

An experimental comparison of tree-data structures for connectivity queries on fully-dynamic undirected graphs (Extended Version)

Qing Chen
University of Zurich
Switzerland
qing@ifi.uzh.ch

Michael H. Böhlen
University of Zurich
Switzerland
boehlen@ifi.uzh.ch

Sven Helmer
University of Zurich
Switzerland
helmer@ifi.uzh.ch

Abstract

During the past decades significant efforts have been made to propose data structures for answering connectivity queries on fully dynamic graphs, i.e., graphs with frequent insertions and deletions of edges. However, a comprehensive understanding of how these data structures perform in practice is missing, since not all of them have been implemented, let alone evaluated experimentally. We provide reference implementations for the proposed data structures and experimentally evaluate them on a wide range of graphs. Our findings show that the current solutions are not ready to be deployed in systems as is, as every data structure has critical weaknesses when used in practice. Key limitations that must be overcome are the space and time overhead incurred by balanced data structures, the degeneration of the runtime of space-efficient data structures in worst case scenarios, and the maintenance costs for balanced data structures. We detail our findings in the experimental evaluation and provide recommendations for implementing robust solutions for answering connectivity queries on dynamic graphs.

CCS Concepts

• Information systems → Data structures.

Keywords

Connectivity, dynamic graph, spanning tree, experimental study

ACM Reference Format:

Qing Chen, Michael H. Böhlen, and Sven Helmer. 2025. An experimental comparison of tree-data structures for connectivity queries on fully-dynamic undirected graphs (Extended Version). In *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data (PACMOD) (SIGMOD 2025)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at https://github.com/qingchen3/Imp_bench_dyn.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
SIGMOD 2025, Berlin, Germany

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

It is common lore that asymptotically faster algorithms are preferable over asymptotically slower alternatives. Since many years this understanding has served our community as a coarse guideline for designing and selecting data structures and algorithms. In recent years, however, a number of solutions have been proposed where more fine-grained evaluations are needed to gain actionable insights into the properties of data structures and algorithms [13, 16, 21, 30, 41].

A problem where insights beyond worst case asymptotic complexity and amortized costs are missing is the connectivity problem for fully dynamic graphs. Connectivity queries over fully dynamic graphs consider graphs with possibly frequent edge insertions and deletions and determine if two vertices are connected. While this fundamental problem has been studied extensively on a theoretical level for dynamic graphs [17–19, 25, 39, 40] and various data structures [15, 26, 31, 49, 51] and algorithms [28, 29, 32] have been proposed, we lack an understanding of how these solutions perform in practice. Typical application areas for fully dynamic graphs are *simulation scenarios*. For instance, power grids are networks with large diameters that include microgrids with smaller diameters. To test the robustness of power grids, islanding techniques [23, 37] are being used to detect the intentional or unintentional division of a connected power grid into disconnected regions. This is done by simulating the deletion of one or multiple edges and running connectivity queries for each possible set of edge modifications to determine if the power network remains connected. Such simulations crucially depend on fast connectivity algorithms since many possible sets of edge deletions must be performed and checked by running a large number of connectivity queries.

To solve the dynamic connectivity problem three classes of solutions, all based on spanning trees, have been proposed (see Section 3 for details). The first class maintains spanning trees without levels. D-trees [15] use a *heuristic that attempts to minimize the sum of distances* between the root and all other nodes in spanning trees, whereas link-cut trees [44] decompose spanning trees into a set of paths and nodes. The second class is based on *Euler tour trees* [26], which are balanced binary trees together with a partitioning of the edges into levels, to get the first polylogarithmic time bound for deleting edges [27]. The third category are *height-bounded trees* to improve the time bounds of balanced binary trees. Height-bounded trees come in two variants: structural trees [49, 51] are k -ary trees (k not being constrained) while local trees [31, 32, 49, 51] are binary trees based on rank trees.

In this empirical study we comprehensively evaluate the performance of solutions for the dynamic connectivity problem. Our goal is to understand the tradeoffs along three main dimensions. The first dimension is the balancedness of spanning trees. Balanced trees provide guarantees for the performance of operations but do not allow to directly represent the edges of the graph by edges of the spanning tree since the organization of the nodes in the spanning tree is determined by the balancedness criteria. This leads to a non-negligible overhead for balanced trees. The second dimension is a partitioned representation of spanning trees. A partitioning of the nodes and edges into multiple levels yields faster operations per level but additional data structures are needed to support the partitioning and the construction and maintenance of the partitioning when the graph changes are expensive. The third dimension are space- versus deletion-efficient data structures and algorithms. The most time-consuming spanning tree operation is the deletion of an edge that breaks a component into two components. In this case it must be checked if a replacement edge exists that reconnects the two components. Deletion-efficient data structures focus on solutions to improve the worst case performance of such deletions by introducing auxiliary data structures and considering amortized costs. While the approaches successfully curb the worst case performance and the amortized costs for some classes of workloads they come with hefty overheads. Space-efficient data structures (D-tree, LCT, ST) trade worst case guarantees for lightweight data structures and algorithms. We find that so far no solution achieves a good trade-off among memory footprints, tree heights and maintenance cost.

We provide the first comprehensive experimental study for all major data structures for connectivity queries to guide future research on this topic. Our main technical contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We implement all major data structures for the dynamic connectivity problem: D-tree, link-cut tree LCT, HK, HKS (a simplified version of HK), HDT, structural tree ST, a variant STV of structural trees, local tree LT, a variant LTV of local trees, and lazy local trees LzT. We provide reference implementations for all solutions, some of which have never been implemented before.
- We extensively evaluate all major data structures on large real-world and synthetic graphs with a wide range of workloads. We generate workloads that decouple the dependency between the insertion and deletion of edges to permit a fine-grained control of the growth rate of the graph, and show that lazy local trees with the lowest amortized costs are the slowest in terms of empirically determined runtime.
- We leverage our insights from extensive implementations and evaluations to offer lessons learned and we provide recommendations for future work to pave the path for the first practical and robust data structure for connectivity queries over fully dynamic graphs.

2 Background

We consider undirected unweighted simple graphs $G = (V, E)$ defined by a set V of vertices and a set E of edges [14, 22, 50]. In an *undirected simple graph*, (u, v) and (v, u) are the same edge. $adj(u)$

denotes the set of vertices that are directly connected to vertex u , i.e., $adj(u) = \{v \mid v \in V, (u, v) \in E\}$. A *path* P is a sequence of m distinct vertices (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m) where $v_i \in V$ and every two neighboring vertices v_i and v_{i+1} are connected by edges $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$. If there are edges connecting v_1 and v_m , the sequence $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m, v_1)$ is a *cycle*. The *diameter* of a graph is the length of the longest shortest path between two vertices. A *connected component* $C = (V_c, E_c)$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a maximal subgraph, with $V_c \subseteq V$ and $E_c \subseteq E$, such that any pair of vertices in C is connected by a path. A *tree* is an undirected graph in which any pair of nodes is connected by exactly one path and there are no cycles. In a *rooted tree* there is a designated root node. Given a connected component $C = (V_c, E_c)$, a *spanning tree* for C is a rooted tree $st = (V', E')$ with $V' = V_c$ and $E' \subseteq E_c$. An edge (u, v) is a *tree edge* if $(u, v) \in E'$, otherwise it is a *non-tree edge*. If the insertion of an edge (u, v) connects two spanning trees, (u, v) is a tree edge for the merged spanning tree. For example, in Figure 1, edges $(1, 2)$, $(1, 3)$ and $(3, 6)$ are non-tree edges while all other edges are tree edges. A *spanning forest* is a set of spanning trees.




Figure 1: Connected component C and spanning tree st for C . Edges are labeled with their levels (described below). Dashed edges are non-tree edges for st .

2.1 Connectivity queries on tree-data structures

Given a graph, a connectivity query for two vertices returns true if there exists a path between the two vertices, otherwise false. All tree-data structures maintain a rooted tree for each connected component of the graph. Answering connectivity queries using tree-data structures boils down to checking if two nodes have the same root node, i.e., they are in the same tree.

Definition 2.1 (Connectivity queries on tree-data structures). Given a tree-data structure for a graph $G = (V, E)$ and two nodes $u, v \in V$, the connectivity query $conn(u, v)$ returns True if nodes u and v have the same root node in the tree, and False otherwise.

Answering connectivity queries on tree-data structures is traversing to the root node and hence the query performance is bounded by the tree heights. The data structures are based on spanning trees and need to maintain themselves due to the insertions and deletions of edges. Inserting and deleting a non-tree edge does not change the spanning tree and hence is trivial to handle. The insertion of a tree edge merges two spanning trees. Deleting a tree edge splits a spanning tree into two, a replacement edge that reconnects the two spanning trees is searched.

2.2 Partitioning Edges by Levels

Existing works maintain data structures and assign a non-negative integer, called *level*, to every edge. Placing edges at different levels

yields better theoretical amortized costs [47] when searching for a replacement edge after a tree edge has been deleted (details follow in Section 2.6). The level of an edge (u, v) , denoted as $l(u, v)$, is 0 when (u, v) is inserted. When an edge (x, y) is deleted, we do an exhaustive search, breadth first search (BFS) or depth first search (DFS), from x or y to find a replacement edge. During this search, if (u, v) is not traversed, $l(u, v)$ remains unchanged. If (u, v) is traversed, $l(u, v)$ is increased by 1 up to a bound that depends on the heuristics used by the method [27, 31, 49, 51]. Let l_{max} be the maximum level on edges. Increasing the level of an edge can be interpreted as pushing down the edge. Edges with a larger level are considered before edges with a smaller level. Levels of edges vary since some edges are traversed multiple times while other edges are never traversed during the search for replacement edges. We write E'_i to refer to level- i edges in E' , hence $E'_i \cap E'_j = \emptyset$ for $0 \leq i < j \leq l_{max}$, and $E' = \bigcup_{i=0}^{l_{max}} E'_i$. The level of a node u , denoted as $l(u)$, is equal to 1 plus the maximum level on edges that are directly connected to u , i.e., $l(u) = 1 + \max\{l(u, x) \mid (u, x) \in E'\}$. We use the term vertices for graphs and the term nodes for trees.

We define level- i tree and non-tree neighbors for each node to facilitate the traversal over level- i nodes. Without differentiating between level- i tree and non-tree neighbors, all level- i edges must be searched during traversals.

Definition 2.2 (level- i tree and non-tree neighbors). Given a spanning tree $st = (V', E')$ with $E' = \bigcup_{i=0}^{l_{max}} E'_i$, the level- i tree neighbors of a node u are $adj_i^t(u) = \{v \mid v \in V', (u, v) \in E'_i\}$. The level- i non-tree neighbors of a node u are $adj_i^{nt}(u) = \{v \mid v \in V', l(u, v) = i, (u, v) \notin E'_i\}$.

Definition 2.3 (level- i neighbors). The level- i neighbors of a node u are $adj_i(u) = adj_i^t(u) \cup adj_i^{nt}(u)$.

Example 2.4. In Figure 1, for vertex 3 $adj_0^t(3) = \{2\}$, $adj_0^{nt}(3) = \{1, 6\}$, $adj_1^t(3) = \{4\}$, and $adj_1^{nt}(3)$ is empty. The level-0 tree edge $(2, 3)$ is stored in $adj_0^t(2)$ and $adj_0^t(3)$, respectively, as $3 \in adj_0^t(2)$ and $2 \in adj_0^t(3)$. Similarly, the level-0 non-tree edge $(1, 3)$ is stored in $adj_0^{nt}(1)$ and $adj_0^{nt}(3)$, respectively.

Existing data structures maintain spanning trees, cumulative spanning trees, or recursive spanning trees. These trees keep track of the nodes in spanning trees (for details, see Section 3). Edges with levels are maintained in two different ways. One way maintains the edges cumulatively, i.e., edges with larger levels and those with smaller levels are maintained together. The other way maintains the edges at each level separately.

2.3 Cumulative Spanning Trees

Definition 2.5 (Level- i Cumulative Spanning Tree). Consider a spanning tree $st = (V', E')$ with nodes V' and edges $E' = \bigcup_{i=0}^{l_{max}} E'_i$. The level- i cumulative spanning tree for st is $c\mathcal{ST}_i = (c\mathcal{V}_i, c\mathcal{E}_i)$ with $c\mathcal{E}_i = \bigcup_{j=i}^{l_{max}} E'_j$ and $c\mathcal{V}_i = \bigcup_{j=i}^{l_{max}} \{v \mid v \in V', \exists x \in V', (v, x) \in E'_j\}$.

Example 2.6. Figure 2 shows the level-0 cumulative spanning tree $c\mathcal{ST}^0$ for C in Figure 1 with level-0 and level-1 edges. In $c\mathcal{ST}^0$, vertex 3 is a level-2 vertex since edge $(3, 4)$ has the maximal level,




Figure 2: Cumulative spanning trees for C in Figure 1. $c\mathcal{ST}_1^{(3)}$ denotes the level-1 cumulative spanning tree that contains node 3.

and vertex 2 is a level-1 vertex since levels of all edges directly connected to vertex 2 are 0.

2.4 Recursive Spanning Trees

Recursive spanning trees use super nodes to maintain the edges and nodes of the next larger level. The level- l_{max} recursive spanning tree contains level- l_{max} edges and level- $(l_{max} + 1)$ nodes. All level- l_{max} recursive spanning trees are super nodes of level- l_{max} in level- $(l_{max} - 1)$ spanning trees. Thus, a level- $(l_{max} - 1)$ spanning tree contains level- $(l_{max} - 1)$ edges, level- l_{max} nodes, and level- l_{max} super nodes.

Definition 2.7 (Level- i Recursive Spanning Tree). Given a spanning tree $st = (V', E')$ with $E' = \bigcup_{i=0}^{l_{max}} E'_i$, a level- i recursive spanning tree for st is $r\mathcal{ST}_i = (r\mathcal{V}_i, E'_i)$ where for each $v \in r\mathcal{V}^i$, (1) v is a level- $(i + 1)$ super node (cf. Definition 2.8) or (2) $v \in V'$ and v is a level- $(i + 1)$ node. Any pair of nodes in $r\mathcal{V}_i$ are connected via level- i edges.

Figure 3 shows a level-0 spanning tree $r\mathcal{ST}_0$ in which s_1 and s'_1 are level-1 super nodes while nodes 1, 2, and 5 are level- $(i + 1)$ nodes. All nodes of $r\mathcal{ST}_0$ are connected via level-0 edges.




Figure 3: Recursive spanning trees for C in Figure 1. $r\mathcal{ST}_1^{(3)}$ denotes the level-1 recursive spanning tree that contains node 3.

Definition 2.8 (Level- $(i+1)$ super node). Given a spanning tree $st = (V', E')$ with $E' = \bigcup_{i=0}^{l_{max}} E'_i$, a level- $(i + 1)$ super node is $s_i = (\mathcal{V}_{s_i}, E'_{s_i})$ with $E'_{s_i} \subseteq E'_{i+1}$. For each node $v \in \mathcal{V}_{s_i}$, v is a level- $(i + 2)$ super node or a level- $(i + 2)$ node in V' . Any pair of nodes in \mathcal{V}_{s_i} are connected via level- $(i + 1)$ edges.

To simplify notation, we write st_i to denote either a level- i cumulative or a recursive spanning tree. If there are more than one level- i spanning trees, st_i is a spanning forest. We use $st_i^{(u)}$ to denote the level- i spanning tree that contains node u .

2.5 Inserting Edges

When an edge (u, v) is inserted, we must determine if (u, v) is a tree or non-tree edge when it is added to the spanning tree. If it is a tree edge the structure of the spanning tree changes since components must be merged. To check if (u, v) is a non-tree edge we run a connectivity query $conn(u, v)$ on level-0 spanning trees. If $conn(u, v)$ returns true, (u, v) is a non-tree edge otherwise (u, v) is a tree edge. The levels of newly inserted edges are set to 0. If (u, v) is a non-tree edge, we add u to $adj_0^{nt}(v)$ and v to $adj_0^{nt}(u)$. If (u, v) is a tree edge, inserting (u, v) merges the level-0 spanning trees that contain, respectively, u and v . For some data structures, edges with small levels are pushed down after the insertions of edges.

2.6 Deleting Edges

When deleting a level- i edge (u, v) , we first determine if (u, v) is a non-tree edge or a tree edge. Edge (u, v) is a level- i non-tree edge if v is in $adj_i^{nt}(u)$ and is a level- i tree edge otherwise. If (u, v) is a level- i non-tree edge, deleting the edge does not change the spanning tree. We only need to remove u and v from $adj_i^{nt}(v)$ and $adj_i^{nt}(u)$, respectively. If (u, v) is a level- i tree edge, the level- i spanning tree $st_i^{(u,v)}$ containing u and v is split into two level- i spanning trees: $st_i^{(u)}$ containing u and $st_i^{(v)}$ containing v . Let $st_i^{(u)}$ be the tree with fewer nodes. We need to know if there is a level- i non-tree edge, called *replacement edge*, that reconnects $st_i^{(u)}$ and $st_i^{(v)}$. We search $st_i^{(u)}$ for a replacement edge. If there is a level- i non-tree edge (tx, ty) that reconnects $st_i^{(u)}$ and $st_i^{(v)}$, we stop the search and turn (tx, ty) into a level- i tree edge, otherwise we move to level $i - 1$ to search for a level- $(i - 1)$ non-tree edge that reconnects $st_i^{(u)}$ and $st_i^{(v)}$ until we either reach level 0 or find a replacement edge. In both situations, the level- i tree edges and level- i non-tree edges traversed during the search are pushed to level- $(i + 1)$. Pushing level- i edges to level- $(i + 1)$ saves costs for future deletions of level- i edges since we do not search edges whose levels are larger than i . Algorithm 1 shows the general procedure for deleting a level- i tree edge.

Algorithm 1: Delete level- i tree edge (u, v, i)

```

1 Remove  $u$  and  $v$  from  $adj_i^t(v)$  and  $adj_i^t(u)$ , respectively;
2  $st_i^{(u,v)}$  splits to  $st_i^{(u)}$  and  $st_i^{(v)}$ ;
3 while  $i \geq 0$  do
4   for  $y \in \{adj_i^{nt}(x) \mid x \in st_i^{(u)}\}$  do
5     if  $(tx, ty)$  reconnects  $st_i^{(u)}$  and  $st_i^{(v)}$  then
6       insert  $(tx, ty)$  as a level- $i$  tree edge;
7       merge  $st_i^{(u)}$  and  $st_i^{(v)}$  into  $st_i^{(u,v)}$ ;
8       push down level- $i$  tree edges and/or non-tree edges;
9       return;
10   $i--$ 

```

3 Major Data Structures

We classify existing data structures into three categories based on the type of spanning trees they are maintaining. In the first

category, the D-tree [15] is a spanning tree without levels, and link-cut tree [43] maintains a set of splay trees [44] to present spanning trees without levels. In the second category, HK [27], HKS [11] (a simplified version of HK), and HDT [29] use Euler Tour trees (ET-trees) [27] to maintain cumulative spanning trees. The third category, structural trees [49, 51], local trees [49, 51], and lazy local trees [31, 49, 51], maintain height bounded recursive spanning trees. When describing the maintenance of data structures, we focus on discussing operations for inserting and deleting tree edges as operations for non-tree edges are trivial. Inserting and deleting non-tree edges do not change spanning trees, we simply update non-tree neighbors of the nodes.

3.1 D-tree

Tree-data structures with nodes that have a high fanout tend to be shallow, resulting in efficient runtime for answering connectivity queries. D-trees apply this principle to spanning trees by minimizing parameter S_d , the sum of distances between the nodes in the tree and the root node. Since D-trees process connectivity queries by traversing from query nodes to root nodes (to check if the query nodes are located in the same tree), minimizing S_d results in a low average runtime.

Constructing a BFS tree results in a spanning tree with an optimal value for S_d . However, maintaining optimal BFS-trees is too expensive for large dynamic graphs, so D-trees employ heuristics to keep the value of S_d low (for details, see [15]). A side effect of having a tree with a low value for S_d is that deleting a tree edge (u, v) usually splits a spanning tree into a large tree $st^{(v)}$, containing v , and a small tree $st^{(u)}$, containing u (w.l.o.g. we assume the large tree contains v). After deleting the edge (u, v) , we traverse $st^{(u)}$ to search for a replacement (non-tree) edge. If we find one we can reconnect $st^{(v)}$ and $st^{(u)}$, i.e., the nodes in $st^{(v)}$ and $st^{(u)}$ are still connected in the graph. Usually, $st^{(u)}$ contains a very small number of nodes, often fewer than ten [15]. If multiple replacement edges exist, we choose the one that re-attaches $st^{(u)}$ to the node that is closest to the root of $st^{(v)}$ to keep the tree as shallow as possible. In order to reconnect $st^{(u)}$, we may have to reroot it. This may also be the case when inserting a new tree edge connecting two previously unconnected components [15].




Figure 4: Operations for delete tree edge $(2, 3)$ in a D-tree for component C of Figure 1. Nodes with red labels are root nodes.

Example 3.1. In Figure 4, after tree edge $(2, 3)$ is deleted, the D-tree is split to $st^{(2)}$ containing node 2 and $st^{(3)}$ containing node 3. The small tree $st^{(3)}$ is traversed to search for non-tree edges. The non-tree edges $(1, 3)$ and $(3, 6)$ reconnect $st^{(2)}$ and $st^{(3)}$. Edge $(1, 3)$ attaches $st^{(3)}$ to node 1 while edge $(3, 6)$ attaches $st^{(3)}$ to node

6. The non-tree edge (1, 3) is selected as inserting (1, 3) into the D-tree maintains a smaller S_d .

3.2 Link-cut Tree

Link-cut trees (LCTs) are a data structure that dynamically adjusts to the workload, bringing down the amortized costs of the operations applied to it [43]. Rather than balancing a tree, an LCT partitions it into separate paths, called *preferred paths*, consisting of *preferred edges*. Nodes that are not part of a preferred path are called *isolated* (see Figure 5(a) for examples of preferred paths and an isolated node 1). Every preferred path is stored as a splay tree (binary search tree) [44], in which the nodes on the preferred path are ordered according to their depth on the path (e.g., see Figure 5(b) for the splay tree of path 2-3-4). Each isolated node is the root node of a splay tree only containing itself. If edge (u, v) is a preferred edge, nodes u and v are in the same splay tree, with u being the predecessor of v . If (u, v) is a non-preferred edge, u and v are found in different splay trees, here denoted $sp^{(u)}$ and $sp^{(v)}$, respectively. Then (u, v) is stored as a *directed pointer*, called *path_pointer*, from the root node of $sp^{(v)}$ to u (in Figure 5(b), the edges (1, 5) and (3, 5) are path_pointers).




Figure 5: Consider the spanning tree in Figure 4. Two preferred paths and the isolated node 1 of the spanning tree are stored as splay trees in the Link/cut tree.

We now turn to representing spanning trees with LCTs. Every non-leaf node in the spanning tree has one preferred child, connected via a preferred edge. However, an arbitrary tree edge of the spanning tree can either be a preferred edge of a non-preferred edge. Deleting a tree edge (u, v) splits the spanning tree $st^{(u,v)}$ into $st^{(u)}$ and $st^{(v)}$. The link-cut tree $LCT^{(u,v)}$ for $st^{(u,v)}$ splits into two link-cut trees, $LCT^{(u)}$ containing u and $LCT^{(v)}$ containing v . There are no procedures in LCTs optimized to search for replacement edges during the deletion of tree edges, though. The directedness of path_pointers makes it hard to efficiently search either $LCT^{(u)}$ or $LCT^{(v)}$ in a top-down fashion, as we do not see subtrees connected via path_pointers from a parent node. Without auxiliary data structures, we have to traverse all the nodes to determine the nodes contained in a specific LCT. Additionally, inserting a replacement edge can merge two preferred paths. *W.l.o.g.*, assume that (t_u, t_v) is the replacement edge and the preferred path containing node t_v is attached to the preferred path containing t_u . All ancestors of t_v in the preferred path become descendants of t_u and have to be reordered.




Figure 6: Delete tree edge (2, 3). Select edge (1, 3) as the replacement edge and insert (1, 3).

3.3 ET-trees for HK, HKS and HDT

HK [27] and HDT [29] use ET-trees, implemented with randomized search trees [42], that have no total orders of nodes to maintain cumulative spanning trees for every level.¹ Merging two balanced binary trees takes $O(\log n)$ time.

An Euler Tour visits all nodes of a spanning tree, starting and ending at the same node (see the example shown Figure 7a) [11, 48]. Each edge is visited twice and each node, except leaf nodes, is visited multiple times, depending on the number of tree neighbors of the node. We write u_i to denote the i -th occurrence of node u in the Euler Tour. For an edge (u, v) of the spanning tree, we write $\langle u_x, v_y \rangle$ and $\langle v_p, u_q \rangle$ to denote the first and second visits of u and v by the Euler tour, respectively. Thus, edge (u, v) is associated with the four occurrences u_x, v_y, v_p and u_q in the Euler tour. Consider a spanning tree with n nodes, an Euler tour includes $2n - 1$ occurrences of the nodes. The ET-tree is a transformation of the Euler Tour into a balanced binary tree, such that each occurrence u_i in the Euler Tour is associated with a node with key u_i in the ET-tree. Note that the sequence of occurrences of nodes in the inorder traversal of this balanced binary tree is equal to the Euler Tour. The ET-tree does not preserve the tree edges of the spanning tree and hence ET-trees must maintain tree edge information explicitly (as attribute values of the nodes in the ET-tree; see Section 4.3).




Figure 7: An Euler Tour of a level-0 cumulative spanning tree cST_0 in Figure 2 starting at node 7 is $7_1, 8_1, 5_1, 2_1, 3_1, 4_1, 3_2, 2_2, 5_2, 1_1, 5_3, 8_2, 7_3, 6_1, 7_3$ (first visiting node 7 and then nodes 8, 5, 2, 3, 4, 3 and so on). The ET-tree is shown on the right hand side.

Example 3.2. In Figure 7, the spanning tree has 8 nodes and the ET-tree has 15 nodes. In the ET-tree, the edge between 2_2 and 8_2 does not exist in the spanning tree. The edge (7, 8) in the spanning tree is mapped to four tree nodes with keys $7_1, 8_1, 8_2, 7_2$.

¹Note: for unweighted graphs each spanning tree is also a minimum spanning tree.

Deleting a level- i tree edge (u, v) splits the spanning tree $st_i^{(u,v)}$ into $st_i^{(u)}$ and $st_i^{(v)}$ and hence splits the Euler Tour of $st_i^{(u,v)}$. Let $st_i^{(u)}$ be the smaller tree. We traverse the nodes in the ET-tree of $st_i^{(u)}$ to find a replacement edge. If there are multiple replacement edges, any of them can be selected. Assume non-tree edge (tx, ty) reconnects $tx \in st_i^{(u)}$ and $ty \in st_i^{(v)}$. The ET-tree for $st_i^{(u)}$ and the ET-tree for $st_i^{(v)}$ are merged through (tx, ty) , which means (tx, ty) must be inserted as a tree edge. The algorithm to merge two ET-trees through (tx, ty) requires that the Euler tours of $st_i^{(u)}$ and $st_i^{(v)}$ start at node tx and node ty , respectively. If this condition is not satisfied, we restructure the ET-trees before merging them.




Figure 8: Delete the tree edge (2, 3). Select the non-tree edge (3, 6) as a replacement edge. Insert (3, 6) as a tree edge.

Example 3.3. Figure 8 shows the maintenance of ET-tree when tree edge (2, 3) is deleted. The smaller ET-tree for $st_1^{(3)}$ is traversed. The non-tree edges (1, 3) and (3, 6) are possible replacement edges. We insert (3, 6) as a tree edge. Details of breaking, restructuring and merging ET-trees can be found in [11, 27].

3.4 Structural Trees and Local Trees

Structural trees and local trees have bounded heights, which offers amortized cost guarantees for connectivity queries. We start out with the structural tree, which is the baseline model for local trees [49, 51].

3.4.1 Structural Tree. In a structural tree, nodes of level- i recursive spanning trees are directly connected to a level- i super node s_i of a recursive spanning tree.

Definition 3.4 (Level- i Structural Tree). Given a level- i recursive spanning tree $rST_i = (rV_i, E_i)$ and the level- i super node s_i for rST_i , the level- i structural tree is $T_i = (V^{T_i}, E^{T_i})$ in which $V^{T_i} = rV_i \cup \{s_i\}$ and s_i is the root. All nodes in rV_i are directly connected to s_i in T_i , i.e., $E^{T_i} = \{(s_i, v) \mid v \in rV_i\}$.

Example 3.5. Figure 9 shows the structural tree T_0 for the level-0 spanning tree and the structural tree T_1 for the level-1 spanning trees in Figure 3.

Inserting a tree edge (u, v) connects structural trees $T_0^{(u)}$ and $T_0^{(v)}$. *W.l.o.g.*, assume that $T_0^{(u)}$ contains fewer leaf nodes (super



Figure 9: Structural trees for recursive spanning trees of Figure 3.




Figure 10: Deleting the tree edge (2, 3) in the structural tree.

nodes are not leaf nodes). Nodes of $T_0^{(u)}$ except the root directly connect to the root of $T_0^{(v)}$. The performance of the insertion is determined by the number of nodes in $T_0^{(u)}$. The worst-case performance for inserting a tree edge is $\Theta(n/2)$ if $T_0^{(u)}$ contains $n/2$ nodes.

When a level- i tree edge (u, v) is deleted, the level- i structural tree $T_i^{(u,v)}$ that contains u and v splits into two level- i structural trees: $T_i^{(u)}$ and $T_i^{(v)}$. Let $T_i^{(u)}$ be the tree with fewer leaf nodes. We traverse the leaf nodes in $T_i^{(u)}$ to find a non-tree edge that reconnects $T_i^{(u)}$ and $T_i^{(v)}$. When the traversal stops, the levels of all traversed tree edges in $T_i^{(u)}$ and visited level- i non-tree edges is increased by 1. Thus, the level- i structural tree $T_i^{(u)}$ becomes a level- $(i+1)$ structural tree. The heuristic of pushing down the smaller tree guarantees a $\log n$ height of a structural tree [29] as there are at most $\log n$ levels. A level-1 super node contains at most $n/2$ leaf nodes that are all from the small tree. A level-2 super node contains at most $n/4$ leaf nodes and so on. The lower bound for the amortized costs for deleting tree edges in structural trees is $O((\log n)^2)$ [51]. The worst-case performance of deleting a tree edge is $O(|E|)$ when all tree edges and non-tree edges have to be traversed and pushed to the next level.

Example 3.6. Figure 10 illustrates the split of $T_0^{(2,3)}$ when the level-0 tree edge (2, 3) is deleted. The structural tree $T_0^{(2)}$ containing node 2 has three leaf nodes while $T_0^{(3)}$ containing node 3 has five leaf nodes, two leaf nodes in s_1 and three leaf nodes in s_1' . Nodes in $T_0^{(2)}$ are pushed down, and $T_0^{(2)}$ becomes $T_1^{(2)}$. We traverse leaf nodes of $T_1^{(2)}$ and find that level-0 non-tree edges (1, 3) and (3, 6) are replacement edges. $T_0^{(2)}$ with root s_1'' connects to the root of $T_0^{(3)}$.

All leaf nodes of the smaller tree have to be traversed when searching for a replacement edge, even though they may not be connected via non-tree edges. In the worst case, if none of the leaf nodes have non-tree neighbors, we traverse all of them unnecessarily. The local tree, which we look at next, transforms the structural

tree to a height bounded binary tree with auxiliary bit arrays to prune leaf nodes without non-tree neighbors.

3.4.2 Local Tree. We first show how the local tree² achieves and maintains a bounded height and then show that the runtime of finding a non-tree edge in the local tree is bounded by the height.

Bounded tree height. A level- i local tree achieves a bounded height by maintaining a bounded number ($\leq \log n$) of *rank trees*, *i.e.*, binary trees with bounded heights. Given a node x of a local tree, we use $x.nl$ to denote the number of leaf nodes in the tree rooted at x . The *rank* of a node x , $rank(x)$, is equal to $\lfloor \log_2(x.nl) \rfloor$ [49]. Two nodes with the same rank are paired up and form a new rank tree. Assume that nodes x and y have the same rank. *W.l.o.g.*, $x.nl \leq y.nl$. We pair up x and y , making x and y the left child and the right child, respectively, of a new node par . The binary tree rooted at par is called a rank tree and the node par is called a rank root (the root of a rank tree). If par is paired with another node, par is not a rank root any more. One node of a local tree can be paired up only once. When no further pair operations can be done, at most $\log n$ rank trees with unique ranks remain. The height of each rank tree is $O(\log n)$. Finally, the local trees connects all rank roots with a path such that rank roots with larger ranks are closer to the root node of the local tree.

Leverage bitmaps to search for a non-tree edge. Each node x of the local tree has an array of l_{max} bits, called *bitmap*, in which the i -th bit tells us if there exists a leaf node of the subtree rooted at x that has a level- i non-tree neighbor. The search for a level- i non-tree edge traverses from the root to leaf nodes and is done by checking if $bitmap[i] = 1$ for the nodes on the path. This prunes the nodes that do not have non-tree neighbors. The runtime of finding a non-tree edge is bounded by the tree height. After we find a non-tree edge, we check if the non-tree edge is a replacement edge.

Definition 3.7 (Level- i Local Tree). Given a level- i structural tree $T_i = (V^{T^i}, E^{T^i})$ with s_i being the root, a level- i local tree for T_i is $L_i = (V^{L^i}, E^{L^i})$ in which $V^{T^i} \subseteq V^{L^i}$ and s_i is the root node. The distance between a node x and the root s_i in L^i is $O(1 + \log(s_i.nl/x.nl))$ (for details, see [49]).





Figure 11: Local trees for structural trees of Figure 9. Non-green nodes are internal nodes in the local tree.

Example 3.8. In Figure 11, rank roots with unique ranks are 5, s_1 , rt in which rt is directly linked to the root s_0 while 5 and s_1 are linked to s_0 via a connecting node. The nl values for nodes 5, s_1 and

²In the original paper [49], local tree was called local search tree. But there is actually no search in the local tree, which is also confirmed by a recent work [32].

rt are 1, 2 and 5, respectively. The *rank* values for nodes 5, s_1 and rt are 0 ($=\lfloor 1 \rfloor$), 1 ($=\lfloor 2 \rfloor$), and 2 ($=\lfloor s_1.nl \rfloor + 1 = 1 + 1$), respectively.

When a level- i tree edge (u, v) is deleted, the local tree changes st_i^u to st_{i+1}^u , pushing down all tree edges and nodes in st_i^u . All nodes of st_i^u are firstly removed from the local tree L_i^u , of $st_i^{u,v}$, and then form a level- $(i+1)$ local tree L_{i+1}^u for st_{i+1}^u . We search L_{i+1}^u for a non-tree edge that reconnects L_{i+1}^u and L_i^v . The search starts at the root of L_{i+1}^u and goes to the left or right subtree whose $bitmap[i]$ is 1. If there exists a level- $(i+1)$ non-tree edge that reconnects st_i^u and st_i^v , L_{i+1}^u is inserted into L_i^v , the level- i local tree that contains v for st_i^v , as a level- $(i+1)$ node. All level- i non-tree edges visited during the search for a replacement, except the replacement edge itself, are pushed down to level $i+1$, and hence we update the bitmap accordingly.



Remove nodes 1, 2, and 5 from L_0 Form s_1'' Insert s_1'' into L_0

Figure 12: Deleting tree edge (2, 3) in the local tree.

Example 3.9. Figure 12 shows that tree edge (2, 3) is deleted, nodes 1, 2, 5 are removed from the the local tree and combined to a level- $(i+1)$ local tree rooted at s_1'' . The levels of tree edges (2, 5) and (1, 5) are increased by 1. The search for a non-tree edge starts at the root node s_1'' and we navigate to left or right subtrees whose root nodes have the 0-th bit of the bitmap set to 1. We find two level-0 non-tree edges (1, 2) and (1, 3), of which non-tree edge (1, 3) is a replacement edge. Edge (1, 3) becomes a level-0 tree edge and s_1'' is inserted as a level-1 node in L_0 . We update the bitmaps for the tree rooted at s_1'' as the level of non-tree edge (1, 2) increases by 1.

To further improve the amortized costs for deleting tree edges, Thorup proposed the Lazy Local Tree [49] that lazily updates the binary tree by additionally maintaining a small subtree, called *buffer tree*.

3.4.3 Lazy Local Tree. The Lazy Local Tree [49] maintains nodes with small nl values (number of leaf nodes) and nodes with large nl values separately. A lazy local tree maintains two local trees in left and right subtrees of the root node, respectively. The subtree in the left branch, called *buffer tree*, contains nodes whose nl values are below a threshold β . The subtree in the right branch contains nodes with nl values $\geq \beta$ or a group of buffer nodes (described in the following) with a total nl value $\geq \beta$. We call a node of the buffer tree a *buffer node* and call the right branch of the lazy local tree *lazy branch*. A node whose nl value is below β can only be inserted into the buffer tree. When the nl value of the buffer tree is equal to or larger than β , the buffer tree becomes a *bottom tree*. The buffer tree (now a bottom tree) is moved to the lazy branch, *i.e.*, inserting the root node of the bottom tree as a rank root into the lazy branch (a local tree). The left branch of the lazy local tree is empty. Inserting a node with nl value $\geq \beta$ into a lazy local tree is the same as inserting a node in a local tree.




Figure 13: Lazy Local trees with $\beta = 2$ for local trees of Figure 11. Bitmaps are not shown for simplicity.

Example 3.10. Figure 13 shows lazy local trees for the local tree in Figure 11. In Z_0 , s_1 can not be placed in the buffer tree as its nl value is equal to β . After nodes 1 and 2 are inserted into the buffer tree, the buffer tree become a bottom tree which is moved to the lazy branch.

When a level- i tree edge (u, v) is deleted, the lazy local tree changes st_i^u to st_{i+1}^u . All nodes of st_i^u are removed from the lazy local tree $Z_i^{u,v}$ for $st_i^{u,v}$. There are three types of nodes in st_i^u : (1) buffer nodes (2) nodes in a bottom tree (3) intermediate nodes with $nl \geq \beta$. Removing (1) and (3) from $Z_i^{u,v}$ works is the same as removing nodes from a local tree. Removing nodes from a bottom tree reduces the its nl and the bottom tree is removed from the lazy branch if its nl value is below β . Nodes of the removed bottom tree are inserted into the buffer tree. After all nodes of st_i^u are removed from $Z_i^{u,v}$, they form a new level- $(i+1)$ lazy local tree lazy local tree Z_{i+1}^u for st_{i+1}^u . If there exists a level- $(i+1)$ non-tree edge that reconnects st_i^u and st_i^v , Z_{i+1}^u is inserted into Z_i^v .




Figure 14: Operations for deleting the tree edge (2, 3) in the lazy local tree Z_0 .

Example 3.11. Figure 14 shows the operations for deleting the tree edge (2, 3) in Z_0 . The bottom tree that contains nodes 1 and 2 is removed from the lazy branch as removing either node 1 or node 2 makes its nl value less than β . Thus, the remained node in the bottom tree is removed from the lazy branch and added to the buffer tree. Nodes 1, 2 and 5 form a level- $(i+1)$ lazy local tree rooted at s_1'' , which is inserted into the lazy branch of Z_0 .

4 Implementations

Table 1 shows that many data structures discussed in Section 3 were not implemented before or use outdated third-party libraries. An link-cut tree cannot be used for the dynamic connectivity problem directly as it does not support the search of a replacement edge and the change of root node of a path. Thus, we extend existing implementations³ with this functionality. To compare the data structures,

³<https://usaco.guide/adv/link-cut-tree?lang=cpp>

we have implemented all of them in Python. In this section, we describe important details for implementing the data structures and discuss how we measure memory footprints.

Data structure	Year	Implementation
Link-cut tree (LCT)	1981	✓
ET-tree (HKS)	1997	(✓)
ET-tree (HK)	1995	(✓)
ET-tree (HDT)	1998	(✓)
Structural Tree (ST)	2000	✗
Structural Tree variant (STV)	2013	✗
Local Tree (LT)	2000	✗
Local Tree variant (LTV)	2013	✗
Lazy Local Tree (LzT)	2000	✗
D-tree	2022	✓

Table 1: Status for major data structures. The symbol "(✓)" means that the implementation is based on an outdated third-party library that is not currently maintained.

4.1 D-tree

Each node u in the D-tree has the following attributes:

- *key*: unique integer identifying u
- *children*: set of pointers to the children of u
- *parent*: pointer to parent of u
- *size*: number of nodes in subtree rooted at u
- *nnt*: set of non-tree neighbors of u

A D-tree maintains a dictionary to look up tree nodes. Thus, given a key x , the dictionary returns the tree node with *key* equal to x . Implementation details are shown in [15].

4.2 Link-cut Tree

Each node u in the link-cut tree (LCT) has the following attributes:

- *key*: unique integer identifying u
- *left*: pointer to left child of u in the splay tree
- *right*: pointer to right child of u in the splay tree
- *parent*: pointer to parent of u in the splay tree
- *nnt*: set of non-tree neighbors of u in the spanning tree
- *path_parent*: pointer to parent of u in the LCT

An LCT maintains a dictionary to look up tree nodes.

4.3 HKS, HK and HDT

Existing implementations [10, 11, 33] for HKS, HK and HDT use randomized search trees [42] to implement ET-trees [10]. A randomized search tree is a balanced binary search tree where the search key of each node, the *priority*, is a random integer. Tree nodes whose keys are equal to the first occurrences are active nodes. For example, Figure 7 shows an ET-tree, in which nodes with keys equal to $1_1, 2_1, \dots, 8_1$ are active nodes. All level- i non-tree neighbors of a vertex u in the graph are stored in the active node with key u_1 in the ET-tree. HKS, HK and HDT use different data structures to keep track of edge and node information. We start out with the attributes maintained by HK. Each node u of HK has the following attributes:

- *key*: integer identifier of u
- *left*: pointer to left child of u
- *right*: pointer to right child of u
- *parent*: pointer to parent of u
- *priority*: priority of u
- *active*: true for u_1 of key u
- *nte*: set of non-tree neighbors of u
- *weight*: number of non-tree edges in tree rooted at u
- *act_dict_i*: maps u to the level- i tree node with key u_1
- *rst*: a randomized search tree where nodes are non-tree neighbors of u

HK maintains the following attributes for keeping tracking of Euler tours and levels of edges:

- *tree_edge_pointer_i*: maps a tree edge of a level- i cumulative spanning tree (u, v) to four level- $(i + 1)$ tree nodes with keys u_x, v_y, v_p and u_q
- *level_of_tree_edges_i*: set of level- i tree edges
- *level_of_nontree_edges_i*: set of level- i non-tree edges

Example 4.1. Consider the level-0 spanning tree cST_0 and the ET-tree for cST_0 in Figure 7. Table 2 shows examples for HK's *tree_edge_pointer_0* and *act_dict_0*.

tree edge	tree nodes	vertex	tree node
(7, 8)	$7_1, 8_1, 8_2, 7_2$	7	7_1
(5, 2)	$5_1, 2_1, 2_2, 5_2$	8	8_1

tree_edge_pointer_0 *act_dict_0*

Table 2: Examples for *tree_edge_pointer_0* and *act_dict_0*



Figure 15: Attributes maintained by HK, HKS and HDT. Symbols $+$ and $-$ represent adding and removing attributes, respectively.

HKS simplifies HK by not maintaining attributes related to levels. Attributes *act_dict_i* and *tree_edge_pointer_i* are replaced by the following attributes:

- *act_dict*: maps u to the tree node with key u_1
- *tree_edge_pointer*: maps a tree edge (u, v) to four tree nodes with keys u_x, v_y, v_p and u_q

Attributes *level_of_tree_edges_i* and *level_of_nontree_edges_i* are not maintained by HKS. HDT maintain the *size* attribute that is the number of nodes in tree rooted at u instead of *weight* attribute. HKS and HK store the non-tree neighbors of a tree node u in a randomized search tree [10] to speed up the random selection of a non-tree neighbor for u . HDT does not use randomized search trees for the non-tree neighbors, which saves space. Our experiments show that storing non-tree neighbors in randomized search trees yields high memory footprints (see details in Section 5.3). Transformations among HK, HKS and HDT are shown in Figure 15.

4.4 Structural Trees and (Lazy) Local Trees

There are two different versions of structural trees. The structural tree (ST) proposed by Thorup [49] maintains tree edges and non-tree edges. This means that given a node u , level- i neighbors of u are classified into level- i tree edge neighbors $adj_i^t(u)$ and level- i non-tree edge neighbors $adj_i^{nt}(u)$. Wulff-Nilsen [51] proposed a variant of the structural tree (STV) that does not differentiate tree and non-tree edges. Instead all level- i neighbors of u are stored in $adj_i(u)$. Since local trees are based on structural trees, there are also two versions for local trees. We call the local tree proposed by Thorup [49] *LT* and the variant of the local tree proposed by Wulff-Nilsen [51] *LTV*. The lazy local tree (LzT) maintains the exact same attributes as LT as LzT is essentially a local tree. We start with the attributes maintained by ST. ST maintains the following attributes:

- *key*: unique integer identifying u
- *children*: set of pointers to the children of u
- *parent*: pointer to parent of u
- *nl*: number of leaf nodes in tree rooted at u
- *level*: the level of u
- *adj_t_i*: maps u to level- i tree neighbors
- *adj_nt_i*: maps u to level- i non-tree neighbors




Figure 16: Attributes maintained by ST, STV, LT, LTV and LzT. Symbols $+$ and $-$ represent adding and removing attributes, respectively.

STV maintains one attribute adj_i that maps a node u to its level- i neighbors $adj_i(u)$ instead of two attributes adj_t_i and adj_nt_i . Local trees are binary trees and hence have attributes *left* and *right* that are pointers to left child and right child of a node, respectively, instead of the *children* attribute. Moreover, nodes of local trees maintain bitmaps and node types which are integers. LT maintains two node attributes for bitmaps, *tree_bitmap* and *nontree_bitmap* that is an array of 64 bits for tree neighbors and non-tree neighbors of a node, respectively. LTV maintains one node attribute *bitmap* that is an array of 64 bits for neighbors of a node.

4.5 Measuring Memory Footprints

Some data structures have better space utilization than others due to the techniques they are leveraging. D-trees (spanning trees) use less space as tree edges are stored in parent and children attributes. ET-trees by nature need more space as they have to keep track of information for Euler tours. Data structures in Table 1 use integers, pointers, sets and maps (dictionaries) to store nodes attributes and edges. We determine the size of an object in bytes, to calculate the

memory footprint for the data structures. The size for a set and dictionary is dynamic and determined by the number of elements. Low memory footprints are good in practice as they tend not to cause memory issues.

5 Experimental Evaluation

We evaluate the data structures in Table 1 on a wide range of synthetic and real-world graphs to work out the memory footprints and performance for connectivity queries and update operations. Our goal is determining the data structures that are feasible to be deployed in graph database management systems (GDBMS). Towards this end, we conduct numerous experiments to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each data structure in Table 1.

5.1 Setup

All data structures and algorithms were implemented in Python 3. We conduct experiments on a machine with 200 GB RAM and 80 GB swap memory, running Debian 10. We repeated all experiments for 5 times on the same machine, which show very similar results.

5.2 Datasets

The diameters of real-world graphs play a crucial role in the performances of the data structures [15]. We distinguish between graphs with small diameters and graphs with large diameters. Real-world graphs tend to have small diameters [1]. USA Road [8] is a real-world graph with a large diameter. We include representative large real-world graphs from various domains (Youtube [38], Stackoverflow [9], USA Road [8], and Semantic Scholar [12]). To further enhance the diversity of our datasets, we use networkX [2] to generate a random graph, a power-law graph, a complete graph, a star graph, and a path graph. Semantic Scholar is used to test the scalability of the data structures. Table 3 summarizes the graphs used in our experiments.

Name	$ V $	$ E $	diameter
Star Graph (SG) [7]	10^7	10^7	small
Path Graph (PG) [5]	10^7	10^7	large
Complete Graph (CG) [3]	4472	10^7	small
Random Graph (RG) [4]	10^6	10^7	small
Power-law Graph (PL) [6]	10^6	10^7	small
youtube-growth (YT) [38]	3.2×10^6	1.44×10^7	small
Stackoverflow (ST) [9]	2.6×10^6	6.3×10^7	small
USA Road (USA) [8]	2.4×10^7	5.7×10^7	large
Semantic Scholar (SC) [12]	6.5×10^7	8.27×10^9	small

Table 3: Statistics of datasets.

5.3 Memory Footprint

The D-tree, LCT, ST and STV are space-efficient data structures as they directly keep track of connected nodes. The other data structures are deletion-efficient data structures as they optimize the amortized costs for finding replacement edges. We measure the memory footprints of the data structures after all edges have been inserted and show the experimental results in Figure 17.




Figure 17: Memory footprints for the data structures of the graphs in Table 3. All data structures except the D-tree run out of memory on SC. Update performances are discussed in Section 5.4.

Figure 17 shows that the D-tree has the lowest memory footprint, followed by ST and STV. HK has the highest memory footprint as it maintains ET-trees for $O(\log n)$ levels and stores non-tree neighbors in random search trees. HK uses up to 85x more memory than the D-tree. ST and STV have lower memory footprints than LT, LTV and LzT on all datasets. As shown in Section 3.4.2, transforming structural trees to local trees requires additional rank roots and additional nodes connecting rank roots. Hence, LT, LTV and LzT maintain more nodes than ST and STV. The memory footprints for HKS, HK and HDT are determined by ET-trees and cumulative spanning trees. As shown in Section 4.3, additional data structures are needed to keep track of Euler tours. Our experiments confirm that HKS, HK and HDT have higher memory footprints than D-tree, LCT and ST. No deletion of edges is the best case for HDT as no edges are pushed down. Even so, HDT has higher memory footprints than the D-tree, ST and STV on all datasets. When edges are pushed down to different levels due to the deletion of edges, HDT maintains ET-trees for cumulative spanning trees at all levels, which can have the same memory footprints as HK in the worst case. HKS has higher memory footprints than HDT especially on CG and ST as HKS stores non-tree edges neighbors in random search trees. On SC, the largest experiments used in our experiments, only the D-tree finishes the insertions of all edges while other data structures run out of memory. The D-tree uses 155 GB of memory on SC.

Table 4 shows the space complexity for the different data structures. All data structures need space to store graph edges. A D-tree is a spanning tree where the parent and children attributes are tree edges. A D-tree needs $|E| - |V|$ space to store non-tree edges and $c * |V|$ space to store nodes. Graphs without non-tree edges yields the lower bound $c * |V|$. Graphs with $|E| = O(|V|^2)$ yield the upper bound $|E| + (c - 1) * |V|$. Parent, children, left and right attributes in all other data structures are not edges of tree structures and hence at least $|E|$ space is required to store edges. ST, STV, LT, LTV and LzT need exactly $|E|$ space to store graph edges. HKS, HK and HDT need more than $|E|$ space to store graphs edges since edges are stored in randomized search trees. The lower bound of the space complexity for storing nodes in ST, STV, LT, LTV and LzT is $c * |V|$ as they need additional space for super nodes. HK and HDT use

$c * |V| \times \log |V|$ space for nodes as they maintain $\log |V|$ ET-trees, one for each level. HKS and HK need additional space for storing non-tree neighbors in random search trees. Note that constant c differs from method to method.

Data structures	Lower bound	Upper bound
D-tree	$c * V $	$ E + (c - 1) * V $
LCT	$c * V $	$ E + (c - 1) * V $
ST, STV	$ E + c * V $	$ E + 2 * c * V $
LT, LTV, LzT	$ E + c * V $	$ E + c' * V (c' > c)$
HKS	$ E + c * V $	$k * E + c * V , k > 1$
HDT	$ E + c * V $	$k * E + c * V * \log V , k \geq 1$
HK	$ E + c * V $	$k * E + c * V * \log V , k > 1$

Table 4: Space complexity for the data structures. Note that $|V| \leq |E| \leq |V| * (|V| - 1)/2$.

5.4 Performance of Update Operations

We generate workloads that consist of sequences of interleaved insertions and deletions. Since no general workloads exist we created them in a way that makes it possible to vary the growth rate of graphs and makes insertions and deletions independent of each other (workloads that delete all inserted edges are not general since many graphs grow [34, 35]; workloads that delete edges a certain time after they have been inserted [15, 45, 52] render insertions and deletions dependent on each other). We use $u_r = \frac{\#insertions}{\#deletions}$, i.e., one deletion occurs per u_r insertions, to quantify the growth of the graph. We start out with the empty graph and insert the edges of the graphs in Table 3. When deleting an edge, we randomly select an edge from the graph. Small u_r values mean that edges are deleted frequently and therefore generate graphs with small connected components. Processing small components is fast and can be done with brute-force approaches and is not the focus of our paper. Large u_r values mean that edges are rarely deleted. For our experiments, we set u_r to 1000, 100, 20, 5 to cover representative scenarios where graphs are growing quickly ($u_r = 1000$) and slowly ($u_r = 5$).

When a workload is run we measure and sum up the runtimes of, respectively, insertions and deletions. These times are used to calculate the average runtime of insertions and deletions for each data structure. We first compare data structures in the same category (for details see Section 3) and determine the best data structure of each category for further comparisons. We compare the best performing structures, and give our guidance for using the data structures. When evaluating the performance of update operations, we do not include SC since only the D-tree can finish the workloads of updates within a few hours. The other approaches can not finish the workloads in several days and end up running out of memory.

5.4.1 D-trees and LCTs. Figure 18 shows the average run time for insertions and deletions for D-trees. Inserting edges on PG and deleting edges on USA is up to several orders of magnitude slower than other datasets. Both PG and USA have large diameters and the D-tree degenerates. The reason is that vertices of graphs with large diameters are connected through long paths and consequently the spanning trees for these graphs include long paths. Updating

D-trees demands the traversals of nodes on long paths, which is inefficient.




Figure 18: Average runtime of update operations for D-trees.

Our experiments show that LCT is dominated by D-tree and ST in terms of update performances. Deleting edges in LCT is up to 10^4 times slower than other data structures. Query performances for LCT are dominated by ST.

5.4.2 HKS, HK and HDT. When evaluating the performance of update operations for HK, we find that updating HK is up to several orders of magnitude slower than HKS and HDT as HK constantly rebuilds the ET-trees across different levels. Hence, we do not show the update performances for HK. Update performances for HKS and HDT are shown in Figure 19 and we find that HKS and HDT have similar update performances. HKS and HDT are comparable in inserting edges. Performances of deletions for HKS and HDT are similar, which means that HDT optimizations do not pay off. HDT is up to several orders of magnitude slower than HKS on PG where all edges are tree edges. For example, HDT is 1335x slower than HKS on PG with $u_r = 1000$. The deletion of any edge in PG splits one path and HDT pushes down all nodes in the smaller path. Compared to HDT, HKS does not push down edges, which can save lot of time. HKS outperforms HDT when edges are frequently deleted, i.e., $u_r = 5$. Since HKS is simpler than HDT, we choose HKS over HDT.

5.4.3 ST, STV, LT, LTV and LzT. Figure 20 shows the update performances for ST, STV, LT, LTV and LzT when $u_r = 1000$ and 100. We do not show evaluations for $u_r = 20$ or 5 as LT, LTV and LzT run out of time on these workloads for some datasets. Our experiments show that ST outperforms LT and LzT in both insertions and deletions. It shows that the LT and LzT optimizations do not improve but slow down the update performances. The reason is that removing nodes from rank trees, adding nodes into rank trees and merging rank trees are more complicated than ST operations. For ST and LT, differentiating between tree edges and non-tree edges is not efficient in practice. ST is comparable to STV in inserting edges over all datasets except the USA dataset. ST is up to 1300x faster than STV for deleting edges. LT outperforms LTV in inserting and deleting edges. Since ST outperforms LT, LzT, STV and LTV, ST is the best in this category. We find that deletion operations in ST, STV, LT, LTV and LzT can take extremely long time. For example, deleting a particular edge in LT on YT takes 10^4 seconds.




Figure 19: Average runtime of update operations for HKS and HDT. HKS and HDT run out of memory on SC.

The deletion outliers are caused by pushing down a large number of nodes. ST is considered the best of this category.

5.4.4 D-tree, ST and HKS. We compare D-tree, HKS and ST, the best of each category. Figure 21 shows the update performances for D-tree, ST and HKS, with $u_r = 1000$ and $u_r = 100$. Inserting edges in ST is the fastest. Inserting edges in D-trees is comparable to ST except on PG and USA, which are graphs with large diameters. Inserting edges in HKS is the slowest and up to one order of magnitude slower than ST. The D-tree outperforms ST and HKS for deleting edges for all datasets except USA and PG. In general, the D-tree outperforms ST and HKS on graphs with small diameters. For PG and USA, ST outperforms HKS in insertions while HKS outperforms ST in deletions.

5.5 Performance for Connectivity Queries

We evaluate query performances during the life span of updates and we choose $test_num = 100$ testing points that are uniformly distributed among the updates. When running queries, we suspend the updates. The updates are resumed at each testing point after the queries have been executed. At each testing point we run 50 million connectivity queries for uniformly distributed pairs of vertices and report the average runtime since running connectivity queries for all pairs of vertices at each testing point is impractical. Let N_u be the total number of updates, *i.e.*, the insertion and deletions of edges. This means there is one testing point per $N_u/test_num$ updates. We evaluate query performances for the D-tree, ST and HKS. We only show query performances with $u_r = 1000$ in Figure 22 as




Figure 20: Average runtime of update operations for ST, STV, LT, LTV and LzT. ST, LT, LzT, STV and LTV run out of memory on SC.




Figure 21: Average runtime of update operations for the D-tree, ST and HKS. HKS and ST run out of memory on SC.

experiments with $u_r = 100, 20$ and 5 show very similar results. Our experiments show that ST is the best for query performances as its tree height is guaranteed to be at most $\log n$. ST outperforms all other data structures in answering queries on all datasets. Query performance for the D-tree on PG is not shown because at each testing point it takes several hours for the D-tree to run queries, which is at least two orders of magnitude slower than ST. On PG and USA, which are worst cases for the D-tree, the query performances for the D-tree degenerate.




Figure 22: Average runtime of queries for the D-tree, HKS, and ST with $u_r = 1000$.

5.6 Lessons Learned and Recommendations

The first lesson is that lazy local trees with the lowest amortized costs are the slowest in terms of actual runtimes. Lazy local trees address the worst case performance when an edge is deleted and a replacement edge must be searched, but the overhead for lazy local trees is substantial and the overall performance suffers. In general, solutions that optimize amortized costs, either implemented with Euler-tour trees or height bounded trees, come at a hefty cost. For the workloads they also make the assumption that all edges are deleted, which is not true in general. Refined theoretical studies are needed to determine the amortized costs for a widely agreed-upon benchmark and workload for fully dynamic graphs. Since no such benchmarks exist, the first critical step is to design and establish a standardized benchmark and workloads that can be used to empirically evaluate solutions.

The second lesson is that a good balance between space-efficient and deletion-efficient data structures has been elusive so far. Our experiments show that the overhead of all deletion-efficient data structures is too high. We find that for workloads with a higher percentage of edge deletions (edge deletions are the most expensive operations) the runtime of the workloads on graphs with large diameters improves for unbalanced spanning trees. The reason is that edge deletions break up long paths into shorter paths. This is effective for even a small number of deletions. A lightweight modification of space-efficient data structures to curb the diameter seems the most promising direction for future research. Our recommendation is to enhance unbalanced spanning trees to avoid deterioration in the worst case.

A third lesson is that constructing and maintaining a partitioned structure, i.e., spanning trees where edges are placed on different levels, is expensive. Researchers who first implemented and evaluated the original Euler-tour tree solutions also observed this and have suggested the simplified Euler-tour tree solution without levels. While a partitioning of spanning trees with a push down of edges to a higher level is theoretically attractive more work is needed to possibly make this a practically attractive solution.

The fourth lesson are the costs for, respectively, computing and updating the attribute values of spanning trees (size, weight, bitmap, rank, etc). The attributes are critical elements for pruning the search space and they can either be computed on demand or materialized. Computing on demand or updating materialized attribute values in

dynamic settings incur very different costs. The design choices for supporting attributes must be based on theoretical and empirical results. Implementing an algorithm without carefully justified design decisions provides partial (and possibly misleading) insights [24].

6 Related Work

The existing data structures for answering connectivity queries on fully dynamic graph have been described in detail in the previous sections. All data structures handle real-time deletions and insertions of edges and hence answer connectivity queries in real-time. Recent work [45, 52] proposes indices for connectivity queries over a batch of snapshots of the graph and show that the D-tree also outperforms HK and HDT in such settings. An alternative to spanning trees are labeling schemes for reachability queries [14, 46]. Usually such approaches focus on directed graphs, and their performance depends on the label size. Update performances for labeling schemes can be quadratic while for approaches based on spanning trees, update performances are usually polylogarithmic or linear. Labeling schemes do not perform well for fully dynamic graphs since the deletions of edges triggers an exhaustive search for updating the labels [15].

Existing experimental studies are outdated, and were done on small graphs with limited workloads, and do not cover D-tree, structural trees, local trees and lazy local trees. Alberts et al. [11] evaluated HK, HKS and a simplified sparsification technique [17] using random and non-random workloads over selected synthetic graphs. The number of updates is from 50 to 5000. Their experiments show that HK is faster than the sparsification for a larger number of updates. Iyer et al. [33] compared HK with HDT on random graphs, semi-random graphs and cliques with at most 70,000 vertices. Random and non-random workloads over the synthetic graphs are used. The number of updates is from 10 to 1,000,000. Their experiments show that HDT and HK are comparable for a large number of updates.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we comprehensively evaluate all the major data structures for the dynamic connectivity problem by comparing their memory footprints, update performances and query performances. We find that none of the data structures is robust in practice. The D-tree and structural tree degenerate in worst case scenarios (line graph or other graphs with large diameters) while all balanced data structures are too expensive to maintain. Data structures based on ET-tree, especially HK, have high memory footprints. A robust data structure should have a bounded tree height (a cheap loose bound is better than an expensive tight bound) and the maintenance of such data structure should not be expensive. In the future, we plan to leverage our findings to advance existing data structures to a practical and robust solution and integrate it into an existing DBMS such as Kuzu [20]. As part of future research it is also interesting to investigate solutions for fully dynamic undirected graphs that are applicable to directed graphs and to work on scalable labelings for the reachability problem that perform well for fully dynamic undirected graphs.

8 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Jürgen Bernard for his valuable suggestions on demonstrating the attributes of the data structures. Qing Chen was partially supported by University of Zürich CanDoc grant Nr. FK-23-021.

References

- [1] 2024. Network Diameter. Retrieved May 24, 2024 from <http://konect.cc/statistics/diam/>
- [2] 2024. NetworkX. Retrieved March 24, 2024 from <https://networkx.org/>
- [3] 2024. NetworkX: complete graph. Retrieved January 9, 2024 from https://networkx.org/documentation/stable/reference/generated/networkx.generators.classic.complete_graph.html
- [4] 2024. NetworkX: gnm random graph. Retrieved January 9, 2024 from https://networkx.org/documentation/stable/reference/generated/networkx.generators.random_graphs.gnm_random_graph.html
- [5] 2024. NetworkX: path graph. Retrieved January 9, 2024 from https://networkx.org/documentation/stable/reference/generated/networkx.generators.classic.path_graph.html
- [6] 2024. NetworkX: power law graph. Retrieved January 9, 2024 from https://networkx.org/documentation/stable/reference/generated/networkx.generators.random_graphs.powerlaw_cluster_graph.html
- [7] 2024. NetworkX: star graph. Retrieved January 9, 2024 from https://networkx.org/documentation/stable/reference/generated/networkx.generators.classic.star_graph.html
- [8] 2024. Road networks for full USA. Retrieved January 22, 2024 from <http://konect.cc/networks/dimacs9-USA/>
- [9] 2024. SNAP: Stack Overflow temporal network. Retrieved January 22, 2024 from <http://snap.stanford.edu/data/sx-stackoverflow.html>
- [10] David Alberts. 1995. Implementation of the dynamic connectivity algorithm by Monika Rauch Henzinger and Valerie King. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/refubium-21860>.
- [11] David Alberts, Giuseppe Cattaneo, and Giuseppe F. Italiano. 1997. An Empirical Study of Dynamic Graph Algorithms. *ACM J. Exp. Algorithmics* 2 (jan 1997), 5–es. <https://doi.org/10.1145/264216.264223>
- [12] Waleed Ammar, Dirk Groeneveld, Chandra Bhagavatula, Iz Beltagy, Miles Crawford, Doug Downey, Jason Dunkelberger, Ahmed Elgohary, Sergey Feldman, Vu Ha, Rodney Kinney, Sebastian Kohlmeier, Kyle Lo, Tyler Murray, Hsu-Han Ooi, Matthew Peters, Joanna Power, Sam Skjonsberg, Lucy Lu Wang, Chris Wilhelm, Zheng Yuan, Madeleine van Zuylen, and Oren Etzioni. 2018. Construction of the Literature Graph in Semantic Scholar. In *NAACL*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/09e3cf5704bcb16e6657f6ceed70e93373a54618>
- [13] Nikolaus Augsten, Denilson Barbosa, Michael Böhlen, and Themis Palpanas. 2010. TASM: Top-k approximate subtree matching. In *2010 IEEE 26th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE 2010)*. IEEE, 353–364.
- [14] Angela Bonifati, George Fletcher, Hannes Voigt, and Nikolay Yakovets. 2022. *Querying graphs*. Springer Nature.
- [15] Qing Chen, Oded Lachish, Sven Helmer, and Michael H. Böhlen. 2022. Dynamic Spanning Trees for Connectivity Queries on Fully-Dynamic Undirected Graphs. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 11 (2022), 3263–3276. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3551793.3551868>
- [16] Jialin Ding, Umar Farooq Minhas, Badrish Chandramouli, Chi Wang, Yanan Li, Ying Li, Donald Kossmann, Johannes Gehrke, and Tim Kraska. 2021. Instance-Optimized Data Layouts for Cloud Analytics Workloads. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data (Virtual Event, China) (SIGMOD '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 418–431. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448016.3457270>
- [17] David Eppstein, Zvi Galil, Giuseppe F Italiano, and Amnon Nissenzweig. 1992. Sparsification—a technique for speeding up dynamic graph algorithms. In *IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*.
- [18] David Eppstein, Zvi Galil, Giuseppe F Italiano, and Thomas H Spencer. 1993. Separator based sparsification for dynamic planar graph algorithms. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*. 208–217.
- [19] Wenfei Fan and Chao Tian. 2022. Incremental Graph Computations: Doable and Undoable. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 47, 2 (2022), 6:1–6:44. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3500930>
- [20] Xiyang Feng, Guodong Jin, Ziyi Chen, Chang Liu, and Semih Salihoglu. 2023. Kuzu Graph Database Management System. In *CIDR*.
- [21] Per Fuchs, Domagoj Margan, and Jana Giceva. 2022. SortedIton: a universal, transactional graph data structure. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 6 (2022), 1173–1186.
- [22] Alan Gibbons. 1985. *Algorithmic graph theory*. Cambridge university press.
- [23] F. Goderya, A. A. Metwally, and O. Mansour. 1980. Fast Detection and Identification of Islands in Power Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems PAS-99*, 1 (1980), 217–221. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAS.1980.319631>
- [24] Kathrin Hanauer, Monika Henzinger, and Christian Schulz. 2022. Recent advances in fully dynamic graph algorithms—a quick reference guide. *ACM Journal of Experimental Algorithmics* 27 (2022), 1–45.
- [25] Monika Rauch Henzinger and Michael L. Fredman. 1998. Lower bounds for fully dynamic connectivity problems in graphs. *Algorithmica* 22, 3 (1998), 351–362.
- [26] Monika Rauch Henzinger and Valerie King. 1995. Randomized dynamic graph algorithms with polylogarithmic time per operation. In *Proc. of the 27th annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (STOC'95)*. 519–527.
- [27] Monika R Henzinger and Valerie King. 1999. Randomized fully dynamic graph algorithms with polylogarithmic time per operation. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 46, 4 (1999), 502–516.
- [28] Monika R Henzinger and Mikkel Thorup. 1997. Sampling to provide or to bound: With applications to fully dynamic graph algorithms. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 11, 4 (1997), 369–379.
- [29] Jacob Holm, Kristian de Lichtenberg, and Mikkel Thorup. 2001. Poly-Logarithmic Deterministic Fully-Dynamic Algorithms for Connectivity, Minimum Spanning Tree, 2-Edge, and Biconnectivity. *J. ACM* 48, 4 (jul 2001), 723–760. <https://doi.org/10.1145/502090.502095>
- [30] Xiao Hu and Ke Yi. 2019. Instance and Output Optimal Parallel Algorithms for Acyclic Joins. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (Amsterdam, Netherlands) (PODS '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 450–463. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3294052.3319698>
- [31] Shang-En Huang, Dawei Huang, Tsvi Kopelowitz, and Seth Pettie. 2017. Fully dynamic connectivity in $O(\log n (\log \log n)^2)$ amortized expected time. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SIAM, 510–520.
- [32] Shang-En Huang, Dawei Huang, Tsvi Kopelowitz, Seth Pettie, and Mikkel Thorup. 2023. Fully Dynamic Connectivity in $O(\log n (\log \log n)^2)$ Amortized Expected Time. *TheoretCS* 2 (2023).
- [33] Raj Iyer, David Karger, Hariharan Rahul, and Mikkel Thorup. 2002. An Experimental Study of Polylogarithmic, Fully Dynamic, Connectivity Algorithms. *ACM J. Exp. Algorithmics* 6 (dec 2002), 4–es. <https://doi.org/10.1145/945394.945398>
- [34] Jure Leskovec, Jon Kleinberg, and Christos Faloutsos. 2005. Graphs over time: densification laws, shrinking diameters and possible explanations. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery in data mining*. 177–187.
- [35] Jure Leskovec, Jon Kleinberg, and Christos Faloutsos. 2007. Graph Evolution: Densification and Shrinking Diameters. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data* 1, 1 (mar 2007), 2–es. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1217299.1217301>
- [36] Qiuyi Lyu, Yuchen Li, Bingsheng He, and Bin Gong. 2021. DBL: Efficient Reachability Queries on Dynamic Graphs. In *Database Systems for Advanced Applications: 26th International Conference, DASFAA 2021, Taipei, Taiwan, April 11–14, 2021, Proceedings, Part II (Taipei, Taiwan)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 761–777. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-73197-7_52
- [37] Pukar Mahat, Zhe Chen, and Birgitte Bak-Jensen. 2008. Review of islanding detection methods for distributed generation. In *2008 Third International Conference on Electric Utility Deregulation and Restructuring and Power Technologies*. 2743–2748. <https://doi.org/10.1109/DRPT.2008.4523877>
- [38] Alan Mislove. 2009. *Online Social Networks: Measurement, Analysis, and Applications to Distributed Information Systems*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Rice University, Department of Computer Science.
- [39] Mihai Patrascu and Mikkel Thorup. 2007. Planning for fast connectivity updates. In *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)*. IEEE, 263–271.
- [40] Mihai Patrascu and Erik D. Demaine. 2004. Lower bounds for dynamic connectivity. In *Proc. of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'04)*. László Babai (Ed.), ACM, Chicago, IL, 546–553. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1007352.1007435>
- [41] Tim Roughgarden. 2019. Beyond worst-case analysis. *Commun. ACM* 62, 3 (feb 2019), 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3232535>
- [42] Raimund Seidel and Cecilia R Aragon. 1996. Randomized search trees. *Algorithmica* 16, 4-5 (1996), 464–497.
- [43] Daniel D. Sleator and Robert Endre Tarjan. 1981. A data structure for dynamic trees (*STOC '81*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 114–122. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800076.802464>
- [44] Daniel Dominic Sleator and Robert Endre Tarjan. 1985. Self-adjusting binary search trees. *J. ACM* 32, 3 (jul 1985), 652–686. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3828.3835>
- [45] Jingyi Song, Dong Wen, Lantian Xu, Lu Qin, Wenjie Zhang, and Xuemin Lin. 2024. On Querying Historical Connectivity in Temporal Graphs. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 2, 3, Article 157 (may 2024), 25 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3654960>
- [46] Jiao Su, Qing Zhu, Hao Wei, and Jeffrey Xu Yu. 2017. Reachability Querying: Can It Be Even Faster? *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 29, 3 (2017), 683–697. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2016.2631160>
- [47] Robert Endre Tarjan. 1985. Amortized computational complexity. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods* 6, 2 (1985), 306–318.

- [48] Robert E Tarjan and Uzi Vishkin. 1985. An efficient parallel biconnectivity algorithm. *SIAM J. Comput.* 14, 4 (1985), 862–874. □
- [49] Mikkel Thorup. 2000. Near-optimal fully-dynamic graph connectivity. In *Proceedings of the thirty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing.* 343–350.
- [50] Douglas Brent West et al. 2001. *Introduction to graph theory*. Vol. 2. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River.
- [51] Christian Wulff-Nilsen. 2013. Faster deterministic fully-dynamic graph connectivity. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SIAM, 1757–1769.
- [52] Chao Zhang, Angela Bonifati, and M. Tamer Özsu. 2024. Incremental Sliding Window Connectivity over Streaming Graphs. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 17, 10 (Aug. 2024), 2473–2486. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3675034.3675040>

9 Appendix

9.1 Complementary materials for the local tree

Algorithm 2 shows the procedure of creating a local rank root by pairing up two nodes with the same rank.

Algorithm 2: Pair(x, y)

input : x and y are two nodes with same rank
output : par : a rank root that is the parent of x and y

- 1 initialize a new node par
- 2 $par.left = x; par.right = y$
- 3 $x.parent = par; y.parent = par$
- 4 $par.nl = x.nl + y.nl$
- 5 $rank(par) = rank(x) + 1$
- 6 $par.bitmap_t = x.bitmap_t \mid y.bitmap_t$ (bitwise OR)
- 7 $par.bitmap_{nt} = x.bitmap_{nt} \mid y.bitmap_{nt}$ (bitwise OR)
- 8 **return** par

Next, we show our proofs for the local tree properties.

LEMMA 9.1. *In a rank tree with the root node r , the depth of a node x $depth(x) = rank(r) - rank(x)$.*

PROOF. *W.l.o.g.*, consider the non-root node x and its parent par . As shown by line 5 in Algorithm 2, $rank(par) - rank(x) = 1$ which is equal to $depth(x) - depth(par)$. We use $anc(x, dx)$ to denote the ancestor of x with the distance dx . Let d_x be the depth of x in the local rank tree, hence

$$\begin{aligned} depth(x) - depth(anc(x, 1)) &= rank(anc(x, 1)) - rank(x) \\ depth(anc(x, 1)) - depth(anc(x, 2)) &= rank(anc(x, 2)) - rank(anc(x, 1)) \\ &\dots \\ depth(anc(x, d_x - 2)) - depth(anc(x, d_x - 1)) &= rank(anc(x, d_x - 1)) - rank(anc(x, d_x - 2)) \\ depth(anc(x, d_x - 1)) - depth(anc(x, d_x)) &= rank(anc(x, d_x)) - rank(anc(x, d_x - 1)) \end{aligned}$$

Summing up,

$$depth(x) - depth(anc(x, d_x)) = rank(anc(x, d_x)) - rank(x)$$

Since $anc(x, d_x) = r$ and $depth(anc(x, d_x)) = depth(r) = 0$, the depth of x in the local rank tree

$$depth(x) = rank(r) - rank(x) \quad \square$$

LEMMA 9.2 ([49]). *The height of a rank tree is at most $\log n$.*

PROOF. *W.l.o.g.*, let y be one leaf node in a rank tree with the root node r . It follows that $r.nl \leq n$ and $y.nl \geq 1$. With Lemma 9.1,

$$\begin{aligned} depth(y) &\leq \log n - \log 1 \\ &\leq \log n \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 9.3 ([49]). *There are at most $\log n$ rank roots with unique ranks for a local tree with n tree nodes.*

PROOF. Let S be the list of rank roots with unique ranks and $|S| = X$. By the definition of rank, $rank(S[i]) = \lfloor \log_2 S[i].nl \rfloor$. It follows that $S[i].nl \geq 2^{rank(S[i])}$. The fact is $n = \sum_{i=0}^{X-1} S[i].nl$. We prove by contradiction. Assume the opposite that $X > \log n$.

- If $X = \log n + 1$, then $rank(S[i]) = i$ for $i < X$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{X-1} S[i].nl &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{\log n} 2^{rank(S[i])} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{\log n} 2^i \\ &\geq 2 * n > n \end{aligned}$$

- If $X > \log n + 1$, $rank(S[X - 1]) > \log n$ as every local rank root has a unique rank. By definition, $S[X - 1].nl \geq 2^{rank(S[X - 1])} > n$.

To conclude, $X \leq \log n$. Hence $|S| \leq \log n$. □

Algorithm 3 shows the construction of a local tree over a sorted list of local rank roots with unique ranks.

Algorithm 3: Construct(S, a)

input : S : a sorted list of rank roots with unique ranks
output : a : the root node of a local tree

- 1 $X = |S|$
- 2 Initialize a node a
- 3 **if** $X = 1$ **then**
- 4 **return** a with $S[0]$ as the left child
- 5 **else**
- 6 $lc = S[0], rc = S[1]$
- 7 **if** $X == 2$ **then**
- 8 $cur = a$
- 9 **else**
- 10 Initialize a new node cur
- 11 make lc and rc as the left and right child of cur , respectively
- 12 $i = 2$
- 13 **while** $i < X$ **do**
- 14 **if** $i == X - 1$ **then**
- 15 $ne = a$ (the root node)
- 16 **else**
- 17 Initialize a new node ne (a connecting node)
- 18 $ne.left = cur$
- 19 $ne.right = S[i]$
- 20 $i = i + 1$
- 21 $cur = ne$
- 22 **return** cur

LEMMA 9.4. *In the local tree with the root node r , the depth for a local rank root rt $depth(rt) \leq 1 + rank(r) - rank(rt)$.*



Figure 23: A local tree constructed by Algorithm 3 when $X \leq 2$.




Figure 24: A local tree constructed by Algorithm 3 for $X > 2$.

PROOF. Let S be the list of rank roots with unique ranks and $|S| = X$.

Case 1: $X \leq 2$

Depths for $S[0]$ and $S[1]$:

- $depth(S[0]) = 1 \leq 1 + rank(r) - rank(S[0])$
- $depth(S[1]) = 1 \leq 1 + rank(r) - rank(S[1])$

Hence, $depth(S[i]) \leq 1 + rank(r) - rank(S[i])$.

Case 2: $X > 2$

A local tree is constructed such that $depth(S[i]) - depth(S[i+1]) = 1$ for $i > 0$. Since rank roots in S have unique ranks, $rank(S[i+1]) > rank(S[i])$, more precisely $rank(S[i+1]) - rank(S[i]) \geq 1$. It follows that $depth(S[i]) - depth(S[i+1]) \leq rank(S[i+1]) - rank(S[i])$.

In general,

$$\begin{aligned} depth(S[i]) - depth(S[i+1]) &\leq rank(S[i+1]) - rank(S[i]) \\ depth(S[i+1]) - depth(S[i+2]) &\leq rank(S[i+2]) - rank(S[i+1]) \end{aligned}$$

...

$$\begin{aligned} depth(S[X-1]) - depth(S[X]) &\leq rank(S[X]) - rank(S[X-1]) \\ depth(S[X]) - depth(r) &\leq rank(r) - rank(S[X]) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, $depth(S[i]) - depth(r) \leq rank(r) - rank(S[i]) + 1$. Since $depth(r) = 0$, $depth(S[i]) \leq rank(r) - rank(S[i]) + 1$.

To conclude, $depth(S[i]) \leq rank(r) - rank(S[i]) + 1$. \square

THEOREM 9.5 ([49]). In a local tree rooted with the root node r the depth of a node x is $O(1 + \log(r.nl/x.nl))$.

PROOF.

- If node x is a rank root, Lemma 9.1 shows that $depth(x) \leq rank(r) - rank(x) + 1$.

- Otherwise, let lt be the root node of the rank tree that contains x . The $depth(x) = dist(x, lt) + dist(lt, r)$, where $dist(x, lt)$ is the x 's depth in the local rank tree rooted at lt and $dist(lt, r)$ is the depth of lt in the local tree. Lemma 9.4 shows that $dist(lt, r) \leq rank(r) - lt.rank + 1$ and Lemma 9.1 shows that $dist(x, lt) = rank(lt) - rank(x)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} depth(x) &= dist(x, lt) + dist(lt, r) \\ &= rank(lt) - rank(x) + dist(lt, r) \\ &\leq rank(lt) - rank(x) + rank(r) - rank(lt) + 1 \\ &\leq rank(r) - rank(x) + 1 \end{aligned}$$


In general,

$$\begin{aligned} depth(x) &\leq rank(r) - rank(x) + 1 \\ &\leq \lfloor \log_2 r.nl \rfloor - \lfloor \log_2 x.nl \rfloor + 1 \\ &= O(\log r.nl - \log_2 x.nl + 1) \\ &= O(\log \frac{r.nl}{x.nl} + 1) \end{aligned}$$


\square

LEMMA 9.6. The height of a local tree is $O(\log n)$.

PROOF. Let x be the node with maximum depth in the local tree rooted at r . The height of the local tree is equal to the $depth(x)$. Theorem 9.5 shows that $depth(x) = O(\log \frac{r.nl}{x.nl}) + 1$. Node x is a leaf node to have the maximum depth, hence $n(x) = 1$. It follows that $depth(x) = O(\log r.nl) + 1 = O(\log r.nl) = O(\log n)$. \square



(a) Node x is a local rank root



(b) Node x is not a local rank root