

Nearly Optimal Fault Tolerant Distance Oracle

Dipan Dey
IIT Gandhinagar
Gandhinagar
India
dey_dipan@iitgn.ac.in

Manoj Gupta
IIT Gandhinagar
Gandhinagar
India
gmanoj@iitgn.ac.in

Abstract

We present an f -fault tolerant distance oracle for an undirected weighted graph where each edge has an integral weight from $[1 \dots W]$. Given a set F of f edges, as well as a source node s and a destination node t , our oracle returns the *shortest path* from s to t avoiding F in $O((cf \log(nW))^{O(f^2)})$ time, where $c > 1$ is a constant. The space complexity of our oracle is $O(f^4 n^2 \log^2(nW))$. For a constant f , our oracle is nearly optimal both in terms of space and time (barring some logarithmic factor).

1 Introduction

In real-life networks, which can be represented as graphs, determining the distance between any two vertices is often necessary. This problem is commonly known as the “all-pair shortest path” problem in the literature. In the data structure version of this problem, the goal is to preprocess the graph to answer distance queries between any two vertices efficiently.

QUERY(s, t): Find the weight of the shortest path from s to t .

For unweighted graphs, the shortest path between all pairs of vertices can be found using the breadth-first search (BFS) algorithm, and the information can be stored in $O(n^2)$ space. The query time is $O(1)$. In the case of weighted graphs, there is extensive research on all-pair shortest path algorithms [Flo67, War62, Fre76, Dob90, Tak92, Han04, Tak04, Zwi04, Tak05, Cha05, Han06, Cha07, Han08, Cha08, Wil14]. Using the state-of-the-art algorithm, we can construct a data structure of size $O(n^2)$ with $O(1)$ query time.

However, real-life networks are prone to failures. Thus, we need to find the distance between vertices, avoiding certain edges or vertices, known as faults in the literature. This paper focuses on edge faults. Let’s formally define the problem. We are given an undirected weighted graph G . We can preprocess G and construct some suitable data structures. These data structures are used to answer queries of the form:

QUERY(s, t, F): Find the shortest path (and its weight) from s to t avoiding the edge set F .

The algorithm that handles the aforementioned query is known as the query algorithm. It utilises the prepared data structures to respond to the query. This combination of data structures and the query algorithm is referred to as a *distance oracle* in the literature. Since we are dealing with faults, our oracle is known as *f -fault-tolerant distance oracle* when $|F| \leq f$. A fault-tolerant distance oracle is evaluated

based on its size, query time (the time required to answer a query), and the number of faults it can handle, i.e., the maximum size of F . In a naive approach, we could store all distances, avoiding all possible faults and return the distance upon query. However, this would consume significant space, albeit with a small query time. Hence, the primary research challenge in this field is to reduce the space while not significantly increasing the query time.

Faults	Space	Query time	Remarks	Reference
1	$\tilde{O}(n^2)$	$O(1)$	\tilde{O} hides polylog n factor.	[DTCR08]
2	$\tilde{O}(n^2)$	$O(\log n)$	-	[DP09]
f	$\tilde{O}(n^{3-\alpha})$	$\tilde{O}(n^{2-(1-\alpha)/f})$	$\alpha \in [0, 1]$ when the preprocessing time is $O(Wn^{3.376-\alpha})$ and edge weights are integral and in the range $[-W \dots W]$.	[WY13]
f	$\tilde{O}(Wn^{2+\alpha})$	$O(Wn^{2-\alpha}f^2 + Wnf^\omega)$	$\alpha \in [0, 1]$, edge weights are integral and in the range $[-W \dots W]$ and ω is the matrix multiplication exponent [CW87, Sto10, Wil12, Gal14, AW21]	[vdBS19]
f	$O(n^4)$	$O(f^{O(f)})$	-	[DR22]
f	$O(n^2)$	$\tilde{O}(nf)$	Edge weights are in the range $[1 \dots W]$	[KS23]

Table 1: Relevant results for fault-tolerant distance oracle

We summarise relevant results in this area in [Table 1](#). When $f = 1$, the oracle presented in [DTCR08] is optimal. For $f = 2$, Duan and Pettie [DP09] designed a nearly optimal distance oracle (barring some polylog n factor). However, for $f > 2$, our understanding of this problem is limited. The results can be categorised into two groups: those with high query time but low space [WY13, vdBS19, KS23], and those with low query time but high space [DR22]. An important question in this field is to develop an oracle that minimises both space (as in [KS23]) and query time (as in [DR22]). In fact, this question is explicitly raised in [DR22], and we quote it here (with minor notation changes).

“Problem 1: Fix a large constant f . Is there an f -failure oracle for handling exact distance queries in undirected graphs with query time $\text{poly}(\log n, \log W)$ and a reasonable size bound?”[DR22]

We answer this question in the affirmative. The main result of our paper is:

Theorem 1.1. *There is an f -fault-tolerant distance oracle that takes $O(f^4 n^2 \log(nW))$ space and has a query time of $O(c^{(f+1)^2} f^{8(f+1)^2} \log^{2(f+1)^2}(nW))$, where $c > 1$ is a constant. Moreover, the oracle returns a path in $(f + 1)$ -decomposable form.*

In the above theorem, we have used the term “ $(f + 1)$ -decomposable form”. We will describe this term now without delving into technical details. Most of the existing fault-tolerant distance oracles return the weight of the shortest path, not the path itself. If they do return the shortest path, their query time becomes $\Omega(n)$. However, our algorithm returns the shortest path while avoiding F in $o(n)$ time. One might wonder if the output size could be as large as $O(n)$, how can we claim a query time independent of n . We will demonstrate that the shortest path from s to t , avoiding F , can be represented in a suitable form of size $O(f)$. This form is termed as $(f + 1)$ -decomposable form. We will formally define this term in [Section 2](#).

For a fixed f , compared to [DR22], our oracle has better space and compared to [WY13, vdBS19, KS23], it has a better query time. In fact, for a fixed f , our oracle is nearly optimal both in terms of space and time (barring some polylog(nW) factor). Also note that the results in [vdBS19, KS23] have a linear dependency on W in terms of space and/or query time, while our result has a polylog dependency on W . One drawback of our result compared to [WY13, vdBS19] is that it works for graphs with weights $[1 \dots W]$ as opposed to $[-W \dots W]$. Another drawback is that the preprocessing time (approximately $\Omega(n^f)$) of our oracle is huge.

1.1 Related works

Single fault tolerant distance oracle, $f = 1$: Demetrescu et al. [DTCR08] designed a single fault tolerant distance oracle in $O(mn^2 + n^3 \log n)$ construction/preprocessing time (the time required to construct the oracle before taking any query) with $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ space and $O(1)$ query time. Bernstein and Karger [BK08] improved the preprocessing time to $\tilde{O}(n^2 \sqrt{m})$ and later to $\tilde{O}(mn)$ time in [BK09a]. The preprocessing times of the above results are $\Omega(n^3)$. Grandoni and Williams [GW19] designed the first single fault tolerant distance oracle with subcubic preprocessing time and sublinear query time. Chechik and Cohen [CC20] kept the preprocessing time as subcubic but improved the query time to $\tilde{O}(1)$. After that, Gu and Ren [GR21] constructed a single fault tolerant distance oracle with $O(n^{2.6146}M)$ preprocessing time and constant query time where M is the maximum edge weight.

Fault tolerant approximate distance oracle: Another direction of work is approximate fault tolerant distance oracle. Here, instead of reporting the exact distance, the oracle returns the approximate distance between two vertices in the presence of faults. Baswana and Khanna [BK13] designed $(2k - 1)(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation distance oracle with $O(kn^{1+1/k} \log^3 n / \epsilon^4)$ (where $k > 1$). For multiple faults, Chechik et al. [CCFK17] designed a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate distance oracle which handled upto $f = o(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n})$ many faults. However, their algorithm had a super quadratic space requirement. Later, Bilò et al. [BCC⁺23] designed a $(3 + \epsilon)$ -approximate distance oracle in sub-quadratic space and sublinear query time.

2 Preliminaries

We are given an undirected weighted graph G where the weight of an edge is integral and is in the range $[1 \dots W]$. For an edge e , $w(e)$ denotes the weight of e . The notation st represents the shortest path from vertex s to vertex t , and $|st|$ denotes its weight. For an edge $e = (u, v)$, $|se|$ is defined as the minimum of $|su|$ and $|sv|$. Let P be an arbitrary path from s to t . We write $P[s, t]$ to indicate that the path starts from s and ends at t . $P[t, s]$ is defined symmetrically. When considering an arbitrary path P , in which vertex u appears before vertex v , $P[u, v]$ refers to the subpath from u to v , and $|P[u, v]|$ represents its weight. Given two paths $P[u, v]$ and $Q[v, w]$, $P \odot Q$ is the concatenation of P with Q . The notation $st \diamond F$ denotes the shortest path from s to t , avoiding a set of edges F , and $|st \diamond F|$ corresponds to its weight. For an edge $e = (u, v)$, $se \diamond F := \arg \min\{|su \diamond F|, |sv \diamond F|\}$ and $es \diamond F := \arg \min\{|us \diamond F|, |vs \diamond F|\}$. $V(F)$ denotes the set of vertices with endpoints in F . For any path P , $(P)_2 := 2^{\lceil \log |P| \rceil}$.

We will assume that the shortest path between any two vertices in the graph is unique, even under edge failures. Uniqueness can be achieved by adding suitable small weights to each edge (e.g., see [PP13]) – we can perturb the edge weights such that any two paths between a pair of vertices have different weights. This approach has also been used in [BK09b, HS01, GS18, DR22].

For any vertex s , T_s denotes the shortest path tree from s . $T_s(x)$ represents the subtree rooted at node x in T_s . For each s , we will store T_s . This takes $O(n^2)$ space for all the vertices in the graph. After constructing T_s , we can preprocess it such that it takes $O(1)$ time to find the shortest path from s to any other vertex in the graph.

For each $0 \leq i \leq \log(nW)$, we will find the first vertex on the st path that is at a distance $\geq 2^i$ from s . We can pre-process T_s to store this information for every $t \in G$. This additional data structure takes $O(n^2 \log(nW))$ space over all shortest path trees. Thus, we will assume that we can find the first vertex that is at a distance $\geq 2^i$ on the st path in $O(1)$ time.

We can extend the above approach to find the 2^i -th vertex not only on a single path but on a collection of shortest paths. To this end, we define the following:

Definition 2.1. A path is termed f -decomposable if it is a concatenation of at most f shortest paths interleaved with at most $f - 1$ edges.

The shortest path in the graph is 1-decomposable. If a path P is f -decomposable, then it can be represented as $L_1 \odot e_1 \odot L_2 \odot e_2 \odot \dots \odot e_{k-1} \odot L_k$ where each L_i is a shortest path and $k \leq f$. Also, the interleaving edges may or may not exist. Thus, each e_i is either an edge or may be empty. It takes only $O(f)$ space to represent P in the above form, making it easy to process. In our algorithms, we will always output paths in the above form. Let us define one more term to formalise this notion:

Definition 2.2. If a path P is represented as $L_1 \odot e_1 \odot L_2 \odot e_2 \odot \dots \odot e_{k-1} \odot L_k$, where each L_i (where $1 \leq i \leq k$) is a shortest path, each e_i is either empty or is an edge and $f \geq k$, then we say that P is in an f -decomposable form.

If P is in f -decomposable form, it becomes easy to process it, as can be seen from the next lemma:

Lemma 2.3. Let $P[s, t]$ be a path in f -decomposable form. Then, the first vertex at a distance $\geq 2^i$ from s on P can be found in $O(f + \log(nW))$ time, where $0 \leq i \leq \log nW$.

This is an easy algorithmic problem, and we prove it in the appendix.

3 Overview

We begin with a fundamental result in this field.

Theorem 3.1. ([ABK⁺02, Theorem 2]) Let G be an undirected weighted graph. For any $F \in E^f$, $st \diamond F$ is $(f + 1)$ -decomposable.

Consequently, $st \diamond F$ contains at most $f + 1$ segments, each of which is a shortest path.

Definition 3.2. (Intermediate vertex) A vertex $x \in st \diamond F$ is called an intermediate vertex if it does not lie on the first and last segment of $st \diamond F$.

A straightforward strategy for finding $st \diamond F$ is to first locate an intermediate vertex x on it and then recursively search for $sx \diamond F$ and $xt \diamond F$. Both $sx \diamond F$, $xt \diamond F$ are f -decomposable, reducing the problem to a smaller subproblem. The key challenge is finding an intermediate vertex. But how to find x if you don't even know $st \diamond F$? To solve this, we will try to find a "hitting set" H that will satisfy two properties:

- (I) The size of H is polynomial in f .
- (II) There exists a vertex in H that lies on $st \diamond F$ and serves as an intermediate vertex.

There is a simple hitting set that satisfies (I) but only partially satisfies (II). Consider a set of edges F^* of size f whose removal maximises the distance between s and t . We can show that either (i) $st \diamond F^* = st \diamond F$ or (ii) an edge of F^* lies on the path $st \diamond F$. In case (i), the answer is essentially the same as the output of the maximiser. However, in case (ii), we find a small set $V(F^*)$ of size $O(f)$ that intersects $st \diamond F$. Unfortunately, this set may include vertices from the first or last segments of $st \diamond F$, making this maximiser less useful.

In [DR22], Ren and Duan developed an algorithm that uses different maximisers. Using these maximisers, they identify a "hitting set" H of size $O(f^3)$ containing an intermediate vertex. Although we won't delve into their approach in detail, their maximiser has size $O(n^4)$, and it is not clear how to reduce this space.

3.1 A new approach

In this section, we describe our approach for handling a single fault in an unweighted graph. Let $R = st \diamond e$, where $e = (u, v)$. We assume vertex u is closer to s along the st path. The path R deviates from the st path at p and merges back at q (refer to [Figure 1](#)). The detour of R is the path between p and q on R , or $R[p, q]$.




Figure 1: X is the set of green vertices and Y is the set of blue vertices. x satisfies (a) and y satisfies (b).

We ask the following question: can we find vertices $x, y \in R$ such that

- (a) If u is the nearest vertex of $V(F)$ from x , then $|xp| < (xu)_2$, and
- (b) If v is the nearest vertex of $V(F)$ from y , then $|yq| < (yv)_2$

Intuitively, x is closer to p than the nearest faulty edge. Similarly, y is closer to q than the nearest faulty edge. We will see later that we can design maximisers using x and y , such that the output of the maximiser not only hits R but also the detour of R . This increases our chances of finding an intermediate vertex. However, the challenge is finding x and y when we don't know R , p , and q .

For one fault, we will construct a small set X and Y that contains x and y , respectively. Let $X = \{x_1 = s, x_2, \dots, x_k = u\}$ be vertices on st path, where the distance between x_{i-1} and x_i is $(x_{i-1}u)_2$. For instance, if $|su| = 2^\ell - 1$, $x_1 = s$, x_2 is at a distance $2^{\ell-1}$ from x_1 , x_3 is at a distance $2^{\ell-2}$ from x_2 and so on. Similarly, we create sequence $Y = \{y_1 = t, y_2, \dots\}$ on the ts path, with distances between y_{i-1} and y_i equal to $(y_{i-1}v)_2$. Both sequences are of length $O(\log n)$.

Consider a vertex $x \in X$ just before p on the st path. If $|xp| \geq (xu)_2$, then there exists another vertex of X between x and p on st path, a contradiction. So $|xp| < (xu)_2$ and we satisfy (a). Similarly, let $y \in Y$ be the vertex just before q on the ts path. Again, $|yq| < (yv)_2$. Also, R passes through both x and y . Thus, we satisfy (a) and (b) and $R = sx \odot xy \diamond e \odot yt$. In [Section 6](#), we demonstrate that it's straightforward to find $xy \diamond e$ using the following maximiser:

$$\mathbb{D}(x, y, d_1 = (xu)_2, d_2 = (yv)_2) = \arg \max_{e^* \in E} \left\{ |xy \diamond e^*| \text{ such that } |xe^*| \geq d_1 \text{ and } |ye^*| \geq d_2 \right\}$$

As we don't know x and y in advance, we try all possible pairs in $X \times Y$. Consequently, the time complexity of our algorithm is $O(\log^2 n)$. Also, the size of our maximiser is $O(n^2 \log^2 n)$.

Now, let's generalise this approach to handle two faults. Suppose $R = st \diamond \{e_1, e_2\}$, with $e_1 \in st$ and $e_2 \in st \diamond e_1$. Let p be the vertex on R from s , after which R deviates from $st \cup st \diamond e$. Symmetrically, define q . Let us assume that p lies on the path $st \diamond e_1$ and q lies on st (See [Figure 2](#)). Consider a sequence $X = \{x_1 = s, x_2, \dots\}$ on the $st \diamond e_1$ path, where distance between any x_{i-1} and x_i is $\min_{u \in V(F)} \{(x_{i-1}u)_2\}$. Similarly, we find a sequence Y on ts path. Interestingly, even for two faults, we show that the size of X and Y remains $O(\log n)$, which is a significant generalisation detailed in [Section 5](#).

As before, there exists vertices $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ satisfying (a) and (b) respectively. Also, $R = sx \odot xy \diamond F \odot yt$. We will demonstrate how to find $xy \diamond F$ by appropriately utilising multiple maximisers. However, when multiple faults are present, finding $xy \diamond F$ is a bit more involved and leverages ideas from [\[DR22\]](#). Specifically, in [Section 8](#), we will show that we can identify a hitting set of size $O(f^3)$ that contains an intermediate vertex of $xy \diamond F$. This completes the overview.




Figure 2: X is the set of green vertices and Y is the set of blue vertices. x satisfies (a) and y satisfies (b).

4 Organisation of the paper

In Section 5, we introduce a new tool “Jump Sequence” which formalises the new approach taken in this paper. In Section 6, as a warm-up, we apply our new approach to design a single fault tolerant distance oracle in undirected weighted graph. In Section 7 and Section 8, we extend our results to f -faults.

5 A new tool: Jump Sequence

Let $R = st \diamond F'$ where $F' \subseteq F$ and F is a set of edges of size f . Let u be a vertex in $V(F)$. Consider the sequence of vertices $x_1 = s, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k$ where, for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, x_i is the first vertex on path R from x_{i-1} satisfying

$$|R[x_{i-1}, x_i]| \geq (x_{i-1}u \diamond F)_2 \quad (1)$$

The sequence $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ is called the *jump sequence* of R using vertex u or $\text{JUMP}(R)$ using u in short. We omit *using* u when it's clear from context. Each vertex in $\text{JUMP}(R)$ is a jump vertex. Imagine sitting at x_{i-1} attached to a rope which starts at u . The rope's length is $(x_{i-1}u \diamond F)_2$, representing how far we can jump on path R . The action of moving from x_{i-1} to x_i is called a *jump from* x_{i-1} *using* u .




Figure 3: A jump from x_{i-1} using u .

Note that we can start the sequence from either s or t , yielding different sequences. We denote $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ as the sequence starting from s and $\text{JUMP}(R[t, s])$ as the other sequence. In this section, we focus on $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$, and all our results apply to $R[t, s]$ by symmetry.

In $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$, we advance along $R[s, t]$ in steps of $(x_1u \diamond F)_2, (x_2u \diamond F)_2$, and so on. Consider the sequence $\{(x_1u \diamond F)_2, (x_2u \diamond F)_2, \dots, (x_{k-1}u \diamond F)_2\}$. We claim that this sequence roughly behaves like a bitonic sequence. That is, we can divide it at a vertex, say x_j , such that:

- (A1) In the sequence $\{(x_1u \diamond F)_2, (x_2u \diamond F)_2, \dots, (x_ju \diamond F)_2\}$, the numbers decrease by at least a factor of two after at most four jumps. Here, the jump from x_1 to x_2 in $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ implies jumping from $(x_1u \diamond F)_2$ to $(x_2u \diamond F)_2$ in the above sequence.
- (A2) In the sequence $\{(x_ju \diamond F)_2, (x_{j+1}u \diamond F)_2, \dots, (x_ku \diamond F)_2\}$, the numbers increase by a factor of two after every four jumps.

The above assertion implies the following lemma:

Lemma 5.1. *The length of $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ is $\leq 8 \log(nW)$*

We now prove (A1). Let $(x_1u \diamond F)_2 = 2^\ell$ (for some $\ell \geq 0$). Consider the next four vertices after x_1 . If, for any $i \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $(x_iu \diamond F)_2 \leq 2^{\ell-1}$, then after at most 4 jumps, we find a vertex x_i where $(x_iu \diamond F)_2$ decreases by at least half. We repeat this process until we reach a vertex, say x_j , for which this condition no longer holds. This proves (A1). Now, let's prove (A2). Assume $(x_ju \diamond F)_2 = 2^\ell$. By construction, for all $i \in \{j+1, j+2, j+3, j+4\}$, $(x_iu \diamond F)_2 \geq 2^\ell$. To prove (A2), we first need to demonstrate that $(x_{j+4}u \diamond F)_2 \geq 2^{\ell+1}$. To do so, we establish the following stronger statement:

Lemma 5.2. *Let $(x_ju \diamond F)_2 = 2^\ell$ and for all $i \in \{j+1, j+2, j+3, j+4\}$, $(x_iu \diamond F)_2 \geq 2^\ell$. Then, for all $i \geq j+4p$, $(x_iu \diamond F)_2 \geq 2^{\ell+p}$ where $p \geq 1$.*

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction on p .

Base Case ($p = 1$): For $i \geq j+4$, assume for contradiction that $(x_iu \diamond F)_2 \leq 2^\ell$. By construction, $R[x_j, x_i] \geq 4 \times 2^\ell$ because $x_j, x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, x_{j+3}, x_{j+4}$ are consecutively at a distance $\geq 2^\ell$ on $R[s, t]$. However, there is an alternate path from x_j to x_i avoiding F , which is $x_ju \diamond F \odot x_iu \diamond F$. The sum of their weights is $< 2^{\ell+1} + 2^{\ell+1} = 4 \times 2^\ell$, contradicting the fact that $R[x_j, x_i]$ is the shortest path from x_j to x_i avoiding $F' \subseteq F$.

Inductive Step ($p > 1$): Assume that for all $i \geq j+4(p-1)$, $(x_iu \diamond F)_2 \geq 2^{\ell+p-1}$. We will now show that for any $i \geq j+4p$, $(x_iu \diamond F)_2 \geq 2^{\ell+p}$. For contradiction, assume that $(x_iu \diamond F)_2 \leq 2^{\ell+p-1}$.

Consider the path $R[x_j, x_i]$. As in the base case, the subpath $R[x_j, x_{j+4}]$ of $R[x_j, x_i]$ has weight $\geq 4 \times 2^\ell$. Similarly, using the induction hypothesis, the weight of the path from the vertex $x_{j+4(p-1)}$ to x_{j+4p} is $\geq 4 \times 2^{\ell+p-1}$. Thus, the weight of the path $R[x_j, x_i]$ is $\geq 4 \times 2^\ell + 4 \times 2^{\ell+p-1} > 2^{\ell+1} + 2^{\ell+p}$. However, there is an alternate path from x_j to x_i that avoids F . This path is $x_ju \diamond F \odot x_iu \diamond F$. The sum of the weights of these two paths is $< 2^{\ell+1} + 2^{\ell+p}$. This is a contradiction as $R[x_j, x_i]$ is the shortest path from x_j to x_i avoiding $F' \subseteq F$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We now extend our result to all vertices in $V(F)$.

5.1 Jump Sequence using the fault set F

Let's create another jump sequence $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ that utilizes each vertex of $V(F)$. The first vertex in $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ is $x_1 := s$. The i -th vertex in $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ is defined as follows: we first find the vertex $u = \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in V(F)} \{(x_{i-1}v)_2\}$. Then, we jump from x_{i-1} using u on the path R . In other words, x_i is the first vertex after x_{i-1} on the path R that satisfies:

$$R[x_{i-1}, x_i] \geq (x_{i-1}u)_2 \tag{2}$$

Notice that by definition, $x_{i-1}u \diamond F = x_{i-1}u$. This is because u is the closest vertex of $V(F)$ to x_{i-1} . Therefore, instead of writing $x_{i-1}u \diamond F$ (as in the previous section), we simply write $x_{i-1}u$. Assuming the setting in above paragraph, we claim the following lemma:

Lemma 5.3. *The length of $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ is $\leq 16f \log(nW)$.*

Proof. Let $u \in V(F)$. Let $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_\ell\}$ be the subsequence of $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ where we jump using u . Consider the sequence $\{(y_1u)_2, (y_2u)_2, \dots, (y_{\ell-1}u)_2\}$. We claim that this sequence also behaves like a bitonic sequence satisfying (A1) and (A2). The proof remains exactly the same as in the previous section. Thus, the length of this subsequence is $\leq 8 \log(nW)$. Since there are at most $2f$ vertices in $V(F)$, the length of $\text{JUMP}(R[s, t])$ is $\leq 16f \log(nW)$. \square

6 Single fault tolerant distance oracle

In our new single fault tolerant distance oracle, we will crucially use the jump sequence with a suitable maximiser. Before describing our maximiser, we note its crucial property :

Lemma 6.1. ([DR22, Claim 4.2]) *Let \mathbb{D} be a maximiser returning an edge set F^* maximising $|st \diamond F^*|$. If F satisfies the maximiser's condition, then either (1) $st \diamond F = st \diamond F^*$ or (2) an edge in F^* lies on the path $st \diamond F$.*

Proof. Let us assume that no edge of F^* lies on the path $st \diamond F$. So, $st \diamond F$ avoids F^* also. Hence, $|st \diamond F| \geq |st \diamond F^*|$ as $st \diamond F^*$ is the shortest path avoiding F^* .

(α)
Now, if F satisfies the maximiser's conditions and F^* is the output of the maximiser, then $|st \diamond F^*| \geq |st \diamond F|$.
(β)

(α) and (β) implies $|st \diamond F| = |st \diamond F^*|$. Also, since we preprocessed the graph ensuring unique shortest path, $st \diamond F = st \diamond F^*$. This completes the proof. \square

For all our maximisers, F will satisfy its condition. Case (1) in Lemma 6.1 is good for us, as it allows us to return $st \diamond F^*$. In most parts of this paper, we focus on case (2). Now, let's examine the maximiser for our single fault-tolerant distance oracle.

6.1 Maximiser

$$\mathbb{D}(x, y, d_1, d_2) = \arg \max_{e^* \in E} \left\{ |xy \diamond e^*| \text{ such that } |xe^*| \geq d_1 \text{ and } |ye^*| \geq d_2 \right. \\ \left. \text{where both } d_1 \text{ and } d_2 \text{ are a power of 2.} \right\} \quad (3)$$

In addition to returning e^* , our maximiser will also return $xy \diamond e^*$. In our algorithm, we will write $(e^*, xy \diamond e^*) \leftarrow \mathbb{D}(x, y, d_1, d_2)$ to indicate this fact. By Theorem 3.1, $xy \diamond e^*$ is 2-decomposable and we can represent it in 2-decomposable form. Thus, the space required to store $(e^*, xy \diamond e^*)$ is $O(1)$. For a fixed pair x, y , there are $O(\log(nW))$ possible values of d_1 and d_2 . Thus, there are $O(\log^2(nW))$ possible maximisers each taking $O(1)$ space. We construct maximisers for all pair of vertices in the graph. Thus, the size of our data-structure is $O(n^2 \log^2(nW))$.

6.2 Query Algorithm

Let us now describe our algorithm $\text{QUERY}(s, t, e = (u, v))$ (See Algorithm 1). Let us assume that e lies on the st path such that u is closer to s than v . We first find $\text{JUMP}(st)$ and $\text{JUMP}(ts)$ using e . This is done by calling the function $\text{FINDJUMP}()$.

We store our final answer in PATH , which is initialised to \emptyset . We define $|\text{PATH}| = \infty$, if $\text{PATH} = \emptyset$. For each pair (x, y) in $\text{JUMP}(st)$ and $\text{JUMP}(ts)$, we call the maximiser $\mathbb{D}(x, y, (xu)_2, (yv)_2)$. Note that by

construction, e satisfies the condition of the maximiser. The maximiser returns $(e^*, xy \diamond e^*)$. Then, we set $P = sx \odot xy \diamond e^* \odot yt$. We then check if P contains e or not. If P does not contain e , then we update our PATH. This completes the description of our algorithm.

<p>Algorithm 1: QUERY($s, t, e = (u, v)$): returns $st \diamond e$</p> <pre> 1 JUMP(st) \leftarrow FINDJUMP($st, \{e\}$); 2 JUMP(ts) \leftarrow FINDJUMP($ts, \{e\}$); 3 PATH \leftarrow \emptyset; 4 foreach $(x, y) \in$ JUMP(st) \times JUMP(ts) do 5 $(e^*, xy \diamond e^*) = \mathbb{D}(x, y, (xu)_2, (yv)_2)$; 6 $P \leftarrow sx \odot xy \diamond e^* \odot yt$ 7 if $e \notin P$ then 8 PATH \leftarrow argmin$\{ P , \text{PATH} \}$; 9 return PATH;</pre>

<p>Algorithm 2: FINDJUMP($P[s, t], F$)</p> <pre> 1 $X \leftarrow \emptyset$; 2 $x \leftarrow s$; 3 do 4 $X \leftarrow X \cup \{x\}$; 5 $u = \arg \min_{v \in V(F)} \{(xv)_2\}$; 6 Let y be the first vertex on $P[x, t]$ path at the distance $\geq (xu)_2$ from x; 7 if y exists then 8 $x \leftarrow y$; 9 while $(xu)_2 \neq 0$ or y exists; 10 return X</pre>

6.2.1 Correctness

In our algorithm, we always update PATH with P that does not contain e . Thus, $|\text{PATH}| \geq |st \diamond e|$. We will now show that there is a pair, say $(x, y) \in \text{JUMP}(st) \times \text{JUMP}(ts)$ for which both P and PATH will be set to $st \diamond e$. This will imply that our algorithm is correct.

Let $R = st \diamond e$. Let us also assume that the detour of R starts at the vertex p on the su path and ends at the vertex q on the vt path (See [Figure 1](#)). Consider the jump sequence $\text{JUMP}(st)$. Let x be the last vertex before p on $\text{JUMP}(st)$ on the st path. Thus, we have, $xp < (xu)_2$. Since the detour of R starts at the vertex p , $R[x, p] = xp$. Thus, we have:

$$|R[x, p]| < (xu)_2 \quad (4)$$

Similarly, in the jump sequence $\text{JUMP}(ts)$, let y be the last vertex such that $ty \leq tq$. Consider the maximiser on the pair (x, y) : $\mathbb{D}(x, y, (xu)_2, (yv)_2)$. Let e^* be the edge returned by this maximiser. Note that e^* must lie on the xy path, as the weight of any other path from x to y is strictly greater than the weight of the xy path. Thus, we have:

$$e^* \text{ lies on the shortest } xy \text{ path which is a subpath of } st \quad (5)$$

There are two cases:

1. e^* does not lie on the path $xy \diamond e$.

Since e also satisfies the conditions of the maximiser, by [Lemma 6.1](#), $xy \diamond e^* = xy \diamond e$. Thus, we correctly set P to:

$$P = sx \odot xy \diamond e^* \odot yt = sx \odot xy \diamond e \odot yt = R$$

Now, we show that we can represent P in 2-decomposable form in our algorithm. By construction, $xy \diamond e^*$ is in 2-decomposable form, say $L_1 \odot e' \odot L_2$. But even R is 2-decomposable and $xy \diamond e^*$ is a subpath of R . Thus, $sx \odot L_1$ must be a shortest path. Similarly, $L_2 \odot yt$ is also a shortest path. Thus, the path P is in 2-decomposable form.

2. e^* lies on the path $xy \diamond e$ or $R[x, y]$

We will see this case cannot arise. By the condition of the maximiser, $|xe^*| \geq (xu)_2$ or $R[x, e^*] \geq (xu)_2$. Using the previous inequality and [Equation \(4\)](#), e^* lies after p on R . But the detour of R

starts at p . Thus, e^* cannot lie on xu path. Similarly, we can show that e^* does not lie on yv . This implies that e^* does not lie on xy path. But this violates Equation (5). So this case cannot arise.

6.2.2 Running Time

Let us first find the time taken by $\text{FINDPATH}(st)$. By Lemma 5.3, there are $O(\log(nW))$ vertices in $\text{JUMP}(st)$. Thus, in $\text{FINDPATH}(st)$, the while loop runs for $O(\log((nW)))$ time. In the while loop, in Line 6, we find a vertex which is at a distance 2^i (for some i) on some shortest path. This can be done in $O(1)$ time. Apart from this, all other operations in the while loop can also be performed in $O(1)$ time. Thus, the running time of $\text{FINDPATH}(st)$ (and similarly $\text{FINDPATH}(ts)$) is $O(\log(nW))$.

Next, we process every pair of vertices in $\text{JUMP}(st)$ and $\text{JUMP}(ts)$. We will show that the time taken to process each pair is $O(1)$ implying that the running time of our query algorithm is $(\log^2(nW))$.

While processing a pair in $\text{JUMP}(st) \times \text{JUMP}(ts)$, the dominating step is to check if P contains e (in Line 7). To check if a shortest path, say ab , contains e , we can check if $|ae| + w(e) + |eb| = |ab|$. Since P is in 2-decomposable form, we can check if P contains e or not in $O(1)$ time.

Thus, we have proven the following:

Lemma 6.2. *There is a single fault tolerant distance oracle that takes $O(n^2 \log^2(nW))$ space and answers each query in $O(\log^2(nW))$ time. Moreover, it returns a path in 2-decomposable form.*

7 From single fault to f faults

In the single-fault algorithm, we know that the fault e must lie on the st path. Also, the detour of $st \diamond e$ starts and ends on the st path. But what happens with multiple faults? How do we define the start and end of the detour? To address this, we introduce some new notations.

We label the shortest path from s to t as path P_1 . Let $e_1 \in F$ be an edge on P_1 . Then, $st \diamond e_1$ is referred to as path P_2 . Let us assume that $e_2 \in F$ is an edge on P_2 . Then P_3 is $st \diamond \{e_1, e_2\}$. We now generalise this recursive definition.

Definition 7.1. (Path P_i 's)

For the base case, let $P_1 = st$. Let e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{i-1} be the distinct edges of F on paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{i-1} respectively where $1 \leq i \leq f$. Then, P_i is $st \diamond \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{i-1}\}$.

For notational convenience, we define $P_0 = \emptyset$. We will now define the notion of the detour of a path, its start and end.

Definition 7.2. (Prefix and suffix of P_i) Let e be the first faulty edge on P_i from s . Then $\text{PREFIX}(P_i) = P_i[s, e]$. Similarly, if e is the first faulty edge on P_i from t , then $\text{SUFFIX}(P_i) = P_i[t, e]$.

Definition 7.3. (Detour of $st \diamond F$, its start and end)

Let p_{out} be the first vertex in $st \diamond F$ from s that does not lie in $\cup_{j=1}^f \text{PREFIX}(P_j)$ and p be the vertex before p_{out} in $st \diamond F$. If p is in $\text{PREFIX}(P_i)$ but not in $\text{PREFIX}(P_0) \cup \text{PREFIX}(P_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{PREFIX}(P_{i-1})$ (where $1 \leq i \leq f$), then the detour of $st \diamond F$ starts on path P_i at p . We define the end of a detour symmetrically (using SUFFIX instead of PREFIX). Let q be the vertex where the detour of $st \diamond F$ ends. The path between p and q on $st \diamond F$ is called the detour of $st \diamond F$.

For example, in Figure 2, the detour of $st \diamond F$ starts on the path P_2 at p as $p \in \text{PREFIX}(P_2)$ but not in $\text{PREFIX}(P_0) \cup \text{PREFIX}(P_1)$. Similarly, the detour of $st \diamond F$ ends on P_1 at q as $q \in \text{SUFFIX}(P_1)$ but not in $\text{SUFFIX}(P_0)$.

Assume wlog that the detour of $st \diamond F$ starts on $p \in P_i$ and ends on $q \in P_j$. Similar to the single fault tolerant distance oracle, we find $\text{JUMP}(P_i[s, t])$ and $\text{JUMP}(P_j[t, s])$. In $\text{JUMP}(P_i[s, t])$, let x be the last

vertex before p in $P_i[s, t]$ (see [Figure 2](#)). Similarly, let $y \in \text{JUMP}(P_j[t, s])$ be the last vertex before q in $P_j[t, s]$. For the pair (x, y) , we use an appropriate maximiser, $(F^*, xy \diamond F^*) \leftarrow \mathbb{D}(x, y, \cdot, \cdot)$ to find $xy \diamond F$ (we will define the maximiser later). In the single fault tolerant distance oracle, we proved no edge in F^* lies on $xy \diamond F$. Unfortunately, here, a vertex in $V(F^*)$ may lie on $xy \diamond F$. Let's consider the easier case. If a vertex $u \in V(F^*)$ is an intermediate vertex on $xy \diamond F$, we can recurse on $su \diamond F$ and $ut \diamond F$. But, if u lies on the first or last segment of $xy \diamond F$, we follow [\[DR22\]](#). In this case, we will see that u will be a "clean" vertex. We now define this notion.

Definition 7.4. (*Intact from failure F*)

A path is intact from failure F if no edge of F lies on the path. A tree T is intact from failure F if none of the vertices of $V(F)$ are in T .

Definition 7.5. (*x -clean and y -clean from failure F*)

Let $R = xy \diamond F$. A vertex $u \in R$ is called x -clean from failure F if xu and $T_x(u)$ is intact from failure F . We call u an x -clean vertex, dropping the term "from the failure F " where it is clear from the context. Similarly, define a y -clean vertex.

An x -clean vertex u lies on the first segment of R , as $x \in R$ and xu is intact from failure F . Additionally, $T_x(u)$ is also intact from failure F . As in [\[DR22\]](#), once we find an x -clean vertex u , we can build a suitable maximiser that finds a fault set F' that:

$$\text{maximises } |xy \diamond F'| \text{ such that } u \text{ is } x\text{-clean from failure } F'.$$

Assume that a vertex $v \in V(F')$ lies on $xy \diamond F$. We will later show that v cannot lie on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$, which fixes the problem for the first segment. Similarly, we can address the issue for the last segment by finding a y -clean vertex. Assuming we have found both an x -clean vertex u and a y -clean vertex v , we can construct a suitable maximiser that finds a fault set F'' that:

$$\text{maximises } st \diamond F'', \text{ ensuring that } u \text{ is } x\text{-clean from failure } F'' \text{ and } v \text{ is } y\text{-clean from failure } F''.$$

We will show that a vertex in $V(F'')$ cannot lie on the first or last segments of $xy \diamond F$; if it lies on $xy \diamond F$, it must be an intermediate vertex. Though we are following an approach similar to [\[DR22\]](#), the space required for all our maximisers (which are different from their maximisers) will be $O(f^4 n^2 \log^2(nW))$. This completes the overview of our algorithm.

8 f - fault Tolerant Distance Oracle

In this section, we will prove [Theorem 1.1](#) using induction on f . For the base case, i.e., $f = 1$, we can use the single fault tolerant distance oracle in [Section 6](#). Let us assume using the induction hypothesis that we have a fault tolerant distance oracle for $1, 2, \dots, f - 1$ faults. In the rest of the paper, we design an f -fault tolerant distance oracle. We will assume that we want to find the shortest path from s to t avoiding F .

To find $st \diamond F$, we will call the function $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r = f + 1)$. For brevity, we drop the fault set F from the arguments given to the query algorithm. The first argument of QUERY is the source and the second argument is the destination. The third argument r suggests to us that the path $st \diamond F$ is r -decomposable. Initially, we call QUERY with $r = f + 1$. Let us now describe the QUERY algorithm (See [Algorithm 3](#)).

By induction hypothesis, using 1-fault, 2-fault, $\dots, f - 1$ -fault tolerant distance oracles, we find paths P_2, \dots, P_f respectively. This is done in the function FINDPATH . In [Section 10](#), we will prove:

Lemma 8.1. FINDPATH returns paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_f in $\leq 10c^{f^2} f^{8f^2+1} \log^{2f^2}(nW)$ time.

Algorithm 3: QUERY(s, t, r)

```
1 if  $r = 0$  then
2    $\lfloor$  return  $\infty$ ;
3  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_f \leftarrow$  FINDPATH( $s, t, F$ );
4 foreach  $i = 1$  to  $f$  do
5    $\lfloor$  JUMP( $P_i[s, t]$ )  $\leftarrow$  FINDJUMP( $P_i[s, t], F$ );
6    $\lfloor$  JUMP( $P_i[t, s]$ )  $\leftarrow$  FINDJUMP( $P_i[t, s], F$ );
7 PATH =  $\phi$ ;
8 for  $(i, j) \in [1 \dots f] \times [1 \dots f]$  do
9   INTERMEDIATE  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
10  foreach  $(x, y) \in$  JUMP( $P_i[s, t]$ )  $\times$  JUMP( $P_j[t, s]$ ) do
11    //  $x$  satisfies the condition of an intermediate vertex
12    if  $sx$  and  $xt$  contain an edge from  $F$  then
13       $\lfloor$  INTERMEDIATE  $\leftarrow$  INTERMEDIATE  $\cup \{x\}$ ;
14    //  $y$  satisfies the condition of an intermediate vertex
15    else if  $sy$  and  $yt$  contain an edge from  $F$  then
16       $\lfloor$  INTERMEDIATE  $\leftarrow$  INTERMEDIATE  $\cup \{y\}$ ;
17    else
18       $\lfloor$   $(P, I) \leftarrow$  FIND-INTERMEDIATE1( $x, y, r$ );
19       $\lfloor$   $P' \leftarrow sx \odot P \odot yt$ ;
20       $\lfloor$  PATH = argmin $\{|PATH|, |P'|\}$ ;
21       $\lfloor$  INTERMEDIATE  $\leftarrow$  INTERMEDIATE  $\cup I$ ;
22  foreach  $u \in$  INTERMEDIATE do
23     $\lfloor$  PATH  $\leftarrow$  argmin $\{|\text{QUERY}(s, u, r - 1) \odot \text{QUERY}(u, t, r - 1)|, |PATH|\}$ ;
24 return PATH;
```

For each path P_i , we then find $\text{JUMP}(P_i[s, t])$ and $\text{JUMP}(P_i[t, s])$. Our query algorithm will return the answer stored in the variable `PATH` which is initialised to \emptyset .

The detour of $st \diamond F$ may start and end on P_i and P_j , respectively. Since we do not know i and j beforehand, we will run our algorithm for every possible i, j pair. We consider each pair (x, y) in $\text{JUMP}(P_i[s, t]) \times \text{JUMP}(P_j[t, s])$. If x or y satisfies the condition of an intermediate vertex, then we add it to the set of `INTERMEDIATE` vertices. Otherwise, we call $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ which returns a tuple (P, I) . In the tuple, P is a path and I is a candidate set of intermediate vertices. In [Section 9](#), we will show that $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ finds an intermediate vertex in $xy \diamond F$ if (x, y) satisfies the following setting:

- (S1) Let $st \diamond F$ be a r -decomposable path and the detour of $st \diamond F$ starts on P_i at the vertex p and ends on P_j at the vertex q . Let x is the last vertex of $\text{JUMP}(P_i[s, t])$ before p on $P_i[s, t]$. Similarly, y is the last vertex of $\text{JUMP}(P_j[t, s])$ before q on $P_j[t, s]$. Also, x and y are not intermediate vertices on $st \diamond F$ (See [Figure 2](#) for an example).

Lemma 8.2. *Let $(P, I) \leftarrow \text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$. The function $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1$ comes with the following guarantees: P is a path that avoids F , I is a set of size $\leq 8f^3$ and the running time of procedure $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ is $O(f^4)$.*

Moreover, if (x, y) satisfies (S1), then either

1. $P = xy \diamond F$ or
2. I contains an intermediate vertex on the path $xy \diamond F$.

Moreover, P is in r -decomposable form.

Some remarks are in order. The function $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ has no guarantees, except for running time, fault free path P and the size of set I , if (x, y) does not satisfy (S1). If (x, y) satisfies (S1), then in the first case, we get $xy \diamond F$ itself. Else, at least one vertex in I is an intermediate vertex on $xy \diamond F$.

If (x, y) satisfies (S1), an intermediate vertex in $xy \diamond F$ is also an intermediate vertex in $st \diamond F$. Since we do not know the intermediate vertex beforehand, we add all vertices of I to `INTERMEDIATE` and recurse our algorithm on each vertex in `INTERMEDIATE`. This completes the description of our algorithm. We now show that our algorithm is correct.

8.1 Correctness

We will first show that our algorithm always returns a `PATH` that avoids F . In $\text{QUERY}(x, y, r)$, `PATH` is set at [Line 18](#) and [Line 21](#). In [Line 18](#), sx and yt are intact from failure F as both x and y are not intermediate vertices. Also, using [Lemma 8.2](#), P avoids F . Thus, P' and in turn `PATH` avoids F . Similarly, we can prove using induction that the `PATH` set in [Line 21](#) also avoids F . Thus, $|\text{PATH}| \geq |st \diamond F|$. We will now show that there is a pair (x, y) for which `PATH` is set to $st \diamond F$ in our algorithm. To this end, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 8.3. *If $st \diamond F$ is r -decomposable, then $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r')$ will return it in r -decomposable form where $r' \geq r$.*

Proof. We prove this lemma using induction on r .

Base Case ($r = 2$): Let us prove the base case when $r' = 2$. The proof remains the same even if $r' > 2$.

1. $\text{QUERY}(s, t, 2)$ returns the correct path.

As $st \diamond F$ is 2-decomposable, no pair (x, y) processed by our algorithm can be intermediate vertices. Let us assume that we process a pair (x, y) that satisfies (S1). In that case, we call $(P, I) \leftarrow \text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, 2)$.

Since $st \diamond F$ is 2-decomposable, so is $xy \diamond F$. Thus, I is empty. By Lemma 8.2, $P = xy \diamond F$, and we have found the correct path, that is, $sx \odot P \odot yt$.

2. The path returned by $\text{QUERY}(s, t, 2)$ is in 2-decomposable form.

By Lemma 8.2, P is in 2-decomposable form, say $L_1 \odot e' \odot L_2$. But even $st \diamond F$ is 2-decomposable and P is a subpath of $st \diamond F$. Thus, $sx \odot L_1$ must be a shortest path. Similarly, $L_2 \odot yt$ is also a shortest path. Thus, the path $sx \odot P \odot yt$ can be represented in 2-decomposable form.

Using the induction hypothesis, let us assume that QUERY returns the correct answer for paths that are f decomposable.

Inductive step ($r = f + 1$): Again, let us prove the lemma when $r' = f + 1$.

1. $\text{QUERY}(s, t, f + 1)$ returns the correct path.

Let us assume that we process a pair (x, y) in $\text{QUERY}(s, t, f + 1)$. If x is an intermediate vertex, then we can recurse using $\text{QUERY}(s, x, f) \odot \text{QUERY}(x, t, f)$. By induction hypothesis, both these functions return the correct path, and we are done. Similarly, if y is an intermediate vertex, we are done. So, let us assume that neither x nor y is an intermediate vertex. Specifically, look at the pair (x, y) that satisfies (S1). In that case, we call $(P, I) \leftarrow \text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, f + 1)$. If $P = xy \diamond F$, then we have found the correct path, that is $sx \odot P \odot yt$.

Otherwise, using Lemma 8.2, there is an intermediate vertex, say $u \in I$ on the path $xy \diamond F$. Since $xy \diamond F$ is a subpath of $st \diamond F$, u is an intermediate vertex even for $st \diamond F$. We then recurse using $\text{QUERY}(s, u, f) \odot \text{QUERY}(u, t, f)$. By induction hypothesis, both these functions return the correct path, and we are done.

2. The path returned by $\text{QUERY}(s, t, f + 1)$ is in $f + 1$ -decomposable form.

There are two places where we set PATH . They are:

- (a) **Line 18**

In Line 18, the algorithm sets PATH to $sx \odot P \odot yt$. By Lemma 8.2, P is in $f + 1$ -decomposable form. Let the first and the last segment of P be xa and by (for some vertex a and b). But even $st \diamond F$ is $f + 1$ -decomposable. Also, since x and y are not intermediate vertices, x lies on the first segment of $st \diamond F$ and y lies on its last segment. Thus, $sx \odot xa$ is the first segment of $st \diamond F$. Similarly, $by \odot yt$ is the last segment of $st \diamond F$. Thus, we also return a path in $f + 1$ decomposable form in Line 18.

- (b) **Line 21**

Let u be an intermediate vertex in $st \diamond F$. Since $st \diamond F$ is $f + 1$ decomposable, we can represent it as $st \diamond F = L_1 \odot e_1 \odot L_2 \odot e_2 \odot \dots \odot e_f \odot L_{f+1}$ where each L_i (where $2 \leq i \leq f$) is a shortest path and each e_i is an interleaving edge. Wlog, let us assume that u is in L_i . By induction hypothesis, $\text{QUERY}(s, u, f)$ will return a path in i decomposable form as $su \diamond F$ is an i -decomposable path. Similarly, $\text{QUERY}(u, t, f)$ will return the path $ut \diamond F$ in $(f - i + 2)$ decomposable form. As the last shortest path of $su \diamond F$ and the first shortest path of $ut \diamond F$ has no interleaving edges, we can merge them and get a path in $(f + 1)$ decomposable form.

This completes our proof. □

8.2 Running Time

We now calculate the running time of $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r)$.

Lemma 8.4. *The running time of $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r)$ is $\leq c^{f^2+r} f^{8(f^2+r)} \log^{2(f^2+r)}(nW)$ where $c > 1$ is a constant.*

If we put $r = f + 1$ in the above equation, we get the running time of $\text{QUERY}(s, t, f + 1)$ to be $\leq c^{(f+1)^2} f^{8(f+1)^2} \log^{2(f+1)^2}(nW)$ as required.

Proof. We will prove using induction on r . Let $T(r)$ be the running time of $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r)$. For the base case, $r = 0$, $T(0) = 1$. Using induction hypothesis, let us assume that $T(1), T(2), \dots, T(r-1)$ satisfies the statement of the lemma. We want to find $T(r)$. Let us first find the running time of $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r)$ excluding recursive calls. In $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r)$, we find the paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_f using $\text{FINDPATH}()$. Using **Lemma 8.1**, $\text{FINDPATH}()$ takes $\leq \underbrace{10c^{f^2} f^{8f^2+1} \log^{2f^2}(nW)}_{\alpha}$ time.

Then, we find the jump sequence for each path P_i . Using induction hypothesis, the path P_i is in i -decomposable form or $\leq f$ -decomposable form. Thus, using **Lemma 2.3**, each jump vertex on P_i can be found in $O(f + \log(nW))$ time. Using **Lemma 5.3**, since there are $\leq 16f \log(nW)$ jump vertices on path P_i , the total time taken to find $\text{JUMP}(P_i[s, t])$ and $\text{JUMP}(P_i[t, s])$ is $\leq c f^2 \log^2(nW)$ (for some suitable constant $c > 1$). Thus, the time taken to find all the jump sequences is $\leq \underbrace{c f^3 \log^2(nW)}_{\eta}$.

Then, we go over each possible pair $(i, j) \in [1 \dots f] \times [1 \dots f]$. There are $\underbrace{f^2}_{\beta}$ such pairs. For each pair $(x, y) \in \text{JUMP}(P_i[s, t]) \times \text{JUMP}(P_j[t, s])$, we may call the function $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, f + 1)$. Using **Lemma 5.3**, there are $\leq \underbrace{256 f^2 \log^2(nW)}_{\gamma}$ possible (x, y) pairs. Using **Lemma 8.2**, the running time of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, f + 1)$ is $\underbrace{O(f^4)}_{\delta}$. Thus, the total time Y taken by $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r)$ (excluding recursive calls) is:

$$Y \leq \underbrace{10c^{f^2} f^{8f^2+1} \log^{2f^2+1}(nW)}_{\alpha} + \underbrace{c f^3 \log^2(nW)}_{\eta} + c \underbrace{f^2}_{\beta} \times \underbrace{256 f^2 \log^2(nW)}_{\gamma} \times \underbrace{f^4}_{\delta}$$

The first term on the RHS dominates the rest if we set c to a suitable high constant. Thus, $Y \leq 12c^{f^2} f^{8f^2+1} \log^{2f^2}(nW)$. Let us now find the total number of recursive calls in $\text{QUERY}(s, t, r)$. The number of intermediate vertices returned by $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ is $\underbrace{8f^3}_{\theta}$. For each intermediate vertex, we call $\text{QUERY}(\cdot, \cdot, r-1)$ two times. Thus, the total number of recursive calls X can be bounded as:

$$X \leq \underbrace{f^2}_{\beta} \times \underbrace{256 f^2 \log^2(nW)}_{\gamma} \times \underbrace{8f^3}_{\theta} \times 2 = 5096 f^7 \log^2(nW) \leq 5096 f^8 \log^2(nW)$$

Hence, we get the following recurrence relation, $T(r) \leq X T(r-1) + Y$ or

$$T(r) \leq 5096 f^8 \log^2(nW) T(r-1) + 12c^{f^2} f^{8f^2+1} \log^{2f^2}(nW)$$

Using induction hypothesis, we put $T(r-1) \leq c^{f^2+r-1} f^{8(f^2+r-1)} \log^{2(f^2+r-1)}(nW)$ in the above equation. Thus, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} T(r) &\leq 5096 c^{f^2+r-1} f^{8(f^2+r-1)+8} \log^{2(f^2+r-1)+2}(nW) + 12c^{f^2} f^{8f^2+1} \log^{2f^2}(nW) \\ &\leq c^{f^2+r} f^{8(f^2+r)} \log^{2(f^2+r)}(nW) \quad (\text{if } c \geq 10192) \end{aligned}$$

□

To complete the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#), we prove [Lemma 8.2](#) and [Lemma 8.1](#) in [Section 9](#) and [Section 10](#) respectively. In [Section 11](#), we bound the space taken by our oracle.

9 Proof of [Lemma 8.2](#)

Before looking at the procedure $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$, let's first examine the maximisers we will employ within it.

9.1 Maximisers

We will use three new maximisers.

First Maximiser: Our first maximiser is as follows:

$$\mathbb{D}_1(x, y, d_1, d_2) = \arg \max_{F^* \in E^f} \left\{ |xy \diamond F^*| \text{ such that the closest vertex of } V(F^*) \text{ is at a distance} \right. \\ \left. \text{at least } d_1 \text{ from } x \text{ and } d_2 \text{ from } y \text{ where both } d_1 \text{ and } d_2 \text{ are power of } 2 \right\} \quad (6)$$

As in [Section 6](#), we assume the maximiser returns F^* and the path $xy \diamond F^*$ is in $f + 1$ -decomposable form. We denote this as $(F^*, xy \diamond F^*) \leftarrow \mathbb{D}_1(x, y, d_1, d_2)$. The sizes of F^* and $xy \diamond F^*$ are both $O(f)$, resulting in a space usage of $O(f)$ per maximiser. For fixed x and y , the total number of maximisers is $O(\log^2(nW))$. Thus, the total space taken by all of \mathbb{D}_1 maximisers is $\sum_{x,y} O(f \log^2(nW)) = O(f n^2 \log^2(nW))$.

Second Maximiser: For each vertex $v \in V(F^*)$ returned by maximiser $\mathbb{D}_1(x, y, d_1, d_2)$, we make two maximisers: (1) $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v)$ and (2) $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, v, d_2)$. We define the first maximiser. The definition of the second maximiser is symmetric.

$$\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v) = \arg \max_{F^* \in E^f} \left\{ |xy \diamond F^*| \text{ such that the closest vertex of } V(F^*) \text{ is at a distance} \right. \\ \left. \text{at least } d_1 \text{ from } x \text{ where } d_1 \text{ is a power of } 2 \text{ and} \right. \\ \left. v \text{ is } y\text{-clean from the failure } F^* \right\} \quad (7)$$

For $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, v, d_2)$, in the conditions, v is x -clean from the failures F^* and the closest vertex of $V(F^*)$ is at a distance d_2 from y . For each maximiser \mathbb{D}_1 , we create $O(f)$ \mathbb{D}_2 maximisers, each requiring $O(f)$ space. Therefore, the total space used by all \mathbb{D}_2 maximisers is $O(f^2 n^2 \log(nW))$.

Third Maximiser: For each vertex $u \in V(F^*)$ returned by maximiser $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v)$, we make a maximiser $\mathbb{D}_3(x, y, u, v)$.

$$\mathbb{D}_3(x, y, u, v) = \arg \max_{F^* \in E^f} \left\{ |xy \diamond F^*| \text{ such that } u \text{ is } x\text{-clean and } v \text{ is } y\text{-clean from failure } F^* \right\} \quad (8)$$

Similar is that case for the other variant of \mathbb{D}_2 maximiser. Thus, for each maximiser \mathbb{D}_2 , we create $O(f)$ \mathbb{D}_3 maximisers. The total size of \mathbb{D}_3 maximisers can be bounded to $O(f^3 n^2 \log(nW))$.

Properties of our maximisers: Whenever we will use our maximisers, we will ensure that F satisfies their conditions. We will later see all our maximisers return a set F^* with one or more of the following guarantees for a pair (x, y) that satisfies (S1):

- (G1) $xy \diamond F = xy \diamond F^*$.
- (G2) $V(F^*)$ contains a vertex that is x -clean from failure F .
- (G3) $V(F^*)$ contains a vertex that is y -clean from failure F .
- (G4) $V(F^*)$ contains an intermediate vertex of $xy \diamond F$.

Let us now go over the cases when these maximisers will be used.

1. Maximiser \mathbb{D}_1 is used when we have neither found an x -clean or y -clean vertex.

We will use \mathbb{D}_1 in our main procedure FIND-INTERMEDIATE₁ (See Section 9.4). The maximiser comes with the following guarantees: either (G1) or (G2) or (G3) or (G4) is true. Thus, in the worst case, we will either get an x -clean or a y -clean vertex from this maximiser.

2. Maximiser \mathbb{D}_2 is used when we either found an x -clean or a y -clean vertex.

Let us assume that we have found a y -clean vertex. In procedure FIND-INTERMEDIATE₂ (See Section 9.3), we will use \mathbb{D}_2 . It comes with the following guarantees: either (G1) or (G2) or (G4) is true. Thus, in the worst case, we will get an x -clean vertex from this maximiser.

3. Maximiser \mathbb{D}_3 is used when we have found both an x -clean and y -clean vertex.

\mathbb{D}_3 will be used in FIND-INTERMEDIATE₃ (See Section 9.2). It comes with the following guarantee: either (G1) or (G4) is true. Thus, in the worst case, we get an intermediate vertex from this maximiser.

Before we move ahead, we would like the reader to again refresh setting (S1) as its assumptions will be used in our arguments henceforth. In the setting (S1), we have assumed that $st \diamond F$ is r -decomposable. Also, x and y lie on the first and the last segment of $st \diamond F$. Thus,

$$xy \diamond F \text{ is also } r\text{-decomposable.} \tag{9}$$

Let us now go over the above three cases in reverse order.

9.2 Found an x -clean and a y -clean vertex

Let us assume that u is x -clean and v is y -clean from failure F . In that case, we call the procedure FIND-INTERMEDIATE₃(x, y, u, v) (See Algorithm 4). In this procedure, we will use the maximiser $\mathbb{D}_3(x, y, u, v)$. Note that by definition of a clean vertex, F satisfies the conditions of \mathbb{D}_3 . Let F^* be the output of $\mathbb{D}_3(x, y, u, v)$. If $xy \diamond F^*$ does not contain any edge from F , we update PATH.

Algorithm 4: FIND-INTERMEDIATE₃(x, y, u, v)

```

1  $(F^*, xy \diamond F^*) = \mathbb{D}_3(x, y, u, v)$ ;
2 INTERMEDIATE  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
3 if  $xy \diamond F^*$  does not contain any edges of  $F$  then
4    $\text{PATH} \leftarrow xy \diamond F^*$ ;
5 for  $z \in V(F^*)$  do
6   //  $z$  satisfies the definition of an intermediate vertex
7   if both  $xz$  and  $zy$  contain an edge from  $F$  then
8     INTERMEDIATE  $\leftarrow$  INTERMEDIATE  $\cup \{z\}$ ;
9 return (PATH, INTERMEDIATE);

```

Then, we go over all $z \in V(F^*)$. If z satisfies the definition of an intermediate vertex, then we add it to the INTERMEDIATE set. Else, we discard it.

9.2.1 Correctness

We will now show that either (G1) or (G4) is true for FIND-INTERMEDIATE₃(x, y, u, v). If F^* does not hit $xy \diamond F$, then by Lemma 6.1, (G1) is true. Also, since $xy \diamond F$ is r -decomposable (using Equation (9)), we also return it in r -decomposable form. So, let us move to the interesting case when an edge of F^* lies in the path $xy \diamond F$. In this case, we will show that (G4) is true.

Lemma 9.1. *If an edge of F^* , say $e = (z, z')$, lies in the path $xy \diamond F$, then at least one endpoint of e , say z , is an intermediate vertex.*

Proof. To show that z is an intermediate vertex, we have to show it lies neither on the first segment nor the last segment of $xy \diamond F$. Let us show that z cannot lie on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$.

Since u is x -clean from failure F , u lies on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$. By the condition of the maximiser, u is x -clean from failure F^* too. Thus, (1) no edge in F^* can lie on xu path and (2) no vertex in $V(F^*)$ can lie on $T_x(u)$.

By (1), e lies after u on $xy \diamond F$. Or, z lies after u on $xy \diamond F$. By (2), z cannot lie on $T_x(u)$. Let us assume that z lies on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$. By (1), it lies after u (as e also lies after u). But then $z \in T_x(u)$, which is a contradiction. Thus, z cannot lie on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$. Similarly, we can show that z cannot lie on the last segment of $xy \diamond F$. Hence, z is an intermediate vertex. □

9.2.2 Running time and the size of INTERMEDIATE set

The maximiser \mathbb{D}_3 returns the path $xy \diamond F^*$ in $\leq f + 1$ decomposable form, taking $O(f)$ space. Consider any shortest path, say ab , in the decomposition. In $O(f)$ time, we can find if any edge of F lies on ab . So it takes $O(f^2)$ time to check if $xy \diamond F^*$ contains any edges from F . To check if a vertex z is an intermediate vertex, we need to check if xz and yz contains any edge from F . Again, this takes $O(f)$ time. Thus, the running time of FIND-INTERMEDIATE₃(x, y, u, v) is $O(f^2)$. Also, we can add at most $2f$ vertices in INTERMEDIATE. Thus, we claim the following lemma:

Lemma 9.2. *The running time of FIND-INTERMEDIATE₃(x, y, u, v) is $O(f^2)$ and the size of INTERMEDIATE set returned by it is $\leq 2f$.*

9.3 Found a y -clean vertex

Let us assume that we have found a vertex v that is y -clean from the failure F . In that case, we call the function $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$. The third parameter of this function indicates that we have not found any x -clean vertex, and the fourth parameter is the y -clean vertex.

We now describe function $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$ (See [Algorithm 5](#)). In this function, we will calculate d_1 , the largest power of 2 no more than the distance of the closest vertex of $V(F)$ from x . Then, we use the maximiser $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v)$. The reader can check that F satisfies the conditions of maximiser. Let F^* be the edges returned by $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v)$. If $xy \diamond F^*$ does not contain any edge from F , we update PATH . Then, we go over all vertices $u \in V(F^*)$. If u satisfies the condition of being an x -clean vertex, then we call function $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3(x, y, u, v)$. If u satisfies the definition of an intermediate vertex, then we add it to the INTERMEDIATE set. Else, we discard u . Before moving forward, let us state an important observation which implies that in $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3$ we are using maximisers that are created in [Section 9.1](#).

Remark 9.3. In $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3(x, y, u, v)$, we will use maximiser $\mathbb{D}_3(x, y, u, v)$ which is one of the $O(f)$ maximisers created from $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v)$.

Algorithm 5: $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$

```

1  $d_1 = \min_{a \in V(F)} \{(xa)_2\}$ ;
2  $(F^*, xy \diamond F^*) = \mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v)$ ;
3  $\text{INTERMEDIATE} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
4 if  $xy \diamond F^*$  does not contain any edges of  $F$  then
5    $\text{PATH} \leftarrow xy \diamond F^*$ ;
6 for  $u \in V(F^*)$  do
7   //  $u$  satisfies the definition of an  $x$ -clean vertex
8   if  $xu$  and  $T_u(x)$  is intact from failure  $F$  then
9      $(P, I) \leftarrow \text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3(x, y, u, v)$ ;
10     $\text{PATH} \leftarrow \text{argmin}\{|P|, |\text{PATH}|\}$ ;
11     $\text{INTERMEDIATE} \leftarrow \text{INTERMEDIATE} \cup I$ ;
12   //  $u$  satisfies the definition of an intermediate vertex
13   if both  $xu$  and  $yu$  contain a failure from  $F$  then
14      $\text{INTERMEDIATE} \leftarrow \text{INTERMEDIATE} \cup \{u\}$ ;
15 return  $(\text{PATH}, \text{INTERMEDIATE})$ ;
```

9.3.1 Correctness

We will now show that either (G1) or (G2) or (G4) is true for $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$. Let $(F^*, xy \diamond F^*)$ be the output of the maximiser $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v)$. If F^* does not hit $xy \diamond F$, then by [Lemma 6.1](#), (G1) is true. Also, since $xy \diamond F$ is r -decomposable (using [Equation \(9\)](#)), we also return it in r -decomposable form. Let us now move to the interesting case when an edge of F^* , say e , lies on $xy \diamond F$. Or an endpoint of e , say u , lies on the path $xy \diamond F$. There are three cases:

(Case I) u is an intermediate vertex.

If u is an intermediate vertex, then (G4) is true.

(Case II) u lies on the last segment of $xy \diamond F$.

We will show that this case cannot arise. Our argument is similar to the one given in the proof of [Lemma 9.1](#). The vertex v is y -clean from failure F so, v lies on the last segment of $xy \diamond F$. Since F^* also satisfies the condition of the maximiser, v is y -clean from failure F^* too. Thus, (1) no edge in F^* can lie on yv path and (2) no vertex in $V(F^*)$ can lie on $T_y(v)$. By (1), e cannot lie on the last segment of $xy \diamond F$. By (2), u cannot lie in $T_y(v)$. As in the proof of [Lemma 9.1](#), if u is in the last segment of $xy \diamond F$, then by (1), it lies after v . But then $u \in T_y(v)$, which is a contradiction. This implies that u cannot lie on the last segment of $xy \diamond F$.

(Case III) u lies on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$.

We will show that u must be an x -clean vertex. Thus, [\(G2\)](#) is true. To prove u is x -clean, we have to show that:

(P1) xu is intact from failure F and

(P2) $T_x(u)$ is intact from failure F .

Since u lie on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$, [\(P1\)](#) is true. We now prove [\(P2\)](#). Let us look back at the setting which led us to call $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$. To this end, we encourage the reader to see Setting [\(S1\)](#) again as we will be using it in the ensuing argument.

Let $R = st \diamond F$. In $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$, we set $d_1 = \min_{a \in V(F)} \{(xa)_2\}$. Since, the detour of R starts at the vertex p on the path P_i , and x is the last vertex of $\text{JUMP}(P_i[s, t])$ before p on the path P_i , we have:

$$P_i[x, p] < d_1$$

Again, since the detour of R starts at the vertex p on the path P_i and x lies before p on path P_i , we can write the above equation as:

$$R[x, p] < d_1 \tag{10}$$

But according to the condition in $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, v)$, u must be at a distance $\geq d_1$ from x . Since u lies on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$ (by the assumption in this case) and x lies on the first segment of R (by assumption in [\(S1\)](#)), we have:

$$R[x, u] \geq d_1 \tag{11}$$

Thus, using [Equation \(10\)](#) and [Equation \(11\)](#), u lies after p on R (See [Figure 4](#) for an illustration). But the detour of R starts at p on P_i (by assumption in [\(S1\)](#)). This implies the following:

$$u \text{ lies on path } R \text{ but not on } P_i[s, t] \tag{12}$$

Some remarks are in order. The above statement is one of the most important deductions in our paper. We are able to prove that u does not lie on P_i but lies on the detour of R . This will help us in proving that u satisfies [\(P2\)](#).

We will now show that $T_x(u)$ contains no endpoints from $V(F)$. For contradiction, let $e_k = (a_k, b_k)$ be the faulty edge whose endpoint is nearest to u in $T_x(u)$. Remember that we have found f paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_f using FINDPATH . Let us assume that e_k is the first edge on $P_k[s, t]$ and a_k is closer to s on P_k . There are two cases depending on whether $P_k = P_i$ or not.

(a) $P_k = P_i$ and $e_k = e_i$

We will show that neither a_i nor b_i lies in $T_x(u)$.




Figure 4: u can lie only on the violet subpath of R . The horizontal black path is P_i .

i. a_i cannot lie in $T_x(u)$

Since u lies on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$ (by assumption in this case), and x lies on the first segment of R (by assumption in (S1)), sa_i avoids F and the shortest path from s to e_i passes through u . Or, $P_i[s, t]$ passes through u . But this contradicts Equation (12) (See Figure 5 for an illustration).

ii. b_i cannot lie in $T_x(u)$

If b_i is nearest to u in $T_x(u)$, then the path sb_i avoids F . But then there is a shorter path from s to b_i that avoids e_i . This is $su \odot ub_i$. Thus, $P_i[s, b_i]$ does not pass through e_i , a contradiction.




Figure 5: If $a_i \in T_x(u)$, then $P_i[s, t]$ contains u and this contradicts Equation (12).

(b) $P_k \neq P_i$

We will show that neither a_k nor b_k lies in $T_x(u)$.

i. a_k cannot lie in $T_x(u)$

If a_k is the nearest vertex to u in $T_x(u)$, then sa_k avoids F . So, $se_k = su \odot ue_k$. Since, the shortest se_k path contains u , P_k also passes through u . Now, by Equation (12), u does not lie on $P_i[s, t]$ but R passes through u . But then the detour of R must start on that path P_k after the vertex u (See Figure 6 for an illustration). This is a contradiction as we assumed that the detour of R starts on path P_i in Setting (S1).

ii. b_k cannot lie in $T_x(u)$

If b_k is nearest to u in $T_x(u)$, then our arguments are the same as in Case (a)(ii).

Thus, u satisfies (P2) and it is an x -clean vertex.




Figure 6: Here the blue path is P_i . su is intact from failure F and is in the first segment of R . So, the detour of R starts somewhere in the dashed path from u to a_k . Or the detour starts on P_k . This contradicts our assumption in (S1) that the detour starts on P_i .

9.3.2 Running time and the size of INTERMEDIATE set

The running time is dominated by Line 8 of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$. In this line, the procedure $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3(x, y, u, v)$ is invoked. But this invocation can happen only $O(f)$ times. Using Lemma 9.2, the running time of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3(x, y, u, v)$ is $O(f^2)$. Thus, the running time of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$ is $O(f^3)$. Moreover, $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3(x, y, u, v)$ returns $2f$ candidate intermediate vertices. Thus, in the worst case, we can add at most $4f^2$ vertices in INTERMEDIATE. Thus, we claim the following lemma:

Lemma 9.4. *The running time of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2$ is $O(f^3)$, and the size of INTERMEDIATE set returned by it is $\leq 4f^2$.*

9.4 Neither found an x -clean or a y -clean vertex

This is the most general case in which we call $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$. Let us describe this function (See Algorithm 6). We first find the distance of the closest vertex of $V(F)$ from x and y . That is, we set $d_1 = \min_{a \in V(F)} \{(xa)_2\}$ and $d_2 = \min_{a \in V(F)} \{(ya)_2\}$. Then, we use the maximiser $\mathbb{D}_1(x, y, d_1, d_2)$. First, note that F satisfies the condition of the maximiser.

Let F^* be the edges returned by $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, d_2)$. If $xy \diamond F^*$ does not contain any edge from F , we update PATH. Then, we go over all vertices $u \in V(F^*)$. If u satisfies the conditions of an x -clean vertex, then we call the function $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, u, \phi)$. Similar is the case when u is a potential y -clean vertex. Else, if u satisfies the conditions of an intermediate vertex, then we add it to INTERMEDIATE set. Else, we discard u .

As in the previous section, we claim the maximisers \mathbb{D}_2 used by us in $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, u, \phi)$ are created from \mathbb{D}_1 maximisers.

Algorithm 6: FIND-INTERMEDIATE₁(x, y, r)

```
1  $d_1 = \min_{a \in V(F)} \{(xa)_2\};$ 
2  $d_2 = \min_{a \in V(F)} \{(ay)_2\};$ 
3  $(F^*, xy \diamond F^*) = \mathbb{D}_1(x, y, d_1, d_2);$ 
4  $\text{PATH} \leftarrow \emptyset;$ 
5  $\text{INTERMEDIATE} \leftarrow \emptyset;$ 
6 if  $xy \diamond F^*$  does not contain any edge of  $F$  then
7    $\text{PATH} \leftarrow xy \diamond F^*;$ 
8 for  $u \in V(F^*)$  do
9   //  $u$  satisfies the conditions of an  $x$ -clean vertex
10  if  $xu$  and  $T_u(x)$  is intact from failure  $F$  then
11     $(P_1, I_1) \leftarrow \text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, u, \phi);$ 
12     $\text{PATH} \leftarrow \text{argmin}\{|P_1|, |\text{PATH}|\};$ 
13     $\text{INTERMEDIATE} \leftarrow \text{INTERMEDIATE} \cup I_1;$ 
14  //  $u$  satisfies the conditions of a  $y$ -clean vertex
15  if  $yu$  and  $T_u(y)$  is intact from failure  $F$  then
16     $(P_2, I_2) \leftarrow \text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, u);$ 
17     $\text{PATH} \leftarrow \text{argmin}\{|P_2|, |\text{PATH}|\};$ 
18     $\text{INTERMEDIATE} \leftarrow \text{INTERMEDIATE} \cup I_2;$ 
19  //  $u$  satisfies the conditions of an intermediate vertex
20  if  $xu$  and  $T_u(x)$  is intact from failure  $F$  then
21     $\text{INTERMEDIATE} \leftarrow \text{INTERMEDIATE} \cup \{u\};$ 
22 return  $(\text{PATH}, \text{INTERMEDIATE});$ 
```

Remark 9.5. In $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, u, \phi)$, we will use maximiser $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, u, d_2)$ which is one of the $O(f)$ maximisers created from $\mathbb{D}_1(x, y, d_1, d_2)$. Similarly, in $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, u)$, we will use maximiser $\mathbb{D}_2(x, y, d_1, u)$ which is one of the $O(f)$ maximisers created from $\mathbb{D}_1(x, y, d_1, d_2)$.

9.4.1 Correctness

We will now show that at least one of the guarantees from (G1) to (G4) is true. Let $(F^*, xy \diamond F^*)$ be the tuple returned by the maximiser \mathbb{D}_1 in $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$. If F^* does not hit $xy \diamond F$, then by Lemma 6.1, (G1) is true. Let us now move to the interesting case when an edge of F^* , say e , lies on $xy \diamond F$. Or an endpoint of e , say u , lies on the path $xy \diamond F$. There are three cases:

1. u is an intermediate vertex.

In this case, (G4) is true.

2. u lies on the first segment of $xy \diamond F$.

In this case, we can show that u is an x -clean vertex or (G2) is true. Our arguments are identical to the one used in (Case III).

3. u lies on the last segment of $xy \diamond F$.

By symmetry, we claim that u is a y -clean vertex or (G3) holds.

9.4.2 Running time and the size of INTERMEDIATE set

The running time of function $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ is dominated by the number of times we call [Line 10](#) or [Line 14](#). Note that either [Line 10](#) or [Line 14](#) is executed in each iteration of the for loop. Wlog, let us assume that [Line 14](#) is executed in each iteration. In [Line 14](#), the procedure $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, u)$ is invoked. But this can happen only $O(f)$ time. Using [Lemma 9.4](#), running time of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, u)$ is $O(f^3)$. Thus, running time of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ is $O(f^4)$. Moreover, $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, u)$ returns $4f^2$ candidate intermediate vertices. Thus, in the worst case, we can add at most $8f^3$ vertices in INTERMEDIATE. Thus, we claim the following lemma:

Lemma 9.6. *The running time of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ is $O(f^4)$ and the size of INTERMEDIATE set returned by it is $\leq 8f^3$.*

9.5 Summary of the the proof of [Lemma 8.2](#)

If the pair (x, y) satisfies [\(S1\)](#), then we can use our discussion in the above three sections. In $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$, in the best case, we find $xy \diamond F$ and return it. Or, we find an intermediate vertex. But in the worst case, we either find an x -clean or a y -clean vertex. Let us assume that we find a y -clean vertex v . Again, in $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2(x, y, \phi, v)$, in the worst case, we find an x -clean vertex u . And lastly, in $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3(x, y, u, v)$, we are sure to find an intermediate vertex in the worst case. Thus, we either return the path $xy \diamond F$ (in the best case) or a set INTERMEDIATE which contains an intermediate vertex of $xy \diamond F$ (in the worst case). Moreover, in the best case we return $xy \diamond F$ in r -decomposable form. Thus, we have satisfied all the requirement of [Lemma 8.2](#) when the pair (x, y) satisfy setting [\(S1\)](#).

Let us now discuss the other guarantees in [Lemma 8.2](#) which donot assume Setting [\(S1\)](#). In algorithm $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1, \text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_2$ and $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_3$, before we update PATH, we always check if the path contains F or not. Thus, the PATH returned by $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y, r)$ avoids F . Using [Lemma 9.6](#), the running time of $\text{FIND-INTERMEDIATE}_1(x, y)$ is $O(f^4)$ and the size of INTERMEDIATE set is $\leq 8f^3$. Thus, we have proven all the requirements of [Lemma 8.2](#).

10 Proof of [Lemma 8.1](#)

We use [Algorithm 7](#) to find P_1, \dots, P_f . P_1 is the st path. For notational convenience, we assume that a “0-fault tolerant” distance oracle finds the path P_1 . To find P_i ($i \geq 2$), using induction hypothesis, we use the $(i - 1)$ -fault tolerant distance oracle, which returns it in i -decomposable form. If P_i does not contain any faulty edge, then we can return P_i as the answer and exit the query algorithm.

To check if P_i contains an edge $e \in F$ or not, we just need four more invocation of $(i - 1)$ -distance oracle, two times in [Line 6](#) and [Line 7](#). Thus, we invoke the $i - 1$ -fault tolerant distance oracle at most $5f$ times in the i -th iteration of the for loop. Thus, the time taken in the i -th iteration of the for loop can be bounded to $< 5fc^{i^2}i^{8i^2} \log^{2i^2}(nW)$. Summing it over all i , the running time of FINDPATHS is $\sum_{i=1}^f 5fc^{i^2}i^{8i^2} \log^{2i^2}(nW) \leq 10c^{f^2}f^{8f^2+1} \log^{2f^2}(nW)$ (if we set $c \geq 2$). This proves [Lemma 8.1](#).

11 Space taken by our oracle

In [Section 9.1](#), we defined maximisers $\mathbb{D}_1, \mathbb{D}_2$, and \mathbb{D}_3 . The combined size of these maximisers is $O(f^3n^2 \log^2(nW))$. In FINDPATH , we employ an i -fault tolerant distance oracle, which also utilizes maximisers $\mathbb{D}_1, \mathbb{D}_2$, and \mathbb{D}_3 . However, the size of these maximisers is $O(i^3n^2 \log^2(nW))$ as here the

Algorithm 7: FINDPATHS(s, t, F)

```

1  $F' \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2 for  $i = 1$  to  $f$  do
3    $P_i \leftarrow st \diamond F'$  found using an  $i - 1$ -fault distance oracle;
4   foreach  $e \in F - F'$  do
5      $flag \leftarrow 0$ ;
6      $R_1 \leftarrow se \diamond F'$  found using  $i - 1$ -fault tolerant distance oracle;
7      $R_2 \leftarrow et \diamond F'$  found using  $i - 1$ -fault tolerant distance oracle;
8     // Check if  $e$  lies on the path  $P_i$ 
9     if  $|R_1| + w(e) + |R_2| = |st \diamond F'|$  then
10       $F' \leftarrow F' \cup \{e\}$ ;
11       $flag \leftarrow 1$ ;
12      break;
13   if  $flag = 0$  then
14      $P_i$  is our answer;
15     exit;
16 return  $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_f\}$ 

```

fault set is of size i . For each $1 \leq i \leq f$, these three maximisers are constructed only once. Therefore, the overall space required for our maximisers is $O\left(\sum_{i=1}^f i^3 n^2 \log(nW)\right) = O(f^4 n^2 \log^2(nW))$.

References

- [ABK⁺02] Yehuda Afek, Anat Bremler-Barr, Haim Kaplan, Edith Cohen, and Michael Merritt. Restoration by path concatenation: fast recovery of MPLS paths. *Distributed Computing*, 15(4):273–283, 2002. 4
- [AW21] Josh Alman and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. A refined laser method and faster matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 522–539. SIAM, 2021. 2
- [BCC⁺23] Davide Bilò, Shiri Chechik, Keerti Choudhary, Sarel Cohen, Tobias Friedrich, Simon Krogmann, and Martin Schirneck. Approximate distance sensitivity oracles in subquadratic space. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1396–1409, 2023. 3
- [BK08] Aaron Bernstein and David R. Karger. Improved distance sensitivity oracles via random sampling. In Shang-Hua Teng, editor, *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2008, San Francisco, California, USA, January 20-22, 2008*, pages 34–43. SIAM, 2008. 3
- [BK09a] Aaron Bernstein and David Karger. A nearly optimal oracle for avoiding failed vertices and edges. In *Proceedings of the forty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 101–110. ACM, 2009. 3

- [BK09b] Aaron Bernstein and David Karger. A nearly optimal oracle for avoiding failed vertices and edges. In *Proceedings of the forty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 101–110, 2009. [3](#)
- [BK13] Surender Baswana and Neelesh Khanna. Approximate shortest paths avoiding a failed vertex: Near optimal data structures for undirected unweighted graphs. *Algorithmica*, 66:18–50, 2013. [3](#)
- [CC20] Shiri Chechik and Sarel Cohen. Distance sensitivity oracles with subcubic preprocessing time and fast query time. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1375–1388, 2020. [3](#)
- [CCFK17] Shiri Chechik, Sarel Cohen, Amos Fiat, and Haim Kaplan. $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate f -sensitive distance oracles. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017, Barcelona, Spain, Hotel Porta Fira, January 16-19*, pages 1479–1496, 2017. [3](#)
- [Cha05] Timothy M Chan. All-pairs shortest paths with real weights in $o(n^3/\log n)$ time. In *Algorithms and Data Structures: 9th International Workshop, WADS 2005, Waterloo, Canada, August 15-17, 2005. Proceedings 9*, pages 318–324. Springer, 2005. [1](#)
- [Cha07] Timothy M Chan. More algorithms for all-pairs shortest paths in weighted graphs. In *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 590–598, 2007. [1](#)
- [Cha08] Timothy M Chan. All-pairs shortest paths with real weights in $o(n^3/\log n)$ time. *Algorithmica*, 50:236–243, 2008. [1](#)
- [CW87] Don Coppersmith and Shmuel Winograd. Matrix multiplication via arithmetic progressions. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 1–6, 1987. [2](#)
- [Dob90] Włodzimierz Dobosiewicz. A more efficient algorithm for the min-plus multiplication. *International journal of computer mathematics*, 32(1-2):49–60, 1990. [1](#)
- [DP09] Ran Duan and Seth Pettie. Dual-failure distance and connectivity oracles. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2009, New York, NY, USA, January 4-6, 2009*, pages 506–515, 2009. [2](#)
- [DR22] Ran Duan and Hanlin Ren. Maintaining exact distances under multiple edge failures. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 1093–1101. ACM, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [8](#), [11](#)
- [DTCR08] Camil Demetrescu, Mikkel Thorup, Rezaul Alam Chowdhury, and Vijaya Ramachandran. Oracles for distances avoiding a failed node or link. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 37(5):1299–1318, 2008. [2](#), [3](#)
- [Flo67] Robert W Floyd. Algorithm 97. *Comm. ACM*, 5:345, 1967. [1](#)
- [Fre76] Michael L Fredman. New bounds on the complexity of the shortest path problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 5(1):83–89, 1976. [1](#)

- [Gal14] François Le Gall. Powers of tensors and fast matrix multiplication. In *International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ISSAC '14, Kobe, Japan, July 23-25, 2014*, pages 296–303, 2014. [2](#)
- [GR21] Yong Gu and Hanlin Ren. Constructing a distance sensitivity oracle in $O(n^{2.5794}M)$ time. In Nikhil Bansal, Emanuela Merelli, and James Worrell, editors, *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2021, July 12-16, 2021, Glasgow, Scotland (Virtual Conference)*, volume 198 of *LIPIcs*, pages 76:1–76:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. [3](#)
- [GS18] Manoj Gupta and Aditi Singh. Generic single edge fault tolerant exact distance oracle. In *45th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2018, July 9-13, 2018, Prague, Czech Republic*, pages 72:1–72:15, 2018. [3](#)
- [GW19] Fabrizio Grandoni and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Faster replacement paths and distance sensitivity oracles. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 16(1):1–25, 2019. [3](#)
- [Han04] Yijie Han. Improved algorithm for all pairs shortest paths. *Information Processing Letters*, 91(5):245–250, 2004. [1](#)
- [Han06] Yijie Han. An $o(n^3 (\log \log n / \log n)^{5/4})$ time algorithm for all pairs shortest paths. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 411–417. Springer, 2006. [1](#)
- [Han08] Yijie Han. An $o(n^3 (\log \log n / \log n)^{5/4})$ time algorithm for all pairs shortest path. *Algorithmica*, 51:428–434, 2008. [1](#)
- [HS01] John Hershberger and Subhash Suri. Vickrey prices and shortest paths: What is an edge worth? In *Proceedings 42nd IEEE symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 252–259. IEEE, 2001. [3](#)
- [KS23] Adam Karczmarz and Piotr Sankowski. Sensitivity and dynamic distance oracles via generic matrices and frobenius form. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2023, Santa Cruz, CA, USA, November 6-9, 2023*, 2023. [2](#), [3](#)
- [PP13] Merav Parter and David Peleg. Sparse fault-tolerant bfs trees. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 779–790. Springer, 2013. [3](#)
- [Sto10] Andrew James Stothers. On the complexity of matrix multiplication. 2010. [2](#)
- [Tak92] Tadao Takaoka. A new upper bound on the complexity of the all pairs shortest path problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 43(4):195–199, 1992. [1](#)
- [Tak04] Tadao Takaoka. A faster algorithm for the all-pairs shortest path problem and its application. In *Computing and Combinatorics: 10th Annual International Conference, COCOON 2004, Jeju Island, Korea, August 17-20, 2004. Proceedings 10*, pages 278–289. Springer, 2004. [1](#)
- [Tak05] Tadao Takaoka. An $o(n^3 \log \log n / \log n)$ time algorithm for the all-pairs shortest path problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 96(5):155–161, 2005. [1](#)
- [vdBS19] Jan van den Brand and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Sensitive distance and reachability oracles for large batch updates. In David Zuckerman, editor, *60th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2019, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, November 9-12, 2019*, pages 424–435. IEEE Computer Society, 2019. [2](#), [3](#)

- [War62] Stephen Warshall. A theorem on boolean matrices. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 9(1):11–12, 1962. [1](#)
- [Wil12] Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Multiplying matrices faster than coppersmith-winograd. In *Proceedings of the 44th Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC 2012, New York, NY, USA, May 19 - 22, 2012*, pages 887–898, 2012. [2](#)
- [Wil14] Ryan Williams. Faster all-pairs shortest paths via circuit complexity. In *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 664–673, 2014. [1](#)
- [WY13] Oren Weimann and Raphael Yuster. Replacement paths and distance sensitivity oracles via fast matrix multiplication. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 9(2), March 2013. [2](#), [3](#)
- [Zwi04] Uri Zwick. A slightly improved sub-cubic algorithm for the all pairs shortest paths problem with real edge lengths. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 921–932. Springer, 2004. [1](#)

A Proof of [Lemma 2.3](#)

Let x be the first vertex at a distance $\geq 2^i$ from s on $P[s, t]$. Since $P[s, t]$ is in f -decomposable form, let us assume that it is represented as $L_1 \odot e_1 \odot L_2 \odot \dots \odot e_{f-1} \odot L_f$, where each L_i is a shortest path. Since we know the weights of these paths and interleaving edges, we can efficiently identify the segment L_i containing x . Let L_i represent the shortest path pq . Suppose we’ve determined that x is at least distance d from p .

If d is a power of 2, we can use information stored at vertex q in the tree T_p to find x . Else, let ℓ be such that $2^\ell \leq d < 2^{\ell+1}$. Then we locate the vertex at a distance $\geq 2^\ell$ -th on the pq path, denoting it as p_1 . We then recursively examine the path p_1q .

In a maximum of $\log(nW)$ recursive steps, we can identify x . Initially, it takes $O(f)$ time to find the shortest path L_i , and then an additional $\log(nW)$ time to locate x on L_i . Therefore, the overall time complexity is $O(f + \log(nW))$.