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Abstract

We study the problem of embedding weighted graphs of pathwidth \( k \) into \( \ell_p \) spaces. Our main result is an \( O(k^{\min(1/p,1/2)}) \)-distortion embedding. For \( p = 1 \), this is a super-exponential improvement over the best previous bound of Lee and Sidiropoulos. Our distortion bound is asymptotically tight for any fixed \( p > 1 \).

Our result is obtained via a novel embedding technique that is based on low depth decompositions of a graph via shortest paths. The core new idea is that given a geodesic shortest path \( P \), we can probabilistically embed all points into 2 dimensions with respect to \( P \). For \( p > 2 \) our embedding also implies improved distortion on bounded treewidth graphs \( (O((k \log n)^{1/p})) \). For asymptotically large \( p \), our results also implies improved distortion on graphs excluding a minor.
1 Introduction

Low-distortion metric embeddings are a crucial component in the modern algorithmist toolkit. Indeed, they have applications in approximation algorithms [LLR95], online algorithms [BBMN11], distributed algorithms [KKM12], and for solving linear systems and computing graph sparsifiers [ST04]. Given a (finite) metric space \((V, d)\), a map \(\phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^D\), and a norm \(\| \cdot \|\), the contraction and expansion of the map \(\phi\) are the smallest \(\tau, \rho \geq 1\), respectively, such that for every pair \(x, y \in V\),

\[
\frac{1}{\tau} \leq \frac{\|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\|}{d(x, y)} \leq \rho.
\]

The distortion of the map is then \(\tau \cdot \rho\). In this paper we will investigate embeddings into \(\ell_p\) norms; the most prominent of which are the Euclidean norm \(\ell_2\) and the cut norm \(\ell_1\); the former for obvious reasons, and the latter because of its close connection to graph partitioning problems, and in particular the Sparsest Cut problem.

We focus on embedding of metrics arising from certain graph families. Indeed, since general \(n\)-point metrics require \(\Omega(\log n/p)\)-distortion to embed into \(\ell_p\)-norms, much attention was given to embeddings of restricted graph families that arise in practice. (Embedding an (edge-weighted) graph is short-hand for embedding the shortest path metric of the graph generated by these edge-weights.) Since the class of graphs embeddable with some distortion into some target normed space is closed under taking minors, it is natural to focus on minor-closed graph families. A long-standing conjecture in this area is that all non-trivial minor-closed families of graphs embed into \(\ell_1\) with distortion depending only on the graph family and not the size \(n\) of the graph.

While this question remains unresolved in general, there has been some progress on special classes of graphs. The class of outerplanar graphs (which exclude \(K_{2,3}\) and \(K_4\) as a minor) embeds isometrically into \(\ell_1\); this follows from results of Okamura and Seymour [OS81]. Following [GNRS04], Chakrabarti et al. [CJLV08] show that every graph with treewidth-2 (which excludes \(K_4\) as a minor) embeds into \(\ell_1\) with distortion 2 (which is tight, as shown by [LR10]). Lee and Sidiropoulos [LS13] showed that every graph with pathwidth \(k\) can be embedded into \(\ell_1\) with distortion \((4k)^{k^3+1}\). See Section 1.3 for additional results.

We note that \(\ell_2\) is a potentially more natural and useful target space than \(\ell_1\) (in particular, \(\ell_2\) embed isometrically into \(\ell_1\)). Alas, there are only few (natural) families of metrics that admit constant distortion embedding into Euclidean space, such as “snowflakes” of a doubling metrics [Ass83], doubling trees [GKL03] and graphs of bounded bandwidth [BCMN13]. All these families have bounded doubling dimension. (For definitions, see Section 2.)

1.1 Our Results

In this paper we develop a new technique for embedding certain graph families into \(\ell_p\) spaces with constant distortion. Our main result is an improved embedding for bounded pathwidth graphs (see Section 2 for the definition of pathwidth and other graph families).

Theorem 1 (Pathwidth Theorem). Any graph with pathwidth \(k\) embeds into \(\ell_p\) with distortion \(O(k^{3/p})\).

Note that this is a super-exponential improvement over the best previous distortion bound of \(O(k)^{k^3}\), by Lee and Sidiropoulos. Their approach was based on probabilistic embedding into trees, which implies embedding only into \(\ell_1\). Such an approach cannot yield distortion better than \(O(k)\), due to known lower bounds for the diamond graph [GNRS04], that has pathwidth \(k + 1\). Our embedding
holds for any $\ell_p$ space, and we can overcome the barrier of $O(k)$ (since $\ell_2$ embeds into $\ell_p$ isometrically, the distortion of Theorem 1 is never larger than $O(\sqrt{k})$). In particular, we obtain embeddings of pathwidth-$k$ graphs into both $\ell_2$ and $\ell_1$ with distortion $O(\sqrt{k})$. Moreover, an embedding with this distortion can be found efficiently via semidefinite-programming; see, e.g., [LLR05], even without access to the actual path decomposition (which is NP-hard even to approximate [BGHK92]). We remark that graphs of bounded pathwidth can have arbitrarily large doubling dimension (exhibited by star graphs that have pathwidth 1), and thus our result is a noteworthy example of a non-trivial Euclidean embedding with constant distortion for a family of metrics with unbounded doubling dimension.

Since graphs of treewidth $k$ have pathwidth $O(k \log n)$ (see, e.g., [GTW13]), Theorem 1 provides an embedding of such graphs into $\ell_p$ with distortion $O((k \log n)^{1/p})$. This strictly improves the best previously known bound, which follows from a theorem in [KLMN05] (who obtained distortion $O((k^{1-1/p} \log^{1/p} n))$, for any $p > 2$, and matches it for $1 \leq p \leq 2$. While [KK16] obtained recently a distortion bound with improved dependence on $k$, their result $O((\log(k \log n))^{1-1/p}(\log^{1/p} n))$ has sub-optimal dependence on $n$.

A General Embedding Framework. The embedding of Theorem 1 follows as a special case of a more general theorem: we devise embeddings for any graph family which admits “shortest path decompositions” (SPDs) of “low depth”. Every (weighted) path graph has an SPD of depth 1. A graph $G$ has an SPD of depth $k$ if after removing some shortest path $P$, every connected component in $G \setminus P$ has an SPD of depth $k - 1$. (An alternative definition appears in Definition 1.) Our main technical result is the following.

**Theorem 2** (Embeddings for SPD Families). Let $G = (V,E)$ be a weighted graph with an SPD of depth $k$. Then there exists an embedding $f : V \rightarrow \ell_p$ with distortion $O(k^{1/p})$.

Since bounded-pathwidth graphs admit SPDs of low depth, we get Theorem 1 as a simple corollary of Theorem 2. Moreover, we derive several other results, which are summarized in Figure 1.1; these results either improve on the state-of-the-art, or provide matching bounds using a completely different approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph Family</th>
<th>Our results.</th>
<th>Previous results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathwidth $k$</td>
<td>$O(k^{1/p})$</td>
<td>$O((4k)^{k/2+1})$ into $\ell_1$ [LS13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treewidth $k$</td>
<td>$O((k \log n)^{1/p})$</td>
<td>$O(k^{1-1/p} \cdot \log^{1/p} n)$ [KLMN05] or $O((k \log n)^{1-1/p}(\log^{1/p} n))$ [KK16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planar</td>
<td>$O(\log^{1/p} n)$</td>
<td>$O(\log^{1/p} n)$ [Rao99]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H$-minor-free</td>
<td>$O((g(H) \log n)^{1/p})$</td>
<td>$O(</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Our and previous results for embedding certain graph families into $\ell_p$. (For $H$-minor-free graphs, $g(H)$ is some function of $|H|$.)

A Matching Lower Bound. Our result of Theorem 1 (and thus also Theorem 2) is asymptotically tight for any fixed $p > 1$. The family exhibiting this fact is the diamond graphs.

**Theorem 3** ([LN04, JS09]). For any fixed $p > 1$ and every $k \geq 1$, there exists a graph $G = (V,E)$ with pathwidth-$k$, such that every embedding $f : V \rightarrow \ell_p$ has distortion $\Omega(k^{\min(1,1/2)})$.

The bound in Theorem 3 was proven first for $p = 2$ in [NR03], generalized to $1 < p \leq 2$ in [LN04] and for $p \geq 2$ by [JS09] (see also [MN13, JLM11]). For completeness, we provide a direct proof of the case $p \geq 2$ in Appendix A. We note that for $\ell_1$ only the trivial $\Omega(k)$ lower bound is known.
1.2 Technical Ideas

Many known embeddings [Bou85, Rao99, KLMN05, ABN11] are based on a collection of 1-dimensional embeddings, where we embed each point to its distance from a given subset of points. We follow this approach, but differ in two aspects. Firstly, the subset of points we use is not based on random sampling or probabilistic clustering. Rather, inspired by the works of [And86] and [AGG+14], the subset used is a geodesic shortest path. The second is that our embedding is not 1-dimensional but 2-dimensional: this seemingly small change crucially allows us to use the structure of the shortest paths to our advantage.

The SPD induces a collection of shortest paths (each shortest path lies in some connected component). A natural initial attempt is to embed a vertex $v$ relative to a geodesic path $P$ using two dimensions:

- The first coordinate $\Delta_1$ is the distance to the path $d(v, P)$.
- The second coordinate $\Delta_2$ is the distance $d(v, r)$ to the endpoint of the path, called its “root”.

![Diagram of shortest path $P$ rooted at $r$, partitioning cluster $X$ into clusters $C_1$ and $C_2$. In cases (a) and (b), the first coordinate (the distance to $P$) provides sufficient contribution. In case (c) the second coordinate (the distance to root $r$) provides the contribution.](image)

Unfortunately, this embedding may have unbounded expansion: If two vertices $u, v$ are separated by some shortest path, in future iterations $v$ may have a large distance to the root of a path $P$ in its component, while $u$ has zero in that coordinate (because it’s not in that component), incurring a large stretch. The natural fix is to enforce a Lipschitz condition on every coordinate: for $v$ in cluster $X$, we truncate the value $v$ can receive at $O(d_G(v, V \setminus X))$. I.e., a vertex close to the boundary of $X$ cannot get a large value. Using the fact that the SPD has depth $k$, each vertex will have only $O(k)$ nonzero coordinates, which implies expansion $O(k^{1/p})$.

To bound the contraction, for each pair $u, v$ we consider the first path $P$ in the SPD that lies “close” to $\{u, v\}$ or separates them to different connected components. Then we show that at least one of the two coordinates should give sufficient contribution. (See, e.g., Figure 2.)

![Diagram showing effect of truncation on contraction.](image)

But what about the effect of truncation on contraction? A careful recursive argument shows that the contribution to $u, v$ from the first coordinate (the distance from the path $P$) is essentially not affected by this truncation. Hence the argument in cases (a) and (b) of Figure 2 still works. However, the

---

1In fact, we use different dimensions for each connected components.
argument using the distance to the root of \( P \), case (c), can be ruined. Solving this issue requires some new non-trivial ideas. Our solution is to introduce a probabilistic sawtooth function that replaces the simple truncation. The main technical part of the paper is devoted to showing that a collection of these functions for all possible distance scales, with appropriate random shifts, suffices to control the expected contraction in case (c), for all relevant pairs simultaneously.

## 1.3 Other Related Work

There has been work on embedding other graph families into normed spaces: Chekuri et al. [CGN+06] extend the Okamura and Seymour bound for outerplanar graphs to \( k \)-outerplanar graphs, and showed that these embed into \( \ell_1 \) with distortion \( 2^{O(k)} \). Rao [Rao99] (see also [KLMN05]) embed planar graphs into \( \ell_p \) with distortion \( O(\log^{1/p} n) \). For graphs with genus \( g \), [LS10] showed an embedding into Euclidean space with distortion \( O(\log g + \sqrt{\log n}) \). Finally, for \( H \)-minor-free graphs, combining the results of [AGG+14, KLMN05] give \( \ell_p \)-embeddings with \( O(|H|^{1-1/p} \log^{1/p} n) \) distortion.

Following [And86, Mil86], the idea of using geodesic shortest paths to decompose the graph has been used for many algorithmic tasks: MPLS routing [GKR04], directed connectivity, distance labels and compact routing [Tho04], object location [AG06], and nearest neighbor search [ACKW15]. However, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first time it has been used directly for low-distortion embeddings.

## 2 Preliminaries and Notation

For \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \), let \([k] := \{1, \ldots, k\} \). For \( p \geq 1 \), the \( \ell_p \)-norm of a vector \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \) is \( \|x\|_p := (\sum_{i=1}^d |x_i|^p)^{1/p} \), where \( \|x\|_\infty := \max_i |x_i| \).

**Doubling dimension.** The doubling dimension of a metric is a measure of its local “growth rate”. Formally, a metric space \((X, d)\) has doubling dimension \( \lambda_X \) if for every \( x \in X \) and radius \( r \), the ball \( B(x, r) \) can be covered by \( 2^{\lambda_X} \) balls of radius \( \frac{r}{2} \). A family is doubling if the doubling dimension of all metrics in it is bounded by some universal constant.

**Graphs.** We consider connected undirected graphs \( G = (V, E) \) with edge weights \( w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0} \). Let \( d_G \) denote the shortest path metric in \( G \); we drop subscripts when there is no ambiguity. For a vertex \( x \in V \) and a set \( A \subseteq V \), let \( d_G(x, A) := \min_{a \in A} d_G(x, a) \), where \( d_G(x, \emptyset) := \infty \). For a subset of vertices \( A \subseteq V \), let \( G[A] \) denote the induced graph on \( A \), and let \( d_A := d_{G[A]} \) be the shortest path metric in the induced graph. Let \( G \setminus A := G[V \setminus A] \) be the graph after deleting the vertex set \( A \) from \( G \).

**Special graph families.** Given a graph \( G = (V, E) \), a **tree decomposition** of \( G \) is a tree \( T \) with nodes \( B_1, \ldots, B_s \) (called bags) where each \( B_i \) is a subset of \( V \) such that the following properties hold:

- For every edge \( \{u, v\} \in E \), there is a bag \( B_i \) containing both \( u \) and \( v \).
- For every vertex \( v \in V \), the set of bags containing \( v \) form a connected subtree of \( T \).

The **width** of a tree decomposition is \( \max_i \{|B_i| - 1\} \). The **treewidth** of \( G \) is the minimal width of a tree decomposition of \( G \).

A **path decomposition** of \( G \) is a special kind of tree decomposition where the underlying tree is a path. The **pathwidth** of \( G \) is the minimal width of a path decomposition of \( G \).

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 graph family \( \mathcal{G} \) is **\( H \)-minor-free** if no graph \( G \in \mathcal{G} \) has \( H \) as a minor.
2.1 The Sawtooth function

Another component in our embeddings will be the following sawtooth function. For \( t \in \mathbb{N} \), we define \( g_t : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R} \) the sawtooth function w.r.t. \( 2^t \) as follows. For \( x \geq 0 \), if \( q_x := \lfloor x/2^t \rfloor \) then

\[
g_t(x) = 2^t - \left| x - (q_x \cdot 2^t + 2^t) \right|.
\]

Figure 3: The graph of the “sawtooth” function \( g_t \). The points \( x_1 = 5 \cdot 2^t-1 \) and \( x_3 = 15 \cdot 2^t-1 \) are mapped to \( 2^t-1 \), while \( x_2 = 10 \cdot 2^t-1 \) is mapped to \( 2^t \).

See Figure 3 for an illustration. The following observation is straightforward.

**Observation 1.** The Sawtooth function \( g_t \) is 1-Lipschitz, bounded by \( 2^t \), periodic with period \( 2^{t+1} \).

The proof of the following lemma appears in Appendix C.

**Lemma 2** (Sawtooth Lemma). Let \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+ \). Let \( \alpha \in [0,1] \), \( \beta \in [0,4] \) be drawn uniformly and independently. The following properties hold:

1. \( \mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} [g_t(\beta x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1})] = 2^{t-1} \).
2. If \( |x - y| \leq 2^{t-1} \), then \( \mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} [\left| g_t(\beta x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\beta y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|] = \Omega(|x - y|) \).
3. If \( |x - y| > 2^{t-1} \), then \( \mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} [\left| g_t(\beta x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\beta y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|] = \Omega(2^t) \).

3 Shortest Path Decompositions

Our embeddings will crucially depend on the notion of shortest path decompositions. In the introduction we provided a recursive definition for SPD. Here we show an equivalent definition which will be more suitable for our purposes.

**Definition 1** (Shortest Path Decomposition (SPD)). Given a weighted graph \( G = (V,E,w) \), a SPD of depth \( k \) is a pair \( \{X,P\} \), where \( X \) is a collection \( X_1, \ldots, X_k \) of partial partitions of \( V \) \(^2\), and \( P \) is a collection of sets of paths \( P_1, \ldots, P_k \), where \( X_1 = \{V\}, X_k = P_k \), and the following properties hold:

1. For every \( 1 \leq i \leq k \) and every subset \( X \in X_i \), there exist a unique path \( P_X \in P_i \) such that \( P_X \) is a shortest path in \( G[X] \).
2. For every \( 2 \leq i \leq k \), \( X_i \) consists of all connected components of \( G[X \setminus P_X] \) over all \( X \in X_{i-1} \).

\(^2\)i.e. for every \( X \in X_i \), \( X \subseteq V \), and for every different subsets \( X,X' \in X_i \), \( X \cap X' = \emptyset \).
In other words, \( \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} P_k \) is a partition of \( V \) into paths, where each path \( P_X \) is a shortest path in the component \( X \) it belongs to at the point it is deleted.

For a given graph \( G \) let \( \text{SPDdepth}(G) \) be the minimum \( k \) such that \( G \) admits an SPD of depth \( k \). For a given family of graphs \( \mathcal{G} \) let \( \text{SPDdepth}(\mathcal{G}) := \max_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \{ \text{SPDdepth}(G) \} \). In the following we consider the \( \text{SPDdepth} \) of some graph families.

### 3.1 The SPD Depth for Various Graph Families

One advantage of defining the shortest path decomposition is that several well-known graph families have bounded depth SPD.

- **Pathwidth.** Every graph \( G = (V, E, w) \) with pathwidth \( k \) has an \( \text{SPDdepth} \) of \( k + 1 \). Indeed, let \( T = (B_1, \ldots, B_s) \) be a path decomposition of \( G \), where \( B_1, B_s \) are the two bags at the end of this path. Choose arbitrary vertices \( x \in B_1 \) and \( y \in B_s \), and let \( P \) be a shortest path in \( G \) from \( x \) to \( y \). By the definition of a path decomposition, the path \( P \) contains at least one vertex from every bag \( B_i \). Hence, deleting the vertices of \( P \) would reduce the size of each bag by one; consequently each connected component of \( G \setminus P \) has pathwidth \( k - 1 \), and by induction \( \text{SPDdepth} \) \( k \). Finally, a connected component of pathwidth 0 is necessarily a singleton, which has \( \text{SPDdepth} \) 1.

- **Treewidth.** Since every tree has pathwidth \( O(\log n) \), we can show that an \( n \)-vertex treewidth-\( k \) graph has pathwidth \( O(k \log n) \). Hence, treewidth-\( k \) graphs have \( \text{SPDdepth} \) \( O(k \log n) \).

- **Planar.** Using cycle separators [Mil86] as in [Tho04, GKR04], every planar graph has \( \text{SPDdepth} \) \( O(\log n) \); this follows as each cycle separator can be constructed as union of two shortest paths.

- **Minor-free.** Finally, every \( H \)-minor-free graph admits a balanced separator consisting of \( g(H) \) shortest paths (for some function \( g \)) [AG06], and hence has \( \text{SPDdepth} \) \( O(g(H) \cdot \log n) \).

Combining these observation with Theorem 2, we get the following set of results:

**Corollary 1.** Consider an \( n \)-vertex weighted graph \( G \), Theorem 2 implies the following:

- If \( G \) has pathwidth \( k \), it embeds into \( \ell_p \) with distortion \( O(k^{1/p}) \).
- If \( G \) has treewidth \( k \), it embeds into \( \ell_p \) with distortion \( O((k \log n)^{1/p}) \).
- If \( G \) is planar, it embeds into \( \ell_p \) with distortion \( O(\log^{1/p} n) \).
- For every fixed \( H \), if \( G \) excludes \( H \) as a minor, it embeds into \( \ell_p \) with distortion \( O(\log^{1/p} n) \), where the constant in the \( \text{big-O} \) depends on \( H \).

As mentioned in Section 1, we get a substantial improvement for the pathwidth case. Our result for treewidth improves upon that from [KLMN05] for \( p > 2 \); they got \( O(k^{1-1/p}(\log n)^{1/p}) \) distortion compared to our \( O((k \log n)^{1/p}) \). Our result appears to be closer to the truth, since the distortion tends to \( O(1) \) as \( p \to \infty \).

Finally, our results for planar graphs match the current state-of-the-art.

Our results for minor-free graphs depend on the Robertson-Seymour decomposition, and hence are currently better only for large values of \( p \). (It remains an open question to improve the \( \text{SPDdepth} \) of \( H \)-minor-free graphs to have a \( \text{poly}(|H|) \log n \) dependence, perhaps using the ideas from [AGG+14].) In general, we hope that our results will be useful in getting other embedding results, and will spur further work on understanding shortest path separators.
4 The Embedding Algorithm

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a weighted graph, and let $\{X, P\} = \{\{X_1, \ldots, X_k\}, \{P_1, \ldots, P_k\}\}$ be an SPD of depth $k$ for $G$. By scaling, we can assume that the minimum weight of an edge is 1; let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be the minimal such that the diameter of $G$ is strictly bounded by $2^M$. Pick $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\beta \in [0, 4]$ uniformly and independently.

For every $i \in [k]$, and $X \in X_i$, we now construct an embedding $f_X : V \to \mathbb{R}^D$ (for some number of dimensions $D \in \mathbb{N}$). This map $f_X$ consists of two parts.

**First coordinate: Distance to the Path.** The first coordinate of the embedding implements the distance to the path $P_X$, and is denoted by $f_{\text{path}}^X$. Let $X_1, \ldots, X_s \in X_{i+1}$ be the connected components of $G[X \setminus P_X]$ (note that it is also possible that $s = 0$). We use a separate coordinate for each $X_j$, and hence $f_{\text{path}}^X : V \to \mathbb{R}^s$. Moreover, for $v \in X$ we truncate at $2d_G(v, V \setminus X)$ in order to guarantee Lipschitz-ness. In particular, the coordinate corresponding to $X_j$ is set to

$$
(f_{\text{path}}^X)_{X_j}(v) = \begin{cases} 
\min \{d_X(v, P_X), 2d_G(v, V \setminus X)\} & \text{if } v \in X_j, \\
0 & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
$$

See Figure 4 for an illustration.

**Second coordinate: Distance to the Root.** The second part is denoted $f_{\text{root}}^X$, which is intended to capture the distance from the root $r$ of the path. Again, to get the Lipschitz-ness, we would like to truncate the value at $2d_G(v, V \setminus X)$ as we did for $f_{\text{path}}^X$. However, a problem with this idea is that the root $r$ can be arbitrarily far from some pair $u, v$ that needs contribution from this coordinate. And hence, even if $|d_G(u, r) - d_G(v, r)| \approx d_G(u, v)$, there may be no contribution after the truncation. So we use the sawtooth function.

Specifically, we replace the ideal contribution $d_G(v, r)$ by the sawtooth function $g_t(d_G(v, r))$, where the scale $t$ for the function is chosen such that $2^t \approx d_G(v, V \setminus X)$. To avoid the case that two
Lemma 4 (Expansion Bound). For any vertices $u, v$, every coordinate $j$, and every choice of $\alpha, \beta$, 
$$|f_j(v) - f_j(u)| = O(d_G(u, v)).$$

Lemma 5 (Contraction Bound). For any vertices $u, v$, there exists some coordinate $j$ such that 
$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha, \beta} [|f_j(v) - f_j(u)|] = \Omega(d_G(u, v)).$$

5 The Analysis

The main technical lemmas now show that the per-coordinate expansion is constant, and that for 
every pair, there exists a coordinate for which the expected contraction is constant. (The proofs of 
these lemmas appear in Section 5.1 and Section 5.2, respectively.)

5.1 Expansion Bound

For the map $f^\text{root}_X$ consists of $M + 1$ coordinates, one for each 
distance scale $t \in \{0, 1, \ldots, M\}$. The coordinate corresponding to $t$ is denoted by $f^\text{root}_X(t)$. Let $r$ be an 
arbitrary endpoint of $P_X$; we will call $r$ the “root” of $P_X$. Let $t_v \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2d_G(v, V \setminus X) \in [2^{t_v}, 2^{t_v+1})$. Set $\lambda_v = \frac{2d_G(v, V \setminus X) - 2^{t_v}}{2^{t_v}}$. Note that $0 \leq \lambda_v < 1$. For $v \in X$, we define 
$$f^\text{root}_X(t)(v) = \begin{cases} 
\lambda_v \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot d_X(v, r) + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) & \text{if } t = t_v + 1, \\
(1 - \lambda_v) \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot d_X(v, r) + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) & \text{if } t = t_v, \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}$$

For all nodes $v \notin X$, we set $f^\text{root}_X(v) = \vec{0}$.

Define the map $f_X = f^\text{path}_X \oplus f^\text{root}_X$, and the final embedding is 
$$f = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} \bigoplus_{X \in \mathcal{X}_i} f_X,$$
i.e., the concatenation of all the constructed embeddings. Before we start the analysis, let us record 
some simple observations.

Observation 3. For the map $f$ defined above, the following hold:

- The number of coordinates in $f$ does not depend on $\alpha, \beta$.
- For every $X \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and $v \notin X$, the map $f_X(v)$ is the constant vector $\vec{0}$.
- For every $X \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and $v \in X$, the map $f_X$ is nonzero in at most 3 coordinates.

Hence, since $\mathcal{X}_i$ is a partial partition of $V$ and the depth of the SPD is $k$, we get that $f(v)$ is nonzero 
in at most $3k$ coordinates for each $v \in V$.
Lemma 6 (Composition Lemma). Let \((X,d)\) be a metric space. Suppose that there are constants \(\rho, \tau\), and a function \(f : X \to \mathbb{R}^s\), drawn from some probability space such that:

1. For every \(u, v \in X\) and every \(j \in [s]\), \(|f_j(v) - f_j(u)| \leq \rho \cdot d(v, u)\).

2. For every \(u, v \in X\), there exists \(j \in [s]\) such that \(\mathbb{E}[|f_j(v) - f_j(u)|] \geq \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot d(v, u)\).

3. For every \(v \in X\), there is a subset of indices \(I_v \subseteq [s]\) of size \(|I_v| \leq k\), such that for every \(j \notin I_v\), \(f_j(v) = 0\). In other words, for every \(v \in X\), \(f(v)\) has support of size at most \(k\).

Then, for every \(p \geq 1\), there is an embedding of \((X,d)\) into \(\ell_p\) with distortion \(O(k^{1/p})\). Moreover, if there is an efficient algorithm for sampling such an \(f\), then there is a randomized algorithm that constructs the embedding efficiently (in expectation).

Now Theorem 2, our embedding for graphs with low depth SPDs, immediately follows by applying the Composition Lemma (Lemma 6) to Lemma 4, Lemma 5, and Observation 3.

5.1 Bounding the Expansion: Proof of Lemma 4

In this section we bound the expansion of any coordinate in our embedding. Recall that the embedding of \(v\) lying in some component \(X\) consists of two sets of coordinates: its distance from the path, and its distance from the root. As mentioned in the introduction, since points outside \(X\) are mapped to zero, maintaining Lipschitz-ness requires us to truncate the contribution of \(v\) of any coordinate to its distance from the boundary. This truncation (either via taking a minimum with \(d_G(v, V \setminus X)\), or via the sawtooth function), means that our proofs of expansion require more care. The details appear below.

Consider any level \(i\), any set \(X \in \mathcal{X}_i\), and any pair of vertices \(u, v\). It suffices to show that \(\|f_X(v) - f_X(u)\|_\infty = O(d_G(u, v))\). To begin, we may assume that both \(u, v \in X\). Indeed, if both \(u, v \notin X\), then \(f_X(v) = f_X(u) = 0\) and we are done. If one of them, say \(v\) belongs to \(X\) while the other \(u \notin X\), then \(f_X(u) = 0\) while \(f_X(v)\) is bounded by \(2^{i+1} \leq 4d_G(v, V \setminus X) \leq 4d_G(u, v)\) in each coordinate.

Moreover, we may also assume that the shortest \(u-v\) path in \(G\) contains only vertices from \(X\). Indeed, suppose their shortest path in \(G\) uses vertices from \(V \setminus X\), then \(d_G(u, V \setminus X) + d_G(v, V \setminus X) \leq d_G(u, v)\). But since both \(f_X(v), f_X(u)\) are bounded in each coordinate by \(4 \cdot \max \{d_G(u, V \setminus X), d_G(v, V \setminus X)\}\), we have constant expansion. Henceforth, we can assume that \(d_G(u, v) = d_X(u, v)\). We now bound the expansion in each of the two parts of \(f_X\) separately.

Expansion of \(f_X^{\text{path}}\). Let \(X_v, X_u\) be the connected components in \(G[X \setminus P_X]\) such that \(v \in X_v\) and \(u \in X_u\). Consider the first case \(X_v \neq X_u\), then \(P_X\) intersects the shortest path between \(v\) and \(u\). In particular,

\[
\|f_X^{\text{path}}(v) - f_X^{\text{path}}(u)\|_\infty \leq \min \{d_X(v, P_X), 2d_G(v, V \setminus X)\} + \min \{d_X(u, P_X), 2d_G(u, V \setminus X)\} \\
\leq d_X(v, P_X) + d_X(u, P_X) \leq d_X(v, u) = d_G(v, u).
\]

Otherwise, \(X_v = X_u\) and the two vertices lie in the same component. Now \(\|f_X^{\text{path}}(v) - f_X^{\text{path}}(u)\|_\infty\) equals

\[
\min \{d_X(v, P_X), 2d_G(v, V \setminus X)\} - \min \{d_X(u, P_X), 2d_G(u, V \setminus X)\}.
\]
Assuming (without loss of generality) that the first term is at least the second, we can drop the absolute value signs. Now the bound on the expansion follows from a simple case analysis. Indeed, suppose \( d_X(u, P_X) \leq 2d_G(u, V \setminus X) \). Then we get
\[
\|f_X^{\text{path}}(v) - f_X^{\text{path}}(u)\|_\infty = \min \{d_X(v, P_X), 2d_G(v, V \setminus X)\} - d_X(u, P_X)
\leq d_X(v, P_X) - d_X(u, P_X) \leq d_X(u, v) = d_G(u, v).
\]
The other case is that \( d_X(u, P_X) > 2d_G(u, V \setminus X) \), and then
\[
\|f_X^{\text{path}}(v) - f_X^{\text{path}}(u)\|_\infty = \min \{d_X(v, P_X), 2d_G(v, V \setminus X)\} - 2d_G(u, V \setminus X)
\leq 2d_G(v, V \setminus X) - 2d_G(u, V \setminus X) \leq 2d_G(u, v).
\]
Hence the expansion is bounded by 2.

**Expansion of \( f_X^{\text{root}} \).** Let \( r \) be the root of \( P_X \). For \( t \in \{0, 1, \ldots, M\} \), let \( p_t \) (respectively, \( q_t \)) be the “weight” of \( v \) (respectively, \( u \)) on \( g_t \)—in other words, \( p_t \) is the constant in (1) such that \( f_{X,t}^{\text{root}}(v) = p_t \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot d_X(v, r) + \alpha \cdot 2^t + 1) \). Note that \( p_t \in \{0, \lambda_v, 1 - \lambda_v\} \) is chosen deterministically, and is nonzero for at most two indices \( t \).

First, observe that for every \( t \),
\[
|f_{X,t}^{\text{root}}(v) - f_{X,t}^{\text{root}}(u)| = |p_t \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot d_X(v, r) + \alpha \cdot 2^t + 1) - q_t \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot d_X(u, r) + \alpha \cdot 2^t + 1)|
\leq \min \{p_t, q_t\} \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot d_X(v, r) + \alpha \cdot 2^t + 1) + |p_t - q_t| \cdot 2^t
\leq \min \{p_t, q_t\} \cdot \beta \cdot |d_X(v, r) - d_X(u, r)| + |p_t - q_t| \cdot 2^t
\leq O(d_G(u, v)) + |p_t - q_t| \cdot 2^t.
\]

The first inequality used that \( g_t \) is bounded by \( 2^t \), and the second inequality that \( g_t \) is 1-Lipschitz; both follow from Observation 1. The last inequality follows by the triangle inequality (since we assumed that the shortest path from \( v \) to \( u \) is contained within \( X \)).

Hence, it suffices to show that \(|p_t - q_t| = O(d_G(u, v)/2^t)\). Indeed, for indices \( t \notin \{t_u, t_u + 1, t_v, t_v + 1\} \), \( p_t = q_t = 0 \), hence \(|p_t - q_t| = 0 \). Let us consider the other cases. W.l.o.g., assume that \( d_G(v, V \setminus X) \geq d_G(u, V \setminus X) \) and hence \( t_v \geq t_u \).

- **\( t_u = t_v \)**: In this case, \(|p_{t_v} - q_{t_v}| = |(1 - \lambda_v) - (1 - \lambda_u)| = \lambda_v - \lambda_u = |p_{t_v+1} - q_{t_v+1}| \). Moreover, this quantity is
\[
\lambda_v - \lambda_u = \frac{2d_G(v, V \setminus X) - 2^t}{2^t} - \frac{2d_G(u, V \setminus X) - 2^t}{2^t}
\leq \frac{2d_G(u, v)}{2^t}.
\]
Hence, we get that \(|p_t - q_t| = O(d_G(u, v)/2^t)\) for both \( t \in \{t_v, t_v + 1\} \).

- **\( t_u = t_v - 1 \)**: It holds that
\[
\lambda_v + (1 - \lambda_u) \leq 2 \cdot \frac{2d_G(v, V \setminus X) - 2^{t_v}}{2^{t_v}} + \frac{2^{t_v+1} - 2d_G(u, V \setminus X)}{2^{t_u}}
\leq \frac{2d_G(v, V \setminus X) - 2d_G(u, V \setminus X)}{2^{t_u}} \leq \frac{2d_G(u, v)}{2^{t_u}}.
\]

If we define \( \chi := \lambda_v + (1 - \lambda_u) \), we conclude that
\[
\begin{align*}
|p_{t+1} - q_{t+1}| &= \lambda_v \\
|p_t - q_t| &= |1 - \lambda_v - \lambda_u| \\
|p_u - q_u| &= 1 - \lambda_u
\end{align*}
\]

\[2d_G(v, u) \geq 2 (d_G(v, V \setminus X) - d_G(u, V \setminus X)) \geq 2^{t_v} - 2^{t_u + 1} \geq 2^{t_v - 1}.
\]

In particular, for every \(t \leq t_v + 1\),

\[|p_t - q_t| \leq 1 \leq \frac{2d_G(u, v)}{2^{t_v - 1}} = O\left(\frac{d_G(u, v)}{2^{t_v - 1}}\right).
\]

### 5.2 Bounding the Contraction: Proof of Lemma 5

Now we need to bound the contraction. A natural proof idea would be to say that vertices \(u, v\) would eventually be separated and then either they are far from the separating path \(P\), or they lie close to the path. And hence either \(d(v, P)\) or the distance from one end of the path (the “root”) would give a large contribution. But the value of the \(v\)’s embedding in any single coordinate cannot be more than \(v\)’s distance to the boundary, and this causes problems. Indeed, if \(u, v\) fall very close to the path \(P\) at some step of the algorithm, they must get most of their contribution at this level, since future levels will not give much contribution. How can we do it, without assigning large values? This is where we use the sawtooth function: it gives a good contribution between points without assigning any vertex too large a value in any coordinate.

To bound the contraction and prove Lemma 5, for nodes \(u, v\) we need to show that there exists a coordinate \(j\) such that \(E_{\alpha, \beta}(|f_j(v) - f_j(u)|) = \Omega(d_G(u, v))\). For brevity, define

\[\Delta_{uv} := d_G(u, v).
\]

Fix \(c = 12\). Let \(i\) be the minimal index such that there exists \(X \in X_i\) with \(u, v \in X\), and at least one of the following holds:

1. \(\min \{d_X(v, P_X), d_X(u, P_X)\} \leq \Delta_{uv}/c\) (i.e., we choose a path close to \(\{v, u\}\)).

2. \(v\) and \(u\) are in different components of \(X \setminus P_X\).

By the definition of SPD such index \(i\) indeed exists. By the minimality of \(i\), for every \(X' \in X_{i'}\) such that \(i' < i\) and \(u, v \in X'\), necessarily \(\min \{d_X(v, P_{X'}), d_X(u, P_{X'})\} > \Delta_{uv}/c\). Therefore, the ball with radius \(\Delta_{uv}/c\) around each of \(v, u\) is contained in \(X\). In particular, \(\min \{d_G(v, V \setminus X), d_G(u, V \setminus X)\} > \Delta_{uv}/c\).

Suppose first that (2) occurs but not (1). Let \(j\) be the coordinate in \(f_X^{\text{path}}\) created for the connected component of \(v\) in \(X \setminus P_X\). Then

\[
|f_X^{\text{path}}_j(v) - f_X^{\text{path}}_j(u)| = \min \{d_X(v, P_X), 2d_G(v, V \setminus X)\} - 0 \geq \min \left\{\frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c}, 2\frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c}\right\} = \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c}.
\]

Next assume that (1) occurs. W.l.o.g., \(d_X(v, P_X) \leq d_X(u, P_X)\), so that \(d_X(v, P_X) \leq \Delta_{uv}/c\). Suppose first that \(d_X(u, P_X) \geq 2\Delta_{uv}/c\). Then in the coordinate \(j\) in \(f_X^{\text{path}}\) created for the connected component of \(u\) in \(X \setminus P_X\), we have

\[
|f_X^{\text{path}}_j(v) - f_X^{\text{path}}_j(u)| \geq \min \{d_X(v, P_X), 2d_G(u, V \setminus X)\} - \min \{d_X(v, P_X), 2d_G(v, V \setminus X)\} \geq \min \left\{2\frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c}, 2\frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c}\right\} - \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c} = \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c}.
\]
Figure 5: $P_X$ is a shortest path with root $r$. $v$ (resp. $u$) is at distance at most $\frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c}$ (resp. $\frac{2\Delta_{uv}}{c}$) from $v'$ (resp $u'$), it’s closest vertex on $P_X$. By triangle inequality $d_X(v', u') \geq (1 - \frac{3}{c})\Delta_{uv}$. As $u', v'$ lay on the same shortest path starting at $r$, $|d_X(v', r) - d_X(u', r)| = d_X(v', u')$. Using the triangle inequality again we conclude $|d_X(v, r) - d_X(u, r)| \geq |d_X(v', r) - d_X(u', r)| - \frac{2}{c}\Delta_{uv} \geq (1 - \frac{6}{c})\Delta_{uv}$.

(It does not matter whether $v$, $u$ are in the same connected component or not.) Thus it remains to consider the case $d_X(u, P_X) < 2\Delta_{uv}/c$. Let $r$ be the root of $P_X$. Let $v'$ (resp. $u'$) be the closest vertex on $P_X$ to $v$ (resp. $u$) in $G[X]$. Then by the triangle inequality

$$d_X(v', u') \geq d_X(v, u) - d_X(v, v') - d_X(u, u') \geq \frac{c-3}{c}\Delta_{uv}.$$ 

In particular,

$$|d_X(v, r) - d_X(u, r)| \geq |d_X(v', r) - d_X(u', r)| - d_X(v, v') - d_X(u, u') \geq \frac{c-6}{c}\Delta_{uv} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{uv}, \quad (4)$$

where we used the fact that $P_X$ is a shortest path in $G[X]$ (implying $|d_X(v', r) - d_X(u', r)| = d_X(v', u')$). See Figure 5 for illustration.

Set $x = d_X(v, r)$ and $y = d_X(u, r)$. Assume first that $d_G(v, V \setminus X) \geq d_G(u, V \setminus X)$. In particular, $t_v \geq t_u$. By the definition of $t_v$, $2d_G(v, V \setminus X) \leq 2^{t_v+1}$. Thus

$$2^{t_v} \geq \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{c} = \Omega(\Delta_{uv}) \quad (5)$$

**Claim 1.** Let $t \geq t_v$, then there is a constant $\phi$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} \left[ |g_t(\beta \cdot x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\beta \cdot y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1})| \right] \geq \Delta_{uv}/\phi.$$

**Proof.** If $|x - y| \leq 2^{t-1}$, then using Property 2 of Lemma 2

$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} \left[ |g_t(\beta \cdot x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\beta \cdot y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1})| \right] = \Omega(|x - y|) \quad (4) \geq \Omega(\Delta_{uv}).$$

Otherwise, using Property 3 of Lemma 2

$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} \left[ |g_t(\beta \cdot x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\beta \cdot y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1})| \right] = \Omega \left( 2^t \right) \geq \Omega(\Delta_{uv}). \quad \square$$

Set $S = \max \{ 8\phi, \frac{8c}{2} \}$. We consider two cases:

- If for some $t \in \{0, 1, \ldots, M\}$, $|p_t - q_t| \cdot 2^t > \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{S}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} \left[ |f_{X,t}(v) - f_{X,t}(u)| \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} \left[ |p_t \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - q_t \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1})| \right]
\geq |p_t \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} \left[ g_t(\beta \cdot x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right] - q_t \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\alpha,\beta} \left[ g_t(\beta \cdot y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right]| = |p_t - q_t| \cdot 2^t = \Omega(\Delta_{uv}).$$

Where the equality follows by Property 1 of Lemma 2.
• The other case is that for every \( t \), \(|p_t - q_t| \cdot 2^t \leq \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{S}\). Note that \( p_v + p_{v+1} = (1 - \lambda_v) + \lambda_v = 1 \). Let \( t \in \{t_v, t_v + 1\} \) be such that \( p_t \geq \frac{1}{2} \). Using (5), \( q_t \geq p_t - \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{2\Delta_w} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2\Delta_w} \cdot \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{S} \geq \frac{1}{4} \). In particular,

\[
E_{\alpha, \beta} [\| f_{X,t}^\text{root}(v) - f_{X,t}^\text{root}(u) \|] = E_{\alpha, \beta} [\| p_t \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - q_t \cdot g_t(\beta \cdot y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \|] \\
\geq \min \{p_t, q_t\} \cdot E_{\alpha, \beta} [\| g_t(\beta \cdot x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\beta \cdot y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \|] - |p_t - q_t| \cdot 2^t \\
\geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{\phi} - \frac{\Delta_{uv}}{S} = \Omega(\Delta_{uv}),
\]

where in the first inequality we used Property 1 of Lemma 2, and in the second inequality we used Claim 1.

Finally, recall that we assumed \( d_G(v, V \setminus X) \geq d_G(u, V \setminus X) \) for the proof above. The other case \( (d_G(v, V \setminus X) < d_G(u, V \setminus X)) \) is completely symmetric.

6 Conclusions

In this paper we introduced the notion of shortest path decompositions with low depth. We showed how these can be used to give embeddings into \( \ell_p \) spaces. Our techniques give optimal embeddings of bounded pathwidth graphs into \( \ell_2 \), and also new embeddings for graphs with bounded treewidth, as well as planar and excluded-minor families of graphs. Our embedding into \( \ell_p \) admits a tight lower bound for fixed \( p > 1 \). We hope that our techniques will be useful for other embedding results.

Our work raises several open questions. While our embeddings are tight for fixed \( p > 1 \), can we improve the bounds for \( \ell_1 \) embedding of bounded pathwidth graphs? Can we give better results for the \( \text{SPDdepth} \) of \( H \)-minor-free graphs? Our approach gives a \( O(\sqrt{\log n}) \)-distortion embedding of planar graphs into \( \ell_1 \), which is quite different from the previous known results via padded decompositions: can these ideas be used to make progress towards the planar graph embedding conjecture?
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A Lower Bound: Proof of Theorem 3

We start with the definition of the diamond graphs $D_k$.

Definition 2 (Diamond Graphs). Let $D_0, D_1, D_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of graphs defined as follows: $D_0$ is a single edge, and for $i \geq 1$, $D_i$ is obtained from $D_{i-1}$ by replacing every edge of $D_{i-1}$ with a square with two new vertices. See Figure 6 for illustration.

For each of the new squares created at level $i$, call the two new vertices a diagonal at level-$i$.

Consider the graph $D_k$. For $1 \leq i \leq k$, denote by $D_i$ the set of all level-$i$ diagonals, and let $E_i$ be the set of pairs of vertices which were edges in $D_i$. It holds that $|E_k| = 4^k$ and $D_k = 4^{k-1}$. Moreover, $D_0$ has pathwidth 1, and it can be verified by induction that $D_k$ has pathwidth $k+1$.

Newman and Rabinovich [NR03] proved that every embedding of $D_k$ into $\ell_2$ requires distortion $\sqrt{k+1}$. Lee and Naor [LN04] generalized it for $1 < p \leq 2$, by proving that every embedding of $D_k$ into $\ell_p$ requires distortion $\sqrt{1 + (p-1)k}$. We will generalize further, specifically, we will prove that for $p \geq 2$, every embedding of $D_k$ into $\ell_p$ requires distortion at least $\left(\frac{k+1}{2p}\right)^{1/p}$.

The following claim will be essential.

Claim 2 ($\ell_p$ Quadrilateral Inequality). For $p \geq 2$, and every four vectors $a, b, c, d \in \ell_p$, it holds that

$$\|a-c\|_p^p + \|b-d\|_p^p \leq 2^{p-2} \left(\|a-b\|_p^p + \|b-c\|_p^p + \|c-d\|_p^p + \|d-a\|_p^p\right)$$

(6)
Figure 6: The first 3 diamond graphs. \( \{s,t\} \) is the level 0 diagonal, \( \{u,v\} \) is the level 1 diagonal, \( \{a_1,a_2\}, \{b_1,b_2\}, \{c_1,c_2\}, \{d_1,d_2\} \) are the level 2 diagonals. \( E_0 = \{\{s,t\}\} \), \( E_1 = \{\{s,u\}, \{t,u\}, \{t,v\}, \{s,v\}\} \).

**Proof.** The proof of the following inequality can be found at [Car04, Theorem 11.12],

\[
\forall x,y \in \ell^p_p, \quad \|x + y\|_p^p + \|x - y\|_p^p \leq 2^{p-1} \left( \|x\|_p^p + \|y\|_p^p \right).
\]

Define \( x_1 = b - a, \ y_1 = a - d \) and \( x_2 = b - c, \ y_2 = c - d \). We get

\[
\|b - d\|_p^p + \|b - 2a + d\|_p^p \leq 2^{p-1} \left( \|a - b\|_p^p + \|d - a\|_p^p \right).
\]

\[
\|b - d\|_p^p + \|b - 2c + d\|_p^p \leq 2^{p-1} \left( \|b - c\|_p^p + \|c - d\|_p^p \right).
\]

By summing up and dividing by 2,

\[
\|b - d\|_p^p + \frac{\|b - 2a + d\|_p^p + \|b - 2c + d\|_p^p}{2} \leq 2^{p-2} \left( \|a - b\|_p^p + \|b - c\|_p^p + \|c - d\|_p^p + \|d - a\|_p^p \right). \quad (7)
\]

The claim now follows by convexity. \( \square \)

Fix some \( p \geq 2 \), and embedding \( f : D_k \to \ell^p_p \). We will assume w.l.o.g that \( f \) is non-contractive, and denote by \( \rho \) its expansion, i.e. distortion. Set \( \alpha_0 = \frac{1}{2^{p-2}} \) and for \( i > 0 \), \( \alpha_i = \frac{1}{2^{(k-i+1)(p-2)}} \). Note that for \( i \geq 1 \), \( \alpha_i \cdot 2^{p-2} = \alpha_{i+1} \). Our proof will be based on the following Poincaré-type inequality

**Claim 3** (Diamond graph \( \ell^p_p \) Poincaré-type inequality).

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\} \in D_i} \|f(x) - f(y)\|_p^p \leq \alpha_{k+1} \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\} \in E_k} \|f(x) - f(y)\|_p^p. \quad (8)
\]
Proof. For edge \( \{x, y\} \in E_{i-1} \), denote by \( \{x', y'\} \in D_i \) the diagonal created by it. We have

\[
\sum_{\{x,y\}\in D_i} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p + \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_{i-1}} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p
\]

\[
= \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_{i-1}} \left( \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p + \|f(x') - f(y')\|^p_p \right)
\]

\[
\leq 2^{p-2} \left( \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_{i-1}} \left( \|f(x) - f(x')\|^p_p + \|f(x') - f(y)\|^p_p + \|f(y) - f(y')\|^p_p + \|f(y') - f(x)\|^p_p \right) \right)
\]

\[
= 2^{p-2} \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_i} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^2_p .
\]

Summing over \( 1 \leq i \leq k \)'s, with appropriate scaling,

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i \cdot \left( \sum_{\{x,y\}\in D_i} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p + \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_{i-1}} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p \right)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i \cdot 2^{p-2} \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_i} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_i} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p .
\]

Hence

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in D_i} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p + \alpha_1 \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_0} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p \leq \alpha_{k+1} \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_k} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p .
\]

As \( E_0 = D_0 \) and \( \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 \), the claim follows. \( \square \)

Next, we calculate

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in D_i} d(x, y)^p = \alpha_0 \cdot \left( 2^k \right)^p + \sum_{i=1}^{k} |D_i| \cdot \alpha_i \cdot \left( 2^{k-i+1} \right)^p
\]

\[
= 2^{2k} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} 4^{i-1} \cdot \left( 2^{k-i+1} \right)^2 = (k+1) \cdot 4^k . \tag{9}
\]

Recall that \( f \) is non-contractive and has expansion \( \rho \). Consequently,

\[
(k+1) \cdot 4^k \overset{(9)}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in D_i} d(x, y)^p
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in D_i} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p
\]

\[
\leq \alpha_{k+1} \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_k} \|f(x) - f(y)\|^p_p
\]

\[
\leq \alpha_{k+1} \cdot \sum_{\{x,y\}\in E_k} (\rho \cdot d(x, y))^p = \alpha_{k+1} \cdot (\rho)^p \cdot |E_k| .
\]

We conclude

\[
\rho \geq \left( \frac{4^k}{|E_k|} \cdot \frac{k+1}{\alpha_{k+1}} \right)^{1/p} = \left( \frac{k+1}{2^{p-2}} \right)^{1/p} = \Omega(k^{1/p}) .
\]
B Proof of Lemma 6

We restate the lemma for convenience:

Lemma 6 (Composition Lemma). Let \((X,d)\) be a metric space. Suppose that there are constants \(\rho, \tau\) and a function \(f : X \to \mathbb{R}^s\), drawn from some probability space such that:

1. For every \(u,v \in X\) and every \(j \in [s]\), \(|f_j(v) - f_j(u)| \leq \rho \cdot d(v,u)\).
2. For every \(u,v \in X\), there exists \(j \in [s]\) such that \(\mathbb{E}[|f_j(v) - f_j(u)|] \geq \frac{1}{\tau} \cdot d(v,u)\).
3. For every \(v \in X\), there is a subset of indices \(I_v \subseteq [s]\) of size \(|I_v| \leq k\), such that for every \(j \notin I_v\), \(f_j(v) = 0\). In other words, for every \(v \in X\), \(f(v)\) has support of size at most \(k\).

Then, for every \(p \geq 1\), there is an embedding of \((X,d)\) into \(\ell_p\) with distortion \(O(k^{1/p})\). Moreover, if there is an efficient algorithm for sampling such an \(f\), then there is a randomized algorithm that constructs the embedding efficiently (in expectation).

Proof. Fix \(n = |X|\), and set \(m = 48\rho \tau \cdot \ln n\). Let \(f^{(1)}, f^{(2)}, \ldots, f^{(m)} : X \to \mathbb{R}^s\) be functions chosen i.i.d according to the given distribution. Set \(g = m^{-1/p} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} f^{(i)}\). We argue that with high probability, \(g\) has distortion \(O(k^{1/p})\) in \(\ell_p\).

Fix some pair of vertices \(v,u \in V\). Set \(d(v,u) = \Delta\). The upper bound follows from Property 1 and Property 3 of the lemma:

\[
\|g(v) - g(u)\|_p^p = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j \in I_v \cup I_u} \left( m^{-1/p} \cdot |f^{(i)}_j(v) - f^{(i)}_j(u)| \right)^p \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j \in I_v \cup I_u} \frac{1}{m} \cdot (\rho \cdot \Delta)^p \leq 2k \cdot (\rho \cdot \Delta)^p,
\]

thus \(\|g(v) - g(u)\|_p \leq O(k^{1/p} \cdot \Delta)\).

Next, for the contraction bound, let \(j\) be the index of Property 2 w.r.t \(v,u\). Set \(\mathcal{F} = \{f : |f_j(v) - f_j(u)| \geq \Delta/2\tau\}\) to be the event that we draw a function with significant contribution to \(v,u\). Then using Property 1 and Property 2,

\[
\frac{\Delta}{\tau} \leq \mathbb{E}[|f_j(v) - f_j(u)|] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{F}] \cdot \frac{\Delta}{2\tau} + \Pr[\mathcal{F}] \cdot \rho \Delta \leq \frac{\Delta}{2\tau} \leq \frac{\Delta}{2\tau}
\]

which implies that \(\Pr[\mathcal{F}] \geq \frac{1}{2\rho \tau}\). Let \(Q^{(i)}_{u,v}\) be an indicator random variable for the event \(f^{(i)} \in \mathcal{F}\), and set \(Q_{u,v} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} Q^{(i)}_{u,v}\). By linearity of expectation, \(\mathbb{E}[Q_{u,v}] \geq \frac{m}{2\rho \tau} = 24 \cdot \ln n\). By a Chernoff bound

\[
\Pr[Q_{u,v} \leq 12 \cdot \ln n] \leq \Pr \left[ Q_{u,v} \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[Q_{u,v}] \right] \leq \exp(-\frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}[Q_{u,v}]) \leq \exp(-3 \ln n) = n^{-3}.
\]

By taking a union bound over the \(\binom{n}{2}\) pairs, with probability at least \(1 - \frac{1}{n}\), for every \(u,v \in V\), \(Q_{u,v} > 12 \ln n = \Omega(m)\). (Recall that both \(\rho, \tau\) are universal constants.) If this event indeed occurs,
then the contraction is indeed bounded:

$$
\|g(v) - g(u)\|_p \geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left( m^{-1/p} \cdot \left| f_j^{(i)}(v) - f_j^{(i)}(u) \right| \right)^p
\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i:Q_{u,v} = 1} \left| f_j^{(i)}(v) - f_j^{(i)}(u) \right|^p
\geq \frac{Q_{u,v}}{m} \left( \frac{\Delta}{2\rho\tau} \right)^p = \Omega \left( \left( \frac{\Delta}{2\rho\tau} \right)^p \right).
$$

In particular, for every $u, v$, $\|g(v) - g(u)\|_p \geq \Omega(\Delta)$. \qed

## C Proof of the Sawtooth Lemma (Lemma 2)

We restate Lemma 2 for convenience:

**Lemma 2** (Sawtooth Lemma). Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $\beta \in [0, 4]$ be drawn uniformly and independently. The following properties hold:

1. $\mathbb{E}_\alpha, \beta [g_t(\beta x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1})] = 2^{t-1}$.

2. If $|x - y| \leq 2^{t-1}$, then $\mathbb{E}_\alpha, \beta [\left| g_t(\beta x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\beta y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|] = \Omega(|x - y|)$.

3. If $|x - y| > 2^{t-1}$, then $\mathbb{E}_\alpha, \beta [\left| g_t(\beta x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\beta y + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|] = \Omega(2^t)$.

**Property 1** is straightforward, as by Observation 1 $g_t$ is periodic with period length $2^{t+1}$. Indeed, for every fixed $\beta$, $\mathbb{E}_\alpha [g_t(\beta x + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1})] = \mathbb{E}_\alpha [g_t(\alpha \cdot 2^{t+1})] = 2^{t-1}$. The following claim will be useful in the proofs of Property 2 and Property 3.

**Claim 4.** For $z \in [0, 2^{t+1}]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} [\left| g_t(z + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|] = \frac{(2^{t+1} - z)^2}{2^{t+1}}$.

**Proof.** Set $(\ast) = \int_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} \left| g_t(z + \alpha) - g_t(\alpha) \right| d\alpha$. By substituting the variable of integration, $(\ast) = \frac{1}{2^{t+1}} \int_{z\in[0,2^{t+1}]} \left| g_t(z + \alpha) - g_t(\alpha) \right| d\alpha$. First assume that $z \leq 2^t$, then there are 5 “phase changes” in $|g_t(z + \alpha) - g_t(\alpha)|$ from 0 to $2^{t+1}$, at $2^t - z$, $2^t - \frac{z}{2}$, $2^t$, $2^t + z$, $2^t + \frac{z}{2}$. (see Figure 7 for illustration). We calculate

$$
2^{t+1} \cdot (\ast) = \int_0^{2^t - z} z d\alpha + \int_0^\frac{z}{2} (z - 2\alpha) d\alpha + \int_0^\frac{z}{2} 2\alpha d\alpha + \int_0^{2^t - z} z d\alpha + \int_0^\frac{z}{2} (z - 2\alpha) d\alpha + \int_0^\frac{z}{2} 2\alpha d\alpha
= 2 \cdot \int_0^{2^t - z} z d\alpha + 2 \cdot \int_0^\frac{z}{2} z d\alpha = (2^{t+1} - z) z.
$$

For $z > 2^t$, set $w = 2^{t+1} - z$. Then using that $g^t$ is periodic,

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} [\left| g_t(w + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|] = \mathbb{E}_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} [\left| g_t(w + z + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(z + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|]
= \mathbb{E}_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} [\left| g_t(2^{t+1} + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(z + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|]
= \mathbb{E}_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} [\left| g_t(z + \alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) - g_t(\alpha \cdot 2^{t+1}) \right|].
$$

Hence by the first case, $(\ast) = \frac{(2^{t+1} - w)w}{2^{t+1}} = \frac{(2^{t+1} - z)^2}{2^{t+1}}$. \qed
Figure 7: $\alpha$ is going from 0 to $2^{t+1}$. $z \leq 2^t$. In each of the figures the leftmost red point represents $\alpha$ while the rightmost red point represents $z+\alpha$. Each of the middle figures represent a moment when $g_t(z+\alpha) - g_t(z)$ changes its derivative.

For the proofs of Property 2 and Property 3 assume w.l.o.g $x > y$. Set $z = x - y$, and

$$(\ast) = \mathbb{E}_{\alpha, \beta} \left[ g_t(\beta x + \alpha \cdot 2^t) - g_t(\beta y + \alpha \cdot 2^t) \right].$$

As $g_t$ is a periodic function, we have that

$$(\ast) = \mathbb{E}_{\beta} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{\alpha} \left[ g_t(\beta z + \alpha \cdot 2^t) - g_t(\alpha \cdot 2^t) \right] \right].$$

Proof of Property 2. Using Claim 4, we have

$$(\ast) = \mathbb{E}_{\beta} \left[ \frac{(2^{t+1} - \beta \alpha) z}{2^{t+1}} \right] = \frac{1}{2^{t+1}} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left( \frac{2^{t+1} \beta^2 - z^2}{3} \cdot \beta^3 |\alpha|_6 \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left( \frac{16}{2} \cdot z - \frac{z^2}{2^{t+1}} \cdot \frac{2^6}{3} \right) \geq \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left( 8 - \frac{64}{3} \cdot 4 \right) \cdot z = \frac{2}{3} |x - y|,$$

where in the inequality we used that $z \leq 2^{t-1}$.

Proof of Property 3. As $g_t$ is periodic function, Claim 4 implies that for every $w \geq 0$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha} \left[ g_t(w + \alpha \cdot 2^t) - g_t(\alpha \cdot 2^t) \right] = \frac{(2^{t+1} - (w \mod 2^{t+1})) (w \mod 2^{t+1})}{2^{t+1}}.$$

Let $a \in [0, 4]$ such that $a \cdot z = 2^{t+1}$ (such $a$ exists as $|x - y| > 2^{t-1}$). The claim follows as,

$$(\ast) \cdot 2^{t+1} = \mathbb{E}_{\beta \in [0, 4]} \left[ (2^{t+1} - (\beta z \mod 2^{t+1})) (\beta z \mod 2^{t+1}) \right]$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor z \rfloor - 1} \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \int_a^{(i+1)a} \left( 2^{t+1} - (\beta \cdot \frac{2^{t+1}}{a} \mod 2^{t+1}) \right) \left( \beta \cdot \frac{2^{t+1}}{a} \mod 2^{t+1} \right) d\beta$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot a \int_0^{2^{t+1}} \left( 2^{t+1} - \gamma \right) \cdot \gamma d\gamma$$

$$= \frac{4}{2a} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{a}{2^{t+1}} \cdot \frac{1}{6} \cdot \left( 2^{t+1} - \gamma \right) \cdot \gamma \cdot \left( 2^{t+1} \gamma^2 / 2 - \gamma^3 / 3 \right) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{t+1}} \cdot \frac{(2^{t+1})^3}{6} = \frac{(2^{t+1})^2}{12}.$$