

Breaking the n^k Barrier for Minimum k -cut on Simple Graphs

Zhiyang He* Jason Li†

December 2, 2021

Abstract

In the minimum k -cut problem, we want to find the minimum number of edges whose deletion breaks the input graph into at least k connected components. The classic algorithm of Karger and Stein [KS96] runs in $\tilde{O}(n^{2k-2})$ time,¹ and recent, exciting developments have improved the running time to $O(n^k)$ [GHLL20]. For general, weighted graphs, this is tight assuming popular hardness conjectures.

In this work, we show that perhaps surprisingly, $O(n^k)$ is not the right answer for simple, *unweighted* graphs. We design an algorithm that runs in time $O(n^{(1-\epsilon)k})$ where $\epsilon > 0$ is an absolute constant, breaking the natural n^k barrier. This establishes a separation of the two problems in the unweighted and weighted cases.

*Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, United States.

†Simons Institute, UC Berkeley, Berkeley, United States.

¹ $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ denotes omission of polylogarithmic factors in n .

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the (unweighted) minimum k -cut problem: given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k , we want to delete the minimum number of edges to split the graph into at least k connected components. Throughout the paper, let λ_k denote this minimum number of edges. Note that the k -cut problem generalizes the global minimum cut problem, which is the special case $k = 2$.

For fixed constant $k \geq 2$, the first polynomial-time algorithm for this problem is due to Goldschmidt and Hochbaum [GH94], who designed an algorithm running in $n^{O(k^2)}$ time. Subsequently, Karger and Stein showed that their (recursive) randomized contraction algorithm solves the problem in $\tilde{O}(n^{2k-2})$ time. This was later matched by a deterministic algorithm of Thorup [Tho08] based on tree packing, which runs in $\tilde{O}(n^{2k})$ time.

These algorithms remained the state of the art until a few years ago, when new progress was established on the problem [GLL18, GLL19, Li19], culminating in the $\tilde{O}(n^k)$ time algorithm of Gupta, Harris, Lee, and Li [GHLL20] which is, surprisingly enough, just the original Karger-Stein recursive contraction algorithm with an improved analysis. The $\tilde{O}(n^k)$ time algorithm also works for *weighted* graphs, and they show by a reduction to max-weight k -clique that their algorithm is asymptotically optimal, assuming the popular conjecture that max-weight k -clique cannot be solved faster than $\Omega(n^{k-O(1)})$ time. However, whether the algorithm is optimal for *unweighted* graphs was left open; indeed, the (unweighted) k -clique problem can be solved in $n^{(\omega/3)k+O(1)}$ time through fast matrix multiplication.² Hence, the time complexity of *unweighted* minimum k -cut was left open, and it was unclear whether the right answer was n^k , or $n^{(\omega/3)k}$, or somewhere in between.

In this paper, we make partial progress on this last question by showing that for *simple* graphs, the right answer is asymptotically bounded away from n^k :

Theorem 1.1. *There is an absolute constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that the minimum k -cut problem can be solved in $n^{(1-\epsilon)k+O(1)}$ time.*

In fact, we give evidence that $n^{(\omega/3)k+O(1)}$ may indeed be the right answer (assuming the popular conjecture that k -clique cannot be solved any faster). This is discussed more in the statement of Theorem 1.3.

1.1 Our Techniques

Our high-level strategy mimics that of Li [Li19], in that we make use of the Kawarabayashi-Thorup graph sparsification technique on simple graphs, but our approach differs by exploiting matrix multiplication-based methods as well. Below, we describe these two techniques and how we apply them.

Kawarabayashi-Thorup Graph Sparsification Our first algorithmic ingredient is the (vertex) graph sparsification technique of Kawarabayashi and Thorup [KT18], originally developed to solve the deterministic minimum cut problem on simple graphs. At a high level, the sparsification process

²As standard, we define ω as the smallest constant such that two $n \times n$ matrices can be multiplied in $O(n^{\omega+o(1)})$ time. The best bound known is $\omega < 2.373$ [AW21], although $\omega = 2$ is widely believed.)

contracts the input graph into one that has a much smaller number of edges and vertices such that any *non-trivial* minimum cut is preserved. Here, non-trivial means that the minimum cut does not have just a singleton vertex on one side. More recently, Li [Li19] has generalized the Kawarabayashi-Thorup sparsification to also preserve non-trivial minimum k -cuts (those without any singleton vertices as components), which led to an $n^{(1+o(1))k}$ -time minimum k -cut algorithm on simple graphs. The contracted graph has $\tilde{O}(n/\delta)$ vertices where δ is the minimum degree of the graph. If δ is large enough, say, n^ϵ for some constant ϵ , then this is $\tilde{O}(n^{1-\epsilon})$ vertices and running the algorithm of [GHLL20] already gives $n^{(1-\epsilon)k+O(1)}$ time. At the other extreme, if there are many vertices of degree less than n^ϵ , then $\lambda_k \leq kn^\epsilon$ since we can take $k-1$ of these low-degree vertices as singleton components of a k -cut. We then employ an exact algorithm for minimum k -cut that runs in $\lambda_k^{O(k)} n^{O(1)}$ time (such an algorithm has been shown to exist, as we will discuss further when stating Theorem 1.3), which is $n^{(1-\epsilon)k+O(1)}$ time. For the middle ground where $\lambda_k > kn^\epsilon$ but there are a few vertices of degree less than n^ϵ , we can modify the Kawarabayashi-Thorup sparsification in [Li19] to produce a graph of $\tilde{O}(n/\lambda_k)$ vertices instead, which is enough. This concludes the case when there are no singleton components of the minimum k -cut.

Matrix Multiplication What if the minimum k -cut has components that are singleton vertices? If *all but one* component is a singleton, then we can use a matrix multiplication-based algorithm similar to the Nešetřil and Poljak’s algorithm for k -clique [NP85], which runs in $n^{(\omega/3)k+O(1)}$ time. Thus, the main difficulty is to handle minimum k -cuts where some components are singletons, but not $k-1$ many. The following definition will be at the core of all our discussions for the rest of this paper.

Definition 1.2 (Border and Islands). *Given a k -cut C with exactly r singleton components, we denote the singleton components as $S_1 = \{v_1\}, \dots, S_r = \{v_r\}$ and denote the other components S_{r+1}, \dots, S_k . A **border** of C is a cut obtained by merging some singleton components into larger components. More precisely, a border is defined by a subset $I \subseteq [r]$ and a function $\sigma : I \rightarrow [k] \setminus [r]$. Given I and σ , we let $S'_i = S_i \cup \{v_j : j \in I, \sigma(j) = i\}$, then the border $B_{I,\sigma}$ is the $(k - |I|)$ -cut defined by the components S'_{r+1}, \dots, S'_k , together with the unmerged singleton components S_j where $j \in [r] \setminus I$. The set of vertices $\{v_i : i \in [I]\}$, corresponding to the merged singleton components, is called the **islands**.*

Given this definition, our main technical contribution is as follows: we show that if the cut C has exactly r singleton components, then we can first apply Kawarabayashi-Thorup sparsification to compute a graph G' of size $\tilde{O}(n/\lambda_k)$ that preserves some borders of C . We then use the algorithm of [GHLL20] on G' to discover a border, which will succeed with probability roughly $1/\tilde{O}((n/\lambda_k)^{k-|I|})$. Finally, we run a matrix multiplication-based algorithm to locate the islands in an additional $n^{(\omega/3)|I|+O(1)}$ time. Altogether, the runtime becomes $\tilde{O}((n/\lambda_k)^{k-s}) \cdot n^{(\omega/3)s+O(1)}$, which is $n^{(1-\epsilon')k+O(1)}$ as long as $\lambda_k \geq n^\epsilon$, where ϵ' depends on ϵ .

We summarize our discussions with the following theorem, which is the real result of this paper.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose there exists an algorithm that takes in a simple, unweighted graph G , and returns its minimum k -cut in time $\lambda_k^{tk} n^{O(1)}$. Let $c = \max(\frac{t}{t+1}, \frac{\omega}{3})$. Then we can compute a minimum k -cut of a simple, unweighted graph in $O(n^{ck+O(1)})$.*

Recently, Lokshantov, Saurabh, and Surianarayanan [LSS20] showed an algorithm for exact minimum k -cut that runs in time $\lambda^{O(k)}n^{O(1)}$. Combining their result with Theorem 1.3, we obtain a minimum k -cut that runs in time $O(n^{ck+O(1)})$ for some constant $c < 1$. We further note that we use their algorithm in a black-box manner, which means if one could derive an exact algorithm with a better constant t , then our algorithm will have an improved runtime up to $O(n^{\omega k/3+O(1)})$.

2 Main Algorithm

In this section, we discuss our algorithm in detail. Given a simple, unweighted graph G , we first run an approximate k -cut algorithm to determine the magnitude of λ_k . If $\lambda_k \leq O(n^{\frac{1}{t+1}})$, then we can run the exact algorithm on G and output its result. Otherwise, we apply Lemma 2.2, which is a modified version of Kawarabayashi-Thorup sparsification [KT18] for k -cuts. These modifications, discussed in Section 3, will give us a graph G' on $\tilde{O}(n/\lambda_k)$ vertices that preserves at least one border for every minimum k -cut of G . Now we fix any minimum k -cut of G , and fix its border $B_{I,\sigma}$ specified by Lemma 2.2. For every possible value of $|I|$, we run Lemma 2.3 to discover $B_{I,\sigma}$ with high probability.

Once we found the border, locating the islands is simple. In Section 5, we present a slight variant of Nešetřil and Poljak's k -clique algorithm [NP85] that solves the following problem in $O(n^{\frac{\omega}{3}r+O(1)})$ time.

Definition 2.1 (r -Island Problem). *Given a graph G , find the optimal $r+1$ -cut C which has exactly r singleton components.*

This enables us to recover the minimum k -cut in G by guessing the number of islands in each non-singleton component specified by the border, and finding them independently. The total runtime is $O(n^{\frac{\omega}{3}|I|+O(1)})$ since the number of islands in any non-singleton component is at most the total number of islands $|I|$. This proves Theorem 1.3.

Our methods are summarized in the following algorithm. Note that for the initial $O(1)$ -approximation step, various algorithms can be used.

Algorithm 1 Main Algorithm

- 1: Run an 2-approximation algorithm of k -CUT in polynomial time [SV95], and let its output be $\overline{\lambda_k}$.
 - 2: **if** $\overline{\lambda_k} \leq 10n^{\frac{1}{t+1}}$ **then**
 - 3: Run the given exact algorithm for k -CUT
 - 4: **else**
 - 5: Apply Lemma 2.2 to obtain a graph G' on $O_k(n/\lambda_k)$ vertices.
 - 6: **for** each $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, r$ **do** ▷ Iterate over possible values of $i = |I|$ of the border $B_{I,\sigma}$
 - 7: Run Lemma 2.3 with parameter $\beta = 1 - (1 - 2/\log n)i/k$.
 - 8: **for** each cut C output by Lemma 2.3 **do** ▷ at most $(n/\lambda_k)^{k-(1-2/\log n)i+O(1)}$ many
 - 9: Guess the number of islands in each non-singleton component of C .
 - 10: Run the Island Discovery Algorithm in each non-singleton component.
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: **end if**
-

2.1 Analysis

Our analysis is divided into three parts, each corresponding to one section of the algorithm. The first part concerns the Kawarabayashi-Thorup sparsification, and the following theorem is proved in Section 3.

Lemma 2.2. *For any simple graph, we can compute in $k^{O(k)}n^{O(1)}$ time a partition V_1, \dots, V_q of V such that $q = (k \log n)^{O(1)}n/\lambda_k$ and the following holds:*

- (*) *For any minimum k -cut C with exactly r singleton components, there exists $I \subset [r]$ and a function $\sigma : I \rightarrow [k] \setminus [r]$ such that the border of C defined by I and σ , namely $B_{I,\sigma}$, agrees with the partition V_1, \dots, V_q . In other words, all edges of $B_{I,\sigma}$ are between some pair of parts V_i, V_j . Moreover, we have $|B_{I,\sigma}| \leq \lambda_k - (1 - 2/\log n)|I|\lambda_k/k$.*

Contracting each V_i into a single vertex, we obtain a graph G' on $\tilde{O}(n/\lambda_k)$ vertices that preserves $B_{I,\sigma}$.

Next, we describe and analyze the algorithm that computes the border. The following lemma is proved in Section 4.

Lemma 2.3. *Fix an integer $2 \leq s \leq k$ and a parameter $\beta \leq 1$, and consider an s -cut C of size at most $\beta\lambda_k$. There is an $n^{\beta k + O(1)}$ time algorithm that computes a list of $n^{\beta k + O(1)}$ s -cuts such that with high probability, C is listed as one of the cuts.*

Finally, we present and analyze the algorithm that extends the border by computing the missing islands in each non-singleton component. The following lemma is proved in Section 5.

Lemma 2.4. *There is a $O_r(n^{\frac{\omega r}{3} + O(1)})$ deterministic algorithm that solves the r -Island problem.*

With these three lemmas in hand, we now analyze Algorithm 1.

Fix a minimum k -cut. The initial Kawarabayashi-Thorup sparsification takes $k^{O(k)}n^{O(1)}$ time by Lemma 2.2, and the border $B_{I,\sigma}$ is preserved by the partition and has size at most $\lambda_k - (1 - 2/\log n)|I|\lambda_k/k$. For the correct guess of $|I|$, Lemma 2.3 detects $B_{I,\sigma}$ with high probability among a collection of $(n/\lambda_k)^{k-(1-2/\log n)i+O(1)}$ many $(k-i)$ -cuts. Finally, for the $(k-i)$ -cut $C = B_{I,\sigma}$, the Island Discovery Algorithm extends it to a minimum k -cut in time $n^{(\omega/3)i+O(1)}$. The total running time is therefore

$$k^{O(k)}n^{O(1)} + (n/\lambda_k)^{k-(1-2/\log n)i+O(1)} \cdot n^{(\omega/3)i+O(1)} \leq k^{O(k)}n^{O(1)} + n^{\frac{t}{t-1}(k-i+2i/\log n+O(1))} \cdot n^{(\omega/3)i+O(1)}.$$

The $n^{2i/\log n}$ term is at most $O(1)^{2i}$, which is negligible. The running time is dominated by either $i = 0$ or $i = k$, depending on which of $\frac{t}{t-1}$ and $\omega/3$ is greater. This concludes the analysis of Algorithm 1 and the proof of Theorem 1.3.

3 Kawarabayashi-Thorup Sparsification

In this section, we prove the following Kawarabayashi-Thorup sparsification theorem of any simple graph. Rather than view it as a vertex sparsification process where groups of vertices are contracted,

we work with the grouping of vertices itself, which is a partition of the vertex set. We use *parts* to denote the vertex sets of the partition to distinguish them from the *components* of a k -cut.

Most of the arguments in this section originate from Kawarabayashi and Thorup’s original paper [KT18], though we find it more convenient to follow the presentations of [GLL21] and [Li19].

Lemma 2.2. *For any simple graph, we can compute in $k^{O(k)}n^{O(1)}$ time a partition V_1, \dots, V_q of V such that $q = (k \log n)^{O(1)}n/\lambda_k$ and the following holds:*

- (*) *For any minimum k -cut C with exactly r singleton components, there exists $I \subset [r]$ and a function $\sigma : I \rightarrow [k] \setminus [r]$ such that the border of C defined by I and σ , namely $B_{I,\sigma}$, agrees with the partition V_1, \dots, V_q . In other words, all edges of $B_{I,\sigma}$ are between some pair of parts V_i, V_j . Moreover, we have $|B_{I,\sigma}| \leq \lambda_k - (1 - 2/\log n)|I|\lambda_k/k$.*

Contracting each V_i into a single vertex, we obtain a graph G' on $\tilde{O}(n/\lambda_k)$ vertices that preserves $B_{I,\sigma}$.

3.1 Regularization Step

We first “regularize” the graph to obey a few natural conditions, which is done at no asymptotic cost to the number of clusters. In particular, we ensure that $m \leq O(\lambda_k n)$, i.e., there are not too many edges, and $\delta \geq \lambda_k/k$, i.e., the minimum degree is comparable to the size of the k -cut.

Nagamochi-Ibaraki sparsification. First, we show that we can freely assume $m = O(\lambda_k n)$ through an initial graph sparsification step due to Nagamochi and Ibaraki; the specific theorem statement here is from [Li19].

Theorem 3.1 (Nagamochi and Ibaraki [NI92], Theorem 3.3 in [Li19]). *Given a simple graph G and parameter s , there is a polynomial-time algorithm that computes a subgraph H with at most sn edges such that all k -cuts of size at most s are preserved. More formally, for all k -cuts S_1, \dots, S_k satisfying $|E_G[S_1, \dots, S_k]| \leq s$, we have $E_G[S_1, \dots, S_k] = E_H[S_1, \dots, S_k]$.*

Compute a $(1 + 1/k)$ -approximation $\tilde{\lambda}_k \in [\lambda_k, (1 + 1/k)\lambda_k]$ in time $k^{O(k)}n^{O(1)}$ [LSS20], apply Theorem 3.1 with parameter $s = \tilde{\lambda}_k$, and replace G with the returned graph H . This allows us to assume $m \leq (1 + 1/k)\lambda_k n$ henceforth.

Lower bound the minimum degree. Next, we would like to ensure that the graph G has minimum degree comparable to λ_k . While there exists a vertex of degree less than $\frac{\tilde{\lambda}_k}{(1+1/k)(k-1)}$, declare that vertex as a trivial part in the final partition, and remove it from G . We claim that we can remove at most $k - 1$ such vertices; otherwise, the vertices together form a k -cut of size less than $(k - 1) \cdot \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_k}{(1+1/k)(k-1)} = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_k}{(1+1/k)} \leq \lambda_k$, contradicting the value λ_k of the minimum k -cut. We have thus removed at most $k - 1$ vertices. The remaining task is to compute a partition of the remaining graph which has minimum degree at least $\frac{\lambda_k}{(1+1/k)(k-1)} \geq \lambda_k/k$. We then add a singleton set for each of the singleton vertices removed, which is at most $k - 1$ extra parts, which is negligible since we aim for $(k \log n)^{O(1)}n/\lambda_k$ many parts in total.

3.2 Kawarabayashi-Thorup Sparsification

It remains to prove the following lemma, which is Lemma 2.2 with the additional assumptions $m \leq 2\lambda_k n$ and $\delta \geq \lambda_k/k$.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose we are given a simple graph with $m \leq 2\lambda_k n$ and $\delta \geq \lambda_k/k$. Then, we can compute a partition V_1, \dots, V_q of V such that $q = (k \log n)^{O(1)} n/\lambda_k$ and the following holds:*

- (*) *For any minimum k -cut C with exactly r singleton components, there exists $I \subset [r]$ and a function $\sigma : I \rightarrow [k] \setminus [r]$ such that the border of C defined by I and σ , namely $B_{I,\sigma}$, agrees with the partition V_1, \dots, V_q . In other words, all edges of $B_{I,\sigma}$ are between some pair of parts V_i, V_j . Moreover, we have $|B_{I,\sigma}| \leq \lambda_k - (1 - 2/\log n)|I|\lambda_k/k$.*

Our treatment follows closely from Appendix B of [GLL21].

Expander decomposition preliminaries. We first introduce the concept of the *conductance* of a graph, as well as an expander, defined below.

Definition 3.3 (Conductance). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a set $S : \emptyset \subsetneq S \subsetneq V$ has conductance*

$$\frac{|\partial_G S|}{\min\{\mathbf{vol}(S), \mathbf{vol}(V \setminus S)\}}$$

in the graph G , where $\mathbf{vol}(S) := \sum_{v \in S} \deg(v)$. The conductance of the graph G is the minimum conductance of a set $S \subseteq V$ in G .

Definition 3.4. *For any parameter $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, a graph is a γ -expander if its conductance is at least γ .*

The following is a well-known result about decomposing a graph into expanders, for which we provide an easy proof below for convenience.

Theorem 3.5 (Expander Decomposition). *For any graph $G = (V, E)$ with m edges and a parameter $\gamma < 1$, there exists a partition U_1, \dots, U_p of V such that:*

1. *For all $i \in [p]$, $G[U_i]$ is a γ -expander.*
2. *$|E[U_1, \dots, U_p]| \leq O(\gamma m \log m)$.*

The partitioning algorithm. To compute the partition V_1, \dots, V_q , we execute the same algorithm from Section B of [GLL21], except we add an additional step 4. Throughout the algorithm, we fix parameter $\epsilon := 1/(k \log n)$.

1. Compute an expander decomposition with parameter $\gamma := 1/\delta$, and let U_1, \dots, U_p be the resulting partition of V .

2. Initialize the set $S \leftarrow \emptyset$, and initialize $C_i \leftarrow U_i$ for each $i \in [p]$. While there exists some $i \in [p]$ and a vertex $v \in C_i$ satisfying $\deg_{G[C_i]}(v) \leq \frac{2}{5} \deg_G(v)$, i.e., vertex v loses at least $\frac{3}{5}$ fraction of its degree when restricted to the current C_i , remove v from C_i and add it to S . The set S is called the set of *singleton* vertices. Note that some C_i can become empty after this procedure. At this point, we call each C_i a *cluster* of the graph. This procedure is called the *trimming* step in [KT18].
3. Initialize the set $L := \bigcup_{i \in [p]} \{v \in C_i \mid \deg_{G[C_i]}(v) \leq (1 - \epsilon) \deg_G(v)\}$, i.e., for each $i \in [p]$ and vertex $v \in C_i$ that loses at least ϵ fraction of its degree when restricted to C_i , add v to L (but do not remove it from C_i yet). Then, add L to the singletons S (i.e., update $S \leftarrow S \cup L$) and define the *core* of a cluster C_i as $A_i \leftarrow C_i \setminus L$. For a given core A_i , let $C(A_i)$ denote the cluster whose core is A_i . This procedure is called the *shaving* step in [KT18].
4. For each core A_i with at most k vertices, we *shatter* the core by adding A_i to the singletons S (i.e., update $S \leftarrow S \cup A_i$) and updating $A_i \leftarrow \emptyset$. This is the only additional step relative to [GLL21].
5. Suppose there are $p' \leq p$ nonempty cores A_i . Let us re-order the cores A_1, \dots, A_p so that $A_1, \dots, A_{p'}$ are precisely the nonempty cores. The final partition $\mathcal{P} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots\}$ of V is $\bigcup_{i \in [p']} \{A_i\} \cup \bigcup_{v \in S} \{\{v\}\}$. In other words, we take each nonempty core A_i as its own set in the partition, and add each vertex $v \in S$ as a singleton set. We call each nonempty core A_i a *core* in the partition, and each vertex $v \in S$ as a *singleton* in the partition.

The lemmas below are stated identically to those in [GLL21], so we omit the proofs and direct interested readers to [GLL21].

Lemma 3.6 (Lemma B.11 of [GLL21]). *Fix a parameter $\alpha \geq 1$ that satisfies $\alpha < o(\delta/\log n)$. For each nonempty cluster C and a subset $S \subseteq V$ satisfying $|\partial_G S| \leq \alpha\delta$, we have either $|C \cap S| \leq 3\alpha$ or $|C \setminus S| \leq 3\alpha$.*

The lemma below from [GLL21] is true for the algorithm without step 4.

Lemma 3.7 (Corollary B.9 of [GLL21]). *Suppose we skip step 4 of the algorithm. Then, there are $O(\frac{m \log m}{\delta^2})$ many sets in the partition \mathcal{P} .*

Clearly, adding step 4 increases the number of parts by a factor of at most k , so we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.8. *There are $O(\frac{km \log m}{\delta^2})$ many sets in the partition \mathcal{P} .*

Since $m \leq \lambda_k n$ and $\delta \geq \lambda_k/k$ by the assumption of Lemma 3.2, this fulfills the bound $q = (k \log n)^{O(1)} n/\lambda_k$ of Lemma 3.2. For the rest of this section, we prove property (*).

The following lemma is a combination of Lemma B.12 of [GLL21] and Lemma 16 of [Li19], and we provide a proof for completeness.

Lemma 3.9. *Fix a parameter $\alpha \geq 1$ that satisfies $\alpha < o(\frac{\delta}{k \log n})$. For any nonempty core A and any minimum k -cut of size at most $\alpha\delta$, there is exactly one component S^* satisfying $|S^* \cap C(A)| > 3\alpha$, and any other component S that is non-singleton must be disjoint from A . Moreover, each vertex $v \in A$ has at least $(1 - 2\epsilon) \deg(v)$ neighbors in S^* .*

Proof. We first show that $|C(A)| > 3\alpha k$. Since $C(A)$ is nonempty, each vertex $v \in C(A)$ has at least $\frac{2}{5} \deg(v) \geq \frac{2}{5} \delta$ neighbors in $C(A)$, so $|C(A)| \geq \frac{2}{5} \delta - 1 > 3\alpha k$ by the assumption $\alpha < o(\frac{\delta}{k \log n})$.

By Lemma 3.6, each component S must satisfy $|C(A) \cap S| \leq 3\alpha$ or $|C(A) \setminus S| \leq 3\alpha$, and the latter implies that $|C(A) \cap S| > |C(A)|/2$, which only one side S can satisfy. Moreover, one such component S^* must exist since otherwise, $|C(A)| = \sum_S |C(A) \cap S| \leq 3\alpha k$, a contradiction. Therefore, all but one component S^* satisfy $|C(A) \cap S| \leq 3\alpha$.

Next, each vertex $v \in A$ has at least $(1 - \epsilon) \deg(v)$ neighbors in $C(A)$, and at most $3\alpha k$ of them can go to $C(A) \cap S$ for any component $S \neq S^*$. This leaves at least $(1 - \epsilon) \deg(v) - 3\alpha k$ neighbors in S^* , which is at least $(1 - 2\epsilon) \deg(v)$ since $\epsilon = 1/\log n$ and $\alpha < o(\frac{\delta}{k \log n})$.

We now show that if S is non-singleton and $|C(A) \cap S| \leq 3\alpha$, then S is disjoint from A . Suppose otherwise; then, any vertex $v \in A \cap S$ has at least $(1 - 2\epsilon) \deg(v)$ neighbors in S^* as before. If we move v from S to S^* , then the result is still a k -cut since S is non-singleton. Moreover, the edges from v to S are newly cut, and the edges from v to S^* are saved. The former is at most $\epsilon \deg(v) + 3\alpha$, and the latter at least $(1 - 2\epsilon) \deg(v)$. Since $\epsilon = 1/\log n$ and $\alpha < o(\frac{\delta}{k \log n})$, the new k -cut is smaller than the old one, a contradiction. \square

Finally, we prove property (*) of Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 3.10. *For any minimum k -cut C with exactly r singleton components, there exists $I \subset [r]$ and a function $\sigma : I \rightarrow [k] \setminus [r]$ such that the border of C defined by I and σ , namely $B_{I,\sigma}$, agrees with the partition V_1, \dots, V_q . In other words, all edges of $B_{I,\sigma}$ are between some pair of parts V_i, V_j . Moreover, we have $|B_{I,\sigma}| \leq \lambda_k - (1 - 2/\log n)|I|\lambda_k/k$.*

Proof. Enumerate the singleton components as $S_1 = \{v_1\}, \dots, S_r = \{v_r\}$. Let T be the set of singleton components S_i such that S_i is contained in a part V_j that has more vertices than just v_i (i.e., $V_j \supsetneq \{v_i\}$). For every such component $S_i = \{v_i\}$, since $V_j \supsetneq \{v_i\}$, we must have $|V_j| > k$, since otherwise it would have been shattered into singletons on step 4 of the algorithm. So there must be a non-singleton component S_{i^*} of the minimum k -cut intersecting V_j (which is unique by Lemma 3.9). This component must be the S^* from Lemma 3.9. We define $\sigma(i) = i^*$.

As we've argued in the previous paragraph, the border S'_{r+1}, \dots, S'_k defined as $S'_i = S_i \cup \{v_j : j \in I, \sigma(j) = i\}$ agrees with the partition V_1, \dots, V_q . It remains to show that $|E(S'_{r+1}, \dots, S'_k)| \leq \lambda_k - (1 - 1/k)|I|\lambda_k/k$. For each component $S_i = \{v_i\}$ with $i \in I$, by Lemma 3.9, the vertex v_i has at least $(1 - 2\epsilon) \deg(v)$ neighbors in $S_{\sigma(i)}$, so merging v_i with $S_{\sigma(i)}$ decreases the cut value by at least $(1 - 2\epsilon) \deg(v)$. It follows that the border has size at most $\lambda_k - (1 - 2\epsilon)|I| \deg(v)$, which meets the bound since $\epsilon = 1/\log n$ and $\deg(v) \geq \delta \geq \lambda_k/k$ by assumption. \square

With Lemma 3.10, this concludes the proof of Lemma 3.2.

4 Finding the Border

In this section, we develop an algorithm to compute the border. The main lemma is the following, where C represents the border we wish to find.

Lemma 2.3. *Fix an integer $2 \leq s \leq k$ and a parameter $\beta \leq 1$, and consider an s -cut C of size at most $\beta\lambda_k$. There is an $n^{\beta k + O(1)}$ time algorithm that computes a list of $n^{\beta k + O(1)}$ s -cuts such that with high probability, C is listed as one of the cuts.*

Our algorithm follows Karger's contraction algorithm, stated below, and its analysis from [GHLL20].

Algorithm 2 Contraction Algorithm [GHLL20]

- 1: **while** $|V| > \tau$ **do**
 - 2: Choose an edge $e \in E$ at random from G , with probability proportional to its weight.
 - 3: Contract the two vertices in e and remove self-loops.
 - 4: **end while**
 - 5: Return a k -cut of G chosen uniformly at random.
-

The key lemma we use is the following from [GHLL20].

Lemma 4.1 (Lemma 17 of [GHLL20]). *Suppose that J is an edge set with $\alpha = |J|/\lambda_k$ and $n \geq \tau \geq 8\alpha k^2 + 2k$. Then J survives lines 1 to 4 of the Contraction Algorithm with probability at least $(n/\tau)^{-\alpha k} k^{-O(\alpha k^2)}$.*

The algorithm sets $\tau = 8\beta k^2 + 2k$, and by Lemma 4.1, any s -cut C of size $\alpha\lambda_k$ for some $\alpha \leq \beta$ survives lines 1 to 4 of the Contraction Algorithm with probability $k^{-O(k^2)} n^{-\alpha k} \geq k^{-O(k^2)} n^{-\beta k}$. The algorithm sets s for the parameter k , and C is output with probability $1/r^\tau \geq k^{-O(k^2)}$. Overall, the probability of outputting C is $k^{-O(k^2)} n^{-\beta k}$. Repeating the algorithm $k^{O(k^2)} n^{\beta k} \log n$ times, we can output a list of cuts that contains C with high probability.

5 Finding the Islands

In this section, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *There is a $O_r(n^{\frac{wr}{3} + O(1)})$ deterministic algorithm that solves the r -Island problem.*

We present an algorithm for r -island which is a variant of Nešetřil and Poljak's k -clique algorithm [NP85]. Given an input graph G , we want to find the optimal r vertices to cut off from G . Note that this is similar to finding the minimum r -clique in G , except that we need to take into account the edges from the r islands to the remaining giant component in G . We first consider the case where r is divisible by 3.

Algorithm 3 Island Discovery Algorithm

- 1: We construct a weighted graph G' as follows — for every subset of vertices S such that $|S| = \frac{r}{3}$, create a vertex v_S . Denote the total number of edges among vertices in S as w_S , and denote the total number of edges between S and $V \setminus S$ as w_S^V . For each pair of vertices v_S, v_T , let $w_{S,T}$ be the total number of edges between S and T if they are disjoint. Add an edge between them of weight $w_{S,T}$.
 - 2: We want to find the minimum weight triangle in the graph G' . To do so, we guess the weight of a minimum weight triangle as follows: Denote the three vertices as $v_{S_1}, v_{S_2}, v_{S_3}$. Guess $w_{S_1}, w_{S_2}, w_{S_3}, w_{S_1}^V, w_{S_2}^V, w_{S_3}^V$, and $w_{S_1, S_2}, w_{S_2, S_3}, w_{S_3, S_1}$.
 - 3: Denote A as the binary adjacency matrix for G' . Let F_i denotes the set of vertices v_S such that $w_S = w_{S_i}, w_S^V = w_{S_i}^V$. Define $A_{1,2}$ to be the matrix A with the rows restricted to vertices in F_1 , and columns restricted to vertices in F_2 . Additionally, for $v_S \in F_1, v_T \in F_2$, if $w_{S,T} \neq w_{S_1, S_2}$, set $A_{1,2}[S, T] = 0$. Define $A_{2,3}, A_{3,1}$ similarly.
 - 4: Compute the matrix product $B = A_{1,2} \times A_{2,3}$. If there exists $v_S \in F_1, v_T \in F_3$ such that $B[S, T] \neq 0, A_{3,1} = 1$, then find v_R such that $A_{1,2}[S, R] = A_{2,3}[R, T] = 1$ and return S, R, T . Otherwise, return Null.
-

Claim 5.1. *Algorithm 3 returns an optimal $(r+1)$ -cut with r islands with probability at least $\frac{1}{O(r^{15}n^3)}$.*

Proof. We first note that given the nine parameters $w_{S_1}, w_{S_2}, w_{S_3}, w_{S_1}^V, w_{S_2}^V, w_{S_3}^V$, and $w_{S_1, S_2}, w_{S_2, S_3}, w_{S_3, S_1}$, the weight of the returned cut would be $w_{S_1} + w_{S_2} + w_{S_3} + w_{S_1, S_2} + w_{S_2, S_3} + w_{S_3, S_1} + (w_{S_1}^V - w_{S_1, S_2} - w_{S_3, S_1}) + (w_{S_2}^V - w_{S_1, S_2} - w_{S_2, S_3}) + (w_{S_3}^V - w_{S_2, S_3} - w_{S_3, S_1})$. In other words, the nine parameters precisely specify the weight of the returned cut. Therefore, if we guess the parameters correctly, our algorithm will return r -vertices that gives the minimum $r+1$ cut with r islands. Note that $w_{S_1}, w_{S_2}, w_{S_3}$ and $w_{S_1, S_2}, w_{S_2, S_3}, w_{S_3, S_1}$ each have $O(r^2)$ possible values, while $w_{S_1}^V, w_{S_2}^V, w_{S_3}^V$ each have $O(rn)$ possible values. Therefore there are at most $O(r^{15}n^3)$ possible combination of values for the nine parameters, which means we guess correctly with probability as least $\frac{1}{O(r^{15}n^3)}$. The rest of the algorithm is a standard triangle detection algorithm using matrix multiplication, which has runtime $O(n^{\frac{\omega r}{3}})$. \square

If r is not divisible by 3, we can add up to two isolated vertices into the graph and reduce to the case where r is divisible by 3. This increase the runtime by a factor of $n^{O(1)}$. Now note that our above algorithm can be easily made deterministic by going over all $O(r^{15}n^3)$ possible combinations of the nine parameters instead of guessing them. This proves Lemma 2.4.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Anupam Gupta for many constructive discussions and comments.

References

- [AW21] Josh Alman and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. A refined laser method and faster matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 522–539. SIAM, 2021.
- [GH94] Olivier Goldschmidt and Dorit S. Hochbaum. A polynomial algorithm for the k -cut problem for fixed k . *Math. Oper. Res.*, 19(1):24–37, 1994.
- [GHLL20] Anupam Gupta, David G Harris, Euiwoong Lee, and Jason Li. Optimal bounds for the k -cut problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08301*, 2020.
- [GLL18] Anupam Gupta, Euiwoong Lee, and Jason Li. Faster exact and approximate algorithms for k -cut. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 113–123. IEEE, 2018.
- [GLL19] Anupam Gupta, Euiwoong Lee, and Jason Li. The number of minimum k -cuts: Improving the karger-stein bound. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 229–240, 2019.
- [GLL21] Anupam Gupta, Euiwoong Lee, and Jason Li. The connectivity threshold for dense graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 89–105. SIAM, 2021.
- [KS96] David R Karger and Clifford Stein. A new approach to the minimum cut problem. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 43(4):601–640, 1996.
- [KT18] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Mikkel Thorup. Deterministic edge connectivity in near-linear time. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 66(1):1–50, 2018.
- [Li19] Jason Li. Faster minimum k -cut of a simple graph. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1056–1077. IEEE, 2019.
- [LSS20] Daniel Lokshantov, Saket Saurabh, and Vaishali Surianarayanan. A parameterized approximation scheme for min k -cut. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 798–809. IEEE, 2020.
- [NI92] Hiroshi Nagamochi and Toshihide Ibaraki. Computing edge-connectivity in multigraphs and capacitated graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 5(1):54–66, 1992.
- [NP85] Jaroslav Nešetřil and Svatopluk Poljak. On the complexity of the subgraph problem. *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, 26(2):415–419, 1985.
- [SV95] Huzur Saran and Vijay V. Vazirani. Finding k -cuts within twice the optimal. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 24(1):101–108, 1995.

- [Tho08] Mikkel Thorup. Minimum k -way cuts via deterministic greedy tree packing. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 159–166. ACM, 2008.