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## Preliminaries

Simple connected undirected graph $G=(V, E), n=|V|, m=|E|$, with a weight $w_{e} \geq 0$ for each edge $e \in E$

Elementary cycle $=$ connected subset of edges whose nodes have degree 2
Cycle $=$ subset of edges $C \subseteq E$ such that every node of $V$ is incident with an even number of edges in $C$


Cycles can be viewed as the (possibly empty) union of edge-disjoint elementary cycles

## Cycle composition

Cycles can be represented by edge-incidence vectors in $\{0,1\}^{|E|}$
Composition of two cycles:

- symmetric difference of the edge-sets $\left(C_{1} \cup C_{2}\right) \backslash\left(C_{1} \cap C_{2}\right)$
- modulo 2 addition of the incidence vectors



## Cycle bases

The collection of all cycles forms a vector space over $G F(2)$, called the cycle space $\mathcal{C}$

A cycle basis $B=\left\{b_{1}, \ldots, b_{\nu}\right\}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ is of dimension $\nu=m-n+1$


## The problem

## Min CB:

Given a connected graph $G=(V, E)$ with a weight $w_{e} \geq 0$ for each $e \in E$, find a Minimum Cycle Basis $B=\left\{b_{1}, \ldots, b_{\nu}\right\}$, i.e., $B$ with minimum $w(B)=\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \sum_{e \in b_{i}} w_{e}$.
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## Applications:

- test of electrical circuits
- structural engineering
- frequency analysis of computer programs
" planning complex syntheses in organic chemistry
" periodic event scheduling,...


## Previous work

- Early methods (Stepanec 64, Zykov 69, Hubicka and Syslo 76) are not polynomial
- First polynomial algorithm by Horton (87) is $O\left(m^{3} n\right)$
- Improved $O\left(m^{\omega} n\right)$ version, where $\omega<2.376$ is the exponent of fast matrix multiplication (Golynski and Horton 02)
- Different $O\left(m^{3}+m n^{2} \log n\right)$ algorithm (de Pina 95)
- Improved $O\left(m^{2} n+m n^{2} \log n\right)$ variant of de Pina's algorithm using fast matrix multiplication (Kavitha, Mehlhorn et al. 04)


## Previous work

- $O\left(m^{2} n^{2}\right)$ hybrid algorithm (Mehlhorn and Michail 06)
- $O\left(m^{2} n\right)$ algorithm based on minimum feedback vertex set, can be improved to $O\left(m^{2} n / \log n+m n^{2}\right)$ using a bit packing trick (Mehlhorn and Michail 07)


## Related problem

Let $T$ be an arbitrary spanning tree of $G$, the $\nu$ cycles obtained by adding $e \in E \backslash T$ form a fundamental cycle basis (FCB) of $G$


Not all cycle bases are fundamental
Min FCB is NP-hard (Deo et al. 82), in fact APX-hard but approximable within $O\left(\log ^{2} n \log \log n\right)$ (Galbiati, A. and Rizzi 07)

Edge-swapping algorithm (A., Liberti et al. 04/09)

## Horton algorithm

Assumption: shortest paths are unique (lexicographic order)

Proposition: the collection of cycles

$$
\mathcal{H}=\left\{P_{u, v_{1}} \cdot e \cdot P_{v_{2}, u} \mid u \in V, e=\left[v_{1}, v_{2}\right] \in E\right\}
$$

contains a minimum cycle basis.
(a)

(b)



$$
|\mathcal{H}| \leq m n
$$

## Horton algorithm

Since the set of all cycles forms a matroid, a greedy procedure yields a minimum CB

Need to test linear independence because not all cycles in $\mathcal{H}$ are in a minimum CB


## Horton algorithm

1) For each node $u$, determine shortest path tree

$$
O(n m \log n) \text { Dijkstra with heap }
$$

2) Construct the candidate cycles in $\mathcal{H}$ and order them by non-decreasing weight $(|\mathcal{H}| \leq \nu n \leq m n)$

$$
O\left(m n^{2}\right) \text { construction and } O(m n \log n) \text { ordering }
$$

3) Find a minimum cycle basis by selecting the $\nu$ lightest linearly independent candidate cycles
$O\left(m^{3} n\right)$ see below

Overall complexity: $O\left(m^{3} n\right)$

## Horton algorithm

## Binary Gaussian elimination:

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

each row can be processed in $O(m r)$, where $r$ is the number of rows above since $r \leq \nu$ and $|\mathcal{H}| \leq n \nu$, we have $O\left(m \nu^{2} n\right)=O\left(m^{3} n\right)$

## Improved de Pina algorithm

Idea: determine cycles of min CB sequentially, considering at each step a basis orthogonal to the lin. subspace generated by cycles computed so far.

Let $T$ be any spanning tree of $G$, and $e_{1}, \ldots, e_{\nu}$ the edges in $E \backslash T$ in some arbitrary order.

Any cycle of $G$ can be viewed as a restricted incidence vector in $\{0,1\}^{\nu}$ (lin. indep. of the restricted and full vectors is equivalent).

(b)


(c)
)

## $[1,4$ $[2,3$ <br> $[2,3]$ $[2,4]$

$[2,4]$
$[5,6]$


## Improved de Pina algorithm

Let $\left\{S_{1}, \ldots, S_{\nu}\right\}$ be the canonical basis for $\mathrm{i}=1$ to $\nu$ do

Find $C_{i}$ as the shortest cycle in $G$ s.t. $\left\langle C_{i}, S_{i}\right\rangle=1$
for $\mathrm{j}=\mathrm{i}+1$ to $\nu$ do
if $\left\langle S_{j}, C_{i}\right\rangle=1$ then $\left.S_{j}:=<S_{j}, S_{i}\right\rangle$

Since $S_{i}$ is orthogonal to $C_{1}, \ldots, C_{i-1}$ and $\left.<C_{i}, S_{i}\right\rangle=1, C_{i}$ is lin. indep.
A shortest $C_{i}$ with $\left.<C_{i}, S_{i}\right\rangle=1$ can be found by shortest path computations in a two level graph

Update $S_{j}$ 's so that $\left\{S_{i+1}, \ldots, S_{\nu}\right\}$ is still a basis of the subspace orthogonal to $\left\{C_{1}, \ldots, C_{i}\right\}$.
$O\left(m^{3}+m n^{2} \log n\right)$ can be reduced to $O\left(m^{2} n+m n^{2} \log n\right)$ with fast matrix multiplication (Kavitha, Mehlhorn et al. 04)

## FVS-based algorithm

Mehlhorn and Michail 07
Consider only Horton candidate cycles whose node $u$ belongs to a close-to-minimum feedback vertex set (FVS) - NP-hard but 2-approximable
$O\left(m^{2} n+m n^{2}\right)$ algorithm with a "simple" way to extract a minimum CB from the above set of candidate cycles
$O\left(m^{2} n / \log (n)+m n^{2}\right)$ variant by using a bit-packing trick

## New hybrid algorithm

Main ideas:

1) Substantially reduce the number of candidate cycles (trim $\mathcal{H}$ )
the candidate cycles in $\mathcal{H}^{\prime} \subseteq H$ are "sparse"
2) Devise an adaptive variant of the linear independence test à la de Pina that iteratively builds the spanning tree $T$.

Algorithm: order the candidate cycles in $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ by non-decreasing weight, and select the lightest $\nu$ linear independent ones

## Reduced candidate cycle set

Besides discarding duplicates


Only keep in $\mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ the isometric cycles $C \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e., which have for each node $u$ an edge $e=\left[v_{1}, v_{2}\right]$ in $C$ s.t. $C=P_{u, v_{1}} \cdot e \cdot P_{v_{2}, u}$


## Reduced candidate cycle set

Isometric cycles can be found in $O(m n \log n)$ by using binary search

Although we still have $\left|\mathcal{H}^{\prime}\right|=O(m n)$, the incidence vectors of these candidate cycles are sparse!

Property (sparsity): $\sum_{C_{i} \in \mathcal{H}^{\prime}}\left|C_{i}\right| \leq m n$, where $\left|C_{i}\right|$ denotes the number of edges in $C_{i}$.

Obvious because each $C_{i} \in \mathcal{H}^{\prime}$ represents $\left|C_{i}\right|$ cycles in $\mathcal{H}$ and $|\mathcal{H}| \leq m n$.
Example: $K_{n}$

## Reduced candidate cycle set

We can also discard any $C$ that admits a wheel decomposition, that is s.t. $C=C_{1}+\ldots+C_{k}$ w.r.t. some root $r$ and with $\left|C_{j}\right|<|C|$ for all $j=1, \ldots, k$


NB: non-isometric is special case with $k=2$ and $r \in C$
Complexity: $O\left(m n^{2}\right)$

## New independence test à la de Pina

Idea: Build the spanning tree $T$ and order the co-tree edges $e_{1}, \ldots, e_{\nu}$ (and hence the witnesses $S_{i}$ ) adaptively so as to reduce the computational load.

We try to avoid updating the other witnesses...
Complexity: $O\left(m^{2} n\right)$ - the bottleneck

## Some computational results

## Instances:

* Hypercubes with $n=2^{d}$; random graphs with densities $0.3,0.5,0.9$ or sparse ( $m=2 n$ ) and random weights (Mehlhorn and Michail 06)
* Euclidean graphs with density $0.1-0.9$, weighted hypercubes, toroidal graphs

Intel Xeon(TM) with 2.80 GHz and 2GB RAM

## Some computational results

Cpu time for random graphs with density $=0.5$

| n | m | $\nu$ | Horton <br> avg - stddev | Hybrid Mehlhorn et al. <br> avg - stddev | New-isometric <br> avg - stddev |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | 612 | 563 | $0.01-0.00$ | $0.04-0.01$ | $0.00-0.00$ |
| 60 | 885 | 826 | $0.02-0.01$ | $0.08-0.01$ | $0.01-0.01$ |
| 70 | 1207 | 1138 | $0.03-0.01$ | $0.19-0.03$ | $0.01-0.01$ |
| 80 | 1580 | 1501 | $0.07-0.01$ | $0.34-0.03$ | $0.02-0.01$ |
| 90 | 2002 | 1913 | $0.10-0.01$ | $0.51-0.02$ | $0.02-0.01$ |
| 100 | 2475 | 2376 | $0.11-0.01$ | $0.72-0.03$ | $0.03-0.01$ |
| 125 | 3875 | 3751 | $0.33-0.01$ | $5.87-0.24$ | $0.05-0.01$ |

Efficient implementation of Horton algorithm performs better than the other algorithms in the literature with better worst-case complexity

## Some computational results

Number of candidate cycles and cpu time for Euclidean graphs with $\mathrm{n}=150$

| density | m | $\nu$ | Horton | New-isometric | New-no-wheels |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.1 | 1228 | 1079 | $21311-0.03$ | $3289-0.02$ | $1163-0.09$ |
| 0.2 | 2388 | 2239 | $54626-0.07$ | $9963-0.03$ | $2342-0.15$ |
| 0.3 | 3452 | 3303 | $106971-0.11$ | $21531-0.04$ | $3436-0.28$ |
| 0.4 | 4613 | 4464 | $155120-0.17$ | $43860-0.07$ | $4577-0.34$ |
| 0.5 | 5668 | 5519 | $200715-0.28$ | $76318-0.16$ | $5625-0.84$ |
| 0.6 | 6725 | 6576 | $262562-0.50$ | $122494-0.31$ | $6670-1.00$ |
| 0.7 | 7866 | 7717 | $334915-0.59$ | $190806-0.36$ | $7791-1.70$ |
| 0.8 | 8936 | 8787 | $398996-0.62$ | $276504-0.49$ | $8872-2.14$ |
| 0.9 | 10108 | 9959 | $472676-0.74$ | $397897-0.57$ | $10015-3.51$ |

## Some computational results

Cpu time for Euclidean graphs with $\mathrm{n}=1000$

| density | Horton | New-isometric |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 0.1 | 31.59 | 9.44 |
| 0.2 | 122.16 | 21.36 |
| 0.3 | 289.26 | 37.41 |
| 0.4 | 630.49 | 64.38 |
| 0.5 | 1321.30 | 105.48 |
| 0.6 | - | 152.73 |
| 0.7 | - | 221.61 |
| 0.8 | - | 331.72 |

## Concluding remarks

- A version of our new hybrid algorithm has a $O\left(m^{2} n / \log n\right)$ worst-case complexity
- In practice it performs at least as well and in general much better than other algorithms
- Since the adaptive linear independence test à la de Pina is very efficient, the version without wheel decomposition is faster
- Is there still margin for improvement? Can we do without independence test -even though it is unlikely to lead to an overall more efficient algorithm?

