

# An Improved Approximation Algorithm for the Minimum 2-Vertex-Connected Spanning Subgraph Problem

Ali Cıvril\*

April 26, 2022

## Abstract

We provide an algorithm for the minimum 2-vertex-connected spanning subgraph problem with approximation ratio  $\frac{4}{3}$ , improving upon the recent factor  $\frac{10}{7}$ . The algorithm is based on an extension of the primal-dual schema, consisting of two distinct phases.

## 1 Introduction

We consider the following fundamental connectivity problem: Given an undirected simple graph  $G = (V, E)$ , find a 2-vertex-connected (or simply 2-connected) spanning subgraph (2-VCSS) of  $G$  with minimum number of edges. We briefly denote this problem by 2-VCSS. This problem is NP-hard via a reduction from the Hamiltonian cycle problem. Furthermore, by the result of Czumaj and Lingas [4], it does not admit a PTAS unless  $P = NP$ . The first result improving the factor 2 for 2-VCSS came from Khuller and Vishkin [9], which is a  $\frac{5}{3}$ -approximation algorithm. Garg, Vempala and Singla [5] improved the approximation ratio to  $\frac{3}{2}$ . Cheriyan and Thurimella [2] also provides the same approximation ratio in a more general context, where they consider  $k$ -connectivity.

Vempala and Vetta [11] claimed the ratio  $\frac{4}{3}$ , which is shown to be not valid by Heeger and Vygen [7]. Jothi, Raghavachari and Varadarajan [8] claimed the ratio  $\frac{5}{4}$ . However, this claim has been later withdrawn (see [6]). Gubbala and Raghavachari [6] claimed to have a  $\frac{9}{7}$ -approximation algorithm. The only complete (and exceedingly long) proof of this claim is in Gubbala's thesis [10], which has not appeared anywhere else. To the best of our knowledge, the algorithm by Heeger and Vygen [7] with factor  $\frac{10}{7}$  stands as the current best among refereed results. This paper also contains a somewhat more detailed discussion about the aforementioned claimed results, implying that theirs is the first improvement over the long-standing ratio  $\frac{3}{2}$ .

The more general problem of finding a  $k$ -connected spanning subgraph admits an algorithm with approximation ratio  $1 + \frac{1}{k}$  [2], which is  $\frac{3}{2}$  for 2-VCSS. It is currently an important open problem to improve this as mentioned in a recent survey of Nutov [12]. This survey also posed the problem of obtaining a better ratio even for  $k = 2$  before the result of Heeger and Vygen [7].

The lower bounding techniques for 2-VCSS thus far have generally referred to disparate combinatorial invariants. None of the results mentioned use LP-based techniques, which are ubiquitous in the field of approximation algorithms. In particular, there is not much hint about the power of the natural LP relaxation provided by Cheriyan, Vetta and Vempala [3], which we will make use of in this paper. The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

---

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

**Theorem 1.** *There exists a polynomial-time  $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm for 2-VCSS.*

We would like to note that there is considerable overlap between the content of this paper and that of another manuscript by the author [1], treating the related minimum 2-edge-connected spanning subgraph problem (2-ECSS). However, there are subtle and important differences in the analyses. Furthermore, the current analysis allows us to get an improved approximation for 2-VCSS (unlike the easier 2-ECSS), which we believe is sufficiently interesting to be considered separately.

## 2 Preliminaries

We first give the LP relaxation for 2-VCSS from [3]. Set  $n := |V|$ ,  $m := |E|$  for the rest of the paper. A setpair is an ordered pair of sets  $W = (W_t, W_h)$  such that  $W_t \subseteq V$ ,  $W_h \subseteq V$  and  $W_t \cap W_h = \emptyset$ . We say that an edge  $(u, v) \in E$  covers  $W$  if  $u \in W_t$ ,  $v \in W_h$  or  $v \in W_t$ ,  $u \in W_h$ . Let  $\delta(W)$  denote the set of all edges in  $E$  that cover  $W$ . If  $|W_t| \geq 1$  and  $|W_h| \geq 1$  with  $p \in W_t$ ,  $q \in W_h$ , then a 2-VCSS has at least  $2 - (n - |W_t \cup W_h|)$  edges in  $\delta(W)$  since if we remove the vertices in  $V - (W_t \cup W_h)$  from the 2-VCSS, the resulting graph has at least this many internally disjoint paths between  $p$  and  $q$ , and each of these paths contributes at least one distinct edge to  $\delta(W)$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the set of all setpairs  $(W_t, W_h)$  such that  $W_t \neq \emptyset$  and  $W_h \neq \emptyset$ . Then according to the discussion above, the following is an LP relaxation for 2-VCSS.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{e \in E} x_e && (VC) \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(W)} x_e \geq 2, && W \in \mathcal{S}, |W_t \cup W_h| = n, \\
& && \sum_{e \in \delta(W)} x_e \geq 1, && W \in \mathcal{S}, |W_t \cup W_h| = n - 1, \\
& && 1 \geq x_e \geq 0, && \forall e \in E.
\end{aligned}$$

The dual of this LP is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{maximize} && \sum_{\substack{W \in \mathcal{S} \\ |W_t \cup W_h| = n}} 2y_W + \sum_{\substack{W \in \mathcal{S} \\ |W_t \cup W_h| = n-1}} y_W - \sum_{e \in E} z_e && (VC-D) \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{W: e \in \delta(W)} y_W \leq 1 + z_e, && \forall e \in E, \\
& && y_W \geq 0, && \forall W \in \mathcal{S}, \\
& && z_e \geq 0, && \forall e \in E.
\end{aligned}$$

Our algorithmic ideas is essentially an extension of the primal-dual 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. 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, corresponding to the dual variables  $W = (W_t, W_h)$  with  $|W_t| = 1$  and  $|W_h| = n - 1$ . 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-VCSS 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 way of ensuring a cheap solution for 2-VCSS 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.

### 3 The Algorithm

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 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  $\deg_F(v) \geq 3$ . 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 all the other vertices are the *internal vertices* of  $P$ . A path whose internal 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 modifies the running solution  $F$ , which is initialized to  $F^1$ . Modifications are performed via *improvement operations*. To this aim, we consider the set  $H$ , which is initialized to  $E \setminus F$ . An edge in  $e = (u, v) \in H$  is called a *critical edge* if  $u$  and  $v$  are the internal vertices of short segments.

The algorithm first iterates over the critical edges  $e$  in  $H$ . Initially, all such edges are declared *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  $F, e$ . Recall that this operation deletes an edge as long as its removal does not violate feasibility, i.e. the residual solution remains 2-connected.  $F$  is updated to the result of this operation if 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 internal 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*.

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

**Proposition 2.** *After  $|E|$  iterations of the first while loop of the second phase, there is no non-futile critical edge in  $H$ .*

---

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

---

```
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 internal vertices of a segment
22        then
23           $F \leftarrow F'$ 
24           $H \leftarrow E \setminus F$ 
25          futile_flag  $\leftarrow$  FALSE
26          Exit the for loop
27  if futile_flag is TRUE then
28    Mark  $e$  as futile
29  while there is an edge  $e \in H$  do
30    // Improvement operation of Type III
31     $F' \leftarrow F \cup \{e\}$ 
32     $H \leftarrow H \setminus \{e\}$ 
33    Perform deletion on  $F'$  considering the edges in the order  $F, e$ 
34    if  $|F'| < |F|$  then
35       $F \leftarrow F'$ 
36  return  $F$ 
```

---

*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  $e$  does not appear in  $H$  again, since it is only incident to internal 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 internal vertices of a newly formed segment. This implies that  $e$  does not appear in  $H$  again.  $\square$

The running time of the second phase subsumes that of the first phase, so we only describe the second phase, and show that it is bounded by a polynomial, disregarding the issue of an efficient implementation. 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 Theorem 1


**Observation 3.** *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.


Assume first that  $e$  is a critical edge between the internal 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 1a. 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 contains another edge  $f \in F$  not belonging to the 2-segments. Otherwise, the solution is not 2-connected. Then an improvement operation of Type I must have included  $e$  into  $F$ , deriving a contradiction.

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-segment with a new edge to obtain  $F'$ . Note that this new edge forms a trivial segment. Remove the internal vertex of a removed 2-segment together with all the incident edges (which includes  $e$ ) from  $G$ , and add the new trivial segment to obtain  $G'$ . For the correctness of our argument, we 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.



**Figure 1:** Contradictions to the existence of a critical edge in an optimal solution: Two 2-segments



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




**Figure 3:** The newly introduced trivial segment is not removed by an improvement operation of Type III


2. An improvement operation of Type III does not remove it.

The assumption that the first condition is not satisfied 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 1b. Thus, we can replace at least one of the 2-segments with a trivial segment.

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-connected as shown in Figure 2a. 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-connected as shown in Figure 2b. 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, as 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 3 in which we show the lower part of the graph in Figure 2b. The redundant edges are shown inside dotted ovals, and the paths are shown in wavy lines in the lower part of the figure. Thus, there is no such  $e'$  and  $f$ , and the trivial segment replacing the 2-segment remains in the solution.



**Figure 4:** Contradictions to the existence of a critical edge in an optimal solution: Two 3-segments



**Figure 5:** A contradiction to the existence of a critical edge in an optimal solution: Two 3-segments

Denote the cost of an optimal solution on  $G$  and  $G'$  by  $OPT(G)$  and  $OPT(G')$ , respectively. Having performed the operation described above, 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 can extend this argument to the other cases: (1)  $e$  is between the internal vertices of a 2-segment and a 3-segment; (2)  $e$  is between the internal 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. An improvement operation of Type I derives a contradiction (See Figure 1a 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 4a, 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 4b, this time via an improvement operation 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 2 and Figure 3. There remains the case shown in

Figure 4c. 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 also needs to ensure that the internal vertex of the newly formed 2-segment is not incident to another critical edge, which is shown in Figure 5. Here we naturally assume that this hypothetical critical edge  $f$  is incident to an internal 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 4.** *Algorithm 1 is a  $\frac{4}{3}$ -approximation algorithm for 2-VCSS.*

*Proof.* Remove all the long segments from  $F$  to obtain  $F'$ . Remove the internal 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-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. 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

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

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. The dual values we use are the ones corresponding to  $W = (W_t, W_h)$  with  $|W_t \cup W_h| = n$  in the dual of the LP relaxation given in Section 2. Let the dual values of all the singleton high-degree vertices be 0. Given this, assign the  $y_W$  dual value 1 to the internal vertices of short segments. For a 3-segment assign the  $z_e$  dual value 1 to the middle edge of the segment. This assignment is feasible, since by Observation 3, 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 either optimally covered or with ratio at most  $\frac{5}{4}$ . Let  $P$  be a trivial segment on  $F$  with the edge  $e$ . We consider two distinct cases.


*Case 1:* There exists a cut  $S_1$  and another edge  $f \in F$  such that  $\delta(S_1) \cap F = \{e, f\}$ . 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 3, 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 6a 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.

*Case 2:* There is no cut  $S_1$  such that  $\delta(S_1) \cap F = \{e, f\}$  for some other  $f \in F$ . This case is depicted in Figure 6b. In particular, the premise and the fact that  $P$  is non-redundant implies that





**Figure 6:** Covering the trivial segments with ratio at most  $\frac{5}{4}$



**Figure 7:** A tight example for the algorithm

one end vertex of  $P$  must be incident to at least two segments, say  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  with identical end vertices. By the argument above,  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are optimally covered with a total length of at least 4. Adding the length of 1 to the constructed dual value for these segments, and noting that they are identified by  $P$  implies that all these segments can be covered with a ratio of at most  $\frac{5}{4}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5 Tight Example

A tight example for the algorithm is shown in Figure 7. 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  $3k + 2$ .

## Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Christoph Hunkenschroder and Jens Vygen for giving information about the status of 2-VCSS.

## References

- [1] A. Cıvırlı. A new approximation algorithm for the minimum 2-edge-connected spanning subgraph problem. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1911.07232, 2019.
- [2] J. Cheriyan and R. Thurimella. Approximating minimum-size  $k$ -connected spanning subgraphs via matching. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 30(2):528–560, 2000.

- [3] J. Cheriyan, S. Vempala, and A. Vetta. An approximation algorithm for the minimum-cost  $k$ -vertex connected subgraph. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 32(4):1050–1055, 2003.
- [4] A. Czumaj and A. Lingas. On approximability of the minimum-cost  $k$ -connected spanning subgraph problem. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 281–290, 1999.
- [5] N. Garg, S. Vempala, and A. Singla. Improved approximation algorithms for biconnected subgraphs via better lower bounding techniques. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual ACM/SIGACT-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 103–111, 1993.
- [6] P. Gubbala and B. Raghavachari. Approximation algorithms for the minimum cardinality two-connected spanning subgraph problem. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization, 11th International IPCO Conference*, pages 422–436, 2005.
- [7] K. Heeger and J. Vysen. Two-connected spanning subgraphs with at most  $\frac{10}{7}$ OPT edges. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 31(3):1820–1835, 2017.
- [8] 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.
- [9] S. Khuller and U. Vishkin. Biconnectivity approximations and graph carvings. *J. ACM*, 41(2):214–235, 1994.
- [10] P. Gubbala. *Problems in Graph Connectivity*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX, 2006.
- [11] 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.
- [12] Z. Nutov. The  $k$ -connected subgraph problem. In T. F. Gonzalez, editor, *Handbook of Approximation Algorithms and Metaheuristics, 2nd ed.*, volume 2, chapter 12. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2018.