

Almost Tight Bounds for Rumour Spreading with Conductance*

Flavio Chierichetti, Silvio Lattanzi, Alessandro Panconesi
Dept. of Computer Science, Sapienza University of Rome
Rome, Italy

chierichetti@di.uniroma1.it, lattanzi@di.uniroma1.it, ale@di.uniroma1.it

ABSTRACT

We show that if a connected graph with n nodes has conductance ϕ then rumour spreading, also known as randomized broadcast, successfully broadcasts a message within $\tilde{O}(\phi^{-1} \cdot \log n)$, many rounds with high probability, regardless of the source, by using the PUSH-PULL strategy. The $\tilde{O}(\dots)$ notation hides a polylog ϕ^{-1} factor. This result is almost tight since there exists graph of n nodes, and conductance ϕ , with diameter $\Omega(\phi^{-1} \cdot \log n)$.

If, in addition, the network satisfies some kind of uniformity condition on the degrees, our analysis implies that both PUSH and PULL, by themselves, successfully broadcast the message to every node in the same number of rounds.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

G.3 [Mathematics of Computing]: Probability and Statistics.

General Terms

Algorithms, Theory.

Keywords

Conductance, rumor spreading, social networks.

1. INTRODUCTION

Rumour spreading, also known as randomized broadcast or randomized gossip (all terms that will be used as synonyms throughout the paper), refers to the following distributed algorithm. Starting with one source node with a message, the protocol proceeds in a sequence of synchronous rounds with the goal of *broadcasting* the message, i.e. to deliver it to every node in the network. In round $t \geq 0$, every node that knows the message selects a neighbour uniformly at random to which the message is forwarded. This is the so-called PUSH strategy. The PULL variant is symmetric. In

round $t \geq 0$ every node that does not yet have the message selects a neighbour uniformly at random and asks for the information, which is transferred provided that the queried neighbour knows it. Finally, the PUSH-PULL strategy is a combination of both. In round $t \geq 0$, each node selects a random neighbour to perform a PUSH if it has the information or a PULL in the opposite case.

These three strategies have been introduced in [5] and since then have been intensely investigated (see the related work section). One of the most studied questions concerns their completion time: how many rounds will it take for one of the above strategies to disseminate the information to all nodes in the graph, assuming a worst-case source? In this paper we prove the following two results:

- If a network has conductance ϕ and n nodes, then, with high probability, PUSH-PULL reaches every node within $O\left(\frac{\log^2 \phi^{-1}}{\phi} \cdot \log n\right)$ many rounds, regardless of the source.
- If, in addition, the network satisfies the following condition for every edge uv and some constant $\alpha > 0$:

$$\max \left\{ \frac{\deg(u)}{\deg(v)}, \frac{\deg(v)}{\deg(u)} \right\} \leq \alpha$$

then both PUSH and PULL, by themselves¹, reach every node within

$$O(c_\alpha \cdot \phi^{-1} \cdot \log n \cdot \log^2 \phi^{-1})$$

many rounds with high probability regardless of the source, where c_α is a constant depending only on α .

The first result is a significant improvement with respect to best current bound of $O(\log^4 n / \phi^6)$ [4]. (The proof of [4] is based on an interesting connection with spectral sparsification [19]. The approach followed here is entirely different.) The result is almost tight because $\Omega(\log n / \phi)$ is a lower bound² — in particular, the bound is tight in the case

¹We observe that the star, a graph of conductance 1, is such that both the PUSH and the PULL strategy by themselves require $\Omega(n)$ many rounds to spread the information to each node, assuming a worst case, or even uniformly random, source. That is, conductance alone is not enough to ensure that PUSH, or PULL, spread the information fast.

²Indeed, choose any n , and any $\phi \geq n^{-1+\epsilon}$. Take any 3-regular graph of constant vertex expansion (a random 3-regular graph will suffice) on $O(n \cdot \phi)$ nodes. Then, substitute each edge of the regular graph with a path of $O(\phi^{-1})$ new nodes. The graph obtained is easily seen to have $O(n)$ nodes, diameter $O(\phi^{-1} \cdot \log n)$ and conductance $\Omega(\phi)$.

*This research is partially supported by a grant of Yahoo! Research and by an IBM Faculty Award.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

STOC'10, June 5–8, 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.

Copyright 2010 ACM 978-1-4503-0050-6/10/06 ...\$10.00.

of constant conductance (for instance, this is the case for the almost-preferential-attachment graphs of [15].) The second result can be proved using the same approach we use for the main one. In this extended abstract we omit the details of its proof.

Our main motivation comes from the study of social networks. Loosely stated, we are looking for a theorem of the form “*Rumour spreading is fast in social networks*”. There is some empirical evidence showing that real social networks have high conductance. The authors of [14] report that in many different social networks there exist only cuts of small (logarithmic) size having small (inversely logarithmic) conductance – all other cuts appear to have larger conductance. That is, the conductance of the social networks they analyze is larger than a quantity seemingly proportional to an inverse logarithm.

Our work should also be viewed in the context of expansion properties of graphs, of which conductance is an important example, and their relationship with rumour spreading. In particular we observe how, interestingly, the convergence time of the PUSH-PULL process on graph of conductance ϕ is a factor of ϕ smaller than the worst-case mixing time of the uniform random walk on such graphs.

Conductance is one of the most studied measures of graph expansion. Edge expansion, and vertex expansion are two other notable measures. In the case of edge expansion there are classes of graphs for which the protocol is slow (see [3] for more details), while the problem remains open for vertex expansion.

In terms of message complexity, we observe first that it has been determined precisely only for very special classes of graphs (cliques [12] and Erdős-Rényi random graphs [8]). Apart from this, given the generality of our class, it is impossible to improve the trivial upper bound on the number of messages – that is, number of rounds times number of nodes. For instance consider the “lollipop graph.” Fix $\omega(n^{-1}) < \phi < o(\log^{-1} n)$, and suppose to have a path of length ϕ^{-1} connected to a clique of size $n - \phi^{-1} = \Theta(n)$. This graph has conductance $\approx \phi$. Let the source be any node in the clique. After $\Theta(\log n)$ rounds each node in the clique will have the information. Furthermore, at least ϕ^{-1} steps will be needed for the information to be sent to the each node in the path. So, at least $n - \phi^{-1} = \Theta(n)$ messages are pushed (by the nodes in the clique) in each round, for at least $\phi^{-1} - \Theta(\log n) = \Theta(\phi^{-1})$ rounds. Thus, the total number of messages sent will be $\Omega(n \cdot \phi^{-1})$. Observing that the running time is $\Theta(\phi^{-1} + \log n) = \Theta(\phi^{-1})$, we have that the total number of rounds times n is (asymptotically) less than or equal to the number of transmitted messages.

2. RELATED WORK

The literature on the gossip protocol and social networks is huge and we confine ourselves to what appears to be more relevant to the present work.

Clearly, at least diameter-many rounds are needed for the gossip protocol to reach all nodes. It has been shown that $O(n \log n)$ rounds are always sufficient for each connected graph of n nodes [9]. The problem has been studied on a number of graph classes, such as hypercubes, bounded-degree graphs, cliques and Erdős-Rényi random graphs (see

[9, 11, 17]). Recently, there has been a lot of work on “quasi-regular” expanders (i.e., expander graphs for which the ratio between the maximum and minimum degree is constant) — it has been shown in different settings [1, 6, 7, 10, 18] that $O(\log n)$ rounds are sufficient for the rumour to be spread throughout the graph. See also [13, 16]. Our work can be seen as an extension of these studies to graphs of arbitrary degree distribution. Observe that many real world graphs (e.g., facebook, Internet, etc.) have a very skewed degree distribution — that is, the ratio between the maximum and the minimum degree is very high. In most social networks’ graph models the ratio between the maximum and the minimum degree can be shown to be polynomial in the graph order.

Mihail et al. [15] study the edge expansion and the conductance of graphs that are very similar to preferential attachment (PA) graphs. We shall refer to these as “almost” PA graphs. They show that edge expansion and conductance are constant in these graphs. Their result and ours together imply that rumor spreading requires $O(\log n)$ rounds on almost PA graphs.

For what concerns the original PA graphs, in [3] it is shown that rumour spreading is fast (requires time $O(\log^2 n)$) in those networks.

In [2] it is shown that high conductance implies that *non-uniform* (over neighbours) rumour spreading succeeds. By non-uniform we mean that, for every ordered pair of neighbours i and j , node i will select j with probability p_{ij} for the rumour spreading step (in general, $p_{ij} \neq p_{ji}$). This results does not extend to the case of uniform probabilities studied in this paper. In our setting (but not in theirs), the existence of a non uniform distribution that makes rumour spreading fast is a rather trivial matter. A graph of conductance ϕ has diameter bounded by $O(\phi^{-1} \log n)$. Thus, in a synchronous network, it is possible to elect a leader in $O(\phi^{-1} \log n)$ many rounds and set up a BFS tree originating from it. By assigning probability 1 to the edge between a node and its parent one has the desired non uniform probability distribution. Thus, from the point of view of this paper the existence of non uniform problem is rather uninteresting.

In [16] the authors consider a problem that at first sight might appear equivalent to ours. They consider the conductance ϕ_P of the *connection probability matrix* P , whose entry $P_{i,j}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, gives the probability that i calls j in any given round. They show that if P is doubly stochastic then the running time of PUSH-PULL is $O(\phi_P^{-1} \cdot \log n)$. This might seem to subsume our result but this is not the case. The catch is that they consider the conductance of a doubly stochastic matrix instead of the actual conductance of the graph, as we do. Observe that there are graphs of high conductance that do not admit doubly stochastic matrices of high conductance. For instance, in the star, no matter how one sets the probabilities P_{ij} , there will always exist a leaf ℓ that will be contacted by the central node with probability $\leq \frac{1}{n-1}$. Since the matrix is doubly-stochastic this implies that ℓ will contact the central node with probability $O(n^{-1})$. Thus, at least $\Omega(n)$ rounds will be needed. Therefore their result gives too weak a bound for the uniform PUSH-PULL process that we analyze in this paper.

3. PRELIMINARIES

Observe that $\frac{1}{2} \text{vol}(V) = |E|$. Given $S \subseteq V$, and $v \in S$, we define

$$N_S^+(v) = \{w \mid w \in V - S \wedge \{v, w\} \in E\}$$

and $d_S^+(v) = |N_S^+(v)|$. Analogously, we define $N_S^-(w) = N_{V-S}^+(w)$ and $d_S^-(w) = |N_S^-(w)|$. Recall that the conductance of a graph $G(V, E)$ is:

$$\Phi(G) = \min_{S \subseteq V: \text{vol}(S) \leq |E|} \frac{\text{cut}(S, V - S)}{\text{vol}(S)}$$

Where $\text{cut}(S, V - S)$ is the number of edges in the cut between S and $V - S$ and $\text{vol}(S)$ is the volume of S .

We now state and prove some technical lemmas that we will use in our analysis. The first one is an “inversion” of Markov’s inequality.

LEMMA 1. *Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t are random variables, with X_i having co-domain $\{0, v_i\}$ and such that $X_i = v_i$ with probability p_i . Fix $p \leq \min p_i$. Then, for each $0 < q < p$,*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_i X_i \geq \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{1-q}\right) \cdot \sum_i v_i \right] \geq q.$$

PROOF. Let $\bar{X}_i = v_i - X_i$. Observe that each X_i and each \bar{X}_i is a non-negative random variable, of mean $p_i \cdot v_i$ and $(1 - p_i) \cdot v_i$, respectively. We use μ to denote the expected sum of the X_i , $\mu = \sum (p_i \cdot v_i)$, and $\bar{\mu}$ to denote the expected sum of the \bar{X}_i , $\bar{\mu} = \sum ((1 - p_i) \cdot v_i)$. Observe that $\bar{\mu} \leq (1 - p) \cdot \sum v_i$.

By Markov’s inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sum_i X_i \leq \left(1 - \frac{1-p}{1-q}\right) \sum_i v_i \right] &\leq \\ \Pr \left[\sum_i X_i \leq \sum_i v_i - \frac{1}{1-q} \cdot \bar{\mu} \right] &= \\ \Pr \left[\sum_i \bar{X}_i \geq \frac{1}{1-q} \cdot \bar{\mu} \right] &\leq 1 - q \end{aligned}$$

Thus the claim. \square

The next lemma gives some probabilistic bounds on the sum of binary random variables having “similar” expectation.

LEMMA 2. *Let $p \in (0, 1)$. Suppose X_1, \dots, X_t are independent 0/1 random variables, the i -th of which such that $\Pr[X_i = 1] = p_i$, with $\frac{1}{2} \cdot p \leq p_i \leq p$. Then,*

1. *if $\frac{pt}{2} > 1$, then $\Pr[\sum X_i \geq \frac{pt}{4}] \geq \frac{1}{32}$;*
2. *if $\frac{pt}{2} \leq 1$, then $\Pr[\sum X_i \geq 1] \geq \frac{pt}{4}$;*
3. *in general, for $P = \min(\frac{1}{32}, \frac{pt}{4})$, we have*

$$\Pr \left[\sum X_i \geq \frac{pt}{128 \cdot P} \right] \geq P.$$

PROOF. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^t X_i$. In the first case, $E[X] \geq t \cdot \frac{p}{2}$; in particular, $E[X] \geq 1$. Therefore, by Chernoff’s bound,

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[X < \frac{1}{2} \cdot E[X] \right] &\leq e^{-\frac{1}{16} E[X]} \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{1}{16}} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{32}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $e^{-x} \leq 1 - \frac{x}{2}$ if $x \in [0, 1]$.

In the second case, we compute the probability that for no i , $X_i = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^t \Pr[X_i = 0] &\leq \prod_{i=1}^t \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right)^t = \left(\left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right)^{\frac{2}{p}}\right)^{\frac{p}{2} \cdot t} \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{p}{2} \cdot t} \leq 1 - \frac{pt}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

So, with probability $\geq \frac{pt}{4}$ at least one X_i will be equal to 1.

The third case, follows directly from the former two, by choosing — respectively — $P = \frac{1}{32}$, and $P = \frac{pt}{2}$. \square

Finally we give a lemma that underlines symmetries in the PUSH-PULL strategy. Let $u \xrightarrow{t} v$ be the event that an information originated at u arrives to v in t rounds using the PUSH-PULL strategy. And let $u \xleftarrow{t} v$ the event that an information that is originally in v arrives to u in t rounds using the PUSH-PULL strategy. We have that:

LEMMA 3. *Let $u, v \in V$, then*

$$\Pr[u \xrightarrow{t} v] = \Pr[u \xleftarrow{t} v]$$

PROOF. Look at each possible sequence of PUSH-PULL requests done by the nodes of G in t rounds. We define the “inverse” of some sequence, as the sequence we would obtain by looking at the sequence starting from the last round to the first. Now the probability that the information spreads from u to v (resp., from v to u) in at most t steps is equal to the sum of the probabilities of sequences of length at most t that manage to pass the information from u to v (from v to u) — given that the probability of a sequence, and that of its inverse, are the same, the claim follows. \square

4. A $O(\phi^{-2} \cdot \log N)$ BOUND

In this section we prove a completion time bound for the PUSH-PULL strategy of $O(\phi^{-2} \cdot \log n)$. Observe that this bound happens to be tight if $\phi \in \Omega(1)$. The general strategy is as follows:

- we will prove that, given any set S of informed nodes having volume $\leq |E|$, after $O(\phi^{-1})$ rounds (that we call a *phase*) the new set S' of informed vertices, $S' \supseteq S$, will have volume $\text{vol}(S') \geq (1 + \Omega(\phi)) \cdot \text{vol}(S)$ with constant probability (over the random choices performed by nodes during those $O(\phi^{-1})$ rounds) — if this happens, we say that the phase was successful; this section is devoted to proving this lemma;

- given the lemma, it follows that PUSH-PULL informs a set of nodes of volume larger than $|E|$, starting from any single node, in time $O(\phi^{-2} \cdot \log n)$.

Indeed, it suffices to observe that, if we flip $c \cdot \phi^{-1} \cdot \log n$ IID coins, each having $\Theta(1)$ head probability, we will end up with $f(c) \cdot \phi^{-1} \cdot \log n$ heads with high probability — with $f(c)$ increasing, and unbounded, in c . This implies that we can get enough (that is, $\Theta(\phi^{-1} \cdot \log n)$) successful phases for covering more than half of the graph's volume in at most $\Theta(\phi^{-1}) \cdot \Theta(\phi^{-1} \cdot \log n) = \Theta(\phi^{-2} \cdot \log n)$ rounds;

- applying lemma 3, we can then show that each uninformed node can get the information in the same amount of steps, if a set S of volume $> |E|$ is informed — completing the proof.

Our first lemma shows how one can always find a subset of nodes in the “smallest” part of a good conductance cut, that happen to hit many of the edges in the cut, and whose nodes have a large “fraction” of their degree that cross the cut.

LEMMA 4. *Let $G(V, E)$ be a simple graph.*

Let $A \subseteq B \subseteq V$, with $\text{vol}(B) \leq |E|$ and $\text{cut}(A, V - B) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B)$. Suppose further that the conductance of the cut $(B, V - B)$ is at least ϕ , $\text{cut}(B, V - B) \geq \phi \cdot \text{vol}(B)$. If we let

$$U = U_B(A) = \left\{ v \in A \mid \frac{d_B^+(v)}{d(v)} \geq \frac{\phi}{2} \right\},$$

then $\text{cut}(U, V - B) \geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B)$.

PROOF. We prove the lemma with the following derivation:

$$\sum_{v \in A} d_B^+(v) + \sum_{v \in B - A} d_B^+(v) = \text{cut}(B, V - B)$$

$$\sum_{v \in A} d_B^+(v) = \text{cut}(B, V - B) - \sum_{v \in B - A} d_B^+(v)$$

$$\sum_{v \in A \cap U} d_B^+(v) + \sum_{v \in A - U} d_B^+(v) = \text{cut}(A, V - B)$$

$$\sum_{v \in U} d_B^+(v) + \sum_{v \in A - U} d_B^+(v) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B),$$

then,

$$\sum_{v \in U} d_B^+(v) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B) - \sum_{v \in A - U} d_B^+(v)$$

$$\sum_{v \in U} d_B^+(v) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B) - \sum_{v \in A - U} \left(\frac{\phi}{2} \cdot d(v) \right)$$

$$\sum_{v \in U} d_B^+(v) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B) - \frac{\phi}{2} \cdot \text{vol}(B)$$

$$\sum_{v \in U} d_B^+(v) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B)$$

$$\sum_{v \in U} d_B^+(v) \geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B, V - B).$$

□

Given $v \in U = U_B(A)$, we define $N_U^\ominus(v)$ (to be read “N-push-U-v”) and $N_U^\oplus(v)$ (to be read “N-pull-U-v”) as follows

$$N_U^\ominus(v) = \{u \in N_U^+(v) \mid d(u) \geq \frac{1}{3} d^+(v)\}$$

and

$$N_U^\oplus(v) = \{u \in N_U^+(v) \mid d(u) < \frac{1}{3} d^+(v)\}.$$

Then,

$$U^\ominus = \{v \in U \mid |N_B^\ominus(v)| \geq |N_B^\oplus(v)|\}$$

and

$$U^\oplus = \{v \in U \mid |N_B^\ominus(v)| > |N_B^\oplus(v)|\}.$$

Observe that $U^\ominus \cap U^\oplus = \emptyset$ and $U^\ominus \cup U^\oplus = U$. In particular, (at least) one of $\text{vol}(U^\ominus) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{vol}(U)$ and $\text{vol}(U^\oplus) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{vol}(U)$ holds. In the following, if $\text{vol}(U^\ominus) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{vol}(U)$ we will “apply” the PUSH strategy on U ; otherwise, we will “apply” the PULL strategy.

Given a vertex $v \in U$, we will simulate either the PUSH the PULL strategy, for $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right)$ steps over it. The “gain” $g(v)$ of node v is then the volume of the node(s) that pull the information from v , or that v pushes the information to.

Our aim is to get a bound on the gain of the whole original vertex set S . This cannot be done by summing the gains of single vertices in S , because of the many dependencies in the process. For instance, different nodes $v, v' \in S$ might inform (or could be asked the information by) the same node in $V - S$.

To overcome this difficulty, we use an idea similar in spirit to the deferred decision principle. First of all, let us remark that, given a vertex set S having the information, we will run the PUSH-PULL process for $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right)$ rounds. We will look at what happens to the neighbourhoods of different nodes in S sequentially, by simulating the $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right)$ steps (which we call a phase) of each $v \in S$ and some of its peers in $N_S^+(v) \subseteq V - S$. Obviously, we will make sure that no node in $V - S$ performs more than $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right)$ PULL steps in a single phase.

Specifically, we consider the following process:

1. at step i , we consider the sets A_i, B_i ; at the first step, $i = 0$, we take $A_0 = B_0 = S$ and $H_0 = \emptyset$;
2. if $\text{cut}(A_i, V - B_i) < \frac{3}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B_i, V - B_i)$, or $\text{vol}(B_i) > |E|$, we stop; otherwise, apply lemma 4 to A_i, B_i , obtaining set $U_i = U_{B_i}(A_i)$;
3. we take a node v out of U_i , and we consider the effects of either the push or the pull strategy, repeated for $\left\lceil \frac{10}{\phi} \right\rceil$ steps, over v and $N_{B_i}^+(v)$;
4. $H_{i+1} \leftarrow H_i$;
5. each node $u \in N_{B_i}^+(v)$ that gets informed (either by a push of v , or by a pull from v) is added to the set of the “halted nodes” H_{i+1} ; v is also added to the set H_{i+1} ;
6. let $A_{i+1} = A_i - \{v\}$, and $B_{i+1} = B_i \cup H_{i+1}$; observe that $B_{i+1} - A_{i+1} = H_{i+1}$;

7. iterate the process.

Observe that no vertex in $V - S$ will make more than $O\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\right)$ PULL steps in a single phase. Indeed, each time we run point 3 in the process, we *only* disclose whether some node $u \in V - S$ actually makes, or does not make, a PULL from v . If the PULL does not go through, and node u later tries to make a PULL to another node v' , the probability of this second batch of PULL's (and in fact, of any subsequent batch) to succeed is actually larger than the probability of success of the first batch of PULL's of u (since at that point, we already know that the previous PULL batches made by u *never* reached any previous candidate node $v \in S$).

The next lemma summarize the gain, in a single step, of a node $v \in U_i$.

LEMMA 5. *If $v \in U_i^{\ominus}$, then*

$$\Pr \left[g(v) \geq \frac{1}{3} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v) \right] \geq \frac{\phi}{4}.$$

On the other hand, if $v \in U_i^{\oplus}$ then

$$\Pr \left[g(v) \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v) \right] \geq \frac{1}{10}.$$

In general, if $v \in U_i$,

$$\Pr \left[g(v) \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v) \right] \geq \frac{\phi}{10}.$$

PROOF. Suppose that $v \in U_i^{\ominus}$. Then, at least $\frac{1}{2}d_{B_i}^+(v)$ neighbours of $d(v)$ have degree $\geq \frac{1}{3}d_{B_i}^+(v)$. Since $v \in U_i$, we have that $\frac{d_{B_i}^+(v)}{d(v)} \geq \frac{\phi}{2}$. Thus, the probability that v pushes the information to one of its neighbours of degree $\geq \frac{1}{3}d_{B_i}^+(v)$ is $\geq \frac{\frac{1}{2}d_{B_i}^+(v)}{d(v)} \geq \frac{\phi}{4}$.

Now, suppose that $v \in U_i^{\oplus}$. Recall that $g(v)$ is the random variable denoting the gain of v ; that is,

$$g(v) = \sum_{u \in N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)} g_u(v),$$

where $g_u(v)$ is a random variable equal to $d(u)$ if u pulls the information from v , and 0 otherwise.

Observe that $\mathbb{E}[g_u(v)] = 1$, so that $\mathbb{E}[g(v)] = |N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)|$, and that the variance of $g_u(v)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[g_u(v)] &= \mathbb{E}[g_u(v)^2] - \mathbb{E}[g_u(v)]^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{d(u)} \cdot d(u)^2 - 1 \\ &= d(u) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since the $g_{u_1}(v), g_{u_2}(v), \dots$ are independent, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[g(v)] &= \sum_{u \in N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)} \text{Var}[g_u(v)] = \sum_{u \in N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)} (d(u) - 1) \\ &\leq \text{vol}(N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3} (d_{B_i}^+(v)) |N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)|. \end{aligned}$$

In the following chain of inequalities we will apply Chebyshev's inequality to bound the deviation of $g(v)$, using the variance bound we have just obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[g(v) \leq \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v) \right] &\leq \\ \Pr \left[g(v) \leq \mathbb{E}[g(v)] - \mathbb{E}[g(v)] + \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v) \right] &\leq \\ \Pr \left[-g(v) + \mathbb{E}[g(v)] \geq |N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)| - \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v) \right] &\leq \\ \Pr \left[|g(v) - \mathbb{E}[g(v)]| \geq |N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)| - \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v) \right] &\leq \\ \Pr \left[|g(v) - \mathbb{E}[g(v)]| \geq \frac{|N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)| - \frac{1}{20}d_{B_i}^+(v)}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}d_{B_i}^+(v)|N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)|}} \cdot \sqrt{\text{Var}[g(v)]} \right] &\leq \\ \frac{\frac{1}{3}d_{B_i}^+(v)|N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)|}{\left(|N_{B_i}^{\ominus}(v)| - \frac{1}{20}d_{B_i}^+(v)\right)^2} &\leq \\ \frac{\frac{1}{6} \left(d_{B_i}^+(v)\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{2}d_{B_i}^+(v) - \frac{1}{20}d_{B_i}^+(v)\right)^2} &\leq \\ \left(\frac{20}{9 \cdot \sqrt{6}}\right)^2 &\leq \frac{9}{10}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the second claim. The third one is combination of the other two. \square

Now we focus on v , and its neighbourhood $N_{B_i}^+(v)$, for $\left\lceil \frac{10}{\phi} \right\rceil$ many steps. What is the gain $G(v)$ of v in these many steps?

LEMMA 6. $\Pr[G(v) \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v)] \geq 1 - e^{-1}$.

PROOF. Observe that the probability that the event " $g(v) \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v)$ " happens at least once in $\left\lceil \frac{10}{\phi} \right\rceil$ independent trials is lower bounded by

$$1 - \left(1 - \frac{\phi}{10}\right)^{\left\lceil \frac{10}{\phi} \right\rceil} \geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{\phi}{10}\right)^{\frac{10}{\phi}} \geq 1 - e^{-1}.$$

The claim follows. \square

For the process to finish, at some step t it must happen that either $\text{vol}(B_t) > |E|$ (in which case, we are done — so we assume the contrary), or $\text{cut}(A_t, V - B_t) < \frac{3}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B_t, V - B_t)$. Analogously,

$$\frac{1}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B_t, V - B_t) \leq \text{cut}(B_t - A_t, V - B_t) = \text{cut}(H_t, V - B_t).$$

But then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \cdot \phi \cdot \text{vol}(S) &\leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \phi \cdot \text{vol}(B_t) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \text{cut}(B_t, V - B_t) \\ &\leq \text{cut}(H_t, V - B_t) \\ &= \sum_{v \in H_t \cap S} d_{B_t}^+(v) + \sum_{v \in H_t \cap (V - S)} d_{B_t}^+(v) \\ &\leq \sum_{v \in H_t \cap S} d_{B_t}^+(v) + \sum_{v \in H_t \cap (V - S)} \text{vol}(v) \end{aligned}$$

Consider the following two inequalities (that might, or might not, hold):

- (a) $\sum_{v \in H_t \cap (V-S)} \text{vol}(v) \geq \frac{1}{1000} \cdot \phi \cdot \text{vol}(S)$, and
- (b) $\sum_{v \in H_t \cap S} d_{B_t}^+(v) \geq \frac{249}{1000} \cdot \phi \cdot \text{vol}(S)$.

At least one of (a) and (b) has to be true. We call *two-cases property* the disjunction of (a) and (b). If (a) is true, we are done, in the sense that we have captured enough volume to cover a constant fraction of the cut induced by S .

We lower bound the probability of (a) to be false given the truth of (b), since the negation of (b) implies the truth of (a).

Recall lemma 6. It states that — for each $v_i \in H_t \cap S$ — we had probability at least $1 - e^{-1}$ of gaining at least $\frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_t}^+(v_i) \geq \frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_t}^+(v_i)$, since $i \leq t$ implies $B_i \subseteq B_t$.

For each v_i , let us define the random variable X_i as follows: with probability $1 - e^{-1}$, X_i has value $\frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_t}^+(v_i)$, and with the remaining probability it has value 0. Then, the gain of v_i is a random variable that dominates X_i . Choosing $q = 1 - 2e^{-1}$, in lemma 1, we can conclude that

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i: v_i \in H_t \cap S} X_i \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{v_i \in H_t \cap S} \left(\frac{1}{20} \cdot d_{B_t}^+(v_i) \right) \right] \geq 1 - 2e^{-1}.$$

Thus, with constant probability ($\geq 1 - 2e^{-1}$) we gain at least $\frac{1}{40} \cdot \sum_{v_i \in H_t \cap S} d_{B_t}^+(v_i)$, which in turn, is at least

$$\frac{1}{40} \cdot \sum_{v_i \in H_t \cap S} d_{B_t}^+(v_i) \geq \frac{1}{40} \cdot \frac{249}{1000} \cdot \phi \cdot \text{vol}(S) \geq \frac{6}{1000} \cdot \phi \cdot \text{vol}(S).$$

Hence, (a) is true with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-1}$. So with constant probability there is a gain of $\frac{1}{1000} \cdot \phi \cdot \text{vol}(S)$ in $\frac{1}{\phi}$ steps. Thus using the proof strategy presented at the beginning of the section we get a $O(\phi^{-2} \log n)$ bound on the completion time.

5. A TIGHTER BOUND

In this section we will present a tighter bound of

$$O \left(\frac{\log^2 \frac{1}{\phi}}{\phi} \cdot \log n \right) = \tilde{O} \left(\frac{\log n}{\phi} \right).$$

Observe that, given the already noted diametral lower bound of $\Omega \left(\frac{\log n}{\phi} \right)$ on graphs of conductance $\phi \geq \frac{1}{n^{1-\epsilon}}$, the bound is almost tight (we only lose an exponentially small factor in ϕ^{-1}).

Our general strategy for showing the tighter bound will be close in spirit to the one we used for the $O \left(\frac{\log n}{\phi^2} \right)$ bound of the previous section.

The new strategy is as follows:

- we will prove in this section that, given any set S of informed nodes having volume at most $|E|$, for some $p = p(S) \geq \Omega(\phi)$, after $O(p^{-1})$ rounds (that we call a *p-phase*) the new set S' of informed vertices, $S' \supseteq S$, will

have volume $\text{vol}(S') \geq \left(1 + \Omega \left(\frac{\phi}{p \cdot \log^2 \phi^{-1}} \right) \right) \cdot \text{vol}(S)$ with constant probability (over the random choices performed by nodes during those $O(p^{-1})$ rounds) — if this happens, we say that the phase was successful;

- given the previous statement, it follows that **PUSH-PULL** informs a set of nodes of volume larger than $|E|$, starting from any single node, in time $T \leq O(\phi^{-1} \cdot \log^2 \phi^{-1} \cdot \log n)$ with high probability.

Indeed, at the end of a phase one has a multiplicative volume gain of

$$1 + \Omega \left(\frac{\phi}{p \cdot \log^2 \phi^{-1}} \right)$$

with constant probability $c > 0$. If one averages that gain over the $O(p^{-1})$ rounds of the phase, one can say that with constant probability c , each round in the phase resulted in a multiplicative volume gain of $1 + \Omega \left(\frac{\phi}{\log^2 \phi^{-1}} \right)$.

Of course, in this modified gain-accounting process, either one gets the $1 + \Omega \left(\frac{\phi}{\log^2 \phi^{-1}} \right)$ multiplicative volume gain at each round of the phase (this happens with probability c), or one does not gain anything during the phase. Furthermore, different phases will have different numbers of rounds. Still, one can use Chernoff bound to prove our desired upper bound on T , by partitioning phases in power-of-2 buckets according to their p 's. The details of this argument are omitted in this version;

- by applying lemma 3, we can then show that each uninformed node can get the information in the same number of rounds, if a set S of volume $> |E|$ is informed — completing the proof.

Given $v \in U = U_B(A)$, we define $\hat{N}_U^\oplus(v)$ (to be read “N-hat-push-U-v”) and $\hat{N}_B^\oplus(v)$ (to be read “N-hat-pull-U-v”) as follows

$$\hat{N}_B^\oplus(v) = \{u \in N_B^+(v) \mid d(u) \geq \frac{1}{3} \cdot \phi^{-1} \cdot d_B^+(v)\}$$

and

$$\hat{N}_B^\ominus(v) = \{u \in N_B^+(v) \mid d(u) < \frac{1}{3} \cdot \phi^{-1} \cdot d_B^+(v)\}.$$

Then, we define,

$$\hat{U}^\oplus = \left\{ v \in U \mid \left| \hat{N}_B^\oplus(v) \right| \geq \left| \hat{N}_B^\ominus(v) \right| \right\}$$

and

$$\hat{U}^\ominus = \left\{ v \in U \mid \left| \hat{N}_B^\oplus(v) \right| < \left| \hat{N}_B^\ominus(v) \right| \right\}.$$

As before, if $\text{vol}(\hat{U}^\oplus) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{vol}(U)$ we “apply” the **PUSH** strategy on U ; otherwise, we “apply” the **PULL** strategy.

The following lemma is the crux of our analysis. It is a strengthening of lemma 5. A corollary of the lemma is that there exists a $p = p_v \geq \Omega(\phi)$, such that after p^{-1} rounds, with constant probability, node v lets us gain a new volume proportional to $\Theta \left(\frac{d_{B_i}^+(v)}{p \cdot \log \phi^{-1}} \right)$.

Lemma 5, that we used previously, only stated that with probability $\Omega(\phi)$ we gained a new volume of $\Theta(d_{B_i}^+(v))$ in a single step. Observe that if we do not allow v to go on for more than one step than the bounds of lemma 5 are sharp.

The insight of lemma 7 is that different nodes might require different number of rounds to give their “full” contribution in terms of new volume, but the more we have to wait for, the more we gain.

LEMMA 7. Assume $v \in U_i$. Then, $\hat{N}_{B_i}^\oplus(v)$ can be partitioned in at most $6 + \log \phi^{-1}$ parts, S_1, S_2, \dots , in such a way that for each part i it holds that, for some $P_{S_i} \in (2^{-i+1}, 2^{-i}]$,

$$\Pr \left[G_{S_i}(v) \geq \frac{|S_i|}{256 \cdot P_{S_i}} \right] \geq 1 - 2e^{-1},$$

where $G_{S_i}(v)$ is the total volume of nodes in S_i that perform a PULL from v in $P_{S_i}^{-1}$ rounds.

PROOF. If $v \in \hat{U}_i^\oplus$, the same reasoning of lemma 5 applies. We assume that $v \in \hat{U}_i^\oplus$.

We bucket the nodes in $\hat{N}_{B_i}^\oplus(v)$ in $K = K_{B_i}(v) = \left\lceil \lg \frac{d_{B_i}^+(v)}{3 \cdot \phi} \right\rceil$ buckets in a power-of-two manner. That is, for $j = 1, \dots, K$, R_j contains all the nodes u in $\hat{N}_{B_i}^\oplus(v)$ having degree $2^{j-1} \leq d(u) < 2^j$. Observe that the R_j 's are pairwise disjoint and that their union is equal to $\hat{N}_{B_i}^\oplus(v)$.

Consider the buckets R_j , with $j > \lg \phi^{-1}$. We will empty some of them, in such a way that the total number of nodes removed from the union of the bucket is an ϵ fraction of the total (that is, of $d_{B_i}^+(v)$). This node removal step is necessary for the following reason: the buckets R_j , with $j > \lg \phi^{-1}$, contain nodes with a degree so high that any single one of them will perform a PULL operation on v itself with probability strictly smaller than ϕ . Roughly the motive behind this node removal is as follows: we want to guarantee that the probability of a “gain” is at least ϕ we are forced to remove nodes having too high degree, if their number is so small that — overall — the probability of any single one of them to actually perform a PULL on v is smaller than ϕ .

The node removal phase is as follows. If R'_j is the set of nodes in the j -th bucket after the node removal phase, then

$$R'_j = \begin{cases} R_j & |R_j| \geq \frac{1}{16} \cdot 2^j \cdot \phi \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Observe that the total number of nodes we remove is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{16} \cdot 2^i \cdot \phi \right) &\leq \frac{\phi}{16} \sum_{i=0}^K 2^i \leq \frac{\phi}{8} 2^{K+1} \\ &\leq \frac{\phi}{8} \cdot 4 \cdot \frac{d_{B_i}^+(v)}{3 \cdot \phi} = \frac{1}{6} \cdot d_{B_i}^+(v). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sum_j |R'_j| \geq \frac{1}{3} d_{B_i}^+(v)$, since $\sum_j |R_j| \geq \frac{1}{2} d_{B_i}^+(v)$.

Consider the random variable $g(v)$, which represent the total volume of the nodes in the different R'_j 's that manage to pull the information from v . If we denote by $g_j(v)$ the contribution of the nodes in bucket R'_j to $g(v)$, we have $g(v) = \sum_{j=1}^K g_j(v)$.

Take any non-empty bucket R'_j . We want to show, via lemma 2, that

$$\Pr \left[g_j(v) \geq \frac{1}{128} \cdot \frac{|R'_j|}{p_j} \right] \geq p_j.$$

(If this event occurs, we say that bucket j succeeds.)

This claim follows directly from 2 by creating one X_i in the lemma for each $u \in R'_j$, and letting $X_i = 1$ iff node u pulls the information from v . The probability of this event is $p_i \in (2^{-j}, 2^{-j+1}]$, so we can safely choose the p of lemma 2 to be $p = 2^{-j+1}$.

Consider the different p_j 's of the buckets. Fix some j . If p_j came out of case 2 then, since $|R'_j| \geq \frac{1}{16} \cdot 2^j \cdot \phi$, we have $p_j \geq \frac{1}{32} \cdot \phi$. If p_j came out of case 1, then $p_j = \frac{1}{32}$. In general, $p_j \geq \frac{\phi}{32}$, and $p_j \leq 1$.

Let us divide the unit into segments of exponentially decreasing length: that is, $[1, \frac{1}{2})$, $[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$, \dots , $[2^{-j+1}, 2^{-j})$, \dots . For each j , let us put each bucket R'_j into the segment containing its p_j . Observe that there are at most $\left\lceil \lg \frac{32}{\phi} \right\rceil \leq 6 + \lg \phi^{-1}$ segments.

Fix any non-empty segment ℓ . Let S_ℓ be the union of the buckets in segment ℓ . Observe that if we let the nodes in the buckets of S_ℓ run the process for 2^ℓ times, we have that, for each bucket R'_j ,

$$\Pr \left[G_j(v) \geq \frac{1}{128} \cdot \frac{|R'_j|}{p_j} \right] \geq 1 - (1 - p_j)^{2^\ell} \geq 1 - e^{-1},$$

where $G_j(v)$ is the total volume of nodes in R'_j that perform a PULL from v in 2^ℓ rounds.

Now, we can apply lemma 1, choosing X_j to be equal $v_j = \frac{1}{128} \cdot \frac{|R'_j|}{p_j}$ if bucket R'_j in segment ℓ (buckets can be ordered arbitrarily) is such that $G_j(v) \geq v_j$, and 0 otherwise. Choosing $p = 1 - e^{-1}$ and $q = 1 - 2^{-\ell}$, we obtain:

$$\Pr \left[G_{S_\ell}(v) \geq \frac{1}{256} \cdot \frac{|S_\ell|}{2^{-\ell}} \right] \geq 1 - 2e^{-1}.$$

□

The following corollary follows from lemma 7.

COROLLARY 8. Assume $v_i \in U_i$. Then, there exists $p_i \in (\frac{\phi}{64}, 1]$ such that

$$\Pr \left[G(v_i) \geq \frac{d_{B_i}^+(v_i)}{5000 \cdot p_i \cdot \lg \frac{2}{\phi}} \right] \geq 1 - 2e^{-1}.$$

where $G(v_i)$ is the total volume of nodes in $N_{B_i}^+(v_i)$ that perform a PULL from v_i , or that v_i pushes the information to, in p_i^{-1} rounds.

PROOF. If $v_i \in \hat{U}_i^\oplus$, the same reasoning of lemma 5 applies. If $v_i \in \hat{U}_i^\ominus$, then we apply lemma 7 choosing the part S with the largest cardinality. By the bound on the number of partitions, we will have

$$S \geq \frac{d_{B_i}^+(v_i)}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{6 + \lg \phi^{-1}} \geq \frac{d_{B_i}^+(v_i)}{18 \cdot \lg \frac{2}{\phi}},$$

which implies the corollary. □

The previous corollary is a generalization of lemma 5, which would lead to our result if we could prove an analogous of the *two-cases property* of the previous section. Unfortunately, the final gain we might need to aim for, could be larger than the cut — this inhibits the use of the *two-cases property*.

We say that an edge in the cut $(S, V - S)$ is *easy* if its endpoint w in $V - S$ is such that $\frac{d_S^-(w)}{d(w)} \geq \phi$. Then, to overcome the just noted issue, we consider two cases separately: (a) at least half of the edges in the cut are easy, or (b) less than half of the edges in the cut are easy.

In case (a) we bucket the easy nodes in $\Gamma(S)$ (the neighbourhood of S) in $\left\lceil \lg \frac{1}{\phi} \right\rceil$ buckets in the following way. Bucket D_i , $i = 1, \dots, \left\lceil \lg \frac{1}{\phi} \right\rceil$, will contain all the nodes w in $\Gamma(S)$ such that $2^{-i} < \frac{d_S^-(w)}{d(w)} \leq 2^{-i+1}$. Now let D_j be the bucket of highest volume (breaking ties arbitrarily).

For any node $v \in D_j$ we have that its probability to pull the information in one step is at least 2^{-j} . So, the probability of v to pull the information in 2^j rounds is at least $1 - e^{-1}$. Hence, by applying lemma 1, we get that with probability greater than or equal to $1 - 2e^{-1}$ we gain a set of new nodes of volume at least $\frac{\text{vol}(D_j)}{2}$ in 2^j rounds. But,

$$\frac{\text{vol}(D_j)}{2} \geq 2^j \cdot \frac{\text{cut}(S, D_j)}{2} \geq 2^j \cdot \frac{\text{cut}(S, \Gamma(S))}{2 \left\lceil \lg \frac{1}{\phi} \right\rceil} \geq 2^j \cdot \frac{\phi \cdot \text{vol}(S)}{2 \left\lceil \lg \frac{1}{\phi} \right\rceil}.$$

Thus in this first case we gain with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-1}$ a set of new nodes of volume at least $2^j \cdot \frac{\phi \cdot \text{vol}(S)}{2 \left\lceil \lg \frac{1}{\phi} \right\rceil}$ in 2^j rounds. By the reasoning presented at the beginning of section 5 the claim follows.

Now let us consider the second case, recall that in this case half of the edges in the cut point to nodes u in $\Gamma(S)$ having $\frac{d_S^-(u)}{d(u)} \geq \frac{1}{\phi}$.

We then replace the original *two-cases property* with the *strong two-cases property*:

$$(a') \sum_{v \in H_t \cap (V - S)} d_{B_t}^-(v) \geq \frac{1}{1000} \cdot \text{cut}(S, V - S), \text{ and}$$

$$(b') \sum_{v \in H_t \cap S} d_{B_t}^+(v) \geq \frac{249}{1000} \cdot \text{cut}(S, V - S).$$

As before, at least one of (a') and (b') has to be true. If (a') happens to be true then we are done since the total volume of the new nodes obtained will be greater than or equal $\sum_{v \in H_t \cap (V - S)} d(v) \geq \phi^{-1} \sum_{v \in H_t \cap (V - S)} d_{B_t}^-(v) \geq \frac{1}{1000} \cdot \phi^{-1} \cdot \text{cut}(S, V - S)$. By Corollary 8, we will wait at most w rounds for the cut $(S, V - S)$, for some $w \leq O(\phi^{-1})$. Thus, if (a') holds, we are guaranteed to obtain a new set of nodes of total volume $\Omega\left(\frac{\text{cut}(S, V - S)}{w}\right)$ in w rounds. Which implies our main claim.

We now show that if (b') holds, then with $\Theta(1)$ probability our total gain will be at least $\Omega\left(\frac{\text{cut}(S, V - S)}{w \log^2 \phi^{-1}}\right)$ in w rounds, for some $w \leq (\phi^{-1})$.

Observe that each $v_i \in H_t \cap S$, when it was considered by the process, was given some probability $p_i \in \left(\frac{\phi}{64}, 1\right]$ by

Corollary 8. We partition $H_t \cap S$ in buckets according to probabilities p_i . The j -th bucket will contain all the nodes v_i in $H_t \cap S$ such that $2^{-j} < p_i \leq 2^{-j+1}$. Recalling that B_i is the set of informed nodes when node v_i is considered, we let F be the bucket that maximizes $\sum_{v_i \in F} d_{B_t}^+(v_i)$.

Then,

$$\sum_{v_i \in F} d_{B_t}^+(v_i) \geq \frac{249}{1000 \left\lceil \lg \frac{64}{\phi} \right\rceil} \cdot \text{cut}(S, V - S) \quad (1)$$

By Corollary 8, we have that for each $v_i \in F$, there exists $p = p(F) \geq \frac{\phi}{64}$, such that with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-1}$, after $\left\lceil \frac{2}{p} \right\rceil$ round, we gain at least $\frac{1}{5000 \cdot p \cdot \lg \frac{2}{\phi}} \cdot d_{B_t}^+(v_i) \geq \frac{1}{5000 \cdot p \cdot \lg \frac{2}{\phi}} \cdot d_{B_t}^+(v_i)$ (since $i \leq t$ implies $B_i \subseteq B_t$). For each v_i , let us define the random variable X_i as follows: with probability $1 - 2e^{-1}$, X_i has value $\frac{1}{5000 \cdot p \cdot \lg \frac{2}{\phi}} \cdot d_{B_t}^+(v_i)$, and with the remaining probability it has value 0. Then, the gain of v_i is a random variable that dominates X_i . Choosing $q = 1 - \frac{5}{2}e^{-1}$, in lemma 1, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\sum_{i: v_i \in F} X_i \geq \frac{4}{5} \cdot \sum_{v_i \in F} \left(\frac{1}{5000 \cdot p \cdot \lg \frac{2}{\phi}} \cdot d_{B_t}^+(v_i) \right) \right] \\ \geq 1 - \frac{5}{2}e^{-1} \geq 0.08. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in $\left\lceil \frac{2}{p} \right\rceil$ rounds, with constant probability we gain at least

$$\frac{1}{6250 \cdot \lg \frac{2}{\phi}} \cdot \sum_{v_i \in F} \frac{d_{B_t}^+(v_i)}{p},$$

which by equation 1, it is lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{6250 \cdot p \cdot \lg \frac{2}{\phi}} \cdot \frac{249}{1000 \left\lceil \lg \frac{64}{\phi} \right\rceil} \cdot \text{cut}(S, V - S) \geq \\ \geq \Omega\left(\frac{\text{cut}(S, V - S)}{p \cdot \log^2 \phi^{-1}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus applying the reasoning presented at the beginning of the section the claim follows.

6. PUSH AND PULL BY THEMSELVES

We now comment on how one can change our analysis to get a bound of $O(c_\alpha \cdot \phi^{-1} \cdot \log^2 \phi^{-1} \cdot \log n)$ on the completion time of PUSH or PULL by themselves. Observe that, if degrees of neighboring nodes have a constant ratio, then the probability that a single node $v_i \in S$ (in our analysis) to make a viable PUSH or to be hit by a PULL is $\Theta(\alpha\phi)$ (indeed, v will have at least $\phi \cdot d(v)$ neighboring nodes in $V - S$, each having at most its degree times α — an easy calculation shows that the probability bound for both PUSH and PULL is then $\Theta(\alpha\phi)$). Using this observation our analysis can be concluded as in the previous section.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] P. Berenbrink, R. Elsässer and T. Friedetzky. Efficient randomized broadcasting in random regular networks with applications in peer-to-peer systems. *Proceedings of PODC*, 2006.

- [2] S. P. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar and D. Shah. Gossip algorithms: design, analysis and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2005.
- [3] F. Chierichetti, S. Lattanzi and A. Panconesi. Rumor Spreading in Social Networks. *Proceedings of ICALP*, 2009.
- [4] F. Chierichetti, S. Lattanzi and A. Panconesi. Rumour Spreading and Graph Conductance. *Proceedings of SODA*, 2010.
- [5] A. J. Demers, D. H. Greene, C. Hauser, W. Irish, J. Larson, S. Shenker, H. E. Sturgis, D. C. Swinehart and D. B. Terry. Epidemic Algorithms for Replicated Database Maintenance. *Proceedings of PODC*, 1987.
- [6] B. Doerr, T. Friedrich and T. Sauerwald. Quasirandom Rumor Spreading. *Proceedings of SODA*, 2008.
- [7] B. Doerr, T. Friedrich and T. Sauerwald. Quasirandom Rumor Spreading: Expanders, Push vs. Pull, and Robustness. *Proceedings of ICALP*, 2009.
- [8] R. Elsässer. On the Communication Complexity of Randomized Broadcasting in Random-like Graphs. *Proceedings of SPAA*, 2006.
- [9] U. Feige, D. Peleg, P. Raghavan and E. Upfal. Randomized Broadcast in Networks. *Algorithms*, 1990.
- [10] T. Friedrich and T. Sauerwald. Near-perfect load balancing by randomized rounding. *Proceedings of STOC*, 2009.
- [11] A. Frieze and G. Grimmett. The shortest-path problem for graphs with random arc-lengths. *Algorithms*, 1985.
- [12] R. Karp, C. Schindelhauer, S. Shenker and B. Vöcking. Randomized Rumor Spreading. *Proceedings of FOCS*, 2000.
- [13] D. Kempe, A. Dobra and J. Gehrke. Gossip-based computation of aggregate information. *Proceedings of FOCS*, 2003.
- [14] J. Leskovec, K. J. Lang, A. Dasgupta and M. W. Mahoney. Statistical properties of community structure in large social and information networks. *Proceedings of WWW*, 2008.
- [15] M. Mihail, C. H. Papadimitriou and A. Saberi. On certain connectivity properties of the Internet topology. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 2006.
- [16] D. Mosk-Aoyama and D. Shah. Fast Distributed Algorithms for Computing Separable Functions. *Transactions on Information Theory*, 2008.
- [17] B. Pittel. On Spreading a Rumor. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 1987.
- [18] T. Sauerwald. On Mixing and Edge Expansion Properties in Randomized Broadcasting. *Proceedings of ISAAC*, 2007.
- [19] D. A. Spielman and S.-H. Teng. Nearly-linear time algorithms for graph partitioning, graph sparsification, and solving linear systems. *Proceedings of STOC*, 2004.