

# Steiner Point Removal with Distortion $O(\log k)$

Arnold Filtser

Ben Gurion University of the Negev  
Email: [arnoldf@cs.bgu.ac.il](mailto:arnoldf@cs.bgu.ac.il)

July 17, 2018

## Abstract

In the Steiner point removal (SPR) problem, we are given a weighted graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a set of terminals  $K \subset V$  of size  $k$ . The objective is to find a minor  $M$  of  $G$  with only the terminals as its vertex set, such that the distance between the terminals will be preserved up to a small multiplicative distortion. Kamma, Krauthgamer and Nguyen [KKN15] used a ball-growing algorithm with exponential distributions to show that the distortion is at most  $O(\log^5 k)$ . Cheung [Che17] improved the analysis of the same algorithm, bounding the distortion by  $O(\log^2 k)$ . We improve the analysis of this ball-growing algorithm even further, bounding the distortion by  $O(\log k)$ .

# 1 Introduction

In graph compression problems the input is usually a massive graph. The objective is to compress the graph into a smaller graph, while preserving certain properties of the original graph such as distances or cut values. Compression allows us to obtain faster algorithms, while reducing the storage space. In the era of massive data, the benefits are obvious. Examples of such structures are graph spanners [PS89], distance oracles [TZ05], cut sparsifiers [BK96], spectral sparsifiers [BSS12], vertex sparsifiers [Moi09] and more.

In this paper we study the *Steiner point removal* (SPR) problem. Here we are given an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  with positive weight function  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , and a subset of terminals  $K \subseteq V$  of size  $k$ . The goal is to construct a new graph  $M = (K, E')$  with positive weight function  $w'$ , with the terminals as its vertex set, such that: (1)  $M$  is a graph minor of  $G$ , and (2) the distance between every pair of terminals  $t, t'$  is distorted by at most a multiplicative factor of  $\alpha$ , formally

$$\forall t, t' \in K, \quad d_G(t, t') \leq d_M(t, t') \leq \alpha \cdot d_G(t, t') .$$

Property (1) expresses preservation of the topological structure of the original graph. For example if  $G$  was planar, so will  $M$  be. Whereas property (2) expresses preservation of the geometric structure of the original graph, that is, distances between terminals. The question is: what is the minimal  $\alpha$  (which may depend on  $k$ ) such that every graph with a terminal set of size  $k$  will have a solution to the SPR problem with distortion  $\alpha$ .

The first one to study a problem of this flavor was Gupta [Gup01], who showed that given a weighted tree  $T$  with a subset of terminals  $K$ , there is a tree  $T'$  with  $K$  as its vertex set, that preserves all the distances between terminals up to a multiplicative factor of 8. Chan, Xia, Konjevod, and Richa [CXKR06], observed that the tree  $T'$  of Gupta is in fact a minor of the original tree  $T$ . They showed that 8 is the best possible distortion, and formulated the problem for general graphs. This lower bound of 8 is achieved on the complete unweighted binary tree, and is the best known lower bound for the general SPR problem.

Basu and Gupta [BG08] showed that on outerplanar graphs, the SPR problem can be solved with distortion  $O(1)$ .

Kamma, Krauthgamer and Nguyen were the first to bound the distortion for general graphs. They suggested a natural ball growing algorithm. Their first analysis provide  $O(\log^6 k)$  distortion (conference version [KKN14]), which they later improved to  $O(\log^5 k)$  (journal version [KKN15]). Very recently, Cheung [Che17] improved the analysis of the same algorithm further, providing an  $O(\log^2 k)$  upper bound on the distortion.

The main contribution of this paper is an even further improvement upon the analysis of the same algorithm, providing an  $O(\log k)$  upper bound for the SPR problem on general graphs. Closing the gap between the lower bound of 8 to the upper bound of  $O(\log k)$  remains an intriguing open question.

## 1.1 Related Work

Englert et. al. [EGK<sup>+</sup>14] showed that every graph  $G$ , admits a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$  over terminal minors with expected distortion  $O(\log k)$ . Formally, for all  $t_i, t_j \in K$ , it holds that  $1 \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{D}}[d_M(t_i, t_j)]}{d_G(t_i, t_j)} \leq O(\log k)$ . Thus, Theorem 1 can be seen as improvement upon [EGK<sup>+</sup>14], where we replace distribution with a single minor. Englert et. al. showed better results for  $\beta$ -decomposable graphs, in particular showing that graphs excluding a fixed minor, admitting a distribution with  $O(1)$  expected distortion.

Krauthgamer, Nguyen and Zondiner [KNZ14] showed that if we allowing the minor  $M$  to contain at most  $\binom{k}{2}^2$  Steiner vertices in addition to the terminals, then distortion 1 can be achieved. They further showed that for graphs with constant treewidth,  $O(k^2)$  Steiner points will suffice for distortion 1. Cheung, Gramoz and Henzinger [CGH16] showed that allowing  $O(k^{2+\frac{2}{\epsilon}})$  Steiner vertices, one can achieve distortion  $2t - 1$  (in particular distortion  $O(\log k)$  with  $O(k^2)$  Steiners). For planar graphs, Cheung et. al. achieved  $1 + \epsilon$  distortion with  $\tilde{O}((\frac{k}{\epsilon})^2)$  Steiner points.

There is a long line of work focusing on preserving the cut/flow structure among the terminals, by a graph minor. See [Moi09, LM10, CLLM10, MM10, EGK<sup>+</sup>14, Chu12, KR13, AGK14, GHP17, KR17].

Finally, there were works studying metric embeddings and metric data structures concerning with preserving distances among terminals, or from terminals to other vertices, out of the context of minors. See [CE05, RTZ05, GNR10, KV13, EFN15a, EFN15b, BFN16].

## 1.2 Technical Ideas

We use the ball growing algorithm presented in [KKN15] (also used by [Che17]), with adjusted parameters. The algorithm work in rounds. In each round, by turn, each terminal  $t_j$  increases the radius  $R_j$  of its ball-cluster  $V_j$  in attempt to add more vertices to its cluster  $V_j$ . Once a vertex joins some cluster, it will remain there. In round  $\ell$ , the radii are (independently) sampled according to exponential distribution with mean  $D \cdot r^\ell$ , where  $r = 1 + \frac{O(1)}{\ln k}$  and  $D = r - 1$ . In each consecutive round, the mean of the distribution is multiplied by  $r$ . This extremely slow growth rate allows us to control (w.h.p) the round in which each vertex will be covered (that is, join some cluster). Specifically, for vertex  $v$  whose closest terminal is at distance  $D(v)$ , w.h.p.  $v$  is covered somewhere between round  $\log_r(\Omega(D(v)))$  to round  $\log_r(O(D(v)))$ . In particular,  $v$  will be covered by terminal  $t$  at distance at most  $O(D(v))$  from  $v$ . Furthermore, every vertex  $v'$  that is covered simultaneously with  $v$  will be also at distance at most  $O(D(v))$  from  $t$ .

In the end of the algorithm, when all the vertices are covered, we contract each cluster into a single vertex to get a minor graph  $M$  on the terminals. The weight in  $M$  of the edge  $\{t_i, t_j\}$  (if exist) is simply set to  $d_G(t_i, t_j)$ . In order to bound the distance in the minor graph between two terminals  $t, t'$ , we partition the shortest path  $P_{t,t'}$  from  $t$  to  $t'$  into a set of intervals  $\mathcal{Q}$ . The length  $|Q|$  of each interval  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$  will be  $\Theta(\frac{D(Q)}{\ln k})$ , where  $D(Q)$  is the distance from  $Q$  to its closest terminal. In particular,  $Q$  will have the property that if some vertex  $v \in Q$  is covered by  $t$  at round  $\ell$ , then with probability at least 0.8, all of  $Q$  is covered by  $t$  (at round  $\ell$ ).

We can show that the expected number of terminals covering the vertices of  $Q$  is constant. In fact, Cheung [Che17] argued that w.h.p every interval  $Q$  is covered by at most  $O(\log k)$  different terminals. This is the reason he pays additional  $\log k$  factor on the distortion. We will use a subtler argument in order to spare this  $\log k$  factor.

We will analyze the covering of all the intervals simultaneously. Consider round  $\ell$ , where terminal  $t_j$  grows its cluster. Note that  $t_j$  might cover vertices from different intervals. Let  $Q_j^\ell$  be the interval containing the closest vertex to  $t_j$ , among the vertices of  $P_{t,t'}$  that were covered by  $t_j$  at round  $\ell$ . The vertices covered by  $t_j$  at round  $\ell$  will create a detour  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$ , which will be charged upon  $Q_j^\ell$ . The sum of the lengths of all the detours created during the algorithm can be used to bound  $d_M(t, t')$ . The length of each  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  equals  $O(\log k) \cdot Q_j^\ell$ .

In each step at most one interval will be charged. All the covered vertices not in  $Q_j^\ell$  will be covered free of charge. We define a cost function  $f$  which is defined by a linear combinations of all the charges upon all the intervals. Essentially  $f$  is proportional to the length of all the created detours, and




Figure 1: The leftmost side of the figure contains a weighted graph  $G = (V, E)$ , with weights specified in red, and four terminals  $\{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4\}$ . The dashed black curves represent a terminal partition of the vertex set  $V$  into the subsets  $V_1, V_2, V_3, V_4$ . The right side of the figure represent the minor  $M$  induced by the terminal partition. The distortion is realized between  $t_1$  and  $t_3$ , and is  $\frac{d_M(t_1, t_3)}{d_G(t_1, t_3)} = \frac{12}{4} = 3$ .

thus can be used to bound  $d_M(t, t')$ . The next step is to use a concentration bounds to show that while some intervals might be charged for large number of detours, on average the cost function will not exceed the expectation by much. However, as the charges upon different intervals are strongly dependent, this requires a subtle argument.

## 2 Preliminaries

Appendix B contains a summary of all the definitions and notations we use. The reader is encouraged to refer to this index while reading.

We consider undirected graphs  $G = (V, E)$  with positive edge weights  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . Let  $d_G$  denote the shortest path metric in  $G$ . Let  $B_G(v, r) = \{u \in V \mid d_G(v, u) \leq r\}$  be the ball around  $v$  in  $G$  with radius  $r$ . For a subset of vertices  $A \subseteq V$ , let  $G[A]$  denote the *induced graph* on  $A$ . Fix  $K = \{t_1, \dots, t_k\} \subseteq V$  to be a set of *terminals*. For a vertex  $v$ ,  $D(v) = \min_{t \in K} d_G(v, t)$  is the distance from  $v$  to the closest terminal.

A graph  $H$  is a *minor* of a graph  $G$  if we can obtain  $H$  from  $G$  by edge deletions/contractions, and vertex deletions. A partition  $\{V_1, \dots, V_k\}$  of  $V$  is called a *terminal partition* (w.r.t  $K$ ) if for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $t_i \in V_i$ , and the induced graph  $G[V_i]$  is connected. See Figure 1 for illustration. The *induced minor* by terminal partition  $\{V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ , is a minor  $M$ , where each set  $V_i$  is contracted into a single vertex called (abusing notation)  $t_i$ . Note that there is an edge in  $M$  from  $t_i$  to  $t_j$  iff there are vertices  $v_i \in V_i$  and  $v_j \in V_j$  such that  $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E$ . We determine the weight of the edge  $\{t_i, t_j\} \in E(M)$  to be  $d_G(t_i, t_j)$ . Note that by the triangle inequality, for every pair of (not necessarily neighboring) terminals  $t_i, t_j$ , it holds that  $d_M(t_i, t_j) \geq d_G(t_i, t_j)$ . The *distortion* of the induced minor is  $\max_{i,j} \frac{d_M(t_i, t_j)}{d_G(t_i, t_j)}$ .

### 2.1 Exponential Distribution

$\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  denotes the *exponential distribution* with mean  $\lambda$  and density function  $f(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda} e^{-\frac{x}{\lambda}}$  for  $x \geq 0$ .  $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$  denotes the the random variable  $X$  distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$ . By  $a + c \cdot \text{Exp}(\lambda)$

we denote a distribution where we sample  $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , and return  $a + c \cdot X$ . A useful property of exponential distribution is *memoryless*: let  $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ , for every  $a, b \geq 0$ ,  $\Pr[X \geq a + b \mid X \geq a] = \Pr[X \geq b]$ . In other words, given that  $X \geq a$ , it holds that  $X \sim a + \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ . Another useful property of exponential distribution is *closeness under scaling*, that is  $c \cdot \text{Exp}(\lambda)$  is equal to  $\text{Exp}(c\lambda)$ . We will use the following concentration bounds, the proof of which appears in [Appendix A](#)

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ 's are independent random variables, where each  $X_i$  is distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(\lambda_i)$ . Let  $X = \sum_i X_i$  and  $\lambda_M = \max_i \lambda_i$ . Set  $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_i \lambda_i$ .*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For } a \geq 2\mu, \quad & \Pr[X \geq a] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\lambda_M}(a - 2\mu)\right). \\ \text{For } a \leq \frac{\mu}{2}, \quad & \Pr[X \leq a] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\lambda_M}\left(\frac{\mu}{2} - a\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

### 3 Algorithm

We will assume that  $\min_v D(v) = 1$ , as we can scale all the weights by a constant (and rescale appropriately the output). In addition, we will assume that the number of terminals  $k$  is larger than a big enough constant, as otherwise the algorithm of [\[KKN15\]](#) is asymptotically optimal.

Before executing our algorithm, we will make some preprocessing to the input graph  $G$ . Our first step will be to use the algorithm of Krauthgamer, Nguyen and Zondiner [\[KNZ14\]](#) to obtain a minor of the input graph such that all terminal distances are preserved exactly, while the minor contains at most  $2 \cdot \binom{k}{2} < \frac{k^4}{2}$  Steiner vertices. Let  $P_{t,t'}$  be an arbitrary shortest path from  $t$  to  $t'$ . Our next preprocessing step will be to ensure that every edge  $e$  on  $P_{t,t'}$  has weight at most  $\frac{c_w}{\ln k} \cdot d_G(t, t')$ , where  $c_w = \frac{1}{2400}$ . This can be achieved by subdividing larger edges by adding additional vertices of degree two in the middle of large edges. This modification will require at most  $\frac{\ln k}{c_w}$  vertices per path, and thus a total of  $\frac{k^2 \ln k}{c_w} < \frac{k^4}{3}$  additional vertices. Thus, after this modification, the graph will contain at most  $k^4$  vertices. As we added only Steiner vertices of degree 2, every induced minor by terminal partition of the new graph, will be a minor of the original graph as well. From now on, we will abuse notation and let  $G$  be the resulting graph (after both modifications) as if it were the original one.

After we finish with the preprocessing, we are ready to execute [Algorithm 1](#), which is the same as the algorithm used by [\[KKN15\]](#) (and [\[Che17\]](#)), with adjusted parameters. Each terminal  $t_j$ , will be associated with a radius  $R_j$  and cluster  $V_j \subset V$ . During the algorithm we will iteratively grow clusters  $V_1, \dots, V_k$  around the terminals. Once some vertex  $v$  joins some cluster  $V_j$ , it will stay there. When all the vertices are clustered, the algorithm terminates. Initially the cluster  $V_j$  contains only the terminal  $t_j$ , while  $R_j$  equals 0. The algorithm will have rounds, where each round consist of  $k$  steps. In step  $j$  of round  $\ell$ , we sample a number  $q_j^\ell$  according to distribution  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$  (note that the mean of the distribution grows by a factor of  $r$  in each round). The radius  $R_j$  grows by  $q_j^\ell$ . We consider the graph induced by the unclustered vertices  $V_\perp$  union  $V_j$ . Every unclustered vertex of distance at most  $R_j$  from  $t_j$  in  $G[V_\perp \cup V_j]$  joins  $V_j$ .

**Theorem 1.** *With probability  $1 - O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)$ , in the minor graph  $M$  returned by [Algorithm 1](#), it holds that for every two terminals  $t, t'$ ,  $d_M(t, t') \leq O(\log k) \cdot d_G(t, t')$ .*

---

**Algorithm 1**  $M = \text{Steiner-point-removal}(G = (V, E), w, K = \{t_1, \dots, t_k\})$

---

1: Set  $r \leftarrow 1 + \delta / \ln k$ , where  $\delta = 1/20$ .  
2: Set  $D \leftarrow \frac{\delta}{\ln k}$ .  
3: For each  $j \in [k]$ , set  $V_j \leftarrow \{t_j\}$ , and set  $R_j \leftarrow 0$ .  
4: Set  $V_\perp \leftarrow V \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k V_j\right)$ .  
5: Set  $\ell \leftarrow 0$ .  
6: **while**  $\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k V_j\right) \neq V$  **do**  
7:   **for**  $j$  from 1 to  $k$  **do**  
8:     Choose independently at random  $q_j^\ell$  distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ .  
9:     Set  $R_j \leftarrow R_j + q_j^\ell$ .  
10:     Set  $V_j \leftarrow B_{G[V_\perp \cup V_j]}(t_j, R_j)$ .    // This is the same as  $V_j \leftarrow V_j \cup B_{G[V_\perp \cup V_j]}(t_j, R_j)$ .  
11:     Set  $V_\perp \leftarrow V \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k V_j\right)$ .  
12:   **end for**  
13:    $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$ .  
14: **end while**  
15: **return** the terminal-centered minor  $M$  of  $G$  induced by  $V_1, \dots, V_k$ .

---

## 4 Covering properties

We say that vertex  $v$  is *covered* if  $v \in \cup_j V_j$ . If  $v$  joins  $V_j$  at round  $\ell$ , we say that  $v$  was covered by  $t_j$  at round  $\ell$ . In this section we upper and lower bound the round in which each vertex is covered. This will imply that every vertex  $v$  is covered by a terminal  $t$  at distance at most  $O(D(v))$ . Furthermore, we will show that if vertices  $v$  and  $v'$  were covered by terminal  $t$  at the same round, then  $d_G(v, t)$  and  $d_G(v', t)$  are asymptotically equal.

We denote by  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CUB}}$  (CUB for covering upper bound) the event that every vertex  $v$  was already covered after the  $\lfloor \log_r(4D(v)) \rfloor$  round.

**Lemma 2.**  $\Pr[\mathcal{E}^{\text{CUB}}] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{k}$ .

*Proof.* Fix some vertex  $v$ . We will show that the probability that  $v$  remains uncovered after the  $m = \lfloor \log_r(4D(v)) \rfloor$  round is bounded by  $k^{-5}$ . Since there are at most  $k^4$  vertices, the lemma will follow by the union bound. Let  $t_v$  be the closest terminal to  $v$ , and denote by  $P_v$  the shortest path from  $t_v$  to  $v$  in  $G$  (which has length  $D(v)$ ). Denote by  $u_*$  the currently covered vertex farthest away from  $t_v$  on  $P_v$ , by  $t_*$  the terminal covering  $u_*$ , and by  $R_{t_*}$  the radius currently associated with  $t_*$ . Set

$$d_* = d_G(t_v, u_*) + (R_{t_*} - d_{G[V_{t_*}]}(u_*, t_*)) .$$

$d_*$  is the *effective* covered part of  $P_v$ . Note that there might be no vertex at distance exactly  $R_{t_*}$  from  $t_*$  to cover. However, if we could add additional vertex at distance  $d_*$  from  $t_v$ , it would be currently covered by  $t_*$ . See Figure 2 for illustration.




Figure 2: At the end of the  $\ell - 1$ , the farthest covered vertex on  $P_v$  was  $u_*^{\ell-1}$ , who was covered by  $t_*^{\ell-1}$ .  $d_*^{\ell-1}$  is the length of the effective covered part of  $P_v$ , which is farther away from  $u_*^{\ell-1}$  by  $R_{t_*^{\ell-1}} - d_{G[V_{\perp}^{\ell-1}]}(u_*^{\ell-1}, t_*^{\ell-1})$  along  $P_v$ . At round  $\ell$ , either  $t_*^{\ell-1}$  increase  $R_{t_*^{\ell-1}}$  (and therefore  $d_*$ ) according to  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ , or some new vertex  $u'$  is covered by terminal  $t_{j'}$  and then  $d_*$  increase additionally according to distribution  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ .

Consider round  $\ell$ , we argue that the increase of  $d_*$  during round  $\ell$  is lower bounded by random variable distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ . Let  $u_*^{\ell-1}$  be  $u_*$  by the end of the  $\ell - 1$  round,  $t_*^{\ell-1}$  be the terminal covering  $u_*^{\ell-1}$ , and  $d_*^{\ell-1}$  be the value of  $d_*$  by the end of the  $\ell - 1$  round. Let  $j$  be such that  $t_j = t_*^{\ell-1}$ . If by the  $j$ 's step of the  $\ell$ 's round,  $u_*^{\ell-1}$  is still the farthest vertex covered on  $P_v$  (that is  $u_* = u_*^{\ell-1}$ ), then  $d_*$  is growing by  $q_j^\ell$  (exactly as  $R_j$ ) which is distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ . Otherwise, let  $u'$  be the first vertex on  $P_v$  further than  $u_*^{\ell-1}$  to be covered by terminal  $t_{j'}$ . It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{G[V_{\perp} \cup V_j]}(t_*^{\ell-1}, u') &\leq d_{G[V_{\perp} \cup V_j]}(t_*^{\ell-1}, u_*^{\ell-1}) + d_G(u_*^{\ell-1}, u') \\ &= d_G(t_v, u_*^{\ell-1}) + R_{t_*^{\ell-1}} - d_*^{\ell-1} + d_G(u_*^{\ell-1}, u') = d_G(t_v, u') + R_{t_*^{\ell-1}} - d_*^{\ell-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $d_G(t_v, u') > d_*^{\ell-1}$ , as otherwise  $d_{G[V_{\perp} \cup V_j]}(t_*^{\ell-1}, u') \leq R_{t_*^{\ell-1}}$ , contradiction to the fact that  $u'$  was not already covered by  $t_*^{\ell-1}$ . By the memoryless property of exponential distribution, given that  $t_{j'}$  covered  $u'$ ,  $R_{j'}$  and therefore  $d_*$  will increase additively according to distribution  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ . Note that  $d_*$  never decreases. We conclude that until  $d_*$  reaches  $D(v)$ , the growth of  $d_*$  in round  $\ell$  is lower bounded by a random variable distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ .

Let  $X_0, X_1, \dots, X_m$  be independent random variables, where  $X_\ell \sim \text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ , and  $X = \sum_{\ell=0}^m X_\ell$ . The probability that  $v$  is not covered after  $m$  rounds is lower bounded by the probability that  $X < D(v)$ . The mean of  $X$  is

$$\mu = \mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{\ell=0}^m \mathbb{E}[X_\ell] = D \cdot \sum_{\ell=0}^m r^\ell = D \cdot \frac{r^{m+1} - 1}{r - 1} \geq r^{m+1} - 1 \geq \frac{r^{m+1}}{2}.$$

The maximal mean of  $X_i$  is  $\lambda_M = D \cdot r^m$ . Note also that  $r^{m+1} > r^{\log_r(4D(v))} = 4D(v)$ , thus  $D(v) < \frac{r^{m+1}}{4}$ . By Lemma 1 we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X \leq D(v)] &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\lambda_M} \left(\frac{\mu}{2} - D(v)\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{D \cdot r^m} \left(\frac{r^{m+1}}{2} - \frac{r^{m+1}}{4}\right)\right) < \exp\left(-\frac{\ln k}{4 \cdot \delta}\right) = k^{-5}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Set  $c_{\text{CE}} = \frac{1}{3}$  (CE for covered early). We denote by  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}$  the event that for some vertex  $v$  and terminal  $t$ ,  $t$  covered  $v$  before the  $\lfloor \log_r(c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v, t)) \rfloor$  round.

**Lemma 3.**  $\Pr[\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}] \leq k^{-3}$ .

*Proof.* We denote by  $\mathcal{E}_{v,t}^{\text{CE}}$  the event that the vertex  $v$  was covered by the terminal  $t$  before the  $\lfloor \log_r(c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v, t)) \rfloor$  round. Note that  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}} = \cup_{v,t} \mathcal{E}_{v,t}^{\text{CE}}$ . We will show that  $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_{v,t}^{\text{CE}}] \leq k^{-8}$ , and the lemma will follow by union bound.

Fix some vertex  $v$  and terminal  $t$ . Denote by  $R_t^\ell$  the value of  $R_t$  after the  $\ell$ 'th round.  $\mathcal{E}_{v,t}^{\text{CE}}$  might occur only if  $R_t^m$  is at least  $d_G(t, v)$  for  $m = \lfloor \log_r(c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d(t, v)) \rfloor$ . The growth of  $R_t$  at round  $\ell$  is according to  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ , where all the rounds are independent. Hence  $R_t^m \sim \sum_{\ell=0}^m \text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ . It holds that  $\mathbb{E}[R_t^m] = \sum_{\ell=0}^m D \cdot r^\ell = D \cdot \frac{r^{m+1}-1}{r-1} \leq r^{m+1}$ . By Lemma 1, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathcal{E}_{v,t}^{\text{CE}}] &\leq \Pr[R_t^m \geq d_G(t, v)] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2 \cdot D \cdot r^m} (d(t, v) - 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[R_t^m])\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2 \cdot D \cdot r^m} \left(\frac{1}{c_{\text{CE}}} \cdot r^m - 2 \cdot r^{m+1}\right)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{\ln k}{2\delta} \left(\frac{1}{c_{\text{CE}}} - 2r\right)\right) < \exp(-8 \ln k) = k^{-8}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Corollary 1.** Assuming  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CUB}}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}}$ , for every two vertices  $v, v'$  who both were covered by terminal  $t$  at round  $\ell$ , it holds that  $d_G(t, v') = O(D(v))$ .

*Proof.* As we assumed  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CUB}}$ ,  $v$  necessarily was covered until round  $\lfloor \log_r(4D(v)) \rfloor$ , that is  $\ell \leq \lfloor \log_r(4D(v)) \rfloor$ . From the other hand,  $\overline{\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}}$  implies  $\ell > \lfloor \log_r(c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v', t)) \rfloor$ . We conclude that  $\log_r(c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v', t)) \leq \log_r(4D(v))$ , and therefore  $d_G(t, v') < \frac{4}{c_{\text{CE}}} \cdot D(v) = 12 \cdot D(v)$ . □

## 5 Clustering Analysis

In this section we describe in detail the probabilistic process of growing clusters, and define a charging scheme that will be used to bound the distortion.

Consider two terminals  $t$  and  $t'$ . Let  $P_{t,t'} = \{t = v_0, \dots, v_L = t'\}$  be the shortest path from  $t$  to  $t'$  in  $G$ . We can assume that there are no terminals in  $P_{t,t'}$  other than  $t, t'$ . This is because if we will prove that for every pair of terminals  $t, t'$  such that  $P_{t,t'} \cap K = \{t, t'\}$  it holds that  $d_M(t, t') \leq O(\log k) \cdot d_G(t, t')$ , the triangle inequality will imply this property for all pairs of terminals.

Set  $P = \{v_1, \dots, v_{L-1}\}$  to be the path  $P_{t,t'}$  without its boundaries  $t, t'$ . For a sub interval  $Q = \{v_a, \dots, v_b\} \subseteq P$ , the *internal length* is  $L(Q) = d_G(v_a, v_b)$ , and the *external length* is  $L^+(Q) = d_G(v_{a-1}, v_{b+1})$ . Set  $c_{\text{int}} = \frac{c_{\text{CE}}}{10} = \frac{1}{30}$  (“int” for interval). We partition the vertices in  $P$  into sub intervals  $Q$ , with the property that each  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$  will contain a vertex  $u_Q \in Q$  such that  $L(Q) \leq \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} D(u_Q) \leq L^+(Q)$ : Such a partition could be constructed as follows. Sweep along the interval  $P$  in a greedy manner, after partitioning the prefix  $v_1, \dots, v_{h-1}$ , to construct the next  $Q$ , we set  $u_Q = v_h$  and simply pick the minimal index  $s$  such that  $L^+(\{v_h, \dots, v_{h+s}\}) \geq \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} D(v_h)$ . By the minimality of  $s$ ,  $L(\{v_h, \dots, v_{h+s}\}) \leq L^+(\{v_h, \dots, v_{h+s-1}\}) \leq \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} D(v_h)$  (in the case  $s = 0$ , trivially  $L(\{v_h\}) = 0 \leq \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} D(v_h)$ ). Note that such  $s$  always could be found, as  $L^+(\{v_h, \dots, v_{L-1}\}) = d_G(v_{h-1}, t') > d_G(v_h, t') \geq D(v_h)$ .

In the beginning of [Algorithm 1](#), all the vertices of  $P$  are *active*. Consider round  $\ell$  in the algorithm when terminal  $t_j$  grows a ball to increase  $V_j$ . Specifically, it picks  $q_j^\ell$  and sets  $R_j \leftarrow R_j + q_j^\ell$  and  $V_j \leftarrow B_{G[V_\perp \cup V_j]}(t_j, R_j)$ . Suppose that at least one active vertex joins  $V_j$ . Let  $a_j^\ell \in P_{t,t'}$  (resp.,  $b_j^\ell$ ) be the active vertex joining to  $V_j$  with minimal (resp., maximal) index (w.r.t  $P_{t,t'}$ ). All the vertices  $\{a_j^\ell, \dots, b_j^\ell\} \subset P_{t,t'}$  with indices between  $a_j^\ell$  to  $b_j^\ell$  become inactive. We call this set  $\{a_j^\ell, \dots, b_j^\ell\}$  a *detour*  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  from  $a_j^\ell$  to  $b_j^\ell$ . See [Figure 3](#) for illustration.

Within each interval  $Q$ , each maximal sub-interval of active vertices is called a *slice*. We denote by  $\mathcal{S}(Q)$  the current number of slices in  $Q$ . In the beginning of the algorithm, for every sub interval  $Q$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(Q) = 1$ , while at the end of the algorithm  $\mathcal{S}(Q) = 0$ .

For an active vertex  $v$ , let  $q_v$  be the minimal choice of  $q_j^\ell$ , that will force  $v$  to join  $V_j$ . Let  $v_j^\ell$  be the active vertex with minimal  $q_{v_j^\ell}$  (braking ties arbitrarily). Let  $Q_j^\ell \in \mathcal{Q}$  be the interval containing  $v_j^\ell$ . Similarly, let  $S_j^\ell$  be the slice containing  $v_j^\ell$ . We *charge*  $Q_j^\ell$  for the detour  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$ . We denote by  $X_Q$  the number of detours the interval  $Q$  is currently charged for. For every detour  $\mathcal{D}_{j'}^{\ell'}$ , which is contained in  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  (that is  $a_j^\ell < a_{j'}^{\ell'} < b_{j'}^{\ell'} < b_j^\ell$  w.r.t. the order induced by  $P_{t,t'}$ ), we erase the detour and its charge. That is, for every  $Q' \neq Q_j^\ell$ ,  $X_{Q'}$  might only decrease, while  $X_{Q_j^\ell}$  might increase by at most 1 (and can also decrease as a result of deleted detours). We denote by  $\tilde{X}_Q$  the size of  $X_Q$  by the end of [Algorithm 1](#). [Figure 3](#) illustrates a single step.

Next, we analyze the change in the number of slices when  $t_j$  grows its cluster at round  $\ell$ . If  $q_j^\ell < q_{v_j^\ell}$ , then no active vertex joins  $V_j$  and therefore  $X_Q$  and  $\mathcal{S}(Q)$  stay unchanged, for all  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Otherwise,  $q_j^\ell \geq q_{v_j^\ell}$ , a new detour will appear, and be charged upon  $Q_j^\ell$ . All the slices  $S$  which are contained in  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  are deleted. Every slice  $S$  that intersects  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  but not contained in it will be replaced by one or two new slices. If  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell \cap S \notin \{\mathcal{D}_j^\ell, S\}$ , then  $S$  is replaced by a single new sub-slice  $S'$ . The only possibility for a slice to be replaced by two sub-slices is if  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell \subseteq S$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  does not contain the extreme vertices in  $S$  (see [Figure 3](#), scenario (A)). This can happen only at  $S_j^\ell$ . We conclude that for every  $Q' \neq Q_j^\ell$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(Q')$  might only decrease, while  $\mathcal{S}(Q_j^\ell)$  might increase by at most 1.

Let  $q_{S_j^\ell}$  be the minimal choice of  $q_j^\ell$ , that will force all vertices in  $S_j^\ell$  to become inactive. If  $q_j^\ell \geq q_{S_j^\ell}$ , then  $\mathcal{S}(Q_j^\ell)$  will decrease by at least one ([Figure 3](#), scenario (B)). We call such occasion a *success*. Otherwise, if  $q_j^\ell < q_{S_j^\ell}$  then  $\mathcal{S}(Q_j^\ell)$  might increase by at most one. We call such occasion a *failure* ([Figure 3](#), scenario (A)).

**Claim 1.** *Assuming  $\ell \geq \log_r(c_{CE} \cdot d_G(v_j^\ell, t_j))$  and  $q_j^\ell \geq q_{v_j^\ell}$ , the failure probability is bounded by  $p = 0.2$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that there is a vertex  $u_{Q_j^\ell} \in Q_j^\ell$  such that  $L(Q_j^\ell) \leq \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} D(u_{Q_j^\ell})$ . In particular, by the triangle inequality  $D(v_j^\ell) \geq D(u_{Q_j^\ell}) - d_G(u_{Q_j^\ell}, v_j^\ell) \geq \left(\frac{\ln k}{c_{\text{int}} \delta} - 1\right) L(Q_j^\ell) \geq \frac{\ln k}{2c_{\text{int}} \delta} \cdot L(Q_j^\ell)$ . It holds that

$$D \cdot r^\ell \geq D \cdot c_{CE} \cdot d_G(v_j^\ell, t_j) \geq D \cdot c_{CE} \cdot D(v_j^\ell) \geq D \cdot c_{CE} \cdot \frac{\ln k}{2c_{\text{int}} \delta} \cdot L(Q_j^\ell) = 5 \cdot L(Q_j^\ell) .$$

As  $\mathcal{S}(Q_j^\ell) \subseteq Q_j^\ell$ , and all the vertices in  $\mathcal{S}(Q_j^\ell)$  are active, for every  $u \in \mathcal{S}(Q_j^\ell)$ ,  $d_{G[V_\perp \cup V_j]}(v_j^\ell, u) \leq L(Q_j^\ell)$  (we used here that  $P_{t,t'}$  is a shortest path). Therefore, if  $q_j^\ell \geq q_{v_j^\ell} + L(Q_j^\ell)$ , all the vertices in  $S$  will be covered by  $t_j$ , and in particular become inactive. We conclude that  $q_{S_j^\ell} \leq q_{v_j^\ell} + L(Q_j^\ell)$ . Recall that




Figure 3: The figure illustrates round  $l$  in Algorithm 1, when  $t_j$  increases  $V_j$ . We present two scenarios for different choices of  $q_j^\ell$ . The black line is part of  $P_{t,t'}$  the shortest path from  $t$  to  $t'$ . The blue intervals  $Q_i$  represent the subsets in  $\mathcal{Q}$ . The red sub-intervals  $S_i$  are slices, maximal subsets of active vertices. Where  $S_2, S_3 \subset Q_2$  and  $S_4, S_5 \subset Q_3$ . The yellow areas represent detours  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , where  $Q_2$  (resp.,  $Q_3$ ) is charged for  $\mathcal{D}_1$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{D}_2$ ). Note that vertices in that areas are inactive.

$t_j$  increases gradually  $q_j^\ell$ , the first vertex to be covered is  $v_j^\ell$ . In scenario (A), the growth of  $q_j^\ell$  quickly terminates and sets  $a_j^\ell = u_1$ ,  $b_j^\ell = u_2$ . While in scenario (B), the growth of  $q_j^\ell$  continues longer, setting  $a_j^\ell = u_3$ ,  $b_j^\ell = u_4$ . Points already inactive are colored in blue. Points which currently covered by  $t_j$ , are colored in red. The green points, are points which still un-covered, but nevertheless become inactive. Points which remain active after the increase in  $V_j$ , are colored in black.

In scenario (A) all the vertices that become inactive,  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$ , included in  $S_4$ .  $Q_3$  is charged for  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$ . The number of slices in  $Q_3$  is increased by 1, and no other changes occur. In scenario (B)  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  contains all the vertices in  $S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5$ , and part of the vertices in  $S_1, S_6$ . The number of slices in  $Q_2$  and  $Q_3$  become 0, while the number of slices in  $Q_1$  and  $Q_4$  remain unchanged.  $Q_3$  is charged for  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$ , while its charge for  $\mathcal{D}_2$  erased. Additionally, the charge of  $Q_2$  for  $\mathcal{D}_1$  is erased. That is,  $Q_2$  will remain uncharged till the end of the algorithm ( $\tilde{X}_{Q_2} = 0$ ).

$q_j^\ell$  is distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(D \cdot r^\ell)$ . Using the memoryless property, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ q_j^\ell < q_{S_j^\ell} \mid q_j^\ell \geq q_{v_j^\ell} \right] &= \Pr \left[ q_j^\ell < q_{S_j^\ell} - q_{v_j^\ell} \right] = 1 - e^{-\left( q_{S_j^\ell} - q_{v_j^\ell} \right) / (D \cdot r^\ell)} \\ &\leq \left( q_{S_j^\ell} - q_{v_j^\ell} \right) / (D \cdot r^\ell) \leq L(Q_j^\ell) / (D \cdot r^\ell) \leq \frac{1}{5} = p. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 6 Bounding the Number of Failures

Set  $\varphi = |\mathcal{Q}|$ . We define a *cost function*  $f : \mathbb{R}_+^\varphi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , in the following way  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\varphi) = \sum_i x_i \cdot L^+(Q_i)$ . Note that the cost function  $f$  is linear and monotonically increasing coordinate-wise. In [Section 7](#) we show that the distance between  $t$  to  $t'$  in the minor graph  $M$  can be bounded (roughly) by the total “length” of all the detours that the intervals were charged for by the end of [Algorithm 1](#). Moreover, w.h.p. the “length” of detour  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  can be bounded by  $L^+(Q_j^\ell)$ . Thus  $f(\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi})$  is an asymptotic bound on  $d_M(t, t')$ . This section is devoted to proving the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.**  $\Pr \left[ f(\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi}) \geq 43 \cdot d_G(t, t') \right] \leq 2 \cdot k^{-3}$ .

Using [Claim 1](#), one can show that for every  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_Q] = O(1)$ , and moreover, w.h.p.  $\tilde{X}_Q = O(\log k)$ . However, we use a concentration bound on all  $\{\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi}\}$  simultaneously in order to prove a stronger upper bound.

### 6.1 Bounding by independent variables

In our journey to bound  $f(\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi})$ , the first step is replacing  $(\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi})$  with independent variables. Consider the following process: we start with  $\varphi$  boxes  $B_{Q_1}, \dots, B_{Q_\varphi}$ , where the box  $B_Q$  resembles the interval  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ . The boxes will contain independent coins. Each coin has probability  $p$  to get 0 (failure), and  $1 - p$  to get 1 (success). Coins can be active and inactive. In the beginning, there is a single active coin in each box  $B_Q$ . We toss the active coins in the boxes in some arbitrary order. When tossing a coin from box  $B_Q$ , the tossed coin becomes inactive. If we get 0 we add two additional active coins to the box  $B_Q$ . The process terminates when no active coins remain. For a box  $B_Q$ , denote by  $Z_Q$  the number of active coins, by  $Y_Q$  the number of inactive coins and by  $\tilde{Y}_Q$  the number of inactive coins at the end of the process. Let  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}}$  be an indicator for the event  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}$  (recall that  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}$  is the event that some vertex  $v$  was covered by some terminal  $t$ , before the  $\lfloor \log_r(c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v, t)) \rfloor$  round).

**Claim 2.** For every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

$$\Pr \left[ f(\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi}) \geq \alpha \right] \leq \Pr \left[ f(\tilde{Y}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{Q_\varphi}) + \mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}} \cdot f(k^4, \dots, k^4) \geq \alpha \right].$$

*Proof.* We will treat  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}}$  dynamically, such that  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}} = 0$  at the beginning of [Algorithm 1](#), and becomes 1 when some vertex  $v$  is covered by terminal  $t$  and round  $\ell \leq \lfloor \log_r(c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v, t)) \rfloor$ . The proof is done by coupling the two process of [Algorithm 1](#) and the coin tosses. We execute [Algorithm 1](#), which implicitly induces slices and detour charges. Simultaneously, we will use [Algorithm 1](#) to toss coins. We will maintain the invariant that, as long as  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}} = 0$ ,  $(Z_{Q_1}, Y_{Q_1}, \dots, Z_{Q_\varphi}, Y_{Q_\varphi})$  is bigger

than  $(\mathcal{S}(Q_1), X_{Q_1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}(Q_\varphi), X_{Q_\varphi})$  coordinate-wise. In the beginning both of them are equal (to  $(1, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 1, 0)$ ). Consider round  $\ell$ , step  $j$ , when  $t_j$  grows its cluster. If  $q_j^\ell < q_{v_j}^\ell$  then nothing happens, and the invariant holds. Else,  $q_j^\ell \geq q_{v_j}^\ell$ . If  $\ell \leq \left\lfloor \log_r c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v_j^\ell, t_j) \right\rfloor$ , then  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}}$  turn into 1, we unwind the coupling and continue each of the processes independently. Otherwise,  $\ell \geq \log_r \left( c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v_j^\ell, t_j) \right)$ . We will make a coin toss from the  $B_{Q_j^\ell}$  box. Let  $p'$  be the probability that  $q_j^\ell < q_{S_j^\ell}$  (and thus  $\mathcal{S}(Q_j^\ell)$  might grow), recall that  $p' \leq p$  (Claim 1). If indeed  $q_j^\ell < q_{S_j^\ell}$ , then the coin set to be 0. Otherwise, if  $q_j^\ell \geq q_{S_j^\ell}$ , then with probability  $\frac{p-p'}{1-p'}$  the coin is set to be 0. Note that the probability of 0 is exactly  $p$ . If the number of slices  $\mathcal{S}(Q_j^\ell)$  is increased by 1, then the number of active coins  $Z_{Q_j^\ell}$  increases by 1 as well. The number of detours  $X_{Q_j^\ell}$  charged upon  $Q_j^\ell$  might increase by at most 1, while the number of inactive coins  $Y_{Q_j^\ell}$  is necessarily increases by 1. For every  $Q' \neq Q_j^\ell$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(Q')$  and  $X_{Q'}$  might only decrease, while  $Z_{B_{Q'}}$  and  $Y_{B_{Q'}}$  stay unchanged. Therefore  $(Z_{Q_1}, Y_{Q_1}, \dots, Z_{Q_\varphi}, Y_{Q_\varphi})$  is at least  $(\mathcal{S}(Q_1), X_{Q_1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}(Q_\varphi), X_{Q_\varphi})$  coordinate-wise after the changes made at round  $\ell$  step  $j$  as well.

At the end of the algorithm (when no slices are left), we might still have some active coins. In this case we will simply toss coins until no active coins remain. Note that by doing so  $(Y_{Q_1}, \dots, Y_{Q_\varphi})$  can only grow. The marginal distribution on  $(\tilde{Y}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{Q_\varphi})$  is exactly identical to the original one.

We conclude: in the case  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}} = 0$ , at the end of the Algorithm 1, the two process remain coupled and hence  $(Y_{Q_1}, \dots, Y_{Q_\varphi})$  greater or equal than  $(\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi})$  coordinate-wise. From this point on,  $(Y_{Q_1}, \dots, Y_{Q_\varphi})$  can only grow. The claim follows as  $f$  is monotone. In the case where  $\mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}} = 1$ , the claim follows as  $\tilde{X}_Q$  is smaller than  $k^4$  for every  $Q$  (as the number of vertices and therefore detours is bounded by  $k^4$ ).  $\square$

## 6.2 Replacing Coins with Exponential Random Variables

Our next step is to replace each  $Y_Q$  with exponential random variable. This is done in order to use concentration bounds. Consider some box  $B_Q$ . Equivalent way to describe the probabilistic process in  $B_Q$  is the following. Take a single coin with failure probability  $p$ , toss this coin until the number of successes exceeds the number of failures. The total number of tosses is exactly  $\tilde{Y}_Q$ . Note that  $\tilde{Y}_Q$  is necessarily odd. Next we bound the probability that  $\tilde{Y}_B \geq 2m + 1$ , for  $m \geq 1$ . This is obviously upper bounded by the probability that in a series of  $2m$  tosses we had at least  $m$  failures (as otherwise the process would have stopped earlier, in fact this true even for  $2m - 1$  tosses). Let  $Z_i$  be an indicator for a failure in the  $i$ 'th toss.  $Z = \sum_{i=1}^{2m} Z_i$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}[Z] = 2m \cdot p$ . A bound on  $Z$  follows by Chernoff inequality.

**Fact 1** (Chernoff inequality). *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be i.i.d indicator variables each with probability  $p$ . Set  $X = \sum_i X_i$  and  $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X] = np$ . Then for every  $\delta \leq 2e - 1$ ,  $\Pr[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq \exp(-\mu\delta^2/4)$ .*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\tilde{Y}_B \geq 2m + 1] &\leq \Pr[Z \geq m] = \Pr\left[Z \geq \left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{2p} - 1\right)\right) \mathbb{E}[Z]\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left(-2m \cdot p \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2p} - 1\right)^2 / 4\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{9}{40}m\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{5}m\right). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that the distribution of  $\tilde{Y}_B$  is dominated by  $1 + \text{Exp}(10)$  (as for  $W \sim \text{Exp}(10)$ ,  $\Pr[1 + W \geq 2m + 1] = \exp(-\frac{m}{5})$ ). Let  $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_\varphi$  be i.i.d. variables distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(10)$ , since all the boxes are independent and  $f$  is linear and monotone coordinate-wise, we conclude:

**Claim 3.** For every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\Pr[f(\tilde{Y}_{B_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{B_\varphi}) \geq \alpha] \leq \Pr[f(1, \dots, 1) + f(W_1, \dots, W_\varphi) \geq \alpha]$ .

*Proof.* Set  $f_{\setminus\{s\}}(x_1, \dots, x_{s-1}, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_\varphi) = \sum_{i \in [\varphi] \setminus \{s\}} x_i \cdot L^+(Q_i)$ . When integrating over the appropriate measure space, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[f(\tilde{Y}_1, \dots, \tilde{Y}_\varphi) \geq \alpha] &= \int_\beta \Pr[f_{\setminus\{1\}}(\tilde{Y}_2, \dots, \tilde{Y}_\varphi) = \beta] \cdot \Pr[\tilde{Y}_1 \cdot L^+(Q_1) \geq \alpha - \beta] d\beta \\ &\leq \int_\beta \Pr[f_{\setminus\{1\}}(\tilde{Y}_2, \dots, \tilde{Y}_\varphi) = \beta] \cdot \Pr\left[1 + W_1 \geq \frac{\alpha - \beta}{L^+(Q_1)}\right] d\beta \\ &= \Pr[f(1 + W_1, \tilde{Y}_2, \dots, \tilde{Y}_\varphi) \geq \alpha] \\ &\leq \Pr[f(1 + W_1, 1 + W_2, \tilde{Y}_3, \dots, \tilde{Y}_\varphi) \geq \alpha] \\ &\leq \dots \leq \Pr[f(1 + W_1, \dots, 1 + W_\varphi) \geq \alpha] \\ &= \Pr[f(1, \dots, 1) + f(W_1, \dots, W_\varphi) \geq \alpha] . \end{aligned}$$

□

### 6.3 Concentration

Set  $\Delta = d_G(t, t')$ . It holds that

$$\Delta \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} L^+(Q) \leq 2\Delta ,$$

as every edge in  $P_{t, t'}$  is counted at least once, and at most twice in this sum. In particular  $f(1, \dots, 1) \leq 2\Delta$ . Recall that every edge in  $P_{t, t'}$  is of weight at most  $\frac{c_w}{\ln k} \cdot d_G(t, t')$ . In particular, for every  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,  $L^+(Q) \leq L(Q) + \frac{2c_w}{\ln k} \cdot \Delta$ . For every vertex  $v$  on  $P_{t, t'}$ , it holds that  $D(v) \leq \min\{d_G(v, t), d_G(v, t')\} \leq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ . Therefore for every  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,

$$L^+(Q) \leq L(Q) + \frac{2c_w}{\ln k} \cdot \Delta \leq \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} \cdot D(u_Q) + \frac{2c_w}{\ln k} \cdot \Delta \leq \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} \cdot \frac{\Delta}{2} + \frac{2c_w}{\ln k} \cdot \Delta = \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} \cdot \Delta .$$

Let  $\tilde{W}_Q \sim L^+(Q) \cdot \text{Exp}(10)$ . In particular,  $\tilde{W}_Q \sim \text{Exp}(10 \cdot L^+(Q))$ . Set  $\tilde{W} = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \tilde{W}_Q$ . Then  $f(W_1, \dots, W_\varphi)$  is distributed exactly as  $\tilde{W}$ . The maximal mean among the  $\tilde{W}_Q$ 's is  $\lambda_M = \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} 10 \cdot L^+(Q) \leq 10 \cdot \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\ln k} \cdot \Delta$ . The mean of  $\tilde{W}$  is  $\mu = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} 10 \cdot L^+(Q) \leq 20\Delta$ . Set  $c_{\text{con}} = 3\delta c_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{200}$  (con for concentration). Using [Lemma 1](#), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[f(W_1, \dots, W_\varphi) \geq (c_{\text{con}} + 2)20\Delta] &= \Pr[\tilde{W} \geq (c_{\text{con}} + 2)20\Delta] \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\lambda_M} ((c_{\text{con}} + 2)20\Delta - 2\mu)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\ln k}{10c_{\text{int}}\delta\Delta} \cdot 20c_{\text{con}}\Delta\right) = k^{-\frac{c_{\text{con}}}{\delta c_{\text{int}}}} = k^{-3} . \end{aligned}$$

Using Claim 2, Claim 3 and Lemma 3, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr \left[ f \left( \tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi} \right) \geq (20c_{\text{con}} + 42)\Delta \right] &\leq \Pr \left[ f \left( \tilde{Y}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{Q_\varphi} \right) + \mathcal{X}^{\text{CE}} \cdot f(k^4, \dots, k^4) \geq (20c_{\text{con}} + 42)\Delta \right] \\
&\leq \Pr \left[ f \left( \tilde{Y}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{Q_\varphi} \right) \geq (20c_{\text{con}} + 42)\Delta \right] + \Pr [\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}] \\
&\leq \Pr [f(1 + W_1, \dots, 1 + W_\varphi) \geq (20c_{\text{con}} + 42)\Delta] + \Pr [\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}] \\
&\leq \Pr [f(W_1, \dots, W_\varphi) \geq (c_{\text{con}} + 2)20\Delta] + \Pr [\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}] \\
&\leq k^{-3} + k^{-3} = 2 \cdot k^{-3} .
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $20c_{\text{con}} \leq 1$ , thus Lemma 4 follows.

## 7 Bounding the Distortion

Denote by  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{Big}}$  the event that for some pair of terminals  $t, t'$ ,  $f \left( \tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi} \right) \geq 43 \cdot d_G(t, t')$ .<sup>1</sup> By Lemma 4 and union bound,  $\Pr [\mathcal{E}^{\text{Big}}] \leq \binom{k}{2} \cdot k^{-3} < k^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 5.** *Assuming  $\overline{\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CUB}}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{E}^{\text{Big}}}$ , for every pair of terminals  $t, t'$ ,  $d_M(t, t') \leq O(\log k) \cdot d_G(t, t')$ .*

*Proof.* Fix some  $t, t'$ . For every round  $\ell$  and step  $j$ , the detour  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$  was charged upon the interval  $Q_j^\ell$ . In addition to the vertex  $v_j^\ell$ ,  $Q_j^\ell$  contains also a vertex  $u_{Q_j^\ell}$  such that  $D(u_{Q_j^\ell}) \leq \frac{\ln k}{c_{\text{int}} \delta} \cdot L^+(Q_j^\ell)$ . By the triangle inequality,  $D(v_j^\ell) \leq D(u_{Q_j^\ell}) + L(Q_j^\ell) = O(\ln k) \cdot L^+(Q_j^\ell)$ . Using Corollary 1 the distances  $d_G(a_j^\ell, t_j)$  and  $d_G(b_j^\ell, t_j)$ , between the terminal  $t_j$  to the boundaries  $a_j^\ell, b_j^\ell$  of  $\mathcal{D}_j^\ell$ , are bounded by  $O \left( D(v_j^\ell) \right) = O(\ln k) \cdot L^+(Q_j^\ell)$ .

By the end of the Algorithm 1, all the vertices in  $P = v_1 \dots v_{L-1}$  are divided into consecutive detours  $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_z$ . Detour  $\mathcal{D}_i$  was constructed at round  $\ell_i$  by terminal  $t_{j_i}$  and is from  $a_{j_i}^{\ell_i}$  to  $b_{j_i}^{\ell_i}$ . In particular  $\mathcal{D}_i$  was denoted  $\mathcal{D}_{j_i}^{\ell_i}$  during the analysis. See Figure 4 for illustration.

For every  $i < z$ , as  $b_{j_i}^{\ell_i} \in V_{t_{j_i}}$ ,  $a_{j_{i+1}}^{\ell_{i+1}} \in V_{t_{j_{i+1}}}$  and  $\{b_{j_i}^{\ell_i}, a_{j_{i+1}}^{\ell_{i+1}}\}$  is an edge in  $G$ , the minor graph  $M$  contains an edge from  $t_{j_i}$  to  $t_{j_{i+1}}$ . Set  $t_{j_0} = t$ ,  $t_{j_{z+1}} = t'$ ,  $b_{j_0}^{\ell_0} = t$ ,  $a_{j_{z+1}}^{\ell_{z+1}} = t'$ , and  $L^+(Q_{j_0}^{\ell_0}) = L^+(Q_{j_{z+1}}^{\ell_{z+1}}) = 0$ . Note that  $\{t_{j_0}, t_{j_1}\}$  and  $\{t_{j_z}, t_{j_{z+1}}\}$  are also edges in  $M$ .<sup>2</sup> We conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
d_M(t, t') &\leq \sum_{i=0}^z d_G(t_{j_i}, t_{j_{i+1}}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^z \left[ d_G(t_{j_i}, b_{j_i}^{\ell_i}) + d_G(b_{j_i}^{\ell_i}, a_{j_{i+1}}^{\ell_{i+1}}) + d_G(a_{j_{i+1}}^{\ell_{i+1}}, t_{j_{i+1}}) \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^z d_G(b_{j_i}^{\ell_i}, a_{j_{i+1}}^{\ell_{i+1}}) + O(\ln k) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^z \left[ L^+(Q_{j_i}^{\ell_i}) + L^+(Q_{j_{i+1}}^{\ell_{i+1}}) \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} d_G(v_i, v_{i+1}) + O(\ln k) \cdot \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} 2\tilde{X}_Q \cdot L^+(Q) \\
&= d_G(t, t') + O(\ln k) \cdot f \left( \tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi} \right) \\
&= O(\ln k) \cdot d_G(t, t') .
\end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup>We abuse notation here and use the same  $\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi}$  for all terminals.

<sup>2</sup>We assume here that each terminal has an edge to itself of length 0.




Figure 4: The vertices  $P = v_1 \dots v_{L-1}$  divided into consecutive detours  $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_5$ .  $t_{j_0}, t_{j_1}, t_{j_2}, t_{j_3}, t_{j_4}, t_{j_5}$  is a walk in the terminal centered minor  $M$  of  $G$  (which induced by  $V_1, \dots, V_k$ ). Note that this walk might not be a (shortest) path in  $M$ . The weight of the edge  $\{t_{j_1}, t_{j_2}\}$  in  $M$  equals  $d_G(t_{j_1}, t_{j_2})$ , which bounded by  $d_G(t_{j_1}, v_{b_{j_1}^{\ell_1}}) + d_G(v_{b_{j_1}^{\ell_1}}, v_{a_{j_2}^{\ell_2}}) + d_G(v_{a_{j_2}^{\ell_2}}, t_{j_2})$ .

□

By Lemma 2, Lemma 3, and Lemma 4,  $\Pr[\overline{\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}} \wedge \overline{\mathcal{E}^{\text{CUB}}} \wedge \overline{\mathcal{E}^{\text{fBig}}}] \geq 1 - (\Pr[\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}] + \Pr[\overline{\mathcal{E}^{\text{CUB}}}] + \Pr[\mathcal{E}^{\text{fBig}}]) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{k^3} - \frac{1}{k} > 1 - \frac{3}{k}$ . Hence Lemma 5 implies Theorem 1.

## 8 Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank his advisors: to Ofer Neiman, for fruitful discussions, and to Robert Krauthgamer for useful comments.

## References

- [AGK14] Alexandr Andoni, Anupam Gupta, and Robert Krauthgamer. Towards  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate flow sparsifiers. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 279–293, 2014.
- [BFN16] Yair Bartal, Arnold Filtser, and Ofer Neiman. Constructing almost minimum spanning trees with constant average distortion. In *SODA*, 2016.
- [BG08] A. Basu and A. Gupta. Steiner point removal in graph metrics. Unpublished Manuscript, available from <http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~abasu/papers/SPR.pdf>, 2008.
- [BK96] András A. Benczúr and David R. Karger. Approximating  $s$ - $t$  minimum cuts in  $\tilde{O}(n^2)$  time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, May 22-24, 1996*, pages 47–55, 1996.
- [BSS12] Joshua D. Batson, Daniel A. Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava. Twice-ramanujan sparsifiers. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 41(6):1704–1721, 2012.
- [CE05] Don Coppersmith and Michael Elkin. Sparse source-wise and pair-wise distance preservers. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '05*, pages 660–669, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2005. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [CGH16] Yun Kuen Cheung, Gramoz Goranci, and Monika Henzinger. Graph minors for preserving terminal distances approximately - lower and upper bounds. In *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2016, July 11-15, 2016, Rome, Italy*, pages 131:1–131:14, 2016.
- [Che17] Yun Kuen Cheung. Steiner point removal - distant terminals don't (really) bother. *CoRR*, abs/1703.08790, 2017.
- [Chu12] Julia Chuzhoy. On vertex sparsifiers with steiner nodes. In *Proceedings of the 44th Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC 2012, New York, NY, USA, May 19 - 22, 2012*, pages 673–688, 2012.
- [CLLM10] Moses Charikar, Tom Leighton, Shi Li, and Ankur Moitra. Vertex sparsifiers and abstract rounding algorithms. In *51th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2010, October 23-26, 2010, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*, pages 265–274, 2010.
- [CXKR06] T.-H. Chan, Donglin Xia, Goran Konjevod, and Andrea Richa. A tight lower bound for the steiner point removal problem on trees. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems, and 10th International Conference on Randomization and Computation, APPROX'06/RANDOM'06*, pages 70–81, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer-Verlag.
- [EFN15a] Michael Elkin, Arnold Filtser, and Ofer Neiman. Prioritized metric structures and embedding. In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015*, pages 489–498, 2015.
- [EFN15b] Michael Elkin, Arnold Filtser, and Ofer Neiman. Terminal embeddings. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2015, August 24-26, 2015, Princeton, NJ, USA*, pages 242–264, 2015.
- [EGK<sup>+</sup>14] Matthias Englert, Anupam Gupta, Robert Krauthgamer, Harald Räcke, Inbal Talgam-Cohen, and Kunal Talwar. Vertex sparsifiers: New results from old techniques. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(4):1239–1262, 2014.
- [GHP17] Gramoz Goranci, Monika Henzinger, and Pan Peng. Improved guarantees for vertex sparsification in planar graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1702.01136, 2017.
- [GNR10] Anupam Gupta, Viswanath Nagarajan, and R. Ravi. An improved approximation algorithm for requirement cut. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 38(4):322–325, 2010.

- [Gup01] Anupam Gupta. Steiner points in tree metrics don't (really) help. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '01, pages 220–227, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2001. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [KKN14] Lior Kamma, Robert Krauthgamer, and Huy L. Nguyen. Cutting corners cheaply, or how to remove steiner points. In *SODA*, pages 1029–1040, 2014.
- [KKN15] Lior Kamma, Robert Krauthgamer, and Huy L. Nguyen. Cutting corners cheaply, or how to remove steiner points. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 44(4):975–995, 2015.
- [KNZ14] Robert Krauthgamer, Huy L. Nguyen, and Tamar Zondiner. Preserving terminal distances using minors. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 28(1):127–141, 2014.
- [KR13] Robert Krauthgamer and Inbal Rika. Mimicking networks and succinct representations of terminal cuts. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2013, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 6-8, 2013*, pages 1789–1799, 2013.
- [KR17] Robert Krauthgamer and Inbal Rika. Refined vertex sparsifiers of planar graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1702.05951, 2017.
- [KV13] Telikepalli Kavitha and Nithin M. Varma. Small stretch pairwise spanners. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Automata, Languages, and Programming - Volume Part I, ICALP'13*, pages 601–612, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer-Verlag.
- [LM10] Frank Thomson Leighton and Ankur Moitra. Extensions and limits to vertex sparsification. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, pages 47–56, 2010.
- [MM10] Konstantin Makarychev and Yury Makarychev. Metric extension operators, vertex sparsifiers and lipschitz extendability. In *51th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2010, October 23-26, 2010, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*, pages 255–264, 2010.
- [Moi09] Ankur Moitra. Approximation algorithms for multicommodity-type problems with guarantees independent of the graph size. In *50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2009, October 25-27, 2009, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*, pages 3–12, 2009.
- [PS89] David Peleg and Alejandro A. Schäffer. Graph spanners. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 13(1):99–116, 1989.
- [RTZ05] Liam Roditty, Mikkel Thorup, and Uri Zwick. Deterministic constructions of approximate distance oracles and spanners. In *Automata, Languages and Programming, 32nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2005, Lisbon, Portugal, July 11-15, 2005, Proceedings*, pages 261–272, 2005.
- [TZ05] Mikkel Thorup and Uri Zwick. Approximate distance oracles. *J. ACM*, 52(1):1–24, 2005.

## A Proof of Lemma 1

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ 's are independent random variables, where each  $X_i$  is distributed according to  $\text{Exp}(\lambda_i)$ . Let  $X = \sum_i X_i$  and  $\lambda_M = \max_i \lambda_i$ . Set  $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_i \lambda_i$ .*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For } a \geq 2\mu, \quad \Pr[X \geq a] &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\lambda_M}(a - 2\mu)\right). \\ \text{For } a \leq \frac{\mu}{2}, \quad \Pr[X \leq a] &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\lambda_M}\left(\frac{\mu}{2} - a\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Set  $t = \frac{1}{2\lambda_M}$ . For each  $X_i$ , the moment generating function w.r.t  $t$  equals  $\mathbb{E}[\exp tX_i] = \frac{1}{1-t\lambda_i}$ . Using the inequality  $\frac{1}{1-x} \leq 1 + 2x \leq \exp(2x)$  (for  $0 < x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ) we have  $\mathbb{E}[\exp tX_i] \leq \exp(2t\lambda_i)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X > a] &= \Pr[\exp(tX) > \exp(ta)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tX)] / \exp(ta) \\ &= \exp(-ta) \cdot \prod_i \mathbb{E}[\exp tX_i] \\ &\leq \exp(-ta) \cdot \prod_i \exp(2t\lambda_i) \\ &= \exp(-ta + 2t\mu) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\lambda_M}(a - 2\mu)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we use Markov inequality, and in the second equality we use the fact that  $\{X_i\}_i$  are independent.

For the second inequality, set  $t = \frac{1}{\lambda_M}$ . It holds that  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(-tX_i)] = \frac{1}{1+t\lambda_i}$ . Using the inequality  $\frac{1}{1+x} \leq 1 - \frac{x}{2} \leq e^{-\frac{x}{2}}$  (for  $0 < x \leq 1$ ) we have  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-tX_i}] \leq e^{-\frac{t}{2}\lambda_i}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X < a] &= \Pr[\exp(-tX) > \exp(-ta)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(-tX)] / \exp(-ta) \\ &= \exp(ta) \cdot \prod_i \mathbb{E}[\exp(-tX_i)] \\ &\leq \exp(ta) \cdot \prod_i \exp\left(-\frac{t}{2}\lambda_i\right) \\ &= \exp\left(ta - \frac{t}{2}\mu\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\lambda_M}\left(\frac{\mu}{2} - a\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

## B Index

### Preliminaries

$d_G$  : shortest path metric in  $G$ .

$B_G(v, r)$  : ball around  $v$  in  $d_G$  with radius  $r$ .

$G[A]$  : graph induced by  $A$ .

$K = \{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$  : set of terminals.

$D(v) = \min_{t \in K} d_G(v, t)$ .

**Terminal partition** : partition  $\{V_1, \dots, V_k\}$  of  $V$ , s.t. for every  $i$ ,  $t_i \in V_i$  and  $V_i$  is connected.

**Induced minor** : given terminal partition  $\{V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ , the induced minor obtained by contracting each  $V_i$  into the super vertex  $t_i$ . The weight of the edge  $\{t_i, t_j\}$  (if exist) set to be  $d_G(t_i, t_j)$ .

**Distortion** of induced minor:  $\max_{i,j} \frac{d_M(t_i, t_j)}{d_G(t_i, t_j)}$ .

$\text{Exp}(\lambda)$  : exponential distribution with mean  $\lambda$ .

### Assumptions

- Minimal distance between two terminals equals 1.
- $k$  is larger then big enough constant.
- There are at most  $k^4$  vertices in  $G$ .
- Every edge on  $P_{t,t'}$  has weight at most  $\frac{c_w}{\ln k} \cdot d_G(t, t')$ .
- There are no terminals other then  $t, t'$  on  $P_{t,t'}$ .

### Constants

$\delta = \frac{1}{20}$ : governs the ratio  $r$ .

$r = 1 + \frac{\delta}{\ln k}$ : is the ratio in which the mean of the exponential distribution grows in each round.

$D = \frac{\delta}{\ln k}$ : initial mean of the exponential distribution in round 0.

$c_w = \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{4} = \frac{1}{2400}$ : governs the maximum (relative) weight of an edge on  $P_{t,t'}$ .

$c_{\text{CE}} = \frac{1}{3}$ . The constant in  $\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}$ .

$c_{\text{int}} = \frac{c_{\text{CE}}}{10} = \frac{1}{30}$ : governs the size of interval in the partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $P$ .

$\varphi = |\mathcal{Q}|$ : number of intervals in the partition  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

$p = 0.2$ : upper bound on the failure probability.

### Events

$\mathcal{E}^{\text{CUB}}$  : denotes that every vertex was already covered after the  $\lceil \log_r(4D(v)) \rceil$  round.

$\mathcal{E}^{\text{CE}}$  : denotes that some vertex  $v$  was covered by some terminal  $t$ , before the  $\lceil \log_r(c_{\text{CE}} \cdot d_G(v, t)) \rceil$  round.

$\mathcal{E}^{\text{fBig}}$  : denotes that for some pair of terminals  $t, t'$ ,  $f(\tilde{X}_{Q_1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{Q_\varphi}) \geq 43 \cdot d_G(t, t')$ .

### Notations

$V_j$  : cluster of  $t_j$ .

$R_j$  : radius of the cluster of  $t_j$ .

$q_j^\ell$  : growth of  $R_j$  in the  $\ell$  round.

$V_\perp$  : set of unclustered (uncovered) vertices.

$P_{t,t'} = \{t = v_0, \dots, v_L = t'\}$ : shortest path from  $t$  to  $t'$ .

$P = \{v_1, \dots, v_{L-1}\}$ :  $P_{t,t'}$  without its boundaries.

$L(\{v_a, v_{a+1}, \dots, v_b\}) = d_G(v_a, v_b)$ : internal length.

$L^+(\{v_a, v_{a+1}, \dots, v_b\}) = d_G(v_{a-1}, v_{b+1})$ : external length.

$\mathcal{Q}$  : partition of  $P$  into intervals  $Q$ .

$u_Q$  : vertex in  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$  with the property  $L(Q) \leq \frac{c_{\text{int}} \delta}{\log k} D(u_Q) \leq L^+(Q)$ .

$a_j^\ell$  : index of the leftmost active vertex covered by  $t_j$  at round  $\ell$ .

$b_j^\ell$  : index of the rightmost active vertex covered by  $t_j$  at round  $\ell$ .

$\mathcal{D}_j^\ell = \{v_{a_j^\ell}, v_{a_j^\ell+1}, \dots, v_{b_j^\ell}\}$ : detour created by terminal  $t_j$  at round  $\ell$ .

**Slice** maximal sub-interval (of some  $Q$ ) of active vertices.

$q_v$  minimal choice of  $q_j^\ell$ , such that  $t_j$  will cover vertex  $v$ .

$v_j^\ell$  : vertex with the minimal  $q_v$  (among active vertices).

$Q_j^\ell$  : interval containing  $v_j^\ell$ .

$S_j^\ell$  : slice containing  $v_j^\ell$ .

$q_{S_j^\ell}$  : minimal choice of  $q_j^\ell$  that forces  $t_j$  to cover all of  $S_j^\ell$ .

$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\varphi) = \sum_i x_i \cdot L^+(Q_i)$ : cost function.

$B_Q$  : a coin box which resembles the interval  $Q$ .

### Counters

$S(Q)$  : (current) number of slices in interval  $Q$ .

$X_Q$  : number of detours the interval  $Q$  is (currently) charged for.

$\tilde{X}_Q$  : number of detours the interval  $Q$  is charged for by the end of [Algorithm 1](#).

$Z_Q$  : number of active coins in  $B_Q$ . Each coin is active when added to the box.

$Y_Q$  : number of inactive coins in  $B_Q$ . A coin become inactive after tossing.

$\tilde{Y}_Q$  : number of inactive coins in  $B_Q$  by the end of the process.