

A framework for boosting matching approximation: parallel, distributed, and dynamic

Slobodan Mitrović*
UC Davis

Wen-Horng Sheu†
UC Davis

Abstract

This work designs a framework for boosting the approximation guarantee of maximum matching algorithms. As input, the framework receives a parameter $\epsilon > 0$ and an oracle access to a $\Theta(1)$ -approximate maximum matching algorithm \mathcal{A} . Then, by invoking \mathcal{A} for $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ many times, the framework outputs a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation of a maximum matching. Our approach yields several improvements in terms of the number of invocations to \mathcal{A} :

- In MPC and CONGEST, our framework invokes \mathcal{A} for $O(1/\epsilon^7 \cdot \log(1/\epsilon))$ times, substantially improving on $O(1/\epsilon^{39})$ invocations following from [Fischer et al., STOC'22] and [Mitrović et al., arXiv:2412.19057].
- In both online and offline fully dynamic settings, our framework yields an improvement in the dependence on $1/\epsilon$ from exponential [Assadi et al., SODA25 and Liu, FOCS24] to polynomial.

1 Introduction

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a matching $M \subseteq E$ is a set of edges that do not have endpoints in common. A matching is called maximal if it is not a proper subset of any other matching, and it is called maximum if it has the largest cardinality among all matchings. Computing maximum matching in polynomial time has been known since the 1960s [35, 36, 66, 41]. Moreover, in recent breakthroughs [28, 72], it was shown how to compute maximum matching in bipartite graphs in almost linear time.

In some settings, it is known that computing a maximum matching is highly inefficient, e.g., in semi-streaming [38, 51], LOCAL, CONGEST, dynamic [53], and sublinear [68, 20]. Moreover, approximate maximum matchings usually admit much simpler solutions, e.g., a textbook example is a 2-approximate maximum matching that results from maximal matching. This inspired a study of $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matchings where, given a parameter $\epsilon > 0$, the task is to find a matching whose size is at least $1/(1 + \epsilon)$ times the size of a maximum matching.

This direction has seen a proliferation of ideas; we discuss some of this work and reference a long list of results on this topic in Section 1.2. This setting was addressed from two perspectives: designing a standalone $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate algorithm and developing an approximation *boosting framework*. The latter refers to algorithms that, as input, receive access to an r -approximate maximum matching procedure. This procedure is then adaptively invoked multiple times to obtain a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation. Some examples of such frameworks, or reductions, include [65, 24] for unweighted and [70, 42, 22, 21] for weighted graphs.

Despite this extensive work, one of the central questions still remains open: *What techniques yield to very efficient boosting frameworks applicable to various computational models?* Our work contributes to this growing body of research by designing a new boosting framework for dynamic matchings and improving the complexity of the existing boosting framework for static matchings.

1.1 Our results

In the rest, we use MCM to refer to maximum cardinality matching, i.e., to maximum unweighted matching. Our first contribution is a framework for the static setting that reduces the computation of $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate MCM to only $O(\log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon^7)$ invocation of a $\Theta(1)$ -approximate MCM.

*Supported by the Google Research Scholar and NSF Faculty Early Career Development Program No. 2340048. e-mail: smitrovic@ucdavis.edu

†e-mail: wsheu@ucdavis.edu

Theorem 1.1. Let $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ be an algorithm that returns a c -approximate maximum matching for a given graph H , where $c > 1$ is a constant. Let $\mathbb{A}_{\text{process}}$ be an algorithm that simultaneously exchanges small messages between the vertices of a component, and does that in time $\mathcal{T}_{\text{process}}$ for any number of disjoint components of G each of size at most $1/\epsilon^d$, where d is a fixed constant. Then, there is an algorithm that computes a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching in G in time $O((\mathcal{T}_{\text{matching}} + \mathcal{T}_{\text{process}}) \cdot \epsilon^{-7} \cdot \log(1/\epsilon))$. Furthermore, the algorithm requires access to $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ words of memory per each vertex.

The algorithm $\mathbb{A}_{\text{process}}$ in [Theorem 1.1](#) is model-specific and simply keeps the vertices in the graph up-to-date. For instance, implementing $\mathbb{A}_{\text{process}}$ in MPC takes $O(1)$ rounds as long as $1/\epsilon^d$ fits into the memory of a machine. We comment more on this in [Appendix A](#). In [Table 1](#) we outline the improvement our result leads in some settings.

Reference	Complexity in ϵ	Setting
[40]	$O(1/\epsilon^{52})$	MPC
[40] + [67]	$O(1/\epsilon^{39})$	MPC
this work – corollary of Theorem 1.1	$O(1/\epsilon^7 \cdot \log(1/\epsilon))$	MPC
[40]	$O(1/\epsilon^{63})$	CONGEST
[40] + [67]	$O(1/\epsilon^{42})$	CONGEST
this work – corollary of Theorem 1.1	$O(1/\epsilon^{10} \cdot \log(1/\epsilon))$	CONGEST

Table 1: An overview of the most related frameworks in the static setting. All the frameworks apply to general unweighted graphs. Additional results are referenced in [Section 1.2](#).

While the framework developed corresponding to [Theorem 1.1](#) can be applied in a static setting by increasing the overall execution time by only a $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ factor, it is not known how to utilize this in the dynamic setting without significantly increasing the update time. On a high level, the reason is that [Theorem 1.1](#) requires access to an oracle that outputs an approximate maximum matching in an adaptively chosen graph. However, even to describe such a graph G takes $\Omega(|E(G)|)$ time, yielding inefficient approximation boosting for dynamic algorithms.

Nevertheless, a more efficient, but also *more restrictive*, oracle can be implemented for dynamic matchings. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, consider an oracle \mathcal{O} that for a given $U \subseteq V$ returns a $\Theta(1)$ -approximate maximum matching in $G[U]$ when $G[U]$ has a large matching. Observe that \mathcal{O} allows changing a subset of $U \subseteq V$, but the graph G remains the same! Moreover, the algorithm invoking \mathcal{O} is allowed to spend $n \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ time preparing the desired subsets U ; this is in line with [\[11, Proposition 2.2\]](#). Prior works [\[11, 24\]](#) already defined this oracle, and showed how to use it to compute a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation of maximum matching by paying an exponential dependence on $1/\epsilon$ in the running time. This motivates the following questions: *Can we design a framework that finds a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation of a maximum matching in G by invoking \mathcal{O} for $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ times?* We answer this question in the affirmative.

Theorem 1.2 (Informal version of [Theorem 7.1](#)). Let $G = (V, E)$ be an n -vertex fully dynamic graph that starts empty and throughout, never has more than m edges. Let \mathbb{A}_{weak} be an algorithm that, given a vertex subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ and a parameter δ , returns in $\mathcal{T}(n, m, \delta)$ time a matching of size at least $\lambda \delta n$ if the maximum matching in $G[S]$ is at least δn . Then, there is an algorithm for the fully dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching problem with amortized update time $O(\mathcal{T}(n, m, \text{poly } \epsilon)/n \cdot \text{poly}(\log n/\epsilon))$.

1.2 Related work

Several lines of work have studied approaches for boosting matching guarantees, e.g., improving approximation or obtaining weighted from unweighted matchings. In the rest, we use MWM to refer to maximum weighted matching.

Frameworks for unweighted matchings. Among the frameworks for boosting matching approximation in unweighted graphs, perhaps the most influential is the one by McGregor [\[65\]](#), initially designed to compute $1 + \epsilon$ approximation in the semi-streaming setting. This approach turns out to be robust enough so that, with appropriate modifications, it can be applied in the MPC [\[30, 7, 46\]](#) and dynamic setting [\[24, 11\]](#). Applying this technique to dynamic graphs – while not substantially increasing the

Reference	Complexity in ϵ	Complexity in n	Setting
[18]	$(1/\epsilon)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$	$\sqrt{n^{1+O(\epsilon)} \cdot \text{ORS}(n, \Theta_\epsilon(n))}$	dynamic
[11]	$(1/\epsilon)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$	$n^{o(1)} \cdot \text{ORS}(n, \Theta_\epsilon(n))$	dynamic
[63]	$\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$	$n/2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$	dynamic, bipartite
[63]	$\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$	$n^{0.58}$	offline dynamic, bipartite
this work, Theorem 7.4	$\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$	$n^{o(1)} \cdot \text{ORS}(n, \Theta_\epsilon(n))$	dynamic
this work, Theorem 7.12	$\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$	$n/2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$	dynamic
this work, Theorem 7.15	$\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$	$n^{0.58}$	offline dynamic

Table 2: An overview of algorithms for fully dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching algorithm that are based on boosting framework of [65] (see [24] for its adaptation in the dynamic setting). Note that the result of [63] and [11] are incomparable, as the exact value of $\text{ORS}(\cdot, \cdot)$ remains unknown.

running time complexity – is significantly trickier than applying it in the static setting. Details on why this is the case are discussed in Section 6. Given that [65] has an exponential dependence on $1/\epsilon$, all the techniques derived from it have at least a single-exponential dependence on $1/\epsilon$ as well. Our work yields a polynomial dependence in the dynamic setting, improving the exponentially priorly known.

In recent work, Fischer, Mitrović, and Uitto [40, arXiv version] proposed a framework that obtains a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation of MCM by $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ times invoking an algorithm that computes a $\Theta(1)$ approximation. This work applies to static graphs in several models, including LOCAL, CONGEST, and MPC.

As was observed in [11, 24, 63], some other approaches, such as [3, 14] for bipartite and [71] for general graphs, can also be used in developing boosting frameworks.

Frameworks for weighted matchings. For computing weighted matchings, Gupta and Peng [50] provide a reduction from general weights to integer weights in the range $[1, \exp(O(1/\epsilon))]$. The result was presented in the context of dynamic matching, although it can be applied to other settings as well, e.g., semi-streaming [54].

Stubbs and Williams [70] develop a reduction from dynamic weighted to dynamic unweighted maximum matching. Namely, they show how to design a dynamic algorithm for $(2 + \epsilon)\alpha$ -approximate weighted from a dynamic algorithm for α -approximate unweighted maximum matching at only poly-logarithmic increase in the update time.

Gamlath, Kale, Mitrović, and Svensson [42] show how to reduce the computation of $1 + \epsilon$ -approximate weighted maximum matching in general graphs to $1 + \epsilon$ -approximate unweighted maximum matching in bipartite graphs. This reduction applies to the static setting in semi-streaming and MPC, and has an exponential dependence on $1/\epsilon$.

For the case of bipartite graphs, Bernstein, Dudeja, and Langley [22] develop a framework that reduces the task of computing fully dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)\alpha$ -approximate MWM to the task of computing fully dynamic α -approximate MCMs. This reduction incurs a logarithmic in n and exponential in $1/\epsilon$ overhead in the running time. In the same work, the authors also develop reductions for general graphs, with approximation guarantees of $3/2 + \epsilon$ and $2 + \epsilon$.

In a very recent work, Bernstein, Chen, Dudeja, Langley, Sidford, and Tu [21] made a significant contribution. In the context of fully dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate MWM, they provide a reduction from a graph with weights in the range of $\text{poly}(n)$ to graphs with weights in the range of $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$. This reduction incurs only $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ additive time. Combined with [22], this results in the fully dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate MWM in bipartite graphs with only polynomial dependence on $1/\epsilon$ in the running time.

Other related work. The approximate maximum matching problem has been extensively studied in numerous settings. For a list of such works, we refer a reader to these and references therein: (semi-)streaming [2, 3, 57, 59, 27, 13, 12, 4, 37, 26, 60, 42, 8, 29, 58, 55, 15, 6], MPC [62, 30, 43, 7, 17, 19, 47, 45, 46, 33], CONGEST and LOCAL [31, 64, 1, 16, 52, 39, 44, 56], and dynamic [49, 23, 10, 9, 25, 73, 24, 18, 11].

1.3 Paper organization

The paper is organized as follows. [Section 3](#) reviews standard notations; [Section 4](#) describes a simplified version of [\[67\]](#)'s algorithm; [Section 5](#) gives a boosting framework faster than [\[40\]](#)'s framework, with applications in MPC and CONGEST; [Section 6](#) adapts the framework from [Section 5](#) to the dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -matching problem; [Appendix A](#) provides additional implementation details.

2 Overview of our approach

Starting point. Our result is inspired by the framework of [\[40\]](#). First, that work describes an algorithm for computing $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching in semi-streaming in $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ passes. Second, that algorithm is extended to a framework that gets an oracle access to: (1) a method for computing $\Theta(1)$ -approximate maximum matchings, and (2) a few simple-to-implement methods on graphs, such as exploring a local neighborhood of a vertex of size $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$.¹ Then, invoking these methods on $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ adaptively chosen graphs, the framework outputs a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation of a maximum matching.

That framework is applicable in any setting that can provide oracle access to those methods. In particular, regarding the dependence on $1/\epsilon$, [\[40\]](#) obtain new results in the static setting in semi-streaming, MPC, CONGEST.

Our improvement in the static setting. The same as [\[40\]](#), our approach also starts with an algorithm that is not a framework. In our case, it is the algorithm of [\[67\]](#). Plugging [\[67\]](#) directly into [\[40\]](#) already gives an improved framework using $O(1/\epsilon^{39})$ oracle calls to $\Theta(1)$ -approximate maximum matchings; [\[40\]](#) performs $O(1/\epsilon^{52})$ many calls. Our algorithm suffices to perform only $O(\log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon^7)$ such calls! To achieve that, we significantly improve the efficiency of the [\[40\]](#)'s framework. We now briefly outline those changes, while details are presented in [Section 5](#). [Section 4](#) outlines the algorithm of [\[67\]](#).

The main bottleneck of [\[40\]](#)'s framework is the simulation of two procedures. The first procedure can be formulated as the following matching problem: A graph H is given. In each iteration, we find a c -approximate matching in H and remove all matched vertices. The process is repeated until the maximum matching size of H drops below a threshold t , from an initial value of s . It is not hard to show that the process requires at most $(s - t)/(t/c)$ iterations, as each iteration finds a matching of size at least t/c . We made a simple observation that, in fact, the maximum matching size in H is decreasing exponentially, and thus $\Theta_c(\log \frac{s-t}{t})$ suffices. This observation enables a simulation using $\Theta(\log(1/\epsilon))$ calls to the c -approximate matching algorithm, instead of $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ calls.

Simulating the second procedure can be formulated as a more complicated matching problem. We again are given a graph H and aim to decrease its maximum matching size to below a threshold. In each iteration, we find a c -approximate matching in H , but now only the matched edges, and not the vertices, are removed from H . In addition, depending on the state of the algorithm, new edges may be added to H after an iteration. Therefore, our previous observation is not applicable. To obtain our result, we present a different simulation for the procedure. Roughly speaking, we show that the edges in H can be divided into $\Theta(\epsilon^{-1})$ different classes, and the simulation for different classes of edges can be done separately. In addition, the simulation of each class can be formulated as a matching problem similar to the first procedure. Utilizing our previous observation, we show that each class requires $\Theta(\log(1/\epsilon))$ calls to the c -approximate matching algorithm, yielding a simulation of $O(\epsilon^{-1} \cdot \log(1/\epsilon))$ calls. Then, our advertised complexity of $O(\log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon^7)$ calls follows from the fact that our simulation follows – a slightly simplified version of – the algorithm of [\[67\]](#), that has $1/\epsilon^6$ dependence.

Our extension to the dynamic setting. As already discussed in [Section 1.1](#), recent results for dynamic matching provide access to an oracle which, given a subset of vertices $U \subseteq V$, outputs a $\Theta(1)$ -approximate maximum matching in $G[U]$ if $G[U]$ contains a large matching. Both the framework of [\[40\]](#) and our framework for the static setting require access to an oracle that outputs a $\Theta(1)$ -approximate maximum matching in an adaptively chosen graph. On a very high level, these two frameworks maintain so-called structures from each unmatched vertex. For the purpose of this discussion, a structure corresponding to an unmatched vertex α can be thought of as a set of alternating paths originating at α . Structures corresponding to different vertices are vertex-disjoint. Each structure attempts to extend

¹The framework also requires an access to $\Omega(n)$ space. This space can be distributed as well.

an alternating path it contains. When an augmentation involving α is found, the entire structure corresponding to α is removed from the graph. These extensions and augmentations in the static setting are handled by defining an appropriate graph H , and then finding a large matching in H . The way H is defined, the sets $V(H)$ and $E(H)$ change as structures change from step to step, even if the set of unmatched vertices remains the same. Each matching edge in H is then mapped back to an extension or an augmentation.² However, in the dynamic case, we do not have access to an oracle that can compute a matching in H .

Our first observation is that we do not need to find all the edges in H affecting α 's structure, but finding one such edge already makes progress. That is, if we know a priori that the alternating path P of a structure will be extended, we could look for an extension of the head vertex of P only. This now allows ideas of randomly sampling a vertex from a structure, and hoping that a sampled vertex is “the right” one to perform an extension on. Indeed, that is exactly what our approach does.

However, this sampling idea does not suffice. The reason is that our static framework maintains two types of vertices – inner and outer ones. Depending on whether a matched edge in H is an outer-inner or outer-outer vertex determines which procedure is invoked to update the state of our framework. In particular, having a matched edge in H whose both endpoints are inner does not make progress in our computation. To ensure that the dynamic matching oracle does not consider inner-inner edges in $G[U]$, instead of working with the original input graph, we work with a graph G' obtained as follows. Given $G = (V, E)$, we make a bipartite graph $B = (L, R, E')$ where R and L are copies of V and there exists an edge $\{x, y\}$ with $x \in L$ and $y \in R$ iff $\{x, y\} \in E$. Then, we maintain the dynamic matching oracle on B and not on G . When our framework samples a set of inner vertices I and a set of outer vertices O , it invokes $G'[L \cap O, R \cap I]$. Full details of this idea are presented in [Section 6](#).

3 Preliminaries

We first introduce all the terminology, definitions, and notations. We also recall some well-known facts about blossoms.

Let G be an undirected simple graph and $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ be the approximation parameter. Without loss of generality, we assume that ϵ^{-1} is a power of 2. Denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively, the vertex and edge sets of G . Let n be the number of vertices in G and m be the number of edges in G . An undirected edge between two vertices u and v is denoted by $\{u, v\}$. Let $\mu(G)$ stand for the maximum matching size in G . An (α, β) -*approximate maximum matching* is a matching of size at least $\mu(G)/\alpha - \beta$. An α -*approximate maximum matching* is a matching of size at least $\mu(G)/\alpha$. Throughout the paper, if not stated otherwise, all the notations implicitly refer to a currently given matching M , which we aim to improve.

3.1 Alternating paths

Definition 3.1 (An unmatched edge and a free vertex). *We say that an edge $\{u, v\}$ is matched iff $\{u, v\} \in M$, and unmatched otherwise. We call a vertex v free if it has no incident matched edge, i.e., if $\{u, v\}$ are unmatched for all edges $\{u, v\}$. Unless stated otherwise, α, β, γ are used to denote free vertices.*

Definition 3.2 (Alternating and augmenting paths). *An alternating path is a simple path that consists of a sequence of alternately matched and unmatched edges. The length of an alternating path is the number of edges in the path. An augmenting path is an alternating path whose two endpoints are both free vertices.*

3.2 Alternating trees and blossoms

Definition 3.3 (Alternating trees, inner vertices, and outer vertices). *A subgraph of G is an alternating tree if it is a rooted tree where the root is a free vertex and every root-to-leaf path is an even-length alternating path. An inner vertex of an alternating tree is a non-root vertex v such that the path from the root to v is of odd length. All other vertices are outer vertices. In particular, the root vertex is an outer vertex.*

Note that every non-root vertex in an alternating tree is matched.

²This is a simplified exposition of the actual process. In the full algorithm, more operations are performed, but they follow the same logic we present here.

Definition 3.4 (Blossoms and trivial blossoms). *A blossom is identified with a vertex set B and an edge set E_B on B . If $v \in V(G)$, then $B = \{v\}$ is a trivial blossom with $E_B = \emptyset$. Suppose there is an odd-length sequence of vertex-disjoint blossoms A_0, A_1, \dots, A_k with associated edge sets $E_{A_0}, E_{A_1}, \dots, E_{A_k}$. If $\{A_i\}$ are connected in a cycle by edges e_0, e_1, \dots, e_k , where $e_i \in A_i \times A_{i+1}$ (modulo $k+1$) and e_1, e_3, \dots, e_{k-1} are matched, then $B = \bigcup_i A_i$ is also a blossom associated with edge set $E_B = \bigcup_i E_{A_i} \cup \{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_k\}$.*

Consider a blossom B . A short proof by induction shows that $|B|$ is odd. In addition, $M \cap E_B$ matches all vertices except one. This vertex, which is left unmatched in $M \cap E_B$, is called the *base* of B . Note that $E(B) = E(G) \cap (B \times B)$ may contain many edges outside of E_B . Blossoms exhibit the following property.

Lemma 3.5 ([34]). *Let B be a blossom. There is an even-length alternating path in E_B from the base of B to any other vertex in B .*

Definition 3.6 (Blossom contraction). *Let B be a blossom. We define the contracted graph G/B as the undirected simple graph obtained from G by contracting all vertices in B into a vertex, denoted by B .*

The following lemma is proven in [36, Theorem 4.13].

Lemma 3.7 ([36]). *Let T be an alternating tree of a graph G and $e \in E(G)$ be an edge connecting two outer vertices of T . Then, $T \cup \{e\}$ contains a unique blossom B . The graph T/B is an alternating tree of G/B . It contains B as an outer vertex. Its other inner and outer vertices are those of T which are not in B .*

Consider a set Ω of blossoms. We say Ω is *laminar* if the blossoms in Ω form a laminar set family. Assume that Ω is laminar. A blossom in Ω is called a *root blossom* if it is not contained in any other blossom in Ω . Denote by G/Ω the undirected simple graph obtained from G by contracting each root blossom of Ω . For each vertex in $\bigcup_{B \in \Omega} B$, we denote by $\Omega(v)$ the unique root blossom containing v . If Ω contains all vertices of G , we denote by M/Ω the set of edges $\{\{\Omega(u), \Omega(v)\} \mid \{u, v\} \in M \text{ and } \Omega(u) \neq \Omega(v)\}$ on the graph G/Ω . It is known that M/Ω is a matching of G/Ω [34].

In our algorithm, we maintain *regular* sets of blossoms, which are sets of blossoms whose contraction would transform the graph into an alternating tree satisfying certain properties.

Definition 3.8 (Regular set of blossoms). *A regular set of blossoms of G is a set Ω of blossoms satisfying the following:*

- (C1) Ω is a laminar set of blossoms of G . It contains the set of all trivial blossoms in G . If a blossom $B \in \Omega$ is defined to be the cycle formed by A_0, \dots, A_k , then $A_0, \dots, A_k \in \Omega$.
- (C2) G/Ω is an alternating tree with respect to the matching M/Ω . Its root is $\Omega(\alpha)$ and each of its inner vertex is a trivial blossom (whereas each outer vertex may be a non-trivial blossom).

3.3 Representation of edges and paths

Each undirected edge $\{u, v\}$ is represented by two directed *arcs* (u, v) and (v, u) . Let (u, v) be an arc. We say (u, v) is *matched* if $\{u, v\}$ is a matched edge; otherwise, (u, v) is *unmatched*. The vertex u and v are called, respectively, *tail* and *head* of (u, v) . We denote by $\overleftarrow{(u, v)} = (v, u)$ the reverse of (u, v) .

Let $P = (u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k)$ be an alternating path, where u_i and v_i are vertices, (u_i, v_i) are matched arcs, and (v_i, u_{i+1}) are unmatched ones. Let $a_i = (u_i, v_i)$. We often use (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) to refer to P , i.e., we omit specifying unmatched arcs. Nevertheless, it is guaranteed that the input graph contains the unmatched arcs (v_i, u_{i+1}) , for each $1 \leq i < k$. If P is an alternating path that starts and/or ends with unmatched arcs, e.g., $P = (x, u_1, v_1, \dots, u_k, v_k, y)$ where (x, u_1) and (v_k, y) are unmatched while $a_i = (u_i, v_i)$ for $i = 1 \dots k$ are matched arcs, we use (x, a_1, \dots, a_k, y) to refer to P .

3.4 Models of computation

Massively Parallel Computation (MPC). The Massively Parallel Computation (MPC) model has become a standard for parallel computing, introduced in a series of papers [32, 61, 48]. It is a theoretical abstraction of popular large-scale frameworks such as MapReduce, Flume, Hadoop, and Spark. An MPC instance consists of M machines whose communication topology is a clique. Each machine is characterized by its local memory of size S . An MPC computation proceeds in synchronous rounds. The input data is arbitrarily partitioned across the M machines while ensuring that data sent to a machine

is no larger than S . During a round, each machine first performs computation locally. At the end of a round, the machines simultaneously exchange messages with the constraint that the total size of messages sent and received by a machine is at most S .

CONGEST. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, CONGEST is a distributed model with $|V|$ machines with the topology between them being E . The computation in this model proceeds in synchronous rounds. In each round, the machines perform computation independently; after that, each machine can send $O(\log n)$ bits of information along each edge. Different information can be sent across different edges adjacent to the same machine. The machines can perform arbitrary computations and use large amounts of space.

Semi-streaming model. In the semi-streaming model [38], we assume the algorithm has no random access to the input graph. The set of edges is represented as a stream. In this stream, each edge is presented exactly once, and each time the stream is read, edges may appear in an arbitrary order. The stream can only be read as a whole and reading the whole stream once is called a *pass* (over the input). The main computational restriction of the model is that the algorithm can only use $O(n \text{ poly log } n)$ words of space, which is not enough to store the entire graph if the graph is sufficiently dense.

Dynamic. In a fully dynamic setting, we assume that edges in a graph are inserted and deleted. In an incremental (decremental) only setting, edges are only inserted (deleted). Our algorithm is supposed to maintain a certain structure after each edge update. For example, after each update, it should be able to report a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation of MCM. In this setting, the goal is to reduce the time the algorithm needs to update the structure after an update.

4 Review of the semi-streaming algorithm in [67]

4.1 Basic notation for the algorithm

Vertex structures. In [67]’s algorithm, each free vertex α maintains a *structure*, defined as follows.

Definition 4.1 (The structure of a free vertex, [67]). *The structure of a free vertex α , denoted by \mathcal{S}_α , is a tuple $(G_\alpha, \Omega_\alpha, w'_\alpha)$, where*

- G_α is a subgraph of G ,
- Ω_α is a regular set of blossoms of G_α , and
- w'_α is either \emptyset or an outer vertex of the alternating tree G_α/Ω_α .

Each structure \mathcal{S}_α satisfies the following properties.

1. **Disjointness:** For any free vertex $\beta \neq \alpha$, G_α is vertex-disjoint from G_β .
2. **Tree representation:** The subgraph G_α contains a set of arcs satisfying the following: If G_α contains an arc (u, v) with $\Omega_\alpha(u) \neq \Omega_\alpha(v)$, then $\Omega_\alpha(u)$ is the parent of $\Omega_\alpha(v)$ in the alternating tree G_α/Ω_α .

We denote the alternating tree G_α/Ω_α by T'_α .

Definition 4.2 (The working vertex and active path of a structure, [67]). *The working vertex of \mathcal{S}_α is defined as the vertex w'_α , which can be \emptyset . If $w'_\alpha \neq \emptyset$, we define the active path of \mathcal{S}_α as the unique path on T'_α from the root $\Omega_\alpha(\alpha)$ to w'_α . Otherwise, the active path is defined as \emptyset .*

Definition 4.3 (Active vertices, arcs, and structures, [67]). *A vertex or arc of T'_α is said to be active if and only if it is on the active path. We say \mathcal{S}_α is active if $w'_\alpha \neq \emptyset$.*

Let F be the set of free vertices. Throughout the execution, we maintain a set Ω of blossoms, which consists of all blossoms in $\bigcup_{\alpha \in F} \Omega_\alpha$ and all trivial blossoms. Note that Ω is a laminar set of blossoms. We denote by G' the contracted graph G/Ω . The vertices of G' are classified into three sets: (1) the set of inner vertices, which contains all inner vertices in $\bigcup_{\alpha \in F} V(T'_\alpha)$; (2) the set of outer vertices, which contains all outer vertices in $\bigcup_{\alpha \in F} V(T'_\alpha)$; (3) the set of *unvisited vertices*, which are the vertices not in any structure.

Similarly, we say a vertex in G is *unvisited* if it is not in any structure. An arc $(u, v) \in G$ is a *blossom arc* if $\Omega(u) = \Omega(v)$; otherwise, (u, v) is a *non-blossom arc*. An *unvisited arc* is an arc $(u, v) \in E(G)$ such that u and v are unvisited vertices.

Labels. The algorithm stores the set of all *matched arcs* throughout its execution. Each matched arc is associated with a *label*, defined as follows.

Definition 4.4 (The label of a matched arc, [67]). *Each matched arc $a^* \in G$ is assigned a label $\ell(a^*)$ such that $1 \leq \ell(a^*) \leq \ell_{\max} + 1$, where ℓ_{\max} is defined as $3/\epsilon$.*

Each matched arc $a' \in G'$ corresponds to a unique non-blossom matched arc $a \in G$; for ease of presentation, we denote by $\ell(a')$ the label of a . Their algorithm also maintains an invariant on the monotonicity of labels along alternating paths from the root.

4.2 Overview of the algorithm

Algorithm 1 gives a high-level algorithm description. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ is a power of 2.

Algorithm 1 A high-level algorithm description.

Input: a graph G and the approximation parameter ϵ
Output: a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching

```

1: compute, in a single pass, a 2-approximate maximum matching  $M$ 
2: for scale  $h = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{8}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon^2}{64}$  do
3:   for phases  $t = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{144}{h\epsilon}$  do
4:      $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \text{ALG-PHASE}(G, M, \epsilon, h)$  ▷ Nothing stored from the previous phase.
5:     restore all vertices removed in the execution of ALG-PHASE
6:     augment the current matching  $M$  using the vertex-disjoint augmenting paths in  $\mathcal{P}$ 
7: return  $M$ 

```

In each phase, the procedure ALG-PHASE is invoked to find a set \mathcal{P} of vertex-disjoint augmenting paths. In ALG-PHASE, we may *hypothetically* remove some vertices from G . After ALG-PHASE, Line 5 restores all removed vertices to G . Then, Line 6 augments the current matching using the set \mathcal{P} of vertex-disjoint augmenting paths, which increase the size of M by $|\mathcal{P}|$.

Algorithm 2 ALG-PHASE: the execution of a single phase.

Input: a graph G , the current matching M , the parameter ϵ , and the current scale h
Output: a set \mathcal{P} of *disjoint* M -augmenting paths

```

1:  $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2:  $\ell(a) \leftarrow \ell_{\max} + 1$  for each arc  $a \in M$ 
3: for each free vertex  $\alpha$ , initialize its structure  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ 
4: compute parameters  $\text{limit}_h = \frac{6}{h} + 1$  and  $\tau_{\max}(h) = \frac{72}{h\epsilon}$ 
5: for pass-bundles  $\tau = 1, 2, \dots, \tau_{\max}(h)$  do
6:   for each free vertex  $\alpha$  do
7:     if  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$  has at least  $\text{limit}_h$  vertices in  $G$ , mark  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$  as “on hold”
8:     if  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$  has less than  $\text{limit}_h$  vertices in  $G$ , mark  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$  as “not on hold”
9:     mark  $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$  as “not modified” and “not extended”
10:  EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH (Algorithm 3)
11:  CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT
12:  BACKTRACK-STUCK-STRUCTURES
13: return

```

4.3 A phase overview (ALG-PHASE)

In each phase, the algorithm executes DFS explorations from all free vertices in parallel; see Algorithm 2 for pseudocode. Lines 1 to 3 initialize the set of paths \mathcal{P} , the label of each arc, and the structure of each free vertex. The structure of a free vertex α is initialized to be an alternating tree of a single vertex α . That is, G_α and Ω_α are set to be a graph with a single vertex α and a set containing a single trivial blossom $\{\alpha\}$, respectively; the working vertex w'_α is initialized as the root of T'_α , that is, $\Omega_\alpha(\alpha)$. The

for-loop in Line 5 executes $\tau_{\max}(h)$ iterations, where each iteration is referred to as a *pass-bundle*. Each pass-bundle consists of four parts:

- (1) Lines 6 to 9 initialize the status of each structure in this pass-bundle. A structure is marked as *on hold* if and only if it contains at least limit_h vertices. Each structure \mathcal{S}_α is marked as *not modified* and *not extended*. The purpose of this part is described in [Section 4.4](#).
- (2) EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH makes a pass over the stream and attempts to extend each structure that is not on hold. Details of this procedure are given in [Section 4.6](#).
- (3) After EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH, CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT is then invoked to identify blossoms and augmenting paths. The procedure makes a pass over the stream, contracts some blossoms that contain the working vertex of a structure, and identifies pairs of structures that can be connected to form augmenting paths. Details of this procedure are given in [Section 4.7](#).
- (4) The procedure BACKTRACK-STUCK-STRUCTURES examines each structure. If a structure is not on hold and fails to extend in this pass, BACKTRACK-STUCK-STRUCTURES backtracks the structure by removing one matched arc from its active path. Details of this procedure are given in [Section 4.8](#).

4.4 Marking a structure on hold, modified, or extended

In the for-loop of Line 6, we mark a structure \mathcal{S}_α *on hold* if and only if it contains at least limit_h vertices. See Lines 7 and 8 of [Algorithm 2](#).

In the for-loop, we also mark each structure as *not modified*. Recall that each structure \mathcal{S}_α is represented by a tuple $(G_\alpha, \Omega_\alpha, w'_\alpha)$; in the execution of a pass-bundle, we mark a \mathcal{S}_α as modified whenever any of G_α, Ω_α , or w'_α is changed. We also mark every structure as *not extended*. In the execution of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH, we mark a structure as extended if it performs one of the basic operations presented in [Section 4.5](#).

4.5 Basic operations on structures

We present three basic operations for modifying the structures. These operations are used to execute EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH and CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT. Whenever one of these operations is applied, the structures involved are marked as modified and extended, except for a case: if a structure \mathcal{S}_α overtakes another structure \mathcal{S}_β (see [Section 4.5.3](#)), only the overtaker (\mathcal{S}_α) is marked as extended.

4.5.1 Procedure AUGMENT(g, \mathcal{P})

- **Invocation reason:** When the algorithm discovers an augmenting path in G .
- **Input:**
 - The set \mathcal{P} .
 - An unmatched arc $g = (u, v)$, where $g \in E(G)$. The arc g must satisfy the following property: $\Omega(u)$ and $\Omega(v)$ are outer vertices of two different structures.

Since $\Omega(u)$ is an outer vertex, T'_α contains an even-length alternating path from the root $\Omega(\alpha)$ to $\Omega(u)$. Similarly, T'_β contains an even-length alternating path from $\Omega(\beta)$ to $\Omega(v)$. Since there is an unmatched arc $(\Omega(u), \Omega(v))$ in G' , the two paths can be concatenated to form an augmenting path P' on G' .

By using [Lemma 3.5](#), we obtain an augmenting path P on G by replacing each blossom on P' with an even-length alternating path. AUGMENT adds P to \mathcal{P} and removes \mathcal{S}_α and \mathcal{S}_β . That is, all vertices from $V(G_\alpha) \cup V(G_\beta)$ are removed from G , and Ω is updated as $\Omega - (\Omega_\alpha \cup \Omega_\beta)$. The vertices remain removed until the end of ALG-PHASE. This guarantees that the paths in \mathcal{P} remain disjoint. Recall that the algorithm adds these vertices back before the end of this phase, when Line 5 of [Algorithm 1](#) is executed.

4.5.2 Procedure CONTRACT(g)

- **Invocation reason:** When a blossom in a structure is discovered.

- **Input:**

- An unmatched arc $g = (u, v)$, where $g \in E(G)$, such that $\Omega(u)$ and $\Omega(v)$ are distinct outer vertices in the same structure, denoted by \mathcal{S}_α . In addition, $\Omega(u)$ is the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_α

Let g' denote the arc $(\Omega(u), \Omega(v))$. By Lemma 3.7, $T'_\alpha \cup \{g'\}$ contains a unique blossom B . The procedure contracts B by adding B to Ω_α ; hence, T'_α is updated as T'_α/B after this operation. The arc g is added to G_α .

By Lemma 3.7, T'_α remains an alternating tree after the contraction, and B becomes an outer vertex of T'_α . Next, the procedure sets the label of each matched arc in $E(B)$ to 0. (After this step, for each matched arc $a \in E(B)$, both $\ell(a)$ and $\ell(\bar{a})$ are 0.)

Note that the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_α , that is, $\Omega(u)$, is contracted into the blossom B . The procedure then sets B as the new working vertex of \mathcal{S}_α . Then, \mathcal{S}_α is marked as modified and extended.

4.5.3 Procedure OVERTAKE(g, a, k)

- **Invocation reason:** When the active path of a structure \mathcal{S}_α can be extended through g to *overtake* the matched arc a and reduce $\ell(a)$ to k .

- **Input:**

- An unmatched arc $g = (u, v) \in G$.
- A non-blossom matched arc $a = (v, t) \in G$, which shares the endpoint v with g .
- A positive integer k .
- The input must satisfy the following.

(P1) $\Omega(u)$ is the working vertex of a structure, denoted by \mathcal{S}_α .

(P2) $\Omega(v) \neq \Omega(u)$, and $\Omega(v)$ is either an unvisited vertex or an inner vertex of a structure \mathcal{S}_β , where \mathcal{S}_β can be \mathcal{S}_α . In the case where $\Omega(v) \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\Omega(v)$ is not an ancestor of $\Omega(u)$.

(P3) $k < \ell(a)$.

For ease of notation, we denote $\Omega(u), \Omega(v)$, and $\Omega(t)$ by u', v' , and t' , respectively. Since v' is not an outer vertex, it is the trivial blossom $\{v\}$. The procedure OVERTAKE performs a series of operations, detailed as follows. Consider three cases, where in all of them we reduce the label of a to k .

Case 1. a is not in any structure. We include the arcs g and a to G_α . The trivial blossoms v' and t' are added to Ω_α . The working vertex of \mathcal{S}_α is updated as t' , which is an outer vertex of T'_α . Then, \mathcal{S}_α is marked as modified and extended.

Case 2. a is in a structure \mathcal{S}_β . By the definition of g , v' is an inner vertex. Thus, v' is not the root of T'_β . Let p' be the parent of v' . Two subcases are considered, where in both cases we re-assign the parent of v' as u' and make corresponding change in G .

Case 2.1. $\alpha = \beta$. By (P2), v' is not an ancestor of u' . We remove from G_α all arcs (p, v) such that $\Omega(p) = p'$. Then, g is added to G_α . In G' , his operation corresponds to re-assigning the parent of v' as u' . Then, we update the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_α as t' and mark \mathcal{S}_α as modified. In addition, \mathcal{S}_α is marked as extended.

Case 2.2. $\alpha \neq \beta$. Similar to Case 2.1, the objective of the overtaking operation is to re-assign the parent of v' as u' in G' . However, we need to handle several additional technical details in this case. The overtaking operation consists of the following steps.

Step 1: Remove from G_β all arcs (p, v) such that $\Omega(p) = p'$; add the arc (u, v) to G_α .

Step 2: Move, from G_β to G_α , all vertices x such that $\Omega(x)$ is in the subtree of v'

Step 3: Move, from G_β to G_α , all arcs (x, y) where x and y are both moved in Step 2.

Step 4: Move, from Ω_β to Ω_α , all blossoms that contain a subset of vertices moved in Step 2.

Step 5: If the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_β was under the subtree of t' before Step 1, we set w'_α as w'_β and then update w'_β as $\Omega(p)$. Otherwise, set w'_α as t' .

After the overtaking operation, both \mathcal{S}_α and \mathcal{S}_β are marked as modified, and only \mathcal{S}_β is marked as extended.

4.6 Procedure EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH

The goal of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH is to *extend* each structure \mathcal{S}_α , where \mathcal{S}_α is not on hold, by performing at most one of the AUGMENT, CONTRACT, or OVERTAKE operations.

Algorithm 3 The execution of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH.

Input: a graph G , the parameter ϵ , the current matching M , the structure \mathcal{S}_α of each free vertex α , the set of paths \mathcal{P}

```

1: for each arc  $g = (u, v) \in E(G)$  on the stream do
2:   if  $u$  or  $v$  was removed in this phase then
3:     continue with the next arc
4:   if  $\Omega(u) = \Omega(v)$ , or  $\Omega(u)$  is not the working vertex of any structure, or  $g$  is matched then
5:     continue with the next arc
6:   if  $u$  belongs to a structure that is marked as modified or on hold then
7:     continue with the next arc
8:   if  $\Omega(v)$  is an outer vertex then
9:     if  $\Omega(u)$  and  $\Omega(v)$  are in the same structure then
10:      CONTRACT( $g$ )
11:    else
12:      AUGMENT( $g$ )
13:    else ▷  $\Omega(v)$  is either unvisited or an inner vertex.
14:      compute distance( $u$ )
15:       $a \leftarrow$  the matched arc in  $G$  whose tail is  $v$ 
16:      if distance( $u$ ) + 1 <  $\ell(a)$  then
17:        OVERTAKE( $g, a, \text{distance}(u) + 1$ )

```

The procedure works as follows. (See Algorithm 3 for a pseudocode.) The algorithm makes a pass over the stream to read each arc $g = (u, v)$ of G . When an arc g is read, it is mapped to an arc $g' = (\Omega(u), \Omega(v))$ of G' . In EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH, we only consider non-blossom unmatched arcs whose tail is a working vertex. Hence, if $\Omega(u) = \Omega(v)$, $\Omega(u)$ is not the working vertex of a structure, or g is a matched arc, then we simply ignore g . If one of u or v is removed, we also ignore g .

Let \mathcal{S}_α denote the structure whose working vertex is $\Omega(u)$, and let \mathcal{S}_β denote the structure containing $\Omega(v)$. We ignore g if \mathcal{S}_α is marked as on hold or extended. Thus, we also ignore g if \mathcal{S}_α is marked as extended. This ensures that each structure only extends once in the execution of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH. (Recall that when a structure is overtaken, it is marked as modified but not extended; therefore, it may still extend in this execution.)

We examine whether g can be used for extending \mathcal{S}_α as follows.

Case 1: $\Omega(v)$ is an outer vertex and $\mathcal{S}_\alpha = \mathcal{S}_\beta$. In this case, g' induces a blossom on T'_α . We invoke CONTRACT on g to contract this blossom.

Case 2: $\Omega(v)$ is an outer vertex and $\mathcal{S}_\alpha \neq \mathcal{S}_\beta$. In this case, the two structures can be connected to form an augmenting path. We invoke AUGMENT to compute this augmenting path and remove the two structures.

Case 3: $\Omega(v)$ is either an inner vertex or an unvisited vertex. Note that v cannot be a free vertex because, for each free vertex γ , it holds that $\Omega(\gamma)$ is an outer vertex. Therefore, v is the tail of a matched arc a . We determine whether \mathcal{S}_α can overtake a by computing a number $\text{distance}(u) + 1$ and compare it with $\ell(a)$. The number $\text{distance}(u)$ represents the last label in the active path, which is computed as follows: If $\Omega(u)$ is a free vertex, $\text{distance}(u)$ is set to 0; otherwise, $\text{distance}(u)$ is the label of the matched arc in G' whose head is $\Omega(u)$. If $\text{distance}(u) + 1 < \ell(a)$, OVERTAKE is invoked to update the label of a as $\text{distance}(u) + 1$.

4.7 Procedure CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT

The procedure CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT performs two steps to identify augmenting paths and blossoms:

Step 1: Repeatedly invoke CONTRACT on an arc connecting two outer vertices of the same structure, where one of the outer vertices is the working vertex. This operation is repeated until no such arcs exist.

Step 2: Repeatedly perform AUGMENT on an arc g connecting outer vertices of different structures, until no such arcs exist.

We omit the implementation details in the streaming model.

4.8 Procedure BACKTRACK-STUCK-STRUCTURES

For each structure \mathcal{S}_α that is not on hold and not modified, BACKTRACK-STUCK-STRUCTURES performs the backtrack operation as follows. If w'_α is a non-root outer vertex of T'_α , we update the working vertex as the parent of the parent of w'_α , which is an outer vertex. Otherwise, set the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_α as \emptyset , which makes \mathcal{S}_α inactive.

4.9 Properties of the algorithm

Let $\Delta_h = 36h/\epsilon$ for each scale h . Let $\Delta = 2304\epsilon^3$, which is the minimum value of Δ_h across all scales. [67] proved the following.

Lemma 4.5 ([67], upper bound on the size of structures). *At any point of a scale h , each structure contains at most Δ_h vertices in G .*

Theorem 4.6 ([67]). *Algorithm 1 outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching.*

5 Boosting framework for graph oracle

This section describes a boosting framework for computing a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching. The framework assumes oracle access to an algorithm for computing a constant approximate matching.

Definition 5.1 ($\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$). *Given a graph H , the algorithm $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ returns a c -approximate matching of H , where $c > 1$ is a constant.*

The boosting framework computes a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching by simulating the semi-streaming algorithm. In the simulation, it invokes $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ $O(c \log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon^7)$ times to simulate EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH (and a few other procedures). The framework also requires a few basic operations on graphs, e.g. exploring connected subgraphs of size $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$. (These connected subgraphs correspond to the structures in the semi-streaming algorithm.) We call these operations $\mathbb{A}_{\text{explore}}$.

In the following, we present a high-level description of this framework, omitting all model-specific details and focusing on how $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ is used for the simulation, as it is the main difference between our and [40]'s frameworks. In Appendix A, we formally define $\mathbb{A}_{\text{explore}}$ and provide implementation details in MPC and CONGEST. In Sections 6 and 7, we adapt this framework to solving the dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching problem.

The following theorem summarizes the framework.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ be an algorithm that returns a c -approximate maximum matching for a given graph H , where $c > 1$ is a constant. Let $\mathbb{A}_{\text{process}}$ be an algorithm that simultaneously exchanges small messages between the vertices of a component, and does that in time $\mathcal{T}_{\text{process}}$ for any number of disjoint components of G each of size at most $1/\epsilon^d$, where d is a fixed constant. Then, there is an algorithm that computes a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching in G in time $O((\mathcal{T}_{\text{matching}} + \mathcal{T}_{\text{process}}) \cdot \epsilon^{-7} \cdot \log(1/\epsilon))$. Furthermore, the algorithm requires access to $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ words of memory per each vertex.*

Theorem 1.1 improves on previous frameworks, developed in [40, 67], that require $\Omega(c \log^2 c / \epsilon^{52})$ and $\Omega(c \log^2 c / \epsilon^{39})$ invocation of $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$, respectively.

Remark 1. *As [40]'s framework, our framework works even if c is a non-decreasing function of n and m . (E.g., the framework works even if $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ returns a $\log n$ approximation.) Furthermore, if the input graph G has maximum degree $\leq D$ and arboricity $\leq L$, then $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ is always invoked on a graph with maximum degree $\leq \frac{2}{\epsilon^3} D$ and arboricity $\leq \frac{2}{\epsilon^3} L$.*

5.1 Notations

To distinguish between the vertices of G and G' , we use G -vertex (resp. G' -vertex) when we refer to a vertex in G (resp. a vertex in G'). The terms G -arc and G' -arc are defined similarly. The *size* of a structure \mathcal{S}_α , denoted by $|\mathcal{S}_\alpha|$, is the number of G -vertices in it.

For ease of presentation, we extend the notation for structures and labels as follows. Recall that \mathcal{S}_α denotes the structure of a free vertex α . For each G -vertex v (resp. G' -vertex v'), we also let \mathcal{S}_v represent the structure containing v (resp. v'). Note that the structure containing a non-free vertex v may change when v is overtaken, while the structure containing a free vertex is fixed throughout a phase. For each matched vertex $v' \in G'$, denote by $\ell(v')$ the label of the matched arc adjacent to v' ; For a free vertex $\alpha' \in G'$, define its label $\ell(\alpha')$ as 0. We define $\ell(v)$ for each G -vertex v in a similar way.

5.2 Overview of the framework

The framework simulates the semi-streaming algorithm (Algorithm 1). Most steps of the algorithm can be simulated in a straightforward way. The main challenge is to simulate the following three procedures: computing the initial matching, CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT, and EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH.

Computing the initial matching. We compute the initial matching as a 4-approximate matching, instead of a 2-approximation. This does not affect the correctness – the algorithm still outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation if we increase the number of phases by a constant factor.

The computation is done by iteratively calling $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ and removing all matched vertices until all removed vertices form a 4-approximation. We show that $O(c)$ calls suffice.

Simulating CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT. Essentially, the simulation of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT and EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH is to find G' -arcs on which the three basic operations (CONTRACT, AUGMENT, and OVERTAKE) can be performed. The following notions characterize such arcs.

Definition 5.2 (type 1 arc, type 2 arc, type 3 arc). *Let $a' = (u', v')$ be an arc in G' . We say a' is of type 1 if it connects two outer vertices of some structure \mathcal{S} , and one of them is the working vertex of \mathcal{S} ; it is of type 2 if it connects outer vertices of two different structures; it is of type 3 if all of the following are satisfied:*

- u' is the working vertex of $\mathcal{S}_{u'}$,
- v' is an inner vertex,
- $\ell(v') > \ell(u') + 1$, and
- $\mathcal{S}_{u'}$ is not on-hold,

We say an arc $(u, v) \in G$ is of type 1, 2, or 3 if its corresponding arc $(\Omega(u), \Omega(v)) \in G'$ is of type 1, 2, or 3, respectively.

Note that types 1, 2, and 3 arcs are, respectively, the arcs on which CONTRACT, AUGMENT, and OVERTAKE can be performed.

Recall that the procedure CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT consists of two steps. On a high level, the two steps are to exhaustively perform CONTRACT (resp. AUGMENT) on type 1 (resp. type 2) arcs in the graph. Step 1 does not require invocations of $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$; it can be done by examining the in-structure arcs (i.e. the arcs with both endpoints in the same structure). Implementation of this step is simple but model-specific; hence we only describe Step 2 in this section.

Step 2 simulates AUGMENT, which removes structures that are connected by a type 2 arc. Thus, if a structure is adjacent to two type 2 arcs, we can only perform AUGMENT on one of them. Based on this property, performing AUGMENT can be phrased as a matching problem: Suppose that the semi-streaming algorithm performs AUGMENT on a set of type 2 arcs N' . Then, N' must form a matching between structures. (More precisely, each structure contains at most one endpoint of edges in N' .) Hence, the simulation first obtains a graph H' by contracting every structure and removing all non-type 2 arcs. Then, it iteratively finds a matching in H' ; if two structures are matched in this matching, AUGMENT is performed to remove both of them (and record the augmenting path in between). By a single argument, it can be shown that each iteration reduces $\mu(H')$ by a constant factor; i.e. $\mu(H')$ drops exponentially throughout iterations. However, since we only invoke $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ times, $\mu(H')$ never drops to

0, meaning there must be some type 2 arcs where we fail to find. We mark all remaining type 2 arcs as *contaminated*, which represents that AUGMENT should have been performed on some of these arcs, but our simulation fails to find them. We show that the set of contaminated arcs admits a small vertex cover, which in turn implies that they only intersect a small number of disjoint augmenting paths; By running $O(c \ln(1/\epsilon))$ iterations, it can be shown that the framework can still find a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching even though it does not simulate the semi-streaming algorithm.

Simulating EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH. EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH performs CONTRACT, AUGMENT, and OVERTAKE on arcs of type 1, 2, and 3, respectively. We focus on the simulation of OVERTAKE first. The simulation of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH can be phrased as a matching problem; that is, we iteratively find matchings consisting of type 3 arcs, and we perform OVERTAKE on each matched arc. However, unlike the simulation for CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT, a matched structure is not removed from the graph, and it can still overtake in the next iteration. This breaks the argument we used previously, i.e., it is now unclear whether the maximum matching size drops exponentially.

To make the simulation efficient, we split the simulation into ℓ_{\max} stages, labeled $1, 2, \dots, \ell_{\max}$. In a stage $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell_{\max}\}$, the goal is to find type 3 arcs (u', v') such that $\ell(u') = s$ (i.e. the overtaker has label s). In each stage, we construct a different graph, denoted by H'_s , where H'_s is the subgraph of G' induced by the set of type 3 arcs. $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ is invoked on H'_s iteratively, and for each invocation we perform OVERTAKE on the arcs in the returned matching. It can be shown that $\mu(H')$ drops exponentially throughout iterations, and hence each stage can be simulated using $O(\ln(1/\epsilon))$ iterations. (As before, after running $O(\ln(1/\epsilon))$ iterations, we mark the remaining type 3 arcs as contaminated and show that they are negligible.) Overall all stages, $O(\ln(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon)$ calls are used.

After completing all stages, there are no type 3 arcs (except the contaminated ones) in the graph. We invoke our simulation of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT to find the remaining arcs of type 1 or 2. It can be shown that this final step does not induce more type 3 arcs. Consequently, after the simulation, the graph contains no arcs of type 1, 2, or 3 except the contaminated ones.

5.3 Computation of the initial matching

The first step of the algorithm is to compute a 4-approximate matching M .

Lemma 5.3. *A 4-approximate matching can be computed with $2c$ calls to $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$.*

Proof. The computation is done by finding matchings in G iteratively. We initialize M as an empty matching. In each iteration, we invoke $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ on the subgraph of G induced by all unmatched vertices. All matched edges returned by $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ are added to M .

Let G_i denote the subgraph on which $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ is invoked in the i -th iteration. Fix an iteration i . We claim that $\mu(G_{i+1}) \leq (1 - \frac{1}{c})\mu(G_i)$ for all i except the last iteration. To see this, consider two matching M_i and M_{i+1}^* , where M_i is the matching found by $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ in i -th iteration and M_{i+1}^* is the largest matching in G_{i+1} . Since we remove all matched vertex in each iteration, M_i and M_{i+1}^* are disjoint. This implies that $M_i \cup M_{i+1}^*$ is a matching in G_i of size $|M_i| + |M_{i+1}^*| \geq \frac{1}{c}\mu(G_i) + \mu(G_{i+1})$. It follows that $\frac{1}{c}\mu(G_i) + \mu(G_{i+1}) \leq \mu(G_i)$, or equivalently

$$\mu(G_{i+1}) \leq (1 - \frac{1}{c})\mu(G_i). \quad (1)$$

Hence, after $2c$ iterations, the matching size in G_τ is at most

$$(1 - \frac{1}{c})^{2c} \mu(G) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{c} \cdot 2c} \mu(G) = e^{-2} \mu(G) \leq \frac{1}{4} \mu(G). \quad (2)$$

Let M_{2c} be the maximum matching of G_{2c} . Note that $M \cup M_{2c}$ is an inclusion-wise maximal matching of G . Hence, $|M| + |M_{2c}| \geq \frac{1}{2} \mu(G)$. Combining the equation with Eq. (2), we have $|M| \geq \frac{1}{4} \mu(G)$. This completes the proof. \square

5.4 Simulation of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT

Recall that CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT consists of two steps:

Step 1: Repeatedly invoke CONTRACT on an arc connecting two outer vertices of the same structure, where one of the outer vertices is the working vertex.

Algorithm 4 Simulating CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT using $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$.

Input: a graph G , the parameter ϵ , the current matching M , the structure \mathcal{S}_α of each free vertex α , the set of paths \mathcal{P}

- 1: simulate Step 1 of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT ▷ After this line, the graph contains no type 1 arc
 - 2: construct H' as defined in [Definition 5.4](#)
 - 3: **for** $22c \ln(1/\epsilon)$ iterations **do**
 - 4: find a matching M' by invoking $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ on H'
 - 5: **for** each arc (u', v') in M' **do**
 - 6: perform AUGMENT on (u', v')
 - 7: **for** each type 2 arc $e \in G$ **do**
 - 8: mark e as contaminated ▷ This step is only for the analysis
-

Step 2: For each arc g connecting outer vertices of different structures, invoke AUGMENT with g .

The purpose of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT is to perform CONTRACT and AUGMENT until the graph contains no arcs of type 1 or 2. A detailed description of our simulation is as follows. (See [Algorithm 4](#).) First, we simulate Step 1 of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT. The implementation of this step is model-specific and hence deferred to [Section 6](#) and [Appendix A](#). In the following, we assume that Step 1 is simulated exactly; that is, G contains no type 1 arc.

To simulate Step 2, we construct the following graph H' .

Definition 5.4. *Given G , H' is constructed as the graph such that:*

- *The vertex set of H' is the set of structures in G .*
- *H' contains an arc $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ if and only if there is an arc in G that connect vertices of the two structures.*

Note that every arc in H' is of type 2.

The simulation is iterative. In each iteration, we invoke $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ on H' to find a matching M' consisting of type 2 arcs. For each arc in $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$, we perform AUGMENT on the two matched structures. This removes all matched structures from H' (because AUGMENT removes the two structures involved). The above procedure is repeated for $22c \ln(c/\epsilon)$ iterations.

At the end of the simulation, H' may still contain some type 2 arcs that are never found by $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$. After the last iteration, we mark all type 2 arcs in G as *contaminated*, representing that these arcs are missed by our simulation. Let E_C denote the set of contaminated arcs marked in the simulation. We remark that the contaminated arcs are identified solely for the analysis. That is, our simulation works even if we do not mark the remaining type 2 arcs as contaminated. (In particular, our implementation in the dynamic model does not mark contaminated arcs. See [Section 6](#).)

Correctness. Recall that the goal is to perform CONTRACT and AUGMENT until the graph contains no arcs of type 1 or 2. Our simulation is inexact only because it does not find all type 2 arcs. In [Algorithm 4](#), these arcs are marked as contaminated. Each contaminated arc represents a potential augmentation that is missed by our simulation. To prove the correctness, we show that we can still find a $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate matching even if these augmentations are missed. Details of this proof are given in [Appendix B](#). In the following, we present a key property used in the proof, showing that the contaminated arcs only intersect a negligible number of augmenting paths. In other words, the number of augmenting paths missed by our simulation is negligible.

We first show that $\mu(H')$ is dropping exponentially in our simulation.

Lemma 5.5. *After the last iteration of [Algorithm 4](#), it holds that $\mu(H') \leq \epsilon^{20}|M|$.*

Proof. We first show that $\mu(H') \leq 3|M|$ before the start of the first iteration. Recall that each AUGMENT finds one M -augmenting path between two structures. Hence, if H' contains a matching of size x , then AUGMENT can be used to find x disjoint augmenting paths in G . Since we start from a 4-approximate matching, G contains at most $3|M|$ augmenting paths at any point of the algorithm. Hence, $\mu(H')$ is at most $3|M|$ before the first iteration.

In each iteration, we find a c -approximate matching in H' and remove all matched structures. Similar to the proof of Eq. (1) in Lemma 5.3, we can show that $\mu(H')$ is decreased by a factor of $(1 - 1/c)$ after each iteration. Therefore, after $22c \ln(1/\epsilon)$ iterations, $\mu(H')$ decreases by a factor of

$$(1 - 1/c)^{22c \ln(1/\epsilon)} \leq e^{-22 \ln(1/\epsilon)} = \epsilon^{22} \leq \frac{\epsilon^{20}}{3},$$

where the last inequality holds for $\epsilon \leq 0.5$. This completes the proof. \square

Recall that our simulation of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT is not exact because it does not perform AUGMENT on the set E_C of contaminated arcs. In the following, we argue that E_C only intersects a small number of augmenting paths, implying that our simulation only misses a negligible number of augmentations.

Lemma 5.6. *Let E_C be the set of contaminated arcs marked in Algorithm 4. Then, E_C only intersects $2\epsilon^{17}|M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths in G .*

Proof. Let $M_{H'}$ be the maximum matching of H' at the end of the last iteration. By Lemma 5.5, $|M_{H'}| \leq \epsilon^{20}|M|$. Since $M_{H'}$ is maximal, $V(M_{H'})$ form a vertex cover of H' , whose size is $2|M_{H'}| \leq 2\epsilon^{20}|M|$. Denote this vertex cover by S' .

Recall that each vertex in H' represents a structure in G . Let S be the set of G -vertices that are contained in a structure in S' . It is not hard to see that S covers all edges in E_C . In addition, S contains at most $|S'| \cdot \Delta \leq 2\epsilon^{17}|M|$ vertices. Therefore, the size of a maximum matching in E_C is at most $2\epsilon^{17}|M|$. Consequently, E_C can intersect at most $2\epsilon^{17}|M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting path. \square

Recall that each phase has $\tau_{\max} = 1/\epsilon^3$ pass-bundles. By Lemma 5.6, the total number of augmenting paths missed in a phase is at most $\tau_{\max} \cdot \epsilon^{20}|M| = \epsilon^{17}|M|$, which is negligible compared to the size of M . Appendix B gives a formal correctness proof that uses this property.

5.5 Simulation of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH

Simulation procedure. Recall that EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH makes a pass over the arcs, and performs CONTRACT, AUGMENT, or OVERTAKE on it whenever applicable. A detailed description of our simulation is given below (see Algorithm 5 for pseudo code). We first focus on the simulation of OVERTAKE. The simulation consists of ℓ_{\max} stages, labeled $1, 2, \dots, \ell_{\max}$. In each stage s , the goal is to simulate OVERTAKE on arcs $(u', v') \in G'$ with $\ell(u') = s$. That is, we focus on the s -feasible arcs defined below.

Definition 5.7 (s -feasible arc). *For integer $s \in [0, \ell_{\max}]$, define an s -feasible arc as a type 3 arc (u', v') with $\ell(u') = s$.*

In each stage, we work on a bipartite subgraph of H'_s consisting of s -feasible arcs.

Definition 5.8 (Bipartite graph H'_s). *H'_s is the bipartite subgraph of G' constructed as follows. The left part consists of all outer vertices u' satisfying the following:*

- u' is a working vertex of some structure that is not marked as on-hold or extended.
- $\ell(u') = s$.

The right part contains all inner vertices v' with $\ell(v') > s + 1$. The arc set is the set of all arcs in G' from the left part of H'_s to its right part. Note that the arc set of H'_s is exactly the set of all s -feasible arcs in G' .

A stage s consists of $O(c \ln(1/\epsilon))$ iterations (see Line 2). In each iteration, $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ is invoked on H'_s to find a matching M' . Then, we perform OVERTAKE using each matched edge returned by $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$. These overtaking operations may modify the graph. We update H'_s to reflect the change and proceed to the next iteration. The above iterative procedure may not find all s -feasible arcs in H'_s . After the last iteration, we mark all remaining s -feasible arcs as contaminated. This completes the description of a stage.

After all stages are executed, Line 9 invokes Algorithm 4 to simulate CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT. This step is to simulate the AUGMENT and CONTRACT operations performed by EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH.

Remark 2. *Recall that the semi-streaming algorithm will call CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT immediately after EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH (see Algorithm 2). Therefore, one can also skip the execution of Line 9 in Algorithm 5, it only causes CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT to be executed two times. We keep Line 9 of Algorithm 5 to make our simulation more similar to the original EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH.*

Algorithm 5 Simulating EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH using $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$.

Input: a graph G , the parameter ϵ , the current matching M , the structure \mathcal{S}_α of each free vertex α , the set of paths \mathcal{P}

- 1: **for** stages $s = 1, 2, \dots, \ell_{\max}$ **do** construct H'_s as defined in [Definition 5.8](#)
 - 2: **for** $22c \ln(1/\epsilon)$ iterations **do**
 - 3: find a matching M' by invoking $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ on H'_s
 - 4: **for** each arc (u', v') in M' **do**
 - 5: perform OVERTAKE on (u', v')
 - 6: reconstruct H'_s as defined in [Definition 5.8](#)
 - 7: **for** each $(u, v) \in G$ such that $(\Omega(u), \Omega(v))$ is in H'_s **do**
 - 8: mark (u, v) as contaminated ▷ This step is only for the analysis
 - 9: execute [Algorithm 4](#) to simulate CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT
-

Analysis. Since there are $\ell_{\max} = O(\epsilon^{-1})$ stages and each stage calls $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$ $O(c \ln(1/\epsilon))$ times, the total number of calls is $O(c\epsilon^{-1} \ln(\epsilon^{-1}))$.

We proceed to analyze the correctness. The analysis consists of three parts. First, we prove that the overtaking operations in [Line 5](#) are well-defined; i.e., each operation is performed on a type 3 arc. More specifically, let $M' = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_t\}$ be the matching found in [Line 3](#); we show that for $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$, e_i is still an s -feasible arc (and therefore a type 3 arc) after we perform OVERTAKE on e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{i-1} . Second, we show the following.

Lemma 5.9. *After running [Algorithm 5](#), there are no arcs of type 1, 2, or 3 in G except the contaminated ones.*

This highlights that our simulation is essentially performing the three basic operations in a different order, and it is inexact only because of the contaminated arcs. Third, we show that the contaminated arcs are negligible, in the sense that they only intersect a small number of augmenting paths in G . This property is used in the full correctness proof in [Appendix B](#).

The proof of Parts 1 and 2 is straightforward but technical, and therefore they are deferred to [Appendix B](#).

Part 3 of the analysis. Consider a fixed iteration. An important property is that all vertices matched in the iteration will be removed in [Line 6](#) of [Algorithm 5](#). To see this, consider a matched arc (u', v') returned by $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$. Since the \mathcal{S}'_u overtakes $\mathcal{S}'_{v'}$, it is marked as extended; in addition, the label of v' is updated to be $s + 1$. By [Definition 5.8](#), u' and v' no longer qualify as vertices of H'_s . That is, when [Line 6](#) reconstructs H' , both u' and v' are removed.

An additional observation is that [Line 6](#) never adds new vertices into H'_s . Consequently, throughout all iterations, H'_s is a decremental graph. We obtain the following using the above observations.

Lemma 5.10. *After the last iteration of [Algorithm 5](#), it holds that $\mu(H') \leq \epsilon^{22}|M|$.*

Proof. In each iteration, [Line 6](#) removes all vertices incident to the c -approximate matching M' , and no new vertices are added to H'_s . This iterative process is similar to our simulation of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT ([Algorithm 4](#)), where we remove a c -approximate matching in each iteration. By repeating the analysis of [Lemma 5.5](#) with H' replaced by H'_s , we show that $\mu(H'_s)$ is decreased by a factor of ϵ^{22} after $22c \ln n$ iteration.

Recall that the left part L of H'_s consists only of outer vertices. Since each outer vertex is matched in M/Ω , $L \leq |M/\Omega| \leq |M|$. Hence, $\mu(H'_s) \leq |M|$ initially, and after all iterations it is reduced to at most $\epsilon^{22}|M|$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.11. *Let E_C be the set of contaminated arcs marked in [Algorithm 5](#). Then, E_C only intersects $2\epsilon^{17}|M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths in G .*

Proof. Let E_s be the set of contaminated arcs marked in [Algorithm 5](#) in stage s . By using [Lemma 5.10](#) and repeating the argument in [Lemma 5.6](#), we know that E_s intersects at most $2\epsilon^{19}|M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths in G . Since there are ℓ_{\max} stages, $|E_C| = \sum_s |E_s| \leq \ell_{\max} \cdot 2\epsilon^{19}|M| \leq 2\epsilon^{17}|M|$. This completes the proof. \square

6 Dynamic matching: Boosting framework for induced subgraph oracle

In previous dynamic algorithms, a key subroutine is a sublinear-time algorithm \mathbb{A}_{weak} for finding a constant-approximate maximum matching in a given vertex-induced subgraph, on the condition that the induced subgraph contains a large matching.

Definition 6.1 (Definition of \mathbb{A}_{weak}). *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a subset of nodes $S \subseteq V$, and a parameter $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the algorithm \mathbb{A}_{weak} returns either \perp or a matching M in $G[S]$ such that $|M| \geq \lambda \cdot \delta n$, where $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ is a constant. In addition, if $\mu(G[S]) \geq \delta n$, then \mathbb{A}_{weak} does not return \perp .*

In the following, we present an algorithm that finds a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching using $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda}$ invocations of \mathbb{A}_{weak} and $\tilde{O}(n \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda})$ time, assuming that $\mu(G) = \Omega(\epsilon n)$. The algorithm is summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.2. *Let \mathbb{A}_{weak} be an algorithm satisfying Definition 6.1. There is an algorithm that given a parameter $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and a graph G with $\mu(G) = \Omega(\epsilon n)$, computes a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching of G by making $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda}$ calls to \mathbb{A}_{weak} on adaptively chosen subsets of vertices with δ set to be $\text{poly}(\epsilon)$. The algorithm spends an additional processing time of $O(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot n)$ per call.*

The algorithm is used as a subroutine in our dynamic algorithms. (See Section 7.)

Remark 3. *In this section, we focus on obtaining an algorithm with $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ dependency in its time complexity. However, we do not attempt to optimize the degree of the polynomial. The resulting algorithm has an $O(\epsilon^{-108})$ dependence on ϵ and only works for $n \geq \epsilon^{-300}$, but the exponents can be greatly reduced by a more careful analysis.*

6.1 Notations

To prove Theorem 6.2, we assume that $\mu(G) \geq t \cdot \epsilon n$ for some constant t . We also assume that $n \geq 1/\epsilon^{300}$; otherwise, a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching can be found by using [34]’s algorithm, which takes $O(m \log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon) = O(n^2 \log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon) = O(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ time. We fix $\delta = \epsilon^{107}$ throughout the section.

Representation of the graph. We assume Random Access Machine (RAM) as the model of computation. The algorithm takes the adjacency matrix of G as input. It stores in memory the tuple $(G_\alpha, \Omega_\alpha, w'_\alpha)$ of each structure \mathcal{S}_α . In addition, it also stores and maintains all in-structure arcs; i.e., the arcs connecting two G -vertices of the same structure. Since each structure contains at most $\Delta = O(\epsilon^3)$ vertices and $\Delta^2 = O(\epsilon^6)$ edges, all structures can be stored using $n \text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ memory.

An auxiliary graph. Our algorithm simulates the framework in Section 5. At the beginning of the algorithm, we create a bipartite graph B , which is defined as follows:

Definition 6.3 (Bipartite graph B). *Let B be a bipartite graph obtained by splitting each G -vertex v into two copies v^+ and v^- , called outer copy and inner copy, respectively. The left part is $V^+ = \{v^+ \mid v \in V(G)\}$ and the right part is $V^- = \{v^- \mid v \in V(G)\}$. The edge set of B is $\{(u^+, v^-) \mid (u, v) \in G\} \cup \{(v^+, u^-) \mid (u, v) \in G\}$. Intuitively, the vertex v^+ represents that v is an outer vertex, and v^- represents that v is an inner or unvisited vertex.*

In our algorithm, each invocation of \mathbb{A}_{weak} will be on either B or G . The graph B is not constructed explicitly. (Explicit construction of B requires $\Omega(m)$ time, whereas our goal is a $O(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot n)$ -time algorithm.) Instead, we only store the vertex set of B . Still, we can assume access to the adjacency matrix of B , because it can be supported by making $O(1)$ queries to G .

6.2 Concentration bounds

We use the following concentration bounds. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k\}$ be $\{0, 1\}$ -random variables. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^k X_i$ and $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X]$.

Lemma 6.4 (Chernoff bound). *If X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k are mutually independent, then $\Pr[X \leq (1 - \gamma)\mu] \leq e^{-\mu\gamma^2/2}$.*

Definition 6.5 (Dependency graph). A dependency graph for \mathcal{X} has vertex set $[k]$ and an edge set such that for each $i \in [k]$, X_i is mutually independent of all other X_j such that $\{i, j\}$ is not an edge.

For any non-negative integer d , we say that the X_i 's exhibit d -bounded dependence, if the X_i 's have a dependency graph with maximum vertex degree d .

Lemma 6.6 ([69]). If X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k exhibit d -bounded dependence, then $\Pr[X \leq (1 - \gamma)\mu] \leq \frac{4(d+1)}{e} \cdot e^{\frac{-\mu\gamma^2}{2(d+1)}}$.

6.3 Overview of the simulation

In the following, we present an overview of our simulation except for `EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH` and `CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT`, which are the only two procedures we do not simulate exactly.

Simulation of the outer loop (Algorithm 1). Line 1 of [Algorithm 1](#) computes an initial matching M . We simulate this step using the approach in [Lemma 5.3](#), that is, to repeatedly find a matching on the set of unmatched vertices. A simple analysis shows that $O(1/(\delta \cdot \lambda))$ calls to \mathbb{A}_{weak} suffices (see [Section 6.4](#) for details).

Consider the for-loop in Line 2. We will describe shortly the simulation for [Algorithm 2](#). Recall that [Algorithm 2](#) removes some vertices during the execution. For each vertex of G , we store a label indicating whether it is removed in [Algorithm 2](#). Hence, Line 5 can be done in $O(n)$ time by setting all vertices as not removed. Line 6 can be done in $O(n)$ time because each of M and \mathcal{P} contains at most n edges. Since the loop has $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ iterations, the total time spent excluding the execution of [Algorithm 2](#) is $O(n \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$.

Simulation of a phase (Algorithm 2). Throughout the algorithm, we maintain the structure of each free vertex and the set Ω of blossoms, which takes $O(n \text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ space. Lines 1-4 of [Algorithm 2](#) can be easily simulated in $O(n)$ time. (Line 2 takes $O(n)$ time because M contains $O(n)$ arcs.) Consider the for-loop in Lines 5-12. Lines 5-9 and Line 12 can be simulated in $O(n)$ time by examining the structure of each free vertex. Lines 10 and 11 are the only two procedures that require a pass over the stream, which we cannot simulate exactly because it takes $\Omega(n)$ time. The simulation of Lines 10 and 11 is described in, respectively, [Sections 5.4](#) and [5.5](#).

6.4 Computation of the initial matching

The first step of the algorithm is to compute a constant approximate matching.

Lemma 6.7. Assume that $\mu(G) \geq den$ for some constant d . A 3-approximate matching can be computed in $O(n/\epsilon)$ time plus $O(1/(\delta\lambda))$ calls to \mathbb{A}_{weak} with $\delta \leq \frac{d\epsilon}{3}$.

Proof. The computation is done by iteratively finding matchings in G . We initialize M as an empty matching. In each iteration, we invoke \mathbb{A}_{weak} on the set of unmatched vertices with $\delta = \frac{d\epsilon}{3}$. All matched edges returned by \mathbb{A}_{weak} are added to M . The procedure is repeated until \mathbb{A}_{weak} returns \perp .

Since \mathbb{A}_{weak} must find a matching of size $\lambda\delta n$ in each iteration except the last, there are at most $1/(\lambda\delta)$ iterations. Each iteration spends $O(n)$ time to update M and uses 1 invocation of \mathbb{A}_{weak} . The claimed running time follows.

We complete the proof by showing that M is a 3-approximation. Consider the matching M after the last iteration. Let M^* be the maximum matching in G . Since \mathbb{A}_{weak} returns \perp in the last iteration, there are at most δn edges in M^* whose endpoints do not intersect M . Since M only contains $2|M|$ endpoints, we have

$$|M^*| \leq 2|M| + \delta n = 2|M| + \frac{d\epsilon}{3}n \leq 2|M| + \frac{1}{3}|M^*|,$$

where the last inequality comes from $|M^*| \geq den$. It follows that $|M| \geq \frac{1}{3}|M^*|$, concluding the proof. \square

6.5 Simulation of `CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT`

Overview. We implement the simulation in [Section 5.4](#) differently. Recall that `CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT` has two steps (see [Section 4.7](#)), which find arcs for `CONTRACT` and `AUGMENT`, respectively.

The first step can be done by scanning all in-structure edges and performing CONTRACT whenever possible. Since each structure and blossom contains at most Δ^2 edges, this step can be done in $O(n\Delta^2) = O(n\epsilon^{-6})$ time.

Recall that in Section 5.4, Step 2 is done by finding matching on a new graph, in which each vertex is a structure and each edge represents a possible augmentation between two structures. Implementing this approach with \mathbb{A}_{weak} is challenging because this new graph is not a vertex-induced subgraph of G or B . To address this, we use the idea of random sampling: Instead of contracting each structure into a vertex, we sample a vertex from each structure and invoke \mathbb{A}_{weak} on the sampled vertices. Let S denote the set of sampled vertices. If an edge $e = (u, v)$ connects outer vertices of two structures in G , there is a probability of at least $1/\Delta^2$ that e appears in $G[S]$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[\mu(G[S])] \geq \mu(G)/\Delta^2$. By adapting the analysis in Lemma 5.5, we show that $\mu(G)$ drops exponentially in expectation.

Simulation procedure for Step 2. The simulation consists of $I = 1/(2\lambda\epsilon^{107}) + 1$ iterations. In an iteration i , we sample one outer G -vertex v from each structure. Let S be the set of vertices that are sampled. We invoke the \mathbb{A}_{weak} on S with $\delta = \epsilon^{107}$ to obtain a matching N on S . Note that each edge in N connects outer vertices of two different structures. In addition, each structure contains at most one vertex matched in N . We perform AUGMENT on each edge in N , which removes all involved structures. This completes the description of an iteration.

Time Complexity. For each iteration, the algorithm spends $O(n)$ time for sampling vertices. Then, \mathbb{A}_{weak} is invoked once to find the matching N . Let (u, v) be an arc in N . Let α (resp. β) be the free vertex such that \mathcal{S}_α contains u (resp. \mathcal{S}_β contains v). In the following, we show that performing AUGMENT on (u, v) can be done in $O(|\mathcal{S}_\alpha| + |\mathcal{S}_\beta|)$ time. First, we find the augmenting path P' in G' between $\Omega(\alpha)$ and $\Omega(\beta)$ by concatenating the tree paths from $\Omega(\alpha)$ to $\Omega(u)$ and from $\Omega(\beta)$ to $\Omega(v)$. Then, we use Lemma 3.5 to transform this P' to P . Since all vertices in P are in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha \cup \mathcal{S}_\beta$, this step, this computation takes $O(|\mathcal{S}_\alpha| + |\mathcal{S}_\beta|)$ time. Then, we mark all vertices in \mathcal{S}_α and \mathcal{S}_β as removed, which can also be done in $O(|\mathcal{S}_\alpha| + |\mathcal{S}_\beta|)$ time. Hence, the AUGMENT operation requires $O(|\mathcal{S}_\alpha| + |\mathcal{S}_\beta|)$ time. Since the structures are vertex-disjoint, performing AUGMENT on all structures matched in $N(i)$ takes $O(n)$ time.

Recall that Step 1 of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT requires $O(n/\epsilon^6)$ time. We conclude that the simulation procedure takes $O(n/\epsilon^6)$ time in total.

Correctness. Consider a fixed iteration i . The matching N returned by \mathbb{A}_{weak} is a set of edges connecting outer vertices of different structure. Thus, $\{(\mathcal{S}_u, \mathcal{S}_v) \mid (u, v) \in N\}$ is a matching in H' (see Definition 5.4). Consequently, the simulation can be seen as a different implementation of Algorithm 4, where in each iteration we find a matching in H' using \mathbb{A}_{weak} instead of $\mathbb{A}_{\text{matching}}$. We now show that I iterations suffice.

Let e' be an edge in H' . By definition, e' corresponds to at least an arc $(u, v) \in G$, which is an arc satisfying $(\mathcal{S}_u, \mathcal{S}_v) = e'$. We say e' is *preserved* if (u, v) is sampled. Since each vertex is sampled with probability at least $1/\Delta$, e' is preserved with probability at least $1/\Delta^2 = \epsilon^6$.

Let N' be a maximum matching in H' at the beginning of iteration i . We first show that if N' is large, then our sampling preserves a large matching.

Lemma 6.8. *Consider a fixed iteration i . If $|N'| \geq \epsilon^{100}n$ at the beginning of i , then $G[S]$ contains a matching of size $\epsilon^{107}n$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-10}$.*

Proof. For each edge $e' \in N'$, define $X_{e'}$ as the indicator random variable of whether e' is preserved. Let $X = \sum_{e' \in N'} X_{e'}$ denoting the number of edges in N' that are preserved. By our discussion above, $\mathbb{E}[X_{e'}] \geq \epsilon^6$. Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{e' \in N^*(i)} \mathbb{E}[X_{e'}] \geq |N'| \cdot \epsilon^6 \geq \epsilon^{106}n.$$

In addition, since N' is a matching, the random variables $\{X_{e'} \mid e' \in N^*(i)\}$ are mutually independent. Applying a Chernoff bound (Lemma 6.4) with $\gamma = 0.5$, we obtain $\Pr[X \leq 0.5\mathbb{E}[X]] \leq e^{-\mathbb{E}[X]\gamma^2/2} \leq e^{-\epsilon^{106}n/8} \leq e^{-10\ln n} = n^{-10}$ for large enough n . (Recall that we have assumed $n \geq 1/\epsilon^{300}$.) Therefore, with probability at least $1 - n^{-10}$, at least $0.5\mathbb{E}[X] \geq \epsilon^{107}n$ edges in N' are preserved. This completes the proof. \square

Claim 6.9. *At the end of all iterations, $|N'| \leq \epsilon^{100}n$ holds with high probability.*

Proof. We say an iteration i ($1 \leq i \leq I$) is *successful* if at least one of the following holds:

- (E1) \mathbb{A}_{weak} finds a matching with at least $\lambda \cdot \epsilon^{107}n$ edges in iteration i ;
- (E2) $|N^*(i)| \leq \epsilon^{100}n$.

By Lemma 6.8, if (E2) does not hold, then (E1) holds with probability $1 - n^{-10}$. Hence, each iteration is successful with probability at least n^{-10} , regardless of the outcome of previous iterations. By a union bound, with probability at least $1 - I \cdot n^{-10} \geq 1 - n^{-9}$, all iterations are successful.

Each time \mathbb{A}_{weak} finds a matching N , we remove $2|N|$ structures from G . Therefore, throughout all iterations at most n edges are found. Thus, (E1) can happen at most $1/(2\lambda \cdot \epsilon^{107}) < I$ times. Hence, (E2) holds at the last iteration with probability at least $1 - n^{-9}$. This completes the proof of the claim. \square

As in Section 5.4, all type 1 arcs in G are said to be contaminated after the last iteration. By Claim 6.9 and since $|M| = \Omega(\epsilon n)$, $\mu(H')$ is at most $\epsilon^{100}n \leq \epsilon^{20}|M|$. By an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 5.6, the contaminated arcs intersect at most $\epsilon^{17}|M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths. This shows that our simulation \mathbb{A}_{weak} can be seen as a different implementation of Algorithm 4. Hence, the correctness proof in Appendix B applies to the simulation as well.

6.6 Simulation of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH

Recall that EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH scans through all arcs in the stream, and performs CONTRACT, AUGMENT, and OVERTAKE whenever possible. To simulate EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH, we follow the approach in Section 5.5. First, we repeatedly find type 3 arcs to perform OVERTAKE. Then, we invoke our simulation for CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT in Section 6.5.

Recall that the finding of type 3 arcs is done by executing ℓ_{\max} stages, where in stage s , we find a matching consisting of s -feasible arcs. In Section 5.5, each stage consists of finding matchings in a derived bipartite graph H'_s . (See Definition 5.8 for the definition of H'_s .) We simulate this approach by finding matchings in B . (See Definition 6.3 for the definition of B .)

Simulation procedure. Consider a fixed stage s . The simulation of stage s consists of $I = 1/(2\lambda\epsilon^{100}) + 1$ iterations. The overall idea is to repeat the procedure and analysis in Algorithm 5. However, for technical reasons, we need to handle “in-structure overtake” separately. More precisely, we maintain the following invariant throughout all iterations.

Invariant 6.10. *At the beginning of each iteration, there are no s -feasible arcs that connect two vertices of the same structure.*

To maintain Invariant 6.10, the following is performed before the first iteration and after each iteration: We scan through each arc connecting two vertices of the same structure; if the arc is s -feasible, we perform OVERTAKE on it and mark the structure containing the arc as extended. After this step, Invariant 6.10 holds.

Each iteration finds a set of type 3 arcs for cross-structure overtake. First, we construct a vertex subset $S \subseteq V(B)$ as follows. We sample one G -vertex from each structure uniformly at random. Let T denote the sampled vertices. For each outer vertex u in T , we add u^+ (the outer copy of u in the graph B) in S if and only if the following holds:

- \mathcal{S}_u is not on-hold or extended,
- $\Omega(u)$ is the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_u , and
- $\ell(\Omega(u)) = s$.

For each inner vertex v in T , we add v^- in S if and only if $\ell(\Omega(v)) > i + 1$. It is not hard to see that for each arc $(u^+, v^-) \in B$, its corresponding arc $(u, v) \in G$ is of type 3. We invoke \mathbb{A}_{weak} on S with $\delta = \epsilon^{107}$ to find a matching $N_B \subseteq E(B)$. Let $N' = \{(\Omega(u), \Omega(v)) \mid (u^+, v^-) \in N_B\}$. Since each structure is only adjacent to at most one arc in N_B , no two vertices in N' may share an endpoint; that is, N' is a matching of H'_s . We perform OVERTAKE on each arc in N' . All type 3 arcs remaining in G after I iterations are considered contaminated.

Analysis. Consider a fixed iteration i in some stage s . Recall that our simulation finds a matching N_B by invoking \mathbb{A}_{weak} . The first step is to show that if H'_s contains a large matching, then \mathbb{A}_{weak} succeeds with high probability. Let N^* be a maximum matching in H'_s at the beginning of iteration i .

Lemma 6.11. *Consider a fixed iteration i in a stage s . At the beginning of iteration i , if $|N^*| \geq \epsilon^{100}n$, then $B[S]$ contains a matching of size $\epsilon^{107}n$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-10}$.*

Proof. Let N_B^* be a matching in B constructed as follows: For each arc $(u', v') \in N^*$, find an arc $(u^+, v^-) \in B$ such that $\Omega(u) = u'$ and $\Omega(v) = v'$ (if there are multiple such (u^+, v^-) , pick any of them). Note that $|N_B^*| = |N^*| \geq \epsilon^{100}n$.

We say an arc $(u^+, v^-) \in N_B^*$ is *preserved* if both of its endpoints are in S . This happens exactly when we sample u from \mathcal{S}_u and v from \mathcal{S}_v . By [Invariant 6.10](#), $\mathcal{S}_u \neq \mathcal{S}_v$, and hence

$$\Pr[(u^+, v^-) \text{ is preserved}] = \Pr[u \text{ and } v \text{ are both sampled}] = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_u|} \cdot \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}_v|} \geq 1/\Delta^2 = \epsilon^6, \quad (3)$$

where the last inequality is because each structure contains at most Δ vertices.

For each arc $e \in N_B^*$, define X_e as the indicator random variable of whether e is preserved. Let $X = \sum_{e \in N_B^*(i)} X_e$ denoting the number of edges in N_B^* that are preserved. Consider an edge $(u, v) \in N_B^*(i)$. By [Eq. \(3\)](#), $\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{e \in N_B^*(i)} \mathbb{E}[X_e] \geq |N_B^*(i)| \cdot \epsilon^6 \geq \epsilon^{106}n$.

Let $\mathcal{X} = \{X_e \mid e \in N_B^*\}$. The random variables \mathcal{X} may not be mutually independent. In particular, two arcs (a^+, b^-) and (u^+, v^-) are dependent if and only if (a, b) and (u, v) are adjacent to a common structure. Since N^* is a matching, each structure is adjacent to at most Δ arcs in N^* . Therefore, each X_e depends on at most 2Δ other random variables in \mathcal{X} . (More formally, X_e is mutually independent of the set of all $X_{e'}$ such that e' does not share a structure with e .) As a result, \mathcal{X} admits a dependency graph ([Definition 6.5](#)) with maximum degree 2Δ .

Applying the concentration bound for limited dependence ([Lemma 6.6](#)) with $\gamma = 0.5$ and $d = 2\Delta$, we obtain

$$\Pr[X \leq 0.5\mathbb{E}[X]] \leq \frac{4(d+1)}{e} \cdot e^{-\mathbb{E}[X]\gamma^2/(2d+2)} \leq e^{-\epsilon^{106}n/(16\Delta+8)} = e^{\Theta(\epsilon^{112}n)} \leq e^{-10 \ln n} = n^{-10},$$

where the last inequality holds for a large enough n . (Recall that we have assumed $n \geq 1/\epsilon^{300}$.) Therefore, with probability at least $1 - n^{-10}$, at least $0.5\mathbb{E}[X] \geq \epsilon^{107}n$ edges in $N^*(i)$ are preserved. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.12. *Let E_C be the set of contaminated edges created by simulating [EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH](#) using \mathbb{A}_{weak} . With high probability, E_C admits a vertex cover of size $O(\epsilon^{92}n)$.*

Proof. Consider a fixed stage s . As argued in [Section 5.5](#), after we perform [OVERTAKE](#) on an arc (u', v') of H'_s , its two endpoints are no longer part of H'_s (because $\mathcal{S}_{u'}$ is marked as extended, and $\ell(v')$ is updated to $s+1$). Hence, whenever \mathbb{A}_{weak} finds a matching, the number of vertices in H'_s decreases by $2\lambda\delta n$. Since H'_s has at most n vertices at the beginning of s , there can only be $1/(2\lambda\delta) < I$ iterations where \mathbb{A}_{weak} finds a matching. By an argument similar to [Claim 6.9](#), we can show that $|N^*| \leq \epsilon^{100}n$ holds with high probability after I iterations. This implies that the contaminated edges created in stage s admit a vertex cover of size $\epsilon^{100}n \times 2\Delta \leq \epsilon^{93}n$. Since there are $\ell_{\max} = O(1/\epsilon)$ stages, the set of all contaminated edges can be covered with $O(\epsilon^{92}n)$ vertices. \square

7 Applications in the dynamic setting

In this section, we present new algorithms for maintaining a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching in the *fully dynamic setting*, using the framework in [Theorem 6.2](#).

7.1 Dynamic settings

In the *dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching problem*, the task is to maintain a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching while the graph undergoes edge updates. We will focus on the *fully dynamic setting* where the graph undergoes both edge insertions and deletions over time. The edge updates are given online: each update must be processed before the next update is given. We denote by $G = (V, E)$ the input graph, $n = |V|$, and m the maximum number of edges in G as it undergoes edge updates. We say a dynamic matching algorithm has amortized update time T if the algorithm's running time on the first

i edge updates is at most $i \cdot T$. Our approach uses the pre-processing time of $n \text{ poly } \log n$. A dynamic $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate matching algorithm is said to succeed with probability p if it maintains a matching M satisfying the following: After any fixed edge update in the update sequence, M is a $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching with probability at least p .

7.2 A framework for dynamic $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate matching

Recent works [24, 18, 11] have shown that the fully dynamic $(1+\epsilon)$ -matching problem reduces to the following problem with a specific set of parameters.

Problem 1. *The problem is parameterized by a positive integer $q \geq 1$ and reals $\lambda, \delta, \alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

Input: *a fully dynamic n -vertex graph $G = (V, E)$ that starts empty, i.e., has $E = \emptyset$, and throughout, never has more than m edges, nor receives more than $\text{poly}(n)$ updates in total.*

Updates: *The updates to G happen in chunks C_1, C_2, \dots , each consisting of exactly $\alpha \cdot n$ edge insertions or deletions in G .*

Queries: *After each chunk, there will be at most q queries, coming one at a time and in an adaptive manner (based on the answer to all prior queries including the ones in this chunk). Each query is a set $S \subseteq V$ of vertices; the algorithm should respond to the query with the guarantee specified in Definition 6.1; that is, it returns either a matching in $G[S]$ of size at least $\lambda \cdot \delta n$ or \perp ; furthermore, if $\mu(G[S]) \geq \delta n$, the algorithm does not return \perp .*

For ease of reference, we list the parameters of this problem and their definitions:

n : *number of vertices in the graph;*

m : *maximum number of edges at any point present in the graph;*

q : *number of adaptive queries made after each chunk;*

λ : *approximation ratio of the returned matching for each query;*

δ : *a lower bound on the fraction of vertices matched in the subgraph of G for the query;*

α : *a parameter for determining the size of each chunk as a function of n .*

*For technical reasons, we allow additional updates, called **empty updates** to also appear in the chunks but these “updates” do not change any edge of the graph, although they will be counted toward the number of updates in their chunks^a.*

^aThis is used for simplifying the exposition when solving this problem recursively; these empty updates will still be counted when computing the amortized runtime of these recursive algorithms.

It is known that dynamic $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate matching reduces to $\text{poly}(\log n/\epsilon)$ instances of Problem 1 parameterized by any $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, $q = (1/(\lambda \cdot \epsilon))^{O(1/(\lambda \cdot \epsilon))}$, $\delta = (\lambda \cdot \epsilon)^{O(1/(\lambda \cdot \epsilon))}$, and $\alpha = \epsilon^2$ [24, 18, 11]. This result provides a framework for solving dynamic $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate matching, showing that it reduces to implementing \mathbb{A}_{weak} for a fully dynamic graph. In the following, we show a reduction with improved parameters $q = 1/\lambda \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$, $\delta = \text{poly}(\epsilon)$. All other parameters and the number of instances of Problem 1 remain the same.

We say an algorithm for Problem 1 has amortized update time T if the algorithm’s running time is at most $i \cdot T$ for answering all queries associated with the first i edge updates. We allow this algorithm to have $n \text{ poly } \log n$ preprocessing time.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ be a parameter. There exist polynomials $f(\epsilon)$ and $g(\epsilon)$ of ϵ such that the following holds for all $\lambda \in (0, 1]$. Suppose that there is an algorithm \mathbb{A} for Problem 1 parameterized by λ and $q = \frac{1}{\lambda \cdot f(\epsilon)}$, $\delta = g(\epsilon)$, $\alpha = \epsilon^2$, and with high probability, \mathbb{A} takes $\mathcal{T}(n, m, q, \lambda, \delta, \alpha)$ amortized time to answer all queries. Then, there is an algorithm that, with high probability, maintains a $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate matching in a n -vertex fully dynamic graph with $\mathcal{T}(n, m, q, \lambda, \delta, \alpha) \cdot \text{poly}(\log(n)/\epsilon)$ amortized update time.*

Proof. The proof of this theorem is a simple adaptation of the proof of [11, Theorem 1]. It directly follows by using Theorem 6.2 to replace [11, Proposition 2.2] in their proof, so that the resulting time complexity has a polynomial dependence on $1/\epsilon$. □

7.3 Dynamic matching via ordered Ruzsa-Szemerédi graphs

[11] had a dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching algorithm based on its connection with *ordered Ruzsa-Szemerédi (ORS) graphs*. Their result is as follows.

Definition 7.2 (Ordered Ruzsa-Szemerédi Graphs [18]). *A graph $G = (V, E)$ is called an (r, t) -ORS graph if its edges can be partitioned into an ordered set of t matchings M_1, M_2, \dots, M_t each of size r , such that for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, the matching M_i is an induced matching in the subgraph of G on $M_i \cup M_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup M_t$.*

We define $ORS(n, r)$ as the largest choice of t such that an n -vertex (r, t) -ORS graph exists.

Lemma 7.3 ([11]). *There exists an absolute constant $c \geq 1$ such that the following holds. For any $k \geq 1$, there is an algorithm $\mathbb{A}_k(n, m, q, \lambda, \delta, \alpha)$ for [Problem 1](#) that with high probability takes*

$$O\left((2q)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{1/k+1} \cdot ORS(n, \lambda \cdot \delta n/2)^{1-1/(k+1)} \cdot n^{6\lambda} \cdot (\log(n)/\delta)^c\right),$$

amortized time over the updates to answer all given queries. The algorithm works as long as $\lambda < (1/12)^k$ and $\alpha \geq \lambda \cdot \delta$.

We obtain the following by combining [Theorem 7.1](#) and [Lemma 7.3](#).

Theorem 7.4. *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ be a given parameter, $k \geq 1$ be any integer. There exists an algorithm for maintaining a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching in a fully dynamic n -vertex graph that starts empty with amortized update time of*

$$O\left(n^{1/(k+1)} \cdot ORS\left(n, \frac{\text{poly } \epsilon}{15^k} \cdot n\right)^{1-1/(k+1)} \cdot n^{10/15^k}\right) \cdot \epsilon^{-O(k)}$$

The guarantees of this algorithm hold with high probability even against an adaptive adversary.

Proof. Let $f(\epsilon), g(\epsilon)$ be polynomials defined in [Theorem 7.1](#). Let $a, b > 0$ be constants such that $f(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon^a$ and $g(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon^b$ for $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}$. We choose the parameters

$$q = \frac{1}{\lambda f(\epsilon)} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda \epsilon^a}, \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{15^k}, \quad \delta = g(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon^b, \quad \alpha = \epsilon^2.$$

(As required in [Lemma 7.3](#), $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{12^k}$ and $\alpha \geq \lambda \delta$ because $\delta = \epsilon^{107}$ in our proof of [Theorem 6.2](#).) By [Lemma 7.3](#), there is an algorithm for [Problem 1](#) with the set of parameters running in an amortized update time of

$$\begin{aligned} & O\left((2q)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{1/(k+1)} \cdot ORS(n, \lambda \cdot \delta n/2)^{1-1/(k+1)} \cdot n^{6\lambda} \cdot (\log(n)/\delta)^c\right) \\ &= O\left(\left(\frac{2 \cdot 15^k}{\epsilon^a}\right)^{k-1} \cdot n^{1/(k+1)} \cdot ORS\left(n, \frac{2\epsilon^b}{15^k}\right)^{1-1/(k+1)} \cdot n^{6/15^k} \cdot (\log(n)/\epsilon^b)^c\right), \\ &= O\left(n^{1/(k+1)} \cdot ORS\left(n, \frac{\text{poly } \epsilon}{15^k} \cdot n\right)^{1-1/(k+1)} \cdot n^{10/15^k}\right) \cdot \epsilon^{-O(k)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $m/n \leq n$ and $\log^c n \leq n^{4/15^k}$. This completes the proof. \square

[Theorem 7.4](#) improves [11]'s result by reducing the dependence in time complexity on ϵ , from $\epsilon^{-O(k/\epsilon)}$ to $\epsilon^{-O(k)}$. The dependence is polynomial for any fixed k . Also, the dependence in the $ORS(\cdot, \cdot)$ term is improved from $ORS\left(n, \frac{1}{15^k} \cdot \epsilon^{O(1/\epsilon)} \cdot n\right)$ to $ORS\left(n, \frac{1}{15^k} \cdot \text{poly}(\epsilon) \cdot n\right)$.

7.4 Dynamic approximate matching via online matrix-vector multiplication

[63] showed new algorithms and hardness results for dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -matching when the input graph is bipartite. The following shows that their results can be extended to general graphs using the new framework. Liu's results are based on the connection between dynamic bipartite matching and the online matrix-vector problem (OMv), which we present as follows.

Definition 7.5 (OMv problem). *In the OMv problem, an algorithm is given a Boolean matrix $M \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$. After preprocessing, the algorithm receives an online sequence of query vectors $v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(n)} \in \{0, 1\}^n$. After receiving $v^{(i)}$, the algorithm must respond the vector $Mv^{(i)}$.*

Definition 7.6 (Dynamic approximate OMv). *In the $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate dynamic OMv problem, an algorithm is given a matrix $M \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, initially 0. Then, it responds to the following:*

- *UPDATE*(i, j, b): set $M_{ij} = b$.
- *QUERY*(v): output a vector $w \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with $d(Mv, w) \leq \lambda n$.

Based on our framework (Problem 1 and Theorem 7.1), to obtain algorithms for dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching, it suffices to describe how to handle the updates and queries in Problem 1. In our algorithms in this section, we handle the queries by implementing \mathbb{A}_{weak} (Definition 6.1), in which the parameter λ is fixed as a constant.

7.4.1 Connection between dynamic approximate OMv and dynamic approximate matching

This section aims to extend the following theorem to general graphs.

Theorem 7.7 ([63, Theorem 2]). *There is an algorithm solving dynamic $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate OMv with $\lambda = n^{-\sigma}$ with amortized $n^{1-\sigma}$ for UPDATE, and $n^{2-\sigma}$ time for QUERY, for some $\sigma > 0$ against adaptive adversaries, if and only if there is a randomized algorithm that maintains a $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate dynamic matching with amortized time $n^{1-c} \text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ in a bipartite graph, for some $c > 0$ against adaptive adversaries.*

Since dynamic bipartite matching is a special case of dynamic matching, the if-direction of Theorem 7.7 holds even on general graphs. To generalize the only-if direction, we present an algorithm for dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching that assumes access to a dynamic $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate OMv algorithm.

Algorithm description. Assume that there is an algorithm \mathbb{A}_{OMv} for $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate dynamic matrix-vector for some $\lambda = n^{-\sigma}$ with update time $\mathcal{T} = n^{1-\sigma}$ and query time $n\mathcal{T} = n^{2-\sigma}$. Based on our framework (Problem 1 and Theorem 7.1), it suffices to describe how to handle the update chunks and queries. In addition to G , we maintain its corresponding graph B as defined in Definition 6.3. We remark that B is used here for a different purpose, which is unrelated to our semi-streaming algorithm. For a vertex subset $S \subseteq V$, let S^+ (resp. S^-) stands for $\{v^+ \mid v \in S\}$ (resp. $\{v^- \mid v \in S\}$). The graph B satisfies the following.

Lemma 7.8. *For any vertex subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, we have $\mu(G[S]) \leq \mu(B[S^+ \cup S^-])$. In addition, any matching M in $B[S^+ \cup S^-]$ can be transformed in $O(n)$ time into a matching in $G[S]$ of size at least $|M|/6$.*

Proof. For any matching M in G , the edge set $\{(u^+, v^-) \mid (u, v) \in M\}$ is a matching in B . Hence, $\mu(B) \geq \mu(G)$.

Let M_B be a matching in B . We can construct a subset of edges $X = \{(u, v) \mid (u^+, v^-) \in M_B\} \cup \{(u, v) \mid (u^-, v^+) \in M_B\}$ in G . Note that every vertex has degree at most 2 in X ; that is, each connected component is either a path or a cycle. We can construct a matching M_X by picking every other edge in the paths and cycles formed by X . It is not hard to see that $|M_X| \geq |X|/3$. Since each edge in X corresponds to at most 2 edges in M_B , we have $|X| \geq |M_B|/2$. Therefore, we can transform M_B into the matching M_X , whose size is at least $|M_B|/6$. Since M_B contains $O(n)$ edges, the transformation can be done in $O(n)$ time. This completes the proof. \square

We use \mathbb{A}_{OMv} to maintain the adjacency matrix N_B of B . That is, N_B is initially empty, and whenever there is an edge update (u, v) on G , we invoke the UPDATE operation to change entries for (u^+, v^-) and (v^+, u^-) .

To handle queries, we implement \mathbb{A}_{weak} using a lemma from [63], which is for finding matchings in induced subgraphs of a bipartite graph.

Lemma 7.9 ([63, Lemma 2.12]). *Assume that we have access to an algorithm for dynamic $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate OMv that maintains the adjacency matrix of a bipartite graph $B = (V_B = L \cup R, E_B)$ with query time $n\mathcal{T}$. Then, there is a randomized algorithm that on vertex subsets $S_1 \subseteq L, S_2 \subseteq R$, returns a $(2, \tilde{O}(D\lambda n))$ -approximate matching of $B[S_1 \cup S_2]$ in $\tilde{O}(n^2/D + Dn\mathcal{T})$ time for any parameter D , with high probability.*

Remark 4. The algorithm in [63, Lemma 2.12] actually returns a matching M in $G'[A \cup B]$ such that it is almost maximal; i.e., at most $\tilde{O}(D\lambda n)$ edges in G' are not adjacent to any edge in M . Since a maximal matching is a 2-approximate matching, the returned matching is also a $(2, \tilde{O}(D\lambda n))$ -approximation.

Our implementation of \mathbb{A}_{weak} is as follows. Recall that each query (S, δ) requires finding a matching of size $\lambda\delta n$ in $G[S]$ for some constant λ , assuming that $\mu(G[S]) \geq \delta n$. Upon receiving a query, we invoke the algorithm in Lemma 7.9 on B with $S_1 = S^+$, $S_2 = S^-$, and $D = n^{\sigma/2}$ to obtain a matching M_B . By Lemma 7.8, if $\mu(G[S]) \geq \delta n$, then $\mu(B[S^+ \cup S^-]) \geq \delta n$. Hence, the size of M_B is at least

$$\mu(B[S^+ \cup S^-])/2 - D\lambda n \geq \delta n/2 - n^{1-\sigma/2} \geq \delta n/4,$$

where the last inequality holds for a large enough n . By Lemma 7.8, M_B can be transformed into a matching M_G in $G[S]$ of size $\delta n/24$. Our implementation of \mathbb{A}_{weak} returns the matching M_G . Note that it satisfies Definition 6.1 with $\lambda = 1/24$.

Time complexity. For each edge update (for Problem 1), we spend $O(\log n)$ time to maintain G and B ; also, we invoke UPDATE of \mathbb{A}_{OMv} , which takes $O(n^{1-\sigma})$ amortized time. Therefore, each edge update is handled in $O(n^{1-\sigma} + \log n)$ amortized time.

For each query, computing S^+ and S^- takes $O(n)$ time. Then, we invoke Lemma 7.9 with $D = n^{\sigma/2}$, which takes $\tilde{O}(n^2/D + Dn\mathcal{T}) = \tilde{O}(n^{2-\sigma/2})$ time. By Lemma 7.8, the final matching M_G can be obtained in $O(n)$ time. Therefore, each query is handled in $\tilde{O}(n^{2-\sigma/2})$ time. Since there are $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ queries every $\Theta(\epsilon^2 n)$ edge updates, the amortized time for the queries is $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot \tilde{O}(n^{2-\sigma/2})/(\epsilon^2 n) = \tilde{O}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot n^{1-\sigma/2})$. Combining with the amortized time for handling updates (i.e. $O(n^{1-\sigma} + \log n)$), our algorithm for Problem 1 has an amortized update time of $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)n^{1-\sigma/2})$. By Theorem 7.1, this implies an algorithm for dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching with amortized update time $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)n^{1-\sigma/2})$. Hence, we obtain the following.

Theorem 7.10. *There is an algorithm solving dynamic $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate OMv with $\lambda = n^{-\sigma}$ with amortized $n^{1-\sigma}$ for UPDATE, and $n^{2-\sigma}$ time for QUERY, for some $\sigma > 0$ against adaptive adversaries, if and only if there is a randomized algorithm that maintains a $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate dynamic matching (in general graphs) with amortized time $\tilde{O}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)n^{1-\delta/2})$ against adaptive adversaries.*

Remark 5. As already mentioned in [11], the conditional lower bounds for dynamic approximate matching in Theorems 7.7 and 7.10 (which assume that dynamic $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate OMv is hard) do not rule out an algorithm that only runs in $n^{o(1)}$ -time when ϵ is a constant. Therefore, it is possible that the algorithm in Theorem 7.4 runs in $n^{o(1)}$ time while dynamic OMv is hard.

7.4.2 Faster algorithm for dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching in general graphs

Using Theorem 7.10, we can obtain an algorithm with $n/2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ amortized update time for dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching in general graphs. The algorithm is based on the following result. Define the *dynamic OMv problem* as the special case of dynamic $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate OMv (Definition 7.6) with $\lambda = 0$; i.e. the output vector Mv for each query must be computed without any approximation error.

Lemma 7.11 ([63, Corollary 2.14]). *There is a randomized algorithm for dynamic OMv against adaptive adversaries with amortized update time $n/2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ and query time $n^2/2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$.*

By letting $\sigma = \log_n(2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})})$, Lemma 7.11 can be equivalently rephrased as a dynamic OMv algorithm with amortized update time $n^{1-\sigma}$ and query time $n^{2-\sigma}$. Since the algorithm is exact, it is also a dynamic $(1 - \lambda)$ -approximate OMv algorithm, where $\lambda = n^{-\sigma}$. We obtain the following by combining this algorithm with Theorem 7.10.

Theorem 7.12. *There is a randomized algorithm that maintains a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching on a dynamic graph G in amortized $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot \frac{n}{2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}}$ update time against adaptive adversaries.*

7.4.3 Faster algorithm for offline dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching in general graph

This section presents a faster algorithm for the *offline dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching problem* in general graphs. The algorithm adapts [63]'s algorithm for offline dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching on bipartite graphs. The problem is the same as dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching problem, except that the algorithm receives the whole sequence of edge updates as the input. Therefore, our

framework (Problem 1) and Theorem 7.1 are still applicable. Furthermore, we can relax the problem as follows. Let G_i denote the graph G after the first $i - 1$ chunks of edge updates. Recall that in the reduction from dynamic matching to Problem 1 (see the proof of Theorem 7.1), each update chunk corresponds to a consecutive subsequence of edge updates, and each query corresponds to an invocation of \mathbb{A}_{weak} for computing an approximate matching in G_i . Since the edge updates are given offline, we can assume that all update chunks are given in the input; in addition, the computation for all G_i can be done simultaneously. (However, the queries for a fixed G_i are still given adaptively.) We divide the computation for all G_i into $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ iterations, where in the j -th iteration, we handle the j -th query for graphs G_1, G_2, \dots, G_t simultaneously; here, $t > 0$ is the number of chunks we handle simultaneously, which will be fixed later.

We need the following lemma to process the queries.

Lemma 7.13 ([63, Lemma 2.11]). *Let B_1, \dots, B_t be bipartite graphs on the same vertex set $V' = L \cup R$ such that B_i and B_1 differ in at most Γ edges. Let $X_i \subseteq L, Y_i \subseteq R$ for $i \in [t]$. There is a randomized algorithm that returns a maximal matching on each $B_i[X_i, Y_i]$ for $i \in [t]$ with high probability in total time*

$$\tilde{O}(t\Gamma + n^2t/D + D \cdot T(n, n/D, t)),$$

for any positive integer $D \leq n$.

As in Section 7.4.1, we maintain the bipartite graph B associated with G . Let B_i be the graph B after the first $i - 1$ chunks of edge updates. Note that all B_i -s are on the same vertex set $L \cup R$, where $L = V^+$ and $R = V^-$. Consider queries $(S_1, \delta), (S_2, \delta), \dots, (S_t, \delta)$, where the i -th query is for the graph G_i .

Lemma 7.14. *There is a randomized algorithm that returns a constant approximate matching on each $G_i[S_i]$ for $i \in [t]$ with high probability in total time*

$$\tilde{O}(t\Gamma + n^2t/D + D \cdot T(n, n/D, t)),$$

for any positive integer $D \leq n$.

Proof. We repeat the argument in the proof of Theorem 7.10 for this lemma. That is, we first invoke Lemma 7.13, with $X_i = S_i^+$ and $Y_i = S_i^-$ for all i , to find maximal matching for each $B_i[X_i \cup Y_i]$. Let M_i be the returned matching for B_i . Since M_i is maximal, it is a 2-approximate matching in $B_i[X_i \cup Y_i]$. Using Lemma 7.8, each M_i is transformed into a matching M'_i in $G_i[S_i]$. Since M_i is a 2-approximate matching, it follows from Lemma 7.8 that M'_i is a 12-approximate matching in $G_i[S_i]$.

The time complexity is analyzed as follows. The computation of $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2), \dots, (X_t, Y_t)$ takes $O(tn)$ time. Invoking Lemma 7.13 requires $\tilde{O}(t\Gamma + n^2t/D + D \cdot T(n, n/D, t))$ time. Transforming all M_i -s to M'_i -s takes $O(tn)$ time. Since the parameter $D \leq n$, $tn = O(tn^2)$. Hence, the overall time complexity is $\tilde{O}(t\Gamma + n^2t/D + D \cdot T(n, n/D, t))$. This completes the proof. \square

Since there are $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ queries for each G_i , by Lemma 7.14, we can handle all queries for G_1, G_2, \dots, G_t in $\tilde{O}(t\Gamma + n^2t/D + D \cdot T(n, n/D, t)) \cdot \text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ time. Let $t = n^x$ and $D = n^y$ for some $x, y \in [0, 1]$ chosen later. The amortized time complexity, over $\Gamma = t \cdot \Theta(\epsilon^{2n})$ edge updates, is

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{O}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot (t\Gamma + n^2t/D + D \cdot T(n, n/D, t))/(tn)) \\ &= \tilde{O}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot (t + n/D + D \cdot T(n, n/D, t))/(tn)) \\ &= \tilde{O}(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot (n^x + n^{1-y} + n^{y-1-x} \cdot T(n, n^{1-y}, n^x))). \end{aligned}$$

For the choices $x = 0.579, y = 0.421$, the amortized runtime is $O(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot n^{0.58})$. (This choice of (x, y) is found by [63].)

Theorem 7.15. *There is a randomized algorithm that given an offline sequence of edge insertions and deletions to an n -vertex graph (not necessarily bipartite), maintains a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching in amortized $O(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon) \cdot n^{0.58})$ time with high probability.*

Acknowledgments

We are highly grateful to Sepehr Assadi for initiating this project. This work is supported by NSF Faculty Early Career Development Program No. 2340048. Part of this work was conducted while S.M. was visiting the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing.

References

- [1] Mohamad Ahmadi, Fabian Kuhn, and Rotem Oshman. Distributed approximate maximum matching in the congest model. In *32nd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2018)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [2] Kook Jin Ahn and Sudipto Guha. Laminar families and metric embeddings: Non-bipartite maximum matching problem in the semi-streaming model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1104.4058*, 2011.
- [3] Kook Jin Ahn and Sudipto Guha. Linear programming in the semi-streaming model with application to the maximum matching problem. *Information and Computation*, 222:59–79, 2013.
- [4] Kook Jin Ahn and Sudipto Guha. Access to data and number of iterations: Dual primal algorithms for maximum matching under resource constraints. *ACM Transactions on Parallel Computing (TOPC)*, 4(4):1–40, 2018.
- [5] Alexandr Andoni, Zhao Song, Clifford Stein, Zhengyu Wang, and Peilin Zhong. Parallel graph connectivity in log diameter rounds. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 674–685. IEEE, 2018.
- [6] Sepehr Assadi. A simple $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximation semi-streaming algorithm for maximum (weighted) matching. In *Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA)*, pages 337–354. SIAM, 2024.
- [7] Sepehr Assadi, MohammadHossein Bateni, Aaron Bernstein, Vahab Mirrokni, and Cliff Stein. Coresets meet EDCS: algorithms for matching and vertex cover on massive graphs. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1616–1635. SIAM, 2019.
- [8] Sepehr Assadi and Soheil Behnezhad. Beating two-thirds for random-order streaming matching. In *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP*, volume 198 of *LIPICs*, pages 19:1–19:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2021.19>, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2021.19.
- [9] Sepehr Assadi, Soheil Behnezhad, Sanjeev Khanna, and Huan Li. On regularity lemma and barriers in streaming and dynamic matching. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC*, pages 131–144. ACM, 2023. doi:10.1145/3564246.3585110.
- [10] Sepehr Assadi, Aaron Bernstein, and Aditi Dudeja. Decremental matching in general graphs. In *49th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP*, volume 229 of *LIPICs*, pages 11:1–11:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2022.11.
- [11] Sepehr Assadi, Sanjeev Khanna, and Peter Kiss. Improved bounds for fully dynamic matching via ordered Ruzsa-Szemerédi graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2971–2990. SIAM, 2025.
- [12] Sepehr Assadi, Sanjeev Khanna, and Yang Li. On estimating maximum matching size in graph streams. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 1723–1742. SIAM, 2017. doi:10.1137/1.9781611974782.113.
- [13] Sepehr Assadi, Sanjeev Khanna, Yang Li, and Grigory Yaroslavtsev. Maximum matchings in dynamic graph streams and the simultaneous communication model. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 1345–1364. SIAM, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch93>, doi:10.1137/1.9781611974331.CH93.
- [14] Sepehr Assadi, S Cliff Liu, and Robert E Tarjan. An auction algorithm for bipartite matching in streaming and massively parallel computation models. In *Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA)*, pages 165–171. SIAM, 2021.
- [15] Sepehr Assadi and Janani Sundaresan. Hidden permutations to the rescue: Multi-pass streaming lower bounds for approximate matchings. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS*, pages 909–932. IEEE, 2023. doi:10.1109/FOCS57990.2023.00058.

- [16] Reuven Bar-Yehuda, Keren Censor-Hillel, Mohsen Ghaffari, and Gregory Schwartzman. Distributed approximation of maximum independent set and maximum matching. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 165–174, 2017.
- [17] Soheil Behnezhad, Sebastian Brandt, Mahsa Derakhshan, Manuela Fischer, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Richard M. Karp, and Jara Uitto. Massively parallel computation of matching and mis in sparse graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '19, page 481–490, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:[10.1145/3293611.3331609](https://doi.org/10.1145/3293611.3331609).
- [18] Soheil Behnezhad and Alma Ghafari. Fully Dynamic Matching and Ordered Ruzsa-Szemerédi Graphs. In *2024 IEEE 65th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 314–327, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, October 2024. IEEE Computer Society. URL: <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/FOCS61266.2024.00027>, doi:[10.1109/FOCS61266.2024.00027](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS61266.2024.00027).
- [19] Soheil Behnezhad, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and David G Harris. Exponentially faster massively parallel maximal matching. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 1637–1649. IEEE, 2019.
- [20] Soheil Behnezhad, Mohammad Roghani, and Aviad Rubinfeld. Sublinear time algorithms and complexity of approximate maximum matching. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC*, pages 267–280. ACM, 2023. doi:[10.1145/3564246.3585231](https://doi.org/10.1145/3564246.3585231).
- [21] Aaron Bernstein, Jiale Chen, Aditi Dudeja, Zachary Langley, Aaron Sidford, and Ta-Wei Tu. Matching composition and efficient weight reduction in dynamic matching. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 2991–3028, 2025. URL: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611978322.97>, arXiv:<https://epubs.siam.org/doi/pdf/10.1137/1.9781611978322.97>, doi:[10.1137/1.9781611978322.97](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611978322.97).
- [22] Aaron Bernstein, Aditi Dudeja, and Zachary Langley. A framework for dynamic matching in weighted graphs. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2021, page 668–681, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:[10.1145/3406325.3451113](https://doi.org/10.1145/3406325.3451113).
- [23] Aaron Bernstein, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Deterministic decremental reachability, scc, and shortest paths via directed expanders and congestion balancing. In *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS*, pages 1123–1134. IEEE, 2020. doi:[10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00108](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00108).
- [24] Sayan Bhattacharya, Peter Kiss, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching size in truly sublinear update time. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS*, pages 1563–1588. IEEE, 2023. doi:[10.1109/FOCS57990.2023.00095](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS57990.2023.00095).
- [25] Joakim Blikstad and Peter Kiss. Incremental $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate dynamic matching in $o(\text{poly}(1/\epsilon))$ update time. In *31st Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA*, volume 274 of *LIPICs*, pages 22:1–22:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.22>, doi:[10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.22](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2023.22).
- [26] Niv Buchbinder, Danny Segev, and Yevgeny Tkach. Online algorithms for maximum cardinality matching with edge arrivals. *Algorithmica*, 81(5):1781–1799, 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-018-0505-7>, doi:[10.1007/s00453-018-0505-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-018-0505-7).
- [27] Marc Bury and Chris Schwiegelshohn. Sublinear estimation of weighted matchings in dynamic data streams. In *Algorithms - ESA 2015 - 23rd Annual European Symposium, Proceedings*, volume 9294 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 263–274. Springer, 2015. doi:[10.1007/978-3-662-48350-3_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48350-3_23).
- [28] Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, and Sushant Sachdeva. Maximum flow and minimum-cost flow in almost-linear time. In *2022 IEEE 63rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 612–623. IEEE, 2022.

- [29] Lijie Chen, Gillat Kol, Dmitry Paramonov, Raghuvaran R. Saxena, Zhao Song, and Huacheng Yu. Almost optimal super-constant-pass streaming lower bounds for reachability. In *STOC '21: 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 570–583. ACM, 2021. doi:[10.1145/3406325.3451038](https://doi.org/10.1145/3406325.3451038).
- [30] Artur Czumaj, Jakub Łącki, Aleksander Mądry, Slobodan Mitrović, Krzysztof Onak, and Piotr Sankowski. Round compression for parallel matching algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 471–484, 2018.
- [31] Andrzej Czygrinow, Michał Hańćkowiak, and Edyta Szymańska. A fast distributed algorithm for approximating the maximum matching. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 252–263. Springer, 2004.
- [32] Jeffrey Dean and Sanjay Ghemawat. Mapreduce: simplified data processing on large clusters. *Communications of the ACM*, 51(1):107–113, 2008.
- [33] Laxman Dhulipala, Michael Dinitz, Jakub Łącki, and Slobodan Mitrović. Parallel set cover and hypergraph matching via uniform random sampling. In *38th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2024)*, pages 19–1. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024.
- [34] Ran Duan and Seth Pettie. Linear-time approximation for maximum weight matching. *J. ACM*, 61(1), jan 2014. doi:[10.1145/2529989](https://doi.org/10.1145/2529989).
- [35] Jack Edmonds. Maximum matching and a polyhedron with 0, 1-vertices. *Journal of research of the National Bureau of Standards B*, 69(125-130):55–56, 1965.
- [36] Jack Edmonds. Paths, trees, and flowers. *Canadian Journal of mathematics*, 17:449–467, 1965.
- [37] Hossein Esfandiari, MohammadTaghi Hajiaghayi, Vahid Liaghat, Morteza Monemizadeh, and Krzysztof Onak. Streaming algorithms for estimating the matching size in planar graphs and beyond. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(4):48:1–48:23, 2018. doi:[10.1145/3230819](https://doi.org/10.1145/3230819).
- [38] Joan Feigenbaum, Sampath Kannan, Andrew McGregor, Siddharth Suri, and Jian Zhang. On graph problems in a semi-streaming model. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 348(2-3):207–216, 2005. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2005.09.013>, doi:[10.1016/J.TCS.2005.09.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TCS.2005.09.013).
- [39] Manuela Fischer. Improved deterministic distributed matching via rounding. *Distributed Computing*, 33(3):279–291, 2020.
- [40] Manuela Fischer, Slobodan Mitrović, and Jara Uitto. Deterministic $(1+\epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching with $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)$ passes in the semi-streaming model and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2022, page 248–260. Association for Computing Machinery, 2022. doi:[10.1145/3519935.3520039](https://doi.org/10.1145/3519935.3520039).
- [41] Harold N Gabow. Data structures for weighted matching and nearest common ancestors with linking. In *Proceedings of the first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 434–443, 1990.
- [42] Buddhima Gamlath, Sagar Kale, Slobodan Mitrovic, and Ola Svensson. Weighted matchings via unweighted augmentations. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 491–500, 2019.
- [43] Mohsen Ghaffari, Themis Gouleakis, Christian Konrad, Slobodan Mitrović, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. Improved massively parallel computation algorithms for mis, matching, and vertex cover. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, PODC '18, page 129–138, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:[10.1145/3212734.3212743](https://doi.org/10.1145/3212734.3212743).
- [44] Mohsen Ghaffari and Christoph Grunau. Faster deterministic distributed mis and approximate matching. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1777–1790, 2023.

- [45] Mohsen Ghaffari, Christoph Grunau, and Ce Jin. Improved MPC Algorithms for MIS, Matching, and Coloring on Trees and Beyond. In Hagit Attiya, editor, *34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC 2020)*, volume 179 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 34:1–34:18, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2020. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. URL: <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/entities/document/10.4230/LIPIcs.DISC.2020.34>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.DISC.2020.34.
- [46] Mohsen Ghaffari, Christoph Grunau, and Slobodan Mitrović. Massively parallel algorithms for b-matching. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*, pages 35–44, 2022.
- [47] Mohsen Ghaffari and Jara Uitto. Sparsifying distributed algorithms with ramifications in massively parallel computation and centralized local computation. In Timothy M. Chan, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 1636–1653. SIAM, 2019. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975482.99.
- [48] Michael T Goodrich, Nodari Sitchinava, and Qin Zhang. Sorting, searching, and simulation in the mapreduce framework. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 374–383. Springer, 2011.
- [49] Fabrizio Grandoni, Stefano Leonardi, Piotr Sankowski, Chris Schwegelshohn, and Shay Solomon. $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate incremental matching in constant deterministic amortized time. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 1886–1898. SIAM, 2019. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975482.114.
- [50] Manoj Gupta and Richard Peng. Fully dynamic $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matchings. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 548–557. IEEE, 2013.
- [51] Venkatesan Guruswami and Krzysztof Onak. Superlinear lower bounds for multipass graph processing. *Algorithmica*, 76:654–683, 2016.
- [52] David G Harris. Distributed local approximation algorithms for maximum matching in graphs and hypergraphs. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 700–724. IEEE, 2019.
- [53] Monika Henzinger, Sebastian Krinninger, Danupon Nanongkai, and Thatchaphol Saranurak. Unifying and strengthening hardness for dynamic problems via the online matrix-vector multiplication conjecture. In *Proceedings of the forty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 21–30, 2015.
- [54] Shang-En Huang and Hsin-Hao Su. $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum weighted matching in distributed, parallel, and semi-streaming settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14425*, 2022.
- [55] Shang-En Huang and Hsin-Hao Su. $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum weighted matching in $\text{poly}(1/\epsilon, \log n)$ time in the distributed and parallel settings. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, pages 44–54, 2023.
- [56] Taisuke Izumi, Naoki Kitamura, and Yutaro Yamaguchi. A nearly linear-time distributed algorithm for exact maximum matching. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 4062–4082. SIAM, 2024.
- [57] Michael Kapralov. Better bounds for matchings in the streaming model. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1679–1697. SIAM, 2013.
- [58] Michael Kapralov. Space lower bounds for approximating maximum matching in the edge arrival model. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 1874–1893. SIAM, 2021. doi:10.1137/1.9781611976465.112.
- [59] Michael Kapralov, Sanjeev Khanna, and Madhu Sudan. Approximating matching size from random streams. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 734–751. SIAM, 2014. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973402.55.

- [60] Michael Kapralov, Slobodan Mitrovic, Ashkan Norouzi-Fard, and Jakab Tardos. Space efficient approximation to maximum matching size from uniform edge samples. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA*, pages 1753–1772. SIAM, 2020. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975994.107.
- [61] Howard Karloff, Siddharth Suri, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. A model of computation for mapreduce. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 938–948. SIAM, 2010.
- [62] Silvio Lattanzi, Benjamin Moseley, Siddharth Suri, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Filtering: a method for solving graph problems in mapreduce. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures*, pages 85–94, 2011.
- [63] Yang P. Liu. On Approximate Fully-Dynamic Matching and Online Matrix-Vector Multiplication . In *2024 IEEE 65th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 228–243, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, October 2024. IEEE Computer Society. URL: <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/FOCS61266.2024.00006>, doi:10.1109/FOCS61266.2024.00006.
- [64] Zvi Lotker, Boaz Patt-Shamir, and Seth Pettie. Improved distributed approximate matching. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 62(5):1–17, 2015.
- [65] Andrew McGregor. Finding graph matchings in data streams. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 170–181. Springer, 2005.
- [66] Silvio Micali and Vijay V Vazirani. An $o(|V| \log |E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs. In *21st Annual symposium on foundations of computer science (Sfcs 1980)*, pages 17–27. IEEE, 1980.
- [67] Slobodan Mitrović, Anish Mukherjee, Piotr Sankowski, and Wen-Horng Sheu. Toward optimal semi-streaming algorithm for $1 + \varepsilon$ -approximate maximum matching. In *under submission*, page 248–260, 2024.
- [68] Michal Parnas and Dana Ron. Approximating the minimum vertex cover in sublinear time and a connection to distributed algorithms. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 381(1-3):183–196, 2007.
- [69] Sriram V. Pemmaraju. Equitable coloring extends chernoff-hoeffding bounds. In Michel Goemans, Klaus Jansen, José D. P. Rolim, and Luca Trevisan, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 285–296, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [70] Daniel Stubbs and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Metatheorems for dynamic weighted matching. In *8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2017)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2017.
- [71] Sumedh Tirodkar. Deterministic algorithms for maximum matching on general graphs in the semi-streaming model. In *38th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2018)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.
- [72] Jan Van Den Brand, Li Chen, Rasmus Kyng, Yang P Liu, Richard Peng, Maximilian Probst Gutenberg, Sushant Sachdeva, and Aaron Sidford. A deterministic almost-linear time algorithm for minimum-cost flow. In *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 503–514. IEEE, 2023.
- [73] Da Wei Zheng and Monika Henzinger. Multiplicative auction algorithm for approximate maximum weight bipartite matching. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization - 24th International Conference, IPCO Proceedings*, volume 13904 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 453–465. Springer, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-32726-1_32.

A Implementation in MPC and CONGEST

Once equipped with [Theorem 1.1](#), our MPC and CONGEST results follow almost directly. Next, we provide a few details on implementing those in MPC and CONGEST.

Our main analysis of the framework concerns the number of invocations to a $\Theta(1)$ -approximate MCM oracle. However, after the oracle returns a matching, a few updates and “cleaning” steps need to be performed. Those steps include extending alternating paths, contracting blossoms, removing specific vertices from the graph, and simultaneously propagating information throughout many disjoint components. As long as each component has size that fits in the memory of a machine in MPC, those operations can be performed in $O(1)$ time. We refer a reader to [\[5\]](#) for details on implementing such a procedure. This yields the following corollary of [Theorem 1.1](#).

Corollary A.1. *Given a graph G on n vertices and m edges, let $T(n, m)$ be the number of rounds needed to compute a $\Theta(1)$ -approximate MCM in MPC. Then, there exists an algorithm that computes a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation of MCM in $O(T(n, m) \cdot \log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon^7)$ many rounds.*

Implementing the aforementioned clean-up procedures is slightly more involved in CONGEST. Nevertheless, if a component has size k , necessary methods can be implemented in $O(k)$ CONGEST rounds. To see why it is the case, observe first that all the vertices belonging to a structure of α can send their small messages to α in $O(k)$ rounds. Then, after aggregating the received information, α can propagate necessary information to all the other vertices in its structure. Given that the maximum component size our algorithm ensures is $1/\epsilon^3$, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary A.2. *Given a graph G on n vertices and m edges, let $T(n, m)$ be the number of rounds needed to compute a $\Theta(1)$ -approximate MCM in CONGEST. Then, there exists an algorithm that computes a $1 + \epsilon$ approximation of CONGEST in $O(T(n, m) \cdot \log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon^{10})$ many rounds.*

B Correctness of the simulation

In this section, we prove the correctness of our simulation. More precisely, we show that the procedures CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT and EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH in [\[67\]](#)’s algorithm (see [Algorithm 1](#) and [Algorithm 2](#)) can be replaced by the corresponding simulated versions in [Section 5](#), and the resulting algorithm still outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate maximum matching. We present the missing proofs in [Appendix B.1](#). An overview of the correctness proof is given in [Appendix B.2](#). Our proofs in this section very closely follow those in [\[67\]](#).

B.1 Missing proofs in [Section 5.5](#)

Recall that the analysis for [Algorithm 5](#) has three parts. In the following, we present the proof of the first two parts.

Part 1. Recall that Part 1 is to show that every OVERTAKE operation in [Line 5](#) of [Algorithm 5](#) is performed on an s -feasible (and therefore type 3) arc. We first establish a property of s -feasible arcs.

Lemma B.1. *Let $(a', b'), (c', d') \in G'$ be two s -feasible arcs that do not share endpoints. Suppose that we modify G' by performing OVERTAKE on (a', b') . Then, (c', d') remains s -feasible after the modification.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3, \mathcal{S}_4$ be, respectively, the structures containing a', b', c', d' before the OVERTAKE operation; if b' (resp. d') is an unvisited vertex, we define \mathcal{S}_2 (resp. \mathcal{S}_4) as the single vertex b' (resp. d'). We first prove the following claim.

Claim B.2. *Before the overtaking operation, $\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \mathcal{S}_3$, and b' were not on the active path of \mathcal{S}_3 .*

Proof. Before the overtaking operation, (a', b') and (c', d') were of type 3. Hence, a' and c' must be the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_3 , respectively. Since $(a', b'), (c', d')$ do not share endpoints, $a' \neq c'$ and thus $\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \mathcal{S}_3$. In addition, since $\ell(a') = \ell(c') = s$, b' cannot be on the active path of \mathcal{S}_3 . This completes the proof. We remark that it is possible for $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_2$ (i.e., a' is overtaking a vertex in its own structure) $\mathcal{S}_2 = \mathcal{S}_3$ (i.e., a' is overtaking the structure of c') or $\mathcal{S}_2 = \mathcal{S}_4$ (i.e., a' and c' are overtaking from the same structure). \square

We now show that (c', d') remains s -feasible after the operation. (See [Definition 5.7](#) and [Definition 5.2](#) for the conditions.) The OVERTAKE operation on (a', b') consists of the following steps (see [Section 4.5.3](#) for details):

- Modify the alternating trees of \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 by re-assigning the parent of b' as a' .
- Update the label of the matched edge incident to b' .
- Change the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 .
- Mark \mathcal{S}_1 as extended; mark \mathcal{S}_2 as overtaken.

Since the overtaken node b' was not on the active path of \mathcal{S}_3 (by [Claim B.2](#)), all nodes on the active path of \mathcal{S}_3 is unchanged. Since $b' \neq d'$, $\ell(d')$ is also unchanged. Hence, c' is still the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_3 , and it still holds that $\ell(c') = s$ and $\ell(d') > s$. Since $\mathcal{S}_1 \neq \mathcal{S}_3$ (by [Claim B.2](#)), \mathcal{S}_3 is not marked as extended. Clearly, d' is still an inner or unvisited vertex and \mathcal{S}_3 is not on-hold. This shows that (c', d') is still s -feasible. \square

Let $M' = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k\}$ be the matching computed in [Line 3](#). Since M' is a matching, e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k do not share endpoints. By [Lemma B.1](#), after we perform OVERTAKE on e_1 , all other arcs in M' remain s -feasible. By induction, where we repeat the above argument in the inductive step, we show that e_i, e_2, \dots, e_k are s -feasible after we perform OVERTAKE on e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{i-1} , for all $i \geq 1$. Therefore, every operation in [Line 5](#) of [Algorithm 5](#) is performed on an s -feasible arc.

Part 2. Recall that the second part is to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.9. *After running [Algorithm 5](#), there are no arcs of type 1, 2, or 3 in G except the contaminated ones.*

Proof. Recall that we invoke the simulation of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT after completing the last stage. Hence, every G -arc of type 1 or 2 is marked as contaminated. Suppose that there is a non-contaminated arc $(u, v) \in G$ that is of type 3. Let $u' = \Omega(u)$, $v' = \Omega(v)$, and $s = \ell(u')$. In the following, we show that (u, v) is already a type 3 arc at the end of stage s , which contradicts the assumption because (u, v) should have been marked as contaminated at the end of stage s .

Since (u, v) is of type 3, \mathcal{S}_u is not marked as extended or on-hold. Hence, during the simulation, u is not overtaken by any structure. (That is, it stays in the structure of the same free vertex. However, it is possible that this structure is overtaken but the operation did not overtake u). In addition, \mathcal{S}_u did not overtake, and we did not apply CONTRACT or AUGMENT on \mathcal{S}_u . Therefore, **at the end of stage s , u' is already the working vertex of \mathcal{S}_u , and $\ell(u') = s$.**

Since v' is not an outer vertex at the end of the simulation, it is not an outer vertex at the end of s . Since the label of v' can only decrease during the simulation, $\ell(v') > s + 1$ at the end of s . By [Definition 5.2](#), (u, v) was a type 3 arc at the end of stage s . This completes the proof. \square

B.2 Key ingredience of the correctness proof

The correctness proof of [\[67\]](#)'s algorithm consists of two key ingredients:

- (I1) Their algorithm does not miss any short augmentation. That is, if one phase of the algorithm is left to run indefinitely and no structure is on hold, then at some point, the remaining graph will have no short augmentation left.
- (I2) If there are at least $4h\ell_{\max}|M|$ vertex-disjoint augmenting paths in G , then the size of M is increased by a factor of $1 + \frac{h\ell_{\max}}{\Delta_h}$ in this phase.

(I2) shows that the algorithm outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate matching after running certain numbers of scales and phases. (I1) highlights the intuition behind the algorithm and is used to prove (I2).

To prove the correctness, we show that (I1) and (I2) also hold for our simulation, except for a small difference caused by contaminated arcs.

Unless otherwise stated, all lemmas, corollaries, and theorems in this section refer to our simulation, in which CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT and EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH are replaced with [Algorithm 4](#) and [Algorithm 5](#).

B.3 Proof of the first ingredient

The modified version of (I1) is as follows.

Definition B.3 (Critical arc and vertex). *Recall that the active path of a structure is a path in G' . We say a non-blossom arc $(u, v) \in G$ is critical if the arc $(\Omega(u), \Omega(v)) \in G'$ is active. In particular, all blossom arcs in a structure are not critical, even if they are in an active blossom. We say a free vertex $\alpha \in G$ is critical if S_α is active.*

Theorem B.4 (No short augmenting paths is missed). *At the beginning of each pass-bundle, the following holds. Let $P = (\alpha, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, \beta)$ be an augmenting path in G such that no vertex in P is removed in this phase and $k \leq \ell_{\max}$. At least one of the following holds: α is critical, P contains a critical arc, or P contains a contaminated arc.*

Properties of a phase. Our analysis of [Theorem B.4](#) relies on the following three simple properties.

Corollary B.5. *After the execution of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT in each pass-bundle, there are no arcs of type 1, 2, or 3 in G except the contaminated ones.*

The following lemma is proven by [\[67\]](#). It is not hard to check that their argument is not affected by contaminated arcs.

Lemma B.6 (Outer vertex has been a working one, [\[67\]](#)). *Consider a pass-bundle τ . Suppose that G' contains an outer vertex v' at the beginning of τ . Then, there exists a pass-bundle $\tau' \leq \tau$ such that v' is the working vertex at the beginning of τ' .*

Invariant B.7. *At the beginning of each pass-bundle, no arc in G connects two outer vertices, unless the arc is contaminated.*

Lemma B.8. *Invariant B.7 holds.*

[Corollary B.5](#) is a direct consequence of [Lemma 5.9](#). Proofs of [Lemma B.8](#) are deferred to [Appendix B.3.2](#).

We remark that [Invariant B.7](#) only holds at the beginning of each pass-bundle. During the execution of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH, some structures may include new unvisited vertices or contract a blossom in the structure. These operations create new outer vertices that may be adjacent to existing ones.

The contaminated arcs can cause some augmenting paths to be missed. We ensure that (I2) holds by running more pass-bundles

B.3.1 No short augmentation is missed (Proof of [Theorem B.4](#))

For a pass-bundle τ , we use Ω^τ and ℓ^τ to denote, respectively, the set of blossoms and labels at the beginning of τ .

Consider a fixed phase and a pass-bundle τ in the phase. Suppose, toward a contradiction, that at the beginning of τ , there exists an augmenting path $P = (\alpha, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k, \beta)$ in G , where $k \leq \ell_{\max}$, such that:

- (i) none of the vertices in P is removed in the phase,
- (ii) α and all arcs in P are not critical, and
- (iii) all arcs in P are not contaminated.

Recall that for an arc to be critical, by [Definition B.3](#), it has to be non-blossom. Hence, some blossom arcs of P may be inside of an active blossom at this moment. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, let u_i and v_i be the tail and head of a_i , respectively; that is, $a_i = (u_i, v_i)$. Let $v_0 = \alpha$. Two cases are considered:

Case 1: There exists an index q such that $\ell^\tau(a_q) > q$. Let q be the smallest index such that $\ell^\tau(a_q) > q$. Since $\ell^\tau(a_q) > q > 0$, a_q must be a non-blossom arc. Let p be the smallest index such that $p < q$ and a_{p+1}, \dots, a_{q-1} are blossom arcs.

We first show that $\Omega(v_p)$ is an outer vertex, and all vertices in the path $(v_p, a_{p+1}, a_{p+2}, \dots, a_{q-1})$ are in the same inactive blossom. If $p = 0$, then $v_p = \alpha$ and thus $\Omega(v_p)$ is an outer vertex. Otherwise, since $\ell^\tau(a_p) \leq p \leq \ell_{\max}$, a_p is visited. Hence, a_p is a non-blossom arc contained in a structure, which also implies that $\Omega(v_p)$ is an outer vertex. For $p < i < q$, since a_i is a blossom arc, $\Omega(u_i)$ and $\Omega(v_i)$ are

both outer vertices. Hence, by [Invariant B.7](#), all vertices in the path $(v_p, a_{p+1}, a_{p+2}, \dots, a_{q-1})$ must be in the same blossom at the beginning of τ . (Here, we can apply [Invariant B.7](#) because all arcs in P are non-contaminated.) Denote this blossom by B . For $p > 0$, since a_p is non-critical at the beginning of τ , we have that B is inactive at the beginning of τ . For $p = 0$, since $v_p = \alpha$ is non-critical, we also have B is inactive at the beginning of τ .

Let $\tau' \leq \tau$ be the last pass-bundle such that B is the working vertex of some structure S_γ at the beginning of τ' . By [Lemma B.6](#), τ' exists, and since B is inactive at the beginning of τ , we further know that $\tau' < \tau$. In τ' , S_γ backtracks from B , and B remains inactive until at least the beginning of τ . Hence, if $p > 0$, $\ell(a_p)$ is not updated between the end of τ' and the beginning of τ . Therefore, $\ell^{\tau'}(a_p) = \ell^\tau(a_p) \leq p$.

By definition of BACKTRACK-STUCK-STRUCTURES ([Section 4.8](#)), S_γ is not marked as on hold or modified in τ' . Hence, $\Omega(v_{q-1}) = B$ is the working vertex of S_γ during the whole pass-bundle τ' . Consider the moment when we finish the execution of CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT in τ' . By [Corollary B.5](#), the path P cannot contain any arc of type 1, 2, or 3 at this moment. We now show that this leads to a contradiction. First, we claim that $\overleftarrow{a_q}$ cannot be in any structure. (Recall that $\overleftarrow{a_q}$ is the reverse direction of a_q .) If $\overleftarrow{a_q}$ is in any structure, then $\Omega(u_q)$ is an outer vertex. This implies that g is an arc of either type 1 or 2, a contradiction. Hence, $\overleftarrow{a_q}$ is not in any structure, and $\Omega(u_q)$ is either unvisited or an inner vertex. In addition, $\ell^{\tau'}(a_q) > q \geq \ell^{\tau'}(a_p) + 1$. (Here, for ease of notation, we define $\ell^{\tau'}(a_p) = 0$ if $p = 0$.) This again leads to a contradiction, because g is a type 3 arc (i.e. OVERTAKE should have been performed on g).

Case 2: For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ it holds $\ell^\tau(a_i) \leq i$. Let $p \leq k$ be the smallest index such that all vertices in $a_{p+1}, a_{p+2}, \dots, a_k$ are blossom arcs at the beginning of τ . Similar to Case 1, if $p = 0$, then $v_p = \alpha$; otherwise, a_p is a non-blossom arc with $\ell^\tau(a_p) \leq p \leq \ell_{\max}$. Hence, $\Omega(v_p)$ is an outer vertex.

For each $i > p$, since a_i is a blossom arc, $\Omega(u_i)$ and $\Omega(v_i)$ are both outer vertices. Hence, by [Invariant B.7](#), all vertices in the path $(v_p, a_{p+1}, a_{p+2}, \dots, a_k)$ must be in the same blossom at the beginning of τ . Denote this blossom by B . Since $\Omega^\tau(\beta)$ is the root of T'_β , it is also an outer vertex. That is, $\Omega^\tau(v_k)$ and $\Omega^\tau(\beta)$ are both outer vertices.

Since P contains an unmatched arc (v_k, β) , by [Invariant B.7](#), $\Omega^\tau(\beta) = \Omega^\tau(v_k) = B$. If $p = 0$, this leads to a contradiction because B contains two free vertices $v_p = \alpha$ and β . If $p > 0$, then $B = \Omega(\beta)$ is not a free vertex because it is adjacent to a non-blossom matched arc a_p , which is also a contradiction.

B.3.2 No arc between outer vertices (Proof of [Lemma B.8](#))

Suppose, by contradiction, that at the beginning of some pass-bundle τ , there is a non-contaminated arc $g' \in E(G')$ connecting two outer vertices u' and v' . Let $\tau_{u'} < \tau$ (resp. $\tau_{v'} < \tau$) be the first pass-bundle in which u' (resp. v') is added to a structure by either OVERTAKE or CONTRACT. Without loss of generality, assume that $\tau_{u'} \geq \tau_{v'}$. There are two cases:

1. u' is added to a structure during EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH (by either OVERTAKE or CONTRACT).
2. u' is added to a structure during CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT.

In the first case, by the proof of [Lemma B.6](#), we know that u' is a working vertex after the execution of EXTEND-ACTIVE-PATH. That is, g' is of type 1 or 2. This contradicts [Lemma 5.9](#).

In the second case, g' is of type 1 or 2 at the moment it is added to a structure. If it is not contracted or removed, it is still of type 1 or 2 after CONTRACT-AND-AUGMENT. This contradicts [Corollary B.5](#).

B.4 Proof of the second ingredient

[\[67\]](#) showed the following; their argument is correct even with contaminated arcs.

Lemma B.9 (Upper bound on the number of active structures, [\[67\]](#)). *Consider a fixed phase of a scale h . Let M be the matching at the beginning of the phase. Then, at the end of that phase, there are at most $h|M|$ active structures.*

The second ingredient is proven as follows.

Lemma B.10. *Consider a fixed phase in a scale h . Let M be the matching at the beginning of the phase. Let \mathcal{P}^* be the maximum set of disjoint M -augmenting ℓ_{\max} -paths in G . If $|\mathcal{P}^*| \geq 4h\ell_{\max}|M|$, then at the end of the phase the size of M is increased by a factor of at least $1 + \frac{h\ell_{\max}}{\Delta_h}$.*

Proof. Consider an augmenting path P in \mathcal{P}^* . By [Theorem B.4](#), at the end of the phase, one of the following must hold:

1. P contains a critical arc or critical vertex,
2. Some vertices in P are removed, or
3. P contains a contaminated arc.

Let \mathcal{P} be the set of disjoint M -augmenting paths found in this phase. In [\[67\]](#), it has been shown that there are at most $h|M| \cdot (\ell_{\max} + 1) + 2\Delta_h \cdot |\mathcal{P}|$ paths in \mathcal{P}^* containing a removed vertex, critical vertex, or critical arc.

We now bound the number of paths in \mathcal{P}^* containing a contaminated arc. By [Lemmas 5.6](#) and [5.11](#), the number of contaminated arcs marked in a pass-bundle is at most $4\epsilon^{17}|M|$. Since each phase has $\frac{72}{h\epsilon}$ pass-bundles, the total number of contaminated arcs in a phase is $288\epsilon^{16}|M|/h \leq 18432\epsilon^{14}|M| = \Theta(\epsilon^{14}|M|)$, where the inequality comes from $h \geq \frac{\epsilon^2}{64}$. For small enough ϵ , this number is at most $h|M|$ (recall that $h|M| = \Omega(\epsilon^2|M|)$).

Combine all above, we obtain $|\mathcal{P}^*| \leq h|M|(\ell_{\max} + 1) + h|M| + |\mathcal{P}| \cdot 2\Delta_h$. Assume that $|\mathcal{P}^*|$ contains more than $4h|M|\ell_{\max}$ paths, then we have

$$|\mathcal{P}| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{P}^*| - h|M|(\ell_{\max} + 2)}{2\Delta_h} \geq \frac{2h\ell_{\max}}{2\Delta_h}|M| = \frac{h\ell_{\max}}{\Delta_h}|M|.$$

The algorithm augments M by using the augmenting paths in \mathcal{P} at the end of the phase. Hence, the size of M is increased by a factor of $(1 + \frac{h\ell_{\max}}{\Delta_h})$ at the end of this phase. This completes the proof. \square

The above lemma shows that each phase increases the size of M by a factor, and the factor is exactly the same as the one proven in [\[67\]](#)'s original paper despite the presence of contaminated arcs. (Intuitively, this is because the analysis in [\[67\]](#) is not tight, and the number of contaminated arcs is so small that its effect fits into the slack of the analysis.) By the analysis in [\[67\]](#), the algorithm still outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation after the chosen number of scales and phases.