

# A Simple and Efficient Parallel Laplacian Solver

Sushant Sachdeva and Yibin Zhao\*

University of Toronto  
 {sachdeva,ybzhao}@cs.toronto.edu

April 28, 2023

## Abstract

A symmetric matrix is called a Laplacian if it has nonpositive off-diagonal entries and zero row sums. Since the seminal work of Spielman and Teng (2004) on solving Laplacian linear systems in nearly linear time, several algorithms have been designed for the task. Yet, the work of Kyng and Sachdeva (2016) remains the simplest and most practical sequential solver. They presented a solver purely based on random sampling and without graph-theoretic constructions such as low-stretch trees and sparsifiers.

In this work, we extend the result of Kyng and Sachdeva to a simple parallel Laplacian solver with  $O(m \log^3 n \log \log n)$  or  $O((m + n \log^5 n) \log n \log \log n)$  work and  $O(\log^2 n \log \log n)$  depth using the ideas of block Cholesky factorization from Kyng, Lee, Peng, Sachdeva, and Spielman (2016). Compared to the best known parallel Laplacian solvers that achieve polylogarithmic depth due to Lee, Peng, and Spielman (2015), our solver achieves both better depth and, for dense graphs, better work.

## 1 Introduction

A weighted undirected graph  $G = (V, E, \mathbf{w})$  is associated with a canonical symmetric matrix called the graph Laplacian,  $\mathbf{L}_G \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times V}$ , such that  $\mathbf{L}_{ij} = -\mathbf{w}_{ij}$  and  $\mathbf{L}_{ii} = \sum_{e:e \ni i} \mathbf{w}_e$ . Solving systems of Laplacian linear equations  $\mathbf{L}_G \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$  is a fundamental linear algebra problem that arises frequently in scientific computing [Str86; BHV08], semi-supervised learning on graphs [ZGL03; ZBLWS04; BMN04], or solving maximum-flow or minimum-cost flow using Interior Point methods [DS08; CKMST11; Mad13; LS14].

The groundbreaking work of Spielman and Teng [ST04] gave the first nearly-linear time algorithms for solving Laplacian linear systems. Since then, there has been considerable work on faster/better algorithms or algorithms in different computation models [KMP14; KMP11; KOSZ13; PS14; CKMPPRX14; LPS15; KLPSS16; KS16; FGLPSY22; JS21]. Most of these algorithms rely on involved graph-theoretic constructions such as low-stretch spanning trees [ST04; KMP14; KMP14; KOSZ13], graph sparsification [ST04; PS14; CKMPPRX14; LPS15; KLPSS16; JS21] and explicit expander graphs [KLPSS16].

---

\*This research is supported by an Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Discovery Grant RGPIN-2018-06398 and an Ontario Early Researcher Award (ERA) ER21-16-284.

In this work, we propose a new parallel algorithm for solving Laplacian linear systems based on block Cholesky factorization (a symmetric block matrix version of Gaussian elimination, see Section 2 and (1)). Similar to [LPS15; KLPSS16], to build such approximate block Cholesky factorization, our algorithm eliminates large sub-matrices of the Laplacian corresponding to “almost-independent sets” in the graph. The challenge in [LPS15] is eliminating these vertices while generating a sparse approximation to the resulting graph (known as the Schur complement). We propose a very simple algorithm to compute sparse approximations to Schur complements based on short random walks. This generalizes the sampling from [KS16] and does not increase the edge count in our graph; hence allowing us to bypass graph sparsification. Putting these together, we obtain a parallel algorithm based purely on random sampling that does not invoke any graph theoretic construction. In addition, we present an application of our technique for generating a sparse approximation to a Schur complement.

**Related works** As mentioned above, most Laplacian solvers rely on graph-theoretic constructions. A notable exception is the work of Kyng and Sachdeva [KS16] which gives a very simple nearly-linear time Laplacian solver based on randomized Gaussian elimination (or Cholesky factorization). Their algorithm is based purely on random sampling and does not require any graph theoretic constructions. The algorithm can be described simply as follows: Eliminate the vertices in a uniformly random order. At each step of elimination, instead of adding a complete clique on the neighbors as dictated by Gaussian elimination, sample a few edges and scale them up appropriately. Despite its simplicity, their algorithm is inherently sequential and does not lend itself to a good parallel algorithm.

In the realm of parallel Laplacian solvers, Peng and Spielman [PS14] obtained the first parallel algorithm with almost-linear work and polylogarithmic depth, but their algorithm requires an involved graph sparsification routine from [ST04; OV11] that is both complicated and requires unspecified large polynomial depth. Lee, Peng, and Spielman [LPS15] gave a different solver that could achieve better depth and work. It was based on the aforementioned block Cholesky factorization approach, but it still required a parallel graph sparsification routine and explicit expander graphs.

In contrast, our algorithm for generating sparse approximations to Schur complements is based on random walks. There are deep connections between random walks, electrical networks, and spectral graph theory. Most notably, there is a long line of work that utilizes random walks and approximations to Schur complements to sample random spanning trees [Bro89; Ald90; Wil96; KM09; MST14; DPPR17; DKPRS17; Sch18]. Recent work by Durfee, Gao, Goranci, and Peng [DGGP19] uses random walks for dynamically maintaining Schur complements. This then led to a few algorithmic advancements in solving maxflow and mincost flow problems [GLP22; BGJLLPS22].

**Our Results** We present a very simple parallel algorithm for solving Laplacian systems. If  $G$  has  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges, our algorithm achieves  $O(\log^2 n \log \log n)$  depth and  $O(m \log^3 n \log \log n)$  or  $O((m + n \log^5 n) \log n \log \log n)$  total work. This improves on the  $O(\log^6 n \log^4 \log n)$  depth and, for dense graphs,  $O(m \log^2 n + n \log^4 n \log \log n)$  work achieved by [LPS15] using parallel sparsifiers from [KPPS17] and the  $O(m \log^3 n)$  running time achieved by [KS16].

Our main results are formally presented in the following two theorems:

**Theorem 1.1.** *There is an algorithm that, given a Laplacian matrix  $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  with  $m$  nonzeros, a vector  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ , returns in  $O(m \log^3 n \log \log n \log 1/\epsilon)$  work and*

$O(\log^2 n \log \log n \log 1/\epsilon)$  depth a vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  such that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{L}} \leq \epsilon \|\mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{L}}$  with high probability.

**Theorem 1.2.** *There is an algorithm that, given a Laplacian matrix  $\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  with  $m$  nonzeros, a vector  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ , returns in  $O((m + n \log^5 n) \log n \log \log n \log 1/\epsilon)$  work and  $O(\log^2 n \log \log n \log 1/\epsilon)$  depth a vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  such that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{L}} \leq \epsilon \|\mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{L}}$  with high probability.*

While we present an analysis based on matrix martingales (see Section 5), a simpler analysis using standard matrix concentration bounds results in only an additional  $\log n$  factor in the total work.

We give our application for generating a sparse approximation to a Schur complement in Section 7.

**Organization** Section 2 gives definitions and facts we use throughout the paper. In Section 3, we give an outline of our algorithm as well as its key components. Section 4 gives a proof of our key result Theorem 3.10. We present the proofs to a few important lemmas in Sections 5 and 6. Our theorem for approximating a specific Schur complement can be found in Section 7. Finally, Appendix A gives all deferred proofs.

## 2 Preliminaries

A symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is positive semidefinite (PSD) (resp. positive definite (PD)) if, for any vector  $\mathbf{x}$  of compatible dimension,  $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} \geq 0$  (resp.  $\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} > 0$ ). Let  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  be two symmetric matrices of the same dimension, then we write  $\mathbf{B} \preceq \mathbf{A}$  or  $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$  if  $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$  is PSD. The ordering given by  $\preceq$  is called Loewner partial order. Let  $\|\mathbf{A}\|$  denote the operator norm of a matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ . For symmetric matrices, it is equal to the largest absolute value of an eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{A}$ . Given a symmetric matrix with eigenvalue decomposition  $\mathbf{A} = \sum_i \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$ , where  $\{\mathbf{v}_i\}_i$  form an orthonormal basis, the pseudoinverse is defined as  $\mathbf{A}^+ = \sum_{i: \lambda_i \neq 0} \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top$ .

**Fact 2.1.** *If  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  are PSD with the same kernel, then  $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$  if and only if  $\mathbf{B}^+ \succeq \mathbf{A}^+$ .*

**Fact 2.2.** *If  $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  is any matrix of compatible dimension, then  $\mathbf{C} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{C}^\top \succeq \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{C}^\top$ .*

We say that  $\mathbf{A}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -approximation of  $\mathbf{B}$ , written  $\mathbf{A} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{B}$  if  $e^{-\epsilon} \mathbf{B} \preceq \mathbf{A} \preceq e^\epsilon \mathbf{B}$ . This relation is symmetric. Moreover, if  $\mathbf{A} \approx_\epsilon \mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{B} \approx_\delta \mathbf{C}$ , then  $\mathbf{A} \approx_{\epsilon+\delta} \mathbf{C}$ .

Let  $G = (V, E, \mathbf{w})$  be a weighted undirected graph (possibly with multi-edges) with edge weights  $\mathbf{w} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . The Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}_G$  of  $G$  is defined as  $\mathbf{L}_G = \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$  where  $\mathbf{D}$  is a diagonal matrix with  $D_{uu} = \sum_{e \ni u} \mathbf{w}(e)$  the weighted degree of vertex  $u$ , and  $\mathbf{A}$  a symmetric nonnegative matrix with 0 diagonal and  $A_{uv} = \sum_{e: e=(u,v)} \mathbf{w}(e)$  where  $u, v$  are distinct vertices. When the context is clear, we write  $\mathbf{L}$  instead of  $\mathbf{L}_G$ . Since different multi-graphs can correspond to the same graph Laplacian, we have written our algorithms completely with respect to the multi-graphs instead of matrices.

**Fact 2.3.** *If  $G$  is connected, then the kernel of  $\mathbf{L}$  is the span of vector  $\mathbf{1}$ .*

We assume for the rest of the paper that all graphs are connected undirected multi-graphs with non-negative edge weights.

We say that  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -approximate solution to the Laplacian linear system  $\mathbf{L} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$  if  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{L}} \leq \epsilon \|\mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{L}}$  where  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbf{L}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{L} \mathbf{x}}$ .

**Block Cholesky Factorization and Schur Complement** Given a bipartition of the rows  $F \sqcup C$ , the block Cholesky factorization of a Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}$  is

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \\ \mathbf{L}_{CF}\mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{FF} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{L}_{CC} - \mathbf{L}_{CF}\mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1}\mathbf{L}_{FC} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1}\mathbf{L}_{FC} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where the matrix in the lower-right block of the middle matrix is defined as the Schur complement of  $\mathbf{L}$  onto  $C$

$$\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{L}_{CC} - \mathbf{L}_{CF}\mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1}\mathbf{L}_{FC}.$$

**Fact 2.4.** *If  $G$  is connected, then the matrix  $\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}_G, C)$  is also a Laplacian matrix of a connected graph.*

**Fact 2.5.** *If  $\mathbf{L}_{FF} \preceq \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_{FF}$ , then*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{FF} & \mathbf{L}_{FC} \\ \mathbf{L}_{CF} & \mathbf{L}_{CC} \end{pmatrix} \preceq \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_{FF} & \mathbf{L}_{FC} \\ \mathbf{L}_{CF} & \mathbf{L}_{CC} \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Parallel Model and Primitives** As adopted by all previous works [PS14; LPS15; KLPSS16] on parallel Laplacian solvers, the runtime bounds of this work are in terms of *work* and *depth* (span). The work of an algorithm is the total number of operations performed, and the depth is the length of the longest chain of sequentially dependent operations. We remark that our algorithms work in the classic CREW PRAM model.

We use several existing parallel primitives implicitly in our algorithm. Since our algorithm uses random walks, we frequently need to perform weighted random samplings and transform between different representations of graphs. Weighted random sampling asks for sampling items from a set with replacement such that the probability of sampling an item is proportional to a given weight.

**Lemma 2.6** ([HS19]). *There is a weighted random sampling algorithm that takes  $O(n)$  work and  $O(\log n)$  depth preprocessing time and  $O(1)$  work and depth for each query.*

**Lemma 2.7** ([BM10]). *There is an algorithm that converts between edge list and adjacency list representation of any multi-graph with  $m$  multi-edges in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth.*

### 3 Block Cholesky Factorization Algorithm

In this section, we present our algorithm for solving Laplacian linear systems, and the key subroutines. The algorithm BLOCKCHOLESKY for recursively applying a sequence of block Cholesky factorization and building the necessary matrices for solving the system is summarized in Algorithm 1. Algorithm 2 summarizes the APPLYCHOLESKY algorithm for solving Laplacian linear systems using the matrices generated by BLOCKCHOLESKY to constant approximation.

#### 3.1 Overview

The block Cholesky factorization of a Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}$  from (1) allows us to write  $\mathbf{L}^+$  as

$$\mathbf{L}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1}\mathbf{L}_{FC} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C)^+ \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \\ -\mathbf{L}_{CF}\mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

```

1 Procedure BLOCKCHOLESKY( $G$ )
2   Initially, let  $G^{(0)} \leftarrow G$ ,  $k \leftarrow 0$ .
3   while  $G^{(k)}$  has more than 100 vertices do
4      $k \leftarrow k + 1$ .
5      $F_k \leftarrow$  5DDSUBSET( $G^{(k-1)}$ ) and set  $C_k \leftarrow C_{k-1} \setminus F_k$ .
6      $G^{(k)} \leftarrow$  TERMINALWALKS( $G^{(k-1)}$ ,  $C_k$ ).
7   Let  $d$  be the last  $k$ .
8   return ( $G^{(0)}, \dots, G^{(d)}; F_1, \dots, F_d$ ).

```

**Algorithm 1:** Block Cholesky Factorization Algorithm

This factorization presents a natural approach to solving Laplacian systems. The upper and lower triangular block matrices are easy to apply, given that the system of  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}$  is easy to solve. As for the middle block diagonal matrix, since a Schur complement of a Laplacian matrix is also Laplacian, we can recursively apply the block Cholesky factorization until the Schur complement is small. To ensure good parallel runtime, we restrict the number of recursions to  $O(\log n)$ . Note, however, that the graph corresponding to the Schur complement of a sparse graph Laplacian can be dense.

Now, our goal is to find a large subset  $F$  such that two conditions hold: 1)  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}$  is an easy matrix to invert, and 2) a sparse approximation to the Schur complement  $\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, V \setminus F)$  can be computed efficiently. If both steps can be done efficiently, then we can recurse on the approximate Schur complement.

We show that it suffices to find  $F$  such that  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}$  represents an “almost independent” graph. To be precise, we will require  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}$  to be a 5-DD matrix, that we define as follows.

**Definition 3.1** (5-DD Matrix). A symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{M}$  is said to be 5-diagonally dominant (5-DD) if for each row  $i$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_{ii} \geq 5 \sum_{j:j \neq i} |\mathbf{M}_{ij}|$ .

In the context of a graph, a subset  $F \subseteq V$  is said to be 5-DD if  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}$  is a 5-DD matrix. 5DDSUBSET (Algorithm 3) is a subroutine from [LPS15] that allows us to find 5-DD subsets efficiently (See Subsection 3.3).

Secondly, we show in Subsection 3.4 that when  $F \subseteq V$  is a 5-DD subset, we can generate a sparse approximation to  $\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, V \setminus F)$  using a simple scheme that samples short random walks (TERMINALWALKS in Algorithm 4).

Before we present the aforementioned steps, we first introduce the notion of  $\alpha$ -boundedness in Subsection 3.2. This notion guides us in studying the central object, *leverage score*, in the Laplacian paradigm.

### 3.2 $\alpha$ -boundedness for Multi-edges

For a positive scalar  $\alpha$ , we say that a multi-edge  $e$  is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t. some Laplacian matrix  $\mathbf{L}$  if its leverage score is at most  $\alpha$ , i.e. the weight of the multi-edge times its effective resistance in  $\mathbf{L}$ :

$$\tau(e) = \mathbf{w}(e) \mathbf{b}_e^\top \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}_e \leq \alpha.$$

We say that a weighted multi-graph  $G$  is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t. a Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}$  if every multi-edge of  $G$  is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}$ .

```

1 Procedure APPLYCHOLESKY( $G^{(0)}, \dots, G^{(d)}; F_1, \dots, F_d; \mathbf{b}$ )
2   Let  $\mathbf{b}^{(0)} \leftarrow \mathbf{b}$ .
3   for  $k \leftarrow 0, \dots, d-1$  do
4     Apply forward substitution to solve  $\begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{Z}^{(k)})^{-1} & 0 \\ (\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k)}})_{C_{k+1}F_{k+1}} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y}_{F_{k+1}}^{(k)} \\ \mathbf{y}_{C_{k+1}}^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{b}^{(k)}$ , where
        $\mathbf{Z}^{(k)}$  is the equivalent operator of JACOBI( $G^{(k)}, F_{k+1}, 1/2d, \cdot$ ).
5      $\mathbf{b}^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_{C_{k+1}}^{(k)}$ .
6     Solve  $\mathbf{L}_{G^{(d)}} \mathbf{x}^{(d)} = \mathbf{b}^{(d)}$ .
7     for  $k \leftarrow d-1, \dots, 0$  do
8       Apply backward substitution to solve
           $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{Z}^{(k)}(\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k)}})_{F_{k+1}C_{k+1}} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{F_{k+1}}^{(k)} \\ \mathbf{x}_{C_{k+1}}^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y}_{F_{k+1}}^{(k)} \\ \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \end{pmatrix}$ .
9     return  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ .
10 Procedure JACOBI( $G, F, \epsilon, \mathbf{b}$ )
11   Set  $(\mathbf{L}_G)_{FF} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y}$  where  $\mathbf{X}$  is diagonal and  $\mathbf{Y}$  is the Laplacian of the induced
       subgraph  $G[F]$ .
12   Set  $l$  the smallest odd integer such that  $l \geq \log_2(3/\epsilon)$ .
13   for  $i = 1 \dots l$  do
14      $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{x}^{(i-1)}$ .
15   return  $\mathbf{x}^{(l)}$ .

```

**Algorithm 2:** Apply Block Cholesky Factorization

For BLOCKCHOLESKY, our input graph  $G$  is required to be a connected undirected multi-graph  $G$  such that each multi-edge is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}_G$  for some  $\alpha < 1$ . Having  $\alpha$ -bounded leverage scores is essential for good matrix concentration guarantees (see Theorem 5.5). Our algorithm maintains the  $\alpha$ -boundedness of all newly sampled multi-edges (see TERMINALWALKS and Section 5).

Given an input simple graph, there are two ways to achieve  $\alpha$ -boundedness initially. Since  $w(e) \mathbf{b}_e^\top \mathbf{L}_G^+ \mathbf{b}_e \leq 1$  for any edge  $e$ , it suffices to split each edge into  $\lceil \alpha \rceil$  copies with  $1/\lceil \alpha \rceil$  times the original weight. This approach is used in Theorem 1.1.

**Lemma 3.2.** *There is an algorithm that, given a weighted simple graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices,  $m$  edges and a positive scalar  $\alpha$  satisfying  $\alpha^{-1} = \text{poly}(n)$ , returns a multi-graph  $H$  with  $O(m\alpha^{-1})$  multi-edges such that each multi-edge of  $H$  is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}_H$  and  $\mathbf{L}_H = \mathbf{L}_G$ . The algorithm runs in  $O(m\alpha^{-1})$  work and  $O(\log n)$  depth.*

For certain applications where the graph is relatively dense, one can improve its work dependency on edges by using a leverage score overestimation scheme and perform the splitting by such estimations. By invoking our Laplacian solver in Theorem 1.1, we get the following guarantees due to [CLMMPS15; Kyn17]. We prove the parallel runtime in Section 6.

**Lemma 3.3.** *There is an algorithm that, given a weighted simple graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges and a positive scalar  $\alpha, K$  satisfying  $\alpha^{-1} = O(n)$  and  $0 < K < m$ , with high probability*

1	<b>Procedure</b> 5DDSUBSET( $G = (V, E, \mathbf{w})$ )
2	Set of vertices $F \leftarrow \emptyset$ initially.
3	<b>while</b> $ F  \leq n/40$ <b>do</b>
4	Let $F'$ be a uniformly sampled subset of $V$ of size $\frac{n}{20}$ .
5	Let $F$ be the set of all $i \in F'$ such that $\sum_{e \in E(G[F]): e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e) \leq \frac{1}{5} \sum_{e \in E: e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e)$ .
6	<b>return</b> $F$ .

**Algorithm 3:** Routine for generating a 5-DD subset [LPS15; KLPSS16]

returns a multi-graph  $H$  with  $O(m + nK\alpha^{-1})$  multi-edges such that each multi-edge of  $H$  is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}_H$  and  $\mathbf{L}_H = \mathbf{L}_G$ . The algorithm runs in  $O(nK\alpha^{-1} + m \log n + \frac{m}{K} \log^4 n \log \log n)$  work and  $(\log^2 n \log \log n)$  depth.

### 3.3 Vertex Elimination using Diagonally Dominant Sets

The work of [LPS15] gives an algorithm that finds a 5-DD subset of constant fraction size of the vertices with linear work and logarithmic expected depth. This is achieved by repeatedly sampling a large subset of vertices and removing vertices that violate the 5-DD condition until the resulting subset is large enough, described in 5DDSUBSET.

**Lemma 3.4** ([LPS15] Lemma 5.2 paraphrased). *For every multi-graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices,  $m$  multi-edges, 5DDSUBSET computes a 5-DD subset  $F$  of size at least  $n/40$  in  $O(m)$  expected work and  $O(\log m)$  expected depth where  $m$  is the number of multi-edges in  $G$ .*

[LPS15] also observed that 5-DD matrices can be solved efficiently using Jacobi method.

**Lemma 3.5** ([LPS15] Lemma 5.4). *Given a 5-DD matrix  $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y}$  where  $\mathbf{X}$  is diagonal,  $\mathbf{Y}$  is a Laplacian, and a scalar  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , the operator  $\mathbf{Z}$  defined as*

$$\mathbf{Z} = \sum_{i=0}^l \mathbf{X}^{-1} (-\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{X}^{-1})^i, \quad (3)$$

where  $l$  is an odd integer such that  $l \geq \log_2 3/\epsilon$ , satisfies  $\mathbf{M} \preceq \mathbf{Z}^{-1} \preceq \mathbf{M} + \epsilon \mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}$  can be applied to a vector in work  $O(m \log 1/\epsilon)$  and depth  $O(\log m \log 1/\epsilon)$  where  $m$  satisfies that  $\mathbf{M}$  can be applied in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth.

The JACOBI algorithm (Algorithm 2) implements the operator described by Lemma 3.5. Such an approximation can then be used to replace  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1}$  subblock in the block Cholesky factorization form to generate an approximation to the Laplacian.

**Lemma 3.6** ([LPS15] Lemma 5.6 paraphrased). *Let  $\mathbf{L}$  be a Laplacian matrix,  $F$  be a 5-DD subset with the complement subset  $C$  and a scalar  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1/2$ . For  $\mathbf{Z}$  as defined in (3),*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \\ \mathbf{L}_{CF} \mathbf{Z} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Z}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{L}_{FC} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \approx_{\epsilon} \mathbf{L}.$$

For completeness, we have included the proofs of Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 in the Appendix A.

1	<b>Procedure</b> <code>TERMINALWALKS</code> ( $G = (V, E, w), C$ )
2	Let $H \leftarrow$ an empty multi-graph
3	<b>for</b> each multi-edge $e \in E$ <b>do</b>
4	Let $u, v$ be the two incident vertices of $e$ .
5	Generate a random walk $W_1(e)$ from $u$ until it reaches $C$ at some vertex $c_1$ .
6	Generate a random walk $W_2(e)$ from $v$ until it reaches $C$ at some vertex $c_2$ .
7	Connect $W_1(e), e, W_2(e)$ to form a walk $W(e)$ between $c_1$ and $c_2$ if $c_1 \neq c_2$ .
8	Add a multi-edge $f_e = \{c_1, c_2\}$ with weight $\frac{1}{\sum_{f \in W(e)} 1/w(f)}$ and let $\mathbf{Y}_e$ be the associated Laplacian of this multi-edge.
9	<b>return</b> <i>The multi-graph <math>H</math>.</i>

**Algorithm 4:**  $C$ -Terminal Random Walks

### 3.4 $C$ -Terminal Random Walks for Approximating Schur Complements

Formally, given a subset of vertices  $C$ , we say a walk  $W = (u_0, \dots, u_l)$  in  $G$  is  $C$ -terminal iff  $u_0, u_l \in C$  and  $u_1, \dots, u_{l-1} \in V \setminus C$ . It is well known that the Schur complement  $\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C)$  is the sum of all  $C$ -terminal walks ([DPPR17] Lemma 5.4) weighted appropriately. The following lemma extends this result to multi-graphs, To distinguish the multi-edges used by the walk, we instead write  $W = (u_0, e_1, u_1, \dots, u_{l-1}, e_l, u_l)$  where  $e_i \ni u_{i-1}, u_i$ . Once again, we say that  $W$  is  $C$ -terminal iff  $W$  is a walk in multi-graph  $G$  and only  $u_0, u_l$  are in  $C$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *For any multi-graph  $G$  with its associated Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}$  and any non-trivial subset of vertices  $C \subseteq V$ , the Schur complement  $\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C)$  is given as an union over all multi-edges corresponding to  $C$ -terminal walks  $W = (u_0, e_1, u_1, \dots, e_l, u_l)$  and with weight*

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^l \mathbf{w}(e_i)}{\prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \mathbf{w}(u_i)} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{w}(u) = \sum_{e: e \ni u} \mathbf{w}(e)$  for any vertex  $u$ .

We defer the proof to Appendix A.

Our algorithm `TERMINALWALKS` samples  $C$ -terminal walks so that the resulting multi-graph has its associated Laplacian matrix in expectation the same as the Schur complement while keeping the total number of samples small. Since each sample is relatively small, we can use matrix concentration inequality to prove that the approximation is close. In Section 5 we formally prove these claims.

### 3.5 A Nearly Log Squared Depth Solver

By preconditioned iterative methods for solving Linear systems, so long as we generate a constant good preconditioner to Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}$  (i.e. an operator that is a constant approximation to  $\mathbf{L}^+$  and fast to apply), we can use such preconditioner to solve linear systems in  $\mathbf{L}$  with only  $O(\log 1/\epsilon)$  overhead for precision  $\epsilon$ . It then suffices to build just a constant approximate inverse to  $\mathbf{L}$ .

**Theorem 3.8** (Preconditioned Richardson Iteration, [Saa03; Axe96]). *There exists an algorithm `PRECONRICHARDSON` such that for any matrices  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{0}$  such that  $\mathbf{B} \approx_\delta \mathbf{A}^+$  and any error*



```

1 Procedure PRECONRICHARDSON( $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{b}, \delta, \epsilon$ )
2   Set  $\alpha \leftarrow 2/(e^{-\delta} + e^\delta)$  where scalar  $\delta > 0$  satisfies  $\mathbf{B} \approx_\delta \mathbf{A}^+$ .
3   Initially set  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \leftarrow \mathbf{B}\mathbf{b}$ .
4   for  $k \leftarrow 1 \dots d = \lceil e^{2\delta} \log(1/\epsilon) \rceil$  do
5      $\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \leftarrow (\mathbf{I} - \alpha \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A})\mathbf{x}^{(k-1)} + \alpha \mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ .
6   return  $\mathbf{x}^{(d)}$ .

```

**Algorithm 5:** Preconditioned Richardson Iteration

tolerance  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ , PRECONRICHARDSON( $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{b}, \delta, \epsilon$ ) returns an  $\epsilon$ -approximate solution  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  to  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$  in  $O(e^{2\delta} \log(1/\epsilon))$  iterations, each consisting of one multiplication of a vector by  $\mathbf{A}$  and one by  $\mathbf{B}$ .

Theorem 3.9 states that we can efficiently generate a sparse block Cholesky factorization that is a constant approximation. Before we state the theorem, we need to define a series of matrices. For any positive integer  $k$ , let  $\mathbf{D}^{(k)}$  be a block diagonal matrix defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{D}^{(k)} &= \mathbf{D}^{(k-1)} - \mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}} + \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}})_{F_k F_k} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{L}_{G^{(k)}} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}^{(k-1)}_{V \setminus C_{k-1}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}})_{F_k F_k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{L}_{G^{(k)}} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

with  $\mathbf{D}^{(0)} = \mathbf{L}$ , and  $\mathbf{U}^{(k)}$  be an upper triangular matrix defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{U}^{(k)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} & ((\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}})_{F_k F_k})^{-1} (\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}})_{F_k C_k} \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{U}^{(k-1)} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{U}^{(k-1)}_{(V \setminus C_{k-1}) F_k} & \mathbf{U}^{(k-1)}_{(V \setminus C_{k-1}) C_k} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} & ((\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}})_{F_k F_k})^{-1} (\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}})_{F_k C_k} \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

with  $\mathbf{U}^{(0)} = \mathbf{I}$  initially. Note that  $\mathbf{U}^{(k-1)}_{C_k C_k} = \mathbf{I}$ .

**Theorem 3.9.** *There exists some  $\alpha^{-1} = \Theta(\log^2 n)$  such that, given any multi-graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices,  $m$  multi-edges such that each multi-edge is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}_G$ , the algorithm BLOCK-CHOLESKY( $G$ ) returns with high probability a sequence of multi-graphs and subsets of vertices  $(G^{(0)}, \dots, G^{(d)}; F_1, \dots, F_d)$  such that*

1. For  $0 \leq k < d$ ,  $G^{(k)}$  has at most  $m$  multi-edges.
2. For  $0 < k \leq d$ ,  $F_k$  is a 5-DD subset of  $\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}}$ .
3.  $G^{(d)}$  has size  $O(1)$ .
4.  $d = O(\log n)$ .

5. With  $\mathbf{D}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{U}^{(k)}$  defined as in (5) and (6) respectively, with high probability

$$(\mathbf{U}^{(d)})^\top \mathbf{D}^{(d)} \mathbf{U}^{(d)} \approx_{0.5} \mathbf{L}_G.$$

The algorithm takes  $O(m \log n)$  work and  $O(\log m \log n)$  depth with high probability.

In the next section, we prove that the above chain of sparse approximate Schur complements suffices to build an approximate inverse for  $\mathbf{L}$ .

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $G$  be any multi-graph with  $n$  vertices,  $m$  multi-edges. There exists some  $\alpha^{-1} = \Theta(\log^2 n)$  such that if each multi-edge of  $G$  is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}_G$  and let  $(G^{(0)}, \dots, G^{(d)}; F_1, \dots, F_d)$  be the output of `BLOCKCHOLESKY`( $G$ ), then, with high probability, the algorithm `APPLYCHOLESKY`( $G^{(0)}, \dots, G^{(d)}; F_1, \dots, F_d; \mathbf{b}$ ) corresponds to a linear operator  $\mathbf{W}$  acting on  $\mathbf{b}$  such that*

$$\mathbf{W}^+ \approx_1 \mathbf{L}_G$$

and the algorithm runs in  $O(m \log n \log \log n)$  work and  $O(\log m \log n \log \log n)$  depth with high probability.

Our main guarantees for multi-graphs with  $\alpha$ -bounded multi-edges follows directly by applying preconditioned Richardson iterations.

**Lemma 3.11.** *There exists an algorithm and a positive scalar  $\alpha$  satisfying  $\alpha^{-1} = \Theta(\log^2 n)$  such that, given input a multi-graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  multi-edges that are all  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t. its associated Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}$ , a vector  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$ , returns in  $O(m \log n \log \log n \log 1/\epsilon)$  work and  $O(\log m \log n \log \log n \log 1/\epsilon)$  depth a vector  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  such that  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{L}} \leq \epsilon \|\mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}\|_{\mathbf{L}}$  with high probability.*

*Proof.* Building the sequence of matrices is given by Theorem 3.9. By Theorem 3.10, there is an operator  $\mathbf{W}$  that can be applied in  $O(m \log n \log \log n)$  work and  $O(\log m \log n \log \log n)$  depth to a conformable vector and  $\mathbf{W}^+ \approx_1 \mathbf{L}$ . Using Fact 2.1,  $\mathbf{W} \approx_1 \mathbf{L}^+$  and that we can use `PRECOND-RICHARDSON`( $\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{b}, \epsilon$ ) to generate an  $\epsilon$  approximation to the system  $\mathbf{L}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$  by Theorem 3.8. Since the algorithm applies  $\mathbf{W}$  for a total of  $O(\log 1/\epsilon)$  times, the total work and depth guarantee is  $O(m \log n \log \log n \log 1/\epsilon)$  and  $O(\log m \log n \log \log n \log 1/\epsilon)$  respectively.  $\square$

Both Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are direct consequences of Lemma 3.11 where the former one uses naive edge splitting due to Lemma 3.2 and the latter one uses Lemma 3.3 with the choice  $K = \Theta(\log^3 n)$ .

## 4 Solving using Block Cholesky Factorization

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.10 for solving the Laplacian system using an approximate block Cholesky factorization.

*Proof of Theorem 3.10.* Notice that each  $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$  is a linear transformation of  $\mathbf{b}^{(k)}$ . Let us define  $\mathbf{W}^{(k)}$  to be the equivalent linear operator of such a transformation. When  $k = d$ , by line 6 of Algorithm 2

the operator is exactly  $\mathbf{W}^{(d)} = \mathbf{L}_{G^{(d)}}$ . For simplicity, we write  $\mathcal{L}^{(k)} = \mathbf{L}_{G^{(k)}}$ <sup>1</sup>. For the rest, one can observe that the operator is

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{W}^{(k)})^+ &= \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{Z}^{(k)})^{-1} & 0 \\ \mathcal{L}_{C_{k+1}F_{k+1}}^{(k)} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \\ 0 & (\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)})^+ \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{Z}^{(k)} \mathcal{L}_{F_{k+1}C_{k+1}}^{(k)} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \\ \mathcal{L}_{C_{k+1}F_{k+1}}^{(k)} & \mathbf{Z}^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{Z}^{(k)})^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)})^+ \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{Z}^{(k)} \mathcal{L}_{F_{k+1}C_{k+1}}^{(k)} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathbf{L}^{(d,k)} = (\mathbf{U}_{C_k C_k}^{(d)})^\top \mathbf{D}_{C_k C_k}^{(d)} \mathbf{U}_{C_k C_k}^{(d)}$  with  $C_0 = V(G)$ . We use backward induction to show that for all  $k$ ,  $(\mathbf{W}^{(k)})^+ \approx_{1/2-k/2d} \mathbf{L}^{(d,k)}$ . The base case is already covered for  $k = d$ . For the induction step, assume the approximation for  $k + 1$ , i.e.  $(\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)})^+ \approx_{1/2-(k+1)/2d} \mathbf{L}^{(d,k+1)}$ . By (5) and (6),

$$\mathbf{L}^{(d,k)} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \\ \mathcal{L}_{F_{k+1}C_{k+1}}^{(k)} & (\mathcal{L}_{F_{k+1}F_{k+1}}^{(k)})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{L}_{F_{k+1}F_{k+1}}^{(k)} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{L}^{(d,k+1)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{I} & (\mathcal{L}_{F_{k+1}F_{k+1}}^{(k)})^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{C_{k+1}F_{k+1}}^{(k)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using our inductive assumption and including  $(\mathbf{Z}^{(k)})^{-1}$  to the topleft block,

$$\begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{Z}^{(k)})^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (\mathbf{W}^{(k+1)})^+ \end{pmatrix} \approx_{1/2-\frac{k+1}{2d}} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{Z}^{(k)})^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{L}^{(d,k+1)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let  $\mathbf{M}^{(k)}$  be defined as

$$\mathbf{M}^{(k)} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & 0 \\ \mathcal{L}_{C_{k+1}F_{k+1}}^{(k)} & \mathbf{Z}^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{Z}^{(k)})^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{L}^{(d,k+1)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{Z}^{(k)} \mathcal{L}_{F_{k+1}C_{k+1}}^{(k)} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, using Fact 2.2 with  $\mathbf{C}$  being the lower triangular matrix,

$$(\mathbf{W}^{(k)})^+ \approx_{1/2-\frac{k+1}{2d}} \mathbf{M}^{(k)}.$$

Note that  $\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}^{(d,k)}, C_{k+1}) = \mathbf{L}^{(d,k+1)}$  directly from block Cholesky factorization. Given the choice of  $\epsilon = 1/2d$ , by Lemma 3.6, we also have  $\mathbf{M}^{(k)} \approx_{1/2d} \mathbf{L}_{C_k C_k}^{(d)}$ , and that

$$(\mathbf{W}^{(k)})^+ \approx_{1/2-\frac{k}{2d}} \mathbf{L}^{(k)}$$

as required.

Lastly, consider the work and depth of APPLYCHOLESKY. For the first for loop, the runtime of each forward substitution is dictated by two parts: (a) solving using Jacobi iteration with equivalent operator  $\mathbf{Z}^{(k)}$ , and (b) apply a subblock of  $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}$  to a vector. Similarly, each backward substitution step, indexed by  $k$ , is also dictated by the same two operations.

We remark that the Laplacian of a multi-graph with  $m$  multi-edges can be applied to a vector in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth. The  $O(\log m)$  depth comes from summing up the value for each entry after all the edge weights and vector values are multiplied in parallel.

As for all  $k < d$ ,  $G^{(k)}$  has  $O(m)$  multi-edges by Theorem 3.9-(1). Thus, applying a subblock of  $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}$  runs in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth. Now,  $\mathcal{L}_{F_{k+1}F_{k+1}}^{(k)}$  is a subblock of  $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}$ , and again

---

<sup>1</sup>Not to be confused with  $\mathbf{L}^{(k)}$ .

by Theorem 3.9-(2), is also 5-DD. So, given the choice of  $\epsilon = 1/O(\log n)$ , Lemma 3.5 gives us that  $\mathbf{Z}^{(k)}$  can be applied in  $O(m \log \log n)$  work and  $O(\log m \log \log n)$  depth.

There is only a small overhead of  $O(1)$  for both work and depth in solving  $\mathcal{L}^{(d)} \mathbf{x}^{(d)} = \mathbf{b}^{(d)}$  due to Theorem 3.9-(3). Therefore, the total runtime is  $O(m \log n \log \log n)$  work and  $O(\log m \log n \log \log n)$  depth by  $d = O(\log n)$ .  $\square$

## 5 Schur Approximation Guarantees

In this section, we formally present the guarantees of the subroutine `TERMINALWALKS` in Algorithm 4 and use them to show Theorem 3.9.

Firstly, we show that our random sampling procedure `TERMINALWALKS` for approximation Schur complements is unbiased.

**Lemma 5.1.** *For every multi-graph  $G$  and every non-trivial  $C \subseteq V(G)$ , `TERMINALWALKS`( $G, C$ ) returns a multi-graph  $H$  such that  $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{L}_H = \mathbf{SC}(\mathbf{L}_G, C)$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $e$ , recall that  $\mathbf{Y}_e$  is the associated Laplacian of newly sampled edge  $f_e$  (See line 8 of `TERMINALWALKS`). Note that  $\mathbf{Y}_e = 0$  if  $f_e$  is not formed due to  $c_1 = c_2$  as in line 7 of `TERMINALWALKS`. By Lemma 3.7,  $\mathbf{SC}(\mathbf{L}_G, C)$  is sum of  $C$ -terminal random walks on  $G$ .

Consider a multi-edge  $e \in G$  and let the incident vertices be  $u, v$ . For the sampled walk  $W(e)$ , let  $W_1(e) = (u_0, e_1, \dots, e_p, u_p)$  with  $u_0 = u$  and  $W_2(e) = (v_0, f_1, \dots, f_q, v_q)$  with  $v_0 = v$ . The probability of  $W(e)$  being sampled is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W(e)) &= \mathbb{P}(W_1(e)) \cdot \mathbb{P}(W_2(e)) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \mathbf{w}(e_i)}{\prod_{i=1}^p \mathbf{w}(u_i)} \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=1}^q \mathbf{w}(f_i)}{\prod_{i=1}^q \mathbf{w}(v_i)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}(e)} \frac{\prod_{f \in E(W)} \mathbf{w}(f)}{\prod_{z \in V(W) \setminus C} \mathbf{w}(z)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $V(W)$  and  $E(W)$  are the multisets of vertices and edges in  $W$ . We set  $\prod_{z \in V(W) \setminus C} \mathbf{w}(z) = 1$  when  $V(W) \setminus C = \emptyset$  to cover the case where both  $u, v \in C$ . Then, the expected entry for any  $c_1, c_2 \in C, c_1 \neq c_2$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \mathbb{E} \sum_e \mathbf{Y}_e \right)_{c_1 c_2} &= - \sum_e \sum_{\substack{W: C\text{-terminal}, e \in W \\ c_1, c_2 \in V(W) \cap C}} \frac{1}{\sum_{f \in E(W)} 1/\mathbf{w}(f)} \cdot \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}(e)} \cdot \frac{\prod_{f \in E(W)} \mathbf{w}(f)}{\prod_{u \in V(W) \setminus C} \mathbf{w}(u)} \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{W: C\text{-terminal} \\ c_1, c_2 \in V(W) \cap C}} \frac{\prod_{f \in E(W)} \mathbf{w}(f)}{\prod_{u \in V(W) \setminus C} \mathbf{w}(u)} \cdot \frac{1}{\sum_{f \in W} 1/\mathbf{w}(f)} \cdot \left( \sum_{e: e \in W} \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}(e)} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{W: C\text{-terminal} \\ c_1, c_2 \in V(W) \cap C}} \frac{\prod_{f \in E(W)} \mathbf{w}(f)}{\prod_{u \in V(W) \setminus C} \mathbf{w}(u)} \\ &= (\mathbf{SC}(\mathbf{L}_G, C))_{c_1 c_2}. \end{aligned}$$

As each  $\mathbf{Y}_e$  is Laplacian, the sum must also be Laplacian, and subsequently the expected sum is also Laplacian. Hence,  $\mathbb{E} \mathbf{L}_H = \mathbb{E} \sum_e \mathbf{Y}_e = \mathbf{SC}(\mathbf{L}_G, C)$ .  $\square$

The following lemma formally lays out an important guarantee of `TERMINALWALKS` for proving our concentration results, i.e.  $\alpha$ -boundedness is “closed” under this operation.

**Lemma 5.2.** *For every multi-graph  $G$  such that each multi-edge of  $G$  is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t. a Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}$ , and every non-trivial  $C \subseteq V(G)$ , `TERMINALWALKS`( $G, C$ ) returns a multi-graph  $H$  with a collection of independent multi-edges  $f_e$  where each is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}$ .*

To show this, we invoke the property that effective resistance is a distance and satisfies triangle inequality.

**Lemma 5.3** ([KS16], Lemma 5.2). *For every weighted, connected multi-graph  $G$  with its associated Laplacian  $\mathbf{L}$ , any three vertices  $u, v, z \in V(G)$  and the pair vectors  $\mathbf{b}_{uv}, \mathbf{b}_{vz}, \mathbf{b}_{uz}$ , then*

$$\mathbf{b}_{uz}^\top \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}_{uz} \leq \mathbf{b}_{uv}^\top \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}_{uv} + \mathbf{b}_{vz}^\top \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}_{vz}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.2.* If  $f_e = e$ , then  $\mathbf{w}(f_e) = \mathbf{w}(e)$  and its  $\alpha$ -boundedness trivially holds. Otherwise, consider the sampled random walk  $W(e)$  and say  $W(e) = (u_0, e_1, \dots, e_l, u_l)$  for some  $l \geq 2$  and w.l.o.g.  $u_0 = c_1, u_l = c_l$ . By applying Lemma 5.3 inductively (and recall that  $\tau$  is the leverage score),

$$\mathbf{b}_{u_0 u_l}^\top \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}_{u_0 u_l} \leq \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{b}_{e_i}^\top \mathbf{L}^+ \mathbf{b}_{e_i} = \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{\tau(\mathbf{b}_{e_i})}{\mathbf{w}(e_i)} \leq \alpha \sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}(e_i)}.$$

Note that by  $u_0 = c_1 \neq c_2 = u_l$ , we can always segment the walk in a way to avoid dealing with self-loops during induction steps. Recall that the weight is set to exactly  $\mathbf{w}(f_e) = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}(e_i)}}$  by line 8 of `TERMINALWALKS`. Therefore,  $f_e$  is  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}$ .  $\square$

We show that the number of multi-edges generated by `TERMINALWALKS` never increases and that the algorithm runs efficiently.

**Lemma 5.4.** *For every multi-graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  multi-edges, and every non-trivial  $C \subseteq V(G)$ , `TERMINALWALKS`( $G, C$ ) returns a multi-graph  $H$  with at most  $m$  multi-edges. If the subset  $F = V \setminus C$  is 5-DD in  $\mathbf{L}_G$ , then the algorithm runs in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth with high probability.*

*Proof of Lemma 5.4.* For the number of edges, notice that each multi-edge  $e \in E(G)$  can spawn at most 1 multi-edge in  $H$ . Thus, the number of multi-edges of  $H$  is at most  $m$ .

Now, we analyze the time complexity of `TERMINALWALKS`. Due to  $F$  being 5-DD, for any vertex  $u \in F$ , a random walk step samples a vertex in  $C$  with probability at least  $4/5$ . Then, the length of the walk  $|W(e)| = O(1)$  in expectation. The longest length of all walks is  $\max_e |W(e)| = O(\log m)$  with high probability. In addition, using the Chernoff bound, the sum of length of all walks is  $\sum_e |W(e)| = O(m)$  with high probability. Thus, it takes  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth to sample all the random walks. There is an additional  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth overhead for the weighted sampling preprocessing time and for converting the new multi-edges back into an adjacency list representation. Hence, the algorithm runs in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth.  $\square$

We now present the proof to our main guarantees to the block Cholesky factorization algorithm in Theorem 3.9. For the rest of this section, we use  $\mathbf{L}$  to denote the input Laplacian. For any PSD matrix  $\mathbf{S}$  such that  $\ker(\mathbf{L}) \subseteq \ker(\mathbf{S})$ , we define

$$\overline{\mathbf{S}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{L}^{+/2} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{L}^{+/2}.$$

Recall the definition to  $\mathbf{D}^{(k)}, \mathbf{U}^{(k)}$  in (5),(6). Now, by (1) the approximate block Cholesky factorization up to iteration  $k$  is then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{L}^{(k)} &= \mathbf{U}^{(k)\top} \mathbf{D}^{(k)} \mathbf{U}^{(k)} \\ &= \mathbf{U}^{(k-1)\top} \mathbf{D}^{(k-1)} \mathbf{U}^{(k-1)} + \mathbf{L}_{G^{(k)}} - \text{SC}(\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}}, C_k) \\ &= \mathbf{L}^{(k-1)} + \mathbf{L}_{G^{(k)}} - \text{SC}(\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}}, C_k)\end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathbf{L}^{(0)} = \mathbf{L}$  initially. By Lemma 5.1, conditional on the choices of BLOCKCHOLESKY up to iteration  $k-1$  and  $F_k$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \mathbf{L}^{(k)} = \mathbf{L}^{(k-1)} + \mathbb{E} \mathbf{L}_{G^{(k)}} - \text{SC}(\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}}, C_k) = \mathbf{L}^{(k-1)}.$$

This establishes a matrix martingale. Thus, to get matrix concentration results, we use the following well established Freedman's inequality for matrices.

**Theorem 5.5** (Matrix Freedman, [Tro11; Tro12]). *Let  $\mathbf{Y}_0, \mathbf{Y}_1, \dots$  be a matrix martingale whose values are symmetric and  $n \times n$  matrices, and let  $\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots$  be the difference sequence  $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{Y}_i - \mathbf{Y}_{i-1}$ . Assume that the difference sequence is uniformly bounded by  $\|\mathbf{X}_i\| \leq R$  for all  $k$ . Define the predictable quadratic variation process of the martingale,*

$$\mathbf{W}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{j-1} [\mathbf{X}_j^2].$$

Then, for all  $t > 0$  and  $\sigma^2 > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} [\exists k : \|\mathbf{Y}_k\| \geq t \text{ and } \|\mathbf{W}_k\| \leq \sigma^2] \leq n \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{t^2/2}{\sigma^2 + Rt/3}\right).$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.9.* Theorem 3.9-(3) is immediate from line 3 of BLOCKCHOLESKY. Theorem 3.9-(2) is guaranteed by Lemma 3.4.

Consider Theorem 3.9-(1). By Lemma 5.4, for all  $1 \leq k \leq d-1$ , the number of multi-edges in  $G^{(k)}$  is at most the number of multi-edges in  $G^{(k-1)}$ . Since initially  $G^{(0)}$  has exactly  $m$  edges, by induction, for all  $k \leq d-1$ ,  $G^{(k)}$  must have  $O(m)$  edges as required.

As for Theorem 3.9-(4), notice that again by Lemma 3.4,  $|C_k| \leq (1 - \frac{1}{40})C_{k-1}$  for all  $k$ . Then,  $d$  is at most

$$d \leq \log_{40/39}(n) = O(\log n). \tag{7}$$

We now consider the approximation result in Theorem 3.9-(5), i.e.

$$(\mathbf{U}^{(d)})^\top \mathbf{D}^{(d)} \mathbf{U}^{(d)} \approx_{0.5} \mathbf{L}.$$

We show the following stronger statement using induction: *For any  $0 \leq t \leq d$ , with probability at least  $1 - \frac{t}{n^\delta}$ , for all  $0 \leq k \leq t$  the approximation*

$$0.7\mathbf{L} \preceq \mathbf{L}^{(k)} = (\mathbf{U}^{(k)})^\top \mathbf{D}^{(k)} \mathbf{U}^{(k)} \preceq 1.3\mathbf{L}$$

*holds conditional on the choice of BLOCKCHOLESKY up to iteration  $k-1$  and the choice of  $F_k$ .* Notice that  $0.7 \geq e^{-0.5}$ ,  $1.3 \leq e^{0.5}$  and  $1 - \frac{d}{n^\delta} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n^{\delta-1}}$ . We can choose an appropriate constant  $\delta > 1$  for high probability.

The base case is trivial as  $(\mathbf{U}^{(0)})^\top \mathbf{D}^{(0)} \mathbf{U}^{(0)} = \mathbf{L}$ . For the inductive case, we start by assuming that all such inequalities hold up to  $t - 1$ . For any  $k$ , conditional on the choices upto step  $k - 1$  of BLOCKCHOLESKY, we assume some random order  $<, \leq$  on the multi-edges of  $G^{(k-1)}$ . As the choices of  $\mathbf{Y}_e$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_f$  in TERMINALWALKS are independent for  $e \neq f$ , such random order does not affect our analysis. To simplify our notation, let  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}}$  denote the conditional expectation on all the choices prior to  $\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}$ . Now, for any  $k$ , let  $\mathbf{X}_e^{(k)} = \mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}$ . Then,  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \mathbf{X}_e^{(k)} = 0$ . Consider the matrix when normalized by  $\mathbf{L}$ , we have

$$\left\| \overline{\mathbf{X}_e^{(k)}} \right\| \leq \max \left\{ \left\| \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \right\|, \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \right\| \right\} \leq \alpha,$$

where the first inequality is due to the PSD of  $\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}$  and subsequently the PSD of  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}}$  and the second inequality is due to Lemma 5.2. Thus, we can set the norm bound  $R = \alpha$  in Theorem 5.5.

On to the predicatable quadratic variation. Let

$$\mathbf{W}^{(k)} = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_e \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(i)}} \left[ \overline{\mathbf{X}_e^{(i)}}^2 \right].$$

Note that since any  $\overline{\mathbf{X}_e^{(i)}}^2$  is PSD, any intermediate  $\mathbf{W}_e^{(k)} \preceq \mathbf{W}^{(k)}$  and any  $\mathbf{W}^{(j)}$  is also subsumed by  $\mathbf{W}^{(k)}$  for  $j < k$ . Thus, it suffices to only consider  $\mathbf{W}^{(t)}$ . For any  $k$  and  $e$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \overline{\mathbf{X}_e^{(k)}}^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}}^2 - \left( \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \right)^2 \preceq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}}^2.$$

Then, by Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_e \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \overline{\mathbf{X}_e^{(k)}}^2 &\preceq \sum_e \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}}^2 \preceq \sum_e \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \left\| \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \right\| \overline{\mathbf{Y}_e^{(k)}} \\ &\preceq \alpha \overline{\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}}, C)} \preceq \alpha \overline{\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}}} \preceq \alpha \overline{\mathbf{L}^{(k-1)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last two inequalities are immediate from the respective block Cholesky factorizations of  $\mathbf{L}_{G^{(k-1)}}$  and  $\mathbf{L}^{(k-1)}$  and Fact 2.2. Now, by our assumption

$$\mathbf{W}^{(t)} \preceq \alpha \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \overline{\mathbf{L}^{(i)}} \preceq 1.3(t-1)\alpha \mathbf{I}$$

and that we can take  $\sigma^2 = C\alpha \log n$  due to  $t \leq d = O(\log n)$  by (7).

By applying the matrix Freedman inequality (Theorem 5.5), the upperbound of probability of failure satisfies

$$n \cdot \exp \left( - \frac{0.3^2/2}{C\alpha \log n + 0.3\alpha/3} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n^\delta}$$

when  $\alpha^{-1} = \Theta(\log^2 n)$  given that  $\delta$  is constant, as required. Note that  $0.7\mathbf{L} \preceq \mathbf{L}^{(t)} \preceq 1.3\mathbf{L}$  is equivalent to  $\left\| \overline{\mathbf{L}^{(t)}} - \mathbf{L} \right\| \leq 0.3$  and that  $\mathbf{L}^{(t)} - \mathbf{L} = \sum_{k=1}^t \sum_e \mathbf{X}_e^{(k)}$ . Combine with the probability of success of at least  $1 - \frac{t-1}{n^\delta}$  up to  $t - 1$ , the probability of success up to  $t$  is at least

$$\left(1 - \frac{t-1}{n^\delta}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^\delta}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{t}{n^\delta},$$

again, as required.

Lastly, let us analyze the runtime complexity. We separate the runtime into three parts: (a) the total runtime of applying 5DDSUBSET, (b) the total runtime of performing TERMINALWALKS, and (c) additional one-time overhead. Recall for (c) that the only overhead is from converting multi-graph into a simple graph for  $G^{(d)}$  which runs in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth.

Consider (a). By Lemma 3.4, each iteration of 5DDSUBSET runs in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth in expectation. As this guarantee merely depends on the parameter of the input multi-graph, the work and depth bounds for all iterations are independent. Now, using Chernoff bound, we get a total work and depth of  $O(m \log n)$  and  $O(\log m \log n)$  using  $d = O(\log n)$ .

As for (b), since Lemma 5.4 has the guarantee written as with high probability, the total work and depth are  $O(m \log n)$  and  $O(\log m \log n)$  again by  $d = O(\log n)$ .

Therefore, combining (a), (b) and (c), we have the total runtime of  $O(m \log n)$  work and  $O(\log m \log n)$  depth.  $\square$

## 6 Achieving $\alpha$ -boundedness Initially

We sketch out a brief justification to Lemma 3.3 in this section. Since the complete justification is rather involved and does not deviate from [CLMMPS15; Kyn17], we only emphasize on the parallel work and depth. The high-level algorithm in Lemma 3.3 runs as follows:

1. Sample a sparser graph  $G'$  with  $\frac{m}{K}$  edges by uniformly choosing edges and scaling weights appropriately.
2. Compute leverage score overestimations of  $G$  using  $G'$ .
3. Split edges into  $\alpha$ -bounded multi-edges using the leverage score overestimations.

We remark that (3) is different compared to [CLMMPS15; Kyn17] which use the leverage score estimations for sparsification instead.

For the first step, we again use the parallel sampling algorithm from [HS19] and transform the graph  $G'$  into appropriate representation in parallel. The reweighting can be done independently. Thus, step (1) runs in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log n)$  depth.

The second step requires the standard dimension reduction approach due to [SS11; KLP15] using the Johnson–Lindenstrauss Lemma for querying leverage score overestimations. Again, we omit the detailed analysis on the estimation factor and focus on the parallel runtime. There are three major steps that we need to consider: (a) sampling a uniform random matrix of dimension  $O(\log n) \times (m/K)$ , (b) solving  $O(\log n)$  systems of  $\mathbf{L}_{G'}$  to  $O(1)$ -approximations, (c) for each edge in  $G$ , compute the  $l_2$  distance of two vectors of size  $O(\log n)$ . All additional one-time overhead is subsumed by these operations. For (a), all entries are sampled by independent Bernoulli random variables, giving us  $O(m \log n/K)$  work and  $O(1)$  depth. For (b), we use our solver in Theorem 1.1 in parallel for each system, resulting in  $O(\frac{m}{K} \log^4 n \log \log n)$  work and  $O(\log^2 n \log \log n)$  depth. As for (c), computing the distances can be done in parallel for each edge, giving work  $O(m \log n)$  and depth  $O(\log \log n)$ . In total, we get  $O(m \log n + \frac{m}{K} \log^4 n \log \log n)$  work and  $O(\log^2 n \log \log n)$  depth.

Note that after (2), the leverage score overestimations  $\hat{\tau}$  satisfy that  $\sum_e \hat{\tau}(e) \leq O(nK)$ . In step (3), it suffices to split an edge  $e$  into  $\lceil \alpha^{-1} \hat{\tau}(e) \rceil$  copies, resulting in  $O(m + nK\alpha^{-1})$  multi-edges and a parallel runtime of  $O(m + nK\alpha^{-1})$  work and  $O(\log n)$  depth.



1	<b>Procedure</b> APPROXSCHUR( $G, C$ )
2	Initially set $G^{(0)} \leftarrow G$ , $k \leftarrow 0$ and $U_0 \leftarrow V \setminus C$ .
3	<b>while</b> $U_k \neq \emptyset$ <b>do</b>
4	$k \leftarrow k + 1$ .
5	$F_k \leftarrow \text{5DDSUBSET}(G^{(k-1)}[U_{k-1}])$ and set $C_k \leftarrow C_{k-1} \setminus F_k$ , $U_k \leftarrow U_{k-1} \setminus F_k$ .
6	$G^{(k)} \leftarrow \text{TERMINALWALKS}(G^{(k-1)}, C_k)$ .
7	<b>return</b> $G_S = G^{(d)}$ where $d$ is the last $k$ .

**Algorithm 6:** Schur Complement Approximation

To summarize, we get a total parallel runtime of  $O(nK\alpha^{-1} + m \log n + \frac{m}{K} \log^4 \log n)$  work and  $O(\log^2 n \log \log n)$  depth as desired.

## 7 Schur Complement Approximation

In this section, we show that with a slight modification to our main algorithm BLOCKCHOLESKY, we can compute a sparse approximation to the Schur complement of  $\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C)$  in parallel. Our algorithm APPROXSCHUR is similar to that given by [DKPRS17].

**Theorem 7.1.** *There exists some  $\alpha^{-1} = \Theta(\epsilon^{-2} \log^2 n)$  where  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$  such that for any multi-graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  multi-edges that are all  $\alpha$ -bounded w.r.t.  $\mathbf{L}_G$  and any non-trivial  $C \subset V$ , APPROXSCHUR( $G, C$ ) returns a multi-graph  $G_S$  such that with high probability the following holds:*

1.  $\mathbf{L}_{G_S} \approx_\epsilon \text{SC}(\mathbf{L}_G, C)$ .
2. The number of multi-edges in  $G_S$  is at most  $m$ .

If  $s = |V \setminus C|$ , then with high probability the algorithm runs in  $O(m \log s)$  work and  $O(\log s \log m)$  depth.

*Proof.* This proof is analogous to that of Theorem 3.9.

Note that a 5DD subset of an induced subgraph is a 5DD subset of the graph itself. By Lemma 3.4, the total number of iterations of APPROXSCHUR is bounded by  $d \leq \log_{40/39}(|U_0|) = O(\log s)$ , where  $s = |U_0| = |V \setminus C| \leq n$ , which is also in  $O(\log n)$ . Note that a subset of size 1 is always 5-DD. So, even when  $n \leq 40$ , the guarantees in Lemma 3.4 still holds true.

The approximate Schur complement is simply the bottom right block of  $\mathbf{D}^{(d)}$  by (5). Thus, the desired approximation guarantee follows directly from the approximation guarantee for the factorization  $(\mathbf{U}^{(d)})^\top \mathbf{D}^{(d)} \mathbf{U}^{(d)}$ . We can then follow the same argument of Theorem 3.9 using Theorem 5.5.

Again, each intermediate Schur complement has at most  $m$  multi-edges and that the number of multi-edges in  $G_S$  is at most  $m$  as well. Moreover, combine with  $d = O(\log s)$ , the algorithm runs in  $O(m \log s)$  work and  $O(\log s \log m)$  depth.  $\square$

## References

- [Ald90] David J. Aldous. “The Random Walk Construction of Uniform Spanning Trees and Uniform Labelled Trees”. In: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 3.4 (1990), pp. 450–465. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0403039> (cit. on p. 2).
- [Axe96] Owe Axelsson. *Iterative solution methods*. Cambridge university press, 1996 (cit. on p. 8).
- [BGJLLPS22] Jan van den Brand, Yu Gao, Arun Jambulapati, Yin Tat Lee, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, and Aaron Sidford. “Faster Maxflow via Improved Dynamic Spectral Vertex Sparsifiers”. In: *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2022. Rome, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 543–556 (cit. on p. 2).
- [BHV08] Erik G. Boman, Bruce Hendrickson, and Stephen A. Vavasis. “Solving Elliptic Finite Element Systems in Near-Linear Time with Support Preconditioners”. In: *SIAM J. Numerical Analysis* 46.6 (2008), pp. 3264–3284 (cit. on p. 1).
- [BM10] Guy E. Blelloch and Bruce M. Maggs. “Parallel Algorithms”. In: *Algorithms and Theory of Computation Handbook: Special Topics and Techniques*. 2nd ed. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2010, p. 25 (cit. on p. 4).
- [BMN04] Mikhail Belkin, Irina Matveeva, and Partha Niyogi. “Regularization and semi-supervised learning on large graphs”. In: *International Conference on Computational Learning Theory*. Springer, 2004, pp. 624–638 (cit. on p. 1).
- [Bro89] A. Broder. “Generating Random Spanning Trees”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. SFCS ’89. USA: IEEE Computer Society, 1989, pp. 442–447 (cit. on p. 2).
- [CKMPPRX14] Michael B. Cohen, Rasmus Kyng, Gary L. Miller, Jakub W. Pachocki, Richard Peng, Anup B. Rao, and Shen Chen Xu. “Solving SDD Linear Systems in Nearly  $M\log 1/2n$  Time”. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’14. New York, New York: Association for Computing Machinery, 2014, pp. 343–352 (cit. on p. 1).
- [CKMST11] Paul Christiano, Jonathan A. Kelner, Aleksander Madry, Daniel A. Spielman, and Shang-Hua Teng. “Electrical Flows, Laplacian Systems, and Faster Approximation of Maximum Flow in Undirected Graphs”. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’11. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, June 2011, pp. 273–282 (cit. on p. 1).
- [CLMMPS15] Michael B. Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, Richard Peng, and Aaron Sidford. “Uniform Sampling for Matrix Approximation”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*. ITCS ’15. Rehovot, Israel: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, pp. 181–190 (cit. on pp. 6, 16).

- [DGGP19] David Durfee, Yu Gao, Gramoz Goranci, and Richard Peng. “Fully Dynamic Spectral Vertex Sparsifiers and Applications”. In: *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2019. Phoenix, AZ, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 914–925 (cit. on p. 2).
- [DKPRS17] David Durfee, Rasmus Kyng, John Peebles, Anup B. Rao, and Sushant Sachdeva. “Sampling Random Spanning Trees Faster than Matrix Multiplication”. In: *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2017. Montreal, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 730–742 (cit. on pp. 2, 17).
- [DPPR17] David Durfee, John Peebles, Richard Peng, and Anup B. Rao. “Determinant-Preserving Sparsification of SDDM Matrices with Applications to Counting and Sampling Spanning Trees”. In: *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. 2017, pp. 926–937 (cit. on pp. 2, 8).
- [DS08] Samuel I. Daitch and Daniel A. Spielman. “Faster Approximate Lossy Generalized Flow via Interior Point Algorithms”. In: *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’08. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2008, pp. 451–460 (cit. on p. 1).
- [FGLPSY22] Sebastian Forster, Gramoz Goranci, Yang P. Liu, Richard Peng, Xiaorui Sun, and Mingquan Ye. “Minor Sparsifiers and the Distributed Laplacian Paradigm”. In: *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. 2022, pp. 989–999 (cit. on p. 1).
- [GLP22] Yu Gao, Yang P. Liu, and Richard Peng. “Fully Dynamic Electrical Flows: Sparse Maxflow Faster Than Goldberg-Rao”. In: *2021 IEEE 62nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. 2022, pp. 516–527 (cit. on p. 2).
- [HS19] Lorenz Hübschle-Schneider and Peter Sanders. “Parallel Weighted Random Sampling”. In: *27th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2019)*. Vol. 144. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. 2019, p. 59 (cit. on pp. 4, 16).
- [JS21] Arun Jambulapati and Aaron Sidford. “Ultrasparse Ultrasparsifiers and Faster Laplacian System Solvers”. In: *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA ’21. Virtual Event, Virginia: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2021, pp. 540–559 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KLP15] Ioannis Koutis, Alex Levin, and Richard Peng. “Faster Spectral Sparsification and Numerical Algorithms for SDD Matrices”. In: *ACM Trans. Algorithms* 12.2 (Dec. 2015) (cit. on p. 16).
- [KLPSS16] Rasmus Kyng, Yin Tat Lee, Richard Peng, Sushant Sachdeva, and Daniel A. Spielman. “Sparsified Cholesky and Multigrid Solvers for Connection Laplacians”. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’16. Cambridge, MA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, pp. 842–850 (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 4, 7, 22).

- [KM09] Jonathan A. Kelner and Aleksander Madry. “Faster Generation of Random Spanning Trees”. In: *2009 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. 2009, pp. 13–21 (cit. on p. 2).
- [KMP11] Ioannis Koutis, Gary L. Miller, and Richard Peng. “A Nearly- $m \log n$  Time Solver for SDD Linear Systems”. In: *2011 IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. Oct. 2011, pp. 590–598 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KMP14] Ioannis Koutis, Gary L. Miller, and Richard Peng. “Approaching Optimality for Solving SDD Linear Systems”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 43.1 (2014), pp. 337–354. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/110845914> (cit. on p. 1).
- [KOSZ13] Jonathan A. Kelner, Lorenzo Orecchia, Aaron Sidford, and Zeyuan Allen Zhu. “A Simple, Combinatorial Algorithm for Solving SDD Systems in Nearly-Linear Time”. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’13. Palo Alto, California, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2013, pp. 911–920 (cit. on p. 1).
- [KPPS17] Rasmus Kyng, Jakub Pachocki, Richard Peng, and Sushant Sachdeva. “A Framework for Analyzing Resparsification Algorithms”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. 2017, pp. 2032–2043. eprint: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611974782.132> (cit. on p. 2).
- [KS16] Rasmus Kyng and Sushant Sachdeva. “Approximate Gaussian Elimination for Laplacians - Fast, Sparse, and Simple”. In: *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. Oct. 2016, pp. 573–582 (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 13).
- [Kyn17] Rasmus Kyng. “Approximate gaussian elimination”. PhD thesis. PhD thesis. Yale University, page, 2017 (cit. on pp. 6, 16).
- [LPS15] Yin Tat Lee, Richard Peng, and Daniel A Spielman. “Sparsified cholesky solvers for SDD linear systems”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.08204* (2015) (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 22).
- [LS14] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. “Path Finding Methods for Linear Programming: Solving Linear Programs in  $\tilde{O}(vrnk)$  Iterations and Faster Algorithms for Maximum Flow”. In: *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. 2014, pp. 424–433 (cit. on p. 1).
- [Mad13] Aleksander Madry. “Navigating central path with electrical flows: From flows to matchings, and back”. In: *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE. 2013, pp. 253–262 (cit. on p. 1).
- [MST14] Aleksander Madry, Damian Straszak, and Jakub Tarnawski. “Fast Generation of Random Spanning Trees and the Effective Resistance Metric”. In: *Proceedings of the 2015 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*. 2014, pp. 2019–2036. eprint: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611973730.134> (cit. on p. 2).

- [OV11] Lorenzo Orecchia and Nisheeth K Vishnoi. “Towards an SDP-based approach to spectral methods: A nearly-linear-time algorithm for graph partitioning and decomposition”. In: *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SIAM. 2011, pp. 532–545 (cit. on p. 2).
- [PS14] Richard Peng and Daniel A. Spielman. “An Efficient Parallel Solver for SDD Linear Systems”. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’14. New York, New York: Association for Computing Machinery, 2014, pp. 333–342 (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 4).
- [Saa03] Yousef Saad. *Iterative methods for sparse linear systems*. SIAM, 2003 (cit. on p. 8).
- [Sch18] Aaron Schild. “An Almost-Linear Time Algorithm for Uniform Random Spanning Tree Generation”. In: *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC 2018. Los Angeles, CA, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, pp. 214–227 (cit. on p. 2).
- [SS11] Daniel A Spielman and Nikhil Srivastava. “Graph sparsification by effective resistances”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 40.6 (2011), pp. 1913–1926 (cit. on p. 16).
- [ST04] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. “Nearly-Linear Time Algorithms for Graph Partitioning, Graph Sparsification, and Solving Linear Systems”. In: *Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’04. Chicago, IL, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2004, pp. 81–90 (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 23).
- [Str86] G. Strang. *Introduction to Applied Mathematics*. Wellesley-Cambridge Press, 1986 (cit. on p. 1).
- [Tro11] Joel Tropp. “Freedman’s inequality for matrix martingales”. In: *Electronic Communications in Probability* 16.none (2011), pp. 262–270 (cit. on p. 14).
- [Tro12] Joel A Tropp. “User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices”. In: *Foundations of computational mathematics* 12.4 (2012), pp. 389–434 (cit. on p. 14).
- [Wil96] David Bruce Wilson. “Generating Random Spanning Trees More Quickly than the Cover Time”. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’96. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1996, pp. 296–303 (cit. on p. 2).
- [ZBLWS04] Dengyong Zhou, Olivier Bousquet, Thomas Navin Lal, Jason Weston, and Bernhard Schölkopf. “Learning with local and global consistency”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 16.16 (2004), pp. 321–328 (cit. on p. 1).
- [ZGL03] Xiaojin Zhu, Zoubin Ghahramani, and John D Lafferty. “Semi-supervised learning using gaussian fields and harmonic functions”. In: *Proceedings of the 20th International conference on Machine learning (ICML-03)*. 2003, pp. 912–919 (cit. on p. 1).

## A Missing Proofs

*Proof of Lemma 3.4, [LPS15; KLPSS16].* As  $F$  is a subset of  $F'$ ,

$$\sum_{e \in E(G[F]): e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e) \leq \sum_{e \in E(G[F']): e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e).$$

So it is guaranteed that returned  $F$  is 5-DD.

Consider the runtime of 5DDSUBSET. As each iteration of the algorithm runs in  $O(m)$  work and  $O(\log m)$  depth, it suffices to show that the probability of the algorithm finishes in each iteration is some constant, specifically  $1/2$ .

Let  $A_i$  be the event that  $i \in F'$  and  $i \notin F$ . The set  $F$  is then the set of  $i \in F'$  for which  $A_i$  does not hold. Notice that  $A_i$  only happens if  $i \in F'$  and

$$\sum_{e \in E(G[F']): e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e) > \frac{1}{5} \mathbf{w}(i),$$

where  $\mathbf{w}(i) = \sum_{e \in E: e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e)$ . Given that  $i \in F'$ , the probability that  $j \in F'$  for  $j \neq i$  is

$$\frac{1}{n-1} \left( \frac{n}{20} - 1 \right).$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{e \in E(G[F']): e \ni i} |\mathbf{L}_{ij}| \middle| i \in F' \right) \leq \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \frac{n}{20} - 1 \right) \sum_{e \in E: e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e) < \frac{1}{20} \sum_{e \in E: e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e) \leq \frac{1}{20} \mathbf{w}(i).$$

By Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \sum_{e \in E(G[F']): e \ni i} \mathbf{w}(e) > \frac{1}{5} \mathbf{w}(i) \middle| i \in F' \right] < 1/4,$$

and that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_i) = \mathbb{P}(i \in F') \mathbb{P}(i \notin F | i \in F') < \frac{1}{20} \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{80}.$$

Using Markov's inequality for a second time gives us

$$\mathbb{P} \left( |\{i : A_i\}| \geq \frac{n}{40} \right) < 1/2$$

as required. □

*Proof of Lemma 3.7.* Consider the Schur complement  $\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C) = \mathbf{L}_{CC} - \mathbf{L}_{CF} \mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1} \mathbf{L}_{FC}$ . Let us write  $\mathbf{L}_{FF} = \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}$  where  $\mathbf{D}$  is diagonal and  $\mathbf{A}$  is nonnegative with 0 diagonally. The matrix  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}$  must be diagonally dominant, and thus,  $-\mathbf{I} \prec \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \prec \mathbf{I}$ . Using the identity that

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{M})^{-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{M}^i$$

for  $\|\mathbf{M}\| < 1$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1} &= (\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A})^{-1} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \left( \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \\ &= \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left( \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \right)^i \right] \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^i \mathbf{D}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this in place of  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}^{-1}$  gives

$$\text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C) = \mathbf{L}_{CC} - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{CF} (\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^i \mathbf{L}_{FC}.$$

As  $\mathbf{L}_{FC}, \mathbf{L}_{CF}$  are non-positive, we can replace them with  $-\mathbf{L}_{FC}, -\mathbf{L}_{CF}$  respectively to makes the terms positive. Recall that each entry of  $\mathbf{A}$  is defined as the weighted sum of all multi-edges connecting them  $\mathbf{A}_{uv} = \sum_{e: e \ni u, v} \mathbf{w}(e)$ . Now, fix two distinct vertices  $s, t \in C$ . For any fixed  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\left( \mathbf{L}_{CF} (\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{A})^{k-1} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{L}_{FC} \right)_{s,t} = \sum_{\substack{W: C\text{-terminal} \\ |E(W)|=k+1; s, t \in V(W)}} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k+1} \mathbf{w}(e_i)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{w}(u_i)}.$$

Summing over all  $k$  as long with the weights of multi-edges of  $(s, t)$  in  $\mathbf{L}_{CC}$  gives the correct identity.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* Recall the definition of  $\mathbf{Z}$  from (3).

$$\mathbf{Z} = \sum_{i=0}^l \mathbf{X}^{-1} (-\mathbf{Y} \mathbf{X}^{-1})^i,$$

where  $l$  is an odd integer such that  $l \geq \log_2 3/\epsilon$ .

The left-hand inequality is equivalent to the statement that all the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{M}$  are at most 1 ([ST04]). To see that this is the case,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{M} &= \sum_{i=0}^l (-\mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y})^i \mathbf{X}^{-1} (\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^l (-\mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y})^i - \sum_{i=1}^{l+1} (-\mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y})^i = \mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y})^{l+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses the assumption that  $l$  is odd. Since  $l+1$  is even, all eigenvalues of  $(\mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y})^{l+1}$  are nonnegative. Then, by the last matrix, all eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{M}$  are at most 1 as required.

The RHS inequality is equivalent to all eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{M} + \epsilon \mathbf{Y})$  are at least 1. Expanding this gives

$$\sum_{i=0}^l (-\mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y})^i \mathbf{X}^{-1} (\mathbf{X} + (1 + \epsilon) \mathbf{Y}) = \mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y})^{l+1} - \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{l+1} (-\mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{Y})^i.$$

Then, the eigenvalues of this matrix are of the form

$$1 - \lambda^{k+1} - \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{l+1} (-\lambda)^i,$$

where  $\lambda$  ranges over the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$ . Given that  $\mathbf{M}$  is 5-DD, we have  $2\mathbf{Y} \preceq \mathbf{X}$ . Then, the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{X}^{-1}\mathbf{Y}$  must be in the range of  $[0, 1/2]$ . Once again, by  $l$  being odd, it suffices to have

$$\epsilon - \lambda^{l+1} - \epsilon \frac{1 + \lambda^{l+2}}{1 + \lambda} \geq 0.$$

The LHS is minimized at  $\lambda = 1/2$ , which gives us that  $\lambda \geq \log_2(3/\epsilon) - 1$ . As  $\epsilon < 1$ , it suffices to instead have  $\lambda \geq \log_2(3/\epsilon)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.6.* Let the matrix in Lemma 3.6 be  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ . We start by defining a matrix

$$\hat{\mathbf{L}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Z}^{-1} & \mathbf{L}_{FC} \\ \mathbf{L}_{CF} & \mathbf{L}_{CC} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 3.5 and Fact 2.5,

$$\mathbf{L} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{L}} \preceq \mathbf{L} + \epsilon \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Y} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{Y}$  is Laplacian with off-diagonal entries the same as  $\mathbf{L}_{FF}$ . This means that  $\mathbf{Y}$  is the Laplacian of a induced subgraph of  $\mathbf{L}$  and that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Y} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \preceq \mathbf{L}.$$

Then,  $\mathbf{L} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{L}} \preceq (1 + \epsilon)\mathbf{L}$ . Now, by Fact 2.1 and (2), the inverse schur complement onto  $C$  is a submatrix of the Laplacian and that  $e^{-\epsilon} \text{SC}^+(\mathbf{L}, C) \preceq \text{SC}^+(\hat{\mathbf{L}}, C) \preceq \text{SC}^+(\mathbf{L}, C)$  since  $e^{-\epsilon} < 1/(1+\epsilon)$ . Using Fact 2.1 again gives us

$$e^{-\epsilon} \text{SC}(\hat{\mathbf{L}}, C) \preceq \text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C) \preceq \text{SC}(\hat{\mathbf{L}}, C).$$

Then, adding  $\mathbf{Z}$  onto the  $FF$  block gives

$$e^{-\epsilon} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Z}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{SC}(\hat{\mathbf{L}}, C) \end{pmatrix} \preceq \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Z}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{SC}(\mathbf{L}, C) \end{pmatrix} \preceq \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Z}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \text{SC}(\hat{\mathbf{L}}, C) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Fact 2.2 with  $C$  set to the lower triangular matrix,  $e^{-\epsilon}\hat{\mathbf{L}} \preceq \tilde{\mathbf{L}} \preceq \hat{\mathbf{L}}$ . Combine with the approximation on  $\hat{\mathbf{L}}$  and by the fact  $1 + \epsilon < e^\epsilon$ ,

$$e^{-\epsilon}\mathbf{L} \preceq \tilde{\mathbf{L}} \preceq e^\epsilon\mathbf{L},$$

which concludes our proof.  $\square$