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## Oblivious routing_problem

(1) Graph instance

(3) Adversarial


Ratio $\eta=\max _{G, D} \frac{\left\|t_{\text {obl }}\right\|_{\infty}}{\left\|t_{\text {opt }}\right\|_{\infty}}$
$\left\|t_{\text {ob }}\right\|_{\infty}=2$

| Input family | Type | Ratio $\frac{\left\\|t_{\text {ob }}\right\\|_{p}}{\left\\|t_{\text {opt }}\right\\|_{p}}$ | Time |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hypercube | $\ell_{2}$ | $O(\log n)$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | Valiant'81 |
| any | $\ell_{\infty}$ | $O\left(\log ^{3} n\right)$ | $\exp (n)$ | Räcke'02 |
| any | $\ell_{\infty}$ | $O\left(\log ^{2} n \cdot \log \log n\right)$ | poly $(n)$ | Harrelson'03 |
| any | $\ell_{1 \leqslant p \leqslant \infty}$ | $O(\log n)$ | poly $(n)$ | Räcke'08'10 |
| expanders | $\ell_{\infty}$ | $O(\log n)$ | $\tilde{O}(n)$ | this work |
| $"$ | $\ell_{1 \leqslant p \leqslant \infty}$ | $"$ | $n / \mathrm{a}$ | Lawler'09 |

\% Ratio lower-bound $\Omega(\log n / \log \log n)$ for expanders Hajiaghayi'06
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$\%$ Computation
$\div$ Vertices $=$ processors, edges $=$ communication links
\% $O(\log n)$ rounds of communication (for expanders)
*- Asynchronous version as well
$\%$ Routing scheme representation
$\%$ Per-vertex routing tables of size $\operatorname{deg}(v) \cdot n$
\% Querying the routing scheme
\% At vertex $v$, given source $s$ and $\operatorname{sink} t$,
$\because$ Compute the next hop in $O(1)$ time using local table
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\& Prior schemes on $\ell_{\infty}$ congestion use tree decompositions
© We use electric flow
\& We use a geometric framework
$\%$ Ratio bound equals $\left\|L^{\dagger}\right\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \leqslant O\left(\frac{\log n}{\lambda}\right)$
© New rounding techniques
© Also see Lawler'09
$\ddot{\circ}$ Fault-tolerance $=$ statements about distribution of edge-flow in electric current
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$\because$ Fix any orientation $u \rightarrow v$ on G's edges
$\because$ A flow is a vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^{E}$
© Think $f_{(u, v)}$ flow travels from $u$ to $v$ if $u \rightarrow v$
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\& The divergence operator, div: $\mathbb{R}^{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V}$,
\% Maps an edge flow to vertex flow imbalance
\& Vertex flow imbalance $=$ incoming flow - outgoing flow

$$
(\operatorname{div} \cdot f)_{v}=\sum_{u: u \rightarrow v} f_{(u, v)}-\sum_{w: v \rightarrow w} f_{(w, v)}
$$

© Say that flow $f$ routes demand $d$ if $\operatorname{div} \cdot f=d$
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## Linear routing schemes

\% A linear routing scheme is a function $R$ such that
$\div R$ maps a demand to a flow that routes it, and
$\because R: \mathbb{R}^{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{E}$ is linear
$\%$ Algebraically,
$\because R: \mathbb{R}^{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{E}$ is a routing iff linear and div $R \cdot d=d$ for all $d$
© Examples
\% Routing along a spanning tree, or
$\%$ Electric routing


## Sets of demands and flows
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## Sets of demands and flows

$\because$ Write a set of demands $\left\{d_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{V}\right\}_{i=1, \ldots, k}$ as $\oplus_{i} d_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times k}$
\% Similarly, a set of flows $\left\{f_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{E}\right\}_{i=1, \ldots, k}$ as $\oplus_{i} f_{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{E \times k}$
$\because$ Say flows $\oplus_{i} f_{i}$ route demands $\oplus_{i} d_{i}$ if $\operatorname{div} \cdot\left(\oplus_{i} f_{i}\right)=\oplus_{i} d_{i}$
$\because$ Simply means:
$\because$ Flow $f_{i}$ routes demand $d_{i}$ for all $i$, by applying
"flow $f$ routes demand $d$ if $\operatorname{div} \cdot f=d$ "

* $x \oplus y$ means concatenate column vectors $x$ and $y$ into $\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & 1 \\ x & y \\ 1 & 1\end{array}\right)$.


## Congestion and norms

$\ddot{\circ}$ For a set of flows $F=\oplus_{i} f_{i}$ the congestion equals
$\%$ The traffic on the most loaded edge, or
$\because\left\|F^{*}\right\|_{1 \rightarrow 1}$ where $\|A\|_{1 \rightarrow 1}:=\sup _{x} \frac{\|A x\|_{1}}{\|x\|_{1}}$
$\%$ Notably, congestion is a norm (over $\mathbb{R}^{E \times \infty}$ )
$\%$ Abbreviate it as $\|F\|$
$\because$ Recall, for a scheme $R$, ratio is $\eta_{R}:=\max _{D} \frac{\|R(D)\|}{\|\operatorname{opt}(D)\|}$
$\%$ W.L.O.G. $\|\operatorname{opt}(D)\|=1$

Theorem For all such $D,\|R(D)\| \leqslant\left\|R\left(D_{\text {worst }}\right)\right\|$, where $D_{\text {worst }}$ demands one unit of flow between endpoints of every edge in $G$.
$\because$ So, $\eta_{R}=\left\|R\left(D_{\text {worst }}\right)\right\|$
$\therefore$ Oblivious routing, history, results $\%$ Geometry and routing
$\%$ Electric flow and electric routing $\%$ Congestion and $L_{1}$ spectral inequalities
\% Remarks and other results
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## Electric flow


\& How to map demand to electric flow?

$$
\nabla \cdot L^{\dagger}: \mathbb{R}^{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{E}
$$

\& where $\nabla: \mathbb{R}^{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{E}$ maps vertex potentials to edge potential differences
$\%$ and $L:=\operatorname{div} \cdot \nabla$

## Derivation of electric flow


© Ohm's law: edge flow $=$ potential difference * edge conductance
\% $\nabla$ maps vertex potentials to edge flow (Ohm's law)
$\because$ div maps edge flows to vertex flow imbalance (a.k.a. demand)
\% $\nabla \cdot L^{\dagger}$ maps demand to edge flows
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$\%$ Electric routing operator is $\nabla \cdot L^{\dagger}$
$\%$ Worst-case demands are $D_{\text {worst }}$ (by theorem)
One unit of demand between the endpoints of every edge in $G$.
$\ddot{\circ}$ So, competitive ratio equals $\left\|\nabla \cdot L^{\dagger} \cdot D_{\text {worst }}\right\|$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \approx\left\|L^{\dagger}\right\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \text { when } G \text { is bounded degree } \\
& =\max _{s \neq t}\left\|\nabla \cdot L^{\dagger}\left(\mathbb{1}_{s}-\mathbb{1}_{t}\right)\right\|_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Laplacian $\ell_{1} \rightarrow \ell_{1}$ norm bound

Theorem:
$\left\|\nabla L^{\dagger}\left(\mathbb{1}_{s}-\mathbb{1}_{t}\right)\right\|_{1} \leqslant O(\log n)$, if $\min _{S \subseteq v} \frac{\left|E\left(S, S^{\complement}\right)\right|}{\min |S|,\left|S^{\complement}\right|}=O(1)$.
$\dot{\circ}$ Think $\left(\mathbb{1}_{s}-\mathbb{1}_{t}\right) \stackrel{L^{\dagger}}{\longmapsto} x \stackrel{\nabla}{\longmapsto} f$, and ask $\|f\|_{1} \leqslant$ ?
$\%$ Local property: Sum of edge lengths on any cut equals 1


## Rounding argument


$k_{i}=$ number of edges cut by $c_{i}$
$n_{i}=$ number of vertices to left of $c_{i}$
Idea Make a few cuts, then upperbound total edge length by (scaled) edge length on cuts.
$\%$ Invariant $k_{i}=\Theta\left(n_{i}\right)$
$\because$ Cut spacing $\Delta_{i+1}=\left|c_{i}-c_{i+1}\right|=$ twice the avg. edge length on $c_{i}$
$\Rightarrow k_{i+1} \leqslant \theta k_{i}$ where $0<\theta<1$ const.
$\Rightarrow \Delta_{i+1} \geqslant \frac{\Delta_{i}}{\theta}$
$\%$ Using $\sum_{i} \Delta_{i} \leqslant \lambda^{-1}=O(1)$
\% Conclude at most $O(\log n)$ cuts
\% Oblivious routing, history, results
$\because$ Geometry and routing
\% Electric flow and electric routing
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© Computation

* Approximate $L^{\dagger}$ by low-degree power-series polynomial in $L$
$\%$ Multiplication by $L$ is one distributed step
\& Potential perturbation
© Computed potentials are not exact
\% Theorem Electric flow under perturbed potentials as good
$\%$ Laplacian symmetrization to get degree independence


## Thank you!
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