Efficient Algorithms for Geometric Partial Matching

Pankaj K. Agarwal Hsien-Chih Chang Allen Xiao

Department of Computer Science, Duke University

June 2019

Geometric (bipartite) matching

A, B



Geometric (bipartite) matching

A, B



Geometric (bipartite) matching

A, B



Geometric (bipartite) partial matching

A, B



$k = 3$

Prior work

	approx.	time	valid q
Hungarian algorithm (Kuhn)	exact	$O(km + k^2 \log n)$	$q \geq 1$
		$O(kn \operatorname{polylog} n)$	
Ramshaw, Tarjan 2012	exact[1]	$O(m\sqrt{k} \log(kC))$	$q \geq 1$
	$(1+\varepsilon)$	$O(n\sqrt{k} \operatorname{polylog} n \log(1/\varepsilon))$	
Sharathkumar, Agarwal 2012	$(1+\varepsilon)$	$O(n \operatorname{poly}(\log n, 1/\varepsilon))$	$q = 1$
new (Hungarian)	1	$O((n + k^2) \operatorname{polylog} n)$	$q \geq 1$
new (cost-scaling)	$(1+\varepsilon)$	$O((n + k\sqrt{k}) \operatorname{polylog} n \log(1/\varepsilon))$	$q \geq 1$

[1] Assuming integer costs $\leq C$.

Unit-capacity min-cost flow formulation



Unit-capacity min-cost flow formulation



Unit-capacity min-cost flow formulation



Unit-capacity min-cost flow formulation



Unit-capacity min-cost flow formulation



Unit-capacity min-cost flow formulation



Unit-capacity min-cost flow formulation



Unit-capacity min-cost flow formulation



Flow terminology



- $c_\pi(v\to w) := c(v\to w) - \pi(v) + \pi(w)$
- θ-optimality: $c_\pi(v\to w) \geq -\theta$ on all residual arcs
- admissible residual arcs: $c_\pi(v\to w) \leq 0$

Cost-scaling (Ramshaw-Tarjan)

- θ-optimality: $c_\pi(v{\to}w) \geq -\theta$ on all residual arcs
- admissible residual arcs: $c_\pi(v{\to}w) \leq 0$

- θ-optimal circulation is $+n\theta$ approx.

- Find θ-optimal circulations for geometrically decreasing values of θ:
  1. Reduce $\theta \leftarrow \theta/2$, while creating $O(k)$ excess.
  2. Refine this pseudoflow into a circulation, while preserving θ-optimality

Cost-scaling for geometric partial matching

- $(1+\varepsilon)$-approx. geometric partial matching reduces into executing $O(\log(n^q/\varepsilon))$ cost scales.

Refinement by blocking flows (Ramshaw-Tarjan)

- Inside Refine:
  1. Hungarian search: raise potentials until an excess-deficit admissible path exists.
  2. Augment by an admissible blocking flow.



- $O(\sqrt{k})$ blocking flows before f becomes a circulation.

Refinement by blocking flows (Ramshaw-Tarjan)

- Inside Refine:
  1. Hungarian search: raise potentials until an excess-deficit admissible path exists.
  2. Augment by an admissible blocking flow.



- $O(\sqrt{k})$ blocking flows before f becomes a circulation.

Refinement by blocking flows (Ramshaw-Tarjan)

- Inside Refine:
  1. Hungarian search: raise potentials until an excess-deficit admissible path exists.
  2. Augment by an admissible blocking flow.



- $O(\sqrt{k})$ blocking flows before f becomes a circulation.

Refinement by blocking flows (Ramshaw-Tarjan)

- Inside Refine:
  1. Hungarian search: raise potentials until an excess-deficit admissible path exists.
  2. Augment by an admissible blocking flow.



- $O(\sqrt{k})$ blocking flows before f becomes a circulation.

Refinement by blocking flows (Ramshaw-Tarjan)

- Inside Refine:
  1. Hungarian search: raise potentials until an excess-deficit admissible path exists.
  2. Augment by an admissible blocking flow.



- $O(\sqrt{k})$ blocking flows before f becomes a circulation.

High-level goal per scale

- Inside Refine:
  1. Hungarian search: raise potentials until an excess-deficit admissible path exists.
  2. Augment by an admissible blocking flow.
- After $O(n \operatorname{polylog} n)$-time preprocessing, perform Hungarian search and find each blocking flow in $O(k \operatorname{polylog} n)$ time.

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)

X: admissible reachable from an excess node



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\mathrm{polylog}\, n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)

X: admissible reachable from an excess node



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\text{polylog}\, n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)

X: admissible reachable from an excess node



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\text{polylog}\, n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)

X: admissible reachable from an excess node



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\mathrm{polylog}\, n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)

X: admissible reachable from an excess node



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\operatorname{polylog} n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\operatorname{polylog} n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\text{polylog}\, n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)

X: admissible reachable from an excess node



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\text{polylog}\, n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Hungarian search with BCP (Agarwal-Efrat-Sharir)



- Dynamic 2D BCP with $O(\text{polylog}\, n)$ update time, $O(\log^2 n)$ query time (Kaplan *et al.* SODA'17)

Problem: Hungarian search looks at too many nodes



Problem: Hungarian search looks at too many nodes



Problem: Hungarian search looks at too many nodes



Problem: Hungarian search looks at too many nodes



Dead/alive nodes

- Alive nodes: nonzero excess/deficit, or adjoining flow support arcs.
- Dead nodes: ones which aren't alive.



- Alive path: residual path between two alive nodes with no other alive nodes in between.
- Don't need to track potential of dead nodes.

Dead/alive nodes

- Alive nodes: nonzero excess/deficit, or adjoining flow support arcs.
- Dead nodes: ones which aren't alive.



- Alive path: residual path between two alive nodes with no other alive nodes in between.
- Don't need to track potential of dead nodes.

Dead/alive nodes

- Alive nodes: nonzero excess/deficit, or adjoining flow support arcs.
- Dead nodes: ones which aren't alive.



- Alive path: residual path between two alive nodes with no other alive nodes in between.
- Don't need to track potential of dead nodes.

Dead/alive nodes

- Alive nodes: nonzero excess/deficit, or adjoining flow support arcs.
- Dead nodes: ones which aren't alive.



- Alive path: residual path between two alive nodes with no other alive nodes in between.
- Don't need to track potential of dead nodes.

Dead/alive nodes

- Alive nodes: nonzero excess/deficit, or adjoining flow support arcs.
- Dead nodes: ones which aren't alive.



- Alive path: residual path between two alive nodes with no other alive nodes in between.
- Don't need to track potential of dead nodes.

Dead/alive nodes

- Alive nodes: nonzero excess/deficit, or adjoining flow support arcs.
- Dead nodes: ones which aren't alive.



- Alive path: residual path between two alive nodes with no other alive nodes in between.
- Don't need to track potential of dead nodes.

Dead/alive nodes

- Alive nodes: nonzero excess/deficit, or adjoining flow support arcs.
- Dead nodes: ones which aren't alive.



- Alive path: residual path between two alive nodes with no other alive nodes in between.
- Don't need to track potential of dead nodes.

Relaxing alive paths

- Alive paths have length 1, 2, or 3.



- Telescoping: $c_\pi(s \to a \to b) = c(a \to b) - \pi(s) + \pi(b)$
- Can still use BCP.

Relaxing alive paths

- Alive paths have length 1, 2, or 3.



- Telescoping: $c_\pi(s{\to}a{\to}b) = c(a{\to}b) - \pi(s) + \pi(b)$
- Can still use BCP.

Relaxing alive paths

- Alive paths have length 1, 2, or 3.



- Telescoping: $c_\pi(s \to a \to b) = c(a \to b) - \pi(s) + \pi(b)$
- Can still use BCP.

Relaxing alive paths

- Alive paths have length 1, 2, or 3.



- Telescoping: $c_\pi(s \to a \to b) = c(a \to b) - \pi(s) + \pi(b)$
- Can still use BCP.

Relaxing alive paths

- Alive paths have length 1, 2, or 3.



- Telescoping: $c_\pi(s \to a \to b) = c(a \to b) - \pi(s) + \pi(b)$
- Can still use BCP.

Relaxing alive paths

- Alive paths have length 1, 2, or 3.



- Telescoping: $c_\pi(s{\to}a{\to}b) = c(a{\to}b) - \pi(s) + \pi(b)$
- Can still use BCP.

Problem: BCP initialization

Initial BCP by rewinding

- X_t and X_{t+1} differ by the newly-matched A points.
- Persistence?

The End

Thank you.