

# Parallel Greedy Spanners

Bernhard Haeupler  
ETH Zürich &  
Carnegie Mellon University

D Ellis Hershkowitz  
ETH Zürich

Zihan Tan  
DIMACS,  
Rutgers University

## Abstract

A  $t$ -spanner of a graph is a subgraph that  $t$ -approximates pairwise distances. The greedy algorithm is one of the simplest and most well-studied algorithms for constructing a sparse spanner: it computes a  $t$ -spanner with  $n^{1+O(1/t)}$  edges by repeatedly choosing any edge which does not close a cycle of chosen edges with  $t + 1$  or fewer edges.

We demonstrate that the greedy algorithm computes a  $t$ -spanner with  $n^{1+O(1/t)}$  edges *even when a matching of such edges are added in parallel*. In particular, it suffices to repeatedly add any matching where each individual edge does not close a cycle with  $t + 1$  or fewer edges but where adding the entire matching might. Our analysis makes use of and illustrates the power of new advances in length-constrained expander decompositions.

# 1 Introduction

A spanner of a graph is a sparse subgraph that approximately preserves pairwise distances.

**Definition 1** (*t*-Spanner). *Given graph  $G = (V, E)$  and  $t \geq 1$ , a  $t$ -spanner is a subgraph  $H = (V, E')$  of  $G$  such that for every  $u, v \in V$  we have*

$$d_H(u, v) \leq t \cdot d_G(u, v).$$

(See Section 2 for notation). Since their formalization by [PS89], spanners have become indispensable in graph sparsification and graph algorithms. For example, they have found applications in distributed broadcast [ABP90, Awe92], network synchronization [Awe85, PU87, ABP90, Awe92, Pel00a], overlay, sensor and wireless networks [BKR<sup>+</sup>02, VWF<sup>+</sup>03, KV02, VRW04, BSDS04, SS10], VLSI circuit design [CKR<sup>+</sup>91, CKR<sup>+</sup>92, SCRS01], routing [WCT02, TZ01], distance oracles [TZ05, Pel00b, RTZ05] and approximate shortest paths [Coh98, RZ04, Elk05, EZ04, FKM<sup>+</sup>05]. Generally speaking, these works make use of sparse spanners; namely, spanners with a small number of edges.

One of the simplest and most well-studied ways of computing a sparse  $t$ -spanner  $H$  is the greedy algorithm. The greedy algorithm is based on what we will call *crucial edges*.

**Definition 2** (Crucial Edge). *Given graph  $G = (V, E)$  and subgraph  $H \subseteq G$ , say that edge  $\{u, v\} \in E$  is  $t$ -crucial with respect to  $H \subseteq G$  if  $d_H(u, v) > t$ .*

In other words,  $\{u, v\}$  is  $t$ -crucial with respect to  $H$  if it does not close a  $(t + 1)$ -cycle in  $H$ . Then, the greedy algorithm for  $G = (V, E)$  is as follows: initialize  $H$  to the empty subgraph; while there exists an edge  $e \in E$  that is  $t$ -crucial with respect to  $H$ , add  $e$  to  $H$ ; return  $H$ .

It is easy to see that the resulting  $H$  is indeed a  $t$ -spanner of  $G$  since, by construction, every edge in  $G$  has a length at most  $t$  path in  $H$  between its endpoints. Additionally, a classic analysis shows the result is sparse, containing at most  $n^{1+O(1/t)}$  edges [ADD<sup>+</sup>93]. Assuming the “Erdős Girth Conjecture” [Erd65], this sparsity is asymptotically-optimal. Furthermore, the greedy spanner is existentially-optimal in that its output is as sparse as possible for any given graph family [FS16].

## 1.1 Our Results

We significantly strengthen the sparsity analysis of [ADD<sup>+</sup>93] by showing that the greedy algorithm works in the unweighted setting even when many crucial edges are added at once. Specifically, the above notion of crucial edges can be applied to a set of edges as follows.

**Definition 3** (Crucial Edge Set). *Given graph  $G = (V, E)$  and subgraph  $H \subseteq G$ , edges  $\hat{E} \subseteq E$  are  $t$ -crucial if each  $e \in \hat{E}$  is  $t$ -crucial with respect to  $H$ .*

Then, we define the parallel greedy algorithm for computing a  $t$ -spanner of  $G = (V, E)$  as follows: initialize  $H$  to the empty subgraph; while there exists a matching  $M \subseteq E$  that is  $t$ -crucial with respect to  $H$ , add  $M$  to  $H$ ; return  $H$ .

Our main result is a proof of the sparsity of the output of the parallel greedy algorithm.

**Theorem 1.** *The parallel greedy algorithm outputs a  $t$ -spanner with at most  $n^{1+O(1/t)}$  edges.*

Even stronger, we show that parallel greedy’s output has arboricity at most  $n^{O(1/t)}$ .

This result seems somewhat surprising. By construction the spanner output by the greedy algorithm has girth at least  $t$ . The classic sparsity analysis [ADD<sup>+</sup>93, ABS<sup>+</sup>20] then makes use of folklore bounds (often called the Moore Bounds) which state that a graph with girth at least  $t$  contains at most  $n^{1+O(1/t)}$  edges. However, one can use no such bounds for the parallel greedy algorithm since the output may have girth as small as 4.

Instead we make use of an entirely different analysis based on length-constrained expander decompositions, a recently introduced tool [HRG22]. Roughly our analysis is as follows. A length-constrained expander decomposition allows us to assume that (up to the deletion of a small number of edges), given a matching in a graph with large minimum degree, one can find many  $t$ -length paths between the matching endpoints such that no edge is used by too many paths. On the other hand, a graph with large arboricity has a subgraph with large minimum degree and so if the output of our algorithm has large arboricity then we can find said non-overlapping paths for the last matching chosen by our algorithm. Since these paths do not overlap too much, one of them must not use any edges in the matching itself, contradicting the  $t$ -crucialness of the edges we choose.

## 2 Notation and Conventions

We review the notation and conventions we make use of throughout this work.

**Graphs.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph and edge-length function  $l_G$ . If unspecified then  $l_G$  assigns every edge value 1. We let  $d_G$  denote the shortest path metric according to  $l_G$  in  $G$ . We let  $n := |V|$  and  $m := |E|$  be the number of vertices and edges. The *girth* of a graph is the minimum number of edges in a cycle. A *matching*  $M \subseteq E$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint edges. Given edges  $C$  we let  $G - C := (V, E \setminus C)$  and  $G + C := (V, E \cup C)$ . We say a subgraph is non-empty if it contains at least one edge. We let  $E_G(U, W) := \{\{u, v\} \in E : u \in U, v \in W\}$  and let  $\deg_G(v)$  give the degree of  $v$  in  $G$ . For  $U \subseteq V$ , the induced subgraph  $G[U]$  on  $U$  is  $(U, E(U))$  where  $E(U)$  is all edges in  $E$  with both endpoints in  $U$ . We drop  $G$  subscript when it is clear from context.

**Arboricity.** A forest cover of graph  $G$  is a collection of edge-disjoint subgraphs  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k$  of  $G$  all of which are forests and whose union is  $G$ .  $k$  is the size of the forest cover and  $G$  is said to have arboricity  $\alpha$  if its minimum size forest cover has size  $\alpha$ .

**Flows.** A (*multicommodity*) flow  $F$  in  $G$  is a function that assigns to each simple path  $P$  in  $G$  a flow value  $F(P) \geq 0$ . We say  $P$  is a *flow-path* of  $F$  if  $F(P) > 0$ . The *congestion of  $F$  on an edge  $e$*  is defined to be  $\text{con}_F(e) = \sum_{P: e \in P} F(P)$ . The *congestion of  $F$*  is  $\max_{e \in E(G)} \text{con}_F(e)$ . The *length* (a.k.a. dilation) of  $F$  is the maximum length of any of its flow-paths.

**Demands.** A demand  $D : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  assigns a non-negative value  $D(v, w) \geq 0$  to each ordered pair of vertices in  $V$ . The load of demand  $D$  is defined as

$$\text{load}(D) := \max_v \left( \max \left( \sum_u D(u, v), \sum_u D(v, u) \right) \right).$$

A demand  $D$  is *unit* if we have  $\text{load}(D) \leq \deg(v)$  for every  $v \in V$ . The size of a demand is written as  $|D|$  and is defined as  $\sum_{v, w} D(v, w)$ . A demand  $D$  is called  *$h$ -length constrained* (or simply  *$h$ -length*) in  $G$  if it assigns positive values only to pairs that are within distance at most  $h$  in  $G$ . Given a flow  $F$ , the *demand routed by  $F$*  is denoted by  $D_F$  where, for each  $u, v \in V$ ,  $D_F(u, v) = \sum_{P \text{ is a path from } u \text{ to } v} F(P)$  is the value of the flow from  $u$  to  $v$ .

**Routing Demands and Matchings with Flows.** We say that a demand  $D$  is *routable in  $G$  with congestion  $\eta$  and dilation  $h$*  iff there exists a flow  $F$  in  $G$  with congestion  $\eta$  and dilation  $h$  where  $D_F = D$ . We say that a matching  $M \subseteq E$  is  *$\delta$ -routable with congestion  $\eta$  and dilation  $h$*  if the demand  $D_M(u, v) = \delta$  iff  $\{u, v\} \in M$  and 0 otherwise is routable with congestion  $\eta$  and dilation  $h$ ; here we imagine that each  $e \in M$  has a canonical  $u$  and  $v$  so that  $\text{load}(D_M) \leq \delta$ .

## 3 High Degree Subgraphs with Routable Matchings

Towards bounding the arboricity of the output of our parallel greedy algorithm, in this section we show that any graph of high minimum degree has a non-empty subgraph of essentially the same minimum degree where any matching can be routed with low dilation and congestion. Specifically, we show the following where  $\Theta_3$  is a fixed universal constant hidden in Theorem 3; later stated.

**Lemma 1.** *There exists a universal constant  $\Theta_3$  such that for every  $t \geq 2$  if we let*

$$\boxed{\phi := 1/(2t \cdot n^{\Theta_3/t} \cdot \log n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \boxed{\delta := t(\log n/\phi)^2}$$

*then every  $n$ -vertex graph  $H$  of minimum degree  $\delta$ , has a non-empty subgraph  $H' \subseteq H$ , such that*

1. **Minimum Degree:**  $H'$  has minimum degree at least  $\boxed{\delta' := \frac{\phi}{2t} \cdot \delta}$ ; and
2. **Routings:** Any matching  $M \subseteq H'$  is  $\delta'$ -routable in  $H'$  with dilation  $t$  and congestion  $o(\delta')$ .

Observe that  $\delta'$ -routing a matching with dilation 1 and congestion  $\delta'$  is trivial; notably the above improves this to congestion  $o(\delta')$ . The rest of this section proves Lemma 1 with length-constrained expander decompositions.

### 3.1 Preliminary: Length-Constrained Expander Decompositions

Our proof of Lemma 1 makes use of length-constrained expander decompositions and so we begin by providing background on length-constrained expander decompositions, mostly from [HRG22]. In short, a length-constrained expander decomposition is a small number of edge length increases so that every length-constrained unit demand in the resulting graph can be routed with low congestion and dilation.

#### 3.1.1 Length-Constrained Cuts (a.k.a. Moving Cuts)

We begin by giving formal definitions of length-constrained cuts which will allow us to define length-constrained expanders and length-constrained expander decompositions.

The following is the length-constrained analogue of a cut.

**Definition 4** (Length-Constrained Cut (a.k.a. Moving Cut) [HWZ20]). *An  $h$ -length cut (a.k.a.  $h$ -length moving cut) of graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a function  $C : E \mapsto \{0, \frac{1}{h}, \frac{2}{h}, \dots, 1\}$ . The size of  $C$  is  $|C| := \sum_e C(e)$ . Any length-constrained cut with support in  $\{0, 1\}$  is called pure.*

The following is the result of applying a length-constrained cut in a graph.

**Definition 5** ( $G - C$ ). *For graph  $G = (V, E)$  with edge length function  $l_G$  and length-constrained cut  $C$ , we let  $G - C$  be  $G$  with the edge-length function which assigns  $e \in E$  value  $l_G(e) + h \cdot C(e)$ . If  $C$  is a pure cut then  $G - C$  is  $G$  with all edges in the support of  $C$  deleted.*

The following gives the length-constrained analogue of separating a demand.

**Definition 6** ( $h$ -Length Separated Demand). *For any demand  $D$  and any  $h$ -length cut  $C$ , we define the amount of  $h$ -length separated demand as*

$$\text{sep}_h(C, D) = \sum_{u, v: d_{G-C}(u, v) > h} D(u, v).$$

Using demand separation, we can define cut sparsity in the length-constrained setting.

**Definition 7** ( $h$ -Length Sparsity of a Cut  $C$  for Demand  $D$ ). *For any demand  $D$  and any  $h$ -length cut  $C$  with  $\text{sep}_h(C, D) > 0$ , the  $h$ -length sparsity of  $C$  with respect to  $D$  is*

$$\text{spar}_h(C, D) = \frac{|C|}{\text{sep}_h(C, D)}.$$

Likewise, we can define the overall sparsity of a length-constrained cut as follows.

**Definition 8** ( $(h, s)$ -Length Sparsity of a Cut). *The  $(h, s)$ -length sparsity of  $h$ -length cut  $C$  is:*

$$\text{spar}_{(h, s)}(C) = \min_{h\text{-length unit demand } D} \text{spar}_{s \cdot h}(C, D).$$

#### 3.1.2 Length-Constrained Expanders

We now move on to formally defining length-constrained expanders. Informally, they are graphs with no sparse length-constrained cuts.

**Definition 9** ( $(h, s)$ -Length  $\phi$ -Expanders). *A graph  $G$  is an  $(h, s)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander if every  $h$ -length cut has  $(h, s)$ -length sparsity at least  $\phi$ .*

We now summarize the crucial properties of length-constrained expanders, namely the fact that they admit low congestion and dilation routings (see Lemma 3.16 of [HRG22]).

**Theorem 2** (Routing Characterization of Length-Constrained Expanders, [HRG22]). *Given graph  $G$ , for any  $h \geq 1$ ,  $\phi < 1$ , and  $s \geq 1$  we have:*

- **Length-Constrained Expanders Have Good Routings:** If  $G$  is an  $(h, s)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander, then every  $h$ -length unit demand can be routed in  $G$  with congestion at most  $O(\log(n)/\phi)$  and dilation at most  $s \cdot h$ .
- **Not Length-Constrained Expanders Have an Unroutable Demand:** If  $G$  is not an  $(h, s)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander, then some  $h$ -length unit demand cannot be routed in  $G$  with congestion at most  $1/2\phi$  and dilation at most  $\frac{s}{2} \cdot h$ .

### 3.1.3 Length-Constrained Expander Decompositions

Having defined length-constrained expanders, we can now define length-constrained expander decompositions. Informally, these are length-constrained cuts whose application renders the graph a length-constrained expander.

More specifically, we will make use of a strengthened version of length-constrained expander decompositions called “linked” length-constrained expander decompositions. Informally, this is a length-constrained expander decomposition which renders  $G$  length-constrained expanding even after adding many self-loops. This is a strengthened version because adding self-loops only makes it harder for a graph to be a length-constrained expander.

The following definition gives the self-loops we will add for a length-constrained expander decomposition  $C$ .

**Definition 10** (Self-Loop Set  $L_C^\ell$ ). Let  $C$  be an  $h$ -length cut of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and let  $\ell$  be a positive integer divisible by  $h$ . For any vertex  $v$ , define  $C(v) = \sum_{e \ni v} C(e)$ . The self-loop set  $L_C^\ell$  consists of  $C(v) \cdot \ell$  self-loops at  $v$ . We let  $G + L_C^\ell := (V, E \cup L_C^\ell)$ .

Using the above self-loops, we can now define linked length-constrained expander decompositions.

**Definition 11** (Linked Length-Constrained Expander Decomposition). Let  $G$  be a graph. An  $\ell$ -linked  $(h, s)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander decomposition with cut slack  $\kappa$  is an  $hs$ -length cut  $C$  such that  $|C| \leq \kappa \cdot \phi m$  and  $G + L_C^\ell - C$  is an  $(h, s)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander.

The following summarizes what sort of length-constrained expander decompositions are possible.

**Theorem 3** (Length-Constrained Expander Decompositions [HRG22, HHG22]). There exists a constant  $\Theta_3$  such that given graph  $G = (V, E)$  with edge lengths,  $h \geq 1$ ,  $s \geq 100$ ,  $\phi \geq 0$  and any  $l \leq 1/(100\phi \log n)$ , there exists a pure  $\ell$ -linked  $(h, s)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander decomposition with cut slack  $hs \cdot n^{\Theta_3/s} \cdot \log n$ .

## 3.2 High Degree Routable Matching Subgraphs (Lemma 1 Proof)

We conclude this section with our proof of Lemma 1.

**Lemma 1.** There exists a universal constant  $\Theta_3$  such that for every  $t \geq 2$  if we let

$$\phi := 1/(2t \cdot n^{\Theta_3/t} \cdot \log n) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta := t(\log n/\phi)^2$$

then every  $n$ -vertex graph  $H$  of minimum degree  $\delta$ , has a non-empty subgraph  $H' \subseteq H$ , such that

1. **Minimum Degree:**  $H'$  has minimum degree at least  $\delta' := \frac{\phi}{2t} \cdot \delta$ ; and
2. **Routings:** Any matching  $M \subseteq H'$  is  $\delta'$ -routable in  $H'$  with dilation  $t$  and congestion  $o(\delta')$ .

*Proof.* The basic idea of the proof is as follows. We first take a linked length-constrained expander decomposition. Then, the result of applying this length-constrained expander decomposition must have high minimum degree because if any vertex  $v$  has its degree drop too low we can find a sparse length-constrained cut (namely the singleton cut separating that  $v$ ). Likewise, matchings are routable with low dilation and congestion because the result of applying our length-constrained expander decomposition is a length-constrained expander.

We begin by more formally describing our length-constrained expander decomposition. Specifically, we apply Theorem 3 to graph  $H$  with parameters  $h = 1$ ,  $s = t$  and  $\ell = 1/(100\phi \log n)$ . Observe

that by our choice of  $\phi$  we may assume that  $l \geq 1$ . We let  $C$  be the resulting pure cut which is a  $1/(100\phi \log n)$ -linked  $(h, s)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander decomposition for  $H$  with cut slack  $t \cdot n^{\Theta_3/t} \cdot \log n$ .

We first define  $H'$ . Observe that by our choice of  $\phi$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} |C| &\leq t \cdot n^{\Theta_3/t} \cdot \log n \cdot \phi \cdot |E(H)| \\ &\leq \frac{|E(H)|}{2} \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $H - C$  contains at least one edge. We let  $H'$  be an arbitrary connected component of  $H - C$  with at least one edge. It remains to show that  $H'$  satisfies the properties required in Lemma 1.

We first show that the minimum degree in  $H'$  is at least  $\delta'$ . Assume for the sake of contradiction that there is a vertex  $v$  in  $H'$  such that  $\deg_{H'}(v) < \delta'$ . Since  $H'$  is a connected graph with at least two vertices,  $v$  has at least one neighbor in  $H'$ ; let  $u$  be an arbitrary such neighbor. By our choice of  $\phi$  and  $l$ , we have that

$$l = 1/(100\phi \log n) = t \cdot n^{\Theta_3/t} / 50 = \omega(1) \geq 2 \quad (1)$$

and

$$\delta' = \frac{\phi}{2t} \cdot \delta = \frac{1}{4t^2 \cdot n^{\Theta_3/t} \cdot \log n} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (2)$$

Thus, from the definition of the set  $L_C^\ell$  and our choice of  $\delta'$  and  $\phi$  and applying Equations 1 and 2, the number of self loops at  $v$  in  $H - C + L_C^\ell$  is at least

$$(\delta - \delta') \cdot l \geq \delta.$$

Likewise, the degree of  $u$  in  $H - C + L_C^\ell$  is at least  $\delta$  since in  $H$  it has degree at least  $\delta$ , and if the cut  $C$  assigns non-zero values to  $d$  of its incident edges, then  $d\ell > d$  self-loops will be added to  $u$ .

Next, consider the demand  $D_0$  which gives value  $\delta$  to  $(u, v)$  and 0 to all other pairs of vertices. Since both  $u$  and  $v$  have degree at least  $\delta$  in  $H - C + L_C^\ell$ , it follows that  $D_0$  is unit in  $H - C + L_C^\ell$ . Likewise, since  $u$  and  $v$  are adjacent in  $H'$ ,  $D_0$  is a 1-length demand in  $H - C + L_C^\ell$ .

Let  $C_0$  be the length-constrained cut that assigns value 1 to all edges in  $E_{H'}(\{v\}, V(H') \setminus \{v\})$  and value 0 to all other edges. Since  $v$  has degree at most  $\delta'$  in  $H'$  we have

$$|C_0| \leq t \cdot \delta'. \quad (3)$$

However,  $C_0$   $t$ -separates  $D_0$  in  $H - C + L_C^\ell$  and since  $D_0$  is a unit 1-length demand and  $H - C + L_C^\ell$  is a  $(1, t)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander it follows that

$$|C_0| \geq \phi \cdot |D_0| = \phi \cdot \delta. \quad (4)$$

Combining Equations 3 and 4 we get

$$\phi \cdot \delta \leq t \cdot \delta'$$

which contradicts the definition of  $\delta'$  as  $\frac{\phi}{2t} \cdot \delta$ .

It remains to show that any matching in  $H'$  is  $\delta'$ -routable. Consider matching  $M \subseteq H'$  and let  $D_M$  be the demand which assigns  $(u, v)$  value  $\delta'$  for each  $\{u, v\} \in M$  (for a canonical ordering of the vertices).  $D_M$  is 1-length by construction and unit in  $H'$  since every vertex in  $H'$  has degree at least  $\delta'$ . Furthermore,  $H'$  is a  $(1, t)$ -length  $\phi$ -expander since  $H - C + L_C^\ell$  is and so  $D_M$  can be routed with dilation  $t$  and congestion

$$O(\log n / \phi) = O(\delta' / \log n) = o(\delta')$$

in  $H'$ . □

## 4 Bounding the Arboricity of Parallel Greedy Graphs

Having shown how to route in high minimum degree graphs in the previous section, in this section we bound the arboricity of any graph constructed in the manner of the parallel greedy algorithm. We abstract out such graphs with the notion of a parallel greedy graph.

**Definition 12** (*t-pg Graphs*). *Let  $V$  be a set of vertices. We say that a sequence of edge sets  $(E_1, \dots, E_k)$  on  $V$  is  $t$ -pg for some integer  $t \geq 2$ , iff for each  $i \in [k]$ ,*

- $E_i$  is a matching on  $V$ ; and
- $d_{G_{i-1}}(u, v) > t$  for each  $(u, v) \in E_i$  where  $G_{i-1}$  the graph on  $V$  with edges  $\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} E_j$ .

*We say that a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is  $t$ -pg iff its edge set  $E$  is the union of some  $t$ -pg sequence on  $V$ .*

The following summarizes our bound on the arboricity of  $t$ -pg graphs.

**Theorem 4.** *Every  $t$ -pg graph on  $n$  vertices has arboricity  $n^{O(1/t)}$ .*

The remainder of this section is dedicated to a proof of Theorem 4. In particular, we will observe that if our parallel greedy graph has high arboricity then it has a high minimum degree subgraph and this subgraph admits low congestion and dilation routings (by Lemma 1). We will then use these routings to contradict the parallel greediness of the input graph.

### 4.1 Preliminary: Minimum-Degree Subgraphs from Arboricity

We begin by noting a known fact about high minimum degree subgraphs of high arboricity graphs.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with arboricity  $\alpha$ . Then,  $G$  has a non-empty induced subgraph with minimum degree at least  $\alpha/2$ .*

The rest of this section is dedicated to showing this folklore fact using some standard arguments.

To show Lemma 2, we will make use of a famous result of Nash-Williams characterizing graph arboricity in terms of graph density as well as two simple helper lemmas.

**Theorem 5** ([NW61, NW64, CMW+94]). *Graph  $G = (V, E)$  has arboricity at most  $\alpha$  iff for every  $U \subseteq V$  we have*

$$|E(U)| \leq \alpha \cdot (|U| - 1).$$

Likewise we make use of the following two simple helper lemmas.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a connected graph with arboricity  $\alpha$ . Then  $|E| + 1 \geq |V| - 1 + \alpha$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $F_1, F_2, \dots, F_\alpha$  be the minimum size forest decomposition of  $G$ . We may assume that  $F_1$  is a spanning tree of  $G$  since if it is not we can always move edges from  $F_i$  for  $i \geq 2$  to  $F_1$  to make it a spanning tree. Furthermore, we may assume that each  $F_i$  contains at least one edge (otherwise we would have violated the definition of arboricity). It follows that  $F_1$  contains  $|V| - 1$  unique edges and  $F_i$  for  $i \geq 2$  contains at least one unique edge, giving the inequality.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with average degree  $\rho := \frac{\sum_u \deg_G(u)}{|V|}$ . Then there is a non-empty  $U \subseteq V$  such that  $G[U]$  has minimum degree at least  $\rho/2$ .*

*Proof.* Our proof is by the following construction: initialize  $U$  to  $V$ ; while there exists a vertex  $u \in U$  such that  $\deg_{G[U]}(u) < \rho/2$  remove  $u$  from  $U$ . By construction the minimum degree of  $G[U]$  is at least  $\rho/2$ .

To see that  $U$  is non-empty, let

$$\rho_U := \frac{\sum_{u \in U} \deg_{G[U]}(u)}{|U|}$$

be the average degree of  $U$ . It suffices to show that our construction always satisfies  $\rho_U > 0$  since if  $U$  is empty at the end of our construction then at some point the numerator of  $\rho_U$  would be 0

and the denominator would be 1 (namely, when  $|U| = 1$ ). This follows since initially  $\rho_U$  has value  $\rho$  and each time we remove a vertex from  $u$  we decrease the numerator of  $\rho_U$  by strictly less than  $\rho$  and the denominator by 1.  $\square$

Using the above theorem of Nash-Williams and our two helper lemmas, we conclude with a proof of Lemma 2.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph with arboricity  $\alpha$ . Then,  $G$  has a non-empty induced subgraph with minimum degree at least  $\alpha/2$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 5 there is a non-empty  $U \subseteq V$  such that

$$|E(U)| \geq (\alpha - 1) \cdot (|U| - 1) + 1 \quad (5)$$

since otherwise we could decrease  $\alpha$  by 1 and still satisfy the inequality in Theorem 5, contradicting Theorem 5. We can assume without loss of generality that  $U$  is connected. Applying Lemma 3 and the fact that  $G[U]$  has arboricity at least  $\alpha$  we have

$$|E(U)| + 1 \geq |U| - 1 + \alpha \quad (6)$$

Thus, combining Equations 5 and 6 we have

$$2|E(U)| \geq \alpha \cdot |U|$$

It follows that the average degree of a vertex in  $G[U]$  is

$$\frac{\sum_{u \in U} \deg_{G[U]}(u)}{|U|} = \frac{2|E(U)|}{|U|} \geq \alpha.$$

and so by Lemma 4 we know that  $G[U]$  and therefore  $G$  contains a subgraph of minimum degree at least  $\alpha/2$ .  $\square$

## 4.2 Arboricity of Parallel Greedy Graphs (Theorem 4 Proof)

In this section, we provide the proof of Theorem 4. We make use of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 from previous sections. We also make use of the following simple helper lemma.

**Lemma 5.** *Every subgraph of a  $t$ -pg graph is also a  $t$ -pg graph.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a  $t$ -pg graph and let  $H$  be a subgraph of  $G$ . Let  $(E_1, \dots, E_k)$  be the  $t$ -pg sequence that generates  $G$ . For each  $i \in [k]$ , let  $E'_i$  be the subset of  $E_i$  that contains all edges lying in  $H$ . Clearly,  $E'_i$  is a matching in  $H$ , and if we denote by  $H_{i-1}$  the graph induced by edges in  $\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq i-1} E'_j$ , then for every edge  $(u, v) \in E'_i$  we have

$$d_{H_{i-1}}(u, v) > t.$$

This follows because otherwise we have

$$d_{G_{i-1}}(u, v) \leq d_{H_{i-1}}(u, v) \leq t$$

and since  $H_{i-1}$  is a subgraph of  $G_{i-1}$  and  $(u, v)$  is also an edge in  $E_i$ , this leads to a contradiction to the assumption that  $(E_1, \dots, E_k)$  is a  $t$ -pg sequence.  $\square$

We conclude with our proof of Theorem 4.

**Theorem 4.** *Every  $t$ -pg graph on  $n$  vertices has arboricity  $n^{O(1/t)}$ .*



*Proof.* Throughout this proof we use the following parameters:

$$\phi = 1/(2 \cdot t \cdot n^{\Theta_3/t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = t(\log n/\phi)^2 = n^{O(1/t)}$$

where  $\Theta_3$  is the constant stated in Theorem 3.

Let  $G$  be any  $t$ -pg graph. Assume for contradiction that  $G$  has arboricity greater than  $2\delta$ . It follows by Lemma 2 that  $G$  has a non-empty (induced) subgraph  $H$  of minimum degree at least  $\delta$ .

We now use Lemma 1 to complete the proof. We apply Lemma 1 to  $H$ ,  $\phi$  and  $t$ . Let  $H'$  be the subgraph we obtain, so  $H'$  is a subgraph of  $H$  and a subgraph of  $G$ , and therefore also a  $t$ -pg graph (by Lemma 5). Let  $(E'_1, \dots, E'_k)$  be a  $t$ -pg sequence that generates  $H'$ . Denote  $M = E'_k$  as the last set in this sequence.

From Lemma 1, there exists a flow  $F$  that sends  $\delta' = \frac{\phi}{2t} \cdot \delta$  units of flow from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $H'$  for each edge  $\{u, v\} \in M$  with congestion  $O(\log n/\phi)$  and dilation  $t$ . Thus, the total amount of flow sent by  $F$  from sources to sinks is  $|M| \cdot \delta'$ . On the other hand, each edge in  $H'$  carries at most  $o(\delta')$  units of flow and so all edges of  $M$  carry at most  $|M| \cdot o(\delta') < |M| \cdot \delta'$  units of flow.

Thus, some flow must be sent through a path that does not contain edges of  $M$ . Let  $\{u, v\}$  be the endpoints of such a path. As the flow only uses paths of length at most  $t$ , this implies that  $d_{H' \setminus M}(u, v) \leq t$ , and it follows that  $d_{H \setminus M}(u, v) \leq t$ , a contradiction to the fact that  $H'$  is a  $t$ -pg graph.  $\square$

## 5 Sparse Spanner from Parallel Greedy (Theorem 1 Proof)

We conclude with our proof that the parallel greedy algorithm produces a sparse  $t$ -spanner.

**Theorem 1.** *The parallel greedy algorithm outputs a  $t$ -spanner with at most  $n^{1+O(1/t)}$  edges.*

*Proof.* The argument that the output graph  $H$  is a  $t$ -spanner is identical to the usual analysis of the greedy algorithm; in particular, if  $G$  has no  $t$ -crucial edges with respect to  $H$  then  $H$  is a  $t$ -spanner. This follows since in such an  $H$ , every edge  $\{u, v\} \in G$  is either in  $H$  or  $d_H(u, v) \leq t$ . Thus, for two arbitrary vertices  $u$  and  $v$  with shortest path  $P = (u = v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k = v)$  in  $G$  we have  $d_H(v_{i-1}, v_i) \leq t$  for each  $i \in [k]$  and so

$$d_H(u, v) \leq \sum_{i \in [k]} d_H(v_{i-1}, v_i) \leq t \cdot |P| = t \cdot d_G(u, v).$$

Likewise, by construction the output of the parallel greedy algorithm is a  $t$ -pg graph. Thus, by Theorem 4 it has arboricity at most  $n^{O(1/t)}$  and so contains at most  $n^{1+O(1/t)}$  edges.  $\square$

## Acknowledgements

Haeupler and Hershkowitz supported in part by NSF grants CCF-1527110, CCF-1618280, CCF-1814603, CCF-1910588, NSF CAREER award CCF1750808, a Sloan Research Fellowship, funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (ERC grant agreement 949272) and the Swiss National Foundation (project grant 200021\_184735). Hershkowitz also supported by Swiss National Science Foundation grant 200021\_184622. Tan supported by a grant to DIMACS from the Simons Foundation (820931).



## References

- [ABP90] Baruch Awerbuch, Alan Baratz, and David Peleg. Cost-sensitive analysis of communication protocols. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 177–187, 1990.

- [ABS<sup>+</sup>20] Reyan Ahmed, Greg Bodwin, Faryad Darabi Sahneh, Keaton Hamm, Mohammad Javad Latifi Jebelli, Stephen Kobourov, and Richard Spence. Graph spanners: A tutorial review. *Computer Science Review*, 37:100253, 2020.
- [ADD<sup>+</sup>93] Ingo Althöfer, Gautam Das, David Dobkin, Deborah Joseph, and José Soares. On sparse spanners of weighted graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 9(1):81–100, 1993.
- [Awe85] Baruch Awerbuch. Communication-time trade-offs in network synchronization. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 272–276, 1985.
- [Awe92] Baruch Awerbuch. Efficient broadcast and light-weighted spanners. *manuscript*, 1992.
- [BKR<sup>+</sup>02] Rebecca Braynard, Dejan Kostic, Adolfo Rodriguez, Jeffrey Chase, and Amin Vahdat. Opus: an overlay peer utility service. In *2002 IEEE Open Architectures and Network Programming Proceedings. OPENARCH 2002 (Cat. No. 02EX571)*, pages 167–178. IEEE, 2002.
- [BSDS04] Yehuda Ben-Shimol, Amit Dvir, and Michael Segal. Splast: a novel approach for multicasting in mobile wireless ad hoc networks. In *2004 IEEE 15th International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (IEEE Cat. No. 04TH8754)*, volume 2, pages 1011–1015. IEEE, 2004.
- [CKR<sup>+</sup>91] Jason Cong, Andrew B Kahng, Gabriel Robins, Majid Sarrafzadeh, and CK Wong. Performance-driven global routing for cell based ics. In *ICCD*, volume 91, pages 170–173, 1991.
- [CKR<sup>+</sup>92] Jason Cong, Andrew B Kahng, Gabriel Robins, Majid Sarrafzadeh, and CK Wong. Provably good algorithms for performance-driven global routing. *Proc. of 5th ISCAS*, pages 2240–2243, 1992.
- [CMW<sup>+</sup>94] Boliong Chen, Makoto Matsumoto, Jianfang Wang, Zhongfu Zhang, and Jianxun Zhang. A short proof of nash-williams’ theorem for the arboricity of a graph. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 10:27–28, 1994.
- [Coh98] Edith Cohen. Fast algorithms for constructing t-spanners and paths with stretch t. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 28(1):210–236, 1998.
- [Elk05] Michael Elkin. Computing almost shortest paths. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 1(2):283–323, 2005.
- [Erd65] Paul Erdős. On some extremal problems in graph theory. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 3:113–116, 1965.
- [EZ04] Michael Elkin and Jian Zhang. Efficient algorithms for constructing  $(1 + \epsilon, \beta)$ -spanners in the distributed and streaming models. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 160–168, 2004.
- [FKM<sup>+</sup>05] Joan Feigenbaum, Sampath Kannan, Andrew McGregor, Siddharth Suri, and Jian Zhang. Graph distances in the streaming model: the value of space. In *Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, volume 5, pages 745–754, 2005.
- [FS16] Arnold Filtser and Shay Solomon. The greedy spanner is existentially optimal. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 9–17, 2016.
- [HHG22] Bernhard Haeupler, Jonas Huebotter, and Mohsen Ghaffari. A cut-matching game for constant-hop expanders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11726*, 2022.

- [HRG22] Bernhard Haeupler, Harald Räcke, and Mohsen Ghaffari. Hop-constrained expander decompositions, oblivious routing, and distributed universal optimality. In *Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 1325–1338, 2022.
- [HWZ20] Bernhard Haeupler, David Wajc, and Goran Zuzic. Network coding gaps for completion times of multiple unicasts. In *Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 494–505. IEEE, 2020.
- [KV02] Dejan Kostic and Amin Vahdat. Latency versus cost optimizations in hierarchical overlay networks. Technical report, Technical report, Duke University,(CS-2001-04), 2002.
- [NW61] C St JA Nash-Williams. Edge-disjoint spanning trees of finite graphs. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 1(1):445–450, 1961.
- [NW64] C St JA Nash-Williams. Decomposition of finite graphs into forests. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 1(1):12–12, 1964.
- [Pel00a] David Peleg. *Distributed computing: a locality-sensitive approach*. SIAM, 2000.
- [Pel00b] David Peleg. Proximity-preserving labeling schemes. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 33(3):167–176, 2000.
- [PS89] David Peleg and Alejandro A Schäffer. Graph spanners. *Journal of graph theory*, 13(1):99–116, 1989.
- [PU87] David Peleg and Jeffrey D Ullman. An optimal synchronizer for the hypercube. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing (PODC)*, pages 77–85, 1987.
- [RTZ05] Liam Roditty, Mikkel Thorup, and Uri Zwick. Deterministic constructions of approximate distance oracles and spanners. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, pages 261–272. Springer, 2005.
- [RZ04] Liam Roditty and Uri Zwick. On dynamic shortest paths problems. In *Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 580–591. Springer, 2004.
- [SCRS01] F Sibel Salman, Joseph Cheriyan, Ramamoorthi Ravi, and Sairam Subramanian. Approximating the single-sink link-installation problem in network design. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 11(3):595–610, 2001.
- [SS10] Hanan Shpungin and Michael Segal. Near-optimal multicriteria spanner constructions in wireless ad hoc networks. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 18(6):1963–1976, 2010.
- [TZ01] Mikkel Thorup and Uri Zwick. Compact routing schemes. In *ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA)*, pages 1–10, 2001.
- [TZ05] Mikkel Thorup and Uri Zwick. Approximate distance oracles. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 52(1):1–24, 2005.
- [VRW04] Pascal Von Rickenbach and Rogert Wattenhofer. Gathering correlated data in sensor networks. In *Proceedings of the 2004 joint workshop on Foundations of mobile computing*, pages 60–66, 2004.
- [VWF<sup>+</sup>03] Jürgen Vogel, Jörg Widmer, Dirk Farin, Martin Mauve, and Wolfgang Effelsberg. Priority-based distribution trees for application-level multicast. In *Proceedings of the 2nd workshop on Network and system support for games*, pages 148–157, 2003.
- [WCT02] Bang Ye Wu, Kun-Mao Chao, and Chuan Yi Tang. Light graphs with small routing cost. *Networks: An International Journal*, 39(3):130–138, 2002.