arXiv:1708.03962v2 [cs.DS] 15 Aug 2017

Dynamic Minimum Spanning Forest with Subpolynomial Worst-case Update Time

Danupon Nanongkai[1], Thatchaphol Saranurak[1], and Christian Wulff-Nilsen[2]

[1]KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden
[2]University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Abstract

We present a Las Vegas algorithm for dynamically maintaining a minimum spanning forest of an n-node graph undergoing edge insertions and deletions. Our algorithm guarantees an $O(n^{o(1)})$ *worst-case* update time with high probability. This significantly improves the two recent Las Vegas algorithms by Wulff-Nilsen [37] with update time $O(n^{0.5-\epsilon})$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$ and, independently, by Nanongkai and Saranurak [24] with update time $O(n^{0.494})$ (the latter works only for maintaining a spanning forest).

Our result is obtained by identifying the common framework that both two previous algorithms rely on, and then improve and combine the ideas from both works. There are two main algorithmic components of the framework that are newly improved and critical for obtaining our result. First, we improve the update time from $O(n^{0.5-\epsilon})$ in [37] to $O(n^{o(1)})$ for decrementally removing all low-conductance cuts in an expander undergoing edge deletions. Second, by revisiting the "contraction technique" by Henzinger and King [15] and Holm et al. [19], we show a new approach for maintaining a minimum spanning forest in connected graphs with very few (at most $(1+o(1))n$) edges. This significantly improves the previous approach in [37, 24] which is based on Frederickson's 2-dimensional topology tree [11] and illustrates a new application to this old technique.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Preliminaries **4**
2.1 Some Known Results for Dynamic MSF 5

3 The Extended Unit Flow Algorithm **6**

4 Locally Balanced Sparse Cut **9**

5 Expander Pruning **11**
5.1 One-shot Expander Pruning 12
5.2 Dynamic Expander Pruning 14
5.2.1 The Algorithm 14
5.2.2 Analysis 15

6 Pruning on Arbitrary Graphs **17**

7 Reduction from Graphs with Few Non-tree Edges Undergoing Batch Insertions **18**
7.1 Reduction to Decremental Algorithms for Few Non-tree Edges 19
7.1.1 Preprocessing 19
7.1.2 Update 20
7.1.3 Correctness 21
7.1.4 Running Time 22
7.2 Contraction 23
7.2.1 Property of Contracted Graphs/Forests 24
7.2.2 The Proof 26
7.3 Reduction to Decremental Algorithm for Few Edges 27
7.4 Reduction to Restricted Decremental Algorithm for Few Edges 28

8 MSF Decomposition **29**
8.1 Expansion Decomposition that Respects a Given Partition 31
8.2 MSF Decomposition Algorithm 33
8.2.1 Analysis 33

9 Dynamic MSF Algorithm **36**
9.1 The Algorithm 37
9.1.1 Preprocessing and Definitions Related to Compressed Clusters 37
9.1.2 Update 42
9.2 Correctness 42
9.2.1 Sketch Graph Preserves MSF 43
9.2.2 Sketch Graph is Extremely Sparse 45
9.3 Running Time 46
9.3.1 Preprocessing 46
9.3.2 Maintaining the Sketch Graph 47
9.3.3 Maintaining MSF of the Sketch Graph 48
9.3.4 Wrapping Up 50

10 Open Problems **51**

A Reduction from One-shot Expander Pruning to LBS Cuts **55**
A.1 The Reduction 55
A.1.1 Upper Bounding $vol(P)$ 56
A.1.2 Upper bounding $vol_H(B_H)$ 58
A.1.3 Lower Bounding Conductance 59
A.1.4 Running time 60

B Omitted Proofs **61**
B.1 Proof of Lemma 3.4 (Unit Flow) 61

1 Introduction

In the *dynamic minimum spanning forest (MSF)* problem, we want to maintain a minimum spanning forest F of an undirected edge-weighted graph G undergoing edge insertions and deletions. In particular, we want to construct an algorithm that supports the following operations.

- Preprocess(G): Initialize the algorithm with an input graph G. After this operation, the algorithm outputs a minimum spanning forest F of G.
- Insert(u, v, w): Insert edge (u, v) of weight w to G. After this operation, the algorithm outputs changes to F (i.e. edges to be added to or removed from F), if any.
- Delete(u, v): Delete edge (u, v) from G. After this operation, the algorithm outputs changes to F, if any.

The goal is to minimize the *update time*, i.e., the time needed for outputting the changes to F given each edge update. We call an algorithm for this problem a *dynamic MSF algorithm*. Below, we denote respectively by n and m the upper bounds of the numbers of nodes and edges of G, and use $\tilde{O}$ to hide polylog(n) factors.

The dynamic MSF problem is one of the most fundamental dynamic graph problems. Its solutions have been used as a main subroutine for several static and dynamic graph algorithms, such as tree packing value and edge connectivity approximation [35], dynamic k-connectivity certificate [10], dynamic minimum cut [34] and dynamic cut sparsifier [2]. More importantly, this problem together with its weaker variants – *dynamic connectivity* and *dynamic spanning forest (SF)*[1] – have played a central role in the development in the area of dynamic graph algorithms for more than three decades. The first dynamic MSF algorithm dates back to Frederickson's algorithm from 1985 [11], which provides an $O(\sqrt{m})$ update time. This bound, combined with the general sparsification technique of Eppstein et al. from 1992 [10], implies an $O(\sqrt{n})$ update time.

Before explaining progresses after the above, it is important to note that the update time can be categorized into two types: An update time that holds for every single update is called *worst-case update time*. This is to contrast with an *amortized update time* which holds "on average"[2]. Intuitively, worst-case update time bounds are generally more preferable since in some applications, such as real-time systems, hard guarantees are needed to process a request before the next request arrives. The $O(\sqrt{n})$ bound of Frederickson and Eppstein et al. [11, 10] holds in the worst case. By allowing the update time to be *amortized*, this bound was significantly improved: Henzinger and King [17] in 1995 showed Las Vegas randomized algorithms with $O(\log^3 n)$ amortized update time for the dynamic SF. The same authors [16] in 1997 provided an $O(\sqrt[3]{n} \log n)$ amortized update time for the more general case of dynamic MSF. Finally, Holm et al. [19] in 1998 presented deterministic dynamic SF and MSF algorithms with $O(\log^2 n)$ and $O(\log^4 n)$ amortized update time respectively. Thus by the new millennium we already knew that, with amortization, the dynamic MSF problem admits an algorithm with polylogarithmic update time. In the following decade, this result has been refined in many ways, including faster dynamic SF algorithms (see, e.g. [18, 32, 21] for randomized ones and [36] for a deterministic one), a faster dynamic MSF algorithm [20], and an $\Omega(\log n)$ lower bound for both problems [26].

Given that these problems were fairly well-understood from the perspective of amortized update time, many researchers have turned their attention back to the worst-case update time in a quest

[1] The *dynamic SF* problem is the same as the dynamic MSF problem but we only need to maintain some spanning forest of the graph. In the *dynamic connectivity* problem, we need not to explicitly maintain a spanning forest. We only need to answer the query, given any nodes u and v, whether u and v are connected in the graph.

[2] In particular, for any t, an algorithm is said to have an amortized update time of t if, for any k, the total time it spends to process the first k updates (edge insertions/deletions) is at most kt. Thus, roughly speaking an algorithm with a small amortized update time is fast "on average" but may take a long time to respond to a single update.

to reduce gaps between amortized and worst-case update time (one sign of this trend is the 2007 work of Pătraşcu and Thorup [27]). This quest was not limited to dynamic MSF and its variants (e.g. [29, 33, 1, 7, 6]), but overall the progress was still limited and it has become a big technical challenge whether one can close the gaps. In the context of dynamic MSF, the $O(\sqrt{n})$ worst-case update time of [11, 10] has remained the best for decades until the breakthrough in 2013 by Kapron, King and Mountjoy [22] who showed a Monte Carlo randomized algorithm with polylogarithmic worst-case bound for the dynamic connectivity problem (the bound was originally $O(\log^5 n)$ in [22] and was later improved to $O(\log^4 n)$ in [13]). Unfortunately, the algorithmic approach in [22, 13] seems insufficient for harder problems like dynamic SF and MSF[3], and the $O(\sqrt{n})$ barrier remained unbroken for both problems.

It was only very recently that the *polynomial improvement* to the $O(\sqrt{n})$ worst-case update time bound was presented [37, 24][4]. Wulff-Nilsen [37] showed a Las Vegas algorithm with $O(n^{0.5-\epsilon})$ update time for some constant $\epsilon > 0$ for the dynamic MSF problem. Independently, Nanongkai and Saranurak [24] presented two dynamic SF algorithms: one is Monte Carlo with $O(n^{0.4+o(1)})$ update time and another is Las Vegas with $O(n^{0.49306})$ update time. Nevertheless, the large gap between polylogarithmic amortized update time and the best worst-case update time remains.

Our Result. We significantly reduce the gap by showing the dynamic MSF algorithm with *sub-polynomial* ($O(n^{o(1)})$) update time:

Theorem 1.1. *There is a Las Vegas randomized dynamic MSF algorithm on an n-node graph that can answer each update in $O(n^{o(1)})$ time both in expectation and with high probability.*

Needless to say, the above result completely subsumes the result in [37, 24]. The $o(1)$ term above hides a $O(\log\log\log n/\log\log n)$ factor.[5] Recall that Las Vegas randomized algorithms always return correct answers and the time guarantee is randomized. Also recall that an event holds *with high probability* (w.h.p.) if it holds with probability at least $1 - 1/n^c$, where c is an arbitrarily large constant.

Key Technical Contribution and Organization. We prove Theorem 1.1 by identifying the common framework behind the results of Nanongkai-Saranurak [24] and Wullf-Nilsen [37] (thereafter NS and WN), and significantly improving some components within this framework. In particular, in retrospect it can be said that at a high level NS [24] and WN [37] share the following three components:

1. *Expansion decomposition:* This component decomposes the input graph into several expanders and the "remaining" part with few ($o(n)$) edges.
2. *Expander pruning:* This component helps maintaining an MSF/SF in expanders from the first component by decrementally removing all low-conductance cuts in an expander undergoing edge deletions.

[3] Note that the algorithms in [22, 13] actually maintain a spanning forest; however, they cannot output such forest. In particular, [22, 13] assume the so-called *oblivious adversary*. Thus, [22, 13] do not solve dynamic SF as we define here, as we require algorithms to report how the spanning forest changes. See further discussions on the oblivious adversary in [24].

[4] Prior to this, Kejlberg-Rasmussen et al. [23] improved the bound slightly to $O(\sqrt{n(\log\log n)^2/\log n})$ for dynamic SF using word-parallelism. Their algorithm is deterministic.

[5] Note that by starting from an empty graph and inserting one edge at a time, the preprocessing time of our algorithm is clearly $O(m^{1+o(1)})$, where m is the number of edges in the initial graph. However, note further that the $o(1)$ term in our preprocessing time can be slightly reduced to $O(\sqrt{\log\log m/\log m})$ if we analyze the preprocessing time explicitly instead.

3. *Dynamic MSF/SF on ultra-sparse graphs:* This components maintains MSF/SF in the "remaining" part obtained from the first component by exploiting the fact that this part has few edges[6].

The key difference is that while NS [24] heavily relied on developing fast algorithms for these components using recent flow techniques (from, e.g., [28, 25]), WN [37] focused on developing a sophisticated way to integrate all components together and used slower (diffusion-based) algorithms for the three components. In this paper we significantly improve algorithms for the second and third components from those in NS [24], and show how to adjust the integration method of WN [37] to exploit these improvements; in particular, the method has to be carefully applied recursively. Below we discuss how we do this in more detail.

(i) Improved expander pruning (Details in Sections 3 to 6). We significantly improve the running time of the *one-shot* expander pruning algorithm by NS [24][7] and the *dynamic* expander pruning by WN [37]. For the one-shot case, given a *single batch* of d edge deletions to an expander, the one-shot expander pruning algorithm by NS [24] takes $O(d^{1.5+o(1)})$ time for removing all low-conductance cuts. We improve the running time to $O(d^{1+o(1)})$. To do this, in Section 3 we first extend a new *local flow-based algorithm*[8] for finding a low-conductance cut by Henzinger, Rao and Wang [14], and then use this extension in Section 4 to get another algorithm for finding a *locally balanced sparse (LBS) cut*. Then in Section 5.1 we apply the reduction from LBS cut algorithms by NS [24] and obtain an improved one-shot expander pruning algorithm.

For the dynamic case, given a *sequence* of edge deletions to an expander, the dynamic expander pruning algorithm by WN [37] dynamically removes all low-conductance cuts and takes $O(n^{0.5-\epsilon})$ time for each update. We improve the update time to $O(n^{o(1)})$. Our algorithm is also arguably simpler and differ significantly because we do not need random sampling as in [37]. To obtain the dynamic expander pruning algorithm, we use many instances of the static ones, where each instance is responsible on finding low-conductance cuts of different sizes. Each instance is called periodically with different frequencies (instances for finding larger cuts are called less frequently). See Section 5.2 for details.

(ii) Improved dynamic MSF algorithm on "ultra-sparse" graphs (Details in Section 7). We show a new way to maintain dynamic MSF in a graph with few ($o(n)$) "non-tree" edges that can also handle a batch of edge insertions. Both NS and WN [24, 37] used a variant of Frederickson's 2-dimensional topology tree [11] to do this task[9]. In this paper, we change the approach to reduce this problem on graphs with few *non-tree edges* to the same problem on graphs with few *edges* and *fewer nodes*; this allows us to apply recursions later in Section 9. We do this by applying the classic "contraction technique" of Henzinger and King [15] and Holm et al. [19] *in a new way*: This technique was used extensively previously (e.g. [16, 15, 19, 20, 37]) to reduce fully-dynamic algorithms to decremental algorithms (that can only handle deletions). Here, we use this technique so that we can recurse.

In Sections 8 and 9, we take a close look into the integration method in WN [37] which is used to compose the three components. We show that it is possible to replace all the three components with the tools based on flow algorithms from either this paper or from NS [24] instead.

[6]For the reader who are familiar with the results in [24] and [37]. The first component are shown in Theorem 4 in [37] and Theorem 5.1 in [24]. The second are shown in Theorem 5 in [37] and Theorem 6.1 in [24]. The third are shown in Theorem 3 from [37] and Theorem 4.2 in [24].

[7]In [24], the authors actually show the local expansion decomposition algorithm which is the same as one-shot expander pruning but it does not only prune the graph but also decompose the graph into components. In retrospect, we can see that it is enough to instead use the one-shot expander pruning algorithm in [24].

[8]By local algorithms, we means algorithms that can output its answer without reading the whole input graph.

[9]Unlike [37], the algorithm in [24] cannot handle inserting a batch of many non-tree edges.

In particular, in Section 8 we consider a subroutine implicit in WN [37], which is built on top of the expansion decomposition algorithm (the first component above). To make the presentation more modular, we explicitly state this subroutine and its needed properties and name it *MSF decomposition* in Section 8. This subroutine can be used as it is constructed in [37], but we further show that it can be slightly improved if we replace the diffusion-based expansion decomposition algorithm in [37] with the flow-based expansion decomposition by NS [24] in the construction. This leads to a slight improvement in the $o(1)$ term in our claimed $O(n^{o(1)})$ update time.

Then, in Section 9, we combine (using a method in WN [37]) our improved MSF decomposition algorithm (from Section 8) with our new dynamic expander pruning algorithm and our new dynamic MSF algorithm on ultra-sparse graphs (for the second and third components above). As our new algorithm on ultra-sparse graphs is actually a reduction to the dynamic MSF problem on a smaller graph, we recursively apply our new dynamic MSF algorithm on that graph. By a careful time analysis of our recursive algorithm, we eventually obtain the $O(n^{o(1)})$ update time.

2 Preliminaries

When the problem size is n, we denote $\tilde{O}(f(n)) = O(f(n)\text{polylog}(n))$, for any function f. We denote by $\dot{\cup}$ and $\dot{\bigcup}$ the disjoint union operations. We denote the set minus operation by both $\setminus$ and $-$. For any set S and an element e, we write $S - e = S - \{e\} = S \setminus \{e\}$.

Let $G = (V, E, w)$ be any weighted graph where each edge $e \in E$ has weight $w(e)$. We usually denote $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$. We also just write $G = (V, E)$ when the weight is clear from the context. We assume that the weights are distinct. For any set $V' \subseteq V$ of nodes, $G[V']$ denotes the subgraph of G induced by V'. We denote $V(G)$ the set of nodes in G and $E(G)$ the set of edges in G. In this case, $V(G) = V$ and $E(G) = E$. Let $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$ denote the minimum spanning tree of G. For any set $E' \subseteq E$, let $end(E')$ be the set of nodes which are endpoints of edges in E'. Sometimes, we abuse notation and treat the set of edges in E' as a graph $G' = (end(E'), E')$ and vice versa. For example, we have $\mathsf{MSF}(E') = \mathsf{MSF}(G')$ and $E - \mathsf{MSF}(G') = E - E(\mathsf{MSF}(G'))$. The set of *non-tree edges* of G are the edges in $E - \mathsf{MSF}(G)$. However, when it is clear that we are talking about a forest F in G, non-tree edges are edges in $E - F$.

A cut $S \subseteq V$ is a set of nodes. A *volume* of S is $vol(S) = \sum_{v \in S} \deg(v)$. The *cut size* of S is denoted by $\delta(S)$ which is the number of edges crossing the cut S. The *conductance* of a cut S is $\phi(S) = \frac{\delta(S)}{\min\{vol(S), vol(V-S)\}}$. The conductance of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is $\phi(G) = \min_{\emptyset \neq S \subset V} \phi(S)$.

Remark 2.1 (Local-style input). Whenever a graph G is given to any algorithm A in this paper, we assume that a *pointer* to the adjacency list representing G is given to A. This is necessary for some of our algorithms which are *local* in the sense that they do not even read the whole input graph. Recall that in an adjacency list, for each node v we have a list ℓ_v of edges incident to v , and we can access the head ℓ_v in constant time. (See details in, e.g., [8, Section 22.1]) Additionally, we assume that we have a list of nodes whose degrees are at least 1 (so that we do not need to probe lists of single nodes).

We extensively use the following facts about MSF.

Fact 2.2 ([10]). *For any edge sets E_1 and E_2, $\mathsf{MSF}(E_1 \cup E_2) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(E_1) \cup \mathsf{MSF}(E_2)$.*

Let $G' = (V', E')$ be a graph obtained from G by contracting some set of nodes into a single node. We always keeps parallel edges in G' but sometimes we do not keep all the self loops. We will specify which self loops are preserved in G' when we use contraction in our algorithms. We usually assume that each edge in G' "remember" its original endpoints in G. That is, there are two-way

pointers from each edge in E' to its corresponding edge in E. So, we can treat E' as a subset of E. For example, for a set $D \subseteq E$ of edges in G, we can write $E' - D$ and this means the set of edges in G' excluding the ones which are originally edges in D. With this notation, we have the following fact about MSF:

Fact 2.3. *For any graph G and (multi-)graph G' obtained from G by contracting two nodes of G, $\mathit{MSF}(G') \subseteq \mathit{MSF}(G)$.*

Definition 2.4 (Dynamic MSF)**.** *A* (fully) dynamic MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ *is given an initial graph G to be preprocessed, and then $\mathcal{A}$ must return an initial minimum spanning forest. Then there is an online sequence of edge updates for G, both insertions and deletions. After each update, $\mathcal{A}$ must return the list of edges to be added or removed from the previous spanning tree to obtain the new one. We say $\mathcal{A}$ is an* incremental/decremental *MSF algorithm if the updates only contain insertions/deletions respectively.*

The time an algorithm uses for preprocessing the initial graph and for updating a new MSF is called *preprocessing time* and *update time* respectively. In this paper, we consider the problem where the update sequence is generated by an adversary[10]. We say that an algorithm has *update time t with probability p*, if, *for each* update, an algorithm need at most t time to update the MSF with probability at least p.

Let G be a graph undergoing a sequence of edge updates. If we say that G has n nodes, then G has n nodes at any time. However, we say that G has at most m edges and k non-tree edges, if at any time, G is updated in such a way that G always has at most m edges and k non-tree edges. We also say that G is an *m-edge k-non-tree-edge graph*. Let $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$. Suppose that there is an update that deletes $e \in F$. We say that f is a *replacement/reconnecting edge* if $F \cup f - e = \mathsf{MSF}(G - e)$.

2.1 Some Known Results for Dynamic MSF

We use the following basic ability of the top tree data structure (see e.g. [30, 3]).

Lemma 2.5. *There is an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that runs on an n-node edge-weighted forest F undergoing edge updates. $\mathcal{A}$ has preprocessing time $O(n \log n)$ and update time $O(\log n)$. At any time, given two nodes u and v, then in time $O(\log n)$ $\mathcal{A}$ can 1) return the heaviest edge in the path from u to v in F, or 2) report that u and v are not connected in F.*

A classic dynamic MSF algorithm by Frederickson [11] has $O(\sqrt{m})$ worst-case update time. Using the same approach, it is easy to see the following algorithm which is useful in a multi-graph where m is much larger than n^2:

Lemma 2.6. *There is a deterministic fully dynamic MSF algorithm for an n-node graph with m initial edges and has $\tilde{O}(m)$ preprocessing time and $\tilde{O}(n)$ worst-case update time.*

Next, Wulff-Nilsen [37] implicitly showed a decremental MSF algorithms for some specific setting. In Section 9, we will use his algorithms in the same way he used. The precise statement is as follows:

[10] There are actually two kinds of adversaries: oblivious ones and adaptive ones. In [24], they formalize these definitions precisely and discuss them in details. In this paper, however, we maintain MSF which is uniquely determined by the underlying graph at any time (assuming that the edge weights are distinct). So, there is no difference in power of the two kinds of adversaries and we will not distinguish them.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be any m-edge graph undergoing edge deletions, and let $S \subseteq V$ be a set of nodes such that, for any time step, every non-tree edge in $E(G) - \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ has exactly one endpoint in S. Moreover, every node $u \in V \setminus S$ has constant degree. Then, there is a decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that can preprocess G and S in time $\tilde{O}(m)$ and handle each edge deletion in $\tilde{O}(|S|)$ time.*[11]

3 The Extended Unit Flow Algorithm

In this section, we show an algorithm called *Extended Unit Flow* in Theorem 3.3. It is the main tool for developing an algorithm in Section 4 called *locally balanced sparse cut*, which will be used in our dynamic algorithm. The theorem is based on ideas of flow algorithms by Henzinger, Rao and Wang [14].

Flow-related notions. We derive many notations from [14], but note that they are not exactly the same. (In particular, we do not consider edge capacities, but instead use the notion of congestion.) A flow is defined on an instance $\Pi = (G, \Delta, T)$ consisting of (i) an unweighted undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, (ii) a *source function* $\Delta : V \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and (iii) a *sink function* $T : V \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. A *preflow* is a function $f : V \times V \to \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f(u, v) = -f(v, u)$ for any $(u, v) \in V \times V$ and $f(u, v) = 0$ for every $(u, v) \notin E$. Define $f(v) = \Delta(v) + \sum_{u \in V} f(u, v)$. A preflow f is said to be *source-feasible* (respectively *sink-feasible*) if, for every node v, $\sum_u f(v, u) \leq \Delta(v)$ (respectively $f(v) \leq T(v)$.). If f is both source- and sink-feasible, then we call it a *flow*. We define $cong(f) = \max_{(u,v) \in V \times V} f(u, v)$ as *the congestion of f*. We emphasize that the input and output functions considered here (i.e. Δ, T, f, and $cong$) map to *integers*.

One way to view a flow is to imagine that each node v initially has $\Delta(v)$ units of *supply* and an ability to *absorb* $T(v)$ units of supply. A preflow is a way to "route" the supply from one node to another. Intuitively, in a valid routing the total supply out of each node v should be at most its initial supply of $\Delta(v)$ (source-feasibility). A flow describes a way to route such that all supply can be absorbed (sink feasibility); i.e. in the end, each node v has at most $T(v)$ units of supply. The congestion measures how much supply we need to route through each edge.

With the view above, we call $f(v)$ (defined earlier) *the amount of supply ending at v after f*. For every node v, we denote $ex_f(v) = \max\{f(v) - T(v), 0\}$ as *the excess supply at v after f* and $ab_f(v) = \min\{T(v), f(v)\}$ as *the absorbed supply at v after f*. Observe that $ex_f(v) + ab_f(v) = f(v)$, for any v, and f is a feasible flow iff $ex_f(v) = 0$ for all nodes $v \in V$. When f is clear from the context, we simply use ex and ab to denote ex_f and ab_f. For convenience, we denote $|\Delta(\cdot)| = \sum_v \Delta(v)$ as *the total source supply*, $|T(\cdot)| = \sum_v T(v)$ as *the total sink capacity*, $|ex_f(\cdot)| = \sum_v ex_f(v)$ as *the total excess*, and $|ab_f(\cdot)| = \sum_v ab_f(v)$ as *the total supply absorbed*.

Remark 3.1 (Input and output formats). The input graph G is given to our algorithms as described in Section 2; in particular, our algorithms do not need to read G entirely. Functions Δ and T are input in the form of sets $\{(v, \Delta(v)) \mid \Delta(v) > 0\}$ and $\{(v, T(v)) \mid T(v) < \deg(v)\}$, respectively. Our algorithms will read both sets entirely.

Our algorithms output a preflow f as a set $\{((u, v), f(u, v)) \mid f(u, v) \neq 0\}$. When f is outputted, we can assume that we also obtained functions ex_f and ab_f which are represented as sets

[11] For those readers who are familiar with [37], Wulff-Nilsen showed in Section 3.2.2 of [37] how to maintain the MSF in the graph $G_2(\overline{C})$ which has the same setting as in Lemma 2.7. $G_2(\overline{C})$ is defined in [37], which is the same as $\overline{C}_2$ in Section 9. In [37], the set of *large-cluster vertices* (or *super nodes*) in $G_2(\overline{C})$ corresponds to the set S in Lemma 2.7 and every non-tree edge in $G_2(\overline{C})$ has exactly one endpoint as a large cluster node. There, the number of large cluster vertices is $|S| = O(n^\epsilon)$ and the algorithm has update time $|S| = O(n^\epsilon)$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$.

$\{(v, ex_f(v)) \mid ex_f(v) > 0\}$ and $\{(v, ab_f(v)) \mid ab_f(v) > 0\}$, respectively. This is because the time for computing these sets is at most linear in the time for reading Δ and T plus the time for outputting f.

Remark 3.2 ($\overline{T}(\cdot)$). We need another notation to state our result. Throughout, we only consider sink functions T such that $T(v) \leq \deg(v)$ for all nodes $v \in V$. When we compute a preflow, we usually add to each node v an *artificial supply* $\overline{T}(v) = \deg(v) - T(v)$ to both $\Delta(v)$ and $T(v)$ so that $T(v) = \deg(v)$. Observe that adding the artificial apply does not change the problem (i.e. a flow and preflow is feasible in the new instance if and only if it is in the old one). We define $|\overline{T}(\cdot)| = \sum_v \overline{T}(v) = 2m - |T(\cdot)|$ as the *total artificial supply*. This term will appear in the running time of our algorihtm.

The main theorem. Now, we are ready to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.3 (Extended Unit Flow Algorithm)**.** *There exists an algorithm* called Extended Unit Flow *which takes the followings as input:*

- *a graph $G = (V, E)$ with m edges (possibly with parallel edges but without self loops),*
- *positive integers $h \geq 1$ and $F \geq 1$,*
- *a source function Δ such that $\Delta(v) \leq F \deg(v)$ for all $v \in V$, and*
- *a sink function T such that $|\Delta(\cdot)| \leq |T(\cdot)|$ (also recall that $T(v) \leq \deg(v)$, $\forall v \in V$, as in Remark 3.2).*

In time $O(hF(|\Delta(\cdot)| + |\overline{T}(\cdot)|) \log m)$ the algorithm returns (i) a source-feasible preflow f with congestion $cong(f) \leq 2hF$ and (ii) $|ex_f(\cdot)|$. Moreover, either

- *(Case 1) $|ex_f(\cdot)| = 0$, i.e. f is a flow, or*
- *(Case 2) the algorithm returns a set $S \subseteq V$ such that $\phi_G(S) < \frac{1}{h}$ and $vol(S) \geq \frac{|ex_f(\cdot)|}{F}$. (All nodes in S are outputted.)*

Interpretation of Theorem 3.3. One way to interpret Theorem 3.3 is the following. (Note: readers who already understand Theorem 3.3 can skip this paragraph.) Besides graph G and source and sink functions, the algorithm in Theorem 3.3 takes integers h and F as inputs. These integers indicate the input that we consider "good": (i) the source function Δ is not too big at each node, i.e. $\forall v \in V$, $\Delta(v) \leq F \deg(v)$, and (ii) the graph G has high conductance; i.e. $\phi(G) > 1/h$. Note that for the good input it is possible to find a flow of congestion $\tilde{O}(hF)$: each set $S \subseteq V$ there can be $\sum_{v \in S} \Delta(v) \leq F \cdot vol(S)$ initial supply (by (i)), while there are $\delta(S) > vol(S)/h$ edges to route this supply out of S (by (ii)); so, on average there is $\frac{\sum_{v \in S} \Delta(v)}{\delta(S)} \leq hF$ supply routed through each edge. This is essentially what our algorithm achieves in Case 1. If it does not manage to compute a flow, it computes some source-feasible preflow and outputs a "certificate" that the input is bad, i.e. a low-conductance cut S as in Case 2. Moreover, the larger the excess of the preflow, the higher the volume of S; i.e. $vol(S)$ is in the order of $ex_f(\cdot)/F$. In fact, this volume-excess relationship is the key property that we will need later. One way to make sense of this relationship is to notice that if $vol(S) \geq |ex_f(\cdot)|/F$, then we can put as much as $F \cdot vol(S) \geq |ex_f(\cdot)|$ initial supply in S. With conductance of S low enough ($\phi_G(S) \leq \frac{1}{2h}$ suffices), we can force most of the initial supply to remain in S and become an excess. Note that this explanation is rather inaccurate, but might be useful to intuitively understand the interplay between $vol(S)$, $|ex_f(\cdot)|$ and F.

Finally, we note again that our algorithm is *local* in the sense that its running time is lower than the size of G. For this algorithm to be useful later, it is important that the running time is

almost-linear in $(|\Delta(\cdot)| + |\overline{T}(\cdot)|)$. Other than this, it can have any polynomial dependency on h, F and the logarithmic terms.

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 3.3. The main idea is to slightly extend the algorithm called *Unit Flow* by Henzinger, Rao and Wang [14].

The Unit Flow Algorithm. The following lemma, which is obtained by adjusting and simplifying parameters from Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.1 in [14]. See Appendix B.1 for the details.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists an algorithm* called Unit Flow *which takes the same input as in Theorem 3.3 (i.e. G, h, F, Δ, and T) except an additional condition that $T(v) = \deg(v)$ for all $v \in V$. In time $O(Fh|\Delta(\cdot)| \log m)$, the algorithm returns a source-feasible preflow f with congestion at most $2hF$. Moreover, one of the followings holds.*

1. *$|ex_f(\cdot)| = 0$ i.e. f is a flow.*
2. *A set S is returned, where $\phi_G(S) < \frac{1}{h}$. Moreover, $\forall v \in S$: $ex_f(v) \leq (F-1)\deg(v)$ and $\forall v \notin S$: $ex_f(v) = 0$.*

We also note the following fact which holds because the Unit Flow algorithm is based on the push-relabel framework, where each node v sends supply to its neighbors only when $ex(v) > 0$ and pushes at most $ex(v)$ units of supply.

Fact 3.5. *The returned preflow f in Lemma 3.4 is such that, for any $v \in V$, $\sum_{u \in V} f(v,u) \leq 0$ if $f(v) < T(v)$.*

The Extended Unit Flow Algorithm. Next, we slightly extend the Unit Flow algorithm so that it can handle sink functions T where for some node v, $T(v) < \deg(v)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Given G, h, F, Δ, and T as inputs, the Extended Unit Flow algorithm proceeds as follows. Let Δ' and T' be source and sink functions where, for all nodes $v \in V$, $\Delta'(v) = \Delta(v) + \overline{T}(v)$ and $T'(v) = T(v) + \overline{T}(v) = \deg(v)$, respectively. Note that $|\Delta'(\cdot)| = |\Delta(\cdot)| + |\overline{T}(\cdot)| \leq |T(\cdot)| + |\overline{T}(\cdot)| = 2m$, and $\Delta'(v) \leq (F+1)\deg(v)$ for all $v \in V$. According to Remark 3.1, we can construct the compact representation of Δ' and T' in time $O(|\Delta(\cdot)| + |\overline{T}(\cdot)|)$.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the Unit Flow algorithm from Lemma 3.4. We run $\mathcal{A}$ with input $(G, h, F+1, \Delta', T')$. $\mathcal{A}$ will run in time $O(h(F+1)|\Delta'(\cdot)| \log m) = O(Fh(|\Delta(\cdot)|+|\overline{T}(\cdot)|) \log m)$. Then, $\mathcal{A}$ returns a source-feasible preflow f with congestion $2hF$ for an instance (G, Δ', T') and the excess function ex'_f (see Remark 3.1). If $\mathcal{A}$ also returns a set S, then the Extended Unit Flow algorithm also returns S; otherwise, we claim that f is a *flow* (not just a preflow) for the instance (G, Δ, T), as follows.

Recall that for any $v \in V$, the followings hold.

$$f'(v) = \Delta'(v) + \sum_u f(u,v)$$
$$f(v) = \Delta(v) + \sum_u f(u,v)$$
$$ex'_f(v) = \max\{f'(v) - T'(v), 0\}$$
$$ex_f(v) = \max\{f(v) - T(v), 0\}$$

We argue that f is a source-feasible preflow for (G, Δ, T) with congestion $2hF$. As guaranteed by $\mathcal{A}$, f has congestion $2hF$. The following claim shows that f is source-feasible, i.e. for all v, $\sum_u f(v,u) \leq \Delta(v)$.

Claim 3.6. $\sum_u f(v,u) \le \max\{0, \Delta'(v) - T'(v)\} \le \Delta(v)$ for any $v \in V$.

Proof. There are two cases. If $f'(v) < T'(v)$, then $\sum_u f(v,u) \le 0$ by Fact 3.5. If $f'(v) \ge T'(v)$, then $\sum_u f(v,u) = \Delta'(v) - f'(v) \le \Delta'(v) - T'(v)$. So $\sum_u f(v,u) \le \max\{0, \Delta'(v) - T'(v)\}$. Since $\Delta(v) \ge 0$, we only need to show $\Delta'(v) - T'(v) \le \Delta(v)$. Indeed, $\Delta'(v) - T'(v) = \Delta(v) - T(v) \le \Delta(v)$. □

Therefore, we conclude that f is a source-feasible preflow for (G, Δ, T) with congestion $2hF$.

Next, we show that the excess function ex_f w.r.t. Δ and T is the same function as the excess function ex'_f w.r.t. Δ' and T', which is returned by $\mathcal{A}$.

Claim 3.7. For any $v \in V$, $ex'_f(v) = ex_f(v)$.

Proof. It suffices to show $f'(v) - T'(v) = f(v) - T(v)$ for all $v \in V$. Indeed, for every $v \in V$, $f'(v) - f(v) = \Delta'(v) - \Delta(v) = \overline{T}(v) = T(v) - T'(v)$. □

Therefore, by Claim 3.7, in the first case where $\mathcal{A}$ guarantees $|ex'_f(\cdot)| = 0$, we have $|ex_f(\cdot)| = |ex'_f(\cdot)| = 0$, i.e. f is a flow for (G, Δ, T). In the second case where $\mathcal{A}$ returns a cut S where $\phi_G(S) < \frac{1}{h}$, we have that $\forall v \in S$, $ex_f(v) = ex'_f(v) \le ((F+1) - 1)\deg(v) = F\deg(v)$ and $\forall v \notin S$, $ex_f(v) = ex'_f(v) = 0$. By summing over all nodes v, we have $|ex_f(\cdot)| = \sum_{v \in S} ex_f(v) + \sum_{v \notin S} ex_f(s) \le F \sum_{v \in S} \deg(v) = F vol(S)$. That is, $vol(S) \ge |ex_f(\cdot)|/F$. □

4 Locally Balanced Sparse Cut

In this section, we show an algorithm for finding a *locally balanced sparse cut*, which is a crucial tool in Section 5. The main theorem is Theorem 4.4. First, we need this definition:

Definition 4.1 (Overlapping)**.** *For any graph $G = (V, E)$, set $A \subset V$, and real $0 \le \sigma \le 1$, we say that a set $S \subset V$ is* (A, σ)-overlapping *in G if $vol(S \cap A)/vol(S) \ge \sigma$.*

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. Recall that a cut S is *α-sparse* if it has conductance $\phi(S) = \frac{\delta(S)}{\min\{vol(S), vol(V-S)\}} < \alpha$. Consider any set $A \subset V$, an overlapping parameter $0 \le \sigma \le 1$ and a conductance parameter $0 \le \alpha \le 1$. Let S^* be the set of largest volume that is α-sparse (A, σ)-overlapping and such that $vol(S^*) \le vol(V - S^*)$. We define $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha, A, \sigma) = vol(S^*)$. If S^* does not exist, then we define $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha, A, \sigma) = 0$. From this definition, observe that $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha, A, \sigma) \le \mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha', A, \sigma)$ for any $\alpha \le \alpha'$. Now, we define the locally balanced sparse cut problem formally:

Definition 4.2 (Locally Balanced Sparse (LBS) Cut)**.** *Consider any graph $G = (V, E)$, a set $A \subset V$, and parameters $c_{size} \ge 1, c_{con} \ge 1, \sigma$ and α. We say that a cut S where $vol(S) \le vol(V - S)$ is a* (c_{size}, c_{con})-approximate locally balanced sparse cut with respect to (G, α, A, σ) *(in short,* $(c_{size}, c_{con}, G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$-LBS cut*) if*

$$\phi(S) < \alpha \qquad \text{and} \qquad c_{size} \cdot vol(S) \ge \mathit{OPT}(G, \alpha/c_{con}, A, \sigma). \tag{1}$$

In words, the $(c_{size}, c_{con}, G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$-LBS cut can be thought of as a relaxed version of $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$: On the one hand, we define $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$ to be a *highest-volume* cut with low enough conductance and high enough overlap with A (determined by α and σ respectively). On the other hand, a $(c_{size}, c_{con}, G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$-LBS cut does *not* need to overlap with A at all; moreover, its volume is only compared to $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha/c_{con}, A, \sigma)$, which is at most $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$, and we also allow the gap of c_{size} in such comparison. We note that the existence of a $(c_{size}, c_{con}, G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$-LBS cut S implies that any (A, σ)-overlapping cut of volume more than $c_{size} \cdot vol(S)$ must have conductance at least α/c_{con} (because any (A, σ)-overlapping cut with conductance less than α/c_{con} has volume at most $c_{size} \cdot vol(S)$).

Definition 4.3 (LBS Cut Algorithm)**.** *For any parameters c_{size} and c_{con},* a (c_{size}, c_{con})-approximate algorithm *for the LBS cut problem (in short,* (c_{size}, c_{con})-approximate LBS cut algorithm*) takes as input a graph $G = (V, E)$, a set $A \subset V$, an overlapping parameter $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$, and an conductance parameter $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. Then, the algorithm either*

- *(Case 1) finds a $(c_{size}, c_{con}, G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$-LBS cut S, or*
- *(Case 2) reports that there is no (α/c_{con})-sparse (A, σ)-overlapping cut, i.e. $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha/c_{con}, A, \sigma) = 0$.*

From Definition 4.3, if there exists an (α/c_{con})-sparse (A, σ)-overlapping cut, then a (c_{size}, c_{con})-approximate LBS cut algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ can only do Case 1, or if there is no α-sparse cut, then $\mathcal{A}$ must do Case 2. However, if there is no (α/c_{con})-sparse (A, σ)-overlapping cut but there is an α-sparse cut, then $\mathcal{A}$ can either do Case 2, or Case 1 (which is to find any α-sparse cut in this case).

The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 4.4. *Consider the special case of the LBS cut problem where the input (G, A, σ, α) is always such that (i) $2vol(A) \leq vol(V - A)$ and (ii) $\sigma \in [\frac{2vol(A)}{vol(V-A)}, 1]$. In this case, there is a $(O(1/\sigma^2), O(1/\sigma^2))$-approximate LBS cut algorithm that runs in $\tilde{O}(\frac{vol(A)}{\alpha\sigma^2})$ time.*

We note that in our later application it is enough to have an algorithm with $\text{poly}(\frac{\log n}{\alpha\sigma})$ approximation guarantees and running time almost linear in $vol(A)$ (possibly with $\text{poly}(\frac{\log n}{\alpha\sigma})$).

Before proving the above theorem, let us compare the above theorem to related results in the literature. Previously, Orecchia and Zhu [25] show two algorithms for a problem called *local cut improvement*. This problem is basically the same as the LBS cut problem except that there is no guarantee about the volume of the outputted cut. Nanongkai and Saranurak [24] show that one of the two algorithms by [25] implies a $(\frac{3}{\sigma}, \frac{3}{\sigma})$-approximate LBS cut algorithm with running time $\tilde{O}((\frac{vol(A)}{\sigma})^{1.5})$. While the approximation guarantees are better than the one in Theorem 4.4, this algorithm is too slow for us. By the same techniques, one can also show that the other algorithm by [25] implies a $(n, \frac{3}{\sigma})$-approximate LBS cut algorithm with running time $\tilde{O}(\frac{vol(A)}{\alpha\sigma})$ similar to Theorem 4.4, but the approximation guarantee on c_{size} is too high for us. Thus, the main challenge here is to get a good guarantee on both c_{size} and running time. Fortunately, given the Extended Unit Flow algorithm from Section 3, it is not hard to obtain Theorem 4.4.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. The rest of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 4.4. Let (G, A, σ, α) be an input as in Theorem 4.4. Define $F = \lceil 1/\sigma \rceil$ and $h = \lceil 1/\alpha \rceil$. Define the source and sink functions as

$$\Delta(v) = \begin{cases} \lceil 1/\sigma \rceil \deg(v) & \forall v \in A \\ 0 & \forall v \notin A \end{cases}$$

$$T(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \forall v \in A \\ \deg(v) & \forall v \notin A \end{cases}$$

Now we run the Extended Unit Flow algorithm from Theorem 3.3, with input (G, h, F, Δ, T). Note that this input satisfies the conditions in Theorem 3.3:

- $h \geq 1$ and $F \geq 1$ because $\sigma \leq 1$ and $\alpha \leq 1$,
- for all $v \in V$, $\Delta(v) \leq \lceil 1/\sigma \rceil \deg(v) = F \deg(v)$ and $T(v) \leq \deg(v)$, and

- $|\Delta(\cdot)| = \lceil 1/\sigma \rceil \, vol(A) \leq \left\lceil \frac{vol(V-A)}{2vol(A)} \right\rceil vol(A) \leq vol(V-A) = \sum_{v \notin A} \deg(v) = |T(\cdot)|$.

The Extended Unit Flow algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ finishes in time $O(hF(|\Delta(\cdot)| + |\overline{T}(\cdot)|) \log m) = \tilde{O}(\frac{vol(A)}{\alpha\sigma^2})$, where the equality is because of the inequalities above and the fact that $|\bar{T}(\cdot)| = \sum_{v \in A} \deg(v) = vol(A)$. When $\mathcal{A}$ finishes, we obtain a source-feasible preflow f with congestion $cong(f) \leq 2hF = O(\frac{1}{\alpha\sigma})$, total excess $|ex_f(\cdot)|$, and possibly a cut S (when $|ex_f(\cdot)| > 0$). Let $c_{size} = \frac{2F}{\sigma} = O(1/\sigma^2)$ and $c_{con} = \frac{2\alpha \cdot cong(f)}{\sigma} = O(1/\sigma^2)$. We output as follows.

- If $|ex_f(\cdot)| = 0$, we report that there is no (α/c_{con})-sparse (A, σ)-overlapping cut (i.e. $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha/c_{con}, A, \sigma) = 0$) as in Case 2 of Definition 4.3.
- Otherwise, we output S as an $(c_{size}, c_{con}, G, \alpha, A, \sigma)$-approximate LBS cut as in Case 1 of Definition 4.3.

To prove that the above algorithm is correct, observe that it suffices to prove that $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \frac{\sigma}{2cong(f)}, A, \sigma) \leq 2|ex_f(\cdot)|/\sigma$. Indeed, if $|ex_f(\cdot)| = 0$, then this implies $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha/c_{con}, A, \sigma) = 0$ by the choice of c_{con}. Otherwise, we have $|ex_f(\cdot)| > 0$. Recall from Theorem 3.3 that the outputted set S is such that $\phi_G(S) < \frac{1}{h} \leq \alpha$ and $vol(S) \geq |ex_f(\cdot)|/F$. This means that $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha/c_{con}, A, \sigma) \leq 2|ex_f(\cdot)|/\sigma \leq c_{size} \cdot vol(S)$. Therefore, we conclude with the following claim:

Claim 4.5. For any (A, σ)-overlapping cut S' where $vol(S') > 2|ex_f(\cdot)|/\sigma$, we have $\phi(S') \geq \frac{\sigma}{2cong(f)}$. That is, $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \frac{\sigma}{2cong(f)}, A, \sigma) \leq 2|ex_f(\cdot)|/\sigma$.

Proof. Let $\Delta(S') = \sum_{v \in S'} \Delta(v)$ be the total source supply from nodes in S', $ex_f(S') = \sum_{v \in S'} ex_f(v)$ be the total excess supply in nodes in S', and $ab_f(S') = \sum_{v \in S'} ab_f(v)$ be the total supply absorbed by nodes in S'. Observe that $\Delta(S') = \lceil 1/\sigma \rceil \, vol(A \cap S')$ and $ab_f(S') \leq vol(S' - A)$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} cong(f) \cdot \delta(S') &\geq \Delta(S') - ex_f(S') - ab_f(S') \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sigma} vol(A \cap S') - |ex_f(\cdot)| - vol(S' - A). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} cong(f) \cdot \phi(S') &\geq \frac{\frac{1}{\sigma} vol(A \cap S') - |ex_f(\cdot)| - vol(S' - A)}{vol(S')} \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{\sigma} vol(A \cap S') - |ex_f(\cdot)| - (vol(S') - vol(A \cap S'))}{vol(S')} \\ &= \frac{(\frac{1}{\sigma} + 1) vol(A \cap S') - |ex_f(\cdot)| - vol(S')}{vol(S')} \\ &\geq (\frac{1}{\sigma} + 1)\sigma - \frac{\sigma}{2} - 1 = \frac{\sigma}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

5 Expander Pruning

The main result of this section is the *dynamic expander pruning* algorithm. This algorithm was a key tool introduced by Wulff-Nilsen [37, Theorem 5] for obtaining his dynamic MSF algorithm. We significantly improve his dynamic expander pruning algorithm which is randomized and has $n^{0.5-\epsilon_0}$

update time for some constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$. Our algorithm is *deterministic* and has $n^{o(1)}$ update time. Although the algorithm is deterministic, our final dynamic MSF algorithm is randomized because there are other components that need randomization.

First we state the precise statement (explanations follow below).

Theorem 5.1 (Dynamic Expander Pruning)**.** *Consider any $\epsilon(n) = o(1)$, and let $\alpha_0(n) = 1/n^{\epsilon(n)}$. There is a dynamic algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that can maintain a set of nodes P for a graph G undergoing $T = O(m\alpha_0^2(n))$ edge deletions as follows. Let G_τ and P_τ be the graph G and set P after the τ^{th} deletion, respectively.*

- *Initially, in $O(1)$ time $\mathcal{A}$ sets $P_0 = \emptyset$ and takes as input an n-node m-edge graph $G_0 = (V, E)$ with maximum degree 3.*
- *After the τ^{th} deletion, $\mathcal{A}$ takes $n^{O(\log\log\frac{1}{\epsilon(n)}/\log\frac{1}{\epsilon(n)})} = n^{o(1)}$ time to report nodes to be added to $P_{\tau-1}$ to form P_τ where, if $\phi(G_0) \geq \alpha_0(n)$, then*

$$\exists W_\tau \subseteq P_\tau \text{ s.t. } G_\tau[V - W_\tau] \text{ is connected.} \tag{2}$$

The goal of our algorithm is to gradually mark nodes in a graph $G = (V, E)$ so that at all time – as edges in G are deleted – all nodes that are not yet marked are in the same connected component in G. In other words, the algorithm maintains a set P of (marked) nodes, called *pruning set*, such that there exists $W \subseteq P$ where $G[V - W]$ is connected (thus Equation (2)). In our application in Section 9, we will delete edges incident to P from the graph, hence the name pruning set.

Recall that the algorithm takes an input graph in the local manner, as noted in Remark 2.1, thus taking $n^{o(1)}$ time. Observe that if we can set $P = V$ from the beginning, the problem becomes trivial. The challenge here is that we must set $P = \emptyset$ in the initial step, and thus must grow P smartly and quickly (in $n^{o(1)}$ time) after each deletion so that Equation (2) remains satisfied.

Observe further that this task is not possible to achieve in general: if the first deletion cuts G into two large connected components, then P has to grow tremendously to contain one of these components, which is impossible to do in $n^{o(1)}$ time. Because of this, our algorithm is guaranteed to work only if the initial graph has *high enough expansion*; in particular, an initial expansion of $\alpha_0(n)$ as in Theorem 5.1 suffices for us.

Organization. The rest of this section is for proving Theorem 5.1. The key tool is an algorithm called the *one-shot expander pruning*, which was also the key tool in Nanongkai and Saranurak [24] for obtaining their Las Vegas dynamic SF algorithm. We show an improved version of this algorithm in Section 5.1 using the faster LBS cut algorithm we developed in Section 4. In Section 5.2, we show how to use several instances of the one-shot expander pruning algorithm to obtain the dynamic one and prove Theorem 5.1.

5.1 One-shot Expander Pruning

In the following, we show the *one-shot expander pruning* algorithm which is significantly improved from [24]. In words, the one-shot expander pruning algorithm is different from the dynamic one from Theorem 5.1 in two aspects: 1) it only handles a single batch of edge deletions, instead of a sequence of edge deletions, and so only outputs a pruning set P once, and 2) the pruning set P has a stronger guarantee than the pruning set for dynamic one as follows: P does not only contains all nodes in the cuts that are completely separated from the graphs (i.e. the separated connected components) but P contains all nodes in the cuts that have low conductance. Moreover, P contains *exactly* those nodes and hence the complement $G[V - P]$ has high conductance. For the dynamic expander pruning algorithm, we only have that there is some $W \subseteq P$ where $G[V - W]$ is connected.

The theorem below shows the precise statement. Below, we think of $G_b = (V, E \cup D)$ as the graph before the deletions, and $G = G_b - D$ as the graph after deleting D. In [24], Nanongkai and Saranurak show this algorithm where the dependency on D is $\sim D^{1.5+\delta}$, while in our algorithm the dependency of D is $\sim D^{1+\delta}$.

Theorem 5.2 (One-shot Expander Pruning). *There is an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that can do the following:*

- *$\mathcal{A}$ is given G,D, α_b, δ as inputs: $G = (V, E)$ is an n-node m-edge graph with maximum degree Δ, α_b is a conductance parameter, $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is a parameter, and D is a set of edges where $D \cap E = \emptyset$ where $|D| = O(\alpha_b^2 m/\Delta)$. Let $G_b = (V, E \cup D)$.*
- *Then, in time $\overline{t} = \tilde{O}(\frac{\Delta|D|^{1+\delta}}{\delta \alpha_b^{6+\delta}})$, $\mathcal{A}$ either reports $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$, or outputs a* pruning set *$P \subset V$. Moreover, if $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$, then we have*
  - *$vol_G(P) \leq 2|D|/\alpha_b$, and*
  - *a pruned graph $H = G[V - P]$ has high conductance: $\phi(H) \geq \alpha = \Omega({\alpha_b}^{2/\delta})$.*

We call $\overline{t}$ the *time limit* and α the *conductance guarantee* of $\mathcal{A}$. If we do not care about the time limit, then there is the following algorithm gives a very good conductance guarantee: just find the cut C^* of conductance at most $\alpha_b/10$ that have maximum volume and output $P = C^*$. If $vol(P) > 2|D|/\alpha_b$, then report $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$. Otherwise, we must have $\phi(G[V - P]) = \Omega(\alpha_b)$. This can be shown using the result by Spielman and Teng [31, Lemma 7.2]. However, computing the optimum cut C^* is NP-hard.

In [24], they implicitly showed that using only the LBS cut algorithm, which is basically an algorithm for finding a cut similar to C^* but the guarantee is only *approximately* and *locally*, one can quickly obtain the one-shot expander pruning algorithm whose conductance guarantee is not too bad. Below, we explicitly state the reduction in [24]. See Appendix A for the proof[12].

Lemma 5.3 ([24]). *Suppose there is a $(c_{size}(\sigma), c_{con}(\sigma))$-approximate LBS cut algorithm with running time $t_{LSB}(n, vol(A), \alpha, \sigma)$ when given (G, A, σ, α) as inputs where $G = (V, E)$ is an n-node graph, $A \subset V$ is a set of nodes, σ is an overlapping parameter, and α is a conductance parameter. Then, there is a one-shot expander pruning algorithm with input (G, D, α_b, δ) that has* time limit

$$\overline{t} = O((\frac{|D|}{\alpha_b})^\delta \cdot \frac{c_{size}(\alpha_b/2)}{\delta} \cdot t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$$

and conductance guarantee

$$\alpha = \frac{\alpha_b}{5c_{con}(\alpha_b/2)^{1/\delta - 1}}.$$

Having the above lemma and our new LBS cut algorithm from Section 4, we conclude:

Proof of Theorem 5.2. From Theorem 4.4 we have that $t_{LSB}(n, vol(A), \alpha, \sigma) = \tilde{O}(\frac{vol(A)}{\alpha\sigma^2})$ and $c_{size}(\sigma) = O(1/\sigma^2)$ and $c_{con}(\sigma) = O(1/\sigma^2)$. So

$$t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b) = \tilde{O}(\frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b^4})$$

[12] Strictly speaking, in [24], they use LBS cut algorithm to obtain the *local expansion decomposition* algorithm which has slight stronger guarantee. Actually, even in [24], they only need the one-shot expander pruning algorithm. So the proof of Lemma 5.3 is simpler than the similar one in [24]. Moreover, the reduction give a deterministic one-shot expander pruning algorithm, but in [24], they obtain a randomized local expansion decomposition algorithm.

and hence

$$\overline{t} = O((\frac{|D|}{\alpha_b})^{\delta} \cdot \frac{c_{size}(\alpha_b/2)}{\delta} \cdot \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b^4}) = \tilde{O}(\frac{\Delta|D|^{1+\delta}}{\delta\alpha_b^{6+\delta}}).$$

We also have $\alpha = \frac{\alpha_b}{5c_{con}(\alpha_b/2)^{1/\delta-1}} = \Omega(\alpha_b \cdot (\alpha_b^2)^{1/\delta-1}) = \Omega({\alpha_b}^{2/\delta})$. □

5.2 Dynamic Expander Pruning

In this section, we exploit the one-shot expander pruning algorithm from Section 5.1. To prove Theorem 5.1, it is more convenience to prove the more general statement as follows:

Lemma 5.4. *There is an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that can do the following:*

- *$\mathcal{A}$ is given G_0, α_0, ℓ as inputs: $G_0 = (V, E)$ is an n-node m-edge graph with maximum degree Δ, and $\alpha_0 = \frac{1}{n^{\epsilon}}$ and ℓ are parameters. Let $P_0 = \emptyset$.*
- *Then G_0 undergoes the sequence of edge deletions of length $T = O(\alpha_0^2 m/\Delta)$.*
- *Given the τ-th update, $\mathcal{A}$ takes $\tilde{O}(\ell^2\Delta n^{O(1/\ell+\epsilon\ell^{\ell})})$ time. Then, $\mathcal{A}$ either reports $\phi(G_0) < \alpha_0$ and halt, or $\mathcal{A}$ updates the pruning set P to P_τ where $P_{\tau-1} \subseteq P_\tau \subseteq V$.*
- *If $\phi(G_0) \geq \alpha_0$ then, for all τ, there exists $W_\tau \subseteq P_\tau$ where $G_\tau[V - W_\tau]$ is connected.*

From Lemma 5.4, we immediately obtain Theorem 5.1 by choosing the right parameters.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We set $\ell = \frac{\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{2 \log\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}$, so that $\ell^{\ell} = O(\frac{1}{\epsilon^{1/2}})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} n^{O(1/\ell+\epsilon\ell^{\ell})} &= n^{O(\log\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}/\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}+\epsilon^{1/2})} \\ &= n^{O(\log\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}/\log \frac{1}{\epsilon})} = n^{o(1)} \end{aligned}$$

when $\epsilon = o(1)$. We apply Lemma 5.4 with this parameters ℓ and $\alpha_0 = \frac{1}{n^{\epsilon}}$ and we are done. □

The rest of this section is for proving Lemma 5.4.

5.2.1 The Algorithm

Let G_0, α_0, ℓ be the inputs for the algorithm for Lemma 5.4. To roughly describe the algorithm, there will be $\ell+1$ *levels* and, in each level, this algorithm repeated calls an instance of the one-shot expander pruning algorithm from Theorem 5.2. In the deeper level i (large i), we call it more frequently but the size of the set D of edges is smaller. We describe the details and introduce some notations below.

We fix $\delta = 2/\ell$. For any n, δ, α, let $f_{n,\delta}(\alpha) = (c_0\alpha)^{2/\delta}$ be the conductance guarantee of the remaining graph from Theorem 5.2 where c_0 is some constant. We define $\alpha_i = f_{n,\delta}(\alpha_{i-1})$ for each *level* $1 \leq i \leq \ell+1$. Note that, we have a rough bound $\alpha_i = \Omega((c_0\alpha_0)^{\ell^i})$ for all i.. Given any input $G' = (V', E')$,D', α', δ, we denote $(X', P') = Prune_{\alpha'}(G', D')$ as the output of the one-shot expander pruning algorithm from Section 5.1 where $P' \subset V$ is the outputted pruning set and $X' = G'[V'-P']$ is the pruned graph. Note that we omit writing δ in $Prune_{\alpha'}(G', D')$ because $\delta = 2/\ell$ is always fixed.

For convenience, we say that a graph X *is an induced α-expander from time τ* if $X = G_\tau[U]$ for some $U \subset V$ and X has conductance at least α, i.e. $\phi(X) \geq \alpha$. For any time period $[\tau, \tau']$, we denote $D_{[\tau,\tau']} \subset E$ a set of edges to be deleted from time τ to τ'. Observe the following fact which follows by the definitions and Theorem 5.2:

Fact 5.5. *Suppose that X is an induced α_i-expander from time τ and $(X', P') = Prune_{\alpha_i}(X, D_{[\tau+1,\tau']})$. Then X' is an induced α_{i+1}-expander from time τ'.*

To maintain the pruning set P, we will additionally maintain a level-i graphs X^i and a level-i pruning set P^i for each level $1 \le i \le \ell+1$. Let X^i_τ and P^i_τ be X^i and P^i at time τ respectively. For each level i, we initially set $X^i_0 = G_0$ and $P^i_0 = \emptyset$, and X^i and P^i will be updated periodically for every d_i time steps where $d_i = n^{1-i/\ell}$ for $i \le \ell$ and $d_{\ell+1} = 1$. Note that $d_\ell = 1$. In particular, this means:

Fact 5.6. *For any number $k \ge 0$ and time $\tau \in [kd_i, (k+1)d_i)$, we have $X^i_\tau = X^i_{kd_i}$ and $P^i_\tau = P^i_{kd_i}$.*

In each time step, we spend time in each of the $\ell+1$ levels. See the precise description on each level in Algorithm 5.1. At any time, for any i, whenever we call $Prune_{\alpha_i}(X^i, \cdot)$ and it report that $\phi(X^i) < \alpha_i$, our algorithm will report that $\phi(G_0) < \alpha_0$ and halt.

Initialization: $X^0 = G_0$ and $P_0 = \emptyset$. For each $1 \le i \le \ell$, $d_i = n^{1-i/\ell}$, $X^i_0 = G_0$, $P^i_0 = \emptyset$.

1. For each level $1 \le i \le \ell$, for each number $k_i \ge 0$, in time period $[k_i d_i + 1, (k_i+1)d_i]$:
   (a) Let k_{i-1} be such that $k_{i-1}d_{i-1} < k_i d_i + 1 \le (k_{i-1}+1)d_{i-1}$.
   (b) During the period, distribute evenly the work to:
      i. Update $(X^i_{(k_i+1)d_i}, P^i_{(k_i+1)d_i}) = Prune_{\alpha_{i-1}}(X^{i-1}_{k_{i-1}d_{i-1}}, D_{[\min\{1,(k_{i-1}-1)d_{i-1}+1\}, k_i d_i]})$.
      ii. Include $P^i_{(k_i+1)d_i}$ into the pruning set P.
2. For level $\ell+1$, at time τ:
   (a) Update $(X^{\ell+1}_\tau, P^{\ell+1}_\tau) = Prune_{\alpha_\ell}(X^\ell_\tau, D_{[\tau,\tau]})$.
   (b) Include $P^{\ell+1}_\tau$ into the pruning set P.

Algorithm 5.1: Dynamic expander pruning algorithm

5.2.2 Analysis

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose $\phi(G_0) \ge \alpha_0$. For any $1 \le i \le \ell$ and k_i, $X^i_{k_i d_i}$ is an induced α_i-expander from time* $\max\{0, (k_i-1)d_i\}$.

Proof. When $k_i = 0$, this is trivial. We now prove the claim for $k_i > 0$ by induction on i. Let k_{i-1} be a number from Step 1.a such that $k_{i-1}d_{i-1} < k_i d_i + 1 \le (k_{i-1}+1)d_{i-1}$. $X^{i-1}_{k_{i-1}d_{i-1}}$ is an induced α_{i-1}-expander from time $(k_{i-1}-1)d_{i-1}$ by induction hypothesis. By Step 1.b.ii and Fact 5.5, we have $X^i_{(k_i+1)d_i}$ is an induced α_i-expander from time $k_i d_i$. By translating back the time by d_i steps, we can conclude the claim. □

Lemma 5.8. *Suppose $\phi(G_0) \ge \alpha_0$. For any time τ, $X^{\ell+1}_\tau$ is an induced $\alpha_{\ell+1}$-expander from time τ.*

Proof. Note that $d_\ell = 1$. By Lemma 5.7 when $i = \ell$, we have that after the τ-th update, X^ℓ_τ is an induced α_ℓ-expander from time $\tau - 1$. By Step 2.a and Fact 5.5, $X_{\ell+1}$ is an induced $\alpha_{\ell+1}$-expander from time τ. □

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose $\phi(G_0) \geq \alpha_0$. Then the algorithm never reports that $\phi(G_0) < \alpha_0$.*

Proof. Recall that the algorithm will report $\phi(G_0) < \alpha_0$ only when, for some i and j, the call of $Prune_{\alpha_i}(X^i_j, \cdot)$ reports that $\phi(X^i_j) < \alpha_i$. By Fact 5.6, Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.8, if $\phi(G_0) \geq \alpha_0$, then X^i_j is an induced α_j-expander for all j and in particular $\phi(X^i_j) \geq \alpha_i$. So the algorithm never reports that $\phi(G_0) < \alpha_0$. □

The following proposition is easy to see by Step 1.b.ii and Step 2.b in Algorithm 5.1:

Proposition 5.10. *For any $1 \leq i \leq \ell + 1$ and k_i, $P^i_{k_i d_i} \subseteq P_{k_i d_i}$.*

Lemma 5.11. *For any τ, $V - V(X^{\ell+1}_\tau) \subseteq P_\tau$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that $V(X^{\ell+1}_\tau) \supseteq V - P_\tau$. Let $k_\ell = \tau$. We have $V(X^{\ell+1}_\tau) = V(X^\ell_{k_\ell d_\ell}) - P^{\ell+1}_\tau$. By Step 1.a and 1.b.i, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
V(X^\ell_{k_\ell d_\ell}) &= V(X^{\ell-1}_{(k_{\ell-1}-1)d_{\ell-1}}) - P^\ell_{k_\ell d_\ell} \\
&= V(X^{\ell-2}_{(k_{\ell-2}-2)d_{i-2}}) - P^{\ell-1}_{(k_{\ell-1}-1)d_{\ell-1}} - P^\ell_{k_\ell d_\ell} \\
&\vdots \\
&= V(X^0) - \bigcup_{0 \leq i < \ell} P^{\ell-i}_{(k_{\ell-i}-i)d_{\ell-i}} \\
&= V - \bigcup_{0 \leq i < \ell} P^{\ell-i}_{(k_{\ell-i}-i)d_{\ell-i}}
\end{aligned}$$

where k_{i-i} is the largest number where $(k_{\ell-i} - 1)d_{\ell-i} \leq k_{\ell-i+1} d_{\ell-i+1}$. (For convenience, let $X^i_j = X^i_0 = G_0$ and $P^i_j = \emptyset$ for any negative $j < 0$.) Observe that $(k_{\ell-i} - i)d_{\ell-i} \leq k_\ell d_\ell$ for all $i \leq \ell$. Therefore, by Proposition 5.10, we have $P^{\ell-i}_{(k_{\ell-i}-i)d_{\ell-i}} \subseteq P_{(k_{\ell-i}-i)d_{\ell-i}} \subseteq P_{k_\ell d_\ell}$. This implies that $V(X^\ell_{k_\ell d_\ell}) \supseteq V - P_{k_\ell d_\ell} = V - P_\tau$. We conclude $V(X^{\ell+1}_\tau) = V(X^\ell_{k_\ell d_\ell}) - P^{\ell+1}_\tau \supseteq V - P_\tau$, by Proposition 5.10 again. □

Now, we can conclude the correctness of the algorithm:

Corollary 5.12. *After given the τ-th update, the algorithm either correctly reports $\phi(G_0) < \alpha_0$ and halt, or updates the pruning set P to P_τ where $P_{\tau-1} \subseteq P_\tau \subseteq V$. If $\phi(G_0) \geq \alpha_0$ then, for all τ, there exists $W_\tau \subseteq P_\tau$ where $G_\tau[V - W_\tau]$ is connected.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.9, we have that the algorithm either *correctly* reports that $\phi(G_0) < \alpha_0$ and halt, or updates the pruning set P to P_τ and $P_{\tau-1} \subseteq P_\tau \subseteq V$ because we only grow P through time. Let $W_\tau = V - V(X^{\ell+1}_\tau)$. By Lemma 5.11, we have $W_\tau \subseteq P_\tau$ and also $G_\tau[V - W_\tau] = X^{\ell+1}_\tau$ which is an $\alpha_{\ell+1}$-expander by Lemma 5.8, when $\phi(G_0) \geq \alpha_0$. In particular $G_\tau[V - W_\tau]$ is connected. □

Finally, we analyze the running time.

Lemma 5.13. *For each update, the algorithm takes $\tilde{O}(\ell^2 \Delta n^{O(1/\ell + \epsilon\ell^\ell)})$ time.*

Proof. We separately analyze the running time for each level. At level i, in time period $[k_i d_i + 1, (k_i + 1)d_i]$, the bottleneck is clearly for calling $Prune_{\alpha_{i-1}}(X^{i-1}_{k_{i-1}d_{i-1}}, D_{[\min\{1,(k_{i-1}-1)d_{i-1}+1\},k_i d_i]})$. Note that $|D_{[\min\{1,(k_{i-1}-1)d_{i-1}+1\},k_i d_i]}| \leq d_{i-1}$. By Theorem 5.2, this takes time $\overline{t}_i = \tilde{O}(\frac{\Delta \cdot d_{i-1}^{1+\delta}}{\delta \alpha_{i-1}^{6+\delta}})$.

Since we distribute the work evenly in the period, this takes $\overline{t}_i/d_i = \tilde{O}(\frac{\Delta \cdot d_{i-1}^{1+\delta}}{\delta \alpha_{i-1}^{6+\delta} d_i}) = \tilde{O}(\frac{\Delta n^{3/\ell}}{\delta \alpha_{i-1}^{6+\delta}})$ per step. This is because $\delta = 2/\ell$, $d_i = n^{1-i/\ell}$, and so

$$d_{i-1}^{1+\delta}/d_i \leq n^{\delta} \cdot d_{i-1}/d_i = n^{\delta+1/\ell} = n^{3/\ell}.$$

Since there are $\ell + 1$ level, this takes in total per time step

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \leq \ell+1} \tilde{O}(\frac{\Delta n^{3/\ell}}{\delta \alpha_{i-1}^{6+2/\ell}}) &= \tilde{O}(\frac{\ell^2 \Delta n^{3/\ell}}{\alpha_\ell^8}) && \text{by } \ell \geq 1 \text{ and } \delta{=}2/\ell \\
&= \tilde{O}(\frac{\ell^2 \Delta n^{3/\ell}}{((c_0\alpha_0)^{\ell^\ell})^8}) && \text{by } \alpha_i = \Omega((c_0\alpha_0)^{\ell^i}) \\
&= \tilde{O}(\ell^2 \Delta n^{O(1/\ell + \epsilon\ell^\ell)}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

By Corollary 5.12 and Lemma 5.13, this concludes the proof of Lemma 5.4, and hence Theorem 5.1.

6 Pruning on Arbitrary Graphs

In Theorem 5.1, we show a fast deterministic algorithm that guarantees connectivity of the pruned graph $G[V - W]$ only when an initial graph is an expander. If the initial graph is not an expander, then there is no guarantee at all. With a simple modification, in this section, we will show a fast randomized algorithm for an arbitrary initial graph that either outputs the desired pruning set or reports failure. Moreover, if the the initial graph is an expander, then it never fails with high probability.

This section is needed in order to make our final algorithm Las Vegas. If we only want a Monte Carlo algorithm, then it is enough to use Theorem 5.1 when we combine every component together in Section 9.

Theorem 6.1. *Consider any $\epsilon(n) = o(1)$, and let $\alpha_0(n) = 1/n^{\epsilon(n)}$. There is a dynamic algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that can maintain a set of nodes P for a graph G undergoing $T = O(m\alpha_0^2(n))$ edge deletions as follows. Let G_τ and P_τ be the graph G and set P after the τ^{th} deletion, respectively.*

- *Initially, in $\tilde{O}(n \log \frac{1}{p})$ time $\mathcal{A}$ sets $P_0 = \emptyset$ and takes as input an n-node m-edge graph $G_0 = (V, E)$ with maximum degree 3.*
- *After the τ^{th} deletion, $\mathcal{A}$ takes $O(n^{O(\log\log \frac{1}{\epsilon(n)} / \log \frac{1}{\epsilon(n)})} \log \frac{1}{p}) = O(n^{o(1)} \log \frac{1}{p})$ time to either 1) report nodes to be added to $P_{\tau-1}$ to form P_τ where*

$$\exists W_\tau \subseteq P_\tau \text{ s.t. } G_\tau[V - W_\tau] \text{ is connected}$$

or 2) reports failure. If $\phi(G_0) \geq \alpha_0(n)$, then $\mathcal{A}$ never fails with probability $1 - p$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SF}}$ be an instance of the Monte Carlo dynamic spanning forest by Kapron et al. [22] that guarantees to maintain a correct spanning forest with probability $1 - p$ when the update sequence has length poly(n). Let $\mathcal{A}_{prune}$ be an instance of the dynamic expander pruning from Theorem 5.1. Given $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SF}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{prune}$, the algorithm is very simple.

The preprocessing algorithm is just to initialize $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SF}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{prune}$ on the graph G in time $\tilde{O}(n \log \frac{1}{p})$ and $O(1)$ respectively. Then, given a sequence of edge deletions, $\mathcal{A}_{prune}$ maintains the pruning set P and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SF}}$ maintains a spanning forest F of the current graph G. We say that F *spans* $V - P$ iff all the nodes in $V - P$ are in the same connected component of F. The update algorithm is just to check if F spans $V - P$. If yes, then we report P as the desired pruning set. If no, then we report failure.

Now, we analyze the update algorithm. The update time of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SF}}$ is $O(\log^{O(1)} n \cdot \log \frac{1}{p})$. Moreover, we can check if F spans $V - P$ easily by implementing ET-tree on F. This takes $O(\log n)$ update time. The time used by $\mathcal{A}_{prune}$ is $O(n^{O(\log\log \frac{1}{\epsilon(n)} / \log \frac{1}{\epsilon(n)})})$. So the total update time is at most $O(n^{O(\log\log \frac{1}{\epsilon(n)} / \log \frac{1}{\epsilon(n)})} \log \frac{1}{p})$

It remains to show the correctness. If the algorithm does not fail, then F spans $V - P$. Hence, there is $W \subset P$ where $G[V - W]$ is connected. Finally, if $\phi(G_0) \geq \alpha_0(n)$, then by Theorem 5.1 we have that there is $W \subset P$ where $G[V - W]$ is connected. Then, F must span $V - P \subseteq V - W$ with high probability, because F is a spanning forest of G with high probability by the guarantee in [22]. □

7 Reduction from Graphs with Few Non-tree Edges Undergoing Batch Insertions

In this section, we show the following crucial reduction:

Theorem 7.1. *Suppose there is a decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ for any m'-edge graph with max degree 3 undergoing a sequence of edge deletions of length $T(m')$, and $\mathcal{A}$ has $t_{pre}(m', p)$ preprocessing time and $t_u(m', p)$ worst-case update time with probability $1 - p$.*

Then, for any numbers B and k where $15k \leq m'$, there is a fully dynamic MSF algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ for any m-edge graph with at most k non-tree edges such that $\mathcal{B}$ can:

- *preprocess the input graph in time*

$$t'_{pre}(m, k, B, p) = t_{pre}(15k, p') + O(m \log^2 m),$$

- *handle a batch of B edge insertions or a single edge deletion in time:*

$$t'_u(m, k, B, p) = O(\frac{B \log k}{k} \cdot t_{pre}(15k, p') + B \log^2 m + \frac{k \log k}{T(k)} + \log k \cdot t_u(15k, p')),$$

where $p' = \Theta(p / \log k)$ and the time guarantee for each operation holds with probability $1 - p$.

The proof of Theorem 7.1 is by extending the reduction by Wulff-Nilsen [37] in two ways. First, the resulting algorithm is more efficient when there are few non-tree edges. Second, the resulting algorithm can also quickly handle a batch of edge insertions.

Although, the extension of the reduction is straightforward and also uses the same "contraction" technique by Henzinger and King [15] and Holm et al. [19], we emphasize that our purpose for using the "contraction" technique is conceptually very different from all previous applications of the (similar) technique [16, 19, 20, 37]. The purpose of all previous applications is for reducing decremental algorithms to fully dynamic algorithms. However, this goal is not crucial for us. Indeed, in our application, by slightly changing the algorithm, the input dynamic MSF algorithm for Theorem 7.1 can also be fully-dynamic and not decremental. But it is very important that the reduction must

give an algorithm that is faster when there are few non-tree edges and can handle batch insertions. Therefore, this work illustrates a new application of the "contraction" technique.

There are previous attempts for speeding up the algorithm when there are few non-tree edges. In the dynamic SF algorithm of Nanongkai and Saranurak [24] and the dynamic MSF algorithm of Wulff-Nilsen [37], they both also devised the algorithms that run on a graph with k non-tree edges by extending the 2-dimensional topology tree of Frederickson [11]. The algorithms have $O(\sqrt{k})$ update time. In the context of [24, 37], they have $k = n^{1-\epsilon_0}$ for some small constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ where n is the number of nodes, and hence $O(\sqrt{k}) = O(n^{0.5-\epsilon_0/2})$. This eventually leads to their dynamic SF and MSF algorithms with update time $n^{0.5-\Omega(1)}$.

In our application paper, we will have $k = n^{1-o(1)}$ and the update time of $O(\sqrt{k})$ is too slow. Fortunately, using the reduction from this section, we can reduce to the problem where the algorithm runs on graphs with only $O(k)$ edges, and then recursively run our algorithm on that graph. Together with other components, this finally leads to the algorithm with subpolynomial update time.

The rest of this section is for proving Theorem 7.1. Although the proof is by straightforwardly extending the reduction of Wulff-Nilsen [37] which is in turn based on the reduction by Holm et al. [19], the reduction itself is still quite involved. Moreover, in [37], it is only outlined how to extend from [19]. Therefore, below, we give a more detailed proof for completeness.

7.1 Reduction to Decremental Algorithms for Few Non-tree Edges

In this section, we reduce from fully dynamic MSF algorithms running on a graph with k non-tree edges and can handle a batch insertion to decremental MSF algorithms running on a graph with k non-tree edges as well. We will reduce further to decremental algorithms running on a graph with $O(k)$ edges in later sections. This can be done by straightforwardly adjusting the reduction from [19, 37], we extend the reduction so that the resulting algorithm can handle batch insertions, and the input algorithm also runs on graph with few non-tree edges.

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose there is a decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ for any m-edge graph with at most k non-tree edges and has preprocessing time $t_{pre}(m, k, p)$ and update time $t_u(m, k, p)$. Then, for any $B \geq 5\lceil \log k \rceil$, there is a fully dynamic MSF algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ for any m-edge graph with at most k non-tree edges such that $\mathcal{B}$ can:*

- *preprocess the input graph in time*

$$t'_{pre}(m, k, B, p) = t_{pre}(m, k, p') + O(m \log m),$$

- *handle a batch of B edge insertions or an edge deletion in time:*

$$t'_u(m, k, B, p) = O\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \log k \rceil} t_{pre}(m, \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')/2^i + B \log m + \log k \cdot t_u(m, k, p')\Big),$$

where $p' = O(p/\log k)$ and the time guarantee for each operation holds with probability $1 - p$.

7.1.1 Preprocessing

We are given an input graph $G = (V, E)$ for $\mathcal{B}$ and parameters B and p. Let $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ denote the MSF of G through out the update sequence. Let $N = E - F$ denote the set of non-tree edges. We have that $|E| \leq m$ and $|N| \leq k$ at each step.

Let $L = \lceil \log k \rceil$ and $p' = p/c_0 L$ for some large enough constant c_0. In the algorithm, we will maintain subgraphs $G_{i,j}$ of G for each $0 \le i \le L$ and $1 \le j \le 4$. Additionally, there is a a subgraph $G_{L,0}$ of G. Let $N_{i,j} = E(G_{i,j}) - \mathsf{MSF}(G_{i,j})$. We maintain an invariant that $N = \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ and $|N_{i,j}| \le \min\{2^i B, k\}$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ be an instance of the decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ from the assumption of Lemma 7.2 that maintains $\mathsf{MSF}(G_{i,j})$. Initially, we set $G_{L,1} = G$ and other $G_{i,j} = \emptyset$. The preprocessing algorithm is simply to initialize $\mathcal{D}_{L,1}$ and the top tree $\mathcal{T}(F)$ on F,

7.1.2 Update

Given the τ-th update, we say that we are at time step τ. There are two cases: either inserting a batch of edges or deleting an edge. In either cases, after handling the update, we then apply the clean-up procedure. We now describe the procedure.

Inserting a Batch of Edges: Let I be a set of edges to be inserted where $|I| \le B$. We define the set R as follows. For each edge $e = (u, v) \in I$, if u and v are not connected in F, then add e to F. Otherwise, u and v are connected in F by the unique path $P_{u,v}$. Let f be the edge with maximum weight in $P_{u,v}$. Note that f can be found using the top tree $\mathcal{T}(F)$. If $w(e) > w(f)$, then we include e to R. If $w(e) < w(f)$, then we set $F \leftarrow F \cup e - f$ and include f to R. Observe that $|R| \le B$. Then we run the clean-up procedure with input R.

Deleting an Edge: Let e be the edge to be deleted. For all i and j, we set $G_{i,j} \leftarrow G_{i,j} - e$ and update $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ accordingly. Let R_0 be the set of reconnecting edges of $\mathsf{MSF}(G_{i,j})$ returned from $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ over all i and j. Among edges in R_0, let f be the lightest edge that can reconnect F. If f exists, set $F \leftarrow F \cup f - e$ and $R \leftarrow R_0 - f$. Otherwise, $F \leftarrow F - e$ and $R \leftarrow R_0$. Then we run the clean-up procedure with input R. Observe that $|R| \le 4L + 1$.

Clean-up: In the following, suppose that $\mathcal{D}'$ is an instance of decremental MSF algorithm running on some graph G'. Let $N' = E(G') - \mathsf{MSF}(G')$. For any i and j, when we write $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'$, this means that we set the instance $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ to be $\mathcal{D}'$. So $G_{i,j} = G'$. If we write $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \emptyset$, this means that we destroy the instance $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$. So $G_{i,j} = \emptyset$. The time needed for setting $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'$ or $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \emptyset$ is constant because it can be done by swapping pointers.

Let R be the set of input edges for the clean-up procedure. Let R' be another set of edges that we will define below. Now, we describe the clean-up procedure. For each i starting from 0 to $L+1$, we execute the *clean-up procedure for level i*. For any fixed i, the procedure for level i is as follows.

For $i = 0$, we initialize an instance of dynamic contracted MSF algorithm $\mathcal{D}'_0$ on $G'_0 = (V, F \cup R \cup R')$. We set $\mathcal{D}_{0,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_0$ for some $j \in \{1, 2\}$ where $\mathcal{D}_{0,j} = \emptyset$.

For $i > 0$, all the steps τ not divisible by 2^i are for initializing an instance of decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{D}'_i$ on a graph G'_i that will be specified below. If 2^i divides τ, we claim that $\mathcal{D}'_i$ is finished initializing on some graph G'_i. For $0 \le i \le L$, we set $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$ for some $j \in \{1, 2\}$ where $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} = \emptyset$. If $i = L + 1$, we just set $\mathcal{D}_{L,0} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$. Then, for any $1 \le i \le L + 1$, we set $(\mathcal{D}_{i-1,3}, \mathcal{D}_{i-1,4}) \leftarrow (\mathcal{D}_{i-1,1}, \mathcal{D}_{i-1,2})$ and $(\mathcal{D}_{i-1,1}, \mathcal{D}_{i-1,2}) \leftarrow (\emptyset, \emptyset)$.

We do the following during the time period $[\tau, \tau + 2^i)$ for initializing $\mathcal{D}'_i$ on G'_i. Let $I_1 = [\tau, \tau + 2^{i-1})$ and $I_2 = [\tau + 2^{i-1}, \tau + 2^i)$ be the first and second halves of the period. During I_1, we evenly distribute the work for initializing $\mathcal{D}'_i$ on G'_i where $G'_i = (V, F \cup N'_i)$, $N'_i = N_{i-1,3} \cup N_{i-1,4}$ for $0 < i \le L$ and $N'_{L+1} = N_{L,0} \cup N_{L,3} \cup N_{L,4}$ for $i = L + 1$. We note that and $N_{i-1,3}, N_{i-1,4}$ and F are the sets of edges at time τ and hence G'_i is a subgraph of G. After I_1, we have finished the initialization $\mathcal{D}'_i$ on the 2^{i-1}-step-old version of G'_i. Therefore, during I_2, we update $\mathcal{D}'_i$ at "double speed" so that after these 2^{i-1} steps, $\mathcal{D}'_i$ is running on the up-to-date G'_i as desired. More precisely,

at time $\tau + 2^{i-1} + k$, we feed to $\mathcal{D}'_i$ the updates of G'_i from time $\tau + 2^{i-1} + 2k$ and $\tau + 2^{i-1} + 2k + 1$, for each $0 \leq k < 2^{i-1}$.

Now, we can define the set R'. At any time τ, before we run the clean-up procedure for level 0. We set R' to be the set of reconnecting edges returned by all $\mathcal{D}'_i$ that are given edge deletions at double speed.

7.1.3 Correctness

To see that the description for clean-up procedure is valid, observe the following:

Proposition 7.3. *For any i and j, $G_{i,j}$ is a subgraph of G at any time.*

Proposition 7.4. *For all $0 \leq i \leq L$, before setting $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$ for some $j \in \{1, 2\}$, we have $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} = \emptyset$ for some $j = \{1, 2\}$.*

Proof. We set $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$ only when 2^i divides τ. But once 2^{i+1} divides τ, we run the procedure for level $i + 1$ and set $(\mathcal{D}_{i,1}, \mathcal{D}_{i,2}) \leftarrow (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. □

Lemma 7.5. *Suppose that $N \subseteq \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$. When $e \in F$ is deleted, let f^* be the lightest reconnecting edge for F in G. Then $f^* \in R_0$.*

Proof. Before deleting $e \in F$, we have $f^* \in N$ and hence $f^* \in N_{i,j}$ for some i, j. As $G_{i,j}$ is a subgraph of G, f^* is also the lightest reconnecting edge in $G_{i,j}$ after deleting e in $G_{i,j}$. So f^* returned by $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ and is included into R_0. □

The following lemma concludes the correctness of the algorithm for Lemma 7.24.

Lemma 7.6. *Throughout the updates, we have $N = \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ and $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$.*

After preprocessing, $N = \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ and $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ by construction. We will prove that both statements are maintained after each update using the claims below.

First, we prove $N \subseteq \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$. When the update is a batch I of edge insertions, R is exactly the set of new non-tree edges (i.e. the new edges in N) because, before inserting I, $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$. When the update is an edge deletion, R is exactly the set of non-tree edges in all $G_{i,j}$ that become tree edges (i.e. the edges removed from $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ but potentially still in N). Now, after the clean-up procedure for level 0, we have that either $N_{0,1}$ or $N_{0,2}$ is set from $\emptyset$ to $R \cup R'$ (i.e. R is included into $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$). Therefore, $N \subseteq \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ after the procedure for level 0.

Claim 7.7. For $1 \leq i \leq L + 1$, $N \subseteq \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ after applying the clean-up procedures of level i.

Proof. For $i \leq L$, suppose we are at time τ divisible by 2^i and we set $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$ where $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} = \emptyset$, $(\mathcal{D}_{i-1,3}, \mathcal{D}_{i-1,4}) \leftarrow (\mathcal{D}_{i-1,1}, \mathcal{D}_{i-1,2})$ and $(\mathcal{D}_{i-1,1}, \mathcal{D}_{i-1,2}) \leftarrow (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. That is, the edges of $N_{i-1,3} \cup N_{i-1,4}$ contributing to $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ are replaced by the edges in N'_i. We argue that after this we still have $N \subseteq \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$. This is because, at time $\tau - 2^i$, when we start the initialization of $\mathcal{D}'_i$ on G'_i, we set $N'_i = N_{i-1,3} \cup N_{i-1,4}$ exactly. Then, from time $\tau - 2^i$ to τ, all reconnecting edges returned by $\mathcal{D}'_i$ are included in to R' in every step. That is, R' contains the edges that are removed from N'_i but potentially still in N. As R' is included into $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ at every step, we are done.

For $i = L + 1$, we set $\mathcal{D}_{L,0} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$, $(\mathcal{D}_{L,3}, \mathcal{D}_{L,4}) \leftarrow (\mathcal{D}_{L,1}, \mathcal{D}_{L,2})$ and $(\mathcal{D}_{L,1}, \mathcal{D}_{L,2}) \leftarrow (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. Although, $\mathcal{D}_{L,0} \neq \emptyset$ before we set $\mathcal{D}_{L,0} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$, we have that $N'_i = N_{L,0} \cup N_{L,3} \cup N_{L,4}$ exactly at 2^i steps ago. Using the same argument, we have $N \subseteq \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ after the procedure. □

Second, we prove that $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j} \subseteq N$ which follows from the two claims below.

Claim 7.8. Whenever an edge f is removed from N, then f is removed from $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$.

Proof. Observe that an edge f can be removed from the set N by one of two reasons: 1) f is deleted from G, or 2) some edge e is deleted and f is a reconnecting edge. If f is deleted G, then f is deleted from all $G_{i,j}$. If f is a reconnecting edge, by Lemma 7.5, we know f is the lightest reconnecting edge in G. But $G_{i,j}$ is a subgraph of G for all i and j. If $f \in N_{i,j}$ for any i, j, then f must be the lightest reconnecting edge in $G_{i,j}$ and hence f is removed from $N_{i,j}$. In either case, when f is removed from N, then f is removed from $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ as well. □

Claim 7.9. Whenever an edge f is added into $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$, then f is added into N.

Proof. For any fixed i, f can be added into $\bigcup_j N_{i,j}$ only when 2^i divides τ and we set $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$. Now, when we start the initialization of $\mathcal{D}'_i$ on G'_i at time $\tau - 2^i$, we set $G'_i = (V, F \cup N'_i)$ and so $N'_i \subseteq N$ at that time. From time $\tau - 2^i$ to τ, there is no edges added to N'_i because no MSF-edge can become non-tree edge in a graph undergoing only edge deletions. Moreover whenever an edge f is removed N, it is removed from N'_i for the same reason as in Claim 7.8. So at time τ, we have $N'_i \subseteq N$. □

Now, we have that $\bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j} = N$ is maintained. To show that $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ after the update, whenever an edge e is deleted, by $N \subseteq \bigcup_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ and Lemma 7.5, the lightest reconnecting edge $f^*$is included in R_0. So $F \leftarrow F \cup f^* - e$ and F becomes $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$. For each inserted edge $e = (u, v)$, we may only remove the heaviest edge f in the path u to v in F. So $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ as well. This concludes the proof of Lemma 7.6.

7.1.4 Running Time

First, we need this lemma.

Lemma 7.10. *For any i and j, $|N_{i,j}| \leq \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}$.*

Proof. First, $N_{i,j} \subseteq N$ by Lemma 7.6 and so $|N_{i,j}| \leq |N| \leq k$. Next, we will prove that $|N_{i,j}| \leq 2^i B$, for any i and j by induction. As we know $|N_{L,0}| \leq k$ and we always set $(\mathcal{D}_{i,3}, \mathcal{D}_{i,4}) \leftarrow (\mathcal{D}_{i,1}, \mathcal{D}_{i,2})$ for all $i \leq L$, it remains to bound only $|N_{i,1}|$ and $|N_{i,2}|$ for all $i \leq L$.

For $i = 0$, in the clean-up procedure we only set $N_{0,1}$ and $N_{0,2}$ as the input set R. When there is a batch insertion, we have that $|R| \leq B$. When there is an edge deletion, we have $|R| \leq 4L + 1$ because, for each i, j, the instance $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ can return one reconnecting edge per time step. Also, observe that $|R'| \leq 2(L+1)$ because, for $1 \leq \mathcal{D}'_i \leq L+1$, $\mathcal{D}'_i$ can return two reconnecting edge per time step (as they are possibly updated at double speed). Therefore, $|N_{0,1}|, |N_{0,2}| \leq |R \cup R'| \leq \max\{B, 4L + 1\} + 2(L+1) \leq 2B$ as $B \geq 5L$. Next, for $0 < i \leq L$, in the clean-up procedure we only set $N_{i,1}$ and $N_{i,2}$ as the set N'_i where $N'_i = N_{i-1,3} \cup N_{i-1,4}$ So $|N_{i,1}|, |N_{i,2}| \leq |N'_i| \leq 2 \cdot 2^i B = 2^{i+1}B$. □

Now, we can conclude the preprocessing and update time of the algorithm for Lemma 7.24.

Lemma 7.11. *The preprocessing algorithm takes $t_{pre}(m, k, p') + O(m \log m)$ time.*

Proof. We can compute $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ in time $O(m \log m)$. The algorithm is to just initialize the top tree $\mathcal{T}(F)$ on F and the decremental MSF $\mathcal{D}_{i,j}$ for all i, j. By Lemma 2.5, we initialize $\mathcal{T}$ in time $O(m)$. Then, as $N_{L,1} = N$ and $|N| \leq k$, we can initialize all $\mathcal{D}_{L,1}$ in time $t_{pre}(m, k, p')$. □

Next, we bound the time spent on the clean-up procedure at each step.

Lemma 7.12. *For each update, the time spent on the clean-up procedure is*

$$O(\sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \log k \rceil} t_{pre}(m, \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')/2^i + \log k \cdot t_u(m, k, p'))$$

with probability $1 - p/2$.

Proof. For each i, we analyze the time spent on the clean-up procedure of level i. When the time step τ is divisible by 2^i, this takes $O(1)$ time because all we do is only setting $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'$ for some $\mathcal{D}'$ for several j. After that, for the period $I_1 = [\tau, \tau + 2^{i-1})$, we distribute evenly the work for initializing $\mathcal{D}'_i$. This takes $t_{pre}(m, |N'_i|, p')/2^{i-1}$ time per step. For the period $I_2 = [\tau + 2^{i-1}, \tau + 2^i)$, we feed the updates to $\mathcal{D}'_i$ at "double speed". This takes $2 \cdot t_u(m, |N'_i|, p')$ time per step. By Lemma 7.10, the total time for step for the clean-up procedure of level i is

$$\frac{t_{pre}(m, \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')}{2^{i-1}} + 2 \cdot t_u(m, \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')).$$

Finally, as $L = \lceil \log k \rceil$, summing the time for all levels give the bound in lemma. Moreover, the bound holds with probability $1 - p' \times O(L) \leq 1 - p/2$. □

Lemma 7.13. *The time for inserting a batch of edges of size at most B and the time for deleting an edge is at most*

$$O(\sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \log k \rceil} t_{pre}(m, \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')/2^i + \log k \cdot t_u(m, k, p') + B \log m)$$

with probability $1 - p$.

Proof. We show the update time outside the clean-up procedure. For insertion, we need $O(B \log m)$ time be the property of top tree. For deletion, we need $\sum_{i,j} t_u(m, |N_{i,j}|, p') = O(t_u(m, k, p') \log k)$ by Lemma 7.10, and the bound holds with probability $1 - p'O(L) \leq 1 - p/2$. By Lemma 7.12, we are done and the bound holds with probability $1 - 2 \cdot p/2 = 1 - p$. □

Lemma 7.6, Lemma 7.11, and Lemma 7.13 concludes the proof of Lemma 7.2.

7.2 Contraction

From Lemma 7.2, we have reduced the problem to decremental algorithms on graphs with few non-tree edges. We want to further reduce the problem to decremental algorithms on graph with few edges (using some additional data structures). Informally, we would like to prove the following:

Lemma 7.14 (Informal statement of Lemma 7.23)**.** *Suppose there is a decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}'$ for any m'-edge graph with preprocessing time $t_{pre}(m', p)$ and update time $t_u(m', p)$. Then, for any m, k where $5k \leq m'$, and B, let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with m-edge graph and at most k non-tree edges. Then, with some additional data structures, there is a decremental dynamic MSF algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ for G with preprocessing time $t'_{pre}(m, k, p) = t_{pre}(5k, p) + O(k \log m)$ and edge-deletion time $t'_u(m, k, p) = t_u(5k, p) + O(\log m)$ with probability $1 - p$.*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 7.23. We use the contraction technique by Holm et al. [19]. Below, we define some related notions and analyze their properties. Then, we show the proof of the reduction.

7.2.1 Property of Contracted Graphs/Forests

For any tree $T = (V, E)$ and the set $S \subseteq V$ of terminals, the connecting paths of T with respect to S are the path that the minimal collections of disjoint paths in T that "connect" the terminals in S. Below is the formal definition:

Definition 7.15 (Connecting Paths)**.** *Given a tree $T = (V, E)$ and a set of* terminals *$S \subseteq V$, the set $\mathcal{P}_S(T)$ of* connecting paths of T with respect to S *is defined as follows:*

1. *$\mathcal{P}_S(T)$ is a collection of edge-disjoint paths.*
2. *The graph $\dot{\bigcup}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_S(T)} P$ is a (connected) subtree of T.*
3. *For any terminal $u \in S$, u is an endpoint of some path $P \in \mathcal{P}_S(T)$.*
4. *For any endpoint u of $P \in \mathcal{P}_S(T)$, either $u \in S$ or there are other two paths $P', P'' \in \mathcal{P}_S(T)$ whose endpoint is u.*

The definition can be extended as follows: for any forest $F = (V, E)$ and a set of terminal S (where possibly $S \not\subset V$), $\mathcal{P}_S(F) = \dot{\bigcup}_{T \in F} \mathcal{P}_{S \cap V(T)}(T)$ is the disjoint-union of $\mathcal{P}_{S \cap V(T)}(T)$ over all (connected) tree T in F.

Condition 4 in Definition 7.15 implies the minimality of $\mathcal{P}_S(T)$. Indeed, suppose otherwise that u is an endpoint of $P \in \mathcal{P}_S(T)$ but $u \notin S$ and there is only one other path P' whose endpoint is u. Then, we can replace P and P' with a path $P'' = P \cup P'$ while other conditions are still satisfied. The following lemma formally shows that the definition of $\mathcal{P}_S(F)$ is uniquely defined.

Lemma 7.16. *For any tree $T = (V, E)$ and a set $S \subseteq V$ of terminals, $\mathcal{P}_S(T)$ is uniquely defined.*

Proof. Suppose there are two different sets $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}'$ of connecting paths of T with respect to S. Let $end(\mathcal{P})$ and $end(\mathcal{P}')$ be the set of endpoints of paths in $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{E}'$. Condition 3 states that $S \subseteq end(\mathcal{P}) \cap end(\mathcal{P}')$. Let $H = \dot{\bigcup}_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P$ and $H' = \dot{\bigcup}_{P \in \mathcal{P}'} P$. Condition 2 states that both H and H' are (connected) subtrees of T.

Observe that all the sets of leaves of H and H' must be the same. Otherwise, we can assume w.l.o.g. that there is a leaf u of H where $u \in V(H) \setminus V(H')$. By Condition 4, $u \in S$ as u is a leaf in H. But $u \notin end(\mathcal{P}')$ which contradicts that fact that $S \subseteq end(\mathcal{P}')$. Now, as H and H' share the same at of leaves, it follows that H and H' are the same subtree in T.

As $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}'$ are different, w.l.o.g. there is a node $u \in end(\mathcal{P}) \setminus end(\mathcal{P}')$. As $S \subseteq end(\mathcal{P}')$, we have that $u \notin S$. By Condition 4, u is an endpoint of three paths $P, P', P'' \in \mathcal{P}$ which are edge-disjoint by Condition 1. In particular, $\deg_H(u) \geq 3$. Next, as $u \in V(H) = V(H')$ but $u \notin end(\mathcal{P}')$, we have that u is an internal node of some path $P' \in \mathcal{P}$. So $\deg_{H'}(u) = 2$. This is a contradiction because H and H' are the same subtree but $2 = \deg_{H'}(u) = \deg_H(u) \geq 3$. □

Below, for any set of edges E', let $end(E')$ denote the set of endpoints of edges in E'. Observe the following:

Proposition 7.17. *For any graph $G = (V, E)$, forest $F \subseteq E$, and any $S \supseteq end(E - F)$, each connecting path in $\mathcal{P}_S(F)$ is an induced path in G.*

Definition 7.18 (Contracted Graphs/Forests and Super Edges)**.** *For any weighted graph $G = (V, E, w)$, forest $F \subseteq E$ and a set $S \supseteq end(E - F)$ of terminals, the* contracted (multi)-graph G' *and* contracted forest F' *with respect to S is obtained from G and F respectively by 1) removing all edges in $F \setminus \dot{\bigcup}_{P \in \mathcal{P}_S(F)} P$, and 2) replacing each connecting path $P_{uv} = (u, \ldots, v) \in \mathcal{P}_S(F)$*

in F with an edge (u, v), called super edge*, with weight $w(u, v) = \max_{e \in P_{uv}} w(e)$. We denote $(G', F') = \mathsf{Contract}_S(G, F)$. For each $e \in P_{uv} \subseteq F$, we say $(u, v) \in F'$ is the* super edge covering e *with respect to S.*

In the following propositions, we show some properties of the contracted graph and forest. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and $F \subseteq E$ be a forest. Denote by $N = E - F$ the set of non-tree edges and $S \supseteq end(N)$ a set of terminal contains points non-tree edges. Let $(G', F') = \mathsf{Contract}_S(G, F)$ be the contracted graph and forest with respect to S. First, we show that the number of edges in the contracted graph is linear in the number of original non-tree edges plus the number of terminals.

Proposition 7.19. *$E(G') = N \dot\cup E(F')$ and $E(G') \leq |N| + 2|S|$.*

Proof. We have that $E(G') = N \dot\cup E(F')$ by construction. It is enough to prove that $|E(F')| \leq 2|S|$. For each tree T in F, let T' be the corresponding contracted tree in F'. Again, let $end(\mathcal{P}_G(T))$ is the set of endpoints of paths in $\mathcal{P}_G(T)$ and let $S_T = S \cap V(T)$ be the set of terminal in T. We have $V(T') = end(\mathcal{P}_G(T)) \supseteq S_T$. Also, for all $u \in end(\mathcal{P}_G(T)) \setminus S_T$, $\deg_{T'}(u) \geq 3$ by Condition 4 of Definition 7.15. It is well known that, in any tree, the number of nodes with degree at least three is at most the number of nodes with degree at most two. So $|S_T| \geq |end(\mathcal{P}_G(T)) \setminus S_T|$ and hence $|end(\mathcal{P}_G(T))| \leq 2|S_T|$. Note that $|E(T')| = |V(T')| - 1 = |end(\mathcal{P}_G(T))| - 1$. So

$$|E(F')| = \sum_{T' \in F'} |E(T')| \leq \sum_{T \in F} |end(\mathcal{P}_G(T))| \leq 2 \sum_{T \in F} |S_T| \leq 2|S|.$$

□

Proposition 7.20. *If $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$, then $F' = \mathsf{MSF}(G')$.*

Proof. As $E(G') = N \dot\cup E(F')$ by Proposition 7.19, we only need to prove that $N \cap \mathsf{MSF}(G') = \emptyset$. For each $e = (u, v) \in N$, then u and v must be connected in F, otherwise F is not spanning. Let $P_{u,v} \subseteq F$ be a path in F connecting u and v. We have that $w(e) > \max_{f \in P_{u,v}} w(f)$ otherwise F is not an MSF. Let $P'_{u,v} \subseteq F'$ be a path in F' connecting u and v. Observe that each edge $e' \in P'_{u,v}$ corresponds to a connecting path $P_{e'} \subseteq P_{u,v}$. So $w(e') \leq \max_{f \in P_{u,v}} w(f)$. So we have $\max_{e' \in P'_{u,v}} w(e') = \max_{f \in P_{u,v}} w(f) < w(e)$. That is, $e \notin \mathsf{MSF}(G')$. □

Here, we show the change of 1) the contracted graph/forest (G', F'), 2) the MSF of the graph $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$, and 3) the MSF of the contracted graph $\mathsf{MSF}(G')$ when we delete an edge e from G. Note that the set S of terminal does *not* change.

Proposition 7.21. *Suppose that $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$. For any edge e of G, let $G_1 = G - e$, $F_1 = F - e$ (so $F_1 = F$ if $e \notin F$) and $(G'_1, F'_1) = \mathsf{Contract}_S(G_1, F_1)$ (note that $S = end(E - F)$).*

1. *If $e \in N$, then $(G'_1, F'_1) = (G' - e, F')$, $\mathsf{MSF}(G_1) = F = F_1$ and $\mathsf{MSF}(G'_1) = F' = F'_1$.*
2. *Else, if $e \in F \setminus \dot\bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_S(F)} P$, then $(G'_1, F'_1) = (G', F')$, $\mathsf{MSF}(G_1) = F - e = F_1$ and $\mathsf{MSF}(G'_1) = F' = F'_1$.*
3. *Else, $e \in \dot\bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_S(F)} P$ and there is a super edge $e' = (u', v') \in F'$ covering e with respect to S. Then, $(G'_1, F'_1) = (G' - e', F' - e')$. Then, one of two cases holds:*
   (a) *$\mathsf{MSF}(G_1) = F - e = F_1$ and $\mathsf{MSF}(G'_1) = F' - e' = F'_1$, or*
   (b) *There is $f \in N$ where $\mathsf{MSF}(G_1) = F \cup f - e = F_1 \cup f$ and $\mathsf{MSF}(G'_1) = F' \cup f - e' = F'_1 \cup f$.*

7.2.2 The Proof

Holm et al. [19] show the following crucial structure based on top tree.

Lemma 7.22 (Lemma 15 of [19]). *There is an algorithm $\mathcal{C}$ that runs in two phases:*

1. *In the first phase: $\mathcal{C}$ maintains an at-most-m-edge forest F undergoing a sequence of edge insertions and deletions. $\mathcal{C}$ can handle each edge update of F in $O(\log m)$.*
2. *Then, in the second phase: given any set N of edges, $\mathcal{C}$ can return $(G', F) = \mathsf{Contract}_S(G, F)$ in time $O(|N| \log m)$ where $G = (V, F \cup N)$ and $S = end(N)$. Moreover, for any edge $e \in F$, $\mathcal{C}$ can return a super edge $e' = (u', v') \in F'$ covering e with respect to S, if e' exists, in time $O(\log m)$.*

Having Lemma 7.22 together with Proposition 7.21, we can prove the main reduction of this section.

Lemma 7.23. *Suppose there is a decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}'$ for any m'-edge graph with preprocessing time $t_{pre}(m', p)$ and update time $t_u(m', p)$. Then, for any m, k where $5k \leq m'$, and B, let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with m-edge graph and at most k non-tree edges. Suppose that $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ and $N = E - F$ are given. Moreover, there is a given instance $\mathcal{C}$ of the algorithm Lemma 7.22 that is running its first phase on F. Then, there is a decremental dynamic MSF algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ for G with preprocessing time $t'_{pre}(m, k, p) = t_{pre}(5k, p) + O(k \log m)$ and edge-deletion time $t'_u(m, k, p) = t_u(5k, p) + O(\log m)$ with probability $1 - p$.*

Proof. The preprocessing algorithm for $\mathcal{B}$ is the following. First, we switch $\mathcal{C}$ to the second phase and give the non-tree edges N to $\mathcal{C}$, and obtain $(G', F) = \mathsf{Contract}_S(G, F)$ where $S = end(N)$. By Proposition 7.19, $|E(G')| \leq |N| + 2|S| \leq 5k$. After that we initialize $\mathcal{A}'$ on G' with probability parameter p in time $t_{pre}(|E(G')|, p) = t_{pre}(5k, p)$. In total this takes $t'_{pre}(m, k, p) = t_{pre}(5k, p) + O(k \log m)$.

Throughout that the edge-deletion sequence for $\mathcal{B}$, the set S is fixed. We will maintain the following invariant 1) $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$, 2) $(G', F') = \mathsf{Contract}(G, F)$, and 3) for each $e \in F$, we can find a super edge $e' = (u', v') \in F'$ covering e with respect to S in time $O(\log m)$.

Given an edge e to be deleted, let $G_1 = G - e$, let $F_1 = F - e$ (so $F_1 = F$ if $e \notin F$) and $(G'_1, F'_1) = \mathsf{Contract}(G_1, F_1)$. We note that we can obtain (G'_1, F'_1) in time $O(\log m)$. Indeed, by Proposition 7.21 either $(G'_1, F'_1) = (G', F')$, $(G'_1, F'_1) = (G' - e, F')$ or $(G'_1, F'_1) = (G' - e', F' - e')$ where $e' \in F'$ is a super edge covering e w.r.t. S. By the invariants 3, we can check which case of Proposition 7.21 holds, and compute (G'_1, F'_1) in time $O(\log m)$. Then, we feed the change from G' to G'_1 to $\mathcal{A}'$. This takes $t_{pre}(5k, p)$ because there is at most 1 edge update from G' to G'_1 according the Proposition 7.21.

Finally, there are two cases. For the first case, suppose that $\mathcal{A}'$ returns a reconnecting edge f, i.e. $\mathsf{MSF}(G'_1) = \mathsf{MSF}(G') \cup f - e'$. We are in Case 3.b of Proposition 7.21. We update F to be $F_1 \cup f$ in $O(1)$ time to satisfy invariant 1 as $F_1 \cup f = \mathsf{MSF}(G_1)$. We update F' to be $F'_1 \cup f$ in time $O(1)$. As $F'_1 \cup f = \mathsf{MSF}(G'_1)$ and $(G'_1, \mathsf{MSF}(G'_1)) = \mathsf{Contract}(G_1, \mathsf{MSF}(G_1))$ by Proposition 7.20, so invariant 2 is satisfied. Observe that f is the only new edge in F and $f \in F'$ is also the super edge covering f w.r.t. to S. So invariant 3 is easily maintained.

For the second case, $\mathcal{A}$ does not return a reconnecting edge. We simply update F and F' to F_1 and F'_1 in $O(1)$ time. By other cases of Proposition 7.21, all the three invariants are maintained. □

7.3 Reduction to Decremental Algorithm for Few Edges

In this section, we show how to speed up the resulting algorithm from Lemma 7.2 using Lemma 7.23. Recall that in the reduction in Lemma 7.2 reduces to decremental MSF algorithms which runs on graphs with few non-tree edges. While the reduction in Lemma 7.23 can quickly reduce further to decremental MSF algorithms running on graphs with few edges, Lemma 7.23 needs some additional data structures to be prepared. So we will show how to augment the reduction in Lemma 7.2 so that at any time the needed additional data structures for Lemma 7.23 is prepared. This gives the following lemma:

Lemma 7.24. *Suppose there is a decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ for any m'-edge graph with preprocessing time $t_{pre}(m', p)$ and update time $t_u(m', p)$. Then, for any m, k where $5k \leq m'$, and B, there is a fully dynamic MSF algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ for any m-edge graph with at most k non-tree edges such that $\mathcal{B}$ can:*

- *preprocess the input graph in time $t'_{pre}(m, k, B, p) = t_{pre}(5k, p') + O(m \log^2 m)$, and*
- *handle a batch of B edge insertions or an edge deletion in time: $t'_u(m, k, B, p) = O(\frac{B \log k}{k} \cdot t_{pre}(5k, p') + B \log^2 m + \log k \cdot t_u(5k, p'))$,*

where $p' = O(p/\log k)$ and the time guarantee for each operation holds with probability $1 - p$.

To prove Lemma 7.24, we show how to augment the reduction in Lemma 7.2 as follows. For each $0 \leq i \leq L+1$ and $1 \leq j \leq 6$, we let $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ be the instance of the algorithm from Lemma 7.22. We say that $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is *ready*, if it is in its first phase and $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is running on $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ undergoing edges updates. When we want to start the initialization of $\mathcal{D}'_i$, we claim that, for some j, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is ready. Then, the ready $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ will be shift to its second phase by plugging into the reduction Lemma 7.24. More precisely, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ will be given a set N'_i where $G'_i = (V, F \cup N'_i)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ needs to return the contracted graph and forest $\mathsf{Contract}(G'_i, F)$. We say that $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is *occupied by* $\mathcal{D}'_i$. For any $\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}''$, suppose that $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ was occupied by $\mathcal{D}'$ and we set $\mathcal{D}'' \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'$, then we say $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is occupied by $\mathcal{D}''$. If $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ was occupied by $\mathcal{D}'$ and we set $\mathcal{D}' \leftarrow \mathcal{D}''$, then we say $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is not occupied by anyone and we say $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is *free*. But note that $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ can be free but not ready. Now, we show how we make sure that for some j, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is ready when we want to start the initialization of $\mathcal{D}'_i$.

Preprocessing. In the beginning all $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ are free. After computing $F = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$, we inserting edges in F into all $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ so that all $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ are ready. In total, this takes additional $O(L \times m \log m) = O(m \log^2 m)$ time to the preprocessing algorithm in Lemma 7.2.

Updates. Fix any i and j. Suppose that at time τ, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ was ready and then is occupied by $\mathcal{D}'_i$. Observe the following. At time $\tau + 2^i$, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ will be occupied by $\mathcal{D}_{i,j'}$ for some $j' \in \{1, 2\}$ as we set $\mathcal{D}_{i,j} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}'_i$. Then, at time $\tau + 3 \cdot 2^i$, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ will be occupied by $\mathcal{D}_{i,j''}$ for some $j'' \in \{3, 4\}$ as we set $\mathcal{D}_{i,j''} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{i,j'}$. Then, at time $\tau + 5 \cdot 2^i$, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ will be free. Then, during the next 2^i steps, we will make sure that $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is ready by spending time $O(B \log m)$ per step. Let F_τ be the MSF that $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ was running on at time τ. When $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ become occupied, we will maintain the difference of edges in F_τ and the current MSF F. At time $\tau + 5 \cdot 2^i$, the difference between F_τ and F is at most $O(B \cdot 2^i)$ edges. So we can update F_τ to become F in 2^i steps, using $O(\frac{B 2^i \log m}{2^i}) = O(B \log m)$ time per step. Summing over all i and j, this takes additional $O(L \times B \log m) = O(B \log^2 m)$ time per step to the update algorithm in Lemma 7.2.

Therefore, for any fixed i, only every 2^i steps one of $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ can changed from being ready to being occupied. But in the next $6 \cdot 2^i$ steps such $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ will become ready. As we have 6 instances $\mathcal{C}_{i,1}, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_{i,6}$. At any time, when we want to start the initialization of $\mathcal{D}'_i$, $\mathcal{C}_{i,j}$ is ready for some j.

Proof of Lemma 7.24. Recall that $\mathcal{A}$ is the algorithm from the assumption of Lemma 7.24 with preprocessing time $t_{pre}(m', p)$ and update time $t_u(m', p)$, and $\mathcal{B}$ is the resulting algorithm of Lemma 7.24 with preprocessing time $t'_{pre}(m, k, B, p)$ and update time $t'_u(m, k, B, p)$.

Let $\mathcal{A}'$ be a decremental MSF algorithm runs on graphs with m-edge and k-non-tree-edge with parameter p. Denote the preprocessing time of $\mathcal{A}'$ by $t^{\mathcal{A}'}_{pre}(m, k, p)$ and the update time of $\mathcal{A}'$ by $t^{\mathcal{A}'}_u(m, k, p)$. To prove Lemma 7.24, we will use Lemma 7.2 to first reduce $\mathcal{B}$ to $\mathcal{A}'$. Then, with additional preprocessing time of $O(m \log^2 m)$ and update time of $O(B \log^2 m)$, the argument above shows that we can further reduce $\mathcal{A}'$ to $\mathcal{A}$ using Lemma 7.23. That is, we have $t^{\mathcal{A}'}_{pre}(m, k, p) = t_{pre}(5k, p) + O(k \log m)$ and $t^{\mathcal{A}'}_u(m, k, p) = t_u(5k, p) + O(\log m)$. Hence, the preprocessing of $\mathcal{B}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} t'_{pre}(m, k, B, p) + O(m \log^2 m) &= t^{\mathcal{A}'}_{pre}(m, k, p') + O(m \log m) + O(m \log^2 m) \quad \text{by Lemma 7.2} \\ &= t_{pre}(5k, p') + O(m \log^2 m), \end{aligned}$$

and the update time of $\mathcal{B}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} &t'_u(m, k, B, p) + O(B \log^2 m) \\ &= O\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \log k \rceil} t^{\mathcal{A}'}_{pre}(m, \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')/2^i + B \log m + \log k \cdot t^{\mathcal{A}'}_u(m, k, p')\Big) + O(B \log^2 m) \quad \text{by Lemma 7.2} \\ &= O\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \log k \rceil} t_{pre}(5 \cdot \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')/2^i + B \log m + \log k \cdot t_u(5k, p')\Big) + O(B \log^2 m) \\ &= O\Big(\frac{B \log k}{k} \cdot t_{pre}(5k, p') + B \log^2 m + \log k \cdot t_u(5k, p')\Big). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows because we claim that $t_{pre}(5 \cdot \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')/2^i = O(\frac{B}{k}) \cdot t_{pre}(5k, p')$. To see this, there are two cases. If $2^{i+1}B \geq k$, then $\frac{t_{pre}(5 \cdot \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')}{2^{i-1}} = \frac{t_{pre}(5k, p')}{2^{i-1}} = O(\frac{B}{k}) \cdot t_{pre}(5k, p')$. If $2^{i+1}B < k$, then $\frac{t_{pre}(5 \cdot \min\{2^{i+1}B, k\}, p')}{2^{i-1}} = \frac{t_{pre}(5 \cdot 2^{i+1}B, p')}{2^{i-1}} \leq \frac{t_{pre}(5 \cdot 2^{i+1}B \cdot \frac{k}{2^{i+1}B}, p')}{2^{i-1} \cdot \frac{k}{2^{i+1}B}} = O(\frac{B}{k}) \cdot t_{pre}(5k, p')$ where the inequality is because $t_{pre}(k, p')$ is at least linear in k. This concludes the proof.

7.4 Reduction to Restricted Decremental Algorithm for Few Edges

The final step is apply the following standard reduction:

Proposition 7.25. *Suppose there is an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ as in Theorem 7.1. Then, there is a decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}'$ for any m'-edge graph with preprocessing time $O(m') + t_{pre}(3m', p/3)$ and update time $O(m'/T(m')) + 3t_u(3m', p/3)$ with probability $1 - p$.*

From Lemma 7.24, we immediately obtain Theorem 7.1.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Given the algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, by Proposition 7.25 there is an algorithm $\mathcal{A}'$ for any m'-edge graph with preprocessing time $t^{\mathcal{A}'}_{pre}(m', p) = O(m') + t_{pre}(3m', p/3)$ and update time $t^{\mathcal{A}'}_u(m', p) = O(m'/T(m')) + 3t_u(3m', p/3)$ with probability $1 - p$. Plugging $\mathcal{A}'$ to Lemma 7.24, we obtain the resulting algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ of Theorem 7.1 that can run on any m-edge graph with at most k non-tree edges. Let $p' = O(p/\log k)$ be from Theorem 7.1 and $p'' = p'/3$. $\mathcal{B}$ has the preprocessing time

$$\begin{aligned} t'_{pre}(m,k,B,p) &= t^{\mathcal{A}'}_{pre}(5k,p') + O(m\log^2 m) \\ &= t_{pre}(15k,p'') + O(m\log^2 m), \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathcal{B}$ has the update time

$$\begin{aligned} t'_u(m,k,B,p) &= O(\frac{B\log k}{k}\cdot t^{\mathcal{A}'}_{pre}(5k,p') + B\log^2 m + \log k\cdot t^{\mathcal{A}'}_u(5k,p')) \\ &= O(\frac{B\log k}{k}\cdot (k + t_{pre}(15k,p'')) + B\log^2 m + \log k\cdot (\frac{k}{T(k)} + 3t_u(15k,p''))) \\ &= O(\frac{B\log k}{k}\cdot t_{pre}(15k,p'') + B\log^2 m + \frac{k\log k}{T(k)} + \log k\cdot t_u(15k,p'')). \end{aligned}$$

□

8 MSF Decomposition

In this section, we show an improved algorithm for computing a hierarchical decomposition of a graph called *MSF decomposition*. This decomposition is introduced by Wulff-Nilsen [37, Section 3.1] and it is the main subroutine in the preprocessing algorithm of his dynamic MSF algorithm and also of ours. Our improved algorithm has a better trade-off between the running time and the "quality" of the decomposition as will be made precise later. The improved version is obtained simply by using the flow-based *expansion decomposition* algorithm[13] by Nanongkai and Saranurak [24] as the main subroutine, instead of using diffusion/spectral-based algorithms as in [37]. Moreover, as the expansion decomposition algorithm is defined based on *expansion* (which is defined in Section 8.1) and not conductance, this is easier to work with and it simplifies some steps of the algorithm in Section 8.1. Before stating the main result in Theorem 8.3, we need the following definition:

Definition 8.1 (Hierarchical Decomposition)**.** *For any graph $G=(V,E)$, a* hierarchical decomposition *$\mathcal{H}$ of G is a rooted tree. Each node $C\in\mathcal{H}$ corresponds to some subgraph of G which is called a* cluster*. There are two conditions that $\mathcal{H}$ needs to satisfy: 1) the root cluster of $\mathcal{H}$ corresponds to the graph G itself, 2) for each non-leaf cluster $C\in\mathcal{H}$, let $\{C'_i\}_i$ be the children of C. Then vertices of $\{C'_i\}_i$ form a partition of vertices in C, i.e. $V(C)=\dot{\bigcup}_i V(C'_i)$. The root cluster is a* level-1 *cluster. A child of* level-i cluster *is a* level-$(i+1)$ cluster*. The* depth *of $\mathcal{H}$ is the depth of the tree. Let $E^C = E(C) - \dot{\bigcup}_i E(C'_i)$ be the set of edges in C which are not edges in any of C'_i's. We call an edge $e\in E^C$ a C-*own *edge, and an edge $f\in E(C)-E^C=\dot{\bigcup}_i E(C'_i)$ a C-*child *edge.*

We note that, for any cluster C with a child C', it is possible that $E(C')\subsetneq E(C[V(C')])$. That is, there might be some edge $e=(u,v)\in E(C)$ where $u,v\in V(C')$ but $e\notin E(C')$. In other words, there can be a C-own edge (u,v) where both $u,v\in V(C')$. Observe the following:

Fact 8.2. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a hierarchical decomposition of a graph $G=(V,E)$. Then $\dot{\bigcup}_{C\in\mathcal{H}} E^C = E$.*

Throughout this section, we assume that, in an input graph with m-edge, the edges have distinct weights ranging from number 1 to m. Throughout this section, let $\gamma = n^{O(\sqrt{\log\log n/\log n})} = n^{o(1)}$ where n is the number of nodes in a graph. The main result of this section is the below theorem:

[13] The expansion decomposition algorithm was used as a main preprocessing algorithm for their dynamic SF algorithm.

Theorem 8.3. *There is a randomized algorithm called* MSF decomposition*, MSFdecomp, which takes the following as input:*

- *a connected graph $G = (V, E, w)$ with n nodes, m edges and max degree 3, where $w : E \to \{1, \ldots, m\}$ is the weight function of edges in G,*
- *a failure probability parameter $p \in (0, 1]$, a conductance parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and parameters $d \geq 3$, s_{low} and s_{high} where $s_{high} \geq s_{low}$.*

In time $\tilde{O}(nd\gamma \log \frac{1}{p})$ where $\gamma = n^{O(\sqrt{\log \log n / \log n})}$, the algorithm returns (i) a graph $G' = (V, E, w')$ with a new weight function $w' : E \to \mathbb{R}$ and (ii) a hierarchical decomposition $\mathcal{H}$ of the re-weighted graph G' with following properties:

1. *For all $e \in E$, $w'(e) \geq w(e)$.*
2. *$|\{e \in E \mid w(e) \neq w'(e)\}| \leq \alpha d\gamma n$.*[14]
3. *For any cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$ and any set of edges D, $\mathit{MSF}(C - D) = \dot{\bigcup}_{C' : \text{child of } C} \mathit{MSF}(C' - D) \dot{\cup} (\mathit{MSF}(C - D) \cap (E^C - D))$.*
4. *$\mathcal{H}$ has depth at most d.*
5. *A cluster C is a leaf cluster iff $E(C) \leq s_{high}$.*
6. *Each leaf cluster contains at least $s_{low}/3$ nodes.*
7. *For level i, $|\dot{\bigcup}_{C : \text{non-leaf, level-}i} E^C| \leq n/(d-2) + \alpha\gamma n$.*
8. *With probability $1 - p$, all non-root clusters $C \in \mathcal{H}$ are such that $\phi(C) = \Omega(\alpha / s_{low})$.*

We call the lower bound of conductance for all non-root clusters is the *conductance guarantee* of the hierarchical decomposition $\mathcal{H}$, which is $\Omega(\alpha/s_{low})$ in our algorithm. Compared with the MSF decomposition algorithm in [37, Section 3.1], our algorithm runs significantly faster and has a better trade-off guarantee between conductance of the cluster and the number of edges re-weighted. In particular, the running time of our algorithm does not depends on the conductance parameter α.

Now, we give some intuition why this decomposition can be useful in our application. Given an input n-node graph G, we set $\alpha = 1/\gamma^3$, $d = \gamma$, $s_{low} = \gamma$, and $s_{high} = n/\gamma$. The algorithm increases the weight of only $(1/\gamma)$-fraction of edges resulting in the re-weighted graph G', and then it outputs the hierarchy decomposition $\mathcal{H}$ of G'. Property 3 of $\mathcal{H}$ is crucial and it implies that $\mathsf{MSF}(G') = \dot{\bigcup}_{C \in \mathcal{H}} (\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C)$, and this holds even after deleting any set of edges. This suggests that, to find $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$, we just need separately find $\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C$, i.e., the C-own edges that are in $\mathsf{MSF}(C)$, for every cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$. That is, the task of maintaining the MSF is also "decomposed" according the decomposition. Other properties are about bounding the size of some sets of edges and the conductance of clusters. These properties will allow our dynamic MSF algorithm to have fast update time.

The rest of this section is for proving Theorem 8.3.

[14] We can actually prove that $|\{e \in E \mid w(e) \neq w'(e)\}| \leq \tilde{O}(\alpha\gamma n)$ but this does not improve the running time significantly.

8.1 Expansion Decomposition that Respects a Given Partition

The *expansion decomposition* algorithm [24] is an algorithm that, roughly, given a graph $G = (V, E)$, it outputs a partition $\mathcal{Q} = \{V_1, \ldots, V_k\}$ of V such that, for each i, $G[V_i]$ has no sparse cuts and there are not many edges crossing different parts of $\mathcal{Q}$. The goal of this section is to extend the algorithm to ensure that each part V_i is not too small. See Lemma 8.5 for the precise statement. This requirement is needed for the construction of the MSF decomposition, as shown in [37], because each leaf cluster must not be too small (Property 6 in Theorem 8.3). The algorithm in this subsection speeds up and simplifies the algorithm in [37, Section 6] which does the same task. Before stating Lemma 8.5, we need the following definition.

Definition 8.4. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a partition of set V. We say that a set $S \subset V$* respects *$\mathcal{P}$ if for each set $U \in \mathcal{P}$, either $U \subseteq S$ or $U \cap S = \emptyset$. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be another partition of V. We say that $\mathcal{Q}$ respects $\mathcal{P}$ if, for each set $S \in \mathcal{Q}$, S respects $\mathcal{P}$.*

We prove the following extended expansion decomposition algorithm:

Lemma 8.5. *There is a randomized algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that takes as inputs a connected graph $G = (V, E)$ with n-node and max degree 3, a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of V where, for each set of nodes $U \in \mathcal{P}$, $G[U]$ is connected and $c_0 s \leq |U| \leq s$ for some constant c_0, a conductance parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, and a failure probability parameter p. Then, in time $O(n\gamma \log \frac{1}{p})$, $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a partition $\mathcal{Q} = \{V_1, \ldots, V_k\}$ of V with the following properties:*

1. *$\mathcal{Q}$ respects $\mathcal{P}$.*
2. *$|\{(u, v) \in E \mid u \in V_i \text{ and } v \in V_j \text{ where } i \neq j\}| \leq \alpha\gamma n$.*
3. *For all $V_i \in \mathcal{Q}$, $G[V_i]$ is connected. With probability $1 - p$, for all $V_i \in \mathcal{Q}$, $\phi(G[V_i]) = \Omega(\alpha/s)$.*

Note that by giving a partition $\mathcal{P}$ where each $U \in \mathcal{P}$ has size around s, the algorithm in Lemma 8.5 will output the partition $\mathcal{Q}$ where each part $V_i \in \mathcal{Q}$ has size at least $\Omega(s)$.

To prove this, we use the expansion decomposition algorithm by Nanongkai and Saranurak [24] in a black-box manner. Before stating the algorithm in Lemma 8.7, we recall that, for any graph $G = (V, E)$, the *expansion* of G is $h(G) = \min_{S \subset V} \frac{\delta(S)}{\min\{|S|, |V-S|\}}$. Note the following connection to conductance:

Fact 8.6. *In any connected graph $G = (V, E)$ with max degree $\Delta = O(1)$, $\phi(G) = \Theta(h(G))$.*

Proof. For any set $S \subset V$, we have $vol(S) \geq |S|$ as G is connected, and $vol(S) \leq \Delta|S|$ as G has max degree Δ. So $vol(S) = \Theta(|S|)$. Hence, $\frac{\delta(S)}{\min\{vol(S), vol(V-S)\}} = \Theta(\frac{\delta(S)}{\min\{|S|, |V-S|\}})$ for all $S \subset V$, and so $\phi(G) = \Theta(h(G))$. □

Lemma 8.7 (Expansion Decomposition [24] (Paraphrased))**.** *There is a randomized algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that takes as inputs a (multi-)graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n \geq 2$ vertices and m edges and an expansion parameter $\alpha > 0$, and a failure probability parameter p. Then, in $O(m\gamma \log \frac{1}{p})$ time, $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a partition $\mathcal{Q} = \{V_1, \ldots, V_k\}$ of V,*

1. *$|\{(u, v) \in E \mid u \in V_i \text{ and } v \in V_j \text{ where } i \neq j\}| \leq \alpha\gamma n$.*
2. *With probability $1 - p$, for all $V_i \in \mathcal{Q}$, $h(G[V_i]) \geq \alpha$.*

The algorithm for Lemma 8.5 is very simple. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a partition $\mathcal{P}$, we contract each set of nodes $U \in \mathcal{P}$ into a single node resulting in a contracted graph $G_{\mathcal{P}}$. Then run the expansion decomposition in Lemma 8.7 on $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ and obtain the partition $\mathcal{Q}'$ of nodes in $G_{\mathcal{P}}$. We just output $\mathcal{Q}$ which is obtained from $\mathcal{Q}$ by "un-contracting" each set of $\mathcal{P}$. Now, we show the correctness of this simple approach.

Lemma 8.8. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with max degree Δ and $\mathcal{P}$ be a partition of V where, for each set of nodes $U \in \mathcal{P}$, $G[U]$ is connected and $|U| \leq s$. Let $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ be a graph obtained from G by contracting each set $U \in \mathcal{P}$ into a single node. If $h(G) \leq \frac{1}{2s}$, then $h(G_{\mathcal{P}}) \leq 4s^2\Delta h(G)$.*

Proof. Consider a cut $S \subset V$ in G where $\frac{\delta_G(S)}{\min\{|S|,|V-S|\}} = h(G)$. Next, consider another cut $S' \subset V$ in G where S' is the union of all sets $U \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $U \subseteq S$. Clearly, $S' \subseteq S$ and so $|V - S'| \geq |V - S|$. We claim that $|S'| \geq |S|/2$. Let $\mathcal{P}_S$ be the collection of set U which contain nodes both in S and $V - S$. Note that $\delta(S) \geq |\mathcal{P}_S|$ because, for each $U \in \mathcal{P}_S$, $G[U]$ is connected. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|S'| &= |S| - \sum_{U \in \mathcal{P}_S} |U \cap S| \\
&\geq |S| - s|\mathcal{P}_s| && \text{as } |U| \leq s \\
&\geq |S| - s\delta_G(S) \\
&\geq |S| - sh(G)|S| \\
&\geq |S|/2 && \text{as } h(G) \leq \frac{1}{2s}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound $\delta_G(S')$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_G(S') &\leq \delta_G(S) + \sum_{U \in \mathcal{P}_S} E(U, S') \\
&\leq \delta_G(S) + \Delta s|P_S| \\
&\leq (1 + \Delta s)\delta_G(S) \leq 2\Delta s\delta_G(S).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that $h_G(S') = \frac{\delta_G(S')}{\min\{|S'|,|V-S'|\}} \leq \frac{2\Delta s\delta_G(S)}{\frac{1}{2}\min\{|S|,|V-S|\}} = 4\Delta s \cdot h(G)$. Next, let $S'_{\mathcal{P}}$ be a set of nodes in $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ obtained from S' by contracting each set $U \in \mathcal{P}$ into a node. Observe that $\delta_{G_{\mathcal{P}}}(S'_{\mathcal{P}}) = \delta_G(S')$ because S' respects $\mathcal{P}$. Also, $s|S'_{\mathcal{P}}| \geq |S'|$ and $s|V(G_{\mathcal{P}}) - S'_{\mathcal{P}}| \geq |V - S|$ because $|U| \leq s$ for all $U \in \mathcal{P}$. So, we can conclude

$$h(G_{\mathcal{P}}) \leq \frac{\delta_{G_{\mathcal{P}}}(S'_{\mathcal{P}})}{\min\{|S'_{\mathcal{P}}|, |V(G_{\mathcal{P}}) - S'_{\mathcal{P}}|\}} \leq \frac{\delta_G(S')}{\frac{1}{s}\min\{|S'|, |V - S'|\}} = s \cdot h_G(S') \leq 4s^2\Delta h(G).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 8.5. Now, we are ready the proof the main lemma.

Proof of Lemma 8.5. The precise algorithm is the following. Given the input $(G, \mathcal{P}, \alpha, p)$ where G has max degree $\Delta = 3$, we first construct a multi-graph $G_{\mathcal{P}} = (V', E')$ obtained from G by contracting each set $U \in \mathcal{P}$ into a node. Note that $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ has at most $\frac{n}{c_0 s}$ nodes, as $|U| \geq c_0 s$ for all $U \in \mathcal{P}$, and $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ has $O(n)$ edges. Then we run the expansion decomposition algorithm from Lemma 8.7 with $(G_{\mathcal{P}}, c_0 s\alpha, p)$ as inputs, and outputs a partition $\mathcal{Q}' = \{V'_1, \ldots, V'_k\}$ of V'. For each $V'_i \in \mathcal{Q}'$, let $V_i \subseteq V$ be the set obtained from V'_i by "un-contracting" each set in $U \in \mathcal{P}$. The

algorithm just returns $\mathcal{Q} = \{V_1, \ldots, V_k\}$ as its output. The total running time is $O(n\gamma \log \frac{1}{p})$ by Lemma 8.7 and because other operations take linear time. Now, we prove the correctness.

Clearly, $\mathcal{Q}$ respects $\mathcal{P}$ by constriction. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\{(u,v) \in E \mid u \in V_i, v \in V_j, i \neq j\} &= \{(u,v) \in E' \mid u \in V_i', v \in V_j', i \neq j\} \\ &\leq (c_0 s\alpha)\gamma \frac{n}{c_0 s} = \alpha\gamma n,\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 8.7. Next, note that $\phi(G[V_i]) = \Theta(h(G[V_i]))$ by Fact 8.6 and the fact that G has max degree 3. So it is enough to show that $h(G[V_i]) = \Omega(\alpha/s)$ for all i with probability $1 - p$. By Lemma 8.8, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, we have that if $h(G[V_i]) < h(G_{\mathcal{P}}[V_i'])/4s^2\Delta$, then $h(G[V_i]) > 1/2s = \Omega(\alpha/s)$ and we are done. So we assume otherwise, which means that

$$h(G[V_i]) \geq h(G_{\mathcal{P}}[V_i'])/4s^2\Delta \geq c_0 s\alpha/4s^2\Delta = \Omega(\alpha/s)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ with probability $1 - p$. We note that we can additionally make sure that $G[V_i]$ is connected with certainty in linear time. This concludes the proof. □

8.2 MSF Decomposition Algorithm

In this section, we just plug the extended version of the expansion decomposition algorithm from Section 8.1 to the approach by Wulff-Nilsen [37] for constructing the MSF decomposition. One minor contribution of this section is that we present the MSF decomposition in a more modular way than how it is presented in [37]. In particular, we list and prove all the needed properties of the MSF decomposition here and hide all the implementation details from the other sections. In particular, the notion of M-clusters (as defined below) is hidden from other sections. We hope that this facilitate the future applications of this decomposition.

First, we need the following algorithm by Frederickson:

Lemma 8.9 (Frederickson [11])**.** *There is an algorithm which takes as input a tree $T = (V, E)$ with n nodes and max degree 3 and a parameter s. Then, in $O(n)$ time, the algorithm outputs a partition $\mathcal{C} = \{V_i\}_i$ of V where $s/3 \leq |V_i| \leq s$ and $T[V_i]$ is connected for all i.*

The algorithm $\mathsf{MSFdecomp}(G, p, \alpha, d, s_{low}, s_{high})$ for Theorem 8.3 is as follows. First, we compute the MSF M of G. Then, given (M, s_{low}) to Lemma 8.9, we compute the outputted partition $\mathcal{P}_M$ called *M-partition*. For each $V' \in \mathcal{P}_M$, we call $M[V']$ an *M-cluster*. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_M$ and $E(\mathcal{C}_M)$ the set of M-clusters and the union of edges of M-clusters respectively. Note that $\mathcal{C}_M$ is just a forest where each tree has size between $s_{low}/3$ and s_{low}. Next, let $d' = d - 2$. For $1 \leq i \leq d'$, we denote by E_i the set of edges of weights in the range $(m - i\frac{m}{d'}, m - (i-1)\frac{m}{d'}]$ which are *not* in $E(\mathcal{C}_M)$. For any $i > d'$, let $E_i = \emptyset$. Finally, we call $\mathsf{Build}(G, \mathcal{P}_M, 1)$ from Algorithm 8.1. Let ExpDecomp denote the extended expansion decomposition algorithm from Lemma 8.5.

8.2.1 Analysis

First, we note that, in Step 2.a, a valid input is given to Lemma 8.5:

Proposition 8.10. *In the recursion by invoking $\mathsf{Build}(G, \mathcal{P}_M, 1)$, if $\mathsf{Build}(C, \mathcal{P}, i)$ is called, then $\mathcal{P}$ is a partition of $V(C)$. Moreover, $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$.*

Proof. We prove by induction. The base case is trivial because $\mathcal{P}_M$ is a partition of $V(G)$. Next, by induction hypothesis, suppose that $\mathcal{P}$ is a partition of $V(C)$ and $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$. So $(C, \mathcal{P}, \alpha, p/n)$ is a

The numbers $n, m, p, \alpha, d, s_{low}, s_{high}$ are fixed by the input of Theorem 8.3.

1. If $|E(C)| \leq s_{high}$, return. // i.e. C is a leaf cluster.
2. Else, // i.e. C is a non-leaf cluster.
   (a) Compute $\mathcal{Q} = \mathsf{ExpDecomp}(C, \mathcal{P}, \alpha, p/2n)$. Write $\mathcal{Q} = \{V^1, \ldots, V^k\}$.
   (b) For all $j \leq k$, set $C^j = (V^j, E^j)$ where $E^j = E(C[V^j]) - E_i$ as a child cluster of C.
   (c) Set $E^C = E(C) - \dot{\bigcup}_j E^j$ as a set of C-own edges.
   (d) For all $e \in E^C$, set $w'(e) \leftarrow \max\{w(e), m - i\frac{m}{d'} + 0.5\}$
   (e) For all $j \leq k$, run $\mathsf{Build}(C^j, \mathcal{P}^j, i+1)$ where $\mathcal{P}^j = \{V' \in \mathcal{P} \mid V' \subseteq V^j\}$.

Algorithm 8.1: $\mathsf{Build}(C, \mathcal{P}, i)$

valid input for the algorithm from Lemma 8.5 in Step 2.a. Let $\mathcal{Q} = \{V^1, \ldots, V^k\}$ be the outputted partition of $V(C)$. By Lemma 8.5, $\mathcal{Q}$ respects $\mathcal{P}$. Therefore, for all j, $\mathcal{P}^j = \{V' \in \mathcal{P} \mid V' \subseteq V^j\}$ in Step 2.e is actually a partition of V^j. That is, for all child clusters C^j of C, when $\mathsf{Build}(C^j, \mathcal{P}^j, i)$ is called, $\mathcal{P}^j$ is a partition of $V(C^j) = V^j$ and $P^j \subseteq \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$. □

As all the steps are valid, we obtain a hierarchical decomposition denoted by $\mathcal{H}$ with the following basic properties.

Proposition 8.11. *We have the following:*

1. $\mathsf{Build}(G, \mathcal{P}_M, 1)$ *returns a hierarchical decomposition* $\mathcal{H}$.
2. *For any cluster* $C \in \mathcal{H}$, $V(C)$ *respects* $\mathcal{P}_M$.
3. *A cluster* $C \in \mathcal{H}$ *is a leaf cluster iff* C *has at most* s_{high} *edges. Moreover, each leaf cluster contains at least* $s_{low}/3$ *nodes.*
4. *With probability* $1 - p$, *all non-root clusters* $C \in \mathcal{H}$ *are such that* $\phi(C) = \Omega(\alpha/s_{low})$.

Proof. (1): There are two conditions we need to show about $\mathcal{H}$. First, the root cluster clearly corresponds to the graph G itself. Next, for any non-leaf cluster C, let $C^1, \ldots, C^k$ be the children of C. We have that $\{V(C^1), \ldots, V(C^k)\}$ is a partition of $V(C)$ by Lemma 8.5 used in Step 2.a.

(2): This follows from Proposition 8.10.

(3): The first statement is by Step 1. For the second statement, for all clusters $C \in \mathcal{H}$, $V(C)$ respects $\mathcal{P}_M$. So $|V(C)| \geq s_{low}/3$.

(4): By Step 2.a, all non-root clusters C is outputted from Lemma 8.5. Since Lemma 8.5 is called at most $2n$ times, the claim holds with probability $1 - 2n \cdot \frac{p}{2n} = 1 - p$. □

In the outputted hierarchical decomposition $\mathcal{H}$, observe that $C \in \mathcal{H}$ is a level-i cluster iff $\mathsf{Build}(C, \mathcal{P}, i)$ is called in the level-i recursion when we call $\mathsf{Build}(G, \mathcal{P}_M, 1)$. For any i, let $E_{\geq i} = \dot{\bigcup}_{j \geq i} E_j$. Note that, for $i > d'$, $E_{\geq i} = \emptyset$. By Step 2.b of Algorithm 8.1, observe the following:

Proposition 8.12. *For any level-*i *cluster* C, $E(C) \subseteq E_{\geq i} \dot{\cup} E(\mathcal{C}_M)$.

Lemma 8.13. $\mathcal{H}$ *has depth at most* d.

Proof. Recall that $d = d' + 2$. Let C' be a level-$(d'+2)$ cluster and C be the parent cluster of C'. Since C is a level-$(d'+1)$ cluster, by Proposition 8.12, $E(C) \subseteq E(\mathcal{C}_M)$. This means that, C is a forest. As C' is connected by Lemma 8.5, C' cannot intersect more than two M-clusters. So $|V(C')| \leq s_{low}$ and, hence, $|E(C')| \leq s_{low}$. As $s_{low} \leq s_{high}$, C' must be returned as a leaf cluster by Step 1. □

For any level-i non-leaf cluster C, let $E_i(C) = E_i \cap E(C)$ and let ∂^C be the set of edges whose endpoints are in different child clusters. By Step 2.b and Step 2.c, observe the following:

Proposition 8.14. *For any level-i non-leaf cluster C, the set of C-own edges is $E^C = E_i(C) \cup \partial^C$.*

We note that Proposition 8.14 is *not* true for a leaf cluster C because E^C may contains some M-cluster edges (i.e. $E(\mathcal{C}_M)$).

Lemma 8.15. $|\{e \in E \mid w(e) \neq w'(e)\}| \leq \alpha d\gamma \cdot n$.

Proof. For any level-i cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$, we claim that $|\{e \in E^C \mid w(e) \neq w'(e)\}| \leq \alpha\gamma \cdot |V(C)|$. Having this claim, the lemma follows because the recursion depth is at most d by Lemma 8.13, and, for any depth i, any two level-i clusters C and C' are node-disjoint.

Suppose that C is a level-i cluster. If C is a leaf cluster, then $\{e \in E^C \mid w(e) \neq w'(e)\} = \emptyset$. So we assume C is a non-leaf cluster. By Proposition 8.14 $E^C = E_i(C) \cup \partial^C$. For any edge $e \in E_i(C)$, we have $w(e) \geq m - i\frac{m}{d'} + 1$, so $w'(e) = w(e)$ by Step 2.d. So $\{e \in E(C) \mid w(e) \neq w'(e)\} \subseteq \partial(C)$. By Lemma 8.5, $|\partial^C| \leq \alpha\gamma \cdot |V(C)|$. So this concludes the claim. □

Lemma 8.16. *For level i, $|\dot{\bigcup}_{C:\text{non-leaf, level-}i} E^C| \leq n/(d-2) + \alpha\gamma n$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}_i$ be the set of level-i non-leaf clusters. By Proposition 8.14, $\dot{\bigcup}_{C\in\mathcal{C}_i} E^C = \dot{\bigcup}_{C\in\mathcal{C}_i} E_i(C) \cup \partial^C \subseteq E_i \cup \dot{\bigcup}_{C\in\mathcal{C}_i} \partial^C$. We have $|E_i| \leq n/d' = n/(d-2)$. Also, by Lemma 8.5, $|\partial^C| \leq \alpha\gamma \cdot |V(C)|$ and hence $|\dot{\bigcup}_{C\in\mathcal{C}_i} \partial^C| \leq \alpha\gamma n$ because any two level-i clusters C and C' are node-disjoint. □

Lemma 8.17. *For any cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$ and any set of edges D,*

$$\mathit{MSF}(C - D) = \dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} \mathit{MSF}(C' - D) \dot{\cup} (\mathit{MSF}(C - D) \cap (E^C - D)).$$

Proof. We only prove that $\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C') \dot{\cup} (\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C) = \mathsf{MSF}(C)$. The lemma follows by observing that the argument holds true even when the set of edges D are removed from all clusters. We write

$$\begin{aligned} E(C) &= E^C \dot{\cup} \dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') \\ &= E^C \dot{\cup} (\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') \cap E(\mathcal{C}_M)) \dot{\cup} (\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') - E(\mathcal{C}_M)). \end{aligned}$$

First, we know that edges in $\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') \cap E(\mathcal{C}_M)$ are tree-edges in $\mathsf{MSF}(C)$ because $E(\mathcal{C}_M) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(G)$ and C is a subgraph of G where some edges not in $E(\mathcal{C}_M)$ have their weight increased. This means that we can construct $\mathsf{MSF}(C)$ using an instance I of Kruskal's algorithm where the initial forest is the edges in $\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') \cap E(\mathcal{C}_M)$.

Next, suppose that C is a level-i cluster. So $\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') - E(\mathcal{C}_M) \subseteq E_{\geq i+1}$ by Proposition 8.12. By Step 2.d, any C-own edge $e \in E^C$ is heavier than any $E_{\geq i+1}$. So the instance I

will scan all edges in $\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') - E(\mathcal{C}_M)$ before any edges in E^C. After finishing scanning $\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') - E(\mathcal{C}_M)$, I has constructed, as a part of $\mathsf{MSF}(C)$, the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{MSF}\left((\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') \cap E(\mathcal{C}_M))\dot{\cup}(\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C') - E(\mathcal{C}_M))\right) \\
&= \mathsf{MSF}(\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} E(C')) \\
&= \dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C') && \text{as } C'\text{'s are node disjoint.}
\end{aligned}$$

Since there are only the edges in E^C that I have not scanned yet, this means that

$$\dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C')\dot{\cup}(\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C) = \mathsf{MSF}(C).$$

□

Lemma 8.18. *The MSF decomposition algorithm* $\mathsf{MSFdecomp}(G, p, \alpha, d, s_{low}, s_{high})$ *runs in time* $\tilde{O}(nd\gamma \log \frac{1}{p})$.

Proof. The bottleneck is the time for calling $\mathsf{Build}(G, \mathcal{P}_M, 1)$. For any level-$i$ cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$, when $\mathsf{Build}(C, \mathcal{P}, i)$ is called, this takes time $\tilde{O}(\alpha\gamma|V(C)| \log \frac{n}{p})$ excluding the time in the further recursion. Again, the lemma follows because the recursion depth is at most d by Lemma 8.13, and, for any depth i, any two level-i clusters C and C' are node-disjoint. □

Proposition 8.11, Lemma 8.13, Lemma 8.15 and Lemma 8.17 concludes the correctness of Theorem 8.3. Lemma 8.18 bounds the running time.

9 Dynamic MSF Algorithm

In this section, we prove the main theorem:

Theorem 9.1. *There is a fully dynamic MSF algorithm on an n-node m-edge graph that has preprocessing time $O(m^{1+O(\sqrt{\log\log m/\log m})} \log \frac{1}{p}) = O(m^{1+o(1)} \log \frac{1}{p})$ and worst-case update time $O(n^{O(\log\log\log n/\log\log n)} \log \frac{1}{p}) = O(n^{o(1)} \log \frac{1}{p})$ with probability $1 - p$.*

By using a standard reduction or a more powerful reduction from Theorem 7.1, it is enough to show the following:

Lemma 9.2. *There is a decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ on an n-node m-edge graph G with max degree 3 undergoing a sequence of edge deletions of length $T = \Theta(n^{1-O(\log\log\log n/\log\log n)})$. $\mathcal{A}$ has preprocessing time $O(n^{1+O(\sqrt{\log\log n/\log n})} \log \frac{1}{p})$ and worst-case update time $O(n^{O(\log\log\log n/\log\log n)} \log \frac{1}{p})$ with probability $1 - p$.*

We note that essentially all the ideas in this section, in particular the crucial definition of *compressed clusters*, already appeared in Wulff-Nilsen [37]. In this section, we only make sure that, with our improved tools from previous sections, we can integrate all of them using the same approach as in [37]. Obviously, the run time analysis must change because our algorithm is faster and need somewhat more careful analysis. Although the correctness follows as in [37], the terminology changes a bit because MSF decomposition from Theorem 8.3 is presented in a more modular way.

The high-level idea in [37] of the algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ is simple. To maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$, we maintain a graph H, called the *sketch graph*, where at any time $\mathsf{MSF}(G) = \mathsf{MSF}(H)$ and H contains only few non-tree edges with high probability. Then we just maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$ using another algorithm for graphs with few non-tree edges.

Organization. The rest of this section is for proving Lemma 9.2. In Section 9.1, we describe the whole algorithm which combines all the tools from previous sections. The preprocessing algorithm is in Section 9.1.1 and the update algorithm is in Section 9.1.2. We summarize all the main notations in Table 1. Next, in Section 9.2, we show that the sketch graph H is indeed maintained such that $\mathsf{MSF}(G) = \mathsf{MSF}(H)$ (shown in Section 9.2.1) and H has few non-tree edges (shown in Section 9.2.2). Note that this implies that $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$ is correctly maintained. Lastly, we analyze the running time in Section 9.3. We first bound the preprocessing time in Section 9.3.1, the time needed for maintaining the sketch graph H itself in Section 9.3.2, and the time needed for maintaining $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$ in H in Section 9.3.3. We put everything together and conclude the proof in Section 9.3.4.

9.1 The Algorithm

For any number m and $p \in (0,1)$, in this section, the goal is to describe the decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}(m,p)$ for any m-edge graph $G = (V,E,w)$ with max degree 3 such that $\mathcal{A}(m,p)$ can handle $T(m)$ edge deletions and, with probability $1-p$, has preprocessing and update time $t_{pre}(m,p)$ and $t_u(m,p)$. We will show that $t_{pre}(m,p) = O(m^{1+O(\sqrt{\log\log m/\log m})}\log\frac{1}{p})$, $t_u(m,p) = O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)}\log\frac{1}{p})$ and $T(m) = \Theta(m^{1-O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)})$. This will imply Lemma 9.2.

By induction on m, we assume that, for any $m_0 \le m-1$ and $p_0 \in (0,1)$, we have obtained the decremental MSF algorithm $\mathcal{A}(m_0,p_0)$ that can run on any m_0-edge graph G_0 with max degree 3 undergoing a sequence edge deletions of length $T(m_0)$. Let $t_{pre}(m_0,p_0)$ and $t_u(m_0,p_0)$ denote the preprocessing and update time of $\mathcal{A}$ on G_0, respectively, that hold with probability at least $1-p_0$.

By this assumption, Theorem 7.1 implies the following. For any number m_1, k_1, B_1 and $p_1 \in (0,1)$ where $k_1 \le (m-1)/15$, there is a fully dynamic algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{few}(m_1,k_1,B_1,p_1)$ that can run on any (multi-)graph G_1 with at most m_1 edges and at most k_1 non-tree edges. Moreover $\mathcal{A}_{few}(m_1,k_1,B_1,p_1)$ can handle inserting a batch of edges of size B_1. Let $t^{few}_{pre}(m_1,k_1,B_1,p_1)$, $t^{few}_{ins}(m_1,k_1,B_1,p_1)$, $t^{few}_{del}(m_1,k_1,B_1,p_1)$ denote the preprocessing time, the batch insertion time, and the deletion time of $\mathcal{A}_{few}(m_1,k_1,B_1,p_1)$ respectively, that hold with probability at least $1-p_1$. Below, we will slightly abuse notation. For any graph G_2, and parameters B_2 and p_2, we denote $\mathcal{A}_{few}(G_2,B_2,p_2)$ as an instance of $\mathcal{A}_{few}(m_2,k_2,B_2,p_2)$ running on G_2 with at most m_2 edges and k_2 non-tree edges.

In the following subsections, we will first describe how we preprocess the input graph G for $\mathcal{A}(m,p)$ in Section 9.1.1. In the process, we introduce several definitions related to *compressed clusters* which were defined in [37] and will be the central definitions of our algorithm. Then, we describe how we update in Section 9.1.2.

9.1.1 Preprocessing and Definitions Related to Compressed Clusters

Let n be the number of nodes in G. We can assume that G is initially connected otherwise we run the algorithm on each connected component of G. So $n = \Theta(m)$ initially. Since we will handle only $T(m) = o(m)$ edge deletions, we have $n = \Theta(m)$ at all time.

Let $\gamma = n^{O(\sqrt{\log\log n/\log n})}$ be the factor from Theorem 8.3. We run the MSF decomposition algorithm $\mathsf{MSFdecomp}(G,\alpha,p,d,s_{low},s_{high})$ where $\alpha = 1/\gamma^3$, $d = \gamma$, $s_{low} = \gamma$, and $s_{high} = n/\gamma$. So we obtain a re-weighted graph $G' = (V,E,w')$ together with its hierarchical decomposition $\mathcal{H}$ with conductance guarantee $\alpha_0 = \Omega(\alpha/s_{low}) = \Omega(1/\gamma^4)$. We denote by $E^{\neq} = \{e \in E \mid w(e) \neq w'(e)\}$ the set of re-weighted edges. Let $E^{\neq}(w)$ and $E^{\neq}(w')$ be the set of weighted edges from $E^{\neq}$ where the weight of e is $w(e)$ and $w'(e)$ respectively. By Theorem 8.3, we know that a cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$ is a leaf cluster iff $E(C) \le s_{high}$ (before any edge deletion). For convenience, we call each leaf cluster a

small cluster and non-leaf cluster a *large cluster*. For any child cluster C' of C, we say C' is a small (large) child of C iff C' is a small (large) cluster.

Proposition 9.3. *Any cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$ has at most $O(n/s_{high})$ large child clusters.*

Proof. All the large children of C are edge-disjoint and each of them contains at least s_{high} edges. □

Let $G_{\text{small}} = \dot{\bigcup}_{C:\text{small}} C.$ be the union of all small clusters. We maintain the MSF M_{small} of G_{small} by separately initializing $\mathcal{A}(C, p)$ on each small cluster C. (Note that we $E(C) \leq s_{high} \leq m - 1$ and so we can initialize $\mathcal{A}$ on C by our assumption.) For any large cluster C, let $M_{\text{small}}(C) = \dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{small child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C')$. As every small cluster has a unique parent and small clusters are node-disjoint, we have the following:

Proposition 9.4. $M_{\text{small}} = \dot{\bigcup}_{C:\text{large}} M_{\text{small}}(C)$.

For each large cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$ excluding the root cluster, we initialize the dynamic pruning algorithm $\mathsf{Pruning}$ on C using Theorem 6.1 with a conductance parameter α_0. Whenever some edge in C is deleted, $\mathsf{Pruning}$ will update a set $P_0^C \subseteq V(C)$ of nodes in C. Initially, $P_0^C = \emptyset$. Let π denote the update time of $\mathsf{Pruning}$ on each C. Given that the sequence of edge deletions in C is at most $O(\alpha_0^2 |E(C)|)$ (as we will show later), as $\alpha_0 = 1/n^{O(\sqrt{\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}})}$, we have

$$\pi = n^{O(\log\log(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log\log n}})/\log(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log\log n}}))} \log\frac{1}{p} = n^{O(\log\log\log n/\log\log n)} \log\frac{1}{p}$$

by Theorem 6.1.

For each large cluster (including the root cluster) $C \in \mathcal{H}$, it is more convenient to define P^C as a union of $P_0^{C'}$ over all large child cluster C' of C. That is, $P^C = \dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{large child of } C} P_0^{C'}$. We call P^C the *total pruning set* of C. Recall the definition of C-own edges E^C from Definition 8.1. For any set $U \subseteq V(C)$, denote by $\overline{E}^C(U) = \{(u, v) \in E^C \mid u \in U \text{ or } v \in U\}$ the set of C-own edges incident to U.

Now, we define an important definition called *compressed clusters*.

Definition 9.5. *For any large cluster C and any set of nodes $U \subseteq \dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{large child of } C} V(C')$, the* compressed cluster of C with respect to U, *denoted by $\overline{C}(U)$ is obtained from C by 1) replacing each small child C' by $\mathsf{MSF}(C')$, and 2) contracting nodes in each large child cluster C' into a single node (called* super node*), and 3) removing edges (used to) incident to U, i.e. removing $\overline{E}^C(U)$.*

For convenience, we define the contraction in the step 2 above such that all C-own edges are preserved. That is, all the self loops are removed except the ones which are C-own edges. Let $E^{\overline{C}(U)} = E^C - \overline{E}^C(U)$ be the set of C-own edges which is not incident to U. The following observation shows some basic structure of $\overline{C}(U)$:

Proposition 9.6. *For any large cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$ and $U \subseteq V(C)$, we have*

- $E(\overline{C}(U)) = M_{\text{small}}(C) \dot{\cup} E^{\overline{C}(U)}$, *and*
- $M_{\text{small}}(C) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}(U))$.

Proof. For the first statement, we partition edges in the cluster C into C-child edges in small children of C, C-child edges in large children of C, and C-own edges. Recall the definitions from Definition 8.1. That is,

$$E(C) = \dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{small child of } C} E(C') \dot{\cup} \dot{\bigcup}_{C':\text{large child of } C} E(C') \cup E^C.$$

We show how $E(C)$ is changed during the process of constructing $\overline{C}(U)$. First, replacing each small child C' of C by $\mathsf{MSF}(C')$ is to replace $\dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:small child of } C} E(C')$ by $M_{\text{small}}(C)$. Second, contracting the large children of C is to remove $\dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:large child of } C} E(C')$. Third, as $U \subseteq \dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:large child of } C} V(C')$, removing edges incident to U is to replace E^C by $E^{\overline{C}(U)}$. So we have that $E(\overline{C}(U)) = M_{\text{small}}(C) \dot{\cup} E^{\overline{C}(U)}$.

For the second statement, by Theorem 8.3, we have

$$\mathsf{MSF}(C) \supseteq \dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C') = M_{\text{small}}(C) \dot{\cup} \dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:large child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C').$$

Let $\widehat{C}$ be obtained from C after replacing each small child C' by $\mathsf{MSF}(C')$ and contracting large children. Note that $\overline{C}(U)$ can be obtained from $\widehat{C}$ by removing all edges incident to U. We claim that $M_{\text{small}}(C) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\widehat{C})$. Indeed, contracting large children of C is the same as contracting edges in $\dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:large child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C')$. But $\dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:large child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C') \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(C)$, so the remaining MSF-edges do not change. So $M_{\text{small}}(C) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\widehat{C})$. As $U \subseteq \dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:large child of } C} V(C')$, the set of edges incident to U is disjoint from $M_{\text{small}}(C)$, so $M_{\text{small}}(C) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}(U))$. □

Let $S_{\overline{C}(U)} \subseteq V(\overline{C}(U))$ be the set of *super nodes* in $\overline{C}(U)$. By Proposition 9.3 C has at most $O(n/s_{high}) = O(\gamma)$ large child clusters, so we have the following:

Proposition 9.7. $|S_{\overline{C}(U)}| = O(\gamma)$.

Next, we partition $E^{\overline{C}(U)} = E_1^{\overline{C}(U)} \dot{\cup} E_2^{\overline{C}(U)} \dot{\cup} E_3^{\overline{C}(U)}$ where $E_i^{\overline{C}(U)}$ is the set of edges $e \in E^{\overline{C}(U)}$ where $(i-1)$ endpoints of e are incident to $S_{\overline{C}(U)}$. Let $\overline{C}_i(U) = (V(\overline{C}), M_{\text{small}}(C) \dot{\cup} E_i^{\overline{C}(U)})$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$. The reason that it is useful to partition $E^{\overline{C}(U)}$ into three parts is because, for $i \in \{2, 3\}$, there is a small set of nodes that "cover" all non-tree edges in $\overline{C}_i(U)$:

Proposition 9.8. *For $i \in \{2, 3\}$, all non-tree edges in $\overline{C}_i(U)$ are incident to $S_{\overline{C}}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 9.6, we have that $M_{\text{small}}(C) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(U))$. So all non-tree edges in $\overline{C}_i(U)$ can only be edges in $E_i^{\overline{C}(U)}$. By definition of $E_i^{\overline{C}(U)}$ for $i \in \{2, 3\}$, each edge $e \in E_i^{\overline{C}(U)}$ is incident to $S_{\overline{C}}$. □

In the algorithm, for each large cluster C, what we really maintain are always the compressed clusters with respect to P^C. We define them with respect to any set U just for the analysis. So we denote $\overline{C} = \overline{C}(P^C)$ and call it simply the *compressed cluster of C*. Also, $E^{\overline{C}}$, $E_i^{\overline{C}}$ and $\overline{C}_i$ are similarly defined, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Although two arbitrary clusters C and D in $\mathcal{H}$ may be not edge-disjoint, we have that this is the case for compressed clusters.

Proposition 9.9. *Compressed clusters are edge-disjoint. That is, for any large clusters $C, D \in \mathcal{H}$, $E(\overline{C}) \cap E(\overline{D}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. $M_{\text{small}}(C)$ and $M_{\text{small}}(D)$ are disjoint by Proposition 9.4. For *any* set $U \subseteq V(C)$ and $U' \subseteq V(D)$, $E^{\overline{C}(U)}$ and $E^{\overline{D}(U')}$ are disjoint. This follows because $E^{\overline{C}(U)} \subseteq E^C$, $E^{\overline{D}(U')} \subseteq E^D$, and $E^C \cap E^D = \emptyset$ by Fact 8.2. So, by Proposition 9.6, $E(\overline{C}(U)) \cap E(\overline{D}(U')) = \emptyset$. □

For each large cluster C, we maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_1)$ using $\mathcal{A}_{few}(\overline{C}_1, 1, p)$. Next, we maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_2)$ using an instance of the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_2$ from Lemma 2.7. Note the constraint in Lemma 2.7 is satisfied. Indeed, Proposition 9.8 implies that every non-tree edge in $\overline{C}_2$ has exactly one endpoint in the set of super nodes $S_{\overline{C}}$. Moreover, every node $u \in V(\overline{C}_2) \setminus S_{\overline{C}}$ has degree at most 3 just because G has max degree 3. Next, we maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_3)$ using instances of the algorithm $\mathcal{A}_3$ from Lemma 2.6.

Remark 9.10. Note that edges in $\overline{C}_3$ consist of $M_{\text{small}}(C)$ and $E_3^{\overline{C}}$, and they do not share endpoints. So $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_3) = M_{\text{small}}(C) \dot\cup \mathsf{MSF}(E_3^{\overline{C}})$. As $M_{\text{small}}(C)$ is already maintained, it is enough to maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(E_3^{\overline{C}})$. So, actually, we run $\mathcal{A}_3$ on the graph consisting of edges from $E_3^{\overline{C}}$. This graph has only $O(\gamma)$ nodes by Proposition 9.7.

Now, we describe the main object of our algorithm. The sketch graph is $H = (V, E(H))$ where

$$E(H) = E^{\neq}(w) \cup M_{\text{small}} \cup \bigcup_{C:\text{large}} (\overline{E}^C(P^C) \cup \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \cup J^C). \tag{3}$$

where $J^C \subseteq E^{\overline{C}}$ is called a set of *junk edges* of a large cluster C. Initially, $J^C = \emptyset$ for all large cluster C. We will describe how J^C is updated later. Note that H can be a multigraph because of $E^{\neq}(w)$.

Remark 9.11. For each edge $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$, we include its original endpoints into $E(H)$ and not the endpoint in the compressed cluster $\overline{C}$ where some nodes are already contracted as one node. This can be done easily by associating the original endpoints of each edge whenever we contract some nodes.

The last step of our preprocessing algorithm is to initialize $\mathcal{A}_{few}(H, B, p)$ on H and obtain $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$. We summarize the preprocessing algorithm in Algorithm 9.1.

1. $(G', \mathcal{H}) = \mathsf{MSFdecomp}(G, \alpha, p, d, s_{low}, s_{high})$ where $\alpha = 1/\gamma^3$, $d = \gamma$, $s_{low} = \gamma$, and $s_{high} = n/\gamma$.
2. Initialize $\mathcal{A}(C, p)$ for each small cluster C and obtain $M_{\text{small}} = \mathsf{MSF}(G_{\text{small}})$ where $G_{\text{small}} = \dot\bigcup_{C:\text{small}} C$.
3. For each large cluster C (excluding root cluster), initialize $\mathsf{Pruning}$ on C with a conductance parameter $\alpha_0 = \Omega(1/\gamma^4) = 1/n^{O(\sqrt{\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}})}$.
4. For each large cluster C,
   (a) construct $\overline{C}_1$, $\overline{C}_2$, and $\overline{C}_3$.
   (b) Initialize $\mathcal{A}_{few}(\overline{C}_1, 1, p)$ and obtain $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_1)$.
   (c) Initialize $\mathcal{A}_i(\overline{C}_i)$ and obtain $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$, for $i = 2, 3$.
5. Construct the sketch graph H where $V(H) = V$ and
$$E(H) = E^{\neq}(w) \cup M_{\text{small}} \cup \bigcup_{C:\text{large}} (\overline{E}^C(P^C) \cup \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \cup J^C)$$
   where, for each large cluster C, $P^C = \emptyset$ and $J^C = \emptyset$ initially.
6. Initialize $\mathcal{A}_{few}(H, B, p)$ on H where $B = O(\pi d)$ and obtain $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$.

Algorithm 9.1: Preprocessing algorithm.

Notation	Description

Algorithms

MSFdecomp	MSF decomposition algorithm from Theorem 8.3
Pruning	Dynamic expander pruning algorithm from Theorem 6.1
$\mathcal{A}_{few}$	Dynamic MSF for graphs with few non-tree edges obtained by induction and using Theorem 7.1
$\mathcal{A}_2$	from Lemma 2.7
$\mathcal{A}_3$	from Lemma 2.6

Graphs, Edges and Parameters

$G = (V, E, w)$	The input graph
γ	The factor $\gamma = n^{O(\sqrt{\log\log n / \log n})}$ from Theorem 8.3
$G' = (V, E, w')$	The re-weighted graph where $(G', \mathcal{H}) = \mathsf{MSFdecomp}(G, \alpha, p, d, s_{low}, s_{high})$ where $\alpha = 1/\gamma^3$, $d = \gamma$, $s_{low} = \gamma$, and $s_{high} = n/\gamma$
$\mathcal{H}$	The hierarchical decomposition of G'
$E(C)$	The set of edges in a cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$. Note that, possibly, $(u, v) \notin E(C)$ but $u, v \in V(C)$
E^C	The set of C-*own* edges. $E^C = E(C) - \dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:child of } C} E(C')$
$E(C) - E^C$	The set of C-*child* edges
$E^{\neq}$	$E^{\neq} = \{e \in E \mid w(e) \neq w'(e)\}$
$E^{\neq}(w)$, $E^{\neq}(w')$	The set of edges in $E^{\neq}$ with weight assigned by w and w', respectively
G_{small}	$\dot{\bigcup}_{C\text{:small}} C$
M_{small}	$\mathsf{MSF}(G_{\text{small}}) = \dot{\bigcup}_{C\text{:small}} \mathsf{MSF}(C)$
H	The sketch graph. See Equation (3).
π	The update time of Pruning. $\pi = n^{O(\log\log\log n / \log\log n)} \log \frac{1}{p}$.

Inside a large cluster C

$M_{\text{small}}(C)$	$\dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:small child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C)$
P_0^C	The *pruning set* $P_0^C \subseteq V(C)$ of C maintained by an instance of Pruning that was initialized in C
P^C	The *total pruning set* of C. $P^C = \dot{\bigcup}_{C'\text{:large child of } C} P_0^{C'}$.
$\overline{E}^C(U)$	The set of C-own edges incident to U. $\overline{E}^C(U) = \{(u, v) \in E^C \mid u \in U \text{ or } v \in U\}$.
$\overline{C}(U)$	The compressed cluster of C with respect to U. See Definition 9.5.
$\overline{C}$	The compressed cluster of C. $\overline{C} = \overline{C}(P^C) = (V(\overline{C}), M_{\text{small}}(C) \dot{\cup} E^{\overline{C}})$.
$E^{\overline{C}}$	The set of $\overline{C}$-own edges. $E^{\overline{C}} = E^C - \overline{E}^C(P^C)$ is the set of C-own edges *not* incident to P^C.
$E_i^{\overline{C}}$	The set of edges in $e \in E^{\overline{C}}$ where $(i-1)$ endpoints of e are incident to super nodes in $\overline{C}$. Note that $E^{\overline{C}} = E_1^{\overline{C}} \dot{\cup} E_2^{\overline{C}} \dot{\cup} E_3^{\overline{C}}$.
$\overline{C}_i$	$\overline{C}_i = (V(\overline{C}), M_{\text{small}}(C) \dot{\cup} E_i^{\overline{C}})$
J^C	The set of junk edges in C

Table 1: Definitions in Section 9

9.1.2 Update

Now, we describe how to update the sketch graph H given an edge deletion of G, so that at every step we have $\mathsf{MSF}(G) = \mathsf{MSF}(H)$ and H is extremely sparse. We will handle at most $T(m) = m/(3\pi d\gamma) \le n/\pi d\gamma$ edge deletions. From now, we just write $T = T(m)$.

We describe how H changes by showing, in the following order, how we update 1) $E^{\neq}(w)$, 2) M_{small} and, for each large cluster C, 3) $\overline{E}^C(P^C)$, 4) $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and lastly 5) J^C.

Let e be a given edge of G to be deleted. We set $G \leftarrow G - e$ and $G' \leftarrow G' - e$. By Fact 8.2, there is the unique cluster C where e is a C-own edge (i.e. $e \in E^C$). We set $E^C \leftarrow E^C - e$. In particular, all ancestor clusters C' of C are changed: $E(C') \leftarrow E(C') - e$ accordingly. For each large cluster C where $e \in E(C)$, the total pruning set $P^C = \bigcup_{C' : \text{large child of } C} P_0^{C'}$ is updated by the instances of $\mathsf{Pruning}$ that was initialized in each large child C' of C. Recall that P^C only grows. If $e \in E^{\neq}(w)$, then we set $E^{\neq}(w) \leftarrow E^{\neq}(w) - e$. This determines the changes of $E^{\neq}(w)$, M_{small}, and $\overline{E}^C(P^C)$ for each large cluster C.

For any large C and $i = 1, 2, 3$, recall that $\overline{C}_i = \overline{C}_i(P^C) = (V(\overline{C}), M_{\text{small}}(C) \dot{\cup} E_i^{\overline{C}(P^C)})$ is determined by P^C and $M_{\text{small}}(C)$. The description above already determines how $\overline{C}_i$ changes. Hence, $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$ is determined as well. Finally, for J^C, whenever some edge f is removed from $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$, for some $\overline{C}$ and $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ but f is actually not deleted from G yet, then we include f into J^C as a junk edge.

Remark 9.12. We call these edges junk edges because of the following reason. Even if H did not include junk edges, then we can show that the algorithm is still correct, i.e. $\mathsf{MSF}(H) = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$. However, junk edges are needed for the performance reason: Given an edge deletion in G, there can be $O(\pi d)$ many edges removed from $\bigcup_{C:\text{large}, i=2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$. But removing that many edges in H will take too much time when we recursively maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$ in H. So we just mark these removed edges as junk edges, but do not actually remove them from H.

By the way we maintain junk edges, we have:

Proposition 9.13. *Given an edge e to be deleted from G, only e can be removed from*

$$\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} (\overline{E}^C(P^C) \cup \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \cup J^C).$$

Reporting Failure. During the sequence of updates, our algorithm might report "failure". Once there is a failure, we terminate the whole algorithm and then restart from the preprocessing. Here, we list the events such that if they happen, the algorithm will report failure. First, we report failure if any instance of $\mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{A}_{few}$ takes time more than the time bound which is guaranteed to hold with high probability. More formally, this is when an instance $\mathcal{A}(m_0, p_0)$, for some m_0, p_0 takes time more than $t_u(m_0, p_0)$ for some update, or when an instance $\mathcal{A}_{few}(m_1, k_1, B_1, p_1)$ takes time more than $t_{del}^{few}(m_1, k_1, B_1, p_1)$ for some edge deletion or more than $t_{ins}^{few}(m_1, k_1, B_1, p_1)$ for some batched insertion of size B. Second, we also report failure whenever some instance of $\mathsf{Pruning}$ from Theorem 6.1 reports failure. It will be shown later in Lemma 9.29 that failure happens with very low probability.

9.2 Correctness

In this section, we suppose that the algorithm does not fails. (Actually, we only need that no instance of $\mathsf{Pruning}$ fails.) Then the sketch graph H is maintained with the two desired properties.

First, we show in Section 9.2.1 that H "preserves" the MSF i.e. $\mathsf{MSF}(H) = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$. Second, we show in Section 9.2.2 that H is extremely sparse i.e. $|E(H) - \mathsf{MSF}(H)| = O(n/\gamma)$.

Before proving the main goals, we prove a small technical lemma which ensures that the sequence of updates in each large cluster is not too long for the dynamic expander pruning algorithm from Theorem 6.1.

Lemma 9.14. *For each large cluster C, there is at most $O(\alpha_0^2|E(C)|)$ edge deletions in C.*

Proof. As $|E(C)| \geq s_{high} = n/\gamma$ and $\alpha_0 = \Omega(1/\gamma^4)$, so $\alpha_0^2|E(C)| = \Omega(n/\gamma^9)$. But the total length of update sequence is $T \leq n/(\pi d\gamma) \leq n/\gamma^9 = O(\alpha_0^2|E(C)|)$ for large enough n. □

From now, in this section we assume that no instance of Pruning fails.

9.2.1 Sketch Graph Preserves MSF

Now, the goal is to prove the following:

Lemma 9.15. $\mathit{MSF}(H) = \mathit{MSF}(G)$.

As the algorithm maintains $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$, we can conclude from this lemma that $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$ is correctly maintained.

Let $H' = M_{\text{small}} \cup \bigcup_{C:\text{large}}(\overline{E}^C(P^C) \cup \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \cup J^C)$, i.e. $H = H' \dot\cup E^{\neq}(w)$. We first show that it suffices to show that $\mathsf{MSF}(G') \subseteq H'$.

Lemma 9.16. *If $\mathit{MSF}(G') \subseteq H'$, then $\mathit{MSF}(G) = \mathit{MSF}(H)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathsf{MSF}(G') \subseteq H'$. Observe that H' is a subgraph of G', so $\mathsf{MSF}(G') = \mathsf{MSF}(H')$. Let $G'' = G' \dot\cup E^{\neq}(w)$ be a multi-graph obtained from G' by inserting $E^{\neq}(w)$ into G'. Note that $G'' = G \dot\cup E^{\neq}(w')$. Since G'' can obtained from G by inserting a parallel edge heavier than edges in G, we have $\mathsf{MSF}(G) = \mathsf{MSF}(G'')$ So

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{MSF}(G) &= \mathsf{MSF}(G'') \\
&= \mathsf{MSF}(G' \dot\cup E^{\neq}(w)) \\
&= \mathsf{MSF}(H' \dot\cup E^{\neq}(w)) && \text{as } \mathsf{MSF}(G') = \mathsf{MSF}(H') \\
&= \mathsf{MSF}(H) && \text{because } H = H \dot\cup E^{\neq}(w).
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma implies that $\mathsf{MSF}(G') \subseteq H'$ because the root cluster of $\mathcal{H}$ corresponds to G'.

Lemma 9.17. *For any cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$, $\mathit{MSF}(C) \subseteq H'$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on the hierarchy $\mathcal{H}$ in a bottom-up manner. For the base case, for each leaf cluster C, $\mathsf{MSF}(C) \subseteq M_{\text{small}} \subseteq H'$ by definition. Next, we will prove that, for any large cluster C, $\mathsf{MSF}(C) \subseteq H'$, given that $\mathsf{MSF}(C') \subseteq H'$ for all child clusters C' of C. By Theorem 8.3, we have that $\mathsf{MSF}(C) = \dot\bigcup_{C':\text{child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C') \dot\cup (\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C)$. So it suffices to show that $\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C \subseteq H'$.

Recall that the total pruning set of C is $P^C = \dot\bigcup_{C':\text{large child of } C} P_0^{C'}$. By Theorem 6.1, for each large child C' of C, there exists a set $W_0^{C'} \subseteq P_0^{C'}$ where $C'[V(C') - W_0^{C'}]$ is connected, because we assume that no instance of Pruning fails. Let $W^C = \dot\bigcup_{C':\text{large child of } C} W_0^{C'}$. We need the following two claims:

Claim 9.18. $\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(W^C)) \cup \overline{E}^C(W^C)$.

Proof. Since $\mathsf{MSF}(C) = \dot{\bigcup}_{C' \text{:child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C') \dot{\cup} (\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C)$ after any edge deletions by Theorem 8.3, one can identify $\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C$ by running Kruskal's algorithm on C where the initial forest consists of edges in $\dot{\bigcup}_{C' \text{:child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C')$.

In other words, let $\widehat{C}$ denote the graph obtained from C by replacing each the small child C' by $\mathsf{MSF}(C')$. Let D_1 be the graph obtained from $\widehat{C}$ by contracting each connected component in $\dot{\bigcup}_{C' \text{:child of } C} \mathsf{MSF}(C')$ into a single node. By the property of Kruskal's algorithm, we have $\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C = \mathsf{MSF}(D_1)$.

Let D_2 be the graph obtained from $\widehat{C}$ by contracting, for each large child C' of $\widehat{C}$, the set $V(C') - W_0^{C'}$ into a single node. Using the fact that $C'[V(C') - W_0^{C'}]$ is connected, we know that $V(C') - W_0^{C'}$ is a subset of a connected component in $\mathsf{MSF}(C')$. That is, D_1 can be obtained from D_2 by further contracting nodes. By Fact 2.3, $\mathsf{MSF}(D_1) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(D_2)$. Since we know $\mathsf{MSF}(D_1) \subseteq E^C$, we have $\mathsf{MSF}(D_1) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(D_2) \cap E^C$.

Observe that $\overline{C}(W^C)$ is exactly the graph that can be obtained from D_2 by removing the nodes in $W^C = \dot{\bigcup}_{C' \text{:large child of } C} W_0^{C'}$. Let E' be the edges in D_2 with some endpoint incident to W^C. So $\mathsf{MSF}(D_2 - E') = \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}(W^C))$. Having all these, we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C &\subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(D_2) \cap E^C \\
&= \mathsf{MSF}((D_2 - E') \dot{\cup} E') \cap E^C \\
&\subseteq (\mathsf{MSF}(D_2 - E') \cup E') \cap E^C && \text{by Fact 2.2} \\
&= (\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}(W^C)) \cup E') \cap E^C \\
&\subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}(W^C)) \cup \overline{E}^C(W^C) && \text{as } E' \cap E^C = \overline{E}^C(W^C) \\
&= \mathsf{MSF}(\bigcup_{i=1,2,3} E(\overline{C}_i(W^C))) \cup \overline{E}^C(W^C) && \text{by } \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} E(\overline{C}_i(W^C)) = E(\overline{C}(W^C)) \\
&\subseteq \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(W^C)) \cup \overline{E}^C(W^C) && \text{by Fact 2.2.}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Claim 9.19. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(W^C)) \cup \overline{E}^C(W^C) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(P^C)) \cup \overline{E}^C(P^C)$.

Proof. Let $E' = E(\overline{C}_i(W^C)) - E(\overline{C}_i(P^C))$. Note that $E' \subseteq \overline{E}^C(P^C) - \overline{E}^C(W^C)$. Indeed, for any edge $e \in E(\overline{C}_i(W^C)) - E(\overline{C}_i(P^C))$, e must be a C-own edge in $\overline{C}_i$ that is incident to P^C because e is removed if P^C is pruned. Also, e is not incident to W^C because e is not removed if W^C is pruned. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(W^C)) &= \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(P^C) \cup E') \\
&\subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(P^C)) \cup E' && \text{by Fact 2.2} \\
&\subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(P^C)) \cup (\overline{E}^C(P^C) - \overline{E}^C(W^C)).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying union of $\overline{E}^C(W^C)$ on both sides completes the claim. □

By the above two claims, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{MSF}(C) \cap E^C &\subseteq \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(W^C)) \cup \overline{E}^C(W^C) && \text{by Claim 9.18} \\
&\subseteq \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i(P^C)) \cup \overline{E}^C(P^C) && \text{by Claim 9.19} \\
&\subseteq H' && \text{as } \overline{C}_i(P^C) = \overline{C}_i \text{ by definition,}
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

By Lemma 9.16 and Lemma 9.17, this implies Lemma 9.15. That is, $\mathsf{MSF}(H) = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$.

9.2.2 Sketch Graph is Extremely Sparse

The goal here is to prove the following:

Lemma 9.20. $|E(H) - \mathit{MSF}(H)| = O(n/\gamma)$.

To prove this, we need to define some definitions. Fix $i \in \{1,2,3\}$. Let $G'_i = (V, M_{\text{small}} \dot\cup \dot\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} E_i^{\overline{C}})$. Recall that $E_i^{\overline{C}}$ is the C-own edges in $\overline{C}$ incident whose $(i-1)$ endpoints are incident to super nodes in $\overline{C}$. Note that G'_i is a subgraph of G'. We can also define a corresponding hierarchical decomposition $\mathcal{H}_i$ of G'_i. For each small cluster C in $\mathcal{H}$, let $C_i = (V(C), \mathsf{MSF}(C)) = (V(C), M_{\text{small}}[V(C)])$ be a small cluster in $\mathcal{H}_i$. For each large cluster C in $\mathcal{H}$, let C_i be a large cluster in $\mathcal{H}_i$ where $V(C_i) = V(C)$ and the set of C_i-own edges is $E^{C_i} = E_i^{\overline{C}}$. From this definition, for every cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$, there is a corresponding cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$. For each large cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$, $\overline{C}_i$ is a subgraph of the compressed cluster $\overline{C}$. We have the following relation between $\overline{C}_i$ and C_i:

Lemma 9.21. *For any large cluster $C \in \mathcal{H}$ and $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, $\mathit{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \subseteq \mathit{MSF}(C_i)$.*

Proof. Observe that $\overline{C}_i$ can be obtained from C_i by contracting each large child C'_i of C_i into a single node. By Fact 2.3, $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(C_i)$. □

Lemma 9.22. *For any cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$, $\mathit{MSF}(C_i) \subseteq \mathit{MSF}(G'_i)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 8.3 and the fact that G'_i is a subgraph of G'. We have the following: for any cluster $C_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$, $\mathsf{MSF}(C_i) = \dot\bigcup_{C'_i:\text{child of } C_i} \mathsf{MSF}(C'_i) \dot\cup (\mathsf{MSF}(C_i) \cap E^{C_i})$. In particular, $\mathsf{MSF}(C'_i) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(C_i)$ for any child cluster C'_i of C_i. Therefore, $\mathsf{MSF}(C_i) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(G'_i)$ because G'_i is the root cluster of $\mathcal{H}_i$. □

Lemma 9.23. $|\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} \mathit{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \setminus M_{\text{small}}| \le \frac{n}{s_{low}/3} + T$.

Proof. By Lemma 9.21 and Lemma 9.22, we have $\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \subseteq \bigcup_{C:\text{large}} \mathsf{MSF}(C_i) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(G'_i)$. So it suffices to bound $|\mathsf{MSF}(G'_i) \setminus M_{\text{small}}|$. Next, observe that $M_{\text{small}} = \dot\bigcup_{C_i:\text{small}} \mathsf{MSF}(C_i) \subseteq \mathsf{MSF}(G'_i)$ by the definition of small C_i and Lemma 9.22. Therefore, $|\mathsf{MSF}(G'_i) \setminus M_{\text{small}}|$ is at most the number of connected components in M_{small}.

Before the first edge deletion, we have that all small clusters are connected and each small cluster has at least $s_{low}/3$ nodes by Theorem 8.3. So there are at most $\frac{n}{s_{low}/3}$ connected components in M_{small} at that time. After T edge deletions, the number of connected components can be increased by at most T. So $|\mathsf{MSF}(G'_i) \setminus M_{\text{small}}| \le \frac{n}{s_{low}/3} + T$. □

Proof of Lemma 9.20. Now, we can bound the number of the non-tree edges of H.

Proof. Recall that $E(H) = E^{\neq}(w) \cup M_{\text{small}} \cup \bigcup_{C:\text{large}}(\overline{E}^C(P^C) \cup \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \cup J^C)$. First, by Theorem 8.3, $|E^{\neq}(w)| \leq \alpha d\gamma n = O(n/\gamma)$. Next, by Lemma 9.23, $|\bigcup_{i=1,2,3;C:\text{large}} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \setminus M_{\text{small}}| = O(\frac{n}{s_{low}/3} + T) = O(n/\gamma)$.

Next, for each edge update on each large cluster, Pruning spends time by at most π by the definition of π. Therefore, $\sum_{C:\text{large}} |P^C| \leq T \times \pi d$ because, for each deletion of an edge e, e is contained in at most d clusters as the depth of $\mathcal{H}$ is at most d by Theorem 8.3, and, for each large cluster C whose edge is deleted, $|P^C|$ can grow by at most π. Hence, $|\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} \overline{E}^C(P^C)| = O(\sum_{C:\text{large}} |P^C|) = O(T\pi d) = O(n/\gamma)$. Finally, we bound $|\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} J^C|$. By definition, J^C contains edges that are removed from $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$, over all $\overline{C}_i$ and $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, but are not deleted from G yet. So $J^C \subseteq \overline{E}^C(P^C)$. Hence $|\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} J^C| \leq |\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} \overline{E}^C(P^C)| = O(n/\gamma)$ as well. □

9.3 Running Time

In this section, we assume again that the algorithm does not fails. Under this assumption, we analyze the running time of the algorithm. We bound the preprocessing time in Section 9.3.1, the time needed for maintaining the sketch graph H itself in Section 9.3.2, and finally, in Section 9.3.3, the time needed for maintaining $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$ in H that changes more than one edge per time step.

Recall the following notations. An instance $\mathcal{A}(m_0, p_0)$, for any m_0 and p_0, has preprocessing time $t_{pre}(m_0, p_0)$ and deletion time $t_u(m_0, p_0)$. Also, an instance $\mathcal{A}_{few}(m_1, k_1, B_1, p_1)$, for any m_1, k_1, B_1, and p_1, has preprocessing time $t^{few}_{pre}(m_1, k_1, B_1, p_1)$, batch insertion time $t^{few}_{ins}(m_1, k_1, B_1, p_1)$, and deletion time $t^{few}_{del}(m_1, k_1, B_1, p_1)$.

9.3.1 Preprocessing

Next, we bound the preprocessing time, which in turn is needed for bounding the update time later in Lemma 9.28.

Lemma 9.24. *Given an n-node m-edge graph G with max degree 3 and a parameter p, Algorithm 9.1 takes $O(m^{1+O(\sqrt{\log\log n/\log n})} \log \frac{1}{p})$ time.*

Proof. Consider each step in Algorithm 9.1. In Step 1, we just run the MSF decomposition which takes $\tilde{O}(nd\gamma \log \frac{1}{p}) = \tilde{O}(n\gamma^2 \log \frac{1}{p})$ by Theorem 8.3. In Step 2, we initialize $\mathcal{A}(C, p)$ for each small cluster C. This takes time

$$\sum_{C:\text{small}} t_{pre}(|E(C)|, p) \leq \frac{n}{s_{high}} \cdot t_{pre}(O(s_{high}), p) = \gamma \cdot t_{pre}(O(n/\gamma), p).$$

where the inequality is because $t_{pre}(m, p)$ is at least linear in m, and $|E(C)| \leq s_{high}$ for each small cluster C. Step 3 takes total time $\tilde{O}(n \log(1/p) \cdot d) = \tilde{O}(m\gamma \log(1/p))$ because Pruning from Theorem 6.1 initializes on a large cluster C in time $\tilde{O}(|V(C)| \log(1/p))$ and the depth of the decomposition is d. In Step 4.a, the total time for constructing all compressed clusters $\overline{C}$ and $\overline{C}_1, \overline{C}_2, \overline{C}_3$ is just $O(n)$.

In Step 4.b, for each large cluster C, we initialize $\mathcal{A}_{few}(\overline{C}_1, 1, p)$. Note that the set of non-tree edges in $\overline{C}_1$ is contained in $E(\overline{C}_1) - M_{\text{small}}(C) = E_1^{\overline{C}}$ by Proposition 9.6. So the initialization takes

$t_{pre}^{few}(|E(\overline{C}_1)|, |E_1^{\overline{C}}|, 1, p)$ time. In total this takes time

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{C:\text{large}} t_{pre}^{few}(|E(\overline{C}_1)|, |E_1^{\overline{C}}|, 1, p) &= \sum_{C:\text{large}} (t_{pre}(O(|E_1^{\overline{C}}|), O(p/\log n)) + \tilde{O}(|E(\overline{C}_1)|)) && \text{by Theorem 7.1} \\
&= \tilde{O}(n) + \sum_{C:\text{large}} t_{pre}(O(|E_1^{\overline{C}}|), O(p/\log n)) \\
&= \tilde{O}(n) + \sum_{1\le i\le d} \sum_{C:\text{large, level-}i} t_{pre}(O(|E_1^{\overline{C}}|), O(p/\log n)) \\
&\le \tilde{O}(n) + \sum_{1\le i\le d} t_{pre}(O(n/\gamma), O(p/\log n)) \\
&= \tilde{O}(n) + \gamma \cdot t_{pre}(O(n/\gamma), O(p/\log n)) && \text{by } d = \gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows because $\sum_{C:\text{large, level-}i} |E_1^{\overline{C}}| \le \sum_{C:\text{large, level-}i} |E^C| \le n/(d-2) + \alpha\gamma n = O(n/\gamma)$ by Theorem 8.3 and $t_{pre}(m, p)$ is at least linear in m.

In Step 4.c, by Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, the total time for initializing $\mathcal{A}_2(\overline{C}_2)$ and $\mathcal{A}_3(\overline{C}_3)$ over all large clusters C, is $\tilde{O}(n)$ because compressed cluster are edge-disjoint and $\mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{A}_3$ have near-linear preprocessing time.

In Step 5, we initialize $\mathcal{A}_{few}(H, B, p)$. This takes time

$$\begin{aligned}
&t_{pre}^{few}(|E(H)|, |E(H) - \mathsf{MSF}(H)|, B, p) \\
&= t_{pre}(O(|E(H) - \mathsf{MSF}(H)|), O(p/\log n)) + \tilde{O}(|E(H)| \log n) \\
&= t_{pre}(O(n/\gamma), p) + \tilde{O}(n) && \text{by Lemma 9.20.}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $m = \Theta(n)$. Now, we conclude that the total preprocessing time is

$$t_{pre}(m, p) = \tilde{O}(m\gamma^2 \log \frac{1}{p}) + O(\gamma) \times t_{pre}(O(m/\gamma), O(p/\log m)).$$

To solve this recurrence, we use the following fact:

Fact 9.25. *Let $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ be a function where $g(n) = \Omega(n)$. If $f(n) \le c \cdot a \cdot f(n/a) + g(n)$, then $f(n) = \tilde{O}(g(n) \cdot c^{\log_a n})$.*

Recall that $\gamma = n^{O(\sqrt{\log\log n/\log n})}$. Let $d_0 = \log_{O(\gamma)} m = O(\frac{\log m}{\sqrt{\log m \log\log m}}) = O(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{\log\log m}})$. After solving the recurrence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
t_{pre}(m, p) &= \tilde{O}(m\gamma^2 \log \frac{\log^{d_0} m}{p} \times c_0^{d_0}) && \text{for some constant } c_0 \\
&= \tilde{O}(m\gamma^2 \log \frac{1}{p} \times m^{O(\sqrt{1/\log m \log\log m})}) \\
&= O(m^{1+O(\sqrt{\log\log m/\log m})} \log \frac{1}{p})
\end{aligned}$$

□

9.3.2 Maintaining the Sketch Graph

We bound the time for maintaining the sketch graph H. For convenience, we first show the following lemma.

Lemma 9.26. *For some large cluster C and $i \in \{2,3\}$, $\mathcal{A}_i(\overline{C}_i)$ takes $\tilde{O}(\gamma)$ time to update $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$ for each edge update in $E(\overline{C}_i)$.*

Proof. For $i = 2$, by Proposition 9.7 the set of super nodes $S_{\overline{C}}$ has size $|S_{\overline{C}}| = O(\gamma)$. So Lemma 2.7, $\mathcal{A}_2(\overline{C}_2)$ has $\tilde{O}(\gamma)$ update time. For $i = 3$, by Remark 9.10, the graph that $\mathcal{A}_3(\overline{C}_3)$ actually runs on is induced by the set of edges in $E_3^{\overline{C}}$, and this graph has $O(\gamma)$ nodes. So each update takes $\tilde{O}(\gamma)$ time by Lemma 2.6. □

The next lemma bounds the time for maintaining the sketch graph H.

Lemma 9.27. *Suppose that the algorithm does not fail. For each edge deletion in G, H can be updated in time $t_u(n/\gamma, p) + t_{del}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), 1, p) + t_{ins}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), 1, p) + \tilde{O}(\pi\gamma^2)$. Moreover, there are at most 2 edge deletions and $B = O(\pi\gamma)$ edge insertions in H.*

Proof. Recall that $E(H) = E^{\neq}(w) \cup M_{\text{small}} \cup \bigcup_{C:\text{large}}(\overline{E}^C(P^C) \cup \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \cup J^C)$. Suppose that we are given an edge deletion in G.

Given the edge deletion in G, there is at most one small cluster C where $\mathsf{MSF}(C) \subseteq M_{\text{small}}$ is changed. $\mathsf{MSF}(C)$ can be updated by $\mathcal{A}(C, p)$ in time $t_u(|E(C)|, p) = t_u(n/\gamma, p)$. In M_{small}, there are at most 1 edge deletion and at most 1 edge insertion.

As we assume that no instance of Pruning fails, $\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} \overline{E}^C(P^C)$ can be updated in time $O(\pi d) = O(\pi\gamma)$. This is because 1) $\mathcal{H}$ has depth at most d by Theorem 8.3 and so each edge is contained in at most d clusters, and 2) for each large cluster C whose edge is deleted, Pruning spends time at most π. Therefore, the size of $\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} \overline{E}^C(P^C)$ can grow by at most $O(\pi\gamma)$ as well.

Next, we bound the time for maintaining $\bigcup_{i=1,2,3;C:\text{large}} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$. For $i = 1$, we have that there is at most one compressed cluster $\overline{C}$ where the deleted edge $e \in E(\overline{C}_1)$ because of edge-disjointness by Proposition 9.9. Observe that $E(\overline{C}_1)$ is determined only by E^C and $M_{\text{small}}(C)$, and not P^C. If $e \in M_{\text{small}}(C)$, then this generates at most one edge deletion and at most one insertion in $E(\overline{C}_1)$. Else, $e \in E^C$, then there is one deletion in $E(\overline{C}_1)$. So the total cost spent by $\mathcal{A}_{few}(\overline{C}_1, 1, p)$ is at most

$$t_{del}^{few}(|E(\overline{C}_1)|, |E_1^{\overline{C}}|, 1, p) + t_{ins}^{few}(|E(\overline{C}_1)|, |E_1^{\overline{C}}|, 1, p) = t_{del}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), 1, p) + t_{ins}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), 1, p).$$

For $i = 2, 3$, we have that $E(\overline{C}_i)$ depends also on P^C. Hence, there are at most $O(\pi\gamma)$ edge updates in $\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} E(\overline{C}_i)$. For each edge update in $E(\overline{C}_i)$ for some large cluster C, $\mathcal{A}_i(\overline{C}_i)$ takes $\tilde{O}(\gamma)$ time to update $\mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$ by Lemma 9.26. Therefore the total time for updating $\bigcup_{i=2,3;C:\text{large}} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i)$ is $O(\pi\gamma) \times \tilde{O}(\gamma) = \tilde{O}(\pi\gamma^2)$. The time for updating $\bigcup_{C:\text{large}} J^C$ is subsumed by other steps. Therefore, the total update time is at most $t_u(n/\gamma, p) + t_{del}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), 1, p) + t_{ins}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), 1, p) + \tilde{O}(\pi\gamma^2)$.

To bound the edge changes in H, by Proposition 9.13, there is no edge removed from $\bigcup_{C:\text{large}}(\overline{E}^C(P^C) \cup \bigcup_{i=1,2,3} \mathsf{MSF}(\overline{C}_i) \cup J^C)$ except the deleted edge itself. So there are at most 2 edge deletions (from edges in $E^{\neq}(w)$ or M_{small}) and $B = O(\pi\gamma)$ edge insertions in H. □

9.3.3 Maintaining MSF of the Sketch Graph

Finally, we bound the time to maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$ which is the same as $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$ by Lemma 9.15.

Lemma 9.28. *Suppose that the algorithm does not fail. The algorithm for Lemma 9.2 has update time*

$$O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)} \log\frac{1}{p}).$$

Proof. By Lemma 9.27, we need to spend time at most

$$t_u(n/\gamma, p) + t_{del}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), 1, p) + t_{ins}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), 1, p) + \tilde{O}(\pi\gamma^2)$$

for maintaining the sketch graph H itself. Moreover, there are only 2 edge deletions and $B = O(\pi\gamma)$ edge insertions in H. Given these updates, we can update $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$ using $\mathcal{A}_{few}(H, B, p)$ in time

$$\begin{aligned} & 2t_{del}^{few}(|E(H)|, |E(H) - \mathsf{MSF}(H)|, B, p) + t_{ins}^{few}(|E(H)|, |E(H) - \mathsf{MSF}(H)|, B, p) \\ = \; & 2t_{del}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), B, p) + t_{ins}^{few}(n, O(n/\gamma), B, p) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 9.20. Note that $m = \Theta(n)$. Write $k = \Theta(m/\gamma)$. We have that the total update time to maintain $\mathsf{MSF}(H)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & t_u(m, p) \\ \leq \; & t_u(k, p) + 3t_{del}^{few}(O(m), k, B, p) + 2t_{ins}^{few}(O(m), k, B, p) + \tilde{O}(\pi\gamma^2) \\ = \; & O(\frac{B \log k}{k} \cdot t_{pre}(O(k), O(p/\log m)) + B \log^2 m + \frac{k \log k}{T(k)} + \log k \cdot t_u(O(k), O(p/\log m))) + \tilde{O}(\pi\gamma^2) \\ = \; & O(\log k \cdot t_u(O(k), O(p/\log m))) + O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)} \log\frac{1}{p}). \end{aligned}$$

The first equality is because of Theorem 7.1. To show the last equality, note first that by Lemma 9.24,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{B \log k}{k} \cdot t_{pre}(O(k), p') &= O(\frac{B \log k}{k} \cdot k^{1+O(\sqrt{\log\log m/\log m})} \log\frac{1}{p}) \\ &= \tilde{O}(\pi\gamma k^{O(\sqrt{\log\log m/\log m})} \log\frac{1}{p}) && B = O(\pi\gamma) \\ &= O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)} \log\frac{1}{p}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, note that $T(m) = m/(3\pi d\gamma) = m^{1-\Theta(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)}$. So $T(k) = k^{1-\Theta(\log\log\log k/\log\log k)}$ and we have $\frac{k\log k}{T(k)} = \frac{k\log k}{k^{1-\Theta(\log\log\log k/\log\log k)}} = O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)})$. Also, $O(B\log^2 m + \pi\gamma^2) = O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)})$. Therefore, we have

$$t_u(m, p) = O(\log m \cdot t_u(O(m/\gamma), O(p/\log m))) + O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)} \log\frac{1}{p}).$$

So solve this recurrence, note that $d_0 = \log_{O(\gamma)} m = O(\frac{\log m}{\sqrt{\log m \log\log m}}) = O(\sqrt{\frac{\log m}{\log\log m}})$ is the depth of the recursion. After solving the recurrence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_u(m, p) &= O(\log^{d_0} m) \times O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)} \log\frac{\log^{d_0} m}{p}) \\ &= O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)} \log\frac{1}{p}). \end{aligned}$$

□

9.3.4 Wrapping Up

As a last step, we show that the algorithm fails with low probability.

Lemma 9.29. *For each update, the algorithm fails with probability $O(\gamma p)$.*

Proof. There are two types of events that cause the algorithm to fail: 1) "$\mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{A}_{few}$ fails": some instance of $\mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{A}_{few}$ takes time longer than the guaranteed time bound, 2) "Pruning fails": some instance of Pruning reports failure. Now, we fix some time step and will bound the probability of the occurrence of each type of events.

First, let E_1 be the event that some instance of $\mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{A}_{few}$ fails. We list the instances of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{few}$ first. Consider Algorithm 9.1. For each small cluster C, there is the instance $\mathcal{A}(C, p)$ (in Step 2). For each large cluster C, there is the instance $\mathcal{A}_{few}(\overline{C}_1, 1, p)$ (in Step 4.a). Lastly, there is the instance $\mathcal{A}_{few}(H, B, p)$ on the sketch graph H. Now, these instances can fail every time we feed the update operations to them. So we list how we feed the update operations to them. Look inside the proof of Lemma 9.27. Given an edge e to be deleted, there is at most one small cluster C where we feed the edge deletion of e to $\mathcal{A}(C, p)$. Also, there is at most one compressed cluster $\overline{C}$ that we need to feed the update to $\mathcal{A}_{few}(\overline{C}_1, 1, p)$. There are at most one insertion and one deletion. For the sketch graph H, by Lemma 9.27 there are at most two edge deletions and one batch of edge insertion fed to $\mathcal{A}_{few}(H, B, p)$. In total, there are $O(1)$ many operations that we feed to the instances of $\mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{A}_{few}$. Each time, an instance can fail with probability at most p by the definition of the parameter p in $\mathcal{A}(C, p)$, $\mathcal{A}_{few}(\overline{C}_1, 1, p)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{few}(H, B, p)$. So $\Pr[E_1] = O(p)$.

Second, let E_2 be the event that some instance of Pruning reports failure. Let E_2' be the event that all large clusters C are such that $\phi(C) = \Omega(\alpha_0)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[E_2] &= \Pr[E_2 \mid \neg E_2']\Pr[\neg E_2'] + \Pr[E_2 \mid E_2']\Pr[E_2'] \\ &\leq \Pr[\neg E_2'] + \Pr[E_2 \mid E_2'].\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 8.3, $\Pr[\neg E_2'] \leq p$. Next, for each large cluster C, if $\phi(C) = \Omega(\alpha_0)$, then the instance of Pruning on C fails at some step with probability at most p by Theorem 6.1. Moreover, there are only $O(d) = O(\gamma)$ many large clusters that are updated for each step. By union bound, $\Pr[E_2 \mid E_2'] \leq O(\gamma p)$. This implies that $\Pr[E_2] = O(\gamma p)$. This conclude that the algorithm fails with probability at most $\Pr[E_1] + \Pr[E_2] = O(\gamma p)$ at each step. □

Finally, we conclude the proof of Lemma 9.2 and which implies Theorem 9.1, our main result.

Proof of Lemma 9.2. By Lemma 9.15, we have that the sketch graph H is such that $\mathsf{MSF}(H) = \mathsf{MSF}(G)$. As the instance $\mathcal{A}_{few}(H, B, p)$ maintains MSF in H, we conclude that $\mathsf{MSF}(G)$ is correctly maintained. The algorithm has preprocessing time

$$t_{pre}(m, p) = O(m^{1+O(\sqrt{\log\log m/\log m})} \log \frac{1}{p})$$

by Lemma 9.24. Given a sequence of edge deletions of length

$$T(m) = m/(3\pi d\gamma) = \Theta(m^{1-O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)}),$$

the algorithm take time

$$t_u(m, p) = O(m^{O(\log\log\log m/\log\log m)} \log \frac{1}{p})$$

for each update with probability $1 - O(\gamma p)$, by Lemmas 9.28 and 9.29. As noted before, we have $m = \Theta(n)$ throughout the sequence of updates. Finally, we can obtain the proof of Lemma 9.2 by slightly adjusting the parameter p so that update time bound holds with the probability $1 - p$ instead of $1 - O(\gamma p)$.

10 Open Problems

Dynamic MSF. First, it is truly intriguing whether there is a *deterministic* algorithm that is as fast as our algorithm. The current best update time of deterministic algorithms is still $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ [11, 10, 23] (even for dynamic connectivity). Improving this bound to $O(n^{0.5-\Omega(1)})$ will already be a major result. Secondly, can one improve the $O(n^{o(1)})$ update time to $O(\text{polylog}(n))$? There are now several barriers in our approach and this improvement should require new ideas. Lastly, it is also very interesting to simplify our algorithm.

Expander-related Techniques. The combination of the expansion decomposition and dynamic expander pruning might be useful for other dynamic graph problems. Problems whose static algorithms are based on low-diameter decomposition (e.g. low-stretch spanning tree) are possible candidates. Indeed, it is conceivable that the expansion decomposition together with dynamic expander pruning can be used to maintain low diameter decomposition under edge updates, but additional work maybe required.

Worst-case Update Time Against Adaptive Adversaries. Among major goals for dynamic graph algorithm are (1) to reduce gaps between *worst-case* and *amortized* update time, and (2) to reduce gaps between update time of algorithms that work against *adaptive* adversaries and those that require *oblivious* adversaries. Upper bounds known for the former case (for both goals) are usually much higher than those for the latter. However, worst-case bounds are crucial in real-time applications, and being against adversaries is often needed when algorithms are used as subroutines of static algorithms. Note that of course deterministic algorithms always work against adaptive adversaries.

The result in this paper is a step towards both goals. The best amortized bound for dynamic MSF is $O(\text{polylog}(n))$ [19, 20]. For dynamic SF problem, the result by [22, 13] implies the current best algorithm against oblivious adversaries with $O(\text{polylog}(n))$ worst-case update time. Our dynamic MSF algorithm is against adaptive adversaries and has $O(n^{o(1)})$ worst-case update time. This significantly reduces the gaps on both cases.

It is a challenging goal to do the same for other fundamental problems. For example, dynamic 2-edge connectivity has $O(\text{polylog}(n))$ amortized update time [19] but only $O(\sqrt{n})$ worst-case bound [12, 10]. Dynamic APSP has $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ amortized bound [9] but only $\tilde{O}(n^{2+2/3})$ worst-case bound [1]. There are fast algorithms against oblivious adversaries for dynamic maximal matching [4], spanner [5], and cut/spectral sparsifier [2]. It will be exciting to have algorithms against adaptive adversaries with comparable update time for these problems.

Acknowledgement. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 715672. Nanongkai and Saranurak were also partially supported by the Swedish Research Council (Reg. No. 2015-04659).

References

[1] Ittai Abraham, Shiri Chechik, and Sebastian Krinninger. Fully dynamic all-pairs shortest paths with worst-case update-time revisited. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, Barcelona, Spain, Hotel Porta Fira, January 16-19*, pages 440–452, 2017. (cit. on p. 2, 51)

[2] Ittai Abraham, David Durfee, Ioannis Koutis, Sebastian Krinninger, and Richard Peng. On fully dynamic graph sparsifiers. In *IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer*

Science, FOCS 2016, 9-11 October 2016, Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA, pages 335–344, 2016. (cit. on p. 1, 51)

[3] Stephen Alstrup, Jacob Holm, Kristian de Lichtenberg, and Mikkel Thorup. Maintaining information in fully dynamic trees with top trees. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 1(2):243–264, 2005. (cit. on p. 5)

[4] Surender Baswana, Manoj Gupta, and Sandeep Sen. Fully dynamic maximal matching in O (log n) update time. In *IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2011, Palm Springs, CA, USA, October 22-25, 2011*, pages 383–392, 2011. (cit. on p. 51)

[5] Surender Baswana, Sumeet Khurana, and Soumojit Sarkar. Fully dynamic randomized algorithms for graph spanners. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 8(4):35, 2012. (cit. on p. 51)

[6] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Danupon Nanongkai. Fully dynamic approximate maximum matching and minimum vertex cover in $O(\log^3 n)$ worst case update time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, Barcelona, Spain, Hotel Porta Fira, January 16-19*, pages 470–489, 2017. (cit. on p. 2)

[7] Greg Bodwin and Sebastian Krinninger. Fully dynamic spanners with worst-case update time. In *24th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2016, August 22-24, 2016, Aarhus, Denmark*, pages 17:1–17:18, 2016. (cit. on p. 2)

[8] Thomas H.. Cormen, Charles Eric Leiserson, Ronald L Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to algorithms*, volume 6. MIT press Cambridge, 2001. (cit. on p. 4)

[9] Camil Demetrescu and Giuseppe F. Italiano. A new approach to dynamic all pairs shortest paths. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, June 9-11, 2003, San Diego, CA, USA*, pages 159–166, 2003. (cit. on p. 51)

[10] David Eppstein, Zvi Galil, Giuseppe F. Italiano, and Amnon Nissenzweig. Sparsification - a technique for speeding up dynamic graph algorithms. *J. ACM*, 44(5):669–696, 1997. Announced at FOCS 1992. (cit. on p. 1, 2, 4, 51)

[11] Greg N. Frederickson. Data structures for on-line updating of minimum spanning trees, with applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 14(4):781–798, 1985. Announced at STOC'83. (cit. on p. i, 1, 2, 3, 5, 19, 33, 51)

[12] Greg N. Frederickson. Ambivalent data structures for dynamic 2-edge-connectivity and k smallest spanning trees. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 26(2):484–538, 1997. Announced at FOCS 1991. (cit. on p. 51)

[13] David Gibb, Bruce M. Kapron, Valerie King, and Nolan Thorn. Dynamic graph connectivity with improved worst case update time and sublinear space. *CoRR*, abs/1509.06464, 2015. (cit. on p. 2, 51)

[14] Monika Henzinger, Satish Rao, and Di Wang. Local flow partitioning for faster edge connectivity. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, Barcelona, Spain, Hotel Porta Fira, January 16-19*, pages 1919–1938, 2017. (cit. on p. 3, 6, 8, 61)

[15] Monika Rauch Henzinger and Valerie King. Fully dynamic 2-edge-connectivity algorithm in polylogarithmic time per operation. Technical note 1997-004, Digital Equipment Corp., Systems Research Ctr., 130 Lytton Rd., Palo Alto, CA, 94301, USA, 12 Jun 1997. (cit. on p. i, 3, 18)

[16] Monika Rauch Henzinger and Valerie King. Maintaining minimum spanning trees in dynamic graphs. In *Automata, Languages and Programming, 24th International Colloquium, ICALP'97, Bologna, Italy, 7-11 July 1997, Proceedings*, pages 594–604, 1997. (cit. on p. 1, 3, 18)

[17] Monika Rauch Henzinger and Valerie King. Randomized fully dynamic graph algorithms with polylogarithmic time per operation. *J. ACM*, 46(4):502–516, 1999. Announced at STOC 1995. (cit. on p. 1)

[18] Monika Rauch Henzinger and Mikkel Thorup. Sampling to provide or to bound: With applications to fully dynamic graph algorithms. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 11(4):369–379, 1997. (cit. on p. 1)

[19] Jacob Holm, Kristian de Lichtenberg, and Mikkel Thorup. Poly-logarithmic deterministic fully-dynamic algorithms for connectivity, minimum spanning tree, 2-edge, and biconnectivity. *J. ACM*, 48(4):723–760, 2001. Announced at STOC 1998. (cit. on p. i, 1, 3, 18, 19, 23, 26, 51)

[20] Jacob Holm, Eva Rotenberg, and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. Faster fully-dynamic minimum spanning forest. In *Algorithms - ESA 2015 - 23rd Annual European Symposium, Patras, Greece, September 14-16, 2015, Proceedings*, pages 742–753, 2015. (cit. on p. 1, 3, 18, 51)

[21] Shang-En Huang, Dawei Huang, Tsvi Kopelowitz, and Seth Pettie. Fully dynamic connectivity in $o(\log n(\log\log n)^2)$ amortized expected time. In *SODA*, 2017. (cit. on p. 1)

[22] Bruce M. Kapron, Valerie King, and Ben Mountjoy. Dynamic graph connectivity in polylogarithmic worst case time. In Sanjeev Khanna, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2013, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 6-8, 2013*, pages 1131–1142. SIAM, 2013. (cit. on p. 2, 17, 18, 51)

[23] Casper Kejlberg-Rasmussen, Tsvi Kopelowitz, Seth Pettie, and Mikkel Thorup. Faster worst case deterministic dynamic connectivity. In Piotr Sankowski and Christos D. Zaroliagis, editors, *24th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2016, August 22-24, 2016, Aarhus, Denmark*, volume 57 of *LIPIcs*, pages 53:1–53:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016. (cit. on p. 2, 51)

[24] Danupon Nanongkai and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Dynamic spanning forest with worst-case update time: adaptive, las vegas, and o(n$^{1/2}$ - ϵ)-time. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017, Montreal, QC, Canada, June 19-23, 2017*, pages 1122–1129, 2017. (cit. on p. i, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 13, 19, 29, 31)

[25] Lorenzo Orecchia and Zeyuan Allen Zhu. Flow-based algorithms for local graph clustering. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 1267–1286, 2014. (cit. on p. 3, 10)

[26] Mihai Patrascu and Erik D. Demaine. Logarithmic lower bounds in the cell-probe model. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 35(4):932–963, 2006. Announced at SODA'04 and STOC'04. (cit. on p. 1)

[27] Mihai Patrascu and Mikkel Thorup. Planning for fast connectivity updates. In *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2007), October 20-23, 2007, Providence, RI, USA, Proceedings*, pages 263–271, 2007. (cit. on p. 2)

[28] Richard Peng. Approximate undirected maximum flows in $O(m\text{polylog}(n))$ time. In *SODA*, pages 1862–1867. SIAM, 2016. (cit. on p. 3)

[29] Piotr Sankowski. Dynamic transitive closure via dynamic matrix inverse. In *45th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2004), 17-19 October 2004, Rome, Italy, Proceedings*, pages 509–517, 2004. (cit. on p. 2)

[30] Daniel Dominic Sleator and Robert Endre Tarjan. A data structure for dynamic trees. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 26(3):362–391, 1983. (cit. on p. 5)

[31] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Spectral sparsification of graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(4):981–1025, 2011. (cit. on p. 13)

[32] Mikkel Thorup. Near-optimal fully-dynamic graph connectivity. In F. Frances Yao and Eugene M. Luks, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 21-23, 2000, Portland, OR, USA*, pages 343–350. ACM, 2000. (cit. on p. 1)

[33] Mikkel Thorup. Worst-case update times for fully-dynamic all-pairs shortest paths. In Harold N. Gabow and Ronald Fagin, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Baltimore, MD, USA, May 22-24, 2005*, pages 112–119. ACM, 2005. (cit. on p. 2)

[34] Mikkel Thorup. Fully-dynamic min-cut. *Combinatorica*, 27(1):91–127, 2007. Announced at STOC'01. (cit. on p. 1)

[35] Mikkel Thorup and David R Karger. Dynamic graph algorithms with applications. In *Algorithm Theory-SWAT 2000*, pages 1–9. Springer, 2000. (cit. on p. 1)

[36] Christian Wulff-Nilsen. Faster deterministic fully-dynamic graph connectivity. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2013, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 6-8, 2013*, pages 1757–1769, 2013. (cit. on p. 1)

[37] Christian Wulff-Nilsen. 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 2017, Montreal, QC, Canada, June 19-23, 2017*, pages 1130–1143, 2017. (cit. on p. i, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37)

A Reduction from One-shot Expander Pruning to LBS Cuts

In this section, we show the proof of Lemma 5.3.

Theorem A.1 (Restatement of Lemma 5.3)**.** *Suppose there is a $(c_{size}(\sigma), c_{con}(\sigma))$-approximate LBS cut algorithm with running time $t_{LSB}(n, vol(A), \alpha, \sigma)$ when given (G, A, σ, α) as inputs where $G = (V, E)$ is an n-node graph, $A \subset V$ is a set of nodes, σ is an overlapping parameter, and α is a conductance parameter. Then, there is a one-shot expander pruning algorithm as in Theorem 5.2 with input $(G, D, \alpha_b, \epsilon)$ that has* time limit

$$\overline{t} = O((\frac{|D|}{\alpha_b})^{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{c_{size}(\alpha_b/2)}{\epsilon} \cdot t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$$

and conductance guarantee

$$\alpha = \frac{\alpha_b}{5c_{con}(\alpha_b/2)^{1/\epsilon-1}}.$$

More precisely, there is an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that can do the following:

- *$\mathcal{A}$ is given G,D, α_b, ϵ as inputs: $G = (V, E)$ is an n-node m-edge graph with maximum degree Δ, α_b is a conductance parameter, $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ is a parameter, and D is a set of edges where $D \cap E = \emptyset$ where $|D| = O(\alpha_b^2 m/\Delta)$. Let $G_b = (V, E \cup D)$.*
- *Then, in time $\overline{t} = O((\frac{|D|}{\alpha_b})^{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{c_{size}(\alpha_b/2)}{\epsilon} \cdot t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$, $\mathcal{A}$ either reports $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$, or output a set of* pruning nodes *$P \subset V$. Moreover, if $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$, then we have*
  - *$vol_G(P) \leq 2|D|/\alpha_b$, and*
  - *a pruned graph $H = G[V - P]$ has high conductance: $\phi(H) \geq \alpha = \frac{\alpha_b}{5c_{con}(\alpha_b/2)^{1/\epsilon-1}}$..*

Observe that ϵ is a trade-off parameter such that, on one hand when ϵ is small, the algorithm is fast but has a bad conductance guarantee in the output, on the other hand when ϵ is big, the algorithm is slow but has a good conductance guarantee.

A.1 The Reduction

Throughout this section, let ϵ be the parameter and let G,D, p, α_b be the inputs of the algorithm where $G = (V, E)$ is an n-node graph, D is a set of edges where $D \cap E = \emptyset$. p is a failure probability parameter, and α_b is a conductance parameter where $\alpha_b < \frac{1}{\gamma^{\omega(1)}}$. We call $G_b = (V, E \cup D)$ the *before graph*. We want to compute the set of *pruning nodes* $P \subset V$ with properties according to Theorem 5.2.

We now define some more notations. Let A be the set of endpoints of D. Let $\mathcal{A}_{cut}$ be the deterministic algorithm for finding LBS cuts from Theorem 4.4. We set the overlapping parameter $\sigma = \alpha_b/2$ for $\mathcal{A}_{cut}$. Let $c_{size} = c_{size}(\sigma), c_{con} = c_{con}(\sigma)$ be the approximation ratios of $\mathcal{A}_{cut}$.

Let $\bar{s}_1, \ldots, \bar{s}_L$ be such that $\bar{s}_1 = 2|D|/\alpha_b + 1$, $\bar{s}_L \leq 1$, and $\bar{s}_\ell = \bar{s}_{\ell-1}/(\bar{s}_1)^{\epsilon}$ for $1 < \ell < L$. Hence, $L \leq 1/\epsilon$. We denote $\alpha = \frac{\alpha_b}{5c_{con}^{L-1}}$. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_L$ be such that $\alpha_L = \alpha$ and $\alpha_\ell = \alpha_{\ell+1} c_{con}$ for $\ell < L$. Hence, $\alpha_L < \cdots < \alpha_2 < \alpha_1 = \alpha_b/5 < \alpha_b/4$.

For any graphs $H = (V_H, E_H)$, $I = (V_I, E_I)$, and a number ℓ, the main procedure $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$ is defined as in Algorithm A.1. For any α' and $B \subset V_H$, recall that $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha')$ is the size of the largest α'-sparse cut S in H where $|S| \leq |V_H - S|$, and $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha', B, \sigma)$ is the size of the largest α'-sparse (B, σ)-overlapping cut S in H where $|S| \leq |V_H - S|$. By definition, $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha') \geq \mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha', B, \sigma)$.

The algorithm is simply to run $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ with time limit $\bar{t}$. If $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ takes time more than $\overline{t}$, then we reports that $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$ (FAIL).

1. Set $B_H = (A \cup A_H) \cap V_H$ where A_H is the set of endpoints of edges in $\partial_G(V_H)$
2. If $vol_H(V_H - B_H) < \frac{3}{\sigma} vol_H(B_H)$, then report $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$ (FAIL).
3. If $\ell = L$, then return.
4. If $\mathcal{A}_{cut}(H, \alpha_\ell, B_H, \sigma)$ reports $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_\ell/c_{con}, B_H, \sigma) = 0$, i.e. there is no (α_ℓ/c_{con})-sparse (B_H, σ)-overlapping cut, then return.
5. Else, $\mathcal{A}_{cut}(H, \alpha_\ell, B_H, \sigma)$ outputs an α_ℓ-sparse cut S in H where $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_\ell/c_{con}, B_H, \sigma)/c_{size} \le vol(S) \le vol(V_H)/2$.
   (a) If $|S| \ge \bar{s}_{\ell+1}/c_{size}$, then include S into pruning set P and recurse on $\mathsf{decomp}(H[V_H \setminus S], I, \ell)$.
   (b) Else, recurse on $\mathsf{decomp}(H, H, \ell + 1)$.

Algorithm A.1: $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$ where $H = (V_H, E_H)$ and $I = (V_I, E_I)$

A.1.1 Upper Bounding $vol(P)$

In this section, we prove that if $\phi(G_b) \ge \alpha_b$ and the algorithm does not fail by other reasons, then we have $vol_G(P) \le 2|D|/\alpha_b$. We will show that the algorithm might fail only if $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$ in Appendix A.1.2.

Let us list all sets of nodes $P_1, \ldots, P_t$ that are outputted by Algorithm A.1 in either Step 2 or Step 5.a and constitute the pruning set $P = \bigcup_i P_i$. Note that $P_i \cap P_{i'} = \emptyset$ for any i, i'. The sets $P_1, \ldots, P_t$ is ordered by the time they are outputted. Let $H_1, \ldots, H_t$ the corresponding subgraphs such that P_i is "cut from" H_i, i.e. $H_1 = G$, $H_2 = G[V - P_1], \ldots, H_t = G[V - \bigcup_{i=1}^{t-1} P_i]$. Note the following fact:

Fact A.2. *For any $i \le t$, $\phi_{H_i}(P_i) < \alpha_b/4$.*

Proof. Since all P_i's are returned in Step 5.a and $\alpha_\ell \le \alpha_1 < \alpha_b/4$. □

Next, we have the following:

Proposition A.3. $\delta_G(P) \le \sum_{i=1}^{t} \delta_{H_i}(P_i)$

Proof. We will prove that $\partial_G(P) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{t} \partial_{H_i}(P_i)$. Let $(u, v) \in \partial_G(P)$. Suppose that $u \in P_j$ for some $j \le t$. Then $v \in V - P \subseteq V(H_j) - P_j$ because $V(H_j) = V - \bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} P_i$. Therefore, $(u, v) \in \partial_{H_j}(P_j) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{t} \partial_{H_i}(P_i)$. □

Proposition A.4. *For any $t' \le t$, if $vol_G(\bigcup_{i=1}^{t'} P_i) \le vol(G)/2$, then $\phi_G(\bigcup_{i=1}^{t'} P_i) < \alpha_b/4$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_G(\bigcup_{i=1}^{t'} P_i) &= \frac{\delta_G(\bigcup_{i=1}^{t'} P_i)}{vol_G(\bigcup_{i=1}^{t'} P_i)} && \text{as } vol(\bigcup_{i=1}^{t'} P_i) \leq vol(G)/2 \\
&= \frac{\delta_G(\bigcup_{i=1}^{t'} P_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{t'} vol_G(P_i)} && \text{as } P_i\text{'s are disjoint} \\
&\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \delta_{H_i}(P_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{t'} vol_{H_i}(P_i)} && \text{by Proposition A.3} \\
&\leq \max_{i \leq t'} \frac{\delta_{H_i}(P_i)}{vol_{H_i}(P_i)} \\
&= \max_{i \leq t'} \phi_{H_i}(P_i) < \alpha_b/4 && \text{by Fact A.2.}
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma is the key observation:

Lemma A.5. *Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. If a cut S is G where $vol(S) \leq vol(G)/2$ is such that $\phi_G(S) < \alpha_b/2$, then $vol_G(S) \leq 2|D|/\alpha_b$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise that $vol(S) > 2|D|/\alpha_b$. Then, as $G = G_b - D$, we have

$$\delta_G(S) \geq \delta_{G_b}(S) - |D| > \alpha_b vol(S) - \alpha_b vol(S)/2 = \alpha_b vol(S)/2,$$

which means, $\phi_G(S) > \alpha_b/2 > \alpha'$, a contradiction. □

Next, we argue against a corner case where $vol(P) > vol(G)/2$.

Lemma A.6. *If $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$ and $vol_G(V) = \omega(|D|/\alpha_b)$, then $vol(P) \leq vol(G)/2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $vol(P) > vol(G)/2$. We will show that $vol_G(V) = O(|D|/\alpha_b)$ which is a contradiction. Let $k \leq t$ be the such that $vol(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} P_i) \leq vol_G(V)/2 < vol(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} P_i)$. Let $P_{<k} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} P_i$. We partition the vertices into 3 sets: $P_{<k}, P_k$ and $Q = V - (P_{<k} \cup P_k)$. Note that $H_k = G[V - P_{<k}]$.

First, we list some properties of $P_{<k}$. Because $vol(P_{<k}) < vol_G(V)/2$, by Proposition A.4, we have $\phi_G(P_{<k}) < \alpha_b/4$ and hence, by Lemma A.5, $vol_G(P_{<k}) < 2|D|/\alpha_b \ll vol_G(V)/6$.

Next, we list some properties of P_k. We have $\phi_{H_k}(P_k) < \alpha_b/4$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
vol_G(P_k) &\leq E_G(P_{<k}, P_k) + vol_{H_k}(P_k) \\
&\leq vol_G(P_{<k}) + vol_{H_k}(Q) \\
&\leq vol_G(P_{<k}) + vol_G(Q).
\end{aligned}$$

Last, we list properties of Q. We have that $\delta_G(Q) = \delta_G(P_{<k} \cup P_k) \leq \delta_G(P_{<k}) + \delta_{H_k}(P_k)$ using the same argument as in Proposition A.3. We claim that $vol_G(P_{<k}) + vol_G(P_k) \leq 2vol_G(Q)$. Because

$$\begin{aligned}
vol_G(V) &= vol_G(P_{<k}) + vol_G(P_k) + vol_G(Q) \\
&\leq 2vol_G(P_{<k}) + 2vol_G(Q) \\
&\leq vol(G)/3 + 2vol_G(Q),
\end{aligned}$$

and so we have $vol_G(Q) \geq vol_G(V)/3$ and hence $vol_G(P_{<k}) + vol_G(P_k) \leq \frac{2}{3} vol_G(V) \leq 2vol_G(Q)$. Therefore, we have the following:

$$\phi_G(Q) = \frac{\delta_G(Q)}{vol_G(Q)} \leq \frac{\delta_G(P_{<k}) + \delta_{H_k}(P_k)}{(vol_G(P_{<k}) + vol_G(P_k))/2} \leq 2\max\{\phi_G(P_{<k}), \phi_{H_k}(P_k)\} < \alpha_b/2.$$

This means that $vol_G(Q) < 2|D|/\alpha_b$ by Lemma A.5. So we can conclude the contradiction:

$$vol_G(V) = vol_G(P_{<k}) + vol_G(P_k) + vol_G(Q) = O(|D|/\alpha_b).$$

□

By the above lemma, we immediately have a strong bound on $vol(P)$. Note that $|D| < \alpha_b^2 m/30\Delta$ implies that $vol_G(V) = \omega(|D|/\alpha_b)$

Corollary A.7. *If $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$, then $vol_G(P) \leq 2|D|/\alpha_b$.*

Proof. By Lemma A.6, $vol(P) \leq vol(G)/2$ and hence $\phi_G(P) < \alpha_b/4$ by Proposition A.4, this implies that $vol(P) \leq 2|D|/\alpha_b$ by Lemma A.5. □

A.1.2 Upper bounding $vol_H(B_H)$

First, we prove that $|D| < \alpha_b^2 m/30\Delta$ implies that $\frac{3}{\sigma} vol_H(B_H) \leq vol_H(V_H - B_H)$ unless $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$.

Proposition A.8. *If $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$, then $vol_H(B_H) \leq 4\Delta|D|/\alpha_b$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} vol_H(B_H) &\leq vol_H(A) + vol_H(A_H) \\ &\leq 2\Delta|D| + \Delta|E_G(P, V-P)| \\ &\leq 2\Delta|D| + \Delta vol_G(P) \\ &\leq 2\Delta|D| + 2\Delta|D|/\alpha_b && \text{by Corollary A.7} \\ &\leq 4\Delta|D|/\alpha_b \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.9. *Suppose that $|D| < \alpha_b^2 m/30\Delta$. If $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$, then the condition in Step 2 of Algorithm A.1 never holds.*

Proof. Suppose that the condition in Step 2 holds. Let P be the pruning set that Algorithm A.1 outputted so far. We have that $H = G[V_H] = G[V - P]$ such that $vol_H(V_H - B_H) < \frac{3}{\sigma} vol_H(B_H)$ where $B_H = (A \cup A_H) \cap V_H$, A is the endpoints of D, and A_H is the set of endpoints of edges in $\partial_G(V_H) = \partial_G(P)$. This implies that

$$vol_H(V_H) = vol_H(V_H - B_H) + vol_H(B_H) < (1 + \frac{3}{\sigma}) vol_H(B_H).$$

Together, we have that $vol_H(V - P) = vol_H(V_H) \leq \frac{16\Delta}{\sigma}(|D|/\alpha_b)$ by Proposition A.8. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} vol_G(V) &= vol_G(P) + \delta_G(P) + vol_H(V - P) \\ &\leq 2vol_G(P) + vol_H(V - P) \\ &\leq 60\Delta|D|/\alpha_b^2. && \text{by Corollary A.7 and } \sigma{=}\alpha_b/2. \end{aligned}$$

But this is contradiction because it means $|D| \geq \alpha_b^2 m/30\Delta$. □

This implies that the parameters for $\mathcal{A}_{cut}$ are valid when it is called.

Lemma A.10. *Whenever $\mathcal{A}_{cut}(H, \alpha_\ell, B_H, \sigma)$ is called, we have that $\sigma \geq \frac{3vol(B)}{vol(V_H - B_H)}$ satisfying the requirement for $\mathcal{A}_{cut}$ as stated in Theorem 4.4.*

Proof. Observe that $\mathcal{A}_{cut}$ can be called only when the condition in Step 2 of Algorithm A.1 is false: $vol(V_H - B_H) \geq \frac{3}{\sigma} vol(B_H)$. That is, $\sigma \geq \frac{3vol(B_H)}{vol(V_H - B_H)}$ and $4vol(B_H) \leq vol(V_H - B_H)$. □

A.1.3 Lower Bounding Conductance

Next, given that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$, we would like to prove an important invariant: if $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$ is called, then $\mathsf{OPT}(I, \alpha_\ell) < \bar{s}_\ell$. In order to prove this, we need two lemmas.

Lemma A.11. *Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. If $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, 1)$ is called, then $\mathsf{OPT}(I, \alpha_1) < 2|D|/\alpha_b + 1 = \bar{s}_1$.*

Proof. Observe that when $\ell = 1$, we have $I = G$. Lemma A.5 implies that $\mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha_1) \leq \mathsf{OPT}(G, \alpha_b/2) \leq 2|D|/\alpha_b$. □

Recall that, in an induced subgraph $H = G[V_H]$ in G, we denote $B_H = (A \cup A_H) \cap V_H$ where where A is the endpoints of D and A_H is the set of endpoints of edges in $\partial_G(V_H)$.

Lemma A.12. *Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha') = \mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha', B_H, \sigma)$ for any $\alpha' < \alpha_b/2$ and induced subgraph $H = G[V_H]$.*

Proof. In words, we need to prove that any α'-sparse cut $S \subset V_H$ where $|S| \leq |V_H - S|$ must be (B_H, σ)-overlapping in H.

First, consider any cut edge $(u, v) \in \partial_{G_b}(S)$ in the before graph G_b where $u \in S$. We claim that either $(u, v) \in \partial_H(S)$ or $u \in A \cup A_H$. Indeed, if $u \notin A \cup A_H$, i.e. u is not incident to any edge in D nor $\partial_G(V_H)$, so all edges incident to u are inside H, and hence $(u, v) \in \partial_H(S)$. It follows that $\delta_{G_b}(S) \leq \delta_H(S) + vol(S \cap (A \cup A_H))$.

Suppose that there is an α'-sparse cut $S \subset V_H$ which is not (B_H, σ)-overlapping, i.e. $vol(S \cap (A \cup A_H)) < \sigma vol(S) = \frac{\alpha_b}{2} vol(S)$. Then we have that

$$\delta_H(S) \geq \delta_{G_b}(S) - vol(S \cap (A \cup A_H)) > \alpha_b vol(S) - \alpha_b vol(S)/2 = \alpha_b vol(S)/2.$$

That is, $\phi_H(S) \geq \alpha_b/2 > \alpha'$, which is a contradiction. □

Now, we can prove **the main invariant**:

Lemma A.13. *Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. If $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$ is called, then the invariant $\mathsf{OPT}(I, \alpha_\ell) < \bar{s}_\ell$ is satisfied.*

Proof. When $\ell = 1$, $\mathsf{OPT}(I, \alpha_\ell) < \bar{s}_1$ by Lemma A.11. In particular, the invariant is satisfied when $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$. The invariant for $\mathsf{decomp}(H[V_H \setminus S], I, \ell)$ which is called in Step 5.a is the same as the one for $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$, and hence is satisfied by induction.

Finally, we claim that the invariant is satisfied when $\mathsf{decomp}(H, H, \ell{+}1)$ is called, i.e., $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_{\ell+1}) < \bar{s}_{\ell+1}$. By Step 5.a, $|S| < \bar{s}_{\ell+1}/c_{size}$. By Step 5, $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_{\ell+1}, B_H, \sigma)/c_{size} \leq |S|$ as $\alpha_{\ell+1} = \alpha_\ell/c_{con}$. Since H is induced by V_H and $\alpha_{\ell+1} \leq \alpha_1 < \alpha_b/2$ satisfying the conditions in Lemma A.12, we have $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_{\ell+1}) = \mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_{\ell+1}, B_H, \sigma)$. Therefore, $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_{\ell+1}) \leq c_{size}|S| < \bar{s}_{\ell+1}$ as desired. □

Finally, we bound the conductance of the components of G^d.

Lemma A.14. *Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. The pruned graph $H = G[V - P]$ has conductance $\phi(H) \geq \alpha$.*

Proof. H is in either Step 3 or 4 in Algorithm A.1. First, if H is returned in Step 3, then $\mathsf{decomp}(H, H, L)$ was called. By the invariant, we have $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_L) < \bar{s}_L \leq 1$, i.e. there is no α_L-sparse cut in H. As $\alpha_L = \alpha$, $\phi(H) \geq \alpha$. Second, if H is returned in Step 4, then $\mathcal{A}_{cut}(H, \alpha_\ell, B, \sigma)$ reports that $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_\ell/c_{con}, B_H, \sigma) = 0$. As $\alpha_\ell/c_{con} < \alpha_b/2$, $\mathsf{OPT}(H, \alpha_\ell/c_{con}) = 0$ by Lemma A.12. That is, $\phi(H) \geq \alpha_\ell/c_{con} \geq \alpha_L = \alpha$. □

Now, it is left to analyze the running time.

A.1.4 Running time

In this section, we prove that if $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$, then $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ takes at most $\bar{t}$ time. In other words, if $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ takes more that $\bar{t}$ time, then $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$ and the algorithm will just halt and report that $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$ (FAIL).

To analyze the running time, we need some more notation. We define the recursion tree $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$. Actually, $\mathcal{T}$ is a path.

- Each node of $\mathcal{T}$ represents the parameters of the procedure $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$.
- $(G, G, 1)$ is the root node.
- For each (H, I, ℓ), if $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$ returns the pruned graph H, then (H, I, ℓ) is a leaf.
- If $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$ recurses on $\mathsf{decomp}(H[V_H \setminus S], I, \ell)$, then there is an edge $((H, I, \ell), (H[V_H \setminus S], I, \ell)) \in \mathcal{T}$ and is called a *right edge*.
- If $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$ recurses on $\mathsf{decomp}(H, H, \ell+1)$, then there is an edge $((H, I, \ell), (H, H, \ell+1))$ in $\mathcal{T}$ and is called a *down edge*.

For any n-node graph G, α is a conductance parameter, A is a set of nodes in G, and σ is an overlapping parameter, let $t_{LSB}(n, vol(A), \alpha, \sigma)$ denote the running time of the LSB cut algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{cut}(G, \alpha, A\sigma)$.

Lemma A.15. *Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. If the depth of the recursion tree $\mathcal{T}$ is $d_{\mathcal{T}}$, then the total running time is $O(d_{\mathcal{T}} \times t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$.*

Proof. At any level of recursion, the running time on $\mathsf{decomp}(H, I, \ell)$, excluding the time spent in the next recursion level, is just the running time of $\mathcal{A}_{cut}(H, \alpha_\ell, B_H, \sigma)$ which is $t_{LSB}(|V_H|, vol(B_H), \alpha_\ell, \sigma) \leq O(t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$ because $|V_H| \leq n$, $vol(B_H) = O(\frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b})$ Proposition A.8, $\alpha_\ell \leq \alpha_b$, and $\sigma = \alpha_b/2$. So the total running time is $O(d_{\mathcal{T}} \times t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$ is if there are $d_{\mathcal{T}}$ levels. □

Now, we bound the depth $d_{\mathcal{T}}$ of $\mathcal{T}$. Recall $L \leq 1/\epsilon$ and $\bar{s}_1 = 2|D|/\alpha_b + 1$.

Lemma A.16. *Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. $\mathcal{T}$ contains at most L down edges, and $Lc_{size}\bar{s}_1^\epsilon$ right edges. That is, the depth of $\mathcal{T}$ is $d_{\mathcal{T}} = Lc_{size}\bar{s}_1^\epsilon = O((\frac{|D|}{\alpha_b})^\epsilon \cdot \frac{c_{size}}{\epsilon})$.*

Proof. There are at most L down edges in $\mathcal{T}$ because Step 3 in Algorithm A.1 always terminates the recursion when $\ell = L$. Next, it suffices to prove that there cannot be $k = c_{size}\bar{s}_1^\epsilon$ right edges between any down edges in $\mathcal{T}$. Let $P = (H_1, I, \ell), \ldots, (H_k, I, \ell)$ be a path of $\mathcal{T}$ which maximally

contains only right edges. Note that $I = H_1$ because (H_1, I, ℓ) must be either a root or a deeper endpoint of a down edges. Suppose for contradiction that $|P| \geq k$.

For each i, let S_i be the cut such that $H_{i+1} = H_i[V_{H_i} \setminus S_i]$ and $\phi_{H_i}(S_i) < \alpha_\ell$. Since $\{S_i\}_{i \leq k}$ are mutually disjoint. We conclude $\phi_{H_1}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} S_i) < \alpha_\ell$ using the same argument as in Proposition A.4. However, we also have that $|S_i| \geq \bar{s}_{\ell+1}/c_{size}$, for all i, and hence $|\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} S_i| \geq k\bar{s}_{\ell+1}/c_{size} \geq \bar{s}_1^{\epsilon}\bar{s}_{\ell+1} = \bar{s}_\ell$. So $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} S_i$ contradicts the invariant for $\mathsf{decomp}(H_1, I, \ell)$, where $I = H_1$, which says $\mathsf{OPT}(H_1, \alpha_\ell) < \bar{s}_\ell$. Note that the invariant must hold by Lemma A.13. □

Corollary A.17. *Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ runs in time $\overline{t} = O((\frac{|D|}{\alpha_b})^{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{c_{size}}{\epsilon} \cdot t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$.*

Proof. We have $d_{\mathcal{T}} = O(\frac{|D|^{\epsilon}}{\alpha_b^{1+\epsilon_\epsilon}})$ by Lemma A.16. By Lemma A.15, we have that $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ runs in time $O((\frac{|D|}{\alpha_b})^{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{c_{size}}{\epsilon} \cdot t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$. □

Now, we can conclude the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem A.1. Suppose that $\phi(G_b) \geq \alpha_b$. By Corollary A.7, we have that the pruning set P has small volume $vol_G(V) \leq 2|D|/\alpha_b$. By Lemma A.14, the pruned graph $H = G[V - P]$ has high conductance: $\phi(C) \geq \alpha = \frac{\alpha_b}{5c_{con}(\alpha_b/2)^{1/\epsilon - 1}}$. Finally, Corollary A.17 $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ runs in time $\overline{t} = O((\frac{|D|}{\alpha_b})^{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{c_{size}(\alpha_b/2)}{\epsilon} \cdot t_{LSB}(n, \frac{\Delta|D|}{\alpha_b}, \alpha_b, \alpha_b))$.

When $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ reports failure, we claim that $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$. Indeed, given that $|D| = O(\alpha_b^2 m/\Delta)$, we have that $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ does not fails in Step 2 by Lemma A.9. So $\mathsf{decomp}(G, G, 1)$ can return FAIL only when its running time exceeds $\overline{t}$ which can only happens when $\phi(G_b) < \alpha_b$. □

B Omitted Proofs

B.1 Proof of Lemma 3.4 (Unit Flow)

The proof is basically by adjusting and simplifying parameters of the following statement from [14]. [15]

Lemma B.1 (Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.1 in [14])**.** *There exists an algorithm* called Unit Flow *which takes the followings as input: a graph $G = (V, E)$ with m edges (with parallel edges but no self loop), positive integers h', F', and U, a source function Δ such that $\Delta(v) \leq F' \cdot \deg(v)$ for all $v \in V$, and a sink function T where $T(v) = \deg(v)$ for all $v \in V$. In time $O(F'h'|\Delta(\cdot)|)$, the algorithm returns a source-feasible preflow f with congestion at most U. Moreover, one of the followings holds.*

1. *$|ex_f(\cdot)| = 0$ i.e. f is a flow.*
2. *$|ex_f(\cdot)| \leq |\Delta(\cdot)| - 2m$. More specifically, for all $v \in V$, $\deg(v)$ units of supply is absorbed at v.*
3. *A set $S \subseteq V$ is returned, where S is such that $\forall v \in S$, $\deg(v) \leq f(v) \leq F' \cdot \deg(v)$ and $\forall v \notin S$, $f(v) \leq \deg(v)$. Furthermore, if $h \geq \log m$, then $\phi_G(S) \leq \frac{20 \log 2m}{h'} + \frac{F'}{U}$.*

[15] We note that the original statement of [14] guarantees some additional properties. We do not state them here as they are not needed. Moreover, the result of the algorithm is a flow in the graph $G(U)$ which is the graph G where the *capacity* of each edge is U, for a given parameter U. We adapt the original statement to use the notion of *congestion* instead. It is easy to see that a flow in $G(U)$ is a flow in G with congestion U and vice versa.

By restricting to only when $|\Delta(\cdot)| \leq 2m$ and $h' \geq \log m$, we can simplify Lemma B.1 to Lemma B.2 below. Note that, when $T(v) = \deg(v)$, we have $ex_f(v) = \max\{f(v) - T(v), 0\} = ex_f(v) = \max\{f(v) - \deg(v), 0\}$.

Lemma B.2. *There exists an algorithm* called Unit Flow *which takes the followings as input: a graph $G = (V, E)$ with m edges (with parallel edges but no self loop), positive integers $h' \geq \log m$, F', and U, a source function Δ such that $\Delta(v) \leq F' \cdot \deg(v)$ for all $v \in V$ and $|\Delta(\cdot)| \leq 2m$, and a sink function T where $T(v) = \deg(v)$ for all $v \in V$. In time $O(F'h'|\Delta(\cdot)|)$, the algorithm returns a source-feasible preflow f with congestion at most U. Moreover, one of the followings holds.*

1. *$|ex_f(\cdot)| = 0$ i.e. f is a flow.*
2. *A cut S is returned where $\phi_G(S) \leq \frac{20\log(2m)}{h'} + \frac{F'}{U}$. Moreover, $\forall v \in S$: $ex_f(v) \leq (F' - 1)\deg(v)$ and $\forall v \notin S$: $ex_f(v) = 0$.*

To get Lemma 3.4, set $F = F'$, $h = \frac{h'}{41\log(2m)}$ and $U = 2hF$. So $\frac{20\log(2m)}{h'} + \frac{F'}{U} < \frac{1}{2h} + \frac{1}{2h} = \frac{1}{h}$. Note that the condition $h' \geq \log m$ becomes $h \geq 1$. Also note that in the input of Theorem 3.3 (thus Lemma 3.4), $|\Delta(\cdot)| \leq |T(\cdot)| \leq 2m$, thus the condition that $|\Delta(\cdot)| \leq 2m$ in Lemma B.2 can be dropped. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.4.