arXiv:1911.01839v1 [cs.DS] 5 Nov 2019

Fully Dynamic Matching: Beating 2-Approximation in Δ^{ε} Update Time*

Soheil Behnezhad†
University of Maryland

Jakub Łącki
Google Research

Vahab Mirrokni
Google Research

Abstract

In fully dynamic graphs, we know how to maintain a 2-approximation of maximum matching extremely fast, that is, in polylogarithmic update time or better. In a sharp contrast and despite extensive studies, all known algorithms that maintain a $2-\Omega(1)$ approximate matching are much slower. Understanding this gap and, in particular, determining the best possible update time for algorithms providing a better-than-2 approximate matching is a major open question.

In this paper, we show that for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a randomized algorithm that with high probability maintains a $2-\Omega(1)$ approximate maximum matching of a fully-dynamic general graph in worst-case update time $O(\Delta^{\varepsilon} + \operatorname{polylog} n)$, where Δ is the maximum degree.

Previously, the fastest fully dynamic matching algorithm providing a better-than-2 approximation had $O(m^{1/4})$ update-time [Bernstein and Stein, SODA 2016]. A faster algorithm with update-time $O(n^{\varepsilon})$ was known, but worked only for maintaining the size (and not the edges) of the matching in bipartite graphs [Bhattacharya, Henzinger, and Nanongkai, STOC 2016].

*A preliminary version of this paper is to appear in proceedings of SODA 2020.

†Supported in part by a Google PhD Fellowship. Research conducted in part while the author was a research intern at Google.

1 Introduction

The problem of maintaining a large matching in the dynamic setting has received significant attention over the last two decades (see [2, 5, 8, 11–13, 15, 17, 19, 24–26] and the references therein). After a long line of work, we now know how to maintain a *maximal matching* in fully dynamic graphs (i.e. graphs that undergo both edge insertions and deletions) extremely fast, that is in polylogarithmic update-time or better [4, 8, 26]. This immediately gives a 2-approximation of *maximum* matching. In a sharp contrast, however, we have little understanding of the update-time-complexity once we go below 2 approximation. A famous open question of the area, asked first[1] in the pioneering paper of Onak and Rubinfeld [25] from 2010 is:

> "*Can the approximation constant be made smaller than 2 for maximum matching* [*while having polylogarithmic update-time*]?" [25]

A decade later, we are still far from achieving a polylogarithmic update-time algorithm. The fastest current result for maintaining a matching with a better-than-2 approximation factor was presented by Bernstein and Stein [10].[2] Their algorithm handles updates in $O(m^{1/4})$ time where m denotes the number of edges in the graph. However, a notable follow-up result of Bhattacharya, Henzinger, and Nanongkai [13] hinted that we may be able to achieve a faster algorithm. They showed that in n-vertex bipartite graphs, for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a deterministic algorithm with amortized update-time $O(n^{\varepsilon})$ that maintains a $2 - \Omega(1)$ approximation of the size of the maximum matching (the algorithm maintains a fractional matching, but not an integral one).

In light of the result of Bhattacharya *et al.* [13], two main questions remained open: First, *is it possible to maintain the matching in addition to its size?* Second, *can the result be extended from bipartite graphs to general graphs?* We resolve both questions in the affirmative:

Theorem 1. *For any constant $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a randomized fully-dynamic algorithm that with high probability maintains a $2-\Omega_{\varepsilon}(1)$ approximate maximum matching in worst-case update-time $O(\Delta^{\varepsilon}) + \operatorname{polylog} n$ under the standard oblivious adversary assumption. Here, Δ denotes the maximum degree in the graph. Also the precise approximation factor constant depends on ε.*

Compared to the algorithm of Bhattacharya *et al.* [13], our algorithm, at the expense of using randomization, maintains the matching itself, handles general graphs, and also improves the update-time from $O(n^{\varepsilon})$ *amortized* to $\widetilde{O}(\Delta^{\varepsilon})$ *worst-case*. In addition, our algorithm is arguably simpler.

Similar to other randomized algorithms of the literature, we require the standard oblivious adversary assumption. The adversary here is all powerful and knows the algorithm, but his/her updates should be independent of the random bits used by the algorithm. Equivalently, one can assume that the sequence of updates is fixed adversarially *before* the algorithm starts to operate.

2 Our Techniques

In this section, we provide an informal overview of the ideas used in our algorithm for Theorem 1 and the challenges that arise along the way.

A main intuition behind the efficient (randomized) 2-approximate algorithms of the literature is essentially "hiding" the matching from the adversary through the use of randomization. For instance if we pick the edges in the matching randomly from the dense regions of the graph where we have

[1] The problem was also stated in multiple subsequent papers e.g. in [14, Section 4], [10, Section 7] or [17, Section 1].

[2] The algorithm of Bernstein and Stein remarkably achieves an (almost) 1.5 approximation.

a lot of choices, it would then take the adversary (who recall is unaware of our random bits) a lot of trials to remove a matching edge. A natural algorithm having such behavior is *random greedy maximal matching* (RGMM) which processes the edges in a random order and greedily adds them to the matching if possible. Indeed it was recently shown by Behnezhad *et al.* [6] that it takes only polylogarithmic time per edge update to maintain a RGMM.

Unfortunately, exactly the feature of RGMM (or of previous algorithms based on the same intuition) that it matches the dense regions first prevents it from obtaining a better-than-2 approximation. A simple bad example is a perfect matching whose one side induces a clique (formally, a graph on vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{2n}$, whose edge set consists of a clique induced on $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ and edges $v_i v_{i+n}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$). The RGMM algorithm, for instance, would pick almost all of its edges from the clique, and thus matches roughly half of the vertices while the graph has a perfect matching.

To break this 2 approximation barrier, our starting point is a slightly paraphrased variant of a streaming algorithm of Konrad *et al.* [22]. The algorithm starts by constructing a RGMM M_0 of the input graph G. Unless M_0 is significantly larger than half of the size of the maximum matching $\textsc{opt}$ of G, then nearly all edges of M_0 can be shown to belong to length-3 augmenting paths in $M_0 \oplus \textsc{opt}$. Therefore to break 2 approximation, it suffices to pick a constant fraction of the edges in M_0, and discover a collection of vertex disjoint length-3 paths augmenting them. Konrad *et al.* [22] showed that this can be done by finding another RGMM, this time on a subgraph G' of G whose edges have one endpoint that is matched in M_0 and one endpoint that is unmatched (though for these edges to augment M_0 well, it is crucial that not all such edges are included in G').

The algorithm outlined above shows how to obtain a $2 - \Omega(1)$ approximate maximum matching by merely running two instances of RGMM. Given that we know how to maintain a RGMM in polylogarithmic update time due to [6], one may wonder whether we can also get a similar update-time for this algorithm. Unfortunately, the answer is negative! The reason is that the second stage graph G' is *adaptively* determined based on matching M_0. Particularly, a single edge update that changes matching M_0 may lead to deletion/insertion of a *vertex* (along with its edges) in the second stage graph G'. While we can handle edge updates in polylogarithmic time, the update-time for vertex updates is still polynomial (in the degree of the vertex being updated). Therefore, the algorithm, as stated, requires an update-time of up to $\widetilde{O}(\Delta)$.

To get around the issue above, our first insight is a parametrized analysis of the update-time depending on the structure of the edges in M_0. Suppose that matching M_0 is constructed by drawing a random *rank* $\pi_0(e) \in [0, 1]$ independently on each edge e and then iterating over the edges in the increasing order of their ranks. We show that the whole update-time (i.e. that of both the first and the second stage matchings) can be bounded by $\widetilde{O}(\rho)$, where

$$\alpha = \max_{e \in M_0} \pi_0(e), \qquad \beta = \min_{e \in M_0} \pi_0(e), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \rho = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}.$$

The reason is as follows. For an edge update e, the probability that it causes an update to matching M_0, is upper bounded by α. (If rank of e is larger than the highest rank ever in M_0, then $e \notin M_0$ and thus its insertion/deletion causes no update to M_0.) On the other hand, in case of an update to M_0, the cost of a vertex update to the second stage graph can be bounded by its degree, which we show can be bounded by $\widetilde{O}(1/\beta)$ using a sparsification property of RGMM (Lemma 3.1) applied to the first stage matching M_0. Thus, the overall update time is indeed $\widetilde{O}(\alpha \cdot \beta^{-1}) = \widetilde{O}(\rho)$.

The analysis highlighted above, shows that as the rank of edges in the first stage matching M_0 get closer to each other, our update-time gets improved. In general, this ratio can be as large as $O(\Delta)$. A natural idea, however, is to partition M_0 into subsets $S_1, \ldots, S_{1/\varepsilon}$ such that the edges in each subset, more or less, have the same ranks (i.e. a max over min rank ratio of roughly Δ^{ε}). We can then individually construct a second-stage graph G_i for each S_i, find a RGMM M_i of it and use

it to augment S_i (and thus M_0). Since there are only $1/\varepsilon$ groups, there will be one that includes at least $\varepsilon = \Omega(1)$ fraction of edges of M_0. Therefore, augmenting a constant fraction of edges in this set alone would be enough to break 2 approximation.

However, another technical complication arises here. Once we choose to augment only a subset S_i of the edges in M_0, with say $\frac{\max_{e\in S_i}\pi_0(e)}{\min_{e\in S_i}\pi_0(e)} \leq \Delta^{\varepsilon}$, we cannot bound the update-time by $\widetilde{O}(\Delta^{\varepsilon})$ anymore. (The argument described before only works if we consider all the edges in M_0.) The reason is that, normally, in the second stage graph G_i we would like to have edges that have one endpoint in S_i and one endpoint that is unmatched in M_0 so that if both endpoints of an edge $e \in S_i$ are matched in the matching of G_i, then we get a length-3 augmenting path of M_0. This makes this second stage graph G_i very sensitive to the precise set of vertices matched/unmatched in the whole matching M_0 (as opposed to only those matched in S_i) and this would prevent us from using the same argument to bound the update-time by $\widetilde{O}(\Delta^{\varepsilon})$.

To resolve this issue, on a high level, we also consider any vertex that is matched in M_0, but its matching edge has rank higher than those in S_i, as "unmatched" while constructing graph G_i (see Algorithm 1). This will allow us to argue that the update-time is $\widetilde{O}(\Delta^{\varepsilon})$. The downside is that not all found length 3 paths will be actual augmenting paths of M_0. Fortunately, though, we are still able to argue that the algorithm finds sufficiently many *actual* augmenting paths for M_0 and thus achieves a $2 - \Omega(1)$ approximation (see Section 5).

3 Preliminaries

For a graph G, we use $\mu(G)$ to denote the size of its maximum matching. Moreover, as standard, for two matchings M_1 and M_2 of the same graph, we use $M_1 \oplus M_2$ to denote their symmetric difference, i.e., the graph including edges that appear in exactly one of M_1 and M_2. For two disjoint subsets $A \subseteq V$ and $B \subseteq V$ of the vertex set V of a graph G, we use $G[A \times B]$ to denote the bipartite subgraph of G whose vertex set is $A \cup B$ and includes an edge e of G if and only if e has one endpoint in A and one in B. Also, generally for a subset E' of the edge-set of G, we use $V(E')$ to denote the set of vertices with at least one incident edge in E'.

Given a *ranking* π that maps each edge of G to a real in $[0, 1]$, the greedy maximal matching $\mathsf{Greedy}(G, \pi)$ is obtained as follows: We iterate over the edges in the increasing order of their ranks; upon visiting an edge e, if no edge incident to e is already in the matching, e joins the matching. Having this matching, for each edge e we define the eliminator of e, denoted by $\text{elim}_{G,\pi}(e)$, to be the edge incident to e that is in matching $\mathsf{Greedy}(G, \pi)$ and has the lowest rank; if e itself is in the matching, then $\text{elim}_{G,\pi}(e) = e$.

The greedy maximal matching algorithm will be particularly useful if the ranking is random. We do this by picking each entry of the ranking (i.e., the rank of each edge) independently and uniformly at random from $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, it is not hard to see that these ranks need not be too long. Namely, the first $O(\log n)$ bits of the ranks are enough to ensure that no two edges receive the same rank with high probability. From now on, whenever we use the term "random ranking" we assume $O(\log n)$ bit ranks from $[0, 1]$ are drawn independently and uniformly at random.

We will make use of the following, by now standard, sparsification property of the random greedy maximal matching algorithm—see e.g. [1, 3, 6, 7, 16, 18, 20].

Lemma 3.1. *Fix an arbitrary graph G and a random-ranking π on its edge-set. The following event holds w.h.p. over the randomization in π: For every $O(\log n)$ bit rank $p \in [0, 1]$, the subgraph of G including edges e with $\pi(\text{elim}_{G,\pi}(e)) > p$, has maximum degree $O(p^{-1} \log n)$.*

4 A Static Algorithm

In this section we describe a static algorithm for finding an approximate maximum matching. We show in Section 5 that the algorithm provides a $2-\Omega(1)$ approximation and show in Section 6 that it can be maintained in update-time $\widetilde{O}(\Delta^{\varepsilon})$.

Intuitive explanation of the algorithm. We start with a RGMM M_0. After that, we partition the edge set of M_0 into $1/\varepsilon$ partitions $S_1, \ldots, S_{1/\varepsilon}$ such that roughly the maximum rank over the minimum rank in each partition is at most Δ^{ε}. Then, focusing on each partition S_i, we try augmenting the edges of S_i by finding two random greedy matchings of subgraphs $G_i'^A$ and $G_i'^B$ that are determined based on set S_i. Roughly, each edge in $G_i'^A$ (and similarly in $G_i'^B$) has one endpoint that is matched in S_i—this is the edge to be augmented—and one endpoint that is either unmatched or matched after the edges in S_i are processed in the greedy construction of M_0. Therefore if for an edge $uv \in S_i$, its endpoint v is matched via an edge vx in the matching of $G_i'^A$ and u is matched via an edge uy in the matching of $G_i'^B$, and in addition x and y are unmatched in M_0 then uy, uv, vx will be a length 3 augmenting path of M_0.

Algorithm 1. Meta algorithm for finding a better than 2 approximation of maximum matching.

Input : Graph $G = (V, E)$ and a parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

$M_0 \leftarrow \mathsf{Greedy}(G, \pi_0)$ where π_0 is a random permutation of E.

for *any* $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 1/\varepsilon\}$ **do**

  if $i < 1/\varepsilon$ **then**

    $S_i \leftarrow \left\{e \mid e \in M_0 \text{ and } \pi_0(e) \in \left(\Delta^{-i\varepsilon}, \Delta^{-(i-1)\varepsilon}\right]\right\}$. // We may call S_i "partition i"

  else

    $S_{1/\varepsilon} \leftarrow \left\{e \mid e \in M_0 \text{ and } \pi_0(e) \in \left[0, \Delta^{-1+\varepsilon}\right]\right\}$.

  $U_i \leftarrow \{u \mid$ for any edge uv either $uv \notin M_0$ or $uv \in \cup_{j=1}^{i-1} S_j\}$.

  // U_i includes nodes that are unmatched in M_0 or matched by edges in $S_1, \ldots, S_{i-1}$.

  For each edge $uv \in S_i$ put its endpoint with lower ID in set V_i^A and the other in V_i^B.

  // The use of IDs is just to simplify the statements. Any arbitrary way of putting one endpoint of the edge in V_i^A and the other in V_i^B would work.

  Partition U_i into U_i^A and U_i^B by each node picking its partition independently and u.a.r.

  Sample each edge in S_i independently with probability $p := 0.03$.

  $V_i'^A \leftarrow$ vertices in V_i^A whose edge in S_i is sampled.

  $V_i'^B \leftarrow$ vertices in V_i^B whose edge in S_i is sampled.

  $G_i'^A \leftarrow G[V_i'^A \times U_i^A]$.

  $G_i'^B \leftarrow G[V_i'^B \times U_i^B]$.

  $M_i \leftarrow \mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^A, \pi_i) \cup \mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^B, \pi_i)$ where π_i is a fresh random permutation of E.

Return the maximum matching of graph $(M_0 \cup M_1 \cup \ldots \cup M_{1/\varepsilon})$.

5 Approximation Factor of Algorithm 1

In this section, we prove that the approximation factor of Algorithm 1 is at most $2 - \Omega(1)$ given that ε is a constant.

We fix one arbitrary maximum matching of graph G and denote it by OPT; recall that $|\text{OPT}| = \mu(G)$. Having this matching OPT, we now call an edge $e \in M_0$ *3-augmentable* if it is in a length

3 augmenting path in $\textsc{opt} \oplus M_0$. Observe that since $\textsc{opt}$ cannot be augmented, this augmenting path should start and end with edges in $\textsc{opt}$ and thus edge e has to be in the middle.

The following lemma is crucial in the analysis of the approximation factor. Basically, it says that for any partition S_i where most of edges in S_i are 3-augmentable (which in fact should be the case for most of the partitions if $|M_0|$ is close to $0.5\mu(G)$), roughly $p/4$ fraction of the edges in S_i are in length 3 augmenting paths in $S_i \oplus M_i$. We emphasize that this does not directly prove the bound on the approx factor as these length 3 augmenting paths in $S_i \oplus M_i$ may not necessarily be augmenting paths in $M_0 \oplus M_i$.

Lemma 5.1. *For any $i \in [1/\varepsilon]$ and any parameter $\delta \in (0,1)$, if $(1-\delta)$ fraction of the edges in S_i are 3-augmentable, then in expectation, there are at least $(\frac{(1-\delta)p}{4} - 4p^2)|S_i|$ edges in S_i where both of their endpoints are matched in M_i.*

In order to prove this lemma, in Lemma 5.2 we recall a property of the greedy maximal matching algorithm under vertex samplings originally due to [21, 22]. We note that the property that we need is slightly stronger than the one proved in [21, Theorem 3] but follows from a similar argument. Roughly, we need a lower bound on the number of vertices in a specific vertex subset that are matched, while the previous statement only lower bounded the overall matching size. We provide the complete proof in Appendix A.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $G(V,U,E)$ be a bipartite graph, π be an arbitrary permutation over E, and M be an arbitrary matching of G. Fix any parameter $p \in (0,1)$ and let W be a subsample of V including each vertex independently with probability p. Define X to be the number of edges in M whose endpoint in V is matched in $\mathsf{Greedy}(G[W \cup U], \pi)$; then*

$$\mathbb{E}_W[X] \geq p(|M| - 2p|V|).$$

Equipped with Lemma 5.2, we are ready to prove Lemma 5.1.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Fix a partition S_i which includes $(1-\delta)|S_i|$ 3-augmentable edges and denote by T_i the subset of edges in S_i that are 3-augmentable; implying that

$$|T_i| \geq (1-\delta)|S_i|. \tag{1}$$

Recall that each edge $e \in T_i$ is the middle edge in a length 3 augmenting path in $\textsc{opt} \oplus M_0$ where $\textsc{opt}$ is a fixed maximum matching of G. Define set $\textsc{opt}^A$ (resp. $\textsc{opt}^B$) to be the subset of edges uv in $\textsc{opt}$ where one of their endpoints, say, v is in $V(T_i) \cap V_i^A$ (resp. $V(T_i) \cap V_i^B$) and the other endpoint u is in set U_i^A (resp. U_i^B).

We say an edge $ab \in T_i$ is *good* if a is matched in $\textsc{opt}^A$ and also b is matched in $\textsc{opt}^B$; and use Y to denote the subset of edges in T_i that are good. We first claim that

$$\mathbb{E}_{U_i^A, U_i^B}[|Y|] \geq \frac{1}{4}|T_i|, \tag{2}$$

where observe that here the expectation is only taken over the randomization in partitioning U_i into U_i^A and U_i^B. To see this, fix an edge $ab \in T_i$ and let au and bv be the edges in $\textsc{opt}$ that along with ab form a length 3 augmenting path. Observe that edge $au \in \textsc{opt}^A$ if $u \in U_i^A$ and $bv \in \textsc{opt}^B$ if $v \in U_i^B$. Since the partition of v and u is chosen independently and u.a.r., there is a probability $\frac{1}{4}$ that both these events occur, implying $ab \in Y$. Linearity of expectation over every edge in T_i proves (2).

Now, consider graphs $G_i^A := G[V_i^A \times U_i^A]$ and $G_i^B := G[V_i^B \times U_i^B]$ and observe that $\textsc{opt}^A$ is a matching of G_i^A and $\textsc{opt}^B$ is a matching of G_i^B. One can confirm that $V_i'^A$ is a random subsample

of V_i^A where for each $v \in V_i^A$, $\Pr[v \in V_i'^A] = p$. More importantly, whether for a vertex v the event $v \in V_i'^A$ holds is independent of which other vertices are in $V_i'^A$. (Though we note that $v \in V_i'^A$ is not independent of those vertices in $V_i'^B$.) Similarly, $V_i'^B$ can be regarded as a random subsample of V_i^B wherein the vertices appear independently from each other. As a result, graph $G_i'^A$ (resp. $G_i'^B$) is essentially obtained by retaining a random subsample of the vertices in the V_i^A (resp. V_i^B) partition of graph G_i^A (resp. G_i^B). We can thus use Lemma 5.2 while fixing matching $\textsc{opt}^A$ to infer that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\begin{array}{l}\#\text{ of vertices in } V(\textsc{opt}^A) \cap V_i'^A \\ \text{matched in } \mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^A, \pi_i)\end{array}\right] \geq p(|\textsc{opt}^A| - 2p|V_i^A|). \tag{3}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\begin{array}{l}\#\text{ of vertices in } V(\textsc{opt}^B) \cap V_i'^B \\ \text{matched in } \mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^B, \pi_i)\end{array}\right] \geq p(|\textsc{opt}^B| - 2p|V_i^B|). \tag{4}$$

Observe that $\mathbb{E}[|V(\textsc{opt}^A) \cap V_i'^A|] = p|\textsc{opt}^A|$ since each edge in $\textsc{opt}^A$ has one endpoint in V_i^A which is sampled to $V_i'^A$ with probability p. Combined with (3) this means that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\begin{array}{l}\#\text{ of vertices in } V(\textsc{opt}^A) \cap V_i'^A \\ \underline{\text{not}} \text{ matched in } \mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^A, \pi_i)\end{array}\right] \leq p|\textsc{opt}^A| - p(|\textsc{opt}^A| - 2p|V_i^A|) \leq 2p^2|V_i^A| = 2p^2|S_i|. \tag{5}$$

Similarly by (4),

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\begin{array}{l}\#\text{ of vertices in } V(\textsc{opt}^B) \cap V_i'^B \\ \underline{\text{not}} \text{ matched in } \mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^B, \pi_i)\end{array}\right] \leq p|\textsc{opt}^B| - p(|\textsc{opt}^B| - 2p|V_i^B|) \leq 2p^2|V_i^B| = 2p^2|S_i|. \tag{6}$$

By (2) we have $\frac{1}{4}|T_i|$ expected good edges. Out of these, each edge $ab \in Y$ is sampled, i.e., $a \in V_i'^A$ and $b \in V_i'^B$ with probability p. Therefore, in expectation, there are a total of $\frac{p}{4}|T_i|$ sampled good edges. Say a sampled good edge ab is wasted if a is unmatched in $\mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^A, \pi_i)$ or b is unmatched in $\mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^B, \pi_i)$. Combined with (5) and (6) there are at most $2p^2|S_i| + 2p^2|S_i| \leq 4p^2|S_i|$ wasted edges. This means that the expected number of sampled good edges that are not wasted is at least

$$\frac{p}{4}|T_i| - 4p^2|S_i|.$$

Moreover, by (1), $|T_i| \geq (1-\delta)|S_i|$. Replacing this into the equation above, we get that there are, in expectation, at least $\frac{p}{4}(1-\delta)|S_i| - 4p^2|S_i| = (\frac{(1-\delta)p}{4} - 4p^2)|S_i|$ good edges that are not wasted, i.e., both of their endpoints are matched in $M_i = \mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^A, \pi_i) \cup \mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^B, \pi_i)$ as claimed in the lemma. □

The following claim shows that there is a subset $S_{i^\star}$ that is "large enough" compared to the size of matching M_0 and is much larger than the total number of edges in previous subsets $S_1, \ldots, S_{i^\star-1}$.

Claim 5.3. *There exists an integer $i^\star \in [1/\varepsilon]$ such that*

$$|S_{i^\star}| \geq \frac{1}{2^{13/\varepsilon}}|M_0| \qquad \text{and} \qquad |S_{i^\star}| > 2^{11}\sum_{i=1}^{i^\star-1}|S_i|.$$

Proof. Let $i^\star$ be the smallest integer in $[1/\varepsilon]$ for which

$$|S_{i^\star}| \geq 2^{12i^\star - \frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0|, \tag{7}$$

we show that both conditions should hold for $i^\star$. First, we have to prove that there is a choice of $i^\star \in [1/\varepsilon]$ satisfying (7). Suppose for the sake of contradiction that this is not the case; then:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{1/\varepsilon} |S_i| < \sum_{i=1}^{1/\varepsilon} 2^{12i-\frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0| = 2^{\frac{-13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0| \sum_{i=1}^{1/\varepsilon} 2^{12i} \ll 2^{\frac{-13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0|(2 \times 2^{12/\varepsilon}) < |M_0|.$$

Observe that subsets $S_1, \ldots, S_{1/\varepsilon}$ partition the edges in M_0 and thus it should hold that $\sum_{i=1}^{1/\varepsilon} |S_i| = |M_0|$; implying that the equation above is indeed a contradiction, proving existence of $i^\star$.

The first inequality of the claim is automatically satisfied for $i^\star$ due to (7) since

$$|S_{i^\star}| \geq 2^{12i^\star - \frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0| > 2^{-\frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0|.$$

It thus only remains to prove the second inequality. For that, observe that since $i^\star$ is the smallest integer satisfying (7), then for any $i < i^\star$ we have $|S_i| < 2^{12i-\frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0|$. This means that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{i^\star-1} |S_i| < \sum_{i=1}^{i^\star-1} 2^{12i-\frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0| = 2^{\frac{-13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0| \sum_{i=1}^{i^\star-1} 2^{12i} \ll 2^{\frac{-13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0|(2 \times 2^{12(i^\star-1)}) = 2^{12i^\star-11-\frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0|.$$

Combining this with (7) we get

$$\frac{|S_{i^\star}|}{\sum_{i=1}^{i^\star-1}|S_i|} > \frac{2^{12i^\star-\frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0|}{2^{12i^\star-11-\frac{13}{\varepsilon}}|M_0|} = 2^{11},$$

implying the second inequality of the claim as well. □

Let us recall a folklore property that if maximal matching M_0 is not already large enough, then most of the edges in it are 3-augmentable.

Observation 5.4 (folklore)**.** *If $|M_0| < (\frac{1}{2}+\delta)\mu(G)$, then at least $(\frac{1}{2}-3\delta)\mu(G)$ edges in M_0 are 3-augmentable.*

Proof. See e.g. [21, Lemma 1] for a simple argument. □

We are now ready to analyze the approximation factor. We prove that for $\delta = \frac{1}{1000\times 2^{13/\varepsilon}}$, the matching returned by Algorithm 1 has, in expectation, size at least $(\frac{1}{2}+\delta)\mu(G)$. We first assume that $|M_0| < (\frac{1}{2}+\delta)\mu(G)$ as otherwise matching M_0 already achieves the desired approximation factor. By Observation 5.4, this means that at least $(\frac{1}{2}-3\delta)\mu(G)$ edges of M_0 are 3-augmentable; meaning that the number of edges in M_0 that are not 3-augmentable is at most

$$|M_0| - \left(\frac{1}{2}-3\delta\right)\mu(G) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}+\delta\right)\mu(G) - \left(\frac{1}{2}-3\delta\right)\mu(G) = 4\delta\mu(G) \leq 8\delta|M_0|. \tag{8}$$

Let $i^\star \in [1/\varepsilon]$ be the integer satisfying Claim 5.3. By (8) there are at most $8\delta|M_0|$ edges in M_0 and thus in $S_{i^\star}$ that are not 3-augmentable. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\text{ of 3-augmentable edges in } S_{i^\star} &\geq |S_{i^\star}| - 8\delta|M_0| \\
&= |S_{i^\star}| - 8\frac{1}{1000\times 2^{13/\varepsilon}}|M_0| \\
&> |S_{i^\star}| - \frac{1}{100} \times \frac{|M_0|}{2^{13/\varepsilon}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq |S_{i^\star}| - \frac{1}{100} \times \frac{2^{13/\varepsilon}|S_{i^\star}|}{2^{13/\varepsilon}} \qquad \text{First inequality of Claim 5.3.}$$
$$\geq 0.99|S_{i^\star}|.$$

Since 0.99 fraction of the edges in $S_{i^\star}$ are 3-augmentable, by Lemma 5.1, there are at least

$$\left(\frac{0.99p}{4} - 4p^2\right)|S_{i^\star}| \overset{p=0.03}{=} 0.003825|S_{i^\star}| > 0.003|S_{i^\star}|$$

edges in $S_{i^\star}$ whose both endpoints are matched in $M_{i^\star}$. We would like to argue that these form length 3 augmenting paths but note that an edge $e \in M_{i^\star}$ may have an endpoint that is already matched in subsets $S_1, \ldots, S_{i^\star-1}$. However, the crucial observation here is that since by the second inequality of Claim 5.3, we have $|S_{i^\star}| \geq 2^{11}\sum_{i=1}^{i^\star-1}|S_i|$ and each edge in $S_1 \cup \ldots \cup S_{i^\star-1}$ can be connected to two edges in $M_{i^\star}$ the number of these length 3 augmenting paths that are also augmenting paths in $\textsc{opt} \oplus M_0$ is at least

$$0.003|S_{i^\star}| - 2 \times \sum_{i=1}^{i^\star-1}|S_i| \geq 0.003|S_{i^\star}| - 2 \times \frac{|S_{i^\star}|}{2^{11}} > 0.002|S_{i^\star}|.$$

Each of these augmenting paths can be used to increase size of M_0 by one, therefore the final matching has size at least

$$|M_0| + 0.002|S_{i^\star}| \geq |M_0| + \frac{0.002}{2^{13/\varepsilon}}|M_0| = \left(1 + \frac{1}{500 \times 2^{13/\varepsilon}}\right)|M_0| \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{500 \times 2^{13/\varepsilon}}\right)\frac{1}{2}\mu(G)$$
$$= \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1000 \times 2^{13/\varepsilon}}\right)\mu(G),$$

which proves the approximation factor is $2 - \Omega(1)$ so long as $\varepsilon > 0$ is a constant.

6 Dynamic Implementation of Algorithm 1

In this section, we describe how we can maintain Algorithm 1 in update time $O(\Delta^\varepsilon + \operatorname{polylog} n)$.

6.1 Tools

We borrow two black-box tools from the previous works. The first one is a simple corollary of the algorithm of Gupta and Peng [19], see also [9] for a proof of this corollary.

Lemma 6.1 ([19]). *Let Δ' be a fixed upper bound on the maximum degree of a graph at all times. Then we can maintain a $(1+\varepsilon)$ approximate matching deterministically under edge insertions and deletions in worst-case update time $O(\Delta'/\varepsilon^2)$ per update.*

We use Lemma 6.1 only for the last step of Algorithm 1 in which we need to maintain a maximum matching of $M_0 \cup M_1 \cup \ldots \cup M_{1/\varepsilon}$ which is a graph with maximum degree $O(1/\varepsilon)$.

The second black-box result that we use is due to the recent algorithm of Behnezhad *et al.* [6] that asserts a random greedy maximal matching can be maintained efficiently.

Lemma 6.2 ([6]). *Let π be a random ranking where $\pi(e) \in [0,1]$ for each edge e is drawn uniformly at random upon its arrival. Then maximal matching $\mathsf{Greedy}(G,\pi)$ can be maintained under edge insertions and deletions in expected time $O(\log^2\Delta \times \log^2 n)$ per update (without amortization). Furthermore, for each update, the adjustment-complexity is in expectation $O(1)$ and w.h.p. $O(\log n)$.*

6.2 Data Structures & Setup

Algorithm 1 computes two types of matchings: (1) Matching $M_0 = \mathsf{Greedy}(G, \pi_0)$ which is a standard random greedy maximal matching of the whole graph G. (2) Matchings $M_1, \ldots, M_{1/\varepsilon}$ which are computed on specific subgraphs of G. Observe in Algorithm 1 that each matching M_i for $i \in \{1, \ldots, 1/\varepsilon\}$ is the union of two random greedy matchings $\mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^A, \pi_i)$ and $\mathsf{Greedy}(G_i'^B, \pi_i)$. A crucial observation here is that these two graphs $G_i'^A$ and $G_i'^B$ by definition are vertex disjoint. Therefore defining graph G_i to be the union of these two graphs, M_i would be equivalent to $\mathsf{Greedy}(G_i, \pi_i)$.

Now we have $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}+1$ graphs $G, G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ and $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}+1$ independently drawn rankings $\pi_0, \pi_1, \ldots, \pi_{1/\varepsilon}$. Therefore, if a priori these graphs were fixed and remained unchanged after each edge insertion/deletion, we could use Lemma 6.2 to update each one of them in expected time polylog n requiring only a total update-time of $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \cdot \text{polylog}\, n$. However, as highlighted in Section 2 the challenge is that the vertex sets of graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ are *adaptively* determined based on matching M_0. That is, a single edge update that changes matching M_0 may lead to many *vertex* insertions/deletions to graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ that are generally much harder to handle than edge updates. Therefore, we need to be careful about what to maintain and how to do it to ensure these vertex updates can be determined and handled efficiently.

Fixing the randomizations. To maintain the matching of Algorithm 1, we fix all the randomizations required. There are two types of randomizations involved: (1) Randomizations on the edges, such as the random rankings and edge samplings; as in Lines 1,15, and 10. (2) Randomizations on the vertices; as in Line 9. We reveal the randomizations on the vertex set in the preprocessing step as it is static. But we reveal the randomizations on the edges upon their arrival. For completeness, we mention the precise random bits drawn below.

For each edge e, we draw the following upon its arrival:

$\mathsf{is_sampled}_i(e) \in \{0, 1\}$: This is drawn for any $i \in [1/\varepsilon]$ independently. It is 1 with probability p and 0 otherwise. It determines the outcome of edge-sampling in Line 10 of the algorithm.

$\pi_i(e) \in [0, 1]$: The rank of e in ranking π_i. This is drawn for any $i \in \{0, \ldots, 1/\varepsilon\}$.

And for each vertex v, in the pre-processing step, we draw:

$\mathsf{partition}_i(v) \in \{A, B\}$: This is drawn for any $i \in [1/\varepsilon]$ independently. It is A with probability 0.5 and B otherwise. The value determines whether v would join U_i^A or U_i^B if it is partitioned in Line 9 of the algorithm.

Data structures. Let us for simplicity define $G_0 = G$. For any vertex v and any $i \in \{0, \ldots, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\}$ we maintain the following data structures:

$k_i(v)$: If v is not part of graph G_i or if it is unmatched in $\mathsf{Greedy}(G_i, \pi_i)$ then $k_i(v) = 1$. Otherwise, if e is the edge incident to v that is in matching $\mathsf{Greedy}(G_i, \pi_i)$ then $k_i(v) = \pi_i(e)$.

$N_i(v)$: The set of neighbors of v in graph G_i. This set is stored as a self-balancing binary search tree in which each neighbor u of v is indexed by $\pi_i(\text{elim}_{G_i,\pi_i}(uv))$. (If v is not in the vertex-set of G_i then simply $N_i(v) = \emptyset$.)

6.3 The Update Algorithm

We run $1+1/\varepsilon$ instances of Lemma 6.2 for maintaining greedy matchings of $G_0, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$. Moreover, we run a single instance of Lemma 6.1 on the edges in union of matchings $M_0 \cup \ldots \cup M_{1/\varepsilon}$.

As mentioned previously, a single edge update to graph G_0 may change the structure of graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ and in particular may lead to vertex insertions or deletions in them. Therefore, our main focus in this section is to show how we can detect these vertices that join/leave graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ and their incident edges in these graphs efficiently. Before that, we need the following lemma. The proof is a simple consequence of Lemma 3.1 and thus we defer it to Appendix B.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that an edge e is inserted to or deleted from a graph G_i for some $i \in \{0, \ldots, 1/\varepsilon\}$. After updating matching $\mathsf{Greedy}(G_i, \pi_i)$ (e.g. by Lemma 6.2) and getting the list L of edges that joined or left the matching, we can update $k_i(\cdot)$ and $N_i(\cdot)$ accordingly in expected time* $\operatorname{polylog} n$.

Consider insertion or deletion of an edge f. We use the following procedure to maintain our data structures and finally the matching returned by Algorithm 1.

Step 1: Updating M_0. We first update matching M_0. This is done by Lemma 6.2 in $\operatorname{polylog} n$ expected time. After that, we also update data structures $k_0(v)$ and $N_0(v)$ where necessary using Lemma 6.3. There are two cases. If matching M_0 changes after the update, then we may have to update the vertex sets of graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$. This is the operation that is costly and we handle it in the next steps. If M_0 does not change, the only remaining update is to see if f itself is part of a graph G_i and reflect that. This only takes polylogarithmic time using Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3.

Step 2: Updating vertex-sets of $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$. The vertex-set of each graph G_i is composed of four disjoint subsets $V_i'^A, U_i^A, V_i'^B$, and U_i^B. One can confirm from Algorithm 1 that whether a vertex v belongs to one of these sets (and which one if so) can be uniquely determined by knowing the edge incident to v that is in matching M_0 or knowing that no such edge exists. Therefore:

Observation 6.4. *If after the update, a vertex v leaves or is added to the vertex-set of a graph G_i, then there must exist an edge connected to v that either joined or left matching M_0.*

By Observation 6.4, to update the vertex-sets, it suffices to only iterate over vertices whose matching edge in M_0 has changed and determine which graph G_i they should belong to. The procedure is a simple consequence of the way Algorithm 1 constructs these graphs and also the randomizations fixed previously. We provide the details in Algorithm 2 for completeness.

It has to be noted that we are only updating the vertex-sets in this step. In particular, for a vertex v that e.g. joins graph G_i, we do not construct its adjacency list $N_i(v)$ yet. This is postponed to the next step after all the vertex sets are completely updated.

Step 3: Updating adjacency lists of $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ and their matchings. The previous step updated the vertex-sets. Here, we update the adjacency lists and the matchings $M_1, \ldots, M_{1/\varepsilon}$. Precisely, we update data structure $N_i(v)$ for each vertex v and each $i \in [1/\varepsilon]$ where necessary. Note that for any vertex v, both $k_0(v)$ and adjacency list $N_0(v)$ were already updated in Step 1.

First, for any vertex v that leaves a graph G_i, we immediately remove its incident edges from the graph one by one. Each one of these should be regarded as edge deletions and thus we can use Lemma 6.2 to update M_i. We then update k_i and N_i data structures accordingly using Lemma 6.3.

Next, for any vertex v that is added to the vertex set of a graph G_i, we have to determine the set of its neighbors in this graph. To do so, we take the steps formalized as Algorithm 3. A crucial observation to note before reading the description of Algorithm 3 is stated below. The proof is a direct consequence of the greedy structure of RGMM, thus we defer it to Appendix B.

Algorithm 2. Updating vertex-sets of $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$.

for *any vertex v whose match-status in M_0 has changed after the update* **do**
  if *v is now unmatched* **then**
    $\ell_v \leftarrow 0$.
  else
    Let e be the edge incident to v that is now in matching M_0.
    Let S_j be the partition to which e will be assigned in Algorithm 1 based on $\pi_0(e)$.
    $\ell_v \leftarrow j$.
  for *any $i \in [1/\varepsilon]$* **do**
    if $\ell_v < i$ **then**
      If $\mathsf{partition}_i(v) = A$, then $v \in U_i^A$. Otherwise $\mathsf{partition}_i(v) = B$, thus $v \in U_i^B$.
    if $\ell_v = i$ **then**
      // At this state, v should be matched in M_0 through its incident edge e.
      if $\mathsf{is_sampled}_i(e) = 0$ **then**
        Vertex v is not in the vertex-set of graph G_i.
      else
        If v is the lower-ID endpoint of e, then $v \in V_i'^A$. Otherwise, $v \in V_i'^B$.
    if $\ell_v > i$ **then**
      Vertex v is not in the vertex-set of graph G_i.

Claim 6.5. *Suppose that the edge f that is being inserted to/deleted from G is part of matching M_0 (if deleted before deletion and if inserted after insertion). Note that if this was not the case, then updating f would not change the vertex sets of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$. Also assume that f belongs to partition S_j of matching M_0 in Algorithm 1. Then this update may only affect vertex sets of graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_j$. In particular, any graph G_k with $k > j$ remains unchanged after insertion or deletion of f.*

Claim 6.5 is algorithmically useful in the following way. Suppose that $f \in S_j$ and let α be the minimum rank considered to be in S_j in Algorithm 1. Then we can remove all edges whose eliminator ranks are less than α from G, and the remaining graph will include all edges that we have to consider for graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_j$. This, by Lemma 3.1 prunes the degrees to $\widetilde{O}(\alpha^{-1})$ and helps reducing the running time. See Algorithm 3 and Lemma 6.6 for the details.

Step 4: Updating the final matching. Finally, recall that we run multiple instances of Lemma 6.1 to maintain a $(1+\varepsilon)$ approximate maximum matching of graph $M_0 \cup \ldots \cup M_{1/\varepsilon}$ which will include our final matching. Throughout the updates above, we keep track of all edges that leave/join these matchings and for each one of them we update this final matching via Lemma 6.1.

6.4 Correctness & Running Time of Update Algorithm

In this section, as the title describes, we prove the correctness of the update algorithm above and analyze its running time. Namely, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *The update algorithm of previous section correctly updates all data structures and the matching and its expected running time per update without amortization is $O(\Delta^{\varepsilon} \operatorname{polylog} n)$.*

Algorithm 3. Updating adjacency lists of $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$.

1 Let f be the original edge that was inserted/deleted from G and suppose that it changed matching M_0 (otherwise, vertex-sets of $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ will remain the same.)
2 Suppose that $f \in S_j$ (if f was deleted, $f \in S_j$ before deletion, and if inserted, $f \in S_j$ after it).
// Note that f has to be in M_0 to change it once updated. Thus it should belong to a set S_j.
3 If $j < 1/\varepsilon$ then let $\alpha \leftarrow \Delta^{-i\varepsilon}$, otherwise if $j = 1/\varepsilon$ let $\alpha \leftarrow 0$.
// α is the lower bound on edge ranks that get partitioned to S_j according to Algorithm 1.
4 **for** *any vertex v and any $i \in [1/\varepsilon]$ such that v joins the vertex set of G_i* **do**
// We can detect these vertices efficiently by only going through the changes found in Step 2 without exhaustively checking all vertices in the graph.
5 $L_v \leftarrow \{u \in N_0(v) \mid \pi_0(\text{elim}_{G_0,\pi_0}(uv)) \geq \alpha\}$
// Set L_v has size $\min\{\Delta, O(\alpha^{-1} \log n)\}$ by Lemma 3.1 and can be constructed in time $\widetilde{O}(|L_v|)$ since all edges in $N_0(v)$ are already indexed by their eliminator ranks.
6 **for** *any neighbor $u \in L_v$ of v* **do**
7 **if** $(v \in V_i'^A$ *and* $u \in U_i^A)$ *or* $(v \in V_i'^B$ *and* $u \in U_i^B)$ *or* $(u \in V_i'^A$ *and* $v \in U_i^A)$ *or* $(u \in V_i'^B$ *and* $v \in U_i^B)$ **then**
8 Add u to $N_i(v)$ and v to $N_i(u)$.
9 Update matching M_i using Lemma 6.2 according to this edge insertion.
10 Update $k_i(\cdot)$ and $N_i(\cdot)$ as necessary by this edge insertion using Lemma 6.3.

Before that, let us show how we can actually turn this update-time to $O(\Delta^\varepsilon + \text{polylog}\, n)$ as claimed by Theorem 1. To do so, given ε, we consider a smaller value for ε, say $\varepsilon/2$. Then the update-time would be $O(\Delta^{\varepsilon/2} \,\text{polylog}\, n)$. Now if $\Delta^{\varepsilon/2} \gg \text{polylog}\, n$, then we already have $\Delta^{\varepsilon/2} \,\text{polylog}\, n \ll \Delta^\varepsilon$. Otherwise, Δ is polylogarithmic and the whole update-time is also polylogarithmic.

As another note, in Theorem 1 we state that the update-time is worst-case but Lemma 6.6 bounds the expected update-time. To turn this into a worst-case bound, we use the reduction of Bernstein *et al.* [8]. For the reduction to work, the crucial property is that the update-time bound should hold in expectation but without any amortization, as is the case here.

Proof of Lemma 6.6. It is easy to verify correctness of Steps 1, 2, and 4 which are actually quite fast and take only $\text{polylog}\, n$ time in total. We do provide the necessary details for these steps at the end of this proof. However, the main component of the update-algorithm is Step 3 which takes $O(\Delta^\varepsilon \,\text{polylog}\, n)$ time. We thus first focus on this step and analyze its running time and correctness.

As before, assume that edge f is updated. If matching M_0 does not change as a result of this update, then the vertex sets of all graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ will remain unchanged. However, if updating f changes M_0, then f should be in M_0 once in the graph. As in Algorithm 3, we assume $f \in S_j$ and let α be the minimum possible rank in S_j. By Claim 6.5, graphs $G_{j+1}, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$ remain unchanged. Also, one can confirm from Algorithm 1 that all edges in graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_j$ have eliminator rank of at least α in M_0. Thus, for any vertex v added to a graph G_i, the set L_v indeed includes all edges incident to v that may belong to G_i. Moreover, by Lemma 3.1 this set L_v has size at most $\min\{\Delta, O(\alpha^{-1} \log n)\}$ and that can be found in time $\widetilde{O}(|L_v|)$ since the neighbors of v in $N_0(v)$ are indexed by their eliminator-rank. The overall update-time required for Step 3 is thus

$$(\#\text{ of edges updated in } M_0) \times \min\left\{\Delta, O\left(\frac{\log n}{\alpha}\right)\right\}.$$

By Lemma 6.2, the number of edges that are updated in M_0 is w.h.p. bounded by $O(\log n)$. It remains to determine the expected value of the second factor in the running time above. Let us use $I_1, \ldots, I_{1/\varepsilon}$ to denote the interval of ranks considered by Algorithm 1. That is, $I_{1/\varepsilon} = [0, \Delta^{-1+\varepsilon}]$ and for any $i < 1/\varepsilon$, $I_i = (\Delta^{-i\varepsilon}, \Delta^{-(i-1)\varepsilon}]$. For edge f that is to be updated, probability that $\pi_0(f)$ is in the ith interval is upper bounded by $\Delta^{-(i-1)\varepsilon}$. Moreover, given that $\pi_0(f)$ is in the ith interval, then $\min\{\Delta, \alpha^{-1} \log n\}$ would be at most $\Delta^{i\varepsilon} \log n$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\min\left\{\Delta, O\left(\frac{\log n}{\alpha}\right)\right\}\right] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{1/\varepsilon} \Pr[\pi_0(f) \in I_i] \times \mathbb{E}\left[\min\left\{\Delta, O\left(\frac{\log n}{\alpha}\right)\right\} \,\middle|\, \pi_0(f) \in I_i\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{1/\varepsilon} \Delta^{-(i-1)\varepsilon} \times \Delta^{i\varepsilon} \log n \leq \Delta^{\varepsilon} \log n.\end{aligned}$$

This means that the overall update-time required for Step 3 is $O(\Delta^{\varepsilon} \operatorname{polylog} n)$.

Now, we focus on the other steps.

In Step 1, only matching M_0 as well as the data structures related to it are updated. These are correct and only take $\operatorname{polylog} n$ expected time by Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3.

In Step 2, we detect the updates to the vertex sets of $G_1, \ldots, G_{1/\varepsilon}$. This is done in Algorithm 2 by iterating over all vertices whose match-status in M_0 is changed and checking the conditions of Algorithm 1. By Observation 6.4, indeed any vertex who gets added/deleted from any graph G_i should have an incident edge in M_0 whose match-status in M_0 has changed. Therefore, we do discover all the updates. Moreover, for each vertex encountered we only spend $O(1)$ time in Algorithm 2 to detect which graph G_i it belongs to and there are w.h.p. only $O(\log n)$ such vertices who have an edge with an updated match-status in M_0 by Lemma 6.2. Thus, the total running time for Step 2 is $O(\log n)$.

Finally, in Step 4, we update the final matching. The graph here is composed of $O(1/\varepsilon)$ matchings and thus has maximum degree $O(1/\varepsilon)$. Therefore, each update by Lemma 6.1 takes $O(1/\varepsilon) = O(1)$ time. Moreover, an edge update to graph M_0 w.h.p. affects at most $O(\log n)$ edges by Lemma 6.2, each of these updated edges may lead to vertex insertions/deletions in each graph G_i. But these propagated vertex insertions/deletions also affect at most $O(\log n)$ edges in each of the graphs. Thus, the total number of edges that leave/join graph $M_1 \cup \ldots \cup M_{1/\varepsilon}$ is at most $O(\log^2 n)$, which is also the upper bound on the running time of Step 4. □

Acknowledgements

Soheil Behnezhad thanks Mahsa Derakhshan, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Cliff Stein and Madhu Sudan for their collaboration in [6] and Sepehr Assadi for many helpful discussions and pointers to the literature.

References

[1] Kook Jin Ahn, Graham Cormode, Sudipto Guha, Andrew McGregor, and Anthony Wirth. Correlation Clustering in Data Streams. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, pages 2237–2246, 2015.

[2] Moab Arar, Shiri Chechik, Sarel Cohen, Cliff Stein, and David Wajc. Dynamic Matching: Reducing Integral Algorithms to Approximately-Maximal Fractional Algorithms. In *45th In-*

ternational Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2018, July 9-13, 2018, Prague, Czech Republic, pages 7:1–7:16, 2018.

[3] Sepehr Assadi, Krzysztof Onak, Baruch Schieber, and Shay Solomon. Fully Dynamic Maximal Independent Set with Sublinear in n Update Time. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 1919–1936, 2019.

[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.

[5] Surender Baswana, Manoj Gupta, and Sandeep Sen. Fully Dynamic Maximal Matching in $O(\log n)$ Update Time (Corrected Version). *SIAM J. Comput.*, 47(3):617–650, 2018.

[6] Soheil Behnezhad, Mahsa Derakhshan, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Cliff Stein, and Madhu Sudan. Fully Dynamic Maximal Independent Set in Polylogarithmic Update Time. In *60th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, to appear.*

[7] Soheil Behnezhad, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, and David G. Harris. Exponentially Faster Massively Parallel Maximal Matching. In *60th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, to appear.*

[8] Aaron Bernstein, Sebastian Forster, and Monika Henzinger. A Deamortization Approach for Dynamic Spanner and Dynamic Maximal Matching. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 1899–1918, 2019.

[9] Aaron Bernstein and Cliff Stein. Fully Dynamic Matching in Bipartite Graphs. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 42nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, pages 167–179, 2015.

[10] Aaron Bernstein and Cliff Stein. Faster Fully Dynamic Matchings with Small Approximation Ratios. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*, pages 692–711, 2016.

[11] Sayan Bhattacharya, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, and Monika Henzinger. Deterministic Fully Dynamic Approximate Vertex Cover and Fractional Matching in $O(1)$ Amortized Update Time. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization - 19th International Conference, IPCO 2017, Waterloo, ON, Canada, June 26-28, 2017, Proceedings*, pages 86–98, 2017.

[12] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Giuseppe F. Italiano. Deterministic Fully Dynamic Data Structures for Vertex Cover and Matching. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 47(3):859–887, 2018.

[13] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Danupon Nanongkai. New Deterministic Approximation Algorithms For Fully Dynamic Matching. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016, Cambridge, MA, USA, June 18-21, 2016*, pages 398–411, 2016.

[14] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Danupon Nanongkai. New Deterministic Approximation Algorithms for Fully Dynamic Matching. *CoRR*, abs/1604.05765, 2016.

[15] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Danupon Nanongkai. Fully Dynamic Approximate Maximum Matching and Minimum Vertex Cover $O(\log^3 n)$ 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.

[16] Guy E. Blelloch, Jeremy T. Fineman, and Julian Shun. Greedy Sequential Maximal Independent Set and Matching are Parallel on Average. In *24th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures, SPAA '12, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, June 25-27, 2012*, pages 308–317, 2012.

[17] Moses Charikar and Shay Solomon. Fully Dynamic Almost-Maximal Matching: Breaking the Polynomial Worst-Case Time Barrier. In *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2018, July 9-13, 2018, Prague, Czech Republic*, pages 33:1–33:14, 2018.

[18] Mohsen Ghaffari, Themis Gouleakis, Christian Konrad, Slobodan Mitrovic, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Improved Massively Parallel Computation Algorithms for MIS, Matching, and Vertex Cover. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2018, Egham, United Kingdom, July 23-27, 2018*, pages 129–138, 2018.

[19] Manoj Gupta and Richard Peng. Fully Dynamic $(1 + \varepsilon)$-Approximate Matchings. In *54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2013, 26-29 October, 2013, Berkeley, CA, USA*, pages 548–557, 2013.

[20] Christian Konrad. A simple augmentation method for matchings with applications to streaming algorithms. In *43rd International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2018, August 27-31, 2018, Liverpool, UK*, pages 74:1–74:16, 2018.

[21] Christian Konrad, Frédéric Magniez, and Claire Mathieu. Maximum matching in semi-streaming with few passes. *CoRR*, abs/1112.0184, 2011.

[22] Christian Konrad, Frédéric Magniez, and Claire Mathieu. Maximum matching in semi-streaming with few passes. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques - 15th International Workshop, APPROX 2012, and 16th International Workshop, RANDOM 2012, Cambridge, MA, USA, August 15-17, 2012. Proceedings*, pages 231–242, 2012.

[23] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal. *Probability and computing - randomized algorithms and probabilistic analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

[24] Ofer Neiman and Shay Solomon. Simple deterministic algorithms for fully dynamic maximal matching. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC'13, Palo Alto, CA, USA, June 1-4, 2013*, pages 745–754, 2013.

[25] Krzysztof Onak and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Maintaining a large matching and a small vertex cover. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, pages 457–464, 2010.

[26] Shay Solomon. Fully Dynamic Maximal Matching in Constant Update Time. In *IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2016, 9-11 October 2016, Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA*, pages 325–334, 2016.

A Greedy Matching Size under Vertex Sampling

In this section, we prove Lemma 5.2 by extending the ideas presented in [21].

Proof. Consider the following equivalent process of constructing $\mathsf{Greedy}(G[W \cup U], \pi)$ that gradually reveals the subsample W of V: We initialize matching $M \leftarrow \emptyset$, initially mark each vertex as *alive*, and then iterate over the edges in E in the order of π. Upon visiting an edge vu with $v \in V$ and $u \in U$, if either v or u is *dead* (i.e., not alive) we discard vu. Otherwise, we call vu a *potential-match* and then reveal whether v belongs to W by drawing an p-Bernoulli random variable. If $v \notin W$, no edge connected to v can be added to M, thus we mark v as dead and discard vu. If $v \in W$, we add vu to M and then mark both v and u as dead as they cannot be matched anymore. One can confirm that at the end of this process, M is precisely equivalent to matching $\mathsf{Greedy}(G[W \cup U], \pi)$.

Let us fix an infinite tape of independent p-Bernoulli random variables $\vec{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots)$ and use it in the following way: Once we encounter the i'th potential-match edge vu whose vertex v is matched in matching M (this is the matching in the statement of lemma, not to be confused with the greedy matching M' we are constructing), we use the value of x_i as the indicator of the event $v \in W$. Observe that if $x_i = 1$, then this edge uv will be added to M'. Moreover, define $X := \sum_{i=1}^{D} x_i$ to be the number of 1's in the tape that we encounter by the end of process. (Here D is the upper bound on the number of times that we reveal a random variable from the tape.) One can confirm that X is precisely the number of vertices in the V-side of M that are matched in M': The precise quantity that lemma requires the lower bound for.

Since each variable x_i is 1 independently with probability p, we expect X to be pD. However, note that the value of D itself is a random variable depending on the randomizations revealed. Nonetheless, since D is a stopping time for the process, we can use Wald's equation [23] to argue that the expected value of X is indeed at least $p\mathbb{E}[D]$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}[D] \geq (|M| - 2p|V|)$ to prove $\mathbb{E}[X] \geq p(|M| - 2p|V|)$ as required by the lemma.

To see why $\mathbb{E}[D]$ is this large, observe that for any vertex $v \in V$ that is matched in M say via edge vu, we will encounter a potential-match edge unless u is matched to another vertex. However, since each vertex in V is sampled into W with probability p, there are in expectation at most $p|V|$ vertices in W. Each such vertex can destroy at most two edges in M. For the rest of $|M| - 2p|V|$ edges, we encounter at least a potential-match edge for which we reveal a random variable of the tape. Thus $\mathbb{E}[D] \geq |M| - p|V|$ and $\mathbb{E}[X] \geq p(|M| - 2p|V|)$ as desired. □

B Missing Proofs

Proof of Lemma 6.3. Updating k_i is easy. If for a vertex v, $k_i(v)$ has to be updated, then an edge incident to it must be in L. On the other hand, there are at most two edges connected to each vertex in L: At most one edge incident to it can join the matching and at most one was in it to leave. Therefore, by simply iterating over the edges in L, we can update $k_i(v)$ of any vertex necessary. This takes $O(|L|)$ time, which by Lemma 6.2 is w.h.p. bounded by $O(\log n)$.

Updating N_i is more tricky. If an edge joins the matching, it can now become the eliminator of many other edges and if the eliminator of an edge uv changes, we have to re-index u and v in each other's adjacency list $N_i(v)$. The crucial observation is that since the matching is constructed greedily, the matching on edges with rank in $[0, \pi_i(e))$ remains unchanged after inserting/deleting e. As a result, if the eliminator of an edge had rank in $[0, \pi_i(e))$, it remains to be its eliminator. Therefore, all the changes occur in the subgraph including edges with eliminator rank before the update was larger than $\pi_i(e)$. By Lemma 3.1 this graph has maximum degree $\min\{\Delta, O(\frac{\log n}{\pi_i(e)})\}$ w.h.p. Moreover, we can iterate over all neighbors g of any edge $f \in L$ with $\text{elim}_{G_i,\pi_i}(g) > \pi_i(e)$ in

time $\min\{\Delta, \frac{1}{\pi_i(e)}\}\operatorname{polylog} n$. Re-indexing each also takes at most time $O(\log \Delta)$. Thus, the overall time required is

$$|L| \times \mathbb{E}\left[\min\left\{\Delta, \frac{1}{\pi_i(e)}\right\}\operatorname{polylog} n\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\pi_i(e)\sim[0,1]}\left[\min\left\{\Delta, \frac{1}{\pi_i(e)}\right\}\right]\operatorname{polylog} n \quad \text{W.h.p. } |L| = O(\log n).$$
$$= O(\log \Delta) \times \operatorname{polylog} n = \operatorname{polylog} n,$$

completing the proof. □

Proof of Claim 6.5. Fix a graph G_k with $k > j$. We first prove no edge is removed from G_k after updating f. Take an edge uv that is in G_k. By Algorithm 1, one endpoint of this edge, say v w.l.o.g., should be matched in M_0 via an edge that belongs to S_k. The other endpoint u, is either unmatched in M_0 or matched via an edge ux where $ux \in S_\ell$ for some $\ell < k$. After the update, v remains to be matched to the same vertex u in M_0 for the following reason. Since $f \in S_j$, $uv \in S_k$, and $k > j$, then $\pi_0(f) > \pi_0(uv)$. As a result, since matching M_0 is constructed greedily by processing the edges in the increasing order of ranks, all the edges processed before f that are in the matching will remain in the matching no matter if f is in the graph or not, meaning that uv will remain in M_0. Moreover, even though edge ux may leave matching M_0, the edge to which u will be matched after the update (if any) will have rank at least $\pi_0(f)$. Thus u will remain in set U_k and as a result, the edge vu will remain in G_k.

A similar argument shows that any edge uv in G_k after the update, should have been in G_k before the update too. More precisely, if v is the part of edge uv that is matched in S_k after the update, then its matching edge in M_0 should have been in M_0 before the update too for precisely the same reason mentioned above. Moreover, no matter the update, if the other endpoint u is in set U_k after the update, it should have been in U_k before the update too. Implying that uv should have also been in G_k before the update.

Combination of the arguments of the two paragraphs above implies that graph G_k remains exactly the same after and before the update. □