

Optimal Offline Dynamic 2, 3-Edge/Vertex Connectivity

Richard Peng¹, Bryce Sandlund², and Daniel D. Sleator³

¹ School of Computer Science, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA
 rpeng@cc.gatech.edu

² Cheriton School of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, CA
 bcsandlund@uwaterloo.ca

³ Dept. of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
 sleator@cs.cmu.edu

Abstract. We give offline algorithms for processing a sequence of 2 and 3 edge and vertex connectivity queries in a fully-dynamic undirected graph. While the current best fully-dynamic online data structures for 3-edge and 3-vertex connectivity require $O(n^{2/3})$ and $O(n)$ time per update, respectively, our per-operation cost is only $O(\log n)$, optimal due to the dynamic connectivity lower bound of Patrascu and Demaine. Our approach utilizes a divide and conquer scheme that transforms a graph into smaller equivalents that preserve connectivity information. This construction of equivalents is closely-related to the development of vertex sparsifiers, and shares important connections to several upcoming results in dynamic graph data structures, outside of just the offline model.

1 Introduction

Dynamic graph data structures seek to answer queries on a graph as it undergoes edge insertions and deletions. Perhaps the simplest and most fundamental query to consider is connectivity. A connectivity query asks for the existence of a path connecting two vertices u and v in the current graph. As the insertion or deletion of a single edge may have large consequences to connectivity across the entire graph, constructing an efficient dynamic data structure to answer connectivity queries has been a challenge to the data structure community. A number of solutions have been developed, achieving a wide variety of runtime tradeoffs in a number of different models [12,13,14,25,20,21,24,26,29,35,39]

The models typically addressed are *online*: each query must be answered before the next query or update is given. A less demanding variant is the *offline* setting, where the entire sequence of updates and queries is provided as input to the algorithm. While an online data structure is more general, there are many scenarios in which the entire sequence of operations is known in advance. This is often the case when a data structure is used in a subroutine of an algorithm [30,7], one specific example being the use of dynamic trees in the near-linear time minimum cut algorithm of Karger [27].

In exchange for the loss of flexibility, one can hope to obtain faster and simpler algorithms in the offline setting. This has been shown to be the case in the dynamic minimum spanning tree problem. While an online fully-dynamic minimum spanning tree data structure requires about $O(\log^4 n)$ time per update [22], the offline algorithm of Eppstein requires only $O(\log n)$ time per update [12].

In this paper, we show similar, but stronger, performance gains for higher versions of connectivity. In particular, we consider the problems of 2, 3-edge/vertex connectivity on a fully-dynamic undirected graph. An extension of connectivity, c -edge connectivity asks for the existence of c edge-disjoint paths between two vertices u and v in the current graph. Vertex connectivity requires vertex-disjoint paths instead of edge-disjoint paths. Current online fully-dynamic 2-edge/vertex connectivity data structures require update time at least $O(\log^2 n)$ [21] and $O(\log^3 n)^4$ [35], respectively, and current online fully-dynamic 3-edge/vertex connectivity data structures require update time at least $O(n^{2/3})$ and $O(n)$, respectively [13]. In contrast, our offline algorithms for 2, 3-edge/vertex connectivity require only $O(\log n)$ time per operation. As the lower bound on dynamic connectivity [33], as well as most lower bounds in general [3, 2, 1, 8], also apply in the offline model, our algorithms are optimal up to a constant factor. This paper further shows that any lower bound attempting to show hardness stronger than $\Omega(\log n)$ time per operation for online fully-dynamic 2, 3-edge/vertex connectivity must make use of the online model.

As a straightforward application of our results, one can consider the use of our algorithms when data regarding a dynamic network is collected, but not analyzed, until a later point in time. For example, to diagnose an issue of network latency across key routing hubs, or determine viability of a dynamically-changing network of roads, our algorithms can answer a batch of queries in time $O(t \log n)$, where t is the total number of updates and queries. Since online fully-dynamic algorithms for higher versions of connectivity are significantly slower, namely, $O(n^{2/3})$ and $O(n)$ time update for 3-edge and 3-vertex connectivity, respectively, our offline data structure makes these computations practical for large data sets when they would otherwise be prohibitively expensive.

Related to our work are papers by Lacki and Sankowski [29] and Karcmarz and Lacki [26], which also apply to the above applications but for lower versions of connectivity. Their work considers a fixed sequence of graph updates, given in advance, and is then able to answer connectivity queries regarding intervals of this sequence, online. This is more general than the model we consider because the queries need not be supplied in advance and data regarding an interval of time is richer than information from a specific point in time. For connectivity and 2-edge connectivity, Karcmarz and Lacki achieve $O(\log n)$ time per operation [26]. Both 2-vertex connectivity and 3-edge/vertex connectivity queries are not supported.

⁴ This complexity is claimed in Thorup's STOC 2000 [35] result. As noted by Huang et al. [24], the paper provides few details, deferring to a journal version that has since not appeared. The best complexity for online fully-dynamic biconnectivity prior to this claim was $O(\log^5 n)$ by Holm and Thorup [20].

The techniques developed in this paper may be of independent interest. Our work has close connections with recent developments in vertex sparsification, particularly vertex sparsification-based dynamic graph data structures [4,11,17,18,10,14,19,28,5,16,15]. In particular, the equivalent graphs at the core of our algorithms are akin to vertex sparsifiers, with the main difference that 2- and 3-connectivity require preserving far less information than the more general definitions of vertex sparsifiers [17,28]. A promising step in this direction is very recent work of Goranci et al. [19], which suggests the notion of a *local sparsifier*. This is a generalization of the sparsifier that we consider here, and leads to efficient incremental algorithms in the *online* setting.

Indeed, offline algorithms haven proven useful for the development of online counterparts in the past. Once such example is recent development in the maintenance of dynamic effective resistance. Recent work in fully-dynamic data structures for maintaining effective resistances online [10] relied heavily upon ideas from earlier data structures for maintaining effective resistances in offline [11,31] or offline-online hybrid [11,30] settings.

The results of this paper were previously published online in the open access journal arXiv [34] and have recently been extended to offline 4- and 5-edge connectivity [32]. This new work achieves about $O(\sqrt{n})$ time complexity per operation.

The rest of this paper will be dedicated to proving the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Given a sequence of t updates/queries on a graph of the form:*

- *Insert edge (u, v) ,*
- *Delete edge (u, v) ,*
- *Query if a pair of vertices u and v are 2-edge connected/3-edge connected/bi-connected/tri-connected in the current graph,*

there exists an algorithm that answers all queries in $O(t \log n)$ time.

For simplicity, we will assume the graph is empty at the start and end of the sequence, but the results discussed are easily modified to start with an initial graph G , at the cost of an additive $O(m)$ term in the running time, where m is the number of edges of G . Further, we assume a fixed vertex set of size n . Any update sequence with arbitrary vertex endpoints can be modified to one on a fixed set of vertices, where the size of the fixed set is equal to the largest number of non-isolated vertices in any graph achieved in the given update sequence.

The paper is organized as follows. We describe our offline framework for reducing graphs to smaller equivalents in Section 2. We show how simple techniques can be used to create such equivalents for 2-edge connectivity and bi-connectivity in Section 3. In Section 4 we extend these constructions to 3-edge connectivity. Our most technical section is 3-vertex connectivity, where constructing equivalent graphs requires careful manipulation of SPQR trees. Unfortunately, due to page limits, this is located in Appendix A.

2 Offline Framework

The main idea of our offline framework is to perform divide and conquer on the input sequence, similar to what is done in Eppstein's offline minimum spanning tree algorithm [12]. Consider the full sequence of updates and queries $x_1, \dots, x_t$, where each x_i is either an edge insertion, edge deletion, or query. Call each x_i an event.

Assume each inserted edge has unique identity. Then for each inserted edge e , we may associate an interval $[I(e), D(e)]$, indicating that edge e was inserted at time $I(e)$ and removed at time $D(e)$. Plotting time along the x -axis and edges on the y -axis as in Figure 1 gives a convenient way to view the sequence of events.




Fig. 1. A timeline diagram of four edge insertions(I)/deletions(D) and three queries(Q), with time on the x -axis and edges on the y -axis.

Fix some subinterval $[l, r]$ of the sequence of events. Let us classify all edges present at any point of time in the sequence $x_l, \dots, x_r$ as one of two types.

1. Edges present throughout the duration ($i_e \leq l \leq r \leq d_e$), we call *permanent* edges.
2. Edges affected by an event in this range (one or both of $I(e), D(e)$ is in (l, r)), we call *non-permanent* edges.

While there may be a large number of permanent edges, the number of non-permanent edges is limited by the number of time steps, $r - l + 1$. Therefore, the graph can be viewed as a large static graph on which a smaller number of events take place.

Our goal will be to reduce this graph of permanent edges to one whose size is a small function of the number of events in the subinterval. If we may do so without affecting the answers to the queries, we can recursively apply the technique to achieve an efficient divide and conquer algorithm for the original dynamic c -connectivity sequence.

We will work in the dual-view, considering cuts instead of edge-disjoint or vertex-disjoint paths. Two vertices u and v are c -edge connected if there does

not exist a cut of size $c - 1$ edges separating them; further, u and v are c -vertex connected if there does not exist a cut of $c - 1$ vertices that separates them.

We need the following definition.

Definition 1. *Given a graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$ with vertex subset $W \subseteq V_G$ and a graph $H = (V_H, E_H)$ with $W \subseteq V_H$, we say that H and G are c -edge equivalent if, for any partition (A, B) of W , the size of a minimum cut separating A and B is the same in G and H whenever either of these sizes is less than c . Similarly, we say H and G are c -vertex equivalent if, for any partition (A, B, C) of W with $|C| < c$, the size of a minimum vertex cut D separating A and B such that $C \subseteq D$ and $D \cap A = \emptyset$, $D \cap B = \emptyset$, is the same in G and H whenever either of these sizes is less than c .*

This gives the following.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $G = (V_G, E_G)$ and $H = (V_H, E_H)$ are c -edge/ c -vertex equivalent on vertex set W . Let E_W denote any set of edges between vertices of W . Then $H' = (V_H, E_H \cup E_W)$ and $G' = (V_G, E_G \cup E_W)$ are c -edge/ c -vertex equivalent.*

Proof. We first show c -edge equivalence. Let (A, B) be any partition of W and consider the minimum cuts separating A and B in G' and H' . Since the edges in E_W are between vertices of W , they must cross the separation (A, B) in the same way. Therefore, if the minimum cut separating A and B had size less than c in either G or H , the minimum cuts separating A and B will have equivalent size in G' and H' . Further, if the minimum cuts separating A and B had size larger or equal to c in both G and H , the minimum cuts separating A and B will also have size larger or equal to c in G' and H' , since we only add edges to G' and H' . Thus G' and H' are c -edge equivalent.

We now consider c -vertex equivalence. Consider a partition (A, B, C) of W . As with edge connectivity, if no vertex subset D exists satisfying the conditions of Definition 1, the introduction of additional edges between any vertices of W will not change the existence of such a set D in G' or H' . Furthermore, if an edge of E_W connects a vertex of A to a vertex of B , no vertex cut separates A and B in G' and H' . Now suppose none of these cases is true, and there exists a vertex set D satisfying the conditions of Definition 1 such that the removal of D disconnects A and B in G and H and further that no edge of E_W connects a vertex of A to a vertex of B . Then the removal of vertex set D still disconnects A and B in G' and H' . Thus c -vertex equivalence of G' and H' follows from c -vertex equivalence of G and H .

Now consider the graph G of permanent edges for the subinterval $x_l, \dots, x_r$ of events. Let W be the set of vertices involved in any event in the subinterval. We will refer to these vertices as *active* vertices, and all other vertices of G not in W as *inactive* vertices. Lemma 1 says that if we reduce G to a c -edge/ c -vertex equivalent graph H on set W , the result of all queries in $x_l, \dots, x_r$ on H will be the same as on G . This is because all cuts in H and G that affect the queries

(therefore of size less than c) are of equivalent size, even after the addition of non-permanent edges in H and G .

This idea can lead to a divide and conquer algorithm if we can produce such equivalent graphs H of small size efficiently. Specifically:

Lemma 2. *Given a graph G with m edges and vertex set W of size k , if there is an $O(m)$ time algorithm that produces a graph H of size $O(k)$ that is c -edge/ c -vertex equivalent to G on W , then there is an algorithm that can answer all c -edge/ c -vertex connectivity queries in a sequence of events $x_1, \dots, x_t$ in $O(t \log n)$ time.*

Proof. We perform divide and conquer on the sequence of events. We take the sequence of events $x_1, \dots, x_t$ and divide it in half. Over each half, we will take the graph of permanent edges, which we denote G , and reduce it to a c -edge/ c -vertex equivalent graph H . We repeat the scheme recursively. As the subintervals get smaller, non-permanent edges become permanent and are absorbed by the production of equivalent graphs. Eventually, we reduce to subintervals with a constant number of events, which can be answered by any algorithm of our choice on a graph of constant size.

Consider the sizes of the graphs in each step of recursion. At the top level, the graph of permanent edges in each half has size $O(t)$, the number of events in the full sequence. Thus in the second level, the graph we start with is of size linear in the number of events in that interval, plus the number of edges that became permanent in that interval, which in turn are bounded by the number of non-permanent edges in the interval at the preceding level. This continues recursively, and the result is that all graphs operated on are of size linear in the number of events processed at that level. The runtime recurrence is $T(t) = T(t/2) + O(t)$, which clearly solves to $O(t \log t)$. If t is polynomially-bounded by n , this is $O(t \log n)$. If not, we may first break the sequence of events $x_1, \dots, x_t$ into blocks of size, say, n^2 . Since the size of the graph cannot be more than $O(n^2)$ in any block, the runtime argument carries through. This proves the lemma.

The remainder of the paper will show the construction of 2-edge, 2-vertex, 3-edge, and 3-vertex equivalent graphs.

3 Equivalent Graphs for 2-Edge Connectivity and Bi-connectivity

We now show offline algorithms for dynamic 2-edge connectivity and bi-connectivity by constructing 2-edge and 2-vertex equivalents needed by Lemma 2. These two properties ask for the existence of a single edge/vertex whose removal separates query vertices u and v . Since these cuts can affect at most one connected component, it suffices to handle each component separately.

The underlying structure for 2-edge connectivity and bi-connectivity is tree-like. This is perhaps more evident for 2-edge connectivity, where vertices on the same cycle belong to the same 2-edge connected component. We will first

describe the reductions that we will make to this tree in Section 3.1, and adapt them to bi-connectivity in Section 3.2.

At times we will make use of the term “equivalent cut”. By this we mean that a cut C' is equivalent to C if it has the same size and separates the vertices of W in the same way.

3.1 2-Edge Connectivity

Using depth-first search [23], we can identify all cut-edges in the graph and the 2-edge connected components that they partition the graph into. The case of edge cuts is slightly simpler conceptually, since we can combine vertices without introducing new cuts. Specifically, we show that each 2-edge connected component can be shrunk to single vertex.

Lemma 3. *Let S be a 2-edge connected component in G . Then contracting all vertices in S to a single vertex s in H ⁵, and endpoints of edges correspondingly, creates a 2-edge equivalent graph.*

Proof. The only cuts that we need to consider are ones that remove cut edges in G or H . Since we only contracted vertices in a component, there is a one-to-one mapping of these edges from G to H . Since S is 2-edge connected, all vertices in it will be on the same side of one of these cuts. Furthermore, removing the same edge in H leads to a cut with s instead. Therefore, all active vertices in S are mapped to s , and are therefore on the same side of the cut.

This allows us to reduce G to a tree H , but the size of this tree can be much larger than k . Therefore we need to prune the tree by removing inactive leaves and length 2 paths whose middle vertex is inactive.

Lemma 4. *If G is a tree, the following two operations lead to 2-edge equivalent graphs H .*

- *Removing an inactive leaf.*
- *Removing an inactive vertex with degree 2 and adding an edge between its two neighbors.*

Proof. In the first case, the only cut in G that no longer exist in H is the one that removes the cut edge connecting the leaf with its unique neighbor. However, this places all active vertices in one component and thus does not separate W and need not be represented in H .

In the second case, if a cut removes either of the edges incident to the degree 2 vertex, removing the new edge creates an equivalent cut since the middle vertex is inactive. Also, for a cut that removes the new edge in H , removing either of the two original edges in G leads to an equivalent cut.

⁵ Here we abuse our requirement $W \subseteq V_H$, where V_H are the vertices of H , slightly. A map of W onto V_H that preserves the cuts needed by c -edge/ c -vertex equivalence is all that is required, but c -edge/ c -vertex equivalence is easier to read without introducing the map notation.

This allows us to bound the size of the tree by the number of active vertices, and therefore finish the construction.

Lemma 5. *Given a graph G with m edges and k active vertices W , a 2-edge equivalent of G of size $O(k)$, H , can be constructed in $O(m)$ time.*

Proof. We can find all the cut edges and 2-edge connected components in $O(m)$ time using depth-first search [23], and reduce the resulting structure to a tree H using Lemma 3. On H , we repeatedly apply Lemma 4 to obtain H' .

In H' , all leaves are active, and any inactive internal vertex has degree at least 3. Therefore the number of such vertices can be bounded by $O(k)$, giving a total size of $O(k)$.

3.2 Bi-connectivity

All cut-vertices (articulation points) can also be identified using DFS, leading to a structure known as the block-tree. However, several modifications are needed to adapt the ideas from Section 3.1. The main difference is that we can no longer replace each bi-connected component with a single vertex in H , since cutting such vertices corresponds to cutting a much larger set in G . Instead, we will need to replace the bi-connected components with simpler bi-connected graphs such as cycles.

Lemma 6. *Replacing a bi-connected component with a cycle containing all its cut-vertices and active vertices gives a 2-vertex equivalent graph.*

Proof. As this mapping maintains the bi-connectivity of the component, it does not introduce any new cut-vertices. Therefore, G and H have the same set of cut vertices and the same block-tree structure. Note that the actual order the active vertices appear in does not matter, since they will never be separated. The claim follows similarly to Lemma 3.

The block-tree also needs to be shrunk in a similar manner. Note that the fact that blocks are connected by shared vertices along with Lemma 6 implies the removal of inactive leaves. Any leaf component with no active vertices aside from its cut vertex can be reduced to the cut vertex, and therefore be removed. The following is an equivalent of the degree two removal part of Lemma 4.

Lemma 7. *Two bi-connected components C_1 and C_2 with no active vertices that share cut vertex w and are only incident to one other cut vertex each, u and v respectively, can be replaced by an edge connecting u and v to create a 2-vertex equivalent graph.*

Proof. As we have removed only w , any cut vertex in H is also a cut vertex in G . As C_1 and C_2 contain no active vertices, this cut would induce the same partition of active vertices.

For the cut given by removing w in G , removing u in H gives the same cut since C_1 has no active vertices (which in turn implies that u is not active). Note that the removal of u may break the graph into more pieces, but our definition of cuts allows us to place these pieces on two sides of the cut arbitrarily.

Note that Lemma 6 may need to be applied iteratively with Lemma 7 since some of the cut vertices may no longer be cut vertices due to the removal of components attached to them.

Lemma 8. *Given a graph G with m edges and k active vertices W , a 2-vertex equivalent of G of size $O(k)$, H , can be constructed in $O(m)$ time.*

Proof. We can find all the initial block-trees using depth-first search [23]. Then we can apply Lemmas 6 and 7 repeatedly until no more reductions are possible. Several additional observations are needed to run these reduction steps in $O(m)$ time. As each cut vertex is removed at most once, we can keep a counter in each component about the number of cut vertices on it. Also, the second time we run Lemma 6 on a component, it's already a cycle, so the reductions can be done without examining the entire cycle by tracking it in a doubly linked list and removing vertices from it.

It remains to bound the size of the final block-tree. Each leaf in the block-tree has at least one active vertex that's not its cut vertex. Therefore, the block-tree contains at most $O(k)$ leaves and therefore at most $O(k)$ internal components with 3 or more cut vertices, as well as $O(k)$ components containing active vertices. If these components are connected by paths with 4 or more blocks in the block tree, then the two middle blocks on this path meet the condition of Lemma 8 and should have been removed by Lemma 7. This gives a bound of $O(k)$ on the number of blocks, which in turn implies an $O(k)$ bound on the number of cut vertices. The edge count then follows from the fact that Lemma 6 replaces each component with a cycle, whose number of edges is linear in the number of vertices.

4 3-Edge Connectivity

We now extend our algorithms to 3-edge connectivity. Our starting point is a statement similar to Lemma 3, namely that we can contract all 3-edge connected components.

Lemma 9. *Let S be a 3-edge connected component in G . Then contracting all vertices in S to a single vertex s in H , and endpoints of edges correspondingly, creates a 3-edge equivalent graph.*

Proof. A two-edge cut will not separate a 3-edge connected component. Therefore all active vertices in S fall on one side of the cut, to which vertex s may also fall. The proof follows analogously to Lemma 3.

Such components can also be identified in $O(m)$ time using depth-first search [36], so the preprocessing part of this algorithm is the same as with the 2-connectivity cases. However, the graph after this shrinking step is no longer a tree. Instead, it is a cactus, which in its simplest terms can be defined as:

Definition 2. *A cactus is an undirected graph where each edge belongs to at most one cycle.*

On the other hand, cactuses can also be viewed as a tree with some of the vertices turned into cycles⁶. Such a structure essentially allows us to repeat the same operations as in Section 3 after applying the initial contractions.

Lemma 10. *A connected undirected graph with no nontrivial 3-edge connected component is a cactus.*

Due to space restrictions, we save the proof for Appendix B.

With this structural statement, we can then repeat the reductions from the 2-edge equivalent algorithm from Section 3.1 to produce the 3-edge equivalent graph.

Lemma 11. *Given a graph G with m edges and k active vertices W , a 3-edge equivalent of G of size $O(k)$, H , can be constructed in $O(m)$ time.*

Proof. Lemma 10 means that we can reduce the graph to a cactus after $O(m)$ time preprocessing.

First consider the tree where the cycles are viewed as vertices. Note that in this view, a vertex that's not on any cycle is also viewed as a cycle of size 1. This can be pruned in a manner analogous to Lemma 4:

1. Cycles containing no active vertices and incident to 1 or 2 other cycles can be contracted to a single vertex.
2. Inactive single-vertex cycles incident to 1 other cycle can be removed.

This procedure takes $O(m)$ time and produces a graph with at most $O(k)$ leaves. Correctness of the first rule follows by replacing a cut of the two edges within an inactive cycle by a cut of the single contracted vertex with one of its neighbors. The second rule does not affect any cuts separating W . It remains to reduce the length of degree 2 paths and the sizes of the cycles themselves.

As in Lemma 4, all vertices of degree 2 can be replaced by an edge between its two neighbors. This bounds the length of degree 2 paths and reduces the size of each cycle to at most twice its number of incidences with other cycles. This latter number is in turn bounded by the number of leaves of the tree of cycles. Hence, this contraction procedure reduces the total size to $O(k)$.

We remark that this is not identical to iteratively removing inactive vertices of degrees at most 2. With that rule, a cycle can lead to a duplicate edge between pairs of vertices, and a chain of such cycles needs to be reduced in length.

References

1. Abboud, A., Dahlgaard, S.: Popular conjectures as a barrier for dynamic planar graph algorithms. In: IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. pp. 477–486 (10 2016)

⁶ Some ‘virtual’ edges are needed in this construction, because a vertex can still belong to multiple cycles.

2. Abboud, A., Williams, V.V.: Popular conjectures imply strong lower bounds for dynamic problems. In: Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. pp. 434–443. FOCS '14 (2014)
3. Abboud, A., Williams, V.V., Yu, H.: Matching triangles and basing hardness on an extremely popular conjecture. In: Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015. pp. 41–50 (2015)
4. Abraham, I., Durfee, D., Koutis, I., Krinninger, S., Peng, R.: On fully dynamic graph sparsifiers. In: 2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). pp. 335–344 (Oct 2016)
5. Assadi, S., Khanna, S., Li, Y., Tannen, V.: Dynamic sketching for graph optimization problems with applications to cut-preserving sketches. In: FSTTCS (2015)
6. Bienstock, D., Monma, C.L.: On the complexity of covering vertices by faces in a planar graph. SIAM J. Comput. **17**(1), 53–76 (Feb 1988)
7. Bringmann, K., Kunemann, M., Nusser, A.: Frechet distance under translation: Conditional hardness and an algorithm via offline dynamic grid reachability. CoRR **abs/1810.10982** (2018), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.10982>
8. Dahlgaard, S.: On the hardness of partially dynamic graph problems and connections to diameter. In: 43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (2016)
9. Di Battista, G., Tamassia, R.: On-line graph algorithms with spqr-trees. In: Proceedings of the seventeenth international colloquium on Automata, languages and programming. pp. 598–611. New York, NY, USA (1990)
10. Durfee, D., Gao, Y., Goranci, G., Peng, R.: Fully dynamic spectral vertex sparsifiers and applications. In: Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing. STOC '19, ACM (2019)
11. Durfee, D., Kyng, R., Peebles, J., Rao, A.B., Sachdeva, S.: Sampling random spanning trees faster than matrix multiplication. In: Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. pp. 730–742 (2017)
12. Eppstein, D.: Offline algorithms for dynamic minimum spanning tree problems. J. Algorithms **17**(2), 237–250 (Sep 1994)
13. Eppstein, D., Galil, Z., Italiano, G.F., Nissenzweig, A.: Sparsification—a technique for speeding up dynamic graph algorithms. J. ACM **44**(5), 669–696 (Sep 1997)
14. Eppstein, D., Galil, Z., Italiano, G.F., Spencer, T.H.: Separator-based sparsification ii: edge and vertex connectivity. In: Siam Journal on Computing (2006)
15. Fafianie, S., Hols, E.M.C., Kratsch, S., Quyen, V.A.: Preprocessing under uncertainty: Matroid intersection. In: 41st International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2016). vol. 58, pp. 35:1–35:14 (2016)
16. Fafianie, S., Kratsch, S., Quyen, V.A.: Preprocessing under uncertainty. In: 33rd Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2016). vol. 47, pp. 33:1–33:13 (2016)
17. Goranci, G., Henzinger, M., Peng, P.: The power of vertex sparsifiers in dynamic graph algorithms. In: European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA). pp. 45:1–45:14 (2017)
18. Goranci, G., Henzinger, M., Peng, P.: Dynamic effective resistances and approximate schur complement on separable graphs. In: 26th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2018). vol. 112, pp. 40:1–40:15 (2018)
19. Goranci, G., Henzinger, M., Saranurak, T.: Fast incremental algorithms via local sparsifiers. CoRR (2018), https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SJrbzuz_szMwsBfeBZfGUWkDEbZKAGD5/view

20. Holm, J., de Lichtenberg, K., Thorup, M.: Poly-logarithmic deterministic fully-dynamic algorithms for connectivity, minimum spanning tree, 2-edge, and biconnectivity. In: Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing. pp. 79–89. STOC '98, ACM, New York, NY, USA (1998)
21. Holm, J., Rotenberg, E., Thorup, M.: Dynamic bridge-finding in $\tilde{O}(\log^2 n)$ amortized time. In: Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA) (2018)
22. Holm, J., Rotenberg, E., Wulff-Nilsen, C.: Faster fully-dynamic minimum spanning forest. In: Bansal, N., Finocchi, I. (eds.) Algorithms - ESA 2015. pp. 742–753. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2015)
23. Hopcroft, J.E., Tarjan, R.E.: Dividing a graph into triconnected components. SIAM J. Comput. **2**(3), 135–158 (1973)
24. Huang, S.E., Huang, D., Kopelowitz, T., Pettie, S.: Fully dynamic connectivity in $O(\log n(\log \log n)^2)$ amortized expected time. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms. pp. 510–520 (2017)
25. Kapron, B., King, V., Mountjoy, B.: Dynamic graph connectivity in polylogarithmic worst case time. SODA (2013)
26. Karczmarz, A., Lacki, J.: Fast and simple connectivity in graph timelines. In: Dehne, F., Sack, J.R., Stege, U. (eds.) Algorithms and Data Structures: 14th International Symposium, WADS 2015. pp. 458–469 (2015)
27. Karger, D.R.: Minimum cuts in near-linear time. J. ACM **47**(1), 46–76 (Jan 2000)
28. Kratsch, S., Wahlstrom, M.: Representative sets and irrelevant vertices: New tools for kernelization. In: Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE 53rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. pp. 450–459. FOCS '12 (2012)
29. Lacki, J., Sankowski, P.: Reachability in graph timelines. ITCS (2013)
30. Li, H., Patterson, S., Yi, Y., Zhang, Z.: Maximizing the number of spanning trees in a connected graph. CoRR **abs/1804.02785** (2018), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.02785>
31. Li, H., Zhang, Z.: Kirchhoff index as a measure of edge centrality in weighted networks: Nearly linear time algorithms. In: Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA). pp. 2377–2396 (2018)
32. Molina, A., Sandlund, B.: personal communication
33. Patrascu, M., Demaine, E.D.: Lower bounds for dynamic connectivity. In: Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing. pp. 546–553. STOC '04, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2004)
34. Peng, R., Sandlund, B., Sleator, D.D.: Offline dynamic higher connectivity. CoRR **abs/1708.03812** (2017), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1708.03812>
35. Thorup, M.: Near-optimal fully-dynamic graph connectivity. In: Proceedings of the thirty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing. pp. 343–350. STOC '00, ACM, New York, NY, USA (2000)
36. Tsin, Y.H.: Yet another optimal algorithm for 3-edge-connectivity. Journal of Discrete Algorithms **7**(1), 130–146 (2009)
37. Weiskircher, R.: New Applications of SPQR-Trees in Graph Drawing. Ph.D. thesis, Universität des Saarlandes (2002)
38. Westbrook, J., Tarjan, R.: Maintaining bridge-connected and biconnected components on-line. Algorithmica **7**, 433–464 (1992)
39. Wulff-Nilsen, C.: Fully-dynamic minimum spanning forest with improved worst-case update time. In: Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC. pp. 1130–1143 (2017)

A Tri-connectivity

Tri-connectivity queries involving s and t ask for the existence of a separation pair $\{u, v\}$ whose removal disconnects s from t . In this section we will extend our techniques to offline tri-connectivity. To do so, we rely on a tree-like structure for the set of separation pairs in a bi-connected graph, the SPQR tree [23,9]. We review these structures in Section A.1 and show how to trim them in Section A.2. As these trees require that the graphs are bi-connected, we extend this subroutine to our full construction in Section A.3.

A.1 SPQR Trees

We now review the definition of SPQR Trees. We will follow the model given in Chapter 2 of [37]. For a more thorough description of SPQR Trees, please refer to [37].

SPQR trees are based on the definition of a split pair, which generalizes separation pairs by allowing the extra case of $\{u, v\}$ being an edge of G . A split component of the split pair $\{u, v\}$ is either an edge connecting them, or a maximal connected subgraph G' of G such that removing $\{u, v\}$ does not disconnect G' .

The SPQR tree is defined recursively on a graph G with a special split pair $\{s, t\}$. This process can be started by picking an arbitrary edge as the root. Each node μ in the tree $\mathcal{T}$ has an associated graph denoted as its skeleton, $skeleton(\mu)$, and is associated with an edge in the skeleton of its parent ν , called the virtual edge of μ in $skeleton(\nu)$. In this way, each virtual edge of a node ν corresponds to a child of ν . For contrast, we will also use real edges to denote edges that are present in G .

- Trivial Case: if G is a single edge from s to t , then $\mathcal{T}$ contains a single Q-node whose skeleton is G itself.
- Series Case: If the removal of the (virtual) edge st creates cut-vertices, then these cut vertices partition G into blocks $G_1 \dots G_k$ and the block-tree has a cycle-like structure. The root of $\mathcal{T}$ is then an S-node, and $skeleton(\mu)$ is the cycle containing these cut vertices with virtual edges corresponding to the blocks.
- Parallel Case: If the split pair $\{s, t\}$ creates split components $G_1 \dots G_k$ with $k \geq 2$, the root of $\mathcal{T}$ is a P-node and the skeleton contains k parallel virtual edges from s to t corresponding to the split components.
- Rigid Case: If none of the above cases apply, then the root of $\mathcal{T}$ is an R-node μ and $skeleton(\mu)$ is a tri-connected graph where each edge corresponds to a split pair $\{s_i, t_i\}$, and the corresponding child contains the union of all split components generated by this pair.

Note that by this construction, each edge in the SPQR tree corresponds to a split-pair. An additional detail that we omitted is that the construction of R-nodes picks only the split pairs that are maximal w.r.t. the edge st . This detail is

unimportant to our trimming routine, but is discussed in [37]. Our algorithm acts directly upon the SPQR tree, and we make use of several important properties of this tree in our reduction routines.

When viewed as an unrooted tree, the SPQR tree is unique with all leaves as Q-nodes. For simplicity, we will refer to this tree with all Q-nodes removed as the simplified SPQR tree, or $\mathcal{T}_{simple}$. Also, it suffices to work on the skeletons of nodes, and the only candidates for separation pairs that we need to consider are:

1. Two cut vertices in an S-node.
2. The split pair corresponding to a P-node.
3. Endpoints of an edge in an R-node.

A.2 Trimming SPQR trees

We now show how to convert a bi-connected graph with k active vertices to a 3-vertex equivalent with $O(k)$ vertices and edges. Our algorithm makes a sequence of modifications on the SPQR trees similar to the trimming from Section 3. We will call a vertex u *internal* to a node μ of the SPQR tree if u is contained in the split graph of μ , and u is not part of the split pair associated with μ . We call a vertex u *exact* to a node μ if it is internal to μ but not to any descendants of μ . Exact vertices provide a way to count nodes according to active vertices without reusing active vertices for multiple nodes.

We first give a way to remove split components with no internal active vertices, which we will refer to as inactive split components.

Lemma 12. *Consider an inactive non-Q split component G' produced by the split pair $\{u, v\}$. We may create a 3-vertex equivalent graph H by the following replacement rule: if u and v are ≥ 3 -vertex connected in G , we may replace G' with the edge uv ; otherwise, we may replace G' with a vertex x and edges ux , vx .*

Proof. Consider a cut in G . If u and v are on the same side of the cut, an equivalent cut exists in H by placing u , v , and possibly x on the same side of the cut. Similarly, a cut in G that removes either u or v can be made in H by removing the same vertex. If a cut in G separates u and v , u and v are not ≥ 3 -vertex connected in G and a vertex w in G' must have been removed since G' connects u and v . Removing x instead of w creates an equivalent cut in H .

In the other direction, if u and v were ≥ 3 -vertex connected in G , also no cut in H separates u and v . If u and v were not ≥ 3 -vertex connected in G , there exists a vertex w in G' whose removal separates u and v in G' . Therefore the cut in H produced by vertices $\{x, z\}$ for some $z \notin G'$ that separates u and v can be made in G by removing $\{w, z\}$ instead. All other cuts in H can be formed in G by placing G' on the same side as any remaining vertex in $\{u, v\}$.

An important consequence of Lemma 12 is that an inactive split component is a leaf in $\mathcal{T}_{simple}$. Because of this, it will be easier to think of inactive split

components in the same way we think of Q-nodes. We define the tree $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ as the tree $\mathcal{T}_{simple}$ with inactive split component leaves removed. Every leaf μ in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ must have an internal active vertex u . Furthermore, any vertex internal to a node η is only internal to ancestors and possibly descendants of η . Since μ is a leaf in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$, it has no descendants. It follows that u is exact for μ and the tree $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ has $O(k)$ leaves.

We will use this to bound the number of leaves in $\mathcal{T}$. However, if G contains an R-node whose skeleton contains a complete graph between active vertices, the number of leaves in $\mathcal{T}$ can still be $\Omega(k^2)$. Therefore, we need another rule to process each skeleton of $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ so that we can bound its size by the number of its exact active vertices and split components.

Lemma 13. *There exists a constant c_0 such that any node μ in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ whose skeleton contains a total of k exact active vertices and virtual edges corresponding to active split components can be replaced by a node whose skeleton contains $c_0 \cdot k$ vertices/edges to give a 3-vertex equivalent graph.*

In other words, the number of children of μ in T is at most $c_0 \cdot k$.

Proof. We consider the cases where the node is of type S, P, R separately.

If the node is a P-node, it suffices to consider the case where there are 3 or more inactive split components incident to the cut pair. Removing at most 2 vertices from these components will leave at least one of them intact, and therefore not change the connectivity between the separation pair, and therefore the other components. Therefore, all except 3 of these components can be discarded.

If the node is an S-node, any virtual edge in the cycle corresponding to an inactive split component that's not incident to two active vertices is replaced by actual edges via Lemma 12. Furthermore, two consecutive real edges in the cycle connecting three inactive vertices can be reduced to a single edge by removing the middle vertex in a manner analogous to Lemma 4.

Therefore the size of the cycle is proportional to the number of exact active vertices and active split components.

For an R-node, we can identify all vertices that are either exact and active, or are incident to virtual edges corresponding to active split components. Then we can simply connect these vertices together using a tri-connected graph of linear size (e.g. a wheel graph) and add the active split components back between their respective separation pairs. Every cut in the new skeleton with a child in $\mathcal{T}_{simple}$ can be produced by the original graph, and the only cuts in the original graph that can't be produced in the new one are cuts isolating an inactive component. Therefore the two graphs are 3-vertex equivalent.

Before we can bound the number of nodes in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$, we must eliminate long paths where a node has only one active child, which in turn has only one active child, etc. This is only possible if there exists an active vertex (vertices) internal to each split component, otherwise by Lemma 12, a node with no internal active vertices becomes a leaf. Since the internal active vertex (vertices) are shared amongst all ancestors, there is no way to associate the active vertex with a

constant number of SPQR nodes. The replacement rule in this Lemma provides a way to get around this.

Lemma 14. *Let μ_1 , μ_2 , and μ_3 be a parent-child sequence of SPQR nodes where μ_2 and μ_3 are associated with split pairs $\{u, v\}$ and $\{x, y\}$ respectively, μ_3 is the single active child of μ_2 , μ_2 is the single active child of μ_1 , and either none of u , v , x , and y are active or $u = x$ and is active. We may replace μ_2 with μ_3 , effectively replacing vertex u with x and v with y .*

Proof. In G , cuts induced by the removal of $\{u, v\}$ and $\{x, y\}$ both give the same partition of active vertices. Therefore, we only need one in H , which is given by the cut $\{x, y\}$. All other cuts in G not present in H only separate inactive split components, which need not be represented in H .

In the other direction, every cut in H is still present in G . Thus the new graph H preserves 3-vertex equivalence.

We can now bound the number of nodes in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ after no reductions via Lemmas 12, 13, and 14 are possible.

Lemma 15. *Consider a graph G where no reductions via Lemmas 12, 13, and 14 are possible. There is a constant c_1 such that the number of nodes in G 's SPQR tree $\mathcal{T}$ is no more than $c_1 \cdot k$, where k is the total number of active vertices in G .*

Proof. As explained earlier, the tree $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ has $O(k)$ leaves. To bound the total number of nodes, we must consider the length of a path of degree 2 nodes in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$. If a node μ on this path has a split pair $\{u, v\}$ with an active vertex, say u , internal to its parent η (implying η does not have u in its split pair), then u is exact for η and we may associate u with η . Otherwise, consider two adjacent degree 2 nodes to which this does not apply. The parent may have an active vertex in its split pair not shared with its child, however then its child cannot have an active vertex in its split pair or else it fits the above situation (the active vertex in the child's split pair is internal to the parent). Therefore this can only happen once until the parent and child have at most one active vertex shared in their split pairs, and the procedure of Lemma 14 may be used to replace the parent node with the child. It follows that we may associate each active vertex along this path to a constant number of SPQR nodes.

Since the number of nodes of degree ≥ 3 in a tree is bounded by the number of leaves, the above shows $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ has $O(k)$ nodes. We now consider the full tree $\mathcal{T}$. This tree adds inactive split components with a constant number of Q-node leaves as well as Q-node leaves themselves to active split components. By Lemma 13, for any node μ in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$, we add at most $c_0 \cdot k$ extra children to μ in $\mathcal{T}$, where k is the sum of active vertices exact to μ and the number of active split components, which are children of μ in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$. The sum of the degrees of all the vertices in $\mathcal{T}_{simple'}$ is $O(k)$, therefore the number of extra nodes in $\mathcal{T}$ is also $O(k)$. Therefore $\mathcal{T}$ has $O(k)$ nodes.

We now consider applying Lemmas 12, 13, and 14 on G to produce a 3-vertex equivalent graph H in linear time.

Lemma 16. *Given a bi-connected graph G and k active vertices W , we may find the SPQR tree associated with G and apply the reduction rules given by Lemmas 12, 13, and 14 until exhaustion in linear time. From this can be constructed a graph H 3-vertex equivalent to G with $O(k)$ vertices and edges.*

Proof. The SPQR tree can be found in linear time [6]. Lemma 15 shows that continued application of Lemmas 12, 13, and 14 produces an SPQR tree $\mathcal{T}$ with $O(k)$ nodes. As each leaf of $\mathcal{T}$ is an edge of the graph it represents, this shows the resulting graph represented has $O(k)$ vertices and edges.

The rules given by Lemmas 12, 13, and 14 can be applied until exhaustion in $O(m)$ time. First, we may apply Lemma 12 by traversing each split component of $\mathcal{T}$ and applying the lemma when possible. Next, we may apply Lemma 13 by a similar traversal. Finally, the rule of Lemma 14 can be applied by keeping a stack of the SPQR nodes of a depth-first traversal of the SPQR tree $\mathcal{T}$. All three rules require a single traversal of $\mathcal{T}$ each and thus can be done in $O(m)$ total time.

A.3 Constructing the Full Equivalent

We now extend this trimming routine for bi-connected graphs to arbitrary graphs. By an argument similar to that at the start of Section 3, we may assume that G is connected. Therefore we need to work on the block-tree in a manner similar to Section 3.2. We first show that we may invoke the trimming routine from Section A.2 on each bi-connected component.

Lemma 17. *Let B be a bi-connected component in G and B' be a 3-vertex equivalent graph for B where the active vertices consist of all cut vertices and active vertices in B . Replacing B with B' gives H that's 3-vertex equivalent to G .*

Proof. By symmetry of the setup it suffices to show that any cut in G has an equivalent cut in H . Since B is two-connected, any cut in B that does not remove at least 2 vertices in B results in all vertices of B on the same side of the cut. This means any vertex in B that's not a cut-vertex in G can be added without changing the cut. This also means that removing these vertices has the same effect in G and H .

Therefore it suffices to consider cuts that remove 2 vertices in B . By assumption, there exists a cut in H that results in the same set of active vertices in C , and cut vertices incident to B on one side. The structure of the block tree gives that the rest of the graph is connected to B via one of the cut vertices, and the side that this cut vertex is on dictates the side of the cut that part is on. Therefore, the rest of the graph, and therefore the active vertices not in B will be partitioned the same way by this cut.

It remains to reduce the block tree, which we do in a way analogous to Section 3.2. However, the proofs need to be modified for separation pairs instead of a single cut edge/vertex.

Lemma 18. *A bi-connected component containing no active vertices and incident to only one cut vertex can be removed (while keeping the cut-vertex) to create a 3-vertex equivalent graph.*

Proof. Any cut in G can be mapped over to H by removing the same set of vertices (minus the ones in this component). Given a cut in H , removing the same set of vertices in G results in a cut with this component added to one side. As there are no active vertices in this cut, the cut separates the active vertices in the same manner.

Long paths of bi-connected components can be handled in a way similar to Lemma 7.

Lemma 19. *Two bi-connected components C_1 and C_2 with no active vertices that share cut vertex w and are only incident to one other cut vertex each, u and v respectively, can be replaced by an edge connecting u and v , preserving 3-vertex equivalence.*

Proof. As there is a path from u to v through these components and w , a minimum cut that separates W in G either removes one of u , v , or w , or has uv on the same side. In the first case, removing u or v leads to the same cut as none of them are active, while in the second case the edge uv does not cross the cut. Since uv is connected by an edge in H , in a cut in H they're either on the same side, or one of u or v is removed. In either case, an equivalent cut in G can be formed by assigning what remains of C_1 and C_2 to the same side as any remaining vertex.

Our final construction can be obtained by applying these routines to the block tree first, then Lemma 17.

Lemma 20. *Given a graph G with m edges and k active vertices W , a 3-vertex equivalent of G of size $O(k)$, H , can be constructed in $O(m)$ time.*

Proof. By a proof similar to Lemma 8, applying Lemmas 18 and 19 repeatedly leads to a 3-vertex equivalent graph H whose block-tree contains $O(k)$ components and cut vertices.

The total number of cut vertices and active vertices summed over all bi-connected components is $O(k)$. Therefore, applying Lemma 17 on each component gives the size bound.

B Omitted Proofs

Proof (Proof of Lemma 10). We prove by contradiction. Let G be a graph with no nontrivial 3-edge connected component. Suppose there exists two simple cycles a and b in G with more than one vertex, and thus at least one edge, in common.

Call the vertices in the first simple cycle $a_1, \dots, a_n$ and the second simple cycle $b_1, \dots, b_m$, in order along the cycle.

Since these cycles are not the same, there must be some vertex not common to both cycles. Without loss of generality, assume (by flipping a and b) that b is not a subset of a , and (by shifting b cyclically) that b_1 is only in b and not a .

Now let b_{first} be the first vertex after b_1 in b that is common to both cycles, so

$$first \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_i b_i \in a. \quad (1)$$

and let b_{last} be the last vertex in b common to both cycles

$$last \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_i b_i \in a. \quad (2)$$

The assumption that these two cycles have more than 1 vertex in common means that

$$first < last. \quad (3)$$

We claim b_{first} and b_{last} are 3-edge connected.

We show this by constructing three edge-disjoint paths connecting b_{first} and b_{last} . Since both b_{first} and b_{last} occur in a , we may take the two paths formed by cycle a connecting b_{first} and b_{last} , which are clearly edge-disjoint.

By construction, vertices

$$b_{last+1}, \dots, b_m, b_1, \dots, b_{first-1} \quad (4)$$

are not shared with a . Thus they form a third edge-disjoint path connecting b_{first} and b_{last} , and so the claim follows. Therefore, a graph with no 3-edge connected vertices, and thus no nontrivial 3-edge connected component has the property that two simple cycles have at most one vertex in common.