

Multiflows under Protocol Interference Model

Peng-Jun Wan

wan@cs.iit.edu

- Introduction
- Adaptive Zero-Sum Game
- Weak Dualities
- Flow Augmentation Methods
- Extensions to Budgeted Variants

- Multihop wireless network: (V, A, \mathcal{I})

- Multihop wireless network: (V, A, \mathcal{I})
- k unicast requests.

- Multihop wireless network: (V, A, \mathcal{I})
- k unicast requests.
- \mathcal{F}_j : the set of flows of the j -th request

- Multihop wireless network: (V, A, \mathcal{I})
- k unicast requests.
- \mathcal{F}_j : the set of flows of the j -th request
- \mathcal{P}_j : the set of paths of the j -th request

- Multihop wireless network: (V, A, \mathcal{I})
- k unicast requests.
- \mathcal{F}_j : the set of flows of the j -th request
- \mathcal{P}_j : the set of paths of the j -th request
- A k -flow is a sequence $f = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k \rangle$ with $f_j \in \mathcal{F}_j \forall j \in [k]$

Theorem

*If there is a polynomial (respectively, a polynomial μ -approximation) algorithm for **MWISL**, then there exist polynomial time μ -approximate algorithms for all four variants of multifold problems.*

Theorem

All four variants of multiflow problems under protocol interference model have a PTAS.

Approximation-Preserving Reduction to Polynomial Approximate Capacity Subregions

Theorem

If there exists a polynomial μ -approximate capacity subregion, then there exist polynomial time μ -approximate algorithms for each of the four variants of multiflow problems.

Ω : capacity region

MWMF

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{j=1}^k w_j \text{val}(f_j) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f_j \in \mathcal{F}_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k \\ & \sum_{j=1}^k f_j \in \Omega \end{aligned}$$

MCMF

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \phi \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f_j \in \mathcal{F}_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k \\ & \text{val}(f_j) \geq \phi w_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k \\ & \sum_{j=1}^k f_j \in \Omega \end{aligned}$$

Maximum Restricted Multiflow

Φ : a poly. μ -approx. capacity subregion

Φ -restricted **MWMF**

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{j=1}^k w_j \text{val}(f_j) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f_j \in \mathcal{F}_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k \\ & \sum_{j=1}^k f_j \in \Phi \end{aligned}$$

Φ -restricted **MCMF**

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \phi \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & f_j \in \mathcal{F}_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k \\ & \text{val}(f_j) \geq \phi w_j, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k \\ & \sum_{j=1}^k f_j \in \Phi \end{aligned}$$

Maximum Restricted Multiflow

- Step 1: solve the Φ -restricted LP to obtain a k -flow $f = \langle f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k \rangle$,
- Step 2: compute a fractional link schedule \mathcal{S} of $\sum_{j=1}^k f_j$
- Step 3: scale f and \mathcal{S} by a factor $1 / \|\mathcal{S}\|$
- approximation bound: μ

Approximation Bounds

Restrictions to the polynomial capacity subregions constructed in the previous chapter yield the following approximation bounds:

- $2 \left(\lceil \pi / \arcsin \frac{c-1}{2c} \rceil - 1 \right)$ in general,
- $\left\lceil \frac{r+1}{h(r)} \right\rceil + 1$ with uniform interference radii.

Flow Augmentation Method for MWMF

- Parameters:

Flow Augmentation Method for MWMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ

Flow Augmentation Method for MWMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ
 - $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$: the trade-off parameter

Flow Augmentation Method for MWMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ
 - $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$: the trade-off parameter
- **Flow Augmentation Stage:** Compute a k -flow f s.t.

$$\frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

Flow Augmentation Method for MWMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ
 - $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$: the trade-off parameter
- Flow Augmentation Stage**: Compute a k -flow f s.t.

$$\frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

- Link-Scheduling Stage**: Compute a link schedule \mathcal{S} of x with **GLS**.

Flow Augmentation Method for MWMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ
 - $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$: the trade-off parameter
- **Flow Augmentation Stage**: Compute a k -flow f s.t.

$$\frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

- **Link-Scheduling Stage**: Compute a link schedule \mathcal{S} of x with **GLS**.
- **Scaling Stage**: Scale both Π and \mathcal{S} by a factor $1 / \|\mathcal{S}\|$ and then return them.

Approximation Bound

- $2(1 + \varepsilon) \mu$ in general:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\|\mathcal{S}\|} &\geq \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\Delta^* \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \\ &\geq \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{2\Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{2(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Approximation Bound

- $2(1 + \varepsilon) \mu$ in general:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\|\mathcal{S}\|} &\geq \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\Delta^* \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \\ &\geq \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{2\Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{2(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}. \end{aligned}$$

- $(1 + \varepsilon) \mu$ if D is acyclic:

$$\frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\|\mathcal{S}\|} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

Flow Augmentation Method for MCMF

- Parameters:

Flow Augmentation Method for MCMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ

Flow Augmentation Method for MCMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ
 - $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$: the trade-off parameter

Flow Augmentation Method for MCMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ
 - $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$: the trade-off parameter
- Flow Augmentation Stage:** Compute a k -flow f s.t.

$$\frac{\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{val}(f_j)}{w_j}}{\Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

Flow Augmentation Method for MCMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ
 - $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$: the trade-off parameter
- **Flow Augmentation Stage**: Compute a k -flow f s.t.

$$\frac{\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{val}(f_j)}{w_j}}{\Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

- **Link-Scheduling Stage**: Compute a link schedule \mathcal{S} of x with **GLS**.

Flow Augmentation Method for MCMF

- Parameters:
 - D : an orientation of D with ILIN μ
 - $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$: the trade-off parameter
- Flow Augmentation Stage**: Compute a k -flow f s.t.

$$\frac{\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{val}(f_j)}{w_j}}{\Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

- Link-Scheduling Stage**: Compute a link schedule \mathcal{S} of x with **GLS**.
- Scaling Stage**: Scale both Π and \mathcal{S} by a factor $1 / \|\mathcal{S}\|$ and then return them.

Technical Issues Yet to Be addressed

- How to define an appropriate interference costs of links and paths?
- How much flow should be routed along those cheapest paths?

- Introduction
- **Adaptive Zero-Sum Game**
- Weak Dualities
- Flow Augmentation Methods
- Extensions to Budgeted Variants

Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Players: an agent and a set E of m loss-incurring adversaries.

Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Players: an agent and a set E of m loss-incurring adversaries.
- Rules in each sequential game round:

Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Players: an agent and a set E of m loss-incurring adversaries.
- Rules in each sequential game round:
 - The agent declares an *adaptive binding strategy* in terms of probabilistic distribution on adversaries.

Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Players: an agent and a set E of m loss-incurring adversaries.
- Rules in each sequential game round:
 - The agent declares an *adaptive binding strategy* in terms of probabilistic distribution on adversaries.
 - The adversaries picks their losses subjected to the **Normalization Rule**: the maximum value of the individual losses = 1.

Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Players: an agent and a set E of m loss-incurring adversaries.
- Rules in each sequential game round:
 - The agent declares an *adaptive binding strategy* in terms of probabilistic distribution on adversaries.
 - The adversaries picks their losses subjected to the **Normalization Rule**: the maximum value of the individual losses = 1.
 - The agent collects the profit according to the **Zero-Sum Rule**: the profit = expected loss of the adversaries w.r.t the agent's binding strategy.

Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Players: an agent and a set E of m loss-incurring adversaries.
- Rules in each sequential game round:
 - The agent declares an *adaptive binding strategy* in terms of probabilistic distribution on adversaries.
 - The adversaries picks their losses subjected to the **Normalization Rule**: the maximum value of the individual losses = 1.
 - The agent collects the profit according to the **Zero-Sum Rule**: the profit = expected loss of the adversaries w.r.t the agent's binding strategy.
- Objective: to realize asap maximum cumulative loss of adversaries $\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \times$ cumulative profit of the agent.

Exponential Binding Strategies

- $L(e)$: the cumulative loss of $e \in E$ at the beginning of a round
- The probability of $e \in E$: $\propto (1 + \varepsilon)^{L(e)}$.

Repeat

$$t = \left\lceil \frac{m \ln m}{\ln(1 + \varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}} \right\rceil$$

rounds:

- 1 **Declaration of exponential binding strategies by agent**

Repeat

$$t = \left\lceil \frac{m \ln m}{\ln(1 + \varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}} \right\rceil$$

rounds:

- 1 **Declaration of exponential binding strategies** by agent
- 2 **Generation of loss** by adversary s.t. the **Normalization Rule**

Analysis of The Game

$t = O(\varepsilon^{-2} m \ln m)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(1 + \varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} &= -\ln\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{2} (1 + 1/\varepsilon)^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Analysis of The Game

$t = O(\varepsilon^{-2} m \ln m)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\ln(1 + \varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} &= -\ln\left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{2} (1 + 1/\varepsilon)^{-2}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem

At the end of the game, the maximum cumulative loss of the adversaries is at most $1 + \varepsilon$ times the cumulative profit of the agent.

Analysis of The Game

- For each round $r \in [t]$

Analysis of The Game

- For each round $r \in [t]$
 - $L_r(e)$: cumulative loss of $e \in E$ at the end of round r

Analysis of The Game

- For each round $r \in [t]$
 - $L_r(e)$: cumulative loss of $e \in E$ at the end of round r
 - l_r : cumulative profit of the agent at the end of round r

Analysis of The Game

- For each round $r \in [t]$
 - $L_r(e)$: cumulative loss of $e \in E$ at the end of round r
 - l_r : cumulative profit of the agent at the end of round r
- $L_0(e) = 0, \forall e \in E; l_0 = 0.$

Analysis of The Game

- For each round $r \in [t]$
 - $L_r(e)$: cumulative loss of $e \in E$ at the end of round r
 - ℓ_r : cumulative profit of the agent at the end of round r
- $L_0(e) = 0, \forall e \in E; \ell_0 = 0.$
- $y_r(e) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{L_r(e)}$: $\forall 0 \leq r \leq t$ and $\forall e \in E$

Analysis of The Game

- For each round $r \in [t]$
 - $L_r(e)$: cumulative loss of $e \in E$ at the end of round r
 - ℓ_r : cumulative profit of the agent at the end of round r
- $L_0(e) = 0, \forall e \in E; \ell_0 = 0.$
- $y_r(e) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{L_r(e)}: \forall 0 \leq r \leq t$ and $\forall e \in E$
- **Zero-Sum Rule**

$$\ell_r - \ell_{r-1} = \sum_{e \in E} \frac{y_{r-1}(e)}{y_{r-1}(E)} (L_r(e) - L_{r-1}(e)).$$

Analysis of The Game

$$\begin{aligned}y_r(E) &= \sum_{e \in E} y_r(e) = \sum_{e \in E} y_{r-1}(e) (1 + \varepsilon)^{L_r(e) - L_{r-1}(e)} \\&\leq \sum_{e \in E} y_{r-1}(e) (1 + \varepsilon (L_r(e) - L_{r-1}(e))) \\&= \sum_{e \in E} y_{r-1}(e) + \varepsilon \sum_{e \in E} y_{r-1}(e) (L_r(e) - L_{r-1}(e)) \\&= y_{r-1}(E) \left(1 + \varepsilon \sum_{e \in E} \frac{y_{r-1}(e)}{y_{r-1}(E)} (L_r(e) - L_{r-1}(e)) \right) \\&= y_{r-1}(E) (1 + \varepsilon (\ell_r - \ell_{r-1})) \\&\leq y_{r-1}(E) \exp(\varepsilon (\ell_r - \ell_{r-1})).\end{aligned}$$

Analysis of The Game

$$y_t(E) \leq y_0(E) \prod_{r=1}^t \exp(\varepsilon(\ell_r - \ell_{r-1})) = m \exp(\varepsilon \ell_t).$$

Analysis of The Game

$$y_t(E) \leq y_0(E) \prod_{r=1}^t \exp(\varepsilon(\ell_r - \ell_{r-1})) = m \exp(\varepsilon \ell_t).$$

$$\varepsilon \ell_t \geq \ln \frac{y_t(E)}{m} \geq \ln \frac{y_t(e)}{m} = L_t(e) \ln(1 + \varepsilon) - \ln m, \forall e \in E$$

Analysis of The Game

e : an adversary with the largest cumulative loss

$$L_t(e) \geq \frac{t}{m} \geq \frac{\ln m}{\ln(1 + \varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon}}.$$

Analysis of The Game

e : an adversary with the largest cumulative loss

$$L_t(e) \geq \frac{t}{m} \geq \frac{\ln m}{\ln(1+\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}}.$$

$$L_t(e) \ln(1+\varepsilon) - \ln m \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} L_t(e).$$

Analysis of The Game

e : an adversary with the largest cumulative loss

$$L_t(e) \geq \frac{t}{m} \geq \frac{\ln m}{\ln(1+\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}}.$$

$$L_t(e) \ln(1+\varepsilon) - \ln m \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} L_t(e).$$

$$\varepsilon \ell_t \geq L_t(e) \ln(1+\varepsilon) - \ln m \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} L_t(e)$$

Analysis of The Game

e : an adversary with the largest cumulative loss

$$L_t(e) \geq \frac{t}{m} \geq \frac{\ln m}{\ln(1+\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}}.$$

$$L_t(e) \ln(1+\varepsilon) - \ln m \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} L_t(e).$$

$$\varepsilon \ell_t \geq L_t(e) \ln(1+\varepsilon) - \ln m \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} L_t(e)$$

$$L_t(e) \leq (1+\varepsilon) \ell_t.$$

- Introduction
- Adaptive Zero-Sum Game
- **Weak Dualities**
- Flow Augmentation Methods
- Extensions to Budgeted Variants

- y : positive function on A

- y : positive function on A
- \hat{y} : length function on A induced by y

$$\hat{y}(a) = y(N_D^{out}[a])$$

- y : positive function on A
- \hat{y} : length function on A induced by y

$$\hat{y}(a) = y(N_D^{out}[a])$$

- $dist_j(\hat{y}) \forall j \in [k]$: length of a shortest j -path w.r.t. \hat{y}

- The weight of the maximum weighted multiflow

$$\leq \mu_y(A) \max_{j \in [k]} \frac{w_j}{\text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}.$$

- The weight of the maximum weighted multiflow

$$\leq \mu y(A) \max_{j \in [k]} \frac{w_j}{\text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}.$$

- The concurrency of the maximum concurrent multiflow is at most

$$\leq \mu \frac{y(A)}{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}.$$

Path-Flow Decomposition

A non-negative function x on $\bigcup_{j \in [k]} \mathcal{P}_j$ is said to be a *path-flow decomposition* of a multiflow $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$ if

$$f_j(a) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} |\{a\} \cap P| x(P), \forall a \in A, j \in [k]$$

Path-Flow Decomposition

A non-negative function x on $\bigcup_{j \in [k]} \mathcal{P}_j$ is said to be a *path-flow decomposition* of a multiflow $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$ if

$$f_j(a) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} |\{a\} \cap P| x(P), \forall a \in A, j \in [k]$$

Lemma

For any path-flow decomposition x of a multiflow $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$,

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \hat{y}(P) = \sum_{a \in A} y(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(N_D^{in}[a])$$

Path-Flow Decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \hat{y}(P) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \sum_{b \in P} \hat{y}(b) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \sum_{b \in P} y(N_D^{\text{out}}[b]) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \sum_{b \in A} |\{b\} \cap P| y(N_D^{\text{out}}[b]) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \sum_{b \in A} |\{b\} \cap P| \sum_{a \in N_D^{\text{out}}[b]} y(a) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \sum_{b \in A} |\{b\} \cap P| \sum_{a \in A} y(a) |\{b\} \cap N_D^{\text{in}}[a]| \end{aligned}$$

Path-Flow Decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \sum_{b \in A} |\{b\} \cap P| \sum_{a \in A} y(a) |\{b\} \cap N_D^{\text{in}}[a]| \\ &= \sum_{a \in A} y(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{b \in A} |\{b\} \cap N_D^{\text{in}}[a]| \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} |\{b\} \cap P| x(P) \\ &= \sum_{a \in A} y(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{b \in A} |\{b\} \cap N_D^{\text{in}}[a]| f_j(b) \\ &= \sum_{a \in A} y(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{b \in N_D^{\text{in}}[a]} f_j(b) \\ &= \sum_{a \in A} y(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(N_D^{\text{in}}[a]), \end{aligned}$$

Lemma

For any feasible multiflow $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$,

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j) \leq \mu y(A)$$

Lemma

For any feasible multiflow $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$,

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j) \leq \mu y(A)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \hat{y}(P) &\geq \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) = \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma

For any feasible multiflow $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$,

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j) \leq \mu y(A)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \hat{y}(P) &\geq \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \\ &= \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) = \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j). \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{a \in A} y(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(N_D^{\text{in}}[a]) \leq \Delta_D^{\text{in}} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right) \sum_{b \in A} y(a) \leq \mu y(A).$$

Weak Duality for MWMF

$f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a maximum weighted multiflow

$$\begin{aligned}\mu y(A) &\geq \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j) = \sum_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}{w_j} w_j \text{val}(f_j) \\ &\geq \left(\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}{w_j} \right) \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)\end{aligned}$$

Weak Duality for MWMF

$f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a maximum weighted multiflow

$$\mu y(A) \geq \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j) = \sum_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}{w_j} w_j \text{val}(f_j)$$

$$\geq \left(\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}{w_j} \right) \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)$$

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j) \leq \mu \frac{y(A)}{\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}{w_j}}$$

Weak Duality for MCMF

$f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a maximum concurrent multifold

$$\begin{aligned} \mu y(A) &\geq \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j) = \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \frac{\text{val}(f_j)}{w_j} \\ &\geq \left(\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{val}(f_j)}{w_j} \right) \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \end{aligned}$$

Weak Duality for MCMF

$f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a maximum concurrent multiflow

$$\begin{aligned}\mu y(A) &\geq \sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j) = \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \frac{\text{val}(f_j)}{w_j} \\ &\geq \left(\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{val}(f_j)}{w_j} \right) \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y})\end{aligned}$$

$$\min_{j \in [k]} \frac{\text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}{w_j} \leq \mu \frac{y(A)}{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}$$

- Introduction
- Adaptive Zero-Sum Game
- Weak Dualities
- **Flow Augmentation Methods**
- Extensions to Budgeted Variants

Interference-Aware Congestion, Costs, and Lengths

- $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a multifold

Interference-Aware Congestion, Costs, and Lengths

- $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a multifold
- *congestion* of a link a due to f : $\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j (N_D^{in}[a])$

Interference-Aware Congestion, Costs, and Lengths

- $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a multifold
- *congestion* of a link a due to f : $\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j (N_D^{in}[a])$
- *congestion cost* of a link a due to f : $y_f(a) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j (N_D^{in}[a])}$

Interference-Aware Congestion, Costs, and Lengths

- $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a multifold
- *congestion* of a link a due to f : $\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j (N_D^{in}[a])$
- *congestion cost* of a link a due to f : $y_f(a) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j (N_D^{in}[a])}$
- *length* of a link a due to f : $\hat{y}_f(a) = y_f(N_D^{out}[a])$.

Flow Augmentation Stage for MWMF

```
 $\forall j \in [k], f_j \leftarrow \mathbf{0};$   
repeat  $\left\lceil \frac{m \ln m}{\ln(1+\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \right\rceil$  times  
   $\forall j \in [k], P_j \leftarrow$  a shortest  $j$ -path w.r.t.  $\hat{y}_f$ ;  
   $j \leftarrow \arg \max_{j \in [k]} \frac{w_j}{\hat{y}_f(P_j)}$ ;  
   $\delta \leftarrow \frac{1}{\max_{a \in A} |P_j \cap N_D^{\text{in}}[a]|}$ ;  
   $\forall a \in P_j, f_j(a) \leftarrow f_j(a) + \delta$ ;
```

Interpretation As An Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Each link $a \in A$ corresponds to an adversary

Interpretation As An Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Each link $a \in A$ corresponds to an adversary
- The cumulative loss of $a =$ its interference-aware *congestion* due to the current f

Interpretation As An Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Each link $a \in A$ corresponds to an adversary
- The cumulative loss of $a =$ its interference-aware *congestion* due to the current f
- σ is determined by the **Normalization Rule**: the loss of each link a is

$$\delta |P_j \cap N_D^{in}[a]|.$$

- By **Zero-Sum Rule**, the agent earns a profit in a round

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{y_f(A)} \sum_{a \in A} y_f(a) \delta |P_j \cap N_D^{in}[a]| &= \frac{\delta}{y_f(A)} \hat{y}_f(P_j) \\ &= \frac{\delta w_j}{y_f(A)} \frac{dist_j(\hat{y}_f)}{w_j} \leq \mu \frac{\delta w_j}{opt}. \end{aligned}$$

- By **Zero-Sum Rule**, the agent earns a profit in a round

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{y_f(A)} \sum_{a \in A} y_f(a) \delta |P_j \cap N_D^{in}[a]| &= \frac{\delta}{y_f(A)} \hat{y}_f(P_j) \\ &= \frac{\delta w_j}{y_f(A)} \frac{dist_j(\hat{y}_f)}{w_j} \leq \mu \frac{\delta w_j}{opt}. \end{aligned}$$

- At the end of the last round, the cumulative profit of the agent is at most

$$\mu \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j val(f_j)}{opt}.$$

Profit vs. Maximum Loss

$$\Delta_D^{in} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mu \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\text{opt}}$$

Profit vs. Maximum Loss

$$\Delta_D^{in} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mu \frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\text{opt}}$$

$$\frac{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{val}(f_j)}{\Delta_D^{in} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{\text{opt}}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

Flow Augmentation Stage for MCMF

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall j \in [k], f_j \leftarrow \mathbf{0}; \\ & \text{repeat } \left\lceil \frac{m \ln m}{\ln(1+\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \right\rceil \text{ times} \\ & \quad \forall j \in [k], P_j \leftarrow \text{a shortest } j\text{-path w.r.t. } \hat{y}_f; \\ & \quad \sigma \leftarrow \frac{1}{\max_{a \in A} \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j |N_D^{\text{in}}[a] \cap P_j|}; \\ & \quad \forall j \in [k] \text{ and } a \in P_j, f_j(a) \leftarrow f_j(a) + \sigma w_j; \end{aligned}$$

Interpretation As An Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Each link $a \in A$ corresponds to an adversary

Interpretation As An Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Each link $a \in A$ corresponds to an adversary
- The cumulative loss of $a =$ its interference-aware *congestion* due to the current f

Interpretation As An Adaptive Zero-Sum Game

- Each link $a \in A$ corresponds to an adversary
- The cumulative loss of a = its interference-aware *congestion* due to the current f
- σ is determined by the **Normalization Rule**: the loss of each link a is

$$\sigma \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j |P_j \cap N_D^{in}[a]|.$$

- By **Zero-Sum Rule**, the agent earns a profit in a round

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{y_f(A)} \sum_{a \in A} y_f(a) \sigma \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j |P_j \cap N_D^{in}[a]| \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{y_f(A)} \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \hat{y}_f(P_j) = \frac{\sigma}{y_f(A)} \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}_f) \leq \mu \frac{\sigma}{\text{opt}}. \end{aligned}$$

- By **Zero-Sum Rule**, the agent earns a profit in a round

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{y_f(A)} \sum_{a \in A} y_f(a) \sigma \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j |P_j \cap N_D^{in}[a]| \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{y_f(A)} \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \hat{y}_f(P_j) = \frac{\sigma}{y_f(A)} \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}_f) \leq \mu \frac{\sigma}{\text{opt}}. \end{aligned}$$

- At the end of the last round, the cumulative profit of the agent is at most

$$\mu \frac{\min_{j \in [k]} \text{val}(f_j) / w_j}{\text{opt}},$$

Profit vs. Maximum Loss

$$\Delta_D^{in} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mu \frac{\min_{j \in [k]} \text{val}(f_j) / w_j}{opt}$$

$$\Delta_D^{in} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mu \frac{\min_{j \in [k]} \text{val}(f_j) / w_j}{opt}$$

$$\frac{\min_{j \in [k]} \text{val}(f_j) / w_j}{\Delta_D^{in} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right)} \geq \frac{opt}{(1 + \varepsilon) \mu}.$$

- Introduction
- Adaptive Zero-Sum Game
- Weak Dualities
- Flow Augmentation Methods
- Extensions to Budgeted Variants

Flow Augmentation Method for Budgeted Multiflows

```
// Flow Augmentation Stage
```

```
:
```

```
// Link-Scheduling Stage
```

```
 $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow$  the greedy link schedule of  $\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j$ ;
```

```
// Scaling Stage
```

```
 $f \leftarrow \frac{1}{\max\{\|\mathcal{S}\|, \sum_{a \in A} g(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(a)\}} f$ ;
```

```
 $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \frac{1}{\max\{\|\mathcal{S}\|, \sum_{a \in A} g(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(a)\}} \mathcal{S}$ ;
```

```
Output  $f$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ .
```

A Virtual Link Representing Budget Constraint

- g : flow expense function of A

A Virtual Link Representing Budget Constraint

- g : flow expense function of A
- “virtual” link a^+ : disjoint from all links in A

A Virtual Link Representing Budget Constraint

- g : flow expense function of A
- “virtual” link a^+ : disjoint from all links in A
- $A^+ = A \cup \{a^+\}$

- y : positive function on A^+

- y : positive function on A^+
- \hat{y} : length function on A induced by y :

$$\hat{y}(a) = y(N_D^{out}[a]) + y(a^+)g(a)$$

- y : positive function on A^+
- \hat{y} : length function on A induced by y :

$$\hat{y}(a) = y(N_D^{out}[a]) + y(a^+)g(a)$$

- $dist_j(\hat{y}) \forall j \in [k]$: length of a shortest j -path w.r.t. \hat{y}

- The weight of the budgeted maximum weighted multiflow

$$\leq \mu \frac{y(A^+)}{\min_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) / w_j}.$$

- The weight of the budgeted maximum weighted multiflow

$$\leq \mu \frac{y(A^+)}{\min_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) / w_j}.$$

- The concurrency of the budgeted maximum concurrent multiflow is at most

$$\leq \mu \frac{y(A^+)}{\sum_{j \in [k]} w_j \text{dist}_j(\hat{y})}.$$

Path-Flow Decomposition

Lemma

For any path-flow decomposition x of a multifold $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in [k]} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_j} x(P) \hat{y}(P) &= \sum_{a \in A} y(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(N_D^{\text{in}}[a]) \\ &\quad + y(a^+) \sum_{a \in A} g(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(a) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma

For any feasible multiflow $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$,

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} \text{dist}_j(\hat{y}) \text{val}(f_j) \leq \mu y(A^+)$$

Interference/Budget-Aware Congestions

- $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a multiflow

Interference/Budget-Aware Congestions

- $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a multifold
- *congestion* of $a \in A$ due to f :

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j (N_D^{in} [a])$$

Interference/Budget-Aware Congestions

- $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a multifold
- *congestion* of $a \in A$ due to f :

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j (N_D^{in} [a])$$

- *congestion* of a^+ due to f :

$$\sum_{a \in A} g(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(a)$$

Interference/Budget-Aware Congestions

- $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$: a multiflow
- *congestion* of $a \in A$ due to f :

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j (N_D^{in} [a])$$

- *congestion* of a^+ due to f :

$$\sum_{a \in A} g(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(a)$$

- *bottleneck congestion* of f

$$\max \left\{ \Delta_D^{in} \left(\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j \right), \sum_{a \in A} g(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(a) \right\}$$

- *congestion cost* of $a \in A$ due to f :

$$y_f(a) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(N_D^{in}[a])}$$

Interference/Budget-Aware Costs and Lengths

- *congestion cost* of $a \in A$ due to f :

$$y_f(a) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(N_D^{in}[a])}$$

- *congestion cost* of a^+ due to f :

$$y_f(a^+) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\sum_{a \in A} g(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(a)}$$

- *congestion cost* of $a \in A$ due to f :

$$y_f(a) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(N_D^{in}[a])}$$

- *congestion cost* of a^+ due to f :

$$y_f(a^+) = (1 + \varepsilon)^{\sum_{a \in A} g(a) \sum_{j \in [k]} f_j(a)}$$

- *length* of $a \in A$ due to f :

$$\hat{y}_f(a) = y_f(N_D^{out}[a]) + y_f(a^+) g(a)$$

FA Stage for Budgeted MWMF

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall j \in [k], f_j \leftarrow \mathbf{0}; \\ & \text{repeat } \left\lceil \frac{(m+1) \ln(m+1)}{\ln(1+\epsilon) - \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} \right\rceil \text{ times} \\ & \quad \forall j \in [k], P_j \leftarrow \text{a shortest } j\text{-path w.r.t. } \hat{y}_f; \\ & \quad j \leftarrow \arg \max_{j \in [k]} \frac{w_j}{\hat{y}_f(P_j)}; \\ & \quad \delta \leftarrow \frac{1}{\max \left(\max_{a \in A} |P_j \cap N_D^{\text{in}}[a]|, g(P_j) \right)}; \\ & \quad \forall a \in P_j, f_j(a) \leftarrow f_j(a) + \delta; \end{aligned}$$

FA Stage for Budgeted MCMF

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall j \in [k], f_j \leftarrow \mathbf{0}; \\ & \text{repeat } \left\lceil \frac{(m+1) \ln(m+1)}{\ln(1+\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}} \right\rceil \text{ times} \\ & \quad \forall j \in [k], P_j \leftarrow \text{a shortest } j\text{-path w.r.t. } \hat{y}_f; \\ & \quad \sigma \leftarrow \frac{1}{\max \left\{ \max_{a \in A} \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j |N_D^{in}[a] \cap P_j|, \sum_{j \in [k]} w_j g(P_j) \right\}}; \\ & \quad \forall j \in [k] \text{ and } a \in P_j, f_j(a) \leftarrow f_j(a) + \sigma w_j; \end{aligned}$$