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## Challenge \#1: Use amortization \& randomization to minimize update time.

## Non-trivial Single-Source

 Distances?Light reading

Known: Incremental/decremental O(n)-time [Even-Shiloach'81] (Next!)

## Easier(?): $(1+\varepsilon)$-approx [Sankowski

 FOCS'04+COCOON'05], [HKN FOCS'14], [BrandNS'17]
## Also: Exact Global Mincut

Polylog (2-ع)-approximate max bipartite matching?

Known: $\mathbf{n}^{1 / k}$-update time (2-1/100 ${ }^{\mathbf{k}}$ approx [BhattacharyNH STOC'16]. Also see [GuptaPeng FOCS'13], [Bernstein-Stein ICALP'15, SODA'16 ]

Also: 3-edge connectivity, approx global min-cut, max-flow, sparsest cut, effective resistance, etc.

## Challenge \#2: Close oblivious-adaptivedeterministic gaps

| Problems | Oblivious adv. |  | Adaptive adv. | Deterministic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spanning Forest <br> (worst case) | polylog $n$ <br> [Kapron King Mountjoy SODA'13] |  | $n^{o(1)}$ <br> [NSW FOCS'17] | $\underset{\text { [EGIN FOCS'92] }}{\sqrt{n}}$ |
| Dec. Single-Source Shortest Path (decremental approximate amortized) | $n^{o(1)}$ <br> [HKN FOCS'14] |  | $\min \left(\frac{n^{2}}{m}, n^{\frac{3}{4}}\right)$ <br> [Bernstein, Chechik STOC'16, SODA'17, ICALP'17] | $\min \left(\frac{n^{2}}{m}, n^{\frac{3}{4}}\right)$ <br> [Bernstein, Chechik STOC'16, SODA'17, ICALP'17] |
| ( $\Delta+1$ )-coloring | polylog(n) <br> [BCHN SODA'18] | Light reading | n [Trivial] | n [Trivial] |
| Dec. Directed SingleSource Shortest Paths (decremental amortized) | $\begin{aligned} & n^{0.9} \\ & \text { [HKN STOC'14] } \end{aligned}$ |  | $n$ <br> [Even Shiloach JACM'81] | $n$ <br> [Even Shiloach JACM'81] |
| Maximal Matching | $O(1)$ <br> [Solomon FOCS'16 |  | $\sqrt{m}$ <br> [Neiman Solomon STOC'13] | $\sqrt{m}$ <br> [Neiman Solomon STOC'13] |
| Cut Sparsifier (worst-case) | polylog $n$ [ADKp Focs'16] |  | m [trivial] | $m$ |
| Spanner (amortized) | polylog $n$ <br> [BKS ESA06, SODA'08] |  | m [trivial] | $\underset{\text { [trivial] }}{m}$ |

## Randomized Dynamic Algorithms

- Las Vegas: Expected update time
- Monte Carlo: Wrong output with small probability


## Assumption: Oblivious adversary.



## De-randomization Applications

Dynamic algorithm as data structure:


Example [Garg-Konemann FOCs'98]:


## Dyn. Shortest Paths $\rightarrow$ Max Flow

Known: rand. $\mathrm{n}^{\circ(1)}$ update time for weighted (1+ $)$ approx decremental st-shortest path [Henzingerkn. FOCS'14]

Garg-Konemann [Focs'98], Madry [sToc'10]: de-randomized $\rightarrow \mathrm{n}^{1+o(1)}$-time ( $1+\varepsilon$ )-approx max flow

Randomized algorithm against adaptive adversary is also enough.


Other examples: Interior point method, Tree packing, Interval packing, Traveling Salesperson.

## Power of Randomization <br> Oblivious adversary takes a long time <br> to destroy random solution

## Example 1: $2 \Delta$-coloring ( $\Delta=$ max degree)

Goal: Maintain $2 \Delta$ -<br>vertex-coloring

Algorithm: Recolor node with a random color from $\geq \Delta$ available colors.
Cost: $\mathbf{O}(\Delta)$ to recolor a node, i.e. to find available colors.

Adaptive adversary can force us to recolor and pay $\mathbf{O}(\Delta)$

Oblivious adversary takes more time to force a node to recolor

## Example 2: maximal matching ${ }_{\text {[Baswana, }}$ Gupta, Sen Focs'11]

- Degree(v) time to rematch node v

- Adaptive adversary can force us to always pay degree(v)

Adaptive Adversary


- Solution: Match randomly. Non-oblivious adversary will take some time to delete matched edge.

Oblivious Adversary


## Challenge \#3 Worst-case update time

Weighted APSP (all-pairs shortest paths):
Maintain distances between every pair of nodes
Amortization may give more power!
Known amortized: $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{2}\right)$ [Demetrescul Focs'o0]
Known worst-case: $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{n}^{2+2 / 3}\right)$ [AbhrahamCK SODA'17]

## Conjecture: $\Theta\left(n^{2.5}\right)$

Some others:

| Problems | Amortized | Worst-Case |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2-edge connectivity | polylog(n) [HLT STOC'98] | $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{m}^{1 / 2}\right)$ [Frederickson FOCS'91] |
| Incremental SSSP | $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{n})$ [EvenS JACM'81] | $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{m})$ |

## Challenge \#4: New Conjectures or Techniques to Separate

worst-case from amortized bounds
2-edge connectivity: polylog(n) amortized [HLT STOC'98] but $\mathbf{O}\left(\mathbf{n}^{1 / 2}\right)$ worst
case [Frederickson FOCS'91]
deterministic from randomized algorithms
Dec. Single-Source Shortest Paths: $\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{0 ( 1 )}}$ randomized [HKN FOCS'14] but

incremental from decremental algorithms
Single-source Reachability: (amortized) polylog(n) incremental but $\mathbf{O}\left(\mathbf{n}^{1 / 2}\right)$ decremental [ChechikHILP STOC'16]

## Cash Opportunities*



## 1. 5,000 SEK (ca. 500 Euros): Prove or disprove the OMv conjecture

## 2. 3,000 SEK Prove or disprove the $\boldsymbol{v}$-hinted $\mathbf{M v}$ conjecture

Related to tight $\Theta\left(\mathbf{n}^{1.407}\right)$ bound for st-reach, etc
v-hinted OMv (informal)
Input: Phase 1: Boolean matrix M, Phase 2: Boolean matrix V, Phase 3: index $i$ Output the matrix-vector product $\boldsymbol{M} \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{i}}$, where $V_{i}$ is the i -th column of $\mathbf{V}$.
Naïve algorithm: Compute $M V$ in phase 2 or $M V_{i}$ in phase 3.
Conjecture: Nothing better than the naive algorithm.

