

L_p Isotonic Regression Algorithms Using an L_0 Approach

Quentin F. Stout

qstout@umich.edu

www.eecs.umich.edu/~qstout/

Abstract: Significant advances in maximum flow algorithms have changed the relative performance of various approaches to isotonic regression. If the transitive closure is given then the standard approach used for L_0 (Hamming distance) isotonic regression (finding anti-chains in the transitive closure of the violator graph), combined with new flow algorithms, gives an L_1 algorithm taking $\tilde{\Theta}(n^2 + n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log U)$ time, where U is the maximum vertex weight. The previous fastest was $\Theta(n^3)$. Similar results are obtained for L_2 and for L_p approximations, $1 < p < \infty$. For weighted points in d -dimensional space with coordinate-wise ordering, $d \geq 3$, L_0 , L_1 and L_2 regressions can be found in only $o(n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log^d n \log U)$ time, improving on the previous best of $\tilde{\Theta}(n^2 \log^d n)$, and for unweighted points the time is $O(n^{\frac{4}{3}+o(1)} \log^d n)$.

Keywords: L_1 isotonic regression, L_p monotonic regression, maximum flow, maximum cut, violator graph, Hamming distance, multidimensional coordinate-wise ordering

1 Introduction

There are many scenarios when one expects that an attribute of objects increases as a function of other attributes. For example, the expected maximum grade level achieved by a person is likely to be an increasing function of their mother’s maximum grade level and father’s maximum grade level. No assumptions are made about the relationship between a lower mother’s grade level and higher father’s high grade versus a higher mother’s grade level and lower father’s.

More generally, let V be a set with a partial order \prec , let f be a function on V . f is *isotonic* iff for all $u, v \in V$, if $u \prec v$ then $f(u) \leq f(v)$. Given arbitrary functions f, g , and nonnegative weight function w , on V and a value p where $p = 0$ or $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, their weighted L_p distance, denoted $\|f - g\|_p$, is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V} w(v) \cdot \mathbf{1}(f(v) \neq g(v)) & \quad p = 0 \\ (\sum_{v \in V} w(v) |f(v) - g(v)|^p)^{1/p} & \quad 1 \leq p < \infty \\ \max_{v \in V} w(v) |f(v) - g(v)| & \quad p = \infty \end{aligned}$$

L_0 is not a true norm and is also known as the *Hamming distance*, 0-1 loss, or Kronecker delta loss. Unweighted data means $w(v) = 1$ for all $v \in V$. f' is an L_p *isotonic regression* of f if it minimizes $\|f - g\|_p$ among all isotonic functions g . Isotonic regressions are unique for $1 < p < \infty$, but not necessarily for $p = 0, 1, \infty$.

Many different terms are applied to various versions of this. For example, often monotonic is used instead of isotonic, and both are non-parametric, or shape-constrained, regression. L_0 isotonic regression is sometimes called monotonic relabeling, and the distance is also known as Hamming distance or 0-1 distance. L_1 regression is sometimes called median regression, the least absolute deviations, or sum of deviations error. The L_p regression error of the optimal isotonic regression is sometimes called the “distance to monotonicity”, and this term is particularly used for the L_0 distance. L_2 is the (sometimes unstated) most common norm for isotonic regression. A large number of other terms apply as well.

Usually we assume the partial order is given via a dag which is connected (for disconnected ones the algorithms would be applied on each piece separately), having n vertices and m directed edges. In Section 4

the edges of the dag will not initially be explicit. We assume the weights are integers in $[0, U]$, though in some cases this assumption isn't required. In this paper, fastest is in terms of O-notation, not necessarily practice. The paper concentrates on algorithms, not on any specific application. Some relevant applications for L_0 appear in [3, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 20], and for L_1 and L_2 the applications are far too numerous to list.

Efficient algorithms for determining isotonic regressions depend on the metric and the underlying dag. L_∞ algorithms are quite different than those for L_p , $1 \leq p < \infty$ and won't be discussed. For linear orders, efficient algorithms are based on a left-right sweep algorithm known as PAVA, pool adjacent violators algorithm (violators will be discussed shortly). PAVA has been used for decades, resulting in algorithms taking $\Theta(n \log n)$ time for L_1 and $\Theta(n)$ for L_2 . The basic ideas can be extended to directed trees. For 2-dimensional grids the fastest algorithms for L_1 and L_2 are based on dynamic programming [16, 17]. For more complex dags the complexity grows significantly.

Here we concentrate on algorithms for the general case, applicable to any dag. The fastest known algorithms utilize variations on maximum flows and linear programming. L_0 uses minimum flow algorithms and takes $\Theta(n^3)$ time [6, 13, 14]. L_1 uses a linear programming approach, taking $\Theta(nm + n^2 \log n)$ time [1]. L_2 uses a maximum flow approach taking $\Theta(nm \log(\frac{n^2}{m}))$ time [8], though to achieve this the flow algorithm must have a property the authors call "monotonicity", which recent algorithms do not possess, limiting the options for improvement. There do not seem to be any published L_p algorithms for other values of p , other than approximation algorithms or the exact algorithms in Theorem 3 which only apply in a very restricted setting.

Recent advances in maximum flow algorithms change some of the relative timing of these approaches. If U is the maximum integer capacity, then the BLLSSSW algorithm [4] takes $\tilde{O}(m + n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log U)$ time with high probability, the Gao-Liu-Peng algorithm [7] takes $\tilde{O}(m^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{328}} \log U)$ time, and the Kathuria-Liu-Sidford algorithm [9] takes $O(m^{\frac{4}{3} + o(1)} U^{1/3})$. Let $\mathcal{F}(n, m, U)$ denote the time of the fastest maximum flow algorithm on a graph of n vertices, m edges, and maximum integer edge capacity U . These algorithms show that $\mathcal{F}(n, m, U) = \tilde{O}(\min\{m + n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log U, m^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{328}} \log U, m^{\frac{4}{3} + o(1)} U^{1/3}\})$ time, which is never worse than $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ if U is polynomial in n (i.e., the algorithm is pseudopolynomial). While the $U^{1/3}$ term in the Kathuria-Liu-Sidford algorithm is far larger than the $\log U$ term in the others, if the capacities are bounded by a constant then it is faster when $m = O(n^{9/8 - o(1)})$. The wikipedia page [21] has been rapidly updated when faster flow algorithms are found.

In Section 2 we use the previous L_0 algorithmic approach, combined with the BLLSSSW algorithm, to improve the time for L_0 isotonic regression, and use this, plus partitioning, to improve L_1 in Section 3.1. In Section 3.2 we show how the faster L_1 algorithm gives a faster exact algorithm for L_2 with integer values and weights, and approximation algorithms for L_p , $1 < p < \infty$. In Section 4 we examine the partial ordering of points in d -dimensional space with component-wise ordering. Using a compact representation of the violator graph, combined with the Gao-Liu-Peng algorithm, results in L_0 , L_1 and L_2 algorithms taking $o(n^{3/2})$ time, compared to the previous best of $\tilde{\Theta}(n^2)$. In Sections 3.1 and 4 we show how the Kathuria-Liu-Sidford algorithm makes further improvements when the data is unweighted.

2 Background and L_0 Isotonic Regression

Many isotonic regression algorithms have descriptions in terms of violators and violator graphs. Given a dag $G = (V, E)$ and a real-valued function f on V , vertices $u, v \in V$ are a *violating pair* if $u \prec v$ and $f(u) > f(v)$, i.e., they violate the isotonic requirement. Using $u \prec_v v$ to denote that u and v are a violating pair, it is easy to see that \prec_v defines a partial order on V . A dag $\hat{G} = (V, \hat{E})$, is a *violator graph* if there is a path from u to v in \hat{G} iff $u \prec_v v$. There may be many violator graphs for a given G and f . For example, if \hat{G} has a path from u to v iff there is an edge from u to v , then the edges of \hat{G} are the transitive closure of the

1. Create a violator dag $\widehat{G} = (V, \widehat{E})$ of G .
2. Find an antichain C of \widehat{G} of maximum weight, where the weight of C is $\sum_{v \in C} w(v)$:
 - (a) Create a flow graph \widehat{G}_f from \widehat{G} .
 - (b) Find a minimum flow on \widehat{G}_f and use this to determine C .
3. Determine an isotonic regression f' :

$$f'(v) = \begin{cases} f(v) & v \in C \\ \max\{f(w) : w \prec v, w \in C\} & \text{if there is a predecessor of } v \text{ in } C \\ \min\{f(w) : v \prec w, w \in C\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Figure 1: Optimal L_0 monotonic relabeling f' of label function f on $G = (V, E)$ with order \prec (see [6, 11, 12, 15])

violating pairs. The edges of the smallest subgraph of the transitive closure which is still violator graph form the transitive reduction.

Let $\mathcal{V}(n, m)$ denote the worst-case time to create a violator graph from a graph of n vertices and m directed edges. Given the edges of the transitive closure the violator graph corresponding to it can be determined in time linear in the size of the closure, so \mathcal{V} is no more than the time to find the transitive closure. Thus $\mathcal{V}(n, m) = O(\min\{nm, n^\omega\})$ since there are algorithms for determining the transitive closure with these times, where ω is such that matrix multiplication can be computed in $O(n^\omega)$ time. It is known that $\omega < 2.4$, but for decades the progress in reducing upper bounds on ω has increasingly yielded miniscule improvements, and the implied constants are so large that the algorithms are galactic. However, Strassen's algorithm, taking $\Theta(n^{\log_2 7} \approx 2.81)$ time, is practical. An important aspect of $\mathcal{V}(n, m)$ is that it is $O(nm)$, and hence is as fast as the previously fastest algorithm for L_1 , and strictly faster than the previously fastest ones for L_0 and L_2 .

The remainder of this section is a rephrasing and condensation of the Background section of [19], which is based on the work of [6, 11, 12, 15]. The fundamental algorithm for finding an L_0 isotonic regression is given in Figure 1, a slightly modified version of a figure in [19]. Note that in L_0 there is no need for a metric on the function or regression values, merely that they are linearly ordered.

The role of C in Figure 1 is that any vertices which are an anti-chain (i.e., there are no directed paths connecting any pair) in \widehat{G} can be used as vertices where $f = f'$, and in fact given any set of vertices D where f is unchanged they can only be part of an isotonic function if D is an anti-chain. Thus picking an anti-chain of maximum weight yields an optimal L_0 isotonic regression, if the remaining values are chosen to create an isotonic function. That is what step 3 does: if v has predecessors in C then $f'(v)$ must be no smaller than $f'(w) = f(w)$ for any predecessor of v in C , and similar it must be no larger than $f(w)$ for any successors in C . Note that if $v \notin C$ then v must have successors or predecessors, or both, in C , since otherwise it could be added to C and increase the anti-chain. There are other possibilities for values of f' on $V \setminus C$ [19], but they aren't needed here.

A flow graph is used to find C . This is illustrated in Figure 2, which is copied from [19]. The flow graph is straightforward to construct from the violator dag \widehat{G} , replacing each vertex v with a pair v_{in} and v_{out} , with an edge from v_{in} to v_{out} . These edges have capacity 1 (or $w(v)$ in the weighted case) and all other edges have weight 0. A minimum flow is found where the flow on any edge is at least the edge's requirement, and this is used to find a maximum cut C . This is essentially the same as max-flow min-cut, but first one needs to find a




Figure 2: Label function on unweighted dag G , one of its violator dags \widehat{G} , flow graph \widehat{G}_f , resulting C

feasible flow on \widehat{G} (one meeting at each edge's requirement) and then minimize it. This is done by subtracting the requirement from the flow, using these values as the capacities on the edges of \widehat{G} and finding a maximum flow on this, and then subtracting this maximal flow from the feasible flow to get the final flow.

Further explanation is in [19], but here the important part is that the time is dominated by the time to create \widehat{G} , and the min flow algorithm. Finding a feasible flow can easily be done using topological sort, creating an excess of at most nU , where U is the maximum weight on any vertex. Thus the dominating factor for the flow is the max flow adjustment. The number of edges in the transitive closure may be $\binom{n}{2}$ even when the number of edges is $n - 1$ (consider a linear order where the initial values are in decreasing order), so the worst case flow time is $\mathcal{F}(n, \binom{n}{2}, U)$

Thus the overall time to find an L_0 isotonic regression is $O(\mathcal{V}(n, m) + \mathcal{F}(n, \binom{n}{2}, U))$. Using the values shown earlier, and assuming U is polynomial in n , this currently is $\Theta(\max\{\min\{n^\omega, nm\}, \tilde{n}^2\})$. Previous results only showed that the regression could be found in $\Theta(n^3)$ time.

3 Partitioning

It has been noted that when there are only 2 labels L_0 isotonic regression is the same as $\{0, 1\}$ L_1 isotonic regression, and thus a way of determining L_0 isotonic regressions is by using L_1 isotonic regression algorithms. Here we reverse that. We start with the L_0 approach of building the violator graph then finding a flow and using that to construct the regression. We expand on this by using an L_1 approach where vertex values and weights are temporarily changed and iterative calls to flow algorithms are made. This is called *partitioning* and will first be applied to find L_1 isotonic regression for an arbitrary number of different values, and then to find L_p approximate and exact isotonic regressions.

3.1 L_1 Isotonic Regression

To expand to an L_1 algorithm for arbitrary values, not just binary ones, we use an observation in [17] (and essentially in [8]). Suppose no values of f are in (a, b) , $a < b$. Create a new weighted function g on V where $g(v) = a$ if $f(v) \leq a$, and $g(v) = b$ if $f(v) \geq b$. The weight at v is the same as its original weight, $w(v)$. There is always an L_1 optimal isotonic regression where the regression values are data values, so there is an optimal regression g' of g where every value of g' is a or b . Further, [17] showed that for any such g' , there is an L_1 isotonic regression f' of f , where $f'(v) \leq a$ if $g'(v) = a$, and $f'(v) \geq b$ if $g'(v) = b$. Using the original weights as the weights in the binary regression represents the increase in error that would occur if $g(v) = a$ but $g'(v) = b$. In this case $[g'(v) - f(v)] - [g(v) - f(v)]$ is $b - a$, so the error increased by $(b - a)w(v)$. The same is true if $g(v) = b$ but $g'(v) = a$. Since the change in errors is always proportional to $b - a$ we can divide by that term and minimize the increase in error by using the original weights.

Let V_a be the vertices where $g' = a$ and V_b the vertices where it is b , and let $G_a = (V_a, E_a)$ and $G_b = (V_b, E_b)$, where E_a contains those edges with both endpoints in V_a , and similarly for E_b . Edges with one

endpoint in a and the other in b are discarded. No vertex of V_b precedes any vertex of V_a , and the final regression values of each set only depend on the weighted function values in that set, so the regressions on G_a and G_b can be computed independently.

The way this is applied is that the initial a and b values are the medians of the original function values (if there are 2), or a is the median and b the smallest value larger than a . Then G_a is partitioned using the first quartile of the original function values (in increasing order) and G_b the third quartile. This halving process continues until, in every subgraph, the splitting values are the only two values remaining in their subgraph. There are at most $\Theta(\log n)$ iterations. The partitioning doesn't cut the graph in half each time, but cuts the number of function values corresponding to any subgraph in half, and the total time at each stage is no more than the time at the first stage. See [17] for further details. That paper does not consider building a violator graph, just constructing an L_1 isotonic regression on a given graph.

Theorem 1 *Given a dag G of n vertices and m edges, with weighted function values f, w where the weights are integers in $[0, U]$, once the violator graph has been constructed, having \hat{m} edges, an L_1 isotonic regression can be found in $O(\mathcal{F}(n, \hat{m}, U) \log n)$ time. \square*

Since the weights used throughout are the original weights of the vertices, if the graph is unweighted then the Kathuria-Liu-Sidford algorithm [9] is the fastest flow algorithm when $\hat{m} = O(n^{9/8-o(1)})$.

3.2 Exact and Approximate L_p Regression

Various approximation algorithms for L_p isotonic regression, based on partitioning and the L_1 algorithm, appear in [17]. The basic idea is that partitioning is correct for general L_p , $1 \leq p < \infty$, so binary L_1 regression is used in a similar fashion as for general L_1 regression. However, it is no longer true that the regression values can always be chosen to be values of the original function. E.g., for a linear order of 2 vertices, with unweighted values 1, 0, the unique L_p regression, $1 < p \leq \infty$ is 0.5, 0.5, while for L_1 the regression values can be α , α for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Thus binary splitting of the function values does not always produce the correct result when $p \neq 1$.

Instead one must somehow split among the possible function values. One important aspect is that for L_p the weights need to be adjusted. Before, when using splitting values a, b , with no function values in (a, b) , a function value $f(v) \leq a$ was temporarily changed to a , with the same weight because it was proportional to the increase in error if the regression value at v was b instead of a . For L_p , $p > 1$ the change in error is not just $b - a$. In [17] it is shown that using weights based on the derivative, $w(v)(a - f(v))^{p-1}$, gives the correct partitioning and can be used iteratively, just as before. However, since the weights are no longer uniformly bounded even if the graph was initially unweighted, the Kathuria-Liu-Sidford [9] algorithm would be significantly slower.

Approximation to within δ means that the regression values are no more than δ away from their value in an optimal isotonic regression. Rounding to a multiple of δ from the smallest function value, and splitting the range in half each time, is a natural partitioning approach and gives a suitable approximation.

Theorem 2 [17] *Let $1 < p < \infty$. Given a dag $G = (V, E)$, a weighted function f, w with integral weights in $[0, U]$, and $\delta > 0$, once the violator graph has been constructed, having \hat{m} edges, an isotonic function within δ of the L_p isotonic regression can be found in $\Theta(\mathcal{F}(n, \hat{m}, U) \log K)$ time, where $K = (\max_{v \in V} f(v) - \min_{v \in V} f(v)) / \delta$ and where the implied constants in the O -notation depend on p . \square*

One can improve the regression by using the true L_p mean as the regression value for each level set (i.e., a connected subgraph) at the end of the process.

Others have looked at approximation algorithms for all L_p as well. Kyng, Rao, and Sachdeva [10] give an algorithm which produces an isotonic regression within an additive error of δ away from optimal, where they are using total error, not vertex-wise. It's moderately easy to adjust the δ in the above theorem to achieve this goal. Their algorithm isn't based on an explicit violator graph, and takes $\tilde{\Theta}(m^{1.5} \log^2 n \log(nU/\delta))$ time. This is faster if $m = \tilde{O}(n^{\frac{2\omega}{3}})$. However, a critical difference is that it only produces an appropriate approximation with probability at least $1 - 1/n$, not probability 1.

There is a more subtle way to do L_p partitioning, but in a restricted setting. For L_1 isotonic regression the values of each level set can be taken to be the weighted median of the function values corresponding to the vertices in the set. For L_p , finding splitting values that are guaranteed to separate the level sets is difficult since it isn't known how close these values can be to each other. However, for integer function values and weights one can compute a δ such that no two level sets have values closer than δ . The details are in [17]. While the following theorem only analyzes binary data values for arbitrary p , for L_2 the values can be arbitrary integers. For L_2 , one can use $\delta = 1/[\sum_{v \in V} w(v)]^2$, and no two subsets with different weighted means (their optimal regression value) can have weighted means closer than 4δ . In particular, no two function values can be closer than this.

To make the answer exact we have to be a bit more careful in partitioning. We always use values that are of the form $u + i\delta$, where u is the smallest function value. Suppose there is a subgraph $G' = (V', E')$ where we know the range of regression values will be in an interval $[c, d]$. To partition it we first choose $x = (c + d)/2$, rounded to the nearest multiple of δ . If there is no value on V' that is in $(x, x + \delta)$ then let the a for partitioning be x and $b = x + \delta$. Otherwise, there is no function value in $(x - \delta, x)$, so let $a = x - \delta$ and $b = x$. Now there are no data values in (a, b) , so the comments about partitioning at the start of Section 3.1 apply.

Theorem 3 [17] *For L_2 , if integral data values are in $[-D, D]$ and integral weights are in $[0, U]$, then for a dag $G = (V, E)$ the exact isotonic regression can be found in the time given in Theorem 2, where $\log K$ is replaced by $\log nDU$.*

For L_p , $1 < p < \infty$, if data values are in $\{0, 1\}$ and weights are in $\{1, \dots, U\}$ then the exact isotonic regression can be found in the same time, where $\log K$ is replaced by $\log nU$. \square

4 Multidimensional Orderings

A very important partial ordering is given by points in d -dimensional space with coordinate-wise ordering. Given points $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$, $x \neq y$, y dominates x iff $x_i \leq y_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Domination is also known as multi-dimensional ordering. There is no requirement that the dimensions are the same, nor even numeric, merely that each is linearly ordered. Many datasets involve such orderings, often with a large number of vertices and occasionally with a significant number of dimensions.

The points may form a grid, which has nice properties such as the fact that the number of edges is linear in the number of points (throughout we ignore constants that depend on d , such as the number of edges emanating from a point in a grid, but will include factors such as $\log^d n$). For 2-dimensional grids an L_2 isotonic regression algorithm, with no restrictions on values nor weights, appeared in [16], taking $\Theta(n^2)$ time. An unrestricted L_1 algorithm, taking $\Theta(n \log n)$ time, appeared in [17]. Both algorithms used a scan-based dynamic programming approach, with the L_1 algorithm also incorporating partitioning. By using trees to aid in the scan these can be extended to arbitrary points in 2-dimensions, adding a $\log n$ factor [17].

Violator-based algorithms do not improve these algorithms because while the original order may be specified by a grid, the violator graph rarely would be. The L_2 algorithm is slower than that for L_1 because it can only guarantee that at each step it partitions into a set of 1 vertex and everything else in the other even though it scans through all vertices (however, each subgraph might be far larger than 1). The L_2 algorithm in [8] has a

similar behavior, though it makes clever use of intermediate calculations while that in [16] doesn't. However, [16] exploits ordering properties of 2-dimensional grids, while the general algorithm in [8] doesn't.

Unfortunately the dynamic programming options in 2 dimensions do not extend to higher ones, so new approaches are needed. In [18] a concise violator graph is given for domination ordering. It incorporates Steiner vertices, which are vertices not in the original graph. The coordinates in each dimension are converted to integers, where if a dimension has x different values the coordinates are the integers in $[0, x - 1]$. They are represented as bit strings of k bits, where $k = \lceil \lg x \rceil$. Steiner coordinates corresponding to strings of length k are of the form $****, 0***, 1***, 00**, 01**, 10**, \dots 1110, 1111$ (for $k = 4$). Given a vertex coordinate $q = q_1 \cdots q_k$ and Steiner coordinate $t = t_1 \cdots t_k$, $q \preceq t$ iff $q = t$ or there is a j , $1 \leq j < k$ such that $q_1 = t_1, q_2 = t_2, \dots, q_j = t_j, q_{j+1} = 0, t_{j+1} = *$; and $t \preceq q$ iff $q = t$ or there is a j , $1 \leq j < k$ such that $q_1 = t_1, q_2 = t_2, \dots, q_j = t_j, q_{j+1} = 1, t_{j+1} = *$. For vertex coordinates $q = q_1 \cdots q_k$ and $r = r_1 \cdots r_k$, if $q \prec r$, $q \neq r$, then there is a $0 \leq j < k$ such that $q_i = r_i$ for $1 \leq j$ and $q_{j+1} = 0, r_{j+1} = 1$. Thus the Steiner coordinate $t = q_1 \cdots q_j * \cdots *$ is such that $q \prec t \prec r$, and if $q = r$ then setting $t = q$ gives $q \preceq t \preceq r$.

In the violator graph $\hat{G} = (\hat{V}, \hat{E})$, a Steiner vertex s is of the form (s_1, \dots, s_d) , where all the s_i have Steiner coordinates and at least one has a $*$. Let S represent all Steiner vertices. Then $\hat{V} = V \cup S$. Given $p = (p_1, \dots, p_d) \in V$ and $s = (s_1, \dots, s_d) \in S$, $p \prec s$ in \hat{G} iff $p_i \preceq s_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$; and $s \prec p$ iff $s_i \preceq p_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Add a directed edge $s \rightarrow v$ to \hat{E} iff $v \prec s$, and $v \rightarrow s$ iff $s \prec v$. There are no edges with both endpoints in V or both in S . For $p, q \in V$, if $p \prec q$ as d -dimensional points (i.e., in the order we are constructing a representation of) then for each dimension i let s_i be the unique Steiner index such that $p_i \preceq s_i \preceq q_i$, and let $s = (s_1, \dots, s_d)$. If $p \neq q$ then there is at least one dimension i where $p_i \neq q_i$, and hence s_i has at least one $*$, i.e., s is a Steiner point. Thus s is the unique Steiner point such that the edges $s \rightarrow v$ and $q \rightarrow s$ are in \hat{E} , and if $p \not\prec q$ there is no path in \hat{G} from q to p . The property that for all $p, q \in V$, $p \prec q$ iff there is a path no longer than 2 from q to p is known as a *2-transitive closure*, and adding the Steiner points makes it a *Steiner 2-transitive closure*. These have been studied for numerous reasons, see [2].

Any vertex has at most $\prod_{i=1}^d k_i \leq \lceil \lg n \rceil^d$ incoming and outgoing edges, hence the total number of edges is $O(n \log^d n)$, and there are no more than this many vertices that have at least one edge. In [18] it is shown that this dag, eliminating any Steiner points with only 0 or 1 incident edges and any edges that were connected to such Steiner points, can be created in $\Theta(n \log^d n)$ time, where the implied constants depend on d . In [18] it is called a *rendezvous graph*, and it is also shown that one dimension can be simplified, reducing the size and time to $\Theta(n \log^{d-1} n)$. This is called the *reduced rendezvous graph*.

In [19] a simple modification was used to create a violator graph. Add an extra dimension, where the value in this dimension is the function value. Reversing the ordering of domination in this dimension, or making the value the negative of the function value and keeping the same definition, turns it into a violator graph. Flow algorithms put weight 0 on the Steiner points. Using this gives:

Theorem 4 *Given a set of points V in d -dimensional space with coordinate-wise ordering, with weighted function (f, w) where the weights are integers in the range $[0, U]$, in $\tilde{\Theta}(\min\{n^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{328}} \log U, n^{\frac{4}{3} + o(1)} U^{\frac{1}{3}} \log^d n\})$ time L_0, L_1, L_2 isotonic regressions can be found. \square*

The time analysis uses the fact that $m = \Theta(n)$. For large weights Gao-Liu-Peng [7] gives the minimum time, but if the data is unweighted then Kathuria-Liu-Sidford [9] is fastest, giving $O(n^{\frac{4}{3} + o(1)} \log^d n)$ time. The exponent in Gao-Liu-Peng differs so little from $3/2$, and there are log factors, so when not needing to be so precise I prefer to state its time as $o(n^{\frac{3}{2}})$. This was used in [19], where the above result was obtained for L_0 isotonic regression on weighted data. For L_2 to get exact values the function values also need to be restricted to the integers, or an approximation of fixed error can be accepted, to get the time indicated.

Using the previous algorithms for weighted data takes $\tilde{\Theta}(n^2 \log^{2d} n)$ time, except for the $\Theta(n \log n)$ L_1 [17] and $\Theta(n^2)$ L_2 [16] 2-d grid algorithms mentioned above (and their extensions to arbitrary 2-dimensional points, with an additional factor of $\log n$).

5 Final Remarks

Recent advances in maximum flow algorithms [4, 7, 9], coupled with the standard approach for L_0 isotonic regression and L_1 partitioning, gives faster algorithms for L_1 (Section 3.1) and L_2 isotonic regression (with restrictions on the weights and values for L_2 , Theorem 3), and approximations for L_p , $1 < p < \infty$ (Section 3.2). The resulting algorithms are never more than logarithmic factors worse than the previous algorithms and are faster if $m = \tilde{\omega}(n)$. However, in practice they might not be faster. The theoretical and observed times are almost totally determined by the performance of the maximum flow algorithms, so efficient implementations of these complex algorithms are needed.

The theoretical improvements are even more significant if the vertices are d -dimensional points with coordinate-wise ordering (Section 4). These partial orders have the very unusual property that a violator graph can be constructed in $\tilde{\Theta}(n \log^d n)$ time, resulting in $\tilde{\Theta}(n \log^d n)$ vertices and edges even if the transitive closure has $\Theta(n^2)$ edges. Further, the time to create it is only a log factor slower than creating an explicit dag for the order, and the number of edges and Steiner vertices also only increase by a log factor. There are some other orders where the vertices are given but the edges are only implied, so perhaps some of the same techniques can be applied to quickly find isotonic regressions. Both the previous and new algorithms require an explicit dag. If pairs of vertices can be compared to determine if there is an edge between them in the transitive closure then in $\Theta(n^2)$ comparisons one can determine the transitive closure, and this might be the best way to create an explicit dag representing the partial order. Further, at the same time one can determine the subset of these edges which represent the transitive closure of the violating pairs. In this case the new algorithms would construct the isotonic regressions faster than the previous algorithms if the transitive closure is $\tilde{\omega}(n)$, and no slower no matter whatever the size of the transitive closure is. An example of such a situation is where the vertices correspond to subsets of a set S and $v \prec w$ iff $v \subset w$. If the vertices are all the subsets of S then there are simple, efficient ways to generate the transitive closure of the partial order, but if there are only a few vertices, compared to the exponential number possible, then pairwise comparisons might be the only reasonable way to create a dag representing the partial order.

References

- [1] Angelov, S; Harb, B; Kannan, S; and Wang, L-S (2006), “Weighted isotonic regression under the ℓ_1 norm”, *Symp. on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp. 783–791.
- [2] Berman, P; Bhattacharyya, A; Grigorescu, E; Raskhodnikova, S; Woodruff, DP; and Yaroslavtsev, G (2014), “Steiner transitive-closure spanners of low-dimensional posets”, *J. Combinatorica* 34, pp. 255–277.
- [3] Brabant, Q, Couceiro, M, Dubois, D, Prade, H, and Rico, Q (2020), “Learning rule sets and Sugeno integrals for monotonic classification problems”, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 401, pp 4–37.
- [4] van den Brend, J; Lee, YT; Liu, YP; Saranurak, T; Sidford, A; Song, Z; Wang, D (2021), “Minimum cost flows, MDPs, and L_1 regression in nearly linear time for dense instances”, arXiv:2001.005719v1.
- [5] Cano, J-R; Gutierrez, PA; Krawcsyk, B; Wozniak, M; García, S (2018), “Monotonic classification: an overview on algorithms, performance measures and data sets”. arXiv:1811.07155
- [6] Feelders, A; Velikova, M; Daniels, H (2006), “Two polynomial algorithms for relabeling non-monotone data”, Tech. Report UU-CS-2006-046, Dept. Info. Com. Sci., Utrecht Univ.
- [7] Gao, Y; Liu, Y; Peng, R (2021). “Fully dynamic electrical flows: sparse maxflow faster than Goldberg-Rao”, arXiv:2101.07233

- [8] Hochbaum, DS; Queyranne, M (2003), “Minimizing a convex cost closure set”, *SIAM J. Discrete Math* 16, pp. 192–207.
- [9] Kathuria, T; Liu, YP; Sidford, A (2020), “Unit capacity maxflow in almost $O(m^{4/3})$ time”, *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS) 2020*.
- [10] Kyng, R; Rao, A; Sachdeva, S (2015), “Fast, provable algorithms for isotonic regression in all L_p -norms”, NIPS.
- [11] Möhring, R (1985), “Algorithmic aspects of comparability graphs and interval graphs”, *Proc. NATO Adv. Study Inst. on Graphs and Order*, Rival, I, ed., 41–101.
- [12] Pijls, W; Porharst, R (2013), “Another note on Dilworth’s decomposition theorem”, *J. Discrete Mathematics* 2013
- [13] Pijls, W; Potharst, R (2014), “Repairing non-monotone ordinal data sets by changing class labels”, *Econometric Inst. Report EI* 2014–29.
- [14] Rademaker, M; De Baets, B; De Meyer, H (2009), “Loss optimal monotone relabeling of noisy multi-criteria data sets”, *Information Sciences* 179 (2009), pp. 4089–4097.
- [15] Rademaker, M; De Baets, B; De Meyer, H (2012), “Optimal monotone relabeling of partially non-monotone ordinal data”, *Optimization Methods and Soft.* 27, 17–31.
- [16] Spouge J; Wan, H; Wilbur WJ (2003), “Least squares isotonic regression in two dimensions”, *J. Optimization Theory and Applications* 117, pp. 585–605.
- [17] Stout, QF (2013), “Isotonic regression via partitioning”, *Algorithmica* 66, pp. 93–112.
- [18] Stout, QF (2015), “Isotonic regression for multiple independent variables”, *Algorithmica* 71, pp. 450–470.
- [19] Stout, QF (2021), “ L_0 isotonic regression with secondary objectives”, arXiv 2106.00279
- [20] Verbeke, W, Martens, D, and Baesens, B (2017), “RULEM: A novel heuristic rule learning approach for ordinal classification with monotonicity constraints”, *Applied Soft Computing* 60 (2017), pp. 858–873
- [21] en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maximum_flow_problem