

Online Deterministic Minimum Cost Bipartite Matching with Delays on a Line

Tung-Wei Kuo

Department of Computer Science, National Chengchi University, Taiwan
twkuo@cs.nccu.edu.tw

Abstract

We study the online minimum cost bipartite perfect matching with delays problem. In this problem, m servers and m requests arrive over time, and an online algorithm can delay the matching between servers and requests by paying the delay cost. The objective is to minimize the total distance and delay cost. When servers and requests lie in a known metric space, there is a randomized $O(\log n)$ -competitive algorithm, where n is the size of the metric space. When the metric space is unknown a priori, Azar and Jacob-Fanani proposed a deterministic $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} m^{\log\left(\frac{3+\epsilon}{2}\right)}\right)$ -competitive algorithm for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$. This competitive ratio is tight when $n = 1$ and becomes $O(m^{0.59})$ for sufficiently small ϵ .

In this paper, we improve upon the result of Azar and Jacob-Fanani for the case where servers and requests are on the real line, providing a deterministic $\tilde{O}(m^{0.5})$ -competitive algorithm. Our algorithm is based on the Robust Matching (RM) algorithm proposed by Raghvendra for the minimum cost bipartite perfect matching problem. In this problem, delay is not allowed, and all servers arrive in the beginning. When a request arrives, the RM algorithm immediately matches the request to a free server based on the request's minimum t -net-cost augmenting path, where $t > 1$ is a constant. In our algorithm, we delay the matching of a request until its waiting time exceeds its minimum t -net-cost divided by t .

1 Introduction

Consider an online gaming platform where players are paired for gameplay. To improve the gaming experience, players with similar skill ratings should be matched together. However, when a new player joins, a suitable matching may not be available immediately. In this case, it is essential to delay the matching process, in the hope of finding a better matching in the near future. Clearly, the waiting time and the similarity between matched players should be considered jointly, and a natural approach is to minimize the sum of both terms.

The above problem is captured by the Minimum cost Perfect Matching with Delays (MPMD) problem [EKW16]. In the MPMD problem, demands arrive over time, and their similarities are modeled by a metric space. When a demand arrives, an online algorithm has the option to postpone the matching process by incurring a delay cost. The objective is to minimize the sum of the total delay time (i.e., delay cost) and the total distance between matched demands in the metric space (i.e., distance cost).

In numerous matching applications, entities can only be matched if they belong to different types (e.g., teacher-student, donor-donoree, buyer-seller, and driver-passenger). These binary classifications motivate the Minimum cost Bipartite Perfect Matching with Delays (MBPMD) problem [ACK17, AAC+17]. In the MBPMD problem, there are two types of demands, servers and requests. An online algorithm has to match each request to a server. Like the MPMD problem, the objective is to minimize the total distance and delay cost.

In this paper, we study the MBPMD problem on a line, where requests and servers are positioned on the real line. For example, skiers (requests) should be matched to skis (servers) of approximately their height [ABN+14]. Another example is matching buyers (requests) and sellers (servers) based on their stated prices. In these examples, requests and servers are represented as numbers on the real line, corresponding to heights or prices. We analyze our algorithm using the standard notion of competitive ratio. In particular, an online algorithm is said to be c -competitive ($c \geq 1$) if for any input, the cost of the algorithm is at most c times the cost of the optimal offline algorithm.

Background. For the MPMD problem, Emek et al. proposed a randomized $O(\log^2 n + \log \Delta)$ -competitive algorithm [EKW16], where n is the number of points in the metric space and Δ is the aspect ratio of the metric space. Azar et al. then proposed a randomized $O(\log n)$ -competitive algorithm, and proved that the competitive ratio for any randomized algorithm is $\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$ [ACK17]. Ashlagi et al. further improved this lower bound to $\Omega\left(\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}\right)$ [AAC+17]. All the above randomized algorithms used the celebrated result of Fakcharoenphol et al. [FRT03] to transform the original metric space into a distribution over Hierarchically Separated Trees (HSTs). As a result, these algorithms need to know the metric space in advance.

The algorithms in [EKW16] and [ACK17] are randomized. For offline problems, we can repeatedly execute a randomized algorithm until we find a satisfactory solution. However, for online problems, we can only execute an algorithm once, and the output cannot be changed. Thus, a more robust approach for online problems is to design deterministic algorithms.

For the MPMD problem, Bienkowski et al. first proposed a deterministic $O(m^{2.46})$ -competitive algorithm, where m is the number of demands to be matched [BKS17]. Bienkowski et al. then proposed a deterministic $O(m)$ -competitive algorithm [BKLS18]. Finally, Azar and Jacob-Fanani proposed a deterministic $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} m^{\log\left(\frac{3+\epsilon}{2}\right)}\right)$ -competitive algorithm for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ [AJF20]. For small enough ϵ , the competitive ratio becomes $O(m^{0.59})$. Unlike the previous randomized algorithms, the above three deterministic algorithms do not need to know the metric space in advance.

When the metric space is a tree, Azar et al. also proposed a deterministic $O(n)$ -competitive algorithm in [ACK17]. Moreover, when $n = 2$, Emek et al. proposed a deterministic 3-competitive algorithm, and proved that 3 is the best possible competitive ratio [ESW19].

For the MBPMD problem, Azar et al. first proposed a randomized $O(\log n)$ -competitive algorithm, and proved that any randomized algorithm has a competitive ratio of $\Omega(\log^{1/3} n)$ [ACK17]. This lower bound is further improved to $\Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}\right)$ [AAC+17]. For deterministic algorithms, Bienkowski et al. first proposed an $O(m)$ -competitive algorithm [BKLS18] for the MBPMD problem. Azar and Jacob-Fanani then proposed an $O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} m^{\log\left(\frac{3+\epsilon}{2}\right)}\right)$ -competitive algorithm for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ [AJF20]. For small enough ϵ , the competitive ratio becomes $O(m^{0.59})$. All the above algorithms are based on the algorithms for the MPMD problem. Moreover, the competitive ratios in [BKLS18] and [AJF20] are tight when the metric space is a line.¹ In summary, prior to our work, the best known competitive ratio for the deterministic MBPMD problem on a line was $O(m^{0.59})$.

Our Contribution and Techniques. In this paper, we introduce a deterministic $\tilde{O}(m^{0.5})$ -competitive algorithm for the MBPMD problem on a line, improving upon the $O(m^{0.59})$ -competitive algorithm of [AJF20]. Specifically, we have the following result.

¹In fact, the competitive ratios in [BKLS18] and [AJF20] are tight when $n = 2$ and $n = 1$, respectively.

Theorem 1.1. *There is a deterministic $O(\sqrt{m} \log^2 m)$ -competitive algorithm for the MBPMD problem on a line.*

Our algorithm is based on the Robust Matching (RM) algorithm proposed by Raghvendra for the online Minimum cost Bipartite Perfect Matching (MBPM) problem [Rag16]. In the MBPM problem, all servers arrive in the beginning, and an online algorithm must match a request immediately after it arrives. The objective is to minimize the total distance cost of the matching. Nayyar and Raghvendra [NR17] proved that the competitive ratio of the RM algorithm for any d -dimensional Euclidean metric space is $O(n^{1-1/d} \log^2 n)$. Raghvendra further proved that for one-dimensional Euclidean metric space, RM algorithm is $O(\log n)$ -competitive [Rag18]. From a bird's eye view, RM algorithm maintains an offline matching M^{OFF} and an online matching M^{RM} , which is the real output matching. When request r_i arrives, RM algorithm computes an M^{OFF} -augmenting path P_i from r_i to some free server s_j . RM algorithm then adds (r_i, s_j) to M^{RM} and augments M^{OFF} by P_i .

Specifically, P_i is such that minimizes the γ -net-cost² among all M^{OFF} -augmenting paths from r_i to a free server. When M^{OFF} is augmented by a path P , edges shared by P and M^{OFF} are removed from M^{OFF} , and other edges in P are added to M^{OFF} . The γ -net-cost of P is the total distance of the edges added to M^{OFF} (multiplied by γ) minus the total distance of the edges removed from M^{OFF} .

There are two major differences between the MBPM problem and the MBPMD problem. Specifically, in the MBPM problem considered by the RM algorithm:

1. All servers arrive in the beginning.
2. Once a request arrives, the request must be matched immediately. Thus, the objective function does not consider delay cost.

To address the above differences, we first introduce a Moving Virtual (MV) server \tilde{s}_i for every request r_i . Specifically, we consider the Time-Augmented (TA) plane [BKS17, AJF20] that adds the time axis to the original one-dimensional space. Thus, the TA plane is two-dimensional. When r_i arrives, \tilde{s}_i and r_i are at the same point in the TA plane, with the time-coordinate being r_i 's arrival time. The time-coordinate of r_i is fixed, while the time-coordinate of \tilde{s}_i is always the current time. Thus, the distance between r_i and \tilde{s}_i in the TA plane is always r_i 's current waiting time. For any real server, its time-coordinate is fixed at its arrival time.

For each request r_i , our algorithm maintains two M^{OFF} -augmenting paths, a *real* augmenting path P_i and a *virtual* augmenting path \tilde{P}_i . P_i is such that minimizes the γ -net-cost among all augmenting paths from r_i to a real free server in the TA plane, and \tilde{P}_i is such that minimizes the γ -net-cost among all augmenting paths from r_i to an MV server in the TA plane, with the last edge connecting a request r_p (possibly different from r_i) to r_p 's MV server \tilde{s}_p .

Initially, the virtual minimum γ -net-cost (i.e., the γ -net-cost of \tilde{P}_i) is zero (since \tilde{P}_i contains only r_i and \tilde{s}_i initially) and is thus less than or equal to the real minimum γ -net-cost (i.e., P_i 's γ -net-cost). After a server arrives or after M^{OFF} is augmented by another request's augmenting path, P_i and \tilde{P}_i may change. Moreover, because the distance between r_p and \tilde{s}_p in the TA plane increases over time, the virtual minimum γ -net-cost increases over time. When the virtual minimum γ -net-cost is greater than or equal to the real minimum γ -net-cost, our algorithm matches r_i to the endpoint server of P_i and augments M^{OFF} by P_i .

In Section 4, we show that the algorithm can be greatly simplified: we match r_i when its waiting time is greater than or equal to the real minimum γ -net-cost divided by γ . Thus, we no longer need MV servers in our algorithm. To this end, we prove that the virtual minimum γ -net-cost is always γ times r_i 's waiting time (Eq. (4)). Nevertheless, MV servers facilitate the analysis of our algorithm in the following senses:

1. In this paper, we upper bound r_i 's delay cost by its real minimum γ -net-cost. Thus, we have to show that the real minimum γ -net-cost cannot suddenly drop below the waiting time, even when a new server arrives. In our proof, we replace the new server with an MV server to create a virtual augmenting path \tilde{P} whose γ -net-cost is a lower bound of the real minimum γ -net-cost. We then lower bound \tilde{P} 's γ -net-cost by the virtual minimum γ -net-cost and Eq. (4).
2. When our algorithm matches r_i at time t , the optimal solution may match r_i to some server s that arrives after time t . In our proof, we replace this future server s with an MV server (which creates a virtual augmenting path) to derive lower bounds for the optimal cost.

In [Rag16], it has been shown that the total distance cost can be upper bounded by the total γ -net-cost. Because we further upper bound the delay cost by the γ -net-cost, our algorithm's total cost is upper bounded by the total γ -net-cost. To prove Theorem 1.1, we then use the techniques in [NR17] to relate the total γ -net-cost to the optimal cost in the TA plane (recall that the TA plane is two-dimensional).

The main challenge in our analysis is to prove that the real minimum γ -net-cost cannot decrease after M^{OFF} is augmented by another request (Lemma 4.2), so that we can upper bound the delay cost by the real minimum γ -net-cost. To this end, we partition P_i and derive lower bounds for the γ -net-cost of P_i 's subpaths.

²In [Rag16], this cost is referred to as the t -net-cost. However, because t denotes time in this paper, we change t -net-cost to γ -net-cost.

1.1 Other Related Work

Without considering waiting times (and thus every request must be matched immediately upon arrival), there has been a considerable amount of research in the literature on how to maximize matching weights or minimize matching costs, considering different arrival patterns for vertices or edges. Relevant literature on these issues can be found in recent years' studies (such as [FHTZ22, KNR22, HSY22, BNW23, Yan24]), or in the excellent survey by Mehta [M⁺13]. On the other hand, some studies have explored settings where recourse is allowed [MSKV19, GKS20, MN20, ADJ20, BFT24]. In this subsection, we focus on online problems that allow delays.

Poisson Arrival Processes. In [MPRS23], Mari et al. considered the MPMD problem and assumed that the request arrival process follows a Poisson arrival process. Specifically, for each point v in the metric space, the interarrival times of requests at v follow an exponential distribution, and arrival processes at different points are independent of each other. Mari et al. considered a simple greedy algorithm: when the total waiting time of two requests exceeds their distance from each other, they are immediately matched. While it has been shown that such an algorithm has a competitive ratio of $\Omega(m^{0.58})$ in instances designed by Reingold and Tarjan [RT81], Mari et al. proved that when the request arrival process is Poisson, the competitive ratio of this simple greedy algorithm is $O(1)$.

Non-Linear Delay Costs. In the MPMD problem, delay cost equals waiting time. Other studies have considered different forms of delay costs. In [LPWW18], Liu et al. assumed that delay cost is a convex function of waiting time. Specifically, if the waiting time is t , Liu et al. assumed that the delay cost is t^α , where $\alpha > 1$. Liu et al. considered uniform metric space, where the distance between any two points is the same. They proposed a deterministic $O(n)$ -competitive algorithm. In [ARV21], Azar et al. considered the case where the delay cost is a concave function of waiting time. They first considered $n = 1$ and proposed an $O(1)$ -competitive deterministic algorithm. Then they considered $n > 1$ and designed a randomized $O(\log n)$ -competitive algorithm based on HST. Azar et al. also considered the bipartite variant and proposed an $O(1)$ -competitive deterministic algorithm (when $n = 1$) and a randomized $O(\log n)$ -competitive algorithm (when $n > 1$).

In [DU23], Deryckere and Umboh similarly considered concave functions and designed a deterministic $O(m)$ -competitive primal-dual algorithm. Deryckere and Umboh also utilized set delay functions as delay cost. Specifically, at each time t , the algorithm incurs delay cost as a function of the set of unmatched requests. They proposed a deterministic $O(2^m)$ -competitive algorithm and a randomized $O(m^4)$ -competitive algorithm. Their approach is based on transforming the MPMD problem into a Metrical Task System (MTS) [BLS92] and solving it using MTS algorithms. Deryckere and Umboh also proved that for this problem, the competitive ratio of any deterministic algorithm is $\Omega(n)$, and the competitive ratio of any randomized algorithm is $\Omega(\log n)$.

Other Matching Problems With Delays. In some games, such as poker or mahjong, more than two players are needed. Therefore, we need to match more than two requests at once. [MWW21, KN23] considered this scenario and designed algorithms based on HST and primal-dual transformation. Another way of allowing delay is setting deadlines. In [ABD⁺18], Ashlagi et al. assumed that each request can wait for δ time units upon arrival and not all requests need to be matched. The algorithm aims to find the maximum weight matching, and Ashlagi et al. proposed an $O(1)$ -competitive algorithm.

Other Online Problems With Delays. Many online problems have variants that allow delays. For example, in online network design problems, algorithms need to purchase network links upon request arrival. In the case where delay is allowed, purchased network links may serve multiple requests simultaneously, reducing purchasing costs [AT19, AT20]. Another example is online service problems, in which a server can be moved to serve requests. In the case where delay is allowed, we can compute the shortest path based on multiple requests, reducing server movement distance [AGGP17, Tou23]. For these problems, randomized $O(\text{poly } \log n)$ -competitive algorithms are first proposed based on HST [AT19, AGGP17]. Azar and Touitou then proposed deterministic $O(\text{poly } \log n)$ -competitive algorithms [AT20, Tou23]. Recently, Azar et al. considered the list update with delays problem and designed a deterministic $O(1)$ -competitive algorithm [ALV24].

2 Preliminaries

Given two sets A and B , a matching M between A and B is a set of vertex-disjoint edges between A and B . An element v is said to be *saturated* by M (or M saturates v) if v is an endpoint of some edge in M . A matching M between A and B is said to be *perfect* if M saturates all elements in $A \cup B$.

Problem Definition. In the Minimum cost Bipartite Perfect Matching with Delays (MBPMD) problem, there is an underlying metric space $\mathcal{M} = (V, d)$. m servers and m requests from \mathcal{M} arrive over time. Let $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m\}$ and $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m\}$ be the request set and the server set, respectively. For any $u \in R \cup S$, $a(u)$ denotes u 's arrival time and $\ell(u) \in V$ denotes u 's location in \mathcal{M} . When u arrives at time $a(u)$, $\ell(u)$ and u 's distances to other requests and servers that arrive by time $a(u)$ are revealed to the algorithm. In this paper, r, r_i , and r_p always refer to some request in R , and s, s_j , and s_q always refer to some server in S .

In the MBPMD problem, an online algorithm computes a perfect matching M between R and S . After a request r arrives, the online algorithm can defer the matching of r by paying the delay cost. If the algorithm matches r and s at time t , then the delay cost is $(t - a(r)) + (t - a(s))$. After r and s are matched, (r, s) is added to matching M and cannot be removed from M afterward. In addition, the algorithm pays for the distance cost $d(\ell(r), \ell(s))$. For simplicity, for any $u_1, u_2 \in R \cup S$, define $d(u_1, u_2) = d(\ell(u_1), \ell(u_2))$.

In this paper, we assume that \mathcal{M} is a line metric. Thus, the location of every server and request is a point on the real line, and the distance between any two elements in $R \cup S$ is their distance on the line. Specifically, for any $u \in R \cup S$, let $\text{pos}(u) \in \mathbb{R}$ be the location of u on the real line. Thus, for any $u_1, u_2 \in R \cup S$, $d(u_1, u_2) = |\text{pos}(u_1) - \text{pos}(u_2)|$.

In summary, an online algorithm for the MBPMD problem has to compute a perfect matching M between R and S . For each edge (r, s) in M , let $\text{mt}(r, s)$ be the time when r and s are matched. Clearly, $\text{mt}(r, s) \geq a(r)$ and $\text{mt}(r, s) \geq a(s)$. Given a perfect matching M and a matching time function mt , define

$$\text{cost}(M, \text{mt}) = \sum_{(r,s) \in M} (|\text{pos}(r) - \text{pos}(s)| + (\text{mt}(r, s) - a(r)) + (\text{mt}(r, s) - a(s)))$$

as the total distance and delay cost of a solution (M, mt) . The objective is to minimize $\text{cost}(M, \text{mt})$.

Augmenting Paths. Given a matching M , an M -alternating path is a path that alternates between edges in M and edges not in M . An M -alternating path P is said to be an M -augmenting path if both endpoints of P are not saturated by M . For any path P , we use $E(P)$ to denote the set of undirected edges in P . For any two sets A and B , define $A \oplus B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$ as the symmetric difference between A and B . Observe that for any M -augmenting path P , $M \oplus E(P)$ is a matching of size $|M| + 1$.

While augmenting paths are typically considered as undirected paths, for the sake of convenience, we often view an augmenting path as a directed path from an unsaturated request r to an unsaturated server s . We often refer to an augmenting path by the natural sequence of its vertices. Specifically, an augmenting path P that originates at r and terminates at s can be written in the form of $P = r'_1 s'_1 r'_2 s'_2 \dots r'_\ell s'_\ell$ for some $\ell \geq 1$, where $r'_1 = r, s'_\ell = s$, and $r'_k \in R, s'_k \in S$ for any $1 \leq k \leq \ell$.

Because augmenting paths are directed, edges in augmenting paths can also be viewed as directed edges. We denote by $\overrightarrow{u, v}$ a directed edge from u to v . For any augmenting path P , we use $\overrightarrow{E}(P)$ to denote the set of directed edges in P , (i.e., $\overrightarrow{E}(P) = \{\overrightarrow{r'_1, s'_1}, \overrightarrow{s'_1, r'_2}, \overrightarrow{r'_2, s'_2}, \dots, \overrightarrow{r'_\ell, s'_\ell}\}$). For any directed edge $\overrightarrow{u, v}$, we say that $\overrightarrow{u, v}$ is in an augmenting path P if $\overrightarrow{u, v} \in \overrightarrow{E}(P)$. We have the following simple fact. Recall that in this paper, r always refers to a request in R and s always refers to a server in S .

Fact 2.1. *Let M be any matching between R and S . Let P be any M -augmenting path that originates at a request and terminates at a server. Let $M^{\text{aug}} = M \oplus E(P)$. Then the following statements hold:*

1. For any $\overrightarrow{r, s} \in \overrightarrow{E}(P)$, $(r, s) \notin M$ and $(r, s) \in M^{\text{aug}}$.
2. For any $\overrightarrow{s, r} \in \overrightarrow{E}(P)$, $(r, s) \in M$ and $(r, s) \notin M^{\text{aug}}$.

In other words, for any directed edge from a request to a server in P , it is added to M^{aug} ; for any directed edge from a server to a request in P , it is not in M^{aug} .

We can then express the γ -net-cost, which was first introduced by Raghvendra [Rag16], based on the directions of edges. For any $\gamma > 1$ and any augmenting path P , the γ -net-cost of P is defined as

$$\gamma \left(\sum_{\overrightarrow{r, s} \in \overrightarrow{E}(P)} d(r, s) \right) - \sum_{\overrightarrow{s, r} \in \overrightarrow{E}(P)} d(r, s).$$

Time Augmented Plane. Throughout this paper, we use M^{OPT} to denote the optimal matching. Observe that for any $(r, s) \in M^{\text{OPT}}$, the optimal solution must match r and s at time $\max(a(r), a(s))$. Thus, the optimal cost can be written as

$$\sum_{(r,s) \in M^{\text{OPT}}} (|\text{pos}(r) - \text{pos}(s)| + |a(r) - a(s)|). \quad (1)$$

The above optimal cost suggests that we can view $S \cup R$ as a set of points in an xy -plane, where each point $v \in S \cup R$ has x -coordinate $\text{pos}(v)$ and y -coordinate $a(v)$. The y -axis can also be viewed as the time axis. We call such an xy -plane the *Time Augmented (TA) plane*. Observe that $|\text{pos}(r) - \text{pos}(s)| + |a(r) - a(s)|$ is the Manhattan distance between r and s in the TA plane. TA planes are also used in [BKS17, AJF20].

Paper Organization. In Section 3, we present our algorithm with MV servers for the MBPMD problem on a line and state some basic properties. In Section 4, we remove MV servers from our algorithm and prove Theorem 1.1.

3 An Online Matching Algorithm with Moving Virtual Servers

In this section, we describe our algorithm, which introduces Moving Virtual (MV) servers into the RM algorithm. We thus call our algorithm the Virtual RM (VRM) algorithm. In the next section, we will present a simplified version of the algorithm without MV servers.

3.1 Moving Virtual Servers

In the VRM algorithm, whenever a request r_i arrives, the algorithm creates a Moving Virtual (MV) server \tilde{s}_i , and sets $a(\tilde{s}_i) = a(r_i)$. Moreover, $\text{pos}(r_i) = \text{pos}(\tilde{s}_i)$. Therefore, we can also view \tilde{s}_i as a point in the TA plane. \tilde{s}_i moves upward in the TA plane. Specifically, at time $t \geq a(r_i)$, the y -coordinate of \tilde{s}_i in the TA plane is t . A simple property is that the distance between an unmatched request and its MV server in the TA plane is always the request's current waiting time. To differentiate between servers in S and MV servers, we call servers in S the **real** servers. Our algorithm never matches a request to an MV server.

For any $u_1, u_2 \in R \cup S$, the distance between u_1 and u_2 in the TA plane, denoted by $D(u_1, u_2)$, is defined as

$$D(u_1, u_2) = |\text{pos}(u_1) - \text{pos}(u_2)| + |a(u_1) - a(u_2)|.$$

For any $r_i \in R$, the distance between r_i and its MV server \tilde{s}_i in the TA plane at time t , denoted by $D_t(r_i, \tilde{s}_i)$, is defined as

$$D_t(r_i, \tilde{s}_i) = t - a(r_i).$$

An important observation is that if at time t , r_i already arrives but a server s has not arrived yet (i.e., $a(r_i) \leq t < a(s)$), then

$$D(r_i, s) \geq a(s) - a(r_i) > t - a(r_i) = D_t(r_i, \tilde{s}_i). \quad (2)$$

3.2 The VRM Algorithm

Like the RM algorithm, the VRM algorithm maintains an offline matching M^{OFF} and an online matching M^{VRM} , which is the real output matching. Unlike the RM algorithm, the VRM algorithm needs to decide the matching time for each edge $(r, s) \in M^{VRM}$, denoted by $\text{mt}^{VRM}(r, s)$. All the servers in M^{OFF} and M^{VRM} are real, and these two matchings saturate the same set of servers and requests. A real server or a request is said to be **free** if it has arrived but not yet matched by M^{OFF} . Initially, both matchings are empty.

We consider two types of augmenting paths, real and virtual, in the TA plane. An augmenting path P is **real** if all servers in P are real. An augmenting path P is **virtual** if the last directed edge of P is from some request r_p to r_p 's MV server (i.e., $\overrightarrow{r_p, \tilde{s}_p}$), and all the other servers in P are real. For any real M^{OFF} -augmenting path P , define the γ -net-cost of P in the TA plane, denoted by $\varphi_\gamma(P)$, as

$$\varphi_\gamma(P) = \gamma \left(\sum_{\overrightarrow{r, \tilde{s}} \in \vec{E}(P)} D(r, s) \right) - \sum_{\overrightarrow{s, \tilde{r}} \in \vec{E}(P)} D(r, s).$$

The γ -net-cost of virtual augmenting paths is defined similarly. The only difference is that the distance function of the last directed edge is D_t instead of D . Specifically, for any virtual M^{OFF} -augmenting path \tilde{P} that terminates at MV server \tilde{s}_p and any time $t \geq a(r_p)$, define the γ -net-cost of \tilde{P} at time t in the TA plane, denoted by $\varphi_{\gamma, t}(\tilde{P})$, as

$$\varphi_{\gamma, t}(\tilde{P}) = \gamma \left(D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p) + \sum_{\overrightarrow{r, \tilde{s}} \in \vec{E}(\tilde{P})} D(r, s) \right) - \sum_{\overrightarrow{s, \tilde{r}} \in \vec{E}(\tilde{P})} D(r, s).$$

We stress that in the above definition, s is a real server. In this paper, we assume $\gamma = 3$ and drop the subscript γ in φ_γ and $\varphi_{\gamma, t}$ if it is clear from the context.

Description of the Algorithm. After a request r_i arrives, the VRM algorithm maintains a real M^{OFF} -augmenting path P_i and a virtual M^{OFF} -augmenting path \tilde{P}_i . Specifically, P_i is such that minimizes the γ -net-cost among all real M^{OFF} -augmenting paths that originate at r_i . On the other hand, for any time t , \tilde{P}_i is such that minimizes the γ -net-cost among all virtual M^{OFF} -augmenting paths that originate at r_i at time t . We call P_i (respectively, \tilde{P}_i) the **real minimum augmenting path** (respectively, **virtual minimum augmenting path**) of r_i . Note that in the absence of free servers, P_i does not exist. If so, we assume $\varphi(P_i) = \infty$.

Fix an offline matching M^{OFF} . Because $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i)$ increases as t increases, $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i)$ exceeds $\varphi(P_i)$ eventually. A request r_i is said to be **ready** at time t if it is free and $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i) \geq \varphi(P_i)$. For any directed path P , denote by $\text{ori}(P)$ and $\text{ter}(P)$ as the first and last vertices in P , respectively. Whenever some request r_i is ready at time t , we first augment M^{OFF} by setting $M^{OFF} \leftarrow M^{OFF} \oplus E(P_i)$. We then add $(r_i, \text{ter}(P_i))$ to M^{VRM} , and set $\text{mt}^{VRM}(r_i, \text{ter}(P_i)) = t$. Finally, we update all free requests' real and virtual minimum augmenting paths (since M^{OFF} is changed).³

In the following, we first explain the subroutine that computes P_i and \tilde{P}_i at any time t (Section 3.2.1). We then discuss the timings for computing P_i and \tilde{P}_i (Section 3.2.2).

3.2.1 Computing Minimum Augmenting Paths

The subroutine for computing P_i and \tilde{P}_i basically follows that in [Rag16]. Let $\tilde{S} = \{\tilde{s}_1, \tilde{s}_2, \dots, \tilde{s}_m\}$. Our algorithm maintains dual variables $z(\cdot)$ for $R \cup S \cup \tilde{S}$ and the following invariants:

$$z(r) + z(s) \leq \gamma D(r, s), \forall r \in R, s \in S. \quad (\text{I1})$$

$$z(r_p) + z(\tilde{s}_p) \leq \gamma D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p), \forall r_p \in R, t \geq a(r_p). \quad (\text{I2})$$

$$z(v) = 0, \forall v \in \tilde{S} \cup \{u | u \in R \cup S, u \text{ is not saturated by } M^{OFF}\}. \quad (\text{I3})$$

$$z(r) + z(s) = D(r, s), \forall (r, s) \in M^{OFF}. \quad (\text{I4})$$

By Invariant (I3), all the dual variables are zero initially. It is easy to see that all invariants hold initially. $z(\cdot)$ is only updated when M^{OFF} is augmented. The subroutine for updating $z(\cdot)$ is discussed in Section 3.2.3. Fix a time t , a free request r_i , an offline matching M^{OFF} , and $z(\cdot)$, we next explain how to compute P_i and \tilde{P}_i .

Let R_{sat} be the set of requests that are saturated by M^{OFF} , and \tilde{S}_{sat} be the set of MV servers of the requests in R_{sat} . Let S_t be the set of servers that arrive by time t . We construct an edge-weighted directed bipartite graph $G_{i,t}$ with partite sets $R_{sat} \cup \{r_i\}$ and $S_t \cup \tilde{S}_{sat} \cup \{\tilde{s}_i\}$. The edge weight is the edge's slack with respect to dual variables $z(\cdot)$. $G_{i,t}$ is called the **slack graph** of r_i at time t and is constructed as follows:

1. For every server s in S_t and every request r in R_{sat} , if $(s, r) \in M^{OFF}$, we add to $G_{i,t}$ a directed edge $\overrightarrow{s, r}$ with edge weight $sl(\overrightarrow{s, r}) = 0$.
2. For every server s in S_t and every request r in $R_{sat} \cup \{r_i\}$, if $(r, s) \notin M^{OFF}$, we add to $G_{i,t}$ a directed edge $\overrightarrow{r, s}$ with edge weight $sl(\overrightarrow{r, s}) = \gamma D(r, s) - (z(r) + z(s))$.
3. For every request r_p in $R_{sat} \cup \{r_i\}$, we add to $G_{i,t}$ a directed edge $\overrightarrow{r_p, \tilde{s}_p}$ with edge weight $sl(\overrightarrow{r_p, \tilde{s}_p}) = \gamma(D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p)) - (z(r_p) + z(\tilde{s}_p))$.

We then set P_i as the shortest path from r_i to the set of real free server in $G_{i,t}$. This can be done by first computing all the shortest paths from r_i to each free real server in $G_{i,t}$ and then outputting the shortest one among these paths. Similarly, we set \tilde{P}_i as the shortest path from r_i to the set of MV servers in $G_{i,t}$. In Appendix A.1, we prove that this subroutine indeed computes the real and virtual minimum augmenting paths. In particular, it can be shown that for any augmenting path P , P 's weight on $G_{i,t}$ equals P 's γ -net-cost. The proof is similar to that in [Rag16].

³If multiple requests become ready at the same time, we choose one of them arbitrarily and process it as described above. Other ready requests' real and virtual minimum augmenting paths will be updated according to the new offline matching. As a result, some ready requests may not be ready after the update.

3.2.2 Timings for Updating P_i and \tilde{P}_i

For each free request r_i , we use the subroutine in Section 3.2.1 to compute P_i and \tilde{P}_i when r_i arrives or whenever one of the following events occurs:

Event SA: A server arrives.

Event AU: M^{OFF} is augmented by another request's augmenting path.

When Event SA occurs, we only need to update P_i , as \tilde{P}_i cannot change due to the arrival of a new server.

Observe that all virtual augmenting paths increase the γ -net-cost by the same speed. Specifically, for any virtual augmenting path \tilde{P} at time t and some future time $t' > t$, we have $\varphi_{t'}(\tilde{P}) = \varphi_t(\tilde{P}) + \gamma(t' - t)$. Thus, if Event AU does not occur (and thus M^{OFF} does not change), then r_i 's virtual minimum augmenting path cannot change. Therefore, we only need to update \tilde{P}_i when Event AU occurs.

Whenever P_i or \tilde{P}_i is updated at some time t , we check whether r_i becomes ready (i.e., $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i) \geq \varphi(P_i)$). If not, we compute the following **ready timing** t_i^{rdy} for r_i :

$$t_i^{rdy} = t + \frac{\varphi(P_i) - \varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i)}{\gamma}.$$

At time t_i^{rdy} , r_i becomes ready. Note that P_i and \tilde{P}_i may change before time t_i^{rdy} . If so, we update t_i^{rdy} again.

3.2.3 Updating the Dual Variables

We update the dual variables $z(\cdot)$ whenever M^{OFF} is augmented by some ready request r_i 's augmenting path P_i . Let t be the time when M^{OFF} is augmented by P_i . Let $G^{pre} = G_{i,t}$ be the slack graph of r_i right before M^{OFF} is augmented by P_i . For each vertex v in G^{pre} , define $sl(r_i, v)$ as the shortest distance from r_i to v in G^{pre} . Let $s^* = \text{ter}(P_i)$. We update $z(\cdot)$ in two steps.

Step 1: • For every request r in G^{pre} , if $sl(r_i, r) < sl(r_i, s^*)$, we then set

$$z(r) \leftarrow z(r) + (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r)).$$

• For every real server s in G^{pre} , if $sl(r_i, s) < sl(r_i, s^*)$, we then set

$$z(s) \leftarrow z(s) - (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, s)).$$

Step 2: • For every $\vec{r}, \vec{s} \in \vec{E}(P_i)$, we set $z(r) \leftarrow z(r) - (\gamma - 1)D(r, s)$.

Note that for every directed edge \vec{r}, \vec{s} considered in Step 2, (r, s) is added to M^{OFF} after r_i is matched.

Recall that all the invariants hold initially. In Appendix A.2, we prove that all the invariants hold after Step 2 is executed. The proof is similar to that in [Rag16]. One difference is that to prove Invariant (I2), we use the property of the VRM algorithm that when \vec{r}_i is matched at time t , $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i) \geq \varphi(P_i)$ must hold. Thus, for any request r_p in G^{pre} , we have $sl(r_i, r_p) + sl(r_p, \vec{s}_p) = sl(r_i, \vec{s}_p) \geq \varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i) \geq \varphi(P_i) = sl(r_i, s^*)$. Therefore, the increase of $z(r_p)$ due to Step 1 (i.e., $sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r_p)$) is at most the slack between r_p and its MV server. Another difference lies in the proof of Invariant (II) for servers that have not arrived yet. Specifically, let r_p be any request in G^{pre} and s be any server that is not in G^{pre} . Because $z(s) = 0$, we only need to prove $\gamma D(r_p, s) \geq z(r_p)$. Because $\gamma D(r_p, s) \geq \gamma D_t(r_p, \vec{s}_p)$ (by Eq. (2)), the proof then follows from Invariant (I2).

3.3 Upper Bounding Distance in the TA Plane and Nonnegativity of γ -Net-Costs

We first state a lemma that upper bounds $D(M^{VRM})$ by the sum of the minimum γ -net-cost over all requests. Specifically, let P_i^* be the real minimum augmenting path of r_i when r_i is ready and matched by the VRM algorithm. The proof of the following lemma is similar to that in [Rag16], and can be found in Appendix A.3. For any matching M , define $D(M) = \sum_{(r,s) \in M} D(r, s)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\gamma > 1$ and M^{VRM} be the final online matching output by the VRM algorithm. Then*

$$D(M^{VRM}) \leq \frac{2}{\gamma - 1} \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(P_i^*).$$

The following lemmas hold throughout the execution of the VRM algorithm. The proofs are similar to those in [NR17], and can be found in Appendix A.4. We stress that in Lemma 3.2, $\text{ter}(P)$ can be any server in S regardless of its arrival time.

Lemma 3.2. *For any real M^{OFF} -augmenting path P , $\varphi(P) \geq 0$.*

Lemma 3.3. *For any time t and any virtual M^{OFF} -augmenting path \tilde{P} at time t , $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}) \geq 0$.*

4 A Simplified Algorithm and Analysis

In this section, we present a simplified algorithm that maintains the same M^{OFF} and M^{VRM} as the VRM algorithm without MV servers. To this end, we prove some properties regarding the change of real and virtual augmenting paths. Throughout the execution of the VRM algorithm, three types of events may occur: a server arrives (Event SA), a request becomes ready (Event AU), and a request arrives (Event RA). The VRM algorithm can be described as an event-driven algorithm:

1. When Event RA occurs, compute the real and virtual minimum augmenting paths for the new request.
2. When Event SA occurs, update the real minimum augmenting paths for all free requests.
3. When Event AU occurs, augment M^{OFF} and update M^{VRM} according to the real minimum augmenting path of the request that becomes ready, and then update the real and virtual minimum augmenting paths for all free requests.

Multiple events may occur simultaneously. If so, these events can be processed in any order.

Fix an arbitrary request r_i . Assume that starting from time $a(r_i)$ to the time when r_i is matched by the VRM algorithm, the algorithm processes events E_1, E_2, \dots, E_ν in order, where E_1 is the event that r_i arrives and E_ν is the event that M^{OFF} is augmented by r_i 's augmenting path (and thus r_i is matched by the VRM algorithm). For any $1 \leq w \leq \nu$, let t_w be the time when E_w is processed. We introduce the following notations to distinguish the states of the VRM algorithm right before an event occurs and right after the event is processed.

- Let $P_{i,w}^{pre}$ and $P_{i,w}^{post}$ be r_i 's real minimum augmenting paths right before E_w occurs and right after E_w is processed, respectively.
- Let $\tilde{P}_{i,w}^{pre}$ and $\tilde{P}_{i,w}^{post}$ be r_i 's virtual minimum augmenting paths right before E_w occurs and right after E_w is processed, respectively.

Define $\varphi_{i,w}^{post} = \varphi(P_{i,w}^{post})$ and $\varphi_{i,w}^{pre} = \varphi(P_{i,w}^{pre})$. Similarly, define $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w}^{post} = \varphi_{t_w}(\tilde{P}_{i,w}^{post})$ and $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w}^{pre} = \varphi_{t_w}(\tilde{P}_{i,w}^{pre})$.

In this paper, we prove that the following two inequalities hold for any $1 \leq w \leq \nu - 1$ (Lemma 4.1). The first one states that after an event is processed, the γ -net-cost of \tilde{P}_i is at most that of P_i .

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w}^{post} \leq \varphi_{i,w}^{post}. \quad (3)$$

The next one states that the simplest virtual augmenting path, $r_i \tilde{s}_i$, is always the the best one. As a result, the virtual minimum γ -net-cost is always γ times r_i 's waiting time.

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w}^{post} = \gamma(t_w - a(r_i)). \quad (4)$$

Lemma 4.1. *Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) hold for any $1 \leq w \leq \nu - 1$.*

4.1 Implications of Lemma 4.1

Implication 1: A simplified algorithm. Recall that r_i becomes ready at time t if $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i) \geq \varphi(P_i)$, and this is the only reason that we need to compute \tilde{P}_i . By Eq. (4), to determine whether r_i is ready, we only need to compare $\varphi(P_i)$ and $\gamma(t - a(r_i))$. Specifically, whenever P_i is updated at some time t , we check whether r_i becomes ready (i.e., $\gamma(t - a(r_i)) \geq \varphi(P_i)$). If not, we compute the following *ready timing* t_i^{rdy} for r_i :

$$t_i^{rdy} = t + \frac{\varphi(P_i) - \gamma(t - a(r_i))}{\gamma}.$$

As a result, in the simplified algorithm, we do not need to compute \tilde{P}_i explicitly.

Implication 2: An upper bound for $\text{cost}(M^{VRM}, \text{mt}^{VRM})$. Observe that for any request r and server s that are matched together at time $\text{mt}(r, s)$, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\text{mt}(r, s) - a(s) \leq \text{mt}(r, s) - a(r) + |a(r) - a(s)|.$$

Thus, the distance and delay cost of (r, s) can be upper bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\text{pos}(r) - \text{pos}(s)| + \text{mt}(r, s) - a(r) + \text{mt}(r, s) - a(s) \\ & \leq |\text{pos}(r) - \text{pos}(s)| + 2(\text{mt}(r, s) - a(r)) + |a(r) - a(s)| \\ & = D(r, s) + 2(\text{mt}(r, s) - a(r)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\text{cost}(M^{VRM}, \text{mt}^{VRM}) \leq D(M^{VRM}) + 2 \sum_{(r_i, s_j) \in M^{VRM}} (\text{mt}^{VRM}(r_i, s_j) - a(r_i)). \quad (5)$$

By Lemma 4.1 (Eq. (3)), after $E_{\nu-1}$ is processed, $\varphi_{t_{\nu-1}}(\tilde{P}_i) \leq \varphi(P_i)$. Because no event is processed between $E_{\nu-1}$ and E_ν , when r_i becomes ready and matched by the VRM algorithm at time t_ν , we must have

$$\varphi(P_i) = \varphi_{t_\nu}(\tilde{P}_i) = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,\nu}^{pre}.$$

Moreover, we have $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,\nu}^{pre} = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,\nu-1}^{post} + \gamma(t_\nu - t_{\nu-1}) = \gamma(t_\nu - a(r_i))$, where the last equality holds due to Lemma 4.1 (Eq. (4)). Thus, for any $(r_i, s_j) \in M^{VRM}$, we have $\varphi(P_i^*) = \gamma(t_\nu - a(r_i)) = \gamma(\text{mt}^{VRM}(r_i, s_j) - a(r_i))$, or equivalently, $\text{mt}^{VRM}(r_i, s_j) - a(r_i) = \frac{1}{\gamma}\varphi(P_i^*)$. Combining with Eq. (5), Lemma 3.1, and $\gamma = 3$, we then have

$$\text{cost}(M^{VRM}, \text{mt}^{VRM}) = O(1) \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(P_i^*). \quad (6)$$

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Recall that by Eq. (1), the optimal cost is $D(M^{OPT})$. By Eq. (6), to prove Theorem 1.1, it suffices to show

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(P_i^*) = O(\sqrt{m} \log^2 m) D(M^{OPT}). \quad (7)$$

The proof is similar to that in [NR17], and we give the proof in Appendix B. The main difference is that in the MBPMD problem, servers arrive over time. However, in [NR17], all servers arrive in the beginning. In our proof, we replace servers that arrive in the future with proper MV servers. For example, to relate $\varphi(P_i^*)$ to $D(M^{OPT})$, [NR17] considered r_i 's augmenting path P in $M^{OFF} \oplus M^{OPT}$, where M^{OFF} is the offline matching right before it is augmented by r_i 's minimum augmenting path. Let r_p be the last request in P . If $\text{ter}(P)$ arrives in the future, we construct a virtual augmenting path \tilde{P} of r_i by replacing $\text{ter}(P)$ with \tilde{s}_p in P . Because $\text{ter}(P)$ arrives in the future, $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}) \leq \varphi(P)$, where t is the time when r_i is matched by the VRM algorithm. By the design of the VRM algorithm, r_i becomes ready at time t , which implies $\varphi(P_i^*) \leq \varphi_t(\tilde{P}) \leq \varphi(P) \leq \gamma D(M^{OPT})$.

Another difference is that in [NR17], the competitive ratio is input sensitive in the sense that the competitive ratio is a function of the server locations. However, because servers are not known in advance in the MBPMD problem, we do not consider input sensitive analysis, and thus our proof is simpler.

4.3 Proof of Lemma 4.1

We prove Lemma 4.1 by induction on w . When $w = 1$, E_w is the event that r_i arrives and thus $t_1 = a(r_i)$. Clearly, $\varphi_{t_1}(r_i \tilde{s}_i) = 0$. Combining with Lemma 3.3, we then have $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,1}^{post} = 0$. Thus, Eq. (4) holds when $w = 1$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.2, Eq. (3) also holds when $w = 1$.

Assume that Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) hold for some $w \in \{1, 2, \dots, \nu - 2\}$. We will prove that Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) hold for $w + 1$, which completes the proof. Because no event occurs between E_w and E_{w+1} , P_i and \tilde{P}_i do not change during E_w and E_{w+1} . In addition, after processing E_w , we must have $t_i^{rdy} \geq t_{w+1}$. (Otherwise, if $t_i^{rdy} < t_{w+1}$, then an event (of type AU) should occur between E_w and E_{w+1} , which leads to a contradiction.) Thus, by the induction hypothesis $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w}^{post} \leq \varphi_{i,w}^{post}$, we then have

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre} \leq \varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre}. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, by the induction hypothesis $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w}^{post} = \gamma(t_w - a(r_i))$, we have

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre} = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w}^{post} + \gamma(t_{w+1} - t_w) = \gamma(t_{w+1} - a(r_i)). \quad (9)$$

We divide the proof into three cases according to the type of E_{w+1} :

Case 1: Event E_{w+1} is of type RA. In this case, r_i 's real and virtual minimum augmenting paths do not change due to E_{w+1} . Specifically,

$$P_{i,w+1}^{post} = P_{i,w+1}^{pre} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{i,w+1}^{post} = \varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre}$$

and

$$\tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post} = \tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{pre} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post} = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre}$$

Thus, by Eq. (8) and Eq. (9), Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) hold for $w + 1$ in this case.

Case 2: Event E_{w+1} is of type SA. Assume that in Event E_{w+1} , a server s arrives. Because \tilde{P}_i does not change due to the arrival of a new server, we then have

$$\tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post} = \tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{pre} \text{ and } \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post} = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre}. \quad (10)$$

Thus, by Eq. (9), Eq. (4) holds for $w+1$ in this case.

Assume that $\overrightarrow{r_p, s_q}$ is the last directed edge in $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$. We first consider the subcase where $s_q \neq s$. In this subcase, P_i is not affected by the arrival of s . We then have

$$P_{i,w+1}^{post} = P_{i,w+1}^{pre} \text{ and } \varphi_{i,w+1}^{post} = \varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre}.$$

Thus, by Eq. (8) and Eq. (10), Eq. (3) holds for $w+1$ in this subcase.

Next, consider the subcase where $s_q = s$. Recall that $\overrightarrow{r_p, s_q}$ is the last directed edge in $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$. Consider a virtual augmenting path \tilde{P} obtained by replacing s_q with \tilde{s}_p in $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$. Because $D(r_p, s_q) \geq a(s_q) - a(r_p) = t_{w+1} - a(r_p) = D_{t_{w+1}}(r_p, \tilde{s}_p)$, we have

$$\varphi_{i,w+1}^{post} \geq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}).$$

Clearly, \tilde{P} is a valid virtual augmenting path of r_i after E_{w+1} . Thus, by the optimality of $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post}$, we then have $\varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}) \geq \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post}$. Therefore, Eq. (3) also holds for $w+1$ in this subcase.

Case 3: Event E_{w+1} is of type AU. The proof of this case follows immediately from Eq. (8), Eq. (9), and the next lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *If Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) hold for some $w \in \{1, 2, \dots, \nu - 2\}$, and Event E_{w+1} is of type AU, then*

$$\varphi_{i,w+1}^{post} \geq \varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre} \text{ and } \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post} = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre}.$$

Proof. Let M_{w+1}^{pre} be the offline matching right before E_{w+1} occurs and M_{w+1}^{post} be the offline matching right after E_{w+1} is processed. Assume that in E_{w+1} , the VRM algorithm augments M_{w+1}^{pre} by request r^* 's minimum augmenting path, denoted by P^* . Thus, $M_{w+1}^{post} = M_{w+1}^{pre} \oplus E(P^*) = (M_{w+1}^{pre} \setminus E(P^*)) \cup (E(P^*) \setminus M_{w+1}^{pre})$. Note that $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$ and $\tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post}$ are M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting paths.

Observe that if $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$ does not use any edge in P^* (i.e., $E(P_{i,w+1}^{post}) \cap E(P^*) = \emptyset$), then $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$ is also a real M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path of r_i ⁴ (in particular, $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$ is a real $(M_{w+1}^{pre} \setminus E(P^*))$ -augmenting path). By the optimality of $\varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre}$, we have $\varphi_{i,w+1}^{post} = \varphi(P_{i,w+1}^{post}) \geq \varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre}$ as desired. Similarly, if $\tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post}$ does not use any edge in P^* , then $\tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post}$ is also a virtual M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path of r_i . Thus, $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post} = \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post}) \geq \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre}$ as desired. Therefore, we assume $E(P_{i,w+1}^{post}) \cap E(P^*) \neq \emptyset$ and $E(\tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post}) \cap E(P^*) \neq \emptyset$.

To prove $\varphi_{i,w+1}^{post} \geq \varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre}$, for any r_i 's real M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path P (e.g., $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$), we construct a real M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path P' of r_i such that

$$\varphi(P') \leq \varphi(P).$$

As a result, when $P = P_{i,w+1}^{post}$, we have $\varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre} \leq \varphi(P') \leq \varphi(P) = \varphi_{i,w+1}^{post}$ as desired.

To prove $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post} = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre}$, we first prove $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post} \geq \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre}$. For any r_i 's virtual M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path \tilde{P} (e.g., $\tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post}$), we construct a real M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path P'' of r_i such that

$$\varphi(P'') \leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}).$$

Because Eq. (3) holds for w , we have $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre} \leq \varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre}$. As a result, when $\tilde{P} = \tilde{P}_{i,w+1}^{post}$, we have

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre} \leq \varphi_{i,w+1}^{pre} \leq \varphi(P'') \leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}) = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post}.$$

Next, we prove $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post} \leq \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre}$. Because $r_i \tilde{s}_i$ is a valid virtual augmenting path for r_i after E_{w+1} is processed and Eq. (4) holds for w , we then have $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{post} \leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(r_i \tilde{s}_i) = \gamma(t_{w+1} - a(r_i)) = \tilde{\varphi}_{i,w+1}^{pre}$.

Construction of P' and P'' . We only give a proof sketch here. The complete proof can be found in Appendix C. The constructions of P' and P'' are similar. Recall that P is any r_i 's real M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path (e.g., $P_{i,w+1}^{post}$). Assume that s is the only server shared by both P and P^* . To construct P' , we first traverse P until s is reached, after which we traverse P^* . We can then prove $\varphi(P') \leq \varphi(P)$ by the optimality of $\varphi(P^*)$. The main difficulty of the proof is to handle the case where P and P^* intersect at multiple servers. To this end, we partition P into subpaths at the intersections of P and P^* , and derive lower bounds of these subpaths' γ -net-costs. \square

⁴A path P is said to be r 's M -augmenting path (or an M -augmenting path of r) if P is an M -augmenting path originating at r .

5 Concluding Remarks

A natural open question regarding Theorem 1.1 is whether the competitive ratio is asymptotically tight. For the MBPM problem, RM algorithm's competitive ratio in [NR17] is almost tight (up to a polylogarithmic factor). However, because matching can be delayed in the MBPMD problem, the lower bound instance and its analysis in [NR17] cannot be directly extended to the MBPMD problem.

References

- [AAC⁺17] Itai Ashlagi, Yossi Azar, Moses Charikar, Ashish Chiplunkar, Ofir Geri, Haim Kaplan, Rahul Makhijani, Yuyi Wang, and Roger Wattenhofer. Min-cost bipartite perfect matching with delays. *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2017)*, 81:1, 2017.
- [ABD⁺18] Itai Ashlagi, Maximilien Burq, Chinmoy Dutta, Patrick Jaillet, Amin Saberi, and Chris Sholley. Maximum weight online matching with deadlines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.03526*, 2018.
- [ABN⁺14] Antonios Antoniadis, Neal Barcelo, Michael Nugent, Kirk Pruhs, and Michele Scquizzato. A $o(n)$ -competitive deterministic algorithm for online matching on a line. In *International Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms*, pages 11–22. Springer, 2014.
- [ACK17] Yossi Azar, Ashish Chiplunkar, and Haim Kaplan. Polylogarithmic bounds on the competitiveness of min-cost perfect matching with delays. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1051–1061. SIAM, 2017.
- [ADJ20] Spyros Angelopoulos, Christoph Dürr, and Shendan Jin. Online maximum matching with recourse. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 40(4):974–1007, 2020.
- [AGGP17] Yossi Azar, Arun Ganesh, Rong Ge, and Debmalya Panigrahi. Online service with delay. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 551–563, 2017.
- [AJF20] Yossi Azar and Amit Jacob-Fanani. Deterministic min-cost matching with delays. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 64(4):572–592, 2020.
- [ALV24] Yossi Azar, Shahar Lewkowicz, and Danny Vainstein. List update with delays or time windows, 2024.
- [ARV21] Yossi Azar, Runtian Ren, and Danny Vainstein. The min-cost matching with concave delays problem. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 301–320. SIAM, 2021.
- [AT19] Yossi Azar and Noam Touitou. General framework for metric optimization problems with delay or with deadlines. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 60–71. IEEE, 2019.
- [AT20] Yossi Azar and Noam Touitou. Beyond tree embeddings—a deterministic framework for network design with deadlines or delay. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1368–1379. IEEE, 2020.
- [BFT24] Sujoy Bhore, Arnold Filtser, and Csaba D. Toth. Online duet between metric embeddings and minimum-weight perfect matchings. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 4564–4579, 2024.
- [BKLS18] Marcin Bienkowski, Artur Kraska, Hsiang-Hsuan Liu, and Paweł Schmidt. A primal-dual online deterministic algorithm for matching with delays. In *International Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms*, pages 51–68. Springer, 2018.
- [BKS17] Marcin Bienkowski, Artur Kraska, and Paweł Schmidt. A match in time saves nine: Deterministic online matching with delays. In *International Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms*, pages 132–146. Springer, 2017.
- [BLS92] Allan Borodin, Nathan Linial, and Michael E Saks. An optimal on-line algorithm for metrical task system. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 39(4):745–763, 1992.

- [BNW23] Niv Buchbinder, Joseph Naor, and David Wajc. Lossless online rounding for online bipartite matching (despite its impossibility). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2030–2068. SIAM, 2023.
- [DU23] Lindsey Deryckere and Seeun William Umboh. Online matching with set and concave delays. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2023)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [EKW16] Yuval Emek, Shay Kutten, and Roger Wattenhofer. Online matching: haste makes waste! In *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 333–344, 2016.
- [ESW19] Yuval Emek, Yaacov Shapiro, and Yuyi Wang. Minimum cost perfect matching with delays for two sources. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 754:122–129, 2019.
- [FHTZ22] Matthew Fahrbach, Zhiyi Huang, Runzhou Tao, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Edge-weighted online bipartite matching. *Journal of the ACM*, 69(6):1–35, 2022.
- [FRT03] Jittat Fakcharoenphol, Satish Rao, and Kunal Talwar. A tight bound on approximating arbitrary metrics by tree metrics. In *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 448–455, 2003.
- [GKS20] Varun Gupta, Ravishankar Krishnaswamy, and Sai Sandeep. Permutation strikes back: The power of recourse in online metric matching. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [HSY22] Zhiyi Huang, Xinkai Shu, and Shuyi Yan. The power of multiple choices in online stochastic matching. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 91–103, 2022.
- [KN23] Naonori Kakimura and Tomohiro Nakayoshi. Deterministic primal-dual algorithms for online k-way matching with delays. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18071*, 2023.
- [KNR22] Haim Kaplan, David Naori, and Danny Raz. Online weighted matching with a sample. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1247–1272. SIAM, 2022.
- [LPWW18] Xingwu Liu, Zhida Pan, Yuyi Wang, and Roger Wattenhofer. Impatient online matching. In *29th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2018)*, volume 123, pages 62–1. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [M⁺13] Aranyak Mehta et al. Online matching and ad allocation. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*, 8(4):265–368, 2013.
- [MN20] Nicole Megow and Lukas Nölke. Online minimum cost matching with recourse on the line. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [MPRS23] Mathieu Mari, Michał Pawłowski, Runtian Ren, and Piotr Sankowski. Online matching with delays and stochastic arrival times. In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 976–984, 2023.
- [MSKV19] Jannik Matuschke, Ulrike Schmidt-Kraepelin, and José Verschae. Maintaining Perfect Matchings at Low Cost. In Christel Baier, Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Paola Flocchini, and Stefano Leonardi, editors, *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019)*, volume 132 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 82:1–82:14, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2019. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [MWW21] Darya Melnyk, Yuyi Wang, and Roger Wattenhofer. Online k-way matching with delays and the h-metric. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06640*, 2021.
- [NR17] Krati Nayyar and Sharath Raghvendra. An input sensitive online algorithm for the metric bipartite matching problem. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 505–515. IEEE, 2017.

- [Rag16] Sharath Raghvendra. A robust and optimal online algorithm for minimum metric bipartite matching. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2016)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016.
- [Rag18] Sharath Raghvendra. Optimal analysis of an online algorithm for the bipartite matching problem on a line. In *34th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2018)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2018.
- [RT81] Edward M Reingold and Robert E Tarjan. On a greedy heuristic for complete matching. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(4):676–681, 1981.
- [Tou23] Noam Touitou. Improved and deterministic online service with deadlines or delay. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 761–774, 2023.
- [Yan24] Shuyi Yan. Edge-weighted online stochastic matching: Beating $1 - \frac{1}{e}$. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 4631–4640, 2024.

A Missing Proofs in Section 3

A.1 Correctness of the Minimum Augmenting Path Subroutine

Recall that the subroutine sets P_i as the shortest path from r_i to the set of real free servers in $G_{i,t}$, and sets \tilde{P}_i as the shortest path from r_i to the set of MV servers in $G_{i,t}$. Due to the construction of $G_{i,t}$, the output P_i (respectively, \tilde{P}_i) is a real (respectively, virtual) M^{OFF} -augmenting path from r_i to some free real (respectively, virtual) servers. Moreover, every real or virtual M^{OFF} -augmenting path starting from r_i has a corresponding path in $G_{i,t}$. Thus, it suffices to show that for any path P in $G_{i,t}$, its distance in $G_{i,t}$ equals $\varphi(P)$ (or $\varphi_t(P)$ if P connects r_i to an MV server). For any path P in $G_{i,t}$, define $sl(P)$ as the total edge weight in P . The correctness of the subroutine is thus a corollary of the following lemmas.

Lemma A.1. *Let P be any path from r_i to any free real server in $G_{i,t}$. Then $\varphi(P) = sl(P)$.*

Proof. By the construction of $G_{i,t}$, we can write P as $r'_1 s'_1 r'_2 s'_2 \cdots r'_\ell s'_\ell$, where $r'_1 = r_i$ and s'_ℓ is a real free server. Moreover, for all $1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$, $\overrightarrow{s'_k, r'_{k+1}} \in M^{OFF}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(P) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} D(s'_k, r'_{k+1}) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Invariant (14)}}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (z(s'_k) + z(r'_{k+1})) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \left(sl(\overrightarrow{r'_k, s'_k}) + z(r'_k) + z(s'_k) \right) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (z(s'_k) + z(r'_{k+1})) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} sl(\overrightarrow{r'_k, s'_k}) + z(r'_1) + z(s'_\ell) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Invariant (13)}}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} sl(\overrightarrow{r'_k, s'_k}) \\
&= sl(P),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because by the construction of $G_{i,t}$, for all $1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$, $sl(\overrightarrow{s'_k, r'_{k+1}}) = 0$. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let \tilde{P} be any path from r_i to any MV server in $G_{i,t}$. Then $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}) = sl(\tilde{P})$.*

Proof. By the construction of $G_{i,t}$, we can write \tilde{P} as $r'_1 s'_1 r'_2 s'_2 \cdots r'_\ell s'_\ell$, where $r'_1 = r_i$ and s'_ℓ is the MV server of some request r_p . Thus, $s'_\ell = \tilde{s}_p$ and $r'_\ell = r_p$. Moreover, for all $1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$, $\overrightarrow{s'_k, r'_{k+1}} \in M^{OFF}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_t(\tilde{P}) &= \gamma D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p) + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} D(s'_k, r'_{k+1}) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Invariant (14)}}{=} \gamma D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p) + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (z(s'_k) + z(r'_{k+1})) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \left(sl(\overrightarrow{r'_k, s'_k}) + z(r'_k) + z(s'_k) \right) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (z(s'_k) + z(r'_{k+1})) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} sl(\overrightarrow{r'_k, s'_k}) + z(r'_1) + z(s'_\ell) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Invariant (13)}}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} sl(\overrightarrow{r'_k, s'_k}) \\
&= sl(\tilde{P}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because by the construction of $G_{i,t}$, for all $1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$, $sl(\overrightarrow{s'_k, r'_{k+1}}) = 0$. \square

A.2 Proof of the Invariants

Lemma A.3. *Assume that Invariants (I1), (I2), and (I3) hold before Step 1 is executed. Then after Step 1, these invariants still hold.*

Proof. Assume that the algorithm augments the offline matching by P_i at time t . In the following proof, M^{pre} and M^{post} refer to the offline matching right before and right after it is augmented by P_i , respectively. Moreover, $z^{pre}(\cdot)$ and $z_1(\cdot)$ refer to the dual variables right before and right after Step 1 is executed, respectively. Thus, by the assumption of the lemma, Invariants (I1), (I2), and (I3) hold with respect to z^{pre} and M^{pre} . Let $G^{pre} = G_{i,t}$ be the slack graph of r_i right before the offline matching is augmented by P_i . Thus, G^{pre} is constructed with respect to M^{pre} and z^{pre} .

Proof of Invariant (I3). Let r be any request that is not saturated by M^{post} . Thus, r is not saturated by M^{pre} and $r \neq r_i$. Therefore, r is not in G^{pre} , and Step 1 does not change $z(r)$. We then have $z_1(r) = z^{pre}(r) = 0$ as desired. Let s be any real server that is not saturated by M^{post} . If s arrives after r_i is matched, then s is not in G^{pre} and thus Step 1 does not change $z(s)$. Thus, $z_1(s) = z^{pre}(s) = 0$ as desired. If s arrives by the time r_i is matched, s is in G^{pre} . Recall that P_i is the shortest path from r_i to the set of free real servers in G^{pre} . The fact that s is not saturated by M^{post} implies that $sl(r_i, s) \geq sl(r_i, s^*)$ (recall that $s^* = \text{ter}(P_i)$). Thus, after Step 1, $z_1(s) = z^{pre}(s) = 0$. Finally, because Step 1 never changes the dual variable of a MV server, we have $z_1(\tilde{s}) = z^{pre}(\tilde{s}) = 0$ for any MV server \tilde{s} .

Proof of Invariant (I2). Let $r_p \in R$ be a request such that $t \geq a(r_p)$. Note that the RHS of Invariant (I2) increases as t increases. Thus, it suffices to prove $z_1(r_p) + z_1(\tilde{s}_p) \leq \gamma(t - a(r_p))$. If $sl(r_i, r_p) \geq sl(r_i, s^*)$, then Step 1 does not change $z(r_p)$. Thus, by Invariant (I3), $z_1(r_p) + z_1(\tilde{s}_p) = z^{pre}(r_p) + z^{pre}(\tilde{s}_p) \leq \gamma(t - a(r_p))$ as desired.

Next, we consider the case where $sl(r_i, r_p) < sl(r_i, s^*)$. In this case, we increase $z(r_p)$ by $sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r_p)$. We only need to show that the increase of $z(r_p)$ is at most the slack between r_p and \tilde{s}_p . In other words, it suffices to show $sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r_p) \leq \overrightarrow{sl(r_p, \tilde{s}_p)}$, or equivalently, $sl(r_i, s^*) \leq sl(r_i, r_p) + \overrightarrow{sl(r_p, \tilde{s}_p)}$. Observe that by the construction of G^{pre} , the RHS of this inequality is $sl(r_i, \tilde{s}_p)$.

Let $\tilde{s} = \text{ter}(\tilde{P}_i)$. Because r_i is ready at time t , we have $sl(r_i, \tilde{s}) = \varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i) \geq \varphi(P_i) = sl(r_i, s^*)$. Because \tilde{P}_i is r_i 's virtual minimum augmenting path at time t , we have $sl(r_i, \tilde{s}_p) \geq sl(r_i, \tilde{s})$. Combining the above two inequalities, we then have $sl(r_i, \tilde{s}_p) \geq sl(r_i, s^*)$ as desired.

Proof of Invariant (I1). For any $r \in R$ and $s \in S$, we will prove $z_1(r) + z_1(s) \leq \gamma D(r, s)$. Let R' be the set of requests r such that r is not in G^{pre} or $sl(r_i, r) \geq sl(r_i, s^*)$. Thus, if a request r is not in R' , then r is in G^{pre} and $sl(r_i, r) < sl(r_i, s^*)$. We divide the proof into cases.

Case 1: $r \in R'$. In this case, Step 1 does not change $z(r)$ and thus $z_1(r) = z^{pre}(r)$. Because Step 1 cannot increase the dual variable of any server, we have $z_1(s) \leq z^{pre}(s)$. Thus, $z_1(r) + z_1(s) \leq z^{pre}(r) + z^{pre}(s) \leq \gamma D(r, s)$.

Case 2: $r \notin R'$ and $(r, s) \in M^{pre}$. In this case, there is a directed edge $\overrightarrow{s, r}$ in G^{pre} , and the only way to reach r from r_i in G^{pre} is via s . Because $sl(\overrightarrow{s, r}) = 0$, we have $sl(r_i, s) = sl(r_i, r) < sl(r_i, s^*)$. Thus, after Step 1, $z_1(r) + z_1(s) = z^{pre}(r) + (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r)) + z^{pre}(s) - (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, s)) = z^{pre}(r) + z^{pre}(s) \leq \gamma D(r, s)$.

Case 3: $r \notin R'$, $(r, s) \notin M^{pre}$, and s is in G^{pre} . In this case, there is a directed edge $\overrightarrow{r, s}$ in G^{pre} . Thus, $sl(r_i, s) \leq sl(r_i, r) + \overrightarrow{sl(r, s)}$, or equivalently, $sl(r_i, s) - sl(r_i, r) \leq \overrightarrow{sl(r, s)}$.

Case 3A: $sl(r_i, s) < sl(r_i, s^*)$. In this subcase, after Step 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& z_1(s) + z_1(r) \\
&= z^{pre}(s) - (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, s)) + z^{pre}(r) + (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r)) \\
&\leq z^{pre}(s) + z^{pre}(r) + \overrightarrow{sl(r, s)} \\
&= z^{pre}(s) + z^{pre}(r) + \gamma D(r, s) - (z^{pre}(r) + z^{pre}(s)) \\
&= \gamma D(r, s).
\end{aligned}$$

Case 3B: $sl(r_i, s^*) \leq sl(r_i, s)$. Because $sl(r_i, s) \leq sl(r_i, r) + sl(\vec{r}, \vec{s})$, in this subcase, we have $sl(r_i, s^*) \leq sl(r_i, r) + sl(\vec{r}, \vec{s})$, or equivalently, $sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r) \leq sl(\vec{r}, \vec{s})$. Thus, after Step 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
& z_1(s) + z_1(r) \\
&= z^{pre}(s) + z^{pre}(r) + (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r)) \\
&\leq z^{pre}(s) + z^{pre}(r) + sl(\vec{r}, \vec{s}) \\
&= z^{pre}(s) + z^{pre}(r) + \gamma D(r, s) - (z^{pre}(r) + z^{pre}(s)) \\
&= \gamma D(r, s).
\end{aligned}$$

Case 4: $r \notin R'$, $(r, s) \notin M^{pre}$, and s is not in G^{pre} . In this case, because $z_1(s) = 0$ (by Invariant (I3)), it suffices to show $z_1(r) \leq \gamma D(r, s)$. Observe that because s is not in G^{pre} , $a(s) \geq t$. Thus, $D(r, s) \geq a(s) - a(r) \geq t - a(r)$. Let \tilde{s} be the MV server of r . By Invariant (I2), $z_1(r) + z_1(\tilde{s}) \leq \gamma(t - a(r))$. Because $z_1(\tilde{s}) = 0$, we then have $z_1(r) \leq \gamma(t - a(r)) \leq \gamma D(r, s)$. □

Because Step 2 only decreases dual variables for requests in P_i , Invariants (I1), (I2), and (I3) still hold after Step 2. Thus, combining the above lemma, we have the following lemma.

Lemma A.4. *Assume that Invariants (I1), (I2), (I3) hold before Step 1 is executed. Then after Step 2, these invariants still hold.*

Lemma A.5. *Assume that Invariant (I4) holds before Step 1 is executed. Then after Step 2, Invariant (I4) still holds.*

Proof. Assume that the algorithm augments the offline matching by P_i at time t . In the following proof, M^{pre} and M^{post} refer to the offline matching right before and right after it is augmented by P_i , respectively. Moreover, $z^{pre}(\cdot)$, $z_1(\cdot)$, and $z_2(\cdot)$ refer to the dual variables right before Step 1 is executed, the dual variables right after Step 1 is executed, and the dual variables right after Step 2 is executed, respectively. It suffices to prove $z_2(r) + z_2(s) = D(r, s)$ holds for any $(r, s) \in M^{post}$.

We first consider the case where $(r, s) \notin E(P_i)$. In this case, $(r, s) \in M^{pre}$ and thus $z^{pre}(r) + z^{pre}(s) = D(r, s)$. Because $(r, s) \in M^{pre}$, there is a directed edge s, \vec{r} in G^{pre} , and the only way to reach r from r_i in G^{pre} is via s . In addition, $sl(\vec{s}, \vec{r}) = 0$. Thus, $sl(r_i, r) = sl(r_i, s)$. After Step 1, we then have $z_1(r) + z_1(s) = z^{pre}(r) + z^{pre}(s) = D(r, s)$. Because $(r, s) \in M^{post}$ and $(r, s) \notin P_i$, r is not in P_i . Thus, Step 2 does not change $z(r)$, and we have $z_2(r) + z_2(s) = z_1(r) + z_1(s) = D(r, s)$.

Next, we consider the case where $(r, s) \in P_i$. Because $(r, s) \in M^{post}$, there is a directed edge \vec{r}, \vec{s} in $\vec{E}(P_i)$. Recall that P_i is the shortest path from r_i to the set of real free servers in G^{pre} . The property of shortest path thus implies that

$$sl(r_i, s) = sl(r_i, r) + sl(\vec{r}, \vec{s})$$

and

$$sl(r_i, r) \leq sl(r_i, s^*) \text{ and } sl(r_i, s) \leq sl(r_i, s^*).$$

Thus, after Step 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& z_1(s) + z_1(r) \\
&= z^{pre}(s) - (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, s)) + z^{pre}(r) + (sl(r_i, s^*) - sl(r_i, r)) \\
&= z^{pre}(s) + z^{pre}(r) + sl(r_i, s) - sl(r_i, r) \\
&= z^{pre}(s) + z^{pre}(r) + sl(\vec{r}, \vec{s}) \\
&= \gamma D(r, s)
\end{aligned}$$

Because \vec{r}, \vec{s} is in $\vec{E}(P_i)$, after Step 2, we then have

$$z_2(r) + z_2(s) = z_1(r) - (\gamma - 1)D(r, s) + z_1(s) = D(r, s).$$

□

Because all invariants hold initially, by Lemmas A.4 and A.5 and induction, all invariants hold throughout the execution of the VRM algorithm.

A.3 Proof of Lemma 3.1

For any path P , define $D(P) = \sum_{(u,v) \in E(P)} D(u,v)$ as P 's distance in the TA plane. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$D(M^{VRM}) = \sum_{i=1}^m D(\text{ori}(P_i^*), \text{ter}(P_i^*)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m D(P_i^*).$$

Next, we argue that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(P_i^*) \geq \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m D(P_i^*), \quad (11)$$

which completes the proof.

Fix any edge (r, s) . The first time (and every subsequent odd-numbered time) (r, s) appears in some request r_i 's minimum augmenting path P_i^* (i.e., $(r, s) \in E(P_i^*)$), (r, s) contributes $\gamma D(r, s)$ to the LHS of Eq. (11) (because (r, s) is added to M^{OFF}). The second time (and every subsequent even-numbered time) (r, s) appears in some request r_i 's minimum augmenting path P_i^* , (r, s) contributes $-D(r, s)$ to the LHS of Eq. (11) (because (r, s) is removed from M^{OFF}). Thus, (r, s) 's amortized contribution to the LHS of Eq. (11) is at least $\frac{\gamma D(r,s) - D(r,s)}{2} = \frac{\gamma-1}{2} D(r, s)$. Specifically, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \varphi(P_i^*) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{(r,s) \in E(P_i^*)} \frac{\gamma-1}{2} D(r, s) = \frac{\gamma-1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m D(P_i^*).$$

A.4 Proofs of the Nonnegativity of γ -Net-Costs

A.4.1 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Write P as $r'_1 s'_1 r'_2 s'_2 \cdots r'_\ell s'_\ell$, where $r'_1 \in R$ and $s'_\ell \in S$ are not saturated by M^{OFF} . By Invariant (I3), we have

$$z(r'_1) = z(s'_\ell) = 0. \quad (12)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(P) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} D(s'_k, r'_{k+1}) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Invariant (I4)}}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (z(s'_k) + z(r'_{k+1})) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Eq. (12)}}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (z(s'_k) + z(r'_{k+1})) - z(r'_1) - z(s'_\ell) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} (\gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - (z(r'_k) + z(s'_k))) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Invariant (I1)}}{\geq} 0. \end{aligned}$$

A.4.2 Proof of Lemma 3.3

Write \tilde{P} as $r'_1 s'_1 r'_2 s'_2 \cdots r'_\ell \tilde{s}_p$, where $r'_1 \in R$ is not saturated by M^{OFF} and $t \geq a(\tilde{r}_p)$. By Invariant (I3), we then have

$$z(r'_1) = z(\tilde{s}_p) = 0. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, by the definition of virtual augmenting path, we have

$$r'_\ell = r_p. \quad (14)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_t(\tilde{P}) &= \gamma D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p) + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} D(s'_k, r'_{k+1}) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Invariant (14)}}{=} \gamma D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p) + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (z(s'_k) + z(r'_{k+1})) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Eq. (13)}}{=} \gamma D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p) + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (z(s'_k) + z(r'_{k+1})) - z(r'_1) - z(\tilde{s}_p) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Eq. (14)}}{=} \gamma D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p) - z(r_p) - z(\tilde{s}_p) + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} (\gamma D(r'_k, s'_k) - (z(r'_k) + z(s'_k))) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Invariants (12)\&(11)}}{\geq} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

B Proof of Eq. (7)

In the following proof, define Φ_i as $\varphi(P_i^*)$.

B.1 Partition of the Request Set

We first partition the request set R into $O(\log m)$ groups R_0, R_1, R_2, \dots based on Φ_i . Specifically, R_0 consists of all requests r_i such that $\Phi_i < \frac{D(M^{OPT})}{m}$. For $\ell \geq 1$, R_ℓ consists of all requests r_i such that $\frac{2^{\ell-1}D(M^{OPT})}{m} \leq \Phi_i < \frac{2^\ell D(M^{OPT})}{m}$. We use the following lemma to upper bound the number of groups.

Lemma B.1. *For any $r_i \in R$, $\Phi_i \leq \gamma \cdot D(M^{OPT})$.*

Proof. Let M^{OFF} be the offline matching right before it is augmented by P_i^* . Let t be the time when r_i is matched by the VRM algorithm. Consider $G' = (S \cup R, M^{OFF} \oplus M^{OPT})$. In G' , there is an M^{OFF} -augmenting path P that originates at r_i . We first consider the case where $\text{ter}(P)$ is a server that already arrives at the system. By the optimality of P_i^* , we then have $\Phi_i = \varphi(P_i^*) \leq \varphi(P)$. Because P alternates between edges in M^{OFF} and M^{OPT} , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(P) &= \gamma \sum_{(r,s) \in E(P) \cap M^{OPT}} D(r,s) - \sum_{(r,s) \in E(P) \cap M^{OFF}} D(r,s) \\ &\leq \gamma \sum_{(r,s) \in E(P) \cap M^{OPT}} D(r,s) \leq \gamma \cdot D(M^{OPT}). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Next, we consider the case where $\text{ter}(P)$ arrives at the system after r_i is matched (and thus $a(\text{ter}(P)) \geq t$). Let r_p be the last request in P (and thus $\overrightarrow{r_p, \text{ter}(P)}$ is the last directed edge in P). Construct a virtual augmenting path \tilde{P} by replacing $\text{ter}(P)$ with \tilde{s}_p . Thus, $D(r_p, \text{ter}(P)) \geq a(\text{ter}(P)) - a(r_p) \geq t - a(r_p) = D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p)$, which implies $\varphi(P) \geq \varphi_t(\tilde{P})$. By the design of the VRM algorithm, when r_i becomes ready and matched at time t , it must be the case that $\varphi(P_i^*) \leq \varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i)$. Thus, we have $\varphi(P_i^*) \leq \varphi_t(\tilde{P}_i) \leq \varphi_t(\tilde{P})$. Because $\varphi_t(\tilde{P}) \leq \varphi(P)$, we then have $\Phi_i = \varphi(P_i^*) \leq \varphi(P)$. The proof then follows from Eq. (15). \square

By Lemma B.1 and $\gamma = O(1)$, the number of groups is $O(\log m)$. Observe that $\sum_{r_i \in R_0} \Phi_i < D(M^{OPT})$. In the remainder of the proof, we fix a request group R_ℓ with $\ell \geq 1$. Let $\Phi = \frac{2^{\ell-1}D(M^{OPT})}{m}$ and thus for any $r_i \in R_\ell$

$$\Phi \leq \Phi_i < 2\Phi. \quad (16)$$

To prove Eq. (7), it is then sufficient to prove

$$\sum_{r_i \in R_\ell} \Phi = O(\sqrt{m} \log m) D(M^{OPT}). \quad (17)$$

Remark B.2. In the partition in [NR17], there is an additional group consisting of requests r_i such that $\Phi_i \leq 16\gamma D(r_i, \text{opt}(r_i))$, where $\text{opt}(r_i)$ is the server that matches to r_i in M^{OPT} . This group is used to facilitate input sensitive analysis, and thus is omitted in our proof.

We then partition R_ℓ into K clusters C_1, C_2, \dots, C_K such that each cluster C_k has a **center request** $c_k \in C_k$ satisfying the following properties:

P1: For any two distinct clusters C_k and $C_{k'}$, $D(c_k, c_{k'}) \geq \frac{\Phi}{2\gamma}$.

P2: For any cluster C_k and any request r in C_k , $D(c_k, r) < \frac{\Phi}{2\gamma}$.

P3: For any cluster C_k , the center request c_k is the first matched request in C_k under the VRM algorithm.

These clusters can be constructed as follows: Whenever a request r is matched by the VRM algorithm, we find the center request c_k that is closest to r . If $D(r, c_k) < \frac{\Phi}{2\gamma}$, we add r to C_k . Otherwise, we create a new cluster and set r as its center request.

B.2 Optimal Paths

For each center request c_k , let M_k be the offline matching right before c_k is matched. Observe that by P3, all requests in C_k are not saturated by M_k . Thus, for each request $r_i \in C_k$, $M^{OPT} \oplus M_k$ has an M_k -augmenting path, denoted by P_i^{OPT} , that originates at r_i . P_i^{OPT} is called the **optimal path** for r_i . We have the following results. Recall that for any path P , $D(P) = \sum_{(u,v) \in E(P)} D(u,v)$. Moreover, for any matching M , define $M \cap P = M \cap E(P)$, $M \setminus P = M \setminus E(P)$, and $P \setminus M = E(P) \setminus M$.

Fact B.3. For any two requests in the same cluster, these requests' optimal paths are vertex-disjoint.

Lemma B.4. Let C_k be any cluster and $r_i \in C_k$. Then $D(M^{OPT} \cap P_i^{OPT}) \geq \frac{1}{\gamma+1}D(P_i^{OPT})$.

Proof. Observe that P_i^{OPT} is a real M_k -augmenting path. By Lemma 3.2, $\varphi(P_i^{OPT}) \geq 0$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \cdot D(M^{OPT} \cap P_i^{OPT}) - D(P_i^{OPT} \setminus M^{OPT}) &\geq 0 \\ (\gamma + 1) \cdot D(M^{OPT} \cap P_i^{OPT}) &\geq D(M^{OPT} \cap P_i^{OPT}) + D(P_i^{OPT} \setminus M^{OPT}) \\ (\gamma + 1) \cdot D(M^{OPT} \cap P_i^{OPT}) &\geq D(P_i^{OPT}). \end{aligned}$$

□

For every request $r_i \in C_k$, define $\delta_i = \max_{v \in P_i^{OPT}} D(c_k, v)$. Next, we give upper and lower bounds of δ_i .

Lemma B.5. Let C_k be any cluster and $r_i \in C_k$. Then $\delta_i \geq \frac{\Phi}{\gamma}$.

Proof. Observe that P_i^{OPT} must contain a server that is not saturated by M_k . Let s be any such a server. It suffices to prove $D(c_k, s) \geq \frac{\Phi}{\gamma}$. We first consider the case where s arrives before c_k is matched by the VRM algorithm. In this case, the path consisting of only $\overrightarrow{c_k, s}$ is a valid M_k -augmenting path of c_k . By the optimality of c_k 's minimum augmenting path and Eq. (16), we have $\Phi \leq \gamma \cdot D(c_k, s)$ as desired.

Next, we consider the case where s arrives after c_k is matched by the VRM algorithm. Let t be the time when c_k is matched by the VRM algorithm. Let \tilde{s} be the MV server of c_k . Thus, $D(c_k, s) \geq D_t(c_k, \tilde{s})$. By the design of the VRM algorithm, at time t , c_k becomes ready, which combined with Eq. (16) implies $\Phi \leq \gamma \cdot D_t(c_k, \tilde{s}) \leq \gamma \cdot D(c_k, s)$ as desired. □

To upper bound δ_i , we need the following property about M^{OFF} , which holds throughout the execution of the VRM algorithm.

Lemma B.6. Let M be any matching that saturates all the vertices in M^{OFF} . Then $D(M^{OFF}) \leq \gamma D(M)$.

Proof. By Invariant (I1), we have

$$\gamma \cdot D(M) = \sum_{(r,s) \in M} \gamma \cdot D(r, s) \geq \sum_{(r,s) \in M} (z(r) + z(s)) = \sum_{(r,s) \in M^{OFF}} (z(r) + z(s)),$$

where the last inequality is due to Invariant (I3) and the assumption that M saturates all the vertices in M^{OFF} . By Invariant (I4), we have

$$\sum_{(r,s) \in M^{OFF}} (z(r) + z(s)) = \sum_{(r,s) \in M^{OFF}} D(r, s) = D(M^{OFF}),$$

which then completes the proof. □

Lemma B.7. Let C_k be any cluster and $r_i \in C_k$. Then $\delta_i < (\gamma + \frac{3}{2})D(M^{OPT})$.

Proof. By the triangle inequality, $\delta_i \leq D(c_k, r_i) + D(P_i^{OPT}) < \frac{\Phi}{2\gamma} + D(P_i^{OPT})$, where the last inequality is due to P2. By Eq. (16) and Lemma B.1, $\Phi \leq \gamma \cdot D(M^{OPT})$ and thus $\frac{\Phi}{2\gamma} \leq \frac{D(M^{OPT})}{2}$. On the other hand, we have $D(P_i^{OPT}) \leq D(M_k) + D(M^{OPT}) \leq (\gamma + 1)D(M^{OPT})$, where the last inequality is due to Lemma B.6. As a result, we have $\delta_i < (\gamma + \frac{3}{2})D(M^{OPT})$. □

B.3 Outer Groups and Balls

We further partition R_ℓ into *outer groups* according to δ_i . Specifically, $r_i \in R_\ell$ is in outer group R^λ if

$$\frac{2^{\lambda-1}D(M^{OPT})}{\gamma m} \leq \delta_i < \frac{2^\lambda D(M^{OPT})}{\gamma m}. \quad (18)$$

By Lemma B.5 and the definition of Φ , $\lambda \geq \ell \geq 1$. By Lemma B.7, $\lambda = O(\log(\gamma m))$. As a result, the number of outer groups is $O(\log(\gamma m))$. Because $\gamma = O(1)$, the number of outer groups is $O(\log m)$.

In the remainder of the proof, we fix a outer group R^λ . To prove Eq. (17), it suffices to prove

$$\sum_{r_i \in R^\lambda} \Phi = O(\sqrt{m})D(M^{OPT}). \quad (19)$$

For each cluster C_k , let $C'_k = C_k \cap R^\lambda$. Moreover, define B_k as a ball centered at c_k with radius $\rho = \frac{2^\lambda D(M^{OPT})}{\gamma m}$. By Eq. (18), $\frac{\rho}{2} \leq \delta_i < \rho$. We then have the following simple fact.

Fact B.8. For every $r_i \in C'_k$, B_k contains all the vertices in P_i^{OPT} .

For any set of edges M , define $M \cap B_k$ as the set of edges in M whose both endpoints are in B_k .

Lemma B.9. For any $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, $D(M^{OPT} \cap B_k) > \frac{\rho|C'_k|}{4(\gamma+1)}$.

Proof. By Facts B.3 and B.8, it suffices to prove that for each $r_i \in C'_k$, $D(M^{OPT} \cap P_i^{OPT}) > \frac{\rho}{4(\gamma+1)}$. By the triangle inequality, $\delta_i \leq D(c_k, r_i) + D(P_i^{OPT})$ or equivalently, $D(P_i^{OPT}) \geq \delta_i - D(c_k, r_i)$. By P2 and Lemma B.5, we have $D(c_k, r_i) < \frac{\Phi}{2\gamma} \leq \frac{\delta_i}{2}$. Thus, $D(P_i^{OPT}) > \delta_i - \frac{\delta_i}{2} = \frac{\delta_i}{2}$. Thus, by Lemma B.4, $D(M^{OPT} \cap P_i^{OPT}) > \frac{1}{\gamma+1} \frac{\delta_i}{2}$. The proof then follows from $\delta_i \geq \frac{\rho}{2}$. \square

B.4 Proof of Eq. (19)

We first state a variant of the Vitali's covering lemma proved in [NR17]. For any ball B_k , let $3B_k$ be the ball centered at c_k with radius 3ρ . Recall that we have K clusters.

Lemma B.10 ([NR17]). *There exists a set $H \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ such that:*

C1: For any two distinct $h_1, h_2 \in H$, $B_{h_1} \cap B_{h_2} = \emptyset$.

C2: For any $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, there exists $head(k) \in H$ satisfying the following properties:

C2A: B_k is contained in $3B_{head(k)}$.

C2B: $|C'_k| \leq |C'_{head(k)}|$.

For any $h \in H$, define $cover(h)$ as the number of clusters that set head to h . Specifically,

$$cover(h) = |\{k | head(k) = h, 1 \leq k \leq K\}|.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{r_i \in R^\lambda} \Phi = \sum_{k=1}^K |C'_k| \Phi \stackrel{C2}{\leq} \sum_{h \in H} |C'_h| cover(h) \Phi.$$

On the other hand, because $\gamma = O(1)$, we have

$$D(M^{OPT}) \stackrel{C1}{\geq} \sum_{h \in H} D(M^{OPT} \cap B_h) \stackrel{Lemma\ B.9}{>} \sum_{h \in H} \frac{\rho|C'_h|}{4(\gamma+1)} = \Omega\left(\sum_{h \in H} \rho|C'_h|\right).$$

Thus, to prove Eq. (19), it suffices to prove $\frac{cover(h)\Phi}{\rho} = O(\sqrt{m})$ for any $h \in H$. Fix $h \in H$. Define C as $\{c_k | head(k) = h, 1 \leq k \leq K\}$. Thus, $|C| = cover(h)$. Let $TSP(C)$ be the distance of the shortest cycle that visits every center request in C in the TA plane. Let $Diam(C)$ be the distance of the farthest pair of center requests in C in the TA plane. By P1, for any two distinct $c_k, c_{k'} \in C$, we have $D(c_k, c_{k'}) \geq \frac{\Phi}{2\gamma}$. Thus,

$$TSP(C) \geq |C| \frac{\Phi}{2\gamma} = \frac{cover(h)\Phi}{2\gamma}.$$

By C2A, we have

$$Diam(C) \leq 6\rho.$$

Combining the above two inequalities and $\gamma = O(1)$, we then have $\frac{cover(h)\Phi}{\rho} = O\left(\frac{TSP(C)}{Diam(C)}\right)$. Because TA plane is two-dimensional, $\frac{TSP(C)}{Diam(C)} = O\left(|C|^{1-\frac{1}{2}}\right) = O(\sqrt{m})$ [NR17], which completes the proof.

Remark B.11. To see that $\frac{TSP(C)}{Diam(C)} = O\left(|C|^{1-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$, let $\Delta = Diam(C)$. Let A be the smallest axis aligned box that contains C in the TA plane. Thus, A has side lengths of $O(\Delta)$. We can divide A into $O(|C|)$ squares of side length $\frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{|C|}}$, and construct a cycle W of length $O\left(|C| \cdot \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{|C|}}\right)$ that visits all centers of these squares. For any $r \in C$, let $center(r)$ be the center of the square that contains r . For any $r \in C$, we then add to W two directed edges $\overrightarrow{center(r), r}$ and $\overrightarrow{r, center(r)}$ at a cost of $O\left(\frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{|C|}}\right)$. These edges and W form a closed walk that visits every vertex in C , and the total distance is $O\left(|C| \cdot \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{|C|}}\right)$. As a result, $TSP(C) = O\left(|C| \cdot \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{|C|}}\right)$, which implies $\frac{TSP(C)}{Diam(C)} = O\left(|C|^{1-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$.

C Construction of P' and P''

Let P and \tilde{P} be any real and virtual M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting paths of r_i , respectively. In this section, our goal is to construct two real M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting paths of r_i , P' and P'' , such that

$$\varphi(P') \leq \varphi(P) \quad (20)$$

and

$$\varphi(P'') \leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}). \quad (21)$$

Recall that in E_{w+1} , the VRM algorithm augments M_{w+1}^{pre} by request r^* 's minimum augmenting path P^* . To construct P' , we partition P at the intersections of P^* and P . The partition can be applied to any r_i 's M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path, be it real or virtual. Thus, in the following proof, we consider any r_i 's M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path \bar{P} and discuss the partition of \bar{P} .

C.1 Partition of \bar{P}

We call a directed edge $\overrightarrow{u, v}$ in \bar{P} an **entry edge** of \bar{P} if (u, v) is not in $E(P^*)$ but v is in P^* . On the other hand, a directed edge $\overrightarrow{u, v}$ in \bar{P} is called an **exit edge** of \bar{P} if (u, v) is not in $E(P^*)$ but u is in P^* .

Claim C.1. *Every entry edge of \bar{P} goes from a request to a server.*

Proof. Let $\overrightarrow{u, v}$ be an entry edge of \bar{P} . Because v is in P^* and any vertex in P^* is saturated by M_{w+1}^{post} , v is incident to some edge e in $M_{w+1}^{post} \cap E(P^*)$. Thus, (u, v) , which is not in $E(P^*)$, cannot be in M_{w+1}^{post} (otherwise, two distinct edges e and (u, v) in M_{w+1}^{post} are incident to v). Because \bar{P} is an M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path, by Fact 2.1, u is a request and v is a server. \square

Claim C.2. *Every exist edge of \bar{P} goes from a request to a server.*

Proof. Let $\overrightarrow{u, v}$ be an exit edge of \bar{P} . Because u is in P^* and any vertex in P^* is saturated by M_{w+1}^{post} , u is incident to some edge e in $M_{w+1}^{post} \cap E(P^*)$. Thus, (u, v) , which is not in $E(P^*)$, cannot be in M_{w+1}^{post} . Because \bar{P} is an M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path, by Fact 2.1, u is a request and v is a server. \square

For any directed path Q and any directed edge $\overrightarrow{u, v}$ in $\vec{E}(Q)$, define $next(Q, \overrightarrow{u, v})$ as the directed edge originating at v in $\vec{E}(Q)$.

Claim C.3. *Let $\overrightarrow{r, s}$ be any entry edge of \bar{P} . Let $s, r' = next(\bar{P}, \overrightarrow{r, s})$. Then $r', s \in \vec{E}(P^*)$.*


Proof. Because \bar{P} is an M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path, by Fact 2.1, (r, s) is not in M_{w+1}^{post} . Thus, \bar{P} 's next edge (s, r') is in M_{w+1}^{post} . Because $\overrightarrow{r, s}$ is an entry edge, s is in P^* . There is an edge (s, r'') in $E(P^*) \cap M_{w+1}^{post}$. Thus, two edges (s, r') and (s, r'') are in M_{w+1}^{post} , which implies $r' = r''$. Therefore, (s, r') is in $E(P^*)$. Finally, because P^* is an M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path and $(s, r') \in E(P^*)$ is in M_{w+1}^{post} , by Fact 2.1, we then have $r', s \in \vec{E}(P^*)$. \square

For any entry edge $\overrightarrow{r, s}$ of \bar{P} , we call s an **entry server** of \bar{P} . Informally, Claim C.3 states that once \bar{P} reaches an entry server, \bar{P} starts to traverse P^* in the reverse direction. On the other hand, for any exit edge $\overrightarrow{r, s}$ of \bar{P} , we call r an **exist request** of \bar{P} . Because \bar{P} is a path, every vertex appears at most once in \bar{P} . Thus, once \bar{P} reaches an entry server, \bar{P} starts to traverse P^* in the reverse direction until \bar{P} reaches an exist request and leaves P^* . Note that because \bar{P} is an M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path, $ter(\bar{P})$ is not in P^* . Thus, there must exist an exist edge after every entry edge.

Let $s_k^X(\bar{P})$ be the k th entry server of \bar{P} , and $r_k^X(\bar{P})$ be the k th exist request of \bar{P} . Let $cr(\bar{P})$ be the number of entry servers of \bar{P} (or informally, the number of times that \bar{P} crosses P^*). When the M_{w+1}^{post} -augmenting path \bar{P} is clear from the context, we may simply write s_k^X , r_k^X , and cr . \bar{P} can then be written in the form of $\bar{P} = r_i \cdots s_1^X \cdots r_1^X \cdots s_2^X \cdots r_2^X \cdots s_{cr}^X \cdots r_{cr}^X \cdots ter(\bar{P})$. We can then divide \bar{P} into subpaths at entry servers and exist requests. Specifically, \bar{P} is divided into $H(\bar{P}), B(\bar{P}, 1), W(\bar{P}, 1), B(\bar{P}, 2), W(\bar{P}, 2), \dots, B(\bar{P}, cr - 1), W(\bar{P}, cr - 1), B(\bar{P}, cr)$, and $T(\bar{P})$, where

1. $H(\bar{P}) = r_i \cdots s_1^X$ is called the **head** of \bar{P} ,
2. $B(\bar{P}, k) = s_k^X \cdots r_k^X$ ($1 \leq k \leq cr$) is called a **back** of \bar{P} ,
3. $W(\bar{P}, k) = r_k^X \cdots s_{k+1}^X$ ($1 \leq k \leq cr - 1$) is called a **wing** of \bar{P} , and
4. $T(\bar{P}) = r_{cr}^X \cdots ter(\bar{P})$ is called the **tail** of \bar{P} .

Figure 1: An example of the partition of P and the construction of P' where $cr = 3$ and $\text{sgn}(s_1^X, r_{cr}^X) = 1$.



For every path $Q = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_\ell$, denote by $\text{rev}(Q)$ the reverse of Q , i.e., $\text{rev}(Q) = v_\ell v_{\ell-1} \cdots v_1$. For every path Q , denote by uQv the subpath of Q that originates at u and terminates at v . Claims C.2 and C.3 imply that every back of \tilde{P} traverses a subpath of P^* backward. Specifically, we have the following simple fact.

Fact C.4. *Let $s\bar{P}r$ be any back of \tilde{P} . Then $\text{rev}(s\bar{P}r) = rP^*s$.*

Construction of P' and P'' . P' is the concatenation of $H(P)$ and the subpath of P^* that originates at $s_1^X(P)$ and terminates at $\text{ter}(P^*)$, and P'' is the concatenation of $H(\tilde{P})$ and the subpath of P^* that originates at $s_1^X(\tilde{P})$ and terminates at $\text{ter}(P^*)$.⁵ In other words, P' (respectively, P'') first traverses P (respectively, \tilde{P}) until the first entry server $s_1^X(P)$ (respectively, $s_1^X(\tilde{P})$) is met, after which P' (respectively, P'') traverses P^* . See Figs. 1 and 2 for examples. Clearly, P' and P'' are r_i 's M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting paths.

C.2 Lower Bounds for Backs and Wings

Observe that while $\varphi(Q)$ is originally defined for any augmenting path Q , the definition can be extended to any (sub)path uQv that alternates between requests and servers:

$$\varphi(uQv) = \sum_{\vec{r}, \vec{s} \in \vec{E}(uQv)} \gamma D(r, s) - \sum_{\vec{s}, \vec{r} \in \vec{E}(uQv)} D(r, s).$$

If Q is a virtual augmenting path terminating at \tilde{s}_p , for any subpath $uQ\tilde{s}_p$ and any time $t \geq a(r_p)$, we have

$$\varphi_t(uQ\tilde{s}_p) = \gamma D_t(r_p, \tilde{s}_p) + \sum_{\vec{r}, \vec{s} \in \vec{E}(uQ\tilde{s}_p)} \gamma D(r, s) - \sum_{\vec{s}, \vec{r} \in \vec{E}(uQ\tilde{s}_p)} D(r, s).$$

Moreover, if a path Q does not contain any edge, then $\varphi(Q) = 0$. By the above definition, we then have

$$\varphi(P) = \varphi(H(P)) + \varphi(T(P)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr(P)} \varphi(B(P, k)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr(P)-1} \varphi(W(P, k))$$

and

$$\varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}) = \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr(\tilde{P})} \varphi(B(\tilde{P}, k)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr(\tilde{P})-1} \varphi(W(\tilde{P}, k)).$$

Let v_h^* be the h th vertex in P^* . Let $|P^*|$ be the number of vertices in P^* . Thus, $P^* = v_1^* v_2^* v_3^* \cdots v_{|P^*|}^*$. Moreover, for any vertex v in P^* , let $\pi(v)$ be v 's order in P^* . In other words, $\pi(v_h^*) = h$ for any $h \in \{1, 2, \dots, |P^*|\}$. For any two vertices u and v in P^* , define

$$P^*(u, v) = \begin{cases} uP^*v, & \text{if } \pi(u) < \pi(v) \\ vP^*u, & \text{if } \pi(u) > \pi(v) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\text{sgn}(u, v) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \pi(u) < \pi(v) \\ -1, & \text{if } \pi(u) > \pi(v). \end{cases}$$

⁵If $s_1^X(P) = \text{ter}(P^*)$, then $P' = H(P)$. Similarly, if $s_1^X(\tilde{P}) = \text{ter}(P^*)$, then $P'' = H(\tilde{P})$.

Next, we lower bound $\varphi(B(\bar{P}, k))$.

Claim C.7. *Let $s\bar{P}r$ be any back of \bar{P} . If $\gamma \geq 1$, then $\varphi_\gamma(s\bar{P}r) \geq \text{sgn}(s, r)\varphi_\gamma(P^*(s, r))$.*

Proof. By Fact C.4, it suffices to prove $\varphi_\gamma(s\bar{P}r) \geq -\varphi_\gamma(rP^*s)$ or equivalently, $-\varphi_\gamma(s\bar{P}r) \leq \varphi_\gamma(rP^*s)$.

$$\begin{aligned} -\varphi_\gamma(s\bar{P}r) &= -\sum_{\overrightarrow{r_p, s_q} \in \vec{E}(s\bar{P}r)} \gamma D(r_p, s_q) + \sum_{\overrightarrow{s_q, r_p} \in \vec{E}(s\bar{P}r)} D(r_p, s_q) \\ &\leq -\sum_{\overrightarrow{r_p, s_q} \in \vec{E}(s\bar{P}r)} D(r_p, s_q) + \sum_{\overrightarrow{s_q, r_p} \in \vec{E}(s\bar{P}r)} \gamma D(r_p, s_q) \\ &= -\sum_{\overrightarrow{s_q, r_p} \in \vec{E}(\text{rev}(s\bar{P}r))} D(r_p, s_q) + \sum_{\overrightarrow{r_p, s_q} \in \vec{E}(\text{rev}(s\bar{P}r))} \gamma D(r_p, s_q) \\ &= \varphi_\gamma(\text{rev}(s\bar{P}r)) = \varphi_\gamma(rP^*s), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to Fact C.4. \square

Next, we lower bound $\varphi(W(\bar{P}, k))$.

Claim C.8. *Let $r\bar{P}s$ be any wing of \bar{P} such that $\text{sgn}(r, s) = 1$. Then $\varphi(r\bar{P}s) \geq \text{sgn}(r, s)\varphi(P^*(r, s))$.*

Proof. Observe that edges in wings are not in $E(P^*)$. Thus, $r\bar{P}s$ alternates between edges in M_{w+1}^{pre} and edges not in M_{w+1}^{pre} (see $W(P, 1)$ in Fig. 1 for an example). Because $\text{sgn}(r, s) = 1$, replacing $P^*(r, s)$ with $r\bar{P}s$ in P^* yields another M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path Q that originates at $\text{ori}(P^*)$. Because P^* is $\text{ori}(P^*)$'s minimum M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path, we have $\varphi(Q) \geq \varphi(P^*)$, which implies $\varphi(r\bar{P}s) \geq \varphi(P^*(r, s))$. \square

For the case where $\text{sgn}(r, s) = -1$, we need the following lemma, whose proof is similar to that of Lemma B.6.

Lemma C.9. *Let $M_1 \subseteq M^{OFF}$. Let M_2 be any matching that saturates the same set of vertices as M_1 . Then $D(M_1) \leq \gamma D(M_2)$.*

Proof. By Invariant (II), we have

$$\gamma \cdot D(M_2) = \sum_{(r,s) \in M_2} \gamma \cdot D(r, s) \geq \sum_{(r,s) \in M_2} (z(r) + z(s)) = \sum_{(r,s) \in M_1} (z(r) + z(s)),$$

where the last inequality holds because M_1 and M_2 saturate the same set of vertices. Because $M_1 \subseteq M^{OFF}$ and by Invariant (I4), we have

$$\sum_{(r,s) \in M_1} (z(r) + z(s)) = \sum_{(r,s) \in M_1} D(r, s) = D(M_1).$$

\square

Claim C.10. *Let $r\bar{P}s$ be any wing of \bar{P} such that $\text{sgn}(r, s) = -1$. Then $\varphi(r\bar{P}s) \geq \text{sgn}(r, s)\varphi(P^*(r, s))$.*

Proof. We prove $\varphi(r\bar{P}s) + \varphi(P^*(r, s)) \geq 0$. Let

$$M_1 = \{(s_q, r_p) | \overrightarrow{s_q, r_p} \in \vec{E}(r\bar{P}s) \cup \vec{E}(P^*(r, s))\}$$

and

$$M_2 = \{(r_p, s_q) | \overrightarrow{r_p, s_q} \in \vec{E}(r\bar{P}s) \cup \vec{E}(P^*(r, s))\}.$$

Observe that $M_1 \subseteq M_{w+1}^{pre}$. In addition, M_1 and M_2 saturate the same set of vertices because $r\bar{P}s$ and $P^*(r, s)$ form an alternating cycle (see $W(P, 2)$ in Fig. 1 for an example). By Lemma C.9, $D(M_1) \leq \gamma D(M_2)$. Because $r\bar{P}s$ and $P^*(r, s)$ do not share edges,

$$\varphi(r\bar{P}s) + \varphi(P^*(r, s)) = \sum_{(r_p, s_q) \in M_2} \gamma D(r_p, s_q) - \sum_{(s_q, r_p) \in M_1} D(r_p, s_q) = \gamma D(M_2) - D(M_1) \geq 0.$$

\square

Proof of Lemma C.5. By Claims C.7, C.8, and C.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^{cr} \varphi(B(\bar{P}, k)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr-1} \varphi(W(\bar{P}, k)) = \sum_{k=1}^{cr} \varphi(s_k^X \bar{P} r_k^X) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr-1} \varphi(r_k^X \bar{P} s_{k+1}^X) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{cr} \text{sgn}(s_k^X, r_k^X) \varphi(P^*(s_k^X, r_k^X)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr-1} \text{sgn}(r_k^X, s_{k+1}^X) \varphi(P^*(r_k^X, s_{k+1}^X)) \stackrel{\text{Claim C.6}}{=} \text{sgn}(s_1^X, r_{cr}^X) \varphi(P^*(s_1^X, r_{cr}^X)). \end{aligned}$$

C.3 Proof of Eq. (20)

In the following proof, s_k^X, r_k^X , and cr refer to $s_k^X(P), r_k^X(P)$, and $cr(P)$, respectively. We first consider the case where $\text{sgn}(s_1^X, r_{cr}^X) = 1$. Divide P^* into A, B , and C such that $A = \text{ori}(P^*)P^*s_1^X$, $B = s_1^X P^* r_{cr}^X$, and $C = r_{cr}^X P^* \text{ter}(P^*)$. Observe that $\varphi(P^*) = \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C)$ and P' is the concatenation of $H(P)$, B , and C (see Fig. 1 for an example). Moreover, the concatenation of A, B , and $T(P)$ is an M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path that originates at $\text{ori}(P^*)$. Because P^* is $\text{ori}(P^*)$'s real minimum M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(P^*) &= \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C) \leq \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(H(P)) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C) &\leq \varphi(H(P)) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(P') &\leq \varphi(H(P)) + \varphi(s_1^X P^* r_{cr}^X) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(P') &\stackrel{\text{Lemma C.5}}{\leq} \varphi(H(P)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr} \varphi(B(P, k)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr-1} \varphi(W(P, k)) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(P') &\leq \varphi(P). \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider the case where $\text{sgn}(s_1^X, r_{cr}^X) = -1$. Divide P^* into A, B , and C such that $A = \text{ori}(P^*)P^*r_{cr}^X$, $B = r_{cr}^X P^* s_1^X$, and $C = s_1^X P^* \text{ter}(P^*)$. Observe that $\varphi(P^*) = \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C)$ and P' is the concatenation of $H(P)$ and C (see Fig. 2 for an example). Moreover, the concatenation of A and $T(P)$ is an M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path that originates at $\text{ori}(P^*)$. Because P^* is $\text{ori}(P^*)$'s real minimum M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(P^*) &= \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C) \leq \varphi(A) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(H(P)) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C) &\leq \varphi(H(P)) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(H(P)) + \varphi(C) &\leq \varphi(H(P)) - \varphi(B) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(P') &\leq \varphi(H(P)) - \varphi(r_{cr}^X P^* s_1^X) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(P') &\stackrel{\text{Lemma C.5}}{\leq} \varphi(H(P)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr} \varphi(B(P, k)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr-1} \varphi(W(P, k)) + \varphi(T(P)) \\ \varphi(P') &\leq \varphi(P). \end{aligned}$$

C.4 Proof of Eq. (21)

In the following proof, s_k^X, r_k^X , and cr refer to $s_k^X(\tilde{P}), r_k^X(\tilde{P})$, and $cr(\tilde{P})$, respectively. The proof is similar to that of Eq. (20). The main difference is that we use the design of the VRM algorithm that when a request (e.g. $\text{ori}(P^*) = r^*$) becomes ready, its virtual minimum γ -net-cost is at least its real minimum γ -net-cost.

We first consider the case where $\text{sgn}(s_1^X, r_{cr}^X) = 1$. Divide P^* into A, B , and C such that $A = \text{ori}(P^*)P^*s_1^X$, $B = s_1^X P^* r_{cr}^X$, and $C = r_{cr}^X P^* \text{ter}(P^*)$. Observe that $\varphi(P^*) = \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C)$ and P'' is the concatenation of $H(P)$, B , and C . Let \tilde{Q} be the concatenation of A, B , and $T(\tilde{P})$. Then \tilde{Q} is a virtual M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path that originates at $\text{ori}(P^*)$. Because P^* is $\text{ori}(P^*)$'s real minimum M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path and r^* becomes ready at time t_{w+1} , we then have $\varphi(P^*) \leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{Q})$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C) &= \varphi(P^*) \leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{Q}) = \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\ \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C) &\leq \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \varphi(B) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\ \varphi(P'') &\leq \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \varphi(s_1^X P^* r_{cr}^X) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\ \varphi(P'') &\stackrel{\text{Lemma C.5}}{\leq} \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr} \varphi(B(\tilde{P}, k)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr-1} \varphi(W(\tilde{P}, k)) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\ \varphi(P'') &\leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider the case where $\text{sgn}(s_1^X, r_{cr}^X) = -1$. Divide P^* into A, B , and C such that $A = \text{ori}(P^*)P^*r_{cr}^X$, $B = r_{cr}^X P^* s_1^X$, and $C = s_1^X P^* \text{ter}(P^*)$. Observe that $\varphi(P^*) = \varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C)$ and P'' is the concatenation of $H(\tilde{P})$ and C . Let \tilde{Q} be the the concatenation of A and $T(\tilde{P})$. Then \tilde{Q} is an M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path that originates at $\text{ori}(P^*)$. Because P^* is $\text{ori}(P^*)$'s real minimum M_{w+1}^{pre} -augmenting path and r^* becomes ready at

time t_{w+1} , we then have $\varphi(P^*) \leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{Q})$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(A) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C) &= \varphi(P^*) \leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{Q}) = \varphi(A) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\
\varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \varphi(B) + \varphi(C) &\leq \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\
\varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \varphi(C) &\leq \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) - \varphi(B) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\
\varphi(P'') &\leq \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) - \varphi(r_{cr}^X P^* s_1^X) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\
\varphi(P'') &\stackrel{\text{Lemma C.5}}{\leq} \varphi(H(\tilde{P})) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr} \varphi(B(\tilde{P}, k)) + \sum_{k=1}^{cr-1} \varphi(W(\tilde{P}, k)) + \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(T(\tilde{P})) \\
\varphi(P'') &\leq \varphi_{t_{w+1}}(\tilde{P}).
\end{aligned}$$