

Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich



FS 2021

Prof. R. Wattenhofer Lioba Heimbach

Principles of Distributed Computing Exercise 9

1 Communication Complexity of Set Disjointness

In the lecture we studied the communication complexity of the equality function. Now we consider the disjointness function: Alice and Bob are given subsets $X, Y \subseteq \{1, ..., k\}$ and need to determine whether they are disjoint. Each subset can be represented by a string. E.g., we define the i^{th} bit of $x \in \{0,1\}^k$ as $x_i := 1$ if $i \in X$ and $x_i := 0$ if $i \notin X$. Now define disjointness of X and Y as:

$$DISJ(x,y) := \begin{cases} 0 & : \text{ there is an index } i \text{ such that } x_i = y_i = 1 \\ 1 & : \text{ else} \end{cases}$$

- a) Write down M^{DISJ} for the DISJ-function when k=3.
- b) Use the matrix obtained in a) to provide a fooling set of size 4 for DISJ in case k=3.
- c) In general, prove that $CC(DISJ) = \Omega(k)$.

2 Distinguishing Diameter 2 from 4

In the lecture we stated that when the bandwidth of an edge is limited to $O(\log n)$, the diameter of a graph can be computed in O(n). In this problem, we show that we can do faster in case we know that all networks/graphs on which we execute an algorithm have either diameter 2 or diameter 4. We start by partitioning the nodes into sets: Let s := s(n) be a threshold and define the set of high degree nodes $H := \{v \in V \mid d(v) \geq s\}$ and the set of low degree nodes $L := \{v \in V \mid d(v) < s\}$. Next, we define: An H-dominating set $\mathcal{D}OM$ is a subset $\mathcal{D}OM \subseteq V$ of the nodes such that each node in H is either in the set $\mathcal{D}OM$ or adjacent to a node in the set $\mathcal{D}OM$.

Note: We define $N_1(v)$ as the closed neighborhood of vertex v (v and its adjacent nodes). Assume in the following, that we can compute an H-dominating set $\mathcal{D}OM$ of size $\frac{n \log n}{s}$ in time O(D).

- a) What is the distributed runtime of Algorithm 2-vs-4 (stated next page)? In case you believe that the distributed implementation of a step is not known from the lecture, find a distributed implementation for this step! Hint: The runtime depends on s and n.
- **b)** Find a function s := s(n) such that the runtime is minimized (in terms of n).
- c) Prove that if the diameter is 2, then Algorithm 2-vs-4 always returns 2.

Now assume that the diameter of the network is 4 and that we know vertices u and v with distance 4 to each other.

Algorithm 1 "2-vs-4". Input: G with diameter 2 or 4 Output: diameter of G1: if $L \neq \emptyset$ then \triangleright We know: This takes O(D). choose $v \in L$ **compute** a BFS tree from each vertex in $N_1(v)$ 3: 4: **else compute** an H-dominating set $\mathcal{D}OM$ ▶ Use: Assumption 5: **compute** a BFS tree from each vertex in $\mathcal{D}OM$ 6: 7: end if 8: **if** all BFS trees have depth 2 or 1 **then** return 2 10: **else** 11: return 4 12: **end if**

- d) Prove that if the algorithm performs a BFS from at least one node $w \in N_1(u)$ it decides "the diameter is 4".
- e) In case $L \neq \emptyset$: Prove that the algorithm performs a BFS of depth at least 3 from some node w. Hint: use d)
- f) In case $L = \emptyset$: Prove that the algorithm performs a BFS of depth at least 3 from some node w.
- g) Give a high level idea, why you think that this does not violate the lower bound of $\Omega(n/\log n)$ presented in the lecture!
- h) Assume $s = \frac{n}{2}$. Prove or disprove: If the diameter is 2, then Algorithm 2-vs-4 will always compute some BFS tree of depth exactly 2.