

15.01.23

Proof (Ad.)

We now show that there is a feasible update sequence R with l rounds for update flow network b iff there is a feasible update sequence \tilde{R} with l rounds for update flow network \tilde{G} .

" \Rightarrow "

Let $R = (r_1, \dots, r_l)$ be a feasible update sequence for b .

We set $\tilde{R}(v, \tilde{F}_i) := R(v, F_i)$ for every $v \in V$, $i \in [l]$, $F_i \in \mathcal{F} - \{F, \bar{F}\}$,

$\tilde{R}(\tilde{u}_{F^0}, \tilde{F}_i) := R(u_{F^0}, F_i), \dots$

$\tilde{R}(v, \tilde{F}) := \begin{cases} \tilde{R}(v, \tilde{F}) & \text{if } v \in V(F^0 \cup F^u) \\ \tilde{R}(v, \tilde{F}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

$\tilde{R}(w, \tilde{F}) := R(s, F)$

Induction?

We show that $\tilde{R} = (\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_l)$ is a feasible update sequence for \tilde{G} . Suppose not. Then let $i \in [l]$ be minimum and $S \subseteq \tilde{F}_i$ be minimal such that there is no branching family for U_i^S .

~~Case $S = \{T_{p, u_i}\}_{p \in P}$ is not valid.~~

~~Then let $c \in E(\kappa(U_i^S, \tilde{G}))$ such that $c(c) < \sum_{p \in P: c \in E(p)}$~~

If $S = \{s\}$, then $i=1$ (otherwise i would not be minimum as $U_{i-1}^{F_{i-1}} \dots$).

15.01.23

Definition: A block sequence $B = (b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$ is an ordered partition of the set B of blocks.

The update sequence R_B induced by block sequence $B = (b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$ is defined as follows:

Every block $b \in b_i$ is updated in rounds $r_{3(i-1)+1}, r_{3(i-1)+2}, \dots, r_{3i-1}, 1 \leq i \leq \ell$. Remove any rounds $r = \emptyset$.

A block sequence $B = (b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$ is feasible for every $i \in [1]$ and every $e \in E$,

$$c(e) \geq \sum_{p: \alpha_p(e, U) = \text{active} \text{ or } \alpha_p(e, U_i) = \text{active}} \alpha_p.$$

Lemma: A block sequence $B = (b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$ is feasible iff the induced update sequence R_B is feasible.

Proof.

" \Leftarrow "

Suppose $R_B = (r_1, \dots, r_{2\ell+1})$ is feasible.

We show that above inequality is satisfied for

" \Leftarrow "

Suppose $R_B = (r_1, \dots, r_{2\ell+1})$ is feasible, and $B = (b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$ is not. Then let $i \in [1]$ and $e \in E$ be such ^{be minimum}

$$U_i = \bigcup_{p \in S} U_p, \quad U(b_i)$$

that $c(e) < \sum_{p: \alpha_p(e, U_i) = \text{active} \text{ or } \alpha_p(e, U) = \text{active}} \alpha_p$.

[We have to relate $\alpha_p(e, U_i) = \text{active}$ with $e \in E(T_p, U_i^S)$ and hence U_i with U_i^S for appropriate i, S .

Claim: $U_i = \bigcup_{p \in S} U_p$ for any $S \subseteq \{r_1, \dots, r_{3i}\}$ for all $i \in [1]$

Proof by induction on i .

$$\text{Induction base } i=1, \quad U_1 = U(b_1).$$

$$U_3 = r_3 \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{2-1} r_i = r_1 \cup r_2 \cup r_3 = U(b_1).$$

$$\text{Induction step } i \rightarrow i+1, \quad U_{3(i+1)}^{3(i+1)} = r_{3(i+1)} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{3(i+1)-1} r_i = r_{3(i+1)-2} \cup r_{3(i+1)-1} \cup r_{3(i+1)} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{3i-1} r_i =$$

$$r_{3(i+1)} \cup r_{3(i+1)-1} \cup r_{3(i+1)-2} \cup U_i = U_i \cup r_{3i+1} \cup r_{3i+2} \cup r_{3i+3} = U_{i+1}$$

We show that above inequality is satisfied for $i \in [1]$ iff r_{3i} ^{r_{3i-2}, r_{3i-1} and} obeys the consistency rule.

" \Leftarrow "

Suppose r_{3i} obeys the consistency rule.

Can we get $\alpha_p(e, U_{i-1}) = \text{active}$ or $\alpha_p(e, U_i) = \text{active}$ iff $e \in E(T_p, U_i^S)$ for some $S \subseteq r_{3i}$?