

Dual Growth with Variable Rates: An Improved Integrality Gap for Steiner Tree

Ali Çivril

November 28, 2020

Abstract

A promising approach for obtaining improved approximation algorithms for Steiner tree is to use the bidirected cut relaxation (BCR). The integrality gap of this relaxation is at least $36/31$, and it has long been conjectured that its true value is very close to this lower bound. However, the best upper bound for general graphs is still 2. With the aim of circumventing the asymmetric nature of BCR, Chakrabarty, Devanur and Vazirani [Math. Program., 130 (2011), pp. 1–32] introduced the simplex-embedding LP, which is equivalent to it. Using this, they gave a $\sqrt{2}$ -approximation algorithm for quasi-bipartite graphs and showed that the integrality gap of the relaxation is at most $4/3$ for this class of graphs.

In this paper, we extend the approach provided by these authors and show that the integrality gap of BCR is at most $7/6$ on quasi-bipartite graphs via a fast combinatorial algorithm. In doing so, we introduce a general technique, in particular a potentially widely applicable extension of the primal-dual schema. Roughly speaking, we apply the schema twice with variable rates of growth for the duals in the second phase, where the rates depend on the degrees of the duals computed in the first phase. This technique breaks the disadvantage of increasing dual variables in a monotone manner and creates a larger total dual value, thus presumably attaining the true integrality gap.

1 Introduction

In the Steiner tree problem, we are given an undirected graph $G(V, E)$, a cost function on the edges $c : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^+$ and a subset of nodes $R \subseteq V$ called *terminals*. The objective is to find a tree T of minimum cost $c(T) := \sum_{e \in E(T)} c(e)$, which connects all the terminals. In general, the solution might contain nodes that are not in R . These nodes are often called *Steiner nodes*, which we represent by the set S . The essence of the problem lies in the case where the nodes are assumed to be the points of a metric space. Thus, we work on the metric completion of the input graph. The Steiner tree problem takes a central place in the field of approximation algorithms. It is a natural generalization of the minimum spanning tree problem and it appears as a special case of a large number of network design problems that are of great interest. As a result, it is one of the fundamental problems that has been intensively studied in theoretical computer science and operations research.

The Steiner tree problem already appears as an NP-hard problem in Karp’s classic paper [21]. In fact, it is NP-hard to find an approximation ratio better than $96/95$ [10, 11]. The fact that a minimum spanning tree on the terminals is twice the cost of an optimum solution has been exploited by early authors [15, 12, 20, 23, 24, 29] resulting in 2-approximation algorithms (see also [30]). The first algorithm breaking the barrier of factor 2 came from Zelikovsky [31] followed by a series of work [3, 25, 22, 19] resulting in the best purely combinatorial algorithm of factor

$1 + \frac{\ln(3)}{2} \approx 1.55$ by Robins and Zelikovsky [27, 28]. For the case of quasi-bipartite graphs in which there are no edges between the Steiner nodes, these authors show that their algorithm provides 1.279-approximation. More recently, an LP-based algorithm was provided by Byrka et al. [5, 6] achieving the approximation ratio $\ln(4) \approx 1.39$, which stands as the current best result. The best approximation ratio on quasi-bipartite graphs is $73/60$ by Goemans et al. [17].

All the algorithms discussed so far are concerned with the concept of a k -restricted Steiner tree. A *component* is a tree whose leaves are all from the set of terminals R . A k -*component* is a component having at most k terminals as leaves. A k -*restricted Steiner tree* T is a collection of components whose union induces a Steiner tree. In this case, the cost $c(T)$ of T is the total cost of its components, counting the duplicated edges with their multiplicity. A theorem of Borchers and Du [4] states that in order to get a good approximation ratio for **Steiner tree**, it is sufficient to consider k -restricted Steiner trees provided that k is large enough. In particular, let ρ_k be the supremum of the ratio between the cost of an optimal k -restricted Steiner tree and the cost of an optimal Steiner tree with no restrictions.

Theorem 1. [4] Given nonnegative integers r and s satisfying $k = 2^r + s$ and $s < 2^r$, we have

$$\rho_k = \frac{(r+1)2^r + s}{r2^r + s} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{\lfloor \log_2 k \rfloor}.$$

Given an optimal solution with a set of components, a specific component is optimal for the problem induced by its terminals. Besides, contracting the nodes in a specific component creates a tree which is also optimal for the residual problem. Using these and Theorem 1, a natural approach for approximating **Steiner tree** is then following: start from a minimum spanning tree on terminals (which is 2-approximate), identify by some greedy selection criteria, a k -component to contract, remove redundant edges and iterate until there is no improvement. The early combinatorial algorithms together with the LP rounding algorithm of ratio 1.39 using the *directed-component cut relaxation (DCR)* have used this general idea. One obvious disadvantage of this scheme is that it requires computing optimal k -components for large values of k . Although this can be done in polynomial-time, in order to attain the claimed approximation ratios, the running time has to be exorbitantly high. Another disadvantage is that the true nature of the algorithms are not fully apparent as there is, to the best of our knowledge, no way of constructing a tight example on which the algorithm is forced to give a solution with quality close to the proven bound.

It is clear by the foregoing discussion that the case for the **Steiner tree** problem with respect to approximability is rather unusual from what we have been used to see for some of the other fundamental combinatorial optimization problems. In the ideal setting, we have an LP relaxation for a problem together with an algorithm fully exploiting this relaxation in the sense that its approximation ratio is equal to the integrality gap of the relaxation. The approximation ratio of the algorithm is usually proven by comparing the cost of the solution to the optimum value of the LP relaxation or the value of a dual feasible solution. It is also not difficult to find a tight example for the algorithm, which would give us hints on improving the approximation ratio. A good example of this phenomenon is the more general **Steiner forest** problem with the undirected cut relaxation and the famous algorithms of [1, 18].

The most promising approach along this line for the **Steiner tree** problem was proposed by Chakrabarty, Devanur and Vazirani [7] who gave an LP relaxation amenable to effective use of the primal-dual schema. In particular, they gave the *simplex-embedding LP* allowing one to embed the nodes of the graph on a high dimensional simplex via the usual synchronous dual growth process. This relaxation is the dual of the usual *bidirected cut relaxation (BCR)*, which proved to be difficult for an application of the primal-dual schema.

1.1 Our contributions

We extend the work of [7] by making use of the simplex-embedding LP. The naive primal-dual approach using this relaxation cannot break the performance ratio of 2 as pointed out by the authors. We overcome this barrier by introducing a new and potentially widely applicable extension of the primal-dual schema. The new technique allows us to construct a dual solution with a larger value and we are able to prove an approximation ratio of $7/6$. This is obtained by comparing the cost of the solution returned by the algorithm directly to the value of the dual solution constructed. Thus, it puts an upper bound of $7/6 = 1.16667$ on the integrality gap of BCR on quasi-bipartite graphs. Note that this is quite close to the lower bound of $36/31 = 1.16129$ from [6].

The contribution of this paper is also related to one of the most important meta-problems in the field of approximation algorithms: the problem of whether one can always fully exploit a relaxation for a given problem. This was already mentioned by Vazirani in his book [30] in the Open Problems chapter, while discussing the Steiner tree problem and whether one can obtain a significantly better approximation ratio using the BCR: “A more general issue along these lines is to clarify the mysterious connection between the integrality gap of an LP-relaxation and the approximation factor achievable using it”.

The first use of the primal-dual schema for approximation algorithms is due to Bar-Yehuda and Even [2], which gives an elegant solution to a basic covering problem. The power and elegance of this approach was then observed by [1, 18] on a more elaborate problem, namely Steiner forest, whose LP relaxation is again a covering LP. The integrality gap of this relaxation is lower bounded by 2. However, a direct application of the primal-dual schema cannot attain this ratio since the degree of the dual variables may be arbitrarily high. The key observation of the authors was that although the dual degrees cannot be bounded, their *average* degree is bounded by 2. The main idea exploiting this fact is then to increase an appropriate set of dual variables synchronously, thereby constructing a dual solution with a larger value. This powerful extension of the primal-dual schema has then become prevalent in the field of approximation algorithms.

Steiner tree is one of the foremost among a bunch of problems for which even this enhancement alone could not give satisfactory results. This is even more remarkable in the light of the BCR, which we now give. We first fix a root node $r \in R$. We then replace each edge $e = \{u, v\} \in V$ by two directed edges (u, v) and (v, u) each with cost $c(e)$. For a given cut $S \in V$, we define $\delta^+(S) = \{(u, v) \in E : u \in S, v \notin S\}$, i.e. the set of edges emanating from S . Then the following is a relaxation for the Steiner tree problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{minimize} && \sum_{e \in E} c(e)x_e && (BCR) \\
 & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta^+(S)} x_e \geq 1, && \forall S \subseteq V - \{r\}, S \cap R \neq \emptyset, \\
 & && x_e \geq 0, && \forall e \in E.
 \end{aligned}$$

The BCR has been known for more than half a century [13], yielding optimal results for finding minimum spanning trees and in general minimum cost branchings. There are results proving upper bounds on the BCR for quasi-bipartite graphs. In particular, Rajagopalan and Vazirani [26] puts an upper bound of $3/2$. Chakrabarty, Devanur and Vazirani [7] puts an upper bound of $4/3$ (via an algorithm that does not run in strongly polynomial-time) for this class of graphs using the simplex-embedding LP. As noted, a direct application of the primal-dual schema using this LP cannot obtain an approximation ratio better than 2 due to the emergence of high degree Steiner nodes. The authors circumvent this barrier by considering inclusion of useful Steiner nodes with

high degree earlier than what is meant by the usual schema. This gives a fast combinatorial $3/2$ -approximation for quasi-bipartite graphs. They also give a polynomial-time $\sqrt{2}$ -approximation using a different method. However, the question of fully exploiting the simplex-embedding LP even for quasi-bipartite graphs remains as an intriguing open problem, especially given that the obtained approximation ratios are still far away from the best lower bound for the integrality gap.

Overall, there might be a more general and systematic approach, which will allow us to construct a better dual solution. In this paper, we provide such an enhancement of the primal-dual schema on top of the idea of growing duals synchronously. Specifically, we run the usual primal-dual schema several times using the simplex-embedding LP. In the earlier phases, we take note of the degrees of the Steiner nodes in the constructed solution. In the later phases, the value of a dual for a given Steiner node is increased with a rate depending on its degree computed in the earlier phases. This forces the algorithm to construct a dual solution with a larger value. We call this technique *dual growth with variable rates*. It is not confined to a strict recipe; there are hints that problem-specific considerations might also be needed. Indeed, one cannot directly get the desired approximation ratio for the problem at hand unless some further processing is performed at the end of a phase. This characteristic is in parallel with the usual primal-dual schema, having wide applicability in different forms. The new extension allows us to prove the following.

Theorem 2. *There exists a polynomial-time primal-dual $7/6$ -approximation algorithm for Steiner tree on quasi-bipartite graphs. Furthermore, the integrality gap of the simplex-embedding LP, and hence the BCR is at most $7/6$ on this class of graphs.*

This improves upon the previous best ratio of $73/60$ by Goemans et al. [17], which uses computationally demanding LP rounding. It is also a significant improvement over the ratio 1.279 of the previous best combinatorial algorithm by Robins and Zelikovsky [27, 28]. The running time of our algorithm is $O((|E| + |V|)|V| \log |V|)$, which is again an improvement over the time complexity $O(|V||E|^2)$ of this combinatorial algorithm.

1.2 Related work

A catalog of different LP relaxations for Steiner tree is given in [16]. Proving an integrality gap of smaller than 2 using one of these relaxations has attracted much attention. An upper bound of 1.55 was proven by [6] for DCR. A simpler proof of this fact using an equivalent formulation appears in [8]. This upper bound was improved by [17] to 1.39 , which also proves an upper bound of $73/60$ for quasi-bipartite graphs and provides a deterministic algorithm with the same performance ratio as that of [6] by solving the LP only once. This upper bound is also valid for the BCR as will be noted below. However, it is not obtained via the usual primal-dual schema.

The relationship between the BCR and the DCR has also been studied. One of the motivations for this is that using the BCR results in much more efficient algorithms due to its size. The first such result was given by [9], which shows that the two relaxations are equivalent on quasi-bipartite graphs. An efficient procedure converting a solution from the BCR to the DCR was then given by [17]. This equivalence is strengthened to the case of graphs that do not have a claw on Steiner nodes by [14]. These are instances which do not contain a Steiner node with three Steiner neighbors.

2 Preliminaries: the simplex-embedding LP

We first provide the necessary background for stating the simplex-embedding LP without giving proofs. All these results together with the LP is from [7]. We are interested in a finite set of points

with positive coordinates. Given $x \in \mathbb{Q}_+^k$, we denote the i th coordinate of x by $x(i)$. Let Δ_k^λ be the λ -simplex of dimension k for some $\lambda > 0$, i.e.

$$\Delta_k^\lambda := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Q}_+^k : \sum_{i=1}^k x(i) = \lambda \right\}$$

Note that there are k corners of this simplex, which form a basis for \mathbb{Q}^k . The distance between two points $x, y \in \Delta_k^\lambda$ is defined as

$$d(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k |x(i) - y(i)|.$$

Given this, the distance between any two corners of Δ_k^λ is λ . Using the simplex-embedding LP, we will naturally identify the nodes in V as points in Δ_k^λ . Thus, for any edge $e = (x, y)$, we define $d(e) := d(x, y)$. Given a tree T , let $d(T) := \sum_{e \in T} d(e)$.

Let $R = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ be an ordered set of k points in Δ_k^λ . We define

$$\gamma(R) := \left(\sum_{i=1}^k z_i(i) \right) - \lambda.$$

Let T be a tree with the vertex set R and another set S of points in Δ_k^λ . Then

Fact 3 (Theorem 3.2 of [7]). $d(T) \geq \gamma(R)$.

Given $e = (u, v) \in E$, let $c(u, v) := c(e)$. We denote $d(z_u, z_v)$ briefly by $d(u, v)$, and $\sum_{(u,v) \in E(T)} d(u, v)$ by $d(T)$. Embed the nodes in $V = R \cup S$ onto Δ_k^λ , where $|R| = k$ and $R = [k]$, by making sure that $c(u, v) \geq d(u, v)$. Let $z(R) := \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ be the embedding of the nodes in R . Denote $\gamma(z(R))$ briefly by $\gamma(z)$. Given an embedding with these properties, we have that

$$c(T) \geq d(T) \geq \gamma(z),$$

which is implied by Fact 3. The optimum value of the following linear program, called the simplex-embedding LP, is then a lower bound for the cost of an optimal Steiner tree:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \gamma(z) = \left(\sum_{i \in [k]} z_i(i) \right) - \lambda && (SE) \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{i \in [k]} z_v(i) = \lambda, && \forall v \in V, \\ & && z_v(i) - z_u(i) \leq d_i(u, v), && \forall i \in [k], \forall (u, v) \in E, \\ & && z_u(i) - z_v(i) \leq d_i(u, v), && \forall i \in [k], \forall (u, v) \in E, \\ & && \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [k]} d_i(u, v) \leq c(u, v), && \forall (u, v) \in E, \\ & && z_v(i) \geq 0, && \forall v \in V, \\ & && d_i(u, v) \geq 0 && \forall i \in [k], \forall (u, v) \in E. \end{aligned}$$

The first set of constraints enforce all the nodes to be on the simplex. An intuitive interpretation of the LP is that one wants to grow the simplex as large as possible, but making sure that one does not stretch the distances between the nodes further than the edge costs, which is implied by the rest of the constraints. We call them the *distance constraints*.

3 The naive algorithm with approximation ratio 2

For the rest of the paper, we assume that the input graph G is a quasi-bipartite graph. In this section, we fully state the basic algorithm suggested by [7]. We give a proof of the performance ratio of 2 as both the algorithm and the analysis provide a stepping stone to the main result of 7/6-approximation.

The algorithm, which we call PRIMAL-DUAL is an application of the primal-dual schema with synchronous dual growth. We think the dual growth as a process over time, and start at time $t = 0$. Initially, the dual variables representing the embedding $z : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+^k$ are all set to 0, i.e. all the nodes are at the origin. The algorithm maintains a candidate solution T , with vertices from the terminal set R , and an empty set of edges. It also keeps a set \mathcal{K} of connected components of T , which is initialized to the singleton nodes of R .

In order to describe the algorithm in more detail and reason about it, we give some more definitions and facts. Let

$$d^+(\{u, v\}) := \sum_{i \in X_u} (z_u(i) - z_v(i)),$$

where $X_u := \{i : z_u(i) \geq z_v(i)\}$. We use this distance mainly for the nodes below the simplex.

Fact 4 (Claim 4.2 of [7]). *Given $u, v \in \Delta_k^\lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$d^+(\{u, v\}) = d^+(\{v, u\}) = d(u, v).$$

Given any two components $K, L \in \mathcal{K}$, we define the distance between the components as $c(K, L) := \min_{u \in K, v \in L} c(u, v)$. We say that an edge is *tight* if $d(u, v) = c(u, v)$. We say that a Steiner node v *links* to a component $K \in \mathcal{K}$ if there exists $i \in K$ such that $d^+(\{i, v\}) = c(i, v)$. The edge (i, v) is called a *link* of v to K . By the algorithm, we will identify the set of terminals R with the coordinates of a given node. Thus, if a Steiner node v links to a component K , we denote the set of coordinates of v corresponding to the terminals in K by z_v^K .

The algorithm PRIMAL-DUAL is given in full detail in Algorithm 1. At time $t = 0$, all the nodes are at the origin and we identify each coordinate with a terminal in R . As time increases with unit rate, terminals increase their respective coordinates with the same rate. Upon merging of components via an edge becoming tight, this rate is adjusted by the total number of terminals in the new component, and the increase is equally “distributed” to the coordinates corresponding to these terminals. The Steiner nodes stay at the origin until they link to a component. Then the coordinates of the Steiner node corresponding to the terminals in the component it links to start to increase, again with a rate inversely proportional to the total number of terminals in the component. By this way, the distance between a Steiner node and the terminals in a component it links to conform the distance constraints.

If a Steiner node hits the simplex, the algorithm performs a merge operation with the components it links to, similar to that of component merging described above. As a final step, we project all the Steiner nodes onto the simplex to satisfy the first constraint of the LP. This operation does not violate the distance constraints. Indeed, before the projection, given any $r \in R$ and $v \in S$ below the simplex, we have $d^+(\{v, r\}) \leq c(v, r)$. The projection only increases the coordinates of v , hence decreases $d^+(\{v, r\})$. Since v is on the simplex, we have $d^+(\{v, r\}) = d(v, r)$ by Fact 4 so that $d(v, r) \leq c(v, r)$.

The procedure continues until there is a single component. It returns the solution T together with the set of duals grown, the vector t of hitting times, the vector Δ of the set of edges included into the solution via a Steiner node upon hitting the simplex and the degree vector δ keeping the cardinalities of these sets.

Algorithm 1: PRIMAL-DUAL($G(V = R \cup S, E), c$)

```
1  $E(T) \leftarrow \emptyset, V(T) \leftarrow R$ 
2  $z \leftarrow 0, t \leftarrow \infty, \Delta \leftarrow \emptyset, \delta \leftarrow 0$ 
3  $\mathcal{K} \leftarrow R$ 

4 while  $|\mathcal{K}| > 1$  do
5   // Increasing the coordinates of the components
6   for each  $K \in \mathcal{K}$  do
7     for each terminal  $i \in K \cap R$  do
8       for each  $v \in K$  do
9         | Increase  $z_v(i)$  uniformly at rate  $\frac{1}{|K \cap R|}$ 
10        end
11      end
12    end

13  // Increasing the coordinates of the Steiner nodes
14  for each  $v \in S$  not in any component do
15    for each component  $K$  that  $v$  links to do
16      | Increase  $z_v^K$  uniformly at rate  $\frac{1}{|K \cap R|}$ 
17      end
18    end

19  until either
20  1)  $c(K, L) = t$  for some  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}$ , where  $c(K, L)$  is attained by some  $e \in E$ , or
21  2)  $\sum_{i \in [k]} z_v(i) = t$  for some  $v \in S$  not in any component, i.e.  $v$  hits the  $t$ -simplex.

22  Perform the following for these cases
23  1)  $\mathcal{K} \leftarrow \mathcal{K} - \{K\} - \{L\}$ 
24   $\mathcal{K} \leftarrow \mathcal{K} \cup \{(K \cup L)\}$ , i.e. merge  $K$  and  $L$ 
25   $E(T) \leftarrow E(T) \cup \{e\}$ 
26  Declare that all  $v \in S$  linking to  $K$  or  $L$  now links to  $K \cup L$ 
27  For each  $v \in S$  linked to both  $K$  and  $L$ , remove the more expensive link

28  2)  $t(v) \leftarrow t$ , i.e. record the hitting time of  $v$ 
29  Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of components that  $v$  links to
30  Let  $L$  be a new component consisting of  $v$  and the components in  $\mathcal{L}$ 
31   $\mathcal{K} \leftarrow \mathcal{K} - \mathcal{L}$ 
32   $\mathcal{K} \leftarrow \mathcal{K} \cup \{L\}$ , i.e. merge  $v$  and  $\mathcal{L}$ 
33  Update the list of components other Steiner nodes link to by  $L$ 
34   $V(T) \leftarrow V(T) \cup \{v\}$ 
35  For each  $L \in \mathcal{L}$ , add the cheapest link of  $v$  to  $L$  to  $E(T)$  and to  $\Delta(v)$ 
36   $\delta(v) \leftarrow |\Delta(v)|$ , i.e. record the degree of  $v$  at hitting time
37 end

38 // Projecting the Steiner nodes onto the simplex
39 for each  $v \in S$  not on the simplex do
40   for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
41     |  $z_v(i) \leftarrow z_v(i) \cdot \frac{t}{\sum_{i=1}^k z_v(i)}$ 
42     end
43 end

44 return  $(T, z, t, \Delta, \delta)$ 
```

The following theorem establishes the approximation ratio of PRIMAL-DUAL.

Theorem 5. *Let $(T, z, t, \Delta, \delta)$ be a solution returned by PRIMAL-DUAL. Then*

$$c(T) \leq 2\gamma(z).$$

Proof. We prove the stronger assertion that given any component K of T at any time t , we have

$$c(K) \leq 2 \left(\left(\sum_{i \in K \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t \right),$$

which implies the theorem. We argue by induction on the size of K . It is sufficient to argue that the inequality holds upon the occurrence of the two types of event stated in the algorithm since at other times both sides of the inequality remain intact. Note also that the inequality vacuously holds at $t = 0$ when the size of K is also 0. In an event of Type 1, two components K and L merge via an edge e . By assumption, $c(K) \leq 2 \left(\left(\sum_{i \in K \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t \right)$ and $c(L) \leq 2 \left(\left(\sum_{i \in L \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t \right)$. Since $c(e) = t$ by definition, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c(K \cup L) &= c(K) + c(L) + c(e) \\ &= c(K) + c(L) + t \\ &\leq 2 \left(\left(\sum_{i \in K \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t \right) + 2 \left(\left(\sum_{i \in L \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t \right) + t \\ &= 2 \left(\sum_{i \in (K \cup L) \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - 3t \\ &\leq 2 \left(\left(\sum_{i \in (K \cup L) \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t \right). \end{aligned}$$

In an event of Type 2, a Steiner node v hits the simplex. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{K_1, \dots, K_\ell\}$ be the set of components v links to and let L be the new component formed. Let the set of cheapest links of v to each of the components in \mathcal{L} be $\{e_1, \dots, e_\ell\}$. Since $c(e_i) \leq t$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ by the algorithm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c(L) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} c(K_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} c(e_i) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \left(\left(\sum_{j \in K_i \cap R} z_j(j) \right) - t \right) + \ell t \\ &= 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{j \in K_i \cap R} z_j(j) \right) - \ell t \\ &\leq 2 \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{j \in K_i \cap R} z_j(j) \right) - t \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that $\ell \geq 2$ by the algorithm (Otherwise, v does not hit the simplex). \square




Figure 1: A tight example for the algorithm of approximation ratio 2

We give a tight example for PRIMAL-DUAL in Figure 1. This is essentially from [7] on which we also show an optimal solution. The set of edges and the Steiner nodes are separated into two figures. The edges in the figure on the left have unit cost. As a result, the Steiner nodes s_1, \dots, s_k hit the simplex at time $t = 1 + \frac{1}{\ell}$ since they all link to $\ell + 1$ distinct components at time $t = 1$. A possible selection of the edges by the algorithm is shown using bold lines, with a total cost of $2k + \ell - 1$. The edges in the figure on the right, which makes an optimal solution, have cost $1 + \frac{1}{\ell}$. Thus, they are not selected. Their total cost is $(1 + \frac{1}{\ell})(k + \ell) = k + \ell + \frac{k}{\ell} + 1$. Set $\ell = \delta k$. The ratio of the cost of the solution found by the algorithm and the cost of the optimal solution is then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2k + \ell - 1}{k + \ell + \frac{k}{\ell} + 1} &= \frac{2k\ell + \ell^2 - \ell}{k\ell + \ell^2 + k + \ell} = \frac{2\delta k^2 + \delta^2 k^2 - \delta k}{\delta k^2 + \delta^2 k^2 + k + \delta k} \\ &= \frac{2 + \delta - \frac{1}{k}}{1 + \delta + \frac{1}{\delta k} + \frac{1}{k}}, \end{aligned}$$

which approaches 2 as k and ℓ tends to infinity, and δ tends to 0.

4 The new algorithm: dual growth with variable rates

The new algorithm consists of several phases run until a certain condition about the Steiner nodes is satisfied, which we state later. We only describe the first two phases in detail. The first phase PRIMAL-DUAL-1, starts by performing the pre-processing step, which by-passes the Steiner nodes of degree 2 in the input graph. It then runs the standard primal-dual algorithm of the previous section, recording the hitting times, and degrees of the Steiner nodes together with the corresponding edges in the vectors t^1 , δ^1 and Δ^1 , respectively. It continues by performing what we call the *post-processing step*, a modification ensuring that the main idea of the second phase works correctly. We first set some terminology to describe this. A Steiner node $v \in S$ together with all the links of v , and their end nodes (i.e. the terminals v links to) is called a *component*, denoted by K_v . The links of v are also called the *links of K_v* . The solution returned by PRIMAL-DUAL consists of a union of components. Let L_v be the set of links of K_v , and L be the union of all these links over the components computed in PRIMAL-DUAL. Note that $E(T^1) \subseteq L \subseteq E$. The post-processing step computes a minimum spanning tree on this union whose edges form a subset of edges in L , thus overwriting T^1 . An example is given in Figure 2. Given a component K_v , if all the links of K_v are in $E(T^1)$, we call v a *full Steiner node*, and the component a *full component*. Otherwise, we say




Figure 2: An example illustrating the post-processing step (edge costs not shown)

that v is a *partial Steiner node*, and the corresponding component is a *partial component*. Given two components K_u and K_v , we say that K_u and K_v are *adjacent* if the links of K_u and K_v share at least two terminals. See Figure 3 for an illustration of various cases, where the edges in $E(T^1)$ are shown by solid, and the other links are by dashed lines.

For $\ell \geq 1$, phase $(\ell + 1)$ uses the data computed in phase ℓ . We describe $\ell = 1$. The algorithm PRIMAL-DUAL-2 starts by applying the first phase. It then continues by re-executing the usual primal-dual schema with some modifications. In the rest of the algorithm, given a Steiner node v with $\delta^1(v) \geq 2$, we impose that v does not link to any component from $t^1(v)$ on. For a Steiner node v below the simplex with $\delta^1(v) = 0$, the coordinates of v are increased with unit rate as usual. Note that $t^1(v) = \infty$ for such a node since it never hits the simplex in the first phase. If $\delta^1(v) \geq 2$, the coordinates of v are increased with a rate defined by the ratio of the size of the intersection of $\Delta^1(v)$ with the current links and the total number of current links. We call this the *modified growth rate*. When such a node hits the simplex, we include the edges already selected by the post-processing step, i.e. there is no further overwriting. The main purpose of “slowing down” such a node is to allow the nodes with degree 0 to “catch up”, thereby rectifying the large approximation ratio of the first phase.

Algorithm 2: PRIMAL-DUAL-1($G(V = R \cup S, E), c$)

```

1 // Apply the pre-processing step: short-cutting the Steiner nodes of degree 2
2 for all  $v \in S$  do
3   | if  $(v, r_1)$  and  $(v, r_2)$  are the only two edges in  $E$  then
4   |   |  $S \leftarrow S - v$ 
5   |   |  $E \leftarrow E - \{(v, r_1), (v, r_2)\}$ 
6   |   end
7 end

8 // Apply the usual primal-dual schema of the previous section
9  $(T^1, z^1, t^1, \Delta^1, \delta^1) \leftarrow$  PRIMAL-DUAL( $G(V = R \cup S, E), c$ )

10 // Apply the post-processing step
11 Compute a minimum spanning tree on the union of the components overwriting  $(T^1, z^1, t^1, \Delta^1, \delta^1)$ 
12 return  $(T^1, z^1, t^1, \delta^1, \Delta^1)$ 

```

Algorithm 3: PRIMAL-DUAL-2($G(V = R \cup S, E), c$)

```
1 // Apply the first phase
2  $(T^1, z^1, t^1, \Delta^1, \delta^1) \leftarrow$  PRIMAL-DUAL-1( $G(V = R \cup S, E), c$ )

3 // Apply the second phase
4  $E(T^2) \leftarrow \emptyset, V(T^2) \leftarrow R$ 
5  $z^2 \leftarrow 0, t^2 \leftarrow \infty$ 
6  $\mathcal{K} \leftarrow R$ 

7 while  $|\mathcal{K}| > 1$  AND not all links have been considered for inclusion into  $E(T)$  do
8   // Increasing the coordinates of the components
9   for each  $K \in \mathcal{K}$  do
10    for each terminal  $i \in K \cap R$  do
11     for each  $v \in K$  do
12      | Increase  $z_v(i)$  uniformly at rate  $\frac{1}{|K \cap R|}$ 
13     end
14    end
15   end

16   // Increasing the coordinates of the Steiner nodes
17   for each  $v \in S$  not in any component do
18     $v$  does not link to any component at time  $t \geq t^1(v)$ 
19    for each component  $K$  that  $v$  links to do
20     if  $\delta^1(v) = 0$  then
21      | Increase  $z_v^K$  uniformly at rate  $\frac{1}{|K \cap R|}$ 
22     end
23     if  $\delta^1(v) \geq 2$  then
24      | Increase  $z_v^K$  uniformly at rate  $\frac{|\Delta^1(v) \cap \{L: v \text{ links to } L\}|}{|L: v \text{ links to } L|} \cdot \frac{1}{|K \cap R|}$ 
25     end
26    end
27   end

28   until either
29   1)  $c(K, L) = t$  for some  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}$ , where  $c(K, L)$  is attained by some  $e \in E$ , or
30   2)  $\sum_{i \in [k]} z_v(i) = t$  for some  $v \in S$  not in any component, i.e.  $v$  hits the  $t$ -simplex.

31   Perform the following for these cases
32   1) Perform the operations of 1) as in PRIMAL-DUAL
33   2) Perform the operations of 2) as in PRIMAL-DUAL except that the set of vertices and edges
      included into  $V(T)$  and  $E(T)$  are those implied by  $\Delta^1(v)$ 
34 end

35 Project the Steiner nodes onto the simplex as in PRIMAL-DUAL

36 // Apply the post-processing step
37 Compute a minimum spanning tree on the union of the components overwriting  $(T^1, z^1, t^1, \Delta^1, \delta^1)$ 
38 return  $(T^2, z^2, t^2, \Delta^2, \delta^2)$ 
```

The slow growth rate of partial Steiner nodes in the second phase results in violation of the distance constraints. We will correct this via a dual-fitting type analysis, down-scaling the simplex. From this point of view, another way of stating why we impose a small growth rate for such nodes is that we want the cost of the solution to be completely paid by the dual. By the dual-fitting




Figure 3: Examples illustrating the adjacencies of components

analysis, the approximation ratio reduces to the maximum multiplicative “distortion” of an edge. There are examples on which the distances are distorted by a factor as large as $3/2$. However, one can show the existence of an alternative instance via which one can argue an approximation ratio of $7/6$ despite the excessive distortion. The desired properties of such an alternative instance are guaranteed by the post-processing step.

The main algorithm runs $r \geq 2$ phases such that in the last phase, the coordinates of all the Steiner nodes hitting the simplex grow with the modified growth rate. In other words, if a Steiner node hits the simplex with unit growth rate in a phase, the algorithm continues to run a new phase. Recall that a new phase uses the data computed in the previous phase. In this sense, the later phases are analogous to PRIMAL-DUAL-2. During the progression of phases, L is modified to include the new links computed in the running phase. The final result is $(T^r, z^r, t^r, \Delta^r, \delta^r)$.

Each phase of the algorithm can be implemented with the same time complexity as that of [7], which is $O((|E| + |V|) \log |V|)$ since the only difference is in growth speeds of duals. We refer the reader to [7] for implementation details. The time complexity of the post-processing step, which involves a minimum spanning tree computation is subsumed by this function. Since the number of phases is at most $O(|V|)$, the overall running time is $O((|E| + |V|)|V| \log |V|)$

We show an execution of the algorithm on an example in Figure 4 to illustrate the idea of dual growth with variable rates. The coordinates of the nodes at important points are given in Table 1. Those of the first phase are in the first row, and the ones in the second phase are in the second row. All the edges are of unit cost and the edges selected by the algorithm are shown via bold lines. In the first phase, all the Steiner nodes link to 3 terminals at time $t = 1$. Thus, they all hit the simplex at time $t = 3/2$, with coordinate values $1/2$ corresponding to the terminals they link to. After the bold edges are selected, we have $\delta^1(s_2) = 3$, $\delta^1(s_1) = \delta^1(s_2) = 2$. In the second phase, assume the post-processing step does not alter the solution returned by the first phase. This is without loss of generality since the graph is symmetric. The Steiner nodes again link to the same 3 terminals at time $t = 1$. Then the full Steiner node s_2 grows the coordinates with unit rate, hitting the simplex at time $t = 3/2$. Meanwhile, the coordinates of s_1 and s_3 are grown with a rate of $2/3$. After $t = 3/2$, the number of links of s_1 and s_3 are both 2. Thus, they grow their coordinates with unit rate, hitting the simplex at time $t = 2$. Note that $\gamma(z) = 7$, which pays for the cost of the solution, and the distance between s_1 and r_4 (and similarly, between s_3 and r_5) is $7/6$, violating




Figure 4: An example on which we illustrate the execution of the new algorithm

$t = 1$	$t = 3/2$	
$r_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$r_1 = (3/2, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	
$r_2 = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$	$r_2 = (0, 3/2, 0, 0, 0)$	
$r_3 = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$	$r_3 = (0, 0, 3/2, 0, 0)$	
$r_4 = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$	$r_4 = (0, 0, 0, 3/2, 0)$	
$r_5 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$	$r_5 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 3/2)$	
$s_1 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$s_1 = (1/2, 0, 0, 1/2, 1/2)$	
$s_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$s_2 = (0, 1/2, 0, 1/2, 1/2)$	
$s_3 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$s_3 = (0, 0, 1/2, 1/2, 1/2)$	
$t = 1$	$t = 3/2$	$t = 2$
$r_1 = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$r_1 = (3/2, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$r_1 = (2, 0, 0, 0, 0)$
$r_2 = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0)$	$r_2 = (0, 3/2, 0, 0, 0)$	$r_2 = (0, 5/3, 0, 1/6, 1/6)$
$r_3 = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0)$	$r_3 = (0, 0, 3/2, 0, 0)$	$r_3 = (0, 0, 2, 0, 0)$
$r_4 = (0, 0, 0, 1, 0)$	$r_4 = (0, 0, 0, 3/2, 0)$	$r_4 = (0, 1/6, 0, 5/3, 1/6)$
$r_5 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 1)$	$r_5 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 3/2)$	$r_5 = (0, 1/6, 0, 1/6, 5/3)$
$s_1 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$s_1 = (1/3, 0, 0, 1/3, 1/3)$	$s_1 = (5/6, 1/6, 0, 1/2, 1/2)$
$s_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$s_2 = (0, 1/2, 0, 1/2, 1/2)$	$s_2 = (0, 2/3, 0, 2/3, 2/3)$
$s_3 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$	$s_3 = (0, 0, 1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$	$s_3 = (0, 1/6, 5/6, 1/2, 1/2)$

Table 1: Execution of the new algorithm on the example in Figure 4

the corresponding distance constraint. In this case, scaling the whole simplex by a factor of $6/7$ gives a feasible solution.

5 Proof of the approximation ratio $7/6$

Theorem 6. *Let $(T, z, t^r, \Delta^r, \delta^r)$ be a solution returned by the algorithm of the previous section. Then*

$$c(T) \leq \gamma(z).$$

Proof. For brevity, we set $T := T^r$, and $z := z^r$. We show that given any component K of T at any time t in the last phase, we have

$$c(K) \leq \left(\sum_{i \in K \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t. \quad (1)$$

We argue by induction on the size of K , for which the base case vacuously holds. We have two types of edges included into the solution via events of Type 1 and Type 2, same as in the first phase.

In an event of Type 1, two components K and L merge via an edge e . By assumption, $c(K) \leq (\sum_{i \in K \cap R} z_i(i)) - t$ and $c(L) \leq (\sum_{i \in L \cap R} z_i(i)) - t$. Since $c(e) = t$ by definition, we get

$$\begin{aligned} c(K \cup L) &= c(K) + c(L) + c(e) \\ &= c(K) + c(L) + t \\ &\leq \left(\left(\sum_{i \in K \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t \right) + \left(\left(\sum_{i \in L \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t \right) + t \\ &= \left(\sum_{i \in (K \cup L) \cap R} z_i(i) \right) - t. \end{aligned}$$

In an event of Type 2, a Steiner node v hits the simplex at time $t = t^r(v)$. Let $\delta := \delta^{r-1}(v) \geq 2$, and

$$t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_\delta \leq t^r(v),$$

where t_i for $i = 1, \dots, \delta$ is the linking time of v to the components implied by $\Delta^{r-1}(v)$.

Proposition 7.

$$t^r(v) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\delta} t_i}{\delta - 1}.$$

Proof. Assume first v is a full Steiner node. Define $\epsilon := t^r(v) - t_\delta$. Since the coordinates of v are increased at a unit rate, the sum of the increments within the time interval $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ is $i(t_{i+1} - t_i)$ for $i \geq 1$. So, we have the following equation to determine $t^2(v)$.

$$(t_2 - t_1) + 2(t_3 - t_2) + \dots + (\delta - 1)(t_\delta - t_{\delta-1}) + \delta\epsilon = t_\delta + \epsilon,$$

which yields

$$\delta t_\delta + \delta\epsilon - \sum_{i=1}^{\delta} t_i = t_\delta + \epsilon,$$

and hence

$$(\delta - 1)t_\delta - \sum_{i=1}^{\delta} t_i = (1 - \delta)\epsilon,$$

so that

$$\epsilon = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\delta} t_i - (\delta - 1)t_\delta}{\delta - 1}.$$

This provides

$$t^r(v) = t_\delta + \epsilon = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\delta} t_i}{\delta - 1},$$

as desired.

If v is a partial Steiner node, by the scheme increasing the coordinates of v , the sum of the increments within the time interval $[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ is still $i(t_{i+1} - t_i)$ for $i \geq 1$ since the growth rate multiplied by the number of coordinates gives

$$\frac{i}{|L : v \text{ links to } L|} \cdot |L : v \text{ links to } L| \cdot (t_{i+1} - t_i) = i(t_{i+1} - t_i).$$

Thus, the desired equality holds as in the case of the full Steiner node. \square

By the algorithm, the increase on the left hand side of (1) is at most $\sum_{i=1}^{\delta} t_i$. By the growth rates, the increase on the right hand side of (1) is $\delta t^r(v) - t^r(v) = (\delta - 1)t^r(v)$. By Proposition 7, these two quantities are equal, completing the inductive step. \square

Given an instance $I = (G(V, E), c)$, let OPT_I denote the cost of an optimal Steiner tree in I . The following theorem together with Theorem 6 establishes the approximation ratio, and finishes the proof of Theorem 2.

Theorem 8. *Let $(T^r, z, t^r, \Delta^r, \delta^r)$ be a solution returned by the algorithm of the previous section on instance $I_1 = (G(V, E), c_1)$. Then there exists an instance $I_2 = (G(V, E), c_2)$ such that*

1. $OPT_{I_1} \geq OPT_{I_2}$;
2. for any $(u, v) \in E$,

$$d(u, v) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [k]} |z_u(i) - z_v(i)| \leq \frac{7}{6} c_2(u, v).$$

Proof. In the instance I_2 , we define the cost function c_2 as

$$c_2(u, v) := \frac{6}{7} d(u, v), \tag{2}$$

for all $(u, v) \in L$. For all $(u, v) \in E \setminus L$, we set

$$c_2(u, v) := \frac{6}{7} c_1(u, v). \tag{3}$$

These clearly satisfy the second condition since $c_1(u, v) \geq d(u, v)$ for all $(u, v) \in E \setminus L$. It only remains to prove the first condition.

Let T be an optimal solution in I_1 . If $E(T) \subseteq E \setminus L$, the first condition immediately holds by (3). Thus, we assume without loss of generality that $E(T) \cap L \neq \emptyset$. The other extreme case $E(T) = E(T^r) \subseteq L$ also leaves nothing to prove as it implies the optimality of T^r .

Claim 9. *Suppose there is no optimal solution in I_1 equivalent to T^r . Then there exists an optimal solution T in I_1 such that for any component K_v computed by the algorithm, either $E(T) \cap L_v = L_v$ or $E(T) \cap L_v = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that there is no such optimal solution. Let T be an optimal solution in I^1 such that $E(T) \cap L_v$ is non-empty and a proper subset of L_v for some $v \in S$. We will show that it is possible to switch to another optimal solution, which only contains edges from L , and will eventually derive a contradiction.

Let $u \in S$ be a Steiner node in T adjacent to the set of terminals $N(u)$ via the edges in $E \setminus L$, i.e. u does not hit the simplex. Let t_u be the (projected) hitting time of u in the last phase as a full Steiner node. Note that $t_u \geq t_{max}$, the maximum of the hitting time of any Steiner node during the algorithm. Consider the set of k edges in $E(T)$, which are incident to u with the other end vertices forming a set of terminals R_u belonging to some components computed by the algorithm including K_v . We delete the links of K_u , and add some new links with end points in R_u , keeping




Figure 5: An illustration for the proof of Claim 9

T connected. In particular, If R_u contains all the terminals of a component K_w , we include L_w to $E(T)$. Assuming without loss of generality that R_u contains some of the terminals of K_v , we include a cheapest subset of L_v to $E(T)$ so as to make it connected. These operations give us another optimal solution: Since the cost of an edge incident to u is at most t_u , by the proof of Proposition 7, the cost of the discarded edges is at least $(k-1)t_u \geq (k-1)t_{max}$. Since we also have that the cost of a link of a component K_w (and K_u) is at most t_{max} , the cost of the included edges is at most $(k-1)t_{max}$, where we again use Proposition 7 for the set of all links of a component (See Figure 5 for an illustration, where the included edges are bold, and the excluded edges are shown using dashed lines). Performing these operations for all $u \in S$, we thus get another optimal solution T such that $E(T) \subseteq L$.

If T contains an edge e between two terminals, which v links to, then we can switch to another optimal solution $E(T) \subseteq L$ by discarding e and adding a link of v to one of the terminals (which was not in $E(T)$). This is due to the fact that the cost of the added link is not more than the cost of e . For both of the cases described above, since $E(T^r) \subseteq L$ forms a minimum spanning tree by the algorithm, $E(T) \subseteq L$ implies that there is an optimal solution equivalent to T^r , contradicting the premise of the claim. The result follows. \square

Given $(u, v) \in E$, we define the *distortion* of e as the additive function

$$D(u, v) := d(u, v) - c_1(u, v).$$

Let T be an optimal solution implied by Claim 9. Since there is no distortion of the edges of a full component, by (2), the corresponding total cost of these edges in I_2 is strictly smaller than that of I_1 . Thus, assume without loss of generality that $E(T)$ contains all the links L_p of some partial component K_p . Let the linking times of p together with the hitting time $t := t^r(p)$ be given as

$$t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_s \leq t.$$

We denote the edge of linking time t_i by e_i .

Claim 10.

$$\sum_{i=1}^s D(e_i) \leq \frac{(s-3)t + (4-s)t_s}{2}.$$

Proof. Note that e_1 is selected by the algorithm, and there is no distortion in the time period $[t_1, t_2]$. We consider the worst-case for the distortion in which e_2, \dots, e_{s-1} are not selected. The

difference between $d(e_i)$ and $c_1(e_i)$ in the period $[t_\delta, t_{\delta+1}]$ for $2 \leq \delta \leq s-1$ increases at a rate of $\frac{\delta-1}{\delta}$. For the period $[t_s, t_{s+1}]$, this rate is $\frac{s-2}{s}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D(e_i) &\leq \left(\sum_{\delta=i}^{s-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\delta} \right) (t_{\delta+1} - t_\delta) \right) + \frac{(s-2)(t-t_s)}{s} \\ &= (t_s - t_i) - \left(\sum_{\delta=i}^{s-1} \frac{(t_{\delta+1} - t_\delta)}{\delta} \right) + \frac{(s-2)(t-t_s)}{s} \\ &= (t_s - t_i) + \left(\frac{t_i}{i} - \left(\sum_{\delta=i+1}^{s-2} \frac{t_\delta}{(\delta-1)\delta} \right) - \frac{t_s}{s-1} \right) + \frac{(s-2)(t-t_s)}{s}. \end{aligned}$$

We bound the last expression by a computation of the telescopic sum excluding a number of initial terms and noting the ascending values of t_δ :

$$\begin{aligned} D(e_i) &\leq (t_s - t_i) + \left(\frac{t_i}{i} - \left(\frac{s-2}{s-1} - \frac{1}{2} \right) t_s + \left(\frac{i-1}{i} - \frac{1}{2} \right) t_i + \frac{t_s}{s-1} \right) + \frac{(s-2)(t-t_s)}{s} \\ &= (t_s - t_i) + \frac{t_i}{2} - \frac{t_s}{2} + (t-t_s) - \frac{2t}{s} + \frac{2t_s}{s} \\ &= t - \frac{t_s}{2} - \frac{t_i}{2} - \frac{2t}{s} + \frac{2t_s}{s} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{2}{s} \right) t + \left(\frac{2}{s} - \frac{1}{2} \right) t_s - \frac{t_i}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 7 on the sum of t_i , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^s D(e_i) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{2}{s} \right) t + \left(\frac{2}{s} - \frac{1}{2} \right) t_s - \frac{t_i}{2} \\ &\leq (s-2)t + \left(2 - \frac{s}{2} \right) t_s - \frac{(s-1)t}{2} \\ &= \frac{(s-3)t + (4-s)t_s}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \square

Let K_q be a component adjacent to K_p . By Claim 9, $E(T)$ does not contain any of the links in L_q . Given two partial components adjacent to K_q , we say that they are *disjoint* if their terminal set common with K_q are distinct. Let ℓ be the number of pair-wise disjoint partial components with links in $E(T)$, and adjacent to K_q . Let the hitting times of the corresponding Steiner nodes be t_1, \dots, t_ℓ in the last phase, and let s_1, \dots, s_ℓ be the number of links (Note that this overrides the notation in Claim 10). We first show that we may assume without loss of generality that $\ell = 1$, i.e. K_p is the only component adjacent to K_q .

Supposing $\ell \geq 2$, note first that K_q must be a full component for T^r to be connected. Given this, we have $t_i \geq t^r(q)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Let t_{max} be the maximum of the hitting times of Steiner nodes in the last phase. Consider the subtree T' of T induced by K_q and all the adjacent pair-wise disjoint partial components. The cost of an edge between two terminals not considered by the algorithm is at least t_{max} . We also have that the sum of the cost of any two links of a Steiner node not hitting the simplex is at least t_{max} . If $\ell \geq |L_q| - 1$, the links of all the pair-wise disjoint partial




Figure 6: An illustration for the the proof of Theorem 8

components coincide with T' . We thus assume $\ell \leq |L_q| - 2$. The cost of T' is then at least

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (s_i - 1)t_i \right) + (|L_q| - \ell - 1)t_{max},$$

where the first term in the sum follows by Proposition 7. Since each link of L_q is of cost at most $t_{min} := \min_{i=1, \dots, \ell} t_i$, the cost of the solution computed by the algorithm is at most

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (s_i - 1)t_i \right) + (|L_q| - \ell)t_{min}.$$

See Figure 6a for an illustration in which $|L_q| = 6$ and $\ell = 3$. Taking the ratio, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (s_i - 1)t_i \right) + (|L_q| - \ell)t_{min}}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (s_i - 1)t_i \right) + (|L_q| - \ell - 1)t_{max}} &\leq \frac{2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} t_i \right) + (|L_q| - \ell)t_{min}}{2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} t_i \right) + (|L_q| - \ell - 1)t_{max}} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{t_{min}}{2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} t_i \right) + (|L_q| - \ell - 1)t_{max}} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{t_{min}}{2\ell t_{min} + (|L_q| + \ell - 1)t_{min}} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{|L_q| + \ell - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that $s_i \geq 3$. If $|L_q| \geq 5$, we have that for $\ell \geq 2$, the ratio is at most $7/6$. We specially handle $|L_q| = 4$ for which an illustration is given in Figure 6b. By Proposition 7, the total cost of the links in L_q is $3t^r(q)$ so that (by a very elementary calculation) there are always two edges ensuring connectivity with a total cost of at most $3t^r(q)/2$. Performing the same calculations above, we obtain that the ratio is at most

$$\frac{2(t_1 + t_2) + \frac{3}{2}t_{min}}{2(t_1 + t_2) + t_{max}} \leq 1 + \frac{\frac{1}{2}t_{min}}{5t_{min}} \leq \frac{11}{10}.$$

Consider now K_p with s links, adjacent to K_q . Let $t_s \leq t$ be the largest linking time, and the hitting time of p , respectively. By the assignment (2), Proposition 7, and Claim 10, we have that




Figure 7: A tight example for the algorithm of approximation ratio $7/6$

for $s \geq 4$, the increase in the cost of OPT_{I_2} contributed by L_p is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{6}{7} \left(\frac{(s-3)t + (4-s)t_s}{2} + (s-1)t \right) - (s-1)t &= \frac{3(s-3)t}{7} - \frac{(s-1)t}{7} + \frac{3(4-s)t_s}{7} \\
&= \frac{(2s-8)t}{7} + \frac{3(4-s)t_s}{7} \\
&= \left(\frac{s-4}{7} \right) (2t - 3t_s) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{s-4}{7} \right) \left(2t - \frac{3(s-1)t}{s} \right) \\
&= \left(\frac{s-4}{7} \right) \left(\frac{3-s}{s} \right) t,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from Proposition 7, the fact that t_s is the largest linking time, and the choice of $s \geq 4$. The increase is thus not more than 0 for this choice. For $s = 3$, the increase in the cost of OPT_{I_2} is at most

$$\frac{6}{7} \left(2t + \frac{t_s}{2} \right) - 2t \leq \frac{6}{7} \left(\frac{5t}{2} \right) - 2t = \frac{t}{7}.$$

Finally, note that T must contain a set of edges with cost at least t_{max} (See Figure 6 again), which results in OPT_{I_2} a decrease of cost at least $\frac{t_{max}}{7} \geq \frac{t}{7}$. This implies that each p induces a smaller cost on OPT_{I_2} than OPT_{I_1} . Applying this observation to all p , we get $OPT_{I_1} \geq OPT_{I_2}$, completing the proof. \square

6 Tight Example

A tight example for PRIMAL-DUAL-2 is given in Figure 7. In both of the phases, s_1 hits the simplex at time $t = 2$ followed by s_2 hitting the simplex. This results in the inclusion of a set of edges of total cost $7 + \epsilon$. The optimal solution has cost $6 + 3\epsilon$.

7 Final remarks

We believe that the idea of growing duals with variable rates is an important extension of the primal-dual schema and should be widely applicable. In the case of Steiner tree on quasi-bipartite graphs,

it improves the approximation ratio from 2 to $7/6$. Turning to the meta-problem mentioned in the introduction, we also have the conviction that the integrality gap of a certain LP relaxation for an optimization problem can always be attained, even under the strong form, requiring a polynomial-time algorithm. This is due to our belief that there is still a lot of room for the development of algorithmic techniques that can exploit LP relaxations.

It is on the other hand, a curious fact that if the rate of growth for duals in the second phase is set to a function other than what we have used, there seems to be no way of getting an approximation ratio better than $7/6$. This fact coupled with our intuition that the scheme we have proposed is strong enough to attain many other integrality gaps lead us to the following.

Conjecture 11. *The integrality gap of the BCR on quasi-bipartite graphs is $7/6$.*

Another question of interest is if one can extend the approach using the simplex-embedding LP to general graphs. This would resolve the long-standing conjecture that the integrality gap of the BCR is bounded away from 2. We suspect that the case of quasi-bipartite graphs already contains the difficult core of the problem, and such an extension is possible. However, this intuition is not as strong as the conjecture above.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Mohit Singh for pointing out an error in our initial approach, which directed us to use the simplex-embedding LP, and anonymous reviewers of preliminary manuscripts whose comments and explicit examples helped us finalize the algorithm. This work was supported by TUBITAK (Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) under Project No. 112E192.

References

- [1] A. Agrawal, P. N. Klein, and R. Ravi. When trees collide: An approximation algorithm for the generalized Steiner problem on networks. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 24(3):440–456, 1995.
- [2] R. Bar-Yehuda and S. Even. A linear-time approximation algorithm for the weighted vertex cover problem. *J. Algorithms*, 2(2):198–203, 1981.
- [3] P. Berman and V. Ramaiyer. Improved approximations for the Steiner tree problem. *J. Algorithms*, 17:753–782, 1994.
- [4] A. Borchers and D.-Z. Du. The k -Steiner ratio in graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 26(3):857–869, 1997.
- [5] J. Byrka, F. Grandoni, T. Rothvoss, and L. Sanitá. An improved LP-based approximation for Steiner tree. In *Proceedings of the 42th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 583–592, 2010.
- [6] J. Byrka, F. Grandoni, T. Rothvoss, and L. Sanitá. Steiner tree approximation via iterative randomized rounding. *J. ACM*, 60(1):6:1–6:33, 2013.
- [7] D. Chakrabarty, N. R. Devanur, and V. V. Vazirani. New geometry-inspired relaxations and algorithms for the metric Steiner tree problem. *Math. Program.*, 130(1):1–32, 2011.
- [8] D. Chakrabarty, J. Könemann, and D. Pritchard. Integrality gap of the hypergraphic relaxation of Steiner trees: A short proof of a 1.55 upper bound. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 38(6):567–570, 2010.

- [9] D. Chakrabarty, J. Könemann, and D. Pritchard. Hypergraphic LP relaxations for Steiner trees. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 27(1):507–533, 2013.
- [10] M. Chlebík and J. Chlebíková. Approximation hardness of the Steiner tree problem on graphs. In *Proceedings of the 8th Scandinavian Workshop on Algorithm Theory (SWAT)*, pages 170–179, 2002.
- [11] M. Chlebík and J. Chlebíková. The Steiner tree problem on graphs: Inapproximability results. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 406(3):207–214, 2008.
- [12] E.-A. Choukhmane. Une heuristique pour le problème de l’arbre de Steiner. *RAIRO Rech. Opér.*, 12:207–212, 1978.
- [13] J. Edmonds. Optimum branchings. *J. Res. Nat. Bureau Stand.*, B71:233–240, 1967.
- [14] A. E. Feldmann, J. Könemann and Chakrabarty N. Olver, and L. Sanità. On the equivalence of the bidirected and hypergraphic relaxations for Steiner tree. *Math. Program.*, 160(1-2):379–406, 2016.
- [15] E. N. Gilbert and H. O. Pollak. Steiner minimal trees. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 16(1):1–29, 1968.
- [16] M. X. Goemans and Y.-S. Myung. A catalog of Steiner tree formulations. *Networks*, 23(1):19–28, 1993.
- [17] M. X. Goemans, N. Olver, T. Rothvoß, and R. Zenklusen. Matroids and integrality gaps for hypergraphic Steiner tree relaxations. In *Proceedings of the 44th Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1161–1176, 2012.
- [18] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson. A general approximation technique for constrained forest problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 24(2):296–317, 1995.
- [19] S. Hougardy and H. J. Prömel. A 1.598 approximation algorithm for the Steiner problem in graphs. In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 448–453, 1999.
- [20] A. Iwainsky, E. Canuto, O. Taraszow, and A. Villa. Network decomposition for the optimization of connection structures. *Networks*, 16:205–235, 1986.
- [21] R. M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In R. E. Miller and J. W. Thatcher, editors, *Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–103. Plenum Press, 1972.
- [22] M. Karpinski and A. Zelikovsky. New approximation algorithms for the Steiner tree problem. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 1(1):47–65, 1997.
- [23] L. Kou, G. Markowsky, and L. Berman. A fast algorithm for Steiner trees. *Acta Inform.*, 15:141–145, 1981.
- [24] J. Plesník. A bound for the Steiner tree problem in graphs. *Math. Slovaca*, 31:155–163, 1981.
- [25] H. J. Prömel and A. Steger. A new approximation algorithm for the Steiner tree problem with performance ratio 5/3. *J. Algorithms*, 36:89–101, 2000.
- [26] S. Rajagopalan and V. V. Vazirani. On the bidirected cut relaxation for the metric Steiner tree problem. In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 742–751, 1999.

- [27] G. Robins and A. Zelikovsky. Improved Steiner tree approximation in graphs. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 770–779, 2000.
- [28] G. Robins and A. Zelikovsky. Tighter bounds for graph Steiner tree approximation. *SIAM J. Disc. Math.*, 19(1):122–134, 2005.
- [29] H. Takahashi and A. Matsuyama. An approximate solution for the Steiner problem in graphs. *Math. Jap.*, 24:573–577, 1980.
- [30] V. V. Vazirani. *Approximation Algorithms*. Springer, 2001.
- [31] A. Zelikovsky. An 11/6-approximation algorithm for the network Steiner problem. *Algorithmica*, 9:463–470, 1993.