanning each V_i , $i \in [k]$. This general and fundamental connectivity problem has been studied in depth in the classic centralized model of computation [1, 18, 37, 41, 54], and the state of the art in the CONGEST model is due to Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60]. Their algorithms are modified and adapted variants of a well-known centralized algorithm by Agrawal et al. [1], but they are specifically tailored to the CONGEST model. One might suspect that their underlying algorithmic techniques could be transferred to other computational models, but this cannot be readily determined from their specialized solution (*model specificity*). Furthermore, even their fastest algorithm runs for $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n})$ rounds—which is known to be necessary in the worst case (*existential optimality*): The Minimum Spanning Tree (MST) problem is a special case of the Steiner Forest Problem with $k = 1$ and $V_1 = V$, to which the $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n})$ lower bound by Das Sarma et al. [27] applies. However, no real-world networks remotely similar to the lower-bound graph are known, and the technique of using *low-congestion shortcuts* has been demonstrated to overcome the \sqrt{n} barrier for MST in many settings [33, 34, 45]. These findings motivate us to revisit the Steiner Forest problem, along with a much broader class of connectivity problems, in an attempt to overcome the abovementioned limitations.

Beyond Model Specificity and Existential Optimality

To tackle the challenges of *model specificity* and *existential optimality*, two paradigms have emerged.

First, numerous works have pushed toward what we term *model agnosticism*, developing algorithms that can be readily instantiated in a wide range of computational models [e.g., 11, 17, 42, 66, 73]. The individual steps of these algorithms are either core tasks like distance computation, identifying connected components, and sorting, which are well-studied across a wide range of models, or they are easily implemented at low cost in any notable model. Hence, we call these algorithms *model-agnostic (meta-)algorithms*.¹ Naturally, model-agnostic algorithms are more robust against model variations, and by allowing us to plug in optimized model-specific subroutines for the core computational problems, they sacrifice little performance over model-specific solutions. Thus,

¹While the term *meta-algorithm* is widely used to describe algorithms that use other algorithms as building blocks (and we often drop the *meta-* for brevity), there is no established term to characterize algorithms working in many *computational models*. We propose *model-agnostic* for this purpose in analogy to its usage in machine learning, where it has come to describe algorithms that are compatible with a wide variety of machine-learning models [30, 76].

model-agnostic algorithms can be viewed as model-agnostic reductions to more basic computational tasks. Moreover, since these basic tasks can be solved by model-specific subroutines, they improve whenever progress is made on the current performance bottleneck in a given computational model.

Second, *universal optimality*, which was coined in the context of distributed computing, pushes to design topology-adaptive algorithms that are asymptotically worst-case optimal on *every* network topology, i.e., when varying input parameters *other* than the underlying communication graph [e.g., 35, 48, 77].² One might argue that this idea is no different than taking into account more parameters, such as the network diameter, the node connectivity, or any other quantity meaningful for the computational task. However, parametrizing complexity by the input graph is extremely general, subsuming a large number of parameters that one might consider, and capturing any *topology-specific obstacle* for the task at hand in a given computational model.

Our Contributions in Brief

In this work, we study a general class of connectivity problems called *Constrained Forest Problems* (CFPs), introduced by Goemans and Williamson [37], through the lenses of *model agnosticism* and *universal optimality*. Intuitively, a CFP is specified by a binary function f that indicates, for each node subset $S \subseteq V$, whether it needs to be connected to the outside world, i.e., if the output must contain an edge from S to $V \setminus S$. For example, the Steiner Forest problem can be specified by $f(S) = 1$ if and only if there exists some $i \in [k]$ such that both $V_i \cap S$ and $V_i \cap (V \setminus S)$ are non-empty, for given disjoint node subsets $V_i \subseteq V$.

Model-Agnostic Algorithm for CFPs. We devise the *shell-decomposition algorithm*, a generic approximation algorithm for CFPs that is efficient if f can be evaluated efficiently.

Theorem 1 (Model-Agnostic Complexity of Constrained Forest Problems). *Given $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and a graph $G = (V, E)$ with polynomially bounded edge weights $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation to a CFP with proper forest function $f: 2^V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ can (up to bookkeeping operations) be obtained at complexity $\tilde{O}((a\text{SSSP} + \text{MST} + \text{RPS} + \text{FFE})\varepsilon^{-1})$, with the terms in the sum denoting the complexities of solving (1) *aSSSP*: $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest, (2) *MST*: Minimum Spanning Tree, (3) *RPS*: Root-Path Selection, and (4) *FFE*: Forest-Function Evaluation for f .*

MST, aSSSP, and RPS (solvable via Transshipment) are well-studied in many models of computation. In contrast, while f must satisfy certain constraints (see Section 2), it can still be (ab)used to force evaluating an arbitrarily hard function g on the entire input.³ Thus, Theorem 1 can be viewed as confining the hardness of the task arising from the choice of f to $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1} \log n)$ iterations of evaluating $f(C)$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is a set of disjoint connected components.

To illustrate the power of our result, we apply our machinery in three models of computation—CONGEST, Parallel Random-Access Machine (PRAM), and Multi-Pass Streaming (MPS)—to three NP-hard CFPs: (1) *Steiner Forest (SF)*; (2) *Point-to-Point Connection (PPC)*, i.e., given $X, Y \subset V$ of equal cardinality, finding a lightest set of edges that balances the number of nodes from X and Y in each induced connected component; and (3) *Facility Placement and Connection (FPC)*, i.e., minimizing the cost of opening facilities at some nodes and connecting a set of clients $C \subseteq V$ to them. Table 1 summarizes our results in CONGEST; for all problems, our PRAM algorithms require $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}m)$ work and $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ depth, and our MPS algorithms need $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ passes and $\tilde{O}(n)$ memory.

²Note that *instance optimality*, which requires that an algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -competitive with any other always-correct algorithm on each instance, including the best algorithm for the specific instance, is often unachievable [48].

³For input graph $G = (V, E)$ with uniform edge weights and any function g , choosing an arbitrary node $v \in V$ and setting $f(S) = 1$ if and only if (i) $S = \{v\}$ or $S = V \setminus \{v\}$, and (ii) $g(G) = 1$ results in a proper forest function f .

Table 1: Overview of CONGEST results for $\varepsilon \in \Theta(1)$ derived from our algorithm. Deterministic and randomized approximations are marked with D resp. R. Here, s is the shortest-path diameter, t is the number of terminals, k is the number of SF input components, Q is the shortcut quality of the input graph, and $T^{PA} \in \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$, $T^{PA} \geq Q$, is the running time of Partwise Aggregation. The $n^{o(1)}$ factors can be removed conditionally on the existence of certain cycle-cover algorithms [73].

Problem	LB		Previous Work		Ref.	Our Work	
		Ref.	APX	Complexity		APX	Complexity
SF(-IC)	$\tilde{\Omega}(Q)$	[48]	$(2 + \varepsilon)$ D	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(sk + \sqrt{\min\{st, n\}})$	[60]	$(2 + \varepsilon)$ D	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\min\{T^{PA}n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\} + k)$
PPC	$\tilde{\Omega}(Q)$	[48]	$\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ R	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\min\{s, \sqrt{n}\} + D + k)$		$(2 + \varepsilon)$ D	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\min\{T^{PA}n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\})$
FPC	$\tilde{\Omega}(Q)$	[48]		—		$(2 + \varepsilon)$ D	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\min\{T^{PA}n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\})$

Table 2: Overview of our CONGEST results for the four input variants of SF, with $\varepsilon \in \Theta(1)$ and the notation of Table 1. Again, the $n^{o(1)}$ stems from the need for better cycle-cover algorithms.

Problem	Input	LB	APX	Complexity
SF-IC	Component identifiers $\lambda: V \rightarrow [k] \cup \{\perp\}$; node v knows λ_v	$\tilde{\Omega}(Q + k)$ R	$(2 + \varepsilon)$ D	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\min\{T^{PA}n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\} + k)$
SF-CIC	As in SF-IC, but node v knows λ_v and $ \{u \in V \mid \lambda_u = \lambda_v\} $	$\tilde{\Omega}(Q + k)$ D	$(2 + \varepsilon)$ R	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{2/3} + D)$
SF-CR	Each node v is given $\mathcal{R}_v \subseteq V \setminus \{v\}$	$\tilde{\Omega}(Q + t)$ R	$(2 + \varepsilon)$ D	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\min\{T^{PA}n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\} + t)$
SF-SCR	$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$; node v knows $\mathcal{R}_v = \{u \in V \mid \{u, v\} \in \mathcal{R}\}$	$\tilde{\Omega}(Q + t)$ D	$(2 + \varepsilon)$ R	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\min\{T^{PA}n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\})$

Approaching Universal Optimality. In our upper bounds for CONGEST, $\sqrt{n} + D$ can largely be replaced by $T^{PA}n^{o(1)}$, where T^{PA} is the running time of an algorithm performing Partwise Aggregation [46]. Due to the respective hardness results [48], this implies that the running times of our solutions to PPC and FPC are universally optimal up to a factor of $n^{o(1)}$.

For SF-IC, this is true up to the additive term of k , the number of input components that need to be connected. Here, Partwise Aggregation is insufficient: Evaluating f requires us to determine, for each set V_i , if it is contained in a single connected component induced by the set of edges that have been selected into the current (partial) solution, but the V_i may not induce connected components in G . Existential lower bounds demonstrate that this obstacle is unavoidable in general [60]. We propose a new graph parameter, the p -weave quality $W(p)$, and the corresponding task of *Disjoint Aggregation on p parts* (DA(p)), i.e., to perform an aggregation on each set in a given partition of V into p parts. The additive k in the running time of our SF algorithm for CONGEST then is replaced by $T^{DA(k)}$, the running time of disjoint aggregation on k parts.

Last but not least, an orthogonal consideration yields surprising results, summarized in Table 2. For the SF problem, the input representation drives the problem complexity. It is known that if to encode connectivity requirements, nodes are given the identifiers of other nodes they must connect to in the output (SF-CR), an existential lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(t)$ applies [60], where t is the number of *terminals*, i.e., nodes that need to be connected to some other node. In our corresponding upper bound, the additive k then becomes an additive t , again resulting in existential but not universal optimality. Interestingly, this picture is turned upside down when inputs are *symmetric* in the following sense: If $u \in V$ knows that it must connect to $v \in V$ by the input, then also v knows that it must connect to u (SF-SCR). In this setting, we can exploit symmetry to efficiently evaluate f using randomized equality testing. This leads to an algorithm running in $\varepsilon^{-3}T^{PA}n^{o(1)}$ rounds,

which is close to universal optimality, provided that an efficient partwise-aggregation routine is available. Similarly, we observe that the $\tilde{\Omega}(k)$ bound can be circumvented if nodes receive not only the identifier of their input component V_i , but also the size $|V_i|$ of this input component (SF-CIC). We then obtain a randomized algorithm running in $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}(\sqrt{n} + D) + \varepsilon^{-1}n^{2/3})$ time.

We note that a simple adaptation of the lower-bound construction from Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60] shows the same hardness (i.e., $\tilde{\Omega}(t)$ for SF-SCR and $\tilde{\Omega}(k)$ for SF-CIC, respectively) for *deterministic* algorithms, based on a communication-complexity reduction from 2-player equality testing. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first natural example of a provably large gap between the randomized and deterministic complexity in the CONGEST model for a *global* problem.

Structure. Having introduced our main definitions in Section 2, we provide a technical overview of our results in Section 3. To conclude the main text, we discuss open questions in Section 4. All proofs, model-specific topics, and further related work are deferred to our comprehensive Appendix.

2 Preliminaries

To begin, we introduce our basic notation and the class of problems we are interested in.

Basic Notation (Table 3). For a set S , we denote its cardinality by $|S|$, its power set by $2^S = \{X \mid X \subseteq S\}$, and the set of its k -element subsets by $\binom{S}{k}$. We extend functions $f: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to subsets $X \subset S$ in the natural way by setting $f(X) = \sum_{x \in X} f(x)$, and write the sets of positive and nonnegative integers no greater than k as $[k] = \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid i \leq k\}$ resp. $[k]_0 = \{i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid i \leq k\}$.

We consider weighted graphs $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$ nodes, $m = |E|$ edges, and edge weights (*edge costs*) $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ polynomially bounded in n .⁴ Each node is equipped with a unique identifier of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bits, which is also used break ties. An ℓ -hop *path* from $u \in V$ to $v \in V$, denoted $p(u, v)$, is a sequence of distinct edges (e_1, \dots, e_ℓ) arising from a sequence of distinct nodes $(v_1, \dots, v_{\ell+1})$ such that $e_i = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E$ for $i \in [\ell]$, $v_1 = u$, and $v_{\ell+1} = v$. The (unweighted) *hop distance* between u and v is the smallest number of hops needed to go from u to v , i.e., $h(u, v) = \min\{i \mid \exists p(u, v) \text{ with } |p(u, v)| = i\}$, and the *hop diameter* of G is $D = \max\{h(u, v) \mid \{u, v\} \in \binom{V}{2}\}$. The (weighted) *shortest-path distance* between u and v is $d(u, v) = \min\{i \mid \exists p(u, v) \text{ with } c(p(u, v)) = i\}$. A *shortest path* between u and v , denoted $P(u, v)$, is a path from u to v of length $d(u, v)$. The *shortest-path diameter* s of G is the maximum over all $\{u, v\} \in \binom{V}{2}$ of the minimum number of hops contained in a shortest path from u to v , i.e., $s = \max\{\min\{|P(u, v)| \mid \{u, v\} \in \binom{V}{2}\}\}$. Given a *cut* $(S, V \setminus S)$, the set of edges with exactly one endpoint in S is denoted as $\delta(S) = \{e \in E \mid |e \cap S| = 1\}$.

In complexity statements, we use \tilde{O} and $\tilde{\Omega}$ to suppress factors of $\log^{\mathcal{O}(1)} n$. An event occurring *with high probability* (w.h.p.) has probability at least $1 - 1/n^c$ for a freely chosen constant $c \geq 1$.

Constrained Forest Problems. We are interested in Constrained Forest Problems (CFPs) as introduced by Goemans and Williamson [37].⁵ Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and a function $f: 2^V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, a CFP asks us to solve the integer program stated as Problem 1, whose dual relaxation is provided as Problem 2.

⁴Assuming polynomially bounded edge weights allows us to encode polynomial sums of edge weights with $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bits, which means that we can encode edge weights in a single message (CONGEST) or memory word (PRAM and MPS). Zero-weight edges arise naturally when simulating contractions in the distributed setting. We can handle them by scaling all non-zero edge weights by n/ε (where w.l.o.g., $1/\varepsilon$ is polynomially bounded as well), and assigning weight 1 to all previously zero-weight edges.

⁵To simplify the technical exposition, like Goemans and Williamson [37], we disallow zero-weight edges. However, it is straightforward to extend our approach to zero-weight edges by scaling edge weights as discussed in Footnote 4.

Problem 1 (CFP Primal IP).

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \sum_{e \in E} c(e)x_e \\ \text{s.t. } & x(\delta(S)) \geq f(S) \quad \forall \emptyset \neq S \subset V \\ & x_e \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall e \in E \end{aligned}$$

Problem 2 (CFP Dual LP).

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \sum_{S \subset V} f(S)y_S \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_{S: e \in \delta(S)} y_S \leq c(e) \quad \forall e \in E \\ & y_S \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

That is, a CFP is a minimization problem whose optimal solution is a *forest* of edges from the input graph G that meets the *constraints* imposed by the *forest function* f . Like Goemans and Williamson [37], we consider CFPs with *proper* functions f , which satisfy (1) *zero*, i.e., $f(V) = 0$, (2) *symmetry*, i.e., $f(S) = f(V \setminus S)$, and (3) *disjointness* (also called *maximality* [38]), i.e., if $A \cap B = \emptyset$ for two sets A and B , then $f(A) = f(B) = 0$ implies $f(A \cup B) = 0$.⁶

For a CFP with forest function f , a node v is called a *terminal* if $f(\{v\}) = 1$, and the number of terminals $\mathcal{T} = \{\{v\} \mid v \in V, f(\{v\}) = 1\}$ for a given function f is denoted as $t = |\mathcal{T}|$.

Specific CFPs. To demonstrate the flexibility of our approach, we consider Survivable Network Design Problems (SNDPs) that originate from three different real-world challenges.

Definition 1 (Steiner Forest (SF)). *Given a partition of the terminals $\mathcal{T} = V_1 \dot{\cup} \dots \dot{\cup} V_k$, find a minimum-cost edge subset connecting the nodes in each input component. The corresponding forest function evaluates to 1 on $S \subseteq V$ if and only if there is $i \in [k]$ such that $\emptyset \neq V_i \cap S \neq V_i$. We distinguish between several input representations:*

SF-CR Terminal v is given the identifiers of other terminals as connection requests $R_v \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

SF-SCR As *SF-CR*, but connection requests are symmetric, i.e., $u \in R_v \Leftrightarrow v \in R_u$.

SF-IC Terminal $v \in V_i$ is given a unique identifier (of size $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$) for its input component.

SF-CIC As *SF-IC*, but $v \in V_i$ is also given the cardinality $|V_i|$ of its input component as input.

SF has practical relevance especially in infrastructure development [1], with MST ($\mathcal{T} = V_1 = V$) and ST ($\mathcal{T} = V_1 \subseteq V$) as special cases. It is NP-complete [55] and APX-hard [19].

Definition 2 (Point-to-Point Connection (PPC)). *Given a set of sources $X \subset V$ and a set of targets $Y \subset V$, find a minimum-cost edge subset such that in each connected component, the number of sources equals the number of targets. That is, for $S \subseteq V$, $f(S) = 1$ if and only if $|S \cap X| = |S \cap Y|$.*

PPC is motivated by challenges from circuit switching and VLSI design, and NP-complete [61].

Our last problem is Facility Placement and Connection (FPC), an NP-complete facility-location-type problem arising, e.g., in operations research. Intuitively, FPC can be stated as follows.

Definition 3 (FPC [intuitive]). *Given for each node $v \in V$ an opening cost $o_v \in \mathbb{N}$ and indication whether it is in the set of clients $C \subseteq V$, identify a subset $O \subseteq V$ of facilities to open and an edge set $F \subseteq E$ such that each client is connected to a facility by F , minimizing $\sum_{v \in O} o_v + \sum_{e \in F} c(e)$.*

To turn this task into a CFP matching our framework, we add one additional node $s \notin V$ and, for each $v \in V$, an edge $\{v, s\}$ of weight $c(\{v, s\}) = o_v$. The task then becomes to determine a (low-weight) Steiner Tree spanning $C \cup \{s\}$, i.e., the special case of SF with $k = 1$.

Definition 4 (FPC [rephrased]). *Given, for each node $v \in V$, an opening cost $o_v \in \mathbb{N}$ and an indication whether it is in the set of clients $C \subseteq V$, solve ST on $G = (V \dot{\cup} \{s\}, E \dot{\cup} \{\{v, s\} \mid v \in V\})$, with edge costs of $c(e)$ for $e \in E$ and $c(\{v, s\}) = o_v$ for $v \in V$ as well as terminals $\mathcal{T} = C \cup \{s\}$.*

⁶We also assume that f is *nontrivial*, i.e., that there exists at least one $S \subset V$ such that $f(S) = 1$.

Even in CONGEST, we can solve ordinary ST instances efficiently, regardless of the specific input representation. However, the *virtual node* s and its incident edges need to be *simulated* in the chosen model of computation. This is trivial in PRAM (simply modify the input representation in parallel) and Multi-Pass Streaming (since we use $\Omega(n \log n)$ bits of memory anyway). For CONGEST, we show that we can simulate the virtual node efficiently using Partwise Aggregation.

Partwise Aggregation and Shortcut Quality. Finally, we introduce a subroutine that we use as a black box to achieve near-universal optimality in cases where efficient solutions are known.

Definition 5 (Partwise Aggregation [33]). *For disjoint node sets $V_1, \dots, V_k \subseteq V$, suppose that V_i induces a connected subgraph. In the Partwise Aggregation (PA) problem, each $v \in V_i$ is given a unique identifier for V_i (of size $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$) and a second $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ -bit value $x(v) \in X$. For a specified associative and commutative operator $\oplus: X \times X \rightarrow X$, for each $i \in [k]$ and each $v \in V_i$, v needs to compute its output $\bigoplus_{w \in V_i} x(w)$.*

Definition 6 (Shortcut Quality). *The shortcut quality of G , denoted by Q , is the maximum over all feasible operators \oplus and partitions of V of the minimum number of rounds in which a CONGEST algorithm with knowledge of the full topology can solve Partwise Aggregation. Put differently, the algorithm may preprocess the graph and the operator, but must then compute the output within Q rounds after the nodes have been given their inputs to the PA instance.*

Haeupler et al. [48] show that $\tilde{\Omega}(Q)$ is a lower bound for MST (i.e., SF and ST with $k = 1$ and $V_1 = V$) and shortest s - t path (the special case of PPC with $|X| = |Y| = 1$)—regardless of the approximation ratio and also for randomized Las Vegas algorithms, i.e., those that guarantee a feasible output. They also prove that PA can be solved in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(Q)$ rounds in the *Supported CONGEST* model, which is CONGEST with the unweighted graph topology given as part of the input.

3 Technical Overview

In this section, we provide a high-level outline of our techniques and the technical challenges to be overcome. We also use this opportunity to discuss the most relevant related work in context.

Model-Agnostic Algorithm for Proper Constrained Forest Problems. Our shell-decomposition algorithm, depicted in Figure 3, is based on the primal-dual formulation for general CFPs given by Goemans and Williamson [37] (GW algorithm), but it can also be seen as a model-agnostic generalization of the algorithm by Agrawal et al. [1], ported to the distributed setting by Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60]. These algorithms have also been called *moat-growing* algorithms [6, 40, 60].

Intuitively, our algorithm operates as follows. We maintain connected *components* \mathcal{C} , initialized to the singletons $\mathcal{C} = \{\{v\} \mid v \in V\}$. A component $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is *active* if $f(C) = 1$. The algorithm concurrently grows balls around all *active components*, with respect to the metric induced by the then-current edge costs c' . In the growth process, two balls can touch only when at least one of their associated components is active, and only when the balls of *two active components* C, C' touch, adding edges to merge the components can make the resulting component inactive—otherwise, i.e., assuming $f(C \cup C') = f(C') = 0$, symmetry implies $f(V \setminus (C \cup C')) = 0$, disjointness $f(V \setminus C) = f((V \setminus (C \cup C')) \cup C') = 0$, and using symmetry again we get $f(C) = 0$, a contradiction.

Until the balls around two components touch, they are disjoint, witnessing that the dual problem has a solution with weight larger than the product of the current radius times the number of currently active components. Accordingly, when merging active components, we can afford to

connect the terminals by adding a shortest path between them to the primal solution, paying a cost of at most twice the radius at merge. Because each merge we perform reduces the number of active components by at least one, the ball growth always witnesses sufficient additional weight in a dual solution to pay for future merges up to an approximation factor of 2. Upon termination, i.e., when all components are inactive, the set of edges we selected constitutes a feasible solution.

The intuition sketched above already suggests that the ball-growing process allows for substantial concurrency. To achieve high efficiency across the board in various models, our shell-decomposition algorithm performs several modifications to the original GW algorithm.

- (A) *Incremental Solution-Set Construction.* We merge active components that touch *regardless* of whether this ultimately turns out to be necessary to satisfy connectivity requirements. This does not impact the approximation guarantee, which was implicit already in the contribution by Agrawal et al. [1] and is now made explicit in our reformulation of the framework of Goemans and Williamson [37]. As a result, we need to determine if f imposes further connectivity requirements only as often as we iterate through the loop in Figure 3.
- (B) *Approximate Distance Computations.* At the cost of a factor of $1 + \varepsilon$ in the approximation ratio, we replace exact distance computations with $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate distance computations. The challenge here is to ensure that we do not violate the dual constraints when charging dual variables (corresponding to cuts) based on the progress of the primal solution. This can be achieved by constructing the dual solution in the true metric space, rather than reusing the approximate distances leveraged by the primal solution. In contrast to the other modifications, this requires a comparatively involved argument, and it is the main technical novelty and contribution in this part of our work.
- (C) *Deferred Forest-Function Evaluation.* Again at the cost of a factor of $1 + \varepsilon$ in the approximation ratio, we let components grow to radii that are integer powers of $1 + \varepsilon$ before reevaluating our forest function to update their activity status. This technique was introduced by Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60] for the Steiner Forest problem specifically; we show its general correctness in the context of the GW algorithm. Using this technique, we can limit the number of loop iterations in Figure 3 to $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1} \log n)$ (assuming polynomially bounded edge weights).

We prove that our model-agnostic shell-decomposition algorithm combines these changes while maintaining an approximation ratio of $2 + \varepsilon$, which is detailed in Appendix B.

Leveraging the modifications specified in Items (A) to (C), to derive concrete algorithms in specific models of computation, what remains is to implement the individual steps in Figure 3. Up to simple book-keeping operations, this entails four main tasks (drawn as colored boxes in Figure 3):

1. *(Approximate) Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest (aSSSP).* This is essentially computing a single-source shortest-path tree with a virtual source node, so we can plug in state-of-the-art algorithms for each model of interest [9, 73].
2. *Minimum Spanning Tree (MST).* This is another well-studied task for which near-optimal solutions are known in all prominent models [29, 48, 71, 72].
3. *Root-Path Selection (RPS).* Here, we are given a forest rooted at sources (where each node knows its parent in its tree and its closest source), along with a number of marked nodes. Our goal is to select the edges on the path from each marked node to its closest source. This problem can be straightforwardly addressed by solving a much more general flow problem: *(Approximate) Transshipment*, in which flow demands are to be satisfied at minimum cost. Again, we can plug in state-of-the-art algorithms for each model of interest [9, 73]. Note that in our case, the solution is restricted to containing the edges of a predetermined forest, such that the solution is unique, edge weights play no role, and the challenge becomes to determine the feasible flow quickly.
4. *Forest-Function Evaluation (FFE).* The remaining subtask is to assess if $f(C) = 1$, for each

component $C \subset V$ in a set of disjoint, internally connected components \mathcal{C} —i.e., to determine which of the components still need to be connected to others. This is the only step that depends on f , requiring an implementation of f matching the given model of computation. Note that f is an arbitrary proper function, so evaluating it can be arbitrarily hard. Thus, our algorithm confines the hardness of the task that comes from the choice of f to $O(\varepsilon^{-1} \log n)$ evaluations of $f(C)$ for disjoint connected components $C \in \mathcal{C}$ (cf. Item (A)). In contrast, the other three subtasks can be solved by state-of-the-art algorithms from the literature in a black-box fashion.

To illustrate the power of our result, we apply our machinery in three models of computation—CONGEST, Parallel Random-Access Machine (PRAM), and Multi-Pass Streaming (MPS)—to three Constrained Forest Problems. Our results follow from Theorem 1 with (1) the referenced results on aSSSP, MST, and RPS, (2) model- and problem-specific subroutines for FFE, and (3) model-specific subroutines for book-keeping operations.

In Table 1, we highlight the improvements over the state of the art that we achieve for our example problems by instantiating our shell-decomposition algorithm in the CONGEST model.

- (I) *Steiner Forest (SF)*. From $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-1}(sk + \sqrt{\min\{st, n\}}))$ time⁷ for a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation and $\tilde{O}(\min\{s, \sqrt{n}\} + D + k)$ time for an $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ -approximation to SF-IC obtained by Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60] to $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximations in time (1) $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}(\sqrt{n} + D) + \varepsilon^{-1}k)$ for SF-IC, (2) $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}(\sqrt{n} + D))$ for SF-SCR, and (3) $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}(\sqrt{n} + D) + \varepsilon^{-1} \min\{n^{2/3}, k\})$ for SF-CIC. For SF-CR, we incur the same running-time overhead of $\mathcal{O}(t)$ as Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60], matching the corresponding existential lower bound they showed.
 - (II) *Point-to-Point Connection (PPC)*. We are not aware of prior work providing CONGEST algorithms for the PPC problem. Here, we obtain a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}(\sqrt{n} + D))$ time.
 - (III) *Facility Placement and Connection (FPC)*. We do not know of any existing CONGEST algorithms for the FPC problem, and we realize a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}(\sqrt{n} + D))$ time.
- We also derive algorithms for SF, PPC, and FPC in the PRAM and Multi-Pass Streaming models, taking $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}m)$ work and $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ depth in the PRAM model, as well as $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ passes and $\tilde{O}(n)$ space in the Multi-Pass Streaming model. To the best of our knowledge, these algorithms are either the first ones to perform these tasks in their respective models or they cover more general classes of instances than the state of the art. Notably, we obtain our diverse results with relative ease once the analysis of our model-agnostic shell-decomposition algorithm is in place—which contrasts with the challenges of directly designing specific algorithms for specific problems in specific models.

Taking Shortcuts. In the CONGEST model, the \sqrt{n} term in the complexity is due to the fact that, in general, it is not possible to solve *Partwise Aggregation* (PA) in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ rounds. PA (see Section 2) denotes the task of performing an aggregation or broadcast operation on each subset in a partition of V that induces connected components [34]. We can leverage PA, inter alia, to determine a leader and distribute its ID, or to find and make known a heaviest outgoing edge, for each component (a.k.a. *part*) in parallel. Such operations are key to efficient MST construction, and any T^{PA} -round solution to PA lets us solve MST in $\tilde{O}(T^{PA} + D) = \tilde{O}(T^{PA})$ rounds [33, 34].

As MST computation is a CFP, it might not surprise that Partwise Aggregation can serve as a key subroutine for other CFPs in the CONGEST model as well. We show that the \sqrt{n} term in the complexity of CFPs can be replaced by T^{PA} . Since this is already known for $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest [73], Minimum Spanning Tree [33], and $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Transshipment [73] (which can be used to solve Root-Path Selection),⁸ again we need to show this for Forest-

⁷Recall that n denotes the number of nodes, k the number of input components, t the number of terminals, D the unweighted (hop) diameter, and s the shortest-path diameter. Both t and s can be up to $\Omega(n)$, regardless of k or D .

⁸The results for approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest and approximate Transshipment are conditional on the existence of fast $(\tilde{O}(1), \tilde{O}(1))$ -cycle-cover algorithms; otherwise, we incur an $n^{o(1)}$ overhead (see Table 1).

Function Evaluation only. This is straightforward for PPC and FPC, and simple algorithms evaluate the forest function for SF-IC and SF-CR in $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA} + k)$ and $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA} + t)$ rounds, respectively.

The substantial literature on *low-congestion shortcuts* provides a large array of results on solving Partwise Aggregation in time comparable to the *shortcut quality* of the input graph, i.e., the best possible running time T^{PA} for Partwise Aggregation [5, 34, 35, 43, 44, 47, 48, 73, 77]. In particular, $T^{PA} \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(D)$ if the input graph does not contain a fixed $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ -dense minor, without precomputations or further knowledge of G [34]. Examples of graphs without $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ -dense minors are planar graphs and, more generally, graphs of bounded genus. Moreover, in *Supported CONGEST* (where (V, E) is known—or rather, can be preprocessed), $T^{PA} \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(Q)$, i.e., within a polylogarithmic factor of the optimum. Due to the modular structure of our results, any future results on Partwise Aggregation and low-congestion shortcuts will automatically improve the state of the art for CFPs in CONGEST.

The Quest for Universal Optimality. In the CONGEST model, it is known that even on a *fixed* network topology, $\tilde{\Omega}(T^{PA})$ rounds are required to obtain *any* non-trivial approximation for a large class of problems. This class includes MST, a special case of SF and ST, and shortest s - t -path [48], a special case of PPC. Thus, this *universal* lower bound applies to our example tasks as well. In particular, our results on PPC and FPC have almost universally tight running times.

In contrast, the additive terms of k and t in the running times of our algorithms for SF-IC and SF-CR, respectively, are only *existentially* optimal [60]: The lower-bound graph—a double star—has shortcut quality $\mathcal{O}(1)$, but in a fully connected graph, it is trivial to evaluate f for all current components in 2 rounds. This motivates us to split Forest-Function Evaluation for Steiner Forest into two parts: (1) determining, for each input component $V_i \subseteq V$ or connection request $r \in \mathcal{R}$, respectively, whether the respective connectivity requirements are *met*, and (2) determining, for each current component $C \in \mathcal{C}$, whether it contains a terminal whose connectivity requirements are *not met*. While the second part can be solved via standard Partwise Aggregation, the first part requires aggregating information within k (or t) disjoint components that may be *internally disconnected*. We call this task *Disjoint Aggregation on p parts*, $DA(p)$, and propose the *p -weave quality* $W(p)$ as a parameter to capture its universal complexity. Using this terminology, for constant ε , our SF-IC and SF-CR algorithms take $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA}n^{\varepsilon(1)} + T^{DA(k)})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA}n^{\varepsilon(1)} + T^{DA(t)})$ rounds in the CONGEST model, respectively. We conjecture that this becomes almost universally optimal if we parametrize SF-IC and SF-CR by restricting $k \leq p$ or $t \leq p$, respectively, and obtain near-universally optimal solutions for $DA(p)$ with $T^{DA(p)} \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(W(p))$. Note that we achieve the trivial bound $T^{DA(p)} \in \mathcal{O}(D + p)$ via pipelining over a BFS tree.

As an orthogonal approach, we explore the effect of the input specification on our SF results. The assumptions that (1) pairs of terminals know that they need to be connected (SF-SCR), or (2) the size of each input component is known to its constituent terminals (SF-CIC) both are plausible, and they change the basis of the applicable existential lower bounds from 2-party *set disjointness* [60] to 2-party *equality*, as detailed in Appendix F.

Assuming SF-SCR, we show how to achieve a running time of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\min\{T^{PA}n^{\varepsilon(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\})$ using efficient randomized 2-party equality testing. We sketch a solution assuming *shared* randomness in our context—standard techniques achieve the same without shared randomness. For each terminal-request pair $\{u, v\}$, we flip a fair independent coin and denote the result by $c_{u,v} \in \{0, 1\}$. Now each component C aggregates $\sum_{u \in C} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{R}_v} c_{u,v} \bmod 2$. Observe that if $u, v \in C$ for request pair $\{u, v\}$, then for SF-SCR, it holds that $v \in \mathcal{R}_u$ and $u \in \mathcal{R}_v$. Hence, if C contains, for each request pair, either both terminals or none of the terminals, then the sum is guaranteed to be 0 modulo 2. Otherwise, fix a request pair $\{u, v\}$ with $u \in C$ and $v \in V \setminus C$. After evaluating the sum up to coin $c_{u,v}$, it is either 0 or 1, and hence, by independence of $c_{u,v}$, with probability $1/2$, the sum is 1

modulo 2. Therefore, performing the process $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ times in parallel, we can distinguish between $f(C) = 0$ and $f(C) = 1$ with high probability. This computation can be performed by a single aggregation, where the aggregation operator \oplus is given by bit-wise addition modulo 2.

Our strategy for SF-CIC is similar, but results in a much weaker bound of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{2/3} + D)$; our main point here is to demonstrate that the $\tilde{\Omega}(k)$ bound can be beaten. We distinguish three cases. (1) Components C of size at most $n^{2/3}$ are spanned by a rooted tree of size $n^{2/3}$. Here, we can aggregate the terminal counts, for all input components, within C at C 's root in $\mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ rounds to determine activity status. (2) For each input component of size at least $n^{1/3}$, we globally aggregate if there are two distinct component IDs with a terminal from that input component. This requires one aggregation for each such input component, all of which can be completed within $\mathcal{O}(n^{2/3} + D)$ rounds via a BFS tree, as there can be at most $n^{2/3}$ input components of this size. (3) For input components of size $s < n^{1/3}$, each component C of size larger than $n^{2/3}$ uses the same strategy as for SF-SCR. However, only input components of the same size can be handled in a single aggregation, as the summation is now modulo s . Hence, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{1/3})$ aggregations by at most $n^{1/3}$ components of size larger than $n^{2/3}$ are required, which again can be performed within $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{2/3} + D)$ rounds.

4 Discussion

In this work, we presented a general model-agnostic framework for the $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation of Constrained Forest Problems (CFPs) and demonstrated its utility on three NP-hard CFPs in three models of computation. We conclude with a number of open questions—beyond applying our framework to other graph problems and computational models—in increasing order of generality:

- (Q1) **Can the running time of SF-CIC in CONGEST be improved to nearly T^{PA} ?**
- (Q2) Many of our results are near-universally optimal in CONGEST, even for randomized algorithms that succeed deterministically, i.e., Las Vegas algorithms—but our algorithms for SF-SCR and SF-CIC are Monte Carlo. Due to existential lower bounds based on the communication complexity of 2-party equality, this is required to (always) achieve small running times w.h.p. **Is $\Omega(Q)$ also a lower bound for Las Vegas CONGEST algorithms?**
- (Q3) **How hard is Disjoint Aggregation, i.e., how can we characterize $T^{DA(p)}$ and $W(p)$?**
- (Q4) The FPC problem minimizes the sum of opening costs and forest costs, disregarding the (typically distance-based) *connection costs* considered in other facility-location-type problems. **Can our approach to FPC be generalized to problems including connection costs?**
- (Q5) As we reduce most of our tasks to few PA instances, in CONGEST, $T^{PA} \approx Q$ rounds are both necessary and sufficient to achieve near-universal optimality. Since PA and DA can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ work and $\mathcal{O}(\log n) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth in PRAM, PA-based algorithms also yield good solutions in PRAM. While PA and DA can be solved in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ memory and two passes in the streaming model, it is unclear if this yields optimal results (unless we insist that the output needs to be held in memory), as we are mostly limited to existential $\tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{n})$ lower bounds. **Are there $\tilde{o}(n)$ -memory streaming algorithms with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ passes? Or, better yet: Is there an analog to universal optimality in the Multi-Pass Streaming model?** Note that PA and $DA(p)$ seem inadequate as parameters here, as each part will require *some* memory for a few-pass implementation, but there may be $\Omega(n)$ parts.
- (Q6) **Does our approach generalize to Constrained Forest Problems on hypergraphs?**
- (Q7) Beyond proper functions, the primal-dual method has proven useful when working with *uncrossing* functions [38]. One of the main features of optimization problems with uncrossing functions is that they are guaranteed to feature an optimal dual solution that is *laminar*. **Can our approach be extended to uncrossing or other non-proper functions?**

Acknowledgments

Part of this work was done while C.C. was a research associate and A.M. was an intern at the Max Planck Institute for Informatics. C.C. was also supported by *Digital Futures* at KTH Royal Institute of Technology.

Appendix

In this appendix, we provide the following supplementary materials.

- A.** Tabular overview of our notation.
- B.** Derivation and verification of our model-agnostic shell-decomposition algorithm.
- C.** Results for proper forest functions in the distributed setting.
- D.** Results for proper forest functions in the parallel setting.
- E.** Results for proper forest functions in the streaming setting.
- F.** Deterministic lower bounds for Steiner Forest input specifications in CONGEST.
- G.** Deterministic Minimum-Spanning-Forest construction with Partwise Aggregation in CONGEST.
- H.** Extended discussion of related work.

A Notation

In Table 3, we summarize the main notation used in this work.

Table 3: Main notation used in this work. All notation involving nodes and edges makes implicit reference to the graph G .

Symbol	Definition	Meaning
$ S $		Cardinality of a set S
2^S	$= \{X \mid X \subseteq S\}$	Set of all subsets (i.e., <i>power set</i>) of S
$\binom{S}{k}$	$= \{X \subseteq S \mid X = k\}$	Set of k -element subsets of S
$[k], [k]_0$	$= \{i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}, i \leq k\}, \{i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}_0, i \leq k\}$	Set of nonnegative resp. positive integers no larger than k
G	$= (V, E)$	Graph with node set V and edge set E
n	$= V $	Number of nodes
m	$= E $	Number of edges
$c(e) \in \mathbb{N}$	$= \{1, 2, \dots\}$	Cost of edge e
$c(Z)$	$= \sum_{e \in Z} c(e)$	Cost of edge subset $Z \subseteq E$
$p(u, v)$	$= (e_1, \dots, e_\ell)$ s.t. $\exists (v_1, \dots, v_{\ell+1})$: $e_i = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E \forall i \in [\ell]$, $u = v_1, v = v_{\ell+1}$	ℓ -hop path between u and v (distinct nodes and distinct edges)
$h(u, v)$	$= \min\{i \mid \exists p(u, v) \text{ with } p(u, v) = i\}$	Hop (= unweighted) distance between u and v
D	$= \max\{h(u, v) \mid \{u, v\} \in \binom{V}{2}\}$	Hop diameter of G
$d(u, v)$	$= \min\{i \mid \exists p(u, v) \text{ with } c(p(u, v)) = i\}$	Shortest-path (= weighted) distance between u and v
$P(u, v)$	$= p(u, v) \text{ with } c(p(u, v)) = d(u, v)$	Shortest path between u and v
s	$= \max\{\min\{ P(u, v) \mid \{u, v\} \in \binom{V}{2}\}\}$	Shortest-path diameter of G
$\delta(S)$	$= \{e \in E \mid e \cap S = 1\}$	Set of edges with exactly one endpoint in $S \subset V$
\mathcal{T}	$= \{v \in V \mid f(\{v\}) = 1\}$	Terminals
t	$= \mathcal{T} $	Number of terminals
k		Number of input components in SF-IC

B Model-Agnostic Algorithm

In this section, we develop our *modified* centralized GW algorithm and establish the correctness of our *model-agnostic* implementation. For completeness, we state the original *centralized* GW algorithm as Algorithm 1. This algorithm yields a $(2 - 2/t)$ -approximation, as proved by Goemans and Williamson [37].

Theorem 2 (Original GW Algorithm [37]). *For a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and proper forest function f , the original GW algorithm (Algorithm 1) yields a $(2 - 2/t)$ -approximation to the optimal solution.*

B.1 Modified Centralized $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -Approximation

The original centralized GW algorithm assumes the presence of a final filtering step to eliminate unneeded edges from the solution, as well as exact distances and immediate forest-function evaluation. Since these assumptions make the algorithm hard to implement efficiently in different computational models, we modify it to work with (1) the *absence* of a final filtering step (i.e., with incremental solution-set construction), (2) $(1 + \varepsilon')$ -approximate distances, and (3) $(1 + \varepsilon'')$ -deferred forest-function evaluation. Stating the result, which we call the *shell-decomposition algorithm*, as Algorithm 2, and illustrating its basic operations in Figure 1, we now prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *For a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and proper function f , the modified GW algorithm with incremental solution-set construction, $(1 + \varepsilon')$ -approximate distance computations, and $(1 + \varepsilon'')$ -deferred forest-function evaluation (Algorithm 2) yields a $(2 - 2/t)(1 + \varepsilon')(1 + \varepsilon'')^2$ -approximation to the optimal solution, i.e., a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for $\varepsilon', \varepsilon'' \leq \varepsilon/4 \leq 1/4$.*




Figure 1: Operation of our shell-decomposition algorithm (Algorithm 2) on an s - t -shortest-path instance seeking to connect the red nodes, starting with $r_0 = 1/2$ (cf. Line 7), and working over phases 0, 1, and 2. Panels are labeled with their phase number and the illustrated step of Algorithm 2. Nodes absorbed by the SSSP forest are drawn in orange, edge-cost reduction is indicated in purple, edges selected into the SSSP forest are marked in green, and edges selected into the solution are marked in black. Distance approximations and deferred forest-function evaluation are not shown.

Algorithm 1: GW algorithm for $(2 - 2/t)$ -Approximation of Constrained Forest Problems [37].

Input: An undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and a proper function f
Output: A forest F and a value LB

- 1 $F' \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2 $LB \leftarrow 0$ // Implicitly set $y_S \leftarrow 0$ for all $S \subset V$
- 3 $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \{\{v\} \mid v \in V\}$
- 4 **foreach** $v \in V$ **do**
- 5 | $r(v) \leftarrow 0$
- 6 **while** $\exists C \in \mathcal{C} : f(C) = 1$ **do**
- 7 | $E_C \leftarrow \{\{i, j\} \in E \mid i \in C_i \in \mathcal{C}, j \in C_j \in \mathcal{C}, C_i \neq C_j, f(C_i) + f(C_j) > 0\}$
- 8 | $\eta, e \leftarrow \min_{e=\{i,j\} \in E_C} \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \frac{c'(e)}{f(C_i) + f(C_j)} \mid c'(e) = c(e) - r(i) - r(j) \right\}$
- 9 | $F' \leftarrow F' \cup \{e\}$
- 10 | **foreach** $v \in C_r \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
- 11 | | $r(v) \leftarrow r(v) + \eta \cdot f(C_r)$
- 12 | $LB \leftarrow LB + \eta \cdot \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} f(C)$ // Implicitly set $y_C \leftarrow y_C + \eta \cdot f(C) \forall C \in \mathcal{C}$
- 13 | $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow (\mathcal{C} \cup \{C_i \cup C_j\}) \setminus \{C_i, C_j\}$
- 14 $F \leftarrow \{e \in F' \mid f(N) = 1 \text{ for some connected component } N \text{ of } (V, F' \setminus \{e\})\}$
- 15 **return** F, LB

Algorithm 2: Shell-Decomposition Algorithm for $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -Approximation of Constrained Forest Problems.

Input: A graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and a proper forest function f
Output: A forest F and a value LB

- 1 $F \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2 $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \{\{v\} \mid v \in V\}$
- 3 $\mathcal{T}^1 \leftarrow \{v \mid f(\{v\}) = 1\}$ // At the beginning, $|\mathcal{T}^1| = t$
- 4 **foreach** $e \in E$ **do**
- 5 | $c'(e) \leftarrow c(e)$ // c' keeps track of *reduced* costs
- 6 $LB \leftarrow 0$
- 7 $r \leftarrow \frac{\varepsilon''}{4}$ // For upper bound (edge selection), we could start with any $r \leq 1/2$
- 8 **while** $\exists C \in \mathcal{C} : f(C) = 1$ **do**
- 9 | $U \leftarrow$ Union of $(1 + \varepsilon')$ -approximate balls of radius r around nodes in \mathcal{T}^1 under edge costs c'^9
- 10 | $F' \leftarrow$ $(1 + \varepsilon')$ -approximate SSSP forest for edge cost c' with set source \mathcal{T}^1 , truncated to U
- 11 | **foreach** $e \in E$ **do**
- 12 | | $c'(e) \leftarrow \max\{0, c'(e) - c_U(e)\}$ // $c_U(e) = \sum_{v \in e} \max\{r - d_{F'}(\mathcal{T}^1, v), 0\}$
- 13 | $C_U \leftarrow$ Connected components of (V, F') containing a (unique) $\tau \in \mathcal{T}^1$
- 14 | $M \leftarrow \{\{u, v\} \in E \mid u \in C_u \in \mathcal{C}_U, v \in C_v \in \mathcal{C}_U, C_u \neq C_v, c'(\{u, v\}) = 0\}$ // Merge candidates
- 15 | $A \leftarrow$ Arbitrary subset of M such that $F' \cup A$ is a forest spanning $(V, F' \cup M)$
- 16 | $F \leftarrow F \cup A \cup \bigcup_{v \in e \in A} \{p_v \mid p_v \text{ is the (unique) path in } F' \text{ from } v \text{ to some } \tau \in \mathcal{T}^1\}$ // Merge
- 17 | $E \leftarrow (E \setminus \{e \in E \mid c'(e) = 0\}) \cup F' \cup A$ // Remove unneeded edges contained in U
- 18 | $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow$ Connected components of (V, F) // Update connected components
- 19 | $\mathcal{T}^1 \leftarrow \{\min\{v \in C \mid f(\{v\}) = 1\} \mid f(C) = 1, C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ // Update active terminals
- 20 | $LB \leftarrow LB + (1 + \varepsilon')^{-1} r |\mathcal{T}^1|$
- 21 | $r \leftarrow (1 + \varepsilon'')r$ // Update ball radius
- 22 **return** F, LB

⁹ U as used in Line 9 contains all parts of edges in a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SSSP forest that lie at distance at most r from their respective roots. Note that U can also contain *parts of* edges, whereas F' (Line 10), a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SSSP forest truncated to U , only contains full edges.

In the following, denote by $i = 0, 1, \dots$ the iterations of the while loop in Algorithm 2, calling each iteration a *merge phase*, and for each phase

- by $r_i := (1 + \varepsilon'')^i \cdot \frac{\varepsilon''}{4}$ the radius r at the *beginning* of phase i (with $r_{-1} := (1 + \varepsilon'')^{-1} \cdot \frac{\varepsilon''}{4}$),
- by $U_i, c'_i, F_i, F'_i, A_i, E_i$, and \mathcal{T}_i^1 the values of the respective variables at the *end* of phase i , and
- by $a_i := |\mathcal{T}_i^1|$ the number of active components at the *end* of the phase i (with $a_{-1} := t$).

To prepare our proof of Theorem 3, we first make a number of basic observations that can be readily verified from the pseudocode of Algorithm 2.

Lemma 1. *For all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that Algorithm 2 does not terminate at the end of phase i , we have*

- (i) $r_i = (1 + \varepsilon'')r_{i-1}$,
- (ii) $c'_{i+1}(e) \leq c'_i(e) \leq c(e)$ for each $e \in E_i$,
- (iii) U_i is spanned by $F'_i \cup A_i$,
- (iv) $U_i \subseteq U_{i+1}$,
- (v) $F'_i \cup A_i \subseteq F'_{i+1}$,
- (vi) $F_i \subseteq F_{i+1}$,
- (vii) $F_i \cup F'_i = F'_i \cup A'_i$ and
- (viii) (V, E_i) is connected and the weighted diameter with respect to reduced costs c' is decreasing.

Proof. The first and the second statement hold by construction due to Lines 21 and 12, respectively. For the third statement, observe that F'_i connects each node in U_i to some node in \mathcal{T}_i^1 , and the set M_i includes all edges that are both contained in U_i (i.e., whose reduced cost has become 0) and connect different connectivity components with respect to F'_i of U_i . Thus, the choice of A_i ensures that U_i is spanned by $F'_i \cup A_i$. This readily implies the fourth statement, since $F'_i \cup A_i \subseteq E_i$, as well as the fifth, since all other edges e of reduced cost $c'(e) = 0$ are removed to obtain E_i , forcing any approximate SSSP solution to reselect the edges from $F'_i \cup A_i$ into F'_{i+1} . The sixth statement holds because the algorithm only adds edges to F , and the seventh statement holds by induction, using that $F_i = F_{i-1} \cup A_i \cup X$ for some set $X \subseteq F'_i$. Finally, for the eighth statement, observe that since U_i is spanned by $F'_i \cup A_i$, whose reduced cost is 0, and any edges not fully contained in U_i remain in E_i , the shortest path between any pair of nodes with respect to c' only becomes shorter: For any edge contained in U_i , there is now a path of reduced weight 0 between its endpoints, while any edge e with reduced cost $c'_i(e) > 0$ is still present and retains at most its original cost $c(e)$. \square

From the above initial observations, we can readily infer that Algorithm 2 always terminates, and for reasonable choices of ε' and ε'' , it does so after a small number of loop iterations.

Lemma 2. *For $\varepsilon', \varepsilon'' \in n^{-\mathcal{O}(1)}$, Algorithm 2 terminates within $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon'})$ iterations of its while loop.*

Proof. Since each of the operations within the loop terminate (assuming correct subroutines), it suffices to show the claimed bound on the number of loop iterations. To exit the while-loop, we must have $f(C) = 0$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is the set of connected components induced by our current edge set F . Recall that edge weights and hence the weighted diameter of the graph are polynomially bounded in n . As $\varepsilon'', \varepsilon' \in n^{-\mathcal{O}(1)}$, there is an $j \in \mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon''})$ for which $r_j = (1 + \varepsilon'')^j \cdot \frac{\varepsilon''}{4}$ exceeds the weighted diameter of G times $1 + \varepsilon'$. By Lemma 1 (viii), this entails that if we reach this phase, then U_j contains the entire connected graph (V, E_j) . By Lemma 1 (iii), U_j (and thus V) is spanned by $F'_j \cup A_j$. The merge operation in Line 16 hence ensures that all terminals in \mathcal{T}_{j-1}^1 are connected by F'_j . Denote by C the connectivity component of (V, F_j) containing the nodes in \mathcal{T}_{j-1}^1 . For each terminal $\tau \notin \mathcal{T}_{j-1}^1 \setminus C$, τ lies in a connected component C' of (V, F_{j-1}) satisfying that $f(C') = 0$. This entails that we can partition $V \setminus C$ into two types of sets: (i) components C' of (V, F_{j-1}) satisfying that $f(C') = 0$, and (ii) non-terminals $v \in V \setminus \mathcal{T}$, which satisfy $f(\{v\}) = 0$

by definition. By disjointness of the proper forest function f , it follows that $f(V \setminus \mathcal{C}) = 0$, and by symmetry it follows that $f(C) = 0$.

Finally, by Lemma 1 (vi), we have $F_{j-1} \subseteq F_j$. Therefore, each connectivity component C' of (V, F_j) other than C decomposes into connectivity components of (V, F_{j-1}) , satisfying that $f(C') = 0$, and non-terminals, which again by disjointness implies that $f(C') = 0$. We conclude that Algorithm 2 terminates at the latest by the end of phase $j \in \mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon''})$, concluding the proof. \square

Next, we ascertain that Algorithm 2 outputs a primal feasible solution.

Lemma 3. *The edge set F output by Algorithm 2 is primal feasible.*

Proof. When Algorithm 2 terminates, we must have exited its while-loop, implying that we have $f(C) = 0$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is the set of connected components induced by our output set F .

Consider any set $S \subseteq V$. If S non-trivially intersects a component $C \in \mathcal{C}$, i.e., $\emptyset \neq S \cap C \neq C$, then there is an edge of F in the cut defined by S , i.e., $|\delta(S) \cap F| \geq 1 \geq f(S)$. Otherwise, $S = \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}_S} C$ for some $\mathcal{C}_S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. As f satisfies disjointness and $f(C) = 0$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}_S$, it follows that $|\delta(S) \cap F| \geq 0 = f(S)$ in this case as well. Thus, we conclude that F is primal feasible. \square

To prove our approximation ratio, we also need to ensure that the value LB output by Algorithm 2 is associated with a feasible dual solution.

Lemma 4. *The value LB output by Algorithm 2 is the cost of a feasible dual solution.*

Proof. Recall that $r = r_i = (1 + \varepsilon'')^i \frac{\varepsilon''}{4}$ in phase i , and denote by j the index of the final phase. Abbreviating $\Delta_i := (1 + \varepsilon')^{-1} r_i$, we can write the value LB as

$$LB = (1 + \varepsilon')^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^j (1 + \varepsilon'')^i \frac{\varepsilon''}{4} a_i = (1 + \varepsilon')^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^j r_i a_i = \sum_{i=0}^j \Delta_i a_i.$$

Denote the cost reduction of an edge achieved in phase i as $\bar{c}_i(e) := c_{U_i}(e) = c'_{i-1}(e) - c'_i(e)$, with $c'_{-1}(e) := c(e)$, and the amount that y is increased in phase i for some set $S \subset V$ as $y_i(S)$. Now observe that to construct a feasible dual solution of value LB , it suffices to, in each phase $i \in [j]_0$, for each component C surviving phase i , increase the dual variables associated with the subsets $S \subset C$ in sum by Δ_i , while ensuring that for each $e \in E$, we maintain

$$\sum_{S: \delta(S) \ni e} y_i(S) \leq \bar{c}_i(e).$$

Since f is proper, we know that for each component C surviving phase i , there exists at least one component C' active in phase i such that $C' \subseteq C$. Therefore, to allocate Δ_i to dual variables associated with C , we can trace the construction of C from the set of components $\mathcal{C}' := \{C' \subseteq C \mid f(C') = 1, C' \text{ is a connected component of } (V, F_{i-1})\}$ (where $F_{-1} := \emptyset$) as follows. Starting with C' as it resulted from phase $i - 1$, we increase the radii of all components $C' \in \mathcal{C}'$ at rate ρ and the y -variables of $C' \in \mathcal{C}'$ at rate $\frac{\rho}{1 + \varepsilon'}$. Thus, we gradually construct U_i and reduce the costs of all edges in the affected cuts (i.e., increase $c_{U_i} = \bar{c}_i(e)$) until the first edge achieves $c'_i(e) = 0$ (or the phase ends). This happens *at the latest* when the first dual constraint in phase i becomes tight—it can happen earlier as the edge cost reductions associated with our radius increases are based on $(1 + \varepsilon')$ -approximate distances. When an edge achieves $c'_i(e) = 0$, we update F and \mathcal{C}' to ensure that both endpoints of e lie in the same component, and we iterate the process described above.

Since C survived phase i , this process does not add an edge to F that lies in the cut $(C, V \setminus C)$ until we have increased the radius by r_i . We claim that at no point in this process, \mathcal{C}' becomes




Figure 2: Illustration of our *shell-decomposition argument* on a small instance of Steiner Forest (SF-IC). Gray lines indicate original edges, black lines indicate (parts of) selected edges, black circle linings indicate active components, and node colors indicate input components. The illustrations provided by Goemans and Williamson [37] (Figs. 2–5) are stylistically similar, but our visualization clarifies the phase-wise charging argument underlying our shell-decomposition algorithm.

empty. Assuming otherwise, we would have that $C = \bigcup_{C' \in \mathcal{C}'} C'$ with $f(C') = 0$ at the respective point of the process, implying the contradiction that $f(C) = 0$ by disjointness of f . Accordingly, the total increase of y -variables that we attribute to C during phase i is at least Δ_i , as desired. Moreover, our direct coupling of the y -variable increases with edge-cost reductions further ensures that the y -variables relevant for any individual edge e increase by at most $\bar{c}_i(e)$, i.e., its cost reduction in phase i , guaranteeing feasibility.

Summing over the a_i components surviving phase i , we increase the dual variables by at least $\Delta_i a_i$ per merge phase, concluding the proof. \square

Finally, we bound the cost of F in relation to LB .

Lemma 5. *Denoting by j the phase after which Algorithm 2 terminates, it holds that*

$$c(F) \leq \left(2 - \frac{2}{t}\right) (1 + \varepsilon'')^2 \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} r_i a_i .$$

Proof. Recall that merge phase $i \geq 0$ is the phase in which $r = r_i = (1 + \varepsilon'')^i \cdot \frac{\varepsilon''}{4}$, and a_i is the number of active components *surviving* phase i . Moreover, note that all edges e added to F satisfy that $c'(e) = 0$ on termination, and that the cost reduction for each edge in phase i is at most $2r_i$, as each endpoint of the edge is contained in at most one tree of F' . Hence, the cost of each edge in F can be amortized over the phases i in which its cost is reduced by the algorithm, i.e., which it starts with $c'_{i-1}(e) > 0$, and in which it intersects U_i . Accordingly, F decomposes into a set of nested *shells* $U_i \setminus U_{i-1}$ (with $U_{-1} := \emptyset$), which the algorithm iteratively and implicitly constructs around active components. This *shell-decomposition argument* is illustrated in Figure 2.

Since in phase i , the remaining edges $F \setminus F_{i-1}$ (where $F_{-1} := \emptyset$) to be added to F form a forest with a_i active components as nodes, and the average degree of such a forest is at most $2 - 2/a_i$, we can bound the cost of the forest F output by Algorithm 2 from above as

$$c(F) \leq \sum_{i=0}^j r_i a_{i-1} \left(2 - \frac{2}{a_{i-1}}\right) \leq \left(2 - \frac{2}{t}\right) (1 + \varepsilon'') \sum_{i=0}^j r_{i-1} a_{i-1} = \left(2 - \frac{2}{t}\right) (1 + \varepsilon'') \sum_{i=-1}^{j-1} r_i a_i,$$

where $a_{-1} := t$. Since F is a feasible primal solution by Lemma 3, each terminal must be incident with at least one edge from F , and the minimum edge weight is at least 1, we have that $c(F) \geq t/2$. On the other hand, $a_{-1} r_{-1} = \frac{\varepsilon'' t}{4(1+\varepsilon'')}$, yielding that

$$c(F) \leq (1 + \varepsilon'') c(F) - \frac{\varepsilon'' t}{2} = (1 + \varepsilon'')(c(F) - 2a_{-1}r_{-1}) \leq \left(2 - \frac{2}{t}\right) (1 + \varepsilon'')^2 \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} r_i a_i. \quad \square$$

Using the above lemmas, we can now prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. Assume that Algorithm 2 terminates at the end of phase j , i.e., $a_j = 0$; by Lemma 2, such a phase exists. Observe that the value LB output by Algorithm 2 then satisfies

$$LB = (1 + \varepsilon')^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^j r_i a_i = (1 + \varepsilon')^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} r_i a_i.$$

By Lemma 3, F is a feasible primal solution. As LB is the cost of a feasible dual solution by Lemma 4, using Lemma 5, we obtain the desired approximation guarantee as

$$\frac{c(F)}{LB} \leq \frac{(2 - 2/t) (1 + \varepsilon'')^2 \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} r_i a_i}{(1 + \varepsilon')^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} r_i a_i} = \left(2 - \frac{2}{t}\right) (1 + \varepsilon') (1 + \varepsilon'')^2. \quad \square$$

B.2 Specification of our Model-Agnostic Algorithm

The task of approximating Constrained Forest Problems to within a factor of $2 + \varepsilon$ in any specific model now boils down to implementing, or more precisely simulating, Algorithm 2. Here and in what follows, we do not discuss the computation of LB , which is straightforward to add if so desired. By Lemma 2, we can divide the computation into $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon''})$ phases, where, starting at phase 0, phase i grows components by radius $r_i = (1 + \varepsilon'')^i \cdot \frac{\varepsilon''}{4}$. In our model-agnostic algorithm, each phase then consists of six main steps, as summarized in Figure 3. In each phase, we tackle six abstract problems, which correspond to the six building blocks of our algorithm.

B.2.1 Problems Used as Building Blocks

Our algorithm is composed of subroutines handling the following problems. The input and output representation are model-specific, so we do not state them here.

Problem 3 (α -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest). *Given a connected graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ and a set of sources $S \subseteq V$, compute a forest F' spanning G such that for all nodes $v \in V$, $d_{F'}(S, v) \leq \alpha d(S, v)$, where $d(S, v) = \min_{u \in S} \{d(u, v)\}$, and $d_{F'}(u, v)$ is the weighted distance between u and v in F' .*

Note that in phase i , we can confine ourselves to computing an α -approximate set-source shortest-path forest up to distance r_i (see Algorithm 2, Lines 9–10).




Figure 3: Overview of our model-agnostic shell-decomposition algorithm for approximating Constrained Forest Problems. Main tasks are colored; simple book-keeping operations are shaded in gray.

Problem 4 (Candidate-Merge Identification). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$, and a rooted forest F' with a subset of its trees marked such that each node v in a marked tree knows that its tree is marked as well as the identity of its root τ_v , identify all edges $e = \{u, v\}$ that are in distinct marked trees and satisfy $c(e) = 0$.*

Problem 5 (Minimum Spanning Tree). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$, compute the Minimum Spanning Tree of G .*

Problem 6 (Root-Path Selection). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$, a rooted forest, and a set of marked nodes $S \subseteq V$, select the forest edges connecting each marked node to its root.*

Problem 6 can be reduced to *approximate transshipment* as follows:

- (i) count the number of marked nodes in each tree;
- (ii) set the demand of each marked node to -1 and the demand of the root of each tree to the number of marked nodes in the tree;
- (iii) set edge costs to 0 for tree edges and to $+\infty$ for all other edges;
- (iv) solve the approximate transshipment problem for these demands and edge weights; and
- (v) select all edges with non-zero flow in the output.

Note that the only non-trivial step of the reduction is the computation of the demand, which boils down to a single Partwise Aggregation.

Problem 7 (Edge-Cost Reduction). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$, a radius r , and an output of Problem 3, compute, for each edge $e \in E$,*

$$c'(e) = \max \left\{ 0, c(e) - \sum_{v \in e} \max\{r - d_{F'}(S, v), 0\} \right\}.$$

Problem 8 (Forest-Function Evaluation). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a partition \mathcal{C} of the node set such that each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ is connected, and a proper forest function $f: 2^V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, evaluate $f(C)$ for each component $C \in \mathcal{C}$.*

B.2.2 Meta-Algorithm Using the Building Blocks

Initialize F , \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{T}^1 , c' , and r as in Algorithm 2. Throughout our algorithm, we maintain a set of connected components \mathcal{C} with activity statuses $f(C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$. At the beginning of phase 0, \mathcal{C} contains exactly the singleton sets corresponding to all nodes, i.e., $\mathcal{C} = \{\{v\} \mid v \in V\}$, and the active components are the terminals. Each phase i of our algorithm (i.e., one loop iteration in Figure 3, simulating one while-loop iteration of Algorithm 2) then consists of the following steps, executed for $r = (1 + \varepsilon'')^i \cdot \frac{\varepsilon'}{4}$.

- (1) *Approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest (aSSSP)*. Assign as temporary edge weight to edge $e \in E$ the reduced cost $c'(e)$ if $c'(e) > 0$ or $e \in F \cup F'$ (where $F' := \emptyset$ in phase 0). Compute a $(1 + \varepsilon')$ -approximate (r -restricted) set-source shortest-path forest F' , using the active terminals $\mathcal{T}^1 = \{\min\{v \mid v \in \mathcal{T} \cap C\} \mid C \in \mathcal{C}, f(C) = 1\}$ as sources, i.e., for each active component, \mathcal{T}^1 contains the terminal with the minimum identifier. After Step (1), for each node $v \in V \setminus \mathcal{T}^1$ we know its parent in the truncated SSSP forest, its closest source $u \in \mathcal{T}^1$ in the respective shortest-path tree (if any), and its distance $d_{F'}(u, v)$ to that source.
- (2) *Edge-Cost Reduction (ECR)*. Using the approximate r -restricted SSSP forest and the distances computed in Step (1), update the edge costs in accordance with Problem 7.¹⁰
- (3) *Candidate-Merge Identification (CMI)*. Identify the candidate merges M between adjacent trees of the aSSSP forest computed in Step (1), using that parents of nodes and reduced edge costs are known.
- (4) *Minimum Spanning Tree (MST)*. Compute a Minimum Spanning Tree T of G with the following edge weights: (i) 0 for edges in F' , i.e., the tree edges in the output of Step (1), (ii) 1 for edges in M , i.e., those determined in Step (3), and (iii) $+\infty$ (or a large value) for all other edges. Mark all selected edges of T that are also in the set M known from Step (3), i.e., the edges constituting A , and add them to F (thus *excluding* all edges with temporary weight greater than 1). For each connected component C' of the forest constituted by the selected edges of temporary weight 0 or 1 that contains a terminal $\tau \in C'$, set $\min\{v \in C' \mid f(\{v\}) = 1\}$ as the new identifier of the component C to be created from C' , making it known to all $v \in C'$.
- (5) *Root-Path Selection (RPS)*. Connect the marked edges identified in Step (4) to the roots (i.e., the node with the same identifier as the component) of the components they connect by adding the necessary edges to F .
- (6) *Forest-Function Evaluation (FFE)*. Using the new component memberships known from Step (4), update the set \mathcal{C} and evaluate $f(C)$ for each updated component $C \in \mathcal{C}$. If $f(C) = 0$ for all such components, terminate and output F . Otherwise, continue with the next loop iteration.

¹⁰We can keep the edge costs in \mathbb{N}_0 by making sure that phases end with integral values of r . Note that $\varepsilon' \geq n^{-\mathcal{O}(1)}$, or distance computations must be exact. Scale all weights by $\lceil 1/\varepsilon' \rceil$. Now rounding r up to the next integer has marginal impact on the approximation guarantee, as overgrowing by factor $(1 + \varepsilon')$ plus an additive 1 is not worse than overgrowing by factor $(1 + 2\varepsilon')$.

B.3 Correctness and Complexity of our Model-Agnostic Meta-Algorithm

Because Algorithm 2 computes a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation by Theorem 1, we can prove the correctness and approximation guarantee of our model-agnostic variant (Appendix B.2) by showing its equivalence to Algorithm 2.

Theorem 4 (Model-Agnostic Shell-Decomposition Algorithm). *For $\varepsilon, \varepsilon', \varepsilon''$ as in Theorem 3, a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and proper function f , the modular shell-decomposition algorithm described in Appendix B.2.2 yields a feasible $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation to the optimal solution.*

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on the phase i , going step by step through the algorithm given in Appendix B.2.2 and arguing why the computed objects, in particular F , match those of Algorithm 2.

We augment the induction hypothesis by the claim that at the beginning of a phase, in Algorithm 2, E contains exactly the edges of non-zero reduced cost and $F_{i-1} \cup F'_{i-1}$. The induction anchor (phase $i = -1$) is given by the identical initialization of objects. For the step to phase $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, observe first that by the induction hypothesis (in particular the additional claim), Step (1) computes the same F'_i and the same distances as Algorithm 2, and hence Step (2) yields the same c'_i . It follows that Step (3) computes the same set M of candidate merges, implying that Step (4) correctly determines A_i and adds it to F . Note that the latter step also updates component memberships and component identifiers, but does not yet evaluate whether $f(C) = 1$ for the new components. This is finally done in Step (6), such that in Step (1) of the next phase, the correct set \mathcal{T}_i^1 will be used. It remains to prove the additional claim that E_i contains exactly the edges of non-zero reduced cost and $F_{i-1} \cup F'_{i-1}$, which now is immediate from Line 17 and Lemma 1 (vii).

We conclude that both algorithms terminate at the end of the same phase j , returning the same forest $F = F_j$, which by Theorem 3 is a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation. \square

The proof of our main theorem, then, follows immediately.

Theorem 1 (Model-Agnostic Complexity of Constrained Forest Problems). *Given $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and a graph $G = (V, E)$ with polynomially bounded edge weights $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation to a CFP with proper forest function $f: 2^V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ can (up to bookkeeping operations) be obtained at complexity $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}((\text{aSSSP} + \text{MST} + \text{RPS} + \text{FFE})\varepsilon^{-1})$, with the terms in the sum denoting the complexities of solving (1) aSSSP: $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest, (2) MST: Minimum Spanning Tree, (3) RPS: Root-Path Selection, and (4) FFE: Forest-Function Evaluation for f .*

Proof. By Theorem 4, our modular shell-decomposition algorithm (Algorithm 2) delivers the desired approximation guarantee. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\varepsilon \in n^{-\mathcal{O}(1)}$, as this is enough to enforce that ε times the cost of an optimal solution is smaller than 1, i.e., a 2-approximation is guaranteed. Thus, it is sufficient to instantiate the algorithm with $\varepsilon', \varepsilon'' \in n^{-\mathcal{O}(1)}$, such that by Lemma 2, the algorithm will terminate after $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon'}) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon}) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ while-loop iterations. In each of these iterations (up to bookkeeping operations), aSSSP, MST, RPS, and FFE computations are performed exactly once, yielding the desired model-agnostic complexity. \square

C Distributed Algorithm

C.1 Computational Model

In the CONGEST($\log n$) model (CONGEST model) of distributed computing [70], the input graph G also models the topology of a distributed system. Each node initially knows its unique $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ -bit identifier, the identifiers of its neighbors, the weight of its incident edges, and its local problem-specific input. Algorithms in the CONGEST model proceed in synchronous rounds. In each round, each node may (1) perform arbitrary, finite computations based on its local information, (2) send one message of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bits to each of its neighbors (where the messages sent to different neighbors may be distinct), and (3) receive all messages sent by its neighbors. The crucial complexity measure for CONGEST algorithms is their *round complexity*, i.e., the number of *rounds* until all nodes have terminated explicitly.¹¹

As a generalization of the model, we will allow for (a constant number of) *virtual nodes*. Their incident edges are not part of the communication topology, and algorithms need to simulate the computations performed by these nodes. We require that, initially, the weights of the edges incident with virtual nodes are known to their non-virtual endpoints, while other inputs to virtual nodes and weights of edges between virtual nodes should be known globally. This addition enables us to apply our results to a wider range of tasks, e.g., Facility Placement and Connection.

Note that all tasks studied in this work require $\Omega(D)$ rounds, even if (V, E) is known to all nodes, i.e., $\Omega(D)$ is a universal lower bound. Moreover, simple standard techniques can be used to chain together subroutines without knowing when they terminate at which node in advance. For simplicity, we omit the respective book-keeping and control from the description of our algorithms.

C.2 Meta-Algorithm

Implementing our model-agnostic algorithm in the CONGEST model, we obtain the following unconditional result.

Theorem 5. *In the CONGEST model with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, a $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation to any proper Constrained Forest Problem can be obtained in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3}(\sqrt{n} + D) + \varepsilon^{-1}FFE)$ rounds, where FFE is the complexity of evaluating f in the distributed setting.*

Proof. To prove this theorem, it suffices to implement the five problem-independent building blocks of our model-agnostic algorithm (i.e., blocks (1)–(5), cf. Appendix B.2.2) with complexity $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-2}(\sqrt{n} + D))$ in the CONGEST model; the claim then follows from Theorem 1. Outside of subroutine calls, all nodes simulate the virtual nodes, i.e., they maintain their state, with the exception of not necessarily knowing the weights of their edges to non-virtual nodes. If not all nodes have the necessary information, this can be fixed in $\mathcal{O}(D)$ rounds by broadcasting the respective information globally.

1. *Distributed α -Approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest.* Rozhon et al. [73] provide a deterministic CONGEST algorithm computing a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate set-source shortest-path forest in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}((\sqrt{n} + D)\varepsilon^{-2})$ time for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, with which we can also compute an r -restricted approximate set-source shortest-path forest F' . This algorithm operates in the minor aggregation model and is capable of handling $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes.

¹¹A secondary complexity measure for CONGEST algorithms is their *message complexity*, i.e., the number of *messages* sent across edges sent before termination. For simplicity, we omit this measure in our exposition.

2. *Distributed Edge-Cost Reduction.* This problem can be solved via local computation based on knowledge from Step 1, i.e., each $v \in V$ can compute the reduced cost of its incident edges based on local information.
3. *Distributed Candidate-Merge Identification.* Each non-virtual node sends the identifier of its root to all neighbors (one round); for virtual nodes, the identifier is known to all nodes. Now it can be locally determined for each incident edge (and those with two virtual endpoints) whether it is a merge candidate.
4. *Distributed Minimum Spanning Tree.* Kutten and Peleg [59] provide a deterministic MST algorithm running in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds. It is not difficult to modify this algorithm to handle $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes. For an explicit solution based on Partwise Aggregation, see Appendix G.
5. *Distributed Root-Path Selection.* Rozhon et al. [73] provide a deterministic CONGEST algorithm for computing $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Transshipment in $\tilde{O}((\sqrt{n} + D)\varepsilon^{-2})$ time for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, i.e., $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ for $\varepsilon \in \Omega(1)$. The algorithm can handle $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes. By the reduction pointed out in Appendix B.2.1 and the fact that a single Partwise Aggregation can be carried out in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$ rounds (see, e.g., [73]), the same time bounds extend to Problem 6. \square

Furthermore, the conditional results by Rozhon et al. [73] translate into the following (partly) conditional results.

Theorem 6. *In the CONGEST model with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Constrained Forest Problems can be approximated up to a factor of $(2 + \varepsilon)$ in $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-3}T^{PA}n^{o(1)} + \varepsilon^{-1}FFE)$ rounds, where T^{PA} is the complexity of solving Partwise Aggregation and FFE is the complexity of evaluating f in the distributed setting.*

Proof. In Theorem 5, the only steps requiring more than $\tilde{O}(D) \subseteq \tilde{O}(T^{PA})$ rounds were $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path forest, Minimum Spanning Tree, and $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Transshipment (for Root-Path Selection). Rozhon et al. [73] provide deterministic algorithms for computing $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path forests and $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Transshipment in $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2}T^{PA}n^{o(1)})$ time. Furthermore, Ghaffari and Haeupler [33] give a randomized algorithm for computing a Minimum Spanning Forest (and, consequently, an MST) in $\tilde{O}(T^{PA})$ time, and we can remove the randomness from this algorithm and handle virtual nodes as detailed in Appendix G. \square

Theorem 7. *In the CONGEST model with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes, if there exists a deterministic $(\tilde{O}(1), \tilde{O}(1))$ -cycle-cover algorithm for $\tilde{O}(1)$ -diameter graphs that runs in $\tilde{O}(1)$ rounds, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Constrained Forest Problems can be approximated in $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2}T^{PA} + FFE)$ rounds.*

Proof. If a deterministic $(\tilde{O}(1), \tilde{O}(1))$ -cycle-cover algorithm for $\tilde{O}(1)$ -diameter graphs that runs in $\tilde{O}(1)$ rounds exists, the algorithms for computing $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path forests and $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Transshipment provided by Rozhon et al. [73] run in $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2}T^{PA})$ time. This suffices to shave off the $n^{o(1)}$ overhead incurred in Theorem 6. \square

Note that all algorithms used as subroutines in Theorems 5 to 7 are deterministic.

C.3 Applications

The solutions presented in the previous section work for *any* proper Constrained Forest Problem in the CONGEST model, and hence, their running time depends on the complexity of evaluating the forest function f . We now instantiate f with our concrete Constrained Forest Problems.

C.3.1 Steiner Forest

There are several ways to specify the input of a Steiner Forest instance in the distributed setting that, perhaps surprisingly, lead to different complexities.

Steiner Forest–Input Components (SF–IC). Our first SF formulation, Steiner Forest–IC, assumes that each node knows the identifier of the input component to which it belongs. This formulation is closest to the model-agnostic formulation.

Problem 9 (Steiner Forest–IC). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and component identifiers $\lambda: V \rightarrow [k] \cup \{\perp\}$, where each node v knows only its component identifier $\lambda(v)$, compute a minimum-cost edge subset $F \subseteq E$ such that for each $i \in [k]$, $\Lambda_i = \{v \in V \mid \lambda(v) = i\}$ is connected in (V, F) .*

With this input specification, we incur an overhead of k , which is existentially optimal [60].

Lemma 6 (Distributed Complexity of Steiner Forest–IC). *In the CONGEST model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Steiner Forest–IC can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3} \min\{T^{PA} n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\} + \varepsilon^{-1} k)$ rounds deterministically, where k is the number of input components. This holds also in the presence of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes.*

Proof. We propose an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA} + k)$ -round algorithm performing Forest-Function Evaluation for SF–IC in the CONGEST model. Our solution consists of two main steps.

- (1) Construct a global breadth-first-search (BFS) tree rooted at an arbitrary node $r \in V$. We identify active components through one convergecast phase toward the root, followed by one broadcast phase from the root. In the convergecast phase, for each input component $i \in [k]$, each node $v \in V$ sends
 - (a) (i, \perp) if there is no node u with $\lambda(u) = i$ in its subtree,
 - (b) (i, C) if each u with $\lambda(u) = i$ in its subtree lies in the same component C and there is at least one such node, and
 - (c) (i, \times) if there are two nodes u, u' in its subtree with $\lambda(u) = \lambda(u') = i$, but $C_u \neq C_{u'}$,

up the BFS tree. Note that each node can determine its message to its parent from those of its children and its local input. In the subsequent broadcast phase, r sends messages down the tree, informing all nodes about which labels are contained in at least two different components. Since there are k different labels and the BFS tree has depth at most D , the whole process can be completed in $\mathcal{O}(D + k)$ time using standard pipelining techniques.

- (2) Leveraging the information gathered in the previous step, locally mark all nodes whose label is contained in at least two different components. Now perform Partwise Aggregation for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ to identify the components containing at least one marked node, and report these components as active. This can be done in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$ time.

Recall that the state of virtual nodes is globally known, so their contribution to the output of the routine can be locally included into the computation by each node. The result of the computation for the virtual nodes is broadcast over the BFS tree in $\mathcal{O}(D)$ rounds.

Plugging this algorithm into Theorems 5 and 6, the lemma follows. \square

Steiner Forest–Symmetric Connection Requests (SF–CR). Our second SF formulation, Steiner Forest–CR, assumes that each node knows the identifiers of the nodes to which it wants to connect. The input components, which are no longer given explicitly, are then the connected components of the graph implicitly defined by the connection requests.

Problem 10 (Steiner Forest–CR). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and a set of connection requests $\mathcal{R}_v \subseteq V \setminus \{v\}$ at each node $v \in V$, compute a minimum-cost edge subset $F \subseteq E$ such that for each $v \in V$ and $u \in \mathcal{R}_v$, u and v are connected in (V, F) .*

With this input specification, we incur an overhead of t , which follows from a reduction in [60] (Lemma 2.3); this is also shown to be existentially optimal [60]. To be self-contained and clarify that virtual nodes are not problematic, we provide a direct implementation here.

Lemma 7 (Distributed Complexity of Steiner Forest–CR). *In the CONGEST model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Steiner Forest–CR can be $(2+\varepsilon)$ -approximated deterministically in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3} \min\{T^{PA} n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\} + \varepsilon^{-1}t)$ time, where t is the number of terminals. This holds also in the presence of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes.*

Proof. We propose an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA} + t)$ -round algorithm performing Forest-Function Evaluation for SF–CR in the CONGEST model. The procedure is similar to that described in Lemma 6.

- (1) Construct a global BFS tree rooted at an arbitrary node $r \in V$. Each terminal τ then sends a message (τ, C_τ) up the BFS tree, and r disseminates this information to all nodes. This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(D + t)$ time using pipelining.
- (2) Using the information gathered in the previous step, check locally for each terminal τ if its connection requests \mathcal{R}_τ are satisfied (i.e., $C_\tau = C_v$ for all $v \in \mathcal{R}_\tau$), and locally mark all nodes with unsatisfied connection requests. Now perform Partwise Aggregation for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ to identify the components containing at least one marked node, and report these components as active. This can be done in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$ time.

Again, the state of virtual nodes is globally known and can be locally considered in determining the output of the routine by each node, and their output can be made globally known within $\mathcal{O}(D)$ rounds. Plugging this algorithm into Theorems 5 and 6, the lemma follows. \square

The ε^{-1} factor multiplied with t can be removed by first applying the reduction to SF–IC given by Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60], adapting the procedure to account for virtual nodes as above.

Steiner Forest–Symmetric Connection Requests (SF–SCR). Our third SF formulation, Steiner Forest–SCR, modifies Steiner Forest–CR to assume that the given connection requests are symmetric (i.e., if u wants to connect to v , v also wants to connect to u).

Problem 11 (Steiner Forest–SCR). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and a set of symmetric connection requests $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$, where each node v knows $\mathcal{R}_v = \{u \in V \mid \{u, v\} \in \mathcal{R}\}$, compute a minimum-cost edge subset $F \subseteq E$ such that for each $\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{R}$, u and v are connected in (V, F) .*

While this specification is subject to a deterministic existential lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(t)$, which we prove in Appendix F, randomization allows us to circumvent this lower bound, shedding the overhead of t incurred by Steiner Forest–CR.

Lemma 8 (Distributed Complexity of Steiner Forest–SCR). *In the CONGEST model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Steiner Forest–SCR can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3} \min\{T^{PA} n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\})$ by a randomized algorithm that succeeds with high probability. This holds also in the presence of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes.*

Proof. We describe an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$ -round randomized algorithm performing Forest-Function Evaluation for SF–SCR in the CONGEST model. To check if a connected component C remains active, we proceed as follows. We first describe the test assuming shared randomness and then use standard techniques to remove this restriction. For each connection request $\{u, v\}$, flip a fair independent coin and denote the result by $c_{u,v}$. C now computes $s_C = \sum_{u \in C} \sum_{v \in V} c_{u,v} \bmod 2$ via Partwise Aggregation. If the result is $0 \bmod 2$, the test is considered passed. Note that if the component is inactive, the outcome is always $0 \bmod 2$, regardless of the coin flips. If it is active, let $\{u, v\}$ be such that $u \in C$ and $v \in V \setminus C$. Thus, $c_{u,v}$ contributes exactly once to s_C . Since $c_{u,v}$ is an independent fair coin flip, regardless of the other summands, the test thus fails with probability $1/2$. By performing the above test $\mathcal{O}(\log n) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ times, with high probability, we correctly determine the activity status of a component C by checking whether it fails one of the tests. Since we can do the $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ individual tests concurrently with $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ -bit messages, the overall operation can be done with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Partwise Aggregations.

Finally, to replace shared randomness, we apply the probabilistic method to prove that sampling a small random seed and broadcasting it is sufficient.¹² To this end, we describe an instance of the test by the node identifiers involved and the graph of connection requests issued between them. There are $2^{\mathcal{O}(n \log n)} \cdot \frac{n(n-1)}{2} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(n \log n)}$ such instances. Now sample uniformly at random N strings, where each string contains, for each pair of possible identifiers, sufficiently many random bits to execute the above test. Note that, for any specific instance, given such a string, the test fails with probability $\varepsilon \in n^{-c}$ for some constant c of our choosing. Fix such an instance and observe that, by construction, the expected number of sampled strings for which the test fails is εN . By Chernoff’s bound, the probability that it fails on $2\varepsilon N$ sampled strings is $2^{-\Omega(\varepsilon N)}$. Selecting $N \in \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1} n \log n)$ and applying a union bound, we reach a non-zero probability that the test fails on *none* of the possible instances with n nodes for more than a 2ε -fraction of the sampled strings.

Using this observation, we can proceed as follows. We determine n and make it known to all nodes (within $\mathcal{O}(D)$ rounds). Then each node locally and deterministically computes the same list of $N \in \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1} n \log n)$ strings satisfying that for no possible instance on n nodes, the test fails when using them as random bit on more than a 2ε -fraction of this list. Finally, a leader (say the node with the smallest identifier) samples uniformly from this list and broadcasts its choice, encoding it with $\mathcal{O}(\log N) = \mathcal{O}(\log(n^{\mathcal{O}(1)})) = \mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bits; flooding this random seed through the network takes $\mathcal{O}(D)$ additional rounds, not affecting the asymptotic complexity.

This algorithm extends to up to $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes as before: The contribution of these nodes is locally included in the computation, and their output is broadcast to all nodes within $\mathcal{O}(D)$ rounds. The claim now follows from Theorems 5 and 6. \square

Steiner Forest–Cardinality Input Components (SF–CIC) Our fourth SF formulation, Steiner Forest–CIC, is essentially Steiner Forest–IC, but with additional information on the cardinality of each input component.

Problem 12 (Steiner Forest–CIC). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and component identifiers $\lambda: V \rightarrow [k] \cup \{\perp\}$, where each node v knows its component identifier $\lambda(v)$ and the*

¹²The approach we describe here is computationally inefficient, (ab)using that CONGEST does not impose limits on local computation. We chose it to enable a simple, self-contained presentation. A computationally efficient alternative is to use polynomial hashing with a sufficiently large prime number; see, e.g., [51, Sec. 15.1].

cardinality of its input component, compute a minimum-cost edge subset $F \subseteq E$ such that for each $i \in [k]$, $\Lambda_i = \{v \in V \mid \lambda(v) = i\}$ is connected in (V, F) .

While this specification is subject to a deterministic lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(k)$, which we prove in Appendix F, randomization allows us to circumvent this lower bound, removing the overhead of k from the running time incurred by Steiner Forest–IC.

Lemma 9 (Distributed Complexity of Steiner Forest–CIC). *In the CONGEST model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Steiner Forest–CIC can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3}(\sqrt{n} + D) + \varepsilon^{-1}n^{2/3})$ time using randomization. This holds also in the presence of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes.*

Proof. We describe an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{2/3} + D)$ -round randomized algorithm performing Forest-Function Evaluation for SF–CIC in the CONGEST model. Leveraging the nodes’ knowledge of the cardinality of their input components, as well as the fact that we can determine the cardinality of a current component C via a simple Partwise Aggregation, the algorithm essentially uses the strategy from SF–IC to handle input components of size at least $n^{1/3}$, and a strategy similar to that from SF–SCR to handle smaller input components. First, all components determine their size using partwise aggregation, where $T^{PA} \in \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n} + D)$. Then each component C of size at most $n^{2/3}$ computes, for each input component, the size of its intersection with C , using $\mathcal{O}(n^{2/3})$ rounds and pipelining internally. On the other hand, for each input-component size $s < n^{1/3}$, each component of size larger than $n^{2/3}$ tests all input components of size s concurrently using a randomized strategy, aggregating random coin flips in a manner similar to our approach in Lemma 8. To this end, again assume shared randomness and flip a fair independent coin c_λ for each input-component identifier λ . Now, each component aggregates $s_C = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{T} \cap C} c_{\lambda(v)} \bmod s$, where correctness is shown analogously to SF–SCR. This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(n^{2/3} + D)$ rounds, as we can pipeline over a global BFS tree with this congestion (at most $n^{1/3}$ input components, $n^{1/3}$ component sizes, and $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ one-bit sums, which can be sent concurrently). The shared randomness can be replaced by broadcasting a random seed of size $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$, as before. Finally, for each input component of size $s \geq n^{1/3}$, we check if there exist at least two different components $C_i \neq C_j$, each containing at least one of its terminals, by pipelining over the global BFS tree as we did for SF–IC. This takes an additional $\mathcal{O}(n^{2/3} + D)$ rounds.

This algorithm extends to up to $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes as before: The contribution of these nodes is locally included in the computation, and their output is broadcast to all nodes within $\mathcal{O}(D)$ rounds. Applying Theorem 5, the lemma follows. \square

Note that the upper bound derived in Lemma 9 is not tight, and we could improve it by selecting cutoffs more judiciously and performing tests more efficiently, at the cost of adding complexity to the presentation. Since the main point here is to highlight the gap between the deterministic and randomized complexities for the global Steiner Forest problem, we leave the details to an extended version of this paper.

C.3.2 Point-to-Point Connection

In the CONGEST model, we can evaluate the forest function for the Point-to-Point Connection problem in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$ time by, for each component, (1) computing the number of sources and targets it contains via Partwise Aggregation, and (2) locally checking whether the number of sources equals the number of targets.

Corollary 1 (Distributed Complexity of Point-to-Point Connection). *In the CONGEST model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Point-to-Point Connection can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3} \min\{T^{PA}n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\})$ time, deterministically.*

C.3.3 Facility Placement and Connection

As Facility Placement and Connection has the forest function of SF with terminals $C \cup \{s\}$, where s is the (sole) virtual node in the input graph and the input format is SF-IC, we can evaluate the forest function in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$, as shown in the proof of Lemma 6.

Corollary 2 (Distributed Complexity of FPC). *In the CONGEST model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, FPC can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3} \min\{T^{PA}n^{o(1)}, \sqrt{n} + D\})$ time, deterministically.*

D Parallel Algorithm

D.1 Computational Model

In the Parallel Random-Access Machine model (PRAM model), multiple processors share one random-access memory to jointly solve a computational problem [31]. Since all contention models for concurrent access to the same memory cell by multiple processors are equivalent up to small ((sub-)logarithmic) factors in complexity [50], we assume that there is no contention. The computation can thus be viewed as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), whose nodes represent elementary computational steps and whose edges represent dependencies. The sources of the DAG, then, represent the input. In the PRAM model, the crucial complexity measures are the total size of the DAG, called *work*, i.e., the sequential complexity of the computation, and the maximum length of a path in the DAG, called *depth*, i.e., the time to complete the computation with an unbounded number of processors executing steps at unit speed.

D.2 Meta-Algorithm

Implementing our model-agnostic algorithm in the PRAM model, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 8. *In the PRAM model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Constrained Forest Problems can be approximated up to a factor of $(2 + \varepsilon)$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3}m + \varepsilon^{-1}FFE_w)$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3} + \varepsilon^{-1}FFE_d)$ depth, where FFE_w and FFE_d are the work and depth required to evaluate f in the parallel setting, respectively.*

Proof. To prove this theorem, it suffices to implement the five problem-independent building blocks of our model-agnostic algorithm (i.e., blocks (1)–(5), cf. Appendix B.2.2) with factor ε^{-1} smaller work and depth in the PRAM model; we then apply Theorem 1.

1. *Parallel α -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest.* Rozhon et al. [73] provide a deterministic parallel algorithm computing a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate shortest-path tree on graphs with non-negative edge weights in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-2}m)$ work for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. We can use this algorithm to solve our *set-source* shortest-path problem by introducing a new node and connecting it to all terminals via edges of weight 0, thus turning the problem into a single-source shortest-path problem. Thus, we can also compute an r -restricted approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path forest F' .
2. *Parallel Edge-Cost Reduction.* Using the knowledge from Step 1, we can compute the reduced costs of all edges according in $\mathcal{O}(m)$ work and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ depth.
3. *Parallel Candidate-Merge Identification.* Using the knowledge from Steps 1 and 2, we can mark candidate edges in $\mathcal{O}(m)$ work and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ depth.

4. *Parallel Minimum Spanning Tree.* Chong et al. [20] provide a deterministic parallel algorithm computing an MST in $\mathcal{O}((n + m) \log n) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + m)$ work and $\mathcal{O}(\log n) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth.¹³
5. *Parallel Root-Path Selection.* Rozhon et al. [73] provide a deterministic PRAM algorithm computing a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate transshipment in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-2}m)$ work for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(m)$ work for $\varepsilon \in \Omega(1)$. \square

D.3 Applications

The algorithm presented in the previous section works for *any* proper Constrained Forest Problem in the PRAM model, and hence, its running time depends on the complexity of evaluating the forest function f in the parallel setting. As we analyze below, instantiating f with our concrete example problems does not incur any overhead over the problem-agnostic steps of our parallel algorithm.

D.3.1 Steiner Forest

We first observe that the other three input representations can be efficiently reduced to SF-IC. This is trivial for SF-CIC. For SF-CR, we perform an MST calculation on the graph $(\mathcal{T}, E_{\mathcal{T}})$, where $E_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the union of an arbitrary spanning tree with the connection requests, and edge weights are 1 for edges coming from connection requests and 2 for those that do not. We then remove all edges of weight 2 from the output and obtain a spanning forest of the input components, from which it is straightforward to generate the SF-IC representation using $\mathcal{O}(t)$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth.

The above graph can be constructed using $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{T} + E_{\mathcal{T}})$ work and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ depth, and the MST computation can be performed in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{T} + E_{\mathcal{T}})$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth using the algorithm by Chong et al. [20]. Note that, up to logarithmic factors, this matches the input size; it is also straightforward to show that the majority of connection requests need to be read to solve the problem with constant probability (and good approximation ratio).¹⁴

Finally, SF-SCR trivially reduces to SF-CR. With this in mind, by slight abuse of notation, in the following, we will refer to SF as a whole and tacitly assume that the input format is SF-IC.

We propose an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth parallel algorithm for performing Forest-Function Evaluation for Steiner Forest in the PRAM model. For each $i \in [k]$, denote by $t_i = |\{v \in V \mid \lambda(v) = i\}|$ the number of nodes $v \in V$ with $\lambda(v) = i$. We can compute the t_i for each $i \in [k]$ by keeping track of (i, count_i) -pairs and performing parallel merge sort, which requires $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ work (as there are at most $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ distinct labels) and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth [22].¹⁵ Using the same method and the fact that we know the current component identifier of each node from Step 3 (MST), we can also count how often each label $i \in [k]$ occurs in a component $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Note that there exist at most n nonzero (C, i, count_i) -triples. Therefore, using one step of computation by n parallel processors, we can evaluate, for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, whether there exists a label $i \in [k]$ such that $t_i \neq |\{v \in C \mid \lambda(v) = i\}| > 0$, and record the result as the new activity status of each component.

Corollary 3 (Parallel Complexity of Steiner Forest). *In the PRAM model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Steiner Forest can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3}m)$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ depth.*

¹³This is optimal up to a logarithmic factor in the work. To the best of our knowledge, all currently known work- and depth-optimal algorithms are randomized [49, 72].

¹⁴Unless we have already determined that all terminals are in the same input component, distinguishing whether there are one or more input components requires to keep reading connection requests. If the instance does not allow to cheaply connect these terminal sets that may or may not be in the same input component, figuring this out is essential for obtaining a good approximation ratio.

¹⁵As t_i remains constant for each $i \in [k]$ over the course of the algorithm, this needs to be done only once overall.

D.3.2 Point-to-Point Connection

We propose an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth algorithm for performing Forest-Function Evaluation for Point-to-Point Connection in the PRAM model. For each node $v \in V$, set $x_v = 1$ if v is a source node, $x_v = -1$ if v is a destination node, and $x_v = 0$ otherwise. In one step of computation by $\mathcal{O}(n)$ parallel processors, calculate $\sum_{v \in C} x_v$ for each component $C \in \mathcal{C}$, and report all components with a nonzero sum as active components.

Corollary 4 (Parallel Complexity of Point-to-Point Connection). *In the PRAM model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Point-to-Point Connection can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3}m)$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ depth.*

D.3.3 Facility Placement and Connection

We add the virtual node s and its edges to the input with $\mathcal{O}(n)$ work and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ depth. The result now follows from Corollary 3.

Corollary 5 (Parallel Complexity of FPC). *In the PRAM model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, FPC can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3}m)$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ depth.*

E Multi-Pass Streaming Algorithm

E.1 Computational Model

In streaming models of computation, an input graph is presented as a stream of edges, which are commonly assumed to arrive in *arbitrary* order. Algorithms are assessed by the number of *passes* they need to make over the stream and the amount of *space* they require (organized in memory words of $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bits). While streaming models differ with regard to the restrictions they impose on either measure, in this work, we consider the *Multi-Pass (semi-)Streaming model* [29], where we are allowed several passes over the stream and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ space.

E.2 Meta-Algorithm

Implementing our model-agnostic algorithm in the Multi-Pass Streaming model, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 9. *In the Multi-Pass Streaming model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Constrained Forest Problems can be approximated up to a factor of $(2 + \varepsilon)$ using $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + FFE_s)$ space and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3} + \varepsilon^{-1} FFE_p)$ passes, where FFE_s and FFE_p are the space and the number of passes required to evaluate f in the streaming setting, respectively.*

To prove this theorem, it suffices to implement the five problem-independent building blocks of our model-agnostic algorithm (i.e., blocks (1)–(5), cf. Appendix B.2.2) with factor ε^{-1} smaller number of passes in the Multi-Pass Streaming model; we then apply Theorem 1, noting that memory can be reused in each iteration. We will store the $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ -sized outputs from Steps (1), (4), (5), and (6) explicitly, while handling Steps (2) and (3) differently to avoid memory cost $\Omega(m)$.

1. *Streaming α -approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path Forest.* Becker et al. [9] provide a streaming algorithm that, given an undirected graph with non-negative edge weights, computes a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate single-source shortest-path tree using $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ space and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ passes for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. We can convert our *set-source* shortest-path problem into a single-source

shortest-path problem by introducing a new node and connecting it to all source nodes by zero-weight edges; we simulate this node and its incident edges by holding them in memory, requiring $\mathcal{O}(n)$ additional words. Moreover, we maintain F and F' in memory, also requiring $\mathcal{O}(n)$ additional words. Note that the lowest node ID (i.e., the component ID) is known for each node as an output of Step (4) from the preceding iteration (or from initialization). Thus, we can compute (and store) the desired r -restricted approximate Set-Source Shortest-Path forest F' .

2. *Streaming Edge-Cost Reduction.* To maintain $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ space, reduced costs of edges are not stored explicitly. We exploit that we store, for each node, not only whether it is in the forest, but also its distance to its root. Thus, we can infer its reduced cost from the values stored for its endpoints whenever the stream hands us an edge.
3. *Streaming Candidate-Merge Identification.* To maintain $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ space, candidate status of edges is not stored explicitly, either. Recall that, in one iteration of the meta-algorithm, an edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ is in M if and only if (i) its endpoints are in different trees of the restricted shortest paths forest, (ii) its reduced cost is 0, and (iii) it has not been deleted from E . The first condition can be checked using the root identifiers (if any) stored by u and v , respectively. We already pointed out that reduced costs are stored implicitly, enabling us to check the second condition. Regarding the third condition, recall that Algorithm 2 deletes all edges that reached reduced cost 0 in an iteration except for those in $F' \cup A$. By Lemma 1 (vii), the edges of reduced cost 0 that are not deleted are exactly those in $F \cup F'$, i.e., at the beginning of an iteration, $F \cup F'$ spans exactly the connectivity components of $(V, F' \cup A)$. By Lemma 1 (iii), this is equivalent to spanning U at the beginning of the iteration (i.e., before the Set-Source Shortest Path forest is computed). Therefore, meeting the condition that u and v lie in different trees of the restricted shortest-path forest implies the third condition, which thus does not need to be checked separately.
4. *Streaming Minimum Spanning Tree.* Feigenbaum et al. [29] provide a streaming algorithm that, given an undirected graph with non-negative edge weights, computes a Minimum Spanning Tree using $\mathcal{O}(1)$ passes and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space.
5. *Streaming Root-Path Selection.* Becker et al. [9] provide a streaming algorithm that, given an undirected graph with non-negative edge weights, computes a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate Transshipment solution using $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ space and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ passes for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ passes for $\varepsilon = \Theta(1)$.

E.3 Applications

The algorithm presented in the previous section works for *any* proper Constrained Forest Problem in the Multi-Pass Streaming model, and hence, its running time depends on the complexity of evaluating the forest function f in the streaming setting. Fortunately, evaluating f in this setting is straightforward in all our applications. For the purposes of the following analysis, recall that before Forest-Function Evaluation, for each node $v \in V$, we already know the identifier of its current component C_v from Step (4) (MST).

E.3.1 Steiner Forest

Like for PRAM, other input representations can be efficiently reduced to SF-IC, with the only non-trivial case being the reduction from SF-CR. As for PRAM, this is covered by performing an

MST computation (followed by simple computations on the memory content), which requires $\mathcal{O}(1)$ passes and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space [29]. Therefore, in the streaming model, we may w.l.o.g. assume that the input representation for SF is SF-IC.

We provide an efficient strategy to evaluate the forest function for SF-IC. For each node $v \in V$, we can learn its label $\lambda(v)$ in a single pass over the edge stream. Storing this information takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space. Without making further passes over the edge stream, we can then count $t_i = |\{v \in V \mid \lambda(v) = i\}|$ for each $i \in [k]$, as well as $|\{v \in C \mid \lambda(v) = i\}|$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and label i assigned to at least one node in C . As noted in the context of the PRAM model, there are at most n distinct labels, and at most n nonzero (C, i, count_i) triples, such that this information can be stored in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space. Using the stored information, we can now evaluate, for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, whether there exists a label $i \in [k]$ such that $t_i \neq |\{v \in C \mid \lambda(v) = i\}| > 0$, and record the result as the new activity status of each component, which again takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space.

Corollary 6 (Streaming Complexity of Steiner Forest). *In the Multi-Pass Streaming model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Steiner Forest can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ passes and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ space.*

E.3.2 Point-to-Point Connection

For each node $v \in V$, set $x_v = 1$ if v is a source node, $x_v = -1$ if v is a target node, and $x_v = 0$ otherwise. Then calculate $\sum_{v \in C} x_v$ for each component $C \in \mathcal{C}$, and report all components with a nonzero sum as active components. This takes a single pass and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ memory words.

Corollary 7 (Streaming Complexity of Point-to-Point Connection). *In the Multi-Pass Streaming model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, Point-to-Point Connection can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ passes and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ space.*

E.3.3 Facility Placement and Connection

We simulate s and its incident edges using $\mathcal{O}(n)$ memory, obtaining the following corollary of the results for SF.

Corollary 8 (Streaming Complexity of FPC). *In the Multi-Pass Streaming model, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, FPC can be $(2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximated in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\varepsilon^{-3})$ passes and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ space.*

F Deterministic Lower Bounds for Steiner Forest Input Specifications in Congest

In this section, we prove that any deterministic algorithm for the Steiner Forest problem with a finite approximation ratio in the CONGEST model has time complexity $\tilde{\Omega}(t)$ (for SF-SCR) and $\tilde{\Omega}(k)$ (for SF-CIC), leveraging ideas from the work of Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60].

Lemma 10 (Deterministic Lower Bounds for Steiner Forest Input Specifications). *In the CONGEST model, any deterministic algorithm for the Steiner Forest problem with a finite approximation ratio takes $\tilde{\Omega}(t)$ rounds if the input is specified via symmetric connection requests (SF-SCR), and $\tilde{\Omega}(k)$ rounds if the input is specified as component identifiers supported by component cardinalities (SF-CIC).*

Proof. We reduce the equality testing (ET) problem to ρ -approximate SF-SCR and ρ -approximate SF-CIC as follows. Let $A, B \subseteq [n]$ be an instance of ET. Alice, who knows A , constructs the




Figure 4: Example of the lower-bound graph used to reduce Equality Testing to Steiner Forest, for an instance with $n = 8$. Node colors indicate input components (SF-CIC) resp. connection requests (SF-SRC), and node shapes indicate which nodes are simulated by which player.

following (sub)graph, depicted in Figure 4: The nodes are the set $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$, representing each $i \in [n]$, and two additional nodes a_+ and a_- . For each $i \in A$, Alice connects node a_i to a_+ ; for each $i \notin A$, Alice connects node a_i to a_- . Formally, the edges are $E_A = \{\{a_+, a_i\} \mid i \in A\} \cup \{\{a_-, a_i\} \mid i \notin A\}$. Similarly, Bob constructs nodes $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$, representing each $i \in [n]$, and two additional nodes b_+ and b_- . For each $i \in B$, Bob connects node b_i to b_+ ; for each $i \notin B$, Bob connects node b_i to b_- . Formally, the edges are $E_B = \{\{b_+, b_i\} \mid i \in B\} \cup \{\{b_-, b_i\} \mid i \notin B\}$. The graph also contains edges $E_{AB} = \{\{a_+, b_+\}, \{a_+, b_-\}, \{a_-, b_+\}, \{a_-, b_-\}\}$. All edges have unit cost, except the edges $\{\{a_+, b_-\}, \{a_-, b_+\}\}$ which have cost $W := \rho \cdot (2n + 2) + 1$. Finally, we set the connection requests to $\mathcal{R}_{a_i} = \{b_i\}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{b_i} = \{a_i\}$ for SF-SCR, and the component identifiers to $\lambda(a_i) = \lambda(b_i) = i$ for SF-CIC, such that the size of each input component is exactly 2.

We show that if the algorithm computes a ρ -approximation to SF-SCR or SF-CIC on this graph, then we can output the answer “YES” to the original ET instance if and only if the algorithm produces an answer that does not include a heavy edge (i.e., $\{a_+, b_-\}$ or $\{a_-, b_+\}$). If $A = B$, then all the requests can be satisfied by selecting the edges $E_A \cup E_B \cup \{\{a_+, b_+\}, \{a_-, b_-\}\}$. If $A \neq B$, then any solution must contain at least one heavy edge (i.e., $\{a_+, b_-\}$ or $\{a_-, b_+\}$), hence it has a weight larger than $\rho \cdot (2n + 2)$.

Now, Alice and Bob can construct the graph based on their input and simulate the algorithm on this graph, i.e., Alice simulates the algorithm on nodes $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{a_+, a_-\}$, and Bob simulates the algorithm on nodes $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{b_+, b_-\}$. The only communication required between Alice and Bob are the messages that cross the edges in E_{AB} . Solving ET deterministically requires exchanging $\Omega(n)$ bits in the worst case [58]. In the CONGEST model, at most $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ bits can cross E_{AB} in each round. Thus, the running time of the algorithm must be $\Omega(n/\log n)$, which is $\tilde{\Omega}(t)$ for SF-SCR and $\tilde{\Omega}(k)$ for SF-CIC. \square

Algorithm 3: Deterministic Minimum Spanning Forest computation in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$ time.

Input: Graph $G = (V, E)$, edge costs $c: E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$
Output: Minimum Spanning Forest F

- 1 $F \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2 $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \{\{v\} \mid v \in V\}$
- 3 **foreach** $i \in [\lceil \log n \rceil]$ **do**
- 4 $F' \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 5 **foreach** $C \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
- 6 | Determine the lightest edge leaving C and add it to F'
- 7 | Add a maximal matching $F_M \subseteq F'$ in the graph (\mathcal{C}, F') to F'
- 8 | If $C \in \mathcal{C}$ has no incident edge in F_M , it adds the edge it selected into F' to F'
- 9 | Merge components connected in F' to update \mathcal{C}
- 10 **return** F

G Deterministic Minimum-Spanning-Forest Construction with Partwise Aggregation

In this section, we give a deterministic CONGEST algorithm to compute the Minimum Spanning Forest (and, consequently, also a Minimum Spanning Tree) in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$ time, derandomizing the algorithm by Ghaffari and Haeupler [33]. Our algorithm is shown as Algorithm 3.

Lemma 11 (Deterministic MSF Computation). *In the CONGEST model, a Minimum Spanning Forest can be computed deterministically in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$ time. This holds also in the presence of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ virtual nodes.*

Proof. Consider first the special case without virtual nodes. Similar to Ghaffari and Haeupler [33], we have $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ phases in total. Denote by \mathcal{C} the set of connectivity components so far. Nodes locally store the smallest identifier of a node in their component as the component ID. Starting with each node in its own component, in each phase, each component $C \in \mathcal{C}$ computes its minimum-weight outgoing edge (breaking ties by identifiers). This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA})$ time by aggregating the minimum over the weights of outgoing edges witnessed by nodes in C . As in the algorithm, denote the set of these edges by F' . Note that F' is part of the MSF, since a lightest outgoing edge can replace a heavier outgoing edge in a spanning tree to obtain a spanning tree of smaller weight.

We now simulate the Cole-Vishkin algorithm [23] to compute a 3-coloring of (\mathcal{C}, F') in $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA} \cdot \log^* n)$ time. It suffices to send the color of the component's parent to the nodes contained in the component, which is achieved in $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA})$ rounds using Partwise Aggregation. Next, we select a maximal matching and add it to the MSF in $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA})$ time by sequentially going over the color classes. When coming to color c , all unmatched components with color c will first check for an unmatched incoming merge, and select one if there are any (breaking ties by identifiers), requiring $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA})$ rounds. For each unmatched component, we add the edge it previously selected into F' to the MSF (also in $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA})$ rounds).

Finally, it remains to determine and distribute the new component identifier within each newly formed connected component. To this end, observe that contracting the old components results in a graph in which each connected component has diameter at most 3: It contains at most one matching edge, and any selected non-matching edge has exactly one matched endpoint. Thus, we

can determine and make known the lowest node identifier within each new connected component by $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Partwise Aggregations and additional communication rounds over the newly selected edges.

Overall, each iteration takes $\mathcal{O}(T^{PA} \log^* n)$ rounds, and iterating $\lceil \log n \rceil$ times guarantees that all connected components are spanned: Each component that is not identical to a connected component of the input graph gets merged with at least one other component in each iteration, at least doubling the minimum size of a non-spanning component in each step. As all edges we add belong to the MSF, the output forest is indeed the MSF of the graph.

To complete the proof, we need to show that the same complexity can be achieved if some of the nodes are virtual. The states of the virtual nodes are maintained by all nodes. When determining lightest outgoing edges, i.e., F' , we perform a (global) aggregation for each virtual node, adding $\mathcal{O}(D)$ rounds, followed by a broadcast to update its state at all nodes. The same applies to all other steps of the algorithm. Thus, essentially the same procedure can be used to implement each of the steps of an iteration with virtual nodes, adding in total $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(D) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{PA})$ rounds. \square

H Further Related Work

Beyond the related work discussed in the main text, here, we briefly summarize relevant research related to the *methodological foundations* of our framework, i.e., primal-dual approaches, as well as relevant literature related to our *class of problems*, i.e., survivable network design problems. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge costs $c(e)$, *survivable network design problems* (SNDPs) ask us to select a minimum-cost edge subset satisfying any given node- or edge-connectivity requirements. Since SNDPs are both NP-hard in general and relevant in practice, their approximability has been studied extensively for specific problems, graph classes, and computational models.

Primal-Dual Approaches. In the classic *sequential setting*, SNDPs saw one of the earliest applications of the primal-dual method for approximation algorithms, yielding $(2 - 2/t)$ -approximations for Steiner Forest and other Constrained Forest Problems with proper forest functions [1, 37, 38], as well as a 3-approximation for 2-ECSS [56] and an $\mathcal{O}(\log k)$ -approximation for k -ECSS [36, 75]. In the *distributed setting*, primal-dual approaches have been leveraged to tackle problems like metric facility location [68], minimum dominating set [69], load balancing [2], approximate weighted matching [67], and approximate k -core decomposition [16]. Notably, by porting the primal-dual algorithm of Agrawal et al. [1] to the distributed setting, the Steiner Forest algorithm presented by Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60] also (implicitly) follows a primal-dual approach. Beyond the models considered in our work, in the *online setting*, primal-dual methods have been combined with ideas from online set cover [3, 39] to design algorithms for fractional network design problems [4, 13].

Most primal-dual results on network design problems have been limited to functions that are *proper* (in particular, satisfying *disjointness*) or at least *uncrossable* (i.e., $f(A) = f(B) = 1$ implies that either $f(A \cap B) = f(A \cup B) = 1$ or $f(A \setminus B) = f(B \setminus A) = 1$, which strictly generalizes disjointness). Optimizing these functions comes with the convenience that there exists an optimal dual solution with laminar support i.e., the sets associated with positive dual-variable values are either nested or disjoint. This might allow us to extend our framework to uncrossable functions, as posed as an open question in Section 4. Moreover, recent work obtains constant-factor approximations even for network design problems specified by functions that are *not* uncrossable and come without laminar optimal-dual support [7]. Hence, further investigating which classes of functions allow for good model-agnostic primal-dual approximations appears as a promising avenue for future work.

Survivable Network Design Problems. Since the literature on SNDPs is incredibly vast, we discuss only the work immediately addressing our example problems.

For *Steiner Forest* (SF), in the *sequential setting*, Garg and Khandekar [32] develop a fully

polynomial-time approximation scheme for *fractional* SF, Borradaile et al. [12] design a polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS) for SF in Euclidean metrics, and Chan et al. [15] give a PTAS for SF in doubling metrics (which include Euclidean metrics as a special case). Furthermore, Bateni et al. [8] design a PTAS for SF on planar graphs and graphs of bounded treewidth. In the *parallel setting*, Suzuki et al. [74] study SF in *unweighted planar* graphs, and in the *streaming setting*, Czumaj et al. [24] design approximation algorithms for *geometric* SF—i.e., both works consider settings that are more restricted than ours. In the *distributed setting*, our work significantly improves over the state of the art established by Lenzen and Patt-Shamir [60].

While *Point-to-Point Connection*, studied in the *sequential setting* already by Li et al. [61], is one of the original Constrained Forest Problems considered by Goemans and Williamson [37], to the best of our knowledge, no prior work has studied Point-to-Point Connection in any of the models we consider.

The *Facility Placement and Connection* (FPC) problem is different from the classic Uncapacitated Facility Location (UFL) problem in that it minimizes the sum of facility-opening and *network-construction costs*, rather than *connection costs* (i.e., client-to-facility distances). Our specification is motivated by the need, identified in operations research, to capture route-sharing scenarios, in which the costs of clients cannot be considered independently [57], and it can be naturally extended to include the *connection costs* from each client to its closest selected facility using the selected forest [64], as posed as an open question in Section 4. For *non-metric UFL*, the $\mathcal{O}(\log c)$ -approximation (where c is the number of clients) obtained by Hochbaum [52] in the *sequential setting* is asymptotically optimal, as approximating set cover (a special case of non-metric UFL) to within factor $(1 - \varepsilon) \ln n$ is NP-hard for every $\varepsilon > 0$ [28]. In contrast, for *metric UFL*, Li [62] obtain a 1.488-approximation by merging techniques from Byrka and Aardal [14] and Mahdian et al. [63]. Recalling that the cost of facility-location problems can be split into node-related costs o (opening facilities) and edge-related costs d (connecting facilities), an algorithm yields a *Lagrangian-multiplier-preserving* α -approximation if its solution S is guaranteed to satisfy, for any feasible solution S^* , $o(S) + d(S) \leq o(S^*) + \alpha d(S^*)$. Here, in recent work, Cohen-Addad et al. [21] give the first Lagrangian-multiplier-preserving α -approximation for $\alpha < 2$ by combining dual fitting with local search.

Both non-metric and metric UFL have also been studied in the *distributed setting*. Specifically in the CONGEST model, Moscibroda and Wattenhofer [65] provide an algorithm that, for every positive integer k , yields a $\mathcal{O}(k(fc)^{1/k} \log(f+c))$ -approximation for *non-metric UFL* in $\mathcal{O}(k)$ rounds (where f is the number of facilities), and for *metric UFL*, Pandit and Pemmaraju [68] give a 7-approximation in $\mathcal{O}(\log f + \log c)$ rounds using a primal-dual approach based on the work of Jain [53]. In the *parallel setting*, Blelloch and Tangwongsan [10] give a $(3 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for *metric UFL* in $\mathcal{O}(m \log_{1+\varepsilon} m)$ work and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1)$ depth. Finally, in the *streaming setting*, Czumaj et al. [24, 26] study *Euclidean uniform UFL* (i.e., UFL on the grid $\{1, \dots, \Delta\}^d$ with uniform facility-opening costs), providing an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for $d = 2$ using one pass and $(\frac{\log \Delta}{\varepsilon})^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ space [26] and, more recently, a $d^{3/2}$ -approximation using one pass and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(d \log \Delta)$ space [25].

References

- [1] Ajit Agrawal, Philip N. Klein, and R. Ravi. 1995. When Trees Collide: An Approximation Algorithm for the Generalized Steiner Problem on Networks. *SIAM J. Comput.* 24, 3 (1995), 440–456. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539792236237>
- [2] Sara Ahmadian, Allen Liu, Binghui Peng, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. 2021. Distributed Load Balancing: A New Framework and Improved Guarantees. In *12th Innovations in The-*

- oretical Computer Science Conference, *ITCS 2021, January 6-8, 2021, Virtual Conference (LIPIcs, Vol. 185)*, James R. Lee (Ed.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 79:1–79:20. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ITCS.2021.79>
- [3] Noga Alon, Baruch Awerbuch, Yossi Azar, Niv Buchbinder, and Joseph Naor. 2003. The Online Set Cover Problem. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, June 9-11, 2003, San Diego, CA, USA*, Lawrence L. Larmore and Michel X. Goemans (Eds.). ACM, 100–105. <https://doi.org/10.1145/780542.780558>
- [4] Noga Alon, Baruch Awerbuch, Yossi Azar, Niv Buchbinder, and Joseph Naor. 2006. A General Approach to Online Network Optimization Problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* 2, 4 (2006), 640–660. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1198513.1198522>
- [5] Ioannis Anagnostides, Christoph Lenzen, Bernhard Haeupler, Goran Zuzic, and Themis Gouleakis. 2023. Almost Universally Optimal Distributed Laplacian Solvers via Low-Congestion Shortcuts. *Distributed Comput.* 36, 4 (2023), 475–499. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00446-023-00454-0>
- [6] Aaron Archer, MohammadHossein Bateni, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, and Howard J. Karloff. 2011. Improved Approximation Algorithms for Prize-Collecting Steiner Tree and TSP. *SIAM J. Comput.* 40, 2 (2011), 309–332. <https://doi.org/10.1137/090771429>
- [7] Ishan Bansal, Joseph Cheriyan, Logan Grout, and Sharat Ibrahimpur. 2023. Improved Approximation Algorithms by Generalizing the Primal-Dual Method Beyond Uncrossable Functions. In *50th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2023, July 10-14, 2023, Paderborn, Germany (LIPIcs, Vol. 261)*, Kousha Etessami, Uriel Feige, and Gabriele Puppis (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 15:1–15:19. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ICALP.2023.15>
- [8] MohammadHossein Bateni, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Dániel Marx. 2011. Approximation Schemes for Steiner Forest on Planar Graphs and Graphs of Bounded Treewidth. *J. ACM* 58, 5 (2011), 21:1–21:37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2027216.2027219>
- [9] Ruben Becker, Sebastian Forster, Andreas Karrenbauer, and Christoph Lenzen. 2021. Near-Optimal Approximate Shortest Paths and Transshipment in Distributed and Streaming Models. *SIAM J. Comput.* 50 (05 2021), 815–856. <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1286955>
- [10] Guy E. Blelloch and Kanat Tangwongsan. 2010. Parallel Approximation Algorithms for Facility-Location Problems. In *SPAA 2010: Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures, Thira, Santorini, Greece, June 13-15, 2010*, Friedhelm Meyer auf der Heide and Cynthia A. Phillips (Eds.). ACM, 315–324. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1810479.1810535>
- [11] Joakim Blikstad, Jan van den Brand, Yuval Efron, Sagnik Mukhopadhyay, and Danupon Nanongkai. 2022. Nearly Optimal Communication and Query Complexity of Bipartite Matching. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022, Denver, CO, USA, October 31 - November 3, 2022*. IEEE, 1174–1185. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS54457.2022.00113>
- [12] Glencora Borradaile, Philip N. Klein, and Claire Mathieu. 2015. A Polynomial-Time Approximation Scheme for Euclidean Steiner Forest. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* 11, 3 (2015), 19:1–19:20. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2629654>

- [13] Niv Buchbinder and Joseph Naor. 2006. Improved Bounds for Online Routing and Packing Via a Primal-Dual Approach. In *47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2006), 21-24 October 2006, Berkeley, California, USA, Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society, 293–304. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2006.39>
- [14] Jaroslaw Byrka and Karen I. Aardal. 2010. An Optimal Bifactor Approximation Algorithm for the Metric Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem. *SIAM J. Comput.* 39, 6 (2010), 2212–2231. <https://doi.org/10.1137/070708901>
- [15] T.-H. Hubert Chan, Shuguang Hu, and Shaofeng H.-C. Jiang. 2018. A PTAS for the Steiner Forest Problem in Doubling Metrics. *SIAM J. Comput.* 47, 4 (2018), 1705–1734. <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1107206>
- [16] T.-H. Hubert Chan, Mauro Sozio, and Bintao Sun. 2021. Distributed Approximate k -Core Decomposition and min-max Edge Orientation: Breaking the Diameter Barrier. *J. Parallel Distributed Comput.* 147 (2021), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JPDC.2020.08.010>
- [17] Yi-Jun Chang, Manuela Fischer, Mohsen Ghaffari, Jara Uitto, and Yufan Zheng. 2019. The Complexity of $(\Delta+1)$ Coloring in Congested Clique, Massively Parallel Computation, and Centralized Local Computation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2019, Toronto, ON, Canada, July 29 - August 2, 2019*, Peter Robinson and Faith Ellen (Eds.). ACM, 471–480. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3293611.3331607>
- [18] Chandra Chekuri and F. Bruce Shepherd. 2008. Approximate Integer Decompositions for Undirected Network Design Problems. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.* 23, 1 (2008), 163–177. <https://doi.org/10.1137/040617339>
- [19] Miroslav Chlebík and Janka Chlebkíková. 2008. The Steiner Tree Problem on Graphs: Inapproximability Results. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 406, 3 (2008), 207–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TCS.2008.06.046>
- [20] Ka Wong Chong, Yijie Han, and Tak Wah Lam. 2001. Concurrent Threads and Optimal Parallel Minimum Spanning Trees Algorithm. *J. ACM* 48, 2 (2001), 297–323. <https://doi.org/10.1145/375827.375847>
- [21] Vincent Cohen-Addad, Fabrizio Grandoni, Euiwoong Lee, and Chris Schwiegelshohn. 2023. Breaching the 2 LMP Approximation Barrier for Facility Location with Applications to k -Median. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2023, Florence, Italy, January 22-25, 2023*, Nikhil Bansal and Viswanath Nagarajan (Eds.). SIAM, 940–986. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977554.CH37>
- [22] Richard Cole. 1988. Parallel Merge Sort. *SIAM J. Comput.* 17, 4 (1988), 770–785. <https://doi.org/10.1137/0217049>
- [23] Richard Cole and Uzi Vishkin. 1986. Deterministic Coin Tossing with Applications to Optimal Parallel List Ranking. *Information and Control* 70, 1 (1986), 32–53. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(86\)80023-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(86)80023-7)
- [24] Artur Czumaj, Shaofeng H.-C. Jiang, Robert Krauthgamer, and Pavel Veselý. 2022. Streaming Algorithms for Geometric Steiner Forest. In *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2022, July 4-8, 2022, Paris, France (LIPIcs, Vol. 229)*,

- Mikolaj Bojanczyk, Emanuela Merelli, and David P. Woodruff (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 47:1–47:20. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ICALP.2022.47>
- [25] Artur Czumaj, Shaofeng H.-C. Jiang, Robert Krauthgamer, Pavel Veselý, and Mingwei Yang. 2022. Streaming Facility Location in High Dimension via Geometric Hashing. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022, Denver, CO, USA, October 31 - November 3, 2022*. IEEE, 450–461. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS54457.2022.00050>
- [26] Artur Czumaj, Christiane Lammersen, Morteza Monemizadeh, and Christian Sohler. 2013. $1+\epsilon$ -Approximation for Facility Location in Data Streams. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2013, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 6-8, 2013*, Sanjeev Khanna (Ed.). SIAM, 1710–1728. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973105.123>
- [27] Atish Das Sarma, Stephan Holzer, Liah Kor, Amos Korman, Danupon Nanongkai, Gopal Pandurangan, David Peleg, and Roger Wattenhofer. 2012. Distributed Verification and Hardness of Distributed Approximation. *SIAM J. Comput.* 41, 5 (2012), 1235–1265. <https://doi.org/10.1137/11085178X>
- [28] Irit Dinur and David Steurer. 2014. Analytical Approach to Parallel Repetition. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2014, New York, NY, USA, May 31 - June 03, 2014*, David B. Shmoys (Ed.). ACM, 624–633. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2591796.2591884>
- [29] Joan Feigenbaum, Sampath Kannan, Andrew McGregor, Siddharth Suri, and Jian Zhang. 2005. On Graph Problems in a Semi-Streaming Model. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 348, 2-3 (2005), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TCS.2005.09.013>
- [30] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2017. Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning for Fast Adaptation of Deep Networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017 (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 70)*, Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh (Eds.). PMLR, 1126–1135. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/finn17a.html>
- [31] Steven Fortune and James Wyllie. 1978. Parallelism in Random Access Machines. In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 1-3, 1978, San Diego, California, USA*, Richard J. Lipton, Walter A. Burkhard, Walter J. Savitch, Emily P. Friedman, and Alfred V. Aho (Eds.). ACM, 114–118. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800133.804339>
- [32] Naveen Garg and Rohit Khandekar. 2002. Fast Approximation Algorithms for Fractional Steiner Forest and Related Problems. In *43rd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2002), 16-19 November 2002, Vancouver, BC, Canada, Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society, 500. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.2002.1181974>
- [33] Mohsen Ghaffari and Bernhard Haeupler. 2016. Distributed Algorithms for Planar Networks II: Low-Congestion Shortcuts, MST, and Min-Cut. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*. SIAM, 202–219. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch16>

- [34] Mohsen Ghaffari and Bernhard Haeupler. 2021. Low-Congestion Shortcuts for Graphs Excluding Dense Minors. In *PODC '21: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, July 26-30, 2021*. 213–221. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3465084.3467935>
- [35] Mohsen Ghaffari and Goran Zuzic. 2022. Universally-Optimal Distributed Exact Min-Cut. In *PODC '22: ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, Salerno, Italy, July 25 - 29, 2022*, Alessia Milani and Philipp Woelfel (Eds.). ACM, 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519270.3538429>
- [36] Michel X. Goemans, Andrew V. Goldberg, Serge A. Plotkin, David B. Shmoys, Éva Tardos, and David P. Williamson. 1994. Improved Approximation Algorithms for Network Design Problems. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. 23-25 January 1994, Arlington, Virginia, USA*, Daniel Dominic Sleator (Ed.). ACM/SIAM, 223–232. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=314464.314497>
- [37] Michel X. Goemans and David P. Williamson. 1995. A General Approximation Technique for Constrained Forest Problems. *SIAM J. Comput.* 24, 2 (1995), 296–317. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539793242618>
- [38] Michel X Goemans and David P Williamson. 1996. The Primal-Dual Method for Approximation Algorithms and its Application to Network Design Problems. In *Approximation Algorithms for NP-Hard Problems*. PWS Publishing Co., 144–191.
- [39] Anupam Gupta, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, and R. Ravi. 2012. Online and Stochastic Survivable Network Design. *SIAM J. Comput.* 41, 6 (2012), 1649–1672. <https://doi.org/10.1137/09076725X>
- [40] Anupam Gupta and Amit Kumar. 2009. A Constant-Factor Approximation for Stochastic Steiner Forest. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2009, Bethesda, MD, USA, May 31 - June 2, 2009*, Michael Mitzenmacher (Ed.). ACM, 659–668. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1536414.1536504>
- [41] Anupam Gupta and Amit Kumar. 2015. Greedy Algorithms for Steiner Forest. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015*, Rocco A. Servedio and Ronitt Rubinfeld (Eds.). ACM, 871–878. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2746539.2746590>
- [42] Bernhard Haeupler, D. Ellis Hershkowitz, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. 2023. Maximum Length-Constrained Flows and Disjoint Paths: Distributed, Deterministic, and Fast. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2023, Orlando, FL, USA, June 20-23, 2023*, Barna Saha and Rocco A. Servedio (Eds.). ACM, 1371–1383. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3564246.3585202>
- [43] Bernhard Haeupler, Taisuke Izumi, and Goran Zuzic. 2016. Low-Congestion Shortcuts without Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2016, Chicago, IL, USA, July 25-28, 2016*. ACM, 451–460. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2933057.2933112>
- [44] Bernhard Haeupler, Taisuke Izumi, and Goran Zuzic. 2016. Near-Optimal Low-Congestion Shortcuts on Bounded Parameter Graphs. In *Distributed Computing - 30th International Symposium, DISC 2016, Paris, France, September 27-29, 2016. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in*

- Computer Science, Vol. 9888*), Cyril Gavoille and David Ilcinkas (Eds.). Springer, 158–172. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53426-7_12
- [45] Bernhard Haeupler, Taisuke Izumi, and Goran Zuzic. 2021. Low-Congestion Shortcuts without Embedding. *Distributed Comput.* 34, 1 (2021), 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00446-020-00383-2>
- [46] Bernhard Haeupler and Jason Li. 2018. Faster Distributed Shortest Path Approximations via Shortcuts. In *32nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, October 15-19, 2018 (LIPIcs, Vol. 121)*, Ulrich Schmid and Josef Widder (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 33:1–33:14. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.DISC.2018.33>
- [47] Bernhard Haeupler, Harald Räcke, and Mohsen Ghaffari. 2022. Hop-Constrained Expander Decompositions, Oblivious Routing, and Distributed Universal Optimality. In *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta (Eds.). ACM, 1325–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519935.3520026>
- [48] Bernhard Haeupler, David Wajc, and Goran Zuzic. 2021. Universally-Optimal Distributed Algorithms for Known Topologies. In *STOC '21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Virtual Event, Italy, June 21-25, 2021*, Samir Khuller and Virginia Vassilevska Williams (Eds.). ACM, 1166–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3406325.3451081>
- [49] Shay Halperin and Uri Zwick. 2001. Optimal Randomized EREW PRAM Algorithms for Finding Spanning Forests. *Journal of Algorithms* 39, 1 (2001), 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jagm.2000.1146>
- [50] Tim J. Harris. 1994. A Survey of PRAM Simulation Techniques. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 26, 2 (1994), 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.1145/176979.176984>
- [51] Nick Harvey. 2023. *A First Course in Randomized Algorithms*. Online Book. <https://www.cs.ubc.ca/~nickhar/Book1.pdf>.
- [52] Dorit S. Hochbaum. 1982. Heuristics for the Fixed Cost Median Problem. *Math. Program.* 22, 1 (1982), 148–162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01581035>
- [53] Kamal Jain. 2001. A Factor 2 Approximation Algorithm for the Generalized Steiner Network Problem. *Comb.* 21, 1 (2001), 39–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S004930170004>
- [54] Kamal Jain and Vijay V. Vazirani. 2001. Approximation Algorithms for Metric Facility Location and k -Median Problems using the Primal-Dual Schema and Lagrangian Relaxation. *J. ACM* 48, 2 (2001), 274–296. <https://doi.org/10.1145/375827.375845>
- [55] Richard M. Karp. 1972. Reducibility Among Combinatorial Problems. In *Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations, held March 20-22, 1972, at the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York, USA (The IBM Research Symposia Series)*, Raymond E. Miller and James W. Thatcher (Eds.). Plenum Press, New York, 85–103. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9
- [56] Philip N. Klein and R. Ravi. 1993. When Cycles Collapse: A General Approximation Technique for Constrained Two-Connectivity Problems. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Integer Programming*

- and Combinatorial Optimization Conference, Erice, Italy, April 29 - May 1, 1993, Giovanni Rinaldi and Laurence A. Wolsey (Eds.). CIACO, 39–55.
- [57] Andreas Klose and Andreas Drexl. 2005. Facility Location Models for Distribution System Design. *European Journal of Operational Research* 162, 1 (2005), 4–29.
- [58] Eyal Kushilevitz and Noam Nisan. 1996. *Communication Complexity*. Cambridge University Press.
- [59] Shay Kutten and David Peleg. 1998. Fast Distributed Construction of Small k -Dominating Sets and Applications. *J. Algorithms* 28, 1 (1998), 40–66. <https://doi.org/10.1006/JAGM.1998.0929>
- [60] Christoph Lenzen and Boaz Patt-Shamir. 2014. Improved Distributed Steiner Forest Construction. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC '14, Paris, France, July 15-18, 2014*. ACM, 262–271. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2611462.2611464>
- [61] Chung-Lun Li, S. Thomas McCormick, and David Simchi-Levi. 1992. The point-to-point delivery and connection problems: complexity and algorithms. *Discret. Appl. Math.* 36, 3 (1992), 267–292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(92\)90258-C](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(92)90258-C)
- [62] Shi Li. 2013. A 1.488 Approximation Algorithm for the Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem. *Inf. Comput.* 222 (2013), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IC.2012.01.007>
- [63] Mohammad Mahdian, Yinyu Ye, and Jiawei Zhang. 2006. Approximation Algorithms for Metric Facility Location Problems. *SIAM J. Comput.* 36, 2 (2006), 411–432. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539703435716>
- [64] Sanjay Melkote and Mark S Daskin. 2001. An Integrated Model of Facility Location and Transportation Network Design. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 35, 6 (2001), 515–538.
- [65] Thomas Moscibroda and Roger Wattenhofer. 2005. Facility Location: Distributed Approximation. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2005, Las Vegas, NV, USA, July 17-20, 2005*, Marcos Kawazoe Aguilera and James Aspnes (Eds.). ACM, 108–117. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1073814.1073834>
- [66] Sagnik Mukhopadhyay and Danupon Nanongkai. 2020. Weighted Min-Cut: Sequential, Cut-Query, and Streaming Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020, Chicago, IL, USA, June 22-26, 2020*, Konstantin Makarychev, Yury Makarychev, Madhur Tulsiani, Gautam Kamath, and Julia Chuzhoy (Eds.). ACM, 496–509. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3357713.3384334>
- [67] Alessandro Panconesi and Mauro Sozio. 2010. Fast Primal-Dual Distributed Algorithms for Scheduling and Matching Problems. *Distributed Comput.* 22, 4 (2010), 269–283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00446-010-0100-X>
- [68] Saurav Pandit and Sriram V. Pemmaraju. 2009. Return of the Primal-Dual: Distributed Metric Facility Location. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2009, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, August 10-12, 2009*, Srikanta Tirathapura and Lorenzo Alvisi (Eds.). ACM, 180–189. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1582716.1582747>

- [69] Saurav Pandit and Sriram V. Pemmaraju. 2010. Rapid Randomized Pruning for Fast Greedy Distributed Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2010, Zurich, Switzerland, July 25-28, 2010*, Andréa W. Richa and Rachid Guerraoui (Eds.). ACM, 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1835698.1835777>
- [70] David Peleg. 2000. *Distributed Computing: A Locality-Sensitive Approach*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA.
- [71] Seth Pettie and Vijaya Ramachandran. 2002. An Optimal Minimum Spanning Tree Algorithm. *J. ACM* 49, 1 (2002), 16–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/505241.505243>
- [72] Seth Pettie and Vijaya Ramachandran. 2002. A Randomized Time-Work Optimal Parallel Algorithm for Finding a Minimum Spanning Forest. *SIAM J. Comput.* 31, 6 (2002), 1879–1895. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539700371065>
- [73] Václav Rozhon, Christoph Grunau, Bernhard Haeupler, Goran Zuzic, and Jason Li. 2022. Undirected $(1+\epsilon)$ -Shortest Paths via Minor-Aggregates: Near-Optimal Deterministic Parallel and Distributed Algorithms. In *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*. ACM, 478–487. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519935.3520074>
- [74] Hitoshi Suzuki, Chiseko Yamanaka, and Takao Nishizeki. 1990. Parallel Algorithms for Finding Steiner Forests in Planar Graphs. In *Algorithms, International Symposium SIGAL '90, Tokyo, Japan, August 16-18, 1990, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 450)*, Tetsuo Asano, Toshihide Ibaraki, Hiroshi Imai, and Takao Nishizeki (Eds.). Springer, 458–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-52921-7_95
- [75] David P. Williamson, Michel X. Goemans, Milena Mihail, and Vijay V. Vazirani. 1995. A Primal-Dual Approximation Algorithm for Generalized Steiner Network Problems. *Comb.* 15, 3 (1995), 435–454. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01299747>
- [76] Jaesik Yoon, Taesup Kim, Ousmane Dia, Sungwoong Kim, Yoshua Bengio, and Sungjin Ahn. 2018. Bayesian Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Kristen Grauman, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 7343–7353. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/hash/e1021d43911ca2c1845910d84f40aeae-Abstract.html>
- [77] Goran Zuzic, Gramoz Goranci, Mingquan Ye, Bernhard Haeupler, and Xiaorui Sun. 2022. Universally-Optimal Distributed Shortest Paths and Transshipment via Graph-Based ℓ_1 -Oblivious Routing. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2022, Virtual Conference / Alexandria, VA, USA, January 9 - 12, 2022*. SIAM, 2549–2579. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977073.100>