Maximal Independent Set
What is a MIS?

An independent set (IS) of an undirected graph is a subset U of nodes such that no two nodes in U are adjacent. An IS is maximal if no node can be added to U without violating IS (called MIS). A maximum IS (called MaxIS) is one of maximum cardinality.

Known from „classic TCS“: applications?
Backbone, parallelism, etc.
Also building block to compute matchings and coloring!
Complexities?
MIS and MaxIS?
Nothing, IS, MIS, MaxIS?

IS but not MIS.
Nothing, IS, MIS, MaxIS?

Nothing.
Nothing, IS, MIS, MaxI$\Sigma$?
Nothing, IS, MIS, MaxIS?

MaxIS.
Complexities?

MaxIS is NP-hard!
So let's concentrate on MIS...

How much worse can MIS be than MaxIS?
MIS vs MaxIS

How much worse can MIS be than MaxIS?

minimal MIS? maxIS?
MIS vs MaxIS

How much worse can MIS be than Max-IS?

minimal MIS?  

Maximum IS?
How to compute a MIS in a distributed manner?!
Recall: Local Algorithm

Send...

... receive...

... compute.
Slow MIS

assume node IDs
Each node v:
1. If all neighbors with larger IDs have decided not to join MIS then:
   v decides to join MIS

Analysis?
Analysis

Time Complexity?

Not faster than sequential algorithm!
Worst-case example?
E.g., sorted line: \(O(n)\) time.

Local Computations?

Fast! 😊

Message Complexity?

For example in clique: \(O(n^2)\)
\((O(m)\) in general: each node needs to inform all neighbors when deciding.)
Independent sets and colorings are related: how?

Each color in a valid coloring constitutes an independent set (but not necessarily a MIS, and we must decide for which color to go beforehand, e.g., color 0!).

How to compute MIS from coloring?
Choose all nodes of first color. Then for any additional color, add in parallel as many nodes as possible! (Exploit additional independent sets from coloring! Example where independent sets are useful: do independent set in parallel 😊)

Why, and implications?
Coloring vs MIS

Valid coloring:
Coloring vs MIS

Independent set:
Coloring vs MIS

Add all possible blue:
Coloring vs MIS

Add all possible violet:
Coloring vs MIS

Add all possible green:
Coloring vs MIS

That's all: MIS!

Analysis of algorithm?
Analysis

Why does algorithm work?

Same color: all nodes independent, can add them in parallel without conflict (not adding two conflicting nodes concurrently).

Runtime?

**Lemma**

Given a coloring algorithm with runtime T that needs C colors, we can construct a MIS in time C+T.
What does it imply for MIS on trees?

We can color trees in $\log^* \text{ time}$ and with 3 colors, so:

**MIS on Trees**

There is a deterministic MIS on trees that runs in distributed time $O(\log^* n)$. 
Better MIS Algorithms

Any ideas?

**Takeaway**

If you can't find fast deterministic algorithms, try randomization!

Ideas for randomized algorithms?
Probability 101

All you will need in the analysis:

**Inclusion Exclusion Principle**

\[ |A \cup B \cup C| = |A| + |B| + |C| - |A \cap B| - |A \cap C| - |B \cap C| + |A \cap B \cap C| \]

Why?
Probability 101

All you will need in the analysis:

**Inclusion Exclusion Principle**

\[
| A \cup B \cup C | = | A | + | B | + | C | \\
- | A \cap B | - | A \cap C | - | B \cap C | \\
+ | A \cap B \cap C |
\]

Why?

- Counted pair overlaps twice
- But then need to add middle again!
- Can be generalized to n sets
Probability 101

Same for probability:

If disks describe event space:

\[ P[ \text{event} \in A \cup B \cup C] = P[A] + P[B] + P[C] - P[A \cap B] - P[A \cap C] - P[B \cap C] + P[A \cap B \cap C] \]
Upper and lower bounds

Upper bound: start to leave out from minus sign

\[
P[ \text{event } \in A \cup B \cup C ] \leq P[ A ] + P[ B ] + P[ C ]
\]

Lower bound: start to leave out from plus sign

\[
P[ \text{event } \in A \cup B \cup C ] \geq P[ A ] + P[ B ] + P[ C ]
- P[ A \cap B ] - P[ A \cap C ] - P[ B \cap C ]
\]
Fast MIS (1986)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases

In a phase:

1. each node $v$ marks itself with probability $1/(2d(v))$ where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of $v$
2. if no higher degree neighbor is marked, $v$ joins MIS; otherwise, $v$ unmarks itself again (break ties arbitrarily)
3. delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore

If $d(v)=0$, assume probability $1$
Fast MIS (1986)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases
In a phase:

1. each node v marks itself with probability $1/(2d(v))$ where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of v
2. if no higher degree neighbor is marked, v joins MIS; otherwise, v unmarks itself again (break ties arbitrarily)
3. delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore

Why is it correct? Why IS? Why MIS?

Note: the higher the degree the less likely to mark, but the more likely to join MIS once marked!
Probability of marking?

Fast MIS (1986)
Proceed in rounds consisting of phases
In a phase:
1. each node $v$ marks itself with probability $1/(2d(v))$
   where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of $v$
2. if no higher degree neighbor is marked, $v$ joins
   MIS; otherwise, $v$ unmarks itself again (break ties
   arbitrarily)
3. delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their
   neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore
MIS 1986

Probability of marking?

Fast MIS (1986)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases:
In a phase:
1. each node $v$ marks itself with probability $1/(2d(v))$
   where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of $v$
2. if no higher degree neighbor is marked, $v$ joins
   MIS; otherwise, $v$ unmarks itself again (break ties
   arbitrarily)
3. delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their
   neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore
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Fast MIS (1986)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases
In a phase:
1. each node $v$ marks itself with probability $1/(2d(v))$
   where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of $v$
2. if no higher degree neighbor is marked, $v$ joins
   MIS; otherwise, $v$ unmarks itself again (break ties
   arbitrarily)
3. delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their
   neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore

Marking... Who stays?
MIS 1986

And now?

**Fast MIS (1986)**

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases:

1. Each node $v$ marks itself with probability $1/(2d(v))$ where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of $v$.
2. If no higher degree neighbor is marked, $v$ joins MIS; otherwise, $v$ unmarks itself again (break ties arbitrarily).
3. Delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore.
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Delete neighborhoods...

Fast MIS (1986)
Proceed in rounds consisting of phases:
In a phase:
1. Each node $v$ marks itself with probability $1/(2d(v))$, where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of $v$.
2. If no higher degree neighbor is marked, $v$ joins MIS; otherwise, $v$ unmarks itself again (break ties arbitrarily).
3. Delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore.
Correctness

Fast MIS (1986)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases
In a phase:

1. each node $v$ marks itself with probability $1/2d(v)$
   where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of $v$
2. if no higher degree neighbor is marked, $v$ joins
   MIS; otherwise, $v$ unmarks itself again (break ties
   arbitrarily)
3. delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their
   neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore

IS: Step 1 and Step 2 ensure that
node only joins if neighbors do not!

MIS: At some time, nodes
will mark themselves in Step 1.
Fast MIS (1986)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases
In a phase:

1. each node $v$ marks itself with probability $1/2d(v)$
   where $d(v)$ denotes the current degree of $v$
2. if no higher degree neighbor is marked, $v$ joins MIS; otherwise, $v$ unmarks itself again (break ties arbitrarily)
3. delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore

Runtime: how fast will algorithm terminate?
Our Strategy!

**We want to show logarithmic runtime. So for example?**

- **Idea 1:** Each node is *removed with constant probability* (e.g., $\frac{1}{2}$) in each round $\Rightarrow$ half of the nodes vanish in each round.

- **Idea 2:** Each *edge is removed* with constant probability in each round!
  As $O(\log m) = O(\log n^2) = O(\log n)$

Unfortunately, this is not true... 😞 Alternative?
Our Strategy!

Achieving logarithmic runtime!

- Idea 3: A constant fraction of all nodes are removed in each step! E.g., a constant subset of nodes is „good“ and a constant fraction thereof is removed...

- Idea 4: Same for edges...

This works! 😊
Joining MIS

Node $v$ joins MIS in Step 2 with probability $p \geq ?$

Proof.

On what could it depend?

- Marked with probability that depends on degree, i.e., $1/2d(v)$. (So at most this...)

- In MIS subsequently if degree is largest... (This is likely then if degree is small!)

We will find that marked nodes are likely to join MIS!
Analysis

Joining MIS

Node v joins MIS in Step 2 with probability \( p \geq 1/(4d(v)) \).

Proof.

Let \( M \) be the set of marked nodes in Step 1.
Let \( H(v) \) be the set of neighbors of v with higher degree (or same degree and higher identifier).

\[
\begin{align*}
P[v \notin MIS | v \in M] & = P[\exists w \in H(v), w \in M | v \in M] \\
& = P[\exists w \in H(v), w \in M] \quad \text{// independent whether v is marked or not} \\
& \leq \sum_{w \in H(v)} P[w \in M] \quad \text{// do not only count exactly one but also multiple} \\
& = \sum_{w \in H(v)} 1/(2d(w)) \quad \text{// see Joining MIS algorithm} \\
& \leq \sum_{w \in H(v)} 1/(2d(v)) \quad \text{// v's degree is the lowest one} \\
& \leq d(v)/(2d(v)) = 1/2 \quad \text{// at most d(v) higher neighbors...}
\end{align*}
\]

So

\[
P[v \in MIS] = P[v \in MIS | v \in M] \cdot P[v \in M] \\
\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot 1/(2d(v))
\]

QED

Marked nodes are likely to be in MIS!
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Achieving Logarithmic Runtime

- Remember: if a constant fraction of all nodes are removed in each step, we get logarithmic runtime

- How to define „good“ nodes? Which nodes are removed most likely?

- Idea: A node with many low-degree neighbors is likely to be removed!
  - A node of low-degree is marked with high probability
  - A marked node is likely to join MIS (and then neighbors are removed too)
Analysis

**Good&Bad Nodes**

A node \(v\) is called *good* if

\[
\sum_{w \in N(v)} \frac{1}{2d(w)} \geq \frac{1}{6}.
\]

What does it mean?
A good node has neighbors of low degree. Likely to be removed when neighbor joins MIS!

**Good Nodes**

A good node \(v\) will be removed in Step 3 with probability

\[
p \geq \frac{1}{36}.
\]

Proof?
Proof („Good Nodes“).

\begin{align*}
\text{Good Nodes} & \quad \text{A good node } v \text{ will be removed in Step 3 with probability} \\
p & \geq 1/36.
\end{align*}

If \( v \) has a neighbor \( w \) with \( d(w) \leq 2 \)?

This case is easy! Our „Joining MIS Lemma“ implies that the probability that this node is removed is at least 1/8: neighbor \( w \) joins with probability 1/8.

So let’s focus on neighbors with degree at least 3: thus for any neighbor \( w \) of good node \( v \), we have \( 1/(2d(w)) \leq 1/6 \).
Proof („Good Nodes“).

**Goal:**

A good node \(v\) will be removed in Step 3 with probability 
\[ p \geq 1/36. \]

Why?

By taking all neighbors of the good node, we have at least \(1/6\) (Definition), and we can remove individual nodes with a granularity of at least \(1/6\) (degree at least 3).
Analysis (3)

Proof („Good Nodes“).

Let \( R \) be event that \( v \) is removed (e.g., if neighbor joins MIS).

\[
P[R] \geq P[\exists \ u \in S, \ u \in MIS] \quad \text{// lower bound: } v \text{ removed only if neighbor from special subset } S \text{ joins}
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{u \in S} P[u \in MIS] - \sum_{u,w \in S} P[u \in MIS \text{ and } w \in MIS] \quad \text{// why?}
\]

By truncating the inclusion-exclusion principle...: Probability that there is one is sum of probability for all individual minus probability that two enter, plus...

\[
P[R] \geq \sum_{u \in S} P[u \in MIS] - \sum_{u,w \in S} P[u \in M \text{ and } w \in M]
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{u \in S} P[u \in MIS] - \sum_{u \in S} \sum_{w \in S} P[u \in M] \cdot P[w \in M]
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{u \in S} \frac{1}{4d(u)} - \sum_{u \in S} \sum_{w \in S} \frac{1}{2d(u)} \cdot \frac{1}{2d(w)}
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{u \in S} \frac{1}{2d(u)} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{w \in S} \frac{1}{2d(w)} \right) \geq \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3} \right) = \frac{1}{36}.
\]

just derived!

QED

A good node \( v \) will be removed in Step 3 with probability \( p \geq 1/36 \).
We just proved:

A good node $v$ will be removed in Step 3 with probability

$$p \geq 1/36.$$ 

Cool, good nodes have constant probability! 😊

But what now?

What does it help?

Are many nodes good in a graph?

Example: in star graph, only single node is good... 😞

But: there are many "good edges"...

How to define good edges?

Idea: edge is removed if either of its endpoints are removed! So good if at least one endpoint is a good node! And there are many such edges...
Analysis

Good & Bad Edges

An edge \( e=(u,v) \) called \textit{bad} if both \( u \) and \( v \) are bad (not good). Else the edge is called \textit{good}.

A bad edge is incident to two nodes with neighbors of high degrees.

Good Edges

At least half of all edges are good, at any time.

Proof?

Fast MIS (1986)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases:

1. Each node \( v \) marks itself with probability \( 1/2 \cdot (\deg(v)) \), where \( \deg(v) \) denotes the current degree of \( v \).
2. If no higher degree neighbor is marked, \( v \) joins MIS; otherwise, \( v \) unmarks itself again (break ties arbitrarily).
3. Delete all nodes that joined the MIS plus their neighbors, as they cannot join the MIS anymore.

Stefan Schmid @ T-Labs Berlin, 2013/4
Analysis

Not many good nodes...

... but many good edges!
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Analysis

Idea: Construct an **auxiliary graph**! Direct each edge **towards higher degree node** (if both nodes have same degree, point it to one with higher ID).

![Diagram showing edge direction from a node with a sad face to a node with arrows pointing to it.]

---

**Helper Lemma**

A bad node \( v \) has out-degree at least twice its in-degree.

---

**So what?**

Sum of incoming edges = Sum of outgoing edges!
So if the number of edges into bad nodes can be at most half the number of all edges, at least half of all edges are directed into **good nodes**! And they are good! 😊
So at least half of all edges are good.
Analysis

Idea: Construct an auxiliary graph! Direct each edge towards higher degree node (if both nodes have same degree, point it to one with higher ID).

**Helper Lemma**

A bad node v has out-degree at least twice its indegree.

Proof („Helper Lemma“).

Assume the opposite: at least $d(v)/3$ neighbors (let’s call them $S \subseteq N(v)$) have degree at most $d(v)$ (otherwise v would point to them). But then

$$\sum_{w \in N(v)} \frac{1}{2d(w)} \geq \sum_{w \in S} \frac{1}{2d(w)} \geq \sum_{w \in S} \frac{1}{2d(v)} \geq \frac{d(v)}{3} \frac{1}{2d(v)} = \frac{1}{6}$$

Contradiction: v would be good!

QED
Fast MIS (1986)

Fast MIS terminates in expected time $O(\log n)$.

Proof („Fast MIS“)?

We know that a good node will be deleted with constant probability in Step 3 (but there may not be many). And with it, a good edge (by definition)!

Since at least half of all the edges are good (and thus have at least one good incident node which will be deleted with constant probability and so will the edge!), a constant fraction of edges will be deleted in each phase.

(Note that $O(\log m) = O(\log n)$.)

QED
Back to the future: Fast MIS from 2009...!

Even simpler algorithm!
Fast MIS (2009)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases!
In a phase:

1. each node chooses a random value $r(v) \in [0,1]$ and sends it to its neighbors.
2. If $r(v) < r(w)$ for all neighbors $w \in N(v)$, node $v$ enters the MIS and informs the neighbors
3. If $v$ or a neighbor of $v$ entered the MIS, $v$ terminates (and $v$ and edges are removed), otherwise $v$ enters next phase!
Fast MIS from 2009...
Fast MIS from 2009...

Choose random values!
Fast MIS from 2009...

Min in neighborhood => IS!
Fast MIS from 2009...

Remove neighborhoods...
Fast MIS from 2009...

Choose random values!
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Min in neighborhood => IS!
Fast MIS from 2009...

Remove neighborhoods...
Fast MIS from 2009...

Choose random values!
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Fast MIS from 2009...

lowest value => IS
Fast MIS from 2009...

... done: MIS!
Fast MIS (2009)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases!

In a phase:
1. each node chooses a random value $r(v) \in [0,1]$ and sends it to its neighbors.
2. If $r(v) < r(w)$ for all neighbors $w \in N(v)$, node $v$ enters the MIS and informs the neighbors.
3. If $v$ or a neighbor of $v$ entered the MIS, $v$ terminates (and $v$ and edges are removed), otherwise $v$ enters next phase!

Why is it correct? Why IS?

Step 2: if $v$ joins, neighbors do not
Step 3: if $v$ joins, neighbors will never join again
Fast MIS (2009)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases!
In a phase:

1. each node chooses a random value \( r(v) \in [0,1] \) and sends it to its neighbors.
2. If \( r(v) < r(w) \) for all neighbors \( w \in N(v) \), node \( v \) enters the MIS and informs the neighbors.
3. If \( v \) or a neighbor of \( v \) entered the MIS, \( v \) terminates (and \( v \) and edges are removed), otherwise \( v \) enters next phase!

Why MIS?

Node with smallest random value will always join the IS, so there is always progress.
Fast MIS (2009)

Proceed in rounds consisting of phases!
In a phase:

1. Each node chooses a random value $r(v) \in [0,1]$ and sends it to its neighbors.
2. If $r(v) < r(w)$ for all neighbors $w \in N(v)$, node $v$ enters the MIS and informs the neighbors.
3. If $v$ or a neighbor of $v$ entered the MIS, $v$ terminates (and $v$ and edges are removed), otherwise $v$ enters next phase!

Runtime?
Analysis: Recall „Linearity of Expectation“

Theorem 5.9 (Linearity of Expectation). Let $X_i, i = 1, \ldots, k$ denote random variables, then

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_i X_i \right] = \sum_i \mathbb{E} [X_i].
$$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove $\mathbb{E} [X + Y] = \mathbb{E} [X] + \mathbb{E} [Y]$ for two random variables $X$ and $Y$, because then the statement follows by induction. Since

$$
P [(X, Y) = (x, y)] = P [X = x] \cdot P [Y = y | X = x] = P [Y = y] \cdot P [X = x | Y = y]
$$

we get that

$$
\mathbb{E} [X + Y] = \sum_{(X, Y) = (x, y)} P [(X, Y) = (x, y)] \cdot (x + y)
$$

$$
= \sum_{X=x} \sum_{Y=y} P [X = x] \cdot P [Y = y | X = x] \cdot x
$$

$$
+ \sum_{Y=y} \sum_{X=x} P [Y = y] \cdot P [X = x | Y = y] \cdot y
$$

$$
= \sum_{X=x} P [X = x] \cdot x + \sum_{Y=y} P [Y = y] \cdot y
$$

$$
= \mathbb{E} [X] + \mathbb{E} [Y].
$$

We sum over all possible $y$ values for a given $x$, so $=1$
We want to show that also this algorithm has logarithmic runtime! How?

Idea: if per phase a constant fraction of nodes disappeared, it would hold! (Recall definition of logarithm...)

Again: this is not true unfortunately... 😞

Alternative proof? Similar to last time?

Show that any edge disappears with constant probability!

But also this does not work: edge does not have constant probability to be removed!

But maybe edges still vanish quickly...?

Let's estimate the number of disappearing edges per round again!
Probability of a node $v$ to enter MIS?

Probability = node $v$ has smallest ID in neighborhood, so at least $1/(d(v)+1)$...

... also $v$‘s neighbor’s edges will disappear with this probability, so more than $d(v)$ edges go away with this probability!

But let’s make sure we do not double count edges!

Idea: only count edges from a neighbor $w$ when $v$ is the smallest value even in $w$‘s neighborhood! It’s a subset only, but sufficient!
Edge Removal: Analysis (1)

**Edge Removal**

In expectation, we remove at least half of all the edges in any phase.

**Proof („Edge Removal“)?**

Consider the graph $G=(V,E)$, and assume $v$ joins MIS (i.e., $r(v)<r(w)$ for all neighbors $w$).

If in addition, it holds that $r(v)<r(x)$ for all neighbors $x$ of a neighbor $w$, we call this event $(v \Rightarrow w)$.

What is the probability of this event (that $v$ is minimum also for neighbors of the given neighbor)?

$$P [(v \Rightarrow w)] \geq \frac{1}{d(v)+d(w)},$$

since $d(v)+d(w)$ is the maximum possible number of nodes adjacent to $v$ and $w$.

If $v$ joins MIS, all edges $(w,x)$ will be removed; there are at least $d(w)$ many.
In expectation, we remove at least half of all the edges in any phase.

**Proof („Edge Removal“)?**

How many edges are removed?
Let $X_{(v\rightarrow w)}$ denote random variable for number of edges adjacent to $w$ removed due to event $(v\rightarrow w)$. If $(v\rightarrow w)$ occurs, $X_{(v\rightarrow w)}$ has value $d(w)$, otherwise 0.
Let $X$ denote the sum of all these random variables.
So:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{\{v,w\}\in E} \mathbb{E}[X_{(v\rightarrow w)}] + \mathbb{E}[X_{(w\rightarrow v)}]
$$

$$
= \sum_{\{v,w\}\in E} P[\text{Event } (v \rightarrow w)] \cdot d(w) + P[\text{Event } (w \rightarrow v)] \cdot d(v)
$$

$$
\geq \sum_{\{v,w\}\in E} \frac{d(w)}{d(v) + d(w)} + \frac{d(v)}{d(w) + d(v)}
$$

$$
= \sum_{\{v,w\}\in E} 1 = |E|.
$$

So all edges gone in one phase?! We still overcount!
Edge Removal: Analysis (3)

Edge Removal
In expectation, we remove at least half of all the edges in any phase.

Proof ("Edge Removal")?

We still overcount:
Edge \{v,w\} may be counted twice:
for event (u=>v) and event (x=>w).

However, it cannot be more than twice, as there is at most one event (*=>v) and at most one event (*=>w):

Event (u=>v) means r(u)<r(w) for all \(w \in N(v)\); another (u' => v) would imply that r(u') > r(u) \(\in N(v)\).

So at least half of all edges vanish!

QED
2009 MIS: Analysis

**MIS of 2009**

Expected running time is $O(\log n)$.

**Proof** („MIS 2009“)?

Number of edges is cut in two in each round...

QED

Actually, the claim even holds with high probability! (see „Skript“)
Excursion: Matchings

Matching

A matching is a subset $M$ of edges $E$ such that no two edges in $M$ are adjacent.

A maximal matching cannot be augmented.

A maximum matching is the best possible.

A perfect matching includes all nodes.
Excursion: Matchings

Maximal.
Excursion: Matchings

Excursion: Matchings

Maximum but not perfect.
Matching

A matching is a subset $M$ of edges $E$ such that no two edges in $M$ are adjacent.
A maximal matching cannot be augmented.
A maximum matching is the best possible.
A perfect matching includes all nodes.

How to compute with an IS algorithm?
Discussion: Matching

An IS algorithm is a matching algorithm! How?

For each edge in original graph make vertex, connect vertices if their edges are adjacent.
Discussion: Matching

MIS = maximal matching: matching does not have adjacent edges!
How to use a MIS algorithm for graph coloring?

Clone each node $v$, $d(v)+1$ many times. Connect clones completely and match edges from $i$-th clone to $i$-th clone. Then?

Run MIS: if $i$-th copy is in MIS, node gets color $i$. 
Discussion: Graph Coloring

Example:
How to use a MIS algorithm for graph coloring?

MIS Coloring
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Discussion: Graph Coloring

Why does it work?

1. Idea conflict-free: adjacent nodes cannot get same color (different index in MIS, otherwise adjacent!), and each node has at most one clone in IS, so valid.

2. Idea colored: each node gets color, i.e., each node has a clone in IS: there are only $d(v)$ neighbor clusters, but our cluster has $d(v)+1$ nodes...
Discussion: Dominating Set

**Dominating Set**

A subset D of nodes such that each node either is in the dominating set itself, or one of its neighbors is (or both).

How to compute a dominating set?
See Skript. 😊
Literature for further reading:

- Peleg‘s book (as always 😊 )

End of lecture