

Distributed Distance- r Dominating Set on Sparse High-Girth Graphs

Saeed Akhoondian Amiri* Ben Wiederhake*[†]

October 8, 2019

Abstract

The dominating set problem and its generalization, the distance- r dominating set problem, are among the well-studied problems in the sequential settings. In distributed models of computation, unlike for domination, not much is known about distance- r domination. This is actually the case for other important closely-related covering problem, namely, the distance- r independent set problem.

By result of Kuhn et al. [KMW16] we know the distributed domination problem is hard on high girth graphs; we study the problem on a slightly restricted subclass of these graphs: graphs of bounded expansion with high girth, i.e. their girth should be at least $4r + 3$.

We show that in such graphs, for every constant r , a simple greedy CONGEST algorithm provides a constant-factor approximation of the minimum distance- r dominating set problem, in a constant number of rounds. More precisely, our constants are dependent to r , not to the size of the graph. This is the first algorithm that shows there are non-trivial constant factor approximations in constant number of rounds for any distance r -covering problem in distributed settings.

To show the dependency on r is inevitable, we provide an unconditional lower bound showing the same problem is hard already on rings. We also show that our analysis of the algorithm is relatively tight, that is any significant improvement to the approximation factor requires new algorithmic ideas.

*Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus, Germany;
{samiri,bwiederh}@mpi-inf.mpg.de

[†]Saarbrücken Graduate School of Computer Science, Germany

1 Introduction

The dominating set problem asks for a set of vertices D of a graph $G = (V, E)$ such that every other vertex of G is a neighbor of a vertex in D . Given that $D = V$ is a trivial solution to the problem, we are interested in finding a set D of small size.

The problem plays an important role both from the theoretical and practical perspective of computer science. For the latter, it serves as an initial set of vertices to form a network backbone and e.g. facilitates constructing small routing tables in networks; for the former, the dominating set problem is a central problem in showing lower bounds for several complexity paradigms: It is one of Karp's 21 NP-complete problems, it is the central $W[2]$ -complete.

We consider the problem in distributed settings, namely on LOCAL and CONGEST models. Intuitively speaking, in these models, every vertex in the graph is a processor, has a unique identifier, and communicate only with its neighbors per round. The CONGEST model restricts the bandwidth of communication links to a reasonable complexity. The aim is to solve the problem with the least number of communication rounds. A more rigorous definition follows in Section 2. We specifically look into the problem of finding a small distance- r dominating set, where each vertex needs to output its membership.

In the following, we first go over the status of domination problems in distributed computing and in particular in sparse graphs. Then we explore existing tools and we explain what is their shortage for our purpose. Afterward, we introduce our results and determine where in the existing literature it belongs to.

Related Work

In distributed settings, for dominating set problem in general graphs recently Kuhn et al. [DKM19] provide a $(1 + \epsilon)(1 + \log(\Delta + 1))$ -approximation of the problem in $f(n)$ rounds, where Δ is the maximum degree and $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is the number of rounds that is needed to compute a special graph decomposition, called the network decomposition [AGLP89, ABCP92, Gha19].

On the other hand, the lower bound of Kuhn et al. [KMW16] shows that finding a logarithmic approximation in sublogarithmic time for minimum dominating set (and some other covering problems) is impossible in general graphs, even in the LOCAL model of computation. Their lower-bound graph has a high girth (as a function of n), but also it was of unbounded arboricity (more generally unbounded average degree).

In fact, they provide a negative example of the famous question of Naor and Stockmeyer: “What can be computed locally?” [NS93].

If we consider a graph class of very high girth and very low edge density, e.g. trees (graphs of infinite girth), the problem is easy to approximate in zero rounds: take all non-leaf vertices.

The above observations raise the following question: In which graph classes does the problem admit a constant approximation factor in a constant number of rounds?

Naturally, given the lower bound, we have to search affirmative answer in sparse graphs. Along this line, there are several interesting results in sparse graphs. Lenzen et al. [CHW08, LPW13] provided the first constant-factor approximation in a constant number of rounds in planar graphs, then this has been improved by Czygrinow et al. [CHW08]. Later Amiri et al. [ASS16, AS16] provided a new analysis method to extend the result of Lenzen et al. to bounded genus graphs. This has recently been improved to excluded minor graphs by Czygrinow et al. [CHWW18].

A natural generalization of excluded minor graphs is the class of bounded expansion graphs, in simple words, bounded expansion graphs also exclude minors but only locally; we may have large clique minor in the entire graph.

On graphs of bounded expansion, there is only a logarithmic time constant factor approximation known for dominating set, however, it seems that one can extend the algorithm of [CHWW18] to bounded expansion graphs as they care only about local minors. If we go slightly beyond those graphs, to graphs of bounded arboricity (where every subgraph has a constant edge density), the situation is worse: only an $O(\log \Delta)$ -approximation in $O(\log n)$ rounds is known. There is a $O(\log n)$ round $O(1)$ -approximation in such graphs, however, this algorithm is randomized [LW10].

What said is all about dominating set, the situation gets drastically worse if we go to distance- r dominating set. That is the only known algorithm that solves the problem on a non-trivial class of graphs (e.g. paths, cliques are among trivial classes of graphs) is the algorithm of Amiri et al. [AOdMRS18] for bounded expansion graphs which provides a constant factor approximation in a logarithmic number of rounds.

The Challenge of Approximating Distance- r Dominating Set

There are several existing approaches one might try to employ to tackle the problem: 1) take the r -th power of the graph and go back to dominating set, 2) decentralized existing decomposition methods in the sequential setting and employ them, 3) use existing fast distributed graph decomposition methods

for sparse graphs. In the following, we explain how all of the above approaches are not practical in providing sublogarithmic round algorithms for distance- r covering problems, and in particular for distance- r dominating set.

For the first approach, clearly we lose the sparsity of the graph already on stars. Hence, we cannot rely on existing algorithms for domination problem in sparse graphs.

If we decentralize the existing sequential decomposition methods, we can barely hope to get anything better than logarithmic rounds: every such decomposition we know already takes polylogarithmically many rounds. Even assuming the decomposition is already given, in such methods we have to sequentially go over the clusters, however the number of clusters is usually at least logarithmic. Hence, we cannot hope for a sublogarithmic rounds.

For the third approach, we first briefly explain how the existing methods work and then explain why it is not possible to stick to known techniques. These methods are mostly inspired by existing methods in classical settings, like Baker's method [Bak94] e.g. the $O(\log^* n)$ round algorithm of [CHS06] is among them. The idea is to find a partition of a sparse graph into connected clusters such that each cluster has a small diameter and the number of in-between cluster edges is small (in the Baker's method, we have treewidth of each cluster is bounded, whereas for distributed settings we require the diameter to be small). Then find the optimal solution inside each cluster efficiently, and given the fact that the number of direct edges between a pair of clusters is small, we ignore/resolve conflicts.

However, the latter already for distance-2 domination fails, as the number of in-between cluster edges in the distance graph is high. Also, we do not have a pleasure to rely on global properties similar to what we exploit in the sequential setting to make our choice wiser. Since such approaches increase the number of rounds. Therefore, any distributed algorithm that solves distance covering problems either have to develop completely new techniques or resolve the above issue concretely tailored for the underlying graph class/problem.

Our Results

As said, we consider a generalization of the dominating set problem, i.e. the distance- r dominating set problem: find a set of vertices D such that every other vertex is within distance r of one of the vertices in D . We fill a gap between the lower bound and upper bounds by analyzing the complexity of the problem on graphs of high girth (similar to the lower bound graph by Kuhn et al.), but given that lower bound graph was relatively dense,

we restrict ourselves to sparse graphs, in particular to bounded expansion graphs (similar to the work of [AOdMRS18]).

In the aforementioned class of graphs, we provide an affirmative answer to the question of Naor and Stockmeyer, by designing a simple deterministic CONGEST constant factor approximation algorithm (more precisely, our constant depends only on r) in a constant number of rounds (again, this constant depends only on r not the size of the graph). Formally, we prove the following Theorem 1 in Lemma 9.

Theorem 1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a graph class of bounded expansion $f(r)$ and girth at least $4r + 3$. There is a CONGEST algorithm that runs in $O(r)$ rounds and provides an $O(r \cdot f(r))$ -approximation of minimum distance- r dominating set on \mathcal{C} .*

As explained earlier, in contrast to our algorithm, the existing methods for domination problems are not extendable to distance- r domination problem.

Given that distance- r dominating set is equivalent to the dominating set of the r -th power of graph, this is one of the few algorithms that can actually provide a constant factor approximation in a non-trivial class of dense graphs for covering problems. There are very few known algorithms with a constant factor guarantee in a constant number of rounds on non-trivial dense graphs, e.g. the algorithm of Schneider et al. [SW08] on graphs of bounded independence number (for the independent set and the connected dominating set problem), partially falls in this category.

To show that our upper bound is reasonably tight, we provide a lower bound as well. This we obtain by a reduction from lower bound for independent set on the ring [CHW08, LPW13] to the distance- r dominating set on rings (of course, the girth of the ring is high). More formally we prove the following Theorem 2.

Theorem 2. *Assume an arbitrary but fixed $\delta > 0$ and $r > 1$, with $r \in o(\log^* n)$. Then there is no deterministic LOCAL algorithm that finds in $O(r)$ rounds a $(2r + 1 - \delta)$ -approximation of distance- r dominating set for all $G \in \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is the class of cycles of length $\gg 4r + 3$.*

We will formally introduce the notion of bounded expansion in the preliminaries, for the moment it is fine to imagine these as generalizations of bounded degree graphs and H -minor-free graphs. For more information on the relation between sparse graph classes we refer the reader to Figure 1.

Paper organization: First, we introduce our notation in Section 2, then in Section 3 we explain the algorithm, and an analysis of its running




Figure 1 Diagram of the relation of sparse graph classes. The graph class in lower bound construction of Kuhn et al. [KMW16] is a subclass of logarithmic girth class. The bounded expansion class is a subclass of bounded arboricity class. Bounded expansion is also a superclass of many common sparse graph classes: planar, bounded genus, excluded minors, and bounded degree. The class of bounded expansion with high girth intersects each of the other four classes, but neither contains nor is fully contained in any of them.

time, correctness, and approximation guarantee is given. We also show that our analysis is asymptotically tight by providing an example that matches the analysis. In Section 4 we provide a lower bound construction and its correctness proof. Finally, we conclude our work in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

We assume basic familiarity with graph theory. In the following, we introduce some of the basic graph notations to avoid ambiguities. We refer the reader to the book by Diestel [Die12] for further reading.

Graph, Neighborhood, Distance- r : We will only consider simple, undirected graphs $G = (V, E)$. For $u, v \in V$, define $d(u, v)$ as the distance (in number of edges) between the two vertices. For a set $S \subseteq V$, we define $d(u, S)$ as the distance between vertex u and any vertex in S .

Two vertices $u, v \in V$ are neighbors in G if there is an edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E$. We extend this definition to the distance- r neighborhood $N^r[v]$ and open

distance- r neighborhood $N^r(v)$ of a vertex v in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} N^r[v] &:= \{u \in V \mid d(u, v) \leq r\} \\ N^r(v) &:= N^r[v] \setminus \{v\} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for a set $S \subseteq V$ we define:

$$\begin{aligned} N^r[S] &:= \bigcup_{v \in S} N^r[v] \\ N^r(S) &:= N^r[S] \setminus S \end{aligned}$$

Girth, Radius: The girth g of a graph G is the length of its shortest cycle, or ∞ if acyclic. The radius R of G is the minimum integer R such that there is a vertex $v \in V$ so that $N^R[v] = V$.

Distance- r Dominating Set: A set $M \subseteq V$ is a distance- r dominating set if $V = N^r[M]$. If additionally there is no smaller such set, then M is a minimum distance- r dominating set of G .

Edge Density, r -Shallow Minor, Expansion: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, its edge density is $|E|/|V|$. A graph H is an r -shallow minor of G if H can be obtained from G by the following operations. First, we take subgraph S of G and then partition vertices of S into vertex disjoint connected subgraphs S_1, \dots, S_t of S , each of them of radius at most r and, at the end contract each S_i ($i \in [t]$) to a single vertex to obtain H . We denote by $\nabla_r(G)$ the maximum edge density among all r -shallow minors of the graph G .

A graph class \mathcal{C} is bounded expansion if there is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ and integer $r \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\nabla_r(G) \leq f(r)$; here f is the *expansion function*. A class of graphs \mathcal{C} has constant expansion if for every integer r we have $f(r) \in O(1)$.

Every planar, bounded genus and, excluded minor graph is a constant expansion graph. Every class of bounded degree graphs is also bounded expansion, but not of constant expansion. For more information on bounded expansion graphs, we refer the reader to the book of Nešetřil and Ossona de Mendez [NDM12].

LOCAL and CONGEST model of computation: The LOCAL model of computation assumes that the problem is being solved in a distributed manner: Each vertex in the graph is also a computational node,

the input graph is also the communication graph, and initially, each vertex only knows its own unique identifier and its neighbors. An algorithm proceeds in synchronous rounds on each vertex in parallel. In each round, the algorithm can run an arbitrary amount of local computation, send a message of arbitrary size to each of the neighboring vertices, and then receive all messages from its neighbors. At the end of the round, each vertex can decide locally whether it wants to halt with an output, or continue. The most common metric is the number of synchronous rounds, i.e. the number of communication rounds.

This model first introduced by Linial [Lin92], later Peleg [Pel00] named it LOCAL model.

The CONGEST model is very similar to the LOCAL model, except that identifiers can be represented in $O(\log n)$ bits, and each message can only hold $O(\log n)$ bits, where n is the number of vertices in the network.

3 Distributed Approximation Algorithm for Dominating Set

We present an algorithm that solves r -MDS with approximation factor $O(r \cdot f(r))$ in time $O(r)$ on graphs with girth at least $4r + 3$. Specifically, we provide an algorithm that proves the following theorem.

Theorem 1 Let \mathcal{C} be a graph class of bounded expansion $f(r)$ and girth at least $4r + 3$. There is a CONGEST algorithm that runs in $O(r)$ rounds and provides an $O(r \cdot f(r))$ -approximation of minimum distance- r dominating set on \mathcal{C} .

We prove this by providing Algorithm 1 satisfying all bounds. At its core, the algorithm is simple: Each vertex computes the size of its distance- r neighborhood, i.e. the distance- r degree. This degree is propagated, so that each vertex selects in its distance- r neighborhood the vertex with the highest such degree. The output is the set of all selected vertices. We expect this to yield a good approximation because only few candidates can be selected.

Algorithm 1 defines this formally. The main technical contribution is Lemma 9, which concludes that Algorithm 1 is correct and satisfies all bounds in Theorem 1.

We say that Algorithm 1 computes a set D by returning \top for all vertices in the set, and \perp for all others. Naturally, messages and comparisons only consider the ID of vertices, and not the vertices themselves. This abuse of notation simplifies the algorithm and analysis. In line 7 we order tuples

Algorithm 1: CONGEST computation of r -MDS, on each vertex v in parallel

```

1: Compute  $|N^r(v)|$ , e.g. using Algorithm 2
2: // Select the vertex with the highest degree:
3:  $(prio^v, sel^v) := (|N^r(v)|, v)$ 
4: for  $r$  rounds do
5:   Send  $(prio^v, sel^v)$  to all neighbors
6:   Receive  $(prio^u, sel^u)$  from each neighbor  $u$ 
7:    $(prio^v, sel^v) := \max_{u \in N^1[v]} \{(prio^u, sel^u)\}$ 
8:   Remember all received messages that contained  $(prio^v, sel^v)$ 
9: end for
10: // Propagate back to the selected vertex:
11:  $D^v := \{sel^v\}$ 
12: for  $r - 1$  rounds do
13:   for each neighbor  $u \in N^1(v)$  do
14:     Determine which vertices sent by  $u$  are in  $D^v$ 
15:     Send these to  $u$ , encoded as a bitset of size  $r$ 
16:   end for
17:   Receive bitsets, extend  $D^v$  accordingly
18: end for
19: return  $v \in D^v$ 

```

lexicographically: Tuples are ordered by the first element (the size of the distance- r neighborhood); ties are broken by the second element (the ID of the vertex).

Observe that counting the neighborhood of the root in a rooted tree is easy; that the graph looks like a tree locally; and that the messages sent across an edge (if any) are identical no matter which vertex is the root. Line 3 avoids informing a vertex about its own subtree.

The remainder of this section proves the correctness, running time, and approximation factor for the algorithm.

Correctness

First we will show basic correctness properties. One can trivially check that all messages contain only $O(\log n)$ many bits. Specifically, the bitsets have only size $r \in o(\log^* n)$.

Lemma 3. *Algorithm 2 computes the size of $N^r(v)$ for each vertex v in*

Algorithm 2: CONGEST computation of $|N^r(v)|$, on each vertex v in parallel

- 1: $n_u := 1$ for all $u \in N^1(v)$
 - 2: **for** $r - 1$ rounds **do**
 - 3: To each vertex $u \in N^1(v)$, send $1 + \sum_{w \in N^1(v) \setminus \{u\}} n_w$
 - 4: $n_u :=$ the number received from u , for each $u \in N^1(v)$
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **return** $\sum_{w \in N^1(v)} n_w$
-

parallel.

Proof. First, observe that in only $r - 1$ rounds of communication, no cycle can be detected, as the girth is at least $4r + 3$. This means that $N^i(v)$ is a tree for every $i \leq r - 1$ and $v \in V$. We define the tree $T_{u,i}^{-v}$ as the (set of vertices in the) tree of edge-depth i , rooted at vertex u , excluding the branch to vertex v , where v is a neighbor of vertex u .

Now we can prove by induction: At vertex v , after the i -th round¹ (where $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$), n_u stores the size of the tree $T_{u,i}^{-v}$.

For the induction basis $i = 0$, we know $\forall u, v : n_u = 1 = |T_{u,0}^{-v}| = |\{u\}|$.

This leaves the induction step: At the beginning of the i -th round (for $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$), we know that $n_u = |T_{u,i-1}^{-v}|$ by the induction hypothesis, for every u, v . Consider vertex v . By construction, its distance- i open neighborhood is the union of all edge-depth $i - 1$ trees of v 's neighbors, so: $N^i(v) = \bigcup_{u \in N^1(v)} T_{u,i-1}^{-v}$. Due to the high girth requirement, we know that all sets in this union are disjoint. Vertex v can therefore compute $|N^i(v)|$ by summing up all its n_u s, and can even compute $|T_{v,i}^{-u}|$ for an arbitrary vertex u by subtracting the corresponding n_u again. This is exactly what happens in line 3. Then v sends $|T_{v,i}^{-u}|$ to each neighbor u , which stores it in the corresponding variable n_v . By symmetry, this also means that vertex v now has stored $|T_{u,i}^{-v}|$ in n_u , thus proving the induction step.

With the meaning of n_u established, line 6 must compute $|N^r(v)|$. \square

Next we show that Algorithm 1 selects the maximum degree neighbor:

Lemma 4. *In Algorithm 1, when the selection phase is over (line 9 and onward), each vertex v has selected a vertex sel^v . This is the unique vertex $\arg \max_{u \in N^r[v]} \{|N^r(u)|, u\}$.*

¹ We interpret “after the zeroth round” as “before the first round”

Proof. By construction, only tuples of the form $(|N^r(w)|, w)$ with $w \in V$ are ever stored. The max operator is commutative and associative, so it is sufficient to prove that each vertex v considers precisely the tuples for $w \in N^r[v]$. This can be shown by straightforward induction: After round i , vertex v considers precisely the tuples for $w \in N^i[v]$. The base case is $i = 0$, the induction step is straight-forward. \square

This shows that each vertex v selects the maximum vertex in v 's neighborhood. Next, we show that this selection is back-propagated:

Lemma 5. *If there is a vertex u that selects v ($sel^u = v$), then $v \in D^u$.*

Proof. Consider the path along which v was forwarded during the selection phase. By straight-forward induction one can see that after i rounds of propagation, the first i many vertices w on this path (starting at u) have $v \in D^w$. The path has length at most r edges, so $v \in D^u$ after r rounds. \square

And because no further vertices are added into any D^v , we get:

Corollary 6. *The selected vertices are precisely the computed set:*

$$D = \{sel^v \mid v \in V\} \tag{1}$$

Together with Lemma 4, this shows that Algorithm 1 indeed computes a dominating set:

Lemma 7. *The computed set D is a distance- r dominating set.*

Proof. Assume towards contradiction that a vertex v is not dominated. Lemma 4 shows that v selected a vertex sel^v in its distance- r neighborhood. Corollary 6 shows that $sel^v \in D$, which distance- r dominates v in contradiction to the original assumption. \square

The time complexity analysis is trivial:

Lemma 8. *Algorithm 1 runs in $O(r)$ rounds.*

Proof. Each loop takes $O(r)$ iterations, and each iteration takes constantly many rounds. Therefore, the overall algorithm takes $O(r)$ rounds. \square

This concludes the basic correctness properties. What remains to be shown is the approximation quality.

Approximation Analysis

In this subsection, we prove the approximation bound in Lemma 9. Specifically, we prove that the size of D , the set of selected vertices, is within factor $1 + 4 \cdot r \cdot f(r) \in O(r \cdot f(r))$ of the size of M , a minimum distance- r dominating set.

Lemma 9. *If the graph class \mathcal{C} has expansion $f(r)$ and girth at least $4r + 3$, then the set of vertices D selected by Algorithm 1 is small: $|D|/|M| \in O(r \cdot f(r))$.*

In the remainder of this subsection we prove Lemma 9. Note that this means that if r is constant, then the approximation factor is constant, too.

We now analyze the behavior of Algorithm 1 on a particular graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$. We begin by showing that the optimal solution implies a partition into Voronoi cells [PS85] which we will use for the rest. First we define what a *covering* vertex is. Note that this can (and often is) different from the vertex selected by the algorithm.

Definition 10. *Let $c : V \rightarrow M$ be the mapping from vertices in V to corresponding dominating vertices in M , breaking ties by distance (smaller), then by ID (smaller):*

$$c(v) := \arg \min_{u \in N^r[v] \cap M} \{(d(u, v), u)\} = \arg \min_{u \in M} \{(d(u, v), u)\} \quad (2)$$

Again we order tuples lexicographically. Now we can partition V into Voronoi cells $H_m := \{v \in V \mid c(v) = m\}$ for each $m \in M$.

Corollary 11. *Each H_m is connected and has radius at most r .*

Proof. As vertex m dominates all vertices in H_m , we know that H_m has radius at most r . \square

Next, we use the high-girth property to show that the Voronoi cells behave nicely:

Lemma 12. *The subgraph induced by H_m in G is a tree.*

Proof. Assume towards contradiction that there is a cycle C' in H_m . We will construct a cycle that has length at most $2r + 1$.

Construct a BFS-tree of H_m rooted in m . Then the cycle C' must contain an edge e between $u, v \in H_m$. Consider the cycle that consists of the path from u to v along the BFS-tree, and the edge u, v . This cycle must have length at most $r + r + 1$, because the BFS-tree has depth at most r . This contradicts G having a girth of at least $4r + 3$. \square

Lemma 13. *For any two Voronoi cells $H_m \neq H_n$, there is at most one edge between them.*

Proof. Let $\{u, v\} \in E$ and $\{s, t\} \in E$ be two different edges between H_m and H_n . W.l.o.g. assume $c(u) = c(s) = m$ and $c(v) = c(t) = n$, and assume $v \neq t$ (but $u = s$ is possible).

By Corollary 11 we know that the subgraphs induced by H_m and H_n are each connected, so there must be a path p_m entirely in H_m between vertices u and s , possibly of length 0. Likewise, a path p_n must exist entirely in H_n between vertices v and t . The union of the paths and the assumed edges forms a cycle $C_{u,v,s,t}$, as no vertex can be repeated. We will now prove that $C_{u,v,s,t}$ is too small.

The paths p_m and p_n have length at most $2r$, each. Therefore we have found the cycle $C_{u,v,s,t}$ to have length at most $4r + 2$, in contradiction to the minimum girth $4r + 3$. \square

Let $G' = (V', E')$ be the result of contracting H_m to a single vertex, for each $m \in M$.

Lemma 14. *The edge set E' is small: $|E'| \leq f(r) \cdot |M|$*

Proof. Using Corollary 11, we can apply the definition of the function $f(r)$:

$$|E'| = \frac{|E'|}{|V'|} \cdot |V'| \leq f(r) \cdot |M| \quad \square$$

Now we can take a closer look at the set of vertices D actually selected by the algorithm. We will construct two sets of bounded size such that their union covers D , and thereby bound the size of D .

Definition 15. *We consider the set D^O of vertices v that were selected by a vertex u in a different Voronoi cell (i.e. $c(v) \neq c(u)$), and the possibly overlapping set D^I of vertices v that were selected by a vertex u in the same Voronoi cell (i.e. $c(v) = c(u)$):*

$$\begin{aligned} D^O &:= \{d \in D \mid \exists v. v \text{ selected } d \text{ with } c(v) \neq c(d)\} \\ D^I &:= \{d \in D \mid \exists v. v \text{ selected } d \text{ with } c(v) = c(d)\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $D = D^I \cup D^O$, and $|D| \leq |D^I| + |D^O|$. In order to prove Lemma 9 it is therefore sufficient to show $D^I, D^O \in O(r \cdot f(r) \cdot |M|)$.

First we will consider D^O , the set of vertices selected across Voronoi cells. There are only few crossing edges, so there can only be few such selections:

Lemma 16. *The set D^O of vertices selected across Voronoi cells is small: $D^O \in O(r \cdot f(r) \cdot |M|)$.*

Proof. Lemma 14 and Lemma 13 tell us that there are at most $f(r) \cdot |M|$ edges across Voronoi cells. For each such edge at most $2r$ different vertices are announced (i.e. r in each direction), therefore there are at most $f(r) |M| \cdot 2r$ many candidates for D^O . \square

Next we prove a bound on the other set of Definition 15: the set D^I of vertices selected from within a Voronoi cell. We will see that these always fall on the spanning tree inside Voronoi cells, which are small. First we define the candidate set:

Definition 17. *For each Voronoi cell H_m , we define the set of vertices \mathcal{T}_m as the union of all shortest paths $P_{u,m}$ between vertex m and each vertex u on the Voronoi boundary:*

$$\mathcal{T}_m := \bigcup_{\substack{\{u,v\} \in E \\ c(u)=m, c(v) \neq m}} P_{u,m} \qquad \mathcal{T} := \bigcup_{m \in M} \mathcal{T}_m$$

This is well-defined due to Lemma 12. Observe that \mathcal{T}_m is not necessarily equal to H_m : All leaves in \mathcal{T}_m have edges in G that lead outside the Voronoi cell. If that is not true for a vertex in H_m , then it will not be in \mathcal{T}_m .

Next we want to prove in two steps that D^I is contained in \mathcal{T} .

Lemma 18. *If $|M| \geq 1$, then there is always a vertex beyond reach:*

$$\forall v \in V \exists u \in V. d(u, v) = r + 1 \tag{3}$$

Proof. Assume towards contradiction there is a vertex v for which no such vertex u exists. Then there is also no vertex u' with $d(u', v) > r + 1$, because one could pick a shortest path, and construct such a u . Therefore $D^I = \{v\}$ is a dominating set, in contradiction to the premise. \square

With this we can show that only vertices in \mathcal{T}_m are selected:

Lemma 19. *Let v be a vertex selected by u in the same Voronoi cell. Then $v \in \mathcal{T}_{c(v)}$:*

$$(sel^u = v \wedge c(u) = c(v)) \implies v \in \mathcal{T}_{c(v)} \tag{4}$$




Figure 2 Typical vertex layout in proof of Lemma 19. The identity of vertex u does not matter, hence it is not shown

Proof. Assume towards contradiction that $v \notin \mathcal{T}_{c(v)}$. For brevity, let $m := c(v)$. Observe that $m \neq v$, because $m \in \mathcal{T}_m$. Let w be the next vertex on a shortest path from v towards m ; possibly m itself. We will now analyze the properties of vertex w and conclude that vertex u should not have selected v . Refer to Figure 2 for an overview.

By Lemma 12, the subgraph induced by H_m is a tree. If we root this H_m -tree at vertex m , we can denote the subtree rooted at v as T_v . This subtree has depth at most $r - 1$, so w covers the entire subtree: $T_v \subseteq N^r(w)$. All vertices $x \in V \setminus T_v$ are closer to w than to v , as all paths from x to v must go through w . So the neighborhood of v is included in the neighborhood of w : $N^r[v] \subseteq N^r[w]$.

Now we can use Lemma 18: There must be a vertex t that has distance $r+1$ to vertex v , so $t \notin N^r(v)$. This means that $t \notin T_v$, and therefore $t \in N^r(w)$. In summary, the degree of w is strictly larger: $|N^r(w)| > |N^r(v)|$, meaning that vertex u would prefer selecting w over v .

All that is left is to show that vertex u is indeed able to select vertex w : If $u \in T_v$, then the maximum depth of $r - 1$ means the distance to w is at most r . If $u \notin T_v$, then w is on every shortest path between u and v , and therefore in reach, too.

This leads to a contradiction: Vertex u selected v , although vertex w is in reach, and has a strictly larger distance- r neighborhood, and should be preferred by the algorithm. \square

Corollary 20. *Selections within a Voronoi cell are restricted to \mathcal{T} : $D^I \subseteq \mathcal{T}$*

Now we can show a bound on D^I by proving it on \mathcal{T} :

Lemma 21. *The set \mathcal{T} is small: $|\mathcal{T}| \leq (1 + 2r \cdot f(r)) |M|$*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary but fixed $\{v, u\} \in E$ with $c(v) \neq c(u)$. Each path $P_{v, c(v)}$ has at most r vertices not in M , because it is a shortest path, and by construction all vertices are dominated by $c(v)$. Each edge in E' corresponds to at most two such paths. With Lemma 14, this bounds the number of paths to at most $2f(r) |M|$.

Therefore \mathcal{T} contains at most $2r \cdot f(r) |M| + |M|$ vertices. \square

Corollary 22. *The set D^I is small: $|D^I| \leq (1 + 2r \cdot f(r)) |M|$*

Proof. Follows from Corollary 20 and Lemma 21. \square

As both $|D^I|$ and $|D^O|$ are in $O(r \cdot f(r) \cdot |M|)$, this concludes the proof of Lemma 9, and thus Theorem 1. More specifically, we proved the upper bound $(1 + 4 \cdot r \cdot f(r)) \cdot |M|$ on $|D|$.

Tightness of Approximation

The previous subsection proved that the algorithm is a $O(r \cdot f(r))$ approximation. Is it possible that the algorithm actually performs significantly better than the analysis guarantees? This subsection proves that there are graphs for which the algorithm yields a $\Omega(r \cdot f(r))$ approximation, meaning that the above analysis of the algorithm is asymptotically tight.

Lemma 23. *There is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and a class of graphs \mathcal{C} of expansion $f(r)$ and girth at least $4r + 3$ such that Algorithm 1 takes $\Omega(r)$ rounds and provides an $\Omega(r \cdot f(r))$ -approximation of minimum distance- r dominating set on \mathcal{C} . (Cf. Theorem 1.)*

Proof. The rest of this subsection constructs such a \mathcal{C} consisting of graphs $G_{r, f(r)}$ for all values of $r \geq 1$ and $f(r) \geq 2$. \square

This does not mean that the problem is hard. It only shows that in the worst case, the presented algorithm may use up the approximation slack.

The construction is a modified version of the subdivided biclique. Let X and Y be two disjoint sets of vertices, each of size $2f(r)$. For each pair $(x, y) \in X \times Y$, connect them with a path $P_{x, y}$ of $2r$ vertices, such that $d(x, y) = 2r + 1$. This means that no vertex can simultaneously cover x and

y , i.e., is within distance r of both x and y . For each $x \in X, y \in Y$, create a set $B_{x,y}$ of $k = 2r \cdot f(r)$ new vertices, and connect each vertex in $B_{x,y}$ by a single edge to the vertex closest to x of each path. Let V be the union of all these sets, and E as described, then $G_{r,f(r)} = (V, E)$ is the constructed graph.

First we prove that the graph class satisfies all requirements.

Lemma 24. *For arbitrary but fixed values of $r \geq 1$ and $f(r) \geq 2$, the graph class \mathcal{C} has expansion $f(r)$ and girth at least $4r + 3$.*

Proof. Let $G_{r,f(r)} \in \mathcal{C}$ be a fixed graph from the constructed graph class. The girth is at least $4 \cdot (2r + 1) > 4r + 3$, as a cycle needs to pass through at least two vertices from X and two vertices from Y . The low expansion can be shown by contracting as much as possible around all vertices in $X \cup Y$, which results in the biclique $K_{2f(r), 2f(r)}$, with $4f(r)$ vertices and $4f(r)^2$ edges. Therefore, the constructed graph has $f^G(r) \geq f(r)$. As this is the optimal contraction choice, this also shows $f^G(r) = f(r)$. \square

Next we show that this graph class causes worst-case behavior. The running time is trivial:

Lemma 25. *Algorithm 1 runs in $\Omega(r)$ rounds on graphs in \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. Follows from the construction of Algorithm 1. \square

Next, we show that the algorithm computes a large dominating set, compared to the optimum:

Lemma 26. *The proposed Algorithm 1 provides an $\Omega(r \cdot f(r))$ -approximation of minimum distance- r dominating set on \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. By construction, $X \cup Y$ is a dominating set, meaning $|M| \leq 4f(r)$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $|D| \geq 4r \cdot f(r)^2$.

We do so by simulating the algorithm on G . We only need to consider the vertices selected by vertices on the paths do. Specifically, pick a specific path $P_{x,y}$ between $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Vertices v_x closer to x than to y cover the attached vertices $B_{x,y}$, so $|N^r(v_x)| \geq 2r + k = 2r + 2r \cdot f(r)$. The vertices closer to vertex x cover more of the other paths ending in x , each step increases $|N^r(v_x)|$ by at least $2f(r) - 1$, and loses at most 1 vertex out of sight in the y direction. Note that we ignore the vertices in $B_{x,y'}$ with $y' \neq y$, which would only make this argument stronger. The important property is that $|N^r(v_x)|$ strictly increases towards x , among vertices v_x with $d(v_x, x) < d(v_x, y)$.

Each vertex v_y closer to y than to x does not cover the attached vertices $B_{x,y}$ close to vertex x , as distance r from them would imply distance r to x . We can compute $|N^r(v_y)| \leq r + N^r(v_r) + 1 - 1 = r + r \cdot 2f(r) < 2r + 2r \cdot f(r) \leq |N^r(v_x)|$, so vertex v_y will choose some vertex v_x . As we already established, $|N^r(v_x)|$ increases with decreasing distance to x . Therefore, each v_y will select the vertex closest to x , meaning at least half of each path will be selected, specifically the one on the v_l side.

In total this means the algorithm selects at least r vertices per path, and there is one such path for each $X \times Y$ combination. Hence $|D| \geq r \cdot 4 \cdot f(r)^2$. Recall that $|M| \leq 4f(r)$, so the algorithm achieves an approximation factor of at least $r \cdot f(r)$ for the constructed graph. Compared with the upper bound of $1 + (4r \cdot f(r))$ this is asymptotically tight. \square

This concludes the proof of Lemma 23 (tightness of approximation).

4 Lower Bound

In this section, we will prove that significantly better approximation of the problem is hard. Intuitively speaking, this is because symmetry cannot be broken in $o(\log^* n)$ rounds, and without that it is hard to construct any non-trivial distance- r dominating set. Hence, this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 2:

Theorem 2 Assume an arbitrary but fixed $\delta > 0$ and $r > 1$, with $r \in o(\log^* n)$. Then there is no deterministic LOCAL algorithm that finds in $O(r)$ rounds a $(2r + 1 - \delta)$ -approximation of distance- r dominating set for all $G \in \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is the class of cycles of length $\gg 4r + 3$.

As we will see later, the trivial distance- r dominating set V (i.e., the set of all vertices), is a $(2r + 1)$ -approximation in the case of cycles.

This has been proven implicitly in the work of [LPW13]. However, we find it simpler to provide a new proof tailored for our setting, but only for n being an multiple of $2r + 1$. In essence, we will show a reduction from “large” independent set to distance- r dominating set, on the graph class of cycles. Intuitively speaking, any algorithm that does significantly better than the trivial dominating set *anywhere* on the cycle leads to a linear sized independent set; and the bound is constructed such that the algorithm needs to do better than trivial somewhere indeed.

The idea is simple: find a distance- r dominating set D on cycle C ; we know two consecutive vertices of D on C are of distance at most $2r + 1$

from each other, hence, these vertices help us to break the symmetry and as $r \in o(\log^* n)$ it yields to an independent set of size $O(n)$ in $o(\log^* n)$ rounds. In the remainder we formalize this argument.

Assume towards contradiction that \mathcal{ALG} is such a deterministic distributed algorithm, which finds a distance- r dominating set in $G \in \mathcal{C}$ of size at most $(2r + 1 - \delta) |M|$, where M is a minimum distance- r dominating set.

We show that \mathcal{ALG} can be used to construct an algorithm violating known lowerbounds on “large” independent set [LPW13, CHW08]:

Lemma 27 (Lemma 4 of [CHW08]). *There is no deterministic distributed algorithm that finds an independent set of size $\Omega(n/\log^* n)$ in a cycle on n vertices in $o(\log^* n)$ rounds.*

We present the reduction algorithm in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3: CONGEST computation of an IS on a cycle $G \in \mathcal{C}_r$, for each v in parallel

- 1: Compute a distance- r dominating set D by simulating \mathcal{ALG} .
 - 2: Determine the connected components $V \setminus D$.
 - 3: **for** each component C_i **do**
 - 4: Determine the two adjacent vertices to C_i , i.e. $u, v \in N(C_i)$.
 - 5: Let u be the vertex with the lower ID, name it representor of C_i .
 - 6: All vertices of odd distance to u in C_i join I .
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **return** I
-

We begin by showing basic correctness:

Lemma 28. *Algorithm 3 runs in $o(\log^* n)$ rounds.*

Proof. By assumption, \mathcal{ALG} executes in $O(r)$ rounds. On the other hand, observe that each vertex in D only covers up to a distance of r . Because D is a dominating set, all component must have length at most $2r$. Hence, discovering the adjacent vertex of lowest ID can be done in $O(r)$, as well as propagating the distance information. By construction $r \in o(\log^* n)$, so Algorithm 3 takes $o(\log^* n)$ rounds. \square

Lemma 29. *Algorithm 3 computes set I which is an independent set.*

Proof. For two distinct vertices $u, v \in I$, if they belong to different components, then there is no edge between them, otherwise if they are in the same component, their distance is at least 2 as they are distinct vertices of odd distance from their representor. Hence, I is an independent set. \square

Now we can show that this yields a large independent set:

Lemma 30. *The dominating set is not too large: $|D| \leq (1 - \delta')n$ for some $\delta' > 0$.*

Proof. By assumption, we know $|D| \leq (2r + 1 - \delta)|M|$, where M is the minimum distance- r dominating set. Construct M' by picking every $2r + 1$ -th vertex, so that $|M'| = n/(2r + 1)$. Note that M' is a distance- r dominating set, so we have $|M| \leq |M'|$. Together we get $|D| \leq (2r + 1 - \delta)n/(2r + 1) = (1 - \delta')n$, for $\delta' := 1/(2r + 1) > 0$. \square

Lemma 31. *The set I is large: $|I| \in \Omega(n/\log^* n)$*

Proof. Many vertices must be part of some component: $|V \setminus D| \geq \delta'n$ for some $\delta' > 0$ by Lemma 30. At least half of those vertices are taken into I , thus $|I| \geq \delta'n/2 \in \Omega(n/\log^* n)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Follows immediately from Lemma 31, as it contradicts Lemma 27. Therefore, the algorithm \mathcal{ALG} cannot exist. \square

Note that this does not preclude randomized algorithms. This is because randomized algorithms can indeed achieve a better approximation quality, at least on cycles, by randomly joining the dominating set with sufficiently small probability if necessary, for several rounds, and finally all uncovered vertices join.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have analyzed the problem of distance- r dominating set for $r \in o(\log^* n)$ in a deterministic setting on graphs of bounded expansion $f(r)$ (e.g. on planar graphs $f(r) = 3$ for every r) and high girth. We provided a simple CONGEST algorithm and proved that it achieves an approximation factor of $O(r \cdot f(r))$ and a running time of $O(r)$. In particular, for constant r , it provides a constant factor approximation in a constant number of rounds.

For the lower bound, we have shown that the standard $o(\log^* n)$ lower bound on bounded degree graphs for other problems, also holds here, even if r is a non-constant. This means that one cannot do much better than Algorithm 1 up to a factor of $f(r)$. For $r \in \Omega(\log^* n)$, the algorithm still works, but the lower bound no longer applies.

For the upper bound, another interesting and useful problem is the distance- r independent set problem on sparse graphs. Especially because of the tight relation between the independent set and coloring and consequently

r -hop network decomposition, it is valuable to further research these topics on sparse graphs.

For the lower bound, we showed that r plays a role in any algorithm, but we do not know whether the existence of the expansion function of the graph class is essential. By the lower bound of Kuhn et al. [KMW16] dependency on sparsity is clear, but to what extent? I.e. is it possible to provide a constant factor approximation in constant number of rounds for the distance- r dominating set problem on graphs of bounded arboricity with high girth?

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to thank our friend Christoph Lenzen and anonymous reviewers for valuable feedback and improvements.

References

- [ABCP92] Baruch Awerbuch, Bonnie Berger, Lenore Cowen, and David Peleg. Fast network decomposition. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '92, pages 169–177. ACM, 1992.
- [AGLP89] Baruch Awerbuch, Andrew V. Goldberg, Michael Luby, and Serge A. Plotkin. Network decomposition and locality in distributed computation. In *30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 30 October - 1 November 1989*, pages 364–369, 1989.
- [AOdMRS18] Saeed Akhoondian Amiri, Patrice Ossona de Mendez, Roman Rabinovich, and Sebastian Siebertz. Distributed domination on graph classes of bounded expansion. In *Proceedings of the 30th on Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, pages 143–151. ACM, 2018.
- [AS16] Saeed Akhoondian Amiri and Stefan Schmid. Brief announcement: A log-time local mds approximation scheme for bounded genus graphs. In *Proc. 30th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC)*. Springer, 2016.
- [ASS16] Saeed Akhoondian Amiri, Stefan Schmid, and Sebastian Siebertz. A local constant factor mds approximation for bounded genus graphs. In *Proc. ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, 2016.

- [Bak94] Brenda S Baker. Approximation algorithms for NP-complete problems on planar graphs. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 41(1):153–180, 1994.
- [CHS06] Andrzej Czygrinow, Michał Hańćkowiak, and Edyta Szymańska. Distributed approximation algorithms for planar graphs. In *Italian Conference on Algorithms and Complexity*, pages 296–307. Springer, 2006.
- [CHW08] Andrzej Czygrinow, Michał Hańćkowiak, and Wojciech Wawrzyniak. Fast distributed approximations in planar graphs. In *Distributed Computing*, pages 78–92. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [CHWW18] Andrzej Czygrinow, Michał Hańćkowiak, Wojciech Wawrzyniak, and Marcin Witkowski. Distributed approximation algorithms for the minimum dominating set in K_h -minor-free graphs. In *29th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC*, pages 22:1–22:12, 2018.
- [Die12] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
- [DKM19] Janosch Deurer, Fabian Kuhn, and Yannic Maus. Deterministic distributed dominating set approximation in the CONGEST model. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2019, July 29 - August 2, 2019.*, pages 94–103, 2019.
- [Gha19] Mohsen Ghaffari. Distributed maximal independent set using small messages. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 805–820, 2019.
- [KMW16] Fabian Kuhn, Thomas Moscibroda, and Roger Wattenhofer. Local computation: Lower and upper bounds. *J. ACM*, 63(2):17:1–17:44, March 2016.
- [Lin92] Nathan Linial. Locality in distributed graph algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 21(1):193–201, 1992.
- [LPW13] Christoph Lenzen, Yvonne Anne Pignolet, and Roger Wattenhofer. Distributed minimum dominating set approximations in

- restricted families of graphs. *Distributed Computing*, 26(2):119–137, 2013.
- [LW10] Christoph Lenzen and Roger Wattenhofer. Minimum dominating set approximation in graphs of bounded arboricity. In *Distributed Computing*, volume 6343, pages 510–524. 2010.
- [NDM12] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Patrice Ossona De Mendez. *Sparsity: graphs, structures, and algorithms*, volume 28. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [NS93] Moni Naor and Larry Stockmeyer. What can be computed locally? In *Proc. ACM 25th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 184–193, 1993.
- [Pel00] David Peleg. *Distributed Computing: A Locality-sensitive Approach*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2000.
- [PS85] Franco P. Preparata and Michael Ian Shamos. *Computational Geometry - An Introduction*. Texts and Monographs in Computer Science. Springer, 1985.
- [SW08] Johannes Schneider and Roger Wattenhofer. A log-star distributed maximal independent set algorithm for growth-bounded graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2008, August 18-21, 2008*, pages 35–44, 2008.