

# A New Approximation Algorithm for the Minimum 2-Edge-Connected Spanning Subgraph Problem

Ali Civril\*

March 29, 2022

## Abstract

We present a new approximation algorithm for the minimum 2-edge-connected spanning subgraph problem. Its approximation ratio is  $\frac{4}{3}$ , which matches the current best ratio. The approximation ratio of the algorithm is  $\frac{6}{5}$  on subcubic graphs, which is an improvement upon the previous best ratio of  $\frac{5}{4}$ . The algorithm is a novel extension of the primal-dual schema, which consists of two distinct phases. Both the algorithm and the analysis are much simpler than those of the previous approaches.

## 1 Introduction

We consider the following fundamental connectivity problem in graphs: Given an undirected simple graph  $G = (V, E)$ , find a 2-edge-connected spanning subgraph of  $G$  with minimum number of edges. We briefly denote this problem by 2-ECSS. It has the following natural LP relaxation, where  $\delta(S)$  denotes the set of edges with one end in the cut  $S$  and the other not in  $S$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_{e \in E} x_e && (EC) \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(S)} x_e \geq 2, && \forall \emptyset \subset S \subset V, \\ & && 1 \geq x_e \geq 0, && \forall e \in E. \end{aligned}$$

The problem remains NP-hard and MAX SNP-hard even for subcubic graphs [3]. Thus, approximation algorithms have been sought. The first result beating the factor 2 came from Khuller and Vishkin [6], which is a  $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation algorithm. Cheriyan, Sebö and Szigeti [2] improved the factor to  $\frac{17}{12}$ . Vempala and Vetta [9], and Jothi, Raghavachari and Varadarajan [5] claimed to have  $\frac{4}{3}$  and  $\frac{5}{4}$  approximations, respectively. Krysta and Kumar [7] went on to give a  $(\frac{4}{3} - \epsilon)$ -approximation for some small  $\epsilon > 0$  assuming the result of Vempala and Vetta [9]. A relatively recent paper by Sebö and Vygen [8] provides a  $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm by using ear decompositions, and mentions that the aforementioned claimed approximation ratio  $\frac{5}{4}$  has not appeared with a complete proof in a fully refereed publication. The result of Vempala and Vetta [9], which was initially incomplete, very recently re-appeared in [4]. Given this, it is not clear if the ratio  $(\frac{4}{3} - \epsilon)$  by Krysta and Kumar [7] still holds. To the best of our knowledge, the ratio  $\frac{4}{3}$  stands as the current best factor. The problem has also been studied in restricted class of graphs. In particular, a paper

---

\*Istinye University, Computer Engineering Department, Sariyer, 34396 Istanbul, Turkey, e-mail: ali.civril@istinye.edu.tr

by Boyd, Fu and Sun [1] presents a  $\frac{5}{4}$ -approximation algorithm for the class of subcubic bridgeless graphs, which is the best factor thus far for this class of graphs.

We provide a new  $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm for 2-ECSS. We also show that its approximation ratio is  $\frac{6}{5}$  on subcubic graphs. The algorithm is essentially based on the primal-dual schema, which is one of the natural approaches for network design problems with connectivity requirements. However, it has not been applied to 2-ECSS so far. The main reason would be the fact that a direct application of the schema yields only an approximation ratio of 2. The main technical contribution of this paper, which we think should be much more widely applicable, is a novel extension of the schema, consisting of two distinct phases. The second phase tries to rectify the large approximation ratio of a direct application of the schema, by considering the inclusion of edges not selected by the first phase, and excluding certain others.

## 2 Preliminaries: The Primal-Dual Schema

In this section we briefly review the naive primal-dual schema applied to 2-ECSS. The following is the dual of the natural LP relaxation for the problem.


$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{maximize} && \sum_{\emptyset \subset S \subset V} 2y_S - \sum_{e \in E} z_e && \text{(EC-D)} \\
 & \text{subject to} && \sum_{S: e \in \delta(S)} y_S \leq 1 + z_e, && \forall e \in E, \\
 & && y_S \geq 0, && \forall \emptyset \subset S \subset V, \\
 & && z_e \geq 0, && \forall e \in E.
 \end{aligned}$$

In a typical application of the primal-dual schema, one grows the duals corresponding to minimal violated cuts synchronously. In our case, the minimal violated cuts are the singleton vertices. The growth of the duals continue until the dual constraint of an edge  $e$  becomes tight, in which case  $e$  is included into the solution, and new minimal violated sets are computed. The iterations repeat until the solution is feasible. For 2-ECSS with unit weights, the dual constraints of all the edges become tight when the dual values of all the cuts reach the value  $1/2$ . In this case all the edges are included into the solution. The schema then performs the so-called reverse-delete operation to ensure that there are no redundant edges in the solution. It considers the edges in the reverse order of their inclusion, and deletes an edge provided that the solution remains feasible. Since all the edges are included at the same time in our case, the inclusion order might be arbitrary. As a result, there is no clever way of ensuring a cheap solution for 2-ECSS via only the reverse-delete operation. In particular, a direct application of the primal-dual schema as explained here can result in an approximation factor as large as 2, which is depicted in Figure 1. The algorithm might select all the edges between the  $n$  vertices forming the vertical path in the middle of the figure and the two vertices on the sides, resulting in a total cost of  $2n$ . The optimal solution has cost  $n + 2$ .


Note also that taking all the edges in a subcubic graph results in the trivial approximation factor  $\frac{3}{2}$ . We will start with a slightly better solution, provided by the primal-dual schema. However, even in this case the approximation ratio cannot be better than  $\frac{4}{3}$  as shown in Figure 2.

## 3 Approximating 2-ECSS via the Enhanced Primal-Dual Schema

The main algorithm consists of two phases. The first phase is the primal-dual schema described in the previous section. In order to describe the second phase and analyze it, we first introduce



**Figure 1:** A tight example for the naive primal-dual algorithm



**Figure 2:** A tight example for the naive primal-dual algorithm on subcubic graphs

some terminology. Given a vertex  $v \in V$  and a feasible solution  $F$ , the degree of  $v$  on  $F$  is denoted by  $\deg_F(v)$ .  $v$  is called a *degree- $d$  vertex* on  $F$  if  $\deg_F(v) = d$ , and a *high-degree vertex* on  $F$  if  $\deg_F(v) \geq 3$ . If  $F$  is clear from the context, we do not pronounce it. For the path  $P = v_1v_2 \dots v_{k-1}v_k$ ,  $v_1$  and  $v_k$  are the *end vertices* of  $P$ ,  $v_2$  and  $v_{k-1}$  are the *side vertices* of  $P$ , and all the other vertices are the *inner vertices* of  $P$ . If a vertex is a side vertex or an inner vertex of  $P$ , it is called a *proper vertex* of  $P$ . A path whose proper vertices are all degree-2 vertices on  $F$  is called a *plain path* on  $F$ . A maximal plain path is called a *segment*. The length of a segment is the number of edges on the segment. If the length of a segment is  $\ell$ , it is called an  $\ell$ -*segment*. A 1-segment is also called a *trivial segment*. For  $\ell \neq 1$ , an  $\ell$ -segment is called a *non-trivial segment*. A non-trivial  $\ell$ -segment with  $\ell \leq 3$  is called a *short segment*, otherwise a *long segment*.

Let  $F^1$  be the solution returned by the first phase. The second phase of the algorithm considers modifications on the running solution  $F$ , which is initialized to  $F^1$ . Modifications are performed via what we call *improvement operations*. The basic idea is to consider certain edges not in  $F$ , which can possibly improve the cost of the solution, or switch to a solution amenable to analysis. To this aim, we consider the set  $H$ , which is initialized to  $E \setminus F^1$ . An edge in  $e = (u, v) \in H$  is called a *critical edge* if  $u$  and  $v$  are the side vertices of short segments.

The algorithm first iterates over the critical edges  $e$  in  $H$ . Initially, all such edges are deemed

---

**Algorithm 1:** 2-ECSS( $G(V, E)$ )

---

```
1 // The first phase
2 Let  $F^1$  be the solution returned by the standard primal-dual schema
3 // The second phase
4  $F \leftarrow F^1$ 
5  $H \leftarrow E \setminus F$ 
6 Mark all  $e \in H$  as non-futile
7 while there exists a non-futile critical edge  $e \in H$  do
8   // Improvement operation of Type I
9    $F' \leftarrow F \cup \{e\}$ 
10  futile_flag  $\leftarrow$  TRUE
11  Perform deletion on  $F'$  considering the edges in the order  $F, e$ 
12  if  $|F'| < |F|$  then
13     $F \leftarrow F'$ 
14     $H \leftarrow E \setminus F$ 
15    futile_flag  $\leftarrow$  FALSE
16  else
17    // Improvement operation of Type II
18    for all edges  $f \in H$  with  $f \neq e$  do
19       $F' \leftarrow F \cup \{e, f\}$ 
20      Perform deletion on  $F'$  considering the edges in the order  $F, e, f$ 
21      if  $e$  and  $f$  remains in  $F'$  AND  $e$  is incident to proper vertices of a segment then
22         $F \leftarrow F'$ 
23         $H \leftarrow E \setminus F$ 
24        futile_flag  $\leftarrow$  FALSE
25        Exit the for loop
26  if futile_flag is TRUE then
27    | Mark  $e$  as futile
28 while there is an edge  $e \in H$  do
29   // Improvement operation of Type III
30    $F' \leftarrow F \cup \{e\}$ 
31    $H \leftarrow H \setminus \{e\}$ 
32   Perform deletion on  $F'$  considering the edges in the order  $F, e$ 
33   if  $|F'| < |F|$  then
34   |  $F \leftarrow F'$ 
35 return  $F$ 
```

---

*non-futile*. In an improvement operation of Type I, the algorithm considers  $F' = F \cup \{e\}$ . It then performs a deletion operation on  $F'$ , considering the deletion of edges in the order  $F, e$ .  $F$  is updated to the result of this operation provided that there is an improvement in the cost.

If the improvement operation of Type I does not result in a modification of  $F$ , an improvement operation of Type II is performed. The algorithm considers  $F' = F \cup \{e, f\}$ , where  $e$  is the same critical edge from the improvement operation of Type I, and  $f$  is another edge in  $H$ . A deletion operation on  $F'$  follows, considering the deletion of  $e$  and  $f$  at the end.  $F$  is updated to the result of this operation given that  $e$  and  $f$  remains in  $F'$ , so that there is an edge deleted from  $F$ , and  $e$

becomes an edge between the proper vertices of a segment. If both of the improvement operations of Type I and Type II do not result in a modification of  $F$ , we declare  $e$  as *futile*, so that it is not considered again.

After the first set of iterations over the critical edges are completed, the algorithm iterates over the edges in  $H$  to perform improvement operations of Type III. For an edge  $e \in H$ , it performs a deletion operation on  $F' = F \cup \{e\}$  by considering the deletion of  $e$  at the end.  $F$  is updated to the result of this operation if it decreases the cost.

### 3.1 Termination of the Algorithm and the Running Time

Efficient implementations of the algorithm is not the focus of this paper. We only show that it can be implemented in polynomial time. The running time of the second phase subsumes that of the first phase, so we only describe the second phase. We first show that the first while loop of the second phase terminates.

**Proposition 1.** *After  $|E|$  iterations of the first while loop of the second phase, there is no non-futile critical edge in  $H$ .*

*Proof.* If a critical edge  $e \in H$  does not lead to any modification by the end of an iteration, it is declared futile. Thus, if all the non-futile critical edges  $e \in H$  do not appear in  $H$  again, the result follows. Given this, let  $e$  be a non-futile critical edge at the beginning of an iteration. If  $e$  is included into  $F$  via an improvement operation of Type I, then clearly  $e$  does not appear in  $H$  again, since it is only incident to proper vertices of a segment formed after the operation. If it is included into  $F$  via an improvement operation of Type II, again by definition  $e$  is only incident to proper vertices of a newly formed segment. This implies that  $e$  does not appear in  $H$  again. The result follows.  $\square$

In a deletion operation, the algorithm checks for feasibility, which can be performed by removing each edge one by one and testing connectivity of the residual graph, taking  $O(|E|(|V| + |E|))$  time using a standard graph traversal algorithm. Recall that in an improvement operation of Type II, the algorithm iterates over all the edges in  $H$ , which is of size  $O(|E|)$ . Considering the proposition above, the total running time of the algorithm is then  $O(|E|^3(|V| + |E|))$ , which subsumes that of the second while loop.


## 4 Proof of the Approximation Ratios

We start with the following important observation.

**Observation 2.** *Consider  $H$  at the end of the first while loop of the second phase. In proving the approximation ratio of the algorithm, we may assume without loss of generality that there exists an optimal solution not containing any critical edge  $e \in H$ .*

*Proof.* We show that if any optimal solution contains such an edge, it suffices to argue the approximation ratio on a modified instance, which does not contain that edge. In particular, we will replace the short segments around  $e$  with trivial segments.

Assume first that  $e$  is a critical edge between the side vertices of two 2-segments, and consider the case in which both end vertices of the 2-segments are identical. Suppose any optimal solution contains  $e$  together with  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  as shown in Figure 3a (These might coincide with the edges of the 2-segments, but this does not affect the argument). Then there must exist a path between the end vertices of  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  in any optimal solution such that the path does not contain  $e$ , but



**Figure 3:** Contradictions to the existence of a critical edge in an optimal solution: Two 2-segments


contains another edge  $f$  not belonging to the 2-segments. Otherwise, no optimal solution contains  $e$ , as it becomes redundant. Given this, if  $f$  is already in  $F$ , then an improvement operation of Type I must have included  $e$  into  $F$ , deriving a contradiction. If  $f$  is not in  $F$ , then an improvement operation of Type II must have included  $e$  and  $f$  into the solution, again deriving a contradiction. Notice that this operation must have indeed been performed, as  $e$  is the middle edge of a 3-segment after the operation.

Consider now the case in which both end vertices of the 2-segments are distinct (The argument for the case in which exactly one of the end vertices are identical is the same). We perform the following operations on the input graph  $G$  and the solution  $F$ . Remove one 2-segment or both of them from  $F$ , satisfying the first condition stated below, and connect the end vertices of a removed 2-segments with a new edge to obtain  $F'$ . Note that this new edge forms a trivial segment. Remove the side vertex of the removed 2-segment together with all the incident edges (which includes  $e$ ) from  $G$ , and add the new trivial segments to obtain  $G'$ . For the correctness of our argument, we crucially require the following two conditions in order on the newly introduced trivial segment, when the algorithm is executed on  $G'$ :


1. It is non-redundant by the end of the first while loop.
2. An improvement operation of Type III does not remove it.

Indeed, this operation cannot create a redundant trivial segment from both of the 2-segments by the end of the first while loop, as this contradicts an improvement operation of Type I: In that case  $e$  would have already been included into the solution for which an illustration is given in Figure 3b.

Consider now the situation before the improvement operations of Type III are performed. Excluding the 2-segments from  $F$ , assume that at least one of the remaining components of the residual solution is 2-edge-connected as shown in Figure 4a. This derives a contradiction to an improvement operation of Type II, which would have included  $e$  and  $f$  into the solution. Thus, none of these components is 2-edge-connected as shown in Figure 4b. In this case assume the trivial segment replaced with the 2-segment on the side of  $f$  is excluded from the solution in an improvement operation of Type III, upon inclusion of  $f$ . This implies that there must be an edge  $e'$  of another trivial segment excluded from the solution. This also derives a contradiction. Because this trivial segment is already redundant at the end of the first while loop. Notice that it cannot be a trivial segment replacing a 2-segment, too, since we replace any 2-segment with a trivial segment if it is not redundant by the end of the first while loop, and if it can be removed by an improvement operation of Type III, we get the contradiction that it should already be redundant by the end of the first while loop. These are depicted in Figure 5 in which we show the lower part of the graph in



**Figure 4:** Contradictions to the existence of a critical edge in an optimal solution: Two 2-segments



**Figure 5:** The newly introduced trivial segment is not removed by an improvement operation of Type III


Figure 4b. The redundant edges are shown inside dotted ovals, and the paths are shown in wavy lines in the lower part of the figure. Overall, there is no such  $e'$  and  $f$ , and the trivial segment replacing the 2-segment remains in the solution.

Having performed the operation of replacing a 2-segment with a trivial segment on  $F$  and  $G$ , denote the cost of an optimal solution on  $G$  and  $G'$  by  $OPT(G)$  and  $OPT(G')$ , respectively. We then have  $OPT(G) \geq OPT(G') + 1$ . Note also that  $|F| = |F'| + 1$ . So  $\frac{|F'|}{OPT(G')} \leq \alpha$  implies


$$\alpha \geq \frac{|F'|}{OPT(G')} \geq \frac{|F'| + 1}{OPT(G') + 1} \geq \frac{|F|}{OPT(G)}.$$

Thus, it suffices to argue  $\frac{|F'|}{OPT(G')} \leq \alpha$ , with the assumption that there is no such  $e$ .

We now extend this argument to the other cases: (1)  $e$  is between the side vertices of a 2-segment and a 3-segment; (2)  $e$  is between the side vertices of two 3-segments. In the first case the argument above works for the subcase in which the end vertices of the segments are identical. Either an improvement operation of Type I or Type II derives a contradiction (See Figure 3a again). If the end vertices are distinct, we only consider the second case, which subsumes the first one, and assume that the end vertices of the 3-segments are distinct (The foregoing argument also works for the case in which they are identical). If  $e$  is as shown in Figure 6a, we can replace at least one of the 3-segments with a trivial segment, which cannot be redundant. Otherwise,  $e$  would have been included into the solution by an improvement operation of Type I, creating a 5-segment as depicted in the figure. The same holds for the case in Figure 6b, this time via an improvement operation



**Figure 6:** Contradictions to the existence of a critical edge in an optimal solution: Two 3-segments




**Figure 7:** A contradiction to the existence of a critical edge in an optimal solution: Two 3-segments

of Type II, taking  $e$  and  $f$  into the solution, again creating a 5-segment. If  $e$  is non-redundant by the end of the first while loop, then we run the same argument we have used for the case of two 2-segments, which is depicted in Figure 4 and Figure 5. There remains the case shown in Figure 6c. In this case we delete one of the end vertices of  $e$  from  $G$ , and replace only the two edges incident to that vertex by a single edge in  $F$ . One finally needs to ensure that the side vertex of the newly formed 2-segment is not incident to another critical edge, which is shown in Figure 7. Here we naturally assume that this hypothetical critical edge  $f$  is incident to a side vertex of another short segment, which cannot be replaced by a trivial segment. However, this contradicts an improvement operation of Type I on  $f$ . Thus, there is no such  $f$ , completing the argument.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *Algorithm 1 is a  $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm for 2-ECSS.*

*Proof.* Remove all the long segments from  $F$  to obtain  $F'$ . Remove the proper vertices of all the long segments together with all the incident edges from the input graph  $G$  one by one to obtain  $G'$ . If the residual graph loses 2-edge-connectivity at any step, add a new edge between the end vertices of the removed segment. Denote the value of an optimal solution on these graphs by  $OPT(G)$  and  $OPT(G')$ , respectively. Note that for an  $\ell$ -segment in  $G$ , there exist in any optimal solution at least  $\ell - 1$  edges corresponding to that segment. In particular, if  $G$  and  $G'$  differ only by a 4-segment, we have  $OPT(G) \geq OPT(G') + 3$ . In this case supposing  $\frac{|F'|}{OPT(G')} \leq \frac{4}{3}$ , we obtain

$$\frac{4}{3} \geq \frac{|F'|}{OPT(G')} \geq \frac{|F'| + 4}{OPT(G') + 3} \geq \frac{|F'| + 4}{OPT(G)} = \frac{|F|}{OPT(G)}.$$



**Figure 8:** The dual assignment optimally covering a trivial segment


Since  $\ell \geq 4$  for the removed segments, it thus suffices to show  $\frac{|F'|}{OPT(G')} \leq \frac{4}{3}$ .

We only have the short segments and the trivial segments in  $F'$  on which we describe a feasible dual solution. We then compare the cost of a set of segments with the associated dual value to argue the approximation ratio. Let the dual values of all the singleton high-degree vertices be 0. Given this, assign the  $y_S$  dual value 1 to the side vertices of short segments. For a 3-segment assign the  $z_e$  dual value 1 to the middle edge of the segment. Note that this assignment is feasible: By Observation 2, we may assume that there exists an optimal solution on  $G'$ , which does not contain any critical edge, so that we do not have to define a positive  $z_e$  value to any other edge. The value of the assignment is 2 for a 2-segment, and  $2 + 2 - 1 = 3$  for a 3-segment, optimally covering the cost of the segments.


We finish the proof by showing that the trivial segments are also optimally covered. Let  $P$  be a trivial segment on  $F$  with the edge  $e$ . Then there exists a cut  $S_1$  and another edge  $f \in F$  such that  $\delta(S_1) \cap F = \{e, f\}$ . Otherwise,  $e$  becomes redundant, and must have been deleted in a deletion operation. Assume without loss of generality that there exists an edge  $g \in \delta(S) \cap (E \setminus F)$ , for any cut  $S$  with  $e \in \delta(S)$  and  $|\delta(S) \cap F| = 2$ . By Observation 2, we may also assume that  $g$  is not a critical edge, hence between high-degree vertices. Assume there is another trivial segment with the edge  $e'$  such that any cut  $S_2$  with  $e' \in \delta(S_2)$  and  $|\delta(S_2) \cap F| = 2$  contains  $g$ . Then we have a contradiction to the improvement operation of Type III, which would include  $g$  into the solution, and exclude  $e$  and  $e'$ , thus creating a cheaper feasible solution. This implies that there is no such trivial segment. Assign  $y_{S_1} = 1$ , and increase the value of  $z_f$  by 1 to maintain feasibility. Note that  $z_g = 0$  is also feasible, since  $g$  is between high-degree vertices, and by the remark above there is no other cut  $S_2$  via which we have to increase  $z_g$  (See Figure 8 for an illustration). The total dual value we have created is thus  $2 - 1 = 1$ , optimally covering  $P$ . Finally, if  $f$  is the edge of another trivial segment, we do not have to increase  $z_f$  by 1, so that the total dual value of 2 covers  $P$  and the trivial segment containing  $f$  optimally. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.** *Algorithm 1 is a  $\frac{6}{5}$ -approximation algorithm for 2-ECSS on subcubic graphs.*

*Proof.* We observe that the extra structure imposed by a subcubic graph forces an optimal solution to take more edges. As a more explicit description of what we have used in the proof of Theorem 3, we think of every vertex “covering” half of the edges incident to the vertex. Remove all the edges covered by the proper vertices and the end vertices of long segments from  $F$  to obtain  $F'$ . Remove the proper vertices and the end vertices of all the long segments together with all the incident edges from the input graph  $G$  one by one to obtain  $G'$ . If the residual graph loses 2-edge-connectivity at any step, add minimum number of edges between the remaining vertices to maintain it. For a removed  $\ell$ -segment in a subcubic graph  $G$ , there exist in any optimal solution at least  $\ell + 1$  edges corresponding to that segment, since the end vertices of the segment are degree-3 vertices on  $G$ ,



**Figure 9:** A tight example for the algorithm



**Figure 10:** A tight example for the algorithm on subcubic graphs

and any feasible solution has to take at least 2 of them. The removed vertices of the segment cover  $\ell + 2$  edges in  $F'$ . Since  $\ell \geq 4$  for the removed segments, it suffices to show  $\frac{|F'|}{OPT(G')} \leq \frac{6}{5}$ , which implies  $\frac{|F|}{OPT(G)} \leq \frac{6}{5}$  by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3. The rest of the proof is identical to the proof of Theorem 3.  $\square$

## 5 Tight Examples

A tight example for the algorithm on general graphs is shown in Figure 9. The algorithm returns a set of  $k$  4-segments with a total cost of  $4k$ . The optimal solution consists of the Hamiltonian cycle of cost  $3k + 2$ . A tight example for subcubic graphs is given in Figure 10. The solution returned by the algorithm consists of 2 6-segments,  $k$  4-segments, and  $2k - 2$  trivial segments, with a total cost of  $6k + 10$ . The cost of the optimal solution is  $5k + 11$ .

## Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Yuginq Ai for pointing out the error in the initial manuscript. We also thank Christoph Hunkenschroder and Jens Vygen for giving information about the status of 2-ECSS.

## References

- [1] S. C. Boyd, Y. Fu, and Y. Sun. A  $5/4$ -approximation for subcubic 2EC using circulations and obliged edges. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 209:48–58, 2016.
- [2] J. Cheriyan, A. Sebö, and Z. Szigeti. Improving on the 1.5-approximation of a smallest 2-edge connected spanning subgraph. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 14(2):170–180, 2001.
- [3] B. Csaba, M. Karpinski, and P. Krysta. Approximability of dense and sparse instances of minimum 2-connectivity, TSP and path problems. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 74–83, 2002.
- [4] C. Hunkenschröder, S. Vempala, and A. Vetta. A  $4/3$ -approximation algorithm for the minimum 2-edge connected subgraph problem. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(4):55:1–55:28, 2019.
- [5] R. Jothi, B. Raghavachari, and S. Varadarajan. A  $5/4$ -approximation algorithm for minimum 2-edge-connectivity. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 725–734, 2003.
- [6] S. Khuller and U. Vishkin. Biconnectivity approximations and graph carvings. *J. ACM*, 41(2):214–235, 1994.
- [7] P. Krysta and V. S. A. Kumar. Approximation algorithms for minimum size 2-connectivity problems. In *18th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, pages 431–442, 2001.
- [8] A. Sebö and J. Vygen. Shorter tours by nicer ears:  $7/5$ -approximation for the graph-TSP,  $3/2$  for the path version, and  $4/3$  for two-edge-connected subgraphs. *Combinatorica*, 34(5):597–629, 2014.
- [9] S. Vempala and A. Vetta. Factor  $4/3$  approximations for minimum 2-connected subgraphs. In *Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization, Third International Workshop (APPROX)*, pages 262–273, 2000.