



Improving the integrality gap for multiway cut

Kristóf Bérczi¹ · Karthekeyan Chandrasekaran² · Tamás Király¹ · Vivek Madan³

Received: 15 May 2019 / Accepted: 20 February 2020 / Published online: 6 March 2020
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature and Mathematical Optimization Society 2020

Abstract

In the multiway cut problem, we are given an undirected graph with non-negative edge weights and a collection of k terminal nodes, and the goal is to partition the node set of the graph into k non-empty parts each containing exactly one terminal, so that the total weight of the edges crossing the partition is minimized. The multiway cut problem for $k \geq 3$ is APX-hard. For arbitrary k , the best-known approximation factor is 1.2965 due to Sharma and Vondrák (Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on theory of computing, STOC, 2014) while the best known inapproximability result due to Angelidakis et al. (Integer programming and combinatorial optimization, IPCO, 2017) rules out efficient algorithms to achieve an approximation factor less than 1.2 under the unique games conjecture (UGC). In this work, we improve the lower bound to 1.20016 under UGC by constructing an integrality gap instance for the CKR relaxation. The CKR relaxation embeds the graph into a simplex and it is known that its integrality gap translates to inapproximability under UGC. A technical challenge in improving the integrality gap has been the lack of geometric tools to understand higher-dimensional simplices. Our instance is a non-trivial 3-dimensional instance that overcomes this technical challenge. We analyze the gap of the instance by viewing it as a convex combination of 2-dimensional instances and a uniform 3-dimensional instance. We believe that this technique could be exploited further to construct instances with larger integrality gap. One of the ingredients of our proof technique is a generalization of a result on *Sperner admissible labelings* due to Mirzakhani and Vondrák (Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on discrete algorithms, SODA, 2015) that might be of independent combinatorial interest.

An extended abstract of this work appeared in the 20th conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO 2019).

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-020-01485-2>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Karthekeyan Chandrasekaran
karthe@illinois.edu

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

Keywords Combinatorial optimization · Multiway cut · Integrality gap · Approximation

Mathematics Subject Classification 90C27 (Combinatorial Optimization)

1 Introduction

In the multiway cut problem, we are given an undirected graph with non-negative edge weights and a collection of k terminal nodes and the goal is to find a minimum weight subset of edges to delete so that the k input terminals cannot reach each other. Equivalently, the goal is to find a partition of the nodes into k sets with each set containing exactly one terminal, such that the weight of the union of the edge boundaries of the sets is minimized. For convenience, we will use k -way cut to denote this problem when we would like to highlight the dependence on k and *multiway cut* to denote this problem when k grows with the size of the input graph. The 2-way cut problem is the classic minimum $\{s, t\}$ -cut problem which is solvable in polynomial time. For $k \geq 3$, Dahlhaus et al. [6] showed that the k -way cut problem is APX-hard and gave a $(2 - 2/k)$ -approximation. Owing to its applications in partitioning and clustering, k -way cut has been intensely investigated in the algorithms literature. Several novel rounding techniques in the approximation literature were discovered to address the approximability of this problem.

The best-known approximability as well as inapproximability results are based on a linear programming relaxation, popularly known as the CKR relaxation in honor of the authors—Călinescu, Karloff and Rabani—who introduced it [4]. The CKR relaxation takes a geometric perspective of the problem. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge weights $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and terminals t_1, \dots, t_k , the CKR relaxation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \min & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e=\{u,v\} \in E} w(e) \|x^u - x^v\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} & \\ & x^u \in \Delta_k \quad \forall u \in V, \\ & x^{t_i} = e^i \quad \forall i \in [k], \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_k := \{(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in [0, 1]^k : \sum_{i=1}^k x_i = 1\}$ is the $(k - 1)$ -dimensional simplex, $e^i \in [0, 1]^k$ is the extreme point of the simplex along the i th coordinate axis, i.e., $e_j^i = 1$ if and only if $j = i$, and $[k]$ denotes the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$.

Călinescu, Karloff and Rabani designed a rounding scheme for the relaxation which led to a $(3/2 - 1/k)$ -approximation thus improving on the $(2 - 2/k)$ -approximation by Dahlhaus et al. For 3-way cut, Cheung et al. [5] as well as Karger et al. [8] designed alternative rounding schemes that led to a $12/11$ -approximation factor and also exhibited matching integrality gap instances. We recall that the integrality gap of a minimization LP is the supremum of the possible ratios between the integral optimum value and the LP optimum value. Determining the exact integrality gap of the CKR relaxation for $k \geq 4$ has been an intriguing open question. After the results by Karger et al. and Cunningham et al., a rich variety of rounding techniques were developed to

improve the approximation factor of k -way cut for $k \geq 4$ [2,3,11]. The best known approximation factor for multiway cut is 1.2965 due to Sharma and Vondrák [11].

On the hardness of approximation side, Manokaran et al. [9] showed that the hardness of approximation for k -way cut is at least the integrality gap of the CKR relaxation assuming the unique games conjecture (UGC). More precisely, if the integrality gap of the CKR relaxation for k -way cut is τ_k , then it is UGC-hard to approximate k -way cut within a factor of $\tau_k - \epsilon$ for every constant $\epsilon > 0$. As an immediate consequence of this result, we know that the 12/11-approximation factor for 3-way cut is tight under UGC. For k -way cut, Freund and Karloff [7] constructed an instance showing an integrality gap of $8/(7 + (1/(k - 1)))$. This was the best known integrality gap until Angelidakis et al. [1] gave a remarkably simple construction showing an integrality gap of $6/(5 + (1/(k - 1)))$ for k -way cut. In particular, this gives an integrality gap of 1.2 for multiway cut.

We note that the known upper and lower bounds on the approximation factor for multiway cut match only up to the first decimal digit and thus the approximability of this problem is far from resolved. Indeed, Angelidakis, Makarychev and Manurangsi raise the question of whether the lower bound can be improved. In this work, we improve on the lower bound by constructing an instance with integrality gap 1.20016.

Theorem 1 *For every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an instance of multiway cut such that the integrality gap of the CKR relaxation for that instance is at least $1.20016 - \epsilon$.*

The above result in conjunction with the result of Manokaran et al. immediately implies that multiway cut is UGC-hard to approximate within a factor of $1.20016 - \epsilon$ for every constant $\epsilon > 0$.

One of the ingredients of our technique underlying the proof of Theorem 1 is a generalization of a result on *Sperner admissible labelings* due to Mirzakhani and Vondrák [10] that might be of independent combinatorial interest (see Theorem 6).

2 Background and result

Before outlining our techniques, we briefly summarize the background literature that we build upon to construct our instance. We rely on two significant results from the literature. In the context of the k -way cut problem and the CKR relaxation, a *cut* is a function $P : \Delta_k \rightarrow [k + 1]$ such that $P(e^i) = i$ for all $i \in [k]$, where we use the notation $[k] := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. The use of $k + 1$ labels as opposed to k labels to describe a cut is slightly non-standard, but is useful for reasons that will become clear later on. The approximation ratio $\tau_k(\mathcal{P})$ of a distribution \mathcal{P} over cuts is given by its *maximum density*:

$$\tau_k(\mathcal{P}) := \sup_{x, y \in \Delta_k, x \neq y} \frac{\Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}(P(x) \neq P(y))}{(1/2)\|x - y\|_1}.$$

Karger et al. [8] defined

$$\tau_k^* := \inf_{\mathcal{P}} \tau_k(\mathcal{P}),$$

and moreover showed that there exists \mathcal{P} that achieves the infimum. Hence, $\tau_k^* = \min_{\mathcal{P}} \tau_k(\mathcal{P})$. With this definition of τ_k^* , Karger et al. [8] showed that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is an instance of multiway cut with k terminals for which the integrality gap of the CKR relaxation is at least $\tau_k^* - \epsilon$. Thus, Karger et al.'s result reduced the problem of constructing an integrality gap instance for multiway cut to proving a lower bound on τ_k^* .

Next, Angelidakis et al. [1] reduced the problem of lower bounding τ_k^* further by showing that it is sufficient to restrict our attention to *non-opposite cuts* as opposed to all cuts. A cut P is a *non-opposite cut* if $P(x) \in \text{Support}(x) \cup \{k+1\}$ for every $x \in \Delta_k$, where we use the notation $\text{Support}(x) := \{i \in [k] \mid x_i \neq 0\}$. Let $\Delta_{k,n} := \Delta_k \cap ((1/n)\mathbb{Z})^k$ where $(1/n)\mathbb{Z} := \{i/n \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. For a distribution \mathcal{P} over cuts, let

$$\tau_{k,n}(\mathcal{P}) := \max_{x, y \in \Delta_{k,n}, x \neq y} \frac{\Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}(P(x) \neq P(y))}{(1/2)\|x - y\|_1}, \text{ and} \\ \tilde{\tau}_{k,n}^* := \min\{\tau_{k,n}(\mathcal{P}) : \mathcal{P} \text{ is a distribution over non-opposite cuts}\}.$$

A lower bound on $\tilde{\tau}_{k,n}^*$ can be obtained by constructing a $(k-1)$ -dimensional instance that has large integrality gap *against non-opposite cuts*. Angelidakis, Makarychev and Manurangsi showed that $\tilde{\tau}_{k,n}^* - \tau_K^* = O(kn/(K-k))$ for all $K > k$ as follows: they construct a $(K-1)$ -dimensional instance that contains the $(k-1)$ -dimensional instance achieving a gap of $\tilde{\tau}_{k,n}^*$ against non-opposite cuts on all its $(k-1)$ -dimensional faces. They show that the resulting $(K-1)$ -dimensional instance achieves a gap of $\tilde{\tau}_{k,n}^* - O(kn/(K-k))$ against all cuts by observing that every cut in $\Delta_{K,n}$ is non-opposite on most of its $(k-1)$ -dimensional faces when $K > nk$.

Thus, in order to lower bound the integrality gap of the CKR relaxation for multiway cut, it suffices to lower bound $\tilde{\tau}_{k,n}^*$. That is, it suffices to construct an instance that has large integrality gap against non-opposite cuts. As a central contribution, Angelidakis, Makarychev and Manurangsi constructed an instance showing that $\tilde{\tau}_{3,n}^* \geq 1.2 - O(1/n)$. Now, by setting $n = \Theta(\sqrt{K})$, we see that τ_K^* is at least $1.2 - O(1/\sqrt{K})$. Furthermore, they also showed that their lower bound on $\tilde{\tau}_{3,n}^*$ is almost tight, i.e., $\tilde{\tau}_{3,n}^* \leq 1.2$.

We remark that $\tilde{\tau}_{k,n}^*$ can be greater than τ_k^* and giving a lower bound for $\tilde{\tau}_{k,n}^*$ does not immediately imply a lower bound on τ_k^* . For instance $\tau_3^* = 12/11$ whereas $\tilde{\tau}_{3,n}^*$ can be arbitrarily close to 1.2.

The main technical challenge towards improving $\tilde{\tau}_{4,n}^*$ is that one has to deal with the 3-dimensional simplex Δ_4 . Indeed, all known gap instances including that of Angelidakis, Makarychev and Manurangsi are constructed using the 2-dimensional simplex. In the 2-dimensional simplex, the properties of non-opposite cuts are easy to visualize and their cut-values are convenient to characterize using simple geometric observations. However, the values of non-opposite cuts in the 3-dimensional simplex become difficult to characterize. Our main contribution is a simple argument based on properties of lower-dimensional simplices that overcomes this technical challenge. We construct a 3-dimensional instance that has gap larger than 1.2 against non-opposite cuts.

Theorem 2 $\tilde{\tau}_{4,n}^* \geq 1.20016 - O(1/n)$.

Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 2 using the discussion above.

3 Outline of ideas

Let $G = (V, E)$ be the graph with node set $\Delta_{4,n}$ and edge set $E_{4,n} := \{xy : x, y \in \Delta_{4,n}, \|x - y\|_1 = 2/n\}$, where the terminals are the four unit vectors. In order to lower bound $\tilde{\tau}_{4,n}^*$, we will come up with weights on the edges of G such that every non-opposite cut has cost at least $\alpha = 1.20016$ and moreover the cumulative weight of all edges is $n + O(1)$. This suffices to lower bound $\tilde{\tau}_{4,n}^*$ by the following proposition.

Proposition 1 *Suppose that there exist weights $w : E_{4,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ on the edges of G such that every non-opposite cut has cost at least α and the cumulative weight of all edges is $n + O(1)$. Then, $\tilde{\tau}_{4,n}^* \geq \alpha - O(1/n)$.*

Proof For an arbitrary distribution \mathcal{P} over non-opposite cuts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{k,n}(\mathcal{P}) &= \max_{x,y \in \Delta_{k,n}, x \neq y} \frac{\Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}(P(x) \neq P(y))}{(1/2)\|x - y\|_1} \\ &\geq \max_{xy \in E_{4,n}} \frac{\Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}(P(x) \neq P(y))}{(1/2)\|x - y\|_1} \\ &= \max_{xy \in E_{4,n}} \frac{\Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}(P(x) \neq P(y))}{1/n} \\ &\geq \sum_{xy \in E_{4,n}} \frac{w(xy) \Pr_{P \sim \mathcal{P}}(P(x) \neq P(y))}{(1/n)(\sum_{e \in E_{4,n}} w(e))} \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha}{1 + O(1/n)} = \alpha - O(1/n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the hypothesis that every non-opposite cut has cost at least α and the cumulative weight of all edges is $n + O(1)$. \square


We obtain our weighted instance from four instances that have large gap against different types of cuts, and then compute the convex combination of these instances that gives the best gap against all non-opposite cuts.

All of our four instances are defined as edge-weights on the graph $G = (V, E)$. We identify $\Delta_{3,n}$ with the facet of $\Delta_{4,n}$ defined by $x_4 = 0$. Our first three instances are 2-dimensional instances, i.e. only edges induced by $\Delta_{3,n}$ have positive weight. The fourth instance has uniform weight on $E_{4,n}$.

We first explain the motivation behind Instances 1, 2, and 4, since these are easy to explain. Let (see Fig. 1)

$$L_{ij} := \{xy \in E_{4,n} : \text{Support}(x), \text{Support}(y) \subseteq \{i, j\}\}.$$

Fig. 1 One face of the simplex with edge-sets L_{12} , L_{23} and L_{31}



1. Instance 1 is simply the instance of Angelidakis et al. [1] on $\Delta_{3,n}$. It has gap $1.2 - \frac{1}{n}$ against all non-opposite cuts, since non-opposite cuts in $\Delta_{4,n}$ induce non-opposite cuts on $\Delta_{3,n}$. Additionally, we show in Lemma 2 that the gap is strictly larger than 1.2 by a constant if the following two conditions hold:
 - there exist $i, j \in [3]$ such that L_{ij} contains only one edge whose end-nodes have different labels (a cut with this property is called a *non-fragmenting cut*), and
 - $\Delta_{3,n}$ has a lot of nodes with label 5.
2. Instance 2 has uniform weight on L_{12} , L_{13} and L_{23} , and 0 on all other edges. Here, a cut in which each L_{ij} contains at least two edges whose end-nodes have different labels (a *fragmenting cut*) has large weight. Consequently, this instance has gap at least 2 against such cuts.
3. Instance 4 has uniform weight on all edges in $E_{4,n}$. A beautiful result due to Mirzakhani and Vondrák [10] implies that non-opposite cuts with no node of label 5 have large weight. Consequently, this instance has gap at least $3/2$ against such cuts. We extend their result in Lemma 1 to show that the weight remains large if $\Delta_{3,n}$ has few nodes with label 5.

At first glance, the arguments above seem to imply that a convex combination of these three instances already gives a gap strictly larger than 1.2 for all non-opposite cuts. However, there exist two non-opposite cuts such that at least one of them has cost at most 1.2 in every convex combination of these three instances (see Sect. 7.1). One of these two cuts is a fragmenting cut that has almost zero cost in Instance 4 and the best possible cost, namely 1.2, in Instance 1. Instance 3 is constructed specifically to boost the cost against this non-opposite cut. It has positive uniform weight on 3 equilateral triangles, incident to e^1 , e^2 and e^3 on the face $\Delta_{3,n}$. We call the edges of these triangles *red edges*. The side length of these triangles is a parameter, denoted by c , that is optimized at the end of the proof. Essentially, we show that if a non-opposite

cut has small cost both on Instance 1 and Instance 4 (i.e., weight 1.2 on Instance 1 and $O(1/n^2)$ weight on Instance 4), then it must contain red edges.

Our lower bound of 1.20016 is obtained by optimizing the coefficients of the convex combination and the parameter c . By Proposition 1 and the results of Angelidakis, Makarychev and Manurangsi, we obtain that $\tau_K^* \geq 1.20016 - O(1/\sqrt{K})$, i.e., the integrality gap of the CKR relaxation for k -way cut is at least $1.20016 - O(1/\sqrt{k})$. We complement our lower bound of 1.20016 by also showing that there exist non-opposite cuts that achieve a factor of 1.20067 for convex combinations of our four instances (see Sect. 7.2).

4 A 3-dimensional gap instance against non-opposite cuts

We will focus on the graph $G = (V, E)$ with the node set $V := \Delta_{4,n}$ being the discretized 3-dimensional simplex and the edge set $E_{4,n} := \{xy : x, y \in \Delta_{4,n}, \|x - y\|_1 = 2/n\}$. The four terminals s_1, \dots, s_4 will be the four extreme points of the simplex, namely $s_i = e^i$ for $i \in [4]$. In this context, a cut is a function $P : V \rightarrow [5]$ such that $P(s_i) = i$ for all $i \in [4]$. The *cut-set* corresponding to P is defined as

$$\delta(P) := \{xy \in E_{4,n} : P(x) \neq P(y)\}.$$

For a set S of nodes, we will also use $\delta(S)$ to denote the set of edges with exactly one end node in S . Given a weight function $w : E_{4,n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the *cost* of a cut P is $\sum_{e \in \delta(P)} w(e)$. Our goal is to come up with weights on the edges so that the resulting 4-way cut instance has gap at least 1.20016 against non-opposite cuts.

We recall that L_{ij} denotes the boundary edges between terminals s_i and s_j , i.e., $L_{ij} = \{xy \in E_{4,n} : \text{Support}(x), \text{Support}(y) \subseteq \{i, j\}\}$. We will denote the boundary nodes between terminals s_i and s_j as V_{ij} , i.e.,

$$V_{ij} := \{x \in \Delta_{4,n} : \text{Support}(x) \subseteq \{i, j\}\}.$$


Let $c \in (0, 1/2)$ be a constant to be fixed later, such that cn is integral. For each $i \in [3]$, we define node sets U_i , R_i , $\text{Closure}(R_i)$ and edge set Γ_i as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U_i &:= \{x \in \Delta_{4,n} : x_4 = 0, x_i = 1 - c\}, \\ R_i &:= U_i \cup \{x \in V_{ij} : x_i \geq 1 - c, j \in [3] \setminus \{i\}\}, \\ \text{Closure}(R_i) &:= \{x \in \Delta_{4,n} : x_4 = 0, x_i \geq 1 - c\}, \text{ and} \\ \Gamma_i &:= \{xy \in E_{4,n} : x, y \in R_i\}. \end{aligned}$$

We will refer to the nodes in R_i as red¹ nodes near terminal s_i and the edges in Γ_i as the red edges near terminal s_i (see Fig. 2). Let $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ denote the subgraph of G induced by the nodes whose support is contained in $\{1, 2, 3\}$. We emphasize that

¹ We use the term “red” as a convenient way for the reader to remember these nodes and edges. The exact color is irrelevant.

Fig. 2 Definition of red nodes and edges near terminal s_1 . Dashed part corresponds to (R_1, Γ_1)



red edges and red nodes are present only in $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ and that the total number of red edges is exactly $9cn$.

4.1 Gap instance as a convex combination

Our gap instance is a convex combination of the following four instances.

1. Instance I_1 : our first instance constitutes the 3-way cut instance constructed by Angelidakis et al. [1] that has gap 1.2 against non-opposite cuts. To ensure that the total weight of all the edges in their instance is exactly n , we will scale their instance by $6/5$. Let us denote the resulting instance as J . In I_1 , we simply use the instance J on $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ and set the weights of the rest of the edges in $E_{4,n}$ to be zero.
2. Instance I_2 : in this instance, we set the weights of the edges in L_{12}, L_{23}, L_{13} to be $1/3$ and the weights of the rest of the edges in $E_{4,n}$ to be zero.
3. Instance I_3 : in this instance, we set the weights of the red edges to be $1/9c$ and the weights of the rest of the edges in $E_{4,n}$ to be zero.
4. Instance I_4 : in this instance, we set the weight of every edge in $E_{4,n}$ to be $1/n^2$.

We note that the total weight of all edges in each of the above instances is $n + O(1)$. For multipliers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4 \geq 0$ to be chosen later that will satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i = 1$, let the instance I be the convex combination of the above four instances, i.e., $I = \lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2 + \lambda_3 I_3 + \lambda_4 I_4$. By the properties of the four instances, it immediately follows that the total weight of all edges in the instance I is also $n + O(1)$.

4.2 Gap of the convex combination

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 3 *For every $n \geq 10$ and $c \in (0, 1/2)$ such that cn is integer, every non-opposite cut on I has cost at least the minimum of the following two terms:*

- (i) $\lambda_2 + (1.2 - \frac{1}{n})\lambda_1 + \min_{\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \{0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha)\lambda_4\}$
- (ii) $2\lambda_2 + (1.2 - \frac{5}{2n})\lambda_1 + 3 \min \left\{ \frac{2\lambda_3}{9c}, \min_{\alpha \in [0, \frac{c^2}{2}]} \{0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3(\frac{c^2}{2} - \alpha)\lambda_4\} \right\}$

Before proving Theorem 3, we see its consequence.

Corollary 1 *There exist constants $c \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4 \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i = 1$ such that the cost of every non-opposite cut in the resulting convex combination I is at least $1.20016 - O(1/n)$.*

Proof The corollary follows from Theorem 3 by setting $\lambda_1 = 0.751652$, $\lambda_2 = 0.147852$, $\lambda_3 = 0.000275$, $\lambda_4 = 0.100221$ and $c = 0.074125$ (this is the optimal setting to achieve the largest lower bound based on Theorem 3). \square

Corollary 1 in conjunction with Proposition 1 immediately implies Theorem 2.

The following theorem (shown in Sect. 7.2) complements Corollary 1 by giving an upper bound on the best possible gap that is achievable using the convex combination of our four instances.

Theorem 4 *For every constant $c \in (0, 1/2)$ and every $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4 \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i = 1$, there exists a non-opposite cut whose cost in the resulting convex combination I is at most $1.20067 + O(1/n)$.*

In light of Corollary 1 and Theorem 4, if we believe that the integrality gap of the CKR relaxation is more than 1.20067, then considering convex combinations of alternative instances is a reasonable approach towards proving this.

The rest of the section is devoted to proving Theorem 3. We rely on two main ingredients in the proof. The first ingredient is a statement about non-opposite cuts in the 3-dimensional discretized simplex. We prove this in Sect. 5, where we also give a generalization to higher dimensional simplices, which might be of independent interest.

Lemma 1 *Let P be a non-opposite cut on $\Delta_{4,n}$ with $\alpha(n+1)(n+2)$ nodes from $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ labeled as 1, 2, or 3 for some $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$. Then, $|\delta(P)| \geq 3\alpha n(n+1)$.*

The constant 3 that appears in the conclusion of Lemma 1 is the best possible for any fixed α (if $n \rightarrow \infty$). To see this, consider the non-opposite cut P obtained by labeling s_i to be i for every $i \in [4]$, all nodes at distance at most $\sqrt{2\alpha}$ from s_1 to be 1, and all remaining nodes to be 5. The number of nodes from $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ labeled as 1, 2, or 3 is $\alpha n^2 + O(n)$. The number of edges in the cut is $3\alpha n^2 + O(n)$.

The second ingredient involves properties of the 3-way cut instance constructed by Angelidakis et al. [1]; these are discussed in Sect. 6. We need two properties that are summarized in Lemma 2 and Corollary 2. We define a cut $Q : \Delta_{3,n} \rightarrow [4]$ to be a *fragmenting cut* if $|\delta(Q) \cap L_{ij}| \geq 2$ for every distinct $i, j \in [3]$; otherwise it is a non-fragmenting cut. We recall that J denotes the instance obtained from the 3-way cut instance of Angelidakis, Makarychev and Manurangsi by scaling it up by 6/5, so the total edge-weight is exactly n .

The first property is that non-opposite non-fragmenting cuts in $\Delta_{3,n}$ that label a large number of nodes with label 4 have cost much larger than 1.2.

Lemma 2 Let $Q : \Delta_{3,n} \rightarrow [4]$ be a non-opposite cut with αn^2 nodes labeled as 4 for some $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$. If Q is a non-fragmenting cut and $n \geq 10$, then the cost of Q on J is at least $1.2 + 0.4\alpha - \frac{1}{n}$.

Due to space limitations, the proof of Lemma 2 is presented in the online supplement. The proof involves modifying Q to obtain a non-opposite cut Q' while reducing its cost by 0.4α . By the main result of [1], the cost of every non-opposite cut Q' on J is at least $1.2 - \frac{1}{n}$. Therefore, it follows that the cost of Q on J is at least $1.2 - \frac{1}{n} + 0.4\alpha$. We emphasize that while it might be possible to improve the constant 0.4 that appears in the conclusion of Lemma 2, it does not lead to much improvement on the overall integrality gap as illustrated by the results in Sect. 7.2.

The second property is that non-opposite cuts which do not remove any of the red edges, but label a large number of nodes in the red region with label 4 have cost much larger than 1.2.

Corollary 2 Let $Q : \Delta_{3,n} \rightarrow [4]$ be a non-opposite cut and $n \geq 10$. For each $i \in [3]$, let

$$A_i := \begin{cases} \{v \in \text{Closure}(R_i) : Q(v) = 4\} & \text{if } \delta(Q) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, the cost of Q on J is at least $1.2 + 0.4 \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2 - \frac{5}{2n}$.

In order to show Corollary 2, we first derive that the cost of the edges $\delta(\cup_{i=1}^3 A_i)$ in the instance J is at least $0.4 \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2 - \frac{3}{2n}$ using Lemma 2. Next, we modify Q to obtain a non-opposite cut Q' such that $\delta(Q') = \delta(Q) \setminus \delta(\cup_{i=1}^3 A_i)$. By the main result of [1], the cost of every non-opposite cut Q' on J is at least $1.2 - \frac{1}{n}$. Therefore, it follows that the cost of Q on J is at least $1.2 + 0.4 \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2$.

We now have the ingredients to prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3 Let $P : \Delta_{4,n} \rightarrow [5]$ be a non-opposite cut. Let Q be the cut P restricted to $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$, i.e., for every $v \in \Delta_{4,n}$ with $\text{Support}(v) \subseteq [3]$, let

$$Q(v) := \begin{cases} P(v) & \text{if } P(v) \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \\ 4 & \text{if } P(v) = 5. \end{cases}$$

We consider two cases.

Case 1: Q is a non-fragmenting cut. Let the number of nodes in $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ that are labeled by Q as 4 (equivalently, labeled by P as 5) be $\alpha(n+1)(n+2)$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Since $|\{x \in \text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3) : Q(x) = 4\}| \geq \alpha n^2$, Lemma 2 implies that the cost of Q on J , and hence the cost of P on I_1 , is at least $1.2 + 0.4\alpha - \frac{1}{n}$. Moreover, the cost of P on I_2 is at least 1 since at least one edge in L_{ij} should be in $\delta(P)$ for every pair of distinct $i, j \in [3]$. To estimate the cost on I_4 , we observe that the number of nodes on $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ labeled by P as 1, 2, or 3 is $(1/2 - \alpha)(n+1)(n+2)$. By Lemma 1, we have that $|\delta(P)| \geq 3(1/2 - \alpha)n(n+1)$ and thus, the cost of P on I_4 is

at least $3(1/2 - \alpha)$. Therefore, the cost of P on the convex combination instance I is at least

$$\lambda_2 + \left(1.2 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \lambda_1 + \min_{\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\}.$$

Case 2: Q is a fragmenting cut. Then, the cost of P on I_2 is at least 2 as a fragmenting cut contains at least 2 edges from each L_{ij} for distinct $i, j \in [3]$.

We will now compute the cost of P on the other instances. Let $r := |\{i \in [3] : \delta(P) \cap \Gamma_i \neq \emptyset\}|$, i.e., r is the number of red triangles that are intersected by the cut P . We will derive lower bounds on the cost of the cut in each of the three instances I_1, I_3 and I_4 based on the value of $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. For each $i \in [3]$, let

$$A_i := \begin{cases} \{v \in \text{Closure}(R_i) : P(v) = 5\} & \text{if } \delta(P) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and let $\alpha := |A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3| / ((n+1/c)(n+2/c))$. Since $c < 1/2$, the sets A_i and A_j are disjoint for distinct $i, j \in [3]$. We note that $\alpha \in [0, (3-r)c^2/2]$ since $|A_i| \leq (cn+1)(cn+2)/2$ and $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$.

In order to lower bound the cost of P on I_1 , we will use Corollary 2. We recall that Q is the cut P restricted to $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$, so the cost of P on I_1 is the same as the cost of Q on J . Moreover, by Corollary 2, the cost of Q on J is at least $1.2 + 0.4\alpha - \frac{5}{2n}$, because $\alpha \leq \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2$. Hence, the cost of P on I_1 is at least $1.2 + 0.4\alpha - \frac{5}{2n}$.

The cost of P on I_3 is at least $2r/9c$ by the following claim.

Claim 1 *Let $i \in [3]$. If $\delta(P) \cap \Gamma_i \neq \emptyset$, then $|\delta(P) \cap \Gamma_i| \geq 2$.*

Proof The subgraph (R_i, Γ_i) is a cycle. If $P(x) \neq P(y)$ for some $xy \in \Gamma_i$, then the path $\Gamma_i - xy$ must also contain two consecutive nodes labeled differently by P . \square

Next we compute the cost of P on I_4 . If $r = 3$, then the cost of P on I_4 is at least 0. Suppose $r \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. For a red triangle $i \in [3]$ with $\delta(P) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset$, we have at least $(cn+1)(cn+2)/2 - |A_i|$ nodes from $\text{Closure}(R_i)$ that are labeled as 1, 2, or 3. Moreover, the nodes in $\text{Closure}(R_i)$ and $\text{Closure}(R_j)$ are disjoint for distinct $i, j \in [3]$. Hence, the number of nodes in $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ that are labeled as 1, 2, or 3 is at least $(3-r)(cn+1)(cn+2)/2 - \alpha(n+1/c)(n+2/c) = ((3-r)c^2/2 - \alpha)(n+1/c)(n+2/c)$, which is at least $((3-r)c^2/2 - \alpha)(n+1)(n+2)$, since $c \leq 1$. Therefore, by Lemma 1, we have $|\delta(P)| \geq 3((3-r)c^2/2 - \alpha)n^2$ and thus, the cost of P on I_4 is at least $3((3-r)c^2/2 - \alpha)$.

Thus, the cost of P on the convex combination instance I is at least $2\lambda_2 + (1.2 - \frac{5}{2n})\lambda_1 + \gamma(r, \alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [0, (3-r)c^2/2]$, where

$$\gamma(r, \alpha) := \begin{cases} \frac{6\lambda_3}{9c}, & \text{if } r = 3, \\ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + \frac{2r}{9c}\lambda_3 + 3 \left(\frac{(3-r)c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4, & \text{if } r \in \{0, 1, 2\}. \end{cases}$$

In particular, the cost of P on the convex combination instance I is at least $2\lambda_2 + (1.2 - 5/(2n))\lambda_1 + \gamma^*$, where

$$\gamma^* := \min_{r \in \{0,1,2,3\}} \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{(3-r)c^2}{2}\right]} \gamma(r, \alpha).$$

Now, Claim 2 completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Claim 2

$$\gamma^* \geq 3 \min \left\{ \frac{2\lambda_3}{9c}, \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(\frac{c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \right\}.$$

Proof Let $\gamma(r) := \min_{\alpha \in [0, (3-r)c^2/2]} \gamma(r, \alpha)$. If $r = 3$, then the claim is clear. We consider the three remaining cases.

1. Say $r = 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(0) &= \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{3c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(\frac{3c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \\ &= 3 \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(\frac{c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

2. Say $r = 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(1) &= \min_{\alpha \in [0, c^2]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + \frac{2}{9c}\lambda_3 + 3 \left(c^2 - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \\ &= \frac{2}{9c}\lambda_3 + \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 2 \cdot 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(c^2 - 2\alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \\ &= \frac{2}{9c}\lambda_3 + 2 \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(\frac{c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \\ &\geq 3 \min \left\{ \frac{2\lambda_3}{9c}, \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(\frac{c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from the identity $x + 2y \geq 3 \min\{x, y\}$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.

3. Say $r = 2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(2) &= \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + \frac{4}{9c}\lambda_3 + 3 \left(\frac{c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \\ &= \frac{4}{9c}\lambda_3 + \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(\frac{c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \\ &\geq 3 \min \left\{ \frac{2\lambda_3}{9c}, \min_{\alpha \in \left[0, \frac{c^2}{2}\right]} \left\{ 0.4\alpha\lambda_1 + 3 \left(\frac{c^2}{2} - \alpha \right) \lambda_4 \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from the identity $2x + y \geq 3 \min\{x, y\}$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.

□

5 Size of non-opposite cuts in $\Delta_{k,n}$

In this section, we prove Lemma 1. In fact, we prove a general result for $\Delta_{k,n}$, that may be useful for obtaining improved bounds by considering higher dimensional simplices. Our result is an extension of a theorem of Mirzakhani and Vondrák [10] on Sperner admissible labelings.

A labeling $\ell : \Delta_{k,n} \rightarrow [k]$ is *Sperner admissible* if $\ell(x) \in \text{Support}(x)$ for every $x \in \Delta_{k,n}$. We say that $x \in \Delta_{k,n}$ has an *inadmissible label* if $\ell(x) \notin \text{Support}(x)$. Let $H_{k,n}$ denote the hypergraph whose node set is $\Delta_{k,n}$ and whose hyperedge set is

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ \left\{ \frac{n-1}{n}x + \frac{1}{n}e_1, \frac{n-1}{n}x + \frac{1}{n}e_2, \dots, \frac{n-1}{n}x + \frac{1}{n}e_k \right\} : x \in \Delta_{k,n-1} \right\}.$$

Each hyperedge $e \in \mathcal{E}$ has k nodes, and if $x, y \in e$, then there exist distinct $i, j \in [n]$ such that $x - y = \frac{1}{n}e_i - \frac{1}{n}e_j$. We remark that $H_{k,n}$ has $\binom{n+k-1}{k-1}$ nodes and $\binom{n+k-2}{k-1}$ hyperedges. Geometrically, the hyperedges correspond to simplices that are translates of each other and share at most one node. Given a labeling ℓ , a hyperedge of $H_{k,n}$ is *monochromatic* if all of its nodes have the same label. Mirzakhani and Vondrák showed that a Sperner admissible labeling of $H_{k,n}$ does not have too many monochromatic hyperedges, which implies that the number of non-monochromatic hyperedges is large.

Theorem 5 (Proposition 2.1 in [10]) *Let ℓ be a Sperner admissible labeling of $\Delta_{k,n}$. Then, the number of monochromatic hyperedges in $H_{k,n}$ is at most $\binom{n+k-3}{k-1}$, and therefore the number of non-monochromatic hyperedges is at least $\binom{n+k-3}{k-2}$.*

Our main result of this section is an extension of the above result to the case when there are some inadmissible labels on a single face of $\Delta_{k,n}$. We show that a labeling in which all inadmissible labels are on a single face still has a large number of non-monochromatic hyperedges. We will denote the nodes $x \in \Delta_{k,n}$ with $\text{Support}(x) \subseteq [k-1]$ as $\text{Face}(s_1, \dots, s_{k-1})$.

Theorem 6 *Let ℓ be a labeling of $\Delta_{k,n}$ such that all nodes with an inadmissible label have label k and the number of such nodes is $\beta \frac{(n+k-2)!}{n!}$ for some $\beta \in [0, 1/(k-2)!]$. Then, the number of non-monochromatic hyperedges of $H_{k,n}$ is at least*

$$\left(\frac{1}{(k-2)!} - \beta \right) \frac{(n+k-3)!}{(n-1)!}.$$

Proof Let $Z := \{x \in \text{Face}(s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}) : \ell(x) = k\}$, i.e. Z is the set of nodes having an inadmissible label. Let us call a hyperedge of $H_{k,n}$ *inadmissible* if the label of one of its nodes is inadmissible.

Claim 3 *There are at most $\beta \frac{(n+k-3)!}{(n-1)!}$ inadmissible monochromatic hyperedges.*

Proof Let \mathcal{E}' be the set of inadmissible monochromatic hyperedges. Each hyperedge $e \in \mathcal{E}'$ has exactly $k-1$ nodes from $\text{Face}(s_1, \dots, s_{k-1})$ and they all have the same label as e is monochromatic. Thus, each $e \in \mathcal{E}'$ contains $k-1$ nodes from Z . We define an injective map $\varphi : \mathcal{E}' \rightarrow Z$ by letting $\varphi(e)$ to be the node $x \in e \cap Z$ with the largest 1st coordinate. Notice that if $x = \varphi(e)$, then the other nodes of e are $x - (1/n)e_1 + (1/n)e_i$ ($i = 2, \dots, k$), and all but the last one are in Z . In particular, x_1 is positive.

Let $Z' \subseteq Z$ be the image of φ . For $x \in Z$ and $i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$, let

$$Z_x^i := \{y \in Z : y_j = x_j \forall j \in [k-1] \setminus \{1, i\}\}.$$

Since $y_k = 0$ and $\|y\|_1 = 1$ for every $y \in Z$, the nodes of Z_x^i are on a line containing x . It also follows that $Z_x^i \cap Z_x^j = \{x\}$ if $i \neq j$. Let

$$Z'' := \{x \in Z : \exists i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\} \text{ such that } x_i \geq y_i \forall y \in Z_x^i\}.$$

We observe that if $x \in Z'$, then for each $i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$, the node $y = x - (1/n)e_1 + (1/n)e_i$ is in Z and hence, $y \in Z_x^i$ with $y_i > x_i$. In particular, this implies that $Z' \cap Z'' = \emptyset$. We now compute an upper bound on the size of $Z \setminus Z''$, which gives an upper bound on the size of Z' and hence also on the size of \mathcal{E}' , as $|Z'| = |\mathcal{E}'|$. For each node $x \in Z \setminus Z''$ and for every $i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$, let z_x^i be the node in $Z'' \cap Z_x^i$ with the largest i th coordinate. Clearly $z_x^i \neq z_x^j$ if $i \neq j$, because $Z_x^i \cap Z_x^j = \{x\}$.

For given $y \in Z''$ and $i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$, we want to bound the size of $S := \{x \in Z \setminus Z'' : z_x^i = y\}$. Consider $a \in S$. Then, $z_a^i = y$ implies that the node in $Z'' \cap Z_a^i$ with the largest i th coordinate is y . That is, $y_j = a_j$ for all $j \in [k-1] \setminus \{1, i\}$ and moreover $y_i \geq a_i$. If $y_i = a_i$, then $y = a$, so a is in Z'' which contradicts $a \in S$. Thus, $y_i > a_i$ for any $a \in S$, i.e. the nodes in S are on the line Z_y^i and their i th coordinate is strictly smaller than y_i . This implies that $|S| \leq ny_i$. Consequently, the size of the set $\{x \in Z \setminus Z'' : y = z_x^i \text{ for some } i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}\}$ is at most n , since $\sum_{i=2}^{k-2} y_i \leq \|y\|_1 = 1$.

For each $x \in Z \setminus Z''$, we defined $k-2$ distinct nodes $z_x^2, \dots, z_x^{k-1} \in Z''$. Moreover, for each $y \in Z''$, we have at most n distinct nodes x in $Z \setminus Z''$ for which there exists $i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$ such that $y = z_x^i$. Hence, $(k-2)|Z \setminus Z''| \leq n|Z''|$, and therefore $|Z \setminus Z''| \leq (n/(n+k-2))|Z|$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}'| = |Z'| &\leq |Z \setminus Z''| \leq \frac{n}{n+k-2}|Z| \\ &\leq \beta \frac{(n+k-2)!}{n!} \frac{n}{n+k-2} = \beta \frac{(n+k-3)!}{(n-1)!}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

Let ℓ' be a Sperner admissible labeling obtained from ℓ by changing the label of each node in Z to an arbitrary admissible label. By Theorem 5, the number of monochromatic hyperedges for ℓ' is at most $\binom{n+k-3}{k-1}$. By combining this with the claim, we get that the number of monochromatic hyperedges for ℓ is at most $\binom{n+k-3}{k-1} + \beta \frac{(n+k-3)!}{(n-1)!}$. Since $H_{k,n}$ has $\binom{n+k-2}{k-1}$ hyperedges, the number of non-monochromatic hyperedges is at least

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n+k-2}{k-1} - \binom{n+k-3}{k-1} - \beta \frac{(n+k-3)!}{(n-1)!} &= \binom{n+k-3}{k-2} - \beta \frac{(n+k-3)!}{(n-1)!} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{(k-2)!} - \beta \right) \frac{(n+k-3)!}{(n-1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We note that Theorem 6 is tight for the extreme cases where $\beta = 0$ and $\beta = 1/(k-2)!$.

We now derive Lemma 1 from Theorem 6. We restate Lemma 1 for convenience.

Lemma 1 *Let P be a non-opposite cut on $\Delta_{4,n}$ with $\alpha(n+1)(n+2)$ nodes from $\text{Face}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$ labeled as 1, 2, or 3 for some $\alpha \in [0, 1/2]$. Then, $|\delta(P)| \geq 3\alpha n(n+1)$.*

Proof Let ℓ be the labeling of $\Delta_{4,n}$ obtained from P by setting $\ell(x) = 4$ if $P(x) = 5$, and $\ell(x) = P(x)$ otherwise. This is a labeling with $(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha)(n+1)(n+2)$ nodes having an inadmissible label, all with label 4. We apply Theorem 6 with parameters $k = 4$, $\beta = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha$, and the labeling ℓ . By the theorem, the number of non-monochromatic hyperedges in $H_{4,n} = (\Delta_{4,n}, \mathcal{E})$ under labeling ℓ is at least $\alpha n(n+1)$.

We observe that for each hyperedge $e = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\} \in \mathcal{E}$, the subgraph $G[e]$ induced by the nodes in e contains 6 edges. Also, for any two hyperedges e_1 and e_2 , the edges in the induced subgraphs $G[e_1]$ and $G[e_2]$ are disjoint as e_1 and e_2 can share at most one node. Moreover, for each non-monochromatic hyperedge $e \in \mathcal{E}$, at least 3 edges of $G[e]$ are in $\delta(P)$. Thus, the number of edges of G that are in $\delta(P)$ is at least $3\alpha n(n+1)$. □

6 Properties of the 3-way cut instance in [1]


In this section, we prove certain properties of the gap instance in [1]. We will use these properties to prove Lemma 2—due to space limitations, we present the proof of Lemma 2 in the online supplement. Next, we derive Corollary 2 from Lemma 2.

6.1 The gap instance in [1]

In this section, we summarize the relevant background about the gap instance against non-opposite 3-way cuts designed by Angelidakis et al. [1]. For our purposes, we scale the costs of their instance by a factor of 6/5 as it will be convenient to work with them. We describe this scaled instance now.

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\Delta_{3,n}, E_{3,n})$ where $E_{3,n} := \{xy : x, y \in \Delta_{3,n}, \|x - y\|_1 = 2/n\}$. Their instance is obtained by dividing $\Delta_{3,n}$ into a middle hexagon $H := \{x \in \Delta_{3,n} : x_i \leq 2/3 \forall i \in [3]\}$ and three corner triangles T_1, T_2, T_3 , where $T_i := \{x \in \Delta_{3,n} : x_i > 2/3\}$. To define the edge costs, we let $\rho := 3/(5n)$. The cost of the edges in $\mathcal{G}[H]$ is ρ . The cost of the non-boundary edges in $\mathcal{G}[T_i]$ that are not parallel to the opposite side of e^i is also ρ . The cost of the non-boundary edges in $\mathcal{G}[T_i]$ that are parallel to the opposite side of e_i are zero. The cost of the boundary edges in L_{ij} are as follows: the edge closest to e^i has cost $(n/3)\rho$, the second closest edge to e^i has cost $(n/3 - 1)\rho$, and

Fig. 3 The instance in [1] for $n = 9$



so on. See Fig. 3 for an example. We will denote the resulting graph with edge-costs as J . The cost of a subset F of edges on the instance J is $\text{Cost}_J(F) := \sum_{e \in F} w(e)$.

For a subset of edges $F \subset E_{3,n}$, let $\mathcal{G} - F$ denote the graph $(\Delta_{3,n}, E_{3,n} \setminus F)$. We need the following two results about their instance. The first result shows that the cost of non-opposite cuts on their instance is at least 1.2.

Lemma 3 [1] *For every non-opposite cut $Q : \Delta_{3,n} \rightarrow [4]$, the cost of Q on instance J is at least $1.2 - \frac{1}{n}$.*

The second result shows that if we remove a set of edges to ensure that a terminal s_i cannot reach any node in the opposite side V_{jk} , then the cost of such a subset of edges is at least 0.4.

Lemma 4 *For $\{i, j, k\} = [3]$ and for every subset F of edges in $E_{3,n}$ such that s_i cannot reach V_{jk} in $\mathcal{G} - F$, the cost of F on instance J is at least $0.4 - (\frac{1}{n})/3$.*

Although Lemma 4 is not explicitly stated in [1], its proof appears under Case 1 in the Proof of Lemma 3 of [1]. The factor 0.4 that we have here is because we scaled their costs by a factor of 6/5.

We next define non-oppositeness as a property of the cut-set as it will be convenient to work with this property for cut-sets rather than for cuts.

Definition 1 A set $F \subseteq E_{3,n}$ of edges is a non-opposite cut-set if there is no path from s_1 to V_{23} in $\mathcal{G} - F$, no path from s_2 to V_{13} in $\mathcal{G} - F$, and no path from s_3 to V_{12} in $\mathcal{G} - F$.

We summarize the connection between non-opposite cut-sets and non-opposite cuts.

Proposition 2

(i) *If $Q : \Delta_{3,n} \rightarrow [4]$ is a non-opposite cut, then $\delta(Q)$ is a non-opposite cut-set.*

- (ii) For every non-opposite cut-set $F \subseteq E_{3,n}$, the cost of F on instance J is at least $1.2 - \frac{1}{n}$.

Proof (i) Suppose not. Without loss of generality, suppose there exists a path from s_1 to V_{23} in $\mathcal{G} - \delta(Q)$. Then, by the definition of $\delta(Q)$, all nodes of the path have the same label, so there exists a node $u \in V_{23}$ that is labeled as 1, contradicting the fact that Q is a non-opposite cut.

- (ii) Consider a labeling $L : \Delta_{3,n} \rightarrow [4]$ where $L = i$ if the node v is reachable from terminal s_i in $\mathcal{G} - F$ and $L(v) = 4$ if the node v is reachable from none of the three terminals in $\mathcal{G} - F$. Since F is a non-opposite cut-set, it follows that ℓ is a non-opposite cut. Moreover, $\delta(L) \subseteq F$. Therefore, the claim follows by Lemma 3. \square

We defer the proof of Lemma 2 to the online supplement of this article.

6.2 Proof of Corollary 2

We restate and prove Corollary 2 now.

Corollary 2 Let $Q : \Delta_{3,n} \rightarrow [4]$ be a non-opposite cut and $n \geq 10$. For each $i \in [3]$, let

$$A_i := \begin{cases} \{v \in \text{Closure}(R_i) : Q(v) = 4\} & \text{if } \delta(Q) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, the cost of Q on J is at least $1.2 + 0.4 \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2 - \frac{5}{2n}$.

Proof Let $A := A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3$. We will show that $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(A))$ is at least $0.4 \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2 - 3/(2n)$ and that there exists a non-opposite cut Q' satisfying $\delta(Q') = \delta(Q) \setminus \delta(A)$. By Lemma 3, $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q')) \geq 1.2 - 1/n$ and the corollary follows.

We first show a lower bound on the total cost of the edges in $\delta(A)$.


Claim 4 $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(A)) \geq 0.4 \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2 - \frac{3}{2n}$.

Proof We will consider a specific non-opposite non-fragmenting cut to give a lower bound on the cost of $\delta(A)$ on J . Let Q_0 be defined as follows (see Fig. 4):

$$Q_0(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_1 \geq 1/2, \\ 2 & \text{if } x_1 < 1/2, x_2 \geq 1/2, \\ 3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, each edge in $\delta(Q_0)$ has a cost of $1.2/(2n)$ and the number of edges in $\delta(Q_0)$ is $2n + 1$. Hence, $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q_0)) \leq 1.2 + 1/(2n)$. Moreover, Q_0 is a non-opposite non-fragmenting cut. We now combine $\delta(A)$ and $\delta(Q_0)$ into a single cut by defining

$$Q'_0(x) := \begin{cases} Q_0(x) & \text{if } x \notin A, \\ 4 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Fig. 4 The labeling Q_0 

We observe that Q'_0 is a non-opposite cut as it is obtained from a non-opposite cut by relabeling a subset of nodes that lie in the strict interior of $\text{Closure}(R_i)$ as 4. As $A_i \neq \emptyset$ implies $\delta(A_i) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset$, we have that $\delta(Q'_0)$ intersects each side of the triangle the same number of times as $\delta(Q_0)$. That is, Q'_0 is also a non-fragmenting cut. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 2 for Q'_0 . The number of nodes labeled by Q'_0 as 4 is exactly $|A|$. Hence,

$$\text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q'_0)) \geq 1.2 - \frac{1}{n} + 0.4 \frac{|A|}{n^2}.$$

By $Q_0(v) = i$ for each $v \in \text{Closure}(R_i)$ and by $\delta(A_i) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset$ for $i \in [3]$, we have $\delta(Q'_0) = \delta(A) \cup \delta(Q_0)$, implying

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cost}_J(\delta(A)) + \text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q_0)) &\geq \text{Cost}_J(\delta(A) \cup \delta(Q_0)) \\ &= \text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q'_0)) \geq 1.2 - \frac{1}{n} + 0.4 \frac{|A|}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We recall that $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q_0)) \leq 1.2 + 1/(2n)$. Hence, $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(A)) \geq 0.4|A|/n^2 - 3/(2n)$. \square

Let $K \subseteq [3]$ denote the set of indices i for which $\delta(Q) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset$ and let Q' be a labeling obtained from Q by setting

$$Q'(v) := \begin{cases} i & \text{if } v \in \text{Closure}(R_i) \text{ for some } i \in K, \\ Q(v) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Claim 5 Q' is a non-opposite cut with

$$\text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q')) \leq \text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q)) - \text{Cost}_J(\delta(A)).$$

Proof The cut Q is non-opposite and $Q'(v) \in \text{Support}(v)$ for each relabeled node v , hence Q' is also a non-opposite cut. For any index $i \in K$, $\delta(Q) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset$ implies $Q(v) = i$ for $v \in R_i$. Thus, we have $\delta(Q') \subseteq \delta(Q) \setminus \delta(A)$ and the claim follows. \square

As Q' is a non-opposite cut, Lemma 3 implies $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q')) \geq 1.2 - 1/n$. By Claim 4, $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(A)) \geq 0.4 \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2 - 3/(2n)$. These together with Claim 5 imply that $\text{Cost}_J(\delta(Q)) \geq 1.2 - 5/(2n) + 0.4 \sum_{i=1}^3 |A_i|/n^2$, finishing the proof of the corollary. \square

7 Limitations of our instances

In this section, we will show two results. In Sect. 7.1, we will show that instances I_1 , I_2 and I_4 are insufficient to obtain a gap better than 1.2. This result also motivates our choice of instance I_3 . In Sect. 7.2, we will show that instances I_1 , I_2 , I_3 and I_4 are insufficient to obtain a gap better than 1.20067, thus exhibiting a limitation of our choice of instance I_3 .

7.1 Insufficiency of instances I_1 , I_2 and I_4 to beat 1.2

In this section, we will show that convex combinations of instances I_1 , I_2 and I_4 are insufficient to obtain an instance which has gap larger than 1.2 against non-opposite cuts. For this, we will exhibit two non-opposite cuts P and P' such that at least one of them will have cost at most 1.2 in every convex combination of instances I_1 , I_2 and I_4 .

1. Consider the cut Q_0 in $\Delta_{3,n}$ defined in the proof of Claim 4. Extend it to a cut P in $\Delta_{4,n}$ as follows:

$$P(x) := \begin{cases} Q_0(x) & \text{if } x_4 = 0, \\ 4 & \text{if } x_4 > 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, P is a non-opposite cut with the cost of P on I_1 , I_2 and I_4 being $1.2 + O(1/n)$, 1 and $1.5 + O(1/n^2)$ respectively. Hence, the cost of P on the convex combination $\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2 + \lambda_4 I_4$ is at most $1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4 + O(1/n)$.

2. Consider the cut P' in $\Delta_{4,n}$ defined as follows:

$$P'(x) := \begin{cases} i & \text{if } x = e^i, \\ 5 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, P' is a non-opposite cut with the costs of P' on I_1 , I_2 and I_4 being 1.2, 2 and $O(1/n^2)$ respectively. Hence, the cost of P' on the convex combination $\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2 + \lambda_4 I_4$ is at most $1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + O(1/n^2)$.

Consequently, for every convex combination defined by λ_1 , λ_2 , λ_4 , there exists a non-opposite cut whose cost on the convex combination instance $\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2 + \lambda_4 I_4$ is at most

$$\min \{1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2\} + O(1/n).$$

The following claim shows that the above expression is at most $1.2 + O(1/n^2)$ for every convex combination.

Claim 6 For every $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_4 \geq 0$ with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_4 = 1$, we have

$$\min \{1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2\} \leq 1.2.$$

Proof For the sake of contradiction, suppose that the claim is false. Then, both expressions are greater than 1.2.

1. We have $1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4 > 1.2$ which implies that $\lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4 > 1.2(1 - \lambda_1) = 1.2\lambda_2 + 1.2\lambda_4$. Hence, $3\lambda_4 > 2\lambda_2$.
2. We have $1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 > 1.2$, which implies that $2\lambda_2 > 1.2(1 - \lambda_1) = 1.2\lambda_2 + 1.2\lambda_4$. Hence, $2\lambda_2 > 3\lambda_4$, a contradiction.

□

We emphasize that instance I_3 is constructed specifically to boost the cost against the non-opposite cut P' .

7.2 Limitation of instances I_1, I_2, I_3 , and I_4

In this section, we will show that convex combinations of instances I_1, I_2, I_3 , and I_4 are insufficient to obtain an instance which has gap larger than 1.20067 against non-opposite cuts.

Proof of Theorem 4 To show this, we exhibit three non-opposite cuts P_1, P_2 and P_3 such that at least one of them will have cost at most $1.20067 + O(1/n)$ in every convex combination of instances I_1, I_2, I_3 , and I_4 .

1. P_1 is same as the non-opposite cut P defined in Sect. 7.1. The cost of P_1 on instances I_1, I_2, I_3 , and I_4 are $1.2 + O(1/n)$, 1, 0, and $1.5 + O(1/n^2)$ respectively. Consequently, the cost of P_1 on the convex combination $\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2 + \lambda_3 I_3 + \lambda_4 I_4$ is at most $1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4 + O(1/n)$.
2. P_2 is same as the non-opposite cut P' defined in Sect. 7.1. The cost of P_2 on I_1, I_2, I_3 , and I_4 are 1.2, 2, $6/9c$, and $O(1/n^2)$ respectively. Consequently, the cost of P_2 on the convex combination $\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2 + \lambda_3 I_3 + \lambda_4 I_4$ is at most $1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3 + O(1/n^2)$.
3. Let P_3 be defined as follows:

$$P_3(x) := \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } x = e^4, \\ i & \text{if } x_4 = 0, x_i \geq 1 - c, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, \\ 5 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, P_3 is a non-opposite cut with the cost of P_3 on I_2, I_3 , and I_4 being 2, 0, and $9c^2/2 + O(1/n)$ respectively. Moreover, if $c < 1/9$, then cost of P_3 on I_1 is 1.2. Hence, if $c < 1/9$, then the cost of P_3 on the convex combination $\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2 + \lambda_3 I_3 + \lambda_4 I_4$ is at most $1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + (9c^2/2)\lambda_4 + O(1/n)$.

Consequently, there exists a non-opposite cut on instance $\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2 + \lambda_3 I_3 + \lambda_4 I_4$ whose cost is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \left\{ 1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3 \right\} + O(1/n) \text{ if } c \geq 1/9 \text{ and} \\ & \min \left\{ 1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{9c^2}{2}\lambda_4 \right\} \\ & + O(1/n) \text{ if } c < 1/9. \end{aligned}$$

The following claim shows that the above terms are at most $1.20067 + O(1/n)$ for every convex combination, thus completing the proof of the theorem. \square

Claim 7 For every $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4 \geq 0$ with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 1$, we have

1. $\min \left\{ 1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3 \right\} \leq 1.2$ if $c \geq 1/9$, and
2. $\min \left\{ 1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{9c^2}{2}\lambda_4 \right\} \leq 1.20067$ if $c < 1/9$.

Proof Minimum of a set of values is at most the convex combination of the values.

1. Suppose $c \geq 1/9$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \left\{ 1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3 \right\} \\ & \leq 0.8(1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4) + 0.2 \left(1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3 \right) \\ & = 1.2\lambda_1 + 1.2\lambda_2 + 1.2\lambda_4 + \frac{1.2}{9c}\lambda_3 \\ & \leq 1.2\lambda_1 + 1.2\lambda_2 + 1.2\lambda_4 + 1.2\lambda_3 \quad (\text{since } c \geq 1/9) \\ & = 1.2. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality above is because $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 1$.

2. Suppose $c < 1/9$. Let

$$\beta := \max \left\{ \frac{3 - 9c^2/2}{2.5 - 9c^2/2 + 27c^3/4} : 0 \leq c < \frac{1}{9} \right\}.$$

Then, it is straightforward to verify that $1.2 \leq \beta \leq 1.20067$. For $c < 1/9$, it follows that $\beta(1 - 3c/2) \geq 1$. Hence, the multipliers $(2 - \beta)$, $3c\beta/2$, $\beta - 3c\beta/2 - 1$ are non-negative and sum to one. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \left\{ 1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3, 1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{9c^2}{2}\lambda_4 \right\} \\ & \leq (2 - \beta)(1.2\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 1.5\lambda_4) + \left(\frac{3c\beta}{2} \right) \left(1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{6}{9c}\lambda_3 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\beta - \frac{3c\beta}{2} - 1 \right) \left(1.2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 + \frac{9c^2}{2}\lambda_4 \right) \\
& = 1.2\lambda_1 + \beta\lambda_2 + \beta\lambda_3 + \left(3 - \frac{9c^2}{2} - \beta \left(1.5 - \frac{9c^2}{2} + \frac{27c^3}{4} \right) \right) \lambda_4 \\
& \leq 1.2\lambda_1 + \beta\lambda_2 + \beta\lambda_3 + \beta\lambda_4 \tag{1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \leq \beta \\
& \leq 1.20067. \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (1) follows from the definition of β and inequality (2) follows from the fact that $1.2 \leq \beta$ and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 1$.

□

8 Conclusion

In this work, we improve the integrality gap of the CKR relaxation for multiway cut to 1.20016. This immediately implies that multiway cut does not admit a $(1.20016 - \epsilon)$ -approximation for any constant $\epsilon > 0$ assuming the unique games conjecture. Our main contribution is a 3-dimensional instance that has a gap of 1.20016 against non-opposite cuts. Our 3-dimensional instance is a convex combination of a uniform 3-dimensional instance and carefully constructed 2-dimensional instances. We are able to analyze the integrality gap of the convex combination by generalizing a result on Sperner admissible labelings due to Mirzakhani and Vondrák. Moreover, we illustrate the limitations of our ingredient instances in the convex combination by showing that there exist non-opposite cuts that achieve a factor of 1.20067 for every convex combination of our four instances.

We note that our generalized result on Sperner admissible labelings holds for arbitrary dimensions. We believe that this generalized result could be helpful in improving the integrality gap further. In particular, it would be interesting to find the best possible gap that can be achieved using 3-dimensional instances against non-opposite cuts. We note that Angeledakis, Makarychev, and Manurangsi's gap instance achieve the best possible gap for 2-dimensional instances against non-opposite cuts [1]. A natural approach towards constructing the best possible 3-dimensional gap instance against non-opposite cuts is to consider alternative 2-dimensional instances in the convex combination instead of the ones that we use in our construction.

Acknowledgements Kristóf Bérczi was supported by the János Bolyai Research Fellowship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and by the ÚNKP-18-4 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry of Human Capacities. Karthik is supported by NSF grants CCF-1907937 and CCF-1814613. Tamás was supported by the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office – NKFIH grant K120254. Vivek was supported by the NSF Grant CCF-1319376. Projects No. NKFI-128673 and No. ED_18-1-2019-0030 (Application-specific highly reliable IT solutions) have been implemented with the support provided from the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund of Hungary, financed under the FK_18 and the Thematic Excellence Programme funding schemes, respectively.

References

1. Angelidakis, H., Makarychev, Y., Manurangsi, P.: An improved integrality gap for the Călinescu–Karloff–Rabani relaxation for multiway cut. In: *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, IPCO, pp. 39–50 (2017)
2. Buchbinder, N., Naor, J., Schwartz, R.: Simplex partitioning via exponential clocks and the multiway cut problem. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC, pp. 535–544 (2013)
3. Buchbinder, N., Schwartz, R., Weizman, B.: Simplex transformations and the multiway cut problem. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA, pp. 2400–2410 (2017)
4. Călinescu, G., Karloff, H., Rabani, Y.: An improved approximation algorithm for multiway cut. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **60**(3), 564–574 (2000)
5. Cheung, K., Cunningham, W., Tang, L.: Optimal 3-terminal cuts and linear programming. *Math. Program.* **106**(1), 1–23 (2006)
6. Dahlhaus, E., Johnson, D., Papadimitriou, C., Seymour, P., Yannakakis, M.: The complexity of multi-terminal cuts. *SIAM J. Comput.* **23**(4), 864–894 (1994)
7. Freund, A., Karloff, H.: A lower bound of $8/(7+1/(k-1))$ on the integrality ratio of the Călinescu–Karloff–Rabani relaxation for multiway cut. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **75**(1), 43–50 (2000)
8. Karger, D., Klein, P., Stein, C., Thorup, M., Young, N.: Rounding algorithms for a geometric embedding of minimum multiway cut. *Math. Oper. Res.* **29**(3), 436–461 (2004)
9. Manokaran, R., Naor, J., Raghavendra, P., Schwartz, R.: SDP gaps and UGC hardness for multiway cut, 0-extension, and metric labeling. In: *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC, pp. 11–20 (2008)
10. Mirzakhani, M., Vondrák, J.: Sperner’s colorings, hypergraph labeling problems and fair division. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA, pp. 873–886 (2015)
11. Sharma, A., Vondrák, J.: Multiway cut, pairwise realizable distributions, and descending thresholds. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC, pp. 724–733 (2014)

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Affiliations

Kristóf Bérczi¹ · Karthekeyan Chandrasekaran² · Tamás Király¹ · Vivek Madan³

Kristóf Bérczi
berkri@cs.elte.hu

Tamás Király
tkiraly@cs.elte.hu

Vivek Madan
vmadan7@illinois.edu

¹ MTA-ELTE Egerváry Research Group, Department of Operations Research, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

² University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, USA

³ Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA