

Nearly Optimal Dynamic Set Cover: Breaking the Quadratic-in- f Time Barrier

Anton Bukov ^{*} Shay Solomon [†] Tianyi Zhang [‡]

Abstract

The dynamic set cover problem has been subject to extensive research since the pioneering works of [Bhattacharya *et al.*, 2015] and [Gupta *et al.*, 2017]. The input is a set system $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ on a fixed collection \mathcal{S} of sets and a dynamic universe of elements, where each element appears in a most f sets and the cost of each set lies in the range $[1/C, 1]$, and the goal is to efficiently maintain an approximately-minimum set cover under insertions and deletions of elements.

Most previous work considers the low-frequency regime, namely $f = O(\log n)$, and this line of work has culminated with a deterministic $(1 + \epsilon)f$ -approximation algorithm with amortized update time $O(\frac{f^2}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f}{\epsilon^2} \log C)$ [Bhattacharya *et al.*, 2021] and a randomized f -approximation algorithm against an oblivious adversary with expected amortized update time $O(f^2)$ for the unweighted case [Assadi and Solomon, 2021]. In the high-frequency regime of $f = \Omega(\log n)$, an $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm with amortized update time $O(f \log n)$ was given by [Gupta *et al.*, 2017], and recently [Solomon and Uzrad, 2023] showed that the same update time of $O(f \log n)$ suffices for achieving approximation $(1 + \epsilon) \ln n$.

Interestingly, at the intersection of the two regimes, i.e., $f = \Theta(\log n)$, the state-of-the-art results coincide (ignoring the dependencies on ϵ and C): approximation $\Theta(f) = \Theta(\log n)$ with amortized update time $O(f^2) = O(f \log n) = O(\log^2 n)$. Up to this date, no previous work achieved update time of $o(f^2)$, even allowing randomization against an oblivious adversary and even for worse approximation guarantee.

In this paper we break the $\Omega(f^2)$ update time barrier via the following results:

- $(1 + \epsilon)f$ -approximation can be maintained in $O\left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log^* f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log C\right) = O_{\epsilon, C}(f \log^* f)$ expected amortized update time ¹; our algorithm works against an adaptive adversary.
- $(1 + \epsilon)f$ -approximation can be maintained deterministically in $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} f \log f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2}\right) = O_{\epsilon, C}(f \log f)$ amortized update time.

Assuming element updates are specified *explicitly*, our randomized algorithm is near-optimal: $(1 + \epsilon)f$ approximation is optimal up to the ϵ -dependence and the update time $O_{\epsilon, C}(f \log^* f)$ exceeds the time needed to specify an update by a $\log^* f$ factor. We view this slack of $\log^* f$ factor as interesting in its own right — we are not aware of any problem for which the state-of-the-art dynamic algorithm admits a slack of $\log^* f = O(\log^* n)$ from optimality.

^{*}Tel Aviv University, bukov.anton@gmail.com

[†]Tel Aviv University, shayso@tauex.tau.ac.il

[‡]Tel Aviv University, tianyiz21@tauex.tau.ac.il

¹ \log^* is the iterated logarithm; we use the notation $O_{\epsilon, C}(\cdot)$ to suppress factors that depend on ϵ and C

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Our result	2
1.2	Technical and Conceptual Contribution	3
1.2.1	Our Approach	4
2	Preliminaries	5
2.1	Primal-dual framework	5
2.2	Basic data structures	6
2.3	Approximation guarantees	7
3	Algorithm description	8
3.1	Deletion	9
3.2	Insertion	9
3.3	Fixing levels	10
3.4	Rebuilding	14
4	Runtime analysis	16
4.1	Potential functions	16
4.2	Deletion	18
4.3	Fixing levels	18
4.4	Insertion	22
4.5	Rebuilding	22
4.6	Total runtime	29

1 Introduction

In the static set cover problem, we are given a set system $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$, where \mathcal{U} is a universe of n elements and \mathcal{S} is a collection of m sets $s \in \mathcal{S}$ of elements in \mathcal{U} , each of which associated with a cost $c_s \in [\frac{1}{C}, 1]$. The *frequency* of the set system $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$, denoted by $f = f(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$, is the maximum number of sets in \mathcal{S} any element in \mathcal{U} belongs to. A collection of sets $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is called a *set cover* of \mathcal{U} if any element in \mathcal{U} belongs to at least one set in \mathcal{S}' . The basic goal is to compute a *minimum set cover*, i.e., a set cover $\mathcal{S}^* \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ whose cost $c(\mathcal{S}^*) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}^*} c_s$ is minimum.

The set cover problem is a central NP-hard problem, which admits two classic algorithms: a *greedy* $\ln n$ -approximation and a primal-dual f -approximation. Importantly, one cannot achieve approximation $(1-\epsilon) \ln n$ unless $P = NP$ [WS11, DS14] as well as approximation $f-\epsilon$ for any fixed f under the unique games conjecture [KR08]. The greedy and primal-dual approximation algorithms for set cover have been extremely well-studied in the static setting and are well-understood by now, and an extensive body of work from recent years aims at efficiently “dynamizing” these algorithms. In the *dynamic* setting of set cover, the goal is to maintain a set cover of low cost, while the universe \mathcal{U} evolves over time. More specifically, the goal is to maintain a set cover $T \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ of low cost while supporting two types of element updates:

- **Insertion.** A new element e enters \mathcal{U} , and the input specifies the sets in \mathcal{S} that it belongs to.
- **Deletion.** An existing element in \mathcal{U} is deleted from all sets in \mathcal{S} that it belonged to.

The two main quality measures of a dynamic algorithm are its approximation ratio $\frac{c(T)}{c(\mathcal{S}^*)}$ and update time, where the holy grail is to achieve approximation approaching that of the best *static* algorithm with as small as possible update time. In the context of set cover: (1) for approximation, given the aforementioned lower bounds, the goal would be either an $O(\log n)$ or $O(f)$ approximation, and (2) for update time, since it takes $\Theta(f)$ time to explicitly represent an element update (by specifying all the sets to which it belongs), the natural goal would be update time $O(f)$.

The dynamic set cover problem was first studied in [BHI15], where a deterministic primal-dual algorithm with $O(f^2)$ approximation and $O(f \log(m+n))$ (amortized) update time was presented.² Later on, a deterministic $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm with $O(f \log n)$ update time was given in [GKKP17]. This work of [GKKP17] essentially “dynamizes” the greedy algorithm, and it is the only previous work that focuses on the high-frequency regime, namely $f = \Omega(\log n)$. In a recent work [SU23], the authors improved the approximation to $(1+\epsilon) \ln n$ with $O\left(\frac{f \log n}{\epsilon^3}\right)$ amortized update time.

All other previous work, which we survey next, focus on the low-frequency regime of $f = O(\log n)$, and they all essentially dynamize the primal-dual algorithm. A deterministic $O(f^3)$ -approximation algorithm with $O(f^2)$ update time was achieved in [GKKP17, BCH17]. The first $O(f)$ approximation was achieved in [AAG⁺19], where the authors proposed a randomized $(1+\epsilon)f$ -approximation algorithm with update time $O\left(\frac{f^2 \log n}{\epsilon}\right)$; this algorithm works for unweighted instances only (where $c_s \equiv 1$ for all s) and it assumes an oblivious adversary. This result was subsumed by [BHN19], where a deterministic $(1+\epsilon)f$ -approximation algorithm for weighted instances was presented, with update time of $O\left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^2} \log(Cn)\right)$.

The works of [AAG⁺19, BHN19] with $(1+\epsilon)f$ -approximation incur a slack of $\log n$ on the update time. Two subsequent works remove the dependency on $\log n$: [BHNW21] gave a deterministic $(1+\epsilon)f$ -approximation algorithm with update time $O\left(\frac{f^2}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f}{\epsilon^2} \log C\right)$, while [AS21] gave a randomized

²For brevity, in what follows we shall not make the distinction between amortized and worst-case update time.

f -approximation algorithm with update time $O(f^2)$, but it assumes an oblivious adversary, and it only applies to unweighted instances.

To summarize, in the low frequency regime of $f = O(\log n)$, no previous work achieved update time of $o(f^2)$, even allowing randomization against an oblivious adversary and even for approximation larger than $O(f)$. For the high frequency regime of $f = \Omega(\log n)$, the only previous work achieves update time $O(f \log n)$ [GKKP17]; interestingly, at the intersection of the two regimes, i.e., $f = \Theta(\log n)$, the state-of-the-art results coincide (ignoring the dependencies on ϵ and C): approximation $\Theta(f) = \Theta(\log n)$ with amortized update time $O(f^2) = O(f \log n) = O(\log^2 n)$.

A fundamental question left open by previous works is whether one can break the quadratic-in- f update time barrier, ideally to achieve an update time of $O_{\epsilon,C}(f)$ (ignoring the dependencies on ϵ and C), i.e., linear in the time needed to explicitly specify an update.

Question 1.1. *Is there $O(f)$ -approximation (or $O(\log n)$ -approximation) algorithm for set cover with update time $o(f^2)$? Further, it is possible to achieve approximation approaching f (or $\ln n$) with update time approaching $O(f)$?*

1.1 Our result

Our main result, which resolves Question 1.1 in the affirmative, is summarized in the following theorem; Table 1 provides a concise comparison between our and previous results.

Theorem 1.1. *For any set system $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{S})$ (with $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ initially) that undergoes a sequence of element insertions and deletions, where the frequency is always bounded by f , and for any $\epsilon \in (0, 0.1)$, there are dynamic algorithms that maintain a $(1 + \epsilon)f$ -approximate minimum set cover with the following amortized update time bounds.*

- Expected $O\left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log^* f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log C\right)$, via a randomized algorithm against an adaptive adversary.
- Deterministic $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} f \log f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2}\right)$.

Remark. For our deterministic algorithm, we shall assume for simplicity that the length of the update sequence is at least $\frac{1}{\epsilon} m \log(Cn)$. In this way, during preprocessing (before the first element is inserted to \mathcal{U}), we prepare a data structure of size $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon} m \log(Cn))$. (The same is done implicitly in previous works whose amortized update time is independent of n [BK19, BHNW21, AS21].) In these algorithms (including ours), all elements $e \in \mathcal{U}$ are assigned a level value $0 \leq \text{lev}(e) \leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon}(Cn) \rceil + 1$, and for each set $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we maintain a list of all elements $E_i(s) = \{e \in s, \text{lev}(e) = i\}$. Since the pointer to each set $E_i(s)$ needs to be retrieved in $O(1)$ time given the index i , we maintain an array of length $O(\log_{1+\epsilon}(Cn))$ storing all the pointers, even if some sets $E_i(s)$ might be empty. (For our randomized algorithm, we can simply use dynamic hash tables [DKM⁺94].)

We emphasize two points regarding our randomized algorithm.

- It works against an adaptive adversary; this is the first randomized algorithm for dynamic set cover that does not make the assumption of an oblivious adversary.
- Assuming element updates are specified *explicitly*, the update time $O_{\epsilon,C}(f \log^* f)$ exceeds the time needed to specify an update by a $\log^* f$ factor. This slack of $\log^* f$ factor is interesting in its own right — **we are not aware of any problem for which the state-of-the-art dynamic algorithm admits a slack of $\log^* f = O(\log^* n)$ from optimality.** (A notable example where such a slack was studied is for the Disjoint-set data structure, where a highly influential line of work improved the $O(\log^* n)$ bound to an inverse-Ackermann bound, later shown to be tight.)

reference	approximation	update time	deterministic?	weighted?
[GKKP17]	$O(\log n)$	$O(f \log n)$	yes	yes
[SU23]	$(1 + \epsilon) \ln n$	$O\left(\frac{f \log n}{\epsilon^3}\right)$	yes	yes
[BHI15]	$O(f^2)$	$O(f \log(m + n))$	yes	yes
[GKKP17, BCH17]	$O(f^3)$	$O(f^2)$	yes	yes
[AAG ⁺ 19]	$(1 + \epsilon)f$	$O\left(\frac{f^2}{\epsilon} \log n\right)$	oblivious	no
[BHN19]	$(1 + \epsilon)f$	$O\left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^2} \log(Cn)\right)$	yes	yes
[BHNW21]	$(1 + \epsilon)f$	$O\left(\frac{f^2}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f}{\epsilon^2} \log C\right)$	yes	yes
[BHNW21]	$(1 + \epsilon)f$	$O\left(f \log^2(Cn)/\epsilon^3\right)$ (wc)	yes	yes
[AS21]	f	$O(f^2)$	oblivious	no
new	$(1 + \epsilon)f$	$O\left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log^* f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log C\right)$	adaptive	yes
new	$(1 + \epsilon)f$	$O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} f \log f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2}\right)$	yes	yes

Table 1: Summary of results on dynamic set cover.

1.2 Technical and Conceptual Contribution

Our algorithm builds upon the primal-dual framework from [BHI15, BK19, BHN19, BHNW21]. In the primal-dual framework, all sets in $s \in \mathcal{S}$ are assigned to levels $\text{lev}(s)$ numbered from 0 to $L = \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon}(Cn) \rceil + 1$. For each element $e \in \mathcal{U}$, its level $\text{lev}(e)$ is defined as the maximum level of any set it belongs to, namely $\text{lev}(e) = \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$. This hierarchical partition of sets and elements into levels defines weights for elements and sets: Each element e is assigned a weight $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$, and the weight $\omega(s)$ of each set s is given as the total weight of elements in it, namely $\omega(s) = \sum_{e \in s} \omega(e)$. A set s is called *tight* if $\omega(s) \geq c_s/(1 + \epsilon)$. The primal-dual framework maintains a hierarchical partition into levels as above, aiming to satisfy the following invariants.

- $\omega(s) \leq c_s, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$.
- All sets on level > 0 are tight.

If both invariants are met, then weak duality implies that the set $T \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ of all tight sets provides a $(1 + \epsilon)f$ -approximate set cover, i.e., $c(T) \leq (1 + \epsilon)c(\mathcal{S}^*)$.

Local approach. To dynamically maintain an approximate minimum set cover via the primal-dual framework, it is perhaps most natural to employ the so-called *local approach*: Each time an element is inserted or deleted, the algorithm will perform some *local* “fixing” steps “around the update” to recover both invariants, to restore a valid and up-to-date hierarchical partition (including up-to-date induced weights). This local approach, which was implemented in [BHI15], has two drawbacks: (1) The update time is $O(f \log(m + n))$, which in particular depends on m, n , and (2) the approximation ratio is $O(f^2)$ rather than $O(f)$. To shave the $\log n$ factor in the update time, [BK19] studied the special case of vertex cover, and introduced a new analysis of the local approach that improves the update time to $O(1)$. Although this new analysis of the local approach generalizes for set cover, it does not fix the second drawback of approximation $O(f^2)$.

Global approach. To obtain a $(1 + \epsilon)f$ -approximation, the subsequent works [BHN19, AAG⁺19] adopted a *global approach* to maintain the primal-dual hierarchical partition. Basically, instead of

recovering the invariants persistently after every element update, the global approach only handles the updates in the following lazy manner.

For each insertion of some element e , if we insist that $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$, then $\omega(s)$ for some sets $s \ni e$ might exceed c_s ; to satisfy the first invariant, we would have to raise the level of such sets, which might set off a long cascade of level changes of elements and sets. The lazy approach would be to simply assign the largest possible weight $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-l}$ without violating any constraints $\omega(s) \leq c_s, s \ni e$. In this way, we have relaxed the requirement that $\omega(e)$ is equal to $(1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$ by assigning it a smaller weight $(1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{ilev}(e)}$ for some *intrinsic* level $\text{ilev}(e)$. This relaxation naturally partitions all existing elements into two categories: (1) *active* elements e where $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$, and (2) *passive* elements e where $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{ilev}(e)} < (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$.

For each deletion of some element e , we simply ignore it, and when deletions have accumulated to a large extent, a rebuild procedure is invoked, which rebuilds a carefully chosen “prefix” of the primal-dual hierarchical partition. Roughly speaking, when the approximation of the current set cover might exceed $(1 + \epsilon)f$, the algorithm of [BHN19] looks for the lowest level k such that the fraction of deleted elements on levels $\leq k$ is large. Then the entire primal-dual hierarchy from levels 0 to k is rebuilt by first moving all existing elements on levels $\leq k$ to level $k + 1$ and then pushing them downward using a discretized water-filling procedure. This ensures that for any element e that remains passive, the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ decreases. It can be shown that the runtime of the rebuild procedure is $O(f|A_{\leq k}| + f|P_{\leq k}|)$, where $A_{\leq k}, P_{\leq k}$ are the sets of active and passive elements that lied on levels $\leq k$ before the rebuild, respectively. For the amortized analysis, the term $f|A_{\leq k}|$ can be charged to the deletions that have accumulated, and the term $f|P_{\leq k}|$ can be charged (via a potential function analysis) to the decrease of gaps $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e), e \in P_{\leq k}$. Using the fact that the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ is bounded by $O(\log n)$, an amortized update time of $O(f \log n)$ is derived.

Combining local and global approaches. To shave the $\log n$ factor while preserving a $(1 + \epsilon)f$ approximation, [BHNW21] combines the local approach with the global approach in the following way. For insertion e , they assign the true weight $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$, and apply the local approach from [BK19] to fix the violated constraints of the first invariant, if any. For deletion e , they follow the same rebuild procedure from [BHN19]. Now there is no dependency on $\log n$, since every element is always active (and the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ does not exist at all).

Alas, this approach incurs a quadratic dependency on f . Indeed, in the analysis of [BHNW21], which uses a potential function $\Phi(\cdot)$, each newly inserted element e adds roughly $\omega(e) \cdot f(1 + \epsilon)^{\text{lev}(s)}$ units to the potential $\Phi(s)$ of element $s \ni e$, and summing over all up to f sets $s \ni e$, the total potential increase could be as large as f^2 .

1.2.1 Our Approach

A careful balance between local and global approaches. To improve over previous works, and in particular bypass the quadratic-in- f barrier in [BHNW21], we seek a better balance between the local and global approaches. On the one hand, to avoid the quadratic-in- f potential increase due to an element insertion, we will still allow e to be passive, so that we can avoid the heavy cost that is incurred by the local approach to fix the violated constraints. On the other hand, we do not want e to be *too passive*, so that e does not participate in too many instances of rebuilding before it becomes active, as this might blow up the update time by a factor of $\log n$. To express this idea in terms of levels, we would like to balance two contradictory requirements: the first is that the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ would be large, while the second is that the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ would be small.

To optimize the balance, when e is inserted, we will assign $\text{ilev}(e) = \text{lev}(e) + \log_{1+\epsilon} f$. On the one hand, we can show that the total potential increase due to fixing the violated constraints would

be better off by a factor of f , as compared to [BK19]; to fix the violated constraints, we apply the same local approach as in previous works. On the other hand, if there are no violated constraints with respect to the intrinsic level $\text{ilev}(e) = \text{lev}(e) + \log_{1+\epsilon} f$ assigned to e , we can make sure that the total time spent on e would be $O(f \log f)$. More specifically, the algorithm will carefully make sure that the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ never increases. Moreover, each time the passive edge e participates in a call to the rebuild procedure, the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ will decrease by at least one. Therefore e can participate in at most $\log_{1+\epsilon} f$ calls to the rebuild procedure, which we show ultimately implies that the total time spent on e is $O(f \log f)$.

Going below $O(f \log f)$ update time: sampling and bootstrapping. To go below $O(f \log f)$ update time, let us take a closer look at the rebuild procedure. For each passive element $e \in P_{\leq k}$, in previous works, one had to scan all the sets $s \ni e$ to test whether e can be activated on level $k+1$ (whether $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} \leq c_s$ is not violated for all $s \in e$), which takes time $O(f)$. The worst-case performance of the algorithm occurs when such tests always fail, so that one always pays $O(f)$ time to decrease the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ by one. To further improve the runtime, our key insight is to only sample $O(f/\log f)$ sets $s \ni e$ and test whether e can be activated with respect to all sampled sets (whether $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} \leq c_s$ is not violated for all sampled sets). If there are at least $10 \log^2 f$ witness sets s for which the test is violated, then one of them will be sampled with good probability, and in that case we have shaved off a $\log f$ factor from the time needed to process e due to the rebuild procedure. Otherwise, we will push down the intrinsic level of e from level $k+1 + \log_{1+\epsilon} f$ to level $k+1 + 2 \log_{1+\epsilon} \log_{1+\epsilon} f$, which increases $\omega(e)$ to $\frac{1}{\log_{1+\epsilon}^2 f} (1+\epsilon)^{-k-1}$, and then apply the local approach to fix the violated constraints. A crucial observation is that we know that the total number of violations is bounded by $\log_{1+\epsilon}^2 f$, which is exponentially smaller than the trivial bound f , and so we can bound the potential increase by $O(f)$ instead of $O(f^2)$. We demonstrate that by a careful repetition of this observation, the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ can be reduced *exponentially* in $O(f)$ time, which ultimately leads to an update time of $O(f \log^* f)$.

Summary. The starting point of our work is the aforementioned dynamic primal-dual algorithms for set cover. However, to break the quadratic-in- f time barrier, and further to achieve the near-optimal (up to the $\log^* f$ slack factor) update time, we had to deviate significantly from previous work. The facts that our approach provides (1) the only randomized set cover algorithm that works against an adaptive adversary, and (2) a rare example of achieving optimal time to within a $\log^* n$ factor — may serve as some “evidence” for the novelty of our algorithm and its analysis.

2 Preliminaries

For any real values $x > 1, y \geq 1$ and integer $\eta \geq 1$, inductively define:

$$(5 \log)_x^{(\eta)} y = 5 \cdot \log_x \left((5 \log)_x^{(\eta-1)} y \right)$$

where $(5 \log)_x^{(0)} y = y$, and define $(5 \log)_x^* y$ to be the minimum value of index η such that $(5 \log)_x^{(\eta)} y \leq 10$.

2.1 Primal-dual framework

We will always assume that $f > \frac{\log C}{\epsilon}$, since otherwise we will simply apply the algorithm from [BHNW21]. For each element $e \in \mathcal{U}$, we assume all the sets s containing e is stored as an array,

not a linked list, so that we can take uniformly random samples from all these sets in $O(1)$ time. This assumption is valid because only the elements are dynamic, while all sets are static.

We will follow the primal-dual framework from [BHNW21, BHN19, BK19]. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ be a constant. Define $L = \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon}(Cn) \rceil + 1$. Each set $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is assigned a level $\text{lev}(s) \in [L]$. The base level of a set is defined as $\text{base}(s) = \lfloor \log_{1+\epsilon} 1/c_s \rfloor$.

Each element e will be assigned a level $\text{lev}(e) = \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$ and weight $\omega(e)$, and $\omega(s) = \sum_{e \in s} \omega(e)$ denotes the total weight of $s \in \mathcal{S}$. In addition, for every set $e \in \mathcal{S}$, we also maintain a *dead weight* $\phi(s)$, and let $\omega^*(s) = \omega(s) + \phi(s)$ be the composite weight.

Definition 2.1. A set s is called *tight*, if $\omega^*(s) \geq \frac{c_s}{1+\epsilon}$, and *slack* otherwise.

2.2 Basic data structures

During the dynamic algorithm, all elements have two categories.

- **Active.** If an element e is *active*, then the value $\text{lev}(e)$ will be correctly maintained, and $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$, and let $A_i \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ be the set of active elements on level i . For each set s and each level index i , our algorithm explicitly maintains a list $A_i(s) \subseteq A_i$ which is the set of active elements in s on level i .
- **Passive.** If an element e is *passive*, due to runtime issues, we might not always keep track of the value $\text{lev}(e)$ all the time. Instead, we can only maintain a *lazy* level $\text{zlev}(e) \leq \text{lev}(e)$ which is refreshed to $\text{lev}(e)$ once in a while.

In addition, we will maintain an extra *intrinsic level* $\text{ilev}(e)$ such that:

- $\text{lev}(e) < \text{ilev}(e) \leq \text{zlev}(e) + \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil$.
- $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{ilev}(e)}$.

Let $P_i \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ be the set of all passive elements whose intrinsic levels are i . For each set s and each intrinsic level index i , our algorithm explicitly maintains a list $P_i(s) \subseteq P_i$ which is the set of passive elements in s on intrinsic level i . Note that for a set s , we do not have the power to enumerate all of its passive element on the same lazy level.

For a set s and index $i \geq \text{lev}(e)$, the weight of s at level i is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(s, i) &= \sum_{\text{active } e \in s} (1 + \epsilon)^{-\max\{i, \max_{t|e \in t \neq s} \text{lev}(t)\}} + \sum_{\text{passive } e \in S} (1 + \epsilon)^{-\max\{i, \text{ilev}(e)\}} \\ &= \sum_{e \in s} \min \left\{ \omega(e), (1 + \epsilon)^{-\max\{i, \max_{t|e \in t \neq s} \text{lev}(t)\}} \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In other words, $\omega(s, i)$ is the weight of s if it were raised to level i . So by definition, $\omega(s) = \omega(s, \text{lev}(s))$, and $\omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1) = \omega(s) - |A_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)| \cdot \epsilon(1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(s)-1}$ which can be computed in $O(1)$ time once we know $\omega(s)$ and $|A_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)|$. We assume that all powers of $1 + \epsilon$ can be computed in constant time; one way of implementing this efficiently is to compute all these powers at the outset in $O(L)$ time.

Throughout the algorithm, let $T \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be all the tight sets, and let $\phi = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \phi(s)$ be the total dead weight. For each i , let $T_i \subseteq T$ be the set of tight sets at level i , let E_i be the set of active elements e such that $\text{lev}(e) = i$, together with passive elements e such that $\text{zlev}(e) = i$. Define $\phi_i = \sum_{s, \text{lev}(s)=i} \phi(s)$ be the total dead weight summed over all sets on level i ; similarly, we can define notations $\phi_{\leq i}, T_{\leq i}, E_{\leq i}$.

Each set E_i, T_i will be maintained as a linked list, and store all pointers to lists $\{T_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq L}$, $\{E_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq L}$ as two arrays of length $L + 1$. When the values of $\text{lev}(s), \text{lev}(e), \text{zlev}(e)$ changes for sets s or elements e , we can update the lists and the weight sums $\phi_i, \omega(E_i), \omega(T_i)$ accordingly in constant time. In addition, as our auxiliary data structures, we need to connect all nonempty sets $\{E_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq L}$, $\{T_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq L}$ in a doubly linked list from lower levels to higher levels. Then this data structure allows us to compute quantities $\phi_{\leq i}, c(T_{\leq i})$ in $O\left(|T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}| + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon}\right)$ time, and $\omega(E_{\leq i})$ in $|E_{\leq i}|$ time.

Implicit zeroing. We need a fast data structure for the following operation.

- Given a level index $0 \leq i \leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$, we want to assign $\text{lev}(s), \phi(s) \leftarrow 0, \forall s \in T_i$, and we need to do this in constant time.

Updating the list T_i, T_0 or sums $\phi_i, \phi_0, c(T_i), c(T_0)$ can be done in constant time. However, this task is impossible if we want to explicitly update all the values $\text{lev}(s), \phi(s) \leftarrow 0, \forall s \in T_i$. So, we have to zero out each individual value $\text{lev}(s), \phi(s)$ in an implicit way. To do this, for each set $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we will associate it with a time stamp $\text{tm}(s)$ which indicates the latest time point when the value of $\text{lev}(s)$ or $\phi(s)$ is explicitly updated. Then, create an array aux of length $\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 2$, where each entry $\text{aux}[i]$ stores the time point t of the latest zeroing operation to level i . Each time we want to access the values of $\text{lev}(s), \phi(s)$, if $\text{lev}(s) > \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$, then $\text{lev}(s), \phi(s)$ are up-to-date. Otherwise, if $\text{lev}(s)$ is currently at most $\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$, then compare $\text{tm}(s)$ and $\text{aux}[\text{lev}(s)]$. If $\text{tm}(s) > \text{aux}[\text{lev}(s)]$, we know that s did not suffer the latest zeroing out on level $\text{lev}(s)$, and hence $\text{lev}(s), \phi(s)$ are referring to their current values; otherwise, s must have undergone a zeroing operation implicitly. In this case, explicitly set $\text{lev}(s), \phi(s)$ to 0, and update $\text{tm}(s)$ accordingly. Here we have implicitly assumed that the time values can be stored in a single word; otherwise, we would rebuild the entire dynamic set cover data structure and reset the time to zero.

Zeroing out the levels of $\text{lev}(s)$ may also affect the levels of other elements. But in our algorithm, we will apply implicit zeroing in a careful manner, so that the levels of sets and elements are consistent.

2.3 Approximation guarantees

Invariant 2.1. *During the algorithm, we will maintain the following invariants.*

- (1) For any set s , $\omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1) < c_s$.
- (2) All sets at level at least 1 are tight.
- (3) If $\omega^*(s) > c_s$, then $\phi(s) = 0$.
- (4) It always holds that $\phi \leq \epsilon(c(T) + f \cdot \omega(\mathcal{U}))$.

Lemma 2.1 ([BHNW21]). *If Invariant 2.1 holds, then $\omega(s) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot c_s$, and $\omega(\mathcal{U}) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}$, where $\text{OPT} = c(\mathcal{S}^*)$ is the total weight of an optimal set cover \mathcal{S}^* .*

Proof. By Invariant 2.1(1) and Eq. (1), $\omega(s) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot c_s$. Furthermore, we have

$$\omega(\mathcal{U}) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{U}} \omega(e) \leq \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}^*} \sum_{e \in s} \omega(e) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot c(\mathcal{S}^*) = (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \text{OPT}$$

This first inequality relies on the fact that \mathcal{S}^* is a valid set cover. □

Lemma 2.2 ([BHNW21]). *If Invariant 2.1 holds and T is a set cover, then the collection of tight sets T is a $(1 + 5\epsilon)f$ -approximate set cover.*

Proof. By definition of tightness, we have $\omega(s) + \phi(s) \geq \frac{cs}{1+\epsilon}$. Then, the cost of T is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} c(T) &\leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \sum_{s \in T} (\omega(s) + \phi(s)) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \omega(\mathcal{S}) + (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \phi \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon)f \cdot \omega(\mathcal{U}) + \epsilon(1 + \epsilon) \cdot c(T) + \epsilon(1 + \epsilon)f \cdot \omega(\mathcal{U}) \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon)^2 f \cdot \omega(\mathcal{U}) + \epsilon(1 + \epsilon) \cdot c(T) \end{aligned}$$

As $\epsilon \in (0, 0.1)$ and by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$c(T) \leq \frac{(1 + \epsilon)^2 f}{1 - \epsilon(1 + \epsilon)} \cdot \omega(\mathcal{U}) \leq (1 + 5\epsilon)f \cdot \text{OPT}$$

□

3 Algorithm description

We will describe three subroutines `Delete(e)`, `Insert(e)`, `FixLevel(e, l)`, and `Rebuild(k)` which constitute the main update algorithm which is shown as Algorithm 1. At the beginning of the algorithm, we assume \mathcal{U} is empty, and so all sets in \mathcal{S} are initialized on level 0. When an element e is deleted from \mathcal{U} , we will call subroutine `Delete(e)` to deal with it; if an element e is inserted, then we will call `Insert(e)`. The insertion of e with an appropriate intrinsic level (namely, $l = \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil + \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$) might violate Invariant 2.1 for some sets $s \ni e$. Hence, we apply subroutine `FixLevel(e, l)` where parameter $l = \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil + \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$, which will make e a passive element on level l and add e to all the linked lists $P_l(s), \forall s \ni e$.

After that, we check if Invariant 2.1(4) is violated. If so, we repeatedly find the smallest index k such that $\phi_{\leq k} > \epsilon \cdot (c(T_{\leq k}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq k}))$, and invoke subroutine `Rebuild(k)`.

Algorithm 1: DynamicSetCover

```

1 initialize  $\text{lev}(s) = 0, \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$ ;
2 foreach element update  $e$  do
3   if  $e$  is deleted then
4     | Delete( $e$ );
5   else
6     | Insert( $e$ );
7   while Invariant 2.1(4) is violated do
8     | find the smallest such  $k$  such that  $\phi_{\leq k} > \epsilon \cdot (c(T_{\leq k}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq k}))$ ;
9     | Rebuild( $k$ );

```

To implement Line 8 which finds the smallest index k such that $\phi_{\leq k} > \epsilon \cdot (c(T_{\leq k}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq k}))$, start with $k = 0$ and each time increase k to the next index $k \leftarrow k'$ where $T_{k'} \neq \emptyset$ using the doubly linked list data structure, and check if $\phi_{\leq k} > \epsilon \cdot (c(T_{\leq k}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq k}))$. In this way, the runtime of locating the smallest k would be $O(|T_{\leq k}|)$; note that the amount of time spent per nonempty level is constant, since we've maintained the quantities per each level separately, and we just need to sum the quantities for prefixes of levels.

3.1 Deletion

We handle deletions in the same way as [BHNW21] which is summarized in Algorithm 2. When an element e is deleted, each set s containing element e subtracts its weight $\omega(s)$ by $\omega(e)$, and compensates for the loss by increasing the dead weight $\phi(s)$ by the weight of e if s was tight. This process takes update time $O(f)$.

Algorithm 2: Delete(e)

```

1 foreach set  $s \ni e$  do
2    $\omega(s) \leftarrow \omega(s) - \omega(e)$ ;
3   if  $s$  was tight then
4      $\phi(s) \leftarrow \phi(s) + \omega(e)$ ;
5     if  $\omega(s) + \phi(s) > c_s$  then
6        $\phi(s) \leftarrow \max\{0, c_s - \omega(s)\}$ ;

```

Besides, we also need to specify how to maintain the underlying data structures after an element deletion. If e is active, then we go over all sets $s \ni e$ and remove e from the linked list $A_{\text{lev}(e)}(s)$; if e is passive, then for each $s \ni e$ and remove it from the linked list $P_{\text{lev}(e)}(s)$. This operation takes update time $O(f)$.

As for the invariants, since Delete(e) does not increase any weight $\omega(s)$, Invariant 2.1(1) is preserved. Also, Invariant 2.1(2)(3) are also preserved due to the way we modify the dead weights. Invariant 2.1(4) might be violated because of increases of some dead weights, but it will be restored by the while-loop on Line 7 of Algorithm 1.

3.2 Insertion

High-level idea. When inserting an element e , the invariants might be violated (Invariant 2.1(1) for some $s \ni e$). We try to make the newly inserted element e active at level $\max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$ if possible, if not we try to make it passive at the lowest possible intrinsic level up to $l = \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\} + \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil$; only if both these options aren't possible, we invoke FixLevel(e, l). Thus, we invoke FixLevel(e, l), only when we can't make the element passive at level $l \leq \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\} + \log_{1+\epsilon} f$, which roughly speaking implies that the potential increase is very small — by a $1/f$ factor smaller compared to if we could make the element passive at level $\approx \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$.

Formal details. Upon an insertion e , assign $\text{lev}(e) = \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$. Define $l = \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\} + \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil$, and define $F = \{s \ni e \mid \omega(s) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-l} > c_s\}$.

- (1) If $F = \emptyset$, then calculate the smallest index $h \geq \text{lev}(e)$ such that $\omega(s) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h} \leq c_s, \forall s \ni e$. If $h = \text{lev}(e)$, then activate e on level e ; otherwise make e a passive element with intrinsic level h . Note that in this case, Invariant 2.1(3) is always satisfied.

A technical note. To compute h in $O(f)$ time, we can first compute the minimum value of the gap $c_s - \omega(s)$, and then enumerate all values $[\text{lev}(e), l]$ to find h , which takes at most $O(\log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\}) = O(f + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon}) = O(f)$ time. This operation will appear again in subroutine Rebuild.

- (2) If $F \neq \emptyset$, then apply subroutine FixLevel(e, l), which will make it a passive element on level l or higher, but making the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ at most $\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil$.

Algorithm 3: Insert(e)

```
1 assign  $\text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$ ;  
2 Define  $l \leftarrow \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\} + \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil$ ;  
3 compute  $F \leftarrow \{s \ni e \mid \omega(s) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-l} > c_s\}$ ;  
4 if  $F = \emptyset$  then  
5   | calculate the smallest index  $h \geq 0$  such that  $\omega(s) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h} \leq c_s, \forall s \ni e$ ;  
6   | if  $h > \text{zlev}(e)$  then  
7   |   | make  $e$  a passive element with intrinsic level  $h$ ;  
8   |   | else  
9   |   | make  $e$  an active element on level  $\text{zlev}(e)$ ;  
10 else  
11 | FixLevel( $e, l$ );
```

3.3 Fixing levels

When subroutine $\text{FixLevel}(e, l)$ is called, we want to assign the intrinsic level of a passive or new element e to l , so Invariant 2.1(1) might be violated because of e 's update. In order to restore Invariant 2.1(1), the algorithm will repeatedly increase the level of s until Invariant 2.1(1) is satisfied. Before describing how to implement this approach, there are two technical caveats we would like to explain.

Technical caveats. When the level of s increases, the level of e may also increase, which decreases the gap between its intrinsic level $\text{ilev}(e)$ and its current level $\text{lev}(e)$. However, if $\omega(e)$ is very close to $(1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$, then for the runtime analysis, the potential function will increase too much. So, our rule here is to keep the gap $d = \text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ unchanged by raising $\text{ilev}(e)$ by one as well.

If we go over all sets $s \ni e$ in an arbitrary order, and increase $\text{ilev}(e)$ in each round, then the tightness of some previously visited $s' \ni e$ might be violated. For this issue, in the original algorithm from [BHNW21], they needed to enumerate $s \ni e$ in a sorted order which already takes $O(f \log f)$ time; note that we cannot use linear time approximate sorting in their algorithm because they needed exact sorting. To circumvent the $\Omega(f \log f)$ sorting overhead, we will take an arbitrary ordering of these sets, and restore tightness by increasing their dead weights.

There are two issues when $\text{ilev}(e)$ increases.

- Each time the intrinsic level $\text{ilev}(e)$ of e changes, we may need to update the weights of sets $s' \ni e$, which already takes $O(f)$ time. When $A_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)$ is empty, we cannot charge this amount of time cost to potential loss.

To resolve this issue, we will update the contribution of $\omega(e)$ to other $\omega(s'), s' \in e$ in a lazy manner only when $s' \ni e$ is being enumerated (which is when we actually need the updated value of $\omega(s')$).

- The decrease of $\omega(e)$ might also violate the tightness of other sets $s \ni e$, but adding to dead weights to $\phi(s)$ due to e might be too costly. In practice, we will only compensate $\phi(s)$ if $\omega(s) \geq c_s$ at the beginning of the algorithm. Otherwise, if $\omega(s) < c_s$ at beginning of the algorithm, then we can show that s must be slack before $\text{FixLevel}(e, l)$ provided that the gap $d = \text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ is at least $\log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon}$; see Claim 4.5 for the actual, more general statement that we prove.

Formal details. Next, let us describe the algorithm more formally, which is summarized as Algorithm 4. The algorithm assumes that $\text{zlev}(e)$ is equal to $\text{lev}(e)$ at the beginning. Let $\text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e) > l$ be the intrinsic level of the element e right before the execution of $\text{FixLevel}(e, l)$; if e is a newly inserted element, then define $\text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e) = \infty$.

First, assign a new intrinsic level $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow l$, update all weights $\omega(s), s \ni e$, and add e to $P_l(s)$ for each $s \ni e$. Keep a record $d = l - \text{zlev}(e)$ at the beginning, and define $F = \{s \ni e \mid \omega(s) > c_s\}$.

During the algorithm, we will make sure that the lazy level $\text{zlev}(e)$ is always equal to $\text{lev}(e)$, and the initial gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e) = d$ never changes. The algorithm then goes over each set $s \ni e$ and process it the following way: First, it updates the weight of s according to the true $\omega(e)$; since $\omega(e)$ may have changed throughout the algorithm's execution, from $(1 + \epsilon)^{-l}$ to some possibly lower weight, yet we haven't updated $\omega(s)$ accordingly, the update of s is done as follows: $\omega(s) \leftarrow \omega(s) - (1 + \epsilon)^{-l} + \omega(e)$.

After that, whenever $\omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1) \geq c_s$, we can first zero out its dead weight $\phi(s) \leftarrow 0$ according to Invariant 2.1(3), and then we increase the level of s by 1; recall that $\omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1)$ can be computed in constant time given $\omega(s), |A_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)|$. In each iteration of the while-loop, the algorithm does the following steps.

- (1) Define $k = \text{lev}(s)$. First, consider the case where $k < \text{base}(s)$. If $\text{zlev}(e) < \text{base}(s)$ and $\text{base}(s) + d > \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$, then simply put $\text{zlev}(e), \text{lev}(s) \leftarrow \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e) - d$, $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$ and quit the while-loop. We will prove that $\omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1) < c_s$ holds after the update, and so we can safely quit the while loop.

Otherwise, assign $\text{lev}(s) \leftarrow \text{base}(s)$. If $\text{zlev}(e) = \text{lev}(e)$ should now increase to $\text{base}(s)$, assign $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow \text{base}(s) + d$. Then, we need to activate all passive elements in $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$: if $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$ is nonempty, then turn all elements in $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$ active; that is, for each $e' \in P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$, remove it from $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)$ and add it to $A_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)$. After that, continue to the next iteration.

- (2) If $A_k(s) \neq \emptyset$, go over all elements $e' \in A_k(s)$ and increase their levels $\text{lev}(e')$ to $k + 1$ as well. Because of this, for each such element e' , we also need to go over all sets $s' \ni e'$ and update the value of $\omega(s')$ by a decrease of $\epsilon(1 + \epsilon)^{-k-1}$.

After that, for each $s' \ni e', s' \neq s$, to restore tightness on set $s' \ni e'$, we need to increase its dead weight $\phi(s')$ by $\epsilon(1 + \epsilon)^{-k-1}$. Next, for each such s' , consider two cases depending on if $e \in s'$; note that membership testing can be done in $O(1)$ time after an $O(f)$ -time preprocessing on all sets $s \ni e$.

- (a) If $e \notin s'$ and $\omega^*(s')$ now becomes larger than $c_{s'}$, reassign $\phi(s') \leftarrow \max\{0, c_{s'} - \omega(s')\}$ to restore Invariant 2.1(3).
- (b) If $e \in s' \neq s$, then since we are being lazy on updating the contribution of $\omega(e)$ to $\omega(s')$, we do not zero out $\phi(s')$ for now.

Note that the true value of $\omega(s')$ could possibly be smaller than the value currently maintained by the algorithm, as the intrinsic level of e is rising throughout the execution of the algorithm, meaning that the true weight of $\omega(e)$ decreases, yet we haven't made sure to update $\omega(s')$ accordingly. Whenever we will need the updated value of $\omega(s')$, we will make sure to "refresh" the up-to-date weight contribution of $\omega(e)$.

Therefore, although Invariant 2.1(3) might be violated by s' for now, we will fix it in the end by assigning $\phi(s') \leftarrow \{c_s - \omega(s'), 0\}$ if $\omega^*(s') > c_{s'}$.




Figure 1: This picture illustrates one iteration of the while-loop that raises set s during the execution of $\text{FixLevel}(e, l)$. There are three active elements $\{e_1, e_5, e_6\}$ denoted by black circles, four passive elements $\{e, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ denoted by white circles. The rectangle denotes $\text{zlev}(e)$, which is equal to $\text{lev}(e)$. Also, there are three sets: $s = \{e, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5\}$ denoted by red color, $s_1 = \{e_1, e_2\}$ denoted by green color, and $s_2 = \{e, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6\}$ denoted by blue color. The level of all three sets is k . The left side of the picture shows the state right before the iteration, and the right side shows the state right after it. During that iteration, e_1 and e_5 got raised from level k to level $k + 1$ and remain active. Elements e_2 and e_4 become active, since they were passive elements at level $k + 1$ and belong to s . Since the lazy level of e was k , both lazy and intrinsic levels got raised by one, so the gap remains equal to d . Finally, the level of s raised to $k + 1$.

Here, during the execution of FixLevel , we do not assume s' was tight whenever $\text{lev}(s') > 0$. This is because FixLevel might also be called within another subroutine Rebuild where Invariant 2.1(2) has not been recovered.

- (3) Now, increase $\text{lev}(s)$ to $k + 1$. If $\text{zlev}(e) = k$, then increase $\text{ilev}(e)$ by one and update $\omega(s)$ accordingly.

Finally, activate all passive elements in $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$: if $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$ is nonempty, then turn all elements in $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$ active; that is, for each $e' \in P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$, remove it from $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)$ and add it to $A_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)$.

After the while-loop terminates, the algorithm keeps a record of the current value of $l_s \leftarrow \text{ilev}(e)$ for the current set s .

After all sets in $s \ni e$ have been enumerated, go over all sets $s \ni e$ again to update the weight $\omega(s) \leftarrow \omega(s) - (1 + \epsilon)^{-l_s} + \omega(e)$, and restore tightness for set $s \ni e$ the following way: if $s \in F$, increase its dead weight $\phi(s)$ by $(1 + \epsilon)^{-l_s} - \omega(e)$; next, if $\omega^*(s)$ is larger than c_s , reassign $\phi(s) \leftarrow \max\{0, c_s - \omega(s)\}$ to restore Invariant 2.1(3).

Algorithm 4: FixLevel(e, l)

```
1 make  $e$  a passive element with  $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow l$ , update all weights  $\omega(s), s \ni e$ , and add  $e$  to
    $P_l(s)$ ;
2  $F \leftarrow \{s \ni e \mid \omega(s) > c_s\}$ ;
3  $d \leftarrow \text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ ;
4 foreach  $s \ni e$  do
5   update the weight  $\omega(s) \leftarrow \omega(s) - (1 + \epsilon)^{-l} + \omega(e)$ ;
   // refresh  $\omega(s)$  according to up-to-date  $\omega(e)$ 
6   while  $\omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1) \geq c_s$  do
7      $\phi(s) \leftarrow 0, k \leftarrow \text{lev}(s)$ ;
8     if  $k < \text{base}(s)$  then
9       if  $\text{zlev}(e) < \text{base}(s)$  and  $\text{base}(s) + d > \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$  then
10        | assign  $\text{zlev}(e), \text{lev}(s) \leftarrow \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e) - d, \text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$ ;
11        | break;
12        |  $\text{lev}(s) \leftarrow \text{base}(s)$  and update  $\text{zlev}(e), \text{lev}(e)$  accordingly;
13        | if  $\text{zlev}(e) = \text{base}(s)$  then
14        | |  $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow \text{base}(s) + d$ ;
15        | activate all passive elements in  $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$ ;
16        | continue;
17        | foreach  $e' \in A_k(s)$  do
18        | |  $\text{lev}(e') \leftarrow k + 1$ ;
19        | | foreach  $s' \ni e'$  do
20        | | |  $\omega(s') \leftarrow \omega(s') - \epsilon(1 + \epsilon)^{-k-1}$ ;
21        | | |  $\phi(s') \leftarrow \phi(s') + \epsilon(1 + \epsilon)^{-k-1}$ ;
22        | | | if  $\omega(s') + \phi(s') > c_{s'}$  and  $e \notin s'$  then
23        | | | |  $\phi(s') \leftarrow \max\{0, c_{s'} - \omega(s')\}$ ;
24        | |  $\text{lev}(s) \leftarrow k + 1$ ;
25        | activate all passive elements in  $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s) \setminus \{e\}$ ;
26        | if  $\text{zlev}(e) = k$  then
27        | | update  $\text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow \text{lev}(s), \text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow \text{lev}(s) + d$ ;
28        | |  $\omega(s) \leftarrow \omega(s) - \epsilon(1 + \epsilon)^{-k-1-d}$ ;
29    $l_s \leftarrow \text{ilev}(e)$ ;
30 foreach  $s \ni e$  do
31    $\omega(s) \leftarrow \omega(s) - (1 + \epsilon)^{-l_s} + \omega(e)$ ;
   // refresh  $\omega(s)$  according to up-to-date  $\omega(e)$ 
32   if  $s \in F$  then
33   |  $\phi(s) \leftarrow \phi(s) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-l_s} - \omega(e)$ ;
34   if  $\omega(s) + \phi(s) > c_s$  then
35   |  $\phi(s) \leftarrow \max\{0, c_s - \omega(s)\}$ ;
```




Figure 2: In this picture, $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ are dirty elements, and $\{e_4, e_5, e_6, e_7, e_8\}$ are clean elements which are put on level $k+1$. The $\text{Rebuild}(k)$ procedure tries to reduce the gaps $\text{ilev}(e_i) - \text{zlev}(e_i)$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. In the deterministic algorithm, the gaps decrease by at least one; in the randomized algorithm, the gaps decrease exponentially.

3.4 Rebuilding

A rebuild operation is invoked when Invariant 2.1(4) is violated at some point. Let k be the smallest index such that $\phi_{\leq k} > \epsilon(c(T_{\leq k}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq k}))$; such index k can be found in time:

$$O\left(\frac{\log C}{\epsilon} + |T_{\leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}| + |E_{\leq k}|\right)$$

using the linked list data structure.

Definition 3.1. An element $e \in E_{\leq k}$ is called dirty, if e is passive and $\text{ilev}(e) > k+1$; otherwise, e is called clean.

Apply implicit zeroing (check its definition in Section 2.2) on all levels in $[0, \min\{\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1, k\}]$. Then, define $U \leftarrow T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}$, and go over all $s \in U$ and increase their levels to $k+1$, and assign $\phi(s) \leftarrow 0$.

Let us first process all clean elements in the following way (which is omitted in the pseudocode). For each clean element e , go over all sets $s \ni e$ on level-0, assign $\text{lev}(s) \leftarrow k+1$, $\phi(s) \leftarrow 0$, and add e to A_{k+1} (if e was passive, then activate it now), and assign a new weight $\omega(e) \leftarrow (1+\epsilon)^{-k-1}$, and update all $\omega(s)$, $\forall s \ni e$ accordingly. After that, add all such $s \ni e$ to U .

For the rest, we will deal with all dirty elements. Let D be the set that collects all dirty elements, and define a set \hat{E} which contains all the clean elements initially. Go over each element $e \in D$. There are two different ways to process element e , depending on whether our algorithm uses randomization. See Figure 2 for an illustration.

Deterministic algorithm. First, raise all sets $s \ni e$ to level $\max\{\text{lev}(s), k+1\}$, and add s to U if $\text{lev}(s) = k+1$. If e is not currently contained in any tight set, then go over all sets $s \ni e$ and raise them to level $k+1$ and add them to U , and assign $\text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow k+1$. Then, compute $h \in [k+1, \text{ilev}(e)]$ to be the smallest integer such that $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1+\epsilon)^{-h} \leq c_s, \forall s \ni e$. Note that such index h must exist, since if we take $h = \text{ilev}(e)$, all sets $s \ni e$ are currently slack and thus $\omega(s) < c_s/(1+\epsilon)$.

If $h > k+1$, then assign $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow h$ and update all the linked lists $P_{\text{ilev}(e)}(s), \forall s \ni e$ accordingly. Otherwise, activate e on level $k+1$ and add it to $A_{k+1}(s), \forall s \ni e$. After that, add e to \widehat{E} .

Randomized algorithm. We first check if e is still passive. This is necessary since e might have been activated when processing previous elements in D . If passive, then move on to the following steps.

Find the index η such that:³

$$(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta+1)} f \leq \text{ilev}(e) - k - 1 \leq (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f$$

We will prove later that η is always at least 1. Next, define:

$$\delta = \min \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f} \right)^4, \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2C} \right)^2 \right\} \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{-k-1}$$

Repeatedly take uniformly random samples of sets $s \ni e$ for $50 \left\lceil \frac{f}{(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f} \right\rceil$ times, and check if $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + \delta > c_s$. If there is one such set s , then we claim that s is tight. To update the lazy level of e , first raise the set level $\text{lev}(s) \leftarrow \max\{k+1, \text{lev}(s)\}$, and assign $\text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow \text{lev}(s)$. After that, continue on to the next element $e \in D$.

Otherwise, go over all sets $s \ni e$, raise them to level $\max\{k+1, \text{lev}(e)\}$, and add them to U if it is slack, and update $\text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$. In the meantime, compute the set \widehat{F} of all $s \ni e$ such that $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + \delta > c_s$. There are three cases below.

$$(1) |\widehat{F}| > \left((5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^2.$$

In this case, let us continue on to the next element $e \in D$.

$$(2) \widehat{F} = \emptyset.$$

In this case, compute

$$h \in \left[k+1, \min \left\{ \text{ilev}(e), \left\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{1}{\delta} \right\rceil \right\} \right]$$

which is the smallest index such that $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1+\epsilon)^{-h} \leq c_s, \forall s \ni e$.

If $h > k+1$, then assign $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow h$ and update all the linked lists $P_{\text{ilev}(e)}(s), \forall s \ni e$ accordingly. Otherwise, activate e on level $k+1$ and add it to $A_{k+1}(s), \forall s \ni e$. After that, add e to \widehat{E} .

Finally, to restore Invariant 2.1(3), for each $s \ni e$ such that $\omega(s) + \phi(s) > c_s$, assign $\phi(s) \leftarrow c_s - \omega(s)$.

³Recall that $(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)}$ is $(5 \log)$ iterated for η times.

$$(3) \quad 0 < |\widehat{F}| \leq \left((5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^2.$$

In this case, we will apply subroutine `FixLevel` on e . More specifically, invoke the subroutine `FixLevel`($e, \min\{\text{ilev}(e), \text{zlev}(e) + d\}$), where:

$$d = \left\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max \left\{ \left((5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^4, \left(\frac{2C}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \right\} \right\rceil$$

As a clarification, during the `Rebuild`(k) subroutine, some active elements were raised to level $k + 1$, and the sets that contain them are temporarily in an incorrect state. But because when processing e we also raise every $s \ni e$, everything is still fine and subroutine `FixLevel` can function correctly.

Post-processing. After we have processed D , some levels of elements in \widehat{E} might be larger than $k + 1$ because of `FixLevel`. As a post-processing step, remove all elements in \widehat{E} whose levels are larger than $k + 1$. Next, let $\widehat{U} \subseteq U$ be all the slack sets in U . For the rest, we need to use the following subroutine `WaterFilling` from [BHNW21, BK19].

Lemma 3.1 ([BHNW21, BK19]). *There is a deterministic subroutine `WaterFilling`($\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E}$) which takes as input a collection of sets and active elements \widehat{U}, \widehat{E} on level \widehat{k} , such that for each $s \in \widehat{U}$, we have $\omega(s) < c_s, \phi(s) = 0$. In the end, all elements in \widehat{E} are still active, and the subroutine places each set $s \in \widehat{U}$ at level $\text{lev}(s)$ such that (1) $\omega(s) < c_s, \phi(s) = 0$, and (2) if $\text{lev}(s) > 0$ then $\omega(s) > \frac{c_s}{1+\epsilon}$. The runtime is $O(f|\widehat{E}| + \widehat{k})$.*

We cannot directly apply `WaterFilling`($k + 1, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E}$) since the runtime would depend on k . Instead, we follow the idea from [BHNW21] and move all elements and sets in \widehat{E}, \widehat{U} to level $\widehat{k} = \min \left\{ k + 1, \left\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C \cdot |\widehat{E}|}{\epsilon} \right\rceil \right\}$. The following lemma claims that directly moving elements and sets to level \widehat{k} does not create weights larger than c_s . So in the final step, we can safely invoke `WaterFilling`($\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E}$).

Lemma 3.2 ([BHNW21]). *After moving sets and elements in \widehat{U}, \widehat{E} to level \widehat{k} , each set $s \in \widehat{U}$ has weight less than c_s .*

4 Runtime analysis

4.1 Potential functions

As the same in [BHNW21], we will define up and down potentials as following, together with a third type called *passive* potentials. The total potential Φ of the set system would be sum of all types of potentials across all elements and sets.

- **Up potential.** Define a parameter $\alpha_i = 2f \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right) (1 + \epsilon)^{i+1}$ for any $0 \leq i \leq L$. Then, the up potential of s is defined as $\Phi_{\text{up}}(s) = \max\{\omega(s) - c_s, 0\} \cdot \alpha_{\text{lev}(s)}$.
- **Down potential.** For any $0 \leq i \leq L$, define $\beta_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{2f}$, and s has a down potential of $\Phi_{\text{down}}(s) = \phi(s) \cdot \beta_{\text{lev}(s)}$.
- **Lift potential.** Each set s has a lift potential of $\Phi_{\text{lift}}(s) = L - \max\{\text{lev}(s), \text{base}(s)\}$.

Algorithm 5: Rebuild(k)

```
1 apply implicit zeroing for all levels  $0 \leq i \leq \min\{\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1, k\}$ ;  
2 define  $U \leftarrow T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}$ , and assign  $\phi(s) \leftarrow 0, \text{lev}(s) \leftarrow k + 1, \forall s \in U$ ;  
3 process all clean elements;  
4 let  $D$  be the set of all dirty elements, and  $\widehat{E}$  be all clean elements;  
5 foreach  $e \in D$  which is still passive do  
6   if deterministic then  
7     assign  $\text{lev}(s) \leftarrow \max\{\text{lev}(s), k + 1\}$  and add  $s$  to  $U$  if  $\text{lev}(s) = k + 1, \forall s \ni e$ ;  
8     if all sets  $s \ni e$  are slack then  
9       compute the smallest index  $h \geq k + 1$  such that  $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h} \leq c_s$ ;  
10      if  $h > k + 1$  then  
11        | assign  $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow h$ ;  
12      else  
13        | activate  $e$  on level  $k + 1$ , and add it to  $\widehat{E}$ ;  
14  if randomized then  
15    find index  $\eta$  such that  $(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta+1)} f \leq \text{ilev}(e) - k - 1 \leq (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f$ ;  
16    define  $\delta \leftarrow \min \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f} \right)^4, \left( \frac{\epsilon}{2C} \right)^2 \right\} \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{-k-1}$ ;  
17    flag  $\leftarrow$  true;  
18    for  $50 \lceil f / (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \rceil$  times do  
19      | uniformly sample  $s \ni e$ ;  
20      | if  $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + \delta > c_s$  then  
21        | assign  $\text{lev}(s) \leftarrow \max\{k + 1, \text{lev}(s)\}, \text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow \text{lev}(s)$ ;  
22        | flag  $\leftarrow$  false and break;  
23    if flag then  
24      | raise all  $s \ni e$  to level  $\max\{\text{lev}(s), k + 1\}$  and add them to  $U$  if slack, and update  
25      |  $\text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$ ;  
26      | compute  $\widehat{F} = \{s \ni e \mid \omega(s) - \omega(e) + \delta > c_s\}$ ;  
27      | if  $\widehat{F} = \emptyset$  then  
28        | compute the smallest index  $h \geq k + 1$  such that  
29        |  $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h} \leq c_s, \forall s \ni e$ ;  
30        | if  $h > k + 1$  then  
31          | assign  $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow h$ ;  
32        | else  
33          | activate  $e$  on level  $k + 1$ , and add it to  $\widehat{E}$ ;  
34          | foreach  $s \ni e$  do  
35            |  $\phi(s) \leftarrow \max\{c_s - \omega(s), 0\}$ ;  
36          | else if  $|\widehat{F}| \leq \left( (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^2$  then  
37            |  $d \leftarrow \left\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max \left\{ \left( (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^4, \left( \frac{2C}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \right\} \right\rceil$ ;  
38            |  $\text{FixLevel}(e, \min\{\text{ilev}(e), \text{zlev}(e) + d\})$ ;  
39  remove all elements in  $\widehat{E}$  whose levels are  $> k + 1$ ;  
40  let  $\widehat{U}$  be all the slack sets in  $U$ ;  
41   $\widehat{k} = \min \left\{ k + 1, \left\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C \cdot |\widehat{E}|}{\epsilon} \right\rceil \right\}$ ;  
42  move all elements and sets in  $\widehat{E}, \widehat{U}$  to level  $\widehat{k}$ ;  
43  WaterFilling( $\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E}$ );
```

- **Passive potential.** Let $e \in E$ be a passive element. If the algorithm is deterministic, then its passive potential is defined as $\Phi(e) = f \cdot (\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$. If the algorithm is randomized, then its passive potential is defined as $\Phi(e) = f \cdot (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^*(\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$.

By definition of our potential functions, when $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$, the set system has potential at most $mL = O(m \log(Cn))$. When an element update is processed, the amortized time (associated with potential function Φ) is defined to be the sum of potential change $\Delta\Phi$ and the real time cost.

4.2 Deletion

By the algorithm, each $\text{Delete}(e)$ takes $O(f)$ time. So it suffices to analyze the potential changes after an execution of $\text{Delete}(e)$. For each $s \ni e$ that was tight before the deletion of element e , its dead weight increases by at most $\omega(e)$.

- If $\text{lev}(s) \geq \text{base}(s)$, then by definition of down potentials, $\Phi_{\text{down}}(s)$ increases by at most:

$$\omega(e) \cdot \beta_{\text{lev}(s)} \leq (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right) \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{\text{lev}(s)+1} \leq (1 + \epsilon) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right)$$

- If $\text{lev}(s) < \text{base}(s)$, then by Invariant 2.1(1), we have since $\omega(s) \leq (1 + \epsilon)c_s$, $\Phi_{\text{down}}(s)$ increases by at most:

$$(1 + \epsilon)c_s \cdot \beta_{\text{base}(s)} \leq (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{base}(s)+2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right) \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{\text{base}(s)+1} \leq (1 + \epsilon)^3 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right)$$

Hence, the total increase of Φ after deletion of e is bounded by $O\left(f\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2}\right)\right)$. Note also that the up potential may only decrease, and the lift and passive potentials remain unchanged.

4.3 Fixing levels

Use super-script “old” to denote the values of the variables right before $\text{FixLevel}(e, l)$ started; for example $\text{lev}^{\text{old}}(s), \omega^{\text{old}}(s)$. For the analysis of FixLevel , assume Invariant 2.1(1)(3) was preserved right before the execution of $\text{FixLevel}(e, l)$. Also, we only need to consider the case that l is smaller than the old value of $\text{ilev}(e)$ right before the execution of $\text{FixLevel}(e, l)$; otherwise, since Invariant 2.1(1) held, none of the while-loop on Line 6 would be triggered.

Let us first state some basic properties of subroutine FixLevel .

Claim 4.1. *In the iteration of the while-loop, if $k < \text{base}(s)$, then we have $\bigcup_{i=\text{lev}(e)+1}^{\text{base}(s)-1} A_i(s) = \bigcup_{i=\text{lev}(e)+1}^{\text{base}(s)-1} P_i(s) \setminus \{e\} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Consider the moment right before FixLevel started. If $\text{lev}^{\text{old}}(s) < \text{base}(s)$ at the beginning, then we must have $\bigcup_{i=\text{lev}(e)+1}^{\text{base}(s)-1} A_i^{\text{old}}(s) = \bigcup_{i=\text{lev}(e)+1}^{\text{base}(s)-1} P_i^{\text{old}}(s) = \emptyset$; otherwise, we would have $\omega^{\text{old}}(s, \text{lev}^{\text{old}}(s) + 1) \geq (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{base}(s)+1} > c_s$, which would violate Invariant 2.1(1). During the algorithm any set level is non-decreasing, and therefore

$$\bigcup_{i=\text{lev}(e)+1}^{\text{base}(s)-1} A_i(s) = \bigcup_{i=\text{lev}(e)+1}^{\text{base}(s)-1} P_i(s) \setminus \{e\} = \emptyset$$

□

Claim 4.2. *During the algorithm, for any passive element e' , it always holds that $\text{zlev}(e') \leq \text{lev}(e') < \text{ilev}(e')$.*

Proof. For the first inequality, the lazy level of other passive elements $e' \neq e$ never increases, so the inequality is preserved. As for e , we always have $\text{zlev}(e) = \text{lev}(e)$ during the algorithm.

For the second inequality, we only need to consider the case where $e' \neq e$, since during the algorithm $\text{ilev}(e) = \text{lev}(e) + d > \text{lev}(e)$.

When $\text{lev}(e')$ is raised due to the increase of some $\text{lev}(s)$ in some iteration to at most $\max\{k + 1, \text{base}(s)\}$, if $k < \text{base}(s)$, then by Claim 4.1, only $P_{\text{base}(s)} \setminus \{e\}$ could be nonempty, implying that $\text{lev}(e') \leq \text{ilev}(e')$. Otherwise, if $k \geq \text{base}(s)$, the algorithm would also activate all elements from $P_{\text{lev}(s)}(s)$ after raising $\text{lev}(s)$ by one, and therefore for such elements ilev isn't defined anymore. \square

Claim 4.3. *During the algorithm, the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e) = d$, we always have $\text{ilev}(e) \leq \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$.*

Proof. The first half of the statement can be verified according to the algorithm. For the rest, let us focus on the second half.

At the beginning of the algorithm we have $\text{ilev}(e) = l \leq \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$. This holds since either $\text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e) = \infty$ or the call to `FixLevel` is with level l (which $\text{ilev}(e)$ will be reset to) that's the min of two arguments, one of them is $\text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$.

Consider any set $s \ni e$ that enters the while-loop. First consider the case where $k < \text{base}(s)$. According to the algorithm, there are two possibilities.

- $\text{zlev}(e) < \text{base}(s)$ and $\text{base}(s) + d > \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$.

In this case, we will raise $\text{lev}(s), \text{zlev}(e)$ to $\text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e) - d$, and set $\text{ilev}(e)$ to $\text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$, and quit the while-loop. As Invariant 2.1(1) held before the subroutine `FixLevel` began, and because we only raise levels and decrease weights throughout this subroutine `FixLevel`, we know that it must be $\omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1) < c_s$ if $\text{ilev}(e)$ is set back to $\text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$. So it is safe to quit the while-loop.

- Otherwise, we know that $\text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$ is at least $\text{base}(s) + d$, so assigning $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow \text{base}(s) + d$ does not violate the inequality.

Next, consider a general case where $k \geq \text{base}(s)$. It suffices to argue $\text{ilev}(e) < \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$. Otherwise, if $\text{ilev}(e) = \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e)$, since levels are non-decreasing throughout the algorithm, and that Invariant 2.1(1) held right before `FixLevel(e, l)` started, we must have $\omega(s, k + 1) < c_s$, which violates the branching condition of the while-loop, contradiction. \square

Claim 4.4. *If $d \geq \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon}$, then for any set s which was slack right before `FixLevel(e, l)` began, $\text{lev}(s)$ never increases during `FixLevel(e, l)`.*

Proof. Since s was slack, then $\omega(s) < c_s / (1 + \epsilon)$. Hence, right after $\text{ilev}(e)$ is assigned to $l \geq d$, we have

$$\omega(s) < \frac{c_s}{1 + \epsilon} + (1 + \epsilon)^{-l} \leq c_s$$

The last inequality holds since $l \geq d \geq \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon} \geq \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2}{\epsilon c_s} \geq \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon c_s}$.

During the algorithm, since $\omega(s)$ never increases, $\omega(s, \text{lev}(s) + 1) \leq c_s$ always holds. Hence, $\text{lev}(s)$ would not be raised during the algorithm. \square

Claim 4.5. *If any set s was tight before `FixLevel`, then s stays tight after the algorithm.*

Proof. There are three possibilities that $\omega(s)$ could decrease, so let us analyze them separately.

(i) Set s is currently rising in the while-loop.

If $k < \text{base}(s)$, then by Claim 4.1, when s is raised to level $\min\{\text{base}(s), \text{ilev}^{\text{old}}(e) - d\}$, all other weights of $\omega(e')$, $e' \in s \setminus \{e\}$ do not decrease. Hence, $\omega(s)$ does not decrease.

Next, we assume $k \geq \text{base}(s)$. Then, by the while-loop condition, $\omega(s, k+1) \geq c_s$. Therefore, after $\text{lev}(s)$ increases, its weight would be at least $\omega(s, k+1) - \epsilon\omega(e)/(1+\epsilon) \geq c_s/(1+\epsilon)$.

(ii) Set s is not currently rising in the while-loop, and weights $\omega(e')$ of some active elements $e' \neq e$ decrease during other instances of the while-loop.

If $e \notin s$, then the current value of $\omega(s)$ is correctly maintained by the algorithm. In this case, according to the algorithm, $\omega(s)$ would be compensated by the increase of $\phi(s)$ which preserves tightness.

If $e \in s$, $\phi(s)$ would increase by exactly the same amount as the decrease of $\omega(s)$ due to the decrease in $\omega(e')$, without checking further if $\omega^*(s) > c_s$; instead, Invariant 2.1(3) will be restored at the end.

(iii) Set s is not currently rising in the while-loop, and $\omega(e)$ decreases as $\text{ilev}(e)$ rises.

In this case, it must be $e \in s$. If $s \in F$, in the end of the algorithm, whenever $\omega(s)$ has decreased due to e , it would be compensated by an increase in $\phi(s)$. So in the end, its tightness is preserved.

Otherwise, if $s \notin F$, by definition we have $\omega(s) \leq c_s$ at the moment when e was assigned to intrinsic level l . Then, since $\omega(s)$ does not increase throughout the algorithm, it would never exceed c_s , so it never triggers the while-loop. Therefore, whenever $\omega(s)$ decreases due to some active elements $e' \neq e$, $\phi(s)$ would be compensated with exactly the same amount, so $\omega^*(s)$ remains the same. Therefore, $\omega^*(s) - \omega(e) = \omega^{\text{old}}(s) - \omega^{\text{old}}(e)$.

In the end, for $s \ni e$, $\omega^*(s)$ may decrease after updating the weight $\omega(s) \leftarrow \omega(s) - (1+\epsilon)^{-l_s} + \omega(e)$. By Claim 4.3, we know that $\omega(e) \geq \omega^{\text{old}}(e)$, so $\omega^*(s) \geq \omega^{\text{old}}(s) - \omega^{\text{old}}(e) + \omega(e) \geq \omega^{\text{old}}(s) \geq c_s/(1+\epsilon)$, which means s remains tight.

□

Next, let us turn to look at potentials. Consider any $s \ni e$ that enters the while-loop and a single iteration of the while-loop. We do not need to worry about the for-loop that scans all passive elements in $P_{k+1}(e) \setminus \{e\}$, since the processing time of each e' can be charged to the clearance of $\Phi(e')$. For the rest, we will only be concerned with other steps in this iteration. We will focus on the case where $k \geq \text{base}(s)$; if $k < \text{base}(s)$, we can decompose the jump of $\text{lev}(s)$ into multiple increments by 1, and repeat the same analysis.

The following inequality holds due to Invariant 2.1 before the execution of `FixLevel`.

Claim 4.6. $\omega(s) - \omega(e) - |A_k(s)| \cdot \epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} < c_s$.

Proof. As we have assumed, Invariant 2.1(1) held before, and the algorithm does not decrease any levels, we know that $\omega^{\text{old}}(s, k+1) \leq \omega^{\text{old}}(s, \text{lev}^{\text{old}}(s) + 1) < c_s$. Also, since the algorithm does not increase any weights except for $\omega(e)$ at the beginning, we can conclude that

$$\omega(s) - \omega(e) - |A_k(s)| \cdot \epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} \leq \omega^{\text{old}}(s, k+1) \leq \omega^{\text{old}}(s, \text{lev}^{\text{old}}(s) + 1) < c_s$$

□

Let $\omega^{\text{new}}(s), \Phi_{\text{up}}^{\text{new}}(s)$ be the weight and potential of s right after this iteration. If $\omega^{\text{new}}(s) < c_s$, then $\Phi_{\text{up}}^{\text{new}}(s) = 0$. So by the while-loop condition that $\omega(s, k+1) > c_s$, we know that the potential change is equal to

$$-\Phi_{\text{up}}(s) = -(\omega(s) - c_s) \cdot \alpha_k \leq -(\omega(s) - \omega(s, k+1)) \cdot \alpha_k \leq -|A_k(s)| \cdot \left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon} \right)$$

Otherwise, by the update rules, all elements on level k are raised to level $k+1$, and $\text{ilev}(e)$ increases by one. Hence, only the potential contributed by $e' \in s \setminus (A_k(s) \cup \{e\})$ would change. By Claim 4.6, the change $\Phi_{\text{up}}^{\text{new}}(s) - \Phi_{\text{up}}(s)$ would be

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\omega(s) - \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \omega(e) - \epsilon |A_k(s)| \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} - c_s \right) \cdot \alpha_{k+1} - (\omega(s) - c_s) \cdot \alpha_k \\ &= \left(\omega(s) - \omega(e) - |A_k(s)| \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{-k} - c_s \right) \cdot (\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k) \\ &= \left(\omega(s) - \omega(e) - |A_k(s)| \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{-k} - c_s \right) \cdot \epsilon \alpha_k \\ &\leq -|A_k(s)| \cdot \left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon} \right) \end{aligned}$$

How about the change to the down potential Φ_{down} due to changes of dead weights and the increase of $\text{lev}(s)$? By the algorithm, each element $e' \in A_k(s)$ increases each $\phi(s')$ by at most $\epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{-k-1}$. So the overall increase of dead weights for $s' \ni e$, except s , would be at most $(f-1)|A_k(s)| \cdot \epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{-k-1}$. As $\text{lev}(s') \leq \text{lev}(e') = k$, the total increase of down potential due to these sets would be bounded by

$$(f-1)|A_k(s)| \cdot \epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} \cdot \beta_k$$

Since $\phi(s) = 0$ in the beginning of the iteration, and we raised s to level $k+1$, the potential increase due to s is at most

$$|A_k(s)| \cdot \epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} \cdot \beta_{k+1} = (1+\epsilon)|A_k(s)| \cdot \epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} \cdot \beta_k$$

Combining everything together, and using the fact that $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the total increase of Φ_{down} would be bounded by

$$(f+\epsilon)|A_k(s)| \cdot \epsilon(1+\epsilon)^{-k-1} \cdot \beta_k \leq \frac{3}{4}|A_k(s)| \cdot \left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon} \right)$$

Claim 4.7. For any $s \ni e$, if $s \notin F$, then $\Phi_{\text{up}}(s) = 0$; otherwise if $s \in F$, the potential $\Phi_{\text{up}}(s) + \Phi_{\text{down}}(s)$ has increased by at most $3f\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2}\right) \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{-d}$.

Proof. If $s \notin F$, then according to the algorithm, $\omega^*(s) \leq c_s$ in the end as well, so $\Phi_{\text{up}}(s) = 0$.

If $s \in F$, at the beginning when e is moved to intrinsic level l , $\Phi_{\text{up}}(s)$ increases by at most

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\text{lev}(s)} \cdot \omega(e) &\leq f \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right) \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{\text{lev}(s)+1} \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(s)-d} \\ &= f \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right) \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{-d+1} \end{aligned}$$

In the end, after updating the value of $\omega(s)$, $\Phi_{\text{down}}(s)$ increases by at most

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\text{lev}(s)} \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{-l_s} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right) \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{\text{lev}(s)+1} \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(s)-d} \\ &< \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \right) \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{-d+1} \end{aligned}$$

Taking the sum and by $2(1 + \epsilon) < 3$, we conclude the proof. \square

Finally, since $\text{lev}(s)$ increases by one or jumps to $\text{base}(s)$ if $k < \text{base}(s)$, the lift potential $\Phi_{\text{lift}}(s)$ decreases by one as well. Taking a summation, the total decrease of Φ would be enough to pay for the runtime of this iteration which is $O(f|A_k(s)| + 1)$. To conclude, we have proved the following properties of `FixLevel`.

Lemma 4.1. *Subroutine `FixLevel`(e, l) preserves Invariant 2.1(1)(3). More importantly, the amortized cost (runtime + potential change) of `FixLevel`(e, l) is at most $3|F| \cdot \left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2} \right) \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{-d}$.*

4.4 Insertion

During `Insert`(e), if $F = \emptyset$ and $h > \text{lev}(e)$, then by minimality of h , we know that there exists $s \ni e$ such that $\omega(s) \geq \frac{1}{1+\epsilon}(\omega(s) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h+1}) > c_s/(1 + \epsilon)$. So s should be tight, and the new element e is still covered by T .

Now, suppose $F \neq \emptyset$ and $h = \text{lev}(e)$. If $\text{lev}(e) > 0$, then by Invariant 2.1(2), e is covered by a tight set. Otherwise, $\omega(e) = 1$, and thus any set containing s would have weight 1, so it is also tight.

For the potential increase in the above two cases, since $\omega(s) \leq c_s$ still holds after the insertion of e , the insertion does not increase the up potential; the increase of the passive potential is at most $f(\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$ for deterministic algorithm, and at most $f \log_{1+\epsilon}^*(\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$ for the randomized algorithm.

Next, let us consider the case where $F \neq \emptyset$. Take any $s \in F$, then before e was inserted, we have $\omega(s) > c_s - (1 + \epsilon)^{-l} > c_s - \frac{\epsilon}{2C} \geq c_s/(1 + \epsilon)$. Hence, all sets in F are tight before we invoke `FixLevel`. Therefore, by Claim 4.5, e should still be covered by tight sets in F after `Insert`(e) finishes. For the potential increase, we can apply Lemma 4.1 with the trivial bound $|F| \leq f$ as $d = \text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e) \geq \log_{1+\epsilon} f$, and obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *For any newly inserted element e , we have $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e) = \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil$. More importantly, the insertion of a new element (without rebuilding cost) takes $O(f)$ amortized time, and increases the total potential Φ by at most $\frac{3f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{3f \log C}{\epsilon^2}$.*

4.5 Rebuilding

As before, use super-script “old” to denote the values of the variables right before `Rebuild`(k) started. Similar to [BHNW21], we need to argue that when a `Rebuild`(k) is invoked, we have released a large amount of potential to compensate for the update time. The difference is that we only compare the potential against the size of $A_{\leq k}$, rather than $E_{\leq k}$.

Lemma 4.2 ([BHNW21]). *We have the following lower bound on the down-potential of $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$, depending on if $E_{\leq k}$ is empty and if $k > \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$.*

- If $E_{\leq k} \neq \emptyset$, then right before $\text{Rebuild}(k)$ has started, $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$ is at least:

$$\sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\} + \frac{f}{\epsilon^2} |A_{\leq k}| + \frac{f \log C}{\max\{\epsilon f, 2C\}}$$

Plus, if $E_{\leq k}$ contains active elements, then $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$ is at least:

$$\sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\} + \frac{f}{\epsilon^2} |A_{\leq k}| + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon}$$

- If $E_{\leq k} = \emptyset$ and $k > \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$, then the down-potential of $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$ is at least:

$$\sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon}$$

- If $E_{\leq k} = \emptyset$ and $k \leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$, then the down-potential of $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$ is at least:

$$\sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\}$$

Proof. Let us first deal with the case where $E_{\leq k} \neq \emptyset$. Take an arbitrary $t \in [k]$ where $E_t \neq \emptyset$, and take an arbitrary element $e_t \in E_t$. If e_t is active, then $\omega(e_t) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-t}$; otherwise, as $\text{ilev}(e_t) \leq \text{zlev}(e_t) + \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil$, we have

$$\omega(e_t) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{ilev}(e_t)} \geq \frac{1}{\max\{f, 2C/\epsilon\}} (1 + \epsilon)^{-t-1}$$

By definition of index k , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\leq k} &> \epsilon \cdot (c(T_{\leq k}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq k})) \\ \phi_{\leq i} &\leq \epsilon \cdot (c(T_{\leq i}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq i})), \forall 0 \leq i < k \end{aligned}$$

Using Abel transformation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k}) &= \sum_{i=0}^k \phi_i \cdot \beta_i = \beta_k \cdot \phi_{\leq k} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i) \cdot \phi_{\leq i} \\ &> \beta_k \cdot \epsilon \cdot (c(T_{\leq k}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq k})) - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i) \cdot \epsilon \cdot (c(T_{\leq i}) + f \cdot \omega(E_{\leq i})) \\ &= \epsilon \sum_{i=0}^k \beta_i \cdot c(T_i) + \epsilon f \cdot \sum_{i=0}^k \beta_i \cdot \omega(E_i) \\ &\geq \epsilon \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{s \in T_i} c_s \cdot \frac{(1 + \epsilon)^{i+1}}{\epsilon^3} + \epsilon f \cdot \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{e \in A_i} \omega(e) \cdot \frac{(1 + \epsilon)^{i+1}}{\epsilon^3} + \epsilon f \cdot \frac{\log C}{\epsilon^2} \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{t+1} \cdot \omega(e_t) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{s \in T_i} \frac{(1 + \epsilon)^{i - \text{base}(s)}}{\epsilon^2} + f \cdot \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{e \in A_i} (1 + \epsilon)^{-i} \cdot \frac{(1 + \epsilon)^{i+1}}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{f \log C}{\max\{\epsilon f, 2C\}} \\ &\geq \sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\} + \frac{f}{\epsilon^2} |A_{\leq k}| + \frac{f \log C}{\max\{\epsilon f, 2C\}} \end{aligned}$$

Note that if e_t is active, then the last additive term can be lower bounded by $\frac{\log C}{\epsilon}$.

Next, let us deal with the case where $E_{\leq k} = \emptyset$ and $k > \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$. By the definition of k , it must be $T_k \neq \emptyset$, so we can take an arbitrary tight set $s_k \in T_k$. Similar to the derivations above and by $E_{\leq k} = \emptyset$, we can prove:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k}) &= \sum_{i=0}^k \phi_i \cdot \beta_i = \beta_k \cdot \phi_{\leq k} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i) \cdot \phi_{\leq i} \\
&> \beta_k \cdot \epsilon \cdot c(T_{\leq k}) - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i) \cdot \epsilon \cdot c(T_{\leq i}) \\
&= \epsilon \sum_{i=0}^k \beta_i \cdot c(T_i) \geq \epsilon \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{s \in T_i} c_s \cdot \frac{(1+\epsilon)^{i+1}}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon} c_{s_k} \cdot (1+\epsilon)^{k+1} \\
&\geq \sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\} + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $E_{\leq k} = \emptyset$ and $k \leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$, then the derivations can be further simplified as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k}) &= \sum_{i=0}^k \phi_i \cdot \beta_i = \beta_k \cdot \phi_{\leq k} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i) \cdot \phi_{\leq i} \\
&> \beta_k \cdot \epsilon \cdot c(T_{\leq k}) - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i) \cdot \epsilon \cdot c(T_{\leq i}) \\
&= \epsilon \sum_{i=0}^k \beta_i \cdot c(T_i) \geq \epsilon \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{s \in T_i} c_s \cdot \frac{(1+\epsilon)^{i+1}}{\epsilon^3} \geq \sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\}
\end{aligned}$$

□

First consider the corner case when $E_{\leq k} = \emptyset$ and $k \leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$. In this case, the runtime of `Rebuild` is bounded by $O\left(\frac{\log C}{\epsilon}\right)$. In the main algorithm `DynamicSetCover`, the value of k in the while loop increases after every execution of `Rebuild(k)`, and so the total runtime contributed by this corner case for each element update is bounded by $O\left(\frac{\log^2 C}{\epsilon^2}\right) = O(f)$. As for the potential increase in this case, the increase of lift potentials is bounded by $\sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}^{\text{old}}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\}$ which can be charged to the release of $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$, according to Lemma 4.2.

For the rest, let us deal with the main case where $E_{\leq k} \neq \emptyset$ or $k > \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1$. Let us analyze the runtime of the `Rebuild(k)` step by step. The easier part is raising the levels of tight sets in $T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}$ and the levels of clean elements in $E_{\leq k} \setminus D$; the runtime of these steps is bounded by

$$O(|T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}| + f \cdot |\widehat{E}|)$$

According to Lemma 4.2, the runtime cost $|T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\leq \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}|$ can be charged to the elimination of down potential $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$; this is because the first term is at least:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s \in T_{\leq k}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\} &\geq \sum_{s \in T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}} \max\{\text{lev}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\} \\
&\geq \sum_{s \in T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}} 1 = |T_{\leq k} \setminus T_{\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1}|
\end{aligned}$$

The runtime cost $f \cdot |\widehat{E}|$ induced by active elements will also be charged to the elimination of $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$, while the part induced by passive elements can be charged to the clearance of their passive potentials. Finally, after invoking $\text{WaterFilling}(\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E})$, the runtime cost $O(f|\widehat{E}| + \widehat{k}) = O(f|\widehat{E}| + \frac{\log C}{\epsilon})$ which is already charged to the decrease of down-potentials, **except for the additive term** $O(\frac{\log C}{\epsilon})$.

In the meantime, we might have also increased the lift potentials of $s \in \widehat{U}$ by $\max\{\text{lev}^{\text{old}}(s) - \text{base}(s) + 1, 0\}$, where $\text{lev}^{\text{old}}(s)$ refers to the level of s right before $\text{Rebuild}(k)$ started. Fortunately, such potential increases can also be paid for by the second term of $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$ in Lemma 4.2.

Here are properties which are common for both deterministic and randomized algorithms.

Claim 4.8. *Assume $\text{zlev}(e) \leq \text{lev}(e) < \text{ilev}(e)$ for all passive elements before $\text{Rebuild}(k)$ started. Then, after Line 3, each set s that was in $T_{>k}$ before Line 3 is still tight.*

Proof. It suffices to argue that $\omega(s)$ is not changed by Line 3 if $s \in T_{>k}$ before Line 3. For each active element $e \in s$, its level $\text{lev}(e)$ was already larger than k even before Line 3, so $\omega(e)$ would not change. For each passive element $e \in s$, the value of $\omega(e)$ could only decrease in Line 3 if $\text{ilev}(e) \leq k$. Fortunately, this is impossible, as otherwise by definition of levels, we would have $k < \text{lev}(s) \leq \text{lev}(e) < \text{ilev}(e) \leq k$. □

Claim 4.9. *Any element $e \in D$ not added to \widehat{E} should contain a tight set.*

Proof. The statement is straightforward for deterministic algorithm. Let us mainly focus on the randomized algorithm.

If $F \neq \emptyset$, then $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + \delta > c_s$ for some $s \ni e$. In the former case, we have $\omega(s) - \omega(e) > c_s - \delta > c_s - \frac{\epsilon}{2C} > \frac{c_s}{1+\epsilon}$, which means s is tight before the execution of FixLevel . If FixLevel is called, then by Claim 4.5, s would still be tight afterwards.

Otherwise, e is assigned to the lowest intrinsic level $h > k + 1$ such that $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h} \leq c_s, \forall s \ni e$. In the latter case, by the minimality of h , there must exist $s \ni e$ such that $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h+1} > c_s$. Hence, $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h} \geq \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} (\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-h+1}) > \frac{c_s}{1+\epsilon}$, so s is also tight. □

Definition 4.1. *During $\text{Rebuild}(k)$, a slack set s is called necessary, if it currently contains some elements not covered by any tight set (sets in T); otherwise it is called unnecessary.*

Claim 4.10. *Right before $\text{WaterFilling}(\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E})$ is invoked, \widehat{U} contains all the necessary slack sets, and all necessary slack sets are on level $k + 1$.*

Proof. The statement is straightforward for deterministic algorithm. For the rest, let us mainly focus on the randomized algorithm.

By the algorithm description, if a slack set s contains some clean elements, then it joins U . If a slack set s contains a dirty element $e \in D$, let us consider the iteration that processes e . If flag is true in the pseudocode, then s would join U . Otherwise, by Claim 4.9, we know that e is already covered by T . Therefore, the only possibility that s does not join U is that all dirty elements in s are covered, and thus s is unnecessary. Finally, since FixLevel preserves the tightness condition of any set, we know that \widehat{U} should collect all the slack sets in the end.

Finally, we need to argue that all necessary slack sets are on level $k + 1$ right before we invoke $\text{WaterFilling}(\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E})$. There are multiple possibilities that a set s is added to U at some moment.

- s was in $T_{\leq k}$, or s was slack and $\text{lev}(s) = 0$.

In this case, from the description of the algorithm s would be first added to U and then moved to level $k+1$. We argue that its level will not rise during any instance of `FixLevel`; this is because $d \geq \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon}$ and by Claim 4.4, we know that $\text{lev}(s)$ stays unchanged.

- s was not in $T_{\leq k}$ and $\text{lev}(s) > k$.

In this case, by Invariant 2.1(2), s must be tight. Since tightness are preserved along the way, s would never join \widehat{U} .

□

Notice that at the beginning of `Rebuild(k)`, we have applied implicit zeroing for all levels $0 \leq i \leq \min\{\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} C \rceil + 1, k\}$. If a set s has been moved to level-0, the levels of some elements $e \in s$ might also need to change with it, and in turn we might also need to change $\omega(s)$. However, since s was moved to level-0 implicitly, the algorithm did not do anything with the levels of $e \in s$, nor update the weight $\omega(s)$. So we need to verify that such bad events would not happen.

Claim 4.11. *After `Rebuild(k)`, for any set s , the data structures $A_i(s)$, $P_i(s)$ and $\omega(s)$ are correctly maintained.*

Proof. For the deterministic algorithm, all elements e that were in $E_{\leq k}$ are visited, all sets $s \ni e$ are processed using $O(f)$ time. So, in the meantime we can spend the same time budget to maintain the data structures $A_i(s)$, $P_i(s)$ and $\omega(s)$ when $\text{ilev}(e)$ or $\text{lev}(e)$ changes.

For the randomized algorithm, we only need to worry about dirty elements $e \in D$, since for each clean element we have also spent $O(f)$ time enumerating their sets. If the for-loop on dirty element e enters the branching Line 23, then we will also enumerate all sets $s \ni e$, and so we have the time to update all the relevant data structures. Otherwise, $\text{ilev}(e)$ would not change at all, so there would be no changes to $A_i(s)$, $P_i(s)$, $\omega(s)$, $\forall s \ni e$. □

Deterministic rebuilding. The analysis of the deterministic algorithm is easier because we have the time budget to go through all dirty element e and enumerate its sets $s \ni e$. This part takes time $O(f|D|)$. Then, we can show that either e is activated and added to \widehat{E} , or one of its sets $s \ni e$ become tight. In the latter case, since $\text{lev}(s) = k+1$ and s is tight, it does not participate in the later subroutine `WaterFilling`. Hence, the passive potential $\Phi(e)$ has decreased by f as the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ has decreased by at least one. Therefore, the total runtime charged to passive edge e would be $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon} f \log f)$.

For the additive term $O\left(\frac{\log C}{\epsilon}\right)$ in the runtime bound of `WaterFilling($\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E}$)`, we can charge it to the decrease of some gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{lev}(e)$ which releases $f > \frac{\log C}{\epsilon}$ units of passive potentials. If all elements in $E_{\leq k}$ were active, then the potential lower bound from Lemma 4.2 can also pay for this additive term.

Together with insertion and deletion operations, the amortized update time would be bounded by $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} f \log f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2}\right)$.

Randomized rebuilding. For the randomized setting, we can assume $C \leq \epsilon f$; otherwise the deterministic runtime is already better. Then, according to Lemma 4.2, the last term $O\left(\frac{\log C}{\epsilon}\right)$ in the runtime of `WaterFilling($\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E}$)` can be charged to the potential decrease of $\Phi_{\text{down}}(T_{\leq k})$, as the last term $\frac{f \log C}{\max\{\epsilon f, 2C\}}$ is at least $\frac{\log C}{2\epsilon}$.

We first show that the algorithm produces a valid set cover T for \mathcal{U} . Indeed, by Claim 4.9 and Claim 4.10, the set \widehat{E} contains all elements that do not contain any tight sets, and \widehat{U} contains all the necessary slack sets. Then, due to Lemma 3.1, all properties in Invariant 2.1 will be restored, and so T is a set cover for \mathcal{U} .

To analyze the runtime, let us begin with basic properties of the algorithm.

Claim 4.12. *For any passive element e , the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ never increases, and $\text{zlev}(e) \leq \text{lev}(e) < \text{ilev}(e)$.*

Proof. The first half of the statement can be verified from the algorithm description of subroutine Rebuild and the fact that this gap never increases during subroutine FixLevel.

For the inequality $\text{lev}(e) < \text{ilev}(e)$, first assume it held before the execution of Rebuild(k). If $\text{ilev}(e) \leq k + 1$ before the execution of Rebuild(k), then it would be activated. Otherwise, if $\text{ilev}(e) > k + 1$, then raising sets in $T_{\leq k}$ to level $k + 1$ would not violate $\text{ilev}(e) > \text{lev}(e)$. During the executions of FixLevel, as we have proved in Claim 4.2, property $\text{zlev}(e) \leq \text{lev}(e) < \text{ilev}(e)$ is also preserved.

Finally, let us check the inequality $\text{zlev}(e) \leq \text{lev}(e)$. There are some possibilities depending on the execution of Algorithm 5.

- Flag is false.

In this case, as we have proved in Claim 4.9, we have found a set tight $s \ni e$. Then we would set $\text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow \text{lev}(s)$. After that, since subroutine FixLevel preserves tightness, s can never join \widehat{U} , and so $\text{lev}(s)$ cannot decrease afterwards due to WaterFilling($\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E}$). Therefore, in the end of the algorithm, we have $\text{lev}(e) \geq \text{lev}(s) \geq \text{zlev}(e)$.

- Flag is true and $\widehat{F} \neq \emptyset$.

In this case, we would scan all sets $s \ni e$, raise each $\text{lev}(s)$ to $\max\{\text{lev}(s), k + 1\}$, and set $\text{zlev}(e) \leftarrow \text{lev}(e)$. As we have proved in Claim 4.9, as $\widehat{F} \neq \emptyset$, e is currently contained in a tight set. Pick a tight set $s \ni e$ such that $\text{lev}(s)$ is maximized. Since all slack sets have levels at most $k + 1$, as proved in Claim 4.10, we know that $\text{lev}(s)$ must equal to $\text{lev}(e)$, thus also equal to $\text{zlev}(e)$ at the moment.

After that, since subroutine FixLevel preserves tightness, s can never join \widehat{U} , and so $\text{lev}(s)$ cannot decrease afterwards due to WaterFilling($\widehat{k}, \widehat{U}, \widehat{E}$). Therefore, in the end of the algorithm, we have $\text{lev}(e) \geq \text{lev}(s) \geq \text{zlev}(e)$.

- Flag is true and $\widehat{F} = \emptyset$.

We only need to worry about the case $h > k + 1$, since otherwise e would be activated. In this case, if $\text{lev}(e) > k + 1$, then by Claim 4.10, e is contained in a tight set s on level $> k + 1$. Since all sets in \widehat{U} are on level $k + 1$, $\text{lev}(s)$ will not drop later on.

If $\text{lev}(e) = k + 1$, then e is contained in a tight set s on level $k + 1$ after the assignment $\text{ilev}(e) \leftarrow h$. Since all sets in \widehat{U} are on level $k + 1$, $\text{lev}(s)$ will not drop later on.

□

Claim 4.13. *For any $e \in D$, after the execution of Rebuild(k), either e becomes active, or the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ decreases by at least one.*

Proof. At the beginning of Rebuild(k), we know that $\text{zlev}(e) \leq k$. Later on, e will be raised to level $\geq k + 1$, so $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ has strictly decreased. Afterwards, it will become activated or enter an instance of FixLevel; in both cases, the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ does not increase. This concludes the proof. □

Now, we are able to bound the total time spent on steps excluding `FixLevel`.

Claim 4.14. *For any e passive elements whose gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ is at least $1 + 2 \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon}$, before the value of $(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^*(\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$ decreases, the total time it spends on steps in `Rebuild` is bounded by $O(f)$ in expectation.*

Proof. Suppose e enters the branching on Line 26 or Line 34 at some point before $\log_{1+\epsilon}^*(\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$ decreases. Then, after this instance of `Rebuild(k)`, by the algorithm description of `FixLevel`, the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ would be at most

$$\left\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max \left\{ \left((5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^4, \left(\frac{2C}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \right\} \right\rceil \leq \max \left\{ (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta+1)} f, 1 + 2 \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon} \right\}$$

If the gap gets below $1 + 2 \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon}$, then due to Claim 4.13, e will be processed by `Rebuild` for at most $O(\log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon})$ times. Therefore, for the rest, the total time charged to e would be at most $O(\frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2})$ before e gets activated or deleted.

Otherwise, the gap is at most $(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta+1)} f$. Therefore, by Claim 4.13, after being processed this instance of `Rebuild`, we have charged e with total runtime $O(f)$ while decreasing the value of $(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^*(\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$ by one.

For the rest, let us assume e never enters those two branches before $(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^*(\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$ decreases. Hence, for the rest, we only need to bound the time on random sampling and the branching where $|\widehat{F}| > \left((5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^2$. Each time e becomes a dirty element in an instance of `Rebuild(k)`, the algorithm spends $O\left(f / (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f\right)$ time in the random sampling step. If $|\widehat{F}| > \left((5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^2$, then we will spend additional time $O(f)$ in this branch. However, in this case, the probability that the random testing fails (flag is true) would be at most

$$\left(1 - |\widehat{F}|/f\right)^{50 \cdot \lceil f / (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \rceil} \leq \left(\frac{1}{e}\right)^{10(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f} \leq \frac{1}{(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta-1)} f}$$

Therefore, the expected time cost of this part is $O(f / (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta-1)} f)$.

Take a sum of both parts, since the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ is at most $\left\lceil (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right\rceil$ at the beginning, and it decreases by at least one, the total time would be

$$O\left(\frac{f}{(5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f} \cdot (5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f\right) = O(f)$$

□

Corollary 4.2. *The amortized expected total time spent on each passive element e in subroutine `Rebuild` is $O\left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log^* f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log C\right)$.*

Proof. By Claim 4.14, what remains is to analyze the amortized cost of `FixLevel` invoked within `Rebuild`. Consider any instance of `FixLevel(e, l)`, and let F be the set defined within `FixLevel(e, l)`. By definition, we know F is the set of all sets $s \ni e$ such that $\omega(s) - \omega(e) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{zlev}(e)-d} > c_s$. Since $\text{zlev}(e) \geq k + 1$, we know that $F \subseteq \widehat{F}$. Therefore, according to Lemma 4.1, the amortized cost of `FixLevel` is bounded by

$$3|\widehat{F}| \cdot \left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2}\right) \cdot (1 + \epsilon)^{-d} \leq 3 \left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2}\right) / \frac{2C}{\epsilon} < 6f/\epsilon^2$$

This is because in this case $|\widehat{F}| \leq \left((5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^2$ and $d = \left\lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max \left\{ \left((5 \log)_{1+\epsilon}^{(\eta)} f \right)^4, \left(\frac{2C}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \right\} \right\rceil$.

According to Claim 4.14, when the gap $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ is at least $1 + 2 \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{2C}{\epsilon}$, the algorithm spends $O(f/\epsilon^3)$ amortized time before η decreases. After that, $\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e)$ decreases each time the algorithm spends $O(f/\epsilon^2)$ amortized time for each e during Rebuild. Since the value $\log^*(\text{ilev}(e) - \text{zlev}(e))$ can decrease for at most $\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log^* f$ times, the overall amortized update time spent on e is $O\left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log^* f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log C\right)$. \square

4.6 Total runtime

To conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1, let $\lambda \in \{\lambda_{\text{rand}}, \lambda_{\text{det}}\}$ be the upper bound on the amortized update time, where $\lambda_{\text{rand}} = \Theta\left(\frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log^* f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} \log C\right)$, and $\lambda_{\text{det}} = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} f \log f + \frac{f}{\epsilon^3} + \frac{f \log C}{\epsilon^2}\right)$ for the deterministic algorithm. Let Γ be the total number of element updates. Without loss of generality, we can assume that at the end of the update sequence, we have $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$; otherwise, we can add Γ artificial deletions which does not change the asymptotic runtime bound.

- **Preprocessing.** Initially $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$, and all sets are slack and on level 0.

If the algorithm is deterministic, then for each $0 \leq i \leq L$, initialize pointers to (currently empty) sets $E_i(s), A_i(s), P_i(s)$ and store them in a random-accessible array. This takes $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon} m \log(Cn))$ time and space.

If the algorithm is randomized, then initialize randomized dynamic hash tables to store pointers to (currently empty) sets $E_i(s), A_i(s), P_i(s)$ [DKM⁺94]. This takes time $O(m)$.

- **Updates.** As we have proved in previous subsections, for each update, the amortized update time is bounded as $\Delta\Phi + \text{runtime} \leq \lambda$.

Let Φ^{init} be the total potential at the beginning, and let Φ^{end} be the total potential at the end. Taking the summation of the preprocessing procedure and all updates, the total update time is bounded asymptotically by $\Gamma \cdot \lambda + \Phi^{\text{init}} - \Phi^{\text{end}}$. Since \mathcal{U} is empty both at the beginning and at the end, we have $\Phi^{\text{init}} = \Phi^{\text{end}}$, which finalizes the proof. Some of the notations used in this paper is summarized in Table 2.

References

- [AAG⁺19] Amir Abboud, Raghavendra Addanki, Fabrizio Grandoni, Debmalya Panigrahi, and Barna Saha. Dynamic set cover: improved algorithms and lower bounds. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 114–125, 2019.
- [AS21] Sepehr Assadi and Shay Solomon. Fully dynamic set cover via hypergraph maximal matching: An optimal approximation through a local approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.06889*, 2021.
- [BCH17] Sayan Bhattacharya, Deeparnab Chakrabarty, and Monika Henzinger. Deterministic fully dynamic approximate vertex cover and fractional matching in $O(1)$ amortized update time. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization: 19th International Conference, IPCO 2017, Waterloo, ON, Canada, June 26-28, 2017, Proceedings*, pages 86–98. Springer, 2017.

Notation	Definition
$\omega(e)$	The weight of element $e \in \mathcal{U}$. $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{ilev}(e)}$.
$\omega(s)$	The total weight of set $s \in \mathcal{S}$. $\omega(s) = \sum_{e \in s} \omega(e)$.
$\phi(s)$	The dead weight of set $s \in \mathcal{S}$.
ϕ	The total dead weight. $\phi = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \phi(s)$.
ϕ_i	The total dead weight of sets on level i . $\phi_i = \sum_{s, \text{lev}(s)=i} \phi(s)$.
$\phi_{\leq i}$	The total dead weight of sets on level i and below. $\phi_{\leq i} = \sum_{s, \text{lev}(s) \leq i} \phi(s)$.
$\omega^*(s)$	The composite weight of $s \in \mathcal{S}$. $\omega^*(s) = \omega(s) + \phi(s)$.
$\omega(i, s)$	The weight of set $s \in \mathcal{S}$ at level i . It is the weight of s if it were raised to level i . $\omega(s, i) = \sum_{e \in s} \min \left\{ \omega(e), (1 + \epsilon)^{-\max\{i, \max_{t \in s} \text{lev}(t)\}} \right\}$.
L	The maximum level of a set, i.e. each set is assigned a level $\text{lev}(s) \in [L]$. $L = \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon}(Cn) \rceil + 1$.
Tight set	A set $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is tight if $\omega^*(s) \geq \frac{c_s}{1+\epsilon}$.
Slack set	A set $s \in \mathcal{S}$ which is not tight, i.e. $\omega^*(s) < \frac{c_s}{1+\epsilon}$.
T	The collection of all tight sets.
T_i	The collection of all tight sets at level i , i.e. a collection of $s \in T$ such that $\text{lev}(s) = i$
$\text{lev}(s)$	The level of set $s \in \mathcal{S}$. $\text{lev}(s) \in [L]$.
$\text{lev}(e)$	The level of element $e \in \mathcal{U}$. $\text{lev}(e) = \max_{s \ni e} \{\text{lev}(s)\}$.
$\text{zlev}(e)$	The lazy level of element $e \in \mathcal{U}$. $\text{zlev}(e) \leq \text{lev}(e)$.
$\text{ilev}(e)$	The intrinsic level of element $e \in \mathcal{U}$. $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{ilev}(e)}$ and $\text{lev}(e) < \text{ilev}(e) \leq \text{zlev}(e) + \lceil \log_{1+\epsilon} \max\{f, \frac{2C}{\epsilon}\} \rceil$.
$\text{base}(s)$	The base level of set $s \in \mathcal{S}$. $\text{base}(s) = \lfloor \log_{1+\epsilon} 1/c_s \rfloor$.
Active element	If an element e is active, then the value $\text{lev}(e)$ is correctly maintained (i.e. $\text{zlev}(e) = \text{lev}(e)$), and $\omega(e) = (1 + \epsilon)^{-\text{lev}(e)}$.
Passive element	If an element e is passive, for which a lazy level $\text{zlev}(e) \leq \text{lev}(e)$ and an intrinsic level $\text{ilev}(e)$ are maintained.
A	The set of active elements.
P	The set of passive elements.
A_i	The set of all active element of level i , i.e. all $e \in A$, such that $\text{lev}(e) = i$
P_i	The set of passive elements of intrinsic level i , i.e. all $e \in P$, such that $\text{ilev}(e) = i$.
$A_i(s), P_i(s)$	$A_i \cap s$ and $P_i \cap s$ respectively.
E_i	The set of active elements e such that $\text{lev}(e) = i$, together with passive elements e such that $\text{zlev}(e) = i$.
$A_{\leq i}, P_{\leq i}, E_{\leq i}, T_{\leq i}$	$A_{\leq i} = \bigcup_{k=0}^i A_k$. The rest are defined similarly.
Dirty element	During a rebuild on a level k an element $e \in E_{\leq k}$ is called dirty, if e is passive and $\text{ilev}(e) > k + 1$.
Clean element	During a rebuild on a level k an element is clean if it is not dirty.

Table 2: Some of the notations used in this paper.

- [BHI15] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Giuseppe F Italiano. Design of dynamic algorithms via primal-dual method. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming: 42nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, pages 206–218. Springer, 2015.
- [BHN19] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, and Danupon Nanongkai. A new deterministic algorithm for dynamic set cover. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 406–423. IEEE, 2019.
- [BHNW21] Sayan Bhattacharya, Monika Henzinger, Danupon Nanongkai, and Xiaowei Wu. Dynamic set cover: Improved amortized and worst-case update time. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2537–2549. SIAM, 2021.
- [BK19] Sayan Bhattacharya and Janardhan Kulkarni. Deterministically Maintaining a $(2 + \epsilon)$ -Approximate Minimum Vertex Cover in $O(1/\epsilon^2)$ Amortized Update Time. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1872–1885. SIAM, 2019.
- [DKM⁺94] Martin Dietzfelbinger, Anna Karlin, Kurt Mehlhorn, Friedhelm Meyer Auf Der Heide, Hans Rohnert, and Robert E Tarjan. Dynamic perfect hashing: Upper and lower bounds. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 23(4):738–761, 1994.
- [DS14] Irit Dinur and David Steurer. Analytical approach to parallel repetition. In *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 624–633, 2014.
- [GKKP17] Anupam Gupta, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, Amit Kumar, and Debmalya Panigrahi. Online and dynamic algorithms for set cover. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 537–550, 2017.
- [KR08] Subhash Khot and Oded Regev. Vertex cover might be hard to approximate to within $2 - \epsilon$. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 74(3):335–349, 2008.
- [SU23] Shay Solomon and Amitai Uzzad. Dynamic $((1 + \epsilon) \ln n)$ -Approximation Algorithms for Minimum Set Cover and Dominating Set. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1187–1200, 2023.
- [WS11] David P Williamson and David B Shmoys. *The design of approximation algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2011.