




Learning-Augmented Query Policies for Minimum Spanning Tree with Uncertainty

Thomas Erlebach   

Department of Computer Science, Durham University, United Kingdom

Murilo Santos de Lima   

Munich, Germany

Nicole Megow   

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Bremen, Germany

Jens Schlöter   

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Bremen, Germany

Abstract

We study how to utilize (possibly erroneous) predictions in a model for computing under uncertainty in which an algorithm can query unknown data. Our aim is to minimize the number of queries needed to solve the minimum spanning tree problem, a fundamental combinatorial optimization problem that has been central also to the research area of explorable uncertainty. For all integral $\gamma \geq 2$, we present algorithms that are γ -robust and $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistent, meaning that they use at most γOPT queries if the predictions are arbitrarily wrong and at most $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})\text{OPT}$ queries if the predictions are correct, where OPT is the optimal number of queries for the given instance. Moreover, we show that this trade-off is best possible. Furthermore, we argue that a suitably defined *hop distance* is a useful measure for the amount of prediction error and design algorithms with performance guarantees that degrade smoothly with the hop distance. We also show that the predictions are PAC-learnable in our model. Our results demonstrate that untrusted predictions can circumvent the known lower bound of 2, without any degradation of the worst-case ratio. To obtain our results, we provide new structural insights for the minimum spanning tree problem that might be useful in the context of query-based algorithms regardless of predictions. In particular, we generalize the concept of witness sets—the key to lower-bounding the optimum—by proposing novel global witness set structures and completely new ways of adaptively using those.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of Computation → Design and analysis of algorithms

Keywords and phrases explorable uncertainty, queries, untrusted predictions

Funding *Thomas Erlebach*: Supported by EPSRC grant EP/S033483/2.

Murilo Santos de Lima: Work done while employed at University of Leicester, United Kingdom, and funded by EPSRC grant EP/S033483/1.

Nicole Megow: Supported by the German Science Foundation (DFG) under contract ME 3825/1.

Jens Schlöter: Funded by the German Science Foundation (DFG) under contract ME 3825/1.

1 Introduction

We introduce learning-augmented algorithms to the area of optimization under explorable uncertainty and focus on the fundamental *minimum spanning tree (MST) problem under explorable uncertainty*. We are given a (multi)graph $G = (V, E)$ with unknown edge weights $w_e \in \mathbb{R}_+$, for $e \in E$. For each edge e , an uncertainty interval I_e is known that contains w_e . A *query* on edge e reveals the true value w_e . The task is to determine an MST, i.e., a tree that connects all vertices of G , of minimum total weight w.r.t. the true values w_e . A query set is called *feasible* if it reveals sufficient information to identify an MST (not necessarily its exact weight). As queries are costly, the goal is to find a feasible query set of minimum size.

We study *adaptive strategies* that make queries sequentially and utilize the results of previous steps to decide upon the next query. As there exist input instances that are impossible to solve without querying all edges, we evaluate our algorithms in an *instance-dependent* manner:

For each input, we compare the number of queries made by an algorithm with the best possible number of queries *for that input*, using competitive analysis. For a given problem instance, let OPT denote an arbitrary optimal query set (we later give a formal definition of OPT). An algorithm is ρ -*competitive* if it executes, for any problem instance, at most $\rho \cdot |\text{OPT}|$ queries. While MST under explorable uncertainty is not a classical online problem where the input is revealed passively over time, the query results are uncertain and, to a large degree, dictate whether decisions to query certain edges were good or not. For analyzing an algorithm, it is natural to assume that the query results are determined by an adversary. This gives the problem a clear online flavor and prohibits the existence of 1-competitive algorithms even if we have unlimited running time and space [23]. We note that competitive algorithms in general do not have any running time requirements, but all our algorithm run in polynomial time.

The MST problem is among the most widely studied problems in the research area of *explorable uncertainty* [34] and has been a cornerstone in the development of algorithmic approaches and lower bound techniques [20, 21, 23, 26, 42, 43]. The best known deterministic algorithm for MST with uncertainty is 2-competitive, and no deterministic algorithm can be better [23]. A randomized algorithm with competitive ratio 1.707 is known [42]. Further work considers the non-adaptive problem, which has a very different flavor [43].

In this paper, we assume that an algorithm has, for each edge e , access to a prediction $\bar{w}_e \in I_e$ for the unknown value w_e . For example, machine learning (ML) methods could be used to predict the value of an edge. Given the tremendous progress in artificial intelligence and ML in recent decades, we can expect that those predictions are of good accuracy, but there is no guarantee and the predictions might be completely wrong. This lack of provable performance guarantees for ML often causes concerns regarding how confident one can be that an ML algorithm will perform sufficiently well in all circumstances. We address the very natural question whether the availability of such (ML) predictions can be exploited by query algorithms for computing with explorable uncertainty. Ideally, an algorithm should perform very well if predictions are accurate, but even if they are arbitrarily wrong, the algorithm should not perform worse than an algorithm without access to predictions. To emphasize that the predictions can be wrong, we refer to them as *untrusted predictions*.

We note that the availability of both uncertainty intervals and untrusted predictions is natural in many scenarios. For example, the quality of links (measured using metrics such as throughput and reliability) in a wireless network often fluctuates over time within a certain interval, and ML methods can be used to predict the precise link quality based on time-series data of previous link quality measurements [1]. The actual quality of a link can be obtained via a new measurement. If we wish to build a minimum spanning tree using links that currently have the highest link quality and want to minimize the additional measurements needed, we arrive at an MST problem with uncertainty and untrusted predictions.

We study for the first time the combination of explorable uncertainty and untrusted predictions. Our work is inspired by the vibrant recent research trend of considering untrusted (ML) predictions in the context of *online* algorithms, a different uncertainty model where the input is revealed to an algorithm incrementally. Initial work on online caching problems [39] has initiated a vast growing line of research on caching [5, 48, 55], rent-or-buy problems [30, 47, 56], scheduling [4, 9, 37, 44, 47], graph problems [19, 36, 38] and many more.

We adopt the following notions introduced in [39, 47]: An algorithm is α -*consistent* if it is α -competitive when the predictions are correct, and it is β -*robust* if it is β -competitive no matter how wrong the predictions are. Furthermore, we are interested in a smooth transition between the case with correct predictions and the case with arbitrarily incorrect predictions. We aim for performance guarantees that degrade gracefully with increasing prediction error.

Given predicted values for the uncertainty intervals, it is tempting to simply run an optimal

algorithm under the assumption that the predictions are correct. This is obviously optimal with respect to consistency, but might give arbitrarily bad solutions in the case when the predictions are faulty. Instead of blindly trusting the predictions, we need more sophisticated strategies to be robust against prediction errors. This requires new lower bounds on an optimal solution, new structural insights, and new algorithmic techniques.

Main results

In this work, we show that, in the setting of explorable uncertainty, it is in fact possible to exploit ML predictions of the uncertain values and improve the performance of a query strategy when the predictions are good, while at the same time guaranteeing a strong bound on the worst-case performance even when the predictions are arbitrarily bad.

We give algorithms for the MST problem with uncertainty that are parameterized by a hyperparameter γ that reflects the user's confidence in the accuracy of the predictor. For any integral $\gamma \geq 2$, we present a $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistent and γ -robust algorithm, and show that this is the best possible trade-off between consistency and robustness. In particular, for $\gamma = 2$, we obtain a 2-robust, 1.5-consistent algorithm. It is worth noting that this algorithm achieves the improved competitive ratio of 1.5 for accurate predictions while maintaining the worst-case ratio of 2. This is in contrast to many learning-augmented online algorithms where the exploitation of predictions usually incurs an increase in the worst-case ratio (e.g., [6, 47]).

Our main result is a second and different algorithm with a more fine-grained performance analysis that obtains a guarantee that improves with the accuracy of the predictions. Very natural, simple error measures such as the number of inaccurate predictions or the ℓ_1 -norm of the difference between predictions and true values turn out to prohibit any reasonable error-dependency. Therefore, we propose an error measure, called *hop distance* k_h , that takes structural insights about uncertainty intervals into account and may also be useful for other problems in computing with uncertainty and untrusted predictions. We give a precise definition of this error measure later. We also show in Appendix A that the predictions are efficiently PAC-learnable with respect to k_h . Our main result is a learning-augmented algorithm with a competitive ratio with a linear error-dependency $\min\{(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) + \frac{5 \cdot k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, \gamma + 1\}$, for any integral $\gamma \geq 2$. All our algorithms have polynomial running-times. We describe our techniques and highlight their novelty in the following section.

The integrality requirement for γ comes from using γ to determine set sizes and can be removed by randomization at the cost of a slightly worse consistency guarantee; see Appendix F.

Further related work

There is a long history of research on the tradeoff between exploration and exploitation when coping with uncertainty in the input data. Often, stochastic models are assumed, e.g., in work on multi-armed bandits [16, 27, 52], Weitzman's Pandora's box [57], and query-variants of combinatorial optimization problems; see, e.g., [31, 40, 51] and many more. In our work, we assume no knowledge of stochastic information and aim for robust algorithms that perform well even in a worst case.

The line of research on explorable uncertainty has been initiated by Kahan [34] in the context of selection problems. Subsequent work addressed finding the k -th smallest value in a set of uncertainty intervals [25, 32], caching problems [46], computing a function value [35], sorting [33], and classical combinatorial optimization problems. Some of the major aforementioned results on the MST problem under explorable uncertainty have been extended to general matroids [22, 42, 43]. Further problems that have been studied are the shortest path problem [24], the knapsack problem [28] and scheduling problems [2, 3, 7, 10, 18]. Although optimization under explorable uncer-

tainty has been studied mainly in an adversarial model, recently first results have been obtained for stochastic variants for sorting [17] and selection type problems (hypergraph orientation) [11].

There is a significant body of work on computing in models where information about a hidden object can be accessed only via queries. The hidden object can, for example, be a function, a matrix, or a graph. In the graph context, property testing [29] has been studied extensively and there are many more works, see [8, 12, 13, 41, 45, 49]. The bounds on the number of queries made by an algorithm are typically absolute (as a function of the input) and the resulting correctness guarantees are probabilistic. This is very different from our work, where we aim for a comparison to the minimum number of queries needed for the given graph.

2 Overview of techniques and definition of error measure

We assume that each uncertainty interval is either *open*, $I_e = (L_e, U_e)$, or *trivial*, $I_e = \{w_e\}$, and we refer to edge e as *non-trivial* or *trivial*, respectively; a standard assumption to avoid a simple lower bound of $|E|$ on the competitive ratio [23, 32].

Before we give an overview of the used techniques, we formally define feasible and optimal query sets. We say that a query set $Q \subseteq E$ is *feasible* if there exists a set of edges $T \subseteq E$ such that T is an MST for the true values w_e of all $e \in Q$ and *every possible* combination of edge weights in I_e for the unqueried edges $e \in E \setminus Q$. That is, querying a feasible query set Q must give us sufficient information to identify a spanning tree T that is an MST for the true values no matter what the true values of the unqueried edges $E \setminus Q$ actually are. We call a feasible query set Q *optimal* if it has minimum cardinality $|Q|$ among all feasible query sets. Thus, the optimal solution depends only on the true values and not on the predicted values.

As Erlebach and Hoffmann [20] give a polynomial-time algorithm that computes an optimal query set under the assumption that all query results are known upfront, we can use their algorithm to compute the optimal query set under the assumption that all predicted values match the actual edge weights and query the computed set in an arbitrary order. If the predicted values are indeed correct, this yields a 1-consistent algorithm. However, such an algorithm may have an arbitrarily bad performance if the predictions are incorrect. Similarly, the known deterministic 2-competitive algorithm for the MST problem with uncertainty (without predictions) [23] is 2-robust and 2-consistent. The known lower bound of 2 rules out any robustness factor less than 2. It builds on the following simple example with two intersecting intervals I_a, I_b that are candidates for the largest edge weight in a cycle. No matter which interval a deterministic algorithm queries first, say I_a , the realized value could be $w_a \in I_a \cap I_b$, which requires a second query. If the adversary chooses $w_b \notin I_a \cap I_b$, querying just I_b would have been sufficient to identify the interval with larger true value. See also [23, Example 3.8] and [42, Section 3] for an illustration of the lower bound example.

Algorithm overview We aim for $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistent and γ -robust algorithms for each integral $\gamma \geq 2$. The algorithm proceeds in two phases: The first phase runs as long as there are prediction mandatory edges, i.e., edges that must be contained in every feasible query set under the assumption that the predictions are correct; we later give a formal characterization of such edges. In this phase, we exploit the existence of those edges and their properties to execute queries with strong local guarantees, i.e., each feasible query set contains a large portion of our queries. For the second phase, we observe and exploit that the absence of prediction mandatory queries implies that the predicted optimal solution is a minimum vertex cover in a bipartite auxiliary graph. The challenge here is that the auxiliary graph can change with each wrong prediction. To obtain an error-dependent guarantee (our error measure k_h is discussed below) we need to adaptively query a dynamically changing minimum vertex cover.

Novel techniques During the first phase, we generalize the classical witness set analysis. In computing with explorable uncertainty, the concept of *witness sets* is crucial for comparing the query set of an algorithm with an optimal solution (a way of lower-bounding). A witness set [15] is a set of elements for which we can guarantee that any feasible solution must query at least *one* of these elements. Known algorithms for the MST problem without predictions [23, 42] essentially follow the algorithms of Kruskal or Prim and only identify witness sets of size 2 in the cycle or cut that is currently under consideration. Querying disjoint witness sets of size 2 (witness pairs) ensures 2-robustness but does not lead to an improved consistency.


In our first phase, we extend this concept by considering *strengthened* witness sets of three elements such that any feasible query set must contain at least two of them. Since we cannot always find strengthened witness sets based on structural properties alone (otherwise, there would be a 1.5-competitive algorithm for the problem without predictions), we identify such sets under the assumption that the predictions are correct. Even after identifying such elements, the algorithm needs to query them in a careful order: if the predictions are wrong, we lose the guarantee on the elements, and querying all of them might violate the robustness. In order to identify strengthened witness sets, we provide new, more global criteria to identify additional witness sets (of size two) beyond the current cycle or cut. These new ways to identify witness sets are a major contribution that may be of independent interest regardless of predictions. During the first phase, we repeatedly query $\gamma - 2$ prediction mandatory edges together with a strengthened witness set, which ensures $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistency. We query the elements in a carefully selected order while adjusting for errors to ensure γ -robustness.

For the second phase, we observe that the predicted optimal solution of the remaining instance is a minimum vertex cover VC in a bipartite auxiliary graph representing the structure of *potential* witness pairs (edges of the input graph correspond to vertices of the auxiliary graph). For instances with this property, we aim for 1-consistency and 2-robustness; the best-possible trade-off for such instances. If the predictions are correct, each edge of the auxiliary graph is a witness pair. However, if a prediction error is observed when a vertex of VC is queried, the auxiliary graph changes. This means that some edges of the original auxiliary graph are not actually witness pairs. Indeed, the size of a minimum vertex cover can increase and decrease and does not constitute a lower bound on $|\text{OPT}|$; see Appendix D.

If we only aim for consistency and robustness, we can circumvent this problem by selecting a distinct matching partner $h(e) \notin VC$ for each $e \in VC$ applying *König-Egerváry's* Theorem (duality of maximum matchings and minimum vertex covers in bipartite graphs, see e.g. [14]). By querying the elements of VC in a carefully chosen order until a prediction error is observed for the first time, we can guarantee that $\{e, h(e)\}$ is a witness set for each $e \in VC$ that is already queried. In the case of an error, this allows us to extend the previously queried elements to disjoint witness pairs to guarantee 2-robustness. Then, we can switch to an arbitrary (prediction-oblivious) 2-competitive algorithm for the remaining queries.

If we additionally aim for an error-sensitive guarantee, however, handling the dynamic changes to the auxiliary graph, its minimum vertex cover VC and matching h requires substantial additional work, and we see overcoming this challenge as our main contribution. In particular, querying the partner $h(e)$ of each already queried $e \in VC$ in case of an error might be too expensive for the error-dependent guarantee. However, if we do not query these partners, the changed instance still depends on them, and if we charge against such a partner multiple times, we can lose the robustness. Our solution is based on an elaborate charging/counting scheme and involves:

- keeping track of matching partners of already queried elements of VC ;
- updating the matching and VC using an augmenting path method to bound the number



■ **Figure 1** Example of a single cycle (left) with uncertain edge weights from intersecting intervals $I_{e_1}, I_{e_2}, I_{e_3}, I_{e_4}$ (middle). Circles illustrate true values and crosses illustrate the predicted values.

- of elements that are charged against multiple times in relation to the prediction error;
- and querying the partners of previously queried edges (and their new matching partners) as soon as they become endpoints of a newly matched edge, in order to prevent dependencies between the (only partially queried) witness sets of previously queried edges.

The error-sensitive algorithm achieves a competitive ratio of $1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{5k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}$, at the price of a slightly increased robustness of $\gamma + 1$ instead of γ .

Hop distance as error metric When we aim for a fine-grained performance analysis giving guarantees that depend on the quality of predictions, we need a metric to measure the prediction error. A very natural, simple error measure is the number of inaccurate predictions $k_{\#} = |\{e \in E \mid w_e \neq \bar{w}_e\}|$. However, we can show that even for $k_{\#} = 1$ the competitive ratio cannot be better than the known bound of 2 (see Lemma 19 in Appendix A). The reason for the weakness of this measure is that it completely ignores the interleaving structure of intervals. Similarly, an ℓ_1 error metric such as $\sum_{e \in E} |w_e - \bar{w}_e|$ would not be meaningful because only the *order* of the values and the interval endpoints matters for our problems.


We propose a refined error measure, which we call *hop distance*. It is very intuitive even though it requires some technical care to make it precise. If we consider only a single predicted value \bar{w}_e for some $e \in E$, then, in a sense, this value predicts the relation of the true value w_e to the intervals of edges $e' \in E \setminus \{e\}$. In particular, w.r.t. a fixed $e' \in E \setminus \{e\}$, the value \bar{w}_e predicts whether w_e is left of $I_{e'}$ ($\bar{w}_e \leq L_{e'}$), right of $I_{e'}$ ($\bar{w}_e \geq U_{e'}$), or contained in $I_{e'}$ ($L_{e'} < \bar{w}_e < U_{e'}$). Interpreting the prediction \bar{w}_e in this way, the prediction is ‘wrong’ (w.r.t. a fixed $e' \in E \setminus \{e\}$) if the predicted relation of the true value w_e to interval $I_{e'}$ is not actually true, e.g., w_e is predicted to be left of $I_{e'}$ ($\bar{w}_e \leq L_{e'}$) but the actual w_e is either contained in or right of $I_{e'}$ ($w_e > L_{e'}$). Formally, we define the function $k_{e'}(e)$ that indicates whether the predicted relation of w_e to $I_{e'}$ is true ($k_{e'}(e) = 0$) or not ($k_{e'}(e) = 1$). With the prediction error $k^+(e)$ for a single $e \in E$, we want to capture the number of relations between w_e and intervals $I_{e'}$ with $e' \in E \setminus \{e\}$ that are not accurately predicted. Thus, we define $k^+(e) = \sum_{e' \in E \setminus \{e\}} k_{e'}(e)$. For a set of edges $E' \subseteq E$, we define $k^+(E') = \sum_{e \in E'} k^+(e)$. Consequently, with the error for the complete instance we want to capture the total number of wrongly predicted relations and, therefore, define it by $k_h = k^+(E)$. We call this error measure k_h the *hop distance*; see Figure 1 for an illustration.

Symmetrically, we can define $k^-(e) = \sum_{e' \in E \setminus \{e\}} k_e(e')$ and $k^-(E') = \sum_{e \in E'} k^-(e)$ for subset $E' \subseteq E$. Then $k^+(E) = k_h = k^-(E)$ follows by reordering the summations.

3 Structural results

In this section, we introduce some known concepts and prove new structural results on MST under explorable uncertainty, which we use later to design learning-augmented algorithms.

Witness sets and mandatory queries Witness sets are the key to the analysis of query algorithms. They allow for a comparison of an algorithm’s query set to an optimal solution.



■ **Figure 2** Example of a single cycle (left) with uncertain edge weights from intersecting intervals $I_{e_1}, I_{e_2}, I_{e_3}, I_{e_4}$ (right). Circles illustrate true values and crosses illustrate the predicted values. For the example, $\{e_1, e_2\}$ is the set of all mandatory edges and $\{e_1\}$ is the set of all prediction mandatory edges.

A subset $W \subseteq E$ is a *witness set* if $W \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ for all feasible query sets Q . An important special case are witness sets of cardinality one, i.e., edges that are part of every feasible query set. We call such edges *mandatory*. Similarly, we call edges that are mandatory under the assumption that the predictions are correct *prediction mandatory*.

For an example, consider Figure 2. In the example, we see the uncertainty intervals, predicted values and true values of four edges that form a simple cycle. We can observe that both e_1 and e_2 are mandatory for this example. To see this, assume that e_1 is not mandatory. Then, there must be a feasible query set Q with $e_1 \notin Q$ for the instance, which implies that $Q = \{e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ must be feasible. But even after querying Q to reveal the true values of e_2, e_3 and e_4 , it still depends on the still unknown true value of e_1 whether there exists an MST T with $e_1 \in T$ (only if $w_{e_1} \leq w_{e_2}$) and/or $e_1 \notin T$ (only if $w_{e_2} \leq w_{e_1}$). Even after querying Q there is no spanning tree T that is an MST for each possible edge weight in I_{e_1} of the unqueried edge e_1 and, thus, Q is not feasible. This implies that e_1 is mandatory, and we can argue analogously that e_2 is mandatory as well.

To argue whether an edge is prediction mandatory, on the other hand, we assume that all queries reveal the predicted values as true values. Under this assumption, a query to e_1 in the example would reveal a value that is larger than all upper limits U_{e_i} with $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, which implies that e_1 cannot be part of any MST and that $T = \{e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ is an MST no matter what the true values of e_2, e_3 and e_4 actually are. Therefore, under the assumption that all predicted values match the true values, $Q = \{e_1\}$ is a feasible query set and, thus, e_2 is not prediction mandatory despite being mandatory. However, we can use a similar argumentation as above to argue that e_1 is also prediction mandatory.

We continue by giving properties that allow us to identify (prediction) mandatory edges. To that end, let the *lower limit tree* $T_L \subseteq E$ be an MST for values w^L with $w_e^L = L_e + \epsilon$ for an infinitesimally small $\epsilon > 0$. Analogously, let the *upper limit tree* T_U be an MST for values w^U with $w_e^U = U_e - \epsilon$. This concept has been introduced in [42] to identify mandatory queries; it is shown that every non-trivial $e \in T_L \setminus T_U$ is mandatory. Thus, we may repeatedly query edges in $T_L \setminus T_U$ until $T_L = T_U$ without worsening the competitive ratio. We can extend this preprocessing to achieve uniqueness for T_L and T_U and, thus, may assume unique $T_L = T_U$.

► **Lemma 1.** *By querying only mandatory elements we can obtain an instance with $T_L = T_U$ such that T_L and T_U are the unique lower limit tree and upper limit tree, respectively.*

Given an instance with unique $T_L = T_U$, we observe that each $e \in T_L$ that is not part of the MST for the true values is mandatory. Similarly, each $e \notin T_L$ that is part of the MST for the true values is mandatory as well. A stronger version of this observation is as follows.

► **Lemma 2.** *Let G be an instance with unique $T_L = T_U$ and let G' be an instance with unique $T'_L = T'_U$ obtained from G by querying set Q , then $e \in T_L \Delta T'_L = (T_L \setminus T'_L) \cup (T'_L \setminus T_L)$ implies $e \in Q$.*

Next we establish a relation between the set $E_M \subseteq E$ of mandatory queries, the set $E_P \subseteq E$ of prediction mandatory queries, and the hop distance k_h .

► **Lemma 3.** *Consider a given problem instance $G = (V, E)$ with predicted values \bar{w} . Each $e \in E_M \Delta E_P$ satisfies $k^-(e) \geq 1$. Consequently, $k_h \geq |E_M \Delta E_P|$.*


For a formal proof, we refer to the appendix. Intuitively, if $e \in E_P \setminus E_M$, then it is possible to solve the instance without querying e . Thus, the relation of the true values $w_{e'}$ with $e' \in E \setminus \{e\}$ to interval I_e must be such that querying $E \setminus \{e\}$ allows us to verify that e is either part or not part of the MST. If the predicted relations of the true values $w_{e'}$ with $e' \in E \setminus \{e\}$ to interval I_e were the same, then querying $E \setminus \{e\}$ would also allow us to verify that e is either part or not part of the MST. Thus, the predicted relation of at least one $w_{e'}$ to interval I_e must be wrong. We can argue analogously for $e \in E_M \setminus E_P$.

Identifying witness sets We introduce new structural properties to identify witness sets. Existing algorithms for MST under uncertainty [23, 42] essentially follow the algorithms of Kruskal or Prim, and only identify witness sets in the cycle or cut that is currently under consideration. Let f_1, \dots, f_l denote the edges in $E \setminus T_L$ ordered by non-decreasing lower limit. Then, C_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ denotes the unique cycle in $T_L \cup \{f_i\}$.

For each $e \in T_L$, let X_e denote the set of edges in the cut of the two connected components of $T_L \setminus \{e\}$. Existing algorithms for MST under explorable uncertainty repeatedly consider (the changing) C_1 or X_e , where e is the edge in T_L with maximum upper limit, and identify the maximum or minimum edge in the cycle or cut by querying witness sets of size two, until the problem is solved. For our algorithms, we need to identify witness sets in cycles $C_i \neq C_1$ and cuts $X_{e'} \neq X_e$.

► **Lemma 4.** *Consider cycle C_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. Let $l_i \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ such that $I_{l_i} \cap I_{f_i} \neq \emptyset$ and l_i has the largest upper limit in $C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$, then $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set. If $w_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$, then l_i is mandatory.*

Characterization of prediction mandatory free instances We say an instance is *prediction mandatory free* if it contains no prediction mandatory elements. A key part of our algorithms is to transform instances into prediction mandatory free instances while maintaining a competitive ratio that allows us to achieve the optimal consistency and robustness trade-off overall. We give the following characterization of prediction mandatory free instances, (cf. Figure 3). Then, we show that prediction mandatory free instances remain so as long as we ensure $T_L = T_U$.



■ **Figure 3** Intervals in a prediction mandatory free cycle with predictions indicated as red crosses

► **Lemma 5.** *An instance G is prediction mandatory free iff $\bar{w}_{f_i} \geq U_e$ and $\bar{w}_e \leq L_{f_i}$ holds for each $e \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ and each cycle C_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. Once an instance is prediction mandatory free, it remains so even if we query further elements, as long as we maintain unique $T_L = T_U$.*

Making instances prediction mandatory free In Appendix C, we give a powerful preprocessing algorithm that transforms arbitrary instances into prediction mandatory free instances.

► **Theorem 6.** *There is an algorithm that makes a given instance prediction mandatory free and satisfies $|\text{ALG}| \leq \min\{(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|\text{ALG} \cup D| \cap \text{OPT}| + k^+(\text{ALG}) + k^-(\text{ALG})), \gamma \cdot (|\text{ALG} \cup D| \cap \text{OPT}| + \gamma - 2)\}$ for the set of edges ALG queried by the algorithm and a set $D \subseteq E \setminus \text{ALG}$ of unqueried edges that do not occur in the remaining instance after executing the algorithm.*

The set D are edges that, even without being queried by the algorithm, are proven to be maximal in a cycle or minimal in a cut. Thus, they can be deleted or contracted w.l.o.g. and do not exist in the instance remaining *after* executing the preprocessing algorithm. This is an important property as it means that the remaining instance is independent of D and

ALG (as all elements of ALG are already queried). Since the theorem compares $|\text{ALG}|$ with $|(\text{ALG} \cup D) \cap \text{OPT}|$ instead of just $|\text{OPT}|$, this allows us to combine the given guarantee with the guarantees of dedicated algorithms for prediction mandatory free instances. However, we have to be careful with the additive term $\gamma - 2$, but we will see that we can charge this term against the improved robustness of our algorithms for prediction mandatory free instances.

4 An algorithm with optimal consistency and robustness trade-off

We give a bound on the best achievable tradeoff between consistency and robustness.

► **Theorem 7.** *Let $\beta \geq 2$ be a fixed integer. For the MST problem under explorable uncertainty with predictions, there is no deterministic β -robust algorithm that is α -consistent for $\alpha < 1 + \frac{1}{\beta}$. And vice versa, no deterministic α -consistent algorithm, with $\alpha > 1$, is β -robust for $\beta < \max\{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}, 2\}$.*

The main result of this section is an optimal algorithm w.r.t. this tradeoff bound.

► **Theorem 8.** *For every integer $\gamma \geq 2$, there exists a $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistent and γ -robust algorithm for the MST problem under explorable uncertainty with predictions.*

To show this result, we design an algorithm for prediction mandatory free instances with unique $T_L = T_U$. We run it after the preprocessing algorithm which obtains such special instance with the query guarantee in Theorem 6. Our new algorithm achieves the optimal trade-off.

► **Theorem 9.** *There exists a 1-consistent and 2-robust algorithm for prediction mandatory free instances with unique $T_L = T_U$ of the MST problem under explorable uncertainty with predictions.*

In a prediction mandatory free instance $G = (V, E)$, each $f_i \in E \setminus T_L$ is predicted to be maximal on cycle C_i , and each $l \in T_L$ is predicted to be minimal in X_l (cf. Lemma 5). If these predictions are correct, then T_L is an MST and the optimal query set is a minimum vertex cover in a bipartite graph $\bar{G} = (\bar{V}, \bar{E})$ with $\bar{V} = E$ (excluding trivial edges) and $\bar{E} = \{\{f_i, e\} \mid i \in \{1, \dots, l\}, e \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\} \text{ and } I_e \cap I_{f_i} \neq \emptyset\}$ [20, 42]. We refer to \bar{G} as the *vertex cover instance*. Note that if a query reveals that an f_i is not maximal on C_i or an $l \in T_L$ is not minimal in X_l , then the vertex cover instance changes. Let VC be a minimum vertex cover of \bar{G} . Non-adaptively querying VC ensures 1-consistency but might lead to an arbitrarily bad robustness. Indeed, the size of a minimum vertex cover can increase and decrease drastically as shown in Appendix D. Thus, the algorithm has to be more adaptive.

The idea of the algorithm (cf. Algorithm 1) is to sequentially query each $e \in VC$ and charge for querying e by a distinct non-queried element $h(e)$ such that $\{e, h(e)\}$ is a witness set. Querying exactly one element per distinct witness set implies optimality. To identify $h(e)$ for each element $e \in VC$, we use the fact that *Kőnig-Egerváry's* Theorem (e.g., [14]) on the duality between minimum vertex covers and maximum matchings in bipartite graphs implies that there is a matching h that maps each $e \in VC$ to a distinct $e' \notin VC$. While the sets $\{e, h(e)\}$ with $e \in VC$ in general are not witness sets, querying VC in a specific order until the vertex cover instance changes guarantees that $\{e, h(e)\}$ is a witness set for each already queried e . The algorithm queries in this order until it detects a wrong prediction or solves the problem. If it finds a wrong prediction, it queries the partner $h(e)$ of each already queried edge e , and continues to solve the problem with a 2-competitive algorithm (e.g., [23, 42]). The following lemma specifies the order in which the algorithm queries VC .

► **Lemma 10.** *Let l'_1, \dots, l'_k be the edges in $VC \cap T_L$ ordered by non-increasing upper limit and let d be such that the true value of each l'_i with $i < d$ is minimal in cut $X_{l'_i}$, then $\{l'_i, h(l'_i)\}$ is a*

■ **Algorithm 1** 1-consistent and 2-robust algorithm for prediction mandatory free instances.

Input: Prediction mandatory free graph $G=(V,E)$ with unique $T_L=T_U$.

- 1 Compute maximum matching h and minimum vertex cover VC for \bar{G} ;
- 2 Set $W=\emptyset$, and let f'_1, \dots, f'_g and l'_1, \dots, l'_k be as described in Lemma 10;
- 3 **for** e chosen sequentially from the ordered list $f'_1, \dots, f'_g, l'_1, \dots, l'_k$ **do**
- 4 Query e and add $h(e)$ to W ;
- 5 **if** $k^+(e) \neq 0$ **then** query set W and solve the instance with a 2-competitive algorithm;

witness set for each $i \leq d$. Let f'_1, \dots, f'_g be the edges in $VC \setminus T_L$ ordered by non-decreasing lower limit and let b be such that the true value of each f'_i with $i < b$ is maximal in cycle $C_{f'_i}$, then $\{f'_i, h(f'_i)\}$ is a witness set for each $i \leq b$.

Proof. Here, we show the first statement and refer to Appendix D for the proof of the second statement. Consider an arbitrary l'_i and $h(l'_i)$ with $i \leq d$. By definition of h , the edge $h(l'_i)$ is not part of the lower limit tree. Consider $C_{h(l'_i)}$, i.e., the cycle in $T_L \cup \{h(l'_i)\}$, then we claim that $C_{h(l'_i)}$ only contains $h(l'_i)$ and edges in $\{l'_1, \dots, l'_k\}$ (and possibly irrelevant edges that do not intersect $I_{h(l'_i)}$). To see this, recall that $l'_i \in VC$, by definition of h , implies $h(l'_i) \notin VC$. For VC to be a vertex cover, each $e \in C_{h(l'_i)} \setminus \{h(l'_i)\}$ must either be in VC or not intersect $h(l'_i)$. Consider the relaxed instance where the true values for each l'_j with $j < d$ and $j \neq i$ are already known. By assumption each such l'_j is minimal in its cut $X_{l'_j}$. Thus, we can w.l.o.g. contract each such edge. It follows that in the relaxed instance l'_i has the highest upper limit in $C_{h(l'_i)} \setminus \{h(l'_i)\}$. According to Lemma 4, $\{l'_i, h(l'_i)\}$ is a witness set. ◀

Proof of Theorem 9. We first show 1-consistency. Assume that all predictions are correct, then VC is an optimal query set and $k^+(e)=0$ holds for all $e \in E$. It follows that Line 5 never executes queries and the algorithm queries exactly VC . This implies 1-consistency.

Further, if the algorithm never queries in Line 5, then the consistency analysis implies 1-robustness. Suppose Line 5 executes queries. Let Q_1 denote the set of edges that are queried before the queries of Line 5 and let $Q_2 = \{h(e) \mid e \in Q_1\}$. Then Q_2 corresponds to the set W as queried in Line 5. By Lemma 10, each $\{e, h(e)\}$ with $e \in Q_1$ is a witness set. Further, the sets $\{e, h(e)\}$ are pairwise disjoint. Thus, $|Q_1 \cup Q_2| \leq 2 \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (Q_1 \cup Q_2)|$. Apart from $Q_1 \cup Q_2$, the algorithm queries a set Q_3 in Line 5 to solve the remaining instance with a 2-competitive algorithm. So, $|Q_3| \leq 2 \cdot |\text{OPT} \setminus (Q_1 \cup Q_2)|$ and, adding up the inequalities, $|\text{ALG}| \leq 2 \cdot |\text{OPT}|$. ◀

A careful combination of Theorems 6 and 9 implies Theorem 8. Full proof in Appendix D.

5 An error-sensitive algorithm

In this section, we extend the algorithm of Section 4 to obtain error sensitivity. First, we note that $k_{\#}=0$ implies $k_h=0$, so Theorem 7 implies that no algorithm can simultaneously have competitive ratio better than $1 + \frac{1}{\beta}$ if $k_h=0$ and β for arbitrary k_h . In addition, we can give the following lower bound on the competitive ratio as a function of k_h .

► **Theorem 11.** *Any deterministic algorithm for MST under explorable uncertainty with predictions has a competitive ratio $\rho \geq \min\{1 + \frac{k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, 2\}$, even for edge disjoint prediction mandatory free cycles.*

Again, we design an algorithm for prediction mandatory free instances with unique $T_L=T_U$ and use it in combination with the preprocessing algorithm (Theorem 6) to prove the following.

► **Theorem 12.** *For every integer $\gamma \geq 2$, there exists a $\min\{1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{5 \cdot k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, \gamma + 1\}$ -competitive algorithm for the MST problem under explorable uncertainty with predictions.*

■ **Algorithm 2** Error-sensitive algorithm for prediction mandatory free instances.

Input: Prediction mandatory free graph $G=(V,E)$ with unique $T_L=T_U$.

- 1 Compute maximum matching h and minimum vertex cover VC for \bar{G} and set $W=\emptyset$;
- 2 Let f'_1, \dots, f'_g and l'_1, \dots, l'_k be as described in Lemma 10 for VC and h ;
- 3 $L \leftarrow T_L, N \leftarrow E \setminus T_L$; /* recompute actual T_L (and T_U) after each query */
- 4 **for** e chosen sequentially from the ordered list $f'_1, \dots, f'_g, l'_1, \dots, l'_k$ **do**
- 5 If e is non-trivial, i.e., has not been queried yet, query e and add $h(e)$ to W ;
- 6 Apply Lemma 1 to ensure unique $T_L=T_U$. For each query e' , if $\exists a$ s.t. $\{e', a\} \in h$, query a ;
- 7 Let $\bar{G}'=(\bar{V}', \bar{E}')$ be the vertex cover instance for the current instance;
- 8 **if** some $e' \in L$ is not in T_L or some $e' \in N$ is in T_L **then**
- 9 **repeat**
- 10 Let $\bar{G}=\bar{G}'$ and $\bar{h}=\{\{e', e''\} \in h \mid \{e', e''\} \in \bar{E}'\}$;
- 11 Compute h and VC by completing \bar{h} with an augmenting path algorithm;
- 12 Query $R=(VC \cup h(VC)) \cap (W \cup \{e' \mid \exists e \in W \text{ with } \{e, e'\} \in h\})$;
- 13 Ensure unique $T_L=T_U$. For each query e' , if $\exists a$ s.t. $\{e', a\} \in h$, query a ;
- 14 Let $\bar{G}'=(\bar{V}', \bar{E}')$ be the vertex cover instance for the current instance;
- 15 **until** $R=\emptyset$;
- 16 Restart at Line 2. In particular, do *not* reset W ;

We actually show a robustness of $\max\{3, \gamma + \frac{1}{|\text{OPT}|}\}$ which might be smaller than $\gamma+1$. Our algorithm for prediction mandatory free instances asymptotically matches the error-dependent guarantee of Theorem 11 at the cost of a slightly worse robustness.

► **Theorem 13.** *There exists a $\min\{1 + \frac{5 \cdot k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, 3\}$ -competitive algorithm for prediction mandatory free instances with unique $T_L=T_U$ of the MST problem under explorable uncertainty with predictions.*

We follow the same strategy as before. However, Algorithm 1 just executes a 2-competitive algorithm once it detects an error. This is sufficient to achieve the optimal trade-off as we, if an error occurs, only have to guarantee 2-competitiveness. To obtain an error-sensitive guarantee however, we have to ensure both, $|\text{ALG}| \leq 3 \cdot |\text{OPT}|$ and $|\text{ALG}| \leq \text{OPT} + 5 \cdot k_h$ even if errors occur. Further, we might not be able to afford queries to the complete set W (Algorithm 1, Line 5) in the case of an error as this might violate $|\text{ALG}| \leq \text{OPT} + 5 \cdot k_h$.

We adjust the algorithm to query elements of f'_1, \dots, f'_g and l'_1, \dots, l'_k as described in Lemma 10 not only until an error occurs but until the vertex cover instance changes. That is, until some f_i that at the beginning of the iteration is not part of T_L becomes part of the lower limit tree, or some l_i that at the beginning of the iteration is part of T_L is not part of the lower limit tree anymore. Once the instance changes, we recompute both, the bipartite graph \bar{G} as well as the matching h and minimum vertex cover VC for \bar{G} . Instead of querying the complete set W , we only query the elements of W that occur in the recomputed matching, as well as the new matching partners of those elements. And instead of switching to a 2-competitive algorithm, we restart the algorithm with the recomputed matching and vertex cover. Algorithm 2 formalizes this approach. In the algorithm, h denotes a matching that matches each $e \in VC$ to a distinct $h(e) \notin VC$; we use the notation $\{e, e'\} \in h$ to indicate that h matches e and e' . For a subset $U \subseteq VC$ let $h(U) = \{h(e) \mid e \in U\}$. For technical reasons, the algorithm does not recompute an arbitrary matching h but follows the approach of Lines 10 and 11. Intuitively, an arbitrary maximum matching h might contain too many elements of W , which would lead to too many additional queries.

Let ALG denote the queries of Algorithm 2 on a prediction mandatory free instance with

unique $T_L = T_U$. We show Theorem 13 by proving $\text{ALG} \leq \text{OPT} + 5 \cdot k_h$ and $\text{ALG} \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}$.

Before proving the two inequalities, we state some key observations about the algorithm. We argue that an element e' can never be part of a partial matching \bar{h} in an execution of Line 10 after it is added to set W . Recall that the vertex cover instances only contain non-trivial elements. Thus, if an element e is queried in Line 5 and the current partner $e' = h(e)$ is added to set W , then the vertex cover instance at the next execution of Line 10 does not contain the edge $\{e, e'\}$ and, therefore, e' is not part of the partial matching \bar{h} of that line. As long as e' is not added to the matching by Line 11, it, by definition, can never be part of a partial matching \bar{h} in an execution of Line 10. As soon as the element e' is added to the matching in some execution of Line 11, it is queried in the following execution of Line 12. Therefore, e' can also not be part of a partial matching \bar{h} in an execution of Line 10 after it is added to the matching again. This leads to the following observation.

► **Observation 14.** *An element e' can never be part of a partial matching \bar{h} in an execution of Line 10 after it is added to set W . Once e' is added to the matching again in an execution of Line 11, it is queried directly afterwards in Line 12, and cannot occur in Line 5 anymore.*

We first analyze the queries that are *not* executed in Line 12. Let $Q_1 \subseteq \text{ALG}$ denote the queries of Line 5. For each $e \in Q_1$ let $h^*(e)$ be the matching partner of e at the time it was queried, and let $h^*(Q_1) = \bigcup_{e \in Q_1} \{h^*(e)\}$. Finally, let Q_2 denote the queries of Lines 6 and 13 to elements of $h^*(Q_1)$, and let Q_3 denote the remaining queries of those lines.

► **Lemma 15.** $|Q_1 \cup Q_3 \cup h^*(Q_1)| \leq 2 \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (Q_1 \cup Q_3 \cup h^*(Q_1))|$ and $|Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup Q_3| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap (Q_1 \cup Q_3 \cup h^*(Q_1))| + k^-(Q_2 \cup Q_3)$.

Proof. First, consider Q_1 and $h^*(Q_1)$. By Lemma 5, the instance is prediction mandatory free at the beginning of each restart of the algorithm. By Lemma 10, each $\{e, h^*(e)\}$ with $e \in Q_1$ is a witness set. We claim that all such $\{e, h^*(e)\}$ are pairwise disjoint, which implies $|Q_1 \cup h^*(Q_1)| \leq 2 \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (Q_1 \cup h^*(Q_1))|$. Otherwise, an element of $\{e, h^*(e)\}$ must occur a second time in Line 5 after e is queried and $h^*(e)$ is added to W . Thus, either e or $h^*(e)$ must become part of a recomputed matching in line 10. By Observation 14 and since e becomes trivial, this cannot happen.

Consider an $e \in Q_2 \subseteq h^*(Q_1)$ and let $e' \in Q_1$ with $h^*(e') = e$. Since $e' \in Q_1$, it was queried in Line 5. Observe that e must have been queried after e' , as otherwise either e' would not have been queried in Line 5 (but together with e in Line 6 or 13), or e would not have been the matching partner of e' when it was queried by Observation 14; both contradict $e' \in Q_1$ and $h^*(e') = e$. This and Observation 14 imply that, at the time e is queried, its current matching partner is either the trivial e' or it has no partner. So, e must have been queried because it was mandatory and not as the matching partner of a mandatory element. Thus, each query of Q_2 is mandatory but, by Lemma 5, not prediction mandatory at the beginning of the iteration in which it is queried. Therefore, Lemma 3 implies that all mandatory elements e of Q_2 have $k^-(e) \geq 1$. It follows $|Q_1 \cup Q_2| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap (Q_1 \cup h^*(Q_1))| + k^-(Q_2)$.

By the argument above, no element of Q_3 was queried as the matching partner to an element of $Q_2 \cup Q_1$. Thus, by Lemma 1 and the definition of the algorithm, at least half the elements of Q_3 are mandatory, and we have $|Q_3| \leq 2 \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap Q_3|$ (and $\frac{1}{2}|Q_3| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap Q_3|$), which implies $|Q_1 \cup Q_3 \cup h^*(Q_1)| \leq 2 \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (Q_1 \cup Q_3 \cup h^*(Q_1))|$.

By the same argument as for Q_2 , all mandatory elements e of Q_3 have $k^-(e) \geq 1$. Thus, $k^-(Q_3) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot |Q_3|$. Combining $k^-(Q_3) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot |Q_3|$ and $\frac{1}{2}|Q_3| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap Q_3|$ implies $|Q_3| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap Q_3| + k^-(Q_3)$. So, $|Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup Q_3| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap (Q_1 \cup Q_3 \cup h^*(Q_1))| + k^-(Q_2 \cup Q_3)$. ◀

The first part of Lemma 15 captures all queries outside of Line 12 and all queries of Line 12 to elements of $W = h^*(Q_1)$. Let Q'_4 be the remaining queries of Line 12. By definition of the algorithm, $|Q'_4| \leq |W|$. Since $|W| \leq |\text{OPT}|$, we can conclude the next lemma.

► **Lemma 16.** $|\text{ALG}| \leq 3 \cdot |\text{OPT}|$.

Next, we show $|\text{ALG}| \leq |\text{OPT}| + 5 \cdot k_h$. Lemma 15 implies $|Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup Q_3| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap (Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup Q_3 \cup h^*(Q_1))| + k^-(Q_2 \cup Q_3)$. Hence, it remains to upper bound $|Q_4|$ with $Q_4 = \text{ALG} \setminus (Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup Q_3)$ by $4 \cdot k_h$. By definition, Q_4 only contains edges that are queried in Line 12. Thus, at least half the queries of Q_4 are elements of W that are part of the matching h . By Observation 14, no element of W is part of the partial matching \bar{h} in Line 10. Hence, in each execution of Line 12, at least half the queries are not part of \bar{h} in Line 10 but added to h in Line 11. Our goal is to bound the number of such elements.

We start with some definitions. Define G_j as the problem instance at the j 'th execution of Line 11, and let G_0 denote the initial problem instance. For each G_j , let $\bar{G}_j = (\bar{V}_j, \bar{E}_j)$, T_L^j and T_U^j denote the corresponding vertex cover instance and lower and upper limit trees. Observe that each G_j has unique $T_L^j = T_U^j$, and, by Lemma 5, is prediction mandatory free. Let Y_j denote the set of queries made by the algorithm to transform instance G_{j-1} into instance G_j . We partition Q_4 into subsets S_j , where S_j contains the edges of Q_4 that are queried in the j 'th execution of Line 12. We claim $|S_j| \leq 4 \cdot k^+(Y_j)$ for each j , which implies $|Q_4| \leq \sum_j |S_j| \leq 4 \cdot \sum_j k^+(Y_j) \leq 4 \cdot k_h$. To show the claim, we rely on the following lemma.

► **Lemma 17.** *Let l, f be non-trivial edges in G_j such that $\{l, f\} \in \bar{E}_{j-1} \Delta \bar{E}_j$, then $k^-(l), k^-(f) \geq 1$. Furthermore, $k^+(Y_j) \geq |U|$ for the set U of all endpoints of such edges $\{l, f\}$.*

► **Lemma 18.** $|\text{ALG}| \leq |\text{OPT}| + 5 \cdot k_h$.

Proof. We show $|S_j| \leq 4 \cdot k^+(Y_j)$ for each j , which, in combination with Lemma 15, implies the lemma. Consider an arbitrary S_j and the corresponding set Y_j . Further, let h_{j-1} denote the maximum matching computed and used by the algorithm for vertex cover instance \bar{G}_{j-1} , and let $\bar{h}_{j-1} = \{\{e, e'\} \in h_{j-1} \mid \{e, e'\} \in \bar{E}_j\}$. Finally, let h_j denote the matching that the algorithm uses for vertex cover instance \bar{G}_j . That is, h_j is computed by completing \bar{h}_{j-1} with a standard augmenting path algorithm. As already argued, at least half the elements of S_j are not matched by \bar{h}_{j-1} but are matched by h_j (cf. Observation 14).

We bound the number of such elements by exploiting that h_j is constructed from \bar{h}_{j-1} via a standard augmenting path algorithm. By definition, each iteration of the augmenting path algorithm increases the size of the current matching (starting with \bar{h}_{j-1}) by one and, in doing so, matches two new elements. In total, at most $2 \cdot (|h_j| - |\bar{h}_{j-1}|)$ previously unmatched elements become part of the matching. Thus, $|S_j| \leq 4 \cdot (|h_j| - |\bar{h}_{j-1}|)$.

We show $(|h_j| - |\bar{h}_{j-1}|) \leq k^+(Y_j)$. According to *König-Egerváry's* Theorem (e.g., [14]), the size of h_j is equal to the size $|VC_j|$ of the minimum vertex cover for \bar{G}_j . We show $|VC_j| \leq |\bar{h}_{j-1}| + k^+(Y_j)$, which implies $(|h_j| - |\bar{h}_{j-1}|) = |VC_j| - |\bar{h}_{j-1}| \leq k^+(Y_j)$, and, thus, the claim. Let $\bar{VC}_{j-1} = \{e \in VC_{j-1} \mid \exists e' \text{ s.t. } \{e, e'\} \in \bar{h}_{j-1}\}$, then $|\bar{VC}_{j-1}| = |\bar{h}_{j-1}|$.

We prove that we can construct a vertex cover for \bar{G}_j by adding at most $k^+(Y_j)$ elements to \bar{VC}_{j-1} , which implies $|VC_j| \leq |\bar{h}_{j-1}| + k^+(Y_j)$. Consider vertex cover instance \bar{G}_j and set \bar{VC}_{j-1} . By definition, \bar{VC}_{j-1} covers all edges that are part of partial matching \bar{h}_{j-1} .

Consider the elements of \bar{V}_j that are an endpoint of an edge in $\{e, f\} \in \bar{E}_j \Delta \bar{E}_{j-1}$ with e, f non-trivial in G_j . By Lemma 17, $k^-(e) \geq 1$ for each such e and $k^+(Y_j) \geq |U|$ for the set U of all such elements. Thus, we can afford to add U to the vertex cover.

Next, consider an edge $\{e, f\} \in \bar{E}_j$ that is not covered by $\bar{VC}_{j-1} \cup U$. Since $\{e, f\}$ is not covered by U , it must hold that $\{e, f\} \in \bar{E}_j \cap \bar{E}_{j-1}$. Thus, $\{e, f\}$ was covered by VC_{j-1} but is not covered by \bar{VC}_{j-1} . This implies $\{e, f\} \cap VC_{j-1} \neq \emptyset$ but $\{e, f\} \cap \bar{VC}_{j-1} = \emptyset$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $e \in VC_{j-1}$. Then, there must be an e' such that $\{e, e'\} \in h_{j-1}$ but $\{e, e'\} \notin \bar{h}_{j-1}$. It follows that $\{e, e'\} \notin \bar{E}_j$. As $\{e, f\}$ is not covered by U , the endpoint e' must be trivial in G_j but non-trivial in G_{j-1} . Thus, e' must have been queried (i) as a mandatory element (or a

matching partner) in Line 6 or 13, (ii) as part of VC_{j-1} in Line 5 or (iii) in Line 12. Case (ii) implies $e' \in VC_{j-1}$, contradicting $e \in VC_{j-1}$. Cases (i) or (iii) imply a query to the matching partner e of e' , which contradicts $\{e, f\} \in E_j$ (as e would be trivial). Thus, $\{e, f\}$ is covered by $\overline{VC}_{j-1} \cup U$, which implies that $\overline{VC}_{j-1} \cup U$ is a vertex cover for \overline{G}_j . Lemma 17 implies $|U| \leq k^+(Y_j)$. So, $|VC_j| \leq |\overline{h}_{j-1}| + k^+(Y_j)$ which concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

Lemmas 16 and 18 imply Theorem 13. Combining Theorems 6 and 13, we show Theorem 12.

6 Further research directions

Plenty other (optimization) problems seem natural in the context of explorable uncertainty with untrusted predictions. For our problem, it would be nice to close the gap in the robustness. We expect that our results extend to all matroids as it does in the classical setting. While we ask for the minimum number of queries to solve a problem *exactly*, it is natural to ask for approximate solutions. The bad news is that for the MST problem there is no improvement over the robustness guarantee of 2 possible even when allowing an arbitrarily large approximation of the exact solution [42, Section 10]. However, it remains open whether an improved consistency or an error-dependent competitive ratio are possible.

References

- 1 Mohamed Abdel-Nasser, Karar Mahmoud, Osama A. Omer, Matti Lehtonen, and Domenec Puig. Link quality prediction in wireless community networks using deep recurrent neural networks. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 59(5):3531–3543, 2020. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2020.05.037>.
- 2 Susanne Albers and Alexander Eckl. Explorable uncertainty in scheduling with non-uniform testing times. In *WAOA*, volume 12806 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 127–142. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-80879-2_9.
- 3 Susanne Albers and Alexander Eckl. Scheduling with testing on multiple identical parallel machines. In *WADS*, volume 12808 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 29–42. Springer, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-83508-8_3.
- 4 Spyros Angelopoulos, Christoph Dürr, Shendan Jin, Shahin Kamali, and Marc P. Renault. Online computation with untrusted advice. In *ITCS*, volume 151 of *LIPICs*, pages 52:1–52:15, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ITCS.2020.52.
- 5 Antonios Antoniadis, Christian Coester, Marek Eliás, Adam Polak, and Bertrand Simon. Online metric algorithms with untrusted predictions. In *ICML*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 345–355. PMLR, 2020. URL: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/antoniadis20a.html>.
- 6 Antonios Antoniadis, Themis Gouleakis, Pieter Kleer, and Pavel Kolev. Secretary and online matching problems with machine learned advice. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- 7 Luciana Arantes, Evripidis Bampis, Alexander V. Kononov, Manthos Letsios, Giorgio Lucarelli, and Pierre Sens. Scheduling under uncertainty: A query-based approach. In *IJCAI*, pages 4646–4652. ijcai.org, 2018. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2018/646.
- 8 Sepehr Assadi, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, and Sanjeev Khanna. Graph connectivity and single element recovery via linear and OR queries. In *ESA*, volume 204 of *LIPICs*, pages 7:1–7:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2021.7.
- 9 Yossi Azar, Stefano Leonardi, and Noam Touitou. Flow time scheduling with uncertain processing time. In *STOC*, pages 1070–1080. ACM, 2021. doi:10.1145/3406325.3451023.
- 10 Evripidis Bampis, Konstantinos Dogeas, Alexander V. Kononov, Giorgio Lucarelli, and Fanny Pascual. Speed scaling with explorable uncertainty. In *SPAA*, pages 83–93. ACM, 2021. doi:10.1145/3409964.3461812.

- 11 Evripidis Bampis, Christoph Dürr, Thomas Erlebach, Murilo Santos de Lima, Nicole Megow, and Jens Schlöter. Orienting (hyper)graphs under explorable stochastic uncertainty. In *ESA*, volume 204 of *LIPICs*, pages 10:1–10:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2021.10.
- 12 Paul Beame, Sarel Har-Peled, Sivaramakrishnan Natarajan Ramamoorthy, Cyrus Rashtchian, and Makrand Sinha. Edge estimation with independent set oracles. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(4):52:1–52:27, 2020.
- 13 Paul Beame, Sarel Har-Peled, Sivaramakrishnan Natarajan Ramamoorthy, Cyrus Rashtchian, and Makrand Sinha. Edge estimation with independent set oracles. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(4):52:1–52:27, 2020. doi:10.1145/3404867.
- 14 Norman Biggs, E Keith Lloyd, and Robin J Wilson. *Graph Theory, 1736-1936*. Oxford University Press, 1986.
- 15 Richard Bruce, Michael Hoffmann, Danny Krizanc, and Rajeev Raman. Efficient update strategies for geometric computing with uncertainty. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 38(4):411–423, 2005. doi:10.1007/s00224-004-1180-4.
- 16 Sébastien Bubeck and Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi. Regret analysis of stochastic and nonstochastic multi-armed bandit problems. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 5(1):1–122, 2012. doi:10.1561/22000000024.
- 17 Steven Chaplick, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Murilo S. de Lima, and Tigran Tonoyan. Query minimization under stochastic uncertainty. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 895:75–95, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2021.09.032.
- 18 Christoph Dürr, Thomas Erlebach, Nicole Megow, and Julie Meißner. An adversarial model for scheduling with testing. *Algorithmica*, 82(12):3630–3675, 2020. doi:10.1007/s00453-020-00742-2.
- 19 Franziska Eberle, Alexander Lindermayr, Nicole Megow, Lukas Nölke, and Jens Schlöter. Robustification of online graph exploration methods. In *AAAI*, 2022.
- 20 Thomas Erlebach and Michael Hoffmann. Minimum spanning tree verification under uncertainty. In *WG 2014: International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, volume 8747 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 164–175. Springer, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-12340-0_14.
- 21 Thomas Erlebach and Michael Hoffmann. Query-competitive algorithms for computing with uncertainty. *Bull. EATCS*, 116, 2015. URL: <http://bulletin.eatcs.org/index.php/beatcs/article/view/335>, doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2015.11.025.
- 22 Thomas Erlebach, Michael Hoffmann, and Frank Kammer. Query-competitive algorithms for cheapest set problems under uncertainty. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 613:51–64, 2016.
- 23 Thomas Erlebach, Michael Hoffmann, Danny Krizanc, Matús Mihalák, and Rajeev Raman. Computing minimum spanning trees with uncertainty. In *STACS*, volume 1 of *LIPICs*, pages 277–288. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Germany, 2008. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.STACS.2008.1358.
- 24 Tomás Feder, Rajeev Motwani, Liadan O’Callaghan, Chris Olston, and Rina Panigrahy. Computing shortest paths with uncertainty. *J. Algorithms*, 62(1):1–18, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.jalgor.2004.07.005.
- 25 Tomás Feder, Rajeev Motwani, Rina Panigrahy, Chris Olston, and Jennifer Widom. Computing the median with uncertainty. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 32(2):538–547, 2003. doi:10.1137/S0097539701395668.
- 26 Jacob Focke, Nicole Megow, and Julie Meißner. Minimum spanning tree under explorable uncertainty in theory and experiments. *ACM J. Exp. Algorithmics*, 25:1–20, 2020. doi:10.1145/3422371.
- 27 John Gittins, Kevin Glazebrook, and Richard Weber. *Multi-armed Bandit Allocation Indices*. Wiley, 2nd edition, 2011.
- 28 Marc Goerigk, Manoj Gupta, Jonas Ide, Anita Schöbel, and Sandeep Sen. The robust knapsack problem with queries. *Comput. Oper. Res.*, 55:12–22, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2014.09.010.

- 29 Oded Goldreich. *Introduction to Property Testing*. Cambridge University Press, 2017. doi:10.1017/9781108135252.
- 30 Sreenivas Gollapudi and Debmalya Panigrahi. Online algorithms for rent-or-buy with expert advice. In *ICML*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2319–2327. PMLR, 2019.
- 31 Anupam Gupta, Haotian Jiang, Ziv Scully, and Sahil Singla. The markovian price of information. In *IPCO*, volume 11480 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 233–246. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-17953-3_18.
- 32 Manoj Gupta, Yogish Sabharwal, and Sandeep Sen. The update complexity of selection and related problems. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 59(1):112–132, 2016. doi:10.1007/s00224-015-9664-y.
- 33 Magnús M. Halldórsson and Murilo Santos de Lima. Query-competitive sorting with uncertainty. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 867:50–67, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2021.03.021.
- 34 Simon Kahan. A model for data in motion. In *STOC*, pages 267–277. ACM, 1991. doi:10.1145/103418.103449.
- 35 Sanjeev Khanna and Wang Chiew Tan. On computing functions with uncertainty. In *PODS*, pages 171–182. ACM, 2001. doi:10.1145/375551.375577.
- 36 Ravi Kumar, Manish Purohit, Aaron Schild, Zoya Svitkina, and Erik Vee. Semi-online bipartite matching. In *ITCS*, volume 124 of *LIPICs*, pages 50:1–50:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ITCS.2019.50.
- 37 Silvio Lattanzi, Thomas Lavastida, Benjamin Moseley, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Online scheduling via learned weights. In *SODA*, pages 1859–1877. SIAM, 2020. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975994.114.
- 38 Alexander Lindermayr, Nicole Megow, and Bertrand Simon. Double Coverage with Machine-Learned Advice. In *ITCS*, volume 215 of *LIPICs*, pages 99:1–99:18, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ITCS.2022.99.
- 39 Thodoris Lykouris and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Competitive caching with machine learned advice. *J. ACM*, 68(4):24:1–24:25, 2021. doi:10.1145/3447579.
- 40 Takanori Maehara and Yutaro Yamaguchi. Stochastic packing integer programs with few queries. *Math. Program.*, 182(1):141–174, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10107-019-01388-x.
- 41 Hanna Mazzawi. Optimally reconstructing weighted graphs using queries. In *SODA*, pages 608–615. SIAM, 2010. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973075.51.
- 42 Nicole Megow, Julie Meißner, and Martin Skutella. Randomization helps computing a minimum spanning tree under uncertainty. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 46(4):1217–1240, 2017. doi:10.1137/16M1088375.
- 43 Arturo I. Merino and José A. Soto. The minimum cost query problem on matroids with uncertainty areas. In *ICALP*, volume 132 of *LIPICs*, pages 83:1–83:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2019.83.
- 44 Michael Mitzenmacher. Scheduling with predictions and the price of misprediction. In *ITCS*, volume 151 of *LIPICs*, pages 14:1–14:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ITCS.2020.14.
- 45 Noam Nisan. The demand query model for bipartite matching. In *SODA*, pages 592–599. SIAM, 2021. doi:10.1137/1.9781611976465.36.
- 46 Chris Olston and Jennifer Widom. Offering a precision-performance tradeoff for aggregation queries over replicated data. In *VLDB*, pages 144–155. Morgan Kaufmann, 2000.
- 47 Manish Purohit, Zoya Svitkina, and Ravi Kumar. Improving online algorithms via ML predictions. In *NeurIPS*, pages 9684–9693, 2018.
- 48 Dhruv Rohatgi. Near-optimal bounds for online caching with machine learned advice. In *SODA*, pages 1834–1845. SIAM, 2020. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975994.112.
- 49 Aviad Rubinfeld, Tselil Schramm, and S. Matthew Weinberg. Computing exact minimum cuts without knowing the graph. In *ITCS*, volume 94 of *LIPICs*, pages 39:1–39:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ITCS.2018.39.

- 50 Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- 51 Sahil Singla. The price of information in combinatorial optimization. In *SODA*, pages 2523–2532. SIAM, 2018. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975031.161.
- 52 William R. Thompson. On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3/4):285–294, 1933. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/2332286.
- 53 Vladimir Vapnik. Principles of risk minimization for learning theory. In *NIPS*, pages 831–838. Morgan Kaufmann, 1991.
- 54 Vladimir Vapnik. An overview of statistical learning theory. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks*, 10(5):988–999, 1999. doi:10.1109/72.788640.
- 55 Alexander Wei. Better and simpler learning-augmented online caching. In *APPROX-RANDOM*, volume 176 of *LIPICs*, pages 60:1–60:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.APPROX/RANDOM.2020.60.
- 56 Alexander Wei and Fred Zhang. Optimal robustness-consistency trade-offs for learning-augmented online algorithms. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- 57 Martin Weitzman. Optimal search for the best alternative. *Econometrica*, 47(3):641–654, 1979. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/1910412.


A Missing proofs and additional material for Section 2

Lower bound for error measure $k_{\#} = 1$

In this appendix we prove the following lemma, which shows that even if a single prediction is wrong ($k_{\#} = 1$), the competitive ratio cannot be better than the known lower bound of 2. Hence, it is impossible to achieve a smoothly degrading performance ratio with respect to the error measure $k_{\#}$.

► **Lemma 19.** *Even if $k_{\#} = 1$, then any deterministic algorithm for the MST problem under uncertainty has competitive ratio $\rho \geq 2$.*

Proof. Consider an input graph that consists of a path P with n edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n and n parallel edges $e_{n+1}, e_{n+2}, \dots, e_{2n}$ between the endpoints of the path, see Fig. 4a. Each edge e_i is given with an uncertainty interval I_i and a predicted value \bar{w}_{e_i} . The structure of the intervals and their predicted values is shown in Fig. 4b. If all the predictions are correct, the MST consists of the path P , and this can be verified either by querying the n edges of P , or by querying the n parallel edges between the endpoints of P . Assume w.l.o.g. that an algorithm queries the left-side



■ **Figure 4** Instance for a lower bound based on the number of inaccurate predictions. (a) Input graph for MST with uncertainty. (b) Uncertainty intervals of the $2n$ edges. Red crosses indicate predicted values, and green circles show true values.

intervals in the order I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n and the right-side intervals in the order $I_{n+1}, I_{n+2}, \dots, I_{2n}$. Before the algorithm queries I_n or I_{2n} , the adversary sets all predictions as correct, so the algorithm will eventually have to query I_n or I_{2n} . If the algorithm queries I_n before I_{2n} , then the adversary chooses a value for I_n that forces a query in I_{n+1}, \dots, I_{2n} (illustrated in Fig. 4b), and the predicted values for the remaining right-side intervals as correct, so the optimum solution only queries I_{n+1}, \dots, I_{2n} . A symmetric argument holds if the algorithm queries I_{2n} before I_n . In either case, the MST is P and the optimal query set consists of n queries, while the algorithm is forced to make $2n$ queries. Furthermore, a single prediction is incorrect, so $k_{\#} = 1$. \blacktriangleleft

Learnability of predictions

In this section, we argue about the learnability of our predictions with regard to the error measure k_h . We show the following result.

► **Theorem 20.** *The predicted values \bar{w} for a given instance of MST under explorable uncertainty are PAC learnable w.r.t. k_h with polynomial time and sample complexity.*

There is given an instance of the MST problem under uncertainty with graph $G = (V, E)$ and a set of uncertainty intervals \mathcal{I} for the edge weights. We assume that the realization w (here, w is a vector of all true values w_e with $e \in E$) of true values for \mathcal{I} is i.i.d. drawn from an unknown distribution D , and that we can i.i.d. sample realizations from D to obtain a training set. Let \mathcal{H} denote the set of all possible prediction vectors \bar{w} , with $\bar{w}_e \in I_e$ for each $I_e \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $k_h(w, \bar{w})$ denote the hop distance of the prediction \bar{w} for the realization with the real values w . Since w is drawn from D , the value $k_h(w, \bar{w})$ is a random variable. Our goal is to learn predictions \bar{w} that (approximately) minimize the expected error $\mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_h(w, \bar{w})]$. As a main result of this section, we show the following theorem, i.e., that the predictions are PAC learnable with regard to k_h . The theorem directly implies Theorem 20.

► **Theorem 21.** *For any $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a learning algorithm that, using a training set of size m , returns predictions $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{H}$, such that $\mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_h(w, \bar{w})] \leq \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_h(w, \bar{w}^*)] + \varepsilon$ holds with probability at least $(1 - \delta)$, where $\bar{w}^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\bar{w}' \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_h(w, \bar{w}')]$. The sample complexity is $m \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(\log(|E|) - \log(\delta/|E|)) \cdot |E|^2}{(\varepsilon/|E|)^2}\right)$ and the running time is polynomial in m and $|E|$.*

Since each I_e is an open interval, there are infinitely many predictions \bar{w} , and, thus, the set \mathcal{H} is also infinite. In order to reduce the size of \mathcal{H} , we discretize each I_e by fixing a finite number of potentially predicted values \bar{w}_e of I_e . We define the set \mathcal{H}_e of predicted values for I_e as follows. Let $\{B_1, \dots, B_l\}$ be the set of lower and upper limits of intervals in $\mathcal{I} \setminus I_e$ that are contained in I_e . Assume that B_1, \dots, B_l are indexed by increasing value. Let $B_0 = L_e$ and $B_{l+1} = U_e$ and, for each $j \in \{0, \dots, l\}$, let h_j be an arbitrary value of (B_j, B_{j+1}) . We define $\mathcal{H}_e = \{B_1, \dots, B_l, h_0, \dots, h_l\}$. Since two values $\bar{w}_e, \bar{w}'_e \in (B_j, B_{j+1})$ always lead to the same hop distance for interval I_e , there will always be an element of \mathcal{H}_e that minimizes the expected hop distance for I_e . As $k_h(w, \bar{w})$ is just the sum of the hop distances over all I_e , and the hop distances of two intervals I_e and $I_{e'}$ with $e \neq e'$ are independent, restricting \mathcal{H} to the set $\mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}_{|E|}$ (assuming the edges are enumerated from 1 to $|E|$) does not affect the accuracy of our predictions. Each \mathcal{H}_e contains at most $\mathcal{O}(|E|)$ values, and, thus, the discretization reduces the size of \mathcal{H} to at most $\mathcal{O}(|E|^{|E|})$. In particular, \mathcal{H} is now finite.

To efficiently learn predictions that satisfy Theorem 21, we again exploit that the hop distances of two intervals I_e and $I_{e'}$ with $e \neq e'$ are independent. This is, because the hop distance of I_e only depends on the predicted value \bar{w}_e and the true value w_e , but is independent of all $\bar{w}_{e'}$ and $w_{e'}$ with $e \neq e'$. Let $k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e)$ denote the hop distance $k^+(e)$ of interval I_e for the predicted value \bar{w}_e and the true value w_e , and, for each $e \in E$, let \bar{w}_e^* denote the predicted

value that minimizes $\mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e)]$. Since the hop distances of the single intervals are independent, the vector \bar{w}^* then minimizes the expected hop distance of the complete instance. Thus, if we can approximate the individual \bar{w}_e^* , then we can show Theorem 21.

► **Lemma 22.** *For any $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, and any $e \in E$, there exists a learning algorithm that, using a training set of size $m \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(\log(|E|) - \log(\delta)) \cdot |E|^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$, returns a predicted value $\bar{w}_e \in \mathcal{H}_e$ in time polynomial in $|E|$ and m , such that $\mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e^*)] + \varepsilon$ holds with probability at least $(1 - \delta)$, where $\bar{w}_e^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\bar{w}_e \in \mathcal{H}_e} \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e)]$.*

Proof. We show that the basic *empirical risk minimization (ERM)* algorithm already satisfies the lemma. ERM first i.i.d. samples a trainingset $S = \{w^1, \dots, w^m\}$ of m true value vectors from D . Then, it returns the $\bar{w}_e \in \mathcal{H}_e$ that minimizes the *empirical error* $h_S(\bar{w}_e) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m h_e(w_e^j, \bar{w}_e)$.

Recall that, as a consequence of the discretization, \mathcal{H}_e contains at most $\mathcal{O}(|E|)$ values. Since \mathcal{H}_e is finite, and the error function k_e^+ is bounded by the interval $[0, |E|]$, it satisfies the *uniform convergence property*; cf. [50]. (This follows also from the fact that \mathcal{H}_e is finite and, thus, has finite VC-dimension; cf. [53].) This implies that, for

$$m = \left\lceil \frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{H}_e|/\delta) |E|^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right\rceil \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(\log(|E|) - \log(\delta)) \cdot |E|^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right),$$

it holds $\mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e^*)] + \varepsilon$ with probability at least $(1 - \delta)$, where \bar{w}_e is the predicted value learned by ERM (cf. [50, 54]). As $|\mathcal{H}_e| \in \mathcal{O}(|E|)$, ERM also satisfies the running time requirements of the lemma. ◀

Proof of Theorem 21. Let $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{|E|}$ and $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{|E|}$. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{H}_{\max} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{H}_e} |\mathcal{H}_e|$. To learn predictions that satisfy the theorem, we first sample a training set $S = \{w^1, \dots, w^m\}$ with $m = \left\lceil \frac{2 \log(2|\mathcal{H}_{\max}|/\delta') |E|^2}{\varepsilon'^2} \right\rceil$. Next, we apply Lemma 22 to each \mathcal{H}_e to learn a predicted value \bar{w}_e that satisfies the guarantees of the lemma for ε', δ' . In each application of the lemma, we use the *same* training set S that was previously sampled.

For each \bar{w}_e learned by applying the lemma, the probability that the guarantee of the lemma is *not* satisfied is less than δ' . By the union bound this implies that the probability that at least one \bar{w}_e with $e \in E$ does not satisfy the guarantee is upper bounded by $\sum_{e \in E} \delta' \leq |E| \cdot \delta' = \delta$. Thus, with probability at least $(1 - \delta)$, all \bar{w}_e satisfy $\mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e^*)] + \varepsilon'$. Since by linearity of expectations $\mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_h(w, \bar{w}^*)] = \sum_{e \in E} \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e^*)]$, we can conclude that the following inequality, where \bar{w} is the vector of the learned predicted values, holds with probability at least $(1 - \delta)$, which implies the theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_h(w, \bar{w})] &= \sum_{e \in E} \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e)] \\ &\leq \sum_{e \in E} \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e^*)] + \varepsilon' \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{e \in E} \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_e^+(w_e, \bar{w}_e^*)] \right) + |E| \cdot \varepsilon' \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{w \sim D}[k_h(w, \bar{w}^*)] + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

◀

B

 Missing proofs of Section 3

Witness sets and mandatory queries

► **Lemma 1.** *By querying only mandatory elements we can obtain an instance with $T_L = T_U$ such that T_L and T_U are the unique lower limit tree and upper limit tree, respectively.*

Proof. Let T_L be a lower limit tree for a given instance G and let T_U be an upper limit tree. According to [42], all elements of $T_L \setminus T_U$ are mandatory and we can repeatedly query them for (the adapting) T_L and T_U until $T_L = T_U$. We refer to this process as the *first preprocessing step*.

Consider an $f \in E \setminus T_U$ and the cycle C in $T_U \cup \{f\}$. If f is trivial, then the true value w_f is maximal in C and we may delete f without loss of generality. Assume otherwise. If the upper limit of f is uniquely maximal in C , then f is not part of any upper limit tree. If there is an $l \in C$ with $U_f = U_l$, then $T'_U = T_U \setminus \{l\} \cup \{f\}$ is also an upper limit tree. Since $T_L \setminus T'_U = \{l\}$, we may execute the first preprocessing step for T_L and T'_U . We repeatedly do this until each $f \in E \setminus T_U$ is uniquely maximal in the cycle C in $T_U \cup \{f\}$. Then, T_U is unique.

To achieve uniqueness for T_L , consider some $l \in T_L$ and the cut X of G between the two connected components of $T_L \setminus \{l\}$. If l is trivial, then the true value w_l is minimal in X and we may contract l without loss of generality. Assume otherwise. If l is uniquely minimal in X , then l is part of every lower limit tree. If there is an $f \in X$ with $L_l = L_f$, then $T'_L = T_L \setminus \{l\} \cup \{f\}$ is also a lower limit tree. Since $T'_L \setminus T_U = \{f\}$ follows from $T_L = T_U$, we may execute the first preprocessing step for T'_L and T_U . We repeatedly do this until l for each $l \in T_L$ is uniquely minimal in the cut X of G between the two components of $T_L \setminus \{l\}$. Then, T_L is unique. ◀

► **Lemma 2.** *Let G be an instance with unique $T_L = T_U$ and let G' be an instance with unique $T'_L = T'_U$ obtained from G by querying set Q , then $e \in T_L \Delta T'_L = (T_L \setminus T'_L) \cup (T'_L \setminus T_L)$ implies $e \in Q$.*

Proof. Let $e \in T_L \setminus T'_L$, then $e \in T_L$ and T_L being unique imply that e has the unique minimal lower limit in the cut X_e of G between the two connected components of $T_L \setminus \{e\}$. Thus, e is part of any lower limit tree for G . For e not to be part of T'_L , it cannot have the unique minimal lower limit in the cut X_e of G' . Since querying elements in $X_e \setminus \{e\}$ only increases their lower limits, this can only happen if $e \in Q$.

Let $e \in T'_L \setminus T_L$. Then $T_L = T_U$ and $T'_L = T'_U$ imply $e \in T'_U \setminus T_U$. Since $e \notin T_U$ and T_U is unique, it follows that e has the unique largest upper limit in the cycle C_e of $T_U \cup \{e\}$. Thus, e is not part of any upper limit tree for G . For e to be part of T'_U , it cannot have the unique largest upper limit in the cycle C_e of G' . Since querying elements in $C_e \setminus \{e\}$ only decreases their upper limits, this can only happen if $e \in Q$. ◀

► **Lemma 3.** *Consider a given problem instance $G = (V, E)$ with predicted values \bar{w} . Each $e \in E_M \Delta E_P$ satisfies $k^-(e) \geq 1$. Consequently, $k_h \geq |E_M \Delta E_P|$.*

Proof. Consider an instance $G = (V, E)$ with uncertainty intervals $I_e = (L_e, U_e)$, true values w_e and predicted values \bar{w}_e for all $e \in E$. Let E_P and E_M be the mandatory queries with respect to the predicted and true values, respectively. We claim that, for every interval I_e of an edge $e \in E_P \Delta E_M$, there is an interval I_g of an edge g that lies on a cycle with e such that at least one of the following inequalities holds $w_g \leq L_e < \bar{w}_g$, $w_g < U_e \leq \bar{w}_g$, $\bar{w}_g \leq L_e < w_g$ or $\bar{w}_g < U_e \leq w_g$. This then implies $k^-(e) \geq 1$.

We continue by proving the claim. Consider an edge $e \in E_P \setminus E_M$. (The argumentation for edges in $E_M \setminus E_P$ is symmetric, with the roles of w and \bar{w} exchanged.) As e is not in E_M , replacing all intervals I_g for $g \in E \setminus \{e\}$ by their true values yields an instance that is solved. This means that for edge e one of the following cases applies:

- (a) e is known to be in the MST. Then there is a cut X_e containing edge e (namely, the cut between the two vertex sets obtained from the MST by removing the edge e) such that e is known to be a minimum weight edge in the cut, i.e., every other edge g in the cut satisfies $w_g \geq U_e$.
- (b) e is known not to be in the MST. Then there is a cycle C_e in G (namely, the cycle that is closed when e is added to the MST) such that e is a maximum weight edge in C_e , i.e., every other edge g in the cycle satisfies $w_g \leq L_e$.

As e is in E_P , replacing all intervals I_g for $g \in E \setminus \{e\}$ by their predicted values yields an instance Π that is not solved. Let T' be the minimum spanning tree of $G' = (V, E \setminus \{e\})$ for Π . Let C' be the cycle closed in T' by adding e , and let f be an edge with the largest predicted value in $C' \setminus \{e\}$. Then there are only two possibilities for the minimum spanning tree of G for Π : Either T' is also a minimum spanning tree of G (if $\bar{w}_e \geq \bar{w}_f$), or the minimum spanning tree is $T' \cup \{e\} \setminus \{f\}$. As knowing whether e is in the minimum spanning tree would allow us to determine which of the two cases applies, it must be the case that we cannot determine whether e is in the minimum spanning tree or not without querying e . If e satisfied case (a) with cut X_e above, then there must be an edge g in $X_e \setminus \{e\}$ with $\bar{w}_g < U_e$, because otherwise e would also have to be in the MST of G for Π , a contradiction. Thus, $\bar{w}_g < U_e \leq w_g$. If e satisfied case (b) with cycle C_e above, then there must be an edge g in $C_e \setminus \{e\}$ with $\bar{w}_g > L_e$, because otherwise e would also be excluded from the MST of G for Π , a contradiction. Thus, $w_g \leq L_e < \bar{w}_g$. In conclusion $k^-(e) \geq 1$, which establishes claim and lemma. ◀

Identifying witness sets

We introduce new structural properties to identify witness sets. Existing algorithms for MST under uncertainty [23, 42] essentially follow the algorithms of Kruskal or Prim, and only identify witness sets in the cycle or cut that is currently under consideration. Let f_1, \dots, f_l denote the edges in $E \setminus T_L$ ordered by non-decreasing lower limit. Then, C_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ denotes the unique cycle in $T_L \cup \{f_i\}$. Furthermore, define $G_i = (V, E_i)$ with $E_i = T_L \cup \{f_1, \dots, f_i\}$. For each $e \in T_L$, let X_e denote the set of edges in the cut of the two connected components of $T_L \setminus \{e\}$. Existing algorithms for MST under explorable uncertainty repeatedly consider (the changing) C_1 or X_e , where e is the edge in T_L with maximum upper limit, and identify the maximum or minimum edge in the cycle or cut by querying witness sets of size two, until the problem is solved. For our algorithms, we need to identify witness sets in cycles $C_i \neq C_1$ and cuts $X_{e'} \neq X_e$. Thus, the following two lemmas alone are not sufficient for our purpose.

► **Lemma 23** ([42, Lemma 4.1]). *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. Given a feasible query set Q for the uncertainty graph $G = (V, E)$, the set $Q_i := Q \cap E_i$ is a feasible query set for $G_i = (V, E_i)$.*

► **Lemma 24** ([42, Lemma 4.2 and ff.]). *For some realization of edge weights, let T_i be an MST for graph G_i and let C be the cycle closed by adding f_{i+1} to T_i . Further, let h be some edge with the largest upper limit in C and $g \in C \setminus \{h\}$ be an edge with $U_g > L_h$. Then any feasible query set for G_{i+1} contains h or g . Moreover, if I_g is contained in I_h , then edge h is mandatory. Further, f_{i+1} has the largest upper limit on C after querying $Q_i = E_i \cap Q$ for a feasible query set Q .*

Lemma 24 shows how to identify a witness set on the cycle closed by f_{i+1} after an MST for graph G_i has been verified. Known algorithms for MST under uncertainty build on this by iteratively resolving cycles closed by edges f_1, \dots, f_l one after the other (and analogously for cut-based algorithms). We design algorithms that query edges with a less local strategy; this requires to identify witness sets involving edges f_{i+1} without first verifying an MST for G_i . The following two lemmas provide new structural insights that are fundamental for our algorithms.

► **Lemma 25.** *Let $l_i \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ with $I_{l_i} \cap I_{f_i} \neq \emptyset$ such that $l_i \notin C_j$ for all $j < i$, then $\{l_i, f_i\}$ is a witness set. Furthermore, if $w_{l_i} \in I_{f_i}$, then $\{f_i\}$ is a witness set.*

Proof. Consider the set of edges X_i in the cut of G defined by the two connected components of $T_L \setminus \{l_i\}$. By assumption, $l_i, f_i \in X_i$. However, $f_j \notin X_i$ for all $j < i$, as otherwise $l_i \in C_j$ for an $f_j \in X_i$ with $j < i$, which contradicts the assumption. We observe $X_i \cap E_i = \{f_i, l_i\}$.

Let Q be any feasible query set. By Lemma 23, $Q_{i-1} = E_{i-1} \cap Q$ verifies an MST T_{i-1} for G_{i-1} . Consider the unique cycle C in $T_{i-1} \cup \{f_i\}$. By Lemma 24, f_i has the highest upper limit on C after querying Q_{i-1} . Since $f_i \in X_i$, $f_i \in C$ and C is a cycle, it follows that another edge in $X_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ must be part of C . We already observed, $X_i \cap E_i = \{l_i, f_i\}$, and therefore $l_i \in C$. Lemma 24 implies that $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set. If $w_{l_i} \in I_{f_i}$, then f_i must be queried to identify the maximal edge in C , so it follows that $\{f_i\}$ is a witness set. ◀

The proof of Lemma 4 for cycles is very similar to the proof of Lemma 25 for cuts. However, it requires the following additional observation.

► **Observation 26.** *Let Q be a feasible query set that verifies an MST T^* . Consider any path $P \subseteq T_L$ between two endpoints a and b , and let $e \in P$ be the edge with the highest upper limit in P . If $e \notin Q$, then the unique path $\hat{P} \subseteq T^*$ from a to b is such that $e \in \hat{P}$ and e has the highest upper limit in \hat{P} after Q has been queried.*

Proof. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ let T_i^* be the MST for G_i as verified by $Q_i = Q \cap E_i$ and let \hat{C}_i be the unique cycle in $T_{i-1}^* \cup \{f_i\}$. Then $T_i^* = T_{i-1}^* \cup \{f_i\} \setminus \{h_i\}$ holds where h_i is the maximal edge on \hat{C}_i . Assume $e \notin Q$. We claim that there cannot be any \hat{C}_i with $e \in \hat{C}_i$ such that Q_i verifies that an edge $e' \in \hat{C}_i$ with $U_{e'} \leq U_e$ is maximal in \hat{C}_i . Assume otherwise. If $e' \neq e$, Q_i would need to verify that $w_e \leq w_{e'}$ holds. Since $U_{e'} \leq U_e$, this can only be done by querying e , which is a contradiction to $e \notin Q$. If $e' = e$, then \hat{C}_i still contains edge f_i . Since $T_L = T_U$, f_i has a higher lower limit than e . To verify that e is maximal in \hat{C}_i , Q_i needs to prove $w_e \geq w_{f_i} > L_{f_i}$. This can only be done by querying e , which is a contradiction to $e \notin Q$.

We show via induction on $i \in \{0, \dots, l\}$ that each T_i^* contains a path P_i^* from a to b with $e \in P_i^*$ such that e has the highest upper limit in P_i^* after Q_i has been queried. For this proof via induction we define $Q_0 = \emptyset$. *Base case $i=0$:* Since $G_0 = (E, T_L)$ is a spanning tree, $T_0^* = T_L$ follows. Therefore $P_0^* = P$ is part of T_L and by assumption $e \in P$ has the highest upper limit in P_0^* .

Inductive step: By induction hypothesis, there is a path P_i^* from a to b in T_i^* with $e \in P_i^*$ such that e has the highest upper limit in P_i^* after querying Q_i . Consider cycle \hat{C}_{i+1} . If an edge $e' \in \hat{C}_{i+1} \setminus P_i^*$ is maximal in \hat{C}_{i+1} , then $T_{i+1}^* = T_i^* \cup \{f_{i+1}\} \setminus \{e'\}$ contains path P_i^* . Since e by assumption is not queried, e still has the highest upper limit on $P_i^* = P_{i+1}^*$ after querying Q_{i+1} and the statement follows.

Assume some $e' \in P_i^* \cap \hat{C}_{i+1}$ is maximal in \hat{C}_{i+1} , then $U_{e'} \leq U_e$ follows by induction hypothesis since e has the highest upper limit in P_i^* . We already observed that \hat{C}_{i+1} then cannot contain e . Consider $P' = \hat{C}_{i+1} \setminus P_i^*$. Since $e' \in P_i^*$ is maximal in \hat{C}_{i+1} , we can observe that $P' \subseteq T_{i+1}^*$ holds. It follows that path $P_{i+1}^* = P' \cup (P_i^* \setminus \hat{C}_{i+1})$ with $e \in P_{i+1}^*$ is part of T_{i+1}^* . Since e is not queried, it still has a higher upper limit than all edges in P_i^* . Additionally, we can observe that after querying Q_{i+1} no $u \in P'$ can have an upper limit $U_u \geq U_{e'}$. If such an u would exist, querying Q_{i+1} would not verify that e' is maximal on \hat{C}_{i+1} , which contradicts the assumption. Using $U_e \geq U_{e'}$, we can conclude that e has the highest upper limit on P_{i+1}^* and the statement follows. ◀

► **Lemma 4.** *Consider cycle C_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. Let $l_i \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ such that $I_{l_i} \cap I_{f_i} \neq \emptyset$ and l_i has the largest upper limit in $C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$, then $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set. If $w_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$, then l_i is mandatory.*

Proof. To prove the lemma, we have to show that each feasible query set contains at least one element of $\{f_i, l_i\}$. Let Q be an arbitrary feasible query set. By Lemma 23, $Q_{i-1} := Q \cap E_{i-1}$

is a feasible query set for G_{i-1} and verifies some MST T_{i-1} for G_{i-1} . We show that $l_i \notin Q_{i-1}$ implies either $l_i \in Q$ or $f_i \in Q$.

Assume $l_i \notin Q_{i-1}$ and let C be the unique cycle in $T_{i-1} \cup \{f_i\}$. Since $T_L = T_U$, edge f_i has the highest upper limit in C after querying Q_{i-1} . While we only assume $T_L = T_U$ for the initially given instance, Lemma 24 implies that f_i still has the highest upper limit in C after querying Q_{i-1} . If we show that $l_i \notin Q_{i-1}$ implies $l_i \in C$, we can apply Lemma 24 to derive that $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set for graph G_i , and thus either $f_i \in Q_i \subseteq Q$ or $l_i \in Q_i \subseteq Q$. For the remainder of the proof we show that $l_i \notin Q_{i-1}$ implies $l_i \in C$. Let a and b be the endpoints of f_i , then the path $P = C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ from a to b is part of T_L and l_i has the highest upper limit in P . Using $l_i \notin Q_{i-1}$ we can apply Observation 26 to conclude that there must be a path \hat{P} from a to b in T_{i-1} such that l_i has the highest upper limit on \hat{P} after querying Q_{i-1} . Therefore, $C = \hat{P} \cup \{f_i\}$ and it follows $l_i \in C$.

If $w_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$ and $l_i \notin Q_{i-1}$, then l_i must be queried to identify the maximal edge on C , thus it follows that $\{l_i\}$ is a witness set. \blacktriangleleft

► Lemma 5. *An instance G is prediction mandatory free iff $\bar{w}_{f_i} \geq U_e$ and $\bar{w}_e \leq L_{f_i}$ holds for each $e \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ and each cycle C_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. Once an instance is prediction mandatory free, it remains so even if we query further elements, as long as we maintain unique $T_L = T_U$.*

Proof. We start by showing the first part of the lemma, i.e., that an instance G is prediction mandatory free if and only if $\bar{w}_{f_i} \geq U_e$ and $\bar{w}_e \leq L_{f_i}$ holds for each $e \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ and each cycle C_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$.

For the first direction, assume $\bar{w}_{f_i} \geq U_e$ and $\bar{w}_e \leq L_{f_i}$ holds for each $e \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ and each cycle C_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. Then each $f_i \in E \setminus T_L$ is predicted to be maximal on C_i and each $e \in T_L$ is predicted to be minimal in X_e . Assuming the predictions are correct, we observe that each vertex cover of \tilde{G} is a feasible query set [20], where $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ with $\tilde{V} = E$ (excluding trivial edges) and $\tilde{E} = \{\{f_i, e\} \mid i \in \{1, \dots, l\}, e \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\} \text{ and } I_e \cap I_{f_i} \neq \emptyset\}$. Since both $Q_1 := T_L$ and $Q_2 := E \setminus T_L$ are vertex covers for \tilde{G} , Q_1 and Q_2 are feasible query sets under the assumption that the predictions are correct. This implies that no element is part of every feasible solution because $Q_1 \cap Q_2 = \emptyset$. We can conclude that no element is prediction mandatory and the instance is prediction mandatory free.

Next, We show that instance G being prediction mandatory free implies that $\bar{w}_{f_i} \geq U_e$ and $\bar{w}_e \leq L_{f_i}$ holds for each $e \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ and each cycle C_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$; via contraposition. Assume there is a cycle C_i such that $\bar{w}_{f_i} \in I_e$ or $\bar{w}_e \in I_{f_i}$ for some $e \in C_i \setminus \{e\}$. Let C_i be such a cycle with the smallest index. If $\bar{w}_{f_i} \in I_e$ for some $e \in C_i \setminus \{e\}$, then also $\bar{w}_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$ for the edge l_i with the highest upper limit in $C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$. (This is because we assume $T_L = T_U$.) Under the assumption that the predictions are true, Lemma 4 implies that l_i is mandatory and thus prediction mandatory. It follows that G is not prediction mandatory free.

Assume $\bar{w}_e \in I_{f_i}$. We can conclude $e \notin C_j$ for each $j < i$. This is because $\bar{w}_e \in I_{f_i}$ and $j < i$ would imply $\bar{w}_e \in I_{f_j}$. As we assumed that C_i is the first cycle with this property, $e \in C_j$ leads to a contradiction. Under the assumption that the predictions are true, Lemma 25 implies that f_i is mandatory and thus prediction mandatory. It follows that G is not prediction mandatory free.

We show the second part of the lemma, i.e., that, once an instance is prediction mandatory free, it remains so even if we query further elements, as long as we maintain unique $T_L = T_U$. We show this part by proving the following claim.

Claim: *Let G be a prediction mandatory free instance with unique $T_L = T_U$, and let G' be an instance with unique $T'_L = T'_U$ that is obtained from G by querying a set of edges Q , where T'_L and T'_U are the lower and upper limit trees of G' . Then G' is prediction mandatory free.*

Let $G = (V, E)$ and $G' = (V', E')$ as well as $T_L = T_U$ and $T'_L = T'_U$ be as described in the claim. We show that G being prediction mandatory free implies that G' is prediction mandatory free via proof by contradiction. Therefore, assume that G' is not prediction mandatory free.

Let T'_L be the lower limit tree of G' , let f'_1, \dots, f'_l be the (non-trivial) edges in $E' \setminus T'_L$ ordered by lower limit non-decreasingly, and let C'_i be the unique cycle in $T'_L \cup \{f'_i\}$. By assumption, $T'_L = T'_U$ holds and $T'_L = T'_U$ is unique. We can w.l.o.g. ignore trivial edges in $E' \setminus T'_L$ since those are maximal in a cycle and can be deleted. Since G' is not prediction mandatory free, there must be some C'_i such that either $\bar{w}_e \in I_{f'_i}$ or $\bar{w}_{f'_i} \in I_e$ for some non-trivial $e \in C'_i \setminus \{f'_i\}$ (cf. Lemma 5).


Assume $e \notin T_L$. Since e is part of $T'_L = T'_U$, Lemma 2 implies that e must have been queried and therefore is trivial, which is a contradiction. Assume $e \in T_L$ and $\bar{w}_e \in I_{f'_i}$. As G is prediction mandatory free, the assumption implies $e \notin C_{f'_i}$ and, therefore, $f'_i \notin X_e$, where X_e is the cut between the two components of $T_L \setminus \{e\}$ in G . Thus (since $e \in T_L$), cycle C'_i must contain some $f \in X_e \setminus \{e\}$ with $f \neq f'_i$. Note that $f \in X_e \setminus \{e\}$ implies $e \in C_f$, where C_f is the cycle in $T_L \cup \{f\}$. By Lemma 5, instance G being prediction mandatory free implies $\bar{w}_e \notin I_f$ where I_f denotes the uncertainty interval of f before querying it. If $\bar{w}_e \in I_{f'_i}$, this implies $L_{f'_i} < L_f$. It follows that f has the highest lower limit in C'_i , which contradicts f'_i having the highest lower limit in C'_i .

Assume $e \in T_L$ and $\bar{w}_{f'_i} \in I_e$. Remember that f'_i is non-trivial and $f'_i \notin T'_L = T'_U$. According to Lemma 2, it follows $f'_i \notin T_L = T_U$. Let $C_{f'_i}$ be the cycle in $T_L \cup \{f'_i\}$. Since G is prediction mandatory free, $\bar{w}_{f'_i} \notin I_{e'}$ for each $e' \in C_{f'_i} \setminus \{f'_i\}$, which implies $U_e > U_{e'}$. It follows that the highest upper limit on the path between the two endpoints of f'_i in $T'_U = T'_L$ is strictly higher than the highest upper limit on the path between the two endpoints of f'_i in $T_U = T_L$. We argue that this cannot happen and we have a contradiction to $e \in T_L$ and $\bar{w}_{f'_i} \in I_e$.

Let P be the path between the endpoints a and b of f'_i in T_U and let P' be the path between a and b in T'_U . Define U_P to be the highest upper limit on P . Observe that the upper limit of each edge can only decrease from T_U to T'_U since querying edges only decreases their upper limits. Therefore each $e' \in P' \cap P$ cannot have a higher upper limit than U_P . It remains to argue that the upper limit of each $e' \in P' \setminus P$ cannot be larger than U_P . Consider the set \mathcal{S} of maximal subpaths $S \subseteq P'$ such that $P \cap S = \emptyset$. Each $e' \in P' \setminus P$ is part of such a subpath S . Let S be an arbitrary element of \mathcal{S} , then there is a cycle $C \subseteq S \cup P$ with $S \subseteq C$. Assume $e' \in S$ has a strictly larger upper limit than U_P , then an element of S has the unique highest upper limit on C . It follows that subpath S and path P' cannot be part of any upper limit tree in the instance G' , which contradicts the assumption of P' being a path in T'_U . We conclude that the graph G' is prediction mandatory free. \blacktriangleleft

C Making instances prediction mandatory free

Algorithm 3 transforms arbitrary instances into prediction mandatory free instances with the following guarantee.



■ **Figure 5** with predictions indicated as red crosses. (a) Intervals in a prediction mandatory free cycle. (b)–(d) Intervals in a cycle that is not prediction mandatory free.

► **Theorem 6.** *There is an algorithm that makes a given instance prediction mandatory free and satisfies $|\text{ALG}| \leq \min\{(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|(\text{ALG} \cup D) \cap \text{OPT}| + k^+(\text{ALG}) + k^-(\text{ALG})), \gamma \cdot (|\text{ALG} \cup D) \cap \text{OPT}| + \gamma - 2\}$ for the set of edges ALG queried by the algorithm and a set $D \subseteq E \setminus \text{ALG}$ of unqueried edges that do not occur in the remaining instance after executing the algorithm.*

Note that the Theorem compares $|\text{ALG}|$ with $|(\text{ALG} \cup D) \cap \text{OPT}|$ instead of just $|\text{OPT}|$ since we combine Algorithm 3 with algorithms for prediction mandatory free instances in the

following sections. We will compare the queries of those algorithms against $|\text{OPT} \setminus (\text{ALG} \cup D)|$, which will allow us to analyze the combined algorithms.

In each iteration the algorithm starts by querying elements that are prediction mandatory for the current instance. The set of prediction mandatory elements can be computed in polynomial time [20]. Our algorithm sequentially queries such elements until either $\gamma - 2$ prediction mandatory elements have been queried or no more exist (cf. Line 1). After each query, the algorithm ensures unique $T_L = T_U$ by using Lemma 1. Note that the set of prediction mandatory elements with respect to the current instance can change when elements are queried, and therefore we query the elements sequentially. By Lemma 3, each of the at most $\gamma - 2$ elements is either mandatory or contributes one to the hop distance.

Afterwards, the algorithm iterates through $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ until the current cycle C_i is not prediction mandatory free. If it finds such a cycle C_i , closed by f_i , it queries edges on the cycle and possibly future cycles as follows. Let l_i denote the edge in $C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ with highest upper limit. As C_i is not prediction mandatory free, the configuration of l_i and f_i and their predicted values must be one of those illustrated in Fig. 5(b)–(c). In each case, the algorithm queries one to three edges while ensuring 1.5-consistency and 2-robustness *locally* for those queries, as well as a more refined guarantee depending on prediction errors that will be needed when the algorithm is used as part of our error-sensitive algorithm in Section 5. Line 6 handles the case of Fig. 5(b), Lines 7–11 the case of Fig. 5(c), and Lines 12–17 the case of Fig. 5(d). We now briefly sketch the analysis of these three cases and defer the formal statements and proof details to Lemmas 27, 28 and 29 in Appendix C. In Line 6, we can show that $\{l_i, f_i\}$ is a witness set (giving local 2-robustness) and either $|\text{OPT} \cap \{l_i, f_i\}| = 2$ (giving local 1-consistency) or $k^+(\{l_i, f_i\}) \geq 1$. For the queries made in Line 10, we can show that if the algorithm queries three edges, OPT must query at least two of them (ensuring 1.5-consistency and 1.5-robustness). If the algorithm queries only the two edges f_i and l_i , they form a witness set (2-robustness) and $k^+(\{f_i, l_i\}) \geq 1$. For Line 11, we show that if the algorithm queries only l_i , then $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set and f_i can be deleted from the instance without querying it (giving 1-consistency and 1-robustness). If the algorithm queries f_i and l_i , they form a witness set and $k^+(\{f_i, l_i\}) \geq 1$. The guarantees we can prove for queries made in Lines 12–17 are analogous, except that the edge l'_i can be contracted instead of deleted if the algorithm queries only f_i in Line 17. After processing C_i in this way, the algorithm restarts. The algorithm terminates when all C_i are prediction mandatory free, which holds at the latest when all edges in E have been queried.

We sketch the proof of Theorem 6. Elements queried in Line 1 to ensure unique $T_L = T_U$ are mandatory by Lemma 1 and can be ignored in the analysis. Each iteration of the algorithm queries a set P_i of up to $\gamma - 2$ prediction mandatory edges e in Line 1, each of which is mandatory or satisfies $k^-(e) \geq 1$ by Lemma 3, showing $|P_i| \leq |P \cap \text{OPT}| + k^-(P_i)$. In the last iteration, these are the only queries, and they contribute the additive term $\gamma - 2$ to the bound. In each iteration prior to the last, a set W_i of at most 3 queries is made in Line 6, 10, 11, 16 or 17. These cases are covered by the following possibilities: (1) The set W_i consists of three edges, and OPT contains at least two of them, giving $|W_i| \leq 1.5 \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap W_i|$ and $|W_i| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap W_i| + 1$; (2) The set W_i consists of two edges, and either OPT contains both or OPT contains one of them and $k^+(W_i) \geq 1$, giving $|W_i| \leq 2 \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap W_i|$ and $|W_i| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap W_i| + k^+(W_i)$; (3) The set W_i contains a single edge e and we can delete or contract another edge $g(e)$ such that $\{e, g(e)\}$ is a witness set, giving $|W_i| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap \{e, g(e)\}|$. Combining these bounds over all iterations yields Theorem 6.

To conclude the section, we observe that all edges queried by Algorithm 3 can, w.l.o.g., be contracted or deleted: Since all queried edges are trivial and we ensure unique $T_L = T_U$, we can observe that each queried $e \in T_L = T_U$ is minimal on a cut and can be contracted, and each queried $e \notin T_L = T_U$ is maximal on a cycle and can be deleted. This allows us to treat the instance after the execution of the algorithm independently of all previous queries.

■ **Algorithm 3** Algorithm to make instances prediction mandatory free

Input: Uncertainty graph $G = (V, E)$ and predictions \bar{w}_e for each $e \in E$

- 1 Ensure unique $T_L = T_U$. Sequentially query prediction mandatory elements (while ensuring unique $T_L = T_U$) until either $\gamma - 2$ prediction mandatory elements are queried or the instance is prediction mandatory free;
- 2 Let T_L be the lower limit tree and f_1, \dots, f_l be the edges in $E \setminus T_L$ ordered by lower limit non-decreasingly;
- 3 **foreach** C_i with $i=1$ to l **do**
- 4 **if** C_i is not prediction mandatory free **then**
- 5 Let l_i be an edge with highest upper limit in $C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$;
- 6 **if** $\bar{w}_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$ and $\bar{w}_{l_i} \in I_{f_i}$ **then** Query $\{f_i, l_i\}$; // cf. Fig. 5(b)
- 7 **else if** $\bar{w}_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$ **then** // cf. Fig. 5(c)
- 8 **if** $\exists l'_i \in C_i \setminus \{f_i, l_i\}$ with $I_{l'_i} \cap I_{f_i} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 9 $l'_i \leftarrow$ edge in $C_i \setminus \{f_i, l_i\}$ with the largest upper limit;
- 10 Query $\{f_i, l_i\}$, query l'_i only if $w_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$ and $w_{l_i} \notin I_{f_j}$ for all j with $l_i \in C_j$;
- 11 **else** Query l_i , query f_i only if $w_{l_i} \in I_{f_i}$;
- 12 **else if** $\bar{w}_{l'_i} \in I_{f_i}$ for some $l'_i \in C_i$ **then** // cf. Fig. 5(d)
- 13 $l'_i \leftarrow$ edge with the largest upper limit in $\{l \in C_i \setminus \{f_i\} \mid \bar{w}_l \in I_{f_i}\}$;
- 14 **if** $\exists f_j \in X_{l'_i} \setminus \{f_i, l'_i\}$ with $I_{f_j} \cap I_{l'_i} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 15 $f_j \leftarrow$ edge in $X_{l'_i} \setminus \{f_i, l'_i\}$ with the smallest lower limit;
- 16 Query $\{f_i, l'_i\}$, query f_j only if $w_{l'_i} \in I_{f_j}$ and $w_{f_i} \notin I_e$ for all $e \in C_i$;
- 17 **else** Query f_i , query l'_i only if $w_{f_i} \in I_{l'_i}$;
- 18 Restart at Line 1;

In the following we present the formal lemmas stating that, in each iteration of Algorithm 3, the queries made in one execution of Lines 6–17 locally satisfy 1.5-consistency and 2-robustness. All lemmas consider a cycle C_i such that all C_j with $j < i$ are prediction mandatory free, l_i is the edge with the highest upper limit in $C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ and predictions are as indicated in Figure 5(b) (Lemma 27), Figure 5(c) (Lemma 28), and Figure 5(d) (Lemma 29).

► **Lemma 27.** *Let $\{f_i, l_i\}$ denote a pair of edges queried in Line 6, then $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set, and either both edges are mandatory or $k^+(\{f_i, l_i\}) \geq 1$.*

Proof. By assumption, all C_j with $j < i$ are prediction mandatory free. We claim that this implies $l_i \notin C_j$ for all $j < i$. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there is a C_j with $j < i$ and $l_i \in C_j$. Then, $T_L = T_U$ and $j < i$ imply that f_i and f_j have larger upper and lower limits than l_i and, since $L_{f_i} \geq L_{f_j}$, it follows $I_{l_i} \cap I_{f_i} \subseteq I_{l_i} \cap I_{f_j}$. Thus, $\bar{w}_{l_i} \in I_{f_i}$ implies $\bar{w}_{l_i} \in I_{f_j}$, which contradicts C_j being prediction mandatory free. According to Lemma 25, $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set.

Consider any feasible query set Q , then Q_{i-1} verifies the MST T_{i-1} for graph G_{i-1} and Q needs to identify the maximal edge on the unique cycle C in $T_{i-1} \cup \{f_i\}$. Following the argumentation of Lemma 25, we can observe $l_i, f_i \in C$. Since we assume $T_L = T_U$, we can also observe that f_i has the highest upper limit in C . By Observation 26, l_i has the highest upper limit in $C \setminus \{f_i\}$ after querying $Q_{i-1} \setminus \{l_i\}$.

If $w_{l_i} \in I_{f_i}$, then f_i is part of any feasible query set according to Lemma 25. Otherwise, $w_{l_i} \leq L_{f_i} < \bar{w}_{l_i}$ and $k^+(l_i) \geq 1$. If $w_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$, then l_i is part of any feasible query set according to Lemma 4. Otherwise, $w_{f_i} \geq U_{l_i} > \bar{w}_{f_i}$ and $k^+(f_i) \geq 1$. In conclusion, either $\{f_i, l_i\} \subseteq Q$ for any feasible query set Q or $k^+(\{f_i, l_i\}) \geq 1$. ◀

► **Lemma 28.** *Let $\{f_i, l_i, l'_i\}$ denote the elements of Line 10. If the algorithm queries all three elements, then $|\{f_i, l_i, l'_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 2$. Otherwise, $k^+(\{f_i, l_i\}) > 0$ and $|\{f_i, l_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$.*

Let $\{l_i, f_i\}$ denote the elements of Line 11. If the algorithm queries only l_i , then $|\{f_i, l_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$ and f_i can be deleted from the instance without querying it. Otherwise, $k^+(\{f_i, l_i\}) > 0$ and $|\{f_i, l_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$.

Proof. By assumption, all C_j with $j < i$ are prediction mandatory free. According to Lemma 4, $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set.

Consider the first part of the lemma, i.e., the elements $\{f_i, l_i, l'_i\}$ of Line 10. Assume first that the algorithm queries all three elements. By Line 10, this means that $w_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$ and $w_{l_i} \notin I_{f_j}$ for each j with $l_i \in C_j$. According to Lemma 4, $w_{f_i} \in I_{l_i}$ implies that l_i is part of any feasible query set. Consider the relaxed instance where l_i is already queried, then $w_{l_i} \notin I_{f_j}$ for each j with $l_i \in C_j$ implies that l_i is minimal in X_{l_i} and that the lower limit tree does not change by querying l_i . It follows that l'_i is the edge with the highest upper limit in $C_i \setminus \{f_i\}$ in the relaxed instance and, by Lemma 4, $\{f_i, l'_i\}$ is a witness set. Thus, $|\{f_i, l_i, l'_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 2$.

Next, assume that the algorithm queries only $\{f_i, l_i\}$. Then, either $w_{f_i} \notin I_{l_i}$ or $w_{l_i} \in I_{f_j}$ for some j with $l_i \in C_j$. Note that if $w_{l_i} \in I_{f_j}$ holds for some j with $l_i \in C_j$, then, by the ordering of the edges in $T_L \setminus E$, the statement holds for some $j \leq i$. If $w_{f_i} \notin I_{l_i}$, then $w_{f_i} \geq U_{l_i} > \bar{w}_{f_i}$ and $k^+(f_i) \geq 1$ follows. If $w_{l_i} \in I_{f_j}$, then $\bar{w}_{l_i} \leq L_{f_j} < w_{l_i}$ and $k^+(l_i) \geq 1$ follows. Therefore, if either $w_{f_i} \notin I_{l_i}$ or $w_{l_i} \in I_{f_j}$ for some j with $l_i \in C_j$, then $k^+(f_i, l_i) \geq 1$.

Consider the second part of the lemma, i.e., the elements $\{f_i, l_i\}$ of Line 11. Assume first that the algorithm queries only l_i . Clearly, $|\{f_i, l_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$ as $\{f_i, l_i\}$ is a witness set. Consider the cycle C_i . As f_i is not queried, it follows $w_{l_i} \notin I_{f_i}$. Furthermore, by definition of Line 11, it holds $I_{l'_i} \cap I_{f_i} = \emptyset$ for all $l'_i \in C_i \setminus \{f_i, l_i\}$. Thus, f_i is proven to be uniquely maximal on cycle C_i and, therefore, can be deleted from the instance. Next, assume that the algorithm queries l_i and f_i . Clearly, $|\{f_i, l_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$ still holds. As f_i is queried, we have $w_{l_i} > L_{f_i} \geq \bar{w}_{l_i}$ and, therefore, $k^+(\{f_i, l_i\}) \geq 1$. ◀

Using an analogous strategy, we can show the following lemma.

► **Lemma 29.** *Let $\{f_i, l'_i, f_j\}$ denote the elements of Line 16. If the algorithm queries all three elements, then $|\{f_i, l'_i, f_j\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 2$. Otherwise, $k^+(\{f_i, l'_i\}) > 0$ and $|\{f_i, l'_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$.*

Let $\{l'_i, f_i\}$ denote the elements of Line 17. If the algorithm queries only f_i , then $|\{f_i, l'_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$ and l'_i can be contracted from the instance without querying it. Otherwise, $k^+(\{f_i, l'_i\}) > 0$ and $|\{f_i, l'_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$.

Proof. By assumption, all C_j with $j < i$ are prediction mandatory free. We claim that this implies $l'_i \notin C_j$ for all $j < i$. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there is a C_j with $j < i$ and $l'_i \in C_j$. Then, $T_L = T_U$ and $j < i$ imply that f_i and f_j have larger upper and lower limits than l'_i and, since $L_{f_i} \geq L_{f_j}$, it follows $I_{l'_i} \cap I_{f_i} \subseteq I_{l'_i} \cap I_{f_j}$. Thus, $\bar{w}_{l'_i} \in I_{f_i}$ implies $\bar{w}_{l'_i} \in I_{f_j}$, which contradicts C_j being prediction mandatory free. According to Lemma 25, $\{f_i, l'_i\}$ is a witness set.

Consider the first part of the lemma, i.e., the elements $\{f_i, l'_i, f_j\}$ of Line 16. Assume first that the algorithm queries all three elements. By Line 16, this means that $w_{l'_i} \in I_{f_i}$ and $w_{f_i} \notin I_e$ for each $e \in C_i$. According to Lemma 25, $w_{l'_i} \in I_{f_i}$ implies that f_i is part of any feasible query set. Consider the relaxed instance where f_i is already queried, then $w_{f_i} \notin I_e$ for each $e \in C_i$ implies that f_i is maximal in C_i and that the lower limit tree does not change by querying f_i . It follows that f_j is the edge with the smallest index (observe that $j > i$ must hold by the argument at the beginning of the proof) and $l'_i \in C_j$ in the relaxed instance and, by Lemma 25, $\{f_j, l'_i\}$ is a witness set. Thus, $|\{f_i, l'_i, f_j\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 2$. Next, assume that the algorithm queries only $\{f_i, l'_i\}$. Then, either $w_{l'_i} \notin I_{f_i}$ or $w_{f_i} \in I_e$ for some $e \in C_i$. If $w_{l'_i} \notin I_{f_i}$, then $w_{l'_i} \leq L_{f_i} < \bar{w}_{l'_i}$ and

$k^+(l'_i) \geq 1$ follows. If $w_{f_i} \in I_e$, then $\bar{w}_{f_i} \geq U_e > w_{f_i}$ and $k^+(f_i) \geq 1$ follows. Therefore $w_{l'_i} \notin I_{f_i}$ or $w_{f_i} \in I_e$ for some $e \in C_i$ implies $k^+(\{f_i, l'_i\}) \geq 1$.

Consider the second part of the lemma, i.e., the elements $\{f_i, l'_i\}$ of Line 17. Assume first that the algorithm queries only f_i . Clearly, $|\{f_i, l'_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$ as $\{f_i, l'_i\}$ is a witness set. Consider the cut $X_{l'_i}$. As l'_i is not queried, it follows $w_{f_i} \notin I_{l'_i}$. Furthermore, by definition of Line 17, it holds $I_{f_j} \cap I_{l'_i} = \emptyset$ for all $f_j \in X_{l'_i} \setminus \{f_i, l'_i\}$. Thus, l'_i is proven to be uniquely minimal in cut $X_{l'_i}$ and, therefore, can be contracted from the instance. Next, assume that the algorithm queries f_i and l'_i . Clearly, $|\{f_i, l'_i\} \cap \text{OPT}| \geq 1$ still holds. As l'_i is queried, we have $w_{f_i} < U_{l'_i} \geq \bar{w}_{f_i}$ and, therefore, $k^+(\{f_i, l'_i\}) \geq 1$. \blacktriangleleft

Using these three lemmas, we give a full proof of Theorem 6.

Proof of Theorem 6. Since Algorithm 3 only terminates if Line 4 determines each C_i to be prediction mandatory free, the instance after executing the algorithm is prediction mandatory free by definition and Lemma 5. All elements queried in Line 1 to ensure unique $T_L = T_U$ are mandatory by Lemma 1 and never worsen the performance guarantee.


Since the last iteration does not query in Lines 6, 10, 11, 16 and 17, the last iteration queries at most $\gamma - 2$ intervals. In the following, we consider iterations i , that are not the last iteration. Each such iteration i queries a set P_i of $\gamma - 2$ prediction mandatory elements in Line 1 and a set W_i in Line 6, 10, 11, 16 or 17. By Lemma 3, each $e \in P_i$ is either mandatory or $k^-(e) \geq 1$.

Consider an arbitrary iteration i (that is not the last one). Then, $|P_i| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap P_i| + k^-(P_i)$ by the argument above. Assume W_i was queried in Line 6, 10 or 16, then Lemmas 27–29 imply $|W_i| \leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot (|W_i \cap \text{OPT}| + k^+(W_i))$. Thus, $|W_i \cup P_i| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup P_i)| + k^+(W_i) + k^-(P_i))$. At the same time, the lemmas imply that W_i is a witness set, and, therefore, $|W_i \cup P_i| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup P_i)|$. Putting it together, we get $|W_i \cup P_i| \leq \min\{(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup P_i)| + k^+(W_i) + k^-(P_i)), \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup P_i)|\}$. Let \mathcal{K}_1 denote the union of all sets $W_i \cup P_i$ that satisfy the assumption and let J_1 denote the index set of the corresponding sets, then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{K}_1| &= \sum_{i \in J_1} |W_i \cup P_i| \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in J_1} \min\{(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup P_i)| + k^+(W_i) + k^-(P_i)), \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup P_i)|\} \\ &\leq \min\{(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{K}_1| + k^+(\mathcal{K}_1) + k^-(\mathcal{K}_1)), \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{K}_1|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that W_i was queried in Line 11 or 17. Let $e_i \in W_i$ denote the element that is queried first, and let $g(e_i)$ denote the element that either is queried second or deleted/contracted after the first query. Since each $g(e_i)$ is either queried or deleted/contracted, no such edge is considered more than once. Lemmas 28 and 29 imply $|W_i| \leq (|(W_i \cup \{g(e_i)\}) \cap \text{OPT}| + k^+(W_i))$ and $|W_i| \leq 2 \cdot |(W_i \cup \{g(e_i)\}) \cap \text{OPT}|$. Thus, $|W_i \cup P_i| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup \{g(e_i)\}) \cup P_i| + k^+(W_i) + k^-(P_i))$ and $|W_i| \leq \gamma \cdot |(W_i \cup \{g(e_i)\}) \cup P_i \cap \text{OPT}|$. Let \mathcal{K}_2 denote the union of all sets $W_i \cup P_i$ that satisfy the assumption, let J_2 denote the index set of the corresponding sets, and let \mathcal{G} denote the union of all corresponding $\{g(e_i)\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{K}_2| &= \sum_{W_i \in J_2} |W_i \cup P_i| \\ &\leq \sum_{W_i \in J_2} \min\{|\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup \{g(e_i)\}) \cup P_i| + k^+(W_i \cup P_i), \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (W_i \cup \{g(e_i)\}) \cup P_i|\} \\ &\leq \min\{|\text{OPT} \cap (\mathcal{K}_2 \cup \mathcal{G})| + k^+(\mathcal{K}_2) + k^-(\mathcal{K}_2), \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (\mathcal{K}_2 \cup \mathcal{G})|\}. \end{aligned}$$



■ **Figure 6** Uncertainty intervals for the lower bound example of Theorem 7. Red crosses indicate predicted values, and green circles show true values.

Let \mathcal{K}_3 denote the queries of the last iteration. Recall that D is the set of edges in $E \setminus \text{ALG}$ that can be deleted/contracted by the algorithm *before the final iteration*. By definition, $\mathcal{G} \subseteq D$. Furthermore, note that $|\mathcal{K}_3| \leq \gamma - 2$ and $|\mathcal{K}_3| \leq |\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{K}_3| + k^-(\mathcal{K}_3)$. Since \mathcal{K}_1 , $\mathcal{K}_2 \cup \mathcal{G}$ and \mathcal{K}_3 are pairwise disjoint, we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{ALG}_1| &= \mathcal{K}_1 + \mathcal{K}_2 + \mathcal{K}_3 \\ &\leq \min\left\{ \left(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}\right) \cdot (|\text{ALG} \cup D \cap \text{OPT}| + k^+(\text{ALG}) + k^-(\text{ALG})) \right. \\ &\quad \left. , \gamma \cdot (|\text{ALG} \cup D \cap \text{OPT}| + \gamma - 2) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

◀

D Missing proofs and examples of Section 4

► **Theorem 7.** *Let $\beta \geq 2$ be a fixed integer. For the MST problem under explorable uncertainty with predictions, there is no deterministic β -robust algorithm that is α -consistent for $\alpha < 1 + \frac{1}{\beta}$. And vice versa, no deterministic α -consistent algorithm, with $\alpha > 1$, is β -robust for $\beta < \max\{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}, 2\}$.*

Proof. Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that there is a deterministic β -robust algorithm that is α -consistent with $\alpha = 1 + \frac{1}{\beta} - \varepsilon$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the instance that consists of a single cycle with the edges e_0, e_1, \dots, e_β and uncertainty intervals as indicated in Figure 6.

The algorithm must query the edges $\{e_1, \dots, e_\beta\}$ first as otherwise, it would query $\beta + 1$ intervals in case all predictions are correct, while there is an optimal query set of size β , which would imply a consistency of $1 + \frac{1}{\beta} > \alpha$.

Suppose w.l.o.g. that the algorithm queries the edges $\{e_1, \dots, e_\beta\}$ in order of increasing indices. Consider the adversarial choice $w_{e_i} = \bar{w}_{e_i}$, for $i = 1, \dots, \beta - 1$, and then $w_{e_\beta} \in I_{e_0}$ and $w_{e_0} \notin I_{e_1} \cup \dots \cup I_{e_\beta}$. This forces the algorithm to query also I_0 , while an optimal solution only queries I_0 . Thus any such algorithm has robustness at least $\beta + 1$, a contradiction.

The second part of the theorem directly follows from the first part and the known general lower bound of 2 on the competitive ratio [23, 34]. Assume there is an α -consistent deterministic algorithm with some $\alpha = 1 + \frac{1}{\beta'}$, for some $\beta' \in [1, \infty)$. Consider the instance above with $\beta = \beta' - 1$. Then the algorithm has to query edges $\{e_1, \dots, e_\beta\}$ first to ensure α -consistency as otherwise it would have a competitive ratio of $\frac{\beta+1}{\beta} > 1 + \frac{1}{\beta'} = \alpha$ in case that all predictions are correct. By the argumentation above, the robustness factor of the algorithm is at least $\beta + 1 = \beta' = \frac{1}{\alpha-1}$. ◀

► **Lemma 10.** *Let l'_1, \dots, l'_k be the edges in $VC \cap T_L$ ordered by non-increasing upper limit and let d be such that the true value of each l'_i with $i < d$ is minimal in cut $X_{l'_i}$, then $\{l'_i, h(l'_i)\}$ is a witness set for each $i \leq d$. Let f'_1, \dots, f'_g be the edges in $VC \setminus T_L$ ordered by non-decreasing lower limit and let b be such that the true value of each f'_i with $i < b$ is maximal in cycle $C_{f'_i}$, then $\{f'_i, h(f'_i)\}$ is a witness set for each $i \leq b$.*

Proof of the second statement. Consider an arbitrary f'_i and $h(f'_i)$ with $i \leq b$. By definition of h , the edge $h(f'_i)$ is part of the lower limit tree. Let X_i be the cut between the two components of $T_L \setminus \{h(f'_i)\}$, then we claim that X_i only contains $h(f'_i)$ and edges in $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_g\}$ (and possibly irrelevant edges that do not intersect $I_{h(f'_i)}$). To see this, assume an $f_j \in \{f_1, \dots, f_l\}$ with $f_j \notin VC$ was part of X_i . Since $f_j \notin VC$, each edge in $C_j \setminus \{f_j\}$ must be part of VC as otherwise VC would not be a vertex cover. But if f_j is in cut X_i , then C_j must contain $h(f'_i)$. By definition, $h(f'_i) \notin VC$ holds which is a contradiction. We can conclude that X_i only contains $h(f'_i)$ and edges in $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_g\}$.

Now consider any feasible query set Q , then $Q_{i'-1}$ verifies an MST $T_{i'-1}$ for graph $G_{i'-1}$ where i' is the index of f'_i in the order f_1, \dots, f_l . Consider again the cut X_i . Since each $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_{i'-1}\}$ is maximal in a cycle by assumption, $h(f'_i)$ is the only edge in the cut that can be part of $T_{i'-1}$. Since one edge in the cut must be part of the MST, we can conclude that $h(f'_i) \in T_{i'-1}$. Finally, consider the cycle C in $T_{i'-1} \cup \{f'_i\}$. We can use that f'_i and $h(f'_i)$ are the only elements in $X_i \cap (T_{i'-1} \cup \{f'_i\})$ to conclude that $h(f'_i) \in C$ holds. According to Lemma 24, $\{f'_i, h(f'_i)\}$ is a witness set. ◀

► **Theorem 8.** *For every integer $\gamma \geq 2$, there exists a $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistent and γ -robust algorithm for the MST problem under explorable uncertainty with predictions.*

Proof. We show that the algorithm that first executes Algorithm 3 and then Algorithm 1 satisfies the theorem. Let $\text{ALG} = \text{ALG}_1 \cup \text{ALG}_2$ be the query set queried by the algorithm, where ALG_1 and ALG_2 are the queries of Algorithm 3 and Algorithm 1, respectively. Let $P \subseteq \text{ALG}_1$ denote the edges queried in the last iteration of Algorithm 3. Furthermore, let D denote the set of edges in $E \setminus \text{ALG}_1$ that can be deleted or contracted during the execution of Algorithm 3 before the final iteration. It follows $D \cap \text{ALG}_2 = \emptyset$.


Assume first that $\text{ALG}_2 = \emptyset$. Then, querying ALG_1 solves the problem. Theorem 6 directly implies $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistency. However, due to the additive term of $\gamma - 2$ in the second term of the minimum, the theorem does not directly imply γ -robustness. Recall that the additive term is caused exactly by the queries to P . As the algorithm executes queries in the last iteration, it follows that the instance is not solved at the beginning of the iteration (a solved instance is prediction mandatory free and would lead to direct termination). Thus, $|\text{OPT} \setminus ((\text{ALG}_1 \cup D) \setminus P)| \geq 1$ and $|P| \leq (\gamma - 2) \cdot |\text{OPT} \setminus ((\text{ALG}_1 \cup D) \setminus P)|$. Ignoring the additive term caused by P , Theorem 6 implies $|\text{ALG}_1 \setminus P| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap ((\text{ALG}_1 \cup D) \setminus P)|$. As $|\text{ALG}| = |\text{ALG}_1 \setminus P| + |P|$, adding up the inequalities implies $|\text{ALG}| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}|$.

Now, assume that $\text{ALG}_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}_1 \cup \text{OPT}_2$ be an optimal query set with $\text{OPT}_1 = \text{OPT} \cap (\text{ALG}_1 \cup D)$ and $\text{OPT}_2 = \text{OPT} \setminus (\text{ALG}_1 \cup D)$. By Theorem 9, $\text{ALG}_2 \neq \emptyset$ implies $\text{OPT}_2 \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $|\text{OPT}_2| \geq 1$. Then, Theorems 9 and 6 directly imply $|\text{ALG}_1 \setminus P| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}_1 \setminus P|$ (since the additive term in Theorem 6 is caused by P) and $|\text{ALG}_2 \cup P| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}_2|$ (since $|\text{OPT}_2| \geq 1$). Together, the inequalities imply γ -robustness.

In terms of consistency, Theorem 6 implies $|\text{ALG}_1| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot |\text{OPT}_1|$ and Theorem 8 implies $|\text{ALG}_2| = |\text{OPT}_2|$. Together, the inequalities imply $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistency. ◀


► **Example 30.** Figure 7 shows a predictions mandatory instance $G = (V, E)$. The corresponding vertex cover instance \tilde{G} is the complete bipartite graph with the partitions T_L and $E \setminus T_L$. Thus, both T_L and $E \setminus T_L$ are minimum vertex covers of size $n/2$. However, querying only l_1 and f_1 (for the true values as depicted in the figure) solves the instance. So, the size of the initial minimum vertex cover is no lower bound on $|\text{OPT}|$.

► **Example 31.** Figure 8 shows an instance $G = (V, E)$ and the corresponding vertex cover instance \tilde{G} . With the uncertainty intervals and predictions of Figure 7, the instance is prediction



■ **Figure 7** Uncertainty graph $G = (V, E)$ (left) and uncertainty intervals of G (right). The black edges $(l_1, \dots, l_{n/2})$ form the lower limit tree T_L and the blue edges $(f_1, \dots, f_{n/2})$ are the edges outside of T_L . Circles illustrate true values and crosses illustrate the predicted values.

mandatory free. Clearly, the minimum vertex cover of the vertex cover instance is $\{f_1, l_1\}$. However, for the true values of Figure 7, querying $\{f_1, l_1\}$ proves that f_1 is part of the MST but l_1 is not. After querying $\{f_1, l_1\}$, the new lower limit tree is the path $f_1, l_{n/2}, \dots, l_3, l_2, l_1$ and all edges outside of the lower limit tree connect the endpoint of the path. The resulting graph has the same form as the one in Figure 7 and the vertex cover instance is the complete bipartite graph. So, the size of the new minimum vertex cover is $(n/2) - 1$, which shows that the size of the minimum vertex cover can increase.




■ **Figure 8** Uncertainty graph $G = (V, E)$ (left) and corresponding vertex cover instance \bar{G} (right). The black edges $(l_1, \dots, l_{n/2})$ form the lower limit tree T_L .

E Missing proofs of Section 5

► **Theorem 11.** *Any deterministic algorithm for MST under explorable uncertainty with predictions has a competitive ratio $\rho \geq \min\{1 + \frac{k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, 2\}$, even for edge disjoint prediction mandatory free cycles.*

Proof. Consider the instance of Figure 9 with the three edges e_1, e_2 and e_3 of a triangle. Using the depicted predictions, the instance is prediction mandatory free by Lemma 5. Clearly, edge e_3 is part of any MST, so it remains to determine which of e_1 and e_2 has larger edge weight. If the algorithm ALG starts querying e_1 , then the adversary picks $w_{e_1} \in I_{e_2}$ and the algorithm is forced to query e_2 . Then $w_{e_2} \in I_{e_2} \setminus I_{e_1}$, so the optimum queries only e_2 . It is easy to see that $k_h = 1$ and, thus, $\frac{|\text{ALG}|}{|\text{OPT}|} = 2 = \min\{1 + \frac{k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, 2\}$. A symmetric argument holds if the algorithm starts querying e_2 . In that case, $w_{e_2} \in I_{e_1}$ and the algorithm is forced to query e_1 . Then $w_{e_1} \in I_{e_1} \setminus I_{e_2}$, so the optimum queries only e_1 . Again, $k_h = 1$ and, thus, $\frac{|\text{ALG}|}{|\text{OPT}|} = 2 = \min\{1 + \frac{k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, 2\}$. Taking multiple copies of this instance (connected by a tree structure), gives the same results for larger values of k_h . ◀



■ **Figure 9** Lower bound example for the proof of Theorem 11. Circles illustrate true values and crosses illustrate the predicted values.

► **Lemma 17.** *Let l, f be non-trivial edges in G_j such that $\{l, f\} \in \bar{E}_{j-1} \Delta \bar{E}_j$, then $k^-(l), k^-(f) \geq 1$. Furthermore, $k^+(Y_j) \geq |U|$ for the set U of all endpoints of such edges $\{l, f\}$.*

Proof. **Case $\{l, f\} \in \bar{E}_{j-1} \setminus \bar{E}_j$ for non-trivial l and f .** Assume w.l.o.g. that $l \in T_L^{j-1}$, $f \notin T_L^{j-1}$, $l \in C_f^{j-1}$, $f \in X_l^{j-1}$ and $I_l \cap I_f \neq \emptyset$, where C_f^{j-1} is the unique cycle in $T_L^{j-1} \cup \{f\}$ and X_l^{j-1} is the set of edges between the two connected components of $T_L^{j-1} \setminus \{l\}$. By Lemma 2, $l \in T_L^j$ and $f \notin T_L^j$.

Since $\{l, f\} \notin \bar{E}_j$, we have $l \notin C_f^j$ and $f \notin X_l^j$. Each cycle containing f must contain an edge of $X_l^{j-1} \setminus \{f\}$ and, therefore, there must be some $l' \in C_f^j$ with $l' \in X_l^{j-1} \setminus \{f, l\}$. This implies $l' \in T_L^j$. On the other hand, $T_L^{j-1} \cap X_l^{j-1} = \{l\}$ and, therefore, $l' \notin T_L^{j-1}$. Lemma 2 implies that l' must have been queried while transforming instance G_{j-1} into instance G_j .

As G_{j-1} is prediction mandatory free, $\bar{w}_{l'} \geq U_l > L_f$ by Lemma 5. However, $w_{l'} \leq L_f$ as $w_{l'} > L_f$ is a contradiction to T_L^j being a lower limit tree. We can conclude $\bar{w}_{l'} \geq U_l > w_{l'}$ and $\bar{w}_{l'} > L_f \geq w_{l'}$, which implies $k^-(l), k^-(f) \geq 1$.

Case $\{l, f\} \in \bar{E}_j \setminus \bar{E}_{j-1}$. W.l.o.g. assume $l \in T_L^j$ and $f \notin T_L^j$. Since l and f are non-trivial, Lemma 2 implies $e \in T_L^{j-1}$ and $f \notin T_L^{j-1}$.

Since $\{f, l\} \in \bar{E}_j$ and $f \notin T_L^j$, the definition of the vertex cover instance \bar{G}_j implies $l \in C_f^j$ such that $I_f \cap I_e \neq \emptyset$, where C_f^j is the unique cycle in $T_L^j \cup \{f\}$.

Define X_l^j to be the set of edges in the cut of G_j between the two connected components of $T_L^j \setminus \{l\}$. Remember that $f \in X_l^j$ since $f \notin T_L^j$ and $l \in C_f^j$. Since $\{f, l\} \notin \bar{E}_{j-1}$ implies $l \notin C_f^{j-1}$, there must be an element $l' \in T_L^{j-1} \cap (X_l^j \setminus \{l, f\})$ such that $l' \in C_f^{j-1}$, where C_f^{j-1} is the unique cycle in $T_L^{j-1} \cup \{f\}$.

As the instance is prediction mandatory free, $l' \in C_f^{j-1}$ implies $\bar{w}_{l'} \notin I_f$ (more precisely $\bar{w}_{l'} \leq L_f$). Further, $X_l^j \cap T_L^j = \{l\}$ holds by definition and implies $l' \notin T_L^j$. According to Lemma 2, $l' \in T_L^{j-1} \setminus T_L^j$ implies that l' must have been queried in order to transform instance G_{j-1} into instance G_j . If $w_{l'} \in I_l$, then $w_{l'} < U_l$, which implies that l does not have the smallest upper limit in cut X_l^j . This is a contradiction to T_L^j being an upper limit tree.

If $w_{l'} \notin I_l$, then also $w_{l'} \geq U_l$ ($w_{l'} \leq L_l$ cannot be the case because l' would have the smallest lower limit in X_l^j which would contradict $l' \notin T_L^j$). As $I_l \cap I_f \neq \emptyset$, we can conclude that $w_{l'} \geq U_l$ implies $w_{l'} > L_f$. It follows $\bar{w}_{l'} \leq L_f < w_{l'}$, which implies $k^-(f) \geq 1$.

Similarly, $l \in C_f^j$, $I_l \cap I_f \neq \emptyset$ and l, f being non-trivial imply $L_f < U_l$. Thus, we have $\bar{w}_{l'} \leq L_f < U_l \leq w_{l'}$, which implies $k^-(l) \geq 1$.

Since all errors of both cases are caused by elements l that have been queried to transform G_{j-1} into G_j , i.e., are contained in Y_j , the arguments in both cases also imply $k^+(Y_j) \geq |U|$ for the set U of all endpoints of edges $\{l, f\}$ that are covered by one of the cases. ◀

► **Theorem 12.** *For every integer $\gamma \geq 2$, there exists a $\min\{1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{5 \cdot k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, \gamma + 1\}$ -competitive algorithm for the MST problem under explorable uncertainty with predictions.*

We actually show a robustness of $\max\{3, \gamma + \frac{1}{|\text{OPT}|}\}$ which might be smaller than $\gamma + 1$.

Proof. Let $\text{ALG} = \text{ALG}_1 \cup \text{ALG}_2$ be the query set queried by the algorithm where ALG_1 and ALG_2 are the queries of Algorithm 3 and Algorithm 2, respectively. Let $P \subseteq \text{ALG}_1$ denote the edges queried in the last iteration of Algorithm 3. Furthermore, let D denote the set of edges in $E \setminus \text{ALG}_1$ that can be deleted or contracted during the execution of Algorithm 3 before the final iteration. It follows $D \cap \text{ALG}_2 = \emptyset$

Assume first that $\text{ALG}_2 = \emptyset$. Then, querying ALG_1 solves the problem. Theorem 6 directly implies $|\text{ALG}| = |\text{ALG}_1| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|\text{OPT} \cap (\text{ALG}_1 \cup D)| + k^+(\text{ALG}_1) + k^-(\text{ALG}_1))$ and $|\text{ALG}_1 \setminus P| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap (\text{ALG}_1 \cup D)|$ (as the additive term of $\gamma - 2$ is caused by P).

Thus, the error-dependent guarantee follows immediately. However, due to the additive term of $\gamma - 2$ in the second term of the minimum, the second inequality does not directly transfer to $|\text{ALG}|$ as $|\text{ALG}| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}|$ might not hold. Recall that the additive term is caused exactly by the queries to P . Since the algorithm executes queries in the last iteration, it follows that the instance is not solved at the beginning of the iteration (a solved instance is prediction mandatory free and would lead to direct termination). Thus, $|\text{OPT} \setminus ((\text{ALG}_1 \cup D) \setminus P)| \geq 1$ and, therefore $|P| \leq (\gamma - 2) \cdot |\text{OPT} \setminus ((\text{ALG}_1 \cup D) \setminus P)|$. Ignoring the additive term caused by P , Theorem 6 implies $|\text{ALG}_1 \setminus P| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap ((\text{ALG}_1 \cup D) \setminus P)|$. We can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{ALG}| &= |\text{ALG}_1 \setminus P| + |P| \\ &\leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT} \cap ((\text{ALG}_1 \cup D) \setminus P)| + (\gamma - 2) \cdot |\text{OPT} \setminus ((\text{ALG}_1 \cup D) \setminus P)| \\ &\leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, assume that $\text{ALG}_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let $\text{OPT} = \text{OPT}_1 \cup \text{OPT}_2$ be an optimal query set with $\text{OPT}_1 = \text{OPT} \cap (\text{ALG}_1 \cup D)$ and $\text{OPT}_2 = \text{OPT} \setminus \text{ALG}_1$. By Theorem 9, $\text{ALG}_2 \neq \emptyset$ implies $\text{OPT}_2 \neq \emptyset$. Thus, $|\text{OPT}_2| \geq 1$. Then, Theorems 6 and 13 directly imply $|\text{ALG}_1 \setminus P| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}_1 \setminus P|$ (since the additive term in Theorem 6 is caused by P) and $|\text{ALG}_2 \cup P| \leq (\gamma + 1) \cdot |\text{OPT}_2|$ (since $|\text{OPT}_2| \geq 1$). Together, the inequalities imply $|\text{ALG}| \leq (\gamma + 1) \cdot |\text{OPT}|$ and, thus $(\gamma + 1)$ -robustness.

We remark that, for $\gamma \geq 3$, the robustness improves for increasing $|\text{OPT}|$. To see this, note that if $\gamma \geq 3$, then $|\text{ALG}_2 \cup P| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}_2| + 1$ and, in combination with $|\text{ALG}_1 \setminus P| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}_1 \setminus P|$, $|\text{ALG}| \leq \gamma \cdot |\text{OPT}| + 1$. Thus, for $\gamma \geq 3$, the robustness of the algorithm is actually $\gamma + \frac{1}{|\text{OPT}|}$. For $\gamma = 2$, the robustness is $3 = \gamma + 1$. Combined, the robustness is $\max\{3, \gamma + \frac{1}{|\text{OPT}|}\}$.

We continue by showing $|\text{ALG}| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot |\text{OPT}| + 5 \cdot k_h$. Theorem 6 implies $|\text{ALG}_1| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot (|\text{OPT}_1| + 2 \cdot \max\{k^+(\text{ALG}_1), k^-(\text{ALG}_1)\})$. Since $\gamma \geq 2$, it follows $(1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot 2 \leq 5$, and we can rewrite $|\text{ALG}_1| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot |\text{OPT}_1| + 5 \cdot \max\{k^+(\text{ALG}_1), k^-(\text{ALG}_1)\}$. Theorem 13 implies $|\text{ALG}_2| \leq |\text{OPT}_2| + 5 \cdot k'_h$, where k'_h is the error for the input instance of the second phase. That is, the instance that does not contain any edge of ALG_1 since those can be deleted/contracted after the first phase. This implies for the error k_h of the complete instance that no error that is counted by $\max\{k^+(\text{ALG}_1), k^-(\text{ALG}_1)\}$ is considered by k'_h and, therefore, $\max\{k^+(\text{ALG}_1), k^-(\text{ALG}_1)\} + k'_h \leq k_h$. Thus, we can combine the inequalities to $|\text{ALG}| \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\gamma}) \cdot |\text{OPT}| + 5 \cdot k_h$. \blacktriangleleft

F Removing the integrality condition from Theorems 8 and 12

The parameter γ in Theorems 8 and 12 is restricted to integral values since it determines sizes of query sets. Nevertheless, a generalization to arbitrary rational $\gamma \geq 2$ is possible by a simple rounding of γ at a small loss in the performance guarantee.

Let $A(\gamma')$ denote the algorithm that first executes Algorithm 3 and then Algorithm 2, both with parameter $\gamma = \gamma'$. For given $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$, we run Algorithm $A(\gamma)$ and achieve the performance guarantee from Theorem 12. Assume $\gamma \notin \mathbb{Z}$, and let $\{\gamma\} := \gamma - \lfloor \gamma \rfloor = \gamma - \lceil \gamma \rceil + 1$ denote its

fractional part. We randomly chose γ' as

$$\gamma' = \begin{cases} \lceil \gamma \rceil & \text{w.p. } \{\gamma\} \\ \lfloor \gamma \rfloor & \text{w.p. } 1 - \{\gamma\}. \end{cases}$$

Then we execute Algorithm $A(\gamma')$. We show that the guarantee from Theorem 12 holds in expectation with an additive term less than 0.021 in the consistency, more precisely, we show the following result generalizing Theorem 12.

► **Theorem 32.** *For every rational $\gamma \geq 2$, there exists a randomized algorithm $\min\{1 + \frac{1}{\gamma} + \xi + \frac{5 \cdot k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}, \gamma + 1\}$ -competitive algorithm for the MST problem under explorable uncertainty, where $\xi = \frac{\{\gamma\}(1 - \{\gamma\})}{\gamma \lceil \gamma \rceil \lfloor \gamma \rfloor} \leq \frac{1}{48} < 0.021$.*

Proof. For a given $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$, we run Algorithm $A(\gamma)$ and achieve the performance guarantee from Theorem 12.

Assume $\gamma \notin \mathbb{Z}$, and the algorithm $A(\gamma')$ is executed with $\gamma' \in \{\lfloor \gamma \rfloor, \lceil \gamma \rceil\}$. For any fixed γ' , the arguments in the proof of Theorem 12 on the robustness imply that the ratio of the algorithm's number of queries $|\text{ALG}|$ and $|\text{OPT}|$ is bounded by $\gamma' + 1$. In expectation the robustness is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\gamma' + 1] &= (1 - \{\gamma\}) \cdot \lfloor \gamma \rfloor + \{\gamma\} \cdot \lceil \gamma \rceil + 1 \\ &= (1 - \{\gamma\}) \cdot (\gamma - \{\gamma\}) + \{\gamma\} \cdot (\gamma - \{\gamma\} + 1) + 1 \\ &= \gamma + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $|\text{OPT}|$ and k_h are independent of γ' , the error-dependent bound on the competitive ratio is in expectation

$$\mathbb{E}\left[1 + \frac{1}{\gamma'} + \frac{5 \cdot k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}\right] = 1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\gamma'}\right] + \frac{5 \cdot k_h}{|\text{OPT}|}.$$

Applying simple algebraic transformations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\gamma'}\right] &= \{\gamma\} \frac{1}{\lceil \gamma \rceil} + (1 - \{\gamma\}) \cdot \frac{1}{\lfloor \gamma \rfloor} - \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma \lceil \gamma \rceil \lfloor \gamma \rfloor} \cdot \left(\{\gamma\} \gamma \lceil \gamma \rceil + (1 - \{\gamma\}) \cdot \lceil \gamma \rceil \gamma - \lceil \gamma \rceil \lfloor \gamma \rfloor\right). \end{aligned}$$

As we consider fractional $\gamma > 2$, it holds $\lceil \gamma \rceil = \lfloor \gamma \rfloor + 1$. Using this, we rewrite the term in brackets as

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\gamma\} \gamma \lceil \gamma \rceil + (1 - \{\gamma\}) \cdot (\lfloor \gamma \rfloor + 1) \gamma - (\lfloor \gamma \rfloor + 1) \lfloor \gamma \rfloor \\ &= \{\gamma\} \gamma \lceil \gamma \rceil + (\lfloor \gamma \rfloor + 1) \gamma - \{\gamma\} \cdot (\lfloor \gamma \rfloor + 1) \gamma - (\lfloor \gamma \rfloor + 1) \lfloor \gamma \rfloor \\ &= (\lfloor \gamma \rfloor + 1) (\gamma - \lfloor \gamma \rfloor) - \{\gamma\} \cdot \gamma \\ &= \{\gamma\} (\lfloor \gamma \rfloor + 1 - \gamma) \\ &= \{\gamma\} (1 - \{\gamma\}), \end{aligned}$$

where the third and fourth inequality come from the fact that $\gamma - \lfloor \gamma \rfloor = \{\gamma\}$. Note that for $\{\gamma\} \geq 0$, the expression $\{\gamma\}(1 - \{\gamma\})$ is at most 1/4, where it reaches its maximum for $\{\gamma\} = 1/2$. Further, notice that for fractional $\gamma > 2$ it holds that $\gamma \lceil \gamma \rceil \lfloor \gamma \rfloor \geq 12$. We conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\gamma'}\right] \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{\{\gamma\}(1 - \{\gamma\})}{\gamma \lceil \gamma \rceil \lfloor \gamma \rfloor} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{48} < \frac{1}{\gamma} + 0.021$$

which proves the theorem. ◀

The generalized variant of Theorem 8 follows along the same lines.

► **Theorem 33.** *For every rational $\gamma \geq 2$, there exists a $(1.021 + \frac{1}{\gamma})$ -consistent and γ -robust algorithm for the MST problem under explorable uncertainty.*