

# Labeling schemes for flow and connectivity

Michal Katz <sup>\*</sup>    Nir A. Katz <sup>\*</sup>    Amos Korman <sup>†</sup>    David Peleg <sup>† ‡</sup>

August 8, 2001

## Abstract

This paper studies labeling schemes for flow and connectivity functions. A flow labeling scheme using  $O(\log n \cdot \log \hat{\omega})$ -bit labels is presented for general  $n$ -vertex graphs with maximum (integral) capacity  $\hat{\omega}$ . This is shown to be asymptotically optimal. For edge-connectivity, this yields a tight bound of  $\Theta(\log^2 n)$  bits. A  $k$ -vertex connectivity labeling scheme is then given for general  $n$ -vertex graphs using at most  $3 \log n$  bits for  $k = 2$ ,  $5 \log n$  bits for  $k = 3$  and  $2^k \log n$  bits for  $k > 3$ . Finally, a lower bound of  $\Omega(k \log n)$  is established for  $k$ -vertex connectivity on  $n$ -vertex graphs where  $k$  is polylogarithmic in  $n$ .

---

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mathematics, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, 52900, Israel. E-mail: [nir\\_michal@hotmail.com](mailto:nir_michal@hotmail.com).

<sup>†</sup>Department of Computer Science and Applied Mathematics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, 76100 Israel. E-mail: [pandit,peleg}@wisdom.weizmann.ac.il](mailto:{pandit,peleg}@wisdom.weizmann.ac.il).

<sup>‡</sup>Supported in part by grants from the Israel Science Foundation and the Israel Ministry of Science and Art.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Problem and motivation

Network representations play an extensive role in the areas of distributed computing and communication networks. Their goal is to cheaply store useful information about the network and make it readily and conveniently accessible. This is particularly significant when the network is large and geographically dispersed, and information about its structure must be accessed from various local points in it.

The current paper deals with a network representation method based on assigning *informative labels* to the vertices of the network. In most traditional network representations, the names or identifiers given to the vertices contain no useful information, and they serve only as pointers to entries in the data structure, which forms a *global* representation of the network. In contrast, the labeling schemes studied here involve using more informative and localized labels for the network vertices. The idea is to associate with each vertex a label selected in a such way, that will allow us to infer information about any two vertices *directly* from their labels, without using *any* additional information sources. Hence in essence, this method bases the entire representation on the set of labels alone.

Obviously, labels of unrestricted size can be used to encode any desired information, including in particular the entire graph structure. Our focus is thus on informative labeling schemes using relatively *short* labels (say, of length polylogarithmic in  $n$ ). Labeling schemes of this type were developed in the past for different graph families and for a variety information types, including vertex adjacency [Bre66, BF67, KNR88], distance [Pel99, KKP00, GPPR01, GKK<sup>+</sup>01, KM01b, GP01], tree ancestry [AKM01, KM01a, AGKR01], and various other tree functions, such as center, least common ancestor, separation level or Steiner weight of a given subset of vertices [Pel00].

The current paper studies informative labeling schemes for flow and connectivity problems. These types of information are useful in the decision making process required for various reservation-based routing and connection establishment mechanisms in communication networks, in which it is desirable to have accurate information about the potential capacity of available routes between any two given endpoints. These kinds of information are particularly useful when reflecting online the current availability in a dynamically changing setting. The methods presented in the current paper are limited to a static graph with fixed topology and edge capacities. Hence our results constitute only a preliminary step towards handling the full problem in the dynamic setting.

## 1.2 Labeling schemes

Let us first formalize the notion of informative labeling schemes. A *vertex-labeling* of the graph  $G$  is a function  $L$  assigning a label  $L(u)$  to each vertex  $u$  of  $G$ . A labeling scheme is composed of two major components. The first is a *marker* algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$ , which given a graph  $G$ , selects a label assignment  $L = \mathcal{M}(G)$  for  $G$ . The second component is a *decoder* algorithm  $\mathcal{D}$ , which given a set of labels  $\hat{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ , returns a value  $\mathcal{D}(\hat{L})$ . The time complexity of the decoder is required to be polynomial in its input size.

Let  $f$  be a function defined on sets of vertices in a graph. Given a family  $\mathcal{G}$  of weighted graphs, an *f labeling scheme* for  $\mathcal{G}$  is a marker-decoder pair  $\langle \mathcal{M}_f, \mathcal{D}_f \rangle$  with the following property. Consider any graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ , and let  $L = \mathcal{M}_f(G)$  be the vertex labeling assigned by the marker  $\mathcal{M}_f$  to  $G$ . Then for any set of vertices  $W = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$  in  $G$ , the value returned by the decoder  $\mathcal{D}_f$  on the set of labels  $\hat{L}(W) = \{L(v) \mid v \in W\}$  satisfies  $\mathcal{D}_f(\hat{L}(W)) = f(W)$ .

It is important to note that the decoder  $\mathcal{D}_f$ , responsible of the  $f$ -computation, is independent of  $G$  or of the number of vertices in it. Thus  $\mathcal{D}_f$  can be viewed as a method for computing  $f$ -values in a “distributed” fashion, given any set of labels and knowing that the graph belongs to some specific family  $\mathcal{G}$ . In particular, it must be possible to define  $\mathcal{D}_f$  as a constant size algorithm. In contrast, the labels contain some information that can be precomputed by considering the whole graph structure.

For a labeling  $L$  for the graph  $G = \langle V, E \rangle$ , let  $|L(u)|$  denote the number of bits in the (binary) string  $L(u)$ . Given a graph  $G$  and a marker algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  which assigns the labeling  $L$  to  $G$ , denote  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}(G) = \max_{u \in V} |L(u)|$ . For a finite graph family  $\mathcal{G}$ , set  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{G}) = \max\{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}(G) \mid G \in \mathcal{G}\}$ . Finally, given a function  $f$  and a graph family  $\mathcal{G}$ , let

$$\mathcal{L}(f, \mathcal{G}) = \min\{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{G}) \mid \exists \mathcal{D}, \langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D} \rangle \text{ is an } f \text{ labeling scheme for } \mathcal{G}\}.$$

## 1.3 Flow and connectivity

In the current paper we focus on flow and connectivity labeling schemes. Let  $G$  be a weighted undirected graph  $G = \langle V, E, \omega \rangle$ , where for every edge  $e \in E$ , the weight  $\omega(e)$  represents the *capacity* of the edge. For two vertices  $u, v \in V$ , the *maximum flow* possible between them (in either direction), denoted  $\mathbf{flow}(u, v)$ , is defined as follows. The maximum flow in a path  $p = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m)$  is the maximum value that does not exceed the capacity of any edge in the path, i.e.,  $\mathbf{flow}(p) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{\omega(e_i)\}$ . A set of paths  $P$  in  $G$  is *edge-disjoint* if each edge  $e \in E$  appears in no more than one path  $p \in P$ . The maximum flow in a set  $P$  of edge-disjoint paths is  $\mathbf{flow}(P) = \sum_{p \in P} \mathbf{flow}(p)$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_{u,v}$  be the collection of all sets  $P$  of

edge-disjoint paths between  $u$  and  $v$ . Then  $\text{flow}(u, v) = \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}} \{\text{flow}(P)\}$ . See Figure 1.




Figure 1: A capacitated graph  $G$ , and the (symmetric) flow between its vertices.

As a special case of the flow function, the *edge-connectivity*  $\mathbf{e}\text{-conn}(u, w)$  of two vertices  $u$  and  $w$  in a graph can be given an alternative definition as the maximum flow between the two vertices assuming each edge is assigned one capacity unit.

A set of paths  $P$  connecting the vertices  $u$  and  $w$  in  $G$  is *vertex-disjoint* if each vertex except  $u$  and  $w$  appears in at most one path  $p \in P$ . The *vertex-connectivity*  $\mathbf{v}\text{-conn}(u, w)$  of two vertices  $u$  and  $w$  in an unweighted graph equals the cardinality of the largest set  $P$  of vertex-disjoint paths connecting them. By Menger’s theorem (cf. [Eve79]), for nonadjacent  $u$  and  $w$ ,  $\mathbf{v}\text{-conn}(u, w)$  equals the minimum number of vertices in  $G \setminus \{u, w\}$  whose removal from  $G$  disconnects  $u$  from  $w$ . (When a vertex is removed, all its incident edges are removed as well.)

## 1.4 Our results

In this paper we present a number of results concerning labeling schemes for maximum flow, edge-connectivity and vertex-connectivity. In Section 2 we present a flow labeling scheme for general graphs, with label size  $O(\log n \cdot \log \hat{\omega})$  over  $n$ -vertex graphs with maximum (integral) capacity  $\hat{\omega}$ . The scheme relies on the fact that the relation “ $x$  and  $y$  admit a flow of  $k$  or more” is an equivalence relation. In Section 3 we establish the optimality of our flow labeling scheme by proving a tight lower bound of  $\Omega(\log n \cdot \log \hat{\omega})$  on the required label size for flow labeling schemes on the class of  $n$ -vertex trees with maximum capacity  $\hat{\omega}$ . For edge-connectivity, this yields a tight bound of  $\Theta(\log^2 n)$ .

In comparison, vertex connectivity seems to require a more involved labeling scheme

whose label size depends on the connectivity parameter  $k$ . In Section 4 we present a  $k$ -vertex-connectivity labeling scheme for general  $n$ -vertex graphs. The label sizes we achieve are  $\log n$  for  $k = 1$ ,  $3 \log n$  for  $k = 2$ ,  $5 \log n$  for  $k = 3$  and  $2^k \log n$  for  $k > 3$ . In Section 5 we present a lower bound of  $\Omega(k \log n)$  for the required label size for  $k$ -vertex connectivity on general  $n$ -vertex graphs, where  $k$  is polylogarithmic in  $n$ .

## 2 Flow labeling schemes for general graphs

In this section we consider the family  $\mathcal{G}(n, \hat{\omega})$  of undirected capacitated connected  $n$ -vertex graphs with maximum (integral) capacity  $\hat{\omega}$ , and present a flow labeling scheme for this family with label size  $O(\log n \cdot \log \hat{\omega})$ . Given a graph  $G = \langle V, E, \omega \rangle$  in this family and an integer  $1 \leq k \leq \hat{\omega}$ , let us define the following relation:

$$R_k = \{(x, y) \mid x, y \in V, \text{flow}(x, y) \geq k\}.$$

We make use of the following easy to prove fact.

**Lemma 2.1** *The relation  $R_k$  is an equivalence relation.*

For every  $k \geq 1$ , the relation  $R_k$  induces a collection of equivalence classes on  $V$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_k = \{C_k^1, \dots, C_k^{m_k}\}$ , such that  $C_k^i \cap C_k^j = \emptyset$  and  $\bigcup_i C_k^i = V$ . Note that for  $k < k'$ , the relation  $R_{k'}$  is a *refinement* of  $R_k$ , namely, for every class  $C_k^i$ , there is a class  $C_{k'}^j$  such that  $C_k^i \subseteq C_{k'}^j$ .

Given  $G$ , let us construct a tree  $T_G$  corresponding to its equivalence relations. The  $k$ 'th level of  $T$  corresponds to the relation  $R_k$ , i.e., it has  $m_k$  nodes, marked by the classes  $C_k^1, \dots, C_k^{m_k}$ . In particular, the root of  $T$  is marked by the unique equivalence class of  $R_1$ , which is  $V$ . The tree is truncated at a node once the equivalence class associated with it is a singleton. For every vertex  $v \in G$ , denote by  $t(v)$  the leaf in  $T_G$  associated with the singleton set  $\{v\}$ . Figure 2 describes the tree  $T_G$  corresponding to the flow equivalence classes for the graph  $G$  of Figure 1.

For two nodes  $x, y$  in a tree  $T$  rooted at  $r$ , define the *separation level* of  $x$  and  $y$ , denoted  $\text{SepLevel}_T(x, y)$ , as the depth of  $z = \text{lca}(x, y)$ , the least common ancestor of  $x$  and  $y$ . I.e.,  $\text{SepLevel}_T(x, y) = \text{dist}_T(z, r)$ , the distance of  $z$  from the root. As an immediate consequence of the construction, we have the following connection.

**Lemma 2.2** *For every two vertices  $v, w \in V$ ,  $\text{flow}_G(v, w) = \text{SepLevel}_T(t(v), t(w)) + 1$ .*

It is proven in [Pel00] that for the class  $\mathcal{T}(n)$  of  $n$ -node unweighted trees, there exists a  $\text{SepLevel}$  labeling scheme with  $O(\log^2 n)$ -bit labels. (This is also shown to be optimal, in




Figure 2: The tree  $T_G$  corresponding to the graph  $G$  of Figure 1.

the sense that any such scheme must label some node of some  $n$ -node unweighted tree with an  $\Omega(\log^2 n)$ -bit label.)

Observe that if the maximum capacity of any edge in the  $n$ -vertex graph  $G$  is  $\hat{\omega}$ , then the depth of the tree  $T_G$  cannot exceed  $\hat{\omega}$  levels, and it may have at most  $n$  nodes per level, hence the total number of nodes in  $T_G$  is  $O(n\hat{\omega})$ . We immediately have that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{flow}, \mathcal{G}(n, \hat{\omega})) = O(\log^2(n\hat{\omega}))$ .

A more careful design of the tree  $T_G$  can improve the bound on the label size. This is achieved by canceling all nodes of degree 2 in the tree  $T_G$ , and adding appropriate edge weights. Specifically, a sub-path  $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k)$  in  $T_G$  such that  $k \geq 2$ ,  $v_0$  and  $v_k$  have degree 3 or higher, and  $v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}$  have degree 2 (with  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  all marked by the same set  $C$ ) is compacted into a single edge  $(v_0, v_k)$  with weight  $k$ , eliminating the nodes  $v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}$ , and leaving the sets marking the remaining nodes unchanged. Let  $\tilde{T}_G$  denote the resulting compacted tree. Figure 3 describes the tree  $\tilde{T}_G$  corresponding to the tree  $T_G$  of Figure 2.

The notion of separation level can be extended to weighted rooted trees in the natural way, by defining  $\text{SepLevel}_T(x, y)$  as the weighted depth of  $z = \text{lca}(x, y)$ , i.e., its weighted distance from the root. The upper and lower bounds presented in [Pel00] regarding  $\text{SepLevel}$  labeling schemes for unweighted trees can also be extended in a straightforward manner to weighted trees, yielding  $\text{SepLevel}$  labeling schemes for the class  $\mathcal{T}(\tilde{n}, \tilde{\omega})$  of weighted  $\tilde{n}$ -node




Figure 3: The compacted tree  $\tilde{T}_G$  corresponding to the tree  $T_G$  of Figure 2.

trees with maximum weight  $\tilde{\omega}$  using  $O(\log \tilde{n} \log \tilde{\omega} + \log^2 \tilde{n})$ -bit labels.

It is also easy to verify that for two nodes  $x, y$  in  $G$ , the separation level of the leaves  $t(x)$  and  $t(y)$  associated with  $x$  and  $y$  in the tree  $\tilde{T}_G$  is still related to the flow between the two vertices as characterized in Lemma 2.2.

Finally, note that as  $\tilde{T}_G$  has exactly  $n$  leaves, and every non-leaf node in it has at least two children, the total number of nodes in  $\tilde{T}_G$  is  $\tilde{n} \leq 2n - 1$ . Moreover, the maximum edge weight in  $\tilde{T}_G$  is  $\tilde{\omega} \leq \hat{\omega}$ .

Combining the above observations, we have the following.

**Theorem 2.3**  $\mathcal{L}(\text{flow}, \mathcal{G}(n, \hat{\omega})) = O(\log n \cdot \log \hat{\omega} + \log^2 n)$ . ■

This bound is asymptotically optimal. In fact, the bound is tight even for the class  $\mathcal{T}(n, \hat{\omega})$  of weighted trees, as proved in the next section.

The above theorem immediately yields the following upper bound for edge-connectivity (which is also shown to be tight in the next section). Let  $\mathcal{G}(n)$  denote the class of  $n$ -vertex unweighted graphs.

**Corollary 2.4**  $\mathcal{L}(\text{e-conn}, \mathcal{G}(n)) = O(\log^2 n)$ . ■

### 3 A lower bound for flow labeling schemes on trees

In this section we establish a lower bound of  $O(\log n \cdot \log \hat{\omega})$  on the label size for flow on the class  $\mathcal{T}(n, \hat{\omega})$  of  $n$ -vertex trees with maximum edge capacity  $\hat{\omega}$  (which is assumed to be integral). The proof idea is based on a modification of the lower bound proof of [GPPR01] for distance labeling schemes.

Let us first define two more functions on tree vertex pairs, named *MaxE* and *MinE*. For two vertices  $u, v$  in a tree  $T$ , let  $Path(u, v)$  denote the unique path from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $T$ . Then  $MaxE(u, v)$  (respectively,  $MinE(u, v)$ ) is the maximum (resp., minimum) weight of an edge on  $Path(u, v)$ .

Observe that on a tree, the maximum flow between two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  equals simply the minimum capacity of an edge on  $Path(u, v)$ , i.e.,  $\text{flow}(u, v) = MinE(u, v)$ . Also, the *MaxE* and *MinE* functions on trees are equivalent, as far as their labeling schemes are concerned. Specifically, a *MaxE* labeling scheme  $\langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D} \rangle$  can be transformed into a *MinE* labeling scheme (and vice versa) as follows. Given a weighted tree  $T$ , let  $\hat{\omega}$  denote the maximum weight of an edge in  $T$ , and let  $T'$  be the weighted tree obtained by replacing the weight  $\omega(e)$  of every edge  $e$  with weight  $\omega'(e) = \hat{\omega} - \omega(e)$ . The *MinE* marker  $\mathcal{M}'$  will transform  $T$  into  $T'$  and then apply  $\mathcal{M}$ . The *MinE* decoder  $\mathcal{D}'$  will invoke  $\mathcal{D}$ , and then apply the inverse transformation on the resulting weight.

Combining these two relationships, it follows that to prove our lower bound on the label sizes required by flow labeling schemes on trees, it suffices to prove it instead for the maximum edge function *MaxE*.

We focus on a special subclass of binary weighted trees referred to hereafter as  $(h, \mu)$ -trees for integer  $h, \mu \geq 1$ . Each tree of this class is a full binary tree with  $h$  levels. Number the levels starting from the bottom of the tree, i.e., with the level of the leaves numbered 1. Each edge  $e$  is associated with a weight  $\omega(e)$  according to its level. The two edges that connect a vertex at level  $i + 1$  to its two children at level  $i$  are assigned the same weight, taken from the set  $Q_i(\mu)$  defined as follows. For  $i \geq 0$ , let  $Z_i(\mu) = i \cdot \mu$  and

$$Q_i(\mu) = \{Z_i(\mu) + j \mid 0 \leq j \leq \mu - 1\}.$$

**Example:** Figure 4 shows a  $(3, \mu)$ -tree. The weights assigned satisfy  $x_i \in Q_0(\mu)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ ,  $x_{1,i} \in Q_1(\mu)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 2$ , and  $x_{2,1} \in Q_2(\mu)$ .  $\square$

Note that a  $(h, \mu)$ -tree  $T$  is completely defined by the triple  $T = (T_0, T_1, x)$ , where  $x$  is the weight associated with the two edges of the top level of the tree, and  $T_0$  and  $T_1$




Figure 4: A  $(3, \mu)$ -tree.

are the two  $(h - 1, \mu)$ -trees attached to the endpoints of those two edges. The subclass of  $\mathcal{C}(h, \mu)$  consisting of  $(h, \mu)$ -trees with topmost weight  $x$  is denoted  $\mathcal{C}(h, \mu, x)$ . Hence  $\mathcal{C}(h, \mu) = \bigcup_{x=0}^{\mu-1} \mathcal{C}(h, \mu, x)$ . By the definition of these binary trees we have

**Observation 3.1** *For every two leaves  $a, a'$  of a tree  $T \in \mathcal{C}(h, \mu, x)$ ,*

1. *If  $a, a' \in T_i$  (for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ) then  $\text{Max}E_T(a, a') = \text{Max}E_{T_i}(a, a')$ .*
2. *If  $a \in T_0$  and  $a' \in T_1$  then  $\text{Max}E_T(a, a') = x$ . ■*

This implies the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2** *Consider two  $(h, \mu)$ -trees  $T = (T_0, T_1, x)$  and  $T' = (T'_0, T'_1, x')$ . For any leaves  $a_0 \in T_0, a_1 \in T_1, a'_0 \in T'_0$  and  $a'_1 \in T'_1$ ,*

$$\text{Max}E_T(a_0, a_1) = \text{Max}E_{T'}(a'_0, a'_1) \iff x = x'. \quad \blacksquare$$

We assume that labels are nonnegative integers in  $\mathbb{N}$ . Define an  $(h, \mu)$ -legal *MaxE* labeling scheme as a scheme  $\langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D} \rangle$  on all binary  $(h, \mu)$ -trees that correctly provides  $\text{Max}E(a_i, a_j)$  between any two leaves  $a_i, a_j$ . Namely,  $\mathcal{D}$  is a decoder function  $\mathcal{D} : \mathbb{N}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$  is a marker algorithm assigning a label  $L(a, T)$  to each leaf  $a$  of any binary  $(h, \mu)$ -tree  $T$ , such that for every two leaves  $a$  and  $a'$  with labels  $\lambda = L(a, T)$  and  $\lambda' = L(a', T)$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  computes the maximum weight of an edge between  $a$  and  $a'$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}(\lambda, \lambda') = \text{Max}E(a, a')$ .

For a  $(h, \mu)$ -legal *MaxE* labeling scheme  $\langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D} \rangle$ , let  $W(\mathcal{M}, h, \mu)$  denote the set of all labels assigned by  $\mathcal{M}$  to nodes in trees of  $\mathcal{C}(h, \mu)$ , and let  $g(h, \mu)$  denote the minimum cardinality  $|W(\mathcal{M}, h, \mu)|$  over all flow labeling schemes on  $\mathcal{C}(h, \mu)$ .

Hereafter, we fix  $\langle \hat{\mathcal{M}}, \hat{\mathcal{D}} \rangle$  to be some *MaxE* labeling scheme attaining  $g(h, \mu)$ , i.e., such that  $|W(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, h, \mu)| = g(h, \mu)$ .

Let  $W(x)$  denote the set of all possible pairs of labels  $(v_0, v_1)$  assigned by  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  to some leaves  $a_j \in T_0$  and  $a_t \in T_1$  respectively, for some tree  $T = (T_0, T_1, x) \in \mathcal{C}(h, \mu, x)$ . Let  $\mathcal{W} = \bigcup_{x=0}^{\mu-1} W(x)$ . As  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq W(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, h, \mu) \times W(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, h, \mu)$  we have

**Lemma 3.3**  $|\mathcal{W}| \leq g(h, \mu)^2$ .

**Claim 3.4** For every  $0 \leq x \neq x' < \mu$ , the sets  $W(x)$  and  $W(x')$  are disjoint.

**Proof:** Consider two different weights  $0 \leq x \neq x' < \mu$ , and assume by way of contradiction that there exists a pair  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in W(x) \cap W(x')$ . Then there exist two  $(h-1, \mu)$ -trees  $T_0, T_1$  such that  $T = (T_0, T_1, x)$  uses the label  $\lambda_1$  for some leaf  $a_{j_1} \in T_0$  and the label  $\lambda_2$  for some leaf  $a_{j_2} \in T_1$ , and there exist two  $(h-1, \mu)$ -trees  $T'_0, T'_1$  such that  $T' = (T'_0, T'_1, x')$  uses the label  $\lambda_1$  for some leaf  $a_{j_3} \in T'_0$  and the label  $\lambda_2$  for some leaf  $a_{j_4} \in T'_1$ . Therefore, by the definition of  $\mathcal{D}$ ,

$$x = \text{MaxE}(a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}) = \mathcal{D}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \text{MaxE}(a_{j_3}, a_{j_4}) = x',$$

implying  $x = x'$ , contradiction.  $\blacksquare$

The following is our main lemma.

**Lemma 3.5** For every  $x \in Q_h(\mu)$ ,  $|W(x)| \geq g(h-1, \mu^2)$ .

**Proof:** In any  $(h-1, \mu^2)$ -tree, and for every edge that connects a vertex on level  $i+1$  to its child on level  $0 \leq i \leq h-1$ , a weight  $\omega_i \in Q_i(\mu^2)$ ,  $\omega_i = i \cdot \mu^2 + j$ , for  $0 \leq j \leq \mu^2 - 1$ , can be represented by the pair of weights

$$y_0 = \omega_i \bmod \mu = j \bmod \mu \quad \text{and} \quad y_1 = \left\lfloor \frac{\omega_i \bmod \mu^2}{\mu} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{j}{\mu} \right\rfloor,$$

such that  $y_0, y_1 \in [0, \mu-1]$  and  $\omega_i = y_0 + \mu y_1 + Z_i(\mu^2)$ .

Consequently, one can associate with any  $(h-1, \mu^2)$ -tree  $T'$  a pair of  $(h-1, \mu)$ -trees  $T_0$  and  $T_1$  as follows. For any edge  $e$  of  $T'$  with weight  $\omega_i = y_0 + \mu \cdot y_1 + Z_i(\mu^2)$ , let the corresponding weight of  $e$  in  $T_0$  (respectively,  $T_1$ ) be  $\omega_{i_0} = Z_i(\mu) + y_0$  (resp.,  $\omega_{i_1} = Z_i(\mu) + y_1$ ). These two trees define also a  $(h, \mu)$ -tree  $T = (T_0, T_1, x)$  in  $\mathcal{C}(h, \mu, x)$ .

Every leaf  $a_j$  of  $T'$  is now associated with two homologous leaves of  $T$ , namely, the leaf  $a_j^0 = a_j$  (occurring in the left part of  $T$ , i.e.,  $T_0$ ), and the leaf  $a_j^1 = a_{j+2^{h-1}}$  (occurring in  $T_1$ ). For every two leaves  $a_j, a_t$  of  $T'$  we now have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MaxE}_{T'}(a_j, a_t) &= \text{MaxE}_{T_0}(a_j^0, a_t^0) \bmod \mu \\ &\quad + \mu \cdot (\text{MaxE}_{T_1}(a_j^1, a_t^1) \bmod \mu) + \mu^2 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{\text{MaxE}_{T_1}(a_j^1, a_t^1)}{\mu} \right\rfloor \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{Max}E_T(a_j^0, a_t^0) \bmod \mu \\
&\quad + \mu \cdot (\text{Max}E_T(a_j^1, a_t^1) \bmod \mu) + \mu^2 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{\text{Max}E_T(a_j^1, a_t^1)}{\mu} \right\rfloor.
\end{aligned}$$

We use this observation to derive a labeling scheme for all  $(h-1, \mu^2)$ -trees using at most  $|W(x)|$  labels. Given an  $(h-1, \mu^2)$ -tree  $T'$ , consider the pair of  $(h-1, \mu)$ -trees  $T_0, T_1$  defined above, and use the marker algorithm  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$  to label the tree  $T = (T_0, T_1, x)$ . Now use the resulting labeling  $\hat{L}$  to define a labeling function  $L'$  for the nodes of  $T'$  as follows. A leaf  $a_j \in T'$  receives as its label the pair  $L'(a_j, T') = \langle \hat{L}(a_j^0, T), \hat{L}(a_j^1, T) \rangle$ . Note that this pair belongs to  $W(x)$ .

The  $\text{Max}E$  decoder  $\mathcal{D}'$  for  $(h-1, \mu^2)$ -trees is now obtained by setting

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}'(L'(a_j, T'), L'(a_t, T')) &= \mathcal{D}'(\langle \hat{L}(a_j^0, T), \hat{L}(a_j^1, T) \rangle, \langle \hat{L}(a_t^0, T), \hat{L}(a_t^1, T) \rangle) \\
&= \hat{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{L}(a_j^0, T), \hat{L}(a_t^0, T)) \bmod \mu \\
&\quad + \mu \cdot \hat{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{L}(a_j^1, T), \hat{L}(a_t^1, T)) \bmod \mu + \mu^2 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{\hat{\mathcal{D}}(\hat{L}(a_j^1, T), \hat{L}(a_t^1, T))}{\mu} \right\rfloor.
\end{aligned}$$

As  $\langle \{\} \hat{\mathcal{M}}, \hat{\mathcal{D}} \rangle$  is a  $\text{Max}E$  labeling scheme for  $(h, \mu)$ -trees we have

$$\mathcal{D}(\hat{L}(a_j^0, T), \hat{L}(a_t^0, T)) = \text{Max}E_T(a_j^0, a_t^0)$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(\hat{L}(a_j^1, T), \hat{L}(a_t^1, T)) = \text{Max}E_T(a_j^1, a_t^1),$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}'(L'(a_j, T'), L'(a_t, T')) &= \text{Max}E_T(a_j^0, a_t^0) \bmod \mu \\
&\quad + \mu \cdot \text{Max}E_T(a_j^1, a_t^1) \bmod \mu + \mu^2 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{\text{Max}E_T(a_j^1, a_t^1)}{\mu} \right\rfloor \\
&= \text{Max}E_{T'}(a_j, a_t).
\end{aligned}$$

So we have obtained a labeling scheme  $\langle \mathcal{M}', \mathcal{D}' \rangle$  labeling any  $(h-1, \mu^2)$ -tree with labels taken from  $W(x)$ . It follows that  $|W(x)| \geq g(h-1, \mu^2)$ .  $\blacksquare$

Combining Claim 3.4 and Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, we deduce the following;

**Corollary 3.6**  $g(h, \mu) \geq \sqrt{\mu} \cdot \sqrt{g(h-1, \mu^2)}$ .

Subsequently, we have:

**Lemma 3.7**  $g(h, \mu) \geq \mu^{h/2}$ .

This allows us to conclude with the lower bound. Let  $\mathcal{BT}(n, \hat{\omega})$  denote the family of  $n$ -vertex balanced binary trees with height  $h = \log(n + 1)$  and weights from the range  $[0, \hat{\omega}]$  where  $\hat{\omega} = h \cdot \mu - 1$ .

**Theorem 3.8**

$$\mathcal{L}(\text{MaxE}, \mathcal{BT}(n, \hat{\omega})) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log(n + 1) \log(\hat{\omega} + 1) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log(n + 1) \log \log(n + 1) .$$

**Proof:** By Lemma 3.7, for the class  $\mathcal{C}(h, \mu)$  we have  $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\omega}, \mathcal{C}(h, \mu)) \geq \frac{h}{2} \cdot \log \mu$ . This yields the theorem, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\hat{\omega}, \mathcal{BT}(n, \hat{\omega})) &\geq \mathcal{L}(\hat{\omega}, \mathcal{C}(h, \mu)) \geq \frac{1}{2} h \log \mu = \frac{1}{2} \log(n + 1) \cdot \log \left( \frac{\hat{\omega} + 1}{h} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log(n + 1) \log(\hat{\omega} + 1) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log(n + 1) \log \log(n + 1) . \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Hence assuming  $\hat{\omega} + 1 > \log(n + 1)$ , there is a lower bound of  $\Omega(\log n \log \hat{\omega})$  for the label size of *MaxE* labeling schemes on trees. Finally, by the relationship mentioned above between *MinE* and flow on trees, we get the following.

**Corollary 3.9** For  $\hat{\omega} > \log(n + 1) - 1$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(\text{flow}, \mathcal{T}(n, \hat{\omega})) = \Omega(\log n \log \hat{\omega})$ .  $\blacksquare$

Each tree  $T$  of  $\mathcal{BT}(n, \hat{\omega})$  can be modified into an unweighted multi-graph  $G_T$  of  $n$  nodes and  $O(n\hat{\omega})$  edges by replacing each edge  $e$  of weight  $\omega(e)$  with  $\omega(e)$  parallel edges connecting the same endpoints. This multi-graph can in turn be transformed into a simple (unweighted) graph of  $O(n\hat{\omega})$  vertices, by adding a new vertex  $p_{u,v}$  in the middle of every edge  $(u, v)$ , splitting it into a path of length 2 consisting of the two successive edges  $(u, p_{u,v})$  and  $(p_{u,v}, v)$ . Starting with  $\mathcal{BT}(\sqrt{n}, \hat{\omega})$  and looking at the class of unweighted  $O(n)$ -vertex graphs obtained by setting  $\hat{\omega} = \sqrt{n}$ , we get the following tight lower bound on the required label size of schemes for edge-connectivity.

**Theorem 3.10**  $\mathcal{L}(\text{e-conn}, \mathcal{G}(n)) = \Theta(\log^2 n)$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 4 Vertex-connectivity labeling schemes for general graphs

In this section we turn to  $k$ -vertex-connectivity, and present a labeling scheme for general  $n$ -vertex graphs. The label sizes we achieve are  $\log n$  for  $k = 1$ ,  $3 \log n$  for  $k = 2$ ,  $5 \log n$  for  $k = 3$  and  $2^k \log n$  for  $k > 3$ .

## 4.1 Preliminaries

We start with some preliminary definitions. In an undirected graph  $G$ , two vertices are called  $k$ -connected if there exist at least  $k$  vertex-disjoint paths between them. A set  $S \subseteq V$  separates  $u$  from  $v$  in  $G = \langle V, E \rangle$  if  $u$  and  $v$  are not connected in the vertex induced subgraph  $G \setminus S$ .

**Theorem 4.1 [Menger] (cf. [Eve79])** *In an undirected graph  $G$ , two nonadjacent vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are  $k$ -connected iff no set  $S \subset G \setminus \{u, v\}$  of  $k - 1$  vertices can separate  $u$  from  $v$  in  $G$ .*

The  $k$ -connectivity graph of  $G = \langle V, E \rangle$  is  $C_k(G) = \langle V, E' \rangle$ , where  $(u, v) \in E'$  iff  $u$  and  $v$  are  $k$ -connected in  $G$ . A graph  $G$  is closed under  $k$ -connectivity if it has the property that if  $u$  and  $v$  are  $k$ -connected in  $G$  then they are neighbors in  $G$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}(k)$  be the family of all graphs  $G$  which are closed under  $k$ -connectivity.

**Observation 4.2** 1. *If  $G \in \mathcal{C}(k)$  then each connected component of  $G$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}(k)$ .*

2. *If  $G = H \cup F$  where  $H, F \in \mathcal{C}(k)$  are vertex-disjoint subgraphs of  $G$ , then  $G \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ .*

A graph  $G$  is called  $k$ -orientable if there exists an orientation of the edges such that the out-degree of each vertex is bounded above by  $k$ . The class of  $k$ -orientable graphs is denoted  $\mathcal{J}_{or}(k)$ .

**Observation 4.3** *If  $G = H \cup F$  where  $H, F \in \mathcal{J}_{or}(k)$  are vertex-disjoint subgraphs of  $G$ , then  $G \in \mathcal{J}_{or}(k)$ .*

**Lemma 4.4** *Let  $G' = \langle V, E' \rangle$  where  $E' = E \cup \{(u, v)\}$  for some pair of  $k$ -connected vertices  $u$  and  $v$ . Then  $G$  and  $G'$  have the same  $k$ -connectivity graph, i.e.,  $C_k(G) = C_k(G')$ .*

**Proof:** Use induction on  $k$ . For  $k=1$  the Lemma is obvious. Assume the Lemma is true for  $k - 1$ . It suffices to show that if two vertices  $w, w'$  are not  $k$ -connected in  $G$  then they are not  $k$ -connected in  $G'$ . Suppose that  $w, w'$  are not  $k$ -connected in  $G$ . If  $w, w'$  are neighbors in  $G$  then let  $G^- = G \setminus \{u, v\}$ . In  $G^-$ ,  $w$  and  $w'$  are not  $k - 1$ -connected and since  $u$  and  $v$  are  $k - 1$  connected in  $G^-$ , by induction hypothesis  $w$  and  $w'$  are not  $k - 1$ -connected in  $G' \setminus \{u, v\}$ . This implies that they are not  $k$  connected in  $G'$  as desired. If  $w, w'$  are not neighbors in  $G$  then by Menger's theorem there exists a set of vertices  $S = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$  that separates  $w$  from  $w'$  in  $G$ . We claim that  $S$  separates  $w$  from  $w'$  also in  $G'$ . The proof breaks into the following cases.

- **Case 1:** One or more of the  $x_i$ 's is  $u$  or  $v$ . Then  $G \setminus S = G' \setminus S$ .

- **Case 2:** None of the  $x_i$ 's is  $u$  or  $v$ . If  $u$  and  $v$  belong to the same connectivity component of  $G \setminus S$  then the connectivity components of  $G' \setminus S$  will be the same as the connectivity components of  $G \setminus S$ , implying that  $S$  separates  $w$  from  $w'$  also in  $G'$ , which is what we wanted to prove. If  $u$  and  $v$  belong to different connectivity components of  $G \setminus S$  then  $S$  separates  $u$  from  $v$  in  $G$ , or in other words,  $u$  and  $v$  are not  $k$ -connected in  $G$ , contradicting our assumption. ■

**Corollary 4.5** *For every graph  $G$ , If  $u$  and  $v$  are  $k$ -connected in  $C_k(G)$  then they are neighbors in  $C_k(G)$ , i.e.,  $C_k(G) \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ .*

**Proof:** Transform a given graph  $G$  into  $G^+ = G \cup C_k(G)$  by adding the edges of  $C_k(G)$  to  $G$ , one by one. By induction on the steps of this process using the previous Lemma, we get  $C_k(G^+) = C_k(G)$ . Therefore if  $u$  and  $v$  were  $k$ -connected in  $C_k(G)$  then they are  $k$ -connected in  $G^+$  and therefore they are neighbors in  $C_k(G^+) = C_k(G)$ . ■

For a connectivity component  $C$  of  $C_k(G)$ , a *leftmost BFS* tree for  $C$ , denoted  $T(C, k)$ , is a BFS tree spanning  $C$ , constructed in the following way. Take a vertex  $r$  from  $C$  to be the root of  $T(C, k)$ . Let  $level(r) = 1$ . Assume we constructed  $i$  levels of  $T(C, k)$  and haven't used all vertices of  $C$ . Construct the  $(i + 1)$ 'st level of  $T(C, k)$  as follows. Repeatedly take a vertex  $v$  of level  $i$  and connect it to all the vertices adjacent to it in  $C_k(G)$  that haven't been included so far in the tree construction. For each such new vertex  $w$  let  $level(w) = i + 1$  and let  $v$  be  $w$ 's parent in  $T(C, k)$ .

When the context is clear we use the notation  $T$  instead of  $T(C, k)$ .

For  $T = T(C, k)$ , we make the following definitions. Let  $W_i$  denote the set of vertices of level  $i$  in  $T$ , and let  $H_i = H_i(C, k) = \langle W_i, E_i \rangle$  be the subgraph of  $C$  induced by  $W_i$ . For vertices  $u$  and  $v$ , denote  $u$ 's parent in  $T$  by  $p(u)$  and let  $lca(u, v)$  be the highest level common ancestor of both  $u$  and  $v$  in  $T$ . Let  $W'_{i+1}$  denote the set of vertices of  $W_{i+1}$  that neighbor at least  $k$  vertices of  $W_i$  in  $C_k(G)$ . Let  $F_i = F_i(C, k)$  be the subgraph of  $C$  induced by  $W_i \cup W'_{i+1}$ .

**Lemma 4.6** 1. For  $T = T(C, k)$ ,  $H_i \in \mathcal{C}(k - 1)$ .

2. For  $T = T(C, k)$ ,  $F_i \in \mathcal{C}(k - 1)$ .

**Proof:** To prove (1), we show that every two vertices  $u, v \in W_i$  that are  $(k - 1)$ -connected in  $H_i$ , are neighbors in  $C_k(G)$  and therefore in  $H_i$ , implying  $H_i \in \mathcal{C}(k - 1)$ . Assume, for contradiction, that  $u$  and  $v$  are not neighbors in  $C_k(G)$ . By Corollary 4.5 they are also not  $k$ -connected in  $C_k(G)$ , i.e., there exists a set  $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$  that separates them in  $C_k(G)$ . Let  $S' = S \cap W_i$ . Since  $S'$  separates  $u$  from  $v$  in  $H_i$  and since  $u$  and  $v$  are  $(k - 1)$ -connected

in  $H_i$  we get that  $|S'| = k - 1$  hence  $S' = S$ , so all the vertices in  $S$  must be of level  $i$ . But then,  $S$  does not separate  $u$  from  $v$  even in  $T$ , which is a subgraph of  $C_k(G)$ , contradicting our assumption.

Turning to (2), let  $u$  and  $v$  be  $(k - 1)$ -connected in  $F_i$ . As before, it suffices to show that they are neighbors in  $C_k(G)$ . Assume for contradiction that  $u$  and  $v$  are not neighbors in  $C_k(G)$  therefore they are also not  $k$ -connected in  $C_k(G)$ , i.e., there exists a set  $S = \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$  that separates them in  $C_k(G)$ . Since  $S' = S \cap F_i$  separates  $u$  from  $v$  in  $F_i$  and since  $u$  and  $v$  are  $(k - 1)$ -connected in  $F_i$  we get, as before, that all the vertices of  $S$  must belong to  $F_i$ .

- **Case 1:** Both  $u$  and  $v$  are of level  $i$ . In this case, as before,  $S$  does not separate  $u$  from  $v$  even in  $T$ , which is a subgraph of  $C_k(G)$ , contradicting our assumption.
- **Case 2:** Without loss of generality  $u$  is of level  $i$ ,  $v$  is of level  $i + 1$  and  $v$  has at least  $k$  neighbors in  $C_k(G)$  of level  $i$ . In this case,  $v$  has at least one neighbor  $w$  of level  $i$  in  $C_k(G) \setminus S$ . Since all vertices of  $S$  are in  $F_i$ ,  $w$  and  $u$  are connected in  $C_k(G) \setminus S$  via the edges of  $T$ . Altogether we get that  $u$  and  $v$  are connected in  $C_k(G) \setminus S$ , contradicting our assumption. ■

## 4.2 Overview of the scheme

We rely on the basic observation that labeling  $k$ -connectivity for some graph  $G$  is equivalent to labeling adjacencies for  $C_k(G)$ . By Corollary 4.5,  $C_k(G) \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ . Therefore, instead of presenting a  $k$ -connectivity labeling scheme for general graphs, we present an adjacency labeling scheme for the graphs of  $\mathcal{C}(k)$ .

The general idea used for labeling adjacencies for some  $G \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ , especially for  $k > 3$ , is to decompose  $G$  into at most 3 ‘simpler’ graphs. One of these graphs is a  $k$ -orientable graph  $K$ , and the other two, called  $G_{\text{even}}$  and  $G_{\text{odd}}$ , belong to  $\mathcal{C}(k - 1)$ . The labeling algorithm for  $G \in \mathcal{C}(k)$  recursively labels subgraphs of  $G$  that belong to  $\mathcal{C}(t)$  for  $t < k$ . When we are concerned with labeling some  $n$ -vertex graph  $G \in \mathcal{C}(k)$  for  $k > 1$ , the first step in the labeling is to assign each vertex  $u$  in  $G$  a distinct identity  $id(u)$  from 1 to  $n$ . This identity will always appear as the last  $\log n$  bits of the label  $L(G, u)$ . Thus, when labeling the subgraphs of  $G$  in the recursion we may assume that the  $id$ 's for the vertices are given.

For graphs  $G = \langle V, E \rangle$  and  $G_i = \langle V_i, E_i \rangle$ ,  $i > 1$ , we say that  $G$  can be *decomposed* into the  $G_i$ 's if  $\bigcup_i V_i = V$ ,  $\bigcup_i E_i = E$  and the  $E_i$ 's are pairwise disjoint.

**Lemma 4.7** *Let  $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}_1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2$  be families of graphs such that each  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  can be decomposed into  $G_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1$  and  $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2$ . If  $\mathcal{G}_1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2$  have adjacency labeling schemes of sizes  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  respectively, then  $\mathcal{G}$  has adjacency labeling scheme of size  $l_1 + l_2$ .*

**Proof:** The general idea in the proof is to use concatenation of the labels of the decomposed graphs. Let  $\langle \mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{D}_i \rangle$  be adjacency labeling schemes for  $\mathcal{G}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Let us construct an adjacency labeling scheme  $\langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D} \rangle$  for  $\mathcal{G}$  as follows.

**The marker algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $\mathcal{G}$ :** For a given graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ , decompose  $G$  into  $G_i \in \mathcal{G}_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Let  $L_i = \mathcal{M}_i(G_i)$  for  $i=1,2$ . We construct  $L = \mathcal{M}(G)$  as follows. For a vertex  $u$  in  $G$ , let  $L(u) = \langle L_1(u), L_2(u) \rangle$  where the first  $l_1$  bits of the label  $L(u)$  consist of  $L_1(u)$  and the next  $l_2$  bits give  $L_2(u)$ . Altogether we use  $l_1 + l_2$  bits.

**The decoder algorithm  $\mathcal{D}$  for  $\mathcal{G}$ :** Let  $G, G_1$  and  $G_2$  be as before. Given the two labels  $L(u) = \langle L_1(u), L_2(u) \rangle$  and  $L(v) = \langle L_1(v), L_2(v) \rangle$  let  $\mathcal{D}(L(u), L(v)) = \mathcal{D}_1(L_1(u), L_1(v)) \vee \mathcal{D}_2(L_2(u), L_2(v))$ .

Since  $G$  was decomposed into  $G_1, G_2$  the vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are neighbors in  $G$  iff they are neighbors in  $G_1$  or in  $G_2$ , hence the decoding algorithm is correct. ■

**Corollary 4.8** *Let  $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_m$  be families of graph such that each  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  can be decomposed into  $G_1, \dots, G_m$  where  $G_i \in \mathcal{G}_i$  for  $i = 1$  to  $m$ . If the  $\mathcal{G}_i$ 's have adjacency labeling schemes of sizes  $l_i$  respectively, then  $\mathcal{G}$  has an adjacency labeling scheme of size  $\sum l_i$ .*

**Lemma 4.9** *Let  $\mathcal{J}_n(k)$  be the family of  $n$ -vertex graphs in  $\mathcal{J}_{or}(k)$ . Assuming id's are given,  $\mathcal{L}(\text{adjacency}, \mathcal{J}_n(k)) \leq k \log n$ .*

**Proof:** Suppose  $G \in \mathcal{J}_n(k)$  then  $G$  is a  $k$ -orientable graph with  $n$  vertices. Hence there exists an orientation to the edges of  $G$  such that the out-degree of each vertex is bounded above by  $k$ . In this orientation, for each  $u$  there exist at most  $k$  outgoing edges, say  $(u, v_1), (u, v_2), \dots, (u, v_t)$ , for  $t \leq k$ .

**The marker algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $\mathcal{J}_n(k)$ :** Label  $u$  by  $L(u) = \langle id(v_1), id(v_2), \dots, id(v_t) \rangle$ , i.e., use the first  $\log n$  bits to write  $id(v_1)$ , the second  $\log n$  bits to write  $id(v_2)$ , etc. Hence, for every  $u$ 's, the size of  $L(u)$  is at most  $k \log n$  bits.

**The decoder algorithm  $\mathcal{D}$  for  $\mathcal{J}_n(k)$ :** Given  $L(u)$  and  $L(v)$ , check whether  $u$ 's id appears in  $L(v)$ , by inspecting each block of  $\log n$  bits in  $L(v)$  separately. Analogously, check if  $v$ 's id appears in  $L(u)$ .

As  $u$  and  $v$  are neighbors in  $G$  iff one of the two cases applies, the decoding algorithm is correct. ■

To illustrate the approach, we precede the treatment of the general case with a discussion of the cases  $k = 1, 2, 3$ , for which slightly better schemes are available. The simple case of  $k = 1$  is handled in Section 4.2.1. For  $k = 2$  we show in Section 4.2.2 that a connected graph  $G \in \mathcal{C}(2)$  can be decomposed into a tree and disjoint graphs in  $\mathcal{C}(1)$ . Graphs in  $\mathcal{C}(1)$  are collections of cliques. It follows that each  $G \in \mathcal{C}(2)$  can be decomposed into a forest (which is a 1-orientable graph) and a graph made of disjoint cliques. For  $k = 3$  we show in Section 4.2.3 that a connected graph  $G \in \mathcal{C}(3)$  can be decomposed into a graph in  $\mathcal{C}(2)$  and a 2-orientable graph.

### 4.2.1 A 1-connectivity labeling scheme

Let us give a labeling scheme for 1-connectivity for  $\mathcal{G}_n$ , the family of all  $n$ -vertex graphs.

**The marker algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $\mathcal{G}_n$ :** Fix  $G = \langle V, E \rangle \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . To each connected component  $C$  of  $G$  assign a distinct identity  $id(C)$  from the range  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . For a vertex  $u \in V$ , let  $C_u$  be the connected component of  $G$  that  $u$  belongs to. The marker algorithm sets  $L(u) = id(C_u)$ .

**The Decoder  $\mathcal{D}$  for  $\mathcal{G}_n$ :** Let  $D(L(u), L(v)) = 1$  iff  $L(u) = L(v)$ .

Clearly  $u$  and  $v$  are 1-connected in  $G$  iff they are in the same connected component, hence the decoder's response is correct. The size of the label is bounded above by  $\log n$ .

**Theorem 4.10**  $\mathcal{L}(1 - \text{v-conn}, \mathcal{G}_n) \leq \log n$ . ■

### 4.2.2 A 2-connectivity labeling scheme

As explained earlier, labeling 2-connectivity for a family of graphs  $\mathcal{G}$  is equivalent to labeling adjacencies for the family  $\{C_2(G) : G \in \mathcal{G}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(2)$ . In this section we present an efficient adjacency labeling scheme for  $\mathcal{C}(2)$ .

Consider a graph  $G \in \mathcal{C}(2)$  and let  $C_1, \dots, C_m$  be its connected components. By Observation 4.2(1)  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}(2)$  for every  $i$ . Fix  $i$  and let  $T = T(C_i, 2)$ .

**Claim 4.11** *The only neighbor of  $u$  in  $G$  which has a strictly lower level than  $u$  in  $T$  is  $p(u)$ .*

**Proof:** Suppose, for contradiction, that there exist neighbors  $v$  and  $w$  such that  $level(w) > level(v)$  but  $v$  is not  $p(w)$  in  $T$ . In this case,  $w$  and  $z = lca(v, w)$  are 2-connected in  $T \cup \{(v, w)\}$ , which is a subgraph of  $G$ . Since  $G \in \mathcal{C}(2)$ ,  $v$  must be a neighbor of  $w$ . Since  $level(w) < level(u) - 1$  we get a contradiction to the way  $T$  was constructed. ■

**Claim 4.12**  $G \in \mathcal{C}(2)$  can be decomposed into a forest  $F$  and a graph  $H$  of disjoint cliques.

**Proof:** Fix a connected component  $C_i$  of  $G$  and let  $T = T(C_i, 2)$ . Since, by Lemma 4.6(1), each  $H_j^i$ , subgraph of  $C_i$  induced by level  $j$  of  $T$ , is in  $\mathcal{C}(1)$ , it follows that  $H_j^i$  is a collection of disjoint cliques. Hence  $G$  can be decomposed into a forest  $F$  and a graph of disjoint cliques,  $H$  composed of the collection of all the  $H_j^i$  from all  $i$ 's and  $j$ 's. ■

Let  $\mathcal{C}_n(2)$  be the family  $n$ -vertex graphs in  $\mathcal{C}(2)$ . Let us now give an adjacency labeling scheme for the graphs of  $\mathcal{C}_n(2)$ .

**The marker algorithm  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $\mathcal{C}_n(2)$ :** Decompose  $G$  into  $F$  and  $H$  as in Claim 4.12. Fix a vertex  $u$  of  $G$ . Let  $p(u)$  be  $u$ 's parent in  $F$ . To each clique  $C$  in  $H$  give a distinct identity from the range  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $id(C)$ . Let  $C(u)$  be the clique in  $H$  that contains  $u$ .

The marker algorithm for  $G$  assigns  $L(u) = \langle id(c(u), id(p(u)), id(u)) \rangle$ . As before we use the first  $\log n$  bits for  $id(c(u))$  the second  $\log n$  bits for  $id(p(u))$  etc. The label size is bounded above by  $3 \log n$ .

**The Decoder  $\mathcal{D}$  for  $\mathcal{C}_n(2)$ :** Given  $L(u)$  and  $L(v)$  we compare  $id(p(u))$  with  $id(v)$  and  $id(p(v))$  with  $id(u)$  to check whether one is the parent of the other in the forest  $F$ . We also check if  $id(C(u)) = id(C(v))$  to see whether  $u$  and  $v$  are neighbors in  $H$ . We do this by looking at the corresponding bits in the label, for example,  $id(p(u))$  is written in the second block of  $\log n$  bits of  $L(u)$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}(L(u), L(v)) = 1$  iff either  $id(C(u)) = id(C(v))$ ,  $id(p(u)) = id(v)$  or  $id(p(v)) = id(u)$ .

Clearly,  $u$  and  $v$  are neighbors in  $G$  iff they are neighbors in  $F$  or in  $H$ , hence the decoder's response is correct. We get the following.

**Theorem 4.13** Let  $\mathcal{G}_n$  be the family of  $n$ -vertex graphs then  $\mathcal{L}(2 - \text{v-conn}, \mathcal{G}_n) \leq 3 \log n$  bits.

### 4.2.3 A 3-connectivity labeling scheme

Again, labeling 3-connectivity for a family  $\mathcal{G}$  is equivalent to labeling adjacencies for the family  $\{C_3(G) : G \in \mathcal{G}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(3)$ . In this section we show how to label adjacencies for  $\mathcal{C}(3)$ .

Consider a graph  $G \in \mathcal{C}(3)$ , and let  $C_1, \dots, C_m$  be its connected components. By observation 4.2(1),  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}(3)$  for all  $i$ . Fix  $i$  and let  $T = T(C_i, 3)$ .

**Lemma 4.14** Each vertex  $u$  has at most one neighbor of  $G$  which has a strictly lower level than  $u$  in  $T$  apart from  $p(u)$ .

**Proof:** Assume, for contradiction, that there exist a vertex  $u$  with two neighbors in  $G$ ,  $v$

and  $w$ , both with a strictly lower level than  $u$  and both different from  $p(u)$ . In this case,  $u$  must be 3-connected in  $G$  to either  $lca(u, v)$ ,  $lca(u, w)$  or  $lca(v, w)$ . However, the levels of  $lca(u, v)$ ,  $lca(u, w)$ ,  $lca(v, w)$  are all smaller than  $level(u) - 1$ , and since  $G \in \mathcal{C}(3)$ ,  $u$  is adjacent to one of them, contradicting the way  $T$  was constructed. (See Fig. 5.) ■




Figure 5: An illustration to the contradiction in the proof of Lemma 4.14.

**Lemma 4.15** *Each  $G \in \mathcal{C}(3)$  can be decomposed into a graph  $H \in \mathcal{C}(2)$  and a 2-orientable graph.*

**Proof:** First, it suffices to show the lemma for connected graphs  $C \in \mathcal{C}(3)$ , since by Observations 4.2(2) and 4.3  $\mathcal{C}(2)$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{or}(2)$  are closed under vertex-disjoint unions. Consider a connected graph  $C \in \mathcal{C}(3)$  and let  $T = T(C, 3)$ . By Lemma 4.6(1), each subgraph  $H_j$  of  $C$  induced by the vertices of level  $j$  in  $T$ , is in  $\mathcal{C}(2)$ . All the subgraphs  $H_j$  are vertex-disjoint, hence by letting  $H$  be the union of all the  $H_j$ , we get  $H \in \mathcal{C}(2)$ . Let  $U$  be the graph  $C$  after deleting the edges of  $H$ . By Lemma 4.14, each vertex  $u$  of  $U$  has at most 2 neighbors of a strictly lower level (one of which is  $u$ 's parent in  $T$ ). Hence directing the edges of  $U$  from higher level vertices to lower level vertices, each  $u$  has out-degree at most 2, i.e.,  $U$  is 2-orientable. ■

By Lemmas 4.7 and 4.9 and from Theorem 4.13 we get the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.16** *Let  $\mathcal{G}_n$  be the family of  $n$ -vertex graphs, then  $\mathcal{L}(3 - \text{v-conn}, \mathcal{G}_n) \leq 5 \log n$  bits.*

### 4.3 A $k$ -connectivity labeling scheme

Finally, labeling  $k$ -connectivity for a family  $\mathcal{G}$  is equivalent to labeling adjacencies for the family  $\{C_k(G) : G \in \mathcal{G}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(k)$ . In this section we show how to label adjacencies for  $\mathcal{C}(k)$ .

Consider a graph  $G \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ , and let  $C_1, \dots, C_m$  be its connected components. By observation 4.2(1),  $C_i \in \mathcal{C}(k)$  for all  $i$ . Fix  $i$  and let  $T = T(C_i, k)$ .

**Lemma 4.17** *Each  $G \in \mathcal{C}(k)$  can be decomposed into two graphs in  $\mathcal{C}(k-1)$  and a  $(k-1)$ -orientable graph.*

**Proof:** Again, it suffices to prove the lemma for connected graphs  $C \in \mathcal{C}(k)$  since by Observations 4.2(2) and 4.3 both  $\mathcal{C}(k-1)$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{or}(k)$  are closed under vertex-disjoint unions. Consider a connected graph  $C \in \mathcal{C}(k)$  and let  $T = T(C, k)$ .

All the  $F_i$ 's for odd  $i$ 's are vertex-disjoint, and  $F_i \in \mathcal{C}(k-1)$  for all  $i$ 's by Lemma 4.6(2). Therefore, by letting  $G_{odd}$  be the union of all the  $F_i$ 's for odd  $i$ 's, we get  $G_{odd} \in \mathcal{C}(k-1)$ . For the same reasoning, by letting  $G_{even}$  be the union of all the  $F_i$ 's for even  $i$ 's, we get  $G_{even} \in \mathcal{C}(k-1)$ .

Let  $K$  be the graph  $C$  after omitting the edges of  $G_{odd}$  and  $G_{even}$  (or equivalently, omitting all edges of all the  $F_i$ 's). The proof is completed once we show that  $K$  is  $(k-1)$ -orientable. Since all edges  $(u, v)$  of  $C$  such that  $level(u) = level(v) = i$  for some  $i$  are in  $F_i$  for the appropriate  $i$ , if  $(u, v)$  is an edge of  $K$  then  $level(u) \neq level(v)$ . By the way  $T$  was constructed, the difference between the levels is 1.

Let us direct the edges of  $K$  from higher level vertices to lower level vertices. Assume, for contradiction, that for some  $u$  and some  $i$ ,  $level(u) = i + 1$  and the out-degree of  $u$  in  $K$  is at least  $k$ . Then  $u$  must have at least  $k$  neighbors of level  $i$  in  $C$ , in which case all edges  $(u, v)$  for  $v$  such that  $level(v) = i$  appear in  $F_i$  and therefore not in  $K$ . Therefore, the out-degree of  $u$  in  $K$  is 0, contradicting our assumption. ■

Before stating and proving the next theorem, let us remark that we can get a weaker upper bound of  $3^k \log n$  label size for  $\mathcal{L}(\text{adjacency}, \mathcal{C}_n(k))$  in the following way. Use induction on  $k$ . For  $k = 1, 2, 3$  our remark holds. For  $k > 3$  fix  $k$  and assume that the remark holds for  $k-1$ . The remark for  $k$  follows from Lemmas 4.9 and 4.17 and Corollary 4.8.

To prove the next theorem, we show that instead of concatenating  $u$ 's labels in the three decomposed graphs  $(G_{odd}, G_{even}, K)$ , it suffices to give  $u$  its label in only two of the three decomposed graphs. This yields the desired  $2^k \log n$  bits bound on  $\mathcal{L}(\text{adjacency}, \mathcal{C}_n(k))$ .

**Theorem 4.18** *Let  $\mathcal{C}_n(k)$  be the family of  $n$ -vertex graphs in  $\mathcal{C}(k)$ , then*

$$\mathcal{L}(\text{adjacency}, \mathcal{C}_n(k)) \leq 2^k \log n.$$

**Proof:** Use induction on  $k$ . For  $k=1, 2$  or  $3$  the theorem holds as seen in Theorems 4.10, 4.13 and 4.16. For  $k > 3$ , fix  $k$  and assume that the Theorem holds for  $k - 1$ . Consider a graph  $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(k)$ . For a vertex  $u$  in  $G$ , let  $C$  be its connected component in  $G$ , let  $T = T(C, k)$  and let  $i = \text{level}(u)$ . Let us now give a labeling scheme for adjacency on  $G \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ .

**The marker algorithm  $\mathcal{M}_k$  for  $\mathcal{C}(k)$ :** For  $t \leq k$ ,  $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(t)$  and  $u$ , a vertex of  $G$ , denote the adjacency labeling on  $G$  by  $L_t(G)$  and  $u$ 's label by  $L_t(G, u)$ . Let  $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(k)$  and let  $u$  be a vertex in  $G$ . we define  $\text{State}(u)$  according to the following three cases:

- **Case 1:**  $u$  participates in both  $G_{\text{odd}}$  and  $G_{\text{even}}$ . Let  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Dual}$ .

Note that in this case the out-degree of  $u$  in  $K$  is 0. The marker algorithm assigns to  $u$  the label  $L_k(G, u) = \langle L_{k-1}(G_{\text{odd}}, u), L_{k-1}(G_{\text{even}}, u) \rangle$  where the first  $2^{k-1} \log n$  bits are reserved for  $L_{k-1}(G_{\text{odd}}, u)$  and the last  $2^{k-1} \log n$  bits are reserved for  $L_{k-1}(G_{\text{even}}, u)$ .

- **Case 2:**  $u$  doesn't participate in  $G_{\text{odd}}$ , i.e.,  $u$  participates only in  $G_{\text{even}}$  and in  $K$ . Let  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Even}$ . Let  $L_k(G, u) = \langle 0^{k \log n}, 10, L(u, K), 00\dots000, L_{k-1}(G_{\text{even}}, u) \rangle$  where the two bits in the second field, 10, indicate that  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Even}$ . the next  $k \log n$  bits are reserved for  $L(u, K)$  and the last  $2^{k-1} \log n$  bits are reserved for  $L_{k-1}(G_{\text{even}}, u)$ .
- **Case 3:**  $u$  doesn't participate in  $G_{\text{even}}$ , i.e.,  $u$  participates only in  $G_{\text{odd}}$  and in  $K$ . Let  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Odd}$ . Let  $L_k(G, u) = \langle 0^{k \log n}, 11, L(u, K), 00\dots00, L_{k-1}(G_{\text{odd}}, u) \rangle$  where the two bits in the second field, 11, indicate that  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Odd}$ , the next  $k \log n$  bits are reserved for  $L(u, K)$  and the last  $2^{k-1} \log n$  bits are reserved for  $L_{k-1}(G_{\text{odd}}, u)$ .

By the definition of  $K$ , it is clear that the out-degree of some  $u$  in  $K$  is higher than 0 iff  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Even}$  or  $\text{Odd}$ .

**The Decoder  $\mathcal{D}_k$  for  $\mathcal{C}(k)$ :** For  $t \leq k$  denote the decoder for  $\mathcal{C}(t)$  by  $\mathcal{D}_t$ . Denote the decoder for  $\mathcal{J}_{\text{or}}(k)$  (from Lemma 4.9) by  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{or}}$ . Given  $L_k(G, u)$  and  $L_k(G, v)$  we will first want to know the states of  $u$  and  $v$ . Take for example  $L_k(G, u)$ . For  $k > 3$ , the first  $k \log n$  bits are 0 iff  $\text{State}(u) \neq \text{Dual}$ . So by looking at the first  $k \log n + 2$  bits of  $L_k(G, u)$  and  $L_k(G, v)$  we know the states of  $u$  and  $v$ . Consider the following cases:

- **Case a:**  $\text{State}(u) = \text{State}(v) = \text{Dual}$ : Then  $\mathcal{D}_k$  for  $G$  uses  $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}$  on  $G_{\text{even}}$  and  $G_{\text{odd}}$  as follows.

$$\mathcal{D}_k(L_k(G, u), L_k(G, v)) =$$

$$(\mathcal{D}_{k-1}(L_{k-1}(G_{odd}, u), L_{k-1}(G_{odd}, v))) \vee (\mathcal{D}_{k-1}(L_{k-1}(G_{even}, u), L_{k-1}(G_{even}, v)))$$

- **Case b:**  $\text{State}(u) = \text{State}(v) = \text{Even}$ : Then  $\mathcal{D}_k$  for  $G$  uses  $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}$  on  $G_{even}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{or}$  for  $K$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_k(L_k(G, u), L_k(G, v)) = \\ \mathcal{D}_{or}(L(u, K), L(v, K)) \vee \mathcal{D}_{k-1}(L_{k-1}(G_{even}, u), L_{k-1}(G_{even}, v)) \end{aligned}$$

- **Case c:**  $\text{State}(u) = \text{State}(v) = \text{Odd}$ : Then  $\mathcal{D}_k$  for  $G$  uses  $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}$  on  $G_{odd}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{or}$  for  $K$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_k(L_k(G, u), L_k(G, v)) = \\ \mathcal{D}_{or}(L(u, K), L(v, K)) \vee \mathcal{D}_{k-1}(L_{k-1}(G_{odd}, u), L_{k-1}(G_{odd}, v)) \end{aligned}$$

- **Case d:**  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Dual}$ ,  $\text{State}(v) = \text{Even}$ : Then let  $\mathcal{D}_k(L_k(G, u), L_k(G, v)) = 1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}(L_{k-1}(G_{even}, u), L_{k-1}(G_{even}, v)) = 1$  or  $id(u)$  appears in  $L(v, K)$ .
- **Case e:**  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Dual}$ ,  $\text{State}(v) = \text{Odd}$ : Then let  $\mathcal{D}_k(L_k(G, u), L_k(G, v)) = 1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}(L_{k-1}(G_{odd}, u), L_{k-1}(G_{odd}, v)) = 1$  or  $id(u)$  appears in  $L(v, K)$ .
- **Case f:**  $\text{State}(u) = \text{Even}$ ,  $\text{State}(v) = \text{Odd}$ : Then

$$\mathcal{D}_k(L_k(G, u), L_k(G, v)) = \mathcal{D}_{or}(L(u, K), L(v, K))$$

To prove correctness, use induction on  $k$ . If  $u$  and  $v$  are neighbors of level  $i$  then the edge  $(u, v)$  appears in  $F_i$  and therefore  $u$  and  $v$  participate both in either  $G_{odd}$  or in  $G_{even}$  depending on the parity of  $i$ . Thus, by comparing the appropriate labels, say  $L_{k-1}(G_{odd}, u)$  and  $L_{k-1}(G_{odd}, v)$ , we can deduce that  $u$  and  $v$  are indeed neighbors by the induction hypothesis.

If  $u$  and  $v$  are neighbors,  $u$  is of level  $i$  and  $v$  of level  $i + 1$ , then the edge  $(u, v)$  either appears in  $F_i$  and  $\text{State}(v) = \text{Dual}$  or it appears in  $K$  and  $\text{State}(v) = \text{Even}$  or  $\text{Odd}$ . Thus, if  $(v, u)$  is in  $F_i$  then if  $i$  is even then both vertices participate in  $G_{even}$  and if  $i$  is odd then both vertices participate in  $G_{odd}$ . By comparing the appropriate labels of  $u$  and  $v$  (either their  $L(k - 1, G_{even})$  label or their  $L(k - 1, G_{odd})$  label and by induction hypothesis we are able to deduce that  $u$  and  $v$  are indeed neighbors.

If  $\text{State}(v) = \text{Even}$  or  $\text{Odd}$ , then the edge  $(v, u)$  is in  $K$  so by looking at  $L(v, K)$  in  $L_k(G, v)$  and detecting  $id(u)$  appearing there we conclude that  $u$  and  $v$  are indeed neighbors.

It is clear that if  $u$  and  $v$  are *not* neighbors in  $G$  then they are not neighbors in either one of the decomposed subgraphs, and therefore, by induction hypothesis we can never deduce that they are neighbors by our procedure.

The size of the label  $L_k(G, u)$  is, by induction, at most  $2^k \log n$  since by Lemma 4.9, the size of  $L(v, K)$  is at most  $k \log n$  and both sizes of  $L_{k-1}(G_{\text{odd}}, u)$  and  $L_{k-1}(G_{\text{even}}, u)$  are at most  $2^{k-1} \log n$ . ■

We get the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.19** *Let  $\mathcal{G}_n$  be the family of  $n$ -vertex graphs, then  $\mathcal{L}(k\text{-v-conn}, \mathcal{G}_n) \leq 2^k \log n$ .*

## 5 A lower bound for vertex connectivity on general graphs

In this section we establish a lower bound of  $\Omega(k \log n)$  on the required label size for  $k$ -vertex connectivity on the class of  $n$ -vertex graphs where  $k$  is polylogarithmic in  $n$ . Fix a constant integer  $c \geq 1$ , assume that  $k \leq \log^c n$  and let  $\mathcal{G}_m$  be the class of all  $m = \frac{n}{2^{(k^2-k)}}$ -vertex graphs  $\langle V, E \rangle$  with fixed id's  $\{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  and degree at most  $k-1$ . Transform a given graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}_m$  into a graph  $T(G) = H$  with  $n$  vertices in the following way. Replace each edge  $e_{i,j} = (v_i, v_j)$  in  $G$  by  $k$  vertices  $w_{i,j}^1$  through  $w_{i,j}^k$  and connect all the  $w_{i,j}^l$ 's to both  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . Since  $G$  has at most  $\frac{n}{2k}$  edges,  $H$  has at most  $n$  vertices. If necessary, add arbitrary isolated vertices to  $H$  so that it has precisely  $n$  vertices.

**Observation 5.1** *Two vertices  $v_i, v_j$  are adjacent in  $G$  iff  $u$  and  $v$  are  $k$ -vertex-connected in  $T(G) = H$ .*

Assume we have a labeling scheme  $\langle \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D} \rangle$  for  $k$ -vertex connectivity on  $n$ -vertex graphs.

**Observation 5.2** *Consider two distinct graphs  $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_m$ , and let  $L_i = \mathcal{M}(T(G_i))$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then there exists a vertex  $v_j$  in  $V$  such that  $L_1(v_j) \neq L_2(v_j)$ , i.e.,  $\{L_1(v_1), \dots, L_1(v_m)\} \neq \{L_2(v_1), \dots, L_2(v_m)\}$ .*

Since the number of graphs in  $\mathcal{G}_m$  is  $\binom{m}{k}^{\Omega(km)}$  which is  $m^{\Omega(km)}$  for  $k$  polylogarithmic in  $n$ , we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.3** *There exists a graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}(k)$  such that  $\{L(v_1), \dots, L(v_m)\}$  consists of at least  $\log m^{\Omega(km)} = \Omega(km \log m)$  bits where  $L = \mathcal{M}(G)$ .*

We get the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.4**  $\mathcal{L}(k\text{-v-conn}, \mathcal{G}_n) = \Omega(k \log m) = \Omega(k \log n)$  for  $k$  polylogarithmic in  $n$ .

## References

- [AGKR01] S. Alstrup, C. Gavoille, H. Kaplan, and T. Rauhe. Identifying nearest common ancestors in a distributed environment. Unpublished manuscript, 2001.
- [AKM01] Serge Abiteboul, Haim Kaplan, and Tova Milo. Compact labeling schemes for ancestor queries. In *Proc. 12th ACM-SIAM Symp. on Discrete Algorithms*, January 2001.
- [BF67] Melvin A. Breuer and Jon Folkman. An unexpected result on coding the vertices of a graph. *J. of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 20:583–600, 1967.
- [Bre66] Melvin A. Breuer. Coding the vertexes of a graph. *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, IT-12:148–153, 1966.
- [Eve79] Shimon Even. *Graph Algorithms*. Computer Science Press, 1979.
- [GKK<sup>+</sup>01] C. Gavoille, M. Katz, N.A. Katz, C. Paul, and D. Peleg. Approximate distance labeling schemes. In *Proc. 9th European Symp. on Algorithms*, August 2001.
- [GP01] C. Gavoille and C. Paul. Split decomposition and distance labelling: an optimal scheme for distance hereditary graphs. In *European Conf. on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Applications*, September 2001.
- [GPPR01] Cyril Gavoille, David Peleg, Stéphane Pérennes, and Ran Raz. Distance labeling in graphs. In *Proc. 12th ACM-SIAM Symp. on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 210–219. ACM-SIAM, January 2001.
- [KKP00] Michal Katz, Nir A. Katz, and David Peleg. Distance labeling schemes for well-separated graph classes. In *Proc. 17th Symp. on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 516–528, February 2000.
- [KM01a] Haim Kaplan and Tova Milo. Parent and ancestor queries using a compact index. In *Proc. 20th ACM Symp. on Principles of Database Systems*, May 2001.
- [KM01b] Haim Kaplan and Tova Milo. Short and simple labels for small distances and other functions. In *Proc. Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, August 2001.
- [KNR88] Sampath Kannan, Moni Naor, and Steven Rudich. Implicit representation of graphs. In *Proc. 20th ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing*, pages 334–343, May 1988.

- [Pel99] David Peleg. Proximity-preserving labeling schemes and their applications. In *Proc. 25th Int. Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, pages 30–41, June 1999.
- [Pel00] David Peleg. Informative labeling schemes for graphs. In *Proc. 25th Symp. on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, volume LNCS-1893, pages 579–588. Springer-Verlag, August 2000.