

Near Optimal Parallel Algorithms for Dynamic DFS in Undirected Graphs *

Shahbaz Khan †‡

Abstract

Depth first search (DFS) tree is a fundamental data structure for solving various graph problems. The classical algorithm [47] for building a DFS tree requires $O(m + n)$ time for a given undirected graph G having n vertices and m edges. Recently, Baswana et al. [6] presented a simple algorithm for updating the DFS tree of an undirected graph after an edge/vertex update in $\tilde{O}(n)$ ¹ time. However, their algorithm is strictly sequential. We present an algorithm achieving similar bounds that can be easily adopted to the parallel environment.

In the parallel environment, a DFS tree can be computed from scratch using $O(m)$ processors in expected $\tilde{O}(1)$ time [2] on an EREW PRAM, whereas the best deterministic algorithm takes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ time [2, 22] on a CRCW PRAM. Our algorithm can be used to develop optimal time (upto $\text{poly log } n$ factors) deterministic parallel algorithms for maintaining fully dynamic DFS and fault tolerant DFS of an undirected graph.

1. *Parallel Fully Dynamic DFS:*

Given an arbitrary online sequence of vertex or edge updates, we can maintain a DFS tree of an undirected graph in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time per update using m processors on an EREW PRAM.

2. *Parallel Fault tolerant DFS:*

An undirected graph can be preprocessed to build a data structure of size $O(m)$, such that for any set of k updates (where k is constant) in the graph, a DFS tree of the updated graph can be computed in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM. For constant k , this is also work optimal (upto $\text{poly log } n$ factors).

Moreover, our fully dynamic DFS algorithm provides, in a seamless manner, nearly optimal (upto $\text{poly log } n$ factors) algorithms for maintaining a DFS tree in the semi-streaming environment and a restricted distributed model. These are the first parallel, semi-streaming and distributed algorithms for maintaining a DFS tree in the dynamic setting.

1 Introduction

Depth First Search (DFS) is a well known graph traversal technique. Right from the seminal work of Tarjan [47], DFS traversal has played a central role in the design of efficient algorithms for many fundamental graph problems, namely, strongly connected components, topological sorting [49], dominators in directed graph [48], edge and vertex connectivity [16] etc.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected connected graph having n vertices and m edges. The DFS traversal of G starting from any vertex $r \in V$ produces a spanning tree rooted at r called a DFS tree, in $O(m + n)$ time. For any rooted spanning tree of G , a non-tree edge of the graph is called a *back edge* if one of its endpoints is an ancestor of the other in the tree. Otherwise, it is called a *cross*

*The preliminary version of this paper have been accepted to appear at SPAA 2017

†Dept. of CSE, IIT Kanpur, India, email: shahbazk@cse.iitk.ac.in

‡This research work was supported by Google India under the Google India PhD Fellowship Award.

¹ $\tilde{O}()$ hides the poly-logarithmic factors.

edge. A necessary and sufficient condition for any rooted spanning tree to be a DFS tree is that every non-tree edge is a back edge. Thus, many DFS trees are possible for any given graph from a given root r . However, if the traversal is performed strictly according to the order of edges in the adjacency lists of the graph, the resulting DFS tree will be unique. Ordered DFS tree problem is to compute the order in which the vertices are visited by this unique DFS traversal.

An algorithmic graph problem is modeled in a dynamic environment as follows. There is an online sequence of updates on the graph, and the objective is to update the solution of the problem efficiently after each update. In particular, the time taken to update the solution has to be much smaller than that of the best static algorithm for the problem. A dynamic graph algorithm is said to be *fully dynamic* if it handles both insertion and deletion updates, otherwise it is called *partially dynamic*. Another, and more restricted, variant of a dynamic environment is the fault tolerant environment. Here the aim is to build a compact data structure, for a given problem, that is resilient to failures of vertices/edges and can efficiently report the solution after a given set of failures.

Recently, Baswana et al. [6, 7] presented a fully dynamic algorithm for maintaining a DFS tree of an undirected graph in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{mn})$ time per update. They also presented an algorithm for updating the DFS tree after a single update in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time. Prior to this work, only partially dynamic algorithms were known for maintaining a DFS tree [8, 9, 19].

Now, major applications of dynamic graphs in the real world involve a huge amount of data, which makes recomputing the solution after every update infeasible. Due to this large size of data, it also becomes impractical for solving such problems on a single sequential machine because of both memory and computation costs involved. Thus, it becomes more significant to explore these dynamic graph problems on a computation model that efficiently handles large storage and computations involved. In the past three decades a lot of work has been done to address dynamic graph problems in parallel [10, 18, 37, 42, 44], semi-streaming [3, 4, 23, 26, 35], and distributed (also called dynamic networks) [5, 28, 30, 33, 46] environments.

In this paper, we address the problem of maintaining dynamic DFS tree efficiently in the parallel environment and demonstrate its applications in semi-streaming and distributed environments.

1.1 Existing results

In spite of the simplicity of a DFS tree, designing efficient parallel, distributed or streaming algorithms for a DFS tree has turned out to be quite challenging. Reif [39] showed that the ordered DFS tree problem is a P -Complete problem. For many years, this result seemed to imply that the general DFS tree problem, that is, the computation of any DFS tree of the graph is also inherently sequential. However, Aggarwal et al. [1, 2] proved that the general DFS tree problem is in RNC ² by designing a randomized EREW PRAM³ algorithm that takes $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. But the fastest deterministic algorithm for computing general DFS tree in parallel still takes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ time [2, 22] in CRCW PRAM⁴, even for undirected graphs. Moreover, the general DFS tree problem has been shown to be in NC for some special graphs including DAGs [21, 52] and planar graphs [24, 29, 45] (see [20] for a survey). In fact for random graphs in $G(n, p)$ model⁵ [15], Dyer and Frieze [14] proved that even ordered DFS tree problem is in RNC . Whether general DFS tree problem is in NC is still a long standing open problem.

² NC is the class of problems solvable using $O(n^{c_1})$ processors in parallel in $O(\log^{c_2} n)$ time, for any constants c_1 and c_2 . The class RNC extends NC to allow access to randomness.

³Exclusive Read Exclusive Write (EREW) restricts any two processors to simultaneously read or write the same memory cell. Concurrent Read Concurrent Write (CRCW) does not have this restriction.

⁴It essentially shows DFS to be NC equivalent of minimum-weight perfect matching, which is in RNC whereas its best deterministic algorithm requires $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ time.

⁵ $G(n, p)$ denotes a random graph where every edge of the graph exists independently with probability p .

In the semi-streaming environment, the input graph is accessed in the form of a stream of graph edges, where the algorithm is allowed only $O(n)$ local space. The DFS tree can be trivially computed using $O(n)$ passes over the input graph in the semi-streaming environment, each pass adding one vertex to the DFS tree. However, computing the DFS tree in $\tilde{O}(1)$ passes is considered hard [17]. To the best of our knowledge, it remains an open problem to compute the DFS tree using even $o(n)$ passes in any relaxed streaming environment [36, 40].

Computing a DFS tree in a distributed setting was widely studied in 1980's and 1990's. A DFS tree of the given graph can be computed in $O(n)$ rounds, with various trade offs of number of messages passed and size of each message. If the size of a message is allowed to be $O(n)$, the DFS tree can be built using $O(n)$ messages [31, 34, 43]. However, if the size of a message is limited to $\tilde{O}(1)$, the number of messages required is $O(m)$ [11, 32, 51].

Thus, to maintain a DFS tree in dynamic setting, each update requires $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ time on a CRCW PRAM in deterministic parallel setting, $O(n)$ passes in the semi-streaming setting and $O(n)$ rounds in the distributed setting, which is very inefficient. Hence, exploring the dynamic maintenance of a DFS tree in parallel, semi-streaming and distributed environments seems to be a long neglected problem of practical significance.

We present optimal algorithms (up to *poly* $\log n$ factors) for maintaining a fully dynamic DFS tree for an undirected graph under both edge and vertex updates on these models.

1.2 Our Results

We consider an extended notion of updates wherein an update could be either insertion/deletion of a vertex or insertion/deletion of an edge. Furthermore, an inserted vertex can be added with any set of incident edges to the graph.

In the parallel setting, our main result can be succinctly described as follows.

Theorem 1. *Given an undirected graph and its DFS tree, it can be preprocessed to build a data structure of size $O(m)$ in $O(\log n)$ time using m processors on an EREW PRAM such that for any update in the graph, a DFS tree of the updated graph can be computed in $O(\log^3 n)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM.*

With this result at the core, we easily obtain the following results.

1. Parallel Fully Dynamic DFS:

Given any arbitrary online sequence of vertex or edge updates, we can maintain a DFS tree of an undirected graph in $O(\log^3 n)$ time per update using m processors on an EREW PRAM.

2. Parallel Fault tolerant DFS:

An undirected graph can be preprocessed to build a data structure of size $O(m)$ such that for any set of $k (\leq \log n)$ updates in the graph, a DFS tree of the updated graph can be computed in $O(k \log^{2k+1} n)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM.

Our fully dynamic algorithm and fault tolerant algorithm (for constant k), clearly take optimal time (up to *poly* $\log n$ factors) for maintaining a DFS tree. Our fault tolerant algorithm (for constant k) is also work optimal (upto *poly* $\log n$ factors) since a single update can lead to $\Theta(n)$ changes in the DFS tree. Moreover, our result also establishes that maintaining a fully dynamic DFS tree for an undirected graph is in NC (which is still an open problem for DFS tree in the static setting).

1.3 Applications of Parallel Fully Dynamic DFS

Our parallel fully dynamic DFS algorithm can be seamlessly adapted to the semi-streaming and distributed environments as follows.

1. *Semi-streaming Fully Dynamic DFS:*

Given any arbitrary online sequence of vertex or edge updates, we can maintain a DFS tree of an undirected graph using $O(\log^2 n)$ passes over the input graph per update by a semi-streaming algorithm using $O(n)$ space.

2. *Distributed Fully Dynamic DFS:*

Given any arbitrary online sequence of vertex or edge updates, we can maintain a DFS tree of an undirected graph in $O(D \log^2 n)$ rounds per update in the synchronous $\text{CONGEST}(n/D)$ model ⁶ using $O(nD \log^2 n + m)$ messages of size $O(n/D)$ requiring $O(n)$ space on each processor, where D is diameter of the graph.

Our semi-streaming algorithm clearly takes optimal number of passes (up to *poly log n* factors) for maintaining a DFS tree. Our distributed algorithm that works in a restricted $\text{CONGEST}(B)$ model, also arguably requires optimal rounds (up to *poly log n* factors) because it requires $\Omega(D)$ rounds to propagate the information of the update throughout the graph. Since almost the whole DFS tree may need to be updated due to a single update in the graph, every algorithm for maintaining a DFS tree in the distributed setting will require $\Omega(D)$ rounds ⁷. This essentially improves the state of the art for the classes of graphs with $o(n)$ diameter.

1.4 Overview

We now describe a brief overview of our result. Baswana et al. [6] proved that updating a DFS tree after any update in the graph is equivalent to *rerooting* disjoint subtrees of the DFS tree. They also presented an algorithm to reroot a DFS tree T (or its subtree), originally rooted at r to a new root r' , in $\tilde{O}(n)$ time. It starts the traversal from r' traversing the path connecting r' to r in T . Now, the subtrees hanging from this path are essentially the components of the *unvisited graph* (the subgraph induced by the unvisited vertices of the graph) due to the absence of *cross edges*. In the updated DFS tree, every such subtree, say τ , shall hang from an edge emanating from τ to the path from r' to r . Let this edge be (x, y) , where $x \in \tau$. Thus, we need to recursively reroot τ to the new root x and hang it from (x, y) in the updated DFS tree. Note that this rerooting can be independently performed for different subtrees hanging from tree path from r' to r .

At the core of their result, they use a property of the DFS tree, that they called *components* property, to find the edge (x, y) efficiently, using a data structure \mathcal{D}_0 . However, as evident from the discussion above, their rerooting procedure can be strictly sequential in the worst case. This is because the size of a subtree τ to be rerooted can be almost equal to that of the original tree T . As a result, $O(n)$ sequential reroots may be required in the worst case. Our main contribution is an algorithm that performs this rerooting efficiently in parallel.

Our algorithm ensures that rerooting is completed in $\tilde{O}(1)$ steps as follows. At any point of time, we ensure that every component c of the *unvisited graph* is either of type *C1*, having a single subtree of T , or of type *C2*, having a path p_c and a set of subtrees of T having edges to p_c . Note that in [6] every component of the unvisited graph is of type *C1*. We define three types of traversals, namely, *path halving* (also used by [6]), *disintegrating traversal* and *disconnecting traversal*. We prove that using a combination of $O(1)$ such traversals, for every component c of the unvisited graph, either the length of p_c is halved or the size of largest subtree in c is halved. Moreover, these traversals can be performed in $O(\log n)$ time on $|c|$ processors using the *components* property and

⁶ $\text{CONGEST}(B)$ model is the standard CONGEST model [38] where message size is relaxed to B words.

⁷For an algorithm maintaining the whole DFS tree at each node, even our message size is optimal. This is because an update of size $O(n)$ (vertex insertion with arbitrary set of edges) will have to be propagated throughout the network in the worst case. In $O(D)$ rounds, it can only be propagated using messages of size $\Omega(n/D)$. (see Section 6.2 for details).

a data structure \mathcal{D} (answering similar queries as \mathcal{D}_0). However, since our algorithm ensures that each vertex is queried by \mathcal{D} only $\tilde{O}(1)$ times (unlike [6]), our data structure \mathcal{D} is much simpler than \mathcal{D}_0 .

Furthermore, both our algorithm and the algorithm by [6] use the non-tree edges of the graph only to answer queries on data structure \mathcal{D} (or \mathcal{D}_0). The remaining operations (except for queries on \mathcal{D}) required by our algorithm can be performed using only edges of T in $O(n)$ space. As a result, our algorithm being efficient in parallel setting (unlike [6]), can also be adapted to the semi-streaming and distributed model as follows. In the semi-streaming model, the passes over the input graph are used only to answer the queries on \mathcal{D} , where the parallel queries on \mathcal{D} made by our algorithm can be answered simultaneously using a single pass. Our distributed algorithm only needs to store the current DFS tree at each node and the adjacency list of the corresponding vertex abiding the restriction of $O(n)$ space at each node. Again, the distributed computation is only used to answer queries on \mathcal{D} .

2 Preliminaries

Let $G = (V, E)$ be any given undirected graph on $n = |V|$ vertices and $m = |E|$ edges. The following notations will be used throughout the paper.

- $par(w)$: Parent of w in T .
- $T(x)$: The subtree of T rooted at vertex x .
- $path(x, y)$: Path from vertex x to vertex y in T .
- $LCA(x, y)$: Lowest common ancestor of x and y in T .
- $root(T')$: Root of a subtree T' of T , i.e., $root(T(x)) = x$.
- T^* : The DFS tree computed by our algorithm for the updated graph.

A subtree T' is said to be *hanging* from a path p if the $root(T')$ is a child of some vertex on the path p and does not belong to the path p . Unless stated otherwise, a component refers to a connected component of the unvisited graph. We refer to a path p in a DFS tree T as an *ancestor-descendant* path if one of its endpoints is an ancestor of the other in T .

For our distributed algorithm, we use the synchronous *CONGEST(B)* model [38]. For the dynamic setting, Henzinger et al. [25] presented a model that has a *preprocessing* stage followed by an alternating sequence of non-overlapping stages for *update* and *recovery* (see Section 6.2 for details). We use this model with an additional constraint of space restriction of $O(n)$ size at each node. In the absence of this restriction, the whole graph can be stored at each node, where an algorithm can trivially propagate the update to each node and the updated solution can be computed locally. Also, we allow the deletion updates to be *abrupt*, i.e., the deleted link/node becomes unavailable for use instantly after the update.

In order to handle disconnected graphs, we add a dummy vertex r to the graph and connect it to all the vertices. Our algorithm maintains a DFS tree rooted at r in this augmented graph, where each child subtree of r is a DFS tree of a connected component in the DFS forest of the original graph.

We shall now define some queries that are performed by our algorithm on the data structure \mathcal{D} (similar queries on \mathcal{D}_0 also used in [6]). Let $v, w, x, y \in V$, where $path(x, y)$ and $path(v, w)$ (if required) are ancestor-descendant paths in T . Also, no vertex in $path(v, w)$ is a descendant of any vertex in $path(x, y)$. We define the following queries.

1. $Query(w, path(x, y))$: among all the edges from w that are incident on $path(x, y)$ in G , return an edge that is incident nearest to x on $path(x, y)$.
2. $Query(T(w), path(x, y))$: among all the edges from $T(w)$ that are incident on $path(x, y)$ in G , return an edge that is incident nearest to x on $path(x, y)$.
3. $Query(path(v, w), path(x, y))$: among all the edges from $path(v, w)$ that are incident on $path(x, y)$ in G , return an edge that is incident nearest to x on $path(x, y)$.

Let the *descendant* vertices of the three queries described above be w , $T(w)$ and $path(v, w)$ respectively. A set of queries on the data structure \mathcal{D} are called *independent* if the *descendant* vertices of these queries are disjoint.

Baswana et al. [6] described the *components* property of a DFS tree as follows.




Figure 1: Edges e'_1 and e'_2 can be ignored during the DFS traversal (reproduced from [7]).

Lemma 1 (Components Property [6]). *Let T^* be the partially built DFS tree and v be the vertex currently being visited. Let C_1, \dots, C_k be the connected components of the subgraph induced by the unvisited vertices. For any two edges e_i and e'_i from C_i that are incident respectively on v and some ancestor (not necessarily proper) w of v in T^* , it is sufficient to consider only e_i during the DFS traversal, i.e., the edge e'_i can be safely ignored.*

Ignoring e'_i during the DFS traversal, as stated in the components property, is justified because e'_i will appear as a back edge in the resulting DFS tree (refer to Figure 1). The edge e_i can be found by querying the data structure \mathcal{D} (or \mathcal{D}_0 in [6]). The DFS tree is then updated after any update in the graph by reducing it to *rerooting* disjoint subtrees of the DFS tree using the components property. Rerooting a subtree $T(v)$ at a new root $r' \in T(v)$ involves restructuring the tree $T(v)$ to be now rooted at r' such that the new tree is also a DFS tree of the subgraph induced by $T(v)$. This reduction will henceforth be referred as the *reduction* algorithm and is described in the following section.

3 Reduction Algorithm

We now describe how updating a DFS tree after any kind of update in the graph is equivalent to a simple procedure, i.e., *rerooting* disjoint subtrees of the DFS tree. Note that similar reduction was also used by Baswana et al. [6] but we describe it here for the sake of completeness as follows (see Figure 2).

1. **Deletion of an edge (u, v) :**

If (u, v) is a back edge in T , simply delete it from the graph. Otherwise, let $u = par(v)$ in




Figure 2: Updating the DFS tree after a single update: (i) deletion of an edge, (ii) insertion of an edge, (iii) deletion of a vertex, and (iv) insertion of a vertex. The algorithm reroots the marked subtrees (marked in violet) and hangs it from the inserted edge (in case of insertion) or the lowest edge (in case of deletion) on the marked path (marked in blue) from the marked subtree. (reproduced from [6])

T . The algorithm finds the lowest edge (u', v') on the $path(u, r)$ from $T(v)$, where $v' \in T(v)$. The subtree $T(v)$ can then be rerooted to the new root v' and hanged from u' using (u', v') to get the final tree T^* .

2. Insertion of an edge (u, v) :

In case (u, v) is a back edge, simply insert it in the graph. Otherwise, let w be the LCA of u and v in T and v' be the child of w such that $v \in T(v')$. The subtree $T(v')$ can then be rerooted to the new root v and hanged from u using (u, v) to get the final tree T^* .

3. Deletion of a vertex u :

Let v_1, \dots, v_c be the children of u in T . For each subtree $T(v_i)$, the algorithm finds the lowest edge (u'_i, v'_i) on the $path(par(u), r)$ from $T(v_i)$, where $v'_i \in T(v_i)$. Each subtree $T(v_i)$ can then be rerooted to the new root v'_i and hanged from u'_i using (u'_i, v'_i) to get the final tree T^* .

4. Insertion of a vertex u :

Let v_1, \dots, v_c be the neighbors of u in the graph. Arbitrarily choose a neighbor v_j and make u the child of v_j in T^* . For each v_i , such that $v_i \notin path(v_j, r)$, let $T(v'_i)$ be the subtree hanging from $path(v_j, r)$ such that $v_i \in T(v'_i)$. Each subtree $T(v'_i)$ can then be rerooted to the new root v_i and hanged from u using (u, v_i) to get the final tree T^* .

In case of a vertex update, multiple subtrees may be required to be rerooted by the algorithm. Let these subtrees be T_1, \dots, T_c . Notice that each of these subtrees can be rerooted independent of each other, and hence in parallel. However, in order to perform the *reduction* algorithm efficiently in parallel, we require a structure to answer the following queries efficiently in parallel. (a) Finding LCA of two vertices in T . (b) Finding the highest edge from a subtree $T(v)$ to a path in T (a query on data structure \mathcal{D}). In addition to these we also require several other types of queries to be efficiently answered in parallel setting as testing if an edge is back edge, finding vertices on a path, child subtree of a vertex containing a given vertex etc. However, these can easily be answered using LCA queries as described in Section 5.1. Thus, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Given an undirected graph G and its DFS tree T , any graph update can be reduced to independently rerooting disjoint subtrees of T by performing $O(1)$ sets of independent queries on the data structure \mathcal{D} and $O(1)$ sets of LCA queries on T , where each set has at most n queries.*

Remark. *The implementation of reduction algorithm is simpler in distributed and semi-streaming environments, where any operation on the DFS tree T can be performed locally without any distributed computation or passes over the input graph respectively. Hence, for these environments the reduction algorithm requires only $O(1)$ sets of independent queries on the data structure \mathcal{D} .*

4 Rerooting a DFS tree

We now describe the algorithm to reroot a subtree $T(r_0)$ of the DFS tree T , from its original root r_0 to the new root r^* . Also, let the data structure \mathcal{D} be built on T (see Section 2). Also, we maintain the following invariant: at any moment of the algorithm, every component c of the unvisited graph can be of the following two types:

C1: Consists of a single subtree τ_c of the DFS tree T .

C2: Consists of a single *ancestor-descendant* path p_c and a set \mathcal{T}_c of subtrees of the DFS tree T having at least one edge to p_c . Note that for any $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}_c$, there is no edge between τ_1 and τ_2 since T is a DFS tree.

Moreover, for every component c we also have a vertex $r_c \in c$ from which the DFS tree of the component c would be rooted in the final DFS tree T^* .

The algorithm is divided into $\log n$ phases, where each phase is further divided into $\log n$ stages. At the end of phase \mathcal{P}_i , every subtree of any component c (τ_c or subtrees in \mathcal{T}_c) has at most $n/2^i$ vertices. During phase \mathcal{P}_i , every component has at least one *heavy* subtree (having $> n/2^i$ vertices). If no such tree exists, we move the component to the next phase. We denote the set of these heavy subtrees by \mathbb{T}_c . For notational convenience, we refer to the heaviest subtree of every component c as τ_c , even for components of type C2. Hence, for any component of type C1 or C2, we have $\tau_c \in \mathbb{T}_c$. Clearly the algorithm ends after $\log n$ phases as every component of the unvisited graph would be empty.

At the end of stage \mathcal{S}_j of a phase, the length of p_c in each component c is at most $n/2^j$. If $|p_c| \leq n/2^j$, we move the component c to the next stage. Further, for any component c of type C1, the value of $|p_c|$ is zero, so we move such components to the last stage of the phase, i.e., $\mathcal{S}_{\log n}$. Clearly at the end of $\log n$ stages, each component would be of type C1.

In the beginning of the algorithm, we have the component induced by $T(r_0)$ of type C1 where $r_c = r^*$. Note that during each stage, different connected components of the unvisited graph can be processed independent of each other in parallel.

Algorithm

We now describe how a component c in phase \mathcal{P}_i and stage \mathcal{S}_j is traversed by our algorithm. The aim is to build a partial DFS tree for the component c rooted at r_c , that can be attached to the partially built DFS tree T^* of the updated graph. Note that this has to be performed in such a manner that every component of the unvisited part of c is of type C1 or C2 only.

Now, in order to move to the next phase, we need to ensure that for every component c' of the unvisited part of c , $|\tau_{c'}| \leq n/2^i$. As described above, after $\log n$ stages every component c' is of type C1. Thus, we perform a *disintegrating traversal* of τ_c which ensures that every component of the unvisited part of c can be moved to the next phase.




Figure 3: The three easier types of traversals shown in blue dotted lines, (a) Disintegrating traversal, (b) Path Halving and (c) Disconnecting traversal.

During \mathcal{S}_j , in order to move to the next stage, we need to ensure that for every component c' of the unvisited part of c , either $|p_{c'}| \leq n/2^j$ (moving it to next stage) or $|\tau_{c'}| \leq n/2^i$ (moving it to next phase). The component is processed based on the location of r_c in c as follows. If $r_c \in p_c$, we perform *path halving* which ensures the components move to the next stage. If $r_c \in \tau \notin \mathbb{T}_c$, we perform a *disconnecting traversal* of τ followed by *path halving* of p_c such that the unvisited components of τ are no longer connected to residual part of p_c , moving them to the next phase. The remaining components of c moves to the next stage due to path halving.

We shall refer to disintegrating traversal, path halving and disconnecting traversal as the *simpler* traversals. The difficult case is when $r_c \in \tau \in \mathbb{T}_c$. Here, some trivial cases can be directly processed by the *simpler* traversals mentioned above. For the remaining cases we perform *heavy subtree traversal* of τ which shall ensure that the unvisited part of c reduces to those requiring *simpler* traversals. Refer to Procedure Reroot-DFS in Appendix A for the pseudo-code of the main algorithm.

We now describe the different types of traversals in detail. For any component c , we refer to the smallest subtree of $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_c$ that has more than $n/2^i$ vertices as $T(v_H)$. Since $n/2^{i-1} \geq |\tau| > n/2^i$, v_H is unique. Also, let $r' = \text{root}(\tau)$ (if $r_c \in \tau$) and $v_l = \text{LCA}(r_c, v_H)$.

4.1 Disintegrating Traversal

Consider a component c of type C1 with new root $r_c \in \tau_c$ in phase \mathcal{P}_i ($n/2^i < |\tau_c| \leq n/2^{i-1}$). We first find the vertex v_H . We then traverse along the tree path $\text{path}(r_c, v_H)$, adding it to T^* (see Figure 3 (a)). Now, the unvisited part of c consists of $\text{path}(\text{par}(v_l), r')$ (say p) and the subtrees hanging from $\text{path}(r_c, r')$ and $\text{path}(v_l, v_H)$. Notice that p is an ancestor-descendant path of T and each subtree not having an edge to p corresponds to a separate component of type C1. The path p and the remaining subtrees (having an edge to p) form a component of type C2. For each component c^* , we also need to find the new root r_{c^*} for the updated DFS tree of the component. Using the components property, we know r_{c^*} has the lowest edge from c^* on the path p^* , where p^* is the newly attached path to T^* described above. Both these queries (finding an edge to p and the lowest edge on p^*) can be answered by our data structure \mathcal{D} (see Section 2). Thus, every component c^* can be identified and moved to next phase. Refer to Procedure DisInt-DFS in Appendix A for the pseudo code.

Remark. If $r_c = r'$, this traversal can also be performed on a subtree from a component c of type

C2 achieving similar result. This is possible because no new path p would be formed and we still get components of type C1 and C2 (being connected to a single path p_c).

4.2 Path Halving

Consider a component of type C2 with $r_c \in p_c = \text{path}(x, y)$. We first find the farther end of p_c , say x , where $|\text{path}(r_c, x)| \geq |\text{path}(r_c, y)|$. We then traverse from r_c to x adding $\text{path}(r_c, x)$ to the tree T^* (see Figure 3 (b)). The component c' of type C2 thus formed will have $p_{c'}$ of length at most half of p_c . Now, the subtrees in c having an edge to $p_{c'}$ would be a part of c' . The remaining subtrees would form individual components of type C1. Again, the new root of each component can be found using \mathcal{D} by querying for the lowest edge on the $\text{path}(r_c, x)$ added to T^* . Refer to Procedure Path-Halving-DFS in Appendix A for the pseudo code.

4.3 Disconnecting Traversal

Consider a component of type C2 with $r_c \in \tau$, where $\tau \notin \mathbb{T}_c$. We traverse τ from r_c to reach p_c , which is then followed by path halving of p_c . The goal is to ensure that the unvisited part of τ is not connected to the unvisited part of p_c (say p') after path halving, moving it to the next phase. The remaining subtrees of c with p' will move to the next stage as a result of path halving of p_c .

Now, if at least one edge from τ is present on the upper half of p_c , we find the highest edge from τ to p_c (see Figure 3 (c)). Otherwise, we find the lowest edge from τ to p_c . Let it be (x, y) , where $y \in p_c$ and $x \in \tau$. This ensures that on entering p_c through y , path halving would ensure that all the edges from τ to p_c are incident on the traversed part of p_c (say p).

We perform the traversal from r_c to x similar to the *disintegrating traversal* along $\text{path}(r_c, x)$, attaching it to T^* . Since none of the components of unvisited part of τ are connected to p' , all the components formed would be of type C1 or C2 as described in Section 4.1. However, while finding the new root of each resulting component c' , we also need to consider the lowest edge from the component on p . Further, since $\tau \notin \mathbb{T}_c$, size of each subtree in the resulting components is at most $n/2^i$. Thus, the resultant components of τ are moved to the next phase (see Procedure DisCon-DFS in Appendix A for pseudo code).

Remark. *If $r_c \in T(v_H)$, this traversal can also be performed on a $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_c$ getting a similar result. This is because each subtree in resultant components of τ will have size at most $n/2^i$ moving it to the next phase. However, if $r_c \notin T(v_H)$ the resultant component c' of type C2 formed can have a heavy subtree and a path $p_{c'}$ of arbitrary length. This is not permitted as it will move the component to some earlier stage in the same phase.*

4.4 Heavy Subtree Traversal

Consider a component c of type C2 with $r_c \in \tau$, where $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_c$. As described earlier, if $r_c = \text{root}(\tau)$ or $r_c \in T(v_H)$, the heavy subtree τ can be processed using disintegrating or disconnecting traversals respectively. Otherwise, we traverse it using one of three scenarios. Our algorithm checks each scenario in turn for its applicability to τ , eventually choosing a scenario to perform an l, p or r traversal (see Figure 4). This traversal ensures that it is followed by a *simpler* traversal described earlier, so that each component will either move to the next phase or the next stage. We shall also prove that these scenarios are indeed exhaustive, i.e., for any τ , one of the scenarios is indeed applicable ensuring that each component moves to the next stage/phase. The following lemma describes the conditions when a scenario is applicable.

Lemma 2 (Applicability Lemma). *After a traversal of path p^* in a subtree $\tau \in \mathbb{T}_c$, every component of unvisited part of c can be moved to the next phase/stage using a simpler traversal if*

path (p_L^* , p_P^* or p_R^*) with an edge to p_c as *eligible* subtrees. In each scenario we ensure \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 by construction, implying that the scenario will not be applicable only if the third condition is violated. Thus, we only need to find the lowest edge on traversed path from the *eligible* subtrees, to determine the applicability of a scenario. Also, the edges (x_p, y_p) and (x_r, y_r) are chosen in such a way that if l and p traversals are not applicable, then r traversal always satisfies *applicability* lemma, with the lowest edge from component containing p_c being (x_d, y_d) , where $x_d \in \tau_d \neq T(v_R)$.

Scenario 1: l traversal

Consider the traversal shown in Figure 4 (a), where $p_L^* = \text{path}(r_c, r')$. Since, this traversal does not create a new non-traversed path, the first two conditions of *applicability* lemma are satisfied. We find the lowest edge on p_L^* (highest edge on $\text{path}(r_c, r')$) from p_c and the *eligible* subtrees, say (x_1, y_1) , where $y_1 \in p_L^*$. In case this edge satisfies the third condition of *applicability* lemma, we perform the traversal otherwise move to the next scenario.

Remark. *This scenario is not applicable only if (x_1, y_1) is a back edge with $x_1 \in T(v_L)$ and $x_1 \notin T(v_H)$.*

Scenario 2: p traversal

Consider the traversal shown in Figure 4 (b), where $p_P^* = \text{path}(r_c, x_p) \cup (x_p, y_p) \cup \text{path}(y_p, \text{par}(v_l))$. To perform this traversal, we choose (x_p, y_p) along with (x_d, y_d) such that either p traversal is applicable, or r traversal is applicable using (x_d, y_d) . We now describe how such a choice of (x_p, y_p) and (x_d, y_d) can be made. Let τ_d and τ_p (if any), be the subtrees hanging from $\text{path}(v_L, v_H)$ containing x_d and x_p respectively.

Choice of (x_p, y_p) and (x_d, y_d)

We find the highest edge on $\text{path}(r_c, r')$ from the *eligible* subtrees hanging from p_L^* (except $T(v_L)$) and the *eligible* subtrees hanging from $\text{path}(v_L, v_H)$. This edge is stored as (x_d, y_d) , where $y_d \in \text{path}(r_c, r')$, is the edge to be used in Scenario 3. The corresponding subtree to which x_d belongs is τ_d . Next, we find the edge (x_p, y_p) , with $x_p \in T(v_L)$ and $y_p \in \text{path}(y_d, r')$, which has the lowest $LCA(x_p, v_H)$ on $\text{path}(v_L, v_H)$. However, if (x_d, y_d) does not exist, (x_p, y_p) is found by considering whole of $\text{path}(r_c, r')$ instead of $\text{path}(y_d, r')$. The existence of back edge (x_1, y_1) implies the following properties of the computed edges (x_p, y_p) and (x_d, y_d) .

Lemma 3. *The edge (x_p, y_p) , which is a back edge, always exists and when used for p traversal satisfies \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 .*

Proof. Recall that (x_1, y_1) is the highest edge on $\text{path}(r_c, r')$ from the *eligible* subtrees hanging from the p_L^* , whereas (x_d, y_d) is the highest edge on $\text{path}(r_c, r')$ from a more restricted set of subtrees. Thus, y_1 is at least as high as y_d on $\text{path}(r_c, r')$. Now, since (x_1, y_1) is a back edge with $x_1 \in T(v_L)$ (see remark in Scenario 1), (x_1, y_1) is also a valid edge for (x_p, y_p) ensuring its existence of p edge. Further, (x_p, y_p) is also a back edge because (x_1, y_1) is a back edge and $LCA(x_p, v_H)$ is at most as high as $LCA(x_1, v_H)$ ensuring $x_p \neq v_L$.

Now, consider the p traversal using (x_p, y_p) , which produces an untraversed path, say $p' = \text{path}(\text{par}(y_p), r')$. To prove that this traversal produces only components of type $C1$ and $C2$ (the condition \mathcal{A}_1), we only need to prove that any *eligible* subtree (subtree hanging from p_P^* with an edge to p_c) is not connected to p' . This is because p' itself is not connected directly to p_c by an edge (as $x_1 \notin p_c$). We first prove this property for the subtrees queried for finding (x_d, y_d) . Since y_p is at least as high as y_d on $\text{path}(r_c, r')$, any such subtree will not be connected to p' . Now, we

are left to prove this property for the remaining subtrees of $T(v_L)$ hanging from p_P^* with an edge to p_c . The only such subtree is $T(v_P)$, the subtree hanging from p_P^* which contains $T(v_H)$ (satisfying \mathcal{A}_2). Since, among all the edges (x, y) from $T(v_L)$ to $path(y_d, r')$, x_p is the vertex with lowest $LCA(x, v_H)$, the subtree $T(v_P)$ is not connected to p' . This is because for any such edge (x, y) , where $x \in T(v_P)$, would have $LCA(x, v_H)$ lower than v_P , which is clearly lower than $LCA(x_p, v_H)$ on $path(v_L, v_H)$. \square

Lemma 4. *On performing r traversal using any edge (x_r, y_r) , which satisfies (i) $x_r \in T(v_P) \cup \tau_p$ (if any), and (ii) the conditions \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 , the r traversal is applicable with the lowest edge from an eligible subtree to p_R^* being (x_d, y_d) (from the eligible subtree τ_d), if either $\tau_d \neq \tau_p$ or τ_d is not traversed by p_R^* .*

Proof. Since (x_p, y_p) is the edge to $path(y_d, r')$ with the lowest $LCA(x_p, v_H)$, the subtree $T(v_P)$ does not have an edge to $path(y_d, r')$. Thus, any subtree of $T(v_P)$, even if *eligible*, cannot have an edge on $path(r_c, r')$ higher than (x_d, y_d) . As a result, if r traversal is performed with $x_r \in T(v_P) \cup \tau_p$, (see Figure 4 (c)), the highest edge on $path(r_c, r')$ (and hence lowest on p_R^*) can be found by querying the same *eligible* subtrees as the ones queried while computing (x_d, y_d) . Also, if some part of $path(r_c, r')$ is not traversed by r traversal, it would effect this lowest edge only if it has an edge to p_c or some eligible subtree, which is avoided by second condition. Finally, it also requires the subtree containing x_d to remain connected to p_c and leave x_d untraversed. Since $LCA(x_p, v_H)$ is at least as low as $LCA(x_d, v_H)$, $T(v_P)$ and τ_d are disjoint. Hence, the only way in which r traversal traverses τ_d is if $x_p \in \tau_p$ and $\tau_p = \tau_d$. \square

Thus, Lemma 3 ensures that our traversal can follow p_P^* as shown in Figure 4 (b). To verify the third condition of *applicability* lemma, we find the new root for the component having path p_c as follows. We find the lowest edge on p_P^* from p_c and the *eligible* subtrees hanging from p_P^* , say (x_2, y_2) , where $y_2 \in p_P^*$. In case this edge satisfies \mathcal{A}_3 , we perform the traversal otherwise move to the next scenario.

Remark. *This scenario is not applicable only if (x_2, y_2) is a back edge with $x_2 \in T(v_P)$ and $x_2 \notin T(v_H)$.*

Scenario 3: r traversal

Consider the traversal shown in Figure 4 (c), where $p_R^* = path(r_c, x_r) \cup (x_r, y_r) \cup path(y_r, r')$. We choose (x_2, y_2) as (x_r, y_r) . However, while computing (x_2, y_2) , τ_p (if exists) would have been partially traversed. Hence, if the lowest edge from τ_p to $path(r_c, r')$, say (x'_2, y'_2) , has y'_2 lower than y_r on $path(r_c, r')$, τ_p would be connected to both p_c and $path(par(v_l), y_2) \setminus \{y_2\}$. This creates a component having p_c which is not of type C_1 or C_2 violating \mathcal{A}_1 . In such a case we choose (x'_2, y'_2) as (x_r, y_r) . The existence of back edge (x_2, y_2) implies the following property of (x_r, y_r) .

Lemma 5. *The edge (x_r, y_r) , which is a back edge, always exists and when used for r traversal satisfies \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 .*

Proof. Existence of (x_2, y_2) clearly implies the existence of (x_r, y_r) . Further, (x_r, y_r) is a back edge since both choices for it are back edges, i.e., (x_2, y_2) (see remark in Scenario 2) and (x'_2, y'_2) (as $root(\tau_p) \neq v_L$).

Now, consider the r traversal using (x_r, y_r) , which produces an untraversed path, say $p' = path(par(v_l), y_r) \setminus \{y_r\}$. To prove that this traversal produces only components of type C_1 and C_2 (hence satisfies \mathcal{A}_1), we only need to prove that any *eligible* subtree (subtree hanging from p_R^* with an edge to p_c) is not connected to p' . This is because p' itself is not connected directly to p_c by an

edge (as $x_2 \notin p_c$). Now, the only such subtrees not queried while computing (x_2, y_2) is τ_p , which is queried while computing (x'_2, y'_2) . Hence for either choice for (x_r, y_r) ((x_2, y_2) or (x'_2, y'_2)), no *eligible* subtree will be connected to p' (ensuring \mathcal{A}_2). \square

Thus, Lemma 5 ensures that our traversal can follow p_R^* as shown in Figure 4 (c). To verify the third condition of *applicability* lemma, we find the new root for the component having path p_c as follows. We find the lowest edge on p_R^* from p_c and the *eligible* subtrees hanging from p_R^* , say (x_3, y_3) , where $y_3 \in p_R^*$. In case this edge satisfies \mathcal{A}_3 , we perform this traversal.

Using Lemma 4 we shall describe the conditions when this edge satisfies *applicability* lemma. The choice of (x_r, y_r) ensures that either $x_r \in T(v_P)$ (see Remark in p traversal) or $x_r \in \tau_p$ (recall the computation of (x'_2, y'_2)). Further, using Lemma 5 our r traversal satisfies \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 . the first two conditions of *applicability* lemma. Thus, using Lemma 4 the scenario is not applicable only in the *special case* where $\tau_d = \tau_p$ and p_R^* traverses τ_d . Refer to Procedure Heavy-DFS in Appendix A for the pseudo code of this traversal.

We now present the conditions of the *special case* and present an overview of how it can be handled. Since $\tau_d = \tau_p$, p_R^* would traverse τ_d only if $x_r \in \tau_d = \tau_p$, i.e., $(x_r, y_r) = (x'_2, y'_2)$. Thus, both the lowest and the highest edges on $path(r_c, r')$, i.e., (x_p, y_p) and (x_r, y_r) , from an eligible subtree hanging from $path(v_L, v_H)$ belong to τ_d . Moreover, since τ_d hangs from $path(v_L, v_H)$, it does not contain $T(v_H)$. This ensures that if modified r' traversal is performed ignoring τ_d , it can be followed by a disconnecting traversal of τ_d described as follows.

Special case of heavy subtree traversal

In this section (x_p, y_p) and (x_r, y_r) correspond to the back edges used in p and r traversals described earlier, whereas $(x_{r'}, y_{r'})$ corresponds to the back edge used in modified r' traversal described below. We now recall the conditions leading to the *special case*, and describe its implications on (x_p, y_p) , (x_r, y_r) and (x_d, y_d) .

Lemma 6. *The conditions of the special case are (i) $x_3 \in T(v_R)$, (ii) $x_p \in \tau_d$, and (iii) $(x_r, y_r) = (x'_2, y'_2)$. Following are the properties of (x_p, y_p) and (x_d, y_d) in this case.*

1. $y_d = y_p, y_3$ is lower than y_d on $path(r_c, r')$, and y_r is lower than y_2 on $path(r_c, r')$.
2. No subtree of τ_d hanging from $path(\text{root}(\tau_d), x_p)$, with an edge to p_c , has an edge lower than y_2 on $path(r_c, r')$.
3. No subtree of τ_d hanging from $path(\text{root}(\tau_d), x_r)$, with an edge to p_c , has an edge higher than y_3 on $path(r_c, r')$.

Proof. Recall the choice of (x_d, y_d) and (x_p, y_p) (see Section 4.4), it was the highest edge from τ_d on $path(r_c, r')$ and (x_p, y_p) was computed such that $y_p \in path(y_d, r')$. Hence, if $x_p \in \tau_d$ we necessarily have $y_d = y_p$. Also, y_3 is strictly lower than y_p (or y_d) else having a lower $LCA(x_3, v_H)$ than $LCA(x_p, v_H)$, (x_3, y_3) would have been selected as (x_p, y_p) earlier. Finally, y_2 is strictly higher than y_r otherwise (x_2, y_2) would have been selected as (x_r, y_r) earlier. Second property holds since (x_2, y_2) (where $x_2 \in T(v_P)$) was the lowest edge on $path(r_c, r')$ from the eligible subtrees after p traversal. Third property holds since (x_3, y_3) (where $x_3 \in T(v_R)$) was the highest edge on $path(r_c, r')$ from the eligible subtrees after r traversal. \square

To handle this special case, we revisit the scenario corresponding to r traversal ignoring the *eligible* subtree τ_d . Hence, we choose $(x_{r'}, y_{r'}) = (x_2, y_2)$ despite having a lower edge (x_r, y_r) . Now, based on the lowest edge from component containing p_c on the traversed path, we append simple traversals to this modified r' traversal in order to satisfy \mathcal{A}_1 . We shall shortly see that in these traversals the conditions \mathcal{A}_2 and \mathcal{A}_3 are implicitly true.




Figure 5: The three traversals for *special case* of Heavy Subtree Traversal (shown using blue dotted lines) followed by a modified r' traversal (shown using blue dashed lines). (a) Root traversal of τ_d , (b) Upward cover traversal of p_1 through τ' , and (c) Downward cover traversal of p_1 using a direct edge (x', y') .

Modified r' traversal

Consider a modified r' traversal using $(x_{r'}, y_{r'}) = (x_2, y_2)$ traversing the path shown in Figure 5 (a), where $p_{R'}^* = \text{path}(r_c, x_2) \cup (x_2, y_2) \cup \text{path}(y_2, r')$. This leaves an untraversed part of $\text{path}(r_c, r')$, i.e., $\text{path}(\text{par}(v_L), y_2) \setminus \{y_2\}$ (say p_1). Using Lemma 6 we know that y_2 is strictly higher than y_r ensuring $y_r \in p_1$. Now, the computation of (x_2, y_2) ensures that no *eligible* subtree (except for τ_d) is connected to both paths p_1 , as well as ensuring the lowest edge on $p_{R'}^*$ from an *eligible* subtree is from τ_d , i.e., (x_d, y_d) . This implicitly satisfies \mathcal{A}_2 and \mathcal{A}_3 , if the appended traversal does not traverse any part of $T(v_{R'})$ or p_c . However, since τ_d is connected to two paths p_1 and p_c (violating \mathcal{A}_1), we need to append $p_{R'}^*$ with another traversal which disconnects the unvisited part of τ_d from the unvisited part of p_1 .

Now, the only *eligible* subtree having an edge to p_1 is τ_d . Still the lowest edge on $p_{R'}^*$ from the component having p_c may not be from τ_d . This is because p_1 and subtrees connected to it are also in the component containing p_c (since τ_d has an edge on p_1). Thus, depending on the lowest edge on $p_{R'}^*$ from the component containing p_c , say (x, y) with $y \in p_{R'}^*$, we have three cases (see Figure 5). If $x \in \tau_d$, we simply perform a *root traversal* of τ_d exploiting property 2 of Lemma 6 to disconnect τ_d and p_1 . On the other hand if $x \in p_1$ or some subtree connected to p_1 , we shall perform a *cover traversal* of p_1 , which visits all vertices on p_1 that are connected to τ_d . As a result, the unvisited part of p_1 is disconnected from τ_d . Since y_r is the lowest edge from τ_d on p_1 , in case x is lower than y_r on p_1 , we simply traverse upwards covering y_d and other endpoints of edges from τ_d incident on p_1 . Else we traverse downwards after making sure that no endpoints of edges from τ_d that incident on p_1 are above x .

Root Traversal of τ_d

In this case the lowest edge from component containing p_c on $p_{R'}^*$ is from τ_d , i.e., (x_d, y_d) . The traversal of $p_{R'}^*$ is followed by the traversal of $p_{R'} = (y_p, x_p) \cup (x_p, \text{root}(\tau_d))$ as shown in Figure 5 (a). Hence, using property 2 in Lemma 6, no subtree of τ_d hanging from $p_{R'}$ is connected to p_c (satisfying \mathcal{A}_1). As described earlier, since $T(v_{R'})$ does not have an edge to τ_d , after the traversal of $p_{R'}^* \cup p_{R'}$, the component having p_c would have the new root in τ_d or p_c (satisfying \mathcal{A}_3).

Cover traversal of p_1

In this case the lowest edge from component containing p_c on $p_{R'}^*$ is from p_1 (say (x', y')) or some subtree τ' (say $(y_{\tau'}, y')$) which is connected to p_1 , where $y' \in p_{R'}^*$. If connected through τ' , we choose the highest edge $(x', x_{\tau'})$ from τ' on p_1 , with $x' \in p_1$. If x' is lower than y_r , we perform the *upward traversal* towards y_2 . Other wise we perform the *downward traversal* towards v_l . In case of upward traversal, when connected through τ' , we update $(x', x_{\tau'})$ to be the lowest edge from τ' on p_1 , which still maintains x' to be lower than y_r . Note that this choice of $(x', x_{\tau'})$ ensures that $path(y_{\tau'}, x_{\tau'})$ is a *disconnecting* traversal of τ' from p_1 in both upward and downward traversals. We also define this path from y' to x' as $p_{\tau'}$, i.e., when connected through τ' (see Figure 5 (b)), we have $p_{\tau'} = (y', y_{\tau'}) \cup path(y_{\tau'}, x_{\tau'}) \cup (x_{\tau'}, x')$. Otherwise, in case of direct edge (see Figure 5 (c)), we have $p_{\tau'} = (y', x')$.

1. Upward traversal on p_1

In case x' is lower than y_r , the traversal of $p_{R'}^*$ is followed by the traversal of $p_{R'} = p_{\tau'} \cup path(x', y_2) \setminus \{y_2\}$ as shown in Figure 5 (b). Since $p_{R'}$ is a *disconnecting* traversal of τ' from p_1 , the unvisited part of p_1 , say p'_1 , is not connected to the unvisited part of τ' . Also, p'_1 is not connected to τ_d and hence the component containing p_c as $y_r \notin p'_1$. Since the unvisited part of τ' is also not connected to p_c , \mathcal{A}_1 is satisfied. As described earlier, the component having p_c will have the new root in τ_d , being the only part of the component connected to $p_{R'}$. Since τ_d is not a heavy subtree, \mathcal{A}_3 is also satisfied.

2. Downward traversal on p_1

In case x' is higher than y_r and we follow the traversal downwards, $path(x', y_2) \setminus \{y_2\}$ might still have edges from τ_d . Hence, we modify the traversal of $p_{R'}^*$ as follows. Let the lowest edge on $path(x', y_2) \setminus \{x', y_2\}$ from τ_d be (x_r^*, y_r^*) , where $y_r^* \in p_1$. In case (x_r^*, y_r^*) doesn't exist, we simply choose $(x_r^*, y_r^*) = (x_2, y_2)$. We now perform a modified r'' traversal using $(x_{r''}, y_{r''}) = (x_r^*, y_r^*)$ traversing the path $p_{R''}^* = path(r_c, x_r^*) \cup (x_r^*, y_r^*) \cup path(y_r^*, r')$ as shown in Figure 5 (c). Since y_r^* is higher than x' , again the path from lowest edge on $p_{R''}^*$ from the component containing p_c , to p_1 would correspond to $p_{\tau'}$. This traversal is then followed by the traversal of $p_{R''} = p_{\tau'} \cup path(x', par(v_l))$ as shown in Figure 5 (c). Since $p_{R''}$ is a *disconnecting* traversal of τ' from p_1 , the unvisited part of p_1 , say p'_1 , is not connected to the unvisited part of τ' . Also, p'_1 would not be connected to τ_d and hence component containing p_c , because y_r^* was the lowest edge above x' on p_1 from τ_d . Since the unvisited part of τ' is not connected to p_c , \mathcal{A}_1 is satisfied. As described earlier, the component having p_c will have the new root in τ_d , being the only part of the component connected to $p_{R''}$. Since τ_d is not a heavy subtree, \mathcal{A}_3 is also satisfied.

Thus, in all the cases of Special Case of heavy path traversal, one of the traversals described above is necessarily applicable. Refer to Procedure Heavy-Special in Appendix A for pseudo code.

Correctness:

To prove the correctness of our algorithm, it is sufficient to prove two properties. *Firstly*, the components property is satisfied in each traversal mentioned above. *Secondly*, every component in a phase/stage, abides by the size constraints defining the phase/stage. By construction, we always choose the lowest edge from a component to the recently added path in T^* ensuring that the components property is satisfied. Furthermore, in the different traversals we have clearly proved how the stage/phase is progressed ensuring the size constraints. Thus, the final tree T^* returned by the algorithm is indeed the DFS tree of the updated graph.

Analysis

We now analyze a stage of the algorithm for processing a component c . In each stage, our algorithm performs at most $O(1)$ traversals of each type described above. Let us first consider the queries performed on the data structure \mathcal{D} . Every traversal described above performs $O(1)$ sets of these queries sequentially, where each set may have $O(|c|)$ parallel queries (refer to Appendix A for the pseudo code). Moreover, each of these sets is an *independent* set of parallel queries on \mathcal{D} (recall the definition of *independent* queries in Section 2). This is because in each set of parallel queries, different queries are performed either on different untraversed subtrees of currently processed subtree or on the traversed path in the currently processed subtree. The remaining operations (excluding queries to \mathcal{D}) clearly requires only the knowledge of the current DFS tree T (and not whole G). Hence, they can be performed locally in the distributed and semi-streaming environment. Performing these operations efficiently in parallel shall be described in Section 5. Since our algorithm requires $\log n$ phases each having $\log n$ stages, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *Given an undirected graph and its DFS tree T , any subtree τ of T can be rerooted at any vertex $r' \in \tau$ by sequentially performing $O(\log^2 n)$ sets of $O(|\tau|)$ independent queries on \mathcal{D} , in addition to local computation requiring only the subtree τ .*

5 Implementation in the Parallel Environment

We assign $|c|$ processors to process a component c , requiring overall n processors. We first present efficient implementation of \mathcal{D} and the operations on T used by our algorithm.

5.1 Basic Data Structures

The data structure maintained by our algorithm uses the following classical results for finding the properties of a tree on an EREW PRAM.

Theorem 4 (Tarjan and Vishkin [50]). *A rooted tree on n vertices can be processed in $O(\log n)$ time using n processors to compute post order numbering of the tree, level and number of descendants for each vertex on a EREW PRAM.*

Theorem 5 (Schieber and Vishkin [41]). *A rooted tree on n vertices can be preprocessed in $O(\log n)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM such that k LCA queries can be answered in $O(1)$ time using k processors on a CREW PRAM.*

Using the standard simulation model [27] for converting a CRCW PRAM algorithm to EREW PRAM algorithm at the expense of extra $O(\log n)$ factor in the time complexity, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *A rooted tree on n vertices can be preprocessed in $O(\log n)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM such that any k LCA queries can be answered in $O(\log n)$ time using k processors on an EREW PRAM.*

We also use the following classical result to sort and hence report maximum/minimum of a set of n numbers on an EREW PRAM.

Theorem 7 (Cole [12, 13]). *A set of n numbers can be sorted using parallel merge sort in $O(\log n)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM.*

5.2 Implementation of \mathcal{D}

Given the DFS tree T of the graph, we build the data structures described in Theorem 4 and Theorem 6 on it. Now, given the post order traversal of T , we assign each vertex with a value equal to its rank in the post order traversal. Now, for each vertex v we perform a parallel merge sort on the set of neighbors of the vertex using $\text{degree}(v)$ processors, requiring overall m processors. Thus, each vertex stores its neighbors (say $N(v)$) in the increasing order of their post order indexes. Due to absence of cross edges in a DFS tree T , the neighbors of every vertex would be sorted in the order they appear on the path from $\text{root}(T)$ to the vertex. Thus, the data structure \mathcal{D} can be built in $O(\log n)$ time (for sorting) using m processors on an EREW PRAM. This allows us to answer the following queries efficiently.

1. $\text{Query}(w, \text{path}(x, y))$: among all the edges from w that are incident on $\text{path}(x, y)$ in G , return an edge that is incident nearest to x on $\text{path}(x, y)$.
2. $\text{Query}(T(w), \text{path}(x, y))$: among all the edges from $T(w)$ that are incident on $\text{path}(x, y)$ in G , return an edge that is incident nearest to x on $\text{path}(x, y)$.
3. $\text{Query}(\text{path}(v, w), \text{path}(x, y))$: among all the edges from $\text{path}(v, w)$ that are incident on $\text{path}(x, y)$ in G , return an edge that is incident nearest to x on $\text{path}(x, y)$.

We now describe how to perform a set of *independent* queries to \mathcal{D} (recall definition of *independent* queries in Section 2) in $O(\log n)$ time on an EREW PRAM as follows. We assign one processor for each vertex $u \in \{w\}, T(w)$ or $\text{path}(x, y)$ (depending on the type of query) to perform the following in parallel. For the vertex u , we would first perform a binary search for the range given by the post order indexes of x and y on $N(u)$ to find the required edge. However, since all vertices of $\text{path}(x, y)$ may not be ancestors of u , $N(u)$ may include some edges not on $\text{path}(x, y)$ too in the given range, corrupting the search results. Hence, the search would be performed on a modified range described as follows. Firstly, assuming x is an ancestor of y , if $\text{LCA}(u, x)$ is not equal to x the search would not be performed (as x is not an ancestor of u). Otherwise, the search is performed on the range given by post order indexes of x and $\text{LCA}(u, y)$. However, in case of $\text{Query}(\text{path}(v, w), \text{path}(x, y))$ we surely know that no vertex of $\text{path}(v, w)$ is a descendant of $\text{path}(x, y)$ (recall its definition in Section 2). Thus, we reverse the roles of the paths taking maximum or minimum accordingly using $|\text{path}(x, y)|$ processors. Thus, each of these queries would require $O(\log n)$ time on an EREW PRAM. Now, given a set of *independent* queries on \mathcal{D} , each processor shall be using different $N(u)$ for finding the corresponding edge. Hence, all the queries can be performed simultaneously on different memory cells abiding the constraints of an EREW PRAM. Now, the highest or lowest edge among all the edges returned by different processors can be found by taking the maximum or minimum in $O(\log n)$ time on an EREW PRAM (Theorem 7). Thus, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 8. *The DFS tree T of a graph can be preprocessed to build a data structure \mathcal{D} of size $O(m)$ in $O(\log n)$ time using m processors such that a set of independent queries of types $\text{Query}(w, \text{path}(x, y))$, $\text{Query}(T(w), \text{path}(x, y))$ and $\text{Query}(\text{path}(v, w), \text{path}(x, y))$ on T can be answered simultaneously in $O(\log n)$ time using $1, |T(w)|$ and $|\text{path}(x, y)|$ processors respectively on an EREW PRAM.*

Extension to handle multiple updates

Consider a sequence of k updates on graph, let T_i^* represent the DFS tree computed by our algorithm after i updates in the graph. We also denote the corresponding data structure \mathcal{D} built on T_i^* as

\mathcal{D}_i . We now show that any query of the type $Query(w, path(x, y))$, $Query(T_i^*(w), path(x, y))$ and $Query(path(v, w), path(x, y))$ on \mathcal{D}_i , can be performed on \mathcal{D}_0 if $path(x, y)$ is an ancestor-descendant path in T . Recall that each such query is performed by querying the $N(x)$ corresponding to each descendant vertex x separately, whose results are later combined. Thus, even if $T_i^*(w)$ is not a subtree of T or $path(v, w)$ is not an ancestor-descendant path of T , it does not affect the processing of the query, as long as $path(x, y)$ is an ancestor-descendant path of T .

The only extra procedure to be performed to answer such queries correctly using \mathcal{D}_0 , is to update the $N(x)$ for any vertex x whose adjacency list is affected by the graph update. For insertion/deletion of a vertex x , we simply add/delete the corresponding list $N(x)$. For insertion of vertex we additionally sort it according to post order traversal of T using n processors in $O(\log n)$ time. Note that we do not need to update the $N(y)$ for each neighbor y of x , as the query path being an ancestor-descendant path of both T_i^* and T would not contain x . However, on insertion of a vertex x , such a query can be made with the entire path representing only x . Hence, we assign the highest post order number to x , and add it to the end of $N(y)$ for each neighbor y of x . This can be done using n processors in $O(1)$ time on an EREW PRAM. Insertion/deletion of single edges can be taken care of individually by each search procedure taking $O(\log n + k)$ time to perform search after k updates. Thus, we have the following theorem

Theorem 9. *The data structure \mathcal{D} built on the DFS tree T of a graph G , can be used to perform a set of independent queries on \mathcal{D}_k of types $Query(w, path(x, y))$, $Query(T_k^*(w), path(x, y))$ and $Query(path(v, w), path(x, y))$, in $O(\log n + k)$ time using $1, |T_k^*(w)|$ and $|path(x, y)|$ processors respectively on an EREW PRAM, if $path(x, y)$ is an ancestor-descendant path of T .*

5.3 Implementation of operations on T

As described earlier several properties of T can be reported in $O(1)$ time using the data structures described in Theorem 4 and Theorem 6.

1. **Determine whether an edge (x, y) is a back edge in T**

This query can easily be answered by finding $l = LCA(x, y)$. If $l = x$ or $l = y$ the edge (x, y) is a back edge in T . Hence, reporting whether an edge is a back edge can be reduced to finding LCA of two vertices in T .

2. **Finding length of a path**

Compare the level of the two end points as reported by structure in Theorem 4.

3. **Given $x \in T(y)$, find child y' of y such that $x \in T(y')$**

For each vertex v of the graph perform the following in parallel (using $|T(y)|$ processors), if $par(v)$ is y and $LCA(v, x)$ is v then report v . This query too reduces to finding LCA of two vertices in T .

4. **Determine whether x lies on $path(y, z)$, where y is ancestor of z**

If $LCA(x, z) = x$ and $LCA(x, y) = y$, then x lies on $path(y, z)$.

5. **Subtrees hanging from a $path(x, y)$**

For each vertex v of the graph perform the following in parallel (using total n processors), if $LCA(v, y) = par(v)$ then $T(v)$ is a subtree hanging from the path.

The number of processors required for the last three queries is equal to the size of the corresponding component, remaining queries requiring a single processor each. Thus, using Theorem 7 and procedures described above we have the following theorem

Theorem 10. *The DFS tree T of a graph can be preprocessed to build a data structure of size $O(n)$ in $O(\log n)$ time using n processors such that following queries can be answered in parallel in $O(\log n)$ time on an EREW PRAM*

- *LCA of two vertices, size of a subtree, testing if an edge is back edge and length of a path using a single processor per query.*
- *Finding vertices on a path, subtrees hanging from a path, child of a vertex containing a given vertex, highest/lowest edge among k edges, using k processors per query, where k is the size of the corresponding component.*

5.4 Analysis

Using these data structures we can now analyze the time required by the *reduction* algorithm on an EREW PRAM. Since the queries on \mathcal{D} and *LCA* queries on T can be answered in $O(\log n)$ time using n processors as described above, Theorem 2 reduces to the following theorem.

Theorem 11. *Given the DFS tree T of a graph and the data structure \mathcal{D} built on it, any update on the graph can be reduced to independently rerooting disjoint subtrees of the DFS tree using n processors in $O(\log n)$ time on an EREW PRAM.*

Implementation details

All operations required for each stage of our rerooting algorithm to reroot a subtree τ , can be performed in $O(\log n)$ time using $|\tau|$ processors using Theorem 8 and Theorem 10 as follows. Both $root(\tau_c)$ and vertex v_H required by our algorithm while processing a component c can be computed in parallel by comparing the size of each subtree using $|c|$ processors. Adding a path p to T^* essentially involves marking the corresponding edges as tree edges, which can be performed by informing the vertices on p . All the other operations of the rerooting algorithm (refer to pseudo code in Appendix A) are trivially reducible to the operations described in Theorem 10. Since our rerooting algorithm requires $\log n$ phases each having $\log n$ stages, we get the following theorem for rerooting disjoint subtrees using our rerooting algorithm.

Theorem 12. *Given an undirected graph with the data structure \mathcal{D} built on its DFS tree, independently rerooting disjoint subtrees of the DFS tree can be performed in $O(\log^3 n)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM model.*

Using Theorem 11, Theorem 12 and Theorem 8, we can prove our main result as follows.

Theorem 1. *Given an undirected graph and its DFS tree, it can be preprocessed to build a data structure of size $O(m)$ in $O(\log n)$ time using m processors on an EREW PRAM such that for any update in the graph, a DFS tree of the updated graph can be computed in $O(\log^3 n)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM.*

Now, in order to prove our result for Parallel Fully Dynamic DFS and Parallel Fault Tolerant DFS we need to first build the DFS tree of the original graph from scratch during preprocessing stage. This can be done using the static DFS algorithm [47] or any advanced deterministic parallel algorithm [1, 22]. Thus, for processing any update we always have the current DFS tree built (either originally during preprocessing or by the update algorithm). We can thus build the data structure \mathcal{D} using Theorem 8 reducing Theorem 1 to the following theorem.

Theorem 13 (Parallel Fully Dynamic DFS). *Given an undirected graph, we can maintain its DFS tree under any arbitrary online sequence of vertex or edge updates in $O(\log^3 n)$ time per update using m processors in parallel EREW model.*

However, if we limit the number of processors to n , our fully dynamic algorithm cannot update the DFS tree in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time, only because updating \mathcal{D} in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time requires $O(m)$ processors (see Theorem 8). Thus, we build the data structure \mathcal{D} using Theorem 8 during preprocessing itself, and attempt to use it to handle multiple updates.

Extending to multiple updates

Consider a sequence of k updates on graph, let T_i^* represent the DFS tree computed by our algorithm after i updates in the graph. We also denote the corresponding data structure \mathcal{D} built on T_i^* as \mathcal{D}_i . Now, consider any stage of our algorithm while building the DFS tree T_i^* . For each component in parallel, $O(1)$ ancestor-descendant paths of T_{i-1}^* are added to T_i^* . Thus, any ancestor-descendant path p of T_i^* , is built by adding $O(\log^2 n)$ such paths of T_{i-1}^* , corresponding to $O(\log n)$ phases each having $O(\log n)$ stages. Hence, p is union of $O(\log^2 n)$ ancestor-descendant paths of T_{i-1}^* , say p_1, \dots, p_k .

Using this reduction, it can be shown that a set of independent queries on path p in \mathcal{D}_i , can be reduced to $O(\log^2 n)$ sets of independent queries on corresponding $O(\log^2 n)$ paths p_1, \dots, p_k on \mathcal{D}_{i-1} (see Section 5.2). Again, each of these paths p_1, \dots, p_k , being an ancestor-descendant path of T_{i-1}^* , is a union of $O(\log^2 n)$ ancestor-descendant paths of T_{i-2}^* , and so on. Thus, any set of independent queries on \mathcal{D}_i can be performed by $O(\log^{2(i-1)} n)$ sets of independent queries on \mathcal{D} , which takes $O(\log^{2i-1})$ time on an EREW PRAM using n processors when $k \leq \log n$ (see Theorem 8 and Section 5.2). The other data structures on T_{i-1}^* can be built in $O(\log n)$ time using n processors (see Theorem 10). This allows our algorithm to build the DFS tree T_i^* from T_{i-1}^* using \mathcal{D} in $O(\log^{2i+1})$ time on an EREW PRAM using n processors (see Theorem 3). Thus, for a given set of k updates we build each T_i^* one by one using T_{i-1}^* and \mathcal{D} , to get the following theorem.

Theorem 14 (Parallel Fault Tolerant DFS). *Given an undirected graph, it can be preprocessed to build a data structure of size $O(m)$ such that for any set of k ($\leq \log n$) updates in the graph, a DFS tree of the updated graph can be computed in $O(k \log^{2k+1} n)$ time using n processors on an EREW PRAM.*

Remark. *For $k = 1$, our algorithm also gives an $O(n \log^3 n)$ time sequential algorithm for updating a DFS tree after a single update in the graph, achieving similar bounds as Baswana et al. [6]. However, our algorithm uses much simpler data structure \mathcal{D} at the cost of a more complex algorithm.*

6 Applications in other models of computation

We now briefly describe how our algorithm can be easily adopted to the semi-streaming model and distributed model.

6.1 Semi-Streaming Setting

Our algorithm only stores the current DFS tree T and the partially built DFS tree T^* taking $O(n)$ space. Thus, all operations on T can be performed without any passes over the input graph. A set of independent queries on \mathcal{D} is evaluated by performing a single pass over all the edges of the input graph using $O(n)$ space. This is because each set has $O(n)$ queries (see Theorem 2 and Theorem 3) and we are required to store only one edge per query (partial solution based on edges visited by

the pass). Note that here the role of \mathcal{D} is performed by a pass over the input graph. Hence, the algorithm is first executed for all the components in turn until each instance of the algorithm queries the data structure \mathcal{D} . This is followed by a pass on the input graph to answer these queries and so on. Since each stage requires $O(1)$ steps (and hence $O(1)$ sequential queries on \mathcal{D}), it can be performed using $O(1)$ passes. Thus, our algorithm requires $O(\log^2 n)$ passes to update the DFS tree after a graph update by executing $\log n$ stages for each of the $\log n$ phases. Thus, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 15. *Given any arbitrary online sequence of vertex or edge updates, we can maintain a DFS tree of an undirected graph using $O(\log^2 n)$ passes over the input graph per update by a semi-streaming algorithm using $O(n)$ space.*

6.2 Distributed Setting

Our algorithm stores only the current DFS tree T and the partially built DFS tree T^* at each node. Thus, the operations on T are performed locally at each node and the distributed computation is only used to evaluate the queries on \mathcal{D} . Using Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, each update is performed by $O(\log^2 n)$ sequential sets of $O(n)$ independent queries on \mathcal{D} . Evaluation of a set of $O(n)$ independent queries on \mathcal{D} can be essentially reduced to propagation of $O(n)$ words (partial solutions of n queries) throughout the network. Using the standard technique of pipelined broadcasts and convergecasts [38], we can propagate these $O(n)$ words in $O(D)$ rounds using messages of size $O(n/D)$. This proves our distributed algorithm described in Section 1.2. We now describe the implementation details in the distributed model.

Implementation in distributed environment

We now present how our algorithm can be implemented on the distributed model. In the synchronous $\text{CONGEST}(B)$ model a processor is present at every node of the graph and communication links are restricted to the edges of the graph. The communication occurs in synchronous rounds, where each nodes can send a message of $O(B)$ words along each communication link. Our model includes a *preprocessing* stage followed by an alternating sequence of *update* and *recovery* stages. The graph is updated in the *update* stage, after which the *recovery* stage starts in which the algorithm updates the DFS tree of the graph. The model allows the algorithm to complete updating the DFS tree (completing the recovery stage) before the next update is applied to the graph (update stage). Similar model was earlier used by Henzinger et al. [25]. We use an additional constraint of a space restriction of $O(n)$ size at each node. In the absence of this restriction, the whole graph can be stored at each node, where an algorithm can trivially propagate the update to each node and the updated solution can be computed locally. Finally, we also allow the deletion updates to be *abrupt*, i.e., the deleted link/node becomes unavailable for use instantly after the update.

Each node stores the current DFS tree T and the partially built DFS tree T^* . Thus, all the operations on T can be performed locally at each node, where the distributed computation is used only to evaluate the queries on \mathcal{D} . Also, using Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 each update reduces to $O(\log^2 n)$ sequential sets of $O(n)$ independent queries on \mathcal{D} . Thus, we shall only focus on how to evaluate such queries efficiently in the distributed environment.

6.2.1 Optimality of message size

We first prove that any distributed algorithm maintaining the DFS tree at each node requires a message size of $\Omega(n/D)$ to update the DFS tree in $O(D)$ rounds. Consider the insertion of a vertex,

such that the final DFS tree uses $O(n)$ of the newly inserted edges. This is clearly possible if the current DFS tree has $O(n)$ branches, where leaf of each branch is connected to the inserted vertex. Thus, the information of at least these $O(n)$ new edges needs to be propagated throughout the network by any algorithm maintaining DFS tree at each node. Now, broadcasting m messages on a network with diameter D requires $\Omega(m + D)$ rounds [38]. In order to limit the number of rounds to $O(D)$, we can send only $O(D)$ messages. Thus, any algorithm sending $O(n)$ words of information using $O(D)$ messages would require a message size of $\Omega(n/D)$. We thus use the *CONGEST*(n/D) model for our distributed algorithm.

6.2.2 Evaluation of queries on \mathcal{D}

Now, each node only stores the adjacency list of the corresponding vertex in addition to T and T^* described above. Recall that a query on \mathcal{D} is merely highest/lowest edge among a set of eligible edges. Hence, it can be easily evaluated for the whole graph by combining the partial solutions of the same query performed on each adjacency list locally at the node. Thus, the focus is to broadcast the partial solution from each node to reach the whole graph, where each node can then combine them locally to get the solution to the query. Moreover, these partial solutions can also be combined during broadcasting itself to avoid sending too many messages as described below.

Performing broadcasts efficiently

Broadcasts can be performed efficiently by using a spanning tree of the graph. To ensure efficiency of rounds we use a BFS tree as follows. After every update, any vertex (say vertex with the smallest index) starts building a BFS tree \mathcal{B} rooted at it. The depth of \mathcal{B} is $O(D)$ and it can be built in $O(D)$ rounds using $O(m)$ messages [38]. All the broadcasts are now performed only on the tree edges of \mathcal{B} as follows. We first describe it for a single query then extend it to handle $O(n)$ queries. Note that it is a trivial extension of the standard pipelined broadcasts and convergecasts algorithm [38]. Each node waits for partial solutions to the query from all its children in \mathcal{B} , updates its solution and sends it to its parent. On receiving the partial solutions from all the children, the root computes the final solution and sends it back to all nodes along the tree edges of \mathcal{B} . Clearly, this process requires $O(D)$ rounds and $O(n)$ messages each of size $O(1)$ (partial solution of a query is a single edge). In order to perform $O(n)$ independent queries efficiently in parallel, on each edge we send D messages of size $O(n/D)$ in a pipelined manner (one after the other) to achieve the broadcast in $O(D)$ time (see pipelined broadcast in [38]). The total number of messages sent would be $O(nD)$. Since the rerooting algorithm requires $O(\log^2 n)$ sequential sets of $O(n)$ queries (see Theorem 3), we get the following theorem.

Theorem 16. *Given any arbitrary online sequence of vertex or edge updates, we can maintain a DFS tree in $O(D \log^2 n)$ rounds per update in a distributed setting using $O(nD \log^2 n + m)$ messages each of size $O(n/D)$ and $O(n)$ local space on each processor, where D is diameter of the graph.*

Remark. *Our initial assumption of adding a pseudo root (see Section 2) connected to every vertex of the graph is no longer valid in the distributed system. This is because both the processors and communication links are fixed in our model. Thus, we need to maintain a DFS forest instead of a DFS tree requiring to handle the cases when some component is partitioned into several components and when two or more components merge as a result of a graph update. The following section describes how this can be achieved in the same bounds described above.*

Maintaining a DFS forest

After every update in the graph, a neighboring vertex of the affected link/node shall broadcast the information about the update to all the vertices in the component. However, in order to limit the number of messages transmitted, exactly *one* vertex from each component so formed needs to initiate the broadcast. We shall shortly describe how to choose this vertex. The chosen vertex also chooses the new root for the DFS tree of the component (say the node with the smallest index). The new root then makes the corresponding BFS tree as described above to perform efficient broadcasts. In case two or more components are merged due to the update, the DFS tree of each component computed earlier is broadcasted to the entire component by the original roots of two components. Since, the size of broadcast (DFS tree) is $O(n)$, it can be performed under the same bounds as described above.

We now describe how to choose the broadcast vertex efficiently. In case of vertex/edge insertion, we choose the inserted vertex or endpoint of the inserted edge with smaller index respectively. In case of vertex/edge deletion, for each component so formed, we choose the neighbor of deleted node/link in T that has the smallest index. For this each neighbor of the deleted node/link needs to know the resultant components formed as a result of the deletion. This can be easily computed locally if each node also stores the articulation points/bridges of the current DFS tree T . Hence, after computing the DFS tree, each node computes the articulation points/bridges of the DFS tree according of the subgraph induced by the edges of T and the adjacency list stored at the node. The vertices/edges present in *all* the sets of articulation points/bridges computed at different nodes will be the articulation points/bridges of the whole graph. Again, this requires each vertex to send $O(n)$ words of information where the partial solutions can be combined. Thus, it can be performed similar to the queries on \mathcal{D} using the same bounds.

7 Conclusion

Our parallel dynamic algorithms take nearly optimal time on an EREW PRAM. However, the work efficiency of our fully dynamic algorithm is $\tilde{O}(m)$ whereas that of the best sequential algorithm [7] is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{mn})$. Even though our fault tolerant algorithm is nearly work optimal, its only for constant number of updates. The primary reason behind these limitations is the difficulty in updating the data structure \mathcal{D} using n processors. Our fault tolerant algorithm avoids updating \mathcal{D} , by naively using the original \mathcal{D} to simulate the queries of updated \mathcal{D} . It would be interesting to see if an algorithm can process significantly more updates using only n processors in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time (similar extension was performed by Baswana et al. [7] in the sequential setting). This may also lead to a fully dynamic algorithm that is nearly time optimal with better work efficiency.

Further, our distributed algorithm works only on a substantially restricted synchronous $CONGEST(n/D)$ model. Moreover, the number of messages passed during an update in the distributed algorithm is $O(nD \log^2 n + m)$, which is way worse than the number of messages required to compute a DFS from scratch i.e. $O(n)$. It would be interesting to see if dynamic DFS can be maintained in near optimal rounds in more stronger $CONGEST$ or $LOCAL$ models.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Christoph Lenzen for suggesting this problem. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Prof. Surender Baswana for valuable discussions and key insights that led to this paper. The idea of extending the parallel algorithm to the distributed setting was rooted in these discussions. Finally, I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and my advisor whose reviews significantly helped me to refine the paper.

References

- [1] Alok Aggarwal and Richard J. Anderson. A random NC algorithm for depth first search. *Combinatorica*, 8(1):1–12, 1988.
- [2] Alok Aggarwal, Richard J. Anderson, and Ming-Yang Kao. Parallel depth-first search in general directed graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 19(2):397–409, 1990.
- [3] Kook Jin Ahn and Sudipto Guha. Linear programming in the semi-streaming model with application to the maximum matching problem. *Inf. Comput.*, 222:59–79, 2013.
- [4] Sepehr Assadi, Sanjeev Khanna, Yang Li, and Grigory Yaroslavtsev. Maximum matchings in dynamic graph streams and the simultaneous communication model. In *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 1345–1364, 2016.
- [5] Baruch Awerbuch, Israel Cidon, and Shay Kutten. Optimal maintenance of a spanning tree. *J. ACM*, 55(4), 2008.
- [6] Surender Baswana, Shreejit Ray Chaudhury, Keerti Choudhary, and Shahbaz Khan. Dynamic DFS tree in undirected graphs: breaking the $O(m)$ barrier, full version of [7]. *CoRR*, abs/1502.02481, 2015.
- [7] Surender Baswana, Shreejit Ray Chaudhury, Keerti Choudhary, and Shahbaz Khan. Dynamic DFS in undirected graphs: breaking the $O(m)$ barrier. In *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 730–739, 2016.
- [8] Surender Baswana and Keerti Choudhary. On dynamic DFS tree in directed graphs. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS*, pages 102–114, 2015.
- [9] Surender Baswana and Shahbaz Khan. Incremental algorithm for maintaining DFS tree for undirected graphs. In *ICALP*, pages 138–149, 2014.
- [10] E. Boros, K. Elbassioni, V. Gurvich, and L. Khachiyan. An efficient incremental algorithm for generating all maximal independent sets in hypergraphs of bounded dimension. *Parallel Processing Letters*, 10:253–266, 2000.
- [11] Israel Cidon. Yet another distributed depth-first-search algorithm. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 26(6):301–305, 1988.
- [12] Richard Cole. Parallel merge sort. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 17(4):770–785, 1988.
- [13] Richard Cole. Correction: Parallel merge sort. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 22(6):1349, 1993.
- [14] Martin E. Dyer and Alan M. Frieze. Probabilistic analysis of a parallel algorithm for finding the lexicographically first depth first search tree in a dense random graph. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 2(2):233–240, 1991.
- [15] Paul Erdős and Alfréd Rényi. On random graphs I. *Publicationes Mathematicae (Debrecen)*, 6:290–297, 1959.
- [16] Shimon Even and Robert Endre Tarjan. Network flow and testing graph connectivity. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 4(4):507–518, 1975.

- [17] Martin Farach-Colton, Tsan-sheng Hsu, Meng Li, and Meng-Tsung Tsai. Finding articulation points of large graphs in linear time. In *Algorithms and Data Structures, WADS*, pages 363–372, 2015.
- [18] P. Ferragina. A technique to speed up parallel fully dynamic algorithms for MST. *J. Parallel Distrib. Comput.*, 31(2):181–189, December 1995.
- [19] Paolo Giulio Franciosa, Giorgio Gambosi, and Umberto Nanni. The incremental maintenance of a depth-first-search tree in directed acyclic graphs. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 61(2):113–120, 1997.
- [20] Jon Freeman. Parallel algorithms for depth-first search. *Technical Report, University of Pennsylvania*, October 1991.
- [21] Ratan K. Ghosh and G. P. Bhattacharjee. A parallel search algorithm for directed acyclic graphs. *BIT*, 24(2):134–150, 1984.
- [22] Andrew V. Goldberg, Serge A. Plotkin, and Pravin M. Vaidya. Sublinear-time parallel algorithms for matching and related problems. *J. Algorithms*, 14(2):180–213, 1993.
- [23] Sudipto Guha, Andrew McGregor, and David Tench. Vertex and hyperedge connectivity in dynamic graph streams. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS*, pages 241–247, 2015.
- [24] Torben Hagerup. Planar depth-first search in $O(\log n)$ parallel time. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 19(4):678–704, 1990.
- [25] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krininger, and Danupon Nanongkai. Sublinear-time maintenance of breadth-first spanning tree in partially dynamic networks. In *ICALP (2)*, pages 607–619, 2013.
- [26] Zengfeng Huang and Pan Peng. Dynamic Graph Stream Algorithms in $o(n)$ Space. In *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2016)*, pages 18:1–18:16, 2016.
- [27] Joseph JáJá. *An Introduction to Parallel Algorithms*. Addison-Wesley, 1992.
- [28] Junting Jin, Xiaowei Shi, Cuiping Li, and Hong Chen. Fast approximation of shortest path on dynamic information networks. In *Web-Age Information Management WAIM*, pages 272–276, 2014.
- [29] Ming-Yang Kao. All graphs have cycle separators and planar directed depth-first search is in DNC. In *VLSI Algorithms and Architectures, 3rd Aegean Workshop on Computing, AWOC, Proceedings*, pages 53–63, 1988.
- [30] Valerie King, Shay Kutten, and Mikkel Thorup. Construction and impromptu repair of an MST in a distributed network with $o(m)$ communication. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC*, pages 71–80, 2015.
- [31] Devendra Kumar, S. Sitharama Iyengar, and Mohan B. Sharma. Corrigenda: Corrections to a distributed depth-first search algorithm. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 35(1):55–56, 1990.
- [32] K. B. Lakshmanan, N. Meenakshi, and Krishnaiyan Thulasiraman. A time-optimal message-efficient distributed algorithm for depth-first-search. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 25(2):103–109, 1987.

- [33] Shuang Liu, Brice Effantin, and Hamamache Kheddouci. A fully dynamic distributed algorithm for a B-coloring of graphs. In *IEEE International Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Processing with Applications, ISPA*, pages 657–662, 2008.
- [34] S. A. M. Makki and George Havas. Distributed algorithms for depth-first search. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 60(1):7–12, 1996.
- [35] Andrew McGregor. Graph stream algorithms: A survey. *SIGMOD Rec.*, 43(1):9–20, May 2014.
- [36] Thomas C. O’Connell. A survey of graph algorithms under extended streaming models of computation. In *Fundamental Problems in Computing: Essays in Honor of Professor Daniel J. Rosenkrantz*, pages 455–476, 2009.
- [37] Chao-Wei Ou and Sanjay Ranka. Parallel incremental graph partitioning. *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, 8(8):884–896, 1997.
- [38] David Peleg. *Distributed Computing: A Locality-sensitive Approach*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2000.
- [39] John H. Reif. Depth-first search is inherently sequential. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 20(5):229–234, 1985.
- [40] Jan Matthias Ruhl. Efficient algorithms for new computational models. *PhD Thesis*, Department of Computer Science, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 2003.
- [41] Baruch Schieber and Uzi Vishkin. On finding lowest common ancestors: Simplification and parallelization. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 17(6):1253–1262, 1988.
- [42] Kirk Schloegel, George Karypis, and Vipin Kumar. Parallel static and dynamic multi-constraint graph partitioning. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 14(3):219–240, 2002.
- [43] Mohan B. Sharma and S. Sitharama Iyengar. An efficient distributed depth-first-search algorithm. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 32(4):183–186, 1989.
- [44] Deepak D. Sherlekar, Shaunak Pawagi, and I. V. Ramakrishnan. $O(1)$ parallel time incremental graph algorithms. In *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 477–495, 1985.
- [45] Justin R. Smith. Parallel algorithms for depth-first searches i. planar graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 15(3):814–830, 1986.
- [46] Bala Swaminathan and Kenneth J. Goldman. An incremental distributed algorithm for computing biconnected components in dynamic graphs. *Algorithmica*, 22(3):305–329, 1998.
- [47] Robert Endre Tarjan. Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 1(2):146–160, 1972.
- [48] Robert Endre Tarjan. Finding dominators in directed graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 3(1):62–89, 1974.
- [49] Robert Endre Tarjan. Edge-disjoint spanning trees and depth-first search. *Acta Inf.*, 6:171–185, 1976.

- [50] Robert Endre Tarjan and Uzi Vishkin. Finding biconnected components and computing tree functions in logarithmic parallel time (extended summary). In *25th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 12–20, 1984.
- [51] Yung H. Tsin. Some remarks on distributed depth-first search. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 82(4):173–178, 2002.
- [52] Y. Zhang. Parallel algorithms for problems involving directed graphs. *PhD Thesis*, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, 1986.

A Pseudo codes of Traversals in Rerooting Algorithm

Procedure Reroot-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c): Traversal enters through r_c into the component c containing a path p_c and set of trees \mathcal{T}_c .	
/* Let current phase be \mathcal{P}_i and current stage be \mathcal{S}_j */	*/
1 $\tau_c \leftarrow$ Heaviest tree in \mathcal{T}_c ;	
2 $T(v_H) \leftarrow$ Smallest subtree having size at least $n/2^i$;	
3 if $ \tau_c \leq n/2^i$ then Return Reroot-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c) in next phase;	
4 if $ p_c \leq n/2^j$ then Return Reroot-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c) in next stage;	
/* Disintegrating Traversal */	*/
5 if $p_c = \phi$ or $r_c = \text{root}(\tau_c)$ then Return DisInt-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c);	
/* Disconnecting Traversal */	*/
6 if $r_c \notin \mathbb{T}_c \cup \{p_c\}$ or $r_c \in T(v_H)$ then Return DisCon-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c);	
7 if $r_c \in p_c$ then Return Path-Halving($r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c, \phi$);	/* Path Halving */
8 Heavy-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c);	/* Heavy Subtree Traversal */

Procedure Process-Comp($\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{T}, p^*$): Moves components created of type $C1$ and components created with $p \in \mathcal{P}$ of type $C2$ to the next stage, after traversal of $p^* = p_1 \cup p_2 \cup p_3$, the newly added path in T^* . Here, $p \in \mathcal{P}, p_1, p_2$ and p_3 are ancestor-descendant paths of T and traversal of p^* ensures components of type $C1$ and $C2$ with paths in \mathcal{P} only.

```

1 foreach  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  do                                     /*  $p = path(x, y)$ , where  $x$  lower in  $T^*$  */
2   foreach  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$  in parallel using  $|\tau|$  processors do
3     if  $Query(\tau, path(x, y)) \neq \phi$  then             /*  $\exists$  edge from  $\tau$  to  $p$  */
4        $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \setminus \{\tau\}, \mathcal{T}_p \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_p \cup \{\tau\};$ 
5     end
6   end
7   for  $p' \in \{p_3, p_2, p_1\}$  do                         /*  $p' = path(x', y')$ , where  $x'$  lower in  $T^*$  */
8      $\{x_p, y_p\} \leftarrow Query(p, path(x', y'))$ ;       /* where  $x_p \in p$  */
9     foreach  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_p$  do  $(x_\tau, y_\tau) \leftarrow Query(\tau, path(x', y'))$ ; /* where  $x_\tau \in \tau$  */
10     $\{x_p, y_p\} \leftarrow$  Lowest edge on  $T^*$  among  $(x_p, y_p)$  and  $(x_\tau, y_\tau), \forall \tau \in \mathcal{T}_p$ ;
11    if  $(x_p, y_p)$  is a valid edge then break;
12  end
13  Add  $(x_p, y_p)$  to  $T^*$ ;
14  Reroot-DFS( $x_p, p, \mathcal{T}_p$ ) in current stage;
15 end
16 foreach  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$  in parallel using  $|\tau|$  processors do
17    $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \setminus \tau;$ 
18   for  $p' \in \{p_3, p_2, p_1\}$  do                         /*  $p' = path(x', y')$ , where  $x'$  lower in  $T^*$  */
19      $(x_\tau, y_\tau) \leftarrow Query(\tau, path(x', y'))$ ; /* where  $x_\tau \in \tau$  */
20     if  $(x_\tau, y_\tau)$  is a valid edge then break;
21   end
22   Add  $(y_\tau, x_\tau)$  to  $T^*$ ;
23   Reroot-DFS( $x_\tau, \phi, \{\tau\}$ ) in next stage;
24 end

```

Procedure DisInt-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c): Disintegrating Traversal of a component c having a path p_c and a set of trees \mathcal{T}_c through the root $r_c \in \tau \in \mathbb{T}_c$, where either $|p_c| = 0$ or $r_c = root(\tau)$.

```

1  $T(v_H) \leftarrow$  Smallest subtree  $\tau'$  of  $\tau$ , where  $|\tau'| > n/2^i$ ;
2  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(r_c, root(\tau))$ ;
3  $T(v_h) \leftarrow$  Subtree from  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $v_H$ ;
4  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \setminus T(v_h) \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(v_h, v_H)$ ;
5 Add  $path(r_c, v_H)$  to  $T^*$ ;
6 if  $|p_c| \neq 0$  then  $p \leftarrow p_c; \mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_c \setminus \tau;$  /* Component of type  $C2$  */
7 else  $p \leftarrow path(par(par(v_h)), root(\tau));$  /* remaining part of  $path(r_c, root(\tau))$  */
8 Process-Comp( $\{p\}, \mathcal{T}, path(r_c, v_H)$ ); /* Goes to DisCon-DFS or next phase */

```

Procedure Path-Halving-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c): Traversal of a component c having a path p_c and a set of trees \mathcal{T}_c through the root $r_c \in p_c$.

```

1  $p_c \leftarrow p_c \setminus \text{path}(r_c, x)$  ;           /*  $p_c = \text{path}(x, y)$  where  $|\text{path}(x, r_c)| \geq |\text{path}(y, r_c)|$  */
2  $p^* \leftarrow \text{path}(r_c, x)$ ;
3 Add  $p^*$  to  $T^*$ ;
4 Process-Comp( $\{p_c\}, \mathcal{T}_c, p^*$ ) ;           /* Goes to next stage */

```

Procedure DisCon-DFS(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c): Disconnecting Traversal of a component c having a path p_c and a set of trees \mathcal{T}_c through the root r_c , where either $r_c \in \tau \notin \mathbb{T}_c$ or $r_c \in T(v_H)$.

```

/*  $p_c = \text{path}(u, v)$ , where  $u$  is ancestor of  $v$  */
1 if  $\tau$  has an edge to upper half of  $p_c$  then
2 |  $(x, y) \leftarrow$  Lowest edge from  $\tau$  to  $p_c$ ;  $p'_c \leftarrow \text{path}(y, u)$  ;           /* where  $x \in \tau$  */
3 else  $(x, y) \leftarrow$  Highest edge from  $\tau$  to  $p_c$ ;  $p'_c \leftarrow \text{path}(y, v)$  ;           /* where  $x \in \tau$  */
4  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(r_c, \text{root}(\tau))$ ;
5  $T(v) \leftarrow$  Subtree from  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $x$ ;
6  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \setminus T(v) \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(v, x)$ ;
7  $p \leftarrow \text{path}(\text{par}(\text{par}(v)), \text{root}(\tau))$  ;           /* remaining part of  $\text{path}(r_c, \text{root}(\tau))$  */
8  $p^* \leftarrow \text{path}(r_c, x) \cup (x, y) \cup p'_c$ ;
9 Add  $p^*$  to  $T^*$ ;
10 Process-Comp( $\{p, p_c \setminus p'_c\}, \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_c \setminus \{\tau\}, p^*$ ) ;           /* Goes to next stage/phase */

```

```

Procedure Heavy-DFS( $r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c$ ): Heavy Subtree Traversal of a component  $c$  having a path
 $p_c$  and a set of trees  $\mathcal{T}_c$  through the root  $r_c \in \tau \in \mathbb{T}_c$ , where  $r' = \text{root}(\tau)$ 

1  $T(v_H) \leftarrow$  Smallest subtree  $\tau'$  of  $\tau$ , where  $|\tau'| > n/2^i$ ;
   /* Considering Scenario 1. */
2  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(r_c, r')$  with edge in  $p_c$ ;
3  $T(v_L) \leftarrow$  Subtree from  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $v_H$ ;
4  $p^* \leftarrow \text{path}(r_c, r')$ ;
5  $(x_1, y_1) \leftarrow$  Highest edge to  $p^*$  from  $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $p_c$ ; /* where  $y_1 \in p^*$  */
6 if  $x_1 \notin T(v_L)$  or  $x_1 \in T(v_H)$  or  $x_1 = v_L$  or  $x_1 \in p_c$  then
7   |   Add  $p^*$  to  $T^*$ ;
8   |    $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $p^*$ ;
9   |   Return Process-Comp( $\{p_c\}, \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_c \setminus \tau, p^*$ );
   |   /* Goes to DisConn, DisInt or Path-Halving */
10 end
   /* Considering Scenario 2. */
11  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \setminus T(v_L) \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(v_L, v_H)$  with edge in  $p_c$ ;
12  $(x_d, y_d) \leftarrow$  Highest edge to  $p^*$  from  $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}$ ; /* where  $x_d \in \tau'$  */
13 if  $(x_d, y_d) = \phi$  then  $y_d = r_c$ ;
14  $(x_p, y_p) \leftarrow \{(x', y') : x' \in T(v_L), y' \in \text{path}(y_d, r') \text{ of minimum } LCA(x', v_H)\}$ ;
15  $p^* \leftarrow \text{path}(r_c, x_p) \cup (x_p, y_p) \cup \text{path}(y_p, \text{par}(v_L))$ ;
16  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(r_c, r')$  with edge in  $p_c$ ;
17  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \setminus T(v_L) \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(v_L, x_p)$  with edge in  $p_c$ ;
18  $(x_2, y_2) \leftarrow$  Lowest edge to  $p^*$  from  $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}$  or  $p_c$ ; /* where  $y_2 \in p^*$  */
19  $T(v_P) \leftarrow$  The subtree hanging from  $\text{path}(v_L, x_p)$  having  $v_H$ ;
20 if  $x_2 \notin T(v_P)$  or  $x_2 \in T(v_H)$  or  $x_2 = v_P$  or  $x_2 \in p_c$  then
21   |   Add  $p^*$  to  $T^*$ ;
22   |    $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(r_c, r')$  and  $\text{path}(v_L, x_p)$ ;
23   |   Return Process-Comp( $\{p_c, \text{path}(\text{par}(y_p), r')\}, \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_c \setminus \tau, p^*$ );
   |   /* Goes to DisConn, DisInt or Path-Halving */
24 end
   /* Considering Scenario 3. */
25  $\tau_d \leftarrow$  Subtree hanging on  $\text{path}(v_L, v_H)$  having  $x_d$ ;
26  $(x'_2, y'_2) \leftarrow$  Lowest edge from  $\tau_d$  to  $(r_c, y_p)$ ;
27 if  $y_2$  lower than  $y'_2$  then  $(x_r, y_r) \leftarrow (x'_2, y'_2)$ ;
28 else  $(x_r, y_r) \leftarrow (x_2, y_2)$ ;
29  $p^* \leftarrow \text{path}(r_c, x_r) \cup (x_r, y_r) \cup \text{path}(y_r, r')$ ;
30  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(r_c, r')$  with edge to  $p_c$ ;
31  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \setminus T(v_L) \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(v_L, x_r)$  with edge to  $p_c$ ;
32  $(x_3, y_3) \leftarrow$  Lowest edge to  $p^*$  from  $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}$  or  $p_c$ ; /* where  $y_3 \in p^*$  */
33  $T(v_R) \leftarrow$  The subtree hanging from  $\text{path}(v_L, x_r)$  having  $v_H$ ;
34 if  $x_3 \notin T(v_R)$  or  $x_3 \in T(v_H)$  or  $x_3 = v_P$  or  $x_3 \in p_c$  then
35   |   Add  $p^*$  to  $T^*$ ;
36   |    $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $\text{path}(r_c, r')$  and  $\text{path}(v_L, x_r)$ ;
37   |   Return Process-Comp( $\{p_c, \text{path}(\text{par}(v_L), y_r) \setminus \{y_r\}\}, \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_c \setminus \tau, p^*$ );
   |   /* Goes to DisConn, DisInt or Path-Halving */
38 end
39 Heavy-Special( $r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c$ );

```

Procedure Heavy-Special(r_c, p_c, \mathcal{T}_c): Special Case of Heavy Subtree Traversal of a component c having a path p_c and a set of trees \mathcal{T}_c through the root $r_c \in \tau \in \mathbb{T}_c$.

```

/* Modified  $r'$  traversal. */
1  $p_{R'}^* \leftarrow path(r_c, x_2) \cup (x_2, y_2) \cup path(y_2, root(\tau));$ 
2  $p_1 \leftarrow path(par(v_l), y_2) \setminus \{y_2\};$ 
3  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(r_c, root(\tau))$  with edge to  $p_1$ ;
4  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \setminus T(v_L) \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(v_L, x_2)$  with edge to  $p_1$ ;
5  $(x', y') \leftarrow$  Lowest edge to  $p_{R'}^*$  from  $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}$  or  $p_1$ ; /* where  $y' \in p_{R'}^*$  */
6 if  $y'$  at most as high as  $y_p$  then
    /* Root Traversal of  $\tau_d$ . */
7  $p_{R'} \leftarrow (y_p, x_p) \cup path(x_p, root(\tau_d));$ 
8 Add  $p_{R'}^*$  and  $p_{R'}$  to  $T^*$ ;
9  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(r_c, root(\tau)) \setminus \{T(v_L)\}$ ;
10  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(v_L, x_2) \setminus \{\tau_d\}$ ;
11  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(x_d, root(\tau_d))$ ;
12 Return Process-Comp( $\{p_c, p_1\}, \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_c \setminus \tau, p_{R'}^* \cup p_{R'}$ ) /* Goes to DisConn, DisInt or
    Path-Halving */
13 end

/* Cover traversal of  $p_1$  */
14 if  $x' \notin p_1$  then /* Connected to  $p_1$  through  $\tau'$  */
15 |  $y_{\tau'} \leftarrow x'$ ;
16 |  $\{x', x_{\tau'}\} \leftarrow$  Highest edge on  $p_1$  from  $\tau'$ ; /* where  $x' \in p_1$  */
17 end

18 if  $x'$  at most as high as  $y_r$  on  $p_1$  then
    /* Upward Cover Traversal of  $p_1$ . */
19 | if  $x_{\tau'} \neq \phi$  then  $\{x', x_{\tau'}\} \leftarrow$  Lowest edge on  $p_1$  from  $\tau'$  /* where  $x' \in p_1$  */;
20 |  $p_{R'} \leftarrow p_{\tau'} \cup path(x', y_2) \setminus \{y_2\};$ 
21 |  $p_1' \leftarrow path(par(v_l), x') \setminus \{x'\};$ 
22 |  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(v_L, x_2)$ ;
23 else
    /* Lower Cover Traversal of  $p_1$ . */
24 |  $(x_r^*, y_r^*) \leftarrow$  Highest edge from  $\tau_d$  to  $path(par(y_r), y_2) \setminus \{y_2\}$ ; /* where  $y_r^* \in path(y_r, y_2)$  */
25 | if  $(x_r^*, y_r^*) = \phi$  then  $(x_r^*, y_r^*) \leftarrow (x_2, y_2);$ 
26 |  $p_{R'}^* \leftarrow path(r_c, x_r^*) \cup (x_r^*, y_r^*) \cup path(y_r^*, root(\tau));$ 
27 |  $p_{R'} \leftarrow p_{\tau'} \cup path(x', par(v_l));$ 
28 |  $p_1' \leftarrow path(par(x'), y_r^*) \setminus \{y_r^*\};$ 
29 |  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(v_L, x_r^*)$ ;
30 end

31 if  $x_{\tau'} \neq \phi$  then /* Connected to  $p_1$  through  $\tau'$  */
32 |  $p_{\tau'} \leftarrow (y', y_{\tau'}) \cup path(y_{\tau'}, x_{\tau'}) \cup (x_{\tau'}, x')$ ;
33 |  $p_{\tau'}^* \leftarrow path(LCA(x_{\tau'}, y_{\tau'}), root(\tau'))$ ;
34 |  $\mathcal{T}_{\tau'} \leftarrow$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(x_{\tau'}, y_{\tau'})$  and  $path(LCA(x_{\tau'}, y_{\tau'}), root(\tau'))$ ;
35 else  $p_{\tau'} \leftarrow (y', x')$ ;  $p_{\tau'}^* = \phi$ ;  $\mathcal{T}_{\tau'} = \phi$ ;
36 Add  $p_{R'}^*$  and  $p_{R'}$  to  $T^*$ ;
37  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\tau'} \cup$  Subtrees hanging from  $path(r_c, root(\tau)) \setminus \{T(v_L)\}$ ;
38 Return Process-Comp( $\{p_c, p_1', p_{\tau'}^*\}, \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_c \setminus \tau, p_{R'}^* \cup p_{R'}$ );
/* Goes to DisConn, DisInt or Path-Halving */

```