Fair Cuts: Motivation, Definition, and Applications

Jason Li (Simons Institute) Joint with Danupon Nanongkai (MPI), Debmalya Panigrahi (Duke), and Thatchaphol Saranurak (UMich)

> SODA 2023 January 22, 2023

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★ □▶ ★ □ ▶ → □ ● の < @

 s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★ □▶ ★ □ ▶ → □ ● の < @

- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:

- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"



Used in divide-and-conquer algorithms for Gomory-Hu tree (all-pairs mincut): "dividing" on s-t mincut does not destroy u-v mincut

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ クタペ

- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.

- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.
 - Suppose *s*-*t* mincut and *u*-*v* mincut cross:



- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.
 - Suppose *s*–*t* mincut and *u*–*v* mincut cross:
 - Consider a maximum *s*-*t* flow, which saturates the cut edges by max-flow-min-cut theorem



- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.
 - Suppose *s*-*t* mincut and *u*-*v* mincut cross:
 - Consider a maximum *s*-*t* flow, which saturates the cut edges by max-flow-min-cut theorem



- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.
 - Suppose *s*–*t* mincut and *u*–*v* mincut cross:
 - Consider a maximum *s*-*t* flow, which saturates the cut edges by max-flow-min-cut theorem



- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.
 - Suppose *s*-*t* mincut and *u*-*v* mincut cross:
 - Consider a maximum *s*-*t* flow, which saturates the cut edges by max-flow-min-cut theorem



- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.
 - Suppose *s*–*t* mincut and *u*–*v* mincut cross:
 - Consider a maximum *s*-*t* flow, which saturates the cut edges by max-flow-min-cut theorem



- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.
 - Suppose *s*-*t* mincut and *u*-*v* mincut cross:
 - Consider a maximum *s*-*t* flow, which saturates the cut edges by max-flow-min-cut theorem



 Obtained a *u*−*v* cut whose size can only be smaller ⇒ also *u*−*v* mincut

- s-t mincut of an (undirected) graph: the smallest set of edges whose removal disconnects s and t
- Uncrossing property of *s*-*t* mincuts:
 - for any s-t mincut and vertices u, v, there exists a u-v mincut that does not "cross"
 - Can be proved by submodularity of cuts. This talk: flow-based proof.
 - Suppose *s*-*t* mincut and *u*-*v* mincut cross:
 - Consider a maximum *s*-*t* flow, which saturates the cut edges by max-flow-min-cut theorem



- Obtained a *u*−*v* cut whose size can only be smaller ⇒ also *u*−*v* mincut
- We have uncrossed the u-v mincut with the s-t mincut.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★ □▶ ★ □ ▶ → □ ● の < @

 [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] s-t mincut can be solved in m^{1+o(1)} time—almost optimal!

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

- [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] *s*-*t* mincut can be solved in *m*^{1+o(1)} time—almost optimal!
 - However, algorithm is very complicated

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ クタペ

- [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] *s*-*t* mincut can be solved in *m*^{1+o(1)} time—almost optimal!
 - However, algorithm is very complicated
 - Inherently sequential

- [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] *s*-*t* mincut can be solved in *m*^{1+*o*(1)} time—almost optimal!
 - However, algorithm is very complicated
 - Inherently sequential
- [Sherman'13,Peng'16] $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate *s*-*t* mincut in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time

- [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] *s*-*t* mincut can be solved in *m*^{1+o(1)} time—almost optimal!
 - However, algorithm is very complicated
 - Inherently sequential
- [Sherman'13,Peng'16] $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate *s*-*t* mincut in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time
 - conceptually much simpler

- [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] *s*-*t* mincut can be solved in *m*^{1+o(1)} time—almost optimal!
 - However, algorithm is very complicated
 - Inherently sequential
- [Sherman'13,Peng'16] $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate *s*-*t* mincut in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time
 - conceptually much simpler
 - can be implemented in parallel

- [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] *s*-*t* mincut can be solved in *m*^{1+o(1)} time—almost optimal!
 - However, algorithm is very complicated
 - Inherently sequential
- [Sherman'13,Peng'16] $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate *s*-*t* mincut in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time
 - conceptually much simpler
 - can be implemented in parallel
- Can approximate mincuts be uncrossed?

- [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] *s*-*t* mincut can be solved in *m*^{1+o(1)} time—almost optimal!
 - However, algorithm is very complicated
 - Inherently sequential
- [Sherman'13,Peng'16] $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate *s*-*t* mincut in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time
 - conceptually much simpler
 - can be implemented in parallel
- Can approximate mincuts be uncrossed?
 - Not necessarily...



- [Chen-Kyng-Liu-Peng-Gutenberg-Sachdeva'21] *s*-*t* mincut can be solved in *m*^{1+o(1)} time—almost optimal!
 - However, algorithm is very complicated
 - Inherently sequential
- [Sherman'13,Peng'16] $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate *s*-*t* mincut in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time
 - conceptually much simpler
 - can be implemented in parallel
- Can approximate mincuts be uncrossed?
 - Not necessarily...



 Main obstacle to obtaining approximate Gomory-Hu tree (all-pairs mincut) from approximate s-t mincut

• Let's look at this example again:



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★ □▶ ★ □ ▶ → □ ● の < @

• Let's look at this example again:



 Can locally improve the s-t mincut, i.e., the s-t mincut was locally bad

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ★ 三▶ ★ 三▶ 三三 - のへで

• Let's look at this example again:



- Can locally improve the s-t mincut, i.e., the s-t mincut was locally bad
- Fair cuts: *s*-*t* cuts that are nowhere locally bad, i.e., uniformly good

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ クタペ

Let's look at this example again:



- Can locally improve the s-t mincut, i.e., the s-t mincut was locally bad
- Fair cuts: s-t cuts that are nowhere locally bad, i.e., uniformly good
- Ideal theorem: for any (1 + ε)-fair s-t cut and vertices u, v, there exists a (1 + ε)-approximate u-v cut that does not cross

• Let's look at this example again:



- Can locally improve the s-t mincut, i.e., the s-t mincut was locally bad
- Fair cuts: s-t cuts that are nowhere locally bad, i.e., uniformly good
- Ideal theorem: for any (1 + ε)-fair s-t cut and vertices u, v, there exists a (1 + ε)-approximate u-v cut that does not cross
- To formally define $(1 + \epsilon)$ -fair, we switch to flow-based perspective again

Definition: an *s*−*t* cut is (1 + *ϵ*)-fair if there exists an *s* → *t* flow such that every edge of the cut is nearly saturated

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

- Definition: an s−t cut is (1 + ε)-fair if there exists an s → t flow such that every edge of the cut is nearly saturated
 - The flow along each cut edge in the s → t direction is at least ¹/_{1+ϵ} times edge capacity



- Definition: an s−t cut is (1 + ε)-fair if there exists an s → t flow such that every edge of the cut is nearly saturated
 - The flow along each cut edge in the s → t direction is at least ¹/_{1+c} times edge capacity



Theorem: for any (1 + ε)-fair s-t cut and vertices u, v, there exists a (1 + ε)-approximate u-v cut that does not cross

- Definition: an s−t cut is (1 + ε)-fair if there exists an s → t flow such that every edge of the cut is nearly saturated
 - The flow along each cut edge in the s → t direction is at least ¹/_{1+c} times edge capacity



- Theorem: for any (1 + ε)-fair s-t cut and vertices u, v, there exists a (1 + ε)-approximate u-v cut that does not cross
- Proof: consider the nearly saturating flow...



- Definition: an s−t cut is (1 + ε)-fair if there exists an s → t flow such that every edge of the cut is nearly saturated
 - The flow along each cut edge in the s → t direction is at least ¹/_{1+c} times edge capacity



- Theorem: for any (1 + ε)-fair s-t cut and vertices u, v, there exists a (1 + ε)-approximate u-v cut that does not cross
- Proof: consider the nearly saturating flow...



- Definition: an s−t cut is (1 + ε)-fair if there exists an s → t flow such that every edge of the cut is nearly saturated
 - The flow along each cut edge in the s → t direction is at least ¹/_{1+c} times edge capacity



- Theorem: for any (1 + ε)-fair s-t cut and vertices u, v, there exists a (1 + ε)-approximate u-v cut that does not cross
- Proof: consider the nearly saturating flow...



・ロト・日本・日本・日本・日本

- Definition: an s−t cut is (1 + ε)-fair if there exists an s → t flow such that every edge of the cut is nearly saturated
 - The flow along each cut edge in the s → t direction is at least ¹/_{1+ϵ} times edge capacity



- Theorem: for any (1 + ε)-fair s-t cut and vertices u, v, there exists a (1 + ε)-approximate u-v cut that does not cross
- Proof: consider the nearly saturating flow...



- Definition: an s−t cut is (1 + ε)-fair if there exists an s → t flow such that every edge of the cut is nearly saturated
 - The flow along each cut edge in the s → t direction is at least ¹/_{1+c} times edge capacity



- Theorem: for any (1 + ε)-fair s-t cut and vertices u, v, there exists a (1 + ε)-approximate u-v cut that does not cross
- Proof: consider the nearly saturating flow...



• Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms
 - Given terminals *T* ⊂ *V*, the minimum isolating cut at terminal *t* ∈ *T* is the minimum cut separating *t* from all other terminals.

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms
 - Given terminals *T* ⊂ *V*, the minimum isolating cut at terminal *t* ∈ *T* is the minimum cut separating *t* from all other terminals.
 - Can compute all minimum isolating cuts (one for each terminal) in about max-flow time

A D > 4 回 > 4 回 > 4 回 > 1 0 0 0 0

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms
 - Given terminals *T* ⊂ *V*, the minimum isolating cut at terminal *t* ∈ *T* is the minimum cut separating *t* from all other terminals.
 - Can compute all minimum isolating cuts (one for each terminal) in about max-flow time
 - What about approximate minimum isolating cuts in approximate max-flow time?

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms
 - Given terminals *T* ⊂ *V*, the minimum isolating cut at terminal *t* ∈ *T* is the minimum cut separating *t* from all other terminals.
 - Can compute all minimum isolating cuts (one for each terminal) in about max-flow time
 - What about approximate minimum isolating cuts in approximate max-flow time?
 - Naïve approach fails because can't uncross

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms
 - Given terminals *T* ⊂ *V*, the minimum isolating cut at terminal *t* ∈ *T* is the minimum cut separating *t* from all other terminals.
 - Can compute all minimum isolating cuts (one for each terminal) in about max-flow time
 - What about approximate minimum isolating cuts in approximate max-flow time?
 - Naïve approach fails because can't uncross
 - Fair cuts: approximate minimum isolating cuts in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time

A D > 4 回 > 4 回 > 4 回 > 1 0 0 0 0

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms
 - Given terminals *T* ⊂ *V*, the minimum isolating cut at terminal *t* ∈ *T* is the minimum cut separating *t* from all other terminals.
 - Can compute all minimum isolating cuts (one for each terminal) in about max-flow time
 - What about approximate minimum isolating cuts in approximate max-flow time?
 - Naïve approach fails because can't uncross
 - Fair cuts: approximate minimum isolating cuts in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time
 - Following known reductions: approximate Steiner mincut, approximate Gomory-Hu tree (all-pairs mincut) in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time, also parallel

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms
 - Given terminals *T* ⊂ *V*, the minimum isolating cut at terminal *t* ∈ *T* is the minimum cut separating *t* from all other terminals.
 - Can compute all minimum isolating cuts (one for each terminal) in about max-flow time
 - What about approximate minimum isolating cuts in approximate max-flow time?
 - Naïve approach fails because can't uncross
 - Fair cuts: approximate minimum isolating cuts in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time
 - Following known reductions: approximate Steiner mincut, approximate Gomory-Hu tree (all-pairs mincut) in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time, also parallel
- Expander pruning in expander decomposition

- Theorem: can compute $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate fair cuts in $\tilde{O}(m/\epsilon^3)$ time.
 - Follows $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate mincut algorithm [Sherman'13]
- Minimum Isolating Cuts: a useful primitive for graph cut algorithms
 - Given terminals *T* ⊂ *V*, the minimum isolating cut at terminal *t* ∈ *T* is the minimum cut separating *t* from all other terminals.
 - Can compute all minimum isolating cuts (one for each terminal) in about max-flow time
 - What about approximate minimum isolating cuts in approximate max-flow time?
 - Naïve approach fails because can't uncross
 - Fair cuts: approximate minimum isolating cuts in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time
 - Following known reductions: approximate Steiner mincut, approximate Gomory-Hu tree (all-pairs mincut) in $\tilde{O}(m)$ time, also parallel
- Expander pruning in expander decomposition
 - First Õ(m) time φ-expander decomposition algorithm for all values of φ