

# Fully Dynamic Shortest Path Reporting Against an Adaptive Adversary

Anastasiia Alokхина<sup>1</sup> and Jan van den Brand<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Georgia Institute of Technology

November 28, 2023

## Abstract

Algebraic data structures are the main subroutine for maintaining distances in fully dynamic graphs in subquadratic time. However, these dynamic algebraic algorithms generally cannot maintain the shortest paths, especially against adaptive adversaries. We present the first fully dynamic algorithm that maintains the shortest paths against an adaptive adversary in subquadratic update time. This is obtained via a combinatorial reduction that allows reconstructing the shortest paths with only a few distance estimates. Using this reduction, we obtain the following:

On weighted directed graphs with real edge weights in  $[1, W]$ , we can maintain  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths in  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.816}\epsilon^{-2} \log W)$  update and  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.741}\epsilon^{-2} \log W)$  query time. This improves upon the approximate distance data structures from [v.d.Brand, Nanongkai, FOCS'19], which only returned a distance estimate, by matching their complexity and returning an approximate shortest path.

On unweighted directed graphs, we can maintain exact shortest paths in  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.823})$  update and  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.747})$  query time. This improves upon [Bergamaschi, Henzinger, P.Gutenberg, V.Williams, Wein, SODA'21] who could report the path only against oblivious adversaries. We improve both their update and query time while also handling adaptive adversaries.

On unweighted undirected graphs, our reduction holds not just against adaptive adversaries but is also deterministic. We maintain a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path in  $O(n^{1.529}/\epsilon^2)$  time per update, and  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate single source shortest paths in  $O(n^{1.764}/\epsilon^2)$  time per update. Previous deterministic results by [v.d.Brand, Nazari, Forster, FOCS'22] could only maintain distance estimates but no paths.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Our Results and Comparison to Previous Work . . . . .	2
1.2	Organization . . . . .	6
1.3	Preliminaries . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Technical Outline</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Warm-up: Undirected Unweighted Graphs . . . . .	7
2.2	Directed Weighted Graphs . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Path Reporting on Weighted Graphs</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Auxiliary graphs . . . . .	12
3.2	Reconstructing Path Segments on Directed Graphs . . . . .	13
3.3	Reconstructing Path Segments on Undirected graphs . . . . .	17
3.4	Blackbox Reductions . . . . .	20
<b>4</b>	<b>Applying the Blackbox Reductions</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	Oracles . . . . .	24
4.2	Final Complexities . . . . .	25
<b>5</b>	<b>Path Reporting on Unweighted Graphs</b>	<b>27</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Auxiliary Graph Proofs</b>	<b>38</b>

# 1 Introduction

In the dynamic shortest path problem, the task is to create a data structure that maintains the shortest paths in a given graph  $G = (V, E)$  undergoing edge insertions and deletions. This problem has a rich history ([ES81; KS98; Kin99; DI02; Tho04; DI04; San05; Tho05; DI06; BHS07; Ber09; RZ11; BR11; RZ12; ACG12; HKN16; HKN14b; HKN14a; ACD+16; BC16; Ber16; BC17; ACK17; HKN18; BGW20; GW20b; GW20a; BGS20; GW20c; GWW20; CS21; CZ21; BGS21; Chu21; BHG+21; KMS22; KMG22; CZ23a]) with various variants being studied, such as partially dynamic (supporting only edge insertions or only edge deletions), fully dynamic (supporting both insertions and deletions), maintaining single-source shortest paths, all-pairs shortest path, or  $st$ -shortest path. In this work, we focus on high-accuracy (i.e. exact or  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate) shortest paths, as opposed to polylog or large constant factor approximations as studied in, e.g., [ACT14; BKS12; BK16; BBG+22; CZ23b].

A trivial solution for dynamic shortest path would be to run Dijkstra’s algorithm from scratch in  $O(n^2)$  time whenever distance information is queried. It was shown by Abboud and V. Williams [AW14] that for shortest paths, beating  $O(n^2)$  update and query time is only possible when using algebraic techniques<sup>1</sup>. Historically, while being the only tools for beating  $O(n^2)$  update and query time, such dynamic algebraic algorithms have the downside that they only maintain the distance [San05; BNS19; BN19] but not the shortest path itself. Only very recently, the first progress has been made in maintaining the shortest path [BHG+21] on unweighted graphs in subquadratic time. However, the path could only be maintained under the oblivious adversary assumption, i.e. future updates are not allowed to depend on the shortest path previously returned by the data structure.

Removing the oblivious adversary assumption has received a lot of attention in the area of dynamic algorithms because, for many use cases the updates are adaptive (i.e. depend on previous results). One such example would be when a dynamic algorithm is used as a subroutine inside another algorithm (e.g. [Mad10; CK19; BLS+20; CS21; BGS21; BBG+22; CKL+22]). Adaptivity issues also occur when the dynamic algorithm is used to analyze an interactive system, and the interactions with the system are chosen based on the output of the dynamic algorithm. Consider, for example, a map service that provides information about the fastest route given current traffic conditions. If the map service redirects its users away from traffic jams, then this will affect the current traffic conditions, so the input to the dynamic algorithm (map service) is adaptive.

Since assuming an oblivious adversary can be very restrictive or unreasonable depending on the application, removing this assumption has a rich history in dynamic algorithms [BHN16; BC16; Ber17; NSW17; CK19; Waj20; GW20a; GWW20; EFG+21; Chu21; BKM+22; BFN22; BBG+22; KMS22] but also in other areas that analyze interactive systems, such as statistics [HU14; RRS+16; JLN+20; BNS+21; KSS22], machine (un-)learning [GJN+21; NRS21], or streaming algorithms [WZ21; ABD+21; KMN+21; ACS+23; BJW+22; BEO22; CGS22; ABJ+22; CLN+22; CNS+23].

We present the first high-accuracy dynamic algorithms that maintain shortest paths against an adaptive adversary in subquadratic time. Despite solving a harder setting, our complexities match or improve that of previous work:

- For  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths on weighted graphs, we match the update and query time of the fastest dynamic algorithm that maintains the  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate distance against an adaptive adversary [BN19], but we also maintain the path itself.
- For exact unweighted shortest paths, we improve the update and query time of [BHG+21] which could maintain the path only against oblivious adversaries and extend it to adaptive adversaries.

---

<sup>1</sup>In [AW14] it was shown that no dynamic algorithm could beat  $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$  update time unless one can multiply two  $n \times n$  matrices in  $O(n^{3-\epsilon})$  time. Algorithms that make use of fast matrix multiplication are referred to as “algebraic”.

Ref.	Update	Query	Path	Directed	Ref.	Update	Query	Path
(1 + $\epsilon$ )-approx., weighted					exact, directed			
[BN19]	$n^{1.816} \frac{\log W}{\epsilon^2}$	$n^{1.816} \frac{\log W}{\epsilon^2}$	×	✓	[San05]	$Wn^{1.897}$	$Wn^{1.529}$	×
Thm 1.2	$n^{1.816} \frac{\log W}{\epsilon^2}$	$n^{1.741} \frac{\log W}{\epsilon^2}$	✓	✓	[BNS19]	$Wn^{1.724}$	$Wn^{1.724}$	×
Thm 1.2	$n^{1.72} \frac{\log W}{\epsilon^2}$	$n^{1.72} \frac{\log W}{\epsilon^2}$	✓	×	[BHG+21]	$Wn^{1.897}$	$Wn^{1.897}$	✓
(1 + $\epsilon$ )-approx., unweighted					[BFN22]	$Wn^{1.704}$	$Wn^{1.704}$	×
[BHG+21]	$n^{1.529+o_\epsilon(1)}$	$n^{1+o_\epsilon(1)}$	✓	×	Thm 1.1	$Wn^{1.823}$	$Wn^{1.747}$	✓
[BFN22]	$n^{1.406} \epsilon^{-2}$	$n^{1.406} \epsilon^{-2}$	×	×				
Thm 1.3	$n^{1.529} \epsilon^{-2}$	$n^{1.529} \epsilon^{-2}$	✓	×				

Table 1: Comparison previous work on fully dynamic shortest paths with edge updates and pair queries. The  $o_\epsilon(1)$  in [BHG+21] is for constant  $\epsilon > 0$ . Previous path reporting results require the oblivious adversary assumption.

- On unweighted undirected graphs, [BHG+21] additionally presented a faster algorithm for  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths against oblivious adversaries. We match their update time and not only extend it to adaptive adversaries but provide a deterministic dynamic algorithm. Previous deterministic results could only maintain the distance [BFN22], so our work is the first deterministic result for reporting paths in subquadratic time.

We remark that the only previous progress on maintaining paths in subquadratic time against adaptive adversaries had been made for the case of reachability, i.e. maintaining *any* path, not necessarily the shortest one. The dynamic algorithm by [KMS22] can maintain reachability with path reporting against an adaptive adversary in  $O(n^{1.75+o(1)})$  amortized update time<sup>2</sup>. We can maintain the shortest path in directed graphs against an adaptive adversary, instead of just any path, in worst-case update time.

## 1.1 Our Results and Comparison to Previous Work

To maintain distances in subquadratic time, algebraic techniques are required [AW14]. Historically, such algebraic data structures could only maintain the distances in a dynamic graph but not the corresponding shortest paths. Only recently have Bergamaschi, Henzinger, P.Gutenberg, V.Williams and Wein [BHG+21] constructed the first extension to shortest path, but their dynamic algorithm works only against oblivious adversaries. Since algebraic tools are so powerful in maintaining distances, a natural question would be how to efficiently extract the path from distance information. In this work, we present such reductions. We show that given few distance queries, we can reconstruct the shortest path. These reductions work against adaptive adversaries and in the special case of unweighted undirected graphs, it is even deterministic. We will first present the implications of our reductions and then discuss the technical idea of our reduction.

Our dynamic algorithms support a trade-off between update and query time. However, as our results heavily rely on fast (rectangular) matrix multiplication [Wil12; Gal14; AW21; DWZ22; GU18], the exact trade-off is complicated to state. For simplicity, we state all our results for a

<sup>2</sup>In [KMS22] this was stated as  $O(n^{1+5/6})$  but recent advances in decremental strongly connected components [CKL+22] imply an  $O(n^{1.75+o(1)})$  bound.

choice of parameters that minimizes the update time. For each theorem, we provide a reference to the detailed version in Section 4 that states the precise update vs query time trade-off.

**Path Reporting against Adaptive Adversaries** Before focusing on graphs with real edge weights, we present a result that works for small integer weights.

**Theorem 1.1** (Directed, Small Weights, Exact, Corollary 4.4). *There exist fully dynamic algorithms maintaining exact shortest paths on directed graphs with integer edge weights in  $[1, W]$ , supporting edge updates and distance queries for any vertex pair. The worst-case update time is  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.823}W)$ , the query time is  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.747}W)$  and the preprocessing time is  $\tilde{O}(n^{2.626}W)$ . The dynamic algorithm is randomized and correct w.h.p., and works against an adaptive adversary.*

The only previous dynamic algorithm that can maintain the exact shortest path in subquadratic time is by Bergamaschi et al. [BHG+21] for directed unweighted graphs (or smaller integer weights). Their update and query complexity is  $O(n^{1.897}W)$ . We improve upon both update and query time to  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.823}W)$  and  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.747}W)$  respectively, despite working in the harder adaptive adversary model. A trade-off between update and query time is possible and stated in Corollary 4.4. The same  $O(n^{1.897}W)$  complexity as in [BHG+21] was first achieved by Sankowski [San05], whose dynamic algorithm returned only the distance but no path. The only faster dynamic algorithm for maintaining the exact distance (but not the path) has  $O(n^{1.703}W)$  update and query time [BNS19].

We remark that the dynamic algorithm by Karczmarz, Mukherjee and Sankowski [KMS22] can maintain reachability with path reporting against an adaptive adversary. Note that here the task is to return *any* path, not necessarily the shortest one. On DAGs, they can maintain *st*-reachability in  $O(n^{1.529})$  worst-case time and single source reachability in  $O(n^{1.765})$  worst-case time, while also reporting a connecting path (or a tree in case of single source). To extend these results to general graphs, their update time becomes *amortized* and in case of *st*-reachability also increases<sup>2</sup> to  $O(n^{1.75+o(1)})$  update time. Our dynamic shortest path algorithm Theorem 1.1 works on directed graphs, so it can also maintain reachability with path reporting in *worst-case* update time.

So far, we have only focused on unweighted graphs (or with small integer weights). Now, we present results that hold on real weighted graphs and return a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest path. We remark that it is unlikely for an *exact* dynamic algorithm with subquadratic update time to exist because that would contradict the APSP conjecture [AW14].

**Theorem 1.2** (Weighted, Approximate, Corollaries 4.2 and 4.3). *There exist fully dynamic algorithms maintaining  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths on weighted graphs with real edge weights in  $[1, W]$ , supporting edge updates and distance queries for any vertex pair.*

- On directed graphs, the worst-case update and query time are  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.816}\epsilon^{-2}\log W)$  and  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.741}\epsilon^{-2}\log W)$  respectively. The preprocessing time is  $\tilde{O}(n^{2.633}\epsilon^{-2}\log W)$ .
- On undirected graphs, the worst-case update and query time are  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.72}\epsilon^{-2}\log W)$ . The preprocessing time is  $\tilde{O}(n^{2.564}\epsilon^{-2}\log W)$ .

*The dynamic algorithms are randomized, correct w.h.p. and work against an adaptive adversary.*

No other known fully dynamic algorithms maintain a  $((1 + \epsilon)$ -approximately) shortest path in weighted graphs in subquadratic time. While there are many dynamic algorithms that maintain paths on weighted graphs, they either maintain large constant or polylogarithmic approximation factors (e.g., [ACT14; BKS12; BK16; BBG+22; CZ23b]), or study harder problems such as APSP and have  $\Omega(n^2)$  update time (e.g., [DI04; Tho05; ACK17; GW20a; CZ23a]). If we ignore the task of returning a path and focus just on returning the (approximate) distance, then the fastest known dynamic algorithm on weighted graphs is by v.d.Brand and Nanongkai [BN19], which can

maintain  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -distances in  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.816}\epsilon^{-2} \log W)$  update and query time<sup>3</sup>. Our result Theorem 1.2 matches this complexity from [BN19] but can return the path itself. (We have the same dependence on fast matrix multiplication, so we match their result also for all future improvements on fast matrix multiplication.)

**Deterministic Results on Unweighted Undirected Graphs** In [BFN22], v.d.Brand, Forster and Nazari showed that maintaining approximate distance estimates can be made deterministic when the input graph is unweighted and undirected. Using their techniques, we can also provide deterministic variants of our dynamic path reporting data structures on unweighted undirected graphs.

**Theorem 1.3** (Undirected, Unweighted, Approximate, Lemma 5.5). *There exists a fully dynamic algorithm that maintains a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path for unweighted undirected graphs. The worst-case update and query time is  $O(n^{1.529}\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  and the preprocessing time is  $O(n^{2.372}\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ . The dynamic algorithm is deterministic.*

The only previous dynamic algorithms for maintaining  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths on unweighted undirected graphs are by Bergamaschi et al. [BHG+21]. Their algorithm could maintain shortest paths in  $O_\epsilon(n^{1.529})$  update and  $n^{1+o(1)}$  query time, but the dynamic algorithm is randomized and required the oblivious adversary assumption. We not only match their update time and extend the dynamic algorithm to adaptive adversaries, but our result is also deterministic.

To support single-source queries, we can extend our dynamic algorithm as follows. Here a query returns an approximate shortest paths tree.

**Theorem 1.4** (Undirected, Unweighted, Approximate, Lemma 5.6). *There exists a fully dynamic algorithm that maintains  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate single-source shortest paths for unweighted undirected graphs. The worst-case update and query time is  $O(n^{1.764}\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  and the preprocessing time is  $O(n^{2.609}\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ . The dynamic algorithm is deterministic.*

**Reduction from Paths to Distances** We show reductions from the dynamic shortest path to dynamic distances. Our algorithm only assumes blackbox access to a dynamic algorithm that can maintain exact and approximate distances and uses this distance information to reconstruct the shortest path. The complexities stated in Section 1.1 are based on using the dynamic distance algorithms by [San05; BN19] (Lemma 4.1). If in the future more efficient dynamic distance algorithms are developed, then our results will become faster as well.

Dynamic algebraic algorithms are very efficient for maintaining short distances but become slower as the maximum distance increases. This kind of data structure maintains “ $h$ -bounded distances”, i.e. for any  $s, t \in V$ , they return the correct  $st$ -distance if the distance is at most  $h$ , and otherwise, it returns  $\infty$ .

**Theorem 1.5** (Simplified version of Theorem 3.17). *Let  $h$  be a parameter between 1 and  $n$ . Assume we are given a distance oracle on a directed graph  $G = (V, E)$  with integer edge weights bounded by  $W$ . Given any two sets  $S, T \subset V$ , the oracle returns  $Wh$ -bounded distances for each pair in  $S \times T$ . Let  $Q_\alpha(|S|, |T|)$  be the complexity of the oracle for returning an  $\alpha$ -approximation of the  $Wh$ -bounded distances for  $S, T \subset V$ .*

*Then given  $s, t \in V$  we can reconstruct an exact  $st$ -shortest path in time*

$$\tilde{O}(Q_1(n/h, n/h) + Q_2(n, n/h) + n \cdot Q_1(1, 1) \log(nW)).$$

---

<sup>3</sup>In [BN19], this was stated as  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.823}/\epsilon^2 \log W)$  update and query time, but their choice of trade-off parameters was not optimal.



Theorem 1.5 is a simplified version of the reduction that yields Theorem 1.1 when combining with the dynamic distance algorithms from [San05; BN19]. We also prove similar reductions for  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths on weighted graphs, which increases the complexity by an  $\tilde{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$  factor (Theorem 3.1).

Notice that we only need a crude 2-approximation<sup>4</sup> for distances of  $n \times n/h$  many pairs (see  $Q_2(n, n/h)$  term in Theorem 1.5) to reconstruct an *exact*  $st$ -shortest path. This is what allows our reduction to be very efficient, and for Theorem 1.1 to be faster than previous work [BHG+21], and for Theorem 1.2 to match previous work of [BN19], despite returning the shortest path.

We give a brief description of the technical ideas used to prove Theorem 1.5, a more detailed description is given in Section 2. As mentioned before, dynamic algebraic algorithms efficiently maintain  $h$ -bounded distances for small  $h$ . Thus they are usually combined with graph techniques (e.g. random hitting sets [UY91]) to decompose long paths  $s \rightsquigarrow t$  into segments  $s \rightsquigarrow h_1 \rightsquigarrow h_2 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow t$  each of short length [San05; BHG+21; BN19; BFN22]. So the task to construct an  $st$ -shortest path reduces to the task of finding  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path for each  $i$ .

While techniques such as predecessor search can efficiently reconstruct the shortest path for *one* such segment, repeating this for *all* segments requires exact distances for upto  $\tilde{O}(n \cdot n/h)$  vertex pairs. Existing algebraic data structures are too slow to compute the exact distances for so many pairs in subquadratic time. We can beat the quadratic barrier because our technique only requires 2-approximate distances for  $\tilde{O}(n \cdot n/h)$  vertex pairs.

This is done via a pre-filtering step that for each segment reduces the search space of potential predecessors. This pre-filtering step uses an *approximate* distance oracle, even if we later compute an *exact* shortest path as in Theorem 1.1. Using the approximate distances, we create for each segment  $h_i \rightarrow h_{i+1}$  a set of plausible vertices  $P_i \subset V$  that could potentially be on the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path. We show that (i) the distances from  $h_i$  to each  $v \in P_i$  suffice to reconstruct the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path, (ii) while any one  $P_i$  could be of size  $O(n)$ , the total size of all  $P_i$  together is small:  $\sum_i |P_i| = O(n \log nW)$  where  $W$  is the largest edge weight in the graph. This means we need only  $O(n \log nW)$  exact  $h$ -bounded distance pairs, which algebraic data structures can compute in subquadratic time.

**Other Related Work and Open Problems** Besides shortest paths, there are also other dynamic problems that can only be maintained in subquadratic time when using algebraic techniques [AW14], e.g. maximum cardinality matching and reachability. Algebraic data structures often have the downside that they maintain only some value (distance, size of the matching, whether there exists some path) but not the object itself (the path or matching), see e.g. [KS02; DI00; San04; San05; San07; San08; BNS19; BN19; BS19; BFN22; GR21; AH22]. For a long time, it was an open problem how to maintain the object itself. The work by [KMS22; BHG+21] and our results are the first results in that direction for reachability and shortest paths. However, for matching the question remains open, even against oblivious adversaries. It is also open whether the shortest path (or reachability with path reporting) can be solved in the same complexity as maintaining the distance (or reachability information) or if there is some strict gap between maintaining the value vs. object. Conditional lower bounds [AW14; HKN+15] imply lower bounds for the value problem and no larger lower bounds are known for maintaining the object.

Similar open problems also occur in non-algebraic dynamic algorithms, i.e. dynamic algorithms for approximate matching. While the size of a matching can be approximated with better-than-2 approximation in  $\text{polylog}(n)$  update time [Beh23; BKS+23], it is open whether the approximate matching itself can be computed in that time. Maintaining the matching itself for 2-approximations

---

<sup>4</sup>In fact, any constant factor approximation would suffice.

was already an active area of research by analyzing how to round fractional matchings to integral ones [Waj20; BK21].

## 1.2 Organization

We start by giving some notation in the preliminaries (Section 1.3). In Section 2 we then outline how to extend dynamic algorithms that maintain distances to support path queries. These results are then formally proven in subsequent sections: Section 3 proves how to extend dynamic distance algorithms for weighted graphs also to maintain (approximately) shortest paths, and in Section 4, these techniques are combined with the dynamic distance algorithms from [San05; BN19] to obtain our results Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. These results are randomized and work against an adaptive adversary. At last, Section 5 considers unweighted undirected graphs and presents deterministic path reporting algorithms.

## 1.3 Preliminaries

With high probability (w.h.p.) means with probability at least  $1 - 1/n^c$  for any constant  $c > 1$ .

**Graph notations.** We will use  $\text{len}_G(u, v)$  for the length of the edge  $(u, v)$  in graph  $G$  and  $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$  for distance between  $u$  and  $v$  in graph  $G$ . We write  $\text{dist}_G^h(u, v)$  for the  $h$ -bounded distances, i.e.  $\text{dist}_G^h(u, v) = \text{dist}_G(s, t)$  if  $\text{dist}_G(s, t) \leq h$  and  $\text{dist}_G^h(u, v) = \infty$  otherwise.

We say  $\tilde{d} \in [0, (1+\epsilon)h] \cup \{\infty\}$ <sup>5</sup> is a  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate  $h$ -bounded  $st$ -distance, if (i)  $\text{dist}_G(s, t) \leq \tilde{d}$  and (ii)  $\tilde{d} \leq (1+\epsilon) \text{dist}_G(s, t)$  when  $\text{dist}_G(s, t) \leq h$ . Similarly, we call any  $\tilde{d} > 0$  a  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate  $h$ -hop bounded  $st$ -distance if (i)  $\tilde{d} \geq \text{dist}_G(s, t)$ , and (ii)  $\tilde{d} = \text{dist}_G(s, t)$  if there is a shortest path using at most  $h$  hop.

We write  $\pi_G^*(u, v)$  for a  $uv$ -shortest path in  $G$ .

We write  $\mathcal{N}_G(v) = [u_1, u_2, \dots]$  for the neighbourhood of a vertex  $v$  in an undirected graph  $G$  sorted in ascending order by the edge length (breaking ties arbitrarily). Similarly,  $\mathcal{N}_{out}(v)$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{in}(v)$  denote the out-adjacent and in-adjacent neighbourhoods of  $v$  in directed graphs, sorted in ascending order by edge lengths.

**Oracles.** Throughout, we will assume access to distance oracles. These oracles are given by running dynamic distance algorithms of previous work [San05; BN19].

**Definition 1.6.** We write  $\mathcal{O}_G^{(1+\epsilon)}$  for an oracle that returns  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate  $h$ -bounded distance estimates on graph  $G$  and supports the following operations

- *preprocess()* – preprocess graph  $G$  in time  $P_{1+\epsilon}$
- *update( $e, w$ )* – update any edge  $e$  in  $G$  to weight  $w$  in time  $U_{1+\epsilon}$
- *queryAll( $S_1, S_2$ )* – query all bounded distances between pairs  $s_1 \in S_1, s_2 \in S_2$  in time  $Q_{1+\epsilon}(|S_1|, |S_2|)$ .
- *query( $u, v$ )* – query bounded distance between  $u$  and  $v$  in time  $Q_{1+\epsilon}(1, 1)$ .

For example, in our pseudo-code, we will write  $\mathcal{O}_G^{(1+\epsilon)}.query(u, v)$  when querying the  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate  $h$ -bounded  $uv$ -distance in  $G$ . Also, for exact distance oracle we'll use notation  $\mathcal{O}_G$  for simplicity.

---

<sup>5</sup>We can w.l.o.g assume that any approximate data structure has output values within this range by setting all values larger than  $(1+\epsilon)h$  to  $\infty$ .



**Integer weight rounding** Our dynamic algorithm relies on the integer weight rounding technique by Zwick [Zwi02]. This technique reduces the task of computing  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate distances on (positive) real weighted graphs to computing  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate distances on integer weighted graphs.

**Definition 1.7.** For real numbers  $0 < A, B$  define the graph  $G' = (V, E')$  to be an  $(A, B)$ -rounded version of the graph with edges  $E' = \{(u, v) \in E \mid \text{len}_G(u, v) \leq B\}$  and integer edge weights  $\text{len}_{G'}(u, v) = \lceil A \text{len}_G(u, v) / B \rceil$ .

**Lemma 1.8** ([Zwi02],[BN19, Lemma 4.9]). Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with  $n$  nodes and real edge weights from  $[1, W]$ . For any  $0 < A, B$  let  $G'$  be the  $(A, B)$ -rounded version of  $G$ .

Then for any path from  $s$  to  $t$  in  $G$  of length  $\text{dist}_G(s, t) \leq B$  let  $h$  be the number of its hops. We have  $\text{dist}_G(s, t) \leq (B/A) \text{dist}_{G'}(s, t) \leq \text{dist}_G(s, t) + (B/A)h$ .

**Lemma 1.9** ([Zwi02],[BN19, Lemma 4.10]). Let  $\epsilon \geq 0$ ,  $0 < a < 1$ ,  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with  $n$  nodes and real edge weights from  $[1, W]$ . For  $k = \lceil \log_2 nW \rceil$  and all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ , define graph  $G_i$  as  $(A, B_i)$ -rounded versions of  $G$  where  $B_i = 2^i$ ,  $A = 2n^a/\epsilon$ .

For the special case  $\epsilon = 0$  we let  $k = 0$ ,  $G_0 = G$ ,  $A = B = Wn^a$ .

Then for any pair  $s, t \in V$  we have  $\text{dist}_G(s, t) \leq \min_i (B_i/A) \text{dist}_{G_i}(s, t)$  and if the  $st$ -shortest path uses at most  $n^a$  hops, then we also have  $\min_i (B_i/A) \text{dist}_{G_i}(s, t) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(s, t)$ .

## 2 Technical Outline

In this work, we present techniques for extending dynamic distance algorithms also to maintain an (approximately) shortest path against an adaptive adversary. To outline our techniques, we will start with a simple warm-up on unweighted undirected graphs in Section 2.1. We describe how to find the  $st$ -shortest path on this type of graph, which also serves as a demonstration of the issues that must be resolved when looking at weighted and/or directed graphs. The subsequent Section 2.2 then describes our techniques for directed and weighted graphs and how these techniques circumvent the problems from the previous subsection.

### 2.1 Warm-up: Undirected Unweighted Graphs

We start with a brief summary of how dynamic algebraic algorithms are used to maintain the distance. We then explain how to extend this result also to return the shortest path.

**Dynamic Distances** Dynamic algebraic algorithms can efficiently maintain bounded distances. For example, Sankowski [San05] presented a dynamic algorithm that maintains  $h$ -bounded distances for any  $h \geq 1$  on unweighted graphs in  $O(hn^{1.529})$  update time, and  $O(hn^{0.529})$  query time to return the  $h$ -bounded distance for any pair of vertices. Via a common hitting set sampling argument (see e.g. [UY91]), this result can be extended to unbounded distances: when sampling  $\Theta(n/h)$  vertices  $S \subset V$ , any shortest path  $s \rightsquigarrow t$  is w.h.p. split into segments  $s \rightsquigarrow h_1 \rightsquigarrow h_2 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow t$  with  $h_i \in S$  for all  $i$ , and each segment using at most  $h$  edges. This leads to the following observation:

**Fact 2.1.** Let  $R$  be a uniformly sampled random subset of  $V$  of size  $\Theta((n/h) \log n)$ . Let graph  $H = (V_H, E_H) = (R \cup \{s, t\}, E_H)$  be a complete graph where for all  $(u, v) \in E_H$  the edge weight  $\text{len}_H(u, v)$  is the  $h$ -bounded  $uv$ -distance in  $G$ . Then w.h.p.  $\text{dist}_H(s, t) = \text{dist}_G(s, t)$ .

So if we know the pairwise  $h$ -bounded distances  $(R \cup \{s, t\}) \times (R \cup \{s, t\})$ , then we find the  $st$ -distance with just  $O((n/h)^2)$  additional time for running Dijkstra’s algorithm on graph  $H$ . The algorithm by Sankowski [San05] maintains these distances in  $\tilde{O}(h(n/h)^2)$  additional time, resulting in overall  $\tilde{O}(hn^{1.529} + n^2/h) = \tilde{O}(n^{1.765})$  time (where  $h = n^{0.235}$ ) for maintaining the  $st$ -distance<sup>6</sup>.

**Reconstructing the Path** As outlined in the previous paragraph, we can assume that we already know that some  $st$ -shortest path consists of segments  $s \rightsquigarrow h_1 \rightsquigarrow h_2 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow t$  where the  $h_i$  (and their order) was found by running Dijkstra’s algorithm on graph  $H$ . For notational simplicity, we can add  $s, t$  to set  $S$  and define  $h_0 = s$  and  $h_k = t$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , so the segments of the  $st$ -path are of form  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, k - 1$ .

To construct an  $st$ -shortest path in  $G$ , we can reconstruct shortest paths between  $h_i$  and  $h_{i+1}$  in  $G$  for all  $i$ .

Note the following observation for all  $u, v \in V$ : any vertex  $w$  belongs to a  $uv$ -shortest path if and only if  $\text{dist}_G(u, w) + \text{dist}_G(w, v) = \text{dist}_G(u, v)$ . Further, if  $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq h$ , then we can verify this property by querying the dynamic algebraic algorithm. Since each segment  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  is an  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path of length at most  $h$ , this observation leads to an intuitive idea: let us run BFS from  $h_i$  to  $h_{i+1}$ , but each vertex  $w$  is only put in the BFS-queue, if

$$\text{dist}_G^h(v_{last}, w) + \text{dist}_G^h(w, h_{i+1}) = \text{dist}_G^h(v_{last}, h_{i+1}) \quad (1)$$

where  $v_{last}$  is the last recovered vertex on the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path. Since querying these distances takes some time, we must bound how many queries we perform.

This question is answered by another important observation – a “no-shortcut” argument, which was also used in [BC16; Ber17; GWW20]. For any  $st$ -shortest path and any  $w \in V$ , the vertex  $w$  cannot be a neighbor of more than 3 vertices on the shortest path. Otherwise we could construct a shortcut  $s \rightsquigarrow v_1 \rightarrow w \rightarrow v_4 \rightsquigarrow t$ , i.e. an even shorter path: Let  $v_1, \dots, v_4$  be the vertices on the  $st$ -shortest path with neighbor  $w$  (enumerated in the same order as on the path). Then we have

$$\text{dist}(s, t) \leq \text{dist}(s, v_1) + \underbrace{2}_{v_1 \rightarrow w \rightarrow v_4} + \text{dist}(v_4, t) < \text{dist}(s, v_1) + \underbrace{\text{dist}(v_1, v_4)}_{\geq 3} + \text{dist}(v_4, t) = \text{dist}(s, t).$$

Thus we perform at most  $O(n)$  distance queries since two distance queries are performed for each neighbor of a vertex on the shortest path and every vertex can be such a neighbor at most three times.

This directly implies that we can maintain the  $st$ -shortest path on unweighted undirected graphs in  $O(hn^{1.529} + n^2/h + n \cdot hn^{0.529}) = O(n^{1.765})$  time, where the first two terms come from the dynamic algorithm by Sankowski [San05] (outlined at the start of this subsection) and the last term comes from the  $O(n)$  queries we perform to construct an  $st$ -shortest path.

**Problems on weighted and/or directed graphs** This idea is not immediately applicable to weighted or directed graphs.

- If edges  $(v_1, w), (w, v_4)$  have large weights, they don’t necessarily give a shortcut.
- If we only know approximate distances, then the above proof breaks down as we cannot verify if a vertex is on the shortest path. (Note that the exact distance cannot be maintained in subquadratic time on weighted graphs with polynomial edge weights under the APSP-conjecture [AW14].)

---

<sup>6</sup>This complexity assumes that set  $S$  is fixed. If we later return the shortest path, then the adversary can learn set  $S$ . So to handle adaptive adversaries, we will resample set  $S$  after each update which increases this complexity to  $O(n^{1.823})$  as in Theorem 1.1.




Figure 1: Directed unweighted graph  $G$  with  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  and  $E = \{(v_i, v_{i+1})\} \cup \{(v_j, v_i) \mid i < j\}$ . Running BFS (even with truncation as in (1)) to construct a path from left to right might iterate over all  $O(n)$  backwards directed edges for each visited vertex until it finds the one edge going forward.

- If the edges are directed, then we can no longer guarantee that  $v_1 \rightarrow w \rightarrow v_4$  is a path as we only know  $v_1 \rightarrow w \leftarrow v_4$ . Thus we cannot bound the number of vertices that the BFS looks at via the no-shortcut argument. In particular, our algorithm might have to look at all  $O(n^2)$  edges in the graph. See Figure 1 for such an example.

The next subsection presents a way to extend the no-shortcut argument to directed weighted graphs.

## 2.2 Directed Weighted Graphs

To best explain how to generalize the approach from the previous paragraph to directed graphs, we first give an alternative (slightly more complicated) argument for the undirected case, which is easier to generalize.

The shortest paths for any segments  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  and  $h_j \rightsquigarrow h_{j+1}$  such that  $j - i \geq 4$  cannot share any adjacent vertices:

$$\underbrace{\left( \bigcup_{w \in \pi^*(h_i, h_{i+1})} \mathcal{N}(w) \right)}_{=: P_i} \cap \underbrace{\left( \bigcup_{w \in \pi^*(h_j, h_{j+1})} \mathcal{N}(w) \right)}_{=: P_j} = \emptyset$$

Here the union  $P_i$  on the left (or right  $P_j$ ) are all vertices that are neighbors of an  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path (or  $h_j h_{j+1}$ -shortest path). If  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  were to share a vertex  $v$ , i.e.  $(w_1, v), (v, w_2) \in E, w_1 \in \pi^*(h_i, h_{i+1}), w_2 \in \pi^*(h_j, h_{j+1})$ , then there would be a shorter  $st$ -path via  $v$ :

$$\text{dist}(s, t) \leq \text{dist}(s, w_1) \underbrace{+ 2}_{w_1 \rightarrow v \rightarrow w_2} + \text{dist}(w_2, t) < \text{dist}(s, h_{i+1}) + \text{dist}(h_{i+1}, h_j) + \text{dist}(h_j, t) = \text{dist}(s, t)$$

Thus they cannot share a vertex.

These unions  $P_i, P_j$  can be seen as a set of “plausible” vertices: They are exactly the vertices for which our BFS search checks if they are on the shortest path, i.e. for any vertex in  $P_i$ , it is plausible that they could be on a  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path.

To extend the approach to directed weighted graphs, we must find a better notion of plausible that allows for a similar “no-shortcut” argument. The idea is to perform the search of vertices on a smaller set of “plausible” vertices for a given segment  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$ . Specifically, consider any set  $P_i$  of vertices such that

$$\mathcal{N}_{out}^{(d)}(h_i) \subseteq P_i \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{out}^{(2d)}(h_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_{in}^{(d)}(h_{i+1}) \subseteq P_i \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{in}^{(2d)}(h_{i+1})$$




Figure 2: A possibility of a shortcut in graph  $G$  between  $h_i$  and  $h_{j+1}$ .

where  $d = \text{dist}(h_i, h_{i+1})$ . Here  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{out}}^{(d)}(h_i)$  are all vertices reachable from  $h_i$  with distance at most  $d$ . In particular, set  $P_i$  contains all vertices  $v \in V$  for which  $\text{dist}_G(h_i, v) \leq d$  and  $\text{dist}_G(v, h_{i+1}) \leq d$ , and all vertices  $v \in P_i$  satisfy  $\text{dist}_G(h_i, v) \leq 2d$  and  $\text{dist}_G(v, h_{i+1}) \leq 2d$ .

We can consider this a set of “plausible” vertices because  $P_i$  contains all vertices on any  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path.

Now let us extend the “no-shortcut” idea for these sets  $P_i$ ’s to show that there are no (or not too many) intersections between  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . For simplicity, let us assume that all segments  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  of the  $st$ -shortest path have roughly the same length despite the graph being weighted. (I.e.  $\text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{i+1}) \in [2^{\alpha-1}, 2^\alpha)$  for all  $i$ . We will later argue why we can assume this.) Then any  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  with  $j - i \geq 7$  cannot share any vertices:

$$P_i \cap P_j = \emptyset$$

If they were to share a vertex  $v$ , then there would be a shorter  $st$ -path via  $v$  (fig. 2):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(s, v) + \text{dist}(v, t) &< \text{dist}(s, h_i) + \underbrace{2 \cdot 2^\alpha + 2 \cdot 2^\alpha}_{h_i \rightarrow v \rightarrow h_{j+1}} + \text{dist}(h_{j+1}, t) = \text{dist}(s, h_i) + 2^{\alpha+2} + \text{dist}(h_{j+1}, t) \\ &\leq \text{dist}(s, h_i) + 2^{\alpha-1}(j+1-i) + \text{dist}(h_{j+1}, t) \\ &\leq \text{dist}(s, h_i) + \text{dist}(h_i, h_{i+1}) + \dots + \text{dist}(h_j, h_{j+1}) + \text{dist}(h_j, t) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in total we iterate over at most  $O(n)$  vertices if we iterate over all  $P_i$  for all  $i$ . We can reconstruct any  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path by iterating over each  $P_i$  as follows: Sort  $P_i$  based on their distance to  $h_i$  and then iterate over  $P_i$  to always find the next successor on the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path via a distance comparison as in (1).<sup>7</sup> By  $\sum_i |P_i| = O(n)$  we need to query only  $O(n)$  distances to reconstruct the  $st$ -shortest path.

The assumption on all  $\text{dist}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \in [2^{\alpha-1}, 2^\alpha)$  can be generalized by splitting segments in groups  $S_\alpha = \{(h_i, h_{i+1}) \mid \text{dist}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \in [2^{\alpha-1}, 2^\alpha)\}$  for  $\alpha = 1, \dots, \lceil \log nW \rceil$  and applying the “no-shortcut” argument to each group. This way we get

$$\sum_i P_i = \sum_\alpha \sum_{P_i \text{ belongs to } S_\alpha} |P_i| = \sum_\alpha O(n) = O(n \log(nW)).$$

So we increase the number of distance queries by at most an  $O(\log nW)$  factor.

To complete the argument, we must construct the sets  $P_i$  for all  $i$ . This can be done by querying 2-approximate  $h$ -hop bounded distances for all pairs in  $S \times V$  and  $V \times S$  (remember,  $S = \{h_i \mid i\}$  where  $h_i$ ’s lie on the shortest path).

<sup>7</sup>Here, we assume that we can compute the exact distance. This is true for small integer weighted graphs. We will later discuss how to handle real weighted graphs for which no exact distance can be maintained under the APSP conjecture [AW14].

Querying large batches of approximate pairwise distances can be done much more efficiently than querying exact distances for individual pairs, see e.g. [BN19] (Lemma 4.1). So the construction of the  $P_i$  is only a small cost of our algorithm.

To summarize, the complexity of reconstructing an  $st$ -shortest path on directed weighted graphs is given by the following

- Query exact  $h$ -hop bounded pairwise distances between hitting set vertices (i.e. pairs in  $S \times S$ ) to construct graph  $H$ .
- Run Dijkstra on  $H$  to obtain segments  $s = h_0 \rightsquigarrow h_1 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow h_k = t$  in  $\tilde{O}(n^2/h^2)$  time.
- Query 2-approximate  $h$ -hop bounded distances for pairs  $S \times V$  and  $V \times S$  to construct plausible sets of vertices  $P_i$ .
- Reconstruct an  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path for each  $i$  by iterating over  $P_i$ . This needs  $O(n \log nW)$  exact  $h$ -hop bounded distance queries.

This leads to the following result:

**Theorem 1.5** (Simplified version of Theorem 3.17). *Let  $h$  be a parameter between 1 and  $n$ . Assume we are given a distance oracle on a directed graph  $G = (V, E)$  with integer edge weights bounded by  $W$ . Given any two sets  $S, T \subset V$ , the oracle returns  $Wh$ -bounded distances for each pair in  $S \times T$ . Let  $Q_\alpha(|S|, |T|)$  be the complexity of the oracle for returning an  $\alpha$ -approximation of the  $Wh$ -bounded distances for  $S, T \subset V$ .*

*Then given  $s, t \in V$  we can reconstruct an exact  $st$ -shortest path in time*

$$\tilde{O}(Q_1(n/h, n/h) + Q_2(n, n/h) + n \cdot Q_1(1, 1) \log(nW)).$$

Observe that our path reconstruction just needs access to a dynamic algorithm that can maintain approximate and exact  $Wh$ -bounded distance oracles. The complexities of our dynamic algorithms stated in Section 1.1 are obtained by using the dynamic distance algorithms by [San05; BN19]. If in the future faster dynamic distance algorithms are constructed, then our path reporting data structures become faster as well.

**Real Weighted Graphs** So far, we assumed that we have access to an exact distance oracle to reconstruct the shortest path for each  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  segment. For real weighted graphs, however, one cannot maintain exact distances in subquadratic time under the APSP conjecture [AW14]. To still be able to reconstruct an approximate shortest path on real weighted graphs we use the integer weight rounding technique from [Zwi02]. Note that by Lemma 1.9 we can compute approximate distances on a real weighted graph  $G$  by computing distances on graphs  $G_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, \log_2 \lceil nW \rceil$ , each with small integer weights. In particular, for any segment  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  there is some  $j$  where the exact  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path on graph  $G_j(h_i, h_{i+1})$  corresponds to an approximate  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path on  $G$ . The graph  $G_j(h_i, h_{i+1})$  has small integer weights so we can compute the exact distances on this graph. So we can reconstruct for any segment  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  the exact shortest path on  $G_j(h_i, h_{i+1})$  and thus an approximate  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path on  $G$ .

### 3 Path Reporting on Weighted Graphs

In this section we prove combinatorial blackbox reductions that allow us to efficiently reconstruct an  $st$ -shortest path in graph  $G$  when given access to a distance oracle for  $G$ . We use these reductions in Section 4 together with the dynamic distance algorithms by [San05; BN19] to maintain the  $st$ -shortest path against an adaptive adversary.

As an example, here we prove reductions such as Theorem 3.1 which construct approximate shortest paths in directed graphs. Later results Theorems 3.16 and 3.17 work for exact shortest paths, or undirected graphs.

**Theorem 3.1** (directed, approximate). *Suppose, there exist  $4n^a/\epsilon$ -bounded distance oracles  $\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X^{(1+\epsilon)}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_X^{(2)}$  with the corresponding time-complexities (as in Definition 1.6) for any integer weighted directed graph  $X$  with  $|V| = n$ . Then there exists an algorithm that supports the following operations on a directed graph  $G = (V, E, w), |V| = n$  with real weights from  $[1, W]$ .*

- *preprocess()* – preprocesses  $G$  in time  $\tilde{O}(\log W \cdot (P_2 + P_{1+\epsilon} + P))$
- *update( $e, w$ )* – updates an edge  $e$  with weight  $w$  in time

$$\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(U_2 + U_{1+\epsilon} + U + Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(n^{1-a}, n)\right)\right)$$

- *query( $s, t$ )* – for any pair of vertices  $s, t$  returns an  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path in time

$$\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(Q_{1+\epsilon}(1, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(1, n) + n^{2-a} + n \cdot Q(1, 1)\right)\right)$$

*The dynamic algorithm is randomized and correct w.h.p. with one-sided error and works against an adaptive adversary.*

The organization of this section is as follows. We first define certain auxiliary graphs, used by our reduction, in Section 3.1. The definition and notation defined there are used throughout this section. In particular, it defines random graphs based on hitting set arguments that are used to split any  $st$ -shortest path into shorter segments  $s = h_1 \rightsquigarrow h_2 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow h_k = t$ . Then in Section 3.2, we describe how to find the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path for any one such segment, when the graph is directed. Section 3.3 does the same, but for undirected graphs. At last, Section 3.4 combines these tools to prove Theorem 3.1 and its variants.

### 3.1 Auxiliary graphs

Throughout this section, we assume  $G = (V, E)$  is the original input graph. Let  $\epsilon \geq 0$  be an accuracy parameter and  $0 < a < 1$  be a hop-parameter, where  $n^a$  will be used for our hop bounds. We let  $G_x$  be the  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded version of  $G$ , as in Lemma 1.9, for  $x = 0, 1, \dots, O(\log(nW))$ .

Our reduction constructs an auxiliary graph  $H$  on  $\tilde{O}(n^{1-a})$  vertices  $V_H \subset V$  with the property  $\text{dist}_H(u, v) \approx \text{dist}_G(u, v)$  for all  $u, v \in V_H$ . The exact definition of  $H$  is given in Definition 3.2.

**Definition 3.2.** *Given graph  $G = (V, E)$ , accuracy parameter  $\epsilon \geq 0$ , hop parameter  $0 < a < 1$ , for  $x = 0, 1, \dots, O(\log(nW))$  let  $G_x$  be the  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded graphs as in Lemma 1.9. Let  $R \subset V_H \subset V$  where  $R$  is a uniformly at random sampled set of  $\tilde{O}(n^{1-a})$  vertices. Given  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $A$ -bounded distance estimates  $\Delta_x \in \mathbb{R}^{V_H \times V_H}$  on each  $G_x$  for the pairs  $V_H \times V_H$ , define  $H$  as follows:*

*$H = (V_H, V_H \times V_H)$  with edge weights<sup>8</sup>  $\text{len}_H(u, v) = \min_x B_x/A \cdot \Delta_x(u, v)$  for each  $u, v \in V_H$ .*

*Note that when  $\epsilon = 0$  and  $G$  has integer weights from  $[1, W]$ , there is only one copy  $G_0$  of  $G$  and the edge weights in the corresponding  $H$  are exact  $n^a$ -bounded distances in  $G$  between any  $h_i, h_j \in V_H$ .*

The following Lemma 3.3 states that graph  $H$  indeed approximates the distances in  $G$ . Since we use common techniques such as hitting-sets and integer weight rounding to construct  $H$ , we will defer the proof to Appendix A.

**Lemma 3.3.** *For any  $u, v \in V_H$ , w.h.p.  $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \text{dist}_H(u, v) \leq (1 + O(\epsilon)) \text{dist}_G(u, v)$ . Equality holds in case of  $\epsilon = 0$ .*

---

<sup>8</sup>For simplicity, assume we remove all edges with  $\text{len}_H(u, v) = \infty$  so all edge weights are finite.



During the construction of  $H$  as in Definition 3.2, we can store which distance estimate  $\Delta_x(u, v)$  was used for any  $u, v \in V_H$ . This implies an assignment of some  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded graph  $G_x$  to each edge.

**Definition 3.4.** For  $H$  as in Definition 3.2, let  $G_1, G_2, \dots$  be the respective  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded graphs. For each edge  $(u, v)$  of  $H$  let

$$x^* = \arg \min_x \frac{B_x}{A} \Delta_x(u, v).$$

We define unique  $G_*(u, v) := G_{x^*}$  (breaking ties arbitrarily) and say that it **well-approximates** the edge  $(u, v)$ .

As outlined in Section 2, our path reconstruction is based on “no-shortcut” arguments. To bound the complexity, we must bound how often we look at any vertex. We will argue that if we look at a vertex too often, then there must have been a shortcut contradicting the shortest path. For this type of argument we need lower bounds on the distances in  $G$ . To derive these, we need the following definition.

**Definition 3.5.** Given a  $st$ -shortest path  $\pi_G = (s = h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k = t)$  in  $H$ , we group the edges  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$  into the following weight-categories  $S_\alpha$  for  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \log nW$ .

$$S_\alpha = [\sigma_1^{(\alpha)}, \sigma_2^{(\alpha)}, \dots, \sigma_l^{(\alpha)}] = [(h_i, h_{i+1}) \mid \text{len}_H(h_i, h_{i+1}) \in [2^{\alpha-1}, 2^\alpha)]$$

The order of edges in the categories matches the order in the  $st$ -shortest path: if edge  $\sigma_a^{(\alpha)} = (h_i, h_{i+1})$ ,  $\sigma_b^{(\alpha)} = (h_j, h_{j+1})$  then  $i < j$  if and only if  $a < b$ .

We can now state the required lower bounds on  $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** Given an  $st$ -shortest path in  $H$  and the split of its edges into weight categories as in Definition 3.5, let  $\sigma_a^{(\alpha)} = (h_i, h_{i+1})$  and  $\sigma_b^{(\alpha)} = (h_j, h_{j+1})$  ( $a < b$ ) be edges from the same weight category  $S_\alpha$ . Then the following holds:

$$\text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{j+1}) \geq 2^{\alpha-2}(b - a)$$

*Proof.* The shortest path in  $H$  from  $h_i$  to  $h_j$  contains all edges  $\sigma_a^{(\alpha)}, \sigma_{a+1}^{(\alpha)}, \dots, \sigma_{b-1}^{(\alpha)}$  of the length at least  $2^{\alpha-1}$ . Hence,  $\text{dist}_H(h_i, h_{j+1}) \geq 2^{\alpha-1}(b - a)$ .

Combining the inequality above with Lemma 3.3 we get a needed result:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{j+1}) &\geq \text{dist}_H(h_i, h_{j+1}) \geq 2^{\alpha-1}(b - a) \Rightarrow \\ \text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{j+1}) &\geq 2^{\alpha-2}(b - a) \end{aligned}$$

□

## 3.2 Reconstructing Path Segments on Directed Graphs

Given  $H$  as in Definition 3.2, and a shortest path  $(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k)$  in  $H$ , our goal is to recover an (approximately)  $h_1 h_k$ -shortest path in  $G$ . Note that we have  $\text{dist}_G(h_1, h_k) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_H(h_1, h_k)$  (Lemma 3.3), and that the edge weight  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  in  $H$  corresponds to the (approximate) length of an  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -path in some  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded graph  $G_x$  by Definition 3.2. So for each  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , our task is to reconstruct the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path in the graph  $G_x$  that well approximates edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$ . To bound the complexity when constructing an  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path in  $G_x$ , we restrict our search space onto a smaller set of “plausible” vertices.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Reporting a shortest  $h_i, h_{i+1}$  path in  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded  $G_x = G_*(h_i, h_{i+1})$  for the directed case

---

```

1 procedure SHORTESTSUBPATH( $G_x, (h_i, h_{i+1}), P_i$ )
2   Let  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$  be an exact  $2A$ -bounded oracle.
3   (By definition of  $P_i$ ,  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v)$  and  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(v, h_{i+1}) \leq 4A$  for each  $v \in P_i$ )
4    $queue \leftarrow$  sorted  $v \in P_i$  by  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(h_i, v)$  in ascending order
5    $v_{last} \leftarrow h_i$ 
6    $\pi \leftarrow []$ 
7   for  $v$  in  $queue$  do
8     if  $\text{len}_{G_x}(v_{last}, v) + \mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(v, h_{i+1}) = \mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(v_{last}, h_{i+1})$  then
9        $\pi \leftarrow \pi || v$ 
10       $v_{last} \leftarrow v$ 
11     else
12       continue
13   return  $\pi$ 

```

---

**Definition 3.7.** Given an edge  $\sigma = (h_i, h_{i+1})$  in  $H$  with finite length, well approximated by  $G_x := G_*(h_i, h_{i+1})$  (Definition 3.4),  $2A$ -bounded  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$ . We define the set of **plausible** vertices for edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$ :

$$P_i = \left\{ v \in V \mid \mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.query(h_i, v), \mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.query(v, h_{i+1}) \leq 2 \cdot \mathcal{O}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \right\}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(h_i, h_{i+1}) < \infty$ . This is because  $\text{len}_H(h_i, h_{i+1}) < \infty$  and this length came from some  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $A$ -bounded distance estimate on  $G_x$ , so  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)A < 2A$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.query(h_i, v), \mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.query(v, h_{i+1}) < \infty$  are for all  $v \in P_i$ .

Our main result of this subsection is the following Theorem 3.8, which states that we can reconstruct the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path in  $G_x$ , when given the set of plausible vertices  $P_i$ . We later prove in Corollary 3.11 that  $|P_i|$  is small on average, which then implies that our algorithm is efficient.

**Theorem 3.8.** Given an edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$ , the  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded version  $G_x$  well-approximating the edge, the set of plausible vertices  $P_i$  for the edge, and  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$  is an exact  $2A$ -bounded distance oracle for  $G_x$ .

Then Algorithm 1 recovers an  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$ -shortest path in  $G_x$  in  $O(|P_i|)$  calls to  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(*, *)$ .

To prove correctness of Theorem 3.8, we must first prove that we can indeed restrict the search space onto the set of plausible vertices  $P_i$ .

**Lemma 3.9.** If  $G_x$  well-approximates the edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  then all the vertices from the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path in  $G_x$  are plausible, i.e. an element of  $P_i$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $G_x$  well-approximates edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$ . As the edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  has finite length in  $H$  we know that  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)A$ , hence,  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(h_i, h_{i+1}) = \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1})$ .

If  $v$  is on any shortest path in  $G_x$  from  $h_i$  to  $h_{i+1}$  then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v) + \text{dist}_{G_x}(v, h_{i+1}) &= \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) && \Rightarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.query(h_i, v) \text{ and } \mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.query(v, h_{i+1}) &\leq 2 \cdot \mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(h_i, h_{i+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that both queries on the LHS don't return  $\infty$  because

$$\text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v), \text{dist}_{G_x}(v, h_{i+1}) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)A.$$

□

We can now prove Theorem 3.8, which states that Algorithm 1 indeed reconstructs an  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path on  $G_x$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.8.* Consider an execution of Algorithm 1, where we are given an edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  from  $H$ , and an integer rounded graph  $G_x$  that well approximates this edge, and a set of plausible vertices  $P_i$ .

**Correctness** First, we remark that any calls to  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}(v, h_{i+1})$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}(h_i, v)$  in Algorithm 1 never return  $\infty$  for vertices  $v$  on the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path. Since  $\text{len}_H(h_i, h_{i+1})$  has finite value, we know  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)A < 2A$ , so all vertices  $v$  on the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path have small enough distance for a  $2A$ -bounded oracle  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$  to return correct finite distances.

Next we argue that we indeed construct the shortest path. First note that by Lemma 3.9 all vertices of any  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path in  $G_x$  are present in the queue defined in line 4.

Let us show by induction that after every added vertex  $v$  to the path  $\pi$  on line 9 (Algorithm 1) there exist some  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path on  $G_x$  that starts with  $\pi$ . The base case is obvious as we start with  $\pi = (h_i)$ .

Suppose, we already constructed path  $(h_i, v_1, \dots, v_g) = h_i \rightsquigarrow v_g$ . By assumption, there exists a  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path with  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_g$  as a head. Note that any vertex  $w$ , for which there exists a  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path starting with  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_g \rightarrow w$ , is in the queue because  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, w) > \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v_g)$  as the queue is ordered. Also any vertex  $w \in \mathcal{N}_{G_x}(v_g)$  is on some  $v_g h_{i+1}$ -shortest path if and only if  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(v_g, h_{i+1}) = \text{len}_{G_x}(v_g, w) + \text{dist}_{G_x}(w, h_{i+1})$  that is being checked on line 8 of the algorithm. Hence, the next vertex we append to our path will be on some  $v_g h_{i+1}$ -shortest path and correspondingly on some  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path.

**Complexity** Executing line 4 takes  $O(|P_i|)$  calls to  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.\text{query}(*, *)$  and additional time  $O(|P_i| \cdot \log |P_i|) = \tilde{O}(|P_i|)$  time for sorting.

As line 7 is executed  $O(|P_i|)$  times and every loop requires  $O(1)$  calls to  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.\text{query}(*, *)$  the total time is dominated by  $O(|P_i|)$  calls to  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.\text{query}(*, *)$ .

□

The purpose of the set  $P_i$  of plausible vertices is to restrict the search space and thus result in a faster algorithm. To give good complexity bounds, we must prove that the set  $P_i$  is small on average.

Recall that set  $P_i$  is defined w.r.t. an edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  that represents some segment on some (approximately)  $st$ -shortest path  $s = h_1 \rightsquigarrow h_2 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow h_k = t$  on  $G$ . Since our final aim is to reconstruct the entire (approximately)  $st$ -shortest path, we will reconstruct the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest paths for all  $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$  by repeatedly calling Algorithm 1 (Theorem 3.8). The following Lemma 3.10 and Corollary 3.11 bound the total size of all  $P_i$  that we construct for  $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$ .

**Lemma 3.10.** *There are  $O(n)$  plausible vertices across all segments from the same weight category (Definition 3.5)  $S_\alpha = \{\sigma \mid \text{len}_H(\sigma) \in [2^{\alpha-1}, 2^\alpha]\}$ :*

$$\sum_{\substack{i: \\ (h_i, h_{i+1}) \in S_\alpha}} |P_i| = O(n)$$




Figure 3: A possibility of a shortcut in graph  $G$  between  $h_i$  and  $h_{j+1}$ . Red curly arrow indicates a  $h_i h_{j+1}$ -shortest path in  $G$ .

*Proof.* Suppose a vertex  $v$  is plausible for edges  $\sigma_a^{(\alpha)} = (h_i, h_{i+1})$  and  $\sigma_b^{(\alpha)} = (h_j, h_{j+1})$ ,  $a < b$  and is well-approximated by  $G_x$  (Figure 3):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v) &\leq \mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.query(h_i, v) \leq 2 \cdot \mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq 2 \cdot \mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(1+\epsilon)}.query(h_i, h_{i+1}) = \\ &= 2 \frac{A}{B_x} \text{len}_H(h_i, h_{i+1}) = 2 \frac{A}{B_x} \text{dist}_H(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq \frac{A}{B_x} \cdot 2^{\alpha+1} \end{aligned}$$

Here we used  $\text{len}_H(h_i, h_{i+1}) = \text{dist}_H(h_i, h_{i+1})$ , which follows from the fact that  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  was on some  $h_1 h_k$ -shortest path. Hence, by Lemma 1.8

$$\text{dist}_G(h_i, v) \leq \frac{B_x}{A} \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v) \leq 2^{\alpha+1}$$

Similarly, we have that  $\text{dist}_G(v, h_{j+1}) \leq 2^{\alpha+1}$ . Combining both inequalities:

$$\text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{j+1}) \leq 2^{\alpha+2}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.6

$$\text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{j+1}) \geq 2^{\alpha-1}(b-a)$$

Therefore,  $b-a = O(1)$ . That means every vertex can be plausible only for  $O(1)$  edges from the same  $S_\alpha$ . So in total

$$\sum_{\substack{i: \\ (h_i, h_{i+1}) \in S_\alpha}} |P_i| = O(n)$$

□

The following Corollary 3.11 bounds the total size of all plausible sets  $P_i$  that we have when reconstructing an approximately  $st$ -shortest path  $s = h_1 \rightsquigarrow h_2 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow h_k = t$ , by reconstructing each segment  $h_i \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  via Algorithm 1 (Theorem 3.8).

**Corollary 3.11.** *There are  $O(n \log(Wn))$  plausible vertices across all segments:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |P_i| = O(n \log(nW))$$

---

**Algorithm 2:** Reporting a shortest  $h_i, h_{i+1}$  path in  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded  $G_x = G_*(h_i, h_{i+1})$  for the undirected case

---

```

1 procedure SHORTESTSUBPATH( $G_x, (h_i, h_{i+1})$ )
2   Let  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$  be an exact  $2A$ -bounded oracle.
3    $v_{last} \leftarrow h_i$ 
4    $\pi \leftarrow [h_i]$ 
5   set of vertices seen before:  $Q \leftarrow \{\}$ 
6   while  $v_{last}$  is not  $h_{i+1}$  do
7     for  $w$  in  $\mathcal{N}_{G_x}(v_{last})$  // it is sorted according to section 1.3
8       do
9         if  $w \in Q$  then
10          | continue
11          |  $Q.add(w)$ 
12          if  $\text{len}_{G_x}(v_{last}, w) + \mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(w, h_{i+1}) = \mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(v_{last}, h_{i+1})$  then
13            |  $\pi \leftarrow \pi || w$ 
14            |  $v_{last} \leftarrow w$ 
15            | break

```

---

*Proof.*

$$\sum_i |P_i| = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\log_2[nW]} \sum_{(h_i, h_{i+1}) \in S_\alpha} |P_i| = O(n \log(nW))$$

□

### 3.3 Reconstructing Path Segments on Undirected graphs

Given  $H$  as in Definition 3.2, and a shortest path  $(s = h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k = t)$  in  $H$ , our goal is to recover an (approximately)  $h_1 h_k$ -shortest paths in  $G$ . Note that we have  $\text{dist}_G(h_1, h_k) \leq (1+\epsilon) \text{dist}_H(h_1, h_k)$  (Lemma 3.3), and that the edge weight  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  in  $H$  corresponds to the (approximate) length of an  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -path in some  $(A, B_x)$ -rounded graph  $G_x$  by Definition 3.2 that well approximates edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$ . So for each  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , our task is to reconstruct the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path in the respective graph  $G_x$ .

For undirected graphs, we use the same approach as in the directed case that we outlined in Section 3.2. The main difference is that we do not need to perform a pre-filtering of the vertices onto a smaller set of plausible vertices. For the directed case in Section 3.2, we had to compute a certain set of plausible vertices (Definition 3.7). However, in the undirected case here, it suffices to define “plausible vertices” only for the sake of analysis. We do not need to compute this set.

**Definition 3.12.** Given an edge  $\sigma = (h_i, h_{i+1})$  we define a set of **plausible** vertices for edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  using uniquely-defined  $G_*(h_i, h_{i+1}) = G_x$  that well approximates it:

$$P_i = \{v \in V \mid \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1})\}$$

Our main result of this subsection is the following Theorem 3.13, which states that Algorithm 2 correctly reconstructs the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path in  $G_x$ . Notably, the complexity scales in the size

of set  $P_i$ . The later Corollary 3.15 shows that when reconstructing the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path for each  $i$ , the total sum of all  $|P_i|$  is nearly linear, giving a very efficient bound on the complexity of Algorithm 2.

**Theorem 3.13.** *Given undirected  $G$ , an edge  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$ , the  $(A, B)$ -rounded version  $G_x$  well-approximating the edge, and  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$  is the exact  $2A$ -bounded distance oracle for  $G_x$ . Then Algorithm 2 recovers a  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$ -shortest path in  $G_x$ .*

*The time complexity is  $O(n \log A)$  plus the time to perform  $O(|P_i|)$  calls to  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(*, *)$ , where  $P_i$  is a set of plausible vertices for  $(h_i, h_{i+1})$  (Definition 3.12).*

*Proof.* We prove the correctness by induction over the number of iterations in Line 6 of Algorithm 2. Suppose we already reconstructed a path  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_{last}$  such that there exists a  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path with  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_{last}$  as a head. To prove that this path is correctly extended, we first need to argue that list  $Q$  only contains vertices that are plausible, i.e. for all  $u \in Q$  we have  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, u) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1})$ .

**$Q$  stored plausible vertices** Vertex  $u$  was added to  $Q$  because it is the neighbor of some  $v_j$  on the  $h_i v_{last}$ -shortest path constructed by the algorithm, i.e.  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_j \rightarrow v_{j+1} \rightsquigarrow v_{last}$ . Observe that  $u$  appeared in  $\mathcal{N}_{G_x}(v_j)$  earlier than  $v_{j+1}$  because no other neighbor of  $v_j$  is iterated over in Line 7 after  $v_{j+1}$ , because of the *break* in Line 15. Since we iterate over the neighbors in ascending order of their edge weights, we have  $\text{len}_{G_x}(v_j, u) \leq \text{len}_{G_x}(v_j, v_{j+1})$ . Using the fact that  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_j$  is the head of some  $h_i v_{last}$ -shortest path we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, u) &\leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v_j) + \text{len}_{G_x}(v_j, u) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v_j) + \text{len}_{G_x}(v_j, v_{j+1}) = \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v_{j+1}) \\ &\leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v_{last}) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Thus vertex  $u$  must be plausible.

**Correctness of the head** First let us remark, the calls to  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query$  never returns  $\infty$  in Algorithm 2 for vertices on the shortest path. Since  $\text{len}_H(h_i, h_{i+1})$  has finite value, we know  $\text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)A \leq 2A$ , so all vertices on the shortest path have distance at most  $2A$  to  $h_i$  and  $h_{i+1}$ , so a  $2A$ -bounded oracle  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$  suffices.

We now argue that Algorithm 2 correctly appends some neighbor  $w$  of  $v_{last}$  to the path  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_{last} \rightarrow w$ , such that this path is the head of some  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path.

The algorithm iterates over the neighbors of  $v_{last}$ . If we append some neighbors  $w$  to the path  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_{last} \rightarrow w$ , then we have by Line 12 that

$$\text{len}_{G_x}(v_{last}, w) + \text{dist}_{G_x}(w, h_{i+1}) = \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_{last}, h_{i+1}).$$

Thus  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_{last} \rightarrow w$  must be the head of a  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path.

Next, we must argue that we do in-fact always append some neighbor of  $v_{last}$  to the path. Since  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_{last}$  is the head of a  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path, there must be a neighbor  $w$  of  $v_{last}$  where  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_{last} \rightarrow w \rightsquigarrow h_{i+1}$  must be a  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path. If no neighbor of  $v_{last}$  is appended to  $h_i \rightsquigarrow v_{last}$ , then that must mean  $w$  was in  $Q$ , and it was not appended because of Line 10. However,  $w$  cannot be in  $Q$  as otherwise we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, w) &\leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v_{last}) \quad \text{by (2)} \\ &< \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v_{last}) + \text{len}_{G_x}(v_{last}, w) = \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, w). \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.



**Complexity** Note that we perform exactly one call to  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.query(*, *)$  for each vertex in  $Q$ . As argued before, these are all plausible vertices, so we can bound the number of oracle calls by  $|P_i|$ .

Next, we must bound how many vertices we iterate through in Line 7. Here iterating over  $w \in \mathcal{N}_{G_x}(v_{last})$  can also be interpreted as iterating over edges  $\{v_{last}, w\}$  incident to  $v_{last}$ . To bound over how many edges we iterate, let us split all edges in  $G_x$  into groups based on their edge weights, i.e. group  $E_\ell$  are edges with weight in  $[2^\ell, 2^{\ell+1})$ . Graph  $G_x$  has edge weights in  $[1, A]$  so there are  $O(\log A)$  such groups. We will argue that we iterate over at most  $O(n)$  edges in each  $E_\ell$ , thus in total we iterate over at most  $O(n \log A)$  vertices in Line 7.

Assume vertex  $w$  was iterated over 4 separate times in Line 7 for the same weight class  $E_y$ . Let  $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5$  be the respective vertices on the  $h_i h_{i+1}$ -shortest path (not necessarily consecutive) for which we iterated over  $w$ . We know by the neighbors being iterated over in ascending order of the edge weights that  $\text{len}_{G_x}(v_k, w) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_k, v_{k+1})$  for  $k = 1, \dots, 5$ , because the first edge on the  $v_k v_{k+1}$ -shortest path must have had edge weight at least  $\text{len}_{G_x}(v_k, w)$ . By  $\text{len}_{G_x}(v_k, w) \in [2^y, 2^{y+1})$  for some  $y$  (since they are from the same weight class) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_1, v_5) &\leq \text{len}_{G_x}(v_1, w) + \text{len}_{G_x}(w, v_4) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_1, v_2) + \text{len}_{G_x}(w, v_4) \\ &< \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_1, v_2) + 2^{y+1} = \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_1, v_2) + 2^y + 2^y \\ &\leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_1, v_2) + \text{len}_{G_x}(v_2, w) + \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_3, w) \\ &\leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_1, v_2) + \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_2, v_3) + \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_3, v_4) = \text{dist}_{G_x}(v_1, v_5) \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. So any vertex  $w$  can be iterated over at most 4 times for the same weight class. Thus in total, Line 7 looks at at most  $O(n \log A)$  vertices.  $\square$

The next Lemma 3.14 and Corollary 3.15 bound how many plausible vertices can exist. This can be used to bound the total time complexity of applying Algorithm 2 (Theorem 3.13) to all segments of some  $st$ -shortest path.

**Lemma 3.14.** *There are  $O(n)$  plausible vertices across all segments from the same weight category  $S_\alpha = \{\sigma \mid \text{len}_H(\sigma) \in [2^{\alpha-1}, 2^\alpha)\}$ :*

$$\sum_{\substack{i: \\ (h_i, h_{i+1}) \in S_\alpha}} |P_i| = O(n)$$

*Proof.* Suppose a vertex  $v$  is plausible for edges  $\sigma_a^{(\alpha)} = (h_i, h_{i+1})$  and  $\sigma_b^{(\alpha)} = (h_j, h_{j+1})$ ,  $a < b$  and is well-approximated by  $G_x$  (Figure 4): Just as in the proof of Lemma 3.10 we have that

$$\text{dist}_G(h_i, v) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, v) \leq \text{dist}_{G_x}(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{i+1}) \leq 2^{\alpha+1}$$

and similarly  $\text{dist}_G(h_j, v) \leq 2^{\alpha+1}$ .

As this is an undirected graph, we can combine both inequalities:

$$\text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{j+1}) \leq \text{dist}_G(h_i, v) + \text{dist}_G(v, h_j) + \text{dist}_G(h_j, h_{j+1}) \leq 2^{\alpha+1} + 2^{\alpha+1} + 2^\alpha \leq 2^{\alpha+3} \quad (3)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.6

$$\text{dist}_G(h_i, h_{j+1}) \geq 2^{\alpha-1}(b - a)$$




Figure 4: A possibility of a shortcut in graph  $G$  between  $h_i$  and  $h_{j+1}$ . Red curly arrow indicates a shortest  $h_i h_{j+1}$  path in  $G$ .

Therefore,  $b - a = O(1)$ . That means every vertex can be plausible only for  $O(1)$  edges from the same  $S_\alpha$ . So in total

$$\sum_{\substack{i: \\ (h_i, h_{i+1}) \in S_\alpha}} |P_i| = O(n)$$

□

**Corollary 3.15.** *There are  $O(n \log(Wn))$  plausible vertices across all segments:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |P_i| = O(n \log(nW))$$

### 3.4 Blackbox Reductions

We now have all tools available to prove the blackbox reduction from dynamic shortest path to dynamic distance algorithms. The main idea is to use hitting set arguments to split any  $st$ -shortest path into shorter segments, then use the results from Sections 3.2 and 3.3 to reconstruct the path for each such segment.

We start by giving our approximate result for directed weighted graphs.

**Theorem 3.1** (directed, approximate). *Suppose, there exist  $4n^a/\epsilon$ -bounded distance oracles  $\mathcal{O}_X, \mathcal{O}_X^{(1+\epsilon)}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_X^{(2)}$  with the corresponding time-complexities (as in Definition 1.6) for any integer weighted directed graph  $X$  with  $|V| = n$ . Then there exists an algorithm that supports the following operations on a directed graph  $G = (V, E, w), |V| = n$  with real weights from  $[1, W]$ .*

- *preprocess()* – preprocesses  $G$  in time  $\tilde{O}(\log W \cdot (P_2 + P_{1+\epsilon} + P))$
- *update( $e, w$ )* – updates an edge  $e$  with weight  $w$  in time

$$\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(U_2 + U_{1+\epsilon} + U + Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(n^{1-a}, n)\right)\right)$$

- *query( $s, t$ )* – for any pair of vertices  $s, t$  returns an  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path in time

$$\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(Q_{1+\epsilon}(1, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(1, n) + n^{2-a} + n \cdot Q(1, 1)\right)\right)$$

The dynamic algorithm is randomized and correct w.h.p. with one-sided error and works against an adaptive adversary.

---

**Algorithm 3:** Querying an  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path in weighted  $G$ 


---

```

// Blue lines are executed on directed graphs only.
1 procedure QUERY( $G, s, t, \epsilon$ )
2   Add vertices  $s, t$  to  $H$  and add edges incident to  $s$  and  $t$  as in Definition 3.2
3   For this, we must call  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(1+\epsilon)}.query(v, V_H)$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(1+\epsilon)}.query(V_H, v)$  for  $v \in \{s, t\}$  for all
    $x$ .
4    $(s = h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{k-1}, h_k = t) \leftarrow$  DIJKSTRA( $H, (s, t)$ )
5   Compute and save  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(\{s\}, V)$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(V, \{t\})$  for all  $x$ 
6   Construct  $P_0, \dots, P_k$  using results of  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(V_H, V)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(V, V_H)$ ,
    $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(V, \{s\})$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(\{t\}, V)$ 
7   for  $i = 0, \dots, k$  do
8      $G_x \leftarrow G_*(h_i, h_{i+1})$ 
9      $\pi_i \leftarrow$  SHORTESTSUBPATH( $G_x, (h_i, h_{i+1}), P_i$ ) // Algorithms 1 and 2, depending
   on if  $G$  is (un-)directed.
10  return  $\pi$ 

```

---



---

**Algorithm 4:** Updating the data structure for given new weight  $c$  for an edge  $e$ 


---

```

// Blue lines are executed on directed graphs only.
1 procedure UPDATE( $G, \epsilon, e, c$ )
2   for all maintained  $G_x$  (as defined in Lemma 1.9) do
3     if  $c \leq B_x$  then
4        $c_x \leftarrow \lceil Ac/B_x \rceil$ 
5        $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.update(e, c_x)$ 
6        $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(1+\epsilon)}.update(e, c_x)$ 
7        $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}.update(e, c_x)$ 
8   Construct  $H$  as in definition 3.2
9   Compute and save results of  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(V_H, V)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(V, V_H)$ 

```

---

*Proof.* Consider the algorithm defined by Algorithm 4 for update operation and Algorithm 3 for query operation (all lines are executed).

**Correctness.** The fact that concatenated shortest subpaths form a  $(1 + O(\epsilon))$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path in  $G$  follows from Lemma 3.3 and the correctness of each subpath comes from Theorem 3.8.

**Complexity.** As we have  $O(\log(nW))$  copies  $G_x$ , the total query time (the lines are from Algorithm 3) is

$$\tilde{O} \left( \underbrace{Q_{1+\epsilon}(1, n^{1-a}) \cdot \log W}_{\text{Edges } V_H \times \{s, t\}, \text{ (Line 2)}} + \underbrace{n^{2-2a}}_{\text{Dijkstra (Line 4)}} + \underbrace{Q_2(n, 1) \cdot \log W}_{\text{Line 5}} + \underbrace{n^{2-a} \log W}_{P_i\text{'s, Line 6}} + \underbrace{n \cdot Q(1, 1) \cdot \log W}_{\text{all ShortestPaths (Line 7)}} \right).$$

Note that the result of  $queryAll(V, V_H)$  for Line 6 was precomputed during the UPDATE routine (Algorithm 4), so the cost of that query does not occur here for QUERY. The complexity of Line 7 is bounded by Theorem 3.8 and Corollary 3.11.

Total update time (the lines are from Algorithm 4):

$$\tilde{O} \left( \left( \underbrace{U_2 + U_{1+\epsilon} + U}_{\text{(Line 5, Line 6, Line 7)}} + \underbrace{Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a})}_{\text{edges of } H, \text{(Line 8)}} + \underbrace{Q_2(n, n^{1-a})}_{\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(V, V_H), \text{(Line 9)}} \right) \log W \right)$$

□

**Theorem 3.16** (undirected, approximate). *Suppose, there exist  $4n^a/\epsilon$ -bounded distance oracles  $\mathcal{O}_X$  and  $\mathcal{O}_X^{(1+\epsilon)}$  with the corresponding time-complexities (as in Definition 1.6) for any integer weighted undirected graph  $X$  with  $|V| = n$ . Then there exists an algorithm that supports the following operations on a undirected graph  $G = (V, E, w), |V| = n$  with real weights from  $[1, W]$ .*

- *preprocess()* – preprocesses  $G$  in time  $\tilde{O}(\log W \cdot (P_{1+\epsilon} + P))$
- *update( $e, w$ )* – updates an edge  $e$  with weight  $w$  in time

$$\tilde{O} \left( \log W \cdot \left( U_{1+\epsilon} + U + Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a}) \right) \right)$$

- *query( $s, t$ )* – for any pair of vertices  $s, t$  returns an  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path in time

$$\tilde{O}(\log W \cdot (Q_{1+\epsilon}(1, n^{1-a}) + n^{2-2a} + n \cdot Q(1, 1)))$$

The dynamic algorithm is randomized and correct w.h.p. with one-sided error and works against an adaptive adversary.

*Proof.* Consider the algorithm defined by Algorithm 4 for update operation and Algorithm 3 for query operation (only black lines are executed, for SHORTESTSUBPATH use Algorithm 2 that doesn't need  $P_i$  as input).

**Correctness.** The fact that concatenated shortest subpaths form a  $(1 + O(\epsilon))$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path in  $G$  follows from Lemma 3.3. The correctness of each subpath comes from Theorem 3.13.

**Complexity.** As we have  $O(\log(nW))$  copies  $G_x$ , each of which has edge weights at most  $A = O(n^a/\epsilon)$ , the total query time (the lines are from Algorithm 3) is:

$$\tilde{O} \left( \left( \underbrace{Q_{1+\epsilon}(1, n^{1-a}) \cdot \log W}_{\text{Edges } V_H \times \{s, t\}, \text{(Line 2)}} + \underbrace{n^{2-2a}}_{\substack{\text{Dijkstra(Line 4)} \\ \text{and } n^{1-a} \cdot n \log A \\ \text{(Theorem 3.13)}}} + \underbrace{n \cdot Q(1, 1) \cdot \log W}_{\text{all ShortestPaths (Line 7)}} \right) \right)$$

Where the complexity of Line 7 is bounded by Theorem 3.13 and Corollary 3.15.

Total update time (the lines are from Algorithm 4):

$$\tilde{O} \left( \left( \underbrace{U_{1+\epsilon} + U}_{\text{(Line 6, Line 7)}} + \underbrace{Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a})}_{\text{edges of } H, \text{(Line 8)}} \right) \log W \right)$$

□

**Theorem 3.17** (directed, exact). *Suppose, there exist  $Wn^a$ -bounded distance oracles  $\mathcal{O}_X$  and  $\mathcal{O}_X^{(2)}$  with the corresponding time-complexities (as in Definition 1.6) for any integer weighted directed graph  $X$  with  $|V| = n$ . Then there exists an algorithm that supports the following operations on a directed graph  $G = (V, E, w), |V| = n$  with real weights from  $[1, W]$ .*

- *preprocess()* – preprocesses  $G$  in time  $\tilde{O}(P_2 + P)$
- *update( $e, w$ )* – updates an edge  $e$  with weight  $w$  in time

$$\tilde{O}\left(U_2 + U + Q(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(n^{1-a}, n)\right)$$

- *query( $s, t$ )* – for any pair of vertices  $s, t$  returns an exact  $st$ -shortest path in time

$$\tilde{O}\left(Q(1, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(1, n) + n^{2-a} + n \cdot Q(1, 1) \log W\right)$$

The dynamic algorithm is randomized and correct w.h.p. with one-sided error and works against an adaptive adversary.

*Proof.* Note that Definition 3.2 extends to  $\epsilon = 0$  in which case there exists only one  $(A, B)$ -rounded graph  $G_0 = G$ .

Consider the algorithm defined by Algorithm 4 for update operation and Algorithm 3 for query operation (all lines are executed).

**Correctness.** The fact that concatenated shortest subpaths form w.h.p. an exact  $st$ -shortest path in  $G$  follows from Lemma 3.3 and the correctness of each subpath follows from Theorem 3.8.

**Complexity.** Total query time (the lines are from Algorithm 3):

$$\tilde{O}\left(\underbrace{Q(1, n^{1-a})}_{\text{Edges } V_H \times \{s, t\}, \text{ (Line 2)}} + \underbrace{n^{2-2a}}_{\text{Dijkstra (Line 4)}} + \underbrace{Q_2(n, 1)}_{\text{Line 5}} + \underbrace{n^{2-a}}_{P_i\text{'s, Line 6}} + \underbrace{n \cdot Q(1, 1)}_{\text{all ShortestPaths (Line 7)}}\right)$$

Note that the result of  $queryAll(V, V_H)$  for Line 6 was precomputed during the UPDATE routine (Algorithm 4), so the cost of that query does not occur here for QUERY. The complexity of Line 7 is bounded by Theorem 3.8 and Corollary 3.11.

Total update time (the lines are from Algorithm 4):

$$\tilde{O}\left(\underbrace{U_2 + U}_{\text{(Line 5, Line 7)}} + \underbrace{Q(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a})}_{\text{edges of } H, \text{ (Line 8)}} + \underbrace{Q_2(n, n^{1-a})}_{\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}.queryAll(V, V_H), \text{ (Line 9)}}\right)$$

□

## 4 Applying the Blackbox Reductions

In this section, we prove our main results for weighted graphs, that is Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 stated in the introduction. The proofs for these results stem from the techniques in Section 3, which presents blackbox reduction from dynamic shortest path to dynamic distances. We apply these reduction to the dynamic distance data structures constructed by [San05; BN19]. In Section 4.1, we state the update and query complexities of [San05; BN19]. Then in the subsequent Section 4.2, we plug the complexities into our blackbox reductions from Section 3, resulting in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

	$\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}$	$\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(1+\epsilon)}$	$\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$
$update(*)$	$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu}/\epsilon)$	$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu}/\epsilon^2)$	$\tilde{O}(n^{1+\mu+a}/\epsilon + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a})$
$query(u, v)$			$\tilde{O}(n^{a+\mu}/\epsilon)$
$queryAll(V_H, V_H)$		$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1-a,1-a,\nu+a)}/\epsilon^2)$	
$queryAll(V, V_H)$	$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)}/\epsilon)$	$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)}/\epsilon^2)$	

Table 2: Complexities of  $4n^a/\epsilon$ -bounded distance oracles on any graph  $G_x$ . Complexities that are not used in the final analysis are omitted. Here complexities of  $\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}$  scale in  $\epsilon$ , because we maintain  $4n^a/\epsilon$ -bounded distances.

	$\mathcal{O}_{G_x}^{(2)}$	$\mathcal{O}_{G_x}$
$update(*)$	$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu}W)$	$\tilde{O}((n^{1+\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a})W)$
$query(*)$		$\tilde{O}(n^{a+\mu}W)$
$queryAll(V_H, V_H)$		$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1-a,1-a,\mu)+a}W)$
$queryAll(V, V_H)$	$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)}W)$	

Table 3: Complexities of  $Wn^a$ -distance bounded oracles on graph  $G$  with integer weights in  $[1, W]$

#### 4.1 Oracles

Let us derive the time complexities for the dynamic distance oracles used in our data structure. We will need the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1** ([San05], [BN19, Theorem 4.2]). *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $a > 0$  and  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$  there exists a dynamic algorithm that maintains  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $n^a$ -bounded distances in a positive integer weighted directed graph. The update time is*

$$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu}/\epsilon + n^{1+\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a}).$$

The query time to query any pairwise  $S \times T$  distances for any  $|S| = n^{\delta_1}$ ,  $|T| = n^{\delta_2}$  (the sets are not fixed, but given when performing the query), is

$$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(\delta_1,\nu+a,\delta_2)}/\epsilon).$$

The exact  $n^a$ -bounded distance can be queried in

$$\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(\delta_1,\mu,\delta_2)+a}).$$

Using this lemma and the fact that  $\omega(a, b, c + d) \leq \omega(a, b, c) + d$  we can derive the needed time-complexities for update and query operations (Table 2 and Table 3). Further, to query the  $uv$ -distance for any pair  $u, v \in V$ , we can pick  $S = \{u\}$ ,  $T = \{v\}$  and get  $\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(0,\nu+a,0)}/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(n^{\nu+a}/\epsilon)$  query time for the approximate  $uv$ -distance and  $\tilde{O}(n^{\omega(0,\mu,0)+a}) = \tilde{O}(n^{\mu+a})$  query time for the exact distance.



## 4.2 Final Complexities

Plugging, the complexities of Lemma 4.1 into the blackbox reduction Theorem 3.1 for approximate directed shortest paths, we obtain the following Corollary 4.2.

**Corollary 4.2** (Approximate, directed). *For any  $0 \leq a \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a fully dynamic algorithms that maintain  $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths for directed graphs with real edge weights in  $[1, W]$ . The preprocessing time is  $O(n^{\omega+a}\epsilon^{-1} \log W)$ , the update time for an edge insertion or deletion is  $\tilde{O}\left(\left(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu} + n^{1+\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)}\right)\epsilon^{-2} \log W\right)$  and querying the shortest path for any  $s, t \in V$  takes  $\tilde{O}\left(\left(n^{2-a} + n^{1+\nu+a} + n^{1+a+\mu}\right)\epsilon^{-2} \log W\right)$  time. The dynamic algorithm is randomized and correct w.h.p. with one-sided error and works against an adaptive adversary.*

Balancing the terms with parameters

$$a \approx 0.25955649, \nu \approx 0.22133053, \mu \approx 0.48088702$$

the preprocessing time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n^{2.633} \log W)$ , query time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.741} \log W)$  and update time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.816} \log W)$  by current bounds on matrix multiplication [Will2; Gal14; AW21; DWZ22; GU18]<sup>9</sup>. These are precisely the complexities stated in Theorem 1.2 for directed graphs.

*Proof of Corollary 4.2.* Using

$$\begin{aligned} Q_2(n^{1-a}, n) &= \tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)}/\epsilon), \\ Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a}) &= \tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1-a,1-a,\nu+a)}/\epsilon^2), \\ Q(1, 1) &= \tilde{O}(n^{a+\mu}/\epsilon), \\ U_2 &= \tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu}/\epsilon), \\ U_{1+\epsilon} &= \tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu}/\epsilon^2), \\ U &= \tilde{O}(n^{1+\mu+a}/\epsilon + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a}) \end{aligned}$$

we have the following complexities.

The preprocessing time is  $O(n^{\omega+a}\epsilon^{-1} \log W)$ . By Theorem 3.1, the update time is

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(U_2 + U_{1+\epsilon} + U + Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(n^{1-a}, n)\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\left(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu} + n^{1+\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)}\right)\epsilon^{-2} \log W\right) \end{aligned}$$

and the query time is

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(Q_{1+\epsilon}(1, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(1, n) + n^{2-a} + n \cdot Q(1, 1)\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\left(n^{2-a} + n^{1+\nu+a} + n^{1+a+\mu}\right)\epsilon^{-2} \log W\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

Using the blackbox reduction Theorem 3.16 for approximate shortest paths on undirected graphs, together with the dynamic distance data structure from Lemma 4.1, we obtain Corollary 4.3.

<sup>9</sup>Parameters balanced via [Bra]. This specific result is available [here](#).

**Corollary 4.3** (Approximate, undirected). *For any  $0 \leq a \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a fully dynamic algorithm that maintain  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths for undirected graphs with real edge weights in  $[1, W]$ . The preprocessing time is  $O(n^{\omega+a}\epsilon^{-1} \log W)$ , the update time for an edge insertion or deletion is  $\tilde{O}\left(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu} + n^{1+\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1-a,1-a,\nu+a)}\right) \epsilon^{-2} \log W$ , and querying the shortest path for any  $s, t \in V$  takes  $\tilde{O}\left((n^{1+\nu} + n^{2-2a} + n^{1+a+\mu}) \epsilon^{-2} \log W\right)$  time. The dynamic algorithm is randomized and correct w.h.p., and works against an adaptive adversary.*

Balancing the terms with parameters

$$a \approx 0.1909, \nu \approx 0.3376, \mu \approx 0.5286$$

the preprocessing time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n^{2.564})$  the query and update time complexities are both  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.72} \log W)$  by current bounds on matrix multiplication [Wil12; Gal14; AW21; DWZ22; GU18]<sup>10</sup>. This is the result stated in Theorem 1.2 for undirected graphs.

*Proof of Corollary 4.3.* Using

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a}) &= \tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1-a,1-a,\nu+a)}/\epsilon^2), \\ Q(1, 1) &= \tilde{O}(n^{a+\mu}/\epsilon), \\ U_{1+\epsilon} &= \tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu}/\epsilon^2), \\ U &= \tilde{O}(n^{1+\mu+a}/\epsilon + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a}) \end{aligned}$$

we have the following complexities.

The preprocessing time is  $O(n^{\omega+a}\epsilon^{-1} \log W)$ . By Theorem 3.16, the update time is

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(U_{1+\epsilon} + U + Q_{1+\epsilon}(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a})\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\left(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu} + n^{1+\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1-a,1-a,\nu+a)}\right) \epsilon^{-2} \log W\right) \end{aligned}$$

and the query time is

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(Q_{1+\epsilon}(1, n^{1-a}) + n^{2-2a} + n \cdot Q(1, 1)\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\left(n^{1+\nu} + n^{2-2a} + n^{1+a+\mu}\right) \epsilon^{-2} \log W\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

At last, we obtain a result for exact shortest paths on directed graphs. For this we use the reduction of Theorem 3.17 together with the dynamic distance results from Lemma 4.1.

**Corollary 4.4** (Exact, directed). *For any  $0 \leq a \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$ , there exists a fully dynamic algorithm that maintains the exact shortest paths for directed graphs with integer edge weights in  $[1, W]$ . The preprocessing time is  $O(n^{\omega+a}W \log W)$ , the update time for an edge insertion or deletion is  $\tilde{O}\left(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu} + n^{1+\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1-a,1-a,\mu)+a} + n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)}\right) W$ , and querying the shortest path for any  $s, t \in V$  takes  $\tilde{O}\left((n^{2-a} + n^{1+\nu+a} + n^{1+a+\mu}) W\right)$  time. The dynamic algorithm is randomized and correct w.h.p., and works against an adaptive adversary.*

<sup>10</sup>Parameters balanced via [Bra]. This specific result is available [here](#).

Balancing the terms with parameters

$$a \approx 0.25308461, \nu \approx 0.2050319, \mu \approx 0.45811651$$

the preprocessing time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n^{2.626})$ , query time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.747})$  and update time complexity is  $\tilde{O}(n^{1.823})$  by current bounds on matrix multiplication [Wil12; Gal14; AW21; DWZ22; GU18]<sup>11</sup>. This is precisely Theorem 1.1 from the intro.

*Proof of Corollary 4.4.* Using

$$\begin{aligned} Q_2(n^{1-a}, n) &= \tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)} W), \\ Q(1, 1) &= \tilde{O}(n^{a+\mu} W), \\ U_2 &= \tilde{O}(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu} W), \\ U &= \tilde{O}(n^{1+\mu+a} W + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a}) \end{aligned}$$

we have the following complexities.

The preprocessing time is  $O(n^{\omega+a} \epsilon^{-1} \log W)$ . By Theorem 3.17, the update time is

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(U_2 + U + Q(n^{1-a}, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(n^{1-a}, n)\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\left(n^{\omega(1,1,\nu+a)-\nu} + n^{1+\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu+a} + n^{\omega(1-a,1-a,\mu)+a} + n^{\omega(1,1-a,\nu+a)}\right) W\right) \end{aligned}$$

and the query time is

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{O}\left(\log W \cdot \left(Q(1, n^{1-a}) + Q_2(1, n) + n^{2-a} + n \cdot Q(1, 1) \log W\right)\right) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\left(n^{2-a} + n^{1+\nu+a} + n^{1+a+\mu}\right) W\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

## 5 Path Reporting on Unweighted Graphs

In this section, we prove our results on unweighted undirected graphs, i.e. Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. We show that we can deterministically maintain approximate shortest paths in subquadratic time. The dynamic algorithms internally use fast rectangular matrix multiplication and their complexity can be parameterized by  $\rho$ , where  $\rho$  is the solution to  $\omega(1, 1, \rho) = 1 + 2\rho$ . Currently,  $\rho \approx 0.529$  using the upper bounds on rectangular matrix multiplication by Le Gall and Urrutia [GU18]. The exact statements proven in this section are given by Theorem 5.1.

**Theorem 5.1** (Undirected, Unweighted, Approximate). *There exist the following fully dynamic algorithms that maintain  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest paths for unweighted undirected graphs.*

1. *A dynamic algorithm with  $O(n^{1+\rho} \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  update and query time to return a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path for any  $s, t \in V$ . The preprocessing time is  $O(n^\omega \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ .*
2. *A dynamic algorithm with  $O(n^{(3+\rho)/2} \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  update and query time to return a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate single source shortest paths tree for any  $s \in V$ . The preprocessing time is  $O(n^{\omega+(1-\rho)/2} \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ .*
3. *If we also allow for  $+4$  additive error, then there is a dynamic algorithm with  $O(n^{1+\rho} \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  update and query time to return an approximate single source shortest path tree  $T$  for any  $s \in V$ . Here  $\text{dist}_T(s, v) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(s, t) + 4$ . The preprocessing time is  $O(n^\omega \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ .*

<sup>11</sup>Parameters balanced via [Bra]. This specific result is available [here](#).

All these dynamic algorithms are deterministic.

Our algorithms build on the deterministic dynamic algorithm by v.d.Brand, Forster and Nazari, [BFN22] which could maintain approximate distances but not the respective paths. Their dynamic algorithm maintains a  $(1 + \epsilon, 4)$ -emulator of the input graph  $G$ . Such an emulator is a graph  $H$  on the same vertex set as  $G$  with the property  $\text{dist}_G(s, t) \leq \text{dist}_H(s, t) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(s, t) + 4$  for all  $s, t \in V$ . Note that  $H$  is not a subgraph of  $G$ , i.e. it can contain edges that do not exist in  $G$ . So while running Dijkstra's algorithm on  $H$  returns good approximations of the distances in  $G$ , it does not return approximately the shortest paths in  $G$ . Our dynamic algorithms from Theorem 5.1 work by replacing edges from  $H$  by short paths in  $G$ . This way, we can transform the shortest path in  $H$  into an approximately shortest path in  $G$ .

We use the following Lemma 5.2 from [BFN22] to maintain the emulator  $H$ .

---

**Algorithm 5:** Emulator construction from [BFN22].

---

```

1 procedure EMULATOR( $G = (V, E), S \subset V$ )
2    $S$  is a subset such that each vertex  $v \in V$  with  $\deg_G(v) > \sqrt{n \log n}$  has a neighbor in  $S$ .
3    $H = (V, E')$  will be the emulator. Initialize  $E' = \emptyset$ .
4   Add each  $\{u, v\} \in E$  to  $E'$  if  $\min\{\deg_G(u), \deg_G(v)\} \leq \sqrt{n}$ 
5   For each pair  $u, v \in S$  with  $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \lceil 4/\epsilon \rceil + 2$ , add edge  $\{u, v\}$  to  $E'$  with edge
   cost  $\text{dist}_G(u, v)$ 
6   return  $H = (V, E')$ 

```

---

**Lemma 5.2** ([BFN22, Section 3.2 for  $d = \sqrt{n}$ ]). *Given an unweighted graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , we can deterministically maintain a  $(1 + \epsilon, 4)$ -emulator with size  $O(n^{3/2} \sqrt{\log n})$ . The worst-case update time is  $O((n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu} + n^{1+\mu})\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  for any  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$  and preprocessing time is  $O(n^\omega \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ .*

*The dynamic algorithm internally runs Algorithm 5 to construct the emulator and maintains pairwise  $(\lceil 4/\epsilon \rceil + 2)$ -bounded distances of  $S \times V$  for the set  $S \subset V$  used in Algorithm 5.*

We now prove in Lemma 5.3 that we can use Lemma 5.2 to obtain approximately shortest paths in  $G$ , by replacing some of the edges in  $H$  with short paths in  $G$ . Note that Lemma 5.3 proves item 3 of Theorem 5.1.

**Lemma 5.3** (Item 3 of Theorem 5.1). *Given an unweighted graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , we can deterministically maintain approximate single source shortest paths. The worst-case update time is  $O((n^{\omega(1,1,\mu)-\mu} + n^{1+\mu})\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  for any  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$  and preprocessing time is  $O(n^\omega \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ .*

*A query receives any  $s \in V$  and after  $O(n^{1.5} \log^{1.5} n + n/\epsilon)$  time returns an approximate shortest path tree  $T$  with  $\text{dist}_T(s, v) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(s, v) + 4$ .*

*Proof.* We run the dynamic emulator algorithm from Lemma 5.2 and let  $H$  be the maintained emulator. During a query, we run Dijkstra's algorithm from  $s$  on emulator  $H$ . This gives us a shortest paths tree  $T$  on  $H$  rooted at  $s$ . Some of the edges in  $T$  might not exist in the original graph  $G$  as  $H$  is an emulator. We will replace each of these edges  $\{u, v\}$  in  $T$  by the  $uv$ -shortest path from  $G$ , via a routine we describe later. Let  $T'$  be the resulting graph.

Note that by line 5 in Algorithm 5, we have that  $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \lceil 4/\epsilon \rceil + 2$ . Thus after replacing edges  $\{u, v\}$  with these shortest paths, the graph  $T'$  has at most  $O(n/\epsilon)$  many edges. So we can run BFS on this modified tree  $T'$  in  $O(n/\epsilon)$  time to get an approximate shortest path tree on  $G$ .

We are left with explaining how to replace an edge  $\{u, v\}$  in  $T$  by  $uv$ -shortest paths.

**Replacing the edges** Consider an edge  $\{u, v\}$  that we want to replace in  $T$  by some  $uv$ -shortest path in  $G$ . Note that we only replace edges  $\{u, v\}$  that exist in  $H$  but do not exist in  $G$ . These edges have  $u, v \in S$  (by Line 5) where  $S \subset V$  is the set from Algorithm 5. Further, the  $uv$ -shortest path has length at most  $\lceil 4/\epsilon \rceil + 2$  (by Line 5) and Lemma 5.2 maintains all distances of pairs  $S \times V$ . So we can sort all vertices  $V$  based on their distance to  $u$ . Then we iterate as follows: for every vertex  $w \in V$  with  $\text{dist}(w, v) = \text{dist}(u, v) - 1$ , check if edge  $\{w, v\} \in E$ . If yes, add that edge to  $T$  and recurse on finding the shortest  $w, v$  path.

In total this takes  $O(n \log n)$  time to replace one  $\{u, v\}$  edge by a  $uv$ -shortest path, because we sort the vertices only once and then iterate over each vertex at most once to check if it's on the  $uv$ -shortest path.

**Bounding the number of replaced edges** The previous paragraph showed that any one edge  $\{u, v\}$  in  $T$  can be replaced by a  $uv$ -shortest path in  $O(n \log n)$  time. To bound the total time, we are left with bounding how many edges in  $T$  must be replaced. We show there are at most  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$  edges in  $T$  that we must replace by short paths.

Note that we only replace edges  $\{u, v\}$  that exist in  $H$  but do not exist in  $G$ . These edges have  $u, v \in S$  (by Line 5) where  $S \subset V$  is the set from Algorithm 5.

Now for sake of analysis, assume the tree  $T$  is directed with the edges oriented away from the source vertex  $s$ . We can assume this, since  $T$  is a shortest path tree rooted at  $s$ . Since it's a tree and not a DAG, each  $v \in S$  has at most one incoming edge in  $T$ . Thus there are at most  $|S| = \sqrt{n \log n}$  edges in  $T'$  that do not exist in  $G$ .

Thus, replacing all edges in  $T$  that do not exist in  $G$  takes  $O(|S| \cdot n \log n) = O(n^{1.5} \log^{1.5} n)$  time.

**Summary** The update time is  $O(n^{1+\rho} \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  as we run Lemma 5.2 to maintain the emulator.

The query time is  $O(n^{1.5} \log^{1.5} n + n/\epsilon)$  as the first term bounds the size of the emulator on which we run BFS, and the time to replace the necessary edges in  $T$  to obtain  $T'$ . The second term bounds the time to run BFS on  $T'$ .  $\square$

The additive  $+4$  error of the shortest paths tree maintained in Lemma 5.3 only matters for pairs  $u, v$  with  $\text{dist}(u, v) < 4\epsilon$  as otherwise the additive error is just a multiplicative  $(1 + \epsilon)$  error. To obtain the distances for these pairs where  $\text{dist}(u, v) < 4\epsilon$ , we can use the following Lemma 5.4.

**Lemma 5.4** ([BFN22; San05]). *There exists a deterministic fully dynamic algorithm that maintains exact  $h$ -bounded single-source distances for unweighted undirected graphs. The update time and query time for any  $s$  is  $\tilde{O}((n^{1+\rho})h^2 \log h)$  and the preprocessing time is  $O(n^\omega h^2 \log h)$ .*

Using the distances maintained via Lemma 5.4, we now want to reconstruct the shortest paths for pairs  $s, t$  with  $\text{dist}(s, t) < 4\epsilon$ . The techniques used to reconstruct the paths are by Karczmarz, Mukherjee and Sankowski [KMS22] which they used to maintain reachability with path reporting on DAGs.

**Lemma 5.5** (Item 1 of Theorem 5.1). *Given an unweighted graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , and  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ , we can deterministically maintain approximate shortest paths.*

*The worst-case update and query time is  $O((n^{1+\rho})\epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ . The query returns for any given  $s, t$  a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path. The preprocessing time is  $O(n^\omega \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ .*

*Proof.* We describe how to extend lemma 5.3 to handle short paths. The issue of item 3 is that it has an additive  $+4$  error wrt. the distance. This only matters for short paths of length  $4/\epsilon$ .

We run Lemma 5.4 to check if the  $st$ -distance is less than  $4/\epsilon$ . This takes  $O(n^{1+\rho} \epsilon^{-2} \log \epsilon^{-1})$  per update and query. We also run item 3 which, if the  $st$ -distance is larger than  $4/\epsilon$ , yields a

$(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate  $st$ -shortest path. If the  $st$ -distance is less than  $4/\epsilon$ , we construct an exact  $st$ -shortest path via the path reporting approach by Karczmarz, Mukherjee and Sankowski [KMS22] as follows.

**Finding the  $st$ -shortest path** Via Lemma 5.4, we get the exact  $4/\epsilon$ -bounded single source distances for  $s$  in  $O(n^{1+\rho}\epsilon^{-2}\log\epsilon^{-1})$  time. Then we sort the vertices  $v \in V$  descending by their distance  $\text{dist}_G(s, v)$ . We set  $v_{last} = t$  and iterate over the list and check for  $v \in V$  if  $\text{dist}_G(s, v) = \text{dist}_G(s, v_{last}) - 1$ . In that case  $(v_{last}, t)$  must be the tail of the  $st$ -shortest path. We set  $v_{last} \leftarrow v$  and continue iterating over  $V$ . This takes  $O(n)$  time in total.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6** (Item 2 of Theorem 5.1). *Given an unweighted graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , and  $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$ , we can deterministically maintain approximate shortest paths.*

*The worst-case update and query time is  $O((n^{(3+\rho)/2})\epsilon^{-2}\log\epsilon^{-1})$ . The query returns for any given  $s$  a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate single source shortest path tree rooted at  $s$ . The preprocessing time is  $O(n^\omega\epsilon^{-2}\log\epsilon^{-1})$ .*

*Proof.* We now describe how to extend item 3 to lemma 5.6.

The issue of item 3 is that it has an additive  $+4$  error wrt. the shortest path. This only matters for short paths of length  $4\epsilon$ . Thus we can use the following approach: (i) run item 3 to obtain some tree  $T$ , (ii) also construct a single source shortest paths tree  $T'$  truncated to depth  $4\epsilon$ . Then we take the union  $T$  and  $T'$ . Note that we have  $\text{dist}_{T \cup T'}(s, v) \leq \text{dist}_G(s, v) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\text{dist}_{T \cup T'}(s, v)$ , because  $T$  contains all edges of short paths, and  $T'$  contains all edges to approximate long paths.

To reduce  $T \cup T'$  to a single tree, we run BFS from  $s$  and return the shortest path tree constructed by the BFS. This final tree is then a  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate shortest path tree rooted at  $s$ .

Finding this tree  $T'$  uses techniques from the path reporting data structure by Karczmarz, Mukherjee and Sankowski [KMS22].

**Finding the shortest paths tree  $T'$**  Construct graphs  $G_1, \dots, G_p$  as follows: Assume the vertices of  $G$  are  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ . Graph  $G_\ell$  contains  $G$  and additional 2 copies  $v'_i, v''_i$  of each vertex  $v_i \in V$ . Further, for each  $\{v_i, v_j\}$  and  $\{v_j, v_k\}$  in  $G$  with  $j \in \{\ell n/p, \dots, (\ell + 1)n/p\}$ , the graph  $G_\ell$  also has edges  $\{v_i, v'_j\}$  and  $\{v'_j, v''_k\}$ .

Observe that for any  $v_i, v_j \in V$  an  $v_i v'_j$ -path exists in  $G_\ell$  if and only if the last vertex visited before  $v_j$  by the path has an index in  $\{\{\ell n/p, (\ell + 1)n/p\}\}$ .

We can now reconstruct the shortest paths tree rooted at  $s$  as follows: Compute the single source distances rooted at  $s$  in  $G$  and each  $G_1, \dots, G_p$ . For each vertex  $t \in V$  we do the following. Go through the  $G_\ell$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, p$  to check if  $\text{dist}_G(s, t) = \text{dist}_{G_\ell}(s, t'')$ . If the equality holds, then we know there is an  $st$ -shortest path in  $G$  with the last vertex visited before  $t$  being a  $v_j$  for  $j \in \{\ell n/p, \dots, (\ell + 1)n/p\}$ . So iterate over  $j \in \{\ell n/p, \dots, (\ell + 1)n/p\}$  and check if  $\text{dist}_G(s, v_j) = \text{dist}_G(s, t) - 1$  and  $\{v_j, t\} \in E$ . When we find such a vertex, add edge  $\{v_j, t\}$  to  $T'$ . At the end of this procedure,  $T'$  is a shortest paths tree rooted at  $s$ .

It takes  $O(n^{1+\rho}\epsilon^{-2}\log(\epsilon^{-1}) \cdot p)$  time to maintain the single source distances for each  $G_\ell$ . Then constructing the paths with above procedure takes an extra  $O(n \cdot (n/p + p))$  time, as for each vertex  $t \in V$  we (i) check the distance  $\text{dist}_{G_\ell}(s, t)$  for each  $G_\ell$ , and (ii) check the distance  $\text{dist}_G(s, v_j)$  for one  $G_\ell$  and  $n/p$  many  $j$ .

By picking  $p = n^{(1-\rho)/2}$  we get a complexity of

$$\begin{aligned} O(n^{1+\rho}\epsilon^{-2}\log(\epsilon^{-1})n^{(1-\rho)/2} + n(n^{1-(1-\rho)/2} + n^{(1-\rho)})) &= O(n^{(3+\rho)/2}\epsilon^{-2}\log(\epsilon^{-1}) + n^{2-\rho}) \\ &= O(n^{(3+\rho)/2}\epsilon^{-2}\log(\epsilon^{-1})) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality used that  $0.5 \leq \rho$ .  $\square$



## References

- [AW14] Amir Abboud and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. “Popular Conjectures Imply Strong Lower Bounds for Dynamic Problems”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2014, pp. 434–443 (cit. on pp. 1–3, 5, 8, 10, 11).
- [ACD+16] Ittai Abraham, Shiri Chechik, Daniel Delling, Andrew V. Goldberg, and Renato F. Werneck. “On Dynamic Approximate Shortest Paths for Planar Graphs with Worst-Case Costs”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2016, pp. 740–753 (cit. on p. 1).
- [ACG12] Ittai Abraham, Shiri Chechik, and Cyril Gavoille. “Fully dynamic approximate distance oracles for planar graphs via forbidden-set distance labels”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2012, pp. 1199–1218 (cit. on p. 1).
- [ACK17] Ittai Abraham, Shiri Chechik, and Sebastian Krinninger. “Fully dynamic all-pairs shortest paths with worst-case update-time revisited”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2017, pp. 440–452 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [ACT14] Ittai Abraham, Shiri Chechik, and Kunal Talwar. “Fully Dynamic All-Pairs Shortest Paths: Breaking the  $O(n)$  Barrier”. In: *APPROX-RANDOM*. Vol. 28. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2014, pp. 1–16 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [ABJ+22] Miklós Ajtai, Vladimir Braverman, T. S. Jayram, Sandeep Silwal, Alec Sun, David P. Woodruff, and Samson Zhou. “The White-Box Adversarial Data Stream Model”. In: *PODS*. ACM, 2022, pp. 15–27 (cit. on p. 1).
- [AH22] Josh Alman and Dean Hirsch. “Parameterized Sensitivity Oracles and Dynamic Algorithms Using Exterior Algebras”. In: *ICALP*. Vol. 229. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022, 9:1–9:19 (cit. on p. 5).
- [AW21] Josh Alman and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. “A Refined Laser Method and Faster Matrix Multiplication”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2021, pp. 522–539 (cit. on pp. 2, 25–27).
- [ABD+21] Noga Alon, Omri Ben-Eliezer, Yuval Dagan, Shay Moran, Moni Naor, and Eylon Yogev. “Adversarial laws of large numbers and optimal regret in online classification”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2021, pp. 447–455 (cit. on p. 1).
- [ACS+23] Idan Attias, Edith Cohen, Moshe Shechner, and Uri Stemmer. “A Framework for Adversarial Streaming via Differential Privacy and Difference Estimators”. In: *LIPIcs* 251 (2023), 8:1–8:19 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BNS+21] Raef Bassily, Kobbi Nissim, Adam D. Smith, Thomas Steinke, Uri Stemmer, and Jonathan R. Ullman. “Algorithmic Stability for Adaptive Data Analysis”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 50.3 (2021) (cit. on p. 1).
- [BHS07] Surender Baswana, Ramesh Hariharan, and Sandeep Sen. “Improved decremental algorithms for maintaining transitive closure and all-pairs shortest paths”. In: *J. Algorithms* 62.2 (2007). Announced at STOC’02, pp. 74–92 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BKS12] Surender Baswana, Sumeet Khurana, and Soumojit Sarkar. “Fully dynamic randomized algorithms for graph spanners”. In: *ACM Trans. Algorithms* 8.4 (2012), 35:1–35:51 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [Beh23] Soheil Behnezhad. “Dynamic Algorithms for Maximum Matching Size”. In: (2023), pp. 129–162 (cit. on p. 5).



- [BKM+22] Amos Beimel, Haim Kaplan, Yishay Mansour, Kobbi Nissim, Thatchaphol Saranurak, and Uri Stemmer. “Dynamic algorithms against an adaptive adversary: generic constructions and lower bounds”. In: (2022), pp. 1671–1684 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BEO22] Omri Ben-Eliezer, Talya Eden, and Krzysztof Onak. “Adversarially Robust Streaming via Dense-Sparse Trade-offs”. In: *SOSA*. SIAM, 2022, pp. 214–227 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BJW+22] Omri Ben-Eliezer, Rajesh Jayaram, David P. Woodruff, and Eylon Yogev. “A Framework for Adversarially Robust Streaming Algorithms”. In: *J. ACM* 69.2 (2022), 17:1–17:33 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BHG+21] Thiago Bergamaschi, Monika Henzinger, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, and Nicole Wein. “New Techniques and Fine-Grained Hardness for Dynamic Near-Additive Spanners”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2021, pp. 1836–1855 (cit. on pp. i, 1–5).
- [Ber09] Aaron Bernstein. “Fully Dynamic (2 + epsilon) Approximate All-Pairs Shortest Paths with Fast Query and Close to Linear Update Time”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2009, pp. 693–702 (cit. on p. 1).
- [Ber16] Aaron Bernstein. “Maintaining Shortest Paths Under Deletions in Weighted Directed Graphs”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 45.2 (2016). Announced at STOC’13, pp. 548–574 (cit. on p. 1).
- [Ber17] Aaron Bernstein. “Deterministic Partially Dynamic Single Source Shortest Paths in Weighted Graphs”. In: *ICALP*. Vol. 80. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017, 44:1–44:14 (cit. on pp. 1, 8).
- [BBG+22] Aaron Bernstein, Jan van den Brand, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, Danupon Nanongkai, Thatchaphol Saranurak, Aaron Sidford, and He Sun. “Fully-Dynamic Graph Sparsifiers Against an Adaptive Adversary”. In: *ICALP*. Vol. 229. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022, 20:1–20:20 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [BC16] Aaron Bernstein and Shiri Chechik. “Deterministic decremental single source shortest paths: beyond the  $o(mn)$  bound”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2016, pp. 389–397 (cit. on pp. 1, 8).
- [BC17] Aaron Bernstein and Shiri Chechik. “Deterministic Partially Dynamic Single Source Shortest Paths for Sparse Graphs”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2017, pp. 453–469 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BGS20] Aaron Bernstein, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. “Deterministic Decremental Reachability, SCC, and Shortest Paths via Directed Expanders and Congestion Balancing”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1123–1134 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BGS21] Aaron Bernstein, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. “Deterministic Decremental SSSP and Approximate Min-Cost Flow in Almost-Linear Time”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1000–1008 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BGW20] Aaron Bernstein, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. “Near-Optimal Decremental SSSP in Dense Weighted Digraphs”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1112–1122 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BR11] Aaron Bernstein and Liam Roditty. “Improved Dynamic Algorithms for Maintaining Approximate Shortest Paths Under Deletions”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2011, pp. 1355–1365 (cit. on p. 1).

- [BHN16] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Danupon Nanongkai. “New deterministic approximation algorithms for fully dynamic matching”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2016, pp. 398–411 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BK21] Sayan Bhattacharya and Peter Kiss. “Deterministic Rounding of Dynamic Fractional Matchings”. In: *ICALP*. Vol. 198. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021, 27:1–27:14 (cit. on p. 6).
- [BKS+23] Sayan Bhattacharya, Peter Kiss, Thatchaphol Saranurak, and David Wajc. “Dynamic Matching with Better-than-2 Approximation in Polylogarithmic Update Time”. In: (2023), pp. 100–128 (cit. on p. 5).
- [BK16] Greg Bodwin and Sebastian Krinninger. “Fully Dynamic Spanners with Worst-Case Update Time”. In: *ESA*. Vol. 57. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016, 17:1–17:18 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [Bra] Jan van den Brand. *Complexity Term Balancer*. [www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~vdbrand/complexity/](http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~vdbrand/complexity/). Tool to balance complexity terms depending on fast matrix multiplication. (cit. on pp. 25–27).
- [BFN22] Jan van den Brand, Sebastian Forster, and Yasamin Nazari. “Fast Deterministic Fully Dynamic Distance Approximation”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2022 (cit. on pp. i, 1, 2, 4, 5, 28, 29).
- [BLS+20] Jan van den Brand, Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Zhao Song. “Solving tall dense linear programs in nearly linear time”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2020, pp. 775–788 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BN19] Jan van den Brand and Danupon Nanongkai. “Dynamic Approximate Shortest Paths and Beyond: Subquadratic and Worst-Case Update Time”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2019, pp. 436–455 (cit. on pp. i, 1–7, 11, 23, 24).
- [BNS19] Jan van den Brand, Danupon Nanongkai, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. “Dynamic Matrix Inverse: Improved Algorithms and Matching Conditional Lower Bounds”. In: *FOCS*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.05067>. IEEE Computer Society, 2019, pp. 456–480 (cit. on pp. 1–3, 5).
- [BS19] Jan van den Brand and Thatchaphol Saranurak. “Sensitive Distance and Reachability Oracles for Large Batch Updates”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2019, pp. 424–435 (cit. on p. 5).
- [CGS22] Amit Chakrabarti, Prantar Ghosh, and Manuel Stoeckl. “Adversarially Robust Coloring for Graph Streams”. In: *ITCS*. Vol. 215. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022, 37:1–37:23 (cit. on p. 1).
- [CZ21] Shiri Chechik and Tianyi Zhang. “Incremental Single Source Shortest Paths in Sparse Digraphs”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2021, pp. 2463–2477 (cit. on p. 1).
- [CZ23a] Shiri Chechik and Tianyi Zhang. “Faster Deterministic Worst-Case Fully Dynamic All-Pairs Shortest Paths via Decremental Hop-Restricted Shortest Paths”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2023, pp. 87–99 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [CKL+22] Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. “Maximum Flow and Minimum-Cost Flow in Almost-Linear Time”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 612–623 (cit. on pp. 1, 2).
- [Chu21] Julia Chuzhoy. “Decremental all-pairs shortest paths in deterministic near-linear time”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2021, pp. 626–639 (cit. on p. 1).

- [CK19] Julia Chuzhoy and Sanjeev Khanna. “A new algorithm for decremental single-source shortest paths with applications to vertex-capacitated flow and cut problems”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2019, pp. 389–400 (cit. on p. 1).
- [CS21] Julia Chuzhoy and Thatchaphol Saranurak. “Deterministic algorithms for decremental shortest paths via layered core decomposition”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2021, pp. 2478–2496 (cit. on p. 1).
- [CZ23b] Julia Chuzhoy and Ruimin Zhang. “A New Deterministic Algorithm for Fully Dynamic All-Pairs Shortest Paths”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2023, pp. 1159–1172 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [CLN+22] Edith Cohen, Xin Lyu, Jelani Nelson, Tamás Sarlós, Moshe Shechner, and Uri Stemmer. “On the Robustness of CountSketch to Adaptive Inputs”. In: *ICML*. Vol. 162. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2022, pp. 4112–4140 (cit. on p. 1).
- [CNS+23] Edith Cohen, Jelani Nelson, Tamás Sarlós, and Uri Stemmer. “Tricking the Hashing Trick: A Tight Lower Bound on the Robustness of CountSketch to Adaptive Inputs”. In: (2023), pp. 7235–7243 (cit. on p. 1).
- [DI00] Camil Demetrescu and Giuseppe F. Italiano. “Fully Dynamic Transitive Closure: Breaking Through the  $O(n^2)$  Barrier”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2000, pp. 381–389 (cit. on p. 5).
- [DI02] Camil Demetrescu and Giuseppe F. Italiano. “Improved Bounds and New Trade-Offs for Dynamic All Pairs Shortest Paths”. In: *ICALP*. Vol. 2380. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2002, pp. 633–643 (cit. on p. 1).
- [DI04] Camil Demetrescu and Giuseppe F. Italiano. “A new approach to dynamic all pairs shortest paths”. In: *J. ACM* 51.6 (2004). Announced at STOC’03, pp. 968–992 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [DI06] Camil Demetrescu and Giuseppe F. Italiano. “Fully dynamic all pairs shortest paths with real edge weights”. In: *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 72.5 (2006). Announced at FOCS’01, pp. 813–837 (cit. on p. 1).
- [DWZ22] Ran Duan, Hongxun Wu, and Renfei Zhou. “Faster Matrix Multiplication via Asymmetric Hashing”. In: *CoRR* abs/2210.10173 (2022) (cit. on pp. 2, 25–27).
- [EFG+21] Jacob Evald, Viktor Fredslund-Hansen, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. “Decremental APSP in Unweighted Digraphs Versus an Adaptive Adversary”. In: *ICALP*. Vol. 198. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021, 64:1–64:20 (cit. on p. 1).
- [ES81] Shimon Even and Yossi Shiloach. “An On-Line Edge-Deletion Problem”. In: *J. ACM* 28.1 (1981), pp. 1–4 (cit. on p. 1).
- [Gal14] François Le Gall. “Powers of tensors and fast matrix multiplication”. In: *ISSAC*. ACM, 2014, pp. 296–303 (cit. on pp. 2, 25–27).
- [GU18] Francois Le Gall and Florent Urrutia. “Improved Rectangular Matrix Multiplication using Powers of the Coppersmith-Winograd Tensor”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2018, pp. 1029–1046 (cit. on pp. 2, 25–27).
- [GR21] Yong Gu and Hanlin Ren. “Constructing a Distance Sensitivity Oracle in  $O(n^{2.5794}M)$  Time”. In: *LIPIcs* 198 (2021), 76:1–76:20 (cit. on p. 5).
- [GJN+21] Varun Gupta, Christopher Jung, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, Saeed Sharifi-Malvajerdi, and Chris Waites. “Adaptive Machine Unlearning”. In: *NeurIPS*. 2021, pp. 16319–16330 (cit. on p. 1).

- [GWW20] Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, Virginia Vassilevska Williams, and Nicole Wein. “New algorithms and hardness for incremental single-source shortest paths in directed graphs”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2020, pp. 153–166 (cit. on pp. 1, 8).
- [GW20a] Maximilian Probst Gutenberg and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. “Decremental SSSP in Weighted Digraphs: Faster and Against an Adaptive Adversary”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2020, pp. 2542–2561 (cit. on pp. 1, 3).
- [GW20b] Maximilian Probst Gutenberg and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. “Deterministic Algorithms for Decremental Approximate Shortest Paths: Faster and Simpler”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2020, pp. 2522–2541 (cit. on p. 1).
- [GW20c] Maximilian Probst Gutenberg and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. “Fully-Dynamic All-Pairs Shortest Paths: Improved Worst-Case Time and Space Bounds”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2020, pp. 2562–2574 (cit. on p. 1).
- [HU14] Moritz Hardt and Jonathan R. Ullman. “Preventing False Discovery in Interactive Data Analysis Is Hard”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2014, pp. 454–463 (cit. on p. 1).
- [HKN14a] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krinninger, and Danupon Nanongkai. “A Subquadratic-Time Algorithm for Decremental Single-Source Shortest Paths”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2014, pp. 1053–1072 (cit. on p. 1).
- [HKN14b] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krinninger, and Danupon Nanongkai. “Sublinear-time decremental algorithms for single-source reachability and shortest paths on directed graphs”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2014, pp. 674–683 (cit. on p. 1).
- [HKN16] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krinninger, and Danupon Nanongkai. “Dynamic Approximate All-Pairs Shortest Paths: Breaking the  $O(mn)$  Barrier and Derandomization”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 45.3 (2016). Announced at FOCS’13, pp. 947–1006 (cit. on p. 1).
- [HKN18] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krinninger, and Danupon Nanongkai. “Decremental Single-Source Shortest Paths on Undirected Graphs in Near-Linear Total Update Time”. In: *J. ACM* 65.6 (2018). Announced at FOCS’14 and ICALP’15, 36:1–36:40 (cit. on p. 1).
- [HKN+15] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krinninger, Danupon Nanongkai, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. “Unifying and Strengthening Hardness for Dynamic Problems via the Online Matrix-Vector Multiplication Conjecture”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2015, pp. 21–30 (cit. on p. 5).
- [JLN+20] Christopher Jung, Katrina Ligett, Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, Saeed Sharifi-Malvajerdi, and Moshe Shenfeld. “A New Analysis of Differential Privacy’s Generalization Guarantees”. In: *ITCS*. Vol. 151. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020, 31:1–31:17 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KMN+21] Haim Kaplan, Yishay Mansour, Kobbi Nissim, and Uri Stemmer. “Separating Adaptive Streaming from Oblivious Streaming Using the Bounded Storage Model”. In: *CRYPTO (3)*. Vol. 12827. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2021, pp. 94–121 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KMS22] Adam Karczmarz, Anish Mukherjee, and Piotr Sankowski. “Subquadratic dynamic path reporting in directed graphs against an adaptive adversary”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2022, pp. 1643–1656 (cit. on pp. 1–3, 5, 29, 30).

- [Kin99] Valerie King. “Fully Dynamic Algorithms for Maintaining All-Pairs Shortest Paths and Transitive Closure in Digraphs”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 1999, pp. 81–91 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KS02] Valerie King and Garry Sagert. “A Fully Dynamic Algorithm for Maintaining the Transitive Closure”. In: *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 65.1 (2002). Announced at STOC’99, pp. 150–167 (cit. on p. 5).
- [KS98] Philip N. Klein and Sairam Subramanian. “A Fully Dynamic Approximation Scheme for Shortest Paths in Planar Graphs”. In: *Algorithmica* 22.3 (1998), pp. 235–249 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KSS22] Aryeh Kontorovich, Menachem Sadigurschi, and Uri Stemmer. “Adaptive Data Analysis with Correlated Observations”. In: *ICML*. Vol. 162. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2022, pp. 11483–11498 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KMG22] Rasmus Kyng, Simon Meierhans, and Maximilian Probst Gutenberg. “Incremental SSSP for Sparse Digraphs Beyond the Hopset Barrier”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2022, pp. 3452–3481 (cit. on p. 1).
- [Mad10] Aleksander Madry. “Faster approximation schemes for fractional multicommodity flow problems via dynamic graph algorithms”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2010, pp. 121–130 (cit. on p. 1).
- [NSW17] Danupon Nanongkai, Thatchaphol Saranurak, and Christian Wulff-Nilsen. “Dynamic Minimum Spanning Forest with Subpolynomial Worst-Case Update Time”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2017, pp. 950–961 (cit. on p. 1).
- [NRS21] Seth Neel, Aaron Roth, and Saeed Sharifi-Malvajerdi. “Descent-to-Delete: Gradient-Based Methods for Machine Unlearning”. In: *ALT*. Vol. 132. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2021, pp. 931–962 (cit. on p. 1).
- [RZ11] Liam Roditty and Uri Zwick. “On Dynamic Shortest Paths Problems”. In: *Algorithmica* 61.2 (2011). announced at ESA’04, pp. 389–401 (cit. on p. 1).
- [RZ12] Liam Roditty and Uri Zwick. “Dynamic Approximate All-Pairs Shortest Paths in Undirected Graphs”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 41.3 (2012). Announced at FOCS’04, pp. 670–683 (cit. on p. 1).
- [RRS+16] Ryan M. Rogers, Aaron Roth, Adam D. Smith, and Om Thakkar. “Max-Information, Differential Privacy, and Post-selection Hypothesis Testing”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2016, pp. 487–494 (cit. on p. 1).
- [San04] Piotr Sankowski. “Dynamic Transitive Closure via Dynamic Matrix Inverse (Extended Abstract)”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE Computer Society, 2004, pp. 509–517 (cit. on p. 5).
- [San05] Piotr Sankowski. “Subquadratic Algorithm for Dynamic Shortest Distances”. In: *CO-COON*. Vol. 3595. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2005, pp. 461–470 (cit. on pp. 1–8, 11, 23, 24, 29).
- [San07] Piotr Sankowski. “Faster dynamic matchings and vertex connectivity”. In: *SODA*. SIAM, 2007, pp. 118–126 (cit. on p. 5).
- [San08] Piotr Sankowski. “Algebraic Graph Algorithms”. In: *MFCS*. Vol. 5162. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2008, pp. 68–82 (cit. on p. 5).
- [Tho04] Mikkel Thorup. “Fully-Dynamic All-Pairs Shortest Paths: Faster and Allowing Negative Cycles”. In: *SWAT*. Vol. 3111. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2004, pp. 384–396 (cit. on p. 1).

- [Tho05] Mikkel Thorup. “Worst-case update times for fully-dynamic all-pairs shortest paths”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2005, pp. 112–119 (cit. on pp. [1](#), [3](#)).
- [UY91] Jeffrey D. Ullman and Mihalis Yannakakis. “High-Probability Parallel Transitive-Closure Algorithms”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 20.1 (1991), pp. 100–125 (cit. on pp. [5](#), [7](#), [38](#)).
- [Waj20] David Wajc. “Rounding dynamic matchings against an adaptive adversary”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2020, pp. 194–207 (cit. on pp. [1](#), [6](#)).
- [Wil12] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. “Multiplying matrices faster than coppersmith-winograd”. In: *STOC*. ACM, 2012, pp. 887–898 (cit. on pp. [2](#), [25–27](#)).
- [WZ21] David P. Woodruff and Samson Zhou. “Tight Bounds for Adversarially Robust Streams and Sliding Windows via Difference Estimators”. In: *FOCS*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1183–1196 (cit. on p. [1](#)).
- [Zwi02] Uri Zwick. “All pairs shortest paths using bridging sets and rectangular matrix multiplication”. In: *J. ACM* 49.3 (2002), pp. 289–317 (cit. on pp. [7](#), [11](#)).

## A Auxiliary Graph Proofs

The following is the hitting set argument from [UY91], commonly used in graph algorithms.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be an  $n$ -node graph and  $h \in N$ . Let  $R \subset V$  be a random sample of size  $\Omega((n/h) \log n)$ . Then w.h.p we have the following: For every  $s, t \in V$  with  $\text{dist}(s, t) \geq h$  there is a shortest  $st$ -path that can be split into segments  $s \rightsquigarrow r_1 \rightsquigarrow r_2 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow r_d \rightsquigarrow t$  where each  $r_i \in R$  and each segment has at most  $h$  hop.*

Before proving Lemma 3.3, we argue that the edge weights of  $H$  as constructed in Definition 3.2 corresponds to short paths in  $G$ .

**Corollary A.2.** *For any pair  $u, v \in V_H$  we have  $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \text{len}_H(u, v)$  and if the shortest  $uv$ -path in  $G$  uses at most  $n^\alpha$  hop, then we also have*

$$\text{len}_H(u, v) \leq (1 + O(\epsilon)) \text{dist}_G(u, v)$$

*Proof.*

$$\text{len}_H(u, v) = \min_x \frac{B_x}{A} \cdot \Delta_x(u, v) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \min_x \frac{B_x}{A} \cdot \text{dist}_{G_x}(u, v) \leq (1 + \epsilon)^2 \text{dist}_G(u, v)$$

where the first step uses the definition of  $\text{len}_H(u, v)$ , the second step uses the definition of  $\Delta_x$  and Lemma A.1, and the last step uses Lemma 1.9.  $\square$

This directly implies  $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \text{dist}_H(u, v)$  for all  $u, v \in V_H$ . We now prove the converse statement (up to approximation error).

**Lemma 3.3.** *For any  $u, v \in V_H$ , w.h.p.  $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \text{dist}_H(u, v) \leq (1 + O(\epsilon)) \text{dist}_G(u, v)$ . Equality holds in case of  $\epsilon = 0$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 3.3.* By the random construction of  $V_H$  and Lemma A.1 there exist a shortest  $uv$ -path in  $G$  that has the form  $u = h_0 \rightsquigarrow h_1 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow h_d = v$  where each  $h_k \in V_H$  and the path  $h_k \rightsquigarrow h_{k+1}$  has at most  $n^\alpha$  edges in  $G$ .

By Corollary A.2 we have  $\text{len}_H(h_k, h_{k+1}) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(h_k, h_{k+1})$  for all  $k$ , therefore

$$\text{dist}_H(u, v) \leq \sum_{k=0}^d \text{len}_H(h_k, h_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{k=0}^d (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(h_k, h_{k+1}) = (1 + \epsilon) \text{dist}_G(u, v)$$

On the other side, we have  $\text{dist}_G(u, v) \leq \text{dist}_H(u, v)$ , because all edges in  $H$  correspond to paths in  $G$  and these edges have upper bounds on the respective path-length as edge weight.  $\square$