

A Simple and Fast Algorithm for Fair Cuts

Jason Li*

Owen Li†

December 2, 2024

Abstract

We present a simple and faster algorithm for computing *fair cuts* on undirected graphs, a concept introduced in recent work of Li et al. (SODA 2023). Informally, for any parameter $\epsilon > 0$, a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -fair (s, t) -cut is an (s, t) -cut such that there exists an (s, t) -flow that uses $1/(1 + \epsilon)$ fraction of the capacity of *every* edge in the cut. Our algorithm computes a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -fair cut in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ time, improving on the $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time algorithm of Li et al. and matching the $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ time algorithm of Sherman (STOC 2017) for standard $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate min-cut.

Our main idea is to run Sherman’s approximate max-flow/min-cut algorithm iteratively on a (directed) *residual* graph. While Sherman’s algorithm is originally stated for undirected graphs, we show that it provides guarantees for directed graphs that are good enough for our purposes.

1 Introduction

The (s, t) -min-cut and (s, t) -max-flow problems are among the most basic and well-studied problems in combinatorial optimization. A long line of research on fast algorithms [FF56, Din70, GR98, LS20] culminated in the recent breakthrough $m^{1+o(1)}$ time algorithm of Chen et al. [CKL⁺22]. A separate line of research has focused on applying max-flow to solve other cut-based problems in combinatorial optimization, most notably Steiner min-cut [LP20], Gomory-Hu tree [ALPS23], and expander decomposition [SW19]. Using the algorithm of Chen et al. as a black box, all of these problems are now solvable in $m^{1+o(1)}$ time, which is optimal up to the factor $m^{o(1)}$.

On the other hand, the algorithm of Chen et al. (and subsequent improvements [VDBCP⁺23]) have a few downsides. First, the algorithms do not quite achieve “near”-linear time, which colloquially means $\tilde{O}(m)$ time where $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ suppresses polylogarithmic factors. In fact, a near-linear time algorithm appears out of reach with the current techniques, which exploit recursion at the cost of $m^{o(1)}$ factors. Also, the algorithms are inherently sequential, leaving open the question of parallel max-flow in $m^{1+o(1)}$ work and sublinear time. These downsides carry over to any algorithm that requires max-flow as a black box, and hence to the cut-based problems mentioned above.

To address these issues, Li et al. [LNPS23] introduced the concept of *fair cuts*, a robust form of *approximate* min-cut. They present an algorithm for $(1 + \epsilon)$ -fair cut in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time that can be parallelized,¹ and then show how to solve $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate Steiner min-cut and Gomory-Hu tree using fair cut as a black box, leading to $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^{o(1)})$ time algorithms for both problems that can be parallelized. They also establish the first $\tilde{O}(m)$ time algorithm for expander decomposition that can also be parallelized.

*Carnegie Mellon University, jmli@cs.cmu.edu

†Carnegie Mellon University, tianwei2@andrew.cmu.edu

¹The parallelization requires $m^{1+o(1)}$ work and $m^{o(1)}$ time, but the $m^{o(1)}$ factors can be improved to polylogarithmic by recent work [AKL⁺24]. For simplicity, we do not discuss parallelization in this paper.

The fair cut problem should be viewed as a generalization of $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate min-cut, which can be solved in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ time by a recent breakthrough of Sherman [She17] but is not robust enough for the above applications.² Nevertheless, there was a gap between the $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ time algorithm for $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate min-cut (and max-flow) and the $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time algorithm for $(1 + \epsilon)$ -fair cut.

In this paper, we close the gap between the two problems by solving $(1 + \epsilon)$ -fair cut in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ time. Conceptually, we present evidence that fair cut is no harder than approximate min-cut despite being more robust and powerful.

Theorem 1. *There is an $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ time randomized algorithm that, with high probability,³ solves $(1 + \epsilon)$ -fair cut on an undirected graph with integral and polynomial capacities.*

Our algorithm is iterative, sending flow on each iteration and updating the *residual* graph, which is directed. Our main idea is observing that Sherman’s approximate max-flow/min-cut algorithm (for undirected graphs) actually performs well on certain *directed* graphs, such as residual graphs of originally undirected graphs.

1.1 Preliminaries

We work with both undirected and directed graphs in this paper. For an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, let $\vec{G} = (V, \vec{E})$ be the directed version of G with each edge replaced by bidirectional arcs of the same capacity. Given a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, let ∂S in an undirected graph be the set of edges with exactly one endpoint in S , and let $\vec{\partial} S$ in a directed graph be the set of arcs whose tail is in S and whose head is not in S . We may also use $\vec{\partial} S$ for an undirected graph G , in which case we are referring to the bidirected \vec{G} .

Throughout the paper, we use $c_G(\cdot)$ to denote edge and arc capacities. For an arc/edge set F , let $c_G(F)$ denote the total capacity of arcs/edges in F . We assume that all capacities are integers and polynomially bounded; in general, we would incur extra $\log W$ terms where W is the maximum integral capacity, but we stick with polynomially bounded for simplicity.

We represent a *flow* as a nonnegative vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}}$ for an undirected graph and $f \in \mathbb{R}^E$ for a directed graph. The *congestion* of a flow is $\max_{(u,v) \in \vec{E}} f(u,v)/c_G(u,v)$, where \vec{E} is replaced by E for a directed graph. Sometimes we abuse notation and say the flow *has congestion* κ if the congestion of the flow is *at most* κ . A flow is *feasible* if its congestion is at most 1. A *demand* is a vector $d \in \mathbb{R}^V$ with $\sum_v d_v = 0$. A flow *satisfies* or *routes* demand $d \in \mathbb{R}^V$ if for each vertex $v \in V$, $\sum_{(v,w)} f(v,w) - \sum_{(u,v)} f(u,v) = d_v$, i.e., the net flow out of v is exactly d_v . A flow is an (s,t) -flow of *value* τ if it satisfies demand $\tau(\mathbb{1}_s - \mathbb{1}_t)$. Here, $\mathbb{1}_v$ is the vector with entry 1 at v and entry 0 elsewhere. We also use $\mathbb{1}$ as the all-ones vector.

Given an undirected/directed graph $G = (V, E)$ and a flow f , the *residual* graph G' of G for flow f is the directed graph with arc capacities $c_{G'}(u,v) = c_G(u,v) - f(u,v) + f(v,u)$ for each (u,v) where either $(u,v) \in E$ or $(v,u) \in E$. Here, $c_G(u,v), f(u,v)$ are zero if $(u,v) \notin E$ and likewise for (v,u) .

A *cut* is a bipartition $(S, V \setminus S)$ of the vertex set where $S, V \setminus S \neq \emptyset$. It is an (s,t) -cut if $s \in S$ and $t \notin S$. For a directed graph G , the *value* of the cut $(S, V \setminus S)$ is $c_G(\vec{\partial} S)$. We require the following fact about the *submodularity* of the directed cut function: for any directed graph G and two sets $A, B \subseteq V$, $c_G(\vec{\partial} A) + c_G(\vec{\partial} B) \geq c_G(\vec{\partial}(A \cup B)) + c_G(\vec{\partial}(A \cap B))$.

We now define the object of study in this paper, a *fair cut*.

²In more technical terms, the concept of *uncrossing two cuts* breaks down for arbitrary approximate min-cuts. Fair cuts are designed to satisfy an approximate version of uncrossing, which suffices for the applications.

³We adopt the convention that *with high probability* means with probability $1 - 1/n^{O(1)}$ for arbitrarily large polynomial in n .

Definition 2. Let s, t be two vertices in V . For any parameter $\alpha \geq 1$, we say that a cut $(S, V \setminus S)$ is an α -fair (s, t) -cut if there exists a feasible (s, t) -flow f such that $f(u, v) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \cdot c(u, v)$ for every arc $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S$.

We defer the matrix notation from Sherman’s approximate max-flow/min-cut algorithm to its relevant Section 3.

2 Fair Cut Algorithm

In this section, we present our fair cut algorithm, establishing Theorem 1. It will be more convenient to prove the following version, where ϵ is replaced by $O(\epsilon \log n)$.

Theorem 3. *There is an $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ time randomized algorithm that, with high probability, solves $(1 + O(\epsilon \log n))$ -fair cut on an undirected graph with integral and polynomial capacities.*

We will use the following approximate max-flow/min-cut primitive for *residual* graphs, which we present in Section 3.

Theorem 4. *Given an undirected graph G , a residual graph G' of G , two vertices s, t , and a parameter $\tau > 0$, there is a randomized algorithm that runs in time $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ and computes, with high probability,*

1. Either an (s, t) -cut of value less than τ , or
2. A feasible flow f in G' routing a demand d such that the residual demand $\tau(\mathbb{1}_s - \mathbb{1}_t) - d$ can be routed in G with congestion ϵ .

Equipped with this flow/cut primitive, the fair cut algorithm is quite simple. We iteratively maintain a cut $(S_i, V \setminus S_i)$ and a flow f_i that both gradually improve over time. On each iteration, we temporarily remove the edges in ∂S_i that are nearly saturated in the right direction, and then call the flow primitive on the residual graph (minus the removed edges) with a careful choice of τ . Depending on whether the flow primitive returns a flow or cut, we either update the current flow or the current cut, leaving the other unchanged.

We present the formal algorithm below.

1. Let f_1 be the empty flow and $(S_1, V \setminus S_1)$ be an arbitrary (s, t) -cut.
2. For iteration $i = 1, 2, \dots, L = \Theta(\log n)$:
 - (a) Let $\vec{U}_i \subseteq \vec{E}$ be all arcs $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S_i$ satisfying $f_i(u, v) \leq (1 - 4\epsilon)c_G(u, v)$, i.e., the “unsaturated” arcs in $\vec{\partial}S_i$.
 - (b) Let $U_i \subseteq E$ be \vec{U}_i with all arcs undirected (and parallel edges removed).
 - (c) Let $G_i \subseteq G$ be the undirected graph $G \setminus (\partial S_i \setminus U_i)$, i.e., remove all edges in ∂S_i that are “saturated” in the right direction.
 - (d) Let G'_i be the residual graph of G_i for the restricted flow $f_i|_{G_i}$, defined as the flow f_i with flow on arcs outside \vec{U}_i removed.
 - (e) Call Theorem 4 on graph G_i , its residual graph G'_i , vertices s, t , and parameter $\tau = 0.5c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$.
 - (f) If Theorem 4 returns a flow h :
 - Set $f_{i+1} = f_i + h$ and $S_{i+1} = S_i$, i.e., add the new flow but keep the current cut.
 - (g) If Theorem 4 returns a cut $(X_i, V \setminus X_i)$:
 - Set $f_{i+1} = f_i$ and S_{i+1} as either $S_i \cup X_i$ or $S_i \cap X_i$, i.e., update the cut but keep the current flow. Of the two choices, pick the S_{i+1} minimizing $c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1})$.
3. Output the (s, t) -cut $(S_{L+1}, V \setminus S_{L+1})$.

It is clear that the algorithm makes $O(\log n)$ calls to Theorem 4 and runs in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time outside these calls, for an overall running time of $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$. For the rest of this section, we prove its correctness.

Our measure of progress is the quantity $c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$, i.e., the total residual capacity of all “unsaturated” arcs in $\vec{\partial}S_i$, which we show drops by a constant factor on each iteration.

Lemma 5. *If Theorem 4 returns a flow h , then $c_{G'_{i+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}) \leq 0.75c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$.*

Proof. Let d be the demand routed by flow h . By Theorem 4, there is a feasible flow r in G_i routing the residual demand $\tau(\mathbb{1}_s - \mathbb{1}_t) - d$ with congestion ϵ . Then, the flow $h + r$ in G'_i routes demand $\tau(\mathbb{1}_s - \mathbb{1}_t)$ (with arbitrary congestion). This flow must pass through the cut $\vec{\partial}S_i$ in G'_i , so $h + r$ sends a net flow of τ across $\vec{\partial}S_i$. Since the flow r has congestion ϵ in G_i , removing it from $h + r$ affects the net flow across $\vec{\partial}S_i$ by at most $\epsilon c_{G_i}(\partial S_i)$, so the flow h sends at least $\tau - \epsilon c_{G_i}(\partial S_i)$ across $\vec{\partial}S_i$. Each arc $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S_i$ in G'_i satisfies $(u, v) \in U_i$, so $f_i(u, v) \leq (1 - 4\epsilon)c_G(u, v)$ and $c_{G'_i}(u, v) \geq 4\epsilon c_G(u, v) = 4\epsilon c_{G_i}(u, v)$. Summing over all arcs $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S_i$ gives $c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i) \geq 4\epsilon c_{G_i}(\partial S)$, so the flow h sends at least $\tau - 0.25c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i) = 0.25c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$ flow across $\vec{\partial}S_i$.

Let H be the residual graph of G_i for the restricted flow $f_{i+1}|_{G_i}$. By definition of residual graph, the quantity $c_{G_i}(\partial S_i) - c_H(\vec{\partial}S_i)$ is exactly the net flow that $f_{i+1}|_{G_i}$ sends across $\vec{\partial}S_i$. Since G'_i is the residual graph of G_i for the restricted flow $f_i|_{G_i}$, the quantity $c_{G_i}(\partial S_i) - c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$ is exactly the net flow that $f_i|_{G_i}$ sends across $\vec{\partial}S_i$. Since $f_{i+1}|_{G_i} = f_i|_{G_i} + h$, the difference of quantities $(c_{G_i}(\partial S_i) - c_H(\vec{\partial}S_i)) - (c_{G_i}(\partial S_i) - c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i))$ is exactly the net flow that h sends across $\vec{\partial}S_i$, which is at least $0.25c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$. In other words, $c_H(\vec{\partial}S_i) \leq c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i) - 0.25c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i) = 0.75c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$. Any previously “saturated” arc $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S_i \setminus \vec{U}_i$ is still “saturated” in flow f_{i+1} (i.e., $f_{i+1}(u, v) > (1 - 4\epsilon)c_G(u, v)$) since the arc is absent from G'_i and hence carries no flow in h . Since $S_{i+1} = S_i$, we have $\partial S_i \setminus U_i \subseteq \partial S_{i+1} \setminus U_{i+1}$, which means that $G_i \supseteq G_{i+1}$. In particular, the arcs in $\vec{\partial}S_i$ present in G'_{i+1} are also present in H , and they have the same capacity since both G'_{i+1} and H are residual graphs for a restriction of f_{i+1} . We conclude that $c_{G'_{i+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_i) \leq c_H(\vec{\partial}S_i)$, and

$$c_{G'_{i+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}) = c_{G'_{i+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_i) \leq c_H(\vec{\partial}S_i) \leq 0.75c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i),$$

as promised. □

Lemma 6. *If Theorem 4 returns a cut $(X_i, V \setminus X_i)$, then $c_{G'_{i+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}) \leq 0.75c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4, the cut $(X_i, V \setminus X_i)$ satisfies $c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}X_i) \leq \tau = 0.5c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$. By submodularity of the cut function $c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S)$,

$$c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i) + c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}X_i) \geq c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}(S_i \cup X_i)) + c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}(S_i \cap X_i)),$$

and by the choice of S_{i+1} ,

$$c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}(S_i \cup X_i)) + c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}(S_i \cap X_i))) \leq \frac{1}{2}(c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i) + c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}X_i)) \leq 0.75c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i).$$

We now claim that $c_{G'_{i+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}) \leq c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1})$. Note that arcs present in both G'_i and G'_{i+1} must have the same capacity since $f_{i+1} = f_i$, so it suffices to show that the arcs in $\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}$ present in G'_{i+1} are a subset of those present in G'_i . Any arc $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S_{i+1}$ present in G'_{i+1}

satisfies $(u, v) \in \vec{U}_{i+1}$, so $f_i(u, v) = f_{i+1}(u, v) \leq (1 - 4\epsilon)c_G(u, v)$. If $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S_i$ as well, then $(u, v) \in \vec{U}_i$ and the arc belongs to G'_i . Otherwise, if $(u, v) \notin \vec{\partial}S_i$, then there are two cases. If $S_{i+1} = S_i \cap X_i$, then since $u \in S_{i+1} \subseteq S_i$, we must have $v \in S_i$ as well. So the edge (u, v) is not in ∂S_i , which means the arc (u, v) belongs to G'_i , establishing the claim. If $S_{i+1} = S_i \cup X_i$, then since $v \in V \setminus S_{i+1} \subseteq V \setminus S_i$, we must have $u \in V \setminus S_i$ as well. So the edge (u, v) is not in ∂S_i , and the same argument follows.

Putting everything together, we conclude that $c_{G'_{i+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}) \leq c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}) \leq 0.75c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$. \square

Finally, we prove the correctness of the algorithm, establishing Theorem 3.

Lemma 7. *The output $(S_{L+1}, V \setminus S_{L+1})$ is a $(1 + O(\epsilon \log n))$ -fair cut with high probability.*

Proof. By Lemmas 5 and 6, we have $c_{G'_{i+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_{i+1}) \leq 0.75c_{G'_i}(\vec{\partial}S_i)$ for each iteration i . Since capacities are polynomially bounded, we start with $c_{G'_1}(\vec{\partial}S_1) \leq n^{O(1)}$, so for large enough $L = \Theta(\log n)$ we have $c_{G'_{L+1}}(\vec{\partial}S_{L+1}) < 4\epsilon$ with high probability. Any arc $(u, v) \in \vec{U}_{L+1}$ belongs to $\vec{\partial}S_{L+1}$ and satisfies $c_{G'_{L+1}}(u, v) \geq 4\epsilon c_G(u, v) \geq 4\epsilon$, so no such arcs exist. In other words, $\vec{U}_{L+1} = \emptyset$, and it follows that $f_{L+1}(u, v) \geq (1 - 4\epsilon)c_G(u, v)$ for all arcs $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S_{L+1}$. To establish fairness, it remains to augment f_{L+1} to an (s, t) -flow.

By construction, $f_{L+1} = h_1 + h_2 + \dots + h_L$, and there exist flows r_1, \dots, r_L in G of congestion ϵ such that each $h_i + r_i$ is an (s, t) -flow. In particular, the flow $f' = f_{L+1} + r_1 + \dots + r_L$ is an (s, t) -flow. Since $r_1 + \dots + r_L$ has congestion $O(\epsilon \log n)$, we have $|f'(u, v) - f_{L+1}(u, v)| \leq O(\epsilon \log n) \cdot c_G(u, v)$ for all arcs (u, v) . In particular, for each arc $(u, v) \in \vec{\partial}S_{L+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f'(u, v) &\geq f_{L+1}(u, v) - O(\epsilon \log n) \cdot c_G(u, v) \\ &\geq (1 - 4\epsilon)c_G(u, v) - O(\epsilon \log n) \cdot c_G(u, v) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1 + O(\epsilon \log n)} c_G(u, v), \end{aligned}$$

so the (s, t) -flow f' certifies that $(S_{L+1}, V \setminus S_{L+1})$ is a $(1 + O(\epsilon \log n))$ -fair cut. \square

3 Approximate Max-Flow on Residual Graphs

In this section, we show how to apply Sherman's approximate max-flow/min-cut algorithm on directed *residual graphs* of an underlying undirected graph. The flow may not satisfy the input demand, but the leftover demand will be routable with low congestion on the *undirected* graph. Our main goal is to prove Theorem 4, restated below.

Theorem 4. *Given an undirected graph G , a residual graph G' of G , two vertices s, t , and a parameter $\tau > 0$, there is a randomized algorithm that runs in time $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon)$ and computes, with high probability,*

1. *Either an (s, t) -cut of value less than τ , or*
2. *A feasible flow f in G' routing a demand d such that the residual demand $\tau(\mathbb{1}_s - \mathbb{1}_t) - d$ can be routed in G with congestion ϵ .*

We first introduce some preliminaries from Sherman [She17]. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, define the matrix norm $\|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} = \max_{\|v\|_{\infty}=1} \|Av\|_{\infty}$, and define $\text{nnz}(A)$ as the number of nonzero entries in A . Define $\Delta_k^m \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ as the set of matrices $X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ with $X \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\sum_j X_{ij} = 1$ for all $i \in [m]$. We now present a key subroutine from [She17]:

Theorem 8 (Corollary 1.8 of [She17]). *There is an algorithm that, given $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with $\|A\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 1$, takes $\tilde{O}(k \text{nnz}(A)\epsilon^{-1})$ time and outputs either,*

- (1) $X \in \Delta_k^m$ such that $AX \leq B + \epsilon R$ where $R \in \Delta_k^n$.
- (2) $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}, Y \geq \mathbf{0}$ such that $\text{tr}(Y(AX - B)) > 0$ for all $X \in \Delta_k^m$.

This result can be used to solve approximate multi-commodity flow, as indicated by Lemma 4.2 of [She17]. Sherman only provided a sketch proof in the original paper. For specificity and completeness, we state and prove a one-commodity flow version of Sherman's Lemma 4.2 for some residual network G' of G , where the matrix R is a congestion approximator for G .

For a given directed graph $G = (V, \vec{E})$, we represent a flow f by its vector of congestions on edges, which is a nonnegative vector in $\mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}}$ where for each arc $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$, the flow f sends $f_{(u,v)} c_G(u, v)$ flow. Note that $\|f\|_\infty$ is exactly the congestion of the flow. We define $C_G \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{E} \times \vec{E}}$ as the diagonal matrix whose entry (u, v) is the capacity of arc $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$. We define $D_G \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{E} \times V}$ as the matrix whose row $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$ has vector $(\mathbb{1}_u - \mathbb{1}_v)^\top$, also called the discrete divergence operator which maps any vector $C_G f$ to the demand satisfied by the flow f . If $G = (V, E)$ is an undirected graph, we treat it as a directed graph with bidirected edge set \vec{E} .

For any *undirected* graph G , an α -congestion approximator is a matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{[r] \times V}$ (where dimension r is unspecified) such that for any demand d whose optimal flow has congestion $OPT(d)$, it holds that $\|Rd\|_\infty \leq OPT(d) \leq \alpha \|Rd\|_\infty$.

Given a directed graph $G = (V, E)$, we say $G' = (V, E')$ is a subgraph of G (denoted as $G' \leq G$) iff for all $(u, v) \in V \times V$, it holds that $c_{G'}(u, v) \leq c_G(u, v)$. In particular, if G' is some residual network for undirected G , then it holds that $G' \leq 2G$.

Lemma 9. *Given an undirected graph G , a subgraph $G' \leq \vec{G}$, and an α -congestion approximator R of G , it holds that $\|RD_{G'}C_{G'}\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 2$.*

Proof. Fix any vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}}$ with $\|f\|_\infty = 1$, and let $d := D_{\vec{G}}C_{\vec{G}}f$. Notice that each pair of anti-parallel arcs e^+, e^- of \vec{G} has the same capacity, and adding a constant to f_{e^+}, f_{e^-} will not change the demand routed by the flow; we perform such operations on each pair of anti-parallel arcs to obtain some f' such that $\min(f'_{e^+}, f'_{e^-}) = 0$ for all pairs of anti-parallel arcs. Now it is evident that $\|f'\|_\infty \leq 2$, and that f' corresponds to a flow f_G of G with demand d and congestion ≤ 2 , so

$$\|RD_G C_G f\|_\infty = \|Rd\|_\infty \leq OPT(d) \leq \|f_G\|_\infty = 2$$

and it follows that

$$\|RD_G C_G f\|_\infty = \|Rd\|_\infty \leq 2$$

so

$$\|RD_G C_G\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 2.$$

Let $F := \{f \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}} : \|f\|_\infty \leq 1\}$ be the set of all directed flows of congestion 1. Since $c_{G'}(u, v) \leq c_G(u, v)$ for all arcs $(u, v) \in \vec{E}$, we have the set inclusion

$$\{D_{G'}C_{G'}f : f \in F\} \subseteq \{D_G C_G f : f \in F\}$$

so

$$\max_{f \in F} \|RD_{G'}C_{G'}f\|_\infty \leq \max_{f \in F} \|RD_G C_G f\|_\infty \leq 2$$

and it follows that $\|RD_{G'}C_{G'}\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 2$. □

Note that Sherman's Stochastic Matrix Algorithm, as per Corollary 1.8 of [She17], may output a dual, and when leveraging Sherman's algorithm to solve approximate (s, t) -max-flow, we may need to explicitly compute a corresponding (s, t) -cut that is integral. The following lemma constructs such a cut in a directed graph, given an infeasibility criterion from Sherman's algorithm:

Lemma 10. *Given a directed graph G and a "potential" vector $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ on vertices, we define a corresponding flow f_ϕ via the following:*

$$(f_\phi)_{uv} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \phi_u > \phi_v \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We also suppose that

$$\phi^\top (d - B_G C_G f_\phi) > 0$$

for some demand d . Then if we sort the vertices by decreasing potential ϕ_v , there must be some prefix $S \subset V$, such that $\sum_{v \in S} d_v > c_G(\vec{\partial}S)$, certifying the infeasibility of such a demand. Furthermore, the cut $(S, V \setminus S)$ can be computed in $O(m + n \log n)$ time.

Moreover, if $d = \tau(\mathbb{1}_s - \mathbb{1}_t)$ for two vertices $s, t \in V$ and parameter $\tau > 0$, then the cut $(S, V \setminus S)$ is an (s, t) -cut with $c_G(\vec{\partial}S) < \tau$.

Proof. We begin with some notation. Let $V_{>x} := \{v \in V(G) : \phi_v > x\}$ denote the set of vertices of G whose potential is strict greater than x , and let $\Delta(S) := \sum_{v \in S} d_v$ denote the sum of demands in the set S of vertices.

Let M be some positive real number such that $|\phi_v| < M$ for all $v \in V(G)$. We seek to prove

$$\int_{-M}^M \Delta(V_{>x}) dx = \phi^\top d > \phi^\top (B_G C_G f_\phi) = \int_{-M}^M c_G(\vec{\partial}V_{>x}) dx$$

because then there must be some $-M \leq x \leq M$ s.t. $\Delta(V_{>x}) > c_G(\vec{\partial}V_{>x})$, and setting $S = V_{>x}$ achieves the desired $\Delta(S) > c_G(\vec{\partial}S)$.

1. For the first equality, it holds that

$$\int_{-M}^M \Delta(V_{>x}) dx = \int_{-M}^M \sum_{v \in V} d_v \cdot \mathbb{1}[\phi_v > x] dx = \sum_{v \in V} \int_{-M}^M d_v \cdot \mathbb{1}[\phi_v > x] dx = \sum_{v \in V} d_v (\phi_v + M)$$

and since d is a demand, it holds that $\sum_v d_v = 0$, so the above equals

$$\sum_{v \in V} d_v \phi_v = \phi^\top d$$

2. For the second equality, we start from the definition of f_ϕ and have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^\top (B_G C_G f_\phi) &= \sum_v \phi_v \cdot \left(- \sum_{(u,v) \in E} c_G(u,v) \mathbb{1}[\phi_u > \phi_v] + \sum_{(v,w) \in E} c_G(v,w) \mathbb{1}[\phi_v > \phi_w] \right) \\ &= \sum_{(u,v) \in E} c_G(u,v) \mathbb{1}(\phi_u > \phi_v) (\phi_u - \phi_v) \\ &= \sum_{(u,v) \in E} c_G(u,v) \max(0, \phi_u - \phi_v) \\ &= \int_{-M}^M \sum_{(u,v) \in E} c_G(u,v) \mathbb{1}((u,v) \in \vec{\partial}(V_{>x})) dx \\ &= \int_{-M}^M c_G(\vec{\partial}V_{>x}) dx \end{aligned}$$

3. The inequality follows from the assumption $\phi^\top(d - B_G C_G f_\phi) > 0$.

Furthermore, if $d = \tau(\mathbb{1}_s - \mathbb{1}_t)$, then notice that

$$\Delta(S) > c_G(\vec{\partial}S) \geq 0$$

and the only way for $\Delta(S) > 0$ is if $s \in S$ and $t \notin S$, in which case $\Delta(S) = \tau$, so $(S, V \setminus S)$ is an (s, t) -cut with $c_G(\vec{\partial}S) < \tau$.

To identify the set $S = V_{>x}$, it suffices to iterate through the cuts corresponding to all $O(n)$ prefixes $S = V_{>x}$, keeping track of $\Delta(S)$ and $c_G(\vec{\partial}S)$. We may start with $|S| = 1$, which includes the vertex v with the highest potential ϕ_v , identify edges in the cut, and compute the value of $c_G(\vec{\partial}S)$; then we keep adding vertices to S , one at a time, in the order of decreasing potentials, and for each added vertex, we re-compute the set of edges in the new cut, then compute the associated capacity. Each update after adding some vertex v requires iterating through $\deg(v)$ many edges, and since $\sum_v \deg(v) = 2m$, the overall time complexity to find the minimum threshold cut is $O(m)$ (after the initial sorting by ϕ_v in $O(n \log n)$). \square

Using Lemmas 9 and 10, we finally prove Theorem 4:

Proof. To convert a single commodity flow into a right stochastic matrix problem, we consider the “empty demand” as another type of commodity. Specifically, we fix $k = 2$ and $X = [f, f_\emptyset]$, where f is the vector of a flow of congestion 1, with its entries indicating congestion on edges, and f_\emptyset is the vector indicating remaining congestion, defined as $f_\emptyset := \mathbb{1} - f$; we also define $A := D_{G'} C_{G'}$, and $B := [d, d_\emptyset]$, where $d_\emptyset := D_G C_G \mathbb{1} - d$ is the empty demand vector. Then $AX = B$ encodes a solution for the single commodity problem.

Next, we cite Theorem 4.4 from Sherman [She17] to compute an α -congestion approximator R of G with $\alpha = (\log n)^{O(1)}$ in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time with high probability, where R is specifically column sparse, i.e. each column contains $O(\log n)$ many nonzero entries. Observe that $(RD'_G C'_G)_{r,e} \neq 0$ iff the directed edge e is in the cut represented by row r of R , and since R is column sparse, there can only be $O(\log n)$ many cuts in R that contain e ; overall we obtain

$$\text{nmz}(RD'_G C'_G) \leq O(m \log n)$$

Since G' is a residual graph of G , we have $G' \leq 2G$, and applying Lemma 9 on subgraph $G'/2$ (and then scaling up by factor 2) gives $\|RD_{G'} C_{G'}\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 4$. Now define $R' := R/4$ and $A_2 := \begin{bmatrix} R'A \\ -R'A \end{bmatrix}$ and $B_2 := \begin{bmatrix} B \\ -B \end{bmatrix}$, so that

$$\|A_2\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} = \|R'A\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} = \|RA/4\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} = \|RD_{G'} C_{G'}/4\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 1$$

and we invoke Theorem 8 to obtain, in time $\tilde{O}(k \text{nmz}(A_2)\epsilon^{-1}) \leq \tilde{O}(k \text{nmz}(RD_{G'} C_{G'})\epsilon^{-1}) \leq \tilde{O}(m\epsilon^{-1})$, either

1. some X and some $S_1, S_2 \in \Delta_2^n$ such that

$$\begin{cases} R'AX - R'B \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} S_1 \\ R'(-A)X - R'(-B) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} S_2 \end{cases}$$

2. some $Y = [y_1, y_2] > 0$ such that

$$\text{tr}(Y(A_2 X - B_2)) \geq 0$$

for all feasible flows $X = [f, f_\emptyset]$

In the first case, combining the two inequalities gives

$$-\frac{\epsilon}{\alpha}S_2 \leq R'(AX - B) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha}S_1$$

thus each row $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ of $R'(AX - B)$ satisfies $\|r_i\|_\infty \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha}$, so that $\|r_i\|_1 \leq 2\frac{\epsilon}{\alpha}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|R'(Af - d)\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} &= \max_{\|v\|_\infty=1} \|R'(Af - d)v\|_\infty \\ &= \max_{\|v\|_\infty=1} \max_i |(R'(Af - d)v)_i| \\ &= \max_i \max_{\|v\|_\infty=1} |(R'(Af - d)v)_i| \\ &= \max_i \|(R'(Af - d))_i\|_1 \\ &\leq \max_i \|(R'(AX - B))_i\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

and it follows from definition of R that if the algorithm returns some flow $X = [f, f_\emptyset]$, then the residual demand $Af - d$ can be routed with congestion $\leq O(\epsilon)$ with respect to the undirected graph G . We may retroactively set ϵ a constant factor smaller so that the congestion is $\leq \epsilon$.

In the second case, it equivalently holds for all feasible flows $X = [f, f_\emptyset]$ that

$$y_1^\top \left(\begin{bmatrix} A \\ -A \end{bmatrix} f - \begin{bmatrix} d \\ -d \end{bmatrix} \right) + y_2^\top \left(\begin{bmatrix} A \\ -A \end{bmatrix} f_\emptyset - \begin{bmatrix} d_\emptyset \\ -d_\emptyset \end{bmatrix} \right) > 0$$

By construction of duplicated rows, we have $y_i = \begin{bmatrix} w_i \\ z_i \end{bmatrix}$, and either one of

- (i) $w_1^\top (Af - d) + w_2^\top (Af_\emptyset - d_\emptyset) > 0$
- (ii) $z_1^\top (Af - d) + z_2^\top (Af_\emptyset - d_\emptyset) < 0$

is true. We further notice that

$$A(f + f_\emptyset) = d + d_\emptyset \iff Af - d = -(Af_\emptyset - d_\emptyset)$$

so we substitute and either one of

- (i) $(w_2 - w_1)^\top (d - Af) > 0$
- (ii) $(z_1 - z_2)^\top (d - Af) > 0$

is true; either of which, according to Lemma 10, implies the existence of some (s, t) -cut $(S, V \setminus S)$ with $c_G(\vec{\partial}S) < \tau$ that can be computed in $O(m + n \log n)$ time. \square

References

- [AKL⁺24] Arpit Agarwal, Sanjeev Khanna, Huan Li, Prathamesh Patil, Chen Wang, Nathan White, and Peilin Zhong. Parallel approximate maximum flows in near-linear work and polylogarithmic depth. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 3997–4061. SIAM, 2024.
- [ALPS23] Amir Abboud, Jason Li, Debmalya Panigrahi, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. All-pairs max-flow is no harder than single-pair max-flow: Gomory-hu trees in almost-linear time. In *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 2204–2212. IEEE, 2023.

- [CKL⁺22] Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. Maximum flow and minimum-cost flow in almost-linear time. March 2022.
- [Din70] Yefim Dinitz. Algorithm for solution of a problem of maximum flow in networks with power estimation. *Soviet Math. Doklady*, 11:1227–1280, 1970.
- [FF56] Lester R Ford and Delbert R Fulkerson. Maximal flow through a network. *Canadian journal of Mathematics*, 8(3):399–404, 1956.
- [GR98] Andrew V. Goldberg and Satish Rao. Beyond the flow decomposition barrier. *J. ACM*, 45(5):783–797, 1998.
- [LNPS23] Jason Li, Danupon Nanongkai, Debmalya Panigrahi, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Near-linear time approximations for cut problems via fair cuts. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 240–275. SIAM, 2023.
- [LP20] Jason Li and Debmalya Panigrahi. Deterministic min-cut in poly-logarithmic max-flows. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020*. IEEE Computer Society, 2020.
- [LS20] Yang P. Liu and Aaron Sidford. Faster energy maximization for faster maximum flow. In Konstantin Makarychev, Yury Makarychev, Madhur Tulsiani, Gautam Kamath, and Julia Chuzhoy, editors, *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020, Chicago, IL, USA, June 22-26, 2020*, pages 803–814. ACM, 2020.
- [She17] Jonah Sherman. Area-convexity, l_∞ regularization, and undirected multicommodity flow. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 452–460, 2017.
- [SW19] Thatchaphol Saranurak and Di Wang. Expander decomposition and pruning: Faster, stronger, and simpler. 2019. To appear in SODA’19.
- [VDBCP⁺23] Jan Van Den Brand, Li Chen, Richard Peng, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P Liu, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, Sushant Sachdeva, and Aaron Sidford. A deterministic almost-linear time algorithm for minimum-cost flow. In *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 503–514. IEEE, 2023.