University of Wrocław: Algorithms for Big Data (Fall'19) 13/01/2020

Lecture 12: Coresets

Lecturer: Przemysław Uznański Scribe: -

## 1 Coresets

Setup: given set of  $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , compute  $C_P(): \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ . For example:

• MEB, a minimal enclosing ball:  $C_P(o)$  is a radius of minimal enclosing ball for set P centered at o.

|P|=n is large, so storing it explicitly is out of the question. Observe that for fixed o, a single  $p \in P$  is enough, that is  $\forall_o \exists_{p \in P} C_P(o) = C_{\{p\}}(o)$ . Can we generalize this observation so it works for all  $o \in \mathbb{R}^2$  at once?

**Definition 1.** We say that  $S \subseteq P$  is a c-coreset for P if for any o and any  $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  there is:

$$C_{S \cup T}(o) \le C_{P \cup T}(o) \le c \cdot C_{S \cup T}(o)$$

Note: this is a stronger definition than just requiring that  $f_S(o)$  is a c-approximation to  $C_P(o)$  (take  $T = \emptyset$ ).

Observe that in case of MEB we have for  $A \subseteq B$ :  $C_A(o) \le C_B(o)$ , so the first inequality is "for free".

**Lemma 2** (Merge property). If S is a c-coreset for P, and S' is a c-coreset for P', then  $S \cup S'$  is a  $c^2$ -coreset for  $P \cup P'$ .

**Lemma 3** (Reduce property). If S is a c-coreset for P and P is a c-coreset for Q, then S is a  $c^2$ -coreset for Q.

We sometimes want a stronger property (which for example MEB satisfies)

**Property 4** (Disjoint merge). If S is a c-coreset for P and S' is a c-coreset for P' and  $P \cap P' = \emptyset$ , then  $S \cup S'$  is a c-coreset for  $P \cup P'$ .

Exercise: proof for MEB.

**Theorem 5.** Assume that a problem is supported by a  $(1 + \alpha)$ -coreset of size  $f(\alpha)$ , computable in linear space, with disjoint merhe property. Then there is a streaming algorithm with  $1 + \varepsilon$  guarantee, with space  $\mathcal{O}(f(\varepsilon/\log n)\log n)$ .

*Proof.* Sketch of a proof: put stream of n elements into binary tree. Each node stores coreset for the range below it.

For two sibling nodes  $N_1, N_2$  covering sets  $A_1, A_2$ , at level i, and parent node N at level i + 1, there is:

•  $N_1$  is  $(1+\alpha)^i$ -coreset for  $A_1$  (and the same for  $N_2,\,A_2$ )

- $N_1 \cup N_2$  is  $(1+\alpha)^i$ -coreset for  $A_1 \cup A_2$
- N is constructed as  $(1 + \alpha)$ -coreset for  $N_1 \cup N_2$
- thuse N is  $(1+\alpha)^{i+1}$ -coreset for  $A_1 \cup A_2$

As a end-result, we have in the root  $(1 + \alpha)^{\log n}$ -coreset for whole input. Selecting  $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon/\log n)$  is enough.

#### 1.1 Coreset for MEB

Construction goes as follow. Choose dense set of directions  $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^m$ , such that for any other direction u, there is always some  $v_i$  such that  $\operatorname{angle}(u, v_i) \leq \alpha$ : this is  $\sim \alpha$ -net on unit-ball (up to trigonometry). We can choose such set of  $m = (1/\alpha)^{\mathcal{O}(d)}$  directions.

Claim 6. For any direction  $v_i$ , pick  $p_i \in P$  that is extremal in that direction. Set  $S = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^m$  is a  $(1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2))$ -coreset for P.

*Proof.* Pick arbitrary T ( $T = \emptyset$  w.l.o.g. in this proof), and P and constructed set S. Fix o. Pick furthest point  $x \in P$ , and close direction  $v_i$ , and maximal in this direction point  $p_i \in S$ . The angle x-o- $p_i$  is small (at most  $\alpha$ ), so the stretch is upperbounded by  $\frac{1}{\cos \alpha} = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$ .

### 1.2 Coreset for median

Approximate median: given sequence of numbers A of number  $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ , return a such that  $(1/2 \pm \varepsilon)n$  elements in A are smaller/larger than a.

Alternative formulation: find a that minimizes  $C_A(a) = \max(|\{i : a_i \ge a\}|, |\{i : a_i \le a\}|)$ . Coreset of size  $1/\varepsilon$ : pick every  $\varepsilon n$  element from sorted A. Easy to see that

$$C_{A \cup T}(a) < C_{A \cup S}(a) < (1 + \varepsilon)C_{A \cup T}(a)$$

Plugging into the theorem, we obtain streaming median computation in space  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 n/\varepsilon)$ . In fact this works for any quantile computation (but the error is additive). Improvement: pre-filter and keep only  $1/\varepsilon^2$  elements (randomly), so space becomes  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2(1/\varepsilon)/\varepsilon)$ .

# 2 Graph algorithms

#### 2.1 Certificates

Graph-theoretic approach, for decision problems.

**Definition 7.** For property  $\mathcal{P}$ , and a graph G, we say that G' is a strong certificate for G if: for any H,  $G \cup H$  is in  $\mathcal{P}$  iff  $G' \cup H$  is in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Examples:

- connectivity: any spanning forest
- non-bipartiteness: any spanning forest + single odd-cycle inducing edge
- edge/vertex connectivity

## 2.2 Spanners

Subgraph approximately preserving distances:

**Definition 8.** H, an edge subgraph of G, is a t-spanner of G, if for any u, v there is

$$d_H(u,v) \le t \cdot d_G(u,v)$$

**Theorem 9.** Any unweighted G contains t-spanner with  $O(n^{1+2/(t-1)})$  edges, and it can be computed in one pass.

*Proof.* Maintain subgraph. Process edges one-by-one. If an edge causes a cycle of length  $\leq t$ , do not insert it.

- 1. This constructs a t-spanner. (Nice easy exercise)
- 2. The graph is sparse enough:
  - Let d = 2m/n be average degree.
  - There is subgraph H of G with minimum degree d' = d/2: keep removing vertices with degree smaller than d'. We cannot end with no vertices, since then we removed less than m edges.

- H has every vertex of degree at least m/n, and no cycle of length t or less.
- BFS tree of depth (t-1)/2 has no cycles in H
- $(m/n-1)^{(t-1)/2} \le |H| \le n$ , which implies bound on m

For weighted graphs: partition edges into  $\log W$  classes, t-spanner of size  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1+2/(t-1)}\log W)$ 

# 3 Massively Parallel Computing

Modern distributed computing model (captures map-reduce, hadoop, spark, etc.).

- input of size n
- M machines, each of space  $S, S = n^{1-\delta}, M \cdot S = \mathcal{O}(n)$ .
- output (might be too large, e.g. size n that does not fit on a single machine)

Computation:

- ullet computation happens over R rounds
- each machine: near linear computation per round, so total computation cost  $\mathcal{O}(n^{1+o(1)}R)$
- each machine communicates  $\sim S$  bits per round, so total communication cost  $\mathcal{O}(nR)$

goal: minimize R

To be continued