Sharp Thresholds in Random Simple Temporal Graphs

Arnaud Casteigts, Michael Raskin, Malte Renken, Viktor Zamaraev

Technical University of Munich

July 4, 2022

LaBRI, University of Bordeaux; Dept. of Informatics, TU Munich; TU Berlin; Dept. of CS, University of Liverpool

Supported: ANR project ESTATE (ANR-16-CE25-0009-03), ERC H2020 grant agreement № 787367 (PaVeS), DFG project MATE (NI 369/17)

Temporal graphs and paths



Temporal graph: graph with edge presence times Temporal path: path with edges crossed at increasing presence times

Our focus: connectivity

- Multiple facets in the temporal setting
- No guarantee that one source-sink is enough
- No guarantees that spanners are small
- Bad examples exceptional or typical?

Our focus: connectivity

- Multiple facets in the temporal setting
- No guarantee that one source-sink is enough
- No guarantees that spanners are small
- Bad examples exceptional or typical?

Our focus: connectivity

- Multiple facets in the temporal setting
- No guarantee that one source-sink is enough
- No guarantees that spanners are small
- Bad examples exceptional or typical?

Transitive

- Directed graph strongly connected iff some source is a sink
- Connectivity always demonstrated by a linear subgraph (incoming + outgoing tree) Single spanning tree in undirected case
- Easy to check

- Transitive
- Directed graph strongly connected iff some source is a sink
- Connectivity always demonstrated by a linear subgraph (incoming + outgoing tree) Single spanning tree in undirected case
- Easy to check

- Transitive
- Directed graph strongly connected iff some source is a sink
- Connectivity always demonstrated by a linear subgraph (incoming + outgoing tree) Single spanning tree in undirected case
- Easy to check

- Temporal connectivity without *O*(*n*)-spanners
 - [Kempe, Kleinberg, Kumar 2000]
- Temporal connectivity by $\Theta(n^2)$ labels without $o(n^2)$ -spanners [Axiotis, Fotakis 2016]
- Ordered cliques have O(n log n)-spanners
 [Casteigts, Peters, Schoeters 2021]
- Minimal spanner: APX-hard

[Akrida, Gasieniec, Mertzios, Spirakis 2017]

- Temporal connectivity without *O*(*n*)-spanners
 - [Kempe, Kleinberg, Kumar 2000]
- Temporal connectivity by $\Theta(n^2)$ labels without $o(n^2)$ -spanners [Axiotis, Fotakis 2016]
- Ordered cliques have O(n log n)-spanners
 [Casteigts, Peters, Schoeters 2021]
- Minimal spanner: APX-hard

[Akrida, Gasieniec, Mertzios, Spirakis 2017]

- Temporal connectivity without *O*(*n*)-spanners
 - [Kempe, Kleinberg, Kumar 2000]
- Temporal connectivity by $\Theta(n^2)$ labels without $o(n^2)$ -spanners [Axiotis, Fotakis 2016]
- Ordered cliques have O(n log n)-spanners
 [Casteigts, Peters, Schoeters 2021]
- Minimal spanner: APX-hard

[Akrida, Gasieniec, Mertzios, Spirakis 2017]

Things can be complicated! ...and hard to check

Question: are these behaviours exceptional or typical?

- Similar random temporal settings Call-any gossiping, Rendezvous population protocols...
- Future interactions independent from past
- Connectivity happens soon $(\approx 1.5 n \log n \text{ edges expected value})$
- Spanners?
- Simple temporal graphs: no repetitions implications?

- Similar random temporal settings Call-any gossiping, Rendezvous population protocols...
- Future interactions independent from past
- Connectivity happens soon $(\approx 1.5 n \log n \text{ edges expected value})$
- Spanners?
- Simple temporal graphs: no repetitions implications?

- Similar random temporal settings Call-any gossiping, Rendezvous population protocols...
- Future interactions independent from past
- Connectivity happens soon $(\approx 1.5 n \log n \text{ edges expected value})$
- Spanners?
- Simple temporal graphs: no repetitions implications?

- Similar random temporal settings Call-any gossiping, Rendezvous population protocols...
- Future interactions independent from past
- Connectivity happens soon ($\approx 1.5 n \log n$ edges expected value)
- Spanners?
- Simple temporal graphs: no repetitions implications?

- Simple: each edge has one label Labels are distinct
- Main model we study: RSTG
- Equivalent representations
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ (Erdős–Rényi random graph) with random edge order
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with random edge labels from [0;1]
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with random edge labels from [0; p]
 - K_n (clique) random edge labels from [0;1], edges after p removed
- Notation: $\mathcal{F}_{n,p}$
- When things happen as p grows for fixed labelling of K_n ?

- Simple: each edge has one label Labels are distinct
- Main model we study: RSTG
- Equivalent representations
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ (Erdős–Rényi random graph) with random edge order
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with random edge labels from [0;1]
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with random edge labels from [0; p]
 - K_n (clique) random edge labels from [0;1], edges after p removed

• Notation: $\mathcal{F}_{n,p}$

• When things happen as p grows for fixed labelling of K_n ?

- Simple: each edge has one label Labels are distinct
- Main model we study: RSTG
- Equivalent representations
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ (Erdős–Rényi random graph) with random edge order
 - $\mathcal{G}_{\textit{n},\textit{p}}$ with random edge labels from [0;1]
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with random edge labels from [0; p]
 - K_n (clique) random edge labels from [0;1], edges after p removed
- Notation: $\mathcal{F}_{n,p}$
- When things happen as p grows for fixed labelling of K_n ?

- Simple: each edge has one label Labels are distinct
- Main model we study: RSTG
- Equivalent representations
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ (Erdős–Rényi random graph) with random edge order
 - $\mathcal{G}_{\textit{n},\textit{p}}$ with random edge labels from [0;1]
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with random edge labels from [0; p]
 - K_n (clique) random edge labels from [0;1], edges after p removed
- Notation: $\mathcal{F}_{n,p}$
- When things happen as p grows for fixed labelling of K_n ?

- Simple: each edge has one label Labels are distinct
- Main model we study: RSTG
- Equivalent representations
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ (Erdős–Rényi random graph) with random edge order
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with random edge labels from [0;1]
 - $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ with random edge labels from [0; p]
 - K_n (clique) random edge labels from [0;1], edges after p removed
- Notation: $\mathcal{F}_{n,p}$
- When things happen as p grows for fixed labelling of K_n ?

Similar behaviour

Few edges get actually repeated

- But independence of past and future is destroyed
- Weak dependencies
- We handle these (now working to handle more)

- $\frac{1}{n}$: footprint gets linear-size connected component
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: footprint gets connected
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: most pairs get connectivity
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: (current WIP) n o(n) vertices get pairwise connectivity
- $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: first temporal source
- $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: most vertices temporal sources
- 3 log n/n: all vertices temporal sources (graph is temporally connected)

- $\frac{1}{n}$: footprint gets linear-size connected component
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: footprint gets connected
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: most pairs get connectivity
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: (current WIP) n o(n) vertices get pairwise connectivity
- $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: first temporal source
- $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: most vertices temporal sources
- $\frac{3\log n}{n}$: all vertices temporal sources (graph is temporally connected)

- $\frac{1}{n}$: footprint gets linear-size connected component
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: footprint gets connected
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: most pairs get connectivity
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: (current WIP) n o(n) vertices get pairwise connectivity
- $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: first temporal source
- $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: most vertices temporal sources
- $\frac{3\log n}{n}$: all vertices temporal sources (graph is temporally connected)

- $\frac{1}{n}$: footprint gets linear-size connected component
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: footprint gets connected
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: most pairs get connectivity
- $\frac{\log n}{n}$: (current WIP) n o(n) vertices get pairwise connectivity
- $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: first temporal source
- $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: most vertices temporal sources
- $\frac{3 \log n}{n}$: all vertices temporal sources (graph is temporally connected)

•
$$\frac{\log n}{n}$$
: $\forall u : \forall v : \mathbf{a.a.s.} u \rightsquigarrow v$
• $\frac{2\log n}{n}$: $\forall u : \mathbf{a.a.s.} \forall v : u \rightsquigarrow v$
• $\frac{3\log n}{n}$: $\mathbf{a.a.s.} \forall u : \forall v : u \rightsquigarrow v$

- $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ has $(1.5+o(1))n\log n$ edges...
- Can we go smaller?
- Need at least 2n 4 labels
- Optimal spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(4+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ Current work in progress: but not earlier
- 2n + o(n)-spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$

- $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ has $(1.5+o(1))n\log n$ edges...
- Can we go smaller?
- Need at least 2n 4 labels
- Optimal spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(4+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ Current work in progress: but not earlier
- 2n + o(n)-spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$

- $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ has $(1.5+o(1))n\log n$ edges...
- Can we go smaller?
- Need at least 2n 4 labels
- Optimal spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(4+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ Current work in progress: but not earlier
- 2n + o(n)-spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$

- $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ has $(1.5+o(1))n\log n$ edges...
- Can we go smaller?
- Need at least 2n 4 labels
- Optimal spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(4+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ Current work in progress: but not earlier
- 2n + o(n)-spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$

- $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ has $(1.5+o(1))n\log n$ edges...
- Can we go smaller?
- Need at least 2n 4 labels
- Optimal spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(4+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$ Current work in progress: but not earlier
- 2n + o(n)-spanner exists in $\mathcal{F}_{n,(3+o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}}$

•
$$\frac{3\log n}{n}$$
: $2n + o(n)$ -spanner
• $\frac{4\log n}{n}$: $2n - 4$ -spanner

Timeline



Timeline



(With WIP results)

- Normally takes $\frac{\log n}{n}$ time and $O(\log n)$ hops for $u \rightsquigarrow v$
- But a vertex can «sleep» with not edges for some time
- Longest observed sleeping time: $\frac{\log n}{n}$
- Sleep determines extra $\frac{\log n}{n}$ per shift of **a.a.s.**!

Building block for larger construction Tree of temporal paths

- Start with a single vertex advanced version: and some starting time
- Add earliest later edge that adds a new vertex to tree
- Repeat

Same can be done in reverse

- Temporal paths between all vertices
- Short temporal paths between all vertices
- Pivot vertex
- Reaches almost everything in $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$, reaches everything in $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Two large trees of temporal paths: almost source from $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$, almost sink by $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Earliest paths to pivot / latest paths from pivot for the rest
- Still not enough for full connectivity, connect directly
- Make sure this has $(2 + o(1)) \frac{\log n}{n}$ edges

- Temporal paths between all vertices
- Short temporal paths between all vertices
- Pivot vertex
- Reaches almost everything in $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$, reaches everything in $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Two large trees of temporal paths: almost source from $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$, almost sink by $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Earliest paths to pivot / latest paths from pivot for the rest
- Still not enough for full connectivity, connect directly
- Make sure this has $(2 + o(1)) \frac{\log n}{n}$ edges

- Temporal paths between all vertices
- Short temporal paths between all vertices
- Pivot vertex
- Reaches almost everything in $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$, reaches everything in $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Two large trees of temporal paths: almost source from $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$, almost sink by $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Earliest paths to pivot / latest paths from pivot for the rest
- Still not enough for full connectivity, connect directly
- Make sure this has $(2 + o(1)) \frac{\log n}{n}$ edges

- Temporal paths between all vertices
- Short temporal paths between all vertices
- Pivot vertex
- Reaches almost everything in $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$, reaches everything in $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Two large trees of temporal paths: almost source from $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$, almost sink by $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Earliest paths to pivot / latest paths from pivot for the rest
- Still not enough for full connectivity, connect directly
- Make sure this has $(2 + o(1)) \frac{\log n}{n}$ edges

- Temporal paths between all vertices
- Short temporal paths between all vertices
- Pivot vertex
- Reaches almost everything in $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$, reaches everything in $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Two large trees of temporal paths: almost source from $\approx 2 \frac{\log n}{n}$, almost sink by $\approx 1 \frac{\log n}{n}$
- Earliest paths to pivot / latest paths from pivot for the rest
- Still not enough for full connectivity, connect directly
- Make sure this has $(2 + o(1)) \frac{\log n}{n}$ edges

- Obstacles to small spanners and early connectivity are rare
- In random simple temporal graphs nearly optimal spanners appear nearly immediately after connectivity
- Weak dependencies can be handled

Thanks for your attention!

Questions?

- Obstacles to small spanners and early connectivity are rare
- In random simple temporal graphs nearly optimal spanners appear nearly immediately after connectivity
- Weak dependencies can be handled